

Durham E-Theses

The changes of the reformation period in Durham and Northumberland

Barbara Nowelle Wilson

How to cite:

Wilson, Barbara Nowelle (1939) The changes of the reformation period in Durham and Northumberland. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

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

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/8346/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

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

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

CHAPTER VII.

THE DOCTRINAL REFORMATION IN DURHAM
AND NORTHUMBERLAND.

It is well known that the North was slow to accept the religious changes. This is of course, largely proved by the rebellion of 1569. It is interesting, however, to try to find signs of this conservative attitude before 1569, and so to be able to show whether the rebellion was merely the signal for the display of a long pent-up hostility to the changes among the people generally, or whether it was simply the result of the schemes of ambitious leaders, or of those with a social grievance, working momentarily upon them. It is also interesting to see whether this conservative attitude was apparent in a clinging to old forms and opposition to the new, or whether the people appeared to submit to the changes.

The extent to which the doctrinal changes were accepted in the North, can be gathered in part from a scrutiny of the wills of the period. These at first generally open with a commendatory clause followed by a request for the prayers of the Virgin and Saints. Whilst under Henry VIII invocation of the Saints was permitted by the Ten Articles of 1536 (1), and by the Bishops' Book of 1537, both were careful to guard against any implied worship of the Saints, the latter stating that although the Saints might be asked to be intercessors, such addresses to them should not be similar to the adoration rendered to God (2). This attitude was also visible in the Royal Injunctions of 1538 (3). In the Litany in the Prayer Book of 1549, however, the requests to Saints for their prayers were omitted, and in 1549 Parliament condemned such invocation (4)

- (1) The Ten Articles said that prayer to the Saints was to be "done without any vain superstition, as to think any Saint is more merciful, or will hear us sooner than Christ, or that any Saint doth serve for one thing more than another or is patron of the same." (Frere "Visit. Arts. & Injts." II, p.6m.)
- (2) Leighton Pullan "Prayer Book" p.77.
3. Here it was said "Where in times past men have used in divers places in their processions to sing "Ora pro nobis" to so many Saints, that they had no time to sing the good suffrages following, as "Parce nobis Domine" and "Libera nos Domine", it must be taught and preached that better it is to omit "Ora pro nobis", and to sing the other suffrages." (Frere "Visits Arts. & Injts." II, p. 32.)
- (4) Ibid p. 194 n.

In Durham and Northumberland the commendatory clause and the invocation were evidently usual in wills up to the end of Henry VIII's reign, and continued to be very general in the reign of Edward VI, even after 1549. In the first volume of Wills and Inventories published by the Surtees Society, of fourteen wills dated in Edward VI's reign, twelve invoke the aid of the Virgin and Saints. As an example part of the will of William Bee, formerly a professed brother of Mountgrace Priory, of March 27, 1551/2, may be given. He wrote "First and principally I bequeath my soul unto Almighty God, my maker, and to the holy prayers of the most glorious Virgin Mary, the blessed mother of our most merciful Saviour Christ Jesus, the well-beloved son of God, the father Almighty, and also to the holy prayers of all the blessed Saints in Heaven." (1). This, of course, is rather more precise in its invocation of the prayers of the Virgin and Saints, than are most, as might be expected in the will of an ex-religious, but wills of the laity contain a similar type of ascription. In the reign of Mary such invocation became practically the rule. Of nineteen wills of her reign in the volume just quoted sixteen have this invocation, and there are examples for every year of her reign. Two examples from wills of laymen of the time follow:- Robert Collingwood of Eslington making his will on June 12, 1556, opened as follows: "First I comit and commend my soul unto the everlasting tuition and defence of Almighty God, our eternal Creator and Redeemer of all mankind, for whose mercy the rather to be extended unto me, I most humbly beseech and trust to have the assistance of our blessed Lady St. Mary the Virgin, and all the holy company of Heaven"(2). Thomas Trollope, of the well-known Thornley family, made his will on August 29, 1558, saying, "My soul I bequeath to Almighty God and Saviour Jesu Christ, who redeemed and bought the same with his most precious blood, beseeching the most holy and pure Virgin Mary, mother of Jesu Christ, and all the saints of heaven to pray for me...." (3).

Up to 1558, therefore, in this respect the old opinions were generally accepted, although for the period before this date two solitary examples of reformed opinions can be given. About 1551 Richard Marshall, the late Prior of the black friars of Newcastle, before the

(1) Wills & Invs. I, p. 135 (2) Ibid, p. 147-8
(3) Ibid p. 174.

doctors of St. Andrew's in Scotland, preached that the paternoster should be said to God only, and not to the Saints. The doctors caused a grey friar to oppose him, but he was hissed away. (1). The authority for this is the preface to Knox's "History of the Reformation". More noteworthy is the fact that Richard Leigh, the master of St. John's Hospital, Barnard Castle, in his will of March 21, 1557/8, had this formula: "I give and bequeath my soul to Almighty God, my maker and redeemer, in whom and by the merits of whose blessed passion I believe to have forgiveness of all my sins"(2). These provide, however, the only two discordant notes, and the opinions of neither the fugitive Prior nor Leigh, who was perhaps the brother of the monastic visitor of that name, must be taken as typical.

In the reign of Elizabeth the change is at once noticeable. Of thirty odd wills in the Surtees Society's first volume, of the years 1558-64 inclusive, only six contain the old invocation, although two more examples can be found in wills of the clergy of the period, given elsewhere, (3). It was now the general rule to commend the soul to God only, in some such form as this: "I bequeath my soul to Almighty God, my body to be buried within the church of.....". Some twenty examples of such an opening can be given from this volume alone. Furthermore already in these years 1558-64, occasionally the aid of the Saints as mediators seems to be definitely set aside, for the testator asserts his belief in the sufficiency of the merits of Christ's death alone to secure him salvation; here the will of Robert Lambton of Stainton in Durham is remarkable as containing also a mention of the Virgin, but not as an intercessor. Dated 1563/4 it reads "I bequeath, commit, and give my soul unto Almighty God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, three persons and one God, trusting surely to be saved from the thralldom of the devil and all other my adversaries, through the mercies and death of Jesus Christ, very God and Very Man, my maker and

-
- (1) Welford II p. 281-2 (2) Wills & Invs, I p. 160.
(3) i.e. wills of George Reed, rector of Dinsdale, of April 20, 1559; & of John Smer, vicar of Stranton, of May 15, 1561, given S.S. 22, p. ciii & cv.

redeemer, and through his goodness only to be in the society and fellowship of his blessed mother Mary, our Lady, and all elect company of heaven" (1).

In the years 1565-70 there are still fewer examples of the invocation of the Saints forthcoming, although until the year 1570 is reached the old form cannot be called exceptional. Out of the three volumes of Wills of the Surtees Society for this period there are three examples of it in 1565, two in 1567, one in 1568, and two in 1570 (2). After 1570, however, it becomes definitely exceptional, the three volumes only supplying three examples for the decade 1570-80. Again, in these years 1565-70 the post Reformation phraseology adopted by Robert Lambton is rather more often found. For each of the years in question one or two examples can be cited, whilst the preamble of the will of a yeoman of Gateshead of 1567 is worthy of quotation as expressing in exact terms that at which the other only hint. It reads, "First I profess and confess one God in Trinity, and that there is no Saviour, no mediator, no advocate, but only Jesus Christ, God and man, and that he alone by the shedding of his most precious blood hath pacified the wrath of God justly conceived against man" (3). After 1570 this form becomes fairly general.

Closely connected with the subject of the invocation of the prayers of the Saints is that of the extent to which the doctrine of justification by faith was accepted. Here the insistence by certain testators on their belief in the sufficiency of the merits of Christ's death to secure them salvation may show some indications of what was to become in the future a real doctrine of justification through faith. Before 1570, however, such assertions seem to have been made chiefly with the purposes of showing that they had put aside the old faith in the virtue of the intercessory prayers of the Saints, and it does not seem that this newer doctrine had as yet taken any hold in the two counties.

A certain difficulty was experienced in enforcing the royal orders with reference to the removal of images of the Saints. At the Royal visitation of 1559 it was presented that at Rothbury, in Alnwick deanery, the images still stood in the church (4). Later, Grindal, in

(1) Wills & Invs. I, p.211. For other examples of these years of the assertion of the sufficiency of the merits of Christ's death see Wills & Invs. I, p.194 (1561/2) p. 197 (1561/2); p.214 (1564/5); p. 222 (1564); & Welford II, p. 393 (1564).

(2) Wills & Invs. I, p.227, 243, 246, 270, 275, 291, 320 & 323
(3) Will of William Browne of May 20, 1567 (Wills & Invs. I p.273; see also p. 242, 299, 262-3, 284, 292, 294, 307, 311, 329. (4) S.P. Dom. Eliz. X. p. 266.

his injunctions of 1571 for York province, had to insist upon the utter destruction of images, and he commanded the churchwardens and ministers, if they could not obtain possession of them in order to deface them, to present this to the Ordinary (1). Furthermore he enjoined that no one was to worship or make any reverence to any cross or image (2). Bishop Barnes in his first visitation articles for Durham in 1577 commanded the churchwardens to see to the removal, amongst other things, of corbel stones on which images used to be placed, and ordered that the places where they had been were to be plastered over by the following Christmas (3). In 1578 Archbishop Sandys in his articles for York province found it necessary to make similar inquiries to those on which Grindal's injunctions had been based (4). Despite these articles and injunctions one church at anyrate, Conniscliffe in county Durham, was later found still to possess on either side of the high altar the corbel stones on which the images had stood (5). This difficulty, however, was not confined to Durham diocese. Presentations at the Royal Visitation of 1559 had shown images still standing in various places, and others hidden away in the hope of another change in the religious order (6); and in 1569 Sandys in Worcester diocese, and in 1575 Parker in Winchester diocese, for example, were obliged to order the removal of images (7). It appears, therefore, that a certain number of churches in Durham and Northumberland still retained traces of those images in which they had been rich in pre-Reformation days even up to 1580, and this, combined with the extracts from wills already given, suggests that the veneration of the Saints died out slowly. However, the people of the two counties showed no especial instringence in this respect; the movement away from the old ideas, although making no headway in the reign of Edward VI, took a rapid step forward with the accession of Elizabeth; nevertheless not until after 1570 can the old forms, as already shown, be called exceptional.

A good deal of information is also available, again chiefly from wills, with respect to the extent to which the belief in the efficacy of prayers for the dead, which was bound up with the doctrine of purgatory, was

-
- (1) Frere "Visit. Arts." III, p. 285.
 (2) Ibid, p. 289. (3) S.S. 22, p. 24.
 (4) Kennedy "Eliz. Episc. Ad." II, p. 98-9.
 (5.) S.S. 22, p. 128.
 (6) Kennedy "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I, p. lxii-lxiii
 (7) Ibid, p. lxiv-lxii.

held. Both the Bishops' Book of 1537 and the King's Book of 1543 had upheld the practice of praying for the dead, although they were averse to the old materialistic conception of purgatory, and the Prayer Book of 1549 made no departure in this respect, providing explicitly for the celebration of mass at burials. The great change came with the second Prayer Book of 1552. In this book prayers for the dead were completely omitted, as was also mass for funerals, and such prayers were definitely discouraged. The Elizabethan Prayer Book of 1559 retained the burial service of the later book. Nevertheless the attitude of the Elizabethan Church was evidently not meant to exclude prayers for those who were dead. The Primer of 1559 contained them, and that the Queen herself desired their use is proved, for on the death of Henry II of France, in that same year, she had a dirige sung by Parker in St. Paul's cathedral, and also a requiem mass. Furthermore a latin version of the Prayer Book published by royal authority in 1560 for scholastic use provided for the mass at funerals. The doctrine of purgatory, however, was condemned by the 1559 Prayer Book. As time went on Elizabeth's wishes on this matter seem to have been ignored. Episcopal injunctions show the bishops insisting that at burials there should be no communions or prayers for the dead, no candles or diriges, and no communions for the dead after their burial (1). In their place funeral sermons and burial feasts were encouraged. Machyn in his Diary, already in April, 1559, described a London funeral thus: "There was a great company of people, two and two together, and neither priest nor clerk, the new preachers in their gowns like laymen, neither singing nor saying till they came to the grave..... and after that one of them went into the pulpit and made a sermon" (2). From that date onwards examples can be multiplied from his Diary of funeral sermons, Bishop Pilkington being the preacher on three occasions in the years 1560-1 (3)

It may now be seen how far the people of Durham and Northumberland kept pace with these changes. Frequently in the reign of Henry VIII wills contained requests for soul masses and diriges to be performed on behalf of the testator, sometimes on the day of burial only, sometimes yearly, and sometimes for a certain term of years. Diriges denoted the matins and

- (1). Kennedy "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I, p. cix.
- (2). Cam. Soc. O.S. vol. 42 p. 143.
- (3). *ibid* pp. 226, 254, 255.

lauds in the office for the dead; vespers for the dead were called "Placebo"; but in the Elizabethan Primer, and probably fairly commonly in wills, both matins and vespers were called by the common term dirige (1). Sir Richard Towgall, a priest of Gateshead, when he made his will in 1541 required his nephew, who was also a priest, to sing fifteen requiem masses for him and fifteen "De quinque vulneribus" (2); and the laity made similar provisions in their wills (3). The general rule was to ask for a mass on the day of burial only, although some people, such as Edward Surtees, a Newcastle draper, would require a yearly soul mass and dirige to be sung in their parish church for ever (4).

Very often, even if a mass or dirige were not specifically asked for, the testator is found leaving money to a priest, and in return asking his prayers, or that he shall sing for the health of his soul. Before their dissolution, it was common to leave money in this way to monasteries and hospitals in return for their good offices. The will of one of the Thornley Trollopes may again be referred to for a good example of this practice. John Trollope, making his will in 1522, after bequeathing his soul to God, the Virgin, and the whole company of Heaven, and various sums of money to various churches, continued, "Also I bequeath to Sir Thomas Cornay £4 to sing for me for two years, if the same Thomas so long live. And if he die afore the said two years so ended than I will that mine Executors cause another priest to sing out the same two years service for my soul. Also I bequeath to the friars of Hartlepool 10/- to sing a trental for my soul. Also to the Observants of Newcastle 10/-. Also to the Mountgrace 10/-. Also to the other three houses of the friars of Newcastle 6/8 to every one of them. Also to the gild of Our Lady of Kelloe 20/-, and my harp..... Also I will that mine executors make an obit of 20/- at my twelvemonth day" (5). To the end of Henry's reign the services of priests for such prayers were still requisitioned in return for a small fee (6).

(1). cf. Leighton Pullan "Prayer Book" p. 71.

(2). Wills & Invs. I. p. 118.

(3). Ibid, pp. 118 (1542), 122 (1545), 124 (1546); & III pp. 1 (1543 & 1544); 4 (1545).

(4). Ibid III, p. 1. Another will providing a good example of such a request is that of Eleanor Hornby of Newcastle of June 26, 1536, published in the Newc. Proc. 3rd. Ser. III, p. 245-7.

(5). Wills & Invs. I, p. 105-6. cf. also the will of Ralph Surtees of Middleton St. George similarly asking the prayers of Neasham and Mountgrace Priors (Ibid, p.133)

(6). Ibid, I, p. 113, 118; & III, p. 5.

In the reign of Edward VI there seems to have been very little, if any, falling off in the number of requests for masses and diriges. Whereas there are seven examples of this kind in the three volumes of Wills and Inventories for the reign of Henry VIII, there are as many as five for this reign, during which Alice Lawson, the widow of James, the Newcastle merchant and purchaser of Neasham Priory, desired a general dirige with all the priests and clerks of the town, and a yearly obit for six years (1). It is noteworthy that such requests are still to be found even as late as 1552, despite the dissolution of the chantries. Furthermore, the custom of leaving money to priests to pray for the testator also continued, although it seems to have been rarer (2).

In Mary's reign "soul masses" and diriges, or trentals of masses, were often asked for (3), and towards the end of the reign, and particularly in 1558, — that is to say up to November 17, the date of Mary's death — the number increased, as the religion of the country was swung back to more extreme Catholicism. Prayers were also sometimes requested, and in this reign a definite return to the chantry idea is visible. For example, Jane Lawson, the late Prioress of Neasham, in her will of 1557 left a priest £6-13-4 as wages for him to sing and pray for her soul for one year in her parish church, (4) whilst Robert Collingwood of Eslington, on June 12, 1556, wrote as follows: "And where I have devised for the erection and continuance forever of a priest to celebrate in the parish church of Whittingham at the altar of..... (left Blank) I will that all and singular the priests hereafter thereto nominated by me or mine heirs serving in the said chantry shall during their time have and enjoy as well one cottage, house and garth in Whittingham, as also one annual rent of £4 out of all my lands etc." (5). He does not state when he had founded, or refounded, this chantry but it seems probable that it was in the reign of Mary (6).

As with respect to the invocation of Saints the accession of Elizabeth and the religious settlement then

- (1). Ibid II, p. 22, note; cf. also I, p. 129 (1549), p. 130 (1549), p. 135 (1551/2); and III, p. 5 (1547).
- (2). Wills & Invs. III p. 7.
- (3). Ibid I, p. 146 (1555), p. 155 (1557/8), p. 168 (1558), p. 172 (1558), p. 174 (1558); III, p. 15 (1558) and Welford II, p. 319-20 (1556)
- (4). Wills & Invs. I, p. 156-7.
- (5). ibid p. 148.
- (6). cf. also Wills & Invs. I, p. 177, 146, 157.

made ushered in an immediate change, so also here the breach from the old ideas is visible, and is even more marked. Some attempt was made positively to undo the work of the previous reign. For example in c. 1563 a grant to John Glynne, a soldier who had served at Newhaven, recited that William Franklin, who had been archdeacon of Durham, and who had died in 1555, (1) had left some property for certain superstitious uses "as diriges, masses, praying for the dead, and such like, and to have continuance for the term of years yet enduring, which by the laws and statutes of this our realm, we ought to have, and are entitled unto, and yet hitherto (as we are informed) have been and as yet are detained and kept from us". The property was therefore granted to Glynne (2).

For her reign only one example is to be found in the three volumes of Wills and Inventories of a request for masses or diriges; this is in the case of Thomas Plumpton, a yeoman of Hilton who made his will in 1562; but it is to be noted that he used the word communion instead of mass (3). Another example is provided by the will of Lancelot Claxton of 1564, given by Conyers Surtees in his "History of Wilington" (4), but after 1565 no such requests are to be found. Similarly there was a sudden falling off in requests for prayers in return for gifts of money, the three volumes, which are rich in Elizabethan wills, providing only four examples. In his will of February 23, 1558/9, Lancelot Hodgson of Lanchester made such a request, but this testator was a brother of Richard and William Hodgson, both noted Recusants (5). In 1560 a Redmarshall man left 6/8 to a priest to pray for him (6), but the other two wills in question date from 1581¹/₂ and 1583 respectively (7).

Instead of asking for masses and diriges the testator very often asked to be buried "with such laudable ceremonies as are by law permitted"; or, "with such rites as the Queen's statutes will allow"; or, "with mortuaries and oblations due and accustomed by the law"; or "with all divine service now most godly set forth".

-
- (1) Randall IX. (2) S.P. Dom. Eliz. XXXI, no. 145.
(3) Wills & Invs. I, p. 206. (4) p. 27.
(5) Wills & Invs. III, p. 18. (6) Ibid I. p. 186.
(7) Ibid II, p. 26; & III p 98 note.

Again and again one of these formulas, perhaps with slight variations, was employed from the beginning of the Queen's reign onwards (1). It is true that such a formula was employed before the reign of Elizabeth (2), but it was then definitely of rare occurrence.

These facts would seem to imply that the people of the two counties accepted with very little difficulty the new order, as far as it involved giving up their old belief in the efficacy of prayers for the dead. It is true that the religious changes of Edward VI's reign in this respect seem to have had no effect in Durham and Northumberland, but time might have been the chief factor lacking in this instance; nevertheless even under Elizabeth the people were probably less docile than would appear from these facts. Archbishop Grindal in 1571 still found it necessary to enjoin that only the service of the Prayer Book should be used for burials, and that there should be no monthly or yearly commemorations of the dead, or other superstitious ceremonies "which tend to the maintenance either of prayer for the dead, or of the popish purgatory" (3). In writing to Cecil on August 29, 1570, he had already complained that the people "offer money, eggs, etc. at the burial of their dead" amongst other of their popish ways (4), and now in 1571 he forbade the saying of "De Profundis" for the dead, or rest at any cross in carrying a corpse to be buried, or the leaving of little crosses of wood (5). Bishop Barnes of Durham in 1577 felt it wise to incorporate in his visitation articles an article running thus, "No communions or commemorations (as some call them) to be said for the dead, or at the burials of the dead; or anniversaries or monethes mindes to be used for the dead, nor any superfluous ringings at burials, @n All Saints day at night, or on the day following, of old superstitiously called All Souls day" (6); again in 1578 an article of Archbishop Sandys was of the same import (7).

In this connection it may be noticed that requests to be buried with those ceremonies or rites, permitted by law, which now became the general rule in Durham and Northumberland wills, did not necessarily imply the omission of prayers for the dead, or of the communion service, for these, as already seen, were not

(1) cf. for example Wills & Invs. I, p. 186, 189, 214, 224, 232, 238, 241, etc. & III, p. 80 etc.

(2) cf. Wills & Invs. I, p. 113 (1545), p. 142 (1553); & III, p. 12 (1555), & p. 14 (1557)

(3) Frere "Visit. Arts." III, p. 286. (4) Ibid p. 253

(5) Frere "Visit." Arts." III. p. 289-90. (6) S.S. 22, p. 16.

(7) cf. Kennedy "Eliz. Episc. & Ad." II, p. 93.

forbidden by law; perhaps therefore, the testators accordingly were buried with some of the old rites — in conformity with their understood wishes — so making the injunctions of the Bishops necessary.

Whilst in London and elsewhere, funeral sermons and perhaps funeral feasts became very usual on Elizabeth's accession, they do not appear to have been used to any large extent in these counties. It is true that the regulations of 1561 of the mercers, grocers, haberdashers, and other incorporated companies of Durham, declared that the brethren should assemble to attend a sermon at St. Nicholas' church on the decease of every brother or sister (1); but the insertion of this rule was doubtless partly due to the necessity of obtaining the confirmation of the Protestant Bishop Pilkington. In the published wills of the period funeral sermons are only mentioned four times. William Walton, a Durham draper, whose will shows him in other ways to have been rather in advance of his time (2), and who may have been affected by the regulation just quoted, in 1566 requested that there should be a sermon at his burial, if it was possible and the preacher could be paid sufficient for his pains (3). This is the earliest example, and the next request of the type does not occur until the year 1579 (4), after which perhaps the practice became commoner. The inventory of John March, a nephew of Robert Barker an alderman of Newcastle, contains interesting details on this subject. His burial took place in 1590/1, and the funeral expenses included 6/8 paid for a sermon, and £1-6-8 for building a pulpit and a stall in a convenient place for a preacher (5). If such expenses were involved this would be an added reason for the scarcity of requests for sermons, and indeed one Henry Smith of Durham, who perhaps was more economical than old fashioned, expressly stated in his will of 1598 that nothing was to be spent on funeral feasts for him, or on a funeral sermon (6). Funeral feasts were not exclusively post-Reformation; for example, as early as 1530 the funeral expenses of John Sayer of Worsall included five marks for a dinner at the burial (7), and requests for such feasts were

(1) Dean & Chap. Reg. II, fol. 146 a.

(2) cf. below p. 33-4. (3) Wills & Invs. I, p. 256.

(4) Welford III, p. 27. (5) Wills & Invs. II, p. 199.

(6) Ibid p. 33-4. (7) Ibid I, p. 110.

sometimes combined with a request for a mass and *dârige* (1) It is true, however, that they became commoner at a later date, for whereas six cases of their being provided for, or paid for, can be found for the period before 1560, there are five cases available for the sixth decade, and six for the eighth decade of the century, as well as a few in the rest of the period (2).

On the whole it would appear, therefore, that whilst on the surface the people of Durham accepted the new ideas of the 1559 Prayer Book in this respect, covertly the old rites were still extensively used, certainly until the time of the rebellion, and perhaps even later.

At this point other services of the Church besides burials may be considered. First, it may be noticed, with reference to clerical robes for such services, that the Royal Injunctions of 1559 had ordered the churchwardens of every parish to deliver to the visitors inventories of vestments, copes, and other ornaments, so leaving the use of vestments in an ambiguous position; but the Interpretations of the Bishops of 1560-1 had been more definite, laying down "that there be used but only one apparel as the cope in the ministrations of the Lord's Supper, and the surplice at all other ministrations" (3). Nevertheless entries in churchwardens' accounts for various parts of England show that albs, tunicles, and other vestments existed, and were apparently in use in the time of Elizabeth; from this fact Dr. Cox deduces that vestments were understood to be sanctioned by the ornaments rubric of the 1559 Prayer Book, but that their use gradually died out on account of the growing Puritanism of the country, and also because of the cost of their maintenance (4). Parker's Advertisements of 1566, however, had laid down that those ministering Holy Communion in cathedral and collegiate churches were to wear copes, but in other churches a surplice alone was to be worn for all ministrations (5); but these Advertisements, being directed against the Puritan wing of the Church, were

-
- (1) e.g. Wills & Invs. I, p. 146 and N.C.H. XIV, p.563n. Other examples of funeral feasts before 1550 can be found in Wills & Invs. I, p. 124; & III, p. 1, and 5.
(2) Wills & Invs. I, p. 206, 259, 289, 304, 391; II, p.40-1 55, 70, 183, 199, 326; III, p. 85; Arch. Ael. 4th. Ser. III, p. 140. (3) Frere "Visit. Arts." III, p.22 & 61.
(4) J.C. Cox "Churchwardens' Accounts" p. 133, 134-5.
(5) Kennedy "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I, p. liv-v.

really prescribing the minimum necessary.

It is evident that in Durham and Northumberland, up to 1570, there was very little difficulty in this respect from the Puritan extremists, and what difficulty there was seems to have been practically confined to the cathedral church under the calvinistic Dean Whittingham. Already in 1564 news reached him that the ornaments rubric was to be enforced, whereupon he, together with two of the prebendaries, Pilkington and Lever, wrote a letter of protestation to the Earl of Leicester, saying, "The letters of many, the report of all, advertise me of a decree either passed or at hand to compel us against our conscience to wear the old popish apparel or be deposed from our ministry"..... Whittingham desired to wear only the black Genevan gown. (1). Later on, in 1566, there were complaints about him, and on his own admission it appeared that he had come into the choir without a surplice, in a round cap and gown, and that on the Christmas Day of 1564 he had ministered Holy Communion without cope or surplice. After a struggle, however, he was obliged to conform (2) Bishop Pilkington had also written to Leicester in 1564 in opposition to the ornaments rubric, and implied that it might lead certain of the clergy of his diocese to resign their livings (3). Nevertheless such a hostile attitude, at this date, was probably limited to the Dean and his colleagues of the cathedral precincts, and it is not until some time after the rebellion that the ordinary parish clergy are found, by refusing to wear even the surplice, showing the same ideas as this energetic exponent of the reformed opinions. On the contrary there is evidence to show that, at any rate in certain churches, the old vestments were still being used.

The commission of January 16, 1553, for the seizure of church goods had directed the commissioners to leave necessary articles of church furniture including, according to their discretion, certain altar linen, and copes and vestments (4). The certificate of

(1) Cam. Soc. Misc. VI. "Life of Whittingham" p. 21 note; & Dixon VI, p. 108-9 from Strype "Parker" 156 & App. no. xxvii.

(2). Cam. Soc. Misc. VI, "Life of Whittingham", p. 22 note, and 23 note.

(3) Lansdown Mas. VII, fol. 212.

(4) S.S. 97, p. 4-7.

the commissioners appointed for Durham county still exists, and in the preface to it they recorded that they had sent the goods seized and the proceeds of those sold to London; these goods included two vestments, two copes, and some tunicles of cloth of tissue (1). In their certificate they entered the number of chalices, patens, bells of various sorts, organs, and a few other properties which they had left in the various churches, but made no mention of vestments (2). The inventories of the commissioners appointed on May 16, 1552, for Northumberland show that most of the churches of that county had one or two vestments each; copes are five times mentioned, albs nine times, and surplises twice (3); the corresponding certificate does not exist for Durham, but its churches were probably richer in this respect than those of Northumberland. In other parts of England often one cope or one vestment was left (4), so perhaps the same was the case here. Certainly in the time of Elizabeth many churches must have been making use of them. In 1557 Joan Lawson left a black vestment, which may have belonged to her monastery, to the high altar of Hurworth church (5), and in the following year William Bell, the rector of Middleton-in-Teasdale, left his church a cope, vestment, and deacon of red silk "tynselde with borders of images of sundry saints" (6). (No doubt at the time of the sale of church property in 1553 many people bought such goods (with the intention of restoring them to the use of the church); and this became possible under Queen Mary. Or perhaps (to prevent future confiscation by royal officials) they may actually have kept them in their own possession, although encouraging their use by those clergy who were agreeable. For example, it is recorded in the inventory of 1564 of Margaret Cottom, a widow living in Gateshead, that there were two vestments, two tunicles, two stoles, and one alb, with three hangers, valued at 20/-, in her parlour (7) and she does not seem to have had any clerical relatives to whom they might have belonged. As late as 1570 the parish clerk of Billingham deposed that there was a cope

(1) Ibid p. 141-2

(2) cf. Ibid p. 142-6

(3) Ibid p. 164-6

(4) cf. Peacock "English Church Furniture", p. 212-24.

(5) Wills & Invs. I, p. 156-9.

(6) Ibid p. 171.

(7) Wills & Invs. I, p. 223.

undefaced in the church (1). The next year Archbishop Grindal,ⁿ enjoining that where popish vestments, albs, tunicles, stoles, and fanons still existed they were to be utterly destroyed, laid down with reference to these, as well as to other property, that the Ordinary was to be apprised of the fact if the churchwardens and minister could not obtain possession of any such article from the people in whose custody it was in order to destroy it (2); at the same time he ordered the clergy to wear a surplice (3), as did Bishop Barnes in 1577 (4), but the latter did not find it necessary to order the destruction of vestments in his diocese (5). It is true that Archbishop Sandys in 1578, and Archbishop Piers in 1590, both made queries similar to Grindal's, with reference to vestments (6), but to a certain extent it is known that these articles and injunctions were based upon previous ones without immediate reference to actual needs. It would seem, therefore, that for some years after Elizabeth's accession the old vestments continued to be used, but that after the time of Grindal's injunctions their use dropped out, most of them probably having been destroyed.

With respect to the baptismal service attacks were to be anticipated, as in the case of clerical apparel, from the Puritan wing of the Church, whilst the more conservative clergy would probably attempt to follow the old usages. The Act of Uniformity and Elizabethan Prayer Book had declared a return to the ornaments in use in the second year of the reign of Edward VI, which meant that both the font and receptacles for oil at baptism were legal; but this Prayer Book, being based upon the second Prayer Book of Edward's reign, at the same time implied that receptacles for oil were not lawful (7). The Royal Order of 1561, being directed against Puritan spoliation, had insisted on the necessity of the font remaining in churches (8).

There is but little evidence that the old customs survived in Durham or Northumberland. In 1571

-
- (1) S.S. 21, p. 198. (2) Frere "Visit.Arts." III p.285.
(3) Ibid p. 275. (4). S.S. 22, p. 17.
(5) Barnes is said to have been employed by the government to search for vestments and copes by F.O. White in his "Lives of the Bishops", p. 184.
(6) Kennedy "Eliz. Episc. Ad." II, p. 98-9; & III, p. 261.
(7) Kennedy "Eliz.Episc. Ad." I, p. lx-lxii.
(8) Frere "Visit. Arts." III p. 108-9.

Grindal had to order that christmatories should be utterly destroyed, and that clergy should not use oil or the chrism, tapers, spittle, or any other such popish ceremonies at baptisms (1); and it is true that Sandys and Piers also enjoined the destruction of christmatories (2), but Barnes, for Durham diocese, had no such injunction, from which it may be concluded that after about 1570 their use did practically cease in the two counties, together with such old customs as were forbidden by Grindal. Indeed there is on the contrary something to show that the clergy were adopting a more Puritan attitude in this service, for in 1568 the churchwardens of Barnard Castle accused their curate, Thomas Clerk, of failing to use the sign of the cross in baptismal services (3). Furthermore in the convocation of 1563 the sixty-four Puritan clergy of the Lower House declared themselves in favour of the abolition of lay-baptism and of sponsors (4), and it appears that the use of lay-baptism was dying out, for when Roger Venis, the vicar of Mitford, was absent from his cure for several months from November, 1569, it was complained that certain children had not been able to be christened for the lack of a priest (5).

The attitude of the people and clergy to the communion service, and ceremonies and ornaments connected with it, provides a clearer indication of the extent to which the doctrinal changes had been accepted in the North. First, with respect to confession before communion, it appears from the Royal Injunctions of 1547 that it was still considered necessary; but both the Edwardian and the Elizabethan Prayers Books made it merely voluntary (6). Nevertheless Thomas Swalwell, who was curate successively of Ebchester, Medomsley, and Brancepeth, was accused in February, 1570/1, of having proclaimed in favour of auricular confession, giving as his authority the action of Christ in ordering the ten lepers to show themselves to a priest — and he made no attempt to deny having spoken thus (7).

- (1.) Ibid p. 285, 275.
- (2) Kennedy "Eliz. Episc. Ad." II, p. 98-9; III, p. 261.
- (3) S.S. 22, p. 138-41.
- (4) Kennedy "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I p. clvi-vii.
- (5) S.S. 21, p. 200.
- (6) Frere "Visit. Arts." III, p. 297-8 notes.
- (7) S.S. 21, p. 202-3.

The use, if it is still to be found after 1559, of old service books, chalices, altars, and various appendages of the former service should show an adhesion on the part of these people of the North to the old doctrine of the mass. With respect to service books the Royal Injunctions of 1559 had expressly ordered that churchwardens should take especial care to deliver to the visitors inventories of "grails, couchers, legends, processionals, hymnals, manuals, portuesses, and such like" (1). Presentations at the royal visitation of the same year showed parishioners privately retaining mass-books in various parts of England (2), and similar trouble was dealt with by Grindal in 1576 in Canterbury diocese, and by Aylmer in London diocese in 1577 and 1586 (3). So also for the northern province Grindal in 1571 ordered that popish books such as antiphoners, mass-books, grailes, portresses, processionals, manuals, legendaries, and other books of the Latin service, should be utterly defaced (4). Sandys in 1578 queried whether this had been done (5), and so did Piers in 1570 (6).

The people of Durham do not appear to have presented a particularly difficult problem in this matter of the destruction of the old service book, but on the other hand they were evidently loath to accept the new English books. The Act of Uniformity and Prayer Book of Elizabeth, by ordaining a return to the ornaments in use in the second year of Edward VI's reign, implied that the Bible, the Paraphrases of Erasmus, a register book, the Homilies, and the Royal Injunctions were, as before, lawful (7). Some of these were of a pronouncedly Protestant tone, and so it is not surprising to read in the "Detectiones and Comperta" of the 1559 visitation that in the parishes of Stainton, Long Newton, and Cockfield all the books which had been there in the time of King Edward had been burned. The books used in King Edward's time in Elwick had been similarly treated, for George Cliff, one of the more recalcitrant prebendaries, was rector of this parish (8). Again much later, in 1575-6, when the church wardens of Muggleswick were

-
- (1.) Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I, p. xliii-v.
 (2) Ibid, p. lxii-iii (3) Ibid, p. lxiv-lxxii.
 (4) Frere, "Visit. Arts." III, p. 285.
 (5) Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. AD." II, p. 98-9.
 (6) Ibid, III, p. 261. (7) Ibid, I, p. lx-lxii.
 (8) S.P. Dom. Eliz. X, p. 261-2.

accused of neglecting to provide the necessary books, they blamed the late parson, Nicholas Sappcott, whom they said, had "put away" their books, including Jewell's books and their Bible (1).

The survival of any old-style chalices is more interesting to note. The commission for Durham county of January 16, 1553, for the seizure of church goods directed that, in order that "churches and chapels may be furnished of convenient and comely things meet for the administration of the Holy Communion in the same", the commissioners should leave one or two chalices in cathedral or collegiate churches, and one in small parish churches where such already existed (2). A study of the certificate of these commissioners shows that this provision was generally carried out, and that over 50% of the churches were also left patens (3). In the reign of Edward VI, under the direction of episcopal injunctions, the transformation of chalices into plain communion cups was begun (4); the change, however, was not completed, and the Act of Uniformity and Prayer Book of Elizabeth, in advocating a return to the ornaments in use in the second year of the reign of Edward VI, had implied that the chalice or cup and paten were lawful (5). Nevertheless under episcopal visitation articles the transformation was continued, and here the following words of Mr. Cripps, writing with reference to this matter in the *Archaeologia Aeliana*, must be noticed. He states that "The change from chalice to communion cup was made all over England with such rapidity that in the course of a few years, say, in the interval between 1558 and 1580, almost every church in every county and diocese from one end of England to the other was provided with vessels adapted for the new use, and everywhere examples of the cups so provided are commonly found at the present day (6) — everywhere but in the extreme north it must now be said — for whereas they are broadcast over the south of England and Midland counties, strange to say only seven individual examples of undoubtedly Elizabethan cups and plates have been brought to light in the whole county of Northumberland, and hardly more, comparatively speaking, in Durham,

- (1.) S.S. 21. p. 307-8. Sappcott does not appear in Surtees' list of rectors of Muggleswick.
- (2) S.S. 97, p. 4-7. (3) Ibid, p. 142-6.
- (4) Arch. Ael. 2nd. Ser. pt. 42, p. 251-2, W.J. Cripps.
- (5) cf. Kennedy "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I, p. lx-lxii.
- (6) Mr. Cripps notes that there are 100 Elizabethan specimens in Kent.

which can, however, show some seventeen specimens.....
If we add to these the very few pieces which appear to be of sixteenth century fashion, but which, owing to want of either inscriptions or hall-marks, cannot be more than approximately dated, we shall still have a far smaller proportion of Elizabethan as compared with more modern plate in Northumberland and Durham than in any other county at all" (1). He then adds that the seven examples in Northumberland are all of 1570 or 1571 and that "this points to some stringent direction on the subject on the part of the diocesan, such as that which we find resulted in Kent in the exchange of chalices, being chiefly effected in the course of the year 1562" (2).

Here again we are therefore faced with the fact that Durham and Northumberland offered a stolid, if passive, resistance to the changes up to the time of the rebellion, as the people of the counties apparently failed to carry out the regulations for the exchange of chalices for communion cups until immediately after the rebellion, in the years 1570-1, when Archbishop Grindal enjoined for York province that no chalice or profane cup or glass, but a communion cup of silver with a cover of silver should be used for the ministration of the communion (3). Actually before the rebellion Bishop Pilkington had found it necessary to countenance a variety of observances, and so had allowed the clergy to administer communion in either chalice or cup (4). Even the presumably stringent orders of the years 1570-1 do not appear to have taken immediate effect, for as late as Bishop Barnes' time it was presented that the chalice, valued at 20/-, belonging to Eton church was delivered to one Richard Morye for him to change it into a communion cup. Apparently he failed to carry out the work promptly, but as the case was dropped he probably produced the finished communion cup soon after the presentation (5). Similarly the churchwardens' accounts of 1600 for Houghton-le-Spring contain a note concerning the weight of the silver chalice ("challans") with its cover (6); in 1602, however, a cessment was taken partly for the "repairing of the communion cup" (7). Finally it may be noticed that there exists even to this

-
- (1) Arch. Ael. 2nd. Ser. pt. 42, p. 253-4.
(2) Ibid p. 254. (3) Frere "Visit. Arts." III, p. 275.
(4) Welford II, p. 392. (5) S.S. 22, p. 128
(6) S.S. 84, p. 278 (7) Ibid p. 280.

day at Hamsterley a silver-gilt pre-Reformation paten (1). These few instances do not mean that Durham and Northumberland showed any special resistance after 1570; indeed elsewhere in England certain bishops found it necessary to order the exchange after that date (2).

The Elizabethan Injunctions of 1559 ordered the quiet removal or destruction of old altars (3). These altars might be as rich as that which Leland described in Darlington church as consisting of "an exceeding long and fair altar stone of variegated marble, that is, black marked with white spots" (4), or they might be of stone. Ample evidence exists that the Injunction was very badly carried out. The Duke of Norfolk wrote to Cecil on January 10, 1559/60, from Newcastle, and spoke of the "altars still standing in the churches, contrary to the Queen Majesty's proceeding." He added, "It would be well that her Majesty's commission should be addressed to the Dean of Durham, and such others as shall be thought meet, authorizing them to see these matters reformed" (5). It appears, therefore, that altars were still standing in Newcastle churches and the surrounding district, and it is noteworthy that Christopher Todd, a Staindrop man, when he made his will on October 13, 1567, desired burial "in the church of St. Gregory at the Trinity altar of the said church in Staindrop" (6). Many of the altars were doubtless removed, but it is apparent from the proceedings of the rebels in 1569 that they were often carefully preserved, actually in the church or in its precincts, ready for that "future order" for which so many hoped, and which the rebellion seemed to promise was dawning. Certain it is that in ten parish churches an altar was set up, whilst two were re-erected in the cathedral (7). So much appeared from the depositions of rebels in Durham county. Now in many of the cases, as at St. Andrew's Auckland, Billingham, Pitlington, and Sedgfield, it was the old altar which was re-erected, and this actually was probably true in most of the other cases.

(1) Conyers Surtees "Hamsterley" p. 17 from Proc. Newc. Soc. Antiq. Ser. II, vol. 3, p. 439.

(2) Kennedy "Eliz. Ep. Ad." I, p. lxxiv-lxxii.

(3) Ibid p. lx-lxii. (4) Arch. Ael. 2nd. Ser. pt. 22, p. 245

(5) Gee "Eliz. Clergy" p. 165 from For. Cal. p. 572.

(6) Wills & Invs. I, p. 270 - he might of course be referring merely to the place where the altar had stood; but the preciseness of the phraseology rather excludes this idea.

(7) cf. S.S. 22 pp. 132-3, 139-40, 163-4, 171, 172-4, 175-7, 179-80, 184-91, 194-8. The churches where we know altars were restored were Auckland, St. Andrew, Billingham, and the churches of St. Giles

It must further be considered that these depositions by no means contain a record of all such proceedings at the time of the rebellion, so that it is fairly safe to assume that many old altars now made a temporary re-appearance, at anyrate in those churches where it is recorded that mass was celebrated.

After the rebellion, as in the case of chalices, the work of the Reformation was pressed on apace; Grindal's strict injunction for the northern province that altars should be utterly taken down, the floors paved and the walls whitened in the places where they had stood, and the altars stones themselves broken up (1), was followed by Barnes' injunction to churchwardens in his diocese in 1577 to see to the removal of the remnants of altars (2); Archbishop Sandys, however, merely queried whether this work had been done (3), and Archbishop Piers in 1590 apparently did not consider it necessary even to make the inquiry. In fact it appears that the old altars were rapidly destroyed practically throughout the two counties in the years immediately following the rebellion, for in only two cases are altars known to have survived until a later period. At Conniscliffe in 1580 it was reported that an altar stood undefaced outside the choir door, whereupon the churchwardens were commanded to certify its removal (4), but in Warkworth Hermitage, in the outer chapel, ~~was~~ ^{was} there an altar, which survived throughout the century (5).

There may lastly be considered all these ceremonies, and incidentals of them, such as sacring bells; hand-bells, and candles, connected with various services, but chiefly with the service of mass. Such ceremonies had in the past been multitudinous; already an order of the Council of January 18, 1548, had abolished ashes, palms, and Candlemass candles, and a Royal Proclamation in the following month abrogated the custom of creeping to the cross on Good Friday, and the use of holy-bread and holy water (6). In the time of

(7) (cont. from previous page): St. Margaret, St. Nicholas, and St. Oswald in Durham, Long Newton, Pittington, Sedgefield, and Stockton.

(1) Frere "Visit. Arts." III, p. 284-5

(2) S.S. 22, p. 24. (3) Kennedy "Eliz. Episc. Ad" II, p. 98-9. (4) S.S. 22, p. 128.

(5) N.C.H. p. 134-5.

(6) Frere "Visit. Arts." II, p. 184-5 notes.

Mary, however, holy-bread, holy-water, palms, and ashes were ordered by proclamation to be restored (1). Under Elizabeth the return to the ornaments in use in the second year of Edward VI's reign, ordained by the Act of Uniformity and the Prayer Book, meant that candlesticks, trindals, or rolls of wax, pictures on walls and windows, receptacles for holy-bread and holy water, for palms and ashes, and Easter sepulchres were illegal, but that two lights on the high altar before the sacrament were lawful (2). The Royal Injunctions of 1559 furthermore ordered that candlesticks, trindals, and rolls of wax should be utterly destroyed, and where monthly sermons were permitted enjoined that emphasis should be laid on works of faith, rather than on setting of candles, praying on beads, and other such ceremonies (3).

Both metropolitical and episcopal visitation articles and injunctions seem to show that certain at anyrate of these old usages were retained in Durham. Archbishop Grindal wrote to Cecil on August 29, 1570, concerning his northern province, and amongst other things stated that the people still prayed on beads or rosaries (4); in his Injunctions of the following year he commanded that no ceremonies were to be used at communion which were not appointed by the Prayer Book, such as crossing or breathing over the elements, and elevation so that people could adore the sacraments (5). He further enjoined that pixes, paxes, hand-bells, sacring bells, censers, crosses, candlesticks, and holy-water stoups should be utterly destroyed, this being the especial charge of churchwardens and ministers (6). Finally he ordered that no one was to wear beads or pray in Latin or English upon them; not to pray on any popish Latin or English primer; nor to burn candles in church at Candlemas; not to worship or make any reverence to any cross or image (7). Then Barnes in his seventh article of 1577 expressly commanded that no rites should be used at divine service save those prescribed in the Prayer Book (8). Perhaps he was referring to such rites as the visitation articles of 1549, which are of questionable authority and were probably never administered,

- (1.) Frere "Visit. Arts." II, p. 328, note.
- (2.) Kennedy "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I, p. lx-lxii.
- (3.) Ibid p. xliii-v
- (4.) Frere "Visit. Arts" III, p. 253.
- (5.) Ibid p. 275 (6) Ibid p. 285.
- (7.) Ibid p. 289. Frere notes that candles at Candlemas had not been especially forbidden under Elizabeth.
- (8.) S.S. 22, p. 17.

stigmatised thus — "For an uniformity that no minister do counterfeit the popish mass, as to kiss the Lord's Table; washing his fingers every time in the communion; blessing his eyes with the paten or sudary, or crossing his head with the paten, shifting of the book from one place to another; laying down and licking the chalice of the communion; holding up his fingers, hands or thumbs joined towards his temples; breathing upon the bread or chalice; showing the sacrament openly before the distribution of the communion; ringing of sacring bells" (1). Finally both Archbishop Sandys in 1578 and Archbishop Piers in 1590 made inquiry whether pixes, paxes, hand-bells, sacring bells, censers, candlesticks, and holy water stoups had all been destroyed or defaced (2).

That such visitation articles were necessary is partly proved by the rebellion of 1569 when two holy-water stoups were set up in the cathedral, and one in each of the churches of St. Giles, St. Margaret, and St. Oswald in Durham, as well as in St. Andrew's Auckland, Sedgefield, Pittington, and Long Newton (3); these were probably in all cases the original water stoups; possibly in some churches it was not even necessary to re-erect them. At the rebellion also, rosaries once more appeared in public (4), having no doubt been used privately for many years.

At the same time in accordance with the Royal Order of 1561 which stated that, where this had not already been done, roodlofts should be transformed so that a chancel screen or partition alone should remain (5), much spoliation of old rood screens took place, except perhaps in such churches as Darlington in which the screen, from its constructional character, was in no danger, saving that its rood and images would have to be removed (6). This removal, however, was but slowly undertaken, as is proved by the fact that Grindal in 1571 urged the necessity of replacing such roods by crests (7). Barnes and Archbishop Sandys enforced this command as far as it concerned removal of the old roods, (8)

(1.) Frere "Visit. Arts." II, p. 191-3

(2) Kennedy "Eliz. Episc. Ad." II, p. 98-9; *ibid* III, p. 261. (3) cf. S.S. 21, pp. 140, 167, 171, 173-4, 175-7, 180, 186, 196. (4) S.S. 21, p. 160.

(5) Frere "Visit. Arts." III, p. 108-9.

(6) cf. W.H.D. Longstaffe, Arch. Ael. 2nd. Ser. pt. 22, p. 246. (7) Frere "Visit. Arts." III, p. 284-5.

(8) S.S. 22, p. 24; & Kennedy "Eliz. Episc. Ad." II, p. 98-9.

and during Barnes' episcopacy the remnants of Coniscliffe rood-loft were reported to be still standing (1), so that the work apparently was not completed until about 1580.

All these things show something of the attitude of the people and their affection for the old forms of the mass, an affection which appears in its full strength in the case of Thomas Swalwell, a clergyman of Durham county. In articles against him in 1571 he was accused, amongst other things, of affirming that, after the prayer of consecration, the substance of bread and wine was replaced by the real and proportionable body of Christ. Of these changes Swalwell, who, it was probably rightly supposed, had been implicated in the rebellion, attempted to make no denial (2).

On a few other questions of a doctrinal nature a certain stubbornness was being shown. One such question was that of the old fasts and feasts which Grindal, on the eve of his metropolitical visitation, told Cecil were being kept as if they have never been abrogated (3). Consequently Barnes stringently ordained that no abrogated holydays should be kept, or divine services celebrated on them; and that no superfluous fasts such as the Lady Fast, St. Trinyon's Fast (St. Trinyon being a northern corruption for St. Ninian), the Black Fast (i.e. the abstinence not only from flesh meats but from the "lacticinia") and St. Margaret's Fast (i.e. St. Margaret of Scotland), were to be observed. This article was similar to that of Bishop Aylmer for London diocese, of the same year (4).

Another question, and a more vital one, was that of the acceptance of the Royal Supremacy. The chief opposition to it had, of course, to be met in Henry VIII's time. The preaching order of 1535 declared that bishops and preachers were to preach against the Bishop of Rome's usurped authority. Tunstal, however, had actually forestalled the order, and was able to write to Cromwell on July 21, 1535, with reference to the King's letters to set forth his title of Supreme Head;— "I had done so myself, and caused others to do the same before receiving the letters, but I thereupon went to Durham

- (1). S.S. 22, p. 128 (2) S.S. 21, p. 202-3.
(3) Cf. his letter of Aug. 29, 1570. Frere "Visit. Apts." III, p. 253.
(4) cf. Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." II, p. 72.

and preached myself" (1). At the beginning of the following year the monastic visitors, Leigh and Layton, wrote to Cromwell in glowing terms of his work in this respect. Through his efforts, they said, no part of the Kingdom was in better order as far as the acceptance of the King's Supremacy was concerned. Both recommended that he should be asked to write a book on the subject, which, they thought, would have great influence with men of learning, and even perhaps with the Kings of Christendom (2).

Their account, however, was probably coloured by the conciliatory treatment they were receiving at the hands of the Bishop (3), and Tunstal's attitude was not illustrative of that of the counties generally. On September 30, 1535, Anthony Heron, who was said to be late of Conniscliffe in county Durham, was indicted for stating both on that day in York castle, and on other occasions in 1535, that the King was not the head of the church, because the Pope held this position; the indictment was endorsed "Billa Vera" (4). In 1539 the Bishop himself stated in a letter to Cromwell, "Very few preachers in Durham and the other northern counties set forth God's word and the King's supremacy" (5), and Richard Marshall, the Prior of the black friars in Newcastle, in the winter of 1535-6 preached a course of sermons against the Royal Supremacy and in favour of the Pope (6). Such an attitude was perhaps only natural in the case of a friar, as from their foundation the mendicant Orders had been firm upholders of the papal authority, but it was none the less dangerous in view of their great influence as preachers. Again in Tunstal's register the oath explicitly renouncing papal authority to be taken at the time of institution was only registered three times (7), and there is only one reference to the oath of supremacy in accordance with the Act (8), whereas in Pilkington's time the oath of renunciation was usually included in the records of institutions and collations (9). The title of Henry VIII, "In terra supremum caput Anglicane

(1). L. & P. VIII, p. 424. (2) L.&P. X, p. 64-5.

(3) cf. above p.4-5. (4) L.& P. IX, p. 160.

(5) L.& P. XIV, ii, App. 7.

(6) L.&P. X, p 236; above p.40.

(7) T.R. nos. 291, 379, 391.

(8) Ibid, no 379.

(9) Ibid, p. lii-iii.

ecclesie", occurs very seldom in this register in institution documents, and in each case the record concerns an institution on the presentation of the King (1).

In the early years of Elizabeth's reign, the attitude of some people of the two counties was still fairly clear. The records of the Royal Visitation of 1559 throw an important light on this matter as far as the clergy were concerned. Many of those clergy who refused to subscribe to the visitation oath took as their ground their belief in the papal supremacy. The Dean himself, Thomas Robertson, refused, saying "That the Bishop of Rome ought to have the jurisdiction ecclesiastical of this realm" (2), and his example was followed on similar grounds by four of the prebendaries. Two others were slightly uncertain in their attitude but veered towards the papal side; of Anthony Salvin, for example, it was entered: "And to the article of supremacy he will not directly answer, but after long consideration he said that he believeth rather that the Bishop of Rome hath jurisdiction within this realm than otherwise" (3). Certain of the thirty five absentees from the visitation may have held similar opinions (4).

On November 14, 1561, Pilkington wrote concerning the people of Durham and Northumberland: "I am grown into such displeasure with them, part for religion, and part for ministering the oath of the Queen's superiority that I know not whether they like me worse or I them, so great dissembling, so poisonous tongues, and malicious tongues I have not seen." He added a postscript to his letter to this effect: "The last day of my visitation, a young priest being called with his churchwardens to take his oath as the rest to present such things as were amiss according to the Queen's Injunctions, refused to swear because he said those Injunctions hang on a farther authority which he could not allow. This he spake openly before all the people, rejoicing much at his own doings; after in communication afore a great number he said he thought that none other temporal man nor woman could have

(1) Ibid, no. 134, 161, 177.

(2) S.P. Dom. Eliz. X, p. 64. (3) Ibid, p. 68.

(4) S.P. Dom. Elix. X, p. 393-5. The prebendaries who declared for the papal supremacy were Robert Dalton, John Tutty, George Bullock, and George Cliff. The other doubter was Nicholas Marley (Ibid, p. 59, 66-70). Beside two of the eight minor canons who refused to sign this entry was made: "Attamen fa^m supremitatem" (Ibid p. 71-2, cf. above p. 136.)

power in spiritual matters but only the Pope of Rome. This boldness the people grow into because they see that such as refuse to acknowledge their due allegiance escape not only punishment, but are had in authority and estimation." (1).

Only, however, about a quarter of the parochial clergy failed to take the oath (2), and most of the thirty five absentees later submitted. The same Thomas Swalwell against whom other charges were brought, was accused in 1570 of failure to declare in sermons four times a year, in accordance with the Royal Injunctions of 1559 (3), that all usurped and foreign power was abolished, and that the Queen had the highest power under God. It was also stated that in August, 1570, he had publicly declared at Ebchester, Medomsley, or elsewhere, that the Queen had no more authority over the spiritual or ecclesiastical state of ministers than any other woman, for if she had such authority over them, then she must also have authority to loose and bind. In his answer, however, he affirmed that he was innocent of these accusations, although a witness was found to say that he had not heard Swalwell ever declare against the usurped foreign power (4). The majority of people, in fact, shrank from an open opposition to the Royal Supremacy; but the existence of this opposition amongst a proportion of the population is proved by the dealings of the rebels of 1569.

These facts taken together do show that, until the two years immediately succeeding the rebellion of 1569, the problem of ecclesiastical administration in Durham and Northumberland was indeed that of stamping out the old forbidden usages rather than that of curbing the action of Puritan enthusiasts. A mere comparison in Grindal's visitation injunctions of 1570-1 of the space allotted to regulations against the too conservative on the one hand, and the too progressive on the other hand, shows that this was the cause.

It has already been seen that with the accession of Elizabeth the belief in the importance attached to the Sainte became much diminished, but that

- (1.) S.P. Dom. Eliz. XX, no. 25.
- (2) Frere, "Eng. Church under Eliz. & James," p. 40-1.
- (3) Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I, p. xlii.
- (4) S.S. 21, p. 201-2, 204.

such a belief cannot be called exceptional until after 1570, and that before 1570 there is no evidence that the doctrine of justification by faith was held. Furthermore the old vestments and old baptismal customs continued to be used until roughly the same date, whilst the exchange of chalices for communion cups was chiefly effected after 1570. If old service books were not retained, there is evidence that the books newly ordained under Edward VI had been treated with ignominy.

On the other hand certain of the old usages continued to some extent until an even later date. For example, whilst requests for prayers and masses for the dead continued unabated in ~~number~~ in Edward's reign, the accession of Elizabeth was marked by a practical cessation of such demands; nevertheless visitation articles show that these remembrances of the dead continued until as late as 1578. Similarly the destruction of the old altars and roods, and the abolition of old feasts and fasts, was not complete until the time of Bishop Barnes, whilst injunctions show that some of the old ceremonies and ornaments connected with the mass were being used until an even later date.

On two important matters only is there no substantial testimony in the years up to 1570 that the people of the two counties showed a stubborn front to the changes. The doctrine of transubstantiation was not openly held, and despite the opposition to it in the reign of Henry VIII the Royal Supremacy seems to have been generally acknowledged in Elizabeth's reign, except in the case of the cathedral Chapter.

A consideration of these points leads to two conclusions. In the first place it appears that opposition to the religious changes, which perhaps partly accounts for the lack of ordinations observed in Tunstall's register, in the years 1535-42 and 1547-55, was fairly general right up to the time of the rebellion, but that after that date, partly no doubt on account of severe repressive measures, this opposition gradually became of much less importance. Material, therefore, was ready for the rebels to work upon, if they could make their cause appear to be at least partly religious.

The second conclusion which emerges is that although there was undoubted opposition, this was not on the surface very pronounced, or very much worse there than in other parts of England. In Durham and Northumberland there was an appearance of submitting to the changes, particularly on such vital points as transubstantiation and the Royal Supremacy, and because of this fact it might have been expected that the government would be unprepared to deal with so violent

a resistance as that of the rising of the Earls.

The first conclusion is reinforced by a letter written by Dean Horn on February 18, 1560, complaining in no measured terms of the religious outlook and attitude of the people, whom, he said, continued in superstitious behaviour, contrary to the order taken for religion, and neglected God's service at the times and places appointed. (1). Additional weight is given to it by the answer of Bishop Pilkington, dated November 22, 1564, to a letter of the Privy Council of October 17 of the same year which required a classification of those Justices of the Peace who were favourable, indifferent, or hostile to the established religion; and suggestions as to those who were fit for office, or who ought to be removed; and also suggestions of appropriate remedies for the repression of popery. The answers of the bishops showed that the dioceses of the North and West, that is Carlisle, Durham, York, Worcester, Hereford and Exeter, were the most hostile, and that this hostility was to be found amongst papists and those favouring the old religion, for, as Miss Bateson in her preface to the letters points out, there is nothing to show that Puritans were included amongst those "not fit to be trusted" (2).

Pilkington, who had already complained to Cecil in a letter of October 13, 1561, that he could not find twelve able Justices of wisdom and authority of any religion (3), conferred for the purposes of his answer with Lord Bedford, Sir John Forster, and Lord Evers. In the Bishopric he and Lord Evers thought themselves justified in commending six of the Justices of the Peace, whilst they reported of fourteen that they lived quietly and obeyed the laws, only one person falling under their suspicion.

Sir John Forster, who was warden of the Middle March, reported very well of Newcastle, which, in matters of religion, he thought to be one of the best towns north of the Trent, although he had to add that the poorer people sometimes hired themselves a preacher, to whose support he thought only a few of them contributed. This report was qualified, however, by Pilkington's conclusion that one of the chief hindrances to the established religion was the fact that certain

(1) S.P. Dom. Eliz. XI, no. 16.

(2) Cam. Soc. Misc. 2nd. Ser. IX, p. iii-iv.

(3) S.P. Dom. Eliz. XX, no. 5.

natives of the district who had become scholars at Louvain were in the habit of sending home books and letters; they were maintained he said, by the hospitals of Newcastle, and were related to the wealthiest people of that town as well as of Durham county (1). One of these scholars at Louvain was that John Raymes who was master of the West Spital, 1558-79 (2), and some of the others were probably the clergy who had been deprived of their livings, as a result of their refusal to accept the religious changes by taking the oath at the time of the 1559 visitation. For the rest of his area Forster thought that he could recommend twelve people as fit to be Justices, but he stated that Sir Robert Ellerker was "a very papist and unlearned"; two other important gentry he disliked or mistrusted,

Lord Bedford was at this time governor of Berwick and warden of the East March, and a truer picture of the real state of affairs came from him. He stated that within his charge he could find no Justice nor anyone whom he could recommend as meet for the office (3). Pilkington tried to give some reason for this by explaining that the people of the Border parishes hired Scottish priests who had fled from Knox's regime, because they were content to take low wages. As he said that they did much harm in dissuading the people, he added, "I have done my diligence to avoid them, but it is above my power." (4). Perhaps it was such priests as these that Forster meant were hired by the poorer people of Newcastle.

Although Pilkington's report upon the Bishopric had on the whole been favourable, it must have been evident that the cathedral city itself was not inclined to bow willingly to the orders of the government. The Dean and Chapter, at the visitation of 1559, had shown the greatest opposition to the Elizabethan religious settlement. The deprivations and new appointments which followed did something to change their tone, but in 1563 Dean Whittingham wrote to Cecil: "The people in the country are very docile and willing to hear God's word, but this town (Durham) is very stiff, notwithstanding they be handled with all lenity and gentleness; the best hope I have that now of late they begin to resort more

(1) Cam. Soc. Misc. 2nd. Ser. IX, p. 65-7.

(2) Welford II, p. 414; above p.

(3) Cam. Soc. Misc. 2nd. Ser. IX, p. 65-7.

(4) Ibid, p. 67.

diligently to the sermons and service" (1).

With regard to the second conclusion, that the people of the two counties did not maintain an open opposition to the religious changes such as would prepare the government to deal with resistance by force, it is yet true that the Pilgrimage of Grace had already shown the general attitude of the people of the North. Royal policy had, in consequence, been directed to the object of making the new forms of religion more palatable. For example, in 1545 Holgate, Archbishop of York, and President of the Council in the North, was instructed to sit with his Council at least one month each year at York, Hull, Newcastle, and Durham, to deliver goals, and to set forth to the people laws on the abolition of the papal power — instructing them carefully in papal abuses. They were also to explain laws for the abrogation of vain holydays such as were appointed by the Bishop of Rome. They were to inquire concerning "intakes" (enclosures), and extreme gressoms and rents, and to see that the poor were not oppressed (2). Much the same instructions were given in 1549 to the Earl of Shrewsbury on his appointment as President of the Council. He and his Council were to help the poor, for example by appointing counsellors for poor suitors, and by redressing wrongful enclosures, and at the same time they were to urge the people to conform to Parliament's ordinances on religion (3).

These orders show an appreciation on the part of the government of the fact that religious discontent was inextricably combined with economic grievances, and as the latter were of extreme importance in the rebellion of 1569, had the government persisted in this policy it is possible that the opposition to its religious policy, although undeniably present and fairly general, might never have come to the surface.

(1) Lansdown Mss. VII, fol. 24.

(2) Welford II, p. 226.

(3) Cal. S.P. Dom, VI, p. 399.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE REBELLION OF 1569.

SECTION I. THE PART PLAYED IN THE REBELLION BY THE
MEN OF DURHAM AND NORTHUMBERLAND.

The arrival of Mary, Queen of Scots, in England, in May, 1568, brought to the fore the question of the succession to the throne, and gave a rallying point for the discontent in the northern counties. The project, which was soon broached, of a marriage between Mary and the Duke of Norfolk, seemed to offer a solution to the first problem which would be acceptable to the Catholics. Although never wholly adopted by the northern malcontents it obtained much support throughout the country, but when the secret reached the ears of Queen Elizabeth, Norfolk was frightened into abandoning the plot. His disgrace and imprisonment exposed the other chief conspirators, the Earls of Northumberland and Westmorland, who, moreover, through the medium of Guerau de Spes, the Spanish ambassador, had entered into connection with the foreign enemies of England; consequently, as a result of their summons to court in October, 1569, they decided to take up arms, and force their policy upon the government.

The rebellion was launched; but, to some extent, the Earls had stumbled into it without any very clear idea of the immediate issues. Many of their supporters had better reason to oppose the policy of the government, although their method of remedying its defects was faulty. The peace with Scotland, subsequent upon the overthrow of Catholicism in the northern kingdom, had diverted interest from the Borders until, at length, their decay became a matter of moment. This decay was partly due to the granting of castles to non-resident captains; the leasing of crown lands to inland men, or men who were not borderers; and the negligence of such Wardens as Sir John Forster, who, although in some ways unfitted for the position, was retained in office as a useful check upon the Percies with whom he was at feud. For these causes of the decay of the Borders the Crown was responsible, but others were the result of the economic changes of the century. The substitution of sheep and cattle for horses and the increase of farms and gressoms had deleterious effects, while the statute of Artificers (of 1563) increased the distress by checking the development of cloth weaving as a domestic industry; and the interruption of the wool trade with Flanders in 1568-9 damaged the prosperity of the northern towns.

The government no longer pursued the conciliatory policy which had found illustration in the instructions issued to Holgate and Shrewsbury on their appointments to the presidency of the council in the north. Particularly during the presidency of Archbishop Young (1564-8) irregularities crept into its administration; sometimes no sessions were held at Newcastle or Carlisle for three or four years together, which, because of the expense of travel, involved a real burden upon the people. The interference of the Crown only aggravated the distress. In 1564-5 Elizabeth sent commissioners to try to get higher profits from the Crown lands in Richmondshire, Barnard Castle, Cumberland, and Northumberland, and so drew a protest from the Earl of Northumberland; but in the following year the commissioners returned to let all the Queen's lands on condition of military service and of "enclosure by quick set hedge" (1).

A solid background of economic hardship had set the scene for an uprising of the northerners, and across the stage as one of the major villains of the piece, Sir William Cecil was made to move. Many of the objectionable points of Elizabeth's ~~policy~~ were ascribed to him. Like Thomas Cromwell, the arch-villain of the Pilgrimage of Grace, he was a man of middle-class birth, and while it was the purpose of the Queen to break the power of the northern lords, she relied upon men of his type to build up the royal authority. Feudalism was still flourishing in the North even in the sixteenth century, but the Act of 1536 "for recontinuing of certain liberties and franchises heretofore taken from the Crown", the Pilgrimage of Grace, and the subsequent establishment in 1537 of the Council in the North as the supreme judicial and administrative authority north of the Trent, had undermined the power of the "ancient nobility". The Act of Resumption, although of general application, was chiefly aimed at the county palatine of Durham, and the grievance was not forgotten. Elizabeth was unable to undo the work of her sister and reunite the Palatinate and Percy lands to the Crown, but she continued the work of her father in its attack upon special jurisdictions. Thomas Percy, the seventh earl of Northumberland and the son of the Sir Thomas Percy who had been executed for his share in the Pilgrimage of Grace, had come into his title and regained the estates of his family during the reign of Mary; by a series of

(1) R. Reid, "Trans. of the Royal Hist. Soc. New Ser. XX, p. 177-189, 189.

petty slights Elizabeth forced him to resign his wardenship of the East and Middle Marches and the Keeperships of Tynedale and Redesdale; she reprimanded him sharply for his interference on behalf of the Crown tenants, and when he claimed by feudal custom the right to receive Mary Stuart she forbade his interference; finally, as a crowning insult, she seized a copper mine which had been discovered on his property at Newlands in Cumberland. (1).

While such actions won for the government the ill-will of those chiefly concerned, they equally increased the hostility of the people generally; as the men who took the place of the Percies and Dacres were often absentees and negligent in the execution of their functions, the borderers soon wished again for the rule of the great lords who had kept open house, and hawked and hunted. Meanwhile some of the lesser gentry had been given reason to harbour grudges against the officials of the Crown. In 1561, Gerard Salvin of Croxdale, John Brimley, the organist of the cathedral, and Robert Birkhead, were ejected from certain tithes of Bishop Middleham rectory which they held by lease of 1539 from the Priory of Durham (2); ~~again~~, similarly, in 1565, Carham rectory (which had belonged to Kirkham Priory) was in the occupation of Luke Ogle, John Carr of Ford, and Robert Collingwood, the constable of Etal, but Thomas Clarke of Wark obtained a lease of it in reversion, and, despite the protests of the existing leasees and of the Earl of Bedford and Sir John Forster, in 1566 he was in possession of a lease dated in 1564 (3). When rebellion was undertaken one of the Salvins, one of the Carrs of Ford, and the constable of Etal, were all found ranged behind the Earls, and, like them, many of the actors in the plot were largely moved by resentment at Elizabeth's policy in government.

A large number of the lesser characters played their part in the scenes which were to follow the imprisonment of Norfolk, because of some personal connection between them and the Earls. Although their power had been in part broken by the measures of Henry VIII, for many years the northern nobility had wielded as royal officials the power which they had previously exercised by feudal right. The Earl of Northumberland was lord of many baronies and manors in Yorkshire, of Alnwick castle, Alnedale, Coquetdale, and South Tynedale in Northumberland, and also of property in Cumberland. Writing of his influence in Northumberland in a letter

(1) R. Reid "Trans. Royal Hist. Soc." New. Ser. XX, p 177-8.

(2) Surtees VI, p.8-9. cf. 1564-5 record of proceedings in

to Cecil of November 24, 1569, Sir John Forster said, "My lord of Northumberland hath in this country land of the yearly rent of 1,000 pounds, whereof he hath many tenants, and as many of them given to the evil as to the good." (1). The Earl of Westmorland was lord of Brancepeth and Raby in Durham; of Middleham and Sheriffhutton in Yorkshire; of Bywell, Bolbeck and Mitford in Northumberland; and of Penrith in Cumberland. Both of them had much patronage at their disposal and maintained a large household staff, so that their service was still an important road to promotion, whilst, equally, it was unwise for their tenants to oppose them either in politics or religion.

Some of the important gentry of Northumberland who were drawn into the rising served the Percies in official capacities. In his early interviews with the Spanish ambassador, Thomas Bates of Morpeth and Holywell, who was chief steward of the barony of Alnwick, had acted as interpreter for the Earl (2). Bates was, in addition, a tenant of the Dacres for some mills in Morpeth (3), and consequently was also employed as intermediary between the Earl and Leonard Dacre (4). The rebels were soon joined by John Carnaby of Langley— for whose father, Thomas, as well as for himself, Sir Reynold Carnaby had obtained from Henry, the sixth earl, the offices of constable of Langley castle and forester of Langley park, and a ninety nine years lease of Langley demesne which was devised to John himself (5). George Horsley of Acklington Park in Warkworth, members of whose family were generally in the sixteenth century farmers or keepers of the Park, threw in his lot with them (6) and was followed by a host of other retainers or household servants of the Earl—such as Tristram Fenwick of Brinkburn; James Swinhoe of Thornhill; George Pringle of Farnacres; the youthful John Sayer of Worsall; Cuthbert Armourer of Belford; the two James Shaftos, father and son, of Tanfield-Leigh; and William Holland, and Robert Widdrington (7).

the Exchequer against these three for unlawful entry into, and occupation of, the church of Middleham in the tenure of Christopher Heyward. DK. Rep. 37, App. I, p. 70-1.
(3.) N.C.H. XI, p. 17.

- (1) Sharpe, p. 83. (2) Sharpe, p. 189-90; N.C.H. IX, p. 84.
(3) Sir John Forster had seized them on the death of Thomas, Lord Dacre, but Bates claimed and recovered them—Sharpe, p. 360-1. (4) Ibid, p. 231; N.C.H. IX, p. 84, 86. (5) Sharpe, p. 230; Arch. Ael. 2nd. Ser. pt. 27, p. 53.
(6) N.C.H. V, p. 378; Sharpe, p. 231.
(7) See next page.

Charles, the sixth earl of Westmorland, brought an even larger following to the cause. Devotion to his service, and a high degree of inter-relationship, accounted for the support of many of the gentry of Durham. The Claxtons of Holywell were constables of his castle of Brancepeth (1), and the family in all its branches was zealously attached to the Nevilles. Robert Claxton of Old Park who was 30 at the time of the rebellion (2) was their tenant for part of his property (3), and as a servant of the earl was already involved in the conspiracy at the beginning of October (4). His relative, Robert Claxton of Burnhall, was only 22 years old in 1569 (5), and being a tenant of the Earl for the manor of Burne Magna (6) no doubt was easily persuaded to join the rebels. Even William Claxton of Wynyard took a prominent part, at least in the preliminary musters, (7), although he cannot have shared the youthful enthusiasm for war of his young relatives, both because ~~Mark~~ of his age (8) and his literary propensities, for he was chiefly noteworthy as a skilful herald and antiquary (9).

One of the Claxtons of Burnhall had married the aunt of Gerard Salvin, (10), and the ramifications of the two families spread far and wide. Robert Claxton of Old Park married Alice Lambton, one of the co-heiresses of Marmaduke Lambton of Bellasis, and so became the uncle of Robert Eden of West Auckland (11). Only 22 in 1569, (12) Eden evidently yielded to the persuasions of his

-
- (7) Sharpe, p. 117, 200, 323, 128-9, 14, 21, 215-6; Surtees II, p. 386; Cal. S.P. Dom. VII, p. 385, 394.
 (1) Surtees III, p. 298.
 (2) Aged 8 years in 1547. D.K. Rep. 44, App. p. 358-9.
 (3) Inq. p.m. Ralph Claxton 1547, Ibid.
 (4) Sharpe, p. 230, 227.
 (5) Aged 13 in 1561, Inq. p.m. William Claxton, D.K. Rep. 44, App. p. 360. cf. he was baptised at St. Oswald's in 1548 (Par. Reg.) (6) D.K. Rep. 44, App. p. 360.
 (7) Sharpe, p. 13 (8) he was 19 in 1549 D.K. Rep, 44, App. p. 359. (9) Surtees III, p. 79.
 (10) Ibid IV, ii, p. 119.
 (11) Robert's father, John, married the other Lambton heiress, Ibid, III, p. 294.
 (12) He was baptised in 1547 at St. Nicholas, Durham Par. Reg.

Uncle Claxton and of his wife, Jane Hutton of Hunwick, who accepted whole-heartedly the restoration of Roman Catholicism in Auckland (1). Through William Claxton of Wynyard, whose mother was a Hebburn of Hardwick, and who had himself married a daughter of Robert Lambert of Owton (2), the Claxtons were connected with two more rebel families (3). Because of his marriage to a daughter of Richard Norton of Norton-Conyers, the patriarch of the rebellion who had taken part in the Pilgrimage of Grace, the younger Gerard Salvin was drawn into the transactions of these times (4); he was himself related to the Blakistons, the Hebburns, and the Parkinsons of Beaumont Hill (5) and, through his wife, to the Bulmers of Turstable and the Killinghalls of Middleton-St. George (6). All these families, or members of them, took part in the rebellion, and the web of interconnection can be traced still further to show close relationship between the Edens and Welburys of Brancepeth and Castle Eden; between the Hebburns, Lamberts, and Tempests of Holmside; between the Blakistons, Welburys, and Trollopes of Thornley; and between the Parkinsons and the Killinghalls (7). Family alliances

(1) S.S. 21, p. 181-3; Sharpe, p. 123, 128.

(2) Surtees III, p. 79. (3) Sharpe, p. 229-30.

(4) Surtees IV, ii, p. 119. The family had some connection with the Nevilles, cf. Gerard Salvin, senior, was an executor of the 1563 will of Henry, the 5th earl (Wills & Invs. II, p. 4-5.)

(5) The brother, Humphrey, of the rebel, Marmaduke Blakiston, married Margaret, the daughter of Richard Hebburn of Hardwick, who had another daughter married to one of the Gerard Salvins (Surtees III, p. 162). Edward Parkinson of Beaumont Hill, the father of Henry, the rebel, in his will of 1567 spoke of his uncle, Gerard Salvin (Wills & Invs. III, p. 37-9).

(6) Katharine, the daughter of Richard Norton married Francis Bulmer, and their son Anthony was amongst the rebels (Sharpe, p. 18) Henry Killinghall's sister married Marmaduke Norton, the 8th. son of the patriarch (ib. p. 286-7.)

(7) John Eden married as his second wife the daughter of Anthony Welbury, the rebel (Surtees I, p. 43). Anthony Hebburn, the rebel, married a daughter of Robert Tempest of Holmside who also took part in the rebellion, and the grandmother of Robert Lambert was a Tempest of Holmside (Ibid III, p. 34, 132-3). The grandfather of John Trollope of the 1569 rebellion married a Blakiston (Surtees I, p. 92-3), and from Wills it appears that an aunt of Anthony Welbury married one of the Trollopes (Wills & Invs. I, p. 426-7, III, p. 87-8). The mother of Henry Killinghall, the rebel, was the aunt of Henry Parkinson, the rebel (Arch. Ael. 2nd. Ser. II, pt. 6, p. 86-7.)

alone may have been sufficient to obtain the support for the rebel cause of certain of the gentry, but they were sometimes supplemented by connection with the Nevilles, whether as tenant or servant, and some of the participants in the rebellion were of so youthful an age as to lend weight to the conjecture that many of the rebels were moved rather by relationships of these types than by any settled principles. Like Robert Claxton of Burnhall and Robert Eden, Henry Parkinson of Beaumont Hill was only 22 years old (1), but he was closely related to the other rebels, and his family was connected with the Nevilles (2). Anthony Hebburn of Hardwick was 27 (3) and Henry Killinghall but a year older (4); both, however, were affected by ties of blood, and the Killinghalls were bound to the cause of the Earl both as his tenants for a moiety of the manor of Middleton-St-George (5) and as his retainers (6). Finally, Gerard Salvin himself was only 31 years old (7).

The brothers, Anthony and John Welbury, were in the service of the Earl (8); the Trollopes were his tenants for the manor of Thornley (9); and other rebels, who have not previously been mentioned, were similarly attached to him, some in official capacities. William Lee of Brandon was his steward and held leases of his property in Brancepeth and elsewhere (10). Nicholas Featherstonehaugh of Brancepeth was keeper of the West Park (11); John Swinburne of Chopwell was a lesee under him and administered his baronies of Bywell and Bolbeck (12), and, through him, connection was established with

(1) aged 20 at the death of his father, 1567, D.K. Rep. 44, App. p. 485.

