

# The Impact of James I's Accession on the North-East of England

*DIANA NEWTON*

UNIVERSITY OF TEESIDE

1. In the final, long, drawn-out days of Elizabeth I's life, Sir John Carey, the deputy governor of the garrison town of Berwick upon Tweed, appealed urgently to Sir Robert Cecil. 'What should I do here,' he demanded, 'not knowing how or for whom to keep this place, being only in the devil's mouth, a place that will be first assailed, and I not being instructed what course to hold' (Salisbury 1902-65, vol. 12, 677). [1](#) These were indeed perilous times. With no heir to the English throne formally nominated, he was terrified that he would be an early victim should the Scottish King James VI attempt to take England by force on the death of the aged and ailing Queen. He was not alone in his unease, for King James himself was conscious that his forces should be in readiness should he need to defend his interest and he had said as much in letters to his English correspondents. Meanwhile, rumours were circulating throughout Europe. [2](#) But Sir John Carey, not a native Northumbrian, was also articulating contemporary estimations about the character of the north-east of England; as remote from central government, ignorant, fiendish, volatile and extremely vulnerable.
2. In the event King James's entry into England was accomplished remarkably smoothly. It was Sir John Carey's younger brother, Sir Robert, who carried the news of Elizabeth's death from London to King James – in a dramatic ride taking less than three days. He took the opportunity to proclaim the new King at Morpeth and Alnwick before calling in on his brother at Berwick. Sir John promptly gathered the garrison, mayor, aldermen and burgesses together to hear his 'short and pithie Oration' proclaiming the new King of England. One of James's first acts was to secure Berwick, it being 'the gate that opened into all his dominions'. James himself progressed into Berwick on 6 April. As he approached, he was met by such a 'peale of ordinance' that it set 'the houses and towers staggering' while the consequent smoke engulfed the entire town, completely obliterating it from view. But, just 'as all darknesse flyes before the face of the sunne, so did these clouds of smoake and gunpowder vanish at his gracious approach'. [3](#) The inference may perhaps be drawn that, from a southern perspective, King James would bring enlightenment to a corner of England that was all too capable of plunging itself into darkness and chaos.
3. Upon leaving the bounds of Berwick James formally entered the realm of England proper, where he was received by William Selby, the Sheriff of Northumberland. As he crossed the border he dismounted, figuratively, from the unruly horse he had been riding for nearly all his life, as King of Scotland, to try out the paces of his new 'towardlie rydding horse' that was England. [4](#) The momentous introduction took place amid 'multitudes' of Scottish, French and English noblemen and gentlemen, with their wives, as well as churchmen, soldiers, townspeople and others, where he was welcomed rapturously. Indeed, he spent two weeks travelling through Northumberland and Durham, being lavishly entertained and feted along the way. James declared himself delighted with everything he encountered and conferred many long overdue knighthoods upon the gentry; a course of action designed, in part, to ensure the loyalty of the localities.

