

Late Feudalism in England: The Case of Richmondshire¹

Anthony POLLARD

University of Teesside

In traditional Japanese society warriors and courtiers belonged to separate orders. This was never so in medieval Europe. The great men of the realm of England were both warriors and courtiers. They fought for their king and they attended his court. There might have been tension between the court and the provinces, especially generated by the role of the king's intimates and most trusted servants, but no great lord was excluded from court on principle. Indeed magnates were expected to attend; and in times of political crisis, such as in the adulthood of Richard II, they demanded that they, not the jumped-up creatures of the king, should lie at the heart of government. The roles of warrior, courtier and bureaucrat were often rolled into one. Thus Richard, Lord Scrope of Bolton, to whom we will return, was in the reign of Richard II an exemplar of chivalry, an ornament of the court and the holder of senior government office. It may be that the ecclesiastics and senior churchmen, who led civil administration and staffed the royal chapel, can be equated with the courtiers who inhabited the imperial city and attended the Emperor in Japan. They were a separate estate. But even here the separation is not complete. Some prelates, notably Bishop Despenser of Norwich in the reign of Richard II, commanded armies. And one diocese, Durham, was a palatinate ruled by a prince bishop who combined both secular and ecclesiastical authority. On one side of his seal he was represented, like the king, as a warrior².

Another difference was that the great landholders of medieval England were also the leading warriors. It may be that at one time a distinction existed between the code and practice of knights as specialist mounted warriors and the lords of great feifs, but by the twelfth century all lord and landholders, from the king down, were also knights, literally in the sense that they were dubbed and culturally in that they subscribed to the code of chivalry. There was no greater honour for a great lord in England after the middle of the fourteenth century than to become a member of the king's elite chivalric Order of the Garter. Knighthood, unlike the separate standing of a samurai, was integral to civil power and authority³. The structure of warrior society in medieval England is known, for want of a better term, as feudalism⁴.

Feudalism, as it has been understood, was a system introduced and developed to organise the kingdom for war. In return for land, great lords (tenants in chief) undertook to serve their king in war with their knights. They in turn vested their knights in land as vassals in exchange for their service with their followers. William I, the Conqueror, was able to institute in his conquered kingdom after 1066 a degree of royal control over not just his tenants in chief, but also their vassals, of which his neighbour the king of France was envious. The feudal kingdom of England was thus at the end of the eleventh century, somewhat more centralised, or perhaps it would be wiser to say less fragmented, than France⁵.

Over time, however, the ties of military feudalism weakened. In part this was a consequence of the very structure of the system. Land granted to vassals was inalienable. Over generations the descendants of the original knights lost the direct association with their 'mesne', or superior, lord from whom the land was held. Failures in the male line led, in a system of primogeniture, to the division of knight's fees, as these original land grants were called. By the thirteenth century knights had been transformed into gentry; professional soldiers had become lesser landed nobles. It became more difficult to call out the feudal levy. The size of armies increased and the cost of war multiplied. Military service was thus computed, and the money, enhanced by significant taxation, used to pay armies, especially armies of infantrymen, either from abroad or recruited at home. Most important of all during the reign of Edward I (1272-1307) the crown first adopted the expedient of entering into formal contracts with its tenants in chief to raise armies, for which they were paid, instead of requiring them to serve under their feudal obligations. Perfected in the reign of Edward III this system of contract armies raised in England effectively rendered the military rationale for feudalism redundant. 5

This paper is about late feudalism in England in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Discussion of it has been dominated since the nineteenth century by the concept of 'Bastard Feudalism'. The phrase was coined by Charles Plummer, who first described the system of contract armies based on the replacement of grants of land to vassals in perpetuity by money payments to indentured retainers for life as a debasement of feudalism. And it was he too who laid at its feet all the woes of the later middle ages; aristocratic disorder, the abuse of power and the blight of the overmighty subject⁶. Such a negative view came under sustained attack by twentieth century historians from several directions. The scale of indentured retaining was shown to be much exaggerated and its use essentially for military service was re-emphasised.

