



Durham E-Theses

Studies in the redistribution of collegiate and chantry property in the diocese and county of York at the dissolution

Kitching, C. J.

How to cite:

Kitching, C. J. (1970) *Studies in the redistribution of collegiate and chantry property in the diocese and county of York at the dissolution*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/8050/>

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.

STUDIES IN THE REDISTRIBUTION OF
COLLEGIATE AND CHANTRY PROPERTY IN THE DIOCESE AND COUNTY OF YORK
AT THE DISSOLUTION .

VOLUME I
(TEXT)

by C.J.Kitching,
(B.A. Dunelm.)

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.

Thesis submitted for the degree of Ph.D. in the University of Durham. 1970

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

'Studies in the redistribution of collegiate and chantry property
in the diocese and county of York at the Dissolution'

by C.J.Kitching

Although much work has been done on the disposal of monastic property, and of chantry property insofar as it affected education, and poor relief, this is the first regional attempt to probe the motives and means of those who bought chantry property. The area chosen for the study is rich in material for every aspect of the Dissolution : Chantry Certificates, and Ministers' and Receivers' Accounts; Particulars for Sale and Lease, and corresponding Letters Patent; records of the Courts of Augmentations, Exchequer and Duchy of Lancaster. Through these and isolated provincial material, it has been possible to compile a reasonably complete picture of the Dissolution, over a wide area of northern England. The thesis surveys the process of sale and lease, central and local administration of the Dissolution, buyers and agents, lands concealed from the crown, and many cases arising in the courts. Its principal conclusion is that by no means all the property was sold, even by the end of the sixteenth century. Much was leased or farmed, especially in the Duchy of Lancaster and in the former collegiate holdings. Although there were some major agents, notably Augmentations officials, everything suggests that few major buyers were interested and that, at this distance from London, purchases were often confined to marginal extension of existing holdings, particularly in the towns, where the decay of much property becomes starkly apparent. Practically nothing was given to favourites. All the worth-while work of the chantries was continued by the crown under stricter control. Contemporary protest was negligible. Moreover, the feasibility of this study is itself testimony to the efficiency of the state under a much maligned government. Tentative explorations among the Ministers' Accounts for other regions suggest that the crown often continued to draw a steady income from the chantries even after 1553.

(Submitted for the degree of Ph.D. in the University of Durham, 1970)

TABLE OF CONTENTS TO THE FIRST VOLUME

Preface	Page ii
List of Abbreviations	v
List of Tables in Volume I	vi
<u>Chapters and sub-sections:</u>	
I. The movement towards dissolution	1
The National Background,1;	
The Regional Background,14.	
II. The Statutes and Commissions	29
The Chantry Acts ,29;	
The compilation of the Chantry Certificates,35.	
The accuracy of the Certificates,38;	
The nature of the endowments,46.	
III. Gifts and Continuations	57
Free Gifts,58;	
Poor Relief,63;	
Education,72;	
Chapels of Ease,86.	
IV. Sales (i)	94
The procedure and the source material,94;	
Approaches to the centre,104;	
Regional contacts and mobility,108;	
The agents and the Ratees,113;	
Patentees and Ratees,120;	
The actual purchasers,130.	
V. Sales (ii)	147
Problems of interpretation,147;	
Tenants and Gentry,152;	
The commissions for sale after 1549,154;	
Administrative problems,160.	
VI. Leases and Copyhold lands	164
Leases and Farms,164;	
The source material,166;	
Procedure for obtaining a lease :Edward VI to Elizabeth,169;	
The Duchy of Lancaster Leases,183;	
Leases outside the Duchy,189;	
Copyhold Land,195.	
VII. The disposal of the movable goods	208
Plate,208; goods and stock,214; lead and bells,220; other fabric,225;	
Case-study: the movables of the East Riding,229.	
VIII. Concealments	237
IX. Litigation	269
X. The Ministers' Accounts	298
The sources,298; rent-collecting and arrears,302;	
exonerations,312; decay and repair,316; fees,324.	
XI. Conclusions: Profit and Loss	326
The National Background,326; the regional picture,332; Saleable commodities ? ,335;	
Conclusion,342.	

PREFACE

The variety of opinion expressed on the dissolution of the chantries and on its impact on English government and society has betrayed the prejudices and inadequacies of the work of many 'historians' over the past four centuries. Like Thomas Fuller in the 17th century, many have been content to concentrate on the scramble for ~~church~~ lands which resulted from the knowledge that:

this was the last dish of the last course, and after chantries, as after cheese, nothing to be expected.¹

The view was endorsed most recently by the historian of the Court of Augmentations himself, who noted that, after a few concessions to the grammar schools,

most of the remainder was devoured by rapacious ministers and courtiers who, by gift, purchase, or illegal expropriation, absorbed the greater portion of the chantry revenue before it ever reached the royal coffers.²

By contrast, the early 19th-century historian of Pontefract was content to observe that for his town, 'no fact of importance occurs during the reign of Edward VI, whose piety has embalmed his memory'.³ But at the other end of the same century, A.F. Leach left no room for doubt that the same Edward VI had ravished the schools.⁴ Lately, the work of Prof. W.K. Jordan in particular has served to confute much of Leach's extremism.⁵

One puzzling question is that of the crown's profit from the dissolution. W.C. Richardson felt that:

the profits actually acquired from these foundations proved to be disappointingly meagre,⁶

whilst another writer, without the benefit of Richardson's work and experience, felt that despite the small value of each individual chantry,

the great number of them brought a vast amount of wealth to the crown, but the king squandered a large portion on his courtiers, and no man knew the total sum thus alienated from the Church.⁷

Such contradictions themselves merit a detailed discussion and justify a further probe into the dissolution, but I was also spurred into attempting this study by an awareness of the scant attention given to the fate of chantry property in comparison with the wealth of valuable work on the monastic lands in recent years. Whoever was interested in so many bits and pieces of property? How did those who wished to buy discover that the sales were in progress, and how did they set about registering their bids? How difficult was the

operation to administer, and did the crown make a profit or a loss ? Was every available bit of property sold off, and if so how quickly ? These were the obvious questions which had never been answered, and the first step towards a solution seemed to lie in an intensive regional study.

The region studied and the period covered demand a little explanation. In order to make the fullest use of the Chantry Certificates and their arrangement by counties, it was necessary to include parts of the county of Yorkshire which lay outside the boundary of the Diocese of York, the area originally planned for the survey. In particular, Richmondshire has been included. The basic area covered, then, may be taken as the counties of Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire. I have not included any lands within this area which belonged to institutions situated elsewhere (notably, Thornton college, Lincs.; St Stephen's College, Westminster), but I have included the chantries of Northallerton and Howden which were technically within the diocese of Durham, though within the area covered, whilst omitting those parts of the diocese which formed islands in other counties. Whilst the bulk of the work refers to the disposal of land between 1545 and 1553, I have not kept rigidly to these limits when a particular line of enquiry demanded further pursuit. Thus, reference will be found to the leasing of chantry property in the twenty years before the dissolution, and to the crown's attempts to trace concealed lands in the later sixteenth century. The primary objective, however, has been to trace the pattern of sale and lease during the reign of Edward VI, and where figures cited are intended to refer to any other period this is clearly stated in the text.

For the purpose of accounts, the year ended at Michaelmas, so that the Ministers' Account for 1553 is the one presented at Michaelmas 1553. In dating, the year is assumed to have begun on January 1st : thus, for example, 20 February 1548/9 is written as 20 February 1549. Spelling has been reproduced as far as possible in the manner of the sources quoted, but I have altered or supplied punctuation where it seemed necessary to facilitate comprehension. In general, major quotations have been inset to distinguish them from the text. Many of the more important tables have been held over to the second volume in order that they may be easily consulted alongside the text

I am indebted to so many people that it is impossible to name them all individually, and to those whose influence is not specifically acknowledged I extend both my gratitude and apologies. To the staff of the Public Record Office I owe most of all. Without their unfailing patience and assistance I could never have seen so much material in so concentrated a sojourn in London. No less helpful were the staffs of the British Museum Manuscript Students' Room, the county halls at Northallerton and Beverley, the public libraries at York, Leeds and Sheffield, the guildhall at Hull, York Minster Library, the Borthwick Institute of Historical Research and the Yorkshire Archaeological Society.

At various stages I have been assisted by communications with Dr Joyce Youings, Mrs Norah Gurney and Prof. Gordon Batho, and discussions with Mr Alan Kreider and Mrs Sybil Jack. My thanks are also due to Prof. S.T. Bindoff and Dr (now Prof.) J.J. Scarisbrick for stimulation derived from their seminars in the University of London, and particularly to the latter for allowing me to launch a preliminary paper for constructive criticism at the hands of other Tudor specialists. Dr Peter Brooks kindly allowed me to test some further ideas before his seminar in the University of Kent at Canterbury.

Above all, I wish to thank Dr David M. Loades, my supervisor, initially for kindling my enthusiasm for Reformation studies, and lately for directing my progress through some of the more difficult back-waters of 16th-century administration. Without his unfailing generosity and hospitality (considerably over and above the call of duty!) my labours would certainly have been the more Herculean.

University College, Durham 1970

C.J. Kitching

Footnotes to Preface

- 1) Cited in W.C. Richardson, History of the Court of Augmentations, 172n.
- 2) Ibid. 172.
- 3) B. Boothroyd, History of the Ancient Borough of Pontefract, 146.
- 4) For works by A.F. Leach, see Bibliography in Volume II.
- 5) For works by W.K. Jordan, see Bibliography in Volume II.
- 6) Richardson, loc.cit.
- 7) Thoresby Society, xvii, 97.

Abbreviations

The following are the abbreviations most commonly used in the footnotes of volume I. Any abbreviations of the full names of parishes and endowments are explained in a further list to be found in volume II (General Appendix I).

AASRP	Associated Architectural Societies Reports and Papers
APC	<u>Acts of the Privy Council</u>
B.J.Ed.S.	British Journal of Educational Studies
BM	British Museum
CPR	<u>Calendar of the Patent Rolls</u>
CSP	<u>Calendar of State Papers...</u>
cl.	(of Statutes) = clause number
DNB	<u>Dictionary of National Biography</u>
Ec.H.R.	Economic History Review
E.Y.K.	<u>Edward VI, The Young King</u> , by W.K.Jordan
EHR	English Historical Review
J.Eccl.H.	Journal of Ecclesiastical History
J.H.Id.	Journal of the History of Ideas
LQR	Law Quarterly Review
Northd	Northumberland
PRO	Public Record Office
<u>Rural Charities</u>	= <u>The Charities of Rural England</u> , by W.K.Jordan
STC	<u>Short Title Catalogue</u>
TCWAAS	Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society
YAJ	Yorkshire Archaeological Journal
YASR	Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Records Series
YCS (I & II)	<u>Yorkshire Chantry Surveys</u> , vols. I & II (Surtees Soc.)

Other works referred to in the footnotes are recorded by a recognisable short title, the full title and particulars being recorded in the

Bibliography at the end of Volume II. The latter includes a list of unpublished theses consulted, which for economy of space are sometimes listed in the footnotes only by author's name and year.

Tables appearing in Volume I

I. Promotions in the diocese and county of York subject to the Tenth as recorded in the <u>Valor Ecclesiasticus</u> . (opp. page 15)	
II. Institutions in the East Riding which surrendered to Sir Michael Stanhope in 1547.	21
III. The distribution of Leases of chantry property prior to the dissolution, according to term.	25
IV. Summary of the changes in gross total income in the chantries of Ripon between 1546 and 1548.	41
V. The descriptions of Bawtry Gild in the Chantry Certificates. p.45	
VI. Contributions of cathedrals of the New Foundation and of certain colleges to charitable works.	64
VII. The fate of the hospitals recorded in the Chantry Certificates of 1546 or 1548.	68
VIII. The fate of schools' endowments in cases where connection with a chantry led to expropriation.	85
IX. The time-lapse between payment for the property and the issue of the Patent.	98
X. The patronage of the Duke of Somerset.	106
XI. The Ratees.	119
XII. The clients of Sir Michael Stanhope and John Bellow.	122
XIII. Chantry Commissioners in various counties known to have had any part in the transactions over chantry property in the diocese and county of York.	126
XIV. The clients of Sir Thomas Bell and Richard Duke.	127
XV. The patentees.	129
XVI. Tenants known to have purchased their own plots.	152
XVII. The commissions for sale, 1553-1563.	159
XVIII. The Duchy of Lancaster Leases, 1548-1553.	186
XIX. The sureties for certain Duchy lessees.	186
XX. The range of Lease values, 1548-1553.	195
XXI. The value and disposal of chantry plate at the Dissolution. p.212	
XXIIa. The disposal of the lead and bells.	225
XXIIb. The disposal of further fabric and goods.	229
XXIIc. The disposal of movable goods in the East Riding by John Bellow and his servants.	234
XXIII. The interim report of John Lambert, Anthony Dale and Richard Bewcock on concealed lands in the wapentake of Ucross up to January 1550.	242
XXIV. The report of another concealment enquiry in Edward's reign, submitted by Anthony Dale, John Lambert and Stephen Tempest.	242
XXV. Summary of expenses claimed in the Ministers' Accounts.	316
XXVI. Salaries of some local officers of the court of Augmentations and others responsible for land revenue.	324
XXVII. The magnitude of payments from chantry revenues to the crown Receivers in various counties for the year ending Michaelmas 1553.	331

XXVIII. Chantry income and pensions as shown in the Receivers' Accounts. (331)

XXIX . Receipts from chantry sources in the Yorkshire parts of the Duchy of Lancaster. 333

XXX . Receipts from chantries in Richmondshire. 333

XXXI . Receipts from chantries in the Yorkshire account. 333

XXXII. The disposal of chantry and collegiate property in the diocese and county of York, 1548-1553. 336

Further Tables which are not listed here appear in the Appendix (vol.II)

* * * * *

CHAPTER I

THE MOVEMENT TOWARDS DISSOLUTION

"Now may they make us believe that their masses be helpful sacrifices both for the quick and the dead. Now must we believe that the Pope's pardons do release us both from pain and fault."

(Supplication of the Poore Commons,
1546.)

1. The National Background

Shortly before it adjourned for Christmas in 1545, Henry VIII's Parliament launched an attack on the abuses of embezzlement which it thought it saw to be widespread among the chantries and colleges. For months there had been rumours that Henry, his finances crippled by the expenses of war and inflation, would turn to the colleges just as, a decade earlier, he had turned to the monasteries, to extricate himself from his difficulties.¹ Many members of Parliament welcomed any expedient which would help reduce the burden of taxation, and they did not conceal this when drawing up the Chantry Act. The need to appropriate land in a national emergency had frequently been recognised in the past.² Most recently, Henry VIII had sought to appease the discontent of the Lancashire Pilgrims, by pointing to the expropriation of the monasteries as an alternative to troubling people with taxes.³ The idea

-
1. Chapuys to the Emperor, June 1545, L.&P. 20 - i, 984. Warfare raised Henry's annual expenditure in his last five years by about 250% (F.C. Dietz, Finances of Ed. VI 74-6). The cost of war and rebellions Jan. 1545 - May 1550 was estimated at £3½m. (P.R.O. S.P. 10/15 f. 18.)
 2. cf. Wyclif's view, E.C. Tatnall in J. Eccl. H., xx.
 3. C. Haigh, 'The Last days of the Lancashire Monasteries', 88.

was firmly rooted by 1548 when Edward VI started to sell chantry lands:

specially for the relief of the Kinges Majestes charges and expences which do dayly growe and encrease by reason of diverse and sundry fortifications. 4.

And in 1550, about to complain of the crown's failure to devote chantry property to educational and social uses, Lever was able to preface his remarks by accepting the principle that:

Such abundance of goods as was superstitiously spent upon vain ceremonies, or voluptuously upon idle bellies, might come to the king's hands to bear his great charges, necessarily bestowed in the common wealth, or partly unto other men's hands for the better relief of the poor, the maintenance of learning and the setting forth of God's word. 5.

Henry himself relied on the gentry's concern for their purses rather than any other factor in obtaining control of the chantries. It was widely felt that, following the dissolution of the monasteries, which had perhaps caused a greater crisis of conscience, the colleges and other ecclesiastical endowments could not survive intact indefinitely.

But alongside those who saw the move primarily as an economic necessity, or as a logical extension of the crown's control over the church on lines firmly laid down under Cromwell, there were several voices demanding the removal of superstitious beliefs and practices. These voices Henry VIII chose not to hear. He did not need their support for the dissolution when the economic motive itself was sufficient to carry the day. And

-
4. APC 1547-50, 184. Edward inherited a foreign debt of £80,000 (Dietz, *op. cit.*, 76). As sales began in 1548 there were reports of French hostility in Scotland. (C.S.P. Foreign 1547-53, 16; W.K. Jordan E.Y.K., 268).
 5. The Sermons of Thomas Lever (1550) ed. E. Arber, 32.

whatever limited sympathies he may have had towards the religious reformers, he could not afford to weaken his position still further in Europe by openly embracing their doctrines, particularly when the bulk of his subjects and many of his most faithful advisers were content with the Henrician reform that retained the old religious observances but removed the last trappings of papal authority in England. At heart, Henry was still a conservative, and the obits he ordained to sanctify his departure from this world were more than mere outward show.⁶

The voices were not kept silent despite the King's personal views. For them, the dissolution of the Monasteries had been the signal for the destruction of purgatory. In 1537 Latimer read into the dissolution of the monasteries more than the crown had intended:

The founding of monasteries argued purgatory to be, so the pulling of them down argueth it not to be, what uncharitableness and cruelty seemeth it to be/destroy monasteries if purgatory /to be! 7.

His sentiments were echoed in 1539:-

as long as praying for souls departed is suffered the people will think that there is a purgatory, and that in process of time will cause many to think that it is a pity that houses of Religion should be decayed whose prayers, as they think, profited much to souls departed. And that thereafter shall cause the King's deeds in suppressing of houses of Religion to be thought uncharitable, and that may be hereafter right dangerous as well to the king's supremacy as to his succession.

-
6. Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, II.ii.289-311. For Henry's beliefs at this period, see J.J. Scarysbrick, Henry VIII, 472 et seq.
 7. L. & P. 12 - i 1312. Cited by L.B. Smith, Tudor Prelates 249.

Wherefore it seemeth not good that the matter be any longer winked at but that it be plainly declared and known whether there be any such place or not, and no man to hold opinion against that declaration. 8.

To the end, however, Henry upheld the belief and practice of prayers for the dead. The controversy over purgatory which had been largely submerged since Wyclif's time except in groups of his followers, had burst out again in the late 1520's and 1530's with the clash between Tyndale and More.⁹ Fish lent his support to the one side, and, appropriately enough, Fisher to the other, whilst Frith and Rastall became engaged in mortal combat.¹⁰ The Defender of the Faith had intervened to stop the debate then by prohibiting the works of Tyndale and Fish in 1531, executing Frith as a heretic and issuing in 1534 a proclamation which included purgatory among controversial topics not to be raised in the pulpit.¹¹ In 1536 a draft reform condemning purgatory was contemplated, but never proceeded further,¹² and the official formularies of the following years

8. L.&P. 14-i 376(4); Smith, op. cit., 169

9. See, inter alia, D.B. Knox, The Doctrine of Faith in the reign of Henry VIII; The English Works of Sir Thomas More (ed. W.E. Campbell); Tyndale, Works III (Parker Soc.) esp. pp. 28, 146.

10. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, IV ii, 662-3; E. Surtz, The Works and days of John Fisher, 295-6; Knox, op. cit., 116; J. Rastell, A new boke of Purgatory (S.T.C. 20719); J. Frith, A disputation of Purgatorie (S.T.C. 11387) and An other boke against Rastel (S.T.C. 11385). The reformed tradition may also be glimpsed in very many other works, including J. Aepinus, Liber de Purgatorio (S.T.C. 166) and the writings of the following in Parker Society: Coverdale II, 258, 473-5; Becon II, 168-183 (esp. 174-6); 387-398 (esp. 393-5) and 413-7; Bradford I 49, 367-74.

11. M. Maclure, The Paul's Cross Sermons, 23-5

12. Ibid., 27.

all retained belief in the efficacy of prayers for the dead.¹³ The King's Book of 1543 continued to refer to the habit as a worthy tradition, even though purgatory was recognised to be non-scriptural and the abuses associated with the papacy had been condemned.¹⁴ The issue was practically dormant in the early forties, perhaps because all the pros and cons had been raised and nothing further could be achieved by mere repetition. But Dr. Edward Crome who had sacrificed his position and dignity on several occasions by preaching on prohibited or controversial topics, saw the Henrician Chantry Act as an admission by the crown of the superstition involved in such observances:-

If trentals and chantry masses could avail the souls in Purgatory, then did the Parliament not well in giving away monasteries, colleges and chantries which served principally to that purpose. But if the Parliament did well (as no man could deny) in dissolving them and bestowing the same upon the king, then is it a plain case that such chantries and private masses do nothing confer to relieve them in purgatory. 15.

Henry was unyielding. He did not need nor want this kind of support, and inevitably Crome was arrested again. Only with the death of the old king did the reformers gain the chance they had waited for. The Injunctions of 1547 were already urging the churches to convert to other uses funds left to maintain lamps and fraternities, and the dying were

13. Especially the Ten Articles and the Bishops' Book.

14. The King's Book (ed. T.A. Lacey), 163.

15. Maclure, op. cit., 36-7; also P. Hughes, The Reformation in England, II, 64-6.

to be exhorted not to leave gifts to support 'pardons, pilgrimages, trentals....and other blind devotions.'¹⁶

This set the mood for the second Chantry Act of 1547 which, as we shall see, attacked its targets on the grounds of superstition.¹⁷

But the 'blindness' of the devotions which had so lost the favour of the reformers had not been demonstrated to the man in the pew, and the further away from London and the ports open to continental thought, the more deeply were they rooted in popular tradition. If the crown declared purgatory not to be, did this overnight extinguish the flames and soothe the pains which so many from all levels of society had believed it offered? The impact of the Edwardian changes on the popular mind will never be capable of examination, but we can perhaps gain some idea of the nature of purgatory as envisaged by many of our forbears from the one popular printed book on the subject which is not part of the academic controversy. The only copy of A little book that speaketh of Purgatory to survive is now in the Huntingdon Library, California.¹⁸ Printed by Wyer about 1530 but with no hint of polemic, or of being written during a raging controversy, it appears to be an attempt to state in popular verse the exact nature of Purgatory and of the pains there, for instruction and for devotion. It cannot be

16. P.L. Hughes & J.F. Larkin (ed.), Tudor Royal Proclamations, I, 397-401.

17. Chapter II below.

18. S.T.C. 3360. Quoted here by kind permission of the Librarian of the Huntingdon Library.

were protesting. Books of this kind did not long survive the controversial thirties, but the ideas they spread certainly did so. Writing in 1561, Jean Veron in the Huntynge of Purgatorye to death²⁶ blamed the legend of St. Patrick's Purgatory, one of the most persistent of medieval romances throughout Europe, for the ignorant belief of most men about purgatory:

Do ye not remember what bokes we had of it
when we were litell chyldren and went to
scoole? 27.

And if the child did not hear such stories, the grown man, at least if he was literate, might find them in most primers published before the reign of Edward VI, in the rubric attached to the '15 OES', or prayers, of St. Bridgit. The 1535 York Book of Hours was among those to state:

These be the 15 oos the which the holy
virgin St. Bridget was wont to say daily
before the holy rood in St. Paul's church
in Rome; whoso say this a whole year he
shall deliver 15 souls out of purgatory of
his next kindred and convert other 15
sinners to good life, and other 15 righteous
men of his kind shall persevere in good life.
And what ye desire of God ye shall have it,
if it be to the salvation of your soul. 28.

The dangers of this rubric were readily appreciated and some steps were taken to remove it. The 'Rouen' primer of 1538 condemned the 'goodly paynted prefaces', though the prayers themselves remained popular, and there can be

26. S.T.C. 24683. 'Newly set forth and alowed accordinge too the order appoynted in the Quenes Maiesties Iniunctions.'

27. Ibid. f. 173 v.

28. Surtees Society vol. 132 (1919: Horae Eboracenses), 76

little doubt that, by association, so did the belief in their power.²⁹

Robert Aske voiced the opinion of most of his countrymen when he lamented that, through the dissolution of the monasteries there were

great number of masses unsaid.....to the
distress of the faith and spiritual comfort
to man's soul. 30.

Likewise there were many more who must have felt that the denial of purgatory by the crown was quite meaningless; the place had become so real to them.

I have treated this subject at perhaps disproportionate length to stress that, whilst we shall be studying the property of the colleges and chantries, the greater devastation probably came to the popular conscience, unable to accept the end of purgatory yet unwilling to defy the crown. This factor lies behind much of the concealment of property on the eve of the dissolution, and it is salutary to bear it in mind as we proceed at a more materialistic

29. See Helen C. White, Tudor Books of Private Devotion, esp. pp. 77-8. It is doubtful whether the spread of the English Bible had altered men's beliefs by 1545 even though Abp. Lee made the reading of Epistle and Gospel in English compulsory throughout the diocese in 1538, (A.G. Dickens, Lollards and Protestants, 171.)

30. M.H. and R. Dodds, The Pilgrimage of Grace, I, 348.

level.

However, there seems to be no contemporary evidence of any ill will towards the crown explicitly because the wills of the dead were subverted by the dissolution. This is a facet invented by later writers³¹ and not even Gardiner raised any protest at the time. Few questioned the crown's right to appropriate the lands of the chantries. And in an age where 'stewardship' was increasingly on men's tongues, the property of the church was an obvious target.

Even without the doctrinal challenge which claimed that endowments for masses and obits were superfluous anyway, all who owned any property were seen to be answerable before God for the way in which they disposed of their profits. Sympathy for the poor, and an equitable distribution of alms, were preached from almost every pulpit and market-cross in the century and a half before the dissolution, and clerics were often themselves the first to criticise the sins of an affluent and acquisitive society³²: a fact which rebounded to the discredit of the church at large and helped swell the chorus of grievances which centred on rents, taxes, tithe and fees, and burst forth only occasionally in serious

31. cf. Jeremy Collier, Ecclesiastical HistoryV, 149: 'as popes have often taken money to let souls out of purgatory, so the king took land, one would almost think, to keep them in.' See also P. Hughes, op. cit. II, 156.

32. See for example G.R. Owst, Literature and Pulpit Chapters V, VI.

episodes like the Hunne case. The general grudge against the clergy for their ignorance, corruption and privileged legal position, was particularised whenever the rapacious landlord was condemned.

The crown, which had an especial duty to protect the commonwealth in time of war, also had a permanent obligation to protect its interests and to maintain its harmony. The Reformation Parliament abolished the lingering concept of the church as a state within the state, and recovered for the crown the jurisdiction over much of the church's land which had evaded its control despite attempts since the Statute of Mortmain³³ to restrict the flow of land into the 'dead hand' of the church where it escaped the feudal burdens formerly imposed upon it.³⁴ The existence of the chantries was testimony to the extent of heed given to this Statute. For the modest fee of a mortmain licence most perpetual endowments were legally created. Endowments in cash or for a term of years needed no such licence, and it was also possible to enfeoff to the use of a chantry without actually giving land to the church for ever: a simple devise which effectively evaded feudal burdens again.

33. Stat. 7 Edw. Ic. 13. (1279).

34. See articles on frankalmoign by F. Maitland, L.Q.R. vii 354, and E.G. Kimball, E.H.R. xliii, 341. For mortmain see J.M.W. Bean, The decline of English Feudalism, 49-66; and for Uses Ibid., 287-291, J.L. Barton in L.Q.R. lxxxi, esp. p. 565, Percy Bordwell in Iowa Law Review xxi (1935).

The Reformation Parliament strove to re-implement the Crown's authority by forbidding the unlicensed endowment of obits for more than 20 years duration,³⁵ and incidentally by the Statute of Uses³⁶ whereby the chantry priest who was the beneficiary of a use should have become the owner of the property, responsible to the crown. Further loopholes were found, as we shall see below.³⁷ Another Act denied the clergy the right to obtain leases of lands other than the demesne of abbeys or the parochial glebe,³⁸ and forbade beneficed clerks to accept extra stipends or 'sing for any soul.' These have to be seen within the context of the taming and subjection of the Church to the Royal Supremacy, the dissolution of the chantries being, from this viewpoint, a logical extension of the crown's authority.³⁹

But beyond the right to order the property of the church, the supremacy gave the king the obligation to use this property to the good of the commonwealth, and the spending of vast sums on warfare was too intangibly beneficial to strike a sympathetic chord in the hearts of the social reformers. We must examine educational and social theory a little more at a later stage.⁴⁰ Crowley's

35. Stat. 23 Hen. VIII c.10.

36. Stat. 27 Hen. VIII c.10.

37. p. 197 et seq.

38. Stat. 21 Hen. VIII c.13.

39. But not, surely, 'simply another stage in the secularisation of Church property' (G.R. Elton, England under the Tudors, 205) in view of the government's declared aims of social reforms.

40. Chapter III below.

condemnation of the notion, 'It is mine owne, who shall warn me to do with mine owne as myself listeth' was warmly received by Hales: 'It may not be lawful for every man to use his own as him listeth, but every man must use that he hath to the most benefit of his country.'⁴¹ And it was these views which led reformers to welcome the dissolution. There was a need for more and better schools, hospitals and almshouses.⁴² The crown could provide from the wealth of the church. But this meant abandoning the rapacious courtiers and cutting the number of gifts. Many were disillusioned by the failure of the monastic expropriations to achieve their desired utopian social reforms.⁴³ By 1550 Lever was beginning to despair of even the Edwardian government's good intentions so boldly announced in the preamble to the second Chantry Act.⁴⁴

-
41. Quoted in W.K. Jordan, E.Y.K., 417. For Commonwealth ideas see W.R.D. Jones, The Tudor Commonwealth; J.W. Allen A history of Political Thought...., part 2 ch. III; and A.B. Ferguson in J.H. Id. 1955, 287.
42. H.C. White, Social Criticism, *passim*. The theme recurs in the works of most of these writers, including Starkey, Fish and Brinkelow. The latter, in the Complaynt of Roderyck Mors had elaborated a scheme to use the 'goods and lands of bishops, deans, canons and chantries to God's glory, to the common wealth and to the help of the poor.'
43. cf. W.R.D. Jones *op.cit.*, 21, 76-7: Crowley and Sir Francis Bigod among others. Bale felt that the property was sold 'to the upholding of dice-playing, masking and banqueting': J.W. Harris, John Bale, 28.
44. 'Covetous officers have so used this matter that even those goods which did seem to the relief of the poor (etc...), be now turned to maintain worldly, wicked, covetous ambition.' From the outset, many expected favourites to gain most, see Cox in L.&P. 21-1, 260.

The dissolution of the chantries caught nobody unawares. It had been expected for a variety of reasons and by people of a wide-range of interests, though under Henry VIII many of their aspirations were unfulfilled. We must now turn to consider our area in more depth.

2. The Regional Background

The humble station of many a chantry priest has left him open to rough treatment at the hands of contemporaries and historians. Chaucer commended his parson for not throwing up his parochial duties and taking a chantry at St. Paul's which would have been an easier life.⁴⁵ In less poetic, but no less vigorous terms, one historian described the cantarists with disdain:

It was doubtless from these men that the greatest discredit came upon the church: they dwelt often in private families in a mean position, and sank to the level of those with whom they lived. 46.

Now whilst there were many cantarists in 1546 who held more than one chantry, there were still more whose chantries were their only official clerical post. Pluralism in the parochial benefices and prebends was not a sign of

45. Cited by A.J. Kempe in Archaeologia xxv, 125.

46. W.H. Hutton in Social England II ii, 635.

Table I : Promotions in the diocese and county of York subject to the Tenth as recorded in the Valor Ecclesiasticus .

* * * * *

This table is included in order to give some idea of the ratio of chantries to other promotions in the early 16th century. The figures are for parochial incumbencies in each deanery, and do not include any monastic foundations. It should be remembered that there were many other clergy not comprised within the categories recorded in the Valor , and equally that there were many chantries and similar endowments which did not have to pay the Tenth, so that the figures for each column can only be very approximate. I have completely omitted both promotions and chantries in the city of York and its Minster, where there were so many clergy as seriously to distort the general picture for the region. For the same reason, the following are also omitted : the collegiate churches of Beverley, Hemingbrough, Howden, Lowthorpe, Sutton, Acaster, Rotherham, Southwell, Ripon and St Sepulchre (York). Even without these institutions, where the greatest number of chantry priests are to be found, the results are significant :-

District	Total no. of promotions paying tenth (incl. chantries)	Chantries paying tenth	Chantries as %
WEST RIDING			
Deanery of the Ainsty	93	44	46
Deanery of Doncaster	139	78	56
Deanery of Pontefract	94	63	66
County Total	326	185	57
EAST RIDING			
Deanery of Buckrose	25	0	-
Deanery of Holderness	51	10	20
Deanery of Harthill	67	17	25
Deanery of Dickering	43	18	42
County Total	186	45	24
NORTH RIDING			
Deanery of Cleveland	35	7	20
Deanery of Bulmer	54	12	22
Deanery of Craven	50	19	38
Deanery of Ryedale	34	8	24
County Total	173	46	27
ARCHDEACONRY OF RICHMOND			
Deanery of Boroughbridge	25	10	40
Deanery of Richmond	28	6	21
Deanery of Catterick	49	23	47
Total	102	39	38
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE			
Deanery of Nottingham	48	15	31
Deanery of Bingham	50	6	12
Deanery of Radford	63	19	30
Deanery of Newark	52	21	40
Jurisdiction of Southwell	26	5	20
County Total	239	66	28
GRAND TOTAL	1026	381	37

a lack of available ordinands; the ill-learned priest of humble origins could not hope to aspire to the choicest preferments and to this extent the chantry provided a home, albeit humble, for the dedicated amateur of small means.⁴⁷ Again, we touch on a topic that will not always be before us as we proceed, yet in human terms the expropriation was to present serious crises of unemployment.⁴⁸ Some idea of the ratio of cantarists to beneficed clergy may be obtained from the lists of promotions paying the tenth in the Valor Ecclesiasticus of 1535. Excluding the collegiate churches and the whole of the city of York as liable to distort the picture we arrive at the numbers of tenthable promotions shown in table I. There were, of course, many curates and other un-beneficed clergy,⁴⁹ just as there were several chantries of a non-perpetual nature not subject to the tenth, but within the limitations of the material the figures show how great a proportion of all clerical posts were accounted for by chantries. The picture did not greatly change by 1546.

47. General works include K.L. Wood-Legh, Perpetual Chantries; G.H. Cook, Medieval Chantries and Chantry Chapels, and A.H. Thompson, English Colleges of Chantry Priests.

48. This study deals only with property and its distribution. Pensions etc. have not been included.

49. See, for example, Y.A.J. xxiv, 62.

The number of chantries in existence varied substantially from year to year. Whilst there was no evidence of such a steep loss of interest in chantry foundations in the north of England as in the south,⁵⁰ there had nevertheless been a change of emphasis during the 16th century, away from the perpetual and towards the short-term endowment.⁵¹ This was mainly attributable to economic pressures rather than either a loss of faith in chantries or a fear of expropriation, though in the 1540's the latter no doubt deterred potential founders from taking too much out of their family estate. The dissolution of the monasteries can only have strengthened the move towards the cash endowment which could speedily be spent up, or the short term deployment of land which would revert to the founder's heirs after a number of years. These trends may be amply illustrated from the wills of the region.

Richard Allen of Brandon near Harewood left 10/- in February, 1543, to a chantry priest to say a trental of masses, with the instruction that, if his estate should prove sufficient for the purpose, a further 10/- be granted to the priest to continue singing for the souls of Allen and his wife for a further quarter of a

50. W.K. Jordan, Rural charities 366, 373, 219; 'Social Institutions of Lancs.' 77-8

51. Jordan, Rural charities, 219: Between 1480 and 1540 $\frac{2}{3}$ of all endowments were for prayers alone

year only.⁵² In May of the same year, William Utley, a chantry priest at Batley, himself left a cash donation to the poor on condition that they prayed for his soul.⁵³ The fear of impending expropriation is also met. Sir William Gascoigne of Gawthorpe left £40 in the winter of 1545-6 for the building of a tomb and the costs of a choir. A priest was to receive £5 p.a. for four years to maintain an obit. Whilst a further six priests were to receive 6/8 per year financed from land he held on lease in Wyke:

So longe as my yeres in the said lease endure
if the said chanteres so long contynewe. 54.

Thomas Wentworth of Wentworth expressed similar doubts when leaving seven marks for an obit:

to prairie for me and my ancetores saulles and
all Christen soulles if the lawe will permit
it 55

New endowments were only proceeding with caution, then, on the eve of the dissolution, but the faith in the observances was still strong throughout the region.

A more serious trend which had hit the chantries was the rise in prices and the corresponding fall in real income. The economic problem was worst in the towns, where property

52. Thoresby Soc. vol. 19: Testamenta Leodiensia 1539-1553, 93-4.

53. Ibid., 87. See also Surtees Soc. vol. 104, Knaresborough Wills, esp. 38 (John Jeffrey); 41 (Wm. Foster); 44-5 (Maud Beckwith).

54. Surtees Soc. vol. 106 Testamenta Eboracensia VI, 234

55. Ibid. 240-1. cf. Brian Appleby (Surtees soc. vol. 26, 68) and Agnes Beane (vol. 104, 53).

swiftly fell into decay. At Hull in 1548 the mayor claimed to have ceased payment to three stipendiaries because the lands supporting them were in decay.⁵⁶ York city had been so crippled economically that it had obtained as early as 1536 an Act of Parliament permitting the local dissolution of several chantries and obits, the proceeds and property going to the corporation.⁵⁷ The Chantry Certificates of 1546 and 1548 show further instances of economic stress.⁵⁸

However, the condition of many chantries was a reflection of the general problem of the church: buildings needing repair; real value of the revenue declining due to inflation; some posts vacant because nobody could be got to take the meagre income they had to offer.⁵⁹ It is wrong, therefore, always to single out the chantries for special

56. Y.C.S. II, 522

57. A.G. Dickens, 'A municipal dissolution', Y.A.J. 36 164. Also R.B. Dobson, 'The foundation of perpetual chantries', Studies in Church History IV, 32: only 1 chantry founded in York after 1501.

58. Y.C.S. I, x. Many chantries had become extinct for lack of funds or incumbent. See, for example, G. Poulson, History of Holderness which records a chantry at Goxhill, 4 gilds and a chantry at Hornsea, and chantries at Burton Pidsea, Roos, Ulram and 6 at Patrington at an earlier date (I., 310, 328, 330, 235-9, 301; II, 41, 67, 9). Of these only 2 gilds at Hornsea and 2 chantries at Patrington survived to 1548

59. Visitation records tell a woeful tale of disrepair e.g. York Minster MSS L2 (3) C. Also Y.C.S. II, 454: the cantarist of St. Mary in the church of St. Peter-the-Less, York, had to serve the cure there 'because the parsonage is so little worth no man will taik yt.' For the general problem of clerical income see P. Heath, English Parish Clergy, chapters II, VIII.

comment without reference to the deeper economic malaise.

But it would also be wrong to accept for our area the general conclusion of a recent writer that:

'Chuntries were falling into desuetude; many had no incumbents and the funds held had been devoted solely to secular purposes.' 60

What strikes us is that there were still over 600 chuntries operating in the area in 1548, and that even some with stipends well below the subsistence level of £5⁶¹ continued as they had for years past. Some of the lowest paid may not have been full-time posts, and all must have required some supplementary income or charity.⁶² That they had continued so long is ample testimony to the faith of those who manned and supported them. Of course some chuntries were vacant in 1546 and 1548: it would have been surprising if this had not been the case. But they were very few, and their vacancy was not necessarily due to the revenue running out.⁶³ By contrast there were belated foundations and institutions

60. J. Simon, 'A.F. Leach on the Reformation - I' in B.J.Ed. S. 1954, 132.

61. P. Heath, op. cit., 23 et seq.

62. See below p. 257 Some 'services' were only for occasional use, perhaps including the 3 at Almondbury worth only 6/6, 8/2 and 10/- p.a. (Y.C.S. II, 303)

63. Chuntries vacant for more than 7 yrs. were not included in the Certificates. Vacancies only seem to have been reported at Badsworth (H.T.), Halifax (Frith), Scruton, Kirk Heaton, Bingham and Ruddington, though at Retford 4 chuntries had been amalgamated following a fire. Compare Durham 12/86 vacant, and Northumberland 7/58, (B. Wilson unpub. Ph.D. thesis (Durham) 248).

to vacant chantries even on the eve of the dissolution.⁶⁴

Nor did our area see any great diversion of funds to 'secular purposes'. The items noted in the Certificates were trivial,⁶⁵ and the more spectacular concealments were probably made with no intention of misappropriation, but merely the recovery of sums which would otherwise have gone to the crown.⁶⁶

Another indicator of a running-down of faith in the institutions might be surrender to the crown, but here we have to remember the fears of the incumbents for their future prosperity, and the attempts of the crown to persuade heads of hospitals and colleges to surrender. Matthew Parker, head of Stoke-by-Clare college in Suffolk begged the crown not to dissolve it, despite approaches that had been made to him offering a good pension in exchange for surrender.⁶⁷ No doubt similar techniques were used

64. The injunctions of 1547, and even the Lincoln Injunctions of 24 April 1548 (Linc. Rec. Soc. xv, 15 (27)) still mention chantries. The crown appointed to one vacant chantry at Prudhoe on Tyne on 12 Sep. 1547 (Surtees Soc. 161 p.93) and the Dean and Chapter of York to one in the minster in Dec. 1547 (York Minster MSS. H3(3) f. 49v.)

65. Y.C.S. I, xi. But the editor's emphasis is wrong. Several of the disputes were legal problems which might have arisen anyway, and most of the remainder were trivial. Far worse spoliation is found in other areas, e.g. J.E. Oxley, The Reformation in Essex, 135 et. seq.

66. Chapter VIII below.

67. Parker Soc., Parker Correspondence, 31-3.

*TABLE

Table II : Institutions in the East Riding which surrendered to Sir Michael Stanhope in 1547.

(Source : C.P.R. I Edward VI, 250, 170.)

Institution	Value stated in <u>Valor Eccl'us</u>	Master (etc.)
St Sepulchre hospital, HEDON	13.18.10 (gross)	Edmund StQuintin
KILLINGWOLDGRAVES hosp.	12. 3. 4 (clear)	Robert Wade
NEWTON GARTH hosp.	40. 0. 0 (clear)	John Uvedale
SUTTON college	19.13. 4 (clear)	Walter Bayne
Prebend of St Andrew, BEVERLEY	51. 9. 5 (gross)	Thomas Thurland
Prebend of St Michael, BEVERLEY	31. 8. 4 (clear)	William Gyles

elsewhere by the crown. The college at Southwell was already to offer its surrender in 1540 following the dissolution of the greater monasteries, but the crown took no action, and in 1543 it was officially re-founded,⁶⁸ an act which was later to be used to justify its restoration by Mary. Thomas Magnus, the warden of Sibthorpe college, also in Nottinghamshire, surrendered it in April 1545, though he had so many other promotions that he was assured of future security.⁶⁹ Apart from this, only one chantry at Tuxford and the hospital of St. James at Northallerton yielded.⁷⁰ Between the two Chantry Acts, however, the heads of six East Riding institutions obtained crown permission to surrender their properties to Sir Michael Stanhope. This was doubtless a move encouraged by the crown to strengthen Stanhope's property holdings around Hull where he was governor.⁷¹ (See Table II)

By and large, we are not left with a picture of decadence any more than one of renewed hope and prosperity in the region. The normal routine of the chantries was continued with little disruption right down to the dissolution.

68. Rymer, Foedera, 6ii, 49; Thoroton Soc. xv, 96

69. Thoroton Soc xvi, 186. Rymer, op. cit. xv. 71; A.H. Thompson, English Colleges, 101. On Magnus see A.G. Dickens in Surtees Soc. 172, 42-4

70. Thoroton Soc. xvii, 100; Rymer, op. cit., 6 - iii, 48.

71. C.P.R. I Edward, 250, 170. D.N.B. Stanhope. For Surrender elsewhere, see Rymer, op. cit. 6 - iii, 76, 77, 80, 104. and C.P.R. I Edw., 182, 183.

One further problem remains to be discussed in depth, because it is one that was left unsolved by the editor of the Chantry Certificates.⁷² That is, whether or not the chantry priests made any attempt either to defraud the crown or to line their own pockets by adopting the policy of many monasteries before their dissolution, in leasing their property at very low rents and for long terms in exchange for a lump sum down.⁷³

Evidence of leases prior to the dissolution is scattered and incomplete. Much of the collegiate and some of the chantry land was let to farm, the farmer returning a fixed yearly sum to the institution concerned. We know this from the post-dissolution Ministers' Accounts which often give the names of the farmers without stating when they began their task or for how long they were entitled to continue. The Chantry Certificates only give occasional glimpses of this practice, a good example being the farming of the revenues of the prebends in Pontefract castle.⁷⁴ Quite distinct from the large farm, was the individual leasehold tenement. Where a chantry endowment consisted of land held by lease from the donor, the cantarist inherited the donor's freehold, and with it the right to issue and renew the leases on his own terms. It must also have been possible for tenants at will to improve their security in

72. Y.C.S. I xi: 'It is possible they (the cantarists) may have granted leases of the lands at low rentals for large considerations...but this would not probably appear on these certificates.'

73 As implied by Henry's Act, see below, ch. II. cf. R.H. Snape English Monastic Finances, 138.

74. Y.C.S. II, 324-5

certain circumstances by buying a lease. Now it is not possible to discover what proportion of all chantry land was held by lease at the dissolution: the Certificates usually record only tenant and rent without specifying the form of tenure, and whilst the Ministers' Accounts sometimes list separately the income derived from tenants by indenture, it is far more frequent to find all the rents listed under the general heading 'rents and farm' or 'rents as well from tenants by indenture as from tenants at will.'

We do have some more specific information of the terms of leases and farms, however. Occasionally, a dispute came before the courts, in which mention was made of a lease otherwise unrecorded. Sometimes, though rarely, a lease which turns out to be a renewal of an existing tenure, states the terms of the old lease. More significantly, leaseholders might register their claims with a local officer (usually the auditor) of the court of Augmentations or the Duchy of Lancaster, and the enrolment books of these officers are therefore treasuries of information. Otherwise we rely on both the willingness of the families to keep their documents, and the diligence of local officers in preserving them. Three major sources supplement the central information: A survey of Acaster College, giving the terms of many of its leasehold tenants; some documents in the archives of the city of Hull; and a long register of many (though not all) chantry leases in the North Riding on the eve of the dissolution. (See Appendix Ia).

The latter document was almost certainly compiled by the chantry commissioners in 1548, possibly at the behest of Sir Nicholas Fairfax in whose family papers it is now deposited, as a rough check for any leases which might have contravened the Chantry Acts. The Acts declared illegal all leases made after 23 November 37 Henry VIII insofar as they related to land that had not previously been leased, or insofar as they failed to retain the usual rents. Edward VI, however, stressed that:

'all other Leasses and Grauntes heretofore made of auny the premisses given, lymited or appointed to the king by this Acte, shalbe as good and avaylable and effectuall in the Lawe to all Intentes, constructions and purposes as yf this Acte had never bene had or made.' 75.

There is almost no evidence of any systematic reduction in the rent charged on the eve of the dissolution. A few tenants after 1548 refused to pay the amount the crown demanded in yearly rent, because their leases were fixed at rents lower than the value assessed by the crown's surveyor.⁷⁶ But these rents were allowed to continue until the leases expired and it is not likely they represented any attempt to defraud. I have not found any subsequent litigation suggesting such fraud.

75. Stat. 1 Ed. VI c. 14 cl. xx.

76. Ministers' Accounts (SC6), Beverley, passim

***TABLE**

Table III : The distribution of the leases of chantry property prior to the dissolution according to term. (*)

<u>TERM</u>	<u>Anno Henry VIII</u>														Ed. VI 1	uncertain
	up to 25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38		
For ever	1					1										1
For life of recipient	1						2		1				1			
Years:																
86		1														
81								7		1						
80									3							
70						1										
66										1						
61											1					
60	1				1		1	3								
51									1							
50						1										
44								1								
42																1
41														1		
40	1					3	1		2	4		1				
38				1					1							
37	1								1							
34									1							
33			1													
31			2										1			
30				1						1		1				
26														1		
24								1								
21	1	1	1		1		5	6	4	20	7	10	5		5	
20					2							2				
17					1						1					
14					1											
12												1				
10												1			1	
5																1
3															1	

(*) For details of the leases, see Appendix Ia.

It is true that all but eleven of the 140 leases whose details I have been able to find arise from the year 30 Henry VIII or later.⁷⁷ But this does not mean that leasing was necessarily becoming more common. Many of them must have been renewals of former leases, or simply filling vacant tenures already held by lease, and presumably previous leases were usually destroyed when new ones were issued, so we would expect the cluster of documents to come in the last years before the dissolution. Similarly, there is no way of telling whether the terms were more generous than before. Chantry priests were not renowned for their record-keeping and we have no hint of the terms of earlier leases.⁷⁸ Long terms were commonplace, though it has recently been suggested that the Common Law offered increasingly less protection to those exceeding 3 lives or 21 years,⁷⁹ and whilst our sample of leases may not be very representative of the total picture it is interesting to note the tendency for terms to settle at or below this figure the nearer we get to the dissolution.

77. Appendix I, and Table III

78. Researchers in monastic history, by contrast, often have detailed registers and cartularies. See J. Youings in Agrarian History of England and Wales IV, 319. Even illegal last-minute leases were sometimes confirmed: Knowles III. 394.

79. See, for example. E. Kerridge, Agrarian problems, 48

There is no trend to longer terms which might indicate fraud. Indeed, many of the longest leases I have found may represent little more than the established practice of the colleges, especially at Acaster, and one lease for the term of 81 years in Scarborough was only for a piece of waste ground returning 1/- per year.

Another phenomenon which might be taken as a symptom of apprehension is the leasing of land to the cantarist himself or to a kinsman, but such leases are few in number and this need not be the explanation.⁸⁰

Some of the leases, far from giving an impression of corruption and embezzlement, show a keen business sense and a loyalty to the crown. At Hull, one lease ended with the date in the form of the regnal year of Henry VIII, 'the supryme hyd of ye Churche of Eynghond, god save ye kyng.'⁸¹ Another from the same source insisted that every 3 years a committee consisting of the mayor, carpenters and the stewards of the chantry priests' lands should inspect the property to see that repairs had been carried out.⁸²

These leases and farms prior to the Dissolution, which are set out in the Appendix, are important also because they affected the future disposal of the property. If all the lands of a chantry were farmed by

80. See Appendix Ia: leases at Hull, Ripon (Wilfred), Doncaster (J) and Preston Jacklin.

81 Hull City MSS:D 568 A

82. Ibid., D557. The chantry priests of Hull were organised in a gild known as the 'Priests of the Table' which administered the chantry lands of the town. See V.C.H. Kingston upon Hull (Yorks. E.R.), 287.

one person who continued to draw the revenues after the dissolution, the potential buyer could gain nothing from the lands until the farm expired. We shall see how heavily this circumscribed the sale of collegiate lands especially at Beverley, Howden, Ripon and Southwell. On the other hand, individual leasehold tenements and even whole chantries consisting of many such, were no obstacle to the buyer who intended to be non-resident and who could exploit the leases, and gain the fines for renewal. The best examples of this would be Wytham's chantry at Sheriff Hutton, or Acaster College, where many leasehold tenements were bought up in a single purchase, because there was no overall farmer to reduce their profitability.⁸³ But to the small buyer wishing to extend his tenure marginally, it was no use buying a leasehold tenement if he had to wait till its tenant's lease expired before making any profit. We shall see that much of the chantry land remaining in crown hands after the sales is known to have been held by lease or farm.⁸⁴

Putting together the charges of the crown against the chantries and the evidence from the region about their survival and conduct on the eve of the dissolution,

83. Chapter XI below

84. Chapter VI below

we can only conclude that the chantries of the county and diocese of York were declining, though far from dead, and that the scramble for their property cannot be significantly illustrated here. Perhaps we have witnessed the calm before the storm.⁸⁵

85. Two Appendixes to this Chapter appear in vol. II.

CHAPTER II

THE STATUTES AND COMMISSIONS

1. The Chantry Acts

Henry VIII's Chantry Act¹ is more remarkable for its omissions than for the matters it contains. In the past it has been readily assumed that but for Henry's death he would have taken the path eventually followed by Edward VI in dissolving all the chantries and disposing of their lands. Was this his immediate intention, and does his Act point towards this conclusion? The habit of praying for the dead was not questioned; there was no prohibition of foundations to this end in future, nor did the Act extend to lesser institutions which perpetuated the habit, namely obits and lights. There was no mention of dismissing chantry priest, and no provision for pensioning the dispossessed; nor was any specific note made of procedure for protecting any socially valuable functions of the institutions under review. Either a very great deal was left to the crown's discretion, or else the Act has been misinterpreted.

It distinguished two classes of foundation. First were those colleges, chantries, free chapels, guilds and stipendiaries whose endowments had been wrongly

1. Stat. 37 Hen. VIII c.4.

appropriated by others and the priests dismissed; in the same breath were mentioned foundations which had in effect been ruined for the future by having their lands leased without the normal rents being reserved. These were all to be bestowed on the crown, the leases declared invalid, and the endowments put to national use in view of the war.² Secondly there were other such foundations which, it said, were well known not to have been used according to their founders' intent. Here, the crown was empowered to issue commissions during Henry's lifetime to take seisin of all their properties for the King, though apparently without making any provision for pensions or any other compensation save the exoneration of first fruits and tenths.³ Such properties, if and when annexed, were to be administered by the Court of Augmentations.⁴ But Henry did not declare these institutions actually dissolved, nor did the Act itself dissolve them. It was a seemingly weak and ill-conceived piece of legislation.

Nevertheless, the King took the unusual step of appearing personally to thank Parliament on 24 December 1545:

2. Ibid. (preamble).

3. Ibid. cll. 6, 13.

4. Ibid. cll. 6-7.

for you, without my desire or request, have committed to myne ordre and disposicion, all Chauntreys, Colleges, Hospitalles and other places specefied in a certain act, firmly trustyng that I wil orde them to the glory of God and the profite of the common wealth. Surely if I contrary to your expectation should suffre the ministres of the Church to decaie or learnyng (which is so great a iuell) to be minished, or pore and miserable people to be unrelieved, you might say that I beyng put in so speciall a trust as I am in this cace, were no trusty frende to you, nor charitable man to mine even Christian, neither a lover of the publyk wealth.....5.

There was no rush to dissolve the institutions referred to in the Act. Commissions to survey the chantries were issued on 14 February 1546 in 24 areas comprising several counties each, and all headed by a bishop.⁶ Though the membership ranged from 5 in Cheshire, Lancashire and the city of Chester to 16 for Kent, Canterbury and Rochester, there was a quorum in each case of only 3 members, and they were not entrusted with executive power to dissolve the chantries, but only:-

before we proceed to the execution of anything therein...to have a true and certain declaration made, 7.

on certain interrogatories to be ministered to the churchwardens and incumbent of every parish, plus two

5. Hall Chronicle (1809), 865.

6. L.&P. 21-i, no. 302 (30) .

7. Y.C.S.I., 2. See also instructions to W. Riding clergy Sheffield: Bacon Frank MSS. 4-1.

other parishioners with no vested interest in the property. The record was to be perused:-

to the intent that we may know which shall
be meet to stand and remain as they now be,
or to be dissolved, altered and reformed.

Information was indeed collected and stored, but no further general action was taken before Henry's death, and none of the commissions for taking seisin, envisaged by the Act, were established, though a few institutions took fright and surrendered.⁸ The evidence quoted suggests that Henry's Act was in every way exploratory, the actual dissolution of the chantries and the disposal of their property not having been fully planned at this stage.

The situation changed markedly with the advent of Edward VI. The new reign was not far spent before a Royal Visitation was conducted, and the Injunctions to which I have already referred were presented to the parishes.⁹ Although the visitors have hardly left a trace of their progress in the north they must certainly have gathered further impressions of the number and wealth of the chantries,¹⁰ so that, with the information

8. Sibthorpe college surrendered 17 April 1545; granted to Thomas Magnus for life then Richard Whalley L.&P. 20-i nos. 534 and 1335 (46).

9. A.G. Dickens, Lollards and Protestants, 178. Visitors included Sir John Hercy, Roger Tonge D.D., William Moreton and Edward Farley. But in instructions to Doncaster clergy (Sheffield: Bacon Frank MSS. 4-1) Hercy is omitted and Thomas Gargrave, John Hearne and John Markham added.

10. N. Wood Reformation and English Education, 30.

of the earlier Certificates, Edward's government had many more facts and figures to present to Parliament when it came to discuss the chantries again in the late autumn of 1547, as it was bound to do, Henry's Act having lapsed with his death.¹¹

We do not know the exact turn of the discussion in Parliament, save that some peers of a conservative religious outlook objected to the doctrinal bias of the new Act's attack on the chantries,¹² and the corporations fought hard and successfully to preserve their rights.¹³ The Act which finally emerged in December 1547 was both more radical and more constructive than its predecessor.¹⁴ Education and poor relief were to be given top priority,¹⁵ the contributions of dissolved institutions to these causes being preserved, and new funds made available for further development. A special commission was established to review all the necessary work being done in the parishes by the forbidden foundations.¹⁶ Chantry priests not required to strengthen the clerical establishment in the parishes were to be pensioned off. Hospitals - which had been included by

-
11. See Index to Commons' Journals, I. New Bill introduced there 30 Nov., and in the Lords 6 Dec. Greatly revised and extended.
12. Journal of House of Lords, I, 308.; N. Wood. Op.Cit., 34.
13. e.g. Lynn and Coventry: A.P.C. 1547-50, 193-5.
14. Stat. 1 Edw. VI c.14
15. Ibid. preamble.
16. cl. 8.

Henry VIII - were reprieved, but by contrast funds given to lights, obits and similar trivial purposes within the parishes were added to the list for dissolution, so that even those parishes which had no chantry were more often than not subject to the Act in some lesser way. Greater definition was given to the chapels which were eligible for dissolution¹⁷ and clear exemptions were issued to the Universities, some royal collegiate foundations, and a few favoured chantries.¹⁸ Copyhold land was to be exempt,¹⁹ and cathedrals and corporations explicitly protected,²⁰ all these caveats being designed to protect the crown from vested interests, and many of them certainly emanating directly from discussion in Parliament and Council.

Two years to the day since the Henrician commissions, the survey began,²¹ with a time limit of three and a half months for the completion of the reports. The emphasis was on the preservation of 'suche rightes, duties and allowaunces as by the same Act to any our

17. cl. 15.

18. cll. 15, 29, 32.

19. cl. 35.

20. cll. 15, 30.

21. Y.C.S. II, 371.

subjects apperteyneth.' Twenty-three commissions, ranging from 5 to 13 members went to work, though the episcopal leadership was removed, and the inclusion of many more county gentry and officials of the Court of Augmentations sealed the crown's determination to reap the harvest quickly.²²

2. The compilation of the Chantry Certificates

The survey of the whole nation, chantry by chantry 'on location', as it were, would have been quite out of the question. Instead, the commissioners in both 1546 and 1548 issued timetables and routes, naming centres they would visit, and calling upon the parochial representatives to be there on a given day at a specified time, armed with rentals of the properties eligible for dissolution, and ready to answer interrogatories sent to them in advance.

Very few traces of their activity survive. In London in 1546 the commissioners, headed by Sir Martin Bowes, ordered the city aldermen to deliver to all vicars and churchwardens schedules of the Commissioners' sittings at the Guildhall, commencing each morning no

22. C.P.R. II Edward, 135ff. For a note on the cost of the commissions see Appendix II a.

later than 7. a.m.²³ We know that the Devon commissioners called at Paignton and Exeter,²⁴ and other counties would doubtless furnish some identifiable bases, though the only positive reference I have found to a Yorkshire centre is one to the East Riding village of Kilham.²⁵ The commissioners would certainly visit all the major towns in the diocese, and such other churches as lay conveniently on their route. Similarly, there is little trace of the original rentals and documents presented to the commissioners by the parishes, perhaps because their information was transcribed and appears in the Chantry Certificates.²⁶

These documents are the principal source of our knowledge of the chantries. Many Certificates have survived intact²⁷, though several counties are not represented at all. Since the 1548 commissioners were making special note of institutions whose work was worth continuing, they drew up - in addition to the full Certificates - abstracts of their more relevant findings on the status and income of the institutions concerned. These 'Brief Certificates' provide a valuable adjunct to the main series, especially in those areas where the full Certificates are defective or missing. For the

23. H.B. Walters, London Churches at the Reformation, 6, 631.

24. H.J. Hanham. 'The Suppression of Chantries in Ashburton' Trans. Dev. Assoc. 1967, 117.

25. Beverley Record Office:DDCC 139/65 f.74

26. One good example in Kent Record Society: Supplement XII ed. Hussey.

27. The principal series (P.R.O.) are: E301 and DL38.

East Riding they are the only form of Chantry Certificate to have survived for either 1546 or 1548.²⁸

The returns were made up predominantly by deaneries in 1546 and by hundreds (or wapentakes) in 1548, again reflecting the more secular outlook of the new government.²⁹ But there are many regional variations in style and content. For example, whilst it was common to submit the returns in English, those for Kent and Leicestershire in 1546 were in Latin. And whilst some counties, like Devon and Yorkshire furnish a wealth of memoranda others returned most barren answers to the interrogatories, as in Nottinghamshire and Leicestershire.³⁰ The Edwardian Certificates contain more entries per county than those of 1546, not only through the inclusion of lights and obits, but also because the second Act extended to institutions not founded in perpetuity, including stocks of money supporting chantries and the like, as well as endowments given for only a term of years still to run.

