

Chapter 8

MONASTERIES AND THE LANDSCAPE

The type of property acquired by religious houses and their economic basis varied according to their location and size; the wealth and generosity of their founders, and their ability to promote endowments among family, peer group, and tenants; and the need and inclination of the communities themselves to develop their economic activities. The type of property conveyed to the religious orders varied as well: land, rents, and services deriving from land, natural materials, mills and ovens which yielded revenue from those who used them, *spiritualia* (churches and tithes), and fairs and markets which could bring valuable tolls and profits. This chapter examines the location and nature of the endowments received by the monastic houses in Yorkshire in order to demonstrate the impact which the expansion of the religious orders had on the pattern of landholding and settlement in the county. Chapter 9 explores the way in which these assets were exploited to produce a financial basis for the religious houses of the county.

First, however, a few words must be devoted to the Cistercian attitude to the economy, since part of the aim of these two chapters must be to discover if, as they were to claim, the White Monks were genuinely different in their practices. The Cistercian outlook on the type of financial assets which were deemed to be acceptable was a distinctive, though not unique one; but the chronology of Cistercian thought on economic matters is still a matter of lively debate. The *Exordium parvum*, chapter XV, 'The Institutes of those monks who departed from Molesme', contains several important statements about Cistercian economic practice.¹ The first, and the one that is there given greatest prominence, is the rejection of churches and tithes, the latter on the grounds that tithes were meant for the specific purposes of maintaining the priest, the church, and the poor, and that it was not for monks to appropriate this revenue. The

¹ *EP*, chapter XV, pp. 77–80.

Monasteries and the landscape

second was a statement of what assets were acceptable, namely, lands 'far removed from the dwellings of men', and watercourses and meadows. The third introduced the fundamentals of Cistercian land management: estates were to be administered through granges, run by lay brothers. These principles were incorporated into the first codification of statutes, traditionally dated to 1134, but probably from nearer 1150.² These went further and specifically banned, as well as *spiritualia*, vills, villeins, rents, revenue from ovens and mills, and similar assets, all of which were 'contrary to the purity of the name and office of monk'.³

Recent historical debate has raised again the question of how soon the Cistercians defined themselves as an order with a distinctive economic basis both in terms of the type of property they found acceptable and the methods of running their estates.⁴ Certainly, there is no indication in other chapters of the *Exordium parvum* and *Exordium Cistercii* that the reasons why Robert and his companions chose to leave Molesme included dissatisfaction with its economic basis; that is, there is no evidence that a distinctive economy formed part of their manifesto of reform. Moreover, as Bouchard has pointed out, the *Exordium parvum* and the *Capitula* alone of Cistercian documents from before the middle of the twelfth century make a clear statement on the subject; and non-Cistercian writers also appear reticent. It finds no mention in the *Apologia* of St Bernard as one of the features which distinguished the White Monks from the Black; in his essay on the Cistercian order William of Malmesbury, who is able accurately to transmit many of the essentials of Cistercian practice, is silent on the subject; and Orderic Vitalis also appears not to define the Cistercians by any unique economic practices, except for their rejection of tithes.⁵ Historians such as Berman and Bouchard, taking together the silence of contemporary writers, and the reception of the order of Savigny into that of the Cistercians in 1147 – apparently without

² In discussing the development of Cistercian economic thought and practice Constance Berman follows the traditional date of 1134 for the codification: see, for instance, 'The development of Cistercian economic practice during the lifetime of Bernard of Clairvaux: the historical perspective on Innocent II's 1132 privilege', in *Bernardus Magister*, ed. J. R. Sommerfeldt, Cistercian Studies Series, 135 (Spencer, Mass., 1992), pp. 303–13. For the reappraisal of the date of the codification, see Holdsworth, 'Chronology of Cistercian legislation', p. 44, and Auberger, *L'unanimité cistercienne*, pp. 135–82.

³ Canivez, *Statuta*, I, 14–15 (no. 9); see also p. 14 (no. 5).

⁴ See, for instance, C. Waddell, 'The Cistercian institutions and their early evolution: granges, economy, lay brothers', in *L'Espace Cistercien*, ed. L. Pressouyre (Paris, 1994), pp. 27–38; Constance Brittain Bouchard, 'Cistercian ideals versus reality: 1134 reconsidered', *Cîteaux*, 39 (1988), 217–31, and *Holy Entrepreneurs: Cistercians, Knights, and Economic Exchange in Twelfth-Century Burgundy* (Ithaca and London, 1991); Constance Hoffman Berman, *Medieval Agriculture, the Southern French Countryside, and the Early Cistercians*, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 76, no. 5 (Philadelphia, 1986); Isabel Alfonso, 'Cistercians and feudalism', *Past & Present* 133 (1991), 3–30.

⁵ Orderic Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History*, IV, 315.

The life within and the world outside

reservations about their practice of accepting resources that ‘monks of our order ought to renounce’ – have suggested that not until the 1130s and later did the Cistercians define themselves as distinctive in their economy.⁶ Such re-evaluation enables us to explain the early acceptance, by Cîteaux and a number of its daughter houses, of churches, tithes, and mills, and suggests that the label, common among historians, of a slide ‘from ideals to reality’ is not appropriate. Berman has stressed that the Cistercians consciously developed the ideology of an economy based on remote sites and newly cleared lands in order to justify the exemption from the payment of tithes on lands which they cultivated themselves, a privilege granted to the entire order by Pope Innocent II in 1132; by the 1130s, she argues, ‘the chief characteristics of fully-developed cistercian economic practice (direct cultivation, pastoralism, and *conversi*) were already present’.⁷ For Bouchard, the economic ‘ideals’ were constructed in the mid twelfth century as a ‘last-ditch attempt by certain abbots’ to set out the goals for which the Cistercians should be aspiring.⁸

There is much that is attractive in this hypothesis. There are, naturally, implications for the dating of the *Exordium parvum*; in order to push the formulation of Cistercian thinking on economic matters into the 1130s, 1140s, or 1150s we have to posit either that the *Exordium parvum* dates from that period, or that chapter XV is a later interpolation.⁹ For our purposes the matter is crucial, for if the Cistercian view had been articulated by around 1121, that is, roughly when a primitive *Exordium* might have been compiled, then it was a part of Cistercian thought by the time the order reached England; if, as Bouchard and Berman would argue, it was not a part of the programme until the 1150s – for there is no reason to date the first codification to 1134 but rather evidence to suggest the 1150s – then it postdated all the Yorkshire foundations. An examination of the Yorkshire evidence may help to elucidate the matter, and to discover whether the different orders and congregations within Yorkshire were truly distinctive.

DEVELOPMENT OF ESTATES: LOCATION

Amongst the earliest endowments received by religious houses were donations in kind. Roger de Mowbray’s initial grant to Byland was a tithe of the foodstuff of his household, collected by a *conversus* named Ligulf,

⁶ Existing houses which were incorporated into the Cistercian order were, for instance, allowed to keep mills acquired before their reception, but thereafter were expected to conform to Cistercian practice: Canivez, *Statuta*, I, 67 (no. 59).

⁷ Berman, ‘Development of Cistercian economic practice’, 312.

⁸ Bouchard, *Holy Entrepreneurs*, p. 190.

⁹ See the arguments of Auberger, *L’unanimité Cistercienne*, pp. 42–60.

Monasteries and the landscape

who, when Roger was visiting 'in remote parts', sold the food and sent the money to the abbot. However, the inconvenience prompted the grant of a landed endowment, the vaccary of Cam, and land in Wildon, Scackleton, and Airyholme.¹⁰ At its foundation Holy Trinity, York, received two-thirds of the tithes of Ralph Paynel's halls of Ashby de la Laund, Scawby, and Tealby (Lincolnshire); and when his son founded Drax Priory his endowment included thirty skeps of meal from Hunslet mill, and from Saltby (Leicestershire) the tithe of his household and kitchen, in grain and malt, and slaughtered sheep and pigs.¹¹ The kind of domestic arrangement reached by Mowbray and the Paynels may have been far from uncommon in the early days of a religious house, before its estates and endowments were organized. However, it could also persist as a form of support. Henry de Lacy granted Pontefract a tithe of his venison in flesh and hides, and, as much as twenty years after the foundation of Drax, Robert de Gant granted the canons there a tithe of his household, in corn, malt, bread, ale, cheese, and butter, and in everything pertaining to his kitchen.¹² Food renders such as these did not form a significant part of the monastic economy; they are, however, important as an indication that the monastic *familia* could be seen as an extension of the secular household of the patron.

It was, however, land which was the most valuable asset conveyed to the religious houses in Yorkshire, and it need not be stressed that in the course of the period 1069 to 1215 a vast amount of land in the county passed into the hands of the monastic order, houses both inside and outside the county.¹³ Clearly enough, the location of the estates of individual houses depended on who gave lands; however, in most, though not all cases the majority of lands lay within fairly easy reach of the monastery. Furthest north in the county lay the Augustinian priory of Guisborough, generously endowed by Robert de Brus, who was followed by his tenants. Entire vills came into the control of the canons, among them Guisborough itself and Kirkleatham. The estates of the priory stretched east to the coastal strip, and west to Kirklevington, and dominated the valley of the Tees. There were only a few outlying assets, notably Sherburn, and East and West Heslerton, on the river Derwent,

¹⁰ *Mon. Ang.*, v, 350. For charters granting Scackleton, Airyholme, and Cam, which show signs of later interpolation or tampering, see *Mowbray Charters*, nos. 33–7; no. 37 was witnessed by Mowbray's steward, George, his only recorded appearance other than this account in the *Historia fundationis*.

