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THE Account Book printed below is of particular interest for at least two reasons: for the light it throws on the financial and political situation of the time and for the information it gives about the organization of the queen's household in the fifteenth century. It is of especial value, since the form in which it is constructed and the unusual wealth of detail that it provides make it more informative than the other extant household accounts of this century. But its worth is increased by the fact that so few of the household accounts of the fifteenth-century queens of England have survived. There are only two accounts of Queen Joan extant, none of Queen Catherine, no other of Queen Margaret, and only one of Queen Elizabeth Wydeville\(^1\); only one of these is the account of a queen-consort—Elizabeth—and not merely of a queen-dowager, and none is both as balanced and as informative as this account of Queen Margaret.

\(^1\) (a) Queen Joan's household accounts both dated from the reign of Henry V when she was only a queen-dowager, living comfortably but in captivity: Exchequer Accounts 406/30 for the period 1 October to 15 December 1419, and Rylands Latin MS. 238 for the period 17 March 1420 to 7 March 1421, published by the present writer, BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY vol. 24, pp. 263-84; vol. 26, pp. 82-100

(b) Queen Elizabeth Wydeville: Exchequer Treasury of the Receipt, Misc. Books No. 207. This account was transcribed by a former pupil of the present writer, Mr. D. H. Jones, M.A., in an unpublished thesis, entitled "A Household Account of Queen Elizabeth Woodville" and presented to the University of Liverpool in 1949.

One may also mention here the account of the household of Queen Elizabeth of York for the period 24 March 1502 to 3 March 1503 (Exchequer, Treasury of Receipt, Misc. Books 210, published by N. H. Nicolas in Privy Purse Expenses of Elizabeth of York, London, 1830). This account illustrates the point made above; that Queen Margaret's account best combines balance and information. Queen Elizabeth's account-book gives particulars of daily expenditure and supplies more details of costs than Queen Margaret's; but its information about receipts is comparatively slight, and the account as a whole is less balanced and digested in form.
Mrs. M. A. Everett-Wood briefly drew attention to its interest and value as long ago as 1846; but it does not appear to have been used by any of the biographers of the queen and has hitherto remained unpublished.

It is well known with what degree of poverty and financial disorder the Lancastrian monarchy was struggling by the reign of Henry VI; yet the resources provided for his queen were on a lavish scale from the first. In 1433 Lord Cromwell, the Treasurer of England, had estimated the net income from the crown lands at only £8,399 19s. 11d.; and Mr. A. B. Steel has calculated that in the 1440's the average amount of cash actually reaching the Exchequer each year was only £9,907 11s. 7½d. Yet a sum of £5,129 2s. could be provided to bring Henry's bride into England in 1445; and next year parliament was induced to assign as her dowry £3,000 a year from the Duchy of Lancaster and £3,666 13s. 4d. a year in cash from other sources. It is true that this total of 10,000 marks was based on precedent. Queen Joan had received a dowry of this sum on her marriage to Henry IV in 1403, and a dowry of the same amount was guaranteed to Queen Catherine by the Treaty of Troyes, which added that the queens of England were wont to enjoy such a dowry. But in the

5 Rot. Parl. v. 118-20. £2,000 was to come from Duchy of Lancaster estates assigned to her, £1,000 from a cash annuity to be drawn from Duchy of Lancaster estates, and £3,666 13s. 4d. from customs, the Duchy of Cornwall, and the royal Exchequer.
6 Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1401-5, p. 213; Rot. Parl. iii. 532.
7 Clause 3 of the Treaty of Troyes reads: "Item, concordatum est, quod praedicta carissima Filia nostra Katherina percipiet & habebit Dotem in Regno Angliae, quemadmodum Reginae Angliae hactenus percipere & habere consueverunt, videlicet, ad Summam Quadraginta Millium Scotorum annuatim; quorum Duo semper valeant unum Nobile Anglicanum" (T. Rymer, Foedera, etc. (Hague ed. 1740), iv. 2, p. 171). For the contemporary English version of this clause, see ibid. p. 179.
fourteenth century “£4,500 was the total often regarded by the convention of the time as a suitable dower”¹ for the queen consort; and in any case to fix the dowry in 1445 by traditional standards was a luxury which the royal finances could not afford. Margaret’s successor, in a reign when the finances of the Crown were being restored to a healthier state, seems to have enjoyed a dowry of only about £4,750² in nominal value.

To be assigned a dowry of 10,000 marks was, however, one thing; to succeed in collecting this amount was a different matter. It has been said that in the fourteenth century “there was often grave discrepancy between the nominal value of the queen’s possessions and the amount which actually reached her coffer”³; and this is particularly true of Queen Margaret’s household. This account includes many items where she claims revenue but nothing has in fact been received for the year under review. Her income should by now have reached £7,000 a year; for on the sudden death of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, at Bury St. Edmunds in 1447, Margaret shared in the spoils of his possessions by taking an additional annuity of 500 marks from the estates of the Duchy of Lancaster.⁴ At first sight her income for the year 31-32 Henry VI might appear to have not only equalled but exceeded this, for the total receipts amounted to £7,563 12s. 1d. But apart from the fact that £52 16s. 2d. of this was from a source not included in her dower,⁵ the sum of £2,808 19s. 10½d., forming part of the “regular” income, was arrears from previous

¹ T. F. Tout, Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England, v (Manchester, 1930), 281. As the essay in this volume on “The Queen’s Household” is not by T. F. Tout but by Professor Hilda Johnstone, this source will henceforward be referred to as Johnstone I, to distinguish it from her second essay on “The Queen’s Household” in The English Government at Work, 1327-1336, vol. i, ed. J. F. Willard and W. A. Morris (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1940), which will be designated Johnstone II.

² Jones, op. cit. p. 12.

³ Johnstone I, p. 282. Queen Catherine’s income fell considerably short in fact of the 10,000 marks promised to her; a valor of 1432 shows a gross income of only £5,098 16s. 7d., or about 6,540 marks net income (R. Somerville, A History of the Duchy of Lancaster, i (London, 1953), 208).


⁵ Queen’s gold, to be dealt with later. See below, pp. 85-86 of the introduction, and fols. 8b-11a of the text.
Moreover, many items were not received until after Michaelmas, 32 Henry VI, when the account was supposed to close. The queen's revenues were thus by no means in such a healthy state as they seem at first sight. The total is both shrunken and swollen; shrunken by the lack of many items which her officials claimed but could not collect, and swollen by the inclusion of many items which should have been paid in a previous year—or, in a less important class, by forestalling revenue which should have been left to the following year's account.

The income of the queen's household was still derived from the same sources as in the fourteenth century. Then, the queen's revenues had come from dower lands, from supplementary grants in cash, and from queen's gold. Each of these sources is still to be found in the account of Queen Margaret's household. First place is given to the income from her dower lands. In the Parliament of 1445-6 lands estimated to be worth in all £2,000 were assigned to her from the estates of the Duchy of Lancaster—especially the honours of Tutbury, Leicester, and Kenilworth, lands in Essex, Hertfordshire, Middlesex, London, and Surrey, and the southern parts. Many of these lands had been part of the dowries of fourteenth-century queens, and some were to be included amongst the dower lands of Margaret's successor. The revenue from these lands seems to have come in comparatively well, a fact which will not surprise us, for the receiver-general

1 £2,662 were arrears from the customs of Southampton, and £146 19s. 10½d. from the revenues of the Duchy of Cornwall (below, fols. 5a, 5b, 6a, 6b). The arrears stretched as far back as the 25th year of Henry VI (fol. 6a).

2 One item was not paid until 5 July, 32 Henry VI (below, fol. 1a); and although this was a special case, since the receiver in question (Robert Whitgreue) had died during the year of the account and the money had to be extracted from his executors, there are many other instances where the items were not received until January, February, March, or April, 32 Henry VI (below, fol. 1a-6b passim). No doubt they were included, nevertheless, to make the account solvent, since the expenses totalled £7,539 15s. 4¾d. (below, fol. 21b).

3 Johnstone II, p. 253. For a definition of queen's gold see below, p. 85. References to treatises by William Prynne and William Hakewill on Aurum Regnae are to be found on p. 263 of Johnstone II.


5 E.g. the High Peak, Haverford, Rockingham, Odiham, Gillingham, Plessaunce, Sheen, Queenhithe, Havering-at-Bower, Hadley, Radwell, etc. (Johnstone II, pp. 254, 258, 260; E36/207, fols. la-7b).
of the queen's revenues, William Cotton, was also the receiver-general of the Duchy. According to a long tradition, going back to 1354,\(^1\) the receiver-general was also the treasurer of the queen's household.\(^2\) The auditors of the account were also Duchy officials (one of them, John Walsh, being a Duchy auditor) and were therefore well placed to know whether the queen was receiving all her income from the Duchy. The Act of 1445-6 had also provided for a cash annuity of £1,000 from Duchy of Lancaster revenues; and this, too, seems to have been paid promptly.\(^3\)

In contrast to this efficient payment from the Duchy revenues is the dearth of income from a source granted to Margaret in 1447, the revenues of the earldom, shire, and lordship of Pembroke.\(^4\) According to an inquisition of 20 May, 29 Henry VI, this source should have produced a net income of £400 2s. 8d.; but although it had been assigned as part of the queen's dowry, it was taken into the king's hands by the act of resumption of 1450 and had been granted to Jasper, Earl of Pembroke.\(^5\) The king promised that the queen should receive all arrears of income from the earldom of Pembroke, and assigned to her other revenues in compensation; the manors and feu farms from which they are to come are named in this account.\(^6\) But nothing had been received from them for the year under review, nor had the queen had any of the arrears of revenue from the earldom of Pembroke which had been reserved to her.\(^7\)

Besides allocating revenues from the Duchy of Lancaster to her, the Act of Parliament of 1446 had assigned to the queen £1,000 from the customs of Southampton, £1,008 15s. 5d. from the issues of the Duchy of Cornwall, and £1,657 17s. 1d. from the royal Exchequer.\(^8\) None of these sources had proved satisfactory to her, however. The revenue from the customs of Southampton seems to have slipped four years into arrears, and to have been paid in full for only one of those years.\(^9\)

