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Abstract

This study examines the northern branch of the Dacre family – the Dacres of Gilsland. The west march of England towards Scotland, on the Anglo-Scottish borders, is the focal point of this thesis, as this contained the powerbase of the northern Dacre lordship. This work evaluates how and why the Dacres were utilised by the Tudor government. As demonstrated by previous research, especially that of Steven Ellis, the Dacres were favoured at times by Tudor government, at other times they found themselves out of favour or even in severe difficulty with the crown. The aim of this thesis is to continue the existing research and put it into a wider and later context.

In addition, this text examines the effectiveness of government on the Anglo-Scottish border. This thesis wishes to re-evaluate various theories about central government control, especially descriptions of the consolidation of crown power, at the peripheries of the Tudor state. This study focuses mainly on the reign of Elizabeth I, especially the early part of her reign, up to c. 1570. It was at this time that two very important events in the north of England occurred: The Rebellion of the Northern Earls and The Rising of Leonard Dacre. These uprisings were to have a significant effect on the power of the noble houses of the Percies, the Nevilles and on the Dacres.

Much research has been carried out on the rebellion of Neville and Percy, but Leonard Dacre’s rising has not been studied in its own right before. It is, in general, described as something of an episode of the Northern Earls’ earlier rising. However, this thesis will show that Leonard Dacre’s Rising can be separated from the Rebellion of 1569. It had different causes and a different outcome. It was, after all, the largest engagement on English soil of the Elizabethan period, and for this reason alone, it is worthy of further research. Firstly, a narrative account of the Northern Dacre family during the Tudor period is provided in order that the Dacres can be put into their correct historical context.
The text incorporates the following abbreviations:

- BL = British Library.
- Border Papers = The border papers; calendar of letters and papers relating to the affairs of the borders of England and Scotland 1560-1603.
- CPR = Calendar of the Patent Rolls.
- CSP = Calendar of State Papers.
- CSP Scotland, Mary Queen of Scots = Calendar of State Papers relating to Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots 1547-1603.
- CSP Spanish = Calendar of letters and state papers relating to English affairs Preserved principally in the Archives of Simancas.
- HMC Salisbury MS = Historical Manuscripts Commission Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. The Marquis of Salisbury, K.G. preserved at Hatfield House Hertfordshire.
- L & P Henry VIII = Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII.
- LPL = Lambeth Palace Library.
- Murdin = A Collection of State Papers Relating to Affairs in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth from the year 1571-1596 transcribed from Original Papers and other Authentic Manuscripts never before published left by William Cecill Lord Burghley and Reposited in the Library at Hatfield.
- Sadler Papers = The State Papers and Letters of Sir Ralph Sadler, Knight Banneret.
- TNA = The National Archives, Kew.
Chapter One: Introduction.

The main objective of this thesis was to re-evaluate the role of Leonard Dacre in governance and to discuss the causes of his rebellion of 1570. Since the inception of the project the work has evolved. The title required changing; the overall aims of the thesis changed slightly. The main change in the thesis has been a shift in focus towards William, 3rd Baron Dacre of Gilsland, and his relationship with the crown. Sources specific to Leonard Dacre are rare: unfortunately, it looks like many aspects of his character will remain hidden from the historian forever. In comparison, sources describing William Lord Dacre and his relationship with the crown are relatively abundant, as is often the case for higher ranked crown servants. There have been other significant changes to the original aims of this thesis. In a similar vein to Steven Ellis’ work of some years previously, Tudor Frontiers and Noble Power, an original aim of this thesis was to discuss the governance of the peripheries at the Tudor state in England and Ireland. Unfortunately, a shortage of time prompted a change to that objective, although that will be something for a future project. The thesis now concentrates on England with occasional allusions to events in Ireland, where pertinent.

Mainly due to the nature of the available primary source material, the thesis now focuses on the governance of the north of England and how the Dacres were utilised in order to govern the area effectively. In addition, this text analyses the changing relationship between the Dacres and the Tudor regime. Ellis has carried out extensive research on the relationship between Henry VII and Henry VIII and Thomas and William Dacre, respectively 2nd and 3rd Baron Dacre of Gilsland. Therefore, the approach of this thesis is to offer a new narrative that

1 See below, esp., pp. 28-94, 111-43.
2 See below, esp., pp. 54, 79-80, 106-107, 185-199. In general, Tudor attitudes towards the nobility of Ireland and those of England should not be treated separately. They are all nobles of the same state. This view was also advocated by a colleague at NUI, Galway: see Gerald Power, ‘The nobility of the English Pale in Tudor Ireland, 1496-1566’ (Ph. D. Thesis unpublished, Galway, 2008), p. 9 (this is also due to be published as a book shortly). For the original piece of research into this subject, see S. G. Ellis, Tudor Frontiers and Noble Power The Making of the British State (Oxford 1995), passim.
describes the Dacres and their fortunes throughout the reigns of Edward VI, Mary I and Elizabeth I. This should help to address the lack of monographic studies of individual noble families and contribute to “a sounder understanding of the nobility as a whole” in order to address a shortcoming commented on by G. W. Bernard.  

In addition to describing Dacre’s relationship with central government, the relationship between Dacre and members of the local community, especially other nobles, is discussed throughout the text. Notably, Dacre’s familial links are discussed. However, much space is devoted to examining his relationship with the crown servants who replaced him at various stages during the reigns of the Tudors. It would hardly come as a surprise to find that Dacre was ill-disposed towards local rivals who usurped his authority. This thesis examines how the feuding described by Hoyle in his work developed and continued throughout the reigns of the Tudors.  

On a theoretical level, and adding to general historical studies of the Tudor state, this study examines various ideas about Tudor government. One area covered by this thesis is how crown power was exercised at a local level in the far north of England. Elton’s theory about a Tudor revolution in government has been much debated, nevertheless, this research adds to his theory in regards to a consolidation of crown power at the peripheries of the state. This work does not engage with his theories about Thomas Cromwell and the significance of his constitutional reforms. However, a problem inherent in Elton’s argument is

---

Baron Dacre of Gilsland and seventh Baron Greystoke (1500–1563), in ODNB (Sept 2004); online edn. (Jan 2008); *idem*, ‘Dacre, Thomas, second Baron Dacre of Gilsland (1467–1525)’, in ODNB (Sept 2004); online edn. (Jan 2008); *idem*, ‘Frontiers and Power in the Early Tudor State’, *History Today* (April 1995), pp. 35-42.  
7 See note 6, above; Elton, *Policy and Police: the Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell* (Cambridge, 1972), passim; *idem*, ‘The Political Creed of Thomas Cromwell’,
evident from the fact that the Dacres held more power locally than the crown servants whom were appointed to replace them at various stages throughout the reigns of the Tudors. This problem is discussed in detail in the latter sections of this text.\(^8\)

The specific attention this thesis gives to the Dacre lordship allows certain theories to be tested against the reality “on the ground”. Much research has already been undertaken on the Dacres’ rise to power under the Yorkists, and of their fall from grace during the reign of Henry VIII.\(^9\) This has meant there has been little focus on the Dacres during the reigns of Edward and Mary. The Tudor experiment of using untried wardens on the Anglo-Scottish borders did not continue into the mid-Tudor period.\(^10\) In fact, as Bush has demonstrated, the Edwardian regime was surprisingly conservative in its treatment and employment of the nobility.\(^11\) This thesis will examine the role that the Dacres played during this period. However, perhaps more important than this, is to seek an explanation for the final removal of the Dacres from office under Elizabeth.

It is not really enough to follow Stone’s research where the nobility appear to have died out for various reasons, only to be replaced by the burgeoning gentle middle class. In this model, although one of the causes of the decline of noble power is crown intervention, the government seems to lack agency in their control of the aristocracy.\(^12\) However, in the case of the Dacres, it is apparent that their relationship with the crown was somewhat significant in relation to their position in society, and indeed, may have been a major factor in their eventual downfall.\(^13\) As for Mervyn James’ research, the rather unexplained inability of the northern nobility to adapt to perceived cultural and societal
change can be brought into question. In fact, James’ own research suggests that the Dacres did modify their behaviour at public occasions in order to come into line with crown expectations. He shows that some of the traditional regalia seem to have been omitted from the funeral of William 3rd Baron Dacre of Gilsland.\textsuperscript{14} In fact, it would seem that the Dacres could adapt to facilitate the wishes of Tudor government, as has been noted by Steven Ellis.\textsuperscript{15}

The previous research, as discussed above, has concentrated on political developments during the reign of Henry VIII, most notably the curtailment of the power of ‘overmighty’ subjects and their replacement by new crown appointed, lesser men.\textsuperscript{16} However, this thesis concentrates on the replacement of traditional crown servants by the Elizabethan government. Significant attention has been paid to the eventual downfall of the Dacres because of its wider implications for theories on Elizabethan governance. During the course of the research on the Dacres and the Elizabethan government, Leonard Dacre’s rising and role in local society is discussed and put into its correct context. That is not to say that this thesis ignores Henry VIII’s reign: it is always pertinent to have some contextual, background work to place later events into their correct historical context.\textsuperscript{17} Another slight change in relation to the overall research project was the incorporation of significant findings about the eventual fate of the remaining Dacres, after their fall from power. Although this part does not contain vast quantities of analytical or theoretical material, it should be of great interest to any historian wishing to study the North or the Dacres in general.\textsuperscript{18}

\textit{The Sources in general.}

In this section, some of the shortcomings of the extant source material are discussed. There are many problems inherent in studying the Dacres. The main one is lack of source material: there are no secondary sources describing west


\textsuperscript{15} Ellis, \textit{Tudor Frontiers}, esp. pp. 146-70


\textsuperscript{17} See below, pp. 21-50, 201-17.

\textsuperscript{18} See below, pp. 180-4.
march society, or analysing the Dacres after the reign of Henry VIII, in any major detail. There are surveys and general studies of Tudor governance: where these offer any crumbs of detail on the Dacres it is generally scanty and is evaluated below. There are also more specific studies, generally in the form of articles but sometimes incorporated into collections or books, usually focusing on one aspect of society or facet of governance, that touch upon areas that are pertinent to the Dacre rule of the west march. An attempt is made to evaluate the usefulness of these sources below. Often inherent within these discourses is the unsuitable historical perception of noble families such as the Dacres and, as a wider element of this, the generally poor perception of the north of England and especially the Anglo-Scottish borders. Even in Elton’s work, the north requires bringing “into line with the more advanced south.” Often the west march is considered the worst part of a bad area; one would expect life there to be nasty, brutish and short, if some depictions of the area are anything to go by.

This, of course, has had a detrimental effect on historical descriptions of the Dacres. John Guy, has described the Dacres as feudal anachronisms – a throwback to medieval robber barons – which is a view that Steven Ellis has challenged successfully. At worst, the Dacres have been viewed as notoriously backward in religion and as unreformed troublemakers and breakers of the peace. Continuously plotting against Henry, Edward or Elizabeth’s erstwhile crown servants the Dacres have been seen as traitors, always ready to fight for

---

19 See below, pp. 14-20.
20 Ibid.
the Roman Catholic cause. Conversely, of course, they were completely compatible in religious outlook to the Marian regime. Unfortunately, this gained the Dacres a poor reputation amongst the advocates of a reformed church. Their letters survive in most cases, as these people often had the most influence, or held positions of authority, with the Elizabethan regime. This has led to problems for the historian.

There are challenges facing the historian in interpreting the surviving sources. Each source has its own bias reflecting either the thoughts of the editor or the contemporary author of the source. Inevitably, the calendered sources are only those that have survived in part or in whole. The vital aspects of some sources may no longer be extant. Some surviving primary sources may be unreadable due to the ravages of time or damage. This is especially true of some of the manuscript material held in the Special Collections reading room of the National Archives, Kew. In this respect, there is also a particular problem of studying the Dacres during the Elizabethan period. Followers of Leonard Dacre were intent on removing evidence of the Dacre estates from the servants of the Duke of Norfolk. They broke up and destroyed chests of manuscripts, including Dacre deeds and rentals. There is also a suggestion that the Earl of Sussex and the Duke of Norfolk conspired to destroy evidence of the Dacre estates that would not help their cause. This fact was uncovered by later investigations into the murkier dealings of the Council of the North.

---


28 For example, nearly the entire collection of William Cecil’s papers have been calendared and are published. Most are extant in manuscript form: see *HMC Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. The Marquis of Salisbury, K.G, preserved at Hatfield House Hertfordshire*. The same can be said of the Papers of Sir Robert Bowes, which form most of Sir Cuthbert Sharpe’s, *Memorials of the Rebellion of 1569* (London, 1840), and Mary Ann Everett Green (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series of the Reign of Elizabeth, Addenda, 1566-1579*. There are also two volumes of the papers of Sir Ralph Sadler, calendared as, Arthur Clifford (ed.), *The State Papers and Letters of Sir Ralph Sadler, Knight Banneret*, 2 vols. The most cursory glance at the viewpoints of Cecil, Bowes and Sadler makes it clear that these manuscript sources do not paint the Dacres in a positive light.

29 *HMC Salisbury MS*, vol. 1, pp. 455-6.

30 See British Library Harleian MSS 6996 art. 55 f. 107. See also Reid, *The King’s Council*, p. 225.
Moreover, surviving documents are far more likely to be extant for the most powerful people or organisations of the day. These would be the various government offices, the embassies, the crown itself and, perhaps, archives from noble or gentry households. These manuscript documents are therefore likely to contain a bias towards the thoughts and perceptions, even propaganda, of the ruling classes. In addition, these documents are likely to reflect on the great issues of the day but are unlikely to contain much evidence about the ordinary day-to-day subjects of the Elizabethan realm. Lesser gentry families, especially those from regions relatively distant from power, are unlikely to figure greatly in the official material which has survived through to this day. This leads to a specific problem of studying Leonard Dacre, who from 1566 became the main representative of the Dacre family.\footnote{See below, pp. 154-60.}

Inevitably, due to his eventual rising against the Elizabethan regime, any study of the Dacres during the late Tudor period would require an examination of the character and motives of Leonard Dacre. Leonard Dacre was never a lord or even, officially, a knight. He had a substantial income, however, which would have put him on a par with many of the gentry of the north and he was, of course, a member of a great household.\footnote{TNA E164/38/31-46 & 60-63; Susan E. Taylor, ‘The Crown and the North of England, 1559-70: a study of the rebellion of the Northern Earls, 1569-70, and its causes’ (Ph. D. thesis unpublished, Manchester, 1981), p. 107. The initial aftermath of Dacre’s rebellion saw the lands of the attainted surveyed by Homberstone. Leonard Dacre’s lands had an income per annum of £288, £259 after charges. However, this may not have been the full extent of Dacre’s income as attempts were made to uncover “concealed” lands, notably “Stainedale Hill” in Yorkshire as late as 32 Elizabeth: see TNA E178/2716. This amount would not include his payments from various offices such as money he would have received as Justice of the Peace for the North Riding of Yorkshire: see Calendar of Patent Rolls, Elizabeth I, 1563-1566, vol. III, no’s 112 & 119. For how this income would have compared with other northern gentry, see the discussion in: James, Family, Lineage & Civil Society: A Study of Society, Politics and Mentality in the Durham Region 1500–1640 (Oxford, 1974), pp. 30-5. See also Meikle, A British Frontier, p. 142; D. Newton, North-East England, p. 23.} The Dacres dominated Cumberland politics for much of the Tudor period. Leonard Dacre, however, was never officially recognised by the authorities as the head of his household. Therefore most of the correspondence from crown sources, which are the best extant records of Tudor England, are addressed to Leonard Dacre’s father, William 3rd Baron Dacre of...
Gilsland. William Lord Dacre had a most interesting life under the Tudors and was for a long period a crown representative as warden of the west march.\textsuperscript{33}

Therefore Leonard Dacre was a lesser man, a younger son of a noble family, and quite unlikely to have had a great many dealings with central authority. Nevertheless, this does not mean that Leonard Dacre has disappeared fully from the historical record. He held his own offices from the crown. He acted as deputy warden of the west march at a troublesome period and, therefore, had many dealings with the crown at this time.\textsuperscript{34} Dacre begins to appear more regularly in the Tudor manuscript sources throughout the wrangling over his inheritance. This is mainly because it was such a large inheritance and the other party in the case was the powerful and influential Duke of Norfolk.\textsuperscript{35} However, Dacre appears most often in the sources as the unruly, ungrateful subject, connected to rebellion and then his own ill-fated rising.\textsuperscript{36}

Contemporary accounts of Leonard Dacre are full of contradictory evidence. The chronicler, Camden mentions Leonard’s reaction to the loss of the Dacre inheritance stating, “he stomacked very much the loss of so goodly an inheritance”. That Camden was willing to chronicle an account of an inheritance case \textit{at all} shows just how significant an inheritance it must have been. Camden may have commented on the Dacre inheritance case as he realised its significance to Dacre’s later actions. He had no difficulty suggesting Dacre’s double-dealing with the rebellious earls and Elizabeth.\textsuperscript{37} However, conversely, Camden stated what a brave and capable leader Dacre was as he led his tenants and borderers into the field to engage the crown forces in battle.\textsuperscript{38} Camden does not openly state that Dacre was unjustified in his rebellion: in fact, by his choice of words, Camden may have implied that he did not believe that Dacre’s actions

\textsuperscript{34}APC, vol. 7, p.41.
\textsuperscript{35}See below, pp. 158-61.
\textsuperscript{36}See, for example, \textit{HMC Salisbury MS}, vol. 1, pp. 455-6.
\textsuperscript{37}William Camden, \textit{Annales Rerum Gestarum Angliae et Hiberniae Regnante Elizabetha}, or \textit{Annales the true and royall history of the famous empressse Elizabeth Queene of England France and Ireland &c. True faith's defendresse of diuine renouwne and happy memory. Wherein all such memorabe things as happened during hir blessed raigne ... are exactly described} (1625 edn.), p. 136.
\textsuperscript{38}Camden, \textit{Annales}, p. 137.
were entirely unjustified. Perhaps he thought that the Dacres had not been treated fairly by the Elizabethan regime.

Raphael Holinshed, another contemporary chronicler, also described Dacre and his forces’ fighting abilities, stating that there were many losses on both sides. He also recounted the loyalties many felt to the Dacres. In addition, Holinshed stated that many women fought for Leonard Dacre, which seems a little unusual. 39 The contemporary accounts of Hunsdon also confirm Leonard Dacre’s capable and brave leadership. Baker seems to reinforce this outlook in his chronicle history. 40 Certainly, there may have been an element of Pease’s “Malleus Scottorum” about their depictions. 41 As has been shown in various works, the Dacre name was connected with various martial deeds against England’s old enemy, the Scots. 42 Unfortunately, it was also linked to treason and malpractice on more than one occasion. 43 Nevertheless, contemporary descriptions of Dacre as valiant, brave and capable are odd depictions of a Tudor rebel. Usually rebels were described as weak or rash. This is evident in the case of the Earl of Northumberland, who was portrayed as being led by a woman’s scorn and evil counsel. 44 The Earl of Essex was portrayed as overly proud, even vain and foolish in the motives for his later actions against the Elizabethan regime. Essex was often described as a coward for his desertion of Ireland. 45 Perhaps, Camden, Holinshed, Hunsdon and Baker were suggesting that not all was wrong with the motives of Leonard Dacre for his actions. For

39 For a discussion of the role of women in protest in early modern England, including a discussion of women’s involvement in the Rebellion of the Northern Earls: see Margaret Keenan, ‘Women and politics in England, 1558-1625: Patronage, petition and protest’ (Ph.D. thesis, Tulane University, Louisiana, United States, 2000); Raphael Holinshed, The Third volume of Chronicles, beginning at duke William the Norman, commomlie called the Conqueror; and descending by degrees of yeeres to all the kings and queenes of England in their orderlie successions, p. 1213. For a possible explanation, see Sharpe, Memorials, p. 222.
40 For Hunsdson’s description, see TNA SP15/17 f. 113; TNA SP15/17 f. 108. For Richard Baker’s, see A Chronicle of the Kings of England from the time of the Romans government unto the death of King James, p. 343-4.
42 For the most up to date account of the wars between England and Scotland and much on the Dacres’ role in them: see John Sadler, Border Fury England and Scotland at War 1296-1568 (Harlow, 2006), passim.
43 See below, pp. 26-34.
44 For “evil counsel”, see TNA SP/15/14 f. 104; TNA SP14/21 f. 7. For Northumberland’s uncertainty and “fear”, see TNA SP15/15 f. 18. For how he was ashamed into action by the scorn of Lady Westmorland, see TNA SP15/21 f. 56.
45 Camden, Annales, pp. 555-6.
modern historians dealing with the actions of Leonard Dacre this appears to have created a problem.

Modern portrayals of Leonard Dacre are at best scanty. References to him are usually passing ones. In most modern accounts, Dacre is described along Hodgson’s lines as “a man of hasty and violent temper”.46 He is described as “the most headstrong and troublesome of the Catholic gentry in the north” by Neville Williams. However, this is not surprising as William’s work concentrates on the Duke of Norfolk.47 Norfolk himself described Dacre, rather richly in light of what happened later, as, “the undutifullest subject of England”: his views on the Dacres are clear.48 It is difficult to quantify exactly how headstrong, or violent of temper, a man was from the available manuscript sources. However, there may be some indications as to where this perception comes from which will be discussed during the course of this study.

Many descriptions of Dacre focus on his Roman Catholicism. Evidence for this emanates from erstwhile, reforming crown servants mainly: it cannot be taken at face value. He is, however, described by the French Ambassador Fenelon as, “millord Dacres du North, principal catholique du pays”, probably in order to elicit some kind of support.49 Professor Kesselring describes Dacre as, “a notorious harborer of priests”.50 The religious makeup of the region and the country as a whole may need to be taken into consideration before statements like this can really be backed up. Quotes from politique reforming Protestants are not likely to represent the notoriety, or otherwise, of keeping a priest at the early stages of the reign of Elizabeth.51 Dacre was associated with priests but it seems that priests serviced most of the gentry, and perhaps the general

---

47 N. Williams, Thomas Howard, p. 118.
49 Bertrand de Salignac de la Mothe Fenelon, Correspondance Diplomatique de Bertrand de Salignac de la Mothe Fénélon, Ambassadeur de France en Angleterre de 1568 a 1575, p. 386.
50 K. J. Kesselring, The Northern Rebellion, p. 48.
51 See, for example, Sadler Papers, vol. I, p. 449. It seems that many modern historians’ accounts must have been influenced by descriptions like this: see below, pp. 117-28.
population, in large parts of the north. It is interesting how the works of Reformation historians such as Haigh and Duffy have changed previous assumptions on the religious makeup of the Tudor community. In addition to demonstrating the religious beliefs of the Dacres, Mary Bateson’s article on the religious inquiries of 1564 back up Haigh and Duffy’s conclusions.

There is one specific modern work dealing with the history of the Dacres, with the Dacre inheritance case and with Leonard Dacre’s failed rising. This is Thomas Lee’s, A History of the Barony of Dacre of Gillesland including extracts from Nichols’s “Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica” Showing how the Barony of Dacre of Gillesland fell into abeyance in 1569, through the mismanagement of the case of the lawful claimant with which are here included references to younger male branches and descendants of that once famous Cumbrian family recorded in history as the “Dacres of the North” whose numerous honours included that of the “Knighthood of the Garter,”, Etc.[Sic]. It is a short book written in the 1930s and published locally in Cheshire in 1936. At only 19 pages long, really, it is a biographical pamphlet. Lee’s referencing of primary sources leaves much to be desired and the book has the agenda of proving Lee and his wife’s claims to the ancient barony. However, the book is not totally useless nor, necessarily, that far-fetched. Unfortunately, it is biased but can still be a useful aid to the historian. It contains the only description of the funeral of Thomas, 4th Baron Dacre of Gilsland, which seems to be extant. In addition, Lee describes the legal battle between Leonard Dacre and the Duke of Norfolk more fully than most. A problem with this source is its availability; the only place where it is available for reading is the British Library at St. Pancras.

An invaluable publication for anyone studying the Rebellion of the Northern Earls and the Dacres is Sir Cuthbert Sharpe’s, Memorials of the Rebellion of 1569. This contains much printed contemporary material that, prior to its

52 See, for example, TNA SP15/14 f. 15; Mary Bateson (ed), ‘A Collection of Original letters from the Bishops to the Privy Council’, in Camden Miscellany, vol. 9 (1905), pp. 49-51.
publication, was unavailable to the average historian. This material now makes up much of the Bowes papers, which are available for viewing at the British Library. The text of the book consists of Sharpe’s transcriptions of these papers with little commentary. The main difficulty with taking these primary documents at face value is the bias inherent within them. Most of the documents in this collection come from crown sources or from those close to the Duke of Norfolk. Sharpe does little to discuss the possible bias in these sources. His is a work of transcribing documents, and as such is invaluable, but Sharpe makes little attempt to discuss the sources he transcribed. Sharpe refers to Leonard Dacre and his rising in an appendix to the main text, again possibly demonstrating that he was unsure whether or not Dacre’s rising could be seen as part of the earlier rebellion of 1569. This has become a theme common to all descriptions of Leonard Dacre’s rising.

Many of the modern studies that shed some light upon Leonard Dacre describe his rising as part of the Rebellion of the Northern Earls. Even in these studies, however, an interesting diversity of opinion occurs. The fullest and most scholarly study of the Rebellion of the Northern Earls is, probably, Sue Taylors’ unpublished thesis. However, in the course of her thesis Taylor describes Dacre’s rising in twenty pages, as a postscript to the main rebellion. Leonard Dacre does not figure prominently in Professor Kesselring’s recent book describing the Rebellion of the Northern Earls. Where Kesselring describes Dacre, he is portrayed as noted above. An earlier and famous account of the Rebellion of the Northern Earls by R.R. Reid, which is to be commended for bringing the Rebellion of the Northern Earls into the spotlight, also mentions little of Dacre’s rising. In the seminal work *Tudor Rebellions*, dealing specifically with rebellions in England, the Dacre rising is barely mentioned; it is covered in a couple of paragraphs. Mervyn James did much for the study of

---

58 Reid discusses Dacre’s motives for rising, however, his actual armed uprising is not described at all: see Reid, ‘The Rebellion of the Earls of 1569: The Alexander Prize, 1905’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, new series, 20 (1906), pp. 171-203.
northern history, but his view that Dacre’s rising resembles a “Scots border incursion” can be questioned; it will be discussed below.\textsuperscript{60}

Following on from these accounts, Dacre’s rising has been placed as a mere episode in the larger Rebellion of the Northern Earls. Nevertheless, the Rising of Leonard Dacre was the largest engagement on English soil of the Elizabethan period. However, Dacre’s rising has never been studied in its own right nor been placed firmly into a convincing historical perspective. That Dacre’s rising had totally different motives and a different character from other contemporary events has obviously caused a problem for historians. This will be discussed throughout the course of this thesis. These omissions or inclusions by modern historians are interesting. It has obviously been difficult for modern historians to decide exactly whether Leonard Dacre’s rising can be seen in the same light as the Rebellion of the Northern Earls or not. One of the main objectives of this thesis is to examine whether or not Dacre’s actions can be separated from those of the northern earls.

\textsuperscript{60} See James, Society, Politics & Culture, p. 302, especially the notes.
General Historiography

This study of the Dacres touches upon many fields of historical research. At its most basic level the narrative offered here charts the fortunes of an individual noble family and, as noted, aims to redress the lack of studies of individual peerage families noted by Bernard.\(^{61}\) However, studies of such a notable northern family also touch upon regional issues. The Dacres were crown servants on the Anglo-Scottish borders and, therefore, this research touches upon studies made of this peripheral part of the English state.\(^{62}\) The Dacres were, of course, a vital part of northern society, especially on the west march in Cumberland and Westmorland. Works touching upon northern society and especially those dealing with the western marches are discussed here. As the Dacres also had several dealings with the crown, some rather more successful than others, this study necessarily deals with several aspects regarding the governance of the Tudor state. In particular, the Dacres served the crown for long periods as Wardens of the Western Marches towards Scotland; therefore works dealing with this crown office are of considerable interest. In this section relevant works to these various fields are examined and described in order to show how these can assist in the research of the history of the northern branch of the Dacre family.

In general, surveys of the reign of Elizabeth or of the Tudors, add little to the historical descriptions of the Dacres. Wallace MacCaffrey discusses, at some length, the events surrounding what he describes as “The Revolt of the Earls” in his study of the earlier part of the reign of Elizabeth I.\(^{63}\) MacCaffrey necessarily concentrates on far wider issues than Dacre’s rising. This study places Dacre firmly as a Roman Catholic dissident more bent on the restoration of the faith and the traditional order of the North than on regaining his own inheritance. Dacre’s attendance at court when the Rebellion of the Earls broke out is

---


described as a fateful event that seriously hindered the Earls’ hopes of success. MacCaffrey does, however, deem the Dacre inheritance case worthy of a mention but does not link it to Dacre’s actions, preferring to see them as part of a far wider conspiracy, or leaving it up to the reader to do that for themselves.

This work focuses specifically on the international plotting, of which Dacre was undoubtedly a part, although how much so is open to question. In his other work on the reign of Elizabeth, *Elizabeth I*, MacCaffrey follows largely the same lines but discusses more vividly the rather exciting episode of Dacre’s supposed attempt to free Mary Queen of Scots.

Works on the formation of the British Isles necessarily include sections on the incorporation of the more outlying parts of the realm into the core – the centralisation and uniformity of the Elizabethan regime. Since the Dacre lands involved much wrangling with the crown and the relationship between the Dacres and the Tudor sovereigns were often strained, these works have integral significance to studies of the Dacres. It is necessary to consider the crown’s attitude towards the Dacres and their strategically placed lands in order to understand Dacre’s motives for rising more fully. Later works by Ellis and Braddick have superseded earlier state formation works by Rowse. Braddick approaches his study of the formation of the state largely from a socio-political historical outlook and concentrates on the variety of offices and the emergence of various offices, posts and crown servants in his work. Therefore, Braddick has little to say about the Dacres specifically. Steven Ellis has written much interesting material relating to the North, and specifically the Dacre’s, in his state formation works. However, Ellis has not covered, for obvious reasons, the entire later history of the Dacres; his work concentrates on state integration and formation and has a wider, more general, remit.
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64 Ibid., p. 228.
65 Ibid., p. 215.
Ellis’ earlier work, *Tudor Frontiers and Noble Power*, which compares the Dacres and the Kildares and demonstrates similarities in the policies the government employed towards the two provide a starting point for this thesis. It is not the intention of this thesis to cover the same ground as Ellis, although earlier historiography, dealing with the period previous to the reign of Elizabeth and Dacre’s rising, will necessarily be explored to put the Dacres into their correct context. However, some of the main points of Ellis’ theory of common Henrician policies of state interaction with the peripheries can be examined and compared with later Elizabethan policies. It may be possible to demonstrate that the Elizabethan regime had a common view of the peripheries of the state, such as the northern border with Scotland and outside the Pale in Ireland, and employed similar policies to incorporate these areas more closely into the core of the realm.

One of the earlier attempts to look at government policies towards the North of England and engaging specifically with the governance of the west march is M.L. Bush’s article “The Problem of the Far North and the Crisis of 1537”. Bush describes a crisis in governance during the reign of Henry VIII at the northern borders, mainly stemming from the inability of the regime to impose crown control on feuding, “over-mighty” subjects. This article has been superseded and incorporated into Hoyle’s work on a similar subject, which concentrates more on the poor personal relations between some border magnates (especially the Dacres, Cliffords and Whartons) and the steps taken to reconcile their feuding ways. More recently, William Palmer engaged, once again, in the debate surrounding the appointment of officials to border office; specifically he engaged somewhat with the west march and the Dacres. However, his theory that appointments to this office were linked intrinsically to government foreign policy can be questioned.
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71 Ellis, *Tudor Frontiers*, pp. 18-77.  
Military historian Mark Charles Fissel has a section dealing with the suppression of the Northern Rebellion in his work on English warfare. He describes some interesting aspects of the rebellion of the northern earls. In *English Warfare*, Fissel tends to look at battles from a strategic, especially logistic, viewpoint. There are shortcomings, however, in Fissel’s description of Dacre’s rising. He describes Leonard Dacre as “Lord Dacre” on more than one occasion. Dacre, however, was not officially a lord in the English sense, no matter how complicated his identity may have been. Fissell also misses the opportunity to discuss the quite illuminating glimpse of tactics offered by contemporary descriptions of the battle. Camden states that Dacre arrayed his forces in a triangular battle formation flanked by cavalry. Hunsdon and Forster also allude to the composition, deployment and strategy of their forces in their accounts of the battle. It would seem that a book dealing with English warfare would find these facts worthy of discussion.

Some more recent research into the emergence of a different regional identity apparent in the extreme north of England at this time has been undertaken. Bush and Hoyle have examined the unusual status of tenants in the border region with each reaching different conclusions. Without the relevant rental books, agreements or contracts, many of which may have been informal rather than written down, it will perhaps never be possible to discern what the exact status of most of Dacre’s tenants was, or indeed to describe the status of many of the border inhabitants. Although not of direct relevance to this thesis, this is of some relevance to studies of the Dacres as it is interesting that they seem to have maintained the loyalty of their tenants throughout the Tudor period.
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76 Ibid., pp. 133, 372.
77 Camden, *Annales*, p. 137; TNA SP 15/17 ff. 239, 245, 251, 253. See also below, pp. 177-80.
79 James, *Society, Politics & Culture*, pp. 270-307. See also below, pp. 92, 156, 169-72.
Newton and Meikle have undertaken much research into northern and border identity. Both Newton’s and Meikle’s work build on the earlier studies of James and his research on northern identity and culture. Although the research of Meikle and Newton focuses on the northeastern part of England, the work of both historians can be useful in demonstrating the different cultural and societal values of the people in the north at this time. Meikle’s work suggests that the border inhabitants of both England and Scotland shared a common identity as borderers. This may be a hard position to defend, as it is clear that there was a clear demarcation between Scotland and England as sovereign states at this time. Scottish and English people both had separate identities as either Scottish or English subjects, rather than a shared identity as “borderers”, although as the outward appearance and customs of the two would be broadly similar there is a valid aspect to this premise.

More pertinently to this work, Ralph Robson has carried out extensive research into the background, emergence and identities of the border surnames: these kin-groups, made up of various graynes, felt no particular allegiance to either state. Within Robson’s work, there are also many references to the various keepers of the liberties of Tynedale and Redesdale. The Dacres held these offices at various times throughout the Tudor period. However, Robson does not engage with specific research into the Dacres in depth: his work concentrates on the “English highland clans”. In addition, in a work dealing with local society, Henry Summerson has written a very detailed survey and narrative study of medieval Carlisle and, what he describes as, the borders. The book is strong in research relating to Carlisle itself and therefore contains much interesting detail about the Dacres and their servants. However, the book is weaker on the border region. This is not surprising as Carlisle the City would have far more available manuscript material than an outlying border area. Unfortunately, for studies of
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80 See James, Society, Politics & Culture, esp. ch. 3; D. Newton, North-East England, passim; Miekle, A British Frontier, passim.
82 Ibid., p. 3.
84 Henry Summerson, Medieval Carlisle: The City and the Borders from the Late Eleventh to the Mid-Sixteenth Century (Kendal, 1993), passim.
the Dacres, their powerbase was the borders themselves rather than the city; therefore, Summerson’s mentions of the Dacres are often passing ones. There is literally no information given about Leonard Dacre’s rising except to say how one Carlisle resident may have been implicated in it.\textsuperscript{85} Again, this is an ample demonstration of the lack of material on the subject.

Marcombe has undertaken much research into regional identity, once again concentrating on the religious identity of a particular region in his collection of essays on the Bishopric of Durham, \textit{The Last Principality}. This book provides invaluable information on contemporary religion and society in Durham. However, the Dacres are seldom mentioned. The Palatinate was not really a major source of income or power for them. A chapter in the book deals with the local community of Durham and their involvement in the 1569 rebellion. The religious and economic factors that motivated local people to rebel are explored. However, Dacre’s rising is not discussed as Leonard Dacre had little connection with the Durham community.\textsuperscript{86} S.J Watts concentrates on a rather later period (1586-1625) in a book that falls into the category of regional studies concentrating on the society of Northumberland during this period.\textsuperscript{87} Although these books give some overview of society in the north and of regional developments and are useful as contextual guides to more general developments in the north of England, neither can help to decipher the drastic changes in crown policy towards governing the west march during the Elizabethan period.

The examples above highlight a general shortcoming from the point of view of anyone studying the Dacres: there is no study of the west march of England. Although Tough’s study of the latter days of the borders adds to Pease’s valiant but incomplete earlier attempt, a comprehensive list of wardens is not available

\textsuperscript{85} Ibid., p. 655.
\textsuperscript{87} S. J. Watts & Susan Watts, \textit{From Border to Middle Shire Northumberland 1580-1625} (Leicester, 1975), passim.
for the west march. As genealogies of the Dacres from this period are also incomplete, there is a wide gap in our knowledge of the north-west parts of England at this time. Presumably, due to the predominance of cities such as Newcastle, most studies except for Summerson’s, noted above, concentrate on the north-east of England rather than the north-west. Therefore, there is a lack of material describing the north-west of England and the Dacres in general. The office of warden has not been discussed in any great detail for some time.

Even studies of individual noble families are not as common as would seem to be relevant for a class of people who clearly held much power within the Tudor state. As Steven Ellis has noted previously, the Dacres would get into the “top ten” of the richest of the Tudor nobility and are therefore probably deserving of a monographic study of their fortunes during the Tudor period. This study aims to address these shortcomings. Firstly, this work describes the Dacres’ early rise to power on the western marches towards Scotland before describing the fluctuating relationship between the Dacres and the Tudor government. In the latter sections, this text focuses on the fortunes of the Dacres and the Elizabethan government, culminating in Leonard Dacre’s rising of 1570. Rather than treating this rising as merely an episode of the Rebellion of the Northern Earls, this rising is treated as a separate event with different causes, which are illustrated and discussed throughout the course of this narrative.

---

Chapter Two: The Power of the Red Bull*: the Early Tudor context.

Origins

It has been suggested that the name Dacre derived from D’acre (of Acre) and related to the crusading knights who famously took the City. However, Bede mentioned the stream Dacore and a monastery of the same name that existed nearby at the turn of the seventh century. This site being near the future Dacre powerbase in Cumberland probably accounts for the rise of a noble family of the same name. Unfortunately, we cannot know the original status of the Dacres in the area. It is possible that the Dacre’s originate from a powerful monastic family: demarcations between monasticism and nobility were blurred during the medieval period as can be demonstrated from the careers and writing of men such as Gregory of Tours and Bede.

The history of the Dacre family is littered with legal cases, judgements and marriages, as are many noble family histories. This thesis is interested chiefly in the Dacres of the North so this will be the starting point. Originally, there had only been one lord Dacre but the lands and title were split between two branches of the family in 1459. The northern Dacre estates centered on the Manor of Multon in the Barony of Gilsland adjacent to the Scottish border in Cumberland, the

---

*The Dacres were often known as the Red Bulls. The Red Bull was the traditional battle-cry of the Dacres. The Dacre standard was made up of three Scallop shells, but was known commonly as the ‘Red Bull’ standard. Thomas Lord Dacre (d.1525) commissioned a great carving of a Red Bull to adorn the ancestral seat of the Dacres, Naworth Castle. This animal makes up one of the large wooden carvings known as ‘the Dacre Beasts’ which are exhibited in the Victoria & Albert museum. Hunsdon describes the taking of the Red Bull badge upon the defeat of Leonard Dacre in 1570: see TNA SP 15/17 ff.251-2. See also http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O48839/figure-the-dacre-bull/ Accessed on 1 Sep 2011.

2 See *Victoria County History* Cumberland, p. 5
4 The title Dacre was split between the Dacres of the North and the Dacres of the South. The peerage title Dacre can be traced back to the early 12th Century: see Cockayne, *Complete Peerage*, vol. 4, pp. 1-26.
Southern Dacre estates centered on the Barony of Vaux in Surrey.\(^5\) From then onwards a Lord Dacre of the South was to sit alongside a Lord Dacre of the North within the House of Lords. The founder of the northern branch of the Dacre family was Randolph, Lord Dacre of Gilsland. Randolph was killed at the battle of Towton in 1461 and was attainted posthumously, as was his surviving, younger brother Humphrey, for choosing to fight on the behalf of King Henry VI.\(^6\) Humphrey, however, maintained a good relationship with Edward IV and the crown reversed his attainder in 1473. Humphrey became the first official Baron Dacre of Gilsland at this time, as the heir male. Richard Fiennes, as the heir general, kept the original title and seat in parliament (as Dacre of the South) that Thomas Dacre, his wife Joan’s father, had occupied. This created the two distinct Dacre family lines – the Southern and the Northern.\(^7\) The Act of Parliament that created the Barony of Gilsland and the northern Dacre lordly title entailed the Barony through the male line. Humphrey was awarded the Barony of Gilsland along with the manor of Halton. He was safe in the knowledge that he could pass on his lands and title to his eldest son, or next male relative.\(^8\)

The crown considered Humphrey important enough to be present at the Coronation of Richard III in 1483.\(^9\) By the latter stages of the 15\(^{th}\) century the Dacres had firmly established a northern barony in Cumberland, with considerable estates, mainly at Gilsland. These lands were on the Scottish border and adjacent to the liberties of Liddesdale and Tynedale. These were areas notorious for their border reivers.\(^10\) This area was of strategic importance to the defence of England from incursions from the Scottish, or from those using Scotland as a base to invade England. Thus, the crown always had at least some interest in the estates and the holders of these lands. It is clear from Bowes and Ellerker’s surveys, printed in detail in Hodgson’s History of Northumberland, that it was extremely easy for border hamlets to fall into decay due to war and lack of refuge for the
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\(^5\) Ibid. Roughly, today near Vauxhall in London. This was well outside the city during the Tudor period.

\(^6\) Cockayne, Complete Peerage, vol. 4, p. 8.

\(^7\) For the full text of proceedings, see TNA SC8/29/1440.

\(^8\) Ibid.; TNA E174/5.

\(^9\) BL Add. MS. 45716 A. ff. 72b-78; Cockayne, Complete Peerage, vol. 4, p.19.

\(^10\) Robson, Rise & Fall of English Highland Clans, pp. 72-4.
inhabitants. The northern branch of the Dacre family did not have lands further south at this time to augment their income should war or reiving have reduced the value of their estates. The crown appointed Humphrey to posts as keeper of Carlisle and Warden of the West March in 1484. The government considered that those with a vested interest in the defence of the lands would be suitable candidates for the job. The wages he received for this are not clear but it seems likely that the rates were inferior to medieval wages.

It was Thomas, 2nd Baron Dacre of the North, the eldest son of Humphrey, who cemented the family’s pre-eminent position in Cumberland. Born in 1467, he brought the Greystoke inheritance into the family by abducting and marrying the king’s ward, Elizabeth Greystoke (heiress to the Baronies of Greystoke and Wem), in 1487. Although forced to pay a recognisance for his actions he eventually managed to bring the considerable lands of the Barony of Greystoke and Wem into the family. Carefully watched, and occasionally restrained by Henry VII, Dacre’s titles were eventually recognised. This marriage brought some lands in Northumberland into the Dacre Lordship – the baronies of Morpeth and Henderskelf including the castles in both. More importantly, the award of Wem meant that the Dacres possessed lands much further south (in Salop/Shropshire) that would give them a necessary and relatively safe income that would be at their disposal regardless of the state of the borders. William, 3rd Baron Dacre of the North, added to the Dacre estates but the estates reached basically their full extent under Thomas, 2nd Baron Dacre of Gilsland.
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13 *CPR, Edward IV, Edward V, Richard III*, 1476-1485, pp. 485-6. The wages he received for this new position of Lieutenant, under the King as Lord Lieutenant of the marches, of the West March are not specified, however, earlier in the year Dacre had been awarded an annuity of 100 marks from “the issues of the County in Cumberland”. Although this payment seemed to reflect Dacre’s position as Sheriff there may be some connection to his office in the Marches: see Ibid., p. 388; *Cal. Doc. Scotland*, vol. 4, no. 1507, p. 309.
14 *Inquisition Post Mortem*, TNA C140/12 no. 162.
16 See ibid., pp.1-2; Ellis, *Tudor Frontiers*, pp. 84-90; TNA SP1/1 f. 71.
The Dacres became major landholders in Cumberland. In fact, with this amount of land and income, especially taking the southern estates into consideration, the Dacres were one of the major landholders within the Tudor state.\textsuperscript{18} The lands on the borders made the Dacres the ideal choice for border wardens, whilst the lands further south gave the Dacres an income safe from the vagaries of the relationship between the states of England and Scotland. However, much of the carving out of the original lordship had been dependent on the relationship between the Dacres and the crown. The Dacres were not the medieval robber barons that Guy has described them as; rather they took their opportunities to further their own interest as any noble family, with concern for their future prosperity, would.\textsuperscript{19} In the following sections this study examines the fluctuating nature of the relationship between the Dacres and the crown in order to chart their fortunes throughout the early Tudor period.

\textit{The Dacres and Early Tudor Government}

Steven Ellis has undertaken much research on the earlier Dacres and has done much to place them firmly back within the elite of the Tudor nobility. As Steven Ellis notes when Thomas 2\textsuperscript{nd} Baron Dacre of Gilsland died in 1525 he was in receipt of an annual income of more than £1500, making him one of the wealthiest peers of the realm.\textsuperscript{20} Ellis takes the history of the Dacres up to and including the crisis years of 1534 and the Dacre treason case. When land acquisitions, loyal tenants and sometime monopoly of the important post of warden of the west march in the area up to this time are taken into consideration it seems that the Dacres dominated Cumberland politics.\textsuperscript{21} In the following section the fortunes of the family throughout this period are examined in order to describe the extent of the Dacre family’s power within the region and their relationship with the early Tudor government.

\textsuperscript{18} Ellis, \textit{Tudor Frontiers}, pp. 105-6.
\textsuperscript{20} Ellis, \textit{Tudor Frontiers}, p. 106; \textit{idem}, ‘Dacre, Thomas, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Baron’, pp. 1-5.
\textsuperscript{21} For the status of the Dacres up to and including the 1534-1535 “crisis” years, see Ellis, \textit{Tudor Frontiers, passim}. 

Leonard Dacre was born around 1522, at possibly the zenith of Dacre power. Initially, his Grandfather, Thomas 2nd Baron Dacre of Gilsland – a martial man – was highly trusted by the Henrician regime. Henry VIII appointed Thomas Lord Dacre to the post of Lord Warden of all three marches in 1510 after he had held the post of warden of the west march during the reign of Henry VII. Described by Pease as a “Malleus Scotorum”, rather famously Thomas Lord Dacre commanded the English reserve at the victory of Flodden in 1513. Leonard, however, his Grandson, had not yet been born, although it is likely that he heard later tales of his Grandfather’s military prowess. Leonard was also too young to remember his Grandfather’s downfall in 1525 for the maladministration of his office as warden of the marches. Dacre was even committed to the Fleet prison for a period. It is not likely that the family reflected long on this episode of Thomas, Lord Dacre’s life, probably preferring to concentrate on his martial exploits against the Scots.

Thomas Lord Dacre was not only the old warrior on horseback and scourge of the Scots that he has sometimes been depicted as. He had a nuanced approach to lordship. In addition to administering his border estates for good defence, he had a hand in urban government and development as well. It is not surprising to find the Dacres intrinsically involved with the evolution of the City of Carlisle as this would be the symbolic and administrative heart of Cumberland, the home county of the Dacres. What is more surprising is that Dacre did not restrict himself to bettering his own locale but also that of the town of Morpeth in Northumberland. Lord Dacre may well have had many reasons to wish to increase his standing in Northumberland. However, previous accounts of the Dacres have failed to show
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22 I have posited this as an approximate date for the birth of Leonard Dacre. This has been done using the record from the Chancery Court TNA C1/1068/56 from 1541 in conjunction with Lord William Howard’s account of the Strangways inheritance: see Lord William Howard pp. 387-389, and in view of Henry VIII’s private act of 1544: see House of Lords, Parliamentary Archives, Private Act, 35 Henry VII, c.24. HL/PO/PB/1/1543/35H8n24. Cf. APC, vol. 7, p. 40 which mentions Leonard Dacre’s, “coming to terme”, which would seem to be incorrect.

23 Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, p.150; idem, ‘Dacre, Thomas, 2nd Baron’, pp. 1-2.

24 Pease, The Lord Wardens, p. 208. For a contemporary account of Dacre’s actions at Flodden, see L&P Henry VIII, vol. 1, p. 668, no. 4441. See also Ellis, ‘Dacre, Thomas, 2nd Baron’, p. 3.

25 Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, p. 163. For a list of complaints and charges levied against Thomas, Lord Dacre and his administration of justice in the Marches, see Hodgson, History of Northumberland pt. 3, vol. 1, pp. 30-40. It is not actually clear how long Dacre was detained in the Fleet: see Guy, The Cardinal’s Court, pp. 122-3.


27 See Summerson, Medieval Carlisle, pp. 466-501.
their part in placing Morpeth at the heart of the administration of Northumberland.\textsuperscript{28}

In the barony of Morpeth the Dacres did much to ingratiate themselves with the middling sort. Perhaps, this was in order to avoid the type of complaints from the Northumberland gentry that put Thomas, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Baron Dacre, in front of Wolsey in 1525.\textsuperscript{29} The Dacres wished to expand their sphere of influence as any ambitious nobles would. The Dacre powerbase was always strong on the west march as shown above: if they could attract a number of followers in the middle and east marches they could build a stronger power base there. This might have enhanced their suitability as border wardens or, at least, garnered greater local assistance and cooperation, making the carrying out of their duties there much easier. Although Thomas Lord Dacre was reluctant to do the job, he served as warden of all three marches for a considerable period throughout the 1510s and up to the mid-1520s.\textsuperscript{30} Clearly, Thomas Lord Dacre did not think the Northumberland gentry were very active in defending their own march. In 1524, he wrote to John Bulmer, complaining that, “the country would not rise and attend him in their own defence considering what the King has spent in defending them during the war”.\textsuperscript{31} It seems that Dacre had considerable difficulty in motivating the Northumberland men to carry out their duty to defend the realm.\textsuperscript{32}

Nevertheless, the Dacres developed their Northumberland estates more than was previously thought. This would discredit Guy’s view of Dacre as being a particularly backward or archaic magnate or James’ view of Dacre as having been essentially a feudal border baron.\textsuperscript{33} In Morpeth in 1519, Thomas Lord Dacre

\textsuperscript{28} Previous studies have pointed out the lack of Dacre influence in Northumberland: see Ellis, \textit{Tudor Frontiers}, pp. 105-6. See also James, \textit{Society, Politics & Culture}, pp. 142-3.

\textsuperscript{29} For a description of these events, see Ellis, \textit{Tudor Frontiers}, p. 163; Hodgson, \textit{History of Northumberland}, pt. 3, vol. 1, pp. 30-40.

\textsuperscript{30} Ellis, \textit{Tudor Frontiers}, pp. 150-1.

\textsuperscript{31} See BL Additional MS 24965 f. 169; \textit{L&P Henry VIII}, vol. 4, pt. 1, no. 123, p. 49.

\textsuperscript{32} 3 Henry VIII cap. 3 (for the original statute, see 13 Edward I cap. 1). The Statute of Westminster had been re-issued in 1511, but, as always, was not adhered to rigidly: see David Grummitt, \textit{The Calais Garrison: war and military service in England, 1436-1558} (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2008), pp. 72-4. See also J. J. Goring, “The Military Obligation of the English People: 1511-1558” (Thesis unpublished, London, 1955), pp. 1-10.

\textsuperscript{33} Guy remarks on the fall from grace of Thomas 2\textsuperscript{nd} Baron Dacre calling it the “end of the age of the medieval robber baron”: see Guy, \textit{The Cardinal’s Court}, pp. 122-3. It is clear, however, that Thomas Lord Dacre was far from a medieval robber baron and had consistently developed his
incorporated several craft guilds into companies. The guilds were formed into
seven companies, as follows: the Merchant Tailors, the Tanners, the Fullers and
Dyers, the Smiths, the Cordwainers, the Weavers and the Butchers. Each company
then laid out different ordinances for each craft, full descriptions of which are not
really within the remit of this thesis. However, a theme common to all of the
ordinances of the crafts is that where a breach of the rules took place a “forfiet or
penaltie” (fine) was to be levied on the guilty party – one-half of which would go
to the craft guild or company concerned and half to the lord Dacre. It seems that
Dacre may have had some hand in the actual drafting of the rules in addition to
approving them. Using the instructions for the weavers as an illustrative example,
the list of ordinances defines breaches of the rules and the penalty to be imposed:

itm nae wever to use to worke any hempe or flocks mixt with woole of intente to
deceive the kings subjects thereby, but for every such faltz forfite 2s to levy as is
aforesaid

[no weaver was to work any hemp or flax, wool mixture with the intent to pass it
off as pure wool, and]

itm that noe man or woman inhabittinge within this said towne shall use or worke
of the occupation of weving either lynnen or other stowfe without agreement of
the said craft e to pay for the said agreement 20d. the one half to the lord the
other to the crafte soe agreed with all.

The Dacres must have received some income from this: presumably, misdemeanoirs were brought before the Dacre manorial court, which was held at
Morpeth regularly. It is not clear whether these ordinances did improve the
standing of the Dacres in the area or make Thomas Lord Dacre more popular in
Northumberland in general. It seems that there was an undercurrent of rivalry
between the Percies and the Dacres at this early stage. This may have been one
of the factors behind the complaints that came from the Northumberland gentry

lordship. It is also clear that the Dacre Lordship and other major border Lordships were not made
irrelevant by Wolsey’s innovations in government – they survived his downfall by several reigns.
See also James, Society, Politics and Culture, pp. 177-85.

34 Earlier, the text shows that one half of the fine would go to the lord (Dacre) the other half to the
craft guild or company concerned. For the full manuscript of the remaining ordinances: see

35 See Northumberland County Archives (Woodhorn), ref. SANT BEQ 28-1-10-002. For the full
remaining records of the guilds, see Northumberland Record Office ref. NRO 989

36 TNA SP 15/28/2 f. 10. See also below, p. 181.

37 Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, pp. 164-70.
against Dacre. It is also unlikely that much military power – in the shape of willing and armed serving men – was available to Dacre from Morpeth. The town was not that close to the border; it was on a main route north; it was more of a stopover point on the road to the far north and it was only small. However, it did produce a decent rental income. In 1540 it was described by Leland as “long and metely well bylded with lowe Howsys, the Stretes pavyd. It is far fayrar Towne then Alenwicke [Alnwick]”.