4. And then he was gone, continuing his ride south to London as the first English monarch to set foot north of Durham since 1487 and the first to approach the Scottish border since 1400. But, though the physical presence of James was soon removed, the repercussions of his accession would resonate very clearly indeed in north-east England. For its outlook was poised to alter fundamentally as it became the focus of the King's cherished dream of completely dissolving the border between England and Scotland. It was his desire that the area would be transformed from an international frontier to a heartland. He made plain his expectations regarding the changed status of the borders in one of his final charges to his Scottish privy council before he left for England on 5 April. He declared that 'the pairt of baith the cuntreys quhilk of lait wes callit the "Mairches" and "Bordouris" and now be the happie unioun is the verie hart of the cuntrey' (Masson and Burton 1877-98, vol. 6, 560). As a manifestation of this new perspective, English central government's policy towards the area, which had pertained throughout the 1590s, would be reversed.
5. The border counties were unusual in the way in which they were governed. First of all there were the Wardens: one for each of the three marches (east, middle and west) with an opposite number across the border in Scotland. The office had a long history – stretching back into the mid-fourteenth century – while the function was even older. Originally it had entailed purely military duties, which then evolved and expanded to include judicial and administrative obligations and powers. Because of its martial genesis, members of the nobility always held the posts. Richard II experimented briefly with appointing outsiders but, by 1399, the Wardenries settled down into the hands of the Nevilles and the Percys, Earls of Westmorland and Northumberland, respectively. [5](#) That remained the practice until the Tudors. Henry VII excluded the Nevilles and the Percys from the Wardenships until 1525, as the degree of direct royal and conciliar intervention in the government of the north east was stepped up (Pollard 1990, 358-9, 389; Ellis 1995, 49). The early death of the Earl of Northumberland and the involvement of his brother, Sir Thomas Percy, in the Pilgrimage of Grace, which resulted in his being attainted, left Henry VIII resolved to 'resume into his own hands the office of warden' of the northern marches, in January 1537 (Brewer 1862-1910, vol. 12, 225). The Earls were briefly restored in the reign of Mary, but with the accession of Elizabeth, the Earls' political fortunes changed again.
6. In 1560, Sir John Forster (a Northumbrian squire and so-called 'godly rogue') was appointed to the post of Warden of the middle march (Meikle 1992, 126-63). He occupied the position for thirty-five years (apart from a brief suspension in 1587-8). After the 'rising of the northern earls' (Charles, sixth Earl of Westmorland and Thomas, seventh Earl of Northumberland), in 1569-70, and the Earls' subsequent removal, the social and political vacuum they left was filled by the gentry. They sat on the various commissions for the borders; such as those to survey the castles on the borders and those to ensure the effective functioning of march law, first codified in 1249, and manifested in days of truce 'rendering unique sentences of redress, reparation and compensation'. [6](#) At the same time, and as their counterparts throughout England did, they also sat on the commissions of the peace and served as sheriff, deputy lieutenants and so forth.
7. In one other, very important, respect, the border counties were different from the rest of England. For, throughout Elizabeth's reign they were exempted from paying parliamentary subsidies; ostensibly, in return for their service on the borders, defending the realm from the Scottish enemy. Yet, there had not been an official Scottish enemy since the middle of the century. And, so, the unofficial Scottish enemy was regularly exhibited as evidence of Northumberland's vulnerability, in the guise of

the desperate marauders and thieves that preyed upon the poor inhabitants of Northumberland. Report after report was sent up to central government, lamenting the state of the 'country' as a result of the endless Scottish raids. It was 'oppressed', 'spoyled', 'utterly impoverished' and 'decayed'; that is, unable to supply sufficient men to defend the borders, which was another obligation peculiar to the border counties. However, Northumberland (and Durham) was not only subject to these incursions, it also claimed to have a particularly lawless population, which was virtually ungovernable. According to an anonymous (and very lengthy) appraisal 'concerning the abused government and afflicted state of Northumberland', written in 1597, the responsibility was that of the justices of the peace who 'appeare not at their quarter sessions in any due order, and often kepe non at quarter days' (PRO, SP 59/36/223).