The inadequacy of this source was largely due to the fact that

\(^1\) Johnstone I, p. 252.  
\(^2\) Somerville, op. cit. pp. 209, 399; below, fol. la.  
\(^3\) Below, fol. 5a.  
\(^4\) Rot. Parl. v. 260b.  
\(^5\) Ibid. pp. 260b-261b.  
\(^6\) Ibid. pp. 261b-262a.  
\(^7\) Below, fol. 8a.  
\(^8\) Below, fol. 2b.  
\(^9\) Rot. Parl. v. 120.  
\(^10\) Below, fols. 5a, 6a, 6b.
parliament had in 1457 given priority to the payment of £20,000 from the customs of Southampton to the king from Christmas, 29 Henry VI, to Christmas, 31 Henry VI, with the result that she had received nothing during this period. Therefore it was enacted in the Parliament of 1453-4 that she should have the arrears of the £1,000 annual grant, and that in future this sum should be a first charge on the customs of Southampton.\(^1\) The payments from the Duchy of Cornwall had been no better. Most of the sums due had remained unpaid, and of the £1,008 15s. 5d. owed for the current year the queen's treasurer had received only £386 19s. 8\(\text{d.}\).\(^3\) But the most difficult source of all seems to have been the royal Exchequer. Over a period of four years, 28-32 Henry VI, it should have provided Queen Margaret's household with £6,631 11s. 8d. According to this account it had furnished her with merely £1,037 5s. 1d. for the year under review, and then not in ready cash but by the method of tallies or other assignments on the issues and profits of various manors, lordships, and fee-farms.\(^3\) The royal revenues were by this time in such a bad state that it would be extremely surprising if William Cotton had not found many of the tallies wholly or partially worthless, because the particular item of revenue had already been paid out to another creditor; and such proved to be the case.\(^4\) For the many uncollected items of the queen's revenue, her treasurer could only record the claims for the current and previous years, in the rather forlorn hope that the Exchequer might be able to pay the outstanding balances in future years. The unhappy experiences of Queen Margaret in her attempts to collect assignments on royal revenue may have helped to convince the government of Edward IV, in its effort at financial retrenchment and reform, that it was better not to make any grants of this kind to the queen. At any rate Queen Elizabeth's sole surviving account-book shows no revenue, or claims for revenue, from such a source; though her receiver apparently succeeded in collecting a much higher proportion of her smaller nominal income.\(^5\)

\(^1\) *Rot. Parl.* v. 258b-259b.  
\(^2\) Below, fol. 6a.  
\(^3\) Below, fol. 8a.  
\(^4\) Below, fols. 6b-8a.  
\(^5\) Apart from the claim made by both queens to queen's gold, Queen Elizabeth Wydeville's income appears to have been drawn entirely from lands and
Both queens, like their fourteenth-century predecessors, maintained their claim to queen's gold, "a sum accruing automatically to the queen consort when anybody entered into a voluntary obligation or fine with her husband, reckoned at one-tenth the value of such fine, but payable in addition to it".¹ Queen's gold had long been hard to collect, partly because those liable to pay it were sometimes unaware of their obligations, partly they were often unwilling to make this further payment in addition to their fine, and partly because it was not easy to draw the line between voluntary and compulsory fines. This prerogative, probably as old as the reign of Henry I, had needed watchful attention in the reign of Henry II;² fourteenth-century queens had met with much opposition to their claims³; and in the next reign it was to be regarded as an intolerable imposition.⁴ But whereas there was to be delay in payment of queen's gold in only two cases in Queen Elizabeth Wydeville's household account,⁵ in that of Queen Margaret most of the items of queen's gold actually received had been paid after a delay not only of months but of years, and in the great majority of instances it had so far been impossible to exact any payment.⁶ This section of the account, on the 'Aurum Reginae', confirms the impression derived from fee-farms. Her total actual income for the year 6-7 Edward IV was approximately £4,540 (the treasurer did not add up the items of revenues, but the auditors made the total £4,540 18s. 11¾d., E36/207, p. 17) as compared with the £7,500 collected by Queen Margaret's receiver; but, as was pointed out above, nearly £3,000 of Queen Margaret's income for the year 31-32 Henry VI consisted of arrears, whereas nearly all the payments to Queen Elizabeth's household seem to have been for current income.

¹ Johnstone II, p. 263. Cf. the definition given in Queen Margaret's account (below, fol. 8b).
⁵ For queen's gold from William Canynges Queen Elizabeth had had to wait only a few months; for the payment from the Prior of Bridlington there had been a delay of about 18 months (E36/207, p. 15; C.P.R. 1461-1467, pp. 433, 496).
⁶ Payments of queen's gold included in this account had arisen from fines made to the king more than five years earlier (e.g. below, fols. 9a, 10a); and unpaid claims were included on fines made as far back as 1445 and 1446 (below, fols. 8b, 10a). Of the fifty-nine claims recorded in this account, forty-three remained unpaid.
earlier sections of the receipts, that the queen’s servants were experiencing great difficulty in collecting her revenues, but displaying tenacity (probably by her orders) in maintaining her claims to them. The number of claims for queen’s gold, and the length of time over which Margaret’s treasurer was pursuing them, contrast markedly with the fewness of the claims included in Queen Elizabeth Wydeville’s account and the brief period which they cover. This tenacity is in keeping with what is already known of the Queen. Whenever the arrangements for the queen’s dower had to be altered, care was taken to try to ensure that she should not lose by the change; and numerous instances are to be found of the reservation of income to the queen when royal revenues were assigned to the royal household or acts of resumption were passed. A study of Margaret’s revenues confirms the impression of her as a woman eager for power and ever watchful to gain and to keep all the income she could, especially in view of the difficulty she experienced in collecting many items of her nominal revenue. In 1449 we find her securing a parliamentary confirmation of a royal licence to her to ship wools elsewhere than to Calais; but if this, or any other money-making schemes, brought in any additional income, it did not help the finances of her household in the year reviewed in the account.

As the income of Queen Margaret’s household is typical in its weakness of the revenues of the Lancastrian monarchy in this period, so the outgoings are characteristic in their lavishness. The liberality of the expenditure where Queen Margaret was concerned had been in evidence even before she reached England. The estimates for the cost of bringing her to England included provision for fifty-six ships to transport her and her household, and

1 Queen Margaret’s account includes fifty-nine, stretching back nearly eight years (below, fols. 8b-11a); Queen Elizabeth’s account has only eleven claims (all but one of which were paid, compared with forty-three remaining unpaid in Queen Margaret’s account) and none goes back further than two years.


3 Ibid. pp. 139, 143, 146, 158, 159, 175, 184, 218, 229, 232, 244, 246, 247, 250, 254, 264, 268, 289, 294, 302, 303, 330, 363.

4 Doubtless her appreciation of the value of money had been enhanced by the experiences of her childhood and adolescence—the impoverishment of her parents and the careful financial management of her guardian and grandmother, Queen Yolande of Aragon.

5 Ibid. pp. 146, 150.
her escort was to include five barons and baronesses, thirteen knights, forty-seven esquires (each with his own valet), eighty-two valets, twenty sumptermen, and others. The actual cost, which included not only conventional household expenses, such as food and wages, but items such as the payments of 23s. 4d. to seven trumpeters, and of 65s. 4d. for transporting a lion (given to her at Titchfield, to the Tower of London), exceeded the receipts by nearly £500. To end accounts with a deficit was to be characteristic of Margaret's finances. Nor was this by any means the only considerable expenditure incurred on the strength of inadequate resources for her arrival into England. The sum of £7,000 was, for example, taken from a half-fifteenth granted in the Parliament of 1445 to pay off debts incurred for jewels and clothing for the queen's coronation; and the king's council ordered large sums to be spent on building for the queen's arrival, as, for instance, erecting a new hall with scullery, saucery, and serving place at Eltham Palace, rebuilding the gatehouse at Sheen and walling the garden there with brick, repairing the Great Chamber, the Queen's Lodging, the Parliament Chamber, and the Painted Chamber at Westminster Palace, and constructing a coronation scaffold in Westminster Abbey. Yet we find William Cleve, clerk of the works, who had just supervised the construction of a new kitchen at the Tower of London and a new drawbridge there, petitioning the council because so far he had received no payment, and his workmen had not had their wages.

1 Stevenson, op. cit. i. 463-4.
2 Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 23,938, fol. 21a, correctly states the total cost at £5,563 17s. 5d. Stevenson, op. cit. i. 460 gives a figure of £5,573 17s. 5d.; but this is £10 too much, as may be seen by adding the "superplusagium" (debt due to the treasurer) of £434 15s. 5d. to the receipts of £5,129 2s. 0d.
3 As was shown above, her household account for the year 31-32 Henry VI has a small surplus only because it includes nearly £3,000 which should have been included in previous accounts. The five surviving accounts of her treasurers of the chamber and keeper of the jewels reveal considerable deficits (E101/409/14, 17; E101/410/2, 8, 11, for the years 24-25, 25-26, 27-28, 30-31, 31-32 Henry VI, for which the respective deficits were £31 12s. 3d., £931 18s. 7d., £786 9s. 10½d., £234 7s. 0½d., and £540 15s. 4d.). The account for 31-32 Henry VI (E101/409/11) is to be published by the present writer in a later number of the BULLETIN.
4 Rymer, op. cit. v. 1, pp. 141-2.
It is therefore not surprising to find in Margaret's household account for the year 31-32 Henry VI that in spite of the financial difficulties of the monarchy, expenditure was on a lavish scale. Some of the items were probably essential such as the wages of the household staff, their expenses while on duty, the cost of materials for drawing up the accounts—pen, ink, parchment, paper, red wax, green cloth, boxes—and so on. But we also find other items which are not routine expenses. Richard Bulstrode was paid £25 9s. 0d. for materials and wages for a "disguising" at the manor of Pleasance at Christmas; a Venetian merchant received £73 12s. 6d. for cloth, silk, and gold; Matthew Philip, a goldsmith of London, was owed £125 10s. for jewels and goldsmith's work. These, however, are small items compared with the £566 13s. 4d. provided for the queen's privy purse, the £733 16s. 5d. paid to Edward Ellesmere, treasurer of her chamber and keeper of her jewels, and the £2,073 5s. 8\frac{1}{4}d. delivered to John Norris, keeper of her great wardrobe. It is true that the queen was spared the large expense which she had two years later, when she gave £3,668 to shore up the tottering finances of her husband's household; but her total household expenditure of £7,539 15s. 4\frac{3}{4}d. seems to have been higher than the usual outlay of fourteenth-century queens, and it was much greater than the cost of her successor's household.

