

Chapter 9

FINANCING THE MONASTERY: THE MANAGEMENT OF ECONOMIC RESOURCES

To explore how the various economic assets described in the previous chapter were administered in order to secure a financial basis on which monasteries could survive is not easy given the nature of the source material, and in particular the absence of account rolls, before 1215. However, this chapter aims, on the basis of charter and narrative sources, to construct a picture of the exploitation of monastic estates. In the case of the three independent Black Monk houses, this investigation is aided by the survival of vacancy accounts in the Pipe Rolls from the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. As in the previous chapter the major debating point must be: was there any distinction between the methods used by different houses and groups or orders, and if so, was the divergence due to ideological or geographical factors?

LORDS OF THE MANOR

Despite the debate about the chronology of the Cistercian documents that outline the thinking of the order on economic matters, it is clear that by the time the expansion of the order was under way in England, the White Monks were developing an economy based on direct cultivation of lands using the labour of *conversi*. This, by implication, ruled out the possession of manors and manorial rights, even if the rejection articulated in the '1134' *capitula* was not indeed framed until nearly two decades later. Manorial exploitation was the antithesis of what came to be seen as classic Cistercian practice. The grant of manors was common, however, among the houses of Black Monks, and when the abbot accepted such a grant he became lord of the manor, entitled to the profits of the demesne land, rights over customary tenants, rents and labour services, and the perquisites of lordship, including profits of the manorial court. In practical terms there was little difference between manors under lay control and those under monastic control.

Financing the monastery

There is evidence to suggest that the Yorkshire Benedictines came into possession of manors and vills in considerable numbers; that is, they enjoyed both land and lordship. Selby came early into the control of Selby itself, Hambleton, and Stanford on Avon (Northants.).¹ St Mary's held those of Appleton Wiske, Hornsea, Myton on Swale, and Hutton-le-Hole, and moieties of Skirpenbeck and Bugthorpe;² and Whitby those of Stainsacre, Newholm, Stakesby, and Whitby.³ Among the Augustinians a similar pattern emerges. Kirkham and Bolton, for instance, acquired the manors in which they were located, as well as Whitwell and Westow (Kirkham), and Embsay and Kildwick (Bolton). Bridlington's endowments included the manors and vills of Bessingby and Speeton, and, although it is not termed a manor, the extent of Robert de Brus's endowment in Guisborough makes it likely that this, too, comprised manorial rights.⁴

The lack of specification in twelfth- and early-thirteenth-century charters, and the absence of account rolls, makes any investigation of how these manorial estates were administered – by whom, whether labour services were commuted to money payments, and so on – fraught with uncertainties. Charters yield the names of a few monastic officials – Abraham, marshal and subsequently sergeant of the abbot of St Mary's, and Daniel, steward (*dapifer*) of the abbot,⁵ Walter de Boynton, steward (*senescallus*) of the abbey,⁶ Thomas, steward of Pontefract,⁷ and Eustace, steward (*dapifer*) of Guisborough, who was brother of two priors, Cuthbert and Ralph⁸ – but the nature of their office and their duties are not specified. At Whitby in the late 1170s officials (*ministri*) of the abbey took the fealty of the provost of one of the abbey tenants concerning rights of pannage.⁹

In some cases it is likely that the monastic cell was the physical centre of manorial administration on the lines of the system developed by Cluny. Under this system a parish church acquired by a monastery became the centre of a bloc of estates, and choir monks were placed there to act as 'local agents'.¹⁰ Certainly the outlying church of Hackness, appropriated

¹ EYC, III, no. 1484; *Selby Coucher*, II, no. 1157; *RRAN*, I, no. 178 (possibly spurious).

² EYC, I, no. 354; II, nos. 648, 792; III, no. 1299; IX, no. 6. ³ *Ibid.*, XI, no. 1.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II, nos. 1135, 1140; VII, nos. 17–18, *Cart. Riev.*, no. 216.

⁵ EYC, II, nos. 793, 1050, 1056; see also I, nos. 265, 461, 540.

⁶ *Ibid.*, I–III, *passim*. In the thirteenth century Sir John de Octon, sheriff of York, was steward of the abbey.

⁷ He regularly attested Pontefract charters, described as steward, steward of the monks, or provost of the monks. See, for instance, EYC, III, nos. 1321, 1550, 1555, 1659, 1669–70, 1719, 1771, 1777, 1866.

⁸ *Ibid.*, II, nos. 695, 700, 719; *Cart. Guis.*, I, no. 20. ⁹ *Cart. Whitby*, I, no. 264.

¹⁰ J. Evans, *Monastic Life at Cluny* (Oxford, 1931, repr. 1968), pp. 65–77; Knowles, *Monastic Order*, pp. 134–6, 432–3.

The life within and the world outside

to Whitby, is variously described as a manor and a cell;¹¹ and the York church of All Saints, Fishergate, a royal grant to Whitby and confirmed by successive kings as a cell, had a resident bailiff: between c. 1180 and 1200 there is reference to rent paid for property in Towthorpe under Galtres, to the bailiffs of Whitby Abbey at Fishergate.¹² Whitby's other cells, Goathland and Middlesbrough, were at the centre of groups of churches and estates, and may also have fulfilled an economic function. In the case of St Mary's the Cumbrian 'cells' developed as dependent daughter houses, but the economic basis of Nostell's cells is suggested by Tockwith's maintenance of its own cartulary, although a dual role for the cells, both economic and pastoral, cannot be ruled out.

Undoubtedly the clearest picture of manorial exploitation derives from the inquest of lands of the Knights Templar, compiled c. 1185 and one of only eleven or twelve such surveys extant from the twelfth century.¹³ As a pattern of monastic exploitation of manorial estates the Inquest needs to be used with caution. It was an investigation into the property of an international order, whose western houses, or preceptories, were never intended to be anything more than economic units. Moreover the organization of the Yorkshire folios is, as Beatrice Lees demonstrated, confused, with some entries transposed. However, the Inquest is an invaluable guide for assessing how Templar lands were acquired, the location of demesne and assized lands, the obligations of tenants, the rents agreed, and Templar ownership of mills and churches.

The Yorkshire material appears to have been organized around the holdings in the three ridings, and into further subgroups. Of the three groups which made up the North Riding estates, group I included the three preceptories of Penhill, Cowton, and Stanghow, and a proportion of estates (the two carucates in Penhill and four out of six in Temple Cowton) was retained in demesne.¹⁴ Group III estates were similarly split between those held in demesne and those held by tenants,¹⁵ whereas group II estates were all leased for money rents.¹⁶ The West Riding estates were divided into two groups centred on the preceptories of

¹¹ By the fourteenth century and in common with other Whitby estates it comes to be referred to as a grange: see B. Waites, 'The monastic grange as a factor in the settlement of north-east Yorkshire', *YAJ*, 40 (1959–62), 627–56 (p. 629).

¹² EYC, I, no. 165; *Cart. Whitby*, I, no. 236.

¹³ PRO, Exchequer, *Misc. Books*, series I (E 164), 16, printed in *Records of the Templars in England in the Twelfth Century*, ed. B. A. Lees, British Academy Records of Social and Economic History, 9 (1935). It was used to famous effect by M. M. Postan, 'The chronology of labour services', reprinted from *TRHS*, 4th series, 20 (1937), 169–93, in W. E. Minchinton, *Essays in Agrarian History* (Newton Abbot, 1968), I, 73–91. For a detailed description of the Yorkshire evidence see Burton, 'Knights Templar in Yorkshire'.

¹⁴ *Records*, pp. 119–20. ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 129–31.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 120–3, 127–9 (entries transposed).

Financing the monastery

Temple Newsam and Temple Hirst. There was a core of demesne land around Temple Newsam, and the nearby church of Whitkirk was also held in demesne. In Temple Newsam two mills were retained as demesne, the rest of the property being held by tenants.¹⁷ In the East Riding there were two groups of estates apparently unconnected to a preceptory.¹⁸ In Allerthorpe one carucate out of the six granted by Richard de Morville was in demesne, and the remainder leased.¹⁹ In group II all except three carucates were leased to tenants.²⁰

The Inquest leaves many questions unanswered, not least the relationship between the estates and the preceptories. The pattern which seems to emerge, however, is that of relatively small areas being worked in demesne, notably around the preceptories of Cowton, Penhill, Stanghow, Temple Hirst, and Temple Newsam, and the remainder leased to tenants for a combination of money rents and service.²¹ There was considerable variation in the balance between the two. In Newbiggin in the West Riding tenants owed yearly anywhere from 2s 6d to 5s per bovat; 2 hens and 20 eggs; 4 boon works, twice to plough with one man, twice to harrow, once to mow, once to make hay; to repair the mill pond when necessary, and to draw in the mill stones; to wash sheep one day and shear another. The cottars owed 12d for twelve acres, 1 hen, 10 eggs, and 4 boon works, and the other services owed by those holding one bovat.²²

There is only one indication in the Yorkshire folios that the Templars leased their estates *ad firmam*, that is, farmed their estate for a money rent. The *summa* for Allerthorpe is followed by the sentence 'Hic est redditus assisus qui fuit antequam Alwerthorp esset ad firmam' ('this is the assized rent as it was before Allerthorpe was farmed').²³ The general conclusion must therefore be that the majority of the widespread Templar lands in the county were manorial; that is, they comprised demesne and tenanted land (assized land), held for a combination of money rents and labour services on the demesne. Extra income came from mills: the third mill of Newsam was rented collectively by the men of the vill for 20s, and the Castle Mills of York, and the mills of Faxfleet and elsewhere yielded an annual rent.²⁴ Income also came from rights over manorial tenants: in Cold Kirby it was recorded that at the death of a tenant a third of his goods went to the lord of the manor.²⁵ The master had control over his free tenants: in Skelton the acre held by Jordan had been taken back by

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 117–19, 127.

¹⁸ No ER preceptory is recorded before 1185; by the early fourteenth century there were two, York and Faxfleet.

¹⁹ *Records*, pp. 123–4. ²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 125–6, 131–2.

²¹ Cold Kirby appears to be the only estate held in demesne where there was no preceptory (p. 130).

²² *Records*, pp. 117–18. ²³ *Ibid.*, p. 124; cf. Finchingfield (Essex), p. 12.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 127, 131–2, 134. ²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 130.

The life within and the world outside

the Templars when the tenant had failed, because of poverty, to pay the rent; while in Allerthorpe the master *per cartam* had freed Arngar of his customary rent and service.²⁶ This suggests a heavy degree of involvement and direct exploitation from the preceptories.

