

# The Economic Problems of the See of York: Decline and Recovery in the Sixteenth Century

By CLAIRE CROSS

A LEGEND has long persisted that the temporalities of the see of York suffered disastrously at the time of the Reformation through spoliation by the crown. Unembellished evidence confirms that in the decade between 1536 and 1546 Archbishops Edward Lee and Robert Holgate surrendered to Henry VIII a very large part of their ancient episcopal lands and that vast northern estates, which the archbishops of York had possessed since long before the Conquest, passed permanently into royal ownership. Yet some early York historians have been reluctant to admit that the crown granted to the see ecclesiastical revenues, chiefly arising from the recently dissolved monasteries, in at least partial recompense for the lands the two successive archbishops had renounced. Undoubtedly during the middle years of the sixteenth century the see of York underwent a period of serious economic disruption but it seems that the archbishops did not have to face a lasting catastrophic fall in their income. Indeed, by 1600 the archbishop of York received an income from temporalities nominally equal to the income his predecessor had enjoyed in 1536. What had changed, and this had long-term consequences both religious and social for the subsequent history of the see, was the source of this revenue.

The first historians of York, James Torre, who wrote his immensely detailed collection on the church in York towards the end of the seventeenth century, and Archbishop John Sharp, who commissioned a reconstruction of the pre-Reformation lands of the see soon after he entered upon his archiepiscopal responsibilities in 1691, from either prudence or considered judgement, did not dwell upon the Henrician impoverishment of the see.<sup>1</sup> Torre meticulously described the manors which Archbishop Lee in 1543 and Archbishop Holgate in 1545 had granted to the crown but refrained (as was his custom) from commenting on the transaction, apart from observing that Holgate “exchanged with the king many of his archiepiscopal lands for other rich parsonages appropriated to the dissolved monasteries.”<sup>2</sup> There was no remark at all on the valuable account of “the present estates of the archbishops of York with some

<sup>1</sup> J. M. Biggins, *Historians of York*, St Anthony's Hall Publications, No. 10, 1956. Torre's two manuscript volumes are in the Minster Library, York.

<sup>2</sup> York Minster Library, Torre, MS. Minster volume, pp. 473, 350-436.

account of their origins" compiled for Archbishop Sharp in 1700.<sup>1</sup> No such reticence curbed later historians. Browne Willis in 1727 wrote largely about the "sacrilegious alienations" begun by Lee in 1543. He reserved, however, his most severe censures for Holgate because of his neglect of the see which "within a month after his translation [January 1544] he greatly impoverished, by passing away to the king and his heirs . . . thirteen manors in Northumberland, forty in Yorkshire, six in Nottinghamshire, and eight in Gloucestershire; in lieu of which he obtained . . . thirty-three impropriations and advowsons, late parcels of abbey lands. . . And though, by these unworthy measures he had heaped and amassed a great deal of wealth, beyond what any other bishop in England was master of, yet it did not prosper with him: for in Edward VI reign he met with his troubles. . ." Having used for his evidence a sixteenth-century manuscript collected by Archbishop Sharp, Willis concluded: "this see being thus pillaged and garbled in Henry VIII's reign, King Edward VI had no room to plunder, nor was here any alienation extorted in Queen Elizabeth's reign. . ."<sup>2</sup> Francis Drake, York's great eighteenth-century historian, took over Browne Willis's opinions as he took over much of his history of the Minster, and repeated the allegations against Edward Lee and Robert Holgate for their improper surrender of archiepiscopal lands to the crown.<sup>3</sup> And so the legend developed. Like most legends it contains a modicum of truth.

When they came to try to describe in detail the extent and the value of the ancient episcopal lands of the see of York, Torre and Sharp discovered that no pre-Reformation receiver-general's accounts (or indeed any detailed accounts) had survived in York. Under these circumstances Torre, confined to York, contented himself with the piecemeal information he could extract from the dean and chapter archives, particularly from the dean and chapter lease books. Sharp took the matter further and had a search made of the Public Records in London. The Henrician survey of the lands of the see seems already to have been missing, but he did find a manuscript in the First Fruits Office which gave a complete description and valuation of the pre-Reformation lands of the see in 1534.<sup>4</sup>

Little new material for reconstructing the ancient archiepiscopal lands has been found since the investigations of Archbishop Sharp. Information in York itself is sparse in the extreme; indeed, the very memory of the pre-Reformation estates seems largely to have disappeared. There exists, however, in the Public Record Office a valor of all the possessions of Edward Lee made at the visitation of the province by Richard Leyton and Thomas Legh on 12 January 1535[6] and

<sup>1</sup> The Church Commissioners' records deposited in the Borthwick Institute, York (to which reference is made by kind permission of the Archivist), CC Ab.2.6. [67789].

<sup>2</sup> Browne Willis, *A Survey of the Cathedrals of York, Durham, Carlisle. . .*, I, 1727, pp. 27, 44-5, 19.

<sup>3</sup> F. Drake, *Eboracum*, 1736, p. 452.

<sup>4</sup> Browne Willis, *Survey*, I, p. 18.

this provides a detailed description of archiepiscopal lands immediately before their general disruption.<sup>1</sup> By 1536 it is clear that the lands of the see of York were administered in nine distinct units, most of them of very ancient formation: in Northumberland the archbishop held the regality of Hexhamshire; in Yorkshire the lordship of Ripon, the barony of Sherburn, the lordship of Otley, and the lordship of Beverley; in Nottinghamshire the lordships of Scrooby and Southwell; and lastly, outside the northern province, the barony of Churchdown in Gloucestershire, and the lordship of Battersea in Surrey.

The regality of Hexhamshire was both one of the most ancient and one of the most valuable possessions of the see of York. In 674 Queen Etheldrid is said to have given it out of her dower to Archbishop Wilfrid in order to endow the archbishopric of York. The regality consisted of the thirteen manors of Hexham, Errington, Wall, Acomb, Hallington, Keepwick, Greenridge, Keenley, East Allen, Catton, Ninebanks, West Allen, and Newlands. Archbishop Melton in 1319 considered that Hexhamshire alone produced a third of the revenues of the archbishopric. Later in the fourteenth century the value of the regality fell sharply because of Scottish raids, but during the latter part of the fifteenth century the income derived from the Northumberland property slowly recovered.<sup>2</sup> Henry VIII's visitors valued the regality of Hexhamshire at a clear annual value of £196 19s. 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ d.<sup>3</sup>

In Yorkshire the lordship of Beverley in the East Riding brought in the highest revenues in the early sixteenth century. Like the regality of Hexhamshire it had come to the see long before the Conquest: Torre maintained that King Athelstan had given it to the archbishopric.<sup>4</sup> It included the manors of Kingston upon Hull, Patrington, Tharltorpe, Frismarsh, Hall Garth, El-loughton, Wetwang, Wilton, Bishop Wilton, Beverley, Skidby, and Bishop Burton. This collection of manors, most of them grouped around Hull but three, Wetwang, Wilton, and Bishop Wilton, in the north part of the East Riding, much nearer to York, was considered in 1536 to produce £462 5s. 10d. free of all encumbrances.<sup>5</sup>

Two other Yorkshire lordships, the barony of Sherburn, and the lordship of Ripon, approached the lordship of Beverley in value. The barony of Sherburn included property in York itself and the manors of Bishopthorpe, Cawood, Wistow, Sherburn, and Bishopslathes. Although by the sixteenth century the barony was apparently administered as a single unit its component manors, unlike those in the regality of Hexhamshire or the lordship of Beverley, seem to

<sup>1</sup> Public Record Office, SC 11/766. This document does not seem to have been used previously by northern historians. It was not published by the Record Commissioners in vol. v of the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* where there is no account of the temporalities of the see of York.