¹¹ *EYC*, vi, nos. 1, 13.

¹² *Ibid.*, iii, no. 1496; and vi, no. 63. For further examples see *ibid.*, iii, no. 1268 (a grant of tithes of venison to Ecclesfield), and vii, no. 18 (a tithe of beasts taken on demesne, granted to Bolton). See also *Mowbray Charters*, no. 215.

¹³ Houses outside Yorkshire which received endowments from patrons who were landowners within the county included Lewes Priory, recipient of lands within the honour of Warenne.

The life within and the world outside

and further south, where the canons obtained free passage across the Humber.¹⁴ In Richmondshire the canons of Easby acquired estates which spread along the valley of the river Swale, and the Cistercian house at Jervaulx also developed its properties in the area. Whitby's estates were concentrated along the coast and its hinterland, although the interests of the Percy family in Cambridgeshire brought minor assets in that county. The Yorkshire estates lay in four main areas: the majority in the immediate vicinity of the abbey itself, where the monks enjoyed complete control over the town;¹⁵ the second along the coastal strip around Scarborough and Robin Hood's Bay; the third on the Yorkshire Wolds; and the fourth comprised a small group of estates in Cleveland, around Middlesbrough, where the landed interests of Guisborough ensured that Whitby's property remained limited.¹⁶ Moving south along the coast we come to the Augustinian priory of Bridlington which, in addition to complete control of the vill, commanded estates along the coast to the north of the priory (as far as Filey) and south to Atwick, Skirlington, and Goxhill. Further groups of estates lay to the south of the Derwent; and a few scattered estates along the north and south bank of the Humber reflect the interests of various knightly families. Moreover, the land-holdings of the Gant patrons in Lincolnshire and Derbyshire brought churches in those counties.

In the area between York and Malton the canons of Kirkham were dominant, with extensive endowments in the area around the priory and east across to Garton on the Wolds. The estates of another Augustinian house, Newburgh, were located within a radius of approximately ten miles around the priory, with just a few estates further afield in Mowbray territory of Masham and Kirkby Malzeard. In fact, Masham was split among Newburgh, Jervaulx, and Fountains. The East Riding houses were also fairly local in the spread of their estates: Warter in the central area between the Derwent and the Hull; Meaux in the valleys of the rivers draining into the Humber; and Watton in the Hull valley and on the coast around Bridlington and Hilderthorpe. Selby, in spite of early royal interest, developed fairly local estates, its land holdings being dominant in the valleys of the Ouse (around Selby itself), Aire, Calder, and Don, and spreading south into Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire. The influence of the tenurial pattern of the founders of houses is well illustrated by the Paynel foundations of Holy Trinity and Drax, both of which held estates in Lincolnshire as well as in the vicinity of the house. Drax also acquired

¹⁴ EYC, II, no. 764. ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, II, no. 886.

¹⁶ See in particular B. Waites, 'The monastic settlement of north-east Yorkshire', *YAJ*, 40 (1959–62), 478–95 (pp. 483–7), and *Monasteries and Landscape in North East England* (Oakham, Rutland, 1997), pp. 35–7.

Monasteries and the landscape

lands in the Leeds and Bingley area, held by the Paynel family. The lands of Pontefract lay almost exclusively in two areas, one to the north and south of the river Aire, and the other in the basin of the river Dearne, around Barnsley and Dodworth. The only exceptions were rents derived from the Lacy estates in Lancashire, in Clitheroe, Burnley, and Colne. The assets of its daughter house of Monk Bretton were even more local in distribution, being situated around the house itself and further west, in the valley of the Dearne. Another Lacy foundation, Kirkstall, retained its first site at Barnoldswick in the west of the county, where patronage in the honour of Skipton brought them estates in Keighley and Riddlesden. The monks, however, accumulated a clutch of estates in the Leeds area, as well as in Pontefract, Darrington, and Stapleton, where its interests overlapped with those of Pontefract Priory. In the extreme south Roche acquired estates to the south of the Don, from Bramley to Kirk Bramwith. In the far west of the county monastic landholding was dominated by Bolton and Sallay. The estates of the canons were concentrated around the first site at Embsay, and Bolton, both in Wharfedale, and in the valley of the Aire, around the Rumilly castle at Skipton, with outlying estates further north, in Long Preston and Malham. Apart from Bolton and Sallay the only other religious house to gain a foothold in Craven was Fountains Abbey, which developed an estate at Malham.

There were monasteries which developed more widespread estates. St Mary's, an abbey enjoying royal patronage and situated in the premier city of the north, had undoubted advantages, and the spread of patronage is reflected in the scattered nature of its estates not just in Yorkshire but across the Pennines, south into Lincolnshire, and as far afield as Suffolk. Within Yorkshire the monks held estates in the valley of the Derwent, between York and Malton, in the East Riding, between the rivers Derwent and Hull, in the Wolds to the north of York, and on the North Yorkshire Moors. Further north, lands lay in the Dales, especially in Swaledale. Another house with dispersed estates was Nostell. Although the bulk of its assets lay in the Lacy heartland of south Yorkshire, in the valleys of the Don, Aire, and Calder, the early encouragement of Archbishop Thurstan and Henry I brought endowments from a wider range of the aristocracy, in Lancashire (the church of Winwick, granted by Stephen count of Mortain), Nottinghamshire (lands in Sookholme and Market Warsop, granted by Henry I), Northumberland (Bamburgh, also a royal gift), Warwickshire (the churches of Newbold Pacey, Leamington Hastings, and Whitnash), Oxfordshire (the church of Haseley), and Staffordshire (the church of Chebsey).¹⁷ St Mary's and Nostell were the

¹⁷ *ENCY*, III, nos. 1428, 1444.

The life within and the world outside

only two Yorkshire houses to administer far-flung estates through a series of cells.¹⁸

Among the Cistercians the houses with the most widely dispersed estates were Rievaulx and Fountains. Although both became extensive land holders in the region of the abbey, indeed took complete control of whole areas, they attracted wider patronage and as a consequence acquired assets at a greater distance. Attention has already been drawn to the way in which Rievaulx secured estates in the Aire and Calder valleys.¹⁹ Fountains amassed a truly remarkable set of estates. In the south of the county alone lay the important grange of Bradley;²⁰ to the west, in Wharfedale, the monks developed estates around Malham, Bordley, and Arncliffe; to the north of the abbey its lands spread on either side of the river Ure up into Swaledale, and along the river Wiske. Byland, a house more modestly endowed, nevertheless extended its influence over the Pennines into Westmorland (Warcop and Asby), and into Teesdale.²¹ The endowment of the nunneries was discussed in a previous chapter, where it was noted that they were usually intensely local in their distribution, partly as a consequence of the status of the founder and partly because of the interaction with the local community.²² The exceptions were St Clement's, York, whose endowments reflect the scattered nature of the archiepiscopal demesne, and Nun Appleton, whose patrons were landowners in Lincolnshire.

That most monastic estates were concentrated in a fairly limited geographical area reflects both patterns of tenure and lordship and the local appeal of many houses. However, it could also be a consequence of deliberate consolidation by religious houses, by sale, exchange, and lease. Thus the monks of Selby chose to farm their vill of Stainton in Craven to the monks of nearby Sallay;²³ the abbot of Oseney (Oxfordshire) demised to Newburgh Priory land in Huggate 'because that land is too remote from our house and therefore of little use' ('quia terra illa a domo nostra nimis erat remota, et ideo minus utilis');²⁴ the Norman foundation of Hambye granted to the canons of Easby forty acres of land with pasture for 200 sheep and 20 cows in Brompton on Swale 'from which before we enjoyed no or little profit' ('de qua antea vel nullam vel modicam habuimus utilitatem'); and Easby leased land in Hesselton to the monks of Jervaulx.²⁵ The monks of Fountains allowed its granddaughter house of Sallay to consolidate its holdings in Bowland by demising pasture there;

¹⁸ See below, pp. 245–6. ¹⁹ See above, pp. 211–12. ²⁰ See below, pp. 263–4.

²¹ On the Westmorland estates, see Janet Burton, 'Charters of Byland Abbey relating to the grange of Bleatarn, Westmorland', *TCWAAS*, 79 (1979), 29–50.

²² See above, pp. 167–70. ²³ *EYC*, xi, nos. 123–4; *Cart. Sallay*, i, no. 49.

²⁴ *EYC*, ii, no. 1257. ²⁵ *Ibid.*, v, nos. 193, 246.

Monasteries and the landscape

and leased land in Malham from the canons of Bolton.²⁶ To Fountains William de Arches confirmed the exchange made by him and his men with the abbey of land in Kettlewell which enabled the monks to acquire property adjacent to that which they had purchased from Walter de Fauconberg.²⁷ Roger de Mowbray granted to Byland licence to make any exchanges of land which it deemed necessary.²⁸

THE NATURE OF MONASTIC ECONOMIC ASSETS

Arable and pasture land

The aim of each monastery would have been to acquire a certain amount of arable land which could yield produce for home consumption and surplus for sale. Some houses were more favourably situated than others. The Holderness region of the East Riding, with its rich clay soils, and parts of the Vale of York, were fertile arable areas: although Holderness in the eleventh century was a marshy area it had a high density of population and plough teams, and was generally a prosperous region.²⁹ In other regions, notably Craven and the Pennines, the climate was harsh, and in all parts there were poor soils which were unsuitable for arable. The monks of Sallay experienced the disadvantages of the climate in Craven for grain-growing; and in Wensleydale the monks of Fors complained of the barrenness of the land, and the excessive rain which caused the crops to rot.³⁰

The absence of any account rolls for the period means that we cannot ascertain the balance between the arable and pasture lands held by religious houses, nor the proportion of food which could be grown or needed to be purchased. We know from later evidence that Malton in the middle of the thirteenth century relied heavily on sheep farming and purchased most of its grain, and that Bolton Priory in the early fourteenth century obtained most of its corn from its demesne lands and tithes.³¹ Such evidence is lacking for the period before 1215, but limited charter evidence indicates where some of the arable land of monastic houses lay. Nunkeeling, for instance, held arable in Bewholme, Marton Priory in

²⁶ *Ibid.*, xi, nos. 47, 243. ²⁷ *Ibid.*, xi, no. 143.