The interest of the expenditure section of this account does not end, however, with the light it throws on the scale of the queen's spending. It is of especial value for the unusual information it affords of the organization of the queen's household at this time. The arrangement of the account is not by any means entirely unconventional. The statement of receipts is similar in form to that in the account of John Forster, receiver-general of

1 Below, fols. 12a-18a. 2 Below, fols. 18b, 19a. 3 Below, fols. 20a, 20b, 21a. The expenditure on Queen Elizabeth Wydeville's great wardrobe for 6-7 Edward IV was only £209 13s. 9\frac{3}{4}d. 4 E101/410/15. Account of William Fallen, treasurer of the royal household for 33-34 Henry VI. The queen's contribution was not even for a whole year, for the account covered merely the period 3 December, 33 Henry VI—11 May, 34 Henry VI. 5 Johnstone I, pp. 231 ff, esp. pp. 264-84; Johnstone II, pp. 253-66. Queen Elizabeth's account is not totalled but the expenses amount to about £4,600 (E36/207, pp. 18-40).
Queen Elizabeth Wydeville for the years 6-7 Edward IV; and both accounts open their statement of expenses with "Feoda militum dominarum et damicellarum infra curiam Regine". This section includes the same officials in both accounts, except that John Forster's account illogically includes the wages of the clerk of the signet at this stage, whereas this official is more rationally grouped with the other clerks in William Cotton's account. But whereas John Forster's account goes straight on to the section "Feoda et vadia officiariorum Regine extra hospicium", William Cotton interposes three sections, giving us the names and wages of all the esquires, clerks, yeomen, grooms, and pages of the queen's household, together with the number of days they were in attendance in her court. This is unique among the extant accounts of the queens of this century; it affords a valuable insight into the organization of the queen's household, especially as the amount states, wherever possible, the special occupation of the clerk, yeoman, groom, or page in question. These particulars were compiled, as William Cotton tells us, from the checkrolls in which were entered the names of all those serving the queen in her household and the number of days when they were in attendance on her. The normal method of making a statement of accounts of the royal household for audit in the Exchequer in this century was to give simply the total spent day by day on basic daily wages. If anything else relating to wages was included, it was only a relatively brief statement of the quarterly or half-yearly fees (feoda) and rewards (regarda), which

---

1 Below, fol. 12a; E36/207, pp. 18-19.
2 The amounts paid were the same in each account, except that Barbalina, one of the principal ladies-in-waiting in the household of Queen Margaret, received 40 marks a year, whereas her successor in Queen Elizabeth's household received only 20 marks.
3 Below, fols. 12b-14a.
4 It does not appear that we are provided with a complete list of the queen's household staff; the chaplains are conspicuous by their absence. Cf. Letters of Queen Margaret of Anjou (ed. C. Munro, Cam. Soc. 1863), p. 91, for a letter from Queen Margaret to the Abbess of Shaftesbury in 1447 to obtain the rectory of Corfe Castle for her chaplain, Michael Tregory.
5 E.g. fol. 12b: vt in rotulis vocatis chekrolles annotati existant vbi omnium armigerorum nomina ac numerus dierum sic servicium et expectancium singillatim specificantur.
were supplements to the basic wage.\(^1\) This is the only account of this century which reveals the basic rates of pay for the different grades in a royal household. It is additional evidence that the Black Book of the Household of Edward IV was correct in its statement of the rates of wages for the various grades of household officials.\(^2\) The list also shows that the queen was not stinted in the number of her servants, and that she was successful in avoiding much reduction of her household in the following year. In 1454 the King's household was reduced in size as an economy measure during his illness, and Queen Margaret's household was to consist of 120 persons.\(^3\) In this account we see that the total number of her officials and servants within the household was not many more than that in 1452-3, so that the reduction to be made in her staff the following year can have been only slight.\(^4\)

Not only the number of her servants but the payment to them was not meagre. The sections which follow in the account deal with higher officers of the household, their expenses outside the household, and payments to persons outside the household who have rendered some service to it during the year under review. These sections are paralleled by corresponding parts in the household account of Queen Elizabeth Wydeville. The officials and the amounts to be paid to them are often the same in the latter account as in the former; indeed, John Forster twice refers to an account of Queen Margaret's household as a precedent—probably this very one.\(^5\) But quite a number of expenses which

\(^1\) E.g. E101/409/9, fols. 36a-38a; E101/409/11, fols. 37b-40a; E101/409/16, fols. 33b-36b; E101/410/9, fols. 42b-45a (Accounts of controllers and treasurers of the household for the years 20-21, 22-23, 25-26, 30-31 Henry VI, sections on “Feoda et roba”).


\(^3\) Nicolas, op. cit. vi. 233. The Black Book of the Household of Edward IV allows the queen’s household only 100 servants (Household Ordinances, p. 24).

\(^4\) It is difficult to draw a clear line between the queen’s servants who are to be reckoned within the household, and those who are to be counted as servants outside; but it looks from this account as though the number of officials and servants who should properly be included within her household was not more than 130. It is true that, as stated above, no provision seems to have been made for some kinds of household officials, e.g. chaplains; perhaps such persons were paid by the treasurer of the king’s household.

\(^5\) E.g. £10 is to be paid to Queen Elizabeth’s chancellor, Roger Radcliff, for his
are set down by the accountant at the same figure as in William Cotton’s account (or at a lower figure) are either totally disallowed by the auditors or reduced substantially, usually to half the original amount. These reductions are always said to be by the queen’s orders—"mandato domine Regine". Moreover, where in some cases Elizabeth made do with one official, Margaret had had two. Thus whereas John Aleyn seems to have acted both as clerk of the signet and secretary in the household of Queen Elizabeth, and at a fee of only £4 (which was disallowed), George Ashby was clerk of the signet, at a fee of £6 13s. 4d., and Nicholas Carent was her "secretarius". In addition, the highest paid official of Queen Margaret’s account, the chief steward of her estates, Viscount Beaumont, at a fee of £66 13s. 4d., does not appear in Queen Elizabeth’s account. This fee had been that of the steward of the queen’s lands in the fourteenth century; and indeed the spirit behind the fees paid to Margaret’s household officials seems in general more akin to the generosity or extravagance of Isabella and Philippa than to the parsimony or thrift of Elizabeth.

In general, however, the organization of Queen Margaret’s household was, as one might expect, nearer to that of Elizabeth’s household in London, “pro vt Laurentius Bothe, clericus, nuper cancellarius Margarete . . . de eadem habuit et percepit et pro vt huiusmodi allocacio facta fuit eidem Laurencio in compoti Willelmi Cotton, nuper receptoris generalis eiusdem Margarete, de anno XXXI mo Henrici” (E36/207, p. 19). (William Cotton’s account, printed below, relates to a year, eleven months of which lay within 31 Henry VI). The same authority is given for an allowance of 20s. for wages for Radcliff’s journey on business from London to Windsor, for a fee of £10 to John Forster and for an allowance of 45s. to him for a journey from London to Windsor (ibid. pp. 19-21). William Cotton had in turn quoted Queen Catherine’s household as a precedent. Below, fol. 14b.

1 E.g. Robert Radcliff’s fee of £40 as chancellor (the same as Laurence Bothe’s in Queen Margaret’s household) is reduced by the auditors to £20; and the fee of £10 for his household, referred to in the previous note, is disallowed entirely. There are twelve more such amendments by the auditors (E36/207, pp. 19-31).

2 E36/207, p. 19; below, fol. 17b. "Secretarius" may merely mean "confidential clerk", as it had originally done; Carent does not seem to have been as important as Ashby.

3 Johnstone I, p. 254.

4 E.g. Queen Philippa’s general attorney in 1337 received a fee of £6 13s. 4d. for that part of his work relating to the household revenues (Johnstone II, p. 287); Robert Tanfield, Queen Margaret’s general attorney, was allowed £10 a year (below, fol. 15a); and John Dyve, attorney-general to Queen Elizabeth, was conceded only £5 (E36/207, pp. 21-2).
than to those of the fourteenth century. Both queens had a chancellor—Margaret’s being Laurence Bothe, already prebendary of St. Paul’s, and soon to be its Dean. In this he resembled the chancellor of Queen Elizabeth in the year 6-7 Edward IV, Robert Radcliff, who was also, at the time of the year under review, a prebendary of St. Paul’s, of which he also later became dean.\(^1\) The subsequent careers of the two men were, however, very different, probably in large measure because of the contrasts in the characters and opportunities of the queens they served. Robert Radcliff died in 1471 still Dean of St. Paul’s.\(^2\) The dominating personality of Queen Margaret, always quick and determined to help those in whom she trusted, did much better for her chancellor. He probably owed his position in the first place to the confidence reposed by the queen in his brother, and predecessor as her chancellor, William Bothe, created in 1447 Bishop of Lichfield, whom her influence had helped in 1451 to secure promotion to the archbishopric of York.\(^3\) It may have been her backing which advanced Laurence to the office of keeper of the privy seal in 1456; it was certainly her support which led to his appointment in January 1457 as one of the tutors to the Prince of Wales, and in September of the same year as Bishop of Durham. Indeed, the latter appointment was a striking testimony to her forcefulness; for Henry VI had already nominated his physician, John Arundell, to the vacant see, and the more energetic recommendation of Queen Margaret was one of the factors which led Pope Calixtus III to provide Laurence Bothe to the bishopric instead.\(^5\) While he was chancellor to


\(^2\) Whereas he held only one prebend from 1458 until his appointment as dean ten years later, Laurence Bothe was given two more prebends in 1453, both on the same day, 21 November (ibid. pp. 407, 449), five years after his appointment to the first prebend in 1449 and less than two months after the close of this household account. Two years later, on 22 November 1456, he was elected Dean.

\(^3\) Rymer, op. cit. v. 1, pp. 171-2; v. 2, p. 43; William Bothe had also been a prebendary of St. Paul’s; he was appointed in 1443 (Le Neve, op. cit. ii. 375).


\(^5\) Rymer, op. cit., v. 2, pp. 77-8. After reciting how the king had formerly written on behalf of Laurence Bothe, the papal bull continues: “In cujus etiam singularem & praecipuam commendationem novissime accepmus Litteras,
Queen Margaret, his post seems to have been no sinecure. The account shows how at every stage almost all payments of importance were authorized by warrants or letters patent under the queen's great seal; and the scale of activity of the queen's household must have kept the chancellor and his subordinates busy.