<sup>2</sup> A. B. Hinds, *History of Northumberland*, III, pt 1, Hexhamshire, 1896, pp. 20-66.

<sup>3</sup> P.R.O., SC 11/766.

<sup>4</sup> Minster Library, Torre, MS. Minster vol., pp. 350-3.

<sup>5</sup> P.R.O., SC 11/766.

have been acquired over a much longer period of time. According to Torre, Athelstan had given the manors of Sherburn, Cawood, and Wistow (and probably Bishopslathes) to the see, but it was not until some centuries later that Archbishop Walter de Grey in 1241 bought the manor of Bishopthorpe near York and attached it to the lordship.<sup>1</sup> Leyton and Legh in 1536 considered that the barony of Sherburn brought in the clear annual value of £329 9s. 3½d. The same visitors valued the lordship of Ripon at a clear annual total of £262 15s. 9½d.<sup>2</sup> Archbishop Sharp thought the see had acquired the entire lordship through the gift of Athelstan. It consisted of the manors of Ripon, Sharrow, Stainley, Ripon Holme, Coltsgate Hill, Penny Croft, Castle Dyke, Whitcliff, Thorp, Monkton, Thornton, Nidderdale, and Bishopside, all close to Ripon and straddling the borders of the West and North Ridings. The lordship of Otley completed the pre-Reformation estates of the see of York in Yorkshire. Otley, a single manor, had yet again come to the see through the generosity of King Athelstan. In 1536 it was estimated to bring in the clear annual sum of £70 15s. 7d.<sup>3</sup>

Outside Yorkshire, but still within the northern province, the see of York owned two important estates in Nottinghamshire, the lordship of Scrooby and the lordship of Southwell. The lordship of Scrooby was composed of six manors: Scrooby itself, Laneham, Askham, Sutton, Northsoke, and Ranskill and was valued in 1536 at a clear £167 11s. 4¾d. a year. Sharp recorded that King Edward granted the lordship of Southwell to the see in 958. By 1536, although made up of various dependent manors, Southwell was being administered as one consolidated unit in a way that the Scrooby lordship apparently was not; the royal visitors valued Southwell lordship at a clear £147 19s. 10d. a year.<sup>4</sup>

The two other estates which the archbishop of York possessed in the south of England just before the Reformation lay very far from the centre of the archiepiscopal see. The more ancient, the barony of Churchdown in Gloucestershire, had belonged to St Peter's Abbey, Gloucester, before the Conquest and seems to have been acquired by the see of York on the translation of Bishop Ealdred of Worcester to York in 1061, although the abbey did not finally cede the barony to York till 1157.<sup>5</sup> It consisted of the eight manors of Churchdown, Hucklecote, Norton, Shurdington, Whitcomb, North Cerney, Compton Abdale, and Oddington. Isolated in the west of England and hundreds of miles from the nearest other archiepiscopal lordship, the barony of Churchdown must always have presented problems of administration for the archbishop's

<sup>1</sup> Minster Library, Torre, MS. Minster vol., pp. 350-63. See also Sharp's description of the ancient lands of the see.—Borthwick, CC Ab.2.6. [67789].

<sup>2</sup> P.R.O., SC 11/766. <sup>3</sup> Borthwick, CC Ab.2.6. [67789]; P.R.O., SC 11/766.

<sup>4</sup> P.R.O., SC 11/766; Borthwick, CC Ab.2.6. [67789].

<sup>5</sup> *V.C.H. Gloucestershire*, vi, 1965, pp. 89, 93-4.

receiver-general. Nevertheless, it was a possession well worth retaining, being valued in 1536 at a clear £186 18s. 0¼d. a year. In contrast with the barony of Churchdown, the lordship of Battersea in Surrey had been deliberately acquired by Archbishop Laurence Booth in the reign of Edward IV and had obviously been bought because of its convenient situation near to London. Compared with the other eight pre-Reformation lordships of the see of York its clear annual value was trivial; it produced in 1536 a mere £14 18s. 1d. a year.<sup>1</sup>

Since no receiver-general's accounts exist we can never know the income the archbishops of York derived one year with another from their ancient estates immediately before the Reformation. There were, however, apparently two separate valuations made by government officials in the 1530's which because of the circumstances behind their compilation can be assumed to be reasonably realistic. In 1534 the see of York was valued at £2,035 3s. 7d. for the purpose of assessing the First Fruits owing to the crown.<sup>2</sup> In the valor of 1536 Leyton and Legh estimated the see of York to be worth a little more than this. They calculated the total clear annual value of the see in spiritualities and temporalities to be £2,195 os. 4¾d. Excluding the revenue from spiritualities the clear annual income from the nine temporal lordships of the see in 1536 seems to have been £1,839 13s. 2¾d.<sup>3</sup> Probably in good years, before Henry VIII assumed the headship of the English church, the archbishop's officials could have hoped to have received around £2,000 from the York temporalities, approximately £1,000 a year less than that which the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* indicates the archbishop of Canterbury enjoyed.<sup>4</sup> The archbishopric of York consequently can be considered to have been a rich see before the Reformation, but it was much less rich than the bishopric of Winchester, valued even in 1559 at £3,700, or the bishopric of Durham, assessed at £2,821 1s. 5d. in 1534.<sup>5</sup>

In 1542 the series of events began which, in the space of two years, transformed the whole economic basis of the see of York. The dissolution of the monasteries and the consequent acquisition of former monastic lands by the crown seem to have encouraged certain royal officials to move on to the next logical step, the acquisition or partial acquisition of episcopal lands by the crown. One radical went so far as to suggest that Henry VIII should confiscate all episcopal lands and that the English episcopate should become a purely salaried body; he thought 2,000 marks a year would suffice for the archbishop of Canterbury, £1,000 a year for the archbishop of York, and that these sums should come

<sup>1</sup> P.R.O., SC 11/766.