(2) In 1563 his father had bought Blackwell in Darlington from the Earl of Westmorland Surtees III, p. 369.

(3) He was 19 in 1561, D.K. Rep. 44, App. p. 425.

(4) Aged 32 in 1573; P.R.O. Dun. Inq. p.m. File 191, no. 35.

(5) D.K. Rep, 44, App. p. 446

(6) cf. in 1548 one of the poor gentlemen in Staindrop hospital was John Killinghall. S.S. 22 p.lxxiv-v.

(7) Aged 33 at the death of his father, 1571 - P.R.O. Dun. Inq. p.m. File 191, no. 24.

(8) Sharpe, p. 117. (9) D.K. Rep. 44, App, p. 519.

(10) Wills & Invs. II, p. 48. Henry, the 5th. Earl, by his will of 1563 made him receiver of all his property in Durham and Northumberland during the minority of his son. Ibid, p. 47. (11) Wills & Invs. II, p. 4.

(12) N.C.H. VI, p. 82, 229 etc.; L. & P. XIII, ii, p. 457.

the Raymes and the Smiths of Nunstainton who also followed the Earl in 1569 (1). The Conyers family were also his servants or officials (2), and the rebels were consequently joined by Ralph Conyers of Cotham-Conyers, Ralph Conyers of Layton, and Richard Conyers of Horden (3); whilst the Hodgsons of Newcastle and Lanchester were in some way involved in the traitorous dealings of these months through the attachment of William Hodgson of the Manor House to his service (4). In addition to all these men who belonged to families for many years prominent in the county, Earl Charles brought with him in 1569 a large number of household servants, some of whom ranked as gentry and some as yeoman, but all of whose names were comparatively little known. Of such sort were Henry Rutter of St. Oswald's, Durham; Henry and John Ridley of Brancepeth; Ralph Shaw of Claadon; Thomas Watson of Raby; and Nicholas Neville of Wolsingham who was a scion of his own house (5).

Some of the rebels, as well as the two Earls themselves, had held governmental or official positions under the Crown in the years preceding the rebellion; Thomas Bates, for example, had represented the borough of Morpeth in Parliament in 1554-5 and 1557-8, had received a commendation of Queen Mary for his services during the Border warfare of 1557, and in 1561 was supervisor of the Crown lands in Northumberland (6). Richard Hodgson of Hebburn was sheriff of Newcastle in 1549, and mayor in 1555 and 1566 (7); and the father of Ralph Conyers of Layton had been High Sheriff of Durham (8). The loyalty, however, which they owed to the Crown was set aside in favour of the loyalty which they owed to their immediate lords, the Earls of Northumberland and Westmorland, a development typical of the worst days of feudalism, but not surprising in

(1) cf. Brand I, p. 80; Surtees III, p. 48. John Swinburne married a Smith of Nunstainton.

(2) Sharpe, p. 228. (3) Ibid, p. 139, 228-9, 128.

(4) Surtees II, p. 322; Sadler II, p. 64.

(5) Sharpe, p. 130, 146; S.S. 21, p. 177-8. Two of the rebels mentioned in the foregoing paragraph were also fairly young. Richard Conyers of Layton was 29, and John Trollope of Thornley was 32 (D.K. Rep. 44, App. p. 360, 519). The others were more mature.

(6) Sharpe, p. 360-1; N.C.H. IV, p. 207-8.

(7) Surtees II, p. 75 (8) Surtees III, p. 37.

view of the fact that the northern gentry seldom came to court, whilst Elizabeth herself had never gone further north in her progresses than the Trent and had never exercised her tremendous personal influence upon the men of the two counties. These were, in fact, still the days when it might be said with justice of the men of Northumberland "They knew no other Prince but a Percy."

Other substantial men of the counties took part in the rebellion, amongst whom must be numbered William Clavering of Old Acres; Robert Collingwood of Abberwick; Thomas Errington of Walwick Grange; the Halls, well-to-do drapers of Durham; Francis Wicliff of Cockshaw; Thomas Musgrave of Newburn; the Swinhoes of Durham; and lastly William Welton of Welton and Thornburgh (1). They were joined by a host of lesser men, gentry, yeomen, traders and men of the poorest classes, many of whose names have been preserved, and upon the backbone of whose support the chances of the success of the rising necessarily rested. The question therefore arises as to what caused these numberless people to risk their lives and their means of livelihood in so hazardous an enterprise. Some were undoubtedly moved chiefly by the grievances already enumerated, economic hardships or personal grudges against the Crown; some joined the Earls simply because they were their followers and servants, and had received their summons to the musters. Where the head of any house took a share in the movement, he was generally accompanied by many cadets and dependants of his family who usually ranked as his household servants; the fortunes of the Earl of Northumberland were shared by John Pearsye or Percy, one of his gentlemen ushers, and Robert Pearsye, his household servant (2); various Nevilles, including the Earl's uncles, Christopher and Cuthbert, joined the rebels (3); and amongst the lists of those taking part in the conspiracy these occur: Claxtons, Conyers, Swinburnes, Fenwicks, Shaftoes, Lamberts and Trollopes, all of whom were probably dependants of the rebels bearing these surnames (4).

(1) Sharpe, p. 272-3, 129, 231; Cal. S.P. Dom. VII, p. 520, Proc. of the Newc. Soc. of Antiq. II, p. 93.

(2) Sharpe, p. 129.

(3) e.g. also Nicholas Neville and George Neville, Sharpe, p. 123.

(4) cf. Sharpe, p. 128-9, 231, 139-40.

The rebels were, therefore, actuated by a variety of motives, but the rallying cry for the majority seems to have been dislike of the innovations in religion and opposition to the ecclesiastical policy of the government, which was to a large extent considered to be the policy of the upstart Cecil, who was known, like Thomas Cromwell, to be strongly anti-Catholic. While it was Elizabeth's aim to break the power of the northern lords, she was also determined to enforce the religious settlement north of the Trent. At first she dared not offend the moderate Catholic party; Shrewsbury remained President of the Council until his death in 1560, and Bishop Pilkington wrote to Cecil in a letter of October 13, 1561, "If Mr. Mennell and other refusing the oath of their allegiance may be on the counsell, in authority still, and have their doings for good, it will encourage other to the like or worse"; and, on November 14, he made another complaint against the retention in office of Sergeant Mennell and men of his kind (1). After the death of Shrewsbury, however, and the securing of the frontier by the Treaty of Leith, the Protestant Earl of Rutland became President, and Archbishop Young, Bishop Pilkington, and Dean Skinner of Durham were given places on the Council, while an article was added to their instructions requiring them to aid the bishops in enforcing the Prayer Book and Injunctions. During the presidency of Young (1564-8) this policy was not rigidly executed, but after the arrival in England of Mary Stuart the laws against Recusants were enforced with increasing severity. The result of these measures was that the Council as a whole took no such part in the rebellion as it had in the Pilgrimage of Grace (2), but they also served to aggravate religious discontent in Durham diocese, where the Bishop and Dean were already disliked. Both were in part intent upon personal gain, and, having been numbered amongst the ranks of the exiles during Mary's reign, could have little sympathy with the opinions of their flocks. Pilkington was particularly obnoxious as a married bishop, and his iconoclastic tendencies were shared to the full by Whittingham, who had become Dean in 1563, although he was a Calvinist and had never been ordained in the Church.

(1) S.P. Dom. Eliz. XX, no. 5, 25.

(2) R. Reid, "The Council in the North", p. 187-8, 193, 195-6, 205.

A certain proportion of the rebels had been connected with the dissolved institutions in one capacity or another. Some had been lay administrators and fee'd servants of the monasteries, sometimes holding what were, in effect, sinecure offices. For example, in 1535 Henry, Earl of Northumberland, was chief steward of Whitby Abbey, he and his heirs having been granted this office in perpetuity under the convent seal; at the same time he was chief steward of Haltemprice Priory in Yorkshire, and of Hexham Abbey, his fee in the last capacity being £5 yearly (1). His brother, Sir William Percy, was steward of Handale, Thyked, and Hampole Priors in Yorkshire; steward of the court of Heminburgh for Durham Priory and of Yokefleet for Finchale Priory (2). Ralph, Earl of Westmorland, was master forester of Guisborough Priory at a fee of £3 (3), and Simon Welbury, the father of the two rebels, was bailiff of Guisborough (4). Some, again, were leasees under the monasteries; the Swinburnes of Chopwell, in 1528, had obtained from Newminster Abbey a fifty-one years lease of Chopwell manor (5), they also held a lease under Hexham of the tithes of Slaley chapelry (6), and, shortly before the suppression John Swinburne and Cuthbert Blunt, had a lease from Blanchland Abbey of the rectory of Bywell St. Andrew together with a grant of the next advowson (7). These examples are sufficient to show the close connection which had existed between the families of some of the rebels and the dissolved monasteries; as, however their fees and leases were generally continued at the suppression, they suffered no immediate ill effects. Some, moreover, of the rebels had become grantees of monastic lands; John Swinburne obtained the fee simple of Chopwell from the Crown grantees, and had a lease from the King of Wylam Hall - which had previously belonged to Tynemouth Priory (8); Simon Welbury in 1553 shared a grant of Castle Eden, which had belonged to Guisborough, with one Christopher Moreland (9); the Fenwicks were in occupation of Brinkburn as a result of a grant from Henry VIII (10); and Thomas Bates, Robert Tempest, and Richard Hodgson had similar grants (11). Nevertheless, in some ways

(1) Valor V, p. 83, 127; Proc. of the Newc. Soc. Antiq. 3rd. Ser. III, p.31. (2) Valor V, p. 44, 87, 94, 303-4. (3) Harl. Mss. vol. 600, fol. 30.
(4) Valor V, p. 81; cf. also in the bursar's roll of 1536-7 Marmaduke Blakiston appears as bailiff of Billingham (S.S. 103, p. 703.) (5) Arch. Ael. 3rd. Ser. XII, p.225. (6) N.C.H. VI, p. 379 (7) Ibid, p.241-2.
(8) Surtees II, p. 276; N.C.H. XII, p. 224.
(9) Surtees I, p.42-3 (10) 29 Henry VIII L.& P. XIII, (cont)

they had cause in later years to regret the suppression; monastic leases were sometimes called in question; monastic chantries, such as the chantries of Ralph and of Thomas Neville in Durham cathedral (1), were swept away; they had made frequent use of monastic hospitality, the monks and nuns had undertaken the education of their children, whilst the fact that a Margaret Trollope was one of the nuns of Neasham in 1539 (2) shows that, by the suppression, the families of the rebels were deprived of a source of provision for the cadets of their house.

In the same way they were affected by the dissolution of the chantries and colleges in 1548. Money which they or their ancestors had bequeathed for the support of priests was appropriated by the Crown, and so they were deprived of their prayers. The remaining portion of the money—which William Blakiston of Coxhoe, a relative of Marmaduke Blakiston, who took part in the rising, had given to find a priest in Norton church—was confiscated (3). Roland Swinburne, a near relative of the rebel, was a prebendary of Norton college (4) and, although he was pensioned, in future it became impossible to find remunerative sinecures of this nature for members of their houses. Staindrop College was in the patronage of the Earls of Westmorland, and notwithstanding the fact that their acquiescence in its suppression seems to have been secured by leases both of it and of Darlington college and by a grant of some of its plate (5), and although the inmates of the house in 1548 continued to draw their annuities until their death—real hardship was inflicted upon the poor by the withdrawal of this source of charity.

It was, in fact, the poorer classes who chiefly suffered by the dissolution. The suppression of the monasteries had increased poverty; a most inadequate provision had been made to replace the charitable work of Durham Priory, and no provision had been made to replace the relief given by the other religious houses of the two counties. Under colour of the Acts to suppress

i, p. 585. N.C.H. VII, p. 470. (11) L. & P. XIII, ii, p. 496; N.C.H. IX, p. 224-

(1) cf. S.S. 18, p. 90-2, 188-9 etc.

(2) L. & P. XIV, ii, p. 284.

(3) S.S. 97, p. 157; S.S. 22, p. lxix.

(4) S.S. 22, p. lxix; Welford II, p. 106.

(5) cf. above p. 394.

the monasteries or chantries not only large and important hospitals such as Staindrop and Kepier had been swept away, but also many smaller foundations. Even more than their richer neighbours they must have resented the suppression of the chantries, and more particularly of the religious gilds which were, at least in part, maintained by their annual subscriptions, and through which they obtained various benefits, not the least of which were unceasing prayers for the health of their souls, for it is probable that the belief in the efficacy of prayers for the departed died more hardly amongst the poor and ignorant than amongst the well-to-do. Similarly, they felt more resentment at the loss of what was beautiful and picturesque in the services and adornment of the church; lights, and images, sometimes maintained by their gilds, pictures, and ceremonies, had been beloved by them, and their destruction or abolition was keenly felt. Inasmuch, therefore, as the rising was the result of opposition to the religious policy of the government, and could be made to appear in the nature of a crusade, the hearty support of many of the lower classes could be counted upon, as well as of a certain proportion of the clergy of the counties; particularly because, as has already been seen, the Crown had abandoned the conciliatory policy in economic matters which had found illustration in the instructions issued to Holgate and Shrewsbury as Presidents of the Council in the North.

In fact, dislike of the innovations in religion was fairly general throughout the two counties amongst both rich and poor; it has been shown in the preceding chapter that, until about 1571, the problem of ecclesiastical administration was always one of stamping out the old practices. In essence, therefore, the rebel cause in 1569 was of the same nature as in 1536; whatever other grievances might be present, the cry which alone had power to unite all classes and types was religious.

Although the Catholic sympathies of some of the leaders were already apparent the majority had been forced to adopt an appearance of submission. Consequently, Pilkington in his answer of November 22, 1564, to the inquiry of the Privy Council concerning Justices of the Peace, commended Earl Charles as fit to be a Justice, and reported that Robert Tempest, Gerard Salvin, and William Smith lived quietly and obeyed the laws, and that the aldermen of Newcastle, amongst whom was Richard Hodgson, were obedient to the government. Some close relatives of the future rebels were also favourably mentioned; for example, Cuthbert Carnaby, the uncle of John Carnaby of Langley who took part in the

rising, was stated in his letter to be meet to be a Justice; and John Blakiston and Edward Parkinson were also said to live quietly and obey the laws, although one was the brother of Marmaduke Blakiston and the other the father of Henry Parkinson, both of whom joined the Earls (1). On the other hand, some of these who took a prominent part in 1569 were already known to be "given to the evil". Sir John Forster, whom Pilkington had consulted, reported that Thomas Bates of Morpeth was unfavourable to the government religion and said that he misliked him, while within the Bishopric Pilkington showed that John Swinburne had kept a priest to say mass for him, and had been fined for this offence (2). Swinburne was evidently already notorious, but in a paper dating from the beginning of November, 1569, Robert Tempest was classed with him as being "evil in religion" (3). Pilkington's report, therefore, did not represent the true state of affairs as far as some of these men were concerned; but indications of their real attitude might already have been found. The conservative outlook of the Salvin family had been illustrated by the fact that two uncles of that Gerard Salvin who took part in the rebellion had refused the oath at the royal visitation of 1559 (4), when Gerard Salvin, senior, had acted as surety for them (5). Probably, the sureties appointed at that time were often in sympathy with the opinions of the recalcitrant clergy. Gerard Salvin himself also acted as surety for Prebendary John Towton; and others acting in a similar capacity included Sergeant Mennell, William Hodgson of Lanchester, and Robert Tempest of Holmside (6). The inventory made in 1571 of the goods of Gerard Salvin, senior, contains mention of a chapel chamber (7) which suggests the possibility of his having employed a private chaplain; and, similarly, there are indications that chaplains were employed by the Parkinsons of Beaumont Hill (8), the Hebburns of Hardwick (9) and

(1) Cam. Soc. Misc. IX, p. 65-7 (2) Ibid (3) Sharpe, p. 8.
(4) i.e. Anthony Salvin, prebendary of Durham etc. and Richard Salvin, rector of Hinderwell, Yorkshire.
(5) S.P. Dom. Eliz. X, p. 54-5, 68, & certificate of recognizances. (6) Ibid (7) Wills & Invs. I, p. 34-5, 51.
(8) cf. Wills & Invs. II, p. 271-2.
(9) cf. in the Inq. p.m. Richard Hebburn it is said that by his will of April 4, 1559, he left an annuity to John Bellarby (D.K. Rep. 44, App. p. 425). By the 1568 will of another member of the family John Bellarby, clerk, was said to be owed £4-14-0 (Wills & Invs. III, p. 45.) In 1559 the next presentation to Greatham was granted in trust for him to the Hebburns' relative, Robert Tempest of Holmside, but the grant did not take effect (T.R. no 373) He does not seem to have been in possession of any living or curacy.

the Claxtons of Old Park (1), while the endowment of a chantry by one of the Collingwoods of Eslington as late as the reign of Queen Mary (2) provides sufficient evidence of the religious outlook of the members of his important family.

From its inception the rising had a definitely religious aspect. The Earl of Northumberland, Leonard Dacre, John Swinburne and some of the Nortons had disliked the project of the Norfolk marriage (3); Dacre's opposition was chiefly the result of his ill-treatment at the hands of the Duke, but Northumberland, who had been converted to Roman Catholicism in 1567, wished Queen Mary to marry a Catholic. Old Norton was an extremist; his son-in-law, Thomas Markenfield of Yorkshire, had been in Rome for some time, where he knew Dr. Morton, the papal envoy who came to England and of whose family another son-in-law was a member. From a European and papal point of view the time seemed ripe for a rebellion of this nature, for the Counter-Reformation had made such progress—as a result of the work of the Jesuits and the Council of Trent—that already the battle against Protestantism seemed to be partly won. The authorities in England realised its religious nature. Sir George Bowes, who was commissioned by the Privy Council to report upon any signs of restlessness in the northern counties, on November 2, 1569, wrote that the Protestants feared trouble because of various assemblies of those who were opposed to the government religion. (4). A paper, already referred to, endorsed by Cecil "Notes of uncertain brutes" (i.e. rumours) stated, "The persons that by the uncertain brutes be named to be great doers in these matters be all evil in religion — as Robert Tempest and John Swinburne of the Bishopric ----" (5).

The two earls were pushed to the fore because of their rank and influence, but the initiative evidently belonged to such men as Swinburne, Tempest and Markenfield, whose principles were already apparent, and at the same time to Leonard Dacre and the Nortons who are supposed to have been responsible for the proposed seizure of Mary, Queen of Scots. Meanwhile, the Earls were urged on in the course proposed by such men as these, both by their friends and by their wives, the two countesses.

-
- (1) cf. above p. 298-9 (2) Wills & Invs. I, p. 147-8.
(3) cf. Sharpe, p. 198-9. (4) Sharpe, p. 7, 9-10.
(5) Ibid, p. 8.

The Earl of Westmorland had married a sister of the Duke of Norfolk, and the Earl of Northumberland, married a daughter of the Earl of Worcester, who proved herself a firm Roman Catholic, and an active participant in the rebellion. Writing to Cecil at the end of November, Lord Hunsdon, the Queen's cousin and Governor of Berwick, said "I am sorry to hear of Westmorland's wilfulness, who hath refused either to hear or follow their advice that hath for his house sake wished him well. The other (Northumberland) is very timorous, and as it is affirmed, hath meant twice or thrice to submit himself, but that his wife being the stouter of the two, doth hasten him, and encourage him to persevere, and rides up and down with their army from place to place; so as the gray mare is the better horse." (1).

In addition to the two Earls and Christopher and Cuthbert Neville, some eleven or twelve of the gentry of the two counties had taken part in the conferences at Topcliffe early in September concerning the Norfolk marriage (2). When this project was abandoned, more conferences were held and the question of a rising for religion was mooted; again various gentry of the Bishopric were present, and John Swinburne and Robert Tempest took a prominent part in a meeting at which Father Copley and another divine debated whether they would have the sanction of the Church in rebelling against the Queen. Father Copley, who had been responsible for the conversion of Northumberland two years previously, decided, however, that unless the Queen was excommunicated and the excommunication published in the country, they could not be absolved from their allegiance; consequently

(1) Sharpe p. 77.

(2) A list entitled "The names of those indicted for conspiracy of treason, Sept. I. II Eliz. at Topcliffe" includes these men of the counties — the two Earls, John Swinburne of Chopwell, Christopher and Cuthbert Neville, Robert and Michael Tempest of Holmside, William Smith of Nunstainton, George Stafford of Brancepeth, Marmaduke Blakiston of Blakiston, John Trollope of Thornley, Ralph Conyers of Layton, Anthony Hebburn of Hardwick, Robert Carr of Ford, Robert Collingwood of Etal; and Brian Palmes of Morton, a Yorkshire gentleman having property in Durham — Sharpe, p. 229-30; cf. also p. 197-9.

no immediate decision was taken (1), but under cover of hunting parties frequent consultations were still held. There ensued the doubtful weeks during which the Earls pursued a vacillating course; on the one hand making frequent professions of their loyalty, whilst at the same time they began to muster their forces. Early in October they both went to York and succeeded in convincing Sussex, the new President of the Council, of their peaceable intentions; meanwhile, however, warlike preparations were continued by their confederates in the Bishopric, and the Queen, dissatisfied with their assurances, ordered Sussex to summon them to London. At the beginning of November, whilst excusing themselves from attendance at court, they still considered journeying to York to prove their innocence; but their wives, Dr. Morton, and some of their friends at length forced them to employ in an active rebellion those troops which had already been raised. At the instigation of these protagonists of vigorous methods William Holland, a household servant of Northumberland, attempted to get rid of a messenger whom Sussex had sent to the Earl at Topcliffe, but, on November 9, the Lord President sent a sharply worded command for the immediate appearance of both the earls at York. Westmorland was afraid of arrest and refused to obey, and Northumberland was apparently alarmed by a false report, probably circulated by his partisans, that Sir Oswald Wilstrop had been sent with a troop of horse to seize him at Topcliffe. As a result, on November 10, they both came to Brancepeth where they were promptly joined by their chief adherents, and on the following day Sir George Bowes of Streatham, the Queen's most loyal supporter within the Bishopric, flung himself into Barnard Castle. The stage was now finally set for rebellion, but a rebellion with as undecided a programme—apart from its religious aspect—and as unwilling and incapable figure-heads as could well be imagined (2).

(1) cf. Sharpe, p. 202, 213. Robert Lambert of Owton, Robert Claxton of Old Park, and Ralph Conyers of Cotham were also indicted for conspiracy on October 7 (Ibid, p. 230), i.e. about the date when this conference took place. George Pringle is also said to have been with the Earls during the conferences (Ibid, p. 200.)

(2) Sharpe, p. 14, 21, 291, 319.

Since November 6 musters had been taking place at Brancepeth. On that day all Westmorland's retainers, household servants, and most of his tenants belonging to Raby lordship, had gathered, fully armed, at Brancepeth, while his other tenants armed themselves in readiness to join him. The Earl and his horsemen together with Claxton of Wynyard trained these forces in skirmishing in one of the parks, and were sometimes joined at the castle by the earl of Northumberland, Richard Norton, Markenfield, Westmorland's two uncles, Robert Tempest, and John Swinburne (1). After the formal rendez-vous of the 10th, the leaders began to muster troops in earnest, and Markenfield, Tempest and Swinburne took frequent journeys about the country side (2), while the Earls were either at Brancepeth or at Francis Bulmer's house in Tursdale (3) where they were sure of a welcome because of Bulmer's marriage to a daughter of old Norton. Bulmer did not actively support them himself, but his son, Anthony, became a participant in the events of the following weeks (4). Meanwhile, troops were being brought in, and on the 10th, the leaders brought up all the bows and arrows in Durham and Barnard Castle. They were joined by a small force from Yorkshire, but were forced to move about to get sufficient food. (5). Some attention had already been given to the necessity of provisioning and paying the troops, for while he was still at ~~Beawish~~ Northumberland demanded from his steward, Thomas Bates of Morpeth, the rents due to him at Whitsun, whereupon Bates sent £90 to the Earl's receiver, George Metcalf (6). Moreover, on about November 8, the rebels had addressed a letter to the Pope asking for his aid; but the letter did not reach its destination until the following February so that his blessing and promise of help in ready cash were some three months too late (7). Their other appeals for aid were destined to prove equally fruitless.

With forces which numbered about five hundred, (8) on Monday, November 14, the Earls and some of the other leaders rode to Durham, from which Dean Whittingham had

(1) Sharpe, p.10, 13. 32-4. (2) Ibid, p.19, 32-4.

(3) Ibid, p.18. (4) Ibid, p. 123.

(5) Ibid, ;.15-17, 32-5. Bowes suspected their men of riding south by night and north by day to make a show.

(6) Ibid, p. 361. (7) Dixon VI, p. 232.

(8) Sharpe, p. 74.

already departed, while the Bishop and his wife had fled south at the first alarm. Entering the cathedral they destroyed the Protestant books and broke up the communion table, and issued a proclamation in the Queen's name to prohibit any services in the cathedral or other churches until their pleasure was further known. Then, having appointed a watch of twenty four horsemen, they rode away (1). Their despatch of a letter to secure the Pope's support had shown that their rebellion was directed towards a restoration of the old religion, and this purpose was stressed in proclamations which they caused to be issued at Staindrop and Durham on November 15. In the Staindrop proclamation they declared that they wished the people to understand "that they intend no hurt unto the Queen's Majesty, nor her good subjects; ~~But~~ for as much as the order of things in the Church and matters of religion are presently set forth and used contrary to the ancient and Catholic faith; therefore their purposes and meanings are, to reduce all the said causes in religion to the ancient customs and usages before used, wherein they desire all good people to take their parts" (2).

On the same day Westmorland summoned his servants and tenants to join him (3) and with the Earl of Northumberland set out for Darlington. On the way they were joined by Thomas Jenny of Yorkshire, Egremont Ratcliffe, a half-brother of the Earl of Sussex, and Marmaduke Blakiston of the Bishopric. The adherence of these men encouraged the commons to throw in their lot with the rebels (4), and so, with a rapidly augmented band, they reached Darlington where they were reinforced by large numbers of outlaws and robbers from Tynedale and Redesdale and other parts of Northumberland (5). On Wednesday mass was celebrated in the town, and with his staff as a rod John Swinburne hastened the attendance of the poor people at the service (6). Another proclamation, issued by Westmorland's command, was penned by Thomas Jenny at the dictation of Blakiston to the effect that the Queen's counsellors were trying to destroy the old nobility and set up a new religion, and announcing that, as foreign powers were intending to invade the kingdom to redress religion, their purpose was to forestall them by undertaking its reformation themselves; all, therefore, between the ages of 16 and 60 were summoned to come

-
- (1) Ibid, p. 36-7. (2) Ibid, p. 41-2.
(3) cf. S.S. 21, p. 177-8. (4) Sharpe, p. 285
(5) Sharpe, p. 40. (6) Ibid, p. 45.

to their support (1). They reviewed their troops; despite the recent additions to their numbers recruits were coming in too slowly. This was partly the result of the fact that the Queen's musters had already been made throughout the country during the summer; as, however, the Earls themselves had been commissioners, the musters had given them an opportunity to inspect the forces which would be at their disposal, or arrayed against them. Another difficulty was to arm their followers, particularly the footmen.

While in the district of Darlington on November 16 and 17, the leaders did what they could to right these defects. They offered high wages to recruits and forced many to join them. Going to Bishopton they compelled all the people to return with them, both the unarmed townsmen and those tenants of John Conyers of Sockburn who were armed in readiness to join him at Barnard Castle where he had gone to support his relative Sir George Bowes. On the 16th. the elder John Sayer of Worsall had also gone to Barnard Castle, but on the same day Francis Norton with a body of one hundred horse came to his house and seized all the armour he found in it, and carried off his son, the younger John Sayer, who was only 24 years old, and who now threw in his lot with the rebels (2). The next day a troop of horse, commanded by one of their captains, Nicholas Fairfax, went to Anthony Catterick's house at Stanwick in Yorkshire. Catterick was a loyalist, and his two sons-in-law, Roger Merrell and Robert Lambert of Owton in the Bishopric, were his guests and later averred that they had had the intention of joining Bowes at Barnard Castle. Fairfax, however, arriving while they were still in bed, forced them to get up and ride back with him to join the rebels; a constraint to which Lambert probably willingly submitted himself for he had already taken part in the treasonable conferences with the Earls in October (3). By November 17 the Earls had also been joined by many important gentry of the counties including besides Swinburne, the Tempests, and Blakiston, William Smith of Nunstainton, George Stafford of Brancepeth, John Trollope of Thornley, Ralph Conyers of Layton, Anthony Hebburn of Hardwick, and Anthony Welbury of Brancepeth, (all of whom belonged to the Bishopric), and by Robert

(1) Ibid, p. 42-3.

(2) Sharpe, p. 42-4. Sayer was 40 in 1585 (P.R.O. Dun, Inq. p.m. File 191, no. 110).

(3) Sharpe, p. 44, 227, 230, 61.

Carr of Ford, Robert Collingwood of Etal, Tristram Fenwick of Brinkburn, and John Carnaby of Langley—who all came from Northumberland (1). Some of these men perhaps, like Lambert, acted under apparent compulsion, and the same was true of many of the less important rebels; while many were disagreeably affected to the cause by the leaders' seizure of weapons and provisions and by their threatening attitude to those who did not join them; nevertheless, there can be little doubt that large numbers of the people of the two counties took their part gladly.

On November 16, when they numbered about one thousand foot and horse, part of the rebel force left Darlington and went to Richmond; on the following day the Earls and the greater part of their troops met at North Allerton, from whence they started on their southward march to Tadcaster (2). In the meantime, the supporters of the Queen within the Bishopric had been mustering their forces. From the beginning, the sense, spirit, and devotion to the service of the Crown of Sir George Bowes had marked him out as their leader. When the musters first began at Brancepeth many of the gentry living in the district, afraid for their property, wished to flee, but some he entertained at his own cost, and the others he persuaded to return home (3). On November 11th he withdrew with his household from Streatham, to Barnard Castle; and on the 13th. he received a warrant to levy men to defend this fortress (4). Within the next few days certain gentry of the Tees valley and the district around Barnard Castle joined him; some were akin to him, such as Robert Bowes the sheriff of the Bishopric, and Robert Bowes the undersheriff; and some, like John Conyers of Sockburn, Thomas Middleton of Barnard Castle, George Bainbridge of Snotterton, John Sayer the elder of Worsall, and John Blakiston of Blakiston, were connected with him by marriage. Other loyalists of the Bishopric included Ralph and Robert Tailbois of Thornton Hall, Francis Parkinson of the Beaumont Hill family, George Tonge of Denton, Christopher Hall, the bailiff of Long Newton; and, by November 23, he had also been joined by Bertram Anderson of Newcastle

(1) All these were indicted for rebellion on Nov. 17. To their number may also be added Brian Palmes of Morton. Sharpe, p. 230.

(2) Sharpe, p. 285. (3) Sharpe, p. 10, 17, 387.

(4) Ibid, p. 19, 25.

and Haswell, John Headworth of Harraton, and Thomas Calverley of Littleburn, the temporal chancellor of the diocese. A number of Richmondshire gentry also made their way to the castle, amongst whom were Anthony Catterick of Starwick and his son-in-law, Roger Mennell, who had successfully escaped from the rebel camp (1). The adherence of these men was important, but did not always ensure that of their families. It has already been seen that, whether as the result of compulsion or otherwise, some of the Conyers, the younger John Sayer, and John Blakiston's brother, Marmaduke, had joined the rebels, so that there was more than a grain of truth in Sadler's complaint when he wrote "If the father comes to us with ten men, the son goes to the rebels with twenty" (2); in similar strain, on November 20, the Council at York had written to the Queen that "many gentlemen show themselves ready to serve your Majesty, whose sons and heirs, or other sons, be on the other side." (3).

By November 15 the gentry of the Tees valley had brought Bowes about one hundred light horse, to add to the one hundred horse and two hundred armed men of the lordship of Barnard Castle and of his own tenants that he had already collected (4). On that date, therefore, he suggested that while the troops of the Earls were out foraging, and so divided, he should fall upon them; this bold suggestion, which, judiciously executed, might have crushed the rising at its inception was not, however, considered prudent by the Council in the North. Meanwhile on the 15th. Bowes had ordered the people of Richmondshire to join him, and had appointed levies to be held north of Wear in unusual places so that they should be safe from attack; in the neighbourhood of Stockton and Darlington he was unwilling to cause large assemblies lest, in these disaffected districts, they should be employed for the advantage of the rebels; he sent, therefore, for the Justices of the Peace of the

(1) cf. Sharpe, p. 30, 39-41, 53, 61, 29. Robert Bowes, the sheriff, was a brother of Sir George. Thomas Middleton and George Bainbridge were his brothers-in-law; John Sayer was his cousin by marriage; John Blakiston and John Conyers had married two of the Bowes family (cf. Surtees III, p. 162; IV, p. 107-8; Arch. Ael. 3rd. Ser. I, p. 84, 86-7.) One of his daughters was married to Sir Thomas Hilton who also was loyal during the rebellion (cf. Sadler II, p. 176.)

(2) Cal. S.P. Dom, VII, p. 129. (3) Sharpe, p. 59.

(4) Ibid, p. 29-30.

two wards in order to decide how to raise men (1). As a result of the musters, by November 19, his foot soldiers had increased to four hundred (2); and later he obtained additional forces from levies in Darlington, Chester, and Richmondshire (3). A certain number of the people were probably influenced by a proclamation which Sussex issued at the Queen's command on the 19th, promising pardon to all those who returned home by November 22, except to the chief leaders—such as the Earls, and John Swinburne and Robert Tempest (4). Nevertheless, he had many difficulties to meet, and he had to confess—in a letter written on the 23rd.—that the people of the district of Barnard Castle itself were fleeing daily to join the Earls, although by fair speeches and gifts of money he tried to encourage them to join him. The people of the Bishopric in particular were going daily to the rebels; he was obliged to promise money to raise men, but at the same time the people were afraid that they would not be paid their wages, for the Earls had caused two of their supporters to proclaim him a traitor and a heretic, while rumours were put about that those joining him would receive no fee. It was indeed true that he was in sore straits for money as the royal receivers had fled; and although the Bishop's chief officers had desired the episcopal receivers to help him, he found them more inclined to bestow the money in their charge upon the rebels (5). He had been hampered, moreover, from the beginning by the fact that the greater part of his armour and weapons were at Newcastle, so that he was speedily cut off from them (6), and also by the fact that those who joined him were all very ill-armed except the gentry (7). Even when he managed to raise and to arm forces he could not depend upon their loyalty.

Immediately the rising began it was recognised by the government that Bowes must be sent outside for help. On November 22 Sussex did actually send him £50, and by the 19th troops had arrived from Lord Scroop, the Warden of the West March and Governor of Carlisle (8); but Sir John Forster, the Warden of the Middle March, on the 25th wrote to explain that he could send no forces because of the unsettled state of Northumberland,

(1) Ibid, p. 29-32.

(2) Ibid, p. 54.

(3) Ibid, p. 264-8.

(4) Ibid p. 51

(5) Sharpe, p. 61-2.

(6) Ibid, p. 17

(7) Ibid, p. 39-41

(8) Ibid, p. 55, 59.

and particularly of the Borders (1). A request for aid sent to William Drury, the marshall of Berwick, brought equally little response; but on the 26th little Robert Bowes was dispatched by his kinsman to try to obtain his help; by November 30, however, he had still been unable to send assistance (2). The Earl of Cumberland for whose support a similar demand had been made, sent a force of one hundred horse, part of which reached the castle on the 28th; but Bowes complained that they were all archers and meanly horses (3).

By November 28 the rebels were already returning to the Bishopric. After reaching North Allerton on the 18th. the Earls had moved quickly south, and passing York had come to Tadcaster on the 22nd. Tadcaster lay only fifty miles from Tutbury so that prompt action might have succeeded in the rescue of Queen Mary — Northumberland's immediate object; then perhaps Alva would have come to Hartlepool, and an effective rebellion been put on foot. But precious time was wasted, and Cecil, having been warned of their intention, sent a courier who caused Mary to be removed to Coventry on the 23rd. Retreat northwards was thereupon decided upon, and Christopher Neville was sent ahead to take possession of Hartlepool and fortify it, probably with the hope that aid from King Philip or Alva would reach them there, and also because the ships in its harbour offered them a mode of escape if such was necessary. Foreseeing the possibility of an attempt upon the town the Earl of Sussex had by the 24th. ordered two hundred men to be stationed there, but they never reached their destination, so that by the 29th. Neville had occupied it without opposition. He had with him a troop of three hundred men, over some of whom George Stafford of Brancepeth seems to have been in command; but little or nothing was done to fortify the town, although the old forms of religion were restored and mass celebrated by a Durham priest called Richard Hartburn (4).

The main body of the rebel force moved into the Bishopric with the intention of assaulting Bowes at Barnard Castle, and then going to Tynedale and Redesdale where they hoped to be re-inforced by the Scots who supported Mary Stuart, and where the Earl of Northumberland expected to be joined by most of the county (5).

(1) Ibid, p. 68-9. (2) Ibid, p. 74, 82-4 (3) Ibid, p. 70, 82. (4) Sharpe, p. 64, 79-81, 84, 122; Sadler II, p. 52; S.S. 21, p. 197.
(5) This was reported to be their plan, cf. Sharpe, p. 83.

Undaunted by the proclamation issued by Sussex on the 28th, which contemptuously answered their proclamation made at Darlington and spoke of them as hypocrites and traitors to the Kingdom, on Thursday, December 1, Christopher Neville issued another proclamation in the Queen's name, ordering the people to repair to Barnard Castle in war array by ten o'clock on Saturday. (1). On the 29th. Bowes reported that there were already garrisons all around him^x. He estimated that they numbered about 1,200 horsemen, and stated that they were being joined daily by the men of the Bishopric, some of whom had previously deserted from them. Meanwhile, they were mustering their troops in the districts of Brancepeth and Raby, and horsemen and footmen, clergy and laity were seen ~~moving~~ about wearing red crosses (2). On December 3 all the soldiers they could levy assembled at Barnard Castle, and the town having already been taken ^{and} occupied, the ~~siege~~ ^{siege} of the castle was started in earnest ^{and} under the direction of the Earl of Westmorland (3).

In addition to their horsemen, whose numbers increased to about 1,500, the Earls had over 3,000 footmen, but Bowes captured a few men who were going to join them, including Christopher Lockwood of Sowerby, who had been Westmorland's secretary, and two gentlemen of Weardale (4). Most of the foot had bows and arrows or bills and jacks, but they were on the whole badly equipped. They had little artillery — on December 1st Bowes said there were only five piece of ordnance ~~within~~ sight — so that they could not hope to do much damage to the walls (5). Bowes himself was also in poor case; although the castle was strong, having three wards, he only had between 600 and 700 men, and in ordnance only three or four slings and a falcon of cast iron (6). The chief hope of the rebels lay in cutting off his supplies, and while on the one hand emphasising the religious nature of their movement by causing a priest, George White, to celebrate mass in the town (7), on the other hand they not only sent out foraging parties but committed malicious spoils upon the property of their opponents and those who had not joined them. The property of Bowes in particular suffered; his corn and

- (1) Ibid, p. 86. (2) Sharpe, p.78-80, 85-6, 91.
(3) Ibid, p. 85-6, 91, 295. (4) Ibid, p. 80-1, 185.
(5) Ibid, p. 83-4, 85-6, 91, 185.
(6) Ibid, p. 90. (7) S.S. 21, p. 182.

his cattle were carried off; Streatham castle, after a preliminary resistance, was defaced, the windows and doors were torn out, the roofing pulled down, and the rich tapestries and other household goods plundered, so that the damage wrought upon his goods there alone was estimated at £1,200. They spoilt the household property and cattle and corn of Dean Whittingham and of the other high ecclesiastics of Durham. Thomas Calverley, the chancellor, was despoiled of all his moveables, and not even left sufficient to pay his rent. Similar destruction was wrought upon the property of Bertram Anderson, Thomas Middleton, the Bainbridges, and the Franklins of Cocken, and even upon the property of Bernard Gilpin, who was absent in Oxford. (1).

As a result of these spoils and their foraging parties the rebels themselves were well supplied; the property of the Bishop, the Dean, and of Bowes in the Stockton district, provided them with ample hay and corn, while they drove up fat cattle from other parts of the county (2). At the same time they captured any of Bowes' men whom they found bringing supplies to the castle (3), and this involved them in skirmishes. Each day they came and offered to skirmish, but Bowes at first thought it prudent to decline their offer, and hence Sir Cuthbert Sharpe thinks may have arisen these lines:

"Coward, a coward of Barney Castell,
Dare not come out to fight the batell" (4).

On the 6th, however, Bowes sent out a party of horse to place some of his cattle in the park, and a skirmish ensued in the course of which some of his men were taken prisoner, over sixty wounded, and two killed (5). Meanwhile, the rebels shot at the outer ward for three days without doing any harm, but on the 8th, apparently on the advice of Sussex, they were allowed to take possession of it, while Bowes with the shot and some of the foot retired into the inner ward. (6). He was now in sore straits for provisions, and Sussex told him to try, with his horsemen, to break through the rebel camp and go to York or Newcastle (7). On the 7th, he sent back to the West those horsemen whom he had received from the Earl of Cumberland (8), but at the same time he began to be troubled by the desertion of his men.

(1) Sharpe, p. 101, 186-7, 287; Surtees I, p. 168. On Dec. 14, Constable, the spy, stated "The town of Middleham is spoiled" (Sadler II, p. 64); this may have referred to Bishop Middleham or to Middleham in Yorkshire.

(2) Sharpe, p. 80. (3) Ibid, p. 81. (4) Ibid.

(5) Ibid, p. 96 (6) Sharpe, p. 92, 94-5, 322. (7) Ibid, p. 92.

(8) Ibid, p. 248-9, 96.

Soldiers were daily leaping over the walls to join the rebels; on Friday, the 9th, some eighty men leapt over at one time, and on Saturday they had become so mutinous that about 150 who were appointed to guard the gates and who had previously always proved themselves loyal, suddenly opened the gates and joined the Earl. More than 200 in this way deserted, and although some thirty-five of them broke their arms, ~~the~~ legs, or necks in making their escape, their defection, combined with the shortage of supplies and the intelligence brought to him at the same time that the water was giving out, probably as a result of the destruction of the leaden pipes by which it was supplied from the nearby reservoirs, finally decided him to come to terms with Westmorland (1). Thereupon, he evacuated the castle and with Robert Bowes and various of the gentry, and 300 horse and 100 foot-bearing with them all the armour they could collect, he made his way to York, which he reached in safety on the 12th. (2).

The rebels derived no profit from this almost bloodless siege (3); they had spent eleven days upon it during, which time the government forces were able to complete their preparations to move against them. Sir John Forster and Sir Henry Percy, who was the Earl's brother and captain of Tynemouth castle, and who had been encouraged by the Queen by more than a hint of the reward to follow his loyalty (4), had collected forces on the Border and were approaching the Bishopric. To meet them the Earl of Northumberland left Barnard Castle on December 5 (5). On the 9th the rebels, hearing that Sussex was about to set out from York with a large army, began again to make feverish attempts to muster forces and money. On that day they issued precepts ordering all between the ages of 16 and 60 to assemble, furnished with arms, at Staindrop on Monday, the 12th, and ended their injunctions "Fail you not hereof, as you tender the setting forward of our proceedings, and will answer at your uttermost peril" (6). On the 12th they issued

(1) Ibid, p. 97-8, 100. (2) Ibid.

(3) Bowes later said that besides the 67 wounded in the skirmish, five of his men were killed; 3 inside the castle, and 2 outside, Sharpe, p. 187.

(4) She wrote to him that she would see to the continuance of the house "in the person and blood of so faithful a servant as we trust to find you" Sharpe, p.55.

(5) Sharpe, p. 92. (6) Ibid, p. 97.

a proclamation in the Queen's name to all tenants of the "late supposed Bishop of Durham" to be ready to pay their rents, due at the preceding Martinmass, into the Exchequer at Durham before Saturday, the 17th. (1). They appointed a muster to be held on Auckland moor and promised payment, but then postponed it until the 14th. Meanwhile they were gathering forces elsewhere in the Bishopric, and also in North Yorkshire; and Sussex, Hunsdon, and Sadler said that the people "are all wholly gone unto them, such is their affection to the cause of religion" (2). They were many in numbers, therefore, but disorderly and unarmed, and, realising their weakness, on December 10 the Earl of Northumberland sent one of his servants, Robert Widdrington, to Leonard Dacre at Naworth to ask him to come to their aid. Dacre sent back answer by Widdrington that if he had not sufficient troops to defeat the Lord Warden at Penrith he would bring his force to the Earl by Thursday, the 15th. As he did not arrive, on Friday, the 16th, Northumberland again sent Widdrington to Naworth, but Dacre excused himself on the ground that he could not assemble his forces without suspicion (3).

The Earls were in Durham city or its immediate neighbourhood during the greater part of this time, and services were held in the cathedral and city churches according to the old forms. (4). On December 15 they marched with their armies towards Newcastle, but they were opposed at Chester-le-Street by Forster and Percy, who had come out from Newcastle with all their soldiers and some ordnances; neither side was able to bring the issue to a pitched battle, and after some skirmishing between the horsemen, the Earls fell back on Durham (5). Meanwhile, Robert Constable, the spy, had visited Westmorland and Northumberland at Brancepeth on the 14th, and by reporting upon the size of the armies which were being brought up against the rebels, had successfully put terror into their hearts; moreover, the free passage which was given to him to return into Yorkshire became a cause of disagreement between them (6). Already disheartened and at war with each other, the news that Sussex had left York on the 11th and was approaching

(1) Ibid, p. 98. (2) Ibid, p. 64, 103.
(3) Ibid, p. 215-6. (4) S.S. 21, p. 143-4 etc; above p. 154, ff.
(5) Sharpe, p. 103-4. (6) Sadler II, p. 62-4, 119.

Darlington, with an army increased to 12,000 men by the arrival of the Lord Admiral Clinton and the Earl of Warwick, finally determined them upon flight. At 1^o o'clock on the 16th. they gave warning to the commons to shift for themselves, and departed with a large number of horse towards Hexham. Within the next day or two Hartlepool was also abandoned; although its position on a peninsula made it potentially a great asset, they had failed to take advantage of their occupation of it, and as there were only a few cobbles in the harbour, and the Queen had taken precautions to prevent the escape of the rebels by sea, it no longer offered them a means of retreat (1).

The Earls hoped that in Hexham Lord Dacre and Lord Hume would come to their aid, and Northumberland still imagined that many of the county would join him (2). Already between eighty and one hundred horsemen had come to him from Northumberland, and about sixty had joined Westmorland from his lordship of Bywell; moreover, they had been joined by many of the thieves and outlaws of Tynedale and Redesdale, and had successfully stirred up the borderers (3). Northumberland's castles of Alnwick and Warkworth were victualled near the beginning of the rising and were held by a good number of armed men (4), for whom Shepharde, a Jesuit, said mass (5). The Dacres had taken possession of the houses in the county which had belonged to their late nephew, and the Earls had offered ~~1/2~~ ^{1/4} day to those who would join them (6). On November 25 Forster pointed out that Northumberland had a great many tenants in the shire who would probably follow the Earls if they should return and join hands with the evil doers of England and Scotland, but who, if they found the Queen's forces were the stronger, would remain obedient (7).

The disorderly flight of the rebels to Hexham proved sufficiently that the government had obtained the upper hand. Early in November Forster, Percy, and William Dewry, the marshall of Berwick, were authorised to levy forces to keep Northumberland quiet, and as Lord Hunsdon, the warden of the East March and Governor of Berwick, remained at York, the burden of its defence

-
- (1) Sharpe, p. 104-5, 107, 79, 109. (2) Ibid, p.285.
(3) Sharpe, p. 40, 59, 185; Sadler II, p.38.
(4) Sharpe, p. 60, 108. (5) N.C.H. V, p. 63-4.
(6) Sharpe, p. 64, 69. (7) Ibid, p. 83.

fell upon them (1). Captain Reed of Fenham, one of the officers of the Berwick garrison who had had a grant in 1561 of the forts of Holy Island and Farn Island, was suspected of having been present at the musters at Brancepeth on November 10, and was accused by the Nortons of having been one of their confederates (2). His presence in Northumberland was, therefore, a thorn in the side of the government officers, and, largely because of him, Drury at first felt unable to send any troops South (3). Forster, too, at first was unable to send aid to Bowes because he was short of money supplies to pay "prest money" (i.e. money lent for an outfit) and wages, while the Earls had enticed people with an offer of so large a sum as sixteen pence a day (4). By November 24, however, an additional strength of 200 men had been sent to Holy Island, and at the beginning of December Drury imprisoned Reed (5). Not long after this, Forster and Percy came to Newcastle with the forces which they had already mustered, and they were soon joined by Valentine Brown, the treasurer of Berwick, with part of the garrison of that town (6).

The attitude of Newcastle was an important factor in the failure of the rising. The reigns of Henry VIII and Elizabeth were a period of commercial enterprise, and the people of Newcastle, devoting themselves to mercantile pursuits, took little part in the ecclesiastical controversies of the time. Although there was an element of disloyalty in the town (7), on the

(1) Ibid, p. 25, 65-7. (2) Ibid, p. 15, 362.

(3) Ibid, p. 83-4. On December 8, Cecil wrote that Drury should watch Captain Reed, "whom we wish to be taken and committed to safe custody" (Sadler II, p.56). On the 14th Christopher Norton told Constable "If Captain Reed, my captain, had been so faithful a man of his promise as men judge him to be, he had been or now amongst us" (Ibid, p. 137).

(4) Sharpe, p. 68-9. (5) Ibid, p.15-16, 64-5. Reed had evidently been wrongfully suspected — cf. he was later set free and knighted. (6) Ibid, p. 103-5

(7) e.g. April 25, 1570, George Lassells of Newcastle was granted pardon for participation in the rebellion (Proc. of the Newc. Soc. Antiq. 4th. Ser. II, p. 93), and Raymes the master of the W. Spital, who had been in Louvain, was imprisoned in Durham gaol as a consequence of the rebellion (Brand I, p. 81). Young Gray, the schoolmaster's son, was also under suspicion (Sharpe, p. 273), and in 1569 mention was made of certain inhabitants of the town "that are towards the Earl of Westmorland" (Welford II, p. 430-2).

whole the Mayor, magistrates, and commonalty were conspicuously loyal (1), and the Protestants demonstrated their dislike of those with Catholic sympathies by causing a fray on Sunday, December 11, as a result of which, Constable wrote, "Mr. Hodgson, a rank papist, is put forth of the town, and the matter pacified". This Richard Hodgson was closely related to the Hodgsons of the Manor House who were in the service of the Earl of Westmorland, and the fortification of his house at Hebburn had perhaps helped to arouse jealousy against him (2). Partly as a result of Dean Whittingham's advice, the fortification of the town had been undertaken at an early date with the assistance of Thomas Gower. At the same time Captain John Carvell of the Berwick garrison, at the request of the Mayor, was stationed there, and assisted in the defence of the town in which he was supported by Thomas Calverley who returned North after levying troops for the support of Bowes at Barnard Castle (3).

On December 16, the day on which the Earls fled to Hexham, Sussex ordered Forster, who had 1,000 horse at Newcastle, to pursue, and the same night he was hard upon their trail (4). Two days later the rebels set out with the intention of going to Alnwick, but after a skirmish with Forster they returned to Hexham. By that time Sussex, who had already made careful plans to facilitate a rapid pursuit, was in Newcastle (5), so the Countess of Northumberland hid the greater part of her husband's plate near Hexham, and on the 19th they set out again for Naworth and Bramton — and, indeed, only just in time, for the next day Sussex reached Hexham. Little hope was left for them; Lord Scrope and the Regent Moray had been advertised of their flight, and because they were already discredited they received no encouragement from the Dacres. Consequently, on the 20th, the two Earls, and the Countess of Northumberland, together with some of their chief supporters and about one hundred horsemen, fled into Liddesdale, there to lead a hunted

(1) cf. Sharpe p. 58, 77 (2) Sadler II, p. 64, 75; Surtees II, p. 75. (3) Cam. Soc. Misc. IX, p. 24; Sharpe, p. 23, 57-8. 186. (4) Sharpe, p. 106.
(5) Ibid, p. 108-10. On the 16th Sussex ordered the Sheriff of the Bishopric to bring horses to Durham by the 18th. "Rather for fear than for goodwill", the people responded well to his demand, so he hoped by the 19th to have 400 arquebusiers ready horsed for the pursuit (Ibid, p. 105, 109.)

life for some weeks. Two of the gentry of the counties, Thomas Bates and Richard Vause of Brancepeth, were indicted for rebellion in Cumberland on the 21st, and by the end of the month some ten others had been captured by Lord Scrope and imprisoned in Carlisle castle (1). In the meanwhile, Sir Henry Gate had taken possession of Hartlepool for the government; Bowes had put one hundred men into Durham castle to guard the numerous prisoners who were already lodged there; and the army of the South under Clinton and Warwick had taken possession of the city. (2) The rising was to all intents and purposes over. Lacking the expected aid from Alva, from the moment of the retreat from Tadcaster it had been doomed to failure. It had accomplished nothing beyond a temporary restoration of the old forms of religion in certain parishes; and there remained only for the government to punish those who had been responsible for these spiritual offences and those who had joined the Earls, while crushing the disturbances which were the inevitable aftermath of the rebellion.

(1) Sharpe, p. 208-9, 113, 105, 123. The gentry of the two counties imprisoned at Carlisle were Anthony Bulmer, John Carnaby, Robert Eden, Nicholas Fairfax, William Holland, George Neville, Oswin Ogle, George Gray, Gerard Salvin, and John Sayer.

(2) Sharpe, p. 110, 130, 39.

SECTION II. THE RESTORATION OF THE OLD FORMS OF
RELIGION, AND THE PUNISHMENT OF THE REBELS.

On their first entry into Durham on November 14, the rebels had ordained that no services should be held until their pleasure was known, but the destruction which they wrought in the cathedral—upon the service books and communion table—was imitated in the other parishes throughout which they passed (1). Not, however, until their return to the Bishopric at the end of the month to undertake the siege of Barnard Castle, and to muster forces, was any positive work carried out towards the restoration of the old forms of religion. It has already been recounted in an earlier chapter how—thereupon—the altars and holy water stoups were replaced in the cathedral, and mass^{was} sung and other services taken in Latin. No fewer than eight of the minor canons were involved in these proceedings; and they were joined by one of the prebendaries, nine lay singing men, and the organist, John Brimley. The fact that the cathedral was crowded with rebel soldiers, citizens, and men of the nearby parishes when William Holmes—a Romanist priest—preached on Sunday, December 4, and reconciled the congregation to Rome, shows that many of the laity also welcomed the changes (2).

Similar scenes were at the same time being enacted in the city churches and in other parishes of the Bishopric. Cuthbert Neville, who had been active in securing a reversion to Roman Catholic forms in the cathedral, was largely responsible for the changes undertaken elsewhere, and was ably supported by Holmes himself, and by Richard Hartburn, a Marian priest who had been deprived of his benefice of Long Newton as a result of the royal visitation of 1559 (3). Other clergy who took a prominent part in the restoration were Robert Pearson, the curate of Brancepeth (4), and George White

(1) Sharpe, p. 36-7, 52.

(2) cf. above p. 154. ff.

(3) He was an absentee at the visitation (S.P. Dom. Eliz. X, p. 393) and was deprived in 1562 (T.R. no. 414). He had previously been vicar of Ponteland, 1555-8, cf. he was ordained sub-deacon on the title of his benefice of Ponteland, March 21, 1555/6, and deacon on the same title, Easter Eve, 1556. (T.R. nos. 312, 313).

(4) S.S. 21. p. 177-8. A priest of the same name was vicar of Sockburn until his death in 1570 (Surtees III, p. 251), and had been an absentee at the visitation of 1559 (S.P. Dom. Eliz. X, p. 393). Sharpe thinks the curate of Brancepeth was the same as the vicar of Sockburn - "who

who seems, like Hartburn, to have been ordained during the reign of Mary (1).

Neville and William Holmes caused a proclamation to be made on Palace Green, ordering the churchwardens of the churches in Durham to set up the old altars and holy water stoups (2). The wardens, who were mostly illiterate labourers, husbandmen, or small shop-keepers, obeyed their commands. William Wright, Simon Ayer and Robert Tedcastle, the wardens of St. Oswald's, placed the old altar stone in position, underlaying it with a piece of timber because it was broken in three; and set up the holy water stoup, which was hidden in a corner of the church covered with earth (3). In St. Margaret's church the old altar stone was not available so Thomas Richmond, the warden, had a new altar built — probably on the feast of the Conception of the Virgin Mary (December 8) — consisting of a "through" stone which he took from the paving of the church floor, and stones and lime brought from the cathedral (4); he also caused the holy water stoup to be re-erected (5). Similarly, the altar and water stoup were restored in St. Giles' church under the direction of the wardens, William Morlay, and Robert Gibson—who was a surgeon (6). In St. Nicholas' church the same work was accomplished under the orders of Henry Hutcheson, a shoemaker, who was sacristan of the church, and of an alderman, probably Alderman Struther who was later executed for his share in the rebellion. (7)

At the same time the necessary work of destruction was going on apace. The wardens of St. Oswald's brought their Bible, Prayer Book, Book of Homilies, and the "Apology" to the end of the bridge where they made a

having a ticket in the great lottery of 1567, his posy, or device, sufficiently expresses his devotion to the house of Neville -- "God save the bull of Westmorland" (Sharpe, p. 260.)

(1) Ordained deacon March 5, 1557/8 (T.R. no. 339), but cf. one of the same name was ordained acolyte Dec. 18, 1546. (Ibid, no. 247.) (2) S.S. 21, p. 174, 170-1.

(3) Ibid, p. 170-1. (4) Ibid, p. 172-4 (5) Ibid.

(6) Ibid, p. 167. The altar stone was placed upon 4 pillars. (7) S.S. 21, p. 163-4. Hutcheson and William Watson, the parish clerk, later denied the report that they had sent two boys to go about the parish with holy water (Ibid, p. 163, 166).

bonfire of them. Their example was imitated in St. Nicholas' parish, whereupon the clerk of St. Giles' brought news of these proceedings to the wardens of his church, and told them that as he was crossing Palace Green he met Mr. Neville and William Holmes who told him to command them to burn their books. Gibson, the surgeon, then produced the Bible and two psalters from his house, and Merley, the other warden, fetched from the curate's chamber the "Apology", the Prayer Book, and two Books of Homilies, and together they burnt them outside Gibson's door in the presence of about forty witnesses; Gibson, however, saved one of the books of Homilies (1).

The clergy had already become active in re-introducing the old forms of service. On December 6, the funeral took place in St. Nicholas' church of a certain Hans Fawcon; William Watson, the parish clerk, was fetched to take part in the service by four of the Earl's men, and at the church he found William Holmes who was preparing to celebrate a burial mass. Holmes asked him if he wished to be reconciled; he refused, but nevertheless stayed for the mass and helped Holmes to put on his vestments. On the following Saturday, December 10, Robert Pearson of Brancepeth sang mass in the choir of the church, whereupon William Headlam, who had been curate of St. Nicholas' since 1556, left the building, but later in the same day Holmes asked him to come to his room on Palace Green. Headlam fell in with his request, and after some persuasion allowed himself to be absolved. The next day, being Sunday, he himself said Matins and evensong in his church in Latin, and during matins blessed bread for the holy loaf or holy bread, and water for holy water (2).

Oliver Eshe, the curate of St. Giles, and William Watson, (the curate of the chapel of St. Mary Magdalen, who was also vicar of Bedlington, and had probably been the chaplain of the Prior of Durham before the dissolution) (3) were both present at services in the cathedral, including the mass, before which Holmes preached and reconciled the people. Eshe, moreover, spoke with Holmes "about saying of service in the church

(1) Ibid, p. 166-8, 170. (2) S.S. 21, p. 462-3, 165-6. Hutcheson, the sacristan, denied the report that he had gone with a handbell to bid people to come to soul mass and dirige, and to mass. (3) cf. above p. 192-3.

of St. Giles," but Holmes said that as Eshe had been a "religious" (1) he was excommunicate. Despite this, however, Eshe blessed water and bread for holy water and holy bread in his church. (2). John Baxter, the rector of the church of St. Mary in the south Bailey, was called upon to bury one Bertram Robson, who had died on November 28; he took the funeral at communion time, but uncertain as to what form he should follow, he came to a relative of the deceased man and "asked his counsel in what manner of service was best for him, the said parson, to bury the said Robson, in." Later Baxter's doubts were set aside, for at the command of Cuthbert Neville, and on the persuasion of John Pearson, one of the minor canons, he allowed himself to be reconciled by William Holmes (3). Meanwhile mass and other services in accordance with the old forms were apparently being celebrated in St. Margaret's church (4); but there is no record of the celebration of any services in St. Oswald's, and perhaps for this reason Neville commanded Simon Ayer, the churchwarden, and probably others of the parish, to come to mass in the cathedral (5).

The influence of the reaction in Durham under Neville's direction was felt in Pittington. William Rawling of Sherburn, one of the wardens, was present on at least one occasion at mass in the cathedral, and undertook the restoration of the altar and holy water stoups in Pittington church. The altar stone was hidden on the floor of the choir, and the water stoup in the bell house, and Rawling was assisted in his work of replacing them by the other churchwarden and the parish clerk; all three of them were urged on in their work by John Wall and Anthony Hall of Durham. Hall seems to have belonged to the family of Halls, drapers of Durham, two of whom were indicted for taking part in the rebellion, and he, with Wall and one other, was responsible for burning the books of Pittington Church. Rawling

(1) cf. above p. 201-2. (2) S.S. 21, p. 137-8, 147, 168.

(3) Ibid, p. 147-8, 209. Baxter was already rector here in 1547 (cf. T.R. no. 268). The advowson belonged to the Earl of Westmorland.

(4) cf. Richmond, the churchwarden, promised the workmen who built the altar that they should have mass the next day. Holy-bread was blessed in the church .S.S. 21, p. 173.

(5) Ibid, p. 172.

later affirmed, perhaps in an attempt to shift responsibility from his own shoulders, that Neville had commanded him to restore the altar and water stoup under pain of hanging (1).

Vigorous action was taken in the parish of Auckland, no doubt because the frequent presence of the iconoclastic Bishop Pilkington at the castle had made the established forms particularly invidious amongst the people. In the destructive measures, thereupon undertaken, which emulated the work of the Bishop himself, John Lilburn, a gentleman of Shildon, took a prominent part, himself tearing up the Bible and breaking up the communion table which he spurned underfoot. Meanwhile William Sklaitor of Eldon, the churchwarden, had found the altar stone, and he supervised its erection and that of the holy water stoup. Similar work was accomplished in St. Helen's church, where inhabitants of the parish who had become soldiers of the Earl's took a savage pleasure in tearing up the books with hands and teeth (2). Edward Willy, the curate of St. Andrew's, made open confession in the pulpit that he had taught the people wrongly (3), and George White came to St. Helen's where he celebrated mass on the second Sunday in Advent (December 4). Before the mass he preached against the established religion, and read the absolution in the Pope's name to all the people. Then he churched Joan Eden, the wife of Robert Eden of West Auckland who was taking part in the rebellion; following the old forms which had been forbidden by episcopal injunctions, he met her at the church door, and taking her by the hand sprinkled holy water upon her. Finally he concluded the service by blessing bread to be distributed as holy bread (4).

While Holmes, White, and Robert Pearson travelled about preaching, reconciling people to Rome and celebrating mass in the north and west parts of the county, Richard

(1) Ibid, p. 175-7; Sharpe, p. 230-1. Note that an Anthony Hall was alderman of Durham, 1576, 1584-5. The Rawlings of Sherburn were a family of old standing there, holding leases for successive generations. S.S.84, p.14.

(2) S.S. 21, p. 179-81.

(3) Ibid, p. 180. He is only mentioned as "Sir Edward", no surname being given, but cf. in a return of 1571 Edward Willy was spoken of as curate here; the return implied that by 1571 he was dead or had resigned (Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 3265).

((4) S.S. 21, p.181-3; W.P.M. Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." p.cix.

Hartburn was active in the district around Stockton, where he was supported by many of the insurgents. In his own old parish of Long Newton, he, with a Captain Welton (who was perhaps William Welton of Welton and Thornburgh) in the name of the Queen and the Earls, commanded the churchwarden to build an altar. With the aid of a few labourers and his daughter, who pressed various young women into his service under threat of a shilling fine, the warden accomplished this work. At the same time a holy water stoup was set up, and Captain Welton and his company entered the church and tore up the books ordered by the Queen's Injunctions. Hartburn thereupon said a mass, and preached a sermon in which he reviled the congregation as "Lowlers" who had been damned for the past eleven years (1).

The people of Sedgefield were more to his mind. They had already given trouble to Pilkington and Robert Swift, who was both their rector and the Bishop's ordinary, by their refusal to allow the communion table to stand in the body of the church; when, in 1567, five years after Pilkington's injunction was given on this matter, Swift caused the order to be carried out, the churchwardens promptly restored it to its old position, one of them boldly affirming that Swift "was a hinderer and no furtherer of God's service" (2). Some of the leading gentry in the rising, such as Anthony Hebburn, Ralph Conyers of Layton, and William Clavering belonged to the parish, and, in addition to them, some thirty-two inhabitants of the various townships had joined the Earls (3). On the return of these men to their homes, after the vain march to Tadcaster, rapid changes were made in the church. A certain Brian Headlam, who was about to rejoin the insurgents at Darlington, determined to burn all the Protestant books of the church before he went. Graphic details exist of the manner in which he, Richard Fleitham, a husbandman, Lancelot Bulman, and Roland Hixson, a churchwarden, carried out this work. Fleitham, and Bulman having roused Hixson from his bed, commanded him in the name of the Queen and the Earls to deliver the book to them. Hixson willingly complied, and carried the five books in his possession to the green

(1) S.S. 21, p. 194-7. "Lowlers" may mean Lollards.

(2) S.S. 21, p. 118-20.

(3) i.e. 19 from Sedgefield, 7 from Fishburn, 4 from Foxton, and 2 from Mordon, — Sharpe, p. 250-2.

where a bonfire was made of them, and of straw, by the cross near the town gate. Although it was only sunrise a large crowd, consisting chiefly of children and young people, soon collected, and amidst their shouts and eager excitement to obtain portions of the books as playthings, Hixson's voice was heard calling out as he stirred up the books with his staff and tried to keep back the plunderers, "Se the dyvell domines fle into the allyment" or "Lo, where the Homilies flees to the devil". The noise finally aroused the parish clerk who brought out the two psalters in his charge to add fuel to the fire, but he saved the Bible by throwing an old book of his own into the flames. (1)

Hixson and the three rebel soldiers were prominent in restoring the high altar and holy water stoup, but the majority of the people of the parish were also involved. One holy day, after service time, the parishioners met together and consulted about the proposed restoration; Hixson then offered wages to various labourers to help in the work, while Fleitham, Bulman, and Headlam commanded others to do their share. The altar stone was lying in a nearby garth and was dragged with ropes into the church by the choir door, and was built up with stones and lime stolen from the parsonage. At the same time the water stoup was taken out of another garth, set in position, and filled with water. From the unnecessarily large number of men who helped to move the altar-stone — according to one reckoning they were said to number about eighty — it is clear that in Sedgefield the reversion to the old forms of worship was both desired by the people generally, and accomplished by them; although, later, to excuse themselves, some of them stated that they had acted under compulsion (2)

On Wednesday, December 7, Richard Hartburn came to the church and said a mass at which the elevation, sacring bells, and other accompaniments of the old service were used. Both Hixson and the parish clerk were present, the former bringing some bread to be used as the holy-loaf. At the same service Hartburn preached saying "the doctrine of England was nought, and that this Realm was cut off from all other nations," and that the congregation were all out of the right way and "worse than a horse that hath been in the mire, which will no more come there again." Then, however, in view of their willingness to

(1) S.S. 21, p. 186-8, 191-3. (2) Ibid, p. 183-93. Some of the labourers stated that a certain John Potter "took the gadd and drove them," but Fleitham acknowledged that he helped, although "although unbidden or commanded by any man."

accept the Roman Catholic religion, he relented, and reconciled them to Rome, finally giving them his benediction. (1)

This vehement supporter of the papal régime also said mass at Hartlepool, during the rebel occupation of the town (2), and at Billingham, Billingham had provided the Earls with a large number of followers (3), and the high altar was soon re-erected, while some of the men under the command of Captain Stafford, who was at Hartlepool, attempted to get possession of the books of the church to burn them (4). Nearby at Stockton, an altar was also built, and the curate, Dacke, was later in trouble, presumably for offences committed during these weeks (5).

Full records do not exist of the similar scenes which took place in other parishes of the counties, but it is known that mass was celebrated in Barnard Castle by George White, and other priests, in such rebel strongholds as Darlington and Warkworth (6). The incumbents or curates of various churches themselves did something towards the restoration of the old uses. John or George Brown, the curate of Chester-le-Street, with the curate of Monkwearmouth, was later accused of having ministered communion with unlawful bread (7). At Lanchester Richard Milner, the curate, publicly read in the parish church "the Latany and other suffrages abolished"; at Heighington the curate, John Nicholson, publicly read out certain psalms in the Latin tongue, apparently with the concurrence of his vicar; and at Seaham the vicar, Thomas Wright, daily said in his chamber in the presence of George Winter, who had been a minor canon, as well as of others, "matutinas Beatae Mariae" (8). Robert Crawford

(1) S.S. 21, p. 186, 189-90.

(2) Ibid, p. 197.

(3) 22; cf. Sharpe, p. 250-2.

(4) S.S. 21, p. 197-8.

Thomas Watson, the parish clerk, was involved in these proceedings but as he denied most of the charges brought against him it is hard to say with certainty what happened in this parish.

(5) Ibid, p. 198. A Ralph

Dacke was ordained acolyte in 1558, and priest May 25, 1559, on a title given by Sherburn Hospital (T.R. nos. 363, 369).

(6) S.S. 21 p. 182; Sharpe, p. 45; N.C.H. C, p. 63.

(7) S.S. 21, p. 198. The curate of Chester is called John Brone in these depositions, but both in 1563 and 1571 a George Brown was curate here (Harl. Mss. vol. 594, fol. 187; Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 3265).

(8) S.S. 21, p. 199. A John Nicholson was ordained sub-deacon on a title of 6 marks from the lands of Edward Parkinson of County Durham in 1547, and deacon and priest in the same year (T.R. nos. 249-50, 256). The vicar of Heighington was William Whitehead and he was later charged in connection with the rebellion.

who, as curate of Billingham, had been an absentee at the visitation of 1559, in 1569 was both rector of Kimblesworth and curate of Whitworth, and was found guilty of having made holy-bread and holy water in the church of the latter parish (1). In Medomsley John Cowper, the curate of Whittonstall, churched three women and married certain people in Latin according to papal rites. Thomas Swalwell, the curate of Medomsley, said that Cowper had been procured by a servant of John Swinburne, but as he himself was already notorious as a favourer of popery it is probable that he was illicitly concerned in the transaction (2). Another ardent supporter of the reversion to Catholicism was John Brown, who was both a minor canon and curate of Wilton Gilbert where, consequently, in the style of other clergy of the counties, he made a confession in the pulpit one Sunday in December that he had led his flock astray for the past eleven years, and thereupon exhorted them to follow him in his new course (3). At both Staindrop and Brancepeth Latin services were taken, probably during the presence of the Earls in these localities, by Holmes, or by Robert Pearson, or even perhaps by Nicholas Forster, the rector of Brancepeth (4). William Melmerby, the vicar of Merrington, who seems to have been related to Richard Hartburn, was also seriously involved in the proceedings of the rebels (5), and although very little is known about the events in Northumberland during this period it is certain that some of the clergy must have followed the same course as those of Durham; for example, Roger Venis, the vicar of Mitford, was absent with the insurgents from the end of November; and William Brigham, the vicar of Ovingham, was charged with offences committed at the same period (6).

(1) S.P. Dom, Eliz. X, p. 393; Surtees II, p. 375; III, p. 393; S.S. 21, p. 199. His will of 1583 shows that he was the same man as the curate of Billingham (Wills & Invs. III, p. 98.) (2) S.S. 21, p. 203-4, cf. above p. 452, 460, 463. (3) Ibid, p. 159-60, 174-5; above p. 157.

(4) cf. S.S. 21, p. 138-40, 177-80; Sadler II, p. 136. On one occasion Pearson baptised a child according to the Latin rite in Brancepeth church, at the command of the Countess. (5) Sharpe, p. 231, cf. he was presented to Merrington by William Hartburn and George Smith, and the mandate to induct him, dated Sept. 19, 1558, was addressed to Richard Hartburn, Bachelor of Laws, and Robert Melmerby, priest (D. & Chap. Reg. II, fol. 59.) (6) S.S. 21, p. 199-201. Venis was ordained in 1558-9, and Brigham in 1567-8 (T.R. nos. 363, 369, 534.)

The flight of the Earls to Hexham and the news of the arrival in the Bishopric of the Queen's forces under Sussex, Clinton, and Warwick caused a quick reaction. Seeking to palliate their offences, the very men who had been responsible for the changes accomplished in the churches, undid their work; the churchwardens of St. Margaret's and Pitlington quietly replaced the altar stones and holy water stoups where they had found them (1) but the wardens of St. Giles' and of Long Newton, to make a greater display of their new-found loyalty, destroyed or threw them away (2). Similarly, John Lilburn of Auckland parish bought a new Bible because he had destroyed the old one; and Headlam, the curate of St. Nicholas' church, burnt the very service book from which he had read the Latin matins and evensong (3). The people of Sedgefield were less easily swayed from their whole-hearted acceptance of Catholicism, and it fell to the Queen's soldiers to break down their altar, whereupon Hixson, the warden, carefully hid the altar stone, and threw away the water stoup, which he covered with straw with the words "Dominus vobiscum" (4).

Partly, perhaps, as a result of their efforts to condone their past offences, and partly because they were poor and ignorant, and had often acted under the commands of such leaders as Cuthbert Neville, the majority of the laity of the two counties who had taken part in the religious restoration were punished lightly. Dr. Swift, as Vicar-General, with another commissary, held a court of inquiry into their conduct, and a total of some one hundred and twenty men and women were examined, including large numbers from Durham city and Sedgefield. Five libels or charges were drawn up which advanced the principles that only the Prayer Book ought to be used; that mass and the Latin service was justly abolished; that altars ought to be removed; and that Bibles and other prescribed books should be kept in churches. On acknowledging these promises and signing a confession of their guilt and sorrow, the offenders were made to do penance and then released (5).

(1) S.S. 21, p. 173, 175-7. (2) Ibid, p. 167, 196.
(3) Ibid, p. 162-3, 180. (4) Ibid, p. 183-93. In
Auckland & Billingham the altar stones were replaced
where they had been found, or in the church, Ibid, p.
180, 197. (5) S.S. 21, p. 127-35; above p. 159.

The clergy were also dealt with by this court, but some of them escaped less lightly. They were more to blame, having often taken the lead, and two of them, William Headlam of St. Nicholas', Durham, and Thomas Pentland the vicar of St. Oswald's, still maintained a recalcitrant attitude several months after the rebellion was over, despite Headlam's first attempt to undo his previous work (1). Two of the clergy were punished by imprisonment in the Bishop's prison (2); and Thomas Swalwell, against whom various other changes were brought at the beginning of 1571, was temporarily suspended from ministration within the diocese (3). George White and Robert Pearson, who had both celebrated masses and been prime movers in these matters, seem to have escaped punishment; perhaps they had fled abroad or into Scotland. William Holmes and Richard Hartburn, however, together with Roger Venis of Mitford, William Melmerby of Merrington, and four minor canons, were indicted for conspiracy and rebellion. The four minor canons were immediately deprived for conforming to papacy (4); Venis was deprived in 1570 on grounds of non-residence, as, even before the rebellion, he had frequently been absent from his cure (5); Melmerby, however, was allowed to retain his benefice (6), and Holmes and Hartburn, being already amongst the ranks of the unbeneficed Romanist or Marian clergy, escaped further punishment; Holmes, perhaps in company with Hartburn, fled abroad (7).

One priest who had taken an even more active share in the rebellion was executed in Durham with some of the commons who had followed the Earls. For their punishment, the whole district from Newcastle to Wetherby was abandoned to martial law. Sussex intended to make at least one terrible example in every village represented amongst the insurgents; to execute those who had incited

(1) cf. there were proceedings against them, April 8, 1570, for having failed to perform their offices at Easter (March 26); S.S. 21, p. 163. Re Thomas Pentland cf. above p. 157, 225. (2) i.e. Richard Milner of Lanchester and Robert Crawford of Whitworth, Ibid, p. 199.

(3) Ibid, p. 201-5. In 1570 he had become curate of Brancepeth. (4) Sharpe, p. 230-1, 260-1; above p. 159.

(5) S.S. 21, p. 200-1; Hodgson II, vol. 2, p. 31; T.R. NO 472. (6) When he made his will, March, 1582/3, he was still vicar of Merrington. S.S. 22, p. cxvii-viii.

(7) cf. below p. 521.

others to rebel, and those who had remained with the Earls after the proclamation of the pardon. The commons had dispersed when the leaders left Durham on December 16, so constables and other officers were examined as to those who were guilty within their constaberies; in some cases, however, it was found that their evidence was not reliable; no constable who had himself joined the rebels was spared (1).

On Saturday, December 31, and the following day Sussex was in Durham carrying out these examinations (2) but Bowes, as Provost-Marshal, was in charge of the executions in the Bishopric, and 1,000 foot and about 400 horse of Clinton's and Warwick's army were assigned to him and to Sussex for their duration. On January 4, Sussex sent Cecil a list of those who were to be executed in the Bishopric, and Bowes was then given a similar list with more detailed orders of the places in which he was to carry out the royal vengeance. This list, with various others which exist, enables a rough estimate to be made both of those who followed the Earls, and of those who suffered death for their offence. In Durham city itself, at the top of Framwellgate, about thirty inhabitants of the town were hanged, and with them thirty prisoners from the castle including the serving men of the Bishopric, and seventeen constables drawn from Chester, Easington and Stockton wards. In Darlington two prisoners, sixteen townsmen, and twenty three constables of the ward were appointed for execution; and in Barnard Castle, twenty of the soldiers that had leaped over the castle walls to join the Earls; in other parts of the county about 172 men were executed in the villages in which they lived (3).