8. Yet, there are surviving quarter sessions records for both Durham and Northumberland for this period and they simply do not bear out that calumny. [7](#) For quarter sessions were held regularly. Moreover, concerns about lawlessness were common to the whole country in the 1590s. In Kent, for instance, William Lambarde was making similarly gloomy observations about the state of his county throughout the decade. His reference to 'the malicious iniquity of this present age, which, taking the bridle in the teeth, rusheth out and runneth on to all dissolution' was regularly reiterated and its cause attributed to the poverty and dearth that epitomized the last years of Elizabeth's reign (Read 1962, 148, 182). And, when the rhetoric is compared with the reality, Northumberland does not emerge as significantly less law abiding than elsewhere in England.
9. Notwithstanding the obvious difficulties in reconstructing patterns of crime in late Elizabethan England from incomplete records, certain broad conclusions can be drawn. For instance, a comparison of extant presentments and indictments before quarter sessions in Northumberland and Worcestershire reveal a pretty similar rate of petty crime. [8](#) Even the incidence of murder was not markedly worse in Northumberland. Between 1597 and 1604 there were 18 murders in the surviving records for Northumberland, while in the same period there were 12 in Hertfordshire, but 26 in Sussex. [9](#) It seems, then, the gentlemen of Northumberland had decided that it was in their best interests to promulgate a perception of acute crisis in the area, in order to continue the favourable financial terms they enjoyed with central government. Furthermore, by exaggerating the lawless nature of Northumberland they could also justify any shortcomings in their performance as county officers.
10. But, then, in 1595 it all went horribly wrong. After years of appearing to do very little in response to the regular bulletins of murder and mayhem, central government responded particularly resolutely to what appeared to be just one more letter regarding the parlous state of the north-east. That August, Toby Matthew, Bishop of Durham, together with judges Beaumont and Drewe, in Durham for the assizes, and Ralph, Lord Eure, wrote to the President of the Council of the North and Lord Lieutenant of the northern shires, Henry Hastings, Earl of Huntingdon. The purpose of this letter was to express their concerns about the deplorable state of counties Durham and Northumberland where both English and Scottish outlaws 'conspired together to make this Busshoprick of Duresme an open spoile and prey to the utter impoverishing and undoing of the poorer sorte, and to the Endangering of such persons of the better sorte' (PRO, SP 59/30/117). They put the blame for this state of affairs squarely upon the Wardens of the west and middle marches. Three courses of action were proposed. Firstly, that the privy council be persuaded to direct the Wardens to execute their offices with 'extraordinarie care and diligence' whilst also undertaking to supervise those officers answerable to them more closely. Secondly, that the privy council

provide a company of well furnished men for the better policing of the region, which they described as 'these remote parts' (thus assuming a London-centred view of Northumberland and Durham). And finally, that the justices of the peace be required to perform their judicial obligations 'according to the Termes of their leases and Estates granted to them'.

11. Five days later Eure wrote, as 'one principall subiecte in this land yt concerneth', to the Queen's principal minister, Lord Treasurer Burghley. Adopting a rather more sensational tone, he acquainted him of the 'distress, calamity, pyttifull complaints, which the cryes of wydowes and fatherless children, even to the skyes in this bushopricke of Durham, by the great theifte, intolerable sufferance of Northumberland, and the weaknes or rather dastardie (if I may so tearme yt) of the inhabitants there' (PRO, SP 59/30/131). He went on to paint a picture of an area where the normal processes of law had broken down completely and pleaded with Burghley to provide some 'speedie redresse' for the consolation of the 'comfortless and distressed people' of Northumberland's highlands. In the event, the 'speedy redresse' turned out to be Eure himself, who was nominated by Burghley to replace the long-standing Warden of the middle march, Sir John Forster. Eure's immediate response to this accolade was to declare that he was 'terrified greatlye to undertake so great a charge knowing myne infinite wants', and to beg for a house that would be 'safe and fitting' for him as he endeavoured to 'reforme thes abuses in the inland gentlemen if they have combined with the outlawes' (PRO, SP 59/30/162). Before he arrived in Northumberland, even, he was adopting a kind of siege mentality and it was to be a couple of months before he plucked up the courage to take up his new post. For, although he was born in Berwick, and his family had a long association with border government, he had not lived in Northumberland for many years and his career had been focused almost entirely upon Yorkshire. [10](#) Notwithstanding his claims to represent the bishopric of Durham, he was largely unfamiliar with the area. On the other hand, both Matthew and Eure were closely linked with Huntingdon regarding their religious position, especially regarding their shared animosity towards Catholic recusancy. [11](#)
12. In the meantime, Forster was left as caretaker of the march. This gave him the perfect defence for any failures on his part, thereafter, for he simply excused himself on the grounds that his authority was being undermined by the common knowledge that he was being replaced, which, in turn, encouraged 'evil people of both realms' to commit more spoils on the borders than ever before (Salisbury 1902-65, vol. 5, 430). The Privy Council were not impressed, however, and they informed him that a commission had been appointed to 'inquire and examine in what state the wardenry shalbe left by you' (Dasent 1890, vol. 25, 45-6). The commission was headed by Sir William Bowes of Streatlam in Durham, who was a trusted ally of Huntingdon. He was joined by Francis Slingsby of Scriven, near Knaresborough in Yorkshire, Clement Colmore, rector of Gateshead, and Henry Anderson, a Newcastle hostman who had recently bought himself an estate in Durham, all of whom were associated in some way with Huntingdon. This was a group of gentlemen whose interests lay south of the Tyne but who were required to gain an accurate impression of conditions in the north of Northumberland.
13. Nevertheless, the commission received the full co-operation of a significant proportion of the Northumberland gentry who confirmed the conclusions reached by the commission, of the wretched state of Northumberland, in a report of their own. A third account, from Huntingdon's secretary, John Ferne, corroborated those two portrayals. The picture presented by the commission was a wretched one. Established