28. A more detailed study by me on East Riding chantries will shortly appear in Y.A.J.
29. There were exceptions, e.g. Devon 1548 still by deaneries.
30. Detailed returns, however, were made for Southwell: see remarks of A.H. Thompson in Thoroton Society Record Series XV, 66. For Leics., A.A.S.R.P. 37 parts I & II. The detailed rents for Cumberland & Westmorland also deserve mention: T.C.W.A.A.S. 1960 p. 66. 1962 p.145.

Many of the Certificates for our area have been printed, but some have disappeared and their information has to be reconstructed from other sources.³¹ Since a good deal of the final judgement on the dissolution depends on the reliability of the information collected in the two sets of Certificates, we must first examine the degree of their accuracy.

3. The accuracy of the Certificates

There is no doubt that vicars and churchwardens compiling their returns left out a good deal which might have been reported, and also put in a good deal which need not have been mentioned. It is not easy to tell how much of the omission was deliberate, but many of the mistakes could certainly be justified, and the crown's early checking of the reports suggests that the information was not expected to be wholly accurate.³²

Every party was hampered by the lack of reliable written evidence of the history of each foundation. The older the chantry, the smaller the chance of the original title deeds being preserved, and we find several cases in which a refoundation, or the continuation of an

31. West and North Ridings (including York) complete: Y.C.S. I and II. For the East Riding only Hull and Beverley: Y.C.S. II., 520, 524 ff. Brief Certificate for E.R. is P.R.O. E 301/119 - see n. 28. For the Duchy of Lancaster in 1548 the Yorks. Certificate is missing. In all cases the Ministers' Accounts (SC6 and DL29) provide valuable information, see P.R.O. Lists & Indexes, Supp. Series, II, and Deputy Keeper's Report No. 45, 80 ff.

32. e.g. see Somerville, Duchy of Lancaster I, 297.

earlier grant were wrongly cited as the deeds of foundation,³³ and many more whose date of origin was unknown. Very few chantry priests kept reliable records of their property and income³⁴, and in any event, the latter must have varied considerably with the yearly cost of repair, vacant tenures and the like. Moreover, the longer the rents had been fixed, the less likely was it that they adequately reflected the true value of the land, a situation bound to prevail as long as surveying depended largely on estimates and guesswork.³⁵

We must therefore treat the values recorded in the Chantry Certificates with due caution, whilst observing that much of the potential inaccuracy was beyond the control of the crown's informants.

A direct comparison between the figures in 1546 and 1548 is almost impossible, for the main Certificates for our area in 1548 were kept separate from the detailed rentals, and the latter have not all survived. Even where we do have rentals, we often find that some tenements for any chantry have changed hands, and thus become difficult to identify among earlier lists. But even a casual glance at the printed Certificates is enough

-
33. The bishop of Ely remarked in 1546 that he could find no diocesan record of chantry foundations in Cambridge, and therefore based his returns on *Valor Ecclesiasticus* (L.&P. 21-i p.79.). At Barwick (*Thoresby Soc.* Vol. 17, 96 ff) and Yarm (Wardell, 79) discrepancies have also been found.
34. But see K.L. Wood-Legh, *A small household of the 15th cent.*
35. On the state of surveying see H.C. Darby in *Geog. Jour.* vol. 82, E.G.R. Taylor in *Ec. H.R.* vol. 17 or John Norden, *The Surveyor's Dialogue*.

to show very substantial variations in both the gross and net yearly values of the property between 1546 and 1548 which call for some general explanations.

Few of the gross totals vary more than a couple of shillings either way between 1546 and 1548, and this may easily be explained by minor adjustments to the 1546 returns, according to the income of the past year. Where the difference is greater than this, we occasionally find that rents which had been undervalued in 1546 or even wholly omitted now appear at their full value. Perhaps the first survey provided the stimulus needed to encourage more accurate research into the endowments. Certainly, the two years between the two surveys gave ample time for discovering any deficiencies caused purely by the speed of the first commission.

The chantries of the collegiate church at Ripon (See Table IV) vary much more than normal in the gross totals returned for the two years, and thus provide a suitably extreme case for explanation. In 1548 the college accounted to the Duchy of Lancaster and no Chantry Certificate has survived. However, we do possess the Ministers' Accounts for the first years after the dissolution,³⁶ showing rentals of the property which can be compared with those in the 1546 Certificate. Excluding the chantry at "Clotherholme" and those in the hospitals surveyed in 1546, but including those at Hutton

36. DL 29/8945.

***TABLE**

Table IV : Summary of the changes in gross total income in the chantries of Ripon between 1546 and 1548.

Sources : Y.C.S. II, 354 ff., and DL/29/8945.

<u>Chantry</u>	<u>Increase</u> <u>£. s. d.</u>	<u>Decrease</u> <u>£. s. d.</u>
St James	3. 10	
St John	9. 4	
St Thomas	1. 16. 4	
St Wilfred	1. 17. 4	
Stammergate chapel	1. 19. 4	
Our Lady	2. 3. 0	
St Andrew	2. 11. 2	
Holy Trinity (above High Altar)	3. 2. 6	
Holy Trinity (below High Altar)	Par	
Hutton Conyers chapel	Par	
Ripon Manor chapel		2. 4. 10

Conyers and the chapel in Stammergate, 11 chantries were recorded in 1546, and one more, that of Our Lady in the ladyloft, in 1548. Only two of these retained the same value in 1548 as in 1546, and this was because they were financed from fixed stipends paid by the King's Receiver of Pontefract from his monastic estates.³⁷ Another chantry, that in the manor, had received a crown rent of 74/2 p.a. in 1546 plus rents of 20/- from five tenements in Kirkgate and one other tenement yielding 6/8. The total income after deducting the crown rent was therefore 26/8. Yet in 1548 the corresponding figure was 56/--made up of 48/- from the Kirkgate tenements and 8/- from the other, showing that the earlier figures must have been artificially low. For the chantries of Holy Trinity and St. Andrew, the discrepancy between the two sets of figures is caused by additional properties having been declared in 1548. Marginal variations in rents for individual tenements affected the chantries of St. John and St. James, but almost every tenement of Our Lady's Chantry had been revalued upwards, and the tenement of Christopher Wall formerly yielding 5/- to the chantry in Stammergate was now recorded at 15/-. Finally, the 1546 Certificate had recorded only a cash payment from Sir William Mallory to St. Wilfred's chantry, whereas in 1548 some property was recorded there.

37. H.T. below high altar, and Hutton Conyers.

Such an exceptional degree of variation shows the Chantry Certificates in their worst light, whilst proving that the 1548 commissioners did not blindly copy out the earlier results. It can only lead us to believe that, at least at Ripon, the 1548 Certificates were much more accurate.

The variations in net totals in the two Certificates are at first sight more disturbing, but here two explanations are forthcoming. In 1546 Henry VIII's commissioners had almost universally assumed that payments due from chantries to the crown were to be deducted in assessing the net total. This was consonant with Henry's policy in selling monastic lands and reserving to himself, inter alia the tenth to which he had previously been entitled. From a perusal of many particulars for sale, it becomes clear that Edward's policy was to offer the full property for sale without reserving any rents to the crown - the sense of which becomes immediately apparent if we consider the elementary problem of who should be responsible for paying such rents if the chantry endowment was split up for sale. If no sale was effected, the crown in any case drew the whole of the revenue, so that deduction of the tenth would have been a meaningless exercise. The result was an administrative simplification in excluding from the dissolution settlement the local offices of the Court

of First Fruits and Tenths.³⁸ Unfortunately, the chantry commissioners or their clerks were not consistent in recording the tenths. In the West Riding in 1548 hardly any tenths were deducted from the gross totals,³⁹ but in the North Riding and the city of York almost all the tenths recorded in 1546 were still deducted in 1548⁴⁰ so that the net values for these areas mean different things. The confusion continued into the 'particulars for sale', with several county surveyors still deducting tenths in order to calculate the clear yearly value of chantries, and the commissioners for sale correcting this at the stroke of a pen.

We find other inconsistencies within the Certificates. The West Riding commissioners in 1548 made separate note of the totals of freehold and copyhold lands,⁴¹ so that the crown could ignore the copyhold in accordance with the Act. In the North Riding only one chantry appears to have been supported by copyhold land, that at Haxby⁴², but its value was, wrongly, reckoned in with the total for the wapentake, and never subsequently claimed. Records of the courts, and Ministers' Accounts, suggest also that the missing Duchy and East Riding Certificates wrongly included some copyhold items.⁴³ The North Riding Commissioners seem to have decided not to include in their

38. The records of First Fruits and Tenths are missing for Edward's reign save for one book of arrears (S.P. 10/16)

39. Tenths were deducted at Long Preston, Dewsbury, Sandal Halifax (H.C.), Fishlake (H.T.) and Thorne (B.V.M.) in 1548.

40. Possible exceptions being Topcliffe (B.V.M. gild) and Wensley.

41. Y.C.S. II, 426-7

42. Y.C.S. II, 477

43. For a list of copyhold lands see Appendix VI.

wapentake totals (of land eligible for confiscation) any sums devoted to purposes they were recommending for continuation: in particular £6. 13. 4. for a school and £4. 10. 8. for a priest at Richmond; £20 for a school at Malton, and £6. 13. 4. at Well and £3. 6. 8. at Romalldkirk for the same purpose.⁴⁴ However, school lands at Bedale (in the same wapentake as Well) were included, as were those for a school at Northallerton.⁴⁵

There were, therefore, inconsistencies in accounting and recording, rendering both the gross and net totals of the Certificates subject to some revision, though it should be realised that the crown was not automatically entitled to anything recorded in the Certificates, even though they formed a rough guide to the potential yield of the chantries.

Further confusion was caused by several factors. In York Minster and the city there were so many chantries, and the dedications of so many of the altars had changed since the making of the Valor Ecclesiasticus, that the revenues of some were omitted and those of others elided or only partially detected.⁴⁶ These troubles were soon ironed out when the chantry bailiffs came to collect the rents after the dissolution, and need not greatly concern us here. More interesting, though no more serious, was

44. Y.C.S. II, respectively pp 517-8, 513, 496, 492.

45. Bedale Y.C.S. II, 495; Northallerton Ibid, 486.

46. R.B. Dobson art. cit., 24.

***TABLE**

Table V : The descriptions of Bawtry gild.
 (a) from Thoroton Soc. Records, XVIII, 161.
 (b) from Y.C.S. II, 426.

(a) Founded by Nicolas Morton to mayntaine a preiste (to) sing masses for ever. Ys worthe by yere in landes, Tenementis and other possessions lying and being in divers and sondry placis within the said parishe of Blithe, As by the Survey therof made, Remayning with the Surveyour there, particulerly yt doth appere :-

	<u>iiij^{li}</u>	<u>iiij^s iiij^d</u>	, wherof in Rentis Resolute
yerely,		xiiij ^s iiij ^d	;
Rentis decayed		xxviij ^s	
yerely		<u>xl^s iiij^d</u>	; and so

Remayneth clere yerely unto Alvered Bingham, Chauntry preiste there, of the age of lxij yeres, unlermed, having none other promocion : xliiij^s.

* * * * *

(b) Averey Byngham, incombent, xl yeres of age, hath none other lyving then the sayd chauntry.

Goods Nil. Plate Nil.

The yerely value of the freehold land iiij^{li} viij^s viij^d

Copiehold nil.

Resolutes and deductions by yere : xiiij^s v^d And so remayneth clere to the Kinges Majestie yerely : lxxiiij^s iiij^d.

the confusion caused by the changing boundaries of authority among the various commissioners, for the civil boundaries of 1548 and the ecclesiastical ones of 1546 did not always conveniently overlap and some chantries disappear from their logical context only to be found certified elsewhere.⁴⁷ The most curious boundary dispute was that over the Trinity Gild at Bawtry which was thought by both Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire commissioners to be in their respective survey in 1548. Whether the incumbent modified his story as a counterblast to these meddling bureaucrats, or whether one of the commissions under the influence of a cordial reception wrongly noted the information given, we shall never know, but the two entries differ in several important details as shown in Table V.

Ages of chantry priests, required in 1548, were often given correct only to the nearest ten years, and similar approximation must have applied to the numbers of communicants, but since neither of these affects the endowment, I have not attempted to examine them.

For all their obvious failings, the Chantry Certificates represent a major feat of government. We have certainly no better compact source material on these institutions and the crown relied on them both in assessing the potential value of the dissolution, and in

47. e.g. Scarborough disappears 1548. Riccall certified with York in 1546 but E.R. in 1548; Bishopthorpe with York in 1546, W.R. 1548 etc.

compiling the later Ministers' Accounts for the collection of revenue. Therefore, whilst there is always a danger of understating values, I have used them (appropriately supplemented by other material) as the starting point of this study.

4. The Nature of the Endowments

With many of the Chantry Certificates readily available in print, a detailed analysis of their content would be irrelevant to this study. But we must have some idea of the nature of the endowments in our area which came to the crown by the dissolution.

The only institutions to offer the crown potential income on the scale of the monastic dissolutions were the greater collegiate churches of the diocese. The sister colleges of Beverley, Ripon and Southwell, though none of them held cathedral status or even housed a suffragan bishop, were richly endowed in land, tithes and offerings, and with buildings rivalling those of many a cathedral church. In each case the determined efforts of the inhabitants and the crown's intention of preserving all that was good in the old foundations secured the continuation of the buildings themselves for parochial use , though most of the endowment became automatically superfluous as the prebends and chantries were discontinued, and only a vicar with a couple of assistant clergy retained.

There was bound to be much here, therefore, that the crown could appropriate.

Associated with the Minster in York were two colleges: that of St. William, which housed the chantry priests and was therefore dissolved, and that of the Bedern which housed the Vicars Choral and was able to prove its inseparable connection with the cathedral endowment and thus secure a reprieve under the terms of the Chantry Act following a high-level consultation among crown lawyers. The size of its holdings in the city may be judged from Canon Harrison's calculation that the college drew rents from 206 tenements in 35 streets.⁴⁸ However, the Vicars Choral had undertaken support of about half the chantries in the Minster, and their payments to this end were demanded and received, by the crown following the dissolution. St. William's college had a much smaller endowment because it was only designed to provide residence for the chantry priests, whose salaries were derived from other sources. In addition, close by the north-west tower of the Minster was the unusual chapel of St. Sepulchre (otherwise called St. Mary and the Holy Angels) which had a semi-collegiate establishment financed mainly from appropriated rectories which brought a heavy obligation of poor relief in many parishes, mainly in the West Riding.

48. F. Harrison, Life in a medieval college, 196.

In the diocese at large there were a further seven colleges surviving in 1548 after the surrender of those at Sibthorpe (Notts) and Sutton-in-Holderness. Their yield to the crown was substantial though not comparable with that of the greater colleges, and more than most dissolved institutions they proved problematic because of the number of clergy and lesser ministers who had either to be pensioned off or absorbed into other posts.

Outside the colleges there were other major concentrations of chantry priests in many of the towns, especially the more important trading centres, though we have seen that the day of the greater foundations, especially in York and Hull, was over. Even though Richard III never carried out his intention of founding a chantry for 100 priests in York Minster⁴⁹ the building contained well over 40 chantries, whilst the number in the city altogether approached 100. In the majestic parish church of St. Mary Magdalene at Newark there were 13, whilst the parishes of Doncaster, Wakefield and Pontefract could boast 9, 10 and 8 respectively. Almost all the towns had chapels in addition to their parish churches, some situated on bridges, as at York, Wakefield and Rotherham, others at convenient points in the townships and used for early masses for travellers, or as places of prayer and refuge in time of plague.⁵⁰

49. G.H. Cook. Medieval Chantries, 46.

50. For plague chapels see Y.C.S. II, 364 (Ripon); I, 180 (Doncaster) and II, 313-4 (Wakefield.)

In the whole area something in the order of 700 individual offices were recorded for dissolution in addition to a very large number of lights and obits. But the colleges and the city of York accounted for 200 of these offices, and many other parishes had more than one chantry, so that the impression that every parish church had a chantry in 1548 (which might be derived from the average)⁵¹ is misleading.

A chantry did not have to be endowed with land. Many cantarists had been paid fixed stipends in cash from the founder's estate, and the crown claimed these yearly sums along with the land. Where services were financed from a 'stock' of money, the crown appropriated all that remained, and where the endowment was in the form of land held only for a term of years, the crown took over the remaining term only.⁵²

But naturally a landed endowment in perpetuity was the most desirable commodity for the crown, and the most marketable. If unsold, it was added to the crown's estates and a steady profit could be anticipated. Not so with the fixed cash grant. It might be given away as a reward but it would not attract buyers because of its inflexibility. Patrons and corporations, including the lords of many manors and bodies such as the corporation

51. W.K. Jordan, Rural charities, 366, uses this estimate.

52. e.g. Thoroton Soc. xviii, 118:99 yrs after foundation in 1515-16, the chantry at Mansfield was to revert to the founder's heirs.

of York and Hull, the York Merchant Adventurers, the Dean and Chapter, Vicars Choral and Clerk of the Fabric, who had paid such stipends to cantarists now owed them to the crown,⁵³ and there is evidence that they were paid for many years to come⁵⁴. Payments of this kind, not arising from any specific lands, were known as 'free rents', and caused a good deal of complication.

Where the crown itself had been the benefactor, it ceased to pay these stipends, and profited to the extent of the yearly saving. One major aspect of the question was the free rent from monastic sources.⁵⁵ It had been the fashion for founders to make monasteries trustees (before their dissolution) of chantries, either by paying a lump sum down - in return for which the monastery guaranteed to pay a chantry priest a yearly stipend for a specified period - or by giving a plot of land which was incorporated into the monastic estates, with the same condition. Such land became the property of the monastery, not of the chantry priest, who only received a fixed stipend. After the dissolution of the monasteries the crown determined to allow chantries they had supported

53. Appendix IIb.

54. e.g. York Minster MSS: M.2 (4) a. A record of payments to the crown, possibly in Elizabeth's reign for chantry stipends.

55. Appendix IIc.

to continue, and therefore, whilst the monastic lands might be sold, the crown Receivers paid the priests' stipends. Occasionally, most of the lands of an abbey were sold or leased to one person, and in this event he had to pay the chantry priest himself, the crown relinquishing all responsibility.⁵⁶ At the dissolution of the chantries, such rents as had been paid by crown Receivers stopped, and for simplicity the chantry bailiffs were not to collect these sums from the Receivers, as this would be merely to pay them into another account. On the other hand the private persons responsible for other former monastic payments now had to pay these sums to the chantry collectors. In neither case was the crown cheated by the dissolution.

Whilst all these sums, saved or gained, increased the crown's profit from the dissolution, free rents had the disadvantage of being fixed and we shall see that the crown looked favourably on potential lessees who sought to prove that an alleged 'free' rent actually arose from land which the crown could claim.

There has been, and there will continue to be, much heated dispute over the need of the parishes for the chantry priests, not only to meet a desire of the population for prayers for the dead, but also to assist in the ministry, at least in the humble capacity of taking services and helping, often in a very informal

56. e.g. Lord Lennox, farmer of Jervaux: Appendix IIc

way, to instruct the young. Chantry priests who did nothing beyond the terms of their foundation must have had plenty of time to spare, and it is as reasonable to imagine them helping in the parish as indulging in farming or kindred pastimes. There is no doubt at all that there were parishes which found their aid indispensable. At St. Martin's, Leicester, for example (though outside our area) we hear that there were

no mo prestis but only the viker, whose stypende or lyvyng ys so sore decayed that he ys not able to ffynde any other preste to serve there, so that withowte the helpe of the seyde chauntrye preste many of the seyde parissyoners in tyme of sycknesse shalbe lyke to perisshe withowte the ryghtis of the church. 57.

This plaintive cry was echoed in most counties, and there is no need to doubt its sincerity, even though it was to the parish priest's own interest to flaunt the merits of any worthy assistants whether they were really needed or not. But for all its caution in asking the commissioners to note the parishes which needed assistants, the feeling behind the second Chantry Act seems to be that the clergy should be supported from funds rightly at the disposal of the parish, and not from extra landed endowments given

primarily for the promotion of superstitious purposes. Nowhere was this more apparent than in the definition of the chapels which were included in the terms of the Act.

Free chapels were those financed from sources other than parochial, and in theory they were not under the auspices of the vicar.⁵⁸ Both Chantry Acts would have dissolved these institutions, in order to make the regulation of religion easier under a unified parochial authority.

Chapels of ease, properly so-called, were built and maintained at parish expense for the ease of parishioners living too far away from the church to attend the services there. They were served by the parish clergy and had no separate endowment beyond the ground they stood on. Edward's Act was quite explicit in excluding them from confiscation, though some were wrongly reported to the chantry commissioners and later became the subject of litigation, as at Stainburn (parish of Kirkby Overblows) and Bank Newton (Gargrave)⁵⁹, both of which were clearly described in the Certificates in terms which make them quite beyond the scope of the Act.

58. For a concise exposition see G.H. Cook, English Medieval Parish Church, 27.

59. Y.C.S. II, 398, 252.

But, alas, the distinction between the two types of chapel was seriously blurred, and there is no doubt that some endowed chapels of ease existed, and had their endowments removed by the dissolution, though the chapels themselves often survived.⁶⁰ In the printed Chantry Certificates for Yorkshire alone, 72 endowed chapels were recorded in 75 entries, some having more than one chantry.⁶¹ In 17 cases there was no mention of a chantry, and the institution recorded was simply described as a chapel, though in the rehearsal of purposes of foundation two of these (at Haxby and Kirkby Wiske) were said to have included prayers for the dead among their objectives, and one (at [†]Kenton) had no other function than this recorded. A further 15 of these entries refer to "chantries", but with no mention of prayers for the dead; and of the remaining 43 entries all but five were founded for both purposes. In the popular mind there was no obvious distinction of motive in founding chapels, and this produced vigorous subsequent argument.

The size of landed endowments varied considerably from chantry to chantry and naturally in rural areas there was a greater tendency for good arable or pasture land to be given. In the towns revenue consisted primarily of dozens of tiny rents emanating from urban

60. See below, Chapter III

61. I exclude chapels already mentioned in towns and castle chapels.

† Kneeton

tenements which were likely to have a less permanent value and a lower price when offered for sale. Outside the colleges there were few tracts of good compact property associated with the dissolved institutions and in the case of endowments for lamps and obits the rents were so often measured in pennies and farthings rather than in shillings, that it is very difficult to imagine anyone other than the contributor of the rent wanting to buy it up. Consequently, we shall find that there were several disincentives to purchase, and that the crown still retained a good deal of chantry property and revenue in the area even at the end of Elizabeth's reign.

A more detailed analysis of the total income of the chantries in the area and of their disposal by Edward VI, is held over until we have analysed gifts, sales and leases, but the order of magnitude is to be found in the Chantry Certificates. Those for 1546 in Yorkshire show a gross total revenue of £5671. 9. 2 $\frac{1}{4}$.⁶² p.a., and since the gross totals for all the deaneries outside the East Riding amount to £3760. 0. 6. it is reasonable to assume that that area - whose Certificates are missing - accounted for something like £1911. 8. 8.

62. Y.C.S. II, 370.

The 1548 Certificates omitted hospitals, but added obits, lights and temporary endowments as well as revaluing the chantries and omitting copyhold lands. No county total has survived, but calculations based on totals for the North and West Ridings, and on the Ministers' Accounts for the Duchy of Lancaster, the East Riding and Nottinghamshire suggest a gross total of £6500 - £7000 p.a. excluding lamps. This total, however, was artificially inflated by the inclusion of many items not eligible, as it transpired, for dissolution - the details of which we shall soon discover, and a working figure of £5000 p.a. is much nearer reality.

The York diocese certainly contained more chantries than any other outside London. Even allowing for its great size, Prof. Jordan could correctly assert that:

No other county (than Yorkshire) exhibited anything like this degree of pious concern with what was undoubtedly a decayed medieval institution. 63.

It will be my intention in the remainder of this study to follow the fate of well over 700 endowments after the dissolution. 64.

63. W.K. Jordan, Rural charities, 366.

64. Three Appendixes to this chapter appear in Vol II.

CHAPTER III

GIFTS AND CONTINUATIONS

Paradoxically, whilst the dissolution of the chantries met with widespread acclaim in many circles, the aspirations of those who supported the move were so diversified that, however the government chose to dispose of the proceeds, many people were bound to be less than satisfied. To many a member of the Commons the chief hope was that by selling the confiscated lands the crown would gain sufficient revenue to reduce substantially the amount it would otherwise have to raise by taxation - a hope which grew as the menace of war increased in the spring of 1548. To the religious reformer the dissolution might be largely an end in itself, with the removal of superstition, but there were many who were not prepared to stop at this point. The crown had promised the furtherance of education and poor relief; now was the chance to see that the lands confiscated from the chantries were redeployed to these ends. To the crown, there was doubtless the hope of increasing the reservoir of land from which to reward faithful servants, but this could not be done on a large scale without risking a public outcry, as long as the other promised amenities were withheld. That it was ever intended materially to increase the royal estates for the long term may well be doubted. The chantry lands may be regarded primarily as a windfall

to be disposed of, to the maximum advantage of the government and the common weal.

In this and the remaining chapters we must survey three distinct methods of disposing of confiscated lands: first by restoring them to fulfil social reforms; secondly by sale; thirdly by annexation to the existing royal estates. All three processes operated simultaneously, and the balance between them could not effectively be planned in advance, because of factors beyond governmental control such as the needs of a wartime economy, the clamour of social reformers, and the exigencies of the land market. Consequently we shall find the social programme taking longer to implement than many had hoped, and the crown being unable to sell as much of the land as it would have liked. Nevertheless the lack of extensive opposition to the crown's post-dissolution policy may be taken as an indication that the country at large remained unaffected, or positively benefited from the reforms undertaken by Edward VI and his ministers as a result of the second Chantry Act.

1. Free gifts

We are fortunate that reason is at last replacing romance as the criterion by which to judge both Edward's disposal of lands and his intentions towards

the promised social reforms, which used to be regarded with strong suspicion. The old commonplace that Edward VI gave away most of the chantry lands and revenue to the 'harpies who swarmed about his court'¹ has long since ceased to carry the respect of historians, and is certainly not borne out by the evidence. The conclusions of generations of scholars have varied in proportion to the amount of good faith they were prepared to attribute to the intentions of Edward's successive advisers, and there has always been the danger of taking at their face value the protests of a Lever, a Bale or an Ascham, who, in the words of one writer,

like academic men in all ages...were much given to hasty expressions of rhetorical pessimism. 2.

Starting from the premise that Henry VIII and Edward VI achieved little, despite their promises, in the realms of social and educational reform - as witnessed by the voices of protest - some writers have too readily overlooked the actual achievements in these fields, and failed to notice the general silence which greeted the crown's successive moves on church property.

-
1. Catholic Encyclopaedia sub 'chantries'; echoed in W.C. Richardson, Court of Augmentations, 173.
 2. D. Bush, 'Tudor Humanism and Henry VIII,' Univ. of Toronto Q. (1938), 170.

A recent detailed analysis of the structure of crown gifts of all types of land over the whole country in the reign of Edward VI³ has shown that over 60% of the total land given away was derived from monastic and attainted property, whilst chantry lands provided only around 11 or 12%, of which a large part is accounted for by grants to charitable purposes rather than gifts to courtiers. Whilst we are rightly sceptical about the extent of giving 'in return for military services', or 'under the terms of the will of King Henry', which might cover a multitude of sins, some such payments must certainly have been expected at the beginning of a new reign, so that few, if any, of the 'gifts' of chantry land could fairly be said to have been squandered.

Indeed, in our area it is difficult to find any gifts. Stanhope certainly acquired surrendered properties, but this was before the dissolution, and was justifiable by the need to strengthen his position in the East Riding, the corporation of Hull being particularly resentful of this outsider as governor of the garrison.⁴ But there was little in the collegiate and chantry property to appeal to bounty-hunters, and therefore it is no surprise that few gifts are detectable.

3. W.K. Jordan, E.Y.K. 119.

4. V.C.H. Hull, 92-3; Y.A.J. xxxiii, 308.

Alexander Pringle received chantry property at Wykeham in Pickeringlythe for services against the Scots⁵, and Cuthbert Musgrave was to receive a beneficial lease of part of Howden college for a similar reason.⁶ The Earl of Bedford obtained a large grant of crown lands, it is true, but the only plot which concerns us here is woodland of Acaster College worth a mere 1/6 per year.⁷

Two of the greatest beneficiaries from land transactions in Edward's reign were the Duke of Northumberland and Lord Clinton and Saye. Yet even their dealings had little impact in our area. Northumberland, strengthening his holdings in the East Riding where he was the crown's steward, acquired four manors of Beverley college's provostry in November 1552 by exchange with the crown. Since the revenues of one of these, Bentley, had been devoted to the repair of the church fabric at Beverley, the town was compensated for the loss by the award of three chantry endowments and some further 'fabric lands'. Northumberland's disgrace within a year of this grant meant that the manors never ceased to appear in crown accounts, being resumed before the following Michaelmas.⁸ Northumberland's only achievement with our property seems to

5. C.P.R. I Edward VI, 319.

6. Chapter VI below.

7. E318/1416.

8. C.P.R. IV Edward VI, 369; Y.C.S. II, 540ff; E318/1820; E305/H8.

have been the acquisition of St. James's chapel in Doncaster for a client.⁹ Clinton, by contrast, showed no interest until Stanhope's attainder, when he acquired two small plots, one yielding 5/- p.a. at Beverley, the other 13/6 p.a. at Hull.¹⁰

Stanhope's fall brought some chantry lands back to the crown, including the hospital of St. Sepulchre at Hedon - a surrendered institution - which was soon granted to Ralph Constable on his retirement as Lieutenant of the Hull garrison.¹¹ But Stanhope's widow, Lady Anne, was allowed to retain much.¹² The fall of John Beaumont, Master of the Rolls, was also to restore to the crown some of the estates of Southwell college which he had bought, and which were swiftly granted out again, this time to Sir Henry Sidney.¹³ But grants such as these have really passed out of the realm of chantry lands proper into that of attainted and escheated lands, and do not properly concern us.

Only two further gifts have come to my notice. A yearly income of £27 from Westminster Abbey, paid to the 'rectory' or chapel in Tickhill castle, was given to the Countess of Northumberland for her lifetime.¹⁴

-
9. C.P.R. III Edward VI, 374 (for John Holmes).
10. E318/1517. See P.R.O. Index to Close Rolls sub 'Clinton'. He also exchanged lands with the crown to receive the prebend-house of St. James, Beverley. (E305/H1) and a chantry house at Laxton Moorhouse, Notts, (Ibid./H2).
11. E318/1538
12. C.P.R. II Mary, 16.
13. E318/1943. The great majority of the endowment remained unsold.
14. C.P.R. IV Edward VI, 407, (13 April 1549) - reversion granted to Shrewsbury, 10 July 1552.

And a portion of the chantry or 'hospital' called 'Le Ancres' at Sprotborough was given to Sir Thomas Darcy on his elevation to the barony.¹⁵ We must conclude that gifts were predominantly trivial in this region.

2. Continuations: poor relief

It was in the crown's contribution to public services that the bulk of the 'gifts' of chantry lands were deployed. Prof. Jordan has observed that:

never before, certainly, and not again until our own generation, has a government ever intervened with as much vigour and enlightenment to secure the social and cultural advance of its own citizens with charitable dispositions of its own. 16.

Yet the method and speed of the procedure failed to quench the burning enthusiasm kindled by the promises of a social programme largely endowed with lands from the dissolved institutions. Once the sale of lands had begun in the spring of 1548, the crown became unwilling to reduce its potential profit by refusing to allow the purchase of those lands which had maintained charitable institutions; and when Sir Walter Mildmay and Robert Kelway were commissioned in June 1548 to assess the contribution of chantries to schooling and poor relief, their objective

15. Ibid, 136 (4 April, 1551).

16. W.K. Jordan, E.Y.K., 121.

***TABLE**

Table VI : Contributions of cathedrals of the New Foundation,
and of certain colleges, to charitable works.
Source : Rymer, Foedera, VI-iii, 129.

*Values per year.

<u>Foundation</u>	<u>To the poor</u>	<u>To road repairs</u>
Canterbury	100 [£]	40 [£]
Westminster	100	40
Winchester	66.13. 4	33.10. 0
Durham	66.13. 4	20
Worcester	40	40
Rochester	20	20
Bristol	20	20
Gloucester	20	20
Chester	20	20
Peterborough	20	20
Ely	20	20
Burton	40	20
Thornton	20	20

was to see that these services did not suffer, by assigning cash grants to support them (until the king had further reflected on the matter) rather than by authorising the grant of any lands.¹⁷ Whilst this was clearly contrary to the intent of the Chantry Act, it is attributable rather to the costs of warfare and the need to respect obvious economic priorities than to any wicked hypocrisy that would deprive charities permanently of their landed wealth.

We do not have to look very far for proof that the crown was genuinely interested in promoting both poor relief and education. The poor law Act of 1536 failed to implement the advanced theories of William Marshal, one of Cromwell's advisers, on the systematic collection of poor relief and the provision of medical treatment to restore the temporarily disabled, yet it can only have heightened the popular awareness of the problem, and of the crown's intention to solve it.¹⁸ When the new cathedrals were established in 1541 each had an obligation to contribute both to the relief of the poor and to the maintenance of roads: duties also incumbent on certain collegiate foundations (Table VI). In March 1548 Edward set up a commission to check that these terms had been observed.¹⁹ The Injunctions of 1547 tried to check some of

17. C.P.R. I Edward VI, 417-8; printed in Y.A.S.R. xxxiii, 68.

18. G.R. Elton, 'An early Tudor Poor Law', Ec. H.R. 1953-4, 55; and W.G. Zeeveld, Foundations of Tudor Policy, 172.

19. C.P.R. V Edward VI, 403.

the worse abuses of a non-resident clergy by ordering every non-resident incumbent earning over £20 p.a. to give one fortieth of his revenue to the poor. Further, for every £100 derived from benefices, all clergy must maintain a student at a school or one of the Universities.²⁰ Nor were the provinces slow to take action. The clergy of the Doncaster deanery were ordered at the Royal Visitation to devise loans to help the honest poor,²¹ and many civic authorities had the matter in hand ahead of government legislation.²²

The maxim, 'Happy is the man that pitieth the poor,'²³ was on everyone's lips even before the advent of Commonwealth Men. But there was bewilderment over state intervention. The proposals of Brinkelow for poor relief in the 1540's were rejected like those of Marshal in the 1530's, and the powerful voices of reformers like Latimer and Lever repeated with monotonous regularity the charge of Robert Aske in the Pilgrimage of Grace that the nobility and the court were painfully unaware of the real problems.²⁴ Charity always seemed to be meted out with reservations, and Brinkelow was to exclaim:

20. Hughes and Larkin, op. cit. I, 397.

21. Sheffield City Library, Bacon Frank MSS. 4-1.

22. W.R.D. Jones, op. cit., 128.

23. Supplication of the Poore Commons, 1546. On the influence of such thought at court see e.g. W.K. Jordan E.Y.K., 386.

24. Zeeveld, op. cit., 169.

for Christ's sake, ye rulers, look upon your
hospitals,
whether the poor have their right there or no. 25.

But the idea persisted that most of the problem was the result of idleness, and Somerset's primary legislative solution, which has been called a 'hysterical and really vicious statute',²⁶ was clear enough indication that even the ministers charged with showing excessive concern for the lower classes did not understand the root causes of poverty.

It is against this background of heightened popular awareness of responsibility for the poor that we must judge the Chantry Act and its implications for the region. But we encounter a fundamental obstacle when trying to decide how much of the chantries' 'poor relief' was needed, and how effectively it was distributed in areas of acute poverty. Can we seriously contemplate a government's wilful abolition of any activities or funds it genuinely regarded as socially desirable? Many, possibly most, sixteenth-century Englishmen left something to the poor in their wills. Sometimes such donations were conditional on prayers being offered for the soul of the donor, in which case the ceremonies, including a distribution of such 'dole' of alms, were referred to as 'obits'. Were they founded because there was a problem of poverty to be met? Certainly not in most cases. They were made

25. Complaynt of Roderyck Mors. (The underlining is mine)

26. Stat. I. Edward VI, C.3. W.K. Jordan, E.Y.K., 177.

as a last act of charity to the relatively poor, and their number and incidence were directly related to the death-rate rather than to the extent of local poverty. Donations were haphazard, and whilst areas with great problems of poverty might find few enough obits to help, others of comparative wealth might equally be over-supplied. This was not the way to tackle the problems, and besides, endowments of this kind were firmly associated with praying for the dead, now considered superstitious. Not surprisingly, few of these obits were recommended for continuation, though we do find a few instances, notably in the Brief Certificate for the East Riding. The amounts thus given to the 'poor' were generally trivial, and their removal was no great loss to the community. Indeed, the end of the casual dole may have increased local determination to institute a really effective solution to the problems of poverty.

In hospitals and almshouses, relief ought to have been more systematic, but it has been observed that the heyday of the hospitals passed with the decline of leprosy in the later middle ages.²⁷ Despite their obvious decay, the Edwardian government looked more favourably on institutions founded primarily for poor

27. B. Wilson unpub. Ph.D. thesis, 365. A.G. Dickens, English Reformation, 209.

Table VII : The fate of the hospitals recorded in the Chantry Certificates of 1546 or 1548.

(* Separate mention of many of these institutions is made in the text)
For more detailed information, see appropriate entries in
V.C.H. Yorks III and Notts II.

Hospitals whose revenue came to the crown (and which were thereby discontinued)

Beverley, St Nicholas ('Frairy')	£5. 6. 5
Nottingham, St John	5.17. 0
Sprotborough , St Edmund ('Ancres')	9.17. 9

(in the last item, there was some dispute, and the hospital survived)

Hospitals whose endowment was not confiscated by the crown in 1548

York, St Mary in the Horsefair	39. 0. 0 (Gross)
York, Jesus & Our Lady (<u>alias</u> Holy Cross, <u>alias</u> St Thomas.	6. 0. 0
Northallerton Maison Dieu	(6. 6. 8) (already dispoiled)
Ripon, St Mary Magdalene	31.13. 4 (Gross in 1576)
Ripon, St John Baptist	11. 0. 0 (" " ")
Hull, Maison Dieu	41. 1. 0 (Net in 1546)

(also at Hull, Gregg's, Ripplingham's and Holy Trinity Hospital survived because they were not even surveyed under the Chantry Certificates)

Pontefract, St Nicholas	16.13. 4
Bawtry, St Mary Magdalene	8.13. 4
Blyth, St John Evangelist	9. 0. 22
Bradbuske	Chantry endowment here sold
East Stoke-by- Newark, St Leonard :	Disputed, see text.
Newark, St Leonard	13.14. 2
Nottingham, St Mary ('Plumtree')	9. 7. 5
Well	Chantry endowment appropriated
Yarm	Chantry endowment appropriated

Unless otherwise stated, the values quoted are Net annual values in 1546.

relief whenever the function of praying for the dead had not gained the upper hand. The hospitals, which would have been dissolved by Henry VIII's Chantry Act, were exempt from the Edwardian Act, though this was left to be inferred from their absence in the list of institutions to be dissolved, rather than explicitly stated. Many endowments were therefore never appropriated by the crown (Table VII).

Yet there was a large group of similar institutions which became subject to the Act because their social functions had dwindled to insignificance, or their association with endowments obviously subject to the Act jeopardised their future. Thus, when the college at Pontefract was dissolved the Knolles Almshouses it had maintained were only recommended for a cash grant instead of retaining lands.²⁸ Already at the time of Leland's visit, the hospital called the 'Frairy' at Beverley was much decayed, and in the Chantry Certificates it appeared as a mere chantry²⁹, whilst the former hospital of Mary Magdalene at Southwell had become a free chapel³⁰; together with the 'hospital of St. John at Nottingham these were dissolved.³¹ The hospital known as 'LeAncres' at Sprotborough was recorded in 1546 with

28. Y.C.S. II, viii.

29. V.C.H. Yorks III, 302.

30. V.C.H. Notts. II, 175.

31. Records of the Borough of Nottingham IV, 23.

functions of a chantry only and yet after a long dispute it seems to have been continued.³²

There is every indication that the crown commissioners had fixed rules for handling these properties. The endowments of chantries and prayers were confiscated; The endowments of poor relief continued, provided that they could be reasonably distinguished from the former, superstitious, uses.

At York the hospital of St. Mary in the Horsefair was not disendowed, though it had run into hard times, and it must have been a welcome relief to all parties when in 1557 its endowment was transferred to the Dean and Chapter to enable them to maintain St. Peter's school.³³ St. Thomas's hospital in the city also benefited by secretly adopting much of the concealed endowment of the Corpus Christi gild.³⁴ Pontefract, despite the protestation addressed to the crown by one of a conservative temperament in Mary's reign,³⁵ did not greatly suffer by the dissolution, for the hospital of St. Nicholas was continued even though it only catered for nine poor people and already drew its income from the crown. The hospital at Well survived right down to the twentieth century, but that at Yarm was dissolved as a chantry and the lead conveyed to Stanhope.³⁶

32. Y.C.S.I., 155. Sheffield City Library: deeds relating to the hospital e.g. CD49 (from 1571).

33. C.P.R. III Mary, 459; York City MSS E28 f.8.

34. Chapter VIII below.

35. A.G. Dickens (ed.) in Y.A.J., xxxvii, 376; YC.S. II, 326 (n)

36. T. Horsfall, Notes on the Manor of Well and Snape, 182. P.R.O. E117/14/122. records Well's continued existence. J.W. Wardell, A history of Yarm, 79. For lead see chapter VII below.

At Ripon, the two hospitals of St. Mary Magdalene and St. John Baptist, though both closely associated with the dissolved college, survived, their total endowment hardly changing between 1546 and a concealment enquiry thirty years later when they were accused of secreting the revenues of their two chaplains and of another priest ministering at the chapel of Studley Roger. Whilst the endowments survived even the later enquiry, they cannot have been achieving much towards the government's programme of poor relief, for it seems that the few poor residents received only 6/8 p.a. and were practically left to fend for themselves.³⁷ In these and similar instances it is likely that the Elizabethan Poor Law reforms effectively eclipsed many of the hospitals which had escaped dissolution and yet did no more than gnaw at the edges of the problem.³⁸

The story did not always finish with the decision of chantry commissioners whether a 'hospital' was a hospital. The courts had to decide several disputes concerning institutions deemed by the crown initially to be eligible for dissolution. The longest and most complicated concerned the hospital of St. Leonard at Stoke-by-Newark, which was all-but extinct in 1547. Two questions were at issue, whether the 'hospital' was in fact only a chantry and thereby eligible

37. DL 44/243; E 134/26-27 Eliz., Mich. No. 29.

38. Several hospitals needed further regulation e.g. St. Nicholas, Pontefract in 1605 (V.C.H. Yorks III, 320) and the Maison Dieu at Hull in 1572 (T. Allen, II. 87).

for dissolution in 1548; and whether a lease made by its master before the dissolution to Sir John Markham (if valid) should take precedence over a post-dissolution crown lease granted on 21 May 1550 to Thomas Molyneux and Robert Fletcher. In 1552 the crown seems to have overlooked the latter lease and instituted one Marmaduke Fulnesby as master, who thereupon sued for restitution of his property. A commission later appointed by Mary to investigate found that the master and brethren had all died by the spring of 1548 and the hospital thereby come to the crown. Fulnesby now having left the scene, Mary appointed one Richard Hopkin as Master even though Molyneux was still defending his lease against the Markham family. The matter was shunted from one court to another: the Duchy of Lancaster, Augmentations, Star Chamber and Requests, and it becomes increasingly clear that warlike conduct by both the Markhams and the Molyneux with, to say the least, ungentlemanly language on both sides, had built the whole issue up into something of a family feud. The outcome of the battle is not recorded, but the hospital evidently continued for in 1575 it was presented that as a Marian refoundation, it was due for dissolution by Elizabeth!³⁹

Nottingham is another centre of interest. The master of St. Mary's hospital resolutely withheld from the crown

39. Sequence reconstructed from E321/20/11; Sta. Cha. 4/2/1-3; Req. 2/119/21, C.P.R.IV Mary, 466; E178/3059.

the endowment of £14. 15. 6. p.a. demanded at the dissolution, and was vindicated in 1550 when Augmentations decided he was to be left unmolested. Not so St. John's hospital which, together with the chantry of St. Mary in St. Mary's church, was granted to the corporation in 1550, for the repair of Trent Bridge.⁴⁰

3. Education

Unless further information unexpectedly comes to light there is little which can be newly stated about the impact of the dissolution on education in our area. This section seeks primarily to sketch the work already done by other historians, from whose work it has mainly been compiled, but without needlessly covering well-trodden ground.⁴¹

The crown was determined that education should be strengthened, both by preserving all that was good in chantry schooling and also by establishing more schools. All clergy, according to their capabilities, were expected to be teachers, and the Injunctions ordered chantry priests to assist in the instruction of youth, though we may well doubt - judging by the low intellectual standards reported of cantarists in the 1548 Certificates - that any instruction they could offer would be either very sound or very advanced,

40. Records of the Borough of Nottingham IV, 16, 22. Compare Bristol whose corporation had to buy a chantry for similar purpose: W.K. Jordan, E.Y.K., 10.

41. See Appendix III a.

and the number of schools recorded is very small in proportion to the total number of chantries. The young king himself placed 'Good Education' at the top of his list of points tending 'to order well the whole commonwealth.'⁴² Yet by 'education' was meant not just schooling, but the training of each individual for his true role in society. There was, indeed, a general prejudice against any idea of schooling for all, as Cranmer discovered when attempting to defend the admittance to the new cathedral school in Canterbury of anyone, of whatever social background, who proved his merits. Cranmer's opponents were not alone in thinking:

it was meet for the ploughman's son to go to plough and the artificer's son to apply the trade of his parent's vocation, and the gentleman's children are meet to have the knowledge of government and rule in the commonwealth. 43.

As with poor relief, so with education, we find the scope of the chantries' effective involvement hard to delimit. It is clear that the casual instruction by the cantarist without the formal foundation of a school did not meet the reformers' demands. But even many of the 'grammar schools' associated with chantries were only modest institutions. Starkey noted,

42. W.K. Jordan (Ed.) Chronicle....of Ed. VI, 165

43. F. Caspari, Humanism and the Social Order, 139.
D. Bush, The Renaissance and English Humanism, 78.

it were nothing amiss to put two or three small schools of £10 a year together and make one good, with an excellent master. 44.

The work of A.F. Leach in dramatising the confiscation of school endowments by Edward VI obscured the fact that we know precious little of the strength of even the grammar schools, for few have left record of the number of their pupils.⁴⁵ or the extent of the instruction given. For our area the information is pitifully small, but it certainly cannot be proved that a district needed a school simply because the founder of a chantry had deemed it right to endow one.

Most of the remaining criticism of Edward VI - once the obviously prejudiced ramblings of pioneer Leach are reconsidered - centres on the fact that in most cases lands were taken away from those schools which were declared to have been run by chantries, and even though most schools continued, the crown retained or sold their lands, giving the schoolmasters only a fixed stipend whose real value was bound to fall. A fair summary of the modern consensus is that of Prof. Jordan that 'the principal harm done was inadvertent'.⁴⁶ The sixteenth-century economic theorists,

44. See J. Simon, Education and Society, 159.

45. The chantry of St. Nicholas at Skipton had 120 pupils. (Y.C.S. II. 403), that at Campden, Glos. 60 to 80 (Trans. Bristol & Glos. Arch. Soc. (1883-4), 280). See P. Heath, English Parish Clergy, 83-4, and J. Lawson, Medieval Education and the Reformation, 13-14.

46. W.K. Jordan, Rural charities, 310. A.G. Dickens, English Reformation, 211.

if such men existed, were largely bewildered by the 'dearth' in which they found themselves, and to give a yearly stipend to a schoolmaster, equivalent to his former profits from land, may well have seemed just, or even generous. More significantly, given that chantries were superstitious, it was quite the most consistent policy to deprive the schools of any permanent association with a landed endowment that was at least in part devoted to 'foolish imaginings.'⁴⁷

Consistency apart, it remains true that the crown's stated intention was not to interfere with the landed endowment of schools run by chantries, yet its immediate action was to award the school master only a cash stipend, and to confiscate all land tarnished by association with the chantries. It was not until late February 1550 that Sir Richard Sackville as Chancellor of Augmentations was unambiguously entrusted with the task of assigning lands from the recent dissolutions, to the maintenance of schools.⁴⁸ The sale of lands had come to a pause at the end of 1549, so that some such measure may long have been planned, but if not, the government may have been encouraged to act by the increasing clamour of preachers like Lever.

47. N. Wood, The Reformation and English Education, 36.

48. C.P.R. III Edward VI, 214-5

Amid the justified criticisms of economic opportunism, we should not forget that there were several quite definite advantages even in the interim settlement. The founders of chantry grammar schools had seen the praying and teaching functions of their foundation as two complementary features: the one would not have been founded without the other. The reformers now declared prayers for the dead illegal and confiscated endowments to this end in 1548. But there was usually nothing to say how much of any endowment was towards a school, and how much towards a chantry: the priest drew his revenues for performing both activities. When, therefore, the crown paid him, as schoolmaster, a stipend equal to the current net yield of the whole endowment, he was effectively receiving the reward of two jobs for performing only one: a not ungenerous settlement, particularly as he remained fully employed unlike many other cantarists who were simply pensioned off. Few schoolmasters were any the worse off, therefore. And whilst it is true that the stipend was fixed, there was nothing to prohibit the acquisition of further lands, with crown permission, for an institution which was now cleared of all guilt and partly administered by the state. Townships proud enough of their schools must surely organise their better endowment, if not by self-help, then by petitioning the crown. And I am not aware of any clamour of injustice following the dissolution.

The chantry commissioners had carefully recorded all the grammar schools and some lesser schools attached to suspect endowments, and most of those in our region appear to have continued, on the crown's initial fixed-stipend policy or by other means. Schools mentioned in the Certificates at Wakefield and Topcliffe were not specifically recommended for continuation, yet that at Wakefield does not seem to have ceased to function, and the original pension of the priest who had kept the school at Topcliffe was soon converted into the payment of a schoolmaster.⁴⁹ The school at Ripon, similarly omitted from the continuations warrants, certainly survived, as we shall shortly discover, and whilst much has been made of the meagre 59/2 p.a. on which the school at Pontefract was made to subsist, we must not forget that it had managed adequately on this sum (albeit derived from land) before the dissolution. Its amalgamation in 1583 with several other schools proves that their competition was too exclusive and their individual endowments too small.⁵⁰ In each case, however, the crown's generosity directly reflected the value of the earlier endowment.

49. Y.C.S. II, 416 and I, 88; Walker, Wakefield, 366; Joan Simon in B.J. Ed. S. (1955), 40n.

50. Y.A.S.R. xxxiii, 43 ff.

The law courts did not hesitate to interpret the Chantry Act literally. School lands at Bradford declared to the chantry commissioners were claimed for the crown by bailiffs after the dissolution, but the inhabitants refused to pay any rent because their land was not attached to any chantry. Taken to the Duchy Court, they easily proved their case: the Chantry Act had no designs on such land.⁵¹

Ripon school was declared by its master, Edmund Browne, to be subject to the Act, and he thereby earned himself a lease of the property for as long as he remained schoolmaster, but the townsmen insisted that the land did not belong to the crown, and the Duchy court upheld their opinion, albeit not until Mary's reign, which may be significant. The town was allowed to form a board of governors to appoint the master and control the lands, (which the crown now relinquished,) worth £8. 7. 2. p.a. At no time was the school totally disendowed therefore, and in June 1555 Philip and Mary formalised the town's control, establishing the school by charter as a corporation with townsmen as governors, and adding a yearly endowment of £17.2.2. in the lands of Ripon chantries.⁵²

51. DL5/7 fol. 37Cv, and Ministers' Accounts.

52. Y.A.S.R. xxvii, 176 ff.

Several other schools never became the object of controversy, and are often forgotten. Schools in both Richmond and Nottingham were mentioned in the Certificates yet not dissolved because they were not maintained by chantries⁵³. At Nottingham confiscation of school land was only just averted, for the school held property of the Holy Trinity gild, fortunately rent-free so that it had no monetary connection. Schools at Doncaster and Newark were also able to prove their independence of superstitious uses.⁵⁴

The lesser schools, however, particularly those attached to colleges for the purpose of training choristers to sing, were redundant after the dissolution of the collegiate establishments. Acaster, Rotherham and Southwell all suffered in this respect and Acaster and Rotherham also lost their separate 'writing schools', whose function must surely have been taken over by the grammar schools continuing there. This does not detract from a general assertion that at the dissolution it was the chantries which were dissolved, and not the schools which they had supported.

Evidently, not all the schools run by the chantries and colleges had an immediate impact upon the towns in which they found themselves. The school at Beverley must have been in this category, for whilst it had certainly

53. Y.C.S. II, 518; V.C.H. Notts. II, 222.

54. V.C.H. Yorks I, 447; Notts. II 208.

existed up to the dissolution, run by the college, the town's governors appear to have regarded it as a private rather than a public concern, for, petitioning the Council in 1552 for the recovery of lands sufficient to maintain the church fabric, they observed that Beverley was a town of many inhabitants:-

Some of them be apte and mete to be brought up in learning whiche are not, for so muche as there is neither gramer schole or any other schole as yet founded. 55.

Had they acknowledged the earlier existence of a school, they would probably have secured a new landed endowment, it being the crown's policy to give priority to areas which already had schools and showed willing to help themselves. Although the Beverley town records are missing for the critical years 1547-62, when they begin again we find the town paying its own schoolmaster.

But Beverley was the one exception. Throughout the country, many other schools were successfully re-endowed with land after petitioning the crown. The most serious criticism that can be levelled against Somerset is that he did not proceed at once to grant to schools land confiscated from the chantries but waited for a formal petition from the locality, to the growing outrage of men like Lever. This meant that many schools continued only

55. Y.A.S.R. xxvii, 113. No school was recorded for Howden College in the Brief Certificate (E301/119). See also V.C.H. Yorks I. 428, the townsmen may simply have meant that no land had been given back to a school.

on a fixed stipend.

The most famous clash between the social theorists and the government came over Sedbergh school in Yorkshire, championed by St. John's College, Cambridge to which it regularly sent scholars. The college summarised the objections to the crown's policy of confiscation. If the wills of the dead were not in themselves superstitious and the endowment of schools no more so, then wills containing such endowments ought to be respected. If a school held land worth £x per year it could make a small profit on incidentals such as entry fines, for which a fixed cash payment of £x from the crown was a poor substitute. If the crown took land yielding, say, £10.0.0, p.a. and sold it at 20 years' purchase (i.e. for £200) while continuing to pay the school £10.0.0. p.a. the crown's profit was at first small, and in the long run became a progressive loss.⁵⁶

Sound though these arguments were they failed to recognise that the initial endowment of £x was for a school and a chantry, and that, as long as the school retained all such lands it was subsisting on superstitious earnings.

Sir Edward Warner, Silvester Leigh and Leonard Bate, whom we shall again encounter as large-scale purchasers of chantry lands, obtained the lands of both the Lupton chantry at Sedbergh and the Rood Gild at Giggleswick which had supported the schools in each township. St. John's Cambridge intervened to block the sale of the lands at

56. Y.A.S.R. xxxiii, 351-2. compare Sheffield's petition in Hunter, Sheffield, 133-4

Sedbergh but unsuccessfully, and this led Lever to preach his famous sermon against the crown's plunder in the early months of 1550. Stipends equivalent to the yearly value of the confiscated lands were awarded to the masters, Robert Hebblethwaite and Richard Carr⁵⁷ and it was a further year before the inhabitants of Sedbergh petitioned for re-endowment. The crown was not ungenerous. Having broken the connection between the school and Lupton's chantry it gave back chantry lands worth twice as much: The revenues of the entire chantry at Ilkley, the rectory and advowson of Weston which had supported obits in York minster, parts of Colley chapel and Hunter's chantry (both in Halifax), parts of the chantries of Our Lady at Thorne and Barnby Dun, a lamp at Fishlake and some land of Rotherham College. The total yearly value was £20. 13. 10. compared with the £10. 17. 0. from Lupton's chantry, and although the endowment was drawn now from scattered sources there were no complaints.⁵⁸ At the same time administration was tightened, with twelve governors chosen from the parish, the schoolmaster being appointed by St. John's, which, continued to receive its scholars. The governors were given further authority to buy lands worth another £20.0.0. p.a.

57. LR6/122/1.

58. C.P.R. IV Edward VI, 97.

It was May 1553 before the vicar and townsmen at Giggleswick took similar action, which brought them the land of Our Lady's chantry at Rise (Aldborough, E.R.) and lands at North Cave formerly belonging to Acaster College. This raised their endowment from a former gross total of £6.6.0. p.a. to a clear £20 p.a. and a new governing body was empowered to buy lands worth a further £30 p.a.⁵⁹ For Sedbergh and Giggleswick alone, then, the crown restored lands which could have been expected to raise £800 p.a. or more if sold at normal rates.

These developments are paralleled in other regions: new school boards were set up following the initiative of town councils, often assisted by the local gentry as at Morpeth and Chelmsford.⁶⁰ Stafford, Bedford, Bath, Birmingham and Retford,⁶¹ all successfully secured chantry lands, whilst Pocklington and Berkhamsted⁶² even obtained Acts of Parliament to support their foundations. It will be observed that when the crown stopped paying the stipend of schoolmasters, control of the schools was handed on to boards of governors, and in this way the dangers of superstition recurring were minimised, and something approaching a system of education was established for the first time.

59. Ibid. V, 68

60. Ibid. IV, 384, 116.

61. Ibid. IV, 21, 405, 439, 40, 47.

62. J. Simon, Education and Society, 227. C.P.R.V Edward VI, 234

It is possible to argue that but for the pressure of Lever and his colleagues little land would have been restored to educational ends following the dissolution. But the first priority was war charges, and to meet these chantry lands had to be sold. Only after the sales were terminated at the end of 1549 was attention turned to the schools. Thereafter re-endowment proceeded for 2 years following petitions to the crown. Are we to see this as a state service only given grudgingly to appease the critics? I think not, and I have tried to show that whilst only three or four schools in our area were re-endowed with land before the end of Mary's reign, the effects on educational facilities were minimal.

What impact did the crown's policy have in the property market? We have seen that Warner, Leigh and Bate bought without scruple chantry lands at Sedbergh and Giggleswick which had partly supported schools. Their purchase also included similar lands at Long Preston. Other buyers took chantry-school lands at Boroughbridge and Retford. The crown did not wish them to be regarded as school lands, but as chantry lands, and the buyers evidently felt secure enough to obtain the lands without the fear of their being re-appropriated for schooling. In the collegiate foundations, particularly at Rotherham and Acaster, no specific lands had been set aside for the schools and the college property was offered for sale regardless.

***TABLE**

Table VIII : The fate of schools' endowments in cases where connection with a chantry led to expropriation.

(N.B. Tables showing the fate of the schools themselves will be found in Appendix III)

The following symbols are used :

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| G = grammar school | * recommended for continuation |
| S = song school | + situated in the Duchy of Lancaster. |
| W = writing school | |
| X = other teaching provided | |

(a) Lands of chantries supporting the following schools were sold before the end of Edward's reign.

- | | |
|----------------------|---------------|
| *Acaster G | * Normanton G |
| Acaster S | * Retford G |
| Acaster W | * Rotherham G |
| +*Boroughbridge G | Rotherham S |
| Gargrave X | Rotherham W |
| *Giggleswick G | * Sedbergh G |
| Long Preston G and S | Wakefield X |

(b) Lands of chantries supporting the following schools were confiscated but not sold before the end of Edward's reign:

- | | |
|----------------------|----------------|
| *Bedale G | +*Pickering G |
| +*Bolton on Dearne G | +*Pontefract G |
| +*Cawthorne G | + Ripon G |
| *Hull G | +*Royston G |
| Keighley X | *Skipton G |
| +*Middleton G | +*Tickhill G |
| *Northallerton G | Topcliffe S |
| +*Owston G | Well G |
| | +*Wragby G |

(c) Other school endowments referred to in the Certificates :

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| *Beverley G | Lands given to the town for repair of church. |
| +Bradford G | Lands wrongly included, exempted after litigation |
| *Nottingham | Exempt because not dependant on chantry. |
| Pocklington G | Not confiscated. |
| Romaldkirk G | Stock of money only. Not confiscated by 1556.
(see E 117/12/40.) |

It might be objected that there were several plots of school land which did remain unsold, yet we shall see that sales of all land in our area were sluggish, and school lands need not have been regarded as a special risk. Nine schools within the Duchy of Lancaster did not see their former lands sold in Edward's reign, but we shall see that it was in any case crown policy to retain as much Duchy land as possible. The chantry lands supporting schools at Bedale, Hull, Keighley, Skipton, Topcliffe and Well also remained unsold. Was this because the crown wished to retain them? Or because potential buyers regarded them as a dangerous risk? Not necessarily. At Hull the property was greatly in decay, and even though the town petitioned for the protection of its school, the crown gave the master only a fixed stipend.⁶³ At Keighley the land was extensively leased, and this would perhaps discourage buyers.⁶⁴

It seems most likely, therefore, that after the dissolution all chantry lands were offered equally for sale, regardless of any connection with education, and that those who bought them had nothing to fear from the crown's expressed intention of founding more schools.