²⁸ *Mowbray Charters*, no. 45. D. E. Greenway points out in the note to this charter that it might apply specifically to Brignall, in which place both Roger and Eustace Fitz John (to whom it is addressed) held lands.

²⁹ See H. C. Darby and I. S. Maxwell, *The Domesday Geography of Northern England* (Cambridge, 1962), pp. 1–232, for an account of the varying conditions and agricultural activities in the county.

³⁰ Note the similarity of the complaints: *EYC*, xi, no. 50; *Mon. Ang.*, v, 571; a dispersal to the mother house of Byland was contemplated.

³¹ R. Graham, 'The finance of Malton Priory, 1244–1257', *English Ecclesiastical Studies*, pp. 247–70 (p. 258); Kershaw, *Bolton Priory*, p. 19.

The life within and the world outside

Cawthorne, Sallay in Askwith (Weston), and Kirkstall in West Headingley.³² The monks of Rievaulx acquired a tillage of twelve acres in East Bolton, one called Ravensdale in Folkton, and in East Heslerton ‘xxx acras . . . de culturis . . . decem de melioribus, decem de mediocribus, decem de deterioribus’ (‘thirty acres of the tillages: ten of the best quality, ten of moderately good, and ten of inferior quality’).³³

All over Europe in the eleventh and twelfth centuries pressure on land was leading to the opening up of new areas, both for arable and pasture. Although historians investigating the part played by the monastic orders have concentrated their attention on the new congregations, like the Cistercians, who actively sought remote estates, studies of the economic activity of the well-established Benedictine houses, as well as those of the regular canons, have demonstrated that assarting and the clearance of lands were not the prerogative of the Cistercians. In France the cartularies of monasteries like St Vincent du Mans, Marmoutier, Angers, and La Trinité de Vendôme, and in England those of Peterborough and Ely, abound with references to land in the process of being cleared.³⁴ Eleventh- and twelfth-century charters leave us in no doubt that clearance was a significant activity in England well into the twelfth century, and that monastic enterprise was an important factor in the opening up of peripheral regions. However, the England of 1086 was already a well-settled country, and colonizable land well exploited.³⁵ Any attempt to assess the importance of Yorkshire houses in the opening up of peripheral lands must clearly take account of regional differences within this large county, and the difficulties of the source material. The much debated point is the nature of Domesday Book ‘waste’. Historians still disagree, but the consensus seems to be that Domesday ‘waste’ reflects less the passage of the armies of the Conqueror through Yorkshire as they harried the lands in the winter of 1069 to 1070 than the incomplete administrative reorganization of the county following the military conquest and political annexation.³⁶ Certainly there were divergences in population and land use. Holderness appears to have been well settled; so too does that area contained in a line from York to Leeds and south through Pontefract to Doncaster and Sheffield. In the north of the county the most densely

³² EYC, III, nos. 1336, 1683; *Cart. Sallay*, II, no. 522; *Kirkstall Coucher*, no. 79.

³³ *Cart. Riev.*, nos. 82, 85, 141; see also nos. 87, 116; EYC, IX, nos. 145, 150 for arable in Morton, Normanby, Skiplam, and Wombledon.

³⁴ See, for instance, R. Latouche, *The Birth of Western Economy* (London, 1961), pp. 271–92. For the colonizing activities of the monks of Peterborough in Northamptonshire, see E. King, *Peterborough Abbey 1086–1310* (Cambridge, 1973), pp. 70–87.

³⁵ M. M. Postan, *The Medieval Economy and Society* (London, 1972), pp. 16–18.

³⁶ W. E. Wightman, ‘The significance of ‘waste’ in the Yorkshire Domesday’, *Northern History*, 10 (1975), 55–71; D. M. Palliser, ‘Domesday Book and the “harrying of the north”’, *Northern History*, 29 (1993), 1–23; Dalton, *Conquest, Anarchy and Lordship*, pp. 23–5.

Monasteries and the landscape

populated area was in the Cleveland hills and the valley of the river Tees. The absence of dense settlement elsewhere, such as Craven, is problematic; it may be that there was a scarcity of population, or it may signify a deficiency in the recording process and a compiler who noted only vill and landowners.³⁷ There appear to have been few populated vill in the upper Pennine region and in the marshy territory around the valleys of the Aire, Ouse, and Don. Low population was recorded in the Humberhead Levels (around Broomfleet) and in the Esk valley and the Pennines. Yorkshire was a county of contrasts where in some regions settlements were a little more than a mile apart, and in others recorded population was low.

The impact of the monastic orders on the landscape was considerable. It was no coincidence that it was in these areas of low population that religious houses gained the strongest foothold. In many of the less cultivated regions vill make their first appearance in monastic charters. In the West Riding, Ousefleet, Whitgift, Pollington, and Swinefleet are first recorded in the cartulary of Selby Abbey.³⁸ Similar evidence emerges in the Craven area from the cartularies of Sallay, Bolton, and Fountains. That extension of cultivated land was taking place in Yorkshire is clear from the references in charters to assarts, riddings, and *terra novalis*. Clearance was in three types of area: the 'technological margin' of marsh and fen in Holderness and the Aire valley; the forests; and regions of sparse population.³⁹ The first stage in monastic participation was, where required, the clearance of the site of an abbey, and there is evidence of this at Meaux, Byland, and Kirkstall, deriving from the narrative accounts of the foundations.⁴⁰ The Kirkstall chronicler was probably recalling the alleged origins of Cîteaux as much as those of his own house when he wrote that the monks 'reducing thick bush to cultivation brought the niggard soil to grow rich with flourishing crops', but we need not doubt that the area on the river Aire was before their coming an unproductive and desolate spot. Evidence for assarting on estates further away from the abbey derives from charters which either give permission to clear lands, or which (in retrospect) grant and confirm lands which had already been assarted by the monastic community. Rievaulx Abbey was granted waste below Pickering Moor, and in East

³⁷ R. Welldon Finn, *The Making and Limitations of the Yorkshire Domesday*, Borthwick Paper, no. 41 (York, 1972), pp. 29–31.

³⁸ EYC, I, no. 484; III, nos. 1543–4, 1738; *Selby Coucher*, I, no. 36. See EPNS, *WR*, II, 7, 10–11, 21.

³⁹ Postan, *Medieval Economy and Society*, pp. 18–25. The most comprehensive discussion of monastic activity in England which, however, concentrates on the Cistercians, is R. A. Donkin, 'The English Cistercians and assarting c. 1128–c.1350', *Analecta Sacri Ordinis Cisterciensis*, 20 (1964), 49–75.

⁴⁰ *Chron. Melsa*, I, 78–9, 82–3; *Mon. Ang.*, v, 353; *Foundation of Kirkstall*, p. 179.

The life within and the world outside

Bolton land 'de qua terra iijj acre et dimidia sunt culte et xxj inculte et nemorose quas sartabunt monachi cum voluerint'⁴¹ ('of which land four and a half acres are cultivated and twenty-one uncultivated and marshy, and the monks shall assart these as they wish'). In Pilley they were granted an assart which they themselves had cleared.⁴² Byland Abbey received permission to assart in Nidderdale and confirmation of lands which the monks had cleared in Osgodby.⁴³ Fountains Abbey was granted land to assart in Brimham, and had evidently been engaged in clearance in Aldburgh, one of its granges; moreover, despite the papal privilege which freed the White Monks from payment of tithes, they agreed to render them to the parish church of Masham 'quia non fuit ibi multum terre arabilis quando primo data est eis sed fere totum monachi postea sartauerunt'⁴⁴ ('because there was not much arable land there when it was first given to them, but afterwards the monks assarted almost all of it'). Land was cleared in Long Marston.⁴⁵ A grant to the monks of Sallay expected that the land would be assarted; this was one of the largest recorded assarts, of one hundred acres.⁴⁶

The White Monks were not alone in clearing or instigating the clearance of lands. The Augustinians of Warter cleared waste in Seaton Ross; Alice de Gant confirmed to Bridlington all the land which the canons had assarted in her forest of Swaledale since the death of her father; Roger de Mowbray granted to the canons of Newburgh all the assarts their men had created in Kilburn.⁴⁷ Selby Abbey cleared land in Pollington;⁴⁸ the foundation grant of Nun Appleton included lands which were only partly assarted, and that of Marrick Priory 'assarts of marsh and marshland'.⁴⁹ On the surviving evidence, however, it would appear that in accordance with the traditional view in Yorkshire it was the White Monks who were most prominent in the clearance of land and the extension of arable.

However, the colonizing activities of the monks must be set in a geographical context already modified by previous assarting. Some charters certainly indicate that the monks benefited from the activities of others. In Clayton-le-Dale, for instance, the monks of Sallay received an assart 'which Eilsa had assarted', 'all the new assart and the land around it' in Bolton by Bowland, 'the assart of Geoffrey', and 'the assart which Siward

⁴¹ EYC, IV, no. 91. On Pickering see below, pp. 256–7. ⁴² *Cart. Riev.*, no. 111.