<sup>2</sup> Browne Willis, *Survey*, 1, p. 18. Willis maintained he had taken this figure from a manuscript collected by Archbishop Sharp. This is the valuation of the see of York used by Dr Hill.—C. Hill, *Economic Problems of the Church*, 1956, p. 26.

<sup>3</sup> P.R.O., SC 11/766.

<sup>4</sup> Canterbury was valued at £3,005 18s 8¾d.—*Valor Ecclesiasticus*, 1, p. 7.

<sup>5</sup> Hill, *Economic Problems*, p. 26; Browne Willis, *Survey*, 1, p. 227.

partly from spiritualities, partly from a central government court.<sup>1</sup> This was a proposal centuries ahead of its time; even Tudor government officials clung to the idea that bishops, like kings, should live off their own estates, but some certainly thought that these estates could well be pruned and the overplus given to the king. They devised plans to require bishops to surrender episcopal manors to the crown and to accept in exchange scattered parcels of monastic lands and other revenues which had recently come to the crown. As Strype commented: "This way of exchanging lands was much used in those times: wherein the princes commonly made good bargains for themselves, and ill ones for the bishoprics."<sup>2</sup>

The archiepiscopal see of Canterbury first attracted the crown's attention. Between 1536 and 1547 Cranmer entered into no less than eight transactions whereby he surrendered ancient archiepiscopal manors to the crown, and Henry VIII or his executors granted him numerous monastic properties in exchange.<sup>3</sup> The turn of the northern see came in 1542. Edward Lee had been made archbishop of York in 1531, perhaps because of his activity in canvassing support on the Continent for the royal divorce. Despite the circumstances of his appointment, he had long been suspected to be a conservative, opposed alike to the royal supremacy and to the new learning and, therefore, had little chance of withstanding the royal will.<sup>4</sup> By an indenture of 12 November 1542 Lee 'sold' to the king the four ancient archiepiscopal manors of Beverley, Skidby, and Bishop Burton in Yorkshire (part of the lordship of Beverley) and the manor of Southwell in Nottinghamshire. He received in return, as the indenture of 19 February 1543 sets out, £71 2s. 10d. in cash and fourteen separate assignments of lands and advowsons. Most of this new property had formerly belonged to Yorkshire monasteries. The crown granted Lee the site of the priory of Marton, and its lands in Marton and Sutton-in-the-Forest in Yorkshire, and the site of the priory of Molesby and its lands, and also lands which had been held by Newburgh priory. The archbishop also acquired Yorkshire land which had once belonged to the Charterhouse of Mount Grace, and the manors of Sutton-under-Whitestone-Cliff, and Kilburn in Yorkshire, and several granges, all of which had been among the possessions of Byland Abbey, together with granges which had belonged to Rievaulx, and lands and a manor which the Knights of St John of Jerusalem had held in Yorkshire. In addition

<sup>1</sup> British Museum, Cotton MS. Cleopatra E. IV, fols. 207-8. This document has been edited by L. Stone.—'Political Programme of Thomas Cromwell', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, xxiv, pp. 9-11. But for an attribution to Thomas Gibson not Cromwell, see G. R. Elton, 'Parliamentary Drafts, 1529-40', *B.I.H.R.*, xxv, pp. 125-30.

<sup>2</sup> J. Strype, *Cranmer*, I, Oxford, 1812, p. 404.

<sup>3</sup> F. R. H. Du Boulay, 'Archbishop Cranmer and the Canterbury Temporalities', *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, LXVII, pp. 19-36.

<sup>4</sup> *Dictionary of National Biography*, xxxii, pp. 347-9 under 'Edward Lee'.

the archbishop received the advowsons of twelve Yorkshire churches and of one church in Nottinghamshire.<sup>1</sup>

All this constituted a straight exchange of archiepiscopal manors for former monastic lands, but the indenture contained one curious provision. As well as the parcels of former monastic land Lee also received the manor of Topcliffe with its very extensive appurtenances in the surrounding Yorkshire villages. This property had never had any connection with a religious house, but had formed part of the estates of the earls of Northumberland which Henry, sixth earl of Northumberland, had left to Henry VIII by will in 1537.<sup>2</sup> The Topcliffe lordship, a valuable consolidated estate, was quite unlike the other relatively small assignments of monastic property and the crown apparently very soon regretted having alienated it to an ecclesiastic.

If the exchange of lands between Edward Lee and the crown seems complicated, it is as nothing compared to the exceedingly intricate exchange to which his successor had to agree. Lee died in September 1544; in January 1545 the king appointed Robert Holgate, who had previously been the non-resident bishop of Llandaff and, since 1538, president of the council in the north, archbishop of York.<sup>3</sup> The price of Holgate's elevation was a mammoth alienation of ancient archiepiscopal lands which Browne Willis and Drake could never forgive. Six weeks after his induction as archbishop on 14 March 1545 Holgate surrendered to the crown the entire barony of Hexhamshire in Northumberland, the barony of Churchdown in Gloucestershire, the manor of Sherburn and Bishopslathes (part of the barony of Sherburn), the whole of the lordship of Ripon, the remainder of the lordship of Beverley which Lee had not exchanged, the lordship of Scrooby in Nottinghamshire, and the Percy lordship of Topcliffe which the see had only been given two years previously.<sup>4</sup> By this one transaction the archbishopric lost some fifty-two ancient manors and this total does not include the newly acquired Percy estates. Of the ancient possessions of the see only the manors of Bishopthorpe, Cawood, and Wistow (part of the barony of Sherburn), and the manor of Otley remained.

The property which the crown granted the archbishop made scant pretence to be an equal exchange. In return for his archiepiscopal manors Holgate received some thirty-nine rectories which had formerly been appropriated to Yorkshire monastic houses. These rectories lay almost entirely in Yorkshire (two were in north Lincolnshire) and had once been in the possession of the monasteries and abbeys of Gisburn, Marton, Newburgh, Monk Bretton, St Oswalds, Pontefract, St Mary's, York, Whitby, Kirkham, Malton, Meux, and

<sup>1</sup> P.R.O., C 66/717. Summarized in *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, xviii, 1, no. 226 (66).

<sup>2</sup> V.C.H. *The North Riding*, II, pp. 70-7.

<sup>3</sup> A. G. Dickens, *Robert Holgate, Archbishop of York and President of the King's Council in the North*, St Anthony's Hall Publications, no. 8, 1955.

