



## Durham E-Theses

---

### *A study of the buildings on the bursars manors of Durham cathedral priory 1270-1540*

Fielding, Jane

#### How to cite:

---

Fielding, Jane (1980) *A study of the buildings on the bursars manors of Durham cathedral priory 1270-1540*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online:  
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/8036/>

#### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Jane Fielding

A Study of the buildings on the Bursar's Manors of Durham Priory:  
1270-1540

ABSTRACT

The object of this study is to establish the range of buildings on the Bursar's manors of Durham Cathedral Priory, and their development through the period 1270 to 1540, using both the historical and the archaeological evidence. The aim was not only to study buildings individually but as part of a working system in relation to both the monastery and community. The intention was to fill one small but important gap in our knowledge of the Priory. The agricultural systems and the ecclesiastical buildings are receiving attention; this study of the secular buildings which are the centres of their estates, complements other work and adds to the picture of the Priory's activities.

Using the Bursar's building accounts, all the buildings on each manor are noted, and their building and repairs considered. Attention is then turned to the materials and methods used in their construction. Both documentary evidence and field work are used to establish and record the location of sites and the layout of buildings on the few sites with visible remains. In addition, their use and organization are examined in an attempt to show their influence on the monastery and local communities. Finally, the Bursar's manors are briefly compared with manorial buildings elsewhere in the country in order to place them in a wider context.

A STUDY OF THE BUILDINGS ON THE  
BURSARS MANORS OF DURHAM CATHEDRAL PRIORY  
1270-1540

JANE FIELDING

Trevelyan College

Thesis submitted for degree of M.A.  
at University of Durham,  
Department of Archaeology

1980

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.  
No quotation from it should be published without  
his prior written consent and information derived  
from it should be acknowledged.



14. MAY 1984

## CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
List of Tables	i
List of Figures	ii
List of Plates	iii
References and Abbreviations	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Introduction	
I The Sources	1
II The Background	9
III The Catalogue	16
IV New Building	31
V The Repairs	43
VI The Materials and Methods	79
VII Location and Condition of Sites	100
VIII The layout of sites	114
IX The Usage of the buildings	126
X Building Policy and Decisions	139
XI Influences of the manorial buildings	146
XII Comparison of Manorial building	159
Conclusion	177
Appendix I: List of Bursars Manors	180
Bibliography	181

LIST OF TABLES

- I Dates of manorial accounts
- II Building by Hugh of Darlington
- III New Building: Bursars' Account Rolls  
Summary
- IV New Building: comparison of  
Bursars' Rolls and Building of  
John Fossor
- V Repairs: Bursars' Account Rolls
- VI Repairs: Chronology
- VII Repairs and Building: coincidence
- VIII Materials: roofing
- IX Materials: walling
- X Prices: Buildings
- XI Prices: Materials
- XII Manor location: in relation to  
settlement
- XIII Manor location: in relation to  
landscape
- XIV Manors present condition
- XV Priors visits to manor
- XVI Halmote Court: locations held
- XVII Summary of Uses
- XVIII Building, Repairs and Income

LIST OF FIGURES

- I        Location of Bursars' Manors
- II       Solid Geology  
         Showing location of manors in relation to  
         settlement and physical features:
- III      Aldingrange and Aycliffe
- IV      Bellasis and Bewley
- V        Bearpark and Muggleswick
- VI      Dalton and Heselden
- VII     Ferryhill and Merrington
- VIII    Heworth and Rainton
- IX      Pitlington and Houghall
- X        Westoe and Wardley
- XI      Plan of Bewley and Muggleswick
- XII     Muggleswick: east and west gables
- XIII    Plan of Bearpark

LIST OF PLATES

i	Aldingrange:	from north east
ii		: east boundary wall
iii	Aycliffe	: east side
iv		: south side
v	Ferryhill	: north side
vi		: east side
vii		: south side
viii	Houghall	: east side
ix		: north side
x	Moat	: south side
xi		: south side
xii		: east side
xiii		: north side
xiv	Merrington:	west side
xv		: east side
xvi	Pittington	: farm south side
xvii		: earthworks between farm and church looking west
xviii		: boundary wall; west side
xix	Billingham	: from north
xx	Heselden	: from east
xxi	Westoe	: from north
xxii	Wardley	: site from south
xxiii		: south west corner
xxiv		: Ditch and bank, north-east
xxv		: " " " north-west
xxvi	Wardley	: east side, south part
xxvii		: " " north part
xxviii	Bewley	: moat and site
xxix		: west gable

xxx           Bewley       : east gable  
xxxxi                 : west gable, blocked window  
xxxii                 : south wall and earlier foundation  
xxxiii                : wall of early building  
xxxiv           Muggleswick: east gable  
xxxv                 : east gable, interior  
xxxvi                 : field to north  
xxxvii                : west gable  
xxxviii        Bearpark   : south side, Priors' chamber,  
                          rooms 1-3  
xxxix                 : south side, camera conventus  
                          rooms 3 & 4  
xxxx                 : detail of 1st floor door,  
                          rooms 3 & 4  
xxxxi                 : detail of entrance, room 1  
xxxxii                : Priors' chamber, west of passage,  
                          north side  
xxxxiii               : Priors' chamber, east of passage,  
                          north side  
xxxxiv                : Room 5, from west  
xxxxv                 : Room 9, from west  
xxxxvi                : Area 10, from south  
xxxxvii               : Room 11, from east

Grimm Drawings: 1. north  
                  2. south  
                  3. east  
                  4. west  
                  5. interior of chapel



REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS

B.A.R.	Bursars' Account Rolls
M.A.R.	Manorial Account Rolls
H.B.	Halmote Book
S.S.	Surtees Society Publication

References to the 'structura domorum' section of the Bursars' Rolls in the text have been given as simply B.A.R. and the year e.g. (B.A.R. 1340). Reference to other sections of the Bursars' Rolls have the section heading following the year.

In references to the manorial accounts the relevant manor is stated after the year e.g. (M.A.R. 1420 Ketton).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank a number of people without whom my work would have been a lot more difficult and much the poorer:

My supervisor Professor Cramp for her interest and stimulating discussions.

Those who over the year have helped and advised me: Barbara Harbottle, Suzanne Hazelgrave, Dr. Lomas, Mrs. le Patourel, Eric Cambridge, all landowners.

My friends who have been cheerful and unflagging companions on site visits and who have, with great perseverance, corrected spellings: Rachel Newman and John Penn.

Those to whom I am especially grateful and to whom I owe most: Pat Musset and especially Martin Snape of the Priors' Kitchen. They both gave me much advice and encouragement which proved invaluable. Martin Snape also read most of the first draft.

Finally but very important: Maggie Appleby who has lived uncomplainingly with the Bursars' manors for a year, has always been ready to listen, and given me ideal conditions in which to live and work.

This is dedicated to Durham and  
all my friends there:  
for four happy and memorable years

A STUDY OF THE BUILDINGS ON THE BURSARS' MANORS  
OF DURHAM CATHEDRAL PRIORY 1270-1540

"This sumptuous church" was Robert Heggs description of Durham Cathedral in 1626. Yet, though one of the greatest Cathedrals of Europe, a showpiece of wealth and power, it is only one of the buildings that belonged to the Prior and Convent of Durham. This wealth was based on humbler buildings, ordinary manors and churches. This study turns attention from the 'sumptuous church' to one group of these ordinary yet important buildings; the Bursars' manors.

The aim is to establish what buildings were on each manor and then to consider the factors affecting the rate and timing of building; the amount and type of repairs, the quantity and organization of materials used, the location and layout of sites and the use of the buildings. The part the manors played in the monastic life and the local landscape will also be examined and Durham manors compared with those elsewhere in the country. From this information an attempt will be made to see if there are any significant differences or similarities between the manors and if the way in which the Priory organized the manors and their buildings can be seen. Also, and equally important with the actual information gained, will be a



consideration of the reliability and limitations of the evidence and methods used and on assessment of how the historical and archaeological sources compare.

The buildings have been studied by two complementary approaches. Firstly through documentary records; mainly the structura domorum or Reparacione Domorum section of the Bursars' Account Rolls, which list repairs and building of all Priory property. These were supplemented by the Manorial Account Rolls. Secondly, through fieldwork, the location and recording of manor sites, which might also include documentary work.

The scope of the study has been restricted to the Bursars' manors between the Tyne and Tees 1270-1540. The date range has been dictated by the documents. The Bursars' Account Rolls do not survive before 1278 and are fragmentary until the 14th century. The series then continues up to the Dissolution. The boundaries of the Tyne and Tees were chosen as a logical geographical unit unaffected by administrative boundary change and also due to practical considerations of travelling distance. The Bursars' manors were chosen as the Bursar was responsible for the majority of the Priory's manors, other obedientiaries being allocated only a few manors each (c 2-8). They also form a coherent group in the documents, of sufficient size for generalizations and comparisons to be made. There was also the problem of which of the Bursars' properties could be considered manors, there are different opinions on this. It was decided to take the list of Bursars' manors used by

Lomas in his Thesis as the basis for this study (Lomas 1973, 337). The criteria for a manor in this list was a place where the Priory had directly exploited demesne. This decision has the advantage of uniformity with a major work and avoids unproductive discussion on an issue where differing views may be equally valid. Wallsend is omitted as it is north of the Tyne also Jarrow as it is significantly different.<sup>1</sup> (Appendix I)

This study is not an isolated piece of research and aims to complement, though necessarily in less detail and with limitations, other work on related aspects of the Priory. The Priory itself has received attention in the 13th century from Meryl Foster and in the 15th from Dobson (Foster 1979; Dobson 1973). Its ecclesiastic buildings are being studied by Eric Cambridge. The manors have been studied from an agricultural and administrative point of view by Lomas and Halcrow (Lomas 1973; Halcrow 1949, 1954) who were basically concerned with the exploitation of the land and the Priory's relations with their tenants. Thus there is a gap, no work has been done on secular building away from the monastery, the building of the estates rather than the land. This is an important gap in the growing picture of the Priory's activities and this study, though of a more limited nature, both in time and scope, than the works mentioned above, is an attempt to go some way towards filling it. More work

1 Jarrow was omitted as it was given to the cell and its upkeep became their responsibility. Thus the Priory never exploited the demesne directly neither are any of its repairs mentioned in the Bursar's rolls. Also another difference is that its buildings were closely associated with those of the monastery, a situation incomparable with other manors.

needs to be done before a complete picture can be drawn. For example the situation in Durham needs to be compared more fully with that elsewhere, both by historical and archaeological evidence, as this has been attempted only briefly using printed sources. However, despite the limitations, a start has been made to study the manorial buildings in detail and put them in the context more fully revealed by other research.




Figure I

## CHAPTER I

### The Sources

Most of the documents used belong to the Dean and Chapter and are housed in the Prior's Kitchen. It is not proposed to give a detailed study of the diplomatic of the documents; where the condition of a roll substantially affects the information gained this will be mentioned. Apart from this, this section attempts only to note the sources used, their limitations and potential for the study of buildings.

#### Published material

The Surtees Society has published some documents relevant to the manorial buildings, which supplement the Account Rolls.

Work done in the time when John Fossor was Prior (S.S. 1839, cxli)

This is a list of building said to be done under Fossor. It has two main limitations. Firstly, Fossor was Prior 1341-74 and there is no way of telling when, within that range, the building took place. Secondly, it gives no detail as to how a building was erected or what repairs took place - it is very general. Its value lies in the fact that it covers the same period as the



Bursar Account Rolls and they can be checked against each other. However there is no way of knowing, if discrepancies appear, which to rely on.

Building of Prior Hugh 1264 (S.S. 1839, 46-7)

This list of work by Prior Hugh Darlington is in a chapter of Robert de Graystanes chronicle. Its main advantage is its early date, as some idea of building work before the account rolls start can be gained. Its disadvantages are that it only mentions a few of the manors and it cannot be certain if this is all the work completed or if it is only the more important. Secondly, like the John Fossor list there is no detail. As it was written later (c. 1326) and is praising Hugh, it must be viewed with caution.

Inventories of 1446 and 1464 (S.S. 1839, ccxci-ccciii;  
S.S. 1871, 99-211)

These were compiled to list all the Priory's property and under some entries repairs and buildings are mentioned. They have the advantage of precise dating (unlike Fossor) and being contemporary with the Bursars Rolls. However they also have two main disadvantages. Firstly not all the manors have the necessary repairs noted as they could be the responsibility of the tenant and this is just noted. Secondly one never knows how much of the work was actually done, what was listed may have been the ideal and not what happened in practice. This is suggested by the high estimate for repairs in the inventory compared with the Bursar's Rolls and a suspicious similarity between some entries: for example Muggleswick:Repairs to hall, chapel,

barn and dairy £26.13. 4 for both years, which suggest nothing had been done in the interim.

Account for construction of new hall at Pittington  
(S.S. 1839, cccxxiii)

This is a very detailed account of all expenses for building the hall. It is an exceptional document; no others as detailed exist for the manors. It is interesting to show the different operations involved but of little general use as it is so exceptional and there is nothing with which to compare it. Also it is fairly late (1456) and this cannot be taken as typical for the whole of the previous century.

Durham Household Book (S.S. 1845)

This is the Bursar Account for 1530-4 written in book form not on a roll. It is similar to the previous Account rolls in form and type of content and can be viewed as their continuation.

Accounts of Finchale (S.S. 1837)

These accounts of this cell were used as Aldingrange were given to Finchale. However the Finchale rolls are of little value as there is no mention of Aldingrange in buildings adjacent to the cell.

### Unpublished Material


#### Bursars Account Rolls

These are the major documentary source. They commence in 1278 but there are only five rolls before 1300 (1278, 1292, 1293, 1297, 1298). The information on these early rolls is fragmentary; sometimes just a total for repairs is given (1293, £10.19. 2) or the building and repairs are

mixed with other items (1278). By the end of the second decade of the 14th century the form is more established with a section structura domorum or reparacione domorum on the repairs side of the account. There are a number of disadvantages which make it difficult to tell if each manor is getting similar coverage.

- i) Some of the rolls are in bad condition or have spoilt areas.
- ii) Sometimes the building is not mentioned - for example 'repairs at Bearpark'.
- iii) Sometimes the place is not mentioned - for example 'repairs to barn and stable'.
- iv) The amount of work cannot always be seen; a list of repairs with a final total is all that is given.
- v) The amount of detail varies greatly, sometimes just 'repairs' or 'wages' is stated, at others detailed quantities are given. Are fuller years just a reflection of a careful Bursar's clerk or did more really happen?  
Thus not all the work on the manors is being seen.
- vi) There are also problems of terminology, for example domus which might mean one room in a range of building or the complete building, and can tell nothing

DATES OF MANORIAL ACCOUNTS



about the building function, or terms whose translation is unknown for example, routynghous at Bearpark.

Therefore although these rolls provide large amounts of information their limitations must always be remembered. Manorial Account Rolls.

These are the other source for detailed repairs and occasionally new building. However the survival of rolls is very spasmodic, they are concentrated in the 1330-40's and 1370-80's (Table I) and thus they cannot be used for chronological comparison as differences may be due solely to the survival of documents. Another disadvantage is that they are of varied quality - Westoe adds 15 otherwise unknown buildings while others add nothing new. They are concerned with minor repairs. This is due to the system of organization where the Bursar took most of the money leaving manorial officials with hardly enough to do their job. They can contain a section of repairs custos domorum but repairs are often in the expenses necessaria and usually involve such things as repairing doors, locks and replacing tiles.

#### Stock Accounts

These refer to the manors of Le Holm and Muggleswick where large flocks of sheep were kept. However their reference to building is limited to mending becaria and do not give details of size or material used.

Apart from these documents, specifically referring to building and repairs, other documents have been used in the location of sites. Some of the sites have been lost and these can be traced back from the 19th century and through post-Dissolution documents to medieval times. This process will be described in more detail later, (p.9) but the main documents are listed below.

Maps: Tithe maps and Church Commission maps of the 18th and 19th centuries show the lands owned by the Dean & Chapter and give names of their tenants.

Post-Dissolution: There are two main sources to follow leases back to the dissolution. The receivers books run from 1541 to 1870 and annually record the name of the tenant and his rent. The renewal book runs from 1660-1828 and is a summary of the receivers book and much quicker to use. A given tenement usually maintains its position in the books despite changes of owner and can thus be traced back.

Pre-Dissolution: The Bursar Rentals can be used in the same way as the post-Dissolution documents described above but in the 15th century there are long gaps. To fill these the Halmote Court Books may be used. These run from 1400-1528 and, among other business, record changes of lease. Before 1400 there are only the Bursars rentals.

Other sources used in the location of sites were the Ordnance Survey Index, the Durham catalogue of aerial photographs, local archaeological and historical society

journals and the prints and drawings in the British Library.

However it is not just a matter of using documents, it is necessary to complement this by a study of the sites themselves. Even once the site is located this brings its own problems. Firstly there is the destruction of the site by modern development (for example Billingham and Fulwell). Secondly, later farm buildings have often destroyed medieval fabric (Ferryhill, Aycliffe). Even if some survives it is fragmentary (Muggleswick) or it is necessary to interpret overgrown earthworks (Wardley). Thus there are few sites with medieval remains and these are obscure making it difficult to establish the outline of the buildings.

With all these limitations both documentary and on the ground it is important to combine both the historical and archaeological evidence to obtain the fullest possible reconstruction of the medieval manors.

## CHAPTER II

### The Background

The object of this chapter is to give a general background to the manors themselves and the institution that owned them. It will consider how the Priory had acquired the manors and the system of central organization into which they fitted. This is relevant as it could affect the treatment of the buildings.

The acquisition seems to have been a piecemeal process with no overall pattern and it is impossible to know what buildings were on the manors when they came into the Priory's possession. There were roughly three different periods of acquisition; those manors which were part of the ancient estate of St. Cuthbert, those donated about the time of the conquest and those added later. There is also Heworth with Wardley whose origin is unknown (S.S. 1871, 107), Rainton, Hesilden, Pitlington and Merrington with Ferryhill are part of the ancient estate (S.S. 1871, 124, 137, 130, 171), Dalton and Aycliffe were pre-conquest donations by Athelstan and his son respectively (S.S. 1871, 121, 160). These six all appear in the forged charter of bishop William Carilef. Westoe as an appendage of Jarrow was given by



Bishop Walcher (S.S. 1871, 118), Fulwell donated by Bishop Carilef (S.S. 1871, 119) and Billingham with Bewley by King William (S.S. 1871, 139). The remainder were acquired by grant or exchange later - Houghall from Thomas de Herrington at the end of the 13th century (S.S. 1871, 200), Bearpark from bishop Farnham (c. 1242-48)(S.S. 1871, 186), Muggleswick in exchange for Hardwick from Hugh de Puiset (S.S. 1871, 182), Bardon from Flambard (S.S. 1871, 146), Bellasis exchanged for Henknoll in 1380 (S.S. 1871, 143), Eden was disputed with the monks of Guisborough after Durham had been given the chapel by the de Brus family (S.S. 1871, 131), Ketton was acquired from the bishop's estates by 1264 (S.S. 1871, 158).

There seems to be no particular policy in this collection. Dobson, whose work on the first half of the 15th century gives a fundamental background to many aspects of Priory life, remarks on the distribution of the manors on rich farm land to the east of the county and in certain groups, for example on the Tyne and around Billingham (Dobson 1973, 280-1). However, in these original grants there is no evidence for the Prior deliberately attempting this. The initiative lay with the donor; the Priory accepted what they were given where ever this was located. Much of the land to the west was owned by the bishop who had large estates in Weardale, the eastern half of the county was more suited to manorial division; it was thus natural most of the Priory's manors would be in this area.

This piecemeal process contrasts with the Cistercian system of acquiring land in logical farming units often away from already cultivated areas. There seems to have been little of this type of planning at Durham: as with other Benedictine houses they did not share the Cistercian dislike of involvement with manorial dues and services. They accepted what they were given and then attempted to exploit it to the full.

By the beginning of the period under consideration a method of administering the manors had been developed. This was based on assigning the obedientiaries manors as a source of revenue to enable them to carry out their duties, a normal practice in Benedictine houses (Knowles 1940, 431-8). This involved the exploitation of the manor closely with the whole monastic economy; it was "to facilitate the running of the monastery, not just estate management" (Foster 1979, 159). This was not a rigid system, its working varied between houses; at Durham it was marked by the predominance of one obedientiary - the Bursar.

At Durham the Prior himself held no manors, he and his household were supported by money channelled to him from the obedientiaries and by them being responsible for paying his expenses (Lomas 1973, 271). Although the Prior was not financially independent he appointed and inspected his officials and thus maintained his control (Lomas 1973, 271). It is difficult to establish the role of the Prior in policy making in any sphere (Dobson 1973, 81) and it is no easier regarding manorial building.

It is never stated if the Prior intervened in deciding on new buildings or repairs or if there was consultation with the chapter, or if it was always a routine administrative matter (Foster 1979, 118).

When the manors were allocated to the various obedientiaries most received between 3 and 8 to provide revenue for their duties. For example the Sacrist received Sacriston, Harehope, Landieu and Biggin (Lomas 1973, 235, 238), the Almoner Witton Gilbert, Burnhope, Rookhope and five others (Lomas 1973, 215-6). Some of the obedientiaries however were totally dependent on the Bursar; for example the Granator and Cellerer until the temporary 15th century division of the Bursarship (Dobson 1973, 287).

The Bursar controlled the remainder of the Priory's property not allocated to other obedientiaries. He received income from the land and churches and was responsible for their upkeep, feeding and clothing the monks and the Prior's expenses, gifts and pensions (Foster 1979, 271-2). The office of Bursar first appeared in 1262-3 and is mentioned in the Constitutions of Hugh of Darlington (Lomas 1973, 271). This development led to the centralizing of control of the Priory's finances - two thirds of the income went to the Bursar (and this should be seen in the context of similar events in other large Benedictine houses. There was pressure in this direction from the Northern General Chapter of Black Monks which led to similar appointments for example at

Selby in 1276 (Dobson 1973, 258). The type of development did vary; Christ Church at Canterbury was fully centralized, no other obedientiaries having their own income while at Norwich there were two separate organizations for the Prior and Convent (Dobson 1973, 258). Dobson considers the proportion of revenue at Durham allocated to the Bursar unusually high but states the financial development at Durham Priory was common enough in other late medieval monasteries (Dobson 1973, 259).

The Bursar was closely associated with the Terrar in the administration of the estate and it is difficult to establish the precise division between them - for example the Terrar's expenses were paid by the Bursar (Halcrow 1949, 4). The Terrar's role changed through the years; at first he was the Prior's land agent, then, with the development of the Bursarship, became his emissary touring the manors with or for him. With the leasing of manors he became largely redundant and in the 15th century often held the office of hostellar simultaneously (Dobson 1973, 256). The Bursar and Terrar visited manors supervising their running: drawing up annual accounts, ordering stock movements (Halcrow 1949, 8). The bursar exercised control by taking the rent collected by the reeve and handing back a small amount for the running of the manor (Halcrow 1949, 4-5). He could thus keep tight control. It was the Bursar who was responsible for most of the building and repairs;

only minor repairs appear in the manorial accounts. This system seemed to work efficiently till the breakdown of the Bursars office in the 1430s. This is apparent in the Reparacione Domorum section of the Account Rolls which are unusually brief and uninformative (1432-7). However this was part of a wider collapse, not just related to the manorial administration (Dobson 1973, 286). Normally the Bursar's central control functioned efficiently to keep the manor in reasonable condition.

The day to day running of the manors was the responsibility of the sergeants or senestiali who were responsible to the Bursar (Lomas 1973, 112). He was a layman, free or unfree, appointed by the monks rather than chosen by the tenants (Halcrow 1949, 89). It was not usual to be in control of more than one manor simultaneously, but they were often transferred from one to another as they formed a skilled body of administrators (Halcrow 1949, 86). The fact that the manors often rendered a deficit does not mean they were inefficient. Instead of the sergeant collecting the rent, using it for his expenses and handing the profit to the Priory, the system elsewhere, the Bursar collected the rent through the Reeve and gave the sergeant an estimated amount for his expenses and this was often inadequate (Halcrow 1949, 5). The expenses were closely scrutinized by the Priory. The Priory's policy in exploiting the manors changed over the years. Dobson states "the most significant and revolutionary development in estate

policy in Durham in the early 15th century was undoubtedly the decision to lease almost all the convent's manorial demesne" (Dobson 1973, 272). The manors were originally exploited as a food source, supplies being sent to Durham and, in the 14th century the Prior travelling round using them. There were few years in which the Prior did not spend some time at most manors (Dobson 1973, 93). Then the grain was sold locally. The Priory took the profit and bought its own supplies. At the end of the 14th century and beginning of the 15th century especially 1407-16, the manors were leased out with increasingly longer leases (Halcrow 1949, 112) until only Bearpark and Pitlington were left. This was also happening elsewhere. Prior Chillenden (1391-1411) established a leasing policy at Canterbury c. 1396. Durham's major period of leasing was thus only a few years behind (Dobson 1973, 272). Three main groups of people took these leases: groups of 3-10 villagers in equal shares, local yeomanry with hopes of increasing their standing, or business men, from Newcastle for example (Dobson 1973, 282). This change to leasing was important in connection with the buildings as the terms of leases could vary: sometimes the tenant being responsible for repairs, at others the Priory, and this could affect their treatment.

It is against this background of acquisition, organization and change that the developments in the building must be seen.

### CHAPTER III

#### The Catalogue

It is first necessary to establish what was actually on each site as stated in the documents. Apart from the limitations stated above (p. 4) there are two major problems in compiling a list of buildings. Firstly it can be difficult comparing different types of document. Buildings which are never mentioned in the Bursars Rolls show up undergoing some minor repair in manorial accounts; for example Bellasis only has one manorial account (miscellaneous charter 73) but this shows an otherwise unknown hall. The lack of manorial accounts for many periods make it impossible to cross-check, thus it cannot be certain that any particular building is missing definitely from a manor, just because it is not mentioned.

Secondly, from the terms used it is not always possible to establish how many of any one type of building were on a site. This is especially difficult with the chambers and barn: for example if the 'Prior's chamber' is mentioned, then 20-50 years later 'the large chamber'; were these the same or different? Thus when compiling the list it is sometimes necessary to give possible maximum and minimum numbers of a particular building.

Thus because of these problems the limitations of the catalogue must be remembered; it is possible there were buildings on the manor which are not mentioned, or there appear to be more than actually existed. However it is an attempt to show what was on each site and how much attention it received without going into too much detail. Despite the reservations made above it should then be possible to compare the manors and see if the type of building and the attention they received differ and if this was significant.

The manors are listed alphabetically with domestic then agricultural buildings. The dates show when they were repaired in any way, with new buildings distinguished. The manorial and Bursar's rolls are also printed differently and work mentioned in John Fossor or the Inventories noted. If problems of how many of any one building arise maximum and minimum will be given. Repairs to unnamed buildings are omitted from this list, though included in the table of repairs, as here the concern is just with establishing the room names. The glossary translates all the terms used in the catalogue and briefly mentions any problems. The terms used in the catalogue are as quoted in the documents but in the rest of the text, apart from cases of possible controversy, the English translation established in the glossary will be used. The term domus if not distinguished in any way is omitted as it could refer to any or none of the buildings already listed.



CATALOGUE

Aldingrange

Domus: 1449\*, 1471

Roof Repairs: 1454, 1471, 1484, 1495, 1497

Aycliffe

Camera domus regis: 1306

Grangia decimalis: 1396, 1397, 1409, 1428, (1446\*),  
1456, 1482, 1487

Ustrina: 1357, 1380, 1389, 1422

Porta: 1351, 1365, 1401

Claustura, fossatus, marus: 1317, 1350, 1379, 1395,  
1414, 1422

Bearpark

Aula: 1335, 1338, 1339, 1365, 1453, 1454, 1464, 1466,  
1472, 1496, 1519, 1531

Capella: 1441, 1495, 1515

Camera:

Prioris: 1324<sup>†</sup>, 1335, 1440, 1449, 1454, 1466,  
1468, 1472, 1478, 1519

Conventus: 1442, 1468, 1498, 1532

senescalli: 1478, 1519, 1533

exterior: (1464)

interior: (1464)

coquina: 1340, 1442, 1444, (1464), 1472, 1478, 1496,  
1500, 1501, 1513, 1519, 1533, 1536

lardaria: 1278, 1303<sup>†</sup>, 1328<sup>†</sup>, 1335, 1338, 1468, 1478,  
1495, 1519, 1531, 1532

pantaria: 1531

le butery: 1532

pomptuarium: (1464)

Grangia: 1304<sup>±</sup>, 1338, 1347\*, 1438, 1454, 1486, 1493,  
1519

magna: 1494

Fenale: 1465, 1468, 1472, 1532

Domus fenii: 1304<sup>±</sup>

Granarium: 1428, 1496

magnum: 1432

Vaccaria: 1302<sup>±</sup>, 1337, 1357, 1366 (1446)

Bavaria: 1332<sup>±</sup>, 1370<sup>±</sup>

Byre: 1478, 1532.