Both chancellors had a clerk of the registers to help them, but Elizabeth was not prepared to pay to her clerk the £5 fee which Margaret allowed to hers. All these warrants and the receipts for payments were stored away ready for the compilation of the account, as is carefully stated in each case. The chancellor's clerk was not the only one writing documents for the queen, however. There was a clerk of the receipt, who deputized for the receiver-general in his absence, and wrote a roll of the knights' fees, indentures, acquittances, obligations, and other memoranda relating to the office of the receiver-general. Margaret's clerk of the receipt, William Nanseglos (who was also receiver of the queen's revenues from Essex, Hertfordshire, Middlesex, and London) was also paid a fee of £5 which was denied to the corresponding official in Queen Elizabeth's household. The clerk of the jewels kept records of the queen's purchases and gifts, and of her personal expenditure, under the direction of the treasurer of her chamber and keeper of her jewels. The clerk of the signet presumably wrote the documents which were sealed with her signet seal; in the nature of the case this account does not include any mention of such documents, for once money had been paid into the queen's chamber and the treasurer of the household had been given receipts for it under her great seal, his responsibility was at an end. The queen's secretary had a particular responsibility for the acts of the council; and, finally,
the clerk of the auditors had the task of engrossing the accounts of various receivers, bailiffs, and feodaries, as well as compiling the treasurer’s account.\(^1\) Some idea of the relative amount of writing done by three of these clerks may be gained from the amount of writing materials bought for them during the year of the account. The parchment, paper, red wax, and ink bought and expended by the queen’s chancery cost 60s., the materials for the receiver-general’s office cost 46s. 8d., and the secretary of the council was supplied with writing materials to the value of 40s.\(^2\)

The clerical and financial officials were not the only important members of the staff of the queen’s household. There was the chamberlain, Sir John Wenlock,\(^3\) whose financial activities did not leave much mark on the treasurer’s account; his chief financial function was presumably to authorize payments from the queen’s privy purse, which did not concern the treasurer of the household.\(^4\) It is significant, in this age of litigation, that a much more prominent place in the accounts is occupied by the law-officers of the queen. Chief among them was Robert Tanfield. As her attorney-general he had the task of prosecuting and defending all kinds of pleas and actions for or against the queen in all the king’s courts; but his usual work seems to have been in the exchequer, where most of the queen’s legal business would naturally lie.\(^5\) Indeed, he had two assistant attorneys to help him in the Exchequer, so great was the pressure of business there. The queen had also three other attorneys, John Vailard, Thomas Lloyd, and Simon Elleryngton, who looked after her interests in the royal chancery and the courts of king’s bench.

\(^1\) Below, fol. 18a. Margaret’s clerk of the auditors slipped in the statement that this was a “great labour” and was paid 40s. for his pains. Elizabeth’s account was compiled by her clerk of the receipts; he was less fortunate, for his fee of £5 was disallowed by the auditors (E36/207, p. 24).

\(^2\) Below, fol. 17b.

\(^3\) He had been usher of the queen’s chamber since at least January 1447, and chamberlain since at least January 1450 (C.P.R. 1446-1452, pp. 28, 311).

\(^4\) See below, fol. 21a, for five large payments, totalling £566 13s. 4d., into the queen’s chamber.

\(^5\) Below, fol. 15a; cf. E36/207, p. 22, for a similar description of the duties of John Dyve, attorney-general to Queen Elizabeth. John Dyve does not appear to have had the two assistant attorneys in the Exchequer enjoyed by Robert Tanfield (below, fol. 16a).
and common pleas. Besides this, five apprentices-at-law were retained at a fee of 26s. 8d. each per annum to be of the queen’s council.

The queen’s council played an important role in administering the large share of the Duchy of Lancaster estates which had been assigned as her dowry, and the household which those estates substantially helped to support. It met every day, and the queen had a council chamber assigned to her in the palace of Westminster. To this council chamber some of the members of the council travelled at times from a distance, and it was doubtless of this council chamber that William Randolf was the usher. The council had an envoy, Roger Morecroft, who was also usher and keeper of the “new tower” at Westminster which the king had assigned to the queen not only for the meetings of her council but also for the safe custody of her books and evidences. The council included not only officials of the household but persons from outside—some of them very important, as, for instance, Edmund Beaufort, Duke of Somerset. Some of its members were not only household officials but collectors of her revenues, thus linking the central and local administration of her affairs.

1 Below, fol. 16a. Queen Elizabeth’s account names attorneys in the courts of Common Pleas (Thomas Thoralde) and King’s Bench (Thomas Luyt), but not in the Chancery. On the other hand it names a solicitor-general, Robert Iseham (E36/207, pp. 23, 25).

2 Below, fol. 16a. Queen Elizabeth paid only two apprentices-at-law (Henry Suthill and Thomas Urswick), but she also paid two serjeants-at-law (Thomas Young and John Catesby.) (E36/207, pp. 25, 26).

3 Below, fol. 19b. Thomas, Lord Scales, was paid “pro diurna diligencia et attendencia in consilio eiusdem Regine.”

4 Below, fol. 16b; C.P.R. 1452-1461, pp. 114, 487.

5 E.g. William Cotton from Suffolk to London.

6 Below, fol. 16a; cf. E36/207, p. 26, where John Wode is also called “hostiarius domus magni consilii” and seven other ushers are paid, as in Queen Margaret’s household, “pro eorum attendencia consilio prefate Regine in officijs suis.”

7 Below, fol. 16b; cf. E36/207, p. 26, for the payment of David Gogh for the same duties, where the precedent of “Roger Morecroft”, messenger for the council and keeper of the new tower, “tempore Margarete, nuper de facto set non de jure Regine Anglie”, is adduced.

8 Below, fol. 17a.

9 Cf. William Nanseglos, collector of the queen’s revenues in Essex, Hertfordshire, Middlesex, and London, who was also clerk of the Queen’s receipt (below, fols. 1b, 16a), and Edward Ellesmere, collector of the queen’s revenues from Marlborough and Devizes, who was also treasurer of the chamber (below, fols. 2a, 20a).
The principal members of Queen Margaret's council at the time of this account seem to have included Viscount Beaumont, her chief steward, Sir John Wenlock, her chamberlain, Laurence Bothe, her chancellor, William Cotton, her receiver-general and treasurer of her household, Edward Hall and Andrew Agard, her knight carvers, Edward Ellesmere, the treasurer of her chamber, Robert Tanfield, her attorney-general, and ten other attorneys and apprentices-at-law.¹

It is easier to note members of Queen Margaret's council in her account than to discern clear evidence of its functions. A century earlier the queen's council had had judicial, administrative, and advisory functions²; and it may well have continued to exercise these as actively in the fifteenth century. It seems to be suggested by the daily meetings of the council, and the recorded journeyings of members of the queen's council about the country engaged on her business.³ Queen Margaret's council could make appointments and perform executive actions⁴; but there are few references in this account to such exercises of authority. In theory the queen was the mainspring of the household organization, as she had been in the days of Queen Isabella and Queen Philippa⁵; and all the instructions to the household officials were issued in her name alone. Doubtless with a queen so vigorous and determined as Queen Margaret the theory was also the reality; and the council, though active, may well have been strictly subordinate to the wishes and commands of the queen. Not that Queen Margaret failed to appreciate the labours of her councillors and officials on her behalf. On the contrary, her ardent nature impelled her to push their interests as energetically as possible. We have already observed an instance

¹ Below, fols. 14b-15a, fols. 20a-20b, fol. 12a, fol. 15b, fol. 16a. Viscount Beaumont was the steward of the queen's lands, not, apparently, of her household, and received the same fee as Philippa's steward of the queen's lands had done (Johnstone II, p. 254). It is interesting that neither Margaret's nor Elizabeth's account mention the steward, controller, or cofferer of the household, who had been so prominent in the fourteenth century households (Johnstone I, pp. 236-57).
² Johnstone II, p. 292.
³ Below, fols. 14b-16b; E36/207, pp. 21, 22.
⁴ Below, fols. 16a, 16b. Roger Morecroft was sent to various parts of England "per mandatum dicte Regine et consiliij sui".
⁵ Johnstone II, p. 291.
of this in the case of Laurence Bothe, her chancellor, and other examples may be found in her letters. Some of them were written on behalf of officials of her household mentioned in this account,¹ and almost all were addressed to influential persons on behalf of protégés of hers. And, as her most recent biographer has pointed out, when her influence was dominant in the government in 1457 and 1458 "she used her period of influence and power to secure promotion for those whom she favoured".²

This eager and incautious support met with varying response from the officials of her household. William Cotton, her treasurer and receiver-general, died fighting on the Lancastrian side at the first battle of St. Albans in 1455³ and Viscount Beaumont, her chief steward, perished in the Lancastrian cause at the battle of Northampton in 1460.⁴ On the other hand, Laurence Bothe made his peace with Edward IV, and found sufficient favour with him to be elevated in 1476 to the archbishopric of York⁵; and Sir John Wenlock, her chamberlain, deserted to the Yorkist side as early as 1455.⁶

¹ Letters of Queen Margaret of Anjou, p. 94 (for Nicholas Carent, Dean of Wells, her secretary); p. 97 (for Thomas Burneby, sewer for the mouth); pp. 107, 108 (for Thomas Sharnborne, a squire of her household); p. 114 (for George Asheby, clerk of her signet); p. 115 (for Margaret Stanlowe, one of her gentlewomen); p. 119 (for Viscount Beaumont, her chief steward, and Edmund Clere, a squire of her household); p. 133 (for Thomas Hery, a groom of her chamber); p. 151 (for Thomas Mowsherst, a yeoman of her household); cf. below, fols. 12a, 12b, 13a, 13b, 17b. On p. 112 of the Letters is a message of 1447-8 from the queen to the customers of Southampton, exhorting them to pay the overdue instalment of her dowry from that port.