<sup>4</sup> P.R.O., C 66/750. Summarized in *Letters and Papers*, xx, 1, no. 465 (39).

the Knights of St John of Jerusalem. The right to receive tithes and other income came to the see with the inappropriate rectories, and in addition the archbishop of York now held the presentation to at least thirty-three vicarages, whereas before the Reformation his direct ecclesiastical patronage had not been extensive. As Professor Dickens has recently remarked these "very substantial grants of tithes, patronages, and revenues which [the archbishops then received] materially increased their power over their clergy and the whole ecclesiastical system of the North."<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of revenue, quite apart from this increase in patronage, the rectories in the exchange deed were said to bring in the clear annual sum of £505 os. 6¼d. The archbishop held the lands and impropriations by a knight's fee and paid the crown an annual rent of £203 17s. 5d.<sup>2</sup>

Contemporaries, royal officials no less than the archbishop's own servants, recognized that by these two exchanges the revenues of the see of York had been considerably diminished, although the extent of the reduction even at this period may have been exaggerated. The year after Robert Holgate's exchange with the crown the king in an indenture of 22 October 1546 agreed in the future to accept £1,000 from every successive archbishop as the full payment of First Fruits,<sup>3</sup> which is a little less than half the First Fruits demanded by the crown before the York exchanges had begun.<sup>4</sup> In addition Henry released Holgate entirely from paying First Fruits of £1,831 13s. 3¼d. for his see of York in consideration of the fact that his lands had been much diminished by his gift to the crown of 14 March 1545.<sup>5</sup>

This gift, or rather double gift, made by Lee and Holgate to the crown of the regality of Hexhamshire, part of the barony of Sherburn, the lordship of Beverley, the barony of Churchdown, the lordship of Ripon, the lordship of Scrooby, and the lordship of Southwell involved the surrender of lands which on the valuation of 1536 brought in the total clear annual revenue of £1,563 8s. 3¼d., a very large sum indeed for the archbishop to have lost.<sup>6</sup> Against this loss, however, must be set the lands and impropriations the crown granted to the see. The manors of Kilburn and Sutton-under-Whitstone-Cliff together with their appurtenances which Henry VIII had given to Lee in 1543 were valued at £57 4s. and £103 10s. a year respectively in 1597, the date of the earliest surviving receiver-general's account. Then the rectories of the Great Collection (as the mass of the rectories of the exchange of 1545 soon came to be known) together with the Cleveland rectories, the Holderness rectories, the West Riding rectories, the wealthy rectory of Doncaster accounted

<sup>1</sup> Dickens, *op. cit.*, p. 19.                      <sup>2</sup> P.R.O., C 66/750.

<sup>3</sup> P.R.O., C 66/795. *Letters and Papers*, XXI, 2, no. 332 (63).

<sup>4</sup> Browne Willis, *Survey*, I, p. 18.

<sup>5</sup> *Letters and Papers, Addenda*, I (2), no. 1737.

<sup>6</sup> P.R.O., SC 11/766.

for separately, and the two Lincolnshire rectories in 1597 raised a total annual income of £779 2s.<sup>1</sup> Thus in 1597 the impropriations together with the new manors the see had received permanently from the crown produced an income of £939 16s. Because of the price rise this sum is probably somewhat in excess of the gross sum the archbishop received immediately after the exchanges had gone through and it does not take into account the annual rent of £203 17s. 5d. at first charged upon the impropriations. When these two points are allowed for it seems reasonably accurate to conclude that through the two exchanges with the crown Lee and Holgate had in combination at this stage forfeited something like half the pre-Reformation annual income of the see.<sup>2</sup>

Had the revenues of the see of York remained at the low ebb of 1546 then Browne Willis would have been justified in censuring Holgate for his sacrilegious alienations, but the death of Henry VIII in practice marked the end of the threat to the remaining possessions of the northern archbishopric. For some sees the reign of Edward VI brought further exchanges and a consequent loss of revenue. In 1547 the new bishop of Lincoln, for example, was required not only to make a disadvantageous exchange of lands with the crown but also to grant manors to Edward duke of Somerset.<sup>3</sup> Through these alienations the revenue of the bishopric of Lincoln was more than halved. Dr Hembry has described in detail how the see of Bath and Wells owned twenty-four manors in 1548 and how it had lost all but seven by the time of Somerset's fall. In 1551 Edward VI's council persuaded Ponet at Winchester to give up the endowments of his rich see for an annual income of 2,000 marks, and Hooper at Gloucester in 1552 had to enter into a similar bargain.<sup>4</sup> For York, however, Edward VI's reign brought a period of peace if not of prosperity. Robert Holgate remained undisturbed in his possession of the see and of its surviving income, troubled only by matrimonial difficulties: his wife, whom he married in 1549, was alleged to have been precontracted to another.<sup>5</sup> The case, however, ultimately went in Holgate's favour and in 1553 he and his wife jointly purchased the former archiepiscopal manor of Scrooby which he intended after their deaths should be restored to the see.<sup>6</sup> For Holgate the accession of Mary meant immediate disaster; in October 1553 he was sent to the Tower and in the following March deprived of his archbishopric for marriage; but it proved, nevertheless, to be a memorable time in the history of the revenues of the see.

In 1555 Mary nominated Nicholas Heath to be the next archbishop of York and the Pope confirmed his election. To the Catholic Mary and the Catholic

<sup>1</sup> Borthwick, CC Ab.6.1. [67791].

<sup>2</sup> See the tables at the end of this article.

<sup>3</sup> R. E. Cole, *Chapter Acts of the Cathedral Church of St Mary of Lincoln, 1547-1559*, Lincoln Record Society, 15, 1920, pp. vii-ix.

<sup>4</sup> P. M. Hembry, *The Bishops of Bath and Wells, 1540-1640*, 1967, pp. 105-53.

<sup>5</sup> *D.N.B.*, xxvii, pp. 128-30, under 'Robert Holgate'.

<sup>6</sup> *C.P.R. Edward VI*, v, pp. 298-9.

Heath the see of York owes a debt which subsequent Protestant archbishops have never been able adequately to acknowledge. Within a few months of Heath's translation to York, Mary released him and his successors from the payment of the annual rents amounting to £258 7s. which had been charged upon various lands and rectories given by the crown to the see at the time of the first and second Henrician exchanges. Mary also granted Heath Suffolk Place in Southwark, once the property of Charles, late duke of Suffolk, in compensation for York Place which had come into the hands of the crown, though the archbishop sold this property soon after.<sup>1</sup>

Far more important, however, than the release from annual rent charges was the restitution to the see of three of its pre-Reformation lordships. Through the generosity of the queen and the energy of Heath, aided by Cardinal Pole, the archbishopric regained the lordship of Ripon in Yorkshire, and the lordships of Southwell and Scrooby in Nottinghamshire. By an indenture of 20 February 1557 which recited how "the revenues of the archbishop of York are much diminished by the grant and surrender of divers lordships formerly belonging thereto made by Robert, late archbishop; and divers lands which formerly belonged to the archbishopric to the yearly value of £1,200 and beyond are in the hands of the crown" Mary granted the lordship of Scrooby and its attendant manors and the lordship of Southwell back to the see.<sup>2</sup>