The Survey is the most comprehensive picture of manorial life which we have from Yorkshire before 1215. Indeed, for Lees it evoked 'an organized village life, a self-respecting peasantry, little burdened by compulsory service' developing under the guidance of the Templars – an assessment which does not sit well with the complaints of excessive exactions by the Templars recorded in the *Meaux Chronicle*.²⁷ However, given the international character of the order, how much can be extrapolated from the Templar survey about monastic administration of manorial estates in Yorkshire generally? The vast majority of surviving charters are those which convey land to the religious orders, and only occasionally do these specify that the grant included the service of tenants or peasants. Adam son of Peter, for instance, granted to Selby land in Langley, Tranmoor, and Brayton, with one villein and his land.²⁸ William Paynel of Hooton Pagnell granted land there to the Knights Hospitaller with pasture, the mill and multure, boon work for the repair of the mill, two villeins, and Gamel son of Arthur and his family.²⁹ In other charters donors of assets promised that they would continue to render service. William son of Roger de Caratil, for instance, granted to the canons of Guisborough two carucates of land in Moredale (Guisborough) for 40s per annum, and for fraternity for his family; the canons in return granted him licence to dig turf where they did, for which he would render the customary boon works which his father had performed in the time of Prior William (d. by 1139).³⁰

The major question must be: in the period before 1215 did the Yorkshire Benedictine and Augustinian houses – those which appear to have been the recipients of manorial lands – manage them directly, as the Templars appear to have done, or put them to farm for fixed money rents; and if the latter, did they then participate in the trend towards high or direct farming associated with the period after 1180? Here I am concerned with rural rather than urban properties, which will be the subject of the next section.

The monastery for which most evidence survives is St Mary's, York. Under Abbot Geoffrey (c. 1119–c. 1138) estates held by the abbey in at least seven places were farmed. In Caythorpe four carucates were granted *in firmo feudo* to Siward for an annual rent of 20 ores (2 marks); before 1130 the town of Dalby was granted *in feudo et hereditate* to Hugh de Flam-

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 118–19, 124. ²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. ccxiii; *Chron. Melsa*, I, 161–2. ²⁸ *EYC*, III, no. 1738.

²⁹ For the grants of this donor to the Knights, see *EYC*, VI, nos. 139–44, 154–5.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, II, no. 755, dated by Farrer to between 1160 and 1180.

Financing the monastery

maville for 25s per annum and common tallage when demanded, as rendered by the other lands of St Mary's; Richard d'Orival granted St Mary's three carucates in East Lilling and two and a half in Fimber, and the abbot and convent, at his request, granted it to his kinsman, Gilbert, *in feudo et jure hereditario*. Similar farms were granted in Foston, Fulford, and Hutton-le-Hole. The rents were to be paid twice yearly, usually at Whitsuntide and Martinmas, but in the case of the Caythorpe estate at Rogation and the feast of St Peter ad Vincula.³¹

Under Abbot Savaric (c. 1138–61) the policy appears to have accelerated. Peter de Fauconberg received three carucates and the site of a mill *in feudo et hereditate*, for one mark for all service and for homage *pro hac tenura* and fealty sworn on the four gospels.³² In Fimber estates were restored to Bertram Haget, Asketil, and John son of Wihard, which had been held by their kin, and the abbot confirmed the subinfeudation of part of the vill by John son of Wihard to John son of Gamel.³³ Alan son of Walter was enfeoffed of the manor of Kirby Misperton to hold for 10s yearly for all service, and the chapter attested that his father had done homage for this land and received it with a knife from Abbot Stephen (d. 1112).³⁴ A number of charters are more specific: two acres in Fulford were leased to a tenant 'in vita sua' ('during his lifetime'), and the agreement was to last 'quamdiu se legaliter habuerit erga nos et bene reddiderit predictum censum' ('for as long as he acts according to law towards us and renders the aforesaid rent').³⁵

Under Abbot Clement freeholders (*franctenentes*) were enfeoffed of lands in Fulford, Skelton, Stokesley, Sunderlandwick, Myton on Swale, Gilling in Ryedale, Hornsea, Acaster Selby, Shipton, Bolton on Swale, Burneston, Croft on Tees, Danby, Finghall, Gilmonby, Hornby, Foggathorpe, Hessle, and Langthorne.³⁶ When a lessee, Warin, was enfeoffed with land in Gilmonby for an annual payment of 12s and provision of a suitable guest house for the abbot and monks and their servants visiting the area, an additional clause stated that if the abbot and convent wished to lease the two bovates of land which they had retained in their own hands (i.e., in demesne), Warin was to hold them under the same conditions as the six he already held.³⁷ No evidence survives on this scale for the other Benedictine

³¹ EYC, II, no. 1063; I, nos. 340, 460, 637; IV, no. 105; York Minster Library, D & C MS A2, fo. 159.

³² EYC, I, no. 540. ³³ *Ibid.*, I, no. 627–30.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, I, no. 602. For similar grants in Rudston and Hessay, see *ibid.*, nos. 455, 528.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, I, no. 325.

³⁶ See, for instance, EYC, I, nos. 330, 342–4, 423, 563; II, nos. 681, 794–5; III, nos. 1878–80; IV, nos. 88, 107–8, 119; V, nos. 189, 219, 281, 331, 349, 355–6; XII, nos. 12, 20; BL Stowe charter 444, leasing the churches of Foxholes and Butterwick, with the tithes, to William the cleric, in return for 7 silver marks per annum and hospitality for the abbot when he should visit those places.

³⁷ EYC, IV, no. 107. Warin was bound to provide, in the guest house, fire, straw, hay, and grass for the horses.

The life within and the world outside

houses, although leases do exist. Whitby was certainly farming some of its estates in Ugglebarnby and Everley;³⁸ and there is limited evidence that Pontefract, too, leased out some of its lands.³⁹

There is an indication of the relative values of sources of Benedictine revenues from vacancy accounts: from Selby following the death of Abbot Gilbert de Vere (1183), from Whitby for 1181–2/3 and 1212 to 1214, following the deaths of Abbots Richard II and Peter, and from St Mary's, York for 1184–5 and 1185–6, following the death of Abbot Clement.⁴⁰ The Pipe Rolls indicate that in the two years leading up to Michaelmass 1185 the income of Selby was as follows:

£259 7s od	from assized farms of the abbey manors (that is, rents from tenants)
£15 6s 8d	from Nor[. . .] and the abbey treasury
£3 2s 2d	from pannage from the woods
£25 1s 6d	from pleas and perquisites (judicial)
£23 15s od	from the sale of hides, cheese and beans

This represents a total income of £325 18s 4d [*sic*], of which £215 16s 3d was expended by the receiver on food and clothing for the monks, and a further sum on payment to servants, expenses on manors, and purchase of lands.⁴¹ The balance (around £110) went to the royal treasury. In 1187–8 Hugh Murdac and Ernisius de Neville rendered account of £245 19s 2d from the manors of Selby for the previous two years, £115 19s 2d derived from the church of Snaith and pensions from other churches, and £27 0s 5½d from perquisites. Of the total of £388 18s 9d, £103 was paid into the treasury and the remainder expended on food for the monks and servants residing at the abbey (£221 11s 3d), on clothing for the monks (£38 10s), to the sacrist (£13 15s), on wages of servants on the abbey manors (£11 8s 10d), and on maintaining the horses of the king and their keepers (£1 15s 7½d). There was some inconsistency in Selby's annual income (on average between £165 and £195), but the higher figure in 1187–8 may be due to the inclusion of *spiritualia*, which do not appear in the earlier account. The bulk of Selby's income appears to have derived from the farm of manorial lands, although income from churches in 1187–8 was considerable.

The vacancy accounts for Whitby for 1180–1 and 1181–2 give no details beyond recording the sums of 50 marks (£33 6s 8d) and £104 3s 1d paid into the treasury in 1181 and 1182 respectively after the purchase

³⁸ See, for instance, *Cart. Whitby*, I, no. 264.

³⁹ EYC, III, nos. 1752, 1758; *Cart. Pont.*, II, p. 582 and no. 315.

⁴⁰ See HRH, pp. 69, 78, 84; *Pipe Roll 31 Henry II*, p. 79, *Pipe Roll 34 Henry II*, p. 1 (Selby); *Pipe Roll 27 Henry II*, p. 50, *Pipe Roll 28 Henry II*, p. 62, *Rotuli litterarum patentium 1201–1216* (Record Commission, 1835), pp. 94, 96, 108, *Pipe Roll 14 John*, p. 5 (Whitby); these accounts are noted in EYC, I, 370–1, II, 232–4. For the York accounts see *Pipe Roll 31 Henry II*, pp. 77–8, *Pipe Roll 32 Henry II*, pp. 84–5. ⁴¹ The amount is unknown because of damage to the manuscript.

Financing the monastery

of food and clothes – the sum for 1181–2 being remarkably consistent with that of Selby. There exists a second account for the years between 1206 and 1209 for which there is no obvious explanation – there was no vacancy at the time but it may have been related to the quarrel between Abbot Peter and the town – during which William de Wrotham, arch-deacon of Taunton, rendered account.⁴² The net issue after purchases and expenses at the abbey and on its manor houses was £414 1s 9d, again roughly £100 per annum.⁴³ Fuller details survive from the vacancy account for the two years between Michaelmas 1210 and 1212, when Henry de Radman and Gilbert Fitz Reinfrid acted as receivers. The income of the abbey was as follows:

£205 2s 8d	from rents from assized lands and the farm of mills
£17 13s 4d	from fisheries
£28 9s 6d	from the profits of the forests
£99 3s 6d	from the farm and pensions of churches
£51 7s 8d	from pleas and perquisites of courts
£4 10s 6d	from the sale of wool, lambs, and small tithes
£6 5s 4½d	the profits of Ugglebarnby. ⁴⁴

Of this income (£412 12s 6½d), a sum of £161 18s 6d was deducted for the food and clothing of the monks; £20 was expended in pensions; and there remained £230 14s 0½d for the Crown. Roughly half Whitby's income, therefore, derived from its manors and mills, a quarter from its churches, and a quarter from forest, fishery, the perquisites of courts, and the sale of surplus produce (roughly one-hundredth of the income).⁴⁵

The vacancy accounts from St Mary's for the financial years 1184–5 and 1185–6 are more complex and give fuller details of expenditure. At Michaelmas 1185 Godfrey de Lucy rendered account of £14 4s 4d from the remainder of the farms of the abbey in the time of the abbot (Clement, who died in August 1184). He also accounted for:

£28 1s 8d	remaining from the <i>auxilium</i> promised to the abbot
-----------	--

⁴² On him see F. W. Brooks, 'William de Wrotham and the office of keeper of the king's ports and galleys', *EHR*, 40 (1925), 570–9.

⁴³ Farrer (*BYC*, II, 233) assumed a vacancy from 1206 to 1213, but Abbot Peter was evidently still alive in 1211. For the accounts of 1206–9 see *Pipe Roll 11 John*, p. 124. The expenses also included those on the horses and dogs of the king. In the roll for Devon William accounted for the tin mines of Devon and Cornwall: it was recorded: 'et in suo superplus quod habet in compoto abbacie de Whitebi de anno preterito cccc et iiij li(bras) et viij d. Et habet de superplus cccc et iiij li(bras) et viij d' ('and in surplus which he has in the account of the abbey of Whitby from the previous year £404 8d. And he has in surplus £404 8d')(p. 145). The account for Whitby for 12 John, Michaelmas 1210, is badly damaged (p. 219).

⁴⁴ One of the abbey manors, about 3 miles south-west of the monastery.

⁴⁵ These may be compared with the abbey accounts from the late fourteenth century: see *Cart. Whitby*, II, 553–85.