Deyeria: 1302<sup>±</sup>, 1337\*, 1354, 1359, 1374, 1445 (1446)

Stabulum: 1438, 1466, 1486, 1501

Affrorum: 1332<sup>±</sup>

Prioris: 1480, 1496

Pullenhous: 1513

Loge: 1501, 1531

Domus iuxta porta: 1348

Routynghous: 1457, 1468, 1472

Drawyn chamber: 1457

Weydraught: 1532

Le Entreye: 1466, 1532

celar: 1390<sup>±</sup>

Acqueductus: 1329

### Bellasis

Aula: 1304<sup>±</sup>, 1305 (Miscellaneous charter 73)

camera: 1304<sup>±</sup>

Grangia 1302, 1332, 1335, 1373, 1375

Granarium: 1358

Becaria: 1302<sup>‡</sup>

Domus super pontem: 1310

Bewley

Aula: 1303<sup>‡</sup>, 1337, 1338, 1339, 1343<sup>‡</sup>, 1399 (1464),  
1468, 1469, 1532

Capella: 1337

Camera: 1337, 1339, 1396, 1407

Prioris: 1306<sup>‡</sup>, 1352, 1421, 1467

magna: 1428, 1511

senescalli: 1343<sup>‡</sup>, 1532

armiger: 1343<sup>‡</sup>

coquina: 1316<sup>‡</sup>, 1428, 1470

pistrina: 1329<sup>‡</sup>, 1329, 1340, 1370<sup>‡</sup>, 1371<sup>‡</sup>, 1374<sup>‡</sup>

lardaria: 1532

pantaria: 1532

Grangia: 1329<sup>‡</sup>, 1332<sup>‡</sup>, 1337<sup>‡</sup>, 1339<sup>‡</sup>, 1352, 1402, 1406,  
1425\*

decimalis: 1407<sup>‡</sup>

Granarium: 1332<sup>‡</sup>

Bararia: 1336, 1371<sup>‡</sup>, 1407<sup>‡</sup> (1446)

Byre: 1374<sup>‡</sup>, 1406<sup>‡</sup>

Stabulum: 1329<sup>‡</sup>, 1329, 1352, 1370<sup>‡</sup>, 1375\*<sup>‡</sup>, 1395, 1399,  
1407<sup>‡</sup>, 1427

Prioris: 1332<sup>‡</sup>, 1337<sup>‡</sup>, 1339<sup>‡</sup>

Becaria: 1306<sup>‡</sup>, 1316<sup>‡</sup>, 1316

Gallina: 1375<sup>‡</sup>

Domus iuxta porta: 1370<sup>‡</sup>, 1372<sup>‡</sup>

Domus firmarii: (1446)

Domus servientes: 1306<sup>‡</sup>, 1337<sup>‡</sup>, 1372<sup>‡</sup>

Ustrina: 1352

Billingham

Aula: 1302<sup>‡</sup>

Camera: 1304\*<sup>‡</sup>, 1305 (miscellaneous charter 2593)

coquina: 1304<sup>‡</sup>

Grangia: 1302<sup>‡</sup>, 1359, 1362, 1366, 1367, 1371, 1373,  
1375, 1377, 1380, 1381, 1388\*, 1394, 1424 (1446)

decimalis: 1334<sup>‡</sup>, 1388\*, 1397, 1407, 1418,  
1422, 1432, 1445 (1446), 1476,  
1487

Granarium: 1348, 1362, 1403, 1423 (1446), 1462, 1496

Bovaria: 1329<sup>‡</sup>, 1333\*<sup>‡</sup>, 1333

Stabulum: 1304<sup>‡</sup>, 1424, 1432, 1449, 1472, 1467, 1487

Porcaria: 1337<sup>‡</sup>

Gallina: 1337<sup>‡</sup>

Domus cum solario: 1333\*<sup>‡</sup>

Bracina: 1342, 1349, 1350

Burdon

Grangia: (1446), 1486\*

Bovaria: (1446)

Domus habitacionis: 1486

Eden

Repairs: 1512

Dalton

Aula: 1302\*

Camera: 1302\*

Grangia: 1302\*, 1302, 1340\*, 1360, 1400, 1471

Granarium: 1306\*

Bovaria: 1320<sup>‡</sup>

Stabulum: 1302\*, 1322

Fery

Aula: 1396 (1446\*)

coquina: 1316<sup>‡</sup> (1446)

pistrina: 1347, 1397, 1423

Grangia: 1317, 1333<sup>‡</sup>, 1349, 1365

magna: (1446)

decimalis: 1375, 1415, 1458, 1487

Bovaria: 1395\*

domus firmari: (1446)

ustrina: 1316<sup>‡</sup>

bracina: 1337, 1338

porta: 1316

Fulwell

Aula: 1336<sup>‡</sup>

Camera: 1380<sup>‡</sup>, 1381<sup>‡</sup>

domini: 1336<sup>‡</sup>

Grangia: 1331<sup>‡</sup>, 1336<sup>‡</sup>, 1376\*, 1380<sup>‡</sup>, 1415, 1423, 1500,  
1511

alta: 1381<sup>‡</sup>

Bovaria: 1379

Stabulum: 1371<sup>‡</sup>, 1380<sup>‡</sup>

Heselden

Grangia: 1334, 1337\*, 1339

Domus fabricationis: 1329

Heworth

Grangia: 1401, 1407, 1427, 1454, 1463, 1468

decimalis: 1396

Bovaria: 1344

Houghall

Aula: 1501

Grangia: 1341, 1370, 1420, 1421, 1425\* (1446, 1464),  
1468, 1531

Granarium: 1371<sup>†</sup>, 1432, 1449 (1446, 1464), 1468

Bovaria: (1446)

Stabulum: 1375<sup>†</sup>

Ustrina: 1300<sup>†</sup>

Ketton

Aula: 1264, 1316<sup>†</sup>, 1379<sup>†</sup>, 1388<sup>†</sup>, 1394<sup>†</sup>

Capella: 1264, 1316<sup>†</sup>, 1335<sup>†</sup>

Camera: 1264, 1339, 1379<sup>†</sup>, 1388<sup>†</sup>, 1394<sup>†</sup> (1446\*, 1464),  
1465, 1474

Prioris: 1379<sup>†</sup>

Servientes: 1376<sup>†</sup>

Coquina: 1316<sup>†</sup>, 1342

butria: 1467

Grangia: 1335<sup>†</sup>, 1335<sup>†</sup>, 1369<sup>†</sup>, 1371<sup>†</sup>, 1379<sup>†</sup>, 1388<sup>†</sup>, 1394<sup>†</sup>,  
1399<sup>†</sup>, 1410<sup>†</sup>, 1415, 1427\* (1446, 1464), 1467,  
1469

Avene: 1373<sup>†</sup>, 1399<sup>†</sup>, 1409

Fenale: 1410<sup>†</sup>

Bovaria: 1333<sup>†</sup>, 1334<sup>†</sup>, 1335<sup>†</sup>, 1336<sup>†</sup>, 1369<sup>†</sup>, 1388<sup>†</sup>

Byre: 1408, 1409

Stabulum: 1316<sup>‡</sup>, 1377<sup>‡</sup>

Becaria: 1316<sup>‡</sup>, 1334<sup>‡</sup>

gallina: 1336<sup>‡</sup>

Bracine: 1316<sup>‡</sup>

Ustrina: 1357

### Merrington

Camera: 1424 (1464), 1531

senescalli: 1427\*

curia/courteous: 1531, 1532

hospitio: 1473, 1480, 1513

Grangia: 1344\*, 1379, 1381 (1446(3)), 1453, 1454 (1464)

Granarium: novum: 1344

vetus: 1344

Bovaria: 1347\* (1446)

Byre: 1376<sup>‡</sup>, 1380<sup>‡</sup>

Stabulum: 1427\*, 1454

Domus firmami: (1446)

Domus servientes: 1347\*

bracina: 1446, 1531

ustrina: 1376<sup>‡</sup>, 1377<sup>‡</sup>, 1378<sup>‡</sup>, 1380<sup>‡</sup>, 1395<sup>‡</sup>

### Muggleswick

Aula: 1424 (1446)

Capella: (1446)

Camera: 1264, 1336

lardaria: 1337

deyeria: 1446

Grangia: 1357, 1446

stabulum: 1340\*

becaria: 1302<sup>†</sup>

Pittington

Aula: 1285<sup>†</sup>, 1298, 1336, 1370 (1446), 1423

Capella: 1354

Camera: 1264, 1285, 1298, 1330, 1331\*, 1336, 1370, 1423,  
1472, 1476, 1514

Prioris: 1371, 1449, 1472, 1492

seneshalli: 1423, 1498, 1514

conventus: 1464

monacorum: 1354

armiger: 1338<sup>†</sup>

vallettus: 1340<sup>†</sup>

inferior: 1339

superportam: 1390<sup>†</sup>

Solar: 1336

coquina: 1304<sup>†</sup>, 1458, 1499, 1532, 1536

Pistrina: 1283, 1327

Pistrina Prioris: 1338<sup>†</sup>, 1472

Deyeria: 1320<sup>†</sup>

Grangia: 1304<sup>†</sup>, 1317, 1330<sup>†</sup>, 1333<sup>†</sup>, 1336\*, 1337, 1338<sup>†</sup>,  
1343, 1390, 1394\*, 1458, 1407, 1506

Frumenti: 1315<sup>†</sup>

Avenie: 1315<sup>†</sup>

Feniale: 1424\*, 1536

Domus fenii: 1376<sup>†</sup>

Granarium: 1336

Bovaria: 1324\*<sup>†</sup>

Stabulum: 1285<sup>†</sup>, 1327<sup>†</sup>, 1330<sup>†</sup>, 1370, 1453, 1532, 1536

Becaria: 1329

Porcaria: 1326<sup>†</sup>

Gallina: 1340<sup>†</sup>



Domus fabricationis: 1338<sup>†</sup>, 1349

Ustrina: 1357, 1358, 1359, 1360, 1363, 1366, 1375, 1376,  
1377, 1379, 1382, 1384, 1388, 1389, 1390, 1406

Bracina: 1343, 1498

Acqueductus: 1439

### Rainton

Grangia: 1350\*, 1446

### Wardley

Aula: 1264, 1302, 1303<sup>†</sup>, 1468

Capella: 1264, 1486

Camera: 1264

armiger: 1331<sup>†</sup>

coquina: 1381

Grangia: 1299<sup>†</sup>, 1303<sup>†</sup>, 1328<sup>†</sup>, 1330<sup>†</sup>, 1331<sup>†</sup>, 1332<sup>†</sup>, 1337<sup>†</sup>,  
1370, 1373, 1379<sup>†</sup>,

Bovaria: 1330<sup>†</sup>, 1337<sup>†</sup>

Byre: 1378<sup>†</sup>

Stabulum: 1328<sup>†</sup>, 1331<sup>†</sup>, 1466\*

Gallina: 1331<sup>†</sup>

Domus Allec: 1299<sup>†</sup>, 1302<sup>†</sup>

farina: 1298

### Westoe

Aula: 1309<sup>†</sup>, 1326<sup>†</sup>, 1330<sup>†</sup>, 1336<sup>†</sup>, 1337<sup>†</sup>, 1370<sup>†</sup>, 1374<sup>†</sup>, 1399

magna: 1327<sup>†</sup>

vetus: 1326<sup>†</sup>

'Esthall': 1371<sup>†</sup>

Capella: 1326<sup>†</sup>, 1336<sup>†</sup>, 1347\*, 1395<sup>†</sup>, 1397<sup>†</sup>, 1399

Camera: 1264, 1327<sup>±</sup>, 1330<sup>±</sup>, 1370<sup>±</sup>, 1395<sup>±</sup>, 1402  
Prioris: 1320<sup>±</sup>, 1326<sup>±</sup>  
senescalli: 1371<sup>±</sup>  
capella: 1414  
firmarii: (1464)  
magna: 1396<sup>±</sup>, 1397<sup>±</sup>, 1399<sup>±</sup>  
porta: 1336<sup>±</sup>  
vetus: 1337<sup>±</sup>

solar: 1330<sup>±</sup>

coquina: 1326<sup>±</sup>, 1327<sup>±</sup>, 1330<sup>±</sup>, 1337<sup>±</sup>

pistrina: 1395<sup>±</sup>

Grangia: 1323\*<sup>±</sup>, 1330<sup>±</sup>, 1336<sup>±</sup>, 1337<sup>±</sup>, 1339<sup>±</sup>, 1373<sup>±</sup>,  
1395<sup>±</sup>, 1396<sup>±</sup>, 1400, 1410, 1427

frumenti: 1330<sup>±</sup>, 1374<sup>±</sup>

magna: 1304<sup>±</sup>, 1326<sup>±</sup>, 1327<sup>±</sup>, 1373<sup>±</sup>, 1397<sup>±</sup>

domus fenii: 1330<sup>±</sup>

Granarium: 1380\*, 1399<sup>±</sup>

Bovaria: 1441

Vaccaria: 1326<sup>±</sup>, 1374<sup>±</sup>

Byre: 1397<sup>±</sup>

Stabulum: 1309<sup>±</sup>, 1326\*<sup>±</sup>, 1370<sup>±</sup>, 1414, 1423

senescalli: 1374<sup>±</sup>

magnum: 1397<sup>±</sup>

Becaria: 1329<sup>±</sup>

Porcaria: 1330<sup>±</sup>

Ustrina: 1390

Portaria: 1339<sup>±</sup>

GLOSSARY

In the catalogue the names of the building appear in Latin unless they are in English in the documents. This glossary gives the translation used when quoting in the text.

Aula:	hall
Capella:	chapel
Camera:	chamber
prioris:	Priors' chamber
conventus:	convent's chamber
senescalli:	sergeant's chamber
capella:	chapel chamber
dominus regis:	Lord King
armiger:	knights' chamber
vallettus:	esquire's chamber
firmari:	farmer's chamber
servientes:	servant's chamber
hospitio:	guest chamber
curia:	court chamber
moracorum:	monk chamber
super )	above )
)porta:	) the gate
iuxta )	near )
vetus:	old chamber
magna:	large chamber
interior:	interior chamber
exterior:	exterior chamber
inferior:	lower chamber

solar: solar  
coquina: kitchen  
lardaria: larder  
pantaria: pantry  
pomptuarium: store room  
butria: buttery  
pistrina: bakehouse  
deyeria: dairy  
Domus: untranslated - either building or room  
    allec: herring house  
    fabricationis: smithy/smiths' house  
    brascina: malthouse  
    servientes: servants' room/house  
    habitationis: chamber  
    iuxta portam: building near gate  
Routynghouse )  
                  )  
Drawing chamber ) translation unknown  
                  )  
Weydraught )  
Grangia: barn  
    frumenti: wheat  
    avene: oat  
    fenale: hay  
    decimalis: tithe  
    alta: high  
    magna: large  
    domus fenii: barn  
Granarium: granary

Bovaria )  
          ) cowshed  
Vaccaria )  
Byre:       byre  
Stabulum:   stable  
          Affrorum:       stable for draught animal  
Becaria:     sheep pen  
Porcaria:    piggery  
Gallina:     henhouse  
Pullenhous:  colts' house  
Portaria:    gatehouse  
Loge:        lodge  
celar:       cellar  
entry:       entry  
ustrina:     limekiln  
brasacin:    malt kiln

Symbols used in catalogue:

- f From manorial accounts
  - ( ) From Inventories
  - \* New building
- 1330 From Bursars' account: repair

CHAPTER IV

New Building

There are relatively few entries in the Account Rolls referring to new buildings. It is rare to find references to the initial construction of a building on a manor. Sometimes this is never recorded and buildings are only mentioned when being repaired, or else the new buildings are of a late date and obviously replacements. Thus it is difficult to know what buildings were on a manor at the beginning of the period. Did the Priory just repair what they inherited, which of the buildings did they erect, did they make fundamental changes and was there a certain minimum they considered vital? Such questions, though important, are almost impossible to answer.

The earliest reference to new building is the passage in Robert Graystones' chronicle referring to the buildings of Hugh of Darlington (Table II). This was written in the 1320s and thus does not have the value of a contemporary document. This only refers to a few manors and does not go into detail about them. At Muggleswick, Hugh was said to have enclosed the park and built the chambers (S.S. 1839, 46-7). The problem here is to say exactly what the chambers consisted of. Greenwell and

Table II

Hugh of Darlington's Work

	<u>Hall</u>	<u>Chapel</u>	<u>Chamber</u>	<u>Park</u>
Bearpark				x
Pittington			x	
Wardley	x	x	x	
Muggleswick				x
Ketton	x	x	x	
Westoe			x	

Knowles consider them to be extensions or an enlargement of existing buildings (Greenwell and Knowles 1895, 6) possibly with the addition of a chapel. The earlier buildings were described as domum magnam made at Muggleswick without permission from the bishop, probably of wood, by a certain William (Greenwell and Knowles 1895, 4-5). The only hint of what this domum magnam comprised comes from another monk William, who saw the camera built but not the whole of the domum magnam (Greenwell and Knowles 1895, 4-5). Thus all that can be said is that Hugh replaced buildings, including a chamber, with another chamber. There is no reference in the Account Rolls to the building of the hall and chapel, later repaired, (S.S. 1839, cci) so it is impossible to say if these were earlier buildings continuing in use, included in the additions of Hugh (as Knowles suggests) or added before the Account Rolls start. There is no mention of

agricultural building, but as these were necessary for the manors' function they must have been included in the original domum magnam even if replaced later. Thus apart from some chambers and farm buildings it is impossible to be precise about the building at Muggleswick.

Prior Hugh also built Hall, chapel and chamber at Ketton, which, at the time of Graystanes' writing, no longer existed as they had been burnt by the Scots (S.S. 1839, 46-7). It is interesting to note in relation to Muggleswick that at Ketton the hall and chapel are explicitly stated as separate from the chamber. Possibly Knowles was wrong in suggesting the addition of a chapel as well as a chamber at Muggleswick. Again there is no mention of the farm buildings. They must have existed yet Hugh was not concerned with their rebuilding. Either they were not prestigious enough to be mentioned or it is possible that Hugh was concerned solely with added domestic accommodation to farms. It is unfortunate that the date of the Scottish destruction mentioned in Graystanes (S.S. 1839, 47) is not fixed as the whole manor was said to be rebuilt by Fossor (S.S. 1938, cxiii) and it would be interesting to know if this was a result of this destruction and how long the manor was left unrepaired.

Wardley was similar to Ketton. Hugh built hall, chapel and chamber which were destroyed by the Scots (S.S. 1839, 47). There is no reference in the Bursars Rolls to the rebuilding so presumably this took place before they became full. Again there is no reference to agricultural building though they surely must have existed before the erection of a new barn in 1335 (B.A.R. 1335-6).



Pittington and Westoe had 'chambers' built, but did this term conceal other buildings, for example hall, chapel. However it is more likely this would have been stated. Again there is no mention of agricultural buildings (S.S. 1839, 47). At Bearpark, Darlington enclosed the park; there were already living quarters here from Prior Bertram's time.

Thus the document gives important early information but offers only a tantalizing glimpse. It is not certain if this is all the building done at this time - is it really only domestic accommodation that is being added or are they not mentioning the agricultural building?

However the manors mentioned are significant; they are all the important ones. Pittington and Bearpark are the two largest; Bearpark, where accommodation existed, is being expanded and Pittington is being developed. Wardley was also important and used for ludi (period of relaxation away from the monastery (see p.129)). The fourth ludi manor is architecturally similar to Muggleswick (Still 1965, 403). The latter, although isolated, was important for its supply of timber and stone and visited by the Prior (B.A.R. 1300-70. Expenses Prioris). The presence of Westoe and Ketton in this group is especially interesting. They had formerly not been considered any different from the majority of manors. However it would seem that Darlington has picked them out from other agricultural manors and has added domestic accommodation. This would explain the lack of mention of agricultural building. Also, from other evidence

(p.77) it can be suggested that these two develop into local centres surrounded by a group of smaller less important manors. It can be suggested that this was the beginning of their rise to importance, as Darlington picked them out and improved the residential accommodation. Thus despite the reservation that the document may not show all the building the inclusion of Ketton and Westoe would seem significant.

Table IIIa

Bursars' Account Rolls

<u>Date</u>	<u>Place</u>	<u>Building</u>
1302	Dalton	stable (? hall + chamber)
	Aycliffe	camera dominus regis
1306	Dalton	Granary
1329	Hesilden	Smithy
1332	Pittington	Chamber
1335	Ketton	Barn
1336	Pittington	Barn
1337	Hesilden	Barn
1337	Bearpark	Dairy
1340	Bewley	Bakehouse
	Muggleswick	Stable
	Dalton	Barn
1344	Merrington	Barn and Granary
	Dalton	<u>Domus</u>
	Heworth	Cowshed and <u>domus</u>
1347	Bearpark	Barn
	Merrington	Cowshed and <u>domus</u>
1348	Billingham	Granary
1358	Ketton	<u>oriolum</u>
1367	Bewley	Salthouse
1370	Wardley	Barn
1375	Ferryhill	Tithe barn
1376	Fulwell	Barn
1379	Fulwell	Cowshed
"	Bewley	Porch
1381	Westoe	Granary
1388	Billingham	Barn
1395	Ferryhill	Cowshed
1401	Heworth	Barn
1419	Houghall	Barn
c.1424	Pittington	Barn
1425	Bewley	Barn
1457	Rainton	Barn
1466	Wardley	Stable
1472	Ketton	Barn
1480	Merrington	Guest chamber
1486	Burdon	Barn
1501	Houghall	Hall

Table IIIb

Summary of New Building in Bursar Rolls

1300-10	2	1370-80	5	1440-50	-
1310-20	-	1380-90	2	1450-60	1
1320-30	1	1390-1400	1	1460-70	1
1330-40	6	1400-1410	1	1470-80	1
1340-50	12	1410-20	1	1480-90	2
1350-60	1	1420-30	2	1490-1500	-
1360-70	1	1430-40	-	1500	1

When looking at the building mentioned in the Bursar's Rolls it is very rare to see what may be the beginning of a manor. This may be possible at Dalton. Although it was never explicitly stated they were for new buildings, there are entries for squaring and sawing of wood for the hall, breaking stone for hall and camera, nails, wood and sawing for the camera, wages of slater for three weeks at a total cost of £7.3.11 (B.A.R. 1302-3). This amount of work would suggest more than repairs. In the same year there was building a new grange and stable. However this could be either a major rebuilding or new development. Apart from this nothing like the complete building of a manor appears.

The majority of new building in the Bursar's Rolls is likely to be replacing older building. Most of the buildings are agricultural in contrast with the list of Darlington's buildings and there is usually only one or two new buildings on each manor. No definite reason for the predominance of agricultural building can be

given but two possible suggestions are either the domestic buildings were better maintained regularly and thus did not need replacing or the agricultural buildings were older and fell into decay sooner. It is impossible to say definitely why this happened.

There are some unusual buildings. There is a camera dominus regis at Aycliffe (B.A.R. 1306-7) with all expenses, quarrying masons and carpentry costing £27.16. 6, a very substantial amount. It is not possible to know what type of building exactly was meant by this term, but as Aycliffe was a park with no manorial buildings, apart from a barn, it may be suggested that it was a hunting lodge rather than an ordinary chamber. Merrington is an interesting exception; it has five new buildings and new domestic accommodation - even a large manor like Bearpark only built a dairy and barn. It seems that Merrington was being developed above the standard of other manors - it was unusual for one to have a courtroom and guest chamber. It can be suggested that Merrington became similar to Ketton and Westoe, but instead of being developed as a centre in the 13th century it was gradually added to over the years until the accommodation was of a suitable standard.

The third source giving information on new building is the works of John Fossor (S.S. 1839, clxi) which lists the Priors' achievements in a similar way to the buildings of Hugh Darlington. Fossor's Priorate was from 1341-74 so this information can be compared with the Bursar's Rolls. This raises various discrepancies - not all the

things in Fossor's list appear in the rolls. Some manors do correspond - Rainton and Merrington for example.

Table IV

Buildings of John Fossor compared with Building in Bursar's Rolls

<u>Manor</u>	<u>Fossor</u>	<u>Bursar</u>
Bearpark	All manor, 2 dairies, byre sheepcot	Barn (work £16; )hall (work £30)
Bellasis	Granary	-
Bewley	Hall, sergeants chamber, kitchen, granary, large barn, porch	Salthouse
Bill'ham	-	Granary
Dalton	Hall, chamber, barn	<u>Domus</u>
Heworth	Hall, barn	Cowshed, <u>domus</u>
Ketton	Whole manor	<u>oriolum</u> (work £4)
Merr'ton	Barn, byre, <u>domus</u> for mules, kiln	Barn, cowshed, granary, <u>domus</u> , roof of hall, large stable
Pitt'ton	Prior & monks chamber, porch, kitchen, stable, dairy	
Rainton	Large barn	Barn
Wardley	-	Barn
Westoe	Chapel, Priors chamber, stable, byre, gate,	(4 wks.work)

(Entries in brackets show work which could refer to one of Fossor's buildings)

Others possibly do, for example Bellasis has a granary mentioned in Fossor and lathes for a granary in the Bursar's Rolls (B.A.R. 1358). Dalton has a barn, hall

and chamber in Fossor and in the Bursars Rolls a barn and a new domus - a term which might cover the hall and chamber (B.A.R. 1341, 1344). There is a similar case at Heworth where in Fossor there is a barn and hall while in the Rolls a cowshed and domus are mentioned (B.A.R. 1344, 1347). It is possible the domus was the hall. In the remainder of cases the Bursars Rolls are lacking many of the things mentioned by Fossor. At Ketton Fossor is supposed to have rebuilt the whole manor, yet all that appears in the Account Rolls are repairs to the kitchen (B.A.R. 1342-3), making an oriel (B.A.R. 1358-9) and repairs 34/- (B.A.R. 1368), which is obviously insufficient. Westoe is similar - according to Fossor a chapel, chamber, byre and stable were built while in the Account Rolls only four weeks work appear (B.A.R. 1350-1). At Bewley there is also a discrepancy, Fossor claiming a granary, porch, kitchen, hall and sergeants chamber, while in the Rolls there is a new bakehouse and threshing floor, a window and acquiring stones (B.A.R. 1346, 1352-3). The most important manors have the greatest difference. Pittington Account Rolls show only lathes (B.A.R. 1343), then various 'work' and roofing - for example 6 weeks work (B.A.R. 1350), roofing smithy 2/8 (B.A.R. 1349), 'work' (B.A.R. 1355, 1356) which could not cover Fossors list. Bearpark, instead of the whole manor as claimed by Fossor, has a new barn (B.A.R. 1347), and substantial repairs to the hall (B.A.R. 1365), then only minor repairs and work. Thus although there are many omissions from the Bursars

Rolls of things in Fossors' list there is little new building in the Account Rolls not mentioned in Fossor. There are two possible explanations for this. Either the Fossor list is exaggerated - rebuilding of a whole manor could mean repairs to part of it and things are included that actually never got built. Alternatively the money for these buildings did not come direct from the Bursar and they thus do not appear on the Rolls. The period seems to have been one of more intensive building, especially at the beginning and end, than at other periods and this could have made it necessary for normal building funds to be supplemented from other sources, possibly from the Prior's own funds. This comparison between the list of Fossors' buildings and the Bursars' Account Rolls show how much the latter do not show, though whether this is just for this period of intensive building or was common through the whole period is impossible to say. It illustrates the difficulties in making any definite statements on the buildings.

However some conclusions may be drawn:

Generally there was not a lot of new building - the majority of manors only have one or two new buildings for the whole period. The exceptions to this are significant: Wardley and Ketton and Muggleswick in Hugh of Darlington's list, Merrington in the Bursars' Account Rolls, Bearpark, Pittington, Bewley, Westoe and Ketton in John Fossors' time. It is unlikely to be chance that these and only these became the important manors. The evidence of the

new building suggests these were deliberately being expanded and were chosen to have more domestic accommodation.

The timing of new building as seen in the Bursar's Account Rolls shows certain concentrations. There are major increases around the 1340 and 1370-80 and slight increases 1420-30 and 1480s. The first two periods are at either end of Fossor's Priorate and the latter during Wessington's. This would suggest that the Prior's personal decision played some part in initiating or encouraging an increase in building.

The type of building also varied. The Darlington list suggests a preponderance of domestic building but the Bursar's Rolls show far more agricultural - there are nearly three times as many barns and byres as halls and chambers. This is a large difference especially when it is remembered that some manors had 4-6 chambers. This could either be because farm buildings were allowed to decay, then rebuilt, while domestic were maintained, or the finance for domestic building came from elsewhere. Above all however it does emphasise the nature of the manors. These were basically agricultural units whose primary purpose was the production of food or revenue, some of which were developed to provide accommodation necessary for residence for officials on inspections or recreation centres, but priority was to be given to the agriculture.

However, it can be suggested that some manors were developing differently from the majority; they received



building attention early in the period, they had more built on them and the domestic buildings were a larger proportion compared with the agricultural.

It is now necessary to consider how the buildings were repaired and if this shows a similar or different picture of how the manors were treated.

## CHAPTER V

### The Repairs

Most of the information in the Account Rolls concerns repairs. These entries can reveal the existence of structures whose building has been unrecorded and they give information on materials and methods used. They are also interesting in themselves: they show differences of amount, type and timing of repairs for each manor and raise the question of whether these differences were the result of chance and local circumstance or the result of varied policies for different manors.

The chronology of the repairs was also considered. From the table it appeared that there were certain times when the majority of manors had an increase in repairs so it was checked to see if a particular manor's increase in repairs corresponded to these times.

The amount spent was also considered. This was done as the same type of repair could vary widely. For example roofing a barn at Ferryhill cost 27/- in 1349 (B.A.R. 1349-50) while seven years later at Bearpark roofing a cowshed was only 18d. (B.A.R. 1356-7). However by the 15th century the amounts are not always listed for individual items so in the table a? has been used to denote a repair without a price.

In the tables only repairs from the Bursars' Rolls are noted. The manorial repairs are omitted due to the spasmodic survival of the Account Rolls. This would distort the chronological distribution of repairs, concentrations appearing merely due to the survival of documents.