³ Paston Letters, i. 333.
⁵ Rymer, op. cit. v. 3, p. 70.
⁶ At the first battle of St. Albans (22 May 1455) he was wounded while fighting on the Lancastrian side (The Paston Letters, i. 331); but in July of the same year he was elected speaker of the commons in the Yorkist Parliament summoned after the battle (Rot. Parl. v. 278), and by 1458 he was sufficiently in the confidence of the Duke of York to be sent to treat for the marriage of one of the duke’s sons to the grand-daughter of the Duke of Burgundy, and, failing that, to one of the French princesses (Stevenson, op. cit. i. 361-77). In 1460 we find Wenlock’s cook, John Byschoppe, leading the attack on the carts of victuals sent to Queen Margaret and her army by the lord mayor of London after the 2nd battle of St. Albans (Gregory’s Chronicle, ed. J. Gairdner, Camden Society, 1876, p. 214). In view of his subsequent desertion to the Lancastrian side, with Warwick, in 1470,
The effects of the queen's dominating personality are also to be seen in some of the largest payments recorded in this account. One of them, it is true, was fixed by custom—the payment for the expenses of the queen and her servants at the rate of £7 a day when she was residing in the king's household.¹ This accounted for £967 7s. 3d. paid to Lord Stourton, formerly treasurer of the king's household, during the years 28-31 Henry VI, and for £797 8s. 11½d. paid to Lord Dudley, his successor for the years 31-32 Henry VI.² But even in this case the expenditure appears to have exceeded that of Queen Elizabeth Wydeville, in whose account there was no corresponding allocation, though she must have dwelt in her husband's household for part of the year; and in all the other large items Queen Margaret's expenditure was on a grander scale than that of her successor. Margaret's clerk avener, who looked after her stables, was allowed £418 19s. 3½d. to maintain them for the year; Elizabeth's clerk avener received only £208 6s. 8d. for the same purpose.³ To her great wardrobe, which supplied articles of clothing and stocks of dress materials, Queen Margaret assigned £2,073 5s. 8½d.; her successor allocated only £1,200 3s. 0½d. for the purchase of such items.⁴ At first sight it may appear as though Queen Margaret's personal resources for exercising her influence were smaller than those of Queen Elizabeth. The latter took for her privy purse £918 18s. 0½d. for the year 6-7 Edward IV compared with only £566 13s. 4d. recorded as paid into her predecessor's chamber during the year of the account.⁵ But Queen Elizabeth's account makes no mention of an allocation to the treasurer of the chamber and keeper of the jewels; whereas Edward Ellesmere, the holder of this position in 1452-3, received in all for his office £800 9s. 9d.⁶

¹ See the statement of the Black Book of the Household of Edward IV on this matter (Household Ordinances, p. 24).
² Below, fol. 20b. In the fourteenth century "it was common for the queen's wardrobe to make grants to the king's" (Johnstone I, p. 283).
³ Below, fols. 19a, 20a; E36/207, p. 39.
⁴ Below, fol. 20a; E36/207, pp. 37, 38.
⁵ E36/207, p. 40; below, fol. 20b.
⁶ Below, fols. 20a, 20b.
Thus Queen Margaret received for all aspects of her chamber expenditure £1,719 7s. 9¼d., an unusually impressive sum with which to make her influence felt. With its aid she could reward her friends by gifts of cash, presents of jewels and other favours, and overawe her foes by the extent of her power.\(^1\) In the struggles which were soon to usher in the Wars of the Roses the queen increasingly took the lead in organizing the forces of the house of Lancaster; and in this task she would need every penny she could gain from her household resources.\(^2\) In following her indomitable efforts in that struggle we are helped by the light shed by this account on the extent of those resources, the way in which they were used, and the organization and personnel of her household which carried out her purposes.

1 See, for example, the five surviving accounts of her treasurers of the chamber for the years 24-25, 25-26, 27-28, 30-31, 31-32 Henry VI (E101/409/14, 17; E101/410/2, 8, 11), which show long lists of gifts of jewels and other presents to servants, friends, and allies. Cf. Paston Letters, i. 378: “The Quene is a grete and stronge labourid woman, for she spareth noo peyne to sue hire thinges to an intent and conclusion to hir power” (John Bocking to Sir John Fastolf, 9 February 1456).

2 Davies’s Chronicle, p. 79, says of her in the year 1459-60: “The queen with such as were of her affynyte rewled the reame as her lyked, gaderyng ryches innumerable”; but all the indications are that the struggle against her foes was a heavy drain on her resources instead of augmenting them. The same source goes on to tell, in the same paragraph, how in order to gain support in Cheshire she kept “open household” there and caused her son the prince to give a livery of swans to all the gentlemen of the countryside.


4 For an annotated biography of William Cotton see Somerville, op. cit. p. 399 In addition to the information given there it may be mentioned that the patent roll tells us he had surrendered the office of keeper of the great wardrobe by 14 June 1453 (C.P.R. 1452-1461, p. 77).
huiusmodi receptoris per ipsum causa officij sui receptis quam de solucionibus, misis, custubus, et expensis a festo Sancti Michælis anno xxxjmo Regis Henrici sexti vsque idem festum extunc proxime sequentem anno eiusdem Regis xxxijdo, scilicet per vnum annum integrum.

Arreragia—Nullum, quia in superplusagio super terminacione vltimi compoti sui anni proxime precedentis———Nullum.

Recepta denariiis de receptore de Tuttebury

Et de denariis receptis de Roberto Whitgreue, armigero, nuper receptore ibidem, tam de arreragiiis suis anni precedentis quam de exitibus recepte sue huius anni ad iij vices, videlicet, prima vice xvo die Maij dicto anno xxxijmo de exitibus xxxijli.vij.s.vij.d., secunda vice xxj die Julij eodem anno per manus Johannis Norrys de arreragiiis suis viij.li.vij.s.ij.d.ob.q., et tercia vice per manus administratoris bonorum et catallorum dicti Roberti ad manus Johannis Hattecliff primo die Marcij supradicto anno xxxijmo xx.li., per iij indenturas restitutas

Et de denariis receptis de Roberto Hill, receptore ibidem de exitibus recepte sue huius anni ad iij vices, videlicet, prima xxv° die Decembris dicto anno xxxijmo cc.li., secunda vice xjmo die Februarij eodem anno cx.li.ix.s.ij.d., et tercia vice xxv°die eiusdem mensis cum uij.h. per manus Radulphi Pole xx.li., per iij indenturas vt supra restitutas—cccxxx.li.ix.s.ij.d.

Et de eodem de huiusmodi exitibus recepte sue per manus Walteri Blounte, balliiui Alti Pecci, die Aprillis supradicto xxxijmo xij° die Aprilis, per indenturas inde restitutas—xx.li.

Et de eodem de huiusmodi exitibus recepte sue per manus dicti Walteri, balliiui Alti Pecci, xij° die Aprilis supradicto xxxijmo, per iij indenturas inde restitutas—xx.li.

1 Tutbury and High Peak were both parts of the honour of Tutbury, from which revenues to the annual value of £927 17s. 4⅜d. were assigned to the queen in 1446 (Rot Parl. v. 118). It will be noted that for the year covered by this account she had received only £526 9s. 8½d., and then only by including items paid in well after the end of the financial year.

2 For Robert Whitgreue’s career see Somerville, op. cit. p. 543; also J. Wedgwood, History of Parliament, Biographies of Members of the Commons House, 1439-1509(H.M.S.O., 1936), p. 941. He attended the coronation of Queen Margaret (Exchequer Accounts, 361/6). He died in 1452 (not in 1449, an alternative suggested by Somerville), and this explains why the first two payments were made by him and the third was made by the administrators of his goods and chattels.

3 See Somerville, op. cit. pp. 540 and 545.


5 See note 1 above.

6 Humphrey Whitgreue was the son of Robert Whitgreue. See Somerville, op. cit. pp. 550, Wedgwood, op. cit. p. 941, and C.P.R. 1452-1461, p. 326. It is not known what kinship Thomas Whitgreue was to Robert.
nuper receptoris ibidem, vi° die Julij dicto anno xxxijdo, per indenturam
xx.li.xix.s.

Et eidem receptori de huiusmodi recepta sua per manus dicti Roberti Hille, receptoris ibidem, ad manus auditoris super vadiis suis——vij.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d.

Et eidem receptori per manus eiusdem Roberti, de huiusmodi recepta sua, iijto die Junij dicto anno xxxijdo, per indenturam——vij.li.

Summa pagine——Dxxvj.li.xix.s.vij.d.ob.q.

fol. Ib

Leycestr’

Et de Thoma Staunton, armigerio, receptori ibidem, de exitibus recepte sue huius anni ad vij vices, videlicet, prima vice nono die Maj dicto anno xxxijmo xxvij.li., secunda vice xixno die Septembris supradiicto anno xxxijdo xxvij.li., tercia vice xxjmo die Nouembris eodem anno xx.li., iijta vice xxijdo die eiusdem mensis xx.li., quinta vice xxij9 die eiusdem mensis per manus Johannes vicecomitis Beaumont xxxij.li.vij.s.vij.d., sexta vice xxvij9 die Januarij dicto anno xxxiiijdo l.li., et vija vice xjmo die Februarij eodem anno per manus Johannes Stanford cx.s.sij.d.ob., per vij indenturas inde restitutas

xx

Summa——xxijjx.li.xvij.s.x.d.ob.

Recepta denarioarum de recepta de Kenelworth

Et de Johanne Beaufitz, receptore ibidem, de exitibus recepte sue huius anni ad iij vices, videlicet, vna vice tercio die Maj dicto anno xxxjmo vj.li.xiiij.s.iiijd., et altera vice xixmo die Februarij supradiicto anno xxxijto xij.li.xj.s.vij.d., per ii indenturas inde restitutas——xijx.li.v.s.

Et de eodem de huiusmodi exitibus recepte sue per manus Johannis Walshh auditoris super feoda et vadia sua sine indentura——xli

Summa——xxix.li.v.s.

Recepta denarioarum de recepta de Berkhamstede

Et de Johanne Thirlowe, receptore ibidem, de exitibus recepte sue huius anni per manus Johannis Stanford ad diuersas vices, videlicet, prima vice xjmo die

1 Revenues to the annual value of £250 7s. 11%d. were assigned in 1446 to the queen from the honour of Leicester (Rot. Parl. vi. 118a). She managed to draw only just over £180 of this for the year of this account.
3 The annual value of the castle and lordship of Kenilworth assigned to the queen in 1446 was said to be £15 4s. 6%d. (Rot. Parl. v. 119a); so she may have received some arrears this year.
4 See Somerville, op. cit. p. 562.
5 The revenues from Berkampstead should have amounted to 40 marks (£26 13s. 4%d.) a year (C.P.R. 1452-1461, p. 340). The honour and manor of B. were in 1495 assigned in jointure to Elizabeth, Queen of Henry VII (Rot. Parl. vi. 462b).

Summa———xxj.li.vj.s.x.d.

Recepta denariorum de recepta comitatus Essex, Hertfordshire, Middlesex, et Londonie

Et de Willelmo Nanseglos,\(^2\) receptore ibidem, de exitibus recepse sue huius anni ad xj vices, videlicet, prima vice vltimo die Maij dicto anno xxxiijmo iiiij xij.li., secunda vice iiiijto die Junij eodem anno xxiiij.li.x.s., tercia vice xij die Octobris supradicto anno xxxiiijto xx.li., iiiijta vice xxiiijto die eiusdem mensis x.li.xiiij.s. iiiij.d., vta vice nono die Augesiadem eodem anno lxxix.li.xiiij.s.iiiij.d., vijta vice iiijto die Decembris anno predicto xxxix.li.v.s.x.d., viijTa vice xij die Januarij eodem anno xj.li.x.s., viijTa vice xxmo die Octobris anno supradicto per manus Petri Preston\(^*\) iiiij.li.xvij.s.vj.d., ixna vice xx° die eiusdem mensis per manus firmanij terre domanij de Walden cvj.s.vj.d., xma vice xxmo die Februarij anno predicto iiiij.li.xv.s.q.d., et xjTa vice secundo die Aprillis dicto anno xxxiiijdo xxxiiij.li.xxij.d., per v indenturas inde restitutas———cccliij.li.xiiij.s.vq.d.

