The estate of the Bishop of Durham in Durham city in the fifteenth century

Woolley, A.G.

THE ESTATE OF THE BISHOP OF DURHAM IN DURHAM CITY IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

A. G. WOOLLEY BA Dunelm

MA THESIS 1991

INDEX OF CONTENTS

INDEX OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

The survival of many of the documents of the bishop of Durham's financial administration for the fifteenth century allows a study of the properties and assets owned by the bishop in Durham City in this period which gives additional information on the areas of Durham under the bishop's control to the information given in M. Bonney's recent study of the town and its overlords and at the same time complements her examination of Durham Priory's estates to give a more complete picture of Durham in the fifteenth century. The thesis concentrates in particular on the second half of the fifteenth century which is well documented and examines the bishop's estates in Durham and its financial position at the time.

The thesis is organised around the properties owned by the bishop in Durham. The study opens with an examination of the financial documents used and of the structure of the bishop's financial administration for Durham City. Two surveys of Durham, the Bishop Hatfield survey of 1383, and the Bishop Langley survey of 1418 are looked at to give an idea of the topography of the Durham estate, and then attention is turned to the bishop's properties themselves. Firstly, the domestic properties, the two mills, the bakehouse, and the market, the assets which provided the bulk of the bishop's revenues from

Durham are examined. Secondly, the Mint, the bishop's meadow, and Franklyn forest, three properties which were part of the Durham estate whose revenues were collected separately from those of the above properties, are studied. This section of the thesis is rounded off with a study of the total revenue the bishop received from Durham.

The study is concluded with an examination of those dwelling in the bishop's estates in Durham, of those working for the bishop in Durham, and of the bishop's administrators in Durham, the latter concentrating on the life and times of the Raket family in the second half of the fifteenth century.

INTRODUCTION

Over the last fifteen years much has been written concerning the economic fortunes of English towns in the fifteenth century, with the area of debate being divided into two distinct phases. Firstly, some historians have used knowledge already known from short-term research in order to give general plans setting out criteria by which the prosperity or lack of prosperity in English towns might be judged. However, other historians have undertaken long-term research projects on individual towns or groups of towns enabling them to suggest reasons for the prosperity or lack of prosperity of these particular towns. Some of the studies of towns printed in the 1980's were actually begun in the 1960's. By finding such criteria for individual towns it is hoped to use them to construct a general theory for all England's towns with an empirical foundation rather than one based on supposition. Indeed, D. M. Palliser in 1988 was able to use the developments in the debate over the 1980's to suggest criteria for a new general theory in his article, "Urban Decay Revisited".

In the first stage of the debate the main protagonists were A. R. Bridbury, R. B. Dobson, C. Phythian-Adams, and S. H. Rigby. Bridbury's belief was that the towns of England were prospering in the fifteenth century, while

Dobson believed that the opposite was true and that the towns of fifteenth century England were in decline demographically and economically. Phythian-Adams also thought the towns were in decline but placed the nadir of their fortunes in the early sixteenth century. S. H. Rigby in the middle 1980's attacked the reliability of the non-statistical evidence used by the latter three historians and the statistical evidence used by Bridbury. Finally Palliser in his 1988 article expressed his doubts concerning the arguments of Bridbury and Dobson before suggesting new directions in which the debate might go.

Bridbury, Dobson, and Phythian-Adams used much the same criteria in their articles spanning the years 1979-1981 concerning the fate of English towns in the fifteenth century despite the different conclusions they drew from the evidence. The two major topics of debate were the lay subsidies of 1334 and 1524 and the petitions of townspeople to the king for remissions from fee farms or taxation. Other lesser topics of debate were admissions of freemen to towns, figures for customs, the flight from the towns of burgesses to avoid office, the effect of the War of the Roses on England's towns, the building of town walls, and the building of houses, churches, and ceremonial buildings.

The debate over tax assessments was started in 1962 in A. R. Bridbury's book, "Economic Growth". In Appendix II of this book, Bridbury compared the figures from the lay

subsidies of 1334 and 1524 for payments made by the towns and the countryside to show increases in the percentage of wealth in counties held by towns.[1] In this way he claimed that in 27 of 29 counties there was an increase in the proportion of urban wealth compared to rural wealth. In Appendix III of this book, he used figures for payments made by the major towns of the country in 1334 and 1524 to construct ratios for each town.[2] He suggested that Boston's 2:1 ratio stood for "ruin", Lincoln's 1:1.25 ratio stood for "stagnation", Coventry's 1:6 ratio for "notable achievement", and Westminster's 1:43 ratio for "enourmous growth". Bridbury used these figures to suggest that most of the towns of late medieval England were increasing rather than decreasing in prosperity. Bridbury stood by his assertions in his 1981 article and again in a 1986 article which was in reply to an attack on his use of the lay subsidies by Rigby.[3]

Dobson, Phythian-Adams, Palliser, and Rigby found problems with Bridbury's use of the subsidies. Dobson's particular worry was that the tax levels for the countryside could have been underassessed in 1334, and also that the taxation was conducted on a different basis in each of the two subsidies.[4] Phythian-Adams said that a comparison between the two subsidies was not possible as in 1524 the tax contribution of a person was included with the taxes from the place where he was in residence when the taxation was being conducted and that many

merchants in towns had rural property which consequently inflated urban totals.[5] He also made the point that even if rich merchants in towns increased the percentage contribution of towns to the wealth of counties this hardly meant that the benefits of urban wealth were widely shared.[6] In 1988, Palliser made the point that the trouble with the use of subsidies was not the invalidity of comparison in itself but rather the possible margins of error for both dates and the long time span between the two subsidies.[7] Even if the percentage of town wealth had increased in 1524, the 190 year gap allows plenty of time for towns to have experienced an economic boom and to be on the downswing by 1524 although still having more wealth than in 1334. Rigby made this point as well, quoting the examples of York, Newcastle, Boston, and Lynn all of which had experienced economic growth after 1334 that was subsiding by 1524.[8] Finally Rigby's article in 1986 was entirely devoted to attacking Bridbury's use of these subsidies. He attacked Bridbury's ratios in Appendix II of "Economic Growth" saying that such ratios were meaningless due to the difference in the two subsidies, and also attacked the use of the surveys in Appendix III saying that the growing proportion of urban wealth in counties was not proof of increasing urban prosperity.[9] If Bridbury's ratios were applied to the counties then 22 of the 27 counties would decline in wealth thus meaning that the increase in the proportion of urban wealth in counties was probably more due to rural decline in prosperity

rather than the growth of urban prosperity.[10] Rigby also says that the impression of a growth in urban wealth was probably exaggerated either by an underassessment of rural wealth in 1324 or an overassessment of urban wealth in 1524.[11] Bridbury said that such an exaggeration would make nonsense of his ratios, but it seems that it is a possibility.

In general the use of the subsidies of 1334 and 1524 to suggest an increase in urban wealth is too suspect taking into consideration all the reservations voiced about it, and one should be wary of any thesis based on the comparison of these subsidies.

Bridbury, Dobson, Phythian-Adams, Palliser, and Rigby all agree to a certain extent that the petition of townsmen for tax or fee farm remission are unreliable but differ on how reliable they are. Bridbury denied that most of the protests had any factual basis saying that it was not surprising that the late medieval towns gave the impression of population shortage and a lack of revenue as they wished to persuade the king that their obligations were too heavy to avoid paying them.[12] Bridbury cites the example of the burgesses of Cambridge who pleaded in 1474 that the town was impoverished because craftsmen were leaving the town due to scholars moving in while 20 years earlier Oxford complained that the town was impoverished because of students leaving the town because there were no artisans there.[13] He also

uses the example of Salisbury which was wealthy and made no fee farm petitions because it had no fee farm, to suggest that other towns were wealthy but had grounds for complaint whereas Salisbury did not.[14] In general Bridbury viewed most of these urban petitions as flimsy and fraudulent excuses stating that they were most prevalent when burgesses had to pay the fee farm and also had to pay a parliamentary grant in the same year. In contrast Dobson and Phythian-Adams were prepared to accept that some petitions were warranted. Dobson stressed that the petitions should not be taken at face value, but that in some cases as Wallingford which only had 44 householders in 1434, they were justified.[15] Phythian-Adams also said that some petitions were exaggerated and based on fiscal chicanery but found it hard to believe that the monarchy could have ben so feeble between 1433 and 1482 to have to buy civic support by surrendering a possible £73,000 in revenue.[16] Palliser voiced some well-warranted reservations about many of the petitions. He refered to Chester's successive remissions which contradicted each other on the dating of decay and also the petitions of Oxford and Cambridge.[17] He also pointed out that some pleas simply reflected a decline in the sources of revenue originally assigned to pay the fee farm and that other parts of the petitioning town may well have been wealthy.[18] Some remissions were also made when the king needed support. Henry VI tried to woo York and Coventry in the 1450's, and Edward IV allowed Lancastrian grants to remain in

force when he came to power.[19] Richard III also made grants to buy popularity.[20] Finally Rigby examined the reliability of the non-statistical evidence producing another example of a subterfuge. In 1431 the keepers of the estate of the bishop of Worcester used a petition as an excuse to hide the refusal of the peasants to pay their dues.[21] However, he also proved that in the case of Grimsby the petitions were warranted. In the case of Grimsby he made the important point that in towns the financial problems of the municipal authorities should be separated from a town's genuine problems.[22]

The petitions of the burgesses of towns may have been justified in some cases. However, clearly not all the petitions were subterfuges and not all of them were justified. Thus, such petitions may be of use in looking at individual towns but they are of little use in a general study of the state of England's towns in the fifteenth century.

Other criteria were used by the historians engaged in this debate to either suggest the improvement or decline in economic fortunes of English towns in the fifteenth century.

Bridbury used evidence on the levels of freemen recruitment to towns to suggest the prosperity of towns. He said that such lists tell us whether towns were attracting burgesses after the Black Death to the same

extent as before and found that the proportion of burgesses was often higher suggesting that better pay and better conditions in towns were still attracting people to towns.[23] However, both Dobson and Phythian-Adams had reservations about the use of freemens' lists. Dobson doubted that such lists could be regarded as an accurate guide to a city's population at a given moment although he was prepared to accept that lower levels of freemen recruitment around 1500 implied that towns were losing their ability to attract immigrants.[24] Phythian-Adams said that it was very hard to measure the proportion of freemen in urban populations both before and after the Black Death.[25] The unreliability of such lists of admissions of freemen must make them inadmissable evidence in a study attempting to give general criteria for judging the state of England's towns in the fifteenth century.

Another area of study that would not be suitable for such a general study is the study of customs records. Dobson tentatively put forward customs records as showing an increasing volume of wool and cloth exports and thus supporting the notion of economic growth in a town such as Southampton.[26] However, Palliser points out that such customs records reveal nothing about the home market or the share of wealth from such exports that would accrue to the town and countryside.[27]

Examples of flight from office are used by Bridbury, Dobson, and Phythian-Adams to bolster their cases. Bridbury claimed that while old merchants had little choice but to stay in the towns where their businesses were, young men still had the choice of staying or leaving but that many of them stayed and willingly took office.[28] He used the example of William Dale, sheriff of Bristol, who in 1518 complained to the Star Chamber that the sheriffs were ruined by the costs of office and were fleeing and asked for Bristol's dues to be reduced.[29] Cardinal Wolsey examined the appeal and instead stated that Bristol's problem was its heavy expenditure on pageantry which was ruining the sheriffs. Dobson on the other hand said that after 1450 there was mass evasion, and used the example of William Dale's complaint to back this up.[30] Finally, Phythian-Adams used the examples of burgesses getting licenses to evade office from the king and the election of such officials being made compulsory in Coventry and Leicester in the 1520's to suggest that such evasions were increasing as a result of the contracting finances of burgesses who could no longer take the burden of civic dues.[31] However, such evasion were by no means universal and the examples are confusing as in the example of William Dale which was used to back up two opposing viewpoints. At the same time York regularly complained of such evasion but kept regulations in force keeping the lower orders of craftsmen and merchants away from holding civic offices.[32] Palliser also found examples of men buying

exemptions then later serving office.[33] Once again it would seem that the evidence of evasion of office does not present a uniform picture for all the towns of England, and that in itself the evidence is unreliable making it unsuitable for use in a general survey of England's towns.

Dobson suggested that some towns suffered because of the Wars of the Roses. In 1461, Carlisle was besieged and Stamford sacked.[34] Reading, Coventry, Leicester, Nottingham, and Salisbury were all forced to pay towards Edward IV's army.[35] However, Palliser denies that the Civil War had any effect with there being only 12 to 13 weeks of war over 30 years.[36] He also says the sack of Stamford in 1461 by the Lancastrians was exaggerated by Yorkist propaganda.[37] The war may have had some indirect effects such as the extortion of money from the above towns and the loss of royal favour but the experience was by no means general.

Finally both Bridbury and Dobson used the evidence of building or the lack of building in towns to further their individual arguments. Bridbury said that in the first half of the fifteenth century there was a boom in the building and rebuilding of town hall and church renovations.[38] He also said that unwanted churches were not evidence of a decline in town life as in the case of Winchester which he says could have repaired its churches if it wanted to.[39] However, such building of town halls

and church renovations are no guide to the wealth of a town. Some building could easily have been conducted through the wealth of an individual and by no means does it necessarily reflect the wealth of civic bodies or the prosperity of towns as a whole. Dobson said that the absence of town hall building, church building, and chantry building in the 1450's showed a decline in the wealth of towns and civic bodies.[40] However, Palliser points out that many churches were simply enlarged, and that if town halls were already in existence then new ones did not need to be built.[41] Dobson also used the lack of building of town walls after 1400 as an example of a decline in the wealth and pride of urban bodies with Alnwick being the only town to build walls after 1400.[42] However, once again Palliser points out that if town walls were in existence then there was no need to build new ones.[43] Thus, Dobson's use of the lack of building to suggest a decline of the economic fortunes of England's towns in the second half of the fifteenth century would not seem to be entirely convincing and would certainly not work as a criterion on which to judge the fortunes of all England's towns in the fifteenth century.

All the criteria used by Dobson, Bridbury, and Phythian-Adams in their general surveys of English towns in the fifteenth century would seem to have been discredited. None of the criteria put forward by them to judge the fortunes of England's towns would be suitable as in the

case of Bridbury's argument they do not show that all towns were prosperous and in the case of Dobson's and Phythian-Adams' argument they do not show that all towns were in decline. As Palliser said, "any general urban trend has to fit the evidence for the large towns as a whole, the small towns as a whole, and last, but certainly not least, the capital.".[44] The general surveys of the above three fail to do this.

The three surveys suffered from a lack of knowledge. They concentrated on what was known despite gaping holes in the knowledge concerning English towns of the fifteenth century without attempting to explore any areas of ignorance or to suggest any such areas that could be explored. S Reynolds also found fault with all three historians in that they were all guilty of consistently refering to demographic decline in the fifteenth century as though it was a universal phenomenon that progressed continuously throughout the fifteenth century.[45] Although there was demographic contraction in many of the towns of late medieval England such contraction was interrupted by periods of stability and growth in the levels of population. Reynolds also complained that the three historians all used the words "decline" and "decay" with abandon as all encompassing terms when in fact greater clarity is needed to show whether the economy, the population, or another feature of the urban life of fifteenth century England was in decay/decline.[46] Reynolds stated that there was a tendency in the general

surveys "to slide not only from population to the economy but from economic activity to prosperity."[47]

Palliser in his 1988 article said that any attempt to make such a general survey "must stay extremely speculative" and that it was more fruitful to make detailed local studies.[48] In this way general criteria for the growth and decline of the economic life and population of England's towns in the fifteenth century might be discovered and if not then at least something would be known about factors that affected certain regions. This was what happened in the 1980's with attempts to find a scheme that all English towns would fit into being replaced by detailed studies of towns and regions in the hope that such studies would show some correlation of factors that brought economic and demographic growth or decline to all the towns of late medieval England.

Obviously, many of the studies of individual towns revealed that their economic growth or decline was largely the result of special local features such as the state of different industries in different regions. However, the study of urban rents is fairly prevalent in most of the studies of towns and acts almost as a unifying feature. Both Dobson and Palliser were dubious about the worth of studying urban rent values. Dobson considered that no general conclusion could be drawn from their movement and Palliser considered that downward

trends in rent values showed a decline in demand because of lower urban population rather than a decline in the economic life of a town.[49] However, A. F. Butcher in his article on the rent values of Oxford and Canterbury wrote that examinations of the rent rolls of urban corporations and religious bodies "may provide the most sensitive indicator of economic and demographic change in urban society in the later middle ages."[50] The movement of rent values certainly shows changes in the population level but also reflects the prosperity of the town. Also at least the years of decline in rent value in individual towns could be compared to attempt to construct some kind of general chronology for the decline of urban population levels.

I now intend to look at some of the examinations of the movement of urban rent values in individual towns made in the 1980's. Such an examination is particularly apt not only because the examination of rent movements formed the crux of many of these studies of towns but also because the movement of urban rents occupies a central position in my examination of the bishop's estates in Durham in the second half of the fifteenth century.

Of all the studies of towns, A. F. Butcher's articles upon Newcastle upon Tyne, Oxford, and Canterbury are the only ones based entirely on evidence from rental rolls. In 1978 Butcher's article on Newcastle upon Tyne was published in Northern History. In the article he

examined the records of the estate of Alice Bellasis who in 1447 gave her Newcastle estate to the masters and scholars of the Great Hall of Oxford University.[51] He found from studying the records that rent values and occupancy of properties declined in Newcastle in the second half of the fifteenth century suggesting that there was a decline in the economic life and the population level of Newcastle which had previously been considered to one of the towns of England that suffered no such decline in the fifteenth century. In 1447 the estate of Bellasis was worth £6 14s 2d, but its value fell to £5 15s 6d by 1457-1458 and to £4 17s 2d in 1466-1467.[52] By 1486-1487 the value had fallen to £3 13s 0d and never rose above £4 again.[53] Arrears were also building up and despite being written off at regular intervals continued to build up to unreasonable levels. Butcher saw the root of the problem being in demographic change as demand for property fell. An epidemic in Newcastle in 1478 meant that no rents were paid for the next four years and Butcher surmised that the population of Newcastle was at its nadir in the 1470's and 1480's.[54] Butcher's research using only rental rolls from Oxford University was very valuable completely disproving all previous notions concerning the state of Newcastle in the fifteenth century.

Butcher's studies of Oxford and Canterbury which appeared in Southern History in 1979 were equally of value. For Oxford he examined the rental rolls of Oseney Abbey.

Again he found that the value of the estate was declining in the second half of the fifteenth century. The declared value of the estate was devalued in 1449 from £201 11s 9d to £170 4s 8d.[55] However, this did not hide the falling income of the estate. In the 1450's the actual revenue was on average 25% lower than the declared value, and by the 1470's actual revenue was 36% lower.[56] Arrears were high in the 1450's and were written off but had grown again by the 1470's.[57] Vacancies were persistent and the slump deepened. By 1509 it reached its lower point with the declared value of the estate being £200 15s 10d but with actual revenue being 56% lower.[58] In Canterbury, the income of Canterbury Cathedral Priory from rents fell in every extant account between 1407 and 1521. Through the fifteenth century problems of vacancy and rent reductions grew and the value of the estate hit rock bottom in the last twenty years of the century. In 1483-1484 the declared value of the estate was £196 15 s 3d but £85 3s was allowed and there were £130 6s 5d of arrears.[59] By 1520-1521 the declared value was £200 0s 1d but of this £101 15s 4d was allowed.[60]

Butcher's studies of Newcastle, Oxford, and Canterbury all show the value of evidence for the movements of rent values and of occupancy of properties. The decline of rent values and in particular the increasing instances of vacancies in the records of all three estates are symptomatic of a decline in the population of the three

towns. At the same time the inability of the three landlords to maintain rent values at the higher level and also the growing arrears which continued to grow despite being regularly being written off are indicators of a decline of the economy of the three towns and consequently of a decline in their prosperity.

Other more extensive studies of towns included examinations of urban rent values and vacancies often as a major feature of these studies. Charles Phythian-Adams' 1979 book on Coventry concentrated more on the social structure of the city but he used evidence from rental rolls in his examination of the years 1518-1525, years of crisis for Coventry, and the forty years prior to this. The rentals of the Corpus Christi Guild show a high level of lost rents steadily decreasing in the 1490's but then rising consistently above 5% in the 1500's and above 10% between 1510 and 1520.[61] Finally the level of lost rents never fell below 17% between 1521 and 1527.[62] Vacancies were also high with 26% of properties vacant by 1523.[63] Phythian-Adams was able to use such evidence to show a crisis in Coventry in the early sixteenth century which was in essence due to the decline of the cloth industry but was exacerbated by demographic crisis.

Phythian-Adams chronicled the economic and demographic crisis in Coventry in the 1520's specifically, but suggested that the city was already failing by the

1440's. In a 1990 article, N. W. Alcock, using the rentals of the Catesby family in Coventry, backed Phythian-Adams' claim.[64] The Catesby family had a sizeable estate whose nominal value varied between £23 and £28 in the years 1444-1484. In the 1440's and 1450's he found that deductions from this total were often small, but between 1475 and 1484 the amount of revenue lost was clearly on the increase. Thus, using these rentals Alcock backs up the assertion of Phythian-Adams that Coventry had been in economic decline for some time before the crisis of the 1520's.

The study of rent movements played a large part in Keene's extensive study of medieval Winchester. Keene looked at all aspects of the life of medieval Winchester with housing being just one of them. However, in Volume 2 of the survey, the gazeteer of Winchester looked at all the individual properties owned by the bishop and followed their rent movements and who were occupying them. Using such an extensive examination of the properties for rent owned by the bishop of Winchester, Keene was able to back up the other evidence that Winchester was in economic decline in the fifteenth century because of the collapse of its clothing industry. He found that by the 1520's some tenements in the areas where the cloth industry operated had fallen to a quarter of their 1420 value and also found that the value of property was falling for properties around the market although not as drastically.[65] In general he found three

distinct trends there being firstly a downward trend in property values, secondly a sharper decline in the value of tenements in the cloth industry quarters, and thirdly, an increase in the value and occupancy of cheap cottages.[66] Keene's research showed that rent values were falling because of the decline of the cloth industry, and consequently the chronology of falling rent values in this study of Winchester gives us an idea of the timetable of decline in the cloth industry.

Finally Richard Britnell and Gerard Rosser were able to use evidence on the movement of rent values in their studies of Colchester and Winchester to overturn previously held conceptions about the economic condition of the above two in the fifteenth century. Britnell was hampered by a lack of evidence on rent values for Colchester itself but used rentals for villages surrounding Colchester which were affected by the varying degrees of prosperity of the cloth trade in Colchester as much as the town itself. For instance Dedham land values rose in the first half of the fifteenth century but in the second half of the fifteenth century they fell as Dedham shared Colchester's experience in the decline of the cloth industry.[67] A rental of 1514-1515 for property owned by the Duke of Norfolk in Colchester showed that rent values had declined with the total value of the properties having fallen by 17%.[69] The use of rent values here contributes to the other evidence that Colchester's cloth industry was in decline and thus help

overturn the previously held conception that Colchester, like Newcastle, escaped the fate of many of England's towns in the fifteenth century. Rosser's study of the rentals for the abbey of Westminster shows that the values of tenements, shops, and other properties in Westminster were all falling in the fifteenth century and that many of the abbey's properties were often untenanted.[70] This evidence combined with his research on other aspects of Westminster life overturns previously held views that the capital avoided economic and demographic decline in the fifteenth century.

Most of the surveys of medieval towns made during the 1980's used rentals and figures for rent movements to show decline in these towns whether economic or demographic and in my study of Durham I was able to use the information on the movement of rent values in the Bishop's Borough to show a decline in rent values in the second half of the fifteenth century as well as an increase in vacancies almost certainly resulting from demographic decline. Margaret Bonney was also able to use the rentals of the bursar, the almoner, and the hostillar of the Priory to show the movement of rent values in the Priory's estate in Durham. However, in some areas the results of her research need reconsideration. Firstly, her chronology was somewhat vague as she simply said that arrears, vacancies, and rent losses were at their highest level between 1400 and 1460 and that after 1460 they were still high but that

the situation was improving.[71] My evidence shows that for the Bishop's Borough the first half of the fifteenth century was one of declining revenues, that there was a slight recovery in the 1450's and early 1460's, but that the instances of rent loss and vacancies increased considerably from this point and showed no sign of improvement in 1509. Bonney said that many of the vacancies and rent losses of the Priory were in St Giles's Borough and the Old Borough and that these vacancies were due to people gravitating to the Bishop's Borough which had no trouble with vacancies.[72] However, my evidence shows this to have been wrong. The Bishop's Borough was as prone to vacancies and rent losses as other parts of Durham. Finally, Bonney seemed to be unaware of the records of the bishop's financial administration concerning rent values in Durham. She stated in her book that "the shortcomings of the surviving evidence for the other Durham landlords and overlords, the bishop, the master of Kepier Hospital, and private landholders make it impossible to assess the size or the value of their Durham estates."[73] In the case of the bishop's estate this is patently not true and I hope that my work on rent values will fill in some of the gaps in her work on Durham.

One other area that some historians have examined in towns is milling. Keene looked at milling in Winchester, and Britnell looked at milling in Colchester. Milling is also a subject which I have examined in my work on the

bishop's estates in Durham. A study of milling in towns if possible is very useful for as Britnell said evidence in lower levels of milling implies a contraction of population, if the decline in activity was caused by the mill in question being unusable because it was being repaired.[74] In Winchester Keene found that milling was on the decline in the late middle ages. In the thirteenth century there were nine mills for public use but by 1400 this number had fallen to 6 and by 1550 only three mills were in operation.[75] Also, although the bishop of Winchester's revenue from his mills stayed consistently at between £20 and £30 from the thirteenth century to the early sixteenth century, inflation meant that the real value of the mills was declining and that the mills may have been worth only half their thirteenth century value by the end of the fifteenth century.[76] The fall off of milling in Winchester was just one of the examples Keene was able to show of the effects of declining trade and population in Winchester in the fifteenth century.

Britnell also found that there was a decline in milling in Colchester in the fifteenth century related to the decline of the cloth trade and of Colchester's population. At the start of the fifteenth century a horse mill set up in the 1390's vanished but this left 8 mills.[77] A windmill disappeared from the records in 1414 and despite the building of Hythe mill in 1428, there were only 7 mills operating in the 1430's and 1440's.[78]

Hythe mill fell into disuse in 1443 leaving only six mills in operation by the 1460's after which it is not possible to follow milling in Colchester.[79] The decline of milling here supports the case for a contraction in Colchester's population in the fifteenth century.

My information on the two mills owned by the bishop of Durham also points to a declining population, with the revenues from the mills having fallen to a very low level in the last twenty years of the fifteenth century. Admittedly, a great deal of revenue was often lost due to the mills being incapacitated but at the same time revenue was still being lost because of a decline in the use of the milling facilities. Margaret Bonney also examined milling in Durham by the Priory and the bishop but was able to give little information concerning the financial performance of the mills (perhaps because no such evidence is available) which might have suggested population trends in the Priory's estate in Durham. Once again, while the records of the bishop's financial administration contain no information on the Priory's mills, I hope that my research will fill some gaps in what is known about milling in Durham in the late medieval period.

In this introduction I have shown the validity of the use of information concerning the movement of rent values and milling in studying the changing economic and demographic situation of towns in the late middle ages. I have used

such information in my research combined with information on other sources of revenue from the bishop's estates in Durham to show that the bishop's estate in Durham, as all the towns studied in the 1980's, suffered economic and demographic contraction in the fifteenth century.