63. Tickell, 207; V.C.W I, 450.

64. The school at Keighley may have ceased to function. It was not a grammar school.

The most surprising feature is the total failure of any local patrons in our area to buy back for the schools the chantry land in question. Scarcely less remarkable is the paucity of petitions for the free gift of chantry lands to strengthen existing schools. Schoolmasters and townships alike accepted the fixed stipend policy with a better grace than we can easily imagine. Is it not time to credit Edward VI once again as the real founder of a controlled policy of state - aided education?

4. Chapels of Ease

Henry VIII had already made one move against Yorkshire chapels in July 1544 when he ordered a survey of the utility of those at Tibthorpe (St. James), Southborne (St. Mary Magdalene), Winteringham, Birdsall, Kilham and Nesswick. The chapel at Tibthorpe was reported as only half a mile from its parish church of Kirkburn, and it had been used three times a week for mass, the chaplain being paid by the vicar. At Southborne the crown commissioners found the chapel vacant for more than a year, 'and we thynk it not necessarie nor requysite to stande.' Little was left of Winteringham chapel which had fallen with Malton priory: its lead had been sold off and also some of the stonework. At Birdsall they recommended demolition: the chapel lay on the land of the attainted Sir Francis Bigod, and had become a haunt of undesirables:-

dyverse beggars and vagabondes doo lye there
in the night tyme.

Kilham was not studied, except to report that it contained a chantry, but the chapel at Nesswick was recommended along with that at Tibthorpe for preservation.

Here, it seems, we have a prototype chantry survey aimed at discovering the social utility of some chapels thought to be dispensable.⁶⁵ It shows that the crown had realised that some such chapels served little useful purpose and might be added to the fund of royal appropriations. It also shows that even local commissioners, headed by Sir Leonard Beckwith, were prepared to endorse the spoliation of such endowments. When churches and chapels became redundant in the 16th century they were pulled down or deserted with less fuss than could ever be the case today under the eagle eye of preservation societies, and we must penetrate beyond the dictates of inbred sentimentality in assessing the importance of the dissolution in this field.

We have already seen something of the problem in discussing chapels of ease and their contribution to parochial life. The Chantry Act was determined to preserve all those which were truly necessary for the local ministry,

65. E301/117.

and equally determined to remove all connection with superstitious endowments. As with alms-giving and education, the decision of the commissioners was often controversial but rarely conceived with any malicious intention to deprive the parishes.

In some parishes chapels were essential, particularly in the remote moors of the West Riding where even Defoe was terrified two centuries later by the isolation and bleakness.⁶⁶ Then we have the Seamer rising of 1549 to testify to the hardship of residents in one area particularly badly hit by the removal of chantries and chapels.⁶⁷

On the other hand, the Seamer rebellion was an isolated incident not echoed elsewhere in the region, or indeed in the country at large. And it is extremely doubtful whether even a devout church-going people really needed the number of chapels which were to be found in each parish. For every chapel regularly cut off by flooding from its parish church⁶⁸ there were many others which, given a move away from chantries, pilgrimages, shrines and the like, were quite redundant. Did the parish of Wath in Richmondshire really need chapels at Middleton Quernhow and Norton Conyers, each within half a mile of the parish church?⁶⁹ At Topcliffe there was a chapel in the

66. W.G. Hoskins, Making of the English landscape, 110.

67. See A.G. Dickens in Y.A.J. xxxiv.

68. Chantry Certificates, passim. See e.g. Thorpe (Barnby Dun), Bolton (Bishop Wilton), Norton-le-clay (Cundall), Whitley (Kellington).

69. Y.C.S. I 102-3, II 504-5

church yard: little wonder it was dissolved.⁷⁰ Think of the chapels on Ouse and Foss bridges in York or on the bridges of Leeds and Wakefield; or the chapels of Mary Magdalene and St. John in Doncaster, St. Nicholas in Beverley, St. John Ad. St. Swithun in Wakefield, Clothierham and Stammergate in Ripon. These could all be sold and no dire consequences to the parochial ministry of a reformed church.

Unfortunately it has proved impossible to discover beyond doubt which chapels survived the dissolution and which fell. The archdeacons' visitation returns which would have proved most useful in identifying clergy serving in chapelries have not survived for this period in the diocese of York. Nevertheless, we must bear in mind that chapels of ease, as such, were not eligible even for inclusion in the Chantry Certificates, which extended to free chapels (extra-parochial) and chapel endowments. Some examples of the implications of this are readily to be found. The parish of Gilling had chapels at South Cowton, Barton, Hutton Longvillers, Eryholm and Forcett. Only that at South Cowton was listed in the 1548 Certificates, and this because it contained a chantry. Whilst the chantry endowment was confiscated the chapel survived along with all the others in the parish.⁷¹ The Certificates refer in passing to chapels at Brompton, ^eDighton and Warsall within the parish o/

70. Ibid. I 87, II 480.

71. Y.A.J. xiv, 396 n. 17 and Ibid., 402.

of Northallerton; and at Coniston in the parish of Burnsall⁷² yet these were not to be dissolved, and they were not surveyed because they were not endowed. Similar examples could doubtless be found for many parts of the diocese.⁷³ Unendowed chapels wrongly noted in the Certificates were exempted after litigation. A chapel of ease under full parochial control was not, therefore, to be dissolved with any chantries it might contain. The chapel at Farlington survived when its chantry was disendowed. The chapel at Ayton (Seamer) was similarly disendowed and the lead from its roof sold off, but the rest of the building was not demolished and it was used again later in the century. The chapel at Rylstone (Burnsall) survived without any mention being necessary in the continuations warrants.⁷⁴ Similarly, chapels at Haxby (Strensall), Dishforth (Topcliffe), Dringhouses, Copmanthorpe and Upper Poppleton (all near York) certainly survived despite their mention in the Chantry Certificates, and without being given continuations warrants. Nor was the generosity of the commissioners for continuations rationed. The three chapels at Airmyn, Carlton and Hoke in the parish of Snaith were all continued,

72. Y.C.S. I. 124. II 412

73. The return of church goods for the East Riding in 1552 (E315/515) records chapels at Thirkelby, Duggleby, Lexington, Butterwick, Awburn, Fraisthorpe, Marton and Skirlaw. Of these, Awburn, Marton and Skirlaw were recorded in the Brief Certificate, but clearly survived despite their disendowment.

74. Lawton Collectio, passim for similar examples.

though the endowment of that at Carlton was naturally sold. At Halifax both the chapels of Elland and Heptonstall survived, though deprived of chantries. Many other chapels were recommended for continuation, and in such cases, whilst the crown confiscated any landed endowment, as in the case of schools it paid a yearly stipend to the priest in charge. But of course many free chapel were totally dissolved. I can find no indication that those at Kneton (Harthill), Thorpe (Barby Dun), Scotton (Farnham) or Newby Wiske (Kirkby Wiske) survived the dissolution to serve as chapels of ease, though the building at Scotton survived.⁷⁵

One note of warning must be sounded in my general defence of Edwardian government policy. The good intentions of the legislature and the executive could only be fully implemented with the willing cooperation of the local officers responsible for effecting policies in the provinces. The surviving recommendations of the chantry commissioners show a good deal of sympathy in communicating to the central government all that deserved preservation in the regions. In turn their reports depended on the sincerity of parochial officers describing the necessity of their endowments. The claims of the latter must certainly have been exaggerated in defence of the status quo. We shall unearth below details of the

75. Information tabulated in Appendix III.

handiwork of the East Riding surveyor, John Bellow, who was accused in Mary's reign of setting his men to work pulling down many chapels not eligible for inclusion in the Act. Such unwarranted excesses were not condoned by the government, but they may be symptomatic of a general tendency to pull down more than was strictly permissible.⁷⁶ In its desire to abolish superstition the crown surely went too far in attacking endowments which happened to be associated with prayers for the dead, and the removal of land from both chapels and schools certainly left some parishes worse off in real terms than before. It is of the utmost importance, however, to realise that the process was not entirely detrimental. Many former chantry priests now became official assistants to the parochial clergy. Several chapels had their legal position clarified under parochial administration, just as the schools came under a stricter supervision by boards of governors. The state thus intervened to strengthen the central authority of the parishes, and to provide machinery for the social services that was not haphazard or casual, nor dependent on the superstitious remnants of the old religion.

It has not been my intention here to explore the full impact of the dissolution in the region, and much more could be said about this. Instead I have attempted hitherto to

76. cf. A.G. Dickens, English Reformation, 213: the activities of John Maynard in Oxfordshire.

explain the Edwardian government policies and to clear the way for the main purpose of this study, an analysis of the crown's handling of the confiscated property itself. To this we must now turn.

CHAPTER IV

SALES (i)

1. The procedure and the source material

The first commission for the sale of chantry lands had been issued to Sir Walter Mildmay and Robert Kelway on 27 April, 1548, two months before they were authorised to make provision for schools and poor relief, three months before the appearance of the continuation warrants directed to the Receivers, and even a month before the deadline for the submission of Chantry Certificates. They were instructed to sell lands to a clear yearly value of £5,000,

or to sicke summe or summes of money to be
made as shalbe necessary for thaffaires
afore rehersed,

'thaffaires' consisting primarily of the war charges.¹

London rang with the news of the sales. The first transactions passed the commissioners' hands no later than 30 April, after which they were kept busy for the best part of fifteen or sixteen months. James Clarke wrote to his master, the Earl of Shrewsbury, of Mildmay and Kelway that they:

sit at Mr. Mildmay's every day, and such
importunate heaving for houses in London
has not the like been seen; 20 years! and
30 years! purchase is nothing almost: such
a stir is among the citizens in purchasing
one another's house over his head that well
is he that pricks highest. Undoubtedly
the sale of the city will be a great thing
as hath been heard of. 2.

-
1. C.P.R. II Edward VI, 57. See also A.P.C. 1547-50, 184-5.
 2. E. Lodge, Illustrations of British History I, 149. The letter is there dated 27 March 1548, but this is impossible if Mildmay and Kelway had not then begun.

But the two commissioners were not always at Mr. Mildmay's, for on 6 April 1549 we find the keeper of the Goldsmiths' Hall, Thomas Whitlock, receiving £4 for his:

diligente attendaunce and travaill frome tyme to tyme sithens the firste begynnynge of the sale of Colledges and chauntries upon the Kinges commissioners sittinge there, As also for the lone of Carpettes and Cusshions and for Candelles with suche other necessaries expended and occupied the tyme aforesaide. 3.

The vast number of London properties noted in the enrolment books of the sales⁴ suggests that interest there completely overshadowed that in the provinces. Here was a rare opportunity for merchants and men of affairs to acquire that vital London base.

But for all the haste of the would-be buyers it was not simply a question of approaching Mildmay and Kelway, fixing a price and walking off with a patent. A great deal of property was to change hands, and the crown had to ensure that it made a reasonable profit on the transactions, and that they were duly recorded for posterity in an intelligible manner. The procedure for sales of land has been studied before, but a summary here will facilitate our comprehension.⁵

First, the intending buyer approached the commissioners, personally or through a servant or agent;

3. P.R.O. E315/258

4. E315/68 and 67; E36/258-9. The first commission was intended to finish at the end of August 1548, but the enrolments show no sign of a break for a further year. Compare R.B. Outhwaite thesis p. 228 where commissions of Elizabeth's reign are shown to have continued with no official authorisation extant.

5. A more detailed study of the making of particulars for grant etc. is to be found in R.B. Outhwaite thesis (see bibliography below).

and asked them to issue a warrant to order the appropriate surveyor to examine the property he wished to buy. The surveyor valued the property and commented on any special features which might influence the market price.⁶ His findings were returned to London, and the applicant again appeared before the commissioners to hear their verdict. Provided that the surveyor had found no objection to a sale, and provided that the commissioners themselves could see no hazards, they determined the price, or 'rate' to be set. If Clarke's letter above is to be trusted, a degree of actual bargaining must have taken place, but there were fixed norms within which the properties were rated. In 1548 urban property sold for ten to fifteen times its estimated yearly value, whilst good arable land might pass for 20 or 21 years' purchase.⁷ The surveyor or his deputy occasionally suggested the price that could reasonably be charged for a given property, and since Mildmay and Kelway were both busy professional men in their own right, commissions for sale apart, it is likely that in many cases the 'rating' was a mere formality based on provincial recommendations.⁸ The surveyor's report, known as the 'particular' for sale, was itself the document presented for rating, and to this the commissioners added

-
6. He had to note any woods, or decayed property, and to warn the commissioners if they had already had the same property rated for someone else.
 7. Habakkuk (in Ecc.H.R. 2nd series x, 364 ff) suggests that likely profit might be estimated on a sale price of 20 times the annual value.
 8. cf. procedure for leases, below, Chapter VI.

the date by which payment had to be completed, and any other conditions of sale,⁹ before the completed document was sent for examination by two crown lawyers¹⁰. If it passed this stage, the cash might be delivered to the Treasurer of Augmentations and the document sent off to be enrolled in the books of sale. Only when the commissioners were satisfied that payment was complete was the property entered in a patent, the legal token of transfer from the crown.

There is no surviving record of any restriction on the status or number of persons who might sue for a patent, and indeed we shall see that some individuals operating alone obtained patents of property they required only for themselves, but they were a small minority. Even though the Letters Patent were issued 'without fine or fee', the costs in suing for them under the great seal must have been substantial¹¹, and perhaps this was sufficient to encourage several purchasers to cooperate in obtaining a composite patent for their

-
9. Under the first commission, the full amount, or at least half, was to be paid in cash, and the rest might be paid within 4 months provided that bonds of £500 were placed for each £200 deferred. The terms of later commissions are discussed in the following chapter.
 10. Chosen from Attorney Gen., attorneys of Augmentations, Wards, First Fruits and D.L., Solicitor Gen., Solicitor of Augmentations and Clerk of Augmentations.
 11. The fee would otherwise have been £7.11.8., but in the Hanaper in each case this was countersigned 'Pardonatur per Carta et Warranta': E101/225/16. For costs in general see Knowles III, 394.

Table IX : The time-lapse between payment for the property and the issue of the patent.

(Based on a sample of 25 of the early patents containing property in our area)

<u>Patentees</u>	<u>Date of payment</u>	<u>Date of patent</u>
Robert and Wm.Swift	22 Jul 48	4 Aug 48
Beaumont and Gies	17 Jul 48	5 Aug 48
Thynne and Hyde	27 Jul 48	10 Aug 48
Bell and Duke	*31 Aug 48	17 Aug 48
Brende	28 Nov 48	13 Dec 48
Eccleston	20 Feb 49	23 Feb 49
Stapleton	27 Feb 49	13 Mar 49
Crofton and Langton	14 Jan 49	16 Mar 49
Stanhope and Bellow	14 Mar 49	2 Apr 49
Agard and Smith	17 Mar 49	10 Apr 49
Marsh and Williams	4 Apr 49	10 Apr 49
Gargrave and Adam	20 Mar 49	11 Apr 49
Reve and Cotton	31 Mar 49	10 May 49
Molyneux and Brook	18 Mar 49	15 May 49
Thynne and Throckmorton	*22 May 49	19 May 49
Howe and Broxholme	22 May 49	5 Jun 49
Warner, Leigh and Bate	26 Apr 49	17 Jun 49
Wolfflet and Wright	10 Jul 49	25 Jul 49
Doddington	22 Nov 49	16 Dec 49
Venables and Maynard	13 Dec 49	21 Dec 49
Peyrent and Reve	26 Nov 49	22 Dec 49
Breton and Nicholas	10 Dec 49	23 Dec 49
Thomas and Salter	23 Jan 50	10 Mar 50
Leveson	15 Mar 50	14 Jul 50
Winlove and Field	23 Jun 50	11 Jul 50

* Items thus marked are quite exceptional, payment having been made after the issue of the patent. It will be noted that there is no regular period between the one operation and the other, but that payment normally precedes the issue of the patent by several weeks, and occasionally by several months.

(The dates of the patents are taken from C.P.R., and those for payment from the Receipts of the Treasurer of Augmentations, E315/342 and 343, where other examples are to be found)

respective properties, passed in the names of only one or two. But the commissioners may well have prohibited or dissuaded smaller purchasers from applying for their own patents because of the sheer volume of work this would have entailed in the patent office, and they may even have directed such applicants to one who would secure their property in his own forthcoming patent. Whether or not this was the case the applicant (or 'ratee', since he was the person who had obtained the rating from the commissioners) certainly had to contact a prospective patentee.

Many of the ratees were figures well known to each other through service of the officers of state, and this is often an indication that they were acting on behalf of provincial clients. Men in such positions could easily come together to persuade one of their number, or another agent, to be the nominal patentee. But there were other ratees who had no such contacts in London, and who had to approach patentees on business terms unless they received a recommendation from some mutual acquaintance.

Another reason for patentees catering for many ratees was that it might take some time for a patent to be issued, and a ratee who had business outside the capital could not afford to be held up indefinitely waiting for the document.¹² By handing over the transaction

12. See Table IX.

to someone living or working in the capital or regularly there on business, the ratee gained considerably in time and money, even if the patentee charged a fee for his services.

On the other hand, the system had its draw-backs. The property did not descend to the ratee (or his provincial client) until the patentee had legally conveyed his interest. Furthermore, the issue of the patent depended on full payment of the sums required from each contributor, so that one who paid up promptly might still be kept waiting for his patent until his fellow ratees had all settled their accounts with the patentee. In the meantime he could officially draw no profits from his land. Yet, all things considered, the system as it evolved was both the fairest and most economical that could be devised. Whereas the purchasers of monastic land had tended to buy large estates, the chantries yielded mainly small and scattered properties, not desired in large quantities by any single buyer, but piece-meal by a horde of persons with localised interests. It was only by corporate effort that so many small transactions could pass through the available machinery without causing chaos.

Despite the truly amazing completeness of the documentation, several anomalies remain, and inevitably some questions have evaded answer. The Treasurer of Augmentations entered payments in his receipt rolls¹³

13. E315/342-9.

only in the name of the patentees, and only to the full amount of the patent. He did not record either the bonds for stalled payments, or the instalments by which the payments were made, but only the full and final total, on a date perhaps corresponding to that of the final acquittance of the patentees' responsibility.¹⁴

Yet some early evidence suggests that the money was not paid by the patentees in a lump sum, but by the individual ratees, for as the particulars were enrolled, marginal notes were at first made of the dates on which payment for each item was made to the Treasurer.

Unfortunately, the practice was soon discontinued,¹⁵ but the few surviving entries of this kind relating to our area show that payments were made by the ratees occasionally on the day of rating, but more often in a period of up to three months later. Actual payment might have been made by a servant or agent of the ratees, and in exceptional cases by the patentee himself if the failure of one client to contribute was delaying the issue of the patent for all the others. Risks of this nature, and the legal burden involved in receiving many tiny pieces of land in several counties further help to explain the tendency of two or more persons taking a patent, and not leaving the whole responsibility to one.

14. No bonds have survived.

15. From E36/259 onwards it is discontinued.

Among purchases of land in our area in Edward's reign I have found only two cases in which payment is not fully recorded. William Neville, ratee of some of the land of Southwell college, paid by instalments which are to be found recorded for several years after the date of his patent. This irregularity, and the subsequent conveyance of the property to John Beaumont, the then Master of the Rolls, may well suggest that influence had been used behind the scenes to authorise the patent with the payment still incomplete. Strict record was kept of the lapse, however, and the entry book of enrolments records:

that the purchaser hath not paide thole some of his purchase and therefore it is commaunded that after the signature of the bill of warrant the same shold remain in the Kinges hand till paid. 16.

The only other offender was Sir Edward Bray.¹⁷

Neville's case is again interesting as providing indication that the long session of sales was caused by an unrecorded extension of the commission, presumably late in 1548, for the record of his total purchase is divided into plots passed 'by thold sale' and by the new.

16. E 315/67 (part I), p. 82v. Further instalments by Neville are to be found in E315/346-7 (20 Nov. 1550, 8 July 1551), E405/500 and /405/508.

17. E 351/2080: Peckham's account.

The Patent Rolls show under whose names the property in all counties was patented, whilst the original and enrolled particulars for grant tell us for whom the property was rated.¹⁸ In the enrolments, a standard form of memorandum for each entry runs:

'Rated for Y, passed in the name of Z
(as parcel of the sum of £n).'

Some time ago Prof. Habakkuk showed the fault in Liljegren's assumption that the names of patentees for monastic lands were a fair guide to the recipients of the property.¹⁹ The local historians who have dutifully recorded the sale of chantry property in terms of the patents alone have sadly fallen into the same trap, for using the formula just expressed, it is very rarely that Y and Z are the same person.

We are faced with a problem that is at once more serious and more fascinating, however. How often is even Y interested in the property for himself, and how often is he acting only as an agent for X, a provincial client? Sometimes we may even locate X only to discover that he too is merely another link in the chain, handing down the property still further. As a result, the positive identification of the ultimate purchaser is not always attainable, but the search is productive in adding flesh to the skeleton of procedure displayed above.

18. Original particulars E318

19. Habakkuk, art. cit, 378-80

Habakkuk rightly reduced the emphasis that had formerly been placed on the speculative element in purchasing lands, in favour of a milder approach which regarded the intermediaries rather as agents, suing for specific properties, and not making blanket-purchases vaguely hoping to sell the land for profit at some future date. The commissioners for sale only issued writs for the survey of specific properties,²⁰ and although we occasionally find a single purchaser buying up all the lamplands or obit-lands of a large area, these seem to be the only possible speculative purchases. In our area there are no examples of the lands of an entire college or wapentake being bought up by a single person and later sold piece-meal. Patents were mainly composed of scattered properties in many counties, and the statement that they were 'purchased' by Z (the patentee) is only a half-truth. In the following sections we must identify Z in all patents including property in our area, but we must also identify the ratees (Y) who were much more deeply involved, and, where possible, their clients (X).

20. I am grateful to Mrs. Sybil Jack for reminding me of this at an early stage in my work.

2. Approaches to the centre

Let us start from the top. Diplomats, courtiers and persons in crown employ had a head's start in the race for chantry lands. They might make direct requests for properties, but in turn they could find themselves the channels through which lesser persons sought to gain access to the crown.

The process began from the first hint of the impending dissolutions in the reign of Henry VIII. Chamberlain, out of England on a diplomatic mission and not wishing to miss his chance to obtain chantry property wrote to Paget to register his claim, and placed all the London dealing in the hands of 'Mr. Pate of Lincoln's Inn'. Paget was also approached by Vaughan for a house in London, whilst others like Cox feared that unless Henry VIII stood firm against them the 'wolves' would devour all the heritage resulting from the dissolution, and the crown would make no profit.²¹

Under Edward VI, Somerset and the Council were the principal sources of patronage for the more influential buyers,²² and Somerset's role in particular is well documented, for a list of persons applying to him for preferment has survived. The original is among the Cecil Manuscripts at Hatfield,²³ but is incomplete, whilst a

21. Letters & Papers 21-i, 27, 189 and - ii, 282.

22. For the Council's intervention see e.g. A.P.C. 1550-2, 53.

23. MS Cecil vol. 144 pp 60-70 (B.M. Microfilm M 485/36).

calendar, also incomplete, rearranging the entries of the original by counties for easy reference, is to be found at the Bodleian Library.²⁴ The parts of these documents relating to our area are abstracted in Table X. Excluding the items listed for Lord Lennox, no entry is valued at less than £4. 13. 4. p.a.²⁵, and endowments of many entire chantries are included, plus some collegiate property, showing that the applicants had only the more appealing plots in view. Since no applicant appears to have more than one property recorded in his name, it seems that these were the first options. Some of the properties were not valued, perhaps because at the time of compilation of the list the Chantry Certificates were incomplete; and there is no indication of the terms on which they were expected to be disposed of.

The range of interest among the applicants is wide: the Earls of Warwick and Shrewsbury, the Marquis of Northampton; Lords Lennox and Neville and Lady Chaloner; regional dignitaries including Stanhope, Clifton and Eynns, army officers like Aldred and Bellingham; the

(*text cont. after table)

-
24. MS Rawlinson Essex 11 fols. 140 (Richmond), 143 (Notts), 155-6 (Yorks). The two agree favourably in detail allowing for obvious clerical errors and alterations e.g. Cuthbert Musgrave appears wrongly in the Bodleian MS, as Gilbert Musgrave (f. 155r) and the £137. 9. 2. of the lease of St. Sepulchre, York has been rounded up to £138 (ibid.)
25. Lord Lennox's grant is a special case. It comprised stipends he had paid yearly to maintain chantry priests.

" 7

Table X : The patronage of the Duke of Somerset

Sources : MS Cecil (Hatfield) , vol. 144 pp 60-70 (BM Microfilm M 485/36)

MS Rawlinson Essex 11 (Bodleian Library) fols. 140,143,155-6.

Lists of endowments and portions of endowments for which suit for preferment was made to Somerset. The names given are those of the persons recorded as having applied for the preferment, and the values of land (etc.) applied for are not always recorded. Where only one chantry was known in a parish in 1548, I have only recorded the name of the parish or chapel. Other abbreviations for the title of endowments are in accordance with standards laid down in the Appendix.

(a) Endowments which actually seem to have passed to Somerset's original client or to a close contact of the client :-

<u>endowment</u>	<u>Somerset's client</u>	<u>stated value</u>	<u>refer to tables of sales and leases (*)</u>
		<u>p.s.</u> £. s. d.	
Tilne	Earl of Shrewsbury	4.13. 4	P.1 (Swift)
Clifton college	Sir Gervais Clifton	-	P.68(Clifton)
Beverley provost.	Sir Michael Stanhope	-	L.1 (Stanhope)
Acaster college	William Thorpe	27. 0. 0	P.7 (Thorpe) (small part +)
Aberford	John Mawd	-	DL.2(Mawd)
Howden college	Cuthbert Musgrave	-	L.3, 12 (Musgrave)
Lowthorpe college	Thomas Eynns	-	L.13(Eynns)
Pontefract coll. (site & movables)	Sir Thomas Smith	-	G. (Smith)
Leeds, BVM	George Bane	-	DL.4(Bane)
Yokefleet	Robert Bellingham	-	L.15(Bell'ngm
Linton	Ralph Constable	-	&Constable)
Bishopthorpe	Laurence Witherall	7. 1. 9	L.17 (With'l)
Tanfield :Marmion	Marquis of Northampton	21. 0. 0	L.31 (North'tn)

Notes : (*) P. see appropriate number in Table of Patents (Appendix IVa).
L. ditto, Table of Leases (Appendix VIa).
DL. ditto, Table of Duchy Leases (Table XVIII in this vol.)
G. ditto, Table of Movable goods etc. (Table XXIIb)
(+) Thorpe bought nothing like the £27 here advertised, but did spend much more on lead and bells (Table XXIIa and b).

(b) Endowments which were disposed of after the dissolution, but to persons apparently unconnected with Somerset's clients.

<u>endowment</u>	<u>Somerset's client</u>	<u>stated value</u>	<u>disposal to others, see tables :-</u>
		<u>p.s.</u> £. s. d.	
Broadbusk	William Cowper	6. 0. 0	P.33(Neville)
Southwell, BVM	Thomas Whalley	6. 6. 8	P.56(Rigges)
Willoughby FC	Hugh Willoughby	(**)	P.67(Eaton)
Southwell, preb. Netherhall	Hugh Wilson	(++)	P.56(Cavendish)
Newark(Chantry unidentified)	'Waller, the porter'	10.10. 0	P.77(Philpot)
Wakefield:Sothill	Lady Chaloner	27. 0. 0	P.21(Gargrave)
Tanfield, BVM	John Philpot	-	L.68(Ainsworth)
Rise	'Mr Knolles'	-	L.55(Wilton)
York, St Sepulchre	William Perpoynt	137. 9. 2	L.39(Webster)

(Cont.)

*TABLE *

(Table X cont.)

Sutton college, (Lancaster chantry)	Thomas Astley	20. 0. 0	surrendered to Stanhope.
Wykeham	William Kildale	9. 2. 8	given to Pringle
Farnley(Leeds)	Earl of Warwick	6.13. 4	DL.14(Chippendale)
Todwick	Thomas Aldred	-	P.11(Whalley)
Brompton	William Proctor	-	DL.10(Astmore)
Pickering castle } Pickering Sprotborough, 'Ancres'	Lord Neville	14. 0. 0	DL.39(Taylor)
Allerton Mauleverer	Gregory Railton	8.17. 8	DL.29(Whalley)
	Humphrey Colley	-	P.53 (Bate)

Notes : (**) together with the items in section (c) this was valued at £15.

(++) together with the items in section (c) this was valued at £48. 1. 1½. (also known as preb. Palisall).

(c) Endowments which do not appear to have been sold or leased by the crown by Michaelmas 1553.

<u>endowment</u>	<u>Somerset's original client</u>	<u>total (p.a.) applied for</u>	
		<u>£. s. d.</u>	
Willoughby, a second chantry (**) Willerton (**)	Hugh Willoughby	(**)	
Southwell, preb. Overhall (++)	Hugh Wilson	(++)	
Preston	'Mr Knolles'	-	
Cornborough	Peter Stapleton	-	
Northallerton (endowment not identified)	Michael Green	11. 3. 0	
Cottingham (?gilds)	Thomas Miller	8. 0. 0	
Malton Castle	Stephen Tubby	7.13. 9	
Rotherham :J&BVM	Ralph Croft	6.13. 4	(stipend only)
York Minster, STEPH.	Lord Lennox	13. 6. 8	"
"	"	6.13. 4	"
Bedale stipendiary	"	9. 0. 0	"
Leeming	"	3. 6. 8	"
Wath (Richmondshire)	"	1.13. 4	"
Gilling	"	2. 0. 0	"
Lazenby(Northallerton)	"	9. 6. 8	"

Notes (**) and (++) see corresponding notes in section (b) above.

Table XI : The Rates

(a list of the persons for whom chantry and collegiate property in the area was rated in those patents passed during the reign of Edward VI)

The following abbreviations are used for status :-

P= peer; K= knight; E=esquire; G=gent; M=merchant ; Y=yeoman
L= of London; S=servant of; T=tenant of the rated property
X=unspecified. CN=Council of the North

Each entry is followed by the number of the patent in which it appears and should be compared with the Table of Patents (Appendix IVa) and the Table of Patentees (Table IV following)

Agard, Ralph ; G L (9)	Eresby, Leonard; G; Linc. Inn (68)
Ampleforth, ?; X (21)	Estofte, Christopher ; E? of (81)
Ashton, Richard; X T (24)	Ellerker (81)
Aslaby, Francis; E (57)	Fairfax, Sir Nicholas; K; JP; CN (17)
Aynsworth (Ainsworth), Simon; S/Sackville (47, 58)	(Fermour, Sir Wm; K (26))
Barnard, Richard; G L (40)	Fisher, Thomas; X (50)
Bate, Leonard; G; collector (30)	Foster, Robert; G of "adcaster (65)
Bellamy, Thomas; S/Stanhope, collector (21)	Frobisher, Francis; E of Doncaster, recorder; (21)
Bellow, John; E; surveyor (6, 17, 21, 42)	(Fulmerston, Richard ; X (26))
Beswell, Godfrey; G; of the founding family (38)	Gargrave, Sir Thomas; K, MP; JP; steward in Duchy; (21)
Boswell, Ralph; S/Sackville (60)	Gascoigne, Henry; S/Williams (48)
Bouham, Robert; S/Rigges (56)	Girlington, Nicholas; G; JP/Lincs., Inner Temple 1552; (16)
Brandon, Sir Chas.; X, MP; of Sheriff Hutton; (17)	Gonnell, Thomas; G L (12)
Bray, Sir Edward; K (55)	Goodall, John; G; S/Rigges (62)
Britten, William; G. L. (81)	Gresham, Sir Richard; K; JP (3)
Carr, Robert; G (41) of Sleaford, Lincs	Grimston, Edward; G?; later MP (30, 53, 74)
Castelyn, Edward; M L (80)	Halley, Jerome; G?; S/Bowes (79)
Cavendish, Sir Thos; K; JP/Herts (56)	Herford, John; X; of Bosberry, Herts (66)
Chapman, Richard; S/Carden (21)	Hewitt, William; M L (1)
Clifton, Sir Gervais; K JP/Notts, of founding family (68)	Holgate, Robert; archbishop (17, 21, 34)
Coddenham, Henry; S/Mildmay (75)	Holmes John; G L; feodary of Pontefract; (2, 76)
Colwiche, Humphrey, of York; S/Somerset (38, 64)	Hungate, Thomas; E of Stillington, S/Sackville; (47)
Constable, Sir Robert; K of Everingham, JP (6)	Kelway, Fras. S/Somerset (47)
Corbett, Richard; X (32)	Kelway, Giles; E of Stroud, Dorset, (43)
Cowper, Edward; clerk, former abbot of Rievaulx (4)	Langdale, Thomas; G of Sancton (82)
Cotton, George; G L (76)	Langham, Thomas; L, baker (34)
Crofton, Wm; M L (15)	Laston, Robert; S/Cranmer (29, 51)
Cranmer, Thos; archbishop; (44)	Lee, Robert; sewer of King's Chamber (60)
Cruz (Cronxe), Wm.; M L (11)	Leigh, Silvester; G of Lupsett (30)
Doddington, John; G L ; S/Mildmay; (61)	London, the grocers of (49)
Doddington, Wm.; G L : S/Mildmay; (72)	Mellys, Henry; G L (37)
Dodsworth, Richard; S/Stanhope; (21)	Metcalfe, Robert S/Somerset (30)
Dolman (Dowman), Thomas; G of Grey's Inn and Pocklington (81)	Mewtas, Sir Peter, K L JP T (14)
Drew, Richard; Y?; of Lound, waterman (28)	Milward, John; X of Coventry (52)
Eaton (Eton) William; G; collector (67)	Montagu, Sir Edward; K; Chief Justice (23)
Ellis, Thomas; G of Doncaster; sometime mayor/alderman; (69)	More, Chris.; X; of Thrintoft (72)

Cont.

porter of the Hull garrison, and a host of small court officials.²⁶ Some of these clients, having shown this early interest in obtaining preferment, proceeded to take patents or leases of the property in question. But they only had first option. The crown did not reserve the plots indefinitely, and Sir Gervais Clifton was fortunate in the lack of demand for Clifton college, for he was not ready to buy until 1552, nobody else having made a bid. There was no light-headed disposal of land or waiving of formalities even for those closest to the court, and several of those granted the first option on property in fact withdrew, doubtless because the purchase-price demanded was too realistic. If there were 'ravening wolves' waiting to devour chantry lands without payment they were effectively held at bay.

If Somerset's client did not make a bid, the property became available on the open market, though not all was disposed of. It is possible that some of his clients actually obtained their property even if the transaction ostensibly passed in someone else's name. But there are cases where this was definitely not so. George Webster, for example, certainly leased St. Sepulchre's, York, for himself and not for Perpoint, Somerset's original client. This list, therefore should not be taken as representing

26. Aldred and Bellingham were captains of the S. and N blocks at Hull; Redhead and Witherell yeomen-almoners; Miller a yeoman-woodward; Stapleton keeper of the Council door and Norton gage of the pantry.

the actual fate of the property, but only early intentions.

Approaches to the officers of state were thus one obvious means of securing preferment to a dissolved chantry or college, and there may have been similar memoranda kept by other key figures, yet even the highest patronage failed to remove the need to pay well for the property.

Far more interesting was the plight of the small client seeking a purchase. Writing to his brother John, Otwell Johnson observes:

to compasse to gett all your chauntries
stueff in your shier at the price it is
praysed for, passeth my capacitie to
attaine unto, not knowing to whom I may resorte
to spede thereof. 27

In the south, the problem was especially great since chantries tended to be better endowed than in the north, and their property became more desirable the closer one came to London itself, and hence the object of greater competition. The same writer suggested that since his brother had a particular interest in one chantry, he should submit a request for it to Mildmay himself:

but it must be done with plainer instructions
than you have nowe sent, & also diligent
attendaunce to be gyven uppon him.

The 'diligent attendaunce' was the crux of the matter. Not only did a potential client need to know exactly what he wanted, and have the cash available to pay for it: he also had to be present to press his claim in person, or else employ an agent. A stay in London was, at the best of times, expensive, and the disincentive to the smallest purchasers would have been too great if personal attendance had been essential. For the northerner the journey itself would be long and costly. What chance, then, did the northern buyer have of presenting his requests?

3. Regional contacts and mobility

Thoughts of the north as a region largely self-contained, where feudalism was still the principal bond of society and where the royal writ scarcely ran, must be almost totally discarded.

The Council of the North, the sheriff and his officers, and the local officials and servants of the Court of Augmentations were among the principal agents of royal communication within our area. War on the Border, with the passage of troops and military commanders, and the garrisons of the royal castles and forts, increased the royal presence and the reciprocal benefit of access to the centre for northerners.

Nor was the region isolated. Yorkshiremen were probably not more attached to their county than their counterparts in, for example, the West-country or East Anglia, and many pursuits might cause them to leave home. The lure of the Inns of Court and the Universities attracted almost all who aspired to a higher education. Professor Dickens has observed that among the literary writers of Tudor Yorkshire, three quarters had received some part of their education at one of these three centres.²⁸ Scholarships and exhibitions to Oxford and Cambridge colleges might be the reward of those who owed their early education to the church,²⁹ and since there were no comparable amenities in the north, those interested in higher education were compelled to pack their bags. Trade must also have taken many merchants from towns like York, Hull or Newark regularly to London, whilst others certainly headed south to seek preferment. Members of Parliament, more especially those elected for the boroughs, might be sources of both influence and information at the capital. To these may be added the bishops and nobility attending the House of Lords.

28. T.R.H.S. 1963, 76.

29. Reginald Lee, provost of Beverley, was studying at Trinity College, Cambridge when the E.R. Brief Certificate (E301/119) was compiled. Note also the link between Sedbergh and St. John's Cambridge (Chapter III).

Even within the region communications were not universally bedevilled with obstacles. J.P.s attending quarter-sessions, clergy attending convocation or being visited by their superiors, merchants and travellers attending the many fairs held regularly in most towns³⁰ all in their way developed the channels of communication, and the ever-increasing circles of friendship and influence for those just a little removed from the bottom ranks of society. We must not be too preconditioned by the lucid writings of Laslett³¹ and others to the belief that the county or parish society was the limit of everyone's social horizon.

It is against this background, I think, that we must study the dissolution of the chantries and the routes by which knowledge of procedure was disseminated in the provinces. The acquisition of even a minor office at court or in the local administration gave a man access through his superiors - if properly tempered - to many potential patrons. 'Horizontal' connections, (with those of equal standing,) might well result also, and naturally, the higher the position held, the greater the chances of access to such patronage.

30. See Agrarian History of England and Wales IV, 468-9.

31. P. Laslett, The world we have lost (1965).

We soon find ourselves in a tangled web of patronage and clientage which is only comprehensible if we realise how many men had contacts above their own station and beyond their own county. For example Richard Whalley,³² M.P., Augmentations Receiver for Yorkshire and steward of Somerset's household, who also held large estates in Nottinghamshire, having to produce four sureties when he bought the manor of Barlborough, came forward with George Lassells esq. of Gateford, Notts.; William Neville, esq. of Torksey, Lincs.; John Seymour esq., of Greisley, Derbys.; and Francis Poole esq., of Dale, Dorset³³: a very mixed group if studied by counties. In another obligation, the sureties of Richard Duke clerk of Augmentations, were Thomas Reve, George Cotton and Alexander Wrightington,³⁴ each of whom, like Duke, appears among the ratings for chantry lands. Clearly, someone approaching Duke and asking for an introduction to Reve (one of the largest patentees of land in the period) would have come to the right man. For every new contact made, a whole new range of potential friends appeared, each with his own friends in turn.

32. See D.N.B.

33. E315/327 f.34 cf. Liljegren pp. 72, 47: Poole and Lassells had also purchased monastic lands.

34. E315/327 f.47.

We must also be careful not to be misled by the titles 16th century Englishmen awarded themselves, for these often convey a false impression of immobility of either habitat or status. The prosperity of many who styled themselves 'yeoman' has been amply demonstrated,³⁵ and a further set of obligations, this time for a fine paid on a Duchy of Lancaster lease, illustrates the widespread interests of even some of this class: Henry Taylor of Isleham, Cambs., yeoman, chose as his sureties John Huskins, (a London brewer) and Henry Bailey of Aldenham, Herefs., another yeoman.³⁶ Simon Welbery and Christopher Morland, two County Durham yeomen, were among the patentees of chantry land, and whilst it is clear that they were entrusted with the task by buyers of higher status, yet it is significant that a transaction worth a total of over £1300 to the crown was allowed to proceed under the names of two mere yeomen.³⁷ Gentlemen and esquires might prove equally inscrutable, and the Pardon Rolls are among the most illuminating sources here. Appropriately enough, one of the most lengthy and interesting of the entries for Edward's reign concerns one who was a patentee of some of our chantry land:

35. See particularly M. Campbell, The English Yeoman.

36. DL 24/1 f.6v.

37. C.P.R. V Edward VI, 150. Among the ratees were Richard Hogeson, a Newcastle merchant and John Norton, a Richmondshire gent.

William Gyes, Guyes or Gies, late of Claxton, alias Longe Clanson, Leicestershire, son of Hugh Gyes late of Claxton deceased, alias late of London, gentleman, alias late of Strond Inne, Middlesex, or of the parish of St. Clement Danes or St Mary de Stroud, Savoye and Harrowe on the Hill, Middlesex, Gentleman. 38.

A man's title depended essentially on his business of the moment, but in the Pardon Rolls his past might catch up with him! Richard Duke had been scarcely less peripatetic:

of London esquire or gent, alias of Otterton, Devon, gent; clerk of Augmentations, alias of Colchester, gent. 39.

With these warnings we may begin to analyse the pattern of patronage within the diocese of York.

4. The agents and the Ratees

Taking first things first, we must isolate and identify those persons who made it known that they were prepared to negotiate for lands. These were the men whom our provincial buyer must approach, long before

38. C.P.R. II Edward VI, 146.

39. Ibid., 139.

there was any question of applying for a patent. The potential buyer of chantry land could do no better than contact one of the local officials of the court of Augmentations. The most influential were the surveyor and auditor, but their deputies, and the collectors of chantry revenue for the crown, might act as intermediaries. We know that John Bellow, the surveyor for the East Riding went about his area at the dissolution, proclaiming publicly that:

yf any woold bye any lande, the king was
disposed to sell landes and he (i.e.
Bellow) would help them to hit. 40.

Bellow was a petty tyrant in his job, if the depositions of a later enquiry are to be believed, but he was a man of considerable influence. He had already been among the most extensive patentees of monastic lands in the 1540's⁴¹ and as mayor of Grimsby in 1547 had successfully petitioned the crown to turn the revenues of a chantry in the town to educational purposes.⁴² His plans for the town included the perfection of a system of water conduits, partly aided, no doubt, by his purchases and theft

40. Beverley Record Office: DDCC/139/65 f.16.

41. See Liljegren, 70,82,89,94,100,107. Also C. Haigh op. cit., 127.

42. C.P.R. I Edward VI, 176-7.

of lead from monastic and chantry premises, and we shall meet him again charged with pulling down many chapels-of-ease without authority.⁴³ Bellow must have travelled regularly to and from London on business, and developed numerous contacts, so it is not surprising that at the dissolution he is found as the ratee for some properties and the joint patentee with Sir Michael Stanhope (a fellow-worker in the crown cause in Yorkshire), of much more. The items rated in Bellow's own name correspond in part to the plots he is known to have undertaken to acquire for others in the region. Some was for Thomas Mitchell, clerk⁴⁴; three prebends' houses at Howden college for Thomas Chapman, and a small piece of the property of Beverley college for Thomas Hinton of Hulbridge.⁴⁵ More important figures also availed themselves of his help, including Francis Aslaby (esquire), who bought some woods at Dalton and Richard Faircliffe, a well-known townsman of Beverley and officer of the provostry, who bought the

43. Below, Chapter VII section 5.

44. Beverley Record Office: DDCC/139/65 f.16.

45. Ibid. ff. 12. 38.

chantry of St. Nicholas there.⁴⁶ We are also informed that when Bellow was not himself going to be 'in town' to handle these deals, he could hand on his clients to other persons who were. In particular the patent to Christopher Estofte of Ellerker and Thomas Dolman of Pocklington was in part commissioned by Bellow on behalf of Richard Feule, a Beverley merchant, and Richard Brown, a bailiff of the provostry.⁴⁷ Exactly which plots they bought it is difficult to determine, since the ratings all appear in the name of either Estofte or Dolman.

It is always wise, then, to treat the ratings with caution. Where they are made in the names of persons of obvious influence and patronage we must not assume that they are themselves the ultimate buyers. In particular this seems to be true of Augmentations officials. Only when they are already tenants of the property rated is there a near-certain chance of their having made the purchase for themselves. Bellow was a tenant of one holding which had returned rent to the fabric fund of Beverley college, and Leonard Bate, a collector of chantry revenue in the West Riding, of another which supported the lamp in Bramham church.⁴⁸

46. Ibid. ff. 40, 60.

47. Ibid. ff. 99. See Table of Patents (Appendix IVa) No. 81. Other clients of Bellow were an innholder, Nicholas Lamer, and a draper, Richard Bell.

48. These tenements are included in Patents 17, 53.

Bellow's activity in touring his area, offering to buy for others, may have been the express policy of the Court of Augmentations, particularly if there was less initial demand for the property than had been anticipated by the crown. It can hardly be coincidental that each of the Ridings of Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire, all have at least one of the local Augmentations men represented among the ratees. Nor is it likely, from the scattered nature of the properties in their ratings, that they were buying for themselves.

In the East Riding Thomas Bellamy, a collector of chantry revenue, made one appearance, but Bellow was the prime mover. As surveyor he would himself be making out the particulars, and would have servants who could keep contact with the commissioners in London when he was not there personally. In the North Riding, Matthew White was the surveyor until his murder at the time of the Seamer rebellion, and a large grant, including much of the chantry property in the city of York, passed in a patent shared by White (a London gentleman) and Edward Bury (an Essex J.P.)⁴⁹ Perhaps surprisingly the West Riding surveyor, Henry Savile, remained aloof from the sales, and yet we shall repeatedly see his handiwork

49. Y.A.J. 1938, 151 (A.G. Dickens). Patent 31.

behind the scenes; here, Leonard Bate, a close friend who became his step-father⁵⁰ was directing operations. In Nottinghamshire the corresponding work was done by William Eaton, a collector and William Rigges, the auditor. Rigges and his servant John Goodall also obtained one patent in which Robert Bougham, yet another of Rigges's servants, and Sir Thomas Cavendish, his predecessor as auditor, were ratees.⁵¹

Quite apart from these local officers we find dignitaries of greater importance involved with the sales either personally or through their servants. Richard Whalley, the Receiver, appears twice as a ratee, and his servant Richard Walker once. Servants of Sackville, Mildmay and Sir John Williams are also listed. Nor was Augmentations the only channel, for we find servants of Shrewsbury,⁵² of Somerset,⁵³ and of Sir Robert Bowes⁵⁴ among others. Both Archbishops are there, as well as a host of courtiers, M.P.s, J.P.s, lawyers and country gentry. Anyone, in fact, who held office locally or nationally, was likely to be called upon as an agent for the acquisition of chantry property, if not by buyers themselves, then by their 'friends'.⁵⁵

(*text cont. after table)

50. Walker, Wakefield, 648.

51. Patents 56, 67.

52. Table XI: Swift, Savile.

53. Ibid R. Thornhill, Metcalfe, W. Neville, Colwich, Hungate, J. Wright.

54. Ibid Halley.

55. See table XI for all refs. in this paragraph.

Table XI continued

TABLE

Morgan, Julius; G	S/Sackville	(29)
Mountain, Thomas; S/	Wrightington	(69)
Neville, Sir Marmaduke; K		(1)
Neville, Wm; E; S/	Somerset	(33)
Newton, Richard; X		(4)
Norton, John; E of Norton	Conyers	(70)
Onely, Edward; X		(46)
Paulet, Sir Wm; Lord St John		(53)
Peck, John; G; JP; of Gray's Inn		(27)
Philpot, William; M of Newark		(77)
Pomeroy, Sir Thos; K		(12)
Ridingfields, Robert; G of		
Lincoln's Inn		(38)
Rigges, William; G; auditor		(8, 19, 56, 62)
Rokeby, Ralph; G; JP; of Lincoln's		
Inn		(69)
Sadler, Sir Ralph; K		(54)
Salvyn, William; G of Acaster-		
Selby		(78)
Saville, Robert; S/Shrewsbury		(21)
Shrewsbury, earl of		(20)
Sidney, Thomas; G	L	(40)
Skinner, John; yeoman of the		
body-guard		(45)
Stanhope, Sir Michael; K, PC, governor		
of Hull; chief gent of Privy-		
Chamber	(5, 6, 17, 34)	()
Stapleton, Richard; E		(63)
Swift, Robert; G	S/Shrewsbury	(1)
Tankard, Wm; G	JP of Lincoln's Inn	
		(65)
Thornhill, Hugh; X		(64)
Thornhill, Robert; G of Walkeringham.		
S/Somerset		(17)
Thorpe, Wm; G	L; groom of the Privy-	
Chamber		(7)
Tiplady, Christopher; X	T of Bolton	
(Yorks)		(11)
Thynne, Sir John; K. steward of		
Somerset's household		(29)
Walker, Richard; S/Whalley		(19)
Welles, George; M of Newark		(25)
Whalley, Richard; E; MP; JP; Receiver		
		(11, 29)
Woodruff, Wm.; G of Lincoln's Inn,		
		(18)
Worrall, Thomas; X		(36)
Wright, John; G	S/Bowes	
	(68, 69, 75, 80)	
York City		(35)

* Addenda :

Johnson, Anthony; S/Thynne (13)
Tresham, George; G.L. (59)
Wrightington, Alexander; S/Duke (71)

One or two of the merchant community felt sufficiently sure of themselves to venture for a rating. William Philpot obtained both a rating and a patent in his own name, and his Newark neighbour George Welles, a draper, obtained a rating. Perhaps surprisingly the number of London Merchants appearing in the ratings is negligible, whereas among patentees they and their townsmen are legion. London gentry appear as ratees, but Yorkshire gentlemen preferred to commission an agent. At least three small ratings went to the sitting tenants, whilst corporate purchases by the city of York and the London gilds accounted for two more. Only one cleric appears, Edward Cowper (the former abbot of Rievaulx).

Such is a brief analysis of the prime movers behind the patents for our area - the men who obtained the ratings and acted as channels of influence through which many others in the province were catered for. They are much easier to identify than their clients, whose part we must shortly consider, but first we turn to the patentees themselves to see who these men were, and what was their relationship to the ratees we have encountered.

5. Patentees and Ratees.

Looking for a patent, the ratee could adopt one of two policies. He might either proceed under his own initiative and obtain the document, or he might take his rating to another interested buyer, and persuade him to obtain the patent and to settle the bargain later. If he decided on the second alternative there were a variety of persons he might approach, through personal friendships, or as I have suggested, through recommendation by the commissioners and others. It is impossible, therefore to make all the purchases fit into one neat pattern, and we have to admit frankly that in many cases there is no obvious and immediate connection between patentee and ratee. On the other hand, it is possible to isolate some clear groups of interest: those who took out patents for themselves and nobody else; those key figures in central and local government who took out patents on behalf of a large number of their fellows and subordinates; and the London merchants and professional men who frequently bought little or no land for themselves, but were acting entirely as intermediaries. Under these circumstances, it is not necessary to prove that all the ratees submitting themselves to a given patentee were known to each other, or indeed that they were known to the patentee himself, except by way of this specific business arrangement.

Very few patentees purchased property rated solely for themselves, and when they did so there is a strong chance that they were not acting as agents, but were interested in adding to their estates. For instance, the Earl of Shrewsbury bought the site of Rotherham college, which he certainly kept for himself,⁵⁶ though a portion of the college's land in Derbyshire passed,⁵⁷ to his servant, Robert Swift. Francis Aslabby, esquire, bought the manor of South Dalton, a part of the provostry of Beverley college, of which he was already the chief tenant,⁵⁸ whilst Richard Stapleton bought the chantry at Carlton near Snaith which he had declared concealed from the crown.⁵⁹ The corporation of the city of York, acting through Sir Michael Stanhope, bought only the land of the gild of SS. Christopher and George.⁶⁰ In none of these patents was there property rated for persons other than the patentee.

Of the higher gentry of our area who obtained patents, Sir Michael Stanhope and Sir Thomas Gargrave deserve special mention. It was natural that they be bombarded with requests from the region, and because of their national positions, (as chief gentleman of the Privy Chamber and father-in-law of Somerset in the case of Stanhope, and as an M.P. and steward

56. See Y.A.S.R. cxxv, 126.

57. Below, pp. 132 (a) and (b).

58. Table of Patents, No. 57. (Appendix IVa)

59. Ibid. 63.

60. Ibid. 35 York Civic Records V, 17, 18.

Table XII : The clients of Sir Michael Stanhope and John Bellow,
as derived from the Particulars for Grant relating
to patents obtained by these two patrons.

<u>Date of Rating</u>	<u>Location of Property</u>	<u>Rated for</u>
E 318/ 1971 :-		
11 June 48	London	Stanhope
11 May 48	Salop.	Roger Smythe of Bridgnorth, Salop.
30 May 48	Lincs.	Stanhope
4 June 48	London	Edward Rogers, gent. of Privy Chamber.
17 May 48	Berks.	Richard Greenway, esq.
11 June 48	Burton on the water	Sir Anthony Kingston
7 June 48	Middlesex	Thomas Street, groom of the Privy Chamber.
12 June 48	Westminster	Stanhope
19 June 48	Notts.	Stanhope
30 May 48	London	Stanhope
E 318 / 1972 :-		
4 July 48	East Riding	Stanhope
19 July 48	East Riding	Bellow
30 July 48	East Riding	Sir Robert Constable
25 July 48	Staffs	John Thurland of Lenton, Notts.
7 July 48	Glos.	Richard Pate of Gloucester
29 July 48	Suffolk	Lord Willoughby
E 318/ 1973 :-		
16 Dec. 48	East Riding	Stanhope
21 Dec. 48	York	Stanhope
8 Dec. 48	Suffolk	Lord Willoughby
23 Dec. 48	East Riding	Sir Nicholas Fairfax
21 Dec. 48	North Riding	Sir Charles Brandon
22 Nov. 48	Salop.	Francis Kenaston of Shropshire
2 Dec. 48	Notts.	Robert Thornhill, servt. of Somerset
22 Nov. 48	London	John Briggs of London.

of the honour of Pontefract in Gargrave's) it is not surprising that they attracted clients from further afield. Whilst each had some property rated for himself it is the clients' commissions in both cases that take up the greater part of the enrolments. Stanhope worked with John Bellow whose activities we have already noted,⁶¹ whilst Gargrave took as his partner one William Adam, probably one of his servants.⁶² Table XII shows the list of clients who obtained the ratings in Stanhope's patents. Gargrave's clients within the diocese were the Archbishop, Francis Frobisher (recorder of Doncaster), John Bellow, Thomas Bellamy, Richard Chapman, Robert Savile and Richard Dodsworth: all officers or servants.⁶³ Then, outside the area his clients were:-

Anthony Uvedale, servant of Somerset
Sir Robert Brandling of Newcastle
Thomas Rithe, servant of Sir John Williams,
Robert Tyrwitt of Ketilby, Lincs.
Richard Laurence of London, ironmonger
Simon Aynsworth of London, gent.
Robert Swift, servant of the Earl of Shrewsbury
John Tottenhurst, servant of Sir Richard Sackville.

Comparing the clients of Gargrave and Stanhope we can readily see the cadres of patronage emerging: councillors, justices, officers, servants and gentry, with London and the court well represented.

61. Patents 5,6, 17.

62. Ibid. 21.

63. See Table XI above.

Of more widespread importance among the patentees we again find the Augmentations officers. In addition to his work with Stanhope, Bellow took one patent jointly with his deputy auditor, William Fuller. Leonard Bate appears twice, and Matthew White and William Rigges are also in evidence.⁶⁴

Since the function of the patentee was primarily that of waiting in London until the formal patent had been issued, collecting it, and arranging the conveyance of each separately rated plot to its rightful owner, it is not surprising that the number of Londoners appearing in the patents far exceeds the number of those who lived and worked normally in our area. Courtiers and councillors like Gargrave and Stanhope, and officials like those of the Court of Augmentations would be expected to spend some time in London on business. But there were a few other patentees whose primary interests lay within the diocese yet who did venture to the capital to secure their patents.

Northern merchants were not present in great numbers. William Philpot of Newark, whom we encounter as a ratee, proceeded to take his own patent, and it is probably indicative of the breadth of his contacts that his clients for lands outside the diocese included William Rigges, William Fairfax of Gray's Inn; Anthony Tallboys, Jerome Halley and John Wright (three servants of Bowes), and

64. Patents 48, 30 & 53; 31 & 37; 56.

Christopher Smith 'of the Exchequer'.⁶⁵ Walter Jobson, a renowned Hull merchant, is the only other of his calling to appear in the patents for our property, in quest of the tithes of Blacktoft and Ellerker for himself, and a small plot for John Skinner, yeoman of the bodyguard.⁶⁶

Among the region's gentry, Estofte and Dolman have already been mentioned. Theirs was one of the largest composite purchases,⁶⁷ and much of it was at the behest of Bellow on behalf of numerous separate clients. Sir John Witherington and Cuthbert Musgrave, though both originating from Northumberland, might be considered in this section for their grant⁶⁸ contained another substantial part of the East Riding property. Robert and William Swift, servants of the Earl of Shrewsbury, were county gentlemen in their own right, yet they seem to have been acting at least partly on behalf of others.⁶⁹ Philip Lovell of Skelton joined Robert Foster of Tadcaster in one patent which included a rating for Foster of lands near his home, and one plot rated in the name of William Tankard, a sergeant-at-law well known in Yorkshire.⁷⁰ Thomas Buckton of Acton and Roger Marshall of Aislaby patented one small plot on behalf of William Salvyn of Acaster Selby, another local gentleman⁷¹. But these few represent the sum total of patentees resident in our region, save for Walter Wolflet,

65. Ibid. 77.

67. Ibid. 81.

69. Ibid. 1; 80.

71. Ibid. 78.

66. Ibid. 45.

68. Ibid. 73.

70. Ibid. 65.

a yeoman from Howden and Robert Wright of Grimsby. Since a great part of their patent was rated for Stanhope⁷² it seems most probable that Wolflet was his servant, and Wright a servant of Bellow. The likelihood is increased when we find another rating in this patent for Archbishop Holgate who had already used Stanhope's assistance in gaining land. The rating of two plots at Settrington for Thomas Langham, a London baker, who happened to be the tenant of some London property also included in the patent, may have been a clerical error.

The activities of the commissioners-for-chantries themselves deserve note. Jordan has observed⁷³ that about one in five of the nominal commissioners made a 'purchase'⁷⁴ and that, of a total of 59 transactions in which these commissioners 'were involved', 41 were in the county to which they belonged or in which they worked. Whilst greater clarity of terminology could have been desired, the point of Jordan's observations is that the chantry commissioners were in a very favourable position for knowing which were the choicest properties, though I suspect that further investigation at a local level would show that, as in the diocese of York, many of these men were approached, or offered their services, as agents, and did not desire very much of the property for themselves. It should also be noted, however, that they were

72. Ibid. 34.

73. E.Y.K., 107.

74. Meaning, obtained a patent.

***TABLE**

Table XIII : Chantry Commissioners in various counties known to have had any part in the transactions over chantry property in the diocese and county of York.

Commissioner	Sat on comm. for	Rôle in transactions concerning our area
Abp. Holgate	Yorks, 46 & 48	Y
Sir N.Fairfax	Yorks 48	Y
Sir T.Gargrave	Yorks 46 & 48	Z, Y, X
Richard Whalley	Yorks 46 & 48	Y S
John Bellow	Yorks 48	Z, Y,(X)
Henry Savile	Yorks 48	(X)
Matthew White	Yorks 48	Z,(Y)
Sir M.Stanhope	Yorks 46	Z, Y, X, S
Sir G.Clifton	Notts 48	Y, X
John Beaumont	Notts 48	X
" "	Leics 46 & 48	
Sir J.Thynne	Wilts 48	Z
Lawrence Hyde	Wilts 48	Z
Thomas Golding	Essex 48	Z
Sir Thomas Carden	Surrey 46 & 48	S
Richard Sackville	" " "	S
Thos. Throckmorton	Gloucs 48	Z
Rich. Fulmerston	Norfk. 48	Z, Y, X
William Cecil	Lincs. 48	Z
Leonard Eresby	Lincs. 48	Y
John Skinner	Lincs. 48	Y
Ralph Rokeby	North'd. 48	Y,(X)
Sir J.Williams	North'ts. 46 & 48	S
Sir R.Gresham	London 46 & 48	Y,(X)
Sir Robert Bowes	North'd 46	
" " "	Westm'd 46	S
William Rigges	Leics 46	Z, Y, S

Z=Patentee; Y=Ratee; X = presumed recipient; S= represented by servt.
Letters in Brackets indicate some uncertainty about participation.

predominantly men well established in their county, or in the central government, so that their appearance as patentees might equally well be related to this fact as to their position as chantry commissioners. Table XIII demonstrates their concern for the property in our region. One or two significant new points emerge. Holgate and Fairfax who both appeared as ratees within a patent issued to Stanhope and Bellow had served with one or other of them in the commissions. Thynne and Hyde who took one patent had served with each other on the Wiltshire commission for 1548, whilst Throckmorton whose name is linked with that of Thynne in another patent,⁷⁵ had served in Gloucestershire in the same year. Fulmerston, who took the Norfolk manors of Pontefract college, and Beaumont, who eventually took much of Southwell college, Clifton who took Clifton college, Gargrave the Sothill chantry at Wakefield, and Stanhope large parts of Beverley college, had all had a hand in surveying them for the crown in the course of the commissions, and without any doubt these were the choicest fruits of the dissolution.⁷⁶ But we have seen how many of these men were acting for others besides, and it is evident when we note the many commissioners from other counties who appear in some guise among the Yorkshire patents that it was public office, as much as a place on the commission, which facilitated the deal.