The abuses once associated with retaining were assigned, following K. B. McFarlane, to weak kingship. The fault was found not to lie in overmighty subjects but in undermighty kings⁷. Where once they were thought to be destabilising, the ties of service were seen as potential agents of stability. Where once retainers were seen as fickle, forever seeking the best deal, they were found frequently to be loyal and devoted servants to their lords. Moreover, retaining, the formal contract of service by indenture itself, was placed firmly in the wider context of lordship, of household, of tenantry and of less formal circles of clientage. Indentured retaining was reduced in significance to one small and highly specific aspect of service; highly visible but not the most important. Moreover, research revealed, payment of cash annuities for life to followers can be traced back as far as 1140, long antedating the supposed emergence of bastard feudalism at the beginning of the fourteenth century. Feudalism and bastard feudalism, it was argued, existed side by side in earlier centuries⁸.

Debate about the nature and significance of bastard feudalism dominated the discussion of political and military society in late-medieval England throughout most of the twentieth century. The remnants of feudalism, which was never abolished, were looked upon as anachronistic. They had little real significance and thus were largely neglected except by antiquaries. Helen Cam wrote about late-feudalism, but her interest was largely in the decay of institutions rather than any continuing vigour⁹. The neglect of the older relationships is perhaps curious for England, like France, contained many feudal liberties, large and small, within which to a greater or lesser extent the king's writ did not run. And even within England regional differences were significant, especially the further one travelled from Westminster, which became the fixed capital relatively early in the history of the kingdom. And where distance from the capital in the north ran into the only land border with another kingdom, Scotland, the difference was marked. Feudalism and then bastard feudalism were, as Michael Hicks has observed, stronger in frontier regions¹⁰. Historians of the north have frequently referred to the surviving feudalism of the region. But this is usually in the loose sense of being old-fashioned, or more specifically dominated by great lords, and not normally in the technical sense. It is also a comment made more generally about the sixteenth century when the Tudors were set on their project to extend more effective central control over the region. The work, for example, of M E James, Bernard Beckingsale and Steven Ellis has kept the discussion alive as far as the sixteenth century was concerned¹¹. But little thought has been given to the possibility that the surviving remnants of feudalism itself, the institutions and

relationships which were originally established in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, continued to have a real impact on society. This paper explores the significance of surviving feudalism and the links between the remnants of feudalism and bastard feudalism in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. It does so by reference to one particular district, the principal frontier region, and will suggest that here earlier feudal relationships still had a role play to play alongside the newer arrangements. Because of the fortune of surviving documentation and the particular political circumstances this is possible to consider one district in the north in some detail. This is the county of Richmond, or Richmondshire, as the far north-west of Yorkshire was known in the fifteenth century.

Richmondshire was heart of the feudal honour of Richmond. It was a clearly delineated area of five wapentakes (the local term for district administration) lying between the rivers Ure and Tees, with the castle of Richmond at its head. The town of Richmond was a seigneurial borough, paying its fee farm to its earl. There, as nowhere else in the otherwise scattered honour, the earl held a large, compact and cohesive liberty. In the French sense of 'county', the liberty of an earl, the district was a county. This seems to have been recognised in the late medieval description of the liberty in Latin as a *comitatus*, or as became commonplace in English as Richmondshire¹². It was approximately the same size as Cambridgeshire where the earl held other properties in his honour. But Cambridgeshire contained the scattered holdings of several feudal honours. With the principal exception of the small ecclesiastical liberty of Ely, the feudal presence there in the later middle ages meant little more than the landed presence of its lords. Richmondshire was by no means the only feudal liberty in the north of England: indeed there were many removing large parts of the counties of Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmorland and Yorkshire from the royal shrievalties. The most distinctive, with the powers of a county palatine, was the ecclesiastical liberty of Durham, approximately the same size as Richmondshire, but this like Hexhamshire to the north, was by virtue of its ecclesiastical status politically of a different character¹³.