Bishop Pilkington, who had returned to the diocese, wrote to Cecil "The number of offenders is so great that few innocent are left to try the guilty." (4). Bowes was accused of harshness, but although the treatment of his property by the rebels might have prompted him to vindictive measures, there is evidence that he treated the people with as much leniency as possible; for example, in Darlington he ordered those responsible for making inventories of the property of the rebels who had

(1) Sharpe, p. 120-1, 124, 134-5, 142. At Darlington the constables were found to be sheltering some of the worst offenders. (2) Ibid, p. 124.

(3) Sharpe, p. 99, 133-4. (4) Ibid, p. 135.

been executed to treat their wives and children favourably (1). Moreover, a fairly large number of the rebels ~~whom~~, it was appointed, should die ~~escaped~~; in certain places they fled, and remained hidden until Bowes' commission had expired; the men of Darlington in particular, including some of the constables, evaded justice in this manner (2). Some were spared, at least temporarily, because Bowes was ordered to reserve such as had a certain amount of property for a later trial (3). The punishment of the rebellion was, however, ferocious, and in the choice of those to be hanged the pressure under which the Provost-Marshal had to work caused little discrimination to be shown. Amongst the rebels who suffered were Lionel Neville at Wolsingham; Thomas Neville at Raby; Michael Trollope at Bradley; and Gerard Salvin at East Brandon, all of whom were scions of the houses of some of the chief leaders of the rising, and with them must be numbered Struther, an alderman of Durham; and Thomas Plumtree, the only priest to suffer death. Plumtree had celebrated mass in Durham cathedral, and was the rebels' preacher, travelling about with them. Captured with other men of the Bishopric in Cumberland, he was imprisoned in Carlisle at the end of December, but was transferred to Durham. Convicted in due form of law, he is said to have been offered mercy if he would conform, but he remained firm (4). Meanwhile the executions in Bywell lordship, Hexhamshire, and Northumberland were entrusted to Sir John Forster, and under his directions Bowes was ordered to see justice done upon nineteen persons (5).

The other commons who had joined the rebel camp were set free after paying fines; Bowes instructed his brother-in-law, Thomas Middleton, to collect the money due "of such as were rebels" with as little offence to the people as possible. Meanwhile, submissions were taken both from them and from those who had incurred some measure of guilt by sharing their charges. Comparatively few went from each town and village to aid the rebels but many of the rest, in this manner, had become implicated, and so the number of those submitting was more than double the number of the insurgents (6). From

-
- (1) Ibid, p. 141. (2) Ibid, p. 140-2, 188
(3) Ibid, p. 134. (4) Sharpe, p. 123, 133, 140, 188, 383.
(5) Ibid, p. 133, 187. (6) Ibid, p. 121, 127-8.

the existent list it appears that about 900 men of the Bishopric had marched with the Earls (1). The seat of the rising was essentially in Darlington and Stockton wards, not so much because the people of these districts were more disaffected than those of the north and west parts of the county, as because it was here that the chief musters were held as the rebels marched from Durham to Darlington and besieged Barnard Castle, while many of the important gentry—including Westmorland himself—owned property in the vicinity of these towns. Darlington, where frequent levies were held, with its suburb of Bondgate, alone contributed 83 men, and an additional 32 came from the outlying townships of Cockerton and Blackwell. Similarly, a glance at the map shows that the villages near Raby were mostly represented in the rebel camp as a result of the musters held there, and also because many of the inhabitants were tenants of the Nevilles; no less than 44 men were drawn from Staindrop itself. While some 522 men seem to have joined the Earls from Darlington ward and 213 from Stockton; little over one hundred came from the two remaining wards, although about twenty joined from the parish of Houghton-le-Spring, where the work of Bernard Gilpin had not as yet had time to take effect. The churches, however, in which a reversion was made to the old forms of service were widely scattered throughout the country, thus providing sufficient evidence that the results of the rising, if successful, would have been willingly accepted throughout the greater part of the Bishopric (2).

By January 11 the executions in Durham were finished, and most of the horse and foot allowed to Bowes were therefore discharged. On February 19, a free pardon was extended to those who had saved their lives by composition, but many were rendered destitute, and— with the disbanded retainers of the Earls and gentry— eked out a livelihood by begging, until a whipping campaign was organised against them by the Vagrancy Act of 1572.

Meanwhile, the punishment of the more important offenders, and of those with property, had been undertaken. But for Elizabeth's parsimony the rising might have been over more quickly, but it had cost the Treasury over £20,000, and she was determined to recoup herself as far as possible. While Sussex was in Northumberland at the end of December, the Bishopric and parts of

(1) Ibid, p. 250-2. The numbers of those who joined from Durham city are not given, but as 30 were executed it may be presumed that at least double that number were implicated. (2) cf. Sharpe, p.250-2; cf. map

Yorkshire were harried and despoiled by the army under the command of Clinton and Warwick, who, moreover, took into their protection any rebels who came to them (1). These proceedings were soon stopped, as they involved a loss to the Crown. The gentry and yeomen who were captured were, instead, reserved for trial at York or Durham so that the Queen might have the forfeiture of their lands (2). A large number of important gentry of the Bishopric were soon imprisoned in Durham castle, to which some of them had been transferred from Carlisle, and from whence a good many were later sent to York. (3) A commission appointed at York to try the chief rebels consisted of Sussex, Hunsdon, Sir Thomas Gargrave, and Sir Gilbert Gerrard, the Attorney-General. On March 24, 1570, these commissioners reported that they had indicted those with landed property, and that they had already condemned eleven people, four of whom had been executed. The other seven, amongst whom were three gentry of Durham, were respited, partly on the excuse that their offence was less, but actually rather from the consideration that, having only a life interest in their property, the Queen would lose by their death (4). For a similar reason a number of other people were ultimately saved, but some were imprisoned for life; some, including Thomas Bates of Morpeth and Marmaduke Norton whose home was at Stranton in Durham, were summoned to London to be arraigned at Westminster (5); some were pardoned by the payment of fines, and by composition many were allowed to redeem their lands; others of the poorer sort were granted free pardons, and among them were a good many yeomen of the Bishopric (6). A large number of the chief leaders of the rising had fled with the Earls into

(1) Ibid, p. 130-1 (2) Sharpe, p. 112-3, 122, 127, 134.
 (3) These gentry of the Bishopric were in Durham prison on January 1: William Clavering of Old Acres, Robert (William?) Claxton of Wynyard, Richard Conyers of Horden, William Holland, Robert Lambert of Ouston, and his younger brothers, George and Clement, Nicholas Neville of Wolsingham, James Shafto of Tanfield -Leigh; and also these who were transferred from Carlisle: Anthony Bulmer of Tursdale, John Carnaby of Langley, Robert Eden of W. Auckland, George Gray and Oswald or Oswin Ogle of Brancepeth, the two Gerard Salvins of Croxdale, John Sayer junior of Worsall; Thomas Swinhoe of Cornhill's name was given but crossed out; of the "meaner sort" there were Robert and John Pearsye, gentlemen ushers of Northumberland, Robert Conyers, Cuthbert Claxton, and Cuthbert Storey of Darlington. (Sharpe, p. 128-30). (4) Sharpe, p. 225-6, 228-9. Those of Durham who were respited were Robert

Scotland; Sir Henry Gate was sent to demand their surrender from the Regent Moray, but Moray was evasive and after his assassination at the end of January, complications ensued, and the majority of the fugitives were able to escape abroad (1).

As Prince Palatine Bishop Pilkington claimed all the forfeiture within the Bishopric; but Elizabeth intended them for herself. Sussex had already foreseen the difficulty and wrote to Cecil on December 25, "Touching present commodity, I find that all the forfeitures that by this late rebellion should grow to the Queen's Majesty in the Bishopric will, indeed, by the laws of the realm, fall out in the end to the Bishop; which will be too great for any subject to receive. And, therefore, before I proceed against the offenders that have estates of inheritance, or great wealth, I think it very necessary that the Queen Majesty should either compound with the Bishop, for his royalties, and keep them still in her hands, or translate him to some other Bishopric, whereby, sede vacante, all might grow to her Majesty" (2). Finally, however, the question was settled by an Act of Parliament which transferred the Bishop's rights to the Queen for that turn. In May, 1571, Parliament also confirmed the attainders of the two Earls, the Countess of Northumberland, and fifty-two others, including twenty three gentry of Durham and Northumberland, all but three or four of whom had fled into Scotland or else abroad (3). All the property of the attainted rebels was forfeited to the Crown; the value of the lands of the chief rebels lying within the Bishopric was put by one estimate at £779-1-4, and by another at £1,058-5-5 (4); and, as these valuations were by no means exhaustive, it is obvious that the forfeiture must have gone a long way to recompense Elizabeth for her expenditure. On the other hand pardons, with restitution of goods, later granted to a few of those

(4) (cont. from previous page) Lambert, Robert Claxton, and Ralph Conyers. (5) Sharpe, p. 232, 286-7.

(6) cf. April 25, 1570. Free pardons were granted by letters-patent to 3 yeomen of Lumley, 3 of Coldhesleden, and 2 of Newbottle. Proc. of the Newc. Soc. Antiq. 4th. Ser. II, p. 93.

(1) Sharpe, p. 139, 236. (2) Ibid, p. 119.

(3) Sharpe, p. 263-74.

(4) Sadler II, p. 191-201; Sharpe, p. 138.

who had been implicated, deprived the Crown of some of the fruits assigned to it by the Act of Attainder, and the fugitives continued to cause anxiety and the necessity of an additional outlay after the rising was over and most of the rebels punished.

SECTION III. THE AFTERMATH OF THE REBELLION

Unrest and disturbances were characteristic of the North and particularly of the Borders for some months after the chief leaders of the rebellion had fled to Scotland. For long there was a strong but false suspicion that the Earl of Westmorland was concealed somewhere in the district of Brancepeth; in the middle of January 1570, Robert Constable, the spy, reported that Cuthbert Neville was either there or in Raby lordship; and his brother Christopher was also thought to be in the vicinity, and to be planning a new outbreak. Rumours of stirrings were given additional weight by the provisioning of Brancepeth castle; by the presence there of the Countess of Westmorland, and the sudden departure of Lord Evers, Dean Whittingham, and others, who left Durham with their families. Bowes himself was alarmed, and felt that the people of Durham were not to be trusted if there was any fresh stir. He kept with him one hundred horsemen, and appointed his brother to take charge of the prisoners in the castle. By the middle of February he had also put two hundred footmen in readiness within the Bishopric, and had persuaded some of the churchmen to prepare armour and weapons instead of taking to flight; by then, however, the two Nevilles had left the district and it was improbable that there would be any fresh attempt to cause a disturbance (1).

Robert Constable had come to Brancepeth partly to deliver a message to the Countess from her husband, for he had already been employed to spy upon the movements of the fugitives in Scotland. Soon after their flight into Liddesdale, the Earl of Northumberland was captured by the Regent Moray and removed on December 30 to Edinburgh, and thence to Lochleven. Imprisoned with him was his servant, George Pringle of Farnacres (2); and James Swinhoe, Ralph Swinhoe, and Robert Collingwood, were also taken, but the two latter soon made their escape (3). Meanwhile his followers were scattered. The Earl of Westmorland with Anthony and John Welbury, the two Riddleys of Brancepeth, and some of his other servants, found refuge at Ferniehurst, the home of the

(1) Sadler II, p. 136; Sharpe, p. 175-9, 297.

(2) Sadler II, p. 111; Sharpe, p. 323.

(3) Sharpe, p. 139, 126; Forster reported their capture in E. Teviotdale on Dec. 31. They were free by Jan. 12.

Kers; Lady Northumberland, after an adventurous time amongst the Border thieves, went to Hume castle where she was joined by Robert Carr, and the two late prisoners, Robert Collingwood and Ralph Swinhoe; Tristram Fenwick, Robert Shafto, and Anthony Ogle were at Bedrule in Teviotdale; and some of the worst offenders, including John Swinburne, Robert Tempest, George Stafford, and later the two Nevilles, were with the barons of Buccleugh at Branxholm castle (1). Other prominent gentry of the Counties were lurking secretly elsewhere, amongst whom were Michael Tempest, William Smith, John Trellope, Anthony Hebburn, and Ralph Conyers of Cotham (2)

The presence of these men in Scotland, where the papal party was still strong, and urged on by the Queen, constituted a grave danger upon the English side of the Border. Sussex and Sadler, therefore, left larger forces than normal under the charge of the Wardens of the Marches, while Bowes levied footmen in Durham to send to Berwick (3). These precautions were soon justified. Towards the end of January raids began under the leadership of Ker of Ferniehurst, Scott of Buccleugh, and the Earl of Westmorland. On one occasion the raiders came to Mindrum and Kirknewton, and carried off 200 prisoners, besides 5,000 sheep and 540 head of cattle and horses (4); on another occasion they penetrated as far as Morpeth, burning houses, slaying men, and taking prisoners. They burnt and ravaged as far as Alnwick, and Drury, the marshall of Berwick, complained of nightly raids approaching each time nearer to the town. Ralph Swinhoe was in command of the forces troubling Drury, and others of his family, together with some of the Carrs of Ford, had joined the Scots, who bragged that they would even enter the Bishopric (5)

At the same time the Queen's generals had to deal with an even more serious disturbance in the West. Leonard Dacre's younger brothers, Edward and Francis, had actively engaged in the rebellion, and he himself had got together large forces at about the time of the rebels' flight to Hexham. The Queen, suspicious therefore of his loyalty, gave orders that he should be summoned to court, and on his refusal to obey the summons Scrope was ordered to arrest him. Dacre

(1) Sadler II, p. 110-11, 117-18; Sharpe, p. 146.

(2) Ibid, p. 139. (3) Ibid, p. 136, 145, 176;

Sadler II, p. 82-3. (4) Scott "Berwick", p. 168-70.

(5) Sharpe, p. 167, 170-2, 178, 273.

thereupon asked for aid from some of the Scottish borderers, and finally, after the great raid to Morpeth, he determined to rebel. The rising, however, was soon over; on February 20, 1570, Lord Hunsdon and Sir John Forster, although many times outnumbered, completely routed Dacre's forces at the Battle of Hall Beck.

The promptitude with which Hunsdon had acted had prevented Scottish aid from reaching Dacre, and although the raids into England continued, the government officials were now free to carry out a counter attack. While Bowes and Lord Evers guarded the frontier, a great punitive raid into Scotland was carried out under the direction of Sussex and the three wardens. The territory through which they passed was left little better than a desert, and a savage vengeance was taken upon those who were innocent as well as those who had helped the rebels (1)

The fear of a union between the English and the Scottish borderers was now over, and the rebels, to whom Scotland no longer offered a safe asylum, were forced to flee to the continent. On August 24, 1570, the Countess of Northumberland left Aberdeen in a ship called "The Port of Leith", with some of her servants and followers, including Cuthbert Armourer, Robert Carr of Ford, the Tempests, and George Pringle of Farnacres, who had made a successful escape from the Regent's prison (2). Three days later the Earl of Westmorland and his servants, Henry and John Ridley, John Welbury, Ralph Shaw of Cleadon, and Thomas Watson of Raby, all of whom had been with him at Ferniehurst, took ship from Aberdeen for the Low Countries (3). They were followed by others of the fugitives, but while the Countess of Northumberland was trying to get enough money in Flanders to pay his ransom, the Earl of Northumberland had remained a prisoner at Lochleven; and John Swinburne, Brian Palmers, and George Smith, the son of William Smith of Nunstainton, fell into the hands of Lord Lindsay who wished to hand them over to the English Government, to be fined and pardoned, in return for a substantial consideration (4). Finally, after he had been in prison for two years, the Regent Morton sold Northumberland to the English for £2,000, and he was beheaded at York on August 22, 1572 (5).

(1) Sharpe, p. 234, 240. (2) Ibid, p.33, 272, 346.
(3) Ibid, p. 272. (4) Sharpe, p. 265. (5) Ibid, p.333.

It is evident from letters sent to them by their compatriots abroad that Swinburne and his companions were, meanwhile, suffering many hardships. In September 1571, the priest, William Holmes, wrote letters to all three, assuring them of his prayers, telling them to rejoice that they were thought worthy to suffer for their religion, and promising to try to send them a book called "Collectio Consolationum vere aurea", and some pictures (1). In January, 1572, letters were written to Swinburne from Louvain by Christopher Danby, one of the chief Yorkshire rebels, and Thomas Bailey, a priest whose home was in the Bishopric (2). Bailey asked to be commended to Swinburne's companions, and said he would have sent them some books, "Agnus Deis", and beads, which they wanted, but he feared that they might not be allowed to have them, and that they might be abused (3). Partly on their behalf, and on that of the Earl, journeys were taken to Scotland by some of the Earl's servants such as George Pringle, Cuthbert Armourer, and James Swinhoe, who was entrusted in March, 1572, with a letter from Michael Tempest to his cousin, Swinburne. They failed to help their master, but, perhaps as a result of their efforts, Smith and Palmes reached the Low Countries in May, 1572, and Swinburne probably at about the same time (4).

Other followers and confederates of the Earls, amongst them were Cuthbert and Christopher Neville, John Trollope of Thornley, Henry Parkinson of Beaumont Hill, Marmaduke Blakiston, and George Horsley of Acklington Park, had, before this date, successfully made their way into Flanders, and brought with them many cadets of the families of the rebels. Robert Tempest of Holmside and his son Michael were joined by a younger son called Robert. William Carr, a base-brother of Robert Carr of Ford, and the young son of John Trollope also joined the exiles. Young Trollope however, became ill, and with Robert Booth of Durham, who had been in Louvain for four years, had to be sent back to England in 1571. At about the same period a large number of moderate Catholics, who had taken no part in the rising, also made their way to the Low Countries; disheartened by the severity of the punishment of the rebellion, they went, in this way, into voluntary exile, appointing trustees to send them

(1) CAL.S.P. Dom. VII, p. 358-9. (2) ^{ibid.} c₆ p. 365-6.
 (3) Ibid, p. 380-1. (4) Ibid, p. 385, 394. cf.
 Swinburne was there before 1574 (S.P. Dom. Eliz. 99,
 no 55)

the profits of their estates (1).

The Countess of Northumberland spent some years in Louvain, but by 1575 she had moved to Brussels; amongst the gentlewomen attendant upon her were Mrs. Lassells, whose home was in the Bishopric, and the wife of Thomas Markenfield of Yorkshire. Her household also included Peter Kirk of Egglecliffe, the Earl's bailiff, Higheton, the Earl's secretary, Dr. Knott, who was her chief counsellor, and eight others; in addition William Carr attached himself to her service (2). The Earl of Westmorland, the other chief figure amongst the exiles, lived mostly at Louvain, with occasional visits to Brussels. Extravagant by nature, the worst side of his character now became apparent, and he was soon deeply in debt. In 1571 he had only twelve or fourteen household servants, but as he kept open house, and had between forty and fifty followers or friends coming to meat with him daily, by 1572 he and his two uncles were forced to depend upon the charity of their fellow exiles; Thomas Jenny, a Yorkshire rebel, pawned his credit to get money for their food and clothing, but that was insufficient, and the Countess had to come to their aid (3).

Fortunately the fugitives were able to depend for their maintenance upon the religious zeal and bounty of the King of Spain; some were granted pensions almost immediately, and others journeyed to Spain between 1571 and 1575 to obtain similar grants. In 1575 the Countess had a monthly allowance of fifty crowns for herself and those dependent upon her, and, in addition, thirty crowns monthly from France from the dowry of the Queen of Scots. At the same date Westmorland was receiving fifty crowns monthly from Spain; but later the pensions of both from King Philip seem to have been doubled. Christopher and Cuthbert Neville, Michael Tempest, John Swinburne, and perhaps William Smith and Marmaduke Blakiston, were also the King's pensioners for some years, but by 1500 only the Earl and the Countess of the fugitives from Durham and Northumberland were being paid (4).

(1) S.P. Dom. Eliz. XCIX, no. 55; CV, no. 10; Add. XX, fol. 180; Cal. S.P. Dom. VII, p. 361-6, 383-4, 416, 457-8.

(2) Cal. S.P. Dom. VII, p. 416; S.P. Dom. Eliz. CV, no. 10. Kirk was indicted for rebellion (Sharpe, p. 231.) (3) Cal. S.P. Dom. VII, p. 368-9 383-4, 410; S.P. Dom. Eliz. CV, no. 10.

(4) A "Mr. Smyth" appears in a list of 1575, and in a list of the same year Blakiston, "a northern man", is said to have gone to Spain to sue for a pension. The amounts of the pensions vary slightly from one list to another. cf. S.P. Dom. Eliz. CV, Nos. 9-10; ccxxxiii,

From the first Burghley's spies had kept him informed of the condition of the exiles and of the people with whom they consorted, and in 1574 Dr. Thomas Wilson, who was later rewarded with the Deanery of Durham, was sent out specially to watch their movements (1). At Louvain they came into contact with many Englishmen who had gone abroad at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, and with certain priests, such as Dr. Bullock, the late prebendary of Durham, who had refused the oath in 1559. Moreover, at Bruges there was a Father Prior, who with his convent, who were all Englishmen, maintained and succoured "poor rebels, papists, and priests, with others". In Louvain Michael Tempest's brother became a student, and in 1571 all the English there, as well as going to church every Thursday to hear mass and to pray for England, seem to have spent much of their time in ranting against the ministers of the Church of England as followers of Luther, who, they thought, was inspired by the devil (2).

Such activities were innocuous enough, but having intrigued with the foreign enemies of Elizabeth before the outbreak of the rebellion, the exiles inevitably tried once more to urge their interference, and were supported by the fact that the papal bull of 1570 — which excommunicated and deposed the Queen — changed the issue to one of European politics while making Roman Catholicism and treason synonymous. At first they were hopeful of a speedy success in their efforts; in 1571 they spoke optimistically of the growing number of their friends in England and of the readiness of England to rebel, even supposing that they would return with a foreign expedition in the following Spring; consequently they sent a message to Mrs. Trollope of Thornley telling her not to sue for her husband's pardon, if she had not already obtained it, as they would soon be in England. In January, 1572, Michael Tempest wrote that they had not as yet obtained the aid of any Prince, but that they expected shortly to be successful in their quest, and so to see an end of all their troubles. The chief movers in these designs were the Earl of Westmorland and those around him at

Nos. 31-2; Cal.S.P.Dom VII, p.378-9; Sharpe, p.33, 348-9.

(1) Sharpe, p.301; Cal.S.P.Dom VII, p.378.

(2) S.P. Dom. Eliz. LXXXIX, No.16; CV, No.10; Cal.S.P.Dom. VII, p.361-3, 368-9.

Louvain, with whom, however, the English congregation who had already been in the town, before the arrival of the rebels, refused to join. In 1571, the Earl had dealings with the Duke of Alva, and in 1572 a scheme was afoot to seize the Queen of Scots and to take the Isle of Man (1). Meanwhile a Mr. Stafford, who was probably George Stafford of Brancepeth, was employed to remain at Paris chiefly to obtain any news from home; and frequent messengers were sent into England, both to obtain information and to stimulate interest in their cause amongst the Catholics. Generally these messengers had themselves been rebels, or were servants of the Earl or Countess. In 1571 the Earl sent Henry Ridley, his constant companion, with letters directed to the Countess of Westmorland and the Earl of Derby; and the Countess of Northumberland often employed Anthony Goodchilde, one of her household, upon missions of this nature. In 1572 another of their agents, William Carr of Ford, was captured by Lord Hunsdon at Berwick as he made his way into England from Leith; and was found to have letters, beads, "Agnus Dei" and friars' girdles for women in child-birth, sewn up into his hose, and to be carrying service books and pictures. He seems to have escaped fairly lightly as the letters which he carried, although designed, in Hunsdon's words, "to maintain that cankered faction", were unimportant (2).

The English government was by no means asleep to the danger from the activities of the rebels abroad, and took strong measures to counteract them. In October, 1572, special instructions were given to the Earl of Huntingdon, on his appointment as President of the Council in the North, to watch carefully the servants and friends of those who had fled, lest suspected persons should resort to them with messages to kindle the sparks of new troubles; and in February, 1574, the Council was asked to search for Ridley, and for George Horsley of Acklington Park, who was also thought to be acting as messenger between the exiles and their friends (3). A more telling stroke, however, had already been given in an Act of 1571, by which it was ordered that all fugitives should return to England within six months under pain of forfeiture of their goods.

(1) Cal. S.P. Dom. VII, p. 361-3, 368-9, 377, 384.

(2) Cal. S.P. Dom. VII, p. 368-9, 416; S.P. Dom. Eliz.

C.V. no. 10. (3) Cal. S.P. Dom. VII, p. 431-2, 457-8.

This Act probably immediately induced the return of some of the moderate Catholics who had not taken part in the rising, and at the same time certain of the late rebels, including some who had been attainted, began to sue for pardon. In 1571 Henry Parkinson of Beaumont Hill sent messages both to Sir George Bowes, whom he had served as well as the Earl of Westmorland, and to his wife, to ask them to obtain grace for him; they were evidently successful in this attempt (1). George Pringle, in order to obtain the favour of the government, in 1572, informed the marshall of Berwick of the plots in Flanders, and, perhaps as a result, obtained his pardon in April, 1574 (2). Meanwhile Westmorland had traitorously decided to run with the hare as well as hunt with the hounds, and on the persuasion of John Lee, Burghley's spy, as early as March, 1572, offered to inform upon the rebels in return for the Queen's mercy (3). Although his suit was not granted, some of the other rebels who had been attainted, and had left England, were pardoned; pardons were granted in July, 1571, to Tristram Fenwick of Brinkburn, and, at the request of the Earl of Leicester, to Anthony Welbury; in 1572, at the special suit of the marshall of Berwick, William Smith of Nunstainton was granted a pardon with restitution of his goods, and was, no doubt, soon joined in England to which he had returned, by his son, George; in 1574 Trollope secured his pardon, and finally in 1576 some of the more recent offenders, including George Horsley, Henry Ridley, James Swinhoe, and John Welbury, were successful in the same quest (4). In addition to them, Ralph Conyers of Cotham, Robert Carr of Ford and Cuthbert Armourer returned to England, and so had presumably been pardoned (5).

Some of the band who had fled abroad in 1571 had died before 1575; the two great protagonists of rebellion, Swinburne and Robert Tempest, were both dead by that date, Tempest having been buried at the Grey Friars in Brussels; furthermore Cuthbert Neville had shot himself, and, as it is recorded, "much ado there was to have him buried" (6). After 1576, therefore, comparatively few of the rebels of the counties

(1) Cal. S.P. Dom. VII, p. 361-3, 365-6. cf. he was certainly in possession of his property, 41 Eliz. (D.K. Rep. 37, App.1, p. 151). (2) Sharpe, p.272; Cal S.P. Dom. VII, p. 431-2. (3) Ibid, p. 389, 394. (4) Sharpe, p. 117, 148, 273. Arch. Ael. 4th. Ser. III, Greenwell Deeds, no. 331. (5) cf. Cal. S.P. Dom. XII, p. 232; Sharpe, p. 271. (6) S.P.Dom. Eliz. CV, no.10; XCIX, no.55.

remained in the Netherlands; those who did were probably only the immediate servants and relatives of Westmorland and Lady Northumberland, with the addition of Michael Tempest, who seems to have died in the service of Spain (1). The Countess wore herself out ceaselessly trying to stir up the interference of Catholic princes on behalf of the Queen of Scots and the Catholic religion, and in 1590, a note to this effect was made by Lord Burghley: "The Countess of Northumberland furiously mad hath 100 crowns at Namur" (2). Westmorland moved from place to place; in 1580 he was in Rouen, "daily playing tennis with some Spaniards with whom he lodges" but about to sail for Spain; in 1590 he was in Rome; and in 1594 back in Flanders; but always without employment or stable plans (3). Interest therefore shifts from the Low Countries to England, to which Elizabeth and her ministers had successfully recalled the greater number of the rebels who had fled abroad — a move of doubtful benefit to herself as they were soon to be numbered amongst the most obstinate and militant Recusants of the two countries:

Meanwhile the greater number of the rebels who had not escaped abroad had also been pardoned. Some of them, including William Claxton of Wynyard, Henry Killingham, Nicholas Featherstonehaugh and William Hodgson, had been taken into the protection of Warwick and Clinton, and so had avoided punishment (4). Others were saved by the intervention of friends or relatives who had been loyal; for example, the youthful Robert Claxton of Burnhall was exempted from the Act of Attainder as a result of the efforts of members of his wife's family, who were nearly connected with the Bowes of Streatlam (5). Perhaps, partly to ensure their loyalty, loans of £50 by letters of Privy Seal were required in 1570 from the close relatives of some of

(1) cf. Sharpe, p. 138. Marmaduke Blakiston, George Stafford, and Ralph and James Swinhoe perhaps also remained abroad until their death. (2) S.P. Dom. Eliz. CCXXXIII, no. 31. (3) Cal. S.P. Dom. III, p. 533; XII, p. 20; Lansd. Mss, vol. 64, fol. 40. The Countess died in 1596, and Westmorland in 1601. (4) Sharpe, p. 142. (5) His wife was Eleanor Warcop, and her sister had married a younger son of the Knight Marshall (Surtees IV, ii, p. 95, 97.). Similarly the pardon of John Sayer, junior, was compounded for in £500 at the suit of Sussex and his father, who had been with Bowes at Barnard Castle (Sharpe, p. 128.)

the other rebels (1). In the same year pardons were granted to some of the lesser offenders (2); and, between 1572 and 1574, to John Carnaby of Langley, Anthony Bulmer, Thomas Bates, Robert Collingwood of Abberwick, Ralph Conyers of Layton and Robert Claxton of Old Park, of whom the two last named had been respited by the York commission but included in the Act of Attainder (3).

A few of the rebels who had not been attainted were forced to sell large portions of their estates after 1575, probably as a result of the expenses to which they had been put by the rising and the compositions which they had to pay to secure their pardon. After his return from abroad Henry Parkinson of Beaumont Hill sold both his manor of Greystones and much of his other property in Haughton-le-Skerne (4); his relative, Henry Killinghall of Middleton-St. George, despite his marriage with an heiress, was similarly obliged to part with his manor of West Hartborne and his principal Darlington possessions (5); later in the century the chief possessions of the Bulmers of Tursdale also became dispersed (6). Robert Claxton of Burnhall sold the manor of Burnhall, and most of his other property, to his relative, George Lawson of Usworth, who made, by his will of 1587, a disinterested effort to allow Claxton to redeem the property. A rash, extravagant nature rather than the financial necessities induced by the rebellion seems, however, to have prevented him from taking advantage of Lawson's

(1) Loans were required from John Eden, Gerard Salvin, and Simon Welbury, whose sons had taken part in the rising; and from Christopher Conyers of Horden whose father had been involved - Sharpe, p. 244-6.

(2) e.g. George Lassells of Newcastle and Thomas Musgrave of Newburn -- Proc. Newc. Soc. of Antiq. 4th Ser. II, 93. (3) Sharpe, p. 18, 268-9, 272, 361-2, Arch. Ael. 2nd. Ser. pt. 59, p. 186. Bates was tried

in London in 1570, and was still imprisoned in the Tower in 1572. He was pardoned in 1574.

(4) Surtees III, p. 274; D.K. Rep. 37, App. I, p. 129, 151. (5) D.K. Rep. 37, App. I, p. 85, 123, 128.

Arch. Ael. 2nd. Ser. II. pt. 6. p. 87, 90. In 1605-6, however, he purchased part of the manor of Nether Middleton. (6) Bartram Bulmer, Anthony's son,

sold Pontop, and the manors of Elmeden, Claxton, and Tursdale. D.K. Rep. 37, App. I, p. 129-30, 161.

offer (1). The majority of those who were not attainted continued in possession of their lands, and seem to have suffered little detriment from their share in the rising. Some of them even prospered exceedingly and accumulated many additional estates. After securing his pardon in 1574, Thomas Bates of Morpeth renewed his leases, and purchased property in Benwell, and South Milbourne, and lands in East Chevington and Morwick from Lord Dacre; in addition he bought some of the possessions of the late Earl of Northumberland in East Hartford; finally at his death, in 1587, he left his wide reaching estates to his brother, Robert (2). The Edens of West Auckland, as the result of fortunate marriage alliances, continued their acquisition of property in that vicinity (3); and the Hodgsons of the Manor House and of Hebburn, and Cuthbert Storey of Darlington similarly were adding to their estates (4). Most of the other gentry of the two counties who had been indicted for rebellion were able to continue in occupation of all their former possessions and offices (5).

(1) Ibid, p. 122; Wills & Invs. II, p. 322-4. Lawson provided that Claxton should regain the lordship of Burnhall on payment of £2,000 within one year to his son, Thomas Lawson, with the proviso that Claxton was not to sell it again, but that it should descend to his heirs male. He also provided for annuities for Claxton's sons, and left "To Mrs. Claxton, wife to the said Robert, £10, to be paid into her own hands, and to be employed to her own use, and her husband not to know of it." (2) N.C.H. IX, p. 224, 288; XII, p. 149, 546-7; V, p. 355-6, 359; Arch. Ael. 4th. Ser. vol. 7. p. 69; Sharpe, p. 363. (3) Robt. Eden, the rebel, c.1577, obtained through the Lambtons lands in Bishop Auckland, St. Helen's and Kelloe. He died in 1584, before his father, in possession of property in Windleston St. Helen's Auckland, and Bellasis. cf. D.K. Rep. 37. App. I, p. 86; Wills & Invs. II, p. 105-6; Conyers-Surtees, "Hist. of St. Helen's Auckland, etc." p. 5-6, 9, 30. (4) William Hodgson of the Manor House, with others, purchased property in Conside etc. in 1594 (D.K. Rep. 37, App. I, p. 132; Arch. Ael. 4th. Ser. III, p. 152-3.) In 1576-9 the Hodgsons of Hebburn bought some property of the Tempests of Holmside, and the Sayers of Worsall (Arch. Ael. 2nd. Ser. I, pt. 1, p. 33-4; 3rd. Ser. I, p. 84.) For Cuthbert Storey's purchases cf. D.K. Rep. 37, App. 1. p. 85. (5) e.g. John Carnaby was still in occupation of his lease of Langley in 1608 (Arch. Ael. 2nd. Ser. pt. 27, p 53.). William Welton of Welton and Thornburgh died in 1571 but his

(cont.)

The estates of the chief rebels were vested in the Crown by the Act of Attainder, and the pardons later secured by some of those named in this Act, while involving the reversal of the attainder, did not generally imply restitution of their property. The result, consequently, of the rising, and of the ensuing confiscations, was to produce an extensive change in the ownership of landed property within the counties. From the lands so placed at the disposal of the Crown it was necessary to reward those who had remained loyal; and, although Elizabeth's meanness prevented some of her servants, such as Sir George Bowes, from being adequately recompensed for what they had lost, grants were soon made, to both him, and to Sir John Forster, Sir Henry Gates, George Preville, the master of the ordnance under Sussex, Thomas Brickwell, the captain of Berwick, Ralph Tailbois, Thomas Calverley, Henry Anderson, and numerous others upon whose support the success of the government cause had depended.

As the result of the forfeitures some of the families of the chief rebels became scattered. Robert Tempest of Holmside had married into the great Oxfordshire family of Lenthall, and some of his younger sons found refuge amongst their maternal relatives, and made for themselves fortunate marriages (1). Dorothy Dymoke, however, Michael Tempest's wife, continued to live in Durham, and from one of his younger brothers the family of Tempest of Old Durham was descended (2).

son Michael eventually succeeded to all his property (N.C.H. X, p. 324); Richard Conyers of Horden died, in 1594, seised of the manor of Horden etc. (P.R.O. Dun. Inq. p.m. File 192, nos. 24, 32), although in 1578 it was entered as in the possession of his son Christopher (D.K. Rep. 37, App. I, p. 100); William Claxton died seised of Wynyard etc. 39 Eliz., 2 years previously having made a settlement of his property (P.R.O. Dun. Inq. p.m. File 192, nos. 74, 85, D.K. Rep. 37, App. I, p. 94 etc.); William Lee at his death was in possession of most, at anyrate, of his leases from the Nevilles, although he seems to have had to spend large sums in recovering some of them (cf. Wills & Invs. II, p. 48).

(1) Surtees II, p. 326. Robert had married Margaret, daughter of Thomas Lenthall of Lachford; his son William married an Oxfordshire heiress and founded the family of the Tempests of Whaddon. (2) Sharpe, p. 33; Wills & Invs. II, p. 41. Dorothy Tempest in 1577 was granted an annuity of £20.

No more is heard of Anthony Hebburn of Hardwick, Robert Tempest's son-in-law, after his escape into Scotland, but some of his family later emerged as gentry in Oxfordshire, where they were probably supported by their Tempest connexions (1).

Although some, therefore, of those who had been attainted were forced to leave the counties for good, and although some had died abroad, no less than thirteen are known to have settled in Durham or Northumberland after the rebellion, and some to have occupied the very estates which they had forfeited. Even the Tempests and Hebburns retained their grip upon a portion of their old property (2), but most of the other rebels were far more fortunate than they were. The possessions of John Trollope of Thornley were entailed to his heir, but he forfeited his life interest in the manors of Thornley, Mordon, and Little Eden. After securing his pardon he became involved in a long struggle with the Crown lessees of these estates, and throughout the reign actually retained possession of them in one shape or another. In 1585 the manor of Thornley and half the manor of Little Eden were leased by Elizabeth to Ralph Bowes, who seems to have come to a good understanding with the Trollopes, for he granted a defeazance of the patent to William Carr of Newcastle for the use of John Trollope, to whom Carr was related, on condition of receiving £100 from Trollope to cover his expenses. In 1574 Trollope had already obtained possession of some property in Thornley through the good offices of his wife's family, the Methams, who had purchased it from the Crown grantess; and until it was presented as concealed land in 1584, he had also held the capital messuage of Thornley. In 1594, he, with others, purchased lands in Kelloe and elsewhere from his own son and heir, Francis Trollope, who was in possession of property in Little Eden and Thornley. On the death of Francis, in the same year, John obtained the custody of his grandson, John the younger, who finally succeeded his grandfather, on his death in 1611, in the battered remains of his estates (3)

(1) Surtees III, p. 34. (2) cf. in 1576 William Tempest of Whaddon sold the Fieldhouse, Gateshead, late of his father, to the Hodgsons of Hebburn, he himself having obtained it from the Crown grantees (Arch. Ael. 2nd. Ser. I. p. 33-4), lands in Heworth, late of Anthony Hebburn, were purchased in 1611 from Robert Bowes and John Hebburn (Surtees III, p. 328) (3) Surtees I, p. 86-9; Arch. Ael. 4th. Ser. III, Greenwell Deeds no. 340, 338; Wills & Invs. I, p. 383; D.K. Rep. 37. App. I, p. 156, 170.

Robert Claxton of Old Park had been exempted from execution by the York commission chiefly because, as it was then stated, "his land was assured to his wife at his marriage, so as the Queen shall lose by his death." (1) Old Park itself was granted to George Frevill, but Claxton continued to live there until his death in 1587, and his wife, Alice Lambton of Bellasis, ^{was} still living there in 1592 (2). From his will, dated September 22, 1587, it appears that he held a lease of Old Park and Bishop's Close, which he left to his wife, and then to his eldest son, John. He also seems to have retained some interest in his lease from the Bishop of Ricknall Grange, for his relative, Thomas Claxton of Windleston, by his will of 1579 left him $13/4$ yearly to be paid unto him ~~forth~~ of the ---- Ricknall Grange for four years." (3). His heir, John Claxton, who was referred to in 1592 as of Old Park and Sadberg, resided at Nettlesworth. Knighted by James I, he inherited a certain amount of the family property, including Preston-on-Skerne and West Morton; furthermore Knitsley, in Lanchester parish, was in some manner obtained by his son, John, who leased part of it to him in 1626 (4).

William Smith of Nunstainton, another prominent rebel, had been granted a pardon with restitution of his goods in 1572, but in the same year Crown leases were made of much of his property, including Nunstainton and the manor of Esh which he held in right of his wife, Margaret Ashe or Esh. In 1576, however, the Queen gave up to him and his wife certain claims which she had to a yearly rent of £20-6-8, and his lands being entailed to his son, restitution of the fee simple of Nunstainton was finally made to George Smith, in 1609, in return for £200. On the death of his mother in 1614 George also inherited the manor of Esh (5), where the family seem to have been living in the meantime (6).

- (1) Sharpe, p. 227. (2) Surtees III, p. 298; Wills & Invs. II p. 294-6; C.R.S. vol. 18, p. 76, 79.
 (3) Wills & Invs. I, p. 425; II, p. 294-6; Sharpe, p. 270-1. (4) C.R.S. vol. 18. p. 78; Sharpe, p. 270-1; Surtees III, p. 330-1, 56; Arch. Ael. 4th. Ser. I, p. 38-9. By his will of 1587 Robert Claxton gave "all my estate title, etc, in all my lands in Preston-upon-Skerne, Knitsley, Greencroft, W. Morton, and Westhall, and all my other lands, unto John Claxton, my eldest son, etc." (Wills & Invs. II. p. 295.) (5) Sharpe, p. 48, 265; Arch. Ael. 2nd. Ser. pt. 59, p. 187, 189; D.K. Rep, 44, App. p. 507-8. (6) cf. Wills & Invs. III, p. 76; II, p. 285.

These three cases may be taken as fairly typical of those of many of the other attainted rebels. Ralph Conyers of Layton and his kinsman, Ralph Conyers of Cotham-Conyers, both forfeited their life interest in their estates, which, nevertheless, they leased from the Crown grantees or from the Crown itself, and resided in their old homes until their death, when their property passed to their next heirs. (1) Similarly, despite Crown grants, Robert Collingwood of Abberwick, and perhaps Tristram Fenwick of Brinkburn, continued to live in their old homes, their estates passing to their sons (2). The Lamberts of Owton were probably less fortunate. Robert, who was attainted, was respited by the York commission, but as no mention of him occurs in later records, it may be presumed that he died, or was eventually executed, or else that he went abroad. His lands had been entailed by his father successively on himself and his two brothers, George and Clement, who were imprisoned with him in Durham gaol in January, 1570. Perhaps, because of their share in the rising, the entail seems to have been ignored; some right however, remained in the family, but it was finally surrendered in 1652 by the grandson of George Lambert (3). In

(1). Conyers of Layton was respited by the York commission, chiefly because "some settlement was made, it's said, of his lands during his father's life, thus the Queen would lose by his death" (Sharpe, p. 228.) His lands were entailed by his father's will (Wills & Invs. I. p. 185), and in 1575 he had a lease of the capital tenement of Layton from the Crown. He died in 1603 (Sharpe, p. 268; Surtees III, p. 37; D.K. Rep. 44, App. p. 361-2). The inventory of Ralph Conyers of Cotham is dated 1581, and amongst his debts is £27-10-0 due for a half year's rent of Cotham, presumably due to Sir Roger Manners, the Crown grantee (Wills & Invs. I. p. 430; Surtees III, p. 218. (2) Robert Collingwood was still alive and living at Abberwick in 1592 (S.P. Dom. Eliz. Add. XXXII, no. 59.) His son, John, died in 1605, and some of his property in Edlingham was finally re-conveyed to his grandson, Robert, in 1616 (Ibid; N.C.H. VII, p. 194-6). Fenwick's sons, George and Gregory, were living at Brinkburn in 1615, and his grandson, George, in 1626 bought Brinkburn from the Forsters. On Tristram's flight to Scotland his relatives, William and Michael, had made an attempt to keep the property in the family (cf. N.C.H. VII, p. 470, 473; Sadler II, p. 118). In 1579 with John Fenwick of Walker he had a lease of Holystone (Dugdale IV, p. 198).

(3) Sharpe, p. 129, 227, 44; Surtees III, p. 132-3. In

Stranton parish, however, in which Owton was situated, another rebel, Marmaduke Norton, the eighth son of the patriarch, made his home, and there occupied himself with farming until his death in 1594 (1). The two Welburys, Westmorland's servants, fared well. Anthony, the elder son, forfeited property which he held in right of his wife, a daughter and co-heiress of Sir Ralph Bulmer of Wilton; and at one period Ralph Hedworth of Pokerley, whose sister Elizabeth he had married as his second wife, held the manor of Castle Eden on trust for his father, Simon, as well as for him; finally, however, on the death of his father he inherited the manor, and died seised of it in 1597 (2). John, the second brother, after the rebellion, married the other daughter of Sir Ralph Bulmer, and, through her, obtained property in St. Helen's Auckland, where he died in 1585 (3).

Some of the attainted rebels who had held official positions, may, perhaps, have regained them after the rising was over. Members of the family of George Howley had generally been farmers or keepers of Acklington Park, and in 1583 the Park was apparently let to him (4); similarly, Robert Collingwood may have regained the office which was generally held by his family of constable of the royal castle of Etal (5). Cuthbert Armourer, who was a younger son of Francis Armourer of Belford and Easington, seems to have lived at Easington in 1577, and to have held the office of constable of Norham castle in 1590 and 1596. In 1596 however, because "the Queen disliked him", he was removed both from this office, and from one which he had held for a long time in Berwick (6).

Of the remaining rebels of the two counties

(3) cont. from prev. p.) 1577 George and Clement Lambert were both said to have no lands, but in 1581 Clement was called "of Bishop Middleham" (Cal. S.P. Dom. VII, p. 520; S.P. Dom. Eliz. CLXXXVII, no 49.)

(1) Sharpe, p. 286-7. (2) Sadler II, p. 196; Surtees I, p. 43; Wills & Invs. II, p. 310-11; P.R.O. Dun. Inq. p.m. File 192, no. 38. (3) Surtees I, p. 43; Wills & Invs. III. p. 87. (4) N.C.H. V, p. 378-9
 (5) cf. Ibid, XI, p. 461-2. (6) N.C.H. I, p. 390; Proc. New. Soc. Antiq. 3rd. Ser. III. p. 141, 146. He occurs in the will of his father of 1574 as owing 20 marks (Wills & Invs. I, p. 405) — perhaps due in connection with his pardon.

named in the Act of Attainder some had probably died soon after the rising was over; some, it has already been shown, died in the Netherlands before 1575, but a few remained there in the entourage of the Countess of Northumberland and the Earl of Westmorland (1). All the estates of Westmorland himself came into the possession of the Crown, and soon became scattered; but the Countess of Westmorland was made an allowance of £200 yearly, which was increased in 1577 to £300, this sum being stated to be for her support and that of her three daughters; in addition she had a lease of the parks of Brancepeth. (2). The Queen remained faithful to her implied promise to Sir Henry Percy, whose loyalty and active co-operation with Sir John Forster had proved of great value during the rebellion, particularly in preventing the royal fort of Tynemouth from falling into the hands of the rebels. The Act of Attainder, therefore, contained a salvo of his rights (3), and he became the eighth Earl, the majority of his brother's estates being restored to him. (4).

The greater number of those who were indicted for taking part in the rising suffered little permanent loss, while about half the number of those who had been, in addition, attainted, under one form or another retained enough property, and sufficient influence, of which they had forfeited no jot by their failure, to make their presence in the two counties a potential source of danger if they refused to conform. The rebellion, and the papal bull of 1570 excommunicating Elizabeth, had resulted in much harsher measures being employed against Recusants, and had heralded the inauguration of the penal code. Nevertheless, partly as a result of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew and the success of Alva in the Netherlands, there was a great increase in Recusancy, fostered, after 1574, by the arrival of missionaries trained at the English college at Douai, which was later moved to Rheims. Another English college was established at Rome in 1579; this college was under the control of the Jesuits, who began

(1) Of Cuthbert Fenwick of South Shields no details seem to be available either before or after the rising.
(2) Sharpe, p. 309-11. She died in 1593 and was buried at Kenninghall. (3) Sharpe, p. 274. (4) The manors of Tanfield, Beamish, Ellingham, property in Luckett, Horton, Eglington etc. were not regranted to him.

to send members of their society to England in 1580. The presence in Durham and Northumberland of many of those who had taken part in the rising meant that these missionaries found a ready field for their work. Moreover the poorer classes, disaffected by the spoliation wrought by the southern army under Clinton and Warwick, were inclined to the cause of the rebels and the Catholics; Gargrave therefore wrote from York on February 1, 1570 - "As before I have written to your honour, I would the property of the rebels' lands were altered; for that would make the tenants and people depend upon the new bandes, and alienate their minds from the old, and take away hope to have gains at their hands." (1).

The condition of the counties immediately after the rising, and the attitude on religious matters of those who had not fled abroad, is well illustrated by a letter of Bishop Pilkington dated October 15, 1571. Addressing himself to Lord Burghley, he wrote: "Right honourable, as I have showed your Grace divers times of the state of this country, so I cannot but put you in remembrance of the same still, though it be to my displeasure. This people grows wild, and I am left alone. The rebels' wives, servants, and friends yet go away with the profit, and much encouraged we know not how; but it discourages many good men. Both the Tempest's wives, both Trollopes, Smiths, Bulmers (whose son is certainly reported to be gone over, his mother being one of Norton's daughters), and Trollope's uncle come at no church, so doth Francis Wicliff (2), and some few of the meaner sort which were their servants, I have called them and done some correction on the men but without any their amendment, and the women are fled from me and hope of great friendship there. So many of their servants be pardoned that it fills the country full of thieves for they will fall to no goodness. If the lands be bestowed on them that will not dwell in the country here will be no service done. The Newcastle carries and recarries many things, for many of this country are at Louvain both afore and since the rebellion" (3)

(1) Sharpe p. 172. (2) cf. Cockshaw. In a list of Recusants of 1577 he was said to have engaged in the rebellion.— cf. Cal. S.P. Dom. VII, p. 520.
(3) S.P. Dom. Eliz. LXXXI, no. 48.

The return of the rebels who had fled to the Netherlands strengthened the Catholic element in the two counties, and it is remarkable that in a list, dated 1574, of Recusants in England, of twelve people named in the Bishopric eight had taken an important part in the rising, while two others were nearly related to them (1). The government was aware of the possible danger from them, and in 1572 the Council in the North and the Justices of the Peace were ordered to exercise a special surveillance of those who had been pardoned, and to try to prevent conferences between them (2). Despite its vigilance, however, there was a good deal of scheming and plotting afoot, and contact was maintained with those who remained abroad. As Bishop Pilkington indicated, connection with the exiles took place chiefly through Newcastle, of which it was written in 1576, despite its loyalty during the rising, "the town of Newcastle are all papists, save Anderson, and yet he is so knit in such sort with the papists that 'aiunt aūt, negunt, negat'" (3). John Carr, the post-master, was responsible for entertaining disguised priests and others making their way into the country; and Robert Heathfield, a merchant, whose uncle, Valentine Taylor was a priest living in the Netherlands, with John Taylor, George Errington, a relative of the Walwick Grange family, and various others of the same town, carried letters between the Catholics of Durham and Northumberland and those beyond the seas (4).

By 1576 most of the old Marian priests were

(1) These rebels appear in the list:— John Trollope, William Smith, Ralph Conyers (of Layton), Ralph Conyers of Cotham, Claxton of Wynyard, Claxton of Old Park, Gerard Selvin, and William Hodgson. The others were Christopher Conyers (i.e. the son of Richard Conyers of Horden), Claxton (of Burnhall?), Francis Colmore, and Anthony Preston. Northumberland county does not appear in the list. S.P. Dom. Eliz. XCIX, no. 55.

(2) Cal. S.P. Dom. VII, p. 427, 436. (3) Letter from Sir William Fleetwood. Welford II, p. 481.

(4) Cal. S.P. Dom. II, p. 406; S.P. Dom. Eliz. CLXXXI, no. 78; Cal. S.P. Dom. IV, p. 439. In 1592 a William Carr of Newcastle was mixed up in a plot to burn certain ships lying at Dieppe — Ibid, III, p. 202-3.

dead, although as late as 1592 as many as six were reported to be in the North of England (1); a certain number of them, moreover, including several from Durham diocese, had taken refuge in the Netherlands (2). Their place was taken by the seminary priests trained abroad, and by the Jesuits. The first arrest of a seminarist in Durham was made in 1586 (3), and after that date they continued to arrive in increasing numbers, although four were executed near Durham in 1590 and three others at the chief towns of the Bishopric in 1594 (4). During the same period quite a large number of young men from the two counties seem to have gone abroad to become students at Rheims, or at some other Roman Catholic college, and among them were several scholars of the cathedral school. In the last decade of the century these students returned to England, some to work in their native county; one of those who undertook missionary work of this nature was that Robert Tempest who had studied in Louvain, where he had accompanied his father and brother, Robert and Michael Tempest of Holmside (5).

(1) S.P. Dom. Eliz. Add. XXXII, no. 64. One of them, Sir William Horne, was perhaps the William Horne who was vicar of Eglington 1557-8 (N.C.H. XIV, p. 364).
(2) In 1571, Philip Sherwood of Durham and Thomas Bailey, whose father lived at Calverley, were both in the Low Countries, and so was William Holmes, cf. Cal. S.P. Dom. VII, p. 361-3, 365-6. (3) Cal. S.P. Dom. XII, p. 355-6 (4) Those executed in 1590 were Edmund Duke, Richard Holyday, John Hogge, and Richard Hill. In 1594 John Boast was executed at Durham, John Ingram at Gateshead, and George Swalwell at Darlington. Ingram had previously been at Abbeville; earlier in 1594 both he and Boast were imprisoned in the Tower. Swalwell was ordained by Barnes in 1577 and was curate of Trindon in 1578; he is also supposed to have been reader in Houghton-le-Spring and master of Kepier School cf. Randall IX; St. Nich's. Durham, and St. Oswald's Parish Registers; Cal. S.P. Dom. III. p. 484, 539; S.S. 22, p. 49. Two other seminarists were executed at Newcastle in 1592-3, and a few others were captured there at about the same period. cf. Welford III, p. 66 70-1, 83. (5) cf. the confession of James Young of Egglecliffe, Cal. SP. Dom. III, p. 257-63. Tempest was at Mignon college, Paris, in 1590, where there was also a William Heighinton who probably belonged to the Bishopric; in 1592 Tempest was in England. Ibid, XII, p. 296-8; S.P. Dom. Eliz. CCXLII, no. 127.

The Trollope's home at Thornley became one of the chief centres of Recusancy in the Bishopric. Before her husband was pardoned and came back to England, Mrs. Trollope had refused to go to church, and had maintained a correspondence with the rebels abroad, and with Philip Sherwood, a priest, who was also in the Low Countries (1). After his return, in 1574, John Trollope soon became known as a prominent Recusant; his uncle, Roger Trollope of Kelloe, earned similar notoriety (2), while another uncle, Thomas Trollope, was captured in 1586 in the company of Bernard Pattenson, who was the first seminary priest to be arrested within the diocese. Pattenson made a successful escape from York castle, but Trollope, who was considered "a dangerous desperate fellow", was still imprisoned in Durham gaol in 1579. As he had been carrying the priest's massing vestments and books, he was regarded as his assistant, and his answers at his examination in 1597 were not favourable to his release, for he refused to say "Amen" to the Lord's Prayer and the prayer for the Queen, but said that he would say "Amen" to a prayer for the Pope (3).

Meanwhile John Trollope, himself, had entertained a variety of priests at Thornley. As early as 1588 Richard Holtby or Duckett, a Jesuit, who was described as a "little man with a reddish beard about the age of 43 years," arrived at Thornley, and for the next five years he made it his headquarters. Other priests ordained abroad were ordered to come to him on their return to England, and they evidently worked under his direction. One of these, Thomas Clarke, after his arrival at Newcastle in 1591, came immediately to Thornley, where he stayed a week and said mass three times for Trollope and his family, and then went into Yorkshire. Francis Stafferton or, as he was sometimes called, "Mark one cheek", John Nelson, and Francis Cleyton, however, made their home at Thornley for two years, between 1591 and 1593. The danger to the government of their presence lay in the fact that they did not confine their ministrations to Trollope's family, but went about teaching the poor and hearing their confessions. Holtby no doubt shared their work, and it is possible that he took a hand in the plots

(1) Cal. S.P. Dom. VII, p. 365-6. (2) Ibid, p. 520; S.P. Dom. Eliz. CXIX, no. 55; CLXXXVII, no. 49. Roger died c. 1579. (3) Cal. S.P. Dom. XII, p. 355-6; IV, p. 355-6.

which were still hatched against the Queen (1). Finally a stop was put to such proceedings; in 1593, as well as Thomas Trollope, John, Anthony; and Margaret Trollope were imprisoned in Durham; while John's wife, his stepmother, Grace Trollope, and half sister, Dorothy, were forced to go into hiding to prevent themselves from having to submit to similar treatment (2). Probably, after their release, some of the family thought it prudent to conform, at least outwardly, but the name of Frances Trollope, John's eldest son and heir, was still entered in recusant rolls in 1593-5 (3).

Trollope had been one of Westmorland's tenants, and those of the Earl's family, servants and tenants, who remained in the two counties formed one of the most important and dangerous groups of Recusants. His sister, Lady Adeline Neville, was allowed to live near Brancepeth after the rising was over, and to retain some of the property of the Nevilles, including Willington. His three daughters, Katharine, Anne and Margaret, were also in the vicinity, and early in 1586 Katharine was married to Sir Thomas Gray of Horton (4), who, with his brothers, Ralph and Arthur, soon became known as Recusants. Through them, moreover, connection was established with other noted Catholics, for two of their sisters had married Radcliffe of Cartington and Thomas Collingwood of Eslington, and Janet Grey, the wife of Ralph, was a niece of David Ingleby for whom search was already being made in the district of Newcastle in 1586, because he was generally in the company of John Boast, a seminary priest of great influence and daring (5)

Although Sir Thomas Gray had assured Walsingham, when his marriage was imminent, of his own and his future wife's conformity, in August, 1586, he was already

(1) Ibid, III, p. 306-7; S.P. Dom. Eliz. CCXLV, no. 24; Add. XXXII, no. 64. (2) S.P. Dom. Eliz. CCXLIV, no. 8.

(3) Recusant Rolls, Pipe Office Ser. 36 & 37 Eliz.

(4) Gray felt some uneasiness about the marriage and got Sir John Forster to write on his behalf to Walsingham concerning it. On May 12, 1586, he himself wrote to Walsingham saying that he had already given Katharine his promise, but stating that neither of them had been offenders, "nor never minds to be". cf. Sharpe, "Chron. Mirab". p. 94-5; Cal. S.P. Dom. II, p. 326; XII, p. 177; S.S. 21, p. 322-6. (5) cf. Cal. S.P.

Dom. XII, p. 365, 367, 191, 193. Sir Thomas and Ralph Gray are given in a list of papists in Northumberland of c. 1587. (Ibid, p. 232); and Arthur Gray and Janet, the wife of Ralph, in a list of 1592 (S.P. Dom. Eliz. CCLXIII, no. 81).

implicated in schemes involving the return of the Earl of Westmorland. In that month one of the government spies wrote: "I have found in the furthest parts of Yorkshire and in the Bishopric sundry persons strongly affected towards the Earl of Westmorland, namely the Lady Adeline Neville, sister to the Earl, who lieth now at Brancepeth, with her is one Curtpenney, a man specially trusted with the Earl's former practises and ----- inward with the chiefest papists in these parts." George Curtpenney had escaped punishment after the rebellion because he was received into the protection of Warwick and Clinton; and the spy reported that others who shared his intrigues were Sir Thomas Gray, "who hath lately married one of the Earl's daughters," "Mr. Perkinson of Beaumont Hill who served the Earl in the rebellion time", "one Swinburne dwelling nigh Brancepeth," William Ingleby of Ripley, and a William Harrington who had sheltered the Jesuit, Campion. (1). Although nothing came of the conferences between these people, and although Sir Thomas died in 1590 (2), in 1593 this report was sent in to Cecil:- "Ye counties of Northumberland, Bishopric, Cumberland, Westmorland, and Yorkshire are much within these two years converted into Popery, and specially Westmorland's tenants and his friends. Davie Ingleby has married Lady Anne Neville, second daughter to the Earl of Westmorland, and he having many friends in the north hopes for a day of alteration, and rides in Yorkshire and the north parts like Robin Hood". (3)

The gatherings at Brancepeth continued, and seem to have centred at the Waterhouse, the residence of a certain William Claxton. Claxton himself was imprisoned for Recusancy in 1593, but masses were said there; in July by a seminarist called Metcalf or Hodgson, and in August by John Boast himself, who had been harboured by Carr, the postmaster of Newcastle, in 1592, and thence had come to Brancepeth. In the same month mass was also said by two other seminarists, one of whom, Lee alias Stapforth, was in the service of Lady Gray, Lady Gray herself, her two sisters, David Ingleby, George Errington, the messenger, Mrs. Claxton, and Adeline Claxton, a daughter of Robert Claxton of Old Park to whom the Earl's sister had been godmother in 1574

- (1) S.P. Dom. Eliz. CXCII, no. 57; Sharpe, p. 142.
- (2) Sharpe, p. 315; Wills & Invs. II, p. 172-5.
- (3) S.P. Dom. Eliz. CCXLV, no. 131.

and who had entered the service of Lady Margaret Neville, were all present at these services. The authorities in the diocese, however, had obtained the information necessary to break up the meetings; in September Boast was captured, and in the course of the following year was executed at Durham, while Mrs. Claxton was imprisoned at Barnard Castle (1). Lady Margaret Neville was also arrested, and was condemned to death for being in Boast's company; Bishop Hutton of Durham, however, in whose house she was a prisoner, in 1594 wrote to Burghley a plea on her behalf, and enclosed her submission. She was still imprisoned in 1595, but was finally pardoned in 1598, when she was already lapsing from her pretended conformity (2).

David Ingleby, and his wife, the Lady Anne, were hidden by their Gray relatives, and so eluded capture; search was still being made for them in 1596 (3). Similarly, Lady Katharine Gray, although she was known to have been present at the Waterhouse and to have received other seminarists such as Francis Stafferton, Mushe, and Bernard Pattenson alias Littleman, for a long time evaded the law by remaining in hiding (4). About Martinmas, 1597, however, she leased Greencroft from Mrs. Alice Hall, who, although herself a conformist, was a sister of Nicholas Tempest of Stella who was well known as a Recusant (5). Furthermore during the rebellion the Halls were among the lesser people mentioned in Sadler's and Constable's dispatches as favourers of the Earl. They had held a moiety of Greencroft since the fifteenth century, and after the attainder of Robert Claxton of Old Park they obtained the other moiety (6), possibly holding it as trustees for him. The house at Greencroft, situated near the fells, in 1598 was said to be strongly built, "with many shifting contrivances", which would make it convenient for the entertainment of guests ill-favoured by the government, amongst whom might be numbered seminarists and perhaps even the Earl of Westmorland

(1) S.P. Dom. Eliz. CCKLV. no. 131; Add. XXXII, no. 64; St. Andrews Auckland, Par. Reg.; St. Nich's. Dun, Par. Reg.

(2) Sharpe, p. 312, 314; Lansd. Mss. vol. 78, fol. 24, 26. Later she married Nicholas Pudsey.

(3) Cal. S.P. Dom. IV, p. 183; XII, p. 365.

(4) Sadler II, p. 204-6; S.P. Dom. Eliz. Add. XXXII, no. 64.

(5) Surtees II, p. 322, 3. (6) *Ibid*, p. 321.

himself (1). It was quite near to Brancepeth and so to the Earl's old tenants and servants; such as the Lees of Brandon, the Nevilles of Wolsingham, the Claxtons of the Waterhouse, and the Riddleys, Fetherstonehaughs, Grays, and Ogles of Brancepeth, some of whom had already been in trouble for Recusancy (2). In other ways it was well-fitted to become the headquarters of those who still retained their old sympathies, for it lay in Lanchester parish where there was a strong connection of Catholics.

Half a mile from Greencroft was the Manor House, the home of William Hodgson, an old servant of the Earl who had been implicated in the rebellion, and nearly at the Deanery lived Lancelot Hodgson, William's nephew, and a younger son of that Richard Hodgson of Hebburn who had been turned out of Newcastle during the rising. Lancelot, and William's eldest son, John Hodgson of the Manor House, were notorious as Recusants, while William himself seems to have been only an occasional conformist (3). The Bulmers of Turisdale owned Pontop manor in the same parish, and their son Anthony, the rebel, was reported in c. 1582 to have been seen in the company of various seminarists and Recusants; and Mrs. Bulmer was known to have harboured certain Romanist priests (4). Finally, there were rebels of less note living in the vicinity, such as the Shaftos of Tanfield-Leigh, who had been tenants of the Earl of Northumberland and had followed him in 1569 (5).

(1) Sadler II, p. 205. (2) Henry Ridley appears in a list of recusants of 1577 (Cal. S.P. Dom. VII, p. 520); Anna Lee and Claxton of the Waterhouse in a list of 1593 (S.P. Dom. Eliz. CCXLIV, no. 8), and Claxton also appears in the recusant rolls of 1592-3, and 1594-5 (C.R.S. vol. 18, p. 79; Recusant Roll 37 Eliz. Pipe Office Ser.)

(3) Lancelot had a grant of the Deanery from his father who had obtained it from the Crown grantees. He and his brother Robert, occur in the recusant roll of 1592-3, and in 1593 Lancelot was in prison; John was said to have fled in 1593, but he occurs in the recusant roll of 1594-5 (C.R.S. vol. 18, p. 79; S.P. Dom. Eliz. CCXLIV, no. 8; Recusant Roll, Pipe Office Ser. 37 Eliz.) William, John's father, occurs in the list of Catholics of 1574, but he sometimes went to church (cf. S.P. Dom. Eliz. XCIX, no. 55; S.S. 21, p. 290); his will of 1598 shows his affection for the late rebels, for in it he made bequests to those who had suffered by the rising (Wills & Invs. II, p. 283-6). (4) Proc. Newc. Soc. Antiq. 4th Ser. III, p. 156, Cal. S.P. Dom. II, p. 57; S.P. Dom. Eliz. CCXLV, no. 131. (5) James Shafto and his son

Many of these people seem to have been in the habit of resorting to Greencroft, for the Lady Katharine was often there, and kept good cheer for her friends, and it was even rumoured that she and John Hodgson had been married. Here the late rebels and their families would meet, and seminary priests be entertained, and also Marian priests, for in 1597 Lancelot Hodgson was married to Mary, the daughter of William Lee of Brandon, Westmorland's late steward, and the ceremony was performed by an old popish priest. Such meetings however, were too dangerous to be allowed to continue, and by May, 1598, Lancelot Hodgson had been imprisoned, and the Lady Katharine at length arrested, by the command of Bishop Mathew, who wrote to Burghley to ask what should be done with her (1).

Through the Grays connection was maintained with the Northumberland Catholics. Not very many of the late rebels were found in the ranks of the Recusants of that county; partly because Northumberland had provided the Earls with comparatively few supporters in 1569, and also because the flight of the Countess, and the succession of the Protestant Sir Henry Percy to the estates of his martyred brother, deprived the Catholics of their natural leaders. Nevertheless the new Earl was himself accused of participation in Ridolfi's plot of 1571 and Throgmorton's plot of 1583, while the exiles in Paris appear to have made some attempt to convert his son (2). The chief centres where Jesuits and seminarists were received were at Cartington, the home of the Radcliffes, Lamendon, the home of the Conyers, Eslington, where the main branch of the Collingwood family lived, and Edlingham where some of the Swinburnes lived. The Collingwoods and Swinburnes were both related to some of the most prominent rebels of 1569, and Robert Collingwood of Abberwick, who had been attainted, with his wife and son, and his son's wife, was given as a Recusant in a list of 1592, and in the recusant roll of 1592-3 (3). A Thomas Musgrave of

James, who was Northumberland's household servant, had both joined the rebels; James the younger narrowly escaped execution — cf. Sharpe, p. 129; Surtees II, p. 386. James the elder, died in 1595, but his son was still living at Tanfield-Leigh at his death in 1637 (Tanfield Par. Reg.; Surtees II, p. 220.)

(1) Sadler II, p. 205-6. Lady Katharine's name had appeared on a list of Recusants of 1592 and on the roll of the same year (S.P. Dom. Eliz. Add. XXXII, no. 59; C.R.S. vol. 18, p. 247. (2) N.E.H. VIII, p. 163-4; Cal. S.P. Dom. XII, p. 55. (3) Cal. S.P. Dom. XII,

Newburn had joined the Earls, and some members of the same family were known as Recusants after 1590; Carr of Ford was also suspected of papistry, and the fact that Cuthbert Armourer was able to report which of the Border gentry had entertained Brierton, and other Jesuits, was probably the cause of the ill favour with which he was later regarded, for it suggested that he himself had had dealings with them (1).

If but few of the late rebels in Northumberland were Recusants, the contrary was the case in the Bishopric. It is true that some of them conformed; Clement Lambert of Bishop Middleham, a brother of Robert Lambert of Owton, had himself taken part in the rising, and in 1577 was named in a list of recusants, but in 1581 Bishop Barnes was able to certify—"He was well persuaded two years ago, and hath come diligently and doth come to the church" (2). His brother George, however, is not known to have conformed, and Robert's wife, Grace Catterick of Stanwick, still maintained an obstinate attitude in the last decade of the century, and was reported to be a harbourer of seminary priests (3). An equally obdurate attitude was taken up by Joan, the wife of Gerard Salvin, who was a daughter of old Norton. She was summoned in 1580 for having absented herself from church for more than a year, but without effect, for in 1583 she was stated to have been absent from church for two years. Her husband, however, although named in a list of 1574 as a Catholic, occasionally came to communion (4). William Smith of

p. 344; S.P. Dom. Eliz. Add. XXXII, no. 59; C.R.S. vol. 18, p. 248-50.

(1) Robert Musgrave and Widow Musgrave of Newburn appear in recusant lists of 1593 and 1597; Carr of Ford and Cuthbert Armourer are mentioned in a list of c. 1587, and a Janet Armourer occurs in the 1597 list. cf. S.P. Dom. Eliz. CCXLIV, no. 8; CCLXIII, no. 81; Cal. S.P. Dom. XII, p. 232. (2) S.P. Dom. Eliz. CLXXXVII, no. 49; Cal. S.P. Dom. VII, p. 520.

(3) S.P. Dom. Eliz. CCXLV, no. 131; George Lambert's name appears in the recusant list of 1577 (Cal. S.P. Dom. VII, p. 520), and Grace Lambert's name in the recusant rolls of 36-8 Eliz. (Pipe Office Ser.); her father, Anthony Catterick, was loyal during the rebellion.

(4) S.S. 22, p. 126; S.S. 84, p. 357; S.P. Dom. Eliz. XCIX, no. 55; Mrs. Salvin, and Jane and Anne Salvin, were named in the recusant list of 1593 — Ibid, CCXLIV, no. 8.

Nunstainton appeared in the same list of 1574, and many of the Blakiston relatives of the rebel, Marmaduke Blakiston, became noted as Recusants, and certain Tempests, who were related to the Holmside family, also failed to conform (1). In addition, as it has already been indicated, a large number of the late tenants and servants of the Earl of Westmorland continued to hope for an alteration of the religious régime, and so—as well as the Trollopes and those of his tenants, who, it has been shown, maintained a connection with the Nevilles—a variety of his followers refused to accept the established forms. Ralph Conyers of Layton, Ralph Conyers of Cotham, Robert Claxton of Old Park, William Claxton of Wynyard, and John Welbury, who had all supported their master during the rising, were known as sturdy Catholics. The wife of Claxton of Old Park and his eldest son, and many other members of the Claxton family, continued to trouble the government by their refusal to attend church even after the death of the head of their house; and their attitude was shared by the son of Richard Conyers of Horden, by the wife of Anthony Welbury, and by some of the Killinghalls (2)

In 1577 an attempt was made to obtain, through diocesan returns, a census of all Roman Catholics; the returns for Durham and Northumberland are wanting, so only eight names are available for the two counties; but a letter written by Bishop Barnes, dated February 11, 1578, suggests that Recusancy was not, as yet, very strong in the two counties. He said that he found the people of Northumberland very obedient, "Albeit there be of those that were of late rebels, and some disolute gentlemen that are noted to talk unseemly, to lie, and rail, and deprave good doings in private assemblies, yet openly they all profess an obedience; and now within all Northumberland I cannot find one person,

(1) Marmaduke Blakiston's brother, Humphrey Blakiston, of Great Chilton, appears in the recusant lists and rolls of 1592-3; his brother John had been loyal to the Queen during the rebellion but John's son, Sir William Blakiston, of Blakiston, and Christopher Blakiston of Coxhoe, also frequently occur as Recusants. Various Tempests are given in these lists, cf. S.P. Dom. Eliz. CCXLIV, no. 8; C.R.S. vol. 18, p. 76, 79; Recusant Rolls, Pipe Office Ser. 36-7 Eliz. (2) cf. S.P. Dom. Eliz. XCIX, NO. 55; CCXLIV; no. 8; C.R.S. vol. 18, p. 76, 78-9. Christopher, the son of Richard Conyers, is given in the list of 1574; Anne Killinghall appears in the list of 1593.

that wilfully will refuse to come to the church and communicate (a few women excepted), for I have driven out of that country the reconciling priests and massers, whereof there were score; they are now gone into Lancashire and Yorkshire, but we are rid of them." The people of Durham, however, he said were more stubborn and churlish, and were supported in their attitude by the clergy of the cathedral (1). Despite this favourable report, the conformity of many of the people appears to have been only on the surface, for in 1586 the Earl of Huntingdon, during his stay in Newcastle, stated that many of those who had lately received seminary priests made not dainty to come to communion, and that many of them were thirsting for the Queen's death (2).

By 1593 a very different picture was presented from that drawn by Bishop Barnes. Toby Mathew, as Dean of Durham, explained how hard it was to make the northern counties as conformable as those of the South (3), and a list, of the same year, of Recusants in the Bishopric gave 107 people, of whom forty-two were imprisoned at Durham, Sadberge, or Brancepeth (4). At the same time Forster reported that the Recusants of Northumberland daily waxed more and more obstinate in harbouring Jesuits and popish traitors (5); in a list of 1592 forty-eight Recusants were named for a portion only of Northumberland (6), and in the recusant roll of 1592-3 the record of accumulated debt for refusal to attend church—unprecedented in the rest of the accounts—showed both the weakness of the executive and the strength of Catholicism in that country (7). Similarly a diocesan return of 1597 showed that there were, by then, about 150 Recusants in Northumberland, and a note at the end stated;—"All and every the persons above named have continued Recusants by the space of two years last or more, and for the same have stood excommunicate by the space of twelve months and more: divers of the

(1) Lansd. Mss. vol. 25, fol. 161. (2) Cal. S.P. Dom. XII, p. 192. (3) Ibid, p. 355-6 (4) S.P. Dom. Eliz. CCXLIV, no. 8. (5) Cal. S.P. Dom. XII, p. 344. (6) S.P. Dom. Eliz. Add. XXXII, no. 59. (7) e.g. Margaret Lawson owed £2,680 for the eleven years from 1581; cf. C.R.S. vol. 18, p. xl-xlv.

principals of them being also indicted" (1). In the same year Dean James of Durham complained that the county and city of Durham was very backward in religion, there being 200 Recusants already indicted, besides others against whom proceedings had not as yet been taken. After pointing out their obduracy under examination he explained that many of them were probably reconciled; they were generally, he said, married, if not by seminarists or Jesuits, by old mass priests; their children were not christened in church, nor educated at common schools, but at home and in secret; and so another generation was growing up in the beliefs of those who "expect that which it were better than there were not one of them left in England than they should ever see." (2).

The conditions of which Dean James complained were reflected in episcopal visitation articles. Archbishop Grindal had stated, in a letter to Cecil of 1570, that in the North "it seemeth to be, as it were, another church, rather than a member of the rest" (3); and his injunctions, which were chiefly directed against Recusants, showed the disorganized conditions resulting from the rebellion. It is significant, however, that when Archbishop Sandys visited his province, in 1578, he fell back almost entirely on Grindal's articles of inquiry, and that Archbishop Piers, in 1590, was obliged to take similar steps against Catholics (4).

Undoubtedly, therefore, Catholicism was strong in the two counties after 1569, and it showed no signs of diminishing in strength as the century progressed. This condition was largely due to the presence in the Bishopric and Northumberland of those who had taken part in the rebellion. It has been shown that in a list of Catholics in Durham of 1574 nearly all those named had taken part in the rising. The imperfection of diocesan returns, and the absence of any section for Durham county in the eleven Elizabethan recusant rolls — although certain inhabitants of Durham appear under Yorkshire (5) — makes it impossible to calculate

(1) S.P. Dom. Eliz. CCLXIII, no. 81. (2) Cal. S.P. Dom. IV, p. 348, 355-6, 420. (3) Frere, "Visit. Arts." III, p. 253. (4) cf. Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I, p. cxciv-vi. (5) cf. C.R.S. vol. 18, p. xiv.

with any exactitude the number of Recusants in the counties; but in the list for Durham of 1593, already mentioned, of 107 Recusants, nearly forty had been rebels in 1569, or else were their close relatives (1). The available returns show that eighteen of the gentry of the counties taking part in the rising, including eight who were attainted, were well known to be Catholics, and that the children or near connexions of seven others were also Recusants. The high degree of inter-relationship between the most important families of Durham and Northumberland, the influence of the late rebels, and the fact that they were able to retain a good deal of their property, meant that as long as they continued to support Catholicism, and made their homes a place of refuge for Marian priests, seminarists, and Jesuits, the papal cause would not be crushed within the two counties, but might rather grow in strength.

While the rising had, therefore, left the Catholic element strong, it had also forced the government to abandon its policy of leniency; the question had become one of loyalty to the Queen, for the papal bull of 1570 had made treason the religious duty of every Roman Catholic. Stern measures were employed against Recusants, and each fresh crisis was followed by an addition to the penal code, so that the rebellion, while driving certain Catholics abroad, also forced active Catholicism in England more and more underground.

It had had other results of importance in the two counties. The liberty of Hexhamshire, from whence the outlaws of Tynedale had harried the North, was taken from the Archbishop of York and incorporated with Northumberland, and the Queen's desire to obtain for herself the property of the rebels led to infringements of the rights of the Palatinate without any shadow of justification. Much spoliation had been wrought by the rebels and by the Queen's army, and the forfeitures, which resulted eventually in vast transfers of property, temporarily left the people without their natural heads, and with a shortage of free holders to serve on juries and in similar capacities (2). The rising also added to declarations of uniformity, for at its outbreak all Justices of the Peace throughout England were required to subscribe declarations of conformity and obedience; following it, the second Book of Homilies was given an extra homily against rebellion composed by Arch-

(1) S.P. Dom. Eliz. CCXLIV, no. 8.

(2) cf. Sadler, II, p. 95-6.

bishop Parker. Parker was also active in securing conformity amongst the clergy, and in 1571-2 a new subscription was required to the articles of religion. Directed in part against the clergy with Catholic sympathies, this new subscription was also aimed against those with Puritan views, and after 1571, as Catholicism was driven underground, signs of Puritan activity became more visible within both Durham and Northumberland. *

CHAPTER IX.