As regards the future development of the county, at various times Morpeth has been the administrative centre and county town of Northumberland, a thriving farmer’s market continues there to this day. The legacy of the Dacre incorporation of the guilds of Morpeth was, in fact, to live on for some time. Until the Municipal Corporations Act of 1835, the guilds or companies elected burgesses and sergeants as written down in Dacre’s ordinances. These men formed an oligarchy, for all intents and purposes forming the administration and the government of the town. It is quite surprising, considering the descriptions of Dacre weakness in Northumberland, to find the Dacres so intrinsically involved in the development of the county. Dacre’s development of Morpeth, however, did not insulate him from the factional nature of Northumberland politics, where many felt their allegiance was due to the Percies rather than the Dacres. In 1525, in a move seemingly encouraged by Wolsey, the crown charged Dacre with gross misrule of the borders. He was removed from office and fined. In October 1525 Thomas Lord Dacre died from a fall from his horse, largely in disgrace.

His eldest son William took his place as the 3rd Baron Dacre of Gilsland. Leonard Dacre may well have attended the funeral but would have been only a young child. William, 3rd Baron Dacre, was Leonard Dacre’s father. This meant

---

38 See below, p. 201-16.
40 “An Act to provide for the Regulation of Municipal Corporations in England and Wales”, 5 & 6 William IV, cap. 76.
42 Ellis, *Tudor Frontiers*, p. 163.
43 *L & P Henry VIII*, 4, pt. i, no. 1727, p. 768.
44 Manuscript proceedings of this funeral are not extant, although Lord Thomas was buried at Lanercost Priory: see Ellis, ‘Dacre, Thomas, 2nd Baron’, p. 3.
that many opportunities became open to Leonard. However, Leonard Dacre was not the eldest son. He had an older brother, Thomas.\textsuperscript{45} He also had two younger brothers, Edward and Francis. This was important: great landed households, not wishing to split their holdings, would practice primogeniture usually. The lands, belongings and title would be inherited by the eldest son.\textsuperscript{46} It can be surmised that Thomas and Leonard were very close in age. Thomas was probably born around 1520, Leonard a little later.\textsuperscript{47} It seems that Thomas and Leonard had many quarrels, which would not necessarily be that unusual for two brothers so close in age. This may account in some way for Camden’s rather cryptic description of William Lord Dacre’s curse of Leonard from his deathbed, “to send him much sorrow for his disobedience”.\textsuperscript{48} Perhaps this was a reference to the squabbling between the two; however, this is discussed below in more detail.\textsuperscript{49} The rivalry between the two brothers may also go some way to explain Thomas’ behaviour towards Leonard. It seems he and his wife Elizabeth wished to keep Leonard out of the inheritance and a massive life interest in Dacre lands was given to Elizabeth prior to the death of Thomas, 4\textsuperscript{th} Baron Dacre of Gilsland.\textsuperscript{50} This, however, is to jump ahead of ourselves. Firstly, the background to Leonard Dacre’s younger life and career will be described: necessarily, the following sections focus greatly on his father, William 3\textsuperscript{rd} Baron Dacre of Gilsland.

\textbf{The Rise of William, 3\textsuperscript{rd} Baron Dacre of Gilsland}

In 1528 William, 3rd Baron Dacre, regained the office of warden of the west march for the Dacres.\textsuperscript{51} After his father’s downfall, it seems he regained the confidence of Henry VIII; or at least coerced the regime into reappointing a Dacre into their traditional role in society. There are some suggestions that Dacre had

\textsuperscript{45} Thomas Dacre would go onto become 4\textsuperscript{th} Baron Dacre of Gilsland. Before this he is often referred to in the sources (which is not often) as Sir Thomas Dacre so as not to be confused with Sir Thomas Dacre of Lanercost who was Thomas 2\textsuperscript{nd} Baron Dacre of Gilsland’s bastard son. See also, below, p 217
\textsuperscript{46} Barbara J. Harris, ‘Property, Power, and Personal Relations: Elite Mothers and Sons in Yorkist and Early Tudor England’, Signs, 15: 3 (Spring, 1990), pp. 606-32.
\textsuperscript{47} See above, p. 25.
\textsuperscript{48} Camden, {	extit{Annales}}, p. 137. See also, below, pp. 95-9.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{50} For an overview of the case, see below pp. 158-61. For the extent of the estates, see below, pp. 201-16.
\textsuperscript{51} His indenture for the wardenship of the west march is still extant: see TNA E101/72/7.
helped to maintain a sense of instability on the west march in order that the crown would remove Henry Clifford, Earl of Cumberland from his position as warden.\textsuperscript{52}

It seems that William Lord Dacre was an astute borderer and followed largely in the footsteps of his father.

William Lord Dacre too, however, was not immune to central power (no one was particularly safe under Henry VIII). Rather famously, in an unusual episode that has been commented on frequently, William, 3rd Baron Dacre of Gilsland, was charged with treason in 1534. The jury acquitted him of these charges in 1535. Graves stated that the crown prosecuted Dacre due to his religious conservatism and opposition to Henrician innovations, this, however is not clear.\textsuperscript{53} It is clear, however, that treasonable dealings with the Scots constituted the offence on which he faced trial.\textsuperscript{54} This unsettling precedent may have perturbed successive border officers. When he put himself forward for the position of Keeper of Tynedale and Redesdale in 1570, Robert Constable wished to include the clause, [that]

\begin{quote}
 alwais he to have the auctoryte of a justice within boith the said countrys, and that it shall not be unlefull for him to assure, speik, or have confarrance with Skottyshe men as occacyon shall serve for the forderance of servysse.\textsuperscript{55}
\end{quote}

The reality of life on the borders was such that dealings with the Scots were not unusual for any of the border lords. The charges against Dacre seem largely to have been fabricated – as the jury noted.\textsuperscript{56} Certainly, there is a suggestion that an almost ‘pre-emptive strike’ was made against conservative regional magnates who were perhaps considered to be potential opponents to Henrician religious innovations.\textsuperscript{57} At a similar time, in 1534, Gerald Fitzgerald, 9th Earl of Kildare, was imprisoned in England for plotting and precipitating rebellion in Ireland. The crown did not find it necessary to put Kildare on trial; he died whilst detained in

\textsuperscript{52} Ellis, \textit{Tudor Frontiers}, pp. 166-9. See also James, \textit{Society, Politics & Culture}, p. 99.

\textsuperscript{53} Graves, \textit{The House of Lords}, p. 112.

\textsuperscript{54} See BL Stowe MS. 396, fol. 5.b. For a list of the charges against him, see \textit{L&P Henry VIII}, vol. 7, pp. 368-70. See also Edward Hall, \textit{Hall's Chronicle containing the history of England…}. p. 815; Ellis, \textit{Tudor Frontiers}, pp. 235-9.

\textsuperscript{55} Sadler Papers, vol. 2, p.129.


\textsuperscript{57} Ellis, \textit{Tudor Frontiers}, pp 173-206; idem, ‘Tudor state formation’, p. 53. See also Ellis with Maginn, \textit{The Making of the British Isles}, p. 98.
the Tower. However, neither Dacre’s nor Kildare’s actions during the 1520s and in 1534 were prompted by religious and conservative opposition to the new policies of Henry VIII alone. Rather both were continuing feuds against local rivals whom they saw as threatening their pre-eminence in their spheres of influence. When the crown favoured their rivals’ claims for local authority – in the case of the Dacres the Cliffords or Whartons, in the case of Kildare the Ormonds or Desmonds – Dacre and Kildare were in strong positions to cause problems for the new men. The crisis of the years 1534-1535 can be seen as a culmination of local power struggles dating back to the 1520s and before in which the crown became involved. Henry may also have been influenced to act against the magnates to limit any possibility of civil unrest from areas where, traditionally, discontented forces had mustered against their rulers.

The crown’s case against Dacre rested much on the evidence provided by Sir William Musgrave. Musgrave had been a Clifford retainer and was to become a Wharton follower. He had quarrelled with William Lord Dacre over an appointment to the office of Keeper of Bewcastle. There were several suits in Star Chamber between the two parties. Personal animosity began to come into these exchanges as arguments began to arise even over trivial matters such as wasteland of little value. Clearly, these men were local rivals and each disliked the other. It should not come as a surprise that the court found that malicious rivals, including king’s man, Thomas Wharton, had contrived the case against Dacre. Although uncommon in the Tudor period, William Lord Dacre’s peers acquitted him on charges of treason. Regardless of this, Dacre confessed to a lesser charge of

58 Bradshaw, ‘Cromwellian Reform and the origins of the Kildare Rebellion’, Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 6: 27 (1977), pp. 69-93. See also Art Cosgrove, Late medieval Ireland, 1370-1541 (Dublin, 1981), pp. 115-21. 59 Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, pp. 178-203. 60 For this viewpoint, see Richard Rex, The Tudors (Stroud, Gloucs., 2009), pp. 62-4. 61 For the charge brought against Dacre, see L&P Henry VIII, vol. 7, pp. 368-70 62 There were various ongoing Star Chamber proceedings between Musgrave and Dacre over Bewcastle and “Wastland”: see TNA STAC 2/18/269; TNA STAC 2/19/127. See also TNA STAC 2/20/52 which includes differences between the parties over lands in Durham. 63 In fact, Dacre was the only peer indicted for treason during the reign of Henry VIII to escape with his life. For how Musgrave was obviously influenced in bringing charges against Lord Dacre: see TNA SP 1/84 f. 166. See also S. T. Bindoff, History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1509-1558 (London, 1982), vol. II, p. 647; James, Society, Politics & Culture, pp. 108-11. See also Clark Stuart Colman, ‘The Cumberland and Westmorland Musgraves c. 1500-1700: aspects of their political careers within the emerging British state’ (Ph.D Thesis, unpublished, Keele University, 2005), pp. 18, 43-55.
misprision of treason (which in legal terms was an admission that he had knowledge of treasonable acts without taking action against them). His sentence was commuted for a considerable fine of £10,000 and he lost the important post of warden of the west march.\textsuperscript{64} The Henrician regime appointed Henry Clifford to this post. The crown had elevated Clifford to the status of first Earl of Cumberland on the fall of Thomas Dacre, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Baron Dacre of Gilsland, in 1525. As Hoyle has commented, this was the second time that Cumberland’s power had challenged Dacre’s position on the west march. Unsurprisingly, this constituted only one of a number of differences between the two men.\textsuperscript{65}

This episode provides an interesting insight into William Lord Dacre’s estate management policies, especially of his Cumberland estates. As noted by Ellis, despite William 3\textsuperscript{rd} Baron Dacre’s pressing need for money to pay his £10,000 fine, it is clear from Dacre’s own words that he would rather lease vacant lands to men of military skill even though he could possibly charge others higher rents or entry fines.\textsuperscript{66} Clearly, William Lord Dacre was as anxious to maintain his position in border society and secure his exposed lands and lordship, as he was to pay his fine to the crown. As for the Dacres as a whole, this was the second time that they had fallen foul of the Henrician regime. On this occasion, it is likely that, being slightly older in age, Leonard Dacre may well have been aware of what had befallen his family.

Following on from the crisis surrounding the circumstances of 1534, it was not long before a major crisis occurred for Henrician rule in the North, The Pilgrimage of Grace of 1536. William, 3rd Baron Dacre of Gilsland, did not hold a border commission at the time. He remained untrusted due to his recent trial for treason. Leonard Dacre would have been a teenager – in Tudor terms still considered a boy. Although the Pilgrimage was a major event for the north of England, it is understandable that the Dacres did little to support it. In many ways, lesser men led the Pilgrimage. Lord Dacre did his best to distance himself from

the rebels, probably wanting to avoid any hint of treason against the king. There is a possibility that Leonard Dacre was not even in the north during this period: later correspondence demonstrates that he spent some of his younger years brought up in the household of John Russell, later created the Earl of Bedford in 1550. It is not clear what the reason for this was – perhaps this was just a type of fosterage designed to strengthen ties between families or to further the education of a child. Russell had many connections at court and should, therefore, have provided the very best of upbringings for a junior member of a noble household. Certainly, Leonard Dacre later thanked the Earl of Bedford for the education he received. The Anglo-Scottish borders did not have many schools to facilitate the latest type of education during Henry’s reign.

A discussion of the Pilgrimage of Grace is beyond the scope of this thesis, especially in consideration of other works on the subject. However, the Dacre family was involved somewhat in instigating the rebellion, especially in relation to Carlisle, and in putting down the rebellion. Almost precipitating the trouble of the pilgrimage, Richard Dacre, a cousin of Lord Dacre, led Dacre followers in what was a family grudge against the Clifford heir, Sir Henry Clifford and Sir William Musgrave. The latter two holed themselves up in Carlisle Castle. These men had ousted the Dacres from their post as border wardens and keepers of Carlisle. This, therefore, was an attempt to settle old scores when an opportunity arose, as opposed to treason or rebellion against the crown. The Pilgrimage was also used as the background of a Dacre attempt to get Sir Thomas Wharton killed – he was an unpopular man, a harsh landlord and abrasive figure. Perhaps more

---

68 TNA SP 15/17 f. 91.
69 Although, as Helen Jewell suggests, the evidence is hard to interpret, there seem to have been few schools on the borders and in Cumberland and Westmorland in particular: see Helen Jewell, “The Bringing Up of Children in Good Learning and Manners”: a Survey of Secular Educational Provision in the North of England, c. 1350–1550”, Northern History, 18 (Jan. 1982), pp. 1-25. See also below, pp. 79-80.
70 For discussions of the Pilgrimage of Grace, see, amongst other works, S. M. Harrison, The Pilgrimage of Grace in the Lake Counties 1536-7 (London, 1981), passim; Dodds & Dodds, The Pilgrimage of Grace, passim; Hoyle, The Pilgrimage of Grace and the Politics of the 1530’s (Oxford, 2001), passim.
71 TNA SP 1/112 f. 220. See also Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, p. 242; Summerson, Medieval Carlisle, p. 489.
72 In 1537, Robert Southwell complained to Cromwell of Wharton’s excessive gressoming of crown tenants at Cockermouth: see TNA SP 1/124 f. 67; Hoyle, ‘Faction, Feud’, p. 598.
importantly he was also an active member of the religious commission that the
crown appointed to suppress religious houses within the Duchy of Lancaster.\textsuperscript{73} It
is relatively surprising, and a testament to the restraint of the ‘pilgrims’, that a bill
posted in Workington, Cumberland which called for the death of Wharton did not
have the desired effect.\textsuperscript{74} Quite simply the Dacres and their following used the
temporarily unsettled situation caused by the Pilgrimage of Grace in an attempt to
further their own cause.

During the pilgrimage, William Lord Dacre, as was necessary to demonstrate
loyalty to the crown and fellow nobles, overtly reconciled himself to Clifford. He
offered to send Clifford aid, if necessary, and expected reciprocation.\textsuperscript{75} Later, Sir
Christopher Dacre brother of Thomas, 2nd Lord Dacre, successfully, and bloodily,
led the forces of Gilsland against the commons besieging Carlisle. This was at the
request of the Duke of Norfolk.\textsuperscript{76} The good townsfolk of Carlisle, including the
Cliffords and Lowthers, were also not averse to requesting the help of the Dacres
even though they were not on good terms at this time.\textsuperscript{77} It seems that many were
aware of the Dacres’ ability to mobilise their tenants quickly and effectively as a
fighting force. These actions demonstrated the Dacres’ ability to motivate their
following and the fighting prowess of their \textit{manraed:} this fact was not entirely lost
on the crown.

Henry VIII’s reaction to the crisis was to lay the blame for the failure of the
governance of the region at the feet of the feuding nobles. He decided to take a
more personal role in the governance of the borders. He re-established a “Council
of these North parts” in 1537, largely as a reaction to the Pilgrimage of Grace.\textsuperscript{78}
The Council of the North was a useful administrative aid and judicial court for the

\textsuperscript{73} TNA DL41/499 f. 5.
\textsuperscript{74} \textit{L&P Henry VIII}, vol. 11, no. 1046; p. 421. See also Hoyle, ‘Faction, Feud’, p. 598; Bush, \textit{The
\textsuperscript{75} TNA SP 1/112 f. 220; \textit{L&P Henry VIII}, vol. 11, no. 1331. See also James, \textit{Society, politics &
culture}, p. 113; Summerson, \textit{Medieval Carlisle}, p. 488.
\textsuperscript{76} For Norfolk’s request for help from Sir Christopher Dacre, see \textit{L&P Henry VIII}, vol. 12, pt 1, no.
426, p. 207. See also Hoyle, \textit{The Pilgrimage}, pp. 11, 392; Summerson, \textit{Medieval Carlisle}, p. 490.
\textsuperscript{77} For Lowther’s and Clifford’s impassioned plea to Dacre for help, see \textit{L&P Henry VIII}, vol. 12,
pt 1, no. 427, p. 207.
\textsuperscript{78} Reid, \textit{King’s Council}, pp. 147, 505-7.
north of England, although this was not Elton’s view of the council.\textsuperscript{79} In some cases, it even rivalled the courts in London, particularly for northern matters. However, with most of its sittings further south, at York, and with the northern magnates making up most of its membership, it did little to influence law and order on the borders. Border wardens remained necessary and powerful: although the wages were not generally high, a warden could use his position of influence to assert authority and power over his local rivals. Therefore, the job of warden was still a sought after post; a point that many feuds were to highlight.

In the aftermath of the Pilgrimage of Grace, the king attempted to consolidate crown power at the borders further by appointing himself Lord Warden of the east and middle marches.\textsuperscript{80} Although he threatened to, Henry VIII however, had no intention of travelling north in person. Despite warnings from Norfolk to the contrary, Henry appointed “mean men” to serve as deputies. Henry’s choices seemed designed to antagonise the northern magnates.\textsuperscript{81} These deputies became the men who, to all intents and purposes, carried out the duties of the border warden, ousting men who thought of the warden posts as their own. In the west march, Henry appointed Thomas Wharton as Deputy Warden. Clifford remained as titular warden until his death in 1542; presumably, the crown did not wish to be viewed as having made a mistake in its appointment of Clifford. It is clear, however, that Clifford’s role became secondary to that of the newly appointed Wharton.\textsuperscript{82} Each deputy required a number of fee’d gentlemen retainers, indicating that Henry’s assertion that “we woll not be bounde, of a necessitie, to be served there with lordes”, was serious, for the time being.\textsuperscript{83}

Mervyn James describes Wharton’s rise and rule of the marches quite fully.\textsuperscript{84} However, it does merit some investigation in the course of this thesis because

\textsuperscript{79} For this view, see Elton, \textit{The Tudor Constitution: Documents and Commentary} (Cambridge, 1982), pp. 171, 200-1.
\textsuperscript{81} Ibid., pp. 48-9.
\textsuperscript{82} Neither the Crown or Clifford wished to be seen as having failed, one in their judgement, the other in their duties: see Bush, ‘The Problem of the Far North’, pp. 48-9; Hoyle, ‘Faction, Feud’, p. 597.
\textsuperscript{84} James, \textit{Society, Politics & Culture}, pp. 91-147.
Wharton’s deputyship, and later wardenship of the west march, marks an innovative attempt by the Tudor crown to limit noble power in the border region. The Clifford Earls of Cumberland and the Dacres had considered the post of warden of the west march to be their own. Undoubtedly, the Dacre treason case of 1534 and subsequent fine had blackened the Dacre name. This made William Lord Dacre an unsuitable candidate for appointment to office. Clifford’s stance against the rebels of the Pilgrimage of Grace had kept some of his reputation intact. However, it was also plain from these events, and from those of ten years earlier, that Henry Clifford, 1st Earl of Cumberland, could not keep the borders in order. Perhaps, Henry VIII had little choice but to appoint a man whom he thought might be capable of keeping good order in such a troublesome march. No doubt, it also helped that Wharton was on good terms with the king and his advisors.

One of the drawbacks of placing a man like Thomas Wharton in office in the West March was expense. He had little following in Cumberland: either Wharton would require crown assistance or the defence of the marches would suffer. The landholdings of the Cliffords and Dacres dominated large parts of Cumberland and Westmorland. Significantly, it was Dacre’s lands which straddled the border. The crown recognised this weakness and appointed pensioned gentlemen retainers to assist Wharton in his office. These included five Dacre followers - John Leigh, Cuthbert Hutton, Thomas Blannerhasset, Alexander Appleby and Lancelot Lancaster: therefore the Dacre interest was included in some respects. This cost the crown a total of at least £234. In addition to this, when Wharton’s standard fee of 200 marks plus a separate fee for Thomas Wentworth to be Keeper of Carlisle is also taken into account, it can be seen that this was over £100 more expensive than the standard fee of £133. 6s. 8d (200 marks) that Dacre had received previously. It is interesting that both Clifford and Dacre’s bastard sons (both called Thomas) were included on this commission. In the Dacre case, this

---

85 See above, pp. 24-40.
87 See below, pp. 201-16.
88 John Leigh seems to have been the most active of these whilst the others seem to have done little to help Wharton at all. It must be presumed that Leigh was a Wharton rather than a Dacre supporter: see BL Add. MS. 32653 f. 286.
was to cause much consternation.\(^{89}\) Henry VIII was definitely not as parsimonious as his father was; however, the amount of extra money spent on this form of governance of the marches highlights the crown’s anxiety to limit the power of the magnates on the borders. Essentially the Dacres lost the office of warden of the west march for the time being. In fact Wharton, ennobled as 1st Lord Wharton in 1544,\(^{90}\) held onto the post into the reign of Edward, until 1549.\(^{91}\)

Ostensibly this was a part of the “Tudor Revolution in Government” as originally conceived by Elton.\(^{92}\) Demonstrating administrative changes in governance in England, and highlighting the role of Cromwell in these changes of the 1530s, Elton’s ‘Tudor Revolution’ entailed a certain degree of centralisation and a move away from aristocratic local rule.\(^{93}\) As can be seen from the above, for the noble border wardens, this meant an attack on their local power and removal from office; county gentry replaced them.\(^{94}\) In the case of Wales, combined with a prolonged “reign of terror” in the name of justice from Bishop Rowland Lee, it meant the setting up of a regional council and the ‘Act of Union’ of 1536.\(^{95}\) In addition, this policy of consolidation sounded the death knell for most of the liberties within England and Wales.\(^{96}\)

For the north of England, the Henrician government set up a regional council that included northern magnates. However, the council was meant to limit their

\(^{89}\) Sometimes the fee was £153 6s.8d for the west march, which probably included the allowance for two deputies or sergeants at £10 each. For the gentry followers and fees paid to them: see *L&PHenry VIII*, vol. 12, pt. 2, nos. 249 & 250, p.106; Ellis, *Tudor Frontiers*, p. 148. For Dacre’s dislike of his bastard brother being party to a faction that, to all intents and purposes, worked against his interest, see TNA E315/473 f. 53. For other differences between the two, see Summerson, *Medieval Carlisle*, pp. 651-3.

\(^{90}\) *Hamilton Papers*, vol. 2, p. 303.

\(^{91}\) See below, pp. 51-7.

\(^{92}\) For the original theory, see Elton, *The Tudor Revolution, passim*.


\(^{94}\) See above, pp. 24-40. This is a similar narrative to descriptions of how, the almost aristocratic, Wolsey had been replaced by the ‘upstart’ Cromwell: see W. Gordon Zeeveld, ‘Social Equalitarianism in a Tudor Crisis’, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 7: 1 (Jan., 1946), pp. 35-55.

\(^{95}\) ‘An Acte for Lawes and Justice to be ministered in Wales’, 27 Henry VIII c.26 [Eng]; often called the Act of Union, this act abolished the liberties provided by marcher territories and extended Councillor government into Wales, similarly to the Council of the North; see J. Gwynfor Jones, *Wales and the Tudor State Government, Religious Change and the Social Order 1534-1603* (Cardiff, 1989), pp 16-22.

\(^{96}\) 27 Henry VIII, cap. 26. This removal of liberties affected Wales and the north of England in the main. These were the areas where the liberties still persisted: see Elton, *England Under the Tudors*, pp. 175-180; Jones, *Wales and the Tudor State*, pp. 1-78.
individual power and strengthen that of the king’s, rather than represent the interests of the nobility. The Dacres had already witnessed a full frontal assault on their power in 1534, as had the strongest magnate in Ireland, the Earl of Kildare. Certainly, the administrative reforms and the regional councils set up during this ‘revolution’ were to remain features of government for some time. However, if the revolution of the 1530s (spearheaded so single-mindedly by Cromwell) was meant to spell the end of regional, aristocratic rule and replace it with centralised, governmental power it certainly did not have this affect for any lasting period. As will be demonstrated during the course of this thesis, rule by border magnates in peripheral areas of the Tudor state was not ended by the reforms of the 1530s. Temporarily, some border magnates had trouble with the regime. For now, the Kildares and the Dacres found themselves excluded from public office.

This did not mean, however, that the Dacres kept quiet in the meantime and meekly accepted Wharton’s and the king’s party’s rule of the marches. As described by Graves and Hoyle there were many differences between Wharton and Dacre. These varied from a dispute over sheep stolen from Dacre in 1534, during his imprisonment, to fishing rights at Cockermouth. However, whatever the complaints against each other were, the true objective for each party was pre-eminence in Cumberland, the west march, and to gain offices from the crown that went with it. It seems that the kingdom felt these differences as far away from Cumberland as London. In 1537 the king and Council were urged to ensure that “whosoever be charged with keeping the West Marches” should get along with Dacre, primarily so that his tenants would help the warden defend the march against the Scots.

There is little doubt that the Duke of Norfolk (or one of his servants) wrote this letter. It opens with the statement that one of the nobility should be Lieutenant of
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97 See above, pp. 24-40.
98 Ibid. See also, below, pp. 51-7.
101 For discussions of this, see Bush, The Problem of the Far North, pp. 40-63. See also Hoyle, ‘Faction, Feud’, pp. 590-613; Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, esp. pp. 261-4; Summerson, Medieval Carlisle, pp. 651-3.
102 TNA SP1/116; L&P Henry VIII, vol. 12, pt. 1, no. 595, pp. 273-4. See also below, p. 92.
the North and Warden General of all three marches – probably Norfolk himself.\footnote{103 TNA SP1/116; L&P Henry VIII, vol. 12, pt. 1, no. 595, pp. 273-4. See also Bush, ‘The Problem of the Far North’, p. 53.}

This letter is a general indication, however, of exactly how difficult it was to govern the west march without the help of Dacre. His strategically placed lordships and large pool of armed, experienced tenants were necessary for the effective rule of the march. This fact was not entirely lost on the crown. In 1523, Surrey informed Wolsey that Dacre had brought 4000 men with him to raid Scotland. Many of these were mounted soldiers – the most prized forces of the day.\footnote{104 BL Caligula B. ii, no. 29. For the Dacre tenants’ military readiness, see Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, p. 101. For a Dacre muster of the west march, see below, p. 92.}

Wharton, however, completely failed to gain the co-operation of Dacre. He also failed to gain the co-operation of Henry Clifford, Earl of Cumberland, with whom he had once been close. In 1538, in a letter to Cromwell, Wharton reported that neither Dacre nor Cumberland “loveth me, as some appearance showeth”.\footnote{105 L&P Henry VIII, vol. 13, pt. 2, no. 115, p. 41.} In addition, it seems that he did not have the respect of the borderers themselves. Much of the local populace regarded Wharton as a harsh, money-grabbing landlord. Even Wharton’s own descendents were willing to admit this fact.\footnote{106 See James, Society, Politics & Culture, p. 118; Edward Ross Wharton, The Whartons of Wharton Hall (Oxford, 1898), p. 25; Summerson, Medieval Carlisle, p. 492.} It comes as little surprise that much of the trouble surrounding the Pilgrimage of Grace in the west march arose out of the grievances of the tenants at Kirkby Stephen, in the Wharton heartland of Westmorland, fanned by the Dacre and Clifford connexion intent on retribution against the ‘upstart’ Wharton.\footnote{107 L&P Henry VIII, vol. 11, no. 1046, 3, p. 421. See also Bush, The Pilgrimage of Grace, pp. 276-7, 309-10, 336-8.}

The feuding between Dacre, Wharton and Clifford broke out in various episodes of violence between followers of the rival parties.\footnote{108 For the fullest account of the feuding and factionalism, see Hoyle, ‘Faction, Feud’, passim.} Even though this was in the North and far from the center of power in London, it had an effect on a strategically important border area. The regime was bound to show at least some concern to matters concerning the defence of the realm, especially considering the
oft-times poor relationship with Scotland during Henry’s reign. Wharton had problems mustering the tenants of Dacre, who were an absolute necessity for the defence of the west march. They were often seasoned soldiers and invaluable for aggressive actions against the Scots. However, Wharton would not be content to rely on Dacre’s co-operation. Wharton wished to usurp the Dacre position in west march society altogether. One way Wharton proposed to deal with Dacre influence in Cumberland was for the crown to take some of the Dacre lands (and some of the most important ones at that) and recompense them with other, strategically less important, crown lands. Summerson quite rightly states that Dacre would have opposed this scheme, as does Hoyle. However, there is some evidence that the government may have considered this option actively at the height of Wharton/Dacre feuding and especially in view of England’s aggressive policy towards Scotland at the time. The following narrative discusses this proposal and places it within its contemporary context. This section relates to Leonard Dacre directly and demonstrates how he gained relatively extensive Yorkshire estates and, therefore, an income befitting a son of a great noble household.

**An ‘indecent proposal’: The Strangways lands**

In 1544, at the height of his power and influence, Wharton wrote a detailed letter to Henry VIII in which he proposed steps to promote stronger crown governance on the northern marches. Amongst moribund proposals, such as clearing the debateable land of trees and of formalising March law and having it read aloud to the residents of the borders, are other more controversial proposals specifically targeting his archrival’s lands. In this letter Wharton proposed, that - “all chief lands of great lordships containing any convenient number of men be held by the Crown”. This may sound a little far-fetched, how could the crown seize land held legally by others? However, in the context of what happened to Percy lands

---

110 See below, p. 92. See also Ellis, *Tudor Frontiers*, p. 101.
at the time, and in light of the fate of the land of abbeys, priories and monasteries, it is not an unrealistic suggestion.\textsuperscript{113} Furthermore, Wharton was very specific about the main Dacre landholdings themselves; Burgh, Greystoke and Gilsland should be the King’s “by exchange or otherwise”. It seems that Wharton may have even wanted the home of the Dacres, Naworth Castle, for himself. If Henry had enacted this proposal, Naworth would have become the principal residence of the keeper of the west march – a position that was, of course, held by Wharton.\textsuperscript{114}

At this time Wharton was the king’s man, he was at the height of his power, he was the victor of Solway Moss and recently ennobled.\textsuperscript{115} Wharton saw definite advantages in the destruction of the Dacre powerbase. He frequently tried to antagonise Henry by likening the Dacres to royals themselves. In one instance, Wharton corresponded with Cromwell stating [that] “in the late Lord Dacre’s days departed there was in these parts amongst the people a word a Dacre a Dacre, and after him, a Clifford having authority, there was a Clifford a Clifford, and even then a Dacre a Dacre a Dacre, and now only a king a king”.\textsuperscript{116} There can be little doubt that Wharton meant statements like this to come to the king’s ear – there would be little point in such rhetoric otherwise. That Henry could not tolerate those who did not recognise his power \textit{alone} was demonstrated on several occasions throughout his reign.\textsuperscript{117} The Dacres remained in disgrace in 1543-1544. Thomas Lord Dacre, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Baron of Gilsland, had died from a fall from his horse in 1525 (but not before falling foul of the regime).\textsuperscript{118} William, 4\textsuperscript{th} Lord Dacre, 3\textsuperscript{rd} Baron Dacre of Gilsland, had narrowly escaped execution for treason in 1534-1535. He had kept his lands, but at a cost of £10,000.\textsuperscript{119}

Interestingly, at the end of the letter to Henry about the Dacre lands is a reference to a previous conversation or correspondence, unfortunately no longer extant,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{114} L&P Henry VIII, vol. 18, pt. 1, no 799, pp. 443-4.
\item \textsuperscript{115} James, Society, Politics & Culture, pp. 91-147.
\item \textsuperscript{116} BL Cotton MS. Caligula B iii, f. 132b. See also Bush, ‘The Problem of the Far North’, p. 53.
\item \textsuperscript{117} For a good overview, see Rex, The Tudors, pp. 36-90.
\item \textsuperscript{118} See above, pp. 27-8.
\item \textsuperscript{119} See above, pp. 30-33.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
which had initially put the idea of the seizure of Dacre lands forward, Wharton stated that this was his opinion a year ago and is his opinion now. However, there is a transcript of a document available in the *Correspondence Relative to Scotland and the Borders*, which again states that Wharton had mooted these very ideas a year previously. It also goes into more detail about exactly what Wharton proposed to do with the Dacre estates. Interestingly, this letter has a date of June 1543 – the same time as when the crown awarded the Dacres the Strangways’ inheritance.\(^{120}\) This shows that Wharton had mooted this idea to Henry at least a year previously. Henry may have actually considered Wharton’s idea of forcing the Dacres to forego their border lordships and have recompense of land further south. It was probably the fact that recompense of land was going to be necessary that put Henry VIII off the idea. However, on 15 June 1543 Henry awarded the Strangways inheritance to the Dacres. He confirmed this award by an act of parliament. Of course, he did keep some interest in the lands for the crown with the reversion of several fees.\(^{121}\)

There may have been some concern about the possible reaction of the Dacres against this plan. Clearly, the Dacres were a powerful force in the area. Henry was no stranger to the fact that the Dacres could muster powerful forces when necessary. The crown would not have failed to notice the men of Gilsland at work in suppressing the disturbances around Carlisle during the Pilgrimage of Grace. Many were aware of the fact that the Dacres could muster 4000-5000 fighting men.\(^{122}\) There is a possibility that Henry was trying to keep the Dacres “on side” by making this award, however, a private act favouring the Dacre claim at this time seems unusual. Henry could have influenced the judicial procedure if he had wanted to, although he had not managed to obtain a guilty charge against William Lord Dacre for treason some years earlier. Henry has been described as notoriously lazy in his governance unless an idea really suited or interested him.

\(^{120}\) *State Papers Published under the Authority of his Majesty’s Commission: King Henry the Eighth, 1830-1852.* (Vol. 5: Part IV): *Correspondence relative to Scotland and the Borders, 1534-46*, p. 306. Unfortunately the manuscript of this document is no longer extant, however, when it is compared with the calendar entry in the *L&P Henry VIII* (see p. 51, n. 151 above), there is little reason for doubting the authenticity of the transcript- the proposals are broadly similar.  

\(^{121}\) (Private Act) 35 Henry VIII, cap. 24, [does not appear in full in *Statutes of the Realm*] but is available at the House of Lords Parliamentary Archives: see HL/PO/PB/1/1543/35H8n24.  

\(^{122}\) See above, p. 39. See also below, p. 92.
Henry first utilised the dry-stamp of his signature mainly because, unlike his father, he had little interest in the day-to-day business of running the realm. Therefore, it seems unlikely that Henry would have had any interest in passing a private act without some motivation.

This land swapping proposal puts into context the private act of Henry VIII awarding the Strangways inheritance to Leonard Dacre. Without this context, it seems a little unusual that the Dacres, so out of favour with Henry, holding no offices of him and feuding with his own favourite in the north, would warrant a private act from Henry granting them substantial lands further south. However, in the interest of balance, this is not the only possible reason for Henry to award the Dacres these lands; merely it seems the most likely. Another possible explanation for this private act is that Henry may have preferred the Dacres’ claim to the Strangways’. There is certainly some evidence that Henry did not trust the Strangways after their involvement in the Pilgrimage of Grace. In fact, he openly described Thomas Strangways as an “arrant traitor” for his support for some of the participants in the Pilgrimage. However, the Dacres were hardly of any better reputation at this time, the stain of the treason case was still upon William Lord Dacre. Feuding and difficult relations with the king’s party in Cumberland characterised much of the Dacre relationship with the crown during the latter 1530s and early 1540s. There is also a possibility that the crown was acknowledging the role that the Dacres took in defending the marches during Scottish attacks such as at Solway Moss, despite Wharton’s downplaying of it.

The Strangways lands were good lands. Hunsdon’s constant reminders to Elizabeth of how he wished to be granted them after the fall of Leonard Dacre demonstrate this. The Dacres’ connection to the Strangways was through Anne’s, sister of Humphrey Lord Dacre, marriage to Thomas Strangways. Therefore,

125 Hoyle, ‘Faction, Feud’, pp. 594-600. See also above, pp. 29-32.
126 In Sir William Musgrave’s account of the battle the role of the Dacre tenants is well documented: see Hamilton Papers, vol. 3, p. 306. This is in stark contrast with Wharton’s account: see Ibid., pp. 312-3. In this description Wharton makes no mention of the role played by the Dacre tenants.
127 For example, see TNA SP15/17 f. 253.
Leonard Dacre was a cousin of James Strangways. In 1541, on the death of their son James Strangways, the Dacres claimed his estates by reversion, as they would be amongst the closest relatives. There is also a suggestion that Strangways had promised the land to the Dacres in some way.\textsuperscript{128} The first evidence of the struggle for these lands came in 1537, when James Strangways, son of Thomas Strangways, named William Lord Dacre and Leonard Dacre in a bill of intrusion.\textsuperscript{129} Apparently, the parties reached an agreement that Leonard Dacre would be the next heir to the lands during a lengthy legal struggle fought out at York.\textsuperscript{130} However, despite this, as shown, there is some suggestion that these lands may have been awarded due to the king’s and Wharton’s interest in the northern Dacre estates: perhaps the king considered there was some merit to Wharton’s proposal.\textsuperscript{131}

Overall, from this episode, an invaluable insight into how Leonard Dacre, a junior member of the Dacre family, received his lands can be gained. No doubt some of the impetus for this private suit for lands came from the fact that Leonard was about to come of age and would require a landed income of his own. The son of a noble family required an income fitting for his status.\textsuperscript{132} Once Leonard received the Strangways lands in Yorkshire, he had a decent powerbase from which to launch his crown career. However, even after Henry’s private act seemed to resolve the issue the struggle for these lands did not end. During the reigns of Edward and Mary there were counter claims to the Strangways lands.

On these occasions the Dacres’ standing and relationship with the respective regimes was such that a claim on behalf of Robert Roos and Sir William Malleverer, the nearest surviving relatives of Strangways, was dismissed out of

\textsuperscript{128} Cockayne, \textit{Complete Peerage}, vol. 4, p.68; Warne (ed.), \textit{The Duke of Norfolk’s Deeds}, p. 188.
\textsuperscript{129} CSP Domestic, 1547-1580, no. 64, p.116; BL Lansdowne MS, vol.106, f. 106.
\textsuperscript{130} Ibid.; TNA C1/1068/56
\textsuperscript{131} For other discussions of this, see Ellis, \textit{Tudor Frontiers}, p. 248; \textit{idem}, ‘Dacre, William 3rd Baron’, p. 2. See also Summerson, \textit{Medieval Carlisle}, p. 500; Hoyle, ‘Faction, Feud’, p. 612
hand with a mere confirmation of the previous award made by Henry VIII. In 1549, the Earl of Shrewsbury used his influence with the crown to help Leonard Dacre, at the petition of his father William Lord Dacre, to defend his title to Upsall against incursions by Roos. It seems that something of a struggle ensued between the Strangways’ male descendants and the Dacres. Roos “refused to pay the rent of the manor of Inghmathley” and assaulted Dacre’s servants, causing more trouble. Nevertheless, the Earl of Shrewsbury’s influence and the Protector’s preoccupation with war with Scotland, in which the Dacres could play a major role, meant that the Dacre titles remained safe. The Dacres’ standing with the Elizabethan regime, however, was not on such a firm footing.

In 1558, immediately upon the accession of Elizabeth to the throne, the surviving co-heirs saw an opportunity to make their claims to the lands once again. When Francis Ratcliffe – the nearest surviving male relative of James Strangways – became a ward of the crown the crown saw an opportunity to revive its interest in the lands. A case was put before the Court of Wards calling for the reversion of the rights to the former Strangways lands to the crown during the minority of Francis Ratcliffe. No doubt, this lengthy dispute with the crown over his only lands and income did little to help Leonard Dacre’s standing with the new regime. It would have cost much money and been of considerable inconvenience for the northerner, Leonard Dacre, to contest the claims made in London against him. The claims against him, however, seem to have been unsuccessful, although a final ruling in the case is not extant.

The crown did much to reinforce its claim to these lands over the ensuing decades. In 1570, Elizabeth awarded her cousin Lord Hunsdon a life interest in the former Strangways lands for the bargain price of 1d an acre. In 1574, the crown once
again demonstrated the fact that these lands were in its gift.\textsuperscript{139} Shortly before the death of Lord Hunsdon, the crown demonstrated the significance of these lands – and how much it coveted them – by re-affirming that the crown held legal title to these Yorkshire estates.\textsuperscript{140} It is clear that the lands were substantial. Some idea of the extent and development of the Strangways’ land and therefore Leonard Dacre’s lands at his attainder can be gleaned from the Yorkshire, \textit{Feet of Fines of the Tudor Period}. The feet of fines from Hilary Term, 32 Henry VIII (1540-1541) states that there were three separate arrangements for the lands, the plaintiffs in all three cases were William Dacre Kt., “Lord Dacre and Graistok”, and Christopher Dacre Kt., the deforciant in each case was James Strangways. The first arrangement concerned “the Manors of Humandby, Mountgrace, and Morton near Est[East]harlesey and 25 messuages and a watermill with lands there”.\textsuperscript{141}

The second arrangement concerned the Manors of West Harlesey, Upsall, Thornbargh, Notton, Aynderby w[i]t[h] the Steple, Skelton, Halykeld, Costerdale, and Oversylton, and 120 messuages, 2 watermills and 1 windmill with lands and rental of 40 hens, £6, 1 peppercorn, 1 gilt [damaged-cup?], 1 pair of hawking gloves, 4 barbed arrows, and 2 red roses in the same and in Kepwycke, South Kylvyngton, Thyske, Rokysby near Lofthows, Whytby, Wolley, Barton [2 words damaged] Morethorpe, Cold-hyndelley, Rihyll, Codworth, Chett, Crygleston, Morton, Tunstall, Warlagby, Pottowe, Midylton Sup.[er] Leuen, Carlton, Faceby, Scruton, Kyrby Subt. Le Knoll [Kirby-under-Knoll], Dryffeld, Massham, Watlous, also the advowsons of the churches of South Kyllyngton, and Aynderby with the Steple, and of the chantry of Holy Trinity in Northallerton, the moiety of the manor of Warlagby, and 3 messuages with lands there, of £9 12s rent in Bylton, and of the advowson of St Martin’s church in Mykelgaty in York.\textsuperscript{142}

The third arrangement between the parties concerned:

\textsuperscript{139} TNA C89/1/4.
\textsuperscript{140} TNA C89/2/24.
\textsuperscript{141} Feet of Fines of the Tudor Period, pt 1, p. 91
\textsuperscript{142} Ibid., p. 92.
Leonard Dacre had several hundred tenants on the Strangways lands, perhaps even as many as a thousand. In addition, the lands were developed extensively, as can be witnessed by the presence of several mills there. However, Leonard Dacre did not passively manage his property and tenants. In fact, he actively built up his lands and acquired lands further south in North Derbyshire at “Eggiston”.

Whilst not engaged on the borders, he actively attended and promoted manorial courts on his lands. He sat like a lord in his seat at Harlesey castle, a house good enough to solicit interest from Henry Carey, Lord Hunsdon. Years later, on the overthrow of Dacre, Hunsdon reminded Cecil that [if he], “might have the keeping of Leonard Dacre’s house, called Herlesey castle, near Northallerton, it might be something towards the matter.” The value of Leonard Dacre’s lands and goods at his attainder, given in the survey after his rising, was £288. This may not accurately reflect the overall value of Leonard Dacre’s lands and goods. Certainly, this did not reflect his total income, which could be augmented by manorial courts, fines and even augmented by the spoils of occasional forays into Scotland. In many ways, Leonard Dacre was as linked to Yorkshire and these lands as much as he was to the traditional Dacre heartland of Cumberland. He was included as a Justice of the Peace of the North Riding of Yorkshire, as well as Cumberland, for
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143 Ibid.
144 Probably Egginton in Derbyshire: see TNA SP15/18 f. 76.
145 TNA SP15/18 f. 15
146 Taken from the general survey of 1570: see TNA E164/38 ff. 31-46, 60-3. See also Taylor, “The Crown & the North”, p. 107.
147 For a previously undisclosed document on one of Leonard Dacre’s own manorial courts at Seamer, Yorkshire, see TNA SC2/211/120. For his Frankpledge before his manorial court, see TNA SP46/13 f. 287.
many years. He served as a Justice of the Peace for Yorkshire in 1558/59 and from 1562-1564.\textsuperscript{148}

To conclude this section, the opening of the reign of Henry VIII had seen the Dacres much in royal favour until Thomas 2\textsuperscript{nd} Baron Dacre’s fall from grace in 1525. Over the next ten years, William Lord Dacre managed to work his way back into the favour of the king, only to face trial on charges of treason during a crisis of royal confidence. He escaped with his life but the stigma of the trial left the Dacre family’s reputation in tatters. The concluding years of Henry’s reign saw a slight rehabilitation of the Dacre family from their earlier disgraces. The crown was, by now, well advertised of the Dacres’ and their men’s fighting prowess. In 1544, Henry VIII personally requested that either Richard or Thomas Dacre (of Lanercost) should levy 200 of the best horse from Burgh or Gilsland “and suche other Places as the sayde Warden and they shall thynke most conveynnent” and send them to aid the king in his endeavours in France, by which he was to capture Boulogne.\footnote{HMC Salisbury MS, vol. I, p.28; L&P Henry VIII, vol. 19, pt 1, p. 123.} Eventually, Thomas Dacre and Jack Musgrave accompanied the men to Dover. They were paid by the mile, so were to prove expensive. They had calculated the journey as being “21 score miles”. However, the northern contingent were still looking for a crown payment of £7 3s. 6d some months later. They believed they had been underpaid as coat and conduct money had only been paid out at 3s. 4d per man.\footnote{For this ingenious piece of arithmetic, see, Ibid., p. 347. From Cumberland to Dover alone is a distance of approx. 310 miles. The journey from Carlisle to Dover is one of 315 miles: see http://www.distance-calculator.co.uk/ (accessed on 15\textsuperscript{th} September 2010).}

In addition, the crown awarded the Dacres the Strangways’ lands. They also began to reappear as regular members of the Commissions of the Peace.\footnote{L&P Henry VIII, vol. 20, pt 1, p. 317.} Perhaps the most telling sign of royal favour was the inclusion of William Lord Dacre in the invasion plans for Scotland. In the Scottish campaign of 1543-1545, William Lord Dacre, like his father had,\footnote{For Dacre’s role at Flodden, see Sadler, Border Fury, pp. 423-41.} commanded 4000 of his own men under the Earl of Hertford, Thomas Seymour (later to become the Duke of Somerset, Lord...}


\textsuperscript{149} For Dacre’s role at Flodden, see Sadler, Border Fury, pp. 423-41.
Protector). Manuscript evidence is not available for much of this campaign but it seems that the Dacres and their tenants left enough of an impression on Seymour to gain his favour.\textsuperscript{153} Seymour effectively took power upon the death of Henry VIII and launched his own campaigns against the intransigent Scots. He, no doubt, knew the assistance of the Dacres would be helpful and, usually, cheap. What this meant for the Dacres would soon become clear.

Chapter Three: The reign of Edward VI and the Dacres

The Protectorate

During the latter years of Henry VIII’s reign, the Dacres were largely out of favour. However, by 1547 it seems that the crown realised, tacitly at least, that co-operation with these northern magnates was necessary to keep good order on the borders.\(^1\) This was vitally important to the incoming regime as under the direction of Protector Somerset a new phase in the ongoing war with Scotland was to begin. As Bush has demonstrated, all the other policies of Somerset’s ‘Protectorate’ were subservient to the needs of the war against Scotland.\(^2\) Considering their several thousand warlike tenants in situ on their border possessions and their intrinsic knowledge of Scottish politics, the Dacres were ideally suited for campaigning in Scotland.\(^3\) Almost immediately, the new government recognised the importance of the role that the Dacres could play in the war against Scotland. In 1547, the Dacres appeared on a list, amongst others, as furnishers of horses suitable for war.\(^4\)

The Dacres had been involved in all of the Tudors’ previous campaigns in Scotland, in some capacity. No doubt, Somerset could recall William Lord Dacre’s contribution to Henry VIII’s Scottish campaign of 1543-1545. At that time, Somerset was the Earl of Hertford. Henry had placed him in overall command of the force that was to invade Scotland. On this expedition, ostensibly as part of “the rough wooings”, Lord Dacre served under him and commanded a rearguard of 4000 men.\(^5\) On this outing, the English achieved a temporary victory in the field: there was much spoliation and burning but Hertford achieved no permanent gains, as was typical of Tudor warfare.\(^6\) Seymour had already developed his garrisoning strategy, which he saw as the

---

\(^1\) See above, pp. 34-43.
\(^4\) TNA SP10/1 f. 60. See also LPL Talbot MS. 3206 f. 139.
way to consolidate English territorial gains in Scotland. Henry VIII, however, overruled his advice. In 1547, Hertford was elevated to a Dukedom as the Duke of Somerset and controlled the Privy Council; his garrison strategy would go ahead. He knew from personal experience that William Lord Dacre and his men could help him achieve his vision for a union between England and Scotland. At the very least, the borders would provide the staging post for the invasion of the northern realm. Somerset may even have considered giving the Dacres a more important role.

Initially, however, the regime under Somerset left the border posts alone. Thomas Lord Wharton remained in his post as Warden General of all three marches. The crown entrusted Wharton with various duties including organising raids into Scotland and gathering intelligence. Traditionally, these were all duties that the Dacres had discharged. In addition, in 1548, the crown gave Wharton responsibility for the distribution of books of religion to the Scots, in order that they might come closer to the regime’s “Godly” beliefs, despite Wharton’s, supposedly staunch, conservatism. King Edward VI and Somerset commissioned a “great bible” for the Scottish church at Dumfries. Wharton sent it there as a reward for the service of Scots loyal to England. However, Somerset may well have found the Scots more appreciative of money or English pensions than books of religion.

Nevertheless, despite Wharton’s forwardness in advancing the new religion, the government favoured the Dacres more under the rule of Protector Somerset than during the latter years of the reign of King Henry. Bush states that this was bound to happen, as it was almost a tradition of new regimes to restore ancient

9 TNA SP 10/1 ff. 28-30; TNA SP 50/1 f. 95. See also Merriman, The Rough Wooings, pp. 13-15; Bush, Government Policy of Somerset, pp. 8-27.
10 TNA SP 50/2 f. 71; TNA SP 50/1 f. 59; TNA SP 15/2 f. 22.
11 TNA SP 15/1 f. 1; TNA SP50/1 ff. 19, 32.
13 TNA SP15/2 f. 32. See also Graves, The House of Lords, p. 104; James, Society, Politics & Culture, pp. 134-40.
Edward VI and the Dacres

bloodlines. This may be the case; however, it seems more likely that Somerset – the martial man – had seen the Dacres and their tenants at work during previous conflicts against Scotland. The Protector recognised the necessity of cooperating with the border magnates for the successful operation of his garrisoning strategy. Another consideration was that constant war was expensive: Bush has shown that the Scottish war of 1547-1549 cost £603,872. The Dacres were usually the cheapest alternative for border rule as they relied upon their own manraed for military service rather than on crown intervention.

In 1548, although he had a leading role in the war on Scotland, Thomas Lord Wharton complained about the greater favour that Dacre received from the government. In March 1548, the crown awarded William Lord Dacre the enjoyment of tithes from crown estates at Penrith, Richardby, Crosby, Langwathby, Stainton and Houghton. This change of patronage was a source of annoyance to Wharton. The wardens of the marches normally received these payments – as he was at pains to explain. One of Wharton’s followers (and one of the original fee’d pensioners appointed by Henry VIII) Sir John Lowther, who was keeper of Carlisle Castle, was also aggrieved at the loss of the use of these lands. His annoyance at this would not last; he would have another – more urgent – grievance upon his replacement by Dacre, soon afterward. This considerable grant of lucrative tithes is further evidence of the shift in policy of the regime of Somerset away from Wharton and towards Dacre. It is clear that both Wharton and Lowther were unhappy with the preferential treatment given to the Dacres in 1548, just as Clifford and Dacre had been unhappy with the rapid advancement of “the upstart” Wharton, over their heads, during the reign of Henry VIII.
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18 TNA SP15/2 f. 161.
19 TNA SP15/2 f. 102.
20 TNA SP15/2 f. 71.
21 James, Society, Politics & Culture, p. 133; TNA SP15/2 f. 102.
22 See below, pp. 55-6.
23 James, Society, Politics & Culture, pp. 133-7; Hoyle, ‘Faction, Feud’, pp. 598-600. See also above, pp. 35-8.
Elsewhere at the peripheries of the Tudor state, during Somerset’s Protectorate the crown rehabilitated some of the more conservative elements of the nobility. Despite wild rumours of his return to his native Ireland and the various intrigues that surrounded him, Gerald Fitzgerald, heir to the Earldom of Kildare was welcomed back into the King’s grace in early 1548. Gradually the crown restored Fitzgerald’s lands, but he would have to wait for a considerable time to receive the full enjoyment of his lands and livery of his title. In a similar vein, the partial rehabilitation of Percy in 1548 was of significance to northern border society. Initially, however, the crown did not entrust Thomas Percy with any official duties. In general, as Bush has noted, the Protectorate made full use of traditional peers and of the conservative nobility. Both rehabilitations could keep these peripheral areas, where there had been difficulties with crown control in the past, relatively subdued. The Dacre, Fitzgerald and Percy lordships were all of strategic significance to England’s defence. Dacre and many of the traditional nobility were of great use for Somerset’s military campaigning.

However, not all was well for the Dacres during the reign of Edward VI. Complaints from Wharton about Dacre’s behaviour on the borders, especially his uncooperative approach to the warden ‘rodes’ commanded by Wharton, were rife. In April 1547, Dacre’s officers of Burgh and Gilsland showed “disobedience in forbening tattende the Kinges Majesties Service uppon the Bordres”. It is obvious from the tone of the letter of 12 April that Wharton’s complaints held much weight with the Privy Council. Somerset, however, often acted independently of his council. It appears that his relationship with William Lord Dacre was an example of this phenomenon. When directed to the Protector, Wharton’s complaints about Dacre were greeted with inaction.
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24 APC, vol. 2, p. 163; TNA SP 10/3 f. 11; TNA SP 61/1 ff. 21, 230-2.
26 2/3 Edward VI Original Act 47.
29 Warden-commanded raids into Scotland.
32 TNA SP 15/1 f. 115; TNA SP 15/2 f. 71.
1547, the council warned Lord Dacre about his conduct, and that of his followers, whilst Somerset promoted Dacre’s rule of the marches above Wharton. This became so apparent, and such a source of annoyance, to Wharton that a contemporary, Sir Thomas Holcroft, informed the Duke that, [Wharton was] “more pricked at of late than a King’s officer should be” about the preferential treatment given to Dacre.