⁴³ *Mowbray Charters*, no. 56; *Yorkshire Deeds*, IX, 195.

⁴⁴ *Mowbray Charters*, nos. 97, 119. However, see below, pp. 264–5.

⁴⁵ On Long Marston see below, p. 261.

⁴⁶ *Cart. Sallay*, I, no. 201 (Acreland). For further references see Donkin, 'English Cistercians and assarting', 68–75.

⁴⁷ EYC, X, no. 66; V, no. 391; IX, no. 165. ⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, I, no. 484.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, I, no. 543; V, no. 173.

Monasteries and the landscape

assarted'.⁵⁰ The monks of Rievaulx obtained the assart which had already been named 'Oggethwaite', and the monks of Roche the assarts 'which used to be Gamel's'.⁵¹ Among the non-Cistercian houses, Nostell accepted from Jordan de Lacy an assart of sixty-eight acres which he had bought from Ralph; Selby took possession of the assarts which Alan de Holme held in Kirk Ella; the nuns of Nun Appleton obtained the assarts of Lambert, John, and Richard, and the nuns of Esholt the ridding of Yeadon.⁵²

The picture of the religious orders as 'pioneers' in assarting land and bringing it to cultivation must be modified in the light of evidence which indicates that they were in receipt of lands cleared by non-monastic communities. Monastic assarting did take place, but often on a modest scale and within limitations imposed by neighbours. Boundaries might be clearly defined. On one occasion at least the monks of Byland were allegedly overzealous in their clearances around Kilburn and Thorpe, and as a consequence came into conflict with Robert de Daiville and Thomas de Coleville. Agreements with both men placed limits on the assarting activities of the monks.⁵³ Roger de Mowbray, in granting pasture lands in Nidderdale to Byland, specified that the community should neither plough nor sow there.⁵⁴ In the strict sense of extending the area 'under the plough' monastic assarting was limited both by previous assarting and by geographical factors. However, monks and canons played an important role in bringing economic activity to underdeveloped areas such as the Pennines (Nidderdale and Swaledale), Craven, and the Ouse/Aire basin, which had previously been areas of sparse population and cultivation. On the evidence the houses which played the most significant role as landowners in these regions were Rievaulx, Byland, Fountains, Sallay, and Selby; but their efforts modified, rather than transformed, the existing pattern of settlement.

Much of the land granted to the religious houses of Yorkshire was not, however, suitable for the growing of grain and other crops. High in the Pennines and on the Dales were areas suitable for sheep farming. Not that sheep were the only animals kept. Pigs were grazed inexpensively in woodland areas and were raised by Bridlington (Scalby forest), Sallay (Clayton), Byland (Nidderdale), and Kirkham (Helmsley).⁵⁵ Cattle were raised by Marton and Easby Pories;⁵⁶ and there are references to vaccaries

⁵⁰ *Cart. Sallay*, I, nos. 124, 135, 275–6. ⁵¹ *Cart. Riev.*, no. 94; *Mon. Ang.*, v, 502, no. 1.

⁵² *EYC*, vi, no. 127; xii, no. 6; I, no. 543; III, no. 1874.

⁵³ Historic Manuscripts Commission, *Reports on Manuscripts in Various Collections*, II (1903), p. 3; Janet E. Burton, 'The settlement of disputes between Byland Abbey and Newburgh Priory', *YAJ*, 55 (1983), 67–72.

⁵⁴ *Mowbray Charters*, no. 53.

⁵⁵ *EYC*, I, no. 363; *Cart. Sallay*, I, no. 276; *Mowbray Charters*, no. 53; *Cart. Riev.*, no. 216.

⁵⁶ *EYC*, II, no. 784; v, no. 213.

The life within and the world outside

on many monastic estates. The earliest appears to be that granted to Byland at Cam (1140); Meaux created one at Akenbergh shortly after its foundation in 1151, and there are others recorded in the twelfth century on the estates of Sallay, Jervaulx, and Kirkstall.⁵⁷ Charters sometimes make reference to the grant of pasture for a specified number of cattle – usually fewer than thirty⁵⁸ – particularly in lowland areas such as the Hull valley, where Meaux obtained several grants of cow pasture,⁵⁹ and in the forests of Wensleydale, Swaledale, and Nidderdale, which were developed as cattle-farming areas by the monks of Jervaulx and Fountains.⁶⁰ Frequently mixed pastures were granted, such as that obtained by Rievaulx in Stainborough for four horses, eight oxen, five cows, and twenty pigs; in Stonecroft for 300 sheep and 200 other animals, and in Little Midgely, Emley, and Eagleshope (Teesdale) for cows, bulls, horses, and oxen.⁶¹ Horses were kept on the estates of Easby, Byland, Rievaulx, and Swine.⁶²

It was, however, sheep farming that became the mainstay of the economy of many Yorkshire religious houses. Although the evidence is nowhere near as abundant for the twelfth as it is for later centuries, the charters of the period leave us in no doubt that sheep pasture formed a significant proportion of the lands conveyed to the monastic order, and that sheep farming quickly became an important feature of their economy. Sheep pastures are recorded in the charters of most houses, including the nunneries of Handale, Nun Appleton, Swine, Yedingham, and Rosedale. Numerous charters make a grant of sheep pasture or the right to share common pasture, in general terms, but from the middle of the twelfth century a minority specify the number of sheep which were to be kept at a certain location. The usual size of pasture granted was for 200 to 300 sheep, sometimes with a site or materials for a sheepfold. Fountains, for instance, received pasture for 200 sheep in West Morton with the site for a fold.⁶³ Malton was granted pasture for 300 sheep in Ebberston, and the nuns of Rosedale the site of a fold, pasture for 200 sheep, a plough team and cattle, in Lockton.⁶⁴ Some pasture lands were, however, more extensive, as Table 1 demonstrates.

⁵⁷ EYC, xi, nos. 75, 115, 121; *ibid.*, iii, no. 1509; *Mowbray Charters*, no. 37. See also EYC, x, no. 90, for cattle on the estates of Meaux in Warter, and *Chron. Melsa*, i, 110, for a vaccary in 'Akenbergh'. R. A. Donkin, 'Cattle on the estates of medieval Cistercian monasteries in England and Wales', *Economic History Review*, 2nd series, 15 (1962–3), 31–53, and *The Cistercians: Studies in the Geography of Medieval England and Wales*, Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, Studies and Texts, 38 (Toronto, 1978), pp. 69–82, 185–6.

⁵⁸ Donkin, *The Cistercians*, p. 73. ⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 73–4. ⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

⁶¹ EYC, iii, no. 1725; *Cart. Riv.*, nos. 91, 95, 115, 305.

⁶² Respectively, in Carperby (EYC, v, no. 213), Nidderdale (*Mowbray Charters*, no. 52), Shidlington (*Cart. Riv.*, no. 95) and Spaldington (EYC, xii, no. 65).

⁶³ EYC, vii, no. 168. ⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, i, nos. 389, 394.

Monasteries and the landscape

Table 1 *Sheep pastures for flocks over 400*

Jervaulx	Rookwith (500) ^a
Meaux	Warter (160) and Myton (400) ^b
Byland	Skirpenbeck (400) ^c
Fountains	Kettlewell (transit for 460) ^d
Rievaulx	Morton (400)
	Heslerton (1,000)
	Hunmanby (500)
	Welbury (600)
	Allerston (1,000)
	Folkton (1,000) ^e
Sallay	Litton (600)
	Marton (400) ^f
Kirkstall	Bessacar (1,000) ^g
Easby	Carperby (500) ^h
Coverham	Kettlewell (1,000) ⁱ
Warter	Seaton Ross (1,000) ^j
Nun Appleton	Immingham (400)
Swine	Spaldington (400) ^k

^a EYC., v, no. 326.

^b *Chron. Melsa*, I, 101, 168.

^c EYC., II, no. 838

^d *Ibid.*, XI, no. 141.

^e *Cart. Riev.*, nos. 80, 85–6, 88, 90, 161, 167.

^f *Cart. Sallay*, I, no. 63; II, no. 406.

^g EYC., II, no. 819.

^h *Ibid.*, v, no. 213.

ⁱ *Ibid.*, v, no. 359.

^j *Ibid.*, x, no. 72.

^k *Ibid.*, I, no. 544; XII, no. 65.

Conditions were sometimes attached to grants of pasture. Torphin de Allerston and his wife and son granted to Rievaulx pasture for 500 sheep in Givendale, inside and outside the vill, where their own flocks and those of their men pastured, and three acres to the east of the tillage 'to enclose their bercary [sheepfold] with a hedge and ditch and to use them as they wish' ('ad berchariam suam, claudendas sepi et fossato et utendas sicut voluerint').⁶⁵ The donors also gave one acre for the provision of straw for the sheepfold, and reserved for themselves half the dung and manure from the sheepfold for all times. A benefactor of Fountains reserved for himself the manure from grazing land for 200 sheep. 'Such petty bargaining', as Donkin called it, marked the transference of pasture rights to the monks, but one should not underestimate the benefits which lay donors saw in the improved breeding and farming techniques of the monks.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, I, no. 386 (*Cart. Riev.*, no. 167).

⁶⁶ Donkin, *The Cistercians*, p. 95.