CHAPTER TWO

THE RECORDS OF THE BISHOP OF DURHAM'S ADMINISTRATION

Before beginning a detailed study of the bishop of Durham's estates in Durham City in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, something must be said about the primary sources that made such a study possible. All of the primary sources used form part of the Church Commission Collection which is housed in the Palaeography Department of Durham University. All of the records were written in medieval Latin which I transcribed and translated.

In my research I used five main sets of sources. The accounts of the coroner of Easington ward, the accounts of the receiver general, the clerk of works' accounts, and two sets of the Books of Transumpt. The availability of these sources largely dictated the period of study. In the late fourteenth and the first half of the fifteenth century, few documents of the bishop's financial administration survive with only the Hatfield survey of 1383 and two general receivers' accounts for 1383-1384 and 1385-1386 surviving for the fourteenth century, and the first half of the fifteenth century only being represented by the Langley survey of 1418, six receiver generals' accounts spanning the period 1416-

1438, and one coroner of Easington ward's account for 1443-1444. The second half of the fifteenth century and the early sixteenth century are well covered by the documents. Between 1455 and 1489, coroners' accounts for Easington ward appear at regular intervals and there is an almost unbroken series of receiver generals' accounts for the period 1458-1479. Nine clerk of works' accounts survive over the period 1458-1504, and there is an unbroken series of the Books of Transumpt from the financial year 1484-1485 to 1502-1503. All in all these primary sources contain much information about the bishop's properties in Durham such as the tenements, mills, and bakehouse as well as information on the bishop's tenants, administration, and revenues.

The accounts of the coroner of Easington ward provide a large amount of information on Durham. The whole estate of the bishop was divided into four wards, Darlington ward, Chester ward, Easington ward, and Stockton ward with Durham City being in Easington ward. Each of the coroners' accounts detailed the rent yielding properties owned by the bishop in the villages and towns of that particular ward. Between 1443 and 1509, fifteen coroners' accounts for Easington ward survive, the only major gaps in the series being between the first account for 1443-1444 and the second for 1455-1456 and between the account for 1488-1489 and the account for 1505-1506.[1]

Each coroners' account was divided into several different sections.[2] The first detailed the total arrears from previous years. Then there was the section giving details under the names of each vill in the ward of rent yielding properties and who was renting them. At the end of each of these paragraphs, a 'summa' for all the bishop's revenues from the vill was given. Following this entries were made for total receipts with arrears, decayed and decreased rents and farms, payments made to the receiver general, further allowances, and finally entries under 'et debet' stating what the coroner still owed. On the other side of the roll, entries were made for outstanding debts in individual vills and under the heading 'supra' for outstanding debts among individual men and officials of standing.

Of these the entries of most interest for Durham City are the paragraph detailing the properties the bishop owned there, and the entries concerning decayed rents and rents declining in value, and the information concerning further allocations of revenue and outstanding debts. The paragraph on Durham details only the bishop's nominal rent income, but using the information on decayed rents and rents declining in value a realistic total for the bishop's actual rent can be derived. The information on further allocations often gives information about the bishop's mills stating how much money was to be written off for days on which the mill was closed for repairs, while the 'supra' often states what arrears there were if

any for the entire revenue from Durham. Thus, the coroner of Easington ward's accounts reveal much information on the bishop's properties for rent, on his tenants, and also gives some important details concerning the bishop's mills.

The accounts of the receiver general provide a relatively complete series of accounts for the third quarter of the fifteenth century and with thirty-four surviving between the 1416-1417 account and the 1505-1506 account represent the most numerous surviving group of documents under study here of the bishop's administration in the fifteenth century.[3] Sadly, the last quarter of the fifteenth century is less well covered with only five accounts appearing after the account of 1478-1479, and these being of a less informative nature than previous accounts, as well as being in a poor condition. The first decade of the sixteenth century is covered by four accounts but unfortunately these are also less informative than previous accounts.

The receiver general's accounts were divided into two halves, the charge side and the discharge side. The former dealt with incoming revenues, the latter with outgoing money most notably fees, pensions, annuities, and building costs. The charge side is divided into sections: the charges from the wards, the charges from the bailiffs of the manors, the account of the master forester including the coal mines, pensions from

churches, fines from writs and fees for charters, and foreign receipts.[4] Of these sections the ones of use in a study of Durham are the charges from the wards and the foreign receipts. The former of course contains the entry for the annual receipts from Durham although a change in the accounting procedure in the sixteenth century gives the entry under the name of whoever collected the revenues rather than the town thus disguising which revenues were from Durham. The foreign receipts section in each account contains information on the Bishopmeadow and the Mint, two parts of the bishop's estates in Durham whose revenues were not included in the revenues from Durham City. However, the discharge side of the account contains more information of interest concerning Durham. Most of this information does not deal with the bishop's revenues or properties in Durham but with individuals, both the bishop's administrators and the bishop's tenants. The discharge side is also divided into well ordered sections: fees and rewards for officers of the bishopric, annuities, chancery expenses, expenses for work done to the Castle, and money paid to the officials of the bishop, some of whom were mentioned as tenants in the coroner's accounts. The section on annuities and repairs on the Castle meanwhile contain information revealing the jobs and other details of some tenants of the bishop in Durham. Therefore, the receiver general's accounts provide a wealth of biographical detail for those living in the bishop's estates in Durham.

There are no Books of Transumpt extant until 1484-1485 but after this a complete set survives until 1502-1503.[5] This source differs from the others in that it was not a final statement for the financial year. The Books of Transumpt were used in the compilation of the receiver general's accounts acting as a notebook in which entries were made when sums of money were paid in.[6] Thus, they show the work of collecting in progress and consequently contain some very rewarding material concerning the bishop's revenues. The Books of Transumpt provide an invaluable source for Durham, in particular for the bishop's mills, the revenues collected by the bailiff of Durham, and the bishop's bakehouse. In the coroner of Easington ward's accounts and the receiver general's accounts mentions are made of the mills with the latter being of particular importance to the revenues from Durham, but they contain no information on the bailiff's revenues and the bakehouse revenues. On the other hand the Books of Transumpt contain accounts for all three, detailing money received and arrears. The mills' revenues, the bailiff's revenues and the bakehouse revenues made up all the bishop's revenues from Durham each year. Thus, the Books of Transumpt play a very important part in a study of the bishop of Durham's estates in Durham itself.

The last major set of accounts of use in a study of Durham in this period are the clerk of works' accounts. Ten of these survive for the second half of the fifteenth

century starting with the account for 1458 and ending with the account for 1503-1504, with the accounts for 1493-1494 and 1494-1495 being the only consecutive accounts.[7] The information from these accounts on the bishop's estates in Durham is almost exclusively confined to the bishop's mills, with only a few references to the bakehouse and the market place. However, the information on the mills is very valuable showing the extent of necessary repairs, the materials used in repairing the mills and the dam, and the cost of maintaining the mills. The sections on Durham's mills also contain information on who was working on these works and how much they were paid. As in the section of the receiver general's accounts concerning repairs to the Castle, there is some information here on the bishop's employees some of whom were also his tenants. The clerk of works' accounts are therefore useful for gaining detailed information on the running of the mills and also for biographical details on the bishop's employees and tenants.[8]

Finally the surveys conducted of the estates of the Bishop Hatfield and the estates of Bishop Langley were used.[9] In both of these surveys a section of Durham appeared detailing the bishop's properties in the town. The contents of both surveys are fully described in the section on the Hatfield and Langley surveys.

Using the aforementioned records a reasonable idea of the state of the bishop of Durham's estates in the fifteenth

and early sixteenth centuries can be gained. The records allow us to follow the bishop's revenues from Durham, the pattern of rents and tenement ownership amongst his tenements and plots, the money made by the mills and the state of repair of the mills, and the condition of the other properties such as the granary, the Mint, and the Bishopmeadow. Finally in some cases it is possible to follow the careers of some of the bishop's officials and tenants, all in all allowing a fairly comprehensive study of the properties, finances, and tenants under the bishop of Durham in the city that acted as his administrative headquarters.

CHAPTER THREE

THE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE OF THE BISHOP'S ESTATES IN DURHAM IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

The financial administration of most of the bishop of Durham's estate in the North-East was conducted on three levels with each level being responsible for a larger area than the previous one. The group of officials refered to as the collectors formed the basis of the structure, each collector being responsible for collecting the revenue from bonded and exchequer lands for one vill or occasionally two or more vills. No allowance was made for arrears in this office, each collector being expected to collect all the anticipated revenues from his vill.[1] The second element in this structure were the four coroners representing Darlington ward, Chester ward, Easington ward, and Stockton ward. The four coroners were responsible for collecting all the rents from free lands in the wards under their jurisdiction. As well as the difference in the areas of responsibility between the coroners and the collectors, the coroners were also responsible not only for arrears incurred in their period of office but also all arrears of previous coroners in the same bishopric.[2] Consequently the coroners in general had to be men of means and social standing as well as ability. The

receiver general headed the administration of the bishop's estates, his position simply being to gather in all the revenues collected by the collectors, the coroners, and the other officials of the bishopric to produce a final reckoning for each financial year. The position of receiver general was one reserved for one of the senior and most trusted of the bishop's officials, considering the responsibility of the position and the breadth of work it entailed, with the final audit normally taking at least two months to complete.[3]

This was the administrative structure for most of the bishop's estates. However, in Durham there was no need for a collector as all the rents in the bishop's estate in Durham were free rents. Consequently, all the rents in Durham were collected by the coroner of Easington ward.

All the intrinsic parts that made up the revenues from Durham were farmed out to the burghers of Durham. The main source of revenue, the two mills of the bishop, were let out to one or more tenants each year. Those who rented the mills were expected to pay the full fee expected for the mills each year, and if they were not able to they were still expected to pay any arrears when their term of renting the mills had ended.[4] The second source of revenues was farmed out to a burgher of Durham who would then act as bailiff of Durham. The position of bailiff of Durham was not the same as the positions of

the bailiffs of Darlington, Stockton, Middleham, and Evenwood who were official appointees of the bishop. The office of bailiff of Durham was taken on by one of the bishop's tenants with the bailiff agreeing to collect a set amount of revenues for the bishop. It seems unlikely that any bailiff in the second half of the fifteenth century could have made a profit from this office and it seems rather to have been a prestige position. In the late fifteenth century, the bailiff was expected to collect the rents from tenements owned by the bishop and market tolls. As with the mills, whoever took on the farm of the revenues of the Burgh had to pay not only the annual fee but also any arrears accumulated in previous years.[5] Finally the third source of revenue, the bishop's bakehouse was farmed out annually to one tenant on the same terms as the other farms.[6]

It seems that there was a rearrangement in this structure in the second half of the fifteenth century. In all the coroners' accounts for Easington ward up to 1470-1471 the information suggests that the bailiff of Durham was responsible for collecting all the revenues for Durham. Of course others ran the mills and the bakehouse but it seems that the bailiff was responsible for collecting the revenues from these properties. For instance in all the coroners' accounts between 1455-1456 and 1470-1471, Adam Frithbank was quoted at the start of each description of Durham as the farmer of Durham's revenues. In the 1455-1456 account other names were given as farmers but in the

other accounts Adam Frithbank appeared as sole farmer.[7] In the section of these accounts recording outstanding debts, Adam Frithbank was refered to as the farmer of both the Burgh and the mills in Durham. However, in all the accounts after that of 1470-1471, the paragraph on Durham merely stated that the revenues of Durham had been farmed out for a certain fee without giving any names of farmers.[8] Also when outstanding arrears were given they were given separately under the names of those renting the mills, the bakehouse, and the revenues of the Burgh rather than being quoted just under the bailiff. Perhaps it was decided to farm the revenues out to a number of individuals rather than to one person to spread what must have been a great financial burden for one person especially if the source of revenue was declining as the growing arrears total for the mills, the bakehouse, and the Burgh in the Books of Transumpt suggest.

The coroner of Easington ward collected revenues for Durham directly from the farmers of the mills, the Burgh, and the bakehouse, and the coroners' accounts reflect this close involvement with Durham. The coroners' accounts recorded any alterations in the rents of properties. Any changes in the situation concerning the bishop's tenements were recorded in the section detailing the decay of rents in Easington ward. Furthermore in the section detailing allowances any money written off from the rent of the mills because of closure due to repairs was recorded as well as other allowances, such as arrears

which were unlikely to be paid or any basic reduction in the rents of the mills. Thus, the coroner of Easington ward was obviously the bishop's official who had the most to do with collecting the revenues from Durham as well as regulating the financial administration of the mills, the Burgh, and the bakehouse.

The receiver general's involvement with the financial administration of Durham was much the same as his involvement with any other vill in the bishop's estates. He was presented with the information as well as the collected revenues from Durham by the coroner and from this he had to deduce a total for Durham's revenues most of which were comprised from the properties leased out by the bishop. However, the receiver general's only concern with Durham was to use the coroner's information rather than to inquire into the finances of the bishop's estates in the town for himself.

The Priory's management of its estates in Durham varied from that of the bishop's administration in some respects. The revenues from the Priory's tenements were directly collected by several officials. The main ones being the bursar, the almoner, and the hostillar, who like the coroner were also responsible for recording any decayed rents or vacancies in the tenements under their administration.[9] The Priory also followed the practice of the bishop's administration in farming out some of its mills for rent by tenants to make more money than would

be generated if they were kept for private use.[10] As in the case of the bishop's mills these rents were collected by the Priory's officials. The only major contrast between the two administrations is the Priory's use of three main official and a number of lesser officials to collect the revenue from rents form the Priory's Durham estates. The Priory had a greater number of properties for rent in Durham than the bishop and the properties were split up between the obedientaries of the Priory, each of whom needed a separate income to meet their responsibilities in the Priory.

Finally something must be said about the other officials whose work was important to the running of the Durham estate, the clerk of works. He has not been mentioned yet due to the different nature of his position. While the other officials had to collect revenues, the clerk of works was actually spending money. His portfolio was to ensure the maintenance of major properties within the bishop's estates. In particular he was responsible for the upkeep of the mills, employ workers to effect such repairs, and also had to pay these workers. The clerk of works also regulated works on the bakehouse, the market place stalls, and the Castle, and his work was obviously of importance to Durham.[11]

The financial administration of Durham had the task of extracting the maximum possible revenue from Durham for the bishop. The spreading out of the financial burdens

in the last quarter of the fifteenth century and the increasing size of arrears at this time demonstrate that the task of the financial administration was becoming more and more difficult as the fifteenth century progressed.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE HATFIELD AND LANGLEY SURVEYS

A study of the Hatfield and Langley surveys gives an idea of the topography of the bishop of Durham's estates in Durham itself in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries as well as revealing information on what sort of properties the bishop owned in Durham, how many properties he owned in Durham, and the position of the properties that he owned. The Hatfield survey was completed in 1383 two years after the death of Bishop Hatfield while the Langley survey was undertaken in 1418, twelve years into the bishopric of Bishop Thomas Langley.[1] Both surveys were undertaken to show what properties the bishop owned in Durham at the time, what the official value of those properties were, where the properties were situated, and who was renting the bishop's properties at that time. The Hatfield survey detailed only the tenements owned by the bishop but the Langley survey gave information not only on the tenements but also on Bishop Langley's administrative buildings on Palace Green and on the other properties that contributed to the revenues derived from Durham. The evidence from these two surveys can be compared to show the changes taking place in individual plots, all of which apart from one can be found and matched up in the Langley survey

using information on previous tenants and site descriptions. However, the information in the two surveys must not be taken at face value. In both cases the rent figures for individual properties and any overall figure for revenue from the bishop's tenements do not represent the actual rent totals for 1383 and 1418 but only show the maximum possible rent the bishop could have derived from his properties in Durham in those years. No account is made for the decline of properties, reductions in rent, or vacancies in these surveys which were drawn up to show the bishop's optimum revenue if all the properties were filled at their stated rents. Secondly, the Langley survey seems to have been less thorough than the Hatfield survey. In the Langley survey in several instances no rent value is given for a property. Also in the Langley survey many of those who are cited as the former tenant were also cited as the former tenant in the Hatfield survey although there had been no intervening tenants. In the Hatfield survey William of Bishopdale had one tenement formerly of John Morepath and paid 12d in rent. In the Langley survey John Cook rented the same tenement but the former tenant was still given as John Morepath although William of Bishopdale clearly intervened between them. This seeming carelessness on the part of those compiling the survey could be explained by the fact that both surveys were based on an even earlier survey in an attempt to establish some continuity. However, despite these reservations, the information in the two surveys is

valuable in enabling us to envisage a topography of the estates in Durham of Bishop Hatfield and Bishop Langley and to evaluate the condition of the respective bishop's estates.

The Langley survey of Durham begins with an introductory passage before going on to list the bishop's tenements.[2] This passage firstly describes the bishop's buildings in the walled area known as the precinct. We are told that the castle was in a good and decent state of repair and that also included within the walled area were a great abbey and the two parish churches of St Mary and St John. However, the bulk of information concerns the bishop's administrative buildings on Palace Green, here refered to as 'Le Place'. Palace Green is described as a courtyard containing two acres of land situated between the lower gates of the Castle and the abbey graveyard. The writer states that in Palace Green there were buildings containing the offices of the chancery, the exchequer, and of receipt as well as the hall for the pleas of justice. Thus, Palace Green was the focal point of the bishop's administration not just for Durham but for all his estates. We are also told that two buildings which would have been focal points for the bishop's tenants, the bakehouse and the large grainstore, were situated on Palace Green. Also on the west side of Palace Green was the old goal which we are told had been out of use due to the building of the great Northgate at the entrance to the Castle which now contained the bishop's goal. Facing

these buildings on the east side were the bishop's Mint and the houses occupied by the constable, the chancellor, and the moneyer. All the buildings described above were included in the precinct with only the bakehouse and the Mint contributing to the revenues of the bishop. The writer goes on to give an inventory of the properties and elements that made up the revenues from Durham. The city of Durham 'with its rents, services, courts, and customs', had two water mills, ovens, a market, and provided market tolls. 'All other profits and commodities, escheats and forfeitures of land and of tenements were let to Nicholas Hayford and his associates for six years at 110 marks a year'. Two other properties listed here which were within the Durham estate but were not included in the bishop's revenues from Durham were Franklyn forest and the Bishopmeadow. The former was the major source of timber for the bishop's building works while the latter was rented out annually for the sum of £5 6s 8d.

The introductory passage of the Langley survey gives a brief inventory of all the major buildings and sources of revenue within the bishop's estate in Durham. The inventory shows that apart from Franklyn forest and the Bishopmeadow, the bishop's larger assets and properties were fairly concentrated, all being located in the Precinct or in the Bishop's Borough, the two central boroughs of the town and the only areas of Durham under the bishop's control.

An examination of the tenements, gardens, and shops rented out by the bishop reinforces the above impression that the bishop's assets in Durham in the period 1383-1418 were concentrated in the two areas under the bishop's control. Certainly, none of the tenements listed in either survey were in boroughs under the control of the Priory.

The main route through the Bishop's Borough and the Precinct ran straight from the market place past Sadlergate and the Bailey to the Northgate, and then continued as the North Bailey. This was the main route into the market place and the bishop's tenements were mostly formed in a linear pattern along this route. The bishop owned properties in Kingsgate which ran down from the North Bailey towards the river, and Owengate which also ran off from the North Bailey going up to Palace Green. He also rented out a large number of gardens and small plots of land above and below the Castle motte most of which backed on to the Bailey.[3]

Table one shows the type of properties under the bishop's control in Durham. The North Bailey, the Northgate, the Bailey, Sadlergate, and Owengate all on or leading to the main route had only tenements apart from the one exception of a venell rented by John Cutler for 2d in 1383 and by John Kay, chaplain for the same rent in 1418,

situated in Sadlergate. The main residential area of the bishop's estates in Durham obviously lay along the main

TABLE ONE: THE TENEMENTS OF BISHOP HATFIELD AND BISHOP LANGLEY IN DURHAM

	HATFIELD			LANGLEY		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
NORTH BAILEY	3	0	0	2	0	0
NORTHGATE	2	0	0	2	0	0
BAILEY	5	0	0	5	0	0
SADLERGATE	3	0	1	3	0	1
MARKET PLACE	0	0	2	0	0	2
KINGSGATE	1	1	0	1	3	0
OWENGATE	3	0	0	3	0	0
PALACE GREEN	1	1	0	1	1	0
ELVET BRIDGE	1	0	0	1	0	1
MOTTE	1	5	0	1	10	0
OTHERS	1	0	2	1	2	1
TOTAL	21	7	5	20	16	5

1 = TENEMENTS
2 = GARDENS AND PLOTS
3 = SHOPS/OFFICES

route to the market place, the majority of plots for rent being comprised of a tenement only. The tenement for the chaplain of the Chantry of St James on Elvet Bridge including an old kiln was known as Milnemeadow in its rent of 5s was exceptional. One of the tenements in the Bailey which was formerly rented by Edward Barton is described in both surveys as now being 'waste land'. This tenement used to have a rent of 10s, a much larger rent than for any of the other tenements appearing in the surveys. Perhaps the large rent was not only an indication of higher rent prices in former times but also the reason for the tenement's abandonment and decay. The

Langley survey also shows that a tenement formerly rented by William of Auckland for 1s had become derelict. In Kingsgate and the land around the motte the properties for rent were nearly all gardens and plots with only one tenement being mentioned in the motte area, and the only tenement in Kingsgate being derelict by 1418. Both these areas were behind the tenements lining the Bailey where there must have been more room for such small plots. A typical example of such a plot is that of Agnes Brown above the motte which in 1383 and 1418 had a rentable value of 4d. All these gardens and plots brought in a fairly small rent. John Kellynghall had a garden in Kingsgate for a rent of 2s in both surveys but all the other gardens and plots mentioned had rents of 1s or less.

In both surveys two shops rented out by the bishop are mentioned. In 1383 John Bowman rented a shop for 10s, and John Cusson rented a newly built shop for 6s 8d. These shops were respectively rented by Agnes Cupper and Thomas Goldsmith in 1418. Both these shops brought in a considerably higher rent than any of the tenements probably because they were in the market place, the commercial hub of the city. However, it would seem strange that in both 1383 and 1418 the bishop rented out only two shops in the market place where the only market in the city took place. One would have thought that a high demand for properties would have existed here which the bishop might have capitalised on by holding more

properties for rent. Either Bishop Hatfield and Bishop Langley were not interested in developing this area of their estate or demand was not high enough to warrant the opening of any new shops.

Some properties do not fit in comfortably under any of the aforementioned headings. As previously mentioned there was the small venell in Sadlergate rented for 2d, and in the Langley survey an entry appeared for two waste plots under the arches of Elvet Bridge which were rented by John Runkhorn for 10d.

A comparison of the two surveys shows an increase in the number of tenants the bishop had in Durham. The 1383 survey detailed only 33 properties being rented out while the 1418 survey listed 41 properties in Durham for rent. However, this increase was due to a rise in the number of small plots and gardens for rent in the motte and Kingsgate areas which increased from 7 in 1383 to 16 in 1418. These plots were small and normally bought in little rent. At the same time the number of tenements remained static. A house rented in 1383 by the Master of Kepier Hospital was not mentioned in the 1418 survey, thus accounting for the slight decline in the number of tenements, but the same house was mentioned in the coroner's account for 1443 suggesting that its disappearance in 1418 was an oversight.[4] However, of the 20 other tenements, one was derelict before 1383 and another became derelict between 1383 and 1418. It does

not appear that the bishop was attempting to increase the number of his holdings in his own borough at this time to any great extent.

A comparison between the rent totals for 1383 and 1418 show little difference. Both figures represent a small amount, that for 1383 being £2 10s 8d and for 1418 £2 13s 4d. The small increase was due to the proliferation of small plots and gardens between the surveys, but its smallness reflects the generally low rent value of such plots. Any increase due to this proliferation would also have been reduced by the decay of William of Auckland's tenement losing 1s and three reductions in rent, one for a tenement on the North Bailey reduced from 4d to 2d, one for a garden on the moat reduced from 1s 6d to 1s, and finally a reduction for the plot of Thomas Colnell above the moat which had been worth 1s 2d in 1383 but was worth only 4d in 1418 because an addition to the Castle fortifications was being built on the plot. All in all both figures show that the bishop's holding in Durham were worth little and that their value was not growing significantly.

Finally a comparison between the Priory's stake in the bishop's land and the bishop's stake shows how small the revenue derived from these tenements was. In 1418 the bishop expected a revenue of £2 13s 4d from his properties in Durham. In contrast in 1424 the almoner of the Priory received £10 10s 2d rent from the Bailey

alone.[5] This not only puts the bishop's revenue from rent in Durham into relief but also shows the preparedness of the Priory to buy up tenements in the bishop's land, while the bishop had no tenements in Priory land.

Perhaps a general explanation for the small and seemingly poor estate of the bishop of Durham in Durham City at this time is offered by the Victoria History of County Durham which explained the situation in terms of local politics. Bishop Hatfield and his successors apparently found living in such close proximity to the wealthy Priory distasteful, and in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, Bishop Auckland, Stockton, and Middleham were prefered residences.[6] This suggests that Durham was not as important to the bishops as other areas and consequently could well have been neglected. Perhaps the bishop was not interested in competing with the Priory for property and influence in the city thus giving the Priory a free rein to expand their estate in Durham.

The two surveys provide a good backdrop to a study of Durham in the second half of the fifteenth century. Despite the intent of the surveys to show the maximum rent available to the bishop from his Durham tenements, plots, and shops they reveal a seemingly static situation with slight increases in some areas balanced by decline in others. The second half of the fifteenth century in comparison was a period of greater change for the bishop's estates in Durham.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE BISHOP'S PROPERTIES FOR RENT IN DURHAM

The bishop of Durham was one of the two major landlords in Durham in the Middle Ages, although by the second half of the fifteenth century, his estate in Durham was smaller than that of the Priory. A detailed study of the coroners of Easington ward's accounts between the years 1443 and 1509 reveals much information on the bishop's tenements, gardens, and other properties for rent in Durham showing the period to have been one of vacant properties and reductions in the nominal rent value of properties as it was in so many of the towns of the fifteenth century that have been studied in detail over the last fifteen years. However, that is not to say that the whole period was one of decline in occupancy for the bishop's properties for rent. A study of the period reveals the chronology to have been more complex than this with times of growth, stability, and decline within the 66 years of study.

The position and layout of the bishop's properties for rent was dealt with in the examination of the Hatfield and Langley surveys and the shape of the estate barely changed throughout the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. All the properties listed in the above

surveys were situated in the areas that the bishop was overlord of in Durham and this situation did not change, with any new properties for rent over the period being either in the Precinct or in the Bishop's Borough. The Priory was by far the dominant overlord in the Old Borough, Elvet Bridge, St Giles' Borough, and the Barony of Elvet in the fifteenth century as well as being the dominant landlord in the Bailey, an area within the bishop's sphere of influence in Durham.[1] It seems that the area that suffered the fewest incursions in the bishop's estates by the Priory was the market place, the central feature of the Bishop's Borough, but the overall impression is that the Priory held a much larger stake in Durham's housing and properties for rent than the bishop did.

The bishop's estate was not expanding its boundaries in the fifteenth century and there was no great expansion within the estate itself. In the Langley survey of 1418 the bishop owned 41 properties for rent in Durham including 20 tenements, 16 gardens and plots of land, 2 shops, 2 plots of waste land under Elvet Bridge, and 1 vennel in Sadlergate.[2] The situation hardly changed between 1418 and 1443. In 1443 the bishop was renting out only three new properties in addition to the properties for rent he owned in 1418.[3] In 1418 the bishop only had two shops in the market place, the only market area of the town, and his lack of involvement in an area of such obvious importance to Durham seems

strange. Perhaps the setting up of two new shops between 1418 and 1443 was an attempt to exploit this asset.