Clearly, William Lord Dacre was a more influential party on the borders than Wharton was. By 1548, without any orders from their warden general, Dacre’s Gilsland tenants had occupied the Debateable Lands in force. In 1550 Dacre declared that it was “for the better maintenance of the king's title and interest of the Debateable Land to go over the same water [of the Sark] into the same bateable, before we either demanded, or granted any assurance”, demonstrating his belligerent policy towards the debateable lands. There seems little reason to doubt that Somerset was content with Dacre’s bellicose intervention against the Scots. This fitted in well with Somerset’s policy of defence in depth on the borders whilst, further into the center of the Scotland, garrisons were established. Although the crown claimed the lands by right of conquest, the Dacre tenants had acted on their own initiative. It seems that Wharton, in his official capacity as warden and crown steward, had some difficulty obtaining the (rather dubiously claimed) rents due to the crown from these lands, although he seemed reluctant to admit this shortcoming.

Dacre had other holdings which, although further south, nevertheless, felt the effects of Somerset’s war. The Dacre family had a long connection with Morpeth, Northumberland. This barony had come into Dacre hands in 1507 through Thomas, 2nd Baron Dacre of Gilsland’s, clever marriage and gradual

34 Ibid. See also below, pp. 54-6.
35 According to his account of a raid upon Scotland when it was rumoured that Wharton had been taken prisoner: see TNA SP 15/2 f. 161; APC, vol. 2, p. 473. Holcroft was one of the King Henry VIII’s Knights of the Privy Chamber and held the title “Sewer of the Chamber”. During the 1530s he received various commissions for the putting down of religious houses throughout the north: see L & P Henry VIII, vol. 11, p. 548; ibid., vol. 12, pt. 2, p. 88.
38 TNA SP15/2 f. 71.
The Somerset regime regularly employed foreign troops to provide for the increasing needs of the Scottish military campaign. In 1547 Henry Manners, the Earl of Rutland, who was in command of the east and middle marches, stationed a force of Italian mercenaries in the town. Their behaviour towards the local populace, and towards Lord Dacre’s deer, did not enamour them to him, or to the good folk of Morpeth. William, 3rd Baron Dacre of Gilsland, wrote at length to Rutland to complain about the Italians’ behaviour but played down any injury to himself. Dacre was more interested in the injustices done to the “King’s faithful subjects” of Morpeth, to the detriment of the country as a whole, rather than in the fact that a few of his deer had been slaughtered, butchered and eaten after having been shot by the Italians in his park enclosure at Morpeth, according to his letter.

The result of Somerset’s aggressive policy towards Scotland, the crown’s lack of money and the genuine need for local power and knowledge, was the reinstatement in April 1549, of William Lord Dacre as warden of the west marches towards Scotland. He was also to be Captain of Carlisle, uniting the two offices, as was often the case. He was to receive 500 marks yearly for the wardenry and a £10 allowance for two Deputies and 40s each for two Sergeants, as was standard. Tellingly, he was also to hold authority in the “King’s lordship of Scotland” demonstrating the crown’s attitude towards the northern kingdom. The regime, however, tried to keep the Lowther/Wharton interest content to some extent and, even though Dacre was appointed Captain of Carlisle, he was not appointed as keeper of the castle. Eventually, the crown took the inevitable – and common sense – measure of appointing William Lord Dacre Keeper of Carlisle Castle on 20 August 1549. Four months after Dacre’s patent for the Captainship of Carlisle had been awarded Lowther was evicted.

---

39 Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, p. 87; Leland, Itinerary, vol. 7, p. 60. See also above, pp. 23-24.
40 TNA SP68/3 f. 55. See also Bush, Government Policy of Somerset, pp. 34-5.
41 Northumberland County Archives (Woodhorn), ref SANT BEQ 28-01-11-39.
42 Ibid.
44 Ibid., This brings to mind the constitutional status of Ireland before 1541. However, it seems that England’s claims were on even more shaky ground in this case: see Brendan Bradshaw, The Irish constitutional revolution of the sixteenth century (Cambridge, 1979), pp. 231-8. See also Elton, The Tudor Constitution, p. 36.
This indicates, rather unsurprisingly, that the incumbent Lowther had not given up this office willingly. 46

Dacre’s fee for the keepership was the standard amount of 100 marks yearly and included a surprisingly generous 10 marks each a year for “20 souldiers” for the keeping of the castle. 47 It is not clear whether the “souldiers” were to receive 10 marks a year, or half year, as there were to be two payments, one at Whitsuntide and one at Martinmass from crown rents at “Penreth [Penrith], Salkeld, Scotby, Sowrby [Sowerby], Langwathby and Gamelsby” in Cumberland. Presumably, the payment of these “souldiers” was 10 marks a year, payable in two instalments – as was customary. This was a time of war and the castle needed defending. Apparently, the castle and Carlisle’s walls were in poor repair. 48 Rather seriously, in 1549 a 14-yard section of Carlisle’s north facing defensive wall (the structure directly in any Scots army’s path) collapsed due to its positioning on wet ground. According to Dacre, a spring undermined the foundations of this section of wall. Dacre addressed this letter to Somerset, Northumberland, however, dictated the reply. 49 By the end of 1549, a power struggle at the centre of power was well underway.

**Regime Change**

In 1547 Somerset wrested the control of King Edward VI, and therefore the state, from the council of executors set up by Henry VIII. 50 By 1549 a clear rival emerged in the shape of John Dudley, Earl of Warwick. Although there were still rivals amongst the council, Dudley completed his seizure of power in 1550. Subsequently he set about asserting his authority throughout the realm. There was much unrest at the borders at this time, mainly stemming from the Scottish wars and from feuding nobles. Two of these nobles were, of course, Wharton and Dacre. Somerset’s removal of Wharton from office and his replacement by

---

46 See above, pp. 53, 56-7.
47 *CPR Edward VI, 1549-1551*, vol. 3, p. 118.
48 TNA SP 15/4 f. 104.
Dacre caused personal offence to Wharton.\textsuperscript{51} He was always likely to use whatever means possible to achieve hegemony over Dacre. He saw the change in regime at the centre of power as a way to change his status on the borders. Dacre was not in a strong position with Dudley’s regime, mainly because he had been a staunch adherent to the Somerset regime.\textsuperscript{52}

The ensuing power struggle and the resultant jockeying for positions on the council caused growing confusion at court. In addition, the divisions within the council caused weak administration on the borders.\textsuperscript{53} No historian has ever fully charted the, constantly changing, stream of personnel that represented the crown on the northern borders at this time. In fact, there has been no sufficient recent research carried out on the office of warden of the west march and investigations reveal a significant gap in our knowledge of Tudor administration.\textsuperscript{54} Pease in his \textit{The Lord Wardens of the Marches}, made a valiant but incorrect early attempt. Tough describes the border posts in the appendix of \textit{The Last Years of a Frontier}. His work is largely correct but, unfortunately, starts in the reign of Mary I. Ellis, in the course of \textit{Tudor Frontiers and Noble Power}, discusses the post of warden in passing. However, this only describes Henry’s reign and the Dacres in depth. Rowse investigates the subject briefly in \textit{The Expansion of Elizabethan England}. The office is probably discussed best by Taylor throughout the course of her thesis, “The Crown and the North of England”, where she does recognise the problems inherent in trying to describe who actually held the offices of Wardens during the 1550’s. There are also useful articles by Hoyle, Bush, and Palmer.\textsuperscript{55} The following section will throw some light on this rather grey area of English history.

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., pp. 177-90.
\textsuperscript{53} LPL Talbot Papers MS.3206 ff. 163, 185.
Under the pretext of putting a “notable ruler” in place on the northern border but, perhaps more correctly, in an attempt to diminish unrest and to prove who was in control of the realm, Warwick appointed himself as Warden-General of the east and middle marches towards Scotland on the 20th April 1550. Perhaps Warwick wanted the extra income: he was given a fee of £1000 a year and a “crewe” of 100 horse – an expensive measure in light of Dacre’s fees. It is not entirely clear whether Warwick considered taking up his northern post. Although he visited Carlisle at some stage, it seems that he did not aspire to remain in the north. By the time he was to seize power from Somerset it had already been decided that he could rule the marches through deputies. At this time, Dacre remained in his position at the west march.

Under the rule of Warwick crown appointed deputies eclipsed the Dacres in power in the marches, once again. Throughout 1550 those who were Dacre’s enemies came to the fore. This is when the Dacre lordship and the Strangways’ lands may have come to the attention of William Cecil. In early 1550, William Lord Dacre, similarly to Cecil, was no longer under the protection of Somerset. Cecil, however, worked his way into Dudley’s grace and became a crown secretary in September 1550. He went on to become a Privy Councillor. Perhaps because of his religious beliefs Cecil, after becoming closely associated with Dudley, counted the Dacres as enemies, or at least people who were potential opponents of his religious, ‘Godly’ reforms. There is, however, a possibility of an earlier acquaintance with the Dacre lordship through his service with Somerset and at Pinkie. Certainly, Cecil would put his knowledge of regional England to good use later. Of course, he was to become

56 Loades, John Dudley, p. 221-2.
57 TNA SP 15/3 f. 106; APC, vol. 3, p. 6. See also, above, pp. 56-7.
58 TNA SP 10/14 f. 161.
62 Conyers Read, Mr Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth (London, 1955), pp. 60-3; Alford, Kingship & Politics, pp. 129-45.
63 P. Williams, The Later Tudors, p. 63.
64 Bindoff, The History of Parliament, vol. I, pp. 603-4; Graves, Burghley, pp. 18-19. There is some possibility that Cecil took the field at Pinkie but did not distinguish himself in military service: see Rapple, Martial Power, pp. 40-1.
even more important during the reign of Elizabeth but this is to jump a little too far ahead.

Dudley, of course, did not carry out any of the duties of warden. In fact, a rather strange wrangling for position on the borders occurred. There was almost a dual system of governance on the borders with some supporting Somerset and some Dudley, which mirrored the machinations at the centre of government. The council promoted the rule of the Marquis of Dorset as Warden General in the North in early 1550, whilst Wharton and Dacre settled their differences. The Marquis of Dorset, Henry Grey, chose John, Lord Conyers, for the West March, Lord Ogle for the Middle March and Sir Michael Stirley for the East March as deputies to serve under him. These border positions proved to be central to the change in regime. By October 1551, Dorset had resigned. He explained his inability to rule the borders and Warwick replaced him as Lord Warden of all three Marches. Dudley was to receive the princely sum of 2000 marks for his services. Despite Dorset’s admission of failure to control unrest on the borders, at the same time during the same council meeting, the crown elevated both Dorset and Warwick to Dukedoms.

Dacre would not cooperate with Wharton nor advance the new religion within his sphere of influence. Dacre’s behaviour towards Wharton and towards the royal appointees proved problematic to the, more reform minded, Dudley-dominated regime. However, Dacre would not hand himself in meekly to receive punishment at the hands of an unfriendly Privy Council. Despite what Graves has said on the matter, when summoned to appear before the Council in December 1550, William Lord Dacre holed himself up in his northern powerbase for a considerable period – citing the usual excuse of pressing border
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67 TNA SP 10/6 f. 60; TNA SP 15/3 f. 106; *APC*, vol. 2, p. 345; *APC*, vol. 3, p. 89. See also Guy, *Tudor England*, pp. 211-6.
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duties as the reason for his non-attendance.\footnote{For the various summons to appear at Court, see APC, vol. 3, pp. 182, 203, 367} This seemed to antagonise the council further. William Lord Dacre was committed to the Fleet Prison for a period when, eventually, he submitted.\footnote{Graves states that Dacre was imprisoned on the 19\textsuperscript{th} November: see Graves, \textit{The House of Lords}, p. 113.} Sometime after 19\textsuperscript{th} December 1551, Sir Robert Bowes released him.\footnote{This is when instructions were given for Dacre’s “enlargement”; see APC, vol. 3, p. 447. It is possible that Dacre was released on the same day although considering the machinery of government from the period it probably took a day or two for his actual release: see Graves, \textit{The House of Lords}, p. 113.} It seems that the Privy Council were determined to make an example of – the constantly feuding – Wharton and Dacre: especially of Dacre. The Dudley regime saw Dacre as the less suitable of the two because (unlike Wharton and Thomas Dacre of Lanercost) he would do little to further the “new religion”, which he clearly opposed.\footnote{See above, pp. 33-4, 52; below, p. 117-24. In 1553, Sir Thomas Dacre was entrusted to carry out the survey of church goods in Cumberland: see APC, vol. 4, pp. 343-4.}

John Dudley’s seizure of power was complete. The newly-created Duke of Northumberland could start to consolidate his position and stabilise the realm. When Northumberland, now titular Warden General of all three Marches towards Scotland, appointed his deputies, he excluded both Wharton and Dacre from office. The rather unusual deputies whom Dorset (now the Duke of Suffolk) had chosen to serve at the borders were confirmed in their posts in December when wages would have been due.\footnote{Ibid., p. 438.} The only post left open to Dacre was on the Commission of the Peace for the East Riding of Yorkshire.\footnote{\textit{CPR, Edward VI, 1547-1553}, vol. 5, p. 353.} His next appointment was as one of the commissioners charged with the task to “collect the third payment of relief from aliens in Cumberland”. The regime was so desperately short of money that it collected payments from the refugees of the Scottish wars who really should have been England’s natural allies.\footnote{Ibid., p. 364.}

Unsurprisingly, difficulties for the regime, the new rulers of the borders and the defence of the realm occurred in the west march. Lord Conyers was a respected landholder with connections in Durham society but had little following in
Cumberland and Westmorland. In January 1552, the crown summoned Conyers to Parliament. The government replaced him as Deputy Warden of the West March with Sir Ingram Clifford. Sir Ingram Clifford was a junior Clifford at this time but, at least, he was a member of west-march, (Westmorland and Cumberland) society. Conyers’ reappointment took place a month later when he replaced Clifford. Both Clifford and Conyers (even with their strength combined) could not hope to match the influence of Dacre on the west march and were minor figures in local society by comparison. The conclusion has to be that the appointment of Clifford was a temporary measure to assuage some difficulties at the borders, perhaps his presence on the borders was a precautionary measure. Perhaps Conyers’ presence in Parliament was necessary to help the Northumberland regime deal with the lingering influence of Somerset.

Considering his following, and considering the unruly nature of the times at the seat of power and on the borders, it is not surprising, that Lord Conyers, Deputy Warden of the West March, did not last long in office. There is little evidence remaining of his time in office except for the mention of disorder on the borders and the killing of English subjects. It is likely that Lord Conyers did not enjoy this brief spell in office on the borders. In November 1551, a letter from King Edward to his Scottish counterpart demonstrated the inability of Lord Conyers to defend English subjects on the west march. Edward called for redress from the Scottish regime for the four Englishmen – three “Storye[s]” and one “Dewell” – that had been killed by Scotsmen on the west march. Conyers had little option but to step down with whatever dignity he still had intact. The Duke of Northumberland, however, had little understanding of Conyers’ predicament. It is clear that Conyers’ dislike and probable inability to discharge the duties of
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his office and his eventual resignation in particular agitated Northumberland greatly. Dudley, however, did his best to play down rumours of sedition on the borders.\textsuperscript{86} The tone of a letter from Northumberland to Cecil, in which he complains of Conyers, “marvelling that he would so suddenly surrender his office, and deeming at my departure from Carlisle to be content to remain at least until he heard from the king or council” suggested that a crisis point was being reached on the borders.\textsuperscript{87} 

Whilst Northumberland remained Lord Warden of the marches, the Dacres remained firmly out of favour. The Scottish wardens, opposite the English wardens, had little respect for the untried deputies put in place by Northumberland’s rule of the borders. The Scots did not respect Truce days nor would they attend the customary meetings for the redress of grievances.\textsuperscript{88} Considering the state of relations between the two realms this should probably be of little surprise. However, in principle, Dacre’s power and connexion could have countered this problem. There is little doubt that Dacre, with his Scottish connections, would have held more weight with his Scottish counterparts than Conyers.\textsuperscript{89} An anonymous contemporary commentator, writing with news from Rome, thought that the change of personnel on the borders had the capacity to cause “great sedition, especially in the north” amongst the noblemen of England.\textsuperscript{90} If the regime were to last this may have been the case, however, this was optimistic rhetoric designed to please a specific audience rather than an unbiased evaluation of the situation at the time. Nevertheless, the regime thought it was prudent to have men of trust in border positions, rather than those who had supported Somerset.

Under the “Protection” of Somerset, Dacre had received preferential treatment. William, 3\textsuperscript{rd} Baron Dacre, had received patronage and favour; he gained promotion over the head of Wharton. Under Northumberland’s rule, Dacre had

\textsuperscript{87} For the full content and tone of this letter explaining Conyers’ exclamations on his leaving office and Northumberland’s exasperation, see TNA SP 10/14 f. 161.
\textsuperscript{88} TNA SP50/5 f. 164.
\textsuperscript{89} Ellis, \textit{Tudor Frontiers}, pp. 155-9.
\textsuperscript{90} TNA SP68/7 f. 99.
been sent to prison for a period. In fact, both Dacre and Wharton were not
friendly to some aspects of the Northumberland regime and both opposed
Northumberland’s innovations in religion in the House of Lords, despite their
personal animosity.\(^{91}\) It is also likely that neither enjoyed Northumberland’s
initial policies towards the rulers of the borders. Dudley’s regime excluded both
from office. However, under Northumberland, Wharton managed to gain the
upper hand from Dacre once more and began to work his way into the duke’s
grace. In 1550, despite his own personal conservatism, Wharton took an active
role in the suppression of the College at Kirkoswald. Clearly, Wharton’s secular
interests could override his personal confessional beliefs. Perhaps he relished
this task as another attempt to annoy Dacre; the Dacres had been major
contributors to Kirkoswald’s works over the years.\(^{92}\) Wharton earned his reward
– upon Northumberland’s replacement of Dorset, the crown appointed Wharton
as Deputy General Warden of all three marches.\(^{93}\)

**Further changes**

There were several reasons for the crown to believe that the appointment of
Wharton would promote good order on the borders. Dudley needed to
consolidate his position at the seat of government and England was still reeling
from the effects of war. War had been costly and Northumberland needed to pay
back loans and avoid imminent bankruptcy.\(^{94}\) Harvests had been terrible for
several years and there had been widespread peasant unrest.\(^{95}\) The
Northumberland regime required peace on the borders. In addition to these
problems, the government worried about any backlash from the borders after the
execution of Somerset in January 1552.\(^{96}\) Wharton, at least, was a man with
much experience of border society and someone who had carried out the office
of warden on various occasions. However, in the past he had failed to rule the
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\(^{91}\) Graves, *The House of Lords*, p. 105.

\(^{92}\) For Wharton’s involvement in the suppression of Kirkoswald, see *APC*, vol. 2, p. 504. See
also Warne, (ed), *The Duke of Norfolk’s Deeds*, p. 270; *L&P Henry VIII*, vol. 3, p. 1499. See also
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\(^{93}\) *CPR Edward VI, 1550-1553*, vol. 4, pp. 258, 277.


\(^{95}\) TNA SP 15/4 f. 164. See also *CSP Domestic 1547-1580*, p. 32; Bush, *Government Policy of

west march effectively without the co-operation of Dacre. The regime hoped that the two would co-operate for the better rule of the marches. On 8 March 1552, Wharton and Dacre affected their public reconciliation. Supposedly, the two would now be “good and unfayned frendes”. However, from the reports of disorders that ensued it seems likely that Dacre and Cumberland did not help matters on the west march. Lord Wharton, acting as Warden General, could not be on the west march constantly as there were also difficulties on the other marches. The misrule of the borders prompted the regime to move towards more tried and tested methods of pacifying the borders as it seemed that the new men appointed to border service did not have the desired effect.

In August 1552 the Northumberland regime attempted to put matters on the borders right. The Privy Council decided that Sir Michael Stirley had not been of significant calibre to serve as a deputy on the east march; Lord Eure replaced him. On the west march, the crown would not consider Dacre for office under Wharton, even more so considering his opposition to Northumberland. However, Wharton advised the regime that the Dacre interest could be, partially at least, mobilised by the placing in office of Sir Thomas Dacre of Lanercost, the bastard brother of William Lord Dacre. Lord Ogle, the consummate border lord, was to continue serving the crown on the middle marches although he was dissatisfied with the income he received from the post. Eventually, the crown augmented Ogle’s income in order to improve his local standing.

There was now a situation whereby the borders were ruled by a non-resident Warden-General, Northumberland, a deputy Warden General, Wharton and three deputies serving under him – Ogle, Thomas Dacre of Lannercost and Eure. Ostensibly, this was almost a return to the medieval system of border governance. However, by digging just below the surface and investigating the
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status of these nobles, it soon becomes clear that these were men of lesser status than the Nevilles and Percys of the 13th-15th centuries. To all intents and purposes, Northumberland was a self-appointed duke. He had not achieved his status through the strength of his lordship and by conquering his lands with his retainers and following. Wharton was considered an upstart by more traditional peers such as Cumberland and Dacre; by their definition he was – his title was only a decade or so old. Ogle and Eure were both from families of good, traditional standing but neither had particularly large followings and both were really from the stock of the retainers of the great families. None of these men could hope to replace the influence of the great magnates who had once ruled at the borders. None had the large followings of tenants that Dacre or Percy could muster. The crown had great difficulty in admitting this shortcoming (if this were even recognised as a problem), however, and continued to try to remedy the situation. Certainly, Northumberland was dissatisfied with the performance of his new deputies and came to the borders in person to see matters first hand.

By the end of 1552, more changes in personnel on the borders were to come. In December, the crown admonished Wharton for his failure to place Lord Eure in office in the middle march and Lord Grey in the east march. Wharton was probably having difficulty coming to grips with the crown’s constantly changing demands whilst defending the borders from Scots bent on revenge for Somerset’s campaign. In addition to his border duties, the crown appointed Wharton as one of the English commissioners responsible for working out a truce over the Debateable Lands. This took much of his time, as treaty negotiations over the Debateable Lands were lengthy and complicated. At least Wharton got some degree of satisfaction from this commission. Wharton would not miss any opportunity to attack his rival Dacre and this was one more
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109 TNA SP15/4 f. 16; TNA SP50/5 ff. 79, 173-6. See also Marcus Merriman, The Rough Wooings, pp. 375-80.
avenue for Wharton to take. As shown, Dacre’s tenants had already taken the Debateable Lands and affirmed their rights by conquest there, rather than to any of the king’s officers.\footnote{See above, p. 55.} This treaty, once concluded, meant that the occupying Dacre tenants would have to withdraw from, at least, half of the Debateable Lands, which once divided, would probably be of little use to either party. The Debateable Lands were not particularly good lands and they were not that large. The Armstrongs and Grahams inhabited these lands. They can be described only as families with little loyalty to either realm. Dividing the Debatable Lands was unlikely to solve the problem of reliance on raiding for the remaining populace on either side of the divide.\footnote{TNA SP50/5 f. 176. “Populace remaining” is one way of describing these people who were likely to show “little loyalty to either realm”: see Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, pp. 61-5; Hodgson, History of Northumberland, III, 2, pp. 171-97. For the Grahams and Armstrongs, see Robson, Rise and Fall of English Highland Clans, esp. pp. 71-3. See also Merriman, The Rough Wooings, pp. 375-80.}

\textit{Lands and Lordship}

By this time, the Debateable Lands had gained more significance to the Dacres. Their tenants had occupied them for several years. It is unlikely that they would want to give them up at all. Scotland and England had argued over the ownership of the Debateable Lands for centuries.\footnote{W. Mackay MacKenzie, ‘The Debatable Land’, Scottish Historical Review, 30: 110 (Oct., 1951), pp. 109-25.} This issue was not easy to solve. Several arguments broke out as to who exactly controlled the Debateable Lands. On the Scottish side, the Armstrongs needed to be quieted whilst it is clear that the Grahams (“Greames”) – a similar ‘highland clan’ – claimed that Dacre tenants had no right to this poor strip of no-man’s land.\footnote{TNA SP10/5 f. 144. See also APC, vol. 4, p. 3.} Claims and counter claims about the ownership of the lands resulted in a long running feud between the Grahams and the Dacres.\footnote{APC, vol. 4, p. 5.} Sir Thomas Dacre of Lannercost imprisoned Richard and Fergus Graham but after inquiries the Privy Council ordered him to release them.\footnote{TNA SP10/5 f. 144; APC, vol. 3, p. 182.} This was at least one occasion where Lord Dacre could work with his bastard brother for the better interests of the family, and perhaps local society, as a whole. The Dacres, however, even when combined in
solidarity, could not maintain their claim to these lands against the wishes of a regime that took advice from Lord Wharton and Sir Robert Bowes.116

On 10 June 1551 the Treaty of Norham finally ended the Scottish war that Somerset had initiated. This meant that the Dacre tenants that occupied the Debateable Lands became viewed as an obstacle to the peace treaty, rather than as a vanguard of the invasion. Northumberland threatened to set up a “great company” to ride over the lands to kill or imprison any that he found there. The crown would not provide compensation or redress – another swipe at the Dacre interest.117 It is likely that Dacre’s tenants soon vacated the Debateable Lands. The arbitration over the division of the Debateable Lands, however, continued for over a year and demonstrated the symbolic importance attached to the ownership of these lands. The reasoned voice of the French ended the wrangling over these lands. Even they were probably weary of travelling to Scotland to fight the English.118

As Merriman states, the French were also far more used to the physical delineation of borders on the ground than the English or Scots. France had many landed borders, England and Scotland only one (with each other) at this time. A permanent groundwork named the “Scots Dike” divided the English and Scottish half of the land. Although the treaty awarded the larger portion of land to the Scots, the English wanted the “stone houses” of the Grahams and the Armstrongs to be in their part of the lands – no doubt so that they could hold some influence over their inhabitants who, at various times, could prove useful.119 The final division of the lands meant that the house of Sandy Armstrong ended up in Scotland whilst the house of Fergus Graham ended up in England.120 Work began on this physical division after the negotiations were

116 Bowes, unsurprisingly, was one of the first to spread the unfavourable rumours about the Dacres during the reign of Elizabeth: see TNA SP 15/15 f.38. Both he and Thomas Lord Wharton were to provide detailed reports about the state of the Debateable Lands to the King’s Council. Their reports were unlikely to compliment Dacre: see APC, vol. 2, p. 473. See also APC, vol. 3, pp. 429-30.
120 TNA SP50/5 ff. 173-4.
completed and the treaty ratified. The treaty was sent north to Scotland with Sir Thomas Dacre in November 1552. 121 William Lord Dacre would have to be content with losing his influence over the Debateable Lands for the time being.

Other developments did not bode well for Lord Dacre. As mentioned earlier, nearly ten years previously Wharton had tried to wrestle part of the Dacre lands away from the Lordship and into crown hands (and for his own use) on a rather spectacular scale. 122 On a rather smaller scale, in June 1552, the crown forced Dacre to forego some of his border holdings. In an exercise rather reminiscent of Wharton’s proposal of several years earlier, Dacre was forced to exchange “certaine landes and tenementes in Poltraghan, Kinkerhill, Aikeshawe, Lyne, Holme, Mashethorne, Comcroke, Daplelandes or Daplemore, Levin, Graynes, Wyntershell, Rydinges and Smithlandes, in the countie of Cumberland” and also all his interests in Bewcastle with the crown. His meagre compensation was the award of crown lands at Papcastle worth £18 19d a year. 123 Taking into consideration the fact that Dacre had been trying to get his son a position as keeper of Bewcastle, 124 this was a double affront to William Lord Dacre’s sensibilities.

Nevertheless, close to the time of the fall of Northumberland, Dacre was still victimised. The crown alienated his lands at Byres Park in Northumberland from him and awarded them to Dudley and his wife. 125 For the time being Dacre was having great difficulty with the regime of Northumberland. It was clear who got the upper hand between Wharton and Dacre under the Northumberland regime. However, unbeknownst to him, Dacre would not have long to wait to seek revenge against Thomas, 1st Lord Wharton, and the Duke of Northumberland,

121 TNA SP50/5 f. 184. For a good overview of the debate over the Debatable lands or “Threaplands” [sometimes Threiplands] as they were called in Scotland, see Merriman, The Rough Wooings, pp. 375-80.
122 See above, pp. 40-4.
124 Unfortunately the document is unclear, due to damage, about which son was to be keeper of Bewcastle. I would hazard a guess that it was Thomas, the eldest son, who would become 4th Baron Dacre of the North, but there is some possibility of it being Leonard Dacre who is mentioned later on in the same manuscript: see LPL Talbot MSS 3206 f. 145.
John Dudley. Edward VI was not a healthy child and Mary was next in line to the throne, according to the Act of Succession of the previous reign.\footnote{35 Henry VIII cap. 1; Loades, \textit{John Dudley}, p. 237-9.}

For the moment, however, the regime attempted to placate Dacre, rather ironically, by the granting of a crown patent by the king to found a Grammar school at Morpeth in Northumberland. Rather unimaginatively, the local gentry decided to name the school the Free Grammar School of Edward VI. As shown previously the Dacres had taken measures to increase their standing with the middling sort of Northumberland society.\footnote{See above, pp. 25-8.} It is revealing that the crown granted this licence at the petition of the bailiffs and burgesses of Morpeth and “many of the King’s subjects thereabouts”. What was ironic to Dacre, and perhaps many of the local inhabitants, was that the lands and incomes of the two dissolved Chantries in Morpeth and those of St Giles, in the Chapel of Witton, were given to the school.\footnote{I Edward VI, cap. 14. See also Haigh, \textit{English Reformations}, pp. 170-2.} The lands were to be held of the crown manor of “Estegrenewiche”, [East Greenwich, London] Kent “at pleasure”. The local bailiffs and burgesses were to appoint Masters and Ushers and write up statutes for the school and scholars. They were to take the advice of Cuthbert Tunstall, the Bishop of Durham, for the time being.\footnote{For the above, see the rather beautiful and interesting charter available for open viewing at the National Archives ref., TNA FEC1/1648. For a plainer, more accessible copy, see \textit{CPR Edward VI, 1550-1553}, vol. 4, p. 384-5.}

Much of the initiative for the founding of the school came from the local populace.\footnote{There are some suggestions that one of the people behind the founding of this school was, William Turner of Morpeth. He was a humanist scholar and became a pioneering botanist: see Whitney R. D. Jones, “Turner, William (1509/10–1568),” in \textit{ODNB}, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, January 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27874> (accessed August 21, 2010).} Nevertheless, this was in Dacre’s barony and he had patronised the dissolved chantries in Morpeth that funded the school. St. Giles was under Wharton’s patronage – therefore making this a joint Wharton and Dacre venture in some ways.\footnote{See above, pp. 25-8. See also above, n. 129.} There is no evidence of any complaint from either of them about the founding of the school. Presumably, both wished to curry favour with the king. Edward seems to have been fond of the latest type of education as is
witnessed by the large amount of ‘good’ grammar schools still bearing his name.\textsuperscript{132} This demonstrates that perhaps the Dacres (and the north in general) were not as “barbarous” or backwards as some authors describe. Obviously, the middling sort of Morpeth (and presumably many others in the north) attached value to the most modern type of education. This school was as modern as most in the south of England.\textsuperscript{133}

During 1553, the young King Edward’s health declined seriously. On 6 July 1553 King Edward died.\textsuperscript{134} This divided the realm between supporters of Henry’s daughter, Mary and Dudley’s regime. As manuscript material on the subject is very scarce, it is difficult to describe events on the borders and piece together exactly who marched to Mary’s aid at Keninghall and Framlingham.\textsuperscript{135} The actions of the Whartons are easier to fathom than the Dacres’: the Whartons hedged their bets and kept their feet firmly within both camps – that of John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland and, his choice of Queen, Lady Jane Grey, and Mary Tudor. Lord Wharton’s eldest son, Sir Thomas Wharton attended Mary well before the death of Edward. He continued to be close to Mary throughout her reign and went on to be one of the signatories that witnessed her will.\textsuperscript{136} However, on Edward’s death, Lord Wharton remained in his post on the borders, nominally serving the regime of the Duke of Northumberland and his puppet, Lady Jane Grey. There is also some evidence that he took his service to Dudley relatively seriously and paid the price for it.\textsuperscript{137}

Dacre was a border magnate and did not seem concerned by the machinations at court, except when they affected him. Loach’s claim that Dacre marched southwards to Mary’s aid is a little far-fetched; the evidence points towards Loades’ more balanced view that Dacre “was clearly declared” for the accession

\textsuperscript{132} For example, see <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/leaguetables/6980134/GCSE-league-tables-Midlands.html> accessed on 18\textsuperscript{th} August 2010.
\textsuperscript{134} See BL add. MS. 48036 f. 210. For an account of Edward’s illness and subsequent death, see Loach, \textit{Edward VI}, pp. 159-69.
\textsuperscript{135} For a discussion of this rather confused period, see Loades, \textit{Mary Tudor: a life}, pp. 70-3.
\textsuperscript{136} Ibid., p. 380.
\textsuperscript{137} P. Williams, \textit{The Later Tudors}, pp. 82-5. See also below, pp. 83-4.
of Mary. William Lord Dacre was unlikely to have marched 300 miles south to join Mary Tudor and her ever-growing band of supporters. He was unlikely to jeopardise his position. He had seen what could happen to those who crossed Tudor regimes on several previous occasions. Just like the outcome of the Wars of the Roses that had placed Henry VII on the throne, no one could be sure about the eventual victor of the struggle for the succession.

Dacre did not choose sides, really the side he supported was chosen for him. No doubt, Dacre did not like Dudley and, presumably, he felt affronted by the way that the regime had taken his lands, imprisoned him and promoted Wharton. An additional factor was that Dacre never did anything to forward the new religion for Northumberland, or even Somerset. He was unlikely to support a regime that innovated in religion. Virtually everyone in the realm knew of Mary's staunch adherence to the Roman church. Dacre was a survivalist and a traditionalist. Although there is no extant evidence of Dacre writing to Mary to support her claim, he had it seems, from his actions and reputation, already openly declared his intentions. He was clearly opposed to the Dudley regime and was naturally disposed to Mary.

Dacre received his due reward for loyalty to Mary. The Marian regime soon ended Lord Wharton’s rule of the borders. Graves states that Wharton’s record of service to Northumberland was “not guaranteed to inspire Mary’s confidence”. However, this is only partially correct since it is plain that Sir

---

138 See Loach, Edward VI, p. 178. For the statement that Dacre marched South to join Mary, when checking the references, ibid., p. 178, n. 58, it will be found that the first three references relate to Dacre’s Roman Catholicism. This was not the only reason to support Mary. The fourth reference relates to a letter to Dacre from one of Mary’s secretaries informing him of Mary’s success: see APC, vol. 4, p. 301. This indicates that Loades’ view that Dacre, “clearly declared” for Mary but did not take the drastic step of marching south is correct: see Loades, The Reign of Mary Tudor: politics, government, and religion in England, 1553-58 (London, 1979), p. 71.

139 See above, pp. 25-33.


141 Loades, John Dudley pp. 158-9; idem, Mary Tudor, pp. 134-70.

142 The convention for men of status like Dacre would be to write a general letter of support and send it down to Mary with one of his sons. There is no evidence of this happening.

143 Graves, The House of Lords, pp. 113-4.
Thomas Wharton, son of Lord Wharton, was a close advisor to Mary.\textsuperscript{144} It would not be long before Lord Wharton manoeuvred his way back into favour with the crown and thus into office on the borders once again. However, the accession of Mary was of great significance to the Dacres and the people of the realm. A new phase in the relationship of the Dacres with the crown was to begin.

\textsuperscript{144} See below, p. 75.
Chapter Four: The Dacres and Mary Tudor

As shown, it is unlikely that Lord Dacre and his followers marched southwards to join the apparent groundswell of support for Mary Tudor. However, it is clear that the Dacres were natural supporters of Mary’s succession.¹ The regime of Protector Somerset had favoured traditional magnate rule and William, 3rd Baron Dacre of Gilsland, had regained his coveted border posts.² Counterbalancing this, having been favoured by Somerset probably counted against the Dacres politically under the ‘rule’ of Dudley, Duke of Northumberland.³ Religious differences had also seen the Dacres as prime targets for removal from important offices by the Duke of Northumberland, but as has been demonstrated, differences of religious persuasion had not entirely counted against the conservative nobility throughout Edward’s reign. In fact, Lord Wharton’s staunch conservatism in religion had been of no hindrance to him in forwarding the reformation of recalcitrant Scots.⁴ Undoubtedly, religion was a factor in deciding the award of patrimony but was not the only factor that the government took into account when selecting suitable candidates for crown posts. Nevertheless, the reign of Mary, with both parties being conservative in religion, and considering Dacre and Dudley’s hostility, was always likely to see more favour given to the loyal, conservative Dacres.

As stated previously, Graves noted that Wharton’s previous service to Northumberland, and his help in advancing the ‘new’ religion, was unlikely to inspire confidence in the regime of Mary for his continued employment on the borders.⁵ However, during the first years of Mary’s reign Wharton was out of favour for more reasons than have been described. Although there is no other extant manuscript evidence, it seems that rumours had reached Court that Wharton had taken the step of “raysynge of hys force agayns the Lorde Dacres

¹ See above, pp. 70-3.
² See above, pp. 51-7.
³ See above, pp. 57-70.
⁴ See above, p. 52.
⁵ See above, pp. 52, 59-73. See also Graves, *House of Lords*, pp. 113-4.
in the defence of the usurper's [the Duke of Northumberland] quarell.” It was fortunate for, and prudent of, Lord Wharton that at least Sir Thomas, his son and heir, was close to the queen. If substantiated, allegations like these, could lead to charges of treason. However, immediately upon her succession, Mary did not exact a bloody revenge on former Dudley supporters – only the duke himself, Sir John Gates and Sir Thomas Palmer faced execution. The crown seems to have ignored Wharton’s misdemeanours but it is clear that a rumour of this sort was a serious blemish on Lord Wharton’s career and was a positive boon to Lord Dacre.

William, 3rd Baron Dacre of Gilsland, did not have to wait long to get his reward for loyalty to Mary. Dacre was somebody conspicuously loyal enough to Mary that the queen advertised him by personal letter of her “goode estate and prosperowse succese” in safeguarding her succession in 1553, demonstrating that he was not in the south of England at the time. Although, conforming to a previously unnoticed or uncommented on pattern the regime of Mary did not change the crown personnel holding border posts initially, preferring to let their existing patents run out. This is an indication of the conservative tendencies of the Tudor monarchs in general. An incoming monarch did not wish to

---

6 See APC, vol. 4, p. 305. The seriousness of these charges is demonstrated by the documents that surround it. The council, at this time, was clearly trying to punish those who had supported the Dudley regime.


8 Gates and Palmer were members of Dudley’s immediate circle, but it is not clear why these men were punished and more prominent others were not: see Loades, Mary Tudor, pp. 184-5; idem, The Reign of Mary Tudor, pp. 71-2. See also P. Williams, The Later Tudors, p. 88.

9 There is no evidence amongst any of the collections of any official court investigation into these allegations against Lord Wharton, only the entry in the journal of the Privy Council. Unfortunately, this is most likely due to the destruction by fire of some of England’s most important archival documents held in the Houses of Parliament during the Tally-stick fire of 1834: see Nicholas Apostolou and D. Larry Crumbley, ‘The Tally Stick: The First Internal Control?’, The Forensic Examiner (Spring 2008), pp. 60-62. There is a possibility it is due to the Palace of Whitehall fire of 1619: see Neville Williams, Royal Homes of the United Kingdom (London, 1971), p. 45.

10 APC, vol. 4, p. 301.

11 See below, p. 200.

undermine the legitimacy of the previous regime despite obvious areas of contention or difference between them.\textsuperscript{13}

Dacre replaced his arch-rival Wharton in January 1554. Initially, the regime placed him in charge of the west and middle marches.\textsuperscript{14} His fee was 1100 marks yearly in total – 600 marks for the west march and 500 marks for the middle march, which had become the traditionally allotted fees.\textsuperscript{15} Dacre’s orders stipulated that he was to go to the aid of Berwick when necessary. Tellingly, he was also appointed Captain of Carlisle, Keeper of Tynedale and Redesdale and Chief Steward of all crown lands within his marches. The crown also allotted the traditional allowance of £10 each for four Deputies to serve under him and 40s each for four Sergeants; two of each would serve in either march.\textsuperscript{16} Although the wages alone would not increase the warden’s wealth greatly, these wages were slightly better than those on offer under the first Tudor were, especially considering the expenses of the post. The main factor of these commissions was the formal recognition of the stewardship of crown lands within the remit of a warden. The extra money that could be made out of these other offices, especially from the stewardships of crown lands or estates, and the prestige that these offices conferred was an important source of income and patronage.\textsuperscript{17}

To calculate how much money these additional offices were worth would be extremely difficult. However, some idea can be gleaned from Thomas Scrope’s, 10\textsuperscript{th} Baron Scrope of Bolton, attempt in 1590 to calculate exactly what a warden’s customary pay should be. He examined Wharton’s records of the 1550s carefully. Certainly, these were more meticulous accounts than any documentation that Dacre left behind. There was, of course, an incentive for Scrope to discover what extra money he could earn from his position as warden: the wage of 600 marks would have been worth much more in 1555 than in 1590.

\textsuperscript{14} APC, vol. 4, p. 382.
\textsuperscript{15} See above, pp. 56-7.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.; CPR Philip & Mary, 1553-1554, vol I, p. 140
\textsuperscript{17} For other discussions on the fees of the border wardens, see Ellis, \textit{Tudor Frontiers}, pp. 49, 147-52; Storey, ‘The Wardens’, pp. 597-609. See also Ellis, ‘A Border Baron’, p. 256.
due to the inflation of the sixteenth century. Scrope demonstrated that (in addition to what had become the traditional 600 marks fee for the post of warden and various other allowances for ‘support staff’ (Sergeants, surgeons, trumpeters etc., which could vary somewhere between 40s and £2) there were customary fees for stewardships and other incidental offices appertaining to the office of warden, as follows:

The receipt of the Queens lands called Queens Hames, and forest of Inglewood, the stewardship thereof, and namminge of the Queens tenants, out of which he pays certain ordinary fees.

The demesnes of Carlisle, office of custom, paying a rent of 20 marks in Exchequer.

His stewardships viz:

i. of Holme, &c. 18l. and ode moneye

ii. of the Bishops lands, fee 40s.;

iii. of the Colledge lands, 26s. 8d.;

iv. of the cell of Wetherall, annexed to the Colledge, &c. 26s. 8d.

The tithe corn of Peareth [probably Penrith], Lang Walbie, Scotbie, Ricardbye, Stainton, Mickle Crosbie, Lytle Crosbie; paying their odde rent to the bishop and Colledge. The half-fishing of Cocker, of the Colledge, without rent. The casualties of these offices uncertaine.

The right to the crown demesnes of Carlisle was of importance to the holder and gave the holder the ability to rent out the good fields adjacent to the city walls. Usually the crown awarded these rights to the Keeper of Carlisle Castle but Thomas 2nd Baron Dacre of Gilsland had effectively amalgamated the office of Keeper of Carlisle with the post of warden of the west march in 1501. However, there were still occasions when the crown appointed non-wardens to the keepership. In 1530 amongst many other differences, Dacre and Clifford feuded over the rights to the Carlisle demesnes, which both rented out for

---


19 TNA SP59/41 f. 238.

20 Summerson, Medieval Carlisle, pp. 650-3.

21 Lowther was keeper of Carlisle Castle whilst Dacre was Captain of Carlisle and Warden of the West March: see Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, p. 52.
relatively low prices to build up a following.\textsuperscript{22} By 1555, Thomas Lord Wharton charged higher rents and gressoms for these lands than had previously been the norm.\textsuperscript{23} Dacre, however, usurped Wharton’s control over the demesnes upon his recovery of the rule of the west march.

The fishing rights of Cockermouth were also relatively lucrative. Dacre and Wharton fought over these rights on various occasions.\textsuperscript{24} From 1437 to 1453, the Percy Earls of Northumberland received £13 6s. 8d. per annum for the farming out of the fishing rights at Cockermouth. By 1478, the Percy income from these rights had declined to £10 6s. 8d. per annum.\textsuperscript{25} A certain amount of guessing would be involved, but a reasonable assumption, erring on the side of caution, would be that the half-rent of the fishery would have been worth at least somewhere between £5 and £10 by the mid-sixteenth century. In total, without knowing the “uncertaine” amounts of money that could come to the warden for offices incidental to the position, or from fluctuating amounts such as the customs receipts of Carlisle, it can already be seen that an extra sum of well over £30 could be made.\textsuperscript{26} This was a far from insignificant sum of money.

Although, as they had now been in crown service for some considerable time, the Whartons were not ‘new’ men, they were still nowhere near as established as families such as the Nevilles or Percys, or even the Dacres.\textsuperscript{27} Initially, in general, the regime of Mary Tudor gave lucrative appointments to, and promoted the careers of, conservatives over the ‘new’ men whom the Henrician government had promoted during its innovations in border government and those whom Northumberland had appointed during the reign of Edward VI.\textsuperscript{28} In this vein, the reign of Mary also witnessed the revival of the fortunes of the Percy Earls of Northumberland. The crown restored Percy at the beginning of her reign although, like William Lord Dacre, the Protectorate government had shown

\textsuperscript{23} Summerison, \textit{Medieval Carlisle}, p. 653.
\textsuperscript{24} LPL Shrewsbury papers MS. 696 f. 55. See also Hoyle, ‘Faction, Feud’, p. 600.
\textsuperscript{25} Bean, \textit{Estates of the Percy Family}, pp. 23-5.
\textsuperscript{26} There seem to be no extant lists or copies of the customs receipts of Carlisle.
\textsuperscript{27} James, \textit{Society, Politics & Culture}, pp. 91-141.
\textsuperscript{28} See above, pp. 30-8, 57-72.
some favour to Thomas Percy in 1549. In May 1557, the crown restored Thomas Percy to all of the family’s lands and appointed him as Lord Warden of all three marches. In practice this meant that Percy governed the east and middle marches personally whilst Dacre ruled the west march under his auspices (although Dacre remained largely independent). By the end of Mary’s reign, Percy held the most extensive influence in the North.

This did not cause any major concern in the west march, as William Lord Dacre was reasonably content to remain influential within his own march and rely on his own tenants and connexion. However, there were problems in the east and middle marches as those who had vested interests there clashed with the restored earl. Certainly, Wharton was none too happy about being relieved from his remaining wardenries. He was to remain as Captain of Berwick, however. In addition, the Neville Earls of Westmorland, who had seemed quite content to remain out of the limelight since their fall from grace in the aftermath of the Wars of the Roses, found their way back into crown service. The crown appointed Henry Neville, 5th Earl of Westmorland, Lord Lieutenant of the forces in the north nearing the end of Mary’s reign, showing the regard her government held the Nevilles in.

Considering the work of Steven Ellis, it is also noteworthy that there was another rehabilitation of a family’s fortune, in another peripheral area of the Tudor State, in Ireland. Like Dacre and Percy, Fitzgerald’s rehabilitation began under Somerset’s auspices. The Marian regime elevated Gerald Fitzgerald to the Earldom of Kildare and Barony of “Ophalye” [Offaly] a few months after Dacre’s appointment as Keeper of Carlisle and its castle. Giving a rather rare glimpse into what was quite an uncommon procedure in Tudor England, the crown adorned Fitzgerald ceremonially with a belt and a sword of honour, along

---

29 CPR Philip & Mary, 1555-1557, vol. 3, p. 495. See also above, p. 54.
30 Loades, The Reign of Mary Tudor, pp. 98, 262; idem, Mary Tudor, p. 243.
31 TNA SP 15/8 f. 175; TNA SP 59/1 f. 45; TNA SP 59/1 f. 127; TNA SP 59/2 f. 3.
32 TNA SP 15/8 f. 55; CPR Mary & Philip, 1557-1558, vol. 4, p. 194. See also Loades, The Reign of Mary Tudor, pp. 262, 287.
with cap and gold circlet upon his head to symbolise his prominence. Although it would be difficult – probably impossible – to ever achieve he was to hold the same honours as his illustrious predecessors had. However, it is doubtful, that the £20 a year from the customs duties of Dublin that the crown awarded to Kildare would recompense him for the difficulties he and his family had faced at the hands of the Tudors.  

The line of Kildare would never be able to attain the pre-eminence amongst Irish society that it once had. Certainly, no Irish magnate was ever to hold the most important offices of state in Ireland. There were no Irish born Lord Lieutenants of Ireland between 1534 and the reign of Charles I. Nevertheless, these restorations of noble blood reveal a distinct general pattern whereby the protectorate partly rehabilitated traditional, conservative noble families, and then the Marian regime restored them fully to their titles and lands. Whilst most accept that the Marian regime was conservative in nature, it is relatively clear that the Protectorate, with all of its accompanying social upheaval, was relatively conservative in nature – especially in its attitude towards the nobility. Perhaps Somerset wished that the grace of the nobility would reflect or shine on him and that others would consider him a gracious and worthy duke, rather than as the rather haughty, self-serving character of some depictions.

The accession of Queen Mary to the throne proved to be most satisfactory and beneficial to the Dacres. William Lord Dacre got the upper hand over his arch-

35 Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, passim. It is not clear whether the £20 was to be in Irish or English coinage as there would be a significant difference in value. Having some knowledge of the administration it is likely that, whatever the licence inferred, this was paid in Irish £. For Kildare’s investiture, see LPL Earl of Kildare MS 608, p.27a [Latin]; CPR Philip & Mary, 1553-1554, vol. I, p. 177. For more on Kildare’s career, see Carey, Surviving the Tudors, passim.

36 For the position Kildare held in Ireland previously, see Ellis with Maginn, The Making of, pp. 58, 75, 78; Ellis, Ireland, pp. 130-3.

37 Bradshaw, The Irish constitutional revolution of the sixteenth century, p. 87.

38 See above, pp. 50-1; Bush, Government Policy of Somerset, pp. 129-31; Guy, Tudor England, p. 227; P. Williams, The Later Tudors, pp. 121-3; Loades, Mary Tudor, pp. 340-1. Duffy has gone some way towards establishing Mary’s reign as something pre-empting the counter-reformation but this would only apply to religious rather than governmental policy and does not question the generally conservative nature of Marian government: see Duffy, Fires of Faith Catholic England under Mary Tudor (Newhaven, 2009), pp. 188-207; idem., The Stripping of the Altars, pp. 524-64. See also Haigh, English Reformations, pp. 203-34.

39 TNA SP10/9 f. 30; TNA SP10/7 f. 8; TNA SP10/8 f. 8. See also P. Williams, The Later Tudors, p. 36; Bush, Government Policy of Somerset, p. 5.
rival Wharton. The Dacres regained their lost offices and the younger relations of William 3rd Baron Dacre gained recognition from the crown with inclusion on northern Commissions of the Peace. In October 1554 Sir Thomas Dacre, William’s eldest son, and Leonard, his second son received patents to be included as Justices of Gaol Delivery for Carlisle Castle, although they did not make up the *quorum*, which was reserved for the more experienced or learned in the law.  

Dacre used his regained position of strength and power to harass his old enemy Wharton. Only a few months into Dacre’s commission Wharton wrote letters to the Marian Council, “wherein he compleyneth of certayne wronges doone unto hym by the Lorde Dacres, prayeing him to leave all thier particuler sutes and griefes to the determynacion of the lawe.”  

No doubt, Sir Thomas Wharton, Lord Wharton’s son and namesake, could bring such matters to the forefront of the Privy Councillors’ minds. This backs up Hoyle’s argument – rather in opposition to the work of James – that the northern notables often fought out legal actions against each other rather than resorting to violence. However, Wharton’s letter implies that William Lord Dacre did not carry out his affairs entirely according to the law. He was willing to go a step further to harass Wharton with whom he had now been feuding throughout the reign of three monarchs. In fact, when the narrative of events between the two parties is examined as a whole, the Wharton/Dacre feud was almost a defining part of each actor’s identity.

**A Noble Marriage**

In other ways, things went well for the Dacres. The strained relationship with the Earl of Cumberland began to improve for the Dacres. This was with the active assistance of the Earl of Shrewsbury who became increasingly

---

40 *CPR Philip & Mary, 1554-1555*, vol 2, p. 106.
influential. Shrewsbury was President of the Council of the North and a Privy Councillor: therefore, he held much sway with the regime. As Hoyle notes, he represented the core of the State – the Court and Council, and the periphery of the State – the Borders and The Council of the North. Shrewsbury managed to avoid the purge of conservatives by the Northumberland regime. He was even put forward for the dreaded position of governing Ireland, where the Talbots had been notorious absentee landlords. Somehow Shrewsbury managed to avoid that poisoned chalice. During Mary’s reign Talbot’s influence grew.

As Hoyle has demonstrated, relations between the Cliffords and Dacres had not been good since the difficulties faced by the Dacres in 1525 and 1534. Both occasions had seen a Clifford replace a Dacre in the prized post of border warden. Although perhaps relations with the Earls of Cumberland had been a little better than with Wharton, probably due to the latter’s standing, there had still been many disputes between them. Shrewsbury saw a way to expand his own sphere of influence in the north and of eradicating a source of unrest in the west march by procuring a marriage between the Dacres and the Cliffords. Shrewsbury reckoned that once Clifford and Dacre were relatives their feuding would cease.