75. Table of Patents, 27.

76. Ibid respectively Nos. 26, 33, 68, 21 and 6/17.

***TABLE**

Table XIV : The clients of Sir Thomas Bell and Richard Duke

<u>Date of Rating</u>	<u>Location of Property</u>	<u>Rated for</u>
8 June 48	Yorkshire	Edward Cowper (former abbot of Rievaulx)
8 June 48	Somerset	William Clerk (clerk of the Privy Seal)
n.d.	Somerset	Laurence Hyde (servant of Sir John Thynne)
12 May 48	Dorset	William Thornhill of Thornhill, Dorset
1&27 June 48	Devon	John Prideaux of the Inner Temple
16 June 48	Devon	Giles Kelway of Stroud, Dorset
6 June 48	London	Richard Hutchinson of London, gent.
2 July 48	London	John Edwards of London
5 July 48	London	Robert Newton of London, upholsterer
30 June 48	London	Henry Coddendam of London
14 June 48	Dorset	William Mathewe

To whom did the would-be purchaser in the diocese turn if none of the native agents was working at the time when he wanted to make his purchase, or indeed, if he did not know such people? Just as patentees with strong interests in our area acted as agents for clients from other areas, so we find the reciprocal process operating. Sir Thomas Bell and Richard Duke had strong West-country roots, though Duke also had national importance as the clerk of Augmentations. Here was a pair of potential patentees whose clientele we might almost predict (see Table XIV). The stray Yorkshire rating for Edward Cowper, the former abbot of Rievaulx, was for the chantry at Kirkby Misperton, and for a small plot of lampland which was subsequently conveyed to its tenant.⁷⁷ Thomas Watson and William Adys were two further West-country patentees who found room for a small Yorkshire rating, and James and John Bysse of Somerset patented part of a chantry at Spofforth on behalf of Jerome Halley, a servant of Bowes.⁷⁸ Richard Monynges and Thomas Watton were two Kentish gentry whose purchase was on behalf of their fellow Kentishmen, including the Archbishop of Canterbury who obtained a rating of the chantry at Radcliffe in Nottinghamshire.⁷⁹

77. Below, p. 142.

78. Table of Patents, 79.

79. Ibid. 44.

Finally, we turn to that vast number of patents which do not fall into any of the neat categories outlined above. Mainly, they are the results of business dealings between provincial clients (or their agents) on the one hand, and the merchant and professional community on the other. Whilst some of the patentees, like Thomas Reve or Wright and Holmes, appear in more than one patent, it was more usual for them to come forward only once: which suggests first that there was no pool of operators regularly petitioning for patents and making it a part of their daily business, and secondly that the purchases represent the aspirations of a large number of buyers and not of a few. Every established London merchant, lawyer, conveyancer and professional of many another walk of life had contacts not only among others of his kind, but quite often among the tangled branches of the tree of court patronage, as well as many casual acquaintances and provincial contacts. A detailed study of all the remaining patents for the area would occupy far too much space and reveal little that cannot be derived from Table XV.

There are still one or two persons of note in the list. Sir John Thynne was the steward of Somerset's household, Sir John Peyrent auditor of the Court of Wards and Thomas March a servant of the Lord Chancellor. Thynne's first patent, shared with his fellow chantry-commissioner Lawrence Hyde, included on plot rated for Sir Richard Gresham whose daughter Thynne had married. His second appearance

***TABLE**

Table XV : The Patentees

(a list of all the patentees of property in the area in the reign of Edward VI : details of the property bought will be found in the Table of Patents - Appendix IVa.)

(i) Patentees with interests in the area (followed by patent nos. as in Appendix IVa)

Adam,Wm. (21)	Molyneux,Sir Edw., J,P. CN (25)
Aslaby,Francis esq. of S.Dalton (57)	Philpot,Wm. of Newark, merch. (77)
Bate,Leonard gt. of Lupsett, collector of chantry revenue (30,53)	Rigges,Wm. gt;auditor (56)
Bellow,John esq. of Grimsby;surveyor (E.R.), M.P.; J.P. (5,6,17,48)	Shrewsbury,earl of;Lord Lieut. CN (20)
Buckton,Wm. gt. of Acton,Yorks (78)	Stanhope,Sir Michael, chief gent. of the Privy Chamber; PC;JP;MP;governor of Hull, (5,6,17)
Cowper,Edward clerk;former abbot of Rievaulx (75)	Stapleton,Ric. esq. of Carleton (63)
Dolman,Thos. gt. of Pickering & Pocklington (81)	Swift,Rob. gt.of Sheffield, JP,serv.Shrewsbury (1,80)
Estofte,Chris. esq. of Ellerker (81)	Swift,Wm. son of Robert "
Foster,Robert, gt. of Tadcaster(65)	Thornhill,Hugh (64)
Fuller,Wm.,gt. deputy auditor,E.R. (48)	White,Matthew,esq. surveyor; chan.commissioner (31,37)
Gargrave,Sir Thos. of N.Elmsall; M.P. (21)	Wolflet,Walter,yeo. of Howden (34)
Goodall,John gt., servant of Rigges (56)	Wright,Rob.yeo.of Grimsby(34)
Hungate,Thos. esq. of Stillington (39)	
Jobson,Walter merchant of Hull (45); M.P.	
Leigh,Silvester gt. of Pontefract (30,53)	
Lovell,Philip gt. of Skelton (65)	
Marshall,Roger gt. of Aislaby (78)	
also:York Corporation (35)	

(ii)Patentees with a marked regional interest in other regions

<u>Sir Thomas Bell and Richard Duke : West of England (4)</u>	
Bell: MP (1552); of Gloucester	
Duke: esq. clerk of Augmentations	
<u>James and John Bysse: gents. of Somerset (79)</u>	
<u>Richard Monynges and Thomas Watton : esquires of Kent (44)</u>	
<u>Thomas Watson and William Addys : gents.of Gloucester and Worcester (16)</u>	
<u>William Eccleston and Anthony Layton : gents. of Lancashire (12)</u>	
<u>Simon Welbery and Christopher Morland:yeomen of County Durham (70)</u>	

(iii)Patentees with no marked provincial interests identifiable. and provincial patentees who worked with London colleagues

<u>OF LONDON, MERCHANT (etc.)</u>	
Brende,Thos. scrivener (11)	Turk,Richard;fishmonger (49)
Brokesby,Bart. " (28)	Nicholas,Ambros;salter (41)
Hulson,John " (28)	Pendered,Wm; founder (7)
Crofton,Wm. draper (15)	Salter,Andrew;taylor (46)
Fairweather,Valentine; haberdasher (75)	Thomas,Robert; " (46)
Herdson,Henry, skinner (47)	Leveson,Walter;unspecif.(51)
Hyde,Laurence, clothworker (3)	Langton,Thomas; " (15)
Hynde,Augustine " (10,49)	Blackwell,Nicholas " (49)
Johnson,John;fishmonger(47)	

Continued on facing page.

TABLE

(Table XV continued)

OF LONDON, GENTLEMAN

Agard, Ralph (18)	Leveson, Edward (51)
Ainsworth, Simon (39)	Marsh, Thomas , servant of the Lord Chancellor (19)
Breton, William (41)	Pease, Edward (42)
Cotton, George (60, 67, 76)	Reve, Thomas (58, 60, 67, 76)
Doddington, John (36, 61)	Smith, Thomas (18)
Doddington, William (")	Taverner, Silvester (10)
Field, Richard (52)	Trappes, Anthony (68)
Golding, George (72)	Wennington, Laurence (54)
Holmes, Thomas (70, 82)	Winlove, William (42, 52)
Howe, John (29)	Wood, Robert (32)
	Wright, John (69, 82)

COUNTY GENTRY OPERATING WITH THE HELP OF LONDON COLLEAGUES

Browne, Leonard gt. (Lincs.) with Trappes ; (68)
 Bury, Edward gt. (Essex) with Matthew White (listed under Item i) (37)
 Cely, Walter gt. (Essex) with Thomas Golding (9)
 Gies, William gt. (Middlesex) with John Beaumont (listed below) (2)
 Williams, Roger (Monmouthshire) with Marsh (19)

GENTLEMEN OF UNSPECIFIED COUNTIES

Chaworth, Thomas (74)
 Danby, John (55)
 Farnham, Thomas and Morrison, Thomas (66)
 Fountain, William and Maine, Richard (43)
 Williams, Anthony and Conyers, John (71)
 Thornton, John (55)
 Hynde, John (10)
 Wise, Fras. (59)

CLASSES OTHER THAN GENTLEMAN

Bray, Sir Edward (London) (55)
 Butler, Sir John (") (74)
 Montagu, Sir Edw. (") (23)
 Thynne, Sir John (Somerset) (3, 27)
 Peyrent, Sir John (London : auditor of the Court of Wards) (40)
 Sadler, Sir Ralph (54)
 Warner, Sir Edward, MP (30); lieutenant of the Tower

Beaumont, John esq. (Leics) (2)
 Brown, John (Essex) esq. (8)
 Brook, Robert esq. (unspecif. 25)
 Broxholme, John esq. (Lincs.) (29)
 Cecil, Wm esq. MP (London) (62)
 Maynard, John, esq. (") (38)
 Throckmorton, Thos. esq. (27)
 Twysden, William esq. (Kent) (8)
 Venables, Richard esq. (38)

Tebold, John, yeo. (59)

was partly to acquire for John Peck of Doncaster two chantries at Sprotborough. Peck, like Gresham, was a Yorkshire J.P. Peyrent was only one of Reve's many successive partners, and the only lands in our area they acquired were to be held for a term of years only. Marsh, working with Roger Williams of Uske, Monmouthshire, was one of the patentees approached by William Rigges and Richard Walker, a servant of Whalley. Here then, we find another cadre of patronage among public officers.

Many of the patentees had experience of the business before when buying monastic lands,⁸⁰ and this only serves to underline the nature of their interests. Most were purely agents. Very few had any direct interest in the property.

It is fair to observe that a sample of patents of any other area must yield broadly similar results in terms of contacts and patronage, since we have seen that buyers did not have to go to a patentee from their own county, and the 'neutral' patentees we have encountered took lands in many counties at once, so that the same figures will appear repeatedly wherever we choose our sample. Whilst this study is based on one region, therefore, it should throw considerable light on others.

80. e.g. Liljegren op. cit., 49 (Bury), 51 (Sadler), 54 (Cotton), 58 (Cely), 81 (Browne), 82 (Howe), 95 (Breton), 104 (Herdson); also Stanhope, Bell, Duke, Foster, Fulmerston, Monynges, Shrewsbury, Bellow, Swift & Rigges.

6. The actual purchasers

We now turn to a more difficult problem. In the terms of the formula set out above, we must find X, the regional purchaser who commissioned Y (the ratee) who contacted Z (the patentee). There were, of course, some instances in which all three were one and the same person. But there were many others in which X and Y were different.

Documentation, which was so thorough in the earlier stages, begins to fail us at this point. Once the cash had been paid up and the patent issued, it was of little direct concern to the crown how many further transactions occurred before the property eventually reached its buyer. Whereas licences-to-alienate were required for land held in chief of the crown, most chantry property was so trivial that it was allowed to pass in free socage, under which such licences were not required.⁸¹ Nor was there any systematic central enrolment of conveyances, though the courts of record would enrol such documents as were brought before them for the purpose. Auditors of the Court of Augmentations had to keep some record of patents granted and sometimes they included known conveyances, so that once the land had passed out of crown control they knew exactly whom to charge for arrears and whom to exonerate from future collection of rent. But

⁸¹. For discussion of types of tenure see next chapter.

their record is incomplete and gives nothing like a full picture of the transfer of land in our area.⁸² Of the central courts of record, Chancery was most popular for registering deeds, and the dorse of the Close Rolls contains record of many transactions involving chantry lands, though unfortunately few relate to our area: in fact only a dozen for the whole of Edward's reign,⁸³ of which three were made by the most notorious pair of patentees, Reve and Cotton, and a further four by Wright and Holmes who seem to have been particularly conscientious in this respect. The Common Pleas registry of deeds yields only one relevant entry, and Kings Bench, as far as I can discover, none.⁸⁴ Since the principle of the conveyance involved the retention by both parties of an indenture containing the details of the settlement, there is always the chance that one part or another of the document will have survived in family papers, or made its way into the various collections of deeds and charters deposited in national and local institutions, but it is my experience that this source is not readily tapped. The county archive offices have many such charters and collections, but the calendaring, (as opposed to the

82. Series begins (P.R.O.): LR1/170

83. See Appendix IVb: Table of Conveyances.

84. C.P. see Table of Conveyances, no. 1. For King's Bench. P.R.O. Index 1337. It is likely that the Council of the North also kept such records.

indexing,) of the documents is almost non-existent, and the chances of finding material are therefore remote. Moreover, if the property changed hands again at a later date, all the early conveyances were passed to the new owner, so that the family records among which such documents are to be found may not be those of the families to whom the land immediately passed. This section, then, cannot be complete or exhaustive, but sufficient material has been unearthed to warrant its presentation.

Sometimes a surviving conveyance tells us very little we do not already know. If one patentee merely assigns his interest to his co-patentee or to a ratee we still have no idea who is behind the purchase in the provinces. Yet in most cases this was a necessary stage.⁸⁵ Where the ratee was himself tenant of the property and received such a conveyance there is good reason to suppose him the purchaser. Where the ratee is not the tenant, and is an Augmentations official, we can be fairly sure he is not the real recipient.

But surprises are in store. On 11 April, 1549 the Earl of Shrewsbury received a patent which included some of the lands of Rotherham college situated at Stavely in Derbyshire. On 4 July he conveyed this portion

85. Table of Conveyances No. 1., and other entries marked 'R'.

to his servant Robert Swift, himself a Derbyshire landowner.⁸⁶ With this evidence alone we would think Swift the obvious purchaser. Yet eighteen months later he exchanged the property with some offered by Sir Peter Fretwell of Stavely,⁸⁷

The records of the Ingilby family at Ripley provide us with the two most interesting sets of conveyances which further illustrate the difficulty in handling this material. On 29 March 1553 Wright and Holmes conveyed to Ralph Rokeby and William Jeffray all the lands at Rotherham and Ripley which had been rated for Rokeby in their patent, and one plot at Cricklestone rated (perhaps wrongly) in the name of Thomas Mountain. This conveyance⁸⁸ tells us something that the rating does not, namely Jeffray's involvement. The fate of the Rotherham property is unknown, but Rokeby proceeded to assign all his interest in the Ripley plot to Jeffray on the day of the first conveyance.⁸⁹ Over two years later Jeffray disposed of his interest to Sir William Ingleby of Ripley in whose muniments the record has survived, so we can be sure that he was at the end of the chain.⁹⁰ But does the lapse of two years indicate that Jeffray

86. B.M. Additional Charters 40175.

87. Ibid. 40176. See also 40179 where Fretwell obtains the manor of Stavely.

88. Close Roll C54/491 m. 12d. Table of Conveyances, 22.

89. Leeds City Library: Ingilby Records Calendar: 1006

90. Ibid. 1007.

was the prime mover and Ingleby only bought him out later? Edward's death and the advent of a Catholic queen might have dictated caution in such dealings until the religious climate was ascertained, in which case it is still possible to regard Ingleby as the purchaser.

Two other renowned patentees and conveyancers, Howe and Broxholme, received a patent on 5 June 1549 including lampland at Ripley. Worth 16/- per year and rated at 22 years' purchase on behalf of Richard Whalley, it must have cost £17. 12. 0. Several times in the ensuing years, however, Whalley was in prison, unable to handle his own affairs⁹¹ and the first extant conveyance is to one William Phelips who may well have been his agent. He was charged £20 for the same plot, and appears to have retained the property for four years before handing it on to Walter Whalley who had been handling his brother's affairs. After a further three years Walter sold $4\frac{1}{2}$ of the original 6 acres to Ingleby.⁹² Again, who was the real buyer? Whalley, Phelips or Ingleby?

There were many reasons why some land transactions took years to complete. In Whalley's case imprisonment played a part. For others absence on business or military service might force a landowner to entrust his affairs

91. I have written more about this in a forthcoming issue of the Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research.

92. Ingilby Records: 1009 - 1011.

to an agent. But another simple possibility in many cases is that the money at one stage or another of the deal, was not immediately handed over. We noted that the payments to the Treasurer of Augmentations were made solely in the names of the patentees, and that there were rarely any signs of default. According to the Patent Roll, the chantry at Middleton Tyas passed in a patent to Winlove and Field on 11th July, 1550. The patentees are recorded as paid up, but unfortunately the particulars for this transaction are wanting, so that we do not know for whom it was rated. However, two years later, two other London agents, George Cotton, and Ralph Hall, the latter a scrivener by profession, are found anxiously trying to extract cash for the property from one John Trystram of Middleton Tyas, gent, who owed them a total of £94, which they recorded in Chancery.⁹³ Since no default in payment is recorded in the Treasurer's account, we must assume that Cotton and Hall had paid for this plot, so that the other ratees in the patent would not have been delayed. Trystram was given the chance to pay them by instalments: £50 within two weeks of the Purification, and £27 within two weeks of both the feast of the nativity of John Baptist and Michaelmas; and he entered a bond of £200 to seal the bargain, with the additional security that if he failed to pay any of the instalments the whole property would be forfeit to his

93. C54/482 m 3d.. Payments were to be made at Ralph Hall's house in Ludgate.

agents. Since we hear nothing more of this we must assume that payments were duly made, but the incident well illustrates the wisdom of the agents working in pairs and seeking enrolment of their pledges and conveyances.

In Tystram's case we have an example of one set of London agents working for a provincial client and obtaining a patent under the auspices of another pair of Londoners: and unusual arrangement, but partly mirrored in one other case. John Peck, a gentleman of Doncaster and a West-Riding J.P., had two chantries at Sprotborough rated in his name on 23 June 1548, though the patent did not issue until almost a year later, in the name of Sir John Thynne and Thomas Throckmorton, and then only allowed the revenue as from 'Easter last past', (i.e. 1549) so that Peck had lost a whole year's potential revenue by the delay in the patent. After a protest to the crown he was reimbursed.⁹⁴ Although the patentees conveyed the property to him, we also find John Maynard, the sheriff of London "restoring" to Peck his interest in the property,⁹⁵ on 23 February, 1553, (suggesting that it had been mortgaged?). The very next day Peck sold out to Thomas Dynham of Borestall, Bucks., esq., with whose family the land remained for much of the rest of the 16th century.⁹⁶ We again see how the fortuitous

95. Sheffield: CD 46

96. C54/490 m 22d. Thereafter, Sheffield CD50, 51: In 1594 it passed from the Dynham family to Godfrey Copley.

94. Sheffield City Library: C.D. 40. The conveyance from the patentees to Peck is mentioned in C54/490 m. 22d, and the repayment in E315/258 f. 115v.

survival of extra pieces of information can change the whole prospect. Peck seemed at first sight the obvious man to have been the buyer, but X turns out to be a most unlikely candidate: a gentleman of a remote shire. Nothing could better illustrate the dangers of generalisation from inadequate material.

There is still another source of confusion among the conveyances themselves. Occasionally the patentees are not known to have conveyed the lands to the ratees at all, but straight to a third party. With Whalley incapacitated, there was good reason for this happening in his case, but in others it may have been more of a routine matter, especially where the ratee was himself only an agent with no direct interest in the property. One portion of the chantry of Our Lady of Pity at Spofforth was patented by Lovell and Foster, and rated for William Tankard, whose legal knowledge and standing in Yorkshire made him an easy target for would-be clients. But the first surviving conveyance is from the patentees to one Bernard Paver⁹⁷ with no mention of Tankard. Another portion of the same chantry was patented by the Bysse brothers in the name of Jerome Halley, a servant of Bowes, yet the conveyance went directly from the patentees to George and John Wharton.⁹⁸

97. Table of conveyances, 20.

98. Likewise, Winlove and Field obtained Siggoston chantry nominally for John Milward of Coventry but conveyed it to Roger Metcalfe. Leigh & Bate obtained Haselwood for Edward Grimston but conveyed it to Sir William Vavasor. (Table of Conveyances 15, 17).

A vexed question is that of the profit made by the middlemen in these conveyances. Usually, the transer was made 'pro quadam competenti pecuniae summa' no figure being specified, the profit being part of a private bargain between the parties, and not for public disclosure. No doubt the figure varied from one agent to another, and the striking of a bargain depended on how urgently the client needed to find an agent and vice-versa. Some figures, however, were committed to paper. For instance, we saw above that Whalley's land priced at £17. 12. 0. changed hands at £20.0.0. in the first conveyance. It is more probable that the patentees agreed to charge the nearest round figure than that they estimated the charge for this deal at £2.8.0. By contrast, when John and William Doddington paid £148.7.8. in cash for a part of the college at Acaster, they handed it on to Thomas Langdale of Sancton for £158.7.8., clearly having decided their services worth £10 (always excepting a clerical error).⁹⁹ John Maynard had issued his quitclaim to Peck (above) for the Sprotborough chantries and another piece of property for £210 whereas Peck sold to Dynham for £240.

How was the conveyance settled? In some cases the parties met, drew up a bill indented describing the deal, and each kept one part of the indent. This must have happened when no attorneys are mentioned, but more frequently the second party in the conveyance was represented by two or three attorneys, often named in the document. The activities of these men are another vital piece of the

99. E318/1581; C54/489 m 5d.

jig-saw of patronage and communications. Often, if they are mere servants, we know nothing beyond their names. Thus Peter Todd, Richard Jackson and James Pratt, all yeomen of San. ton, were attorneys to deliver seisin of part of Acaster college from the patentee (Doddington) to the buyer, Thomas Langdale¹⁰⁰. Others were of higher status. When Robert Thornhill conveyed the lampland at Laxton Moorhouse, Notts., to Roland Dickenson, his attorneys were a chaplain and the vicar of Laxton¹⁰¹. Gentlemen and professional colleagues also acted as attorneys,¹⁰² and occasionally, (perhaps even generally,) a formal ceremony of seisin was held before witnesses.¹⁰³

If we relied solely on conveyances we should soon run short of information in our quest for X. The ratings and particulars give us some clues, notably, as I have indicated, when the ratee is already tenant. Sometimes interesting results lie just below the surface. We found Shrewsbury in the list of Somerset's earliest clients¹⁰⁴ requesting the chantry at Tilne, Notts., and observed that the property was in fact patented by Robert and William Swift, his servants. William Swift was one of the tenants of the land concerned and may well have been the buyer. Archbishop Holgate bought two chantries at Hemsworth, his birthplace, where he was later to found a hospital.¹⁰⁵

100. Table of Conveyances, 19 cf. 30.

101. Ibid. 6.

102. Ibid. 10,13,15,25,27.

103. Ibid. 6. is endorsed to this effect, with the names of a dozen witnesses.

104. Above, Table X

105. Table of Patents, 17. C.P.R. III Mary, 341-2

He also bought a house at Bishopthorpe, near his palace, though I have been unable to discover his interest in another plot at Silkeston.¹⁰⁶ At any rate, he was one example of the ratee-purchaser. By contrast there were many public figures whose ratings consisted of such diversified property that they cannot have been for themselves alone. One supplementary source of information is the series of Ministers' Accounts returned by the collectors of chantry revenue after the dissolution, inspected by the regional auditors, and reported to London.¹⁰⁷ The rents were appropriated to the crown from Easter 1548, and individual bargains were made with purchasers as they undertook responsibility from the crown. Thus, in a patent issued between Easter and Michaelmas, 1548, the chances were that the buyer would be entitled to draw the rents of the property concerned as from Easter, 1548, and the normal process was to back-date the right to rents in this way to the previous rent-collecting season. Inevitably, this created problems. If the purchaser was not swift enough in registering his rights, the collector could easily have got to work and collected the rents for that session, only to find that in his next account he would have to record that they had been repaid to the purchaser. Conversely, the purchaser might draw the rents from the tenants, beating the collector at his own job, before the official ratification, (in the form of a conveyance,) had been duly shown to the auditor, and the collector thereby

106. Table of Patents, 34, 21.

107. P.R.O. series SC6. For a discussion of this material see below, ch.x.

exempted from responsibility for the appropriate plot or plots. In such a case, the collector would be compelled to record the person who had so drawn the rents as 'in arrears' because technically this was true. Unless the purchaser showed the auditor his authority for drawing rents before the next account, he would again appear in arrears, this time for two sessions. Machinery worked slowly in the accounting world, and it was common for the 'ministers' to continue recording their arrears long after the actual settlement had been made, merely because it was simpler to do this than to write the offending property out of the accounts, or to make specific investigations. The exact method of recording arrears, however, was not necessarily consistent from one collector to another, or even throughout the account of a single collector. To exempt himself from responsibility for uncollected rents he had to record the name of the person who he thought had detained them from the crown. If he had always named the rent-paying tenant of the property as the person thus in arrears, the Ministers' Accounts would not have been a helpful source for locating X, since we want to know who was drawing the rents, not who was paying. But fortunately we find a different procedure, in which the persons alleged to have detained rents 'colore litterarum patentum' are rarely tenants. Sometimes we find the patentee, sometimes the ratee and sometimes another party, but whoever is named, we may be reasonably sure that it is the person who bore responsibility for payment in the collector's eyes.

In some cases, interpretation is reasonably easy. For example, in the account for 1551, the collector charged arrears for part of a chantry at Halifax and a light in St. John's church, Hungate, York, both of which properties had been given by Letters Patent to Sedbergh school. The person named as detaining the rents was the schoolmaster, Robert Hebblethwaite, but we know that he had a perfect right to them: only the collector was not satisfied. By 1552, the problem had been solved, and Hebblethwaite was no longer charged.

Very occasionally, one person is charged arrears one year, and another the next for the same property. For example, John Bellow was charged for a part of Holy Trinity chantry, Howden, worth 10/8 per year, in the account for 1553, and until 1556, when the charge was transferred to Thomas Davy, who was immediately exonerated on showing his claim to the property through the patent awarded to Witherington and Musgrave. The likely explanation here is that Davy was the purchaser of the property, that his claim had been placed with Witherington and Musgrave through Bellow, (in the same way as the latter had handed on some clients to Estoft and Dolman,) and that the deal was not completed in writing to the satisfaction of the collector, for a period of several years after the actual issue of the patent.

Thomas Langdale, the gentleman of Sancton whom we found receiving a conveyance of property of Acaster College, appears in the accounts for 1553-5 for this property and for obit-land at Sancton, which makes it doubly certain that he was the purchaser. On a humbler scale, Roger Dalton was tenant of some lampland at Kirkby Misperton worth only 6d. p.a., which was patented by Bell and Duke and rated in the name of Edward Cowper¹⁰⁸. It is Dalton's name that appears among these nominal arrears, more examples of which may be found in Appendix IV C.

Before we leave this discussion of conveyances that have survived, the activities of some prominent townsmen deserve especial note among the purchases. It would have been surprising had not the aldermen and merchants bought at least some of the property in the towns after the dissolution. We saw that Bellow's soundings in the East Riding attracted offers of purchase by several merchants and gentry of Beverley and district. Two surviving conveyances take the story a little further, for Stanhope and Bellow sold their interest in the mansion of the college's seven-rectors to Abraham Metcalfe, surveyor of the provostry¹⁰⁹ and some property of St. Mary's prebend to Thomas Barton, a collector of chantry rents, who was

108. Table of Patents 4.

109. Table of Conveyances, 2.

also a tenant.¹¹⁰ In the Ministers' Accounts for 1549 we find that Robert Grey had ordered the prebend-house of St. Stephen, but had pulled it down before the first account.¹¹¹ John Eggesfield, Esq. 'detained' the rents of the prebend-house of St. Peter, also purchased by Stanhope and Bellow,¹¹² whilst Henry Hogenliffe, a bailiff of the chamberlainship of Beverley, apparently bought part of Kelk's chantry, worth £2 a year.¹¹³ Stanhope had already acquired several plots in Beverley by surrender and had taken a lease of much of the provostry.¹¹⁴ From 1548 to 1551 the prebend-house of St. James was charged to him, and from 1549 to 1551 the house of the Sacristan; whilst over the same period the prebend-house of St. Katherine was jointly charged to Stanhope and Bellow. This might simply indicate that they had not yet completed the deal with their clients, but it might also mean that Stanhope had bought the property for himself to strengthen his holdings in the town. Still in the East Riding, we saw that Bellow bought some of the prebendal houses at Howden for a client, yet in the Ministers' Accounts he is himself charged, a fact which should reinforce our caution when using this material. Thomas Davy bought further plots at Howden from Estofte and Dolman, again probably at Bellow's behest.¹¹⁵

110. Ibid. 5.

111. Probably to raise cash to save the church. See below, Chapter VII.

112. 1548. Eggesfield was discharged 1553 for obit-land at Sutton on Derwent.

113. Appendix: Table of Nominal Arrears. 29.

114. Below.

115. Table of Conveyances, 29.

The city of York presents a greater problem. Many plots of chantry property there were sold, yet we have only the smallest information about their future disposal. Some had been rated for Humphrey Colwiche, a York merchant, and we find him conveying just one piece of it to Robert Hall, an alderman of York.¹¹⁶ In the Ministers' Accounts we find William Holmes and George Gale, both aldermen, listed in arrears, and Gale was tenant of the property cited in his name.¹¹⁷ In a second conveyance, Wright and Holmes sold to Peter and William Newark, (two York gentlemen) and Percival Crawforth, the mayor, several plots in the city and North Riding¹¹⁸, and where such joint ownership is suggested, it seems likely that these gentlemen were acting on behalf of others. Once again, it is the established aldermen, mainly of the merchant community, who come to the fore in our admittedly meagre information, but nobody is recorded as buying up huge amounts of chantry property.

However, it is for Doncaster that the greatest amount of evidence has survived. A great deal of the chantry property in the town was bought up in the reigns of Edward VI and Mary in a series of patents awarded to different people. But irrespective of the patentees, the property seems eventually to have devolved upon a small handful of important townsmen here too: they may have been working together to acquire the

116. Ibid. 14.

117. Table of Nominal Arrears 19.

118. Table of Conveyances: 26.

houses involved, and they certainly knew each other well.¹¹⁹ Francis Frobisher, the recorder of the town, and a J.P. in the West Riding, obtained a rating for some property in the patent to Gargrave and Adam¹²⁰ and also appears drawing rents for the same property in the Ministers' Accounts for 1550 and 1551. Significantly, he is also charged with other rents in the town which had been rated in the name of Giles Kelway, who seems to have been one of the many ratees who were just figures of convenience obtaining properties at the behest of their clients. Some more of the rents in Kelway's batch were now charged to John Welbore, and Kelway himself is not mentioned. Another purchaser of Doncaster houses was the feodary of Pontefract, John Holmes.¹²¹ But it was in the reign of Mary that the most significant transactions occurred, when Thomas Ellis and Thomas Symkinson received conveyances of houses patented by Vavasor and Ward¹²². Ellis was a notable benefactor of the town and it is possible that he used some of the property to endow his almshouse, whilst Frobisher and Welbore were both charged in the Ministers' Accounts for some part of his rating, and Ellis was also charged for that part of the Rood chantry which had been patented by Sir Ralph Sadler.

119. Ellis & Frobisher both witnessed Simkinson's will. Ellis was mayor in 1532, 1543, 1553 and 1559 (Miller, pp. 81, 169) and gave some of his chantry property to the hospital in 1562 (Tomlinson p.40). Simkinson and Frobisher were among the trustees of the hospital (Falconar p. 23).

120. Table of Patents. 21.

121. Table of Nominal Arrears, 15.

122. Table of Conveyances, 32, 33.

The reader will by now be aware that there are many chantry properties listed among the patents, but for which I have not hitherto suggested a buyer. Nevertheless, a clear pattern of the procedure for purchase has emerged, together with some idea of the interrelation of X, Y and Z. In the following chapter a broad summary of the pattern of sales for the area will be given, though the exact extent of sales in relation to other means of deploying the land is kept over until Chapter XI.¹²³

123. Three Appendixes to the present chapter will be found in Vol. II.

CHAPTER V
Sales - (ii)

- 147 -

1. Problems of Interpretation

Our attention in the previous chapter was directed primarily towards the activities of provincial and national agents found buying chantry lands. To whom did the agents sell the lands? Look at the property of the West Riding and the Duchy of Lancaster. Leonard Bate, the collector of chantry revenue and a key figure for our area, appears in two patents.¹ In the first his fellow patentees are Sir Edward Warner, Lieutenant of the Tower of London, and Silvester Leigh, a Yorkshire neighbour of Bate's. In the second it is Leigh alone who joins him. In each case the property in the Duchy of Lancaster is rated in the name of Edward Grimston (a pensioner of the King from Ipswich and later both an M.P. and a munster-master).² Yet in one enrolment the signature of Leigh, and not that of Grimston witnesses the transaction.³ Nor did the properties form a compact block. Can Grimston be seen as anything more than a convenient London agent? The West Riding property in the first patent was rated for Leigh and Bate, that in the second for Paulet. But in the latter case the grant comprised small pieces of a score of chantries and obits. Bate was himself the tenant of the lampland at Bramham and he also detained for himself at least one other property at Wakefield which he later used to found an almshouse.⁴

1. Table of Patents (Appendix IV a) No. 30 and 53.

2. D.N.B.

3. E36/258 f. 49 v.

4. Walker, Wakefield, 225.

What, then of Paulet? It is singularly unlikely that he was directly concerned with such paltry properties, and he must, like Grimston, be considered as nothing more than an agent. Two flimsy pieces of evidence - the signature of Leigh and the tenure of Bate - are all we have to indicate that they were the real operators here, though a glance back at the Table of Conveyances will remind us that they also appear conveying to Sir William Vavasor his chantry at Haselwood.⁵ The first patent is the more puzzling. All the available endowments of 7 chantries in the deanery of Otley, 8 in the deanery of Craven and 6 in the deanery of Pontefract, plus parts of several others were bought up. We might think this looks like speculation by Bate, whose position would have placed him favourably for disposing of the land. But is this a reliable explanation? We know that his step-son the West Riding surveyor Henry Savile, later took from Bate the chapel of St. John in Wakefield and some other tenements in the town⁶ Here, then, is a definite client. Furthermore, the structure of the particulars for grant is interesting, for instead of listing together all the lands of each chantry rated, we find parts of chantry A or B interspersed in the list among other endowments, and this strongly suggests that different clients wanted the various parts.⁷ It is also noteworthy that the

5. Appendix IV b, No. 17.

6. Walker, op. cit., 217 ff; 648. Borthwick Institute, Wills vol. 18 f. 11v.

7. A similar technique may be applied to the particulars for the patents of Wolflet & Wright (E318/2031), Estoft & Dolman (E318/1599) and Pease & Winlove (E318/1854-6).

grant did not extend to all of the remaining endowments in any one deanery.⁸ Speculation begins to look unlikely, but in the absence of further information it is possible to say no more than that Bate was the West Ridings primary agent, and that he certainly bought lands on behalf of other clients including Savile. The two men may, indeed, have bought extensively in their native West Riding without selling much to other buyers, though of this there is no surviving proof known to me. We shall shortly see that they also obtained some of the copyhold chantry lands.⁹

In Nottinghamshire also there are many unresolved purchases. When Neville bought part of Southwell college for John Beaumont the patent also included the chantries at Brodbusk and Sturton.¹⁰ No syndicate bought as widely as Leigh and Bate had done in the West Riding, and we find that the remaining purchases of whole endowments were spread among several different patents.¹¹ This makes it unlikely that any one buyer was accumulating chantry lands in the area, as the orders for such a person would presumably have been placed through only one or two patentees. A glance at the patents awarded to Howe and Broxholme, Reve and Cotton, Breton and Nicholas, and Marsh and Williams will show that purchases tended everywhere in the county to be fragmentary, not compact, and highly selective:¹² the result of small

8. There were some obvious deterrents. Many of the chantry lands in the Craven deanery were held by lease with several years still to run, whilst the chantries at Marston and Bramham (d. of Otley) were poorly endowed. Bate thus probably secured all the best lands available.

9. Below, Chapter VI.

10. Patent No. 33.

11. See Notts. entries in Patents 1, 5, 15, 40, 44, 60.

12. Patents 29; 58, 60, 67, 76; 41; 19.

purchases by divers individuals, doubtless resulting from the sort of advertisement of the sales which we saw Bellow making in the East Riding.

The third problem zone is the city of York itself. We have already found indication of sporadic purchases by the merchant and aldermanic community, but the greatest single purchase of chantry lands in the area went to Matthew White, the North-Riding surveyor, and Edward Bury.¹³ White had written up the Chantry Certificates for the city which fully intended to recover most of the lands. The corporation even went so far as to give Sir Michael Stanhope an annuity in June 1548 partly to obtain the preferment of these lands. But the city could not afford the price asked and the crown was not giving the lands away. It was a big enough struggle to afford the lands of the gild of St. Christopher and St. George, which Stanhope eventually secured for them¹⁴. The corporation was not behind the grant to White and Bury: if it had been its name would have been mentioned in the patent or the transaction would be recorded in the city records. The particulars are missing (could this have anything to do with the confusion arising from White's murder in the Seamer rebellion?) and we have only a single conveyance of a tiny part of the property. Chantry lands appearing in a rental in the city archives do not correspond with these in

13. Patent 37.

14. Patent 35. York civic records, iv, 181, 177.

White's patent and can only be the fruit of concealment enquiries later in the century.¹⁵ Perhaps, as in the other grants of York property, it was the merchant community which invested in chantry property. If so there was scope here for someone greatly to extend his holdings and his yearly income from rent, though there were still many chantry houses left in the city in the crown's hands because the dissolution, as in so many other towns, completely saturated the market.

The fourth problem concerns lights and obits. Their endowments had at least the advantage of being small and within the range of small purses, but the great disadvantage of being very widely scattered. These, indeed, were the dregs as far as the crown was concerned - a nuisance to administer and difficult to market. It does seem that a degree of speculative buying must have prevailed in this sector. Why else should Robert Thornhill buy up all the lamplands of Nottinghamshire, or Matthew White those of the North Riding?¹⁶ Other areas produce similar results: Sir Edward Bray bought the lights and obits of Lindsey (Lincs) and Buckinghamshire, Cely those of Essex, Pease and Winlove those of Oxfordshire.¹⁷ It is as unlikely that all the fate of these lands had been predetermined before the patent as it is that the patentees wanted them for themselves. The most likely buyers were the tenants of the plots, from whom the agents may have extracted generous remuneration.¹⁸

15. York city MSS: E76

16. Patents 17, 37.

17. LR2/65 f.30v; SC6/P&M/30: E318/1640; Oxford Rec. Soc.
p xx.

18. Note the conveyance by Thornhill of one such plot:
Conveyance No. 6.

***TABLE**

Table XVI : Tenants known to have purchased their own plots.

There is every indication that many small tenants eventually purchased their own plots of chantry land, though specific proof is wanting in all but a few cases. The numbers in the left-hand column refer to the table of Patents (Appendix IVa). The tables of Conveyances and Nominal Arrears will be found in Appendix IV b and c.

<u>Pat.</u>	<u>endowment</u>	<u>tenant involved</u>	<u>evidence</u>
11	S.Cowton	Christopher Tiplady	tenant was ratee
14	London property of Pontefract coll.	Sir Peter Mewtas	tenant was ratee
17	Beverley,fabric	John Bellow	tenant was ratee
21	Doncaster(var.)	Francis Frobisher	tenant was ratee
28	Skafthworth	Richard Drew	tenant was ratee
53	Bramham light	Leonard Bate	tenant was patentee
57	Beverley, manor of S.Dalton	Francis Aslaby	tenant was ratee

17	Beverley,preb. BVM	Thomas Barton	Conveyance no.5
31	York,Wm/WmOB	Henry Binks	Conveyance no.
		William Watson	
		Gregory Peacock	
71	Howden(various)	Thomas Davy	Conveyance no.29
82/	Sancton obit & part of Acaster coll.	Thomas Langdale	Conveyance no.19,30
61			

4	Kirkby Misperton lamp	Roger Dalton	Nominal Arrears. 3
21	Wakefield MM	Richard Pymond	Nominal Arrears.11
48	Stainford	William Smith	Nominal Arrears.15
65	Terrington lamp	Robert Smithson	Nominal Arrears.13

2. Tenants & Gentry:-

Looking back over the patents at large we can see tenants behind several purchases, and it is evident that these men were particularly well-placed when the land was not the subject of keen competition. Some examples are shown in Table XVI, but this is not necessarily the end of the list. There were, particularly in the towns, many instances of a single holding being bought, leaving the remainder of an endowment in the crown's hands, and this type of purchase points towards the small tenants.¹⁹

At the other end of the scale, did nobody make a sound and substantial investment in chantry lands? Stanhope built up his holdings in the East Riding around Hull and Beverley, but we have seen that even he handed on to others some of the properties he acquired. The yeomen-patentees Wolflet and Wright were almost certainly working for Stanhope and Bellow, with several purchases in the same area. Walter Jobson, a Hull merchant, bought the tithes of Blacktoft and Ellerker in March 1550 and may well have been one of the hidden purchasers behind some of Stanhope and Bellow's activity. Meanwhile, Cuthbert Musgrave was establishing himself as a major landholder at Hemingbrough and Howden,

19. See entries in the following Patents for Wansford (81), Riccall (78), Settrington (34), Skirlaugh (6), Cornborough (21), Thirsk (66), Sheriff Hutton (17), Malton (75), Wath (18), Middleton Q. (70), Norton (70), Harewood (10) etc.

and Thomas Langdale of Sancton made a considerable investment in the East Riding estates of Acaster College at North and South Cliff and North and South Cave. We also met Francis Aslaby buying the manor of S. Dalton. Other purchases in the East Riding were fragmentary, with townsmen buying prebendal mansions and small plots of chantry land. Only about half a dozen gentry seem to have made significant purchases here, then.

In the West Riding the Earl of Shrewsbury is the only noble landowner known to have invested in chantry or collegiate property, with his servants the Swifts making minor purchases. Gargrave bought the endowment of the Sothill chantry at Wakefield, one of the richest in the area, whilst Whalley lurks in the background and appears occasionally as a ratee. Here we also find the great unknown of the Leigh and Bate transactions.

The North Riding, Richmondshire and Nottinghamshire yield no large gentry investments, save Sir Gervais Clifton's purchase of part of his college, Hugh Thornhill's purchase of most of the prebend of Beckingham at Southwell, and Beaumont's investment at Southwell.

Adding these observations to those derived from the conveyances recorded above, we must conclude that the chantry and collegiate lands of our area were not good investment material, that they were not used to further the fortunes of more than a handful of gentry, and that the small buyer, wishing marginally to extend his holdings or to purchase his freehold, was as likely as any other person to end up with the

property. In the towns it seems to have been the established community of merchants and aldermen who made most of the dissolution. The overall effect can only have been to confirm the status quo of property ownership, save for marginal variations, and this is another good reason for the dissolution passing with so little unrest.

3. The commissions for sale after 1549

So far, we have noted only the first commission for sale, which terminated its activities towards the end of 1549. However, our analysis of the purchases has been carried down to the end of Edward's reign, since from the buyer's point of view the method of procedure throughout was similar.

Yet there were some notable changes of detail in the terms of the succeeding commissions, dictated by an increased awareness of the need for stricter scrutiny to prevent speculation, and to reduce delays and costs. Therefore we must briefly consider the commissions between 1550 and the early years of Elizabeth's reign, though it is not my intention to analyse in depth the sales between 1553 and 1563, which are recorded in Appendix Va.

Throughout 1548 and 1549 the costs of war had first claim on the profits of the dissolution and sale, and almost all the charitable amenities continued by the crown had to subsist on a cash grant only, all attempts to get a landed endowment being, for the moment, stifled. For example, a Bill was introduced into the Commons in January 1549 to restore lands to schools, but after three readings there it was dropped in the Lords after only a single reading - perhaps because the time was not yet ripe for increased spending, or perhaps because assurances were given that the matter was in hand, the crown needing no separate Statute to implement what had already been entrusted to it in the second Chantry Act.²⁰

The fall of Somerset in the autumn of 1549 did not impede the sales, but by the end of the year the commissioners had completed their work, and against mounting clamour from the left the crown was able to commission Sackville at last to give land to schools. For over two years there were no more routine sales of chantry land.

By the summer of 1552 there had been a serious deterioration of the country's financial position, and the Council's attempt to discover how many schools had been established²¹ was

20. Index to Commons' Journal sub 'Schools'; Lords Journal:I 342. Simon, Education and Society, 230.

21. 5 June 1552: A.P.C. 1552-4, 68.

probably prompted by a desire to re-commence the sales rather than to survey the good works it had been able to accomplish, for just over a month later, on 13 July, 1552, a new commission for sale was issued, which was renewed three times in Edward's last year.²²

Whilst economic changes demanded recourse to sales, political changes demanded a new approach to their management. The period 1550-1552 had seen the disgrace of several officials in the financial administration, among them Sir John Williams, the Treasurer of Augmentations. Others, including the Yorkshire Receiver, Richard Whalley, had spent some time in prison for supporting Somerset. As a preliminary move towards a more centralised and reliable administration, Sir Edmund Peckham, high Treasurer of the Mint was put in charge of all accounts relating to the Crown's landed revenue, including those formerly administered by the Treasurer²³. At the beginning of Mary's reign, one further commission was issued with payments to be made to Peckham, but in her first year Augmentations was abolished, its officers mainly incorporated in the Exchequer, and Peckham's interim supervision was over. Henceforth, sales were noted by one of the Tellers of the Exchequer and entered on his rolls.²⁴

22. C.P.R. IV Edward, 354.; Ibid., 390 (18 Nov. 1552); V, 277 (12 Dec.); Ibid., 184 (15 Mar. 1553), Covering all crown lands.

23. C.P.R. IV Edward, 354; W.C. Richardson, op. cit., pp. 177, 249.

24. 16 Nov. 1553: C.P.R. I Mary, 265. However, Peckham's surviving account (E351/2080) does not appear to include chantry sales under Mary. For the Tellers' Rolls see E405/119-124 (Mary); 125-7 (Eliz); E405/499-518, sub. Nicholas Brigham (Mary), Roger Alford (1st comm. Eliz.) and Thomas Gardiner.

This reorganisation meant a different approach to accounting. In the beginning, the Treasurer had separately noted both income and expenditure from chantry sources, presumably so that the crown could see at a glance in the early years of the sales how profitable these new lands were. In 1548 and 1549 almost every penny was spent on warfare.²⁵ By 1552, chantry lands had come to be regarded as merely an integral part of the crown's estates, and no separate account of disbursements from this source was kept by Peckham, though he still followed the Treasurer's practice of entering payments for purchase under the name of the patentee. When the Exchequer took over in 1554, even this practice was dropped, each individual payment being recorded in the payer's name which makes specific plots of chantry land increasingly difficult to trace unless the searcher is fortunate enough to know the name of the payer in advance.

Other refinements were introduced. Instead of the two signatures of Mildmay and Kelway, it was necessary from 1552 to obtain those of six or more commissioners before any sale was valid.²⁶ In the commission of 13 July 1552 one of the signatories had to be either Sir John Gate, (vice-chamberlain of the Household,) or Sir Robert Bowes, (Master of the Rolls) another either Sir Richard Sackville, (Chancellor of Augmentations,) or Sir Walter Mildmay, (General Surveyor); and the rest of the quorum were chosen from the bishops of London and Norwich, Sir Philip Hoby, the attorney-general, and the solicitor-

25. See Appendix Vb.

26. C.P.R. III Edward, 214; A.P.C. 1552-4, 253.

general. Payment for purchases had to be made within two to three weeks after the rating, though under Mary and Elizabeth there was renewed demand for all to be paid immediately:²⁷ a far cry from the three month limit of Edward's first commission.

But amid this increasing strictness towards the sales, the crown had eventually to offer some incentives. Under Edward's first commission, any compact plot of land in a single manor or holding worth over £4 p.a. had to be held in chief by knight service.²⁸ Little chantry land came within this classification, though it did affect collegiate property. Mary decided this was a deterrent to the smaller buyer, and from September 1556 offered a new level of £10 p.a. or 6 acres in a single holding, though Elizabeth promptly cut this back to £6. 13. 4.²⁹ In our region this had no noticeable effect, and it was in any case accompanied by a stricter enumeration of provisions. Thus, from 20 April 1557, all payments were to be made in ready cash at the time of the rating, and no land held in chief was to be rated at less than 24 years' purchase, whilst the old restrictions on the sale of lands in the Duchies of Lancaster and Cornwall, on the ancient demesne, or within 2 miles of the royal palaces, remained.

27. LR2/65 et seq.

28. On the hatred of feudal obligations see Hurstfield in L.O.R. lxx (1949), 72. Land not thus classified was held in free socage of a crown manor, and from 1552 the fictitious manor of 'East Greenwich' became the standard entry: see Table of Patents.

29. C.P.R. III, Mary, 554; I Eliz., 119. See also R.B. Outhwaite thesis p. 231: In Elizabeth's later commissions the limit was raised to £10 (1589) and £20 (1599).

Table XVII: The Commissions for Sale, 1554-1563:

29 March	1554	<u>CPR</u>	I Mary,	265
27 April	1554		I "	301
20 August	1554		II "	205
28 September	1556		III "	554
16 May	1558		III "	314
28 June	1559		I Eliz.	119
20 October	1561		II "	112

The sale of purely chantry lands had reached minuscule proportions by 1553, and both the commissions and the grants began increasingly to concern themselves with other lands besides.

The observations of Habakkuk on the increase in rates as the century progressed are well borne out in this area. Even at the beginning of the sales the magical figure of 20 years' purchase is rarely to be found. Of the particulars rated in June 1548 many show a trend towards 24 years' purchase, and even Robert Thornhill buying lamplands, had to pay this. Town houses fetched 10, 13 or 15 years, and the best land as high as 26. Every item, however, was rated on its own merits and it is very improbable that the commissioners had an overall 20 year figure in view even if it was on this basis that estimates of profits were made. With the renewal of sales in 1552 rates had risen on average by one year's purchase for comparable properties, and the range of rates in the 1552 sales for our area includes, 5, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24 and 26 years on individual items. Under Mary and Elizabeth prices rose much higher still.³⁰

30. Habakkuk: Ec. H.R. 2nds X. 365-6. W.K. Jordan, E.Y.K., 104.

4. Administrative problems

The procedural changes outlined above show the Tudor state adapting to combat the worse effects of speculation and inflation. A great deal of thought was put into the mid-century structural reforms in the finance machinery, and the discovery of so much corruption, which has been the main feature of the historian's criticism of Edward's reign, was ironically an indication of more thorough scrutiny of accounts.

Corruption apart, the cost of administration was inevitably high even though Mildmay had supervised the amalgamation of the courts of General Surveyors and Augmentations in 1546-7 to reduce the number of duplicated officers. The dissolution of the chantries necessarily increased the strain on an already overworked band of clerks and messengers, and on 20 March 1549 Thomas Tyrrell, Richard Hall and Robert Mackerell were awarded a total of £15:-

in consideracon that they have hadde sins the erection of the Courte of Augmentacions much more travaile then before tyme by reason of the Sale of Colledges and Chauntrie landes as allso for the delyveringe of dyverse lettres sent to sundrie personnes for the payementes and bringinge in of the kinges majesties debtes and otherwise as by a warraunte frome the Chauncellor appearith. 31.

As late as 1557 Richard Duke, one of the clerks, received a grant of £97.4.0. by the King's warrant for enrolling the Letters Patent for pensions to the dispossessed clergy.³²

31. E315/257 f 107.

32. E315/261 f. 69 v.

Many other incidental expenses were incurred³³, but this was not the limit of the problems caused by the dissolution.

Liaison and trust between the commissioners in London and the surveyors and auditors in the provinces was all important, for there were many points at which complications could arise in the process of sale. The speed of the early sales caught some surveyors unawares, following as it did so closely on the preparation of the Chantry Certificates. For example, the early demand for the site of Acaster College by William Thorpe could not be fully satisfied: the lead and bells were

nott yet surveyed, for the surveyors had no tyme therto. 34.

But once organised, the local officers provided a valuable supply of information, and were able to save the commissioners from several embarrassing scenes. James Bank of Maltby knew that the chapel at Bank Newton was a chapel of ease maintained by the vicar of Gargrave, yet still applied for it. The commissioners might have accepted, but the surveyor warned in a memorandum that the lands were claimed by the vicar.³⁵ At Retford, though it made no difference to the sale, the surveyor noted that the chantry land had been used for a school.³⁶ At Walkeringham, the churchwardens insisted that some land was devoted to the maintenance of the Trent's banks, but the surveyor observed,

33. e.g. E315/257 f 102²: Thomas Argall £10 for making a book of sales; E314/23/7 f.57: Richard Garth £40 for recording payments up to 4 Edward.

34. E315/68 f. 158 v.

35. E315/68 f. 398 v. 'he desyereth to bye this at his owne perill'.

36. Ibid. f. 201.

notwith standing they gave the rent thereof unto a prest who Inioyed the same within the space of fower yeres last past, and thus the same preist was alweis removable at the pleasure of the parishoners. 37.

One danger was that land already rated for one party would inadvertently pass also in a grant to another, and even despite regional vigilance mistakes were made. Brende's patent³⁸ included land at Milby worth 20/- p.a. for a gild at Ripley, yet the same plot was also patented by Stanhope shortly afterwards, and Stanhope's purchase price consequently had to be repaid.³⁹ Lord Clinton was similarly discomfited by obtaining a deed of exchange with the crown and discovering some of the land to have been previously sold by the crown to a third party!⁴⁰

Mistakes might also appear in the enrolments. When William Woodruffe first had his rating for the Lady Chantry at Wath on Deame enrolled, his name was spelt 'WODDEFFORDE' and the entry was expunged, to be correctly re-written later.⁴¹ Similarly, the first enrolment of Sir Gervais Clifton's application for Clifton College rated in June 1552, was crossed out and,

enrolled after, and the particular mended by cause the name of the townewas mystaken. 42.

Other entries were crossed out when, for some reason, the ratee didd not proceed to take a patent.⁴³ But these corrections

37. E318/1866

38. Patent 11

39. Patent 17; E315/105 f. 151 v.

40. E305/G34.

41. E315/67 f. 231 v and f. 324 r.

42. LR2/65 ff. 42. 122.

43. e.g. E315/68 f 387. Wright at Osmotherley; f 439 Babthorpe at Newsome; E318/1599 Cherry Burton crossed out of particulars for Estoft, etc.

after all, show that there was a conscientious mind at work, and the written record of the sales as it remains must very substantially reflect the actual dealings which took place.

A final assessment of the importance of the sales in the whole framework of the disposal of chantry land in our area cannot be made until we have examined alternative modes of disposal, which will in turn throw more light on the nature of the property, the status of those interested in it, and the complexity of the operation.

CHAPTER VI
LEASES AND COPYHOLD LANDS

1. Leases and Farms

The intricacy of the sales operation and the turmoil of a lively land-market in the south must not beguile us into assuming that everywhere all the chantry property was swiftly sold off. We shall see in the concluding chapter that in our area only about a quarter of the disposable total was sold or given away by 1553,¹ which leaves a great deal still to be accounted for. Such as was not sold was leased, farmed, or administered directly by the bailiffs of the crown. The unwillingness of the crown to sell some lands was matched by that of the subject to buy others, and in large measure the story of leased chantry lands is that of the crown's struggle to administer properties which could otherwise have been serious liabilities.²

We saw that a good deal of collegiate and chantry property was already leased or farmed on the eve of the dissolution, and that both Henry VIII and Edward VI had sought to preserve and protect the rights of existing leaseholders where their tenure was within the terms allowed by the Chantry Acts. There was no question of a purchaser of such lands moving in, ousting the current leaseholder and/or exploiting his land

-
1. After 1553 sales did not again reach significant proportions until the end of Elizabeth's reign. For a survey of these later sales, see the unpublished Ph.D. thesis of R.B. Outhwaite (Nottingham 1964), 'Studies in Elizabethan Government finance.'
 2. For a table of chantry lands leased 1547-1553 see Appendix VIa.

personally, for the leaseholder was protected by the law. This situation was bound to affect the pattern of sales.

For instance, collegiate property let to farm in large blocks with a long term still to run at the dissolution might interest major landowners who already employed farmers for their estates and did not expect to work the land personally, but it would hardly interest the smaller man wanting to invest just a little and to exploit the land directly. If the major landowners showed no interest in buying, such lands were easily administered by the crown; but even if they did buy, the old policy of farming was continued, and indeed on the larger estates it was indispensable.

Small leasehold tenements posed less of a problem. Tenures would expire and the landlord could then demand an entry fine from his new tenant, or a renewal fine from the old. Such plots were therefore quite appealing to purchasers, but could still not interest the small man out to profit from immediate direct exploitation of the soil, unless he happened to be the leaseholder buying his own small plot.³

In this chapter, however, we shall be concerned with the process of leasing which followed the dissolution. As long as the crown retained chantry and collegiate property it had to deal with the daily business of making new leases and renewing old ones, these being routine duties inherited

3. A similar observation on the way previous leases hampered future sales was made of Devon monastic estates by Dr. J.A. Youings, (Ph.D. thesis p. 121.)

from the chantry priests. Moreover when it seemed likely that entire chantry endowments or large tracts of collegiate land would remain unsold - either by deliberate royal policy, or through lack of buyers - it became desirable to reduce the burden of the revenue collectors by appointing farmers who would be responsible for the revenues of such lands. Whether in the case of leases to individual tenants or in the case of farms of more extensive lands, the crown handed over to others the right to exploit the land directly, and received in return only a cash rent each year. The principle involved in the two types of transaction was therefore identical, and they are both recorded under the general term 'Leases' in the documents we shall consider. In the following discussion I am referring solely to leases of collegiate and chantry property throughout, unless otherwise stated.

2. The source material

Although we encountered some problems of method in dealing with the sales of chantry land, they are as nothing in comparison with those posed by the leases. Particulars for sale were kept in books corresponding with the sittings of the various commissions for sale. The Patent Rolls served as a key to the names of purchasers, thus making the indexes to particulars intelligible. Moreover, the few deficiencies in such indexes were readily made good by the

format of the enrolments themselves, where each successive entry usually had a marginal reference in a thicker pen to indicate the county to which it referred.

None of these facilities is fully available in the quest for leases. Leaving aside for the moment the property within the Duchy of Lancaster, there are few original particulars for leases of chantry land in our area,⁴ and the enrolments of all leases for Edward's reign appear in the same series of books, with no distinction between those for chantry lands and those for other crown lands. Despite their immaculate presentation in seven large volumes⁵, there are few marginal headings, and the extensive indexes nevertheless fail to facilitate the search for leases in any given area, not least because the searcher has no key corresponding to the Patent Rolls to furnish him in advance with a list of lessees. Even the final resort of searching all the entries for references to Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire is little consolation, for many prove to be 'red herrings' dealing with other classes of land. Fortunately there are some sources of cross-reference, notably the fines paid to the Treasurer of Augmentations at the commencement of a lease, but not all leases bore fines and not all those which did so are recorded among the payments!

4. For those surviving see P.R.O.: E315/208 b.

5. E315/219 to 225.

The assessments and tables which follow are the fruit of a laborious search of the material, though it would be surprising if they represented all the leases for the area issued under Edward VI. Moreover, the young king inherited many other valid leases which were not immediately renewed, so that even a complete register of crown leases granted in his reign would not include all the leasehold land.

Variations in governmental procedure complicate the search for leases granted after 1553. Under Edward, leases passed under the seal of the Court of Augmentations, but in the reign of Mary, when Augmentations was absorbed into the Exchequer, a new system had to be devised which continued through Elizabeth's reign.

Under Mary, a single volume of the old-style Augmentations enrolments survives⁶ before the Exchequer took over. Thereafter the system proved too much either for 16th century archivists or for their modern counterparts, for there is no trace of enrolments, which were entrusted to the Clerk of the Pipe,⁷ and leases of a yearly value of over £2, which began to be enrolled in the Patent and Originalia Rolls, are few in number. The net result is an almost total absence of leases for the reign.⁸

6. E 315/226.

7. According to the commission. See, inter alia, B.M. Cotton Titus B IV, p. 60.

8. Though there is one incomplete book of counterparts: E311/13.

Under Elizabeth, leases again become numerous, but their discovery the more complicated. Enrolments are no longer in books, but on scores of small rolls arranged by counties,⁹ and once again the sorting out of relevant items from the maze of irrelevant ones is a long task. The Tellers' Rolls¹⁰ record fines paid, but few of the leases for our area are detectable there. An added complication for Elizabeth's reign is that of knowing whether leases are originals or renewals, for whilst a few are specifically stated to be renewed to the holder, many others have no information one way or the other. The later leases, however, are richer in details, and have been heavily drawn upon in what follows, as illustrative material.

3. Procedure for obtaining a lease: Edward VI to Elizabeth

The procedure for obtaining a lease or farm of chantry property was almost identical to that for a purchase. Commissioners were empowered by the crown to lease chantry lands. In earlier days authority over leases had been bestowed on the itinerant justices or the Lord Treasurer, and under Henry VIII it fell to the General Surveyors in the newly established Court before its absorption in the Court

9. E309.

10. E401/1796 et seq; E405/127.

of Augmentations. Under Mary, Augmentations was, in turn, absorbed into the Exchequer, and with this change the right to regulate leases passed firmly into the hands of the Lord Treasurer.¹¹

Mildmay and Kelway, in their capacity as disposers of chantry lands, had no power under Edward to issue leases, which came under the auspices of the Chancellor of Augmentations.¹² But it is interesting to note that Mildmay is usually among the three signatories on the particulars for leases, the chancellor and one other officer accompanying him.