religion was suffering for want of preachers, there being 'scant three . . . to be found in the whole country, ' so that the superior 'number and diligence of the Semynaries with more liberty resorting thither, being driven from other places of both the realmes' were having little difficulty in finding willing converts to Roman Catholicism. Common law was undermined by the Warden 'using *another* coourse of Justice' in his own best interests; march justice was rendered ineffective by 'the *unlawfull complots and combynacons of the Englishe with the Scottes*'; while the Treaty of Berwick was perverted by the Scots with, what appeared to be, Forster's compliance. There had been 200 murders since 1567-8 and, of two thousand furnished horsemen certified two years before, only one hundred could be accounted for. This 'contagion' or 'Gangrene thus noysomely molesting *the foot of the kingdome*' affected the entire bishopric, as far afield as the 'Rivers of Tease, weare and darwent', where there were instances of assaults on houses more than seventy miles from the border. [12](#) From the Scottish border to the river Tees the shared experience was one of alarm and consternation.

14. The gentlemen of Northumberland drew attention to 'the huge decays and losses sustained by the inhabitants of the middle march in these last two years', and dwelt on the tortures inflicted by the Scots on the English, which they described in graphic detail (Salisbury 1902-65, vol. 5, 476-7). Ferne's conclusions, that the cause of the mischief lay with the degree of Anglo-Scottish 'convenues and conferences', predictably, were very similar to those of Bowes and the rest of the commission. For they had observed that the reason for the woeful state of affairs in the middle march was '*that the wardens and opposite officers, being ever chosen of borderers bred and inhabiting there, they doe contynewally cherishe their favourites and strengthen themselves by the worst disposed*' (Salisbury 1902-65, vol. 5, 493-4). In the late autumn of 1595, the gentlemen of Northumberland were, no doubt, delighted to be rid of Sir John Forster, who had provoked most of them at some stage of his thirty-five year assignment as Warden. The relatively unknown Eure clearly seemed preferable. But what those who obliged Huntingdon with an account of the parlous state of the middle march cannot have anticipated, was that, in a couple of months, most of them would be removed from the Northumberland commission of the peace and replaced by gentlemen from Durham and Yorkshire (PRO, C/66/1468v). For the appointment of Eure was just part of the Tudors' centralizing policy, which was determined to bring the localities more firmly under their control.
15. Later, in 1596, a commission appointed 'for border causes' also differed fundamentally in its composition from the norm. Whereas the most recent commission, in 1588, had consisted, more conventionally, of the Wardens and their deputies – namely Sir John Forster (Warden of the middle march), Sir Robert Carey (Warden of the east march) and his deputy, Sir John Selby, together with the Warden of the west march – the 1596 commission was composed of Bishop Toby Matthew, Sir William Bowes, Francis Slingsby and Clement Colmore – none of whom were from Northumberland. The omission of the Wardens and deputy Wardens was because the setting up the commission had been prompted by 'complaint on either side of both the wardens and the deputies'. [13](#) For within a year it was abundantly clear that Eure was proving to be quite unequal to the task of governing the middle march, and he was attracting precisely the same criticisms as had Sir John Forster.
16. Not the least of Eure's faults was his failure to cultivate appropriate allies amongst the Northumberland gentry, which left him rather more closely identified with Catholics than might be deemed suitable for an avowed champion of Protestantism and opponent of recusancy. Eure's chief associates were Sir Ralph Gray of Chillingham,