THE PARISH CLERGY, AND THE GROWTH
OF PROTESTANTISM IN
DURHAM AND NORTHUMBERLAND.

SECTION I. THE PARISH CLERGY, 1536-1603, AND THE CAUSES OF DEPRIVATIONS EFFECTED AMONGST THEM.

The constant changes in progress in the ecclesiastical order in the sixteenth century necessarily aroused disaffection amongst the parochial clergy. Episcopal and archidiaconal visitations, and their counterpart — the gathering of the clergy in diocesan synods and chapters, — provided a means to control their doctrinal opinions. Moreover, at the Reformation there emerged a new form of visitation, the royal visitation, which was specially directed towards the enforcement of the innovations in religion. During Tunstal's episcopate it seems probable that the Justices of the Peace were set to watch the clergy and report upon any unrest amongst them (1). Later, special regulations were made with regard to ordinands. Candidates generally belonged to the diocese in which they were ordained, and by regulations of 1575 profession of the thirty nine articles was made necessary. No one was allowed to enter a benefice without production of letters of orders, or to carry out ecclesiastical functions in any parish without the license of the Ordinary (2). In the visitation articles of Bishop Barnes, in 1577, strict rules were laid down concerning synods, which were to be held at Easter and Michaelmas in the Galilee chapel, presided over by the spiritual chancellor or his deputy; and concerning also general chapters, which were to be held by the chancellor or vicar-general in each ward or deanery twice every year. These injunctions were regularly carried out for some years, but after the death of Barnes, in 1587, the attendance of the clergy at such assemblies was required less often (3).

A certain number of the clergy who had been ordained before 1535 could reconcile with conscience an adaptation to the various changes, in tongue and services, which occurred in the ensuing twenty five years. Some — like Richard Marshall who was rector of Stainton 1532-82, and vicar of Corbridge 1544 - c.84 (4); Robert Selby

(1) cf. L. & P. X. 1077. (2) Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I, p. lxxxi-iii. (3) cf. S.S. 22, p. 20-1; S.S. 84, p. 16,-17, 19, 22. The churchwarden's accounts of Pitlington for 1584-6 contain yearly items for the expenses of attending these chapters etc. After Barnes' death the appearance of the churchwardens was only required at the visitation of the Official held twice yearly, or those of the Bishop in person. (4) Surtees III, p. 64; N.C.H. X, p. 200.

who was vicar of Norham from 1537-65, and of Berwick 1541-65 (1); and John Dacre, the rector of Morpeth 1532-67, who was a pluralist on a large scale (2) may have been actuated by the desire to retain their rich benefices, or by indifference to the changes. Such a man as George Reed, however, who held the rectory of Dinsdale, which was only worth £4-11-4, from 1529 until his death in 1561 (3), is perhaps less likely to have been moved by such base motives. Like others more learned than himself he may have recognised that the essentials of worship remained the same, and may have felt it his duty to continue to minister to the people committed to his charge, despite this upheaval of formularies. Some of the clergy probably evaded the law and only taught their flock what they thought good, using such ceremonies as they considered fitting (4).

Because of their death, promotion, or deprivation, comparatively few priests continued in undisturbed possession of any one benefice throughout the changes. Some sixty incumbents of benefices, or ecclesiastical dignitaries, were deprived between the years 1535 and 1603, and, as a result, during the same period vacancies were caused in about fifty parishes (5). Only eleven of these deprivations took place before the accession of Elizabeth. Two clergy were removed from their benefices in 1539, certainly in one case, and probably in the other also, as the result of opposition to the suppression of the monasteries. (6). In 1549 the vicar of Newcastle forfeited his benefice because he had

(1) Raine, "N. Durham", p. 263; D. & Chap. Reg. I. fol. 13b. (2) Hodgson II, vol. 2, p. 392-3.

(3) Surtees III, p. 241; Valor V, p. 317.

(4) cf. John Brown, the minor canon, as curate of Witton-Gilbert in 1569 said that he had left out whatever he thought not good, and taught that which he thought good (S.S. 21. p. 175.) It was reported that Richard Stele, who occurs curate of Kyloe, 1595/6, buried someone in a garth instead of bringing him to the church. (cf. Raine, "N. Durham", p. 190.)

(5) A few of the deprivations are uncertain. Bishop Tunstal was deprived twice, and so was John Hall as rector of Wodnar.

(6) i.e. Richard Hylyard, vicar of Norton (1538-9), who advised the monks not to surrender and then fled to Scotland (Surtees III, p. 158; above p. 79.); and James Whytskil, vicar of Wardon. The advowson of Wardon belonged to Hexham Priory, and the cure was often served by one of the canons (TARR no. 161; S.S. 46, p. ix); perhaps Whytskill was a canon and had taken part in the Priory's resistance to its dissolution.

failed to pay the King's tenths (1); and in 1552 Tunstal was removed from his bishopric to pave the way for the Duke of Northumberland's ambitious designs upon the Palatinate.

The reign of Queen Mary ushered in a new régime. Before her accession the position of the clergy had been very little changed, but the deprivations which took place throughout England early in 1554 affected the whole personnel of the Church, in a way hitherto unparalleled, for it has been estimated that they must have involved the incumbents of one in every six benefices in the Kingdom (2). The cause of these deprivations seems to have been, not, as has been suggested, ordination under the Edwardine Ordinal, but in every case—the marriage of the priest concerned (3). The great Repeal Act which came into force in December 1553, involved the annulment of the Edwardine Act allowing priests to marry and the Queen's Injunctions of March 1554, commanded the bishops to deprive married clergy. Those, however, whose wives were dead, or who put them away, were, it was ordered, to be treated with more leniency, and might be admitted to some other ecclesiastical position. Considerable warning was given of the execution of this policy, and, therefore, before the deprivations were effected in February and March, 1554, many of the clergy had either fled, or had separated from their wives (4).

The home dioceses are found to have been the most affected by this reversion to Catholic practice, and the numbers and ratios of the deprived steadily diminish the greater the distance from London (5). Dean Horn of Durham fled abroad; but only six of the parochial clergy of Durham and Northumberland, including one who was also a prebendary of the cathedral, were deprived. The cause of their removal is fairly clear. Whereas Tunstal's

(1) Brand I, p. 304. Henry Eglington was vicar, 1543-9.

(2) cf. Frere, "Marian Reaction," p. 77.

(3) Birt in "The Eliz. Relig. Settlement" says that those who held livings on Edwardine ordinations were ejected as mere laymen. Frere in "The Marian Reaction" shows that the cause of deprivation in 143 out of 150 cases in London diocese is stated to be marriage (p. 55-9), and says that he has failed to find a single instance in which Edwardine orders were cited as the cause of deprivation (p. 136). (4) Frere "Marian Reaction", p. 54-5, 60-1, 76-7.

(5) Ibid, p. 51-4.

register shows no ordinations for the whole of Edward's VI's reign, the Dean, Prebendary John Rudd, and William Harrison (the late Abbot of Alnwick) were certainly married, and so, presumably, were the other four, one of whom seems to have belonged to Harrison's confraternity.

(1). Although, however, only seven are known to have forfeited their promotions it is probable that this number should be increased. The records for the whole northern province are unsatisfactory, but on the analogy of the case of Norwich diocese—in which a formal return from the Bishop shows that 243 clergy were deprived, although the episcopal register would lead to the idea that only 172 suffered in this manner,—it is obvious that some of the benefices affected were only described in episcopal registers as "vacant", and it is probable that some of those men who were stated to have "resigned" had really been deprived; moreover, no computation can be made of the number of the unbeneficed clergy who were suspended or removed (2). On the other hand, it is true that there were comparatively few institutions in Durham and Northumberland in the early years of the reign. The wise moderation of Bishop Tunstal, which prevented him from employing the methods of persecution pursued in other parts of the country, no doubt made it easier for certain priests to obtain other benefices by separating from their wives; while the Catholic outlook of the diocese as a whole, meant that celibacy was still the general rule amongst the clergy.

If the Catholic sympathies of the majority of the people of Durham and Northumberland ensured little alteration in the ecclesiastical personnel during the reign of Mary, they were equally bound to imply opposition to the Elizabethan settlement of religion. This opposition was stiffest amongst the cathedral clergy who had most cause for gratitude to the Marian regime, and, as the result of their refusal to subscribe the oath at the royal visitation of 1559, the Dean and five

(1) The six parochial clergy were (1) John Rudd, vicar of Norton, 1539-54 (T.R. nos. 298, 300; Wills & Invs. II, p. 64-6) (2) William Harrison, rector of Bothal 1546-54 (Randall X, p. 327; L. & P. XXI, i, p. 148; N.C.H. II p. 463, 441); (3) Thomas Atkinson rector of Elwick 1546-54 (Surtees III, p. 86); (4) Ralph Galland, late canon of Alnwick, vicar of Alnham 1538, probably to 1554 (Randall X, p. 23; (5) Nicholas Lawes, vicar of Haltwhistle, 1535-54 (Hodgson II, vol. 3, p. 125); (6) Alexander Brown, rector of Shipwash, 1547-54 (Ibid vol. 2. p. 148).
(2) cf. Frere, "Marian Reaction", p. 51-4.

prebendaries were deprived of all their preferments. Their deprivations involved vacancies in four parishes and in the mastership of Sherburn hospital; and, in addition, one prebendary who eventually conformed was removed from a benefice in order to allow the restoration of a priest deprived in 1554 (1). The visitors generally experienced little difficulty in obtaining the subscription of the clergy outside the cathedral chapters, and in this respect the two counties proved no exception. At the session which they held in Auckland Dr. Thomas Sigiswick, who was incumbent of both Gainford and Stanhope, and William Whitehead, the vicar of Heighington, refused to sign, and they were supported in their attitude at their re-appearance at a later session held in Durham by William Carter, the archdeacon of Northumberland and rector of Howick. The clergy of Northumberland proved conformable, probably largely because of the attitude assumed by Bernard Gilpin, who ~~was~~ himself sat as a deputy commissioner in Alnwick (2). Bishop Tunstal's deprivation, consequent upon his opposition to the new settlement, was, however, already known, and perhaps as a result of his influence others besides the three already cited withheld their subscription. There were 35 absentees from the visitation (3), and it is evident from later deprivations that certain of the clergy either evaded subscription on one excuse or another, or signed with mental reservations.

Excluding the cathedral dignitaries, twelve or thirteen beneficed clergy were deprived in the years 1559-64; some, undoubtedly, as Recusants. In 1561 it was determined to proceed against those who had managed to evade subscription and accordingly in May, 1561, a commission was addressed to the Archbishop of York, the Earl of Rutland, the Bishops of Durham and Carlisle, and twelve others, to administer the oath within the province of York (4). A letter from Bishop Pilkington, dated November 14, 1561, shows that he thereupon undertook a visitation of his diocese (5). Returns of clerical recusancy do not survive, but Pilkington was evidently only partially successful. The cases of Thomas Sigiswick

(1) The parishes affected were Billingham and Norton, from which Robert Dalton was deprived; Pitlington, from which Nicholas Marley was deprived; and Sedgefield, from which Anthony Salvin, who was also master of Sherburn was deprived. George Cliff was removed from Elwick to allow the restoration of Thomas Atkinson, cf. above p. 139.
(2) S.P. Dom. Eliz. X, p. 57-8, 61, 77-85. (3) Ibid,

(cont.)

and Archdeacon Carter were brought before the Ecclesiastical Commission in London; both were deprived and confined to certain districts in Yorkshire (1). Four priests whose ordinations or presentation to benefices in Queen Mary's reign, or whose absence from the visitation of 1559, prove them to have been undoubtedly Catholic in sympathy, were also deprived between 1559 and 1564 (2), and with them two others who were probably Recusants (3). The remaining five, however, seem to have been deprived for non residence or for holding a plurality of cures.

It was ordained by episcopal injunctions that each clergyman could only serve one cure, unless specially licensed, and he was supposed to reside there unless similarly dispensed; in his absence he was expected to provide a substitute (4). Such rules, however, had

(3) cont. from prev. p.) p. 393-5. Bishop Sparke was amongst them as rector of Wolsingham. 36 names are given but one man was entered twice in different capacities.

(4) Cal. S.P. Dom. VI, p. 510. (5) S.P. Dom. Eliz. XX, no. 25.

(1) Cal. S.P. Dom. VI, p. 521-5. Sigiswick, who was described as "Learned, but not very wise", was to remain within 10 miles of Richmond; and Carter, beside whose name was written "Not unlearned, but very stubborn and to be considered", was to remain within 10 miles of Thirsk. Sigiswick was also deprived of his Regius Professorship of Divinity in Cambridge (Gee, p. 264.)

(2) i.e. (1) Robert Pates, rector of Bothal 1554; absentee 1559 and deprived the same year so that William Harrison might be restored (S.P. Dom. Eliz. p. 395; Randall X, p. 327.) Also Bishop of Worcester, 1555-9. (Gee, p. 261)

(2) Richard Hartburn, rector of Long Newton 1558. Ordained 1556; absentee 1559; deprived 1562 (T.R. nos. 312-3, 414; S.P. Dom. Eliz. X. p. 393; Surtees III, p. 217); (3) Nicholas Crawhall, rector of Haltwhistle 1554, where he replaced a priest deprived by Mary; formally inhibited "ab ingressu ecclesiae" and cited to appear at Auckland, 1562, and, on not appearing, excommunicated by Pilkington; deprived by 1564 (Hodgson II, vol. 3, p. 125; Arch. Ael. 2nd. Ser. pt. 49, p. 17).

(4) George Hyndmers, probably the late sub-prior of Hexham; as vicar of Alnham an absentee in 1559. Probably deprived, as the Queen made another presentation to the vicarage in 1560 (S.P. Dom. Eliz. X, p. 395; N.C.H. XIV, p. 570).

(3) i.e. (1) Hugh Hutchinson, vicar of St. Oswald's, Durham, 1550-62; he had been presented by Gerard Salvin, a strong Catholic (T.R. nos. 280, 416); (2) Thomas Pattenson, rector of Bishop Wearmouth 1548-60

(cont.)

not always been followed, and the deprivations of Queen Mary's reign tended to increase pluralism and therefore absenteeism. The royal visitors of 1559 took cognizance of these matters, and so are found to have entered in their "comperta" that there was no curate either at Esh or at Whitburn, that the vicar of Wallsend and the rector of Stanhope were non resident, and that the rector of Gateshead did not keep hospitality. They also showed that five of the clergy who absented themselves from the visitation were non-residents, and themselves made provision for the maintenance by the vicar of Newcastle of a curate at Gosforth. (1). Action immediately followed their report. Sigildwick, who was rector of Stanhope, it has already been seen, was deprived for refusing the oath, and the death of William Bell, the non-resident rector of Middleton-in-Teesdale and of Gateshead, removed another cause of complaint (2). In 1555 Brian Baines, although apparently a layman, had been presented to the rectory of Egglecliffe; in 1559, being non-resident, he failed to appear at the visitation. In September, 1561, however, the Bishop issued an order for the sequestration of the fruits of his benefice, and for his citation to answer charges of having leased the tithes and oblations of the church and absented himself from his cure; as a result, later in the same year, he was deprived (3). In 1562 Richard Forster was ejected from his vicarage of Gainford in Durham diocese for holding, illegally, two benefices with cure of souls (4); and Adam Lofthouse, who had obtained the rectory of Sedgfield in 1560, and who must, therefore, have acquiesced at least temporarily in the religious settlement, was also removed from his living, presumably because he was in possession of benefices in other parts of England (5). In the

(3)(cont. from prev. p.)(Surtees I, p. 231) Note that he already appears rector there in the Valor, V, p. 313.

(4) Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I, p. lxxxiii-lv.

(1) S.P. Dom. Eliz. X. p. 83, 259-63, 393-5.

(2) cf. Wills & Invs. I. p. 171-2.

(3) T.R. nos. 402, 407; S.P. Dom. Eliz. X, p. 393; (Surtees III, p. 200.

(4) T.R. no. 410. Vicar of Gainford from 1559, and also incumbent of Chidleyn in Lichfield diocese (Surtees IV, p. 12).

(5) T.R. no. 415. Also vicar of Gedne in Lincoln diocese, and rector of Outwell in Norfolk.

following year Richard Cliff was deprived of his benefices of Boldon and Whitburn, probably for failure to provide a curate (1); and, finally, in 1564 the pluralist John Hall, who had been incumbent of Kirknewton since 1554, and of Wooler since 1561, and therefore must have conformed, was deprived of the latter benefice. He, however, had at least by 1563 provided a curate in one of his parishes, and perhaps as a result he was later restored. (2). With regard to the other clergy who were stated in 1559 to be non-resident, it may be noticed that two already maintained curates, and that the remaining two had obtained curates by 1563, by which date, moreover, there seems to have been a curate at Esh (3). Despite this attempt to correct the evils of pluralism and non-residence, in 1563, when Pilkington made a return to articles issued by the Privy Council, twenty-six clergy held more than one ecclesiastical promotion within the two counties, and only ten of these twenty-six employed a curate in one of their benefices; in addition, several held promotions in other parts of England (4).

From the foregoing record it is apparent that an attempt was being made to stamp out some of the prevalent abuses which resulted, in part, from the vacancies caused by deprivations, even while to accomplish this object and to ensure adherence to the Elizabethan settlement — further deprivations were effected. Consequently, apart from the members of the Chapter, eight clergy were ejected for recusancy, & five others were removed either as non-residents or pluralists or for some similar reason. It must not be assumed, however, either that these five, or the clergy who retained their positions, had wholeheartedly accepted the new settlement. It is possible that William Whitehead, who had refused the oath at the visitation,

(1) T.R. nos. 188, 419; Curtees II, p. 52. He became rector of Boldon in 1541, and of Whitburn in 1550.

(2) N.C.H. XI, p. 295, 126, Harl. Mss. vol. 594, fol. 194. He was ordained in 1533-5 (T.R. nos. 95, 127, etc.).

(3) i.e. Richard Marshall, vicar of Corbridge, and John Dacre, rector of Morpeth, absentees in 1559, both had curates; by 1563 George Winter as vicar of Wallsend had a curate, and Thomas Ogle, who was rector of Shipwash and Shilbottle, and was an absentee in 1559, had a curate at the latter parish. The name of the curate of Esh in 1563 is not actually given — cf. S.P. Dom. Eliz; X, p. 259-60, 393-5; Harl. Mss. 594, fol. 191, 193, 188.

(4) 9 prebendaries and 5 minor canons held one or more benefices; 10 of the other clergy held (cont)

never actually conformed, and although he was nominally incumbent of Heighington until his death in 1576 there is no evidence that the sequestration of his living, imposed in 1559, was ever removed (1). Some of the thirty-five absentees at the visitation failed to appear because they were non-resident, but some were later deprived as Recusants; and, of the remainder, four were ordained during Queen Mary's reign (2), and several before 1535 (3), so that they must have been Catholic in sympathy. Probably in the northern province it was not thought politic to bring pressure to bear upon all those who had evaded subscription. There is, in fact, no direct evidence of the subsequent submission of the absentees, and it is noticeable that in 1564 Dean Whittingham complained "many papists enjoy liberty and livings who had neither sworn obedience to the Queen, nor yet do any part of their duty." (4). Finally, with respect to those who did take the oath it must be recognised that many of the country clergy probably hardly understood the purport of the articles, and that in the words of Birt, "Many of these parish clergy, who thus subscribed, were known to their Elizabethan bishops as being merely outward conformists; and as episcopal injunctions record, were quietly 'waiting for a day', expecting the next turn in the wheel of fortune when Catholicism would again be uppermost." (5).

If the whole of England is considered, it is found that most deprivations effected after 1564 were of Puritans rather than of Recusants (6); this, however, was not generally true of Durham and Northumberland until after 1572. In the period 1564-72, whilst a few clergy were deprived for Puritanism, the war was still mainly directed against Catholics and non-residents and pluralists. In 1565 three clergy were ejected from their livings; one of these three, George Cliff, was removed from ~~Billingham~~, but as he was also a prebendary and vicar of ~~Elwick~~, it is probable that action was taken against him on grounds of non residence, moreover,

(4) cont. from prev. p.) 2 benefices, 1 held a benefice and the mastership of a hospital, and 1 held two curacies. Of the parochial clergy John Shaires, Roland Pratt, John Dacre, and Edward Mitchell held benefices outside the diocese. cf. Harl. Mss. vol. 594, fol. 187-195, lists of prebendaries given in Hutchinson, list of minor canons given in the Treasurers' Books etc.

(1) cf. Birt, "The Eliz. Religious Settlement", p. 154-5.
 (2) i.e. George Rayne, the curate of Cockfield, Anthony Barrow and Nicholas Maughan, curates of Wardon, and Cuthbert Ellison, the master of Tyne Bridge chapel, cf.

(cont.)

in 1584 he was restored to this living (1). It is possible that the other two priests were deprived for opposition to the ornaments rubric (2). In 1566 William King, who had become archdeacon of Northumberland and rector of Howick in 1561, was deprived for non-residence (3); and in the following year the enforcement of Archbishop Parker's "Advertisements" involved more deprivations. Directed mainly against Puritans, they had led to the removal from their stalls of William Birche and Thomas Lever, both of whom had been ordained under the Edwardine Ordinal (4). At the same time John Blackhall, who had been presented by the Bishop in 1565 to the vicarage of Berwick, was also deprived; as the presence of the garrison made the general tone of the town staunchly Protestant, Blackhall probably may be correctly described as a Puritan (5).

One deprivation, however, resulting from the enforcement of the "Advertisements" was of a prebendary who was opposed to them from a Catholic point of view (6),

(2)(cont. from prev. p.) S.P. Dom. Eliz. X. p. 393-5; T.R. nos. 311-13, 339, 329. (3) i.e. John Forster, John Watson, Nicholas Forster, Thomas Thompson, Richard Marshall — cf. Tunstal's register. (4) Dixon VI, p. 108-9. (5) Birt, p. 139. (6) Cf. Gee, "Eliz. Clergy", p. 236-47.

(1) cf. above p. 162.; In Harl. Mss. vol. 594, fol. 188, 190, he does not appear as having a curate in either of his benefices, but Robert Crawford occurs curate of Billingham in 1559-60 and 1566 (S.P. Dom. Eliz. X, p. 393; D. & Chap. Reg. II, fol. 122a, 214 b).

(2) Thomas Palmer was deprived of Embleton vicarage which he had held since 1551 (N.C.H. II, p. 69), and William Resely of Whelpington vicarage which he had held since 1558 (Hodgson III, vol. 1, p. 205). Reseley was ordained, 1531-2, and seems to have been a protégé of Thomas Cromwell who tried to obtain for him the vicarage of Billingham in 1537 (T.R. nos. 536-7, 539; L. & P. XII, ii, p. 431); later he may have become curate of Monkwearmouth (cf. S.S. 22, p. 50, 73). (3) He was a prebendary of Canterbury and of Windsor, and died in 1590; cf. T.R. no. 447; Hutchinson II, p. 224.

(4) Frere, "Marian Reaction", p. 187-8, 202, above p. 151.

(5) T.R. nos. 438, 458. (6) i.e. William Todd, who had been a monk of Durham, cf. above p. 151.

and the rebellion of 1569 brought to the surface the latent hostility of many of the older clergy to the Elizabethan settlement. The necessity of punishing those who had taken a part in the attempted restoration of Catholicism led to the deprivation of four minor-canon, one of whom was also curate of Witton Gilbert; and at the same time the vicar of Mitford, who had been absent from his cure with the rebels, was deprived for non-residence (1). Partly as a result of the rebellion, an Act was passed in 1571 "for ministers of the church to be of sound religion" which provided for clerical subscription to the Articles on pain of deprivation. Directed in part against Puritans, in Durham and Northumberland Marian clergy were its chief victims. Pilkington had already administered the articles in 1569-70 to some of the clergy who were suspected of Catholic sympathies (2), and in 1571-2 the new subscription involved the deprivation of Thomas Wright and Robert Crawford, who had both taken some share in the rebellion; of Thomas Benson, a priest ordained during Queen Mary's reign (3); and of one of the prebendaries of Durham who had originally been a monk (4). In the same years an added effort was made to check the evils of pluralism and non residence. A canon of 1571 made two the maximum number of cures to be served by any one clergyman, and inquiry was made by Archbishop Grindal's visitation

(1) John Brown, minor canon, was deprived of Witton-Gilbert in 1570 (Surtees II, p. 371.) Concerning Roger Venis, vicar of Mitford, cf. S.S. 21, p. 200-1.

(2) Christopher Thorabye, vicar of Stannington, David Taylor, vicar of Bolam, Bartholomew Bartley, rector of Whatton, and Robert Lighton, vicar of Long Horsley all subscribed in that year. All four seem to have been either ordained, or presented to benefices, during Mary's reign (S.S. 22, p. 134-5; Hodgson II, vol. I, p. 374; vol. 2, p. 90-1; Wills & Invs. I, p. 202).

(3) Wright was deprived of Elton in 1571; he was also vicar of Seham c. 1563 until his death in 1575. Another Thomas Wright occurs vicar of Sockburn 1570-2 (d) (cf. Surtees III, p. 211, 251; I, p. 271; Harl Mss. 594, fol. 189). Crawford was deprived of Kimblesworth 1572; he was also curate of Whitworth 1568-83 (d) (T.R. no. 490; S.S. 21, p. 199; Surtees II, p. 375; III, p. 293). The third priest, Thomas Benson, was ordained in 1556, and was deprived of Muggleswick in 1572; note also that a Thomas Benson occurs curate of Stanhope in 1563 and 1567, and vicar of Edmundbyers (1570-5 (d) (T.R. no. 313; Surtees II, p. 362, 364; Harl. Mss. 594, fol. 188;

(cont.)

articles of the same year whether parsons and vicars were resident and dwelt continually in their benefices. (1). Consequently, the rector of Ingram (who also held a benefice in Carlisle diocese) and the vicar of Newburn, were both deprived for non-residence in 1571-2 (2); but it is noticeable on the one hand that Giles Robinson, the vicar of Newburn, had been presented to his benefice during Queen Mary's reign and was an absentee in 1559, and therefore probably a Catholic (3), and on the other hand that Wright, Crawford and Benson were all pluralists. Where, therefore, recusancy and non-residence were found together extreme measures were resorted to; but probably a good many of those who had offended in only one respect were allowed to retain their cures.

Although moderation had been used in dealing with the Catholic clergy it may safely be said that, by 1572, only the Marian priests who were willing to submit to the new régime remained in possession of their benefices. After that year, deprivations were increasingly a sign of the growth of Puritanism in the two counties. As a result, however, of Bishop Barnes' visitation of 1577, and the chancellor's visitations of 1578-9, a further and vigorous attempt was made to check the practice of non-residence. Action was taken against John Mackbray, who was vicar both of Newcastle and of Billingham, and against the vicar of Stranton, for failure to reside in their cures or to provide sufficient substitutes (4); and in June, 1578, the Bishop summoned Arthur Shafto before him, for holding the two livings of Challerton and Stamfordham (5). None of these three

(3) cont. from prev. p.) Wills & Invs. III, p. 37.

(4) i.e. Stephen Marley, cf. above p. 161.

(1) Frere, "Visit. Arts" III, p. 257, 262.

(2) John Shaires was rector of Ingram 1533-71, and also rector of Oldale, Carlisle (N.C.H. XIV, p. 461; Randall X, p. 75-6); Giles Robinson was vicar of Newburn 1557-72 (S.S. 21, p. 217-8; N.C.H. XIII, p. 130).

(3) S.P. Dom. Eliz. X, p. 394.

(4) S.S. 22, p. 115, 135-7, cf. Mackbray resigned from Newcastle early in 1578, but was restored later in the year - Ibid, p. 72; Welford II, p. 508-9.

(5) Shafto showed a dispensation from Cardinal Pole, dated 1556, which the Bishop refused to admit; nevertheless he died in possession of both benefices - cf. N.C.H. IV, p. 269.

cases resulted in deprivation; but in 1578 William Duxfield, one of the more prominent of the Protestant clergy of the diocese who held certain official positions during Barnes' Episcopate, was deprived of Bothal rectory, evidently for holding a plurality of cures (1). In 1578-9 two clergy were deprived for non-payment of tenths (2), but with the exception of their cases, and that of Duxfield, it is possible that all the deprivations after 1572 were due to the extreme views of the priests concerned. One priest was deprived in 1575 (3), and five others in 1577-9, all of whom may have been Puritan in outlook (4)..

After 1579 no more deprivations occur, either of the cathedral or the parochial clergy (5), although a good many suffered sequestration for non-payment of tenths, or for some similar reason (6). The deprivations

(1) He was rector of Bothal 1563-78, rector of Shipwash 1571-87, and vicar of Bishop Middleham 1577-85. He was the chancellor's deputy at the visitations of 1578 and 1582 - cf. Hodgson II, vol. 2, p. 148; Purtees III, p.7; S.S. 21, p. 91; S.S. 22, p. 99. (2) i.e. (1) John Hall, who had been restored to Wooler in 1577 (N.C.H. XI, p. 295); and (2) Robert Cuthbert, rector of Simondburn 1572-8 (Randall X, p. 307; Cal. S.P. Dom, VII, p.547). (3) i.e. Gawin Brown, vicar of Mitford since 1572 - Hodgson II, vol. 2, p. 31. (4) Those deprived 1577-9 were (1) William Deane, vicar of Newburn from 1573 (N.C.H. XIII, p. 130) (2) Lionel Boldon, curate of Belford; in Jan. 1578 he was in prison (S.S. 22, p.39, 78). Deprivation uncertain (3) Christopher Watson, rector of Ingram from 1571 (N.C.H. XIV, p. 461). Various other priests of this name occur. (4) Robert Taylor, vicar of Lesbury from 1563 (Harl. Mss. 594, fol. 193; N.C.H. II p. 441). He was excommunicated in Jan. 1578 (S.S. 22, p. 41.) (5) Thomas Wilkinson, vicar of Bywell St. Peter from 1568. At the visitations of 1578 "fugam fecit" was written beside his name, and he was excommunicated, and deprived by 1579 (S.S. 22, p. 30, 71, 93, 32-3; N.C.H. VI. p. 113.) (6) Note, however, in 1579, John Raymes, the master of the West Spital, was deprived, and in 1581 John Kingsmill, the master of Greatham hospital - cf. above p.413,416. (6) e.g. 1593 Augustine Spencer, vicar of Mitford, and Henry Ewbanke, rector of Washington; also John Craddock, vicar of Gainford, George Garthwaite, vicar of Heighington, Emanuel Barnes, rector of Wolsingham, Edward Bethorne, vicar of Eglington; and before 1578 Edward Troutbeck, rector of Whitfield, and Edward Colston, vicar of Chatton - cf. D.K. Rep.37, App.I, p. 117-8, 120; Randall X, p.173-4,

of Mary's reign and of the first years of Elizabeth's reign had resulted in an increase in the number of dispensations to hold in plurality; and the pillaging of sees and other ecclesiastical promotions, by diminishing the value of benefices, led to an increase in pluralism (1). Nevertheless, it has been shown that vigorous if spasmodic attempts were made to curb the abuses resultant upon this practice, and they seem to have been rewarded with some measure of success. Five deprivations were made in the course of the years 1559-64 for non-residence, or for the unlawful holding of more than one living, and only six in the four following decades; again, whereas in 1563 twenty six clergy held more than one benefice within Durham and Northumberland, Raine estimates that, in 1578, of some 200 clergy only twelve held more than one living (2). Throughout the period, however, a certain number of the clergy — including generally several of the cathedral dignitaries — were in possession of ecclesiastical promotions in other parts of the country (3).

A dearth of suitable candidates to serve as curates in the larger parishes, and in the innumerable chapels of ease in Northumberland, led to the employment of Scottish priests. Even before the Reformation, in 1535, it was reported that there were several Scots holding cures in Durham and Northumberland (4); and, during the reign of Edward VI, reformers such as John Knox himself, and John Rough, were appointed by the government as preachers in Newcastle and Berwick (5). By 1563 there were no less than twenty five Scots employed as curates in the parishes and chapelries of Northumberland, often by the non-resident clergy; and

§357; Hodgson II, vol. 3, p. 109.

(1) cf. Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I, p. cl.

(2) S.S. 22, p. 78. (3) e.g. in a list of

pluralists of c. 1574 four Durham men appear: S.P. Dom. Eliz. Add. XXIII, no. 74. (4) S.P. Henry VIII, vol. 102, "Compend. Compert." p. 31

(5) S.S. 50, p. 265-70, 276. Knox married the sister of Sir George Bowes, the Knight Marshall - cf. Sharpe, p. 372.

five within the county of Durham (1). Pilkington showed that a large number of them were Roman Catholics fleeing from Knox's regime, and deplored the evil effects of their ministry (2). As the years went by and the Catholics amongst them were weeded out, the total number of Scottish priests serving as curates was diminished, so that at the chancellor's visitations of 1578 only ten were mentioned (3). Even in 1563, however, some of their number shared the reforming opinions of Knox, and were therefore allowed to continue their ministry (4). Later certain Scots obtained benefices, amongst whom was John Mackbray, the vicar of Newcastle, who was an exile at Frankfort during Queen Mary's reign (5); some, moreover, occur in Bishop Barnes' ordination lists (6). Their presence should be taken therefore, in the later years of the reign, as a sign rather of the growing Protestantism of the clergy of the two counties, than as showing the continuance of Recusancy amongst them.

As well as leading to the employment of Scottish ministers, the vacancies caused partly by the deprivations and partly by the removal of unbeneficed clergy, opened the way for a large number of unlicensed clergy, some even without letters of orders, to obtain curacies or livings. At the chancellor's visitation of January and February, 1578, no less than forty-five curates in Northumberland and forty-three in Durham were found to be unlicensed (7). Their failure to obtain

(1) cf. Pilkington's return, Harl. Mss. vol. 594, fol. 188-195. Most of their names are given. (2) cf. in 1564 he stated "The Scottish priests that are fled out of Scotland for their wickedness, and here be hired in parishes on the Border because they take less wages than the other, and do more harm than others could or would in dissuading the people" (Cam. Soc. Misc. 2nd. Ser. IX, p. 67); and in 1565 he said many of the chapels of Northumberland had no priests unless it were vagabond Scots who dared not abide in their own country (Cal. S.P. Dom. VI, p. 577). (3) S.S. 22, p. 29, 31, 35, 36-8, 55, 76-7. (4) e.g. 1563 John Douglas, a Scot, was allowed to continue to preach in Berwick. Later he was curate of Lambley (Scott "Berwick", p. 161; S.S. 22, p. 31). (5) Welford II, p. 26-7. (6) cf. S.S. 22, p. xcix - ci. (7) S.S. 22, p. 29-62.

licences may in some cases have been merely the result of negligence, but their employment should also, probably, be taken as a sign that Recusant or Puritan priests or deacons were to be found amongst the ranks of the unbeneficed clergy. That some of them were Recusants is shown by the fact that amongst their number was George Swalwell, the curate of Trimdon, who was executed with certain seminary priests in 1594. Probably, however, a larger proportion of them were Puritans, for at least seven of them were Scottish priests, and two of them seem to have been priests who had been deprived of their benefices as Puritans in the preceding years (1). In the same years, 1578-9, five cases of beneficed clergy or curates who were serving cures without letters of orders were dealt with. (2). In 1571 Archbishop Grindal had sought throughout the parishes of the North the names of those holding benefices who were laymen "not being in orders", and enjoined that no one who was not at least a deacon or licensed by the Ordinary should say divine services. Regulations to much the same effect were made by Bishop Barnes in 1577; and by Archbishop Sandys in 1578 (3); and, if the attack made in 1578 upon Dean Whittingham's Genevan orders is also considered, such orders suggest that action was taken in these five cases as the result of an attempt to check the growth of Presbyterianism amongst the Puritans.

It seems probable, therefore, that by 1578 most of the delinquent clergy were Puritans, although, as the presence of George Swalwell amongst the unlicensed curates serving in Durham county proves, a certain number of Recusant priests were to be found amongst them even at that date. Between 1559 and 1572 the majority of deprivations were for Recusancy, and within that period twenty four priests, including eight members

(1) i.e. Nicholas Lawes, the curate of Hesleden, who should probably be identified with the Nicholas Lawes deprived in 1554, and William Reisley, the curate of Monkwearmouth, who may be the priest of that name deprived in 1565. (2) i.e. Thomas Savage, curate of Cornhill; Cuthbert Pattenson, a Scot, curate of Slaley; Richard Warren or Warrinell, vicar of Edlingham; Robert Baker, vicar of Norham; Ralph Grey, vicar of Whelpington - cf. S.S. 22, p. 31, 40, 93; N.C.H. VII, p. 157; Raine "N. Durham" p. 263. (3) Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I, p. lxxxiii, 74, 91; Frere "Visit. Arts." III, p. 282.

of the capitular body, were ejected, undoubtedly because they were Marian in sympathy. Moderation was, however, always employed in dealing with the Catholics; at first it was not politic to enforce the new settlement too rigorously; and, even after rebellion, few were deprived unless they had taken a prominent part in the rising or had also offended by breaking episcopal regulations concerning residence in their cures. Partly, however, as a result of this very moderation, by 1572 all the Marian clergy actually in possession of benefices seem to have conformed. After that date there is no evidence of any deprivation for Recusancy, but, on the other hand, Puritanism began to assume a place of some importance. At most, however, only eleven clergy were deprived because they were too advanced in their opinions, and although the presence of Scottish ministers and unlicensed clergy shows that more of them might correctly have been described as extremists than by this would appear, it is necessary to review other aspects of ecclesiastical administration, and to seek elsewhere if evidence is to be found indicating that Puritanism, or even Protestantism, had obtained a strong hold in the North before the end of the century.

SECTION II. THE TEACHING OF THE REFORMED DOCTRINES.

Complaints of increasing Recusancy amongst the people of Durham and Northumberland, in the last two decades of the century, and the space allotted in episcopal injunctions—even after 1572—to regulations concerning the rooting out of the old forms and the checking of the work of seminary priests and Jesuits, seem to show that Protestantism had taken very little hold in the two counties. After 1572, however, the triumph over the Romanizing party was for the moment complete, and it was possible to make a real attempt to prepare the ground for a sturdy growth of Protestantism in the future.

The work of such reforming preachers as Bernard Gilpin and John Knox, during the reign of Edward VI, had obtained a certain measure of success, and although a few clergy were deprived in Queen Mary's reign, Tunstal's refusal to persecute those who were considered to hold heretical opinions made it possible for the new doctrines to spread peacefully. (1). After the rebellion the Protestant element were anxious to show their loyalty to the Queen, which had become, in fact, synonymous with their acceptance of the established religion. Lawrence Dodsworth, who had been appointed rector of Gateshead in 1564, in his will of June 4, 1571, declared that he renounced "all the Pope's false and usurped primacy, and all his detestable enormities, beseeching God to deliver His church from all his errors and false doctrines, for he is the very anti-Christ enemy and adversary to the glorious gospel of our Saviour Jesus Christ." (2). Interesting also in this respect is the following entry in the parish register of St. Oswald's, Durham, containing as it does more than a flavour of Puritanism:- "The Register Book of the Parish of St. Oswald's made the 25th day of March, A.D. 1580..... written and kept..... by Charles Moberlay Vicar..... according to the Queen's proceedings, whose doings God direct to his glory and the profit of the said parish,

(1) cf. S.S. 50, p. 280.

(2) Welford II, p. 447.

and to the maintaining of the Queen's Majesty's godly proceedings, whom God preserve to reign over us, to the abolishment of Popery, and strange and false religion, and to the maintaining of the gospel, Grant O Lord that she may long continue a mother in Israel, with prosperous health, honour and felicity, and after this her great government in this life, she may with Moses, Joshua, Debora, and other godly governors, enjoy a crown of eternal glory, good Reader say Amen." (1). Again when in 1584 Throgmorton's Plot led to the formation of "The Association" with the object of protecting the life of the Queen, upon which hung the fate of the Protestant cause, the men of the two counties were not backward in giving their signatures to the bond (2).

They did not confine their activities to professions of loyalty, and of zeal, in the cause of the Queen. The Protestant Reformers based their faith upon the understanding of the scriptures; and in order to bring this knowledge within the reach of every man they stressed preaching and Bible reading. As an essential preliminary they, therefore, attempted to improve the learning of the clergy. Most of the parochial clergy were deficient in the knowledge necessary for those who were to expound the Scriptures, but the priests in charge of the distant parishes in Northumberland and upon the Borders were perhaps outstandingly ignorant. To their clerical functions they often added all the qualifications of a borderer. Bishop Pilkington pointed out in 1564 that the majority went about armed with sword and dagger (3); and such wealthy incumbents as Cuthbert Ogle of Ilderton and Thomas Henley of Woodhorn were as much soldiers as priests, and did not think it inconsistent with their profession to take a part in the Scottish wars (4) — while some of their less fortunate brethren were known,

(1) Printed edition of the Register, p. 24.

(2) cf. Cal. S.P. Dom. XII, p. 133.

(3) Lansd. Mss. vol. VII, fol. 212. (4) cf. Ogle was carried off prisoner by the Scots in 1543; later he himself captured some of them. cf. L. & P. XVIII, i, p. 401, 418, 515, etc. cf. also the will of Thomas Henley of 1558, in which he mentions his steel cap, his swords, guns, horse furniture etc. Wills & Invs. III, p. 145-6.

in 1552, as Border thieves (1). Sir Francis Leek's description of Robert Selby, the vicar of Berwick, of whom he wrote in 1560 "I doubt whether he can say his Paternoster truly, either in Latin or in English," may serve as a very fair picture of the prevailing ignorance (2).

Long before the accession of Elizabeth attempts had been made to rectify such conditions. Even before the Reformation, in the existence for example of Norton college, the prebends of which were generally treated as exhibitions to be held at the Universities, facilities had been offered to those who wished to study. During the reign of Henry VIII the clergy were frequently admonished to read the Scriptures, and in some dioceses were expected to possess "The Institution of a Christian Man". The Royal Injunctions of 1547 laid further stress on the study of the Scriptures by the minor clergy, and instructed the bishops to test their progress; at the same time provision was made for the inauguration of cathedral libraries (3). Even the Marianists were unable to overlook their deficiencies, and, following the Henrican statutes, by the cathedral statutes of 1554 certain University qualifications were made necessary for the Dean and prebendaries of Durham (4). The Elizabethan Injunctions of 1559 ordained that clergy under the degree of M.A. were to possess a New Testament in Latin and English, and Erasmus' "Paraphrases", and were to study them with a view to examination at visitations of the bishops and ordinaries (5). While some attempt was therefore being made to improve their learning, the government was inclined to limit the number of preachers because of its fear of seditious teaching; uniformity, its chief objective, could as well be attained by the reading of set homilies by priests who could not themselves preach (6). The Puritan wing of the church, re-enforced

(1) Surtees I, p. 166. (2) cf. Scott, "Berwick," p. 351. (3) Frere, "Visit. Arts." II, p. 10, 44, 122-3; N. Wood, "The Reformation and English Education" p. 191-4. (4) cf. S.S. 143, p. 87, 103. (5) Frere, "Visit. Arts." III, p. 10, 13-14. (6) cf. N. Wood, p. 219-25.

by those with Prebyterian views, nevertheless continued to stress the necessity of a learned ministry (1).

During the episcopate of Bishop Barnes (1577-87), who — if he lacked the genuine Puritanism of Pilkington — was a stern disciplinarian, a real attempt was made to ensure the full execution of injunctions previously made upon this head and even to an extent probably unlooked for by the governing authorities. In pursuance of the Royal Injunctions of 1559 it was ordered by Parker's "Advertisements" of 1566 that archdeacons, during their visitations, should appoint certain portions of the New Testament to be learned by heart by all curates, and should demand a rehearsal of these passages at the next synod (2). The Canons of 1571 repeated this order, and in the same year Archbishop Grindal of York enjoined a rather similar system (3). Thereupon Barnes, by his injunctions of 1577, ordered that tasks and exercises should be set for the clergy at the bi-annual visitations of each ward and deanery carried out by the chancellor or vicar-general, and that they should be examined in tasks previously set (4). There is no proof that previous monitions concerning the examination of their progress in learning were ever carried out in Durham or Northumberland, but there is direct evidence that Barnes' injunction was enforced throughout the two counties.

At the chancellor's visitation of January and February, 1578, no previous tasks having been set, no examination was held; but the clergy who were summoned at the beginning of the visitation were ordered to read and learn the gospel of St. Mathew, so that they would be able to give a written account of the various chapters, in Latin, at the next general chapter. When this monition was given to the clergy summoned in February, its terms were altered so that the task might be learnt either in Latin or in English, and an account given of it either in writing or orally (5). The necessity of altering the exercises — which was originally by no means difficult — throws rather a painful light upon the qualifications of the clergy, but the record of the proceedings of the visitation of July, 1578, shows that it was enforced fairly efficiently. Of a total of 195 clergy cited within the two counties nearly fifty failed

(1) cf. in 1588 the Warwickshire Classes declared the necessity of a learned ministry - Cam. Soc. 3rd. Ser. VIII, p. 17. (2) Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I, p. liv-v. (3) Ibid, p. xcvi-c. (4) S.S. 22, p. 20. (5) S.S. 22, p. 32, 44-5.

to attend, generally because of illness or some other good reason; in addition to these, twenty nine who did attend seem to have been excused from the task, but as most of this group were graduates, it is probable that they were all men of already acknowledged learning. The sixteen priests in Northumberland and the eight in Durham, who, however, without excuse had utterly neglected the task were admonished to have it ready and prepared by the time of the Michaelmas synod, and at the same time were sometimes threatened with excommunication; twenty-two others in Northumberland and seven in Durham who had not completed the exercise were also respited until the Michaelmas synod. This visitation showed the marked superiority in learning of the clergy of Durham over those of Northumberland; a greater number of them were excused because of their known proficiency, and whereas thirty nine of them had completed the task in July, only twenty two of the Northumberland clergy had finished it (1).

At the visitation of January, 1579, the clergy were similarly enjoined to prepare a task on St. Luke's gospel for the following July, when a task upon St. John was set for them. In later years there is no reference to an annual or bi-annual exercise of this nature, but special tasks seem to have been imposed for a few clergy (2). In 1586 Convocation made a regulation that all ministers of cures, under the degree of Master of Arts or of Bachelor of Laws, who were not licensed as public preachers, should, before the following February, provide themselves with a Bible and Bullinger's "Decades", from their daily and weekly readings of which they were to make abstracts. These abstracts were to be shown quarterly to some preacher assigned for the purpose, and through him and the archdeacons the progress of the clergy was to be reported to the Bishop, so that the negligent might be punished. Later, in 1590, Archbishop Piers categorically enforced this arrangement within his province (3). Perhaps in conformity with this new order, in July, 1586 a task upon the epistle of St. Jude was set for the junior clergy of Durham and

(1) cf. S.S. 22, p 70-78. Note that most of those who were excused the task were referred to as "Mr.," showing that they were graduates. (2) Ibid, p. 97-8, 100. cf. in 1583 Richard Marshall, rector of Stainton, and Giles Widdowes, vicar of Bishopton, were appointed special tasks. (3) Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I, p. XCVII, CI.

Northumberland. (1). The fact, moreover, that the system was continued, at least in part, is shown by the writings of Dr. Jackson of Durham, who stated that the synods "did constantly examine the Licensed Readers, how they had profited in their learning, by their Exercises, which they did as duly exhibit unto the Chancellor, Archdeacon, etc., as they did their orders or their fees. Such as had profited well were licensed to preach once a month, or once a quarter, having certain books appointed, from whose doctrine they should not swerve, but for the most part translate. The books then in most esteem were Melancthon, Bullinger, Hemingius (especially in Postils and other opuscula of his), or other writers, who were most conformable to the Book of Homilies, which were weekly read upon severe penalty." (2).

While administrative zeal showed itself in an attempt to improve the learning of those already in charge of cures, a simultaneous effort was being made to raise the standard of learning amongst ordinands. The object of the foundation of cathedral grammar schools, as well as of other schools, was largely to maintain a supply of educated clergy, and some of the scholars of Durham School were later ordained on titles within the diocese (3). In 1561 various suggestions were addressed to the Bishops, including the establishment of a high standard for those who wished to take the orders; (4) some of which suggestions were embodied in the Canons of 1571 and in regulations drawn up in 1575. In 1583 Whitgift set forth the ideal that graduates alone were to be ordained, or, at anyrate only those who could give an account of their faith in Latin (5). Orders were issued for the province of York in c. 1585 which, as an attempt to bring the northern province into line with the Southern, enjoined that bishops should only ordain candidates of their own diocese, or those who had been members of a University, and that all candidates were to be examined to find out whether they had been students of divinity and could read the Scriptures in Latin (6).

A first glance does not suggest that the reformers succeeded in raising the standard of learning amongst ordinands in Durham and Northumberland. In the ordination lists of Bishop Tunstal's register no degrees

(1) S.S. 22, p. 101. (2) Quoted in S.S. 22, p. 20~~1~~

(3) e.g. the case of Robert Garrett - cf. below p. 61-2.

(4) Cal. S.P. Dom. VI, p. 514-5. (5) Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I, p. lxxxi-ii. (6) Ibid III, p. 196.

are entered after the dissolution, but in the years 1533-5 seven ordinands are entered as holding the degrees of Bachelor or Master of Arts or of Bachelor of Laws (1), whereas in the ten years of Barnes' episcopate out of 212 candidates ordained deacon only twenty seven were graduates (2). Bishop Pilkington's ordination lists, of which there are eighteen, seem to show that he took little interest in his ordinations; only two candidates are recorded as holding degrees, although undoubtedly some of the others were graduates, titles were rarely entered, and the whole given in a haphazard fashion (3). These conditions were remedied by Barnes; his ordinations were regular, were improving in number of candidates, and, in addition, were taken by the Bishop himself. Moreover Barnes made an attempt to accomplish the ideal set forth by Whitgift, for in December, 1583, he required that ordinands should be able to give in Latin an account of their faith in accordance with the Synodal Articles (4).

Barnes was also careful to preserve the tradition of learning within the cathedral, where he seems to have founded a Divinity lecture (5). His efforts, and those of the other reformers were, in part at least, rewarded, for the wills and inventories of the clergy of the two counties seem to indicate a rising level of learning. The wills, or inventories, of sixty-eight clergy who died within the period covered by Elizabeth's reign have been published, the majority of them in the three volumes of the Surtees Society devoted to documents of this nature (6). Although it is obvious that priests who had in their possession a certain number of books would not necessarily mention them in their wills, and equally evident that occasionally where they existed they were omitted in inventories (7), it is noteworthy that books

(1) T.R. nos. 77, 90, 101, 105, 114-5, 122. (2) 14 held the degree of B.A.; 2 were M.A.'s of Scottish Universities; 10 were M.A.'s of English Universities; and one was an L.L.D. cf. S.S. 22, p. xcvi-cii. (3) cf. T.R. nos. 434, 534 etc. (4) S.S. 22, p. xcvi-cii. (5) cf. in a letter to Burghley of Dec. 14, 1579, he asked permission for Mr. Hugh Broughton "a learned and godly preacher" to read a Divinity lecture there, and at the same time to retain his fellowship in Christ's College, Cambridge, S.P. Dom^o Eliz. CXXXIII, no. 3. (6) A good many are also to be found in S.S. 22, Appendix X, and in Welford's "History of Newcastle". One has been consulted in Arch. Ael. 2nd. Ser. pt. 55, p. 104-5, and one in Raine's "N. Durham", p. 128-9. (7) e.g. Robert

of any sort only occur in thirteen out of a total of forty-four wills or inventories made between 1558 and 1580, whereas they are mentioned in fourteen out of twenty-four wills or inventories drawn up in the remaining twenty-three years of the reign. It was natural that their possession should become more widely spread with the diminishing costs induced by printing, but at the same time these figures may be taken as an indication that the clergy as a whole were taking more interest in book learning; at the same time it must be noticed that nearly half the total number of those in whose wills or inventories books are mentioned were either prebendaries or minor canons of the cathedral.

These wills furnish other interesting particulars. Bibles are only mentioned in nine cases, and in two of these cases the Geneva Bible is specified; completed by William Whittingham, Thomas Sampson, and other Marian exiles before their return to England after the accession of Elizabeth, this edition was preferred for private use by most of the Puritans. It is also evident that, of the clergy who died before 1580, those whose wills show them to have possessed libraries of any size were, generally speaking, themselves Puritans. For example amongst them must be numbered Bishop Pilkington, who left many of his books to the school which he had founded at Rivington, but some of the old writers to the poorest libraries in Cambridge, and certain later writers to those who hoped to become preachers. Amongst them also was William Birche, the rector of Stanhope, who had been deprived of his prebend for non-conformity, in 1567. In his will of 1575, books, with which he was richly supplied, formed a very large part of his bequests, and included the Geneva Bible which he left as an heir-loom to his brother; Beza's Testament; Calvin's "Institutes"; the Greek and Latin testament with Erasmus' annotations; the works of Erasmus and Melancthon; Canon Law and Civil Law Books; books on ecclesiastical history; classical writers and Hebrew books; and finally "A Reply to Dr. Whitgift" by Thomas Cartwright. The possession of this last-named book shows that he was infected with the prevailing Presbyterian spirit which was to be found

Lighton, vicar of Long Horsley, in his will of 1584, mentions an old written Bible and a written chronicle, but there is no mention of books in the inventory of his property - cf. S.S. 22, p. cxxviii-ix.

among many of the Puritans (1). Six instances occur of priests leaving some of their books or their Bibles to their clerical brethren; this fact shows again that they were true reformers in their desire to spread knowledge, and particularly the knowledge of the Bible (2).

The chief object of the reformers in attempting to secure a learned ministry was to provide able preachers. In the later middle ages there was a good deal of preaching in large towns and the Universities, and a certain amount of preaching was done by the monks; regular sermons were, for example, delivered by the monks of Durham on Saturday afternoons, while other sermons were given in the churches of Durham (3). Again, the mendicants were famous as preachers, and they possessed great influence because of their out-spokenness, and the fact that they mixed with all classes. On the other hand, there was much neglect of the sermon on the part of bishops and the parochial clergy. This resulted partly from negligence, partly from ignorance on the part of many of the clergy, partly from the fact that foreign pluralists held livings in England, but perhaps chiefly from the necessity of obtaining preaching licenses, which could only be obtained with difficulty after Lollard preachers had, by their attack upon the Church, caused a tightening up of discipline in this respect. Moreover, even the friars were subject to limitations imposed by the jealousy of the secular clergy, and, like bishops and curates, were subject to decline, negligence, and corruption (4).

While the Reformation put an end to such

(1) for Pilkington's Will cf. Wills & Invs. II, p. 8- 1; and for Birche's will S.S. 22, p. cx-xiv.

(2) cf. Wills & Invs. I, p. 217-21, 194-6; S.S. 95, p. 123-4, 264; S.S. 22, p.cxxix-cxxx, cx-exiv. For other clerical wills or inventories in which books are mentioned cf. Wills & Invs. I, p. 134-6, 240-1, 274, 304-5, 426-7; II, p. 312, 318-22; III, p. 36, 80-2, 102, 145-6; S.S. 21, p. 125-6; S.S. 22, p. cxiv-v, cxix-xxv, cxxviii-ix, cxxxi-iv, cxli-v; Welford III, p. 106-7; Raine, "N. Durham", p. 128-9. Other clergy who seem to have owned quite a lot of books were Francis Trollope, the vicar of Sockburn, whose books were mostly those enjoined by episcopal injunctions etc; Bishop Sparke; and William Massie, the vicar of Stranton, whose books covered a wide range of knowledge. (3) G.R. Owst, "Preaching in Medieval England", p. 52, 147-60.

(4) G.R. Owst, p. 26-38, 41-6, 66-95, 129-43.

preaching as had been done by monks and friars, at first no attempt was made to remedy the conditions which had led to neglect of the sermon on the part of bishops and secular clergy. The Prior of St. Oswald's, Nostell, in writing to Thomas Cromwell in 1538 complained of a great scarcity of preachers, adding: "Newcastle and the country round about is also destitute of good pastors"; writing again a few months later he stated: "It is a great pity there is never one preacher betwixt Tyne and Tweed" (1). His verdict was to some extent endorsed by Bishop Tunstall (2), but, from his words, it is apparent that the shortage was partly due to the fact that the sermon was being used as a government weapon to enforce the changes effected in religion.

Preachers might, as well as giving an understanding of the Scriptures, imbue in the people opinions hostile to the government; consequently the medieval practice was continued by which preaching was regarded as a special function only to be performed by those formally authorised. Parochial clergy, having authoritative cure of souls, were entitled by their office to deliver sermons in their own churches, but in addition to them certain men who might, or might not, be in possession of benefices, were licensed to preach in specified districts. These special licences might be issued by the Bishop — in which case they were limited to the diocese — or by the Universities, or by the Crown (3).

A firm control was kept upon all types of preachers. The content of the sermons of the parochial clergy was sometimes enjoined; for example in the Royal Injunctions of 1536 it was ordered that a certain number of sermons should be preached every year on the subject of the Royal Supremacy, and this Injunction was in substance retained both in 1547 and 1559. During the reign of Edward VI, as the government was alarmed by the amount of unorthodox preaching, in April 1548 parish priests were forbidden to preach, and the right of issuing licences was confined to the king, the Protector, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, although in the case of Durham the stringency of this rule was relaxed for Tunstall, together with the Bishop of Ely, was authorised in 1550 to appoint such chaplains and others to preach as he thought fit. Cardinal Pole again made the Bishop's

(1) L. & P. XIII, ii, p. 395; XIV, i, p. 130.

(2) Ibid, XIV, ii, App. 7. (3) N. Wood, "The Ref. and Eng. Educ." p. 203-4, 207-8.

license necessary (1). On the accession of Elizabeth all preaching was forbidden by a proclamation of December 27, 1558, but the Royal Injunctions of 1559, which ordained monthly sermons by the parish priest, or some licensed preacher, relaxed the inhibition. The Bishop's "Interpretations" of 1560-1, however, showed more clearly the early policy of Elizabethan episcopal administration. They enjoined "That if the parson be able he shall preach in his own person every month, or else shall preach by another", but incumbents of benefices were not to be penalised if "they preach in their own persons, or by a learned substitute, once in every three months of the year." On Sundays on which no sermon was preached it was expected that a homily should be read from the Books of Homilies issued in 1547 and 1563, and by Parker's "Advertisements" of 1566 it was ordered that unlicensed clergy should confine their exhortations to reading ^{the} homilies (2). Archbishop Grindal in his Injunctions of 1571 enforced these regulations in the northern province, providing for sermons at least four times a year, and for the reading of homilies, including the homily which had just been written against rebellion. (3).

Inevitably such regulations, springing from the desire of the government to control the pulpit, tended to diminish the amount of active teaching, and throughout the century complaints came in of the lack of preachers. In 1560 Dean Horn wrote querulous accounts of the morality in general of the people of Durham and Northumberland, of their ignorance, their superstitious behaviour, and of their neglect of church going, all of which he ascribed largely to the lack of ministers and of preaching (4). In 1568 the Council in the North reported that in many churches no sermons had been preached for several years, and that this was chiefly due to the ignorance of the clergy (5). In 1595 Sir William Bowes wrote, with reference to the Borders, "True Religion hath taken very little place, not by the unwillingness of the people to hear, but by want of means, scant three able preachers being to be found in

(1) Ibid, p. 204-6, 209-13; Gairdner, "Lollardy and the Reformation," III, p. 185. (2) Frere, "Visit. Arts." III, p. 9-11, 18, 59-60, 174. (3) Ibid, p. 278-9, 283-4. Sandys' Injunctions of 1578 were to the same effect, cf. Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." II, p. 94. (4) S.P. Dom. Eliz. XI, no. 16; XIV, no. 45. (5) Cal. S.P. Dom. VII, p. 64-5.

the whole country." (1). Finally, at the close of the reign, in 1602, a comment upon the conditions still existing is seen in the proposals that, in order to diminish crime in Northumberland, the Bishop of Durham should compel his incumbents to be resident, and to preach, and that the Queen's farmers of Hexham, Holy Island, Bamburgh, and Tynemouth — who either left these churches unprovided or served by mean curates — should also provide preachers (2).

While, however, government policy tended to check preaching, the chief Protestant clergy stressed the sermon, and the Puritans regarded it as the chief part of the service. They wished the clergy to preach at least once every Sunday, and were opposed to the reading of homilies (3); they suggested, moreover, that the success of the seminarists was due to lack of teaching and preaching (4). Consequently, although no provision was made by the continuance warrants of 1548 for preachers within Durham and Northumberland, certain preachers endeavoured, during the reign of Edward VI, to inculcate the new doctrines in the people of the two counties. Bernard Gilpin had obtained a license as an itinerant preacher, and he made it his especial mission to minister to the people of Tynedale and Redesdale, where, as his biographer states, "in that time the word of God was never heard of to be preached amongst them but by Master Gilpin's ministry" (5). Special arrangements were made for preachers in Newcastle, and in the garrison town of Berwick. After his release from the French galleys in 1549, John Knox was employed by the Council for two years as preacher in Berwick; he was then removed to Newcastle, where he remained until June, 1553. Preaching continually in St. Nicholas' church, his teaching proved too advanced even for the government of the day, and he was called upon to answer written articles (6). John Rough, another Scottish reformer, was also sent by Somerset to preach in these two towns (7).

During the Catholic reaction of Queen Mary's reign the value of the sermon was to some extent

-
- (1) Cal Border Papers II, p. 171. (2) Cal S.P. Dom. VI, p. 213-4. (3) cf. Cam. Soc. 3rd. Ser. VIII, p.16.
(4) N. Wood, "The Ref. and Eng. Educ." p. 197.
(5) From Carleton's biography, quoted in Surtees I, p.167.
(6) cf. Dixon III, p. 330-4; S.S. 50, p. 267, 274, 276.
(7) Ibid. p. 265.

appreciated, and consequently it was ordained by the cathedral statutes of 1555 that the Dean and prebendaries should preach not only, as ordered by the Henrician statutes, in the cathedral, but also in other parts of the diocese (1). In the next year Tunstal followed up this command by enjoining that the Dean and Chapter should provide for frequent sermons, especially during Lent, in all churches appointed to them (2). The fact that after the accession of Elizabeth great importance was still attached to the preaching function of the members of the capitular body is apparent in the conditions of dispensation from residence granted to certain of their number (3), and in 1568, because of the destitution of many churches, the Council in the North ordered that preachers — particularly those belonging to cathedrals — should, within their own dioceses, assign to themselves districts through which they should travel, preaching in the various churches; the Justices of the Peace were commanded to accompany them and procure orderly and sufficient audiences (4).

Other arrangements made before 1558 were continued and amplified. On the appointment of a new governor in Berwick in 1560 new orders were made for the garrison, including, for the first time, regulations concerning church attendance. In accordance with the orders, preachers were sent to the town, amongst whom were men of such advanced views as Dean Horn, Thomas Sampson, and Francis Bunny of Ryton. The preachers and their co-adjutors were maintained, in part, by payments from the Queen's treasurer and the soldiers of the garrison, and in part by the Dean and Chapter, to whom the cure belonged, and who sometimes supplied the preachers from amongst their own number (5). Special preachers were still occasionally sent to Newcastle. In 1588, at the request of the inhabitants of the town,

(1) cf. S.S. 143, p. 108. (2) Frere, "Visit. Arts". II, p. 414. (3) e.g. (1) order from the Queen, Jan. 31. 1561, that while John Rudd is absent for 2 years on certain specified business he shall receive his stipends as if in residence, on condition that he provides for "such sermons to be made there yearly, as he is by order bound to make"; (2) Similar order for William Stevenson to receive his stipends as long as he is preacher in Berwick, or is occupied in preaching in the North. D. & Chap. Reg. II. fol. 135b. 144a. (4) Cal. S.P. Dom. VII, p. 64-5. (5) Scott "Berwick", p. 152-3, 161, 352, 462; Surtees II, p. 265, Other preachers were Prebendary William Stevenson and John Douglas, a Scot. On

John Udale was sent there by Huntingdon, the President of the Council in the North. He was not licensed either by the Bishop or Archbishop, as the sees were vacant; he had already had dealings with John Penry, the writer of many very radical tracts against the bishops, and was himself imprisoned in 1590 for complicity in the marprelate tracts; nevertheless he seems to have proved acceptable to some at least of the people of Newcastle, for the Mayor himself was one of the sureties at the baptism of his daughter (1). In Durham city there were also occasionally special sermons; for example, the mercers, grocers, and other trade guilds, in accordance with their rules of 1561, attended a sermon in St. Nicholas' church every year within twenty days of Martinmass (2). The citizens, apart from these special sermons, had also opportunity of hearing sermons in the cathedral, where, in Whittingham's time, they were given three times a week (3).

A fairly ample provision was, therefore, made for such towns as Newcastle, Berwick, and Durham, but the majority of churches were very ill-served. Bishop Burnes tried to remedy this defect by himself preaching in the district of Durham and Auckland, and by obtaining the assistance of his licensed clergy generally throughout the two counties. This system was inaugurated in 1578, when thirty clergy were appointed special preachers for the year, beginning at Michaelmas. In addition to their ordinary quarterly and monthly sermons in their own cures, and any sermons which they might preach voluntarily, they were each assigned a certain number of sermons to be given in specified churches. A total of 215 sermons were to be preached within the county of Durham, with only two or three exceptions every parish church and parochial chapel having at least one sermon assigned to it, while such chapels of ease as Eggleston in Middleton-in-Teesdale and Sadberge in Haughton-13-Skerne were also

Nov. 13, 1560, Dean Horn wrote to Cecil with reference to the new orders, of which he said that he approved cf. S.P. Dom. Eliz. XIV, no. 45.

(1) Cam. Soc. 3rd. Ser. VIII, p. xlvi; Welford III, p. 57; St. Nich's. Par. Reg. Sept. 7, 1589, "Marie, daughter of Mr. John Udall, preacher", baptised.

(2) cf. D & Chap. Reg. II, fol. 145 a. (3) i.e. on Sunday mornings, and on Wednesday and Friday - cf. Lansd. Mss. vol. VII, p. 24.

included in the scheme (1). Two or three sermons each were assigned to most of the churches or chapels, but the old collegiate churches of Darlington, Lanchester, St. Andrew's Auckland, and Chester-le-Street were allowed five, six, or seven sermons a-piece, and the fact that as many as five were appointed to Brancepeth suggests that particular care was taken of those parishes which had been centres of the late rebellion. North-umberland fared less well. Exclusive of the churches of Hexhamshire, as being within the diocese of York, some fifty churches or parochial chapels were not mentioned, amongst which were churches of such important or large parishes as those of Ponteland, Shilbottle, Woodhorn, Embleton, Ford, and Haltwhistle. In the remaining churches and chapels generally one or two sermons were to be preached, making a total for the whole county of eighty-eight sermons (2).

By this scheme the Bishop formalised and put into effective shape the plan which had been enjoined by the Council in the North in 1568, and which such preachers as Bernard Gilpin had already made individual attempts to anticipate. The chosen preachers were drawn from both counties and included the Bishop himself, the two archdeacons, and nine prebendaries. All were men of some learning, having the right to the title of "Magister" which implied that they were graduates of a University, and one was Regius Professor of Divinity in Cambridge University (3). Twenty one of the thirty were to preach one of their sermons at Bishop Auckland — a wise precaution enabling the Bishop to keep a check upon the doctrinal views which they were likely to teach. Those who were not required to preach before him were men with whose opinions the Bishop was already well acquainted, and whom he could trust, as amongst them were Dean Whittingham, Bernard Gilpin, and Robert Swift the chancellor. The choice of preachers showed a decided favouring of advanced Puritan views, for as well as the Dean, there had been chosen Leonard and John Pilkington

(1) The only churches or parochial chapels excluded were Kelloe and Stockton. Ebchester was probably included with Chester-le-Street where 7 sermons were to be preached, and Kimblesworth with Witton-Gilbert with which it was united in 1593 — already one man served both cures. 2 sermons were assigned to "Durham", which may have been preached in the churches of St. Mary-le-Bow and St.-Mary-the-Less, as they were not mentioned.

(2) S.S. 22, p. 80-91. (3) i.e. Leonard Pilkington.

the brothers of the late Bishop, Ralph Lever, Francis Bunny (who was an admirer of Calvin and said to be one of the most notable favourers of Puritanism at the time) (1), John Mackbray (2), and John Barnes, the Bishop's brother (3). To what extent the system was continued in later years is not apparent, but it is evident that, springing largely from the stress laid by the Puritans upon the importance of the sermon, it would tend, as formularised by Bishop Barnes, to the advance of Puritanism within the two counties.

In the later years of Barnes' episcopate other attempts were made to increase the number of preaching clergy and sermons. By the Act of 1585 for the incorporation of Sherburn hospital it was ordained that the master should be a preacher, without charge or cure elsewhere (4), and, partly as a result of their attempt to prevent its dissolution, the Corporation of Newcastle, in appointing a master of the West Spital in 1586, made a condition that he should cause twelve sermons to be preached in the town each year. As the new master failed to perform his duties they appointed one of the curates of St. Nicholas' church as preacher, with residence in the hospital (5). There, moreover, are other indications of the increased importance which was becoming attached to sermons. Pulpits of some sort were fairly general in the middle ages (6), but they were amongst the furniture specifically ordered to be provided in churches by episcopal injunctions for the North in the later sixteenth century (7), and action was sometimes taken against church wardens for having neglected this monition (8). The custom of appropriating pews had existed in some parts of England before the

(1) Surtees II, p. 265. (2) Dr. Jackson, a later vicar of Newcastle, complained that Knox, Udale, and Mackbray "had sown their tares" in Berwick and Newcastle, and seemed to imply that they had perhaps started Propheesyings - cf. Welford III, p. 26-7. (3) S.S. 22, p. 80-91.
(4) Surtees I. p. 132. (5) cf. S.S. 137, p. 8; A.R. Laws, "Schola Novacastrensis", p. 59.
(6) G.R. Owst, p. 160-4. (7) they were enjoined by Archbishop Grindal in 1571 (Frere, "Visit. Arts" III. p. 283-4) and by Barnes in 1577 (S.S. 22, p. 25.)
(8) cf. S.S. 22, p. 118-9; N.C.H. I, p. 347; II, p. 289.

Reformation (1); but a great impetus was given to it by the spoliation and impoverishment of churches during the Reformation, and by the necessity of sitting quietly during sermons. Churchwardens accounts show that the system was employed in St. Oswald's church in 1580, and that it was introduced at Pittington in 1584; probably the accounts of other churches would show that it came into use in them at about the same period (2). At Houghton-le-Spring and Mitford there is evidence to show that it was already in existence in 1569-70 (3).

In addition to the special function of preaching which was assigned only to a limited number of the clergy, all rectors, vicars, and curates were expected to instruct their parishioners in the elements of religion. Following the orders laid down by the Royal Injunctions of 1536 and 1547, inquiry was made at the visitation of 1559 whether they were teaching their people the Pater Noster, the Creed, and the Commandments in English. The Prayer Book of 1559 enforced the order, and required that such instruction should be given on Sundays and holy days, for half an hour before evening prayer(4). By these regulations it was hoped that at least a minimum of religious education would be obtained by the non-school-attending part of the population, and in 1571 Grindal prescribed for the northern province a system which would ensure that this instruction should be received by all. He enjoined that the clergy should, within their own parishes, take the names of all young people between the ages of six and twenty years who could not say the catechism, and should summon them all in rotation. The system was also designed to provide a means by which the conformity of the parishioners might be tested, for the clergy were ordered to present the names of those parents or guardians who refused to send their children to such lessons. With rather less detail his injunction was repeated by Bishop Barnes in 1577, and by Archbishop Sandys in 1578 (5). There is evidence to show that the catechism was taught fairly regularly in the churches of Durham; in a letter of 1563 Dean

(1) cf. G.R. Owst, p. 167. (2)cf. S.S. 84, p. viii-xi, 13, 119; Cox, "Churchwardens' Accounts", p. 186-9.
(3) cf. S.S. 21, p. 93, 106. (4)Frere, "Visit. Arts." II, p. 6-7, 116, 119; III, p. 258. (5) Frere, "Visit. Arts." III, p. 275-6; S.S. 22, p. 15-16; Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." II, p. 93. The Canons of 1571 also enforced this instruction in the catechism.

Whittingham explained that it was expounded on Sunday afternoons and on holy days within the cathedral (1), and Dr. Thomas Jackson, who was born at Witton-le-Wear in 1578, writing at a later date, told how he was instructed in the catechism by the curate of Witton, "from whose lips", he said, "(He' but a mere grammar scholar, and one that knew better how to read an homily, or to understand ~~H~~emingius, or other Latin Postills, than to make a sermon in English) I learned more good lessons, than I did from many popular sermons." (2).

It must be acknowledged that even at the end of the century the ordinary parish clergyman was deficient in the knowledge necessary for any minister who was to deliver frequent sermons, but a real effort had been made, particularly during Barnes' episcopate, to improve the standard of learning amongst them, and also amongst ordinands. As a result, there is some evidence that the standard was raised, the clergy of Durham county and those with advanced Puritan views especially showing a higher degree of learning. In consequence, although there was a great shortage of preachers in both counties, Durham was rather better provided than Northumberland in this respect. Even by Barnes' scheme for special preachers only a very inadequate provision could be made for the northern county, but preachers were generally available in both Newcastle and Berwick. The preachers appointed in these towns, and those chosen by Barnes, were often Puritan in their outlook, and it is, therefore, true to say that to a large extent what success was attained in the attempt to secure a learned and preaching ministry was the result of their work, as, also, it tended to redound to their advantage by spreading their religious opinions. It could not be expected, however, that the fruits of their work would appear, except in isolated cases, within the limits of the sixteenth century, but in the meanwhile a solid grounding in the elements of the established religion was being given by the ordinary parochial clergy, while those who were not licensed to preach were both enjoined to read authorised homilies to their congregations and to teach the children of their parishes to read and write (3) — an essential

(1) Lansd. Mss. vol. VII, fol. 24. (2) Quoted in S.S. 22, p. 25-6. (3) This was enjoined by Grindal in 1571, and by Barnes in 1577; cf. Frere, "Visit. Arts." III, p. 281; S.S. 22, p. 19.

preliminary to that knowledge of Bible which it was the object of the reformers to bring within the reach of all. Moreover, instruction in the doctrines of the established church was given in grammar and vernacular schools, which were still regarded as falling within the ecclesiastical sphere of control.

SECTION III. SIGNS OF THE GROWTH OF PROTESTANTISM,
AND OF PURITANISM.

If extremist views were only to be found in rather rare cases in the sixteenth century, there were already many signs of the spread of Protestantism in these two counties. One such sign may be found in the increasing proportion of married clergy. In 1521 King Henry VIII had issued a proclamation threatening those who married with deprivation; despite this order several instances of their marriage can be found, some dating from as early as 1537 and 1539 (1); the clergy of Durham and Northumberland do not, however, like their brethren in the South, seem to have assumed that legal marriage was possible (2). In 1547, shortly after the accession of Edward VI, Convocation sanctioned their marriage, and early in 1549 Parliament gave civil sanction to the new order. Seven of the clergy of the two counties are known to have taken advantage of this ruling, for they were deprived of their benefices at the beginning of Queen Mary's reign, as a result of her order to this effect delivered to the bishops (3); it is possible moreover, that some of the other clergy had been married, but had separated from their wives and so obtained presentation to some other benefice.

The accession of Elizabeth involved a reversion to the Edwardine practice. The Royal Injunctions of 1559 permitted the marriage of the clergy; it was not, however, encouraged, and it was enjoined that the Bishop and two Justices of the Peace were to give their approval, and that the consent of the woman's parents or guardians was to be obtained. (4). Between 1560 and 1570 about fifteen cases can be found of clergy of the two counties who had married, for the custom, if frowned at by Elizabeth, was sanctioned by the example of some of the chief dignitaries of the diocese, amongst whom were such extremists in doctrine as Bishop Pilkington (5), Lawrence Pilkington the vicar of Norham, Dean Whittingham,

(1) cf. Cam. Soc. 1st. Ser. XXVI, p. 160-1; Waters, "Parish Registers", p. 35. (2) cf. Cuthbert Ogle of Ford in his will dated June 5, 1530, mentioned his four sons who were the children of his "servant", Isabel Musgrave. N.C.H. XIV, p. 396; cf. also Scott, "Berwick", p. 393; Wills & Invs. III, p. 66. (3) cf. above p. 553-4.
(4) Frere, "Visit. Arts." III, p. 18-19.
(5) Wills & Invs. II, p. 8-11.

Prebendary John Rudd, and Laurence Dodsworth the rector of Gateshead. (1). Evidence exists to show that an additional twenty five clergy were married during, or perhaps before, the eighth decade of the century; again, a large number of the married clergy were those who shared the strongly Puritan views of such a man as William Birche of Stanhope (2). In the ninth decade of the century at least forty clergy, additional to those whose marriage is known to have taken place before 1580, were married, amongst whom, again, many held extremist views, and were in possession of some of the most important ecclesiastical promotions within the two

(1) cf. Nov. 24, 1568 the marriage of Laurence Pilkington in the Par. Reg. of St. Mary the Less, Durham; the baptism of various children of Dodsworth appears in Gateshead Par. Reg. after 1565; cf. also his will given Welford II, p. 447. For Whittingham and Rudd, cf. above p. 23, 143. The other clergy known to have been married in or before this decade were (1) the curate of St. Margaret's (Par. Reg. Feb. 28, 1563/4); (2) Charles Moberley, vicar of St. Oswald's (Par. Reg. Oct. 19, 1585); (3) John Foster, rector of Edmundbyers (Wills & Invs. I, p. 312-3); (4) Richard Greg of Hartlepool (Wills & Invs. III, p. 55); (5) Edward Bankes, rector of Long Newton (Par. Reg. May 9, 1568; Randall VIII); (6) Edmund Beane, rector of Stanhope (Wills & Invs. I, p. 221-2); (7) Richard Farrow, rector of Winston (Ibid, III, p. 53-4); (8) George Bartram, master of the Tyne Bridge chapel (Welford III, p. 24); (9) William Harrison, rector of Bothal; (10) Thomas Atkinson, rector of Elwick (above p. 20, 554)

(2) cf. his wife was buried at St. Mary-le-Bow, Nov. 23 1574. The others were:-(1) Adam Halyday, rector of Bishop Wearmouth (above p. 149.); (2) Richard Fawcett, rector of Boldon (Par. Reg. April 30, 1575, and Aug. 18, 1583); (3) Michael Pattekson, curate of St. Margaret's (Par. Reg. March 28, 1579); (4) John Stevenson, officiating minister at St. Mary le-Bow (Par. Reg. Feb. 24, 1579/80); (5) John Martin, curate of Embleton (St. Mary the Less Par. Reg. Nov. 25, 1577); (6) Thomas Jackson, curate of Horton (Ibid, Nov. 29, 1579); (7) Robert Bellamy, rector of Egglecliffe, (Par. Reg. Jan. 16, 1578/9; (8) Henry Naunton, vicar of Gainford (Par. Reg. Feb. 15, 1578/9); (9) William Bennet, vicar of Kelloe (above p. 149.); (10) Richard Milner, curate of Lanchester (S.S. 21, p. 289); (11) Ralph Tunstal, rector of Easington (Surtees III, p. 217); (12) James Maynard, curate of Middleton-in-Teesdale (Par. Reg. Oct. 11, 1579); (13) Richard Rawling, vicar of Stranton (Wills & Invs. I, p. 423-4); (14) Arthur

counties. By this period Bishop Barnes was married (1), and so were a large number of the prebendaries, including Emanuel Barnes, (2), Clement Colmore (3), Francis Bunny (4), Robert Swift, Thomas Lever (5), Leonard Pilkington (6), John Pilkington (7), and even George Cliff — lately a monk — (8), while amongst prominent Puritan clergy of the counties who had married may be mentioned John Mackbray of Newcastle, John Udale, the preacher there, James Fernside (9)^{and} Richard Dearham of Whickham (10, John Barnes of Houghton-le-Skerne (11) and Richard Clerke of Berwick (12). Although, however, during these

Shafto, vicar of Stamfordham (S.S. 22, p. CXV-VII etc); (15) John Dobson, curate of Hexham (Par. Reg. May 29, 1579); (16) Thomas Benson, rector of Edmundbyers (Arch. Ael. 2nd. Ser. pt. 55, p. 104-5); (17) John Hog, vicar of Stamfordham (Randall X, p. 302); (18) John Oliver, vicar of Warden (Hodgson II, vol. 3, p. 406) (19) Thomas Clerke, vicar of Berwick (Par. Reg. Jan. 6, 1588-9 etc; Randall X, p. 146); (20) Cuthbert Ewbanke, curate of St. Nicholas, Newcastle (Par. Reg. Aug. 26, 1574); (21) John Grame, curate of Newborough (Ibid, Sept. 2, 1577); (22) Bernard Vincent, curate of Berwick (Ibid, Nov. 9, 1574); (23) George Gray, curate of St. John's Newcastle (Welford II, p. 516); (24) John Killingworth, vicar of Long Benton (N.C.H. XIV, p. 412-3).