With the Marian reforms, leases of land under £2 p.a. passed under the Exchequer seal, those from £2 to £6. 13. 4. under the Great Seal, and over this limit, the Signet. But this was soon realised to present sharp disincentives to the would-be small lessee who, for a lease of fractionally over £2 p.a. would have to pay the full fees of the Great Seal. On 4 May 1557 the limits were modified:¹³ the £2 limit was raised to £5 and the fee for leases between £5 and £6. 13. 4. was fixed at £1. 0. 4., but over this all the customary fees were charged. Three commissioners chosen from Rochester, Hastings, Englefield, Waldegrave and Baker, were to sign all leases. They were soon replaced, however, by another commission under which the Lord Treasurer, under-Treasurer of the Exchequer and Chancellor of the Exchequer were to be among the signatories.¹⁴

12. C.P.R. III Edward VI, 214.

13. C.P.R. III Mary, 312.

14. C.P.R. I Eliz., 444.

11. Guide to the P.R.O. I, 74.

Under these later commissions in particular, the conditions for the issue of a lease were no less stringent than those for a sale. The maximum term was twenty-one years or three lives, and all tenants had to undertake to maintain the property in good order, paying their rents no later than forty days after the appointed feasts, and placing bonds for security with the Barons of the Exchequer. No leases in reversion were allowed without the crown's express permission. As with the sales, then, administrative procedure was streamlined in the middle years of the century.

Once it was known that the crown was prepared to lease chantry lands the same channels of patronage tapped by purchasers were put to work for the lessees. Just occasionally, the crown intervened directly to secure a lease for a trusted servant. For example, Cuthbert Musgrave was awarded a lease of the prebend of Skelton in Howden college without paying any rent, at the specific request of Edward VI.¹⁵ At first, however, it was once again Somerset who became the major source of preferments, and we find his hand in no fewer than eight of the leases of property in our area.¹⁶

15. E310/4/32/53: 'The Kynges majesties plesser ys by the advysse of hys most honorable Counsell yt a grante of the premyssez be made to Cuthbert Musgrave for term of hys lyff, withowte payynge anythyng for the same.' Musgrave had served Henry VIII in the Scottish wars (C.P.R. I Mary, 242). See also Surtees Society Vol. 122, p. 158. There were isolated royal interventions in Elizabeth's reign, but never without consulting the commissioners: e.g. E310/28/164/17 and 47.

16. See below, p. 194, and Appendix VIa, Nos. 4, 11, 14, 17, 18, 21, 23, 26.

Provincial patrons must also have been active, though we do not find lengthy letters of commendation such as those which tended to support quests for monastic land a decade earlier. Only an occasional letter survives with the leases, like that from Archbishop Holgate pressing the claim of one who had fought on the borders.¹⁷ In 1573 we find one William Hellard securing a renewal of a lease of collegiate land at Rudston through the good offices of John Boynton, gentleman.¹⁸ Once again, the officers of the Court of Augmentations might help, though it was apparently unwise always to entrust one's leases to them. John Bellow, for example, was accused of offering to secure a renewal for one client, obtaining the old lease to present to the commissioners, and instead selling it to a third party!¹⁹ Not all were so untrustworthy.

Patrons were approached not simply to further an application but also in the hope that they would be sufficiently influential to obtain the lease at beneficial rates or terms. Under Edward VI all leases granted to servants are passed without an entry fine, whilst a few other favoured persons have to pay only half a year's rent as fine, the standard fine being a full year's rent.²⁰ As fines rose steeply under Elizabeth, it became the more urgent to have influence at court. Ralph Constable, because he was a gentleman pensioner of the crown, was able to secure a lease of lands formerly belonging to Rotherham college in 1561, paying only two years' rent as a fine when all around him were charged four or five years.²¹

17. E310/4/33/33 -- this illustrates the genre of letters, though it does not refer to chantry property.

18. E310/29/171/74.

19. Beverley DDCC 139/65 f. 48.

20. See Appendix VIa.

21. Details reported in E310/164 (19).

By one means or another, then, with patronage or perseverance, applications for leases were laid before the commissioners who proceeded to issue a warrant to the surveyor of the appropriate region to survey the property and note its state of repair, extent of woodland, proximity to royal estates, the names of the present tenants, and the estimated gross and net annual values. This done, the document was returned for scrutiny to the commissioners and if it met with their approval they set the term for which it was to run and the entry fine, added any special conditions, and finally subscribed their names to the particular, sending it off to the clerks for enrolment, and for the making of the lease and its counterparts.

Very few original particulars have survived, making it impossible to determine with any accuracy the time taken between the making of the particular and the eventual enrolment. In most cases the last known particular bears the same date as the enrolment, but this may be an administrative fiction designed for easy reference.

As with particulars for sale, responsibility for the accuracy of the final document rested heavily with the local officials. In the whole scheme of the work of these men the time allotted to the chantries cannot have been of more than modest significance, yet the auditors had to keep record of leases and purchases in their areas because it not infrequently happened that more than one client applied for the same plot, and the auditor had to be able to tell

at a glance whether a plot for which he received a request had already been committed to someone else.²² In practice this meant that the local officer, if he were a man of determination, could exercise a greater overall influence on the flow of leases than could the London commissioners. This was amply demonstrated by the career of Anthony Roue, auditor in Yorkshire in the 1560's and 1570's who often submitted interesting memoranda, having made his own bargains with the clients, and only then asked the approval of the central officers.

Approached by John Ingleby for the chantry in St. John's, Hungate, York, he wrote:-

We have agreed wythe the said John Ingleby gt. that he shall have a lease of the premisses in (accompt?) for xxj yeres, payinge for a fyne xxxij^{li} x^s if it shall please your honors to assent therunto. 23.

And when he discovered a plot of concealed land belonging to the gild at Sutton on Galtres, he was able to report:-

We have concludyd wythe the tenante that he shall have a lease for xxj yeres for the fyne of xlijs^s 24.

If all local officials were as diligent and enthusiastic in their duty, the crown commissioners' function must have been largely reduced to the formality of signing a pre-arranged agreement.

22. See, for example, the entry book of the auditor for the North parts of the Duchy of Lancaster, DL42/135. Many examples of alterations in particulars are to be found, e.g. E315/198 p. 61; E310/4/32/87; E310/3/20/4,13,14 and 17.

23. E310/31/185/1 (dated 1562).

24. E310/32/193/38 (dated 1563).

The paramount importance of the local office becomes the more apparent the closer one looks at the many leases of Elizabeth's reign. There was a marked tendency for chantry property to fall into disrepair and the auditor became an intermediary between crown and tenants, on the one hand informing the crown of the state of the property, and on the other, pleading (especially as prices rose steeply) for generous terms to encourage a client to accept a lease. In some cases the local memoranda amount to little less than an outright pleading of the client's cause before the crown. For example, one Yorkshire surveyor begged in 1584 on behalf of a tenant, Richard Robinson:-

that yt woulde please your honour in consideration of his poore estate and the greate costes and charges wich hee have ben at in defendinge his right, to graunte hym a lease hereof without fyne. 25.

The last word lay with the commissioners in London, but they saw the need to dispose of property that was costly to maintain in good order, and can have had no qualms in complying with the auditor's requests.²⁶

The Yorkshire records abound with references to decaying chantry and collegiate property. Land adjoining the coast at Leven²⁷ had been insufficiently defended against the tides and become waterlogged by the mid - 1560's. It was therefore passed in a lease for the generous term of 60 years, and with no entry fine: two great incentives to the lessee to make the

25. E310/32/192/9.

26. But they occasionally ignored calls for clemency. One tenant paid 4 yrs' fine despite decay (E310/29/170/45) and another, in 1581, had to pay 2 yrs' fine even though the land was flooded (E310/32/191/8).

27. A manor of Beverley college.

land return some reasonable rent for the future.²⁸ Much of the East coast suffered in this way, and the costs of keeping out the sea at Hornsey were successfully pleaded as a reason for the reduction of the entry fine to two years' rent on one lease.²⁹ In addition, there was land exposed to ravages of the weather, particularly on the Wolds, where there was 'neither wodde nor tymbre growinge,' and 'no maner of hay gotten, but the tenantes forced to bye for all their cattell.'³⁰

If the countryside suffered from exposure, the towns fared no better for all their compactness and shelter. One tenant at York had been ready to give the crown his land as a dead loss until Roue promised him aid in securing a lease, which was bound to be a more satisfactory solution for all parties.³¹ The great danger to the crown here, and in Doncaster in 1571³², was that the property would fall into such a state of decay that the crown would be left with no income at all, and no property worth disposing of either. In the face of such a threat, the auditor and surveyor had to exercise their persuasive talents to the full. Nowhere was the task more difficult than at Beverley where the town's governors could not be bullied into taking on a lease of

28. E310/29/170/56.

29. E310/29/171/56.

30. E310/27/162/13.

31. E310/27/162/12: 'the tenante....wolde have geven them upp into the quenes handes but that I promysed my furtheraunce in gettingehym a Lease', (dated 1568).

32. E310/31/183/9. Other Doncaster leases E310/27/162/69 and E310/29/171/66.

decrepit chantry property.³³ Time and again during the 1560's and 1570's the auditor tried to persuade them, but only succeeded in engaging a group of tenants to buy their own small plots piecemeal. It was not without justification, then, that he sighed,

I wolde wisshe that all her majesties landes
there myght be letten by lease. 34.

Another large lease was undertaken by tenants in 1582, but at length the town was prevailed upon, and in 1587 it took over the latter lease, obtaining very favourable terms: 60 years' tenure and no entry fine.³⁵

Decay was not the only ground on which an entry fine might be waived or reduced, and the term extended. There were, for example, some cases in which chantry revenue had initially been recorded as a yearly cash grant, or 'free' rent, not arising from lands,³⁶ - the least useful form of revenue for the crown since there was no hope of increasing the yield. If therefore, a client volunteered to prove the original statement false and show that the revenue did in fact arise from specific lands, his offer was gladly accepted, though he had to undertake the proof at his own expense and bear the costs of any actions that might arise should he trespass or make a false accusation. Informers and gamblers

-
33. e.g. E310/28/165/115: 'I have often tymes moved the governors of the towne to take all the Quenes majesties lands and howses to gether by Lease but they will not take them except they myght have all the decayes rent free,' (dated 1573).
34. E310/28/165/115; E310/29/171/67
35. E310/29/174/70. At Nottingham similarly, Barsey and Patten were prevailed upon in 1566 to take a lease of all the remaining decayed chantry property - E310/22/114 (15).
36. See Appendix IIb and c,

made reports on land belonging to several of the Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire chantries: St. Thomas's in All Saints, Pavement, York (1562); Kirkby Malhamdale (1565); Skelton Castle and Bingham (1575)³⁷ Moreover, when it became the fashion to root out concealed lands similar enterprises were launched with great temerity, again at the entrepreneur's own risk and expense, to prove lands concealed from the crown.³⁸ In the event of success in either of these measures, the informer could reasonably expect to secure a favourable lease of the premisses he reported.

After the early Edwardian period there were few lessees fortunate enough to avoid paying a fine altogether. One of the attractions of a lease from the crown's point of view was that it offered, in addition to yearly rent over a long period, the opportunity of this bonus whenever renewal was sought. The fine being generally calculated as some multiple of a year's rent, it followed that the higher the value of the lease, the higher that of the fine. If rents were to remain stable and be faithfully respected, the crown could only make leasing profitable by means of such fringe benefits, or by selling the reversion of a lease either to the heir of the

-
37. Respectively E310 nos. 27/162/5; 28/168/5; 29/171/34; 22/115/69. The first is typical: 'Itt appearythe by the Recorde of this Chauntrye That this xij^s iiij^d ys A ffree rent goynge out of the premisses. Nevertheles yt is verye Lyckelye that the said tenement with th^e appurtenance oughte to be the Quenes majesties inheritance. The informer, James Leppyngton, offerethe all his costes & charges to prove the same...to be her highnes inheritance.'
38. E310/22/114/7 (dated 1570). 'The procurer herof will defende the Quenes majesties tytle if it will please your honours to graunte hym a lease of the premisses withoute anie ffine paininge.' Similar grants at numbers 27/162/26; 30/177/15; 31/188/43.

lessee or to some other person - the result in either case being an incentive to the tenant to yield his lease after perhaps fourteen or fifteen years, to ensure that it was renewed to his liking, and not bought by a rival over his head, or left in suspense by his death. Most reversions on chantry property were bought by heirs or co-tenants because there was nothing to appeal greatly to rivals.

Among the Edwardian leases of chantry property I have inspected there was none with a fine higher than a single year's rent, a very modest figure perhaps deliberately held out by the crown as an incentive to the small man, and with the hope of rapidly passing a lease, and thus allëviating the burden on its own collectors and bailiffs as soon as possible. For it was not like saving up for a purchase and having to pay twenty years rent or so. Here was the opportunity, for a down-payment of a year's rent, to embark on 21 years' undisputed tenure. Since the rent payable to the crown after the dissolution was the same as that paid to the chantry priest before, and since crown rents tended to remain static, crown lessees could have a good bargain.³⁹

Under Mary there are too few figures to allow of a general statement on fines, though the fines in our area do not seem to be a complete number of years' rent. Yet under Elizabeth, the system of estimating fines as a multiple of a year's rent re-appears, and just as we noted a steep rise in rates for the

39. The crown made a profit on the fines for entry, but not by raising rents.

sale of land in her reign, so the entry fines on leases rise beyond the Edwardian level. In the case of some concealed land of a gild at Sutton-on-Galtres in 1563, the fine was as high as seven years' rent, but this was abnormal. In leases for our area in the period 1558-1563 I have observed 2 with a fine of 6 yrs., 12 at 5 yrs. and 24 at 4 yrs. rent. But these high levels prevailed only for a short time, and tenants seeking renewal of existing leases later in the reign did not again face such heavy fines.⁴⁰ All the leases in this period up to 1563 are for 21 yrs. save one of 20 yrs.⁴¹

It must be remembered that the lessee was not free to do as he wished with his property, but remained responsible to the crown for its upkeep. Therefore property let by the crown should ideally have ceased to be a burden on the administration, any repair being the responsibility of the lessee, who at the end of his term was expected to answer for any deterioration.⁴² For this reason the tenant was allowed to cut sufficient wood,

ut habet sufficientem maerem et housebote pro
reparacione necnon hedgebote, firebote, ploughbote
& cartebote. 43.

but all woods surplus to these requirements (usually few on chantry properties) were separately listed and had to be left intact. We have seen how difficult the problem of repairs could

40. 2 or 3 years' became the normal fine.

41. One Duchy lease was later queried because it was for more than 21 years - see DL41/29/4, Sir Thomas Holcroft's Ripon prebends.

42. Whereas property still administered by the crown was a burden - see below, Chapter X

43. LRL/170 f. 122 v.

be in remote areas.

Where a lease was obtained by one tenant on behalf of himself and his neighbours another condition might be entered in the lease that he must grant them individual leases. Many other leases carried a standard proviso not to expel the sitting tenants (where these were not themselves the lessees). But it is quite impossible to assess the extent to which these provisions were enforced, for by the time we reach the lowest rungs on the ladder of sub-tenancies we are far below the level of recorded history. There are isolated complaints which bring some cases of apparent exploitation to light in the courts,⁴⁴ but for the rest even the change of a tenant from one document to the next in any series is no necessary indicator of expulsion, for Death was a regular caller in the 16th century village, and mobility cannot be excluded.

Payment of the fine and prompt payment of rent were the other principal conditions of the grant. Rent was collected at fixed feast days often Michaelmas and Easter or the Annunciation, after which the tenant had a maximum of 40 days grace before he could expect the bailiff to call.⁴⁵ In all but three cases I have been able to find record of payment, 12 beforehand (from one to twenty-five days) and 7 afterwards by up to one month. It is not possible from such figures to detect any general pattern or apparent regulation of the period

44. e.g. Beverley DDCC 139/65 f. 71 where a tenant reports eviction.

45. See, inter alia, C.P.R. I Eliz., 444.

in which the fine itself had to be paid, save that it is unlikely that payment could have been deferred much beyond a month and the lease guaranteed. Certainly no clear pattern of prior payments such as we found for the purchases can be discovered. Since all those payments made on the day of enrolment were for leases to the sitting tenants, and another tenant paid only two days before enrolment, it may be that the clients were themselves in London for the deal, or else had appointed attorneys for a short term to transact the business as quickly and as cheaply as possible.⁴⁶

For the reigns of Mary and Elizabeth I have been unable to make similar comparisons. Exhaustive searches of the Tellers' Rolls have failed to produce evidence of the payment of fines for the majority of leases and no simple explanation is apparent. I can find no evidence that payment was made to any other person, and there are no surviving bonds of obligation which would prove payment, possibly because the bonds were destroyed once the obligations had been fulfilled.

Having surveyed the procedure for leases over a long period, we must now turn back to the time just after the dissolution to observe what part leases had in the immediate landed settlement.

Whilst they must be treated together, the documents are of three broad categories. First, those in which the crown chose to lease or farm land specifically as an alternative to selling it. Secondly, those in which the crown found

46. But Stephen Guye, tenant at Thirsk, paid 20 days after enrolment, and 4 other tenants paid in advance by 6, 12, 13 and 17 days.

an interim farmer for the lands until someone could be prevailed upon to buy. Finally those in which the crown, simply because it stepped directly into the shoes of the chantry priests, granted leases or renewals of leases merely to preserve the status quo, but with no intention that these lands be exempt from sale. We shall see that it is by no means easy to distinguish between these types of document, and in particular to draw the line between those lands the crown deliberately withheld from sale, and those it was wanting to sell, but unable to dispose of.

4. The Duchy of Lancaster Leases

Since the Duchy leases almost all fall neatly into the first category they deserve separate treatment. The crown had excluded the ancient demesne and the Duchies of Lancaster and Cornwall from the competence of the commissioners for sale of chantry lands unless specific permission were obtained for such sales.⁴⁷ Whilst this did not prevent a considerable amount of Duchy land being sold, it becomes apparent from a study of the leases that the crown was determined to preserve as much as it could from the plunder. A large portion of Duchy of Lancaster

47. For Duchy complaints of falling revenue, and the crown's attempt to check this by preserving land, see Haigh p. 126.

chantry land was copyhold, and will be separately discussed below, but for the remainder, the lands were absorbed at the dissolution and placed under the responsibility of the Receiver, William Mallet, who rendered account for them until some farming policy might be worked out.⁴⁸ From the earliest opportunity, farmers were appointed, though there is nothing in the documents to indicate whether these men were given chantries to farm in return for services, or whether they sued for the privilege themselves. Some 'perks' must have been expected, notably the chance to 'adjust' the rents and fines of the sitting tenants whilst rendering only a fixed sum to the crown, but this was evidently considered more desirable than leaving the collection of rents to the Receiver's men. There is no mention of an entry fine in the Duchy farms, and the status of the farmers suggests that this concession was itself one of the rewards of office, yet some care was taken in selecting farmers, for the documents were not all issued at once, but spread over a long period, with a marked concentration in June - July or November - February, depending on the sittings of the Duchy Court, and suiting the administrative convenience of commencing payments for leases from one of the recognised feasts.

Table XVIII shows details of all known Duchy leases in the area in Edward's reign, whilst Table XIX lists the sureties chosen by various lessees to guarantee their payment of rent, as shown by the bonds of obligation, which

48. See Receivers' Accounts DL 29/8945 etc.

have survived for the Duchy alone. The list of verifiable lessees (Table XVIII) is not quite identical with the list of putative lessees among the bonds (Table XIX). Of the latter there were 37, 8 of whom styled themselves 'of London Yeoman'. Only one lessee, Robert Bates, is identifiable as a lawyer, though 2 others appear as sureties. Otherwise, a large group held major or minor offices under the crown⁴⁹: George Bane ('of the household, Yeoman') was a groom of the Privy Chamber, and John Maud a gentleman of the household. Thomas Boswell was deputy steward of the honour of Tickhill; Sir Thomas Holcroft Receiver General of the Duchy; John Holmes feodary of Pontefract; William Layton surveyor of Duchy Woods; Richard Whalley Augmentations Receiver for Yorkshire, and John Wright constable for Leicester. William Thorpe was a groom of the Privy Chamber who bought the site of Acaster College. Thomas Tusser was almost certainly the famous court musician and writer of the treatise on husbandry who made his way to fame through the patronage of Paget.⁵⁰ George Grimesditch may have been a relative of one by the same surname who was bailiff of Halton fee in the Duchy. And could Edward Moody ('yeoman') perhaps be the same man who, until his death in 1552, was water-bailiff of Dover?⁵¹ Finally, William Blage and John Goodwin identify themselves as London merchants.

(*text cont. after Tables)

49. For most of the identification that follows, see Somerville, Duchy of Lancaster, I.347 et. seq.

50. D.N.B.: 'TUSSER'.

51. C.P.R. IV Edward VI 321.

Table XVIII : The Duchy of Lancaster Leases, 1548-1553

(Where a parish only had one recorded chantry, only the name of the parish or chapel is given. Where there was more than one chantry, the institution in question is identified by the standard abbreviations explained in the Appendix.) All leases for 21 years, with no fine. Ripon college excluded. Fractions of a penny omitted.

Chantry	Lessee	clear yearly value of land leased	Date
1. Misterton	Thornhill, Robt.	4.15. 8	8 June 48
2. Aberford, BVM	Mawd, John	11.18. 0	3 July 48
3. Pontefract, preb. de Luce	Kyne, William	13. 5. 4	3 July 48
4. Leeds, BVM	Bane, George	6.19. 8	4 July 48
5. Owston, Harrison	Holmes, John	3. 5. 7	8 July 48
" BVM	"	2. 5.10	"
" JE	"	2. 4. 1	"
6. Pontefract, preb. de Potterton	Regnalds, John	13. 3. 4	10 July 48
7. Batley, A	Aprice, Edward	3.15. 8	8 Nov. 48
8. Haddlesay, Genne	Wright, John	5. 3. 2	10 Dec. 48
9. Pontefract, d. of St Clement	Jackson, Richard	6.10. 0	10 Dec. 48
10. Brompton	Astmore, William	5. 3. 6	12 Dec. 48
1. Pontefract, HT college (site)	Layton, William	1. 0. 0	16 Dec. 48
2. Fryston, BVM	Lock, Humphry	3.15. 0	20 Dec. 48
3. Purston Jaglin	Eggleston, William	3.18. 0	22 Dec. 48
4. Farnley (Leeds)	Chippendale, Thos. & Bowling, Ric.	11. 7. 4	n. d. 1548
5. Osgodby	Yewle, Ralph	4. 0. 8	2 Jan. 49
6. Badsworth, BVM	Paget, Thos.	4. 5. 0	12 Jan. 49
" A	"	5. 4. 6	"
7. Barnborough	Tamkin, Rich.	3. 0. 6	12 Jan. 49
8. Birstal	Beckwith, Thos.	4. 1. 9	12 Jan. 49
9. Methley	Clayton, Henry	3. 0. 2	25 Jan. 49
10. Middleton (Rothwell)	Blage, William	4. 8. 1	25 Jan. 49
1. Wragby, K	Maddock, Fulk	3.13. 4	25 Jan. 49
2. Haselwood, N.	Taylor, Henry	5.13. 8	29 Jan. 49
3. Adwick	Grimesditch, Geo.	4. 7.10	3 Feb. 49
3. Whitgift	"	3.19. 4	"
4. Melton	Charlton, Edward	6.10. 2	4 Feb. 49
5. Rothwell, SAV	Cawdrey, John	5. 8. 0	20 Feb. 49
6. Huddersfield, HT	Goodwin, John	4.19.10	24 Feb. 49
7. Pontefract, d. of St Clement	Lyttle, Thomas	19.15. 4	25 Feb. 49
8. Kellington	Fairman, Swithun	6.10. 0	26 Feb. 49
9. Sprotborough, 'Ancres'	Whalley, Richd.	9.17. 9	10 Mar. 49
10. Tickhill, HT-G	Tusser, Thos.	5. 9. 1	22 May 49
" HC-G	"	6. 5. 0	"
1. Leeds, K	Chippendale, Thos.	6. 8	12 June 49
2. Rothwell BVM(S)	Thorpe, William	4. 6. 0	26 Nov. 49
3. "	"	6. 0. 9	28 Nov. 49
4. Wath, N	Kenyon, William	2.13. 2	4 Dec. 49
5. Darrington	Smalman, Thos.	5.7.11	n. d. 1549
6. PonEefract, Rushworth	Calverd, William	3. 0. 6	16 May 50

(Cont. on next sheet)

(Table XVIII cont.)

37. Whitkirk, HT	Bates, Robert	1.14. 2	16 May 50
38. Tickhill, H	Boswell, Thos.	5. 3. 1	20 May 50
" BVM	"	7.14. 5	"
39. Pickering	Taylor, Henry	6. 8. 4	2 Mar 51
"	"	3. 0. 2	"
40. Barnsley JB & JE	Bosville, Ralph	10.18. 5	n. d.1551

Table XIX : The sureties for certain Duchy lessees.

On most leases of Duchy property, guarantors were required to submit bonds on behalf of the lessees. A book of such 'security bonds' has survived (DL24/1) and from it the following references have been taken. The numbers at the left of each entry refer to the corresponding leases shown in Table XVIII above, and where the status or residence of lessee and guarantor is given in the bonds, this has been set out in the lists which follow the key below. The numbers to the right of each entry refer to the identification lists below, which include both lessees and guarantors (in alphabetical order).

		Lessee Guar.					L Guar.		
No.	Chantry	No.	I	II	No.	Chantry	No.	I	II
1.	Misterton	80	66	31	21.	Wragby K	55	7	33
2.	Aberford	57	56	46	22.	Haselwood	79	45	8
3.	not represented				23.	Whitgift	40	41	19
4.	Leeds, BVM	9	61	76	24.	Melton	29	11	42
5.	not represented				25.	Rothwell SAV	22	9	27
6.	not represented				26.	Huddersfield	39	72	52
7.	Batley, A	1.	29.	77	27.	not represented			
8.	Haddlesay	89	63	75	28.	Kellington	34	47	14
9.	not represented				29.	'Ancres'	87	88	68
10.	Brompton	4	36	62	30.	Tickhill HC-G	84	83	82
11.	Pontefract coll.	50	2.	38	31.	Leeds, K not represented			
12.	Fryston	53.	47	70	32.	Rothwell, BVM	81	22	5
13.	Osgodby	90	35	77	33.	"	"	"	"
14.	Farnley (Leeds)	24	15	50	34.	not represented			
15.	Purston Jaglin	32	1	15	35.	not represented			
16.	Badsworth, BVM	64	11	32	36.	not represented			
"	A	"	"	"	37.	Whitkirk	12	73	74
17.	not represented				38.	Tickhill (2)	17	60	49
18.	Birstal, BVM	13	29	64	39.	not represented			
19.	not represented				40.	not represented.			
20.	Middleton(Rothwell)	14	69	67					

The following additional sureties have been found, for parts of Ripon college (excluded from Table XVIII,) and for other institutions for which I have found no record of a lease :-

41. Ripon, T	29	1	64	46. Haselwood	25	16	26
42. Ripon, preb. Stanwick	44	37	18	47. Osgodby	71	48	28
43. Ripon, WILF	21	51	20	48. Royston	10	65	30
44. Ripon, JE & MM	3	43	86	49. 'Nidd' Chapel	54	85	6
45. Ripon, HT	58	78	59				

Continued Overleaf

(Table XIX cont.)

A list of the persons involved either as lessees or as sureties in the Duchy of Lancaster book of security bonds, as tabulated on the previous page :-

1. Aprice, Edward, of London, yeo.
2. Arscot, John, of Middle Temple, esq.
3. Askham, Anthony, of Kirk Deighton (Yorks),gt.
4. Astmore, William, of Hallow, Worcs. , yeo
5. Atherton, Robert, of London, gent.
6. Backhouse, Adam, of Ripon, clerk
7. Bagnoll, William , of London, yeo.
8. Bailey, Henry, of Aldenham, Herefs, yeo.
9. Bane, George, groom of the Privy Chamber
10. Bank, James, of Maltby (Yorks), gt.
11. Barnborough, Augustine, of London, gt.
12. Battes, Robert, of Middle Temple, gt.
13. Beckwith, Thomas, of London, yeo.
14. Blage, William, of London, gt.
15. Bolling, Richard, of London, yeo.
16. Bonde, Thomas, of Thistleworth, Middx, yeo.
17. Boswell, Thomas, of Tickhill (Yorks), gt.
18. Braddell, John, of Whalley, gt.
19. Bull, Robert. of London, gt.
20. Calverd, Thomas, of London, yeo.
21. Calverd, William, of London, gt.
22. Cawdrey, John, of Leeds, yeo.
23. Charlton, Edward, of London, gt.
24. Chippendale, Thomas, of London, yeo.
25. Clayton, Henry, of London, yeo.
26. Clayton, Lawrence, of High Roding, Essx, clerk
27. Darley, William, of Whitkirk, yeo.
28. Downes, Thomas, of Pockleton (Pocklington ?), gt.
29. Downes, William, of London, gent. or yeo.
30. Duffield, Robert, of Castleton.
31. Ebdon, Richard, of London, tailor.
- 32/33 (probably identical): Eccleston/Eggleston, William, of London, yeo.
34. Fairman, Swithun, of London, gt.
35. Fludd, Robert, of London, yeo.
36. Forsett, William, of London, gt.
37. Gerrard, Gilbert, of Grey's Inn, gent.
38. Gilbert, William, of London, yeo.
39. Goodwin, John, of London, gt.
40. Grimesditch, George, of London, gt.
41. Groves, Roger, of London, gt.
42. Harrison, George, of London, gt.
43. Hill, Peter, of London, stationer
44. Holcroft, Sir Thomas, of Vale Royal, Cheshire
45. Huskins, John, of London, brewer
46. Johnson, Anthony, of London, yeo.
47. Kyne, William, of London, gt.
48. Lacy, Marmaduke, of Fulketon, gt.
49. Lambert, Roger, of Tickhill (Yorks), yeo.
50. Layton, William, of London, gt.
51. Leke, William, of Topcliffe (Yorks), gt.
52. Little, Thomas, of London, gt.
53. Locke, Humphrey, of Winkfield, Berks, yeo.
54. Lutie, Thomas, of Inde (Yorks), clerk.
55. Maddocke, Fulke, of London, yeo.
56. Mawde, Anthony, of York, gt.
57. Mawde, John, of the Household, gent.
58. Modie, Edward, yeo.
59. Newton, Edward, gt.
60. Norris, Christopher, of Tickhill (Yorks), yeo.

(Cont. on next sheet

(Table XIX cont.)

61. Norton, Nicholas, of London, grocer.
62. Paget, Hugh, of Worcester, yeo.
63. Paget, John, of Wentbridge (Yorks), gt.
64. Paget, Thomas, of Wentbridge (Yorks), gt.
65. Peck, John, of Doncaster, gt.
66. Peck, William, of Hull, vintner
67. Philipps, John, of London, fletcher
68. Philipps, William, of London, yeo.
69. Ponder, Simon, of London, pewterer
70. Potter, John, of London, yeo.
71. Raysinge, Roger, of Malton (Yorks), gt.
72. Saunders, Blaise, of London, merchant
73. Scothorpe, Thomas, of Leavening (Yorks), gt.
74. Settell, Robert, of Barwick (Yorks), gt.
75. Stringer, William, of London, yeo.
76. Sutton, Robert, of London, servant.
77. Tamkyn, Richard, of London, yeo.
78. Tankard, Edward, gt.
79. Taylor, Henry, of Isleham, Cambs., yeo.
80. Thornhill, Robert, of Walkeringham, (Notts),
81. Thorpe, William, of London, esq.
82. Tusser, Andrew, of Islington, Middx., gt.
83. Tusser, Clement, of 'Rewynsall', Essx., gt.
84. Tusser, Thomas, of London, gt.
85. Vavasor, Richard, of Nafferton (Yorks), gt.
86. Wayteman, Thomas, of London, stationer
87. Whalley, Richard, of London, esq.
88. Whalley, Walter, of London, salter
89. Wright, John, of London, gt.
90. Yewle, Ralph, of London, yeo.

Whilst this does not account for everyone, it shows that there was a distinct cadre of London and household patronage, at work, and that they were a close-knit group is further borne out by their interchange of sureties. Eccleston, taking the farm of the chantry at Purston Jaglin took as his sureties Messrs. Aprice and Bowling, who were both on the list of lessees. Bowling and Chippendale took a joint lease at Farnley, whilst Eccleston appeared as a surety for Maddocke at Wragby and for Paget at Badsworth. Paget in turn, supported Beckwith at Birstall and Wright at Haddlesay, and so on. Only seven of the lessees recorded in the book are described as living within the diocese, and one of these was a Duchy Official (Boswell) whilst all the others have Londoners as sureties save Bank.

Londoners or not, these men appear to have taken their responsibilities as farmers seriously if the Ministers Accounts are to be believed, for a check of those accounting to the Receiver, Mallet, in the first year of Mary's reign⁵² shows 27 of the chantry accounts being answered in person by farmers identical to those in table XVIII. For the rest, Mallet's own name appears, but this does not indicate that the farmer was not himself responsible, for it became increasingly common to reduce work by merely entering all payments under the Receiver's name. Few of these farms were

52. DL 29/8948.

renewed to the original recipients when the first term expired, which shows how the crown used the Duchy lands to give each successive generation of aspiring suitors some reward. If and when they made their way to the top they would be glad to drop these minor assets which cannot have been easy to collect year by year. John Holmes, the exception to prove the rule, obtained two consecutive renewals of his leases of the chantries at Owston and was proud enough of the achievement to cease styling himself 'of London,' and begin to use the variant 'of Owston.'⁵³ But in the later leases of Elizabeth's reign the farms seem to have gone increasingly to tenants rather than to remote courtiers as the latter's term expired.

Despite the policy of widespread farming, by 1563 less than half the Duchy's land in the diocese seems to have been thus disposed of, which suggests that either there were no candidates prepared to take on the duty, or else the crown was deliberately holding much of the Duchy in reserve for future rewards for service, or even for sale if the need arose. I have suggested that purchasers were less likely to show an interest in property which was heavily encumbered by leases and farms, and the simple expedient of retaining some land in direct crown control ensured a supply of fluid capital for an emergency. The Duchy lands, however, proved to be among the most durable, and were still being separately accounted in 1759.⁵⁴

53. DL42/33 f 412 v and DL 42/35 f. 205.

54. Below, Chapter XI.

Of the Edwardian leases in Table XVIII, all but 6 represent farms of the complete lands of the institution in question. At Owston a small plot of Harrison's chantry (otherwise leased to Holmes) was sold in 1549 in the name of one Thomas Worrall. One of this surname appears in the 1546 Certificates as the recipient of a free rent issuing from the property, so it may be that he was buying back a small portion that he or his ancestors had bestowed on the chantry.⁵⁵ It was not to be expected that the whole of the college at Pontefract be farmed, for its lands were scattered, and much of its foundation preserved: William Layton leased only the site. At Barnborough, Leigh and Bate bought such of the property as was not included in Tamkyn's lease. With Warner, they also bought part of St. Saviour's chantry at Rothwell, the rest of which was leased to John Cawdrey. The revenue of the chantry of St. Katherine at Leeds and that of Holy Trinity at Whitkirk consisted largely of free rents, and these were not farmed. These six cases apart, it was the crown's policy to farm all or nothing of each chantry.

Very little leasing of Duchy property was attempted between March 1551 and the beginning of Elizabeth's reign when most of the original farms expired. But Elizabeth took the opportunity to lease some more Duchy lands for the first time, and as the reign progressed farmers were found

55. Y.C.S. I., 173.

for the more complex and less attractive units such as the obit and light lands⁵⁶ and eventually the scattered concealments.⁵⁷

5. Leases outside the Duchy

Outside the Duchy the analysis of leases is necessarily more complex, because the crown had no such consistent policy of withholding lands from sale and using the farms of single chantries to reward minor suitors. Since we have no competent register of the leasehold lands inherited by the crown from the cantarists, it is quite impossible to assess how much chantry land was leased altogether by the end of Edward's reign, for the post-dissolution leases granted by Edward himself tell only part of the story. Non-fraudulent leases in existence in 1547 were, as we have seen, recognised as valid by the crown, and there was no necessity for the holders to seek renewal because of the dissolution. Indeed, a comparison of the leases issued by Edward with those known to have existed before the dissolution reveals that very few leaseholders took the trouble to seek confirmation of their title.

56. DL 42/33 p. 474 v., Edward Hutchinson undertakes a lease of lands thus bestowed in Pickeringlythe (1564).

57. DL 42/36 p. 111 Thomas Phillips receives Duchy concealments totalling £90 p.a. (33 Eliz.).

How far may we regard post-dissolution leases issued by Edward as purely routine matters? After all, with the acquisition of so many lands, there were bound to be some tenures expiring and some vacant by the death of the previous holder. Therefore, as long as the crown retained the property it was responsible for issuing fresh leases. On the other hand, how far was leasing and farming regarded as a specific alternative to selling the lands? Rents had to be collected somehow as long as chantry lands remained in crown hands, and it would materially ease the job of the collector if he had to deal only with one farmer per chantry instead of all the individual tenants. Unhappily, the answers to these questions remain highly speculative, though the acquisition of a lease from the crown did not guarantee to the lessee that the land would not subsequently be sold by the crown to another landlord. In some small degree, therefore, the Table of Leases issued by Edward VI is overshadowed by that of Patents for sale, since the two processes were concurrent, and lands leased one month might be sold the next, so that the lessee would have to face a new landlord.

Let us first examine those post-dissolution leases which appear to justify classification as 'routine' for the reasons outlined above. During Edward's reign many leases were issued to persons stated within them to be tenants of the property in question, or some part of it. Some like William Addison of Stokesley, Alexander Colyer of Thirsk, Ralph Wash of Melsonby or Cuthbert Coxson of Doncaster, took

leases only of their own tenements.⁵⁸ Others took wider leases: for example, Thomas Quyver of Kildwick, though tenant of land yielding only 6/- p.a. took a lease worth an annual total of £3. 7. 11, and Richard Richardson, tenant of a plot yielding 3/4 p.a. to St. Sepulchre's chapel, York, secured a lease worth £8. 19. 2.⁵⁹ In such cases the nominal lessee may well have been acting on behalf of his fellow tenants, as was certainly the case when Henry Wood and Richard Ampleford leased the whole of the known chantry land at Stainburn for £13. 3. 0.⁶⁰ Altogether well over a quarter of all known leases for the area between 1548 and 1553 are positively stated to have gone to the sitting tenants, and the figure may be very much higher if many of the remaining nominal lessees were not working on their own behalf. We know, for example, that William Mudd 'alias Muddeley of London yeoman' who leased land worth £2. 4. 0. p.a. belonging to the chantry of Our Lady of Pity at Spofforth on 28 April 1553, had sold his interest a full month before the enrolment to another yeoman, William Foster, who in turn sold out to the sitting tenants, Christopher Kynghtson and John Suttly.⁶¹ As a general guide, the smaller the yearly value of the lease, the greater the likelihood that it goes to the tenant.

58. Appendix VIa nos. 28, 37, 70, 6.

59. Ibid. nos. 5, 32. Richardson already farmed these lands on the eve of the dissolution and here only renewed his lease: See E315/221 f 229 v.

60. Appendix VIa no. 38, stated to be for the tenants.

61. Ibid. No. 67. For the conveyance, E210/D.9668.

There was a remarkable degree of stability in tenure despite the dissolution, and undoubtedly it gave some tenants the opportunity to buy their freehold. We have already noted some examples in connection with the sales, but further hints are to be found among the leases. Thus John Sutton, who already owned some land in the archdeaconry of Richmond, took two leases of chantry property there in 1552-3⁶². By the end of Mary's reign nobody had bought the freehold from the crown, and Sutton was then able to buy the land he had previously leased.⁶³ Cuthbert Coxson and James Stokes of Doncaster who each leased some chantry property in 1551 may have been the ultimate purchasers when the same plots were sold in 1553, though their names do not appear among the surviving conveyances.⁶⁴ Similarly we find the leasehold of John Yewle at Sherburn and Alex Colyer at Thirsk among later purchases.⁶⁵

Two further documents might be classified as routine. The Marquis of Northampton renewed his pre-dissolution farm of the chantry of Maud Marmion at Tanfield, and Walter Wolflet took similar precautions for his prebendal lease of Barmby in Howden College.⁶⁶ These, taken with the known tenant - leases, already account for over £116 p.a. of a total for all known Edwardian leases in the area of £753 p.a.

62. Appendix VIa nos. 63, 69.

63. C.P.R. IV Mary, 41, 279 and appropriate particulars.

64. Appendix VIa nos. 6, 52. Also Table of Patents nos. 60, 68.

65. Appendix VIa nos. 36, 37. Patents 80, 66. John Skinner (Lease 24) a yeoman of the bodyguard, obtained the farm of Tinsley chantry and later purchased it (Patent 80).

66. Appendix VIa nos. 31, 49.

Almost all the remainder consists of farms of substantial plots of land, over £525 p.a. being accounted for by farms of collegiate land. In part, we have a situation approaching that in the Duchy of Lancaster, with land, once let to farm, not coming on the market for sale. This was a cheap and easy way of rewarding faithful service, particularly in the army or the civil administration. But in a few cases, parts of the land which had passed to such farmers were soon sold off, suggesting that the farm was only intended as a temporary expedient pending sale.⁶⁷ We noted that Cuthbert Musgrave acquired the prebend of Skelton at Howden at the express wish of the crown and without paying a penny.⁶⁸ This remained his throughout the reign, and beyond, and he also applied for the farm of the rest of the college, (except the prebend of Barmby, already taken by Wolflet,) and in this case, several parts of the property were subsequently sold.⁶⁹ Nearby at Hemingbrough, Christopher Salmon, a groom of the Privy Chamber, obtained a farm of the whole college, and once again parts of it were sold before the reign was out.⁷⁰

Sir Michael Stanhope again appears, now taking a farm of a large portion of the provostry at Beverley⁷¹. Other important officials also helped to farm the colleges: Thomas Eynns, the Northumberland Receiver, at Lowthorpe⁷²; Robert Gough, the

67. The Ministers' Accounts (SC6) also record that many pre-dissolution farmers, particularly at Beverley, continued to account.

68. Above p. 171

69. Musgrave's lease is only recorded in B.M. Harley 605, not in the main Augmentations series. He may himself have bought some of the property.

70. Above p. 152 Patent 73.

71. Appendix VIa no. 1. For other Beverley leases, nos. 44, 50, 55.

72. Ibid. no. 13.

Nottinghamshire Receiver, and one of his collectors, William Eaton, at Southwell;⁷³ Walter Whalley, (acting on behalf of his brother, the Yorkshire Receiver,) at Rotherham.⁷⁴

Nor were the collegiate lands the only reward for crown servants. Robert Thornhill, a servant of Somerset and a Nottinghamshire gentleman in his own right, obtained the farm of three chantries at Missen and Misterton.⁷⁵ Lawrence Witherell, who farmed the chantry at Bishopthorpe, was a yeoman almoner of the King,⁷⁶ and Robert Mackerell, farming the chantry at Cornborough (Sheriff Hutton) was a messenger in the Court of Augmentations.⁷⁷ John Sawghwell, William Fairfax and Richard Fisher, though otherwise of minor import, also received farms through the patronage of Somerset.⁷⁸ All these farms, obviously awarded for service, were immune from purchase under Edward VI, though this was not always the case. For example Robert Bellingham, an officer of the Hull garrison, secured the farm of the chantry at Yokefleet, which was very soon sold to Wolflet.⁷⁹

The drawing of meaningful conclusions from such disparate evidence cannot be easy. Yet it is notable that no syndicates such as we encountered in the purchasing process were interested in leases, and that each lease or farm was of a compact block of lands. Those recipients who

73. Ibid. nos. 34, 65, 62.

74. Ibid. no. 53.

75. Ibid. no. 10. Thornhill also appears in Patent 17, and Table XVIII.

76. E310/4/32 no. 55. See also original list of Somerset's clients, above p. Appendix VIa no. 17.

77. E310/4/32 no. 18. (App. VIa no. 33): no fine because of his costs in travelling on business.

78. Appendix VIa nos. 4 & 16; 11; 14.

79. Ibid. 15. For Bellingham cf. above, Table

***TABLE**

Table XX : The range of lease values, 1548-1553.

(From the leases for the area, excluding those for the Duchy of Lanc.)

*Totals are clear yearly values as expressed in the leases.

<u>Value of lease</u> <u>p.a.</u>	<u>Number of</u> <u>leases at this</u> <u>value</u>	<u>Total value</u>
£50 and over	4	328. 3. 10
£20 and under £50	5	142. 16. 10
£10 " " £20	5	60. 2. 0
£ 8 " " £10	5	43. 4. 6
£ 6 " " £ 8	8	54. 19. 3
£ 4 " " £ 6	10	52. 16. 6
£2 " " £ 4	19	55. 4. 1
£1 " " £ 2	10	11. 14. 5
10/- " " £ 1	4	3. 2. 6
Under 10/-	4	1. 4. 2
Total	<u>74</u>	<u>752. 8. 1</u>

were not tenants were very largely minor crown servants, and in this respect, far from squandering the resources of the chantries, the crown judiciously farmed them out, retaining a yearly revenue, albeit fixed. There is a remarkable absence of identifiable local gentry whom we occasionally met in the purchases.⁸⁰ In short, there is every indication that the chantry and collegiate lands aroused little major interest in the diocese, and the immediate market was small. Nevertheless, the extent of post-dissolution leasing demands that this aspect of the chantry settlement receive more attention from historians, who have tended to regard the whole settlement solely in terms of sales. Above all, continuity of tenure is everywhere noticeable, and this must have been a primary factor in the smooth passing of the chantries.⁸¹

6. Copyhold Land

A further aspect of the post-dissolution landed settlement which has been completely neglected by historians is the fate of those copyhold lands which had supported chantries.⁸² Chantries thus endowed were, of course, dissolved with the rest, but in the second Chantry Act the crown specifically excluded the copyhold land from confiscation.⁸³ Nobody has sought to discover what became of the sums paid by copyholders to chantry priests.

80. cf Haigh op. cit; 137: lessees of Lancashire monastic property also of lower status than purchasers.

81. For leases 1553-1563 see Appendix VIb.

82. One lone query was raised in 1929 but never answered, Notes & Queries, vol. 157. p. 295.

The status of the copyholder before the law has recently been the subject of much detailed research,⁸⁴ but while Gray came to the conclusion that protection at Common Law only came during the sixteenth century,⁸⁵ Kerridge, starting from the work of Coke, has shown that from as early as the fourteenth century copyholders had been achieving effective defence at Common Law by instigating proceedings of trespass against a landlord who chose to evict them without clear justification.⁸⁶ The crown would doubtless have preferred to see such disputes settled as a purely domestic affair within the manorial courts, which ought to have been the proper venue, yet it did not deny access to the Common Law courts, nor to the Equity courts when impartial settlement was deemed impossible at a manorial level.⁸⁷

Whatever the earlier history of the security of copyholders, it is clear that by the middle of the sixteenth century much had been achieved, and the crown showed itself willing to intervene directly to further their cause. Thus, when the Earl of Northumberland

83. Stat. 1 Edw. VI c. 14 cl. 35.

84. C.M. Gray, Copyhold Equity and the Common Law and E. Kerridge, Agrarian Problems.

85. Gray op. cit., ch. 2. Kerridge, 60-4 et. seq.

86. Kerridge 69-70.

87. Ibid. 73-5.

was appointed chief steward of crown lands in the East Riding,⁸⁸ one of the terms of his appointment was the scrutiny of all purchases of land and of all changes of tenure in the area, in order to prevent the exploitation of copyholders. Mary was no less anxious to continue the work, for her commissioners for the sale of crown lands⁸⁹ were empowered to give first option to copyhold tenants who could afford to buy their own plots, and this process accelerated up to the beginning of the seventeenth century.⁹⁰

The Chantry Act must be seen against this background, but it was not solely motivated by concern for the tenants. For the confiscation of copyhold land would have brought the crown into conflict with many manorial authorities to whom the freehold of the land belonged, and the resulting tangle of customary rights would have created serious problems for the courts.

The problem only arose because of the situation, at first sight anomalous, whereby copyholders managed to incur obligations both to the lord of the manor and to a chantry priest, in circumstances often tantamount to the creation of a use. And it is only comprehensible if we remember that the profits to be drawn from a given piece of land greatly

88. C.P.R. IV Edward VI, 344.

89. B.M. Harley 608 f. 3r: 'a great commoditie maye growe unto us by the alyenatyng, sellynge and makinge freholde suche landes....as are holden of us by Copie of Courte Roll..... and yet to reserve the rentes accustomed to be payd.'

90. Kerridge 55. Campbell The English Yeoman, 144.

exceeded the customary rent due to the manor.⁹¹ But there are variations of procedure which demand explanation.

First of all, copyholders might form a parish gild whose members pooled their savings and finally raised enough money to buy their copyhold land from the manor. They retained their own tenements, but paid some of their profits to a chantry priest or stipendiary who had no estate in their land. The lord of the manor might effectively safeguard his interests by reserving a yearly rent to himself when he sold the property, and even if this equalled the customary rent of the former copyhold his claim would not have been unreasonable. The best example is the chantry at Hampsthwaite in the Lordship of Knaresborough, which the 1546 Chantry Certificate records as

Havyng no foundation other than by reason of a
guyld, whereunto the sayd parochians, wyth
divers other of theyre acqueyntaunce have resort
unto, and hadde, by reason therof, gathered so
moche money by processe of tyme, as they purchased
in londes and tenements of copyholde lande holden
of the Kynges Majestie for hys lordeshype of
Knaresburgh for the mayntenaunce of a pryste to
helpe the curate. 92.

The certificate goes on to note the sum of 39/2 payable by way of reserved rent to the king in the lordship of Knaresborough.

An alternative method of gaining control of the land for such purposes started with the formation of a group of copyholders as feoffees, but this time without the purchase of any land from the manor. Whilst paying their customary rents

91. See Appendix VIId.

92. Y.C.S. II. 237.

to the manor, they assigned their profits to a chantry priest as under the first arrangement, and by the device of an enfeoffment to his use, they ensured against the payment of entry fines at the change of each individual tenure, since the feoffees became a pseudo-corporation which never died, and thus the group-holding was never eligible for renewal. When one feoffee died his interest passed not to his heir, but to the other feoffees though they regularly appointed other members to the group as their numbers declined, to avoid the interest becoming concentrated in a few hands.⁹³ This is illustrated at Fryston by what the chantry commissioners reported of the chapel:

Ther is no incumbent belongyng to the sayd chapell, nor landes, but one close, beyng copieholde, gyven to certen feoffes by copie to th'entente the proufyttes therof shulde be bestowed of such prystes as shulde say masse there. 94.

But such a situation had emerged only by undue leniency on the part of the manorial authorities, including the crown itself. Copyhold land was never intended to be treated in this way, and the enfeoffment to use had by-passed the Statute of Mortmain, since it was not necessary to obtain a mortmain licence if the land never became the property of the church. Quite clearly in examples of the kind just cited the property was the feoffees' or the manor's

93. A.W.B. Simpson, 172.

94. Y.C.S. II. 221.

whilst the priest had no interest or estate in it save the yearly sum he was paid by the feoffees themselves. The rights of many manors would have been infringed had the crown confiscated in 1548 the freehold of all land bestowed on chantries in this way.⁹⁵

But the greatest landowner in our area was the crown itself, and particularly in the Duchy of Lancaster there was a heavy concentration of chantries supported from copyhold lands. In Yorkshire the Duchy lands comprised the honour of Pontefract and the lordships of Knaresborough, Ripon, Tickhill and Pickering with their constituent manors. Once it was decided to dissolve the chantries - with the provisos rehearsed above for copyhold lands - who was to receive the profits?

On 1st June, 1548, order was taken, and a patent issued under the Duchy Seal, explaining the immediate position as follows:-

many parcelles of landes, tenementes and Rentes holden by copie of Courte Roll of our sayde honors, Manors and Lordhippes have (contrarye to the polytyke lawes and statutes of this our Realme, and agaynste the custome of the same honors, manors and Lordhippes, and to our dysenheryson wythe the losse of oure fynes relieffes and other servyces) bene surrendred and gyven to feffes and otherwyse to the use of Chauntrey prystes and other Incorporacions mencioned in the late estatute whereby Collegis and Chauntreys wyth others were gyven to our possession. Nevertheless we are contented that

95. For a summary of known copyhold lands see Appendix VIc. It should be noted that the commissions for their disposal firmly asserted that the crown could have confiscated them had it chosen.

suche prystes and other spirytuall persons as had the profyttes of the same at the tyme of the making of the said estatute shall have and enioye the profyttes thereof duryng there naturall lyves accordinge to the estatute aforesayde, and also that all lawfull leases thereof made to any other persons according to the custome of the said honors, manors & lordshippes, shall stand and be good accordinge to the purporte of the same Leasses. 96.

The apparently generous concession of the crown in allowing the chantry priests to continue receiving the profits during their lifetimes was little more than a simple administrative device to avoid the payment of a pension. In receiving only a fixed annual sum from the land, these priests were treated little differently from those supported from freehold lands or free rents, with the important exception that, since their income was dependent on returns from a specific landed endowment they would stand a greater chance of being paid more promptly than the chantry priests at large who had to wait the convenience of the system of book-keeping, and whose income was derived from the funds of the receiver of the Duchy or the Court of Augmentations.⁹⁷

But what followed was not a simple cancellation of the existing uses. The chantry priests were not to be allowed any interest in the land itself, but only to continue drawing the profits.⁹⁸ The patent recited above goes on to grant all the copyhold chantry lands in the crown's honour of Pontefract and the lordships of Knaresborough and Tickhill to John Cotton

96. DL42/96 f. 22 v.

97. At Sherburn failure to pay the priest was to be punished by the award of the copy for the offending tenements to the priest himself.

98. Except at Knaresborough, see below.

who had served both Henry VIII and Edward VI in the northern wars. He or his heirs and assigns were to take over the copyhold rights of the former feoffees, who would nevertheless remain as tenants because the new copyholder would certainly be an absentee.

Cotton was too busy fighting to settle the business for himself, and in due course he appointed the steward of the honour, Sir Thomas Gargrave, together with one Thomas Darley, as his attorneys. Gargrave and Darley were to be admitted to the copyhold of each plot, in each manor, which had maintained a chantry, and they were to pay the profits yearly to the priest in his lifetime, and thereafter to Cotton and his heirs. In other words they were to have the copyhold to the use of the priest and then of Cotton. In each case, any feoffees were to surrender their rights to the new copyholder.

On 3 May 1549 Gargrave and Darley, armed with the patent, appeared at Wakefield manor court,⁹⁹ where the long process of enrolling them as copyholders for all relevant land in the manor began. They paid the customary entry fines for each plot, which they were to hold under the terms set out above, and for the moment they remained nominal copyholders, though without ousting the sitting tenants.

99. Y.A.S. Library M.D. 225. Wakefield Court Roll 1548-9. See Appendix VIc.

A clearer picture of the proceedings is found at Sherburn where they appeared in the manor court on 16 May.¹⁰⁰ Here, the two chantries of St. Martin and St. Roche had been maintained from copyhold lands. For that of St. Roche, the 1546 Chantry Certificate had observed:

the vicar of Shyerborne of the tyme beyng dothe
alweyes take the sayd landes by copie and payeth
to the Kynges Majestie for a fyne at every
chaunge of a vicar.....Cs. 10l.

The vicar, Matthew Smithson, appeared in court and surrendered his copyhold, which Gargrave and Darley undertook. It was then agreed that the chantry priest be paid £4. 13. 4. a year and the vicar 5/- a year for their respective lives. Two days later, Cotton relinquished his rights in favour of Anthony Hammond, gent. and his two sons (?), William and Anthony Hammond. Cotton clearly felt that the sale of his interest was the best action he could take to make a reasonable reward of this otherwise strange grant, and we find that at the other chantry in Sherburn, when the feoffees had surrendered their rights to Gargrave and Darley, Cotton in turn allowed the former tenants to buy back their copies.

At Hatfield, Gargrave and Darley had appeared on 13 May,¹⁰² when they received the copyhold of a further half dozen chantries, though not, apparently, handing on their title to others. Here, Cotton sold out to Gargrave himself on 18 August, and the latter seems to have retained the copy for at least the next year.

100. Leeds City Library GC/M3/119 Box IE.

101. Y.C.S. II. 227.

102. Leeds City DB205/1548-9 and 1549-50 Hatfield Court Rolls.

Back at Wakefield, no major attempt was made before the autumn of 1549 to sell off the copy. As at Hatfield, Cotton must have sold to Gargrave, for on 4 October another court was held, at which Gargrave sold many of his plots to the West Riding surveyor, Henry Savile, one to Savile's stepfather Leonard Bate whom we found so active in buying chantry lands from the crown, and others to John Deighton, (who escapes further identification,) and Robert Chaloner Esq. The only tenant who bought back his copy was John Shephard, of the lampland at Sandal, but the Briggs family of Halifax who had supported one chantry in that township from copyhold lands, also managed to buy back their interest. The appearance of Savile in this list makes it the more likely that he was among the unidentifiable buyers of other chantry property in the West Riding. Bate, however, sold his interest to the tenant on 30 May in the following year, and it may well be that other plots ultimately found their way back to the tenants when they had saved enough to buy out the original recipients. It has to be remembered that neither Savile nor any other recipient could draw any profit from the land while the chantry priest was still alive, and money was only to be made by encouraging tenants or others to buy back the copyhold.¹⁰³

To complicate the matter further, Cotton was killed in battle in the autumn of 1549 before final arrangements for the disposal of the lands had been made. Darley and one

103. This paragraph summarised in Appendix VIe.

William Adam (whom we found working with Gargrave in the purchases of chantry land), offered to pay all Cotton's debts to help his widow, if she would give them the right to dispose of the remaining copyhold. The crown accepted these terms, and issued another patent on the lines of that we have seen, substituting the names of Darley and Adam for that of Cotton.¹⁰⁴

Darley and Adam paid off Cotton's debts by selling back the copyhold of at least one manor's chantry lands - at Slaidburn, and the resulting document¹⁰⁵ is of some importance since it is the only one I have found in which the sums paid by the tenants to the sellers, and the yearly rents paid by the tenants to the cantarist beforehand, are shown side by side. The rates vary so much between one plot and the next that they must be related to the quality of the property in question. Savile, as surveyor, was again consulted over what would be appropriate sums to charge. An element of actual bargaining with some of the tenants, discovering what prices they were prepared to pay for their copy, may also have intervened to cause such variety in rates.

At Knaresborough, a manor court was held on 4 May 1550 at which procedure was rather different.¹⁰⁶, the chantry priests themselves seem to have been admitted to the copyhold, for the regular formula reads as follows:-

104. DL 42/96 f. 27. (23 Nov. 1549) sent to all manorial stewards 15 Dec. Copyhold lands in other Duchy manors were to be disposed of as follows:- Ripon, Pickering, Tutbury, Clitheroe and Accrington by Sir Edward Warner, Henry Savile and James Gardiner; Lincolnshire by William Layton and Robert Bull (*Ibid.* fols. 30v., 41).

105. Appendix VI f.

106. DL 30/492/4.

ad hanc curiam venit X, capellanus, nuper incumbens cantariae Sancti x in ecclesia parochiale de Y, et cepit de Domino Rege (...description of lands and tenements)...quae cantariae predictae dudum pertinaverunt.

However, it is quite clear that the cantarist, even under these over-generous conditions, might hold only for the term of his life, after which the copy was to pass to Darley and Adam. The latter were not slow in selling their interest to others, and in such a large number of cases are the recipients the tenants that this must have been the general rule, provided that they could afford to buy back their interest, and did not wish to assign it to someone else. Among those who are not tenants, however, we find William Tankard, the renowned lawyer from Boroughbridge, Sir William Ingleby of Ripley whom we met buying freehold chantry land there, and Thomas Slingsby esq., himself a tenant of part of the land whose copyhold he secured, and deputy seneschal of the manor court.

Whilst we know from a later court case that a similar manor court was convened at Barwick in Elmet on 7 May 1550 to admit Darley and Adam,¹⁰⁷ and that they sold out almost at once to the Duchy Receiver, William Mallet who in turn sold out four years later to John Gascoigne, court rolls for the rest of the area have not survived for this period.

Outside the Duchy there were few copyhold chantry lands, though there was a small group in the East Riding which was reported granted to Anthony Brown esquire.¹⁰⁸ The other

107. DL 1/154 (P2).

108. SC6/P&M/353.

context in which we shall encounter the lands is in the Ministers' Accounts, particularly among the arrears, for though copyhold was excluded from confiscation, it was, in a few cases, wrongly charged in the Ministers' Accounts.¹⁰⁹ It must be presumed that copyhold chantry land not in crown manors was left at the disposal of the lord of the manor.

The surviving evidence enables us to say with confidence that in this sector, as in that of leases, the sitting tenants were not greatly disturbed as a result of the dissolution. The lord of the manor - the crown in all the cases we have considered - was indeed better off as a result, for he was able to resume his right to collect the customary entry fines where these had been evaded by feoffees. The more stages there were between the crown's grant to Cotton and the eventual settlement of the copyhold, the more the crown was able to acquire by way of entry fines. Meanwhile, Gargrave, Savile and their intimates who acquired the land could not fail to make a steady profit, either from continuing to occupy the copyhold, or from selling to the sitting tenant. In this aspect of the dissolution, therefore, as in all others hitherto considered, the crown's local officers were well placed to augment their fortunes.