whose first wife was suspected of harbouring seminary priests (Watts with Watts 1975, 79), and his brother Sir Edward of Morpeth. By allying himself with long-time rivals of the Widdringtons, Eure incurred the enmity of that very powerful Northumberland family whose members served as Members of Parliament and Sheriffs. His appointment of Yorkshiremen, in particular Ralph Mansfield and Thomas Percy (later implicated in the gunpowder plot) to key border offices was storing up trouble for the future. The consensus grounded in opposition to Forster soon collapsed and Eure found himself at loggerheads with a significant proportion of the Northumberland gentry. When he had to explain himself to the privy council, he pleaded that it was the 'roote insolence of those within my government, respecting more there severall lustes than the necessary service of their countrie which hath hindered me' (PRO, SP 59/32/191 and 193), and he added a catalogue of his frustrated attempts to impose order.

17. Matters were made worse when it was believed that Eure had entered into an ill-judged alliance with his opposite number on the Scottish middle march, Robert Ker, laird of Cessford. For Ker was involved in long-running disputes with a number of Northumberland gentlemen, including Henry Widdrington and his brothers which had come to a dramatic head, in the summer of 1596, when Ker had assaulted the Widdrington's castle at Swinburne, and taken Roger Widdrington prisoner. [14](#) Consequently, Widdrington and certain other Northumberland gentlemen had withdrawn themselves from the middle march, declaring themselves unable to live under the Warden's rule. Their departure had serious repercussions for the government of the borders, which was appreciated by the Queen and Sir Robert Cecil, if not by Eure who regarded their behaviour as a personal affront to himself. 'Thus am I crossed', he reported, 'and my government disliked' (PRO, SP 59/33/48) and, by extension, compromised. When the Widdringtons, Selbys and other Northumberland gentlemen accompanied the Earl of Essex on his voyage to the Azores it was time for central government to take a hand. With the Queen receiving 'howerly complaint of the Borders devastation', Cecil relayed her insistence that they return 'for she in no sort likes that they should leave the frontiers soe weakened' (PRO, SP 12/264/61). This was a clear recognition that policing the frontier was the business of the local gentry with their particular understanding of conditions obtaining there.
18. This was the crux of the issue. The centralizing ambitions of the Queen and Burghley and Cecil and Huntington – which had resulted in the appointment of Eure to the Wardenship of the middle march – appeared to have been accomplished with the seeming complicity of the resident Northumberland gentry, driven by exasperation with Sir John Forster but, of far more significance, was the growing threat of war with Ireland, late in 1594. It was by no means clear that the King of Scotland would not ally himself with the Irish rebels, making the borders the frontline against an enemy state. Although this never happened, some Scots were worryingly inclined to assist the rebels. And, when the Scottish King did send reinforcements to Ireland in 1602, there was some confusion among the Irish about the side upon which they had come to fight (Hamilton *et al.* 1860-1912, vol. 10, 122-3). In these uncertain times it was no doubt felt that the security of the realm, especially on the sensitive north-eastern border, could not be left solely to the gentlemen of Northumberland.
19. It was unfortunate that Eure proved to be such a disaster as the agent of central government's plans, driving away experienced governors of the borders, and leaving them dangerously exposed. Eure resigned early in 1598 (Watts with Watts 1975, 122), and was replaced by Sir Robert Carey. He was not a native Northumberland gentleman either, although he was the son of Lord Hunsdon, one time Warden of the

east march. Temperamentally he was very different from Eure, not least in that he was eminently suited to border life. He greeted his preferment to deputy Warden of the west march under his brother-in-law, Lord Scrope, in 1593, after an unproductive time spent at court, with relish. 'I took myself to the country', he wrote in his memoirs, 'where I lived with great comfort: for we had a stirring world, and few days passed over my head but I was on horseback, either to prevent mischief, or to take malefactors' (Mares 1972, 22-3). On the death of his father, in July 1596, he was appointed acting Warden of the east march.