Summa———cccliij.li.xiiij.s.vq.d.

Recepta denariorum de recepta in partibus australibus


Summa———clxxiiij.li.xvj.s.iiij.d.ob.

Recepta denariorum de Marleburgh et Devyses

1 These are the revenues of the honours of Tutbury, Lancaster and Leicester in the shires of Essex, Hertford, Middlesex, and London, assigned to the queen in 1446 (Rot. Parl. v. 118b). Their annual value is not stated separately.

2 See Somerville, op. cit. p. 608.

3 The term “south parts” denoted an administrative unit of the Duchy of Lancaster and comprised its estates in the shires of Southampton, Wiltshire, Somerset, Dorset, Devon, Cornwall, Berkshire, Oxford, Hereford, and Worcester. (Somerville, op. cit. p. 99, 104 n. 1, 113 n. 4).

4 See Somerville, op. cit. p. 622.

5 Cf. C.P.R. 1446-1452, p. 559, where a grant of the revenues of Marlborough and Devises and other lands, originally made to her by letters patent dated 24 February 1447, is now (28 February 1452) confirmed to her for life. M. and D. were granted to Queen Elizabeth Wydeville in 1467 (Rot. Parl. v. 627b).
Et de Edwardo Ellesmere, receptore ibidem, de exitibus recepte sue huius anni xjmo die Marcij anno xxxijd. dicti Regis Henrici Sexti, per indenturam inde restitutam —————————————— ciiij.li.

Recepta denario rum de recepta de Middelton' et Merden'

Et de Johanne Thornebury, armigero, receptore ibidem, de exitibus recepte sue huius anni per manus Edwardi Ellesmere ad duas vices, videlicet, vna vice penultimo die Januarij supradicto anno xxxijd. xl.li., et altera vice tercio die Marcij eodem anno xl.li., per ij indenturas inde restitutas —————————————— iiiij.li.

Recepta denario rum de feodo nomine Comitis Essex

Et de Johanne Pygote, vicecomite comitatus Essex, anno xxvto dicti regis Henrici sexti de parte xl.li.x.s.x.d. per annum de feodo nomine comitis eiusdem comitatus Ducatui Regis Lancastrie pertinente annuatim, percipiendo per manus vicecomitis eiusdem comitatus pro tempore existentis ad terminos Pasche et Sancti Michelis equaliter et dicte Margarete Regine in dotem concesso, videlicet, in partem solucionis feodi predicti pro dicto anno xxv per indenturam inde penes dictum Johannem remanentem —————————— x.li.x.s.x.d.

De xxx.li. residuentibus dicti xl.li.x.s.x.d. de feodo nomine comitis comitatus predicti dicte Regine anno xxvto debitis non reddit, eo quod restant in manus dicti Johannis Pygote vicecomitis ibidem eodem anno nondum solute vnde idem vicecomes debet Regine respondere. Et recept ———————————— Nihil.

Nec reddit de xl.li.x.s.x.d. de consimili feodo nomine comitis eiusdem comitatus domino Regi ducatui sue predicte pertinente annuatim, percipiendis vt supra ad terminos predictos equaliter et eidem Regine vt pro anno xxvijd. dicti Regis Henrici Sexti debitis, eo quod remanent in manus Georgij Langham vicecomitis predicti eodem anno xxvijd. nondum soluti, vnde idem vicecomes debet Regine respondere. Et recept ———————————— Nihil.

Set reddit de denariis receptis de Johanne Godmerston, vicecomite comitatus predicti, supradicto anno xxxijd. de feodo nomine comitis eiusdem comitatus xl.li.x.s.x.d. per annum percipiendis ad terminos supradictos equaliter, videlicet, in persolucione feodi predicti pro eodem anno xxxijd. per indenturam inde penes dictum Johannem remanentem ———————————— xl.li.x.s.x.d.

Summa —————————— li.li.xx.d.

Summa pagine —————————— ccciiiijv.li.xvii.s.ob.

3 The Fee of the Shire of Essex, granted in 1446, should have been worth £40 10s. 10d. a year (Rot. Parl. v. 119a).
Recepta denarioorum de thesauriarj domanij et comitatus Pembroke

De aliquibus denarioorum summis per ipsum recepturis de arreragiis aliquorum balliivorum aut ministrorum diuersorum et manerijorum ibidem hoc anno non reddit, eo quod aliquos [sic] huiusmodi denarios ad manus dicti receptoris generalis Regine minime liberati fuerunt vt dicit super sacramentum suum nihil.

Nec reddit de aliquibus exitibus comitatus castri et domanij de Pembrok' cum membriis et pertinentibus suis in comitatu Hereford ac marchia Wallie eadem comitatu adiacente aut castri ville et domanij de Kilgarran cum membriis et pertinentibus suis neconon castri ville siue domanij de Llanstephan cum membriis et pertinentibus suis in comitatu et marchia predictis valoris cccc.li.iij.s.vij.d. per annum supradixtae Margarete Regine nuper concessis in partem recompensacionis et deducionis cuiusdam summe MMMDClxvij.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d. eadem Regine concessae et assignate in partem dotis ad terminum vite sue, videlicet, de exitibus aut proficuis eorum eorum diuersorum manerijorum terrarum aut tenementorum a supradiicto festo sancti Michelis anno xxxiiimo seu postea, eo quod idem rex ex assensu prefate Regine ac de auisamento et assensu dominorum spiritualium et temporalium ac communitatis regni sui Anglie in parliamento suo apud Redyng anno regni sui xxxiiimo inchoato et tento existente auctoritate eiusdem parliamenti dedit et concessit Jaspero de Hatfeld, Comiti Pembroch' fratro suo, comitatum, castra, domania, et villas predicta cum membriis et pertinentibus suis, habenda a festo sancti Michelis dicto anno xxxiiimo eadem Comiti et heredibus masculis de corpore sue exentibus et ad effectum quod rex recompensacioni prefati consorti sue pro dictis comitatu castris domaniis ac ceteris premissis concedere dignaretur nihil.

Recepta denarioorum de recepta domanij de Hauerford West

Set reddit de denariis receptis de Thoma Parker, armigero, receptore ibidem, de exitibus receptis sue huius anni xxviiij0 die Julij supradiicto anno xxxiiimo per manus Mathei Phelipp', per indenturam—cxxv.li.x.s.vij.d. Summa—cxxv.li.x.s.vij.d.

1 In 1451 the revenues of the shire, castle, lordship, and towns of Pembroke (including those of Kilgarran and Llanstephan), amounting in all to £400 2s. 8d. a year, were granted to the queen as part of her dowry. In 1453 they were transferred to Jasper Tudor, Earl of Pembroke; and not only was the queen fully compensated by other grants but it was provided that all arrears from Pembroke due down to the transfer of the lands to Jasper should be paid to the queen (Rot. Parl. v. 261a-262b).

2 The lordship, castle, manor and town of Haverford West was estimated to be worth £121 2s. 6d. a year (C.P.R. 1452-1461, p. 340).

3 Thomas Parker was an usher of the king's chamber and king's esquire in June 1453, i.e. during the year of this account (C.P.R. 1452-1461, p. 77).
Recepta denariorum de recepta de Rokyngham 1 et aliorum maneriorum in comitatu Northampton

Et de denariis receptis Johanne Hattecliff, receptore ibidem, de exitibus recepte sue huius anni ad duas vices, videlicet, vna vice xvi die Septembris supradicto anno xxxij° xiiij.li.vj.s.viiij.d., et alia vice ultimo die Februarij eodem anno cxli.li., per ij indenturas—cliiij.li.vj.s.viiij.d.

Summa—cliiij.li.vj.s.viiij.d.

Recepta denariorum de recepta de Odiam' et Guillyngham 2

Et de Edwardo Ellesmere,3 receptore ibidem, de exitibus recepte sue huius anni ad duas vices, videlicet, vna vice de exitibus domanij de Guillyngham xlvj.li., et altera vice de exitibus domanij de Odiam xxli., sine indentura lxvj.li.

Summa—lxvj.li.

Summa pagine—cccxliij.li.xvij.s.iij.d.

fol. 3a

Haueryng atte Bowere Bradwell’ Kiddeswell’ Hadley et Colcest’ 4

Et de Willelmo Nanseglos,5 receptore ibidem, de exitibus recepte sue huius anni ad iij vices, videlicet, vna vice xx° die Februarij supradicto anno xxxij° xxxiiij.li.xiiij.s.xij.d.ob., secunda vice xxvj° die eiusdem mensis xxxvj.li.xj.s.xj.d., et tercia vice per manus balliui de Kiddeswell ad manus Nicolai Shapp’ auditoris viij.li.s.x., vt patet per compotum suum de hoc anno—lxxvij.li.xiiij.s.xj.d.ob.

Summa—lxxvij.li.xiiij.s.xj.d.ob.

Manerium de Plesaunce in Grenewiche 6

De aliquibus denarioorum summis per ipsum recepturis de Roberto Cheseman collectore reddituum et firmarum ibidem de exitibus officij sui huius anni non reddit, eo quod aliquos huiusmodi denarios per tempus predictum minime receptit, nec idem Robertus ad compotum suum pro eodem officio reddendum hoc anno comparuit—nihil.

1 The castle, manor, lordship and forest of Rockingham formed part of the estates granted to Margaret in 1453 as compensation for the loss of Pembroke (Rot. Parl. v. 261b). See p. 104 note 1. In 1467 it was granted to Elizabeth Wydeville (ibid. p. 627a).

2 The castle, lordship, manor, and hundred of Odiam (Hants.) and the manor, town, barton, and forest of Gillingham (Dorset) were also granted as compensation for the loss of Pembroke.