BURSAR'S ACCOUNT ROLLS: REPAIRS

Amount	Wardley	Westoe	Ratton	Pittington	Muggleswick	Merrington	Ketton	Houghall	Heworth	Heselden	Fullwell	Ferryhill	Eden	Dalton	Burden	Billingham	Bewley	Belasis	Bearpark	Aycliffe	Aldingrange	
1300																						
1305																						
1310																						
1315																						
1320																						
1325																						
1330																						
1335																						
1340																						
1345																						
1350																						
1355																						
1360																						
1365																						
1370																						
1375																						
1380																						
1385																						
1390																						
1395																						
1400																						
1405																						
1410																						
1415																						
1420																						
1425																						
1430																						
1435																						
1440																						
1445																						
1450																						
1455																						
1460																						
1465																						
1470																						
1475																						
1480																						
1485																						
1490																						
1495																						
1500																						
1505																						
1510																						
1515																						
1520																						
1525																						
1530																						
1535																						
1540																						

Table V



### Aldingrange

There are only five entries for this manor from the mid-15th century onwards. They are uninformative; pointing and roofing (B.A.R. 1454, 1484, 1495, 1497), repairs to domus (B.A.R. 1471), new roof (B.A.R. 1471), which reveal nothing about what buildings existed. It was leased in 1389 but as there are no entries before this and none for 60 years after, the effect of this cannot be seen. The manor was given to Finchale Priory, a cell of Durham, whose account rolls do not contain the same detail as the Bursar's. This would explain a total blank for the manor but it is curious why entries start to appear in the Bursar's Rolls. There are no manorial accounts for Aldingrange so even the routine maintenance cannot be seen. Thus almost nothing is known about what the manor consisted of or how it was treated.

### Aycliffe

The only repairs are to the tithe barn (B.A.R. 1396, 1409, 1428, 1456, 1482, 1487). Apart from the building of the camera domini regis (above, p.37) no other buildings are mentioned. Thus there is no evidence for a manorial curia; both the camera and the tithe barn could be anywhere on the lands. The repairs to the tithe barn are infrequent and for small amounts. There are however repairs to other things: fences (B.A.R. 1317, 1379, 1414), ditches (B.A.R. 1317, 1422), walls (B.A.R. 1350, 1351) and gates of the Park (B.A.R. 1351, 1365, 1401). A lime-kiln is mentioned in 1357, 1380 and 1422 (B.A.R. 1357,

1380, 1422) and there were fulling and water mills in the vicinity. There are incidental references in the Bursar's Rolls to timber from Aycliffe Park and lime being transported elsewhere; for example Ketton (B.A.R. 1389). This lack of structural repairs and the provision of supplies, as well as some of the terms used - for example 'wall of park' (B.A.R. 1350), gate of park (B.A.R. 1351) would suggest that this manor was a park with few buildings, being used as a resource centre for other manors. The effect of leasing cannot be seen as it took place in 1290 before full records start. It could be possible that the other buildings were leased and the tenant was responsible for repairs. However it is very unlikely as on other manors this does not remove all mention of buildings. In the 1446 inventory the repairs were not the responsibility of tenant and only the tithe barn and mills are mentioned (S.S. 1839, ccxcix). It would seem the manor was being used in a special way as shown by repairs.

#### Bearpark

There are no repairs mentioned before 1335 in the Bursar's Account Rolls. The early part of the century has some manorial accounts (1302, 1303, 1305, 1309, 1320, 1325) which contain routine repairs; roofing, cowshed and dairy 5/7d. (M.A.R. 1302), repairing walls of barn with nails 19d. (M.A.R. 1304), larder door 7d. (M.A.R. 1328). In 1335 larger repairs started which seem especially to concentrate on the hall: repairing hall £16. 0. 7, a large amount on a single building (B.A.R.1335),

repairing hall, roofing hall (B.A.R. 1338), repairing hall (B.A.R. 1339). Prior Fossor claims to have rebuilt the manor after a Scottish raid but does not date this (S.S. 1839, cxli). Hutchinson suggests dates of 1315 and 1346 (Hutchinson 1787, 335). However there is no evidence of extensive repairs after 1315 till the 1330s which would suggest the damage was slight or the manor was left unrepaired for many years. The largest amount of work was, 1342-3 £16. 8. 9, which could be part of Fossor's work immediately after he came to office but is not relevant to a raid in 1346. The only other substantial items are a new barn (B.A.R. 1347) and repairs to hall (B.A.R. 1366), oriel 14/3d. (B.A.R. 1366); thus nothing to suggest wholesale reconstruction after a raid or the rebuilding of a whole manor. Thus from the mid 1330s there was a period of increased building but it is difficult to link this to rebuilding after a raid or the rebuilding of the whole manor. However it is possible that the money for such exceptional repairs came from other sources than the Bursar and what these rolls show is the more routine work. After Fossor there is a gap in repairs 1374-1416. The work of Fossor seems not to have been continued by his successors and no further repairs seemed necessary. In the 15th century the run of repairs is much more regular (1422, 24, 25, 28, 32, 34, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41, 42, 44) and were small maintenance jobs, for example roofing large granary (B.A.R. 1432). No particular buildings received more attention than

others. This pattern continues for the rest of the century, though it becomes increasingly difficult to see the amount of work done. The leasing in 1465 seems to have made no difference to the pattern.

Other points of interest arise from the list of repairs. The repair of chimneys starts to appear before the mid 15th century, mending fireplace in kitchen (B.A.R. 1442), mending chimney (B.A.R. 1478) for example, but there was no reference to their installation or repair earlier. They do not seem to be common: one at Merrington, one at Bewley, two possibly at Pittington (B.A.R. 1480, 1406, 1485, 1492, 1467). It is curious they are not mentioned earlier or more frequently. There are repairs noted to some buildings whose function is not known, the routynghouse (B.A.R. 1457, 1468, 1472), drawyn chamber (B.A.R. 1457) and the weydraught (B.A.R. 1532). A possible suggestion for the first is a house but this has no parallels on other manors. The drawyn chamber could be short for a withdrawing chamber but again this is only a possibility. Their function is unknown. There are references to a lodge though it is not stated if this meant the gatehouse or a hunting lodge in the park (B.A.R. 1514, 1501). The use of the manor as a stud is indicated by repairs to the coltshouse (pullen-hous, B.A.R. 1513). This is the only manor with this building. The reference to roofing 'entry' between the kitchen and hall (B.A.R. 1466) suggests that an entry could be a covered passage rather than just a porch which



would be the normal idea for the term (B.A.R. 1532). Repairs to things other than buildings are mentioned; there are floodgates (B.A.R. 1333), possibly on the river below the site, and an aqueduct, a feature mentioned only here and at Pittington (B.A.R. 1329). This could suggest it was only built on more elaborate sites. It is impossible to say if it was used for the internal movement of water or transporting it to the site.

Thus there seems to have been an intensive building phase in the 1330-40s after a period of neglect, then a steady maintenance of the buildings in the 15th century.

### Bewley

After an entry for 1298 there is a gap in the Bursars' Rolls until the 1330s, similar to Bearpark. The 1298 entry comprises repairs with chalk and nails to the gardrobe, the only reference to this room on any of the manors. The manorial accounts show small maintenance repairs; mending walls 2/- (M.A.R. 1303), roofing bake-house 12d. (M.A.R. 1329), repairing servants' domus 20d. (M.A.R. 1306). There are more mentions of walls round buildings than elsewhere, round the barn, kitchen, granary, prior's stable as well as round the manor itself (M.A.R. 1303, 1316, 1329, 1332. B.A.R. 1381). When the entries start in the Bursars' Rolls they show a concentration on domestic buildings; the hall, chamber and chapel (B.A.R. 1337), the hall twice (B.A.R. 1338), hall and chamber (B.A.R. 1339). Then both domestic and agricultural

buildings appear. There is a gap from 1352-79 then a concentration across the turn of the century; 2 stables (B.A.R. 1395), chamber (B.A.R. 1396), hall, chamber and stable (B.A.R. 1399), barn (B.A.R. 1402), barn (B.A.R. 1406), camera (B.A.R. 1407). An explanation for this could be the leasing in 1409. The manor had been allowed to run down, then was repaired before leasing. In the 15th century there are regular repairs (B.A.R. 1414, 15, 18, 20, 21, 24, 27, 28, 33, 36) including some large amounts - £6. 3. 4 (B.A.R. 1414), £1.13.11 (B.A.R. 1420), £1.19. 3 (B.A.R. 1469). The leasing seems to mark a change from spasmodic concentration of repairs to a more regular method of maintenance but it could be coincidence that the leasing coincided with this change (above, p.48). Apart from the tithe barn which the Prior would always keep, all the repairs are to domestic buildings after leasing, thus it could be that only the farm buildings were leased and the Priory kept control of the domestic for the ludi and Halmote Court. Therefore it could be suggested that the leasing brought significant changes both in what was repaired, in emphasising the domestic buildings, and the methods - becoming regular instead of spasmodic. There are also mentions of repairs to the dovecot (B.A.R. 1406) and limekiln (B.A.R. 1352) which add to the picture of the manor.

### Bellasis

From the Bursar's Account Rolls the only buildings noted are agricultural; the granary and barn (B.A.R. 1358, 1302, 1335, 1375). However there is one manorial account for 1305 (Miscellaneous charter 73) which refers to the hall. This again shows the problems in using the Bursar's rolls; if there had not been the chance survival of one document a different interpretation could have been put on the site. The repairs spread through the first half of the 14th century are small maintenance. The leasing in 1373 seems to have caused a change. There is a concentration of repairs to the barn; two in 1373 £2. 6. 8, £1. 6. 8 (B.A.R. 1373) and one in 1375 (B.A.R. 1375); after these there are no further references at all. Possibly once things had been put in order the repairs were made the responsibility of the tenant. The inventory of 1446 confirms this (S.S. 1839, ccxcvii). There is one unusual item: repairs to bridge and domus on the bridge £3.19.10 (B.A.R. 1310). Bellasis was a moated site and this could be the bridge over the moat with a type of gatehouse. Therefore this manor seems to have been primarily agricultural with little domestic accommodation whose repairs before leasing were few and spasmodic.

### Billingham

Again like at Bellasis the Bursar's Rolls are misleading. From them it appears that only arable agricultural buildings are repaired but from the manorial accounts there are a hall and chamber (M.A.R. 1302, 1304);

the cowshed and piggery show it was not just arable (M.A.R. 1333, 1331). The leasing in 1359 starts more regular repairs; before there was about one a decade but afterwards about three on average, sometimes five. This regular series of small repairs is unusual especially in the 14th century. It happens at Bearpark and Pittington in the next century but these were the most important manors while Billingham appears basically agricultural. There appears no obvious explanation for this difference. There are more references here to an orchard wall than elsewhere (B.A.R. 1380, 1381, 1359, 1363); a walled orchard does not seem usual on a manor. There are also references to a dovecot (B.A.R. 1337, 1359, 1367) and a malkiln (B.A.R. 1342, 1350).

### Burdon

This manor is similar to Aldingrange in that there are very few references to it (three) and all in the 15th century. They are fairly uninformative. The first is just 'work' (B.A.R. 1437). The other two entries are both 1486, a new barn £1.13. 8 and repairs to a domus £1. 8. 0 (B.A.R. 1486). The similar prices would suggest £1.13. 8 could not be the total for a whole new barn when it exceeds repairs by only 5/1. Either it was repairs, not a total new building, or there were other sources of money. The manor was leased in 1270 so the effect of this cannot be seen. In the 1446 inventory two barns and a cowshed are mentioned. The repairs are assessed by the

Prior as with the majority of manors (S.S. 1839, ccxcvii) so unless this was only a temporary measure there is no reason for so few entries in the Bursar's Rolls. As this is the case it is impossible to make any generalizations.

### Dalton

Dalton is unusual as for the first half of the 14th century there are very few repairs, just new building: new barn (B.A.R. 1302), new stable (B.A.R. 1302), new granary (B.A.R. 1306-7), more than on any other manor at this time. The only repairs are to the old barn (B.A.R. 1302) and the cowshed (B.A.R. 1340). There is a 35 year gap between 1306 and 1340 with no repairs at all and the manorial accounts give no building information. After more building in the 1340 barn (B.A.R. 1340) domus (B.A.R. 1344) the manor is leased in 1348 and there is a change from building to repairs. There are long gaps between repairs 1360-1400, 1401-71 with a concentration between them, repair and lathes (B.A.R. 1400), roofing barn (B.A.R. 1400-1), repairs (B.A.R. 1401). There was also a change in the type of buildings repaired after leasing; there is no further mention of domestic buildings. This is the reverse of the situation at Bewley where the agricultural buildings are not mentioned (above, p.50). Bewley was important for holding ludi, the Halmote Court, and when visiting the bishop (Dobson, 1973, 94), thus it was necessary to keep domestic buildings. At Dalton the probable leasing of these suggest that it was primarily agricultural. The spasmodic nature of repairs also suggest that the manor was

not considered very important and only repaired when necessary. When they did do repairs they tended to be expensive-£6. 2. 6 (B.A.R. 1401), £2. 2. 2 (B.A.R. 1340), - which supports the idea that the building had been left until substantial work was necessary. There is also mention of a dovecot (B.A.R. 1310). Thus the manor initially had a lot of new building then seems only to have had spasmodic attention paid to it and was primarily agricultural.

### Eden

This manor has fewest references of all in the Bursars' Rolls and there are no manorial accounts. There is one entry; repairs to roof and daubing (B.A.R. 1512), no mention of any buildings at all. The manor was not leased till 1399 so the leasing has not concealed repairs. Thus the buildings on this manor are totally unknown.

### Ferryhill

For the majority of the 14th century the repairs have long gaps between them: 1317-47, 1350-65, 1375-95. Then at the end of the century there is a sudden concentration, new bovaria (B.A.R. 1395), repairs to hall (B.A.R. 1396), repairs to bakehouse (B.A.R. 1397), repairs (B.A.R. 1397). After this there were again long gaps, 1423-58, 1459-87. The concentration cannot really be explained by the leasing in 1381, or by the manor being taken in hand again later, as the repairs continue

spasmodically in the 15th century. The concentration occurs almost at the same time as at Dalton (above, p.53) but there is no obvious explanation; it does not coincide with any major phases of work. The first repair item, a barn is unusual as it cost £13.17. 4 to repair (B.A.R. 1317), while a new tithe barn cost £2.14. 5 (B.A.R. 1375). The repair cost is so exceptionally large that it must have amounted to nearly total rebuilding while the tithe barn probably had money from elsewhere spent on it. Some of the repairs were fairly substantial 60/- (B.A.R. 1397), roofing 27/- (B.A.R. 1349), bakehouse repairs 30/- (B.A.R. 1423), so the pattern seems to be large spasmodic repairs, as at Dalton, rather than regular smaller ones like Billingham (above, p.52). When considering what was repaired two things stand out: firstly the repetition of the tithe barn (B.A.R. 1375, 1415, 1458, 1487) which need not have been on the manor site, and secondly the references to the bakehouse (B.A.R. 1347, 1397, 1423). This is unusual, the only other ones being at Pittington, 'Prior's bakehouse' (B.A.R. 1472) and Bewley (B.A.R. 1346) especially as these are at more important manors yet are only mentioned once each. It could be possible that Ferry was producing bread for use on other manors but this is unlikely due to transportation problems. The more likely explanation is that the manorial bakehouse for the village, where the Priory's tenants had to bake their bread, was actually within the manorial complex rather than in the village as at other places. (It was the

right of the Lord of the manor to insist on tenants using his oven or paying commutation (Page 1936, xxvii. Below, p.155). The only domestic building on the manor was the hall (B.A.R. 1396). There were no chambers and the manorial accounts do not show any more domestic buildings. Thus it seems a primarily agricultural manor with only spasmodic repairs.

### Fulwell

From the Bursars' Rolls Fulwell appears only to have agricultural buildings but the manorial accounts show repairs to hall and camera (M.A.R. 1336). There are no repairs at all in the 14th century (only 2 new buildings), despite the fact it was not leased. The manorial accounts for the 14th century show minor repairs: roofing hall 12d. (M.A.R. 1336), nails and lock for door 3/- (M.A.R. 1371). The Bursars' Accounts for the 15th century show spasmodic repairs whose value usually is not stated and there are no manorial accounts to fill the gaps 1423-37, 1437-84. The manor was leased in 1416 which had no noticeable effect. However, it is a late leasing date for an ordinary agricultural manor. There seems no explanation for this apart from a basic lack of concern with the manor in the 14th century.

### Heselden

This seems to be a basically agricultural manor, all repairs except one are to the barn but there are no manorial accounts to check this. Thus it does not mean there was



no hall or chamber. There is one unusual item, the domus fabri (B.A.R. 1329), the smithy. The only other manor which mentions this is Pittington (B.A.R. 1349). It is strange there are not more mentioned, unless they were only included in the account roll if on the manor itself and most were in the village. Apart from the concentration of repairs in the 1330s, for example carpentry on barn (B.A.R. 1334), smithy (B.A.R. 1329-30), barn (B.A.R. 1337), there are only two other entries, 1381 and 1435. The leasing took place in 1290 so the effect of this cannot be seen. The amounts for the later repairs are not noted but the earlier ones are small: 5/- (B.A.R. 1329), 10/- barn wall and lathes (B.A.R. 1334). Thus it seems that this manor only had small amounts spent on it on rare occasions.

#### Heworth

There are few repairs in the 14th century: slating (B.A.R. 1377) and roofing (B.A.R. 1396). There is then a concentration at the turn of the century, stone, for barn £4 (B.A.R. 1400), repairs £1. 3. 2 (B.A.R. 1406), repairs to barn £5. 3. 4 (B.A.R. 1407). This is similar to the concentrations at Dalton and Ferry (above, p. 53, 55). The 15th century has smaller spasmodic repairs: pointing barn 10/- (B.A.R. 1427), repairs to barn 8/4 (B.A.R. 1463), repairs to barn 7/6 (B.A.R. 1468). The leasing took place in 1290 so this cannot be seen to have any effect. There are no manorial accounts but the Buildings

of John Fossor"lists a hall here, not mentioned in the Bursars' rolls (S.S. 1839, cxli). The Bursars' Rolls do mention a domus habitationis (B.A.R. 1463) probably some form of chamber. Thus although the manor was primarily agricultural it did have the basic domestic accommodation but apart from at the turn of the century received little attention.

### Houghall

This received far more attention than the previous two manors. One distinctive feature of the 14th century repairs was the frequency with which the slater was needed: for example (B.A.R. 1330, 34, 35, 36, 38, 41, 48, 49). The second half of the century has fewer repairs (B.A.R. 1370, 1382) but the 15th century has a frequent and regular series (B.A.R. 1414, 1420, 1425, 1432, 1449, 1466, 1478, 1482, 1488, 1493, 1501). In this respect it is similar to Billingham rather than Fulwell or Heselden. It is possible that Billingham and Houghall were considered more important farms and care was taken, especially in the 15th century, to maintain them, perhaps as they could have supplied Bewley and the monastery. No domestic buildings are mentioned till 1501 when a new hall was built (B.A.R. 1501). It is impossible to say if this was the first building of a hall, as there are no references to its repair earlier, or a replacement because the old one had never been repaired. The leasing in 1409 seems to have made no immediate difference. Repairs to the

ditches (B.A.R. 1390, 1432) and a lock to defend the fields from the river (B.A.R. 1379) suggest it was a boggy area. Houghall was another moated manor like Bellasis and Wardley, and traces of this can be seen on the ground but here there is no reference to it in the documents. Thus the manor seems primarily agricultural but received quite a lot of attention more regularly in the 15th century.

### Ketton

The repairs here in the 14th century are both to domestic and agricultural buildings: granary, chamber, barn, kitchen (B.A.R. 1310, 1339, 1335, 1342). After one mention early in the century (B.A.R. 1310) there is an increase in the 1330s in a similar way to Bearpark and Bewley (e.g. carpentry work (B.A.R. 1335), repairing lathes of camera (B.A.R. 1339), boards for doors (B.A.R. 1335). There is then one repair a decade (1342, 1358, 1368) until a 20 year gap (1368-90). After this the repair is unusually large £7. 0. 4 (B.A.R. 1390) which suggests the manor had been allowed to decay and was then put to rights. There was then another 20 year gap (1390-1409) before more regular repairs in the 15th century (B.A.R. 1431, 34, 37, 46, 54). This is similar to the increasing repair rate in the 15th century on other manors - Bearpark and Bewley (above, p.47,50). Unfortunately for some of these repairs no detail is given, just work stated (B.A.R. 1434, 1337, 1454). The leasing in 1412 seems to make no difference, more regular repairs had started before this

(B. A.R. 1408, 1409) and both domestic and agricultural buildings continued to be repaired. There are references to the repair of walls, fences, hedges and ditches as if the manor was set in the park (B.A.R. 1329, 1390: 1380, 1414: 1412: 1412,1432). It also had a walled garden or orchard (B.A.R. 1384). There is a parallel for this at Billingham (above, p.52). There are references to a dovecot (B.A.R. 1337, 1329) and a limekiln though lime was also bought from Aycliffe (B.A.R. 1389). There were both fulling and water mills on the manor. All these 'extras' not present on manors such as Fulwell, Hesilden or even Houghall plus a full range of domestic and farm buildings and an increase in repairs in the 15th century suggest that the manor was one of importance. It had a chapel (M.A.R. 1316) which sets it apart from the majority of ordinary manors. Thus Ketton seems to have a wider range of domestic building than the majority of manors and be frequently repaired. This distinguishes it as a manor of importance.

### Merrington

Here again there is a marked gap at the beginning of the 14th century with no repairs (above, p.53). The first concentration of work however does not take place in the 1330s as at Bearpark and Bewley but in the mid 1340s, pointing granary (B.A.R. 1344), repairs to domus (B.A.R. 1347), work 3 weeks (B.A.R. 1350). There is then a 25 year gap until the end of the 1370s: repairs to barn

wall (B.A.R. 1379), work (B.A.R. 1380), slating (B.A.R. 1381), walls of barn (B.A.R. 1381). This pattern of gaps and concentrations continues into the next century rather than it becoming more regular (above, p.47,50); 1395-1424, gap; repairs to chamber (B.A.R. 1424), chamber for sergeant (B.A.R. 1427); 1427-1453 gap; pointing barn (B.A.R. 1453), mending barn and stable (B.A.R. 1454). The leasing in 1386 does not seem to have changed the pattern at all. The gaps continue into the 16th century, (1480-1513, 1513-31). Both domestic and agricultural buildings are repaired till the mid-15th century but after this only domestic ones are mentioned; there seems no obvious reason for the change. The only buildings referred to are a chamber (B.A.R. 1464, 1531), the guest room (B.A.R. 1473, 1480, 1513) and a court room (B.A.R. 1531, 1532): courtehous 1531, camera curia 1532. It seems as if in the late 15th and 16th centuries this manor is being developed differently from others, possibly as an administrative centre for holding the Halmote Court and entertaining visiting dignitaries. This gives the manor an importance, despite only spasmodic repairs, similar to that of Ketton and Westoe (above, pp.60, 68), though of later development, and above the ordinary agricultural ones.

### Muggleswick

There are again no repairs in the Bursar's Rolls before the 1330s despite the existence of Hugh of

Darlington's chambers built in 1264. The manorial and stock accounts do not add any information on the buildings. The 1330 repairs are quite detailed, for example lathes for slates (B.A.R. 1333), digging stone 1/10d. and breaking stone 14/8d. for a buttress (B.A.R. 1336). However both here and later the actual names of buildings are not often mentioned; pointing (B.A.R. 1348), work (B.A.R. 1354), repairs (B.A.R. 1395). There is a gap 1363-1395 but apart from this repairs were fairly regular until 1424 when no further repairs are mentioned which is strange, especially as Muggleswick was the one manor not leased. Unfortunately there are no manorial accounts to fill this gap. Some repairs must have taken place as the site has the best preserved remains of any of the manors; presumably money came from other sources. This blank is in contrast with other manors whose repairs increased in the 15th century. There is one entry referring to a domus in the park (B.A.R. 1354). In most cases, references to a domus do not state where it is situated but this shows that it cannot be presumed that the domus are part always of the manorial curia. There is nothing in the building section of the Bursar's Rolls to show this to be one of the two major stock rearing centres for the Priory (Dobson 1973, 277). The cowshed and sheep pens are not mentioned. The stock accounts also do not go into details of the building; there are more references to fences than anything else (Stock Account, Muggleswick 1431, 1430, 1424). From scattered entries in the repairs section of the account it can be seen that Muggleswick acted as a supplier of slates and timber for work on other manors; 3000 lathes

from Muggleswick (B.A.R. 1427), 1500 shingles (B.A.R. 1422), timber cutting at Muggleswick (B.A.R. 1336). Thus after a concentration Muggleswick was spasmodically repaired till 1424.

### Rainton

There are no repairs to buildings on this manor at all. The only buildings mentioned are a new barn (B.A.R. 1350) and one at West Rainton (B.A.R. 1457). The other entries are repairs to the gate of the park (B.A.R. 1342, 1350, 1370). Thus Rainton seems similar to Aycliffe; the only building being a barn somewhere on its land and its importance lying in its supply of timber from the park. It seems more limited than Aycliffe however. There is no mention of mills or kilns. Unfortunately there are no manorial accounts to check if any buildings are missing from the Bursars' rolls. The leasing in 1320 cannot be seen to have any effect as there are no repairs before this. Repairs were fairly spasmodic, 1342, 1350, 1370, 1457, then a halt. Possibly with only one barn the small amount of maintenance needed would appear in the manorial accounts. Thus this appears to be a manor with a specialized function but one which received little attention.

### Pittington

Pittington has more early references than most manors (B.A.R. 1264, 1298, 1313, 1317) but there is a marked increase in the 1330s, for example there are four

references for 1336. During this period (to the end of 1330s) the domestic buildings receive more attention: 8 entries as compared with 4 for the agricultural, for example roofing chambers (B.A.R. 1330), carpenters' hall and chamber (B.A.R. 1336). The amounts are also fairly large, 49/4d. (B.A.R. 1317), 36/- (B.A.R. 1336), 35/- (B.A.R. 1336), 35/- (B.A.R. 1338) which is unusual for frequently repaired buildings. After this concentration there is a fairly regular and frequent series of repairs throughout the next half century, 1354, 55, 65, 67, 70, 71, 76, 82, 84, 90, 97 both of agricultural and domestic buildings but generally of smaller amounts than before; 6/4d. (B.A.R. 1377), 8/6d. (B.A.R. 1370), 2/- (B.A.R. 1371). The repairs continue more frequently through the 15th century (1410, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25) as at Bewley and Bearpark (above, p.50<sup>47</sup>) but the amount spent is rarely stated. From the mid 15th century to 1506 all repairs are to domestic buildings only; it is only in the 16th century roof repairs that the barn is mentioned again. As the manor was let in 1456 perhaps the domestic accommodation was used for ludi and the Halmote Court were kept by the Prior and only the agricultural buildings leased. Pittington was an important manor apart from its agricultural function. Apart from this the leasing does not seem to have affected the frequency of repairs. There are certain unusual things about Pittington. One is the smithy (B.A.R. 1349), the only other one is at Heselden



(above, p.57) and the same explanation for its presence is likely; that here the village smithy happened to be in the manorial area whereas on other manors it was not and thus did not appear in the accounts. The aqueduct and conduit mentioned (B.A.R. 1439) are only paralleled at Bearpark (above, p.49) and, as suggested before, they only exist on the most important manors, where the buildings are more complex. There are a large number of references to lime burning, more than on any other manor; repairs to the kiln are noted in 1357, 58, 59, 60, 63, 66, 75, 77, 77, 79 for example. These could have produced lime either for building or putting on the fields. The supply of stone seems to have come from the quarries at Sherburn (B.A.R. 1432-42). They must have produced more lime than could be used at one manor and it would have been transported to other manors as was the lime from Aycliffe (above, p.45) or timber from Rainton (above, p.63). There are also references to a dovecot (B.A.R. 1310,1359) and to the wall round the manor (B.A.R. 1466). Thus Pittington had a lot of repair work concentrating on the domestic buildings after the mid 15th century. It was obviously one of the most important manors.

#### Wardley

The first half of the 14th century is unusual because there are a number of repairs early on (B.A.R. 1264, 1298, 1302, 1316) but none in the 1330s, when there is an increase on most manors. There are manorial accounts for

this period but they only show routine repairs; roofing cowshed 6d. (M.A.R. 1330), henhouse 6d. (M.A.R. 1331), roofing barn 6d. (M.A.R. 1332). After this gap in the 1330s there is a regular series of repairs: 1340, 1354, 1368, 1373, 1381, then another gap until 1420. These repairs of 1420 are substantial £4.19.11 as if the manor had become run down and there was a lot of work necessary. The manor had been leased during this gap in 1386. After the 1420 repairs there was another long gap until 1466 then the repairs become regular again, 1468, 1471, 1484, 1486, 1493 as in the middle of the previous century. Thus the pattern of repairs in both centuries was similar with no 15th century increase as at Bewley and Bearpark. The leasing seems to have made no difference to the timing or type of repair. The manorial accounts show two items of interest. One is the herring house (B.A.R. 1299, 1302). This does not appear at other places; obviously because of this manor's location near the Tyne they were making use of easily available natural resources. However it cannot be seen if the herring were consumed only on the manor or sent elsewhere. Also in the manorial account is work on the bridge (M.A.R. 1303). Wardley is the second place with reference to a bridge and like Bellasis has a moat. No other manors have references to bridge so this suggests it was the bridge over the moat which is being referred to rather than one on the estate. There is also reference to a dovecot (B.A.R. 1338). Thus although Wardley was one of the ludi manors the pattern

of repairs was different here from the other important manors with no increase in the 1330s and well spaced rather than frequent repair in the 15th century. This suggests that it did not enjoy the popularity of the other important manors in the 15th century. This is supported by the figures for the Priors' visits drawn from the Expenses Prioris pro Maneria section of the Bursar's Account Roll. For the first half of the 14th century Wardley was visited 29 times for over 152 days, while at Bewley, though visited 24 times, the Prior spent only 73 nights. The situation is reversed in the second half of the century: Bewley was visited 22 times for 40 nights but Wardley only 10 times for 7 nights (below, p.132). Thus the use of the manors changed over the years. Wardley was eclipsed by Bewley and this is reflected in the amount of repairs.