109. Below, chapter X.

CHAPTER VII

THE DISPOSAL OF THE MOVABLE GOODS

1. Plate

Although we have dealt first with the disposal of the lands of the chantries, an operation which generally preceeded this was the rounding up of all the movable goods eligible for confiscation, and the sale of such items as were of little use to the crown, including the lead, bells and fabric of such chapels as were scheduled for demolition.

The crown had gained considerable experience in handling such commodities through the dissolution of the monasteries a decade earlier, though there had certainly been problems locally, such as the cost of transporting heavy or bulky materials, the danger of highway robbery,¹ and the finding of a market for unwanted 'ornaments' and goods. But in this earlier operation, advantages of scale had offset the worst liabilities, and the appetite for church plate in particular, once whetted, was not easily satiated, even though it must have been clear that costs would rise sharply when the concern was no longer with monasteries, but with smaller, more scattered buildings. Some of the plate had been diverted to the use of

1. An armed guard of 40 men escorted gold sent from York mint to London at the death of Henry VIII: E101/296/18.

the royal household, but much of the rest ended up in the Tower Mint, melted down and used for coinage. Under Sir John Williams, the amount of plate turned into coinage was valued at over £15,000.²

The issuing of new indentures for the provincial mints³ within days of the establishment of the Edwardian Chantry Commissions strongly suggests that the crown intended from the start to turn much of the chantry plate into coinage, following Henrician precedent. But if the enterprise was to be a success, speed was essential, for there was a fear that patrons and others, fearing the impending dissolution, would remove whatever they could before the crown could lay hands on it.

Concern over church plate was not restricted to chantries. In 1547 the bishops were being asked to note the extent of the plate-endowments in each parish, with a view to more equitable distribution among those parishes which had little or none.⁴ It was not long before this concern was channelled into official inventories of the parochial endowments, and the attack on the plate of the chantries was only the prelude to the more sinister onslaught on the parish churches later in the reign of Edward VI.

2. Account of the Monastic Treasures, 68 (abbotsford Club, 1836). His term of office was from 1540 until 1545 : W.C. Richardson, op. cit., p.188n.

3. For York, E101/306/3 (16 Feb. 1548).

4. Surtees Soc. vol. 97 p. xi. On 17 Oct. 1547 Holgate was taking order to stop the flching of church goods and plate which had begun 'upon some vague brutes' - E.H.R. ix, 546.

The Henrician Chantry Commissioners obtained from the parish representatives who waited upon them lists of all the supposed goods and plate in the possession of each chantry, and were ordered by the terms of their commission to make 'inventories indentyd' for the incumbents of the dissolved institutions.⁵ Nothing was yet collected, and like everything else about the Henrician Act this suggests that the crown had not yet fully determined to dissolve all chantries. Indeed, the inventories were little more than a pledge that the property would not be embezzled, and the incumbents were to

kepe the same untyll our further pleasure be knowne in that behalfe.

The commissioners, therefore, saw no plate themselves, but only the inventories produced by the parishes, and this left ample scope for 'foul play'. Sometimes the value of the plate was given, sometimes only its weight.

Between the two chantry Acts, little occurred, save that the Injunctions of 1547 demanded the destruction of shrines, and it was presumably under this order that the great Corpus Christi Shrine at York was melted down. When the new Chantry Commissioners sat in 1548, they were able to use as a guide to the goods and plate they could expect from each institution the inventories drawn up two years

5. Y.C.S. I, 3.

earlier. In our area, the returns this time were uniform in giving the weight of the plate in ounces, but other than this, the procedure for the collection and disposal of the booty varied from region to region. The Nottinghamshire surveyor had most of the plate rounded up and dispatched to the jewel-house in the Tower of London before the 1548 Certificates were completed, and the documents therefore contain no entries under this heading. Elsewhere in the diocese, the simple total of goods and plate was entered for each institution, and there is nothing to match the earlier Cumberland Certificates⁶ which had contained detailed inventories of jewels and plate, and not the mere totals. Whilst they were not all as swift as the Nottinghamshire officials, the commissioners were everywhere determined to execute the dissolution speedily. Sooner or later, the surveyors in each county had the plate collected together at strategic centres and weighed impartially by merchants and townsmen. We find the enormous mass of plate from the college at Beverley being weighed on the spot by bailiffs and the governors of the town,⁷ and the West Riding plate being collected at Wakefield, Elmsall, Rotherham and York.⁸ Thereafter, only the smallest items of plate were sold locally, and the rest went in bulk to the Jewel House, (whence it was carried to the Tower Mint,) or to one of the provincial

6. T.C.W.A.A.S. n.s. lxii, 147 et. seq.

7. Beverley Record Office, DDCC 139/65 f. '16' (end of volume).

8. E301/118, respectively 12, 13, 26 May and 4 June 1548.

Table XXI : The value and disposal of chantry plate at the dissolution

(1) Plate taken to the Mint at York, and melted down
(Source : E 101/296/18 and E101/302/28 :York Mint accounts)
(for the Corpus Christi Shrine, see also Archaeologia, x)

Plate of the Corpus Christi Shrine (York) :	1009 oz. gilt 21 oz. silver	} £ 315.18. $\frac{3}{4}$
Plate of the York Minster Reliquary	: 328 oz. gilt 20 oz. silver	
Chantry Plate from Lancashire		£ 119. 3. 8
Chantry Plate from Northumb'd, Durham, Cumb'd & Westm'd.		£ 134.18. $\frac{3}{4}$
Chantry Plate from the East Riding :	731 oz. gilt 240 oz. p/gilt 82 $\frac{1}{2}$ oz. white	} £ 466.13. 1

In the process of melting down for re-issue, the following sums were wasted :- CC Shrine : £13. 5. $\frac{6}{4}$; Minster reliq., £3. 6. $\frac{2}{4}$; Lancashire, £2.10.10; Northern Counties, £2.12. $\frac{4}{4}$; East Riding, £11.15. 9.

(ii)Plate received at the Jewel House of the Tower of London by Sir Anthony Aucher:-

Nottinghamshire : (B.M. Harley, 284 f.88) White, 307 oz, ¾q.

mints. Strangely enough, the plate from Nottinghamshire and the North and West Ridings went to the Tower Mint and not to that at York, either because the crown wished to limit the production of the York mint, or because it already had too much work on hand with the plate it had received, or was about to receive, from the East Riding, Lancashire, Cumberland, Westmorland, Northumberland, and Durham: all of which we find mentioned in its accounts. Before the rush started, it had already dealt with the plate of the Corpus Christi Shrine, but with a staff of only ten men, and authority to mint only coins of denominations up to 4d, it was not of any great importance, save that it eased the burden of the London Mint, and eased the flow of small coins in everyday use, which became a more significant operation with the later debasements. Table XXI shows the operation of the York Mint at the dissolution.

Although the total handed to the crown looks impressive, it was made up of many tiny pieces. The poorer chantries had no plate of their own, but borrowed from the parish. Even if they had their own plate it usually consisted of little more than the bare necessities of chalice and cruets. Therefore, outside the colleges the list of plate collected is unimpressive. At Harewood only a single silver spoon was declared, and this was one of the few items to be sold on the spot.⁹ In the whole of the West Riding, the chantry of Jesus and Our Lady at Rotherham (with two chalices) was

9. Ibid.

the only dissolved institution other than Rotherham college that had more than a single chalice, according to the lists drawn up in 1548. Endowments were not quite so sparse in the North Riding, for chantries at Topcliffe and Thirsk recorded three chalices each, and others at Wath, Norton Conyers and Stokesley two each.

But there was a good deal of concealment, and much of it may have been so successful as never to come to the crown's attention even as a result of the later concealment commissions. One commission investigating in Edward's reign found one chalice and one vestment undeclared in each of the chantries or chapels at Ilkley, Keighley, Kildwick, Kirkby Malhamdale, Mitton and Rilston, whilst at Skipton it unearthed three chalices and several vestments, and at Bank Newton it discovered the chantry goods to have gone into the 'custody' of the patron, Thomas Bank.¹⁰ Dozens of chalices and crucifixes must have been temporarily transferred into the keeping of the parishes or withdrawn by patrons maintaining they had been loaned on the condition of chantry services being performed. At Raisthorpe, the parishioners sold one chalice 'for thuse of the church',¹¹ and at Sandal Magna, Sir Thomas Waterton removed a vestment worth 12/-.¹² But the only specific refusal to hand over

10. E315/123.

11. Borthwick Institute R VII G. 467.

12. E301/118.

plate once discovered seems to have been at Conisbrough, where Ralph Hodgson, a yeoman, withheld a chalice weighing 7 oz.¹³

The weight was very important, because it was on this basis that the plate was valued. Even allowing for fractional variations in quality, there still seems to have been considerable fluctuation in the prices charged at different centres for pieces of roughly the same weight. An ounce of parcel-gilt plate which would fetch 3/8 in Westmorland was worth 4/- throughout the North and West Ridings and Richmondshire, though in York city it was fetching 4/3 or 4/4, and gilt plate there reached 5/- or more.¹⁴ When we consider the 1062 oz. raised from the college at Rotherham, or the 1200 oz. from Beverley,¹⁵ we can begin to see how valuable the operation was.

2. Goods and stock

If the disposal of the plate was fairly straightforward, the same cannot be said of the goods and 'ornaments' (vestments). Plate had a high utility value either in its pristine state

13. Ibid. At Sedbergh a silver cross with figures (worth £50) was withheld (E315/115); at Studley and Skelton near Ripon one chalice each was found as late as 18 Eliz. (DL44/243 p. 41).

14. cf. Numismatrical Chronicle, 4th s., vii, 339: parcel-gilt plate fetched 4/10 per oz. in the West Country.

15. Beverley, DDCC 139/65 f.4.

or melted down for coinage, whereas the bulk of the other possessions of the chantries and colleges was an encumbrance to the crown. For example, the inventory of goods at Greystoke college in Cumberland¹⁶ consists mainly of household articles, ranging from kitchen-cloths to pots and pans, knives and forks, tables and chairs. There were few who wanted to buy such articles, and it is not surprising that many of the goods listed or valued at the time of the Chantry Certificates never saw their way into the records of the Court of Augmentations. The commissioners and surveyors sold some for what little they could get, or even gave them away to the poor. We note, for example, that the goods of Yorkshire in the 1546 Certificate were valued at £865 - 14 - 3¹⁷, yet the later record shows nothing like this figure ever being sold off. For the whole of the West Riding Henry Savile accounted for only £65 of goods sold, and Matthew White was robbed of his total takings from this source, £60, when he was murdered in the North Riding, his assistant Richard Vavasor, later being able to explain away much of the rest as uncollected or unsold.¹⁸

Again it was the colleges which produced the largest totals. At Rotherham the goods were assessed at £37.10.0., and at Beverley £42. 7. 4. But a large proportion of this

16. T.C.W.A.A.S. n.s. lx, 92.

17. Y.C.S. II, 370.

18. See below, p.219.

sum was the value of vestments, the disposal of which had to be closely scrutinised to insure against the possibility of continuing superstition on the one hand, or irreverence on the other. Many were resumed by patrons and benefactors, like William Salvyn of Acaster Selby who bought up the vestments of Hemingbrough college, and would have restored them under Mary, once satisfied of the stability of her regime, had not her untimely death put them in jeopardy again.²⁰ Alternatively, vestments were restored to the parishes, or in the final instance cut up and given to the poor.²¹

The surveyors were still left with the unpleasant duty of disposing of the trash, a job which was willingly contracted out to others if they volunteered, Edward Pease bought up all the goods of Derbyshire en bloc,²² and Robert Waller many of those in Nottinghamshire.²³ At Southwell, William Neville who bought the prebendal mansions and some other lands, also bought most of the superfluous goods,²⁴ and Thomas Eynna who had leased Lowthorpe college also bought its goods.²⁵

20. Burton, Hemingbrough, 24.

21. This became common practice, see Surtees Soc. vol. 97, 5. P. Tyler, The Ecclesiastical Commission, 5.

22. E315/343.

23. E315/68 f. 503v. et seq.

24. E315/342.

25. E405/508 and E117/13/126.

From the start there had been a rush on the objects of the slightest value, more particularly in London, where one observer noted that:

ther be men at haund to snatche up thinges of auny proffite befor the visitores can prayse them, 26.

and went on to warn his correspondent that small objects like candlesticks were saturating the market and forcing the prices down. It was to be the lingering feeling throughout the 16th century that there had been many persons who

took many things away without Commissions seeing all things were put to the spoil. 27.

But in the north the market was very sluggish, and it was well into Mary's reign before the surveyors were able to give anything like a full account of their profits, and before Waller finished paying up for the Nottinghamshire goods he had undertaken to sell. To his credit, Savile did manage to sell for 39/4 some mass-books which had been valued at nil in the inventories.²⁸

Among the easiest items of the movable property to confiscate should have been the stocks of money left to maintain obits, lights or occasional services, and the stocks of cattle which had been bequeathed to support the poor from a yearly hire charge. Surprisingly, these items proved troublesome. As late as 1556, Richard Vavasor had failed to

26. SP 46/5 f. 252.

27. Y.A.S.R. cxxv, 139.

28. E301/118.

round up or remove a stock of sheep from Helmsley,²⁹
At Kildwick in Craven, the villagers successfully defended
in court their need for the alms raised from a stock of
cows.³⁰ It was in the knowledge that similar difficulties
were arising throughout the country, with far too much of
the chantries' movable wealth still unaccounted for, that
Mary issued a commission on 14 November 1555 to William
Berners, Thomas Mildmay and John Wiseman, esquires,³¹ to
investigate the amounts of lead, bells, plate and jewels
which should have come to the crown since the dissolution
of the monasteries and chantries. Most of the records
about movable property after the dissolution, apart from
the plate, are indeed to be found among the papers presented
to these commissioners who must have been very hard worked
if they read all the evidence meticulously. They were
empowered to demand accounts from the surveyors of each area,
to call witnesses by privy seal if necessary, and to imprison
offenders in the Fleet. On 25 March 1556 they issued their
interim report, regretting that

they cannot make at this tyme Certen or absolute
aunswere or reoport what will come of the sale of
leade and Bell metall other then the Reoport afor-
said for that they have not yet made full Colleccion
of Suche Bargaynes as have passyd aswell in the tyme
of our late soverayne Lordes Kynge Henry the viijth
& King Edward the vjth within whoes tymes very notable
bargaynes were made.

29. E117/12/40.

30. E315/520 f. 213. I have shown in tables for a forthcoming
article in Y.A.J. that this practice pertained also in the
East Riding.

31. C.P.R. III Mary, 25.

At this stage 20 counties had submitted no reports at all, but even so the commissioners were able to report a total of £806. 5. 9. thought to be owing from the chantries, and 216 oz of plate not surrendered, with a total extant debt, including the monasteries, of over £3500.³² Happily, all of Yorkshire is represented among the accounts they had received, though Nottinghamshire was one of the recalcitrant counties.

The picture built up from the surviving accounts is by no means a happy one. Reporting for the North Riding, Richard Vavasor alleged that between the 1546 and 1548 Certificates, £30 of the ornaments and stock had disappeared without trace, £60 had been lost at White's murder, and although a total of £224 had to be explained, only £30 had actually been paid in after all permitted deductions, and that not until Mary's reign. Many excuses were adduced,³³ and we can see in Vavasor's account the working of one adept at that favourite 16th century accountants' sport of making the expenses balance, or preferably exceed, the income. In the West Riding, Savile claimed back almost half of the £67 he received from the sale of goods, to cover his expenses.³⁴ The most poignant example I have noted, however, comes from outside our immediate area. Thomas Eynns travelled from London to Durham to survey some uncollected stock, and supervise

32. E163/24/21 (unpaginated).

33. Appendix VII c.

34. E117/13/64.

its transportation into crown custody. The quest for the stock took a group of commissioners eight days, and they estimated their costs at £21. 12. 0. On top of this, Eynns's own expenses came to £55. 4. 8., but some of them were disallowed, and he was only given £21. 18. 0., though he was able to recoup a further £15. 10. 0. under another heading. At the final reckoning the crown received only £22. 3. 0. from the stock whose value had been reckoned at £81. 3. 0. If similar situations prevailed elsewhere in the country, we must surely conclude that the disposal of the stock, and more particularly the tracking down of items unaccounted for, was the least profitable, and the most costly aspect of the dissolution.³⁵

3. Lead and Bells

The value of the fabric took longer to assess and was not usually included in the Chantry Certificates. Surveys were made subsequently, but the final valuation of the heaviest items, lead and bells, could not be determined until they had been taken to one of the official royal weigh-houses.

35. Surtees Soc. Vol. 97, 155.

Skilled guesswork was the most that could be brought to bear on the valuation of such commodities in situ.

In 1548, Henry Savile was asked to survey the site of Acaster College for a prospective purchaser, but when he came to consider the bells he was forced to admit that

their as vj belles wiche as not yett weied for
that there is no weight wherewith to weye the
same beyngre greatt nearer than Hull or Grymysbye. 36.

The Hull weigh-house handled most of the lead in the diocese as well as the bells. Lead was among the most valuable commodities the church had to offer whenever it was plundered, but because free chapels and colleges not needed for parochial worship were the only entire buildings eligible for demolition under the Act, there was little enough to come on the market from this source. Lead was not, in any case, a scarce commodity. There had been a flourishing trade in the metal along the Ouse and its tributaries up to the fifteenth century and it was still a living industry in the West Riding. At York as late as 1555 a new convention was made among the watermen for the handling of shipments:

A fother of leade, taken in at the crayne, twelve
pence, and yf it be lightened, sextene pence. 37.

Isolated references suggested that most of the lead and bells from the dissolved monasteries and colleges was dispatched by water whenever this was possible, for on a cart travelling over

36. E315/67 f. 249 v.

37. Surtees Soc. Vol. 129 p. 156 and intro. A fother was one ton of lead: see calculations of Durham lead in Surtees Soc. Vol. 22, lxx, lxx, and Walker, Wakefield, 242.

16th-century roads, especially in the north, a long journey with such a heavy load was no mean feat. Sir Leonard Beckwith, accounting in Mary's reign for the lead of St. Mary's Abbey, York, mentions its delivery to the royal surveyor at 'Clifton Banks',³⁸ and on another major consignment the cost of transport by water to Hull is detailed.³⁹

A greater problem than the weighing was the demolition itself. The materials were so heavy that it was not a job that could be done by everyone. Plumbers were called in to assess the value of the lead and to help in the dismantling,⁴⁰ and even though the work is often said to have been done by the surveyor, it is unlikely that he did more than supervise the operation. In the East Riding, as we shall shortly see, it was common for the surveyor or his deputy to press the local inhabitants into demolishing their own chapels. In some cases an elementary furnace may have been erected on the spot to melt down the metal into manageable lumps for transport.⁴¹

The cost of both the commodity and the operation meant that the small investor was virtually excluded from the trade in lead which resulted from the dissolutions, and experienced merchants and officers tended to provide the market. Once

38. E117/13/128.

39. E117/10/53.

40. See for example Borthwick Institute R VII. G. 467.

41. See Knowles III, 384.

obtained, the lead might be put to a variety of uses. Roofing and repair of houses was the foremost. William Pulleyn, the crown's farmer of the chapel at Scotton, was accused of threats to remove the lead to repair his house without telling the crown.⁴² Sir Nicholas Fairfax was accused by a North Riding J.P. in Mary's reign of snatching the lead from Tolthorpe chapel of ease and covering the chapel with thatch to hide his transgression.⁴³ John Bellow had grander designs: at least some of the lead he collected went towards the building of a water conduit in his home town of Grimsby.⁴⁴ The lead of some of the dissolved colleges went to the buyers of the sites, and in such cases it seems unlikely that every piece passed through the weigh-house. William Thorpe, who bought the site of Acaster College, also bought 21 fothers of lead for £4 per fother, and six bells for £42. The Earl of Shrewsbury bought 8 fothers with the site of Rotherham College, even though his patent had excluded lead and bells. Sir Thomas Smith bought the lead and bells of Pontefract College along with the fabric, and added to his purchase the lead and bells of the chapels in Stammergate (Ripon) and Wykeham, the three properties all being in the Duchy of Lancaster. He then sold out to the Duchy Receiver, William Mallet, though not before Bellow had intervened unsuccessfully at the Hull weigh-house to try to divert the spoil to Sir Michael Stanhope.⁴⁵

42. DL1/27/W.18.

43. E117/14/115; E117/13/23. He was also brought before the Council of the North for similar depredations at Tollerton (? = Tolthorpe): E134/misc. 2515.

44. E117/13/49

45. DL1/212/M.4. For a summary of this paragraph see Table XXII.

Stanhope was the purchaser of the bulk of the lead yielded by the dissolution in our area.⁴⁶ As governor of Hull, his costs were minimal once he had got the metal to the weigh-house, but he never conducted his operations in person, leaving one in the hands of Richard Mansell, a servant, and another in those of Walter Jobson, (a Hull merchant with plenty of experience in handling lead) and William Hewitt, a London merchant. The crown itself bore the cost of transporting the metal to Hull, and the North Riding surveyor, William Laken, claimed £48. 4. 2. for his part in it.⁴⁷ There is no evidence to show what Stanhope did with the lead after purchase, but as in the case of the sale of lands, it is possible that the nominal buyer was only an agent. It would seem very probable that Bellow took a large share and Jobson the rest if indeed Stanhope parted with it.

The remaining lead and bells are easily accounted for. Henry Savile bought the lead from St. Mary Magdalene's chapel at Doncaster, and Walter Jobson two bells from 'Snaith' chapel.⁴⁸ At Wakefield, the lead and bells of the chapel on the bridge and St. John's chapel were included in the patented grant of the sites to Warner, Leigh and Bate.⁴⁹ Bate remained responsible for the lead on St. Mary's chapel there, whilst the two bells of St. Mary Magdalene's chapel (Wakefield) were sold by 1555 to an

46. E117/13/64 for W.R.: E117/12/40 and E117/14/107 for N.R.

47. LR6/122/1.

48. Perhaps that at Rawcliffe in the parish of Snaith.

49. C.P.R. II Edward VI, 269.

Table XXIIa: The disposal of the lead and bells

(f = fother; c = hundred weight ; q = quarter.)

The North Riding : Lead and bells from dissolved institutions were all sold to Sir Michael Stanhope. They were taken by the surveyor, William Eaken, to Hull, and received there by Richard Mansell on behalf of Stanhope (E 117/14/107 : 30 Oct. 1550)

Chapel	yield	Chapel	yield
Topcliffe yard	3f and 1 bell	Ellerton	2f and 1 bell
Skipton	1½f, 14lb.	Dale Grange	½f
Rainton	1f	Lartington	1 bell
Lazenby	2f and 1 bell	Thoralby	3½f, 3q. and 1 bell
Hackforth	3f and 1 bell	Yarm hosp.	½f, 6c.
Fencottes	2½f	Ayton	3f and 3 bells
Thrintoft	2f and 1 bell	Seamer	6f
Total given : 31 f, 6c., 3q, 14lb.		and 10 bells weighing "vij ^c dimid".	

The West Riding : Some lead was sold to Sir Michael Stanhope as in the N.R. Some was sold to the purchasers of the site of dissolved institutions. A full account was given by the surveyor in 1556, from which the following figures are derived (E 117/13/64)

To Stanhope : Ferrybridge 2f; Sherburn 2f; Hambleton 4f.; Snaith 3f : when these items were weighed, they were found to be 1½f, 30lb over the original estimate, and the total delivered to Stanhope was 12½f. 30lb.

Other Lead : Acaster College 21f. sold to William Thorpe, the purchaser of the site, for £84.
Doncaster, MM chapel, 1½ f. sold to Henry Savile:£10
Wakefield Bridge chapel, 1f.3q. sold to Warner, Leigh and Bate, the purchasers, for no extra charge

Selby Chapel, 7f in possession of Sir Leonard Beckwith
Wakefield BVM, 1½f in possession of Leonard Bate
Ecclesfield 1f in possession of the Countess of North'd.

Bells: Wakefield MM. 2 bells sold for £1 to unknown buyer by 1555
Acaster College, 6 bells sold to Thorpe for £42.
Snaith chapel(?Rawcliffe), 2 bells sold to Walter Jobson for £2.
Sandal Castle, 1 bell in custody of the Keeper, John Peck.
Selby chapel, 2 bells in possession of Sir Leo. Beckwith
Wakefield SWITHUN, 2 bells }
Wakefield Bridge, 2 bells } sold with premisses to Warner,
Wakefield St John 2 bells } Leigh and Bate, no charge.

The East Riding : no surviving information
Nottinghamshire : no surviving information

Duchy of Lancaster : Lead, 23 f. 1q., comprising 17 fothers from Pontefract college, 6f.1q from Ripon valued at £93. (DL 29/8955)

Bells, 800lb., valued at £7.13. 4
comprising 3 bells of Pontefract college
1 bell at Ripon sold for £1 by the Receiver in 1548-9.

All thought to have been sold to Sir Thomas Smith in the first instance (see text).

unknown buyer, and those from St. John's chapel were temporarily installed in St. Mary's on the bridge during the Marian restoration of services.⁵⁰ The bell at Sandal castle was reprieved because the castle was still a fort and it was thought a bell was essential.

No accounts of the lead and bells of the East Riding have survived, save one information that Robert Gray had sold lead from the provostry at Beverley worth £6,⁵¹ and a J.P., William Thwaite of Lund, had taken the lead of the chapel there without payment.⁵²

4. Other fabric.

The rest of the fabric of dissolved colleges and chapels - stone or brick, glass and woodwork, aroused a more general interest than the lead, because quantities coming onto the market were so small that the great builders who had made the most of the monastic dissolutions were not interested, and smaller local buyers were therefore able to meet their immediate needs. Little appears in the records of the Court of Augmentations to suggest that the crown made much from the

50. E117/13/64 See also M. Otley, 'Chantry Bridges', 12.

51. E117/14/120-1 But see section 5 below.

52. Bellow to Stanhope:- SP 46/124 f. 86.

sale of these items, and in many cases the cost of demolition would outweigh the advantages of sale, so that the chapels were simply disendowed and left standing unused. Only very occasionally do local deeds give any idea of their immediate fate. The chapel on Leeds Bridge, in the Duchy of Lancaster, was sold in 1551 for £30 to one Richard Booth among others.⁵³ The chapel of St. William on Ouse Bridge, York, was used as a Council chamber for the city Corporation, and partly converted into dwelling houses.⁵⁴ St. Mary Magdalene's chapel in Wakefield had a further 200 years to go before it was demolished, ending its days as a wool shop.⁵⁵ Rotherham college was converted into a malthouse.....⁵⁶ and so on. Those who bought the site and lead of the colleges at Acaster and Pontefract (William Thorpe and Sir Thomas Smith) acquired all the fabric also, though the colleges at Beverley, Howden, Hemingbrough, Lowthorpe, Ripon and Southwell all survived because they were parish churches, and their fabric was scarcely affected by the dissolution.⁵⁷

-
53. From a list of the documents in Leeds Parish Church 'Pious Uses Bundle 3' deposited at Leeds City library.
54. See York City MSS. Bridgemasters' Accounts C.89 no. 4. and C.90 nos. 1-3; Raine, Medieval York, 216 notes its restoration under Mary. cf. accounts for Foss Bridge, C. 81 nos. 9-11: by 1563-4 the chapel there was "occupied for a store house" and dissolved in the following year (Raine, op. cit. 69.)
55. Walker, Wakefield, 225.
56. Y.A.S.R. cxxv, 126.
57. The removal of so much of the endowment of Howden college, however, and the use of fabric from the choir to repair the nave, necessitated the closure of half the church, which now stands in ruins. The Court of High Commission ordered the chancel lead to be pulled down in the late 16th century (reported in El34/43 Eliz. Michaelmas/21).

Whilst the amount of demolition caused by the dissolution was small, and few spectacular ruins were left to remind the parishioners of a former glory, there is still plenty of evidence of the unpopularity of the crown's employees, the surveyors and bailiffs, whose function it was to dispose of the unwanted properties, and it is very difficult to determine where the accusations of the residents are so over-stated as to be unreliable, and how far there was any intention on the part of the local officers to defraud both the crown and the parishes by selling off parts of chapels which were not eligible for dissolution under the terms of the Act.

In the West Riding, John Lambert, one such bailiff, acquired an unsavoury reputation as

a man beyng more forwarde in plucking downe of
Churches and Chappells then in buyldyng or
meynteynyng of the same,

when the parishioners of Malham reported him for plundering their chapel of ease.⁵⁸ The same man had already been compelled by the Court of Augmentations,⁵⁹ to repay to the inhabitants of Farnley (Otley) 5 marks, for damage done to their chapel, and his colleague, William Clapham, had to repay them £6. 13. 4. In this case, both parties seem (as usual in Tudor lawsuits!) to have a thoroughly respectable case, each being wholly contradictory to the other, but the judges decreed in favour of the parishioners. The story appears to

58. Cl/1373/84.

59. E315/105 f. 192 b.

run as follows. The chapel had been recommended for continuation, but the incumbent was ill, and for three years after the dissolution no services had been said, the door had been left open and sheep wandered in and out at will. Lambert and Clapham reported that they had been told the chapel was going to ruin, and had gone to investigate, but the inhabitants maintained that it was these two themselves who had done the damage in carrying off parts of the fabric. The defendants countered the claims of the parish that it was a chapel of ease by observing that there were two perfectly good bridges over the alleged 'torrents' which prevented parishioners getting to the parish church. Moreover, the patron had removed a chalice, and one of the villagers had secreted a large lump of lead which, he claimed, had blown off the roof in a storm. Lambert and Clapham took away the lead, and had it consigned with the rest of the lead from their region to Stanhope. The court merely took account of the fact that a chapel of ease had been despoiled, without examining the rights and wrongs of its existence, so that the work of the two culprits seemed the blacker by its decision.⁶⁰ I think there is room for doubt that they acted rapaciously, though if they proceeded without higher authority they exposed themselves to attack. Their action does not seem to be matched, judging by surviving court records, in the rest of the West

60. E315/123/ f. 239 and E315/520 f. 25.

***TABLE**

Table XXIIb : The disposal of further fabric and goods

as demonstrated by payments made to the crown.

<u>Source</u>	<u>Paid</u>	<u>BY</u>	<u>For</u>
E 323/5 f.5	£85	Sir Thomas Smith	Fabric & bells of Pontefract college
E 315/342	£38	William Neville	Ornaments of Southwell college & some goods of Nottinghamshire
"	£30	John Parrate	Iron from gates of 3 chapels in York Minst,
E117/13/106 and E315/342	£93.13.4*	William Thorpe	Lead, bricks & windows of Acaster college.
E117/13/106 and E315/344	£42	William Thorpe	Bells of Acaster college
E315/ 344	£300*	Sir M. Stanhope	Lead of chantries etc. in the north and west Ridings.
E405/508 (3-4 Phil.+M.)	£45.17. 2	Thomas Eynns	Goods of Lowthorpe coll.
"	£116. 0. 0	Robert Grey	Glass, lead, iron, tin of the prebendal mansion of St Mary, Beverley.

Sales by the surveyors. reported in Mary's reign

E 405/ 121 Henry Savile sells W.R. goods totalling £70
Robert Vavasor reports sale of N.R.goods £30

* see Table XXIIa above

Riding or Nottinghamshire, but in the following section the greatest plunder is discussed, and this puts their action into perspective.

5. Case study: the movables of the East Riding

We are unfortunate in the loss of the Chantry Certificates for the East Riding which would have told us exactly which chapels were noted by the commissioners, and what they had to say about them, as well as giving us totals for the goods and plate for the area. From the Brief Certificate, we saw that it was possible to reconstruct most of the continuations warrant, and thus fill some of the gap. But the greatest possible importance now attaches to a document in the East Riding Record Office at Beverley.⁶¹ It is an inquisition into the activities of the East Riding surveyor, John Bellow, after the dissolution of the chantries, and taken at face value it is a most damning indictment of the behaviour of this crown servant in the destruction of chapels and the seizing of much else that does not appear in the Brief Certificate to have been eligible for dissolution.

61. DDCC139/65.

There is no doubt that Bellow was in deep water. He had become involved in a feud with Sir John Constable early in Mary's reign, and the Privy Council, tired of their charges and counter-charges, referred the dispute to the Court of Requests for an impartial settlement, binding each party in the sum of £1000 to keep the peace.⁶² No trace of proceedings is to be found in that Court's records. However, at about the time Berners and Mildmay were calling for the account of the East Riding chantries, Constable and Bellow filed charges against each other in the Star Chamber, alleging violent outbursts.⁶³ In particular, Constable charged Bellow with ruthless exploitation and mismanagement of the chantries in his area. Meanwhile the Earl of Shrewsbury headed a commission investigating the state of religion in the North, and he summoned Bellow to appear before him at York on 20 August 1556, but Bellow excused himself on the grounds that he resided outside the diocese of York and was beyond Shrewsbury's reasonable jurisdiction; that he was already charged in Star Chamber, and a commission headed by Sir Thomas Gargrave was to sit at Beverley and Hull on 22-24 August to investigate anything for which Shrewsbury could possibly want him; and that he trusted to be included in the pope's general pardon of religious offenders.⁶⁴ The Beverley document is the fruit of Gargrave's labours, but we must expect some exaggeration since the interrogatories were administered on Constable's behalf against Bellow to scores of witnesses.

62. A.P.C. 1554-6 271-2, 276.

63. The documentation is incomplete, but see Sta. Cha. 4/9/10 and 4/10/11

64. Appendix VII d.

Taking their testimony, first of all, at face value, it was said that at Holme on Spalding Moor Bellow had valued the goods and plate of the chantry for his official report at 10/-, though they consisted of a chalice weighing 12 oz. (which alone must have been worth four times this sum), three vestments with albs 'and appurtenances', a brass holy-water 'fatt', and a bell.⁶⁵ At Howden he had valued woods at £9 which were said to be worth closer to £100.⁶⁶ The stone from the chapel at Melton and the woodwork from that at Hulbridge had been carried off to Lincolnshire for Bellow's own use.

But apart from falsifying the accounts for profit, and secreting the proceeds, it appears that Bellow and his assistant Richard Mansell were running a protection racket among the inhabitants of those chapelries not eligible for dissolution. His biggest opportunity came, said the witnesses, when the site of Beverley college was offered for sale to Sir Michael Stanhope. Bellow called a public meeting and announced that, if the town could raise £100 Stanhope would be willing not to let the building be pulled down, but:

yt must goo downe...onles ye of the towne will laye
yor heades together and provide Mr. Stanhopp a Cli.

The crown could never have condoned such action, and it certainly had no intention of selling the building of Beverley college which was recognised to be a parish church.

65. DDCC 139/65 f. 10.

66. Ibid. f. 12.

Still, the governors of the town put their heads together, and, led by Robert Gray, a former bailiff of the college, they pulled down and sold some of the outbuildings in order to raise the £100.⁶⁷ The cash was delivered to Stanhope, but nobody was able to say how much commission Bellow had made on the deal.

It was not as easy for the smaller townships to muster corporate enthusiasm of this kind and save their endowments, and Bellow's reign of terror as seen through the eyes of the inhabitants was the worse in such places. William Edwyn of Yokefleet deposed that:

there ys a chappell standinge in Yokeflete the which ys A Chappell of ease for that Towne being Amyle of verrey evell and foule waie distant from the parishe Church, the which Chappell ys covered with leadde and hath two belles in hit. And the same chapell was surveyed by Rychard Mansell, deputie to the said John Bellow. And the said Rychard Mansell said that the same chapell shuld be taken downe. Whereupon this examine and others of that Towne sent to Mr Bellow to entreate for their Chappell and compounded with hym for fyve markes to lett the same stand still, wich some of v markes was gathered in the said Towne and sent to the said Mr Bellow who receved the same, and so their Chappell was suffred to stand and remayne. 68.

Others were not so fortunate. At Buckton three or four residents agreed to raise £6 and Mansell promised the chapel would stand as long as any other in the deanery of Dickering,

67. Ibid f 359. Compare with the town's action to save the church fabric, above p. 61. See also E117/13/108:- Stanhope's receipt of £100 for a licence for the church to stand, 23 September, 1549.

68. DDCC 139/65 ff. 15-16.

but almost immediately sent his servants to pull it down (which no doubt proved ominous for the rest of those in the deanery!). All the valuables were carried off, leaving only the stone and timber to the miserable inhabitants who were even pressed into taking the loot to Bridlington. One deponent

saieth that he hath herdmany saye that Bellowe
hathe ben a great taker of bribes & rewardes. 69.

His reputation preceded him, and it was not long before the villagers were coming forward with their peace-offerings to buy him off before he even set his price. At Bridlington they gave him one chalice, but he seized another one. At Bempton they gave him a chalice and a stock of £3. 13. 4. in cash. He was never unprepared: at Hornsey he produced a bodkin (which he evidently carried around for the purpose) to pluck a precious stone out of a ring which had only been on loan to a gild there.⁷⁰ The constable at Pockthorpe was ordered by Bellow's servants to have the lead from the chapel there carried to the waterside to await his arrival,⁷¹ and a case at York in the diocesan records shows the inhabitants of Towthorp similarly forced to help remove the lead and bells from their chapel.⁷²

The size of the indictment is massive, and however exaggerated some of the claims may have been it is abundantly

69. Ibid. f. 72.

70. Ibid. ff. 77, 74, 81.

71. Ibid. f. 71

72. R. VII G. 467.

Table XXIIc : The disposal of movable goods in the East Riding by John Bellow and his servants

(Source : Beverley Record Office, DDCC 139/65 : depositions against John Bellow) Folio references below are to this book.

(a) Goods and Plate said to have been listed and/or removed by Bellow

f. 10, 72	<u>Bellasize</u>	1 chalice worth 26/8
4	<u>Beverley</u>	Total value of college plate, 1200½ ounces
11	<u>Wansford</u>	1 chalice (11½ oz); 7 vestments; 1 cupboard;
		2 Flanders chests; albs and appurtenances
48	<u>Swine</u>	1 chalice (£2.13. 4); vestment; sacring bell
25	<u>Howden</u>	Gilt plate, 15 oz.; p/gilt. 57½ oz;
		Silver 99½ oz.
38	<u>Hulbridge</u>	1 Chalice (£4); 1 bell(3 c wt.); vestment
29	<u>Humbleton</u>	1 candlestick stolen by Bellow

(b) Chapels demolished by Richard Mansell and his servants

f. 66	Speeton, Thirkelby, Lutton, Cawthorpe by Mansell.

	Melton, Etton, Lund, Tibthorpe, Fordon, Buckton,
	Kelk, Rise, Thorne, Southborne, Pockthorpe by servants.

(c) Lead removed

f. 89	<u>Southborne</u>	5 cwt. taken to Hull for Bellow
72	<u>Bellasize</u>	2 bells sold to Thomas Davy
18	<u>Beverley</u>	Brass and latens taken from tombs in the church and sold to Robert Raphelles for £8
48	<u>Swine</u>	2 fothers melted down
46	<u>Melton</u>	16 fothers and bells worth £6. taken to Hull for Bellow
18 et seq.	<u>Buckton</u>	5 fothers and a bell (3 cwt) taken to Bridlington

(d) Goods, ornaments etc.

f. 68, 88	<u>Stamford Bridge</u>	}	Stone and Timber given to Ralph
	<u>Grimston</u>		Richardson in exchange for a gelding worth £4.
90	<u>Buckton</u>	}	Stone and Timber sold to locals,
	<u>Fordon</u>		valued respectively, £1.19. 0; £1.13. 4
71	<u>Pockthorpe</u>		Stone and Timber sold to Gilbert Makeley.
46	<u>Melton</u>		Fabric sold to locals : stalls 8/-, Windows, £3/6/8; porch, 8/-.
57	<u>Beverley</u>		Stone taken to Lincolnshire for Bellow
			10 copes and vestments to Lancelot Alford, £3/6/8.
			1 suit of vestments to Nicholas Lymer, no value given
25	<u>Howden</u>		vestments sold to Richard Whalley.

For further notes on the plate of the East Riding, see Appendix VIIa.

clear that few in the East Riding had any respect at all for Bellow or Mansell. We have here something more than the routine grumbles of the parishioner disappointed in seeing his endowment confiscated.

But this is not the end of the story. In February and March 1557 the Council persuaded the J.P.s of Yorkshire and Lincolnshire first to seize Bellow's goods and then to bring a formal indictment against him and his accomplices.⁷³ By May he was in the Fleet trying to account for all the lost pennies of his chantry dealings,⁷⁴ his captivity easing the work of his opponents who scarcely appear any more trustworthy.

In particular he was asked to account for the goods of Howden college for which the crown had received no recompense. Here that other suspicious figure Richard Whalley was implicated. Bellow had instructed his servant, (following a warrant from Mildmay and Kelway,) to give the vestments of Howden to Whalley.⁷⁵ Thomas Davy delivered them on his behalf at the end of May 1549. When Bellow was arraigned, he referred the commissioners to Whalley, specifying which vestments he had sent him, whilst Whalley insisted that he had not been given all those listed by Bellow. On first hearing the charge against him, Whalley had referred to Davy as his 'lovinge ffrende', but the same man was soon being vilified from the same lips for his 'most lewde sklander.'

73. A.P.C. 1556-7, 49, 62.

74. E 117/14/118 (1): See Appendix.

75. E 117/13/130.

Whalley had not yet paid anything for the vestments he had received, and he promised to give account forthwith.⁷⁶ I have found no evidence whether all was successfully acquitted, but the case is useful again in showing the work of agents, since Whalley admitted to selling the vestments as instructed by the Chancellor of Augmentations, and Bellow had apparently thought that Cuthbert Musgrave had the preferment of the vestments in question. Both Whalley and Bellow knew from bitter experience that the reckoning of every penny would be exacted once suspicions were aroused.

Bellow's other principal foes were Lord and Lady Lennox. From his prison he maintained that he had a signed bill to show that Lord Lennox had received the lead from the chapel at Wansford, and sold it to Robert Gray; and that Lady Lennox had taken the chalice and ornaments of the chantry at Newsholme. Lady Lennox retorted that he was an 'unjust and naughty man' and his story mere fabrication, but in view of her own Catholic leanings it is difficult to believe her.⁷⁷

Bellow's goods were restored to his wife on 20 June, 1557,⁷⁸ and he was at liberty a year later,⁷⁹ though the outcome of his case remains a mystery. It well illustrates the danger to a crown official of becoming involved in a feud and having his books examined, and the danger of delegating

76. E117/13/129 and E117/13/131.

77. See the correspondence in Appendix VIIId.

78. A.P.C. 1556-8, 106.

79. Ibid. 355.

authority to servants in so important a matter as the status of chapels.

That Bellow was guilty of rapacity over and above the call of duty we cannot doubt. His case also shows that the dissolution in at least one small area - the East Riding - carried with it more hardships and heartaches for the population than the crown ever intended or licensed. But perhaps the parishioners were as guilty as Bellow in detaining items which ought to have been declared; perhaps much of what he appropriated was rightly subject to the Chantry Act, even if it did not end up in the crown's hands as intended. The close liaison between Bellow and Stanhope might have protected the former from proceedings at first under Edward, and we shall never know whether the Council of the North was asked to investigate his activities, but the parishioners themselves have left no trace of having begun any proceedings against him: they left this to Constable, several years after the depredations, and unlike the men of Seamer, not so very many miles away, they felt it unnecessary to organise armed resistance.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCEALMENTS

No 16th century administration was capable of high efficiency in detecting all lands and dues which were rightly its own. Whenever the crown acquired large estates by attainder or expropriation, fragments here and there escaped the net, so that every subsequent acquisition added its portion to the total backlog of 'concealments'. In part, this was accepted as inevitable, surveying and reporting methods being what they were, and it was beneficial rather to administer well the lands which had been successfully acquired, than to spend time and money attempting to trace those which had been wrongfully detained. Nevertheless, concealment was a cause for concern, particularly where it was deliberately contrived to deprive the crown of wardships or other major dues,¹ and numerous attempts were made, notably in Elizabeth's reign, to detect such misappropriations by encouraging informers and by appointing commissions of enquiry to examine all types of concealments.

The resulting documentation is treasure-trove to the historian, though it is extremely difficult to analyse quantitatively, and for the present study I have not attempted such an analysis. The bulk of the evidence available suggests the need for a further investigation of the whole problem of concealments, on a scale that is beyond my present aim, yet

1. J. Hurstfield, The Queen's Wards, 34 ff. See also his articles in T.R.H.S. 1949, 95. and History 1952, 131.

it is doubtful whether a reliable quantitative assessment will ever be made, for many of the documents are badly stained or faded, and they deal in pennies and halfpennies rather than pounds and shillings, making their study arduous.

But it is essential to derive such satisfaction from this material as we can, even when it is drawn from late in Elizabeth's reign, since it gives a useful indication of the magnitude of concealment at the time of the dissolution itself. How and why was such information unearthed? Why were the lands concealed in the first place? Was the momentum of the enquiries controlled by the crown or by private buyers and speculators?

The manuscript evidence consists of special commissions and their reports and depositions, court cases, and incidental information derived from many other sources, together with leases and grants of the concealed property.² Let us then enter the 'mire of concealments' and discover whether it need still be regarded by the historian as the Slough of Despond! May we not rather see the pursuit of concealments as a major Elizabethan hobby?³

We saw at the outset that the Chantry Certificates were not wholly reliable, and could never have been so with the tendency of rents and other income and expenditure to fluctuate year by year. There is no doubt that much of the

2. P.R.O. Classes E 178, E 134, E 302. The Special Commissions are calendared in D.K.R. 38.

3. cf. Hurstfield, The Queen's Wards, loc. cit.: 'one of the great outdoor sports'.

alleged concealment was in fact the result of unstable revenue or defective accounting, with no necessary intention to defraud. The clearest evidence in support of this comes from the returns of a commission in 18 Elizabeth which examined the rents drawn from certain chantry properties and compared them with the highest values in known written rentals of the same properties. Some of the findings are set out below:⁴

part of endowment located in:	Rent paid @ Eliz. 18	Value in Rental	Difference
All Saints, North St.	12. 4.	14.10	2.6.
All Saints "	6. 2.	7.8.	1.6.
St Denys, York	6. 0.	6.8.	8.
Barton-le-willows	10. 0.	13.4.	3.4.
Tunstall	1. 0.	1.4.	4.
Malton, St Nicholas	8.	1.0.	4.
Malton, St Leonard	10.	1.0.	2.
Malton, St. Leonard	1. 0.	1.8.	8.
Wykeham	1. 0.	1.4.	4.
Wykeham	1. 0.	1.6.	6.
Malton Castle	1. 0.	1.4.	4.

The method of surveying and recording the chantries and the speed with which the operation was achieved, however, made it inevitable that some items were overlooked, and although a tenant or the recipient of his rent clearly stood to gain by not declaring the crown's right, it is by no means certain that the concealment was made with his connivance. Some small landed endowments remained even when the chantries (etc.) which they had supported fell into disuse, and many old chapels and their garths, no longer used at the time of the

4. derived from E 407/7/145.

dissolution, were simply forgotten, only to be rooted out subsequently as 'concealed'. We cannot regard these as a product of a popular conspiracy to defraud the crown.

However, in many parishes there was a conspiracy of silence. If anything was to be confiscated, it was up to the crown to find it, and there were few parishes in which, by the end of the century, nothing had been found concealed, whether deliberately or technically.

There is no reason to suppose the successive Tudor governments ignorant of the errors and omissions of the Chantry Certificates. The two sets were compared and closely checked both under Edward VI, and by the commission under Berners and Mildmay in Mary's reign. That the crown was by no means satisfied with the results is demonstrated by the early issuing of commissions to examine the matter further.⁵ Some areas were initially surveyed particularly badly. The wildest parts of the Yorkshire Dales were almost assured of retaining their free chapels for use as chapels of ease by the very nature of the terrain, whether they were eligible for dissolution or not. Commissioners trying to penetrate to the remote uplands were made forcibly aware of the distances from the nearest parish church, and the insurmountable difficulties to the inhabitants if all available chapels were not licensed to continue. One such area, centred on

5. e.g. Somerville Duchy of Lancaster, I, 297.

Sedbergh, was the subject of an early concealment commission.⁶ Richard Bewcock, Anthony Dale and John Lambert - the local collectors of chantry revenue - started there in their investigation of concealments throughout the West Riding, but their task proved much more arduous than they had supposed, and their interim report on 4 February 1550 was apologetic. They had only been able to cover a single wapentake, and had been sorely delayed because the winter in the hills was 'paynefull and fowle'. Surprisingly, they had to submit a request for copies of the Chantry Certificates, with which they had not been previously armed, and without which they could not hope to determine what had been concealed. Their findings are predictable. The chapel at Garsdale, 6 miles from its parish church at Dent, was surrounded by 'daungerous mountayns' which would prevent the parishioners there attending any services at all if the chapel were dissolved.⁷ The same was true of Bentham chapel, 6 miles from its parish church at Ingleton in the far north west of the county. In both these cases, though the full endowment had escaped attention in 1548, the chapels were licensed to continue, provided that they purchased a Bible and the 'Paraphrases' in English and used them as in a parish church. The chapel at Austwick, however, was in such a sorry state that the commissioners had serious doubts whether it was of any practical use at all for the future: it would be

7. Already in 1548 it had been described as a 'wyld and morishe contree': Y.C.S. II, 413.

6. E 315/115 f. 11 (introductory letter) and ff. 2. et. seq. (findings).

Table XXIII: The interim report of John Lambert, Anthony Dale and Richard Bewcock on concealed lands in the wapentake of Ucross up to January 1550.

(Source : E 315/115 f. 3)

SEDBERGH : £1. 6. 8 p.a. land in Lancashire for a gild there.
 27.10. 9 in uncollected goods.
 40. 0. 0 in cash
 +33. 6. 8 the estimated sale value (capital) of the school building, according to the commissioners.
 50. 0. 0 estimated value of a silver rood with figures.

*DENT (Garsdale chapel) : Unvalued : 1 chalice, 2 bells, 2 vestments.
 2. 6. 8 p.a. land in addition to that disclosed 1548.

BENTHAM 40. 0. 0 cash in hand for various prohibited uses.

AUSTWICK 14. 3 p.a. estimated value of the chapel building

THORNTON IN LONSDALE, and HORTON IN RIBBLESDALE still to be visited.

Notes : (+) The school at Sedbergh was not unhoused to my knowledge, but the value of the schoolhouse should have been in the 1548 Certificates.

(*) The chapel at Dent was not dissolved, but was allowed to continue as a necessary chapel of ease.

Table XXIV : The report of another concealment enquiry in Edward's reign, submitted by Anthony Dale, John Lambert and Stephen Tempest.

(Source : E315/123 f. 151)

Chapels which ought to have been in the crown's hands. Those marked (*) were the only ones actually to have appeared in the Chantry Certificates.

- (a) Roofed with lead : *Farnley, Hubberholme, Settle.
- (b) Roofed with tile or stone : Austwick, *Bank Newton, Bolton Bridge, Emsby, *Garsdale, Hanlith, Harewood Bridge, Hellifield, Horsforth, Howgill, *Long Preston, 'Molseys', Otley Bridge, Skipton, (St. James), Settle Bridge, Wigglesworth, Winterburn.

Unregistered goods, ornaments and stock :-

Malham : lead in the custody of Anthony Dale, the collector.

Giggleswick : cash totalling £140 for lights etc.

Sedbergh: Two stocks of £40 each for lights and for a gild.

Broughton, Guiseley : Stock of goods in each place unvalued.

Bolton by Bowland: £10 cash.

Bingley: an undeclared chantry, with its lands not yet valued.

Skipton: 3 chalices, and the ornaments and goods of the chantries of Our Lady, St Nicholas and the Holy Rood uncollected.

Keighley: 1 chalice and 1 vestment.

Kildwick, Ilkley, Kirkby Malham, Rilston, Mitton and Emsby :

1 chalice and one 'ornament' each.

Pudsey and Malham : 1 chalice each, that at Pudsey for a chantry.

Bank Newton, 1 chalice and 1 vestment.

difficult even to find a buyer. The results of this commission are shown in Table XXIII, though they were untypical of the majority of the later concealment commissions' findings, since, in such a remote area, they were able to discover large endowments which would have been in the Certificates, had a thorough survey been possible.

The local official was best placed to discover concealed lands by his ability to visit the places in question, talk to the local inhabitants, and try to secure the cooperation of the constables in his quest.⁸ But a good deal was still left to chance, and it is hardly surprising that successive commissions touring the county down to the beginning of the following century were repeatedly able to find new portions of concealment in areas which had nominally been covered already. During this Edwardian commission, no accurate means of valuing goods and plate had been devised, and the values of land and buildings are referred to as estimates, which is probably what we ought to expect from officials who, though trusted, were not highly trained in these matters, as a surveyor or his deputy might reasonably have been expected to be. They must, however, have known the basic steps, and they certainly did not trust their senior, the West Riding surveyor, Henry Savile, for under another commission Dale and Lambert, this time acting with Stephen Tempest, making an inventory of chapels, goods and plate, before they were

8. e.g. E 315/115 f.3.

seriously depleted by embezzlers, found Savile himself in possession of some of the chapel land at Farnley,

neither content to inquire hym self of concealmentes nor with that that we do bot as mych. 9.

Under this commission, something, however small, was found concealed in every parish of the deanery of Craven included in the 1548 certificates, which we may well take as a useful pointer to the extent of concealments throughout the county. Twenty chapels, estimated to be worth £19. 1. 8. p.a., and numerous items of goods and stock were unearthed, as is demonstrated in Table II. No further major returns to concealment commissions have survived for the reign of Edward VI.

The quest for concealments naturally declined in Mary's reign, since the queen was more inclined to restore lands to the church despite the fears of the landowning classes in a hostile Parliament.¹⁰ One major enquiry was made in the diocese, however, at Hull, where the crown attorney received information of substantial concealment of gild, chantry and obit lands by four merchants, Henry Thruscros, Alexander Stockdale, Walter Jobson, and John Overall. In the autumn of 1557 they were apprehended and sent to the Fleet pending investigation, but bailed by John Bellow and a London merchant, Alexander Emerson. With little difficulty they were able to

9. E 315/123 f. 151: 12 July 1549. Neither Lambert nor Dale can be regarded as entirely trustworthy: see Chapter VII, sec. 4.

10. See particularly Mary's pledge to restore the lands, reported in Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vii pt. 1, p. 34.

prove that the lands with which they were charged had been in the possession of the corporation long before the Chantry Acts, and were not eligible for dissolution. The crown apparently accepted this on condition that the lands were restored to their original uses, but this was precluded by the advent of Elizabeth, who accepted that the lands did not belong to the crown.¹¹

Elizabeth had none of the reservation of her sister towards church property. She recovered most of what Mary had restored, and resumed a more materialistic outlook. But her early years were too preoccupied with the establishment of her authority at home and abroad to allow any time for the recovery of concealed lands as a determined national policy.

Yet in cases where the finding and proving of concealments could be done at other people's expense, disposal of the lands presented little problem.. Informants who desired a lease of the property had no difficulty in securing it, and persons who undertook to prove individual plots concealed were almost certain to obtain a favourable lease conditional on such proof.¹² It was soon realised that if sufficient lands were to be found, they would constitute a useful fund from which to reward servants, instead of dipping into reserves of good crown land. Largesse of this kind, however, could be more of a burden than a reward, and only the hope of profit on the

11. Hull City records, M 45 (a) ff. 4-7; M 45 (d) 5; M 45 (f). See also Tickell, 803, 813.

12. e.g. B.M. Lansdowne 34/47: 45 small East Yorkshire properties worth a total of £4. 14. 11 p.a. were leased to George and Hugh Robson without fine because they had discovered them at their own costs. C.P.R. V Eliz. 48: Richard Senhouse secured a lease of the property of St Lawrence's hospital, Canterbury after guaranteeing to prove its concealment.

re-sale of the lands can have inspired the 'beneficiaries' to opt for this form of payment. Concealed chantry lands were in general minute, with rents usually much less than 1/- per tenant, making it the more surprising that another stage in the process developed, whereby certain stalwarts even sought permission to search for concealments over a wide area, having no specific informations on which to start, but considering it nonetheless worthwhile.

Thomas Paynell, who had served four successive monarchs, found his reward on 14 May 1560 when Elizabeth granted him the rights over such concealed lands as he might discover at his own expense in four counties to a yearly value of £26. 13. 4. Like many of his fellows who dealt in concealments, Paynell was to find it very hard to round up lands to this total. Before his death shortly after the grant, he had collected evidence against lands totalling £17. 17. 5. p.a. which were confirmed by Letters Patent to his executors on 26 November 1563. Yet this was only two-thirds of his authorised yield, and, not to be out-witted, John Strowbridge and John Nettleton, his executors, continued the search. As if some curse lay on the operation, Strowbridge soon followed Paynell to the grave, leaving Nettleton high and dry, still looking for the rest of his £8. 15. 11 p.a. due to the estate of Paynell. He contracted a debt with Francis Barker, a London Merchant Tailor, and by the time the last of the land had been discovered, it had to be granted to Barker to pay off the debt. If this was a reward for faithful service,

Paynell would probably rather have let his talents slip by unrecognised! Even the property he himself unearthed consisted of over 50 individual tenancies distributed throughout Middlesex, Essex, Hertfordshire and Yorkshire, so that the business of selling off to the tenants or other purchasers in the hope of profit must itself have been exhausting.¹³ Only a person or a syndicate with extensive contacts throughout the country could hope to make a decent profit on negotiations of this kind. The crown itself, with its numerous local officers, was best equipped to do the job, but the officers were already hard worked and the difficulties encountered by clients about the search for concealments were a salutary warning to the crown and others not to embark on the project until its profitability had been tested.

John Pickarell was another client thus to be 'favoured' by the crown, and again, happily for him, it was his executors after his death who had to bear the burden. As steward of Somerset's household, Pickarell had loaned the duke over £900 without recompense - a debt which Elizabeth now decided to honour in part. Cecily Pickarell, his widow, was granted several large blocks of concealed lands, but in each case they consisted predominantly of tiny particles which only a reliable agent could have hoped to sell off. The first such grant involved scores of small holdings

13. Reconstructed from C.P.R. Elizabeth II, 159; III, 52; V, 236-8.

scattered throughout the counties of Gloucester, Hereford, Worcester, Shropshire, Warwick, Stafford, Derby, York, Lincoln, Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Middlesex and London, and, for all that totalling only £13. 3. 8. p.a.¹⁴ Two subsequent grants yielded a further £16. 15. 4. and £9. 15. 8. p.a.¹⁵ but it would be interesting to know how much of a blessing this was really thought by those on whom the royal benevolence had fallen.

The ambition to make a small profit out of concealment 'safaris' penetrated the royal household, though whether the participants were prompted by higher authority or acted purely on their own initiative remains a secret. Sir George Howard, the master of Elizabeth's armoury, was first in the hunt, and bagged six patents full of concealed lands between 21 July 1559 and 4 April 1561.¹⁶ Shortly afterwards the Lieutenant of the Tower, Sir Edward Warner, who had already shown an interest in the purchase of chantry lands, found the new sport too good to miss, and lent his support to the enterprise of Ralph Shelton of Depeham, Norfolk, which netted £24. 0. 4. on 15 September, 1561.¹⁷

Thomas, Lord Wentworth, became the first to realise the commercial prospects of hunting for concealments, by securing from Elizabeth a patent to permit the recovery of lands to the yearly value of £200, which he was then to hold

15. Ibid. II, 554, 566.

16. Ibid. I, 87, 307, 395, 427; II, 10, 160.

17. Ibid. II. 104, Warner also received one grant in his own name, II, 329.

in fee-farm, yielding the appropriate yearly rents to the crown. The fullest state cooperation was to be given. If Wentworth needed official help to prove that some plots were concealed, he was to contact the solicitor or attorney of the Exchequer, or the chancellor or attorney of the Duchy,¹⁸ who would issue a special commission. In the period covered by the Patent Rolls hitherto calendared, Wentworth had already shown himself in deadly earnest, and his team must have been both large and energetic, judging by the results achieved.¹⁹

Other agents who had neither the close relation to the crown of the last three men examined, nor the advantage of being royal creditors, were beginning to come forward in the 1560's offering to trace concealed lands. Elizabeth accepted, but only on the clear understanding that any lands they found they would have to buy, which suggests an awakening of the crown's own interest. The rate of purchase, however, at around 12 years, perhaps half of what they would have paid had the lands not been concealed, was very favourable.²⁰

18, according to the location of the lands.

19. C.P.R. Eliz. V, 5, 227, 273, 341, 397. The entries get longer and more fragmentary. Wentworth had additional securities: if any of the lands were later discovered by legal process not to be concealed he was to be allowed to replace them, and when he sued for a commission out of the Exchequer or the Duchy its members were to be his own nominees.

20. William Grice (C.P.R. Eliz. III, 62, 453) paid £216 for lands worth £17. 19. 11 p.a. and £251. 14. 6. for lands worth £20. 19. 6½. Many other examples may be found of concealments, e.g. III, 11, 474; IV, 46, 51, 162, 225, 352; V 43, 331, 334.

By 1570 much more than a purely local interest had been aroused, and the list of Special Commissions issuing from the Exchequer testifies to the acceleration of activity. Discussion of the problems and procedure of the concealment commissions grew during the 1580's, and several plans for dealing with them were evolved.