Richmondshire was the most important of the feudal liberties in the region in lay hands. However lay possession was complicated, and from the point of view of the crown to an extent mitigated by the fact that it was the hereditary possession of the dukes of Brittany, an absentee lord. It is necessary to dwell briefly on the history of relationships between the crown and the dukes of Brittany, which explains why it was frequently escheated and how it came to be that by the later middle ages *de facto control* more often than not lay in English hands. It is a tortuous

history, but it is the reason why, unusually for feudal honours, a small but significant body of evidence concerning feudal relationships in the late-medieval honour of Richmond exists, and from which one may attempt to assess the continuing significance of feudalism for Richmondshire in the era of bastard feudalism.

The diplomatic exigencies of the Hundred Years War largely determined possession in the fourteenth century. A suitable point to begin is the death in 1341 of the childless John III. The English lands of the duke escheated to Edward III, who in 1342 created his two-year-old son, John of Gaunt earl of Richmond. At the same time he took up the cause of one of the rival claimants, John de Montfort and committed himself for the next seventeen years, successfully, to securing the duchy for his candidate. But relationships between the John IV duke of Brittany and the English crown were never straightforward. John, who faced the continuous challenge of his rival for possession of the duchy was prepared, when it suited him, to come to terms with the king of France if this offered greater security. This he did in the late 1360s. But in 1372 he returned to the English fold, marrying Edward III's daughter Mary and being vested in the earldom of Richmond, which Gaunt, reluctantly surrendered. No sooner than this treaty was sealed than John was driven from the duchy into exile. For some of the next six years he took refuge in England. He was able to return to Brittany in 1379. But in 1381 he turned his coat again, and the earldom of Richmond was forfeited. Now it was vested in the hands of Richard II's queen, Anne of Bohemia. After her death in 1394 the way was open for Richard II to conclude a new alliance with John and in 1398 he sealed a treaty with him that included the restoration of Richmond.¹⁴

A year later two events occurred which brought this dance to an end: John IV died and Henry IV took the throne of England. He, Henry IV, perhaps conscious of his father's claim, kept possession of the title. The revenues and feudal rights in the honour were thereafter granted for fixed terms to leading supporters of the crown until in 1457 Henry VI created his half-brother Edmund Tudor, earl of Richmond. The county of Richmond itself, Richmondshire, became the virtual fiefdom of the Nevilles of Middleham, with but one short interruption between 1425 and 1444 when John, duke of Bedford, the uncle of Henry VI was granted it. Nine years after his death it reverted to Neville control, in the junior line of the Nevilles of Middleham, first Richard earl of Salisbury and then his son Richard, Warwick the Kingmaker, and, after his death, his political heir Richard of Gloucester, the future Richard III. Edmund Tudor and his son were never able to make good their possession of the earldom, especially the county of Richmond itself, until in 1485

Henry Tudor defeated Richard III and took the throne of England for himself as Henry VII¹⁵.

This is a complex story, but it is important for our assessment of the continuing significance of the feudal relationship between earl, or the grantee of the county, and Richmondshire society. First of all, because of changing possession and the existence of claim and counter claim between the houses of Lancaster and Montfort in the late fourteenth century, the question of what rights, privileges and income were entailed continuously recurred. Hence a body of documentation concerning the Honour was created and furthermore carefully kept. One set, known as the *Registrum Honoris de Richmond* is preserved in the British Library and was published under that name by the antiquary Roger Gale in 1722. This contains material relevant to the county of Richmond from the decades either side of 1400¹⁶. Another document, 'Le Livre des Domaines' is to be found in the Archives de Loire-Atlantique at Nantes and is a survey made for Duke John IV in 1398 when the honour was restored to him for the last time. These documents contain for the county of Richmond, details of the wards and fines owed by them, feudary accounts and, for 1398, an extent of the lands retained in demesne which produced revenue for the duke¹⁷.

First, and one supposes foremost for those who sought to possess the county, Richmondshire was a source of income. In 1398 the eight manors, four villis, two forests and the borough of Richmond were valued at just over £460 p.a. In addition the earl received revenues from the tolls exacted on the passage of goods through the county and the wards, fines and other feudal levies¹⁸. The earl also held the privilege of return of writ, which meant that the sheriff of Yorkshire was excluded from the county. The sheriff's tourn was held instead by the bailiff of the five wapentakes. Financially the feudal income was insignificant: less than 5% in 1398, although this grew proportionally as the income from land shrank in the first half of the fifteenth century¹⁹. But the feudal dues had an importance out of all proportion to their monetary value.