The life within and the world outside

£194 7s 5d	from the farms of the abbey manors and the free tenants and mills, for the whole year
£116 3s 7d	from tithes and churches paying an annual pension
£81 9s 0d	from aids, pleas and <i>gersum</i>
£2 0s 0d	relief from Alexander and Thomas de Etton
£31 9s 9d	from grain, wool and other sales
£467 15s 9d	TOTAL [<i>sic</i>]
The abbey expenses were:	
£46 13s 4d	to the court of the chamber, by the king's order
£20	same
£4 7s 0d	for the clothes of almspeople (<i>prebendarios</i>) each year
£4 9s 0d	for the works of the church, this year
£1 11s 4d	to the precentor for the making of books for the church
£10 11s 8d	to the sacrist for lights, vestments, and church ornaments
£36 17s 2d	to the chamberlain for the clothes of the monks
£157 17s 2d	to the sustenance of the monks
£14 7s 9d	to the cellarer for the monks' food
£22 3s 2d	for turves, and for hiring ships to carry wood for the abbey fires, and to collect hay, and for utensils for the offices of the abbey
£19 15s 0d	for wages for the abbey servants
£38 17s 4d	for food and wages for servants in the manors and working the abbey lands
£3 10s 0d	to the provost of Beverley for service on land in Poppleton
£0 12s 0d	to Josce the Jew of York as a pledge which he holds in Hessay on the land of Thomas, who owes £84 14s 10d
£5 5s 8d	in old money to the monks of the church to make a chalice and a gospel book (<i>textus</i>) in the service of the church, on the order of the king

The receiver owed £79 9s 2d, and rendered account of the debt. The accounts for 1186–7 show only minor variations.

It is clear from these sets of accounts that the three independent Benedictine houses in the county were subsisting in much the same way. Their income derived from the farms of manors, from judicial pleas, and from the exercise of lordship, which brought them payments for relief and custody. There is no indication that the Yorkshire houses were participating in the direct exploitation of estates which was beginning to be characteristic of southern and midland houses.⁴⁶

⁴⁶ This was a slow process, and at houses such as Westminster took a long time to implement: see Burton, *Monastic and Religious Orders*, pp. 250–2, for some examples.

Financing the monastery

URBAN LANDLORDS

It was demonstrated in the previous chapter that a number of Yorkshire religious houses obtained considerable urban property, particularly in York. Those houses which were located at a distance from the city would presumably have retained some property in their own hands to accommodate an abbot or prior when he visited York, or officials on business, although the canons of Malton preferred to use suburban property for their visits and continued to lease their urban tenements.⁴⁷ As early as the '1134 codification' the Cistercians had conceded that their abbeys might acquire urban property, but laid down that no monks nor *conversi* should reside there.⁴⁸ In the case of houses which themselves had an urban or suburban location, the widespread leasing brought in considerable revenue. As is to be expected, St Mary's was the largest monastic urban landlord, and its cartulary bears witness to the practice of leasing.⁴⁹ Under Abbot Geoffrey messuages in Fossgate were rented out, and under his successor, properties in Ousegate, Bretgate, and St Saviourgate. By the time of Abbot Clement (1161–84) property all over York was being rented to tenants, usually for life only; only those in Bootham, just outside the city and adjoining the abbey, brought in labour services as well as money rent.⁵⁰ Tenants included Josce the Jew, who paid 4s yearly for a messuage in Fossgate, and Gerard son of Lewin, who leased a messuage in the churchyard of St Michael Spurriergate for 16s.⁵¹ Leasing of urban properties was a lucrative, if for most houses not a large, proportion of their income.⁵²

If lordship over manors was a source of revenue, then so too was lordship over towns, not merely possession of urban property, but powers such as control over entry and exit, communication, the transfer of property, and the issue of justice. The clearest evidence of a northern monastic borough derives from Whitby. The vill and port had been granted to the monks by the founder of the abbey, and royal and archiepiscopal charters had confirmed the monks in their considerable liberties, including a fair at the feast of St Hilda, the seaport, and seaweed along the strand.⁵³ Some idea of the nature of, and income from, the

⁴⁷ See above, pp. 234–5. For Malton see Golding, *Gilbert of Sempringham*, p. 438.

⁴⁸ Canivez, *Statuta*, I, 30 (no. 71). In 1189 the chapter attempted to limit Cistercian urban property to one house per abbey in any given town: *ibid.*, p. 112 (no. 11).

⁴⁹ See especially Manchester, John Rylands Library Latin MSS 220–221; EYC, I *passim*.

⁵⁰ EYC, I, nos. 310–12; John Rylands Library Latin MSS 220–221, fos. 123r–125v; the service included finding one man in the autumn for hay making.

⁵¹ John Rylands Library Latin MSS 220–221, fos. 100r–101r.

⁵² For the rents due from the York property of the religious orders c. 1230, see PRO E/25/1.

⁵³ For this grant by Henry II: EYC, II, no. 870.

The life within and the world outside

monastery's urban lordship can be derived from the charter which Abbot Richard and the convent granted to the burgesses of Whitby, probably between 1175 and 1181. This appears to have been an unusually early recognition, by a monastic landlord, of the growing corporate spirit of townspeople, for it granted considerable liberties to them.⁵⁴ They were allowed free laws and privileges; rights to common pasture; and four roads by which they could enter and leave the borough. The obligations which were due from them were: 5d yearly from every toft, half payable at Whitsuntide and half at Martinmas; to offer any land for sale to the abbot for first refusal, and, if he did not wish to purchase it, to obtain his consent to the sale (the purchaser, on receiving seisin, was to pay 4d to the abbey and 1d to the burgesses); and to attend the three yearly hearings of pleas, at Epiphany, Easter, and the feast of St Hilda.⁵⁵ However, Richard's successor, Abbot Peter, saw the liberties granted by the abbey as detrimental to its own interests, and challenged its right to make such a grant. In 1199 he offered 100 marks if the burgesses ceased using the charter which they had been granted until its validity had been tested in the king's court, and by 1201 had proved his case. The position of the abbey as lord of the town clearly brought sizeable profits which the granting of liberties to its burgesses would undermine.

THE CISTERCIAN GRANGE

The *Exordium parvum* and statutes contain several important statements about economic practice. Two of these were discussed in the previous chapter; the third introduced the principles of Cistercian land management: estates were to be administered through granges, run by lay brothers. Granges were to be no more than one day's journey (*dieta*) from the mother house, thus allowing the *conversi* to hear mass regularly and monks to visit the grange and return within the day, safeguarding their vow of stability. No women were allowed within the grange, and further rulings regulated the minimum distance deemed appropriate between granges.⁵⁶ The grange system accordingly allowed for economic activity while preserving monastic discipline. Its novelty lay in the consolidation of estates for the greater efficiency of management and in the reliance on *conversi* and hired labour rather than manorial services. Initially a Cistercian house might fail to attract any but local attention and its early estates were usually within a fairly small distance from the abbey. As they

⁵⁴ For monastic borough lords generally see N. M. Trenholme, *The English Monastic Boroughs* (Columbia, Miss., 1927).

⁵⁵ EYC, II, no. 886; see also pp. 232–4.

⁵⁶ Canivez, *Statuta*, I, 14 (no. 8), 20 (no. 32), 29 (no. 68), 30 (no. 72), 45 (no. 1), 60 (no. 3).

Financing the monastery

widened their circle of benefactors and patrons the monks were able to expand into new areas, and to consolidate existing holdings. It was at this stage that a grange was established, the word applying both to the estate and to the buildings at its centre.

The creation of the Cistercian grange

The eight Yorkshire houses created among them by 1215 a total of 83 granges.⁵⁷ In his pioneering article of 1936 Bishop argued that a distinctive feature of Yorkshire granges was the speed with which they were established.⁵⁸ The table on pages 274–6 bears out his assessment: most Cistercian granges were in existence by 1215, and many a good deal earlier. Even allowing for the difficulties of precise dating (the thirteen granges of Fountains of which the first record is the 1199 confirmation of Richard I, for instance, may have been created some years earlier), we can be confident that Fountains, Kirkstall, Byland, and Meaux embarked on a programme of grange creation within ten years, Rievaulx within twenty and Sallay and Roche within thirty years.

Frequently, though not always, the earliest grange to be established was the home grange. That of Meaux was created by the depopulation of the existing vill of *Melsa* ('ubi ipsum villa seu manerium de Melsa fuerat situatum extat modo grangia nostra quae Northgrangia nuncupatur' ('in that place where the same vill or manor of Meaux was located, there now exists our grange which is called North Grange')) and was confirmed as 'grangia juxta abbatiam' ('the grange near the abbey') in 1154. The *Historia* of Byland Abbey records the reduction of the vill of Old Byland to a grange following the abandonment of the site in 1147, and this was also the fate of the former abbey sites of Kirkstall (at Barnoldswick) and Jervaulx (Dale). In addition to these, both the abbey and the home grange of Sallay evidently involved some depopulation. The creation, between 1147 and 1167, of Rievaulx's home grange at Griff may have involved the displacement of population, since Everard de Ros confirmed as one of the boundaries of his assart and woodland 'the ancient road by which the men of the vill of Griff used to go to the mill of Sproxton'.⁵⁹

⁵⁷ For a pioneer study of the Yorkshire grange, see T. A. M. Bishop, 'Monastic granges in Yorkshire', *EHR*, 51 (1936), 193–214, 758. This has been extended and amplified through the researches in particular of Waites, 'Monastic grange'; Colin Platt, *The Monastic Grange in Medieval England: A Reassessment* (London, 1969); R. A. Donkin, 'The Cistercian grange in England in the 12th and 13th centuries, with special reference to Yorkshire', *Studia Monastica*, 6 (1964), 95–144, and *The Cistercians*. For a discussion of Gilbertine granges see Golding, *Gilbert of Sempringham*, pp. 394–419.

⁵⁸ Bishop, 'Monastic grange', 200. ⁵⁹ *Cart. Riev.*, no. 44.

The life within and the world outside

There is some evidence that elsewhere lands were cleared of their peasant settlers to make way for a grange. When, between 1190 and 1193, the monks of Kirkstall lost the important grange of Cliviger to Richard son of Eland, Abbot Lambert accepted from the abbey patron, Robert de Lacy, the vill of Accrington. The inhabitants were expropriated and a grange created; the ill-feeling which ensued led to the burning of the grange and the killing of three *conversi*.⁶⁰ When the monks of Sallay were granted land in Acreland they had to promise that those working the land would be allowed to finish the growing season.⁶¹ At Thorpe Underwood Geoffrey Haget, brother of the abbot, granted the whole vill, evidently displacing the rural population; a grange was in existence by 1199.⁶² The grant to Roche of Little Todwick and whatever belonged to the vill suggests that depopulation took place in order to create the abbey grange of Todwick. In all these places – and others – it is likely that the displaced *rustici* were recruited as *conversi* or hired labour, like the tenants at Revesby who, on the foundation, were given the choice of remaining or obtaining new lands.⁶³ In other instances benefactors granted labour services and villeins which secured the transfer of land held by unfree tenants and provided the basis for hired labour. Roger de Mowbray's grant to Rievaulx of Welburn, which later became part of Angram grange, included all the *rustici* who wished to remain rather than depart.⁶⁴ Byland accepted from Roger, Alfnaf his man of Kirkby Malzeard, and from Fulk Paynel the service of Robert son of Henry and his heirs in Nether Silton. The monks of Kirkstall received one carucate of land in Cliviger with all the villeins there, Siward the carpenter *cum tota sequela sua*, and the services of Hugh son of David de Tong.⁶⁵

The previous chapter drew attention to the clearance of new lands by the Cistercians. Both Rievaulx and Fountains lay close to areas which in 1086 contained 'conspicuous clusters of wasted and low-value holdings'.⁶⁶ Although the degree of recovery by the 1130s is uncertain, it is significant that, as Donkin calculated, between 50 per cent and 60 per cent of the granges of these two abbeys lay in areas waste or mostly waste in 1086.⁶⁷ The most important of these was Rievaulx's Pickering grange. In 1157 Henry II ordered royal officials to make recognition of the waste below Pickering, and to cause the monks to be put in possession of it; his charter of 1158, which granted the waste to the monks,

⁶⁰ *Foundation of Kirkstall*, pp. 183–4. ⁶¹ *Mon. Ang.*, v, 515, *Cart. Sallay*, i, no. 207.