- (1) March 27. 1582, he married Jane Dyllycote (St. Oswald's Par. Reg.) cf. also April 8, 1581, burial of Mrs. Barnes, his wife, at Auckland (Par. Reg). (2) Houghton-le-Spring Par. Reg. Aug. 19, 1583. (3) St. Mary le Bow Par. Reg. June 21, 1584. (4) Ryton Par. Reg. Nov. 1584. (5) above p. 148-9. (6) S.S. 22, p. cxxxiv-ix (7) Easington Par. Reg. Aug. 26, 1585 (8) above p. 149. (9) St. Nicholas', Newcastle, Par. Reg. Jan. 6, 1582/2, May 8, 1586, Sept. 7, 1589. (10) Par. Reg. July 4, 1602. (11) Surtees III, p. 342. (12) Par. Reg. May 17, 1590.

Evidence of the marriage of the following clergy can be found in the parish registers of the places of which they were incumbents or curates:- Miles Casse and John Robson, curates of St. Andrew's, Auckland; William Dampont, curate of Escombe; Marmaduke Myers, vicar of Bishop Middleham; Thomas Liddell, curate of Chester; Ralph Smith, curate of Denton; Richard Jackson, curate of Easington; Robert Woods, curate of Egglecliffe; William Wood, vicar of Greatham; Henry Wanless, vicar of Hesledon; John Biers, curate of Jarrow; Miles Watmough, curate of Lanchester; Peter Norman, curate of Esh; James Rand, vicar of Norton; Thomas Revington, curate of Winston; Richard Holdsworth, vicar of Newcastle. Evidence of the marriage of the

first thirty odd years of Elizabeth's reign the clergy were getting married in increasing numbers, much uncertainty was attached to the position of their wives. Bishop Pilkington in his will of February 4, 1571/2 mentioned his wife Alice Kingsmill, and referred to her as "now my known wife", so probably alluding to the fact that his marriage was kept secret for some time, no doubt in deference to Elizabeth's known dislike of married clergy (1). Even Dean Whittingham referred to his wife as "Katherina Whittingham, alias Jaqueman", (2), and in some cases the clergy are found, as late as 1582, describing their children as base-born in drawing up such legal documents as wills, although they were probably the children of real, though still legally doubtful, marriages (3). Even in the ninth decade of the

following clergy occurs in the registers of St. Mary le Bow or St. Mary the Less, Durham:- Robert Prentice, William Smith, Thomas Little, petty canons; Charles Vicars, vicar of Castle Eden. The following were also married within this decade: John Revell (Dinsdale Par. Reg.); William Massie, vicar of Stranton (married, Nov. 20, 1583, Alice Pilkington; Sharpe, "Chron. Mirab." p.6.); Richard Hancock, vicar of Ponteland (N.C.H. XII, p.430); Thomas Henley, vicar of Woodhorn (Wills & Invs. III, p. 145-6); William Hodgson, rector of Gateshead (St. Nicholas, Newc. Par. Reg.); and lastly Richard Satterthwaite rector of Ingram (N.C.H.XIV, p. 461.

(1) Wills & Invs. II, p. 8. (2) Ibid, p. 14-19. (3) (cf. John Forster, rector of Edmundbyers, by his will of Aug. 8, 1570, left the residue of his property to "John Foster, my son, and to Katherine Simpson, my bootler" (Wills & Invs. I, p. 312-3); but his successor, Thomas Benson, in his will of Dec. 10, 1575, spoke of "John Foster, base-begotten son of John Foster, clerk, late parson of Edmundbyers", and left the residue of his own property to Kathleen Blomer and "William Benson, my base-begotten son" (Arch: Ael. 2nd. Ser. pt. 55, p. 104-5). cf. similarly a testator by will of 1577 left certain property to "Katherine Bell, base-daughter of John Hogge, sometime vicar of Stamfordham" (Randall X, p. 302), and Arthur Shafto, a later vicar of Stamfordham, in his will of January 30, 1581/2, called his wife Jane Jobson, and left property to John and Robert, the sons of Jane Jobson (S.S. 22, p. cxv-vii)

century the unusual care with which marriages of the clergy were sometimes entered in parish registers shows the doubt which was still liable to be thrown upon their legality. For example, beside the entry in Chester-le-Street parish register of the marriage on May 30, 1586, of Thomas Liddell, "minister of Chester" and Agnes Cragg, it was noted that the Bishop's license had been obtained as well as the consent of the parents, and to the entry of the marriage at Hesledon on November 23, 1585, of Henry Wanless, the vicar, were subjoined the names of the officiating clerk and of eight witnesses who were present, "with many others" (1). A change was noticeable during the last thirteen years of the reign. There does not seem any longer to have been a doubt of the legality of their marriages, and consequently an increasing number of the lesser clergy followed the example of the higher dignitaries. Records show that rather more than forty were married within this period, apart from those who had married in previous years (2).

During the whole period covered by Elizabeth's reign the chief sources of information on this subject

(1) Chester and Hesledon Parish Registers.

(2) Evidence of the marriage of the following clergy can be found in the registers of the parishes in which they officiated:- Roger Ackroyd, rector of Winston; William Stock and John Fell, curates of Auckland; Robert Throckmorton, vicar of Aycliffe; -- Davison, curate of Bishop Wearmouth; Nicholas Cockey, curate of Brancepeth; William Calam, vicar of Conniscliffe; William Murray, and John Watson, curates of St. Giles, Durham; Robert Dobson, curate of St. Nicholas's Durham; Cuthbert Hilles and -- Brown of St. Oswald's; John Craddock, vicar of Gainford; Francis Green, vicar of Grindon; Thomas Dickson, curate of Hamsterley; Francis Kaye and Giles Garthwaite vicars of Heighington; Robert Hutton, rector of Houghton-le-Spring; James Nelson, curate of Ryton; Marmaduke Blakiston, rector of Sedgefield; John Wood, curate of Sedgefield; Thomas Imgemethorpe, rector of Stainton; Ambrose Lowther and William Lawson curates of Earsdon; William Morton, vicar of Newcastle; Michael Frisell, curate of Gosforth; John Murray, curate of St. John's, Newcastle; and John Knaisdayke, curate of All Saint's, Newcastle. Evidence of the marriage of the following clergy is to be found in the registers of St. Mary le Bow or St. Mary the Less, Durham:- Christopher Smith and John Philpot, minor canons, and Christopher Boycke. These also were married:- Thomas Benyon, vicar of Embleton (St. Giles' Par. Reg.); Robert Murray, vicar

(Cont.)

are the parish registers of the churches of the two counties, but some of these registers are not available and some only begin rather late in the century; the information which they give can be supplemented, and also checked, from other sources, such as wills (1), but nevertheless it remains true that many more clergy must have been married than is now apparent. What evidence does exist, seems to show that comparatively few were married before the time of the rebellion, but that, in later years, when less doubt was entertained of the legality of the proceeding, the custom became fairly general. Originally the greater number of those who were married were men with advanced Puritan views, but this was no longer the case at the end of the century; the fact, however, that the clergy were getting married in increasing numbers may be taken as an indication of the spread of Protestant ideas; ~~and~~ moreover, the practice gave rise to a new generation who were bred up in the Protestant outlook of their fathers.

Some of the sons of the married clergy were ordained, and themselves obtained benefices within Durham or Northumberland; Richard Colmore, the second son of Prebendary Clement Colmore, became rector of Elton in 1608 (2), while another son, Mathew, succeeded his father in 1619 as rector of Brancepeth (3). The Puritan, Thomas Clerke, seems to have been succeeded in his vicarage of Berwick by his son Richard (4); Robert

of Pittington (S.S. 95, p. 264); Ralph Billingham, curate of St. Margaret's (Arch. Ael. 4th. Ser. III, p. 153); George Wrightson, curate of Ebchester (Surtees II, p. 337); Henry Ewbank, prebendary, (St. Oswald's Par. Reg.); John Calhill, rector of Redmanshall (Egglescliffe Par. Reg.) John Robson, vicar of Hart (Greatham Par. Reg.); and Toby Mathew the Dean of Durham (St. Nicholas, Newc. Par. Reg.)

(1) Such checking is often advisable because the names of the clergy are sometimes entered in the registers as if they were laymen, consequently if they were married, or their children baptised, in any churches but those of which they were incumbent, the fact of their marriage may escape notice. (2) Surtees III, p. 211. This was evidently the Richard who was baptised June 21, 1584, at St. Mary le Bow. (3) Conyers-Surtees, "Hist. of Brancepeth Church", p. 19. (4) cf. he made Richard executor of his will of 1589, and a Richard Clarke became vicar in the same year - cf. Randall X, 145-6; Par. Reg.

Blakiston succeeded his father, Prebendary Marmaduke Blakiston, as rector of Sedgefield in 1631, and two of his brothers also became clergymen (1). James Fernside, a son of the rector of Whickam of the same name, became vicar of Long Benton in 1621; (2); Mathias Wrightson was a son of George Wrightson, the curate of Ebchester, and was himself curate of Esh from 1623, to which he added the curacy of Ebchester on his father's resignation in 1626 (3). In addition, instances occur of sons of beneficed clergy of Durham diocese obtaining ecclesiastical promotions in other parts of England (4). The Queen's objection to married clergy was seen in an Act of 1575 which, after pointing out that ample revenues were granted to the clergy so that they might show hospitality, and that many had neglected this duty and kept fewer servants so that they might reserve their income for the children, ordered that all bishops, deans, masters of colleges, and other clergy should retain as many servants as they had employed in 1539, and that their wives should give themselves to prayer, alms deeds, and ministering to the poor (5). To what extent this injunction was put into effect does not appear, but at least it is certain that in many cases, not only the clergy themselves, but also their wives and members of their families frequently stood as godparents at the baptism of both rich and poor children of their parishes (6).

The names of godparents were only entered in a few of the parish registers of the time. The Puritans wished to discontinue the use of sponsors altogether, and there are indications that their attitude with regard to the baptismal service was being adopted by some of the clergy of Durham and Northumberland. As, after the accession of Elizabeth, Cardinal Pole's order of 1555 for the entry of names of sureties in registers was no longer enforced (7), failure to enter their names cannot be held, generally, to imply that the incumbent

(1) Surtees III, p. 32, 163. (2) N.C.H. XIII, p.402; He was baptised at Whickham in 1589 (3) Surtees I, p. 337, 302. (4) e.g. Richard, the son of Richard Holdsworth, the vicar of Newcastle, became a prebendary of Lincoln, Dean of Worcester, etc. (Brand, I, p. 304; Welford III, p. 106-7). He was baptised Dec. 20, 1590 (pAr. Reg.) (5) Cal. S.P. Dom. VII, p. 478. (6) e.g. in Boldon, Richard Fawcett, the rector, his wife Agnes, and some of his children were often sureties (Par. Reg.); similarly Mrs. Dampont, the wife of the curate of Escombe, Jane Green, the wife of the vicar of Grindon, were sometimes sureties (Parish Registers; cf.

had dispensed with their services, in the manner of the minister of St. Olave's, Southwark who, Machyn records, christened a child without a godfather, and upon the midwife remonstrating, stated that it was only a ceremony (1). In many cases it is evident that sponsors had taken part in the service, even if their names were only entered in the case of christenings of children of the more important parishioners (2); similarly in most of the parishes in which their names were entered irregularly, or never at all, they had, it is probable, actually been present. (3). Even, however, if this is true the failure to register their names in many of the parishes of the counties seems to suggest that no great importance was attached to the part which they played, although they may have been employed in accordance with the rules generally laid down by episcopal injunctions (4). In some cases, moreover, it may be suspected that the incumbent actually took the service without their active participation. It is noticeable that in the parish register of Easington, which begins in 1590, the names of godparents are not given until 1604, that is to say they were omitted until the death, in 1603, of the Puritan John Pilkington, who, as archdeacon of Durham, was rector of the parish from 1563 (5). They were omitted in the register of Middleton-in-Teesdale of which Leonard Pilkington was incumbent; at Whickham where James Fernside was rector; at Witton Gilbert where Laurence Pilkington was incumbent for many years; at Berwick, and also in such parishes as Eggescliffe, Gainford, Gateshead, Houghton-le-Spring, Redmarshall, and Ryton which were generally held by some of the more advanced prebendaries such as Henry Maunton, William Birche, Clement Colmore, Emanuel Barnes, or Francis Bunny (6). The fact, therefore, that their names were not registered in many of the parishes which were held by men of known Puritan sympathies makes it possible that in these and in other parishes their use was either discontinued, or at least held of small importance.

also the register of St. Nicholas', Newcastle, etc.

(7) R.E.C. Waters, "Parish Registers", p. 8.

(1) Diary - Cam. Soc. 1st. Ser. vol. 42, p.242.

(2) e.g. this was the case at Chester, Conniscliffe, Denton, Dinsdale, Merrington, Pittington, and Sedgfield.

(3) They are entered irregularly, in the registers of St. Andrew's, Auckland, Boldon, and Grindon. (4) Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I, p. cxi-iii.

(5) Hutchinson II, p.220-1. (6) cf. Surtees II, p. 118, 264; I, p. 156;

III, p.200, 71; IV, p. 12.

In Newcastle, however, the names of sureties were given regularly from February 1575/6; possibly Mackbray's negligence in this respect had been the occasion of a special monition to the clergy of the town.(1). It must also be added that Barnes' injunctions of 1577 contain no order to enforce their use, which may imply either his sympathy with the Puritans on this head, or, on the other hand, that they were generally employed.

The Puritan clergy of the Lower House of Convocation who had declared, in 1563, against the use of sponsors, also wished to abolish lay-baptism(2). Bishop Barnes taking his stand upon the same ground, in 1577 forbade any woman to baptize, and enjoined that ministers should baptize in the private houses only in cases of extreme necessity. His injunction was partly directed against Recusants, for he ordered the clergy to present the names of any woman who acted in contravention of this injunction, or who used superstitious ceremonies at births, and an injunction of the Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry shows that, under the protection of the Prayer Book, Recusants were administering private baptism (3). Entries in parish registers of burials of unchristened children, which are fairly common, seem, however, to show that in this respect the Puritan attitude adopted by the Bishop proved acceptable to many of the clergy and people (4). The Puritans were also opposed to the use of the sign of the cross at baptism, and as early as 1568 a curate of Barnard Castle was accused of failing to use it (5). In some dioceses their practices led to frequent injunctions that the use of the font

(1) The registers of St. John's and St. Andrew's, Newcastle, begin respectively in 1587/8 and 1597, and the names of godparents are nearly always given.

(2) Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I, p. clvi-vii.

(3) S.S. 22, p. 18; Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I, p. cxi-iii.

(4) Barnes had ordered that unbaptised children should be buried in the churchyard, although not with the usual rites (S.S. 22, p.18). There are several such entries in St. Oswald's Parish Register - cf. 1586-7, 1590; cf. also the registers of St. Andrew, Auckland, Coniscliffe, Greatham, Heighington, Pitlington, Newcastle etc.

(5) cf. above p.452.

must continue, and as Barnes included the font in his list of furniture which had to be provided in all churches (1), it is possible that its removal had been undertaken in certain parishes.

There is some evidence that active opposition was experienced in the two counties from the Puritan wing of the Church with regard to the prescribed minimum of clerical apparel. Dean Whittingham, and a few of his colleagues of the cathedral, had given trouble in this respect in 1564-6, when the ornaments rubric was enforced, and after 1570 their attitude seems to have been shared by some of the parochial clergy. In accordance with the orders laid down by the "Interpretations" of 1561, and the "Advertisements" of 1566, Archbishop Grindal enjoined the use of the surplice at all services (2). Barnes found it necessary to include in his articles a strict injunction that the clergy should wear surplices at the ministration of the sacraments, and dark cloaks out of doors (3); and in 1578 and 1590 Archbishop Sandys and Archbishop Piers made inquiry whether this injunction was carried out (4). Records of the attitude which made such articles necessary survive in the case of Ralph Smith, the curate of Gainford, who was charged by the churchwardens in 1586 with failure to wear his surplice for holy communions, baptisms, and marriages (5).

Although, even after the rebellion, an attempt to check Recusancy still dominated the regulations made by episcopal injunctions for the northern province, certain articles were directed against Puritans, and show that they were becoming of some importance. Grindal enjoined in 1571 that churchwardens should present to the Ordinary the names of maintainers of sectaries, disturbers of divine service, and keepers of secret conventicles, preachings, or lectures (6). Similarly Piers, at his metropolitanical visitation of 1590, made inquiry of the churchwardens concerning any innovations introduced by the clergy, and, in orders laid down for the province in the following year, gave instructions that clergy deviating from the rites of the

(1) Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I, p. cxi-iii; S.S.22, p. 25. cf. in the Pittington churchwardens' accounts of 1588 there is an item for 2/6 for moving the font (S.S. 84, p. 27). (2) Frere, "Visit. Arts." III, p. 161, 275. (3) S.S. 22, p. 17. (4) Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." II, p. 91; III, p. 260. (5) S.S. 22, p. 131. (6) Frere, "Visit. Arts." III, p. 293.

Prayer Book were to be dealt with according to the law (1).

The churchwardens were in part responsible for the maintenance of the forms of the established religion within their own parishes. Proceedings were taken against them if the prescribed furniture or books were lacking in their churches. In his injunctions of 1577 Barnes ordered that the "Postils" and "Defence of the Apology" should be obtained and kept within each church, as well as the two books of Homilies, the Queen's Injunctions, the Bishop's own monitions, and various other books such as a Bible and a communion book (2). The Paraphrases of Erasmus were not specifically mentioned in this list, but, after being first enjoined by the Royal Injunctions of 1547, they had been ordered for the northern province by Grindal in 1571, and records of proceedings against churchwardens in the ensuing years of Barnes' episcopate show that their possession was considered necessary (3). "The Defence of the Apology" was issued in 1567, and Barnes seems to have wished to substitute it for the "Apology"; the latter book had been translated in 1564, when it was ordered that a copy of it should be placed in parish churches. The "Postils", or expositions upon the epistles and gospels, had been written abroad chiefly by Nicholas Heming, a Dane, but they had later been translated; their public use was probably confined to Durham diocese (4). Some of these books, and in particular the Paraphrases, represented an advanced doctrinal standard, but although it was found that the churchwardens of certain parishes had failed to procure them, their general use seems to have been effectively enforced, and — as extracts already quoted from the works of Dr. Jackson show — they were set as the basis of exhortations to be delivered by some of the clergy (5). Probably the incumbent of the parish sometimes

(1) Kennedy "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I, p.cxciv-vi. (2) S.S. 22, p.25. (3) Frere, "Visit. Arts" II, p. 117-8; III, p. 283-4. In 1579 there was office taken against the churchwardens of Hart and Wardon for failure to procure the Paraphrases (S.S. 22, p. 124-5.) (4) S.S. 22, p.25-6. (5) In 1579-80 the wardens of Escombe, Seaham, Trimdon, Haydon, Bridge, Croxdale, and Cornhill were in trouble for failure to obtain either the "Postils" or "Apology", cf. S.S. 22, p. 115-129; Raine, "N. Durham", p.323. The lists of books in two churches at this period survive, and may be given here. The list for Billingham appears in the parish register:- "Imprimis, a great Bible Paraphrasis; iiii Communion Books; Jewell and Harding; Book of Injunctions; a Book of Homilies;

bought the books himself, and presented them to the church; Francis Trollope, for example, by his will of 1579 left to Sockburn church (of which he was vicar) the Paraphrases, the Homilies, the Postills, the Injunctions, and also Nowell's Catechism (1).

Signs of the growth of Puritanism can also be found in other matters for which the churchwardens were chiefly responsible. The Royal Order of 1561, which was directed against Puritan spoliation, had enjoined that, although rood lofts were to be transformed, chancel screens should not be destroyed (2); nevertheless metropolitan visitations articles for the northern province suggest that, in some churches, the screens themselves had been removed (3). Again, although whitewashing of churches cannot be regarded simply as a debasing idea of post-Reformation times, the substitution in the last decade of the century in such churches as St. Oswald's and St. Margaret's in Durham, of whitewashed walls painted with sentences of Scripture (4) for the old style of mural decoration, seems to suggest the influence of Puritan ideas. On the other hand, although the Puritans were opposed to the use of organs, and succeeded in effecting their removal in certain parts of England (5), there is no evidence of an attack upon them or upon church music within Durham and Northumberland. Organs are recorded to have been left at three churches in Durham county by the commissioners of 1553 — whose duty it was to take possession of a certain amount of ecclesiastical property for the use of the King — and it is evident that they continued in use (6). In the Protestant

Nicholas Heminge Book; a book of Wilful Rebellion" (cf. Surtees III, p. 147.) The list for Pitlington appears in the book of churchwardens' accounts:—"1 new Bible and 1 old.1 Psalter, 2 communion books, Paraphrases of Erasmus. Apology of Jewell. Queen's Injunctions; 2 books of Homilies, Heming's Postills. Account Book of the Churchwardens, Register" (S.S. 84, p. 11-12.)

(1) Wills & Invs. I, p. 226-7. (2) Frere, "Visit. Arts." III, p. 108-9. (3) Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I, p. lxxiii-iv. (4) cf. S.S. 84, p. 123.

(5) e.g. at St. Martin's Leicester, etc. cf. Cox "Churchwardens' Accounts", p. 183, 196-8.

(6) i.e. they were left at Embleton in Sedgely, St. Margaret's, Durham, and Houghton-le-Spring (S.S. 97, p. 142, 144-5). The organ at Houghton occurs in the churchwarden's accounts of 1600-2; (S.S. 84, p. 278-80); there was also an organ at Morpeth in 1552 (S.S. 97, p. 165.)

town of Berwick Sir Francis Leek proposed, in 1560, not only an increase in the salaries of the vicar and curate but also that two singing men should be maintained, at stipends of £13-6-8 each (1). An organ was in use in the church of St. John in Newcastle in 1571, (2) while in the cathedral itself, despite Dean Horn's disapproval, there is ample evidence that the organ was generally used, and the calvinistic Dean Whittingham always encouraged the use of music in the services (3).

Hitherto attention has been concentrated chiefly upon the clergy in seeking for signs of the growth of Protestantism in the two counties, but it is necessary now to take into consideration not only their attitude, but also, that of the laity in general. On this subject wills are the chief sources of information. Because the Protestant reformers grounded their position upon the understanding of the Bible by all the laity, Bible reading took in their eyes an equally important place with preaching; but although schools were set up and an attempt made to encourage vernacular education the great majority of the population were illiterate. This fact is strikingly apparent in the wills of the period, which were generally drawn up by the incumbent of the parish or the curate because of the inability of the testator to write. The duty, not only of visiting the sick, but also of moving them to draw up their wills, was actually enjoined upon the parochial clergy by episcopal injunctions (4), and ample evidence exists that they fulfilled this duty, generally being rewarded for their services as scribes by a small fee or legacy (5). The illiteracy of the people and the price of books necessarily limited the possession of Bibles to the richer classes, such as the merchants of Newcastle; but it is nevertheless startling to find that, in all the wills and inventories of the laity published for this period, Bibles or Testaments are only mentioned in eighteen cases, all of

(1) Scott, "Berwick", p. 351. (2) Welford II, p.445.

(3) Cox, "Churchwardens' Accounts," p. 196; Cam. Soc. Misc. VI, "Life of Whittingham," p. 23; Treas. Bks. D. & Chap. Treas.

(4) cf. Grindal's Injunctions of 1571 - Frere, "Visit. Arts." III, p. 3, 280.

(5) cf. in the 1571 will of John Heworth, a quarryman of Gateshead - "Paid to the parson making the will, and writing it over thrice", 6/8" (S.S. 50, p. 287.), cf. also Sharpe, "Chron. Mirab." p.22. Sometimes, it must be said, they performed this service very badly - cf. the will of Francis Armourer of Belford of 1576 which was drawn up by Laurence Duncan, the curate there (Wills & Invs. I, p. 404-5). In very rare cases the testator, being a

which, moreover, belong to the last two decades of the century. It is true that the owners in four of these cases, were, if not Recusants, at least conservatives in religion (1), but the remainder were probably people of Protestant views, and some were undoubtedly extremists. Sometimes in addition to their Bible certain of the laity possessed books which can leave no doubt of their religious opinions; ~~for example~~ for example Fox's "Acts and Monuments", or "Book of Martyrs", was enumerated amongst the books of Mrs. Whittingham; of Nicholas Ridley of Willimoteswick, who belonged to the same family as Bishop Ridley; of William Carey of Berwick, who was related to Lord Hunsdon; of Thomas Toby, a barber-surgeon of Newcastle, and of Robert Atkinson, a merchant of that town, who also owned a book written by Peter Martyr. Calvin's commentaries upon the Psalms also occasionally occur (2). An interesting sentence from the will of John Burrell of Headlam may be quoted, for it is significant of the fact that — even if the private possession of Bibles was rare, in accordance with the ideas of the reformers — the people of the two counties were beginning to base their beliefs upon their reading of the Bible. In this will, dated July 3, 1585, Burrell declared: "My ground and belief is, that there is but one God, and one mediator between God and man, the which is Christ Jesu, according as I find it written in the Scriptures of God, canonical." (3).

This quotation calls attention to a point which has already been observed in an earlier chapter. It has been shown that the accession of Elizabeth was

layman, records that he has written the will with his own hand - e.g. Wills & Invs. II, p.281; III, p.78)

(1) i.e. William Lee of E. Brandon, who had been steward to Westmorland; John Eden, the father of the rebel of 1569; Robert Booth of Old Durham, a noted Recusant; and John Farbeck, a mercer of Durham (Wills & Invs. II, p. 43-4, 209, 282, 330), who was perhaps the "Firbeck of Durham" who, c. 1592, persuaded a seminarist to come to the North (Cal. S.P. Dom. III, p. 261-3).

(2) Wills & Invs. II, p. 15-16, 122, 139, 150, 264; III, p. 116. For other wills in which Bibles occur cf Ibid, II, p. 54, 155, 215, 229, 264-7, 299, 303; III, p. 109; Welford III, p. 24-5, 91. Service books, primers, etc. occur in Wills & Invs. I, p. 362; II, p. 251. Note that

Fox, the martyrologist, was a prebendary of Durham, 1572-3. (3) Wills & Invs. II, p. 111.

marked by a great and immediate decrease in the number of wills containing the customary invocation of the prayers of the Virgin and Saints, and also that such requests for their mediation became exceptional after 1570. The three volumes of wills and inventories published by the Surtees Society, although they are rich in Elizabethan wills, only contain five examples of this old form for the last three decades of the reign, and one of these is in the Will of the noted Recusant, Richard Hodgson of Newcastle (1), while in two other cases the testator, although he commended his soul to the Virgin^{and} Saints as well as to God, expressly adds a clause to the effect that he hopes for forgiveness by the merits of Christ's death (2).

The reformers condemned invocation of the prayers of the Saints, and the practical cessation of such invocations in Durham and Northumberland after 1570 is significant of the growth of Protestantism in the two counties. Instead, the wills of the period generally open, either with a commendation of the soul of the testator to God alone, or else without any commendatory clause at all. Fairly often, however, the belief in the efficacy of the prayers of the Saints seems to be definitely set aside by some such statement as that of John Burrell—of the belief of the testator that Christ is the only mediator—and in several cases — where there is laid down the sufficiency of His death alone to secure salvation — an approach is found to the doctrine of justification by faith. Such phraseology was occasionally adopted in the earlier years of the reign, (3) but the examples of it are more in number, and more striking in character, in the years following the rebellion. The position which these testators tended to adopt had been set forth in its extreme form as early as 1531 by Roger Dichaunte, a merchant of Newcastle, who was tried for heresy because he had stated "That it is but vain to pray to Saints, because Christ is only our Mediator", and "Also that, because we be justified by faith, no good work neither commanded by God nor invented by man can make us acceptable to God" (4)

(1) Wills & Invs. II, p. 115. In his will, however, the words "and to all the blessed company of heaven" are struck out. (2) Wills & Invs. I, p. 401; III, p. 65. For the 2 other wills containing the old invocation cf. Ibid, p. 69; I, p. 431. (3) cf. above p. 439-40. (4) S.S. 21, p. 45.

In the published wills of the clergy of the two counties not one example can be found of the invocation of the saints after 1561, but on the other hand there are a good many examples available for the post-rebellion period of the priest affirming his belief in the sufficiency of Christ's death to secure salvation (1). In this respect the will of the late monk, William Bennet, is peculiarly interesting for it shows his affection for the old doctrine of justification by works on which, however, he had superimposed the beliefs of the reformers. Having outlived most of his brother monks, he made his will in 1583, and wrote: "First I bequeath my soul into the merciful hands of God, through Jesus Christ, our Saviour, by whose merits and passion only I hope to be saved, beseeching Him of his infinite goodness to give me grace and so to live whiles I am here, that I may die His faithful servant." (2). Equally noteworthy is the will of Bernard Gilpin. Brought up in the Church of Rome, he had slowly been convinced by the doctrines of the reformers, and his declaration of his faith is that of a thoughtful and sincere adherent of the Protestant religing. Dating his will October 17, 1582, he began: "First I bequeath and commend my soul into the hands of Almighty God, my creator, not trusting in mine own merits, which am myself a most wretched sinner, but only in the mercy of God, and in the merits of Jesus Christ, my Redeemer and Saviour; for that I am taught by His holy apostles, that there is none other name under the heaven, given to man, wherein we must be saven, but only in the name of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, neither is there any other salvation" (3).

Turning now to the laity: an even nearer approach to the doctrine of justification by faith is found in the testament of 1592 of George Rochester, a Newcastle saddler, whose will opens as follows: "I, George Rochester do from my heart, with a lively faith in the name of my Saviour Christ Jesus, recommend my soul to tham that gave it, craving mercy and forgiveness of my sins in the mediation of mine only saviour, being verily persuaded that for the death and passion of the same, my soul shall be partaker of bliss, presently after the departure of thereof out of my wretched body, and therefore I renounce my work,s, seem they never so good, and of

(1) cf. Wills & Invs. I, p. 377-9, 426-7; II, p. 8-11; 145-6; S.S. 22, p. cx-xv, cxxix-xxxiv. (2) S.S. 22 p. cxviii. (3) Wills & Invs. II, p. 84.

cleave only to the mercy of my Heavenly Father, and Christ my Saviour." (1). Wills of the same period containing a very similar profession of faith are those of John Hudson and William Shell, merchants of Newcastle and Alnwick; John Heath, the co-founder with Gilpin of Kepier school; John Whetacre of Durham; and John Ironside of Houghton-le-Spring (2). In addition, examples can be multiplied after 1570 of wills in which the Testators, being laymen, set forth their dependence upon the merits of Christ's death alone, to secure salvation (3). It is true that in two cases the Saints are mentioned in the opening clauses even as late as this period, but only, however, with the pious hope that, through the merits of Christ's death, the testator may join their company in heaven (4).

The belief in Christ as the only mediator, and in the salvation wrought by His death alone, was coupled with the renunciation of the old doctrine of purgatory, and the discontinuance of masses, diriges, and prayers for the dead. It has already been shown that, while there are indications that masses and commemorations for the souls of the departed were still employed, possibly even after the time of the rebellion, the reign of Elizabeth had nevertheless ushered in a striking change in this respect also. Whereas requests for masses or prayers were very common in wills made before her accession, after 1558 only six cases occur of similar requests, and four of them belonging to the period before 1565 (5). Bishop Pilkington in making his will in 1572 wrote, "My body I commit to be buried at the discretion of my friends, so that it be with as few Popish ceremonies as may be, or vain cost;" (6); his

(1) Wills & Invs. III, p. 151-2. (2) Ibid, I, p.437; II, p. 279; III, p. 103; Welford III p. 24-5; Surtees IV, p. 71. (3) cf. Wills & Invs I, p. 357, 375, 383, 386, 394, 5, 416, 424, 437; II, p. 7, 8, 24; III p. 93, 145, 156, 159, 170. (4) Ibid II, p. 313; III, p. 154. (5) above p. 445. The two cases of the period after 1565 are to be found in the 1582 will of Richard Marshall, the registrar, and in the 1583 will of Edward Lynne of Whitworth. The will of the former shows that he had some connection with Thomas Watson, the Marian Dean of Durham, and the latter was evidently related to Robert Crawforth, the priest who took part in the rebellion of 1569, cf. Wills & Invs. II, p. 26; III, p. 98. (6) Wills & Invs. II, p. 8-11.

attitude, however, was more extreme than that of most of the people of the two counties, which may perhaps be typified by the following extract from the 1588 will of John Eden of Auckland: "I give unto the poor folk, to be distributed among them, in the day of my burial £6-13-4, not in consideration that I do believe that their prayers then can prevail anything for me, but to testify my good will toward them." (1). His words, showing clearly that he no longer held the old belief in the efficacy of prayers for the dead, are the more noteworthy as coming from one whose family was involved in the rebellion of 1569, and who was probably himself in most ways a conservative in religion (2).

Prayers and masses for the dead tended to be replaced by funeral feasts and sermons. Funeral feasts, while not exclusively post-Reformation, or confined to those with Protestant views, became more common in the later decades of the century (3), and whereas, in the published wills of the period, only one request for a funeral sermon can be found before 1570, such requests are comparatively frequent after that date, although the expenses involved generally seem to have limited them to people of property (4). Humphrey Hancock of Ponteland by his will of May 15, 1579, left 10/- to pay for a funeral sermon, which he wished to be preached by John Mackbray, or else by "that godly and learned man, Master Francis Bunny, parson of Ryton, upon the text 'Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord', or else to entreat of the resurrection." (5). Bunny and the successive vicars of Newcastle were evidently popular preachers at funerals; on May 18, 1595, Mrs. Barbara Mitford was buried at Hesledon, and Richard Holdsworth, Mackbray's successor at Newcastle, preached the sermon; but on May 16, 1596, at the burial of Henry Mitford in the same parish, a hired preacher was employed (6). Money

(1) Ibid, p. 326. (2) Note also the will of William Browne of Gateshead of 1567 from which the following extract is taken:- "there is no sanctification, no redemption, nor purgation of sin but only by the merits of the Christ's death and passion, and all other superstitions and feigned cattells only devised to illude the simple and unlearned as the vile abuse of the see of Rome, I utterly detest and abhor". (Wills & Invs. I, p.273).
(3) cf. above p.447-8. William Melmerley, the vicar of Merrington who had taken part in the rebellion, left money for a dinner for his neighbours, and so did Francis Trollope, the vicar of Sockburn (S.S. 22, p. cxvii-viii; Wills & Invs. I, p. 426-7). (4) above p.447-8.
(5) Welford III, p. 27 (6) Hesledon Par. Reg.

disbursed at the funeral of Sir John Forster included 50/- paid to some cooks; £18-8-6 paid for banqueting stuff; and a payment of £5 to Mr. Murton, the preacher; this Mr. Murton was the William Morton who had become vicar of Newcastle in 1596. (1). Sometimes the Bishop preached, as on the occasion of the funeral of John Boast — the seminarist executed in 1594 — when Bishop Mathew delivered the sermon, and is recorded to have said "It was pity so much worth should have died that day." (2).

In Wills, episcopal registers, parish registers and other documents of the time, occasionally words and expressions were used which have a distinct flavour of Puritanism. The term "minister" was generally made use of by the reforming clergy who wished to evade the discredited title of "priest" (3), and in the registers of Bishop Pilkington and Bishop Barnes, in records of institutions or in ordination lists, the Puritan title "preacher of God's word", or "minister" was often used (4). In certain parishes the incumbents or curates were nearly always referred to as preachers. In Berwick, after 1565, this title was not confined to the special preachers provided for by the new orders of 1565; Thomas Clerke, who became vicar of Berwick in 1567, referred to himself, as "preacher" in his will of 1589, and again, in the entry of his burial on April 24 of that year he was entered not as vicar of the town, but as "preacher" (5). Similarly his successor, Richard Clerke, was generally spoken of as "preacher", and so were other clergy, some of whom were probably curates of the parish (6). The clergy of Newcastle were often given the same title. In the parish register of St. Nicholas' church, on November 16, 1583, the burial of John Mackbray was recorded when he was entered as "preacher"; on September 5, 1596, the burial of "Mrs. Richard Holdsworth vicar and preacher of God's word," occurs, while William Morton

(1) N.C.H. I, p. 159; cf. also Surtees II, p. 265.

(2) Sharpe, p. 312.

(3) cf. Frere, "Marian

Reaction," p. 114-5.

(4) cf. T.R.; Barnes' Reg.;

S.S. 22, p. c-ci.

(5) Randall X, p. 146; Par. Reg.

(6) cf. Richard Clerke is called "preacher" in the parish register in 1590, and 1606, when the burial of his wife and his own burial are entered. Other clergy of Berwick referred to as preacher include Edward Dawes, "preacher and blind", who was buried in 1578, Cuthbert Strother in c.1565, William Clerk and William Selby in 1604 (Scott, "Berwick", p. 352-3. Selby became vicar of Berwick in 1607).

was generally entered as "preacher of God's word" on the many occasions when he acted as surety at baptisms (1). A similar designation was applied to the incumbents of Gateshead, Whickham, Woodhorn, Hartburn, and Simondburn, (2) and although the term chiefly implied that the incumbent was a licensed preacher, its general use was significant of the increased importance attached to the sermon. Wills, moreover, show that the old term "altar" was also being replaced amongst the ordinary people by a new term made appropriate by royal and episcopal injunctions, and so, for example, Gawin Clavering of Callaley in 1580 bequeathed "to the church of Whittingham so much as will buy a cloth of green for the table in the choir." (3). Other names and phrases appearing in parish registers, wills and inventories, are also indicative of the growth of Puritanism (4). Finally, in this connection, the opening portion of the will of Sir John Forster may be quoted. Written in 1601, it reads, "I, John Forster of Alnwick Abbey within the county of Northumberland, Knight, considering that I am a stranger upon earth, and know not how soon it will please my Lord the God to call me out of this perplexed sinful state of life unto the Mount Sion to the city of the living God, the celestial Jerusalem, to the Assembly and congregation of the firstborn, which are written in heaven and to the presence of the mighty God where there is safety of joys for evermore..... therefore make my will." (5) Such phrases and terms were not, however, very common, even at the end of the century.

While the preceding chapter has shown the strength of Recusancy in the two counties, supported as it was by the late rebels of 1569, many of whom had retained much of

(1) Similarly James Bamford, William Allanson, William Pearson, one Smathwaite, and Robert Hagthropp generally appear as preachers — some of them were definitely employed in this capacity - cf. Welford III, p. 106-7, 109; St. Nicholas Par. Reg; Wills & Invs. III, p. 177, 167. (2) St. Nich's. Par. Reg. Whickham Par. Reg; Cal.S.P. Dom. IV, p. 502; III, p. 555; V, p. 217. (3) Wills & Invs. II, p. 34; cf. also III, p. 145, 153. (4) cf. the inventory of Robert Barker of Newcastle, of c.1590, to which is prefixed the names of the appraisers with the opening "Praise God Always" (Ibid II, p. 178); and the baptism of an illegitimate child in 1598 at Sedgfield which is entered thus: "Forsaken, filius meretrix Agnetis Walton" (Waters, "Parish Registers," p. 38). (5) N.C.H. I, p. 158.

their property and influence, the facts given in this chapter equally show that the work of the reformers was beginning to take effect. None of the clergy were deprived for Recusancy after 1572, but, on the other hand, their acceptance of the new régime and new doctrines is illustrated in their wills in which the invocation of the mediation of the saints is no longer to be found, but, in its place, the elements of the doctrine of justification by ~~faith~~^{faith}; it is also apparent in the growing proportion of those who were married, and in the raising of the standard of learning amongst them, largely as the result of the work of Bishop Barnes. The last mentioned trait is significant of the attempt which was being made to teach the new doctrines to the laity, both by means of regular instruction in the catechism and the elements of religion,^{and} also by an increase in the amount of active preaching. Although there was a shortage of preachers until the end of the century it is nevertheless true that the old style clergyman, who was often almost as much a soldier as a priest, was giving place to his more learned brother, who was obliged to give at least a minimum of religious instruction to his parishioners, and who was sometimes, in addition, a licensed schoolmaster. Bibles were only possessed by a very small proportion of the population, but it has been shown that the people were beginning to base their faith upon their own reading of the Scriptures, for practically all churches possessed one or two Bibles, and also certain prescribed books, some of which were of a very Protestant nature. Wills illustrate the fact that the laity, as well as the clergy, had abandoned the old belief in the efficacy of the mediation of the Saints and of prayers and masses for the dead.

From this account it is also evident that extremist views were held by a certain section both of the clergy and of the laity, and that the influence of these Puritans was making itself felt in several directions. Generally the most learned clergy, such as William Birche, and the most active preachers, such as Francis Bunny and John Mackbray, were to be found in their ranks, and the attempts which were made to raise the standard of clerical learning, and to provide a larger number of preachers, reflect their work. Similarly, the fact that originally nearly all the married clergy were extremists in doctrine, illustrates the spread of their ideas. Episcopal injunctions show certain articles directed against the innovations which they strove to introduce into church services. There is positive proof, in a few cases, of their opposition to certain ceremonies connected with the

baptismal service and to the ornaments rubric and, particularly after 1572, several deprivations may be ascribed to the growth of Puritanism; while the presence of Scottish ministers, unlicensed clergy, and ministers without letters of orders serving cures within the two counties, was probably due to the same cause. That some of the laity shared their opinions is proved by wills and other documents which, in their very language, and in the books which are thus shown to have been possessed by some of them, give sufficient evidence of the religious opinions of these people. Nevertheless the records of ecclesiastical administration, even until the end of the century, suggest that the problem presented by the increasing influence of the Puritans was of small importance, compared to the problem of rooting out Catholicism from the two counties, and investigation of surviving sources of information on the subject tends inevitably to the conclusion that, at most, it can only be said that the majority of the people had adopted what may be termed a neutral Protestantism; they were generally, by constraint, law-abiding in their acceptance of the established religion, but they probably felt little enthusiasm for the new forms. On the other hand, by the zeal of the few, a real attempt was being made, by preaching and teaching, both in churches and in schools to bring up the new generation in the understanding of the reformed doctrines.

CHAPTER X.
THE SCHOOLS OF THE TWO COUNTIES.

SECTION I, THE PROVISION FOR EDUCATION BEFORE THE
REFORMATION.

It is the opinion of one writer upon schools that "The ancient provision of secular education in 'the Bishopric' of Durham, before the Reformation, was in all probability far greater relatively to the population than that made at any other period, until we come to the present century." (1). The early sixteenth century was, in fact, marked by a widespread interest in learning and in education; new foundations, such as St. Paul's school, London, and Wolsey's school in Ipswich, and new chantry schools, show that this interest was not confined to the monarch who himself dabbled in theology, poetry and music. The practice of scattering hand bills, which now became common in times of political trouble, and the production by the reformers of books in English evidently were based on the assumption that a fair proportion of the people could read (2). In Northumberland this increased interest is shown by the foundation, in 1542, of a new school in Morpeth, where before only a chantry had existed, and also by the will, of 1525 of Thomas Horsley of Newcastle, which was to result, some twenty years later, in the establishment of the school bearing his name (3).

The two counties were, however, already fairly well supplied with educational institutions. Vernacular or elementary instruction was sometimes given by the parish priest; sometimes in chantry schools — although these were more usually grammar schools — and sometimes by men who could at anyrate themselves read, although they were neither priests nor qualified grammar masters. Proof of the existence of vernacular schools can be found in the certificates of the chantry commissioners and in the records of Durham Priory, and in addition to them ^{there} were, in various places, song schools. Schools of this second type were never mere singing schools, but also provided elementary instruction.

Records seem to show that most of the monasteries of the two counties hardly concerned themselves at all with the advancement of learning amongst the laity; this, however, was not true of Durham Priory. The inventory of John Hymers of Holy Island of 1545 shows that money was due to him from certain individuals for the board

(1) A.F. Leech in *V.C.H.* I, p. 365. (2) N. Wood, "The Ref. and Eng. Educ," p. 2-5. (3) cf. below p. 650, pp.

of their sons or relatives, thus, in the words of Raine, going "far to prove that he was a schoolmaster upon the island." (1). Some years had already elapsed since the suppression of the cell of Holy Island in 1536-7, but it is possible that his school had been connected with the Priory. There was also a school in Norham from an early period, in the patronage of the Prior and convent of Durham (2), which may still have been in existence in the sixteenth century.

In Durham itself the Priory maintained a song school, of which the chief characteristics can be gathered from the indenture of February 17, 1536/7, appointing John Brimley as its master. By this agreement he promised to teach the monks and the eight secular boys whom the Prior or his deputy assigned to him for that purpose. He was to instruct them in plain song and pricknotes, the monks and one or two of the boys were to be taught to play the organ, and, on the accustomed days, he was to teach them their letters. In return the convent granted him £6-0-0 yearly, and three ells of woollen cloth, and also arranged that he should have his food and drink with the household of the Prior (3). The indenture of 1513, by which Thomas Hashewell had been appointed masters of the school, had assigned to him much the same duties, but had further specified that the teaching of letters was to take place on every holy day, four times a day, twice before noon and twice after noon, while in return he had been granted £10-0-0 yearly and three ells of cloth (4). Apparently, therefore, the stipend of the choirmaster had been diminished, but in the earlier instance board and lodging were not provided (5). From time to time the master was, in addition, the recipient of gratuities; for example in 1416-17 he was granted 2/6 by the commoner as a gratuity, and in 1536-7 a gift of 20d. from the bursar "ad ludum suum." (6). He was not only master of the choristers but was himself the organist, and in the account rolls of the monastery he is generally referred to as the "cantor".

Whereas the indenture of 1537 gave the number

(1) Wills & Invs. I, p. 114. (2) Raine, "N. Durham", p. 258. (3) Dun. Priory Reg. V. fol. 261-2.

(4) S.S. 9, p. ccccxliii-xiv. (5) In the Valor (V, p. 302) his stipend is given as £6-13-4, but this must have been included his allowance for clothing; note that here Brimley is already given as master.

(6) S.S. 100, p. 287, 695.

of the boys of the school as eight, it appears from the "Rites" and from the account rolls that there were only six. In the latter five "clericuli" or "pueri ecclesiae" and one "puer" or "gromus ecclesiae" are mentioned; in the feretrar's roll of 1504-5 an entry is made of the purchase of "liberatura" (togas perhaps, i.e. gowns) for the five boys of the church, and a similar item occurs in the 1507-8 roll; the sixth boy, the "gromus ecclesiae", at intervals received small sums, presumably for work performed in connection with the church (1). The school in which these boys were taught was in the cemetery garth, but as they had their meat and drink with the children of the Almonry (2), and as the boy-bishop, who was always chosen by the singing-boys from amongst their own number, was alternatively referred to in the rolls as "episcopo puerili" or "episcopo Elemosinario", it seems probable that it was closely connected with the Almonry grammar school, which was in effect, therefore, a twin song and grammar school (3).

Newminster Abbey evidently maintained a song school in which five ^{as well as four choristers} boys were taught (4); and in view of the provision of the foundation charter of the small house of the Trinitarian friars in Newcastle — that these friars should support three clerks to keep school in the chapel of their house — (5), it may probably be safely assumed that several of the other monasteries of the counties gave at least some vernacular instruction.

The certificates of the chantry commissioners of 1546 and 1548 prove the existence of three chantry schools in which elementary education was given. In both Alnwick and Durham there were twin schools, in each case, one being a grammar school and the other a song school. In 1548 William Hudson, who had been a canon of Alnwick Abbey, was one of the incumbents of the chantry of the Virgin in that town, and was in charge of the song school (6). The Durham schools were connected with the chantry in the Galilee chapel, and

- (1) S. S. 107, p.62-3; S.S. 100, p.306-7, 419.
- (2) S. S. 107, p.62-3.
- (3) cf. S.S.103, p.lxxiii-iii; Leach, in V.C.H. I, p.370, suggests that the choristers were chosen from amongst the Almonry boys, but cf. it is definitely stated in the "Valor" that the 30 poor scholars of the Almonry school study grammar (Valor V, p.303); the choristers must, therefore, have been additional to these thirty.
- (4) Minis.Accts. 27-9 Hen.VIII, No. 7371, m.46; above p.50.
- (5) Dugdale, VIII, p.1563.
- (6) S. S. 22, p.lxxxiii; cf. he was pensioned in the same year - below p.764.

in 1535 and 1546 William Cockey was one of the incumbents of this chantry and also master of the song-school (1). Sometimes in small places the reading, song and grammar schools were combined in one person; this was the case at Barnard Castle, where, in 1546, Peter Cowerd, incumbent of the gild of the Trinity, was master of a free song and grammar school for the children of the town (2). These are the only chantry schools of this class of which definite records remain, although there were probably many others, which may perhaps have existed without any precise foundation. There is, for example, some indication that there was a school at Bishop Wearmouth, for a return of August 3, 1586, to a commission on concealed lands gives details of many parcels of property which had belonged to the chantry of the Virgin in Bishop Wearmouth, and amongst these were a cottage, and a house called "theschool house" valued at 6d. (3).

It seems probable that there were song schools attached to some, if not to all, of the collegiate churches of Durham. No mention of such schools occurs in the chantry certificate of 1548, but on the other hand reference is made in the "Valor" to six lay choristers at Auckland college, and to a lay chanter at Darlington college. The richer hospitals would also be expected to support song schools, and here again the "Valor" gives some help, as it shows that four choristers were maintained at both Sherburn and Greatham hospitals; at Staindrop college or hospital there were two choristers in 1548 but in the "Clavis Ecclesiasticus" of Bishop Barnes there are stated to have been as many as eight (4). Newcastle certainly must have had vernacular schools, and the statement that on July 24, 1503, when Princess Margaret reached Newcastle on her way to Scotland to marry James IV, she was met at the end of the bridge by "many children revested of surplices, singing melodiously hymns and playing on instruments of many sorts" (5) implies the existence of more than one song school. Again there seems to have been a school of this class in

-
- (1) Valor V, p. 242; Aug. Off. Chantry Certif. 18, no.63
(2) Ibid, no. 85 (3) Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. no.3296.
(4) Valor V, p. 309, 315-6; S.S. 22, p. lxxiv-v.
(5) A.R. Laws, "Schola Novacastrensis", p. 10.

Brancepeth, for Lancelot Claxton, by his will of April 28, 1548, asked to be buried there, and left money to the various priests and clerks who took part in his funeral, and also one penny "to every scholar that hath a surplice" (1). If there was, therefore, a song school in so comparatively small a parish as Brancepeth, schools of the type must also have existed in larger places, where they were ^{no doubt} maintained by the parish priest, or else by chantry priests.

A consideration of grammar schools existing before the Reformation immediately shows that the greater number were connected with chantries; the monasteries, although they occasionally, as ordinaries in their peculiars; as rich landlords; or as trustees for others, founded or controlled such institutions had, as a rule, little connection with them (2). Here Durham Priory was to some extent an exception, for the school which it supported in the Almonry, although connected with a song school, was itself a grammar school. Under the heading of the Priory it is recorded in the "Valor" that certain money was given to the support of thirty poor scholars coming daily to the Almonry, and that the sums spent on their food and drink amounted yearly to £21-13-4; these scholars, the clerk added, studied "artem grammaticalem" in the school of the monastery (3). Again, it is noteworthy that in the almoners' accounts rolls, from the middle of the fifteenth century, payments of £3 yearly are occasionally stated to have been made to the master of the "grammar" school (4).

The last master of this school was Robert Hartburn, who was also rector of Kimblesworth and chaplain both of the Almonry hospital and of St. Mary's Magdalen's hospital. He was therefore in receipt of a yearly income amounting in all to £11-6-8, (5) and in addition the Almoner paid the bursar 40/- "pro mensa magistri scholae" (i.e. for his board) (6). Like the choirmaster, moreover, he received various gratuities, including apparently an allowance for his clothing, and occasional

- (1) Wills & Invs. I, p. 124. (2) Leach, "Eng. Schs. at the Ref." p. 19. (3) Valor V, p. 303.
(4) cf. V.C.H. I, p. 370; S.S. 100, p. 251.
(5) cf. in 1535 Kimblesworth rectory was worth £3-6-8, and as chaplain of St. Mary Magdalen he was paid £5 (Valor V, p. 302, 313.) Hartburn was already master and chaplain in 1535; ~~he was rector of Kimblesworth~~ 1526-43 (S.S. 107, p. 91, 274; Surtees II, p. 375).
(6) S.S. 103, p. 686; S.S. 58, p. 328.

payments of soul silver (1). The children of the Almonry were day-boarders; they were taught in the Almonry itself but had their meals in a loft on the north side of the Priory gates, their food being reserved for them from the novices' table (2). Their curriculum included not only book learning but various types of manual work; the almoner's roll of 1522-3 shows an expenditure of 18d. on bread and ale for the boys when they were hay-making, and they seem to have helped the labourers employed in getting stone from his quarry in Elvet (3). They were also employed to execute small services connected with the church; it was their duty, for example, to clean the great Paschal candlestick. (4).

Hexham Priory seems to have been the only other monastery of the two counties to which a grammar school was attached. The monastic school was incidentally mentioned in connection with the Scottish invasion of 1296, and in the course of his visitation of the town in 1294 Archbishop Romayne is recorded to have appointed a master of his "grammar" school. The editor of the Northumberland County History suggests that this school was probably swept away at the dissolution (5), but it seems doubtful whether it had survived until the sixteenth century.

There were no less than five grammar schools attached to chantries or gilds. Two of them, it has already been noticed, were also connected with song schools. The twin-school in Alnwick was attached to the chantry of the Virgin in St. Michael's parish church, and, according to the foundation deed of the chantry of 1448, besides singing masses, one of the chaplains was to instruct poor boys freely in grammar. The Earl of Northumberland was the founder and principal benefactor of the chantry, but the nomination of the chaplains was given to the burgesses of the town. A house was soon built for the two priests near to the church, and was probably used as a school house (6). In 1548 the grammar master was Thomas Thompson, who, together with his colleague of the song school, was said to be "well-learned

(1) cf. S.S. 99, p. 283, 110; V.C.H. I, p. 370; S&S. 100, p. 251. (2) S.S. 107, p. 91-2.
(3) S.S. 99, p. 255, 237, 241; S.S. 103, p. xlii-iii.
(4) S.S. 103, p. xlii-iii (5) N.C.H. III, p. 211.
ed. A.B. Hinds. (6) Tate, II, p. 70-2.

of honest conversation and qualities." (1). The two chantry schools in Durham also dated from the fifteenth century, both having been founded by Bishop Langley in 1414; they were not, from a financial point of view, connected with the Priory's schools, for it appears from the "Valor" that the revenues of the chantry were made up by yearly payments of £4 from the Bishop, and of £16-13-4 from the monastery of Jervaulx (2). The masters of Langley's schools, like those of Alnwick, were ordered to teach the poor freely, and otherwise to charge moderate fees; both served as chantry priests at the altar of the Virgin and St. Cuthbert in the Galilee chapel. (3). The last grammar masters all seem to have been graduates; Ralph Todd, who held this position in 1535, was a Bachelor of Civil Law; his successor Henry Stafford, was an M.A. of Oxford; and Richard Hartburn, the master of the school in 1546, held the same degree (4).

The grammar school at Barnard Castle, connected with the gild of the Trinity has already been mentioned, and a fourth school of the same type was the newly founded grammar school of Morpeth to which also reference has been made. By an indenture of February 1, 1541/2, between, on the one hand, Dr. Cuthbert Marshall — who was feoffee with others of the property of the chantry of the Virgin in All Saints chapel in Morpeth — and on the other hand, attorneys acting for the burgesses of the town — Marshall enfeoffed the bailiffs and aldermen with the property of the chantry. In future they were to present to it when vacant, and it was provided that the priest so appointed "should keep a school and teach the children of the burgesses and inhabitants of the said town in grammar and other literature, without taking any wage or salary for the same" (5). He was, however, allowed to take into the school other fee-paying pupils, and the burgesses agreed to maintain his stipend at the sum of £6-13-4 by making up the deficiency if the revenues of the chantry did not amount to this total (6). The foundation, put in this manner upon a new basis, seems actually to have been a stipendiary service closely connected with the chantry of the Virgin in All Saints

(1) S.S. 22, p. lxxxiii. (2) Valor V, p. 300, 242; cf. also p. 324 where the sum paid by Jervaulx Abbey is said to be £6-12-4. (3) A.F. Leach, "Eng. Schs. at the Ref." p. 52-3. (4) T.R. no. 219; V.C.H. I, p.374. (5) Hodgson II, vol. 2, p. 508. (6) Ibid.

chapel, and Thomas Husband, the priest and schoolmaster appointed in 1541/2, was entered as a stipendiary in the 1548 certificate. In this certificate he was stated to be "well-learned, of honest conversation and qualities, having no other living than the same stipend." (1).

The last chantry grammar school of which mention must be made may have been connected with the college of Darlington. It has sometimes been assumed that, as there were six foundations known as colleges in Durham county, there must have been six collegiate grammar schools. This assumption is based upon the theory that collegiate churches always supported schools of this type (2), but while it is true that colleges of old foundation had, as one of their primary duties, the maintenance of a grammar school, colleges founded after the middle of the thirteenth century do not seem to have had any strict ruling in this respect. Of these later foundations, ~~only~~ some only had song schools, but on the other hand, those situated in populous districts, often had grammar schools attached to them (3). There is no evidence at present available to suggest that grammar schools were maintained by Auckland, Norton, Staindrop, Chester, or Lanchester colleges — although two of them were probably founded before the middle of the thirteenth century — but as the Darlington body was both a college of old foundation and situated in the midst of an already populous district, it might well be expected that there would have been a school of this type attached to it. If, however, this supposition is to be proved it must be shown that the chantry of All Saints in the parish church, the incumbent of which was bound to keep a free grammar school (4), was connected with the college. Various facts suggest that this was the case. The master of the school in 1548 was Thomas Richardson (5), who, the pensions warrants and returns show, was also a minister of the college (6); moreover, his predecessor in the chantry, Leonard Melmerly, also seems to have been a minister, or

(1) S.S. 22, p.lxxxv; below p.642-3. (2) This is the argument of A.R. Laws in "Schola Novacastrensis" p.2; cf. also V.C.H. I, p.365, & p. 396. (3) Leach, p.12, 20-2. (4) Aug. Off. Chantry Certif. 18, no. 102. (5) S.S. 22, p.lxx-i. (6) Exch. K.R. Accounts etc. Bdle. 75, no. 11, m.4; Bdle. 76, no. 13, p. 6b; Exch. K.R. Misc. Bk.31.

curate, employed by the Dean (1). Possibly, therefore, the chantry was originally founded to increase the salary of that minister of the church who was already charged with the duty of keeping a grammar school; certainly arrangements of this type were made in the case of several other colleges (2), and it is noticeable that Thomas Richardson drew a stipend in both capacities in 1548 (3).

It seems probable that grammar schools must also have existed in such large places as Newcastle and Berwick. Grindal states, in his biography of Bishop Ridley that the latter learnt his grammar at Newcastle, and as Ridley went to Cambridge c. 1508 this seems to suggest that there was indeed a grammar school in the town before that date. Moreover, when Christ's College, Cambridge, was founded in 1506, it was ordained that six of the twelve fellows and twenty three of the forty seven scholars should belong to the northern counties, and it is noticeable that Newcastle family names often occur in the lists of students before 1550 (4). Similarly a reference in 1279 to the "Rector Scholarum" of South Berwick, and the mention in the Lanercost chronicle of scholars hastening to the schools of Berwick, may indicate the presence of a grammar school in that town (5). There can be little doubt that other schools of this type existed; the chantry certificates are by no means exhaustive in this respect, for there would not, of course, appear upon them schools which had no connection with a chantry; nor those in which the master was a layman; nor those kept by towns or gilds (but without fixed endowment); nor those which were "concealed".

Before the Reformation, in addition to the provision made for vernacular and secondary education, a certain stimulus was given to scholars who wished to go to the universities. In the early part of the century a lead was given on this matter by Henry VIII himself, for the Royal Injunctions of 1536 ordered that holders

-
- (1) cf. in 1533 he occurs curate of Darlington, Longstaffe p. 206; Valor V, p. 326. Note also that Melmerby in 1548 was a prebendary of Auckland college (S.S. 22, p. lxxv.), and as there was a noticeable tendency for the colleges to have, to some extent, the same personnel, this fact suggests that he had already been connected with a college. (2) V.C.H. I, p. 388; Leach, p. 14, 322. (3) cf. Chantry certificate and pensions warrants, as above. (4) A.R. Laws, "Schola Novacastrensis" I, p. 9, 11. (5) Scott "Berwick", p. 392.

of benefices worth over £100 should give an exhibition to one scholar (1). A similar design was apparent in the foundation ordinances of Christ's College, Cambridge, and in the gift, in 1516, of John Claymond to Corpus Christi College, Oxford (of which he was President) of £480 to purchase lands, the rents of which were to maintain six scholars, one of whom was to be elected from Norton or Stockton (2). Claymond had at one period been vicar of Norton, and, for the benefit of students of the same parish, he established two scholarships at Brasemose College by his will of June 6, 1537 (3).

Facilities were also offered within the two counties to those who wished to study at Oxford or Cambridge; for example, in 1537, on his appointments as master of the Tyne Bridge chapel by the Mayor and Corporation of Newcastle a certain John Brandling was given permission to remain at any university for the ensuing six years (4); similarly in 1501 the vicar of St. Nicholas', Newcastle, was said to be non-resident because he was a student at Cambridge university (5). Furthermore, by a curious perversion of the original foundation, the eight prebends of Norton college were generally used as exhibitions at the universities, and when the rectorial tithes were leased in 1548, after the suppression of the college, this was stated to be an ancient custom (6). The practice was not unique, for three of the thirteen prebends of Credition College in Devonshire were employed in the same manner (7).

The portionaries or prebendaries of Norton were sometimes laymen; on April 22, 1502, Bernard Skelton, "generosus", was collated by the Bishop to one of the prebends (8), and in the "Clavis Ecclesiasticus" of Bishop Barnes mention was made of the eight lay portionaries of the college (9). It seems probable that the prebends, each of which was worth £6 in 1548, (10) were not used simply to enable their holders to study at the universities but rather as an additional source of income. They were held for a much longer period than the prebendaries can have wished to study; four of the eight prebendaries named in the 1548 certificate already

-
- (1) Frere, "Visit. Arts." II, p. 10. (2) Randall IX.
(3) V.C.H. I, p. 373. (4) S.S. 137, p. 133.
(5) S.S. 22, p. xxiii. (6) Harl. Mss. vol. 605, fol. 78.
(7) Leach, p. 15. (8) T.R. no. 199. (9) S.S. 22, p. 5.
(10) S.S. 22, p. lxix.

held their positions in 1535 (1), and fresh appointments in this century were often made because of the death of the last office-holder (2). Moreover, four of the portionaries of 1540 held other preferments simultaneously with their prebends (3). In this respect their custom only approximated to that of the prebendaries of the other four colleges, but if they were in residence in their livings they cannot have employed their exhibitions as intended. However, this fact does not preclude the possibility of their having made use of their portions to study for a part at least of the period during which they held them; Anthony Salvin, for example, who obtained a prebend in 1544, later occurs in 1556 as holding the degree of S.T.B. (4). On the analogy of the case of John Brandling, the master of the Tyne Bridge chapel, it may, in addition, be supposed that the mere holding of some other living would not necessarily prevent them from taking up residence at a university; in such cases the additional money from their prebends would have been welcome as making possible the maintenance of priests to take charge of their incumbencies during their absence.

Much more work was done by the monks of Durham Priory in this attempt to encourage study at the universities, and their work in this respect was made possible by the original support of the Bishops. In 1286 the Priory purchased some property in the suburbs of Oxford from the Abbess of Godstow, and immediately some of the monks were sent to study in the university. As a result of this transaction Durham college was established (5). Bishop Richard de Bury took a great interest in the new foundation, and it was permanently endowed by Bishop Hatfield. By the foundation statutes thereupon drawn up it was ordained that the establishment should contain eight student monks or "socii," chosen by the chapter of Durham Priory, and from their number one was to be selected by the Prior to be Warden. According

(1) Ibid, & Valor V, p. 318-9. (2) cf. Randall IX, e.g. Lancelot Thwaites appointed March 1, 1539, p.m. John Warren; John Irelande appointed 1540 p.m. Folbury.
(3) i.e. (1) Lancelot Thwaites who was vicar of St. Oswald's, Durham, 1534-50, and of Egglescliffe 1541-55; (2) John Tunstal who was vicar of Haughton-le-Skerne 1534-c.1563; (3) Nicholas Lenthall who was a prebendary of Auckland, c. 1535-48; (4) Anthony Salvin who was rector of Winston, 1545-59, etc. cf. above p.332.
(4) T.R. no. 216; D. & Chap. Reg. II, fol. 25a.
(5) V.C.H. I, p. 366.

to the "Rites" there was a school for novices in the Priory itself, and it is stated that the most apt of these novices were chosen to be sent to the college. By the statutes the stipend of the fellows was fixed at £10-0-0, further allowances being made for the cost of taking the degrees of B.D. and D.D. In addition to these there were to be eight secular students, studying grammar or philosophy, who were to be selected by the four or five senior monks; four from the city or diocese of Durham; two from Allertonshire, and two from Howdenshire. These scholars, who were generally called "pueri" or "scholares seculares", could remain in the college for seven years; they were under no obligation to take vows, and were to receive a yearly stipend of five marks, or £3-6-8. The Bishop of Durham's connection with the college was maintained for he was appointed as its visitor (1).

By the time of the "Valor" a slight change had been made in the payment of stipends; the Warden now received £12-0-0, which was said to be in accordance with Hatfield's foundation, and the other seven monks £8-0-0 each, whilst the eight poor lay scholars were receiving four marks, or 53/4 each. In addition 40/- was paid to the friars of the four orders studying in the university, or to other poor people. The net income of the college, which all came from spiritual sources such as tithes, was £115-4-4, from which £6-0-0 had to be paid out to the receiver (2). The account roll of the college for the year 1540-1 which still exists, is the last for the college in its old form. According to this roll its total revenue had increased slightly since 1535 (3) and proportionately the stipends of the fellows had risen to £8-3-9½, this money being paid to them, the roll shows, in four quarterly terms. The numbers had been maintained according to the original constitution, as it still consisted of a Warden, seven fellows, and eight scholars (4).

The Durham Bursar's roll of 1538-9, amongst the

(1) cf. H.E.D. Blakiston "Durham Coll. Rolls" - Oxf. Hist. Soc. XXXII. p. 15-16. (2) Valor V, p. 306.

(3) when the gross income was £122-13-7 - (Valor V, p.306) It was now £128-10-4. (4) from roll in the D. &

Chap. Treas. Oxon. no. XIV. Note Blakiston (Oxf. Hist. Soc. XXXII p. 21) says that the stipends had been diminished since the time of the "Valor" by about one fifth, but he appears to be assuming that the payments were made in three terms, whereas the roll seems to show that they were made in four terms.

pensions payable from rectories, has this entry:-
"De ecclesia Mickle Benton nichil, quia assignatur
fratribus nostris studentibus in Oxonia" (1). As
the church of Long Benton was, from the fourteenth
century, appropriated to Balliol college in Oxford, (2)
this entry seems to suggest that the appropriation was
made with the condition that the money, or part of it,
so assigned to the college should be used for the
maintenance of certain monks of Durham Priory who were
studying there.

The results of this survey may now be summarised.
It appears that the provision which was made for education
in Durham and Northumberland before the Reformation
included the erection of at least six grammar schools;
and of four schools of an elementary type. There are,
in addition, indirect references to, or uncertain records
of three other grammar schools and of ~~twelve~~ vernacular
or song schools. Of any other schools which existed,
there are apparently no records surviving. The large
number of the schools concerning which any information
is available were connected with chantries, for five of
the grammar schools belonged to this group, and at least
three of the elementary schools. This was the case
throughout England (3), and meant that, here as elsewhere,
the dissolution of the chantries would be a more vital
move than any other taken in the course of the
Reformation, as far as the prospects of education for
the people were concerned.

Of conditions in these schools but little is
known, but it is certain that they did, wherever they
existed, do much to prevent education from becoming the
prerogative of the rich. They were all free schools
in one sense or another; as in the case of Morpeth and
Barnard Castle they might be free to children of the
inhabitants of the town, or, as in the case of Langley's
schools and the Alwick chantry schools, they might
provide a free education for the poor whilst other
pupils were charged moderate fees. The two schools
connected with Durham Priory not only provided a free
education but also free board, and it was, in addition,
possible for the scholars taught in these schools to earn
small sums by way of gratuities. Unfortunately it is
impossible to say to how many children the benefits of
education were thus extended as the numbers of pupils
are only known in the case of the two schools last
mentioned.

(1) S.S. 58 p. 328.
(3) Leach p. 52-4.

(2) N.C.H. XIII, p. 399.

The Prior and Convent of Durham appointed the masters of the schools dependent upon them; the masters of Hexham was appointed by the Archbishop of York, and the masters of Langley's schools by the Bishop of Durham. But, as the masters of ^{the} Alnwick schools and of Morpeth were nominated by the burgesses of the town, there was a certain amount of local and democratic control. Where the salaries of the masters are known, they seem in every case to have been adequate and in some cases good. Although in the schools at Alnwick, Barnard Castle, and Darlington their stipends were only between four and five pounds (1), in Morpeth schools and in the Durham Priory song school they were £6-13-4; in the Almonry school £11-6-8; and in Langley's schools more than £9. The total stipend, of £11-6-8, of the master of the Almonry school was made up by payments for his services, not as master only, but also as chaplain in various chapels dependent upon the monastery, and the same was to some extent true of the stipends of the other masters mentioned. Most of these masters were also, in fact, priests celebrating masses in chantries or chapels; while one, the master of the Priory song school, was also organist of the cathedral. It appears, therefore, that at this date the work of teaching was never, generally speaking, held to require the full time of the officeholder — a conclusion which suggests that the number of pupils in the various schools must have been fairly small. With regard again to the stipends of the masters of the Priory schools, it must be added that these wages by no means represented their full profit as they also received their board, various gratuities (such as soul-silver), and also aid towards the furnishing of their wardrobes. Similarly the Alnwick masters were provided with a house, and the master at Morpeth could increase his income by fees imposed on pupils living outside the town. On the whole, therefore, they must have enjoyed a comfortable return for their labours.

The two counties were well provided with exhibitions to be held at the universities. Provision was made both at Christ's College in Cambridge and at Corpus Christi College in Oxford for scholars from the North, or, more precisely, from Durham county. The known cases of two clergy show that it was often made possible for priests or deacons to study at the universities, even after they had obtained benefices or other preferments. Moreover, at Norton college there were eight exhibitions for a similar purpose, each of

(1) cf. below p. 640-1, 643, 645.

the value of £6-0-0 or more, and in Oxford, besides eight monks, eight secular students from the diocese were supported at Durham College, where they received a grant of at least 53/4. Finally, for the monks of the Priory there were, perhaps, exhibitions available at Balliol college in Oxford.

SECTION II - THE RESULTS UPON EXISTING SCHOOLS OF THE
DISSOLUTION OF THE MONASTERIES AND CHANTRIES.

The dissolution of the smaller monasteries does not seem to have had much effect upon existing educational institutions; it is true that there may have been a school on Holy Island connected with the cell of Durham Priory, but even if this was the case it must have continued to exist long after the dissolution of the cell (1). The dissolution of the larger monasteries had, however, more important results, and implied drastic changes to the three educational establishments dependent upon the Priory.

It was stated in the deed of May 12, 1541, by which the church of Durham was refounded, that one purpose of the new foundation was to make provision for a liberal training in letters (2), and, in connection with Henry's scheme of 1539 for founding new bishoprics from the revenues of the monasteries, a plan was made to found a college in Durham. In addition to a provost, twelve prebendaries, ten petty canons and other ministers and servants, the staff of the church was to include four readers in humanity, divinity, and physics, a schoolmaster and usher, and a master of the children. The master last mentioned was to be in charge of ten choristers, and there were also to be sixty scholars, who were to be taught both grammar and logic in Hebrew, Greek and Latin; and twenty students in divinity; ten being supported at each university (3). This grandiose scheme was never put into effect, but an alternative plan was drawn up which was, in most particulars, eventually followed. By this scheme, which was headed, "A proportion for the maintenance of Hospitality, Learning, Divine Service, Alms, and other necessary expenses in the cathedral church of Durham to be erected, founded and established by the King's Majesty's goodness," it was provided that there should be a Dean, twelve prebendaries, twelve petty canons, various other ministers, and ten choristers and a master of the choristers. Moreover, under the heading of Learning, provision was made for a reader in divinity at a stipend of £26-13-4; for twelve scholars who were to be supported at the University of Oxford, each receiving £9-11-8; for eighteen scholars each of whom was to be

(1) cf. above p.610-11.

(2) S.S. 143, p. 4-5.

(3) "Henry VIII's Scheme of Bishoprics", ed. Henry Cole, p. 26-7.

paid £4; and for a schoolmaster and usher in charge of these scholars who were to receive £10 and £6-13-4 respectively. (1). By this more modest plan some attempt was made to maintain the educational traditions of the Priory, and attention must be given to the question of the extent to which its proposals, with reference to education, were eventually carried out. Unfortunately, of the transitional period of a year and a half which elapsed between the surrender of the Priory on December 31, 1539, and the refoundation in May 1541, very little record can be found; but as in the case of Durham College in Oxford this gap is partly bridged by surviving account rolls, the history of the college may be considered first.

The account roll of 1540-1 has already been mentioned, and shows that, during the intervening period, the college was still existing according to its original foundation, with a Warden, seven fellows and eight secular students (2). It had been surrendered at the end of 1539 with the rest of the property of the Bridge, but both the site and its appurtenances were included in the endowment of the church of Durham of May 16, 1541 (3). In accordance with the scheme previously drawn up, by foundation statutes of the same date the Dean and Chapter were charged to maintain twelve students of theology at the University of Oxford, at the yearly cost of £9-11-8 each (4). In order to execute this charge, the Dean and Chapter allotted to the college an annual cash payment of £100 and the revenue of Frampton church, which was of the yearly value of £28-6-8, as the sums from the churches which had been appropriated to it were now comingⁱⁿ to them directly. The account roll of Michaelmas 1541 - Michaelmas 1542 shows further details of its composition, which had, inevitably, been altered slightly from that of the previous year. Instead of the Warden a Rector was appointed, and as well as the Rector there were seven fellows each receiving £9-10-0 a year; and four scholars each receiving £7-10-0, so that the total paid each year to fellows and scholars amounted in all to £106. This account roll includes amongst its particulars, payments to Dr. Richard Smyth-Henry VIII's reader in Divinity at Christchurch — and also to members of the college going to London on business

(1) "Henry VIII's Scheme of Bishoprics", ed. Henry Cole, p. 28-31. (2) cf. above p. 621.; and roll in Dun. Treas. Oxon, no. XIV. (3) S.S. 143, p. 27. (4) cf. L. & P. XX, i, p. 179.

connected with it (1). Perhaps this business had included a re-arrangement of stipends. With regard to the personnel of the college, the roll shows that George Cliff, who had been the most senior of the student monks in the preceding year, now, in the year 1541-2, was Rector; and that the other "socii" or fellows were the same as the "socii" of 1540-1, with the addition of William Taylor, who in 1540-1 was one of the eight scholars. Three of the four scholars were chosen from amongst the eight scholars of 1540-1, but the fourth was new (2).