#### Westoe

Westoe is unusual in the amount of information to be gained from the manorial accounts. There are more entries per year than for other manors and the amounts spent are larger, £5. 2. 6½, £5. 0. 7½, £3. 8. 2, £3. 0. 0 (M.A.R. 1309, 1323, 1324, 1370). They are not particularly detailed but they do mention the names of buildings more frequently, for example instead of just stating 'roofing', they list the rooms affected: barn, large hall, kitchen, 2 chambers, hall, servants chamber (M.A.R. 1327). This is fortunate as the Bursar Accounts in the 14th century

are very unhelpful. There is a blank until 1350 then 4 week work (B.A.R. 1450), then another 30 years gap till 1380. In 1380 and 1381 there was work on the granary then another blank till the turn of the century. Could it be possible that either by intention or accident some of the large amounts were appearing in the Manorial instead of the Bursar's Rolls? There is a concentration of repairs at the turn of the century similar to those at Dalton and Ferryhill (above, p.53,55); roofing barn and chapel (B.A.R. 1399), stone for barn (BA.R. 1400), raising floor of camera (B.A.R. 1402). The manor was leased in 1409 and there is a change to more frequent repairs, 1410, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28. Then a gap until 1436, another concentration: repairs (B.A.R. 1336, 1340), mending cowshed (BA.R. 1441), mending large barn (B.A.R. 1342), then no further entries. Unfortunately this time there are no surviving manorial accounts to fill the gap; if these had survived it might have been possible to see the continuation of frequent repairs as at the beginning of the 14th century. The inventory of 1446 has one interesting item: repairs were necessary to domorum et camerarum pro habitacione firmarii et husbandria quam domorum et camerarum pro competenti recepcione senescalli terrarii et Bursarii (S.S. 1839, ccxcii). This supports the idea that at leasing the manor could be split, for example at Bewley (above, p.50). Thus the number of rooms and the beginning of frequent repairs in the 15th century suggests that this was one of the more important manors

similar to Ketton rather than an ordinary agricultural one. It is unfortunate the documents do not continue to confirm or contradict this.

Thus it can be seen that the repairs on the manors were quite varied but that there were also similarities between how some manors were treated. Before drawing any general conclusions on whether this was accidental or deliberate, a number of specific points can be made.

1. There are changes in the form and terminology of the documents themselves. By the 15th century the repairs are often listed one after the other across the rolls and a total given after a few items, rather than one item per line. Thus it is difficult to see the amount spent on any one repair. The rolls become more detailed in one way with more names of workmen and quantities of material but less helpful as they do not mention to which building the repairs are being done. The terms used also change for example from grangia to orrea for barn.
- 2a The things that need most repair are the roofs usually made of slate and the references to roofing or pointing (punctacione) are frequent. Pointing seems to refer to the roof not the wall of a building, it was usually done by a slater, its measurements of how much done are given in the same units as slating

(B.A.R. 1376) and, a small indication, the pointing is usually 'on' a building not 'of' as if it was on top (B.A.R. 1422, 'super byer', 1532). The barns have more repairs than other buildings. There are a number of possible reasons for this, a) there are more barns than other buildings, b) they have rougher treatment than domestic buildings, c) they are less well built or of less durable materials, d) they are repaired for longer rather than being rebuilt as it does not matter how they look.

2b The henhouses and pigpens are only mentioned in manorial accounts and seem to be flimsy structures, for example henhouse: walls 6d., boards 2d., roof 3d. (M.A.R. Wardley 1331). They were thus relatively cheap and could be erected by manorial officials without reference to the Bursar. They would be fairly impermanent structures and leave few traces on site. On the other hand dovecots seemed expensive to maintain, for example Billingham repairs 27/2d. (B.A.R. 1337), Dalton repairs 10/8d. (B.A.R. 1310), Fulwell repairs 25/- (B.A.R. 1339), Wardley repairs 27/8d. (B.A.R. 1338). They are mentioned at the above manors and Bewley, Pittington and Ketton.

2c On most manors there are references to boundaries. Some had walls; these could either be round the whole manor as at Pittington or individual buildings as at Bewley (M.A.R. 1316) or round gardens and orchards as at Billingham (B.A.R. 1380). Even today walls denoting the boundary of the manor site can be

seen for example at Ferry or Aycliffe. Sometimes fences and ditches were used as boundaries for certain areas for example at Houghall (B.A.R. 1390, 1432) or Bearpark: 'ditch round fence of stallions and mares' (B.A.R. 1348).

- 2d Repairs to chimneys start in the 15th century. There is no mention of them being built or maintained before this. They seem either to be in the kitchen or an important room: repairing kitchen chimney Pittington (B.A.R. 1467), mending kitchen chimney Bearpark (B.A.R. 1442); mending chimney in guest chamber Merrington (B.A.R. 1480), making fireplace in Prior's chamber Bewley (B.A.R. 1406). Apart from one reference, Dalton (B.A.R. 1472) they are all in important manors.
- 2e From the names of buildings mentioned in the course of repair it would seem that certain manors had specialized functions because of their geographical location; Herring house at Wardley, Park at Rainton and Aycliffe, Limekilns at Pittington, timber from Muggleswick, mills at Aycliffe. Other specializations seem to be for no special reason; stud at Bearpark, bakehouse at Ferryhill, guest chamber at Merrington. Some of these must have been due to the Prior's own wishes. Although this is not strictly part of the repairs policy the information gives more idea about what was on each manor and how they were organized.

3. There seem to have been periods when there was an increase in repairs on certain manors. If these periods are compared there emerge four times when there was an increase in repairs for quite a number of manors. Firstly the times of increase on individual manors are listed and from this the overall periods can be seen.

Table VI

Bearpark:	1325-50 (1360-70)	Houghall:	1330-50
			1370-75
Bewley:	1335-50, 1400-25		1415-20
Billingham:	1375-80, 1405-20	Merrington:	1425-30
Dalton:	1340-45, 1400-05	Muggleswick:	1330-55
Ferryhill:	(1315-20), (1395-1400), 1415-25	Pittington:	(1310), 1335-50, 1405
Fulwell:	1415-25	Rainton:	1455
Hesilden:	1325-35	Wardley:	(1480-90)
Heworth:	1340-50, 1375-8, 1400-25		

(Those in brackets do not coincide with the major periods)

<u>c. 1330-1350</u>	<u>1370-80</u>	<u>1400-25</u>	<u>1455-70</u>
Bearpark	Houghall	Bewley	Heworth
Bewley	Heworth	Billingham	Merrington
Dalton	Billingham	Dalton	Rainton
Heselden		Ferryhill	
Heworth		Fulwell	
Houghall		Heworth	
Merrington		Houghall	
Muggleswick		Merrington	
Pittington		Pittington	



# MANORS UNDERGOING BUILDING and REPAIRS




Table VII

Thus there are two major periods of increase for a lot of manors near the beginning of each century 1330-50 and 1400-25, with a supplementary increase round the turn of the third and fourth quarters 1370-80, 1460-70. When these repair figures are compared with those for new building the peaks occur in exactly the same places for both (Table VII).

These increases correspond with the beginning and end of Fossor's Priorate and the beginning of Wessington's with the highest peaks at the beginning of each.

This would suggest that control from the monastery land, especially the Prior's influence did affect significantly the building programme and it was not a totally haphazard affair.

The only other chronological change is that in the 15th century on some manors there is a change from spasmodic to regular repairs, for example Bearpark, Bewley, Pittington, Ketton, also Billingham and Houghall in lesser amounts. It seems that this change was mainly on the more important manors.

Thus when the chronology of repairs is considered the most important conclusion is the emergence of certain periods of increased activity.

4. When the average amount spent at different manors is considered there does not appear to be any general pattern. Some important manors, for example Pittington, only have medium amounts spent on them while basically agricultural ones have large amounts

(when they get any attention) for example Heworth. This was because Pittington had more regular attention than manors such as Fulwell and Heworth. Thus the amount spent does not relate to the manors' status, the timing of attention is more relevant.

5. The effect leasing the manors had on the buildings was also considered. There are only a few manors where any effect is noticeable. At Bellasis there is a concentration of repairs immediately after leasing, pointing barn, repairing barn (B.A.R. 1373), repairing barn (B.A.R. 1375). Then a total stop. At Westoe the repairs become much more regular after the leasing in 1409 though this could be due to an increase in the 15th century like Bearpark and Bewley. At Bewley there is the possibility that the leasing split the domestic and agricultural buildings (above, p.50). These are the only manors where any effect can be seen and thus it is not really possible to generalize on the effect of leasing except that it does not seem to have caused any major change common to all manors.

Apart from these specific points (1-5) certain general conclusions may be drawn. There are a variety of methods by which the Priory faced the problem of maintaining their property, but some of the manors were treated in a similar way. It is possible to tentatively define certain groups that received similar treatment.

Aldingrange, Burdon, Eden and Jarrow have too few

repair entries to permit generalization. Aycliffe and Rainton have few structural repairs and seem to have been used as parks as a source of timber.

There is then a group which seem to be primarily just agricultural manors. They may have had a hall or chamber as accommodation for the visits of Bursar and Terrar but these hardly appear in the building or repairs. The repairs they did receive were infrequent and they had little attention altogether. These are Bellasis, Heselden, Heworth and Fulwell.

There are then some manors which are also basically agricultural but are distinguishable in various ways from those above. There are two manors, Billingham and Houghall which, though having only basic domestic accommodation received a different repair treatment. Instead of having few and spasmodic repairs they were regularly maintained. At Billingham this took place from the mid 14th century and at Houghall especially in the 15th century. These two might thus be more important agriculturally. The other three which varied were Muggleswick, Dalton and Ferry. These three were the only basically agricultural ones which received Prior's visits. Muggleswick had additional accommodation in the form of the chapel. This was probably due to its isolation; monks could not travel there and back in winter and if it was stayed in by the Prior and his retinue they would need somewhere for services. It was visited 26 times for 45 days from 1300-1370. Its maintenance was spasmodic

like the other agricultural manors. It was distinguished by the Prior's visits - perhaps for hunting, and the buildings necessary for this. Ferryhill has only one reference to a hall and thus seems similar to the agricultural group but is distinguished by the number of references to a bakehouse. This may be fortuitous due to its placing in the manor not the village or it may be some sort of specialization. Dalton appears different due to the amount of building in the early 14th century. However after this it is treated as an ordinary agricultural manor with few repairs. Both these manors were visited by the Prior, Ferry 12 times for 24 nights and Dalton 6 times for 29 nights. Thus all these four have something more than the ordinary manors. However they have a basic agricultural predominance and do not come into the higher groups of manors with extensive domestic accommodation. Perhaps a suitable classification would be 'agricultural plus' showing their basic affinity but also distinguishing them.

There is then a group of four manors well known as being important. They had better domestic accommodation, a different repairs policy and were used for holding the ludi; i.e. Bearpark, and Pittington, Bewley and Wardley - the former two being predominant. The first three all had increased repairs in the 15th century from spasmodic amounts in the 14th century. They become regular and frequent. Wardley had no 15th century increase but it had been used for Prior Tanfield's retirement and for

the ludi. By the 15th century its popularity as a centre away from Durham seems to have been eclipsed by Bewley. The latter was used extensively during the Wessington Priorate, for example when he visited the Bishop (Dobson 1973, 95). These were the most important manors.

The remaining manors, Westoe, Ketton and Merrington were different both from these four and the agricultural ones. They had more domestic buildings than the agricultural manors but were not as elaborate as the 'big four'. Neither were they visited so often. Ketton is treated in the same way as Bearpark and Pitlington with an increasing amount of repairs in the 15th century to both agricultural and domestic buildings. Merrington did not develop its importance until the 16th century. In the 15th century it had spasmodic repairs but by the 16th century there was an important change, agricultural repairs ceased (like Bewley, above, p.50), the court house and guest house were developed and only Bearpark had more 16th century repairs. This would all suggest that it was undergoing a later development into an important centre like Ketton had earlier. Westoe is a difficult case. There is an increase in repairs at the beginning of the 15th century as if it was like Ketton, then a blank. This is similar to the gap at the beginning of the previous century when there is an increase in repairs in the manorial accounts. However the 15th century manorial accounts do not survive. From the beginning of the increase in repairs and the superior accommodation at Westoe (4-6 chambers

and a chapel) it is possible to suggest a similar development and treatment to Ketton but it is impossible to be definite because of the lack of documents. Also it cannot be seen if all the buildings were repaired in the 15th century like Ketton, Pittington and Bearpark, or just domestic like Bewley and Merrington in the 16th century.

This difference in what was repaired cut across the top two categories of manor. With Pittington, Bearpark and Ketton having all buildings repaired in the 15th century and Merrington and Bewley only the domestic and Westoe with a question mark there seems no obvious reason for this difference. Also cutting across all these categories are the periods of increased repairs and building. This would suggest these increases were due to some central decision, not the individual manor's needs, possibly under the initiative of the Prior himself.

Thus the major conclusion from a study of repairs is the emergence of distinct groups of manors. There are the basically agricultural ones including those receiving only minimum attention and the 'agricultural plus' ones. There are the four ludi manors. Between these two groups are the three manors which become important centres - Ketton and Westoe developed by Darlington, Merrington expanded in the 16th century and all three having better buildings and more repairs than the agricultural ones and being treated similarly to the four ludi manors. These three are a distinct intermediate group.

CHAPTER VI

The building materials and methods

The Account Rolls, in addition to entries referring to new building and repairs, contain information of the quantity, price and origin of materials used in the building. Reference is also made to the methods of construction. Sometimes this is indirect through the tasks men were paid to do, in other places there are detailed descriptions of building, including the tools used. However there are difficulties in using the documents for this information. The later documents are more detailed, which gives an imbalance. The entries often do not state the building for which the materials are intended or the quantity used. Despite this the place of origin and lines of transport sometimes can be reconstructed, and some idea of the type of materials used can be gained. If prices of buildings are given it is interesting to compare these with each other, even if the place of building is not known, so that some idea of the average price of a particular building can be gained. Firstly the materials used will be considered, then their origin, then the price. After this any information on methods used will be examined.



I. Materials used

Roofing: stone

Table VIII

<u>Date</u>	<u>Manor</u>	<u>Building</u>	<u>Method of Description</u>
1298	Pittington	Stable	Roofing with slates
1302	Dalton	hall, chamber	Wages of slater
M.A.R.1336	Westoe	barn, chamber	slater or...
1338	Bearpark	barn, hall	slater or...
M.A.R.1343	Bewley	hall, sergeants & esquires chambers	slater or...
1343	Westoe	barn, cowshed	roofing: pointing & 1000 slates
1347	Merrington	cowshed	slates £9.6.7
1349	Ferryhill	barn	slater & s000 slates
1353	Bewley	barn	quarrying stone & pointing of roof stone
1368	Bewley	chamber	pointing & 50 slate pins
1370	Pittington	stable	pointing slates
1372	Ketton	barn	slater on ...
1375	Billingham	barn	roofing with stone
M.A.R.1380	Fulwell	barn	roofing with stone
M.A.R.1394	Ketton	hall, chamber, barn	slater on ...
M.A.R.1394	Westoe	chapel, chamber	slater on
M.A.R.1394	Westoe	barn, bakehouse	roofing with stone
M.A.R.1396	Westoe	barn	roofing with stone
M.A.R.1397	Westoe	chapel, large stable & barn byre	slater on
1400	Dalton	barn	roofing with stone
1442	Westoe	large barn	stone roof
1446	Houghall	barn, cowshed	stone roof
1453	Pittington	stable	stone roof
1453	Bearpark	hall	stone roof
1484	Wardley	'domus'	stone roof
1492	Pittington	Prior's chamber	stone roof
1498	Bearpark	convents chamber	stone roof
1500	Bearpark	kitchen	stone roof
1501	Bearpark	stable, lodge, kitchen	tiling
1511	Fulwell	barn	stone roof
1514	Pittington	lardar, sergeants chamber	tiling
1514	Bearpark	lodge	tile roof
1531	Merrington	courthouse	stone roof
1531	Bearpark	lodge	stone roof

Summary of building with stone roofing

Bearpark: hall, convent's chamber, kitchen, barn,  
stable, lodge

Bewley: hall, sergeants' and esquire's chambers,  
barn

Billingham: barn

Dalton: hall, chamber, barn

Ferryhill: barn

Fulwell: barn

Houghall: barn, cowshed

Ketton: hall, chamber, barn

Merrington: courthouse, barn

Pittington: Prior's chamber, sergeants' chamber,  
larder, stable

Westoe: chapel, chamber, barn, cowshed, large  
stable, bakehouse

Roofing: non-stone

Table VIIIa

1333	Billingham	malthouse	lead
1421	Bewley	chamber	lead
1476	Billingham	tithe barn	thatch
1515	Bearpark	Prior's chapel	lead

As Tables VIII and VIIIa show the material used most frequently was stone slates. The usual terms for this were either co-opitura cum slatstan or tectura lapida. Tiles are also mentioned (tegulae) but these could be the same as the stone slates, for example in 1484 at Wardley tegulari are mentioned in the list of materials but the work is described as tectura lapida, and at Bearpark the

lodge had a tectura tegula in 1514, but in 1531 tectura lapida. Thus it is possible the two were used interchangeably and both refer to a roof made of stone slates, (S.S. 1845, 345) similar to those used today, pinned to the rafters through a hole in the top. The term punctatio (pointing) refers to the repair of such roofs not to pointing walls; pointing of roof stones (B.A.R. 1353), pointing slates (B.A.R. 1370), confirm this as well as the fact that it was usually the slater who performed the operation. It seems that all types of buildings had stone roofs, not just the most important halls and chapels, except perhaps the smallest, such as henhouses, which only appear in the manorial accounts.

Other materials fall a long way behind the stone slates. Lead seems to have been used on important buildings. There seems, however, no reason for its use on the malthouse at Bewley rather than stone. Thatch is rarely mentioned. This might be because it was used on the smaller buildings which appear only on manorial accounts and these usually do not give details of materials. One unusual entry is for the tithe barn at Billingham which was thatched (B.A.R. 1470: operant super tectura straminea orrii deciale de Billingham). This is the only mention of such an important building as a tithe barn being thatched. It may be due to the local geography: Billingham is low-lying and often marshy and thus suitable stone may have been difficult to acquire, reeds or straw being more easily available. There is one

reference to shingles (cindula) at Muggleswick (B.A.R. 1421), but it does not state on which building they were used. This again may be due to local circumstances, there would have been sufficient timber at Muggleswick to make this practicable.

Walling:

Table IX

	1298	Pittington	stable	breaking stone
M.A.R.	.1303	Bearpark	larder	walls with stones
M.A.R.	.1316	Ketton	kitchen & malt- kiln	mason remaking walls
M.A.R.	.1327	Pittington	stable	stable of stone
M.A.R.	.1336	Westoe	hall	mason on walls
M.A.R.	.1340	Pittington	valet's chamber	stone walls
	1344	Heworth	cowshed	cowshed of stone
	1352	Bewley	barn	stone for walls
M.A.R.	.1369	Ketton	barn	stone barn
M.A.R.	.1372	Westoe	<u>domus</u>	stone <u>domus</u>
M.A.R.	.1396	Westoe	barn	stone barn
	1421	Houghall	barn	stone walls
	1472	Billingham	stable	wattle & daub
	1478	Bearpark	byre	stone wall

Again stone is the most frequently mentioned material, though sometimes it is not possible to be certain if the full height of the wall is of stone; the reference could be to foundations (Pittington 1298, Westoe 1336). Its use on quite humble buildings, for example the stable, show it was the most easily available and cheapest material. There are no mentions of timber frame walling. There are few references to halls or chambers of stone but this is probably partly due to the documents (entries referring to materials are fairly rare anyway) and partly because it was taken for granted they would be of stone.

Billingham again has an unusual entry in a wattle and daub stable: 'wattles and wands 18d. clay 4/-' (B.A.R. 1472) which was also thatched. This could again be explained by the geography and the resulting lack of local stone (above, p.82). Some of the smaller buildings such as the henhouse are never mentioned as being made of stone and were possibly flimsy wooden structures (M.A.R. Wardley 1331, above p.70). There are also references to daubing walls, for example dalbura murorum gabulorum caminorum at Pittington (B.A.R. 1492) and similar entries for Merrington (B.A.R. 1480) and Bearpark (B.A.R. 1478). It is possible that some walls were timber and daub, but it is equally likely that the dalbura was added to stone walls especially on gable and round chimneys (B.A.R. 1496) to seal cracks, especially necessary round a chimney. It is also possible the references are to whitewashing stone walls. As Salzman states "It is often impossible to be certain whether the process alluded to is daubing or whitewashing" (Salzman 1952, 190). There are very few references to the materials of which chimneys were made; Bewley had one of clay (B.A.R. 1485) and Dalton one of stone (B.A.R. 1472). There is no further evidence for them.

Thus it is clear that stone was the most widely used building material both for roofs and walls and the use of any other material was very limited, usually explicable by local conditions.

## II. Origin of Material

As well as mentioning where material were used their place of origin is also sometimes stated. This can be used to show how the resources for the manors were organized and the amount of contact between them.

### Stone:

The quarry most often mentioned is at Esh which seems to have supplied places throughout the country not just in its locality, for example Bewley (B.A.R. 1532). There are also references to stone from Esh without a destination being stated (B.A.R. 1331-4). Some was probably destined for Durham but there are no references of stone being moved from Durham, so it is impossible to see how much was used in Durham itself and how far it acted as a temporary depot for materials being moved elsewhere. Sherburn quarries are also mentioned (B.A.R. 1440-4) but these do not seem to serve such a wide an area as those at Esh. The only destination named is Pittington, though the stone could have also been used elsewhere. There were manors, which seemed to have their own sources for stone, probably just for local use as there is no mention of it being transported elsewhere. These were Pittington (B.A.R. 1467-70), Houghall (B.A.R. 136699), Wardley, (B.A.R. 1347), Aycliffe (B.A.R. 1472) and Bearpark (B.A.R. 1363). Stone did not necessarily have to be quarried; at Bewley digging for stone is mentioned (as opposed to 'quarrying')(B.A.R. 1352), and at Muggleswick getting stone for the butress (B.A.R. 1336).

This could mean just removing stone from a local outcrop. Thus as well as a central supply much stone seems to have been obtained locally, which would reduce transport costs.

Slates:

These seem to have been stone rather than 'grey slates', the type of slates used today. One source of supply was Esh (B.A.R. 1337, 1376-80), it is possible that some of the stone from Esh referred to slates. Another source was Muggleswick, for example 2000 slates (B.A.R. 1379). Some came to Durham but it is impossible to see, as with the ordinary stone, if they were moved elsewhere later. Large quantities came from Bearpark both for named and unknown destinations; 10,000 for Ketton (B.A.R. 1376-7), 18,500 from Bearpark for Fulwell (B.A.R. 1376), 16,000 slates at Bearpark (B.A.R. 1382). Apart from these three major centres no other sources of slates are mentioned, which contrasts with the local stone production. This suggests that only certain types of stone were suitable for slates and this made their production more specialized.

Metal:

The only metal whose place of origin is noted is lead. Iron must have been used both in buildings and for tools but no mention is made of its acquisition. There was both local and imported lead. The local lead came from Weardale (B.A.R. 1359) but no specific place is named. Thus it is not possible to know if the monastery had it mined on their own land, the Almoner held

Rookhope (Lomas 1973, 215), or bought it from the bishop who had large estates in Weardale. Lead from Muggleswick is also mentioned, but again it is not stated if it was mined here or transported from here after being brought from other mines (B.A.R. 1359). Lead was also brought from further afield, Richmond and Ripon being mentioned (B.A.R. 1359).

Timber:

There are certain manors which were important centres for the production of timber. Muggleswick was the major supplier of lathes, thin strips of wood placed across the rafters to take the roofing material or used as wall filling before plastering. Muggleswick is the only named source for them and their production must have been an important part of the manor's function; for example, 6000 lathes for slates, 4500 lathes from Muggleswick (B.A.R. 1349), 4000 slate lathes at Muggleswick (B.A.R. 1357), 2000 lathes from Muggleswick to Durham (B.A.R. 1425-9), 3000 lathes from Muggleswick to diverse places (B.A.R. 1427). Muggleswick also produced shingles (B.A.R. 1357, 1422, 1500) but the place of use is not stated apart from Muggleswick itself (B.A.R. 1421). Apart from these specialized uses ordinary 'timber' also came from Muggleswick. This probably refers to larger pieces used for major construction; for example 'cutting and squaring large timber at Muggleswick' (B.A.R. 1313). The other main sources of timber were the parks at Rainton and Aycliffe. They have references to timber



rather than any specialized sorts such as lathes (B.A.R. 1457-66). They are both called parks and the only building they have is one barn. Thus it would seem this production of timber was their main function (above, p.65). The only other manor mentioned as producing timber is Bearpark (B.A.R. 1335), but this seems to be unusual and this park is not as important as Rainton and Aycliffe.

As well as locally produced timber the Priory imported Estland boards (B.A.R. 1337, 1347). These came from Scandinavia, for example <sup>Norway, or Estonia</sup> ~~Denmark~~. Whether this was to provide better quality or larger timber for certain work or due to a lack of timber locally is not clear. Boards are usually mentioned as being used to make doors or gates - board bought for barn door at Ketton (B.A.R. 1336), 6 boards for door of lower chamber at Pittington (B.A.R. 1339), but were probably also used more generally.

The other sort of timber mentioned are wattles which also came from the parks - from Aycliffe for Ketton, for example (M.A.R. Ketton 1335), or from Bearpark for their own use (B.A.R. 1495). The exception is Billingham where the origin of the wattles used for the stable is not stated, presumably they were collected locally due to the marshy conditions.

Thus there were three main centres for the production of timber and a certain pattern of moving it between the manors. Muggleswick was a major supplier to all manors even if the other parks were nearer for example to Pittington, Bearpark, Hesilden (B.A.R. 1336) and Wardley

(M.A.R. 1370). Aycliffe timber was used on other southern manors, for example Ferryhill (B.A.R. 1473) and Ketton (M.A.R. Ketton 1372), but is not mentioned going north of Durham. Rainton performed the same function in the north sometimes supplying timber, or other goods made from timber - for example 8 hurdles made at Rainton for Pittington (B.A.R. 1349). Bearpark did not supply as much as the other parks, and indeed received timber from elsewhere (B.A.R. 1336), but did send timber as far as Billingham or to places near other parks like Pittington (B.A.R. 1336). This is surprising and suggests it acted as a reserve source, used perhaps when there were deficiencies elsewhere. The northern manors also received supplementary supplies from Newcastle through Wardley. It is difficult to see the place of Durham in this pattern. It was an obvious place for materials to pass through especially from Muggleswick - 2000 lathes from Muggleswick to Durham (B.A.R. 1425-9, above, p.62), but it is impossible to say how much of such material was used in the Priory and how much, if any, transported further. There does not seem to be much north-south movement across Durham due to the two parks of Aycliffe and Rainton serving the two separate areas. Thus there seems to be a logical inter-manorial organization for the distribution of material.

III. Prices

Prices of Buildings

Table X

<u>Barns</u>		£	s.	d.
1335	Ketton	4.	5.	10
1337 & 1339	Heselden	4.	12.	6
1340	Dalton	10.	11.	10
1344	Merrington	12.	0.	20
1347	Bearpark	3.	11.	4
1350	Rainton	6.	13.	4
1375	Ferryhill	2.	14.	5
1401	Heworth	7.	15.	5
1425	Bewley	25.	18.	8
1425	Houghall	31.	17.	9
1457	Rainton	11.	2.	8
1472	Ketton	1.	3.	7
1486	Burdon	1.	3.	8
<u>Other Agricultural</u>				
1347	Cowshed - Merrington	3.	11.	4
1379	Cowshed - Fulwell	5.	3.	1
1395	Cowshed - Ferryhill	2.	6.	8
1306	Granary - Dalton	4.	13.	4
1381	Granary - Westoe	5.	6.	8
1302	Stable - Dalton	2.	19.	8
1466	Stable - Wardley	1.	2.	8
<u>Domestic</u>				
1306	'Camera dominus regis' - Aycliffe	27.	16.	6
1337	Dairy - Bearpark	6.	14.	8
1352	window - Bewley	6.		8
1358	Gallery - Ketton	3.		4
1421	Window - Bewley	11.		8

The tables show the cost of the buildings stated to be newly built which might suggest the amount would be the total cost. However some of the amounts are so small that this must be questioned. It is doubtful that a difference in size or construction method could account for Rainton costing £11. 2. 8 in 1457 and Ketton in 1472 only £1. 3. 7 (B.A.R. 1457, 1472). It would seem more

likely that in the latter case only part of the building was actually rebuilt, or else part of the cost is concealed money coming from other sources. When the prices for the barns are compared, with the reservation that they may not be the totals, it does seem that prices rise towards the middle of each century and fall again during the second half. There seems no obvious reason for this and the problems of the documents make it unwise to suggest any firm conclusions. With the other farm buildings apart from barns, there are really too few of any one type to make comparisons valid. They do not, however, have the wide variations of the barns, the prices of each type falling within reasonable limits. A granary seems more expensive than a cowshed which is usually more than the stable. The information for domestic buildings is even more limited, no prices for new halls are given, and only one chamber which was an exceptional one; it was more expensive than any other building apart from a barn at Houghall 125 years later. This suggests it must have been unusually elaborate. There is no other dairy to compare with Bearpark and windows could vary greatly in size and elaborateness. Thus a comparison of building prices produces little useful information, both the buildings themselves and the prices are too varied and there is no way of telling how much the documents conceal.