⁶² *Memorials of Fountains*, i, 125; *Cart. Fount.*, ii, 718–19, nos. 3–6.

⁶³ *Mon. Ang.*, v, 454–5, no. 1. ⁶⁴ *EYC*, ix, no. 152.

⁶⁵ *Mowbray Charters*, no. 66; *EYC*, vi, no. 43; *Kirkstall Coucher*, nos. 275, 296; *EYC*, iii, no. 1766; cf. the remarks of Hill, *English Cistercian Monasteries*, p. 67.

⁶⁶ Donkin, *The Cistercians*, p. 57; see above, pp. 224–7.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 58; the Yorkshire average was 44 per cent.

Financing the monastery

was renewed between 1176 and 1179 'ut infra ipsas divisas domos et bercharias aedificant et terram colant et exercent per totum sicut eis placuerit' ('so that they shall build houses and sheepfolds there and cultivate the land, and use it throughout as they wish').⁶⁸ In 1206 the grange is recorded by the name of Kekmarish, and by 1307 there was a second grange below Pickering at Loftmarishes (Allerston). At Cowton grange Earl Conan confirmed the grant of land on Moulton Moor made by his father, including the sixty acres which the monks had assarted since the time of his father.⁶⁹ As Bishop pointed out, the absence in the section of the Fountains cartulary containing the Bramley charters of any quitclaims suggests that the grange was established in previously uncultivated lands.⁷⁰ The Cistercians created granges both by depopulation and by the clearance of new lands, sometimes a combination of both.

Consolidation of granges

The granges of Rievaulx below Pickering were, because of the unencumbered nature of the land, quickly consolidated. In other areas tenurial complexity meant that gaining complete control took longer. The speed with which granges were apparently created may therefore be deceptive. It is significant that when accepting grants of land in a new area, monks might seek licence to obtain further parcels by grant, purchase, and exchange.⁷¹ To give a full account of the consolidation of their granges by the Yorkshire Cistercians is not possible here. A useful example of the process is provided by Meaux Abbey, which is unusually well documented both in its charters and in the chronicle of Thomas Burton, who was able to list the lands acquired and the granges created under successive abbots.⁷² Granges were begun under the first abbot, Adam (1150–60), of which one, the North Grange, has already been mentioned. A second, Bealeys, was confirmed to the monks as early as 1151, but not retained.⁷³ Blanchemarle Grange (Warter) originated in a grant by Geoffrey Dagon of one carucate called Arras, lying between North Dalton and Warter, 'where no one else ever enjoyed common rights', for which the monks agreed to pay the donor 1 mark per annum as long as he lived. The grant was confirmed by William de Roumare and Agnes his wife, who added sixty acres to the north of the grange which Adam had

⁶⁸ *Cart. Riev.*, p. 261 and nos. 189, 205–10; *EYC*, I, nos. 401–7. ⁶⁹ *EYC*, IV, no. 45.

⁷⁰ Bishop, 'Monastic grange', 214. ⁷¹ See, for example, *Cart. Riev.*, no. 55.

⁷² Burton clearly had access to a cartulary, or a collection of original charters, and perhaps a list of benefactions such as has survived from Rievaulx (for which see *Cart. Riev.*, pp. 260–2).

⁷³ See below, p. 268.

begun; and further pasture and arable land was acquired.⁷⁴ The heirs of Geoffrey were unwilling to relinquish the yearly payment, which continued to be paid to the time of the ninth abbot (1249–69). The grange was extended by the acquisition of pasture lands in Warter and Prestowe ‘infra curtem grangie nostre’ (‘within the court of our grange’).⁷⁵

Salthaugh Grange (Keyingham) initially comprised pasture by the river Humber and one carucate of arable. It was the grant of the founder of the abbey, William of Aumale, but the monks still found it prudent to expend 60 marks in order to compensate those who felt they had a claim before ‘grangiam unam ibidem apud Saltagh incepimus aedificare’ (‘we began to build a grange there at Salthaugh’).⁷⁶ Hayholme Grange was constructed on the ‘holme’ of one carucate of land between Leven and ‘Brystyllia’ granted by Robert de Scures when he became a novice at Meaux (between 1150 and 1160); Burton noted that it was on this site that the *manerium* of the monks was constructed. By 1177 Hayholme was confirmed as a grange, but claims were still being made to it between 1182 and 1197.⁷⁷ Octon Grange was a deliberate purchase. Robert de Octon, former sheriff of York, had become a monk at Meaux. His son, Henry, sold two and a half carucates and the site of the grange to the monks for 40 marks when he left for Jerusalem, and the monks were obliged to perform forinsec service on the land. Godfrey de Harpham, to whom much of the service was due, augmented the grant, and later, when he became a novice at Meaux, quitclaimed the right he had to the land on which the grange was built, the exterior wall which enclosed the court, and the enclosures for the sheep which the monks had built in front of the gate of the grange. Burton hints at the gradual process of consolidation when he stated ‘et ibi tunc continuo grangia est incepta’ (‘and there at that time the grange was begun and continually [expanded]’).⁷⁸

Wharram le Street, the most distant of the abbey granges, was begun with a grant made by William Fossard in compensation for his failure to guarantee to the monks his earlier grant of Bealeys. He therefore granted two carucates of land in Wharram le Street, a spring and a water course to

⁷⁴ *Chron. Melsa*, I, 99, 101–2. The grants (unspecified) of Geoffrey, William de Roumare, and Agnes of Aumale, were confirmed by King Stephen and by Henry II in January 1154; the grange of Blanchemarle was confirmed by Pope Anastasius IV in January 1154: *EYC*, III, nos. 1384–6.

⁷⁵ *Chron. Melsa*, I, 230.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 85–9; Burton claims that the grange was confirmed by King Stephen (p. 87). It was relocated by Abbot William (1249–69) because of inundations of the river. Pasture in Salthaugh was confirmed by Pope Hadrian IV in 1156: *EYC*, III, no. 1388.

⁷⁷ *Chron. Melsa*, I, 96, 221; Burton notes also that Robert was the second man to die during his noviciate. For the confirmation of 1177 see *EYC*, III, no. 1392.

⁷⁸ *Chron. Melsa*, I, 102–3. This is a phrase he also uses to describe the creation of Wawne grange (p. 104). The earliest charter evidence for Octon grange occurs in the bull of Alexander III (1172): *EYC*, III, no. 1391. For the quitclaim of Godfrey see *EYC*, II, no. 1064.

Financing the monastery

bring water to the vill for a mill, which was to be solely for the use of the brethren.⁷⁹ Wharram was confirmed to the monks as a grange in 1172,⁸⁰ and a series of incidents recorded by Abbot Burton indicates how the grange estate was built up in the time of Abbot Philip (1160–82). William Fossard the younger had fallen into debt to Aaron the Jew of Lincoln to the tune of over 1,800 marks (£1,200) and had pledged his lands to him. He then approached the abbot with the suggestion that the abbey take over the debt in return for Wharram, and lands in Bainton and Neswick were offered as pledges. The abbot was at first unwilling, but was tempted by Aaron's offer, that should the abbey take on the debt he would reduce the amount by 500 marks. Philip therefore agreed to pay off a debt of 1,260 marks at the rate of 60 marks a year. However, the death of Aaron shortly afterwards, and the reversion of his debts to the Crown, began a series of disasters for the abbey, for the Crown claimed the full amount of the debt, including the 500 marks which Aaron had remitted. William Fossard, too, denied responsibility and it was only after lengthy litigation that the monks won the case. It was to be a short-lived respite, for in the time of Abbot Alexander (1197–1210) the grange was plundered by Robert de Turnham, the servants and all but two *conversi* expelled, and a number of buildings demolished.⁸¹

Similarly beset by difficulties was Philip's creation of granges in Moor (Beeford), Myton, and Wawne.⁸² Having acquired half a carucate in Moor fields, pasture for 300 sheep in the northern part of Beeford, and a further six acres missing from the initial half carucate, Abbot Philip decided on the creation of a grange and began to construct houses. He faced opposition, however, in particular from the canons of Thornton, who claimed rights of common pasture. In the time of Philip's two successors the canons went so far as to occupy pasture lands right up to the gates of the grange. The grange estate was, however, extended by Abbot Thomas (1182–97). Acer of Beeford granted two sellions in Beeford near to Moor Grange, and five perches within the court, a portion of land to the west of the enclosure, measuring 2 perches by 44 perches, and one to the east, measuring 2 perches by 20, all of which abutted the grange.⁸³ As late as the years between 1197 and 1210 the monks acquired from

⁷⁹ *Chron. Melsa*, I, 103–4; the grange of Bealeys subsequently passed to the nuns of Swine.

⁸⁰ *EYC*, III, no. 1391.

⁸¹ For a detailed description of the episode, see *Chron. Melsa*, I, 175–8, 231–2, 289–91.

⁸² Alexander III confirmed the granges of Wharram, Blanchemarle, Octon, Myton, and Moor in 1172, and Wawne, Salthaugh, Moor, Hayholme, Wharram, and Myton in 1177: *EYC*, III, nos. 1391–2. Donkin ('Cistercian grange', 131) includes Croo as a grange of Meaux by 1182, but although Abbot Philip did acquire lands there, the implication in *Chron. Melsa*, I, 165, is that the grange was a later creation.

⁸³ *Chron. Melsa*, I, 163–4, 225–6.

The life within and the world outside

Amandus son of John de Owstwyk land ‘quam habuit apud grangiam nostram de la More, quam de eodem prius ad terminum tenebamus’ (‘which he had in our grange of Moor, which we formerly held of him for a fixed term’).⁸⁴ For some decades, therefore, the monks had evidently been leasing land within their grange enclosure.