A Tudor marriage was, of course, not like a modern marriage. Whilst easy enough for the poor or lower stratum of society (perhaps a little too easy for some) a marriage between noble families could take years of negotiation. It

---

46 LPL Talbot Papers MS.3205, ff. 223-7. See also Hoyle, ‘Faction, Feud’, p. 608.
48 For an instance of the regard Queen Mary had for him, see LPL Talbot Papers MS.3205, f. 8.
51 Remarkably, (amongst other things) a promise of marriage was enough to be viewed as a legally binding marriage by some courts. For an overview of the marriage process in the North-West of England during this period, see J. Mc Nabb, ‘Ceremony versus Consent: Courtship,
was far more of an ‘actual’ contract than marriages of today [possibly excluding the pre-nuptial arrangements of modern-day celebrities]. One of the surprisingly modern aspects of the negotiation is that William Lord Dacre did not seek to impose his will upon his daughter Anne. He would not force her to marry Clifford against her will. Instead, he allowed her time to give her consent to the marriage freely. The manuscript sources demonstrate that Dacre wrote to the Earl of Shrewsbury asking for advice on his daughter’s marriage to Cumberland as early as January 1551.\textsuperscript{52} It seems that the parties brokered an agreement during 1552. Dacre and Clifford agreed upon sureties of £4000 and a dowry of 2,150 marks.\textsuperscript{53} It took some considerable time to broker such an important marriage: it was not until 21 August 1554 that William Lord Dacre wrote to the Talbot from Carlisle stating that he had sent for his daughter Anne, “to knowe hir minde towards my Lorde of Cumberlende”. Initially she had not been impressed by the Earl of Cumberland but now “freely consented” to marry him. Lord Dacre also asked that the dowry be below £1000 as he had a large family to support and had “manyfolde Sutes” outstanding at law.\textsuperscript{54} Perhaps he was not receiving as much income from the crown lands within his remit that he would have liked. This helps solve the confusion over the date of the marriage between Anne Dacre and Henry Clifford, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Earl of Cumberland. It is more likely that they were married in late 1554 or early 1555, rather than in 1552/1553 as posited by Cockayne.\textsuperscript{55}

Shrewsbury’s matchmaking was a success and he furthered his own cause at the same time. This noble marriage ended much of the trouble between the Cliffords and the Dacres. No doubt, it was convenient for the President of the Council of the North to have two northern notable relatives at the council table.\textsuperscript{56} Another interesting aspect of Henry, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Earl of Cumberland, and Anne Dacre’s marriage is the esteem in which Henry Clifford held Leonard Dacre. A part of the

\textsuperscript{52} LPL Shrewsbury Papers MS 695 f. 92.
\textsuperscript{53} There is a possibility that this document could, in fact, relate to a later date as it is fragmented and damaged and the date is illegible: see LPL Talbot Papers MS 3206 f. 157.
\textsuperscript{54} LPL Shrewsbury Papers MS 696 f. 39.
\textsuperscript{56} Reid, King’s Council, pp. 172-90.
marriage negotiations involved lands in Westmorland. Sir Thomas Dacre, William Lord Dacre’s eldest son, and Leonard Dacre were both named in Clifford’s licence to alienate lands held in tail male in Westmorland. It is not clear exactly what lands went to whom, due to the surviving evidence. In the Earl of Cumberland’s will there is further evidence of the esteem he felt for Leonard Dacre. In his will, Clifford named his “brother”, 57 Leonard Dacre, as one of three men trusted enough to hold the keys allowing access to the chest of Clifford deeds and “muniments”. It seems that Leonard Dacre must have been a highly esteemed and trusted relation of the Earl of Cumberland to hold such a prominent position. The other men entrusted with these keys were William Farrand and Laurence Preston. Clearly, Leonard Dacre held precedence over these other men, as he was first on the list. 58 A poignant moment and the difficulty Clifford had in recognising his bastard son, Thomas Clifford, resonates through the years when he is described as “kinsman of the Earl” in his will. 59 Cumberland put his new relatives first. 60

*The Feuding Continues: Wharton and Dacre.*

By the 1550s, William 3rd Baron Dacre had survived through various problems with the different Tudor regimes over a period of over twenty years of service. He was an experienced man and a survivor of differing crown regimes and policies. The same was true of Wharton, although he had not had the difficulty of treason charges to face. He had been through good times and rather leaner times. Somerset had not favoured him, Northumberland had. 61 The Marian regime investigated Wharton’s actions but the position of his son allowed him to escape proscription for supporting Northumberland. 62 Despite their varying

57 Interestingly unqualified in any way: he was his brother-in-law but this seems to show genuine affection.
58 William Farrand appears to have become a Doctor of Law but at this time was one of the Earl’s estate officers: see TNA SP12/160 f. 121. Preston appears to have been one of Clifford’s most trusted servants, possibly his estate manager or chief steward: see HMC Salisbury MS, vol. 5, p. 433
60 Precedence was given to relations over laymen: see the Will of Henry Clifford, 12th Lord Clifford and Second Earl of Cumberland in, J.W. Clay, “The Clifford Family”, *The Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, 18 (1905), pp. 382-5.
61 See above, pp. 51-73.
62 See above, pp. 71, 73-5.
relationships with the regimes, the two had not given up on one aspect of life on the west march: their continuing feuding with each other. During the reign of Mary, Dacre eclipsed Wharton’s power. Wharton would not let Dacre’s influence stop him attempting to undermine his rival, however, and continued to try to highlight the deficiencies of Dacre’s rule of the marches to the new regime.

By May 1554, it was clear that Dacre did not relish his role as warden of the middle march. It is likely that he wanted to turn this over to the Percy interest who had a far greater following there – similarly to the situation of 1527. The queen, however, would not let Dacre resign from his office and renewed his patents on 27th August 1554. A year later, by May 1555, Wharton’s complaints against Dacre started to erode the crown’s faith in him. Amongst other things, Wharton suggested that Dacre was sluggish to deliver what were relatively unimportant bills – bills for redress from pilgrims to northern shrines. However, these bills may have seemed more valuable to Queen Mary than to Dacre, especially as she often turned to Cardinal Pole for counsel. Wharton, of course, knew this fact due to the proximity of his son to the queen and Court. In a similar vein, Wharton also suggested that Richard Dacre, a difficult-to-control cousin of Lord Dacre, joined with a Captain Eddrington in a raid against Scotland at a time when there was a supposed peace between the realms. Seemingly, William Lord Dacre answered for this, which got the offenders off the hook, for the time being. No issue was too petty to comment on if it could land the other party in hot water with the regime, or even just slightly dent their reputation, as the quarrelling between these two local rivals continued.

63 APC, vol. 5, p. 22. See also Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, pp. 166-9.
64 APC, vol. 5, p. 67. See also Hoyle, ‘Faction, Feud’, p. 67.
65 TNA SP 15/7 f. 118. See also Duffy, Fires of Faith, p. 114; Loades, Mary Tudor, pp. 318-9.
66 See above, pp. 71, 74-5.
67 It was Richard Dacre who had been involved in an incident with Clifford and Musgrave that has led to comments on his character from James, Ellis and Hoyle: see James, Society, Politics & Culture, pp. 118, 182. See also Hoyle, ‘Faction, Feud’, p. 597; Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, p. 242. Eddrington or Edrington is a relatively common surname today but was not so common in this period. The name seems to relate to a territory in the East March somewhere around Berwick: see Rotuli Scaccarii Regum Scotorum The Exchequer Rolls of Scotland, vol. I, p. 361. It is possible that this Eddrington is perhaps Hatheryngton of Gilsland: see Summerson, Medieval Carlisle, p. 685. Alternatively, he could be the “Hugh Erinton” examined at York by the Justices of Durham for “treasonable speeches” against Edward VI: see LPL Talbot Papers MS.3206 f. 37. Regardless of whether or not he was one of these people, it seems that he was a well-known troublemaker.
68 TNA SP15/7 f. 118.
In addition, in order to curry favour with influential parties, Wharton tried to ingratiate himself with the 5th Earl of Shrewsbury, Francis Talbot. However, his complaints about Lord Dacre did not have the desired effect on Shrewsbury who was Dacre’s relation through marriage. By mid-1555 Wharton, the crown man, had been without significant office for over a year into the reign of Mary. His harrying letters to the Council of the North and to the Privy Council, coupled with Dacre’s actual unwillingness and probable inability to govern the middle march effectively, began to have the desired effect on the regime – Wharton was to replace Dacre as the Warden of the middle march. However, by a strange quirk of fate Wharton managed to break his leg and could not physically carry out any duties. He was to replace Dacre as Warden of the middle march when his leg had healed well enough. Dacre, however, was certain to remain in his position as warden of the west march: he was the only suitable candidate for the job considering his widespread influence in the locality and his loyalty to the Marian regime.

The uneasy position of Dacre’s extensive border holdings was also of consequence to the relationship between Dacre and the crown. William Lord Dacre and his tenants had not quite relinquished their claims to the Debateable Lands although, at a higher level, negotiations between the regimes of England and Scotland about these lands, and other matters, continued. Dacre had decided that in order to improve his own landholdings, and to secure the boundary of his rather exposed lordships against raids, he needed to gain a foothold in the area that raiding so often came through. However, he was unable to continue his claims openly whilst the Marian regime was negotiating with the Scots in an attempt to avoid conflict and its resultant expenditure. The Dacres could not afford to be implicated in causing trouble with the Scots although Lord Wharton did his best to inform the council of Dacre’s

---

69 LPL Talbot Papers MS 3194, ff. 19, 67.
71 *APC*, vol. 5, p. 124.
wrongdoings.\textsuperscript{74} Clearly, the English government did not want to provoke full-scale warfare on the Anglo-Scottish Border. Mary had inherited a large deficit due to the previous regime’s (especially Protector Somerset’s) policy towards Scotland and did not want to follow a similar policy.\textsuperscript{75} It was especially important for the Marian regime to limit the expenses of warfare as the crown wished to re-endow the church and promote traditional domestic reforms.\textsuperscript{76} In addition, the north may not have been in a position to furnish men to face the Scots: the register of St Andrews parish, Penrith described the outbreak of plague in Westmorland and Cumberland in 1554.\textsuperscript{77}

Nevertheless, William Lord Dacre continued to seek gains from his newly won stewardship of the crown lands within his remit. This included the crown’s half of the Debateable Lands, which the Grahams inhabited. Dacre did not actually ever manage to rid the crown lands of the Grahams, as he threatened, when they did not pay his impositions.\textsuperscript{78} Nor did he receive any money in new fines or rent from them, if that was what he wanted. William Lord Dacre, however, managed to coerce the Grahams to do his bidding. Consequently, in order to maintain his claims to the Debateable Lands, the Dacres employed the rather under-handed tactic of harassing the Scots by using members of the border surname clan. In January 1555, the regime formally recognised oaths that members of the Graham surname had made to Dacre [that]

Richard Greyme, Peter Greyme and William Greyme, of the countie of Cumbreland, stande bounden eche of them for another in the somme of two hundreth pounds a pece, whiche they acknowleage to owe unto the King and Quenes Majesties.

The condicion of the recognizaunce is suche that if the above named Greymes and every of them be fromhensfourth of good abearing towards the King and Quenes Heighnes' subjectes, and shewe themselfes in all poyntes of thier

\textsuperscript{74} APC, vol. 5, pp. 13, 22.  
\textsuperscript{75} See above, pp. 51-3.  
\textsuperscript{76} Loades, Mary Tudor, p. 320; P. Williams, The Later Tudors, p. 106. See also D Potter, ‘Britain and the Wider World’, in Jones & Titler (eds.), A Companion to Tudor Britain, pp. 182-200.  
\textsuperscript{77} C[arlisle] R[ecord] O[ffice] PR 110 StA/1.  
\textsuperscript{78} LPL Talbot Papers MS3194 f. 19.
Majesties service in the Borders obedient to the Wardeyn of the Marches and other officers there for the time being, and, moreover, do what lyeth in them from tyme to tyme to bring in the rebelles and suche others of thier surname as lately fledd into Scotlände to be aunswerable to the lawe, thenne this present recognizance to be voide and of none effecte.  

The Dacres had feuded previously with the Grahams over rights to the Debateable Lands. Clearly, the Dacres got the upper hand on this occasion. William Lord Dacre managed to assert enough influence over the Grahams to make them swear fealty to him and his monarch. However, no one could be sure about the reliability of the surnames’ oaths or bonds.

Dacre could unleash the Grahams against the Scots, or whomever he wished, or he could throw them in prison or attempt to convict them for murders he knew they had committed. Dacre, in fact, blackmailed the blackmailers. Dacre could hide behind their illegal enterprises, as no one would really find their behaviour that unusual. Using the border surnames was unlikely to provoke a costly (to Dacre and for the crown) war as they often raided anyone they saw fit to on their own initiative. During the run up to war in 1556, Dacre ignored “disorders” performed by the Grahams against the Scots. Despite the Privy Councillors’ claims that they had written to Dacre “two or thre severall tymes”, to force him to make redress and reform his actions, it had little effect on Dacre. It is clear that Dacre had little inclination to make restitution to the Scots for raids against those inhabiting lands that he believed were his by right of conquest. These are precisely the kind of actions that have led to descriptions of the Dacres as troublemakers and breakers of the peace.

Wharton’s contacts kept him

---

79 APC, vol. 5, pp. 89-90.
80 William Lord Dacre had imprisoned Richard Graham in 1528 but had been thwarted by Sir William Musgrave: see Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, p. 204; Clark Stuart Colman, ‘The Cumberland and Westmorland Musgraves c. 1500-1700: aspects of their political careers within the emerging British state’ (Keele University, Ph.D Thesis Unpublished), p. 44. See also above, pp. 67-9.
82 The Graham had been responsible for the murder of tenants of Sir Thomas Hilton according to Dacre. For the above, see LPL Talbot Papers MS3194, ff. 11, 19, 67; TNA SP 51/1 f. 37; Sadler Papers, vol. I, pp. 451-3. For a different view on Dacre control over the Grahams, see Tough, The Last years of a Frontier, pp. 190-1.
83 Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, pp. 61-6; Watts, From Border, pp. 24-30; D. Newton, North-East England, pp. 64-5.
84 Summerson, Medieval Carlisle, p. 652. See also N. Williams, Thomas Howard, pp. 60, 118.
informed about the situation but he was unable to prove anything. The Grahams resorted to Wharton for protection from Dacre many times – once again, this was an example of Dacre using his position to harass former followers of his nemesis. 85

It is clear who had gained the upper hand in the power struggle between Wharton and Dacre. In 1556, William Lord Dacre had enough confidence in his position and relationship with the crown to present a plan for the building of a fort at “Blacke Banke” which was opposite the Keep of Langholm at Annandale in Scotland. He must have had confidence that his role in society in the west march would last for a considerable period. Dacre sent this plan to the Privy Council who decided it would only “cause the Scots to do the same” and would be a waste of money, which, seems to have been in short supply. 86 This compares interestingly with the “Platte” described by Merriman as being drawn up by Christopher Dacre to build a network of forts along the border as a part of an early English Maginot Line [or later Hadrian’s Wall] against Scotland. 87 However, the crown did not adopt either plan, if indeed they were entirely separate plans. 88

In some ways, it seems that the Dacres could almost be considered as experts at designing defensive structures. 89 On a previous occasion, Rockcliffe Castle, built by Thomas Lord Dacre, had been mooted as a successful prototype for border defensive structures: it was still in use nearly 100 years later. 90 Perhaps this expertise was the reason the Privy Council found it necessary to inform William Lord Dacre of the “overthrow” of Pietro Strozzi in 1554; although the council may have felt this was just relevant news or useful information that

85 The Grahams had been used much to Wharton’s advantage against the Scots in the 1540s: see Hamilton Papers, vol. I, pp. 83-8; L&P Henry VIII, vol. 16, pp. 491-2. See also LPL Talbot Papers MS 3194, f. 19; TNA SP 15/18 f. 118. See also APC, vol. 2, p. 447.
86 For an overview of finances during the reign of Philip and Mary, see Loades, The Reign of Mary Tudor, pp. 291-320.
88 It seems a little strange that two Dacres came up with entirely separate plans on entirely separate occasions.
89 There is a slim possibility that these are in fact the same plan: see Merriman, ‘The Epystle to the Queen’s Majestie’ and Its ‘Platte’; Architectural History, 27 (1984), pp. 25-32; idem, The Rough Wooings, pp. 386-8.
90 BL Cotton Caligula MS D/II f. 68; Hodgson, History of Northumberland, pt. 3, vol. 2, p. 203. See also Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, p. 94.
would help Dacre in his dealings with the Scots. Strozzi was a famous Italian commander and a defensive expert who had improved the ability of Scottish fortifications to withstand English onsloughts.  

However, Dacre was not above rebuke. Evidently, he realised that the Whartons, through the actions and position of Sir Thomas Wharton, were beginning to have more influence at the centre of power than he was. In 1556, Lord Wharton highlighted problems on the Debatable Lands to the Privy Council and perhaps to the queen herself through Wharton’s son and namesake. Dacre asked for leave to come to Court, no doubt to present his side of the story. According to Dacre, the borders were in “good order”. Wharton, however, told the council otherwise and managed to get a very strong rebuke written to Dacre by the council with the apparent knowledge of the queen. This had little actual effect on the actions of Lord Dacre who actively stepped up his campaign against Wharton and his adherents, including his own half-brother and bastard, Sir Thomas Dacre. Dacre’s behaviour caused mounting concern amongst some at Court. The council ordered him to stop his harassment of Sir Thomas Dacre or “eny of his servantes or his tenantes”. By late 1556, Wharton had begun to gain more influence over the Privy Council than Lord Dacre held.

**A Border Baron and War**

The reigns of Mary and Philip were, however, still a return to almost the height of Dacre power and were a time of active crown service for Leonard Dacre. The Dacres were a necessary and inexpensive measure for defence on the Borders. Mary’s choice of religion and marriage aligned England with Spain. The

---

92 *APC*, vol. 5, p. 357.  
93 Ibid., p. 325.  
95 *APC*, vol. 6, p. 3.
government expected French intrigue to cause trouble from Scotland.\(^96\) A positive upshot of this for the regime was improved relations with Irish conservatives and less expense on military outlay on the other island.\(^97\) However, the regime considered that the defences and the men available to curtail invasion on the Anglo-Scottish Border were inadequate. The crown augmented forces with levies or with captains commanding trained bands [mercenaries] from further south.\(^98\) One example of these men was the rather shadowy Captain Tutty and his one hundred men who served with Leonard Dacre on the west march during the war with Scotland. Certainly, the sources suggest that this was rather an annoyance for Dacre.\(^99\)

In late 1556, despite rebukes and warnings about Dacre’s activities on the west march, the crown once again recognised his influence in the locality. As Somerset had, the crown required Dacre’s cooperation in military matters.\(^100\) Dacre had influence in Scotland and was able to advertise the crown of the “proceindinges of the Scottishe rebelles”. Dacre was informed that he was to “take the leading” of all “hable and serviceable men” in Cumberland and Westmorland, once the General Survey had been carried out.\(^101\) Evidently the crown was preparing for the inevitable war with the Scots and French with typically cheap methods. Shrewsbury, too, was eager to highlight the necessity of the assistance of Lord Dacre in the upcoming conflict.\(^102\) However, despite the council’s previous instructions, and Shrewsbury’s representations, Dacre was not part of the initial invasion force. Upon the invasion, the crown ordered Dacre to remain on the defensive within the west march. Whether or not he wished to participate actively in the campaign is not clear from the remaining evidence. Generally, William Lord Dacre does not seem to have been quite the

\(^96\) TNA SP 69/1 f. 115; TNA SP 69/2 f. 139; TNA SP 51/1 f. 44; TN A SP 15/8 f. 127. See also H. F. M. Prescott, *Mary Tudor the Spanish Tudor* (London, 2003), pp. 415-37.


\(^98\) LPL Talbot Papers MS.3206 ff. 291-2. It seems that there were plenty of men willing to serve for decent pay: see TNA SP 11/11 f. 123.

\(^99\) APC, vol. 6, pp. 396, 424. For Tutty, see TNA SP69/9 f. 146; TNA SP69/10 ff. 77, 100. See also APC, vol. 7, p. 40.

\(^100\) See above, pp. 51-7.

\(^101\) APC, vol. 6, p. 9.

\(^102\) LPL Talbot Papers MS.3195, ff. 131, 147.
soldier that his father was and was relatively content to delegate activities of a
martial nature to his sons or cousin. 103

Throughout 1556 and 1557, preparations for war took precedence over the day-
to-day administration of estates and of Dacre’s quarrels. Intelligence arrived
daily with news of French reinforcements sent into Scotland.104 The English
regime did its best to survey and raise forces in the traditional manner, as best it
could from shire musters and levies. This episode offers another insight into
exactly the type and power of force the Dacres could raise from amongst their
own tenants and those others who were loyal and willing to serve. The muster
rolls of February 1557 show that Dacre was able to muster 5425 persons for the
defence of his march. Of these, the 3275 that were furnished comprised 328
light horse, 446 archers and 2501 bill men. This compares incredibly favourably
for Dacre with the Bishop of Durham’s 1769 persons of whom 964 were
furnished, Lord Eure’s 143 persons, with Wharton’s 2638 persons, of whom
1634 were furnished, or the Earl of Cumberland’s 1200 furnished men.

Most full musters of England’s much more highly populated southern shires
could not raise the kind of fighting force that the Dacres could. For example, the
shires of Norfolk provided 2670 able men, Sussex 5889 men, Cheshire 4071
men and Herefordshire 1931 men. The Hampshire returns show the highest
muster figure with 6031 able men.105 This amply demonstrates the importance
of the Dacre manraed to the defence of the realm. These figures are also
interesting in that they demonstrate the highly militarised state of society in
Cumberland, in stark contrast to places such as Herefordshire. Whereas
Herefordshire had once been on the frontier of Wales, it was a quiet midlands
shire by the 1550s.106

103 TNA SP15/8 f. 17. See below, pp. 105-6, 148. See also above, p. 35.
104 TNA SP15/8 f. 87.
105 For an abstract of the muster roll, see TNA SP11/11 f. 33. For estimates of the population in
the northern border counties, see Robert Newton, ‘The Decay of the Borders: Tudor
Northumberland in Transition’, in Chalkin & Havinden (eds.), Rural Change and Urban Growth
1500-1800 (London, 1974), pp. 8-10; Tough, The Last Years of a Frontier, pp. 26-7; Norman
McCord & Richard Thompson, The Northern Counties from AD 1000 (London, 1998), pp. 113-
31. For a summary of the general population, see P. Williams, The Later Tudors, pp. 1-4, 162-4.
106 Max Lieberman, The medieval March of Wales: the creation and perception of a frontier,
The Dacres and Mary Tudor

Tudor armies were not particularly large by modern standards or even in comparison to other 16th-century, European armies. The typical Tudor army consisted of perhaps between 10,000 and 20,000 men. Armies sent to intervene in Ireland sometimes consisted of only a few hundred men and often consisted of up to a couple of thousand men. The army sent by Elizabeth under Essex in 1598 numbered 19,000 men and was comparable to armies England sent to the continent. Clearly, if Dacre alone could muster 4000 men they would make up almost a quarter of an entire Tudor force. They were also particularly effective and experienced fighting men. Coming from the west march, as they did, there was often the very real necessity of defending their homes against Scottish or border surname raids. These were not the poorly armed vagabonds or lame conscripts of many later armies.¹⁰⁷

Considerations for war, however, did not pre-occupy William Lord Dacre so intensely that he ignored completely the management of his estates. He – like others – was always on the lookout for opportunities to increase his income. In early 1557, Dacre asked for a licence to repair south in order to answer a suit at the Exchequer. Evidently, the queen refused him permission to do so.¹⁰⁸ Presumably, due to the difficulties involved in communication with the north,¹⁰⁹ and considering the time involved in travelling, Dacre had already set out southwards when he received the queen’s instructions to “repair to the borders” for the better defence of the realm.¹¹⁰ During this journey, Dacre received news of the death of one of his relations, Lord Conyers. Conyers was Dacre’s nephew and apparent friend.¹¹¹ Conyers also held the post of Steward for the crown estates of Richmondshire and Middleham (former Neville estates now in Wensleydale, North Yorkshire).¹¹² This was a position that Dacre wanted for

¹⁰⁸ APC, vol. 6, p. 220.
¹⁰⁹ For an interesting insight into the sometimes-desperate state of the “post” during the Early Modern Period, see H. Ellis, Original Letters, 3rd Series, vol. 2, pp. 270-2.
¹¹⁰ APC, vol. 6, p. 220.
¹¹¹ His father was married to William Lord Dacre’s sister, Ann: see LPL Talbot Papers MS.3205 f. 19.
¹¹² Seemingly they came into crown hands after the slaying and attainder of Richard Neville, ‘Warwick the Kingmaker’: see BL Cotton MS Julius B XII, 22, f. 143.
himself. Both were areas of good land, suitable for tillage or pastoral farming. Middleham also contained some fine woodland. Dacre was anxious to add to his remit over crown lands and wished to add the Stewardship of Richmondshire and Middleham to his already lucrative posts. The crown, however, used these stewardships as part of the rehabilitation of the Percys and awarded them to Thomas Percy, 7th Earl of Northumberland. Although Dacre did not get what he wanted, it did not seem to cause any general ill feeling between the two.

War seemed inevitable but clearly the regime could ill afford and little wanted war in the north with Scotland, or indeed with France. Throughout 1557, English negotiations with the French and Scottish delegations were ongoing in an attempt to avoid war. As was usual for the Dacres with their extensive Scottish connections, William Lord Dacre played a part in these negotiations. He was to deliver whatever pledges the commissioners decided were necessary. It seems that Dacre did not enjoy this role, perhaps being more used to personal involvement in the negotiations or perhaps because some of the points that were raised required redress by him. An article of complaints in French – ‘Complaintes l'Escosse contre Angleterre’ [complaints of the Scots against England] – lists the killing and placing of the head of one James Litil on the wall of Carlisle by Dacre as something still requiring redress from the English.

Another point raised by the Scots was Wharton’s “finding” of £3700 (Scottish) on a plundered ship: certainly he never accounted for this. Margaret Stuart, Lady Lennox, also complained of the “many wrongs” Dacre had committed against Scotland. William Lord Dacre received a rebuke from the Privy Council designed to stop him hindering the lengthy, legal, diplomatic process.

113 TNA LR2 vol. 186 ff. 16-60; TNA E134/31 & 32Eliz/Mich 16.
114 TNA SP11/11 f. 10.
115 APC, vol. 6, p. 121.
116 LPL Talbot Papers MS.3195 f. 267.
117 These pledges are seemingly agreed items between the two; promises rather than physical pledges in the form of hostages: see TNA SP51/1 f. 42.
118 Liddel [as in strength or water] or possibly Little [usually more contemporary].
119 TNA SP52/1 f. 2a.
120 LPL Talbot Papers MS.3195 f. 17.
that would possibly prevent costly open conflict.\textsuperscript{121} For some reason, however, Dacre seemed little interested in ending the war between the two realms. This seems a little unusual: it is not clear how the war would profit him or his holdings. Leonard Dacre was another who was not happy with redress made to the Scots. He wrote to Shrewsbury in June 1557 and complained that the Scots spent the money provided by the crown to make war on the English.\textsuperscript{122} Perhaps, the Dacres were being a little more realistic than Mary or the Council. Perhaps, being the men ‘on the ground’, they realised that war was unavoidable.

This thesis will not engage with the entire political scene or with the whole proceedings of the, relatively \textit{phony}, war with the Scots that was to have such far-reaching consequences for England. The main actions of the war in the North were limited to border skirmishes. Marian England did not fight this war on the same scale that the Protector’s regime had. Nevertheless, the French were successful in averting English attention from elsewhere and got the prize they required, and the one that hurt Mary so much, the port and pale of Calais.\textsuperscript{123} This, however, is beyond the scope of this thesis. To come back to one of the main points of this thesis, that is the career of Leonard Dacre, this is a pivotal juncture. It is clear from our previous writings that Leonard Dacre had had an interesting and varied upbringing. He had seen the many rises and falls of his family’s reputation throughout his life; before, even, he had started upon his own career of crown service.

\textit{Leonard Dacre, servant of the crown}

Current descriptions of Leonard Dacre are not usually ones with positive connotations.\textsuperscript{124} All neglect, however, his days of rather traditional crown service. In this section, Leonard Dacre’s days of crown service at a national and local level will be described and it will be demonstrated that it was not at all inevitable that he would become an enemy of the crown. The reign of Mary witnessed possibly the zenith of Leonard Dacre’s crown career and

\textsuperscript{121} TNA SP15/8 f. 43. See also \textit{APC,} vol. 6, p. 121.
\textsuperscript{122} LPL Talbot Papers MS.3195 f. 36.
\textsuperscript{123} For an overview of the proceedings at Calais, see Prescott, \textit{Mary Tudor,} pp. 453-68
\textsuperscript{124} See above, pp. 9-11. See also below, pp. 122-4.
demonstrates that he was not really the consummate rebel that he has been described as – at least not by 1558.\textsuperscript{125}

In 1558, despite instructions given by Mary to the contrary, William Lord Dacre was in London pleading against a suit that William Hewitt, an Alderman of London, had lodged at the Exchequer. A contractual agreement between Bartram Anderson,\textsuperscript{126} Leonard Dacre and William Lord Dacre on one side and William Hewitt on the other had clearly gone wrong. The suggestion was that William Hewitt paid for £2020 worth of lead that, allegedly, had never arrived. One of the problems for Dacre was that this case was not before the Council of the North but was in London – a place where Hewitt would have more influence and better representation than Dacre. Dacre did not fare well during the proceedings of the original case at the Exchequer. However, the queen released him from his obligations. The crown required that his undivided attention was focused on military matters.\textsuperscript{127} Nevertheless, Hewitt continued to exert pressure on Dacre through the courts. As a result, Bartram Anderson,\textsuperscript{128} a commoner, found himself in the Fleet prison, although he was released later on Dacre’s recognisance. Eventually, in August 1558, the Lords hauled Dacre before them and he agreed to a bond of recognisance in the sum of £2020: even his standing with the regime was not enough to halt the process at English Common law.\textsuperscript{129}

A consequence of this was William 3\textsuperscript{rd} Baron Dacre’s continuing absence from the North. This necessitated that his sons deputised for him on the borders. From now on Leonard and Thomas were at the very forefront of the war against the Scots.\textsuperscript{130} Hodgson’s statement that he never really heard any mention of the eldest son of William Lord Dacre, Sir Thomas Dacre, is in fact a little

\textsuperscript{125}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{127}See \textit{APC}, vol. 6, p. 322.
\textsuperscript{128}Bartram Anderson went on to become a highly esteemed member of Newcastle’s elite and his association with the Dacres, although costly to himself, demonstrates Dacre’s willingness to engage with the Merchant society of the Town or City as well as his usual associations with conservative countrymen: see D. Newton, \textit{North-East England}, pp. 39, 53. See also Bindoff, \textit{The History of Parliament}, vol. I, pp. 319-21.
\textsuperscript{129}\textit{APC}, vol. 6, p. 391.
\textsuperscript{130}\textit{APC}, vol. 6, p. 220.
It seems that he initially, as much as Leonard, was involved in the raiding and counter-raiding between England and Scotland. Sometime before June 1557, Sir Thomas Dacre was involved in a successful defensive action against Scots raiders. Apparently, the English got the upper hand in the skirmish and inflicted the heavier of the losses upon the Scots. Sir Thomas Dacre found it necessary to inform his father of the engagement by letter. This suggests that Lord Dacre was already in London. Another point to back this up is the fact that the queen and Privy Council had seen the letter suggesting that William Lord Dacre had given it to them, although the possibility remains that he had sent this letter on to them to demonstrate the fealty and bravery of his offspring. In December 1557, the Council thanked Lord Dacre for the diligence of his two sons who had raided against the Scots in “Annerdale” [Annandale].

Thomas’ forays were not the first actions of a man newly burst onto the scene. Evidence obviously difficult for Hodgson to find (he was a 19th century local historian) shows that Sir Thomas Dacre was returned as a Knight of the Shire for Cumberland in 1553 and was, as shown previously, a Justice of Gaol delivery for Carlisle in 1554 and a Justice of the Peace for Cumberland in 1555. In addition, some evidence that relates to Sir Thomas Dacre’s marriages and religious beliefs is extant. The main thing stopping Sir Thomas Dacre from becoming a major figure in the history of the North is the fact that he died before any of the pivotal events for the Dacre family took place. There is also a lack of evidence due mainly to the fact that Thomas Dacre, 4th Baron Dacre of Gilsland, never became a border warden. Therefore, there was not much correspondence between him and the crown. However, for some reason Sir Thomas Dacre and his father seem to have fallen out. This throws into doubt

133 *APC*, vol. 6, p. 95.
134 Ibid., p. 220.
135 TNA SP 11/5 f. 64 [28v-29]; *CPR Philip & Mary, 1553-1554*, vol. I, p. 106.
136 There is a possibility that this is a mistake in transcription but considering the usual formula of Privy Council proceedings, whereby a note is made to the left and then expanded upon in more detail to the right; there is a decent possibility that this was the case. Unfortunately, as is so
Camden’s oft quoted statement that William 3rd Baron Dacre cursed Leonard from his deathbed and wished to “send his son much sorrow for his disobedience”.  

If there was indeed a deathbed curse, it could have been directed against Thomas Lord Dacre for his marriage choice, or could, in fact, have been a useful bit of Tudor propaganda showing William’s usefulness to the Tudor regime and reflecting Leonard’s future ‘disobedience’. This has been commented on as some kind of cryptic allusion to Leonard Dacre’s later rebellion. However, this may just be a useful icon utilised by Camden to demonstrate the wisdom of William Lord Dacre, whom the regime had decided to employ, in comparison to the evil wilfulness of Leonard Dacre, whose destiny it was to be a rebel. It would hardly be unusual for writers patronised by the Tudors to include details making their masters seem naturally good and the enemies of their masters seem particularly evil. Probably the most enduring image of evil has to be Tudor depictions of Richard III. Interestingly, Leonard Dacre has also been depicted as being deformed in some way, perhaps this is just a coincidence, a common piece of iconography symbolising disobedience and evil, or may give some indication as to who Shakespeare was eluding to in his descriptions of Richard III.  

After all, Leonard had not been disobedient by 1563 when his father died. Really, he had simply had a rather traditional crown career with accompanying border service by this time.

Therefore, the suggestion can be made that Thomas fell from his father’s grace due to his choice of bride. He was the heir apparent to a large landed estate and

---

138 Ormsby (ed.), *Selections from the Household Books of The Lord William Howard, Of Naworth Castle* (Durham, 1878), pp. 366-7. See also Hodgson, *History of Northumberland*, pt. 2, vol. II, p. 380. Perhaps this was just a useful bit of Tudor propaganda demonstrating the wisdom of William Lord Dacre, whom the regime had decided to employ, in comparison to the evil wilfulness of Leonard Dacre, whose destiny it was to be a rebel. It would hardly be unusual for writers patronised by the Tudors to include details making their masters seem naturally good and the enemies of their masters seem particularly evil. Probably the most enduring image of evil has to be Tudor depictions of Richard III: see Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy*, pp. 84, 114. See also, Charles Ross, *Richard III* (California, 1984), xix-xlvi. Dacre is described as ‘Dacre of the crok’ed back’, by one of Cecil’s agents, Christopher Rookesby, recounting what he knew of the plotting surrounding Mary Queen of Scots: see Haynes, p. 446.
his father expected him to marry into a decently connected family, as the Dacres had done in the past. His first choice of spouse was Elizabeth Neville, daughter of the Earl of Westmorland. This fitted into the general pattern of Dacre marriages, or indeed ‘good’ noble marriages. Neville had extensive connections in northern society and the marriage would bring about further ties of kindred between the two powerful northern noble families. In addition, this marriage would have enriched the Dacres with land and, presumably, Elizabeth Neville would have had a relatively substantial dowry. However, there is no evidence of a dowry or lands being given to the Dacres, so we cannot be entirely sure if this marriage ever took place, or if marriage agreements were honoured. When Elizabeth Neville died, seemingly at a similar time to when the wedding was to have taken place; Sir Thomas Dacre’s second choice of marriage was unwise in the respect that it did nothing to enrich the families’ status or fortunes: he married Elizabeth Leybourne who brought nothing into the family with her. This was against the advice that his grandfather, Thomas 2nd Baron Dacre of Gilsland, had offered. His views on marriage were clear, “undoubtedly my said lord must needs have some money, and he has nothing to make it of, but only of the marriage of his said son”, he had stated. Certainly, this wedding did not fit into the general pattern of past Dacre marriages, which had dramatically altered Dacre fortunes for the better. To make matters worse, Thomas Dacre potentially alienated a good part of the Dacres’ border holdings to his wife, as part of the marriage settlement. Leonard Dacre was not best pleased.

Throughout the late 1550s, it was increasingly obvious that William Lord Dacre’s health was waning. In 1556, an “ague” laid him up for a long period. By late 1557, Leonard Dacre already took a more active role than Thomas did in the defence of the borders – perhaps strengthening his hopes of becoming the future Lord Dacre. In October, Leonard Dacre headed a considerable force of

---

139 See above, pp. 21-4. See also below, pp. 201-16.
140 Elizabeth Neville’s Inq. Post Mortem took place in 1548. It is not entirely clear whether her marriage with Thomas Dacre ever took place or was legally recognised: see TNA E 150/244/27; TNA C 142/86/47; Cockayne, Complete Peerage, vol. 4, pp. 22-3.
141 Barbara J. Harris, English aristocratic women, 1450-1550: marriage and family, property and careers (Oxford, 2002), p.23; Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, p. 84. See also above, pp. 210-6.
250 men. He rode to the relief of Berwick as many considered it to be at risk from Scottish and French attack although, as it turned out, there was little cause for concern. These men were veteran border horse and expected prompt payment for their services. Certainly, their sorties provided intelligence about Scottish actions on the borders. A letter from Shrewsbury indicated that provisions were hard to come by and money was in short supply; shortages caused by war had caused inflation in the price of victuals. Leonard Dacre acted decisively and on his own initiative sent a man directly to the Earl to receive payment for his men. The Earl of Shrewsbury’s honour forced him to give the money to Leonard’s men out of his own pocket. As seemed to have become almost customary by now, the crown – especially in the form of its representatives at the peripheries of the state – was short of money.

Another development for the Dacres was also to occur at this time: the formalisation of their relationship with the border surname clan of the Armstrongs. On 10 February 1558, the crown wrote up an official warrant (after lengthy requests from William Lord Dacre) to the receiver of the County of Cumberland. The crown put Sandy Armstrong, Headman of the Armstrongs, and ten of his sons in wages of 9d. per day of service during “present and future wars” with the Scots. From now on Leonard Dacre would be riding with the Armstrongs on his exploits against the Scots. No doubt, their local knowledge and undoubted experience of fighting would help his military effectiveness. However, to be working with such people would not advance Leonard Dacre’s courtly sensibilities and help his dealings with the centre of power; probably, this was not good for the Leonard Dacre’s image. It was these men, along with Leonard Dacre, who constituted Lord Dacre’s “order” and carried out a raid into Teviotdale in mid 1558. Therefore, the Dacres had some control over the Grahams by coercion and controlled the Armstrongs by collusion. The Dacres

143 LPL Talbot Papers MS. 3195 f. 236. See also TNA SP 59/1 ff. 62, 87.
144 LPL Talbot Papers MS. 3195 f. 240.
145 TNA SP15/8 f. 145.
146 APC, vol. 6, p. 237.
147 See above, pp. 86-89.
controlled probably the greater part of the border surnames inhabiting the Debateable Lands – both Scots and English alike.\textsuperscript{148}

In August 1558, the regime recognised Leonard Dacre as being actively in command of the west march. His father William Lord Dacre, although aged, had been called before the House of Lords and the Privy Council, not for the first time, to answer the charges still being pursued by William Hewitt, Alderman of London.\textsuperscript{149} In his official letter of office, Leonard Dacre was warned in a rather matriarchal fashion to have “regarde not to hassard himself and those under his charge further then may stande with the suerty of the Borders”. There was also a rather veiled warning to Leonard Dacre to carry himself in the appropriate fashion. He was to “be agreeable to the consideracion and good conducte that ought to be in one occupying the place and charge that he doothe.”\textsuperscript{150} It is not clear whether this was just a standard warning or if there were rumours about the character of Leonard Dacre of which the Privy Council were aware. This statement asks questions about Leonard Dacre’s identity, his “civility” and his “suitability” for high office. The crown did not issue this type of warning to other Wardens such as Wharton, or even to Sir Thomas Dacre of Lanercost, although both William 3\textsuperscript{rd} Baron Dacre, and Thomas, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Baron Dacre of Gilsland, had received similar veiled warnings about proper conduct.\textsuperscript{151}

Leonard Dacre was to annoy the Scots as best he could with what trusty and skilful people he could find. The council advocated a ‘scorched earth’ policy of burning crops, which would, no doubt have a greater effect on inflation in the area.\textsuperscript{152} It is clear that, despite restrictions, there was much cross border trade in

\textsuperscript{148} T NA SP 59/5 f. 47; APC, vol. 6, pp. 210, 213-4. Essentially the Grahams were an English border surname clan whilst the Armstrongs were Scottish. However, the blurred nature of the border and the mixed nature of border society meant that there was often little national allegiance felt by such border clans: see Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, pp. 61-5; idem, The Pale and the Far North, pp. 19-22; Tough, The Last Years of a Frontier, p. 15; Border Papers, vol. I, p. 393.
\textsuperscript{149} Ibid., pp. 391, 394. William Lord Dacre was born in 1500, meaning he was well over 50 years old: see Ellis, ‘William Dacre 3\textsuperscript{rd} Baron’, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{150} Border Papers, vol. I, p. 373.
\textsuperscript{151} See for example, John Lord Conyers’ appointment: CPR Edward VI, 1550-1553, vol. 4, p. 186. Thomas Dacre’s appointment: ibid., p. 256. For Conyers’ appointment by Mary to the East March in 1554: see CPR Philip & Mary, 1553-1554, vol. I, p. 177. Cf. William Lord Dacre’s appointment at the same time: ibid. William Lord Dacre’s grant is during “good behaviour” but none of the others are qualified by statements like this.
\textsuperscript{152} APC, vol. 6, p. 373.
English markets. The last few months of Mary’s reign witnessed Leonard Dacre raid and counter raid against the Scots. He raided the Scots in August and early September – all times for harvesting the crops. Doubtless he did much damage. The crown congratulated Leonard Dacre for his ridings in Annandale and at Langholm in particular. However, Dacre acted with a little more gusto than the government really appreciated as shown in the communication of January 1558

thanks to Leonard Dacre for his late good expoyte upon the Scottes, and he required to geve thankes to Captain Tutty and the reste that served with him. And as the Lordes do very well lyke hys forwardness, so woulde they have wysshed he had forborne thannoyinge of them, and stand only upon his own guarde, consyderinge they will seke to revenge it

Letters like this caused Hodgson to describe Leonard Dacre as a man of “hasty and violent temper”. However, he carried out the duties that the crown had allotted to him in the best way that he could.

Leonard was accompanied in these duties by Captain Tutty and his band of 100 light horse. Dacre does not seem to have enjoyed their company. On several occasions, the council informed him to continue their service, so indicating that Dacre may have requested permission to discharge them. At least they were battle hardened: seemingly they were available to hire for whoever would employ them. Tutty’s band does not seem to have been made up of the politest of men. In 1556, Tutty served in France but, according to Wotton, he looked to “have his band out of England, for of those who are here few are able to arm and horse themselves, and those who call themselves gentlemen will not serve under him”. However, Tutty’s help was necessary since the Langholm expedition was particularly dangerous. The Scots march at Langholm contained a keep permanently manned by a land sergeant and 20 men, a quite major

153 TNA SP15/21 f. 147. See also Summerson, Medieval Carlisle, p. 651; Meikle, A British Frontier, pp. 260-4.
156 APC, vol. 6, pp. 396, 423, 425.
157 TNA SP 69/10 ff. 77, 100; TNA SP 59/1 f. 218.
158 CSP Foreign, Mary, 1553-1558, pp. 276-8; TNA SP 69/9 f. 146.
defensive consideration at the time. The English and Scots had fought over this ground for many years. Langholm and the surrounding west march had been a major staging post (used by both sides) during the Scottish wars orchestrated by Protector Somerset.

Leonard Dacre’s force was mounted and probably raided rather than engaged the enemy. It is likely that they were mobile enough to bypass any kind of defensive structure. They could evade the watch set by the Scots if they went about their work at night. The suggestion from the sources is that Dacre rode with the most unsavoury type of border society – men whose assurances could not be trusted – border surnames such as the Armstrongs. The crown ordered him not to “assure” any more Scots due to their deceitful manner. According to the Privy Council the Scots that were assured through Leonard Dacre’s “zeal” were just as dangerous to the man they were serving as to the enemy. A general undertone of mistrust permeates through the letters from the council of Mary and Philip and creates a feeling that the councillors almost wanted to rein in the ‘wildness’ of Leonard Dacre’s character. It seems that the government enjoyed his exploits against the Scots but also felt that he could endanger any peaceful overtures that the English made at the time. An additional factor was that he was not the Lord Dacre or even the heir to the Dacre Lordship as the regime was at pains to point out. He was a lesser member of a household and therefore was more open to criticism than its lordly heads were.

Consequently, historians have not considered other more noble aspects of Leonard Dacre’s character. Evidence for how he administered his own manorial estates – the lands from the Strangways inheritance – is relatively scanty. The remaining evidence, however, demonstrates that Leonard Dacre did much to ensure good rule (and lordship) on his Yorkshire estates. Leonard Dacre presided over manorial courts on his Yorkshire estates as part of his duties to his tenants. It is clear from the number of ‘jurors’ present that a Court Leet,
Manorial Court or Baronial Court was held regularly on Leonard Dacre’s estates, but unfortunately not much evidence of actual proceedings has been left by the surviving folio. 165 The evidence shows how important good lordship was to Leonard Dacre as he presided over proceedings in Yorkshire and made his “frankpledge” before the same courts. 166 The Dacres seem to have continued this practice: William Lord Dacre made a Frankpledge before one of his Shropshire courts, at Loppington, in 1540. 167 Unfortunately the ins and outs of actual ‘cases’ before the courts are not explained but it is clear that these traditional courts were maintained throughout the time that Leonard Dacre held these lands.

Clearly, however, Leonard Dacre relished his role at the head of a considerable force of men raiding deep into enemy territory and, no doubt, enjoyed taking all the spoils of war. This was part of an overall Dacre identity of strength in wartime, something that he had inherited from his Grandfather, Thomas, 2nd Baron Dacre of Gilsland. 168 This was necessary at the troubled borders of the realm. At Court, during the reign of Philip and Mary, this type of behaviour was beginning to be considered as out-dated. 169 Philip and Mary required peace, not least of all due to a financial crisis left over from the reign of Edward VI and the subsequent wars with Scotland. 170 Strong leadership was required to hold tenants, assured Scots and borderers in check at the periphery of the state and Leonard knew the reality of this. Unfortunately for Dacre the social differences between soldier and courtier become harder and harder to reconcile as civil, courtly society and behaviour developed during the latter half of the 16th century. 171

165 See the previously unnoticed manuscript: TNA SC2/211/120.
166 TNA SP46/13 f. 287.
167 Shropshire County Archives [Shrewsbury] [no title] ref, 103/1/4/8.
168 See above, pp. 24-5, 90.
171 For the reign of Elizabeth this is discussed in detail by Rapple: see Martial Power, esp. pp. 19-85. The genesis of this attitude was already to be found in Mary’s reign as Rapple inadvertently demonstrates: see ibid., pp. 43-9.
These episodes demonstrate the exclusion of Sir Thomas Dacre, heir apparent to the Dacre lordship, from important office. He was not as trusted by his father as much as Leonard Dacre was; backing up Reid’s comment that Leonard Dacre was “the ablest of Lord Dacre’s sons”.¹⁷² Leonard Dacre also received many other affirmations of his ability and influence in the locality. Whereas Sir Thomas Dacre represented the family’s interest and sat for Cumberland in the House of Commons in 1553, by 1558 Leonard had replaced him. Leonard represented Cumberland for the Dacre interest in the House of Commons in 1558, 1559 and 1563 showing the regard that the local political community had for him.¹⁷³ It must be assumed that Dacre was not overly active in his role in the Commons since he had many other duties. He served as a temporary replacement and then as deputy for his father on the west march. Unusually, despite all of this, a letter of January 1558 mentions Leonard Dacre coming to term. This would not seem to be the case and presumably relates to land or livery that Dacre sought. It seems unlikely that 1558 witnessed Dacre’s coming of age. He had already been involved in fighting at the borders for several years. By 1558, as shown, Leonard Dacre had established himself as an active member of the political nation and an active servant of the crown under the rule of Mary.¹⁷⁴

In a more general sense, however, what is entirely clear is that, by the end of Mary’s reign (and certainly well into the beginning of Elizabeth’s reign) and during the reign of Edward VI, noble rule of the localities was far from over. In fact, nobles whom the crown had considered unsuitable for office previously, for one reason or another, could be reinstated. Nobles who were unsuitable to one government may not have been quite so unsuitable to another government. If Elton’s “Tudor Revolution in Government” had been completed during the 1530s then it must be said that one aspect of it - the replacement of the power of the border magnates by new men at the peripheries of the state (in this case specifically the north of England but also in Ireland), - was not continued. Border magnate power was not broken and replaced by the king’s writ; at least

¹⁷² Reid, King’s Council, p. 192.
¹⁷⁴ Dacre was probably born sometime in the 1520s considering the manuscript evidence: see above, p. 25, n. 22.
not fully by any means. Indeed, the Dacres carried out many activities that contravened the wishes or orders of their respective regimes. As shown, they often feuded with members of the king’s party, notably Wharton.

The Dacres dominated local politics and continuously bounced back from periods of exclusion to resume a dominant position within west march society. They would use whatever means was at hand to gain an advantage over their opponent – be they local rival or foreign enemy. When and where governments curtailed Dacre power by the advancement of “mean men” like Wharton, Dacre power was redeployed later for the defence of the kingdom. It seems appropriate to describe, as Steven Ellis has put it, the replacement of magnate power by men such as Wharton during the 1530s as an experiment in government that ultimately failed. As for the Council of the North, whilst it was a laudable attempt at consolidating royal, centralised power in the northern parts of the realm, it was destined to become controlled by the power of local magnates and to take decisions that were at loggerheads with the wishes of the regime.

In short, it seems that if there was (and, undoubtedly, there were far-reaching constitutional reforms) a type of Tudor revolution in government, during the 1530s, especially at the peripheries of the English state, then it was an incomplete revolution. In order to show how incomplete it was it would seem prudent to show how the revolution in government at the peripheries of the state was finally affected. For this, the reign of Elizabeth, with all of its inherent religious problems and problems of succession and faction, will need to be examined. This will shed further light on the completion of the Tudor revolution in government. However, since the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth is thirty years removed from the ‘revolutionary’ decade of the 1530s is revolution the appropriate term? Gradual transformation with peaks and troughs of government-backed activity might be a more apt way to describe the changes in

---

176 Hoyle, ‘Faction, Feud’, pp. 597-600. See also above, pp. 31-44, 53-64, 64-9, 74-81, 84-91.
177 See above, pp. 25-55, 57-80.
179 TNA SP 53/1 f. 7; TNA SP 53/4 f. 27. See also Reid, *Kings Council*, pp. 201-5.
180 Elton, *The Tudor Revolution, passim*. 
government that occurred at the peripheries of the state by the end of Elizabeth’s reign. Arguably, these events perhaps culminated at the Battle of Kinsale in 1601 as peripheral magnate power made a last desperate throw of the dice in a vain attempt to stop the consolidation of centralised power in traditionally magnate controlled peripheral areas.

---

Chapter Five: The Dacres and the Accession of Elizabeth

Problems for all

Mary Tudor died on 17 November 1558. Her sister Elizabeth succeeded her to the throne. England was now to have two female monarchs in succession – a most unusual occurrence.¹ There were several problems for the new regime to face. Perhaps the most pressing problems were the settlement of religion, foreign policy and financial matters.² This thesis will not engage with Elizabeth’s negotiations with religious and political matters at the centre of power as this has been discussed in many other works.³ On the borders, the Marian regime had restored Dacre and Percy to their former positions and had shown favour to Westmorland.⁴ If the magnates on the borders expected any immediate official backlash from the new regime, their fears were unfounded.⁵ The new regime was little interested in replacing the men who held posts at the peripheries of the realm whilst it needed to deal with more pressing matters. However, there are indications of crown animosity towards its more conservative nobility such as Percy during the earliest years of Elizabeth’s reign. Certainly, for Leonard Dacre the accession of Elizabeth was not an occasion for celebration.⁶

At the end of 1558, although he was still active on the borders and active as a Justice of the Peace, Leonard Dacre was on a forced absence from the borders. Just over a month into Elizabeth’s reign, the crown brought an action of

³ For a good general overview of occurrences at the centre of power, see MacCaffrey, The Shaping of, esp. pp. 1-70.
⁴ See above, pp. 72-82.
⁵ The conservative northern family who suffered worst immediately upon the change of regime were the Whartons. Sir Thomas Wharton was arrested immediately upon Elizabeth’s succession for “debts to the Queen”. However, the true motive for his arrest was probably his closeness to Mary: see above, pp. 71, 75. In 1561 he was arrested for religious practices, hearing private mass (which was not really a criminal activity) but there is a suggestion he was suspected of a conspiracy against Elizabeth: see TNA SP 15/11 ff. 9-10; TNA SP 12/18 ff. 17, 105; CSP Domestic 1547-1580, pp. 176-80.
⁶ See below, pp. 108-112. See also above, p. 45.
The Dacres and the Accession of Elizabeth

The crown mounted a challenge to Leonard Dacre’s title to the Strangways lands; lands the crown had awarded to him during the reign of Henry VIII. It seems that Cecil, who was party to litigation against the Dacres through his intimate connection with the Northumberland, Dudley regime during the reign of Edward VI (and who was to become master of the Court of Wards), informed the incumbent, Thomas Parry, that there was an opportunity to further the crown’s interests at the expense of Leonard Dacre. Unfortunately, much of the manuscript evidence for this case is no longer extant, so it is not clear what exactly the outcome of the case and the fate of these lands were. According to his attainder, Leonard Dacre still held much of the Strangways lands in 1570. Therefore, it must be assumed that Thomas Parry and his ward were unsuccessful in their suit.