There were 62 knights fees in the county. That is to say the original alienation of land by the first earls had been made to support 62 knights, his vassals who owed castleguard at the 'new' castle of Richmond and were to pay reliefs, aids and other occasional payments to their lord on various occasions. Castleguard was owed for two months of the year and the walls were divided into sections at which traditionally individual knights and their descendants were to stand guard. By the late-fourteenth century noone served in person: the feudal levies had been long

commuted into annual cash payments called wards and fines. Moreover in 1398 the 62 knights fees were owed by just 28 descendants of the original vassals²⁰.

Subinfeudation had also occurred so that a proportion of the knights fees were held of three subordinate fees: the Constable's fee, the Middleham fee, and the Marmion fee. The largest of the three, originally created for the hereditary constable of the castle, was purchased by Sir Geoffrey Scrope in 1320-1. This was subsequently divided between the two Scrope peerages of Bolton and Masham. In Richard II's reign an inquisition recorded that the two branches held 13 knights fees between them, the greater part being held by the Masham branch. The Middleham fee was smaller. In the reign of Henry IV, a surviving record reveals, there were 43 subtenants who between them contributed to six knights fees, and the castleguard owed in their name, held by the Nevilles. The total income of the fee, including free rents and other miscellaneous sources, was c £ 12 pa, of which £ 2 was delivered in wards to the bailiff of the wapentake of Hang West. The Marmion fee, so named from an earlier tenant, but held from mid-fourteenth century by FitzHughs, was the smallest²¹.

One of the manors held by Scrope of Bolton was Croft on Tees. The principal sub tenant there in 1440 was John Clervaux. He owed half a knight's fee and his total rents and fines paid to Scrope came to 2s 11d. There were five other free tenants who paid small sums of money, or rendered a barbed arrow or rose at midsummer²². Throughout the county many rents were paid in kind, in pepper or cumin as well as an arrow or a rose. The lord of each fee retained a feodary, an officer whose responsibility was to collect these dues, and who accounted annually. As was the wont in late-medieval accounting, the feodary's charge could be eclectic. The feodary of the Marmion (FitzHugh) fee, for example, received fines and wards, free rents, escheats and the profits of the baronial courts, but he had additionally accrued the responsibility for collecting the rents of some tenants at will and by the early fifteenth century the 'new rent' for the forge at Leeming. The office seems to have been hereditary, or at least customarily held by members of the same family: Foxholes for the Marmion fee and Weltdens at Middleham²³. Because of subinfeudation, the feudal structure of the county was complex, and had direct implications not only for the earl, for most of the later middle ages an absentee in the person of the crown or the duke of Brittany, but also for the three great resident peerage families, the Scropes, Nevilles and FitzHughs, who held the subordinate fees.

There are several indicators of the continuing importance of feudal rights.

One lies in the very concern to continue collection of the various financial dues and the careful keeping of the record. Not only do we have the records kept by the crown and the duke of Brittany, but we also have a sizable collection of FitzHugh records, including several feodary's accounts and a significant run of the records of the court baron of the fee, held no fewer than 17 times a year (three-weekly) at the village of Thornborough near Tanfield (possibly the original centre of the fee) dealing with the suits of free tenants (and incidentally producing a regular income of £ 2 or so p.a.)²⁴. It was important for the likes of Neville, FitzHugh and Scrope to keep a record of their feudal tenants because of the windfalls that could occur through escheat or wardship. In 1417-18 Henry Lord FitzHugh struck lucky. Two heirs came his way and he was able to sell the marriages of the underage John Laton and Marmaduke Exelby for the combined sum of £ 49²⁵. Not just kings profited from feudal rights. It is probably for this reason that in 1465 when John, Lord Scrope sold all his demesne land in Croft to Richard Clervaux, his principal tenant, he still retained the free rents, fines and castleguard for all the land held by knight's service as well as the lordship of the manor itself²⁶.