These preliminary remarks would seem to indicate that concealments were not simply pursued by the crown to defend a legal principle of ownership. In the early years at least, much of the initiative came from the subject, with informations from aggrieved local parties, or applications from hopeful speculators, and the crown was slow to embark on costly enquiries when others were prepared to do the job at their own expense. Once the extent of the concealment was fully realised, the appetite not only of the speculators, but of the crown itself was fully whetted, and the full machinery of the Exchequer was thrown into the battle, producing as a by-product the vast documentation which survives. For as long as possible the crown allowed others to pay for the search, but the time came when the investigations had to be regularised and controlled. The pressing financial needs of the crown in the 1580's probably contributed as much to its eventual participation as did any desire to cash in on the subject's new-found prosperity through concealments.

There was a good deal of variety in the size and importance of the concealment commissions issued during the reign of Elizabeth. Many were of an exploratory nature, covering a wide range of counties, and probably intended mainly to sound out information which might be checked in greater detail by more particular commissions to be appointed subsequently. One commission, for example, covered the counties of Flint, Kent, York, Leicester, Middlesex, Shropshire and Huntingdon²¹, and another Lincoln, Suffolk, Norfolk, Nottingham, Derby, York and Northumberland.²² Even at a county level, it was more common for the commissioners to cover every type of crown land (including monastic and attainted land) rather than to confine their attentions to chantry land alone. Consequently the returns of the commissioners were a long time in the making. One particularly thorough commission, sitting at many centres throughout Yorkshire, took nine months to complete its findings.²³ But there were, of course, other commissions which went to investigate informations concerning specific properties, and their task was soon accomplished. By and large, little property in the diocese was discovered through individual informations of this sort. In the course of their work,

21. E 178/2889.

22. E 178/2935.

23. E 178/133 in the summer and autumn of 26-7 Elizabeth. Among the places visited were York (castle and guildhall), Hornsea and Beverley; Gargrave, Doncaster and Rotherham; and Thirsk. A good deal of the return is illegible, but very few tenancies were worth more than 1/- p.a.

collectors and auditors might discover small plots and add them to their yearly accounts without the fuss of a special commission²⁴. Incidentally such local officers stood a very good chance of gaining for themselves leases of property they discovered.²⁵

But a more systematic search was required if the whole picture of the concealments was to be revealed, and although I have found no specific instructions for concealment commissioners operating in our area, the procedure must certainly have been similar to that adopted in other nation-wide campaigns of the kind.²⁶ The sheriff of each county to be visited was informed of the dates on which the commissioners would attend, and the appointed place or places of the meeting. It was then his duty to discover by any means at his disposal who were the persons most likely to know about the concealed lands.

If the commission was acting upon information received, the task would be comparatively simple, for the informant would often name those implicated in the concealment. And at the least, the sheriff could gather together the tenants of the disputed property, and such worthy locals whose memories were good enough to permit the tracing of the earlier history of the lands. The commissioners no doubt sent a list of the

24. e.g. DL/29/8951.

25. e.g. E 310/117 (45).

26. See Appendix VIII

exact points of their enquiry to aid the sheriff in impannelling his jury. Thereafter, procedure would be as in any other court of inquest, with jurors answering specific interrogatories on oath before the concealment commissioners.

Where no information had been laid, the object of the commission was to search for concealed lands with the help of local witnesses. Here the scale of operations was much greater. Many more persons would have to give testimony²⁷ and without the cooperation of the inhabitants the task would have been very nearly impossible. Not only the sheriff, but constables, church wardens, clergy, and anyone in positions of responsibility in wapentake or parish were hustled into action, giving their own information and assembling those who knew more than themselves. In such cases, the sheriff must have impannelled a jury which set out to ask the questions for itself, and whose foreman returned its written findings to the commissioners,²⁸ who could then ask further questions on points arising.

Informing against neighbours²⁹ was encouraged for raisons d'etat, but nothing akin to a secret police was used to extract the information. Neither were there any

27. e.g. E 178/1772, over 40 witnesses, the majority over 50 yrs; or DL 44/244: 29 people.

28. e.g. E 178/1440 'The verdet of William Blenkharne foreman of the Jurey of Pattrington aforesaide and other his fellowes Concernynge certaine Articles gyven in Charge to be inquired upon by her majesties Commission within the Sowthe Balyewicke of Holdernes in the Countie of Yorke!.

29. This was rather different from the role of the professional informer nurtured by the Tudor state (see G.R. Elton in C.H.J. 1954). Local informants were not necessarily paid for their services except in the right to a beneficial lease of the property.

serious recriminations against those in possession of the concealed lands, for in many cases the original culprits were long since dead. Resistance to the crown's prying is recorded so rarely that the occasional instance merits a note. For not everyone was happy about the practice of informing, and even those who accepted it as a necessary evil were often unaware of the reason for the fuss. More than a generation separated the last active chantry priest from the bulk of the concealment commissions, and there were many who had never seen a chantry, and perhaps only knew what such a thing was through oral tradition. The commission visiting the East Riding in 1591³⁰ had particular trouble in this respect, and fines of £1 each on at least twenty people were passed for their non-appearance or for obstruction:

'William Thomson would not appeare: fine xx s ... and by the othe of William Hardie the said Wm. Thomson toke hold of Hewgh Robson bosome & called him Rascall & strake the Commyssion. Also the said Jurey of Pattrington wold not sett downe no Rente, nor how long the said premisses haith bene holden without rent painge.'

Villages and townships alike had been made to feel the heavy hand of the central government, which must have benefitted enormously from the acquaintance with local institutions and attitudes derived from the concealment commissioners' reports.

30. E. 178/1440.

But was the benefit mutual? There seems nothing to point to a more ready or willing acceptance by the localities of governmental interference, and to the last there must have been many who resolutely refused to declare the 'crimes' of their ancestors.

The method and extent of concealment varied a good deal from place to place, depending mainly on the nature of the endowment itself. Some observances were known only to a few, whilst others were common knowledge. The celebration of many obits, for example, was well known through the habit of reading out before the assembled congregation the roll of those who had contributed to the relief of the poor and the upkeep of the church by their testamentary benefactions. If a list is repeated often enough the names tend to become firmly implanted in the listener's memory, and remain so for many years. This fact, together with the tendency of the elderly to reminisce on their youth helps to explain why Tudor inquests often relied on the testimony of the oldest people in the area. As late as 36 Elizabeth - half a century since the original endowment - some of the oldest parishioners of St. Margaret's, Walmgate, York, could remember having heard the name of Agnes Manners read out at the head of the bede roll of persons to be prayed for after she had left money not only for masses for her own soul, but also for annual distributions to the poor.³¹ Notoriety might also

31. E 134/ 35-36 Elizabeth/Michaelmas, 15.

be achieved for such ceremonies by the ringing of bells in honour of the dead - a practice forbidden after the Reformation.³² Yet it seems that even those observances which everybody knew about might not reach the crown's ears spontaneously, provided that nobody had a pressing public conscience or a grudge against those chiefly responsible for the concealment. When examining the records of concealment we are constantly posing the question how many people were in the secret, and why was more not revealed at an early stage when there were chantry collectors, church wardens, constables and commissioners all supposedly on the watch.

Although chantry foundations (especially in parish churches where there might be effigies or tombs of the dead in whose honour the chantry was founded) could scarcely escape public attention, it is very probable that endowments of occasional masses or obits were known only to the priest and the church wardens, and were thus easier to conceal. By contrast, almost everybody who went to church could see any lamp burning in honour of a saint or of the dead, and there must have been considerable connivance to keep this knowledge from successive commissioners.³³ The lamp itself might easily be removed as a tangible object, so that even a prying visitor to the church or the archdeacon himself could be forgiven for assuming that superstitious practices had been either non-existent or else

32. E 178/1784: a deponent at Clareborough (Notts) recalled being present 'at the ringing of bells at the dole' of an obit.

33. A 'light' might consist of many candles, all paid for by different people, see for example E.L.Cutts, 313-4.

fully declared and now abolished. The Certificates of 1548 listed hundreds of these tiny endowments, but since lights had been a central part of the worship of the unreformed church, the chantry commissioners must have realised that even the large number they found did not approach the actual total. Subsequent visitations, and the proceedings of the High Commission show that it was many years before the practice of burning lamps before images or in the sanctuary ceased.³⁴ The endowments were so small that the church wardens may not have thought it worthwhile to report them to the crown. A few pence would make no dramatic difference to the total collected, and since the lamps were often supported by the poorer inhabitants who could not afford to contribute to a chantry, it may have seemed like local charity simply to tell the benefactor to keep his pennies in his purse, and not to inform the crown.

But deliberate concealment could be a hazardous business. The very names of fields and holdings might betray the whole story. Hundreds of examples are to be found: 'Lady Close' at Otley, 'lampe wonge' at Calverton, 'kirke lathe' at Caunton, 'St. James's land' at Saund[er]by, 'Kirk Hedlondes' at South Leverton, 'Church Piece' at Colston ... all of them eventually discovered by the crown.³⁵ It seems reasonable to infer that

34. P. Tyler, The Ecclesiastical Commission.

35. References drawn respectively from E 178 nos. 2605, 1776, Ibid., 3059 and 1772.

this was precisely the sort of evidence for which commissioners and agents like Wentworth were looking. Where the residents realised this danger, the names might be dropped or changed, but this was no insurance against their being unearthed in some earlier rental. At Sutton Bonnington (Notts) there was land given to the maintenance of lights at Loughborough (Leics):-

'and now called Brigham (by a newe gyven name)
to defraude the Kinges Maiestie therof'. 36.

There must have been many similar alterations throughout the county.

Whereas a light might be physically removed to prevent discovery, and an obit forgotten because there was no visible trace of it, chapels themselves could not so easily pass into oblivion: the business of dismantling or converting them was more difficult and more expensive. However, some were little more than small huts or cottages, sparsely furnished, and neglected for the greater part of the year. One commission reporting on Nottinghamshire in 15 Elizabeth, furnishes several examples. At Rampton there was an annual mass on 'plough day' and at Laneham a solemn mass only on St. James's day.³⁷ At Oxton the chapel had probably not been used since the late 1530's, for it was built as the focus of an annual pilgrimage in honour of St. Margaret.³⁸

*

37. patron of the town.

38. E 178/1772 cf. C.P.R. Eliz V 237: at Wold Newton a priest celebrated on St. Gregory's day and at Gresborough on Trinity Sunday.

*36. E 321/24/84 cf. the 'lady close' at Guiseley which became 'new close' after the dissolution (E 134/34 Eliz. Hilary/15).

The use of small buildings on a single day of the year was characteristic of the faith of our ancestors in the intercession of saints. Humble and insignificant as many of these chapels were, the buildings, if unaltered, remained a potential betrayal for those who had concealed the endowments, and a variety of actions were taken to ensure that the chances of discovery were minimised. At Kersall in the parish of Knesall, the inhabitants went to the extraordinary lengths of spending 40 marks in pulling down their free chapel so that they might secrete its endowment. Alas, this also meant that the school which had been maintained there ceased to function.³⁹ In other areas the remedy was not so drastic. At Gristhorpe, for example, the chapel was converted partly into a barn and partly into almshouses,⁴⁰ whilst at Blyth lead was stripped from the roof of a chapel, which was then covered with straw and converted into a cottage to appear less conspicuous.⁴¹ At Fenton, there had been a small stone chapel with a lead roof and two bells, the centre of a pilgrimage where the locals 'offred legges & armes of waxe & suche like.'⁴² It was demolished in Edward's reign, and the fabric used to build two small cottages on the site, set in a pleasant garden with trees, but unfortunately the new inhabitants took less pride

39. E178/1784. Others destroyed included that at Carlton (Notts) of which only the walls were left standing (ibid), and the 'hermitage' at Great Ouseburn (DL 44/244), which was not destroyed, however, until about 1570.

40. E 178/1772.

41. E 321/24/84.

42. The offering of replicas of the limbs to be healed was a common devotional practice, cf. Castiglione, The Book of the Courtier, 191. (Pelican edition).

in their abode than had the chaplains, for by the time it was drawn to the attention of the commissioners the buildings were derelict and the garden had become a wilderness.⁴³

It would be an exaggeration to describe these chapels as essential to the spiritual welfare of the parishioners. Most were not, and could never have sufficed as, chapels of ease. Moreover, perhaps in the knowledge that their days were numbered, they were not refurbished and many fell rapidly into decay. The chapel at Otley Bridge, though reported in one of the earliest returns,⁴⁴ was already falling down, and a grant of concealed lands in Yorkshire to Francis Barker included several ruined chapels and the like.⁴⁵ Such buildings had endowments so small that their demise occasioned no more than a general apathy, and the inhabitants did not deliberately conspire to prevent the crown's discovering them, but simply left the business of discovery to the crown's officials who were clearly more interested than themselves. The crown had enough decayed property on its hands without adding to the stock, and might even have preferred plots carrying such a liability to have remained concealed.⁴⁶

The most intriguing instances of concealment are furnished by the larger towns of the diocese, rich in endowments, many of which were directly supported by the town

43. E 178/1772 m.3.

44. E 315/123 f. 239.

45. C66/1026.

46. cf. DL 44/536 The concealed free chapel at Norton (Kirk Smeaton parish) was so badly decayed at the time of its discovery that the cost of repair exceeded a year's revenue from the endowment.

councils or trade gilds determined to defend their heritage to the last against the encroachments of the crown. York, with its galaxy of trade gilds and scores of chantries was almost bound to indulge in concealment, though the motive was frequently not to defraud the crown, but rather to preserve for the city and its ancient corporations such sums as could be devoted to charitable purposes. Furthermore, the exclusion of trade gilds as such from the dissolution may have caused some genuine confusion in societies which barely distinguished between the sacred and secular aspects of their constitution. Charitable foundations were almost inseparable from the gild services, which in the reformers' eyes were at worst superstitious and at best merely foolish works of supererogation.

The gild of merchant tailors of York paid £4 p.a. to a priest, one Robert Collinson, celebrating offices in the church of St Helen-on-the-Walls, but failed to disclose this endowment to the Chantry Commissioners because, as they insisted after discovery, being a merchant gild, they had thought themselves exempt.⁴⁷ We also learn that the masters of the gild of St Anthony and the gilds of SS Christopher and George refused to certify their religious observances to the commissioners.⁴⁸ All of these gilds were

47. E 321/34/45 (5 November 1550).

48. E 321/27/9.

discovered before the end of the reign of Edward VI, but a more deft concealment under the very nose of the crown was that of part of the gild of Corpus Christi, which suffered heavily at the hands of the Reformers, having its costly shrine broken up and melted down at the York Mint, and its Corpus Christi day procession disbanded. Much that was most popular about its observances had therefore disappeared. However, it maintained the hospital of St Thomas, whose fellows successfully evaded successive royal attempts to dissolve that foundation also. In 1552, to add strength to their struggle, they admitted some aldermen as members and the lord mayor was elected master. It was not until 1576 that the endowment was registered as concealed, and even this was hotly contested until the city was allowed to buy back much of the land to continue its charitable work.⁴⁹

Perhaps it was the finding of the concealed hospital endowment here that directed the attention of Sir James Crofts himself to the city when he was seeking concealments in 1584. His deputies began to make a nuisance of themselves in that year as far as the city was concerned, and the lord mayor and aldermen, insisting rather inanely that there could not be any undeclared lands in the city, nevertheless compounded with William Mappleton, Croft's servant, for £100 to have any that might be found. Prior to this a public meeting had been called, and the citizens asked to think over whether they each

49. The Register of the Guild of Corpus Christi, ed. R.H. Skaife, (Surtees Soc. vol. 57), xii-xiv; 298 ff.

wanted to make a separate deal with the commissioners for any lands they might know to be concealed, or whether they would prefer to entrust the operation in toto to the lord mayor, which they duly did. A committee was appointed to draw up a list of the many items of concealment. Thinking the agreement with Mappleton to hold good, they dispatched the £100 to Crofts, with £20 bonus for Mappleton. But Crofts was not so easily satisfied. If they took all the concealed lands within the city for £100 and then new items were to be found, he could easily make a loss on the deal. He only agreed to accept on condition that the corporation pay him extra should lands over the £100 come to their attention. Since many of the city's chantries had been legally dissolved by private Act of Parliament in 1536, the corporation was sure that there were no major items left unrecorded, and it gave its assurance that the purchase was:

'not ment for our owne benefitt, but to the intent that every tenant therof maye have his owne land at our handes againe, payinge ratablie according to suche sommes of money as we have or shall disburse about the same.' 50.

Clearly the discovery of lands which could thus be bought up by a corporate interest saved a good deal of hardship for the crown commissioners, and it is interesting to note that the pattern of tenant purchases which we have previously had

50. York Civic Records VIII, 78-9, 85, 87, 120. There were other concealments in the city; e.g. by a curious error, the chapel of St William on Ouse Bridge returned no profits to the crown until after an enquiry in 1552, 3 years after White and Bury had bought much of its endowment: E 315/122 f. 37 et. seq.

occasion to note is repeated here when we have advanced forty years from the dissolution.

York was not alone in sheltering many concealments. Nottingham was another town where vested interests came together in 1548 to thwart the crown, and again the story is well documented. The tanners' gild had supported the gild of St. Katharine in St Mary's Church, having annual celebrations with organ music on the feast of their patron saint. The requisite money for maintenance was entrusted by the tanners to the town council,⁵¹ but:

about suche time as it was thought Chauntreys should go downe, the Tanners who were the masters & overseers of the said Chauntrey or guilde, who had at that tyme St Katherine for their Saincte, did devise with the heddes of the towne & Serjaunt Powtrell⁵² who was then recorder of the saide towne, howe to put the landes into suche handes as it mought not come into the kinges hand by the lawe. 53.

The gild's overt activities ceased and the organ was evidently dismantled for when the gild resumed its activities in the reign of Mary it had then a 'paire of Regalls for lack of Organs'.⁵⁴ Under Elizabeth activities again ceased for fear of recriminations, and it was the mid-1570's before the concealment was detected.⁵⁵

51. £2. p.a.

52. Nicholas Powtrell who figured in many prominent commissions in the latter part of the century.

53. E 178/1784.

54. The Regal was very popular in the 16th century. Henry VIII had 13 single and 5 double instruments. It was smaller than most organs consisting of reed stops of a very harsh nature: C. Clutton and A. Niland, The British Organ 31-2, 52.

55. Part of the gild of St George in St Peter's church, and part of the chantry in Nottingham castle were also concealed, see E 178/1776.

It seems to have been generally supposed that the participation of the notaries and city fathers added a certain respectability to the concealment. We have encountered it both at York and Nottingham, and in the only worthy discourse on concealments hitherto in print, Mr. Peter Wenham has shown it also at Richmond.⁵⁶ There, all but two of the town's chantries were tacitly ignored when the crown commissioners were listing them in 1548, and these two were only included because the crown was known to have record of their foundation. The full truth of the sequel remains a little obscure. Whilst charges of concealment were made, and the case taken up in the Court of Requests following counter-charges by the town, the council constantly protested that there was no evidence that the lands had actually been bestowed on the superstitious uses with which they were charged, and an absence of positive proof did more to secure their eventual reprieve than did a definite vindication of the town's innocence.

Fears for educational and charitable endowments were among the foremost causes of concealment of entire foundations. Ripon was yet another town in which a group of inhabitants came together to suppress information. A school existed there for many years in close connection with the Rood Gild.⁵⁷ At the dissolution two townsmen, William Scott and

56. L.P. Wenham, 'The chantries, gilds, obits and lights of Richmond' in Y.A.J. vol. 38 (3 parts).

57. A.F. Leach, Yorkshire Schools - I (Y.A.S.R. vol. 27), lvii et seq. It was common to detain lands declaring them to have been put to quite other uses, see E.E. Dodd, 'Bingley Chantry Endowments' in Bradford Antiquary, 1952-62, 98-9. See also essays by H.I. Judson in Ibid. 1933-9, 312, and Ibid. 1940-50, 55.

Anthony Frankish, unwilling to see the school dissolved, and not trusting the promises of the crown to further the educational programme, arranged that the gild itself be concealed and only the school declared (at a smaller sum, and without disclosing the exact nature of the endowment). All might have been well, but reflecting on their action they determined to go further and improve the standard of teaching by threatening to dismiss the incompetent schoolmaster, Edmund Brown. At this, Brown informed against them and revealed the existence of lands to support the school, gaining for himself a 21-year lease of the property worth £8. 7. 2. p.a. He was thus the prototype of the vengeful informer who was to prove so dangerous to many involved in concealment. No further investigation was conducted until 1577 when Brown's lease had expired, and though the story of the concealment became plainer, the commissioners could find little land that had not been declared by Brown. The school in the meanwhile had been amply protected by Philip and Mary who assigned to its upkeep the revenues of four chantries.⁵⁸

Small townships were as proud of their endowments as large towns, and seem to have gone to equal lengths to ensure their preservation. But it is not always easy to determine their motives. In some cases they were guided by the consideration that if they concealed the lands at all they had committed a crime, so they might as well make the most of an unexpected

58. Y.A.S.R., vol. 27, 182-3.

windfall and divide the spoil. At Everton (Notts) for instance, the Morrow Mass chantry was ignored and its funds

'kept and concealed by the Inhabitantes of the towne and devided emongest themselves, and some part payeth yet rent to the churchemasters.' 59

At Ordsall in the same county, a considerable amount was spent on the rebuilding of a house that had supported the morrow mass priest there:

(the house) being in great decay the towneship emongest themselves did make a pece of money & did build a new house ... & the same was made, brought home & sett up at the charge of the towne & was then knowen to be the church house & church land for & to the uses aforesaide. 60.

Whey they should have chosen to start this building as late as 1545 it is difficult to imagine, but it was hardly conceivable that persons in this position should stand passively by and watch the crown destroy all their labour.

The longer the crown waited before probing for concealments, the fewer people there were left who had themselves participated in the old style religion and known its attractions. But whilst this might make for a more sympathetic acceptance of the crown's policy, it also meant that the commissions were increasingly faced by a younger generation of tenants who might genuinely be unaware of the uses to which their property had been put decades ago. Seventeen years after Elizabeth's accession, John Labrey of Calverton (Notts) owned a plot of land,

59. E 178/1784.

60. E 178/1788.

for wich he payeth rent at this presente to the poore mens boxe, but howe & to what use it was used in the begynning of King Edwardes tyme & before he knoweth not, but it hathe bene alwayes called by the name of lampe wonge. 61.

His ignorance may have been feigned, but we do not need to assume this. The lapse of time also led the crown to forget its own findings under earlier commissions. The lands at Hull which had been confirmed to the corporations by Elizabeth after the hint of concealment which we have examined, were once again declared concealed in the 1580's and presented to Sir James Crofts. It was the following century before this injustice was righted.⁶² Similarly, a Duchy of Lancaster commission in 1591 produced a long list of alleged concealments, most of which appear to be nothing of the kind, but rather a rehearsal of those copyhold lands to which the crown had no right by the term of the 1548 Chantry Act.⁶³ Which all goes to show that for all the weight of documentation, there was some inadequacy in the cross-referencing of court records and their subsequent consultation.

61. E 178/1776. Even following the discovery of concealment it was not always the case that a chapel was dissolved. The chapel at Chapelthorpe near Wakefield remained undetected until 1576, when the parishioners put up a spirited defence. The land was confiscated, but the building preserved, and as late as 1624 it was bought back by the parish to maintain as a chapel, (Walker, Wakefield, 340).

62. Hull City records, M 45 (d) 5 and (f).

63. DL 42/36.

The measure of success of the concealment commissioners is also the measure of the failure of the Chantry Commissioners. An appendix to this chapter gives some idea how widespread was the concealment, but whilst parish after parish was affected it must again be emphasised that the great majority of the entries refer to pennies and fractions of pennies, rather than to large and valuable institutions wholly concealed from the crown. The administrative effort spent on the initial chantry surveys was as nothing compared with the protracted dealings of the concealment commissioners, though both give great credit to the government capable of devising and controlling them.

CHAPTER IX

LITIGATION

From time to time we have caught glimpses of the role of the law courts in untangling some of the knotty problems raised by the dissolution. But any attempt to assess the justice of the resulting land settlement would be incomplete without a more concentrated study of the number and nature of the cases arising, insofar as the surviving documentation will allow. Inevitably there are depositions and pleadings for far more cases than there are extant decrees, for many cases must have been settled out of court, and many charges withdrawn in order to save time and money. Nevertheless, enough decrees remain to show clearly the course followed by the judges, and even without a decree we can often learn much about the nature of complaints in situations arising from the dissolution.

The expropriation of chantry-priests by the crown meant a minor revolution in landlord-tenant relations: overnight, thousands of small tenants found their allegiance transferred to a new landlord - the crown or its subsequent nominee. Yet for the great majority of tenants the dissolution wrought no major upset, or we should surely have heard of expropriations, rack-renting and the like, which are notably absent from the surviving litigation. Those who leased the land from the crown seem to have paid the same rent at each renewal of the lease, and only through the entry-fines was the crown able to make any profit.

Whether these men, and those who bought chantry land, were as generous with the sitting tenants we cannot be certain, save by the absence of protests.

In handling the case material, caution is essential. For within a few years of the dissolution much of the chantry land that had changed hands had effectively been dissociated from superstitious uses and had become absorbed in the estates of new owners. It is sometimes artificial to light on a case just because it is calendared as concerning "chantry" land, and the further away we get from 1548, the greater the likelihood that such cases will concern disputes of tenure, bargain or covenant which do not stem directly from the dissolution.

For example, the crown did not sell or lease any of St. Mary's chantry at Keighley immediately after the dissolution, but honoured the terms of several leases made by the cantarist, only insisting that the rents were now paid to the crown. There was no change of tenure here, as a result of the dissolution. Yet shortly afterwards we hear of a husbandman, Richard Hall, with his two kinsmen William and John (described as labourers) entering some of the property, uprooting hedges and fences and ploughing up the land. This was almost certainly a gesture against enclosure rather than anything directly to do with the dissolution.¹ Even in some of the cases we shall shortly

1. E 321/26/63 (= E321/30/52).

examine, the danger of attributing too much to the dissolution will be apparent.

Another warning is perhaps desirable. Violence and self-help were still normal in the enforcement of claims to property in Tudor England. Men readily banded together armed with the nearest convenient weapons if the evident bias or tardiness of the process of law, or the persons administering it, threatened to deprive them of what they considered to be their rights. This has two important consequences: first, that the arousing of apparently violent response in disputes over chantry property does not mean that the local population regarded such cases with any greater passion than any others concerning disputed rights to land; and secondly, since it was necessary to prove wrongful entry in order to instigate a case against an opponent, there was an over-liberal usage of the charge of entry "*vi et armis*" in great abundance of detail to make the picture look as black as possible; therefore the exact details of many an alleged intrusion deserve to be treated with the utmost caution, not to say scepticism. A white lie was often as impressive as a good witness! Dr. Youings showed that at Exeter a group of locals attacked royal servants (dismantling a Rood loft) with picks, spades, shovels and anything else they could lay hands on.² In Manchester, one Robert Fletcher

2. J. Youings, Ph.D. thesis, 101.

laid a complaint against a dozen ring-leaders of a band protesting against his possession of land attached to St. George's chantry: similar elementary weapons were used, and this time there was even a pair of bagpipes in evidence, presumably to lend an air of martial dignity to the proceedings: the protesters demonstrated their wrath by digging up 500 bucketfuls of earth as a token gesture.³ For callous brutality nothing I have encountered surpasses the case concerning lands of St. Mary's chantry in the North Aisle at Rothwell: William Johnson of London took a lease of the property on 31 May 9 Elizabeth, but on 9th January following, four men burst into a house, and:

then and there with greate crueltie and vigor,
not havinge before theire eyes the feare of God
nor the dawnger of the Quenes majesties lawes,
dyd assaulte, hurte and beate one pore woman
called widow Ellis, and here pore and nedye
fatherles children, Tennaun^utes unto your Orator,
occupyenge the premisses at his sufferance.

They robbed her of many possessions and threw the rest out into the street, and the woman with them, before occupying the house, and slowly dismantling and despoiling it.⁴

-
3. L.&C.R.S. xl 30-1 Compare DL1/140 [W.1.] where in 1568 intruders on the land of the Rushworth chantry at Pontefract had 'not only moven thee grasse thereuppon growinge, but also have taken, leadd, dryven and carrydd away the same.' See also E. Kerridge Agrarian Problems, 82.
4. DL1/76 [J.1.] The defendants insisted, by contrast, that the woman had left voluntarily. On the problem of violence, see e.g. A.W.B. Simpson, op. cit., 42.

Making due allowances, therefore, we can proceed to an analysis of some of the cases which seem to be relevant. Almost every law-court in the realm had competence over some aspect of the dissolution. In London, King's Bench and Common Pleas registered deeds and conveyances, but as far as our area is concerned they did not handle disputes over title or possession of chantry lands, even where violence was alleged. This was left to the courts of Augmentations, (after 1553 the Exchequer) and Duchy Chamber as we might expect. Star Chamber and Requests were sometimes concerned with chantries, though we have already noted the only cases there which relate to property in our area.⁵ The Council of the North probably played a greater part than we shall ever know in the absence of its records, whilst the manorial courts dealt with the disposal of copyhold lands,⁶ and the activities of Quarter sessions or assizes are only known from incidental reports elsewhere.

There are several well-defined groups of cases. First the crown itself sometimes instigated proceedings against those who appeared to be in arrears with their rent as scheduled in the Chantry Certificates or the Ministers'

5. above, pp.71,230.

6. Chapter VI above.

Accounts. It was advisable to defer such proceedings for several years in the hope that the offender would either pay up or show good reason why not. We shall examine the artificiality of many lists of arrears in the following chapter, and comparatively few persons - a hard-core of persistent resisters - were ever prosecuted. The pursuit of offenders as a matter of public policy could be costly, and there is no case in our area, known to me, where the crown was able to extract an extra penny by litigation against anyone other than its own revenue collectors! In face of absolute denials by major landlords that they had supported chantry priests, and the loyalty of their tenants called to give testimony, the crown usually found it impossible to produce any sufficiency of evidence against them, and case after case was dismissed. It must have been a difficult decision for many whether to yield unquestioningly to the crown's demands in order to retain favour and peaceful co-existence, or to incur the costs of a lawsuit by stoutly defending one's own rights and refusing to pay. Perhaps this sort of consideration was among those encouraging the gentry to take an interest in the elements of law at the Inns of Court. Resistance was the first step to acquittal.

Some went to devious lengths to defraud the crown. Sir Brian Stapleton left a rent of £4. 6. 8. from his estate to a chantry at Terrington, but after his death came the dissolution, and his widow, lady Jane, ordered her bailiff not to pay the rent to the crown, but to keep it for

her. The unfortunate bailiff was encountered by royal officials and valued his immediate freedom more than his mistress's pleasure, paying 2 years' rent he owed. But when he tried to reclaim the sum from lady Jane she refused to reimburse him, and he had to enter a plea in Chancery against her.⁷

But against those whose bailiffs did not cooperate, the crown was ready to begin processes. Sir Thomas Metham of Metham had paid 5 marks per year to one stipendiary in Metham manor, and 6 marks to the chantry of St. Andrew at Howden, whilst the bishop of Durham had paid a stipendiary in his own manor at Howden, sometimes known as St. Cuthbert's chantry⁸. The estate accounts for Howden still show the bishop paying this chaplain after the dissolution, but the crown received nothing from him.⁹ No decision was reached in either case before Edward's death, though commissioners examined witnesses and returned their depositions to London. The evidence suggested that there had been no regular foundations in these three instances, nor any obligation to pay a priest, and that the two manorial "chantries" were only family chapels served by private chaplains. The Exchequer under Mary therefore acquitted both defendants.¹⁰

7. Cl/1364/42.

8. Metham: E321/36/29 and E315/129 f 96. Bp. of Durham E321/38/4; E321/24/78. Metham became a troublesome recusant under Elizabeth: Tyler *op. cit.*; 39.

9. Durham University. Dept., of Palaeography = CC97-98.
10. L.T.R. Memoranda Roll (P.R.O. Index 6924) Hilary, 2-3 P.R.M. (Metham) and Easter 2-3 P&M (Bp.).

The commissioners investigating Metham's case had met at Howden, and the same day took depositions relating to another manorial chapel, that of Sir Peter Vavasor at Spaldington. Information had been laid by the vicar of Bubwith that the chaplain, though a stipendiary, had not been notified to the chantry commissioners. This was a case of over-eager public loyalty, for the crown had no intention of abolishing such private chaplaincies and the vicar did not accuse Vavasor of keeping a chantry, so the verdict was inevitably in Vavasor's favour.¹¹ The testimony of one witness is interesting in that it tells us something about education in a layman's household:-

Barthillmeu abbott of Bellassisse in the countye of Yorke, gent, of the age of xxxix^{ti} sworne and examynede deposithe. He saithe yt he being a childe aboute the age of tenne yeres was in Sr Peter Vavasor his housse at Spaldington in the countye of Yorke and ther wentt to the scolle emonges his children with one Sr Johne Bakloke then chaplayne to the said Sir Peter; and by cause this deponentt thought hym sellffe and his felowes sore handeled wished hym sellff and them to have a new master, whiche Mr. Vavasor permitted hering, sayd they shuld have a new Mr and so shortlye after the said Sir Peter dyd putt hym awaye and hyred an other priest called Sir John Dame which ther taught bothe Mr. Vavasores children and this deponentt, which Sir Johne Dame was shortly after putt awaye by the said Sir Petere & one other hyred by him & none of them called chauntre priestes, nor any chauntre founded within the chappell of Spaldington a ffor said to his knolege, nor yett to thys daye that ever he harde of any ther. 12.

11. E 315/105 f. 150 v.

12. E 315/132 f. 43.

Several other lords of manors were absolved from paying the crown rents claimed to be for chantries, including Sir William Vavasor at Haselwood,¹³ Sir William Tempest at Giggleswick,¹⁴ the earl of Cumberland at Skipton Castle,¹⁵ and Sir Christopher Metcalfe at Aysgarth.¹⁶

These were not the only cases in which a firm stand against the demands of the crown resulted in acquittal, and it may be that many people were silently exploited (as far as our records are concerned) because they had not the courage or expertise to resist wrongful demands for cash or lands. Only those who did resist have left proof of the fact, and their repeated success shows the strict impartiality of the judicature in enforcing the spirit, as well as the letter, of the second Chantry Act. Justice, then, was certainly done for those who put themselves at the courts' mercy, though this may have been a costly operation.

The Bedern college of vicars choral at York Minster refused to surrender because the Act had denied any intention of attacking cathedral property. The site had been hastily sold following the Act, but the buyers were unable to draw any profits, and the Dean and Chapter were able to produce documentary evidence that the college was an

13. L.T.R. Memoranda Roll: Michaelmas 1-2 P&M f. 188.

14. Ibid. Easter 2 Eliz m.4.

15. Ibid. Mich. 1-2 P&M m. 76.

16. E 315/105 f. 190 cf. testimony of Certificates, Y.C.S. I. 105, II, 501.

integral part of the cathedral's endowment, which led to its acquittal, and the annulment of the grant.¹⁷

Few were as well placed as the Dean and Chapter in having access to documentation and legal advice. The raids of Bellow and his accomplices on chapels of ease in the East Riding¹⁸ are not mentioned in the London records, for no tenants were bold enough to speak out against him. Tudor justice tended to help those who helped themselves by taking the first courageous act and defying their social superiors if necessary to present a charge. How well-founded were the charges against Bellow, it is impossible to tell, but many of them could have been spared had all parishioners been as determined as those of Alverthorpe who denied Bellow's contention that their church was a chantry, and were able to satisfy the court that it was a joint cure with Thornton nearby.¹⁹ Other chapels not originally scheduled for continuation were destined to achieve it by process of law, including that at Dent in Craven, reprieved on condition of purchasing an English Bible and the Paraphrases of Erasmus to equip it for Protestant worship;²⁰ chapels at Askrig²¹ and Bank Newton²² and that at Stainburn, over which a long and complex battle was fought before continuation was granted.²³

-
17. E315/105 ff. 239 v - 240. The Chief Justice was consulted before a ruling was given.
18. Chapter VII section 5 above.
19. E 315/116 f. 11.
20. E 315/105 f. 175 v.
21. E 315/105 f. 140.
22. E 315/132/f. 72 et seq.
23. E 315/105 f. 177v (also E315/114 f. 68, 69; E315/113 f. 83-5; E315/114 f. 62; E315/131 f. 17).

We have noted how the parishioners of Bradford rightly refused to yield land given solely to a school: the judges decreed 'the kinges maiestie not entytuled there unto by anie Article or braunche contayned in the Statute of Chauntrys.'²⁴ This was solely because the lands, though owned by the parish, were not attached to a chantry. Few other grammar schools listed in the Chantry Certificates encountered this sort of problem, but we find copyholders of the Jesus service in Leeds similarly acquitted after resisting the false claims of a crown bailiff on their lands.²⁵ But the most interesting cases of determined local resistance and its success are those over the obits at Kildwick and over the continuation of the chapel at Farnley in the parish of Otley.

The crown's attitude to obits in general was plain enough. They were manifestations of a superstitious belief in the saving-power of Good Works, and they were not even effective alms since in most cases they were too small to extend to more than a lucky few who were not even the most deserving. The abolition of obits must not be mistaken for a confiscation of useful funds for poor relief, and the courts again rigidly applied the Act when considering the obits at Kildwick. Here, the major contribution had been a lump sum of £80 from the estate of John Rycroft, 30/- of which was to be distributed annually among the poor of the parish, plus

24. DL 5/8 f. 370 v.

25. DL 5/12 f. 307.

a further £80 invested in cattle to be hired out, as was common practice, at 8d. per head per year, the proceeds again going to the poor. Here was something rather more than the casual dole associated with most obits, and perhaps it was for this reason that the sum was not declared to (or by) the 1548 chantry commissioners. While investigating concealments a few years later, the crown collectors heard of the obits and tried to confiscate the funds for the crown. A further commission was ordered to investigate in 1552²⁶, and the parishioners demonstrated the usefulness of the relief in the parish, where the founder's wishes had been systematically fulfilled....

except one yeare about iiij yeares past in whiche yeare the hoole parcelles rysyng of the said kyne was bestowyd in ffurnyshyng of a Carte to serve the kynges Majestie in to Scotland. 27.

Meanwhile, at Farnley in the parish of Otley²⁸ the parishioners were fighting to preserve their chapel. Although it had been omitted from the 1546 Certificates altogether, it appeared in 1548²⁹ when it was said to be a mile away from the parish church. It failed to receive an official recommendation for continuation, but the parishioners attested that the auditor had assured them it could continue. If so, he failed to inform his collectors whom we have already encountered removing all they could from the site.³⁰ The

26. E 315/129 ff. 98-101.

27. E 315/520 f. 113 and decree, E315/105 f. 262 v.

28. N.B. not Farnley in parish of Leeds.

29. Y.C.S. II, 396.

30. Chapter VII Section 4 above.

parishioners protested, but there were several notable discrepancies between their testimony and that of the collectors. For example, the chapel's main justification was said to be that the two rivers tended to flood and prevent the residents getting to the parish church. To this the royal officers replied:

ther is a costly and goodly Bridge of stone of v
or vj arches wherby aswell the tenauntes of the
township of Newhal and all other villages and
howses over that side the water of Wharfe as also
the tenauntes of the same township of fferneley
may over at ther pleasure with horse and Carte
passe and repasse with ease without any daunger
of the rage of the water, to ther parisshe church
of Otteley, 3l.

The chaplain had been ill for several years and the chapel, left unlocked, had become a haven for sheep, so that for both these reasons no services had actually been performed there. This would have been reason enough for the collector's proceeding to acquire it for the crown. But even with this against them, the parishioners won their case and proved again that the judges were acting impartially and that the crown had no intention of depriving the parishes of much-needed facilities.

The only case coming to my attention in which a plaintiff tried but failed to prove wrongful appropriation by the crown was of a rather different nature anyway. Thomas Webster, master of St John's hospital, Nottingham,

3l. E 315/123 f. 239; E315/520 f. 25 and decree, E 315/105 f. 192 v.

challenged the decision to close it down and give the property to the corporation. The crown had nothing either to gain or lose in this case, having already granted the property to the town without charge.³²

Another group of cases were those in which the crown's appropriation or subsequent disposal of the property was in conflict with bargains and leases made before the dissolution. Again it may be true that court cases tell only half the story, and that there were sporadic expropriations and disturbances which we shall never discover, for want of written evidence, but the number of cases recorded before the courts is very small compared with the number of tenants whose landlord changed as a result of the dissolution. The existence of so many leases of chantry property on the eve of the dissolution was bound to lead to certain anomalies. For although it was the crown's intention to respect the rights of the lessees, it could only do so if it knew of all the leases and it is certain that this was not the case, however good the local registration that seems to have taken place. There was thus a distinct possibility that the crown or its later nominee might claim more from the land than was legally defensible. For example, the new landlord might seek to exploit the land directly for himself, or might issue a lease of some part of the land, cutting across the rights

32. Cl/1321/16. Under Mary, the rector of Lowthorpe tried to recover some of the college endowment leased by the crown (Cl/1437/61): it was in any case temporarily restored under the Act restoring spiritualities.

of an existing leaseholder. Another source of trouble might be the reluctance of the sitting tenants to recognise their new landlord, particularly if he were more exacting than the chantry priest. But the dissolution must have produced sufficient confusion in some areas to enable the more quick-witted to assert claims to the property, even if they looked so slender as to have no chance of survival in a law court. It is in such cases that the repeated absence of decrees makes interpretation hardest, and whilst they might be caused by the change of ownership at the dissolution, the problems are surely more symptomatic of land-transactions in general than of the chance association of these particular lands with chantries. Indeed, several of the tenurial problems they highlight would have arisen irrespective of the dissolution.

In 4 Elizabeth we find one Robert Bradforth, a tenant at will of some chantry land at Birstall, uprooting hedges and converting pasture into arable land, apparently because one Richard Peck was trying to assert his own rights to the same property, and Bradforth wished to confuse the boundaries to thwart his opponent. Peck claimed that in 21 Henry VIII the feoffees of the chantry had sold the land in question (of which Bradforth was a tenant) to the Peck family - in other words, that it was not chantry land any longer. Bradforth, by contrast, insisted that he had paid his rent to the cantarist and subsequently to the crown, but never to Peck, and that it clearly was chantry property,³³

33. DL1/52 [P.2.].

At Spennithorne in 8 Henry VIII, Sir Ralph FitzRandall enfeoffed certain persons with land, to the use of a cantarist for 20 years, and thereafter to the use of FitzRandall's heirs, yielding 5 marks per year for the land. The feoffees were still performing this duty when the Statute of Uses was passed, by which the Use ought to have been executed and the chantry priest himself have become the legal owner of the property, just within his 20 year limit. George FitzRandall protested in Chancery at the disinheritance of his family but with no success, and following the death of the cantarist shortly before the first Chantry Act, the feoffees, still in business, agreed to pay the stipend to the vicar of Spennithorne. At the dissolution the vicar reported the payment, but the feoffees protested that they were not obliged, after their 20 years to pay a priest.³⁴

In both these cases, though chantry land is in dispute, it is very clear that the litigation arose from the complexities of landholding rather than from association with the chantry. More relevant to the dissolution was the case of St Wilfred's chantry, Ripon, where, unknown to the crown, the previous cantarist had issued a lease to his kinsman Randall Bromflet who was not a sitting tenant. At the dissolution the crown gave the farm of the whole chantry to William Cawarde who issued individual leases of their holdings

34. E 321/24/30, cf. SP10/5 item 16 where the heirs of Sothill tried unsuccessfully to recover the endowment of the family chantry in Wakefield also endowed by a Use.

to the sitting tenants, unaware of Bromflet's rights which were therefore pleaded in the Duchy Court.³⁵

At Farnley in the parish of Leeds, the crown leased the chapel following the dissolution, to Thomas Chippendale and Richard Bowling.³⁶ Shortly afterwards, Bowling sold his interest entirely to Chippendale. Thus far there was no dispute. But after Chippendale's death, his son Edward claimed the property, and was challenged by one John Godson claiming to have received the lease from Thomas Chippendale. This seems to have been an opportunist move to disinherit the rightful heir, though no motives become apparent and the court upheld the son's rights.³⁷ The matter did not rest here, for we find further complaints against Chippendale's tenure, though without any decree.³⁸

The crown farmer of St Saviour's chantry at Rothwell, John Cawdrey, was similarly embarrassed when William and Gilbert Leigh, esquires, claimed to hold lands from the former cantarist since 'long tyme befor the mak yng of the statut.'³⁹ Or again, Robert Waller who bought from the crown 24 cows given to maintain obits in North and South Collingham and Lawforth (Notts) could not acquire them from the residents, who regarded them as their own property. Waller lamented,

35. DL1/31 [B21].

36. See Table XVIII.

37. DL5/10 f. 80v Godson was ordered to restore 40/- to Edward or forfeit £100.

38. DL 1/31 [B9]; DL 3/77 [B7].

39. DL 1/31 [C4].

the said paryshneres be greatlye frendyd and alyed in the said countye, and your said ovatour is a stranger thear. 40.

The provost of Hemingbrough college at first refused to yield any of his revenue to the crown lessee, Christopher Salmon,⁴¹ and trouble arose also between the lessee of Lowthorpe college, Thomas Eynns, and the former master, John Brandsby, who detained a year's revenue and would not move out of the premisses until ordered by the Court.⁴² William Kyne, the crown lessee of the Luce prebend at Pontefract, was faced by recalcitrant tenants, and when he sold his interest to Thomas Paget they still refused to pay their tithes to him.⁴³ The farmer of a portion of chantry land at Badsworth was refused his rent from 1564 and impounded the tenants' cattle in distraint, but this was of no avail, since they recaptured them.⁴⁴

Evidently, judged by the cases cited above, it was not only the sitting tenants who might be threatened by the dissolution, but here and there crown nominees were thwarted in gaining rents or dues assigned to them. It may be that exploiters suffered as much, on balance, as exploited.

It might fairly be observed that our study of cases tells us more overall about the problems of land tenure and the administration of justice than about the dissolution of

40. E 321/26/71.

41. E 321/32/11.

42. E 315/116 ff. 18-9, also E321/31/1 and 63; E 321/25/86.

43. Part of the confusion was the extent of the prebend's property (cf. DL42/96 f. 24). For Paget's plea, see DL1/34 [P3].

44. DL1/80 [S1]. As late as 31 Eliz. a new farmer was having tenant trouble here: DL1/102 [W.4.].

the chantries. An interesting by-product is a glimpse of the relationships of the various law courts.

A case from well beyond our period illustrates the sort of confrontations that might take place. In the Easter Term, 1572, the Duchy Court decreed land at Saunderby to have belonged to the chantry there, thus over-ruling the claim of William Peck that it was not chantry land. The crown lessee Thomas Bullock, despite the court's ruling, found his land invaded by a gang, one of whom, Edward Stanhope, attempted unsuccessfully to re-open the case, this time in the Exchequer.⁴⁵ Bullock appealed to the Duchy to defend him, but the Exchequer ordered him not to proceed. The next step is unrecorded, but a few years later the gang was re-convened under one Henry Leake, against whom Bullock brought an action in the Duchy Court where Bullock was again vindicated. This made no difference. A paper decision by a court in London had still to be implemented in the provinces. The property was raided, 2 geldings and 3 mares stolen, and a crop of barley ravished. From this point the dispute clearly turns on commons rights and no longer on claims to chantry land. Bullock had put his cattle on the common land when it should have been available for all. They had

45. DL1/106 [B.6.] and DL1/124 [B14]: E 133/1/157.

strayed on to land which was not his, and duly been impounded, but he refused to recognise the decision and retrieved them without paying the customary fine. Further evidence suggests that from the moment he had moved in as farmer, Bullock had done his utmost to subvert the local customs, and a long list of charges for petty offences had been brought by himself and John Sidenham, lord of the manor, against each other. This was the climate of the times, the courts in London having to assert their decisions against the feuding local landowners. In the jealous protection of the respective privileges of the court of Exchequer and that of the Duchy it is reminiscent of the conflict between Augmentation and the Duchy over the disposal of Duchy lead.⁴⁶

Yet it would be wrong to think of the courts in perpetual opposition to one another. There were difficulties over territorial boundaries of their respective jurisdictions, and some inevitable disputes. Snaith in S. Yorkshire was at the very edge of the Duchy. The chantry of Rawcliffe in the same parish was leased by the Duchy to John Hutchinson on 19 December 2 Elizabeth for 53/5½ per year, but four years later George Darcy, searching for concealments, found another £5. 15. 0. worth of land there undeclared, and obtained a lease which he sold to Thomas Dudley esquire. Dudley claimed the plot held by Hutchinson also, and this caused

46. DL5/10 f. 267. v.

the judges of Exchequer and Duchy to confer, and eventually to decide that Hutchinson's lease was invalid because the land was not within the Duchy.⁴⁷

A defendant dissatisfied with proceedings, or with the likely outcome of a case in one court, occasionally tried to start another case elsewhere either to get a more favourable verdict or to put his opponent to greater expense. Thomas Jackson, a tenant of Aberford chantry, allowed a fellow tenant, John Wetherett to sue for a renewal on his behalf. But Wetherett kept the new lease for himself once Jackson had given him his documentary evidence, and the Council of the North would therefore not support Jackson's plea that he had been a former lessee. Jackson appealed to the Duchy⁴⁸. Or again, Thomas Cowper brought an action against the crown lessee of land at Haddlesay, Thomas Jameson, before the Council of the North; and Jameson took up, the challenge in the Duchy Court.⁴⁹

47. All reported at DL1/86 [H1].

48. DL1/64 [I.1] anno 7 Eliz; Wetherett still upheld his case and we find him, and not Jackson, renewing the lease. DL1/144 [A16].

49 DL1/137 [S7]; DL1/124 [A43] annis 25-27 Eliz. The work of the Council of the North is met only occasionally. Sir N. Fairfax was ordered by this court to refurbish Tollerton chapel (E134/Misc./2515), and early in Elizabeth's reign it heard a complaint brought by a collector against tenants who refused to repair their property (SC6/ELIZ/2695 sub SIGGLESTHORNE-BEVERLEY). In Mary's reign it was responsible for rooting out books of 'prophecy' and users of lewd words (Sheffield City Library. Bacon Frank MSS 4-1 between pp 178 & 9).

The exact competence of one court or another was a matter frequently raised. Replications on disputed chantry land carried as a matter of course the assertion that the evidence of the Information was inadequate, and often the rider that the dispute was a matter for Common Law. But Common Law was less able than the equity courts to defend a tenant who had lost his title deeds, and we find a series of petitions in Chancery alleging such loss, or the unlawful detention of charters by other parties. Documentary evidence always weighed more heavily than word of mouth. Just as the ministers refused to exonerate patentees from paying rent until patents were shown, and pensioners could not receive payment until they produced their patents, so the law courts required written documentation. Edward Cowper who bought the chantry at Kirkby Misperton from the patentees, Thomas Bell and Sir Richard Duke, found the inhabitants refusing to yield the title deeds and had to sue for redress in Chancery⁵⁰; and we find the same happening to William Cronxe at Worsborough, Robert Harrison at Beckingham and Sir William Gascoigne at Darrington⁵¹. Similarly, Barker and Blackway who acquired much concealed land in Yorkshire early in Elizabeth's reign, lost their letters patent and had to sue for protection in Chancery.⁵²

50. C1/1206/79.

51. Respectively C1/1206/89; C1/1303/25; C1/1354/6.

52. C3/11/41 and 60; C3/19/12.

The grant of a patent for chantry land, therefore, was not always the passport to the recipient's smooth entry on the property, but with few exceptions these cases may be regarded as the teething troubles of the post-dissolution land settlement, soon outgrown. Our approach to cases has necessarily been selective, but it has shown that the crown achieved by litigation very little beyond what its ministers had already achieved by persuasion. Crown-sponsored prosecutions were therefore kept to a minimum.

There were cases which do not easily fit into the categories I have distinguished, the most important being those concerning concealments, which have in part been examined in a previous chapter and few of which date from Edward's reign.⁵³ There were some cases in which lessees failed to sub-let as promised,⁵⁴ but these were little to do with the chantries. Others might justly arouse curiosity, like the case of the cantarist at Marston, already 90 years old at the dissolution, who arranged for a younger man to claim to be cantarist and to draw the pension, paying it to the actual cantarist during his lifetime and thereafter retaining it for himself.⁵⁵ The cases chosen do, however, illustrate the difficulties facing the

53. For Edwardian cases involving concealments see E321/19/61 and 78 (Carlton near Snaith) and E 321/26/33 (Linley manor chantry) most concealments were discovered without law suits.

54. e.g. at Thirsk, E 315/520 f. 80.

55. E 321/25/16 cf. L & C.R.S. x1, 69-70, where the cantarist at Eccleston (Lancs) urged his tenants to pay him and not the crown.

crown in the administration of justice and the collection of rents, and by any interpretation, the dissolution must have materially added to the work of the courts and local officers if the sort of cases I have discovered for Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire were repeated on a wide scale elsewhere.

After Edward's reign, the number of cases concerning disputes over chantry lands noticeably decreases. Land tenure had again begun to stabilise in areas where the dissolution caused immediate disputes. With the exception of the Michaelmas term, 6 Eliz. and Easter term 7 Eliz. when a number of intrusions were discussed in the courts, probably as the result of concealment commissions, the Index to Intrusions entered on the K.R. Memoranda Roll records only a dozen or so cases relevant to the diocese in the period up to 15 Elizabeth.⁵⁶

The cluster of cases in the two terms mentioned above, is interesting because nearly all of them strengthen the view that the crown rarely achieved anything by prosecution in these disputes. But a more aggressive and determined attack on potential offenders was displayed than had been evident under Edward, when the record of imprisonments or even attachments is negligible. Writs of privy seal might be issued to persuade defendants to appear and answer cases against them. Failing this, the sheriff was ordered to attach the defendants and present them himself. If the cases were heard in the local

56. P.R.O. Indexes 10317-8.

assizes it was his job to impanel a jury. But at all three stages we regularly encounter failings. The sheriff fails to return a writ, or to find the culprit,⁵⁷ or to impanel a jury. Even when he has a jury he often finds that the crown's evidence is insufficient to force a conviction, and the case has to be dismissed. Without the full cooperation of the local officers Tudor justice was no justice at all.

In the Michaelmas Term 6 Elizabeth, Sir Richard Stapleton and his son Brian were acquitted of charges that they had intruded into lands which had supported a stipendiary at St. John's chantry, Kirkby Overblow. The case had been brought before the Exchequer, which referred it back to the Assizes at York where the land was said to belong to the Stapleton family, not the crown.⁵⁸ There had been no difficulty in getting the Stapletons to appear, even though the sheriff failed to return the writs against them. But Richard Gascoigne in another case reported the same term, was less fortunate. No final decision is recorded, but he was arrested and put in the Fleet pending investigation of a charge that he had detained a stipend paid to East Haddlesby church. The sheriff failed several times to impanel a local jury to hear the case, and again the issue was referred to the Assize judges⁵⁹. I have not

57. e.g. DL1/38 [DL]: William Denman, farmer of the Ripon prebends, entrusted £60 to his brother Thomas who absconded. He could not be found and no writ could therefore be delivered to him.

58. E159/348 m. 459 (20 Nov. 5 Eliz.)

59. Ibid., m. 461.

found evidence of this happening in Edward's reign.

The crown's record in the following Easter term was not good. Only now were the judges coming to any decisions on informations laid nearly 3 years previously, mainly on 1st July 4 Eliz. Moreover, the crown was clutching expensive straws to maintain its principle of legal possession, with minimal success. Lampland at Kayton was alleged by one John Nettleton to have been concealed by the tenants from the crown. In eight successive law terms, writs were issued to the sheriff to apprehend the tenants and present them for questioning. Only in the ninth term were they finally represented by an attorney, Thomas Fanshaw, who proved the evidence against them insufficient.⁶⁰ Similarly, it took 3 attempts before Isabel Battell could be represented by an attorney on charges of detaining obit land at Bubwith - again the information was inadequate.⁶¹ Arbitrary arrest pending investigation was not unusual if the defendant could be found. In the Easter term, 6 Edward VI, the court of Common Pleas registered a foot of fine whereby land at [†]"Wilmersley" formerly owned by Sir William Gascoigne was handed over to trustees and returned by them to William Gascoigne (jr) for 7 years and then to his wife Margaret, and after her death to William and his heirs. Within the 7 years, Gascoigne died, still seised of the property,

60. E159/350 m 362.

61. Ibid m. 363.

† Womersley

but Margaret survived and married one Peter Stanley who thus inherited the rights. But meanwhile the crown had decided that some of the land had been part of the Lady chantry at "Wilmer[†]sley", and, notwithstanding the foot of fine, called Stanley to answer. On his refusal he was held in contempt and arrested and put in the Fleet, though later released on bail on condition of daily appearance. When finally called before the Exchequer, his mention of the foot of fine,⁶² terminated the crown's case against him. Clearly there had been a major breakdown of communciations. The crown could not be expected to remember every bargain registered in its courts, but it could have allowed time for the defendant to prove his answer. Stanley so firmly resisted the crown's wrong claims, however, that he was held to be contumacious. Perhaps even today absence of an innocent man from testimony could be too readily taken as a sign of guilt, but in Elizabethan England it cannot have been with the greatest of confidence that an innocent party submitted himself to the rigours of the courts, sure of his freedom.

Although this enquiry has discovered several fascinating cases it would be wrong to imagine hundreds of tenants rushing to court after the dissolution. In most of the diocese

62. Ibid. m. 364. Foot of fine: CP 25 (2) 65/541.

† Womersley

the transition was remarkably smooth, or if not, local remedies were adoped which have not come down through recorded history.

If the bulk of the tenantry knew nothing of the litigation that was in progress, the same cannot be said of the local gentry who repeatedly sat on commissions taking depositions. If they failed to secure a position on the bench of J.P.s, responsible service of this kind was a good preparation for future preferment, and without the willing cooperation of these unpaid men the machinery of justice would have ground to a halt. They could choose where to sit to hear witnesses, though their reports do not always announce this venue. Witnesses in the case of Kildwick obits referred to above had to meet the commissioners at Wakefield.⁶³ The whole process of appointing commissioners, convening witnesses and taking depositions might be very protracted, not least because the same gentry might be called upon to sit on various commissions at the same time. One commission was reprimanded for its delay in starting work,⁶⁴ even though John Arscot, the senior member, was surveyor of Duchy woods and presumably therefore a busy man.

63. E315/129 f. 99.

64. DL 42/96 ff. 31v, 24. Cf. E321/35/35: it took 5 months from commission to depositions in this case.

But it is not my purpose to analyse the effectiveness of the English legal system in depth, and after this brief inroad into a vast subject we must conclude that the dissolution was not implemented brutally, without consideration of the rights and feelings of others, but rather with the utmost concern that as much cash and as little fuss as possible might be raised.

CHAPTER X

THE MINISTERS' ACCOUNTS

In discussing first concealments and then litigation, we have seen some of the problems posed by the dissolution for the crown. But the greatest lingering burden was the day-to-day administration of the lands and revenues which had not been sold. In our area this demanded a formidable network of officials employed specifically for the purpose, and it was almost a century before the chantry lands had reached such small proportion as to be capable of absorption in the general accounts of crown lands. As a final preparation for our conclusions about the efficiency and cost of the dissolution in the area we must pause to examine this problem.

1. The Sources:

There can be no better starting-point than the amazingly complete series of Ministers' Accounts in the Public Record Office: accounts which I have studied in depth for Edward's reign, and in outline down to 1563 for comparison. The "ministers" referred to were the collectors of chantry revenue working on the crown's behalf after the dissolution. Where colleges had employed their own bailiffs and collectors, as was particularly the case on a large scale at Beverley, these men retained their office in the new crown administration. For the rest, collectors were appointed, probably at the suggestion of the Receiver and auditor of Augmentations for the districts concerned,¹ and as we shall see they were paid a salary for what

1. e.g. SC6/Mary/356 in Craven, Henry Clapham is appointed collector by John Fisher, the Receiver (1556).

must at times have been an arduous task.

The size of the areas and the number of chantries over which the collectors had competence varied considerably. In the Duchy of Lancaster, the Receiver for the Yorkshire lands, William Mallet did most of his own collecting at first until crown farmers were appointed to relieve him of some of the burden. We therefore continually find Mallet as collector rendering account to Mallet as Receiver! But outside the Duchy the crown did not widely adopt the policy of farming out whole chantries in preference to offering them for sale, and chantries were grouped together under rent-collecting areas, each area giving a yearly account to the appropriate Receiver. In the North and East Ridings the wapentake was chosen as the logical area of collection, whereas in the West Riding some more arbitrary division of labour was made, the areas being named not after wapentakes, but after certain townships. The city of York merited two accounts as did its Minster, and the Bedern and St. William's colleges and St. Sepulchre's chapel there one each. The property of Howden college constituted several separate accounts, and Beverley had no fewer than 31 separate divisions. In the north, Richmondshire was treated as a single account, and the same was true of Nottingham shire, save that Nottingham town had its own account, and Southwell college eight. Excluding the Duchy, in which each chantry was separately accounted because of the farming system, there was a total of 88 accounting areas

in the territory under review.²

But the situation is less complex than might at first appear. The accounts for the bulk of the three ridings and the city of York were put together each year in a single entry roll which is the largest for any county for chantries alone. Accountants in these areas were responsible at first to Richard Whalley, and later to his successors as Receiver of Augmentations revenue for Yorkshire - a post which continued even after Augmentations had been absorbed by the Exchequer. The Duchy, as we noted, was Mallet's concern, whilst the ten Nottinghamshire accounts were presented to Robert Gough and that for Richmondshire to Richard Bunny, the respective Receivers.³ There are, therefore, four series of documents to be consulted, with separate rolls for each year in view.