In addition to dealing with the ward of the crown’s suit for his lands, Leonard Dacre sued for a general pardon. The pardon roll of January 1559 demonstrates that he received a general pardon “for all treasons, felonies except murders and robberies in dwelling houses and on or near the highways” for a standard fee of 26s. 8d. It is not clear what Dacre’s ‘crimes’ were – probably they were related to the Strangways land dispute. At this time, he was not admonished for harbouring priests, which would not have been unlawful. Leonard stayed in the Dacre house at Ivy Bridge in London as evidenced by a letter from his father. That the Dacres kept a house in London demonstrated their widespread patrimony; they did not use this for court or parliamentary proceedings exclusively. In fact, the Dacres were notorious non-attendees at parliament or

---

7 Strangways was a ward of the crown: see TNA SP 15/13 f. 1.
8 See above, pp. 40-8.
9 Graves, Burghley, pp. 1-37; Read, Mr Secretary Cecil, pp. 62-87. See also above, pp. 59.
10 See TNA SP 12/1 f. 61. Leonard Dacre was still in possession of these lands at the time of his attainder in 1570: see TNA SP 15/17 f. 253. For a discussion, see Reid, King's Council, p. 192, which states that, in fact, these lands were taken from him. Cf. Sue Taylor, 'The Crown & the North', p. 112. Taylor states that it is not clear exactly what happened in the course of this litigation with the crown during the 1560s. See also TNA SP 10/5 f. 144 which amply demonstrates that Cecil was aware of Dacre’s northern lands.
12 See above, pp. 40-8.
13 TNA SP12/1 f. 61; 27 Elizabeth I, cap. 2; Kesselring, The Northern Rebellion, p. 48. See also below, p. 126
court (as were many northern nobles). Nevertheless, as the case of the deal with Alderman Hewitt of London demonstrated, the Dacres actively developed trade links with the cities of Newcastle and London, although some recent research has revealed that Hewitt may have had a local connection with the Dacres. As discussed previously, this deal went badly wrong for the Dacres but many more may have proceeded smoothly and left little trace in the records.

The letter William Lord Dacre wrote to his son Leonard was a very interesting one in that, again, there were no signs of animosity between the two. In fact, the father wrote this letter affectionately – which is something the transcription in the *Calendar of State Papers* does not do justice to – thus, once again, casting Camden’s description of William’s deathbed curse into doubt. This letter makes it clear that there was a true bond of affection between father and son. Not only did William Lord Dacre send “my right haurtie commendations” to his son but he also signed off as “your lovinge ffather William Dacres”. It is obvious that the ‘loving father’ wished his son well. Lord Dacre urged Leonard to approach the Privy Council with information gained from “secret espialls”. Through his network of spies, Dacre had learnt of a French plan to land 50 cannon and 10,000 men in Scotland. If Leonard Dacre gave the council this intelligence, there was a distinct possibility he would go up in their esteem – no matter how alarmed the English regime may have been. However, courtly

---


15 There was a Hewitt family living on the borders at Rockcliffe, firmly within the Dacre remit. However, it cannot be ascertained whether there was any connection between the two: see C(arlisle) R(ecord) O(ffice), Sheffield Family of Broadfields, Southwark Papers, DSHEFF/2/1.

16 For the transcription, which leaves out much information for some reason, see *CSP Foreign, Elizabeth I*, vol. I, p. 118. For the original document (which is in unusually good condition), see TNA SP 70/2 f. 105.

17 See above, pp. 105-8.

18 TNA SP 70/2 f. 105.

patronage and recognition for service appear to have been relatively hard to procure from the Elizabethan regime.21

Although Leonard Dacre was chastised initially for his dealings with the crown, he was never in any grave danger. Examining the wider situation, immediately upon the succession of Elizabeth the time was not yet ripe for the government to attack overtly the vested interests of the more conservative nobility. The conservative noble Thomas Howard, 4th Duke of Norfolk, was as powerful as Robert Dudley was at this very early stage of Elizabeth’s reign.22 For the time being, the conservative nobles held great power – especially at the fringes of the realm. Initially, the Elizabethan regime did not change the personnel on the Council of the North or on the borders.23 The elderly Francis Talbot, 5th Earl of Shrewsbury, remained in charge of the Council of the North, on which sat his two relatives - Lord Dacre and Clifford. William Lord Dacre retained his position as warden of the west march. He held office alongside the restored Thomas Percy, Earl of Northumberland who remained in his post as the warden of the middle and east marches.24 The same personnel served the crown in the North of England in 1559 as had served the crown in 1558.

For the North of England, and indeed of interest for those who wished to promote a more integrated or at least ‘friendly’ British Isles, events in Scotland were at the forefront of a foreign policy crisis.25 To go into depth about occurrences in Scotland would be beyond the scope of this thesis. However, to outline developments in Scotland would throw some light on the matter. French, essentially Guise, interests supported Mary of Guise, Regent of Scotland, and

22 TNA SP 15/9/1 f. 21. See also Hartley, Proceedings, pp. 68-9; MacCaffrey, The Shaping of, p. 69; Stone, The Crisis, p. 141.
23 For the list of those appointed to sit on the Council of the North by Elizabeth, see TNA SP59/1 f. 14.
24 See above, p. 78-9.
many of the Scottish nobility opposed her. There were two main motives for this opposition. One was antipathy towards her religion, which was staunchly Roman Catholic – whilst many Scots were followers of Knox, the other was French involvement in governance. Mary was seen as a French puppet who brought Scotland to war against the English and promoted French rather than domestic Scottish interests. In many ways, the Scots proved to be as xenophobic about the French as they were about the English. Although England was Scotland’s usual enemy and France Scotland’s usual ally (auld enemie and auld ally), alignments in politics were beginning to transform. Many of the Scots nobility were in close correspondence with Cecil. These, along with English pressure and cajoling, exerted a greater influence on many other Scottish nobles than either their dowager regent could, or indeed her successor would.

Although there was not a full-blown civil war in Scotland, there was much tension and some outbreaks of fighting. The French party, in particular, prepared to fortify key positions, especially around Edinburgh [probably the only Scottish town of note] and quartered them with French troops to maintain the interests of their own party on Scottish soil. This helped to encourage an anti-French feeling amongst the Scots and alarmed her more powerful neighbour into deeper involvement. The English regime exacerbated the difficulties of the Scottish regime by actively undermining them – initially politically rather than militarily – by giving money to disaffected nobles. England, of course, would have much to gain in removing French influence from Scottish politics and in promoting a new alliance north of the border. Not all in government appreciated this; Cecil

26 TNA SP 70/4 f. 76; TNA SP 70/3 f. 168. See also William Murdin, A Collection of State Papers Relating to Affairs in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth from the Year 1571-1596 ..., vol. 1, p. 268; Wormald, Mary Queen of Scots, pp. 75-102.
28 TNA SP 52/1 ff. 92, 117, 122. See also CSP Foreign Elizabeth, vol I, p. 266-7.
29 TNA SP 52/1 f. 316. See also CSP Scotland, Mary Queen of Scots, vol. 1, pp. 251-2.
31 TNA SP 59/1 ff. 64, 87, 211.
32 Despite what Mary Queen of Scots learnt from her French ensignants: see TNA SP 51/1 f. 60.
33 TNA SP 52/1 ff. 105, 125, 132.
pushed this policy forward – apparently without the queen’s full commitment.\textsuperscript{34} Instability in the northern realm meant that conditions on the borders were unsettled.

This caused problems for the border officers. The wardens received an extra threepence per day in wages to compensate for the continuing shortage of foodstuffs caused by the “troublous” conditions on the borders. Officially, however, the regime denied any price rises had occurred at the peripheries of the realm.\textsuperscript{35} This inflation prompted landlords to ask for higher rents from customary tenants on the borders – tenants who held their lands throughout their lifetimes at fixed rents.\textsuperscript{36} Some tenants may still have held their lands by performing services for their lords or through military border service to the crown.\textsuperscript{37} The Privy Council forwarded a letter to Lord Dacre for redress, it had been sent by Nicholas Morton of “Scatby”, in which he complained about being charged rent by a Clifford retainer “Barres”.\textsuperscript{38} The Council considered Lord Dacre averse to higher rent exactions – which could weaken border defence – backing up Steven Ellis’ findings about Lord Dacre’s general estate management policies.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{35} APC, vol. 7, p. 16; TNA SP 12/21 f. 72. No doubt this prompted the regime to issue the ineffectual proclamation of 1561: see TNA SP 59/5 f. 7. See also R. Newton, ‘The Decay of the Borders’, pp. 2-31; Ellis, ‘Center and Periphery in the Tudor State’, in Jones (ed.), A Companion to Tudor Britain, pp. 133-50, esp. pp. 142-3.
\textsuperscript{36} See, for example, Henry Brinkelow, Complaynt of Roderyck Mors, sometime a gray fryer, unto the parliment house of Ingland his natural country: for the redresse of certen wicked lawes, evel custom ad cruell decreys, (unpaginated) chapter II. Although written c.1542 there was every reason for this book to be reprinted in 1548 and in 1560. There was widespread social unrest caused by Somerset’s proclamations and changes in rural customs (often enclosure was blamed), in 1548. In 1560 the Elizabeth government were ruling a largely bankrupt, from previous wars, and divided country over religion, while only a year into her reign. Her accession was perhaps not as welcomed as it might seem to have been with the benefit of hindsight: see Jones, The Birth of the Elizabethan Age, pp. 1-30. See also idem, ‘Elizabeth’s First Year’, pp. 29-31.
\textsuperscript{38} Scotby, near Carlisle.
In his appeal, Morton explained that despite having held land near Carlisle by “court roll” and since “time out of hand”, many landholders had been evicted from their holdings and replaced by rent-paying tenants from Gilsland. The council were aware that problems of this nature could cause disharmony amongst border society. The fate of Nicholas Morton and his fellow petitioners is unknown but it seems unlikely that Dacre would have wanted to prejudice the claims of Gilsland tenants to the lands. Nevertheless, the crown asked Dacre to investigate these claims and, as was customary, “staie” the borders. The regime considered that having many people “in harness” for the defence of the borders was useful and prudent for the time being, especially considering the turbulent domestic situation in Scotland.

In 1559, in a measure mirroring the appointment of Westmorland during the previous reign, the crown appointed Thomas Howard, 4th Duke of Norfolk, as Lord Lieutenant of the North parts. He took charge of operations against the Scots and French. It was at this time that Norfolk came into closer contact with the Dacre Lordship and that the next Lord Dacre, Sir Thomas Dacre, chose to follow his party. This was also the first time Norfolk met his future wife, Lady Elizabeth Dacre (née Leibourne). In 1561 the Duke and Earl Marshall of England further feted the nobility of the realm with a great hunting party held at Norwich. Thomas Percy, Earl of Northumberland and Henry, 9th Baron Scrope of Bolton, were present. It is not clear whether any of the Dacres attended.

---

40 Seemingly, these tenants held their land through some form of customary tenancy they owed military service, defending the border from invasion, as part of this: see TNA SP 15/4 f.57; Calendar of Border Papers, vol. 1, pp. 20-3, 30-3; Hoyle, ‘An Ancient and Laudable Custom’, pp. 25-6. See also C. E. Searle, ‘Customary tenants and the enclosure of the Cumbrian commons’, Northern History, 29 (1993), pp. 126-53.

41 Some historians have highlighted the importance of economic grievances in causing the Pilgrimage of Grace: see C.S.L Davies, ‘The Pilgrimage of Grace reconsidered’, Past & Present, 41 (Dec. 1968), pp. 54-76. More recent scholarship has focused on the Pilgrimage of Grace as being derived from various different uprisings with various local causes. Undoubtedly, however, one of the rebels’ grievances was economic: see Hoyle, The Pilgrimage, passim. See also Fletcher & MacCulloch, Tudor Rebellions, pp. 24-51.

42 TNA SP 15/8 f. 250.

43 See above, p. 79. This was one of the measures recommended to Cecil: see TNA SP 59/1 f. 49; HMC Salisbury MS, vol. 1, p. 178. See also Murdin (ed.), A Collection of State Papers Relating to Affairs…, vol. 1, p. 229.

44 TNA SP 52/1 f. 253; HMC Salisbury MS, vol. 1, pp. 167-8. See also N. Williams, Thomas Howard, pp. 54-5; MacCaffrey, The Shaping of, p. 69.

45 BL Add. MSS 48023 f. 364v; Simon Adams, Ian Archer & G. W. Bernard (eds.), ‘A ‘Journall’ of Matters of State Happened From Time to Time as Well Within and Without the
This would seem to fit into a general pattern of Norfolk consolidating his position with the northern nobility and trying to maintain a semblance of a conservative, noble party.\textsuperscript{46}

Despite Tough’s claim that Norfolk could not trust Dacre, it is clear that he was to take Dacre’s advice where appropriate.\textsuperscript{47} By 1559, William Lord Dacre had been involved in the politics of the borders for over thirty years. His spies were the most trusted for information from Scotland.\textsuperscript{48} He had as much influence in Scotland as any previous Dacre (or perhaps any other Englishman) had. The regime utilised his relationships with Scottish border lairds, such as Lord Maxwell, the Kerrs of Ferniehurst and Lord Hume in an attempt to keep the borders in order and to promote their own party in Scotland.\textsuperscript{49} Dacre and Maxwell were to smuggle English or Scots without official passports across the border on the western marches.\textsuperscript{50} The crown advised Dacre to ensure continuing good relations with Maxwell and, as was almost customary, to “staie” trouble at the borders.\textsuperscript{51} However, Maxwell and Dacre were not to stay on good terms.\textsuperscript{52}

In May 1559, the crown appointed William Lord Dacre to treat with the Scots in order to negotiate and further ratify the earlier treaty of Câteau-Cambrésis.\textsuperscript{53} His colleagues were the Earl of Northumberland, Bishop Cuthbert Tunstall of...
Durham and Sir James Crofts.\(^{54}\) They negotiated the original treaty with the Scots commissioners within a couple of months. The two governments ratified this as the Treaty of Upsettlington in 1559.\(^{55}\) This Treaty signalled the end of the continuing border dispute. However, peace for the Scots became more and more unlikely as intense religious and political rivalry divided the northern kingdom. Mary was losing her influence over Scotland. The regent’s power and strength of personal rule were not enough to halt a reformation that was already well underway.\(^{56}\) Her death in 1560 left a power vacuum in Scotland that the Lords of the Congregation were only too willing to fill.\(^{57}\) The reform minded congregational nobles replaced her government, with a little help from the English.\(^{58}\)

The tumultuous nature of Scottish politics throughout this period meant that the northern realm’s central government lacked authority. Although complaints about Dacre’s behaviour were rife, Scottish border lairds could expect little help from central government.\(^{59}\) Dacre used the unsettled situation to his advantage. He maintained his claim to the Debatable Lands and continued to feud with the Scottish lairds that opposed him. Tough has claimed that Dacre was in league with the Regent of Scotland to make trouble for Maxwell, whom she did not recognise as her warden.\(^{60}\) In fact, the accession of Elizabeth, and Cecil’s plans for Scotland, allowed Dacre to continue with the same policy towards the Scots in the opposite march that he had pursued throughout the latter years of Mary’s reign.\(^{61}\) The treaty of Upsettlington meant that Dacre could not take arms openly

\(^{54}\) TNA SP 52/1 ff. 22-5.
\(^{55}\) TNA SP 52/1 f.71; CSP Scotland Mary Queen of Scots, vol. I, p. 211. For further treaties, see TNA SP 52/2 f. 61; TNA SP 52/2 f. 100.
\(^{56}\) BL Egerton MS. 1818 ff. 5-9; TNA SP 59/1 f. 139. See also Wormald, Mary Queen of Scots, pp. 102-28; Jones, “Elizabeth’s First Year”, pp. 48-49.
\(^{57}\) TNA SP 52/4 f. 18 & ff. 23-5; CSP Foreign Elizabeth, vol. 3, pp. 496-7; Ellis with Maginn, The Making of the British Isles, pp. 118-9; Wormald, Mary Queen of Scots, pp. 99-103.
\(^{58}\) TNA SP 52/1 ff. 145-6; CSP Foreign Elizabeth, vol. 2, p. 155. See also Doran, Elizabeth I, pp. 16-21; Wormald, Mary Queen of Scots, pp. 100-2.
\(^{59}\) TNA SP 52/1 f. 183; TNA SP 70/13 f. 106; TNA SP 52/6 f. 108. See also CSP Scotland Mary Queen of Scots, vol. I, p. 209.
\(^{60}\) This would not explain him continuing the feud with Maxwell once she was dead or why the English regime would not interpret Dacre’s actions as treachery as they had earlier: see Tough, The Last Years of a Frontier, p. 191. See also above, pp. 29-32.
\(^{61}\) See above, pp. 86-104.
against the Scots. However, employing the Grahams to do his dirty work, Dacre continued to act against Scottish border lairds, almost at will.\footnote{62}

\textbf{“Favourable in Religion”: the Elizabethan Religious Settlement}

For the English regime, there would be many benefits in promoting a stable and friendly government in Scotland: not least to negate unfriendly French influence and secure England’s northern border.\footnote{63} William Lord Dacre, however, and many of the border lords, or lairds, on both sides of the border would not view a more Protestant regime with any great favour. The borders were considered conservative in religion by the standards of both realms.\footnote{64} Even many years into Elizabeth’s reign, in 1564, the results of investigations into the religious beliefs of the border gentry showed that almost none were “favourable” in religion.\footnote{65} The Dacres did not favour the new religion and later historiography has painted a picture of them as noted Roman Catholics.\footnote{66} However, the years 1558-1560 did not see the stark religious divides that occurred later. It did not matter intensely if the Dacres were Roman Catholic or of the new religion – loyalty to the crown was more important. Moreover, at this time even the most conservative were loyal to the crown and considered so.\footnote{67} In the main, the Dacres served the crown as best they could regardless of their religious tendencies.

Attacks on Roman Catholicism at the peripheries of the realm did not begin in earnest during the earliest years of Elizabeth’s reign.\footnote{68} 1559 and 1560 were early days for the Elizabethan religious settlement. Even after several years, the

\footnote{62}Ibid. See also below, pp. 130-41.  
\footnote{63}TNA SP 52/2 f. 75; CSP Foreign Elizabeth, vol. 2, pp. 103-6; HMC Salisbury MS, vol. 1, p.193. See also Alford, The Early Elizabethan Polity, p. 8.  
\footnote{64}Meikle, A British Frontier, pp. 197-226. See also S. M. Keeling, ‘The Reformation in the Anglo-Scottish Border Counties’ Northern History, 15: 30 (1979), pp. 24-42.  
\footnote{66}See above, p. 10. See also below, pp. 118-25.  
\footnote{67}It was not until 1561 that the first arrests took place for the private hearing of Roman Catholic mass. The first official lists of Recusants were not compiled until 1561: see, TNA SP 15/11 ff. 12-13; TNA SP 15/11 f. 74.  
earlier Edwardian religious settlement had penetrated border society only superficially; the only reformed liturgy that many of the border populace had come into contact with were probably the books that Protector Somerset had bombarded Wharton and Scotland with.\(^{69}\) The northernmost churches had avoided much of the Edwardian reformation and had needed to do little to restore traditional Marian religion.\(^ {70}\) In Durham in particular, probably the most important diocese for English borderers, there was no great progress towards an innovative religious settlement whilst Cuthbert Tunstall was the incumbent Bishop. In late 1559, the crown removed him from the Bishopric of Durham and he died shortly after.\(^ {71}\) As shown above, however, in 1558-1559 Tunstall was trusted to treat with the Scots.\(^ {72}\) Unaccustomed to northern society as Norfolk was, the “state” of religion north of York surprised him. Upon his arrival in the north, as Lord Lieutenant of the North parts, he found “matters of religion” were “far out of order” with “altars still standing in the churches”. Norfolk advised that the Dean of Durham, Robert Horn, could bring the diocese of Durham closer towards “the queen’s proceedings”.\(^ {73}\)

There was a similar situation on the west march and throughout the bishopric of Carlisle. On Elizabeth’s succession, the Bishop of Carlisle was Owen Oglethorpe. He has found a place in history as the man who crowned Queen Elizabeth: he was willing to act for the queen’s coronation when others would not.\(^ {74}\) Oglethorpe, however, could not bring himself to support innovations in

---

\(^{69}\) See above, p. 52.

\(^{70}\) Haigh, English Reformations, pp. 177-81. See also Duffy, The Stripping of the Altars, p. 528.

\(^{71}\) William Hutchinson, The History and Antiquities of the County Palatinate of Durham, vol. I, pp. 540-2; David Marcombe, ‘A Rude and Heady People’, pp. 119-21. Tunstall was warned not to attend Elizabeth’s first Parliament: see TNA SP 12/1 f. 86.

\(^{72}\) TNA SP 12/7 f. 71; TNA SP 52/1 f. 23. See also above, p. 115.


\(^{74}\) See TNA SP 15/9/1 f. 17. Bishop Tunstall appointed “three meet persons” to attend in his place: see TNA SP 12/1 f. 86. See also, Catholic Record Society, Miscellanea, vol. I p. 35; H. Hawkins, ‘The Chapel at Keld, Shap’, Transactions of the Cumberland & Westmorland Antiquarian & Archaeological Society, 3\(^{rd}\) Series, Vol. IX (Kendal, 2009), pp. 69-90, esp. pp. 80-1.
The first sign of any concerted attempt to address religious reform in Cumberland came in 1561. This year witnessed the appointment of John Best as Bishop of Carlisle. He decided that an immediate visitation of the churches in his locality was necessary. However, Bishop Best seems not to have wished to go on a general visitation throughout Cumberland – although that is what he named his rather shoddy investigation. Instead, he seemed to favour bringing the local clerics in to see him; perhaps he was a little wary of the perilous conditions of travel in the west march. He attempted to administer the Oath of Supremacy,
but more importantly to enforce the Act of Uniformity, to the “wicked imps of Antichrist” within his diocese. Three priests (two of Dacre’s patronage and one of Clifford’s) did not come to see him but, according to Best, “fled” to avoid subscribing.  

82 Best called in the priests from “twelve or thirteen” 83 of the churches in Gilsland but they refused to come in. One of these was Robert Dalton, a late Prebendary of Durham who saw nothing wrong with openly saying mass, as was apparently the case at Stapleton.  

Bishop Best was obviously none too impressed by the attitude of the inhabitants of the locality towards the Dacres. Famously he described Lord Dacre as “something too mighty in this country, and as it were a Prince”. 85 Despite his complaints about Dacre’s misrule of the borders, Best’s main issue with Dacre was his lay influence over presentments to the local church. The Bishop also had a strange experience whilst being entertained by Wharton and his daughter but unfortunately, he did not go into detail describing it. Whatever happened, it is clear that Bishop Best found it most distasteful.  

As for the mass of people within his remit, Best seemed to think that they enjoyed his sermonising and realised that they had previously “been deceived” by false doctrine. At least, that was what he told his government. 87 However, followers of the new religion were very much in the minority in Cumberland. Most shared the beliefs of their traditional, local leaders of society rather than a new, innovating southern regime. 88

---

82 These men could well have been Priests who were refugees of the Scottish reformation. For an example of the way Roman Catholic clergy were treated in Scotland: see TNA SP 52/6 ff. 153, 169.

83 It is particularly interesting that a Bishop could not even accurately ascertain the number of churches in his own locality: ones that he was, nominally, in charge of. This demonstrates the difficulty that historians of the church have had in assessing the extent of the early modern church in Cumberland: see CSP Foreign, Elizabeth, vol. 4, p. 191. See also Hawkins, ‘The Chapel at Keld, Shap’, pp. 69-90.

84 TNA SP 15/11 f. 74.

85 CSP Foreign, Elizabeth, vol. 4, p. 191; Summerson, Medieval Carlisle, p. 645.

86 At the same time Wharton’s son and namesake was being investigated for hearing mass, although it was probably his closeness to the previous regime that caused the most concern: see TNA SP 15/11 f. 10; TNA SP 12/16 f. 117.

87 CSP Foreign, Elizabeth, vol. 4, p. 191.

88 James, Society, Politics & Culture, pp. 304-7; Summerson, Medieval Carlisle, pp. 645-6; Marcombe, ‘The Local Community and the Rebellion of 1569’, in ‘A Rude & Heady People’, p. 130; Kesselring, ‘Mercy and Liberality: The Aftermath of the 1569 Northern Rebellion’, History,
Certainly, the Dacres were of a conservative and traditional, Catholic religious persuasion (and a few sources support this). All of the Dacres (Thomas Lord Dacre, Elizabeth his wife and Sir Thomas Dacre of Lanercost) described by John Best, Bishop of Carlisle, in 1564 were “to be reformed in Religion” or “admonished in Religion”.\(^89\) Leonard Dacre was listed as one of the “justices and no favorers in Religion” in the North Riding of Yorkshire by Archbishop Young of York.\(^90\) Regardless of the fact that wills were not necessarily good guides to religious persuasions, the formulation of the Dacre wills, Lord Thomas Dacre’s and Lord William Dacre’s wills, were traditionally Catholic in nature. In his will, William, 4th Baron Dacre, evoked Saint Margaret\(^91\) and bequeathed money for prayers and for Catholic works. A man who would have held the highest credentials – John Throckmorton, carefully witnessed the will.\(^92\) Father Huddlestone listed Elizabeth Dacre in one of his Catholic obituaries.\(^93\) In addition, at Naworth there is a priest-hole, however, this was almost certainly a later addition to Naworth Castle and does not date from the days when it was a Dacre stronghold.\(^94\)

The Clifford Earls of Cumberland also seem to have held traditional religious beliefs.\(^95\) Lord Scrope was one of the few northern nobles with any type of

---

\(^{89}\) Bateson, “Letters from the Bishops”, pp. 50-1.

\(^{90}\) Ibid., p. 71.

\(^{91}\) A relatively well-known northern, Scottish Saint whose Saint’s day was, in fact, very close to the day of Elizabeth’s succession, 16th November: see Henry Gray Graham, *St Margaret Queen of Scotland* (St Louis, Missouri, 1911), passim.


\(^{94}\) It could well date from the time of the early residency of the Howards (they still live there to this day): see <http://www.medieval-castle.com/architecture_design/medieval_priest_hole.htm> Accessed on 15th September 2009.

\(^{95}\) Henry Clifford, 2nd Earl of Cumberland, was suspected of religious non-conformity by the Elizabethan regime but this was never proved: see Hoyle, ‘Letters of the Cliffsords’, pp. 20-1. The lesser branches of the Cliffsords were accounted Roman Catholic by the 17th Century Roman Catholic community: see Catholic Record Society, *Miscellanea*, vol. I, pp. 106, 116, 119.
reforming beliefs. However, he certainly cut a far lesser figure than the Cliffords or Dacres. These men controlled the advowsons to churches in their localities, to which they would present their kin or connexion. In 1561, Lord Dacre presented Henry Dacres to a living at Skelton after the incumbent would not subscribe to the Act of Supremacy. In addition, there was often little alternative to appointing poor priests (often escaping from Scotland’s Reformation) who would accept the low wages available. Therefore, the clergy often supported traditional belief systems without really meaning to subvert people away from loyalty to the crown. By 1587, little had changed according to Tobie Matthew. As late as 1663 there was a Dacre serving as the incumbent vicar at Haltwhistle in the Tynedale area of north Northumberland. In the 18th and 19th centuries, a Dacre served the spiritual needs of the people of Carlisle. In 1867, Joseph Dacre filed for the care of his brother Rev. William Dacre of Irthington, Carlisle who was no longer capable *compos mentis.*

From the utterances like those of Sir Ralph Sadler accusing the Dacres’ of being “ranke papists” (and then crossing out his remarks), and from some of the descriptions of modern historians, we could be excused for thinking that the Dacres actively recruited everyone to their faith and subverted the ‘true’ Protestant faith. Neville Williams described Leonard Dacre as “the most headstrong and troublesome of the Catholic Gentry in the North” and offered

96 Scrope’s religious leanings are evident from the following manuscripts: TNA SP 59/8 ff. 62, 141; TNA SP 15/17 ff. 95, 101. See also Bateson, ‘Letters from the Bishops’, p. 50.
97 It cannot be proven whether he was a relative or not, however, it seems doubtful that Best’s cause was better served by a Dacre: see CRO DRC 1/3 ff. 3-4. See also Summerson, *Medieval Carlisle*, p. 645.
102 TNA C211/36/25.
104 It is probably Sadler’s papers that have had an influence on more modern historians: see esp. Tough, *The Last Years of a Frontier*, pp. 191-2.
Norfolk’s description of Lord Dacre as “the undutifullest subject of England”.\(^{105}\) A more modern historian, Professor Kesselring has described Leonard Dacre as a “notorious harbore of priests”\(^{106}\). In these narratives, the Dacres are almost likened to Jesuit missionaries, but it must be remembered that this was well before the British Isles were targeted by their activities.\(^{107}\) There is little evidence of the Dacres being overly concerned about religious conservatism; at least no more than anyone else at that time. Throughout England many great men, or even men of the more middling sort, were not followers of the new religion during the early 1560s. Although it is difficult to quantify, it has to be assumed that in a great part of England many of the lesser sort were of traditional religious beliefs. There was nothing unusual or “notorious” about the Dacres being conservative Catholics during the early part of the reign of Elizabeth I. Only a year or two into the reign the religious settlement was far from final and absolute.\(^{108}\) There is a distinct possibility that most of the populace of England was Catholic at this time.\(^{109}\)

Gradually, however, at the seat of power men of the new religion gained the upper hand over conservative Catholics. Cecil played a central role in this.\(^{110}\) He promoted the interests of those who were ‘favourable’ in religion and especially those who kept him informed about the comings and goings in their localities. From the manuscripts, Cecil seems to have had a keen interest in regulating border service and defence.\(^{111}\) Cecil liked to be informed of local or regional affairs as can be witnessed by the large collection of his personal writings and memos on subjects such as the north and Ireland.\(^{112}\) These memos, tellingly

\(^{105}\) N. Williams, *Thomas Howard*, p. 60.

\(^{106}\) Kesselring, *The Northern Rebellion*, p. 48.


\(^{111}\) Bl. Cotton Caligula B/IX/1 ff. 160, 193, 207, 233. See also TNA SP 59/2 f. 54; TNA SP 59/1 ff. 49, 62.

enough, often appeared beside each other, perhaps indicating that some in government held a common view on regulating and governing the peripheries. And Cecil, of course, as Elizabeth’s chief minister and “most trusted councillor” was in a position to promote the interests of “his friends and servants that depended and waited on him”. This was an age where the reformed grew in influence. However, their reach did not extend into the society of the west march during the early years of Elizabeth’s reign.

The Northern Nobility

Throughout this period, William Lord Dacre remained in his post as warden of the west march. However, in other developments, in late 1559 Thomas Percy, 7th Earl of Northumberland, stepped down from his post as warden of both the middle and east marches. It is clear that powerful forces undermined his position. Sadler informed Cecil constantly that the Earl of Northumberland and his brother (Henry Percy) were not to be trusted in their “doings” with Scotland. The Earl was not so simple as to be unaware of this. It does not seem that Sadler vilified Northumberland due to religious differences. Although the Earl was conservative and noble in outlook (and certainly a follower of Norfolk), he was not staunchly against the Elizabethan reform of religion. Thomas Percy does not appear to have been of a genuinely Roman Catholic persuasion until 1567, when a wandering Priest named Copley “reconciled” him to the Roman faith. It is most likely that before the regime started treating him with disrespect he had little regard for religion, although his wife Lady

---

114 For example, TNA SP 59/4 ff. 105, 188; Graves, Burghley, pp. 4-7; Alford, The Early Elizabethan Polity, p. 24; MacCaffrey, ‘Place and Patronage’, pp. 109-26. In 1563 Thomas Dacre, 4th Baron Dacre of Gilsland, solicited Cecil for the office of his deceased father: see BL Lansdowne MS. 6 no. 40 [f.108].
115 TNA SP 52/1 f. 198; TNA SP 59/2 f. 3. See also CSP Foreign, Elizabeth, vol. I, pp. 538-9; Tough, The Last Years of a Frontier, pp. 188-92.
117 See below, pp. 125-8.
118 Copley was a Scot escaping the northern kingdom’s religious upheavals: see Sharpe, Memorials, pp. 204, 213.
Northumberland, Anne Percy (nee Somerset) remained staunchly traditional in her practice of religion.\(^{119}\)

One of the reasons that prompted Northumberland to step down from office not discussed by Reid or Sharpe, perhaps due to the availability of the manuscripts, was a further slight to the Earl’s honour.\(^{120}\) This was the fact that he wished the use of Hexham Abbey for his brother-in-law Francis Slingsby whom he appointed as Keeper of Tynedale. Sadler and Forster conspired to ensure the crown denied Percy’s requests. These very same people were determined to highlight deficiencies in his border administration.\(^{121}\) In fact, border politics and faction were evidently factors surrounding this episode. Lady Carnaby, the lay resident of Hexham Abbey, was intent on giving up nothing for the Earl. Carnaby was Sir John Forster’s sister and there was on-going tension between Northumberland and Forster. Percy removed Forster from the deputy wardenship of the middle march and dismissed Rowland Forster, Forster’s younger brother, from the Captaincy of Wark Castle.\(^{122}\) Forster used Sadler and his party in order to protect himself from the influence of the Earl.\(^{123}\) The crown considered Percy’s complaints but took Sadler’s part in the argument. The council judged that some other place would suit his purposes.\(^{124}\) Undoubtedly, Percy viewed the favour given to Forster as seriously undermining his position of authority.

In addition, the Elizabethan regime slighted the earl several times by encroaching on his traditional feudal rights.\(^{125}\) However, the overriding factor

---


\(^{120}\) Ibid.; Reid, ‘The Rebellion of the Earls’, \textit{passim}.

\(^{121}\) TNA SP 59/1 f. 239; TNA SP 52/1 f.198; \textit{CSP Foreign, Elizabeth}, vol. I, p. 516, 538; \textit{Sadler Papers}, vol. I, pp. 390-1.


\(^{123}\) TNA SP 59/2 f. 3; TNA SP 52/1 f. 164 ; \textit{CSP Foreign Elizabeth}, vol. 2, pp.127-8. See also Kesselring, \textit{The Northern Rebellion}, p. 47.


\(^{125}\) BL Add. MS. 33591/64 f. 179; TNA SP 59/1 ff. 110, 127, 145. See also Reid, ‘The Rebellion of the Earls’, pp. 178-9; James, \textit{Society, Politics & Culture}, pp. 278-307.
that caused Northumberland to resign his post was lack of money.\textsuperscript{126} The regime ordered the Earl to augment his forces with levies but it is clear that money for their pay was not getting through to him. In December 1559, Percy complained to Cecil

\begin{quote}
We be able nothing to withstand the enemy's power, they be of so great force, having their country so strong withal and we so weak, having no assistance of the country to account of, for that they be all for the most part in wages.\textsuperscript{127}
\end{quote}

The clear implication of this was that, once again, the crown’s parsimony was affecting border defence. Rumours abounded about the poverty of the earl. Sir Thomas Norton, MP and co-author of \textit{Gorboduc}, railing against the Rebellion of 1569 shortly after its conclusion, heaped shame upon the Earl by recounting [how he]

\begin{quote}
hardly beareth the countenance of his estate with his small portion of that which his ancessors sometime had and lost. His dayly sales and shiftes for necessitie, even when he hadde lesse charge than to mainteine an armie, both in Sussex and else where are well known\textsuperscript{128}
\end{quote}

Eventually, Northumberland gave up his post but this did not prevent his later employment. Percy was elevated to the Order of the Garter in 1563.\textsuperscript{129} Later he was trusted to escort the Scottish queen on her supposed visit south.\textsuperscript{130} Above all, it must be remembered that Northumberland voluntarily stepped down from his post. The crown did not remove him from his post. Certainly, the reason why he was out of favour does not seem to be that he was suspected of religious non-conformity, on the face of it.\textsuperscript{131} In the east march Grey, who was already at Berwick, replaced Northumberland. No doubt, Northumberland was further

\textsuperscript{126} Wardenships could sometimes cost the incumbent dearly as Thomas, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Baron Dacre, pointed out in 1524: see Ellis, \textit{Tudor Frontiers}, p. 151.

\textsuperscript{127} TNA SP 59/1 f. 10.

\textsuperscript{128} Thomas Norton, \textit{To the Quenes Maiesties poore deceyued subiectes of the north countrey, drawn into rebellion by the Earles of Northumberland and Westmerland}, pp. f. iii and over. (Text is unpaginated).

\textsuperscript{129} George Frederick Beltz, \textit{Memorials of the Order of the Garter}, clxxix.

\textsuperscript{130} TNA SP 59/6 ff. 56, 67, 72. See also below, pp. 141-2.

\textsuperscript{131} For a different view: see Kesselring, \textit{The Northern Rebellion}, p. 47.
agitated when replaced by Forster in the middle March. This meant that Dacre was the sole remaining warden who had traditional religious beliefs and was, in fact, the last remaining ‘traditional’ border warden.

By 1561, the northern nobility felt beleaguered in their northern powerbase. Many did not come to parliaments, although this was not unusual for the northernmost peers in particular. It does not seem that they were actively encouraged to attend Elizabethan parliaments, many summons’ south were for some ticking off or another. When they did come to parliament they formed – a not very coherent – somewhat conservative bloc. Nobles like Clifford, Wharton and Dacre could have had a common outlook on the regimes’ religious changes and were potential allies. However, people who had been openly feuding for years were not reconciled easily. Besides, the regime did not seek radical reform in earnest. Initially, the government sought to consolidate its position and avoid strife (and expense) wherever possible.

Certainly, however, the northern nobility aligned themselves with more powerful and influential parties. Some of the more conservative northern nobles, such as Westmorland and Northumberland, decided to follow the lead of the highest-ranking noble in the land, the Duke of Norfolk, and became part of his connexion. Presumably, Neville and Percy hoped to benefit from the Duke’s patronage and protection. By the end of 1561, all three were members of

---

Gray’s Inn. This may have helped Percy become elevated to the Order of the Garter. However, it seems to have been of little help in his other dealings with the crown. Others followed the lead of men such as Sadler and Wharton and actively sought promotion through the burgeoning influence of Cecil. Essentially, these crown men gradually took over the rule of the borders. Dacre does not seem to have been a member of any particular party or connexion, except for through his familiar links, and seems to have merely maintained his influence throughout west march and border society. Clearly, Dacre had little influence at court or in parliament.

In 1561 the northern nobility attempted to put aside some of the differences between them and especially to put an end to the feuding between Wharton, Dacre and Cumberland. As shown previously, Francis 5th Earl of Shrewsbury had acted to conciliate the Cliffords and the Dacres through marriage. George, the 6th Earl, took on his father’s mantle and tried the same course to reconcile Wharton, Clifford and Dacre. There were serious differences between Wharton and Dacre as has already been demonstrated. There were also serious differences between Wharton and Clifford. As described in detail by Hoyle, followers of the parties had almost come into open conflict some years previously. In November 1561, the two parties came closer to reconciliation upon the occasion of the marriage between Ann Talbot and Thomas 1st Baron Wharton. The couple were mature and experienced and seemed to have no

140 Seemingly, not to learn about the law: see N. Williams, Thomas Howard, pp. 81-3. There were many dealings between the three due to Norfolk’s position as Lord-Lieutenant of the North parts: see TNA SP 59/2 ff. 54, 82.
144 TNA SP 52/1 f. 218; TNA SP 52/5 f. 37i; TNA SP 59/5 f. 112. See also Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, pp. 262-5.
145 The fullest account of this feuding is offered by Hoyle: see Hoyle, ‘Faction, Feud’, passim.
149 Ann Talbot was the daughter of George Talbot, 4th Earl of Shrewsbury. She was sisiter in law to William Lord Dacre, who had married her sister Elizabeth Talbot. Henry Clifford, 1st Earl of Cumberland, married another of her sisters, Margaret Talbot. Therefore, all were related by marriage. It is not clear whether the fifth or the sixth Earls of Shrewsbury began negotiating this
real problems in their relationship, despite their families’ differences. ¹⁵⁰ However, the newfound spirit of co-operation between the northern nobility did not satisfy Lord Wharton. He still complained of Dacre’s and Clifford’s actions towards him. No doubt, they still looked unfavourably upon the supposed usurper.¹⁵¹ It is clear that the marriage between Wharton and Lady Bray (nee Ann Talbot) did not end all of the concerned parties’ grievances overnight.

Nevertheless, from the perspective of the Dacres the first two years of Elizabeth’s reign were rather uneventful. The regime continued the status quo in the west march. The Council of the North was unchanged and the Dacres, in the shape of William Lord Dacre, maintained their position within the northern administration.¹⁵² The crown was as poor and as pragmatic as it ever had been. Similarly to many previous regimes, it was best to keep the Dacres onside, use their manraed for the defence of the Anglo-Scottish border and employ their influence and knowledge in Scottish affairs.¹⁵³ The crown, in the guise of Cecil, had launched an attack on some of the more southerly Dacre lands but had been unable to prise the lands from Leonard Dacre.¹⁵⁴ However, unfriendly (to the Dacres) influences had begun to undermine the Dacre position from the outside.

The Rise of the Reformed

Upon the accession of Queen Elizabeth and her appointment of William Cecil as Chief Secretary a new Privy Council was also formed.¹⁵⁵ Of significance to the Dacre cause (other than the appointment of William Cecil) was the appointment of Sir Ralph Sadler, Knight Banneret, to the council.¹⁵⁶ He, like Cecil, had been

---

¹⁵⁰ Both had been married and widowed previously. Lord Wharton was over 60 years old; Anne Bray (nee Talbot) was over 40 years old: see Bindoff (ed.), The History of Parliament, vol. 3, pp. 597-9.
¹⁵¹ LPL Talbot MS 3196, f. 123. See also Hoyle, ‘Faction, Feud’, p. 609.
¹⁵² See above, pp. 76-81; Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, pp. 163-70. See also below, pp. 136-9.
¹⁵⁴ For a discussion: see Jones, ‘Elizabeth’s First Year’, pp. 29-30. See also Alford, The Early Elizabethan Polity, pp. 30-3; Read, Mr. Secretary Cecil, pp. 117-23.
a Dudley (Northumberland) supporter during the reign of Edward VI. It is not clear how and why, but it is clear from his writings that he had little regard for the Dacres. When sent on a mission, ostensibly kept secret by Cecil, to help the cause of the Lords of the Congregation in Scotland to obtain the upper hand over their sovereign, Sadler resided at Berwick. Sir James Croft's, another former Northumberland supporter and supposedly staunch reformer, accompanied him on this mission. As soon as they reached the borders, these men were to send reports to Cecil about the state of the Congregation cause in Scotland. However, they sent more information about the activities of Northumberland and Dacre than they did about events in Scotland.

Sadler was always eager to highlight deficiencies in Dacre’s rule of the marches. He complained of Dacre’s inaction in controlling the Grahams’ incursions into Scotland. The Grahams raided border lairds who were now Lords of the Congregation and therefore allied to England, such as John, Lord Maxwell. Sadler stated that Dacre

lies at Carlisle, and winks at it, saying he has no command from the Queen neither to stay them nor to bid them ride, and they may do as they list. We say not it is true, but must think it by his will or negligence.

In 1560 Maxwell wrote to Dacre personally. He placed the blame squarely on him for the attacks of the Grahams. Sadler thought that Dacre could influence the Grahams to do his bidding. He may well have had a point, as suggested

---

157 Alford, *Kingship and Politics*, pp. 150-6. Sadler was a Privy Councillor during the latter days of Henry VIII and early reign of Edward VI. He was master of the Great Wardrobe by 1548 but sent north to the borders and Scotland that summer. By early 1549 he regained his seat on the Privy Council: see *L&P Henry VIII*, vol. 21, pt. 2, p. 383; TNA SP 46/1 f. 154; TNA SP 15/3 f. 34; *APC*, vol. 2, p. 350.

158 Hasler (ed.), *The House of Commons 1558-1603*, vol. 3, pp. 318-21; *Sadler papers*, vol.I, vi-x.


160 See, for example, TNA SP 59/1 ff. 261-2; TNA SP 52/1 ff. 198, 218; Tough, *The Last Years of a Frontier*, pp. 190-1. See also below, pp. 131-34.

161 TNA SP 52/1 f. 210.

162 *CSP Foreign, Elizabeth*, vol. 2, pp. 271-2.
earlier. However, it was usual practise for border wardens to attempt to control the border surnames by one means or another. They were useful in times of war and were “notorious troublemakers” in times of peace. They were a destabilising influence at the borders whose activities a warden needed to control to maintain the peace. During Henry’s conflicts with the Scots throughout the 1540s, Wharton had employed the Grahams to his advantage against recalcitrant Scots. In 1544, Wharton rode into Scotland with 50 of the clan and burnt Annan. However, in 1560, despite Scotland’s strife and England’s intervention, much of the west march on the English side of the border seems to have been remarkably quiet. Perhaps Dacre’s policies towards the Scots were having the desired effect.

In addition to blackening the Dacre name, Sadler was very much in the pursuit of office for members of his own circle. Religious differences did not always prove barriers to political alliances. It should be of no surprise to find that Thomas, Lord Wharton, attached himself to Sadler’s party in the North and solicited his help in an attempt to regain lost political ground and office. Another notable figure involved in Sadler’s circle, and growing in importance in northern affairs, was Sir John Forster. In 1559, Sadler put him forward as a “meet deputy warden and keeper of Harbottel”.

The factional nature of northern society can be witnessed by Sadler’s later remarks. He wrote to the council and outlined his choice of suitable wardens. He recommended both Wharton and Forster for posts. In addition, he suggested that he “never saw the

---

163 See above, pp. 87-9.
164 Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, pp. 155-67. See also Robson, Rise & Fall of English Highland Clans, pp. 179-87.
166 The Grahams were said to be “under no government except the Warden”: see Tough, The Last Years of a Frontier, p. 15; Border Papers, vol. 1, p. 393.
169 Until Maxwell decided to take the fight to the English borderers: see below, pp. 134-41.
170 TNA SP 52/1 f. 206; CSP Foreign Elizabeth, vol. 2, pp. 40, 66. See also Alford, The Early Elizabethan Polity, p. 31.
171 Harbottle Castle, Northumberland, a keep built by the Umfravilles at the order of Henry II to defend against the Scots: see TNA C132/39; TNA SP 59/1 f. 262. See also http://www.northumberlandnationalpark.org.uk/understanding/historyarchaeology/harbottlecastle/harbottlecastlehistoricalbackground.htm> accessed on 1 August 2011.
Marches better ordered than in the time of the late King Henry”.172 This was merely an attempt to play on Elizabeth’s rather conservative nature.173 He may have wanted to remind his audience of Dacre’s earlier problems with the Tudor monarchy. Sadler recommended that the crown should remove Dacre from office and even that Dacre “be well charged with negligence”174 which was, again, rather uncomfortably reminiscent of the difficulties that William Lord Dacre had faced at the hands of the Henrician regime.175

One reason that may be suggested for the differences between Sadler, Crofts and Dacre is that Sadler was overlooked as a commissioner in the 1558/59 treaties with the Scots and that Crofts (who was included on this commission) found Dacre hard to work with. The Scots directed many of their complaints against Dacre.176 William Lord Dacre and his sons had raided Scotland many times. Sometimes they had acted with more fervour against the Scots than the regime desired.177 However, Dacre was in no way inclined to make any redress for actions he had undertaken as warden.178 Both Sadler and Crofts’ religious sensibilities and close connections with other religious reformers may have also had a bearing on their relationship with Dacre.179 Sadler always liked to highlight deficiencies in Dacre’s character; especially ones that he thought would cause consternation to the influential chief secretary. In September 1559, he informed Cecil, “You know what he is, and we think he would be very loath that the Protestants in Scotland, yea in England, should prosper if he might lett it”.180 The fact that he was willing to call the Dacres “ranke papists” (along with

172 In addition, he had to include the list of Wardens from the latter part of Henry’s reign – Wharton, and Ralph and William Eure. He probably realised that for much of the reign a Dacre was a Warden: see TNA SP 59/1 f. 262; CSP Foreign Elizabeth, vol. I, p. 589.
173 For Elizabeth’s conservatism, see MacCaffrey, Elizabeth I, p. 298; Jones, ‘Elizabeth’s First Year’, pp. 27-8.
175 See above, pp. 29-32.
176 Again, casting doubt on Tough’s claim that Dacre was in league with the Regent: see Tough, The Last Years of a Frontier, p. 191; TNA SP 52/1 f. 2a; CSP Scotland, Mary Queen of Scots, vol. I, p. 209.
177 See above, pp. 101-3.
178 TNA SP 52/1 ff. 23-5.
180 TNA SP 52/1 f. 210.
his other rather colourful remarks about Roman Catholics) demonstrates Sadler’s rather dogmatic views on religion or, at least, the views he put forward to please his benefactor.181

Lord Grey also complained about Dacre’s rule of the marches. He called for a “fitter man” for Lord Dacre’s “room”.182 However, he cannot be considered as impartial or unbiased. Clearly legal issues caused difficult relations between the two northern nobles. According to Grey, Dacre filed suits of quitclaim (effectively transferring his interest in lands) at the Council of the North and avoided Grey’s litigation or, at least, delayed the course of law greatly.183 In this way, Dacre could avoid the judgements of the lawyers and the new, more reform-minded appointees to the Council of the North.184 In 1561, Grey wished to bring this matter to the attention of the council by going to York to present his case. However, during such a troublesome period it was difficult for those stationed at Berwick to get permission to leave their posts. Grey hoped to make a sympathetic regime aware of his difficulties with Dacre but had to be content to do it in writing rather than in person.185

Although these constant allegations of Dacre’s misrule must be considered as relatively serious, it does not appear that the power of Sadler and his adherents had any effect on influencing the crown into removing William Lord Dacre from office.186 Sadler’s rather overly reformed, ‘Godly’ statements did not influence Elizabeth greatly.187 The influence of a more conservative, noble party

---


182 TNA SP 59/5 f. 216.

183 Dacre or his sons were often justices of the peace for Cumberland: see above, pp. 47-8, 97, 108, 121. Dacre or Dacre followers often figured in local courts: see Summerson, Medieval Carlisle, pp. 530-9. See below, pp. 180-1. See also above, pp. 27, 47-8.

184 The Council in the North was reshuffled after the death of Francis Talbot, Fifth Earl of Shrewsbury, in late 1560: see TNA SP 59/3 ff. 207, 250; TNA SP 59/4 f. 10; CPR Elizabeth I, 1560-1563, vol. 2, p. 18. See also Reid, Kings Council, pp. 193-4.

185 TNA SP 59/5 ff. 216, 220.

186 In 1562, Grey still complained about Dacre and made his frustrations clear, to no avail: see TNA SP 59/5 f. 220.

with leading figures such as Shrewsbury and Norfolk matched the influence of the reformed party at this time.\footnote{188} The queen may also have been rather sceptical of Sadler’s claims or quite simply unwilling to invest time and money in a reordering of the borders.\footnote{189} Dacre was not removed from office until much later; again confirming the rather conservative nature of Tudor policy towards the borderlands in general.\footnote{190} Nevertheless, these allegations cannot have enhanced the overall perception and image of Dacre.

**Another Feud – John Lord Maxwell**

Eventually, the council called William Lord Dacre to Court. He was ordered to meet up and formalise an agreement with his opposite – the Scots’ warden Lord John Maxwell.\footnote{191} Maxwell seems to have considered Dacre responsible for the Grahams and Sandes’ raids on Scottish border lairds. At any rate, these lairds started to seem desperate to stop the raids and incursions made against them.\footnote{192} In accordance with the instructions that were laid out at Christmas 1559 each party in the formal “indenture” which followed was to hold a major “day of truce and prisoner exchange, without hindrance or reprisal, each May and September”.\footnote{193} Although the meeting was near Carlisle and between the two parties, it is clear that Dacre was the party to be reformed. In addition to clauses that were more mundane, relating to the handing over of prisoners, each party was required not to “trespass or interfere” with the “sovereign government” of their respective realms. The Privy Council admonished Dacre further by ordering him to end his harassment of Thomas Dacre and his adherents.\footnote{194}

\footnote{188} See above, pp. 81-4, 111.
\footnote{189} For example, see the Privy Council’s reaction to complaints against Dacre in 1561: TNA SP 52/6 f. 108. An alternative reason is given below: see below, pp. 143-6.
\footnote{190} See below, pp. 200. See also above, pp. 51-7, 74-9.
\footnote{191} TNA SP 52/1 f. 218.
\footnote{192} CSP Foreign Elizabeth, vol. 2, pp. 271-2.
\footnote{193} TNA SP 59/2 f. 54 (no. 18). For a less ambitious document: see TNA SP 59/4 f. 272.
\footnote{194} BL Cotton Caligula B/X f. 156. Thomas Dacre of Lanercost was another adherent of Wharton and Sadler, much to Lord Dacre’s consternation: see CSP Foreign Elizabeth, 1558-1589, vol. 2, pp. 28, 40. See also Summerson, Medieval Carlisle, pp. 651-2.
Nevertheless, complaints about Dacre’s alleged collusion with border thieves continued. Lord Maxwell found it necessary to write straight to Elizabeth’s government with his complaints. However, it proved hard for Maxwell to obtain redress. The English government, which had been supplying money constantly to the Scots, was unwilling to pay the six or seven thousand pounds in damages that the Scots asked for. William Lord Dacre was unwilling – and perhaps unable – to pay this. The crown asked Thomas Randolph, the English ambassador in Scotland at Edinburgh Castle, about Dacre’s activities. Clearly, Randolph was a Dacre supporter; “I love the Lord Dacres howse beste of any one mans in England, and love the Lord Whartons worste” he wrote to Cecil. This was a clear demonstration of how much the wider political community was aware of the hatred between Dacre and Wharton. It is interesting how frank Randolph was with Cecil about his partiality for the Dacre cause. Being the Lord Dacre’s supporter, however, did not stop Randolph from forwarding Maxwell’s complaints to Cecil. In fact, Maxwell was not an easy person to get along with and even had difficulties with Wharton. Certainly, however, Dacre and Wharton did not ally with each other to annoy Maxwell, or for any other reason.

Inevitably, the matter between Maxwell and Dacre attracted the attention of others who would not prove to be friendly to the Dacres, such as Forster. He also found it necessary to highlight the unruly nature of persons within the west march and explained that he could do nothing about complaints against them without Dacre’s cooperation. However, Sir John Forster was a minor figure at this time. Although he was part of Sadler’s circle, he held even less influence with the regime than the Dacres and their supporters. Matters should have reached a head in 1561 when the privy councils of both realms were called upon to resolve a local dispute that was having international consequences. The Privy

195 TNA SP 52/5 f. 37 i; TNA SP 52/6 f. 22.
196 TNA SP 52/1 f.2a; TNA SP 52/5 f.37 i.
198 TNA SP 59/2 f. 180; TNA SP 52/5 f. 37.
199 Similar complaints were made about Wharton but it does not seem that Dacre and Wharton were in league against this ‘rather prickly’ Scot: see TNA SP 52/5 f. 36. See also Taylor, ‘The Crown & the North’, pp. 76-8.
200 TNA SP 59/4 f. 113.
201 TNA SP 59/2 f. 3. See also CSP Foreign Elizabeth, vol. 2, pp. 83, 127-8.
Council consulted Queen Elizabeth but it seems that she was relatively indifferent to the complaints against Dacre. The outcome was that the English Privy Council explained rather shortly to the Scottish Council, and to James Hamilton, 2nd Earl of Arran and Duke of Chatelherault, that the Lord of Maxwell, John Maxwell, should “suspend his complaints” and that the matter would be dealt with in due course. Presumably, Elizabeth was not overly concerned with such trifles as the problems of Maxwell.