This restoration of the Nottinghamshire lordships may have been a little less munificent than on first sight it appears. The crown had retained the lordship of Scrooby in its own hands and one of the many grants Edward VI had made to John, duke of Northumberland, had been the office of keeper of the manor and park of Scrooby.<sup>3</sup> Then, in May 1553, scarcely more than a month before he died, Edward VI had permitted Archbishop Holgate and Barbara his wife to buy back the manor of Scrooby and lands in Ranskill for the sum of £630 7s. 6d.<sup>4</sup> As has been mentioned earlier Holgate had intended to restore this manor to the see after the deaths of himself and his wife, so morally, if not legally, in 1557 Scrooby could already be considered to have been returned to the see. The remaining manors of Laneham, Askham, Sutton, and North Soke had not been included in Holgate's purchase, but Mary in this grant of 20 February 1557 restored these estates also to the archbishopric.

No prior transaction had taken place to qualify Mary's generosity in returning the manor of Southwell to the see. In the fourteen years which passed between the surrender of Southwell to the crown in 1543 and its restoration by Mary, Southwell had undergone a series of changes in ownership which directly reflect the political instability of those years. Henry VIII had retained the manor and placed a succession of keepers over the house and parks of

<sup>1</sup> *C.P.R. Mary*, III, pp. 187-8; *ibid.*, III, p. 439.      <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 264-5.

<sup>3</sup> *C.P.R. Edward VI*, IV, p. 344.      <sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, V, pp. 298-9.

Southwell;<sup>1</sup> his son in 1550 granted the manor to John, then earl of Warwick and later duke of Northumberland.<sup>2</sup> A year later Warwick alienated the manor to John Beaumont, Master of the Rolls, but his enjoyment of the manor can only have been brief for in May 1552 Beaumont was forced to surrender his property and goods to the crown for a gross abuse of his judicial office.<sup>3</sup> The next grant of the manor brought its new owner even less profit: only days before he died Edward made the manor over to Sir Henry Sidney: this grant was subsequently cancelled on the Patent Roll with a note that Sidney surrendered the manor of Southwell to Mary on 17 October 1553.<sup>4</sup> Although Mary allowed several leases to be made of lands in the manor of Southwell, the estate had no more owners before it passed back to the archbishop of York in 1557.<sup>5</sup>

The valuable lordship of Ripon had a far less eventful history after Holgate had exchanged it with the crown. In 1545 the crown immediately annexed it to the duchy of Lancaster, and it remained under the administration of the duchy until Mary restored it to the archbishopric.<sup>6</sup> The three lordships of Ripon, Scrooby, and Southwell on the 1536 valuation brought in an annual revenue of £578 7s. 0¼d. Mary had indeed dealt very well with the see. One of her last acts had been to confirm to Archbishop Heath and his successors as archbishops of York all the rectories and vicarages granted in the Henrician exchanges, but now held by the archbishop in frank almoign and no longer by knight service, an unseemly form of fee for a churchman.<sup>7</sup> After his study of the lands of the archbishopric, Torre with justice concluded "in truth, the see of York owes to Queen Mary and this archbishop more than a third part of its present revenues."<sup>8</sup>

On the accession of Elizabeth, another Protestant sovereign, the newly restored lands of the archbishopric again seemed likely to fall prey to an impecunious monarch. The first parliament of Elizabeth passed an act which allowed the queen during the vacancy of a see to exchange episcopal manors and other lands for impropriations and other ecclesiastical revenues still in royal possession, and the bishops elect tried in vain to persuade the queen for the greater good of the church to forego or at least to limit the profits to herself from such exchanges.<sup>9</sup> In fact a few days after she had received the remonstrance of the bishops the queen instructed the Barons of the Exchequer to

<sup>1</sup> *Letters and Papers*, xix (1), p. 646; *Ibid.*, xxi (1), no. 199 (59).

<sup>2</sup> *C.P.R. Edward VI*, III, pp. 71-4; *Ibid.*, IV, pp. 61-2.

<sup>3</sup> *D.N.B.*, II, pp. 57-8 under 'John Beaumont'. <sup>4</sup> *C.P.R. Edward VI*, v, pp. 60-2.

<sup>5</sup> *C.P.R. Mary*, I, p. 291; *Ibid.*, III, p. 47. *C.P.R. Philip and Mary*, IV, p. 117.

<sup>6</sup> *Letters and Papers*, xx (2), no. 850 (21). There is no mention of the regrant of the lordship of Ripon in the calendars of Patent Rolls for the reign of Mary, but it is quite certain the lordship was restored at this period. The archbishops were drawing revenues from Ripon again by the reign of Elizabeth.—Borthwick, CC Ab.6.1. [67791].

<sup>7</sup> *C.P.R. Philip and Mary*, IV, p. 420; *C.P.R. Mary*, III, pp. 187-8.

<sup>8</sup> Browne Willis, *Survey*, I, p. 46.

<sup>9</sup> J. Bruce and T. T. Perowne, eds., *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, Parker Society, Cambridge, 1853, no. lxviii.

proceed with an exchange of lands of the sees of Canterbury, London, Ely, Hereford, and Chichester, and, ominously for the northern sees, then to investigate a "like exchange with the rest of the bishoprics that be richly endowed, as York, Winchester, Durham, Bath, Sarum, Norwich, and Worcester."<sup>1</sup> By 1559 York could well again be considered to be richly endowed but, in spite of the threats, the lands of the see escaped any further changes at this time.

As Elizabeth's reign progressed influential laymen, rather than the queen herself, presented a greater danger to the integrity of the lands of the see. Leicester, never averse to improving his own fortunes at the expense of the church, tried unsuccessfully to wrest Southwell from the archbishopric in 1587.<sup>2</sup> Archbishop Sandys, who must have been a formidable adversary even for Leicester to encounter, thwarted his attempt, as he also did a proposal to lease or otherwise part with York House in London. "These be marvellous times," Sandys complained to Burghley, "The ministers of the word, the messengers of Christ, are become *contemptibiles omni populo*, and are esteemed *tanquam excrementa mundi*. This was foreshowed, and in our time performed. It may be feared God hath some great work in hand. For this ignominy is done unto himself."<sup>3</sup> Yet Sandys for all his indignation succeeded only in postponing and not preventing the ultimate surrender of York House. The last exchange of lands of the see of York, a very minor exchange when compared with the two Henrician exchanges, took place in 1622 when Archbishop Toby Matthew agreed to surrender York House to the crown in return for the Yorkshire manors of Brighton, Sancton, Acomb, and Beckhay Grange.<sup>4</sup>

With this one exception of York House the lands of the see of York proved to have reached a state of equilibrium by the beginning of Elizabeth's reign; the archbishops managed to retain lands which had never been alienated in the Henrician exchanges together with the lands restored by Mary, but the other ancient lands which they had lost, they lost permanently. The history of these former archiepiscopal properties deserves to be mentioned if only because it mirrors in a small span the great secularization of church lands which the sixteenth century witnessed. The regality of Hexhamshire, surrendered by Holgate to the crown in 1545, remained in royal possession throughout the rest of the sixteenth century, and its thirteen constituent manors continued to be treated as one unit. Sir John Forster, warden of the Middle Marches and the dominant landowner in the area, administered the regality on behalf of the crown. A survey of 1608 gave the rental of the regality of Hexhamshire as £191 14s. 1¼d., a slight decrease upon the valuation made by the Henrician commissioners in 1536. With the union of the crowns of England and Scotland

<sup>1</sup> *Parker Correspondence*, no. lxix.