TABLE TWO: THE TYPES OF PROPERTY FOR RENT OWNED BY THE BISHOP OF DURHAM 1443-1509

CORONERS' ACCOUNT	TENEMENTS	GARDENS	SHOPS	OTHERS	TOTAL
1443-1444	20	16	4	4	44
1455-1456	17	22	6	4	49
1459-1460	17	25	6	4	52
1465-1466	18	24	6	4	52
1466-1467	18	23	6	4	51
1469-1470	19	23	6	4	52
1470-1471	19	22	6	4	51
1474-1475	19	22	6	4	51
1477-1478	19	22	6	4	51
1480-1481	19	22	6	4	51
1486-1487	19	22	6	4	51
1488-1489	19	22	6	4	51
1505-1506	19	23	6	4	52
1508-1509	19	23	6	4	52

Between 1443 and 1509 the number of properties the bishop had for rent changed little, increasing slightly in the first twenty years of the period and then stabilising. The coroner's account of 1455-1456 showed a growth from 44 to 49 properties and in the 1459-1460 account there was a further increase to 52 properties.[4] This increase was due to a growth in certain types of properties, the number of tenements actually decreasing from 20 to 17 between 1443 and 1456. The increase was firstly due to a growth in the number of gardens and plots for rent from 16 in 1443 to 22 in 1456 and finally to 25 in 1460. The proliferation of such small plots also took place between the Hatfield survey where 7 such properties were for rent

and the Langley survey where the number had grown to 16.[5] It seems that such small plots most of which had small rents were growing in popularity over the first half of the fifteenth century. The second element of this increase was due to the development of two new shops for rent in the market place once again suggesting that the policy was to make more of this asset.

The coroners' accounts from that of 1469-1470 to that for 1508-1509 show that the growth of the bishop's estate had reached its full extent. The number of properties for rent remained virtually static fluctuating between 52 and 51 properties and ending at 52 properties in 1509.[6] Any change was due to slight fluctuations in the number of gardens and plots for rent. Some of these plots being small were probably of an ephemeral nature with three of the gardens mentioned for the first time in 1459-1460 being vacant by 1471. Between 1460 and 1509 only three new properties appeared in the accounts. Two new tenements appeared, one of them in 1470, the house of John Henryson on Elvet Bridge, being the only newly built house recorded in the accounts.[7] One new garden appeared in the 1505-1506 account, but these were only changes during the latter fifty years of the period under study.[8]

The obvious implication of this study of the number of properties the bishop held for rent in Durham is that compared to the Priory, the bishop came a very poor second in terms of properties held for rent. In 1501,

the almoner, one of the three main officials responsible for the collection of rent in Durham for the Priory, reported that 70 of the rents under his jurisdiction were unattainable.[9] This figure of 70 properties representing only the number of lost rents for properties shows that the Priory held many more properties for rent than the bishop. Some improvement was made by the bishop in the fifteenth century particularly in the development of the market place, but in other areas there was no change. It must also be remembered that the paragraph in each coroner's account listing the bishop's holdings in Durham was a record of the potential extent and revenue of the estate, not taking into account any properties whose value was decreasing or more significantly any properties that had fully declined and were no longer in a fit state to rent out to tenants. Taking this into consideration, the small estate of the bishop in Durham City must have been even smaller in actual terms.

Having established the size of the bishop's estates in Durham, I will now look at the levels of rent of individual properties and the total potential revenue the bishop could have expected from his properties for rent in Durham. The figures for rent are drawn from the paragraph in each coroner's account detailing the full extent of the bishop of Durham's estate. The rent figures for individual properties and the total do not take into account any reductions in rent or any complete decay of properties and therefore represent the nominal

rent or rather what the bishop would have got if each property was leased at its nominal value and what he would have get if all his properties were leased at their maximum potential value.

The individual properties can be divided into three separate categories, tenements, gardens and plots, and shops. Those properties refered to as 'tenementum' in the coroners' accounts could strictly be defined simply as a distinct unit of land with precise boundaries, but most of the tenements refered to here would have included some sort of dwelling. The simple definition of a 'tenementum' certainly leaves a great deal of room for variation, and tenements could range from the poorest of hovels to stone build houses of some size. This variation if reflected in the wide range of rents the bishop's tenements in Durham had. The two highest rents for tenements in Durham were those for the properties stated as belonging to John Runkhorn and the rector of the Church of the Virgin Mary in 1443 both of whom had an annual rent of 5s to pay.[10] The former included one house, a kiln, and a meadow while the latter was merely stated to be a tenement. At the other end of the scale the tenement of the Sacrist of Durham had a rent value of only 2d.[11] The majority of the tenements had a rent value ranging between one and two shillings, one shilling being the most common nominal rent for tenements. In his study of Winchester, Keene found that few cottages had a value of over 6s 8d and that there were many who paid

only one shilling for their cottages.[12] This suggests that in Durham the majority of tenements contained dwellings equivalent to small cottages with there being few dwellings of substance for rent. The Bishop's Borough being a popular place to live in as it was near to the market, and also being restricted in size by the Castle on one side and the sheer descent to the Wear on the other was probably congested with many small dwellings cramped together, and this would also account for the low rent values of tenements.

The gardens and plots rented out by the bishop tended to be of a low rent value. As in the Hatfield and Langley surveys, the highest rent value was that for the gardens owned by John Kellynghall at a rent of 2s.[13] However, the rest of the gardens had very low rents probably due to their small size. A plot of land rented by Robert Sotheron, chaplain from 1455 measured only seven feet by six feet and consequently had a rent of only 1d.[14] A larger plot of land measuring 32 feet by 6 feet fetched a rent of 4d due to its greater size.[15] These gardens and plots cannot have needed much attention or repair by the bishop, but they were never going to bring in a large amount of revenue for him.

The bishop's shops in the market place were able to command by far the highest nominal rents of the bishop's properties for rent and this fact must have been recognised by the increase in shops from 2 in 1418 to 6

in 1456. Two shops collectively rented by William Bentlay and John Stevenson had a nominal rent of £1 in 1443-1444 which was reduced to 18s 3d in the coroner's account of 1455-1456.[16] A further two shops rented by Thomas Silton for most of the period had a joint rent of 13s 4d.[17] Finally two shops which were probably smaller were rented by Adam Frithbank and Thomas Cornford from 1455 onwards for 3s 4d and 3s respectively.[18] The rents that these shops could bring in was obviously of importance in this small estate constituting nearly half the total potential revenue of the estate.

Not surprisingly a small group of properties providing a small potential revenue adds up to a small potential total revenue. In the coroner's account for 1443-1444 this revenue was £4 1s 2d, its lowest level, and in the account for 1459-1460 it was £4 7s 3d, its highest level.[19] In comparison to the revenues of other ecclesiastical landlords this represents a very small amount. In 1464, the bursar of Durham Priory collected £30 8s 6d from rents of tenements in Durham including the rent of Elvet bakehouse.[20] In the early sixteenth century the bursar collected £23 4d in 1508 from rents of tenements while the almoner in 1501 was able to collect £35 5s 7d from Durham rents.[21] Obviously the Priory had a much greater total income from rents than the bishop in Durham. The sacrist of the Priory of Westminster between 1450 and 1475 was able to collect on average £188 from his properties in Westminster and £209 annually between

1475 and 1500.[22] Even a small group of properties in Newcastle upon Tyne left by Alice Bellasis to the Great Hall of Oxford University in 1447 had a nominal rent value of £6 14s 2d although the actual value of the estate in the second half of the fifteenth century was closer to £4.[23] All the above figures serve to stress the small revenue from properties for the bishop especially as they are with the exception of the latter example actual rent totals rather than nominal ones. Why did the bishop's properties for rent in Durham amount to such a small total revenue from rents? Firstly, an obvious reason for this is the dominance of the Priory as landlord in the town which restricted the bishop to a small area of holdings. Secondly, a possible reason is that the bishop had more properties which he had granted to retainers for military or other service which would therefore contribute no rent. In this way he could have lost potential revenue from properties in Durham.

The bishop's total potential revenue from his properties for rent in Durham was small, but this figure can be reduced further by lost rents. I will look at lost rents in two sections, the first examining rents lost due to properties being vacant, the second examining rents lost through negotiating a lower rent value than the nominal rent for properties.

TABLE THREE: THE NUMBER OF PLOTS LOSING REVENUE 1443-1509

CORONER'S ACCOUNT	RENT REDUCED	PROPERTY VACANT	TOTAL
1443-1444	5	6	11
1455-1456	6	6	12
1459-1460	6	7	13
1465-1466	5	8	13
1466-1467	3	13	16
1469-1470	3	10	13
1470-1471	3	11	14
1474-1475	5	14	19
1477-1478	5	14	19
1480-1481	5	15	20
1486-1487	5	15	20
1488-1489	5	15	20
1505-1506	0	9	9[1]
1508-1509	0	9	9[1]

1: Totals do not include a group of gardens which lay vacant as a figure for revenue lost from them is given without a figure for the number of gardens.

TABLE FOUR: REVENUE LOST FROM PROPERTIES FOR RENT 1443-1509

CORONER'S ACCOUNT	RENT REDUCTION	PROPERTY VACANT	TOTAL
1443-1444	7s 10d	4s 11d	12s 9d
1455-1456	12s 8d	4s 11d	16s 7d
1459-1460	12s 8d	5s 4d	18s 1d
1465-1466	14s 10d	6d 7d	£1 1s 5d
1466-1467	14s 10d	15s 10d	£1 10s 8d
1469-1470	16s 6d	17s 6d	£1 14s 0d
1470-1471	16s 6d	17s 6d	£1 14s 0d
1474-1475	16s 6d	10s 5d	£1 6s 11d
1480-1481	16s 6d	17s 1d	£1 13s 7d
1486-1487	16s 6d	17s 1d	£1 13s 7d
1488-1489	16s 6d	17s 1d	£1 13s 7d
1505-1506	--	17s 1d	17s 1d
1508-1509	--	18s 1d	18s 1d

Vacant properties can be divided into two categories, long-term vacancies and short-term vacancies. The properties included in the former category remained vacant for a long enough period to confirm that they had fallen into complete disrepair and were beyond recovery,

while those in the latter category were vacant because there was no tenant for them in particular years. In the former category were the tenements of the Prior of Durham, Thomas Clerk, John Maydenstane, and Robert Menell which appeared on the back of each coroner's account for being in the long-term arrears. These arrears mounted up and were occasionally written off, but there was obviously no hope of the arrears being paid. Further long-term vacancies were the tower of the master of Kepier Hospital and the garden of John Hyndeley both of which were empty in 1443 and remained so throughout the period.[24] A property which became vacant in 1465-1466 was one formerly rented in entirety by Thomas Barbour for the rent of 1s 2d whose rent had fallen to 4d because the bishop was undertaking building work on part of the plot.[25] In 1465-1466 the whole plot became vacant and remained so. Throughout the period 1443-1509 other plots became vacant and failed to find another tenant, thus joining the ranks of the long-term vacancies.

The three examples of short-term vacancies are particularly important as the examples are of four shops of the bishop sited in the market place. Firstly, in the financial year 1466-1467 two shops formerly rented by Thomas Silton for 13s 4d which had already had 5s 4d removed from their value lost a further 8s because of a lack of tenants to take the rent on.[26] The two shops were still empty by 1471 but obviously by the account of 1474-1475 they had found tenants as they were not

mentioned as being vacant.[27] In 1480-1481 another shop which had a rent of 6s 8d lost all this due to being vacant and finally the shop rented under the name of Adam Frithbank from the 1455-1456 account at a value of 3s 4d was listed as vacant in the accounts for the sixteenth century.[28] When properties situated in the only market site in Durham could not find tenants, the suggestion is that the economic situation of Durham cannot have been too healthy in the second half of the fifteenth century. This notion is backed up further by a reference in the coroners' accounts from 1480 onwards to five shops which were all vacant losing £1 2d in revenue.[29] These shops were not mentioned previously and must have been acquired or built after 1478. However they were acquired, they never found tenants. For some reason, the value of the five shops had been raised to £1 15s by 1505 but they still remained vacant.[30] The lack of tenants for these shops reinforces the impression that the economy of Durham must have contracted if tenants could not be found to take on properties in an area one would have expected to be in great demand. The increasing instances of vacancies also suggest that the population of the Bishop's Borough was on the wane as there was no pressure on land with many properties remaining empty once they became vacant.

The bishop was not alone in finding trouble with growing vacancies and decayed rents in the second half of the fifteenth century with two officials of the Priory losing

rents. The hostillar reported only 4 waste rents in 1440 but in 1509 this figure had risen to 32.[31] The almoner meanwhile reported 70 waste rents in 1501 as opposed to only 24 in 1448.[32] Margaret Bonney shows that some of the boroughs of Durham were in decline in the fifteenth century particularly the Old Borough in which South Street experienced waste tenements before 1400.[33] However, she suggests that it was the boroughs furthest away from the market place that suffered the most decay with those near the market place and the Bishop's Borough suffering no such problems.[34] However, the vacancies detailed above, particularly those in the market place show that the Bishop's Borough was as prone to vacancies and decayed rents as the rest of Durham was.

If properties were vacant then all the potential revenue from them was lost but some properties, while not becoming vacant, lost potential revenue because their nominal rent was reduced. Two of these properties were affected by building work. The plot formerly rented by Thomas Barbour was at a reduced rent of 4d between 1443 and 1460 because of such work.[35] Secondly the account for 1469-1470 stated that the tenement of Robert Pencher, Chaplain, normally rented for 5s had its rent reduced by 1s 8d because part of the tenement had been occupied by the clerk of work's men who were doing repairs on the bishop's mills.[36] However, all the other properties thus affected were shops for rent in the market place. Being the properties with the highest rent in the bishop's

estates in Durham, their nominal rent would have been the most negotiable particularly in times of a recession in trade.

In the fifteenth century each of the sections detailing the decay of rents in the coroners' accounts records growing reductions from the nominal rents of the shops eventually stabilising in the 1480's at a much lower rent value than that stated in the paragraph detailing the nominal rent value of properties in Durham City. The account of 1443-1444 listed only small reductions. One shop rented by Gilbert Grove had its rent reduced from 10s to 6s 8d, while another rented by Thomas Goldsmith for 6s 8d had its rent reduced by 4d only to 6s 4d.[37] Lastly two shops rented by William Bentlay at 20s had their rent reduced by only 3s 4d to 16s 8d.[38] Between 1444 and 1455 a further devaluation had obviously been necessary. The coroner's account for 1455-1456 reported that the two shops rented by William Bentlay and William Cornforth which had a collective rent of 16s 8d in 1444 had been further reduced. Their nominal value had been reduced from £1 to 18s 8d and this then had to be reduced to 13s meaning that a further 5s 8d had to be written off.[39] The shops previously rented by Gilbert Grove and Thomas Goldsmith at 6s 8d each also had their rent reduced. John Richebone rented both shops with a nominal value of 13s 4d at the reduced rate of 8s, meaning that 5s 4d had to be written off.[40] Finally in this account, a shop formerly rented by Adam Frithbank and subsequently

by John Salton at a nominal value of 3s 4d had its rent reduced to 2s 6d thus losing 10d.[41] Further reductions in the actual rent values of these shops were made in the account for the financial year 1459-1460 with the actual rent of the two shops rented by William Bentlay and William Cornforth being reduced from 13s 4d to 10s, a further loss of 3s 4d.[42] After this only one further reduction was made. Between 1469 and 1478, the shop rented by William Bentlay alone for 5s had its rent further reduced by 1s 8d lowering its actual rent to 3s 4d.[43] Obviously a vacancy occuring in any of the bishop's shops was more serious than a reduction in rent, but even so such reductions serve just as well in pointing to a time of economic difficulty.

All of the six shops rented out by the bishop between 1443 and 1509 lost revenue in one way or another. Two of the shops, one of which was said to have been rented out by William Bentlay, and the other rented out by William Cornforth, John Stevenson, and others had a combined nominal rent of £1 in 1443.[44] Because of reductions in rent by 1478 these two shops were only worth 3s 4d and 5s respectively, a drop of more than half in value over only 45 years.[45] The two shops rented in the 1443-1444 account by Gilbert Grove and Thomas Goldsmith had a nominal value of 16s 8d and after reductions in that year were worth 13s.[46] However, 11 years later in 1455 their value had been reduced to only 8s, again a drop of more than half in value but this time in only 11 years.[47]

Occurences of rent reduction in such properties were common in the fifteenth century. Rosser found that many tenements as well as shops were declining in rent value in Westminster. For instance five chantry houses were built in 1404 reached their maximum value of £8 13s 4d in 1427 but in the second half of the fifteenth century were frequently untenanted and when occupied provided a total revenue of £3 to £4.[48] Also three shops erected in 1398 had a nominal rent value of £1 each but from 1411 onwards were only able to command a rent of 13s 4d.[49] Keene recorded many shops in Westminster which declined in value such as a small shop in the city centre let for 8s from 1402 to 1432 which declined in value to 3s 4d by 1437, rose again to 6s 8s by 1460 but from 1463 onwards had a value of only 3s 4d.[50] Butcher also found rent reductions in Newcastle upon Tyne in the second half of the fifteenth century. In Newcastle the revenues from the estate of Alice Bellasis given to the Great Hall of Oxford University in 1447 worth £6 14s 2d in 1447 were worth only £3 13s 0d in 1486-1487 due to reductions in rent and vacancies.[51]

One puzzling aspect of such rent reductions is that the two coroners' accounts extant in the first decade of the sixteenth century detailed no such reductions thus suggesting that the bishop's shops were being rented at their full nominal rent value. If this were true then it would seem that between 1489 and 1505 there had been some revival in the economic fortunes of the bishop's Durham

estates. However, any such statement must be treated with extreme caution particularly as the group of five shops that first appeared in the 1480-1481 account were still empty at a loss of £1 15s, and as another shop was vacant at a loss of 3s 4d.[52] Other tenements, gardens, and plots which had been empty in 1489 were still empty in 1505, countering the notion of a revival. It would certainly seem unlikely with other shops and properties lying vacant that the two shops under the name of William Bentlay would be being rented at their full value of 18s 8d.

Finally something must be said about the bishop's properties being rented on leaseholds rather than freeholds, a growing trend in the second half of the fifteenth century. Most of the bishop's properties had freehold rents giving the tenants legal rights to the property with no time limit. However, most of the new properties that the bishop acquired between 1443 and 1470 were let out on leaseholds. In 1443-1444, the bishop only had 3 leasehold properties, but this number grew to 5 in 1455-1456, 7 in 1459-1460, 8 in 1466-1467, and 9 in 1469-1470, a figure at which the number of leasehold properties remained in 1509. It would not seem that the bishop was attempting to gain greater control over his tenants by limiting their legal rights as all but one of the leases were for life. However, in another way the bishop could have been attempting to gain more control over his tenants. Freehold tenants were notorious for

being the most independent class of tenants. M. Bonney found that many freehold rents owned by the Priory were not paid for fifty or sixty years, and that in general freeholders were reluctant to pay rent to the Priory.[53] Consequently in the fifteenth century the Priory's policy was to avoid the creation of new freeholds and to attempt to acquire the freeholders' interest in the land when possible.[54] Perhaps the bishop shared this experience of freeholders being reluctant to pay their rent and this spurred the introduction of leaseholds albeit more slowly than it did in the Priory's estates in Durham.

Despite the gaps in the coroners' accounts between 1443 and 1509 a general chronology for the bishop's properties for rent in the period can be constructed. Between 1418 and 1443 there was slight growth in the number of properties the bishop had for rent but this does not necessarily mean that the bishop's actual revenue had increased. No figures for vacancies or reduced rents exist for 1418 making such an assessment impossible. Between 1443 and 1466 the number of decayed and vacant plots was increasing slightly. In 1443 there were only six vacancies and the vacant properties had probably been empty for some time. These were joined by the plot of Thomas Hyndeley which in 1459 was refered to as unoccupied and therefore cancelled, and by the plot of Thomas Barbour which became completely vacant in 1465.[55] The rent value of the shops was also being reduced increasing the total of lost rents from 12s 9d in 1443-

1444 to £1 1s 5d. The following financial year proved to be a turning point. In one year five more of the bishop's properties became vacant including two shops, perhaps a sign of economic decline in the town resulting from demographic decline. Some of the vacancies must have been filled by 1469 with only 10 vacancies but the level of lost revenue was still on the increase.[56] In the following year the occupancy of properties declined further with one garden and one waste patch under Elvet Bridge being recorded as unoccupied and therefore cancelled, and this slide continued in 1474 and 1475 with three more gardens having become vacant since 1471.[57] The two shops which had become vacant were now occupied meaning that the total of lost revenue from rents was less but the situation was still obviously getting worse. From 1475 to 1489 there was virtually no change suggesting that for the moment the occupancy of plots in Durham had reached a nadir. The only change appeared in the coroner's account of 1480-1481 with a shop being vacant at a loss of 6s 8d raising the total of lost revenue to £1 13s 7d a level at which it remained in 1489.[58] Thus, it would seem that the years 1466-1475 were the time of greatest decline in the occupancy of plots, and that while the situation did not get much worse between 1475 and 1489 it also did not improve at all. Between 1489 and 1509 there may have been some improvement in the economic situation attested to by the fact that no reductions in rent were mentioned for the bishop's shops in either of the coroners' accounts for

the first decade of the sixteenth century, meaning the shops were occupied at their full value. However, in these two accounts a figure of 6s 2d lost for vacant gardens was given.[59] While this clause did not give the number of these plots it is possible that a large number of gardens were included within this figure. Therefore between 1489 and 1509 it is possible that there was further decline in the occupancy of the bishop's properties for rent.

TABLE FIVE: ACTUAL REVENUE FROM THE BISHOP'S PROPERTIES FOR RENT IN 1443-1509

CORONER'S ACCOUNT	NOMINAL REVENUE	LOST REVENUE	ACTUAL REVENUE
1443-1444	£4 1s 2d	12s 9d	£3 8s 5d
1455-1456	£4 6s 1d	16s 7d	£3 9s 6d
1459-1460	£4 7s 3d	18s 1d	£3 9s 2d
1465-1466	£4 6s 9d	£1 1s 5d	£3 5s 4d
1466-1467	£4 6s 1d	£1 10s 8d	£2 15s 5d
1469-1470	£4 6s 5d	£1 14s 0d	£2 12s 5d
1470-1471	£4 5s 11d	£1 14s 0d	£2 11s 9d
1474-1475	£4 5s 11d	£1 6s 11d	£2 19s 0d
1477-1478	£4 5s 9d	£1 6s 11d	£2 18s 10d
1480-1481	£4 5s 9d	£1 13s 7d	£2 12s 2d
1486-1487	£4 4s 10d	£1 13s 7d	£2 11s 3d
1488-1489	£4 5s 3d	£1 13s 7d	£2 11s 8d
1505-1506	£4 5s 7d	17s 1d	£3 8s 6d
1508-1509	£4 5s 7d	18s 1d	£3 7s 6d

Margaret Bonney found that for parts of Durham under the control of the Priory, the period containing the most instances of vacancy of properties was between 1400 and 1460 and that the situation got no worse after this.[60] However, my study of the bishop's properties for rent in Durham show that in the central part of the town which one would have expected to suffer least from vacancies and rent reductions, the period of greatest decline in

occupancy was from 1466 onwards and that there had been little if any recovery by 1509. That is not to say that there was no decline in occupancy of the bishop's properties for rent prior to 1466, but it was only from 1466 onwards that properties which had recently been occupied began to become vacant with any regularity. Bonney's study of the Priory's lands in Durham deals with a considerably larger estate than that of the bishop in Durham but the presence of the town's commercial centre in the Bishop's Borough would surely have made it a focal point for not only the bishop's tenants but also all the other inhabitants of the town. Therefore, a decline in the occupancy of properties in the Bishop's Borough and especially a decline in the occupancy and rent values of shops in the market place must surely provide a good indication of a general malaise in the town as a whole.

In conclusion an explanation must be offered for the increasing difficulty in finding tenants for properties in the Bishop's Borough. Firstly, this decline in occupancy and rent values would probably have been the result of some contraction of the town's economy. The bishop's shops would be particularly sensitive indicators of any economic contraction, and the inability to find tenants for some shops and to charge the full rent value for the others is surely an indication of decreasing demand for products sold in the market. In turn certain occurances suggest that an economic contraction in Durham was due to a demographic contraction in Durham in the

second half of the fifteenth century. Firstly, the very fact of plots becoming vacant in the town centre where fierce competition would have been expected suggests this. Many of the gardens and plots that bacame vacant may have been sited on poor marginal land but even so the lack of tenants for such plots demonstrates a complete absence of any pressure on land resources. Secondly, the inability to charge the full rent values for shops in the market place suggests that there was little competition for such properties in the second half of the fifteenth century. Finally, the reduction in rent values of such properties could be a reflection of a decline in the money taken at the bishop's shops due to a reduction in the number of people using them. As the shops stood in the only market area in Durham, trade could not have been enticed away by a new market, and it would therefore seem that less people were using Durham market.

Whether the decline in occupancy of tenements, gardens, and shops in the bishop's estates in Durham was due to demographic contraction, such a decline still points to the fact that the Bishop's Borough was not the vibrant centre of a thriving town in the second half of the fifteenth century.

CHAPTER SIX

THE BISHOP'S MILLS

In 1450, Durham had 8 mills, a figure comparable with the number of mills in other urban communities at the time. In Bury St Edmunds there were six mills in the fifteenth century;[1] in Colchester there were six mills in the 1450's and 1460's;[2] in Winchester there were seven town mills by the sixteenth century.[3] Obviously Durham was well served by milling facilities in the fifteenth century, an unsurprising fact considering the central position of the River Wear in the town's life. Of these eight mills, six were owned by the Priory, while the other two were owned by the bishop.[4] Two of the Priory's mills were fulling mills, used in the cloth industry for the cleaning and thickening of cloth, but the others were all corn mills.[5] The Priory kept its corn mill below the Cathedral for its own use.[6] The bishop himself had used the Jesus mill on the east end of the Abbey weir below the Cathedral to supply flour to the Castle and peninsula but this mill had passed into the estate of the Priory by the fifteenth century.[7] The other mills of the Priory and the bishop were leased to those wishing to be the tenants of the mills. On the one hand this was a way of making a large amount of revenue, but on the other, both overlords were obliged to provide a mill to be used by

their tenants and in turn the tenants were obliged to grind their corn at their lord's mill, paying multure for use of the mill.[8] Free tenants either did not have to pay for use of their overlord's mill or paid only a fraction of the fee, but all others paid the full amount.[9]

The bishop's mill which stood on the right bank of the river below St Nicholas' Church served the walled town under the control of the bishop and was certainly in existence by the thirteenth century making it one of the oldest mills of the Wear basin.[10] It stood on a terrace which is now ten feet above the present level of the River Wear, and was fed by a diagonal weir which is now eight feet above the river bed.[11] In the early fifteenth century a further small mill was built on the site.[12] In the administrative documents of the bishopric, the older mill was refered to as the North mill. The building of the later mill at the start of the fifteenth century would seem to suggest an increased demand for milling facilities from the bishop's tenants, probably as a result of an increase in the numbers of tenants living in the Bishop's Borough in the early fifteenth century.