The life within and the world outside

The coming of the monastic order to Yorkshire, and its rapid and extensive territorial acquisitions had a lasting impact on the landscape. From the Tees in the north to the Sheaf in the south there was no area in which land did not pass to the monks, canons, and nuns. In some regions, where concentrated estates were accumulated by individual houses, the impact was more obvious. There was a close correlation between monastic estate development and those areas with either 'waste' or low recorded population in 1086; and although the degree of recovery between that date and the coming of the monastic orders is not recorded, there can be no doubt of the monastic contribution to recovery and economic expansion. Recent studies have tended to modify the 'frontier thesis' of Cistercian settlement, and played down their contribution to the opening up of lands.⁶⁷ However, it is clear that in Yorkshire, although the White Monks were not alone in their efforts, they were responsible for the settlement of previously unexploited areas as well as the extension of others, and that their activities modified the landscape of the county.

Manorial perquisites

Although land was undoubtedly the most important source of wealth for the religious houses of medieval Yorkshire, there were others. Mills were among the most valuable of manorial assets because they brought with them a monopoly of milling, and multure, income from the tenants who were obliged to have their corn ground there. The grant of a mill to a religious house was, therefore, a double benefit, for if it was sited on or near monastic property it also brought free milling for the community's own produce.⁶⁸ The foundation endowment of Bridlington included the mills adjoining thirteen carucates of land in the vill, and that of Guisborough the mills of the vill with soke and multure; William de Roumare, in endowing Warter, granted the site of all the mills on his lands, and quittance from multure; as founder of Embsay, Cecily de Rumilly provided several mills for the canons. Nostell took possession of the mills of Saxton, Norton, Bramham, Shafton, Harlington, and 'Culcenea'.⁶⁹ Grantors in particular took care to safeguard the rights of the recipients, as Cecily de Rumilly did when she conveyed to the canons of

⁶⁷ See, for example, Alfonso, 'Cistercians and feudalism'.

⁶⁸ For a useful discussion of medieval mills, both general and relating to one particular region, see M. L. Faull and S. A. Moorhouse (ed.), *West Yorkshire: An Archaeological Survey to A.D. 1500*, 4 vols. (Wakefield, 1981), III, 702–23.

⁶⁹ EYC, II, no. 1135; X, no. 66 (see also no. 72, and XI, no. 166); VI, no. 13; VII, no. 4 (see also no. 11, and III, no. 1861); II, no. 1018, III, nos. 1529, 1533, 1561; VIII, nos. 100–101; BL MS Cotton Vespasian E XIX, fo. 53v.

Monasteries and the landscape

Embsay the mill of Silsden (Kildwick) in order to ensure that the canons derived full profit from the grant.⁷⁰

From this discussion it will be clear that the regular canons in particular benefited from the grant of mills. They are not uncommon in the endowments of Yorkshire Benedictine houses, which acquired them both in areas where they controlled extensive property and elsewhere; Selby Abbey held the mill of Shitlington from the middle of the twelfth century even though it had no other property in the vill. It was because mills brought with them income derived from the work of others that the Cistercians came to ban their possession except where they were solely for the use of the monastic community. That as early as 1157 the ban had to be renewed indicates a concern about the consequences of accepting such grants, and some historians have seen the seeds of decline as lying in the incorporation of houses of other orders, notably Savigny, which were allowed to keep their mills.⁷¹ Mills for their own use could be found in the precinct of abbey and grange, and the grant of permission to erect a mill, as Fountains received at Kirkheaton, adjoining its grange at Bradley, or Rievaulx at Blacker, near its proposed grange at Shitlington, are cases in point.⁷² The possession of mills further away from Cistercian estates – like that of Hunslet, granted to Sallay – suggests a wider exploitation of milling rights,⁷³ but generally the Yorkshire evidence does not show any but the most minor infringements. Charters of the period tend not to distinguish different types of mill, corn, fulling, and tanning, and it is not therefore certain how frequently Cistercian possession of a mill denotes cloth production at abbey or grange, as opposed to the milling of corn. Certainly the Cistercian houses of Stanley and Newminster possessed fulling mills by the late twelfth century.

Natural resources

As fish was an important constituent of the monastic diet, and salt necessary for preserving, the grant of fisheries and salt pans was significant, and was received by a wide range of houses. Several fisheries and sites for fish weirs were obtained along the river Tees by Guisborough,

⁷⁰ EYC, vii, no. 4; see also, for instance, *Cart. Guis.*, i, no. 1; EYC, xii, no. 83 (protection of a grant to the nuns of Swine). Faull and Moorhouse (*West Yorkshire*, iii, 703) and Richard Holt (*The Mills of Medieval England* (Oxford, 1988), p. 38) point out that Cecily's charter contains one of the earliest recorded references to the illegal use of handmills.

⁷¹ Canivez, *Statuta*, i, 14–15 (no. 9), 64 (no. 36), 67 (no. 59). For this assessment of the impact of the merger with Savigny, see Hill, *English Cistercian Monasteries*, pp. 80–115.

⁷² EYC, iii, nos. 1706, 1709, 1727–8.

⁷³ *Cart. Sallay*, ii, no. 505. For instances of other Cistercian houses acquiring mills see Hill, *English Cistercian Monasteries*, p. 73.

The life within and the world outside

which also had a salt pan at Coatham, by Rievaulx (Newsham, Stainsby, and Normanby), and by Byland (Gaterigg, Linthorpe, and Coatham).⁷⁴ Drax Priory was provided with a draft of nets along the river Ouse, and from William de Stuteville the monks of Fountains received a fishery on the Ure and Ouse from Boroughbridge to the city walls of York, with one fisherman and his servants, two boats, a seine, and a net; a sole restriction was that the monks were not to construct a fishgarth. Fountains also held a fishery on the Swale near Topcliffe, one at Malham Tarn and half on the Wiske.⁷⁵ Nostell and Pontefract both had fisheries at Beal on the river Aire, and Selby on the Trent at Crasgarth (Lincs.) and on the Ouse at Whitgift and Selby. Fisheries on the Derwent were obtained by Drax, Fountains, and Warter.⁷⁶ St Mary's, York, secured fisheries at Haines (on the river Don), Bradmere and Wroot – and in Bradmere three good pike and twelve bream on the feast of the Assumption of St Mary – as well as a monopoly of fishing on Hornsea Mere. Meaux Abbey had extensive fisheries on the rivers Hull and Humber.⁷⁷

The grant of materials – wood, stone, and ore – aided the monastic order in Yorkshire not only in the economic exploitation of their estates but also in the construction of the buildings of abbey, grange, sheepfold, and barn. Malton and Yedingham, for example, received yearly cart loads of wood, the first for the kitchen and the second for the making of ploughs.⁷⁸ Easby and Sallay received quarries to aid in building work; and Sallay also obtained timber from the wood of Billington.⁷⁹ Grants of turbaries brought essential fuel.⁸⁰ Sometimes a number of assets were combined: Robert III de Stuteville granted to the monks of Meaux the site of a mill on the river Hull in Cottingham, a croft and a fishery there, a wooden castle for the construction of the bakehouse and stables, and other offices of the monastery, and branches from the woods of Cottingham for the repair of carts.⁸¹

Three Cistercian houses were instrumental in the larger scale development of industrial sites in the county. The origins of one of these lay in the grants made by Adam son of Peter to Rievaulx Abbey.⁸² Adam granted all the minerals and dead wood for smelting on his land in the vill of Halton, Shipley, Kirkheaton, and Chellow, with exclusive mining

⁷⁴ *Cart. Guis.*, II, nos. 781, 1117; *Cart. Riev.*, nos. 114, 116, 315; *EYC*, II, no. 703. See also J. McDonnell, *Inland Fisheries in Medieval Yorkshire 1066–1300*, Borthwick Paper, 60 (York, 1981).

⁷⁵ *EYC*, VI, no. 13; I, no. 517; V, no. 285; XI, nos. 23, 38–9.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, XI, nos. 164, 171; XII, no. 98.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, III, nos. 1299, 1302; VIII, no. 30; I, no. 354; *Chron. Melsa*, I, 100.

⁷⁸ *Mowbray Charters*, no. 185; *EYC*, I, no. 392.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, V, nos. 149–54; *Cart. Sallay*, I, no. 255.

⁸⁰ See, for example, *EYC*, VI, no. 122 (Nostell), and Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Fairfax 7, fo. 5 (Kirkham).

⁸¹ *Chron. Melsa*, I, 99; *EYC*, IX, no. 9.

⁸² See above, pp. 211–12.

Monasteries and the landscape

rights. At a second location, Shitlington, he granted fifteen acres to build forges in which to make iron and necessary utensils; and all the minerals in Flockton and Shitlington, and all the dead wood for use in their forges. He protected the interests of the monks by granting 'ut nullus alius favercam habeat ad ferrum faciendum in his predictis locis, nec mineriam nec carbonem asportet extra territoriam predictarum villarum' ('that no other shall have a forge in the aforesaid places for the making of iron, nor transport minerals nor charcoal out of the territory of the said vill'). Adam completed his endowments to Rievaulx by granting a forge, with all the minerals of the vill and the forests.⁸³ Rievaulx's second iron-working site, at Faweather (Bingley), also originated in grants of mineral rights from Adam.⁸⁴

Grants which were intended to lead to the mining activities of a second Cistercian house, Byland, were concentrated in two areas, Kirkby Malzeard and Denby. Roger de Mowbray granted materials and minerals and a tithe of lead in Kirkby Malzeard; William son of Osbert de Denby granted iron ore in Clover Leys (formerly Claverlay, Denby) and they received as well a furnace and fuel in Emley.⁸⁵ Byland developed two granges which concentrated on iron working; these were at Bentley and Denby, and a right of access linked the two sites. Finally, Fountains Abbey developed an important industrial estate in Bradley (Huddersfield/Kirkheaton) from an early grant of a forge by Ralph son of Nicholas, which was augmented when Thomas, brother of Adam son of Peter, granted all the dead wood belonging to five bovates in Kirkheaton, and iron ore wherever it could be found 'excepta terra que culta fuerit postquam Henricus rex Anglie . . . primo coronatus fuit' ('except for the land which was brought into cultivation after Henry, king of England, was first crowned'). The grant included charcoal for the forges.⁸⁶ Further exploitation is indicated by Adam de Crosland's grant of millstones from his land in Crosland for use in the abbey mills at Bradley, reserving for himself and his heirs the remainder of the quarry; he further allowed the monks to have wood for making the millstones and licence to take them over his land, provided that they did not transverse corn and meadow.⁸⁷

There are other instances of grants of mineral rights which were apparently not taken up. There is, for example, no indication that the monks of Fountains exploited Roger de Mowbray's grant of mineral

⁸³ *Cart. Riev.*, nos. 91, 94–5, 100. ⁸⁴ See above, p. 212.