<sup>2</sup> J. Strype, *Annals of the Reformation*, III, 1728, p. 461.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, III, pp. 550-1.

<sup>4</sup> Borthwick, CC Ab.2.6. [67789].

in 1603 the significance of the regality as a border zone disappeared and hence also its particular political importance to the crown. In 1632 Charles I agreed to sell the whole regality to Sir John Fenwick who had married one of Sir John Forster's daughters.<sup>1</sup>

The barony of Churchdown in Gloucestershire, which the crown also gained from the see of York in 1545, resembled the regality of Hexhamshire in that it too continued to be administered as a single unit. The crown, however, retained the barony for a far shorter time: on 1 June 1552 Edward VI granted the barony together with its manors of Churchdown, Hucklecote, Norton, Shurdington, Witcomb, North Cerney, Compton Abdale, and Oddington to Sir Thomas Chamberlain, and during Elizabeth's reign Chamberlain received two confirmations of his absolute possession of the property together with a release of rent charges.<sup>2</sup>

The ancient episcopal manor of Sherburn-in-Elmet in Yorkshire (and possibly also the subsidiary manor of Bishopslathes which may have been subsumed within the head manor of Sherburn) found its way equally quickly into lay hands. For the payment of £1,554 18s. 4d. on 9 June 1549 Edward VI granted the manor, its lands, and liberties to Richard Tyrrell and Ambrose Wolley. Fifteen years later, in January 1564, Richard Tyrrell and Grace his wife obtained a licence from the crown to alienate this chief manor of the barony of Sherburn to William Hungate and, although the archbishops did succeed in establishing their claim to certain parks in the vicinity of Sherburn which they maintained had never formed part of the manor, the manor of Sherburn itself was never reunited to the now truncated archiepiscopal barony of Sherburn.<sup>3</sup>

Of all the four lordships, or parts of lordships, which the archbishopric lost through the Henrician exchanges, the lordship of Beverley seems to have suffered the greatest fragmentation. The crown did not even receive this lordship of twelve manors as one unit, for the manors of Beverley, Skidby, and Bishop Burton came to the crown in 1543, but the remainder of the lordship only two years later. In 1552 Edward VI, in an exchange of lands on this occasion with a layman, granted John duke of Northumberland the three manors of Beverley, Skidby, and Bishop Burton in return for certain lands of the duke.<sup>4</sup> On the execution of Northumberland these manors reverted to the crown, but Elizabeth made a new grant of the manors of Beverley and Skidby, which his father had once held, to Lord Robert Dudley in 1561.<sup>5</sup> Leicester, however, only kept Beverley and Skidby for five years and then exchanged them with Eliza-

<sup>1</sup> A. B. Hinds, *History of Northumberland*, III, pt 1, Hexhamshire, pp. 20-66; *Letters and Papers*, xx (1), no. 465 (54); *C.P.R. Elizabeth*, IV, no. 1384.

<sup>2</sup> *C.P.R. Edward VI*, IV, 357; *C.P.R. Elizabeth*, I, p. 305; *Ibid.*, III, no. 2147.

<sup>3</sup> *Letters and Papers*, XXI, (1), no. 1248; *C.P.R. Edward VI*, II, p. 342; *C.P.R. Elizabeth*, III, no. 256.

<sup>4</sup> *C.P.R. Edward VI*, IV, pp. 117-18. <sup>5</sup> *C.P.R. Elizabeth*, II, pp. 189-91.

both for other crown lands nearer to the centre of his estates in Warwickshire.<sup>1</sup> Other manors and lands which had formerly been part of the lordship of Beverley were retained by the crown in the earlier years of the reign of Elizabeth and leased to laymen; in 1563 Christopher Estofofte, a member of the council in the north, obtained a thirty years' lease of the manor of Bishop Burton and lands in Bishop Burton and Wilton; two years later the queen granted Thomas Appleyard a twenty-one years' lease of the demesne lands of the manor of Bishop Wilton; in 1568 William Kirkeby had a similar lease of lands in Elloughton, and in 1569 Christopher Hatton leased demesne lands in Patrington from the crown for thirty years.<sup>2</sup> Of all these manors which had made up the lordship of Beverley the only manor the crown appears to have alienated before 1572 is the manor of Kingston on Hull, the reversion of which Mary made over to Sir Henry Gate in 1557.<sup>3</sup> None of these manors, however diverse their individual histories, ever returned to the church but all were permanently secularized.

No historians have questioned the fact that the see of York lost many lands in the sixteenth century of great economic and historical value; but whether the archbishopric also sustained a lasting substantial decrease in its income is a matter much more open to dispute. In his seminal book on the economic problems of the English church between 1583 and 1640, Dr Hill made the important point that, harried though they may have been by avaricious laymen, late Elizabethan bishops "were still rich and powerful enough to be envied and criticized. Canterbury, Winchester, and Ely were all worth more than £2,000 a year; York, Durham, Salisbury, London were all over £1,000."<sup>4</sup> The Elizabethan archbishops of York certainly enjoyed an income well over £1,000; indeed, their annual income exceeded £1,000 by far more than some seventeenth- and eighteenth-century apologists for the church have been prepared to admit. Unfortunately, no receivers' accounts for the see of York survive before the very end of the sixteenth century, but an approximate assessment of the income of the see can be made with reasonable accuracy for the beginning of Elizabeth's reign to include the revenues restored to the see by Mary. The ancient lands of the see which the archbishop had retained under Henry VIII, part of the barony of Sherburn, the lordship of Otley, and the manor of Battersea together produced £280 1s. 3½d. annually on the 1536 valuation. Then, on the basis of the same valuation, the ancient lands restored by Mary, the lord-

<sup>1</sup> *C.P.R. Elizabeth*, III, no. 2567.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, II, p. 508; *Ibid.*, III, no. 1942; *Ibid.*, IV, no. 1927; *Ibid.*, IV, no. 2575.