From the above information it may appear that the Priory had something of a monopoly of mills in Durham. However, two facts must be pointed out. Firstly, as stated in the section on the bishop's properties for rent in Durham, the Priory had tenants in all the boroughs of Durham and

was obliged to provide milling facilities for its tenants in these boroughs.[13] Thus, the Priory had Scaltok mill in Elvet Borough as well as South Street mill in the Old Borough.[14] In contrast the bishop only had to supply the needs of his tenants in the Bishop's Borough. Secondly, the two mills, and in particular the South mill, were large mills capable of providing corn grinding facilities for all of the bishop's tenants. The size of the mills is reflected in their nominal rent value. The North mill being the smaller of the two had a nominal rent of £12 while the South mill had a nominal rent of £24, together making a nominal rent of £36. In contrast Scaltok mill had a nominal rent of only £12 in 1419 which had sunk to £10 by 1495.[15] This mill served all the Priory's tenants in Elvet Borough but the nominal rent implies that it was a smaller mill than the bishop's South mill. The records of mills in Winchester also suggest that the bishop's mills were of a large size. The largest group of mills, the three mills at Durngate were let for £24 in total in 1430, and then in 1451 were let along with the grain mill at Segrim for £24 8s 4d in total.[16] The fact that the South mill in Durham had a nominal rent equivalent to that for four mills in Winchester, and also had a nominal rent twice the size of one of the Priory's major mills in Durham suggests that the South mill was one of a large size and was designed to serve the needs of all the bishop's tenants. The North mill, although smaller, with a nominal rent of £12 must have been a reasonably large mill in itself. Overall the nominal rent of £36 must be

a reflection of the size of the bishop's mills and their ability to provide corn grinding facilities for all the bishop's tenants, two factors which obviously made them valuable properties in Durham.

The two mills were not only valuable properties in Durham as a whole but were also very valuable in the context of the bishop's revenues from his Durham estates. The £36 potential revenue from the mills formed part of a maximum revenue of £53 6s 8d up to 1475 and part of £54 13s 4d from 1477 onwards.[17] Consequently the financial performance of the mills had a great effect on the total revenues of the bishop from his Durham estates.

Regular evidence of the financial performance of the mills would throw a great deal of light on the state of the bishop's revenues as a whole in Durham. Unfortunately for most of the period such evidence is not extant. Prior to 1484 the only regular sources of information on the mills appear in the coroner of Easington ward's accounts, each of which details any reduction in the rent of the mills due to their closure because of repairs, and the clerk of works' accounts which detail any such repairs undertaken on the mills. However, from 1484 onwards there is a great deal of evidence on the financial performance of the mills due to the survival of the Books of Transumpt covering each financial year from 1484 to 1503. In most of these Books of Transumpt figures are given for any money paid in by

the tenants of the mills, arrears of money owed by present tenants and sometimes by former tenants, and any money written off from the nominal rent of the mills. Therefore, between 1484 and 1503 the financial position of those renting the mills and of the mills themselves can be easily followed.

Before 1484 only conjecture can be made about the success or otherwise of the tenants renting the mills in paying the £36 expected for the rent of the two properties. However, although it is not possible to attain any degree of accuracy in assessing the financial viability of the mills prior to 1484, the general trend seems to have been that during the third quarter of the fifteenth century, most of the rent was successfully raised if not all of it. This impression is conveyed by two sources. Firstly, as the mills revenues formed such a large part of the bishop's revenues in Durham, a low figure for total revenue in a financial year would probably result from low receipts from the mills. However, in sixteen receiver generals' accounts between 1453 and 1479, the total revenue for a financial year only fell below £36 in five years and fell below £30 in only two financial years.[18] In seven of these financial years the total revenue was over £40 and in 1464-1465 it was over £50.[19] This amount of revenue would not have been collected if there had been a large shortfall in the receipts from the mills. Secondly, in the coroners' accounts before 1484 there is no mention of any money written off from the

rent of the mills apart from rent written off for short periods of closure due to repairs. This implies that between 1453 and 1479 the two mills were in good working order throughout the period and were not losing large amounts of money through closure. Finally two figures are extant before 1484 for arrears of rent for the tenants of the mills, both figures appearing in the coroner's account of 1474-1475.[20] The two tenants of the mills, Robert Milner and John Johnson were in arrears respectively of £12 5s and £7. These two figures represent at least half the annual rent for the two mills and although no assessment of the financial position of the mills in the 1470's can be made using these figures alone, perhaps they serve as indicators of the growing difficulty in collecting rent for the mills that was experienced in the last twenty years of the century.

The existence of a Book of Transumpt for each financial year between 1484 and 1503 allows a detailed study of many aspects of the running of the mills and of their financial viability. I will look at these different aspects separately, examining the pattern of tenure for the mills, money written off from the nominal rent of the mills, money paid in by the tenants, and arrears of payment of the rent for the mills, and will then attempt to combine these separate aspects into a chronology of the financial performance of the mills between 1484 and 1503.

The nineteen year period under study includes several different patterns of tenure for the two mills. Firstly, the existence of two separate mills on the site meant that either both mills could be rented together by one tenant or that each mill could be rented separately. In the financial year 1487-1488 Thomas Stevenson leased the mills on his own and then William Brotherburn leased the mills on his own between 1488 and 1491. The mills were also leased by one tenant in the following year and also between 1500 and 1503. Between 1484 and 1487 and in 1492 and 1493 the mills were leased by two tenants. In these cases it is not stated whether each tenant was renting a mill separately from the other and it seems more likely that both tenants were sharing the burden of the rent of the mills as a whole. Finally in the years 1493-1495 the mills were leased by a group of three tenants, once again probably a move to spread the burden of paying the rent for the two mills. In the case of the Priory's mills, the farmer of the mill and the miller were often different, the farmer taking on the rent of the mill and employing the latter to run and maintain it.[21] Whether this happened in the case of the bishop's mills is not clear, but if it did at all in the nineteen year period under study it would probably have been when both mills were leased to one person who would have needed someone else to run one of the mills. Between 1459 and 1470, Adam Frithbank was sole farmer of the mills, granary, and Burgh of Durham and he would have employed someone else to run the two mills for him.[22]

Judging from the information on the mills between 1484 and 1503, the average period of tenure was no more than a few years. Five of the tenants only rented the mills for a year and Thomas Stevenson rented them for a year and 74 days making the rent he had to pay £43 7s 6d rather than £36. Other tenants or groups of tenants rented the mill for two years or in two cases for three continuous years, but in only one instance were the mills let for more than one year at a time. In 1488 William Brotherburn leased both mills for a two year period at a total rent of £60 but this was the only case of a lease of more than one year.[24] Perhaps the short length of leases given for the mills in this period is a reflection of the difficulty of paying the full rent at this time and consequently the accumulation of large and unreasonable arrears for anyone renting the mills for a long period of time.

TABLE SIX - THE TENANTS OF THE MILLS

YEAR	TENANTS
1484-1485	JOHN COLT AND JOHN JOHNSON
1485-1486	JOHN COLT AND JOHN JOHNSON
1486-1487	JOHN JOHNSON AND JOHN POTTER
1487-1488	THOMAS STEVENSON
1488-1489	WILLIAM BROTHERBURN
1489-1490	WILLIAM BROTHERBURN
1490-1491	WILLIAM BROTHERBURN
1491-1492	ROBERT SMYTH
1492-1493	CUTHBERT BILLYNGHAM AND RICHARD CROSBY
1493-1494	W JOHNSON, D JOHNSON, THOMAS WILLYNSON
1494-1495	W JOHNSON, D JOHNSON, THOMAS WILLYNSON
1495-1496	JOHN COLT AND JOHN POTTER
1496-1497	JOHN COLT AND WILLIAM RICHARDSON
1497-1498	JOHN COLT AND WILLIAM RICHARDSON
1498-1499	JOHN COLT AND WILLIAM RICHARDSON
1499-1500	JOHN COLT AND WILLIAM RICHARDSON
1500-1501	WILLIAM RICHARDSON
1501-1502	WILLIAM RICHARDSON
1502-1503	JOHN BOLONTE

It appears that in most financial years some loss of revenue from the mills was unavoidable due to the mills being closed because repair work was being undertaken on them. All the coroners' accounts for Easington ward up to 1478 recorded revenue lost from the North and South mills due to closure, but the sums lost were often small. In the year 1465-1466 only 18s 4 1/2d had to be written off from the rent of the South mill as it was closed for two weeks while the North mill was only closed for four days losing 3s 11 1/4d.[25] The most substantial reduction recorded in these accounts was in 1466-1467 when the South mill was closed for 31 days at a loss of £1 17s 4 1/2d and the North mill was closed over 69 days at a loss of £2 1s 7d.[26] The above figures were deducted from the amount owed by whoever was renting the mills in those years.

TABLE SEVEN - MONEY WRITTEN OFF FROM THE RENTS OF THE MILLS BECAUSE OF CLOSURE DUE TO REPAIRS

YEAR	SOUTH MILL	NORTH MILL
1455-1456	£1 11s	£2 6s 1 1/2d
1465-1466	18s 4 1/2d	3s 11 1/4d
1466-1467	£1 17s 4 1/2d	£2 1s 7d
1469-1470	14s 5 1/2d	7s 10 1/2d
1470-1471	---	---
1474-1475	10s 6d	7s 6 1/2d
1477-1478	£3 3s 11d	---

The accounts for the mills in the Books of Transumpt between 1484 and 1492 do not record any reduction because of repair work indicating that in these years the mills must have been in a good state of repair. However, in four of the financial years between 1493 and 1500, large

amounts of revenue were lost because of repairs being made on the mills. In 1493-1494 there was a reduction of £4 9s 9 1/2d from the original rent of the mills because of repair work undertaken on both mills over a period of 65 days.[27] There were more dramatic losses in 1495-1496 with first £6 13s 4d and then a further sum of £10 5s being taken from the rent of the mills.[28] The former figure was lost because the mills were occupied entirely by the clerk of works and the latter reduction was due to the clerk of works leasing the mills to John Colt and John Potter at much reduced rate, perhaps because work was still being undertaken on the mills. In 1496-1497

TABLE EIGHT - RENT WRITTEN OFF 1484-1503

YEAR	AMOUNT WRITTEN OFF
1484-1491	---
1491-1492	£8
1492-1493	£17 1s
1493-1494	£13 16s 5 1/2d
1494-1495	£25 5s
1495-1496	£9 6s 8d
1496-1497	£36
1497-1498	£23
1498-1499	£23
1499-1500	£32 19s 5d
1500-1501	£25 5s 5d
1501-1502	£19 1s 4d
1502-1503	£22

the mills must have been occupied for the whole year because of repairs being made. They had already been leased out for £13 at a loss of £23 and then the remaining £13 was paid by the clerk of works presumably because his workmen occupied both mills for the whole year.[29] A similar occurence took place in 1499-1500 when

of the £36 rent for the mills £32 19s 5d was written off because both mills were being repaired for most of the year, the rent for the year being reduced to 60s 7d.[30] Finally although it is not actually stated in the Books of Transumpt, the figures imply that from 1496 onwards the South mill was not open at all or that if it was open its capacity to provide milling facilities for the bishop's tenants had been seriously impaired. Between 1496 and 1500 the two mills were leased for only £13 and between 1500 and 1503 they were leased for £10 14s 7d, £16 18d 8d, and £14. Such a large reduction in the rent of the mills can only have resulted from the South mill being out of operation as the mills were too valuable to the bishop for such a large reduction to be made due to a decline in usuage of the mills. Also such a decline would probably not have been so sudden as to make £13 difference in the rent for the mills between 1495-1496 and 1496-1497. A possible answer is contained in the clerk of works' account for 1493-1494 which stated that the Wear had flooded, breaking the dam and causing great damage to the South mill.[31] Perhaps the damage reported in 1493-1494 rendered the mill unusable. In the 1494-1495 account there is very little information on the mills and in the 1495-1496 account £16 18s 4d was written off because of repairs.[32] Thus, the above information suggests that between 1494 and 1503 at least the South mill was near unusable because of flood damage.

All the above revenue was lost due to unavoidable circumstances. However, money was also written off from the rent of the mills because the situation made such action necessary. The mills were leased at only £13 from 1496 probably because the South mill was out of action. However, they were leased for a reduced amount before 1496. Between 1484 and 1491 the mills were leased for £30 and £6 was written off. This sum of £6 was written off from the nominal rent value of £36 of the mills in all subsequent Books of Transumpt. In the financial year 1491-1492 they were leased for £28, a loss of £8 and between 1492 and 1496 they were leased for £26 13s 4d, a loss of £9 6s 8d annually. Leasing the mills at a reduced rent could be an indicator of two things. Firstly, it means that the bishop was not finding it easy to find tenants for his mills and had to lower the rent to attract tenants. Secondly, it could indicate a drop in the number of people using the milling facilities in the Bishop's Borough, making the nominal rent of £36 unrealistic. Whatever the reason for such leases, they suggest that the mills were becoming less profitable both for the tenants and for the bishop.

Another indicator of the above statement is the writing off of large sums in 1492-1493.[33] The mills were leased to Cuthbert Billyngham and Richard Crosby for the sum of £26 13s 4d but the rent was further reduced to £11 2d. Why this reduction was made is not clear, but it could be something to do with the two tenants being refered to as

appruatores. This term was commonly used for someone who rented mill buildings but used them for another purpose. (Perhaps it was the case that the two tenants in this year were using the mill buildings for other purposes.) This would then also indicate that the bishop was having trouble renting out his mills and had to lease them out for other purposes at a significantly reduced rate.

There is one other instance of money being written off in the Book of Transumpt for 1491-1492.[34] Thomas Stevenson was the tenant of the mill in 1487-1488 but he still owed £23 16s 2d of his rent in 1491. However, the money he owed was written off apparently because of a disease and pestilence in Durham. The probability seems here that whatever Thomas did had been seriously affected by the pestilence in Durham and that consequently at the time he was not able to pay his arrears. The true significance of this statement is the very clear indication of demographic decline in Durham, a decline which in the case of Thomas Stevenson and no doubt in other cases was affecting the economic situation in Durham.

Such evidence of rent being written off is a good indicator of difficulties faced by the tenants of the mills in paying the expected rent. However, the clearest signposts of trouble in raising the sum of money for the rent of the mills are the figures for actual sums of money paid by the tenants and the figures for the money they still owed. The amount of money they were able to

pay towards the rent would be directly connected to the amount of money they had received from those using the mills to grind corn. Thus, low totals for money paid in not only calls the economic viability of the mills into question, but also suggests a decline in the number of the bishop's tenants using the mills perhaps resulting from a demographic decline within the bishop's estates in Durham.

Between 1484 and 1503 there was some fluctuation in the payments made by the tenants of the mills, but before 1500 a unifying factor was that all the payments were small and in most cases were much less than the expected payment of revenue, the years 1487-1494 being a nadir for the level of payments in relation to exactly how much the bishop hoped to receive from the rent of his mills.

TABLE NINE - RENT PAID IN BY THE TENANTS OF THE MILLS AND ARREARS

JOHN COLT AND JOHN JOHNSON

YEAR	ARREARS	RENT PAID
1484-1485	£13 6s 8d	£7 11s 8d
1485-1486	£5 15s	---
1486-1487	£5 15s	---
1487-1488	£5 15s	3s 4d
1488-1489	£5 11s 8d	6s 8d
1489-1490	£5 5s	9s 10d
1490-1503	£4 16s 10d	---

THOMAS STEVENSON

YEAR	ARREARS	RENT PAID
1488-1489	£43 7s 6d	£7 11s 4d
1489-1490	£36 16s 2d	---
1490-1491	£36 16s 2d	---
1491-1492	£36 16s 2d	£12
1492-1503	£23 16s 2d	(Written off)

WILLIAM BROTHERBURN

YEAR	ARREARS	RENT PAID
1488-1489	£60	£2 6s 8d
1489-1490	£57 13s 4d	£1 16s 8d
1490-1491	£55 4s 8d	£1 10s
1491-1492	£80 14s 4d	---
1492-1503	£80 14s 4d	---

ROBERT SMYTH

YEAR	ARREARS	RENT PAID
1491-1492	£28	---
1492-1493	£8 10s	£5 16s 8d
1493-1503	£2 13s 4d	---

CUTHBERT BILLYNGHAM AND RICHARD CROSBY

YEAR	ARREARS	RENT PAID
1492-1493	£15 12s 4d	---

D & J JOHNSON AND THOMAS WILLYNSON

YEAR	ARREARS	RENT PAID
1493-1494	£22 3s 6 1/2d	£8 5s
1494-1503	£12 18s 6 1/2d	---

JOHN COLT AND JOHN POTTER

YEAR	ARREARS	RENT PAID
1495-1496	£9 5s	---

JOHN COLT AND WILLIAM RICHARDSON

YEAR	ARREARS	RENT PAID
1496-1497	---	---
1497-1498	£13	£8 13s 4d
1498-1499	£17 6s 8d	£4 6s 8d
1499-1500	£3 7s	---
1500-1501	£10 14s 7d	£10 6s 8d
1501-1502	£16 8s 8d	£13

JOHN BOLONTE

YEAR	ARREARS	RENT PAID
1502-1503	£14	£13 6s 8d

The Books of Transumpt from 1484 to 1487 give details on three tenants, John Colt, John Johnson, and John Potter,

but for the latter tenant there is not enough information to construct a clear picture of his rent payments. In 1484 both Johnson and Colt owed £15 for the rent of the mills, but this figure did not increase at all, probably meaning that either the mills were out of use for some of the period or that they had been requisitioned for the bishop's use.[35] It would be very unlikely that they had been leased to the above tenants for £30 over a three year period. However, while Johnson and Colt may not have held the mills for all three years, they each paid the £15 over a five year period. John Colt had only paid £4 13s 4d of his share in 1484 and despite making payments by 1489-1490 he was still well short of paying the full amount he owed.[36] There are no further entries for Colt meaning that the rest of his rent probably went unpaid. On the other hand, John Johnson had paid £12 in 1484, but took another four years to reduce the amount he owed to a negligible amount.[37] The rent payment figures for the above tenants are not truly representative in that they only had £15 to pay and took five years to settle the debt. However, their slowness in payment and John Colt's failure to finish paying his rent perhaps indicate some trouble in raising the full £15 when they were the tenants of the mills.

Thomas Stevenson and William Brotherburn who rented the mills in 1487-1488 and between 1488 and 1491 respectively provide the best examples of low rent payments for the mills, and these figures provide the best contrast

between actual and expected payment as both men rented the two mills on their own at a slightly reduced figure of £30 a year. Thus, if large amounts of revenue were lost it was due to the poor financial performance of the mills rather than to any reduction in rent due to repair work. Thomas Stevenson rented the mills for one year and 74 days meaning that he owed £43 7s 6d rent.[38] However, the 1488-1489 Book of Transumpt recorded only two payments made by him, one of £2 18s, the other of £4 13s 4d.[39] These were the only cash payments that Stevenson made, a fact which suggests that in his year of tenure he had difficulty in paying the rent from the money he received from those using the mills. In 1491-1492 Stevenson's arrears were reduced by £12 for a butt of Malmesy and other victuals that he gave to the bishop, but the rest of his arrears were written off.[40] Consequently Stevenson made cash payments totalling only 1/7 of the rent he was expected to pay.

William Brotherburn's payments were even smaller than those of Thomas Stevenson. He rented the mills on a two year lease between 1488 and 1490 for £60 and then for a further year for £30. Thus, for his three year tenure he had to pay a very substantial financial burden of £90, a figure virtually equivalent to the amount the bishop could have potentially received from Durham over two years. However, Brotherburn came nowhere near to completing payment. In the Book of Transumpt for 1488-1489, one payment of £2 6s 8d was recorded, and in the

following year a further payment of £1 16s 8d was made.[41] Finally in 1490-1491 he paid £1 10s, but no further payments were recorded.[42] In three years William paid £5 13s 4d out of an expected payment of £90. Thus, he paid only 1/18 of the possible revenue for the mills over his three year period of tenure. William's tenure was a low point for the mills, the very low levels of revenue paid in suggesting again that the tenant was receiving very little money because fewer people were using the mills making it impossible for the lessee to pay the £30 rent or to even come close to paying that figure.

The payments of Thomas Stevenson and William Brotherburn are well covered but for the subsequent tenants of the mills there are some gaps in the information on rent payments. Also compared to the above tenants the small payments of those renting the mills from 1491 onwards do not appear quite as drastic due to reductions in the rent of the mills because of their use for different purposes or because of their closure due to repair work or damage. However, in some cases the small payments made despite the large reductions in rent still show the difficulties experienced by the tenants of the mills in paying the full rent for them. Robert Smyth, the tenant in 1491-1492, had a much reduced rent to pay because of repairs being done and also because he had leased the properties for a much lower cost than their nominal value. Consequently the account of 1491-1492 stated that he owed only £8 10s.[43] Only one payment made by Robert was

recorded but this meant that he had paid nearly all the rent expected of him.[49] Greater difficulty was experienced by William Johnson, David Johnson, and Thomas Willynson, the three tenants of 1493-1494. Despite a rent reduced to £16 9s by money being written off and by a payment of £4 8s 10d by Thomas, the three could not pay the rent.[45] William Johnson and Thomas Willynson both failed to pay all their share of the rent, and David Johnson paid nothing at all. Thus in 1494-1494 even though each tenant had a small sum to pay, they struggled to pay it. Finally John Colt and William Richardson rented the mills between 1496 and 1500 at £13 a year. In the year 1497-1498 they paid £8 13s 4d, but in the following year they only paid the arrears from the previous year. In 1496-1497, the mills were completely out of action and no other mention is made of payments made by them after 1499.[46] Thus, the experience of William Richardson and John Colt and of the other tenants of the mills between 1491 and 1499 shows that there was still some difficulty in raising the money to pay the rent of the mills probably due to a continued low number of people using them to grind corn.

Between 1500 and 1503 the size of payments were at their highest level in the period. In 1500-1501, William Richardson paid nearly all of his rent and in 1501-1502 he paid £12 of the £16 8s 8d rent.[47] Finally in 1502-1503, John Bolonte paid nearly all of his £14 rent.[48] While a large amount of revenue was still being lost

because of rent being written off probably due to the South mill being out of operation, at least the increase in the money being paid in suggests that more people were using the North mill than had been doing so in the previous sixteen years. In all three years the tenants of the mills paid more than William Brotherburn did for three years tenure when both mills were fully operative.

Throughout the period 1484-1503, the small size of payments made by the tenants of the mills meant that all of them in varying degrees were in arrears of rent. From 1491 the annual large reductions in the rent of the mills meant that these arrears totals were much smaller that they had been, but between 1487 and 1491 when first Thomas Stevenson and then William Brotherburn were renting the mills alone at £30 a year, the arrears totals were much larger. Between 1484 and 1490 John Colt and John Johnson only had to pay £15 each, and as it seems that they were no longer renting the mills after 1485 then the amount of rent they owed did not increase. By 1490 John Johnson owed a negligible amount while John Colt owed £4 15s 5 1/2d.[49] Between them although they took six years to pay the rent of the mills they had paid 84% of what they owed. Also the tenants of the mills after 1491 who did not have as much to pay as previous tenants were more succesful in reducing their arrears to negligible amounts. Robert Smyth, tenant in 1491-1492, reduced his arrears to £2 13s 4d while John Colt and William Richardson, tenants in 1497-1498, and William

Richardson, sole tenant in 1501-1502 were able to reduce their arrears to under £5.[50] The same William in 1500-1501 and John Bolonte in 1502-1503 were more sucessful in reducing arrears, both owing under £1 when their years of tenure were over, and the only serious arrears after 1491 were those for 1493-1494 when despite having their rent much reduced because of repair work the three tenants left arrears of £12 13 1/2s unpaid, and the arrears of 1498-1499 when John Colt and William Richardson paid the arrears of the previous year but failed to pay any of the £13 rent for that year.[51] For most of the financial years between 1491 and 1503 the arrears totals are negligible, but this is more a reflection of the reduction in rent of the mills because of repair work or because of their use for other purposes rather than any improvement in the ability of the tenants to pay the rent.

The arrears of Thomas Stevenson and William Brotherburn show most accurately how much revenue could be lost when the mills were in full working order and had been rented out at nearly their full nominal rent. Thomas Stevenson owed £43 7s 6d for his period of tenure and by 1488-1489 Thomas had reduced the arrears to only £35 16s 2d.[52] In 1491-1492 he was only able to reduce his arrears my making a payment in kind leaving them at £23 16s 2d.[53] This sum was then written off meaning that a significant amount of revenue in the context of the bishop's total revenue from Durham had been lost.

William Brotherburn was under a greater financial burden than Thomas Stevenson, renting the mills between 1488 and 1491 at £30 a year meaning that he should have paid £90 in rent for his three years of tenure. However, he proved to be even less equal to the task than the previous tenant. By 1490-1491 his arrears for the first two years of his tenure were £55 13s 4d and after a further year's tenure his arrears had risen to the sum of £80 14s 4d.[54] The arrears stayed at the latter figure and there is no mention of any attempt to pay them off after 1492. William's arrears for his three years tenure were quite obviously of a considerable size and the loss of such a large amount of revenue in the years 1488-1491 must have had a very detrimental effect on the size of the bishop's revenues from Durham as a whole.

At no stage in the period 1484-1503 was the financial position of the bishop's mills particularly healthy. Between 1491 and 1503 the true financial position of the mills is masked because of reductions in the rent due to repairs and the possible closure of the South mill in most of these years. Consequently, the years 1487-1491 appear to be a nadir whereas if both mills had been in full working order throughout the period, the financial performance in other years could have been just as poor. However, the fact remains that the tenants of the mills between 1487 and 1491 made the smallest cash payments towards their rents and these years must therefore have

been seen as the worst years for the mills in terms of revenue they provided for the bishop. From 1500 onwards there appears to be some slight cause for optimism with the receipts for each year being over the £10 mark in contrast to the very low receipts of the previous sixteen years. The explanation for the poor financial performance of the mills over these years could relate to demographic contraction within the bishop's estates in Durham. The tenants of the mills would have raised the money to pay the rent by charging the tenants of the bishop to grind corn at the mills. Thus, any contraction in the money they raised could have been related to a contraction in the population. The small sums of money paid by the tenants of the mills between 1487 and 1491 suggest that if there was a demographic crisis it was at its worst in these years, while the increased receipts in the first three years of the sixteenth century suggest that the population of the Bishop's Borough was slowly on the increase.

In conjunction with the previously related figures for money paid to the bishop for the rent of the mills, something must be said about money paid out by the clerk of works, the bishop's official in charge of the upkeep of his estates, for repair of the mills. Although the money for repairs was paid by the clerk of works rather than by the tenants of the mills, a comparison of the revenue from the mills with the outlay for repairs on the mills can show if the bishop's mills were economically

viable or if more money was spent on their maintenance than was paid in by the tenants of the mills.