The complaints may have had some consequences, however. It may have been due to this that William Lord Dacre was removed from the Council of the North. However, the death of Francis Talbot may have caused the crown to reshuffle the personnel on the northern council. Talbot’s replacement was Henry Manners, 2nd Earl of Rutland, who was of the new religion and had been a follower of John Dudley. In 1561 the council took charge of religious investigations. Dacre soon fell foul of the newly made-up council. Richard Dudley arrested Hodgson, a priest, in his house but the northern council did not take the matter seriously. Rutland, the new President, merely requested of Dacre “that the bearer Richard Dudley may not forfeit his favour in consequence of his having arrested one Hodgson a priest in his lordship’s house”. In the political climate of 1561 having a priest, who had been deprived for refusing either the Oaths of Supremacy or Uniformity, in one’s house was not really considered a crime. However, in the 1580s, at a time of much starker religious division, this same Hodgson seems to have become somewhat of a bugbear to the regime.

Despite ignoring the complaints of the stauncher Protestants, Dacre considered that some action would be prudent on his behalf. It was becoming increasingly

---

202 TNA SP 52/6 f. 108.
203 TNA SP 59/4 f. 10.
204 In fact, the Council of the North had a more reformed membership by 1561, especially its leader Rutland and Lord Scrope: see TNA SP 59/4 f.10. See also Bernard, The Power, p.70; Reid, Kings Council, pp. 193-4.
205 Ibid.
206 CRO (Kendal repository), Le Fleming family of Rydal Hall MS, WDRY/5/12. Dudley was particularly interested in highlighting the unsuitability of the Dacres: see HMC Salisbury MS, vol. I, pp. 459-61. Dudley was a Westmorland knight and has the distinction of being one of the Justices adjudged to be favourable to the new religion during the inquiries of 1564: see Bateson, ‘Letters from the Bishops’, p. 51.
207 TNA SP 53/19 ff. 91,109; TNA SP 78/7 f. 16. See also CSP Scotland, Mary Queen of Scots, vol. 9, pp. 12-13.
obvious that Elizabethan appointees could take action against him, even in his fastness on the borders. In reply to the charges, William Lord Dacre made a show of bringing in the Grahams and of listing all of their names and various relations. Dacre swore in the Grahams, as had happened before, and they were ‘assured’ as English allies against the Scots.\(^{208}\) The crown implored them to use the same tactics against the Scots whilst the realms were at war “as they did them hurt in time of peace for their own interest and private commodity”.\(^{209}\) However, late 1561 witnessed more complaints from Maxwell about Dacre’s behaviour. Perhaps Maxwell considered that Queen Mary’s (Mary Queen of Scots) arrival in Scotland was significant enough to overrule Elizabeth’s previous instructions to “suspend his complaints”.\(^{210}\) Eventually the Queen and Cecil combined, under pressure, to compel Dacre to make redress to Maxwell.\(^{211}\) Dacre was seemingly unimpressed and carried on regardless. He employed delaying tactics and cited a Warden Court and subsequent executions as a matter too pressing to disregard.\(^{212}\) Dacre made no attempt to provide restitution to Maxwell.

In late 1561, Dacre retaliated against Maxwell’s campaign of complaints about him by bringing some complaints of his own to the attention of the Scottish council.\(^{213}\) The relationship between Maxwell and Dacre continued to deteriorate throughout 1562. In January 1562 Lord Maitland, a genuinely Reformed Protestant and party to the ongoing machinations with the English regime, wrote to Cecil about Dacre’s complaints. He warned that Dacre was making “frivoll” excuses in answer to Maxwell’s continuing charges. He ended his letter with veiled warnings about Maxwell’s anger: “You know how on willing [unwilling] a man the Maister off Maxwell is to beare long a manifest injury.” Maitland joined in the chorus calling for Dacre’s removal from office.\(^{214}\) It is doubtful that Dacre would have been worried about physical threats; however, there were now powerful forces in Scottish politics acting

\(^{208}\) See above, pp. 87-90.
\(^{209}\) TNA SP 59/5 f. 9. See also Robson, Rise & Fall of English Highland Clans, pp. 133-5.
\(^{210}\) TNA SP 52/6 ff. 108, 126, 159. See also TNA SP 59/5 f. 216.
\(^{211}\) TNA SP 59/5 f. 151.
\(^{212}\) TNA SP 59/5 f. 112.
\(^{213}\) Dacre still had powerful connections in Scottish politics: see below, p. 138.
\(^{214}\) TNA SP 52/7 f. 11.
against him. This makes it seem unusual that, again, the regime did not consider it necessary to act upon such allegations. Evidently, the English regime felt that they held the upper hand in power relations with the Scottish lords and did not feel under any immediate pressure to act.

In keeping with his character, Cecil kept abreast of regional affairs, especially those which affected the cause of religion in Scotland. In February 1562, Cecil enquired directly of Randolph about Dacre’s activities. In this way he bypassed Sadler’s ineffectual reports. Randolph lived up to his title of ambassador and was very diplomatic in his reply to Cecil: he downplayed the problems between Dacre and Maxwell. He described Maxwell’s complaints as doubtful and “lacking in veritie” and stated that this was a private matter between Maxwell and Dacre. Randolph’s unswerving loyalty to Dacre shines through the years when he reminded Cecil of the matter of a couple “of verie fatte does unto the Lord of Mare agaynste his marriage” [does that Dacre had sent to the Lord Marr as a wedding gift]. Marr was another leading figure amongst the Lords of the Congregation and, no doubt, Dacre wished to demonstrate his widespread connections within Scottish politics.

Regardless of government intervention, the feud between Maxwell and Dacre showed no signs of abating. On the very last day of February, Queen Elizabeth wrote to Dacre personally. The queen asked him to conform in matters of “justice and amity” as was supposedly the case on the east and middle marches. The crown also ordered a meeting between Dacre and Maxwell. Bothwell would stand as Maxwell’s protection, presumably so that the Scottish laird could

---


216 See below, pp. 144-6.


218 Interestingly this gives us a date for the marriage of John Erskine, 6th Baron and later 1st Earl of Marr and Annabel Murray: it must have been around this time, late 1561 or early 1562. Henry Summerson gives the date as before 1557 in his article: “Erskine, John, seventeenth or first earl of Mar (d. 1572), magnate and regent of Scotland”, in ODNB, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, January 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/17838 (accessed August 10, 2010).

219 These where deer, presumably from one of Dacre’s many parks: see TNA SP 52/7 f. 23.
achieve some kind of parity in status to Dacre. However, not all was peace and amity on the other marches despite the crown’s rhetoric. On the east march, Lord Grey and Lord Home could not agree over the exchange rate of English money to Scots money. The English warden complained that he lost a halfpenny for every two pence because of Lord Home’s wish to stand by an ancient custom of paying £4 Scots for every £1 English received. There seems to have been a genuine concern about a shortage of money on the borders, especially at Berwick. Grey employed “Searchers” to stop the removal of money from the realm – which cannot have helped cross border trading and certainly would not have remedied the problem.

Unusually, Forster took Dacre’s side in his quarrel with the Scots and did not approve of their treatment of the Grahams. It seems that Forster was living up to the picture of him depicted by Maureen Miekle: he was an ambitious man who was likely to use whatever connections he could to his advantage. Certainly, he was not so “Godly” that he would ignore the strength of Dacre and others in the north. In addition, he probably preferred to see the Grahams marauding in Scottish territory rather than through Northumberland. In 1558, a Northumberland resident, Francis Chesylde, claimed that the average Northumberland household was so used to the raids of the “ranke-riders” that the Scots impersonated them to get English prisoners and spoil without a fight. Forster pointed out that the border surnames of Liddesdale held little respect for the Scottish wardens. Presumably, neither did he: Forster explained rather gleefully that the Grahams had raided to near the residence of the Laird of Cesford, Warden of the Scottish Middle March. As things stood Sir John Forster, Lord Grey and William Lord Dacre all got on poorly with their Scottish counterparts.

In April 1562, despite Queen Elizabeth’s instructions, and despite their earlier agreement, open conflict broke out between William Lord Dacre’s adherents
and Maxwell and his men. 226 William Lord Dacre sent a long letter to the English Privy Council outlining his version of the events of the day. 227 Despite Lord Dacre’s downplaying of his role in the affair, the Privy Council were none too pleased to hear of the disorders that were immediately apparent. From Lord Dacre’s account, it seemed that he had sent his son for redress at a day of truce with the Scots. The letter does not specify which son but it was presumably Leonard Dacre as he was his deputy and had often accompanied his father on such occasions. Apparently, Leonard Dacre sent an English party headed by Richard Dacre (not necessarily a wise choice for diplomatic negotiations) 228 ahead for assurance. They discovered that Maxwell had already ridden into England with a large party to chase “plompes and outlawes”. 229 This was a breach of border law and of their previous indenture: 230 as Dacre pointed out Maxwell was chasing “English men on English grounde”. The “Laird Drumlangrick” [Drumlanrig], whom Maxwell had left behind as assurance, asked the English to negotiate. However, both parties were extremely agitated: the English refused to treat with the Scots or to make any kind of redress. 231

The letter explained that six men from each realm could have sat down to work out a solution. 232 However, the tone suggests that perhaps the English and Scots parties could have fought for the respective honours of their Lords – Maxwell and Dacre – similarly to the fighting for honour of the past. 233 During the foray

227 Evidently, written by a scribe.
228 It was Richard Dacre who had caused the trouble in Carlisle that has led to comments from Hoyle, Summerson and James on his behaviour: see Summerson, Medieval Carlisle, p. 488-9; Hoyle, ‘Faction, Feud’, p. 597; James, Society, Politics & Culture, p. 113. For Richard Dacre’s rather wild exploits in Ireland: see TNA SP 60/3 f. 6. See also TNA SP 1/112 f. 128.
229 ‘Plomps’ may refer to helpers or maintainers of thieves but in this case, it may refer to a particular grayne of the Grahams: see Thomas Carlyle, ‘The Debateable Land’, in LSE Selected Pamphlets (London, 1868), pp. 6-9, 14-18, 30.
230 This clearly breached border custom and was a breach of the provisions of their previous indenture: see above, p. 145-7. See also Cynthia J. Neville, Violence, Custom and the Law: The Anglo-Scottish Border Lands in the Later Middle Ages (Edinburgh, 1998), pp. 83-154.
231 For Dacre’s account of events, see TNA SP 59/6 f. 1.
232 Old border custom was to have a commission made up of twelve men (originally knights) to adjudicate over matters of border law. The custom was to have both realms equally represented, although this was not always the case: see Tough, The Last Years of a Frontier, pp. 96-9. See also Neville, ‘Keeping the Peace on the Northern Marches in the Later Middle Ages’, EHR, 109: 430 (Feb. 1994), pp. 1-25.
of Maxwell and his fifty men into England, it appears that various confrontations had taken place. The English killed Maxwell’s servant George Bell\(^{234}\) and hurt other men and horses. According to Dacre, no Englishmen were hurt but the Scots killed two horses. When the Scots further attempted to follow the smaller English party back into England, the Grahams had the final word in the conflict. Whilst the Scottish intruders were in retreat one Willy Graham, “Braydes Willy” “shot over the Sark amongst them”. Despite such an obviously serious confrontation, Dacre still expected to meet Maxwell on May 16\(^{th}\). The Maxwell-Dacre feud was now costing lives and the English regime would surely act.\(^{235}\) By August 1562, even Randolph, who had always been an ally of Lord Dacre, seemed to tire of the constant complaints of Dacre misrule.

However, despite these events, as late as June 1562 William Lord Dacre, along with Cumberland, Northumberland, Lord Ogle and Sir John Forster were appointed to escort Mary Queen of Scots on her supposed visit to England.\(^{236}\) The regime still trusted Dacre to perform certain delicate tasks. Negotiations about the visit of Mary to England had started early in the year, strangely at Mary’s request.\(^{237}\) Mary’s visit, however, never occurred. Queen Elizabeth also cancelled her visit to the North.\(^{238}\) To the detriment of many a pseudo-historical novel, the two were destined never to meet. Such a state occasion would have been very difficult to organise between the two countries. There can be little doubt that the crown chose Lords Dacre, Cumberland and Northumberland to escort the Queen of Scots because they could provide ample security for her person. These were the leading figures of northern society at the time and between them they could command several thousand men.\(^{239}\) If Elizabeth was to have met Mary then she would have done the same as Henry VIII proposed to do some time earlier when he was to have met King James V – ride to York and

---

\(^{234}\) In the source, he is named “George Bell alias Maxwell”; he may well have been an illegitimate relation of John Maxwell.

\(^{235}\) For the above account, see TNA SP 59/6 f. 1.

\(^{236}\) TNA SP 52/6 f. 178; TNA SP 59/6 f. 56.

\(^{237}\) TNA SP 52/7 f. 31; TNA SP 52/7 f. 43. See also HMC Salisbury MS, vol. I, p. 266.

\(^{238}\) TNA SP 52/7 f. 58. See also CSP Scotland, Mary Queen of Scots, vol. I, p. 635.

\(^{239}\) TNA SP11/11 f. 33; TNA SP 59/1 f. 207; TNA SP 12/2 f. 130; Ellis, ‘Civilizing Northumberland: Representations of Englishness in the Tudor State’, Journal of Historical Sociology, 12: 2 (June 1999), pp. 103-27, 116. See also above, pp. 78-80, 92-3.
meet on English soil, presumably so that the meeting could take place in more cosmopolitan, ‘civil’ surroundings. The Scottish government could not offer the protection that the northern magnates could at this time.241

The end of Dacre rule

By late 1562 and 1563, however, William Lord Dacre’s position on the borders was effectively undermined. On the borders of the realm, the reformed party had gained the upper hand – although amongst northern society in general they were still very much in the minority. Those who were followers of the reformed party and not favourable to the Dacre cause now ruled the other marches. As shown, Thomas Percy, Earl of Northumberland stepped down from office in November 1559.242 Initially, Lord Grey de Wilton replaced him. However, Sir John Forster’s extensive kinship, and the championing of his cause by men like Sadler, meant that he controlled the middle march and much of Northumberland’s gentle society – at least that part that was not entirely dependent on the Percy interest.243 By November 1560, Forster’s local influence was recognised and the crown appointed him as warden of the middle march.244 Lord Grey of Wilton was warden of the east march, and as has been shown, he was no friend to the Dacre cause.245 The Council of the North was no longer a hotbed of northern conservatism.246 An alliance of an unfriendly government, an unsympathetic Northern Council and antagonistic neighbouring wardens now faced Dacre.

Nevertheless, Dacre did not fall from his position of power due to these circumstances. Unfortunately, Dacre could no longer provide justice on the west march. Evidently, matters of justice in the west march were out of his control.

240 HMC Salisbury MS, vol. 13, p. 59. For Henry VIII’s visit north Thomas Wharton was required to send his spies into Scotland to find information about James V’s sincerity. The Dacres were out of favour at this time: see [amongst others], L&P Henry VIII, 1540-1541, vol. 16, no. 1143, p. 539.
241 Wormald, Mary Queen of Scots, pp. 102-28.
242 See above, pp. 124-7.
243 James, Society, Politics & Culture, pp. 282-93.
244 TNA SP 59/4 f. 235; CSP Foreign Elizabeth, vol. 4, p. 221.
246 Reid, King’s Council, pp. 186-8. See also above, pp. 83-4, 120-34.
Richard Dacre was the true ruler of the west march. According to Randolph, he was “a man who would oversee that which a severe man would not let pass”, confirming Summerson’s view of him.\textsuperscript{247} The reason for this was William Lord Dacre’s infirmity: had Dacre been fit he would not have allowed another to usurp his authority. William Lord Dacre was, by this time, a very old man at over 60 years old and was, unsurprisingly, sick and infirm.\textsuperscript{248} In November 1562, the Privy Council summoned Dacre to appear before them; no doubt to answer the mounting charges against him. He replied in an uncharacteristically weak, sprawling and spidery hand. He complained of the corruptness of his body, his years and his debility. Travelling in the winter could cost him his life he argued. He begged the council to excuse his attendance until the spring.\textsuperscript{249}

In April 1563 Henry Scrope, 9\textsuperscript{th} Baron Scrope of Bolton, a hero of Leith – but probably more importantly a man of the new religion and a friend of Sadler and Grey – replaced Dacre as warden of the west march.\textsuperscript{250} Scrope’s first meeting with Maxwell was to be kept secret, no doubt to avoid any Dacre interference.\textsuperscript{251} The crown was obviously well aware of a lingering Dacre influence in the area. In November 1563 William Lord Dacre died.\textsuperscript{252} His eldest son, Thomas, replaced him as 4\textsuperscript{th} Baron Dacre of Gilsland. The crown recognised his lineage and granted his livery in June 1564.\textsuperscript{253} A new phase in the history of the Dacres was about to begin.

\textit{Border Power}

Perhaps the most striking element of the first few years of Elizabethan rule and the relationship between the crown and William Lord Dacre is the tolerance the crown had for Dacre’s activities on the borders. Demonstrated by the events

\textsuperscript{247} TNA SP 52/7 f. 70; \textit{CSP Foreign, Elizabeth}, vol. 5: p. 232; Summerson, \textit{Medieval Carlisle}, p. 488-9. See also above, pp. 33, 85, 140.
\textsuperscript{248} Ellis, ‘Dacre, William, 3\textsuperscript{rd} Baron’, pp. 1-4. See also above, p. 99.
\textsuperscript{249} TNA SP 59/6 f. 151.
\textsuperscript{250} TNA SP 52/3 ff. 14, 71, 104. For Scrope’s appointment: see \textit{CPR Elizabeth I, 1560-1563}, vol. 2, p. 476.
\textsuperscript{251} TNA SP 59/6 f. 236.
\textsuperscript{252} For a brief account of William Lord Dacre’s death, see Ellis, ‘Dacre, William, 3\textsuperscript{rd} Baron’, pp. 3-4.
\textsuperscript{253} \textit{CPR Elizabeth I, 1563-1566}, vol. 3, p. 20.
between Maxwell and Dacre is the fact that throughout the four years of squabbling, claims and counter claims and eventually outright fighting, the Elizabethan regime never found it necessary to remove Lord Dacre from his position as Warden of the West March. Considering that the Tudor regimes were influenced in their choice of wardens by foreign matters (usually the English relationship with Scotland) this seems strange.\textsuperscript{254} Although the claims against him became more widespread and pervasive throughout the late 1550s and early 1560s, Dacre was little admonished for interfering with the pro-English Scottish party. There may be several reasons for this. An obvious reason is expense and local power: Dacre had the men on the ground – his tenants. He did not need government support to strengthen the defence of his march. Dacre was always a cheap method of defending the border: there was no one who could raise the kind of local power and forces on the border that a Lord Dacre could.\textsuperscript{255}

Sue Taylor explains Dacre’s continuing service on the borders as being due to the antipathy of the Scottish Lairds to the usual alternative – Wharton.\textsuperscript{256} Alternatively, however, the crown may not have ousted Dacre from border office due to the complexities of the English relationship with Scotland. William Lord Dacre was well placed to spy on Scottish proceedings and to influence Scottish politics.\textsuperscript{257} Clearly, the Dacres had often advised the regime on the situation in Scotland.\textsuperscript{258} Dacre’s use of the border surnames, such as the Grahams, against Scottish border lairds had a positive effect on the Congregation cause in Scotland. It is clear that many of the border lairds such as Ormiston, Maxwell, the Kerrs of Cessford and Feniehurst and Lord Home rushed to join the Congregation cause in 1559/1560.\textsuperscript{259} Scottish border lairds could hardly be blamed for being \textit{politique} in outlook and choosing whichever

\textsuperscript{254} Palmer, ‘High Officeholding’, pp. 579-95.
\textsuperscript{255} See above, pp. 92-4. See also Ellis, \textit{Tudor Frontiers}, pp. 80-106, 146-70.
\textsuperscript{256} Taylor, ‘The Crown & the North’, p. 77.
\textsuperscript{257} APC, vol. 7, p. 16; Ellis, \textit{Tudor Frontiers}, pp. 154-69. See also above, p. 138.
\textsuperscript{259} TNA SP 52/1 ff. 82, 94, 153. Many, like Maxwell, can hardly be considered as truly reformed in religious beliefs: see Charles Rogers, ‘An Estimate of the Scottish Nobility during the Minority of James VI with Preliminary Observations’, \textit{Transactions of the Royal Historical Society}, 2 (1873), pp 222-96. See also below, n. 260.
side was in the ascendancy. Presumably, the Scottish border lairds were desperate for attacks against their territory and possessions to end. By siding with the Congregation, they could come under the protection of the English government and end attacks on their lands or possessions. They would also receive money for their trouble. In September 1559, even the fanatic reformer John Knox recognised that money was likely to be the main motivating factor for many to join his crusade.

Although there is no evidence of the regime encouraging Dacre’s behaviour on the borders, they did nothing in the face of extreme pressure from the Scottish government, and from men such as Sadler, Crofts, Grey and even the Scottish queen to remove Dacre. Perhaps it was more the case that the regime ‘winked at’ Dacre’s activities than Dacre winked at the activities of the Grahams. If this was the case, crown policy was, in fact, one of deniability: Dacre was rebuked, but never too harshly. This simply kept the Scottish regime and Congregation nobles satisfied that the English government would take some action. If it was a decision of policy to allow Dacre to continue his feuding with men such as Maxwell, it was a successful ‘carrot and stick’ approach. Border lairds who did not conform to the English government’s wishes had little protection or redress against border raids. The Scottish regime was in such a state of confusion and disarray at this time that it was not in any position to stay the turmoil on its own borders. This policy would explain Cecil’s lack of action in dealing with the constant complaints about the activities of the Dacres. The regime did not treat William Lord Dacre with the same contempt that it showed for Northumberland. Ironically, if this was the case, considering William Lord

---

261 TNA SP 52/1 ff. 222, 226.
263 The Queen of Scots was also moved to complain about Dacre: see TNA SP 52/8 f. 3; CSP Scotland, Mary Queen of Scots, vol. I, p. 676. See also above, pp. 90-2, 128-42.
265 TNA SP 52/6 f. 108; TNA SP 59/5 ff. 151, 260.
266 See above, pp. 124-7.
Dacre’s personal beliefs, he had been a major motivation to the border Scots in changing their allegiance.

The crown removed Lord Dacre when he could no longer administer any kind of justice within his own march. At the height of his powers, it is unlikely that someone like Maxwell and fifty men would have ridden against Dacre’s wishes so openly. Even whilst he was unable to lead his own men, it is clear that Dacre’s forces caused the Scots to retreat. In addition, by the time of his death, regardless of the personal standing of his son Thomas, 4th Baron Dacre of Gilsland, Dacre power was no longer seen as a necessity on the borders. Scotland, which had often been a thorn in the side of the English, was now far closer to England in outlook. Cecil’s policy of supporting reforming interests in Scotland had begun to bear fruit. Certainly, Scottish border lairds would not be mounting any raids against England, as most were now part of an English-backed, Protestant and Congregation cause.

Even bearing in mind, however, the relative lack of a threat from Scotland and the myriad complaints against the Dacres, these facts in themselves do not fully explain the reason why the crown quashed Dacre power on the border by removing them from office entirely. In the case of previous Tudor monarchs periods of trouble for the Dacres, such as Thomas Lord Dacre’s trial in Star Chamber for maladministration of justice on the borders, or William Lord Dacre’s treason case, still saw the reinstatement of the Dacre interest after

---

267 TNA SP 52/7 f. 70. For lists of official duties highlighting the necessity of keeping the peace and upholding the law, see TNA SP 59/20 f. 198. See also TNA SP 59/41 f. 238.

268 See above, pp. 140-2.

269 Although Mary Queen of Scots was Roman Catholic and a Guise, when she came to the throne in 1561 she could not exert enough influence over her reformed nobility to create any serious danger to the Elizabethan regime by direct military intervention. Marriage was the one way she hoped to lay claim to the English throne: see Wormald, Mary Queen of Scots, pp. 102-66.

270 For an overview of wars between England and Scotland, including much detail about the role of the Dacres, see John Sadler, Border fury, passim.

271 Alford, The Early Elizabethan Polity, pp. 74-86; Wormald, Mary Queen of Scots, pp. 102-28; MacCaffrey, The Shaping of, pp. 55-70. See also above, pp. 111-13.

272 Ibid.; TNA SP 70/52 f. 69. See also, Heal, Reformation in Britain, pp. 365-7; Wormald, Mary Queen of Scots, pp. 102-66; Brown, ‘The Making of a “Politique”’, passim. “Diverse” Scots noblemen and gentry offered service to England throughout 1563: see TNA SP 52/8 ff. 12, 30.

273 Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, pp. 81-106. See also Summerson, Medieval Carlisle, p. 652.
longer or shorter periods in the political wilderness. There was little reason why the crown could not reappoint a Dacre as a border warden after William’s demise. However, Thomas, 4th Baron Dacre of the North, was never to receive the warden’s office, nor was his more capable brother Leonard. However, for now, the extensive Dacre lordship remained firmly under Dacre control.

From 1563 onwards, after the death of William Lord Dacre, the reforming interests that had been working against the Dacre cause got their wish. Constant complaints from men such as Sadler, Crofts, Grey and even from the Scottish regime were enough to taint the identity of any family, no matter how great they had been. By the mid-1560s, the crown considered the Dacres wholly unsuitable for office. Cecil and his reforming friends were certainly in control of patronage and Dudley had the queen’s favour. There was an ever-narrowing view on who was acceptable for positions. Friendship or familial ties with Dudley or Cecil were particularly important, as were “suitable” religious beliefs. Military strength in the border area counted for little. Presumably, the crown believed that the Scots had been quieted for good. This, more than any other factor precluded Thomas and Leonard from any crown favour. As a result, the Dacres became famed more for their conservative religious beliefs and constant feuding than for any martial activity in defence of the realm. They were seen as part of a past order of feudal magnates who could now be replaced by more modern and suitable (reformed) servants of the Elizabethan regime. It is this viewpoint that has become prevalent in historical descriptions of the Dacres. This is what persuaded Guy to describe Thomas Lord

274 See above, pp. 27-32, 51-56, 75-79.
275 Reid, King’s Council, p. 192. Thomas was famed for his good housekeeping and hospitality but, unfortunately, little else: see CSP Domestic Elizabeth, Addenda, 1566-1579, p. 255.
276 See above, pp. 128-40.
278 Or seemingly in any area: see Rapple, Martial Power, pp. 19-85.
279 TNA SP 59/13 ff. 201, 252. See also CSP Scotland, Mary Queen of Scots, vol. 5, pp. 74-80.
281 James, Society, Politics & Culture, pp. 423-34. See also Guy, The Cardinal’s Court, pp. 122-3.
Dacre as a “medieval robber Baron” and for the Dacre family to be seen as part of a wider context of a backward, traditional northern society.  

In fact, as has been demonstrated many times over the course of this thesis, the Dacres were quite forward looking in trade and in estate management. In some ways, the Dacres up to this point intersect more fully with the transitional point between the traditional and the new nobility than has previously been realised. The Dacres served both Reforming and traditional Catholic regimes with equal gusto, especially when it suited them. A similar case can be made for many of the northern nobles: as shown earlier, Wharton served the Protectorate and Warwick during the reign of Edward VI. Wharton even advanced the reformation in Scotland despite his own personal beliefs. The key point of noble crown service was their suitability and usefulness at any given time. The Dacres, therefore, should have been employable or, at least, useful for crown service due to their influence in local society. However, it seems that they were not considered at all suitable for crown service during the rest of Elizabeth’s reign. It even seems likely, from the remaining evidence that the Elizabethan regime actively sought to diminish the power of noble houses like the Dacres as the following section will demonstrate.

---


283 See above, pp. 25-28, 35-8, 69-70, 96. See also below, pp. 201-16


285 Perhaps pointing to a direction for further research: see Hoyle, ‘Henry Percy, 6th earl’, pp. 180-1.

286 See above, pp. 52, 64, 55-70.
Chapter Six: The Dacres without portfolio

This section evaluates the relationship between the crown and the Dacres after 1563, when the Dacres no longer held official crown posts on the Anglo-Scottish border. Events during the run-up to the Rebellion of the Northern Earls and Leonard Dacre’s Rising will be discussed here. In the following narrative the motives behind Leonard Dacre’s Rising will be examined. This research will demonstrate that Leonard Dacre’s Rising can be separated from that of the northern earls, as it had a different character, and certainly different causes.

The death of William Lord Dacre in 1563 was a major turning point in the relationship between the crown and the Dacres. On 21 November 1563, Thomas Dacre wrote to Cecil explaining that his father having died “lately” that he required Cecil’s warrant for the “finding of his office”. Thomas 4th Baron Dacre of Gilsland never held the important offices that his father had. He seems to be an enigma of history about whom we know little. It seems he did little to improve the Dacre’s local, regional or national standing. Certainly, he was not an effective estate or money manager – his jointure to Elizabeth Leybourne alienated potentially vast swathes of land in Cumberland, the Dacre heartland, to outside interests for as long as she lived. Certainly, Leonard Dacre was displeased with what he saw as the overly generous jointure given to Elizabeth Leybourne, the second wife of Thomas, 4th Baron Dacre. There is a suggestion of trouble between the brothers upon Thomas Dacre’s inheritance of Naworth.

However, descriptions of Thomas, 4th Baron Dacre of Gilsland, are lacking due to a dearth of evidence. Much of this lack of evidence may be because Thomas Dacre did not hold office in the North. Certainly, he would have been hard pressed to figure as greatly in the sources as his father and grandfather had; unfortunately not always for the right reasons. There would be little reason for the regime to have a great deal of interaction with a noble who held no office.

---

1 BL Lansdowne MS. 6 no. 40.
2 TNA SP 15/18 f. 37; CSP Domestic Elizabeth, Addenda, 1566-1579, p. 255. See above, pp. 96-8. See also below, pp. 210-13.
4 See the notes on this paper: TNA SP15/13 f. 186.
and was very distant from court and the seat of power. Another knock-on effect of not holding office may also have been lack of funds. Although the wages for border warden were not usually enough in themselves to enrich the holder, the 500 marks or so wages on offer during this period could certainly augment a lordly income.\(^5\) More importantly, a lot of extra cash could be made by selling various offices on the crown lands that were also often within a warden’s remit or by exploiting the various rights, duties, customs or tithes that were available to the stewards of crown lands.\(^6\)

Therefore, Thomas 4\(^{th}\) Baron Dacre of Gilsland has remained famous solely for the remarks made about his good entertainment and housekeeping in documents found at Naworth Castle. He has been admonished for poor estate management and for failing to secure the family fortunes.\(^7\) The crown, of course, had serious misgivings about him, due mainly to his Roman Catholic beliefs as attitudes towards Catholicism hardened throughout the 1560s.\(^8\) However, Thomas Lord Dacre did try to maintain the network of nobility that had served his father so well.\(^9\) His first son Francis, his younger brother’s namesake, was a Godchild of the Earl of Shrewsbury’s, however Francis died young in early 1566.\(^10\) Thomas 4\(^{th}\) Baron Dacre also maintained traditional Dacre relationships with his tenants. He maintained entry fines and rents at relatively low levels, which did little to keep the family’s flagging finances ticking over, unfortunately.\(^11\) There was a suggestion that Thomas Dacre found it hard to control the local Grahams whilst he still had any kind of nominal duty to do so.\(^12\) Nevertheless, he never seems to have been considered for office at all, again demonstrating the perceived unsuitability of the Dacres for office under the, now settled, Elizabethan government.

---

\(^5\) TNA SP 59/41 ff. 238-46. See also TNA SP 15/32 f. 68.
\(^6\) See above, pp. 76-8.
\(^7\) Bindoff, *History of Parliament*, vol. 2, p. 3.
\(^9\) See above, pp. 81-4.
\(^10\) LPL Talbot Papers MS.3206 fol. 489.
\(^11\) As evidenced by the complaints of Dacre tenants upon his death: see TNA SP 15/13 ff. 184-96. See also below, pp. 156-8.
\(^12\) CSP Scotland, *Mary Queen of Scots*, vol. I, p. 680.
This lack of consideration for the Dacre cause and relative lack of interest in Dacre affairs sums up the crown’s interest in happenings in the Dacre lordship for the next three years. Of course, that does not mean that the crown had no interest at all in the affairs of the borders. In general, crown interest, especially Cecil’s, throughout this time focused on keeping expenses on the borders to a minimum. The crown employed Baron Scrope as warden of the west march and, to make matters worse, paid him what was frankly a pittance. The crown paid Scrope exactly the same fee that Wharton had received at the beginning of Edward VI’s reign, 20 years beforehand. Cecil based all of the expenses for the marches on Wharton’s old accounts: no doubt, this helped save the crown money but did not enhance the ability of the wardens to carry out their duties.\textsuperscript{13} This affected Scrope’s ability to muster men for the defence of his march. However, this was not the only factor limiting Scrope’s power in Cumberland and Westmorland.

Although being warden of the west march meant that Scrope was steward of the crown lands, on the borders he held no local power. He had limited local lands and tenants. The defences of the west march became weaker under Scrope’s rule. In 1565, a survey of England’s defences in the west march found Carlisle, Bewcastle and Penrith in great decay.\textsuperscript{14} Even as early as 1568, the crown recognised there was a problem of decay on the borders as instructions to the Council of the North demonstrate.\textsuperscript{15} It was not a case of Scrope being a poor warden, or being unwilling to carry out his duties: he simply did not have the resources or local power to carry out the task he was allotted without crown subvention. He faced a problem similar to that situation which Dacre had when charged with ruling the east and middle marches previously.\textsuperscript{16} A further problem was that under Cecil and Elizabeth’s tight fiscal controls he was not going to

\textsuperscript{13} TNA SP 15/32 f. 68 shows a total figure in fees of £624. This figure, however, includes all of the fees and expenses for deputies, Sergeants, surgeons and the various other offices under the warden. Scrope could not have made a large profit out of such a sum. TNA SP 59/41 ff. 238-46 demonstrates how the Elizabethan regime actively sought out records of previous fees (unsurprisingly from the reign of Edward VI, when Cecil was a crown secretary) and sought to give the office-holders of the Elizabethan period the same amount of money.

\textsuperscript{14} TNA SP 15/12 f. 165.

\textsuperscript{15} TNA SP 15/14 f. 91. Tough puts the date as far back as preceding 1558: see Tough, The Last Years of a Frontier, pp. 175-85.

\textsuperscript{16} Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, pp. 104-5, 150-63. See also above, pp. 25-8.
receive any funding or extra men for defence of his march. In fact, Scrope would have to fend for himself in an area that was riven intensely by conflicting loyalties and sometime feuding.

Scrope managed to heal the international rift caused by Dacre and Maxwell’s continuous feuding but he could not influence the local borderers greatly. Whereas a Dacre would often ride amongst, or at the head of his own tenants, Scrope was forced to rely on the loyalties of local men who would not necessarily feel any bond of service to him. As stated, Scrope was a man of the wrong religion for the region but the correct religion from the viewpoint of the crown. Undoubtedly, his views did not win him many new friends amongst west march society. In addition to this, although there is no direct evidence available, it has to be suspected that the Dacres and their followers, and probably Wharton, did not look favourably upon Scrope’s wardenship. There is no evidence of the three working together, or even complaints of tardiness in helping that marked out the Wharton and Dacre feud over the wardenship. It has to be wondered how much co-operation Scrope could expect from the border magnates: a fact that was borne out in the later rebellion. Scrope’s letters were directed mainly to Bedford, Cecil and Forster. Unsurprisingly, all three were men of a similar religious outlook.

Scrope seems to have spent only a limited time in west march society. As already seen, his initial negotiations with Maxwell were kept secret, due to fear of Dacre interference. In 1565, there were further admissions of Scrope’s and by extension the crown’s weakness on the west march. When taking local musters it seems that Scrope could barely keep order, as evidenced by his complaints about the borderers:

Has here taken the musters by virtue of a commission from the Lord Lieutenant, whereupon the Borderers gather such presumption of wars as he can scarcely

\[18\] Tough, The Last Years of a Frontier, p. 198.
\[19\] See above, pp. 121-2.
\[20\] For examples, see TNA SP 59/8 ff. 98,141; TNA SP 15/12 f. 34.
\[21\] TNA SP 59/6 f. 236. See also TNA SP 52/8 f. 93.
keep them from disorder, and fears that they shall upon such bruits as they have thereof use hostility. 22

From Scrope’s letter it sounds as if the borderers were willing to wage war on their own initiative – certainly such actions were almost unprecedented. An admission like this of his limited influence amongst local society should have sounded alarm bells with the regime. However, as was often the case, the crown looked the other way. Scrope was completely out of touch with feelings amongst the borderers: he spent far more time residing at home in Bolton Castle or in the City of Carlisle than he did amongst the border defenders. 23

From the perspective of border society, the crown had abandoned it. Outrages committed by unrestrained border-surnames became more commonplace. Within only a couple of years of the last Dacre wardenship, the borders were in decay. 24 Upheavals in Scotland continued but the crown did not continue its intervention on behalf of the Scottish Lords. Undoubtedly, this was due to a severe lack of funds. Clearly, Sussex and Sidney’s belligerent policy towards Ireland proved to be a drain on a weak and under-funded government.25 Even though border surnames rode unrestricted against the English borderers, due to increased Scottish military activity, the borders remained under-manned.26 In addition, the crown asked Scrope to defend the Almain miners who were attempting to exploit the area’s natural resources. Seemingly they had been at the receiving end of attacks but it is not clear by whom.27 Nevertheless, the crown asked Scrope to levy 50 light horse for service in Ireland where conflict with Shane O’Neill, but mainly illness, had decimated the English army.28 The defences of the borders were severely weakened. Borderers may well have been

22 CSP Foreign Elizabeth, vol. 7, p. 447; TNA SP 59/10 f. 10.
23 TNA SP 70/59 f. 49; TNA SP 52/8 f. 118; TNA SP 59/8 f. 55; TNA SP 15/12 f. 49.
26 TNA SP 59/11 ff. 33-9, 150, 196.
27 TNA SP 12/40 f. 188. Undoubtedly, when an area was as poor as this it has to be suspected that foreign workers may have been exploited by people who would normally be law abiding subjects. These attacks may not have been carried out by the “ranke-riders”. It is revealing that not only Scrope, the warden, was asked to deal with this matter but also the local Justices of the Peace. 28 APC, vol. 7, pp. 312-3; TNA SP 15/13 f. 60.
uneasy about the men in positions of authority: they were not proving adequate for their protection and were not the natural leaders of border society.

However, whereas some of the border holdings may have been suffering more than usual from unrest the main Dacre border holdings seemed little affected. Dacre border manors still had a system of defence, land-sergeants and lookouts regardless of whether or not a Dacre was the border warden. The way the Dacre border holdings had been built originally up meant that there was always at least an *ad hoc* system of defence in Dacre border holdings such as Gilsland. Thomas Carlton remained as the Land-Sergeant on the Gilsland estates throughout the period. Initially a Dacre servant, Carlton transferred his loyalties to the Howards. Carlton’s duties did not change; he remained responsible for the raising and leading of Gilsland tenants in their own defence.29

The system of governance put in place by the earlier Lord’s Dacre, especially Thomas, 2nd Baron Dacre of Gilsland meant that the Dacre border holdings could exist autonomously without central control. Local Dacre manorial courts delivered much of any local justice regardless of who was the incumbent border warden. Crown interference was still rare on the Dacre border holdings. Clearly, the crown found it difficult to interfere with matters of religion in any of the Dacre patronised churches and the local populace had little to fear from crown governance.30 Rents remained low as Thomas Lord Dacre attempted to build up his local following and ensure a stable legacy against a backdrop of quarrelling with his brother Leonard over the lands awarded to his wife.31 This situation was not going to last, however, as a double tragedy hit the Dacre family.

**The Dacre Lands and Good Lordship**

The first in a chain of unfortunate events for Thomas Lord Dacre was the death of his son Francis. Francis had been born sometime in late 1559 or early 1560,

---

29 Thomas Carleton, the long serving Land Sergeant of Gilsland, was at pains to point out this fact in 1597 – without wishing to cause too much offence to Elizabeth: see TNA SP 59/36 ff. 78-80; *Border Papers*, vol. 2, pp. 447-8. See also Ellis, *Tudor Frontiers*, pp. 147-56.
31 See above, pp. 29-30, 96-99. See also below, pp. 210-14.
as can be evidenced from Dacre’s request to Shrewsbury to become the child’s Godfather. Francis died in late 1565 or early 1566. He must have been only five or six years old. It is not clear how the child died but there is a suggestion that this child had never been particularly healthy, the request to Shrewsbury had been marked “haste”: perhaps this was because communications were often slow but may indicate the pressing need for a Godfather. The child may have been considered sickly and, perhaps, not likely to live long. However, Thomas and Elizabeth had another son, George and three daughters Anne (sometimes known as Nanne), Mary and Elizabeth. Clearly, Thomas Lord Dacre had lived up to his responsibility to continue the Dacre lineage. No doubt, he was spurred on in this respect by continuing rivalry between himself and Leonard Dacre. It is impossible to tell how much this death affected Thomas 4th Baron Dacre but this is not where the misfortunes of the family ended. Within a few months Thomas Lord Dacre was dead himself – he died on 1st July 1566. He left vulnerable estates protected by an underage heir and a widow and daughters in his stead. Parties had been keeping a close eye on the situation, notably Leonard Dacre and Thomas Howard, 4th Duke of Norfolk. Immediately upon the death of Thomas Lord Dacre relations between the inhabitants of the west march reached a crisis. Some like Thomas Carlton, Land Sergeant of Gilsland, remained loyal to Lady Dacre and ultimately followed her lead into later service. Others like Leonard Musgrave may have had some kind of inkling about the possible fate of the barony, and therefore of any lands they might hold of the Dacre Lords, and allied themselves to Leonard Dacre. They made an immediate attempt to get George Dacre into their custody. Initially, Leonard claimed that he had legal guardianship of the boy. However, Elizabeth Dacre and her advisors rebutted this immediately, as in fact, no legal judgements had been made. In fact, wardship could have been awarded only after what

---

32 For Dacre’s request for Shrewsbury to be the Godfather to Francis, see LPL Talbot papers MS. 3196 fol. 61. For the death of Francis, see LPL Talbot Papers MS. 3206 fol. 489.
33 Apparently, the Duke of Norfolk called Anne, Nanne, out of affection: see N. Williams, Thomas Howard, p. 117.
36 TNA SP 15/13 f. 184. See also HMC Salisbury MS, vol. I, p. 455.
would have been a lengthy process involving the crown and Court of Wards, which was dominated by the figure of Cecil. Leonard Dacre decided that in the old adage “possession is nine-tenths of the law” and tried to take the boy, George, away from his mother by force. There is little manuscript evidence remaining describing these events but it seems that Dacre was able to muster enough force to besiege Naworth for a period. Leonard Musgrave was certainly one who helped him in this matter.\(^{37}\) It was at this time that the Duke of Norfolk and Leonard Dacre became deadly enemies: unfortunately for Dacre, the Duke of Norfolk held far more influence with the regime than he did.\(^{38}\)

Ultimately, Dacre’s rather direct attempt to gain control of George Dacre failed. Norfolk, however, was busily plotting his moves for acquiring wardship of the boy. He decided to strengthen his case (and enrich himself with lands) by taking the hand of Thomas’ widow. Immediately, Norfolk received a licence (for an undisclosed fee) from the Archbishop of Canterbury, Matthew Parker, to marry Lady Dacre.\(^{39}\) At this time, Cecil was busily trying to rid the court of the influence of Dudley. Norfolk, in this case, was his natural ally. It was merely a formality that the Court of Wards would award the wardship of George Lord Dacre to Norfolk in order to cement his political allegiance.\(^{40}\) This meant that, from 1566 onwards, the Dacre lands were no longer controlled by, or for, the Dacre interest: essentially, the Dacre lordship existed to enrich the Duke of Norfolk and augment crown income. Therefore, it is hardly surprising that the low rents and entry fines of the Dacre estates were one of the first things to increase under the new estate manager. In addition, many old “contracts” between Dacre lords and tenants, essentially the tenancies at will described by Ellis, were terminated and many tenants found themselves forcibly evicted from

---

\(^{37}\) TNA SP 15/13 ff. 186-7.


\(^{39}\) A dispensation would have been necessary due to the fact that both had been married previously. There is some suggestion that Norfolk had some kind of leverage over Parker and the customary fee was waived: see LPL Faculty office, Muniment books, Muniment book F1/B f.1.

\(^{40}\) Read, *Mr Secretary Cecil*, pp. 335-7. See also MacCaffrey, *The Shaping of*, p. 140.
their lands.\textsuperscript{41} There was widespread disaffection with the new rule of the Howards over traditional Dacre lands.\textsuperscript{42}

There were several complaints and grievances over Norfolk’s new management of Dacre estates.\textsuperscript{43} Many addressed their suits to Cecil. He was Master of the Court of Wards and, therefore, responsible for the tenants’ situations. It cannot be said for sure whether Leonard Dacre actively encouraged complaints about Norfolk’s lordship, but at least one complainant named Leonard Dacre as his witness. A particularly poignant plea came from one John Fawcett of the Barony of Greystoke who stated that he and his wife had 19 children (presumably they did not all survive) but had been forcibly ejected from their holdings forcing them to “go a begging”. Obviously, the Duke of Norfolk was privy to much of the correspondence in the area, as he had already endorsed this plea with his notes. According to Norfolk, the suitor was a troublemaker who refused to be a good tenant and would not recognise “my Lady”.\textsuperscript{44} On 4 September 1567, only a year after her ex-husband, “my Lady” died during childbirth: there were no suggestions of wrongdoing on anyone’s behalf.\textsuperscript{45}

The Dacre brothers Leonard, Edward and Francis did not take the matter of Norfolk’s intrusion into their family lightly. They still had many followers amongst Cumberland society, despite the fact that none was now the head of their house. It seems that far from being “the most headstrong and troublesome” member of the Dacre family, Leonard, in fact, delegated that role to his younger brothers.\textsuperscript{46} Tensions ran high amongst west march society. When Francis came upon one of Norfolk’s erstwhile servants, one of his legal advisors and most trusted servants, Lawrence Bannister,\textsuperscript{47} Francis chose to strike him full in the

\textsuperscript{41} They are described as contracts here, however, in a legal sense many were just agreements by word of mouth, or at the most a pledge in front of a manorial court: see Ellis, \textit{Tudor Frontiers}, pp. 98-103.
\textsuperscript{42} TNA SP 15/13 ff. 184-96.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid. See also above, pp. 155-7.
\textsuperscript{44} Elizabeth Howard (nee Leybourne); TNA SP 15/13 f. 196.
\textsuperscript{45} For the fullest account of Elizabeth Howard’s death, see N. Williams, \textit{Thomas Howard}, pp. 128-9.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., p. 118.
\textsuperscript{47} Bannister was a former Dacre estate manager who kept his position within the Howard household, which probably explains the Dacres’ dislike of him: see Taylor, ‘The Crown and the
The residents of Carlisle became involved and it was not long before a wider affray broke out. Apparently, the melee attracted the attention of the sitting justices of assize, which was in session. From the confused accounts of the proceedings, it is not clear who continued to attack whom. It is clear, however, that the crown wished to lay the blame squarely on the shoulders of the Dacres and their followers. This, again, should come as little of a surprise, as Scrope, who was responsible for matters of justice in the march, was Norfolk’s brother-in-law. The protagonists escaped with bonds of recognisance for their continuing good behaviour and Bannister was not seriously hurt. Nevertheless, there were more troubling times ahead for the Dacre family.

The Dacre Land Case

The case of the Dacre lands is one of the more discussed aspects of the Dacre family history. There is little point in restating the case verbatim here. It would seem more pertinent to outline the important and relevant details to set Dacre’s later actions into context. The event that made a case necessary was the unfortunate death of the “little Lord Dacre” George in May 1569. Many have found the circumstances of his death questionable or suspicious to say the least. The sources explain merely that the little Lord Dacre died when a vaulting horse, which was unsecured, fell on him. Of course, vaulting horses can be relatively heavy, especially Tudor ones, but it still seems a very strange cause of death. In addition, the large inheritance that was now to become solely the possession of the Howards adds a particularly modern motive for wishing the little Lord Dacre dead. However, there is no concrete evidence of any foul play.

53. Cockayne, Complete Peerage, vol. 4, p. 1-26. See also N. Williams, Thomas Howard, p. 117.
The boy’s death threw the matter of the Dacre title into question immediately. Leonard Dacre assumed the title Lord Dacre of Gilsland, providing evidence of William Lord Dacre’s entail as proof of his entitlement. Norfolk knew that this might well threaten his hold over the lands and opposed Dacre’s claim on behalf of the co-heirs. Norfolk could be relatively sure of winning the case: he had checked into the matter on a previous occasion, which had been more of a testing of the water than the mere inquiry into legal rights that it has been portrayed as. In addition, Norfolk was, of course, the Earl Marshall of England and was, therefore, fully entitled to adjudicate on this matter himself. However, even Norfolk knew this might not have been looked on as fair and relinquished his rights in this case. He asked Elizabeth to appoint a special commission to hear the case. This was duly formed; it consisted of Northampton, Arundel, Pembroke and Leicester. These were hardly impartial peers. Arundel, Henry Fitzalan, was a relation of Norfolk and Northampton, William Parr, was one of the staunchest reformers in the realm and can hardly have been considered unbiased. Pembroke, William Herbert, was a close supporter of Norfolk and therefore hardly sympathetic to the Dacre cause. It has to be presumed that Leicester’s inclusion was an attempt to make sure that crown interest was represented. Another nail in the coffin for Leonard Dacre’s case was the presence in court of Cecil. He spoke on behalf of the wards, in favour of the Norfolk wardship, and of the rights of the co-heirs.

Dacre could hardly have faced stiffer, more powerful opposition, but Leonard stubbornly fought his corner. At Greenwich Palace, on 12 June 1569, after Cecil’s speech on the rights of the co-heirs, Dacre’s representative asked for more time to search the available records. It cannot be said for sure whether Dacre had an idea that something was being hidden from him. No one can be

---

55 TNA STAC 5 D37/16; Reid, King’s Council, p. 200. William Lord Dacre’s will entails the lands through the male line: see Durham University Library, Palace Green, H[oward] of N[aworth] P[apers] C172/1 ff. 1-6.
56 TNA SP 12/40 ff. 186-7. See also N. Williams, Thomas Howard, p. 117.
58 Read, Mr Secretary Cecil, pp. 442-6.
59 N. Williams, Thomas Howard, p. 118.
sure if Leonard Dacre was aware of the previous award of Edward IV or not.\textsuperscript{60} The commission adjourned in order to re-convene one week later. On their reappearance, Dacre could only state that he had found no new evidence and merely restated his original case, which rested upon William Lord Dacre’s entail. However, evidence recovered from Dacre’s possessions suggests that he was aware of the award made by Edward IV.\textsuperscript{61} As Sue Taylor states, it cannot be ascertained when Leonard Dacre discovered this information, or why – if he did know about it – he decided to ignore it.\textsuperscript{62} In any case, the commission, as expected, ruled on behalf of the co-heirs with the proviso that should new evidence be forthcoming a new hearing could be held.\textsuperscript{63} On 6 July 1569, the Duke of Norfolk committed the wardship of the three Dacre sisters and co-heirs to a council of wards made up of Lawrence Bannister, William Cantrell, John Dixie and John Blannerhassett. Presumably, this deflected any possible comeback from this case away from himself.\textsuperscript{64} To consolidate his position still further, Norfolk betrothed all three wards to his sons. The Dacre lordship would now remain in Howard hands, as Naworth Castle does today.\textsuperscript{65}

Although evidence is not as substantial as it may seem in some accounts, it is hardly surprising that Dacre held a grudge against the crown and turned to doing his best to spreading disaffection with Elizabethan rule. What is perhaps more surprising is that he had little difficulty in finding a ready audience for his grievances. It seems likely that Leonard Dacre was expecting some kind of trouble with the regime in 1569/70 as he transferred leases held of Cumberland over to his sister Anne, Countess Cumberland, presumably so that they might be kept in the family in some way.\textsuperscript{66} For much of the north of England, this was by no means the reign and government of Elizabeth of Gloriana myth and legend. In fact, the Elizabethan regime was now ruling over a largely Roman Catholic north through reformed governors. Less abstractly, in the case of Dacre tenants,

\textsuperscript{60} For the original award made by Edward IV, see TNA SC8/29/1440.
\textsuperscript{61} TNA SP 15/18 ff. 45-6.
\textsuperscript{63} TNA STAC 5/H81/543.
\textsuperscript{64} Lancashire Record Office, [no title] ref: DDX 19/218.
\textsuperscript{66} See the Will of Henry Clifford, 12\textsuperscript{th} Lord Clifford and Second Earl of Cumberland in, Clay, ‘The Clifford Family’, pp. 382-5.
perceived crown policy had seen them subjected to higher rents and entry fines. Some suffered eviction from the lands they had held for generations. At least one Dacre tenant, Richard Atkinson, voiced his concern at the end of traditional “good” lordship and at the new greed by which Norfolk exploited the tenants.67

The Dacre Rebellion

The crown, however, seemed completely oblivious of any discontent in the north, or, simply ignored it. Perhaps the attention of government focused more on events elsewhere, especially the Duke of Norfolk and Mary Queen of Scots’ marriage scheme.68 It was Norfolk’s marriage that provided what proved to be the catalyst for the first rising in the north, that of the Northern Earls – Westmorland and Northumberland – Thomas Percy and Charles Neville.69 As has already been shown, Thomas Percy was aggrieved at his treatment by the regime. He had essentially been pushed out of office and slighted by being replaced by his greatest enemy, Forster.70 Neville was different; perhaps his main grievances concerned the new, almost Puritanical regime that the crown installed in his powerbase in the Bishopric.71 This thesis will not attempt to go over all of the reasons for Northumberland and Westmorland’s rebellion; how their actions can be separated from those of the Dacres is more pertinent to this thesis.

Although there were arguments as to the cause of their rebellion, and differences over which grievances were to be aired, there was one striking similarity between Westmorland and Northumberland: that is, both were connected to

---

67 TNA SP 15/18 ff. 37-43. For a full discussion of Atkinson’s complaints and advice, see James, Society, Politics & Culture, pp. 270-307. It has to be presumed that where one tenant felt moved to write a letter to his traditional lord that others could well have been of a similar opinion.