<sup>3</sup> *C.P.R. Mary*, III, p. 448.

<sup>4</sup> C. Hill, *The Economic Problems of the Church*, p. 39. Dr Hill here had in mind the net annual income received by the archbishops and bishops, whereas throughout this article I am more concerned with the income produced by the archiepiscopal lands rather than with the net income the archbishop actually enjoyed.

ship of Ripon, the lordship of Scrooby, and the lordship of Southwell, brought in a further £578 7s. 0¼d. The income of the new lands and impropriations cannot be calculated with the same precision since 1597 valuations have to be used, but the two new manors of Kilburn and Sutton-under-Whitestone-Cliff and their appurtenances may already have produced £160 14s. a year while the rectories of the Great Collection and other impropriations and tithes in Yorkshire may perhaps have been worth the 1597 sum of £779 2s. a year. Therefore the see could well have received a total income from temporalities in 1560 of £1,798 14s. 3¾d. In 1536 before any of the exchanges had taken place the Henrician visitors had stated that the clear annual value of the temporalities of the see amounted to £1,839 13s. 2¾d. Apparently in 1560 the see of York was within some forty pounds of the identical annual income at which it had been valued before all the tumultuous changes of the latter years of the reign of Henry VIII.<sup>1</sup>

It could plausibly be argued that these reconstructed figures for 1560 hide a number of hidden charges, that, for example, the archbishop may well have been indebted to the crown for First Fruits and tenths, and that the remaining archiepiscopal lands may have been leased to laymen for long terms at disadvantageous rents. Grindal, to name only one Elizabethan archbishop of York, maintained that his clear annual income taking one year with another did not exceed £1,300; but by this acknowledgement he also implied that his gross income was in excess, presumably considerably in excess, of this figure.<sup>2</sup> There can be no positive answer to such objections for the early years of Elizabeth's reign but the series of receivers' accounts which begin in 1597 can provide some sort of retrospective check. In 1597 the archbishop of York had a total annual income of £1,889 16s. 6d. In 1601 his income fell a little to £1,805 13s. 6d.; the following year it fell further to £1,794 16s. 8¾d.; in 1605 it declined even more to £1,783 os. 8½d. Then in 1609 came a notable rise to £2,057. There are then no receivers' accounts until 1627 in which year the archbishop received a very similar sum of £2,027 6s. 0¼d. The average income for the five years around the turn of the sixteenth century was approximately £1,866 2s. 9d., and of this the average sum brought in by the exchange impropriations alone came to £797 12s.<sup>3</sup>

These bald figures do not take into account the income in kind which the archbishop still enjoyed "for his better means of maintenance and hospitality." In 1638 he received 144 quarters of wheat from the rectories of Hutton-on-Derwent, Nafferton, Skipsea, and Haxey and also 389 quarters of barley, 37

<sup>1</sup> All these figures are based on P.R.O., SC 11/766, the 1536 valuation, and on Borthwick, CC Ab.6.1. [67791], the 1597 valuation.

<sup>2</sup> W. Nicholson, ed., *Remains of Edmund Grindal*, Parker Society, Cambridge, 1843, p. 354. I owe this reference to the kindness of Dr Hill.

<sup>3</sup> These figures are taken from the following accounts: Borthwick, CC Ab.6.1-6. [67791-67796].

quarters of oats, and 21 quarters of pease. The tenants of Cawood, Wistow, Sutton-under-Whitestone-Cliff, Kilburn, Hutton-on-Derwent, and Nafferton provided 253 hens, 36 capons, 24 geese, 10 swine, and 1,000 eggs. Nor did the archbishop's servants fail to exact a tithe from the sea. His tenants at Whitby and Lythe dispatched to Bishopthorpe annually 400 salt fish, 5,000 herrings, and six horse loads of wet fish.<sup>1</sup>

The fragmentary Parliamentary valuations and prices named in the subsequent sales of the lands of the see give yet further evidence of the wealth of the see of York in the seventeenth century. The York archiepiscopal lands apparently raised a grand total of £63,786 7s. 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. which would suggest a notional annual income from rents nearer to £3,000 than to £2,000.<sup>2</sup> At the Restoration all the former archiepiscopal lands returned to the see and when, forty years later, Archbishop Sharp at the beginning of his archiepiscopate "took early and extraordinary pains to qualify himself for so weighty a charge as he had undertaken by inquiring into . . . the present estates and possessions of the archbishopric of York" he found that his income was £2,519 16s. 2d.<sup>3</sup> This sum did not include the provisions in kind from certain rectories so that his total income in 1700 was in the region of at least £2,800. The archbishop carefully noted that a third of his income came from rents which were not capable of improvement. His eighteenth-century successors had no hesitation in raising the rents of the larger part of the lands of the see which could be improved.<sup>4</sup> Taking a general view of the income of the archbishopric of York between 1536 and 1700, it is difficult not to conclude, as Professor Du Boulay concluded for the see of Canterbury, that in the long run the crown dealt with the see relatively gently.<sup>5</sup> The archbishops of Canterbury and York, even if this was no longer true of all their episcopal brethren, could still be counted princes of the church.

Yet while over the span of the century the Henrician exchanges together with the Marian restorations do not seem to have caused a notable decrease in the archbishop's income it cannot be denied that the exchanges did bring about a marked change in the economic basis of his revenue. In 1536 the archbishop received a negligible part of his income from impropriations; after the second exchange, which brought the 'Great Collection' of rectories to the see, between a third and a half of the whole archiepiscopal income came from this one source. In 1559 the Elizabethan bishops elect had felt some scruples, when they protested against the queen's scheme to proceed with the further ex-

<sup>1</sup> Borthwick, CC Ab.2.1. [67799].

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, CC Ab.8.4. [67555]; Browne Willis, *Survey*, 1, pp. 21-6.

<sup>3</sup> T. Newcome, *Life of John Sharpe D.D.*, 1, 1825, pp. 134-6.

<sup>4</sup> Borthwick, CC Ab.2.6. [67789].

<sup>5</sup> F. R. H. Du Boulay, 'Archbishop Cranmer and the Canterbury Temporalities', *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, LXVIII, pp. 19-36.

changes of episcopal lands in return for crown impropriations, lest provision of an adequate living might not be made for the incumbents of impropriated benefices.<sup>1</sup> The archbishop of York, for one, after 1546 owed his wealth in no small measure to the relative privation of some thirty-three vicars of livings of which he was now rector. Archbishop Sandys saw the mote in his opponents' eye, but ignored the beam in his own. In a sermon he preached on the evil effects of impropriations he maintained that the common people in the country areas "pine away and perish for want of this saving food: they are much decayed for want of prophecy." "But why doth the country want preachers?" he continued. "The people pay tithes of that they have; therefore there must needs be sufficient to maintain them. If things were well ordered, this sequel were good. But the chiefest benefices were by the Pope long since impropriated unto monks which devoured the fruits, and gave a silly stipend unto a poor Sir John to say mass; and as they left it, so we find it still. Where livings were not impropriated by the Pope, there they are for the most part so handled, that patrons maintain themselves with those tithes which the people give, and ministers have that which the patrons leave."<sup>2</sup> "Thus," commented Strype, "did the zealous archbishop represent publicly these wrongs to the discouragement of the ministry; and which he himself had felt and struggled with."<sup>3</sup> He held back, however, from explaining to his readers that Sandys benefited from impropriations as much as any great lay impropriator.