Most of the coroners' accounts for Easington ward record money written off from the rent of the mills because of closure. However, the clerk of works' accounts show that the bulk of the work as well as the bulk of the expenditure was for work undertaken on the dam. The dam was vital as it regulated the water supply passing to the mill wheels and if the dam was ineffective or worse had been washed away then the mills could not have operated at all. Consequently, repairs to the dam were of importance. The dam was constructed using wood, stone, and moss, either with a foundation of a trapezoidal pile of stones with branches on top to form a ryssdam or with hurdles weighed down with stone.[55] New timber, stone, and in particular moss were regularly needed to restrengthen the dam and if the River Wear flooded then the dam would more than likely be swept away making it necessary to completely rebuild it. Working on the dam was a time consuming business needing a considerable amount of manpower not just in the actual repair work but also in the quarrying of stone, the chopping of timber, the collection of moss, and the carriage of all three to the site of repairs. The cost of all the materials used and of the manpower used could often amount to a sizeable sum. By contrast the actual mills themselves needed less attention. Much of the work undertaken on them seems to have been of a specialist nature being undertaken by only

one or two craftsmen for much shorter periods of time than was taken by groups of craftsmen who were making repairs to the dam. In some of the accounts of the clerk of works no repair work on the actual mills was recorded at all. The work on the mills themselves was done when either part of the wheels or part of the internal machinery needed repairing and such repairs were not necessary every year. The only occasions when extensive repair work would be needed on the mills would be when the dam had been broken often due to flooding, allowing the river to pass to the mills unregulated. Either the mill wheels or the mill buildings could be damaged as a result of the above taking place as in the case of the South mill which was reported to be damaged because of flooding in the clerk of works' account of 1493-1494.[56]

TABLE TEN - MONEY SPENT BY THE CLERK OF WORKS ON MILL REPAIRS

YEAR	DAM REPAIRS	RAW MATERIALS	MILL REPAIRS
1458-1459	£2 7s 8 1/2d	12s 11 1/2d	£1 7s 6d
1469-1470	14s 6d	£3 1s 6d	3s 7 1/2d
1475-1476	£41 5s 8 1/2d	£28 4s 2d	---
1477-1478	£8 16s 1/2d	£3 6s 7 1/2d	£5 13s 2d
1480-1481	£8 11s 7 1/2d	£12 7s 1d	---
1489-1490	£2 4s	£1 19s 4 1/2d	---
1493-1494	£55 0s 6d	?	---
1494-1495	£2	£6 19s 1d	---

TABLE ELEVEN - TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT BY THE CLERK OF WORKS ON THE MILLS

YEAR	AMOUNT SPENT BY CLERK OF WORKS
1458-1459	£4 8s 2d
1469-1470	£3 19s 7 1/2d
1475-1476	£69 9s 10 1/2d
1477-1478	£17 15s 10d
1480-1481	£20 18s 8 1/2d
1489-1490	£4 3s 4 1/2d
1493-1494	£55 0s 6d
1494-1494	£8 19s 1d
1503-1504	---

Prior to 1484 when we do not have figures for money paid in for the rent of the mills, a direct comparison between the latter and money spent on the upkeep of the dam and the mills is not possible. However, bearing in mind that £36 was the maximum potential revenue for the mills in a year, at least we can compare expenditure to what might possibly have been paid for the rent of the mills. Using the figure £36 as a yardstick the years 1475-1476, 1477-1478, and 1480-1481, were years of heavy expenditure on the mills while in the years 1458 and 1469-1470 the level of expenditure on repair work was much smaller. Unfortunately the poor quality of the 1473 clerk of works' account makes an assessment of repairs in 1473 impossible.[57]

In 1458 work was undertaken on the dam over three weeks, a short period of time meaning that the clerk of works did not have to pay too much in wages, his greatest outlay being 7s 6d in wages for John Long who inserted some stone in the dam for 18 days, and few materials were needed to repair the dam apart from a little moss and

some timber. A little work was also undertaken on the mills' wheels and a new clapper, trundels,and other necessary parts were purchased but overall 1458 was a year when little expenditure was needed.[58]

1469-1470 was also a year of little expenditure. Two groups of workmen repaired the dam, the first comprised of three men who worked for 18 days, the second of four men who worked for 21 days. The wages bill was again small. The most was spent on materials for repair and in particular for the provision and carriage of stone from quarry for which Robert Hill received £1 6s 8d. However, overall few repairs needed doing in this year.[59] In both years the amount on money spent on repairs was probably much less than the amount of revenue received from tenants of the mills, and thus in these years the mills were probably financially viable.

The levels of expenditure recorded in the accounts for 1475-1476, 1477-1478, and 1480-1481 provide a complete contrast to that of the latter two accounts in that they were much larger. In 1477-1478 the repair work was fairly evenly split with repair work being made on the dams, a little money being spent on timber and stone to repair the dams, various purchases being made for the mills such as millstones, a clapper, and trundels, and some work being done on the roof of the South mill.[60]

In 1480-1481 all the work was undertaken on the dam. Various groups of workmen were employed for long periods of time, such as John Wittimen and seven carpenters being employed over a period of 153 days at 5d a day per person receiving a total of £3 17s 6d in wages. A larger sum of money was paid for the materials used to repair the dam and for the work of those providing the materials, the two largest payments being of £4 5s 10d for two labourers quarrying stone from the River Wear and carrying it to the dam over 284 days and of £3 19s 2s for two workers who collected rock and gravel over 109 days for the repair of the dam.[61] In both these years the expenditure on the mills and dam must have been equivalent to most if not all of the rent paid in by the tenants of the mills and therefore in terms of money paid by the tenants compared to money spent on repairs the mills must have been struggling to be economically viable in these years.

The worst of these three years and the year of highest expenditure by far in all the accounts of the clerk of works was 1475-1476 when large amounts of money were spent on the repair of the dam.[62] No money was spent in this year on the actual mills, all the repair being made on the dam.

In 1475-1476, the mill pond was being reconstructed, and the dam was consequently being rebuilt. These two tasks required the use of considerable amounts of labour and materials. Various groups of artisans worked on the

repair of the dam over long periods of time. For instance, one group of eight artisans worked over a period of 303 days, receiving the wage of £6 6s 3d, while another group of five artisans with labourers worked during a 400 day period receiving £5. The above would not have been working on the dam and the mill pond for all that period but the length of time taken shows that the work being undertaken must have been extensive. Those supplying the materials also worked for some time, a group of 19 men working on the dam and carrying timber and rocks for 144 days at a total wage of £12 6s 8d. The total wage bill for work on the dam and the mill pond in 1475-1476 was £41 5s 8 1/2d. A large amount of money was also spent on materials to effect the repairs, £8 10s 0d being spent on one lot of timber and stone and £4 6s 6d being spent on another. Overall £28 4s 2d was spent on materials and the total expenditure for repairs was £69 9s 10 1/2d. Even if the tenants of the mills had paid £36 rent, the maximum expected revenue for the mills in a year, the bishop would still have lost money on his two mills, and if they had failed to pay that amount then he would have lost even more money on the mills. Such expenditure on repairs would not only cancel out revenue made in 1474-1475 but would also eat up any profit from the mills for the following year at least. Therefore, the repairs described in the 1474-1475 account show that when extensive work was needed perhaps due to the dam getting washed away, the expense could be considerable and as in the above case could easily be nearly twice as

much as the £36 nominal rent of the mills for one year. The 1474-1475 account offers only one such example of this, but in any of the years for which clerk of works' accounts do not exist, similar expenditure could have been necessary making the mills a loss making operation in that year and also for some years afterwards.

Of the other clerk of works' accounts, those for 1489-1490 and 1494-1495 detail years of little expenditure on repairs while the account for 1503-1504 did not mention any work being done on the mills at all. However, the 1493-1494 account like the 1475-1476 account revealed that year to have been one of high expenditure on the bishop's mills by the clerk of works. Unlike previous accounts, the payment of individual workers was not described. Rather, one clause stated that the dam had been broken by the River Wear flooding and that consequently the South mill had been damaged. Because of the above happening the clerk of works incurred expenses of £32 6s 8d.[63] A second statement says that further expenses of £23 13s 10d had been incurred in repairing the dam making in total an expenditure of £54 0s 6d on the upkeep of the mills in 1493-1494.[64] As in 1475-1476 the amount of money spent on the upkeep of the mills far outweighed the money that might have been expected from the rent of the mills and as only £9 5s was paid by the tenants of the mills in this year, six times the amount paid by the tenants was spent on repairs.[65] Such a situation would have made the mills unprofitable in that

year, and indeed in the last twenty years of the fifteenth century when as shown receipts were small, the need to pay out such large sums of money in repairing the mills would have made them almost a liability to the bishop. However, he continued to maintain them as a service to his tenants in the Bishop's Borough, both because he was obliged to and perhaps because he was manifesting his paternalism as landlord towards his tenants.

Detailed information on the mills may only exist for the period 1484-1503 but that information reveals some of the problems that would have affected the mills at all times, such as the need to make repairs, the inability of the tenants to pay the rent, and the effect that a drop in demand for use of the mills to grind corn could have on the revenues of the bishop from the mills and as a result from Durham as a whole. More specifically, the low level of rent payments, the high level of arrears of rent, and the loss of rent due to the mills being leased and being closed due to repairs shows that the nineteen year period was not only one of decline for the actual fabric of the mills, but also for the numbers using the mills, the implication being that at some time during the last twenty years of the fifteenth century, Durham was struck by a demographic decline from which it was just beginning to recover by 1503.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE BISHOP'S BAKEHOUSE

In the Books of Transumpt between 1484 and 1501, an annual account appears for the bakehouse which was farmed out to tenants along with the mills, the tolls, and the rents of Durham. The bishop was obliged to provide a bakehouse for the use of his tenants in the same way that he was obliged to provide milling facilities, and it seems likely that the money paid to the bishop by the farmer of the bakehouse was raised through charging the bishop's tenants for using the bakehouse to bake their own bread.

A bakehouse would have occupied as important a position in the life of the bishop's tenants as the mills did but there is much less information on the bakehouse. It is known that the bishop's bakehouse was extant in 1182, much earlier than the two bakehouses owned by the Priory.[1] The Bishop Langley survey of 1418 also refers to a bakehouse on Palace Green.[2] However, apart from this, information on the bishop's bakehouse is scarce until the last twenty years of the fifteenth century. The bulk of the information deals with money paid in for the farm of the bakehouse but the clerk of works' account

of 1480-1481 describes some repairs being made on a furnace.[3]

The bakehouse was farmed out annually in the 1490's for £5 6s 8d. Unlike the mills, the bakehouse was farmed out only to one lessee probably because of the smaller rent which would not have been so burdensome to one lessee. The position of the lessee of the bakehouse is somewhat unclear but it seems that the farm of the bakehouse was paid to the bailiff rather than directly to the coroner. Therefore, the lessee of the bakehouse was responsible for paying the farm and any arrears but the bailiff was responsible for collecting the farm from him and ensuring that he paid the full amount. Between 1487 and 1495, the lessee of the bakehouse was John Harryson who was responsible for paying the farm but could keep any profit from the bakehouse. Robert Cemit, the bailiff, was responsible for collecting the farm from him, the Book of Transumpt for 1489-1490 stating that Robert owed the sum of £34 13s 4d for the farm of the Burgh and the bakehouse in the fifth and sixth years of John Shirwood's episcopate.[4] However, prior to Harryson's tenancy, Thomas Fenton, the bailiff, was the lessee of the bakehouse, and from 1495, Robert Cemit, bailiff, was lessee of the bakehouse. Thus, this would suggest that it was more standard practice for the bailiff to be in charge of the bakehouse rather than it having a separate lessee.

The farm of the bakehouse was much smaller than that of the mills, but a fall in the level of payments towards the farm or the existence of arrears of rent for a communal building in the Bishop's Borough could also be used to show a time of economic difficulty in Durham. No figures for the payment of the farm of the bakehouse exist before 1489 but figures given here show that there were arrears from previous years. In 1489-1490, Thomas Fenton still owed money for the bakehouse in previous years although how much he owed is not stated.[5] In 1489-1490, John Harryson paid £3 6s 8d and was let off £2 for collecting money for the bishop in Houghton and Easington ward, thus meaning that the £5 6s 8d rent had been covered.[6] However, it was hoped that Harryson would pay £10 13s 6d meaning that there had been arrears from the previous year of a fairly substantial size.

TABLE TWELVE - RECEIPTS FROM THE BAKEHOUSE

YEAR	LESSEE	RECEIPTS
1489-1490	JOHN HARRYSON	£5 6s 8d
1490-1491	JOHN HARRYSON	£3 13s 4d
1491-1492	JOHN HARRYSON	£3
1492-1493	JOHN HARRYSON	£7 14s 4d
1493-1494	JOHN HARRYSON	---
1494-1495	JOHN HARRYSON	£5 6s 8d
1495-1496	ROBERT CEMIT	£5 6s 8d
1496-1497	ROBERT CEMIT	---
1497-1498	ROBERT CEMIT	£3 6s 8d
1498-1499	ROBERT CEMIT	£5 6s 8d
1499-1500	ROBERT CEMIT	£3 13s 4d
1500-1501	ROBERT CEMIT	£5 6s 8d

The years 1490-1501 can be divided into two separate periods, the first between 1490 and 1498 when the amount of rent paid and arrears consistently fluctuated, the

second between 1498 and 1501 when the annual rent was paid each year. In the eight financial years between 1490 and 1498, figures for payment and arrears are not given in 1493-1494 and in 1496-1497.[7] Arrears occured in four years, with the highest arrears total occuring in 1491-1492 when only £3 was paid out of £7 owed.[8] 1492-1493 was a year of large receipts, with three payments reducing the money owed by Harryson from £9 6s 8d to the sum of £1 13s 4d.[9] In 1494-1495 Harryson paid the full rent owed for the bakehouse for the year, with the arrears having been written off presumably because of the change in bishop from Shirwood to Fox, and Robert Cemit paid only £3 6s 8d of the rent in 1497-1498 leaving arrears of £2.[10.11] In the years 1490-1498 the instances of arrears for the farm of the bakehouse show that this was not a time of economic prosperity in Durham as the lessee was not only not able to make enough money to pay the farm but also would not have made any profit for himself from the bakehouse. The reason for this probably being that ~~less~~ fewer people were using the bakehouse either because the population of the Bishop's Borough had contracted or because the bishop's tenants could not afford to use the bakehouse. However, the fact that in some years the lessees were able to pay the full farm and arrears as well shows that the situation was not consistently getting worse and that the future could at least be viewed with some optimism.

Between 1498 and 1501 the farm of the bakehouse was paid in full each year. Robert Cemit still owed £2, but it seems that this was not going to be paid as in both 1498-1499 and 1500-1501 he paid only the rent owed for those years leaving the £2 arrears untouched.[12] The year 1499-1500 is the only occasion recorded when the bakehouse was closed.[13] Between 7 June and St Michael's Day it was closed meaning that £1 13s 4d was written off from the farm because of the closure for a period of a quarter of a year and 23 days. Robert Cemit paid the £3 13s 4d expected for that year once again leaving the £2 arrears untouched.

Perhaps the payment of all the farm of the bakehouse in these three years ties in with the increased payments for the rent of the mills at the same time to suggest that in the last few years of the fifteenth century and the beginning of the sixteenth century some slight recovery was taking place after a period of economic depression and perhaps demographic contraction.

There is very little information on the maintenance of the bakehouse, but this is probably because little maintenance was needed. Only in the Book of Transumpt for 1499-1500 was any closure of the bakehouse recorded, and the lack of entries for money written off because of closure in the coroners' accounts suggests that they needed much less attention than the mills which were closed every year for repairs. The clerk of works'

account for 1480-1481 records work done on a furnace, presumably part of the bakehouse.[14] Nine cartloads of stone were brought to Durham for the construction of a new furnace, and three workers were paid 12s for working on the roof and laying the foundation for the new furnace. Finally 1s 8d was paid to two carpenters for making tables to used at the furnace. The above work was not extremely costly, and as the only example of work on the bakehouse it suggests that maintenance of the property was cheap.

Overall it seems that the bishop's bakehouse was a more profitable property for the bishop and whoever was renting it than the mills in the last twenty years of the fifteenth century. The whole farm was paid in six of the years meaning that in those years the lessee would have made some profit and that the bishop would have received the full amount of revenue he expected from the property. The absence of regular outgoings of money because of repairs or closure of the bakehouse also meant that the bishop was not spending more money on the maintenance of the bakehouse than he was receiving from the fee farm. All in all, the impression gained is that in most years the bakehouse was an economically viable property for both bishop and lessee.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE MARKET AND MARKET TOLLS

The market place was the central feature of Durham itself, and the market held was of great importance both to the Bishop's Borough and to the town of Durham. As the only market in Durham it attracted people to the Bishop's Borough to buy goods and also to rent out shops from the bishop. Also, as Durham and its environs had no large scale industry, the existence of a market in Durham which would attract both the inhabitants of Durham and the inhabitants of the many small villages in the surrounding area was essential to the prosperity of the town.

The market place was a definite focal point for the life of the town with three main thoroughfares, Clayport from the North-East, Fleshewergate from the South-East, and Silver Street from the South-West leading to it.[1] In the south west corner of the market place stood the tollbooth which was the bishop's courthouse and also a place for the bishop to collect fines, rent, and tolls.[2] The tollbooth was a first floor room with shops and stalls underneath it which were leased out to mercers.[3] In the description of Durham in all the coroners' of Easington ward accounts the shops leased out by the bishop were all

described as being under the tollbooth. These shops were permanent but on market day the market place would have been filled with temporary stalls.[4] The actual market day was held every Saturday and three big fairs took place each year, two on St Cuthbert's Days on March 20 and September 4, and one every year on Whit Tuesday.[5]

There are a dearth of references to market tolls in the records of the bishop's financial administration, the only references to market tolls appearing in the bailiff's accounts in the Books of Transumpt. The lack of information on market tolls prior to 1484 makes it impossible to say how much revenue the bishop was making from tolls and consequently makes it difficult to say with any accuracy how prosperous the market was, and no figures for market tolls collected were given in the bailiff's accounts. However, the lack of figures for receipts of market tolls made by the bailiff does not necessarily mean that these figures were just not recorded but rather that such tolls had been abandoned by the bishop in order to try and encourage new traders and customers to the market. A parallel example of this is the experience of Winchester and the tolls of Winchester market in the fifteenth century. In Winchester the city authorities were aware of a decline in trade between 1410 and 1430, and in the hope of encouraging trade and traders to use the market they freed resident and external merchants of all tolls and dues except payments for out of town butchers and fishmongers and fixed

structure stalls. This measure deprived the bailiff of a very important source of revenue for the fee farm and consequently the bailiff was awarded £8 annual compensation to be paid from the common fund of the citizens.[6] Perhaps the same thing happened in Durham.

The possibility that market tolls had been abandoned by the last twenty years of the fifteenth century is further suggested by various entries in the bailiffs' accounts. Firstly, in all the extant bailiffs' accounts the bailiff was paid £3 6s 8d towards the fee farm, a sum refered to as the 'bailiff's fee'. From 1491-1492 onwards, a further annual payment of £3 6s 8d was made to the bailiff refered to as being 'in regarda'.[7] Finally from 1492-1493 onwards another annual payment of £3 6s 8d was made to the bailiff to help him with the fee farm.[8] These payments could have served a similar purpose to the annual payment of £8 to the bailiff of Winchester with the bailiff of the Bishop's Borough receiving money in lieu of the market tolls he would have received. Secondly, in all the bailiffs' accounts from 1490-1491, the bailiff was allowed £1 for tolls from the meat market.[9] This is a clear indication that tolls on meat were no longer being collected and certainly points to a general abandonment of market tolls by the bishop in Durham.

Such an abandonment of market tolls in Durham would certainly suggest that the market which had once been a

prosperous centre for both the life of Durham and its environs was struggling economically by the last quarter of the fifteenth century, either because traders were reluctant to operate there or because of a fall in demand.

The decline in rent values and vacancies in the shops of the bishop in the market place would also suggest that the prosperity of the market and therefore the desirability of holding a stall there was declining in the second half of the fifteenth century. All the shops that the bishop held in the market place were rented out for less than their nominal value during this period, and some of the shops were vacant for periods of time. The writing off of £1 2d from the £12 expected from the bailiff because of the lack of tenants for a group of five shops from 1480-1481 seems in particular to point to a decline in the attractiveness of the market place to merchants and traders.

In her study of Durham Priory, Margaret Bonney also found that the market was not as prosperous in the second half of the fifteenth century as it had been previously. She found that in the High Middle Ages, many luxury goods were sold in the market but that by the Late Middle Ages only goods of an inferior quality were sold.[10] She also found that by the late medieval period, the Priory made few purchases from the market, prefering other markets of the region.[11] Whether or not the bishop was buying goods

from the market is not stated in the records of the bishopric, but all the information points to a decline in the prosperity of Durham market in the fifteenth century.

The market was a focal point for the Bishop's Borough, the whole town, and the area surrounding the town. Perhaps a decline in the prosperity of the market reflected a general decline in the importance and prosperity of Durham in the second half of the fifteenth century.

CHAPTER NINE

THE BISHOP'S MINT

The facility of the bishop of Durham to mint coins for the Palatinate was one of the most important outward signs of the power of the bishop both within his lands and in the country as a whole. Thus, the operation of the Mint in Durham was a matter of importance for the bishop's local and national prestige more than a profit making exercise. Consequently, the bishop's moneyer was a valued employee within the bishop's administration. There was a house for whoever was the moneyer on the north side of Owengate which was refered to in the Langley survey's description of Palace Green, and in 1455, a garden was also leased to the moneyer, increasing the land owned by the moneyer and showing the value of the position.[1] Each moneyer had the financial responsibility of paying a fixed fee for the Mint and making a profit if possible but the true importance of the position was in the minting of coins for the bishop to manifest his power in the Palatinate.

Throughout the second half of the fifteenth century the bishop's Mint and moneyer were refered to regularly, an acount for the Mint appearing in each of the receiver general's accounts. The Langley survey contained a

reference to the moneyer stating that, "the Mint is run by Mulcinus of Florence, the lord's minter, and is worth £2 a year but at the time of the change of the English currency it returns 20 marks".[2] Between 1418 and 1453 the lack of continuous documentation makes it hard to say who the moneyers were but between 1453 and 1479 a continuous series of the receiver generals' accounts allow this. John Arscot was the moneyer from 1453 to 1460, John Norwell from 1460-1471, Robert Dixson from 1472-1475, and finally Robert Bagot from 1476 onwards.[3] In the Book of Transumpt of 1487-1488, Robert Bagot was still the moneyer and remained so by 1492.[4] The position of moneyer was obviously a long term one.

In the first half of the fifteenth century, the bishop's Mint was at a low ebb. It was in disuse for a time, and there were few distinguishing features between the royal and episcopal coins issued there.[5] Obviously at this time the bishops were not using their coinage as a statement of their power and independence. In the second half of the fifteenth century the minting of episcopal coinage in Durham regained some impetus. In 1460, a new moneyer, John Norwell, was bonded to pay a farm to the bishop and to deliver up the dies after a year.[6] However, a real resurgence came in 1473 when King Edward IV granted the right to the bishop to coin half-pence as well as sterlings.[7] Consequently the bishop licensed a goldsmith of York to make new coining dies.[8] This new interest in the Mint continued in 1476 when a grant was

made to William Omoryghe to make new coining irons for the Mint under the auspices of John Kelyng, the Receiver General.[9] However, this new impetus was ended when Richard III took away the privilege of minting episcopal coins.[10] Finally Henry VII authorised that the Durham Mint had to pay 4 marks a year to the Royal Mint to rent the coining dies for the Durham Mint, thus removing much of the Mint's independence.[11]

The revenues from the Mint were recorded in the section detailing foreign receipts in each receiver general's account and were not included within the total revenue from Durham that also appeared in these accounts. The figures appearing are rounded off and it seems likely that each year a farm was agreed for the Mint which the moneyer was responsible for paying. However, despite the official nature of these extant figures for the Mint, the increases and decreases in the size of the figure show not only growth and decline in the volume of coinage being produced but possibly also fluctuations in the importance of the Mint.

In 1453-1454, the receiver general's receipts from the Mint were at their lowest ebb, amounting to £1 10s, and in 1458-1459 this figure had only risen to £2.[12] In the two subsequent years, receipts from the Mint totalled £4 6 1/2d and £6 13s 4d respectively, an increase on the previous figures but still not a large amount.[13] The small level of receipts from the Mint in these years

could tie in with the low ebb of the Mint's importance in the first half of the fifteenth century.

The receipts of the next ten years were more substantial showing a revival of the Mint. In 1464-1465 the receipts from the Mint were £14 4s 11 1/2d, a great improvement on the receipts of the previous ten years.[14] In the following year the receipts fell to £10 and for the next three years no figure for receipts from the Mint was given.[15] However, in 1469-1470 £20 was received by the receiver general.[16] In the following year these receipts fell again to £10 but overall between 1464 and 1471 receipts from the Mint suggest that more work was being done there than before 1464.[17]

The years 1472-1474 represent the period of greatest activity in the bishop's Mint in the second half of the fifteenth century. It was in 1473 that the right was given to the bishop to coin half-pence and this was probably the reason for the high receipts. In 1472-1473 £26 13s 4d was received from the Mint and in 1473-1474 £33 6s 8d was received.[18] The large receipts of these two years show that the minting of foreign coins was at its highest level with full advantage being taken of the recent grant.

In 1476-1477 and 1478-1479 receipts fell again to £13 6s 8d and from this year the receiver generals' accounts had no figures for receipts from the Mint.[19] However, an

entry in the Books of Transumpt from 1487 onwards said that the farm of the Mint was £6 13s 4d.[20] This reduction must have been a result of the restrictions on the independence of the Mint by Richard III and Henry VII which in turn must have restricted the importance of the Mint to the bishop of Durham.

The right of the bishop to mint his own coins in Durham was still a matter of some prestige for the bishop, but by the second half of the fifteenth century the bishop's Mint was not as important as it had been. Apart from the receipts of 1472-1474, receipts were on the whole £10 or lower and those for 1487 onwards are particularly telling, pointing to a demise in the influence of the mill because of restrictions on the minting of episcopal coins.

TABLE THIRTEEN - RECEIPTS FROM THE MINT 1453-1492

YEAR	MONEYER	RECEIPTS
1453-1454	JOHN ARSCOT	£1 10s
1458-1459	JOHN ARSCOT	£2
1459-1460	JOHN ARSCOT	£4 6 1/2d
1460-1461	JOHN NORWELL	£6 13s 4d
1464-1465	JOHN NORWELL	£14 4s 11 1/4d
1465-1466	JOHN NORWELL	£10
1469-1470	JOHN NORWELL	£20
1470-1471	JOHN NORWELL	£10
1472-1473	ROBERT DIXSON	£26 13s 4d
1473-1474	ROBERT DIXSON	£33 6s 8d
1476-1477	ROBERT BAGOT	£13 6s 8d
1478-1479	ROBERT BAGOT	£13 6s 8d
1487-1488	ROBERT BAGOT	£6 13s 4d
1488-1489	ROBERT BAGOT	£6 13s 4d
1489-1490	ROBERT BAGOT	£6 13s 4d
1490-1491	ROBERT BAGOT	£6 13s 4d
1491-1492	ROBERT BAGOT	£6 13s 4d

CHAPTER TEN

THE BISHOPMEADOW

The Bishopmeadow or Le Bisshopmedowe as it was refered to in the records of the bishop's administration was one of the properties of the bishop's Durham estate, but as with the Mint the revenues derived from it were not included in the Durham revenues. Rather, they were included with the revenue from other such meadows in the section for foreign receipts in the receiver generals' accounts. The Bishopmeadow was refered to in the Bishop Langley survey of 1418 which stated that there was "a certain meadow called Le Bisshopmedowe containing by estimation 28 acres" which was let for £5 6s 8d a year.[1] The implication in this survey and in subsequent references to the Bishopmeadow is that it was either a property adjoining or contained within Franklyn forest in Framwellgate.

The Bishopmeadow was leased out annually for a farm which the tenant or tenants were expected to pay in total, being allowed to keep any profits themselves. The nominal value of the Bishopmeadow was £5 6s 8d, but it was leased out for less than this in all extant instances between 1453 and 1497. Presumably the tenant would have made money from the meadow by grazing livestock on it or

by selling crops grown in it. It seems that the Bishopmeadow was a property which the bishop would let out on a long lease. For instance in the receiver general's account of 1453-1454, it was stated that William Tong held the property on a lease for 12 years, and William Ronceby and associates leased the property between 1458 and 1467.[2] John Poyd was tenant between 1467 and 1469 but after this the name of the tenant was not given until 1473.[3] John Raket and associates leased the Bishopmeadow between 1473 and 1475 at least, but after this date infrequent references to the meadow make it impossible to establish any sense of continuity for the lessees of the Bishopmeadow.[4]

Unlike other properties there was little fluctuation in the receipts from the Bishopmeadow. Of the twenty-five years in which figures for receipts are extant, £5 was paid by the lessees in fifteen of the years. Thus, there was no problem for the tenants leasing the property in paying the full farm for the meadow. However, where the figures for receipts are different it seems that the bishop was actually using the Bishopmeadow for his own use. In the receiver general's account of 1469-1470, it was stated that £5 had been received, but then that £2 10s had come from the bishop himself because part of the meadow was being used by him.[5] In 1476-1477 and 1478-1479 the farm of the meadow was only £2 10s meaning that in these years the bishop was again using some of the meadow for his own purposes.[6] In two years the meadow

was kept entirely in the hands of the bishop. In 1470-1471 the bishop was using the meadow to graze his horses and it was not leased out at all. Also in 1472-1473 the meadow was not leased out as the bishop was using it as pasture land and also for timber from Franklyn wood which was destined for used in repairing the dam.[7] The timber may have been merely stored in the field or perhaps it was being prepared for use in the repair of the dam before being transported. Finally between 1487 and 1492 the Bishopmeadow was leased for only £1 17s 6d. Why the farm had been reduced in these years was not stated but in the light of previous reductions it would seem likely that the bishop was using part of the meadow for his own purposes.