⁸⁵ *Mowbray Charters*, no. 48; *EYC*, III, no. 1808.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, III, nos. 1692, 1762; C. T. Clay, 'Bradley: a grange of Fountains', *YAJ*, 29 (1929), 97–106; G. Coppack, *Fountains Abbey* (London, 1993), pp. 84–5.

⁸⁷ *EYC*, VIII, no. 137. For the granges associated with these industrial sites see below, pp. 263–4.

The life within and the world outside

rights in Nidderdale, though there are references to their forge at Aldburgh; Jervaulx received from Earl Alan of Richmond the right to mine any iron ore they found on his land; and Sallay had permission to take all the iron ore and dead wood for charcoal in Salesbury (Lancashire).⁸⁸ In none of these cases did major industrial activity develop: not all the economic opportunities offered by benefactors were exploited.

Urban property

Urban property provided both a base for servants and representatives of monasteries engaged in trade, and money rent. It is not surprising that it was the houses located in or just outside towns, notably St Mary's, York, which developed as the major urban landlords, but they were not alone. A useful starting point is an inquest of around 1230 into the York property of religious houses.⁸⁹ This indicates that over thirty monasteries and other religious institutions had come into possession of 163 properties within the city. St Mary's and Holy Trinity were recorded with fifteen each, St Andrew's with twelve, and the nuns of St Clement's with seven. Tenements had also been acquired by Selby, Guisborough, Nostell, Kirkham, Bolton, Bridlington, Fountains, Rievaulx, and Nun Monkton. The survey, however, clearly under-records the extent of monastic ownership of York property. St Mary's from an early date had established itself as the dominant landlord in Bootham and Gillygate, in the suburbs, and in the twelfth century acquired property all over the city and notably in Ousegate, Walmgate, Marygate, Coney Street, Fossgate, Bretgate, St Saviourgate, Hungate, Spurriergate, Blake Street, Micklegate, and Fishergate.⁹⁰ There is no mention in the survey of the possessions of Whitby, which at an early date acquired property in Fishergate, Walmgate, Blake Street, and near the Minster, administered from the abbey cell in the church of All Saints, Fishergate. Bolton had property in Blake Street and St Andrewgate, Nostell in Aldwark and Clementhorpe, and Malton in Skeldergate. Among the Cistercians – whose statutes at first forbade, and then attempted to limit, the acquisition of town property⁹¹ – the tenement of the monks of Fountains in Coney Street is recorded, but not those in Stonegate and Nessgate, nor is the property of Rievaulx in Layerthorpe, of Byland in Coney Street, of Kirkstall outside Micklegate, nor of Meaux.⁹²

⁸⁸ *Mowbray Charters*, nos. 103–4, 115, 135; *Mon. Ang.*, v, 569, no. III; *Cart. Sallay*, I, no. 285.

⁸⁹ PRO E/135/25/1; for a summary see *VCH, City of York*, p. 49.

⁹⁰ See Manchester, John Rylands Library Latin MSS 220–221, fos. 96v–98, 100–103, 106–107v; *EYC*, I, *passim*. ⁹¹ See below, p. 253.

⁹² For Fountains's York property see BL MS Add. 40009, pp. 201–82, calendared in *Cart. Fount.*, I, 267–91. Before 1176 the monks had obtained property on the river Ouse in the city (pp. 224–6). See also *Cart. Riev.*, no. 368 (p. 262); *EYC*, I, no. 245; *Kirkstall Coucher*, no. 204.

Monasteries and the landscape

By the early thirteenth century the abbot of Easby had property in Bootham, which was leased out, the abbot however reserving for himself a place to stay whenever he was in York;⁹³ and the abbot of Sallay made similar provisions for his properties in North Street and Micklegate.⁹⁴

York was clearly the main urban centre for the Yorkshire monastic houses, but they obtained property in other towns, most notably Beverley, an important regional and overseas trading centre, where Rievaulx and Meaux secured tenements.⁹⁵ St Mary's, Fountains, Sallay, and Meaux all obtained property in the Lincolnshire market and trading town of Boston;⁹⁶ and Fountains, Malton, and Bridlington were landlords in the major port of Scarborough.⁹⁷ By 1199 Fountains also had property in Yarm, Hartlepool, and Grimsby.

Churches and spiritualia

It has been demonstrated in earlier chapters that parish churches and associated revenues were a staple, indeed an outstanding, feature, of monastic endowment in the late eleventh and throughout the twelfth century. It is not intended here to repeat the details of the churches granted to individual houses, though it is perhaps worth recalling the numbers in which they came into the hands of the monastic order.⁹⁸ Among the Benedictines, Whitby Abbey received grants of twenty-seven churches and chapels in the period up to around 1215. Holy Trinity received twelve parish churches and a moiety of a thirteenth, and the alien cell of Birstall was at the centre of fifteen East Riding churches conveyed to the abbey of Aumale. St Mary's, York, received nine churches by 1093, and by 1157 had acquired in the region of thirty-four more.⁹⁹ The Augustinian canons were major recipients of such grants.¹⁰⁰ Subsequent benefactors of the Black Monks and the regular canons added church after church, until a significant number had been placed in the hands of the religious orders. As we have seen, there are instances which indicate that a parish church formed the basis of the female community, and these churches continued to serve both the monastic and the wider community. Under the influence of churchmen who sought to wrest the patronage of parish churches from lay

⁹³ BL MS Egerton 2827, fo. 135. ⁹⁴ *Cart. Sallay*, II, nos. 562–3.

⁹⁵ *Cart. Riev.*, nos. 135, 368 (p. 262); *Chron. Melsa*, I, 228–9.

⁹⁶ For Fountains see *Cart. Fount.*, I, 114–21, abstracts of BL MS Cotton Tiberius C XII, fos. 119v and 230–9.

⁹⁷ *EYC*, I, nos. 366, 368–9.

⁹⁸ For a full discussion of this problem see Janet E. Burton, 'Monasteries and parish churches in eleventh- and twelfth-century Yorkshire', *Northern History*, 23 (1987), 39–50.

⁹⁹ Comparing *EYC*, I, no. 350 (confirmation of William II), and no. 354 (confirmation of Henry II).

¹⁰⁰ See above, pp. 69–97.

hands, founders and patrons conveyed such rights to the monastic order.¹⁰¹

By the twelfth century, however, a number of *caveats* had been added to the wholesale transfer of churches to the monastic and religious orders; from within the monastic body members of reformed groups resisted such possession, their argument being that ecclesiastical revenues should be reserved for the support of those who served altars. A fundamental feature of the Cistercian economy was their rejection of churches and revenue derived from ecclesiastical sources.¹⁰² In this they were followed by the Premonstratensians, and the orders of La Grande Chartreuse, Grandmont, and Fontevault. When the order of Savigny joined that of Cîteaux in 1147 its houses were allowed to retain the churches they held, although some individuals, perhaps under Cistercian influence, had already refused churches: Abbot Roger of Byland declined to accept the *ius patronatus* of Thirsk, Hovingham, and Kirkby Malzeard at about the time of the merger because he was 'of scrupulous conscience concerning the cure of souls' ('homo scrupulosae conscientiae pro cura animarum').¹⁰³ The Gilbertines, an order which had a canonical element, allowed the possession of churches, the only restriction being that they should not be farmed to others without the consent of the order.¹⁰⁴ For Benedictine and Augustinian houses, however, churches could be a significant source of revenue.¹⁰⁵

However, not all grants of churches were either immediate or effective. Having granted a church, the donor might expect to retain rights during his lifetime: Samson d'Aubigny granted to his cousin's foundation of Newburgh seven churches (c. 1145) but stipulated that he was to hold the churches for as long as he lived *in laicali habitu*, and after his entry into the religious life, or his death, his son, Roger, was to hold the four churches in the Isle of Axholme and a fifth, rendering an annual payment to the prior.¹⁰⁶ Other patrons manipulated grants to their own advantage: among the initial endowments of Guisborough was the church of Skelton, but the founder's grandson, Adam II de Brus, fell into dispute with

¹⁰¹ For discussion of this phenomenon, see, for instance, G. Constable, 'Monastic possession of churches and "spiritualia" in the age of reform', *Il Monachismo e la Riforma Ecclesiastica (1049–1122)*, Miscellanea del Centro di Studi Medioevali, 6 (Milan, 1971), pp. 304–31; Morris, *Papal Monarchy*, pp. 60–2; B. R. Kemp, 'Monastic possession of churches in England in the twelfth century', *JEH*, 31 (1980), 133–60. For the development of Yorkshire parishes see the ongoing series of *Fasti parochiales*, published by the Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series. Symptomatic of the attitude towards lay possession of churches was the statement of Roger de Flammaville, that he was granting the church of Norton to the Gilbertines of Malton *quantum fas est laici persone*, as far as it was within the power of a lay person to do so: BL MS Cotton Claudius D XI, fo. 55.