Prices of Materials

Table XI

Timber

Lathes :	1306	Bewley	5d.	per 100
	1333	Billing	6d.	per 100
	1336	Westoe	1½d.	per 100
	1339	"	2½d.	"
	1343	Pittington	10d.	"
	1371	Ketton	12d.	"
	1372	"	18d.	"
	1382	Ketton	20d.	"
	1396	Westoe	14d.	"
	1410	Ketton	1d.	"

---

Brods :	1303	Pittington	5d.	"
	1306	Bewley	1¼d.	"
	1320-3	Dalton	1d.	"
	1328	Westoe	3d.	"
	1329	"	2d.	"
	1331	Pittington	1¼d.	"
	1332	Bewley	1½d.	"
	1335	Ketton	½d.	"
	1337	Wardley	1½d.	"
	1357	Pittington	3d.	"
	1370	Westoe	6d.	"
	1372	Ketton	2½d.	"
	1373	Westoe	3d.	"
	1399	"	3d.	"
	1399	Ketton	4d.	"

---

Nails

Spikings	1300	Pittington	5d.	"
	1316	Billingham	4d.	"
	1329	Westoe	7½d.	"
	1333	Billingham	4d.	"
	1335	Ketton	6¼d.	"
	1336	Westoe	5d.	"
	1336	Pittington	6d.	"
	1336	Ketton	5d.	"
Short	1320-3	Dalton	3d.	"
	1336	Pittington	4d.	"
	1370	Westoe	2d,	"
Fliwyngs	1306	Bewley	2d.	"
	1333	Billingham	1¼d.	"
Thaknail	1370	Westoe	14d.	"
Bec nail	1320	Dalton	5d.	"
Slate Pins	1336	Pittington	2d.	"
	1368	Bewley	2d.	"

---

Slates

teguli	1386	Westoe	20d. per 100
	1410	Ketton	6.6d. "
slates	1372	Ketton	12d. "
	1372	Ketton	12d. "
	1376	Ketton	"
	1386	Westoe	"

As well as the cost of whole buildings the documents give prices of materials mainly timber and nails. These are usually stated in quantities of 100, if not they have been calculated to this.

Lathes: There is a spread of entries for the 14th century but few for the 15th century. This is probably due to the change in the documents (above, p.43); in the 15th century a number of items were listed before the price given. There were varied qualities of lathes; the basic division was between those made from the inner heart of the wood and those made from the outer sappy wood, the latter being about half price (Salzman 1952, 241). This could account for the unusually low prices at Westoe in 1336 and 1339 and Ketton 1410, these could be of inferior quality. The other prices seem quite high. Salzman quotes prices in other areas: 1295 oak lathes 6d. and saplath 3d. per 100 at Windsor; 1386 herlaths 10d. and saplaths 5d. per 100 at Westminster; 1435 hertlaths 6d. and saplath 4d. per 100 at Shene (Salzman 1952, 241). There is a corresponding rise in prices between Durham and the south at the beginning of the fourth quarter of the 14th century with a decrease afterward. The Durham lathes were, however, expensive even for the better quality.

This suggests they were of a particularly strong variety, to carry the stone slates, comparable with those at Ripon in 1408 at 12d. per 100 or York at  $8\frac{3}{4}$ d. per 100 (Salzman 1952, 241), rather than with the flimsier southern ones. It is annoying not being able to see how the sequence developed in the 15th century.

Boards: There were also a variety of boards, some extremely large, the average costing about 4d. each (Salzman 1952, 242). These may be compared with those from Billingham which are priced at 2d. each (M.A.R. 1333). There are no other mentions in the Durham Rolls of prices of boards.

Slates: There are few prices for slates and unfortunately these are clustered near the end of the 14th century and for two places only - Ketton and Westoe. The two for Westoe though for the same year are widely different and the Ketton entries vary over a few years. It is not possible to make any meaningful comparisons.

Nails: These give the most detailed information. There is a wide range of places but all entries are from the 14th century.

The most common are brods or broddis which are flat with no heads (Salzman 1959, 314). In the Durham Rolls they vary between 1d. and 6d. per 100, most falling between 1d. and 3d. This is comparable with figures elsewhere; London 1333, 6d.; York 1327, 1d.; York, 1371,  $1\frac{3}{4}$ d. (Salzman 1959, 314). The next most frequently

mentioned are the 'spikings', a general purpose nail; in Durham they vary between 4d. and 7d. per 100. Elsewhere prices were more varied; 1279 Rockingham 3d. per 100, 1310 Clarendon 14d., 1353 Westminster 10d. and Ripon at the same date 5d., 1533 at Middleham 4d. per 100 (Salzman 1959, 306). It thus seems they varied by region as the northern prices are similar to those at Durham, with Clarendon and Westminster higher. Other nails have too few entries to make any generalizations; shortnails were presumably small nails, they seem cheaper than the normal spikings. The term 'becnails' has no parallel elsewhere, neither does 'fliwyngs' but presumably the latter were very small as they are the cheapest nail. 'Thaknails' were only 3d. per 100 in 1327 in York (Salzman 1959, 304) and thus the Durham ones seem expensive, but the one entry could be exceptional and not typical of this nail's price. Slate pins are mentioned only twice and show an unusual consistency at 2d. per 100 in different places over 30 years, they were obviously equivalent to the cheaper sort of nails, though they would be made of wood. The rate elsewhere seemed much cheaper, 1d. per 1000 at Woodstock 1265 and the same at Merton in 1335 (Salzman 1959, 234). Thus types of nails show a greater consistency of price than lathes or complete buildings, but they can differ from other areas, especially from the south. This suggests that distant comparisons at this date are of limited value and prices varied according to local conditions.

Thus the amount of information to be gained from price comparison is limited. This is partly due to the



document. Entries for new buildings are so varied it is doubtful the full price is always shown. For materials there are often insufficient entries for one type of the material, or the time span they cover is limited. Even when sufficient entries appear it is impossible to explain the variations in price, and comparisons with other parts of the country are of limited value. However some idea of the type of material used in the construction of the manors and its price range has been given.

#### IV. Building Methods

There are few places in the Account Rolls where it is possible to be certain all the steps in the construction of a building are mentioned. There are three fairly detailed descriptions but even these all vary. Apart from this it is possible to gain some idea of building methods, from the tasks men were paid to do and the treatment of materials. Often both stone and wood are mentioned, but their use is not always stated. Thus it is impossible to be certain if the stone was always for the walls and the timber for the roof, which is usually the case if it is stated explicitly (above, p.83), or if the stone was just for the foundation and the timber for wall frames and roof. The following operations were usually involved in the erection of a building.

The usual preparatory work was the cutting, squaring and sawing of timber, sometimes all three, at others some combination of them (B.A.R. 1310) 1313, 1298, 1302). Then

either carpentry work is mentioned or the wages of the carpenter given (B.A.R. 1337, 1347). These operations are paralleled by the getting or breaking of stone (B.A.R. 1298, 1336) and masons' wages (B.A.R. 1347). The other major operation is the roofing, the wages of the slater being given often with a helper (B.A.R. 1302, 1337). Less frequently the lathes are noted (B.A.R. 1454) and wages given for this (M.A.R. Fulwell, 1336). The making of doors or gates was with boards (B.A.R. 1317, 1316, 1336, 1339, 1347)(above, p.94). There then sometimes appears a list of material used; for example iron (B.A.R. 1338), presumably for nails or latches, chalk or lime, though it is not always stated if this is for the mortar or white-wash (B.A.R. 1333, 1336, 1492). In the later accounts there are references to daubing, though daubing with clay and whitewashing cannot be distinguished (B.A.R. 1380, 1492, 1496)(above, p.84). The later Account Rolls are also different in that they give a list of all material involved rather than the spasmodic mentions or list of operations which were usual previously, for example for the hall at Houghall, loads of timber, stone, tiles, chalk and clay (B.A.R. 1501).

The three detailed accounts all have different formats. The barn at Heselden (B.A.R. 1337) seems to have been of timber with thatched roof, unless the walls were standing from a previous building. The Accounts mention Estland board, board nails, thatch straw, pins for thatch, hoops, wattles and rods, and gives wages for carpenters, roofers

and daubers. Thus for one building we probably have a complete list of materials and type of work involved. The detail in the account for a barn at Rainton is very different. This states the number of people working often with their names, the time worked, rate per day and total. It does not mention material used or, in any detail, the tasks the men did (B.A.R. 1350). Such detail of pay does not appear usually until the 15th century, and then it is just lists of men without stating where, or on which building they were working. The average wages seems to be 3d. or 4d. per day, with helpers at 1d. but this does not add to the information on the buildings themselves. The third detailed account is possibly better, combining information on materials with costs. A summary will give a full picture of a barn's building: stone from the quarry at Aycliffe with carriage by tenants of Aycliffe 73/4d; coal for burning kiln 6/6d. and its carriage 2/1d; wages for burning 2 kilns with stone giving 68 'celar' of lime 35/7d; carriage 22/8d.; 3 'celar' of lime bought 6/8d. Removing wall and making new 11 rods of wall £4.19. Od.; carting timber out of park 12/7d; carriage to Ketton, carpentry work 76 days 38/-, 9/8d., 12/-, 32/-; 6000 tiles bought from Ketton, carriage 60/-; 4000 tiles bought 22/6d.; tiles from quarry at Haron to Ketton 43/4d; sand and its carriage 34/-; roofing 16 rod 72/-. This account gives a good impression of the work involved in a building's construction. The fullest account of any building is that of Pittington Hall (S.S. 1839, cccxxiii-vi), but as this is exceptional it cannot be used for comparison with the material in the Bursar's Rolls.

Thus a typical manor, if such a thing existed, would have a majority of stone buildings with stone roofs and some lesser ones probably of wood or wattle and daub with thatched roofs. Some idea of from where these materials came, how they were moved, has been given though the documents do not give a complete picture. Some impression of how these materials were assembled has also been given. There appears to be no overall pattern of prices but as much information as the documents yield has been noted. Despite these limitations, and the fact that few firm conclusions can be drawn from such evidence, consideration of these aspects has added to the knowledge of the manors' buildings and their organisation.

## CHAPTER VII

### Location and Condition of Sites

Attention will now be turned from purely documentary information on the buildings to the archaeological evidence and a consideration of the manor sites. Before being able to examine any remains of a site and see if their location affected their development, it was often necessary to locate a formerly unknown site. This process will first be explained.

#### 1. Method of locating sites

The aim was to see if a possible site on the ground could be linked to a medieval documentary reference to the manor, or if a site could be located from the documentary information. The collection of Dean and Chapter documents made it possible to use a fairly standard method.

i) It is necessary to have a map or plan which shows the possible site and gives a tenants name for it. This tenant will then be followed through the documents. Any map, whether tithe, enclosure, or church commission for example, which fulfills this criteria is acceptable. Problems can arise as sometimes the tenants mentioned

in the documents are not mentioned on the maps or there are no maps for the period and area under consideration.

ii) Records of lease renewals are then used to trace the changes in tenant for the holding - if the map was later than 1828 the Receivers Books are used. These run from the establishment of the Dean and Chapter in 1541 to 1870 and record annually the tenant and rent for each holding. The books are arranged in order of the Chapter's estates, running clockwise round the county; along the Tyne, down the coast to the Tees, then up the centre to Durham. In each estate the holdings are always listed in the same order, so changes in tenant can be followed by noting the position on the page, adjoining tenants names and the rent of a holding. Thus the relevant tenement can be traced through successive owners. As leases were usually renewed about every seven years, by consulting every seventh book all the changes will be noted.

Once 1828 has been reached by this method or if the map was earlier than this date the Renewals Books can be used. Instead of being an annual record these are a summary of all the changes in tenants for a holding until the Restoration. The holdings are arranged in the same way as the Receivers Book and the tenants chronologically under each.

From the Restoration it is necessary to return to the Receivers Books which go back to 1541.

If any problems arise for this period the actual leases may be checked:



a) Dean and Chapter Register. This is in 142 volumes and has the text of leases and an index and should be used first. However there are gaps in the early 19th century.

b) Church Commission Counterpart Leases.

The major difficulty is there is no proper index. They can however fill the gaps in the Register.

The transition must then be made to the medieval records. These are arranged according to the obedientiary to whom the property was assigned. So firstly it must be established which obedientiary held the plot being followed. This is possible as the Receivers Book 2 has the initial of the obedientiary at the beginning of each entry. For this study it needed to be the Bursar or it was clear the wrong holding was being traced.

Once it has been established that the Bursar held the land, the Bursar's Rentals may be used to follow the property. The last person named as tenant of the holding in the Receivers Books should appear in the Rentals. These are set out in the same form at the Receivers Books and the holding can be followed in the same way. The 16th century has a good coverage of Rentals but the 15th has so few (1432, 1495 only), it is impossible to trace the holdings, especially as there are large gaps in the 1432 Rental.

From 1495 it is thus necessary to use the Halmote Court Books. There are three books 1528-1492, 1491-1440, 1439-1400, which among other things record all changes

of leases. The first two are indexed by place, the third only by the place-name heading in the margin. It is necessary to look up the relevant place and see if the last named tenant is mentioned transferring the property to a new tenant. The leases state the old and new tenants, an instruction to keep the property in good order, but no useful information on the size or location of the holding. A holding can be traced right through the 15th century in this way filling the gap in the Rentals.

If a lease does not appear in the Halmote Book or Rental it is worth checking the Locelli, some of which contain leases.

From 1400 it is necessary to return to the Rentals. The 14th century is more fully covered, though the rentals of 1395 and 1382-6 are the most useful, they mention which holding was the manor more frequently than the others. Thus it is to be hoped that the tenement being followed links up with one mentioned as the manor in one of the rentals.

If no site on the ground or a map seems to offer a starting point and 'the manor of' is mentioned in the medieval documents it is possible to reverse the procedure until a person is named whose holding can be located.

There are problems with this method and it is rare to get a straightforward connection. The Post-Dissolution Documents are not the main problems as there is an almost complete series and they are in good order; none of the manors being traced were lost at the Dissolution or



Restoration, often difficult periods. Sometimes it is not easy to find a map that both shows a holding and gives the tenants name. The area may not be covered or the Terrier book lost. The medieval documents were more difficult, especially with the gaps in the Bursars' Rentals. Also sometimes it is never stated which holding in the area was the manor.

However, the major problem was not due to the documents themselves but to the method of land management. There was often a complete reorganization of land in the 15th century; the tenants and the demense land were amalgamated then divided equally between the tenants. This obviously destroys the possibility of following the owner of one piece of land. This process can be traced in the Halmote Books, for example Rainton (Halmote Book I, 1409), Westoe (Halmote Book II, p.40) or Ferryhill (Halmote Book III, 129). Thus even if an early rental mentions a manor no connection can be made.

The following is the list of manors whose location was unknown (other sites can be located by grid reference - Appendix I). The starting point of the possible site on the ground is given first then the result of following them through the documents.

Aycliffe 'Monks End':

Followed to Thomas Hurworth in Halmote Book II (136, HBII 50) but he had many holdings and it is impossible to distinguish the relevant one.

Burdon:

No trace on ground. Manor mentioned in 1396 Rental; traced to Halmote Book (HBI, 129) but no further mention.

Dalton:

No trace on ground. Manor mentioned in 1395 Rental; traced to Halmote Book III (HB III,40) when village and manor divided into six. However, throughout the Halmote Book the vicar often held the manor site (HB I,51,109, HB II,133) so it could possibly be the site of the old vicarage, which was demolished in 1964. Redistribution of land prevents tracing.

Eden:

No trace on ground. Wilkinson held manor (HB III, 44), but no further trace.

Ferryhill:

Manor house; Hallgarth Ponds. Site followed through Renewal and Receivers books to Halmote Book III (HB III,129) when village was divided equally between tenants.

Division of land prevents tracing.

Fulwell:

Largest barn on church commission map followed as possible site. Followed to Halmote Book III (HB III,1493). Manor divided by four. Division of land prevents tracing.

Heselden:

Hamlet of Monk Heselden near the church. 'Manor' mentioned in Halmote Book III followed till tenant, Hall, vanishes in 1507. Granted to Henry VIII, tithes and advowson restored. The manor stayed with the crown till James I (V.C.H.46). Heselden Hall to the east was granted by

Elizabeth to Robert Bowes (17.10.1572)(V.C.H.47). Thus the manor was not on the site of the hall and was probably under the present farm near the church.

Heworth:

Heworth Grange. John Russel, leasee on map does not appear in the Renewals Book. Robert Heworth held the manor Halmote Book I (HB I,29) but there is no further mention. Thus there are inexplicable blanks.

Ketton:

No obvious site: could be either Ketton Hall or Newton Ketton. Manor conveyed to Henry VIII (Henry VIII 36). It was regranted in Edward VI reign and passed through various people till the Milbank family acquired it in the 17th century (V.C.H. 330). Although their family papers have been studied no trace of the original manor has been found. (The new mansion is Ketton Hall.)

Merrington:

Hallgarth. Followed to Ralph Willy through renewal and Receivers book but in 1487 it was divided between him and two others (HB II, 1487). Division of land prevents tracing.

Rainton:

Two possible sites: Rainton Grange and Priors Close. Latter given to the 7th Prebendal Stall and unable to be traced. Grange farm traced through Renewals and Receivers Book to Halmote Book I (HB I, 1409) when manor divided into eight, one of whom had owned the Grange. Communally responsibility for upkeep of the barn, hedges, ditches and walls. Division prevents further tracing. Grange farm likely site.


Westoe:

Manor House and Westoe farm. Tenant or map not in Renewal Books. Traced from Bursars Rental of 1395 to Halmote Book II (HB II,40). Manor divided into eight. Division prevents tracing.

Thus in six cases it was the division of land which prevented tracing. However, even where a definite identification is not possible a tentative location for a site has been suggested. It is only in the case of Burdon, Eden, Ketton and Fulwell that this is not possible. The former two are the most inexplicable, at least the process by which Ketton was granted away and Fulwell divided can be seen. It is interesting that both Burdon and Eden have fewest documentary references as well as being difficult to locate. For both these reasons they cannot really be discussed. Thus with differing degrees of certainty most sites can be identified.

## 2. The Location of Sites

Having established the location of the majority of the manors an attempt will be made to see if this affected their development and buildings. Were similarities of location reflected in the manor buildings and their treatment by the Priory? Firstly various factors of location will be considered.



**Figure II**

Table XII

Manors' relation to Settlement

In village: Westoe, Dalton, Aycliffe,  
Merrington, Ferryhill

In hamlet: Heselden, Muggleswick,  
Pittington (may have been  
isolated in medieval period)

Isolated: Bewley, Billingham, Bellasis,  
Aldingrange, Houghall,  
Bearpark, Rainton, Heworth,  
Wardley

Unknown: Eden, Burdon, Ketton, Fulwell

Manors' relation to Churches

Next to Church: Dalton, Heselden,  
Merrington, Muggleswick,\*  
Pittington\*

Isolated from Church: Aycliffe, Aldingrange,  
Bearpark,\* Bewley,\*  
Billingham, Bellasis,  
Ferryhill, Heworth,  
Houghall,\* Rainton, Westoe,\*  
Wardley\*

(\* denotes own chapel)

Table XIII

Manors' relation to landscape

Geology: drift

Boulder Clay: Aldingrange, Bewley, Bellasis,  
Billingham, Fulwell, Ketton,  
Rainton, Westoe


Upper Clay: Wardley, Heworth

Magnesium Limestone: Ferry, Merrington

Glacial Sand: Pittington, Heselden

Alluvium: Aycliffe, Dalton, Houghall

# ALDINGRANGE



# AYCLIFFE







Figure III

BELBIS



BEWLEY



500

0

1/2


yds

miles


Figure IV



# BEARPARK



# MUGGLESWICK



500

yds


0

1/2


miles

Figure V

DALTON



HESELDEN




500  
yds

0


1/2  
miles

Figure VI

# FERRYHILL



# MERRINGTON




500  
yds

0


1/2  
miles

Figure VII

HEWORTH



RAINTON



500

yds


0

1/2


miles

Figure VIII

PITTINGTON



HOUGHALL




500  
yds

0


1/2  
miles

Figure IX

WARDLEY



WESTOE



500  
yds

0

1/2  
miles

Figure X

Height:

0-50': Bewley, Bellasis, Billingham, Westoe,  
Wardley, Houghall

50-100': Aldingrange, Aycliffe, Bearpark,  
Dalton, Fulwell, Heselden, Heworth,  
Ketton, Rainton, Pittington

100-150': Ferryhill

150-200': Merrington

200-300'; Muggleswick

Drainage:<sup>1</sup>

River Plain: Bewley, Bellasis, Billingham,  
Houghall, Heworth, Wardley,  
Westoe

Hillside above Stream: Aldingrange, Aycliffe, Bearpark,  
Dalton, Heselden, Muggleswick,  
Rainton, Pittington

Hill Top: Ferryhill, Merrington

- 1 The manors seemed to divide themselves into 3 categories - those on flat, lowlying land near a major river (Tyne, Tees & Wear). Those on flat land but high away from streams. Both manors in this category had ponds nearby. The remaining manors were all situated slightly above small streams.)

Aspect:

South: Aldingrange, Aycliffe, Dalton,  
Heselden, Heworth

West: Bearpark, Muggleswick, Rainton

Flat: Bewley, Billingham, Bellasis,  
Ferryhill, Merrington, Houghall,  
Wardley, Westoe

This examination seems to have produced very negative results; none of the manors which form the groupings of manors distinguished in building and repairs chapters (above, pp. 42, 81 ) fall into the same categories above, neither do any of the groups of manors in one category above repeat themselves in another. Some manors stay together

such as Ferryhill and Merrington or Bewley, Billingham and Bellasis but this is because they were situated together.

Certain conclusions may be drawn; most manors are situated away from villages and churches. The more important have their own chapel but this does not seem to affect their relation with the church. Geographically most are situated between 50' and 100' near but above a water supply. There is a uniformity in aspect, either flat or facing south and west. Geologically most are not located on very fertile soil but on clay or exposed limestone. Thus for the majority their situation rather than their soil was good. However there seems to be no overall pattern; there are similar types of manor in different groups above and a common type of location is shared by different types of manors. Thus the location of a manor seems to have had no effect on its type or development in the medieval period.

### 3. Condition of Sites

Once they had been located all the sites were visited. Those with upstanding remains or earthworks will be examined in detail in the next chapter. Here their present state will be noted and the factors which have influenced them considered.



Aldingrange



Plate i



Plate ii

Aycliffe



Plate iii



Plate iv

Ferryhill



Plate v



Plate vi



Plate vii

Houghall



Plate viii



Plate ix

Houghall



Plate x



Plate xi



Plate xii



Plate xiii

Merrington



Plate xiv



Plate xv

Pittington



Plate xvi



Plate xvii



Plate xviii





Plate xix: Billingham



Plate xx: Heselden



Plate xxi: Westoe

Table XIV

Manors' Present Condition

Remains:	Bearpark, Wardley, Muggleswick
Farms on site:	Aldingrange, Aycliffe, Ferryhill, Heselden, Houghall, Merrington, Rainton, Pittington, Westoe
Destroyed:	Bewley, Bellasis, Billingham, Dalton, Heworth
Unknown:	Burdon, Eden, Fulwell, Ketton
(Remains includes earthworks and visible masonry.)	

Before considering possible factors which may have influenced these groups some specific points may be made.

Firstly those sites which are destroyed suffered fairly recently, Bewley through housing development in the mid 1960s, Billingham under the chemical works, Bellasis under more recent expansion, Heworth also by houses of the last 20 years; all these appear as farms on recent O.S. maps. Thus total obliteration of sites is a modern phenomenon.

The two most obscure sites, Burdon and Eden (above, p.74) are also worst documented. Perhaps so few repairs were carried out that they decayed and were lost early in the middle ages.

Thirdly those with actual remains are some of the most important manors. Muggleswick was never leased, Bearpark was the largest, most frequently used and last to be leased. Wardley, Pittington and Bewley, all with earthworks, were the other manors where ludi were held.

There are three main factors which could have affected the manor and influence the category into which

they now fall; their medieval type, their location, their treatment for example at the Dissolution or when leased.

Similar location does not seem to be the reason for a similar fate. The manors in each category above do not match those in the categories considering location (above, p.108-9). The medieval types of manors only explain one category. There is a correlation between the most important manors and remains but there is no distinction now between the purely agricultural, the 'agricultural plus' and the intermediate groups of manor. Their later treatment does not seem to have been of importance either. At leasing some were divided between a group of men, for example Dalton or Rainton, but these can appear in the same category as those leased to one man, such as Bewley and Heselden respectively. Manors that were granted away at the Dissolution are now in the same category as those that were returned to the Dean and Chapter for example Hesilden and Pittington; Ketton and Fulwell. Thus no one particular factor seems to have been the cause of the manors present state.

The major conclusion which stands out is that on the majority of sites there are farms, fulfilling the same function as the medieval manors. Of those sites which are now destroyed most were also farms. The sites with remains have farms in close proximity. Thus it appears that it was not location or similar treatment, either in medieval period or later, that accounts for the state of the site today, but the basic function of the manor as a

farm. Although the actual buildings have changed their use has continued through the years and today's buildings fulfil the same function as their medieval predecessors.

CHAPTER VIII

The Layout of the Buildings

This chapter will consider those sites where there are sufficient remains, either as earthworks or upstanding, to attempt a reconstruction of the rooms that existed and to examine how these relate to documentary information. Unfortunately this is only possible on a few sites, due to later building; Muggleswick and Bearpark have upstanding remains, Bewley was investigated before its demolition and Wardley has earthworks. There are three main difficulties. These are all exceptional manors; three are where ludi were held (p.129) and Muggleswick an isolated stock-rearing one, thus it must be remembered these were not typical of the majority. The documents rarely mention the position of the buildings or their relation one to another. When examining remains on the ground it is difficult to know what their function was. However these are the only sites where examination of remains is possible and thus, despite the problems, an attempt will be made to see how the documentary and field evidence combine.

Wardley



Plate xxii



Plate xxiii

Wardley



Plate xxiv



Plate xxv

Wardley



Plate xxvi



Plate xxvii



Wardley

This is the only one of the four manors with just earthworks and the site is not in a good state of preservation. The south east corner has been divided from the rest by railway lines and this part used as waste ground. The other three quarters is in a farmers field who has been dumping on the site, filling in ditches, for many years. Thus some features will have been obscured. The site was surveyed in the last century when it was in better condition (Hodgson 1822, 112-7). His sketch plan shows the overall dimensions of the moat but does not consider any internal features. This outline is visible today (plate xxii) with the bank showing clearly at the north side (plate xxiv). Some internal features can also be distinguished. The northern half of the internal area is raised slightly but though uneven no outline of any building can be traced. On the east side of the southern half there is an outline of a building (plate xxvii) and a raised area to the south of this (plate xxvi). The rest of the southern half can be very waterlogged with a stream on the west side (plate xxiii).

The documents mention a hall, two chambers, chapel and kitchen as domestic building, and a barn, byre, stable and herring house (p.66 ). The most likely suggestion for their arrangement would be a range with the domestic buildings situated on the raised northern part, and the agricultural building down the east side where the outline is sufficiently large to be the barn and byre remains. The remaining buildings and any others possibly

Plate xxviii



Plate xxix

Plate xxx



Plate xxxi



Plate xxxii

Plate xxxiii



not mentioned in the document could be located on the opposite side of the southern part.

Although the outline of individual rooms cannot be seen an overall arrangement of buildings round an open court can be suggested. This could not be verified without excavation but existed elsewhere (p.174) and would seem the most likely arrangement from combining available evidence.

### Bewley



The manor of Bewley was on the site of Low Grange Farm where medieval fabric was incorporated into a dwelling. It was demolished to make way for new development in the mid 1960s. Some investigation, though necessarily limited, was carried out (Still 1963, 391-403). However no aerial photographs exist, the foundations are no longer visible and the development did not reveal any adjoining structures. Thus all that can be used are architectural details and the basic plan.

There are two buildings. Firstly the one that was above ground until the 1960s, which was possibly one large room in medieval times, and secondly another rectangular one whose end was revealed by excavation. This had buttresses and was attached to the first at the north east corner and had its west end destroyed by modern drains. From excavation the buttressed building was the earlier, its foundation underlying the south wall of the standing building. The buttress would indicate a late 12th century

date. It is difficult to say how much later it was built, possibly it was 14th century or even later, as it has few diagnostic features. It cannot be certain that the two were in use simultaneously; the method of attachment would seem unnecessarily complex if the two were to be used together (Fig.XI). It is possible that the buttressed building went out of use when the later building was constructed. However this need not necessarily be so, the arrangement could have provided a defensible entrance to the earlier building.

It is difficult to establish how the two buildings were used, a hall, chapel and two chambers are mentioned in the documents. The function of the earlier buildings cannot definitely be established as its full dimensions are not known, it could have been large enough for a hall and chapel, or just a simple towerlike chamber. The later building could have been constructed as improved accommodation, the larger room being the hall with a chapel off it, and the chambers remaining in the old tower. This would be most likely if the older building was small and contained just a chamber. However it is possible as an alternative that the chapel remained in the buttressed building (as possible at Muggleswick, p.120) and the hall and Priors chamber expanded to the new building. Without knowing dimensions of this older building this must remain speculative. There are similarities with Muggleswick in the buttresses, corner join and lack of diagnostic features in the later building, but as the arrangements there are also uncertain this does not help at Bewley.



# MUGGLESWICK



/// above ground

(after Knowes)

# BEWLEY



(after Still)

Figure XI

Thus the buildings are relatively simple with an unusual joining. However due to the lack of full dimensions it is almost impossible to tie documentary references to buildings on the ground and thus few definite conclusions can be drawn.

### Muggleswick

This is the most isolated manor and has the most upstanding remains. These consist of a substantial east gable of one building with large buttresses and the smaller west gable of a building to the south of the first joined to it at the north east corner (Fig. XI). When Knowles investigated the site more of the western building remained, its south wall is no longer visible, and he dug to expose foundations now under sheds and debris. Thus he seemed to have revealed the full extent of the major range of buildings (Knowles 1895).

The buttresses would suggest the eastern building to be of 12th century date. This would fit with the evidence of William, a monk when the Convent of 1229 was being drawn up.<sup>1</sup> He stated that in the time of Hugh de Puiset a domum magnam was built out of the bishop's forest without his permission (Knowles 1895, 4-5). Knowles takes this to mean it was made of wood but this is not necessarily so; they could have taken stone from the jurisdictional

1 In the 12th and 13th centuries there were frequent disputes between the bishop and the Prior and convent concerning their rights to property. In 1229 an agreement was reached between the two parties, after the taking of evidence, called Le convent.