20. From there Carey was able to observe Eure's management of the middle march where 'every year grew worse and worse, that none flourished but malefactors', chiefly as a result of his misplacing his trust and his inability to cultivate suitable allies among the Northumberland gentry (Mares 1972, 46). Carey, on the other hand, closely identified himself with the area, especially after he married Elizabeth Trevannion, widow of Sir Henry Widdrington, uncle of Henry and Roger, in 1593. Carey reiterated his affinity with the north when he recounted how, after time spent at court, 'new occasion was offered me to continue a northern man still' (Mares 1972, 44), as Warden of the middle march, early in 1598. He was able to draw upon the services of his step-nephew, Henry Widdrington, and his ally, William Fenwick, as his deputies and as keepers of Redesdale and Tynedale respectively. The fact that he never encountered the level of opposition that his predecessors had may well be attributed to the way in which he integrated himself into Northumberland and identified himself so closely with the north, and especially the north east. He remained in office for five years, when the accession of James VI and I and his resolution to dissolve the borders rendered the Wardenries redundant.
21. The new King announced by proclamation, issued from Greenwich on 19 May 1603, that the borders 'shall be no more the extremities, but the middle'. He predicted, somewhat optimistically, that 'the inhabitants thereof [would be] reduced to perfect obedience'; [15](#) and insisted that the English and Scots should regard themselves as one people (*unus grex*). However, he never really explained how this was to be achieved. [16](#) In the same way, despite repeated claims by historians, he never really tackled the question of the future of march law and the Wardenries. According to Watts, and reiterated by Bruce Galloway, James abolished march law and discontinued the office of Lords Warden by proclamation from Newcastle on 13 April. [17](#) But, the 'copie of the king's proclamation' issued from Newcastle was more concerned with labouring his title to the English throne before going on to charge that all rebels are to be 'persewit and punished with fyre and sword accordinglie'. [18](#) This reflected the King's current concerns. He was still not sure that his accession would not be disputed, while the charge was a response to the so-called 'busy week', when some of the inhabitants of the west march disingenuously claimed that all laws were in abeyance until the new King was crowned. There is nothing about march law or Wardens in the proclamation. Technically, march laws continued in force until they were abolished by Act of Parliament in 1607, [19](#) while in practice they slipped into oblivion. In any case, it has been argued that, while '[i]n theory, these statutes established a strict iron curtain between Carlisle and Berwick, [t]he reality was very different' (Galloway 1986, 65). For much of the time, long before 1603, the borders were more apparent than real and 'only recognized by the native borderers when it suited them'. It was often only when an individual fell foul of the laws across the border that it miraculously reappeared, otherwise there were abundant instances of cross-border friendships, marriages and financial transactions (Meikle 2001 and 1988, ch.7).

22. Gradually the government of the borders was restored to the resident Northumberland gentry. Early in June 1603, George Clifford, Earl of Cumberland, was appointed Lord Lieutenant of the three border counties of Cumberland, Westmorland and Northumberland; an indication of how the whole of the north was regarded as a coherent entity by central government. But, while Cumberland's interests lay in the north west, the fact that he had sponsored a sea-voyage to Brazil, led by Robert Widdrington, gave him an *entrée* to north-eastern society and led to his choosing Robert's brother, the recently knighted Henry Widdrington, for his deputy in Northumberland. The restoration was complete when the commission of the peace, issued in 1604, was composed of many resident Northumberland gentry, also newly knighted. [20](#)
23. So, the most significant aspect of the impact of James I's accession on the north-east of England was the removal of central government interference in its affairs. Tudor policy, first discernible under Henry VII and intensified under Elizabeth, has traditionally been seen as drawing the claws of the local magnates who had developed into monstrous, Yeats-and-Sellarman-like, 'overmighty subjects' under the Lancastrian kings in the fifteenth century. But, it has recently been argued that the borders were actually far better governed and more efficiently defended in the Lancastrian years – especially during the minority of Henry VI – when the Scots and English were encouraged to resolve their own problems, and generally did so more peacefully and effectively than when Westminster was involved. [21](#) James VI and I was able, at a stroke, to restore this pre-Tudor approach of devolution. Above all, after 1603 central government was no longer unduly concerned about the administration of the English borders, because there was no longer a potentially hostile state on the other side of that border. The King of England was entirely confident that he could rely on the support of the King of Scotland; at least, for as long as those Kings were James Stuart.