Blakiston, in dealing with the college account rolls, says that Cliff, the new Rector, "appears from incidental remarks in his accounts to have considered the position humourous", and adds; "Such an establishment if worked by the Chapter in connection with the School, might have been very serviceable, but it fell through at once and George Cliff did not even trouble to complete his final comptus." (3). It is true that the re-established college had only a very short life, but these remarks seems to imply that it came to an end rather sooner than was actually the case. The comptus for Michaelmas 1541-Michaelmas 1542 was not completed, but the particulars from which it should have been composed exist for the whole year, and there are also particulars for the term from Michaelmas 1542 to Christmas 1542, containing the usual quarterly payments to "socii" and scholars (4). Moreover, there exists amongst the Miscellaneous Charters in the Dean and Chapter Treasury a receipt dated December 10, 1544, by which John Pullan, one of the fellows of the College, acknowledged the payment of the exhibitions due to himself and to ten others (5). Of the eleven scholars so

(1) cf. H.E.D. Blakiston, Oxf. Hist. Soc. XXXII, "Dun. Coll. Rolls", p. 21-2, 67-70. (2) From a comparison of their names as given Ibid p. 67-8, and in Roll Oxon no. XIV, D. & Chap. Treas. (3) Oxf. Hist. Soc. XXXII, p. 22. (4) Ibid, p. 67-8, 70. Note, however that although there are still expenses connected with certain necessary repairs, there no longer appear payments to servants of the college (as cook, bibliste, and manciple) neither are there such payments in the term from the Feast of St. John the Baptist 1542 to Mich. 1542. (5) The Charter runs thus:- "John Pullan, scholar and fellow of Durham College in Oxford, hath received the day and year above said of Dr. Watson and Master Nicholas Marley the exhibitions of Master Potter, Mathew, Taler, Gylpynge, Hudson, Blunt, Ratcliffe, Gray, Greyne,

mentioned all except two (1) appear amongst the fellows or scholars of the 1541 roll; the twelfth scholar was probably the Rector, George Cliff, who must have been an absentee. From these facts it appears, therefore, that the college did actually continue in being up to the time of its surrender on March 20, 1544/5, when it was finally dissolved. At this date a new arrangement was made by which the Dean and Chapter, in consideration of the fact that the King exonerated them from the charge — by their statutes of foundation — of maintaining twelve students at Oxford, surrendered to him some of their property (2). The site and buildings of the college remained in the hands of the Crown until they were granted out in 1553; in the following year they were purchased by Sir Thomas Pope, and, using them as a nucleus, he thereupon founded Trinity College, to which, however, he gave new endowments. In some sense, then, the old college remained, but its severance from Durham was complete, and so the two counties sustained a heavy loss.

A better fate was reserved for the grammar schools of Durham. Of these, it has been seen, there were two: the school attached to Langley's chantry, which was independent of the Priory, and the monastic Almonry, which was surrendered at the end of 1539 with the other property of the monastery. As a result of the arrangements made at the re-foundation of the church, these two schools were in some sense combined, or it is perhaps better to say, Langley's school was connected with the new Dean and Chapter, and so was inevitably given some of the characteristics of the old Almonry school. The exact fate of the Almonry school at the dissolution is uncertain, but as it is possible that the masters of Langley's schools, in return for the Priory's confirmation of their endowment from the episcopal revenues, sometimes gave their services freely in the Almonry, it seems probable that some of its scholars were immediately transferred to the chantry grammar school (3). Such a transaction would have been the more easily accomplished because of the fact that

Redman, over and beside mine own which is £3-7-6, which exhibitions of the aforesaid men do surmount with the rearedges to £24-4-2." It is signed by Pullan (Misc. Cart. D. & Chap. Treas. no. 2744). It is evidently a receipt for one term; the exhibitions for the Christmas term 1542 mounted to £26-10-0.

(1) i.e. Gylpynge & Redman. (2) Oxf. Hist. Soc. XXXII, p. 22; L. & P. XX, i, p. 177, 179. (3) cf. V.C.H. I,

their master, Robert Hartburn, had, through his position as rector of Kimblesworth and chaplain of St. Mary Magdalen, other means of livelihood. Meanwhile, despite the connection of Jervaulx with the Pilgrimage of Grace and the consequent dissolution of the Abbey, Langley's schools continued to receive their full revenue. To prevent their spoliation, on November 14, 1537, just when the dissolution of Jervaulx Abbey was taking place (1), Tunstal wrote to Cromwell asking him to give orders for the payment of the stipends of the two chantry priests or schoolmasters, for the maintenance of whom lands had been given to the Abbey. His request was evidently granted, for a note occurs of a payment, on September 29, 1539, from the forfeited lands of Jervaulx monastery, to Henry Stafforde and William Cockey, schoolmasters at Durham (2). Their income from the Bishop must have been paid as usual.

In the Henrican statutes for the cathedrals the scheme for a new cathedral grammar school appeared in full for the first time. These statutes were completed in the course of the year 1544, but it has already been shown that Durham received no copy of them and, as they remained only in draft form, that they were never of binding force, although they were generally accepted. The attack upon Bishop Tunstal and his see followed, under Edward VI, and led to the important changes made in Durham in Queen Mary's reign, by which the see was reconstituted and new statutes issued to the Chapter, and confirmed by the great seal. These were, however, based upon the earlier statutes, and as far as the regulations for the school were concerned a quotation of them may be held to imply the general sense of the Henrican code (3).

By these Marian statutes it was provided that eighteen poor boys — who soon became known as the King's scholars — (4) were to be entered in the school; they were to have some rudiments of knowledge already, and were not to be admitted if they were over fifteen years of age, unless they had been choristers, to whom if they were suitable, preference was to be given. It was supposed that other boys would also be entered

p. 373. The Almonry school had clearly ceased in 1541, as it was spoken of in the receiver's accounts of that year in the past tense - Ibid, p. 369.

- (1) Dixon I, p. 497. (2) L. & P. XII, ii, p. 381; XIV, ii, p. 77. (3) cf. S.S. 143, p. xl-i, liii-iv.
(4) cf. S.S. 22, p. 103.

in the school. Each of the King's scholars was to receive a stipend of 15/- yearly, and, in addition, 3/4 a month for board and commons. Two masters were to be appointed, one learned in Latin and Greek, and a junior master capable of teaching the first rudiments of grammar. The headmaster was to be paid £5-2-0 yearly, and 6/- a month for board and commons; and the undermaster £2-19-2 yearly and an allowance of 4/8 for the same purpose. Both the masters and King's scholars were also given aid towards the replenishing of their wardrobes, as the headmaster was to be given four yards of cloth at 5/- a yard; the undermaster three yards at 4/6 a yard; and each boy two and a half yards at 3/4 a yard. They were either to receive this amount of material every year, or else the money equivalent. The curriculum to be followed was to be settled by the Dean and Chapter with the consent of the Bishop. Prayers were to be said in the school three times a day, and the master and boys were required to attend high mass each day until the singing of the Agnus Dei was finished, and also to be present in the choir on feast days (1). According to the Henrican statutes the masters were to have their meals with the minor canons in the common hall (2).

So the scheme was settled, but at what date the change was actually made is uncertain. On May 28th 1541, Sir Thomas Hilton and certain other commissioners were appointed to assign houses both for the members of the capitular body, and for the headmaster, the usher, and the eighteen King's scholars; no instrument, however, survives by which ^{such} assignments were made (3). It is stated in a manuscript of Bishop Cosin that Henry Stafford, who was the grammar master of Langley's school, c. 1539-44, was the first head of the new school^m and that he retained the house, salary, and school-house of Langley's foundation; (4) but despite this statement it seems probable that Langley's school continued in its old form for some years after the erection of the Dean and Chapter. On July 6, 1544, Robert Hartburn, M.A., was collated by the Bishop to the chantry of the Virgin and St. Cuthbert in the Galilee chapel; as William Cockey was master of Langley's song school in 1535, and was still holding this position in 1546, Hartburn must, therefore, have become master of the grammar school, if it still

(1) cf. S.S. 143, p. 87, 143-7, 153, 155, 157, 159, 161, 178-81. (2) Ibid, p. 11. (3) V.C.H. I, p.374.

(4) V.C.H.I, p.375; T.R. no.219.

existed as in previous years (1). From the chantry certificate of 1546 this appears to have been the case, for under the title of the chantry of the Virgin and St. Cuthbert an account is given of the foundation by Langley, and it is stated that the incumbents, Hartburn and Cockey, had to keep a grammar school and a song school; the value of the incumbents' stipends, as given here, was practically the same as by the "Valor" (2). On the other hand, the 1548 chantry certificate contained no mention either of the chantry or of the schools, and this was the more remarkable because, in accordance with the terms of the Chantry Act of 1547, the commissioners responsible for making the certificate were ordered to take especial note of grammar schools, in order that they might be continued (3). The presumption to be drawn, therefore, from the omission of Langley's chantry in the later certificate is that the schools had, as chantry schools, ceased to exist, and that they had been replaced by the cathedral grammar and song schools. On this theory the transition must have taken place between the years 1546 and 1548 (4); but it is possible that preliminary arrangements for the conversion of the chantry grammar schools into the cathedral school had been made as early as 1541; this would account for the reference to Henry Stafford in Cosin's manuscript as the first head of the new school.

Despite the omission of all references to Langley's schools in the certificate of 1548, the revenues of the chantry were reserved for the support of the cathedral grammar and song schools. The Durham continuance warrant of 1548 equally contained no mention of them, but it appears from the accounts of the receiver-general in the North for 1548-9 that a special warrant was issued with reference to their revenues by Sir Walter Mildinay, one of the two special commissioners appointed to deal with matters of this nature. In these accounts, under the heading of payments of stipends of schoolmasters in the Bishopric from the lands and possessions belonging to the manor of Keverdley in Lancashire, which were parcel of the property of the late monastery of Jervaulx, the following entry occurs:- "In yearly stipends or wages of Robert Hartburn and William Cockey, masters of the grammar school founded through the late chantry of the Blessed Virgin and St. Cuthbert in the cathedral church

(1) cf. T.R. no. 219; Valor V, p. 242; Aug. Off. Chantry Certif. 18. no. 63. (2) Aug. Off. Chantry Certif. 18, no. 63. (3) Leach, p. 67. (4) As the first surviving treasurer's book is of the year 1557-8 it cannot be proved that payments to the masters at the hands of the D. & Chap. began then.

of Durham at £16 yearly, and 13/4 to be distributed to the poor according to the foundation of the same chantry - viz. in such allowance by virtue of a warrant of Sir Walter Mildmay, signed by his hand, for a year and a half, ending at Michaelmas 3, Edward VI, (i.e. 1549) £25" (1). The pensions commission and return of 1552, a special commission on Durham and Alnwick schools addressed to the Bishop and dated June 12, 1570, and the accounts of the receiver-general of 1574-5, show that this total of £16-13-4 — which was equivalent to the sum previously paid to Langley's schools from the lands of Jervaulx Abbey — was regularly paid by the Crown receiver to masters of schools in Durham; and as the names of these masters are given it appears that part of the sum went to the cathedral song school and part to the headmaster of the grammar school, although, in the warrant, the grammar school alone was mentioned (2). Langley's chantry had also been endowed by the Bishop with £4, and the sum of £2, which had been due from the episcopal revenues to the grammar master of the chantry, continued to be paid to the master of the re-organised grammar school (3).

By what appears a coincidence almost too curious to be possible, the last master of Langley's grammar school bore the same name — Robert Hartburn — as the last master of the Almonry school. In fact it seems tempting to assume that that two should be identified, for it would have been natural for the Bishop to promote the master of the Almonry school, which was dissolved in 1539, to Langley's school as soon as a vacancy occurred. Additional weight is given to this argument by the fact that a new rector was appointed to succeed Hartburn in Kimblesworth rectory in 1543, for this rectory had always been held together with the Almonry; on the other hand, it is recorded in Tunstal's register that the vacancy at Kimblesworth was due to the death of Hartburn (4). It is, however, barely possible that a mistake was made in the register, and that "per mortem" should read "per resignationem". If this were the case, and Hartburn was really the ex-master of the Almonry

(1) Minis. Accts. 2-3 Edw. VI, no. 698, fol. 44a.

(2) Exch. K.R. Accounts etc. Bdle. 76, no. 13, p. 13a, 21a; Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 3265; V.C.H. I, p. 376. A return to another special commission of July 4, 1576, also shows these masters as being paid by the Crown receiver (Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 3265); cf. below p.636.

(3) V.C.H. I, p. 372.

(4) T.R. no. 209.

school, the transition must have been made more simple, and so, in several ways, the new school would have been a development of both of the old ones, for Hartburn became headmaster of the re-founded school (1).

Of Hartburn's successors between 1557 and 1603 (2) the first three may have been laymen, but later it evidently became the custom to appoint priests to the mastership; of the ushers only one or two appear to have been laymen. All those who were priests, with the exception of Hartburn himself, also held curacies or benefices, and, in at least four cases, they held such promotions simultaneously with their position as master; ~~and~~ generally these preferments were within the city of Durham. Four of the ushers were also readers of the epistle or gospel in the cathedral, and one was a minor canon. Probably they were allowed to hold positions of these types partly in order to increase their income. It has been shown that, with the addition of allowances made for their board and clothing, the total receipts of the master, according to the cathedral statutes, were to be £9-14-0 and of the usher £6-8-8; it appears, however, from the Treasurer's books that they were actually paid rather more, the master receiving £10, and the usher £6-13-4 (3).

In most ways the ordinances of the school seem to have remained practically unaltered. The eighteen King's scholars often occur in the records of the Dean and Chapter, and the close connection of the school with the cathedral was obviously maintained (4). In Dean Whittingham's time the prayers ordered at the opening of the school day, at 6 a.m., were said in the cathedral, and the Dean himself apparently did some teaching for he wrote in a letter of 1563, "Because we lack an able schoolmaster I bestow daily three or four hours in teaching the youth, till God provide us of some that may better suffice." (5). One of the headmasters, William Thewles, was deprived of his office for refusing

(1) cf. below, Appendix IV. It is possible that while Stafford was still master of Langley's grammar school Hartburn acted as second master - cf. V.C.H. I, p. 375.

(2) a full list of the headmasters and ushers is given below, appendix IV. (3) D. & CHAP. Treas.

(4) cf. Treas. Bks. D. & CHAP. Treas; Misc. Cart. no. 3057, iv.

(5) Lansd. Mss. VII, fol. 24. He might of course have been referring to the song school.

to take the oath at the time of the royal visitation of 1559, and the growth of Recusancy in the two counties in the later decades of the century led to the incorporation, in new statutes which were drawn up for the school in 1593, of strict injunctions that the master should be an abhorer of papistry, and that due care should be taken for "the planting of true religion in the scholars" (1). A few years after the new statutes were made, Peter Smart, an extremist in doctrine, was appointed headmaster, and was soon in trouble for non-conformity (2). Apart, however, from difficulties of this type the history of the school seems to have been uneventful.

On the whole, it probably benefitted by the change. It is true that whereas before the dissolution a free education in grammar had been provided for more than thirty poor boys in the Almonry or in Langley's school, a free education was now provided for only eighteen boys, although there was no limit to the number of fee-paying pupils. On the other hand the standard of teaching was probably raised, and the new school was far stronger than the two schools which it superseded; in the words of Leach in his book on "English Schools at the Reformation": "The grammar school master was converted from the chantry priest of St. Cuthbert in the Galilee, an outsider, into an integral part of the foundation (i.e. of the newly founded secular college), with the position and pay equal, or almost equal, to that of a residentiary & canon" (3).

The Priory had maintained, in addition to the Almonry grammar school, a song school in which six or eight boys were given some elementary instruction by a master who was also the cathedral organist. This school suffered very little alteration as a result of the suppression and of the erection of the new capitular body. Its position, however, was moved from the cemetery to the old sacristan's checker, or office, which abutted on the north aisle of the choir. By the Marian statutes, which in this respect also were based upon the Henrican code, it was ordered that the choir-master or organist should teach ten choristers to sing and to play the organ, and should also be in charge of their "education and liberal instruction in letters and at table" and of their health and welfare generally. His stipend was to be £5-7-0 yearly, augmented by an

(1) The pupils were to have weekly lessons on the established religion, to learn some authorised catechism, and to take notes of sermons - cf. V.C.H. I, p. 377.

(2) cf. below, Appendix IV. (3) p. 58.

allowance of 6/- a month for board and commons, and an allowance for clothing of three yards of material at 5/- a yard, or the money equivalent. His total receipts were, therefore, equivalent to those of the headmaster of the grammar school, and it appears from the treasurers' books that, like him, he actually received £10. The choristers were granted the same stipends and allowances as the grammarians (1).

The first master of the reconstituted school was John Brimley, who had been the last master of the Priory song school, which was probably, therefore, maintained with very little change during the transitional period succeeding the surrender of December 1539. The Treasurers' books show that Brimley continued in the office of choirmaster until 1569-70, when he was succeeded by Thomas Harrison, one of the lay-clerks (2); his removal from office was probably due to the rather prominent part which he had taken in the restoration of the old forms of service during the rebellion, although it is true that Harrison had also been implicated in these proceedings. (3). Harrison occurs as choirmaster in the Treasurers' books until 1576, when, for the first time, there appears in his place the name of William Brown, who was also organist from that date (4). As Brimley died on October 13, 1576, it seems probable that he retained the position of organist until his death, although he was no longer master of the choristers. Added weight is given to this assumption by the beautiful epitaph which was written upon his tomb, which ran as follows:- "John Brimleis body here doth ly / Who praised God by hand and voice / By musickes heaveⁿlie harmonie / Dull minds he made in God rejoice 7 His soul unto the heavens is lyft / To praise Him still that gave the gyft /." (5)

It appears that there were generally two masters

(1) S.S. 143, p. 87, 143, 155, 157. (2) In the first part of the year 1569-70 Brimley was paid as choirmaster, but later in the year Harrison was paid as choirmaster - D. & Chap. Treas. (3) cf. S.S. 21, p. 148-9, 151-4. (4) Brown's name occurs in the books of 1576-7 and 1580-1. Harrison may have been the man of the same name who was one of the two choristers of Staindrop college in 1548 (S.S. 22, p. lxxiv); he occurs in the treasurer's books as a lay clerk from 1564 to 1581, and as choirmaster in the books of 1569-70 and of 1570-1 cf. Treas. Bks. D. & Chap. Treas. (5) Quoted from S.S. 107, p. 161-2.

of the school from the time when it was reorganized. Its reorganization must have taken place at about the same time as that of the grammar school, and it may, therefore, be held to have replaced Langley's song school as well as the old Priory song school. It seems evident, moreover, that the masters of both the old schools taught in the new school. John Brimley certainly did; and the extract already quoted from the accounts of the receiver-general of the North for 1548-9 shows that William Cockey, the last master of Langley's song school, was paid, as the master of a school in Durham, part of the sum of £16-13-4 originally due to the chantry; and, under the same title he occurs in receipt of this stipend in the pensions commission and return of 1552 (1). He was also attached to the cathedral staff in another capacity, for the first treasurer's book, that of 1557-8, shows that he was one of the minor canons (2). It appears from a special commission on schools of June 12, 1570, that by that year the payment by the Crown receiver of a portion of the sum of £16-13-4 was being made to Thomas Harrison (3), and as Harrison is known to have been master of the song school at that date, this fact sufficiently proves that Cockey must have held this position in previous years (4). The commission of 1570 had named John Pearson as being one of the masters to whom part of the revenue of the late chantry was due, but Bishop Pilkington pointed out in his return that he had been superseded in the previous year by Thomas Harrison (5), who, the Treasurers' books show, had replaced John Brimley in the year 1569-70. It appears in fact that John Brimley and John Pearson, who was one of the minor canons, were masters concurrently for some years before 1569, when both seem to have been removed because of their share in the rebellion; Pearson furthermore, was indicted as a rebel and deprived of his minor canonry for conforming to papacy (6).

There also seems to have been a master holding

(1) Minis. Accts. 2-3 Edw. VI, no. 698, fol. 44a; Exch. K.R. Accts. etc. Bdle. 76, no. 13, p. 13a, 21a.

(2) D. & Chap. Treas. (3) Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 3265. (4) In 1574-5 part of the payment of

£16-13-4 was still being made to Harrison. The other part always went to the headmaster of the grammar school, cf. V.C.H. I, p. 376. (5) Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 3265. (6) Sharpe, p. 231, 260.

office simultaneously with Thomas Harrison, for although in the Treasurers' books William Brown appears in the office after 1576, there is a record in Bishop Barnes' register (dated December 22, 1582) of the appointment of John Rangell to teach the ten children of the choir school, the appointment, it is stated, being made because of the death of Harrison. It is evident that Harrison died in 1582, as after that date his name ceases to appear in the Treasurers' books as a lay clerk. Harrison and Brown, therefore, must have held office together. Perhaps one of the masters merely trained the choir as such, and played the organ, while the other, in the words of the document in Barnes' Register to which reference has just been made, "did exercise the room and place of keeping school for bringing up of ten young children to be instructed in the catechism, and forthwith made fit to go to the grammar school, and likewise to be taught their plain song and entered in their pricksong." (1) According to this document the appointments of both Harrison and Rangell were made with the consent of the Bishop by the Queen's auditor and receiver in the North; this was stated to be the customary procedure (2). Such a custom was, no doubt, due to the fact that part of the sum of £16-13-4 paid by the Crown receiver went to the song school (3) while the sum of £2 from the Bishop's revenues, which had previously been appropriated to Langley's song school, was also paid towards its maintenance (4).

Of later masters of the school not much is known. William Brown's name appears in the extant Treasurers' books of 1576 to 1604, and although Rangell held office until 1622, he seems to have been assisted at different periods by Robert Masterman and William Smith, one of the minor canons who was organist and at the same time a composer and amateur organ-builder (5).

In Whittingham's time the children of the school accompanied the grammarians at prayers in the cathedral every morning at 6 a.m. Perhaps the Dean sometimes taught them himself, for he was skilled in music. (6).

(1) Barnes Reg. fol. 11a. (2) Ibid. Rangell, like Harrison, was also a lay clerk - cf. Treas. Bk. 1588-9, D. & Chap. Treas. (3) Exch. K.P. Spec. Comm. 3265. (4) cf. V.C.H. I, p. 376. (5) Masterman occurs choir-master in 1588-9 (Treas. Bk. D. & Chap. Treas.) Smith was organist 1588-98 (S.S. 103, p. 733; S.S. 107, p. 298; cf. also V.C.H. I, p. 376). (6) Lansd. Mss. VII, fol. 24; Cam. Soc. Misc. VI, "Life of Whittingham," p. 23.

Their general education was designed to fit them to enter the grammar school, and the Marian statutes provided that scholarships should, as far as possible, be given to the choristers for whom as special concession was made with regard to age of entrance (1). The song-school, so re-organised, was, therefore, in a very good position. The money devoted to its support exceeded the total sum expended upon both the old song schools which it superseded, for now the choristers themselves received fixed stipends, whilst the salary of the chief master was at least larger than that received by either of the old song school masters. The number of boys educated in this manner cannot be compared as the numbers at Langley's school are not known, but certainly there was an increase over the numbers at the Priory song school. The encouragement given to them to pass on to the grammar school, and the possibility whilst there of gaining exhibitions to the universities, must have made it possible for even the very poor to obtain a higher education. The fact that both the grammar and song school were doing good work under efficient masters was certified by Bishop Pilkington in returns to special commissions of June 12, 1570, and July 4, 1571 (2).

The only other schools which must have been affected by the suppression of the monasteries were the monastic schools at Newminster, ~~and~~ Hexham and the Walknoll in Newcastle, which, if all actually in existence, must have been swept away together with the houses upon which they were dependent. More momentous results were to follow from the attack upon the chantries. It was ordered by the Royal Injunctions of 1547 that chantry priests should exercise themselves in teaching children to read and write and in bringing them up in good manners (3). It is possible that the ensuing visitation showed that they were not giving due attention to their teaching functions; at any rate the Chantry Act of 1547 was passed almost immediately afterwards and provided for the dissolution of chantries, free chapels, gilds and similar endowments, although it exempted colleges of the universities, and schools such as Eton and Winchester. The Act also ordered that commissioners thereupon to be appointed, should arrange for the continuance of grammar schools maintained, in accordance with their foundation, by

- (1) S.S. 143, p.143-7. The treasurers' books show that the choristers fairly often entered the grammar school
- (2) Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 3265.
- (3) Frere, "Visit. Arts" II, p.129.

chantries or gilds, provided that such schools were still actually in existence. Grammar schools, therefore, were to escape dissolution, but no mention was made of the song and writing schools which were attached to quite a large number of the chantries (1).

As a result of the Act commissioners were appointed on February 14, 1548, and were ordered to make certificates showing, amongst other things, in what places grammar schools existed in connection with chantries or gilds; the fate of the schools therefore, depended to a large extent upon the information which they supplied. Of the eight commissioners appointed for Durham and Northumberland only Sir Thomas Hilton, Sir Robert Brandling, Robert Mennell and Henry Whitreason did the actual work of drawing up the certificates for these counties (2). After the Pilgrimage of Grace Sir Thomas Hilton had proved loyal to the government and had accepted the religious changes; consequently in 1549 he was given the important position of captain of Tynemouth castle (3). Brandling, who was a member of the Felling and Gosforth family, was mayor of Newcastle on many occasions; he was knighted by the Duke of Somerset, and was reported, in 1564, to be obedient to the government in religious matters (4); ^{both} Hilton and Brandling were grantees of monastic property (5). Henry Whitreason was an official who seems to have had no other connection with Durham and Northumberland, and Robert Mennell, the Sergeant-at-law, belonged to a North Yorkshire family, and, although later he showed himself opposed to the Elizabethan religious settlement, he was, at this period, on numerous commissions for the two counties. Probably none of the four, therefore, were strongly in favour of the maintenance of the chantries, but on the other hand it is probable that Hilton and Brandling made some attempt to maintain the educational institutions in their counties. Moreover the actual information contained in the certificates was chiefly obtained by the commissioners by sending a list of articles to each parish (6), and the parochial officials to whom such application was made, no doubt endeavoured to supply information which would show that the existing

(1) cf. Leach, p. 65-70. (2) S.S. 22, p. lviii, lxxvii
(3) N.C.H. VIII, p. 158-9 (4) Arch. Ael. 1st. Ser. IV, p. 138; Cam. Soc. Misc. IX, p. 66. (5) L. & P. XIV, 1, p. 610; N.C.H. XIII, p. 472. (6) cf. Leach, p. 72-3.

scholastic establishments should be maintained.

It had at first been intended that these original commissioners should also provided for the continuance of certain chantry schools, but, as it has already been noticed, a second commission was issued on June 20, 1548, by which Mildmay and Kelway were appointed to undertake this work. Although Mildmay had some interest in learning, neither of these two officials could be expected to take such a liberal attitude^{as} probably would have been adopted by commissioners led by Hilton and Brandling. Action thereupon taken with regard to endowments was meant to be only temporary; the commission stated that so much money as had hitherto been employed for schools was to be paid annually, "until such time as other order and direction shall be taken therein." Warrants, based upon a Brief Certificate, or abstract of the county commissioner's certificate drawn up by the local surveyor, were thereupon issued for the continuance of these schools, and signed by Mildmay and Kelway. As, for most schools, no "other order" was taken, the arrangements so made were generally permanent (1). This meant that the local surveyor, who was really only a clerk, also had an important part in deciding the fate of the schools, and such a man would tend to follow, not the strict law, but the orders of his particular chief, whose interest would lie in economy.

In addition to Langley's schools in Durham, the history of which has already been traced, there were various other endowments connected with chantry or collegiate foundations in the two counties, all of which were necessarily affected by the Act of 1547, and the commissions subsequently issued. Amongst these endowments were grammar schools attached to chantries or gilds in Alnwick, Morpeth, Darlington, and Bernard Castle; song schools in the last and first named places, and perhaps at certain colleges and hospitals; and, in addition, prebends in Norton college which were tenable as exhibitions at the universities.

The clear value of the twin song and grammar schools in Alnwick, which were attached to the chantry of the Virgin in the parish church, was given in 1535 as £10-10-6 (2), but by the 1548 certificate their net value was said to be only £8-3-4. As a result, when it was ordered by the Brief Certificate and continuance warrant, that the grammar school should continue under

(1) cf. Leach, p. 73-6.

(2) Valor V, p. 330.

the care of Thomas Thompson, the former master, the stipend assigned to him was only £4-1-8, for it was presumed that the song school master had been in receipt of the other half of the chantry's income (1). A schedule of rents dating from soon after 1548 shows that this stipend was largely made up of money accruing from property which had belonged to chantries in Warkworth and in Alnwick. It was regularly paid until about 1555, when, for some reason which is not known, it was withheld by the receiver; Thompson however, appeared before the barons of the Exchequer and successfully demanded its payment, together with any arrears which were due (2). The returns to special commissions addressed to the Bishop on June 12, 1570, and July 4, 1571, show that it was duly paid after this date.

The Bishop certified that the school was in a suitable place and was efficiently kept (3), but it is evident that it was very generally felt that it had been defrauded of part of its rightful income. In 1573, when Sir John Forster was granted some property of the value of 3/- which had belonged to the chantry of the Virgin, and which was given as concealed, his right to hold it was disputed by John Steinton or Stanton one of the schoolmasters. Perhaps until this date the master of the school had continued, with the connivance of the burgesses, to enjoy this rent in addition to his stipend (4). On July 8, 1588, the burgesses addressed a petition to Lord Burghley in which they stated that the grammar and song school had been worth £13-6-8, or twenty marks, and that, at the dissolution, one of the masters "did give in his portion of that stipend as parcel of a chantry, the other (being unwilling to frustrate the town of so great a benefit) employed his part to the keeping of a school, according to the first foundation thereof." They stated that the endowment was originally given for two schoolmasters, but that in later years the masters began to celebrate mass every day in the church, and so came to be known as chantry priests. Finally, as the grammar school served not only Alnwick, but a large part of Northumberland as well, they petitioned that the full sum of twenty marks might again be paid to the master, instead of a stipend of only £4-1-8 (5). Although the

(1) S.S. 22, p. lxxxiii; Aug. Off. Chantry Certif. 94, m.2; Cont. Warrant no. 20. (2) Tate, "Alnwick" II, p. 75-6. (3) Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 3265. (4) cf. Tate II, p. 78. (5) Ibid, p. 77-8.

burgesses misrepresented certain of the facts so as to strengthen their ground, and were unsuccessful in their petition, it was undoubtedly true that the school had suffered by the change. In 1578, however, while Stanton, who was also parish clerk, was still grammar master, there was a second master in the town called, Ralph Grey who may have given some elementary instruction, as the chantry song school had been swept away (1).

The chantry grammar school in Morpeth suffered, at the dissolution, in much the same way as the school in Alnwick. It has already been noticed that it had been founded as recently as 1542, when it had been attached to a stipendiary service at the altar of the Virgin in All Saints' chapel; the burgesses were made patrons of the school and agreed to make up the deficiency, if the revenue of the service did not amount to the sum of £6-13-4 (2). In 1548, however, its net value was given as £6-12-10 (3), and consequently this was the sum assigned to Thomas Husband by the continuance warrant, in which it was ordered that the school should be continued, as in previous years, under his mastership (4).

It was not only in Alnwick that dissatisfaction was felt with the results upon schools of the 1547 Chantry Act; this was the case throughout England, and point was given to the general feeling by Thomas Lever, the master of St. John's College in Cambridge, who was later to hold important positions in Durham diocese. In a sermon preached before the King he stated that the Act was used to rob learning and to spoil the poor, and gave instances to enforce his view (5). Perhaps partly as a result of his complaint at least fourteen schools were refounded by the Duke of Northumberland, and Dixon states in recording this fact, "it may be worth while to notice that it was where the Duke of Northumberland had acquired estates that these remissions to the public need were made; and Morpeth in Northumberland may be added to the list." (6)

Particulars for a grant of property to Morpeth school were drawn up in 1551, and in accordance with the

(1) cf. Ibid, p. 81. In 1570 Edward ^{Maxwell} was master of the school, but on his death in 1571 he was succeeded by Stanton (Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 3265). (2) cf. above p. 61p. (3) S.S. 22, p. lxxv. In 1546 its value was given as only £6-8-2 (Aug. Off. Chantry Certif. 18, no. 41). (4) Aug. Off. Chantry Certif. 94, m.2; Cont. Warrant, no. 20. (5) Tate, II, p. 72; Leach, p. 78. (6) Dixon III, p. 459.

petition of Lord Dacre and the burgesses and bailiffs of the town a charter of refoundation was granted to it on March 12, 1551/2. This charter provided that the refounded school should be named the Free Grammar School of Edward VI; there were to be a master and under-master, both to be appointed by the burgesses and bailiffs, who, together with the Bishop, were empowered to draw up its statutes (1). The property with which it was endowed had all been chantry property; it had belonged to the various chantries and stipendiary services in All Saints chapel; to the chantry of St. Giles in Netherwitton; and to the Lady Mass service in Ponteland church; its total value was £20-10-8, but the odd shillings and pence were reserved to the Crown (2). Thomas Husband seems to have become the headmaster of the re-found school, and to have retained this position until c. 1573; (3) by 1578, however, he had been superseded by John Maxwell, who was licensed, whilst at that date Nicholas Milburne (or Ridley) was undermaster (4). Husband and Maxwell, like their colleague at Alnwick, had evidently, with the connivance or consent of the burgesses, continued to occupy a house which had belonged to the dissolved chantry with which the school was connected; their unlawful tenure was exposed, however, by an inquest on concealed property of May 13, 1575. (5). In these later years such parts of the old chapel of All Saints as had survived the dissolution were incorporated in the school buildings; the school bell had actually belonged to the chantry of the Virgin (6).

By reason of the re-foundation Morpeth school had, therefore, actually benefitted by the dissolution, but the two chantry grammar schools of Durham county were less fortunate. Darlington school, which may have been in some manner connected with the college, was attached to the chantry of All Saints in the parish church of which the net value was given in 1546 as only £3-8-3; in 1548, however, it was valued at £4-12-4, but in 1535, it had been worth as much as £4-15-0. Nevertheless by the schools continuance warrant, Thomas Richardson, who was continued in his office of school-master, was only assigned a stipend of £4-0-8 (7),

(1) from foundation charter given in Hodgson II, vol. 2, p. 509-11. (2) Ibid; Leach ii, p. 158-9.

(3) cf. in 1573 he witnessed a will, Hodgson II, vol. 2, p. 402, 404. (4) Ibid, & S.S. 22, p. 33.

(5) Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 2884. (6) Hodgson II, vol. 2, p. 401.

(7) Aug. Off. Chantry Certif. 18, no. 102; S.S. 22, p. lxx-i; Cont. Warrant no 9.

perhaps because, in his capacity as a minister of the college, he was at the same time granted a pension of £4 (1). Temporarily, therefore, adequate provision was made for the master, and it appears that Richardson's stipend was soon increased to £4-3-8 (2), but his successors, at least one of whom was, like him, a priest, could not depend upon a government income to eke out their meagre wages. Moreover it seems probable that by 1559 the growth of the school had made it necessary to employ a second master, for in this and succeeding years, a Robert Hall occurs as schoolmaster in Darlington, although Richardson retained his office until at least 1575 (3). An attempt was, therefore, made to improve its position, and as a result of a petition addressed to the Crown by the Earl of Westmorland and Bishop Pilkington, a royal charter was granted on June 15, 1567, to what was henceforth to be known as the Free Grammar School of Queen Elizabeth. For the time being the four churchwardens were constituted governors of the school, and were given the appointment of the master and undermaster. Property which had belonged to All Saints chantry was once again granted to the school, for the support of the masters, and was valued at £5-4-10; a portion of this property was actually in the tenure of Robert Hall in 1567, and so it seems possible that it had been concealed in 1548 (4). By this charter the damage done to the school at the dissolution was partly repaired, but the new endowment can hardly have sufficed for two masters.

(1) Exch. K.R. Accounts etc. Bdle. 75, no. 11, m. 4.

(2) cf. Minis. Accts. 2-3 Edw. VI, no. 698, fol. 44a; V.C.H. I, p. 388. In the schedule of the 1552 pensions commission his stipend was given as £4-3-4,— he failed to appear at this date to state whether these wages had been duly paid. cf. Exch. K.R. Accts, etc. Bdle. 76, no. 13 p. 13, 21a.

(3) It is possible that Hall, who may have been parish clerk, was master of a vernacular school. cf. V.C.H. I, p. 388; Longstaffe "Hist. of Darlington," p. 257; Wills & Invs. III, p. 22; S.S. 22, p. cv. These are the other masters given by Longstaffe: Robert Ovington, who was deprived by Henry Dethicke and Thomas Burton when the churchwardens were ordered to elect a new master; Lewis Ambrose, who occurs 1587; one of this name was vicar of Sockburn in 1604 (Surtees III, p. 257).

(4) Surtees III, p. 377; Longstaffe, p. 256-60.

A harder fate was to befall the school in Barnard Castle which had been kept by the priest of the gild of the Trinity. It was stated by the commissioners responsible for the chantry certificate of 1546, that he combined under his care a free grammar school and a song school for the children of the town. The commissioners of 1548, however, although mentioning the gild, the value of which they gave as £4-18-8 net, made no reference to either school (1) and consequently no provision was made for the continuance of the grammar school. Although by the foundation the priest was to take charge of a grammar school as well as of a song school, in practice the two schools had probably been combined to form only a song or vernacular school; even if this was the case, however, real injury was inflicted by the confiscation of the revenues of the gild which might at any time have been used to re-open the grammar school.

Another educational institution suffered a fate similar to that of Barnard Castle. The Chantry Act of 1547, in addition to chantries, free chapels, and gilds, had vested colleges in the Crown, and as a result the endowment of Norton college was appropriated, although it was generally employed to provide exhibitions at the universities. The eight exhibitioners or prebendaries were pensioned, and a lease was immediately granted of the property of the college (2).

This account of the effects of the dissolution of the monasteries and chantries shows, therefore, that a heavy blow was dealt to the means provided in the two counties to encourage study at the universities, through the dissolution, first of Durham College in Oxford, and then of Norton college. With respect to secondary or grammar schools it has been shown that three such establishments may have been suppressed; this, however, was not such a loss as it might appear at first sight, for of these three the schools at Barnard Castle and Hexham had perhaps already ceased to exist, and although the monastic Almonry in Durham was surrendered, the refounded cathedral school really incorporated it as well as Langley's school. Of those which survived the upheaval, probably only Alwick school sustained any long-standing injury. In the assignment of stipends to the schoolmasters of the schools which were continued in

(1) Aug. Off. chantry Certif. 18, no. 85; S.S. 22, p.lxvii.

(2) Exch. K.R. Accounts, etc. Bdle. 75, no. 11; above p. 283.

1548, only the bare stipend of the chantry priests was considered, without taking into account the augmentations which they were accustomed to receive. At Alnwick an attempt of the burgesses to secure an increase of the master's salary proved fruitless, but in Darlington some remedy of this evil was obtained by the royal charter of 1567, and in Morpeth a fairly liberal endowment of £20 was secured for the school by the charter of 1552. The one grammar school which emerged from the changes in Durham city had definitely benefitted and, strong in its connection with the Dean and Chapter, was to flourish in the succeeding years. The endowments of those schools which had been chantry schools were chiefly, or wholly, drawn from property which had belonged to the chantries, and at Alnwick, Morpeth, and Darlington the stipend assigned to the schoolmaster in 1548 may at first have been increased from the rents of concealed lands or houses. For grammar schools, therefore, the changes of the Reformation did not, on the whole have deleterious effects, and the necessary alterations must have been accomplished smoothly, for nearly all the masters of the pre-Reformation schools were continued in their old positions.

The heaviest loss was in the sphere of elementary or vernacular education. No provision was made for the continued maintenance of song and writing schools in the Chantry Act of 1547, and, as a result, the song schools in Alnwick, Barnard Castle, and Durham were dissolved, although with regard to the last it must be remembered that the new Dean and Chapter song school amply replaced the chantry as well as the Priory school. As, however, the chantry commissioners appointed for Durham and Northumberland never mentioned song schools in their certificates, save incidentally to the mention of grammar schools, it is obvious that many other schools of this type must have existed, but have been destroyed in 1548. There are indications that song schools were maintained at Auckland and Darlington colleges, and also in certain monasteries and in some of the richer hospitals, such as Staindrop; none of them however, seem to have survived the changes of the Reformation period.

SECTION III. SCHOOLS OF THE SECOND HALF OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

Some account has been given in the preceding pages of the chief effects of the dissolution of the monasteries and chantries upon the educational institutions of Durham and Northumberland; indirectly, however, the vast changes of the Reformation period had other and equally important results, which now await consideration. The propagandist value of schools was fully recognised in the sixteenth century, on the one hand by the Jesuits — who designed, through them, to win back Protestants to the Roman Catholic faith — and on the other hand by the Reformers, who intended to use them to maintain a supply of educated clergy, to inculcate the new doctrines, and also to give that elementary instruction in letters through which the ordinary layman would be enabled to base his faith upon his own reading of the Scriptures. Education was not, however, only regarded from this point of view; the spirit of the renaissance with its love of learning had, quite early in the sixteenth century, led to the foundation of several schools in the South of England, and as the century progressed its influence was more and more felt in the North, where, it will be shown, the people in general began to evince an interest in learning for its own sake, quite apart from religion.

In various parts of England the more Protestant clergy were founding grammar schools in which the reformed doctrines were taught; Mathew Parker founded a school in Rochdale, Archbishop Grindal in St. Bees, Bishop Pilkington in Rivington, while within Durham county Bernard Gilpin founded a school at Houghton-le-Spring and Robert Swift at Sedgfield. Carleton, his biographer speaks of Gilpin as supplying the place of a bishop partly because of his attempts to increase the existing facilities for education (1). In 1560 he started a school in his parish of Houghton-le-Spring by taking boarders into his own house, and as early as 1569 he attempted to obtain an endowment and a royal charter for the institution (2). He was not successful at first, but his great influence as one of the most venerated exponents of the reformed doctrines enabled him to obtain for his scheme the support of the wealthy

(1) quoted from Surtees I, p. 167. (2) V.C.H. I, p.393.

John Heath of Kepier. Heath, a merchant of London who had been Warden of the Fleet, had purchased Kepier hospital from Lord Ormiston, the Crown grantee. Himself a firm Protestant, he must have arrived to take up his residence in Durham just after the conclusion of the 1569 rebellion, and Surtees remarks:- "The situation of a Southern stranger seating himself at this juncture on the ruins of a religious house, would require both conduct and resolution. Mr. Heath was probably in advance of the age he lived in." (1). Such was the man who became Gilpin's chief partner in endowing the school at Houghton-le-Spring, for which letters-patent were finally obtained in 1574.

By the charter of foundation the institution was named "the free grammar school and almshouse of Kepier", this title being chosen, no doubt, partly in compliment to Heath and partly because a large part of its revenues came from lands which had belonged to the late hospital. It appears from Gilpin's will, and from a list of yearly revenues of the school of 1616, that Heath endowed it with the gilly tithes of Bishop Wearmouth, and with pensions out of the rectories of Gateshead, Ryton, and Whickham; while Gilpin bestowed upon it the gilly tithes of Easington, Chester, Whitburn, Cleadon, and Ryhope, which he had purchased from Heath for £240. All this property had belonged to Kepier hospital, and so once again it was assigned to charitable uses (2). Another donor to the school, John Franklin of Cocken in Houghton parish, was also connected with the hospital, for he belonged to the same family as William Franklin, its last master, and John Franklin, the receiver-general of the house in 1535, who had obtained a lease of its property in 1546 (3). The school was also endowed by William Carr of Cocken who was related by marriage to Franklin, and in later years was given further endowments by Gilpin himself; it is, therefore, stated in the parish register of Houghton beside the entry of Gilpin's burial on March 5, 1583, that he "bestowed in building and endowing of the same (i.e. of the school) £460." (4). Finally John Heath, by his will of 1589, left it an additional sum to be used for exhibitions to the universities (5), and Gilpin provided that half of his property not otherwise devised

(1) Surtees IV, ii, p. 66. (2) Hutchinson II, p.556;
Wills & Invs. II, p. 83-94. (3) S.S. 95, p. 262;
Valor V, p. 308; Conyers-Surtees, "Hist. of Frosterley,"
p. 16-17. (4) Wills & Invs. II, p. 83-94; Par. Reg.
(5) Surtees IV, p. 71.

should be used for the same purpose, for certain selected scholars (1).

The school seems to have been attended by quite a large number of pupils; Gilpin boarded twenty four of them in his own house and others were boarded in the town, whilst some of them came daily from the neighbouring parishes. They were taught by a master and usher who were appointed by the governors, and Gilpin himself taught some of the scholars. Special provision was made for the poor, for he expressly reserved the property which he had bought from Heath for the maintenance of the usher and three poor scholars, and those children whom he boarded in his own house were either charged very small fees, or else nothing at all.

Gilpin and Heath were appointed by the charter as the first governors of the school, and they were empowered to draw up its statutes. Surtees thinks that at Gilpin's death this power had never been exercised as he had directed the whole administration himself, but in his will he commended the school to the care of his successor in Houghton rectory, asking him to see that the statutes were duly kept. By 1582 he had obtained the patronage of the Bishop of Durham for the school, and it was to him, John Heath, and Richard Bellasis of Morton House in Houghton, who seems to have succeeded him as governor, that he finally and with great earnestness committed its care in the future. The school had been founded for so short a time that he evidently felt some anxiety for its fate; how dear it was to his heart is apparent throughout the long document which is his will. In this, no one connected with it was forgotten, scholars whether living in his house in the parish, or elsewhere, and the two masters, were all left legacies. (2). The first master appointed on the foundation was a graduate, Robert Copperthwaite, who was also curate of the parish; he still held this position in 1578, but by 1582 he had been succeeded by Christopher Rawson, a Bachelor of Arts. The usher in 1578 was Adam Dowson, who was buried at Houghton on June 13, 1582; he was succeeded in the same year by Francis Reisley (3). Gilpin's anxiety for the school was unnecessary; it was maintained and flourished, and produced many notable scholars such as Henry Airey,

(1) Wills & Invs. II, p. 93. (2) Surtees I, p. 158; Wills & Invs. II, p. 83-94; S.S. 95, p. 21 n.

(3) Surtees I, p. 160; S.S. 22, p. 47; WILLS & INVS, II, p. 93; V.C.H. I, p. 394. It is also possible that George Swalwell, the Recusant, was attached to the school,

his own nephew, who became provost of Queen's college in Oxford (1). It did, therefore, fulfil his purpose which may be summed up in his own words:- "And I trust that I may boldly affirm that whatsoever is given to a godly grammar school, it is given to the maintenance of Christ's holy gospel"(2).

Similar, evidently, was the purpose of Robert Swift who had married the daughter of that protagonist of education, Thomas Lever, and who was himself prebendary of the first stall in the cathedral from 1562 to 1599, and also rector of Sedgefield, and spiritual chancellor for some years both to Pilkington and Barnes (3). Himself an L.L.B., in 1596 he purchased property in Sedgefield which he surrendered on May 12, 1596, to the twenty four of the parish "to be bestowed to the use of the parish clerk of Sedgefield from time to time, to dwell in, and to teach and instruct, in the principles of the Christian religion and of grammar, all such poor men's children of the same parish as, in the direction of the said twenty-four, are not deemed able to pay for their school hire." Three years later John Fairless, who was then parish clerk, received, by order of the churchwardens 10/- for the repair of the school, and they arranged that, in the future, he was to receive the same sum twice a year. (4). Already, therefore, school buildings had been secured, and here also a free education in grammar was provided for the poor.

Three grammar schools were founded by rich laymen within this period, the first of which was Horsley's school in Newcastle. Actually provision had been made for this school in 1525, but as it did not come into being until c. 1545, when some of the most important of the Reformation changes had already been effected, and did not receive its charter until 1600, it may be dealt with here. Thomas Horsley, a Newcastle merchant who had held high office in the town but who had, apparently, no children, decreed by his will of 1525 that his wife should have the use of his property for her life time, but that on her death it should be held by the Corporation in trust for the use of a schoolmaster. The Mayor and Corporation accepted the office of trustees, and added four marks yearly to the stipend of the master; they appointed fourteen acting trustees to manage this gift, and amongst their number were Sir

for in 1577 he was given as reader at Houghton, and schoolmaster - cf. Longstaffe "Hist. of Darlington". p.123.
(1) Wills & Invs. II, p. 85n. (2) Ibid p. 93.
(3) Hutchinson II, p. 170-1 (4) Surtees III, p. 419.

William Heron of Ford (one of Horsley's tenants), five aldermen, the registrar of Durham, and three clergy. On the death of Horsley and his wife the school was established in St. Nicholas' churchyard, the master being paid at the rate of £5 yearly (1). It has already been noticed that there was probably a pre-Reformation grammar school in Newcastle but it seems evident that it was now merged in the new school. It is also interesting to note that at the end of the Brief Certificate of 1548, upon which the continuance warrants were based, there was a memorandum running thus:- "Towns meet for schools and hospitals, Newcastle, Morpeth, Alnwick, Hexham." (2). Horsley's school may therefore have been felt to supply the need thus brought to the notice of the government.

The school was fairly soon transferred to the chapel off the West Spital hospital, and almost immediately afterwards, on December 13, 1599, the Corporation granted a lease of the old school house. This move was not made merely with the object of providing better accommodation, but in furtherance of their project of partially converting the hospital into an educational institution. In order to give the school a more secure foundation the charter issued to Newcastle in 1600 included directions for the establishment of a Royal Free Grammar School, which was incorporated and given power to hold lands not exceeding £40 yearly in value. (3).

Of the nine masters who are known to have held office during this century (4), one, William Allanson, was curate of St. Nicholas' church; of the ushers John Murray was perpetual curate of St. John's, whilst Thomas Oxley probably became curate of Bamburgh and later obtained a benefice in Kent. Furthermore, John Gray, the earliest known master, may perhaps be identified with a priest of that name who had held a living in Cambridgeshire, 1552-4 (5). The first occurrence of the payment of the master's stipend is in 1561 when 25/- was paid to him for his quarterage; 25/- continued to be the amount paid until February, 1576/7, when the item ran thus:- "Paid to the master of the high (grammar) school and his son Humphrey Gray, for their quarterage 50/-.." (6)

(1) A.R. Laws "Schola Novocastrensis" p. 20-1, 23, 27, 30; Welford II, p. 88. (2) Aug. Off. Chantry Certif. 94, m.3. (3) S.S. 137, p. 8-9. (4) Brand I, p. 87-9. (5) A list of them is given in Arch. Ael. 3rd. Ser. vol. 21, p. 132-40; A.R. Laws. (6) Ibid. (6) Welford II, p. 372 and 498.

This, however, was a temporary arrangement, caused probably by the illness of John Gray, who was not mentioned at the visitation of 1577/8, although he was still being paid as master in 1581; he died in 1583 and was buried at St. Nicholas' church on August 22, 1583. His son, as he was receiving more than the stipend of an usher, was probably acting as a kind of co-head, but he became sole master in 1584. After this date, as new masters were appointed, the stipend was rapidly increased. Francis Burrowes on his appointment in 1594 was assigned a salary of £10, and in the following year when, owing to his part in the controversy concerning the grand lease of Gateshead and Whickham, he was superseded by Cuthbert Ogle, the latter was promised a salary of £20; but as a result of the rapid changes in the mastership which then ensued the amount may have fluctuated from time to time. Similarly, the usher's stipend was increased; John Murray on his appointment in 1590 was granted £6 yearly, but when Oxley was preferred to the same position in 1601 he was granted £10. Probably at least five of the masters or undermasters were graduates, and two of them seem to have held the degree of Master of Arts (1).

The augmented wages paid to the masters probably indicate an increase in the number of boys attending the school (2). This increase must have been responsible for the appointment of an undermaster, for an usher of the school occurs for the first time in 1590; the office, however, appears to have been vacant in the years 1596-1600. The advance of the new institution must have been seriously hindered by the controversy concerning the grand lease to which reference has just been made. The headmaster, Burrowes, had unwisely taken part in the struggle and was consequently dismissed in 1594, although he had been granted his office on the recommendation of the Archbishop Of York, and the President of the Council in the North. There followed a period of confusion, for Cuthbert Ogle was appointed to replace him, but Burrowes appealed to the Council in the North, and, as a result, was restored. From 1595 to 1599 there were therefore, two headmasters, both of whom were paid by the Corporation. A crisis was

(1) Arch. Ael. 3rd. Ser. vol. 21, p. 132-40.

(2) It seems to have been attended by boys coming from a great distance; cf. Gabriel Hall of Ottercap, a member of the Redesdale clan, by his will of April 14, 1563, directed that his sons should be sent to the Newcastle school - Welford II, p. 388.

reached in November 1599, when Burrowes was again ejected from the school, which the Mayor locked up and placed in the care of William Allanson, the curate of St. Nicholas. After some years of continued strife, on Allanson's death in 1602, Burrowes was again reinstated. Grave damage must have resulted from this long drawn out struggle, but with Burrowes' final resignation in 1603 the school was able to enter upon a more peaceful phase of its existence (1).

Towards the end of the century a grammar school was established at Hexham, which, like Newcastle, was recorded at the end of the Brief Certificate of 1548 to be a suitable place for the erection of continuance of a school or hospital (2). George Lawson of Little Usworth in Durham, a man of beneficent intentions, who made an unavailing attempt to preserve the Burnhall estates in the family of that Robert Claxton who took part in the rebellion of 1569, by his will of 1587 bequeathed £20 for the maintenance of a grammar school in the town. His interest in it was due to his marriage to one of the daughters and co-heiresses of Sir Reynold Carnaby; as Carnaby had profited by the dissolution of the Priory, of which he had obtained a grant in 1538, Lawson's gift might be regarded in some sense as reparation for the injury inflicted by its suppression, for it has already been shown that there had been a grammar school connected with the Priory which may have survived until the sixteenth century (3). His bequest was perhaps the occasion of the drawing up of the grammar school charter, which was granted on June 18, 1599. By this charter the Free Grammar School, as it was named, was placed under the control of twelve governors who were to constitute a body corporate, and act in conjunction with the Archbishop of York in the appointment of a master and an usher. Despite Lawson's bequest and a type of voluntary rate which the governors seem to have instituted, the fact that no grant of revenue accompanied the royal grant of a charter meant that the school's resources were so small that it was found necessary to charge fees (4).

(1) Arch. Ael. 3rd. Ser. vol. 21, p. 132-4. Robert Fowberry became master in 1603; the two ushers whose names are known, who have not been mentioned above, were Mr. Cooke, and Thomas Boswell; it is not, however, certain that the letter was attached to this school.

(2) Aug. Off. Chantry Certif. 94, m. 3. (3) Wills & Invs. II, p. 322-3; L & P. XIII, ii, p. 409.

(4) Its regular accounts do not begin until 1608 - cf. Cal. S.P. Dom. V, p. 214-5; N.C.H. III, p. 211-13, 217-19.

The third school of this group was founded at Heighington in 1600 or 1601 by Elizabeth Jennison of Walworth. She was the daughter of Edward Birch, a groom-porter of Henry VIII, and was probably, therefore, brought up in the doctrines of the reformed religion. She founded the school with an endowment of £10 yearly so that it might be free for the children of all the inhabitants of the parish; actually, however, these "free" scholars paid 4d. as an entrance fee and 2d. a quarter. According to its ordinances ~~the~~ the purpose of the school was chiefly to instruct children in the principles of the Christian religion according "to some learned and godly book of catechism set forth by public authority." The new foundation was placed under ecclesiastical control as the Bishop was to be its visitor, while the Dean and Chapter of Durham were to appoint the master and the trustees (1).

The religious motive was, therefore, present in the foundation of at least one of the schools endowed by the laity. It probably, moreover, played a large part in the establishment of Bishop Auckland grammar school, which was founded, or re-founded, by James I, in 1603. This school was closely connected with St. Anne's chapel, and the twelve governors who were appointed by the charter may have been the select vestry, taken over from the ecclesiastical part of the foundation. (2). The school may, therefore, have existed in some form before 1603. Two years after the grant of the charter Anne Swift endowed it with a rent-charge of £10 out of some property in Stanhope (3). This Anne Swift was the widow of Robert Swift, who had himself endowed a school in Sedgefield, and the daughter of Thomas Lever. As the charter of foundation had been obtained on her petition she evidently shared the conviction of both these men of the importance of education generally, and particularly as providing a grounding in the established religion. Shortly after this period grammar schools were also founded at Wolsingham (4) and at Berwick. For some time during the sixteenth century there had been talk of the necessity of a grammar school in the latter town, and finally, in 1610, Sir William Selby bequeathed his

(1) Surtees III, p. 317; V.C.H. I, p. 399-400. The endowment was actually for £11 yearly, but £1 was reserved for the poor of the parish. (2) Arch. Ael. 3rd. Ser. XII, p. 167. (3) V.C.H. I, p. 396-7. (4) in 1614 - Conyers Surtees "Hist. of Wolsingham" p.32.

property in Marygate to be used for this purpose (1).

It has been shown that the dissolution of the monasteries and chantries dealt the heaviest blow to schools of an elementary type. Perhaps it was partly an appreciation of this fact, as well as a desire to bring up the rising generation in the new doctrines, which led the State and the Church to make ordinances which, if fully carried out, would have provided a large proportion of the population with the possibility of obtaining some elementary education. In his injunctions of 1571, Archbishop Grindal ordered the clergy who could not preach to "teach children to read, to write, and to know their duties towards God, their Prince, parents, and all others." In 1577, Bishop Barnes of Durham in much the same terms enjoined that all clergy, not licensed to preach, should teach the children of their cures to read and to write, and exhort the parents of those who were apt to send them to school (2). The parish clerks was ordered to carry out similar duties. The three main qualifications of the clerk in the middle ages had been ability to sing, to read the epistle, and to teach. Generally, however, the last qualification had not been insisted upon, but the idea of its necessity survived in the sixteenth century, and consequently Grindal also enjoined that the parish clerk should "endeavour himself to teach young children to read, if he be able so to do," (3).

It is probable, and it may later be seen to what extent, that some of the schools which now came into existence were due to these injunctions. Some, however, owed their origin to other causes, such as bequests in wills, and some had probably existed before the Reformation and had survived because they were not attached to any ecclesiastical institution which was, itself, dissolved.

The existence of a large number of parish schools can be proved from the records of the chancellor's visitation of January and February, 1578, for on the occasion of this visitation schoolmasters were generally cited. Some of the masters whose names were therefore recorded evidently belonged to the grammar schools of the two counties (4), but allowance

(1) Scott, "Berwick", p. 393. (2) Frere, "Visit. Arts." III, p. 281; Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." II, p. 74.

(3) Frere, "Visit. Arts". III, p. 173 291.

(4) Thus, for example, under the church of St. Mary in the S. Bailey the names of Robert Cook and Christopher Green are given, who were the Durham grammar school masters - S.S. 22, p. 46.

can be made for this fact. Apart from schools in Newcastle which may be considered separately, the records show that there were parish schools in Corbridge, Alston, Woodhorn, Berwick, and Boldon; in each of these places there was one master except in Berwick where there were three, and so, perhaps, there were three schools. Against other places the words "no schoolmaster" were entered and seem to imply that a school was generally maintained in them; these places were Bywell St. Andrew, Kirkhaugh, Chellerton, and Simondburn, (1) and as John Stevenson, who was rector of Kirkhaugh at the time of the visitation, bequeathed £20 for a schoolmaster in his parish (2), the supposition is probably correct. Since, moreover, the fact of there being no schoolmaster was only entered in this manner in the case of Corbridge deanery there may have been schools in the other deaneries of which no record survives, because the office of schoolmaster was temporarily vacant at the time of the visitation; furthermore the list for Durham county is by no means complete.

Four more schools, at least, are known to have existed in the Bishopric. John Emson, the vicar of Greatham, by his will of 1558 desired burial in Greatham church, and left money to the lay and clerical staff taking part in his funeral, and 2d. to each of the scholars (3). Evidently these scholars were attached to Greatham hospital song school, of which some mention was made in the "Valor"; the school, with the hospital itself had, therefore, survived the changes made in the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI. Similarly John Duckett, the curate of Whitworth, by his will of August 24, 1568 asked to be buried in St. Margaret's church in Durham, with which he had previously been connected, and amongst his funeral expenses there occurs an item for 1/10 paid to "ye scholars of St. Margaret's church" (4); here also there must, therefore, have been a song school. Thirdly Thomasine Heath of Aycliffe, the widow of John Heath of Kepier, made her will on October 14, 1596, and bequeathed 6/8 to Robert Stevenson the "school master at Aycliffe" (5). Finally, in a case of 1575 or 1576 concerning a brawl in the churchyard of Wolsingham, Christopher Lawson who was entered

(1) S.S. 22, p. 29-51.

(2) Hodgson II, vol. 3. p.65.

(3) Wills & Invs. I, p. 169.

(4) Wills & Invs. I

p. 288-9

(5) Ibid III, p. 163. She was buried 4

days later - Par. Reg.

in the records of the case as "yeoman, alias schoolmaster, aged 26" was accused of having beaten a certain boy who was not one of his scholars (1).

Wills and inventories of the period also give proof of the existence of one or two more schools in Northumberland. Amongst the debts owed by Nicholas Ridley of Willimoteswick was the sum of 26/8 due "to the schoolmaster" (2); this schoolmaster probably taught in the parish of Haltwhistle, in which Willimoteswick was situated. From the will and inventory of 1582 of Lancelot Thirlwall, who also lived in Haltwhistle, it appears that Lancelot's son, William, was being taught by the curate of Alwinton, to whom he owed one shilling for William's "school hire" (3); it must be presumed therefore, either that the curate had at one time been master of Haltwhistle school, or else that there was another school situated in Alwinton.

In addition to these schools, the existence of which seems fairly certain, entries in parish registers and similar documents suggest that there may have been writing schools in certain other parishes. For example, a "William Viccars, schoolmaster" was buried at Chester-le-Street on November 28, 1609, and on March 26, 1600, George Sadler of Yarm in Yorkshire, "schoolmaster," was married in Egglecliffe to Mrs. Anne Ourde (4). Again Thomas Ingemethorpe, who was rector of Stainton from 1594 until 1638, after his deprivation from the position of headmaster of Durham school to which he had been appointed in 1610, retired to Stainton where he taught ten or twelve boys until his death (5); and, as baptisms of various Ingemethorpes occur in the parish register from October 3, 1591, it seems possible that he had been schoolmaster of the parish even before he became its rector. Finally it may be noticed that William Bell, the rector of Middleton-in-Teesdale, by his will of 1558 made a conditional bequest of some silver and gold plate to "poor scholles" in Berwick, Norham, and Middleton (6), and that, as there were two schoolmasters in Alwick in 1578, one of the two may have been in charge of a writing school in this town (7)

- (1) S.S. 21, p. 305-7. (2) Wills & Invs. I, p. 399
(3) Wills & Invs. II, p. 77. (4) Parish Registers.
A Thomas Viccars, who was a priest was master of Alwick school in 1611 (Tate II, p. 81). (5) Surtees III, p. 64.
(6) Wills & Invs. I, p. 171-2. The word "scholles" probably means scholars so that it does not necessarily imply the existence of schools in these places.
(7) cf. above p. 642.

Turning now to Newcastle, it is found that the evidence of the existence of schools of this class is both fairly copious and slightly confusing. In the records of the visitation of 1578 schoolmasters were mentioned in connection with each of the four churches of the town. Humphrey Gray and Thomas Boswell, whose names were entered under the heading of St. Nicholas' church, were probably both masters of the grammar school, but John Stokoe and John Bowke, whose names also occur under the same heading, must have been the masters of a writing school. This writing school appears for the first time in the corporation accounts in 1601, when Robert Johns was its master at a salary of £20, and from that date at least it was situated in St. Nicholas' churchyard. In the visitation records one master was mentioned in connection with each of the churches of St. John and St. Andrew, but under the title of All Saints' Church the names of as many as five were entered; possibly, therefore, there may have been a song school as well as a writing school in All Saints chapelry, or, alternatively, one or two of these five masters may have belonged to the French school (1).

Mention was first made of the French school in 1562 but it may have originated in the pre-Reformation period. It was supported by the Council and was at first under the direction of Peter Demont and at a later date of a Mr. Rosse, who was recorded in 1596 to have received 20/- from the Corporation for keeping a French school in which only children of freemen of the town could be taught (2).

The early history of what was probably a writing school in the West Spital can also be followed in this

(1) S.S. 22, p. 42-3; Arch. Ael. 3rd. Ser. vol. 21, p. 134-5, 139-40; A.R. Laws "Schola Novacastrensis" p.62-3. The Robert Johns who became master of St. Nicholas' writing school in 1601, is probably the Mr Johns given as a master at All Saints' in 1578. The other masters at All Saints' in 1578, were Thomas Colston, William Coupland, John Lighton and Arthur More; the master at St. John's was Anthony Ellington, and at St. Andrew's Thomas Wigham. In the parish register of St. Nicholas church on August 28, 1593, there occurs the baptism of Henry "son of Michael Baites, yeoman and schoolmaster"; this Michael Baites may have belonged to St. Nicholas' writing school. On October 8, 1599, at St. John's church, Isabel Baitts, daughter to Thomas Baitts, schoolmaster, was baptised. Thomas Baitts may have been a master in St. John's writing school. (2) A.R. Laws, "Scola Novacastrensis", p. 38; Welford III, p. 109.

century. It has been shown that, in order to prevent any attempt on the part of the Crown to appropriate the estates of the hospital, the Corporation had tried to make it partially an educational institution. Accordingly, as early as 1567, in granting the next presentation to Ralph Lawson and William Selby, they made a condition that the master appointed by them should pay £13-6-8 for the support of a schoolmaster (1). Selby and Lawson presented in 1579, (2) at which date the school must have come into existence. When Henry Ewbanke was appointed to the mastership he entered into bond, on March 8, 1585/6, to maintain at his own cost a free school with an able master who was to instruct children of the freemen of the town at a payment of only 6d. quarterly. As, however, he was charged with neglecting his duties in this respect, the Corporation forced him to resign in 1615, and themselves appointed a master at a salary of £20 yearly, who was to reside in the hospital (3).

Lastly there are also records of a choir school attached to St. Nicholas' church, which was quite distinct from the writing school. Unlike the two schools just mentioned, this school was not dependent upon the Corporation, which, however, following its usual custom of paying the clerical and lay staff of St. Nicholas, paid both the master's salary and for the upkeep of the choristers. Generally the parish clerk seems to have been master of the school; for example in 1561 Peter Fayrburne was paid his wages as clerk, and given an additional 40/- for teaching the four choristers, and in c. 1576 Thomas Pearson was paid 20/- as clerk, and 10/- "for keeping and teaching four boys for maintaining service in St. Nicholas' church." At the later date, however, there was a second master attached to the school, who was also paid 10/- (4).

Altogether there appear to have been, therefore, as many as seven schools in Newcastle in which some elementary instruction was given; this number was not, however, disproportionate to the size and wealth of

(1) S.S. 137, p. 8.

(2) Welford II, p. 514.

(3) S.S. 137, p. 8; A.R. Laws, "Schola Novacastrensis," p. 57-9.

(4) i.e. John Wallis who occurs in the 1586 will of Thomas Key, one of the clergy of the church, as the singing master - Cf. Arch. Ael. 3rd. Ser. vol. 21, p. 134-5; Welford II, p. 372; A.R. Laws, "Schola Novacastrensis" p. 62-3.

the town. Probably, if as many records were available for other parts of the two counties as still survive for Newcastle, the number of schools already enumerated could have been greatly increased.

The records which do survive do not give very much help in determining to what extent the injunctions were carried out by which clergy and parish clerks were ordered to teach the children of their parishes to read and to write. Although priests were fairly often appointed as masters of grammar schools, only three cases occur of their giving elementary instruction (1). Similarly, although parish clerks are known to have been masters of some of the grammar schools of the counties, (2), only three cases are available in which they can be proved to have taught in elementary schools (3). These facts suggest that the Injunctions were not fully executed, but it is possible that both the clergy and the parish clerks gave occasional and perhaps rather informal instruction of this nature, and so were not generally considered as schoolmasters. Some of the schools which have been mentioned, such as Greatham song school, existed before the Reformation changes, but probably the majority came into existence in the post-Reformation period and were founded either through the initiative of private individuals or of town councils, or else as a result of the episcopal injunctions.

If considerable reparation was made, in this manner, for the damage done to elementary schools by the dissolution of the monasteries and chantries, the same is hardly true with regard to exhibitions for students to go to the universities. Even in this sphere however, some remedy was attempted. Not only the Royal Injunctions of 1536, but also those of 1547 and 1559, had ordered that holders of benefices worth over £100 should give an exhibition to one scholar (4). There is some evidence that the richer clergy of the counties, including the pluralist Robert Hindmer, William Birche, the rector of Stanhope, and Prebendary William Todd,

(1) i.e. in Boldon Edmund Marche was both schoolmaster and curate in 1578 (S.S. 22 p.51); a priest was master of a school in Alwinton or Haltwhistle in c. 1582; and Ingemethorpe, the rector of Stainton, probably acted as schoolmaster in that parish (above p. 657.)

(2) e.g. of Alwick and Sedgfield (3) i.e. they taught in St. Nicholas' choir school and in St. Andrew's school Newcastle (1578), and in Woodhorn school (1578) (S.S. 22, p. 34, 43). (4) Frere "Visit. Arts." II, p. 10, 121-2; III, p. 11-12.

were actually maintaining scholars at the universities in accordance with this order; and in at least two cases the scholars seem to have been their own relatives (1). Moreover, the will of Bernard Gilpin of Houghton-le-Spring shows that he was helping to support several students at Oxford or Cambridge (2), and it is probable that many of those who shared his appreciation of the necessity of an educated ministry also did what they could in this direction.

Some of the grammar schools of the counties had exhibitions attached to them. It has already been shown that Kepier school was provided with endowments of this nature by its founders, Gilpin and Heath. A few of the pupils of Newcastle grammar school who went to Cambridge were probably supported by similar gifts, for Jeanne Lewen, the widow of a wealthy Newcastle merchant, by her will of 1569 made a bequest of 10/- each to four poor scholars at Cambridge who had been born in the town (3). The Dean and Chapter of Durham had the duty of appointing to at least one university exhibition for scholars of Durham school, and accordingly on September 1, 1556, Florentus Stevenson, "a modest youth, moderately learned in grammar, and suitable for higher studies," was presented by them to the Master and Fellows of Christ's College in Cambridge, where Dr. Thomas Pattenson had founded this exhibition (4). In 1558 they made a second presentation to the scholarship, this time of a grammarian of sixteen years of age called Robert Garrett (5), and in his case, at anyrate, the purpose which no doubt Pattenson had had in view in founding it seems to have been answered, for Garrett became vicar

(1) cf. the inventory of Hindmer shows that he owed £7 "for the exhibitions and commons of John Hindmer at Cambridge." John Hindmer was his nephew and one of his executors (Wills & Invs. I, p. 161, 164; P.R.O. Dun. Inq. p.m. File 191, no. 52; D.K. Rep. 44, App. p.425). William Todd by his will of 1567/8 left all his goods to his niece and to William Todd, a "scholar at Cambridge" (Wills & Invs. I, p. 269). Birche, in his will of 1575, referred to a certain Richard Dalton as "my scholar", and left him £6 and some books because he was at one of the universities (S.S. 22, p. cxi, cxii).

(2) Wills & Invs. II, p. 83-94. (3) Wills & Invs. I, p. 306. (4) D. & Chap. Reg. II, fol. 16a. This may have been the Thomas Pattenson who was rector of Bishop Wearmouth in 1535, but who was deprived in 1560 (Randall IX; Valor V, p. 313). (5) D. & Chap. Reg. II, fol. 53b.

of Eglington in 1577, by which date he had obtained the degree of S.T.B. (1).

The case of another grammarian going to Cambridge University as an exhibitor of the Dean and Chapter suggests that they were not always so fortunate in their selection of scholars, and also that they had other exhibitions at their disposal. In the last decade of the century a seminary priest, James Young, was arrested in the South, and in the course of his examination stated that he had been brought up at Durham school as a Queen's scholar. In 1579 he was granted an exhibition of five marks yearly, and left Durham with the pretence of going to Cambridge, but really in order to go abroad. Actually he travelled to London, and thence to Rheims where, finding some of the same school who had become priests, he followed their example and studied at Rome and elsewhere (2). Generally speaking, however, the scholars sent to Cambridge did at least complete their course of study there, even if they did not return to the North as ordinands. It may also be noticed that Francis Kay, or Key, who was appointed headmaster of Durham school in 1580, in the following year was allowed £3-6-8 by the chapter "towards his proceeding in Cambridge" - presumably to his M.A. degree (3).

It has already been suggested that, apart from the desire of the reformers to obtain an educated ministry, the people generally were becoming interested in learning. This can be proved in part from a study of the wills of the period. Although documents of this nature show that, with the exception of the clergy, very few people possessed books - it has been estimated that of books mentioned in deeds and wills there were only about fifty in Newcastle and thirty in other parts of Northumberland (4) - it is yet noticeable that towards the end of the century requests concerning the schooling of the testators' children or relatives became fairly frequent. Whilst in the three volumes of Wills & Inventories published by the Surtees Society, no such request can be found before 1550, and only one in the decade of 1550-60, in the eighth decade of the century ten cases of this type occur. Sometimes the testator definitely requested that some child

(1) Randall X. (2) Cal. S.P. Dom. III, p. 257-61. Note that the Durham Treas. bk. of 1579-80 contains a payment of 40/- to a scholar of Cambridge for his exhibition - S.S. 103, p. 717. (3) V.C.H. I, p. 377. (4) A.R. Laws, "Schola Novacastrensis", p. 15.

dependent upon him should be sent to school, and left money for this purpose. For example, by his will of 1587 John Ferry of Ferryhill charged his executors to maintain his son at school for ten years; similarly Anthony Middleton of Durham county in 1575 left some money for his grandson to be kept at school or at the Inns of Court until he was twenty one; whilst John Heron of Chipchase, in 1590, left as much as £10 for the schooling of his grandson (1). Sometimes, however, the testator merely couched his wishes in some such terms as those used by Robert Lambton of Stainton in 1563, when he left the tuition of his son William to his cousin, who was to see that he was "brought up in Godliness, virtue and learning." (2). The vast majority of these requests were made by the gentry of the two counties, but some of them were made by rich tradesmen and merchants, such as Edward Hudspeth, a tanner of Durham; and Bertram Anderson and Robert Barker of Newcastle; furthermore one is to be found in the will of a yeoman, William Gibson of Stranton (3). Whether this schooling meant merely a vernacular or a more advanced education cannot generally be told; except in the case of such a will as that of Elizabeth Fenwick of East Matfen, who requested in 1585 that her son Arthur should be kept at school until he could "perfectly read and write". (4). In three cases, however, a university education was definitely mentioned; as early as 1566 William Walton of Durham, who was evidently unusually broad-minded, desired that his two younger sons should "should follow the school at University" and accordingly made special provision for them. Some twenty years later Robert Eden of West Auckland made similar arrangements for his son, whilst Elizabeth Donkin recorded in her will of 1585 the fact that she had made an allowance to the son of her first marriage, with a tanner of Gateshead, for this period of residence at Cambridge University (5).

(1) Wills & Invs. II, p. 36, 201; III, p. 129.

(2) Ibid, I, p. 212; II, p. 81, etc. (3) Ibid, II, p. 13, 182; III, p. 109, 164. (4) Wills & Invs III, p. 113.

(5) Ibid I, p. 254-5; II, p. 106; III, p. 112. cf. also the wills of the following people which contain requests for their children or dependents to be sent to school:- John Hutton of Hunwick, John Duckett, curate of Whitworth, Anthony Place of Dinsdale, Edward Lawson of Bywell, George Lawson of Neasham, John Blakiston of Blakiston, Christopher Hall of Wingate Grange, Robert Muschamp of Lowick, and John Gascoigne of Darlington - Ibid, I, p. 234, 289, 314, 434; II, p. 23, 146, 276, 305; III, p. 14.

Occasionally, furthermore, in the latter half of the century charitable bequests included gifts of money or of books to schools or to poor scholars. Although never, in this century, a common form of charity, a few more examples of the practise may be added to those which have already been mentioned in connection with particular schools. The same William Walton who desired that his two younger sons should go to the university left 10/- to poor scholars of Durham school; Richard Belassis of Morton left £5 to Kepier School, of which he was a governor; and William Birche, the rector of Stanhope, bequeathed all the English books which he had not otherwise devised to the inhabitants of Stanhope and Durham who could read (1). The same desire to help poor students may also be seen in a note in the Dean and Chapter Treasury, dated October 23, 1593, of 10/- "given to a poor scholar, a french man, cast on land at the Holy Island, towards his charges into his country" (2).

Although it is true that books were scarce, it appears not only that libraries were inaugurated in the cathedral and in the church of St. Nicholas in Newcastle (3), but that private people amongst the laity were collecting libraries of their own. For example, Bertram Anderson left his grandson John Calverley £10 to buy himself books, whilst Sir Henry Widdrington left Roger Widdrington £100, "for the better maintenance of his study and library." (4). Consequently, although it may be true that there were very few lettered people in the two counties even in the second half of the century, it is undeniable that the desire to learn was rapidly spreading, and it was, no doubt, partly this fact which made it eminently necessary for the Church to control the type of teaching that was given in the schools.

(1) Wills & Invs. I, p. 254; II, p. 338; S.S. 22, p. cxii.

(2) D. & Chap. Treas. Misc. Cart. no. 3352.

(3) cf. above p. 118, 165; Arch. Ael. 4th. Ser. IX, p. 125.

(4) Wills & Invs. II, p. 13, 225-6.

SECTION IV. THE CONTROL OF EDUCATION BY THE CHURCH
— CONCLUSIONS.

The Church had concerned itself with the teaching given in schools from an early period, but, as a result of the Reformation, it became of vital importance that it should have a real control of education. This was, in the first place, due to the fact that Recusants and Puritans were often to be found in the ranks of the schoolmasters, and that Marian schoolmasters sometimes clung to office in the hope that there would be a reversion to the old forms of religion, also that priests who were deprived as a result of the royal visitation of 1559 occasionally became private tutors, and after 1574 both these groups were reinforced by the seminarists. Equally, later in the reign, extremists and Puritans were sometimes found holding office in schools, and certain deprived Puritan clergy, who were not fitted for much else than teaching, probably became private tutors. Secondly, the Church was interested in the control of education because — by regulations to enforce both the teaching of the catechism and regular church attendances — the schoolmaster might be made an instrument to ensure conformity amongst his pupils. Thirdly, as it has already been shown, it was hoped that the more promising pupils would enter the sacred ministry.

Schoolmasters were therefore considered ecclesiastical officers; an attitude which was however, by no means new, for the medieval master, who was often in minor orders, as early as the twelfth century had been obliged to obtain a license from the Ordinary (1). Under Queen Mary some attempt was made to supervise teaching, but a much firmer attitude was immediately adopted on Elizabeth's accession. The Royal Injunctions of 1559 enforced the necessity of a license from the Ordinary, and it was ordered that teachers should be regularly examined and approved by the Bishop before such license was granted. After 1563 they became liable to have the oath of Supremacy tendered to them, and as a result of the rebellion of 1569, searching inquiries were made concerning teachers in private houses (2)

Masters of grammar schools were, moreover, subject to restrictions in the matter which they taught.

(1) N. Wood, "The Ref. & English Educ." p. 51-4.

(2) Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I, p. xliv, cxi-cxlii.

In 1535 they were ordered by proclamation to teach the Royal as opposed to the Papal Supremacy, and by the Royal Injunctions of 1559 they were commanded to imbue in their pupils a love of the established religion, and to oblige them to memorise portions of the Bible in English. In 1553 a catechism for use in schools was produced, and by 1575 the learning of Dean Nowell's catechism, which superseded this earlier one, had become part of the routine of the curriculum. Finally, in accordance with rules laid down in the canons of 1571, they were expected to oblige their pupils to attend church, and to examine them on the sermons at which they had been present (1).