Muggleswick

Plate xxxiv



Plate xxxv






Plate xxxvi



Plate xxxvii


MUGGLESWICK

East Gable



DATUM

West Gable



JFP:JF

Figure XII

area of the forest. Unfortunately exactly what was built is not known; William states he only saw the camera built not the whole domus. This 12th century date is also suggested by the round window in the east gable, now partly blocked. The tracery is a later insertion c.1300-30 (Eric Cambridge, pers. comm.) and the corbels may also be a later addition, possibly the result of the 'repairs' at the turn of the 14th century (B.A.R. 1395, £5.10. 2; 1412 £9.16. 1).

The dating of the other buildings is more difficult. Drawings of this and the east gable were done (Fig. XII) but showed no significant difference that could indicate differing dates. There are insufficient remains of this building to show any features to date it. It is likely to be later; there is nothing to suggest it is as early as the 12th century, it is an odd way of joining the two buildings together if they are contemporary (Fig. XI). However from the Bursar's Rolls there seems to be no major new building in the 14th century. Thus as it is later than the 12th century but earlier than the 14th, it could be the camera that Hugh of Darlington built in the mid 13th (S.S. 1839, 46-7). This of course cannot be proved, but as he is noted as building at Muggleswick it is the most likely date for the building.

Again it is difficult to be certain of how the rooms were used and the following is only one suggestion. The buttressed building is 3-storied and if it existed on its own there would have been a chamber with a chapel in the room with the east window. Then it was decided to expand the accommodation; Muggleswick was visited at intervals by the Prior (p. 131) and the western building constructed.




Figure XIII



Plate 1




Plate 2




Plate 3




Plate 4



The larger room in it providing a hall and the west end an additional chamber. The chapel would need to remain in an east facing room and would have stayed in the older building with a chamber under it.

Although it can never be proved how the Prior used these buildings this would seem the most logical way.

### Bearpark

This was the most important and elaborate of the Priory's manors visited frequently by Prior and monks (p.131). Here both earthwork and upstanding walls remain but it is still difficult to establish exactly where the rooms were. There are four main types of evidence to be used; the list of rooms that can be compiled from the Bursars' rolls (p.18-9) and an inventory of 1684;<sup>2</sup> drawings of the site by Grimm in the 18th century (plates 1-5), architectural detail on upstanding masonry and the plan of the site.

The drawings (Plates 1-5) confirm the basic layout of rooms 1-6 on the plan (Fig.XIII) and show the chapel to lead off room 4 at x (Plates 1-5). They also show some important architectural detail, especially of the windows of rooms 4 and 6 (Plate 3). This, together with the Bursars' Rolls and inventory list of rooms, suggest that

2 The inventory was part of the Inquisition of Dean Granville and is quoted by Hutchinson. It lists the following rooms at Bearpark: Hall, 2 passages near the hall, one large kitchen with oven, a back room adjoining the west end of the kitchen, dining room, a great room leading to the chapel called the dormitory, arches with 2 rooms above the arches, chapel and room under it, 2 or 3 rooms called the Prior's chamber, stairs, vaults under all and every of the lower floor or rooms except the hall, kitchen and room adjoining the kitchen, sundry outhouses; ruins only and courts.

Bearpark



Plate xxxviii



Plate xxxix

Bearpark

Plate xxxx



Plate xxxxi

the traditional attribution of room 4 as the 14th century hall should be questioned. The range of building 1-4 and the chapel are 13th century. This can be established from architectural details such as the doorway into room 1, the moulding on the first floor doorway between rooms 3 and 4 and the drawings of the chapel window (Plate 5 Eric Cambridge, pers. comm.). It is likely that at this date room 4 was the hall with Prior's lodging to the west and chapel to the east. This arrangement can be paralleled at Finchale, where there were Prior's lodgings of similar standard. However at the beginning of the 14th century things change. There was much work on the 'hall' (B.A.R. 1338 £16. 0. 7; 1339 £2.16. 3). With this amount of alteration it would seem unlikely the 13th century appearance of room 4 would have survived. However the window tracery of room 6, as shown in the drawing (Plate could be of this date. £16 plus is a substantial amount of money and could have paid for the construction of room 6 at this date, for use as the hall.

The Bursars' Rolls mention a camera conventus, probably a room used by monks when visiting for ludi and this would be the most likely function for room 4 in the 14th century. This suggestion is supported by the 1684 inventory which mentions a great room, leading to the chapel called the dormitory (Hutchinson 1787, 336). This must refer to room 4 as it is the only one leading to the chapel. Although dormitory is obviously the wrong term as it is not in a monastery, it conveys the idea of a room used by all the

Bearpark



Plate xxxxii



Plate xxxxiii

monks, the equivalent of camera conventus. The inventory also states that all rooms have vaults under them apart from hall, kitchen and room behind the kitchen. This is not totally true as the drawings do not show the chapel with them (Plate 5). However it is clear from this that the hall is separate from the main south range where vaults can be seen today (for example room 3), and located nearer the kitchen range (7-9 fig.XIII). Thus in the 14th century room 6 was most likely to be used as the hall and room 4 as the camera conventus.

Rooms 1 and 3 with their adjuncts are most likely to be the Priors' chamber. These were most probably on the top floor, as they are mentioned being roofed (B.A.R. 1335) and the room on this level is shown in the drawings with an oriel window (Plate 4). The Priors' apartments were the most likely place for this elaboration and both the windows and passage 2 are paralleled in the Priors' lodgings at Finchale. Also it states there were 2 or 3 rooms in the Priors' chamber and it is difficult to establish how many small rooms existed to the north of rooms 1 and 3. Room 3 has various descriptions; it could be the room referred to in the inventory as the room above the arches, or the chamber over the celars in the Manorial Rolls (M.A.R. 1347). As the Priors' lodgings were above ground level they could have extended across the passage, and rooms 1 and 3 could be the camera exterior and interior referred to in the 1446 inventory (S.S. 1871, 190-191). The room under the Priors' lodging could have been other

Bearpark



Plate xxxxiv



Plate xxxxv

chambers such as the sergeants. Thus the Prior's chambers probably consisted of rooms 1 and 3, over passage 2, with smaller rooms off to the north.

Moving to the other end of east range, the buildings indicated here on the plan fit well with those mentioned in the documents. The inventory of 1684 refers to two passages near the hall and the Bursar's Rolls to the entry between the kitchen and hall (B.A.R. 1466), probably meaning the screens passage, shown by 7 on the plan. This leads to room 8 the kitchen and 9 which would correspond to a back room adjoining the west end of the kitchen. This plan fits the order of rooms mentioned in the inventory while no other buildings on the site would do. This also helps confirm room 6 as the hall, as the kitchen would lead off the hall and this would not be possible on room 4. Thus this range, 7-9, would seem to be the service area.

This leaves room 5 which appears on the ground and in the drawings as small and square with no distinguishing features to suggest its function. The only room from the 1684 inventory unaccounted for is the dining room, which is one possibility, leading off the camera conventus. Alternatively it could be the sergeants' chamber mentioned in the Bursar's Rolls (B.A.R. 1478, 1519, 1533). However no definite use can be assigned to this room.

Area 10 (fig.XIId) might be a yard rather than a room. It is very large; there are no rooms mentioned in the Bursar's Rolls that would fit it, also no building in this position appears on the drawings (Plate 1) and if



Bearpark



Plate xxxxvi



Plate xxxxvii

it was the major room its size suggests Grimm would hardly have ignored it. The buildings near this, 11 and 12, are indistinct and could be less substantial buildings such as stables and the sundry ruined outhouses of the inventory.

The farm buildings, barns and byres would most likely be on the site of the present farm away from the domestic buildings and it is thus impossible to trace them. It is also impossible to locate the gatehouse drawn by Grimm. It could be at an entrance on top of the hill near the farm, or on an approach from the river at the base of the hill.

This postulated arrangement of rooms cannot of course be proved but does not result in any inconsistency in the different forms of evidence. All major rooms are accounted for and their layout fits the architectural details shown on the remains and drawings. Thus, although not claimed to be definitive, it seems the most likely arrangement, accounting for all the evidence.

Thus these four sites have few common characteristics. At Wardley the arrangement of individual rooms cannot be seen but a possible overall layout of ranges round a court can be suggested. At Bearpark, the most elaborate and complex manor, most of the rooms can be tentatively identified, but it cannot really be compared with other manors as it is so much more elaborate. Bewley has some similarities to Muggleswick but its full extent is not known and their layout is different. At Muggleswick some identification of rooms may be suggested but despite the

quantity of remains this is still tentative. Thus the only conclusions that can be drawn are that in 3 of the 4 cases the buildings are still fairly simple and on all the sites the layout varies; it is impossible to predict how the buildings will be arranged. The same conclusions emerge when other manors elsewhere are considered (p.171).

Most important, as shown by Bearpark, it is only when all forms of evidence are fully considered is it possible to establish the layout and function of buildings.

CHAPTER IX

The Usage of the Buildings

The way in which the Priory used its manors would have been one of the most important factors affecting the buildings on it, and thus this must be considered. Both building accounts and other documents (stock accounts, Halmote Rolls) show that the Priory's use of the manors varied between sites. At some manors there was a definite specialization, at others additional activities to a primarily agricultural function. An attempt will be made to see both from the documents and the sites, how far such different uses are evident and how these affected the buildings. As well as establishing the uses of the site, it is also an investigation into how well these sources show the uses and how the documents and fieldwork compare.

The buildings must always be seen as working units - this was their importance to the Priory. If they are viewed in isolation, just as pieces of architecture without considering their function, much of their interest and their importance is lost.

All the manors were used as farms, though of what type and how important this was in relation to their other activities varied. There was some specialization in the

type of farming, the most obvious being the stock farms of Muggleswick and Le Holme (Stock Accounts: Lomas 1973, 114). Other manors also kept <sup>animals</sup> as part of mixed farming (M.A.R. dorse), but at these two stock keeping predominated and the Priory's herds were concentrated here. Unfortunately Le Holme is never mentioned in the Bursar's Rolls neither has it any manorial accounts. It is only mentioned in the stock keeper accounts and the entries are very uninformative, referring only to doors and walls of unnamed buildings, or the sheeppen (Stock Accounts 1349, 1350; 1338, 1351). As for Muggleswick, the buildings as known from the documents are no different to those on any other farms, and there are no more stock buildings (cattle sheds for example) than on other manors. Neither is there anything on the site which would suggest the manor was predominantly a stock keeping one. Though there are more remains at Muggleswick than most other sites these are mainly the domestic accommodation, - the farm buildings are probably under the present day farm. Thus neither from the building accounts or from the site is there any indication of the specialization at Le Holme and Muggleswick.

Another agricultural specialization is the use of certain manors as parks, supplying timber and stone, the major ones were Aycliffe, Rainton and Muggleswick and to a lesser extent Bearpark (above, pp. 88-9). This use is reflected in the documents by references to timber and stone from the manor and upkeep of the gates, fences, ditches of the parks (above, p.45). There is nothing that

distinguishes this use on the ground. Aycliffe and Rainton, the two manors whose primary function was as parks, lack any agricultural building apart from one barn each, but as for many manors there is no trace of the buildings on the ground, this is not distinctive. Thus the indication of this use comes from the documents not the site.

The other manors were agriculturally not specialized and this is reflected in the basic similarity of the building on the majority. From the dorse of the manorial accounts it can be seen that they grew the same variety of grain; wheat, barley, oats, sometimes malt, peas and beans and Houghall and Ketton also grew Rye. They all kept animals; draught animals, cattle, pigs, hens, geese, and ducks, occasionally horses (for example at Ketton (M.A.R. 1331) and Merrington (M.A.R.1376)). Sheep are not usually mentioned. Thus each manor would be fairly self sufficient. Exchanges of stock and grain between manors could take place (Halcrow 1949, 8), but this was the result of necessity rather than interchange between specialized units. Thus the same buildings would be necessary on most manors, the only difference being that some manors had more of each building type. The standard requirement would be barn, granary and cattleshed, though one of the barns could be used as the granary without this being stated as a separate term. Apart from those manors with very few entries (Burdon, Eden, Aldingrange) only Heselden has no cattleshed. Unfortunately few of the ordinary agricultural manors survive on the ground

(above, p.111) so these buildings cannot be traced.

A common factor with all these uses - stock farms, parks, and ordinary agricultural manors, is that their use can be seen from the documents but not on the ground. These ways in which the Priory used a manor does not show in the building remains.

One use of certain manors, which is clearly reflected in the documents and also can be seen at the sites themselves, is the holding of ludi.<sup>1</sup> The manors usually visited were Bearpark, Pittington, to a lesser extent Bewley and Wardley and once Ketton (B.A.R. 1300-1370. Expense Prioris pro maneria). The favour these enjoyed depended partly on the Prior's whim but Bearpark was by far the most frequently used. The preference these manors enjoyed is reflected in the buildings; they have more domestic accommodation - 4/6 chambers, hall and chapel at Bearpark, 4/7 chambers and hall at Pittington, 3 chambers, hall and chapel at Ketton for example. They also received more attention for repairs especially in the 15th century (above, p.73). The sites can also reflect this importance; there are extensive remains at Bearpark, earthworks at Wardley, record of the medieval work at Bewley recently

1 These were periods of relaxation when the Prior and some of the monks retired to a manor for two or more weeks. They were held at Easter, All Saints, the Purification and the feast of St. John the Baptist. Contact was less formal between monks and officials, strict rules of eating were relaxed and entertainment provided (Dobson 1973, 97-8)

destroyed (above, p.124). Pittington unfortunately has only fragmentary earthworks. The site of Ketton is unknown. Thus the majority of sites with actual remains today were those where ludi were held. There were, however, differences between the manors and how they were used by the Priory. At Bearpark, although there was a farm, this was apart from the domestic accommodation. However Pittington was a centre for the Halmote Court, a lime-burning centre and a large farm, which does not seem to have been separate from the domestic accommodation. Therefore it can be suggested that at Pittington the Prior was still amongst administrative business and activities, while at Bearpark he was free from these pressures. Wardley and Bewley were used less frequently for ludi than the other two. Wardley had domestic accommodation in the 13th century (S.S. 1839, 46-7) but did not receive the increased amount of repairs the others did in the 15th century. Bewley was not used very often for ludi but was popular with the later Priors as a visiting place (below, p.131). Thus although all four were used for ludi, the way in which they were treated varied. The documents show they were important with more domestic building and usually more repairs. In the field they are the only manors, apart from Muggleswick, with surviving remains. Thus both sources show the manors use and importance.

The Prior did not visit his manors just for ludi but also, especially in the 14th century, travelled round visiting most manors during the year and staying at the



most important. By 1405 this was limited to Bearpark, Pittington, Bewley, Westoe and Ketton (Dobson 1973, 94) which are those suggested, by the buildings mentioned and repairs, to be the most important (above, p.76-8). By 1416 only Bearpark and Pittington were unleased and the Prior did not continue to visit as in the previous century (Dobson 1973, 94). The Priors' visits for the 14th century can be reconstructed from the section Expenses Prioris pro maneria in the Bursars' Account Rolls but caution must be used, especially with the number of days spent at a manor. There are often omissions and thus the number stated is very much a minimum, but the differences between the manors are large enough to compare them with each other and clearly show which were used most frequently. The documents give this information from 1300-1370, after this they rarely refer to anything apart from visits or ludi to Bearpark or Pittington. The table shows the total number of visits to each manor mentioned during this period and the minimum number of days spent there.

Table XV

Priors' Visits to Manors

<u>Manor</u>	<u>No. of visits</u>	<u>No. of days</u>
Bearpark	151	940
Pittington	111	649
Bewley	46	113
Wardley	39	159
Ketton	41	104
Muggleswick	26	45
Westoe	19	30
Merrington	19	9
Dalton	12	24
Ferryhill	6	29

The number of visits and days spent are usually spread fairly evenly over the years but with Bewley and Wardley there appeared to be a change around the middle of the century, so the figures for these manors are divided here.

	<u>Wardley</u>	<u>Bewley</u>
1300-50:		
No. of visits	34	30
No. of days	152	97
1350-70:		
No. of visits	5	16
No. of days	7	16

Thus although there is obviously less time spent at both in the second category, the decrease for Wardley is much more dramatic and very little time was spent there in the second half of the century. At Bewley, after a concentration in the first decade of the century, there were very few visits in the first half century (B.A.R. 1300-1370. Expenses prioris pro maneria). It seems possible that these were alternative centres away from Durham, Wardley was used in the early part of the century and Bewley favoured later. Muggleswick was visited spasmodically throughout, Pittington and Bearpark regularly and frequently. Dalton was visited only at two periods, 1310-15 and 1340-45. Merrington was visited regularly in the first half of the century, apart from 1330-40 when Fery had its main period of visits; this was obviously an alternative to Merrington. Merrington visits after 1350 were much less frequent. Ketton was visited throughout, though slightly less often in the

second half of the century, whereas Westoe was rarely visited in the first half but there was a definite increase in the second. It may be possible that these two were alternatives like Ferry and Merrington (B.A.R. 1300-1370. Expenses prioris pro maneria).

Thus the Prior's visits to his manors show the same hierarchy of manors as suggested by type of buildings and repairs. None of the ordinary agricultural ones were visited. Dalton and Fery were 'agricultural plus' (presumably Houghall was not on the itinerary as it was so close to Durham and Pittington). Muggleswick was again one on its own. Bearpark and Pittington were far above all the others, followed by the other two ludi manors. Between these infrequency of visits as with the repairs, were Ketton then Westoe and Merrington, the latter two visited less frequently than Ketton. It is difficult to say if these were visited because their accommodation was good, or if they were set in good repair in order to be visited. However, this use confirms the conclusions reached earlier from the buildings and repairs (above, p.76-8), but is basically seen from the documentary sources rather than from the remains on the site.

Another specialized way of using some of the manors was the holding of the Halmote Court. This was the Prior's court used to settle disputes between tenants, record land transactions and enforce agricultural arrangements. It was held tri-annually in different centres. It is difficult to see which manors were used, as the place is

not always included in the heading, and there are large gaps for the first half of the 14th and 15th centuries.

Table XVI

Locations of Halmote Court

<u>1300-50</u>	<u>1350-1400</u>	<u>1400-50</u>	<u>1450-1500</u>	<u>1500-30</u>
Pittington	(7)Pittington	Bewley	(33)Bewley	(28)Bewley
Ferryhill	(5)Merrington		(6) Pittington	(12)Jarrow
Hesilden	(4)Ferryhill		(4) Merrington	(5) Pittington
	(4)Billingham		(2) Ferryhill	Merrington
	(3)Hesilden		(2) Jarrow	Bellasis
	(2)Aycliffe			
	Rainton			

(Amount in brackets show number of times held)

There are some unexpected places, Rainton, Aycliffe, Bellasis, which do not have much domestic accommodation, but the court was only held here once and was probably due to unusual circumstances. Others appear regularly; Pittington, Ferryhill and Merrington which run right through the period. There is a courthouse mentioned at Merrington (B.A.R. 1531, 1532) but this only appears at a late date when Merrington was of little importance compared to Bewley or Jarrow. However, the manors use does seem to have affected the buildings in this one place. Apart from those which appear throughout the period there were obvious changes in policy with the rise of Jarrow and Bewley in the 15th and 16th centuries: Bewley being used 33 times between 1450-1500, after appearing once before and Jarrow 12 times 1500-30, after being used twice

between 1450-1500. However, the reason for this sudden development at this time is never stated. By 1500 there is a more logical spread of manors used for the court; Jarrow for the north, Bewley for the south and Pittington and Merrington evenly spaced on either side of Durham, than in 1300 when they were all south of Durham and close together. They also all had suitable accommodation, apart from the one occurrence of Bellasis, obviously unusual. However, overall there seems no logical pattern for where the court was held. Apart from the courthouse at Merrington this use is not reflected in the buildings on the manors.

Sometimes the buildings on a manor can suggest a use or specialization not otherwise known. The Bakehouse at Ferryhill is mentioned more frequently than others elsewhere (above, p.55). This might be because Ferry acted as a baking centre for other places, but it could also be just that the village bakehouse happened to be within the manorial curia here. A smithy is only mentioned at Pittington and Hesilden (above, p. 57); one would expect more smithies than these even if activities were concentrated on these manors. Again a more likely explanation than specialized use is that these were the only places where it was within the curia not in the village. Merrington is the only place with a guest house. This is rather strange as it is relatively close to Durham where better accommodation would be available; if the Priory was going to build a guest house one would expect it to be

further away, there seems no reason for building it at Merrington. However, this use affected the building. Limekilns are only mentioned at certain manors; Ketton, Westoe and Bewley once each (B.A.R. 1357, 1390, 1352), Aycliffe in 1357, 1380, 1389, 1422, and Pittington numerous times (above, p. 65). The last two seem to be the major centres, with Pittington in a class of its own, with the others as area centres to supplement these as they are well spread in the county. Unfortunately it is not stated if the lime is to be used on the fields or for building. Malt kilns were situated at Ferry (B.A.R. 1337 & 8), Billingham (B.A.R. 1342, 1349, 1350), Merrington (S.S. 1839, cxlii) and Pittington. Billingham and Merrington also had malthouses (B.A.R. 1334, 1531). There seems no logic behind the positioning of these kilns; why put them at Ferry and Merrington which are close then have none north of Pittington? The use of certain manors for the production of lime and malt can be seen from the documents mentioning the kilns but no trace of them has been found on the ground. Thus some of these seeming specialized uses may be only due to the documents, for example the smithy and bakehouse, others seem to have no obvious explanation (though the Priory may have had their reasons which are now obscure) for example the guesthouse. Only the use of certain manors for lime production seems to have been organized logically. All these uses can be seen from the documents but cannot be traced on the sites.

When the two sources, the documents and the sites,

which show how the manors were used are compared it is clear that in this case the documents are much more useful. The building accounts both show uses that were previously known and add new ones while very few uses can be seen on site.

Table XVII

Summary of Uses

	<u>Documents</u>	<u>Site</u>
Stock	x	
Park	x	
Agricultural	x	
Ludi	x	x
Prior's Visits	x	
Halmote	x	
Kilns	x	
Other:		
Bakehouse	x	
Smithy	x	
Guesthouse	x	

How far are the ways the Priory used the manors reflected in the buildings and were the buildings erected for a specific use, or were manors used for specialized activities because of suitable buildings? Sometimes the buildings on a manor did reflect a special purpose for example the more elaborate ludi Manors, or negatively, the lack of buildings on the manors used as parks. However at other times a specialized use is not reflected in the buildings, for example holding Halmote Court in places like Aycliffe or Heselden without suitable buildings, or the predominance of stock at Muggleswick without any variation in the buildings. Even when a use is shown by buildings there is sometimes

no reason for the specific manors being used, for example with guesthouse or malkilns. As the state of the manors when acquired by the Priory is not known it cannot be seen how far they fitted a use to existing buildings. However there seem few buildings on a manor with a specialized function and it is likely they gradually adapted and developed the necessary facilities (for example the ludi manors grew gradually rather than being suddenly designated as such). There was no uniformity in manors used for similar activities.

Thus a use or function cannot indicate the buildings of a manor, nor can the buildings themselves show exactly the use or status of the manor.



CHAPTER X

Building Policy and Decisions

The aspects of the buildings considered so far: new building, repairs, construction techniques, layout and usage, all show that the manors can vary greatly yet also have some overall system of organization. It is then necessary to consider how and by whom the treatment of the buildings is decided upon. This cannot be answered directly from the documents, they never say why a barn was rebuilt or who ordered a series of repairs, but these are questions relevant to a study of the buildings and as such ought to be considered. Even if definite answers are not possible on such a speculative matter, different factors can be discussed and an attempt made to evaluate their relative importance.

There are a number of possible suggestions for how and by whom decisions on the manors were made. No single one is necessarily the complete answer, the influence of a number may operate at any one time, and there may be others whose effect cannot be seen.

1. Circumstances of the original grant  
to the Priory
2. Local conditions

3. Tenants' Policies
4. Chance happenings
5. Central control

The influence of each will be considered, then an attempt made to see which was most important in affecting the manorial buildings.

1. Effect of the original grant:

As stated in Chapter II there are three main periods for the acquisition of the manors, those part of the ancient estate, those given circa the conquest and those acquired by grant or exchange later (above, p. 9). If these are compared however there does not seem to be any one type of manor in any one group, there are agricultural and important areas in each group:

Pre-conquest: Merrington, Ferry, Pittington,  
Dalton, Aycliffe, Heselden,  
Rainton

Circa Conquest: Fulwell, Billingham, Bewley

Later: Houghall, Bearpark, Eden,  
Burdon, Ketton, Bellasis,  
Muggleswick

Thus any one type of grant does not lead to a type of manor.

However, the state of each manor when it was given to the Priory is not known and thus the state of the buildings could have exercised a strong influence; if it was large and prosperous manor it might have developed into an important one under the Priory. This process cannot be

seen. However, most of the manors would have needed extensive repairs sometime during the 300-400 years it was held by the Priory which would have allowed opportunity for change, letting some decay and others develop. Extensive building can be seen in the documents, for example the 'rebuilding' of Ketton and Bearpark (S.S. 1839, cxliii). This makes it unlikely the Priory was being ruled by what was there previously. The manors which became important had more building earlier in the period, under Hugh of Darlington for example, as at Ketton, Westoe and Wardley (S.S. 1839, 46-7) or Bearpark by Prior Bertram, but the agricultural ones did not. This would suggest the manors were originally much the same and after the Priory took over some of the formerly agricultural ones were expanded. Thus it seems unlikely that the original building on a manor dictated its status.

## 2. Local conditions:

These would have some effect on the way a manor was used and thus its buildings. Obviously some soils or situations were more suited to certain activities than others. However this could not be the full reason for differences. Wardley had a herring house as it was near the coast - but Westoe, also near the coast, did not. The park had to have timber supplies, but other areas were also well wooded but not used in this way, for example Eden. Billingham was prosperous agriculturally but did not expand to have domestic accommodation as

did Bewley, situated nearby on similar ground. At the other end of the county the situation of Wardley is no better than that of Heworth, yet the former developed while the latter remained agricultural. Thus a manor's situation could lead to it being used in a certain way (e.g. as a park), but does not explain why some manors developed while those in a similar situation did not.

### 3. Effect of Tenant:

It is possible that the plans and ideas of a tenant of a manor could affect the treatment of the buildings. This is difficult to trace. Some manors were leased very early e.g. Burdon 1270, Aycliffe 1290 (Lomas 1973, 336), and even later leases are very vague about the tenants rights and scope to alter buildings. In the 15th century inventories it is clearly stated when repairs are the responsibility of the tenant, only three out of the Bursar's manor in 1446 (S.S. 1839, ccxci, ccxciii, ccxcvii), but what scope this gives them is not clear. However as it was the Priory which dictated the terms of the lease they could presumably keep control of what the tenant could do, they would want the buildings kept in repair but it is doubtful they would allow a tenant to totally change the manor. Thus while leased, the type of manor would remain substantially unchanged.

### 4. Chance happenings:

There is certainly an element of chance in the development of the manor. Why Bewley and Pittington become important rather than Billingham or Houghall, for

example, could have been due to a prior's whim. Also, there seems no clear reason for some specialized use, for example, the guest house at Merrington or maltkiln at Ferry. However, it was not chance in that there was no control at all, but there seems no overall plan and these structures could as easily be elsewhere. It could not be chance that Bearpark became elaborate and important but it seems a piecemeal growth not following a predefined plan.

5. Central control:

The reasons mentioned above to suggest why the buildings on the manors differ do not fully explain why some manors became more important than others. Those reasons played some part but there must have been some central control which allowed variations but organized the overall system.

It is then a matter of considering how this central control was exercised, if it was by the Prior, Bursar or Convent as a whole and if there was one major decision on the type of manor, or if it was a gradual development. There is no evidence for a preconceived idea of the buildings that ought to exist on a certain type of manor, the buildings on manors of the same type could be varied, and as long as the manor fulfilled its function this was sufficient. However, a decision must have been made on how many chambers or barns were to be built on a site. Once these buildings had been erected it was sound policy to maintain these rather than build up further

manors instead. Thus once a hierarchy had been established, little effort seems to have been made to change it and Fulwell, Heselden and Bellasis, for example, had little chance of developing from agricultural manors.

However, the question remains of by whom and how this original decision was made. It would have little to do with the manorial officials whose money was limited by the Bursar. The Bursar authorized building as he was providing the money, but it is obvious he need not be the only source; for example, in his rolls there is part payment for a barn at Wardley 26/8d. of 66/8d. (B.A.R. 1370) and the rest does not appear in his rolls. Buildings appear in the list of John Fossor to be built on Bursar's manors, but no money is recorded in the Bursar's Rolls and at the beginning of the account of the building of Pittington Hall in 1450 the Bursar receives money from the sub-prior, hosteller and terrar (S.S. 1839, cccxxiii). Thus the building would need wider sanction. The Prior seems to have had some influence as shown by the increased activities at the beginning of Fossor's Priorate and during Wessington's (above, p. 73). However at these periods the work would be mainly replacing existing buildings. The original decision of how to develop the manors does not seem to have been made at the same time for all the manors. Some were being developed by Darlington in the mid 13th century, for example Ketton and Wardley (S.S. 1839, 46-7), others such as Merrington not until the 16th century (B.A.R. 1531-2, above, p. 61).

Although the method of initially deciding on how a manor should be developed is obscure one possible explanation may be suggested. This is no more than a hypothesis as no documents reveal such matters, but it is an attempt to explain why the manors are as they are. The development of the manor could have grown from the system of the Priors' visits. Certain manors were favoured either through convenience of situation or simply the Prior's likes. These were visited more frequently and thus developed buildings suitable. As the Priors later realized the advantages of such accommodation they made sure it was maintained, and developed a sufficient number of manors with such accommodation, leaving others at a basic agricultural level. Thus it was unlikely there was one major central decision to increase accommodation on certain manors, but the Prior and central authorities closely controlled and directed the development of the more important manors to their own advantage.