Now whilst some accountants were responsible only for small areas - Mathew White for Pickering, John Green for Scarborough, Brian Makely for Lowthorpe college in 1548, for example - others had much wider authority. Thus, Thomas Bellamy collected for the whole of the East Riding except Beverley and Lowthorpe, Robert Mann for the whole of York including the colleges and Minster, and Leonard Bate and John Eyre for six areas each

2. For a key to the accounts, see Appendix Xa. To reduce the necessity of footnotes, references for the rest of this chapter will be to the year of accounting and the area in each case, and not to the exact membrane number of the item cited, the numbering of the originals being, in any case, incomplete.

3. For a list of Receivers see W.C. Richardson, op. cit., 281-2.

in the West Riding. Therefore, whilst separate accounts were made for each area within a collector's competence there are fewer men accounting than there are separate accounts. The number of accounts rendered by any one man probably depended on the availability of men for the job and the nature of the terrain to be covered.

The functions of the minister were to collect for the crown all such rents - including free rents - as were rightly its due by the Chantries' Act; to deduct at source such sums as had been disbursed on the repair of the property, or lost that year through "decay"; to see proof of title from anyone claiming to have bought chantry land from the crown, and if satisfied, to cease claiming those properties and their rents on the crown's behalf; to record those who did not pay (and sometimes their reasons for refusing); and finally to present his account, and any cash he had left after expenses, to the Receiver for his area. The auditor scrutinised the accounts of each minister, and was entitled to a fee for his pains, usually of 2/-. The Receiver's own function was to collect the cash from all the ministers responsible to him for crown lands; to enter it in his general account, which included income from other crown estates under the Survey of Augmentations (or the Duchy); to deduct his own expenses and to pay necessary charges, such as crown pensions and annuities. We shall see that for several years many Receivers had to pay out more in chantry pensions and crown stipends than they received solely from chantry lands.

Finally, the Receiver was to yield any remaining cash to the Treasurer of Augmentations⁴ or the Receiver General of the Duchy, as appropriate.⁵

The great majority of the accounts for the area in Edward's reign have survived. For the three ridings and Richmondshire the Ministers' Accounts are complete from 1548 to 1563, though the Receiver's Accounts are fragmentary. For Nottinghamshire there are no Ministers' Accounts for 1552, but otherwise Edward's reign is fully represented, and there is a view of account taken in 1554; there are, however, no Receivers' accounts. For the Duchy, both Ministers' and Receivers' Accounts are incomplete;⁶ but nevertheless in every sector a reasonable impression of the procedure may still be obtained.

2. Rent-collecting and arrears.

The first function of the minister was to collect the rents due to the crown, and to record any arrears, with explanations of his failure to collect. We were able to use the 'nominal arrears' as a guide to purchases in cases where, pending the showing of his title, a patentee or client who

4. From 1554 to the Tellers of the Exchequer.

5. In the border counties, among others, arrears were transferred to the Receivers' Accounts in order to leave the ministers a clean slate.

6. See Appendix Xa.

had bought the land was considered responsible for the rent in the crown's books. Practically every divisional account for our area could yield examples. Typical among them was the case of Richard Whalley who had the chantry at Todwick rated for him on 19 September 1548 and received a patent on 13 December with the right to rents back-dated to Easter.⁷ He had drawn the rent for the period Easter to Michaelmas in anticipation of his grant (this being easy in his case since he was the Yorkshire Receiver and could presumably stifle any criticism from his juniors), and was listed in arrears at Michaelmas because he had no patent to show. A comment, perhaps arising from a later inspection, was written against the entry:

videantur litteras patentes aut fiat distress

Yet even after the granting of the patent he was recorded in arrears until 1553.⁸

Arrears tended to accumulate unchecked at the foot of the account, and some accountants deliberately retained money they had collected but listed it in arrears as a means of balancing the books and ensuring there was no deficit. Whilst this postponed the evil hour of reckoning it was a practice widely adopted in the 16th century.⁹ But there was also a

7. C.P.R. II Edward VI, 73.

8. Sub account for West Riding: 'DIVERSE HAMLETS'. He also claimed £2 p.a. from the chantry at Thorpe (Barnby Dun) which was charged against him every year, and for which he received no patent.

9. Whalley himself was arrested for manipulating arrears. See Chronicle & Political Papers of Ed. VI (ed. Jordan), 129.

simpler explanation, I suspect. The account book for one year was probably used by the clerk copying up the order of entries for the next account. It was simpler to list the arrears than to take the trouble of writing out of the account the items which had been duly explained by production of the title deeds. In this way, simple administrative routine accounts for some of the vast lists of arrears which accumulate. The system was cumbersome, in that the accountant was never as far into actual arrears as his figures suggested, and yet not over-inefficient, for the auditor could see at a glance who was alleged to owe money, and could easily verify whether the charge was justified. It seems to have been expected that purchasers would show their title to the royal officers, rather than that the latter should seek them out. Moreover, the auditors welcomed a system which enabled them to keep a firm check on the work (and particularly the debts) of their subordinates. Dealing with other people's money, the local officer could not be too careful. William Rigges, writing in answer to a complaint lodged by Cecil against his assistants in 1550 observed,

I wold wysse that your mastershippe had the experience of a numbre of them as I have & then I ame sure you wold nott be offendyd with me for that cause. ffor where I ame nott able to controwll them by no record in ther demaundes of allowance it is to mouche that they wold aske and therefore I use to respect thos rentes which I have no recorde of tyll I have Certyfycat ffrom the Surveyours. 10.

By no means all arrears are to be explained by the simple time lapse before the records caught up with the facts! Landlords refusing to pay free rents, or schools or copyhold tenants refusing to recognise the crown's claims to their property, stood firmly by the letter of the Chantry Act, and until the courts had reached a decision in their favour - as they invariably did - they were charged arrears. There was also confusion caused by the overlap of certain chantry and monastic accounts. Chantries financed by free-rents from monasteries were not to be accounted for by the chantry bailiffs, but the payment from the monastic accounts simply ceased, except in cases where the stipends were paid by crown farmers and not monastic Receivers. I have not encountered any cases in which the persons held to be in arrears simply refused all payment to the crown without adducing one of the above reasons. In particular there is no murmur of protest against the dissolution itself.

The accounts for the Craven district of the West Riding well illustrate the problems that arose. The executors of Sir Richard Gresham were charged in 1548 for the chantry at Rilston which he had bought, only to be absolved in 1549, the title having been shown. Henry Barrow, charged for St. Mary's chantry at Skipton was not cleared of "arrears" until 1552, though his patent passed in 1549. In 1548 Sir John Tempest was charged for a stipend due to the Tempest chantry at Giggleswick from the revenue of Dereham abbey (Norfolk) which he administered.

Right down to 1556 Richard Bunny, Receiver in Richmondshire, was charged for the stipend of a priest at Garsdale, though in that year it was finally decided that Lord Scope, the Receiver of St Agatha's abbey (Easby) from which the stipend was paid, was answerable. All these 'arrears' proved artificial.

A similar situation pertained in the county of Nottinghamshire. A chantry at Huddersfield (Yorks) held some land in Nottinghamshire, where the collector claimed the rents for two years, only to find they had already been accounted for in Yorkshire. The stipend of a priest at Mansfield and another at Fletborough were detained from the crown until in 1553 an Augmentations ruling was announced that since the two priests were omitted from the pension lists they had a right to draw these stipends for their lifetime. Lord Sheffield, who had paid a stipendiary at Ruddington, died in 1550, and the sum was not paid to the crown for two years, but this was probably due to confusion in his estate. In 1553 one Anthony Burrowfield was charged for Beckingham chantry, but absolved in the following year through a patent granted to Thomas Reve.

For one reason or another, therefore, we can discount the great majority of the arrears. But the problems were not uniformly distributed among the collecting districts. For example, the prebends of Beverley and Howden colleges had derived most of their income from leases or tithes.

The pattern of tenure here hardly changed at the dissolution, and practically nothing was sold, so that there was no cause for arrears. If we look back at the Craven area of the West Riding, however, we find that even after all expenses and arrears were deducted the collector, Anthony Dale, owed £73. 18. 11 in 1550, and ⁱⁿ1551 it was still reported that he would not render account. Not until 1558 did this district yield anything to the crown, and this was two years after Dale's replacement by Henry Clapham. In a book of arrears compiled in 1556 Dale was described as a 'verie evell person',¹¹ though he had by then been forced to place bonds for repayment of his debts. He had been reported to Winchester (Lord Treasurer) in 1555 by the West Riding surveyor:

for that the said Anthonye Daile woulde not come in to accounte nor anye proces coulde be gotten served uppon hym youre Lordeshippe dide wryte to mye Lorde of Cumberland to attache the saide Daile unto the Custodie of the Sheriff of the Shier to have hym furth comynge whan and where your Lordshippe will appoynt. 12.

Dale was in charge of a particularly troublesome area, but had no excuse for his repeated incompetence. The crown was unwise to wait so long before proceeding against him, but there seems to be an underlying assumption that collectors would pay up if given long enough, and we saw in the last chapter that the crown was regularly unsuccessful in its

11. E101/520/15 f. 25 r.

12. SP46/8 f. 42.

prosecution of apparent offenders. Another collector, Thomas Bellamy in the East Riding, became seriously indebted without being able to account for the sums involved, and had his goods seized in distraint.¹³ Quite apart from his general arrears, Bellamy was one of the unfortunate accountants who were caught napping by the debasement of the currency. On 30 April 1551, a royal proclamation ordered that from 31 August the shilling was to be worth only 9d. and the groat 3d. On 9 July another proclamation ordered the change to be made forthwith, not waiting for the 31 August deadline. Finally on 17 August, a third proclamation brought down the original shilling to sixpence, the groat to 2d, the twopence to 1d. and so on. Between the Annunciation and 9 July, Bellamy had collected £213. 19. 11 of chantry revenues in the old coinage, which suddenly became worth only 3/4 its face value on that date. As early as 7 July he had tried to take his money to the Receiver, or rather the acting Receiver, Walter Whalley, who, presumably on instruction from higher authority, refused to accept any of it. Indeed, he would not receive it until after 17 August, after which the money was only worth half the face value at the time of its collection. It is uncertain whether Bellamy had had advance warning of the changes and deliberately collected

13. E101/520/15 f. 31r. His arrears (for Hemingbrough college) totalled £101. 11. 11½.

his money earlier than usual to ease the burden on the tenants, or whether it was normal for him to collect at these dates but Whalley had been informed not to receive any cash until the crown's pleasure were further known. However, an Exchequer process in the Easter Term 1-2 Philip & Mary exonerated Bellamy of the half-years' arrears,¹⁴ and similar credit was given to other collectors who had been thus caught out.¹⁵

How seriously did the crown view arrears and what attempts did it make to check them? It was common knowledge that the totals were artificially swollen: this could hardly be avoided when sales kept pace with collection of rents, and the collectors were not to know in advance which properties were to be sold. The auditors who checked the collectors' figures each year must share the blame for excessive arrears. But in many cases marginal comments, particularly in the first accounts, order process to be made against apparent offenders. Whilst it is possible that these comments were made by the auditor or Receiver as the account was presented, it seems more likely that they were made on higher authority, for there is evidence of several attempts by the central government to organise a concerted scrutiny of the chantry accounts. It may be that until the

14. Reported in LR1/179 f. 56 v.

15. Ibid. f. 120 (Faircliffe); E101/520/15 ff. 27r and v (Mann and Newark).

main sales of land were over there was deliberately little attempt to examine the chantry account, for a period of stability was needed before the true pattern of post-dissolution settlement could be analysed and offenders weeded out. Other departments including First Fruits and Tenths,¹⁶ were examined towards the end of Edward's reign, but it was only with the absorption of Augmentations into the Exchequer under Mary that a thorough survey of the chantry settlement began. In 1556 a book of arrears of chantry rents was compiled¹⁷, which listed all the Yorkshire arrears extant, and served as a basis for investigations, the results of which were added to the original document. About one in seven of the items listed was found to be artificial because the land had been duly patented. A similar proportion again was annulled, the items now being fully paid up. If we add to these the remaining claims on patents still to be verified, and other obviously deserving cases, such as those where copyholders refused payment, we have accounted for over half the entries in the book. Other justified entries might be more eccentric. At Settrington a man named Haunce was excused because 'non est compos mentis',¹⁸ At Sandal, Thomas Mountain had been charged 1/- per year for land which was not his.¹⁹ At the end of the book, the totals,

16. SP10/12 Arrears book.

17. E101/520/15.

18. Ibid. f. 29 v.

19. Ibid. f. 26 r.

(including monastic and other lands) showed that of the nominal arrears in the county more than half were either explained or likely to be so.²⁰

Sperat: £4237. 8. 10.

Dubit : £2752. 10. 4.

Desperat: £2012. 12. 2.

This pattern, and the unhappy outcome for the crown of the proceedings launched against offenders, partly explains the tendency to let matters lie. Arrears were expensive to follow through, and there is every indication that the situation became worse rather than better with time.

Nowhere is this better illustrated than in the Yorkshire part of the Duchy of Lancaster. One arrears book was prepared here in 15 Elizabeth,²¹ another, which has not survived, in 22 Elizabeth, and a third, which refers back to the lost book, in 29-30 Elizabeth.²² But keeping a running total was different from proceeding against offenders, and one book repeatedly ignored decisions clearly stated in its precursors. Robert Toller was charged for part of the Magdalene chantry at Knaresborough, but exonerated in 22 Elizabeth because the property had been sold as much as 9 years earlier to Francis Barker. In 29 Elizabeth Toller was again wrongly charged.²³ No rent was extracted from the tenants of the chantry at Osgodby until 5 Elizabeth, but they

20. For an early Elizabethan book of arrears for Notts. see SC6/Eliz./1777.

21. DL 41/29/3.

22. DL 41/29/4.

23. Ibid. f. 42.

were not challenged, and this early deficit was still recorded in the last book of arrears.²⁴ At Rawcliffe (Snaith) tenants were to be questioned in 22 Elizabeth, but by the time of the third book nobody could discover what action had then been taken;²⁵

The Duchy's Receivers' Accounts amplify the incompetence. After the first chantry account in 1549, about £275 was recorded in arrears. By 1555 this had risen to £360. The restoration of spiritual revenues by Mary caused confusion and boosted the total to £1090 in 1557 whilst Elizabeth inherited £1485 arrears, and by the end of her reign the total had reached £2210 largely on the strength of accumulated debt on the same items.²⁶

3. Exonerations

Another part of the Ministers' Accounts which was an inevitable concomitant of the arrears concerned those items which were discounted, or 'exonerated', because the crown had relinquished its earlier claims. It was an umbrella-like category for many items which could often more properly

24. Ibid. f. 42.

25. Ibid. f. 44 v.

26. See respectively DL29/8955, 8957, 8959, 8961, 8965.

have been treated under headings such as 'repair' or 'decay' which will be separately noted below.

Many of the accounts for the first years after the dissolution have enormous exonerations. Some districts accounted at Michaelmas 1548, in which case only half a year's rent was due to the crown. Yet to ease the calculation and to standardise the format for future years, the rents for one whole year were recorded, and then half a year's rent exonerated to cover the period when the land was still held by the cantarist. In a few areas (including the Duchy) the first account was not made until Michaelmas 1549, when the rents for two years were recorded and half a year exonerated.

A more lasting use of this heading was for the recording of patents shown and the absolving^{of}/arrears which had been wrongly charged. Monastic free rents due from crown Receivers had all been written out of the main Yorkshire account by 1549, though Richmondshire and the Duchy experienced more protracted trouble. A rent of £13. 6. 8. due to Rotherham College from land in Herefordshire was regularly charged in the main account, and written out in the exonerations with a note that it was paid to the Hereford Receiver.

Sometimes exonerations amounted to a confession of errors made. In the East Riding, particularly in Dickering, the 1548 account wrongly counted as yearly revenue some of the fixed stocks of cash for obits and lights, and when these were systematically charged again in 1549 the collector had

to spend some time with the auditor sorting out what was reasonably to be regarded as yearly rent.

The East Riding produced several other friction points. The collector at Beverley had allowed most of the costs of supplying the church and its officers to be deducted before any payment was made in the Chamberlain's account. From the start, the fees of most officers there were queried: 'cease these allowances from henceforth!', and yet heavy expenses were regularly passed. Another collector in Beverley had to abandon 4/9 in 1555,

et quod nullo modo levare possit et ignoratur
de quibus personis unquam fuit levabilis. 27.

Similarly, 9/- was dropped from the account of the Bedern in Howden in 1551 because the current owner had fled, leaving nothing behind him.²⁸ But there were other more interesting allowances. At Beverley, a minor industry seems to have been made of stakes and poles, which must have been used for fencing and repairs, or for strengthening the coastline against the encroachments of the sea. Described as 'fasciculi', they are recorded in several sectional accounts as expenses. At South Dalton in 1552, 3700 were claimed at 1/- per 100; at Walkington in 1551, 4900 at 1/2 per 100 (57/2) and carriage at 2/- per 100 (4. 18. 0.). The 'fabric-lands' of the manor of Bentley claimed two years allowances in 1550 for a "baragio ffasiculonun"

27. Account for 'BEVERLEY WITHOUT!.

28. The Bedern, as at York, was the common house of the vicars choral.

costing £17. 7. 10, whilst in 1552, 6300 at 1/2 per 100 plus carriage at £1 per 1000, binding at 11/8 per 1000 and 3/- to tenants for counting them, added up to over £10. Although there was a separate heading for repairs, defence of the coastline in 1550 at Leven, (again in Beverley) was exonerated at 15/9 and when in 1552 the cost shot up to £4. 15. 9. it provoked the retort:

If this allowance doos contynewe it is mete that the Surveyor doo see the reparacions upholden according to the covenant or elles this to be disallowed. 29.

In 1549 the purchase of books, including the Paraphrases of Erasmus at 6/8 was allowed as a deduction for the prebend of Howden, whilst in the same year 35/8 was allowed in Howdenshire for the poor, and 6/11 for copyhold wrongly claimed.

Finally among the sundry allowances and exonerations we find those sums held in "respite", that is, written out every year, and never cancelled in the body of the account, so that the respite had to be renewed or disallowed each year, and if the crown found a better claim it could assert it. Once sums got into this category they were dutifully copied out year after year, with no real attempt to check the progress of the enquiries. Here we could cite £8. 4. 0. at York first recorded in 1551 of some houses left vacant on account of the plague & dilapidations³⁰

29. The higher sum continued to be charged, and was explained as the cash equivalent of a former 72 days' labour service.

30. Account for 'York - II'.

Table XXV : Summary of expenses claimed in the Ministers'Accounts

Derived from the Ministers' Accounts, 1548-1553 as detailed in App.Xa. The totals under each account for each area have been added together to reach the figures below, which are not themselves to be found in the accounts. The figures from the Duchy of Lancaster have been omitted because the accounts for this period are too fragmentary.

(i) "Exonerations" (Chapter X, section 2)

	<u>Yorks.</u>	<u>Richmond</u>	<u>Notts.</u>
1548	1387. 7. 7	24. 2. 7	No a/c
1549	277.15.11	35. 3. 6	105. 7. 1
1550	307.14. 0	31.16.10	27.12. 7
1551	363.15. 9	21. 0. 0	1. 6. 8
1552	332. 1. 5	23.13. 4	No a/c
1553	211. 0. 2	14. 6. 8	32. 2. 4

These figures represent simply adjustments to the gross totals shown in the collectors' accounts, and are therefore only technically expenses.

(ii) Legitimate expenses:

<u>YORKSHIRE</u>	<u>1548</u>	<u>1549</u>	<u>1550</u>	<u>1551</u>	<u>1552</u>	<u>1553</u>
resolutes:	29.17. 4	51. 1. 7	43.13. 5	48. 8. 5	42.17. 7	35.18. 6
repair :	4.11. 7	55. 4. 0	134. 7. 3	134. 4. 9	133.17. 4	130. 8.10
decay :	24.12. 8	39.18.11	37.11. 0	46. 3. 2	58.11. 5	42.18. 9
fees :	69. 4. 2	115.14. 0	108.18. 8	124.18. 8	114.16. 8	106. 8. 0
total :	128. 5. 9	261.18. 6	324.10. 4	353.15. 0	350. 3. 0	315.14. 1
<u>RICHMOND</u>						
resolutes:	3.17. 9	3.17. 9	3.14. 1	3.14. 1	3.14. 1	1. 4. 3
repair :	nil	nil	3.16. 4	6. 7. 6	4.19. 9	6. 0. 0
decay :	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
fees :	4. 2. 0	7.12. 0	7. 2. 0	7. 2. 0	7. 2. 0	7. 2. 0
total :	7.19. 9	10.19. 9	14.12. 5	17. 3. 7	15.15.10	14. 6. 3
<u>NOTTINGHAMSHIRE</u>						
resolutes:		34.14. 6	27. 8. 1	26. 2.10		16.19. 3
repair :		23. 6. 1	34. 3.11	23.19. 4		16. 2. 8
decay :		12.19. 8	19.10. 5	7.17. 4		14. 8. 0
fees :		33. 6. 8	23. 3. 4	22. 0. 0		22. 0. 0
total :		104. 6.11	104. 5. 9	79.19. 6		69. 9.11

as sworn by a jury of 'probi homines', or £2. 7. 0. at Alcock's chantry at Hull for 6 decayed tenements respited from 1553 to 1563.

Amounts claimed each year under this heading will be found in Table XXV. The rise and fall of these figures is of little significance, as it depended largely on the purely administrative act of recording and exonerating patentees. The figures are therefore only included as an interesting commentary on the scale of the operation.

4. Decay and Repair.

Whereas the exonerations and the arrears were usually listed at the foot of each separate account, being the last major items after which, hopefully, the account would balance, there were several stages before this. Having enumerated the rents for which he was expected to account, the collector proceeded to list his allowances. The first comprised 'resolutes', that is, rents outgoing from the property to landlords (often benefactors of the chantry or lords of the manor in which the land was situated). In the Chantry Certificates such resolutes had constituted most of the difference between the gross and net annual values of the chantries, but after the dissolution all those

payable to the crown were ignored in the accounts, since the king had acquired all the property. Moreover, as chantry lands were sold many of the outgoing rents due to persons other than the crown were handed on to the buyers as an obligation, so that the sums claimed under this heading fell steadily.

The same could not be said of allowances for 'decayed' rents: rents which the collector had been unable to collect because the property stood vacant, without a tenant, or badly derelict.

Dereliction was a fate which all too easily befell houses in the 16th century. The humbler dwellings might literally fall down in a strong wind, as at Welwick (Beverley) in 1553, when rents of £2 were dropped because property was destroyed by a storm. Bad weather was always a hazard. At the Bedern in Howden the total recorded in decay shot up from 1/- in 1551 to 43/4 in 1552, evoking an angry comment, 'revive this decay!'.³¹ But a more serious threat no doubt came from fire which could threaten the existence of a whole street if it began in a town. In 1555 the account for the chantry of the Assumption at Ripon (Duchy of Lancaster) recorded 8/- in decay:-

eo quod dictum tenementum ad terram prostratum per
plures annos elapsos necnon per ignem combustum.

At Topcliffe in 1553³² a house yielding 6/8 was burnt down.

31. By 1553, the sum had fallen to 28/4 and remained at this level down to 1563.

32. Account for 'BIRDFORTH'.

Sheer neglect by the crown itself or by the previous owners meant that much property had been allowed to fall into ruin for lack of repair, though there are signs that the crown's responsibility here may have been minimal. Repairs were costly, and the crown inherited some poor property, no doubt partly because the fear of impending confiscation had seriously reduced the earlier tenants' incentive to maintain the property. This can be seen from the large amount of decay reported even in the first account after the dissolution, when for example, the chantry of Holy Trinity, Whitkirk (Duchy of Lancaster) already had one plot in decay 'per multos annos elapsos.' Similarly, a plot due to yield 6/8 to Our Lady's chantry at Leeds (D.L.) was described as:-

totaliter in decasu pro defectu reparationis, et nullum profitum inde percepi potuit.

Other excuses for decay were numerous. In 1550 the collector for Our Lady's chantry at Wakefield was unable to identify houses in York which should have yielded a rent.³³ In 1553 Richard Adamson had fled 'extra patriam' and none of his rent could be recouped because he left neither family nor friends³⁴. At Driffild in 1550, 32/- was recorded in decay

eo quod aliqui eorum sunt pauperi.....et reliqui in fugam se dederunt. 35.

The detention of sums by the poor was a frequent allegation.³⁶

33.Account for 'WAKEFIELD'.

34.NOTTINGHAM SHIRE.

35.Also reported in 1553: SC6/P&M/353 m. 47.

36.Particularly in the East Riding, see SC6/Ed. VI/565, m.60v (35/8 at Brantingham), m.62 (56/- in Dickering), m.65 (30/- Buckrose), m.66. (33/4 in North Holderness), m. 68v. (76/2 in Harthill).

But whilst a variety of causes of decay were produced there was a great concentration in some areas, particularly the towns. Without further detailed work on the area it would be difficult yet to say how far this reflected a general economic decline, or indeed how genuine or exaggerated were the stories of decay for the crown's ears. Just as uncertainty of the future fate of the chantry property had made many reluctant to repair their holdings on the eve of the dissolution, so fear of new landlords, or indeed of the chances of the property's being handed about by successive regimes, might well have discouraged tenants from taking on chantry lands and houses after the dissolution. It is impossible to tell whether houses became vacant because of disrepair, or whether they fell into disrepair because they were already vacant.

If the accounts are to be believed, Malton³⁷ and Scarborough had many vacant houses and the situation did not materially improve down to 1563. Presumably, the longer they were left vacant, the greater was the chance of their total decay as far as the crown was concerned. Even property kept in good repair was little use if there was no tenant to provide a rent. No wonder, then, that the auditor (or others) could occasionally write:

37. Account for 'RYEDALE'.

The Surveyor to use his diligence to revive
this sum decayed. 38.

Was it concern for the future of property or the fear of
a divine curse on possessions plundered from the church
that kept some plots vacant for many years? Of some
property in York vacant since 1548 it was reported in 1559
that:

in decasu existit et nemo occupare conducere
voluerit.

Yet there are signs that the surveyors were taking
the initiative. Enquiries were begun where there was any
doubt about the legitimacy of the allowance for decay.
When the Ryedale collector consistently failed to return
the 13/4 for one house in Malton, a jury of twelve and
the churchwardens of New Malton were convened to answer
questions, and they certified that whilst the house had
formerly belonged to a chantry, the proceeds had always
been given to the poor, and after the dissolution they
had sold the house and distributed the money in alms.
The sum was evidently allowed to them and the crown ceased
to charge.³⁹ At Bawtry in 1553 it was reported that the
surveyor, Henry Savile had allowed a ruined cottage to pass
without rent for 3 years on condition that the tenant used
this respite to restore the building with whatever he would
normally have paid in rent. Once again, this illustrates
the discretionary power of the regional officers of the

38. Account for 'YORK: BEDERN' 1552 cf 'BEVERLEY VICARS'
for same year.

39. Account for 'RYEDALE', 1550 and 1551.

court of Augmentations.

Derelict property was dangerous in the towns not only because it gave the corporation a bad name, but because vacant tenures meant pavements uncleaned and drains blocked; moreover, disease might be thought to breed, or at least to lurk there. For these reasons among others doubtless, York corporation repeatedly pressed its M.P.s to bring to the crown's attention the deplorable state of the crown-owned houses in the city.. The campaign began on 16 February 1553⁴⁰ and was repeated for Mary's benefit on 25 September, when it was suggested that the gift of some property for the furtherance of St. Thomas's hospital would be an act of charity warmly received by the city;⁴¹ The Steward of crown lands in the East Riding was approached in 1555⁴², and in 1562 Archbishop Young, Lord President, received a strong protest of the urgency of the matter, but his lack of success is manifested by the continuing commissions to M.P.s to raise the matter.⁴³ There is little doubt that the city's claims were extravagant, and stemmed largely from its failure to buy much of the chantry land because of the inability to afford the purchase price.

We must not over-dramatise the issue. There were many accounts free from all decay, including much of Beverley and the other Collegiate lands. Whilst the exposed areas of the moors and wolds, and the low-lying

40. York Civic Records, V, 87.

41. Ibid. 93.

42. Ibid. 136.

43. Ibid. VI, 51, 118; cf. VIII, 22 ff.

areas of the East Coast, accounted for some decay, we must conclude that it was predominantly in the towns that it was felt most.⁴⁴ Moreover, to a remarkable extent, after 1553, the amount claimed in decay stabilised or improved. Repairs kept pace with dereliction, and the result is a indication of the surveyors' reliability. As long as lands remained in the crown's hands, and were not sold or leased, he had to deal with repairs.

But although some money was spent to revive decayed properties, there was also a good deal of preventative repair before decay arose. Thus, although no decay was ever reported in the Acaster college accounts, over £8 was spent on repairs to property there between 1549 and 1553, after which most of the college's lands had been sold off. Many other examples might be cited: no decay at Pickering, yet over £8. 10. 0. spent on repairs between 1549 and 1553; no decay in the prebend of Howden, yet about £6.10.0. spent on repair in 1551 and 1552, and so on.

In the remoter areas, especially if there was a lack of timber, repairs could prove costly, and might be disproportionate to the value of the property. Whensome houses in the East Riding belonging to the Richmondshire chantry of St Mary, Hornby, were repaired in 1550, the cost of £3. 16. 4. was about half the chantry's entire yearly value⁴⁵, and in the following year, repairs to a single tenement in Richmondshire

44. Compare with evidence from leases, above, Chp. VI.

45. RICHMOND account.

itself cost £3. 17. 0. Although a certificate detailing the repairs had to be given to the surveyor, most accountants fail to specify which chantries were concerned, and give only a total cost of repairs in their area.

Was this, perhaps, a source of speculation? It is almost impossible to tell. In 1553 John Sutton, a chantry collector and tenant of one chantry house at Catterick, got his own property repaired at crown expense. But if the burden could be shifted to others it was. One collector in the East Riding tried to levy a fine on some tenants for their refusal to keep a boundary hedge in good order, and when they would not pay, he evidently took the case to the Council of the North⁴⁶. We have no way of telling how many such petty offences were dealt with on the spot, but this is the only one I have found mentioned in the Ministers' Accounts.

Repairs remained a consistently heavy drain on some accountants' resources, though the problem naturally decreased as property was sold or leased. The surviving records, however, show beyond all doubt that the crown was making a genuine attempt to keep the property in good order and even in York where the complaint of the corporation was raised in 1553, we find one accountant spending over £20 and the other over £25 in repairs between 1549 and 1553.

46. SC6/ELIZ/2695 BEVERLEY (Sigglesthorne).

***TABLE**

Table XXVI : Salaries of some local officers of the court of
Augmentations and others responsible for land revenue

LR 1/171 f.422 :	Robert Faircliffe	1. 6. 8
	(collector in Beverley provostry)	
f.424 :	William Tyndale	6. 0. 0
	(collector for Beverley prebends)	
f.389 :	Sir Michael Stanhope	
	(Chief Steward of Crown lands, E.R.)	13. 6. 8

E 315/221	<u>COLLECTORS:-</u>	
f.198v:	John Ireworth (Southwell vicars)	2. 0. 0
	William Eton (Southwell chantries)	6.13. 4
	Richard Gough (Southwell prebends)	6. 0. 0
	Leonard Bate (West Riding chantries)	13. 6. 8
	William Pool (Nottinghamshire chantries)	6.13. 4
f. 200 :	William Eton (more Southwell chantries)	2. 0. 0

* * * * *

For comparison, the following salaries were paid from the Receivers' and Treasurer's accounts to the more senior officers.

E 315/257		
f. 63r :	North, Sackville, Williams(each)	300. 0. 0
f. 50	Moyle, Mildmay (each)	200. 0. 0
	Goodrick,Pope,Gates,Henneage,	
	Arcscot (each)	100. 0. 0
	Gosnold	80. 0. 0
	Duke (clerk)	40. 0. 0
f. 49r :	Richard Jeyner (clerk)	50. 0. 0
f. 50 :	William Turner (auditor)	43.13. 4
LR 6/122/4	:	
	Richard Whalley (Yorks. Receiver)	13. 6. 8
	Henry Savile (W.R. surveyor)	13. 6. 8
	William Laken (N.R. surveyor)	13. 6. 8

The acquisition of the chantries brought no great prestige to the crown. Sale was the motive, not permanent incorporation into the royal estates, and in areas like this, where a good deal was directly administered even in 1563 the bill was disappointingly great.

5. Fees

The last items regularly allowed as deductions were the fees of the auditor for inspecting the accounts and the wages of the collectors. For every account he audited, the auditor might claim a fee of 2/-, and in most accounts this is the only item regularly appearing under the title of 'fees'. The wages of the collectors varied considerably according to the size of the areas over which they bore responsibility and among the surviving patents conferring office on these men we find these set out in Table XXVI. Where a collector was responsible for more than one account it was common for the whole sum of his wage to be deducted from the account of one district. Thus, Leonard Bate had all of his £13. 6. 8. p.a. paid from the Yorkshire revenues of St. Stephen's, Westminster which he collected, and the East Riding Collector Thomas Bellamy received £16. 13. 4. from the wapentake of Harthill each year from 1548 to 1555. From 1556-9 his successor, Thomas Baker, was refused a fee because of his negligence in accounting. Even when it was

restored in 1560 a remark was added in the account that,

Thacomptantes fee owght not to be allowed
because he is to accompt for diverse years. 47.

The fees of college officers, particularly at Beverley and St. Williams, York, caused some anxiety. At Beverley the accountant for the Manor of S. Dalton within the provosty in 1548 bore the fees of the provost's Receiver General (Thomas Barton), the auditor (Hugh Fuller), seneschal (Richard Faircliffe), bailiff (Abraham Metcalfe) and Sir William Babthorpe. In the margin was commented,

see the patent and vouche the date. The Receyvor
and auditor are to be compounded withal for these
fees.

What exactly happened is not disclosed, but by 1550 only the auditor's 2/- is claimed on this account. At St. William's, £7 was claimed in 1548, but 'this fee is to (sic) great.' Nevertheless, the account bore the burden of the Bedern college and the minster and City chantries, and every succeeding year until 1555 £9 was allowed as the combined collector's fee, the accounts there-after being merged with those for the North Riding as far as fees were concerned. At least it may be said that in this sector the administration of the dissolution was self-financed. This was not to be the case, as we shall see, for the pensions.

47. E 310/29/170 (47) Baker's estate was distrained
after his death.

CHAPTER XI

CONCLUSIONS: PROFIT AND LOSS

It should by now be evident that the dissolution of the chantries and sale of their property were not accomplished at one stroke in 1548, and that even by the end of Edward's reign a good deal of chantry property continued to return a yearly rent to the crown. We have watched some of the lasting effects of the dissolution down to the very end of the sixteenth century: sporadic sales, many leases of chantry lands, concealments, litigation, and local administration. And although I have not discussed pensions, they presented a further problem for many years.

Having analysed the procedure for sales, leases and administration, and having identified the persons involved insofar as our source material will allow, we must, in conclusion, attempt to discover just what proportion of the land confiscated in 1548 had been sold off by 1553, and why anything remained in the crown's hands at all. By this means we may come close to an assessment of the long-term financial advantage of the dissolution to the crown.

1. The National Background

Professor Jordan has calculated that during Edward's reign a total of £272,858. 8. 0. was paid for the purchase of chantry lands from the crown, whilst lands with a 'capital'

value of £47,317 also from the chantries were given away or restored to charitable uses.¹ By 1553, he feels that:-

very little remained save the debris, the bits and pieces which were not immediately saleable. 2.

We have seen that Londoners tumbled over each other in the stampede to buy up chantry property in the capital, and it is evident that there were several other areas, notably in the south, where such trade was brisk. Nevertheless, on the evidence presented for our area we can only accept Jordan's general conclusion with reservations. First of all, even among the unsaleable commodities the crown was able to find a steady income: it withheld such stipends as it had formerly paid (from monastic receipts) to certain chantries, and it continued to draw from landlords and corporations many 'free rents' which they had paid to chantries.³ Moreover, when we examine the continuing income from the chantries in Michaelmas 1553 it is hard to agree with Jordan's 'bits and pieces', though we must concede that, for one reason or another much of the remaining property was indeed unsaleable at the time.

Calculation of the total income from the chantries on a national scale at any one time is fraught with difficulties. For example, there was a vast gulf between the gross totals collected by the bailiffs of chantry land, and the amounts

-
1. W.K. Jordan, E.Y.K. 119.
 2. Ibid. 110.
 3. Appendix II b & c.

they were able to pay to their Receiver having deducted the sort of allowances we examined in the previous chapter. In his turn, the Receiver had to meet many more expenses before he could hand on any profits to his superiors in London. Pensions and annuities were the main burden on his account, but there was no effort to ensure that the dissolution of the chantries was self-financing in this respect: indeed the system of accounting positively discouraged such procedure. The Receiver listed all his revenues from every source, of which the chantries formed only a tiny part, and then listed his expenses, payable from his total assets. Chantry pensions were thus not paid purely out of the receipts from chantry property, but this meant that whenever pensions exceeded chantry revenue in a Receiver's account, the dissolution was effectively producing a local loss, which could only be subsidised from the income from other sources. At the same time, we have to remember that the ready cash raised from the sales exceeded by far any such local deficit and was administered in central, not local, accounts, first by the Treasurer of Augmentations, then by Peckham and, after 1553, by the tellers of the Exchequer. Further, there was not a regular deficit on the chantries in each county, so that taking the whole country we shall have a rather different picture.

The problem is how to acquire statistics for the whole country. The Ministers' Accounts, with all the deductions and complications reviewed above, cannot possibly be a reliable source for estimating income, except in their final entries, that is, of their payments to the Receiver, which we find fully recorded in the series of Receivers' Accounts. But even these totals of payment are not wholly reliable. It was not unknown for a collector (like Anthony Dale in Craven) to fail to render account, in which case the sums paid might be artificially low. By contrast, when such sums were subsequently recouped and paid in, they would increase the year's total, making it artificially high. Even if the sum recorded were free from such distortion, it would not represent the real value of the remaining land to the crown, for the revenue had already passed through the hands of the collectors, and expenses of maintenance and the like had been deducted. If such land were to be sold, the costs of repair and the fee for audit would be wiped off the slate, the former being passed on to the new purchaser and the latter being abolished. In other words, the potential sale-value of the property was higher than the payments to the Receiver would indicate.

It must be clear, then, that without scrutinising the Ministers' Accounts for every county as I have scrutinised those for Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire, and making adjustments to the totals paid, to counterbalance the eccentricities of any one year's accounts, we could not comfortably regard the totals paid as an accurate indication of the profit of

the dissolution. Nevertheless, having stated the objections, I still believe this to be the easiest path to our objective, and we can conduct a simple experiment with the aid of the surviving Receivers' Accounts. Not all counties are covered in the surviving accounts for Michaelmas 1553, but often there is an account for 1552 or 1554. The 1552 account precedes Edward's last sales and is therefore over-stating the income we should expect for the end of Edward's reign, but the 1554 account is much closer to that for 1553, since Mary's first year saw few sales of chantry lands. Because the figures are necessarily so tentative, I have only tabulated them correct to the nearest £5.⁴ The results are shown in Tables XXVII and XXVIII

4. But to the nearest £1 in Table XXVIII

***TABLE**

Table XXVII : The magnitude of payments from chantry revenues to the crown Receivers in various counties for the year ending Michaelmas, 1553 (or nearest year, as in Table XXVIII.)

<u>Over £1000</u> YORKSHIRE	<u>£500-£1000</u> LINCOLNSHIRE DEVON	<u>£300-£500</u> CORNWALL STAFFORDSHIRE DORSET LONDON	<u>£200-£300</u> SOMERSET WILTSHIRE GLOUCESTERSHIRE WARWICKSHIRE BERKSHIRE SHROPSHIRE DURHAM
<u>£150-£200</u> NORTHUMBERLAND SUFFOLK KENT SUSSEX NORTHANTS ESSEX CHESHIRE	<u>£100-£150</u> RICHMONDSHIRE NORFOLK HERTFORDSHIRE	<u>£50-£100</u> WESTMORLAND CAMBRIDGESHIRE OXFORDSHIRE HEREFORDSHIRE MIDDLESEX HAMPSHIRE DERBYSHIRE BUCKINGHAMSHIRE	<u>£50 and below</u> LEICESTERSHIRE RUTLAND WORCESTERSHIRE SURREY HUNTINGDONSHIRE

Table XXVIII : Chantry income and pensions as shown in the Receivers' Accounts. (Michaelmas 1553 unless stated; correct to £5)

<u>Area of Receipt</u>	<u>Receiver's total income</u>	<u>Chantry income</u>	<u>Chantry pensions</u>	<u>Stipends continued</u>
1. Dors., Som., Dev., Cornwall	15,350	1585	1275	150
2. Yorkshire	13,400	1690	1370	290
3. Rich., Dur., Cumb., Westm., Northd.	11,260	680	885	335
4. Norf. Suff. Cam. Hunt.	10,610	395	95 (**)	*
5. E/S.M/S.Lond.Herts.	6,375	650	1920	50
6. Kent, Surr., S/S	4,400	385	555	*
7. Berk. Buck. Ox. Beds.	1,645	+ 375	405	25
<u>Michaelmas 1554 :-</u>				
8. Gloucestershire	6055	245	75	45
9. Wiltshire	5730	210	60	60
10. Hampshire	2005	100	70	5
<u>Michaelmas 1552 :-</u>				
11. Northants, Warwk, Leics, Rutld, Salop, Staff, Heref, Worcs.	10175	1250	1750	525

(* no figure available) (+ very high arrears this year : this figure low.)
Sources : Receivers' Accounts (LR 6), as follows :-

1. no: 104/4	6. no: 113/5	11. no: 123/1.
2. 122/3	7. 96/5	
3. 123/9	8. 28/1	(**) far too low : in the previous
4. 56/7	9. 23/1	year the sum was £530, with
5. 62/1	10. 33/1	over £70 in stipends

N.B. The figures are presented as no more than an approximate guide : see explanation in text.

Yorkshire was the biggest county and also had more chantries than any other county, but even so it is remarkable for the gulf separating its revenue from that of its nearest rival - and this figure does not include any of the income from the Duchy of Lancaster or Richmondshire. Only a third of the counties studied returned less than £100 in this year, whilst another third returned over £200 to the crown each. Table XXVIII gives rather more precise figures for each Receivership, showing that in several areas there was less income from the chantries by 1553 than expenditure on pensions and continuations. Worst off was the Receiver for the London area, with pensions three times his chantry income because so much property had been sold, and even in Yorkshire where there was still a large income from the chantries, the margin of income over pensions was far from comfortable, in this case because there were so many chantry priests. Other regions, particularly East Anglia, Gloucestershire and Wiltshire, seem to have been more fortunate. Taking the country as a whole, and including now the income of something like £2000 from chantries of the Duchy of Lancaster,⁵ it seems that after Edward's sales there was still a yearly income from chantries in the order of £10,000, which may well be an under-estimate in view of the factors rehearsed

5. For relevant accounts see Lists in Deputy Keeper's Report 45, esp. nos. 1485, 2718, 3674, 4573, 5279, 5828, 6826, 7369, 11783.

above. Interestingly enough, a crown estimate in 1549 set the total of chantry pensions at £11,147. 14. 1.,⁶ so that, by the purest chance, income from the chantries, even after the sales and all other deductions, must just about have balanced expenditure on pensions, though in view of the methods of accounting it is extremely unlikely that this was effectively planned to be so. Nevertheless, this strongly suggests that the dissolution was not ruinous to the crown even in the short term, especially when we remember the major revenue from the sale of lands, which these figures do not take into account.

2. The Regional picture

Only at a local level can we effectively carry the study further than 1553, and even here there are problems. For whilst there are surprisingly complete series of Ministers' Accounts, the Receivers' Accounts for our four areas (Yorkshire at large, Nottinghamshire, Richmondshire and the Yorkshire parts of the Duchy of Lancaster) are incomplete. The Duchy of Lancaster area makes the most interesting survey, as shown in Table XXIX. Here, a separate Receivers' Account was indeed kept for the chantries,

6. H.M.C. report Salisbury I (Cecil), 75.

*TABLE

Table XXIX : Receipts from chantry sources in the Yorkshire parts of the Duchy of Lancaster for the years shown-

Figures to the nearest £1, gross receipts before deduction of fees etc.

<u>Account no:-</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Receipts from collectors</u>	<u>Paid to the Receiver General</u>	<u>Cash in hand</u>
DL 29/567/8955	3Ed.VI	1351 (1½yrs)	Nil	Nil
8956	6Ed.VI	841	17	Nil
8957	1+2 P+M	826	Nil	Nil
8958	2+3 P+M	800	Nil	20
8959	4+5 P+M	767	180	Nil
8960	5+6 P+M	310	185	Nil
8961	1 Eliz.	776	100	163
/568/8962	2 Eliz.	763	120	334
8963	11 Eliz	774	169	390
8964	39 Eliz.	799	527	Nil
8965	40 Eliz.	799	612	8

Table XXX : Receipts from chantries in Richmondshire-

<u>Year</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Total chantry revenue to nearest £1</u>	<u>Pensions & Stipends paid</u>
1548	Ministers' A/c	49 (½yr)	Not recorded
1549	"	112	"
1550	"	104	"
1551	"	109	"
1552	"	106	"
1553	"	78	"
<u>Receiver's A/C:-</u>			
1554	LR6/116/1	99	116
1558	6	98	86
1568	117/1	92	29
1578	9	83	Nil
1586	118/3	83	Nil
1596	7	78	Nil
1602	10	29	Nil

Table XXXI : Receipts from chantries in the Yorkshire account.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Receipt from chantries (£)</u>	<u>Pensions nearest £</u>	<u>Stipends paid</u>
1549	LR6/122/1	2154	1738	291
1552	2	2185	1605	307
1553	3	1693	1368	292
1555	4	1815	1255	295
1556	5	1616	1219	273
1557	6	1116	not fully listed	
1558	7	901	not fully listed	
1564	8	1662	480	276
1582	9	1767	123	234
1602	10	1516	17	242

and the pensions were paid from this fund alone, any remaining cash being thereafter transmitted to the Receiver General of the Duchy in London. In the first years, pensions and expenses ate up all the profits from the chantries in the Yorkshire part of the Duchy, and nothing was handed to the Receiver General from this source. Only at the end of Mary's reign did the situation materially improve, but since Elizabeth was determined not to sell Duchy lands despite the pressures of war, a steady and by no means meagre income of approaching £800 p.a. came to the Receiver, and by the end of the reign he was able to pay over 75% of this to the Receiver General. Had the crown been able to retain other chantry lands until the pensioners began to die off, similar results could have been expected from other areas. But we must remember that from the outset the government had planned to spend large amounts of the profit from the dissolution on warfare and the social services. It is hardly just to blame them for fulfilling their resolution.

Outside the Duchy we have no corresponding measure of profit, for the other Receivers merged chantry income and expenditure in their general accounts for all crown lands. For Richmondshire there is no Receiver's Account until 1554, after which Table XXX shows income and expenditure for a sample of yearly accounts down to the end of the century, yielding a broadly similar view of steadily increasing profits.

From the 1570's no further pensions were being paid, but further sales at the end of Elizabeth's reign materially reduced the profits that had previously been shown.

The absence of Receivers' Accounts for Nottinghamshire and the defective nature of Ministers' Accounts make an equivalent analysis there impossible, but amounts paid by the collectors to the Receiver in Edward's reign were as follows:-

1548	No account
1549	£730 (1½ years)
1550	£678
1551	£658
1552	No surviving account
1553	£430

In the first year of Mary's reign there was again no account surviving, and subsequently the restoration of Southwell college removed a good deal of the crown's profit for the county. It seems inevitable that pensions here substantially exceeded income for many years into the future.

There remains the county of Yorkshire at large, comprising the bulk of the three Ridings and the city of York. During Edward's reign, the Ministers' Accounts show payments to the Receiver from chantry revenues as follows:-

1548	£977.	1.	2.	(½ yr.)
1549	£1969	11.	8.	
1550	£1793	11.	1.	
1551	£1596	11.	4.	
1552	£1739	6.	8.	
1553	£1381	7.	6.	

These figures exclude the few collecting areas catering for the lands of colleges situated outside the diocese, which, however, I have not subtracted from the totals to be found in the surviving Receivers' Accounts as shown in Table XXXI. In

that Table, we once again find the crown drawing an ever increasing profit from the remaining lands as the number of pensioners decreased.

The Duchy's chantry account runs until 1759⁷, when the remaining lands were absorbed into the general account. The rest of our region cannot compete with this longevity, but a rental of West Riding chantry property in the reign of Charles I still recorded a gross annual value of £130 p.a. and a similar document for the East Riding £115 p.a.⁸ Whilst these totals indicate that a great deal was sold at the turn of the century, they also prove that much that the crown had retained must have been saleable, given favourable market conditions. Finally, therefore, we must return to 1553 and discover what proportion of the saleable assets had been disposed of, and why the remainder had not been sold.

3. Saleable Commodities?

That the crown's continuing income from the chantries in our area was not derived primarily from mere 'debris' is abundantly clear? Why then was so much unsold in 1553? Was it crown policy to preserve as much capital as possible either as a long-term investment or as a fund from which to

7. DL 29/9062/572.

8. Respectively, SC12/29/34 and 31.

Table XXXII : The disposal of Chantry and Collegiate property in the diocese and county of York, 1548-1553.

Explanatory Note:-

Taking the gross total annual income for each chantry as expressed in the 1548 Certificate, compared with the sums subsequently claimed in the Ministers' Accounts, but excluding certain items which were wrongly included, notably the Bedern College in York, and excluding stocks of cash, and endowments for lamps and obits, we arrive at the Gross Total Annual income in 1548 (col. a). From this are deducted the crown's own contributions in cash to chantries (Appendix II b & c), and all property later found by court process not to have been eligible for confiscation, also payments made from one chantry to another, which would otherwise lead to their double reckoning. This gives the Amended Gross Total in 1548 (col. b). There follow the figures for items restored, or given away (Chapter III), and from which the crown therefore derived no profit (col. c); and the total sold by Michaelmas, 1553 (col. d). Gifts and sales are expressed as a percentage of the Amended Gross Total, and in each case the gross figures are cited. Finally, an approximate estimate of the percentage of the Amended Gross Total which was neither given away nor sold is recorded (col. e). Fractions of a penny have been ignored throughout. Pontefract college is included in the total for the Duchy of Lancaster, and Clifton college in that for Nottinghamshire. The figures in this table are the result of calculations based on scores of Ministers' accounts which were apparently never added up by contemporary accountants.

Part I : The Colleges

	Gross 1548	Amended	Gifts &c %	Sales %	Remains % e
BEVERLEY:					
provostry	426. 3. 6	402. 0. 6	nil	53. 1. 4(13)	(87)
prebends	530.10. 2	334. 0.11	60.12. 4(18)	21. 1. 0(6)	(77)
chantries	178.10. 6	135. 10. 3	19.15. 8(14)	26. 0. 2(19)	(67)
total	1135. 4. 2	871.11. 8	81. 8. 0(8)	100. 2. 6(12)	(80)
SOUTHWELL:	637. 7. 6	603. 7. 2	13. 6. 8(2)	140.11. 0(23)	(75)
RIPON :	394. 1. 1	344. 3. 6	nil	5. 9. 8(2)	(98)
HOWDEN :	179.10. 9	175. 8. 9	49. 2. 5(27)	16.16. 4(9)	(64)
ROTHERHAM:	142.16. 5	129. 9. 9	2.19. 1(2)	31. 0.11(24)	(74)
HEMINGBROUGH:	115.17.11	107. 2. 3	nil	17.10.10(16)	(84)
LOWTHORPE:	62.16.10	58. 7. 5	nil	nil	(100)
ACASTER :	37.15. 0	37.15. 0	15. 1. 8(40)	14.13. 3(39)	(21)
York,					
St WILLIAM :	25. 7. 8	23.14. 8	nil	6.13. 8(28)	(72)
St SEPULCHRE:	194. 3. 2	128. 9. 9	10. 0. 0(8)	1. 0. 0(1)	(91)
total (incl. Beverley)	2925. 0. 6	2479. 9.11	171.17.10(7)	333.18. 2(13)	(80)
Part II : chantries outside the colleges :-					
DUCHY	628. 7. 5	596.16. 3	36.17. 9(6)	77.16. 0(13)	(81)
W.RIDING	511.19.10	424. 8.11	11.19. 8(3)	206.13. 8(48)	(46)
NOTT'S.	404. 7. 7	291.15.11	32. 6. 4(11)	124. 3. 4(43)	(46)
E.RIDING	253.11. 6	186. 8. 2	5. 5. 2(3)	28.18.11(16)	(81)
N.RIDING	244. 5. 1	198.17. 6	nil	24. 3. 4(12)	(88)
York MINSTER	237.17.10	160.19. 6	nil	24. 9. 0(15)	(85)
York CITY	192.10. 1	168.17. 5	nil	53. 7. 2(32)	(68)
RICHMONDSHIRE	188.17. 6	134. 3. 6	nil	21.16. 2(16)	(84)
HULL CITY	41.15. 8	37.15. 8	8.10. 0(22)	9. 8. 4(24)	(54)
total (Pt II)	2703.12. 6	2200. 2.10	94.18.11(4)	570.15.11(26)	(70)
Grand Total:	5628.13. 0	4679.12. 9	266.16. 9(6)	904.14. 1(19)	(75)

pay pensions and finance social reforms? In the Duchy of Lancaster such an approach is manifest. Was it, on the other hand, a geographical accident, the crown being able to raise all it wanted in sales of southern chantry property? This is not apparent, particularly when we look at the heavy northern sales in 1552-3.

I have followed through the Ministers' Accounts from 1548 to 1553 chantry by chantry for the whole of our area, and after making compensating adjustments for entries which are obviously incorrect, for example chantries still wrongly charged after they had been sold, I have reached the figures shown in Table XXXII. Ignoring hospitals, and other institutions which were omitted from the 1548 Certificates, and ignoring stocks of money, and endowments of lamps, obits and occasional services - in other words, dealing solely with endowed chantries and stipends, we have been discussing property with a gross annual yield of £5628. 13. 0. in 1548. Deducting from this total sums paid by the crown itself, and items wrongly included in the Chantry Certificates and later exonerated by the collectors or by litigation, we are left with an amended gross total (still in 1548) of £4679.12.9. p.a. In Prof. Jordan's terms this represents a 'capital' value of substantially over £90,000 at an assumed average purchase price of around 20 years. Of this, less than 6% was given away for any reason including charitable purposes, and less than 20% was sold. In other words, over the whole

area studied about three-quarters of all the disposable income from the chantries (including freerents not derived from lands) was still in crown ownership at the end of Edward's reign. An uncertain percentage of the remaining land - probably the majority - was by then held from the crown on lease, but judging by the amounts spent by the collectors on items such as repairs, a substantial amount of land was still being directly administered by crown bailiffs. Much of the collegiate revenue was tied up in tithes and spiritualities which were temporarily restored to the church by Mary and resumed by Elizabeth, but the crown does not appear deliberately to have retained such revenues, for some leases and sales certainly included tithes, which were therefore deemed marketable commodities. It was, however, unlikely that many buyers would be interested in free rents with no land, and therefore no hope of profit. These amounted to something like £430 p.a., were technically disposable, (Appendix II b & c) and certainly not mere 'debris'.

But this means that we still have some good land to account for. It was certainly the policy of the crown to retain Duchy of Lancaster property. Sales there reached only 13% of the disposable total. There were extensive crown lands in the East Riding of which first Stanhope and later Northumberland were Chief Stewards, and it may be that here, too, there was some reluctance on the crown's part to sell lands, the total reaching only 16%, and less still in the

colleges at Beverley, Howden, Hemingbrough and Lowthorpe. Certainly the East Riding had many chantry endowments let out to farm or held on lease, and it was clearly to the crown's advantage to retain compact blocks of property in this way. Nevertheless, many small inroads were made into the chantry property here by purchasers. Even in the biggest prize of all, Beverley college, Francis Aslabay was able to buy the manor of South Dalton, and Estofte and Dolman that of Lockington. Nor have I found traces of frustrated would-be buyers queueing up and being turned away by a crown reluctant to sell. The tardiness of sales here, then, probably did not derive from crown policy, but from an absence of interested buyers. Even after John Bellow had toured his area advertising the sales, only small buyers came forward, interested in isolated plots. The North Riding and Richmondshire could evidently summon up no greater enthusiasm than the East Riding.

Why, then, were people not buying? Numerous explanations present themselves. So far from London we could in any case expect little competition, and fewer persons able to afford to buy whole manors of collegiate property, though this had not greatly affected the sale of monastic lands. Potential buyers would, however, find their freedom to do as they wished with the property heavily circumscribed by extant leases or farms, the legality of which the crown acknowledged. But again, this would not deter the greater landlords who

were used to handling sub-tenants. A greater disincentive may have been the military tenure certain to be imposed on such extensive properties - a troublesome extension of feudal exactions. However, the sort of men likely to be interested in buying whole manors were equally likely already to have encountered feudal obligations which would not be dramatically extended by purchases of collegiate property. Another possible object to such a purchase might be that the property was not considered safe from reappropriation for church purposes, particularly if there were a general uncertainty under Edward, with Mary in the background, which way the religious wind might blow next. That this might have been the case is suggested by the percentage of sales at Acaster and Rotherham, (two colleges which were to be abandoned as non-parochial, and for which there was less fear as a result,) when compared with the East Riding colleges, which were parish churches. At this point, however, our leases and farms come back into the picture, for neither Acaster nor Rotherham had adopted policies of extensive farming, but had issued individual leases to tenants, which was obviously a preferable situation for the buyer.

If great tracts of collegiate land remained unsold, we find the prebendal and chantry mansions selling well. When John Beaumont bought some of Southwell college via William Neville, he concentrated on the prebendal mansions and a few tithes. After his disgrace these properties were

given to Sir Henry Neville, but Mary was still able to refound Southwell college because so much of the original endowment had been preserved without sale. Stanhope bought the prebendal mansions at Beverley, though not all for himself, whilst Thomas Davy and others secured those at Howden and William Eccleston patented those at Ripon. In each case these represented almost the only property that had been held in demesne before the dissolution, the rest having been largely let to farm.⁹

The revenues of Pontefract and Ripon colleges were further secured by being situated within the Duchy of Lancaster, and those of St. Sepulchre's, York, by being leased.

Away from the colleges there were certain types of property which did not sell. The aldermen and merchants of York or Wakefield, Doncaster or Newark, might buy widely in their towns, but they were certainly not interested in buying up the whole of the property which came on the market. The market was completely saturated with unwanted town-houses after the key men had exercised their marginal preference. We have repeatedly encountered the 'decay' which so badly affected all of the towns, and this certainly affected the chances of sale in Malton, Scarborough and Hull. The story of the glut of chantry

9. All the cases cited here are mentioned in Chapters IV and V above. See particularly Ch. V section 1, and Tables in the Appendix.

houses recurs even in the smaller towns like Rotherham and Tadcaster, Thirsk and Northallerton, and in the whole diocese Newark was the only town managing to dispose of practically all its property. A collection of plots of arable land could be worthwhile for a buyer, but a collection of houses appealed to a more limited market.

Perhaps the very word 'collection' is the key to the problem outside the colleges. There was no hope of large, compact yields of land from most chantries. Many tiny properties and their rents went to make up the total income, so that the broad acres of the monastic dissolutions were not widely repeated. Where opportunities might have arisen, the small buyer could find himself deterred by the existence of leases, as at Helmsley and Pockley in the North Riding. Apart, therefore, from any economic malaise which might have prevented buyers raising the necessary cash, the most likely explanation of the lethargy of the sales in our area is the unattractive nature of the property. Nevertheless, over 40% of the lands in the West Riding and Nottinghamshire were sold off, and this must be mainly attributed to the activities of the Augmentations officials Leonard Bate and William Rigges. Sadly, it is precisely in these last two areas that we have least information about the ultimate disposal of the lands.

4. Conclusion

This survey has shown some of the dangers of treating English history as if it were the same thing as the history of London and the south east. The pattern of sales, the aspirations and class of the purchasers, and the feasibility of the crown's retaining chantry property even after 1553 were all markedly different.

There have been several points at which the information available has been insufficient to admit of the sort of conclusions we should have liked to be able to make. For example, who was really behind those purchases in the West Riding and Nottinghamshire? Precisely how much land was leased before the dissolution, and precisely how much was leased and farmed in 1553? Perhaps it is not so essential to answer these questions after all, for enough conclusions have been possible even without them.

But to my mind the greatest revelation of this study has not concerned the buyers of chantry land at all, but the administration which made the whole process possible. With all the inefficiencies that we have had to note, it achieved a remarkably competent handling of an enormously intricate operation which touched the interests of many thousands of tenants even in our limited area, without causing any major changes in the tenurial structure, or any known diminution of amenities which were considered desirable to the Protestant mind. The people remained to

be educated to the new ideas, and the removal of much of what they had considered, (and indeed still considered), essential to the redemption of the soul and the edification of the spirit. But in what concerned their material security in this world they had little to bemoan, and it was probably this factor as much as any other which ensured the acceptance of crown policies with very little public murmur. The perils of the modern rent-collector were as nothing compared with those faced by his 16th-century counterpart, and it would be unjust to close this study without once again paying tribute to the local and central officers and scribes of the Court of Augmentations who were able to implement the decisions of the government with a minimum of delay and fuss. It was on such foundations that England's greatness under the Tudors rested.

C.J. Kitching
DURHAM 1970.