The schools of Durham and Northumberland seem to have been particularly strictly supervised. As early as 1559, William Thearles, the master of Durham grammar school, was bound over by the royal visitors to appear before the Court of Ecclesiastical Commission because he had refused the oath; in the same year he was superseded in his office, and later he was forbidden to enter Durham diocese. As the oath could not legally be tendered to schoolmasters until 1563, the commissioners may have acted on the ground that his licence had been issued by a Marian bishop, and so had automatically become invalid. An unsuccessful attempt seems to have been made at the same time to eject Thomas Iveson, the usher of the school; and it is probable that after a preliminary resistance he conformed, and therefore was allowed to retain his office (2).

Records of episcopal administration show that the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of Durham made various efforts to enforce the government regulations concerning both teachers in schools and private tutors. Grindal led the way with an injunction for the province of York, by which it was ordered that no schoolmaster should teach openly, or privately in a gentleman's house or elsewhere, unless he was of sound religion and licensed by the Ordinary. He was not to teach anything against the established religion, but was to instruct his scholars in the Latin catechism, and also in those portions of Scripture "most meet to move them to the love and due reverence of God's true religion now truly set forth by the Queen's Majesty....." (3). Articles based upon this injunction were issued by Archbishop Sandys

(1) N. Wood, "The Ref. & Eng. Educ." p. 154-61, 165-70.
(2) cf. below, p. 800.; N. Wood, "The Ref. & Eng. Educ." p. 270-2.
(3) Frere, "Visit. Arts" III, p. 291.

in 1578 and by Archbishop Piers in 1590 (1). So as to enforce the orders more efficiently schoolmasters were generally cited, as well as the clergy, at the chancellor's visitation of Durham and Northumberland in January and February, 1577/8. Inquiry was made whether they were licensed, and of twenty six masters named in the records of the visitation it appears that ten were not formally authorised (2). As there is no evidence that any of them were ejected it is probable that they fulfilled the necessary conditions, and duly obtained license to exercise their profession.

Various other means were employed to control education. It has been seen that it was enjoined, both by Grindal and Barnes, that those clergy who were not preachers should give instruction in the catechism and in reading and writing, and furthermore, that the parish clerk should share in this duty. This order provided a means of ensuring that religious teaching should conform with the doctrines of the established religion. Although only three of the clergy are known to have taught in elementary schools, they frequently held office in the grammar schools of the counties; for example seven or eight of the masters appointed in Durham school before 1603, and three or four of the masters in Horsley's school were priests or deacons. Similarly, parish clerks occasionally taught in grammar schools as well as in elementary schools. The object, however, of ensuring conformity by the appointment of priests and clerks may not always have been attained, for in 1578 Edmund Marche, the curate and schoolmaster at Boldon, Amor Oxley, Thomas Wigham and John Stanton, who were respectively parish clerks and schoolmasters at Woodhorn, St. Andrew's, Newcastle, and Alnwick, were all unlicensed (3). Probably, however, the system generally answered its purpose.

Just as the old foundation statutes of grammar schools had contained regulations concerning religious observances, strict injunctions enforcing daily attendance at cathedral services and the use of authorised prayers were incorporated in the statutes of the cathedral which had reference to the re-founded grammar school in Durham. Similarly a prominent position was given to the religious aspect of the education provided in Heighington school, which, it was ordered, was to be in

(1) Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." II, p. 98; III, p. 262.

(2) S.S. 22, p. 29-51. (3) S.S. 22, p. 34, 38, 43, 46, 51; Tate II, p. 81.

accordance with the established religion. Finally it must be noticed that five of the new grammar schools were controlled by religious bodies or by officials directly dependent upon the Dean and Chapter; by the royal charter of 1567 the grammar school at Darlington was placed under the governance of the four churchwardens; Heighington school was partly controlled by the Dean and Chapter and by the Bishop, and both Sedgefield and Bishop Auckland schools seems to have been directed by the select vestries of these parishes. In addition all song schools were under the control of the staff of the church or chapel to which they were attached.

As a result of all these measures, schools of the post-Reformation period must have been almost as much under the direction of the Church as the schools which they superseded, which had, generally speaking, been connected with a monastery or chantry or some other religious foundation. In this way, therefore, the change caused by the Reformation was to some extent counter-acted, but it remains to be seen whether the other results of the religious changes were similarly counter-balanced. For this purpose the statement, that "The ancient provision of secular education in 'the Bishopric' of Durham, before the Reformation, was in all probability far greater relatively to the population than that made at any other period, until we come to the present century" (1), may be recalled, as providing some criterion by which to judge the changes.

It is difficult to make a comparison of the number of schools before and after the dissolution, as it is known that many must have existed of which no record survives; this is probably particularly true of the pre-Reformation period, for the chancellor's visitation of 1577/8 gives a survey of the number of schoolmasters in the greater part of the two counties such as is not obtainable for the earlier period. As far as can be known, however, it appears that whereas there were between six and nine grammar schools, and between four and ~~twelve~~ schools of an elementary type before the Reformation, there were, in the later period, nine or ten grammar schools, and between twenty-two and twenty-seven elementary schools. These figures can, however, be very misleading if they are thought to imply a very large increase in the numbers of elementary schools, for it is in the case of schools of this type that, as has already been shown, records of pre-Reformation educational institutions are particularly lacking. What they can be held to imply with a fair degree of safety is that, despite the dissolution of

(1). A.F. Leach in V.C.H. I, p. 365.

certain schools involved by the sweeping away of the monasteries and chantries the numbers of schools were not, by the close of the period, diminished but rather, perhaps, slightly increased. Such an increase, however, may not have been proportionate to the increase in the population, and so the statement quoted above may still remain true. Moreover if exhibitions to the universities are also considered it is given additional weight, as even if the injunctions by which the richer clergy were to support scholars, and the exhibitions attached to schools such as Keping and Durham are considered, these would hardly compensate for the dissolution of Norton college and Durham college in Oxford.

Conditions in the schools appear to have remained much as before. They were still, in theory, "free" schools, and generally in practice free, or nearly free, to the poor; in such schools as Durham grammar school and song school the boys received small stipends and allowances for their board and clothing; fees, where charged, seem to have been very small, for example, in the West Spital school in Newcastle they were only sixpence a quarter. Here the new or re-founded schools compare quite favourably with the old schools in which also the poor were often taught without charge, and in the case at anyrate of the Almonry school, were also given their food. Salaries, which before the Reformation seem to have varied from something over £4 to about £9, in this later period appear to have been slightly larger. Although at Alwick the master only received just over £4, generally ushers were paid about £6 and masters £10; whilst at Newcastle, at the close of the century, the masters were in some cases paid as much as £20. This increase, however, was probably partly offset by the diminishing value of money.

In one respect, at least, there seems to have been a definite advance. This advance lay in the increasing interest in education which was taken by the people in general. It is apparent from the wills of the period that even if the older generation were often practically illiterate, and consequently seldom the owners of books, they did in some cases appreciate the benefits of education for their own children as well for the children of the poor. As, however, a greater interest was already being taken in education before the changes of the Reformation were ushered in, this advance was not wholly due to the changes themselves. The general conclusion, therefore, which emerges from a study of the conditions in the two counties must be, not that the Reformation encouraged or damaged the spread

of education, but the merely negative conclusion
that it did not retard it.

CHAPTER XI
THE RESULTS OF THE REFORMATION
CHANGES IN DURHAM AND
NORTHUMBERLAND.

THE RESULTS OF THE REFORMATION CHANGES IN DURHAM AND
NORTHUMBERLAND UPON I - THE CROWN.

The immediate cause of the dissolution of the monasteries, the hospitals and the chantries was pecuniary, and as the wholesale confiscation of property dedicated to religious purposes was one of the most important aspects of the Reformation — particularly where the northern counties were concerned — the results of the religious changes may first be summarised from the point of view of the advantages accruing to the royal Exchequer. Definite figures cannot be given in this respect, as an estimate of the value of the property of the monasteries, and also of most of the hospitals, must depend upon the figures of the "Valor", from which certain religious houses were omitted; moreover there is little evidence of the profit obtained by the Crown both as a result of the sale of the moveables of the dissolved foundations, and from those lands which were at first concealed from the royal commissioners.

If allowance is made for these facts, and, on the other hand, for the fact that the endowment of the Dean and Chapter of Durham in 1541 and the continuance of certain foundations in 1548, deprived the Crown of a potential revenue of about £1,780 (1), the King must nevertheless have secured an income of well over £2,000 from the suppression of the monasteries in Durham and Northumberland, and of nearly £1,300 from the dissolution of the chantries and colleges. In addition, the suppression of hospitals which were neither dependent for their income upon the monasteries nor reckoned as colleges, brought the Crown more than £200, (2) and, as a result of the commission of 1553 for the seizure of certain goods belonging to parish churches, 809 ounces of plate was received in London from the churches of Newcastle alone, while the sale of property confiscated from the churches of Durham county brought a clear profit of £60. (3) These figures give some indication of the extent of the total revenue which

(1) i.e. the new Dean & Chapter was granted £1233-4-2 in temporalities and £494-19-3 in spiritualities; and £51-3-3 was assigned to schools, etc, in 1548.

(2) The revenues of the smaller hospitals such as St. Leonard in Durham, Rothbury, Tweedmouth, Jesmond and the Domus Dei in Berwick cannot be included in this total as they are not known.

(3) cf. S.S. 97, p.141-2,167.

must have been acquired by the government, although it is true that, at first, certain expenses had to be met. The costs of surveys necessitated by the dissolution and concurrent measures do not seem to have been very large, but pensions granted to the dispossessed religious and to incumbents of chantries and colleges, and the continuance of fees, annuities, and corrodiess payable by the monasteries, involved a fairly heavy expenditure. In 1541 £645 odd was being paid to monastic pensioners, and about £200 to lay-annuitants and corrodiens (1), while in 1548 a total of nearly £685 was granted in pensions to members of the foundations dissolved in that year. Economy was exercised however, in grants of pensions to chantry priests of Durham, which were often less than the standard rate laid down for them, and although the Crown seems to have fulfilled its obligations in their payment, at least until 1553, its liabilities in this respect diminished rapidly, partly as a result of the death of the pensioners and partly because it was always provided that the pension should cease if the grantee was preferred by the Crown to ecclesiastical promotions of equal value.

Heavier expenses than these, however, fell upon the Crown as a result of the religious changes, because they provoked first, the rising known as the Pilgrimage of Grace, and later were chiefly responsible for the rebellion of the Earls in 1569. The latter insurrection was estimated to have cost the Treasury some £20,000, but this expenditure was to a large extent offset by the profits of the forfeitures within the Bishopric which, by the consent of Parliament, were transferred from the Bishop for that occasion. As neither rising was confined to Durham and Northumberland it may, on the whole, be concluded that substantial financial advantages accrued to the Crown as a result of the confiscations of the Reformation period within these two counties alone.

The results of the religious changes were also of value to the Crown from a political and military point of view. Much of the property acquired from the dissolved institutions was granted out, but some was retained, and included, for example, the fortress of Tynemouth, the strategic value of which was amply demonstrated during the rebellion of 1569. Moreover the centralising policy of the Tudors, which implied an attempt to break the power of the great northern lords, was itself made the easier by the religious

(1) in 1553 the sums paid to annuitants and corrodiens were £118-9-8 in Durham, and £68-3-4 in Northumberland Exch. K.R. Misc. Bk. 31.

rebellions, as they provided both the opportunity and the necessary excuse to carry the policy still further; the attack upon the privileges of the Bishop of Durham, who as Prince Palatine, was the most powerful of these lords, may, therefore, be considered next.

II. THE BISHOP.

This centralising policy, pursued by Henry VIII and his successors, successfully deprived the Palatinate of Durham of its judicial independence, while at the same time the financial necessities or rapacity of the Crown, combined with the negligence and greed of some of the occupants of the see, robbed it of many of its possessions.

At the beginning of the sixteenth century the great ecclesiastical franchise of the county palatine, or, as it was sometimes called, the Bishopric, included not only Durham itself, but also the parcels of Bedlington, Islandshire, and Norhamshire in Northumberland, and those of Allerton, Sadberge, Crake and Howdenshire in the county of York. Over these districts the Bishop had slowly acquired what were, in effect, royal rights, until by the fourteenth century this sovereignty had reached its peak; by then a judicial machinery had been established which effectually excluded that of the Kingdom. Although, however, in theory their competence was complete, the palatine courts were never final, and they were unable to exclude the King's prerogative, even if they could exclude his justices; moreover, there soon arose a perceptible tendency towards the extension of the royal justice at the expense of the Palatinate. The turmoil and disorders of the fifteenth century prevented an effort from being made to extinguish what was rapidly becoming an outworn instrument of government, but the growth of legal science, and the work of definition of fifteenth century lawyers, prepared the way for the final blow at the hands of the Tudors (1).

The expansion of the royal authority under the guidance of Thomas Cromwell, resulted in the passage through parliament, early in 1536, of the "Act for recontaining certain liberties and franchises heretofore taken from the Crown". This Act made the King's writ current throughout the country; deprived the Bishop of the power to grant pardons and to appoint judicial officers; and extended the King's peace to Durham, so that, in future, fines imposed on judicial officers for contempt and similar causes accrued to him. On the other hand it stated that the liberties of the Bishopric were to be unaltered, and also that judicial officers were to have the same powers and to perform the same

(1) cf. Lapsley, p. 258-9.

duties as before, but with the sanction, not of the Bishop, but of the King. The old forms were therefore retained but, in effect, the King's supremacy was fully established and the Palatinate shorn of its judicial independence. This change is well illustrated in the contrast between the formula by which, up to this period, the sheriff on taking office had sworn to maintain the power and privileges of the Bishop, and the formula by which Sir Robert Tempest was sworn as sheriff in 1560, for, as Lapsley points out "half of this verbose document consists in the acknowledgement of the complete and supreme rights of the Queen over the bishopric and the Bishop." (1).

The chancery, which had been re-organized by Wolsey, probably escaped the operation of the Statute, and the independent organisation of the judiciary was scrupulously observed (2); nevertheless, other inroads were made upon the immunities of the see. Henry VIII regulated the right of sanctuary, and although the privileges of Durham cathedral were untouched in this respect, it seems to have been possible for the central government to obtain the extradition of persons who had taken sanctuary in it. The Bishop's rights with respect to criminals who took refuge in the Palatinate were generally scantily respected (3). Similarly his privileges were affected by the Act of Supremacy, which finally abolished the anomaly of his temporal relations with the clergy and the ecclesiastical courts of the county palatine (4). Finally, when the independence of the Palatinate jurisdiction had been, in this manner, already snatched away, the new arrangements made for the King's Council in the North successfully sapped the life of the palatine courts. Originating as a result of the disorders of the fifteenth century, Henry VIII, after allowing its commission to lapse, revived the Council, and completed its organisation after the Pilgrimage of Grace. The extensive powers thereupon granted to it, together with the attitude of Bishop Tunstal, who as president seems to have approved of this centralising policy — laid the judiciary at the feet of the Council, which was able to remove any case from the palatine courts and sometimes even held its sessions in Durham (5).

The King's attempt to break up the great

-
- (1) Lapsley, p. 82, 196-7. (2) Ibid, p. 189, 197-8.
(3) Ibid, p. 251-5. (4) Ibid, p. 53-4.
(5) Reid, p. 41-147, 243-4, 280-5, 316-9; Lapsley, p. 262-3.

franchises of the North had been largely successful by the close of his reign. The death in 1537 of Henry, Earl of Northumberland, had given him all the Percy lands; Holgate, on becoming Archbishop of York in 1545, surrendered to him all the liberties of the see and many of its manors; the King had already obtained Beverley, and in 1546 he also acquired Redesdale. Durham remained, therefore, the only liberty north of the Trent not united to the Crown, and it is probable that Henry was only waiting for Tunstal's death to obtain possession of it as well (1). During the reign of his son, Edward VI, the union was actually accomplished, although it would seem rather to advance the designs of the newly created Duke of Northumberland than the power of the Crown. The accession of Mary involved the reversal of this policy; the Bishopric and see were reconstituted and restored to Tunstal, but as the price of this restoration, to appease the corporation of Newcastle to which Gateshead had been annexed by an act concurrent with that which dissolved the Bishopric, Tunstal was obliged to grant the mayor and burgesses a long lease of the Salt Meadows of Gateshead (2). More important, however, was the fact that his long imprisonment and the temporary union of the Palatinate with the Crown, had allowed the Council in the North to secure a control over the Bishopric which could never afterwards be wholly abolished (3).

Despite these changes, at the accession of Elizabeth the Bishopric remained in many respects untouched, for its boundaries were as yet secure, its revenue was practically undiminished, and the judicial and administrative organisations still retained the forms of independence. Nevertheless, the stultification of the whole system may be illustrated by the disuse of the episcopal mint, which seems to have been quietly suppressed at the close of Tunstal's episcopate (4). His deprivation and death offered the opportunity for which Henry VIII had probably been waiting; although, however, Elizabeth was bent upon pursuing her father's policy, at this juncture she was in no position to undo Mary's work and reunite the Palatinate to the Crown. But by robbery of its lands on one pretext or another, and by further attacks upon its independence, she

(1) Reid, p. 162-3. (2) Welford II, p. 293, 306.
(3) Reid, p. 319-20. (4) Lapsley, p. 281-2. John Richardson, who died in 1562, was probably the last coiner for the see of Durham (Wills & Invs. I, p.203). A reference to the mint, dated May 24, 1549, occurs in Wriothsley's chronicle (II, p. 13-14, Cam. Soc. 2nd. Ser);

succeeded in curtailing its importance, if she was unable to dissolve it.

Pilkington, unpopular in Durham and Northumberland as a Protestant and as a married bishop, was forced to rely for support upon the Council in the North and was therefore unable to check its interference in the Palatinate. Not in fact, until 1580 was any attempt made to limit the growing power of the Council, and this attempt was probably largely due to the unwillingness of the Dean and Chapter to abide by the terms of an agreement made in 1576, when their dispute with their customary tenants had been brought before the Council. The stay of a suit in the chancery of Durham in 1579 seems to have brought the controversy to a head, and after the death in 1595 of the President, Huntingdon, the Bishop began to issue injunctions under the palatine seal for the stay of suits before the Council. Whether he managed to curtail its encroachments is questionable (1), but it seems evident that in these later years of the century the Queen obtained a certain measure of control over the Chancery. In 1596 a book of orders, which regulated its practice, was drawn up and issued under the Queen's authority, and it is noticeable that in 1600 an equity case was stated to have been heard "before Thomas Calverley esquire, chancellor of the county palatine of Durham; together with the assistance and in the presence of Edward Drewe, the Queen's Majesty's serjeant at law, then and yet one of the Queen's Majesty's justices itinerant in the said county and eftstones likewise at large." (2).

Elizabeth, in the meanwhile — generally without any show of justification — had embarked upon a course of robbery of the possessions of the Bishopric. In 1535 its total gross revenue was £3,128-17-8, (3), and financially it had suffered little under Henry VIII. By virtue of an act of Parliament of 1558 the Queen immediately confiscated more than a quarter of its possessions including Norhamshire, Allertonshire, Easington ward, and Gateshead. When restitution of his temporalities was made to Pilkington in 1561 these manors and demesnes were excepted, but his frequent complaints of the manner in which his authority was

probably therefore it was not abolished in 1536 as has been suggested.

(1) Reid, p. 320-1. (2) Lapsley, p. 198.

(3) i.e. inclusive of £830-9-10 from its parcels in Northumberland and Yorkshire - Valor V, p. 300.

impaired by the losses so incurred (1) were finally rewarded in 1566, when the detained lands, with the exception of Norhamshire, were restored to him in return for a yearly rent charge of £1,000 odd (2). A few years later, however, Elizabeth used the pretext of the necessity of punishing those who had taken part in the rebellion of 1569 to inflict further losses upon the see.

Probably as a result of his accommodating attitude Tunstal was left with various minor liberties, including the right to forfeited lands, despite the fact that an act had been passed in 1534 which stated that all lands and tenements in which persons attainted of treason had any estate of inheritance should pass to the King as forfeiture. In 1539 the Bishop made a grant of Thorp-Bulmer, which had been forfeited by the attainer of Sir John Bulmer, but in this case the issue was avoided as the grant was expressly stated to be made with the assent of the King (3); again, however, in 1544 and 1556-7 he made similar grants on his own authority (4). Until 1569 no important lands had been in question, but the vast forfeitures resulting from the Act of Attainder offered the Queen the possibility of recouping herself for her expenditure in suppressing the rising; consequently the Act provided that all property, whether in the Palatinate or elsewhere, should, for that turn, devolve upon the Crown. Pilkington brought the matter to court, but was unsuccessful both in this suit (5) and at the same time in an attempt to claim Hexhamshire as falling within his jurisdiction; (6); he did, however, frustrate the Queen's attempt in 1574 to obtain possession of the fisheries of Norham.

Bishop Barnes, who was frequently involved in disputes with his own tenants and himself connived at

(1) cf. S.P. Dom. Eliz. XX, nos. 5, 25; XVII, no. 9.

(2) In the same year he seems to have been submitted to partial imprisonment because of his insistence upon his rights - cf. Ibid, XXXIX, no. 78, 81. (3) Lapsley p. 47; D.K. Rep. 37, App. I, p. 13; 44, App. p. 334.

(4) D.K. Rep. 37. App. I, p. 12; 44, App. p. 334, 470.

In the first year of Elizabeth's reign an attempt was made to reverse the last grant, which consisted of property which had belonged to Ninian Menvill - cf. Surtees IV, p. 47-8. (5) cf. however, 22, Eliz. a

grant by the Bishop of certain property of John Swinburne of Chopwell D.K. Rep. 37, App. I. p. 98.

(6) Cal. S.P. Dom. Add. VIII, p. 395-6.

the oppression and exactions of his officials and relatives (1), was unable to maintain the rights of the see against the rapacity of the court. He immediately granted the Queen the fisheries of Norham, and, in later years, granted her many of the episcopal manors by long leases. Under his successors, Bishop Mathew Hutton (1589-94) and Bishop Toby Mathew (1595-1606), the same policy of alienating parcels of the property of the bishopric was pursued on a smaller scale. (2). On the other hand Bishop Mathew, in a suit brought against the Queen in 1600-3, obtained ample recognition of his right to forfeited lands (3), and although Hutton allowed Elizabeth to make a further encroachment, by granting a charter of incorporation to the mesne-borough of Hartlepool the position of which had already been the cause of much debate, Mathew obtained a formal decision in 1598 that the manor lay within the liberties of the Bishopric (4).

A document amongst the state papers dated May 7, 1575, which is entitled "Sundry particular inconveniences falling on the inhabitants within the Bishopric of Durham by the dissolution of the county palatine there," seems to show that there was a renewal of the project of uniting the liberty to the Crown (5); nevertheless the franchise escaped total shipwreck at the hands of the Tudors, and Miss Calthrop states, in dealing with the recusant rolls of the end of the century, "The absence of any section for Durham in the eleven Elizabethan recusant rolls may be accepted as contributory evidence of the survival of the courts of the Palatinate long after its supremacy had come to an end with the Act of Resumption of 1536". (6). While, however, the old forms were to survive for several centuries, the Reformation period had seen the virtual eclipse of the sovereignty of the Bishop as Prince Palatine, and the structure of independence which remained was slowly drained of all real life as the scope of royal justice was extended throughout the land.

At the same time as his temporal power was diminished, in some respects the Bishop's authority in his spiritual capacity was increased. It seems probable that in Durham diocese, as well as in other parts

(1) cf. Cal. S.P. Dom. II, p. 103, 108, 192, 570; XII, p. 241.
(2) cf. Cal. S.P. Dom. III, p. 79; Surtees I, p. lxxxvi.
(3) Hutchinson I, p. 475. (4) Surtees III, p. 102;
D.K. Rep. 37, App. I, p. 147. (5) S.P. Dom. Eliz. v
ciii, no. 42. (6) C.R.S. XVIII, p. xiv.

of England, the innovation, in 1535, of the royal visitation resulted, in practice, in the inhibition of the ordinary episcopal visitation for the remainder of the reign (1); nevertheless, the Bishop's visitatorial powers were extended. The monks and canons of the Cistercian and Premonstratensian Orders were exempt from the visitation of the diocesan, and consequently the Abbeys of Newminster, Alnwick and Blanchland were outside the sphere of his discipline; the friars, moreover, although dependent upon him for ordination and preaching licenses, were otherwise wholly free from episcopal interference (2). These limitations upon his disciplinary powers were withdrawn by the Act for the dissolution of the larger monasteries, in which it was stated that religious houses and their appropriated churches should in future lie within the visitation of the Ordinary (3). Similarly, the transformation of the monastic chapter in Durham into a secular chapter tended to augment his authority. With the conventual chapter he had sometimes been in active collision, for his position as honorary Abbot gave him no real control, and as visitor his function was never supplemented by well-defined corrective powers. By the Marian statutes, however, for the drawing up of which Tunstal had been chiefly responsible, (4) his dignity was safeguarded, his visitatorial and corrective powers were enlarged and he was made arbiter in the event of certain disputes. Meanwhile, before these statutes were completed, the dissolution of the chantries and colleges — the latter had, in part, owed their existence to an attempt to offset the independence of the monastic chapter — had materially diminished the patronage at his disposal. This loss was, however, counterbalanced by the transference from the Crown to the Bishop, in 1556, of the right to present to the twelve prebends of the cathedral.

The frequency with which Tunstal was called away from Durham, particularly after his appointment as President of the Council, led to the erection of a suffragan see of Berwick, in accordance with an act of 1534 which had made such arrangements possible. (5). After the death of Tunstal, Thomas Sparke, the suffragan

(1) Frere, "Visit. Arts." I, p. 133-4. (2) cf. Baskerville, "Eng. Monks and the Suppr. of the Monasteries," p. 72, 231. (3) "Statutes of the Realm," III, p. 733-9. (4) Frere, "Visit. Arts." I, p. 146. (5) L. & P. XII, ii, p. 80; Dixon I, p. 232.

appointed in 1537, does not seem to have exercised his episcopal functions, and the office was allowed to lapse altogether, on Sparke's death in 1571. (1). His position, however, had always been one rather of profit to the people of the two counties, from the point of view of the provision made for their spiritual welfare, than a stay to the power of the Bishop, which, if slightly extended in spiritual matters, had suffered an irreparable blow in temporal affairs.

(1) cf. Birt, "Eliz. Relig. Settlement," p. 156.

III — THE CLERGY AND THE CHURCHES OF THE COUNTIES.

The dissolution of many religious bodies, and the seizure of a great deal of church property, necessarily involved important changes in the provision made for the spiritual care of the people of the two counties. The change effected in the cathedral church by the transformation of the monastic chapter into a secular chapter, although striking in character, was less serious in its ultimate results than the changes effected elsewhere. A vast amount of spoliation of the treasures of the cathedral accompanied the dissolution of the Priory and the tenure of office of such extremists as Dean Horn and Dean Whittingham, but the erection of the secular capitular body to replace the Prior and convent was accomplished smoothly, and was disguised by the fact that the Dean, nine of the prebendaries, and the greater number of the minor canons had been inmates of the Priory. These men, who had remained within the precincts of the monastery in the transitional period from December 1539 to May 1541, maintained the services of the church with very little alteration, and, as the Dean and Chapter of Durham at the later date were endowed with nearly all the old possessions of the Priory. During the period of Northumberland's ascendancy there was real danger that the property of the new capitular body would suffer as a result of the attack upon the Bishop and Dean, but its rights were safeguarded when the division of the see was undertaken, and the restoration effected by Queen Mary included confirmation of its position by the issue of statutes under the great seal. Consequently, although the greater part of Elizabeth's reign was marked by religious strife in which many of the cathedral staff were involved, and in the later years by a certain amount of mal-administration and abuse in the direction of its affairs, the Dean and Chapter emerged at the end of century both wealthy and secure. Furthermore an ample provision had been made for the maintenance of the cathedral services by the staff assigned to it in 1541.

If, however, church property suffered comparatively little where the cathedral was concerned, the contrary was the case with the parochial churches of the two counties. In the pre-Reformation period severe ecclesiastical censures had kept private pilfering within bounds, (1) but after 1535 the

(1) cf. however, in 1533/4 it was stated that one, Henry

"General Sentence", or solemn curse pronounced by the clergy four times a year upon — amongst others — those who robbed the church, was disused, for it was ill-fitted to the temper of a period during which the government itself became the chief despoiler of property dedicated to religious purposes (1).

The first blow, directed against the monasteries, resulted in much wanton destruction. Although the monastic church at Hexham continued in use as the parish church, only the name of Tynemouth Priory church was allowed to remain for parochial purposes, and the church of Blanchland Abbey, to which an ecclesiastical district had been attached, fell into complete disuse until 1752. The attack upon "popish ornaments" which accompanied the dissolution of the monasteries led to additional destructive measures, which may be illustrated by the defacing, in 1547, of the famous Corpus Christi Shrine of St. Nicholas' church in Durham (2). The reign of Edward VI ushered in by the passage of an Act for the dissolution of colleges and chantries, as a result of which between 145 and 185 chantries, gilds, stipendiary services or similar endowments, were swept away in Durham and Northumberland. Their loss was keenly felt for they had often supported processions, and maintained lights and images, and all those accessories which beautified the services of the parish church and the building itself. The churches in which they were situated had also benefitted financially by their existence; on the one hand parish gilds had often made gifts of their surplus revenue to the churchwardens, or had made them loans without charging any interest (3), and on the other hand some of the foundations were charged with annual payments towards the repair of the church, whilst the whole revenues of certain stipendiary services in Northumberland ~~and~~ which were too small to support a priest were employed for a similar purpose at the time of the dissolution (4).

Dicson, had broken into W1 Auckland church, and taken a chalice, some books, and money - S.S. 21, p. 49.

(1)cf. Frere, "Visit. Arts". II, p. 55.

(2) S.S. 107, p. 69, 102. (3)cf. Cox, "Churchwardens' Accounts", p. 58-9; Jessopp, "Before the Great Pillage," p. 40-51.

(4) In only one case was a rent of this nature returned to the church to which it had belonged - i.e. Berwick church retained possession of the Callet fishery in the Tweed which had appeared in the 1548 certificate - S.S. 22, p. lxxxvii; Scott p. 429.

The seizure of monastic and chantry property, together with rumours that parochial church goods were to be confiscated, encouraged men of all classes to begin to fall upon the spoil themselves, sometimes with the connivance of the clergy and other responsible persons who felt that local benefactors had a better claim than the King to property of this nature. John Hynde, for example, who was an attorney at York, took from the church of Hart twenty sheep, certain bells, cruets and other ornaments,^{and} the materials of which the revestry was built for his own use (1). His malpractices were discovered during the reign of Queen Mary, but frequent commissions on concealed property issued during Elizabeth's reign show something of the extent to which church property, as well as chantry property, was embezzled during this period (2). As such transactions involved a potential loss to the Crown, in order to prevent and forestall them a series of commissions were issued for inventories to be made of parochial church goods (3), and after a final set of inventories had been drawn up in 1552, new commissioners were appointed on January 16, 1553, who were to take possession on behalf of the King of the ready money, plate, and jewels certified in 1552. These commissioners were ordered to leave within each church a necessary minimum of furniture, and Sir George Conyers, Sir Thomas Hilton, William Bellasis and Richard Vincent — to whom the Durham commission was addressed — interpreted their orders fairly liberally, leaving one or two chalices in seventy six of the eighty four churches or chapels which they visited (4), one or two patens in about fifty per cent. of the churches; and generally two or three large bells, and between two and four sanctus, sacring, hand, or clock bells. Compared to the treatment received by the churches of York city, which were only left one chalice each, very few bells, and apparently no patens, the Durham churches were generously treated, and they were, in addition, sometimes left their organs and other furniture (5). On the other hand, the 1552

(1) S.S. 97, p. 157-8. (2) e.g. Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 1715 - Lands of the church of Bywell St. Peter worth 40/-, and of Newbourn churchworth 20/-, presented as concealed. (3) S.S. 97, p. x-xiv. (4) 5 of the 8 churches in which no chalice was left were dependent chapels. (5) S.S. 97, p. 4-7, 141-6, xv. Note that in the Durham return no mention was made of vestments or altar linen, but some goods of this nature were presumably left.

inventory (which survives for Northumberland, exclusive of Newcastle) shows that most of the churches of that county had only one chalice, and that that was often of tin, and only a few bells (1); in some cases they must therefore, have been left almost destitute as a result of the 1553 commission. Unfortunately, neither county was able to benefit by the attempt made by Queen Mary to restore the goods confiscated from parish churches, as the commissions for both Durham and Northumberland were fully executed, the goods disposed of, and the plate probably melted down before she became Queen (2).

Even when the confiscations were over the churches continued to suffer from their effects. In the first place, the spoliation which had been wrought, and the plunder of the gilds and chantries, led the people to despair of ever replacing what had been lost; consequently local enterprise tended to be crushed. Secondly, bequests in wills by which money or furniture were given to the church, although fairly common throughout the Tudor period, became less frequent towards the end of the century partly, it is probable, because of the gradual abandonment both of the belief in the efficacy of prayers and masses for the dead and of the doctrine of justification by works (3). Any such falling off in voluntary gifts was the more serious because the Church could no longer draw any income from such accustomed sources as parish gilds, and gifts made in order that the donor's name might be recited each Sunday upon the bede roll. While, therefore, the churches of Durham and Northumberland drew part of their income both before and after the Reformation from the possession of houses (4), or lands (5), or a flock of sheep (6), or from payments for "fair stalls" or tombs within the church (7), in the later years of the century

(1) S.S. 97, p. 159, 164-6 (2) cf. S.S. 97, p. xvi-xvii, III (3) For post-Reformation bequests to the church, cf. Wills & Invs, I, p. 171, 286,; II, p. 171, 173-4; III, p. 67, 91, 153; Arch. Ael. 4th. Ser. IX, p. 124-5; S.S. 84, p. 278 etc. (4) St. Oswald's, St. Giles' and St. Mary the Less in Durham all had property of this type, that of St. Giles' having apparently come to it from the gild of St. Giles, cf. SS. 95, p. xxxvi, 160-1, 169; S.S. 84, p. 118, 125; Wills & Invs. II, p. 280. (5) Lands were owned by St. Nicholas Durham, Whickham, and All Saints' Newcastle - cf. Surtees II, p. 242; IV, ii, p. 50; Welford II, p. 62. (6) Pitlington and Hart both had flocks of sheep - cf. S.S. 84, p. 4, 15; S.S. 97, p. 158. (7) Interments of this type were very

new and additional means of raising money had to be employed. The appropriation of pews became more usual, and brought in a small revenue; fees were charged for burials, christenings, and banns, (1), and recourse was taken more frequently to special cessments or rates. Compulsory rating was practically unknown in pre-Reformation times, but in Elizabeth's reign it became fairly general (2), and was employed in Durham and Northumberland to obtain "rogue money", which was used for prisoners and soldiers, and money for church repairs, and for bread and wine to be used at communions (3).

Lack of money; the apathy wrought by the spoliation already effected; and the feeling of insecurity bred by government confiscations and the ravages of the Scots — which the peace with Scotland of Elizabeth's reign had failed to check (4) — meant that in the latter half of the century many churches and chapels were allowed to fall into disrepair. In 1559 the royal visitors noted that seven churches in Durham county or in Newcastle, were either out of repair, or else actually in ruin and decay (5). Attempts were soon made to restore order in this respect; the royal visitors enjoined that a fifth part of clerical income should be spent on the repair of decayed chancels, and this rule was enforced by Grindal for the northern province in 1571; moreover, his injunctions and those of Bishop Barnes contained full directions addressed to churchwardens with regard to the upkeep of the furniture and fabric of their churches (6). Despite these orders records of proceedings in the ecclesiastical court show that the decay of churches and chapels, and particularly of those situated in Northumberland, remained a matter of pressing importance, and one which, it cannot be doubted, was largely due to the Reformation.

Even more serious than the effects of the

common - cf. the parish registers of St. Andrew Auckland, St. Nicholas Durham, Lanchester, Hexham, Morpeth; the fee, although, in other parts of England generally 6/8, (Cox, "Churchwardens' Accounts" p. 169) in Durham was apparently 3/4 for an adult and 1/8 for a child (cf. S.S. 84, p. 16, 18, 36, etc; S.S. 58, p. 304; T.R. no. 541; Wills & Invs. I, p. 226, 247, 320 etc).

(1) Cox, "Churchwardens' Account, p. 58. (2) Ibid, p.11-12

(3) cf. S.S. 84, p. 24, 269, 272, 278, 280; Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 1752. (4) e.g. in 1587 4 Scots carried

off 4 rolls of lead from Ingram parish church - NQC.H. XIV, p. 465. (5) S.P. Dom. Eliz. X, p. 82, 259-63.

(6) Kennedy, "Eliz. Episc. Ad." I, p.lxxviii.

religious changes upon the churches themselves, were their consequences upon the provision which had been made for priests and curates to serve in the large parishes of the two counties, and this despite the fact that the immediate effect of the dissolution was to increase the number of clergy available. At least eleven inmates of the suppressed monasteries held benefices before the dissolution but after 1539, at the smallest estimate, about 160 monks and about sixty friars, to all of whom capacities had been granted, were added to the ranks of the secular clergy of the two counties. Some twenty monks were immediately provided with positions on the staff of Durham cathedral, but apart from them, and those who were already in possession of benefices, about forty five or fifty monks, and apparently all but one of the friars, were left without any pension at all; to them; therefore, employment of some sort became a necessity. The remainder were pensioned, but as their pensions were, on an average, only sufficient to procure for them a very bare livelihood, the greater number of them also shared the search for employment in some ecclesiastical capacity. The monks of Durham and the canons of Alnwick fared best in this respect, partly, no doubt, as the result of grants of the next advowsons of churches appropriated to their houses, which had already been made for their benefit. In all some fifty five or sixty of the ex-religious are known to have obtained benefices or curacies within the two counties; at least twelve of this number held two or three ecclesiastical promotions simultaneously and it is probable that actually rather over fifty others must have been given similar positions.

In addition, about twenty-two monks or friars became chantry priests or attached to the collegiate churches of Durham; employment of this nature proved, however, to be only temporary. By the dissolution not only of the chantries, colleges and similar foundations, but also of various hospitals, at least 150 clergy were deprived of their promotions; deans and prebendaries of colleges are not included in this total as they were, generally, already in possession of benefices or some other means of livelihood. Fifteen of this number were immediately appointed to positions for which provision had been made in the continuance warrants of 1548, and, most of the others were granted pensions which averaged in the case of the chantry priests £4-0-1, and in the case of ministers of colleges £4-3-6½. In some cases therefore, the pension only provided a bare subsistence rate, and, as sixteen chantry priests and all the chaplains of those hospitals which had been dissolved

received neither pension nor promotion in 1548, it was as necessary for the majority of these secular clergy to obtain employment as for the dispossessed religious themselves. Only sixty-six, however, can be shown to have been successful in this quest, and it is noticeable that a large number of them continued as curates, or in some similar capacity, in the very parishes in which they had formerly served.

ek While, therefore, it is apparent from these facts that as a result of the dissolution, first of the monasteries and then of the chantries, there must have been for some years an almost overwhelming supply of clergy, the majority of whom wished to obtain employment, it also appears that their presence was not taken advantage of to the extent to which it might have been. On the one hand a hiatus which occurs in Tunstal's ordination lists shortly after the suppression of the monasteries and a similar hiatus during Edward VI's reign suggest, amongst other things, that their absorption into the ranks of the secular clergy was made the occasion for a diminution in the normal number of ordinands in the diocese; and on the other hand, it seems evident that cupidity on the part of the Crown, or of the Crown grantees upon whom the duty of appointing to various churches and curacies had devolved, prevented their employment in many districts where their work could have been of infinite value. It is possible, however, that some of them gave their services voluntarily in the capacity of assistant curates, depending for their livelihood upon their pensions alone.

Some change in the provision made for the spiritual cure of churches which had been appropriated to monasteries, or had been dependent upon collegiate bodies, necessarily resulted from the dissolution, and this change—and the attempts of the Crown to replace or to better the provision already existing — must now be considered. The appropriation of churches to monasteries was in itself in the nature of an abuse, and the suppression offered an excellent opportunity to rectify the conditions resulting from the practice; nevertheless an attempt at improvement was only made in one case. Beside the record of the institution of John Wilson in 1541 to Castle Eden, it is noted in Tunstal's register that this was the first institution to the vicarage; the church had previously been served by stipendiary priests appointed by Gaisborough Priory, to which it was appropriated. The new arrangement was, however, transitory, for in 1563 — by which date Simon Welbury had been granted the spiritual and temporal property of the monastery in this parish — the Bishop recorded that there there was "neither parson nor vicar there,"

but only a curate. Similarly, in the time of Bishop Barnes the church was always served by stipendiary priests (1). Practically no recompense was made for the damage done to the spiritual life of the two counties by the suppression of (if cells be included) as many as twenty-eight religious houses within the two counties. The inmates of these houses, who numbered altogether, about 250, with the possible exception of the monks of Tynemouth, had maintained themselves without undue dependence upon the local gentry or laity, and had generally been popular amongst the people. Even the cursory report of the ill-natured visitors of 1535 had shown that the standard of morality amongst them was high, and had failed to provide any evidence either that superstitious were attached to the relics which they treasured, or that they were much in debt.

The dissolution of the colleges in 1548 inflicted further damage, for which equally little reparation was made. It is true that injurious leases show that the collegiate bodies had not always been free from abuse, and that the deaneries and prebends, although generally held by men of learning and importance, were in some cases sinecures; on the other hand ample provision had been made for the spiritual care of the large parishes of the collegiate churches through the ministers attached to these foundations. The arrangements made by the continuance warrants to replace the old establishments were most inadequate; Auckland and its outlying chapelries, which had been served in 1548 by eleven ministers maintained by the dean and prebendaries, was assigned only three assistant priests in addition to a curate or vicar; similarly a vicar and one assistant were appointed to serve the cures of Chester, Lanchester, Darlington, and Staindrop, where previously — in addition to deans or masters and prebendaries — there had been five, six, or seven, chaplains or ministers. The accounts of the receiver-general in the North for 1548-9 show, however, that a slight improvement was

(1) Surtees I, p. 42-3, 45; Harl. Mss, 594, fol. 190; S.S. 22, p. 5. Welbury and Moreland were granted 20/- from the rectory and various tithes, etc, in 1553; but in 1573 it was stated that the chapel of Eden, with the offerings, tithes, and profits in Eden belonging to the chapel, — all in the tenure of Welbury or his assigns, and late of Guisborough, — were concealed (Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 741); his son, Anthony, however, died, seised of this property, 39 Eliz.

immediately made. It appears from the accounts that the receiver paid five instead of four curates in Auckland, and three instead of two curates in both Chester and Lanchester parishes; but to offset this increase in numbers the stipend of each curate was diminished (1).

The parishes of the collegiate churches, as well as the greater number of the other parishes of the two counties, had also depended for their spiritual cure upon the incumbents of chantry foundations, which, however, shared the fate of the colleges. Generally, each endowment of this type was sufficient to maintain one priest, and where the revenues of any foundation had fallen below the minimum necessary for this purpose, they were often supplemented by parochial offerings. Although there is some evidence of the embezzlement of property of chantry foundations, and that their incumbents were sometimes pluralists, non-residents or laymen, the majority were in good condition and the incumbents, if indifferently educated, were certified in 1548 to be of good character. There had been about twenty-five stipendiary services in the two counties, the purpose of which was chiefly to provide services additional to the main services of the church; moreover, the 1546 chantry certificate, by frequent repetition of the fact that parish churches would be very ill-served without the aid of incumbents of chantry foundations, clearly shows that both stipendiary priests and chantry priests were often treated as assistant curates. In consideration of this fact, the continuance warrants provided for the appointment of certain priests chosen from the ranks of the chantry priests to serve as assistants in the four churches of Newcastle, ~~and also~~

(1) Minis. Accts. 2-3 Edw. VI, no. 698, fol. 44-5. This arrangement was still maintained in 1571 (cf. Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 3265). By the continuance warrant the vicar or curate of Auckland was to receive £20, and the three assistants £8 each. The receiver, however, paid £5-6-8 to four of the curates of Auckland and £2-13-4 to the fifth. Similar diminutions in the amount of the stipends of the curate were effected at Chester and Lanchester. The stipend of the vicar of Staindrop was also diminished, although there was still only one assistant in the parish. It is noticeable, furthermore, that the vicars or curates named in the receiver's accounts were not always the men who had been appointed to these positions by the continuance warrants. With regard to Lanchester, it must be also noticed that after,

in Berwick and Widdrington; while the two chapels of St. John in Weardale, and of Frosterley, were continued under the care of their former incumbents. Some of these arrangements, however, appear either never to have been put into effect, or else, like those made for Castle Eden, to have proved only temporary; for example, both in 1548-9 and 1571 no payment was made by the Crown receiver for a curate in Widdrington, and the office of curate of Berwick had been allowed to fall vacant by the later date (1).

A further loss was sustained by the attack upon the hospitals which, even if they were not dissolved, were crippled in respect of their religious observances. The contrast in their position before and after the dissolution may be illustrated in the case of Greatham hospital. In the earlier period this hospital supported, as well as various lay-clerks and choristers, four chaplains who were stated in 1546 to do important work in upholding the service of God in the parish church; after the Reformation, however, there was apparently only one resident chaplain, the vicar of Greatham acting as an additional chaplain; while towards the close of the century the master himself was often a layman. No attempt at all was made to repair the damage inflicted by the confiscation of property of the hospitals, and, in fact, despite its enormous acquisitions of Church property, only in one other case were the officials of the Crown responsible for an effort to improve the supply of clergy in the two counties. This was at Gosforth where, as a result of the complaints of the parishioners, the royal visitors of 1559 decreed that the vicar of Newcastle should always maintain a curate, to whose support the parishioners were to contribute (2).

It is evident from these facts that only the most meagre arrangements were made to replace the losses incurred by the dissolution, and that churches and chapels throughout the two counties suffered severely

as before. 1548, there was a curate at Satley who was appointed and paid by Kepner hospital (Harl. Mss. 594, fol. 190), and that, in the time of Bishop Barnes, some of the curacies of the parish were held together (cf. S.S. 22, p. 52 etc).

(1) Minis. Accts, 2-3 Edw. VI, no. 698, fol. 46; Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 3265. (2) Provision was made for the churchwardens and parishioners themselves to appoint a curate if the vicar defaulted - cf. S.P. Dom. Eliz. X, fol. 83.

in the provision made for their spiritual cure. During Elizabeth's reign, when a large number of the ex-religious and of the secular clergy dispossessed in 1548 were already dead, the accumulated ill-effects of the wholesale confiscations became more apparent, and were made the subject of bitter complaints. The advowsons and rectorial tithes of a large number of churches had fallen to the Crown as a result of the suppressions, and its failure to make adequate provision for such churches was vividly described by Bishop Pilkington. In a return of 1563, which he drew up in response to articles sent to him by the Privy Council, he stated that Auckland, Darlington, Chester and Lanchester "were the best benefices within the diocese, and are dissolved, and are now in the Queen's Highness' disposition, having neither parsons nor vicars, nor yet learned curates, and the parishes large, and have divers chapels appendent unto them" (1). The following entries in his return, with regard to churches which had been appropriated to the monasteries, may also be noticed:- Monkwearmouth - "Neither parson nor vicar there, the Queen's Majesty the disposition thereof, having curate there." Felton - "Destitute of a vicar these 3 or 4 years. The Queen's Majesty patroness thereof." Kirkharle - "Of long time vacant and destitute of a vicar, the Queen's Highness patroness thereof." (2). Again in 1564-5, when he was required to make a return of vacant benefices within his diocese, he stated that there were three vacancies, and added a note that in many parishes, especially in Northumberland, vicars had to serve from two to five chapels each, some of which were far from the parish church. He went on to point out that such chapels had no priests, unless it were vagabond Scots, and that they were, therefore, better served when they belonged to the Abbeys; in Durham county he said that there were great parishes from which the Queen received large revenues, and yet they were either left without parson or vicar but only with unlearned priests to whom she allowed ~~4~~ or £5 yearly, or else without even a curate (3).

The Crown had only retained a certain proportion of the rectorial tithes and advowsons which had come to it by reason of the suppression. The "Valor" shows that the monks of Durham county drew over £500 from spiritual sources; the total for Northumberland

(1) Harl. Mss. vol. 594~~n~~, fol. 187b. (2) Harl. Mss. vol. 594, fol. 190, 192-3. (3) Cal. S.B. Dom. VI, p. 577; S.P. Dom. Eliz. XXXIV, no. 27.

cannot be calculated exactly, but it must have been nearly £300 (1). After the dissolution a portion of this tithe was returned to the cathedral church of Durham, or to other churches, but the bulk was thrown into the market and was obtained by the laity. Such purchases were made easier by the fact that the monks had often employed laymen to collect impropriated tithes, or had sometimes farmed out whole benefices; consequently after the suppression in many cases these collectors and lessees petitioned the Court of Augmentations to renew their leases or even to sell them the rectorial tithes. (2) The stabilising effect of transactions of this nature was soon recognised, and led to the alienation of a great deal of property of this type; by 1558 twenty-four parcels of tithe in Durham and Northumberland had been granted to laymen or to lay corporations, and during the reign of Elizabeth forty-three parcels were similarly alienated (3). Furthermore, a large quantity of tithe which had belonged to suppressed hospitals and colleges was granted out at the same time.

As a result of such sales many of the laity became responsible for the provision of ministers in churches and chapels of the two counties. The feeling that some improvement might have been made in these cures when their tithes were granted out, instead of allowing them to continue in as bad or perhaps a worse condition than before, is apparent in the return of 1563. In this return the Bishop incorporated such notes as the following:- St. Nicholas, Durham - "Being the head and chief church in the city of Durham hath neither parson nor vicar, but a poor man the curate, his name William Headlam. The said church was annexed to the late hospital of Kepire, now in the order and disposition of John Heath, a cowper of London;" St. Giles - "Being of the same sort ----- having neither parson nor vicar"; Satley chapel - "The master of Kepire aforesaid hath all the tithes and offerings thereof. Hath a Scottish priest, his name Michael Smith." (4).

The negligent manner in which the Crown grantees were apt to carry out their duties may be illustrated from the cases of Robert Felton and Sir John Forster. Felton, who may be taken as an example of the lesser men who profited by the dissolution, enjoyed a grant of part of the tithes of the extensive parish of Hartburn.

(1) cf. Savine, "Eng. Monas. on the Eve of the Dissol." p. 91-2, 98-101. (2) Ibid, p. 110-113.

(3) From figures given by J.C. Hodgson in Proc. of the Newc. Soc. Antiq. 3rd. Ser. III, p. 15-16.

(4) Harl. Mss. vol. 594, fol. 190-1.

It was presented, however, in 1579 that the chapel of Thornton, which lay within this parish, was vacant by his default, and it was added that he would "find no curate, ~~yet~~ so bound." (1). Forster, partly as a reward for his services to the Crown, had fattened upon grants of Church property. In 1541 he purchased the cell of Bamburgh together with various tithes which had belonged to it (2), and so became responsible for the provision of ministers in Bamburgh church and its out-lying chapels. The way in which he fulfilled his obligations may be seen, both from a return drawn up by Pilkington in 1571, in which it was stated with reference to Lucker and Beadnell chapels "There are sometime two curates we are informed of the Scots nation, Sir John Forster, warden of the Marches, by reason of a lease pays their salaries", (3), and by the fact that, during the episcopate of Bishop Barnes, both these chapels and that of Tughall were frequently vacant or without church-wardens and parish clerks (4). The condition of affairs recorded in Clarkson's survey of 1567 as existing in Brainshaugh chapelry throws an even worse light upon his practices in this respect. Once the site of a Priory dependent upon Alnwick Abbey, before the Reformation Brainshaugh was converted into a parochial curacy which was served by two canons of the Abbey; in 1567, however, Forster was in possession of a lease of the chapel, and did not even maintain one priest there, with the result that services were only held in the chapel at Easter, instead of three times a week as had previously been the custom (5). Finally it may be noticed that he, together with the farmers of Hexham, Holy Island and Tynemouth, was accused in 1602 of leaving churches unprovided or supplied only with mean curates (6).

Not only negligence, but also cupidity and greed were evidently responsible for the fact that many churches and chapels were vacant or served by unlearned curates, or else by Scottish ministers, to whom small wages could be paid and who were evidently not always the most estimable of characters. Vacancies and the employment of Scottish priests were, however, also due to deprivations of the clergy resulting from the doctrinal changes or from the war upon non-residence and pluralism.

While some of the clergy retained their

(1) S.S. 22, p.98.

(2) L. & P. XVI. p.727.

(3) Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm.3265. Note, however, that in 1548-9 the curates of these chapels were each paid £4 by the Crown receiver (Minis.Accts. 2-3 Edw.VI, No.698, fol. 46a).

(4) S.S. 22, p.39, 78, 94, 99.

(5) N.C.H. V, p.484-5, 487, 493.

(6) Cal.S.P. Dom.VI, p.213-4.

promotions throughout the period, either because they were indifferent to the changes or because they recognised that the essentials of creed remained the same, about sixty were deprived between 1535 and 1579 and, as a result, vacancies were caused in about fifty parishes. The majority of these deprivations were due to opposition to the established forms of religion; consequently, while only eleven deprivations were effected before 1558, excluding members of the cathedral clergy, as many as twelve or thirteen beneficed clergy were ejected between 1559 and 1564. When it is considered, moreover, that no record survives of the number of unbeneficed clergy who were removed for opposition to the doctrinal changes it is evident that the Reformation was responsible, in another of its aspects, for diminishing the provision which had been made for the spiritual welfare of the people.

The practice of pluralism, together with its attendant evil of non-residence, was very prevalent at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, partly as a result of the deprivations, and partly because the seizure of so much Church property was already beginning to affect the numbers of the clergy. An energetic effort was made to diminish both practices, and the partial success of this attempt is shown by the facts that whereas, in 1563, between twenty six and thirty clergy held more than one ecclesiastical promotion, in 1578 only about twelve held a plurality of cures; again, whereas five clergy were deprived of their benefices between 1559 and 1564 for pluralism or for non-residence, only six were deprived for similar reasons after the later date. Although, however, some success attended this effort, for many years the prevalence of both practices had deleterious effects upon provision for spiritual care of the people.

A useful indication is found of the results of the confiscations, and at the same time of the extent to which the reformed doctrines were accepted, in the frequency with which the service of Holy Communion was celebrated. The ideal of a weekly celebration took no root, but, following the regulations generally laid down by episcopal injunctions, both Grindal in 1571 and Barnes in 1577, ordered that Communion should be ministered in each parish at least once a month (1). Despite this order, in practice there were seldom more than four Communion each year. Churchwardens' accounts show that celebrations in Pittington were most irregular;

(1) Frere "Visit. Arts." III, p. 275, 287; S.S. 22, p.13.

probably for some years before 1587 and again in 1590-1 and 1591-2 there were none at all. In the intervening years there were generally three Communion seasons, two of which were at Easter and Christmas (1). In St. Oswald's, Durham, and in Houghton-le-Spring Communion services were more regular and were generally between three and five in number (2). There were also occasionally special celebrations at marriages, or when whole households communicated (3), or by reason of a special order from the spiritual court resulting, either from the fact that there had been no celebration in the parish for more than a year, or from representations that certain people had neglected to communicate (4).

The reaction from the Romish doctrine of the mass meant that in some sense the service took a less important place than of old, but on the other hand the necessity of enforcing conformity led to episcopal regulations by which a minimum attendance of at least three times a year at the service was made compulsory upon all (5). Consequently the fact that no Communion was celebrated for many months or even years together in certain parishes, such as Pittington, the inhabitants of which had taken a prominent part in the rebellion, must be taken in part as an index of the prevalence of Recusancy.

At the same time other factors resulting from the Reformation changes were responsible for the small number of Communion services, and amongst these must be included shortage of priests and lack of the necessary furniture; for example, from proceedings against John Mackbray who was vicar both of Newcastle and of Billingham, it appears that on more than one occasion when a Communion was desired in the latter parish, it could not be celebrated because the curate whom he had out in charge was only a deacon, (6); and again in 1578 it was recorded of the parishioners of Cornhill "They have had no communion since Christmas last saving at Easter, for that they lacked a communion cup: the curate is gone away from them." (7). An even greater deterrent lay in the cost of the bread and wine. The incidence of this burden had hardly been felt before

(1) cf. S.S. 84, p. 5-7, 24-5, 28, 32-5. (2) Ibid, p. 119-21, 125-7, 129-31, etc. (3) Ibid, p. 119-21, 276-8; S.S. 21, p. 135-7. (4) S.S. 84, p. 5-6, 267.
(5) cf. S.S. 22, p. 13. (6) S.S. 21, p. 135-7.
(7) Raine, "N. Durham," p. 323.

the Reformation, but in the second half of the century the cost of the elements had to be met by special cessments. The change may be illustrated in the case of Newcastle parish. At the time when an Exchequer special commission was drawn up in 1592, it was believed that until the passage of the Chantry Act of 1547, "There was paid or satisfied a penny for every chaldre of coals shipped within the port of Newcastle-upon-Tyne to be sold, for maintenance of bread, wine, and wax to be spent at masses in the said town of Newcastle;" this tax was stated to be received by the officers of the Town chamber who provided the bread, wine and wax needed in the four churches. It was deposed, however, that after the accession of Elizabeth, every communicant of the town, who was a householder "paid pence a piece, and every servant or other communicant $\frac{1}{2}$ d a piece for the finding of bread and wine, since which time there have been no contribution forth of the said town chamber for the same" (1).

Such cessments were not wholly new, (2) but they became far more common because of the poverty of the churches in the second half of the century, and are found in use at Pitlington from 1587, and in Houghton-le-Spring from 1595 (3). The cost of the elements seems to have been surprisingly large — perhaps as a result of speculation (4) — consequently there was a great deal of opposition to such rates. In Pitlington it was found almost impossible to collect sufficient money so, in 1590, it was agreed by the Select Vestry that landlords should be answerable for the payment of 2d. by each cottager but, as receipts were still short, in 1595 the new vicar undertook to provide the elements, hoping himself to be able to collect the money due (5).

(1) Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. no. 1752. (2) cf. it was deposed, May 10, 1591, in a case concerning Owton manor that $53/4$ was paid out of the manor to Tynemouth Priory, "saving only $1\frac{1}{2}$ d. by every communicant of the same house paid to the vicar of Stranton." (P.R.O. Dun. Interrogs. & Depositions, Bdle. I.). Note also in a case of 1575-6, St. Margaret's Durham, was said to contribute to St.

Oswald's "in Latin service time" $1\frac{1}{2}$ d. and 1d. in bread, and 3d. for each householder every 7 years for holy bread (S.S. 21, p. 278-81.) (3) S.S. 84, p. 5-6, 267-8.

(4) cf. Cox, "Churchwardens' Accounts", p. 94-101.

(5) S.S. 84, p. 6-7, 29, 37. Some churches did not have to resort to such cessments; e.g. by the deed of endowment of 1541, the Dean and Chapter of Durham were charged with annual payments of $13/4$ to Norham church and of $35/4$ to St. Oswald's Durham, for bread and wine at Easter (S.S.

The difficulty of obtaining a sufficient number of celebrations of the Holy Communion in the various churches of the counties presents, therefore, a picture of the destitution and lack of adequate provision for the spiritual welfare of the people resulting from the spoliation of the Reformation period. Additional evidence of these conditions is found in the necessity experienced in the later years of the century of combining various curacies in one person (1), or of entrusting the duty of ministering in outlying chapels to the incumbent of the parish himself (2), and finally, in the fact that certain chapels were frequently vacant, sometimes for many years together; for example in Northumberland alone, eight vacancies were recorded during the chancellor's visitation of January, 1579, (3), and ten in January, 1582 (4), while in the same period a large number of parochial chapels were without churchwardens.

In considering the provision which was made for the spiritual care of the various parishes, and the failure to supply incumbents for the existing chapels, it must also be remembered that many chapels were swept away as a result of the Reformation changes, although they had often been situated in well chosen places and might have been used for the diffusion of the reformed doctrines. Some were disused after the suppression of the monasteries upon which they were dependent (5), but most survived

143, p. 57) St. Oswald's seems to have received additional yearly payments from the chapelry of Croxdale (S.S. 84, p. 134-7.)

(1) e.g. temp. Barnes, Cambo and Hartington were held together, and so were Beltingham and Lambley, and Rock and Rennington - cf. Hodgson II, vol. 3, p. 335; N.C.H. II, p. 149; S.S. 22, p. 75, 93-4. (2) e.g. Dodington was generally served by the vicar of Chatton; and between 1575 and 1583 Ryall chapel was served by the vicar of Stamfordham, who nominally had a service there once a month - cf. N.C.H. XII, p. 296; XIV, p. 144.

(3) S.S. 22, p. 93-4. (4) Ibid, p. 99.

(5) e.g. Newminster Abbey maintained a chapel at Memmerskirk in Kidland which does not seem to have survived its dissolution (Arch. Ael. 3rd. Ser. VIII, p. 25-6) Similarly, chapels at Bingfield and Spindleston, and a chapel on the Tees Bridge in Middleton-St.-George, which were maintained by monasteries, as well as such purely monastic chapels as those of Bearpark and St. Cuthbert in the Sea (Holy Island), seem to have disappeared with the monasteries.

until 1548, the stipends of the officiating ministers generally being paid by the Court of Augmentations, or, in the case of those which had been under the care of Durham Priory, by the newly appointed Dean and Chapter (1). More damage was inflicted, in this respect, by the dissolution of the hospitals and chantries. The certificate of 1546 had shown that many of the chapels which were then destroyed had served as chapels of ease; it showed for example that the chapels of Weetslade, Cambois, Piercebridge, Barmer, and Hilton in Monkwearmouth were necessary to the localities in which they were situated because of the great extent of many of the parishes, the hard winters in the North, and the ravages of the plague; and that hospital chapels, such as that of Ellishaw, were also used as chapels of ease. Despite the plea advanced in this manner for their continued existence, and the fact that the Chantry Act of 1547 expressly stated that chapels of ease to which only a minimum amount of property appertained should escape its operation, a total of twenty-seven chantry-chapels or free chapels in Durham, and of eighteen in Northumberland, together with a variety of hospitals chapels were, however, destroyed or disendowed.

It is true that the continuance warrant of 1548 appointed that the chapels of St. John in Weardale and St. Botolph in Frosterley should continue in use, and also that certain other chapels which appeared in the certificates of 1546 and 1548 or were in essence chantry foundations, were maintained. Generally speaking, however, as their revenues had been confiscated, chapels of the latter class were only used for occasional services such as baptisms and burials (2), and at the same time a number of chapels of ease which had never been accounted chantries, and various private chapels,

(1) e.g. the stipend of the chaplains of Ferryhill, Hilton in Staindrop etc, were paid by the Dean and Chapter in 1541, but in 1557-8 (the date of the first Treasurer's Book) these sums were being paid to the Crown receiver; cf. further, appendix, p. 755, 759, etc.

(2) e.g. St. Katharine's, Barnard Castle, St. Anne's Bishop Auckland, Coatham Amundevill, Hilton in Monkwearmouth, and Kepier hospital chapel were occasionally used - cf. below, appendix, no. II, and St. Giles', Durham Par. Reg. Certain chapels which had been under monastic control also survived for a brief period after 1548 - e.g. there was still a chaplain at Chibburn Preceptory in 1550-1 (Arch. Ael. 2nd. Ser. pt. 46, p. 274), and William Watson was still being paid in 1557-8 as incumbent not only of the parochial chapel of St. Mary

were either neglected altogether or else, similarly, used only for occasionally purposes (1). A large number of chapels had fallen into disuse and gradual decay before the Reformation, which was to some extent, therefore, only hastening a usual process; but even when the great spoliation effected in the period from 1536 to 1548 was over, the rate at which chapels were abandoned must have been unusually high. This was largely because the Crown, not satisfied with the enormous profit which it had already obtained, attempted to take possession of some of the remaining chapels under colour of the Chantry Acts.

Frosterley chapel itself, although provided for by the continuance warrant, was allowed to fall into decay before 1563, and Pilkington's return of 1571 shows that the stipend assigned to its incumbent was used to maintain a curate in Wolsingham parish (2). Later the chapel and its appurtenances were presented as concealed, and were granted in 1586 to John Awbrey and John Radcliffe (3). Awbrey and Radcliffe also received a grant at about the same date of the "concealed" chapels of Fishburn in Sedgfield, and of Heworth in Jarrow, although they had both been in use in 1563 (4).

Magdalen but also of St. Helen's chapel over the Abbey Gates (Treas. Bks. D. & Chap. Treas.).

(1) e.g. certain church property was left at Sheraton chapel in Hesledon in 1553 (S.S. 97, p. 144), but no mention occurs of it after this date; similarly the chapel of Cawsey Park in Hebburn, and the private chapel of Lambton in Chester were probably disused (Hodgson II, vol. 2, p. 133; Surtees II, p. 170). Other chapels which were only used for burials etc. include St. Helen's Hartley in Earsdon (cf. Par. Reg. a burial there in 1603), the Monkhouse at Shoreston in Bamburgh which was a chapel maintained by the monks of Farn (1597 a testator asked to be buried there - N.C.H. I, p. 306), and St. Thomas the Martyr in Durham (1597 during the plague there were many burials there - Sharpe, "Chron. Mirab." p. 49).

(2) cf. Harl. Mss. vol. 594, fol. 188; Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 3265. William Chapman, who had been incumbent of the chapel, was the curate of Wolsingham in 1571.

(3) Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 3296; Arch. Ael. 2nd. Ser. IX, p. 20.

(4) Certain ecclesiastical property was left at Fishburn in 1553 (S.S. 97, p. 145) and there was a curate there in 1563; in the return of 1563 Pilkington wrote beside Heworth chapel "neither parson, vicar. or curate but sometimes on Sundays" (Harl. Mss. vol. 594, fol. 189, 191), cf. also Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 3296;

Other chapels, if not wholly destroyed, were crippled by the seizure of their property; despite active protests on the part of the parishioners, the endowment for a priest to serve in the chapel of ease at Stockton had been confiscated in 1548 (1), and similarly, although the chapel of Sadberge in Houghton-le-Skerne continued in use throughout the period, property given for the maintenance of a priest to officiate in it was returned as concealed in 1585 (2). Sometimes, however, the attempt of the Crown to obtain possession of chapels of this type, or of their property, was successfully foiled. In 1551 royal officials tried to lay hands upon the chapel of Eggleston in Middleton-in-Teesdale, but a commission was demanded to prove the King's title, and showed that it was parcel of the parish church, from which it was three miles distant, and that its incumbents were removeable by the rector of the parish. As a result of the inquiry the chancellor of the Court of Augmentations ordered that it should continue in use as hitherto, until the King's title was proved (3); curates of the chapel

Arch. Ael. 2nd. Ser. IX, p. 20-1. As Heworth belonged to the Dean and Chapter, who were bound to pay a certain sum yearly to the chaplain (cf. S.S. 143, p. 59; D. & Chap. Treas'ers Bks.), and as there was a chaplain there in 1633 (Surtees II, p. 83), it seems doubtful whether the chapel ever actually became the property of the Crown grantees.

(1) When the endowment for this stipendiary service was leased to William Crofton of London, Nov. 26, 1548, the following memorandum was added, which was to a large extent based upon the certificate of 1546; - "The chapel of Stockton aforesaid standeth a mile from the parish church aforesaid (i.e. Norton), not only for the easement of the inhabitants of the town of Stockton, but also for the easement of divers parishioners of sundry other parishes in the winter time when for rainy floods they can come no whither else to hear divine service" (Harl. Mss. vol. 605, fol. 77b). Probably because of further trouble from the parishioners, c. 1555, Thomas Eynns was employed to make a new survey of the chapel and certain tithes etc, and to deliver possession to Crofton (S.S. 97, p. 155). After this date the vicar of Norton probably maintained the curate at his own expense.

(2) Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 3296; Harl. Mss. vol. 594, fol. 189; S.S. 22, p. 55, 96, etc. (3) In 1565 an inspeximus was made of this record, and sealed by the Dean & Chapter, May 21, 1566 - D. & Chap. Reg. II, fol. 216.

occur, therefore, in the time of both Pilkington and Barnes; in 1585, however, another attempt was made upon some of its property, which was again presented as concealed (1).

Although little effort was made to repair the positive damage wrought by the Reformation, in some respects the reformers tried to improve conditions already existing among the clergy. The attempt to diminish the practices of pluralism and non residence was partially successful, but these practices were themselves largely due to the religious changes. A more definite advance was made with regard to their learning and the amount of preaching in the two counties. Largely as a result of the efforts of the reformers, particularly during the episcopate of Barnes, the clergy of the pre-Reformation period who were in some cases nearly as much soldiers as priests and sometimes ignorant of the tongue in which they were expected to read the services in Church, were replaced by men whose knowledge of the Scriptures was tested both before they were ordained, and after they had obtained titles. The chief object of the reformers in their attempt to raise the standard of learning amongst the clergy was to obtain a preaching ministry. Although many complaints were made throughout the century of the lack of preachers, something was done in the time of Barnes to remedy the deficiency through the enforcement of a system by which certain chosen clergy were to preach sermons in specified churches, as well as in their own cures; in addition, by regulations made in 1585-6 preachers were attached to the West Spital in Newcastle and to Sherburn Hospital. If by the end of the century no very marked improvement was apparent in either respect, this was chiefly due to the fact that no encouragement was received from the government, for those in authority were mainly concerned to enforce conformity which it was felt could as well be obtained by the reading of homilies by priests with little or no learning.

Inasmuch as the provision for the spiritual care of the people was concerned, the Reformation period resulted in a minimum of positive improvement. Such improvements as were made of conditions previously existing were effected, less through the support of, than in despite of the government, which itself made very

(1) Harl. Mss. vol. 594, fol. 188; S.S. 22, p. 58 etc; Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 3296. According to the "Valor" (V, p. 326) the rector paid £3 yearly to the curate here.

inadequate reparation for the inevitable loss suffered by the dissolution of many religious foundations within the two counties. The dissolution of these bodies, and the accompanying confiscation of all sorts of ecclesiastical property, meant that churches, parochial chapels and chapels of ease throughout the counties were despoiled and fell into decay, or were destroyed; that the supply of clergy was diminished; and that many parishes were left destitute or insufficiently provided with ministers, because of the cupidity or negligence of the holders of the property of the dissolved bodies, or as a result of the vacancies caused by the doctrinal changes and the practice of non-residence. Poverty and destitution were, therefore, the aftermath of the Reformation in the churches of Durham and Northumberland.

IV THE LAITY

The Reformation brought both profit and loss to the laity of the two counties. In the first place the dissolution of the monasteries and later of other religious bodies offered them an opportunity of bettering their status. When the suppression of the monasteries became imminent most of the patrons of the houses within Durham and Northumberland petitioned for grants of their property for themselves, and in the meanwhile some of them, together with many of the more powerful gentry, obtained favourable leases from the monks, or grants of annuities, remunerative offices, or of next advowsons of churches appropriated to the threatened communities. While some of these grants were called in question after the dissolution and perhaps annulled, the majority were confirmed and brought profit to their holders for many years.

Most of the lands which had belonged to the monasteries were at first retained by the Crown, although a large proportion of them were leased to officials or to local gentry. Soon, however, it became apparent that this vast quantity of property, subject to a variety of tenures and encumbrances, could not be centralised and at the same time that sales of monastic lands tended to have a stabilising effect. Consequently in the later years of Henry VIII's reign the government began to sell a large amount of the confiscated property, and Henry's successors pursued the same policy. In Durham and Northumberland a good deal of late monastic property was returned to ecclesiastical hands by reason of the endowment, in 1541, of the Dean and Chapter of Durham with most of the lands which had belonged to Durham Priory, and also as a result of the endowment of the Dean and Chapter of Carlisle with property in Northumberland which had belonged to Carlisle Priory. On the other hand, except in one case, the clergy of the two counties do not seem to have obtained personal grants of monastic property (1).

The laity were the chief beneficiaries, but it is noticeable that most of them were strangers to the North; a few were courtiers, Crown officials or officials of the Court of Augmentations, but the greater number were syndicates of London merchants. Many of

(1) The exception is in the case of John Killingworth, the vicar of Long Benton, who int. 1579-83, had a grant of Fenham, late of Mount St. John - N.C.H. XIII, p. 292-3.

them had extensive grants in other parts of England, and their purchases were, in fact, often in the nature of a speculation, or, if procured on favourable terms, a reward for past services. Generally, therefore, they became mere channels of transfer, and through such merchants as Henry Avetson, Barantine, and Throckmorton of London; John Bellow of Grimsby and John Boxholm of London; Thomas Reve of London; and such courtiers or officials as Sir Richard Gresham, Ambrose, Earl of Warwick, John Cockburn Lord of Ormiston, Sir Arthur Darcy, Sir Christopher Hatton, Lord Latimer, and Sir Ralph Sadler — all of whom were grantees on a large scale — lands within Durham and Northumberland were generally obtained by inhabitants of the two counties. The case of John Heath, the London merchant who purchased Kepier hospital in 1568 from Lord Ormiston and took up his residence there, was exceptional. Amongst the secondary purchasers were a certain number of landed gentry such as Sir John Forster and his relative Thomas Forster of Adderstone, Ralph Tailbois of Thornton, Sir William Bellasis, the Ogles, the Widdringtons, and the Hiltons. Some of these men together with members of other prominent families, including Sir Reynold Carnaby, William Lord Evers, and various Collingwoods, Delavals, Fenwicks, Featherstonehalghs, Horsleys, Whiteheads, and Welburys, also bought lands directly from the Crown, which, moreover rewarded its servants in the North, such as John Carr, the captain of Wark, by similar grants. Contemporaneously Henry and Bertram Anderson, James Lawson, Sir Robert Brandling, William Dent and other merchants of Newcastle were buying property either directly from the government or from the original grantees, and as the Crown made certain grants to the Corporation of Newcastle the moneyed men and the trading interests became bound to its support. The wisdom of this policy was seen during the rebellion of 1569, when very few grantees of such property sided with the rebels, and Newcastle remained steadfastly loyal to the Queen.

A certain amount of property was retained for official use, whether, as in one case, to provide a residence for the Council in the North during its sessions in Newcastle, or, as in various other cases, to be used to increase the facilities for the defence of the two counties. Most of the remainder which was not already alienated from the Crown was leased to local gentry or yeomen who, as patrons, stewards, receivers, auditors, annuitants, or lay administrators of one sort or another had already obtained an inside knowledge of the monastic estates and property and did not hesitate to petition for grants of those portions of the estates

most profitable to themselves (1). Generally speaking, therefore, the result of these transactions was to retain the tenure or ownership of lands lying within the two counties in the hands of natives of Durham and Northumberland who were, in this manner, given an unrivalled opportunity to enrich themselves.

As a result of these facts the change was, in some sense, less violent than might have been anticipated, but the substitution in many cases of lay lords for ecclesiastical lords often had unfortunate results upon the tenantry. Some of these results were seen in 1569, when the ranks of the rebels were recruited by those to whom the religious changes and the interruption of the wool trade with Flanders had brought economic hardship. This rebellion involved loss of property to some of the followers of the Earls; nevertheless, the majority of those with landed estates seem to have suffered less than might have been expected. About half the number of those who were attainted retained sufficient property and influence to be a menace to the government in their refusal to conform, while of those who were indicted some — for example, Thomas Bates of Morpeth — prospered exceedingly in the years following the rising. Nevertheless, the rebellion helped to break the power and independence of the northern lords, which had already been undermined by the Act of Resumption and the establishment of the Council in the North as the supreme judicial authority north of the Trent. Opposition to the governmental policy of the Crown had been one of the causes of the rising, and the power and extensive patronage of the Earls of Northumberland and Westmorland had ensured for them a large following amongst their tenantry, and had shown that feudalism was still strong in the North. After its suppression, however, Westmorland's estates reverted to the Crown, and the powerful Neville connection was eventually broken up. Sir Henry Percy, as the eighth Earl of Northumberland, was allowed to retain the majority of his brother's estates, but the Queen kept a firm control upon his movements. In addition, if some of the followers of the Earls did not suffer severely as a result of the rising, certain families, including those of the Tempests of Holmside and the Hebburns of Hardwick,

(1) Pickthorn, "Early Tudor Government," p. 377-84; Grants of property and names of grantees are taken from Dugdale, Tanner, Northumberland County History, Hodgson Raine, Surtees etc.

lost nearly all their property, and were scattered, whilst others had to sell large portions of their estates to pay the expenses both of the rising and of their pardons.

The large compositions extracted from those who had taken any sort of part in the rebellion meant that a further burden was placed upon the charitable resources of the counties, and one which could very ill be borne because of the damage already inflicted upon hospitals and almshouses. In 1535 there had been, apart from small almshouses, some twenty-three hospitals existing in Durham and Northumberland, and although some of them were already in a state of decay, or suffering from injurious leases and an ill choice of masters, the majority were doing exceedingly useful work, from which the laity were the chief to benefit. Following the dissolution of the monasteries, as many as ten houses were destroyed including the important hospital of Kepier, and at the same time grants of both corrodies and places as bedesmen, from which the poor had often benefited, and promiscuous distributions in charity by the monks and nuns, all ceased. Then, with the dissolution of the chantries, six other hospitals seems to have fallen, amongst them being the flourishing hospital of Staindrop, and, at the same date, a total of over £12 was confiscated, which had been distributed by the chantries in charity, or assigned to certain almshouses. As in other respects, so also here, most inadequate reparation was made for what was lost, for only a sum of £1 - 6 - 8 (paid by one of the chantries to almshouses in St. Margaret's parish in Durham) was continued in 1548, and provision was only made for one almshouse attached to the cathedral, and a distribution to the poor of £66-13-4 by the Dean and Chapter to replace the enormous amount of work for charity which had been done by the monasteries of the two counties.

Seven hospitals survived, three of which had successfully been protected from an attempt made on behalf of the Crown to obtain possession of them as well as of those houses already dissolved; in addition there were about seventeen almshouses, nearly all of which had been founded before the Reformation. These surviving houses, however, were very ill-distributed, and the religious changes had had the unfortunate effect of aggravating the tendency already existing for their officials to abuse their positions to their own private gain. Barnard Castle hospital which, in 1593, was shown to be without any poor inmates at all because its property had been engrossed by its masters, provides an extreme example of this practice. Although bequests

made in wills, and attempts to reform the abuses show that the spirit which had led to the foundation of so many charitable institutions was not dead, undeniably the resources available for the support of the sick and poor had been unmercifully crippled, at the same time as the dissolution of the religious communities, and the hardships inflicted by the economic changes and by the rebellions added to the number of the indigent.