Myton Grange began with the promising grant of four bovates, pasture for 400 sheep, a fishery on the Humber, and two parts of a saltpan as well as the toft where the hall was sited, and in the course of the twelfth century the estate was augmented by exchanges. A monk of Meaux was bequeathed 40 marks by his brother, and when he died the sum was used to purchase one carucate of land in Thorpe near Aldbrough from William de Caux when he became a Templar; this was later exchanged for land in Myton.⁸⁵ The earliest grants of Wawne had been made at the time of the foundation, but repeated and unsuccessful attempts by the monks to secure possession of the church from the abbey of Aumale, and temporary resumptions of grants – made by Henry Murdac – by Archbishop Roger, delayed the implementation of a grange until the 1170s.⁸⁶

Abbot Thomas (1182–97), as we have seen, consolidated holdings around Moor and Hayholme Granges, and he is also recorded as having repaired existing grange buildings while adding new ones.⁸⁷ He is credited with the creation of only one grange, at Tharlesthorpe (Pattrington). Robert the constable, an elderly knight of William of Aumale, took the cross with Richard I, and before departing for the Holy Land he granted, in exchange for 160 marks, all his demesne (500 acres) at Tharlesthorpe, and the capital messuage which became the focus of the grange.⁸⁸ The creation of four granges by Abbot Alexander (1197–1210) is a similar tale of acquisition and consolidation. From grants of just a few bovates of land he began the creation and consolidation of granges in Arnold and Was-sand, and Innocent III also confirmed Arram and Skerne as granges.⁸⁹ Finally, Abbot Hugh (1210–20) bought three bovates of land in Routh for 20 marks, and with a grant of a further half carucate began the construction of a grange.⁹⁰ After 1215 few granges were added to the estates of Meaux. The story of the first sixty-five years of the abbey’s existence, in terms of its economy, is one of mixed fortunes. As we will see, there were times when the monks suffered severe financial crises.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 309–10.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 168–9, 220. By the fourteenth century the grange had been devastated by floods.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 83–4, 93–5, 178, 217–18. On the significance of their attempts to secure the church see below, p. 267.

⁸⁷ *Chron. Melsa*, I, 217.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, I, 220. Pattrington is now a lost vill: see EPNS, *ER*, p. 25, recording the inundation and disappearance of Tharlesthorpe in the fourteenth century, described in *Chron. Melsa*, III, 183, 243.

⁸⁹ *Chron. Melsa*, I, 329. ⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, I, 362–5.

Financing the monastery

However, these years are also ones of remarkable persistence and tenacity. By grants (some linked to the entry of a novice), purchase, and exchange the monks of Meaux built up a series of classic Cistercian granges, which they enclosed and hedged by ditches and dykes. Even allowing for the unusually rich and detailed records which make Meaux uniquely well documented, the achievement of the abbots of Meaux was a remarkable one, and one which left its imprint on the landscape of the East Riding.

The nature of the documentary sources for the other Yorkshire Cistercian abbeys does not permit such a full reconstruction of the consolidation of the grange estates. However, there is sufficient to suggest that the monks did not always wait to acquire the whole of their estate before creating a grange, and the notion of the Cistercian grange agriculture being practised in isolation from lay agriculture must be modified. Just as at Meaux's granges of Blanchemarle, Oulton, and Moor, the laity held land within the grange court or enclosure for years after the creation of the grange, so at granges of Fountains and Kirkstall lay and monastic landowners apparently worked side by side, at least until the monks were able to buy out their rivals. In 1172 Fountains and John son of Fulk reached a final concord concerning a ditch or embankment which John had constructed outside the gate of the grange of Kirk Hammerton, and land which he ploughed between the gate of the grange and the road.⁹¹ At Kirkstall's grange of Bessacar a lay person held land within the court of the grange in the monks' enclosure next to the bercary and the croft in front of the gate and within the alder grove of the monks.⁹² One charter at least shows the monks of Fountains collaborating with neighbouring lay persons in the clearance of lands at their grange of Long Marston, for it referred to the assart which the monks, with their collaborators (*participibus*) had caused to be cleared at their own expense.⁹³ The Cistercian desire to cultivate their lands in isolation from lay agriculture, reiterated in 1214, was evidently not easy to achieve in practice.⁹⁴ The Yorkshire Cistercians, however, embarked on an ambitious programme of grange creation from their very beginning. The establishment, by Fountains Abbey, of granges at Warsill, Sutton, Cayton, Cowton, Dacre, and Aldburgh⁹⁵ within ten years of the abbey being absorbed into the Cistercian order bears striking testimony to the rapid recovery of its fortunes after 1135 and the administrative skill of its personnel.

The siting of a grange to some extent depended on the land which benefactors were willing to give, and this, along with the possibilities for

⁹¹ EYC, II, no. 738. ⁹² *Ibid.*, II, no. 823. ⁹³ *Cart. Fount.*, II, 522–3, no. 20.

⁹⁴ Canivez, *Statuta*, I, 428–9 (no. 58).

⁹⁵ Aldburgh had been intended as the site for a new abbey: see above, p. 107.

The life within and the world outside

future expansion and consolidation, in turn conditioned whether abbeys observed the ruling that granges should be within a *dieta* of the mother house. In many cases this was observed. Of the granges of Fountains, only those of Bradley, Wheldrake, Busby, and Eston lay more than – and very little more than – twenty miles from the abbey. Although, as Waddell has pointed out, monks and *conversi* travelling by horse rather than on foot could cover a fair distance,⁹⁶ the Westmorland granges of Byland, for instance, would have infringed the regulations. The willingness of Byland to undertake expansion there was conditioned by its relatively unexploited state and the absence of other monastic interests in the area.

Indeed, the lands acquired by Byland in the vicinity of the abbey led to clashes with the nearby monastery of Rievaulx, some four miles away.⁹⁷ Before 1145 Byland had been forced to concede to Rievaulx the right to make a ditch across their land at the foot of Ashberry Hill.⁹⁸ A more extensive agreement highlights the problems caused by the proximity of estates in three areas: Rievaulx's grange of Griff and Byland's lands in Deepdale, as well as lands both houses enjoyed in Scawton; Hesketh Grange (Rievaulx) and Old Byland Grange; and between the West Riding industrial sites of Rievaulx at Shitlington and Byland at Emley.⁹⁹ Also enjoying interests in the same areas as Rievaulx was Malton, whose canons the monks of Rievaulx accused of encroaching on the waste land below Pickering.¹⁰⁰ The competing interests of Rievaulx and Fountains in Cleveland led to an investigation and a decision, confirmed by the abbots of Cîteaux and Clairvaux, that the granges of both houses should remain where they were at present located, but no encroachment of lands or fishing rights was to be made.¹⁰¹

Types of granges

It was Bishop's judgement that most granges were predominantly arable; indeed, he pointed to the derivation of the word 'grange' and its association with granary. However, recent research has modified his view, and demonstrated that granges could have been the focus of varied economic activity depending on their location, the terrain, and the nature of the monks' interests. As we have seen with Meaux, many granges comprised a mixture of pastoral and arable lands. Other granges were more specialized. In 1176 Roger de Mowbray granted the monks of Fountains a

⁹⁶ Waddell, 'Cistercian institutions', 30.

⁹⁷ The second site of Byland, at Old Byland, occupied between 1142 and 1147, was only one mile from Rievaulx.

⁹⁸ *Cart. Riev.*, no. 244. ⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, no. 243 (1147 × 67). ¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, no. 267.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, no. 241. No granges are named but the coastal location suggests Eston (Fountains) and Normanby (Rievaulx).

Financing the monastery

road leading from Aldburgh, where they had a grange, to the moor between Swinton and Nidderdale, for their cattle, and by the thirteenth century the whole of Nidderdale was devoted to cattle farming.¹⁰² There is reference to a cattle station on the Fountains grange of Baldersby.¹⁰³ The moorland granges of Byland and Rievaulx were predominantly given over to sheep farming, and the frequent reference to *bercarie* on the grange estates of Meaux shows their importance in the region of Holderness. At Allerston, associated with the Marishes granges of Rievaulx, one grant alone conveyed to the monks pasture for 500 sheep and the enclosure of a sheepfold, while the donor reserved for himself the right to take dung.¹⁰⁴

In the Tees valley the granges of Fountains and Rievaulx were probably mainly occupied with the production of salt and the farming of fish. At Normanby Rievaulx received pasture for sheep and other animals, and fisheries.¹⁰⁵ The property of Fountains at Eston on the Tees is not recorded as a grange in the period to 1215. However, it may well have functioned as one, since Stephen de Mainhill granted to the monks all the sand of his vill of Eston where the tide flows as far as the river Tees, to construct as many fisheries in whatever location they wished, together with two acres to make more buildings and a road to them through his land.¹⁰⁶

Several granges were devoted to industrial activities. Rievaulx acquired land in Stainborough on which forges were constructed by 1150, and the land was enclosed by ditches and hedges. They were given a monopoly of iron production in the vill, and by 1185 at the latest this had become a grange.¹⁰⁷ The industrial site at Faweather (Bingley) and the four vills of Halton, Shipley, Heaton, and Chellow, which yielded dead wood and minerals, were evidently productive, as two granges were established in the area, at Halton and Faweather.¹⁰⁸ A third industrial site was Shitlington, a centre of iron production. Between 1150 and 1160 the monks received land there on which to construct a grange, but there is no further reference to a grange, and it is possible that the assets there were administered from Stainborough Grange.¹⁰⁹ In the same region, and for

¹⁰² *Mowbray Charters*, no. 129. ¹⁰³ *Cart. Fount.*, I, 90, no. 2. ¹⁰⁴ *Cart. Riev.*, nos. 86, 167–8.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, nos. 116–19, 169; *EYC*, II, nos. 739–40, 742–3.

¹⁰⁶ *Cart. Fount.*, I, 296, no. 1. See also the reference to the conveying and buying of fish: *ibid.*, 297–8, nos. 5–6.

¹⁰⁷ *Cart. Riev.*, nos. 91–8, 345; *EYC*, III, nos. 1725–6, 1737.

¹⁰⁸ For Faweather see Clay, 'Bradley', 97 (1260, then called Rumblesmoor); for Halton the documentary evidence for a grange is late, but given that the endowment comprised the whole vill it is likely that it was created soon after its acquisition. For the identification of the monastic forges, see Faull and Moorhouse, *West Yorkshire*, III, 774, 779.

¹⁰⁹ For the grant of the site of the grange see *Cart. Riev.*, no. 99, *EYC*, III, no. 1727, and for licence to improve their pond in order to construct a mill above the river running to Blacker in Upper Hoyland, *Cart. Riev.*, nos. 95–6, *EYC*, III, no. 1728.