Finally the bishop also used the revenue derived from the Bishopmeadow in one instance to reward one of his administrators. In 1475-1476 the bishop granted an annuity of £1 6s 8d to John Raket for his service as the custodian of the armour of the bishop in the wardrobe of Durham Castle.[8] This annuity was to be taken each year from the receipts of the Bishopmeadow.

The information in the records of the bishop of Durham shows the Bishopmeadow to have been a property with several uses. The bishop could farm it out to make money, or could use it himself if necessary. He could also use the receipts from the meadow to reward an employee. Thus, while the Bishopmeadow may not have been

one of the bishop's most valuable properties in Durham it was certainly a useful one.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

FRANKLYN FOREST

Franklyn forest was one of the most important properties of the bishop in Durham. The forests owned by the bishop in the North-East of England were amongst the most lucrative of his possessions, and Franklyn forest was no exception. However, as with the Mint and the Bishopmeadow, Franklyn forest served other and more important purposes than just bringing in revenue for the bishop.

Franklyn forest was situated in Framwellgate as was the Bishopmeadow and it was refered to in the Langley survey which stated that "there is also a place called Franklyn full of great oaks containing by estimation 300 acres...".[1] The latter statement shows that it was a forest of considerable size. As with other forests of the bishop, Franklyn would have been under the jurisdiction of the master forester. Unfortunately only one account of the master forester is extant covering the years 1476-1479, and this account itself is in a poor state of repair.[2] In the other sources, references to the financial aspect of Franklyn forest are few, with only two references to the foresters, one appearing in the Books of Transumpt from 1484 onwards stating that the

fee of Henry Massy, forester of Franklyn, was £3 15s, and the other appearing in the receiver general's account of 1495-1496 when John Raket received a fee of £2 17s for being the custodian of "Frankleyn parc, Ryton forest, and Milburnflanshe".[3] However, this dearth of information on the financial aspects of the forest does not matter as the most important use of the forest for Durham life was as a source of materials to make repairs. On his doorstep the bishop had a very valuable source of timber which he could use to repair his mills, properties, or to make repairs on the Castle.

In the clerk of works' accounts, the clerk of work recorded payments made to workmen for materials, and occasionally the source of materials was stated, particularly when payment was made for the carriage of materials from one place to another, or when material was being gathered in a particular place. In the accounts, Franklyn was often refered to as the source of timber, and in instances when the source of timber was not stated, it seems more than likely that it would have come from Franklyn forest. In 1458, a year of light expenditure on repairs, Franklyn was refered to three times.[4] John Brighton was paid 3 1/2d for collecting timber there, Richard Billyngham was paid 9s 2d for 11 cartloads of timber that he brought from Franklyn to the mills, and a group of five workmen were paid 6s for working there for five days gathering timber for the mills. 1469-1470 was also a year of light expenditure on

repairs, but again timber from Franklyn was used in the repair of the dam.[5] John Wall received 4s for 8 cartloads of timber he brought from the forest, and a further 2s for carriage of yedyres and piles from there for two days. Five women also received 3s 7d for the collection and carriage of wood, moss, and other useful materials for repairing the dam. Both 1458 and 1469-1470 were years when only minor repairs were needed on the dam for the mills but Franklyn was still important as probably the major source of raw materials.

The clerk of works' account for 1475-1476 shows just how important Franklyn forest was as a source of raw materials in a year when much repair was being undertaken.[6] The amount of work undertaken suggests that in this year the dam was being completely rebuilt and thus much timber and stone was needed. Franklyn forest was refered to in name six times for this work. 16 Cartloads of timber were taken from there to the dam for 4s and a carpenter was paid 6s 8d for work at Franklyn. However, much more extensive work was done at Franklyn forest itself. Five workmen gathered and carried timber and piles from Franklyn over 162 days for £2 14s. It also seems that Franklyn forest was not only a source of timber but also a source of stone as four workmen quarried stone there intermittently over 346 days for £4 16s 1d. William Wyatt and Robert Smyth were paid £8 10s for collecting and carrying stone from Franklyn to the mills and were paid a further £4 9s 4d for collecting and

carrying timber, stone, piles and flekes to the mills. The latter entry shows the true wealth of raw materials that could be obtained from Franklyn forest.

The clerk of works' accounts for 1477-1478, 1480-1481, and 1489-1490 contain references to Franklyn forest in connection with the mills and the account of 1480-1481 also refers to work being undertaken in the market place using raw materials from the forest.[7] Two carpenters were paid £3 15s for collecting timber for use in the repair of the Shambles, the place of the butcher's market, and John Mason was paid 12s 11d for the carriage of 3 cartloads of timber from Franklyn to the market place for the same work. Thus, materials from Franklyn were also used in other areas of the bishop's estates in Durham.

Finally, stone and timber from Franklyn forest was used in making repairs on the Castle. A few references to the forest are made in the accounts of each of the receiver generals detailing expenses incurred through work on the Castle. For instance, John Stevenson, mason, quarried rock at Franklyn in December 1453 for repairs being made on the Castle and was paid £1 1s for his work.[8] Thus, the forest was a source of raw materials for work being carried out on the Castle as well as the bishop's properties in Durham which he was obliged to maintain.

The fact that Franklyn forest was part of the Durham estate must have been of immense value to the bishop. He had to maintain the mills and his properties for rent for his tenants and also needed raw material for work on the Castle. If he had had to obtain these materials from another part of his lands which was further away or get materials from another landlord the expense would have been much greater, not only for manpower and carriage of raw material but also for the materials themselves. However, the existence of such a rich source of timber and stone in Durham meant that the bishop could undertake repair and building work in Durham without worrying about the cost of the raw materials being prohibitive.

CHAPTER TWELVE

THE BISHOP'S TOTAL REVENUE FROM DURHAM

Having examined the sources of revenue owned by the bishop in Durham, the logical step is to look at the bishop's total revenue from Durham City. This revenue was principally derived from the receipts from the mills, rents, market tolls, and the bakehouse and the figure given in the receiver generals' accounts for the revenues from Durham was made up from the receipts from these assets. The revenues from the Mint and the Bishopmeadow were included amongst the foreign receipts and did not form part of the revenues from Durham. All the above were leased out, the rents and market tolls to the bailiff, the mills occasionally to the bailiff in the second half of the fifteenth century but mostly to separate lessees, and the bakehouse either to the bailiff or to a separate lessee. Thus, how much the bishop made from Durham was entirely dependent on how much he received from those who were paying the farm for his properties.

In the fifteenth century the first extant figures for total revenue appears in the receiver general's account of 1416-1417, and the last in the receiver general's account of 1496-1497.[1] There are figures for the total

revenue from Durham for twenty-five years, the most concentrated period being 1458-1479 from which figures for total revenue survive for almost every year. Between 1418 and 1458, the total receipts from Durham are only known in three years. The knowledge of total receipts in the years 1484-1503 can be augmented using the figures for receipts from the mills, bakehouse, and Burgh, but attempting to construct a figure for total revenue from the receipts for these separate items has its problems. Receipts for all the above properties are not given in some of the financial years, and the figures given do not necessarily represent the final receipts. The Books of Transumpt were not official documents but were rather notebooks used in their preparation and consequently the financial positions of the mills, the Burgh, and the bakehouse are not always stated clearly. Thus, while the Books of Transumpt can be used to estimate what the annual total revenue from the bishop was between 1484 and 1503, the figures for total revenue derived from these books are by no means definitive.

Before looking at the figures for actual receipts in the accounts of the receiver general, it is necessary to make an examination of the figures given at the start of each description of properties for rent in Durham in the accounts of the coroner of Easington ward. This figure represents the amount the bishop's properties had been leased for, and although the figures show only the maximum revenue that the bishop hoped to receive from the

farm of his properties, any upward or downward trends in the level of the figure can be used to show similar changes in actual receipts of revenue and also in the economic condition of the Bishop's Borough.

In each coroner's account the formula of the statement remains virtually the same, the figure for the farm being given and then the name of the lessee or lessees of the various properties of the bishop in Durham, the properties being leased, and finally what their nominal value was. Some perspective to these figures is given by the Hatfield and Langley surveys both of which recorded what the farm of the bishop's property was. In the Hatfield survey of 1383, Alan of Billyngham, John of Boynton, Roger Aspour, Roger Flesshewer, and Richard Kyrkby were leasing the bishop's properties in Durham for £80.[2]

TABLE FOURTEEN - THE FARM OF THE BISHOP'S BOROUGH

YEAR	FEE FARM
1383	£80
1418	£80
1443-1444	---
1455-1456	£53 6s 8d
1459-1460	£53 6s 8d
1465-1466	£60
1466-1467	£53 6s 8d
1469-1470	---
1470-1471	£53 13s 4d
1474-1475	£53 13s 4d
1477-1478	£54 13s 4d
1480-1481	£54 13s 4d
1486-1487	£54 13s 4d
1488-1489	£53 13s 4d
1505-1506	£54 13s 4d
1508-1509	£54 13s 4d

Thirty-four years later there had been no change in the situation with the Langley survey recording that in 1418, "The City of Durham with its rents, services, courts, and customs...are let to Nicholas Hayford and his fellows at six years for 110 marks a year.".[3] 110 marks was equivalent to £73 6s 8d. Thus, between 1384 and 1418 the size of the farm of the bishop's properties in Durham declined but only by a small amount. Between 1384 and 1418 the potential of the bishop's estates in Durham to produce revenue declined slightly but it was soon to decline dramatically.

Between 1418 and 1455 there was a large decline in the size of the farm but between 1455 and 1509 the annual sum for which the bishop leased his properties was fairly stable. In 1455 the bishop's estate in Durham was leased to Adam Frithbank and five others for only £53 6s 8d, £20 less than in 1418.[4] In the 37 year hiatus between these figures the revenue producing potential of the Durham estate must have declined considerably, and as the amount of revenue the properties that made up the estate made was to a large extent dependent on the number of people using them, it seems possible that the loss of revenue was due to a decline in the number of people living in the Bishop's Borough. From the 1455 figure the farm changed little. In 1465-1466 it rose again, perhaps an indication of an improvement in economic conditions in the years from 1455, but it fell again the following year to the 1455 level.[5] The bishop's estate was leased at

this amount until 1477-1478 when there was a slight increase in the farm.[6] Perhaps this increase was due to the building of five new shops first mentioned in 1480-1481, but these shops were never occupied thus making the increase a dead letter. In 1508-1509, the farm of the bishop's properties still stood at the 1477 figure and the stability of the sum would seem to suggest that after a decline in the economic condition of the Bishop's Borough in the first half of the fifteenth century, the situation stabilised in the second half of the fifteenth century. However, the actual receipts from the bishop's property in Durham show that the level of revenue was still continuing to decline, and if the figures in the Books of Transumpt are to be believed, this decline was particularly sharp in the last twenty years of the century.

The actual revenue of the bishop of Durham cannot easily be divided up into periods of decline and growth. Periods of falling revenue are interrupted by a year of large receipts and vice versa. However, looking at the annual total revenues, trends can be seen either of growth or decline. I have divided the figures for revenue from Durham for the years 1416-1497 into 6 periods which roughly correspond to periods of increasing and decreasing receipts.

TABLE FIFTEEN - THE ACTUAL REVENUE FROM DURHAM

YEAR	AMOUNT OF REVENUE
1416-1417	£76 6s 2d
1418-1419	£76 6s 2d
1424-1425	£76 7s 6d
1427-1428	£62 9s 11d
1434-1435	£66 14s 2d
1438-1439	£43 4s 10d
1453-1454	£34 2s 10d
1458-1459	£48 4s 7d
1459-1460	£43 8s 11d
1460-1461	£40 7s 8d
1464-1465	£50 14s 0d
1465-1466	£45 1s 1d
1466-1467	£41 17s 5d
1467-1468	£38 6s 6d
1468-1469	£22 6s 1d
1469-1470	£47 13s 1d
1470-1471	£38 5s 7d
1472-1473	£34 1s 9d
1473-1474	£44 0s 3d
1474-1475	£37 5s 2d
1476-1477	£35 2s 5d
1478-1479	£18 13s 4d
1494-1495	£3 9s 8d
1495-1496	£5 10s 5d
1496-1497	£23 2s 8d

The first of these periods spans the years 1416-1425 for which three figures are extant. The first two of these give the revenue as £76 6s 2d and the third shows a slight increase in revenue from Durham.[7] These sums of money would have paid off all the lease of £73 6s 8d for the bishop's properties in Durham as stated in the Langley survey and equally would have paid most of the farm in 1383. These receipts show that there was little change in the revenues from Durham between 1383 and 1425 and consequently that this was a period of stability for the economy of the Bishop's Borough and probably also for population levels in the Borough as well.

The next two figures show a decline in revenue. In 1427-1428 there was an annual revenue of £62 9s 11d much lower than that of three years before.[8] This rapid decline indicates that in the three year gap between figures something must have occurred to cause a sharp downswing in the economic fortunes of the bishop's properties and judging by the way the bishop's properties made money, a demographic contraction would seem to be the most likely explanation. If the receipts of this year were a one off then they could possibly be explained by the closure of one of the mills, but in 1434-1435 the annual revenue total was only slightly larger and still £10 lower than the 1424 total.[9] There may have been a demographic decline in this period but compared to the next two totals for revenue, this period appears as the calm before the storm.

By 1438-1439 the revenue had fallen dramatically to a total of £23 10s lower than the previous total.[10] This decline can probably be attributed to an economic and demographic crisis in Durham at this time and it seems that this crisis reduced the potential to make money of the bishop's properties in Durham. After 1438-1439 the bishop received over £50 from Durham only once.

A 14 year gap exists between this receiver general's account and the next one for 1453-1454 but by the latter date the revenue from Durham had again declined dramatically.[11] It is possible that demographic and

economic decline put in motion by the crisis of 1438-1439 had not stopped there and that population and as a result revenue had continued to decline. However, looking at the subsequent revenues it seems more likely in this case that revenue was lost from the mills or another of the bishop's assets through closure due to repairs.

Four totals for revenue from Durham are extant between 1458 and 1465, and suggest a recovery from the crisis of 1438-1439. In 1458-1459 the annual revenue was £48 4s 7d, a great improvement on that of the previous receiver general's account, but in the next two years the total was lower.[12] However, in 1464-1465 the revenue from Durham had risen to over £50.[13] Judging by the revenue for this year and that for 1458-1459 it would seem that there had been some recovery in the prosperity of the bishop's assets for farm in Durham, and the two lower figures could again have been due to loss of rent through closure of the mills because of repairs. Perhaps the population of the Bishop's Borough was on the increase, but any recovery must not be overstressed as the total revenue was still nowhere near what it had been previously. Between 1458 and 1465 most of the farm for Durham would have been paid but only because it had been lowered to accomodate the decline in revenue from the bishop's estate in Durham.

Between 1465 and 1469 the revenue from Durham again began to decline, but more slowly than in 1438-1439. After the

total revenue for 1464-1465, the largest total in the second half of the fifteenth century, the revenue fell in the next three years to a much lower total in 1467-1468 showing that the slight recovery from the position of 1438-1439 had been halted and that the economy of the Bishop's Borough was in decline albeit a slow one.[14] The revenue for 1468-1469 was very low in comparison to the totals of previous years but this decline was almost certainly due to the loss of revenue because of the closure of one of the mills as subsequent revenues returned to a similar level to that of 1467-1468.

The total revenues for the years 1469-1477 are relatively stable showing little fluctuation, but they prove that the impression from the revenues of 1465-1468 was correct in that the capacity of the bishop's assets in Durham to produce revenue seems to have been reduced. In 4 of the 6 figures for revenue from Durham in these years, the revenue was under £40 but above £30.[15] In 1469-1470 and 1473-1474 the revenue was well over £40, but for the most part it seems that the value of the bishop's properties were in decline.[16] The two receipts of over £40 could suggest that lower totals were again due to a reduced rent because of closure of the mills, but the coroners' accounts showed this period to have been one of increasing vacancies in the properties for rent held by the bishop. The decline in revenue could well have been caused by a combination of a decline in the capacity of

the bishop's properties to serve his tenants, and a decline in the number of the bishop's tenants themselves.

Finally between 1478 and 1497 only four figures for total revenues from Durham are extant and two of these seem a little suspect due to the very low sums of money recorded. In 1478-1479 and 1496-1497 the total revenues were around the £20 mark and despite the gap between these two figures, they fit in with the figures for total revenue calculated from the Books of Transumpt, all of which suggest that the annual revenue of the bishop from Durham had fallen to about £20.[17] However the two figures for 1494-1495 and 1495-1496 are very low indeed.[18] Despite there being no figure for the mills in the Books of Transumpt of these years, more money came from the bakehouse alone in 1494-1495 than was recorded in the receiver general's account. The most likely explanation for the low revenue recorded would be that the receiver general's account was compiled before all the revenue from Durham had been paid in, and that consequently not all the revenue from Durham was recorded.

Obviously between 1479 and 1509 there are gaps in the figures for total revenue from the bishop's properties in Durham which can be filled to a certain extent by the figures for the bishop's properties in the Books of Transumpt from 1484 to 1503. However, as previously stated there are some problems in attempting to calculate

annual total revenue from these figures. Of the nineteen financial years covered by the Books of Transumpt, there are no figures for the mills in three years, no figures for the bakehouse in nine years, and one year in which there is no account for the bailiff of Durham. In only seven years are there figures for all three properties and in 1486-1487 there are no figures for any of the properties. Most of the payments detailed in the bailiff's account are also not strictly payments made by the bailiff to the bishop of money collected by the bailiff. Rather, most of the payments detailed in the bailiff's account were made by the bishop to the bailiff in lieu of money the bailiff would have collected from the market tolls as it seems that the bishop had relaxed these to encourage more traders to the market. This means that in most cases much of the money the bishop received from the bailiff had been paid by the bishop in the first place and consequently cannot be viewed as revenue from Durham. However, I have included these payments in the totals of revenue from Durham calculated from the Books of Transumpt as the same method would have been employed in the receiver generals' accounts.

Despite these reservations the Books of Transumpt are still useful in suggesting upward or downward trends in the revenue of the bishop from Durham. Three distinct periods can be noticed over the nineteen years. Between 1484 and 1491, the annual revenue from the mills, Burgh, and bakehouse was distinctly low. Revenues from the

TABLE SIXTEEN - TOTAL REVENUE CALCULATED FROM THE BOOKS OF TRANSUMPT

YEAR	MILLS	BURGH	BAKEHOUSE	TOTAL
1484-1485	£7 11s 8d	£3 6s 8d	?	?
1485-1486	----------	£3 6s 8d	?	?
1486-1487	----------	----------	?	?
1487-1488	3s 4d	£3 6s 8d	?	?
1488-1489	£10 4s 8d	£3 6s 8d	?	?
1489-1490	£2 6s 6d	£3 6s 8d	£5 6s 8d	£10 19s 10d
1490-1491	£1 10s	£6 13s 4d	£3 13s 4d	£11 16s 8d
1491-1492	£12	£6 13s 4d	£3	£21 13s 4d
1492-1493	£5 16s 8d	£6 16s 8d	£7 14s 4d	£20 14s 8d
1493-1494	£8 5s	£9 19s 0d	?	?
1494-1495	?	£9 19s 0d	£5 6s 8d	?
1495-1496	?	£9 19s 0d	£5 6s 8d	?
1496-1497	----------	£12 6s 2s	?	?
1497-1498	£8 13s 4d	£9 6s 8d	£3 6s 8d	£21 6s 8d
1498-1499	£4 6s 8d	£9 19s 0d	£5 6s 8d	£19 12s 4d
1499-1500	?	£9 12s 4d	£3 13s 3d	?
1500-1501	£10 6s 8d	£6 13s 4d	£5 6s 8d	£22 6s 8d
1501-1502	£13	£9 6s 8d	?	?
1502-1503	£13 6s 8d	£9 0s 8d	?	?

bakehouse were not given for the first five years of these years but as £5 6s 8d was the maximum that would have been received if all was paid in the when receipts for the bakehouse were not given, the total revenue would still have been low. In 1484-1485 and 1488-1489 if £5 6s 8d had been paid for the bakehouse then over £15 would have been received.[19] However, in 1485-1486 and 1487-1488, less than £10 would have been received as receipts for the mills were very low.[20] Also the fact that all the recorded receipts for the Burgh in these years had been paid by the bishop emphasises the very low level of revenue the bishop was receiving from his Durham estate at the time.

In 1489-1491 when the receipts from all three sources of revenue were given the total revenue was again very low.

The low level of revenue resulted from very small receipts from the mills which were under William Brotherburn at the time. It is known that both mills were in full working order at this time and therefore the low receipts of these years and indeed of the whole seven year period can only be blamed on a further decline in the amount of revenue the bishop's assets could produce, possibly because of a decline in the number of people using the mills, the bakehouse, and the market.

Between 1491 and 1500 the revenue totals increased a little and for the most part were around the £20 mark. In all of these years some revenue was lost either due to the mills being leased at a much reduced rent or to the South mill being closed for repairs, a fact that obviously severely limited the potential revenue from Durham. In four of these years there were figures for all three properties, the lowest being £19 12d 4d in 1498-1499 and the highest being in 1491-1492 when £21 13s 4d was the revenue from these properties.[21] Also in three years the revenue from the mills was not given and if it had been the total revenue would probably have been £20 or above.[22] The revenue from the bakehouse was not given in 1493-1494 and 1496-1497.[23] In the former year the revenue from the bakehouse would almost certainly have made the total revenue over £20 but in the latter year it would have been under £20 whatever as the mills were closed for the whole year. Between 1491 and 1500 there was some improvement in the total revenue of the

bishop from Durham although the revenue was still much lower than it had been in the rest of the century. The increase in revenue was also due to some extent to an increase in the payments made by the bishop to the bailiff in lieu of market tolls which somewhat negates any air of optimism concerning the economic condition of the Bishop's Borough. In the previous periods low revenue totals were due to low payments alone, while in this period low revenue totals were largely due to the loss of revenue from the closure of the South mill. However, the question is whether or not the revenue totals would have been much larger if both mills had been operative and for these nine years the answer would probably be no. Despite a much reduced rent, the full rent of the mills was not paid in any of these nine years, and thus the revenue total would probably not have been that much larger.

Finally between 1500 and 1503 it seems the economic condition of the Bishop's Borough was improving with revenue totals becoming slightly bigger. In 1500-1501, much revenue was lost again because of repairs to the mills but all the expected rent was paid, and all the rent for the bakehouse was paid. Thus, the total revenue was only just over £20 but was obviously limited unavoidably.[24] In the following year most of the lease of the mills was paid and the total revenue was the same as that of the previous year. However, no figure was given for the bakehouse and the total revenue would have

been nearer £30 if there had been one.[25] In the following year, the same thing happened again with the full rent for the mills being paid but no rent for the bakehouse being given.[26] Again the revenue would have been nearer £30. In these three years there were definite signs of recovery in the revenues. Again the question is whether or not the revenues would have been greater if they had not been limited by unavoidable circumstances, but here the answer is probably yes. In two of these three years the full rent for the mills was paid, and if the rent had not been limited then the tenants could have paid more, possibly bringing the bishop's revenue from Durham over £30 again for the first time in 25 years.

A comparison with the revenues of other towns and vills under the control of the bishop of Durham and of the Priory's estate in Durham serves to emphasize how great the decline of the bishop's revenues from Durham was in the fifteenth century. There was a decline in the revenues from most of the towns and vills in Easington ward in the second half of the fifteenth century, but nowhere was the decline in revenue as great as that in Durham. In 1458-1459, the revenues from Durham were on a par with most of those for Easington ward but by 1478-1479 the picture was very different.[27] Twelve vills had higher revenues than Durham in this year, but the truly significant fact is that their revenues were much greater than those from Durham. For instance Easington provided

£61 6s 3d for the bishop, Wearmouth provided £45 4s 4d in revenue and Ryhope provided £44 6s 8d. These figures show that Durham which had been and potentially still could be one of the most lucrative vills for the bishop in Easington ward was by 1478 well down the list of his most valuable vills.

During the second half of the fifteenth century the Priory experienced problems in collecting revenue as well, something attested to by the large number of decayed and waste rents recorded by both the almoner and the bursar.[28] However, both the bursar and the almoner managed to increase the amount of revenue they were receiving from Durham over the second half of the fifteenth century although in the case of the bursar the amount of revenue he was collecting by the end of the fifteenth century was still much lower than the revenue totals for the end of the fourteenth century.[29] By the early sixteenth century, these two revenue collectors for the Priory were able to collect over £70 annually from the Priory's Durham estate, well over twice the amount of revenue the bishop was receiving from Durham at this stage.

The decline in the total revenue of the bishop of Durham from his Durham estates in the fifteenth century was dramatic with the revenue of the last 20 years of the century being roughly a quarter of what it had been in 1416. This decline resulted from the decline of the

revenue producing capacities of many of the bishop's properties with low receipts resulting from increasing vacancy of tenements, declining revenues from the mills due to both a fall in the use of the corn grinding facilities provided and in the material fabric of the mill buildings, and falling receipts from market tolls obviously indicating a decline in the market itself. The decline in revenue from the mills and rents points to a decline in the population of the Bishop's Borough, but a decline in the market, the focal point of the economic life of the whole town suggests a decline in the economy of the town as a whole. Thus, at the end of the fifteenth century Durham was still the religious and administrative centre of the bishop's lands in the North East but it was no longer of economic importance to the bishop.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

THE PEOPLE OF THE BISHOP'S BOROUGH

In studying the properties for rent, the mills, the bakehouse, and the other properties owned by the bishop in Durham, I have come across many names either of those living in the Bishop's Borough or those who were closely connected with the bishop's Durham estates through employment or in an administrative capacity. In some cases it is possible to say something about those refered to in the documents of the bishop's administration mostly through references to work undertaken for the bishop which at least tells us the professions of some of the people of the Bishop's Borough. I intend to use such cases where there is enough detail on a particular tenant to show what sort of people populated the Bishop's Borough, and also if possible to say something about how wealthy they were and their consequent position in the society of Durham. I have divided such cases into six different groups, the clergy, craftsmen, menial labourers, businessmen and merchants, men of substance, and administrators. Some of these groupings may seem vague but where appropriate I have made distinction between distinct groups within each large grouping, for instance in the case of the many trades that come under the umbrella of craftsmen.

Unsurprisingly, the first of these groupings, the clergy, was fairly prevalent among the tenants of the Bishop's Borough. The church was at the very centre of Durham life with the Cathedral, the Priory, and each borough having its own parish church. A sizeable proportion of the population of Durham must have been connected with one of the above religious establishments and this is reflected in the number of clergymen mentioned in the coroner of Easington ward's accounts as living in the Bishop's Borough. I have subdivided the clergymen mentioned into three groups, the first being refered to as chaplains, the second being refered to in connection with a particular chapel, and the third being officials of the Priory who rented properties in the Bishop's Borough.