## Notes

1. This article has emerged from work currently being undertaken for the AHRB centre for north east England history which will culminate in *North east England elites, c1569-1625*.
2. See, for example, Bruce (1861), 49; *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1601-1603*, 298-300.
3. This account is based on *The True Narration of the Entertainment of his Royal Majestie, from the time of his Departure from Edenbrough, till his Receiving at London: with all, or the most speciall Occurrences*, first published in London in 1603, later printed in Nichols (1828), 53 ff.
4. The analogy was James's own, used in a letter to Sir Robert Cecil. See Bruce (1861), 31.

5. Since 1425, it was the younger family of the first Earl of Westmorland (the Earl of Salisbury and his son the Earl of Warwick) and, later, Richard, Duke of Gloucester, in 1470.
6. For a through treatment of border government see Neville (1998).
7. There are quarter sessions rolls in the Durham record office for 1595 to 1625 (DRO CRO Q/S/I 1-8). These have been edited and calendared by C. M. Fraser for the publications of the Surtees Society (1991). The Northumberland record office holds a single volume, entitled the *Vetera indictamenta*, which contains copies, in an early modern hand, of original indictments and presentments, between 1595 and 1630 (NRO, QS1). There is a gap between 1618 and 1627 that is neatly filled by material concerning public office in the Delaval family papers, also in the Northumberland record office, which is most abundant for precisely those dates (NRO, 1 DE/7 ff. 48ff).
8. *Vetera indictamenta*, *passim*; Bund (1900), *passim*.
9. *Vetera indictamenta*, ff. 14r, 25v, 91v; Cockburn (1975a), 130-165; Cockburn (1975b), 18; Cockburn (1975c), 333-422; Cockburn (1975d), 3-5.
10. Northumberland (1893-1940, vol. 5, 27; *ibid.*, vol. 5, 242-3; Page (1914-23), vol. 2, 245; *ibid.*, vol. 1, 533; Cockayne (1926), vol. 5, 181-2. Although Eure was Vice-president of the Council in the North he appears to have left little trace of his performance. See Reid (1921).
11. See, for example, Watts with Watts (1975), 78-80, 87; Freeman (1987), 163-5.
12. BL, MS Cotton, Caligula, D, ii, ff. 230ff. The letter is part of a collection of William Bowes's private papers which were damaged by fire and is supplemented (indicated here in italics) from a transcript in BL, MS Harleian 4648, ff. 250ff. It is also calendared in Bain (1894-6), vol. 2, 86.

13. Bain (1894-6), vol. 1, 306; Bain *et al.* (1898-1969), vol. 12, 328; Bain (1894-6), vol. 2, 199.
14. BL, MS Cotton, Caligula, D, ii, fo. 271.
15. Strype (1824), vol. 4, 378-9; Steele (1910), vol. 1, 108; Larkin and Hughes (1973), vol. 1, 18-20.
16. McIlwain (1965), 292; Wormald (1996), 148-171.
17. Watts with Watts (1975), 134; Galloway (1986), 16. They cite a letter from the King to messengers, sheriffs and others calendared in HMC, 12th report, appendix 7, *Mss of Le Fleming of Rydal Hall*, 12, which announces that a proclamation is to be made, against all rebels and their wives and bairns. It does not mention either march law or Wardens.
18. Cumbria record office (Kendal), WD/Ry/HMC no.70.
19. 4 Jac. I, c.1.
20. BL, MS Add., 38139, ff. 146-7.
21. See, for example, Neville (1998) and Pollard (1990).

## List of Works Cited

Bain, Joseph. Ed. 1894-6. *The Border Papers: Calendar of Letters and Papers Relating to the Affairs of the Borders of England and Scotland*. 2 vols. Edinburgh: H.M. General Register House.

Bain, Joseph, *et al.* Eds. 1898-1969. *Calendar of the State Papers Relating to Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots, 1547-1603, Preserved in the Public Record Office, the British Museum, and Elsewhere in England*. 14 vols. Edinburgh: HMSO.

Brewer, J.S. *et al.* Eds. 1862-1910. *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII*. 21 vols. London: Longmans, Green and Co.

Bruce, John. Ed. 1861. *Correspondence of James VI of Scotland with Sir Robert Cecil and others in England*. London: Camden Society.