The life within and the world outside

the same purpose, Byland established granges at Bentley in Emley and Denby (Upper Whitley). The boundaries of the forges in Shitlington and Emley had to be carefully delineated, as did the source from which minerals were to be drawn. This area of West Yorkshire appears to have been the prime industrial site, but there were others, such as the forge at Fountains' Aldburgh grange and at Bradley grange, which would become in the thirteenth century a centre for the production of pottery. Byland's grange at Old Byland had a tile kiln.¹¹⁰

Tithes

A cornerstone of Cistercian economic policy was the exemption, granted by Innocent II in 1132, of freedom from the payment of tithes on lands which the monks cultivated themselves, a privilege which was restricted in 1215 to lands newly brought into cultivation (*novalia*). It is in the operation of their grange policy that we can detect the most fierce defence and assertion of this right. The monks of Rievaulx moved quickly to secure from the canons of Kirkham, who held the parish church of Helmsley, freedom from the payment of tithes on their initial endowment of Griff and Stilton.¹¹¹ By 1152 the monks had secured control of land in East Cowton, which was quickly converted into a grange. They agreed to pay 3 silver marks a year to the monks of Durham for the loss of tithes incurred by their church of Northallerton, in which parish Cowton lay, although in later decades the sum was challenged.¹¹² There was also potential conflict with Durham over the tithes due to its church of Leake, in which parish Rievaulx had developed a grange at Crosby; this was averted by the monks agreeing to pay 2 marks a year in lieu of tithes.¹¹³ Low Bolton (East Bolton) was developed into a grange following the initial grant by Acaris de Tunstall (1173) and its increment by the men of the vill. This is a clear instance of the resettlement of an existing population. In a settlement reached by judges-delegate between 1196 and 1214 the monks agreed to pay to Alexander the clerk 3s yearly for life in lieu of the tithes of corn yielded by their land in Bolton lying between their grange and Deepdale.¹¹⁴ Controversy raged over the tithes due from Hoveton and Welburn.¹¹⁵ An agreement between the monks and the canons of Newburgh, who had been granted the church of Welburn by Roger de Mowbray – also Rievaulx's chief benefactor in this

¹¹⁰ *Mon. Ang.*, v, 351. ¹¹¹ *Cart. Riev.*, nos. 234–5.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, nos. 53, 236, 258; *EYC*, II, no. 956; *PUE*, I, no. 194.

¹¹³ *Cart. Riev.*, nos. 50, 221; *EYC*, II, nos. 954–5. ¹¹⁴ *EYC*, IV, no. 99.

¹¹⁵ Although Welburn is not recorded as a grange until 1301, the monks had come into possession of the entire vill, apart from the church, by 1157, and it is unlikely that the creation of a grange was delayed.

Financing the monastery

area – specified which lands were to be free from tithes and which liable for payment.¹¹⁶ Even areas which were apparently newly brought into cultivation were subject to claims, and a useful example is provided by the Pickering granges of Rievaulx. In 1206 the monks agreed to pay 20s annually to the dean and chapter of York for tithes on land which they held in the parish of Pickering, belonging to their grange at Kekmarish, but the agreement proved to be in need of frequent renegotiation.¹¹⁷

There was trouble for Abbot Alexander and the monks of Meaux over the tithes at Myton Grange from Richard Duchet, the clerk who had obtained the church of Hesse in which parish part of the grange lay. The problem, Abbot Burton later claimed, related to the tithes on land which the monks cultivated themselves. Abbot Alexander's predecessors had paid a sum of money – but never more than a mark a year – to keep the peace. The abbot, however, claimed that he had never actually paid anything and refused. Richard allegedly invaded the grange and seized 40 wagons and 3 ploughs. It was only after an appeal to the pope, and considerable expense, that an agreement was reached whereby the abbot, for the lifetime of Richard only, promised to pay 20s yearly for the tithes *pro bono pacis*.¹¹⁸ Abbot Alexander also entered into a dispute over the tithes of the grange of Wharram le Street, the church of which was held by Nostell Priory as part of its prebend in York Minster.¹¹⁹ The creation of Cistercian granges improved the efficiency of the White Monks but at the same time the privileges which they enjoyed threatened vested interests.

Emulators of the Cistercian grange

So successful was the Cistercian grange system that it came to be emulated by members of other orders, and in particular the Premonstratensians and the Gilbertines. Of the granges of the White Canons details are few, but it can be established that Easby created granges at Middleton Tyas and Easby itself by 1184.¹²⁰ By 1191 the abbey had also established granges at Scales, Brompton on Swale, and Carperby.¹²¹ The Gilbertines evidently adopted the Cistercian system early, for by 1164 the two orders reached an agreement regulating the distance between their granges in the same way as between Cistercian granges.¹²² Was the Gilbertine grange merely a carbon copy of the Cistercian? Or did it have a parallel, though separate,

¹¹⁶ *Cart. Riev.*, no. 332. ¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, nos. 363–6; see also no. 277. ¹¹⁸ *Chron. Melsa*, I, 311–13.

¹¹⁹ For details see *ibid.*, I, 323–5. ¹²⁰ *EYC*, IV, no. 110, V, no. 149.

¹²¹ *PUE*, I, no. 278; BL MS Egerton 2827, fo. 310v (mentioned in *EYC*, V, 138).

¹²² For the most recent discussion of the Gilbertine economy, and especially the grange, see Golding, *Gilbert of Sempringham*, pp. 394–419.

development? There are clearly some borrowings. In many ways – the process of consolidation, the organization, and the reliance on hired labour (which the Gilbertines admitted earlier than the Cistercians) – the canons imitated the White Monks. By the time the surviving Gilbertine institutes had been drawn up in the early thirteenth century the Cistercian practice of confining granges to within a day's journey had been adopted. However one major distinction between the Cistercian and the Gilbertine grange was the control of the parish church or glebe which Golding sees as the imperative for the Gilbertine grange.¹²³ The possession of church land and tithes could, he demonstrates, be the catalyst for the creation of a grange estate: the majority of Gilbertine granges were created in parishes where the canons and nuns held title to the church, and where they failed to gain title, attempts to establish a grange foundered. His example of Watton, ten of whose eleven medieval granges lay either in the parish of Watton or in another parish controlled by the canons, is a convincing one.¹²⁴ Malton, in contrast, lay in an area where other religious houses, notably Kirkham, had already been granted a large number of advowsons before the arrival of the Gilbertines. Malton established granges at Mowthorpe (ER), Kirby Misperton, and Wintringham, by 1178.¹²⁵ In its other granges the church – like that of Rillington, a moiety of which was appropriated to Byland – lay in other hands, and this impeded the development of the grange estate.

Bishop cited examples where Augustinian granges were apparently centred on the parish church;¹²⁶ however, the late date of some of these references and the lack of precision in the way in which the term 'grange' was used by the Augustinians make it difficult to get a sense of the nature of the estate and its management. Between 1154 and 1157 Ralph de Thurnscoe confirmed the lands held by Nostell in Thurnscoe, namely, the land outside the canons' grange at 'Cherebarue'; another charter locates the land near Holwell, now represented by Howell House in Thurnscoe.¹²⁷ Roche Abbey's interests in Thurnscoe, and the three-way dispute among Roche, Sallay, and Holy Trinity for the possession of the

¹²³ This point is also made in more general terms by Waites, 'Monastic grange', 638–9, who shows that there was an almost complete correlation between what, in the later Middle Ages, were referred to as the granges of Whitby, and the churches controlled by the abbey.

¹²⁴ Golding, *Gilbert of Sempringham*, p. 405. It is not easy to establish which of these were created before 1215.

¹²⁵ *PUE*, I, no. 154. Malton held the advowson of Wintringham alone. Only two other granges, Malton and Norton, coincided with the possession of the church: Golding, *Gilbert of Sempringham*, pp. 398–406.

¹²⁶ Bishop, 'Monastic granges', 205, citing, for example, Guisborough's granges of Marton and Ormesby, which appear to have been created c. 1200 after the surrender of glebe land to the priory.

¹²⁷ See *EYC*, VI, no. 130; BL Cotton MS Vespasian E XIX, fo. 28r-v; *EPNS*, *WR*, I, 92.

Financing the monastery

church, may have been due in part to Roche's ambitions to establish a grange.¹²⁸ The canons of Drax had, by the late twelfth century, a grange on the marshland one and a half miles from the priory, at Newhay; this may have functioned like a Cistercian home grange.¹²⁹

The acquisition of the advowson and glebe was clearly an important factor in the development and maintenance of influence within a parish, and was sufficient to cause other houses to withdraw from the competition to consolidate a grange. In 1152 Rievaulx acquired a grange site at Willerby, and twenty years later was still developing it. However, by 1175 it had ceded the land to Bridlington, which, having acquired the church, began the consolidation of a grange estate.¹³⁰ Given the Cistercian reluctance to accept churches, their acquisition could not have had the same imperative in the development of the grange as it did for canons. Although the regulations were being broken by the late twelfth century, there is little correlation between the few churches held by the Yorkshire Cistercians and their granges. However, this did not mean that attempts were not made to secure churches. Byland held the church at its grange of Old Byland, and acquired the church of Warcop in its grange of Bleatarn, although it lost it to Easby. Roche attempted to secure Roxby church.¹³¹ Meaux tried on numerous occasions to gain control of the church of Wawne. At the foundation of the abbey the count of Aumale granted 'whatever he had in Wawne of his own patrimony and of the patrimony of the archbishop, and the church of the vill'.¹³² However, without real explanation, Burton noted that 'because of many adverse circumstances they never possessed the church of Wawne'. Henry Murdac, as archbishop, had granted two carucates in Wawne to the monks, but they were resumed by Archbishop Roger. Some time later Abbot Thomas brought a case against the rector of Wawne in the presence of papal judges-delegate concerning what he claimed was unjust exaction of tithes *contra tenorem privilegiorum nostrorum*. His successor, Alexander (1197–1210), made a renewed attempt to claim the church by virtue of the grant of the founder, but dropped it at the instance of Countess Hawise.

At least one nunnery claiming Cistercian identity appears to have operated a grange economy. Swine Priory was granted twelve acres in Spaldington (Bubwith) on which to erect granges, as well as woodland and pasture for grazing cows, sheep, mares, and foals.¹³³ Moreover the

¹²⁸ See above, p. 237. ¹²⁹ EYC, vi, no. 38; *Cal. Pat. R.* 1307–13, p. 347.

¹³⁰ *Cart. Riev.*, no. 147; *Cart. Brid.*, pp. 114–15; EYC, ii, nos. 1228, 1230.

¹³¹ See above, p. 237.

¹³² *Chron. Melsa*, i, 83–4, and, for what follows, i, 93–5, 217–18, 296–9.

¹³³ EYC, xii, no. 65.

The life within and the world outside

territorial ambitions of the nuns led to the loss to them, by Meaux Abbey, of one of its early granges, Bealeys. An agreement reached between the two houses in the second decade of the thirteenth century allowed for the free flow of water from Lambwath, previously impeded by 'Monkdyk', through the nuns' grange of Fairholme.¹³⁴ There are indications of a grange economy at another 'Cistercian' nunnery. A papal bull for Siningthwaite granted to it, as a Cistercian house, protection that 'no-one shall dare to commit violence, rapine or theft, to set fire, or capture or kill a man within the cloisters of your places or granges'.¹³⁵

The grange was a dynamic force in the agrarian transformation of the county. By cutting across parochial and manorial boundaries it enabled the Cistercians and those who emulated them to consolidate their holdings for greater efficiency of management. As this study has shown, we must guard against generalizations. Cistercian granges were usually begun early, but their full consolidation could take years and was achieved at different rates according to the nature of the land and the tenurial complexity of the area. The granges of the regular canons were not pale imitations of those of the White Monks, for they appeared to have their own dynamic for creation, the possession of church, glebe, and tithe. Although there are indications that the Cistercians attempted to gain control of a limited number of churches in the parishes in which they created granges, the two developments remained, on the whole, distinct.