Five men appear in the coroners' accounts simply described as chaplains with no reference being made to which of the ecclesiastical establishments in Durham they belonged to. John Palman rented two gardens in Kingsgate between 1443 and 1460, John Lomid rented two gardens on the motte from 1455 for 1s 8d, and Thomas Hyndeley rented one garden from 1455 for 6d.[1] It appears that these properties were not tied with the occupation of a particular office but that they were supplementary gardens rented out separately by the clergymen to support themselves. Also, between 1443 and 1460, a venell in Sadlergate was rented by John Elstow, chaplain for 1d. By 1465-1466, this property has passed to John Lowe, also

a chaplain.[2] This suggests that the ownership of this venell was tied to the occupancy of a particular position but unfortunately it is not stated what this was.

Four other chaplains were refered to in the coroner's account of 1443-1444 but the properties they occupied were tied to the ecclesiastical offices they held, and were passed on from one occupier of the office to the next.

John Runkhorn was the chaplain of the Chapel of St Jacob which stood on Elvet Bridge. He paid 5s rent a year for a house, a kiln, and a field called Milnemeadow. The same John also paid 10d for two plots under the arches of Elvet Bridge, but these were not automatically held by the chaplain as his successor leased only one of the plots.[3] The house, kiln, and meadow were tied to the office of chaplain of this chapel as they were passed on to John's successor, Robert Pencher. The position of rector of the Chapel of the Blessed Virgin also entailed accommodation, the occupier having an annual rent of 5s to pay for a tenement next to the Northgate.[4] The property description also states that the tenement was near to a venell. Perhaps the venell refered to as being rented by John Elstow, chaplain, also went with this position.

The best documented clergymen are the two chaplains of the Chapel of Thomas Langley. The coroners' accounts

state that the chaplains paid a rent of 1s 6d for a tenement next to the house of the archdeacon and also paid 1s for a garden next to their tenement.[5] Also from 1455 onwards, one of the chaplains, Robert Sotherton, leased a plot of land on the motte for only 1d.[6] These chaplains were refered to in each of the annuities sections of the receiver generals' accounts. In each account it was stated that the receiver general had been allowed £4 for each of two chaplains of the Chantries of the Blessed Virgin Mary and St Cuthbert in the chapel of the Blessed Virgin Mary in the Galilee of Durham to pray for the soul of Thomas Langley, former bishop of Durham. Bishop Langley had set aside land valued at £8 in Ryton, Whickham, Whitburn, Boldon, Cassop, and Hardwick to pay the annuity.[7] From the receiver generals' accounts we can also find out who the chaplains were. Robert Sotherton was one of them throughout the references to the annuity while the others were Robert Grene between 1458 and 1461, John Spicer between 1464 and 1466, Nicholas Kelchirch in 1466-1467, and Hugo Forster between 1467 and 1479. The £8 annuity would have enabled the two chaplains to pay their rent easily and would also have given them some money to live off.

Finally each coroner's account refers to four properties in and around the Bailey being rented by officials of the Priory.[8] The commoner rented one tenement in the Bailey for 2s. His official position in the Priory was to look after the Common House beneath the monks' dormitory and

to provide fuel and candles for it.[9] He also bought spices for the monks in Lent. The sacrist rented a tenement in Sadlergate for the very low rent of 2d. His position was to ensure the upkeep of the cathedral church's fabric making sure that bells, windows, wax, wine, bread, incense, and vestments were in good order.[10] Whether the tenements of these two were used for any official Priory business is not known.

The almoner rented a tenement in the North Bailey with a garden for 3s. His duty was to look after the poor and infirm and he maintained two infirmaries as well as a school. It is possible that the tenement in the North Bailey acted as one of the infirmaries, the Domus Dei as it was known.[11] The almoner was also one of the main rent collectors for the Priory and all in all was an official of some importance. His tenement was one of the few properties for rent in the Bishop's Borough that had a stone roof.[12]

Finally, the prior had a dwelling in the North Bailey which was rented for 4d a year. The prior was head of the Priory, and as with the other officials the existence of a tenement for the occupier of the position shows the importance of the prior in Priory life.

The high profile of clergymen in the Bishop's Borough was obviously a by-product of the power of the church in Durham. The importance of the clergy in the community is

also reflected in certain tenements being attached to certain offices, and the annuity for the chaplains of Thomas Langley. The other chaplains refered to may also have received financial assistance in this way to help pay their rents. The clergy played no direct part in the economic life of the community, but in the case of Durham the religious life was more important than the economic, and the esteemed position the clergy were often held in reflects this importance.

The special position of the clergy separated them from the rest of the bishop's tenants whose livelihood depended on the opportunities the economy of Durham offered them. Unfortunately, the records of the bishop's financial administration tells us little about any industry in Durham. However, sections in the receiver generals' accounts and in the clerk of works' accounts allow us to look at some of the trade of those living in the Bishop's Borough and also those living elsewhere in the area who worked for the bishop.

A study of the sources on trade in Durham gives the impression that building was of great importance to the economy of the Bishop's Borough and Durham and that the prevalence of this trade made Durham attractive to many construction workers in the building trade and also to many unskilled labourers.

The bishop's building works opened up many employment opportunities for unskilled labourers. Whether or not any of these unskilled labourers were tenants of the bishop is in most cases not known due to the fossilisation of the lists of properties for rent in the coroners' accounts and the consequent failure to update the names of tenants renting the bishop's properties. However, with the large number of works, it seems likely that at least some of those involved would have been tenants of the bishop.

The work on the Castle recorded in the receiver generals' accounts was normally on a fairly small scale and consequently there was on the whole no need for large groups of labourers to be employed. However, the work undertaken on the mills, the dam, and the mill pond was often extensive and lasted for long periods of time. Unskilled labour was needed to perform tasks such as helping in setting stone, timber, and moss in the dam. Much unskilled labour was also used either in the gathering of timber and moss or the quarrying of stone, and people were also needed to carry raw materials from their sources, normally Franklyn forest, to the mills.

In all the clerk of works' accounts there are many references to groups of unskilled labour. Those actually working at the mills were either employed directly by the clerk of works or by a craftsman. A good example of the former is an entry in the account for 1475-1476 which

simply states that 10 labourers were employed for 60 days at 2d a day with a final outlay of 10s 2d.[13] These labourers had no special function but were on hand to do anything that needed doing. Their low wage reflects the unskilled nature of the work. An even larger group of 19 men were employed for 123 1/2 days in shoring up the mill pond. Their work was valued slightly higher at 3d a day with £1 10s 10 1/2d being the final wages bill for them. An example of more skilled men employing others appears in an account of 1477-1478. Here, two men, simply refered to as craftsmen, employed an unnumbered group of workers in the carriage of stone, timber, and other materials to the dam and in the use of these materials to strengthen the dam. Many men must have been involved in this work as the wage bill was £8 15s 4 1/2d.[14]

In years when extensive work was undertaken on the mills and the dam much unskilled labour was used in procuring raw materials. Many men were employed in getting timber from Franklyn forest and carrying it to the mills. In 1480-1481 six men were paid £2 1s for 82 cartloads of timber that they collected and then transported to the mills.[15] This is just one instance of the employment of many in collecting timber. Others were involved in quarrying rock and carrying it to the mills. In 1475-1476 when much rock was used in the construction of the mill pond, four workers spent 346 days in Franklyn forest quarrying stone.[16] For this they were paid £4 6s 6d, and once again this is one of many references to such

employment. Finally, even in years when little repair work was needed, moss was needed to repair the dam. Moss was used in constructing the dam but was regularly washed away and needed to be replaced. In 1458 William Johnson was paid 1s for 24 loads of moss.[17] The gathering of moss was not necessarily a lucrative profession unless vast amounts were used but it was one that anyone could do. Some of the very few instances of women working for the bishop are to do with the collection of moss. In 1475-1476 when large amounts of moss were needed, two women were paid £1 for moss gathered.[18] In the accounts of 1480-1481 and 1489-1490 further entries of payment were made for women collecting moss. In the former account 11 women collected moss but not as much as in 1475-1476 as they were only paid 9s 8d, and in the latter account two women received 6s 6d for moss collected.[19] Thus, while the gathering and transporting of timber was restricted to men because of the nature of the work, the collection of moss was unskilled work that gave employment opportunities for the women of Durham.

The opportunities work on the mill created would have given many unskilled people employment. The wages were not as good as those given to craftsmen but even so would have enabled unskilled labourers to survive or would have supplemented their income. In years when much repair work was necessary it seems likely that most of the bishop's tenants and also some dwellers in the Priory's estates would have been involved.

The building trade gave employment to many unskilled labourers, but skilled craftsmen would have been needed to do all jobs that required specialist knowledge in the bishop's buildings works. Unfortunately there is little information on the building or repairing of domestic houses in the records for the Bishop's Borough which means that the position of the lower level of craftsmen involved in house building remains something of a dark area. However, there is much information on building and repair work undertaken on the Castle, the mills, and the dam. Certainly work on the Castle and mills would have needed specialists, and as a result many of the references are to stonemasons who were considered to be the top of the hierarchy of such craftsmen. The number of specialist building projects must have made Durham an attractive centre for the 'elite of craftsmen'.

In each receiver general's account there was a section detailing expenses incurred through repairs made on the Castle, and some of the tenants renting properties in the Bishop's Borough were also working for the bishop as craftsmen. Simon Ross who was renting a garden between 1455 and 1460 for 6d had worked on the Castle in 1453-1454 and 1458-1459. He was a stonemason and in the first of these years he worked on the stone doorway of the Great Stables.[20] In the latter year he was only mentioned in connection with carrying stone to the Castle with his wife and after 1460 he was not mentioned at all

suggesting that he was a travelling stonemason rather than one in the permanent employment of the bishop.[21]

John Stephenson was the lessee of one of the bishop's shops but this was not his only profession. In 1453-1454 he was paid £1 1s for quarrying stone at Franklyn forest and was described as being a stonemason.[22] It seems that he was a jack of all trades as in 1459 he was working for the bishop carrying the Books of Audit from Durham to North Auckland.[23]

William Usworth was also it seems an itinerant mason as he rented his garden between 1455 and 1460 and then disappears from the coroners' accounts. In 1453-1454, William was also working on the stone doorway of the Great Stables which seems to have been the major project in this year.[24] In 1458-1459 he did much work on the fireplaces of the Castle, working on fireplaces in the Great Hall, and in the kitchens.[25] However, he was also refered to in this year as having done work as a waller, a profession more usually associated with the building of domestic houses, and perhaps this was his normal line of work.

Finally John Honke, the husband of Maria Honke who rented a garden for 6d, worked as a mason for the bishop. In 1458-1459 he worked under William Usworth on the same project that William was working on in that year, and recieved 3d for his work on 28 May.[26]

At least four of the bishop's tenants were stonemasons and many more of them may have been subsequently although we cannot know this due to the names of the tenants in the coroners' accounts hardly being updated after 1460. However, the fact that at least four stonemasons were living in the Bishop's Borough shows that it was an attractive site for such craftsmen with plenty of opportunities for work.

Other craftsmen who would have occupied a less exalted position in the hierarchy of craftsmen were tenants of the bishop and worked on the Castle and also on the Priory estate. William Moss was a carpenter and worked on a number of projects in the Castle. In 1453-1454, William did work on a new toilet in the "camera regia" of the Castle, and also worked on a new door for the Great Stables. In the same year he also did repair work in the Lower Hall and the kitchen.[27] He was not mentioned again until 1465 when he worked on the doorway of the Great Hall and also on the lintel of the constable's stables.[28] It seems that William worked alone but many masons employed carpenters in the domestic building trade and thus Durham must also have been an attractive place for carpenters.

William Plummer did work on the Castle but the trade of plumber was more usually associated with the domestic building trade. He rented a 6d plot from the bishop from 1443 onwards but was not mentioned until 1460-1461 when

he made guttering for a tower in the castle and also for a tower next to the Northgate.[29] In 1464-1465 he repaired the guttering of the chancery, and in the following year he was much in demand.[30] He repaired the guttering of the Great Hall and also took on a large job in repairing the aqueduct.[31] William also did some work for the Priory in 1464 when he made a lead gutter for a tenement next to Clayportgate.[32] There must have been plenty of work for someone of a specialist profession such as that of plumber in Durham.

Finally two of the bishop's tenants were not mentioned in the bishop's records but did some work for the Priory. Robert Litster and John Clerk were setters and worked on the foundation of a tenement in Elvet Borough in 1468.[33] Many of the bishop's tenants may have been craftsmen as the above two who may not have been needed for work on the Castle but found employment in the domestic building trade whether for the bishop or for the Priory.

The extensive repairs that needed to be made almost annually to the bishop's mills and in particular to the dam that fed the mills with water also provided plenty of work for craftsmen in Durham. Carpenters were particularly in demand as a great deal of timber was used in the construction of the dams which needed to be cut down to the appropriate size and also to be placed correctly in the dam. In 1475-1476 the mill pond was being created and the dam had to be recreated. Several

teams of carpenters were involved in this work ranging between two and seven carpenters working together. For instance, Robert Coxley, William Coxley, William Robson, John Green, and Thomas Wear were employed for 400 days receiving £5 for their work.[34] Such extensive works obviously created many opportunities for employment for carpenters. There were less employment opportunities for masons. They were needed in the construction of walls to shore up either end of the dam and also in work on the actual mill buildings. However, it was not necessary to undertake such work on a regular basis and thus the clerk of works' accounts contain much fewer references to masons. The 1458 account contains several references to masons working on the dams but after this such references to masons are infrequent.[35]

The wages of masons, carpenters, and other craftsmen varied according to the work being done but for the most part the level of pay was between 4d and 6d a day, rarely rising above the latter figure. Masons do not seem to have been paid any more than other craftsmen despite the specialist nature of their work. However, with the large amount of building work undertaken by both the bishop and the Priory in Durham, craftsmen in the building professions would have been able to enjoy a good standard of living. Some masons and carpenters were able to employ others such as William Usworth, mason, who employed Simon Ross, also a mason, to help him. Also, as seen in work on the dam, groups of craftsmen often worked

together when working on large scale projects, sometimes employing labourers to help them out. Another point concerns the freedom of craftsmen working for the bishop to work for the Priory. Margaret Bonney posed the question whether those working on domestic building works for the Priory were restricted to Priory work. Looking at the situation from the bishop' point of view, the only example here is of William Plummer who worked both for the bishop and the Priory in 1464. Although an isolated example this suggests that such craftsmen did have freedom to ply their trade wherever they wanted.

Finally it seems reasonable to suggest that the bishop may have used his properties for rent to attract skilled craftsmen to work for him full-time. Many of the properties occupied by these craftsmen had been leased to them, possibly on favourable terms, as some sort of retainer for their services. Perhaps the bishop wanted such craftsmen to work for him alone on his building projects and compensated them for money they could have made by working for others by offering cheap accommodation.

In general, the Bishop's Borough with the Castle, the Cathedral, the mills, and the bishop's domestic properties as well as the Priory's estate must have been particularly attractive to craftsmen in the building trade who were looking for regular employment and it would not be surprising if many more of the bishop's

tenants in the second half of the fifteenth century were specialists in the building trade than the examples given here.

Like the building trade the market must have created employment opportunities for the tenants of both the bishop and the Priory in Durham. As we have seen previously the evidence from market tolls or rather the lack of it points to a decline in the use of Durham market in the second half of the fifteenth century, but it was still the only market in Durham and also the major market in the area. The market was still used as an outlet for Durham merchants and the bishop's shops were for the most part occupied, albeit often at a reduced rate. Thus, the market was still a place where the traders of Durham could earn a living although it may have lost some of its ability to attract new traders and merchants in the second half of the fifteenth century.

Unfortunately the records of the bishop's financial administration cast little light on the different kinds of trade in the market and the purchases made from the market by the bishop's officials and consequently we know little about the victualling trade's connection with the bishop's court at this time. However, in each of the receiver generals' accounts the section recording expenses necessary and minute in the chancery occasionally records purchases made from the Durham market or from Durham traders. These purchases were

often of a fairly specialised nature either for use in the Castle or for the audit but perhaps there were some merchants who specialised in selling paper, candles, and other goods needed by the chancery just as there must have been others who specialised in exotic foodstuffs for use in the bishop's court. Many merchants would have operated to serve the needs of the bishop's court in Durham as much as to serve their fellow citizens.

Some of the people known to have been tenants of the bishop are refered to in these accounts supplying specialist goods for the financial administration of the bishop. In 1453-1454, Thomas Marshall who had a tenement in the North Bailey sold some paper to the bishop for use in the Castle.[36] In the same year, Thomas Barbour who leased one of the bishop's shops sold him one large bag and six other bags which were to be used for carrying money from the audit to the bishop in Auckland.[37] Thomas received 1s for this sale. In 1458-1459 Richard Waynpayn who rented a garden for 8d sold the chancery some candles for use in the time of audit for 3d.[38] Of course the sale of candles was not as specialised as the sale of paper to the chancery, as everyone needed candles and they were cheap and widely available. Two others of the bishop's tenants were refered to in the 1460's as having supplied the chancery with goods. In 1460-1461 William Corneforth who had a 4d plot in Walkergate sold 3 lots of arrows to the Castle for 1s 3d, the sale of arrows perhaps reflecting a troubled time in the region.[39]

William appeared again in 1467-1468 when he sold paper to the chancery for 10d to be used in the books of the Great Receipt.[40] Finally Adam Frithbank who we shall look at in greater detail later on was the tenant of one of the bishop's shops for which he paid 3s 4d a year between 1455 and 1467. In 1465 he sold 3 pieces of green cloth to be used to cover the tables in the chancery being paid 6s.[41] This is the only piece of evidence on the commercial activities of Adam Frithbank and from this it can only be suggested that he was a cloth merchant.

Richard Waynpayn and Adam Frithbank would probably have had a broader market than the chancery but the instances of purchases made by the chancery from the bishop's tenants alone suggests that the needs of the chancery created a specialist market for such goods as wax, ink, paper, and parchment which would otherwise not have existed, in much the same way as the group of goldsmiths making sales to the bishop's court who would not have been in Durham if the market had not been created by the bishop's court. The victualling trade also probably served the needs of the bishop's court as much as those of the town. Overall, despite the dearth of information it seems likely that many of the bishop's tenants would have been engaged in commerce with the bishop's court, Durham, and the environs of Durham although the number of those engaged in commerce may have shrunk at the same time as the market seems to be in decline.

Having looked at the craftsmen, labourers, and small businessmen of the Bishop's Borough who formed the lower strata of its society, I shall now look at some of the wealthier and consequently more important citizens of the Bishop's Borough. A unifying factor for the first four of the men to be examined is that they were all at one time or another bailiffs for Durham. The bailiff was also the farmer of the Bishop's Borough, a financially hazardous position as the farmer had to meet any deficit from his own pocket, and consequently had to be a man of means.

The first of these men is Hugo Boner who was renting one of the bishop's shops in 1443-1444 for 10s.[42] He had been the bailiff in 1421 and in 1434-1435 he was again taking a financial risk, farming the Bishop' Borough with William Conyers, William Smith, and Robert Weardale, another of the bishop's tenants for £84 a year on a six year lease.[43] Boner must have been a fairly wealthy man to take on such office when the farm of the Bishop's Borough was at its peak and his renting of a shop suggests that he had made his money as a trader and merchant.

The aforementioned Adam Frithbank was one of the farmers of the Bishop's Borough and between 1456 and 1470 he was the sole farmer and the bailiff. Obviously, Adam had to be a man of substance to be an office holder for such a long period of time, and it was previously suggested that

he may have been a cloth merchant. However, as well as being the bailiff of Durham, Adam was also a minor official of the bishop. In 1459-1460 he was the custodian of the Northgate and was paid 4d a day for guarding the Earls of Northumberland and Westmorland on their way to Pontefract on 14-16 November.[49] In this year, Adam was also the bishop's sub-gaoler and a reference to him stated that he was given a 10d bonus for his diligent work. In the following year the latter entry appeared again but from 1465 onwards Adam was not mentioned in connection with this position.[45] However, it appears that he was not only a prominent member of the community but also a valued servant of the bishop, and in the period 1450-1470, Adam Frithbank must have been one of the more important individuals of the Bishop's Borough.

Two of the subsequent bailiffs were involved in the administrative structure of the bishopric. John Stathorn who was the bailiff of Durham at some stage between 1470 and 1484 also held administrative posts. In 1472-1473 he was the clerk of works and he also held posts as the bailiff of Stockton, the custodian of Brilley Park, and the forester at Birtloe.[46] Thomas Fenton, the bailiff between 1484 and 1489, ran up large arrears during his term of office, but he must have still remained in favour with the bishop as in 1494-1495 he held high office as one of the principal administrators involved in the audit for that year.[47]

The latter two bailiffs were part of a class of professional administrators in Durham who were able to become relatively well off through work they did for the bishop and also through rewards they obtained from the bishop for their work. Two lesser examples of this administrative class are John Henryson and John Harryson. The former was distinguished in that he occupied the only newly built tenement in the second half of the fifteenth century, a house on Elvet Bridge which he leased for 4d from 1469-1470. This fact suggests that he was in favour with the bishop and he was mentioned twice for doing work for the bishop. In 1453-1454 8d costs were allowed to the receiver general which were incurred when he travelled from Durham to the Sadberge for the session of justice.[48] He was not mentioned again until 1477-1478 by which time it seems that he had advanced his position within the administration. In this year he travelled with William Smethyst, Thomas Colman, and knights in the four wards collecting revenue over a 73 day period, the group incurring expenses of £10 7s 8d.[49] This was obviously a big job that John had been entrusted with and suggests that he was now one of the bishop's senior administrators. The latter official, John Harryson, was the lessee of the bakehouse between 1489 and 1496 and at the same time he was a collector for Houghton and Easington.[50] He was an administrator of a lower station than John Henryson but still must have been a man of some means to lease the bakehouse.

Most of the men who were well off in the Bishop's Borough were also administrators for the bishop although whether they made money through working for the bishop, through other work, or by birth is not clear. What is clear is that the bishop's administration which was centred in Durham offered opportunities for the educated, the well off, or retainers of the bishop not only to find employment but also advancement within the administrative structure. The group examined previously were all important members of the administration but were not amongst the top flight of administrators. One family, the Rakets, provides good examples of how particular administrators or a family could find favour and advancement in terms of status and wealth through the administrative structure of the bishop's estates.

The careers of Richard Raket, William Raket, and John Raket span the whole of the second half of the fifteenth century. What their family relationship was is not certain but it seems probable that they were brothers with John Raket being the youngest of the three. Richard Raket is the only one listed in the accounts of the coroner of Easington ward as renting property in the Bishop's Borough, but he was only renting gardens. Considering the amount of time that all three would have spent in Durham, they possibly had accommodation granted to them by the bishop.

Richard Raket's career probably began well before 1453 and lasted until 1471. Throughout the years 1453-1471 he held the posts of clerk of justice at peace for which he received a £3 fee each year, and keeper of the bishop's riding equipment for which he received 13s 4d annually. However, he occupied many positions in the administration which were much more important. In 1458 his acumen as an administrator was recognised when along with William Swift and Richard Barnby he was appointed receiver general when the bishopric was vacant due to the vacancy between Bishops Nevil and Booth.[51] From this point he consistently held high office, being clerk of the coroners between 1458 and 1471, clerk of the exchequer from 1458 to 1461 and again in 1463-1464, and clerk of great receipt from 1464 to 1471 for which he received £5. His name also occurred in the account for chancery expenses between 1453 and 1466 for expenses incurred while travelling to collect the arrears of collectors, distraining them, and riding to the bishop with the money. Richard travelled most in 1453-1454 but still continued to do so even after 1458. As one of the bishop's chief officials, Richard received financial rewards. He received £8 13s 4d each year through his fees and in 1460-1461 was granted £4 15s 4d for the expenses of him and his household.[52] In 1464-1465 he was given the large sum of £8 15s 4d for his work as the clerk of great receipt.[53] Richard was obviously a highly valued servant by the bishop and the rewards and fees

granted to him reflect the fact that he was at the top of his profession.

William Raket was part of the bishop's financial administration at the same time as Richard Raket but his career lasted longer ending in 1479. William never occupied the highest office, that of receiver general, but in his career he held many of the senior posts of the administration. Between 1453 and 1479 William held two posts continuously. For this 26 year period he was chief auditor receiving an annual fee of £5 and was also clerk of the chancery and custodian of the rolls receiving £2 a year. William also took part on many important commissions. He served on the commissions of justice for gaol delivery, conserving peace, and statutes for the assizes.[54] In 1457 he was assigned by Henry VI in the vacancy between bishops to organise the display of archers for the royal visit, was on the commission to survey the bishop's forests in Booth's first year, and in 1458-1459 was on the commission which examined the running of the bishop's coal mines.[55] Much later on in 1476 he was on the commission to enquire into the value of Bishop Langley's possessions.[56] In 1476, before Bishop Booth was translated, William surrendered his letters patent of appointment as clerk of the chancery and custodian of the rolls to John Raket to ensure family

continuity in the office. William received £7 each year in fee but 1460-1461 was the only year in which he received any further benefits. In this year the receiver general was allowed £14 6s 0d for money paid for the expenses of William Raket and household, and a further £4 15s 4d paid for William's work as clerk of the chancery and custodian of the rolls. William also received £1 6s 8d for expenses during the time of audit making 1460-1461 a particularly lucrative year.[57] The one puzzling feature of William's career is an entry in the receiver general's account of 1474-1475 stating that £13 6s 8d was received from William from his pardon.[58] What he was pardoned for is not stated but the misdemeanour he committed cannot have been too serious as he was on a commission for Bishop Langley in 1476.

Richard and William Raket must have held most of the major posts of the financial administration in Durham between 1453 and 1471, and must have become wealthy men through patronage from the bishop. They would certainly have been among the most illustrious men in the Bishop's Borough. Both men were well established by 1453, but the younger John Raket had to start from lowly beginnings. However, after Richard and William had retired he went on to be as important if not a more important man in the administration of the bishop than his brothers.

John held his first position in 1470-1471 when he was paid for writing the rentals of the coroners.[59] From

these small beginnings John began to take over the positions of Richard and William Raket. In 1472 he became clerk of the justice at peace and in 1475 he became keeper of the bishop's riding equipment.[60] Unlike Richard Raket he received no direct fee for this post but was rather granted an annuity of £1 6s 8d to be taken from the revenues of the Bishopmeadow. In 1475-1476, John was still relatively low down in the administrative structure being collector for Chester in this year but it was in 1476 that he first shared the office of clerk of the chancery and custodian of the rolls with William Raket as well as becoming the clerk of the great receipt in this year and receiving the £5 fee this entailed.[61] John became clerk of the chancery on his own in 1479 and also became coroner of Chester ward in this year receiving a further annual fee of £4.[62] He held all these positions until 1497 at least meaning that each year he received £15 6s 8d in fees alone. The lack of receiver generals' accounts between 1479 and 1494 means that these years are blank ones for the career of John Raket but by 1494, John had progressed further. He was one of the chief auditors in this year and also received £2 10s as supervisor of repairs being made on the castle.[63] In the following two years, John was one of the chief auditors receiving £17 expenses for audit with John Metkalfe in 1495-1496 and £27 2s 9d in 1496-1497 with three others. In 1495-1496 he also received £2 17s for acting as custodian of Franklyn Park, the forest of Ryton, and the Milneburneflanshe.[64] How John's career

progressed after 1497 is not known but there is no reason to think that it would not have been just as successful and lucrative if not more so.

John Raket's career represents a pinnacle for the tenants and employees of the bishop examined in this survey. He was the most wealthy and influential man in the bishop's administration in the last twenty years of the fifteenth century and must have had considerable influence both in Durham and in the bishop's estates as a whole.