68 For the marriage scheme of the duke & Mary, see MacCaffrey, The Shaping of, pp. 199-220. See also P. Williams, The Later Tudors, pp. 256-61; Wormald, Mary Queen of Scots, pp. 182-3.

69 N. Williams, Thomas Howard, pp. 143-69. See also Kesselring, The Northern Rebellion, pp. 52-3.

70 See above, pp. 124-7, 142.

Norfolk. Dacre’s later rising was not, for obvious reasons, a pro-Norfolk affair: Leonard Dacre would not promote the cause of the man who had usurped his title and ended his noble house. Neville’s wife was a Howard. Both he and Percy had been close to Norfolk for quite some time. Both men were privy to Norfolk’s intrigues. Norfolk gave this fact away entirely (and effectively sold the two Earls out) when he wrote them a letter asking them not to rise: what more evidence could a paranoid crown need of rebellious intentions? The Dacres, however, did not remain entirely aloof from the rebellion of the Earls. Their tenants certainly did not. Sue Taylor made a brave attempt at recreating exactly where the protagonists in this rebellion came from. Many were Dacre tenants as can be evidenced from her findings.

In addition, there is a suggestion that Edward and Francis Dacre were involved in a plot to take over Carlisle Castle and kill the Bishop. Scrope had left Carlisle with a large group of armed men in an attempt to quell the rebellion in the countryside. The Bishop of Carlisle, John Best was left in charge of the citadel. It is from him that the account of these actions comes. Apparently, Edward Dacre brought soldiers into the city quietly, in small groups, to avoid attention. Somebody had uncovered intelligence of the intended plot and the Bishop had doubled the garrison. Realising this, the Dacres baulked at the taking of a fortification, especially without any artillery. That did not stop Francis inquiring boldly as to the intentions of the Bishop towards the Dacres. The Bishop rebuffed him immediately. However, of course, this account cannot be accepted as entirely correct: it was not written until 13 December, sometime after the initial rebellion. This may be part of a crown attempt to implicate the Dacres in the Rebellion of the Earls. The account does not come from an unbiased source and there is no other evidence to corroborate it. Bishop Best had often

---

72 TNA SP 15/15 f. 25; TNA SP 15/14 ff. 262-3. Apparently, an argument broke about between the Earls and their adherents as to what exactly the cause of the rebellion was. Westmorland was none too keen on using religion as his motive for challenging crown authority: see Sharpe, Memorials, pp. 196-200. See also Kesselring, The Northern Rebellion, pp. 50-6.
73 Despite Williams’ claims that he became reconciled to the Norfolk marriage scheme and that the rising was to be supported by Spanish troops: see N. Williams, Thomas Howard, pp. 150-1
75 N. Williams, Thomas Howard, p. 169. See also Kesselring, The Northern Rebellion, p. 52; Sharpe, Memorials, pp. 195-6.
77 TNA SP 15/15 f. 166.
been at pains to limit the influence of the Dacres over his diocese.\textsuperscript{78} The episode does shed some light as to the attitude of the Dacres towards the rebellion, however. They certainly did not wish to rebel openly against the queen but they would use the disordered situation to their advantage: certainly, that is what Leonard Dacre did.

Despite foreign ambassadors’ tales about the willingness of Dacre to rebel, and despite claims about his intrinsic involvement with Mary Queen of Scots, Dacre’s actions in the Rebellion of the Northern Earls are relatively easy to fathom.\textsuperscript{79} Put quite simply, he would not rise for the sake of the Duke of Norfolk’s marriage and did not assist the northern earls openly. Clearly, Leonard Dacre took the opportunity of the outbreak of the rebellion to lay claim to his ancestral lands. In fact, how involved with the plotting he really was must be open to question. He was not even in the north when rebellion broke out; he was at court attempting to appeal the matter of his inheritance.\textsuperscript{80} No doubt, he believed that the discredit and the detention of the Duke of Norfolk provided him with an excellent opportunity to restate his claims to the Dacre Lordly title with vigour.\textsuperscript{81} Upon news of the outbreak of the rebellion, the queen called Dacre into her presence.\textsuperscript{82} It would be very interesting to know exactly what the two discussed: unfortunately, this has remained private and no amount of research can bring this to light.

After the meeting, Dacre hastened north, seemingly buoyed by what had transpired during his meeting with the queen. To all intents and purposes, Leonard Dacre then assisted Scrope, his local rival, in quelling the rebellion.\textsuperscript{83} In fact, he was even commended for his “diligent service” against the rebels by none other than Thomas Radcliffe, 3\textsuperscript{rd} Earl of Sussex, a close friend of Norfolk’s.\textsuperscript{84} Dacre did not stop there; as with the situation during the Pilgrimage

\textsuperscript{78} See above, pp. 117-25.
\textsuperscript{79} Kesselring, \textit{The Northern Rebellion}, pp. 32-5. See below, pp. 164-9.
\textsuperscript{80} TNA SP 15/15 f. 38; TNA SP 15/14 f. 262.
\textsuperscript{82} TNA SP 15/15 f. 140; TNA SP 15/18 ff. 31-5, 43. See also, Kesselring, \textit{The Northern Rebellion}, p. 53; MacCaffrey, \textit{The Shaping of}, p. 228.
\textsuperscript{83} TNA SP 15/15 ff. 164, 213.
\textsuperscript{84} TNA SP 15/15 f. 221.
of Grace there were scores for the Dacres to settle. There was now one overriding issue for the Dacres: the recovery of their estates and title. The political situation allowed Leonard Dacre to take the best possible course of action open to him. Traditionally, the Dacres were a martial family, Dacre was a martial man – he decided to take the direct course of action and re-enter the former Dacre possessions by force, if necessary.

By piecing together the evidence, it is possible to build up a picture of exactly what Leonard Dacre and his followers did. At around the end of November, one Edmund Turner, as part of his duties to his new employer, the Duke of Norfolk, was sent to receive the revenues of Dacre properties, apparently in order that he could collect what fees were due to be paid to the crown. The crown would have been due to receive a large proportion of Dacre revenues because the Dacre co-heirs were wards of the crown. Other servants of the Duke, notably Thomas Carlton the Land-Sergeant of Gilsland, met Turner “along the road”. Carlton and his companions advised Turner not to go any further as he might be in danger of his life. Apparently, Edward Dacre and some “disordered persons” had taken Greystoke Castle by scaling the walls with ladders. The confrontation that occurred had not passed without any violence, although life had been spared: [when] “Dacre had commanded Bird to deliver up the keys, which being refused, one of the company drew his dagger and struck Bird in the shoulder, whereof he lay in great peril of death.” Of course, this made Dacre’s actions all the more unpalatable to the regime. According to Turner, Dacre was depriving the queen of her rightful income. The crown was not going to receive its dues on this occasion.

Similarly, Gilsland branches of the Bells and Milburnes took Naworth and threw out the new keepers. Kirkoswald Castle and College were likewise

86 There seems to be little extant evidence of who Bird was exactly; perhaps the most likely assumption is that he was a Dacre servant originally who remained in his position as a Steward of Greystoke during the minority of George Lord Dacre. See HMC Salisbury MS, vol. I, p. 455.
87 The Milburnes were a branch, or grayne, of a Northumberland, Tynedale, border surname family: see D. Newton, North-East England, p. 65; Robson, Rise & Fall of English Highland Clans, p. 199. The Bells were another border surname clan who originated from the Scottish side of the border, Middlebie in Annandale, but also inhabited the English west march and Gilsland
occupied, as was Rockcliffe Castle. Other “ill disposed persons” took Askerton Castle and Denton tower. Dacre adherents also seized the Pele tower at Cumcatch. As Edmund Turner put it, “The taking of the said castles was as it were all in one instant, in the name of Lord Leonard Dacre, to the Queen's use, for that his grace [the Duke of Norfolk] was beheaded, as the report was, with the day and place of his execution.”\footnote{HMC Salisbury MS, vol. I, pp. 455-6.} However, what Dacre’s repossession of his properties may, in fact, indicate is a re-entry of property in order to initiate a \textit{Quo Warrantio} legal claim and have the Dacre land case re-opened. Dacre may well have suspected that he could get a more favourably disposed crown hearing and a fairer judgement on his lands considering the rumours surrounding Norfolk and the disordered nature of the realm at this time. Clearly, this was a remarkably well organised, well-planned and precisely executed operation.

The account also reveals the attitude of Leonard Dacre towards the Duke of Norfolk. Presumably, Dacre believed that Norfolk would be revealed as the true traitor. After all, it was he who had plotted to marry the Queen of Scots without Elizabeth’s knowledge. Norfolk had been thrown into the Tower for his treachery.\footnote{TNA SP 12/59 f. 13; HMC Salisbury MS, vol. I, p. 458. See also N. Williams, \textit{Thomas Howard}, pp. 157-79; Guy, \textit{Tudor England}, pp. 273-5; MacCaffrey, \textit{The Shaping of}, pp. 219-46.} There would have been every reason for Dacre, and much of northern society, to believe rumours that Norfolk had been executed, or at the very least, that he would be in the near future.\footnote{HMC Salisbury MS, vol. I, p. 455-6.} In fact, it seems remarkably cautious and restrained of Elizabeth’s government not to execute Norfolk at this time. One would suspect that Henry VIII would not have been so hesitant. However, Norfolk was never trusted fully again and it was not long before he fell foul of the regime.

Leonard Dacre presumed that, having assisted in the putting down of the Rebellion, and in light of Norfolk’s treachery, the crown would award him “quiet possession” of the family’s belongings and title. He was grossly mistaken as several forces worked against him, further blackening what was already a rather stained reputation. The two main forces working against Dacre were the
The Dacres without portfolio

size and value of the Dacre estates and the influence of Norfolk’s adherents at court. The crown, in particular Cecil as Master of the Wards, would lose a considerable income should the Dacre lands be awarded to the rightful heir. Whilst the co-heirs held the lands, Cecil could make a considerable sum of money from the duties to the crown. He seemed reluctant to forego this. Cecil had already spoken on behalf of the co-heirs and throughout 1569/70 was anxious to find suitably damning intelligence about Dacre. Cecil extracted rather jumbled confessions from several suspects about the involvement of Leonard Dacre in the plotting of the rebel earls. Thomas Beale recounted how there had been several communications between the Earls and Dacre. Oswald Wilkinson, William Norton and Christopher Norton gave a story of how Leonard Dacre and “Old Norton” had been privy to the Earls’ plans on the very outbreak of the rebellion.

Bearing in mind Dacre’s absence from the north at the outbreak of the rebellion and the, at least, two-or-three day journey required to get to London, this is dubious evidence to say the least. There was ample motive for the suspects to give pleasing confessions to their interrogators. William and Christopher Norton wished to have their lives and have that of their father spared. Presumably so too did Beale and Wilkinson. Cecil was not interested in the accuracy of the confessions against Dacre. He was merely interested in implicating Dacre in the Rebellion of the Earls and in retaining possession of the lands in the hands of the crown. For their part, confederates of Norfolk’s did their best to implicate Dacre in the rebellion. Interestingly, however, Scrope and Sussex, Norfolk’s brother-in-law and friend respectively, both changed their stories of Dacre’s treachery and changed their description of his actions as an “evil counsellor” to the earls to accounts of Dacre’s diligence. They do not seem to have believed that

91 TNA SP 15/15 f. 38. See also above, pp. 166-9.
93 TNA SP 15/15 f. 243. See also TNA SP 15/15 f. 38. “Old Norton” was Richard Norton of Norton Conyers and Keeper of Norham Castle. He was a leading figure in the Pilgrimage of Grace and considered as notorious religious conservative by the reign of Elizabeth: see Bush, The Pilgrimage of Grace, pp. 150-6; Sharpe, Memorials, pp. 275-88.
94 CSP Domestic Elizabeth, Addenda, 1566-1579, pp. 412-5.
96 For Dacre’s suspected involvement as an “evil counsellor” to the earls, see TNA SP 15/14 f. 262; Kesselring, The Northern Rebellion, p. 48-51. For his diligence according to Sussex, see
Dacre had been involved within the rebellion initially, or at the very least they changed their opinions to what they believed might be suitable in the current political climate.\textsuperscript{97} At best, evidence for Dacre’s scheming and plotting with the rebel earls is scanty and is nothing more than hearsay. Of course, today this would not be admissible as evidence against a suspect. During a particularly paranoid period of Elizabeth’s reign, however, this evidence seemed far more damning.\textsuperscript{98} Unsurprisingly, Wharton had also been at pains to point out Dacre disaffection and plotting.\textsuperscript{99} However, it was not this particular evidence that tipped the scales against Leonard Dacre. It was evidence from Scotland that prompted the queen to issue a commission for Dacre’s arrest.\textsuperscript{100} Evidence had reached court that Dacre was in contact with several of the Scottish border lairds and that many looked to him for assurance. This was a particularly frightening prospect for the queen since her government supported Regent Murray whilst Mary Queen of Scots was in the north of England. Many of the Scottish border lairds were adherents of their queen.\textsuperscript{101} If they joined forces with the earls and Dacre, a worst-case scenario could become reality for the English government. Mary Queen of Scots could be freed and would have an army behind her, and a Roman Catholic one at that.\textsuperscript{102}

Despite the fact that Cecil gained much from the Dacre lands, if this scenario became a reality he would lose far more: he could even lose his life. As one of the “evil counsellors” surrounding Elizabeth, he was always likely to be a prime

\textsuperscript{97} TNA SP 15/15 f. 140. For Dacre’s good service, see TNA SP 15/15 f. 221. See also TNA SP 15/15 f. 73.
\textsuperscript{99} BL Cotton Caligula, B. IX. f. 384. Despite the fact that, apparently, he had offered to rise once he knew what course Dacre would take: see TNA SP15/17 f. 181. For other evidence of Wharton’s role in the rising, see TNA SP 15/15 f. 38.
\textsuperscript{100} TNA SP 15/17 ff. 68-9.
\textsuperscript{101} TNA SP 52/17 ff. 14-7. See also TNA SP 59/16 f. 186.
\textsuperscript{102} TNA SP 59/16 f. 202. See also Wormald, \textit{Mary Queen of Scots}, pp. 181-3; Read, \textit{Mr. Secretary Cecil}, pp. 460-1; MacCaffrey, \textit{The Shaping of}, pp. 199-246.
target for rebel retribution.\footnote{For one of the rebel declarations (there were several different versions), see BL Harlian MS 6990 fol. 44. For another version, see Sharpe, \textit{Memorials}, pp. 42-3. See also Fletcher & MacCulloch, \textit{Tudor Rebellions}, pp. 162-3.} Therefore, Cecil went to great pains to present all the evidence together in order to create a picture of a coherent plot on the behalf of Leonard Dacre and, perhaps, northern Roman Catholics in general.\footnote{BL Cotton Caligula, B. IX. ff. 386, 400.} Cecil was the arch politician and knew that foreign involvement in the domestic plotting, especially something related to Mary Queen of Scots, would demand stern action from a queen anxious to defend her title.\footnote{For example, see TNA SP46 ff. 261-2. See also \textit{CSP Foreign Elizabeth, 1558-1559}, vol. 1, p. 521; MacCaffrey, \textit{The Shaping of}, pp. 153-89.} Dacre had quickly gone from hero of the crown to the villain of the piece. No doubt, he had suspected that this was really the last throw of the dice and had taken precautions. As stated, he had alienated lands of his own.\footnote{See above, p. 160.} In addition, he had provisioned Naworth for a possible attack.\footnote{TNA SP 15/17 f. 236.} Presumably, he knew that his rivals would attempt some action against him.

Rumours abounded as to Leonard Dacre’s actions throughout this period. There is relatively little reliable evidence to go on. However, historians, presumably due to the popular, exciting and often scandalous nature of histories describing the tragic Mary Queen of Scots, have seized upon one rumour about Dacre’s actions: this was Leonard Dacre’s supposed attempt to free Mary Queen of Scots from her captivity at Wingfield. The original source for this rumour is Murdin’s transcription of state papers from the reign of Queen Elizabeth.\footnote{William Murdin (ed.), \textit{A Collection of State Papers relating to affairs in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth from the year 1571-1596.}} The examination of John Leslie, the Bishop of Ross, apparently revealed that Mary had told the Bishop that Dacre had spoken to her “from the leads” [the roof or guttering] and had tried to talk her into making her escape with him.\footnote{See, Murdin, vol. 1, p. 30.} She turned him down, as the Duke of Norfolk, her advisor and supposedly future husband, could hardly consider Dacre a friend.\footnote{Ibid. See also Kesselring, \textit{The Northern Rebellion}, p. 49.} This one source cannot be considered as reliable since these interrogations were often designed in order to get answers that the regime wanted. In addition, the Bishop of Ross openly...
states that he was merely passing comment on what Mary told him. The events described took place two years before this examination, in the summer of 1569, which is quite a considerable length of time beforehand: as Kesselring notes, Ross’ examination should be treated with caution.\textsuperscript{111} However, despite the tenuous nature of these claims, MacCaffrey includes them within both of his books on the Elizabethan regime.\textsuperscript{112} Williams also includes them within his narrative history of the Duke of Norfolk.\textsuperscript{113} It has to be wondered whether these claims were included within the books for entertainment value rather than as unbiased historical accounts. Mary Queen of Scots remains a popular figure amongst publishers to this day.

As Kesselring states, much of this evidence and rumour must be taken as much as an attempt to blacken the protagonists’ character and to explain future actions as anything else.\textsuperscript{114} Regardless of this, it was still patently obvious to Dacre that powerful forces were acting against him and that he would need to defend his possessions once more. In the west march, military action against the Dacres was relatively difficult to organise. Sussex was far from confident that he could raise the necessary forces. In addition, he was probably not convinced that he would receive much help from the government after being on the receiving end of several rebukes from the queen.\textsuperscript{115} Scrope had now served the government on the west march for seven years: he, more than anyone else, knew the influence of the Dacres amongst west march society. Scrope explained, “I wrote you how I was directed by the Earl of Sussex to apprehend Leonard Dacre, and my opinion that this country was not to be trusted in that service,” … “I assure you he is not to be touched with the force of this country. I may levy a good number, yet few will be found to execute their force against a Dacre”.\textsuperscript{116} Clearly, Scrope had no confidence in the west marchers’ allegiance to the crown. He expected that the inhabitants of the west march would show loyalty to their local and traditional leaders rather than to the recently appointed officers of the crown.

\textsuperscript{111} Kesselring, \textit{The Northern Rebellion}, p. 51.
\textsuperscript{113} N. Williams, \textit{Thomas Howard}, p. 158.
\textsuperscript{114} Kesselring, \textit{The Northern Rebellion}, p. 51.
\textsuperscript{115} TNA SP 15/17 ff. 95-121.
\textsuperscript{116} TNA SP 15/17 f. 143. See also \textit{CSP Domestic Elizabeth, Addenda, 1566-1579}, pp. 215-6.
Troops would be required from elsewhere and would need the ‘correct’
motivation to deal with Leonard Dacre. This motivation was forthcoming from
two sources. One was Lord Hunsdon: he was not only eager to serve the queen,
he was also anxious to receive due credit and accompanying reward. Hunsdon
had his eyes fixed firmly on Leonard Dacre’s prime Yorkshire estates – motive
enough for wishing to inflict a defeat on a rebel.\footnote{TNA SP 15/17 ff. 183, 213, 253. See also above, pp. 39-48.} The other was the men of
Berwick who, commanded by Forster and Hunsdon, were not only seasoned
soldiers but were also likely to have heard many stories about the treachery of
the Gilsland Dacres from one of their arch-rivals, Sir Thomas Dacre of
Lanercost.\footnote{Hunsdon states he was aided by the 300 “chiefest of the 500 at Berwick”: see TNA SP 15/17 f. 235. See also CSP Domestic Elizabeth, Addenda, 1566-1579, p. 238.} He had been in command at Berwick for several years and it seems
unlikely that he had never spoken of his feud with his relatives.\footnote{TNA SP 59/5 f. 231; TNA SP 59/4 f. 212; Summerson, Medieval Carlisle, pp. 651-2. See also above, pp. 37, 134.} Soldiers to
deal with Dacre were drawn from Berwick and from the middle march, where a
certain element amongst Northumberland society had often been at loggerheads
with the Dacres.\footnote{For the complaints of the Northumberland gentry against Thomas 2\textsuperscript{nd} Baron Dacre, see Hodgson, Northumberland, pt 3, vol. I, pp. 35-6.} Hunsdon was unsure about the exact size of his forces (he
was not sure exactly how many men Forster had raised) but by using his
estimates, he had around 800-1000 foot at his disposal and approximately 500-
600 horse.\footnote{Hunsdon gives these approximate figures as he explains how his forces were to approach Naworth: see TNA SP 15/17 f. 213.}

Hunsdon and Forster, therefore, managed to muster a small, yet well-trained,
highly motivated and well-equipped force to deal with Leonard Dacre. However,
they lacked any type of heavy ordnance. This would be essential if the crown
was serious about taking a stronghold like Naworth Castle.\footnote{Hunsdon states that Naworth could not be taken without ordnance but also observed that
none would be forthcoming: see TNA SP 15/17 ff.165, 215. For a short description of Naworth
Castle, see Adrian Pettifer, English Castles: A Guide by Counties (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1995),
p. 45.} Nevertheless, no
ordnance was forthcoming and Hunsdon set about elaborate plans to draw
Leonard Dacre out onto open ground. Dacre, on the other hand, had little
intention of leaving his ancestral home. He had at least some knowledge of the
preparations Hunsdon and Forster had made against him. He assumed the title of Lord Dacre and stated that the crown had awarded livery of his possessions. There is no corroborative evidence for Dacre’s claims but it has to be wondered what had been promised in his audience with the queen. Unfortunately for Dacre, he also seems to have injured his leg in his work against the rebels in the west march; a fact that of which Sussex was well aware. Nevertheless, despite his misgivings Dacre decided to come out and face his enemies eventually: his troops emerged “crying and shouting as if they had been mad”. What these actions may, in fact, demonstrate is a previously unconsidered motive for Dacre’s rising: he may well have been prompted to act due to the fervour of his own tenants and local forces. Traditional Dacre tenants had seen rent increases and evictions from their new landlords; the wardship of George ‘the little’ Lord Dacre had not seen their traditional rights protected. In addition, the Southern Army that had been sent to suppress the Rebellion of the Northern Earls had not acted with any kind of restraint. The southern soldiers had spoiled large areas of the north, as both Sadler and Sussex had pointed out. Subjects both “good and bad” had their possessions sacked and stolen. The feelings of much of the west march population must have been running high, explaining their “crying and shouting” and their forwardness in engaging crown forces.

Nevertheless, the reason Dacre chose to leave Naworth and engage Hunsdon and Forster’s forces in open ground is not clear. However, a few facts can be taken into consideration. Dacre was an experienced soldier. He probably realised that a prolonged siege would lead only to hardship and starvation, and that eventually there would only be one outcome. The more time crown forces had, the more resources they could gather. It would only be a matter of time before cannon were brought to bear on Naworth and he could not withstand that. An additional factor was the size of crown forces levied against him. Clearly, Dacre fancied his chances against Hunsdon, Forster and their men. Apparently,
he offered them battle on several occasions, which they declined. He had a superior force, numbering around 3000, twice as many men as Hunsdon and Forster had at their disposal.

There was now no going back as the two forces played a game of cat and mouse with each other. In fact, although crown forces had set out to capture Dacre, he took the initiative. Upon coming out of Naworth, his force shadowed the smaller force commanded by Hunsdon. Militarily speaking, it was probably this overconfidence in the ability of his men that led to Dacre’s downfall. Being smaller in number, the crown force took up a defensive position; Dacre’s forces remained on the offensive. Divided into three battles, each in a triangular formation, according to Hunsdon, upon a heath near a small stream Dacre’s force “gave the proudest charge upon my shot” that he had ever seen. The crown forces were able to form a rough defensive position flanked by their cavalry. They managed to unleash at least one volley of fire from their harquebusiers against Dacre’s oncoming rebels. No doubt, this volley caused much damage and confusion to what was essentially a scratch force of untrained men: several hundred of the rebels were killed. Although Hunsdon, showing little regard for the men under his command, did not mention it, several hundred soldiers of the crown forces were also killed. The engagement must have lasted for some time. Mervyn James has described Dacre’s rising as similar to a Scots border incursion but this was a far larger force than those that usually carried out Scottish raids. This was, in fact, the largest military engagement on English soil during the nearly half a century long reign of Elizabeth. For that fact alone it must be regarded as significant.

---

129 TNA SP 15/17 f. 251.
130 TNA SP 15/17 ff. 213, 253.
131 TNA SP 15/17 f. 251; CSP Domestic Elizabeth, Addenda, 1566-1579, pp. 214-5. The battle site has never been identified, except from this evidence, archaeologists have failed to discover artefacts from this battle. It has always been assumed to be somewhere near Geltisbridge, in Cumberland. At this time, members of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society (CWAAS) are trying to identify and investigate where this conflagration took place.
132 TNA SP 15/17 ff. 249-51. Women were also involved, according to Holinshed: see above, p. 9.
133 TNA SP 15/18 ff. 115-7.
134 James, Society, Politics & Culture, p. 302. Raiding parties, by their vary nature, were usually smaller and the make up of Dacre’s force was not necessarily Scottish: see above, pp. 100-103. See also below, pp. 170-2, 200-1.
For obvious reasons, the battle had great significance for the power of Leonard Dacre and the power of the Dacre lordship. Dacre had now shown himself openly to be a traitor. However much truth there had been in wild rumours about Dacre’s involvement with the earls and other plots, Dacre had now taken that final step into rebellion. Apparently, crown forces nearly captured him on the battlefield but “certain Scots” saved him from the clutches of Hunsdon’s men.\textsuperscript{135} Dacre escaped capture and fled to Alexander, 5\textsuperscript{th} Lord Home’s house, Home Castle, on the Scottish side of the border.\textsuperscript{136} Later in 1570, the English government ordered the Scot to hand over the traitors but Home would have none of it. Hunsdon (who had been entrusted to capture Dacre), explained [that], “Lord Home said that he would die a Dacre, for a Dacre kept his father and mother three years”.\textsuperscript{137} English forces exacted a steady, bloody and prolonged revenge on the Scottish borderers for harbouring English rebels.\textsuperscript{138} Both Westmorland and Dacre were rumoured to be behind raids into the English realm.\textsuperscript{139} Essentially, however, these raids amounted to little more than forays.\textsuperscript{140} The position of the now exiled Dacre and Westmorland on the Scottish borders was tenuous to say the least. Eventually, both managed to smuggle themselves over to Spanish Flanders and received Spanish pensions.\textsuperscript{141}

While in exile the pair quarrelled with each other, this was due mainly to Westmorland’s discontent with Dacre’s delayed reaction to the rising. However, meetings were held at Mechlin and Louvain in an attempt to patch up relations between the fugitives.\textsuperscript{142} The English regime had not quite seen the end of these champions of Roman Catholicism: for now, since the publication of the Papal

\textsuperscript{135} TNA SP 15/17 f. 251. See also Sharpe, \textit{Memorials}, pp. 219-20.
\textsuperscript{137} Once again demonstrating Dacre influence over Scottish borderers: see TNA SP 59/16 f. 272. Home’s parents had been kept by the Dacres after being outlawed in Scotland in 1515: see Douglas, ‘Fast Castle’, pp. 68-9.
\textsuperscript{138} TNA SP 52/18 f. 230. See also Sharpe, \textit{Memorials}, pp. 233-40; Sadler, \textit{Border Fury}, pp. 530-5; Tough, \textit{The Last Years of a Frontier}, pp. 213-9.
\textsuperscript{139} TNA SP 59/16 ff. 213-6.
\textsuperscript{140} \textit{CSP Scotland, Mary Queen of Scots}, vol. 3, p. 69. See also Tough, \textit{The Last Years of a Frontier}, p. 213.
\textsuperscript{141} TNA SP 15/21 f. 30; TNA SP 12/105 f. 25. See also \textit{CSP Spanish}, vol. 2, p. 255.
\textsuperscript{142} TNA SP 15/20 f. 35.
Bull, *Regnans in Excelsis*, in 1570, that is what both became.\(^{143}\) Although Westmorland had explained that he would not fight for religion and Dacre had certainly not done so, both were now viewed as part of a wider Roman Catholic conspiracy against a beleaguered Protestant nation.\(^{144}\) Both did plot against the Elizabethan regime. In view of the way the crown had treated Dacre, this was hardly surprising.

Described by the French Ambassador Fènèlon as “Milord Dacre principal catholique du Nord” Dacre took a leading role in plots against the queen.\(^{145}\) Rumours abounded about Dacre’s involvements in various plots against the Elizabethan regime. Often the rumours centred on the ongoing dispute in Scottish and English politics about the restoration of Mary Queen of Scots.\(^{146}\) Dacre conspired with George, 5\(^{th}\) Lord Seton, to get men and money for an invasion, first of Scotland to promote the Marian party and then, on to England. Dacre had a personal audience with Alva in order to elicit his support.\(^{147}\) According to the report of John Lee, at one stage, the plotters went as far as obtaining artillery pieces, 5000 men, guns and the ships to carry them.\(^{148}\) It seems, however, that the alarming reports from English agents to Burghley were merely rumours.\(^{149}\) None of the plots ever came to fruition and many rumours were probably exaggerated, perhaps in an attempt to curry favour with Burghley and the regime.

Although upset and perturbed by some of the English government’s actions towards the Spanish and the Netherlands, it does not seem that the Duke of Alva, Governor of the Spanish Netherlands and Flanders, or Philip II of Spain had


\(^{145}\) Probably more in order to elicit favour for his reports rather than the whole truth but interesting in that it shows knowledge of Dacre’s status in foreign circles: see Correspondence de la Mothe Fènèlon, p. 386.

\(^{146}\) TNA SP 15/21 f. 30. See also TNA SP 52/22 f. 51.

\(^{147}\) TNA SP 15/21 f. 35.

\(^{148}\) TNA SP 15/20 ff. 140, 165, 220.

\(^{149}\) Cecil was raised to the peerage as Lord Burghley in 1571, perhaps as a reward for his part in putting down the rebellions and for ‘discovering’ the plots of 1569-1571: see Read, *Mr. Secretary Cecil*, p. 467.
quite the stomach or resources to commit fully to an invasion of England.\textsuperscript{150} He was willing to shelter fugitives from Elizabeth’s Reformation and English rebels and, of course, hear their plans: having another sovereign’s enemies in one’s pocket was merely a tried and tested part of early modern politics. Alva gave the rebels pensions, although he would not enrich them, but he would not risk open war against England.\textsuperscript{151} Alva had his own problems in the Netherlands and there was always the possibility, although ever decreasing, of some future Spanish match with Elizabeth, or a revival of the traditional imperial alliance, that England had often made use of to invade France in the past.\textsuperscript{152}

**The Aftermath**

However, it is clear that despite Dacre’s failure, there was widespread support for the Dacre cause on the Anglo-Scottish borders. In addition, there is every reason to believe that the regime realised that not all had been quite right about the way Dacre was treated. Upon the defeat of the northern earls, retribution against the supporters of the earls was swift and terrible. In fact, the executions after the northern rebellion stand out as particularly cruel and vindictive.\textsuperscript{153} Rebellions that were much more serious had not seen the number of executions that were to occur in the north.\textsuperscript{154} Although precise numbers are hard to quantify, around 600 at least were put to death.\textsuperscript{155} With astonishing efficiency, the crown surveyed the lands and goods of the rebels and wrote up various books of rebel belongings.\textsuperscript{156} In addition, and described in other works – notably by Kesselring – the regime extorted much money and property out of its more wealthy


\textsuperscript{151} TNA SP 70/120 f. 64; *CSP Foreign, Elizabeth*, vol. 9, pp. 543-4.

\textsuperscript{152} Doran, *Elizabeth I*, pp. 30-1.


\textsuperscript{154} For example, the far more widespread Pilgrimage of Grace was followed up by 178 executions in 1537: see Ellis, ‘Promoting ‘English Civility’ in Tudor Times’, in Levai & Vese (eds.), *Tolerance and Intolerance in Historical Perspective* (Pisa, 2003), pp. 155-70, p. 160. See also Fletcher & MacCulloch, *Tudor Rebellions*, pp. 102-3.

\textsuperscript{155} The original lists of those who were appointed to die is printed in Sharpe, *Memorials*, pp. 127-130, 133-4, 140-4, 155-6, 225-32, 250-2. For a reappraisal of the numbers executed, see H. B. McCall, ‘The Rising in the North: A new light upon one aspect of it’, *The Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, 13 (1905), pp. 74-87.

\textsuperscript{156} TNA SP 15/18 f. 49.
northern subjects, in order that they might receive a pardon.\textsuperscript{157} Obviously, the regime wished to teach the north a harsh lesson for its treachery.

Retribution after Dacre’s rising was in stark contrast to this. In fact, there was no punishment at all for the average members of society. Several of the leaders, and many members of border surname families, however, were indicted for their part in Dacre’s rebellion. The Taylors, Fosters, Grahams and Armstrongs, seem to have been implicated in particular.\textsuperscript{158} The government, nevertheless, perhaps heeding Hunsdon’s advice that the west marches lay wide open to foreign attack since the rebellion of Dacre, pardoned all of ‘the meaner sort’ of the west march dwellers who had been involved.\textsuperscript{159} Interestingly, there was a strong border surname and local connection amongst those indicted with Leonard Dacre. Perhaps this indicates that there was some truth in the statement that Dacre had deceived many and mustered the locals on the pretext of protecting against Scottish invasion.\textsuperscript{160} However, perhaps the leniency used against the Dacre rebels indicates a tacit admission by the crown that in this instance the avarice of Norfolk, who was by now completely untrusted, had caused a breakdown in relations with a traditional lord. Perhaps the crown could recognise its own complicity in the matter.

Regardless of this, many of those whom the crown indicted to stand trial at Carlisle evaded capture and were still at large several years later. Unsurprisingly, the regime found it hard to round up all of the rebels, especially the border surnames. Anthony Armstrong plagued the western marches in late 1571, killing a Gilsland tenant in the process.\textsuperscript{161} In April 1572, Armstrong raided Christopher Dacre’s land and burnt five houses, seemingly in retribution for his role in suppressing the rebellion.\textsuperscript{162} Thomas and William Hetherington of Scotby were still at large in the summer of 1572, although evidently Scrope managed to exert

\textsuperscript{158} TNA SP 15/18 f.125. See also Sharpe, \textit{Memorials}, pp. 231-2.
\textsuperscript{159} For Hunsdon’s advice on the state of the west march, see TNA SP 15/17 f. 259. For the general pardon, see TNA SP 15/18 f. 6.
\textsuperscript{160} TNA SP 15/17 f. 254a; TNA SP 59/16 ff. 202-3. See also above, n. 156.
\textsuperscript{161} TNA SP 15/20 f. 191.
\textsuperscript{162} TNA SP 59/18 f. 100.
pressure upon them. In late 1572, William Graham had not been executed for his role in Dacre’s rising, as pleas to Burghley for his release show. In short, the warden of the west march, in the shape of Henry Lord Scrope, had much difficulty in maintaining law and order on the border.

The change of personnel on the borders, in conjunction with the loss of the Dacre and Percy lordship, greatly reduced the capacity of England to protect the Anglo-Scottish borders. Although the borders had been in “decay” for some years, this signalled a new and pro-longed weakening of military strength on the English side of the border. The Dacre lordship was no longer under the control of the military-minded Dacres. The Earls of Northumberland, when reinstated, would not reside on their northern estates. In short, men of power with vested interests in the safety and defence of their tenants no longer held any power on the borders. Rents increased, the population of the English border plummeted. Raiding by the border surnames either increased in frequency, or remained as frequent as it always had been, but without the same mechanisms to keep their activities in check. In 1583, the west march required an intervention by fifty men of the Berwick garrison to prevent the Liddesdale Scots’ raids into Bewcastledale. Scottish raiding became so frequent that it was even used as an excuse for poor attendance at Scrope’s musters.

And attendance at Scrope’s musters, of course, steadily declined. Many in the north began to reminisce fondly about the days when resident martial lords – such as the Dacres, ruled them. In 1597, Thomas Carlton, Dacre’s former Land-Sergeant of Gilsland left the crown in no doubt as to its obligation to defend the

163 TNA SP 15/21 f. 156.
164 TNA SP 52/23/2 ff. 198-200. See also CSP Foreign, Elizabeth, vol. 10, p. 187.
165 Decay of the borders had been worried about for some time. During Henry VIII’s reign there were various inquiries into the state of the borders and some surveys, notably Bowes and Ellerker’s. In 1543 some explanations as to the causes of decay in the east and middle marches were offered: see L&P, Henry VIII, vol. 18, pt. 1, no. 800, pp. 444-5. The decay of the west marches was usually measured by the fall in numbers of suitably furnished and active horsemen, the most prized border forces of the day: see CSP Scotland, Mary Queen of Scots, vol. 6, pp. 642-3; Border Papers, vol. 2, p. 689
166 Rose, Kings in the North, p. 489.
167 TNA SP 59/22 f. 31.
168 TNA SP 59/20 f. 154.
The Dacres without portfolio

border counties, seemingly to no avail. However, people harking back to the old order in the north were to be disappointed. Leonard Dacre was destined never to return to his native land. He received recognition of his title from foreign powers. Dacre died in exile in Brussels in 1573. On his tomb, in St. Nicholas Church, Brussels, he was styled Baron Dacre of Gilsland, Burgh, Morpeth, Greystoke, Henderskelf and Wemme [who]“existimans hic gloriose in fide catholica mori quam in sua Anglia in schismate nefando vivere” [preferred to remain here to die in the Catholic faith than live in his England in schism].

Leonard Dacre’s left no heir; he never took Atkinson’s advice to get married. That, however, was not quite the end of the Dacre lordship as a revealing final episode was to show.

Immediately upon the attainder of Leonard Dacre, a lengthy and complicated battle over the Dacre lands was to ensue. In general, there was no problem with Leonard Dacre’s own estates, centering on Harlesley in Yorkshire. These, along with all of Dacre’s belongings, were forfeit to the crown as Dacre was attainted for treason. The crown duly awarded these to Hunsdon, who had solicited the queen and erstwhile secretary for them on more than one occasion. The problem focused on the Dacre lordship itself. Rather ironically, the crown had managed to manufacture a legal problem for itself. Despite the government’s insistence that the lordship had reverted to the crown upon Leonard Dacre’s attainder, the lands were, in fact, legally in the hands of the co-heirs. Title remained with the co-heirs and the crown became increasingly frustrated by attempts to extort money from those who legally held the lands. Unsurprisingly, the Elizabethan regime never recognised fully the title of the co-heirs to the lands. The problem was not resolved satisfactorily until the reign of James I. In 1603 Lady Arundel and Lord William Howard paid over £20,000 for the title to their (however unjustly won) legally-held lands. In the meantime,
The crown did its best to annoy the co-heirs. Both William Howard and Arundel came under pressure for non-conformity in religion. However, the most significant threat to the co-heirs’ title to the lands came from Francis, the youngest and last of William Lord Dacre’s sons.

---

175 TNA SP 78/10 f. 107; TNA SP 53/15 f. 86. See also Ormsby (ed.), Lord William Howard, xiv.
Chapter Seven: Francis Dacre and the crown

This section, largely a post-script, examines the fate of the final remnants of the northern Dacre family. In particular Francis Dacre’s pursuit of the title and lands which he felt were rightly his is discussed. The eventual outcome of his struggle and the final demise of the Dacre of Gilsland lineage is described here in some detail.

Although largely exonerated of any blame in the rebellion of the earls or in Dacre’s rising, Francis Dacre had fled the realm in 1570. He resided in Scotland. It seems he maintained close relations with the upper echelons of Scottish society.\(^1\) On his return to England in 1584, it seemed natural enough for him to revive the Dacres’ legal claim to their former lordship.\(^2\) Since the Duke of Norfolk’s execution in 1572, the way seemed open for some type of reconciliation between the house of Dacre and the crown.\(^3\) There are certain indications that the crown, too, thought that it should recompense Francis in some way, perhaps recognising his family’s mistreatment, albeit tacitly. Apparently, the crown awarded him a pension of £200, although it seems he had serious difficulty getting payment. More telling than this, however, was the government’s rather strange ruling on the state of the Dacre lands. In 1584, in a move unprecedented in English history and in the common law, a ruling in the Dacre land case was made in favour of both the co-heirs and Francis Dacre. The instructions were interpreted as allowing tenants to choose which of the parties they wished to pay their rent to. Francis Dacre interpreted the instructions as formalising agreements he had entered into with former Dacre tenants to recognise him as their lord and to pay him the accompanying rents.\(^4\) William, Lord Howard interpreted the instructions as vindicating the legal rights of the co-heirs.\(^5\)

\(^1\) TNA SP 15/18 f. 110. Lord Morton advocated favour towards Francis Dacre in 1574: see TNA SP 52/26/1 f. 1.
\(^2\) It seems that this may have also been occasioned by the death of Edward Dacre, Francis’ elder brother: see TNA SP 52/46 f. 66.
\(^3\) N. Williams, *Thomas Howard*, pp. 189-254.
\(^4\) TNA SP 15/28/2 f. 10.
\(^5\) TNA SP 12/169 f. 103.
Inevitably, the struggle to win over the tenants’ loyalties promoted trouble in an already ‘troubulous’ society. According to Francis Dacre in 1584, armed men disturbed the traditional Dacre court at Morpeth, whilst William Howard vehemently denied any such charges.\(^6\) Again, throughout 1586 and 1587, more trouble sprang up between the rival parties of Arundel, Dacre and Howard. This time the trouble was rather more serious and merited crown intervention.\(^7\) The crown decided that it would take possession of the Dacre estates due to the ‘riotous’ behaviour of the opposing parties. The crown would pay each party the grossly inadequate sum of £600 in compensation. William Lord Howard and Philip Howard, Lord Arundel, were bound over in the sum of £5000 each to obey the crown’s ruling. The rents were now, supposedly, due to the crown despite the legal process which had awarded the Dacre estates to the co-heirs rather than the heirs male of the Dacres.\(^8\) This was, no doubt, a bitter blow to both Francis Dacre’s chances of reviving the Dacres’ claim to the lands and to the co-heirs’ legal title. At least the crown’s actions brought about some type of reconciliation between the feuding factions. By the end of 1587, Henry Huntingdon, Earl of Hastings and Lord President of the council of the north could inform the crown that both parties now sought a “speedy” resolution at common law.\(^9\)

However, the course of law was not that straight and true. Throughout 1588, further trouble flared between the followers of Francis Dacre and Lord William Howard. It seems that Dacre’s adherents came off worse this time.\(^10\) The epicentre of the trouble was Morpeth, where once again the traditional Dacre court caused a great affront to the sensibilities of William Howard.\(^11\) Many of Dacre’s followers were forced to repair to Dacre for safety due to the numbers of armed retainers massed against them.\(^12\) Even the pulpit was not free of the struggle between the northern plaintiffs, the crown bound over Leonard

---

\(^6\) TNA SP 15/28/2 f. 10. See also Ormsby (ed.), *Lord William Howard*, pp. 397-9.
\(^7\) TNA SP 15/30 ff. 34, 51.
\(^8\) *APC*, vol. 15, pp. 173-4, 190.
\(^9\) TNA SP 15/30 f. 36.
\(^10\) *CSP Scotland, Mary Queen of Scots*, vol. 9, pp. 583-6.
\(^11\) TNA SP 15/30 ff. 205-7.
\(^12\) *APC*, vol. 15, pp. 372-5. See also *Border Papers*, vol. I, p. 335; *CSP Scotland, Mary Queen of Scots*, vol. 9, pp. 583-6.
Musgrave, who had always been a Dacre adherent, for an unspecified period or sum for moving “certain persons to adhere to Dacre” from the pulpit.\(^{13}\) In March 1589, another element was thrown into the maelstrom of cases over the Dacre lands when Gerard Lowther and Richard Lowther, apparently from “some malice of their own”, managed to overturn all the previous awards and gain the heartland of the Dacre estates, Gilsland and Burgh through the common law, for the use of the crown.\(^{14}\)

This was the final straw for Francis Dacre, who was by now exhausted and largely penniless due to the legal cases in which he was involved. In September 1589, he wrote an apology to the queen for leaving court, and the realm, as he returned to Scotland, where he felt far more welcome.\(^{15}\) Just in case the crown was not aware of what Francis Dacre had in mind, one Capt. Steven Ellis confirmed that Francis Dacre had left the realm for Scotland, taking his young son with him. On 19 September 1589 Ellis explained that it was likely to cause trouble on the borders [for] “he means to match his son to some of Her Majesty’s unfriends in Scotland. As the Border men here are his favourers, it is very dangerous, particularly as there are no officers to keep such people in subjection.”\(^{16}\) He had little faith in Scrope’s ability to keep the west march in order. However, as was common with Tudor pleas, Ellis seems to have wanted appointment to a position to keep the ‘wilfull’ northern subjects in order: what Ellis’ fate was is unclear.

Ostensibly, the Tudor regime should now have found itself washed of all responsibility towards the Dacres. However, Francis managed to remain a rather forlorn figure in English politics. He would not disappear quite as readily as the crown and William Howard would have liked. In October 1589, Dacre procured the favour of King James VI of Scotland. King James asked for Dacre’s plight to be taken into consideration. Once again, the Scottish influence of the Dacres was utilised.\(^{17}\) Nevertheless, Francis Dacre could not live on the friendship of

---

\(^{13}\) TNA SP 15/30 f. 205. See also above, pp. 155-6.  
\(^{14}\) TNA SP 15/31 f. 15. See also Ormsby (ed.), *Lord William Howard*, pp. 382-91.  
\(^{15}\) BL Cotton Caligula D/I f. 429. See also *CSP Scotland, Mary Queen of Scots*, vol. 10, p. 156.  
\(^{16}\) TNA SP 15/31 f. 104.  
\(^{17}\) *CSP Scotland, Mary Queen of Scots*, vol. 10, pp. 171-3.
people in high places. In 1590 he threatened to travel to Spanish Flanders, no
doubt in order to offer his services to the King of Spain and receive the due
recognition of his status as a thorn in the side of the English government.18 From
the available evidence, it is not clear whether he ever really meant to go or not.
According to a report from Bowes, a servant of Dacre’s, one John Pott, “gave
Bowes notice of his master’s departure, affirming that he sawe him on the sea,
yet upon better advice Dacre returned, resolving to give over that voyage, and to
committ him self and his estate to her majestie’s goodnes.”19

The ‘queen’s goodness’, however, was not bestowed upon Francis and once
again, he determined to leave the Isles and seek his fortune at the hands of the
Spanish. His son resided in the College at Louvain and Dacre decided to visit
him on his way to the Spanish Court.20 It is not clear exactly how long Dacre
spent at the Spanish Court, or on the continent. Certainly, by 1598 Francis Dacre
had returned to Scotland. He did not have a good word to say about the Spanish:
presumably, he failed in his attempt to find a decent living amongst them.21 In
April 1598 Francis Dacre sought the help of the Earl of Essex to procure the
queen’s favour. Essex was rather unimpressed by Dacre’s previous behaviour
but he promised that he would endeavour to help if Dacre kept his end of the
bargain.22 Dacre never stopped in his quest to be restored to Elizabeth’s
favour.23 Nevertheless, he was still to receive what might well have been
English money in another form. In 1602, King James VI of Scotland rewarded
Dacre’s service to him with a yearly pension of 600 crowns.24 However, this
may have constituted an attempt to placate Dacre as James awarded the Dacre
lands to the co-heirs upon his accession to the English throne in 1603.25

18 TNA SP 52/46 ff. 66, 73-5.
19 TNA SP 52/46 f. 74. See also CSP Scotland, Mary Queen of Scots, vol. 10, p. 441.
20 TNA SP 52/47 ff. 103-4. See also CSP Scotland, Mary Queen of Scots, vol. 10, p. 575-6.
23 TNA SP 52/66 f. 61. See also HMC Salisbury MS, vol. 10, p. 291.
24 TNA SP 52/69 f. 43.
25 TNA SP 14/5 f. 79.
Although Francis Dacre was apparently styled Lord Dacre by the Jacobean regime, he would never regain the Dacre ancestral lands.  

Dacre was implicated in the Gunpowder plot of 1605. He managed to escape punishment, however, although at one stage he was a fugitive. Francis made various offers to the crown for the Dacre estates, each one more desperate than the last. He offered to take possession of the estates yet alienate two-thirds to the crown. Subsequently Francis Dacre offered to forego all claims to the Dacre title in return for some of his lands. He seems to have run out of credit from James, who eventually pensioned him, his wife Alice and his son Randolf (sometimes known as Randall), presumably to keep Francis quiet. The pensions do not seem to have been paid frequently, if at all: Francis Dacre was threatened with arrest for his ‘many debts’ in 1611. Nevertheless, Francis never gave up on his mission to restore the Dacre line but died, poor and disappointed, in 1632. His son Randolf, the last of the male line of the Dacres of the north, was soon to follow: he died in London in 1634, in extremely poor circumstances. In an ironic final twist, perhaps demonstrating a certain guilty conscience, the closest remaining relative of the Howards, Thomas, Earl of Arundel and Surrey, paid for the conveyance of Randall’s body to Cumberland. He was buried in Greystoke, in the very heart of the former Dacre estates. This brought the male line of the Dacres of the north to its end. The barony joined the countless others that have become extinct over the years.

---

26 Therefore indicating that he was admitted into the peerage at some stage. However, I have not been able to find any evidence for this: see HMC Salisbury MS, vol. 15, pp. 46, 258. See also TNA SP 52/62 f. 75; TNA SP 14/38 f. 16.
27 TNA SP 14/16 f. 74. See also HMC Salisbury MS, vol. 20, p. 294.
29 HMC Salisbury MS, vol. 21, p. 177.
30 Francis was awarded a pension of £200, his wife £100 and his son £50: see CSP Domestic, James I, 1603-1610, p. 491.
31 TNA SP 14/77 f. 120. Sometimes Randolf was entitled Randall or Ranulf: see TNA SP 16/406 f. 99.
32 Cockayne, Complete Peerage, vol. 4, pp. 25-6.
33 For a brief discussion, see Stone, The Crisis, pp. 78-81.
Conclusion

During the course of this thesis some quite surprising findings are intermingled with perhaps rather less surprising findings. The findings that perhaps fit in best with existing research centre on the role of the Dacres as part of government administration and their perceived suitability for service under successive Tudor regimes. It is clear that the Dacres were employed much to the government’s advantage during the Yorkist and Early Tudor period. Therefore, the Dacres, as has been stated by Bush and Ellis, fit into the classic Tudor historical narrative as being utilised by the crown initially in an attempt to curtail the influence of what had become perceived as “overmighty subjects”, most notably the Nevilles and the Percys.¹ The Dacres were therefore of the utmost suitability for border service under Henry VII. Henry saw the Dacres as loyal to him, despite their previous Yorkist sympathies. The first Tudor made Thomas Lord Dacre even more loyal to the crown by limiting his influence and ensuring the balance of power in the relationship lay strictly with the crown. This was achieved by a combination of imposing fines and bonds for good behaviour upon his person, and by gradually restoring estates to him.² However, one would suspect that the Dacres were not averse to the judgement made upon Richard Empson and Dudley upon the death of Henry VII.³

Henry VIII’s reign with regard to the Dacres requires little explanation from this thesis. This is due to the work already carried out on the subject by Steven Ellis. Broadly speaking, perhaps much of Henry VIII’s role in government can be characterised by periods of intense interest in a subject, followed by more-or-less disregard when something else caught his interest, or when other fancies took his attention.⁴ The Henrician government’s relationship with the Dacres can perhaps be categorised in this way. Henry seems to have had little regard or interest in affairs on the northern borders until developments forced his hand.

² See Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, pp. 77-87. See below, n. 3. See also above, pp. 22-33.
interventions of Wolsey, rather than the king himself. A further cause of this
could well have been tension between Dacre rule and the Percy interest: it was
the Northumberland gentry who complained of Dacre’s behaviour. Dacre, at this
time, ruled over gentry who had little connection with his lordship and their
complaints may well have been a manifestation of their desire to be ruled by
their natural leaders – the Percys. Thomas Lord Dacre’s death in 1525 negated
any long lasting effect that this period of difficulty with the government may
have had on the suitability of the Dacres for local governance. Within three
years, the crown admitted William third Baron Dacre of Gilsland to the
wardenship of the west march in his father’s stead, despite the trouble Thomas
had had with the regime.⁵

When Dacre was appointed warden of the middle and east marches he had only
limited lands there.⁶ Scrope had a similar difficulty when appointed as warden
of the west march on William Lord Dacre’s removal in 1563.⁷ He held only
limited lands and influence in Cumberland and Westmorland. Most of Scrope’s
holdings were further south of the border than the Dacre estates. Similarly to
Dacre, when Dacre complained of the inaction of the Northumberland gentry to
follow him in their own defence, Scrope had difficulty motivating west march
residents to follow him.⁸ There is little wonder that he was unsure of their
loyalty at the time of Dacre’s rising.⁹ It seems that the border residents
responded best to their own landlords and natural leaders. They seem to have
been rather unforthcoming in service to those that were seen as outsiders.

This amply demonstrates the suitability (more perhaps even the necessity) that
the Henrician Government had in employing the Dacres as the natural leaders of
society on the borders of the English west march. As can be seen in countless
examples, throughout this thesis, the Dacres were the nobles who held the most
power and influence upon the west march. Clearly, the Dacres could mobilise
several thousand of their own tenants and followers to defend the English border,

---

⁵ See above, pp. 30-2.
⁶ Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, pp. 92, 104-5.
⁷ See above, pp. 151-3.
⁸ See above, pp. 25-7.
⁹ See above, pp. 169-70.
or even to invade Scotland when necessary. This obvious suitability for border service, however, did not save William, third Baron of Dacre of Gilsland, from the reaches of Henry’s reformation. It is not really the necessary for this thesis to question the government’s motive in charging Dacre with treason: other works have dealt with this sufficiently. However, Dacre’s rehabilitation with the regime is of the most interest to this thesis ultimately, as it demonstrates the perceived suitability of the Dacres for border service after having faced treason charges. It is not entirely clear whether the Dacres were on the road to rehabilitation a few years after William’s acquittal. However, the case of the Strangways lands may indicate that Henry’s government was keen to, at least, keep the Dacres nominally content. More interesting than this, however, is Somerset’s promotion of the Dacres to their traditional position of authority shortly after his seizure of power.