The grange has long been seen as the force which enabled the Cistercians to fulfil their ambition to live outside the manorial economy.¹³⁶ Isabel Alfonso has argued that this presents a misleading picture. She suggests that it is an assumption which derives from the admiration for large, compact, estates worked by a productive work force, which is characteristic of nineteenth-century historiography, and was not necessarily part of the Cistercian agenda. Further, she maintains that the Cistercians exercised seigneurial power early; that is, from the beginning they were indeed part of the manorial structure. The Yorkshire evidence shows that the White Monks placed a high premium on consolidating their estates, and their efforts in this direction distinguished them from houses of other orders. The administration of those estates also suggests a distinctive approach. It is true that there is evidence that peasants on some of the estates that were taken over by the Cistercians became lay brothers, or remained as rural workers on those estates, and that, in consequence, the Cistercian economy, like the manorial one, was based on 'relations between domination and subordination'. The archaeological evidence suggests that peasant settlements could exist alongside granges. However,

¹³⁴ *Chron. Melsa*, I, 356–7.

¹³⁵ *Mon. Ang.*, v, 466, no. VII.

¹³⁶ Alfonso, 'Cistercians and feudalism'.

Financing the monastery

there is nothing in the period before 1215 to suggest that the Cistercians operated as rentiers, and the assumption that the *dominium* exercised over lay brothers could be equated with feudal power cannot be sustained.

MONASTIC HOUSES AND THE MARKET PLACE

The production of surplus on monastic estates led to their involvement in commercial activities. A number of religious houses profited from having their own fairs, Nostell at the house itself and at Woodkirk, Bolton at the house, Whitby within the town, and St Mary's, York, at Boston.¹³⁷ Others were aided by freedom from toll when they went to market to sell their goods – the monks of Byland at Helmsley, for instance¹³⁸ – or by benefits which enabled them to transport their goods without paying toll; the canons of Drax had a ferry over the river Don, the monks of Meaux a ferry across the Humber at Wawne, and the canons of Guisborough free passage at Hessele.¹³⁹ Other benefits brought by urban lordship included control over harbours.¹⁴⁰ By 1204, when the merchants of English sea-ports were taxed, the Yorkshire ports were Selby, Yarm, Coatham, Whitby, Scarborough, Hedon, Hull, and York, in all of which monastic houses were property holders. Meaux controlled the port of Wyk, later Kingston upon Hull, which was part of Myton, until 1293.¹⁴¹

Of all the monastic economic activities in the Middle Ages it is the engagement in the production and export of wool that has figured largest in the historiography of the period. Yet the origins and development of the monastic wool trade before 1215 are poorly documented, and early references to the movement of goods overseas are ambiguous. As early as 1133 Rievaulx received royal licence for its men and horses to travel freely, though as the dictates of the order required movement overseas once a year it is uncertain whether this related to trading activities, or to journeys to and from the General Chapter.¹⁴² Henry II granted similar freedom of passage to Byland and Kirkstall, and to Fountains, Meaux, and Jervaulx, that their men and goods should be quit of toll, pontage, and passage in England and Normandy.¹⁴³

The very scale of monastic, and particularly Cistercian, pasture lands and flocks suggests that some houses would from an early date have had

¹³⁷ *RRAN*, III, nos. 621–2; *EYC*, VII, no. 20; *ibid.*, IV, no. 8. ¹³⁸ *EYC*, X, no. 95.

¹³⁹ *EYC*, I, nos. 40, 489–90, II, no. 764; *Chron. Melsa*, I, 93. In addition Pontefract had a ferry at South Ferriby (*Cart. Pont.*, II, no. 400).

¹⁴⁰ *EYC*, II, no. 1146 (Bridlington).

¹⁴¹ See J. Bilson, 'Wyke upon Hull in 1293', *Transactions of the East Riding Antiquarian Society*, 26 (1929), 37–105.

¹⁴² *Cart. Riev.*, no. 195.

¹⁴³ *Mon. Ang.* v, 343, *Kirkstall Coucher*, no. 310; *EYC*, I, no. 74; III, no. 1389, v, no. 374.

The life within and the world outside

considerable surplus wool for disposal. Reference was made in the previous chapter to grants of pasture for a specified number of sheep, and it is important to remember both that these might be a minimum number, with pasture being overused, and that monasteries frequently received swathes of moorland where numbers were not specified. Monastic flocks could number several thousand sheep. Fragmentary though the evidence is, there are some indications of monastic involvement in trade and financial dealing before 1215.¹⁴⁴ In the time of Abbot Denis of Roche (1159–71) the house was in debt to the Flemish wool merchant and financier, William Cade of St Omer, to the tune of 22 pounds of wool and 2,200 fleeces in sacks, indicating not only the practice of borrowing, but the production of wool and its sale in advance.¹⁴⁵ A recognition of the dominance of the Cistercians generally in wool production came in 1193, when for the ransom of Richard I they, along with the Premonstratensians and Gilbertines, were required to give, as their contribution, a year's wool clip – an event which led the Yorkshire chronicler, William of Newburgh, to remark that wool was the chief part of the Cistercians' livelihood.¹⁴⁶ Such prominence suggests that the sparsity of documentary traces of overseas wool dealings before the end of the twelfth century masks an established and thriving trade. However, the Cistercian monks were clearly not alone, for in the 1190s Martin son of Edric paid 5 marks for the recovery of six sacks (1,200 fleeces) and four stones of good wool, and four sacks of other wool which he claimed from the nuns of Swine; and William son of Elias paid 20 marks for the recovery of 7,000 fleeces for which he had already paid the abbot of St Mary's. In 1200 and again in 1204 William son of Robert sued the nuns of Swine for twenty sacks of wool (4,000 fleeces) and 10 marks.¹⁴⁷

By the early thirteenth century the picture starts to be less ambiguous. In 1212 Fountains was evidently trading with the Flemish merchants of St Omer.¹⁴⁸ In 1224 the abbots of Fountains, Kirkstall, and Roche received licence for free movement and protection of a shipload of their wool. The abbot of Meaux was permitted to have one shipload of wool taken abroad for sale; and the abbots of Byland and Jervaulx received licence to sell wool in Flanders, or anywhere else abroad except for the kingdom of France.¹⁴⁹ Of the eight Yorkshire Cistercian houses, six received licence to sell wool abroad, and the only non-Cistercian house to receive similar permission was St Mary's, York, which was allowed free movement of its

¹⁴⁴ For a brief discussion see Donkin, *The Cistercians*, appendices 9–10.

¹⁴⁵ H. Jenkinson, 'William Cade, a financier of the twelfth century', *EHR*, 28 (1913), 209–27, 731–2 (p. 221).

¹⁴⁶ Howden, *Chronica*, III, 210; Newburgh, *Historia*, I, 399.

¹⁴⁷ T. H. Lloyd, *The English Wool Trade in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1977), p. 289.

¹⁴⁸ Canivez, *Statuta*, I, 401–2 (no. 55). ¹⁴⁹ *Cal. Pat. R. 1216–1225*, pp. 449, 461, 492, 509.

Financing the monastery

wool under the conduct of William, nephew of Hereward de Lenn.¹⁵⁰ By the fourteenth century Yorkshire houses were among the leading wool producers noted by Francesco Balducci Pegolotti. Fountains was top of the list with 76 sacks of wool, approximately 15,000 fleeces, for sale. Rievaulx was next with 60 sacks (12,000 fleeces), followed by Jervaulx and Bridlington, 50 sacks (10,000), Malton, 45 sacks (9,000), and Watton, 40 sacks (8,000). Byland, Kirkham, Whitby, and St Mary's were reckoned to have between 30 and 40 sacks, Meaux, Kirkstall, Guisborough, Roche, and Warter between 20 and 30; Sallay, Newburgh, Easby, Egglestone, Ellerton, Arden, Rosedale, and Nostell, between 10 and 20, and Coverham, Swine, Marrick, Hampole, Drax, Wykeham, Thicket, St Andrew's, York, and St Clement's, fewer than 10.¹⁵¹ Monastic sheep flocks supplying for this one market could, therefore, run into the thousands. Pegolotti's list suggests that the White Monks were the major force in, but did not overwhelm, wool production.

ECONOMIC STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

Finally, how sound was the economic basis of the religious houses in Yorkshire in the period 1069 to 1215? The thousands of charters conveying land to the monastic order in the county before 1215 are witness to its considerable success. They also give a hint of the problems it faced, for from a monastic desert Yorkshire had turned into an area with clusters of monasteries competing for lands and endowments. This rendered necessary the kind of agreements between individual houses in close proximity mentioned above, and led also, on occasion, to opposition from lay landholders who stood to lose from the expansion of the monastic order. Numerous instances could be cited, from Torphin son of Robert's quarrel with Easby over the mill there, and that of William de Marton with Sallay Abbey over a road to its grange at Stainton, to the dispute between Rievaulx and Alan de Ryedale over the boundaries of Welburn, Hoveton, and Bowforth.¹⁵²

From time to time monasteries made claims of poverty, which appear to have been intended to secure a change of site (Jervaulx, Kirkstall), an additional endowment (Sallay) or the appropriation of a church. However, when the dispersal of a convent took place this seems to suggest that serious, if temporary, problems were being encountered. Before the removal of the convent of Fors to Jervaulx (1156) its disbandment was

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 459.

¹⁵¹ Francesco Balducci Pegolotti, *La Pratica della Mercatura*, ed. A. Evans, Medieval Academy of America, 24 (Cambridge, Mass., 1936).

¹⁵² EYC, v, no. 150; *Cart. Sallay*, 1, no. 65; *Cart. Riev.*, no. 153 (EYC, ix, no. 157).

The life within and the world outside

contemplated.¹⁵³ The dispersal of Kirkstall (1174) seems to have been the result of the combination of disease among the abbey flocks, a failure of the crops, internal dissension, the loss of the grange of Micklethwaite, and the poor judgement of Abbot Ralph Haget in attempting to bribe Henry II to secure its return. After the reassembly of the community the abbot agreed to try to modify expenses.¹⁵⁴ In the late 1180s Sallay was in financial trouble, and the abbots of Clairvaux, Igny, and Mortemer advised that the abbey be disbanded totally or removed to another site.¹⁵⁵

Despite the apparent success of Meaux in expanding its estates, it was after only ten years that the first recorded dispersal took place. Abbot Adam's ambitions to increase the numbers to forty monks were limited by his resources; Abbot Burton recorded the tradition that the house was so poor that the abbot could not afford clothing for the novices, and was forced to disperse the community.¹⁵⁶ Adam's successor, Philip, reassembled the convent, expanded the abbey's estates, and, as we saw earlier, entered into a risky transaction with William Fossard in order to secure land in Wharrah le Street.¹⁵⁷ After a promising start Abbot Thomas (1182–97) was forced once again to disband the community, the economic problems being caused by a series of disasters: the loss of lands in Wharrah, a fire at Cottingham mill, the failure of the crops, the low market value of grain, and the financial burden of giving up a year's wool clip in 1193. Reassembly was made possible by William Rule, parson of Cottingham, who on his entry as a novice granted the abbey the sum of £20.¹⁵⁸

It is difficult to know how unusual the problems encountered by Meaux were. Certainly it had its fair share of bad luck, though many of the factors mentioned in connection with the dispersal of 1193 would have hit most Yorkshire Cistercian houses, and others. What seems to have affected Meaux in particular – and it was not unusual in this – was the presence of abbots with grand ambitions and little head for business. Abbot Philip's decision to take on Fossard's Jewish debt, coupled with the money spent on consolidation of granges, and the ambitious building programmes of both Philip and Thomas, were in no small part responsible for Meaux's financial problems.