Bund, J.W. Willis. Ed. 1900. *Calendar of the Quarter Sessions Papers, 1591-1643*. Worcester.

Cockayne, G.E. Ed. 1926. *The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom*. Vol. 5 revised and enlarged. London: St Catherine Press.

Cockburn, J.S. Ed. 1975a. *Calendar of Assize Records: Hertfordshire Indictments, Elizabeth I*. London: HMSO.

Cockburn, J.S. Ed. 1975b. *Calendar of Assize Records: Hertfordshire Indictments, James I*. London: HMSO.

Cockburn, J.S. Ed. 1975c. *Calendar of Assize Records: Sussex Indictments, Elizabeth I*. London: HMSO.

Cockburn, J.S. Ed. 1975d. *Calendar of Assize Records: Sussex Indictments, James I*. London: HMSO.

Dasent, J.R. Ed. 1890. *Acts of the Privy Council of England*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode.

Ellis, Stephen G. 1995. 'Tudor State Formation and the Shaping of the British Isles.' In *Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State 1485-1725*, edited by Stephen G. Ellis and Sarah Barber. London: Longman.

Freeman, Jane. 1987. 'The Distribution and Use of Ecclesiastical Patronage in the Diocese of Durham, 1558-1640.' In *The Last Principality: Politics, Religion and Society in the Bishopric of Durham, 1494-1660*, edited by David Marcombe. Nottingham: University of Nottingham.

Galloway, Bruce. 1986. *The Union of England and Scotland, 1603-1608*. Edinburgh: J. Donald.

Hamilton, Claude Hans, *et al.* Eds. 1860-1912. *Calendar of State Papers Relating to Ireland in the Reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary and Elizabeth*. 24 vols. London: HMSO.

Larkin, James F., and Hughes, Paul L. Eds. 1973. *Stuart Royal Proclamations*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

McIlwain, Charles Howard. Ed. 1965. *The Political Works of James I*. New York: Russell and Russell.

Masson, David, and Burton, John Hill. Eds. 1877-98. *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*. 14 vols. Edinburgh: H.M. General Register House.

Mares, F.H. Ed. 1972. *The Memoirs of Robert Carey*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Meikle, Maureen. 1988. 'Lairds and Gentlemen: A Study of the Landed Families of the Eastern Anglo-Scottish Borders, c1540-1603.' Unpublished PhD. University of Edinburgh.

Meikle, Maureen. 1992. 'A Godly Rogue: The Career of Sir John Forster, an Elizabethan Border Warden.' *Northern History* 27: 126-63.

Meikle, Maureen. 2001. 'The Sixteenth-Century Anglo-Scottish Borderland as a Frontier: Myth or Reality?' Unpublished paper given to the 'Regions and Borders of Northern Europe' conference at the University of Durham.

Neville, Cynthia. 1998. *Violence, Custom and Law: The Anglo-Scottish Border Lands in the Later Middle Ages*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Nichols, John. Ed. 1828. *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First*. 4 vols. London: J.B. Nichols.

Northumberland. 1893-1940. *A History of Northumberland*. Northumberland County History Committee. Newcastle upon Tyne.

Page, William. Ed. 1914-23. *The Victoria County History of the County of York, North Riding*. 2 vols. London: Constable (vol. 1) and London: St Catherine Press (vol. 2).

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

Read, Conyers. Ed. 1962. *William Lambarde and Local Government: His 'Ephemeris' and Twenty-Nine Charges to Juries and Commissions*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Reid, Rachel Robert. 1921. *The King's Council in the North*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.

Salisbury. 1902-65. *Manuscripts of the Marquess of Salisbury*. London: Historical Manuscripts Commission.

Steele, Robert. Ed. 1910. *A Bibliography of Royal Proclamations of the Tudor and Stuart Sovereigns, 1485-1714*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Strype, John. 1824. *Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion*. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Watts, S.J., with Watts, Susan. 1975. *From Border Shire to Middle Shire: Northumberland, 1586-1625*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Wormald, Jenny. 1996. 'James VI, James I and the Identity of Britain.' In *The British Problem, c1534-1707: State Formation in the Atlantic Archipelago*, edited by Brendan Bradshaw and John Morrill. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 148-71.