Thus different reasons played a part in the development of the manor; agricultural specialization partly through local circumstances, some specialized buildings appearing for no apparent reason, the development of a type of hierarchy of manors with better buildings, possibly in response to the practical needs of the Priors' perambulations, centrally controlled. The result was not a rigid system of almost identical buildings on certain types of manor, but a varied collection of buildings enabling a function to be fulfilled, and which allows the manors to be divided into the broad categories mentioned above.

## CHAPTER XI

### Influence of the Manorial Building

After considering the building, repairs, arrangement and use of the buildings, the scope of the study will be widened to consider the manors in their context, to see how they affected the monastery and their local community and how their buildings compare with those of other estates. They must be seen not just as a series of unconnected buildings, but as part of a working system.

#### The manors effect on the Monastery

There are two complementary aspects of how the monastery was affected by the manors; what the manors contributed to the monastic life and how far they were a drain on its resources.

The most obvious contribution of the manors was their provision of food and, later, the profit from selling the grain and their rents. In the 13th and early 14th centuries the Priors and their retinue travelled extensively, spending some time at most of their manors (Dobson 1973, 93) using some of the food produced on each, and thus saving transport costs. In the later 14th and 15th centuries instead of using the grain directly the Priory sold it and used the money to provide for their needs



(Lomas 1973, 113). Although the manor may also have been used for other things such as the provision of building materials and the holding of courts (above, p.134), this production of grain was their primary function. This is emphasised by the fact that a barn is mentioned on all manors, even if no other buildings are.

In the 15th century the Prior's visits were curtailed to those manors used for relaxation (principally Bearpark and Pittington), as the majority of manors were leased. The income from these leases was vital to the monks; 18% of their income was from manorial leases. This was their second largest single source of income; 58% came from tenements and messuages but only 8% from mills and 4% from labour services. The Priory thus did not have direct control over the buildings but, on some leased manors, buildings were reserved for them. For example at Westoe the chambers were divided between that for the farmer and that for the Bursar, Terrar and Sergeant (S.S. 1839, ccxcii).

Although grain was predominant the manors were mixed farms providing peas, beans and keeping stock, both in large quantities at Muggleswick and to a lesser extent on all manors. Herring was provided by Wardley (B.A.R. 1298). Thus the manors were vital to the monastery's ability to feed itself.

However, food was not the only commodity the manor provided. Some of the manors supplied building materials, either for the monastery itself or for the maintenance of

other manors. Timber came from Muggleswick, Aycliffe and Rainton, stone from Bearpark and Muggleswick (above, p. 89 ). The monastery had to supplement this by buying some goods for example lead from Ripon (B.A.R. 1359) or boards from 'Estland' - Scandinavia (B.A.R. 1337), but the production of basic material on their own manors must have saved money and transport.


The manors also contributed to monastic life by their provision of accommodation. This could be for business, the holding of the Halmote Court or the inspection of the manor by Bursar or Terrar, or it could be social, the private meeting of Prior with Bishop (Dobson 1973, 94) or the holding of ludi. The manors' location, scattered through the country, meant there was always some accommodation available in the necessary place. For the monks themselves the prospect of a stay away from Durham must have been inviting, offering a change of scene, the absence from irritating characters and a relaxation of discipline. The ludi and other less formal visits must have been vital escapes from the confines of the cloister and it was the manors, especially those with more elaborate buildings, which made this possible.

Thus although the major and vital contribution of the manor was to the material support of the monks and to the monastic economy, they also played a part in the spiritual welfare of the monks. Without these manors the monastery would have been very much the poorer.

On the other hand the manors were a drain on the resources of the monastery. Financially it is very

difficult to establish the extent of this. Ideally one should compare the total spent on building and repairs of the manor with the total income and expenditure but there are difficulties on both sides of this comparison. Firstly it is impossible to calculate exactly the amount spent on the manors in any one year. In the Reparacione Domorum section there are items of expenditure, such as men's wages, quantities of material, work done, which may refer to the manors, but cannot be proved to do so. If these were omitted the total would be an underestimate, but it is equally unlikely they all refer to manors; some were for churches, tenements or the monastery itself and to include them would make the total too large. Thus an estimate of the manors upkeep could be wildly inaccurate. The situation with the Bursar's income and expenditure is no easier; the system of accounting makes the production of an accurate total almost impossible. Arrears which are never received are added in as income, there are totally unrecorded cross-payments from other obedientiaries and thus even after complex calculations any total produced could not be relied on (Lomas: comment). Also money could be given for a specific building from other obedientiaries without this appearing in the Account Rolls, as can be seen in the Pittington Hall Account (S.S. 1839, cccxxiii). However, instead of annual totals, the trends of income, worked out by Lomas, offer some possibility of establishing how the manors affected the monastery's resources (Lomas 1973, 285-86). Six main

# MANORS UNDERGOING BUILDING and REPAIRS



periods are distinguished and these can be compared with the periods of building and repairs:

1. Large and rising income: 1290 onwards, ending in the north with Bannockburn and elsewhere c.1330.
2. Period of collapse immediately after period 1. Attempt to retrieve situation till 1349.
3. Further collapse with Black Death.
4. Revival in decade after Black Death back to 1340 level, 2. and between 1370-80 to pre 1320 level 1.
5. Gradual erosion toward end of the 14th century and till mid 15th.
6. Revival, and stability 1480 onwards with small increases.

When this pattern is superimposed on the building and repair periods (Table XVIII) the result is surprising. The main periods of increased building activity (1330-40 and the early 14th century) coincide with decreases in income and the peaks in income with only moderate amounts of building. The reasons for this are not clear. However, it can be suggested that it was due to a lack of foresight in organization. Building programmes were planned during periods of rising income, the monks could not predict a coming fall in income and when it happened carried out the programme regardless. There is no way in which the building could have caused a fall in actual

income, only in the end balance of the monastery. To enable the building programme to be carried out funds could be diverted from elsewhere, not shown in the Bursar's Rolls, and these would cover the cost during the decline. As the building increases co-incide with the Priorates of Fossor and Wessington, they were perhaps partly due to their initiative as they could oversee all the accounts, transfer the necessary money and possibly use their own resources to enable the work to be completed.

This comparison, though not with detailed annual figures, shows that to carry out the building they wished, the convent would go against the economic forces - probably because these were not understood or predicted.

The financial burden was not the only one the manors imposed on the Priory. There was also the drain of manpower and time. The upkeep of the buildings must have needed discussion and organization, for example regarding new building or the movement of materials, which cannot have been settled at a purely local level, either because they involved contact between the manors or the Bursar's authorization of expenditure. The supervision of the manors involved a considerable work load for the Bursar; he was helped in this by the Terrar who also travelled round the manors, but he carried the responsibility. He held the mid year review of accounts and annual audit, with the detailed enquiry into the sergeant's expenses, organized the movement of stock and selling of grain (Halcrow 1949, 16, 34). The pressures of being

responsible for a large part of the Priory's income were complained of throughout the 15th century, and monks repeatedly attempted to resign as 'the labour of the said office was unbearable for one man' (Dobson 1973, 285). It became increasingly difficult to fill the post; there were 13 Bursars in 21 years in Hemingburgh's Priorate (Dobson 1973, 285) and the appointment of Lawson as Bursar finally led to the collapse of the system. He was unable to show proper accounts, and concealed accumulating arrears; this incompetence is reflected in the building accounts where the entries for 1432-8 are brief and totally non-informative (B.A.R. 1432-8). Thus not only were the manors a constant drain on manpower but proved to be a burden that contributed to central economic chaos. Although this was only the case under incompetent management they must have been a constant distraction from the spiritual demands of monastic life.

The impact of the manors on the monastery was not a static situation. As Dobson states "Prior Hemingburgh's decision to lease the entire demesne of almost all the Durham manors was undoubtedly the most dramatic event in the history of the convent's estates policy in the later middle ages" (Dobson 1973, 94). In one way this lightened the burden on the monastery, as less supervision was necessary; for example, the Terrar in the 15th century often doubled as the hosteller (Dobson 1973, 257). The responsibility for repairs passed to the tenants involving less expenditure. However, it could also remove some of

the advantages of the manors and impose its own problems. The Priory was accustomed to buying food so that was no change, but the leasing of buildings could remove the possibility of their use as accommodation and restricted places to be visited. Also the Priory was often left responsible for repairs, as shown in the 1446 and 1464 inventories. The major new problem was finding tenants for the manors. "The monks ability to profit from the very real possibilities of successful arable farming on their Durham estates depended absolutely on their success in securing suitable tenants" (Dobson 1973, 282). The inventories show a number of manors 'in the Lord's hand', due to a lack of tenants, for example Ferry and Bewley in 1446 (S.S. 1839, ccc, ccxcvi). Some periods were more difficult than others. For example, the rents at Ketton in 1430-40 were higher than 20 or 80 years later, (Ketton 1444 £25, 1464 £22, 1530 £24) (Dobson 1973, 273). Those who took leases found it was not always to their advantage (Dobson 1973, 284). Thus leasing, as well as some advantages, also brought its problems.

Thus it can be seen that the connection between the manors and the monastery was close and could have far reaching effects. Although this was sometimes to the monasteries disadvantage, the manors were however vital to its wellbeing.



### The Manors in the Community

Attempting to establish the effect of the manor in its locality is even more difficult than considering its relations with the Priory, as central records do not cover this aspect of manorial history. The relationship of the Priory, as a landholder, with its tenants has been considered elsewhere (Lomas 1973 *passim*) but there are certain points, linked more closely to just the buildings, which can be made. Firstly, however, it must be stated that having a Bursar's manor in or near a village would be fundamentally very little different from any other sort of manor for the local inhabitants, and this must be remembered when other points are being made. Everyday life would be the same as elsewhere in the area.

One minor difference with the Priory's manors may have been that the Priory, as an institution, was immortal, and thus the buildings did not suffer from changes of policy with different owners, or be allowed to decay between owners. Thus there was perhaps a greater stability. The different types of manor would affect the community in different ways. The ordinary farming ones would be very similar to any others but those visited by the Prior and retinue would have more effect on their surroundings. There may have been the need for more servants and provisions temporarily. The buildings on these manors were repaired more frequently, requiring more labour and materials and thus would involve the local tenants (B.A.R. 1472, barn at Ketton).

The most important way in which the buildings affected the locals would be through those used communally, such as the bakehouse, smithy, mills and kilns. There is very little evidence in Durham to show how the system of bakehouses worked but from parallels elsewhere it can be seen that ovens and bakehouses were used communally. In the accounts of Wellingborough manor, belonging to Crowland Abbey, in the rent and services there is an entry of 26/8d. de furnis in 1283. This is described as a payment from the men of Wellingborough for licence to bake where they wanted, which was a commutation of the Lords ancient right to insist on all unfree men baking bread in the demesne oven (Page 1936, xxvii). On Durham manors bakehouses are mentioned at Ferry, Bewley and Pittington. On the latter it is called the Prior's bakehouse (B.A.R. 1472) but this need not be separate to the one used communally, it could just show ownership rather than use. Ferry is unusual in that there are three references to its bakehouse (B.A.R. 1347, 1397, 1423). There are two possible explanations for this and the fact that the bakehouse is not mentioned in more than these three places. *Perhaps* these were centres doing baking for surrounding manors; there is a parallel for this in the brewing for Crowland (Page 1936, xxxi) but this is unlikely as bread is perishable. Alternatively, it is just chance that the bakehouses on these manors are actually in the curia, not in the village, and thus come into the Bursar's rolls (above, p. 55). Another system, instead of the villagers coming to use the Priory's facilities, was for these to be rented out to tenants. In the

Wellingborough Accounts, there is an entry of 26/8d. for the farm of 4 ovens (Page 1936, xxvii). This was similar to the situation in Heworth where 3 bakehouses were leased (Bursar's Rental 1539, 20).

It is possible that there were centres for brewing for the Durham manors as at Crowland (Page 1936, xxxi). Merrington is one likely candidate with mentions of a malthouse (B.A.R. 1531) and malkiln (S.S. 1839, cxlii) as has Billingham (B.A.R. 1333, 1342). Pittington and Ferry just have kilns (B.A.R. 1343, 1337) and Ketton a brewhouse (M.A.R. 1316). However, it may just be chance that these appear to be repaired and they are really more widespread. The other sort of kilns mentioned are lime-kilns, at Ketton (B.A.R. 1357), Aycliffe (B.A.R. 1357, 1380, 1422), Westoe (B.A.R. 1390), Bewley (B.A.R. 1352) and Pittington frequently (above, p. 64). However, there is nothing to suggest these were in common use. They could be just for the Priory's own use either for liming fields or for making mortar. Mills are also mentioned on most manors but these would be used as under any manorial lord with the tenants having to bring their flour. The tenants would have to cooperate to maintain these communally used facilities (Lomas 1973, 50, HB I, 1409 Rainton). Thus it can be difficult to see how far some of these manorial buildings affected the local community; some may have been solely for the Priory's use. However, when used communally they would be used much as on any other manor.

The development of leasing would also affect the manors' role, though largely in a negative manner; the

Priory's involvement would be even less. Sometimes they had no responsibility for repairs and the visits of Bursar and Prior would decrease or cease. However, leasing could change the organisation of the whole village. Instead of leasing to a single tenant, the Priory sometimes amalgamated the tenant's and the demesne land, then divided it equally to lease to the former tenants. This brought about a totally new land allocation (for example, Halmote Book II, p.40 Westoe, Halmote Book I 1409 Rainton, Halmote Book III 1493 Fulwell). The results of this on the buildings are difficult to trace but sometimes one large farm no longer fitted the new structure, no one person could afford to take it on and thus the buildings fell into disuse and decayed (Platt 1969, 104). On the other hand, if the manor was leased to one man there was probably very little change.

The Priory's ownership of the manors involved them with other local landowners, and this could affect their standing and the respect in which they were held by the community. The manors were vital as they contributed to the Priory's wealth which was partly responsible for their position and influence. Their income was only matched in the area by the bishop of Durham. This gave the Prior the standing necessary to act as arbiter in local disputes and maintain his neutrality. For example, in the quarrel between the two branches of the Neville family, he was asked in 1440 to arbitrate by both sides but declined (Dobson 1973, 191) and he settled the feud between the Herons and Manners of Northumbria (Dobson 1973, 197).

However, their landholding could involve the Priory themselves in disputes with local lords, for example, with Thomas Claxton over a Castle Eden tenement, or more seriously with the Hiltons of Monkwearmouth, which led to the Master of Monkwearmouth suggesting ambush (Dobson 1973, 194-6). Thus their concern for their land could lead the Priory to damaging and irreligious conduct.

Therefore the manor's affect on the monastery can be shown to have been a drain at times of falling income and a heavy administrative burden but this is balanced by their provision of vital resources; food, rents and accommodation. Their affect on the community is less marked, not differing basically from other Lords and most noticeable in the ownership of communally used buildings such as the bakehouse. Perhaps the most important conclusion to emerge is a realization of the number of ties the manors had with the monastery and community; it is impossible to study them just as isolated units, as their influence could be wide ranging and important.

## CHAPTER XII

### Comparison of Manorial Building

The intention of this chapter is to compare the type and treatment of buildings on the Bursar's manors with that of buildings elsewhere. Various types of land owners will be considered; some Cathedral Priories, other Benedictine institutions, Cistercian manors, non-monastic ecclesiastical estates and lay estates in different parts of the country.

Two main types of sources have been used; printed account rolls showing building and repairs, and excavation reports to illustrate the arrangement of building to supplement these; secondary accounts of estate organization have also been consulted. However, there are problems with all these sources. The secondary sources very rarely mention the buildings in detail; they tend to concentrate on management of the land, peasant dues and central organization. The difficulty of the account rolls is to compare like with like. For example, often manorial not obedientiary accounts are printed; they are earlier than the Durham rolls or for a very limited time span, or the system of organization is different. Thus it is impossible to be certain the same type of information would be included. There are two snags with using excavation

reports. There are so few of the Durham manors with remains that any generalizations about their layout must be made with caution. Secondly, few manors elsewhere have been completely excavated. Usually only separate buildings are reported which makes it difficult to suggest a layout or use for them. These problems must be remembered when comparing other buildings with the Bursar's.

Firstly examples from other Cathedral Priories, the most closely comparable with Durham. The most important of these was Canterbury for which information can be gained from a description of the organization and remains of buildings, rather than from account rolls. The organization of the Canterbury manors was different from that of Durham. They were divided into four custodies with a warden in charge of each (Smith 1969, 100). This warden was a monk and originally purely supervisory, leaving a sergeant to account directly to the monastic treasurers (Smith 1969, 101-3). In 1289 the warden's powers were increased by having to render the account themselves. There was strong central control; for example, new buildings over £2 had to be sanctioned by the Prior himself (Smith 1969, 108). The wardens were assisted by stewards under whom were the manorial sergeants, bailiffs and reeves (Smith 1969, 111). Although the Warden and Steward did the same job as the Durham Bursar and Terrar, they were fundamentally different as they were purely responsible for the manors and not part of the central administration.<sup>1</sup> Thus the system of maintaining the

1 Canterbury's organization was more centralized than Durham's with all revenues going to the Treasurers and none direct to other obedientiaries whereas some of Durham's income went to obedientiaries other than the Bursar.

manors and their buildings was different at Canterbury.

Some remains of the buildings belonging to Canterbury manors may be studied, for example, at Minster in Thanet. Here the layout of the 12th century buildings can be seen and they are very simple; a hall, chamber with tower and chapel set round a courtyard presumably with the service buildings under the main rooms (Platt 1969, 19). Platt considers that the simplicity of this plan continued until the end of the 14th century (Platt 1966, 26). This is no more elaborate than the Durham buildings would appear to be. It is unfortunate that the descriptions of the organization at Canterbury do not give any details of what building or repairs took place to compare with these plans. However, although the organization at Canterbury was different, the buildings themselves were similar to those at Durham. It may be tentatively suggested that the Durham system of having some manors with better buildings and more frequent attention (for example Ketton, Westoe and Merrington, above, p. 78) surrounded by lesser manors, may have been a type of organization, though much less formalized, similar to Canterbury custodies and used to divide the manors into regional groups

Another Cathedral Priory, Ely, seems to have had more similarities with Canterbury rather than Durham. There was a centralized administration with treasurers and a senescallus forinsecus who itinerated the manors like the Canterbury warden (Smith 1969, 110). The manors were categorized into a home group, supplying provisions, and more distinct ones giving cash, which is again a more formalized system than at Durham. However this gives



no indication of what buildings were on a manor, or how they were maintained. If the parallel with Canterbury can be continued, it may be suggested that although the organization is more centralized at Ely than at Durham, the buildings would not differ significantly.

Moving outwards from the most closely comparable institutions, other Benedictine houses, such as Abingdon may be examined. Here the information is in the form of a series of printed treasurer's rolls and an account of the organization. The latter is at the other extreme to Canterbury. All obedientiaries were independent; they owned separate parts of the abbey's estates and separate buildings. They drew up their own accounts and there was a complex system of cross payments (Kirk 1891, xliii-xliv). The obedientiaries were not responsible to the treasurer, though they and the manorial officials paid money to him (Kirk 1891, xi, xiii). The greatest amount of the treasurer's expenditure was on building (Kirk 1891, xvi). This system meant that the obedientiaries were more independent than at Durham and more variation in the buildings was possible. When details of the Account Rolls are studied it is difficult to find specific buildings mentioned (Kirk 1891, 27-8, 46-7). They go into details (lathes 22d., 6000 tiles with carriage 2/6d., for example), but do not give names of rooms or buildings. The quantity and price of materials are given in more detail than in the Bursar's Rolls but this is of little use if their purpose is not known. Thus as the organization is different, there are no remains, and the

account rolls do not contain similar information, it would not be valid to compare Abingdon and Durham.

There are a series of account rolls for Wellingborough, a manor of Crowland, and these do give names of rooms. However, there are problems. Firstly, it must be remembered that these are manorial not obedientiary accounts. At Durham these contain less detail than obedientiary ones and are concerned with only minor repairs. Also there is only a short run of accounts and these are earlier than the majority of Durham rolls. Despite these reservations they seem to give similar information to the Durham manorial accounts, mentioning the same type of rooms. There is little information on how the care of the buildings was organized; there was a travelling steward responsible for the manors instead of the Bursar, a different system as he was not one of the important obedientiaries (Page 1936, xvli). There is an inventory of 1320 which lists the rooms on the manor; hall, chamber, kitchen, stable and granary, with a church nearby (Page 1936, xxiv), which is similar to Dalton, for example, and again has the basic simplicity noted at Canterbury. The arrangement of common ovens and bakehouses also has parallels in Durham (Page 1936, xxvii, above p. 55). This suggests that despite problems inherent in the documents and variations in organization, the buildings were similar.

Other Benedictine manors where remains exist are similar with those above and at Durham. For example, Charney Basset has a solar (chamber), chapel, hall and kitchen, Broadway had a hall, chamber, oratory and a

detached kitchen, and Cumnor a hall, chamber, chamber over the pantry and buttery (Platt 1969, 35-38). None of this suggests elaborate buildings and Durham manors as seen from the account rolls could stand comparison with them.

Moving away from Benedictine houses it is interesting to compare the buildings with those of the Cistercians. There was a different approach to holding of property between the two; the Cistercians attempted to keep apart from manorial duties and revenues by setting up new granges away from existing settlement, while the Benedictines accepted manors with their temporal entanglements. Once this ideological difference has been noted it is possible to compare and contrast the buildings. Platt demonstrates that the buildings on a Cistercian grange were not merely a replica of those at the abbey itself as was formerly thought (Platt 1969, 10,21). The order was initially short of money and the buildings would have been kept simple with only those strictly necessary being built; usually the agricultural ones and a hall and chamber. Sometimes these would be added to later, often with a chapel (Platt 1969, 24). By the 14th century there is documentary evidence for the rooms and their arrangement, for example, at the manor of Duleek of Llanthony. One side of the courtyard had domestic buildings, hall, chapel, chamber and undercroft, pantry and larder; the second side had service buildings, bakery, brewhouse, malt trough, kiln, oven and the threshing floor; the third side had the agricultural buildings, granary, cow house, stables and gate (Platt 1969, 32-3). Thus there was nothing monastic or elaborate about the building or the arrangement. An

example nearer Durham, Meaux belonging to Fountains, was as simple as some Durham buildings ; in 1396 the chamber, hall and kitchen were the only domestic buildings (Platt 1969, 41). Thus, although the buildings on a Cistercian grange could become more elaborate in the 15th century, they were not a replica of monastic ones; neither did they differ significantly from those on a Benedictine manor.

The information from a Cistercian account rolls does nothing to contradict the impression gained from the remains and Platt's general account. The Account Book of Beaulieu Abbey mentions a number of granges but is often lacking in detail; for many (for example Burgate and Coxwell) it just states In dominibus emendandis et cooperiendis cum grangia (Hockey 1975, 90, 104, 110, 115, 121). The buildings that are mentioned confirm Platt's idea of simple accommodation, for example, hall, chamber, cowshed (Hockey 1975, 70). Here the system of organization bears more resemblance to that of Canterbury, rather than Durham, with three major groups of manors, those round Faringdon, the Great Close near Beaulieu and the remaining scattered one (Hockey 1975, 13-15). Those in the Great Close exchanged supplies with the abbey, the others selling produce and sending cash in a similar way to Ely (above, p.161). Thus the two major features of this brief examination of Cistercian buildings is their simplicity and basic similarity to Benedictine ones. An example from the other major ecclesiastic landowners, the bishops, will also be considered. One rich and powerful bishop was that of Winchester; there are accounts from here

for 1210-11 (Holt 1964). Although they are nearly 100 years before those at Durham they are very similar as they mention the buildings, rather than a lot of detail. The structure of the account and organisation is also similar to Durham, they are between the extremes of Canterbury and Abingdon, part of the income is allocated to the obedientiaries but the Bursar controls the bulk of it (Smith 1969, 25). However, at Winchester the person visiting the manors was a steward, and he reported to the central treasurer rather than combining the functions as the Durham Bursar did. One snag with this estate is that it is impossible to see any development in the buildings as the account rolls are for one year only. However, with this one limitation, it would appear that the buildings mentioned and repairs done were similar to those at Durham and the organisation closer than some Benedictine houses.

It would be useful to have investigated the policies of the bishop of Durham to give a local comparison. However, there is no study of the bishops' buildings or any printed sources referring to them sufficiently fully. On a more general level Lomas considers there was no great difference between bishop and Priory; "it is clear that the 27 manors belonging to the bishop of Durham were very similar to those of his Chapter" (Lomas 1973, 288). Thus although no positive conclusions may be drawn about the bishop's buildings, there is no reason why they should differ significantly.

Before turning to lay lords, one further institution will be considered, Merton College, Oxford which held the

manor of Cuxham. This is one of the few occasions where the information on buildings in the account rolls has been fully considered, both individually (Harvey 1978, Appendix II) and in their arrangement (Harvey 1965, 32-6). The accounts are very good as they both mention the names of buildings and go into detail, for example, wattles for barn wall 2 $\frac{1}{4}$ d. (Harvey 1976, 185). The result is a comprehensive list of buildings often with their construction material and possible location. Thus differences in the quality of the evidence means that comparison with Durham must be made with caution. The Bursar's Rolls rarely mention all buildings on a manor, reference to material is spasmodic and it is usually impossible to establish their position. Thus apparent differences may be due only to defects in the evidence. Some comparison can be made. One difference is the lack of chambers at Cuxham; by other standards this would be an important manor but on comparison with Durham manors there are 3-6 chambers. The differences in structural technique can also be seen. Even such important buildings as the hall have wattle and daub walls (Harvey, Appendix II) while in Durham most walls even of agricultural buildings, are of stone. This variation is the result of regional differences, not of those between institutions. Four barns and two granaries are more than would usually appear on a Durham manor. Again this is probably due to regional variation, with larger and richer farms further south, not to the institutions policies. Thus comparisons can be made but

it is impossible to say how the Durham manors would appear if the documents were similar to those of Cuxham.

Examples of lay estates have been drawn from different parts of the country. The Stratton accounts primarily concern the south west; Adam de Stratton had control of the estates of Isabel de Forz. The main accounts are earlier than Durham ones running from 1269-1287. They are a mixture of small repairs and large buildings, for example new barn £32.15. 5, new cowshed £2. 9. 8½d. in 1274 (Farr 1959, 120,63), but do not give quantities or construction methods. The buildings seem more similar to Durham rather than to Cuxham; hall, 2-4 chambers, 2 barns, 2 cowsheds, though regional differences still exist, roofing with straw and wattles, for example (Farr 1959, 32). There are reeve's accounts which show the same detail as Durham manorial accounts. Thus this organization and maintenance of buildings seems similar to that at Durham.

The description of the Norfolk manor of Forncett shows that here too both the organization and buildings themselves were similar to those at Durham. The steward visited the manor and there was a resident bailiff on each (Davenport 1966, 22). The individual manors do not appear to be part of any larger groups. The buildings started to be leased in the last quarter of the 14th century but not all the buildings and manors were leased; for example, the chamber near the gate, sheephouse, carthouse, stable and barn were specified in 1376 (Davenport 1906, 51). This is similar to the situation on some Durham manors such as Westoe and

Bewley (S.S. 1839, ccxcii, above p. 74). The list of rooms both at the end of the 13th century and during the 14th (Davenport 1966, 21, 49) are similar to those on Durham manors. The only difference is again in the use of regional materials; clay wall, thatched with straw, and even the hall thatched with reeds (Davenport 1906, 21). However, the 15th century development of the buildings is different. At this period Forncett gradually fell into decay; with the leasing process buildings were left unused and by 1491 most of the manor had disappeared (Davenport 1906, 56-7). At Durham the continuity provided by an institutional owner prevented similar decay. Even at the Dissolution the majority of manors were transferred to the Dean and Chapter and continued in use as farms to the present day.

There are also a series of accounts for one of the greatest landowners, the Earls of Cornwall. These are contemporary with the early Bursar rolls but run for only one year. The lands were scattered widely through the country so the organization was different to Durham. The manors were divided into nine groups, each with its own steward; Bekhamsted, Mere, Wallingford, St. Valery Eyre, Devon, Cornwall and Knaresborough (Midgley 1942, xx-xxiii). This is similar to the Canterbury system (above p.160). The accounts, however, are similar to Durham manorial accounts with small and detailed amounts. Unfortunately, this only amounts to a few entries for any one manor and no generalization about the number or arrangement of the buildings is possible.

There are no printed accounts of buildings for any



of the northern lay estates.

As well as those manors with printed account rolls those which have been excavated give information on buildings. Here the major disadvantage is that few manor sites have been totally excavated and often evidence only exists for disparate buildings. Also none of the Bursars' manors has been fully excavated. Some investigation took place at Muggleswick in the last century but this was just removing debris from wall lines, some work was done in the immediate vicinity of the domestic buildings at Bewley before demolition and a programme of work has just commenced at Bearpark this year. Thus no complete plans of the Bursars' manors exist. However, some comparison of layouts can be attempted even from this limited evidence.

The excavation at Northolt Manor, Middlesex (Hurst 1961) shows in detail the changes in the kitchen area. This is of interest as they show the relationship of the bakehouse to the kitchen which may be relevant to Ferryhill and Bewley, where both buildings also existed. The excavations reveal the large number of ovens and hearths (Hurst 1961, 215). It should be remembered when reading documents with more than one reference to these that they need not refer to the same one. Also emphasised is the number of times minor alterations could take place. It would be more valuable if excavations of this sort were carried out on sites, with detailed documentary evidence, to see if these alterations could be connected with repairs mentioned in the documents.