In other cases, however, there is evidence of more shrewd financial acumen, and self confidence. The instances, cited above, of selling wool in advance by a small number of houses,¹⁵⁹ argue for a degree of confi-

¹⁵³ *Mon. Ang.*, v, 571–2. ¹⁵⁴ *Foundation of Kirkstall*, pp. 182–3. ¹⁵⁵ *Cart. Sallay*, II, no. 615.

¹⁵⁶ *Chron. Melsa*, I, 107. ¹⁵⁷ See above, pp. 258–9. ¹⁵⁸ *Chron. Melsa*, I, 233.

¹⁵⁹ But, interestingly, comprising a Cistercian and a Benedictine monastery and a Cistercian nunnery.

Financing the monastery

dence in a convent's ability to produce. Moreover, the willingness of some abbeys to enter into financial arrangements with money-lenders suggests a purposeful expansion of property. In the time of Abbot Hugh of Roche (1179–84), only a few years after the record of the wool owed to William Cade, the abbey was in debt to the Jews.¹⁶⁰ The borrowing of money for the purpose of buying up encumbered estates is likely to be what lay behind the debt owed to Aaron of Lincoln, in 1186, by a group of Cistercian houses (Rievaulx, Kirkstall, Roche, Newminster, Kirkstead, Louth Park, Revesby, Rufford, and Biddlesden). In that year Aaron died, and Richard I later commuted the debt owed by these nine houses from 6,400 marks (£4,266) to 1,000 marks, payable to himself.¹⁶¹ That the debt was recorded as a joint one might indicate that the Yorkshire Cistercians were acting together with houses outside the county and their own monastic families in order to purchase land.

The twelfth century was the period in which the monastic houses of Yorkshire accumulated most of the estates that they were to acquire. Although it is not possible to rank houses in terms of relative wealth, it is likely that in most cases the houses rated as most wealthy by the *Taxatio ecclesiastica* (1291) and the *Valor ecclesiasticus* (1535) – for all the defects of these sources – were the most wealthy by 1215. This would place St Mary's, York, Whitby, Selby, Fountains, and Guisborough high on the list. There were a few anomalies, however, and it is unlikely that the relatively low value of Rievaulx (£278 10s 2d in 1535) was reflected throughout its history.¹⁶² For the period before 1215 the only glimpses we have of the financial health or otherwise of houses are recorded in narrative sources, and the assessment of a number of Cistercian houses for Danegeld in 1161–2.¹⁶³ Any such traces are of limited value, however, for against the 'paper' value of a monastery needed to be set its considerable expenses, the daily maintenance of the community, land acquisition – the monks of Fountains paid out over £500 within a few years to the Mowbray family alone – and ambitious building programmes. Nevertheless within the course of a century and a half the monastic order in Yorkshire had become the controller of a high proportion of its wealth.

¹⁶⁰ *Mon. Ang.*, v, 505, no. xiv.

¹⁶¹ See H. G. Richardson, *The English Jewry under Angevin Kings* (London, 1960), pp. 90–1.

¹⁶² *VE*, v, 144.

¹⁶³ *Pipe Roll 8 Henry II*, p. 52, assessing Rievaulx at 1 mark, Byland at 12s 8d, Fountains at 9s 10d, Meaux at 9s 8d, Jervaulx at 7s 5d, Sallay at 6s 9d and Kirkstall at 6s 8d. Easby was assessed at 5s.

APPENDIX

Table of Cistercian granges

The date represents the earliest recorded date for the existence of the grange.

Fountains Abbey

Cayton	1135 × 38	<i>Memorials of Fountains</i> , I, 56
Aldburgh	1135 × 38	<i>Ibid.</i>
Warsill	1146	<i>EYC</i> , I, no. 79
Cowton	1146	<i>Ibid.</i> ; <i>Memorials of Fountains</i> , I, 86
Kilnsey	1143 × 47	<i>Ibid.</i>
Marton le Moor	1143 × 47	<i>Ibid.</i>
Dacre	1146	<i>EYC</i> , I, no. 79
Sutton	1146	<i>Ibid.</i>
Morker	1156	<i>EYC</i> , I, no. 80
Baldersby	1160	<i>EYC</i> , XI, no. 269
Kirk Hammerton	1172	<i>EYC</i> , II, no. 738
Kirby Wiske	1181	<i>EYC</i> , V, no. 285
Brimham	1189	<i>Memorials of Fountains</i> , II, 8–10
Bouthwaite	1199	<i>Ibid.</i>
Greenberry	1199	<i>Ibid.</i> , II, 13–18
Thorpe Underwood	1199	<i>Ibid.</i>
Arnford	1199	<i>Ibid.</i>
Busby	1199	<i>Ibid.</i>
Bradley	1199	<i>Ibid.</i>
Sleningford	1199	<i>Ibid.</i>
Bramley	1199	<i>Ibid.</i>
Bordley	1199	<i>Ibid.</i>
Galphay	1199	<i>Ibid.</i>
Malham	1199	<i>Ibid.</i>
Marston	1199	<i>Ibid.</i>

Meaux Abbey

North Grange	1151	<i>Chron. Melsa</i> , I, 81
Bealeys	1151 (lost)	<i>EYC</i> , III, no. 1383
Blanchemarle	1154	<i>Ibid.</i> , no. 1384
Hayholme	1150 × 1160	<i>Chron. Melsa</i> , I, 96

Financing the monastery

Octon	1150 × 1160	<i>Ibid.</i> , I, 99
Wharram le Street	1150 × 1160	<i>Ibid.</i> , I, 99
Salthaugh	1150 × 1160	<i>Ibid.</i> , I, 87
Myton	1172	<i>EYC</i> , III, no. 1391
Moor (Beeford)	1172	<i>Ibid.</i>
Wawne	1177	<i>Ibid.</i> , no. 1392
Tharlesthorpe	1182 × 1197	<i>Chron. Melsa</i> , I, 220
Wassand	1197 × 1210	<i>Ibid.</i> , I, 308
Arram (Atwick)	1197 × 1210	<i>Ibid.</i> , I, 329
Arnold	1197 × 1210	<i>Ibid.</i> , I, 305–6
Skerne	1197 × 1210	<i>Ibid.</i> , I, 329
Routh	1210 × 1220	<i>Ibid.</i> , I, 362–5
<i>Rievaulx Abbey</i>		
Cowton	1152	<i>Cart. Riev.</i> , p. 260
Crosby	1152	<i>Ibid.</i>
Hesketh	1157	<i>Ibid.</i> , no. 58
Griff	1147 × 67	<i>Ibid.</i> , no. 243
Welburn	1147 × 67	<i>Ibid.</i> , no. 57
Hunmanby	1160 (lost)	<i>Ibid.</i> , nos. 78–9, 197, 250, p. 260
Low Bolton	1173	<i>Ibid.</i> , nos. 139–40, p. 262
Morton (Harlsey)	1170 × 1176	<i>Ibid.</i> , nos. 87–8
Normanby	1170 × 1180	<i>Ibid.</i> , no. 241
Little Broughton	1180 × 1188	<i>Ibid.</i> , nos. 123–5, p. 262
Skiplam	1189	<i>EYC</i> , IX, no. 148
Stainborough	1185?	<i>Cart Riev.</i> , p. 284 (Falthwaite)
Halton (Bingley)	c. 1185	<i>Ibid.</i> , p. 283
Kekmarish	1206	<i>Ibid.</i> , no. 363
<i>Byland Abbey</i>		
Wildon	1142	<i>Mon. Ang.</i> , v, 350
Old Byland	1147	<i>Ibid.</i> , 351; <i>Cart. Riev.</i> , no. 243
Thorpe (Coxwold)	1160 × 70	Historic Manuscripts Commission, <i>The Manuscripts of his Grace the Duke of Rutland</i> , IV, 4
Murton	1170 × 1190	<i>EYC</i> , III, no. 1839
Shap	1189	<i>Cal. Ch. R.</i> I, p. 314
Asby	1189	<i>Ibid.</i>
Bleatarn	1189	<i>Ibid.</i>
Denby	late twelfth century	BL Add. chs 7427, 7432, 7414–5; <i>Yorkshire Deeds</i> , VI, 6
Bentley (Emley)	late twelfth century	BL Add. chs 7456, 7453; <i>Yorkshire Deeds</i> , VI, 72–3
Snilesworth	1207	HMC, <i>Rutland</i> , IV, 76
<i>Kirkstall Abbey</i>		
Barnoldswick	1152	<i>Foundation of Kirkstall</i>
Riddlesden	1152 × 1162	<i>Kirkstall Coucher</i> , no. 254; <i>EYC</i> , VII, no. 162
Micklethwaite	1167	<i>Kirkstall Coucher</i> , p. 22
Roundhay	1177 × 1185	<i>Mon. Ang.</i> , v, 535, no. XII; <i>EYC</i> , III, no. 1509
Bessacar	1187	<i>EYC</i> , II, no. 820
Cliviger	c. 1200	<i>Mon. Ang.</i> , v, 528, 531

The life within and the world outside

Accrington	c. 1200	<i>Ibid.</i>
Hooton Pagnell	1191 × 1216	<i>Ibid.</i> , 528
<i>Sallay Abbey</i>		
Barrowby	1172	<i>Cart. Sallay</i> , I, 63–5
Ellenthorpe	1172	<i>Ibid.</i>
Sallay (home)	1172	<i>Ibid.</i>
Stainton	1172	<i>Ibid.</i>
Sunderland (Lancs)	1172	<i>Ibid.</i>
Wolffington	1189	<i>Cal. Ch. R.</i> , II, 163
Askwith	1189	<i>Cart. Sallay</i> , II, 138–9
Elam	1189	<i>Ibid.</i>
Tadcaster	1217 × 1223	<i>Ibid.</i> , no. 578
<i>Roche Abbey</i>		
Brancliffe	1176 × 1189	<i>EYC</i> , III, no. 1412
Corby	1179 × 1184	<i>Mon. Ang.</i> , V, 505, no. XIV
Armthorpe	1186	<i>Ibid.</i> , no. XIII
Barnby	1186	<i>Ibid.</i>
Kirk Bramwith	1186	<i>Ibid.</i>
Aggacroft	1186	<i>Ibid.</i>
Roxby	1189 × 1199	<i>Cal. Ch. R.</i> , I, 146
Todwick	1186 × 1213	<i>EYC</i> , VI, nos. 111–12
<i>Jervaulx Abbey</i>		
Dale	1156	<i>Mon. Ang.</i> , V, 571, 573; <i>EYC</i> , V, no. 372