Whereas Sandys attacked only lay impropriators and passed in silence over impropriators who were churchmen, at least one of his successors in the see does seem to have felt that rich prelates of church had a duty to help the lower clergy who scraped an inadequate living from an impropriate benefice. His biographer described how, when Sharp became archbishop of York, he devised a new rule for himself which did not come "within the ordinary and stated duties of his office" by reserving the prebends in his gift for the clergy beneficed in his diocese or retained in his family. "He made it his unalterable practice always to elect them out of such as lived in his diocese, and had recommended themselves by doing their duties in their respective parochial cures. By which means no cathedral in England was better attended by clergy, and the service more regularly performed than at York; or the ministers of small livings in any diocese more encouraged to attend their charge; because this good bishop would reward their diligence by such compensations, more especially those in York city, on whose conduct the world had a more especial eye; hoping his example would influence his successors to take the like course."<sup>4</sup> Yet how much

<sup>1</sup> Bruce and Perowne, *Parker Correspondence*, no. lxviii.

<sup>2</sup> J. Ayre, ed., *Sermons of Edwin Sandys*, Parker Society, Cambridge, 1842, pp. 154-5.

<sup>3</sup> J. Strype, *Annals of the Reformation*, III, 1728, p. 556.

<sup>4</sup> T. Newcome, *Life of John Sharpe D.D.*, I, pp. 117-19.

more would Sharp have helped his poor clergy if, instead of selecting the deserving among them for Minster prebends, he had permanently enlarged their livings by restoring to them the impropriations he held, archiepiscopal impropriations which by 1700 annually exceeded £1,000 in value.<sup>1</sup> But this would have amounted to a virtual social revolution within the church, raising up the clerical poor, bringing down the ecclesiastical princes, till they approached a common mediocrity of income; and the religious leaders of the reign of Queen Anne were no more capable of contemplating such an innovation than Elizabeth's churchmen had been.

The myth that the archbishops of York in the sixteenth century endured grievous spoliation at the hands of the crown which eighteenth-century historians have perpetuated should be recognized for what it is, a pious deception. The archbishops, indeed, lost very many ancient manors which had belonged to the see from time immemorial, and a considerable part of these manors was lost permanently; but they received from the crown lands and, above all, impropriations in exchange. By at least 1600 the archbishop of York received an income nominally as substantial as that enjoyed by his predecessor immediately before the Reformation, an income moreover which continued to appreciate considerably throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Those who in the long run bore the cost of the two exchanges of land Henry VIII had made with the see of York were not the archbishops of York but members of that much abused ecclesiastical estate, the incumbents of livings now impropriated to the archbishopric.

<sup>1</sup> Borthwick, CC Ab.2.6. [67789].

TABLE I  
THE ANCIENT ARCHIEPISCOPAL LANDS OF THE SEE OF YORK

County	Lordship	1536 Valuation (P.R.O., SC 11/766)			1597 Valuation (Borthwick, CC Ab.6.1)			1700 Valuation (Borthwick, CC Ab.2.6)			Fate after the Reformation
		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	
Northum-berland	Regality of Hexhamshire Manors of Hexham, Errington, Wall, Acomb, Hallington, Keepwick, Greenridge, Keenley, East Allen, Catton, Ninebanks, West Allen, Newlands	196	19	4½	—	—	—	—	—	Alienated at the 1545 exchange, then remained with the crown till 1632 when it was sold.	
York-shire	Lordship of Ripon Manors of Ripon, Sharrow, Stanley, Ripon Holm, Colts-gate Hill, Penny Croft, Castle Dyke, Whitcliff, Thorpe, Monkton, Thornton, Nidderdale, Bishopside	262	15	9½	266	12	8½	303	5	4	Alienated at the 1545 exchange and annexed to the Duchy of Lancaster. Restored to see by Mary.
„	Barony of Sherburn (total valuation 1536 £329 9s. 3½d.) Palace and tenements in city of York	7	2	0	6	19	3	10	4	8	Remained with see.
„	Manor of Bishopthorpe	23	15	3½	21	1	7	20	1	8	Remained with see.
„	Manor of Cawood	77	5	2	71	15	7	215	14	9	Remained with see.
„	Manor of Wistow	75	15	7	77	9	10	118	16	7½	Remained with see.
„	Land in Sherburn	10	19	7	—	—	70	0	0	Remained with see.	
„	Manor of Sherburn	83	51	4	[sic]	—	—	—	—	Alienated at 1545 ex-change. 1549 sold by crown to Richard Tyrrell. 1564 sold by Tyrrell to Wm. Hungate. Alienated at 1545 ex-change.	
„	Manor of Bishopslathes	53	6	8	—	—	—	—	—	Alienated at 1545 ex-change.	
„	Lordship of Otley	70	15	7	76	6	11	77	5	5	Remained with see.
„	Lordship of Beverley Manors of Kingston on Hull, Patrington, Tharltorpe, Fris-marsh, Hall Garth, Elloughton, Wetwang, Wilton, Bishop Wilton, Beverley, Skidby, Bishop Burton	462	5	10	—	—	—	—	—	Alienated at 1543 and 1545 exchanges. In 1572 still in crown hands except for Kingston on Hull which had been granted to Sir Henry Gates.	
Notting-hamshire	Lordship of Scrooby Manors of Scrooby, Laneham, Askham, Sutton, Northsoke, Ranskill	167	11	4¾	181	9	1½	183	5	4	Alienated at 1545 ex-change, but restored by Mary.
„	Lordship of Southwell	147	19	10	114	17	2¾	225	15	1	Alienated at 1543 ex-change, but restored by Mary.
Glouces-tershire	Barony of Churchdown Manors of Churchdown, Hucklecote, Norton, Shur-dington, Witcomb, North Cerney, Compton Abdale, Odding-ton.	186	18	0¼	—	—	—	—	—	Alienated at 1545 ex-change. In 1552 granted by the crown to Sir Thomas Chamberlain.	
Surrey	Lordship of Battersea and Wandsworth	14	18	1	68	16	8½	58	18	7½	Remained with see.