But the significance was ritualistic and symbolic as well. The rendering of the barbed arrow or the rose at midsummer was a performance enacted every year to the earl or his proxy. It is surely no coincidence either that two of the fee holders, Lords Scrope and Ralph earl of Westmorland following in his footsteps put up two magnificent castles, both in Wensleydale within a few miles of each other, to rival the comital castle itself at Richmond. Richard, Lord Scrope expended a considerable sum from the profits of war and office between 1378 and 1396 building a modern state-of-the-art fortified palace, which not only put his marker down on central Wensleydale, but also provided him with up-to-date suites of accommodation. Not to be outdone, following his marriage to John of Gaunt's daughter Joan Beaufort in 1397, Ralph Neville, earl of Westmorland transformed his castle of Middleham over the next twenty years into a palace which would match it²⁷. Their contemporary Henry FitzHugh stayed out of the race; he put his energies instead into promoting the Brigittine order in England²⁸.

One of the lists of knights fees and castleguards for Richmond to be found in the collection known as the Register of the Honour is illustrated by a plan of the castle showing by banners who was responsible for each section of the wall²⁹. This is many years after anyone had actually done their stint of two months duty pacing the ramparts. But the visualisation of feudal service by lovingly depicted displays of coats of arms suggests that the service was thought of as honourable, a

mark of the superior status within local society of the 28 gentlemen, of varying degrees of wealth, who had inherited this privilege. To owe wards and fines in Richmondshire was to mark one out as a cut above one's neighbours.

Yet the idea of a symbolic duty of the principal feudal tenants to defend the castle, also represented the reality that military service was still expected of them. In 1398 John IV, duke of Brittany, was anxious that his agents surveying the county identified precisely who his tenants were. They were identified as homagiers (holders of knights fees) tenants by fealty (free tenants), and tenants 'par verge' (tenants at will who held virgates of land). His agents reported back however that the tenants had not given homage to him, a great prejudice to him and his heirs. They hinted that they were prevented from so doing by William Scrope, earl of Wiltshire one of the king's closest servants³⁰. They may well have been right, for no king would allow any of his subjects to swear allegiance to a foreign power, least of all a duke of Brittany, who had a track record second to none for turning his coat. It was inconceivable that the duke would be allowed to raise troops in the county of Richmond to serve in pursuit of his own French ambitions, or even deploy them in support of the king of France against England.

But when the crown retained the earldom there was no such danger. Indeed the king's proxy was expected to raise the men of Richmondshire in the king's service. This proxy seems invariably to have been one of the three fee holders. Duke John himself when an exile and resident in England between 1373 and 1379, and under close supervision, seems to have struck up a close relationship with the eminent and much respected Richard, Lord Scrope, the builder of Castle Bolton and Chancellor of England in 1378-80. He was constable and steward in 1398³¹. But in the interim, when after 1381 the crown resumed the earldom, Lord FitzHugh became the lessee of the castle and county for which he paid £ 433. 6s. 8d³². But eventually Ralph Nevill, earl of Westmorland, who had inherited the Middleham fee in 1388 and settled it on his countess Joan Beaufort and their children, and was furthermore after 1399 the king's brother in law, ran out the winner. From 1399 until his death in 1425 he held a life grant of the county, a grant eventually renewed for the benefit of his son and grandson³³.

There were many forms of military service for the crown performed by these generations of Nevilles during which they could call upon the feudal tenants of Richmondshire. One was to defend it against rebels, especially in 1403 and 1405; another was to lead men to France, as in 1417 and 1436; and a third, and the most important, was to deploy them in the defence of the Scottish border as wardens of

the west march. Tenants made up by far the greater proportion of the manpower of armies in late-medieval England, especially for home defence and during civil wars. Chronicle accounts indicate, and surviving household records, confirm that during the wars of the Roses participants called out their tenants to fight their battles³⁴. This is conventionally interpreted as the exercise of landlord power, but it also involved a feudal obligation. In the county of Richmond all the tenants of the earl, and the holders of the three fees on the earl's behalf could be raised through the terms of their tenancies. The grantee of the county of Richmond could in effect call up the feudal levy within the county. Those who served were usually paid and compensated for their service. In 1448, for instance, Lord FitzHugh acknowledged the service of his tenants of Mickleton against the Scots that year. But they served also because they had a duty so to do³⁵.