In concluding this study of the people and society under the bishop in Durham two general points stand out. Firstly, in the study of the bishop's mills, the bakehouse, the properties for rent, and market tolls it was revealed that these assets were becoming less lucrative in the second half of the fifteenth century because of a decline in the number of people using them. However, this study has shown that areas such as the building trade made Durham an attractive site for craftsmen even though other areas of the economy of the Bishop's Borough were in decline and also that despite this decline in particular of Durham's market, there were still rich men living in Durham. Thus, the situation in Durham in the second half of the fifteenth century cannot entirely have been one of decline in all spheres of life of the Bishop's Borough.

Secondly, although there is obviously a bias in the evidence, the existence of the society of the Bishop's Borough as it was in the second half of the fifteenth century seems to have depended entirely on the existence of the bishopric in Durham. The building trade and consequently the employment of many craftsmen and labourers depended on the bishop's building works on the Castle, the mills, and houses and if the bishop had abandoned these then all the employment generated by them would have been lost. In the case of the market we cannot say definitely how the market's profitability would be affected by the lack of the bishopric but considering that the supplies the bishop's court would have needed it seems likely that the market would have lost much of its business. The small group of retailers dealing in paper and other goods for the chancery would not have existed. Finally without the presence of the bishop's administration in Durham such men as the Raket family would not have been able to become so successful. For the people of the Bishop's Borough the opportunities opened up by the presence of the bishopric were essential and in many areas it seems that the bishopric gave the Bishop's Borough if not the whole of Durham its raison d'etre.

CONCLUSION

A study of the bishop's properties in Durham allows certain conclusions to be drawn about the bishop's estates in Durham in the fifteenth century.

Firstly, the estate was fairly small and if anything its size was declining rather than increasing in the fifteenth century. Throughout the second half of the fifteenth century some of the bishop's domestic properties were vacant and other domestic properties became vacant and did not find new tenants. Also, both the bishop's mills were closed at one time or another because of repairs and by the last ten years of the century it seems possible that the larger of the two mills had fallen into disrepair and had consequently been closed indefinitely.

Secondly, the value of the estate was on the wane throughout the fifteenth century. The bishop's domestic properties would have brought in little revenue if they were all occupied at their full value and due to properties being vacant and the rent of certain properties being reduced the revenue from these properties was between a third and a half less than the maximum potential revenue from them in the second half of the fifteenth century. The revenue from these properties

was at a nadir in the last quarter of the fifteenth century. Revenue was lost from the two mills due to their closure, and large amounts of revenue were lost when the larger of the two mills was incapacitated. However, revenue from the mills was also on the wane, being particularly low in the last twenty years of the century with those leasing the mills often running up large arrears during their tenure. Finally, the possible abandoning of market tolls meant that a major source of revenue was lost to the bishop. This loss of revenue from the above properties in particular in the second half of the fifteenth century meant that the total revenue of the bishop from Durham was often only half what it had been at the start of the fifteenth century, and in the last quarter of the century was often only a quarter of what it had been.

The first of the two conclusions can be explained easily. By the fifteenth century the Priory was certainly the dominant landlord in Durham, and its policy was to expand the size of its estate. However, it would seem that the bishop was less interested in expanding his estate and its small size was probably due to the bishop's acceptance of the Priory's dominance as landlord rather than any intransigence on his part. The extensive work undertaken by the bishop on the mills would certainly seem to show that he was not neglecting the Durham estate. The decline of the fabric of the mills itself was due to the violence of the mill stream which caused

frequent flooding and eventually led to the site being abandoned.

The loss of revenue can also be explained partly in such simple terms. Some of the domestic properties which come under the heading of long-term decay may have been uninhabitable because they had fallen into decrepitude. Much revenue was also lost because of the closure of the two mills, particularly in the 1490's and 1500's when the larger of the two mills was probably closed. However, the combined evidence of properties becoming vacant, of the revenue from the mills declining, and of the market tolls being abandoned to try and revive a flagging market point to a possible decline in the population of the bishop's estate in Durham in the second half of the fifteenth century. In the case of the market, trade could also have been taken away because of local merchants and traders prefering to operate in Newcastle upon Tyne than Durham.

A decline in the economic situation in Durham in the fifteenth century may not seem dramatic in comparison to some industrial towns whose economic and demographic decline was due to a collapse in the industrial base of those towns. Durham had no large scale industry and consequently had less to lose than some towns. However, Durham had been a prosperous market town in the North East, and an economic decline of the bishop' estates which were at the heart of the town probably stemmed from

a decline in the usage of the market and consequently of Durham's regional position. By the end of the fifteenth century, it would seem that any relevance Durham had in the North East and nationally stemmed solely from the presence of the church in the town rather than from any aspect of town's economy.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION

1. A. R. Bridbury, Economic Growth in the Later Middle Ages, London 1962, App. II.

2. Ibid., App. III.

3. A. R. Bridbury, Dr Rigby's Comment: A Reply, Ec.H.R., 2nd ser., 39, 1986.

4. R. B. Dobson, Urban Decline in Late Medieval England, Trans. Roy. Hist. Soc., 5th ser., 27, 1977, pp 18-19.

5. C. Phythian-Adams, Urban Decay in Late Medieval England, in Towns and Societies, eds., P. Abrams and E. A. Wrigley, Cambridge, 1978, pp 160-161.

6. Ibid., p. 161.

7. D. M. Palliser, Urban Decay Revisited, in Towns and Townspeople in the fifteenth century, ed. J. F. Thompson, Gloucester, 1988, p. 4.

8. S. H. Rigby, Late Medieval Urban Prosperity: The Evidence of the Lay Subsidies, Ec.H.R., 2nd ser., 39, 1986, p. 416.

9. Ibid., pp 411-412.

10. Ibid., p. 412.

11. Ibid., pp 412-413.

12. A. R. Bridbury, English Provincial Towns in the Late Middle Ages, Ec.H.R., 2nd ser., 34, 1981, p. 2.

13. Ibid., p.2.

14. Ibid., p.8.

15. R. B. Dobson, Op. Cit., p. 11.

16. C. Pythian-Adams, Op. Cit., p. 162.

17. D. M. Palliser, Op. Cit., p. 4.

18. Ibid., p. 4.

19. Ibid., p. 5.

20. Ibid., p. 5.

21. S. H. Rigby, Urban Decline in the Later Middle Ages: the Reliability of the Non-Statistical Evidence, Urban History Yearbook, 1984, p. 45.

22. Ibid., p. 54.

23. A. R. Bridbury, Op. Cit., pp. 12-13.

24. R. B. Dobson, Op. Cit., p.17.

25. C. Phythian-Adams, p. 160.

26. R. B. Dobson, Op. Cit., p. 17.

27. D. M. Palliser, Op. Cit., p. 3.

28. A. R. Bridbury, Op. Cit., p. 12.

29. Ibid., pp. 13-14.

30. R. B. Dobson, Op. Cit., p. 12.

31. C. Phythian-Adams, Op. Cit., p.175.

32. D. M. Palliser, Op. Cit., p. 6.

33. Ibid., p. 5.

34. R. B. Dobson, Op. Cit., p. 15.

35. Ibid., p. 15.

36. D. M. Palliser, Op. Cit., p. 6.

37. Ibid., p. 6.

38. A. R. Bridbury, Op. Cit., p. 14.

39. Ibid., p. 14.

40. R. B. Dobson, Op. Cit., pp. 7-10.

41. D. M. Palliser, Op. Cit., p. 7.

42. R. B. Dobson, Op. Cit., p. 6.

43. D. M. Palliser, Op. Cit., p. 7.

44. Ibid., p. 2.

45. S. Reynolds, Decline and Decay in Late Medieval Towns: A Look at Some of the Concepts and Arguments, Urban History Yearbook, 1980, p. 76.

46. Ibid., p. 76.

47. Ibid., p. 77.

48. D. M. Palliser, Op. Cit., p. 13.

49. R. B. Dobson, Op. Cit., p. 18, D. M. Palliser, Op. Cit., p. 3.

50. A. F. Butcher, Rent and The Urban Economy: Oxford and Canterbury in the Later Middle Ages, Southern History, 1979, p. 12.

51. A. F. Butcher, Rent, Population and Economic Change in Late-Medieval Newcastle, Northern History, 14, 1978, p. 67.

52. Ibid., p. 69.

53. Ibid., p. 69.

54. Ibid., p. 76.

55. A. F. Butcher, Rent and The Urban Economy: Oxford and Canterbury in the Later Middle Ages, Southern History, 1979, p. 31.

56. Ibid., p. 37.

57. Ibid., p. 37.

58. Ibid., p. 37.

59. Ibid., p. 39.

60. Ibid., p. 39.

61. C. Pythian-Adams, Desolation of a City: Coventry and the Urban Crisis of the Late Middle Ages, Cambridge, 1979, p. 53.

62. Ibid., p. 53.

63. Ibid., p. 65.

64. N. W. Alcock, The Catesbys in Coventry: A Medieval Estate and its Archives, Midland History, 1990, pp. 14-16.

65. D. J. Keene, Survey of Medieval Winchester, Vol. 1, Oxford, 1985, p. 239.

66. Ibid., p. 243.

67. R. H. Britnell, Growth and Decline in Colchester 1300-1525, Cambridge, 1986, p. 252.

68. Ibid., p. 257.

69. Ibid., p. 258.

70. G. Rosser, Medieval Westminster 1200-1540, Oxford, 1989, pp. 74-88.

71. M. Bonney, Lordship and the Urban Community: Durham and its Overlords 1250-1540, Cambridge, 1990, p. 127.

72. Ibid., pp. 127-128.

73. Ibid., p. 121.

74. R. H. Britnell, Op. Cit., p. 21.

75. D. J. Keene, Op. Cit., p. 61.

76. Ibid., p. 61.

77. R. H. Britnell, Op. Cit., p. 197.

78. Ibid., p. 198.

79. Ibid., p. 198.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER TWO - THE RECORDS OF THE BISHOP'S ADMINISTRATION

1. SEE BIBLIOGRAPHY: PRIMARY SOURCES.

2. EG CC 188725.

3. SEE BIBLIOGRAPHY: PRIMARY SOURCES.

4. EG CC 189812.

5. SEE BIBLIOGRAPHY: PRIMARY SOURCES.

6. EG CC 220199.

7. SEE BIBLIOGRAPHY: PRIMARY SOURCES.

8. EG CC 190044

9. The Bishop Hatfield Survey, pp. 162-3, The Surtees Society, Reprint 1967, Vol. 32, Durham.
Church Commission, The Bishop Langley Survey.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER THREE - THE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE OF THE BISHOP'S ESTATES IN DURHAM IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

1. P. N. Granger, The Revenues and Financial Administration of the Bishopric of Durham 1457-79, MA University of Durham, 1975, Chapter Three.

2. Ibid., p. 21.

3. Ibid., p. 141.

4. See Books of Transumpt CC 20199-220197/15.

5. See Books of Transumpt CC 20199-220197/15.

6. See Books of Transumpt CC 20199-220197/15.

7. CC 188726.

8. CC 188730 - CC 188735.

9. M. Bonney, Lordship and the Urban Community: Durham and its Overlords, 1250-1540, Cambridge, 1990, pp. 267-268.

10. Ibid., p. 56.

11. See Clerk of Works' Accounts CC 190044-190046.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER FOUR - THE HATFIELD AND LANGLEY SURVEYS

1. Ed. W. Page, The Victoria History of the County of Durham, Vol. 2, London, 1907, p. 22.

2. Church Commission, the Bishop Langley Survey.

3. See The Bishop Langley Survey, pp. 162-3, The Surtees Society, Reprint 1967, Vol. 32, Durham.
Church Commission, the Bishop Langley Survey.

4. CC 188725.

5. M. Bonney, Lordship and the Urban Community: Durham and its Overlords, 1250-1540, Cambridge, 1990, p. 266.

6. Ed. W. Page, The Victoria History of the County of Durham, Vol. 2, London, 1907, p. 20.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER FIVE - THE BISHOP'S PROPERTIES FOR RENT IN DURHAM

1. M. Bonney, Lordship and the Urban Community: Durham and its Overlords, 1250-1540, Cambridge, 1990, p. 104.
2. Church Commission, the Bishop Langley Survey.
3. CC 188725.
4. CC 188726, CC 188727.
5. The Surtees Society, The Bishop Hatfield Survey, Vol. 32, 1857, pp. 162-163.
6. CC 188735.
7. CC 188728.
8. CC 188734A
9. M. Bonney, Op. Cit., p. 267.
10. CC 188725.
11. CC 188725.
12. D. J. Keene, Survey of Medieval Winchester, Vol. 1, Oxford, 1985, pp. 238-239.
13. CC 188725.
14. CC 188726.
15. CC 188726.
16. CC 188726.
17. CC 188725.
18. CC 188726.
19. CC 188725, CC 188727.
20. M. Bonney, Op. Cit., p. 265.
21. Ibid., p. 266.
22. G. Rosser, Medieval Westminster, 1200-1540, Oxford, 1989, p. 342.

23. A. F. Butcher, Rent, Population and Economic Change in Late-Medieval Newcastle, Northern History, XIV, 1978, p. 67.

24. CC 188725.

25. CC 189697.

26. CC 189697.

27. CC 188730.

28. CC 188732, CC 188734A.

29. CC 188732.

30. CC 188734A.

31. M. Bonney, Op. Cit., p. 268.

32. Ibid., p. 267.

33. Ibid., p. 45.

34. Ibid., p. 45.

35. CC 189697.

36. CC 188728.

37. CC 188725.

38. CC 188725.

39. CC 188726.

40. CC 188726.

41. CC 188726.

42. CC 188727.

43. CC 188728.

44. CC 188725.

45. CC 188731.

46. CC 188725.

47. CC 187726.

48. G. Rosser, Op. Cit., pp. 74-75.

49. Ibid., p. 75.

50. D. Keene, Op. Cit., Vol. 2, p. 479.

51. A. F. Butcher, Op. Cit., pp. 67-70.

52. CC 188734A

53. M. Bonney, Op. Cit., p. 113.

54. Ibid., p. 113.

55. CC 188727, CC 189697.

56. CC 188728.

57. CC 188730.

58. CC 188732.

59. CC 188734, CC 188735.

60. M. Bonney, Op. Cit., p. 127.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER SIX - THE BISHOP'S MILLS

1. R. S. Gottfried, Bury St Edmunds and the Urban Crisis 1290-1539, Princeton, 1982, p. 19.

2. R. H. Britnell, Growth and Decline in Colchester 1300-1525, Cambridge, 1986, p. 198.

3. D. J. Keene, Survey of Medieval Winchester, Vol. 1, Oxford, 1985, p. 161.

4. M. Bonney, Lordship and the Urban Community: Durham and its Overlords, Cambridge, 1990, p. 54.

5. Ibid., p. 55.

6. Ibid., p. 56.

7. D. A. Kirby, Some Physical and Economic Aspects of Water Use in the Wear Basin, PHD Thesis, 1968, p. 44.

8. Ibid., p. 48.

9. Ibid., p. 48.

10. Ibid., p. 43.

11. Ibid., App. B, Ref. G. R. NZ 274427.

12. Ibid., App. B, Ref. G. R. NZ 274427.

13. See section on the Bishop's Properties for Rent.

14. M. Bonney, Op. Cit., p. 54.

15. Ibid., p. 56.

16. D. J. Keene, Op. Cit., p. 1082.

17. See CC 188730, CC 188731.

18. Below £36: CC 189812, CC 189826, CC 189830
Below £30: CC 189822, CC 189831.

19. Over £40: CC 189814, CC 189815, CC 189816, CC 189819, CC 189820, CC 189823, CC 189828
Over £50: CC 189818.

20. CC 188730.

21. M. Bonney, Op. Cit., p. 57.

22. CC 188727.

23. CC 220198/4, p. 98.

24. CC 220198/5, p 131.

25. CC 189697.

26. CC 188627.

27. CC 220197/2, p. 42.

28. CC 220197/6, p. 120.

29. CC 220197/7, p. 156.

30. CC 220197/10, p. 297.

31. CC 190050.

32. CC 220197/6.

33. CC 220197/1, p. 14.

34. CC 220198/11, p. 242.

35. CC 220199, p. 15.

36. CC 220198/5, p. 131.

37. CC 220198/5, p. 131.

38. CC 220198/5, p. 131.

39. CC 220198/5, p. 131.

40. CC 220198/11, p. 242.

41. CC 220198/5, p. 151.

42. CC 220198/10, p. 195.

43. CC 220198/11, p. 228.

44. CC 220198/12, p. 268.

45. CC 220197/2, p. 42.

46. CC 220197/8, p. 205, CC 220197/12, p. 248.

47. CC 220197/14, p. 375, CC 220197/13, p. 343.

48. CC 220197/15, p. 408.

49. CC 220198/5, p. 131.

50. CC 220197/14, p. 375, CC 220197/15, p. 408.

51. CC 220197/12, p. 252.

52. CC 220198/5, p. 131.

53. CC 220198/11, p. 242.

54. CC 220198/11, p. 228.

55. D. A. Kirby, Op. Cit., p. 53.

56. CC 190050.

57. CC 190104.

58. CC 190044.

59. CC 190103.

60. CC 190047.

61. CC 190048.

62. CC 190045.

63. CC 190050.

64. CC 190050.

65. CC 220197/2, p. 42.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER SEVEN - THE BISHOP'S BAKEHOUSE

1. M. Bonney, Lordship and the Urban Community: Durham and its Overloads 1250-1540, Cambridge, 1990, p. 101.
2. Church Commission, the Bishop Langley Survey.
3. CC 190048.
4. CC 220198/5, p. 151.
5. CC 220198/5, p. 151.
6. CC 220198/5, p. 151.
7. CC 220197/2, CC 220197/7.
8. CC 220198/11, p. 233.
9. CC 220198/12, p. 271.
10. CC 220197/3, p. 73, p. 127.
11. CC 220197/8, p. 206.
12. CC 221097/12, p. 252, p. 375.
13. CC 220197/10, p. 302.
14. CC 190048.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER EIGHT - THE MARKET AND MARKET TOLLS

1. M. Bonney, Lordship and the Urban Community: Durham and its Overlords 1250-1540, Cambridge, 1990, p. 59.
2. Ibid., p. 98.
3. Ibid., p. 64.
4. Ibid., p. 64.
5. M. Hope Dodds, The Bishop' Borough, 1914, p. 109.
6. D. J. Keene, Survey of Medieval Winchester, Vol. 1, Oxford, 1985, p. 100.
7. CC 220198/11, p. 233.
8. CC 220198/12, p. 271.
9. CC 220198/10, p. 195.
10. M. Bonney, Op. Cit., p. 171.
11. Ibid., p. 174.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER NINE - THE BISHOP'S MINT

1. Church Commission, the Bishop Langley Survey.

   Ed. W. Page, The Victoria History of the County of Durham, Vol. 3, p. 24.

2. Church Commission, the Bishop Langley Survey.

3. P. N. Grainger, The Revenues and Financial Administration of the Bishopric of Durham 1457-1479, MA Thesis, p. 169.

4. CC 220198/3, p. 67.

5. G. T. Lapsley, The County Palatinate of Durham, Longmans, 1900, p. 230.

6. P. N. Grainger, Op. Cit., p. 169.

7. Ibid., p. 10.

8. Ed. W. Page, The Victoria History of the County of Durham, Vol.3, p. 25.

9. Ibid., p. 25.

10. G. T. Lapsley, Op. Cit., p. 280.

11. Ibid., p. 281.

12. CC 189812, CC 189814.

13. CC 189815, CC 189816.

14. CC 189818.

15. CC 189819.

16. CC 189823.

17. CC 189824.

18. CC 189826, CC 189828.

19. CC 189830, CC 189831.

20. CC 220198/3, p. 67.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER TEN - THE BISHOPMEADOW

1. Church Commission, the Bishop Langley Survey.
2. CC 189812.
3. CC 189821.
4. CC 189828.
5. CC 189823.
6. CC 189830.
7. CC 189831.
8. P. A. Grainger, The Revenue and Financial Administration of the Bishopric of Durham 1457-1479, MA Thesis, p. 33.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER ELEVEN - FRANKLYN FOREST

1. Church Commission, the Bishop Langley Survey.
2. Ibid.
3. CC 220199, p. 11.
4. CC 190044.
5. CC 190103.
6. CC 190045.
7. CC 190048.
8. CC 189812.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER TWELVE - THE BISHOP'S TOTAL REVENUE FROM DURHAM

1. CC 189809, CC 190309.
2. The Surtees Society, The Bishop Hatfield Survey, Vol. 32, 1867, pp. 162-163.
3. Church Commission, the Bishop Langley Survey.
4. CC 188726.
5. CC 189697, CC 188627.
6. CC 188731.
7. CC 189809, CC 189787, CC 189810.
8. CC 190184.
9. CC 188686.
10. CC 189811.
11. CC 189812.
12. CC 189814, CC 189815, CC 189816.
13. CC 189818.
14. CC 189819, CC 189820, CC 189821.
15. CC 189824, CC 189826, CC 189829, CC 189830.
16. CC 189823, CC 189828.
17. CC 189831, CC 190309.
18. CC 190222, CC 189598.
19. CC 220199, CC 220198/4.
20. CC 220198/1, CC 220198/3.
21. CC 220198/11, CC 220198/12, CC 220197/8, CC 220197/12.
22. CC 220197/3, CC 220197/6, CC 220197/10.
23. CC 220197/2, CC 220197/7.
24. CC 220197/14.
25. CC 220197/13.

26. CC 220197/15.

27. CC 189831.

28. M. Bonney, Lordship and The Urban Community: Durham and its Overlords 1250-1540, Cambridge, 1990, pp. 267-268.

29. Ibid., pp. 262-263.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER THIRTEEN - THE PEOPLE OF THE BISHOP'S BOROUGH

1. CC 188726.
2. CC 189697.
3. CC 189697.
4. CC 189697.
5. CC 188725.
6. CC 188726.
7. CC 189812.
8. CC 188725.
9. M. Bonney, Lordship and The Urban Community: Durham and its Overlords, 1250-1540, Cambridge, 1990, p. 280.
10. Ibid., p. 280.
11. Ibid., p. 279.
12. Ibid., p. 85.
13. CC 190045.
14. CC 190047.
15. CC 190048.
16. CC 190045.
17. CC 190044.
18. CC 190045.
19. CC 190048, CC 190049.
20. CC 189812.
21. CC 189814.
22. CC 189817.
23. CC 189815.
24. CC 189812.
25. CC 189814.

26. CC 189814.

27. CC 189812.

28. CC 189819.

29. CC 189816.

30. CC 189818.

31. CC 198919.

32. M. Bonney, Op. Cit., p. 90.

33. Ibid., p. 92.

34. CC 190045.

35. CC 190044.

36. CC 189812.

37. CC 189812.

38. CC 189814.

39. CC 189816.

40. CC 189821.

41. CC 189819.

42. CC 188725.

43. CC 188686.

44. CC 189815.

45. CC 189816.

46. P. N. Grainger, The Revenues and Financial Administration of the Bishopric of Durham 1457-1479, MA Thesis, 1975, p. 96.

47. CC 190222.

48. CC 189812.

49. CC 189831.

50. CC 220198/5, p. 151.

51. P. N. Grainger, Op. Cit., p. 146.

52. CC 189816.

53. CC 189818.

54. P. N. Grainger, Op. Cit., p. 185.

55. Ibid., p. 186.

56. Ibid., p. 186.

57. CC 189816.

58. CC 189829.

59. P. N. Grainger, Op. Cit., p. 187.

60. CC 189826.

61. CC 189830.

62. CC 189831.

63. CC 190222.

64. CC 189598.

b) Coroner of Easington Ward, accounts

1443-1444	188725
1455-1456	188726
1459-1460	188727
1465-1466	189697
1466-1467	188627
1469-1470	188728
1470-1471	188729
1474-1475	188730
1477-1478	188731
1480-1481	188732
1486-1487	188733
1486-1487	188896
1488-1489	188734
1505-1506	188734A
1508-1509	188735

c) Books of Transumpt

1484-1485	220199
1485-1486	220198/1
1486-1487	220198/2
1487-1488	220198/3
1488-1489	220198/4
1489-1490	220198/5
1489-1490	220198/6
1490-1491	220198/7
1490-1491	220198/8
1490-1491	220198/10
1491-1492	220198/9
1491-1492	220198/11
1492-1493	220198/12
1492-1493	220197/1
1493-1494	220197/2
1494-1495	220197/3
1495-1496	220197/6
1496-1497	220197/7
1497-1498	220197/8
1497-1498	220197/9
1498-1499	220197/12
1499-1500	220197/10
1500-1501	220197/14
1501-1502	220197/13
1502-1503	220197/15

c) Clerk of Works, accounts

1458	19044
1489-1470	190103
1473	190104
1475-1476	190045
1477-1478	190047
1480-1481	190048
1489-1490	190049
1493-1494	190050
1494-1495	190051
1503-1504	190046

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SECONDARY SOURCES

a) Books

M. Bonney, Lordship and the Urban Community: Durham and its Overlords, 1250-1540, Cambridge, 1990.

A. R. Bridbury, Economic Growth: England in the Later Middle Ages, London, 1962.

R. H. Britnell, Growth and Decline in Colchester, 1300-1525, Cambridge, 1986.

R. S. Gottfried, Bury St. Edmunds and the Urban Crisis, 1290-1539, Princeton, 1982.

M. Hope-Dodds, The Bishop's Borough, 1914.

D. J. Keene, Survey of Medieval Westminster, 2 Vols., Oxford, 1985.

G. T. Lapsley, The County Palatinate of Durham, New York, 1900.

W. Page, Ed., The Victoria History of the County of Durham, Vol. 2, London, 1907.

C. Phythian-Adams, Desolation of a City: Coventry and the Urban Crisis of the Late Middle Ages, Cambridge, 1979.

G. Rosser, Medieval Westminster, 1200-1540, Oxford, 1989.

The Surtees Society, The Bishop Hatfield Survey, Vol. 32, Durham, 1857.

b) Articles

N. W. Alcock, 'The Catesbys in Coventry: A Medieval Estate and its Archives', Midland History, XV, 1990.

A. R. Bridbury, 'English Provincial Towns in the Later Middle Ages', Economic History Review, 2nd. ser., XXXIV, 1981.

A. R. Bridbury, 'Dr Rigby's Comment: A Reply', Economic History Review, 2nd. ser., XXXIX, 1986.

A. F. Butcher, 'Rent, Population and Economic Change in Late-Medieval Newcastle', Northern History, XIV, 1978.

A. F. Butcher, 'Rent and the Urban Economy: Oxford and Canterbury in the Later Middle Ages', Southern History, I, 1979.

R. B. Dobson, 'Urban Decline in Late Medieval England', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th. ser., XXXVII, 1977.

D. M. Palliser, 'Urban Decay Revisited', in J. F. Thompson, ed., Towns and Townspeople in the fifteenth century, Gloucester, 1988.

C. Phythian-Adams, 'Urban Decay in Late Medieval England', in P. Abrams and E. A. Wrigley, eds., Towns in Societies, Cambridge, 1978.

S. Reynolds, 'Decline and Decay in Late Medieval Towns: A Look at some of the Concepts and Arguments', Urban History Yearbook, 1980.

S. H. Rigby, 'Urban Decline in the Later Middle Ages: The Reliability of the Non-Statistical Evidence', Urban History Yearbook, 1984.

S. H. Rigby, 'Late Medieval Urban Prosperity: The Evidence of the Lay Subsidies', Economic History Review, 2nd. ser., XXXIX, 1986.

c) Theses

P. N. Grainger, The Revenues and Financial Administration of the Bishopric of Durham 1457-1479, MA Thesis, Durham University, 1975.

D. A. Kirby, Some Physical and Economic Aspects of Water use in the Wear Basin, PHD Thesis, Durham University, 1968.