The excavations at Weavertorpe, Yorkshire are of separate buildings; an early hall, then, of more interest, the great hall and associated buildings (Brewster 1972). The hall itself was 54 by 26 feet; unfortunately due to external limitations the ancilliary buildings could not be totally excavated. On the west side was a room 14 feet long unbonded to the hall. On the south side were two rooms, one 12 feet wide, the other 12 by 9 feet. On the east there were also two rooms, the south wall of the southern one keyed into the hall but the northern wall unbonded; it is possible they later become one room with a central division. To the north the east wall of the hall continued to form a privy (Brewster 1972, 123-4). This is more useful as it shows rooms in relation to each other but their extent is partly unrecovered and their function unknown. Again more information could be gained by matching this plan with documentary references to the rooms. It can be suggested that this hall represents a stage between the simple freestanding hall and the later, medieval development, of ranges of buildings round a courtyard. It gives some indication of how varied arrangements could be.

Two sites more closely comparable with the Bursar's manors are at Redhills near Darlington, because of its geographical proximity, and the Archbishop of York's manor at Otley, as it was visited in the same manner as the more important Durham ones. The excavations at Redhills were the more limited, trenching taking place on various parts

of the moated site but only two buildings were excavated. Building A was 13 by 26 feet and traces remained of six uprights used to carry the frame. Building B was 30 by 50 feet, had a clay platform floor, <sup>and</sup> large stone supports for timber post and rubble stone footings (Still & Pallister 1978, 58). Again it would have been informative to see how the documents would have described the buildings, as most of the Durham manors as seen in the Bursar's rolls have stone not timber walls. There are a number of possible explanations. The phrasing of the Bursar's rolls conceals some types of buildings; this may have been an earlier timber hall and a stone one was built later (there is room elsewhere within the moat for this), <sup>Alternatively,</sup> the lord might have been poorer than the Priory and only had timber buildings, or it may be a geographical distinction. Redhills is comparatively close to the Billingham area, where the Bursar's manor was thatched not roofed with stone as normal. None of these could be proved without further investigation. Thus although the site sheds little light on how the manor was arranged it does offer a warning against making generalizations; just because the Bursar's manors were usually of stone this cannot be taken to imply that others in the same area would be. It would be useful to see if documentary evidence for this site would have revealed its differences. Without both this and archaeological evidence it is difficult to get a complete picture.

At the Otley site excavation was limited by development, and concentrated on one range. This contained a chapel

and chamber over an undercroft and was of several phases. Phase one was represented by a series of postholes. Phase two was the erection of an apsidal building, 51 by 22 feet, the chapel. Phase three saw this extended to the west and the raising of the chapel to first floor level above the undercroft. Phase four was the squaring of the apsidal end and further western extension with a one storey room. Phases five and six were the demolition of the chapter and reuse of the west end (Le Patourel 1973, 121-37). As well as these major phases minor changes also took place, for example the digging of a drain or the addition of a northern porch between phases 3 and 4 (Le Patourel 1973, 127). This all shows the number of changes that one range could undergo and gives some idea of what 'repairs' or 'work' in the Durham Accounts might involve. It also emphasises the variability of the manors which can be missed by purely document work.

The excavations at Cawton, a Cistercian Grange, by Platt, enable comparison to be made with another order (Platt 1969 & 1966). It was a site enclosed by a bank and ditch, *probably* more to keep cattle out than as a fortification (Platt 1969, 155). There were 12th century buildings on the site, possibly of timber, which were destroyed by the Scots (Platt 1969, 157). In the 14th century there was a change in construction and alignment. The buildings were entirely timber with no stone footings and with walls of upright posts and wattle and daub (Platt 1969, 159). They formed a chamber (20

by 16 feet) connected to the upper end of a hall, 36 by 20 feet, which also had a kitchen with fireplace at the opposite end. The hall was tiled both on the roof and floor and was glazed (Platt 1969, 160). To the south and east of this domestic range were a stable and a barn. The Benedictine manors whose rooms were mentioned above (p.161) have a similar layout with their hall, chapel and chambers in one range, sometimes with a free-standing kitchen and the agricultural buildings on other sides of a court, or in an outer court as at Tisbury (Platt 1966, 31). Thus although the exact arrangement could vary, there is a basic similarity between the orders.

Penhallam manor in Cornwall is an example of a lay owned manor which has been completely excavated, and shows what information on layout can be gained from this (Beresford 1974). Four periods have been identified. There were slight pre-conquest features in a series of postholes (Beresford 1974, 99). This was followed by a hall within a ringwork 25-38 feet wide and constructed soon after the conquest (Beresford 1974, 97). There were no other substantial buildings associated with this hall. The first major phase of the manor dates from the end of the 12th and beginning of the 13th centuries. A chamber was added on the first floor between 1180-1200, and the undercroft of this and the hall used as the pantry and buttery (Beresford 1974, 102-5). They had stone packed foundations  $4\frac{1}{2}$  feet wide. The early 13th century wardrobe and garderobe were on the north side, the kitchen was on the west and the chapel on the south (Beresford

1974, 107). In the mid 13th century the buildings developed further but on a different alignment. The hall was made of ashlar with a two light mullioned window (Beresford 1974, 107). The west range contained a first floor chamber with garderobe, and a chapel also of ashlar and glazed (Beresford 1974, 111). The kitchen was separate but linked by a passage and in the late 13th century the hearth was replaced by a fireplace; the buttery and servery were below the hall. The other domestic buildings were also present, a bakehouse, brewhouse, 2 ovens and a kiln (Beresford 1974, 109). Thus the development from a single hall to a complex manor was completed. Again the layout was one of a varied arrangement of rooms within a basic plan of ranges round a courtyard similar to that both of the Benedictine and Cistercian manors.

Thus despite the limitations and varying quality of the evidence some conclusions may be drawn from this comparative material. Two preliminary points may be made. The manor was not a static institution and its buildings and layout changed throughout the Middle Ages; buildings became more elaborate, methods of maintaining them altered, their arrangement was realigned, These developments can be seen both from the documents and on the ground. Secondly, both these sources, historical and archaeological, need to be used if the buildings are to be fully understood; lacking either one the information is incomplete. Having stated this there are three main conclusions.

Firstly, the system of organizing the manors varied; there was differing amounts of central control, the role

of the overseer varied, some were arranged into groups, others not. However, this seemed to have little effect on the buildings; different systems of organisation were used for similar buildings.

Secondly, there was a basic similarity in the types of buildings on the manor whoever the owner. Early in the middle ages they were simple, usually just hall, chamber and kitchen for domestic buildings, and barn or granary and stable for the agricultural. They could become more elaborate with the addition of a chapel, bakehouse, brewhouse and more barns but during this process the similarity was often maintained.

Thirdly, there was great variation in the precise way these buildings were laid out; no two manors seem the same. Yet over these differences there developed a common form of ranges round a courtyard, domestic and agricultural building separate. This form was common to all types of manor whatever the order, or area, whether secular or ecclesiastical but within these there was no universal layout.

Thus this comparison has given some idea of what manors elsewhere were like. There does not appear to be any one type of organization or arrangement against which to match the Bursar's manors. They do however, show the same characteristics of simplicity of buildings and variety of arrangement. Differences in their owner seems to have had little effect on the buildings.

### CONCLUSION

Four main conclusions emerge from a study of the buildings on the Bursar's manors. These refer both to the buildings themselves and, in a wider context, to their links with the monastery.

Firstly, and possibly most importantly, it can be suggested from an examination of the buildings and their treatment that there were five different categories of manor (Chapters III, IV, V):

- (1) Ordinary agricultural manors with only the basic buildings.
- (2) 'Agricultural plus'; those with some additional buildings or more frequent attention.
- (3) Parks; used to supply timber and stone, the only building being a barn.
- (4) Manors where the ludi were held; the important four with more elaborate accommodation, frequent attention and visited most often by Prior and monks.
- (5) An intermediate group, lying between the agricultural and the ludi manors, formerly not distinguished as a separate group. These had more domestic buildings than the agricultural manors, an early development of new buildings and frequent repairs especially in the 15th century.



Thus there is not just a two tier system of ordinary and ludi manors but three tiers with an intermediate group of important manors.

Secondly, there are distinct chronological periods when both new building and repairs increased (Table VII). These periods cut across all the categories mentioned above and show when the Priory seemed to initiate major building programmes.

Thirdly, the variety of the buildings and manors must be emphasised. This is apparent in the manor's location (Chapter VII), the arrangement of the buildings (Chapter VIII) and when manors elsewhere in the country are considered (Chapter XII). There were no common factors of location, no preconceived patterns of layout. Both the Priory and owners of manors elsewhere developed the buildings as suited the individual site and circumstances.

Fourthly, despite this variety, a picture of central control emerges. Although the buildings varied, someone had to order their construction and maintenance. The different categories of manors and periods of increased activity could not have been organized without some overall control from the monastery. The Prior himself was probably important in this, initiating periods of building, transferring money and causing certain manors to be developed (Chapters IX and X). The manors were not isolated buildings but closely linked to the monastery (Chapter XI).

The potential of the different sorts of evidence varies. The documents give much detailed information especially on

repairs but do not say much on the layout and function of the buildings. The results from fieldwork were more limited, due to later building on the sites and modern destruction. It was those sites where remains did exist, and this information was combined with that from the documents, which proved most productive, for example, Bearpark. Both forms of evidence have their limitations but for this study the documents provided more information. However, fullest results were obtained on those sites where both sorts of evidence could be combined.

Thus some new information has emerged from the study of these buildings. There existed groups of manors allowed to develop as best suited their individual needs but under central control. However, the maximum amount of information can only be gained by combining documentary evidence and fieldwork. More work needs to be done, for example, on other obedientiaries' manors, by excavation, in a more detailed use of comparative material. However this study has examined some of the problems and potential of detailed investigation of buildings; it has shown that it is not just the magnificent buildings but also the ordinary ones that are fascinating and rewarding to study.

APPENDIX I

Bursar's Manors

	<u>Grid</u> <u>Reference</u>	<u>Date of Leasing</u>
Aldingrange	246430	1389/97
Aycliffe	286226	by 1290
Bearpark	243439	1465
Bellasis	480232	1373
Bewley	468254	1409
Billingham	478225	1359
Burdon	Unknown	by 1270
Dalton	407481	1348/66
Eden	Unknown	1399
Ferryhill	290329	1381
Fulwell	Unknown	1416
Heselden	455373	by 1290
Heworth	293616	by 1290
Houghall	279403	1409
Ketton	Unknown	1412
Merrington	263315	1386
Muggleswick	045501	Unleased
Pittington	328437	1456
Rainton	329474	by 1320
Wardley	307619	1386
Westoe	372661	1409

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources: Unprinted

Dean and Chapter muniments: All housed at Priors' Kitchen,  
Durham

1. Bursars' Account Rolls:

1278-9; 1292-3; 1293-4; 1297-8; 1298-9; 1300-1; 1302-3;  
1306-7 A/B; 1308-9 A/B; 1309-10; 1310-1 A/B; 1313-4 A/B;  
1314-5 A/B; 1316-7 A/B; 1317-8; 1318-9; 1328-9;  
1329-30 A/B/C; 1330; 1330-1 A/B; 1331-2; 1332-3; 1333-4;  
1334-5; 1335-6 A/B/C; 1336-7; 1337-8 A/B; 1338-9 A/B;  
1339-40; 1340-1; 1341; 1341-2 A/B; 1342 A/B; 1342-3 A/B;  
1343-4 A/B; 1344-5 A/B; 1347-8 A/B; 1348-9; 1349 A/B;  
1349-50 A/B; 1350-1 A/B; 1351-2 A/B; 1352-3; 1353-4;  
1354-5 A/B; 1355 A/B; 1355-6 A/B; 1356-7 A/B; 1357-8;  
1358-9 A/B; 1359-60; 1360-1 A/B; 1361-2; 1362-3 A/B;  
1363 A/B; 1363-4; 1365-6; 1366-7; 1367-8; 1368-9;  
1370-1; 1371-3; 1373-4; 1374-5 A/B/C; 1375-6; 1376;  
1376-7; 1377-8; 1378-9; 1379-80; 1380-1; 1381-2; 1383-4;  
1384-5; 1386-7; 1387-8; 1388-9; 1389-90; 1390-1 A/B;  
1391; 1394-5; 1395-6; 1396-7; 1397-8; 1399-1400;  
1400-1; 1401-2; 1402-3; 1404-5; 1406-7 A/B; 1407-8;  
1408-9; 1409-10; 1410-11; 1411-2; 1412-3 A/B; 1414-5;  
1415-6 A/B; 1416-17 A/B; 1418-19; 1419-20; 1420-21;  
1421-2; 1422-3; 1423-4 A/B; 1424-5; 1425-6; 1426-7;  
1427-8 A/B; 1428-9; 1429-30; 1431-2; 1432; 1432-3;  
1433-4; 1434-5; 1435-6 A/B; 1436-7 A/B; 1437-8;  
1438-9 A/B; 1439-40 A/B; 1440-1 A/B; 1441-2; 1442-3;  
1443-4 A/B; 1444-5; 1445-6 A/B/C; 1446-7 A/B; 1449-50;  
1453-4; 1454-5; 1456-7; 1457-8 A/B; 1458-9 A/B;  
1462-3 A/B; 1464-5; 1465-6; 1466-7; 1467-8; 1468-9;  
1469-70; 1470-1; 1471-2; 1472-3; 1473-4; 1474-5;  
1475-6; 1476-7; 1478-9; 1479-80; 1480-1; 1481-2;  
1482-3; 1483-4; 1484-5; 1485-6; 1486-7; 1487-8; 1488-9;  
1492-3; 1493-4; 1494-5; 1495-6; 1496-7; 1497-8;  
1498-9 A/B; 1499-1500; 1500-1; 1501-2; 1503-4 A/B;  
1504-5; 1505-6; 1506-7; 1507-8; 1508-9; 1509-10;  
1510-1 A/B; 1511-2; 1512-3; 1513-4; 1514-5; 1515-6;  
1519-20; 1523-4; 1536-7

2. Manorial Account Rolls:

Bearpark:

1327-8; 1328-9; 1329-30; 1330-1; 1331-2; 1332-3;  
1333-4; 1334-5; 1335-6; 1336-7; 1337?; 1337-8;  
1338 A/B; 1339-40; 1340-1; 1341-2; 1342-3; 1343-4;  
1370-1; 1371-2; 1372-3; 1373-4; 1374-5; 1396 &  
1396-7; 1397-8; 1398-9; 1403-4; 1404-5; 1406-7;  
1400\*50

Bewley:

1305-6; 1316-7; 1329-30; 1332; 1332-3; 1336-7;  
1337-8; 1339-40; 1343-4; 1369-70; 1370-1; 1371-2;  
1372-3; 1374-5; 1375-6; 1376-7; 1377-8; 1378-9;  
1405; 1405-6 A/B; 1406-7; 1407-8

Billingham:

1305-6 + 1306; 1315-6; 1316-7; 1327-8; 1328-9;  
1329-30; 1330-1; 1333; 1333-4; 1334-5; 1335; 1336-7;  
1337-8; 1339-40; 1343-4

Dalton:

1305-6; 1316; 1331-2; 1332-3; 1336-7; 1340; 1340-1;  
1343-4

Ferby:

1316-7; 1331-2; & 1332; 1332-3; 1333 A/B; 1333-4;  
1446-7 A/B

Fulwell:

1331-2; 1336; 1336-7; 1337-8; 1340-1/2; 1343-4; 1369-70;  
1370-1; 1371-2; 1372-3; 1373-4; 1374-5; 1375-6;  
1377-8; 1378-9; 1379-80; 1380-1; 1381-2; 1382-3;  
1383-4; 1384-5; 1385-6; 1386-7; 1387-8; 1388-9;  
1389-90; 1390-1; 1391-2; 1392-3; 1393-4; 1394-5;  
1395-6; 1401-2 & 1402-3; 1410-1; 1411-2; 1412-3

Houghall:

1369-70; 1370-1; 1371-2; 1372-3; 1373-4; 1374-5;  
1375-6; 1376-7; 1377-8; 1378-9; 1379-80; 1380-1; 1381-2;  
1382-3; 1383-4; 1385-6; 1388-9; 1389-90; 1390-1; 1391-2;  
1392-3; 1393-4; 1394-5; 1395-6; 1396-7; 1397-8; 1398-9;  
1405-6; 1406-7; 1407-8 A/B; 1425-6

Ketton:

1296-7; 1316-7; 1331-2; 1333-4; 1334-5; 1335-6; 1336-7;  
1339-40; 1343-4; 1369-70; 1370-1; 1371-2; 1372-3;  
1373-4; 1374-5; 1375-6; 1376-7; 1377; 1377-8; 1378-9;  
1379; 1379-80; 1380-1; 1381-2; 1382; 1385-6; 1388-9;  
1389-90; 1390-91; 1391-2; 1392-3; 1393-4; 1394-5;  
1395-6 & 1396; 1396-7; 1397-8; 1398-9; 1399-1400;  
1400-01; 1401-2; 1402-3; 1404-5; 1405-6; 1406-7;  
1409-10

Merrington:

1376; 1376-7; 1377-8; 1378-9; 1379-80; 1380; 1380-1;  
1381-2

Pittington:

1277-8; 1288-6; 1316-7; 1327-8 A/B; 1328-9; 1330-1;  
1331-2; 1333; 1333-4; 1335-6; 1338; 1339-40; 1340-1;  
1344-5; 1376-7; 1377-8; 1378-9; 1379-80; 1380; 1380-1;  
1382; 1382-3; 1383-4; 1384-5; 1388-9; 1389-90; 1390-1;  
1392-3; 1393-4; 1394-5; 1395-6; 1396-7; 1397-8;  
1398-9; 1399-1400; 1405-6; 1406-7; 1407-8; 1408-9;  
1409-10; 1412-3; 1413-4; 1418-9; 1419-20; 1422-3;  
1428-4; 1424-5; 1427-8; 1428-9; 1429-30; 1433-4;  
1446-7 A/B; 1449-50; 1450-1; 1451-2

Wardley:

1277-8 (with Heworth); 1289; 1290; 1290-1; 1328-9;  
1329-30; 1330-1; 1331-2; 1332-3; 1333-4; 1334-5;  
1336-7; 1337-8; 1343-4; 1375 & 1375-6; 1376-7; 1377-8;  
1378-9; 1379-80; 1380-1

Westoe:

1326-7; 1327-8; 1328-9; 1329-30; 1330-1; 1331-2;  
1336-7; 1337-8; 1339-40; 1340-1; 1343-4; 1370-1;  
1371-2; 1372; 3; 1373-4; 1374-5; 1375-6; 1393-4;  
1394-5; 1395-6; 1396-7; A/B; 1397-8; 1398-9; 1399-1400;  
1400-1; 1401-2; 1402-3; 1404-5; 1407-8

Enrolled Manorial Accounts:

1299-1303:

Bearpark & Houghall: 1299-1300; Houghall - 1300  
Bewley - 1299-1300; Pittington - 1299-1300;  
Warley - 1299-1300; Rainton - 1299-1300; Ketton -  
1299-1300; Muggleswick - 1299-1300; Houghall -  
1300-07; Pittington - 1300-01; Houghall - 1301-2;  
Houghall - 1302; Pittington - 1302; Bewley - 1301-2;  
Billingham - 1302; Muggleswick - 1300-01;  
Muggleswick - 1302; Bearpark - 1302; Rainton - 1302-3;  
Dalton - 1302-3; Bellasis - 1302-3; Bewley - 1302-3;  
Billingham - 1302-3; Billingham - 1303; Muggleswick -  
1302-3; Ketton - 1302-3; Wardley - 1302-3; Bearpark -  
1302-3

1303-5:

Bellasis - 1304-3; Bewley - 1303-4; Billingham - 1303-4;  
Rainton - 1303-4; Wardley - 1303-4; Pittington - 1303-4;  
Bearpark - 1303-4; Ketton - 1303-4; Westoe - 1304;  
Muggleswick - 1303-4; Muggleswick - 1304; Westoe - 1304;  
Bewley - 1303-5; Bellasis - 1304-5; Pittington - 1304-5;  
Bearpark - 1304-5; Billingham - 1304-5; Ketton - 1304-5;  
Rainton - 1304-5;

1304-5:

Pittington - 1304-5; Bearpark - 1304-5

1305-6:

Bearpark - 1305-6; Billingham - 1305-6; Billingham - 1306;  
Ketton - 1305-6; Houghall - 1305-6; Houghall - 1306;  
Fery - 1305-6

1309-10:

Billingham - 1309-10; Bearpark - 1309-10; Dalton - 1309-10;  
Westoe - 1309-10; Pittington - 1309-10; Ketton - 1309-10  
+ 1310; Muggleswick - 1309-10

1319-20:

Bellasis - 1319-20; Billingham - 1319-20; Houghall -  
1319-20; Pittington - 1319-20; Dalton - 1319-20;  
Bearpark - 1319-20; Bearpark - 1320; Westoe - 1319-20;  
Westoe - 1320;

1320-1:

Pittington - 1320-1; Ketton - 1320-1; Houghall - 1320-1;  
Dalton - 1320-1; Bearpark - 1320-1; Billingham - 1320-1;  
Bewley - 1320-1; Fery - 1320-1; Westoe - 1320-1;

1322-3:

Westoe - 1322-3; Wardley - 1322-3; Pittington - 1322-3;  
Dalton - 1322-3; Bewley - 1322-3;

1323-4:

Dalton - 1323-4; Pittington - 1323-4; Houghall - 1323-4;  
Houghall - 1324; Billingham - 1323-4; Wardley - 1323-4;  
Bewley - 1323-4; Bellasis - 1323-4; Westoe - 1323-4;  
Ketton - 1323-4;

1324-5:

Ketton - 1324-5; Ketton - 1325; Fery - 1324-5;  
Wardley - 1324-5; Dalton - 1324-5; Bearpark - 1324-5;  
Bearpark - 1325; Westoe - 1324-5; Westoe - 1325;  
Billingham - 1325; Pittington - 1324-5; Pittington - 1325

1325-6:

Ketton - 1325-6; Pittington - 1325-6; Westoe - 1325-6;  
Dalton - 1325-6; Billingham - 1325-6; Bewley - 1325-6;  
Wardley - 1325-6; Bellasis - 1325-6

1298-1302:

Rainton - 1298-9; ? 1298-9; Rainton - 1301-2;  
Wardley - 1301-2

3. Stock Accounts:

1338, 1349, 1350, 1351, 1377, 1387

Muggleswick: 1422; 1424-5, 1428, 1430-1, 1431-2

4. Bursars Rentals:

Rentale Domus Dunelm: 1339-49

Bursars Rental (miscellaneous charter 7068): 1341-2

Rentale Saccarri Domini Prioris Dunelm (miscellaneous charter 425): 1382-86

Rentale Bursar: 1395

Bursars Rental: 1432

" " : 1493

" " : 1507-10

" " : 1512

" " : 1516-17

Rentale Bursarii: 1538

Rentale et Expenses Bursarii Dunelm: 1539

5. Halmote Records:

Halmote Book: 1400-39; 1440-91; 1492-1528

6. Receivers Books: 1541-1870

7. Renewals Books I & II: 1660-1828

8. Leases: Dean & Chapter Register of Leases  
Church Commission schedule of Chapter Estates,  
counterpart leases, Stall Rentals & Accounts:  
7th Prebend SRA/7/1-8

9. Miscellaneous charters: 70-74; 425; 2593-9; 7068;

10. Locelli: IV No. 226; V No. 30; XXVII No. 1

11. Church Commission Maps

Aycliffe

Burdon

Bearpark

Bewley

Billingham

Dalton

Fulwell

Heworth

Ketton

Merrington

Muggleswick

Rainton

Pittington

Wardley

Westoe

12. Tithe Maps: (housed at South Road Branch: class mark DR)

Burdon

Dalton

Eden

Fulwell

Heselden

Ketton

Rainton

Shotton



Primary Sources: Printed

- Surtees Society (1837): Priory of Finchale, vol. 6  
(London 1837)
- Surtees Society (1839): Historiae Dunelmensis scriptores  
tres, vol. 9 (London 1839)
- Surtees Society (1846): Durham Household Book, vol. 18  
(London, 1846)
- Surtees Society (1872): Feodarium Prioratus Dunelmensis,  
vol. 58 (London 1872)
- Surtees Society (1886): Halmota Prioratus Dunelmensis,  
vol. 82 (London 1886)

Secondary Sources:

- Aberg, F. A. (ed.)(1978): Medieval Moated Sites (C.B.A.  
Research Report 17; London 1978)
- Barley, M. W. (1964): The English Farmhouse and Cottage  
(London 1964)
- Barmby, J. (1890): "Pittington and its church", Transactions  
of the Architectural and Archaeological Society of  
Durham and Northumberland III (1890) 1-32
- Batey, G. T. (1943): "Notes on Houghall", Transactions of  
the Architectural and Archaeological Society of Durham  
and Northumberland IX (1943), 33-42
- Beresford, G. (1974): "Medieval Manor of Penhallan",  
Medieval Archaeology XVIII (1974), 90-145
- Billings, R. W. (1846): Architectural Antiquities of Durham  
(Durham 1846)
- Brewster, T. C. M. (1972): "Excavation at Weaverthorpe  
Manor, E. Riding", Yorkshire Archaeological Journal  
44 (1972), 114-133
- Coppact, G. (1974): "Low Caythorpe, East Yorkshire: The  
manor site", Yorkshire Archaeological Journal 46  
(1974), 34-41
- Davenport, F. G. (1906): Economic development of a Norfolk  
Manor 1086-1565 (London 1906)
- Dobson, R. B. (1973): Durham Priory: 1400-1450  
(Cambridge 1973)
- Farr, M. W. (ed.)(1959): Accounts and Surveys of the  
Wiltshire lands of Adam de Stratton (Wiltshire  
Archaeological & Natural History Society Records  
Branch, XIV, Devizes 1959)

- Greenwell, W. & Knowles, W. H. (1890-5): "Muggleswick", Transactions of the Architectural and Archaeological Society of Durham and Northumberland IV (1890-95) 3-24
- Halcrow, E. M. (1954-5): "Decline of Demesne Farming on the estates of Durham Cathedral Priory", Economic History Review VII (1954-5) 345-56
- Harvey, P. D. A. (1965): A Medieval Oxfordshire Village 1240-1400 (Oxford 1965)
- Harvey, P.D.A.(ed.)(1976): Manorial Records of Cuxham, Oxfordshire 1200-1359 (Oxfordshire Record Publication, 50; London 1976)
- Hockey, S. F. (ed.)(1975): Account Book of Beaulieu Abbey (Camden 4th Series, 16; London 1975)
- Hodgson, J. (1822): "An enquiry into the Antiquity of an ancient entrenchment called Wardley," Archaeologia Aeliana I (1822) 112-117
- Holt, N. R. (ed.)(1964): Pipe Roll of the Bishopric of Winchester 1210-11 (Manchester 1964)
- Hurst, J. G. (1961): "The Kitchen Area of Northolt Manor Middlesex", Medieval Archaeology V (1961) 211-299
- Hutchinson, W. (1785, 1787, 1794): History of Durham (Newcastle 1785, 1787, Carlisle 1794)
- Kirk, R. E. G. (ed.)(1891-2): Accounts of the obedientiars of Abingdon Abbey (Camden Society new series, 51, London 1891-2)
- Knowles, M. D. (1940): Monastic Order in England (Cambridge 1940)
- Knowles, M. D. (1948-59): Religious Orders in England 3 vols. (Cambridge 1948-59)
- Lomas, R. A. (1978): "The Priory of Durham and its demesne in the 14th and 15th centuries", Economic History Review 2nd series vol. 31 no. 3 (1978), 339-353
- Mercer, E. (1975): The English Vernacular House (R.H.C.M. London 1975)
- Midgley, L. M. (ed.)(1942): Earldom of Cornwall Accounts 1296-7 (Camden 3rd series LXVI London 1942)
- Neve, J. Le (1963): Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae: Northern Province 1300-1541 (London 1963)
- Neve, J. Le (1971): Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae: Monastic Cathedrals 1066-1300 (London 1971)

- Nicholson, T. (1969): "Report of Excavations at Dalden Tower 1965-6", Antiquities of Sunderland 24 (1969) 56-62
- Page, F. M. (ed.) (1936): Wellingborough Manorial Accounts 1358-1328 (Northamptonshire Record Society VIII, Kettering 1936)
- Patourel, H. E. J. Le & Wood, P. (1973): "Excavation of the Archbishops of York's Manor house at Otley", Yorkshire Archaeological Journal 45 (1973) 115-141
- Platt, C. P. S. (1969): The Monastic Grange in Medieval England (London 1969)
- Salzman, L. F. (1952): Building in England to 1540: a documentary history (Oxford 1952)
- Smith, R. A. L. (1969): Canterbury Cathedral Priory (Cambridge 1969)
- Still, L. (1965): "Excavation at Low Grange Farm", Transactions of the Architectural and Archaeological Society of Durham and Northumberland XI (1965) 391-403
- Still, L. & Pallister, A. F. (1978): "Excavations of a moated site at East Red Hall, Haughton le Skerne, Darlington", Transactions of the Architectural and Archaeological Society of Durham and Northumberland IV New Series 1973-6, 85-99
- Still, L. & Southeran, J. (1966), Medieval origins of Billingham (Barnard Castle 1966)
- Surtees, R. (1816, 1820, 1823, 1840); History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham (London 1816, 1820, 1823, 1840)
- Victoria County History: Durham (London 1905, 1907, 1928)
- Woods, M. E. (1948-9): "13th Century domestic architecture in England", Archaeological Journal supplement cv (1948-9), 1-150
- Unpublished Theses:
- Foster, M. R. (1979): "Durham Cathedral Priory 1229-1333: Aspects of the Ecclesiastical history and interests of the monastic community", Ph.D. Cambridge 1979
- Halcrow, E. M. (1949); "Administration and Agrarian Policy of the Manors of Durham Cathedral Priory," B. Litt. Oxford 1949
- Lomas, R. A. (1973): "Durham Cathedral Priory as a landowner and landlord 1290-1540", Ph.D. Durham 1973

Platt, C. P. S. (1966): "The Monastic Grange: a survey of  
the historical and archaeological evidence, Ph.D.  
Leeds 1966