It is in the obligation of the lords of Middleham, as wardens of the west march, to defend the kingdom against the Scots that we come back to indentured retainers. For the wardens were licensed to retain with this in view. We have for three years, ca 1457-8, 1464-5 and 1473-4, receivers' accounts of the lordship of Middleham which list twenty or so fees paid to indentured retainers and charged to the revenues of the lordship. The personnel changes, but all are drawn from the same group of gentry and tenants mainly of the county itself, holding fees of the earl or the three principal sub-tenants. A key factor linking all three groups of retainers, and the different lords they were retained to serve (Richard Neville, earl of Salisbury, Richard Neville, earl of Warwick, and Richard, duke of Gloucester), is the pivotal role of the Conyers family, headed in 1457-8 by Christopher and thereafter by his son Sir John. Both men held the combined offices of steward and constable of both Middleham and Richmond as well as the bailiwick of the wapentake in survivorship. They were the key men in the administration of both the lordship of Middleham (including the Middleham fee) and of the county of Richmond. As the lieutenants of the grantee of the county they exercised, at third hand, the earl's authority on the ground. Around them were recruited many of their kinsmen and neighbours as indentured retainers whose primary function was to serve their lord as warden of the west march, especially in providing reinforcements when war threatened³⁶. The bastard feudal arrangement was laid over the historical feudal structure of the county.

But while these men and their dependents were retained primarily to defend the realm from the Scots, from 1455 to 1471 they were also deployed in civil war, as frequently against the crowned monarch as on his behalf. As soon as the Nevilles declared for York, Richmondshire was mobilised in his support: in 1455, 1459,

1460-61 and, in the wars in the north on behalf of the newly crowned Edward IV. But between 1469 and 1471 they were mobilised no fewer than four times by Warwick the Kingmaker *against* Edward IV. Contemporary commentators and chroniclers continually emphasised the role in the civil wars of the men of Richmondshire. They did not refer so frequently to Warwick's 'retinue', or 'menie' or 'fellowship'³⁷. For they were aware that this was more than just a bastard feudal affinity. The deep-rooted and long-standing feudal relationships of Richmondshire, the county of Richmond, created a cohesiveness and unity in the district, which, in support of, or in opposition to the crown, was a potent force. This was more than 'bastard' feudalism as understood by Plummer, or McFarlane or even Hicks. It was late feudalism, alive and kicking at the end of the middle ages in England.

The county of Richmond was not typical of England as a whole. It may not even have been typical of the north. There were several other liberties, especially nearer the Scottish border, in Cumberland and Northumberland. The most famous was the county palatine of Durham, on paper more independent and more powerful than the county of Richmond. Unlike Richmond, Durham had its own sheriff and its own higher courts. Yet, by virtue of its lord being a bishop, and thus in effect the appointee of the crown, in the later middle ages, just as Richmond, Durham was subject to royal political control³⁸. New research conducted under the auspices of the Arts and Humanities Research Board Centre for North East England History is already under way on the other liberties in Northumberland. This will, in due course reveal how important late feudalism was within their bounds. Nevertheless what we know of Durham and Richmond is enough to show that it was a significant presence in the north of England in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. It would therefore be worth the while of the historian of late feudalism in England to bear in mind that just as it can be demonstrated that key features of bastard feudalism preceded bastard feudalism itself, so also it can be argued that remnants of earlier feudalism retained their relevance in one part of the realm well into the era of bastard feudalism. And, as with all feudalism in England, early, late or bastard, throughout the middle ages, the lords of Richmond, and their principal tenants, were adept at being warriors, bureaucrats and courtiers all at the same time.