3 See p. 103 note 1.

4 The revenues from these sources should have totalled £156 a year (C.P.R. 1452-1461, p. 340).

5 See p. 102 note 2.

6 The manor of Plesaunce in Greenwich, which later formed part of Queen Elizabeth Wydeville’s dowry, had formerly been enjoyed by Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester (Rot. Parl. v. 627b).
Feodifirma de le Quenehithe in London

Set reddit de denariis recepturis de Ricardo Lee et Ricardo Allee, nuper vicecomitibus ciuitatris Londinie, per manus Edwardi Ellesmere xiiij° die Februarii anno xxxij°, de quadam summa x.li. per annum eidem Regine pro termino vite sue per dictum Regem Henricum sextum per literas suas patentes 1 concessa parcella quinquaginta librarum foedifirme ripe Regine Londinie, percipienda a xiiij° die Februarii anno xxv° annuatim per manus maioris et communitatis ciuitatris Londinie aut per manus vicecomitatis comitatus Londinie et Middlesex siue aliorum occupatorum aut receptorum eiusdem ripe siue firme pro tempore existencium ad festa Pasche et Sancti Michelis per equales porciones, videlicet, de huiusmodi foedii firma, tam ab eodem xiiij° die Februarii anno xxv° vsque festum Pasche tunc proxime sequentem, accidentem ix° die Aprilis, per xliii dies iuxta ratam dictarum x.li. per idem tempus, quam ab eodem festo Pasche vsque festum Sancti Michelis anno xxix°, scilicet per terminis Michelis et Pasche anno xxv°, Michelis et Pasche anno xxvij°, et Michelis anno xxix° infra tempus accidentibus, per indenturam penes eosdem remanentem xxxv.li.xviij.s.xlj.d.ob.

De xxx.li. de dicta firma x.li. per annum eidem Regine in forma predicta pro termino vite sue concessis, et eidem pro annis xxx°, xxxjmo, et xxxij° dicti Regis Henrici sexti debitis, non reddit, eo quod remanent in manibus maioris com­munitatis et vicecomitatis ciuitatatis predicte nondum solute. De quibus quidem xxx.li. predicti maior communitas et vicecomites ciuitatatis predicte per tempus predictum existentes debent Regine respondere. Et recepit nihil.

Nec reddit de xxx.li.,2 parcella l.li foedifirme ripe Regine Londinie per­cipianda annuatim in forma supradicta prefate Regine per dictum Regem Henricum sextum in recompensacionem supradicti domanij de Pembrok' a festo Sancti Michelis anno xxxj° Regis predicti ad terminem vite sue in partem dotis sue concessae auctoritate parliamenti sui apud Redyng inchoati et tenti dicto anno xxxj°, per literas suas patentes soluende terminis Pasche et sancti Michelis equaliter, videlicet, per predictum tempus huius compoti, eo quod remanent in manibus predictorum maioris communitis et vicecomitum ciuitatis predicte nondum solute. De quibus xxx.li. predicti maior communitas et vicecomites ciuitatatis predicte per tempus supradictum debent Regine respondere. Et recepit nihil.

De Willelmo Clerk et Thoma Dauent', nuper balliuis ibidem per manus Johannis Norrys penultimo die Nouembris supradicto anno xxxij°, de quadam summa x.li. per annum eidem Regine prefate Regine pro termino vite sue per dictum Regem Henricum sextum per literas suas patentes concessa, parcella

1 This grant was confirmed for life by letters patent dated 28 February 1452 (C.P.R., 1446-1452, p. 559). Nevertheless the payments were in arrears.
2 Rot. Parl. v. 262b.
3 C.P.R., 1446-1452, p. 559. Cf. note 1 above.
QUEEN MARGARET OF ANJOU, 1452-3

illarum centum et viginti librarum feodifirmé ville Norhampton siue firme ville Norhampton quam burgenses siue homines eiusdem ville pro eadem villa Regi et heredibus suis annuatim reddere tenentur, perciuanda a xxiiijto die Februariij anno xxvto dicti Regis Henrici sexti per manus burgensium hominum seu balliuorum aut aliorum receptorum, firmariorum, siue occupatorum ville predicte pro tempore existencium ad festa Pasche et Sancti Michaelis per equeales porciones, videlicet, tam ab eodem xxiiijto die Februariij anno xxvto vsque festum Pasche tunc proxime sequentem, accidentem non die Aprilis, per xliii dies, iuxta ratam dictarum x.li. per annum, per idem tempus quam ab eodem festo Pasche vsque festum Sancti Michaelis anno xxxmo, scilicet per terminis Michaelis et Pasche anno xxvijto, Michaelis et Pasche xxvijto, Michaelis et Pasche anno xxvijto, Michaelis et Pasche anno xxvijto, et Michaelis anno xxxmo, infra tempus accidentibus, per indenturam penes ipsos remanentem——xlvj.li.xj.s.iij.d.

De xx.li. de quadam summa x.li. per annum, de parte cxx.li. feodifirmé ville predicte eidem Regine in forma supradicta pro termino vite sue concessa, et sibi pro hoc anno et anno proxime precedente debite hoc anno non reddit, eo quod restant nondum solute. De quibus quidem xx.li. balliui ville predicte per tempus predictum existentes debent Regine respondere. Et recepit—nihil.

Summa——xlvj.li.xj.s.iij.d.

Annua pensione abbatis de Oseney

Et de abbaté et conuentu de Oseney per manus Edwardi Ellesmere penultimo die Januariij supradicto anno xxxijdo de illis x.li. annulis, parcella illarum viginti librarum annuarum quas abbas et conuentus de Oseney qui de patronatu Regis existit, Regi et heredibus suis reddere tenentur per annum de siue pro medietate duorum molendinorum aquaticorum subitus castrum Oxonie et toto prato iuxta Oseney vocato Kyngesmede ac medietate cuiusdam piscarie vocata Themse a ponte vocato Hidebrugge vsque eadem molendia que Richardus Foresto nuper tenuit ad terminum vite sue ex concessione Regis pro viginti libris Regi annuatim reddendis, percipiendi annuatim eidem Regine decem libras illas a dicto xxiiijto die Februariij dicto anno xxvto pro termino vite sue per manus eiusdem abbatis et successorum suorum aut aliorum occupatorum, firmariorum, siue receptorum molendinorum predictorum, aut firme predicte ad terminos Pasche et Sancti Michaelis per equeales porciones, videlicet in persolutione dictarum x.li. pro hoc anno, per indenturam penes ipsos abbatem et conuentum remanentem——x.li.

Summa——x.li.

Manerium de Fekenham

De aliquibus denariis summis per ipsum recepturis de officiariis et ministris Regine ibidem hoc anno non reddit, eo quod aliquos huiusmodi denarios (sic) ad manus dicti receptoris generalis per tempus predictum minime liberati fuerunt, vt dicit super sacramentum suum——nihil.

Summa pagine——lvj.li.xj.s.iij.d.

1 Ibid.
2 The manor of Feckenham should have produced £25 6s. 8d. a year (C.P.R. 1452-1461, p. 340).
Feodifirma ville de Scardeburgh et ville de Walgrave

De clxiiij.li.xiiiij.s.ij.d. de quadam summa xxvij.li. eidem Regine pro termino vite sue per dictum Regem Henricum sextum per literas suas patentes concessa, percipianda annuatim a predicto xxvij° die Februarij anno xxv° pro termino vite sue tam de feodifirma villa de Scardeburgh quam de feodifirma villa de Walgrave alias dicte Wallesgrave alias dicte Waldegrave et sexaginta acrarum terrarum cum pertinentibus per manus burgensium hominum siue balliourum eiusdem ville aut aliorum receptorum firmariorum siue occupatorum ville manerij et terrarum predictarum pro tempore existencium ad terminos Pasche et Sancti Michælis per equales porciones et eidem Regine pro hoc anno et viginti annis precedentis debita ultra xvj.li.v.s.x.d. de parte dictarum xxvij.li. anno xxv° debitorum per manus Johannis Lumbrard et Roberti Ammlith balliourum ville predictae anno xxv° eisdem Regis soluturarum hoc anno non reddit, eo quod remanent in manicibus balliourum eiusdem ville nondum solute, vnде ijdem balliui ibidem pro tempore existentes debent Regine respondere. Et recept nihil.

Feodifirma ville Bristoll

Set reddit de denariis recepturis de Johanne Stanley, nuper maiore ville Bristoll', in persolucionem cij.li.xv.s.vj.d. de feodifirma ville predicte per annum prefate Regine pro termino vite sue in partem dotis sue per dictum Regem Henricum sextum concesse, percipianda annuatim de exitibus, proficuis, et reuencibus, firmis, et quibuscumque alij commoditatibus ville predicte per manus maioris balliourum burgensium receptorum siue aliorum occupatorum quorumcumque eiusdem ville ad terminos Sancti Michælis et Pasche per equales porciones, et supradicte Regine pro termino Michelis anno xxxj° debitis, videlicet, pro eodem termino, per acquietanciam penes dictum Johanne maiorem ville predicte eodem anno remanentem—li.li.vij.s.ix.d.

Et de Willelmo Codder, nuper maiore ville Bristoll', in persolucionem cij.li.xv.s.vj.d. de feodifirma ville predicte prefate Regine in forma predicta concessa, percipianda annuatim, vt supra, et eidem pro hoc anno xxvij° debito, videlicet, pro supradicte terminis Pasche et Sancti Michælis infra tempus predictum accidentibus ad iij vicess, vna vice iij° die Decembris dicto anno xxxj°, li.li.vij.s.ix.d. et altera vice die (sic) eodem anno, li.li.vij.s.ix.d. per ij indentures penes dictum Willelmum remanentes—cij.li.xv.s.vj.d.

Summa—cliiij.li.iij.s.ij.d.

Firma et incrementum ville Suthamptori

Et de Thoma Payne, nuper vicecomite ville predicte, de quadam summa cl.i. de firma et incremento eiusdem ville per annum prefate Regine concessa, habenda et percipianda annuatim a dicto festo sancti Michælis anno xxxj° pro termino vite

2 Queen Elizabeth Wydeville was in 1467 assigned the same sum from this source (Rot. Parl. v. 625a).
3 These revenues from Southampton, Norwich, Ipswich, Nottingham, and Derby were all part of the compensation for the loss of Pembroke, assigned to Margaret in the Parliament of Reading in 1453 (Rot. Parl. v. 262b).
sue per manus hominum eiusdem ville pro tempore existentium
ad terminos Pasche et Sancti Michelis equaliter in recompensationem
supradicti domanij de Pembroke cum membris, videlicet, pro dictis
terminis Pasche et Sancti Michelis infra tempus compoti accidentibus—c.li.

Summa———c.li.