¹⁰² Canivez, *Statuta*, I, 14–15 (no. 9). ¹⁰³ *Mon. Ang.*, v, 351.

¹⁰⁴ Golding, *Gilbert of Sempringham*, p. 356. Golding's lengthy discussion of the Gilbertines and their churches (pp. 356–91) provides a useful comparison for the present chapter.

¹⁰⁵ For the Augustinians and their churches, see Robinson, *Geography of Augustinian Settlement*, I, 172–272, II, 404–78. ¹⁰⁶ *Mowbray Charters*, no. 196.

Monasteries and the landscape

the canons when he forced them to pay a pension to his chaplain, Adam, until the church should fall vacant and they could appoint him to the living.¹⁰⁷ Later patrons might dispute possession of churches: the Ros family, for instance, questioned certain rights which Kirkham had in Kirkham itself, Helmsley, Kirbygrindalythe, and Garton.¹⁰⁸ Often the rights of the incumbent had to be protected, occasioning another delay before possession could be effective: Ivo de Karkeni, granting Hesse church to Guisborough, secured the tenure of his nephew, John, rector of the church.¹⁰⁹

The insecurity of monastic possession can be demonstrated with reference to a number of the churches of two Paynel foundations, Drax and Holy Trinity, both of which experienced difficulty retaining their churches for two main reasons: the subsequent grant to another religious house, and encroachment by monasteries with landed interests in a parish. Among the endowments of Holy Trinity was the church of Thurnscoe; however, the interests of the Vavasour family in the vill led them to make a second grant of the church, to the Cistercian monks of Sallay. Moreover, extensive land acquisitions in the region led to a third claim, by the monks of Roche, and a three-way tussle developed, which was eventually won by Sallay.¹¹⁰ Adel was another church granted to Holy Trinity, but it was challenged for possession by Kirkstall, which had estates in the vill.¹¹¹ When William Paynel founded Drax he granted two churches – Irnham and Roxby – which his father had previously granted to Holy Trinity. Drax itself, however, experienced difficulty in retaining Roxby, which was claimed by Roche, and Irnham was disputed by Bardney Abbey; eventually Drax was successful in its claims.¹¹² The canons temporarily lost another of their churches, Swinstead, which Robert de Gant granted ‘in ignorance’ to Guy the clerk at the request of King Stephen’s son, Eustace.¹¹³ Delays in taking possession of a church, changes in inclination on the part of patrons, and the desire of monasteries with landed interests in a parish to secure those interests by the possession of the church, even at the expense of others, all meant that transfers could be far from smooth.

Unless a charter stated that the house was to take a pension only, the

¹⁰⁷ EYC, II, nos. 660, 675. ¹⁰⁸ PUE, III, no. 294.

¹⁰⁹ EYC, IX, no. 101; see also no. 102.

¹¹⁰ EYC, XI, no. 115 and VI, 228–9. For the possible reason for Roche’s attempts to secure the church, see below, pp. 266–7.

¹¹¹ EYC, VI, no. 7; Kirkstall itself failed to retain Marton church, which was lost to Bolton Priory (*Fasti parochiales*, vol. IV, ed. N. K. M. Gurney and C. T. Clay, *YASRS* 133 (1971), 94–5).

¹¹² EYC, VI, no. 75; *Cunia Regis Rolls*, I, 431.

¹¹³ EYC, VI, no. 80; PUE, III, no. 320. For another example see *Mowbray Charters*, nos. 203, 325; *YMF*, I, 81–2, II, 51–6.

The life within and the world outside

grant of the church probably conveyed at minimum the advowson, the right to present the incumbent. Sometimes the wording was specific: Roger de Mowbray confirmed Newburgh in possession of the *ius patronatus* of Brafferton; Easby was granted *quicquid juris et patronatus* Ismania, daughter of the founder, had in the church of Great Langton, and similar phrases appear in the charter conveying to the canons the church of Stanwick St John.¹¹⁴ After the destruction of Barnoldswick church the monks of Kirkstall were granted the right to present to its two dependent chapels, which were raised to the status of parish churches.¹¹⁵ Following a dispute about Adwick on Dearne church a papal enquiry ordered the officials of the archbishop of York to receive the parsons presented to them by the canons of Nostell.¹¹⁶

A further step allowed a religious house to appropriate a church and thus enjoy all its revenue. Evidence of this derives generally not from the charters of grantors, although it is sometimes implicit in them that the churches were to be *in proprios usus* of the monastery. The most explicit statement, that of the 'foundation charter' of Guisborough, namely that Robert de Brus had granted eight churches 'ut decedentibus clericis qui quasdam de praedictis ecclesiis tenent, habeant eas canonici praefati ad sustentationem suam' ('so that, when the clerks who hold any of the said churches are dead, the said canons might hold the churches for their own maintenance'), is in itself one of the suspicious features of the charter.¹¹⁷ Generally evidence for appropriation derives from papal or archiepiscopal licence to convert the church *ad proprios usus*. The implications were both financial and pastoral: the monastery would benefit from the revenues of the church and in return would have to undertake to see that the cure of souls was provided for. However, the reason given for licence to appropriate was generally, though not always, financial: the poverty of the house, either real or fictional. The earliest intention to appropriate may belong to the office of Archbishop Thomas II (1109–14), although the identity of the archbishop is uncertain and may be Thurstan (1114–40). This is the permission to Holy Trinity Priory to appropriate the churches of Leeds, Adel, Barton-le-Street, and Hooton Pagnell.¹¹⁸ Before 1140 Thurstan approved the appropriations of Skipton with its dependent chapel of Carleton, and Kildwick (Bolton), and Bessingby (Bridlington), in the case of Kildwick the reason being the poverty (*inopia*) of the canons.¹¹⁹ When Archbishop Roger licensed Nostell to appropriate

¹¹⁴ *Mowbray Charters*, no. 209; *EYC*, v, nos. 256–9, 269.

¹¹⁵ See above, p. 119.; the monks presented to Bracewell in 1230: *Reg. Gray*, p. 33.

¹¹⁶ *EYC*, III, no. 1682. Nostell also presented to Weaverthorpe (*ibid.*, I, no. 29).

¹¹⁷ *Cart. Guis.*, I, nos. 1–2. ¹¹⁸ *EEA*, v, no. 29; *EYC*, VI, no. 11; see below, p. 241.

¹¹⁹ *EEA*, v, no. 33; *EYC*, VI, no. 8.

Monasteries and the landscape

Featherstone, Batley, Felkirk, and Warmfield, it was 'ad sustentationem suam et hospitalitatem augmentandam . . . ita ut liceat eis fructus et omnes obventiones et possessiones earundem ecclesiarum cum vacaverint in proprios usus convertere' ('to the increase of their maintenance and hospitality . . . that they shall be allowed when the churches become vacant to convert to their own use all the fruits and offerings and possessions of the same churches').¹²⁰ Licences to appropriate were granted to Easby, with respect to the churches of Stanwick and Great Langton;¹²¹ Byland (Old Byland);¹²² Whitby (Whitby, Hackness, Great Ayton, Ingleby Greenhow);¹²³ Monk Bretton (Royston);¹²⁴ Drax (Drax, Bingley and Foston);¹²⁵ and Guisborough (Skelton in Cleveland).¹²⁶ It is also possible that Gainford church was intended to be appropriated by St Mary's, York.¹²⁷ The Cistercians appear to have appropriated only two churches before 1215: Byland (Byland Abbey) and Barnoldswick (Kirkstall).¹²⁸ The order as a whole received from King Richard I the church of Scarborough, the revenue of which was to help defray the costs of attendance at the General Chapter.¹²⁹

These are all instances in which the archbishops of York authorized the appropriation of a particular church or churches. The appropriation of a church was not, however, merely a financial matter, for it involved the monastery in the provision of spiritual care, either through one of its own number, who was a priest, or through the appointment of a stipendiary chaplain. From the latter part of the twelfth century papal authorization for the appropriation of any church, provided that certain conditions be met, became increasingly common. Pope Lucius III, in confirming four churches to Warter, allowed the canons to place in any of the churches, when they became vacant, four, or at the very least three of their number, 'quorum unus dyocesano presentetur episcopo ut ei curam animarum committat ita quidem quod ei de spiritualibus vobis autem de temporalibus debeat respondere' ('of whom one shall be presented to the diocesan bishop so that he may commit to him the cure of souls, so that he ought to respond to him concerning the spiritual side of things and to

¹²⁰ EYC, III, no. 1481. ¹²¹ *Ibid.*, v, nos. 261, 270.

¹²² *Ibid.*, III, no. 1834. ¹²³ *Ibid.*, II, no. 881.

¹²⁴ *The Letters of Pope Innocent III concerning England and Wales: A Calendar with an Appendix of Texts*, ed. C. R. and M. G. Cheney (Oxford, 1967) pp. 219–20 (app. no. 268).

¹²⁵ EYC, VI, nos. 23, 70; Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Top. Yorkshire C 72, fo. 44r.

¹²⁶ EYC, II no. 675.

¹²⁷ G. V. Scammell, 'Four early charters relating to York', *YAJ*, 39 (1958), 86–90.