Notes

- 1 I would like to record my gratitude to Melanie Devine for allowing me to use ideas and material from her current doctoral research on Richmondshire between 1372 and 1425. In this respect this is to some extent a jointly authored essay.
- 2 Comparisons between Japan and Europe are drawn from discussion during the conference at Nichibunken in March 2003. For the specific references to the reign of Richard II of England see Saul 1997, pp. 50-1 (Scrope), 102-5 (Despenser), 108-34, 148-75 and 366-434. For Durham see Lapsley 1900 *passim* and Thornton 2000, 83-100.
- 3 For knighthood see Keen 1984, *passim* and Kaeuper, 1999, *passim*.
- 4 'Feudalism' is a much debated term. I use it here for convenience as an historiographical shorthand.
- 5 For 'bastard feudalism' see Prince 1933; McFarlane 1945 (1981), pp.161-80 (23-44); McFarlane 1973; Jones and Walker 1994;
- 6 Plummer 1985, pp.15-16.
- 7 McFarlane 1964 (1981), p.238.
- 8 Coss 1989; Crouch, Coss and Carpenter 1991; Hicks 1995, *passim*
- 9 Cam 1940 (1963).
- 10 Hicks 1995, 81-4.
- 11 James 1986; Beckingsale 1969; Ellis 1995 and 1999.
- 12 Page 1919, pp. 9-17; Mason 1963; Thomas 1994; Pollard 2001, pp 118-19.
- 13 Thornton 2000.
- 14 Jones 1970; Goodman 1992, pp. 29-32, 185-6.
- 15 Griffiths 1981, 698; Pollard 1990, pp. 258-9, 317-18, 321, 327, 370, 372-3, 383; Pollard 2001, pp. 117-22.
- 16 British Library, Cotton Faustina B vii, folios 72-132; Gale 1722.
- 17 Archive de Loire-Atlantique, E116; Klin 1995. I would like to record my gratitude to Michael Jones for bringing this work to my attention and for lending me a copy.
- 18 Klin 1995, pp.2-11.
- 19 Pollard 1989 and 2001, pp.118-19.
- 20 Klin 1995, p.78.
- 21 Gale 1722, pp.77-88.
- 22 Gale 1722, pp 81-2; Pollard 1990, p.97-8.
- 23 Gale 1722, pp 78-80; 81-2; 87; North Yorkshire County Record Office, ZJX 3/2/40, 76, 89, 96, 99, 114, 115.
- 24 North Yorks County Record Office, ZJX 3/1/70-116.
- 25 Pollard 1990, p.98.
- 26 Pollard 2001, p.101.
- 27 Emery 1996, pp.303-12, 368-72.
- 28 Harriss 1985, pp. 86-7, 110.
- 29 British Library, Faustina B vii, fo 85v; Gale 1722, p. 28.
- 30 Archives de Loire Atlantique, E116, fo 5, 18v; Klin 1995, p.11.
- 31 Archives de Loire Atlantique, E116, fo 5; Saul 1997, p.51.
- 32 Jones 1970, pp.192-3.
- 33 Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1399-1401, p.241; Pollard 2001, pp. 117-18.
- 34 Hicks 1995, pp. 185-200.
- 35 Pollard 1990, p.16.
- 36 Pollard 1990, pp. 128-9; Pollard 1976; Pollard 2001, 51-75.
- 37 Pollard 1990, pp.262-3, 271-315.
- 38 Pollard 1996; Thornton 2000.