Summa pagine———ccliiij.li.iiij.s.iiij.d.

fol. 4b

Feodifirma ciuitatis Norwici

Et de denariis receptis de Thoma Elys et Roberto Sirede, nuper
vicecomitatabus ciuitatis Norwici, de quadam summa centum marcarum de
feodi firma ciuitatis Norwici siue de firma ville Norwici per annum
prefata Regine concessa, habendis et percipiendis a dicto festo Sancti
Michelis anno xxxjmo pro termino vite sue per manus ciuium
ciuitatis aut ville predicte pro tempore existenciam ad
terminos Pasche et Sancti Michelis, videlicet, pro eisdem terminis infra tempus
compoi accidentibus per indenturam penes eosdem remanentem

lxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d.

Summa———lxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d.

Firma ville Gippewici

Et de (sic) ville Gippewici, in partem solutionis xxxij.li.vj.s.vijij.d. pet
annum concessis, habendis et percipiendis a dicto festo sancti
Michelis anno xxxjmo pro termino vite sue per manus burgensium
eiusdem ville pro tempore existencium ad terminos Pasche et sancti
Michelis equaliter——xx.li.

De xiiij.li.vj.s.vijij.d. residuis dictorum xxxij.li.vj.s.vijij.d. de firma ville
predicte prefata Regine in forma predicta concessis non reddit, eo quod remanent
in manibus dictorum burgensium burgensium nondum soluti. De quibus quidem

Summa———xx.li.

Firma ville Notyngham

De xli. de firma ville Notyngham supradicte Regine concessis, habendis et
percipiendis annuatim a supradicto festo Sancti Michelis anno xxxjmo pro termino
vite sue per manus hominum eiusdem ville pro tempore existencium ad terminos
Pasche et Sancti Michelis equaliter non reddit, eo quod remanent in manibus
hominum eiusdem ville nondum solute. De quibus quidem xli. homines ville
predicte debent Regine respondere. Et recepit———nihil.

Firma ville Derb'

Set reddit de denariis recepturis de Johanne Weston et Stephano Thomson
nuper balliuis ville Derb' de parte xxvj.li.xiiij.s.iiij.d. de firma ville Derb' prefata
Regine concesso, habendorum et percipiendorum annuatim a dicto festo

1 These revenues from Southampton, Norwich, Ipswich, Nottingham, and
Derby were all part of the compensation for the loss of Pembroke, assigned to
Margaret in the Parliament of Reading in 1453 (Rot. Parl. v. 262b).
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
Sancti Michælis anno xxxjmo pro termino vite sue per manus hominum eiusdem ville pro tempore existentium in recompendacione dicti domanij de Pembrook cum membris ad festa predicta equaliter, per indenturam penes dictos balliuos remanentem—xvij.li.viiij.d.


Summa——xvij.li.viiij.d.

Summa pagine——ciiij.li.xiiij.s.

Recepta denariorum de receptore generali Ducatus Lancastrie

Set reddit de denaris recepturis de Willelmo Cotton armigero, receptore generali domini Regis Ducatus sui Lancastrie, in persolucionem M.li. prefate Regine concessarum, habendarum et percipiendarum eidem Regine ad terminum vite sue annuatim ad terminos Pasche et Sancti Michælis in partem dotis sue de exitibus, proficuis, et reuencibus omnium reddituum castrorum, domaniorum, maneriourum, terrarum, et tenementorum honororum, reddituum hereditamentorum et aliorum emolumentorum quorumcumque dicti Ducatus Lancastrie tam in Anglia quam in Wallia in manibus Regis existentium et remanencium, utra predicta castra domania terras et tenenta ac cetera premissa parcelle ducatus predicti in partem dotis sue assignate, per manus receptoris generalis ducatus predicti pro tempore existencis—M.li.

Et de eodem Willelmo receptore generali dicti ducatus vt pro annuitate, D marce concesse prefate Regine ad terminum vite sue, percipiende annuatim de omnibus castris, honoribis, domanij, maneriis, terris, et tenementis, redditibus, et seruiciis ducatus predicti ad festa Pasche et Sancti Michælis equaliter, videlicet, pro eisdem terminis infra tempus compoti accidentibus cccxxxiij.li.vij.s.viiij.d.

Recepta denariorum de custumis in portu ville Suthampton

De Thoma Cooke et Johanne Somerton, collectoribus custumis et subsidii in portu ville Suthampton, in persolucionem cxxxiij.li.vij.s.xj.d. anno xxvjmo dicti Regis Henrici sexti prefate Regine debitorum de parte M.li. de illis MMMDclxvliiij.s.iiiij.d. concessis et assignatis eidem Regine, habendis et percipiendis annuatim ad terminum vite sue ad terminos Pasche et Sancti Michælis per equales porciones in partem dotis sue, videlicet, dictarum M.li. tam de paruis quam de magnis custumis Regis heredum et successorum suorum in predicto portu ville Suthampton per manus collectorum earundem custumarum pro tempore existencium xx die Octobris supradiicto anno xxxijmo, per indenturam penes custumarios predictos remanentem—cçxxxiij.li.vij.s.xj.d.

Et de eisdem collectoribus per manus Johannis Norrys xxmo die Octobris dicto anno xxxijmo in persolucionem M.li. anno xxixmo dicti Regis Henrici sexti

1 Part of the original dowry of 1446 (Rot. Parl. v. 119b, 120a).
2 See p. 99 note 4. 3 See note 1.
prefate Regine debitarum et sibi concessarum in forma supradicta, percipiendorum ad terminos predictos ut supra, per indenturam penes dictos custumarios remanentem——————M.li.

Et de eisdem collectoribus de parte M.li. anno xxxмо dicti Regis Henrici sexti debitarum prefate Regine et sibi concessarum, percipiendorum modo et forma supradictis ad terminos supradictos equaliter ad vj vices, videlicet, prima vice predicto xxо die Octobris anno xxxijмо ccxxix.li.xij.s.i.d., secunda vice dictis die et anno xlviij.li.xiij.s.iiij.d., tercia vice xxiiijмо die Januariij eodem anno c.ii., per tres indentaturas penes eosdem remanentes —————ccccxviii.li.v.s.v.d.


Nec reddit de MM.li. eodem Regine pro hoc anno et anno proxime precedente debitis de supradictis MMMDclxxj.li.xiij.s.iiij.d. concessis et assignatis dicte Regine in partem dotis sue in forma supradicta, eo quod restant in manibus collectorum predictorum nondum soluti. De quibus quidem MM.li. iijdem collectores vel collector ibidem pro tempore existentes debent Regine respondere.

Summa———MDcxlviij.li.xiij.s.iiij.d. xx

Summa pagine———MMDcccciiij.li. xx

Recepta denariorum de receptore generali Ducatus Cornubie 2

De clxvii.li.xij.s.j.d. de parte ciiijxiij.li.xij.s.j.d. de illis cccxxiiij.li.xj.s.iij.d. prefate Margarete Regine ad terminum vite sue concessi percipiendi annullatim de exitibus, proficuis, et reuencibus ducatus predicti ac de exitibus, proficuis, et reuencibus cunagij stanni in comitatibus Cornubie et Deuonie per manus generalis receptoris ibidem et quorumcumque aliorum receptorum, occupatorum, siue firmariorum eorundem proficuorum et reuencuum pro tempore existencium in recompensacionem cccxxiiij.li.xj.s.iiij.d. diuersorum annuitatum diuersis personis ad terminum vite separatim concessarum de castris, domanijs, manerijs, terris, et tenementis ac alijs parcellis Ducatus Regis Lancastrie predicte Regine in partem sue dotis assignatis et eisdem pro anno xxixмо dicti Regis Henrici sexti debitis et non plus quam quarxxvij.i. de annuitate Thome Gresley chiualero deuenta in manibus Regine per mortem eiusdem deducuntur et defalcuntur non reddit, eo quod restant in manibus dicti Johannis Breknok 3 generalis receptoris dicti

1 In 1454 it was enacted that Margaret should have first claim on the customs of Southampton for her thousand pounds; for she had been unable to collect this sum in 1451 and 1452 owing to the fact that in 1451 it had been enacted that the king was to be preferred in payment of £20,000 from the customs of Southampton and London for two years from Christmas, 1450 (Rot. Parl. v. 259, 214).

2 The original grant in 1446 from the revenues of the Duchy of Cornwall was £108 15s. 5d. a year (Rot. Parl. v. 120b).


Set reddit de denariis recepturis de predicto Johanne Breknok armigero, generali receptore dicti Ducatus Cornubie, in persolucione Mviij.li.xv.s.v.d. de quadam summa MMMDclxvij.li.xij.s.ij.d. concessa et assignata dicte Regine habenda et percipiendae annuatim ad terminum sue ad terminos Pasche et Sancti Michaelis archangeli per equales porciones in partem dotis sue videLicet dictorum Mviij.li.xv.s.v.d. de exitibus, reuencibus, et proficuis stannae et cunagij stanni in comitatus Cornubie et Deuonie per manus receptoris generalis sui heredum et successorum suorum eiusdem Ducatus et quorumcumque aliorm sensorum, occupatorum, siue firmarium eorumdem proficorum exituum et reuencuum et dicte domine Regine anno proxime precedenti debitis, vlta Dccclxij.li.xv.s.vj.d.ob. eodem anno oneratur xv° die Maij dicto anno xxxijmo per manus Thome Scotte per indenturam penes dictum Johanne remanentem cxlvj.li.xix.s.s.d.ob.

Summa pagine—cxlvj.li.xix.s.s.d.ob.

fol. 6a

Adhuc recepta denariorum de receptore generali Ducatus Cornubic

Et de eodem Johanne Breknok in partem solucionis Mviij.li.xv.s.v.d. concessorum et assignatorum dicte Regine, habendorum et percipiendorum vt supra ad terminos supradictos equaliter in partem dotis sue et eodem Regine pro hoc anno xxxijmo debitis ad vij vices, videLicet, prima vice per manus Johannis dominij de Duddeley thesaurij hospiciij Regis penultimo die Octobris supradicto anno xxxijmo D.li., secunda vice decimo die Nouembris eodem anno per manus Johannis
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domini de Stourton cc.li., tercia vice xv° die Decembris eodem anno per manus Johannis Wode c.li., quarta vice dictis die et anno per manus eiusdem Johannis l.li., quinta vice die et anno predictis per manus Thome Scotte lx.s.j.d.ob., sexta vice xviij° die Aprilis dicto anno xxxijdo per manus Johannis Hardewik xxiiij.li.xix.s. vij.d., et septima vice xxviij° die Aprilis eodem anno per manus Johannis Pury x.li. per vij indenturas penes dictum Johannis remanentem

Dccciiijvj.li.xix.s.vij.d.ob.

Et recepit—nihil.


(To be continued)