Somerset’s employment of the Dacres, indicate that the government deemed the Dacres suitable for border service despite their previous problems with the regime. It is perhaps then unsurprising that the Marian regime employed the Dacres on the west march in the same way, demonstrating the rather conservative nature of Tudor government in general, up to at least the end of the reign of Mary I. For although ousted briefly during Dudley’s seizure of power, William Lord Dacre served almost constantly as warden of the west march towards Scotland throughout the mid-Tudor period. The Elizabethan regime, too, employed the Dacres in their traditional position as wardens of the west march initially. It may well have been entirely necessary for the new government to bed themselves in more fully before making any radical changes to the personnel who ruled the borders of the realm.

However, the question remains: what changed after 1563 and why did the Elizabethan government not rehabilitate the Dacres in the same way as others had previously? The conclusion is obvious but rather uninstructive: the

---

10 See above, pp. 48-9, 92, 170-2.
11 See Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, pp. 174-206. See also above, pp. 29-31.
12 See above, pp. 42-9.
13 See above, pp. 51-6.
14 See above, pp. 75-9. See also below, p. 217.
15 See above, pp. 51-6, 75-9.
Elizabethan government viewed the Dacres as unsuitable for border service. In fact, the Elizabethan government attacked Dacre power at its very core by undermining their lordship in the most extraordinary fashion. Clearly, the Dacres were considered completely unsuitable for employment by the Elizabethan regime: in fact, it seems the Dacres merited outright attack and eradication using whatever means the government could mobilise. Cecil, of course, was the man that sprang into action. The Dacre land and inheritance case is clearly a break from the norm of Tudor governance. It was significant enough to merit a mention by Holinshead, Camden and other contemporary “historians”.

A contributing factor in the Dacres perceived unsuitability may have been that the Dacres did little to ingratiate themselves with courtly society. Their continuous feuding with Wharton, as highlighted by Hoyle and demonstrated throughout this thesis, could hardly have endear them to those with more courtly sensibilities. Wharton and Dacre were never reconciled; the feuding between the two was so ingrained that people were aware of their differences throughout the realm. This can hardly have helped the already poor perceptions of the Dacres as Catholics upon the accession of Elizabeth. William Lord Dacre carried on regardless, however, and even extended his feuding to his Scottish counterpart Maxwell. On this occasion, the feuding was so serious that it culminated in armed confrontation. However, this feuding does not fully explain the Dacres’ standing with the Elizabethan regime: Sussex, Norfolk and Leicester all had open feuds with other nobles but did not suffer in the same way as the Dacres did.

This helps to clear up one issue that this thesis has raised but it also brings into the foreground a far more fundamental question about Elizabethan policy. Firstly, however, Leonard Dacre’s involvement with the rebellion of the northern earls requires attention. It is clear that historians have implicated

16 See above, pp. 158-62.
17 See above, pp. 8-9, 97-101.
18 And even at the Scottish Court: see above, pp. 134-5.
19 See above, pp. 134-42.
20 Read, Mr. Secretary Cecil, pp. 331-5. See also Elton, England under the Tudors, p. 295; Guy, Tudor England, pp. 254-5.
Leonard Dacre with much of the plotting surrounding the Rebellion of the Northern Earls. It is hardly surprising that someone who had been treated the way that Dacre felt himself to have been treated by the Elizabethan government would not necessarily be loyal to that regime. However, whereas it seems likely that Dacre had full knowledge of the intentions of the northern earls, he did not raise a finger to help them in their rebellion.\textsuperscript{21} Essentially, the northern earls were part of the Duke of Norfolk’s connexion and Dacre, therefore, was unlikely to have supported them.\textsuperscript{22} This becomes more obvious when examining Dacre’s actions during the rebellion: Dacre seized what were rightfully Dacre possessions at a time when the Duke of Norfolk languished in the Tower. Dacre may well have suspected that Norfolk would be revealed as the traitor and executed, leaving the way open for Dacre to reclaim his natural inheritance. Unfortunately, from Dacre’s perspective, the crown did not execute Norfolk until 1572.\textsuperscript{23} In the meantime, Dacre made the choice to defend his possessions by force, whilst the crown determined to bring him to heel using force, the two parties’ irreconcilable positions meant that a battle between the two was inevitable.

Neither Dacre nor his followers lacked in bravery but better-trained forces in the shape of the Berwick garrison beat them. This meant that the crown had the victory over Dacre and could control the narrative surrounding the Dacre rising – as the saying goes “to the victor the spoils”. As has been seen throughout this thesis the Dacres were conservative in religion, as was much of the nobility throughout the Tudor period. Therefore, when the crown highlighted the unsuitable, treasonable and Catholic nature of Leonard Dacre this seemed reasonable enough as he remained amongst the fugitives as an exile at Mechlin. However, as we have seen, nothing was further from Dacre’s mind than the restoration of Roman Catholicism. He fought simply for his own possessions once he knew that the crown would not give them to him.\textsuperscript{24} In 1570, by the time of Leonard Dacre’s rebellion, it is clear that the bond between the Dacres and

\textsuperscript{21} See above, pp. 161-70.
\textsuperscript{22} See above, pp. 127-9. See also Guy, \textit{Tudor England}, p. 273.
\textsuperscript{23} Presumably, not from a Howard perspective: see N. Williams, \textit{Thomas Howard}, pp. 238-54. See also above, pp. 156-70.
\textsuperscript{24} See above, pp. 161-70.
west march society had not been broken. By 1570 Dacre influence had perhaps diminished from its apogee but Leonard Dacre still raised 3000 fighting men to defend his own rights against those of the state, although, it seems that Dacre did not tell all of his followers the exact target of his anger. The failure of Dacre to raise the fighting force that his father and Grandfather had, may be best explained by many Dacre tenants’ involvement in the earlier rising of the northern earls, Northumberland and Westmorland, which many seemed happy to support and subsequently paid the penalty for that support.

However, the fact that Dacre did raise 3000 men to defend what was really his own position in northern society is very interesting. The Dacre rebellion cannot be seen as entirely a popular revolt. If this were the case then we would expect to have at least one remaining list of demands from the rebels, as was the norm for this type of rebellion, such as in the case of the Pilgrimage of Grace, the Commotions of the summer of 1549 and countless other rebellions before or since. On their initial gathering perhaps Dacre tenants could have been misled that their lands were under threat from Scotland and that they were mustering for the crown. However, it must have become increasingly obvious to the local populace that what they were facing was a crown force. Clearly, when the two sides in the Battle of Geltbridge came face to face, the pretence that it was Scots that Dacre’s force were facing could not have been kept up. Hunsdon himself stated that Dacre’s force fought bravely. He also stated [that] “all affirm that he persuaded them it was only for the maintenance of his title, and to keep the possession, which otherwise would be taken from him by force.” Dacre’s force knew exactly who they were fighting and did not back down.

The ravages of the, predominantly southern, forces that suppressed the slightly earlier Rising of the Northern Earls was perhaps a contributing factor behind the

---

25 See above, pp. 170, 175.

26 Leonard Dacre raised a force of around 3000 in comparison to previous Dacre forces which had numbered closer to 4000: see above, pp. 48-9, 91-2, 170-2. See also esp., Talyor, ‘The Crown and the North’, (appendix), pp. 8-175. See also McCall, ‘The Rising in the North’, pp. 74-87.

27 As many stated after their involvement with the Northern Earls: see CSP Domestic Elizabeth, Addenda, 1566-1579, p. 271.

28 Ibid., p. 244.
motivation of Dacre’s rebels. As Sussex stated, the Southern Army made no distinction between spoiling “the good and the bad”.\(^{29}\) Perhaps many thought they did not have much to lose in backing a Dacre and fighting a regime which seemed so antagonistic to much of their own beliefs, and so intent on stealing their belongings. Dacre tenants may also have been angered by increased rents and entry fines on the estates whilst they were out of Dacre control. If Richard Atkinson’s attitude towards the Duke of Norfolk was in any way typical it seems he was not at all popular: “he will be a covetous traitor all his days, he has entered on all your living, and now will on all your father’s substance, and like a greedy dog…”\(^{30}\) It has already been shown that there were various disputes between the Duke and his tenants over rent increases and evictions.\(^{31}\) These factors indicate a possibility that Dacre was forced into action by many of his local followers. The initial occupation of the Dacre properties may have, in fact, constituted part of a legal *a certiorari* claim to the properties, which explains the co-ordinated attack. This may have constituted an attempt by Leonard Dacre and his closest supporters to have the Dacre land case re-opened.\(^{32}\)

Ultimately, Leonard Dacre may not have wanted to face the regime head on in the field. He may well have been swept up in an anti-regime and anti-southern rage on behalf of many frightened and angry northern tenants. None the less, the loyalty showed to the Dacre cause makes it obvious that the west march residents wanted to be led by a Dacre. This is what demonstrates ultimately their suitability for border service and their potential ability to raise a fighting force in the west march more efficiently than any before or after them. Dacre was more of a victim of a clear miscarriage of justice and of circumstances beyond his control. As shown, time and time again, from his up-bringing in the household of the Earl of Bedford, to his management of his Yorkshire estates and his representation of Cumberland and Yorkshire society as a JP and MP, Dacre’s career was ostensibly that of a normal junior member of a powerful family. He was no radical or ready-made rebel.

\(^{29}\) See TNA SP 15/17 ff.12-15. See also Kesselring, *The Northern Rebellion*, pp. 120-21.

\(^{30}\) See TNA SP15/18 f.37.

\(^{31}\) See above pp. 156-7.

\(^{32}\) See above pp. 163-5.
The modern day historical narrative describing Leonard Dacre as a counter-reformation radical and ‘priest harbourer’ derives from the descriptions of the crown and its erstwhile followers, rather than from any unbiased evaluation of Dacre’s motives. Dacre himself, post rebellion, had little choice but to go where his reputation as a rebel would be considered valuable, rather than a disadvantage. Mechlin or Louvain was merely the most suitable hiding place for Dacre. There, co-religionists could consider him as a hero who fought against a heretical queen. In addition, he could keep in touch with his homeland and maintain an interest in any further plotting which might have brought about a reversal of the Dacres’ ill fortune.

From the perspective of the study of Tudor government, however, the Dacre rebellion has far more interesting and general consequences. In the north itself, the Rebellion of the Northern Earls and Dacre’s rebellion allowed a consolidation of crown power at the northernmost reaches of the Tudor state. Post-rebellion, the English government lost no time in rewarding its own followers and in punishing rebels by seizing their lands and property and, in many cases, taking their lives. This would seem to back up the argument that the 1569/70 rebellions mark a watershed in English history. Before 1570, the government was largely tolerant towards the Catholic population; afterwards, due to the rebellion and the subsequent Papal Bull, Regnans in Excelsis, Roman Catholicism was seen as an enemy that threatened the very existence of an isolated Protestant state. Accordingly, the crown increased fines and penalties for recusancy after 1570. In addition, there was an upsurge in radical Protestant rhetoric designed to attack the Roman Church and Roman Catholicism directly. This is the type of narrative that this thesis was expected to highlight.

See above, pp. 4-13, 125-33.
35 See above, pp. 173-6.
36 Ibid. See also below, pp. 200-1.
largely backing up previous studies of the Elizabethan period. However, that has not been the case. This requires some elaboration.

When examining the Dacres specifically, it is clear that successive regimes would usually reinstate the Dacres after a period in the political wilderness. This should have been no different under the Elizabethan government unless there was something particular or peculiar about the Elizabethan government and the Dacres, or those similar to the Dacres. However, when Thomas Dacre, 4th Baron Dacre of Gilsland, became eligible for the Dacres’ usual position in west march society, the crown (or Cecil alone?) do not seem to have considered him for office. There must have been a reason for this. The improved relationship with Scotland goes some way to explaining why Dacre power was no longer a necessity on the Anglo-Scottish borders; reinforcing the premise that martial power was not needed on a border with a like-minded and allied state. This narrative, however, does not explain fully the government’s actions after this point. In fact, a reappraisal of Elizabethan government and attitudes may be necessary for the relationship between peripheral, conservative nobility and the crown throughout the 1560s to be understood more fully.

Clearly, the crown and its supporters antagonised much of the peripheral nobility of the Tudor state almost immediately upon Elizabeth’s succession. Northumberland stepped down from his office, angered by the regime’s attitude towards him in 1559. The government replaced Westmorland with Norfolk immediately upon deciding to intervene in Scotland. Casting the net wider, if Ireland were included within this narrative – as a peripheral part of the Tudor state and a place that is in some ways comparable to the north – these findings

39 See Jones, The Birth of the Elizabethan Age, pp. 17-86; Guy, Tudor England, pp. 277, 298-301. For an alternative view, see Heal, Reformation in Britain, pp. 374-80.
40 See above, pp. 51-8, 75-80. See also below, p. 200-1.
42 Which would have pleased Elizabeth due to the savings that could be made on military outlay at the borders: see Rapple, Martial Power, p. 107. See also Bush, ‘The Problem of the Far North’, p. 63; Doran, Elizabeth I, pp. 16-21; Guy, Tudor England, pp. 265-6; Read, Mr Secretary Cecil, p. 191-2; Alford, The Early Elizabethan Polity, pp. 59-70.
44 See above, pp. 124-8.
45 See above, p. 114-5.
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are reinforced.\textsuperscript{46} In Ireland, the Elizabethan government regarded Shane O’Neill as a savage who merited conquest and death, which perhaps seems a little unsurprising.\textsuperscript{47} However, this is certainly a break with the policy of “surrender and regrant” and a move towards conquest and consolidation.\textsuperscript{48} More telling, perhaps, though was the government’s treatment of men like Desmond when taken in conjunction with the treatment of the Dacres. The Elizabethan government antagonised both greatly. Both lost out in major cases that directly affected their power and income. In Dacre’s case, the whole lordship was lost: in Desmond’s case Ormond greatly undermined his local power.\textsuperscript{49} Neither lordship survived Elizabeth’s reign. Probably, the greatest surprise should be that Desmond’s lordship survived for so long.\textsuperscript{50}

Taking all of these occurrences into account it has to be said that there is an indication that the Elizabethan government carried out an actual policy of diminishing, or even eradicating, the power of its greatest conservative subjects at the peripheries of the realm and promoting the power of reformers, and in many cases lesser men, to replace them. This policy did not emerge from the ruins of Dacre’s rebellion or from the ruins of Munster. In fact, it can be suggested that it was largely government policy that was to blame for creating these very rebellions. There is no clear or convenient line of demarcation between when traditional Catholic and conservative nobility were suitable, tolerated or became perceived as unsuitable for public office. What can be suggested from this study, however, and perhaps other studies which may need to be carried out after this, that a few years after the succession of Elizabeth marks the border between acceptance of the ‘old’ and replacement with the ‘new’. Presumably this when the regime had settled in and had become accepted,

\textsuperscript{47} In fact Sussex, the same Sussex who dealt with the Northern rebellion, harboured a deep personal dislike for Shane O’Neill, which was probably exacerbated by O’Neill’s wish to marry Sussex’s sister: see Ellis, Ireland, pp. 274-91.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., pp. 154-5.
\textsuperscript{50} McCormack, The Earldom of Desmond, pp. 187-92.
and felt it could tackle the perceived problem of its peripheral traditional conservative nobility.

More simply, this thesis indicates that the conservative northern nobility were almost certainly an anathema to the Elizabethan government, as was much of the nobility in Ireland. The government perhaps believed that if the conservative leaders of society were removed then the local populace would accept the Elizabethan religious settlement. Accordingly, the crown went on a pre-emptive strike against its peripheral nobility. This motive and policy would then allow for the general ambivalence shown towards recusancy during the first years of Elizabeth’s reign to be explained adequately, whilst reconciling the fact that the conservative nobility did not get off so lightly – as shown by this thesis.

The attack on the power of the Dacre lordship and the removal of the Dacres from any kind of position of power marks a watershed in English history, which is probably what merited Camden including the episode in his history of Britain. Here the crown removed a noble from power by the subversion of the normal legal process in order to facilitate a reformist agenda. It would seem pertinent to suggest that much of this policy was the brainchild of Cecil – he after all, was the deciding factor in the Dacre land case. However, this thesis has not been to evaluate the role of Cecil in government, rather it has been looking at the Dacres specifically in order to ascertain any historical patterns of crown policy towards them. Cecil’s re-evaluation from a rather conservative man, concerned with uniformity above all else, to a rather militant stance must await further research, of which Alford has already laid the groundwork.

This brings much previous study on the consolidation of crown power at the borders of the state into question. Clearly, there was no revolution in government on the borders of the state during the reign of Henry VIII. The changes made to personnel in the marches on the Anglo-Scottish borders were

---

53 See above, pp. 158-62.
merely temporary expediencies. Dacre was removed due to a perceived unsuitability and those others who would have been the normal choice, such as Cumberland, had also largely failed in their duties. Southern nobles proved to be unsatisfactory, so the only choice open to Henry’s government was to appoint the strongest and best place person they could. Wharton fitted the bill quite conveniently at the time, as he was at least a local landholder. However, much crown assistance was required for this intervention as Wharton could not rival the power of a Clifford or a Dacre in west march society at this time. The required subvention was expensive – more expensive than simply re-employing the Dacres – and naturally enough, once the Dacres had served their time in the political wilderness, they were re-instated into their natural position in west march society. They were the ideal choice for warden of the west march due to their cheapness and influence. As has been shown by this thesis, and by much research undertaken by Bush, those who had been replaced during any of the Henrician innovations found their way back into crown service during the mid-Tudor period. The Edwardian and Marian regimes were conservative in nature, despite their conflicting religious beliefs, and simply viewed the traditional problem of the defence of the marches in the traditional way. The Dacres served both Edward VI’s government and Mary’s regime as border wardens and do not seem to have had any particular qualms about working for either, although the Dacre’s did not promote Edward’s religious innovations whatsoever.

To sum up the Dacre’s relationship with the crown, to conclude this thesis, therefore becomes rather straightforward. The Dacres were suitable for service under both Henrys, during much of Somerset’s Protectorate and throughout Mary’s reign. This would fit in with existing research, which has shown that the conservative nobility were utilised in their traditional roles in society throughout this period. This really backs up much of Bush’s and Ellis’ research in regard to the employment of magnates as wardens of the marches on the Anglo-Scottish

---

56 See esp. Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, pp. 238-47.  
57 See above, pp. 51-8, 74-9. See also below, p. 200-1.  
59 See above, pp. 51-9, 76-80, 117-25.
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borders. The Henrician innovations can then be seen as an experiment which ultimately failed. By the end of Henry’s reign there were signs that even the Henrician government were beginning to recognise that fact, with the award of the Strangway’s lands as just one example of favour shown towards the previously out of favour magnates. Edward VI (in the guise of the Protector’s government) and Mary I reigns witnessed the reversal, more-or-less in full, of any of these temporary measures and both re-instated the traditional leaders of society into their traditional positions of power at the peripheries of the realm.

This does not mean, however, that the Dacres were merely feudal, martial overlords. The perception of Dacre being a feudal lord, overtaken by a more modern civil and ordered society catered for by the state, has been given considerable credence but is not backed up by events during and after Dacre’s rising. This episode makes it quite clear that many were more disposed to follow Dacre than the new crown servants who replaced him. Leonard Dacre was not even officially a lord and Scrope was, but the inhabitants of the west march didn’t make this distinction. What has influenced authors such as James writing off the Dacre rising as a Scots border incursion, whilst instead concentrating on the failure of the Northern Earls to muster their tenants to follow them on their rebellion, is unclear. However, Dacre’s rising is certainly not the average type of Tudor rebellion – it was an unusual occurrence not really matched throughout Elizabeth’s forty-five year reign.

Clearly, Elizabeth’s reign heralds a break with tradition. The crown antagonised the conservative nobility throughout the peripheries of the state almost immediately on the accession of Elizabeth to the throne. When events in other peripheral parts of the Tudor state are taken into consideration, especially in Ireland, the treatment of the Dacres comes even more sharply into focus. Quite

61 See above, pp. 41-9.
63 See above, n. 58. See also, esp., Guy, The Cardinal’s Court, pp. 122-3. See also above, pp. 169-180.
64 James, Society, Politics & Culture, pp. 302.
simply the Elizabethan regime went on the attack against its peripheral nobility almost immediately: certainly, by the mid 1560s, the power of peripheral conservative magnates, or marcher lords, had almost disappeared. Certainly, the Dacres lost their crown offices and then even lost their title and estates.\(^65\) The fate of the Dacres was just one outcome stemming from this overall policy. The *via media* of the Elizabethan settlement, therefore, may require some revision in order to reconcile the crown’s treatment of its conservative nobility; for undoubtedly it was the Catholic nobility that suffered the harshest treatment from the reforming regime, although it was probably not entirely due to either party’s religious beliefs.\(^66\)

Of course, from the perspective of state formation, this narrative is ultimately reconcilable with strengthening the government’s hold over much of the state. This did happen, the rebellions of the northern earls, Dacre, Desmond and many others allowed the crown to control areas in which they had never held great authority. For example, as has been shown, the crown was one of the interested parties in the Dacre estates. Cecil’s intrinsic involvement in the Dacre land and inheritance hearings can be viewed as government intervention in legal matters.\(^67\) Therefore, Dacre’s rebellion can be blamed on the actions of the crown itself. In a rather circular fashion, the Elizabethan regime caused the rebellions, put down the rebellions and ultimately gained from the rebellions. However, to think that the crown colluded with a subject to destroy another subject’s rightful inheritance, for simply political expedience and monetary gain, is not in keeping with the myth of a bumbling, faithful Cecil the administrator or with most portrayals of Elizabeth. It is certainly not nice to think of the fate of George ‘little Lord’ Dacre and the poor protection he was offered by his wardship with the man who would have most to gain by his death – Norfolk. The crown must shoulder the burden of the blame for the destruction of the Dacres. However, we cannot be entirely sure whether it all happened by design

---

\(^65\) See above, pp. 150-9.
\(^66\) See Read, *Mr. Secretary Cecil*, p. 468; Dickens, *The English Reformation*, pp. 452-3. This viewpoint has been somewhat revised by scholars such as Haigh: see Haigh, *English Reformations*, pp. 235-84. See also above, pp. 114-5, 125-31, 158-61.
\(^67\) See above, pp. 109, 154-60.
or whether it was just a culmination of a series of unfortunate events for the Dacre family.

Ultimately, however, the Dacres were removed from their position in west march society: one that they had held for nearly the entire Tudor period. How it seemed to the local populace to be ruled by newcomers amongst them, rather than by their traditional, local ruler is hard for a modern day person to understand. Undoubtedly, this, however, was a contributory factor to the breakdown of ‘natural’ and traditional mechanisms of governance in society in the places where this natural order was subverted. Therefore, the North saw a “decay of the borders”, many complaints of indifferent justice and the worsening of the activities of the border surnames. In Ireland, the removal of conservative local lords had an even wider effect. It left a vacuum in society that the erstwhile New English the crown sent to replace them could not fill. Perhaps, the almost religious urge to celebrate the “flight of the Earls” as one of the saddest days in Irish history best demonstrates this. In the north of England, however, the narrative has remained one of difference from the south. Perhaps a major contributing factor to these places differences with lowland England is Elizabethan government policy and the divides that it created. For, after all, in both the north of England and in Ireland, the reforming, innovating and “godly” crown servants who presided over these regions ruled over a largely conservative population. This was a recipe which was always likely to, and certainly did, have longer term consequences for the status of these regions within the emerging British state.

---

68 For example, see above, pp. 151-3, 156-8.
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Wardens of the English West March towards Scotland.¹

1486-1525: Thomas, second Baron Dacre of Gilsland
1525-1527: Henry, eleventh lord Clifford and first earl of Cumberland
1527-1534: William, third Baron Dacre of Gilsland
1534-1537: Henry, eleventh lord Clifford and first earl of Cumberland
1537-1542: Henry, eleventh lord Clifford and first earl of Cumberland²
1543-1549: Thomas, first lord Wharton
1549-1550: William, third Baron Dacre of Gilsland
1550-1553: See above, pp. 38-55.
1553-1563: William, third Baron Dacre of Gilsland
1563-1592: Henry, ninth lord Scrope
1593-1603: Thomas, tenth lord Scrope
1603-1608: George, third earl of Cumberland

Dacre’s Rising

The following were to be indicted at Carlisle on charges of treason for their part in Dacre’s Rebellion:


¹ The exact dates have not been included due to confusion amongst the sources, deriving mainly from the incompleteness of some the records from this period. Calendar entries are, in some places, contradictory whilst the patent rolls have many omissions, rather unfortunately. However, the years given illustrate, in a short form, the influence of the Dacres amongst West March society quite clearly.
² His Deputy, Thomas Wharton acted as the warden to all intents and purposes: see above, pp. 35-6.
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yeoman, Thomas Hetherington, West Lynton, yeoman, Thomas and William Hetherington, Scotby, Thomas Farlaham, Askerton, yeoman, Christopher Elwoode, Denton, yeoman, Robert Mylburne, Farlaham, yeoman.  

The Dacre Estates

Unfortunately, no rentals for the critical period of the 1560s are fully extant. However, by piecing together earlier and later rentals and by using the available evidence a picture of the extent of the Dacre lands at the time can be built up. By around the middle of the 16th Century the Dacre estates in Cumberland were comprised of 4 -

The Lordship of Burgh [pronounced “Bruff”5] and including the demesnes and manors of Burgh-on-Sands. This included lands and tenements at Burgh itself, Longburgh, Langcroft, Dikesfield, Bowstedhill, Murhouse, Ayckton, Wyginby, Thorneby, Thorneby Moore, Parton, Downehull, Dromlening (or Dromlyning), Biglands, Gamelsby, Laythes, Wampoole, Lavereckstone, Etterby, Thursby (or Thurisby), Bemond (or Bemont or Bemonde), Kirkanders (or Kirkandrews), Rowcliffe (Roughcliffe, Rokley or Rockliffe) and its Castle, Westlyvington (Westlevington or Westlenton), Fingland, Finglanrigg, Cardonock, Drumbrugh (or Dromburgh or Drumburgh and its Castle), Bownes (Bowness or Bowlenes), Glasson (or Glassen), Whittrigg, Whitriglees, Easton (or Eston). In addition, the Dacres had some property and twenty-seven tenants in and around the City of Carlisle.6

Also in Cumberland was the Barony or Lordship of Gilsland which also contained the demesnes and manors of Lyversdale (Liversdale), Brampton, Denton, Walton, Farlam, Talkin and Castle-Carrock. This had been the extent of

3 TNA SP 15/18 f.125. See also Sharpe, Memorials, pp. 231-2. Compare this with the amount appointed for punishment for involvement with the Rebellion of the Northern Earls: see esp., McCall, ‘The rising in the north’, pp. 74-87. See also above, pp. 175-7.
4 I have tried to give as many alternative spellings as I have come across in brackets after the place names although even these are not intended to be exhaustive.
6 For the City of Carlisle, see Summerson, Medieval Carlisle, p.650. For the other estates, see Nicolson & Burn, History & Antiquities, vol. 2, p. 351; Arundel Castle Archives, D7121-7122; Warne (ed.), The Duke of Norfolk’s Deeds, p. 273.
the Dacre Lordship before the Greystoke inheritance and had come from
marriage to the Multon heir.

Coming from the Greystoke inheritance and greatly enhancing the family’s
fortunes were:

In Cumberland: the Barony of Greystoke (Graystoke, Graistock) with its Castle,
rights and members (of the baronial title), and manors of, or lands and tenements
in Greystoke, Motherby, Stainton, Skelton (including former house of Edward
Skelton in Carlisle), Soulby, Matterdale (Madirdale, Motherdale), Grisdale
(Greydale, Graydale), Johnby, Little Blencow, Gill, Murrey, Threkeld,
Warkthwaite, Penruddock, Hutton Roof, Hutton John, Hutton Soil, 7
Wethermelock (Wethermelott, Wethermallet, Watermillock), Sparkhead, Berrier,
Newbiggin (Newbigging, Newbiggen), Fulkholme, Standwick, Caldecote,
Thistlethwaite (Thistlethwayte, Thistlethwaite), Melmorby, “free rents of seven
tenants in Penrith”, “one in Carleton”, “several messuages and tenements in”8
Ullesby, Kirkland, Kirkoswald (Kirkoswold, Keyrkeiswald), Glassonby
(Glassenby), Ramwicke, Skalehouses (Scalehouse, Scalehose) and Ainstable
(Ainstableth), Staffol and Ravenwick.

In Westmorland the Dacre estates included manors, lands, tenements and
“hereditaments” [hereditary rights]9 in Hoffe (Hoff), Dribeck (Drybeck), Orton
(Overton), Glencoine (Glencoyne), Barton, Dufton, Patterdale (Patrikdale),
Depedale (Deepdale), Farleton, Farleton Knott, Sandwick, Ulleswater
(Ullswater, Ulswater) “and [its] fishing”10, and Appleby.

---

7 Hutton John, Hutton Soil and Hutton Roof are small territories described as “Constablewicks”: see Nicolson and Burn, History & Antiquities, vol. 2, p. 348. It seems that these territories may never have fully passed to the Dacres after the Greystoke marriage as they were alienated to “Roger son of William del Heved” in 32 Edward I: see TNA Chancery, Inquisitions Ad Quod Damnum, ref. C143/46/6. They were always part of the Greystoke Barony and, later on the Parish: see TNA Census Returns HO 107/72. The lands ended up in the hands of the Huddlestones, the story of which is not in the scope of this thesis.


10 Ibid.
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In Salop (now mainly laying in Shropshire) the Barony or Lordship of Wem (Wemme, Wemm)\(^{11}\), with all its rights, members and “appurts”\(^{12}\) (appertaining rights and apparatus such as courts, mills etc), tenements and hereditaments in “Hoppington” (Loppington)\(^{13}\), Hinstock, Tillula (Tilly), Asten, Edstaston, Cotton, Stanbroke, Horton, Lowe and Diches, Newton, Overly, Steyll, Slaypw and Hawood.

On the creation of the Northern Dacre line and Southern Dacre line some of the lands were apportioned between the two branches of the family. Humphrey obtained the Barony of Gilsland along with the manor of Halton.\(^{14}\) The Southern Dacres, the Fiennes’, received recompense of the manors of Holbeach in Lincolnshire and Fishwick and Ecclestone in Lancashire to add to their southern estates.\(^{15}\) However, as is the case for much of the Dacre lordship, questions remain over this division of these lands. Henry Howard states that the share of the Dacre lordship held by the southern Dacres included-

1st. The Maner of Dacre.
2nd. The Manor of Kirkoswald.
3rd. The Maners of Blackhill, Rowcliffe, Glassonby, Staffold, Lazonby, Brackenthwaite and Newbiggin in Cumberland.
4th. The Barony of Barton, and Maners of Patterdale and Martindale, with the Forest of Martindale and Grisdale in Westmorland.
5th. The lands near Holbech, Lincolnshire.
6th. I believe, also, the Maners of Fiswicke, Over Kellet, and Eccleston, in the County of Lancaster.\(^{16}\)

Whilst there is agreement with Cockayne over Fishwicke, Ecclestone and Holbech, Cockayne makes no mention of Over Kellet.\(^{17}\) There is however, little

---

\(^{11}\) Nominally brought into the Dacre family through the Greystoke marriage in 1488 (when the crown recognised the marriage as legal) but much wrangling did not allow Dacre the full enjoyment of the title and rents of these lands until 1509: see Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, pp. 85-87.


\(^{13}\) Ibid.

\(^{14}\) Ibid.; TNA E174/5.

\(^{15}\) Cockayne, Complete Peerage, vol. 4, p. 19.

\(^{16}\) For the above, see Henry Howard, Indications of Memorials, Paintings and Engravings of Persons of the Howard Family, section XI, appx., re “Dacre Possessions”.

\(^{17}\) Cockayne, Complete Peerage, vol. 4, pp.1-26 [esp. pp. 18-26].
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problem with Over Kellet being included within the southern lordship as it does not appear on later Dacre rentals. It seems likely that Over Kellet was given to the southern branch of the family. As Howard noticed himself, however, there is a problem with the Barony of Barton as this is listed having been transferred, as part of the later legal settlement, to Ann, Countess of Arundel, as one of the heirs general. It is unlikely that Barton ever passed to the southern branch of the Dacre family. There are other problems with Henry Howard’s division of the lands. It is clear that Kirkoswald, Newbiggen and Rockcliffe were all in the hands of the northern Dacres during the 16th century. It is not clear whether there was any agenda on the behalf of Henry Howard to stake any claim to these lands having passed to the southern line. He was a direct descendant of Lord William Howard and his mistakes are probably genuine ones, perhaps owing to the difficulty in sourcing and scarcity of the sources. This, however, is beyond the scope of this thesis. Considering the available evidence it is extremely unlikely that these lands ever passed to the southern Dacres.

The will of Thomas Lord Dacre demonstrates that Kirkoswald was very much in the hands, and also the thoughts of, the Dacres of Gilsland. Thomas Lord Dacre established a college of monks there in around 1520. In his will, he stated that his widow Elizabeth should be provided for out of “the revenues of Kirkoswald Castle” and that all the “Whitmonday farm” rents from Kirkoswald should be invested in finishing the “werkes of Kirkoswald”. Clearly, Kirkoswald castle was being repaired or improved at this time. Rockcliffe also contained a Dacre castle that was well known for the suitability of its border defensive position. Newbiggen appears in several Dacre deeds throughout the 16th century. This has caused some confusion as to the extent of Dacre lands. It seems that some of Henry Howard’s research must be disregarded. Due to these shortcomings, it

18 TNA SP15/32 f. 133.
21 Arundel Castle Archives D7112/2; Warne (ed.), The Duke of Norfolk’s Deeds, p. 270.
22 TNA SP15/17 f. 90.
23 See for example, Arundel Castle Archives, CW53-CW57; Carlisle Record Office, DHG 14/16; Warne (ed.), The Duke of Norfolk’s Deeds, pp. 30-5.
seems that the more reliable commentators are Cockayne and Nicholson and Burns, primary sources not withstanding.\textsuperscript{24}

In the East Riding of Yorkshire the marriage of Thomas, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Baron Dacre of Gilsland, and Elizabeth Greystoke brought the Barony of Hinderskelf and its castle into the family – this is now “Castle Howard” a seat of the Howard descendents of the Duke of Norfolk. There were also small parcels of land held in other areas, such as the Dacre manor of Morpeth in Northumberland which comprised a small hamlet, described in 1549 as a “little street standing in the heigh way”\textsuperscript{25} and a motte and bailey castle. In Durham the Dacres gained the manors of High and Low Coniscliffe (which became known as Over Coniscliffe and Nether Coniscliffe), Neasham and Brierton.\textsuperscript{26} The Greystoke marriage also brought some even more far-flung manors into the Dacre Lordship - there were lands in Leicestershire, Bedfordshire, Middlesex, Yorkshire, Lancashire, Hertfordshire and Suffolk. Using Steven Ellis’ calculations, these lands could have been worth another £30-£40 of rental income for the Dacres by the early 16\textsuperscript{th} Century. By 1611, Lord William Howard was in receipt of over £100 from the lands in Middlesex and Hertfordshire alone.\textsuperscript{27}

A treatise written by Lord William Howard during the 1590s shows his part of the Dacre inheritance and the incomes thereof. It reads as follows\textsuperscript{28}:

Yorkshire- The Castle, parke and Manor of Hynderskelf, rental income per annum, £110 12s.9d. The Manor of Crostwaite cum[and or with] Holwick, rental income per annum, £14 18s.10d. The Manor of Thorpbasset, rental income, per annum, £50 12s.8d. The Manor of Butterwicke, rental income, per annum, £21 3s.3d. The Manor of Dringhowe, rental income, per annum,


\textsuperscript{26}Ormsby (ed.), \textit{Selections from the Household Books of The Lord William Howard, Of Naworth Castle} (Durham, 1878), pp. 5, 409; BL Landsdowne MS. 106 f. 49.

\textsuperscript{27}Ellis, \textit{Tudor Frontiers}, p. 88; BL Landsdowne MS. 50 f. 84.

\textsuperscript{28}This is my own transcription and translation. See also Northumberland County Archives (Woodhorn) SANT BEQ 28-1-10-218.
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£6 17s.4d. The Manor of Nidd, rental income, per annum, £22 8s.7d. The Manor of Burnholme, rental income, per annum, £30 3s.4d. The Manor of Morton superSwale, rental income per annum with the Manor of Thrintofte, £32 9s.10d. The Manor of Thornton in le More, rental income, per annum, £11 8s.7d. The Manor of Welberrie, rental income, per annum, £18 8s.7d. The Manor of Grymthorpe, rental income, per annum, £57 3s.5d. Tenement in the City of York 20s. Total- £377 12s.4d.

Bishopric of Durham.- The Manor of Breerton rental income, per annum, £25 5d. The Manor of Nesham rental income, per annum, £32 17s. The Manor of Over-Coniscliffe with Nether Coniscliffe, £32 7s.3d. Total- £124 2s.10d.

Within Northumberland.- The Castle, Barony, and Manor of Morpeth, with the “Burrough”, and the East and West “parke” there, per annum, £168 12s.6d. The Manor of Benridge, rental income, per annum, £6 5s. The Manor of Ulgham per annum, rental income, £30 9s.10d. The Manor and Forest of Horseley, cum[with] Todborne, per annum, £10 16s.5d. The Manor of Angerton, Cumberton and Hartborn cum[with] Midleton Morrell, per annum, £33 3s.5d. The Manor of Hedon “super murum" 29 cum[with] Newebiggyn per annum, £36 8d. The manor of Benton cum Killingworth, and Tynmouth, per annum, £13 11s.4d. The Manor of Stannington cum West Dudden, rental income, per annum, £15 4s.2d. The Manor of Netherton rental income, per annum, £20 14d. Total £334 4s.7d.

The above are described in the margins as having been former Greystoke possessions. The sum total of income from these is given as £835 19s.9d per annum.

The treatise goes on to describe former Dacre possessions in Cumberland as follows:

The Barony of Gillesland in which is contained two Castles, viz. Naward [Naworth] and Askerton; four parks, viz. Naward, Brampton, Drigwoode

---

29 Would be the equivalent of “supermare” as in Weston-Super-Mare- [Weston over sea, or on sea].
and Askerton; one Forest called Brierthwaite; “the commaundement of the men within that Baronie under the office of the land sergeant to be placed by the Lord thereof”, per annum total £217.

This gives a sum total rental income from all the former Dacre lands awarded to Lord William Howard of £1042 19s.9d.

This is very interesting as in the pre-text to this list William Howard writes that this was “…an inheritance of great royaltie, making of ancient rent one thousand and fortie pounds by yeare, as maie appeare by the particulars within written,…”. In fact, this may be very close to the income the Dacres received from these lands.

When this sum of rental is added to the sum of rental income for the share of lands given to Anne Dacre, Countess of Arundel, which in 1585 were stated as £737 9s, it can be seen that the overall rental income from the Dacre estates was around £2000 per annum. However, these figures should not be taken to represent the true income the Dacres’ received from their lands: it was obviously of some benefit to underestimate rental incomes from landed possessions in order to avoid paying higher taxes. In addition, there are some adjustments to the figures that would need to be taken into account for sales from the estates. This is especially the case for the part of the Dacre possessions that were inherited by Anne Dacre. Philip Earl of Arundel was often in financial difficulty and he does not appear to have been an astute landlord. There were at least two significant sales of land from Anne Dacre’s portion of the inheritance before 1585. Parts of the manor of Barton which are listed as producing a rent of £2 per annum were sold to Cuthbert Sysson and Edward Harrysoun for the sum of £245 6s. 8d. The sum of money involved in the purchase indicates that these lands

30 BL Lansdowne MS. 106 f. 49; BL Lansdowne MS. 50 f. 84. Much similar information can be gleaned from, Arundel Castle Archives, A1053. Unfortunately, however, the manuscript is damaged and incomplete in some places and is written in Latin. These figures are also backed up by manuscripts held at the Northumberland County Archives, which list parts of the Dacre Lordship, and originate from the court cases of the 1560s, apparently: see SANT BEQ 28-01-06 ff. 37, 38-42.
31 BL Lansdowne MS. 45 f. 84, cap. 7.
33 See the various debts of the Earl of Arundel: BL Lansdowne MS fol. 84.
could have produced far more income than the measly rental income listed. Several hundred year leases may be a modern phenomenon but were certainly not standard during this period.\textsuperscript{34} There was also a sale of lands in Cumberland during the same year for £19. These lands were listed as having a yearly rental of around £1. This perhaps seems a little more realistic from the sum involved in the sale.\textsuperscript{35} It is clear that the 1580s were not good years for the Arundels. Taking these sums and factors into consideration, it would seem that Steven Ellis’ estimate of £3000 for William, 3\textsuperscript{rd} Baron Dacre of Gilsland’s, annual income at his death in 1563, may be close to the mark. This sum, of course, would have to take into consideration the amount of income available from the position of Warden of the Marches and any extra money (stewardships etc.) that could be procured from this.\textsuperscript{36}

There are also three separate crown extents available for the Dacre lands from the Court of Wards.\textsuperscript{37} These are useful for evaluating the Dacre incomes from their more peripheral estates, away from the Dacre heartland of Cumberland, in particular. The 1565 Court of Wards values the Dacre lands outside of Cumberland as follows:

In Bedfordshire the Dacres held the manor of Wyboston, held from the crown in lieu of Knight’s service, the yearly income of this was valued at £17. In Leicestershire the manor of Narborough was held to be worth £25 12.s. 5.d in 1565. In Suffolk the manors of Aylesbourne and Willisham were worth only £5. In Lancaster the Dacres held more considerable lands, including Halton, Halton Park, Aighton and Highfield worth £45 19.s. 5.d. There were also lands in Hertfordshire, “certain lands and rents called the Ladies Milton” valued at £20. Considering the yearly values offered by Ellis and Lord William Howard above this seems to be a relatively accurate valuation of these lands yearly worth to the Dacre coffers.

\textsuperscript{34} Arundel Castle Archives D7077.
\textsuperscript{35} Arundel Castle Archives D7115.
\textsuperscript{36} Ellis, ‘Dacre, William, 3\textsuperscript{rd} Baron’, p. 3. See also above, pp. 75-7.
\textsuperscript{37} For the following, see the valuation and extent of the Dacre lands: TNA WARD 9/138 & TNA WARD 9/139.
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Considerable lands, originating from the Greystoke match, in Yorkshire were valued at £267, whilst the lands in Shropshire at Wem and Loppington, amongst other areas, were valued at £126 9.s. 8.d. Other, more northern estates in Northumberland centered mainly on Morpeth and including lands at Clifton, Benton, Stannington, Tynemouth amongst others are valued at £77 16.s. 8.d.

The valuations of the Dacre estates in Cumberland seem a little conservative, considering other work carried out on the subject. This, however, is not inconsistent with research carried out on the workings of the Court of Wards. The manors of Dacre and moiety of other lands in Gamelsby, Newbiggen and Swalesdale are valued at a mere £38 16.s. 11.d. However, the estates at Burgh and others, including Langburgh, Eden, Ayleton, Elton Thurlsby, Kirkandrews, Burnstaple, Eske, Westlevington, Effersby and Blackhall are valued at £206 11.s. 5.d. Papcastle is valued at £18. The Dacre rents in the City of Carlisle and its surrounds are valued at £8 7.s. 6.d. The fiefs of other lands including Aylesland, Maltbourne and Kirkby are valued at £7 6.s. 8.d.

Still in Cumberland, the manor of Kirkwold and the corbage of Kirkwold Park, and other rights of commonage in Glassonby and Staffol were worth £66 6.s. 5.d. However, far more valuable were the Dacre manors of Naworth and Brampton and the moiety of other lands at Askerton, including rents in Tynedale, Lanark, Crossby and Nunby, which (amongst other rights) were valued at £137 14.s. 7.d. There were also the rents of a hamlet called Newlands and lands in Ermsby (?possibly Ormsby, which is in Westmorland), valued at £20.

Further lands in Cumberland, coming from the Greystoke match, are listed in the Court of Wards valuation of 1565. This includes the lordship or manor of Greystoke and its appertainances of Matterdale, Grinisdale, Stainton, Sparkesfield and rights in the lordship of Goldsborough and Gamelsby (?). They are valued at £257 7.s 5.d.

---

38 Hurstfield, ‘Lord Burghley as Master of the Court of Wards, 1561-98’ in Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 4th Series, XXXI, pp. 95-118.
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The Court of Wards records also show the value of Dacre estates in Westmorland in 1565. The manor of Overton was worth £21 17.s. 5.d. Overhoff and Netherhoff with the free Burgage of Appleby and the manor and commonship of Drybeck were valued at £21 11.s. 5.d. Lands including the manor of Barton, Martindale, Patterdale and the park of Glenmore were valued at £25 11.s 5.d. Coming from the Greystoke match are further lands at Dufton, valued at £29 16.s. 6.d. If the Court of Wards totals are taken into consideration then a value of approx. £1445 can be given to the Dacre estates on the occasion of their valuation by the Court of Wards in 1565.

There are further valuations undertaken by the Court of Wards, demonstrating the difficulty the crown had in determining the full extent of the Dacre lands. In fact a further two evaluations took place. Largely these are copies of the earlier valuations. However, they do have a couple of surprising features. One is the inclusion of Dacre lands in Oxfordshire, valued at £30, with one of the portions of land in Egremont valued at a mere 8.d. This has never been brought to light in any previous research. It should perhaps be considered unlikely that the Dacres did ever hold lands in Oxfordshire and the reason these lands are included is unclear, and likely to remain so. In addition, there are no Dacre estates in Durham mentioned in the Court of Wards evaluation. Perhaps this is due to the difficulty the crown had in staking claims to lands where the Bishop still retained almost Regalian rights.

The only valuation that attempts to measure the Dacre lands to any extent is the one from 1569, occasioned by the death of George ‘the little’ Lord Dacre. However, the measurements are rough and incomplete and demonstrate the difficulty and complexity of measuring lands at this time quite strikingly. Nevertheless, the extent and development of the Dacre lands can be demonstrated by the legal method used to obtain a life interest for Lady Elizabeth Dacre, wife of Thomas 4th Baron Dacre of Gilsland, in the northern

39 TNA WARD 9/139
40 See Kesselring, Northern Rebellion, pp. 130-31. See also Newton, North-East England, pp. 48-50.
41 TNA WARD 9/139
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estates. The Foot of fine contains much information about the Dacre estates at
Henderskelf, Greystoke, Wem and Dufton. It reads as follows:-

Final concord between Thomas, Lord of Dacre, Gyllesland and Graistocke, and
Elizabeth his wife, plaintiffs, against Thomas Carus, Serjeant at Law, William
Rosewell esq., Solicitor General, Thomas Preston, esq. and Laurence Banaster,
gent, deforciants of:

i.) The Barony and Castle of Hynderskelff alias Hylderskelf with the
liberties, franchises and manors of Hynderskelf, Thornepassett alias
Thorpebassett, Burnholme, Grymthorpe, Welbury, Thornton in le More,
Nydd, Mortone, Thirnetofte, Slyngeby, Hutton upon Darwen’,
Skargilthorpe, Burnholme, Butterwike and Fangfosse, with the park of
Hynderkelf and 500 messuages, 600 tofts, 500 cottages, 10 mills, 10
dovecotes, 600 gardens, 400 orchards, 8000a. land, 3000a. meadow,
10,000a. pasture, 3000a. wood, 10,000a. moor, 10,000a. furze and heath
and £50 rent in; and also in Faram, Wygenthorpe, Terynton,
Gaunthrop, Amortherby, Malton, Relyngton, Skamiston, Bysdefalde,
Northgrymston, Quarram in le Strete, Dogleby, Shurborne, Staxton,
Flyxton, Folton, Benton, Sledmere, Drynhowe, Mollescroft without
Beverley, Etton, Bylby, Waplyngton, Millington, Youlthrop, Meltinby,
Yapham, Raystrop, Howgate Parva, Gobedalle, Unkelby, Hyngham,
Grymston, Blesthroppe, Osmonderley, Calottes, Croftwhaite and
Howewike and the advowson of the churches of Thorpebassett and
Folton, all in co. York; and one messuage and garden in the City of
York.

ii.) The Barony and Castle of Graystocke and the manors of Graystocke,
Skelton and Laythes and the forests or free chases of Flastowarde and
Grysdall with their liberties; and the feedings of Gowberrra with appurts;
and 300 messuages, 300 cottages, 12 mills, 400 gardens, 300 orchards,
5000a. land, 3000a. meadow, 6000a. pasture, 8000a. wood, 10,000a.
furze and heath, and 20 free rents in Graystocke, Skelton, Laythes,
Eyilcambon’, Newbyggyn, Gyll, Grysedall, Berear, Sowerby,
Newlands, Stokelwathie Magna, Staneton, Motherbye, Matterdale,
Wethermealock and Sparkehed; and the avowsons, gifts, etc. of the
churches of Grastocke and Skelton in Co. Cumberland.
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iii.) The Barony of Dufton with its liberties and franchises and the manor of Dufton with its appurts. And 40 messuages, 20 cottages, 2 mills, 40 gardens, 30 orchards, 1000a. land, 500a. meadow, 2000a. pasture, 1500a. wood, 2000a. moor, 2000a. furze and heath, 3 free rents and rent of a pound of pepper, with appurts. in Dufton and Appleby, and advowson of the church of Dufton in co. Westmorland

iv.) The manors of Weme, Loppington and Hynstocke with their appurts and 300 messuages, 400 cottages, 5 mills, 8 dovecotes, 300 gardens, 200 orchards, 1500a. land, 1000a. meadow, 2000a. pasture, 1000a. wood, 1000a. moor, 1000a. furze and heath and 100 marks in rent, with appurts. in Weme, Tyllula alias Tylley, Aston, Edstaston, Cotton, Standbroke, Horton Lowe and Dythes Newton, Oberley, Steyll, Slape, Hanwood and Loppington, and the advowson of the church of Weme in co. Salop.

The deforciants acknowledge that all the various baronies, manors and other premises above are the right and inheritance of the plaintiffs and they release and quitclaim them to the plaintiffs; who immediately transfer them all to the deforciants to hold during the life of Elizabeth Dacre. 42

The above is a standard form of land exchange used throughout the Tudor period. 43 This one, however, did have interesting consequences for Leonard Dacre as discussed. 44

Adding together the total amounts of land and developments in this feet of fine Thomas, 4th Baron Dacre of Gilsland, signed away a life interest in the Dacre Lordship to Elizabeth Dacre [nee Leybourne] his wife, consisting of, at least, 1141 messuages, 600 tofts, 45 1220 cottages, 29 mills, 18 dovecotes, 1341 gardens, 930 orchards, 15500a. “land”, 7500a. meadow, 20,000a. pasture, 13,500a. wood, 13,000a. moor, 23,000a. furze and heath, 100 marks and £50

42 I have left the spellings of places as they were written at the time, rather than standardising them. Dated Hilary term 1565: see Arundel Castle Archives, D7113; Warne (ed), The Duke of Norfolk’s Deeds, p. 270-2.
44 See above, pp. 157-66.
45 Showing an interesting concern for categorising dwellings separately.
customary rents. In addition, 6 advowsons to churches were given to Elizabeth along with a pound of pepper, or presumably its monetary equivalent, something worth a considerable sum at this time. Certainly Leonard Dacre was none too pleased with the jointure awarded to Elizabeth Dacre, he stated that it was greater ‘than ever anye the wyves of the auncestors of the said Lorde Dacre had’. 47

It seems likely that these baronies were not the mainstay of the Dacre military effort. It was prudent to keep the border defences within the control of the Lord Dacre. Only twenty-three free rents are mentioned in this document. Presumably, at least some of these were for service of some sort to the Dacres. 48 The military levies for the Dacres seem to have come mainly from the Gilsland and Burgh baronies. The proximity of the border to Gilsland and Burgh probably slightly precluded their development along the same lines. This is also demonstrated by the fact that in the 1611 audited accounts for the rental incomes of Lord William Howard, he received £1145 16s.10d. for the Yorkshire lands, £107 18s.8d. for the Durham lands, £1057 2s.3d. for the Northumberland lands and £411 14d. for the Cumberland lands. 49 The Yorkshire, Durham and Lancashire rents, therefore, rose considerably over a twenty-year period.

However, it is noticeable that where Lord William Howard had most trouble in raising rents, and therefore increasing his income, was in Cumberland. Whether this was because of its proximity to the border or because of resistance from stubborn landholders cannot be ascertained. It may well be the case that the forms of customary tenancy so often advocated by the Dacres to maintain their power in the region may have precluded any attempts to raise rents on these more exposed holdings. Certainly, many were unimpressed by the original change in ownership of land from Dacre to Howard that occurred in the 1560s.

---

46 These could be of various values to the holder and could be lucrative especially if the church had a particularly wealthy living.  
48 For service due to the Dacres, see Ellis, Tudor Frontiers, pp. 97-8. See also James, Society, Politics & Culture, pp. 142-3, 270-307.  
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This is demonstrated by the many complaints over strong-arm tactics, rent increases and evictions that reached court.\(^{50}\)

However, despite these extents and research no-one can really be fully certain of the full income and extent of the Dacre lands. Certainly, legal cases continued for years over northern Dacre estates. These are the main reason as to why there is much confusion over the Dacre lands. As late as 1679 questions remained over the legal title to the lands as the, newly created, Earl of Sussex tried to ascertain his title to lands in the Manors of Dacre, Holbeck and Barton.\(^{51}\)

Various antiquarians have tried to demonstrate differing legal titles to the land, much in the way that Thomas Lee did in the twentieth century.\(^{52}\) It seems where there is a title to be gained, and some money possibly, that people will strive to stake a claim to it.

Moreover, as Helen Miller points out, due originally to the crowns’ method of taxation it was to a landholder’s advantage to underestimate his landed income. Hence the most famous example of the supposedly incorruptible Cecil: he was assessed for subsidies at 200 marks per year throughout the reign of Elizabeth. Cecil’s actual income was closer to several thousand pounds per year. His son Thomas Cecil had this subsidy assessment increased to £200 and then £300, after the death of his father, however, this was still not anywhere near the mark of his actual net worth.\(^{53}\) Undoubtedly, assessments of Dacre income were not as far from the mark as this but these figures still need to be treated carefully for anyone hoping to give an exact income for the Lords Dacre, or in fact an accurate income of any of the sixteenth century peerage. All that anyone can be sure of is that the landed income of the Dacres was high; high enough to elicit the unwelcome attention of those wishing to enrich themselves further.

\(^{50}\) See above, pp. 156-8.

\(^{51}\) See CSP Domestic, Charles II, 1679-80, vol. 21, p. 46.

\(^{52}\) See above, p. 11.

\(^{53}\) Miller, ‘Subsidy Assessments’, esp pp. 22-23.
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