References

- Beckingsale 1969
 B. W. Beckingsale, "The Character of the Tudor North", *Northern History*, 4 (1969).
- Cam 1940
 H.M Cam, "The Decline and Fall of English Feudalism", *History*, 25 (1940). Repr in *Liberties and Communities in Medieval England*, Cambridge 1963.
- Coss 1989
 P. R. Coss, "Bastard Feudalism Revised", *Past and Present*, 125 (1989).
- Crouch 1991
 D. A. Crouch, P. R. Coss and D. Carpenter, "Debate: Bastard Feudalism Revised", *Past and Present*, 131 (1991).
- Ellis 1995
 S. G. Ellis, *Tudor Frontiers and Noble Power: the Making of the British State*, Oxford, 1995.
- Ellis 1999
 S. G. Ellis, "Civilizing Northumberland: Representations of the Tudor State", *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 12 (1999).
- Emery 1996
 Anthony Emery, *Greater Medieval Houses of England and Wales, 1300-1500: Vol 1, Northern England*, Cambridge, 1996.
- Gale 1722
 R. Gale, *Registrum Honoris de Richmond*, London, 1722.
- Goodman 1992
 Anthony Goodman, *John of Gaunt: the Exercise of Princely Power in Fourteenth-Century Europe*, Harlow, 1992.
- Griffiths 1981
 R. A. Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI: the Exercise of Royal Authority, 1422-1461*, London, 1981.
- Harriss 1985
 G. L. Harriss, ed, *Henry V: the Practice of Kingship*, Oxford, 1985.
- Hicks 1995
 Michael Hicks, *Bastard Feudalism*, Harlow, 1995.
- James 1986
 M. E. James, *Society, Politics and Culture*, Oxford, 1986.
- Jones 1970
 M. C. E. Jones, *Ducal Brittany, 1364-1399: Relations with England and France during the Reign of Duke John IV*, Oxford, 1970.
- Jones and Walker 1994
 M. C. E. Jones and S. Walker, "Private Indentures for Life Service in Peace and War", in *Camden Miscellany*, 33. Camden, Fifth Series, 3, 1994.
- Kaeuper 1999
 Richard W. Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence in medieval Europe*, Oxford, 1999.
- Keen 1984
 M. H. Keen, *Chivalry*, New Haven, 1984.
- Klin 1995
 Jerome Klin, "L'Honneur de Richmond a la fin du XIVeme Siecle". Maitrise d'histoire dissertation, Universite' de Haute-Bretagne, Rennes, 1995.
- Lapsley 1900
 G. T. Lapsley, *The County Palatine of Durham: a Study in Constitutional History*, Cambridge, Mass, 1900.

Mason 1963

J. F. A. Mason, "The Honour of Richmond in 1086", *English Historical Review*, 68 (1963).

McFarlane 1945

K. B. McFarlane, "Bastard Feudalism", *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 20 (1945); repr in *England in the Fifteenth Century: Collected Essays*, ed G. L. Harriss, London, 1981.

McFarlane 1964

K. B. McFarlane, "The Wars of the Roses", *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 50 (1964); repr in Harriss, ed, *England in the Fifteenth Century*, 1981.

McFarlane 1973

K. B. McFarlane, *The Nobility of Later Medieval England*, Oxford, 1973.

Page 1914

W. Page, ed, *The Victoria History of the County of Yorkshire: the North Riding*, London, 1919.

Plummer 1885

Sir John Fortescue, *The Governance of England*, ed. Charles Plummer, London, 1885.

Pollard 1976

A. J. Pollard, "The Northern Retainers of Richard Neville, earl of Salisbury", *Northern History*, 11 (1976).

Pollard 1989

A. J. Pollard, "The North-Eastern Economy and the Agrarian Crisis of 1438-40", *Northern History*, 25 (1989).

Pollard 1990

A. J. Pollard, *North-Eastern England during the Wars of the Roses: Lay Society, War, and Politics 1450-1500*, Oxford, 1990.

Pollard 1996

A. J. Pollard, 'The Crown and the County Palatine of Durham, 1437-94', in *The North of England in the Age of Richard III*, ed Pollard, Stroud, 1996.

Pollard 2001

A. J. Pollard, *The Worlds of Richard III*, Stroud, 2001.

Prince 1933

A. E. Prince, "The Indenture System under Edward III", in *Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait*, ed J. G. Edwards and others, Manchester, 1933.

Saul 1997

Nigel Saul, *Richard II*, New Haven, 1997.

Thomas 1994

Hugh M. Thomas, "Subinfeudation and Alienation of Land, Economic Development, and the Wealth of Nobles on the Honour of Richmond, 1066 to c.1300", *Albion*, 26.3 (1994).

Thornton 2000

Tim Thornton, "Fifteenth-Century Durham and the problem of Provincial Liberties in England and the Wider Territories of the English Crown", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, sixth series, 10 (2000).