¹²⁸ EYC, III, no. 1834; EYC, I, no. 622; *EEA*, v, no. 121. The monks of Byland were granted the church of Rillington, but this was disputed and it was not until 1344 that the whole church was appropriated (*Fasti parochiales*, v, 31–6). Tadcaster was appropriated to Sallay in 1241 (EYC, XI, *Cart. Sallay*, II, nos. 612, 615).

¹²⁹ EYC, I, no. 365.

The life within and the world outside

you (the canons) concerning temporal affairs').¹³⁰ In 1190 Celestine III issued a similar bull to Bridlington, allowing the canons to place two or more in nineteen of the churches it had been granted and a moiety of a twentieth. That the wholesale appropriation of churches by the regular canons could be envisaged is indicated by a letter of Pope Alexander III to Archbishop Roger de Pont L'Evêque, stating that regular canons within the diocese were to be allowed to serve any of the churches and chapels granted to them provided at least three canons, if not four, were placed in each church.¹³¹

These papal provisions regarding appropriations by the regular canons amount to blanket permission to transfer parochial revenues into their hands, and at the same time serve the spiritual needs of the diocese. The regulations concerning the number of canons to be placed in each church reflect the concerns of the authorities, expressed at the Third Lateran Council of 1179, that monks and canons were not to serve churches without companions ('non singuli . . . ad quascumque parochiales ponuntur ecclesias sed in majori conventu aut cum aliquibus fratribus maneat': 'they shall not be placed individually in parishes, but shall remain in full convent or with other brethren'): in other words, they were to serve churches which were close enough to the monastery not to require a monk or canon to be resident, or they were to be staffed by a group of brethren.

Clearly practical issues would dictate whether or not a monastery could avail itself of licence to appropriate. Many of the churches lay at a distance which would not have allowed a monk or canon to visit the church and return in one day. Moreover, the numbers in priories would not have permitted the placing of three canons in each church. Licence to appropriate was not, therefore, automatically followed by the act itself. Opinions of historians have varied as to how far in the twelfth century canons and monks did serve churches in their care – the absence of archiepiscopal registers makes any systematic investigation impossible. For J. C. Dickinson, English regular canons probably served fewer of their churches than did those of the better-staffed continental houses.¹³² For Hamilton Thompson it was likely that Bolton, in common with other Augustinian houses, served the churches in the vicinity of the priory.¹³³ Nicholl suggested that the cell system developed by Nostell was intended to facilitate the service of parish churches by the canons them-

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, x, no. 73. ¹³¹ *PUE*, II, no. 169.

¹³² Dickinson, *Austin Canons*, p. 240; see also his remarks on p. 232. For a general discussion of the problem see M. Chibnall, 'Monks and pastoral work: a problem in Anglo-Norman history', *JEH*, 18 (1967), 165–72.

¹³³ Thompson, *Bolton Priory*, p. 34.

Monasteries and the landscape

selves.¹³⁴ The problem does not admit of easy resolution; perhaps the best we can say is that there was no slowing down in the rate of appropriations, and the blanket permissions received by the canons suggest no waning of enthusiasm by the popes.

A solution to the problem of numerical weakness which may have prevented monasteries from enjoying the full benefits of appropriation was the ordination of a vicarage, with the monastery assuming the position of corporate rector and paying a proportion of the revenue to a vicar. The earliest Yorkshire evidence for licence to ordain vicarages in Holy Trinity's churches of Leeds, Adel, Barton-le-Street, and Hooton Pagnell derives from a charter issued either by Thomas II (1109–14) or Thurstan (1114–40) – if the former then this would provide an unusually early example of the ordination of a vicarage.¹³⁵ By 1205 a vicarage had been instituted in the church of Leeds, whose vicar received one-third of the revenue. In general the Yorkshire houses soon seemed to have conformed to the growing expectation that this share, one-third, of the revenue, would be that allotted to the vicar. This is also recorded at Ecclesfield, appropriated to St Wandrille by 1188, and at Wath near Ripon, appropriated by Mont St Michel,¹³⁶ although on occasion the archbishop allowing the proceeding merely stipulated that sufficient provision should be made for the vicar.¹³⁷ The recorded instances of the intention to create vicarages in Yorkshire churches appropriated to monastic houses are not numerous. However, the tendency towards standardization of phraseology in charters suggests not, as Hartridge once suggested, that 'churches were served . . . by vicars under terms made locally without any reference to a general system'¹³⁸ but that such a system with the practice of assigning one-third of the revenue to the vicarage had emerged and been accepted. Cheney demonstrated that before 1215 roughly 200 to 300 vicarages had been established in England.¹³⁹ The Yorkshire evidence suggests that by 1215 the way was

¹³⁴ Nicholl, *Thurstan*, pp. 135–6. A letter of Prior Ethelwold as bishop of Carlisle was addressed to 'omnibus fratribus sancti Oswaldi qui extra domum in cellulis habitant' (EYC, III, no. 1473).

¹³⁵ See EEA, v, no. 29, and the references there cited. See also Roger de Pont L'Évêque's institution of Paulinus de Ledes as vicar on the presentation of the prior and convent (EYC, VI, nos. 82, 84–5).

¹³⁶ CDF, I, 61, no. 178; EYC, III, no. 1278; v, no. 316.

¹³⁷ For example, Geoffrey de Lucy and William de Chimeli, successive archdeacons of Cleveland, allowed Easby to institute vicarages in the churches of Stanwick St John and Great Langton (EYC, v, nos. 261, 270). Archdeacon Honorius later stated that he had set aside 100s from Great Langton for the rectory (the canons) and the remainder for the vicar (BL MS Egerton 2827, fo. 295).

¹³⁸ R. A. R. Hartridge, *A History of Vicarages in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1930, repr., 1968), p. 29.

¹³⁹ C. R. Cheney, *From Becket to Langton: English Church Government 1170–1213* (Manchester, 1956), pp. 131–6. For instances of ordination of vicarages in the diocese of Chichester see *The Acta of the Bishops of Chichester*, ed. H. Mayr-Harting, Canterbury and York Soc., 56 (1964), pp. 57–60. See also the ongoing volumes in EEA.

The life within and the world outside

already being paved for the great number of vicarages ordained during the period of office of Walter de Gray (1215–55).¹⁴⁰

There was, naturally, room for abuse in the creation of vicarages; monasteries as corporate rectors might fail to appoint a vicar, or might make inadequate provision for him.¹⁴¹ More serious, however, was the separation of the tithes and other revenues from the parish church.¹⁴² Until the reform movement of the eleventh century monasteries were able, with spasmodic opposition from bishops, to obtain tithes, until 'by the middle of the eleventh century tithes were an established part of monastic revenue'.¹⁴³ As with the recovery of the advowson of parish churches, the late eleventh century onwards witnessed an attempt by the ecclesiastical authorities to restore tithes to parish churches. The arguments were conducted on a theoretical level – how far were monks to be regarded as clerics – and on the practical level of the problems raised for the parish priest by the diminution of his revenue. A stark example is provided by St Mary's Abbey, York, which by 1157 had come into possession of the tithes of thirty parishes in which they had no other rights.¹⁴⁴ In such cases agreements could be reached with the patron of the church, either directly or through an intermediary. One such agreement was made concerning the church of Kirklevington, held by Guisborough. Celestine III delegated the abbots of Kirkstall and Swainby and the prior of Malton to inquire into the tithes of Kirklevington, which had been appropriated by two clerks on behalf of St Mary's Abbey, York. The compromise which they proposed involved the York abbey retaining the tithes but compensating the canons with the tithes of one of their own churches, Hessle, in return for a yearly payment of one pound of cumin.¹⁴⁵

This chapter has demonstrated that the period covered by this book was one in which financial assets of all kinds – lands, natural resources, manorial rights, and *spiritualia* – were conveyed to the religious orders in

¹⁴⁰ His register provides evidence of the creation of vicarages in, for example, churches appropriated by Yedingham (Yedingham), Nostell (Rothwell, Warmfield, Felkirk, Tickhill, Badley, South Kirkby), Guisborough (Hessle, Stainton), Bridlington (Scalby), Cîteaux (Scarborough), Monk Bretton (Royston).

¹⁴¹ For a discussion of complaints of this nature, with specific reference to the diocese of Worcester, see Cheney, *Becket to Langton*, p. 135.

¹⁴² On a second cause for concern, the exemption which the Cistercians and the Military Orders had acquired from the payment of tithes on lands which they worked themselves, and which, after 1215, was restricted to *novalia*, see below, pp. 264–5.

¹⁴³ Constable, 'Monastic possession of churches', 312, and *Monastic Tithes from their Origins to the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 1964).

¹⁴⁴ EYC, I, no. 354.

¹⁴⁵ BL Stowe charter 405; cartulary copy in *Cart. Guis.*, II, no. 673. For a similar restitution see EYC, II, no. 729.

Monasteries and the landscape

great numbers. It has shown, as well, that the first of the distinctive ‘twin planks’ of the Cistercian economy, that is, a land-based economy, which rejected *spiritualia* and *temporalia* which involved the labour of others, was, by and large, maintained; its abbeys appear to have acquired few mills and churches before 1215. The evidence from the Yorkshire houses therefore indicates that the Cistercians aimed for a land-based economy, with where possible a balance between arable and pasture, which would clearly depend on the nature of the terrain of the abbey itself and the grange estates. How far those distinctive qualities were carried through in the area of financial exploitation is the subject of the following chapter. In terms of the impact on the landscape, a fuller assessment must await a discussion of the running of monastic estates; however, it can be suggested that although houses of all orders appear to have participated in the colonization of marginal and underexploited areas and in the extension of arable and the area under the plough, it is rightly with Cistercian estates that this activity is most closely associated.