Other institutions partly charitable in nature, from which the laity had been the chief to benefit, were the schools of the two counties. As a large number of them had been dependent upon either monasteries or chantries, it could not be expected that they would pass through the Reformation period unscathed. While, however many elementary schools were swept away at the dissolution, and while the provision made for university education was harmfully affected by the suppression of Durham college in Oxford and of Norton college, on the whole grammar schools suffered little; very few were destroyed, and of those which survived some, including Durham and Morpeth schools, were left in a stronger position than before. Moreover, the increased interest in education which was typical of the Renaissance period, and the desire of the reformers to give all the laity at least sufficient knowledge to be able to read the Bible themselves, led, in the post-Reformation period, to the foundation of vernacular schools and of grammar schools some of which had university exhibitions attached to them, and to regulations by which the clergy were ordered to give a certain minimum of instruction, not only in the catechism, but also in reading and writing. Finally regulations by which the richer clergy were expected to support poor scholars were also drawn up at this period. On the whole, therefore, the facilities offered to the laity for the education of their children remained much the same, after and before the religious changes, more particularly because most of the schools retained their character as free schools.

If the Reformation brought potential profit to the upper classes amongst the laity by granting them the opportunity to enrich themselves from the property of the dissolved institutions, it also involved rebellion, through which many of them suffered in property and independence, and in the loss of the hospitality and various other benefits offered to them by the monasteries. The poorer people suffered more severely, for as tenants of new masters bent upon self-aggrandisement, they found themselves subject to new exactions even while they were deprived of many of the charitable institutions to which they had been accustomed to turn in sickness or in poverty. For the generality of the

laity, therefore, the profit of the period was more than counterbalanced by its losses in material welfare, as well as in spiritual welfare.

V - THE DOCTRINAL VIEW OF THE PEOPLE.

A study of the extent to which the doctrinal changes of the Reformation were accepted in Durham and Northumberland before 1553, when the accession of Queen Mary ushered in a Catholic reaction, seems to show that, generally speaking, both the clergy and people submitted to the changes without active opposition. It is true, that some of the friars of Newcastle had opposed the work of the Reformation Parliament, and that the comparative smallness of the number of ex-religious who obtained benefices may have been due to their refusal to accept the new forms. Furthermore, the submission of the majority appears to have been only on the surface, for there is ample evidence that the old forms and beliefs were, in practice, retained. The Catholic interlude of Queen Mary's reign was, therefore, accepted gladly, more particularly because wide-spread spoliation had accompanied the reform in doctrine, and because the persecuting methods employed by some of the Marian bishops were unknown in Tunstal's diocese. The wholehearted reversion to Roman Catholicism meant that the accession of Elizabeth involved a change to which a fairly large proportion of the clergy felt themselves unable to accede. As a result, therefore, of the Royal Visitation of 1559, six members of the capitular body and eight other beneficed clergy, who may all be termed Recusants, were deprived of their promotions. Of the other clergy of the counties it seems probable that a good number successfully evaded subscription to the oath by which acceptance of the new régime was recorded, or became merely outward conformists, for it is noticeable that until 1572 most of the deprivations which occur were due to Recusancy.

The years 1571-2 may, in fact, be taken as a turning point with regard to the acceptance and enforcement of the doctrinal reformation. While it is evident that, in some respects, the accession of Elizabeth had involved a striking and immediate change, wills, records of episcopal visitations, and similar sources, prove that the use of the old forms and ceremonies and of the old vestments, altars, chalices, and mass books was never exceptional until after that date. On some of the more outstanding questions — such as the doctrine of transubstantiation and of the Royal Supremacy — there is little evidence of active opposition to the Queen's wishes, but such documents bear witness to the fact that the laity in general, together with many of the clergy, clung to the old

usages. It was their conservation in religion which gave the rebels of 1569 material upon which to work. Devotion to the service of the two Earls, economic distress, and discontent at the governmental policy of the Queen all played their part in this rising, but the chief cause was a religious one. The increasing severity with which the laws against Recusants were enforced, dislike of certain characteristics of the Bishop and Dean, and of the religious changes in general, gave the rebels a certain unity of purpose and one which, from the first, was placed in the forefront. The rebellion was, therefore, accompanied by a restoration of the old forms of service, both in the cathedral and in some twenty five parishes of Durham county alone. The ease with which this temporary restoration was accomplished gives sufficiently striking testimony to the hold which the old religion still maintained amongst many of the people, and the fact that the parishes in which it was effected were widely scattered throughout the county seems to suggest that the success of the rebels would have been generally acclaimed, in so far as it involved a reversion to Roman Catholicism.

The suppression of the rising, and the punishment of the chief offenders, closed the period in which Catholicism undisputedly, and to some extent openly, held a prominent place in Durham and Northumberland. Henceforth, because a belief in the Papal Supremacy became synonymous with treason, Recusancy was driven underground, and an opportunity was offered to enforce the reformed doctrines amongst the majority of the people, many of whose leaders had been taken from them. Advantage was taken of this opportunity not only by severe repressive measures, but also by positive work such as may be illustrated by the foundation of schools in which the reformed doctrines were taught, and an active attempt to secure a learned and preaching ministry. The partial success which attended the effort can be seen in the wills of the later decades of the century, which give evidence of a discontinuance of the old beliefs in the virtue of prayers for the dead and of the intercession of the saints.

During the same period advanced Puritan views began to obtain an increasing hold amongst a certain section of the clergy and laity; before 1571 these opinions had, generally speaking, been confined to a few members of the capitular body, but after that date deprivations of the clergy and the presence of unlicensed clergy and of Scottish ministers in the counties were generally a sign rather of Puritanism

than of Recusancy. Similarly, evidence of Puritan views was to be found in a dislike of certain ceremonies and ornaments enforced by episcopal injunctions, and also in a changing terminology and new expressions of belief to be found in wills and kindred documents. There was, moreover, some indication that the Presbyterian attitude which pervaded the doctrines of many Puritans found some support within the two counties.

If, however, the Puritan wing of the church was clamorous here, as elsewhere, more real danger was experienced in the later years of the century from the increasing strength of the Recusants. For about ten years after the rebellion they had given comparatively little trouble, but by 1590 their activities gave cause for some alarm. Supported by the presence of Jesuit and seminary priests, and by the return and partial re-instatement of some of the rebels, they both absented themselves from church (in Northumberland successfully evading the payment of fines imposed for this offence) and held frequent meetings the purpose of which, it was suspected, was not only religious. By 1597 there were known to be about 150 recusants in Northumberland and more than 200 in Durham, and it was evident that their numbers were increasing.

Such numbers do, however, at least show that the majority of the population were, if not voluntarily, at least by constraint conformists, and, as the active preaching and teaching of the reformers could not be expected to bear fruit until a new generation had arisen, the future of the established Church in these two counties was reasonably assured by the close of the century. If the people in general had been slow to accept the doctrinal changes involved by the Reformation, this was not surprising, in view of the fact that both the Bishop and his flock had suffered more material loss than the people of most of the southern counties, as a result of other changes which accompanied the reform in doctrine — such loss as were implied for example, by the infringement of the liberties of the Palatinate, by the suppression of monasteries, hospitals, and chapels, in districts where they had done essential service, and by the robbery of property of churches already impoverished by Scottish raids. The Reformation was, therefore, necessarily more unpopular in the North than in the South, and no surprise can be felt that it was only accepted at the cost of rebellion.

APPENDIX I

THE MONKS OF DURHAM PRIORY AT THE DISSOLUTION.

An attempt is made in the following pages to give the names of all the monks who can be proved to have belonged to Durham Priory at its dissolution in 1539, showing where possible the positions which they held in the Priory, or to which of its cells they had been attached. If any of them are known to have obtained ecclesiastical promotions after the suppression, this fact is also indicated, fuller details of these promotions being given in the appropriate chapters.

1. Bailey Cuthbert. Occurs in the 1540 pensions list, and in the pensions returns of 1552 and 1553, as well as in the bursar's book of 1533-4. Probably attached to Lytham cell before its dissolution, cf. it is entered in the 1552 return that he did not appear before the commissioners, "but it is informed that he is living and remaining in Lancashire." (1)
2. Bennet Robert. Was bursar of the convent in 1539, and already held this position in 1530. (2) Became a prebendary and vicar of Gainford (3)
3. Bennet William S.T.P. Brother of Robert. Occurs in the bursar's book of 1531-4. He was steward in 1532-3, and was the last prior of Finchale, occurring as such as on Sept. 12, 1536. His name is given in the list of 1541 headed, "Nomina nuper monachorum in ecclesia cathedralis Dunelmensi." (4). Became a prebendary & obtained the benefices of Kelloe and Aycliffe. (5)

(1) L. & P. XV, p. 552; Exch. K. R. Accounts etc. Bdle. 76, No. 13, p. 4 & 17; Exch. K. R. Misc. Bk. 31; S. S. 18, p. 286-7.

(2) S. S. 107, p. 99; S. S. 18, p. 133

(3) cf. above p. 102, 109.

(4) S. S. 18, p. 91-2, 100, 226, 231, 288; S. S. 6, p. xxxi; L. & P. XVI, p. 712

(5) cf. above p. 101, 108-9.

4. Blakiston Ralph. A member of the family of Blakiston of Blakiston. Dom. Ralph Blakiston, as a brother of the Priory was presented by the convent to the custody of the cell of Lytham on May 17, 1529, and was still prior there in 1535. Previously he had been master of Farn Island, where he occurs in 1518. (1) Became a prebendary. (2)
5. Blithe John. Was ordained acolyte as a monk of Durham on March 30, 1532. Occurs in the 1539 and 1540 pensions lists, and in the pensions returns of 1552 and 1553. (3) Became curate of Hunstanworth and perhaps of Dissington. (4)
6. Brown Henry. Occurs in the bursar's books 1531-4. On August 16, 1532, 5/- was paid to him for travelling expenses on his removal from Durham to Holy Island. He was still in Holy Island in 1533-4, but later returned to Durham, and was the last commoner of the Priory. (5) He became a minor canon. (6)
7. Brown John, senior. Occurs in the bursar's books 1530-3. He was commoner between 1530 and 1535, (7) and became a minor canon (8)
8. Brown John, junior. He also appears in the bursar's books of 1530-4, and occurs in the pensions lists of 1539 and 1540, and in the pensions return of 1552. (9)

(1) S.S.103, p.742; Dun. Priory Reg. V, fol. 230a; Valor V, p.305; Raine, "N. Durham", p.343.

(2) cf. above p.102.

(3) T.R.No.539, L.& P.XIV, ii, p.292; XV, p.552; Exch.K.R.Accounts, etc. Bdle.76, no.13, p.4 & 17; Exch.K.R.Misc.Bk.31.

(4) cf. above, p.198-9.

(5) S.S.18, p.92, 99, 159, 188, 309; S.S.107, p.101.

(6) cf. above, p.103.

(7) S.S.18, p.23, 133, 188-9; S.S.100, p.298.

(8) cf. above p.103.

(9) S.S.18, p.22, 197, 286-7; L.& P.XIV, ii, p.292; XV, p.552; Exch.K.R.Accounts etc. Bdle.76, No.13, p.4 & 17.

9. Byndley John. Occurs in the bursar's books of 1532-4(1)
He became a minor canon ^{and curate} of Luggleswick.(2)
10. Chilton Robert. As a monk of Durham he was ordained
acolyte on March 30, 1532. He appears in
the pensions lists of 1539 and 1540, and
in the pensions returns of 1552 and 1553.
He had probably been attached to the cell
of Stamford, cf. this entry in the 1552
return: "Robert Chilton did not appear,
but it is informed us that he is living
and remaining at Stamford".(3)
11. Cliff, George S.T.B. Was ordained as a monk of Durham,
March 30, 1532. In 1540-1 he was the senior
fellow of Durham College, Oxford (4), and
after the re-foundation became its first
rector and perhaps a minor canon; later
he became a prebendary of Durham, vicar of
Billingham, and rector of Elwick and of
Brancepeth.(5)
12. Crossley Richard. He was at Finchale in 1531, and was
one of the "Decani Monasterii" in 1531-3.
At the dissolution he was master of the
novices. He occurs in the 1539 and 1540
pensions lists.(6)
13. Cuthbert George. Occurs in the bursar's books of 1532-4
(7). He became a minor canon and rector of
Kirkhaugh. (8)

(1) S.S.18, p.189, 197, 286-7.

(2) cf. above, p.103, 112.

(3) T.R.No.539. L.& P. XIV, ii, p.292; XV, p.552; Exch.K.R.
Accounts etc. Bdle. 76, No.13, p.4 & 17; Exch.K.R.Misc.Bk.31.

(4) T.R. No.539; S.S. 107, p.221; D.& Chap.Treas. Roll Oxon.
No.XIV.

(5) cf. above, p.104, 107-9, 162, 627.

(6) S.S.18, p.25, 99, 102, 200, 299; S.S.107, p.96; L.& P. XIV, ii,
p.292; XV, p.552.

(7) S.S.18, p.188-9, 296.

(8) cf. above, p.103, 112-3.

14. Dove John. Occurs in the pensions lists of 1539 and 1540 (1)
15. Duckett John. Was one of the "Decani Monasterii" 1530-3, and master of Farn Island in 1535-6. He occurs on the pensions lists of 1539-40, and the pensions returns of 1552 and 1553.(2) He became a chantry priest in St.Margaret's church, Durham, and curate of Whitworth.(3)
16. Eggleston Christopher. Occurs in the bursar's books of 1532-4; on the pensions lists of 1539 and 1540, and the pensions return of 1552.(4)
17. Forster Richard. According to the bursar's book he celebrated his first mass in 1538; he occurs on the pensions lists of 1539 and 1540, and the pensions returns of 1552 and 1553.(5) He may have become vicar of Gainford. (6)
18. Forster John. Occurs in the bursar's books of 1530-4.(7) He became a minor canon and rector of Edmundbyers.(8)

(1) L.& P.XIV,ii,p.292; XV,p.552. Query if he was the Dom John Durham occurring in the bursar's book of 1532-3 (S.S.18 p.133,197), who was removed to Farn in 1535-6 (cf. amongst the sacristan's expenses an item for "carrying Dom John Durham to Farn", S.S.100,p.419).

(2) S.S.18,p.25,102,200; Valor,V, p.305; Raine "N.Durham",p.343; L.& P.XIV,ii,p.292; XV.p.552; Exch.K.R.Accounts etc. Bdle 76 no.13,p.4 & 17; Exch.K.R.Misc.BK.31.

(3) cf.above, p.176,214.

(4) S.S.18,p.188-9,296; L.& P.XIV,ii,p.292; XV.p.552; Exch. K.R.Accounts, etc. Bdle.76,Mo.13,p.4 & 17.

(5) S.S.18,p.340; L.& P.XIV,ii,p.292; XV.p.552; Exch.K.R. Accts.etc. Bdle.76,no.13,p.4 & 17; Exch.K.R.Misc.Bk.31.

(6) cf.above, p.199.

(7) S.S.18,p.22,197,286-7

(8) cf.above, p.103,112.

19. Forster Thomas. Occurs in the bursar's book of 1538 when he celebrated his first mass.(1)
He became a minor canon.(2)
20. Forster William. Appears in the bursar's books of 1531-4. In 1533-4 he was Prior's chaplain, and at the dissolution keeper of the garner.(3)
He may have become a minor canon.(4)
21. Gonbie Giles. Occurs in the pensions lists of 1540.(5)
22. Hacford William. Occurs in the bursar's book of 1531-2, and in the book of 1539-40 as being at Witton-Gilbert during the plague.(6).
Became a minor canon.(7)
23. Harper Thomas. Occurs on the pensions lists of 1539 and 1540, and the pensions return of 1552.(8)
24. Herington Richard. Occurs in the bursar's books of 1532-3; was master of Farn in 1520, and of Wearmouth in 1533-5.(9)
25. Holbourne Thomas. Occurs in the bursar's books of 1530-4. He was master of the infirmary 1526-35. He appears on the pensions lists of 1539 and 1540, and the pensions return of 1552.(10)
26. Hyndmer Edward. S.T.P. Was warden of Durham College, Oxford, in 1535, and still in 1540-1. His name appears on the 1541 list entitled "Nomina nuper monachorum in ecclesia cathedralis Dunelmensis." (11) He became a prebendary and spiritual chancellor to Bishop Tunstall(12)

(1), S.S.18, p.340.

(2) cf. above, p.103.

(3) S.S.18, p.90-1, 197, 240; S.S.107, p.100.

(4) cf. above, p.104.

(5) L.& P.XV, p.552. Query if he was the Giles Preston appearing in the bursar's books of 1530-1 & 1533-4 (S.S.18, p.22, 286-7)

(6) S.S.18, p.91-2, 99, 337.

(7) cf. above p.103.

(8) L.&P. XIV, ii, p.292; XV, p.552; Exch.K.R.Accts.etc.Bdle.76 no.13, p.4 & 17.

(9) S.S.18, p.200; Raine "N.Durham" p.358; S.S.29, p.231; Valor V, p.304. Note that there was a monk of Durham of this name in 1501 (S.S.22, p.ix).

(10) S.S.18, p.23, 133, 188-9, 206, 296; S.S.99, p.283-4; L.& P.XIV, ii p.292; XV, p.552, Exch.K.R.Accts.etc.Bdle 76, no.13, p.4 & 17.

(11) Valor V, p.306; D.&Chap.Treas.Roll Oxon.no.XIV; L.&P.XVI, p.712

(12) cf. above, p.101, 109.

27. Johnson Richard. Appears on the pensions lists of 1539 and 1540.(1) He may have become a chantry priest in Edsington.(2)
28. Lighton John. Appears on the pensions list of May,1541.(3)
29. Mathew John S.T.B. As a monk of Durham was ordained acolyte on March 30,1532. He was a fellow of Durham College in 1540-1, and his name appears in the "Nomina nuper monachorum in ecclesia cathedralis Dunelmensi."(4) He was still a fellow of Durham College in 1544, and became a minor canon, and minister of the church of St.Mary-le-Bow, Durham.(5)
30. Marley Stephen S.T.B. On December 17,1530, he was presented to the custody of the cell of Stamford. In May,1533, he resigned from the mastership of the cell; and at the dissolution was sub-prior and master of the frater. His name appears in the "Nomina nuper monachorum in ecclesia cathedralis Dundelmensi."(6) He became a prebendary.(7)
31. Potter Thomas S.T.B. Was one of the fellows of Durham College in 1540-1, and his name appears in the "Nomina nuper monachorum in ecclesia cathedralis Dunelmensi." (8) He was still in Durham College in 1544, but may have become a minor canon.(9)
32. Rawe Roger, alias Roger Hawe. Occurs in the bursar's book of 1538 when he celebrated his first mass, and on the 1539 and 1540 pensions lists, and the pensions returns of 1552 and 1553.(10)

(1) L.& P.XIV,ii,p.292; XV.p.552.

(2) cf.above p.181-2.

(3) L.& P.XVI,p.398.

(4) T.R.No.539; D.& Chap.Treas.Roll Oxon.No.XIV; L.&P.XVI,p.712

(5) D.& Chap.Treas.Misc.Cart.2744; above p.104-5,113.

(6) Dun.Priory Reg.V.fol.240a, 249-50; S.S.107,p.93; L.& P.XVI, p.712.

(7) cf.above,p.101.

(8) D.& Chap.Treas.Roll Oxon.no.XIV; L.& P.XVI,p.712.

(9) D.& Chap.Treas.Misc.Cart.No.2744; above p.104-5.

(10) S.S.18,p.340; L.& P.XIV,ii,p.292; XV.p.552; Exch.K.R.Accts. etc. Bdle.76,no.13,p.4 & 17; Exch.K.R.Misc.Bk.21.

- Rawe Roger (contd). He became chaplain of the chantry chapel of St. Botolph, Frosterley, and later obtained the benefice of Rounton in Yorkshire.(1)
33. Risely Christopher. Occurs in the bursar's books of 1531-3, on the pensions lists of 1539 and 1540, and the pensions returns of 1552 and 1553.(2) He became a stipendiary in St. Oswald's church, Durham.(3)
34. Robinson Christopher. Appears on the pensions lists of 1539 and 1540.(4)
35. Robinson Cuthbert. Appears on the pensions lists of 1539 and 1540, and the pensions return of 1552.(5)
36. Robinson John. Occurs on the pensions lists of 1539 and 1540, and the pensions returns of 1552 and 1553 (6). He may have become assistant priest in St. Andrews, Auckland.(7)
37. Robinson Thomas. Occurs on the pensions list of 1540, and the pensions returns of 1552 and 1553.(8)
38. Scott John. Occurs on the pensions lists of 1539 and 1540, and the pensions returns of 1552 and 1553.(9)
39. Smerthwaite John. Occurs on the pensions lists of 1539 and 1540, and the pensions returns of 1552 and 1553(10)
40. Smith John, alias John Porter. Was chamberlain in 1525-6, but by 1532-3 he had become sacristan, and he

-
- (1) cf. above p. 181, 197.
- (2) S.S. 18, p. 90-2, 197; L. & P. XIV, ii, p. 292; XV, p. 552; Exch. K.R. Accounts etc. Bdle 76, no. 12, p. 4 & 17; Exch. K.R. Misc. Bk. 31.
- (3) cf. above p. 176.
- (4) L. & P. XIV, ii, p. 292; XV, p. 552.
- (5) L. & P. XIV, ii, p. 292; XV, p. 552; Exch. K.R. Accounts etc. Bdle. 76, no. 13, p. 4 & 17.
- (6) L. & P. XIV, ii, p. 292; XV, p. 552; Exch. K.R. Accounts etc, Bdle 76, no. 13, p. 4 & 17; Exch. K.R. Misc. Bk. 31.
- (7) cf. above p. 200.
- (8) L. & P. XV, p. 552; Exch. K.R. Accts. etc. Bdle 76, no. 13 p. 4 & 17; Exch. K.R. Misc. Bk. 31. He should perhaps be identified with the monk, Thomas Eden, who was at Witton-Gilbert during the plague, 1539-40 (above, p. 92. ; S.S. 18, p. 337)
- (9) L. & P. XIV, ii, p. 292; XV, p. 552; Exch. K.R. Accts. etc. Bdle 76, no. 13, p. 4 & 17; Exch. K.R. Misc. Bk. 31.
- (10) L. & P. XIV, ii, p. 292; XV, p. 552; Exch. K.R. Accts. etc. Bdle 76, no. 13, p. 4 & 17; Exch. K.R. Misc. Bk. 31.

40. Smith John (contd) still held this office at the dissolution, He appears in the pensions list of May, 1541, and the pensions returns of 1552 and 1553. (1) He probably became rector of Kimblesworth. (2)
41. Sotheren John. According to the bursar's book he celebrated his first mass in 1538. He occurs on the pensions lists of 1539 and 1540, and the pensions returns of 1552 and 1553. (3) He became a chantry priest in Aycliffe. (4)
42. Sparke Thomas, S.T.B. He took his degree in 1528 at Durham College. By 1530 he had become chamberlain, and he still held this office at the dissolution when he was also prior of Holy Island. In June, 1537, he was appointed Bishop-suffragan of Berwick. His name appears in the "Nomina nuper monachorum in ecclesia cathedralis Dunelmensi." (5) He became a prebendary, master of Greatham hospital, and rector of Wolsingham. (6)
43. Strother Henry, alias Henry Richardson. Occurs in the bursar's books of 1530-4, and on the pensions lists of 1539 and 1540. (7)
44. Swalwell John. Was master of Wearmouth in 1526-7, and of Jarrow, 1531-7. He occurs on the 1539 and 1540 pensions lists, and the 1552 pensions return. (8)

(1) S.S. 99, p. 196; S.S. 18, p. 188; S.S. 100, p. 417; S.S. 107, p. 97; L. & P. XVI, p. 398; Exch. K.R. Accts. etc. Bdle, 76, no. 13, p. 4 & 17; Exch. K.R. Misc. Bk. 31. Note that in 1501 a John Porter was commoner (S.S. 22, p. ix).

(2) cf. above p. 191-2.

(3) S.S. 18, p. 340; L. & P. XIV, ii, p. 292; XV, p. 552; Exch. K.R. Accts. etc. Bdle 76, no. 13, p. 4 & 17; Exch. K.R. Misc. Bk. 31.

(4) cf. above, p. 176-7.

(5) S.S. 107, p. 224, 100, 282; S.S. 18, p. 4; S.S. 99, p. 196; Valor V, p. 304; Raine "N. Durham", p. 128; L. & P. XII, ii, p. 80; XVI, p. 712, XI, p. 350.

(6) cf. above, p. 101, 108.

(7) S.S. 18, p. 1, 193, 238, 332; L. & P. XIV, ii, p. 292; XV, p. 552. As Henry Richardson's name occurs on the 1540 list in the position that Henry Strother's name occupies on the 1539 list it is obviously an alias, although not actually stated to be so.

(8) S.S. 29, p. 230, 135; Valor V, p. 304; L. & P. XIV, ii, p. 292; XV, p. 552; Exch. K.R. Accounts etc. Bdle 76, no. 13, p. 4 & 17. Note that there was a monk of this name in the Priory in 1501 (S.S. 22, p. ix).

45. Swalwell Miles. As a monk of Durham he was ordained acolyte on March 30, 1532. He appears on the pensions lists of 1539 and 1540, and the pensions return of 1552.(1) He became a chantry priest in All Saints Church, Newcastle, and then assistant priest in St. John's church, Newcastle.(2)
46. Todd William S.T.P. On June 1, 1531-2, he was paid 5/- for travelling expenses on his removal from Durham to Holy Island. He took his degree in Oxford in April, 1537. His name, as a monk of Durham, occurs several times on the British Museum copy of "Reginald Dunelmensis" which he probably made; it also occurs in the "Nomina nuper monachorum in ecclesia cathedralis Dunelmensi." (3) He became prebendary, vicar of North Allerton, and archdeacon of Bedford.(4)
47. Trotter Richard, alias Richard Best. Occurs in the bursar's books of 1530-4, on the pensions list of May, 1541, and the pensions returns of 1552 and 1553. He was probably attached to Lytham cell as this entry occurs in the 1552 return:- "Richard Best is remaining at Lethom in Lancashire and did not appear."(5)
48. Watson John. Appears on the pensions lists of 1539 and 1540(6)
49. Watson Roger.S.T.P. Was terrar of the convent at the dissolution, having probably succeeded Christopher Blunt in this office on the death of the latter, in March, 1534. His name appears in the "Nomina nuper monachorum in ecclesia cathedralis Dunelmensi." (7) He became a prebendary, rector of Rothbury, and vicar of Pittington.(8)

(1) T.R.No.539; L.& P.XIV, ii, p.292; XV, p.552; Exch.K.R.Accts. etc.Bdle 76, mo.13, p.4 & 17.

(2) cf.above, p.176, 287.

(3) S.S.18, p.71; Raine in 'Wills & Invs.I, p.269n ; S.S.1, p.xvii-xviii; L.& P.XVI, p.712.

(4) cf.above, p.101, 108, 142.

(5) S.S.18, p.1, 22, 189, 197, 286-7; L.& P.XVI, p.398; Exch.K.R.Accts. etc.Bdle.76, no.13, p.4 & 17; Exch.K.R.Misc.Bk.31.

(6) L.& P.XIV, ii, p.292; XV, p.552.

(7) S.S.107, p.99; S.S.18, p.133, 256; L & P.XVI, p.712.

(8) cf.above, p.101, 108-9.

50. Watson William, senior, alias William Wyllome S.T.B. Was chamberlain 1527-8, and master of the feretory 1530-9. At the dissolution he was also deece prior. His name occurs in the "Nomina nuper monachorum in ecclesia cathedralis Dunelmensi." (1) He became a prebendary.(2)
51. Watson William, junior. Was Prior's chaplain at the dissolution. He occurs on the pensions lists of May,1541, and the pensions returns of 1552 & 1553.(3) He became chaplain of the chapels of St.Helen, St.Bartholomew and St.Leonard, & St.Mary Magdalen, Durham, and vicar of Bedlington.(4)
52. Whitehead Hugh S.T.P. Ordained priest Dec.18,1501. In 1512 he became warden of Durham College, Oxford, and in 1524 Prior of Durham.(5) He was appointed Dean of Durham in 1541.(6)
53. Woodmass Alexander. Occurs on the pensions lists of 1539 and 1540, and the pensions returns of 1552 and 1553.(7) Probably the same as the Alexander Durham who celebrated his first mass in 1517, and appears in the "Compendium Compertorum" as an inmate of Jarrow cell.(8)
54. Wright Roger, alias Roger Midlayme or Middleham. Was Prior's chaplain in 1530-1, and became cellarer in the course of the year 1532-3, which office he still held at the dissolution.

(1) S.S.99,p.196; S.S.18,p.25,102,299; S.S.100,p.482-3;S.S.107, p.94; L.& P.XVI,p.712.

(2) cf.above, p.102.

(3) S.S.107,p.101,275; L.& P.XVI,p.398; Exch.K.R.Accts. etc. Bdle.76,no.13,p.4 & 17; Exch.K.R.Misc.Bk.31. For the reason for differentiating this William Watson from the feretrar cf.above p.192.

(4) cf.above p.192-3.

(5) Lansdown MSS.980,fol.61.

(6) cf.above p.101.

(7) L.& P.XIV,ii,p.292; XV,p.552; Exch.K.R.Accts.etc. Bdle 76, no.13,p.4 & 17; Exch.K.R.Misc.Bk.31.

(8) Cleop.E.IV,fol.194b; S.S.18,p.1,340.

54. Wright Roger(contd) He appears on the pensions list of May, 1541. (1) He probably became a chantry priest in St. Oswald's church, Durham. (2)

The names of most of these monks, the position of all of whom as inmates of the Priory in 1539 seems to be well authenticated, also occur, with the pensions paid to them, in the accounts of the Receiver-General of the North for 1548-9, and the names of some of them may be found in depositions and similar documents of the period. In addition, moreover, to these fifty-four the names of other priests occur who may have been members of the confraternity at the dissolution, but as there is no certain proof that this was so, their cases have been reserved for treatment here.

- A. In the list entitled "Nomina nuper monachorum in ecclesia cathedralis Dunelmensi" the names of 1) Robert Dalton, 2) Nicholas Marley, 3) John Towton appear. All three of these were prebendaries appointed at the re-foundation in 1541 (3), but there is no other indication that they were ex-religious. The list does not, in fact, appear to be at all accurate, as Robert Bennet and Ralph Blakiston, who had certainly been monks and who became prebendaries in 1541, are not entered on it. Neither does its list of petty cannons seem to be complete. (4)
- B. On March 30, 1532, eight monks of Durham were ordained acolyte. Five of these were certainly still members of the community in 1539, but no further mention occurs of 1) Thomas Mansforthe, 2) John Fishburn, 3) Richard Denys. (5)
- C. The following all occur in account rolls of officials of the monastery of 1536-9, so that it seems probable that at any rate the majority of them were still alive in 1539:-
1) Dom Thomas Hawkwell, Prior's chaplain 1536-7 (6); 2) Dom William Brantingham, Prior's steward 1536-7 (7); Dom John Swan, occurs 1536-7 (8); 4) Dom Robert Stroder occurs 1536-7 (9)

(1) S.S. 18, p. 9, 222, 326; S.S. 99, p. 109; S.S. 103, p. 707; S.S. 107, p. 99; L. & P. XVI, p. 398. As the Christian name of only two other monks was Roger (i.e. Roger Water & Roger Rawe), & as Roger Midlayme was cellarer at any rate from 1532-1537, it seems evident that he is the Roger Wright of the "Rites" & pensions list cf. above p. 180. (2) cf. above p. 180-1 (3) L. & P. XVI, p. 420, 712. (4) cf. above p. 104. (5) T.R. No. 539 (6) S.S. 103, p. 690 & 698. (7) S.S. 103, p. 690 & 695. (8) S.S. 103, p. 669. (9) S.S. 103, p. 674

C. 5) Richard Billingham, "monachus", occurs 1536-7 (1);
(contd) 6) Cuthbert Heighington, "socius or clerk of the feretrar 1536-8 (2); 7) Dom John Lumley occurs 1538-9 (3).

D. A few cases occur of a priest in a benefice or curacy after the dissolution who may possibly have been a monk of Durham, e.g.

1. Thomas Merley became vicar of Embleton in 1544, having been presented by Merton College (4). A Dom Thomas Merley occurs in the bursar's book of 1532-3, and in the feretrar's rolls of 1536-7 and 1537-8 (5), but does not appear in the pensions list, and he is not known to have obtained any promotion immediately upon the dissolution.
2. John Johnson was curate of Holy Island in 1545 (6). Holy Island was appropriated to the Dean and Chapter and leased to Bishop Sparke (7), so he is perhaps to be identified with the Dominus John Johnson mentioned in the Wearmouth account rolls of 1526-7 and 1533-4. (8) His name is not on the pensions lists.
3. George Bates. The mandate to induct Lancelot Thwaits to St. Oswald's Vicarage in July 1534, was addressed amongst others to "Dom George Bates". (9) Bates was clerk of the feretory and registrar of Durham Priory at the dissolution according to the "Rites" (10), but he was also rector of St. Mary-le-Bow, 1520-36, and was collated by the Bishop to Kelloe rectory on May 14, 1536 (11)

(1) S.S.103, p.676.

(2) S.S.100, p.482-3.

(3) S.S.58, p.312.

(4) N.C.H. II, p.49, 59, 69.

(5) S.S.18, p.157; S.S.100, p.482-3.

(6) Wills & Invs. I, p.113.

(7) cf. above p.70.

(8) An item of 40/- occurs in these rolls "pro mensa domini Johannis Jonson", or "de Johanne Jonson pro mensa" (S.S. 29 p.230-2) - i.e. for board & lodging. This sounds as if he was not actually an inmate of the monastery.

(9) Dun. Priory Reg. V. fol. 254a.

(10) S.S.107, p.78-94

(11) Surtees IV, ii, p.41; T.R.No.137.

3. George Bates (contd). He resigned from Kelloe in 1547, and his will was proved in 1548. (1) Although it would be fairly natural for the Bishop to care for the interests of the monks of Durham Priory, especially of the registrar with whom he would be brought into close connection, on the other hand Bates' tenure of benefices which were not in the gift of the Priory suggests that he was not a religious. Moreover there is no positive proof that any Durham monks held benefices before the dissolution and it is doubtful if mandates to induct were ever addressed to monks.

E. In the bursar's books of 1530-4 the priests serving the churches or chapels dependent upon the monastery nearly always have the prefix "Dominus" attached to their names. Generally also the name of the place of which they were chaplain is stated. The later history of some of them can be discovered. For example the Dom Christopher Cawarte, chaplain, occurring in the bursar's book of 1533-4 (2), was probably the Christopher Cowerd who became incumbent of the chantry of Our Lady in Dinsdale, of which the Convent was patron (3). Again the Dom Richard Ayre who occurs as chaplain of Heighington in the bursar's book of 1531-2 (4), probably became curate of St. Oswald's, Durham, which was also in the patronage of the Priory and then of the Dean and Chapter (5). Similarly Robert Forrest, the vicar of Pitlington church, which was appropriated to the Priory, was entered as "Dominus" (6). It is evident that in at anyrate the majority of cases these chaplains were not monks, although it is tempting to make identifications on the assumption that they were religious, because several of them are found at a later date in promotions in the gift of the Priory or Dean and Chapter. None of them, however, appears in the pensions lists, although had they been monks

(1) Randall IX; Wills & Invs. I, p.127.

(2) S.S.18, p.288.

(3) Aug. Off. Chantry Certif. 18, no.96; S.S.22, p.lxviii.

(4) S.S.18, p.131.

(5) cf. in the Treasurer's book of 1557 beside the entry of the payment of the stipend of the vicar of St. Oswald's there is recorded a payment to "R^c Ayre", curate there (D. & Chap. Treas.) As a Sir Robert Ayre was buried in St. Oswald's in 1554 (Par. Reg.), this must have been Richard Ayre.

(6) S.S.18, p.234.

they certainly would have been granted pensions, as their stipends as chaplains were not such as to warrant such an omission.(1)

- F. Despite the surrender of the Priory in 1539, Durham College in Oxford appears from its account roll of 1540-1 to have been maintained according to its original constitution with eight fellows and eight students. It might be presumed, therefore, that the "socii" or fellows of that year were the eight monks who had held these positions in the previous years. Four of them probably were, but as 1) George Blunt 2) James Gray 3) Anthony Todd and 4) Hugh Winter were not studying theology but took the degrees of B.A. or B.C.L. it is not certain that they had also belonged to the community(2).

In considering which of the priests in these last pages may actually have been inmates of the monastery two facts must be borne in mind. In the first place, while in religion the monks often adopted as their second name the name of their native town or village. In 1539-41, however, when the pensions lists and letters-patent founding the Dean and Chapter were issued, these names were rejected in favour of their paternal surnames, so that often identifications should be made of those monks who are named in the bursar's books and the accounts rolls with those occurring in these latter documents. Secondly, as "Dominus" seems to have been applied as a courtesy title to priests serving churches and chapels belonging to the convent, its appearance in the records of the Priory must not always be supposed to indicate that those to whom it was applied were members of the community. In view of these facts it is probable, therefore, that only a very small proportion of the priests mentioned above should be added to the list of the fifty-four monks of Durham Priory given at the beginning of this appendix.

-
- (1) Others appearing in the bursar's books of 1530-4 were Dom Robert Dawson, chaplain of Harverton, Dom Robert Galloway, chaplain of Herrington, Dom William Blenkinsopp, chaplain of St. Nicholas, Durham, Dom James Duckett, chaplain, Dom Roger Willy, chaplain of Ferryhill, etc. (S.S. 18, p. 269, 299, 314, 25, etc.) The history of all of these priests can be traced, but there is no other indication that any of them were monks.
- (2) D. & Chap. Treas. Roll Oxon. XIV; Oxford Hist. Soc. XXXII, p. 67. Blunt & Gray were still at the college in 1544 (D. & Chap. Treas. Misc. Cart. No. 2744).

APPENDIX II.

THE CHANTRY and COLLEGIATE FOUNDATIONS OF DURHAM and NORTHUMBERLAND.

In the two tables immediately following all chantries, chantry-chapels, gilds, free chapels, and endowments for the support of lights, obits, anniversaries, or of the church work, which appear in the "Valor" and the 1546 and 1548 certificates are classified under parishes and the more important parochial chapelries. Similar foundations not appearing in these sources are included, if they existed in 1535 or later, or if, although dormant, their property had not been set aside for other uses before 1535. On the other hand no endowment which appears to have come to an end before that date is given; private chapels are not included; and parochial chapels and chapels of ease are excluded, even if an attempt was made to obtain them for the Crown under colour of the Chantries Acts.

An effort has been made to prevent such a reduplication of chantries etc. as easily arises because they often occur under more than one dedication as if they were separate institutions, particularly where two foundations had been united before 1535. The confusion which is liable to arise because of the variety of names given to the foundations in the certificates, or because of the failure to name them at all, can often be overcome by a comparison of their values, or of their incumbents as given in the different returns, or by reference to the pensions warrants and returns which name the chantry of the grantee; furthermore the fact that the 1546 certificate gives the "Valor" valuation of each endowment aids identifications.

I. The Table for County Durham

a) Contents:- The value of each foundation, is given according to the figures of the "Valor" and the chantry certificates, as this provides a useful index both of its condition, and of the sums accruing to the Crown on the dissolution, and also because the pension or stipend granted to the incumbent depended upon its value in 1548. Stocks of money, lead, and bells pertaining to each institution according to a Brief Certificate

made in the time of Philip and Mary are also included in another column as throwing additional light upon the same points.⁽¹⁾ This Brief Certificate was based upon the 1548 certificate, but its returns have been used in preference to those of the latter document because they contain additional information. Incumbents of each foundation from 1535 onwards are given as far as possible, and in addition the pensions or promotions assigned to them in 1548; if a cantarist was in receipt of more than one pension granted in 1548, this fact is indicated in the footnotes. In the footnotes it is also stated if the foundation had been connected with a monastery, if it survived in 1548, and if it was charged with the upkeep of a school or distribution in alms, or an outlay for the repair of the church. Finally it must be noted that the names of all the parishes, and the chief parochial chapelries of Durham have been included to give some idea of the ubiquity and importance of the chantry foundations of the county.

b) References:- Unless expressly stated to the contrary in the footnotes, all values given for 1535 are taken from "Valor Ecclesiasticus" V, pages 300,302,312,318,320-6; values in 1546 are taken from Augmentation Office Chantry Certificate 18, Nos.51-111; and values in 1548 from the certificate as printed in Surtees Society Publications 22, Appendix VI. The names of incumbents at these dates are taken from the same sources. Stocks of money etc. as given in the Brief Certificate made in the time of Philip & Mary are taken from this certificate as printed in Surtees Society Publications 97, p.146-154; and the pensions of the chantry priests etc. from the enrolment of warrants in Exchequer K.R. Accounts, etc. Bundle 75, No.11.⁽²⁾

(1) It must be borne in mind, however, that as many chapels were tiled the fact that they had no lead does not imply that they were in a state of decay.

(2) Note that portions of a penny have been omitted in giving values. In the values given (a) means the gross value and (b) the net value.

Parish or Parochial Chapelry.	Chantries, Gilds, Services, etc.	Value in 1535 by "Valor Ecclesiasticus"	Value in 1546 by Chantry Certificate.	Value in 1548 by Chantry Certificate.	Stocks of money lead, &c by Brief Certificate temp. Philip & Mary.	Incumbents 1535 onwards.	Incumbent 1548 with Pension or Provision.
St. Andrew Auckland.	Chantry of St. John the Baptist	a) £4.13.4. b) £3.15.0.	a) £6.16.4. b) £5.12.3.	a) £7. 1.4. b) £6. 4.2.		1535 William Scott	William Scott - Pension £5
	Chantry of our Lady	a) £5.17.8. b) £5. 0.8.	a) £7.19.2. b) £6.12.1.	a) £8.12.6. b) £7.15.8.		1535 Alexander Metcalf	Alexander Metcalf Pension £6
	Gild of St. Anne in the Chapel of St. Anne (1)		a) £2. 1.0. b) £1.15.0.	a) £2. 5.0. b) £2. 0.0.	Stock 20/-		Roger Willy. Pension £2

(1) In 1548 this entry is put beside the value of the gild "Cum 14/8; de terr. cast." The chapel survived, cf. a baptism there May 18, 1576 (Par.Reg.). Note that in a return of July 15,, property in Witton occurs as concealed, which is stated to have been given by Blanchland Abbey for a perpetuity in the Church of Auckland (Exch.K.R., Spec.Comm.3296).

Parish	Chantries, etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incum- bents 1535 onwards.	Incum- bent 1548, Pension
St. Andrew Auck- land. (contd)	Gild of the Trinity.		20/-	a) 20/- b) 19/10	Stock 8/4		Michael Myers
	Lands for a light,			4/-			
St. Helen Auck- land.	St. Hugh's gild in Evenwood Chapel				Stock £2.10.0. Lead c.2 fathers		None
Aycliffe	Gild of our Lady.			£3. 5.4.	Stock £5		George Towers. Pension £3 (1)
	Gild of St Katherine.			Nil	Stock £20		John Sothe- herne

(1) By Pole's book his pension is given as £2.13.4. (Exch.K.R. Misc. Bk.31).

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548, Pension
Barnard Castle	Gild of the Trinity (1)		a) £4. 9.4. b) £4. 1.0.	a) £5. 7.0. b) £4.18.8.			Peter Cowerd Pension £4
	Chantry of the Virgin (2)	£4. 9.0.	a) £5.4.10 b) £4.12.7.	a) £6. 0.4 b) £5. 6.4	Lead c.2 $\frac{3}{4}$ fothers	1535 William Stephen-son	William Stephen-son Pension £4
	Lady Priest Service or Perpetuity.	a) £3.19.0 b) £3.14.10 (3)	a) £4. 7.4. b) £3.15.8.	a) £4. 3.0. b) £3.18.10		1535 Henry Betson	Henry Betson Pension £3

(1) To which a school was attached.

(2) This chantry was certainly in the church, cf. 1546 & 1548 certificates, but as its lead was entered it was presumably in a detached portion of the building. It was sometimes called Birtrie or Byrketre chantry (s.s.22, p.3; Wills & Invs. III, p.29.)

(3) In the "Valor" it is called the chantry of the Virgin in the church, but the value and name of the cantarist show that the Lady Priest was intended.

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548, Pension
Barnard Castle (contd)	Chantry of the 12 Apostles in the Castle Chapel	£5. 0. 4.	a) £6. 13. 4 b) £6. 3. 3.	£6. 13. 4		1535 & 1548 Thomas Sanderson. 1554 Christopher Robinson (1)	Thomas Sanderson.
	Chantry of St. Margaret in the Castle Chapel	a) £5. 14. 0 b) £5. 12. 6	a) £5. 19. 0 b) £5. 11. 3	a) £5. 19. 0 b) £5. 17. 6		1535 Robert Hillary or Elly	Robert Hillary or Elly Pension £5. 8. 0 (2)
	Chantry - Chapel of St. Helen.			2/-	3 bells in the steeple		None
	Chantry - Chapel of St. Katharine (3)			2/-			None

(1) T.R.No.296. This chantry evidently survived in 1548, & Robinson must have been instituted on the death of Sanderson.

(2) This chantry must also have survived, & therefore Elly occurs for the first time as a recipient of a pension in 1553 (Exch.K.R.Misc.Bk.31).

(3) Possibly survived. cf. 1 bell was left in the chapel in 1553 (S.S.A97, p.143)

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548 Pension
Barnard Castle (contd)	A yearly obit.			7/10			
Billingham							
Bishop-Middleham							
Bishop-ton	Lands for a light (1)						
Bishop Wear-mouth	Chantry of the Virgin	£3. 6.8 (2)	a)£3.12.0. b)£2.19.10	a)£3.15.4. b)£3. 9.5.		1535 Ralph Parkin-son.	Ralph Parkin-son. Pension £3.
	Chapel of St. Leonard. Silks-worth (3)						
Boldon							

(1) Lands valued at 13/4 yearly belonging to this light occur as concealed in return of June. 4, 1584 (Exch.K.R.Spec.Comm.1742), & in a return of August 31, 1586, Giles Widdowes, the vicar, confessed that he had concealed property valued at 6d. belonging to the light (ibid.No.3296).

(2) In the "Valor" this chantry is said to be in Sunderland, & the incumbent's name given as Ralph Parkin.

(3) Given as concealed in a return of Feb. 12, 1572 (Exch.K.R.Spec.Comm.No.3296; cf. also Proc. of Newe.Soc. Antiq. 3rd Ser. III, p. 118-9)

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548 Pension
Brannceth.	Chantry of Jesus	a) £7. 1.0 b) £6. 19. 11	a) £9. 0.6 b) £7. 4.7 (1)	a) £8. 9.4 b) £7. 6.10	1 chalice.	1535 Nicholas Hoggard. 1546 Henry Skathlock	Henry Skathlock. Pension £5
Castle Eden	Chantry of St. John (2)						
Chester-le-Street	Chantry of our Lady	a) £5. 10.0. b) £5. 8.0	a) £5. 9.6. b) £4. 18.8.	£5. 8.10		1535 Leonard Raughton	Thomas Hollyman. Pension £4
	Chantry of St. George.	a) £4. 19. 4 b) £4. 15. 10	a) £5. 3.0. b) £4. 13.0.	a) £5. 3.0 b) £4. 13.0		1535 John Purles. 1546 Geoffrey Glenton	Geoffrey Glenton. Pension £4

(1) Chantry not named.

(2) In 1575 property in Bywell, late of this chantry, was granted out (N.C.H. VI, p.270). It is stated in Mackenzie & Ross ~~11, 22~~ that a William Cutory was the last incumbent, and had a pension of 30/- in 1553. This does not seem to appear in Pole's book.

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548 Pension.
Chester- le-Street (contd)	Chantry- Chapel of Harraton or Harver- ton. (1)	£4.13.4.	a) £4.13.4 b) £4. 4.0.	£4.13.4		1535 Robert Dawson. 1546 William Hutton.	William Hutton. Pension. £4
	The Anker House Chantry- Chapel				Lead c. $\frac{1}{4}$ fother		None
Cockfield							
Comnis- cliffe.	Chantry of the Virgin (2)	£4.13.4	a) £5. 8.0 b) £4.18.8	£5. 8.0		1535 George Watson	None
	Stipend- iary Service			a) £1. 8.0 b) £1. 7.9			John Vasy Pension £1.8.0.
	Gild (3)						
Dalton	Lands for a light			1/-			

(1) Durham Priory paid the whole of the stipend of the chaplain here, & the chantry was granted to the Dean & Chapter in 1541 (Valor V.p.302; s.s.103, p.702, etc; s.s. p.702, etc.; s.s.143, p.31).

(2) Not named in the "Valor" or 1546 certificate.

(3) The gild-house & garth occur as concealed in a return of June 4, 1584 (Exch. K.R.Spec.Comm. No.1742).

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548, Pension
Darlington	Chantry of All Saints	a) £6. 6. 8 b) £4. 15. 0	a) £4. 11. 8 b) £3. 8. 3	a) £4. 19. 0. b) £4. 12. 4 (1)		1535 Leonard Melmerby	Thomas Richardson. Stipend as Schoolmaster £4. 8. 0(2)
	Chantry of St. James in the Bishop's Manor (3)	£5. 13. 4	a) £5. 13. 4 b) £5. 2. 0.	£5. 13. 4		1535 Thomas Emerson. 1546 Ralph Cotes.	Ralph Cotes. Pension £5
	Chantry-Chapel of Badlefield. (4)	£2	a) £2. 6. 8 b) £2. 2. 8			1535 Richard Manchester 1546 Robert Bushell or Bishoppe	Robert Bushell. Pension £2. 6. 8.

(1) Additional rents to the value of 3/- belonged to the Grammar School in 1548.
(2) Aug. Off. Cont. Warrant. No. 9.A. Grammar School has been attached to the chantry.
Richardson also had a pension as a minister of the college. (3) This chantry seems to have been combined with a chantry of the Virgin in the Church (Longstaffe, p. 198). The stipend of the priest in 1535 was made up by a payment of £3 from the Bishop, & £2. 13. 4. by the Prior of Durham; in 1548 the former sum was paid out of the Exchequer, & the latter by the Court of Augmentations. Presumably by a mistake the total value of the chantry in 1548 is given as £6.
(4) The incumbent of this chantry, which was once a leper hospital, was also a Prebendary of the college, & so Robert Bushell drew a second pension in this capacity. Further the holder of the Prebend of Prestgate (value 33/4 in 1535) acted as a second chaplain. In 1535 the Prebendary of Prestgate was Thomas Chambre, & in 1548 Simon Binks.

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbents 1548. Pension
Darlington (contd)	Yearly Obits			5/2			
	Rents for a light			2/-			
Denton							
Dinsdale	Chantry of our Lady (1)	£2.13.4	a) £2.17.0. b) £2.11.8	£2.17.4		1535 Thomas Caward or Calvert 1546 Christopher Cowerd	Chris - topher Cowerd. Pension £2.10.0.
	Chantry or Free Chapel (2)						
Durham Cathedral and Precincts	Chantry of the Virgin & St. Cuthbert. (3)	a) £20.12.4 b) £19.16.5	a) £20.13.4 b) £18. 0.4			1535. William Cockey & Ralph Todd. 1539 Cockey & Henry Stafford. 1544 & 1546 Cockey & Robert Hartburn M.A. (4)	

(1) The stipend of the chaplain was paid by Durham Priory & the chantry was granted to the Dean & Chapter in 1541 (Valor V.p.302,325; S.S.103,p.702,etc.; S.S.143,p.31). In the 1546 certificate it is called the chantry of St.Katharine. (2) Occurs as concealed in a return of Feb.12,1572 (Exch.K.R.Spec.Comm.No.3296). (3) Sometimes called Bishop Langley's chantry. Grammar & Song Schools were attached to it. In 1535 £16.12.4. of its reveue was drawn from Jervaulx Abbey & £4 from the Bishop In 1539 payment of the former sum was obtained from the Crown (L.& P.XIV,ii,p.77). In 1546 stated to distribute 13/4 yearly in alms. (4) L.& P.XIV,ii,p.77. Hartburn was collated by the Bishop on July 6,1544 (T.R.No.219). This chantry no longer existed in 1548, but Cockey and Hartburn seem to have become masters in the cathedral schools.

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548.
Durham Cathedral & Precincts	Gild of St. Cuthbert (1)	£4.18.4	a) £7.10.4 b) £6. 2.1	a) £7.14.8 b) £6.16.3	1 chalice	1546. Edward Adthe. (2)	Edward Adthe. Pension £6
	Chapel of St. Helen over the Priory Gate (3)					1541 William Watson (4)	
St. Giles, Durham.	Chantry in Durham Castle	£2				1535 William Blenkinsopp (5)	Richard Middleton Pension £5
	Gild of St. Giles	a) £4. 7.4 b) £2.17.1 (6)	a) £6.15.10 b) £4.11.8	a) £7. 7.2 b) £5.14.1	1 chalice	1535 Richard Middleton	
St. Margaret, Durham	Obit of John Smith			a) 4/- b) 3/-			
	Chantry of our Lady (7)	a) £4.18.4 b) £4.14.3	a) £7. 4.0 b) £4.17.0	a) £7.13.4 b) £5. 3.7	1 chalice	1535 James Duckett. 1546 John Duckett	John Duckett. Pension £5.

(1) Value in 1535 taken from 1546 certificate as not in "Valor Eccl. V." Often appears in Priory Sacrist's roll (cf. S.S. 100 p. 402). The Priory made a payment of 15/- to the Gild which was continued by the Dean & Chapter (S.S. 143, p. 59).
(2) S.S. 97, p. 127. (3) cf. Hutchinson II, p. 270. The stipend of the incumbent was paid by the Priory & then by the Dean & Chapter. Apparently still in use in 1557-8 (D. & Chap. Treas., Treas. Bks.). (4) D. & Chap. Reg. I, fol. 14a. (5) Collated by the Bishop Oct. 20, 1534 (T.R. No. 109). (6) Called a chantry in the "Valor". (7) Almshouses were dependent upon it in 1546 & 1548. It was in the patronage of the Priory & then of the Dean & Chapter, & received £2 of its revenue from it (Valor V, p. 302, 324; S.S. 143, p. 31 & 59; Dur. Priory Reg. V, fol. 239 etc.)

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents onwards	Incumbent 1548. Pension
St. Margaret, Durham (contd)	Chapel of St. Leonard (1) Chapel of St. Bartholomew (3) Gild of St. Margaret (4) Lands for yearly Obits & for anniversaries					1541 William Watson (2) 1541 William Watson (2)	
St. Mary-le-Bow, Durham.	St. Katharine's chantry Chantry-Chapel in Kingsgate (5)	a) £3.18.10. a) £4.19.3 b) £3.13. 8 b) £4.5.4	a) £5.4.11. 1 b) £4.17.10 chalice	a) £1.0.8. b) £1.0.1		1535 George Barkley	George Barkley. Pension £4
St. Mary the less, Durham							

(1) Perhaps connected with the hospital of St. Leonard. Occurs as a free chapel, concealed, in a return of Feb. 12, 1572 (Exch. K. R. Spec. Comm. 3296). In 1574 granted out by the Crown (Surtees IV, p. 136-7). (2) Presented by the Dean & Chapter, cf. Reg. I, fol. 14a. (3) Occurs as a free chapel with some property, concealed, in return of Feb. 12, 1572 (Exch. K. R. Spec. Comm. 3296; cf. also Proc. New Soc. Antiq. 3rd Ser. III, p. 118-9). (4) In a return of Oct. 29, 1573, property in St. Margaret's, which belonged to the gild of St. Margaret until the dissolution, stated to be concealed (Exch. K. R. Spec. Comm. 741). (5) As a free chapel granted out by James I (S. S. 95, p. 250).

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548
St. Nicholas, Durham.	Chantry of St. John the Baptist & St. John the Evangelist (1)	a) £4.14.0	a) £6.7.4	a) £6.10.0	1	1535 James Gibson	James Gibson. Pension £5
		b) £4.4.0	b) £4.18.3	b) £5.12.2	chalice		
	Chantry of the Trinity (2)	a) £6.5.9	a) £7.1.10	a) £7.3.10	1	1535 William Butterwick. 1546 John Marshall.	John Marshall. Pension £5
		b) £5.18.9	b) £6.7.5	b) £7.1.4	chalice		
	Chantry of St. James (3)	a) £4.6.8	a) £5.11.10	a) £5.18.10	1	1535 Lance- lot Smith. 1541 Cuthbert Nat-ress (4) 1546 William Mason	William Mason. Pension £5
		b) £3.17.4	b) £4.17.6	b) £5.12.2	chalice		

(1) Received 2/- rent from the Prior of Finchale (Valor V, p.304, 323). In patronage of the Durham Almoner (Surtees IV, p.48). Not named in the "Valor".
(2) Received 3/4 rent from Surham Priory (Valor V, p.302), and was in patronage of the Almoner (Surtees IV, p.48). (3) Received 20/- rent from Durham Priory (Valor V, p.325), and was in patronage of the Almoner (Surtees IV, p.48).
(4) D. & Chap. Treas. Misc. Cart. 2697. He was buried Aug.30, 1544 (Par.Reg.)

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents onwards	Incumbent 1548 Pension
St. Nicholas, Durham. (contd)	Chantry of our Lady A. (1)	a) £4. 3. 4 b) £3. 16. 5	a) £3. 17. 0 b) £3. 7. 2	a) £4. 1. 2. b) £3. 18. 8	1 chalice	1535 Richard Swallowell. 1541 & 1546 Richard or Thomas Hildreth (2)	None
	Chantry of our Lady B. (3)	£2. 18. 5	a) £4. 11. 0 b) £3. 19. 9	a) £4. 14. 0. b) £4. 9. 3	1 chalice	1535 William Blenkinsopp. 1546 John Dawson	John Dawson. Pension £4.
	Chantry of St. Margaret (4)						
	Gild of the Corpus Christi (5)	a) £4. 17. 4 b) £3. 15. 6	a) £5. 8. 10 b) £4. 9. 3	a) £6. 3. 0. b) £5. 10. 7	1 chalice	1535 John Pearson. 1546 Robert Melmerby	Robert Melmerby Pension £5
	Gild of St. Nicholas (6)	a) £6. 8. 0 b) £4. 18. 4		a) £1. 19. 0 b) £1. 3. 0.		1535-41 Thomas Atkinson (7)	None

(1) It received 28/- from Durham Priory (Valor V, p. 302), & was in the patronage of the Priory and then of the Dean & Chapter (S.S. 143, p. 31). (2) Called Richard Hildreth in 1541 (D. & Chap. Treas. Misc. Cart. 2697), & Thomas Hildreth in 1546 certificate (3) A second chantry founded at the same altar. Received 14/- from Durham Priory (Valor V, p. 302) & was probably in its patronage. One of the chantries of the Virgin also had 2/- yearly from Finchale Priory (1b p. 304). (4) Mentioned in a deed of 1551 (Arch. Ael. 3rd Ser. XIII, p. 26). (5) It received 24/- yearly from Durham Priory & then from the Dean & Chapter (Valor V, p. 302; S.S. 143, p. 59). (6) In the "Valor" called a chantry or gild. (7) Buried March 3, 1541 (Par. Reg.) Gild perhaps vacant from then.

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548.
St. Nicholas, Durham.	Chantry-chapels of St. James & St. Andrew on Elvet Bridge (1)	a) £4. 7. 0. b) £3. 16. 3	a) £4. 8. 4. b) £3. 12. 11	a) £4. 6. 10 b) £3. 18. 6	Lead c. 2 1/2 Fothers 1 Bell (2)	1535. Lancelot Smith. 1546 Lewis Bell	Lewis Bell Pension £3
	Lands for Obits & Anniversaries for term of years.			a) £1. 19. 4 b) £1. 10. 4	£9 (3)		
	Lands for Obits & Anniversaries in perpetuity			a) £1. 13. 9 b) £1. 6. 10			
St. Oswald's, Durham.	Chantry of our Lady (4)	a) £4. 19. 8 b) £4. 7. 10	a) £6. 3. 4 b) £5. 0. 7	a) £6. 0. 4 b) £5. 9. 0		1535 Richard Bennett Pension £5	Richard Bennett Pension £5

(1) Much confusion has arisen in the past between these chapels & the chantry of St. James in the church, particularly as the same man was incumbent of the chapels & chantry in 1535 (Valor V, p.324-5). The priory & then the Dean & Chapter were patrons of St. James on Elvet Bridge & paid 4/- of the chaplain's stipend (S.S.143 p.31, 59). (2) Lead delivered to Richard Benson for the use of Richard Brackenbury, surveyor of the King's stable, by virtue of a warrant dated May 13, 1554. The incumbent stated to have stolen the bell. (S.S.97, p.147). (3) Given by Maud Bailes & Thomas Dixon. (4) It received 28/7 yearly from Durham Priory & 1/7 from Finchale (Valor V, p.302, 304, 324). It was in the patronage of the Priory & then of the Dean & Chapter (S.S.143, p.31).

Parish	Chantryes etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548. Pension
St. Os-wald, Durham. (contd)	Chantry of S.S. John the Baptist & Evangelist.	a) £11.11.4 b) £11. 8.8	a) £12.9.4 b) £10.7.2	a) £12. 9.4 b) £11.8.10	1 chalice	1535 Christopher Waterford 1544 Roger Wright (1) 1546 Edward Pop-ley	Edward Popley. Pension £6.13.4.
	Stipendiary service at altar of the Holy Cross. (2)		a) £ 3.9.4 b) £ 3.1.8	a) £ 3.12.0. b) £3 . 7.8			Christopher Riseley. Pension £3.7.8.
	Chantry of Richard Booth (3)					1531-41 William Maltby	
	Lands for a yearly obit (4)			a) 5/- b) 2/-			
	Gild of the Trinity (5)						

(1) D. & Chap. Reg. I, fol. 23-4. (2) Altar not named in the 1546 or 1548 certificates, but it is in the pensions warrants, & cf. S.S. 22, p. 7. (3) Occurs in Durham Bursar's books 1531-41 (S.S. 18, p. 132, 295). Expenses of the cathedral from Mich. 1540 to June 1541 contain payment of 50/- to Dom William Maltby for two terms (D. & Chap. Treas. Misc. Cart. 6081). Query if it came to an end in 1541. (4) Charged with a payment in alms. (5) In Bursar's book 1538-9 is receipt of 1/- from brothers of the Trinity in St. Oswald's church (S.S. 58, p. 326).

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents onwards	Incumbent 1548 Pension
Easington	Chantry of the Virgin	£4. 7.0.	a) £4.10.7 b) £3.17.5	a) £4. 7.8 b) £4. 1.7		1535 William Barbon. 1546 Richard Johnson.	Richard Johnson. Pension £3
	Chantry of Our Lady of Pity (1)	£4.13.4	a) £5. 0.0 b) £3.19.1	a) £5. 0.0 b) £4. 9.5		1535 Christopher Harrison. 1546 Thomas Worthie	Thomas Worthie. Pension £4
	Chantry of the 12 Apostles (2)	£4. 0.0	a) £4.10.3 b) £4. 1.3	a) £4.11.3 b) £4.10.3		1535 George Burrell	George Burrell. Pension £4
	Chantry in the free chapel of All Saints, Haswell	20/-	a) 20/- b) 18/-	20/-		1535 Nicholas Holmes	Nicholas Holmes
Manchester							
Edmundbyers							
Walescliffe							
Elton							
Elwick							

(1) A separate foundation; sometimes called John Jackson's chantry (cf. Arch. Ael. 2nd Ser. pt. 46, p. 291-2; S.S. 18, p. 23 etc.). It received £3 yearly from Durham Priory (Valor V. p. 302), & was in the patronage of the Priory & then of the Dean & Chap. (S.S. 143, p. 31). (2) Called in the "Valor" the chantry of S.S. Peter & Paul.

Parish	Chuntries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548. Pension
Escombe							
Gainford.	Chantry of Our Lady (1)	£4.18.7	a) £4.12.0 b) £4. 2.2	£4.16.0.		1533 John Bateson	John Bateson. Pension £4
	Chantry-Chapel of St. Mary Magdalen or Barmer Chapel (2)	£2. 0.0	£2. 0.0	Nil		1535 Thomas Hall. 1546 Anthony Brackenbury.	Henry Brackenbury.
Gateshead	Chantry-chapel of the Virgin at Pierce-bridge (3)	£4. 8.6	a) £5.17.0 b) £5. 8.1	£5. 4.4	1 chalice 1 bell	1535 John Burne. 1546 Peter Carter or Carr	Peter Carter. Pension £4
	Chantry of our Lady	a) £5. 4.8 b) £3.15.4	a) £7. 2.1 b) £6. 3.3	a) £8. 6.4 b) £7.11.6	1 chalice	1535 William Gollayn 1544 William Freind (4) 1546 William Blenkin- insopp.	William Blenkin-sopp. Pension £6 (5)

(1) Not named in the "Valor". (2) Appears under both names. By 1546 the grant of the chantry to the Brackenburys had presumably put an end to its use as such. (3) For its dedication cf. S.S.22, p.4. (4) Surtees II, p.119-120. (5) In the accounts of the Receiver-General of the North he is said to be one of the incumbents of this chantry (Minis.Accts. 2-3, Edw.VI, No.698, fol.24b.).

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbents 1548 Pension
Gateshead (contd)	Chantry of S.S. John Baptist & Evangelist (1)	a) £6.17.0 b) £6.12.8.	a) £7.16.8 b) £6.16.8	a) £7.16.8 b) £7.10.0	1 chalice	1535 Robert Galele 1546 Thomas Hutchinson	Thomas Hutchinson Pension £6
	Chantry of the Trinity		a) £6.1.6 b) £5.10.7	a) £6.3.10 b) £5.9.4	1 chalice	1546 John Hutchinson	John Hutchinson Pension £5
	Chantry of the Trinity in the hospital of St. Edmund the Bishop (2)	a) £4.14.8 b) £4.4.2				1535 German Creighton. 1544 John Hutchinson	

(1) Surtees also gives a chantry of St. Loy founded like this one by John Dolphanby (Surtees II, p.119-20), & on Sept. 27, 1532, Tunstal instituted Robert Galele to St. Loy's chantry (T.R.No.54). As Galele was incumbent of the chantry of St. John in 1535 the two foundations had probably been united. The Thomas Worthie & Richard Jackson (i.e. Johnson) whom Surtees gives as pensioned incumbents of Gateshead chantries really belonged to Easington. (2) It would be tempting to identify this chantry with the one above, but in the "Valor" it is stated to be in the "chapel of Gateshead", & John Hutchinson was instituted to it, Mar. 9, 1544, when it was definitely stated to be in the chapel of the hospital of St. Edmund (Welford II, p.215-6; Boyle & Knowles, p.303). This chantry in 1535 received 3/4 yearly from Tynemouth Priory (Valor V.p.322).

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548. Pension
Gateshead (contd)	Stipendiary service or chantry of St. Giles in the Hospital of St. Edmund the King (1)		£2. 3. 4 (2)	£4. 13. 4	Lead on chapel c. 4½ fother		Robert Lynsey Pension £4
Great-ham							
Grindon							
Hamsterley.	The Guild of the Virgin. (3)			Nil	£7		Roland Brown. Pension £2. 4. (4)
Hart							
Hartlepool.	Chantry of our Lady	a) £4. 0. 0. b) £3. 15. 11	a) £6. 18. 10 b) £5. 18. 1	a) £7. 3. 6. b) £6. 9. 5		1535 John Holmes	John Holmes. Pension £5

(1) Called the chantry of St. Giles in the accounts of the Receiver-General of the North (Minis. Accts. 2-3 Edw. VI, No. 698, fol. 26b). The endowment is stated in the 1548 certificate to be for a term of 99 years by indenture of Aug. 12, 1537. The certificate does not show in which hospital it was, but cf. Boyle & Knowles p. 306. (2) Well-ford II, p. 238. (3) Occurs in the 1548 certificate, where its value is given as nil, & it is said to have no stock & no incumbent. Its dedication is given in Pole's book. (4) Occurs as incumbent with this pension in Pole's book only.

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548.
Hartlepool (contd)	Chantry - Chapel of St.Helen (1)	a) £4. 0.0 b) £2.18.0	a) £6. 4.6 b) £5.18.8	a) £6. 2.4 b) £4.17.3	1 chalice. Lead c.4½ fothers. 1 bell (2)	1535 Richard Howtill Oct.1535 Richard Greg (1)	Pension Richard Greg.Pen- sion £4
Haughton-le-Skerne	Stipend- iary Ser- vice Chantry - Chapel of St.Mary Magdalen in Coatham Amunde- ville (3) Quit rent for a light before the image of Our Lady			Nil	£4		None
					6/-		

(1) Said to be in the church by the 1546 certificate, but the chapel was evidently intended. A chantry of St.Nicholas may have been combined with it. (cf. Surtees III, p.117; T.R.No.125). The chapel may have belonged to Guisborough Priory (Surtees III, p.119). (2) By warrant of Aug.6, 1549, the lead was delivered to the inhabitants of the town. (3) cf. Surtees III, p.270, for dedication etc. It continued in use, if there was a curate there in 1563 (Harl.Mss.594, fol.189; cf. also S.S.22, p.3), but in 1584 it was presented as concealed (Exch.K.R.Spec. Comm.1742).

Parish	Chantries etc,	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incum- bents 1535 onwards	Incum- bent 1548. Pension
Haugh- ton-le- Skerne (contd)	Quit rent for repair of the church			8/-			
	Yearly obit			a) 4/6 b) 2/6			
Heigh- ington Hesle- den	Gild of Heigh- ington (1)						
	Stipendiary service (2)			£4 (3)			Miles Duffield
	Chantry- Chapel in Hutton Henry (4)		4/-	2/8	1 chalice 1 bell (5)		None
	Lands to maintain a lamp (6)						

(1) 30/- was said to be due to it on May 15, 1536 (T.R.No.541). The gild house occurs as concealed in a return of June 4, 1584 (Exch.K.R.Spec.Comm.1742). (2) In the 1548 certificate this service is entered as in the parish of "Hutton", but as footnote 4 shows Hesleden is intended. (3) For a term of years. (4) In the 1548 certificate, & therefore in the Brief Certificate made temp. Philip & Mary, it appears as "The chapel of Hutton in the parish of Monk Hesleden." Moreover, in a certificate as "The chapel of Howton in the parish of Monk Hesleden." Moreover, in a return of April 22, 1575, the free chapel of Hutton Henry in Monk Hesleden occurs as concealed with its appurtenances (Exch.K.R.Spec.Comm.3296). In 1546 the revenues were stated to be disposed of according to the discretion of the parishioners (5) No lead because tiled. (6) Occur as concealed in return of April 22, 1575 (Exch.K.R.Spec.Comm.3296).

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548. Pension
Hesleden (contd)	Property for the painting & upkeep of the image of the Virgin (1)			1548			
Houghton-Spring	Chantry-chapel or gild of Houghton or the Trinity (2)	16/4	a) 19/4 b) 15/8	a) £1.5.4 b) 18/4	1 chalice lead c. 1/2 fother. £2	1535 John Sanderson	John Sanderson
	Chantry or gild of the Virgin	12/-				1535 William Todd	
	Chantry of the Virgin & St. Katharine (3)	£3.9.4.	a) £3. 8.0 b) £3. 1.0	a) £3. 10.0 b) £3. 6.8	1 chalice	1535 Thomas Wright	Francis Trollope Pension £3

(1) Property given by Robert Barker. Occurs as concealed in return of July 15.... (ibid). (2) Occurs under both names & designations. The incumbent not mentioned in 1546, when moreover the gild was stated to be in the church. (3) Unnamed in the "Valor"; called St. Katharine's chantry in 1546 when the incumbent was the same as in 1535; called Our Lady's chantry in 1548; the "Clavis Eccl. of Barnes & the values show it was one chantry (cf. S.S. 22 p. 7). Possibly the chantry gild of the Virgin became combined with the chantry of St. Katharine to form this one service.

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent. 1548. Pension
Houghton-le-Spring (contd)	Chantry-chapel of the Virgin in W.Herrington (1)	£4.13.4	a) £4.13.4 b) £4. 4.0	1548	1 chalice 1 bell	1535 Robert Galloway	Robert Galloway Pension £4
Hurtanworth							
Hurworth							
Jarrow	Chantry in Heworth Chapel (2)						
Kelloe							
Kimbleworth							
Lamesley	Free chapel in Eighton (3)						
Lanchester	Stipendiary service (4)			Nil	20/-		William Wright

(1) The whole stipend of the chaplain was paid by Durham Priory (Valor V.p.302, 325; S.S.103, p.703). It was in the patronage first of the Priory & then of the Dean & Chapter (S.S.143, p.31). The chantry-chapel has sometimes been stated to have been in W.Rainton or in the church, evidently by mistake. (2) In 1588 property called the Katharine close, given for the celebration of mass for souls of all faithful departed in Heworth, was sold (Surtees II, p.83). (3) Occurs as concealed in a return of Feb.12, 1572 (Exch.K.R.Spec.Comm.3296). Probably dedicated to the Trinity - cf. Hutchinson II, p.466, who puts it in Gateshead parish.

(4) Gerard Elyson of Kelloe gave £4 for a priest to serve in Lanchester for one year; at the dissolution 20/- remained as one quarter of the year had not yet run (cf. S.S.97, p.157). His executors were responsible for this money (ibid), but note that in 1548 the incumbent's stipend of 40/- is said to be paid by the Receiver of the Court of Augmentations.

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548. Pension
Lan- chester (contd)	Yearly obit (1) Money for a light Chantry in Holmside Manor (2)			a) £1.9.8 b) 19/2 Nil	16/8		
Long Newton							
Medoms- ley							
Merrington	Gild of the Trinity & St. Nicholas Gild of our Lady (3) Chantry - chapel of St. Nicholas, Ferryhill (4)	10/-		2/8		1535 & 1541 Roger Willy (5)	None

(1) Charged with 8/6 towards the repair of the churches. (2) Provided for in 1540 by agreement between the Tempests (Surtees II, p.325-6). (3) Property belonging to it occurs as concealed in a return of August 25, 1585 (Exch.K.R.Spec.Comm. 3296). (4) Durham Priory paid 10/- yearly to the Chaplain (Valor V.p.302), & the fee was continued by the Dean & Chapter (S.S.143, p.57). For its dedication cf. S.S.58, p.322. (5) Occurs chaplain 1541 - D. & Chap. Treas. Misc. Cart. 2697.

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548, Pension
Middleton St. George	Chantry or Free Chapel (1)	£4		1548		1535 onwards	1548, Pension
Middleton-in-Teesdale	Chantry of the Virgin (2)	£3.13.4	a) £3.13.4 b) £3.6.0	£3.13.4		1535 James Lokey or Lacke	James Lacke Pension £3
Monk Wearmouth	Lands for a light Stipendiary service			9/-			
	Chantry-chapel of Hilton (3)	£6.13.4	a) £6.13.4 b) £6.0.0	1/8 £6.13.4		1535 Thomas Stevenson (4)	None Thomas Stevenson Pension £5
Muggleswick							
Norton	Stipendiary service (5)			Nil	£12		William Herteborne

(1) By the "Valor" said to be in the hand of Christopher Conyers of Middleton St. George, who was in receipt of its fruits. Apparently connected with the sinecure rectory or rectorial portion held by Conyers (cf. Surtees III, p.224-5; S.S.22, p.4). Query if the same as the chapel of St. John on or near the bridge. (2) Not named in the 1546 or 1548 certificate. (3) Presentations to this chapel by the Barons of Hilton had to be confirmed by Durham Priory, & strict conditions were imposed by the latter (cf. S.S.29, p.240). It has been confused by Surtees etc. with the chapel of Hilton in Staindrop parish, cf. below p.159. Survived for burials, cf. Sir Thomas Hilton wished to be buried in it in 1558 (Arch. Acl. 2nd ser. pt.22, p.149). (4) Presented Apr.27, 1531, by Sir William Hilton, & the presentation confirmed by the Priory (Dun. Priory Reg. V, fol.241-2). (5) In the Brief Certificate called an Obit, the 1548 document given by William Blakton, was for 20 years at £4 yearly. 3 years, in 1548, were still to run & so £12 remained (S.S.97, p.157).

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc	Incumbents 1535 onwards.	Incumbent 1548, Pension
Pittington	Chantry of our Lady with the Chantry of St. Katharine (1)	£3.16.8	a) £4.10.8 b) £4. 0.7	a) £4.11.4 b) £4. 9.3		1535 John Kirkman	John Kirkman. Pension £4
Redmarshall	Lands for a light (2)						
Ryton							
Seaham							
Sedgefield	Chantry of St. Thomas	£5. 0.0	a) £5. 6.8 b) £4.16.8	£5. 6.8.		1535 Richard Turner	Richard Turner. Pension £4
	Chantry of St. Katharine (3)	a) £10.10.0 b) £8.19.0	a) £11.0.0 b) £7. 1.5	a) £11.6.8 b) £8.12.8		1535 Edmund Stapleton	Edmund Stapleton Pension £6
	Stipendiary Service			a) 12/- b) 11/8			Not presented.

(1) The two chantries were united in March, 1532/3, when Kirkman was presented to them (Dun. Priory Reg. V, fol. 249a). The Priory was patron & then the Dean & Chapter (S.S. 143, p. 31). In the "valor" the chantry is unnamed & in 1546 & 1548 called the chantry of the Virgin. (2) Occur as concealed in a return of June 4, 1584 (Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 1742). (3) Stated in 1546 to be charged with a payment of 20/- in alms.

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548, Pension
Sedgefield (contd)	Chantry or Gild of the Virgin (1)			1548		1535 onwards	
	Chantry - chapel in Bradbury (2)	5/-				1535 Richard Turner	
	Chapel of St. Mary Magdalen Foxton (3)						
Sockburn							
South Shields	Chantry or service of Our Lady (4)						
Staindrop	Gild of Staindrop (5)						

(1) cf. Apr. 24, 1571, Inq. p. m. Gerard Salvin who died seized of a rent of 6/8 late of this chantry (P. R. O. Dur. Inq. p. m. File 191, no. 24). Occurs as a gild in a deed of 1501 (Arch. Acl. 4th Ser. III, p. 138; cf. also Surtees III, p. 31). (2) Durham Priory paid this sum of 5/- to the incumbent (Valor v. p. 302); later it was paid by the Dean & Chapter (S. S. 143, p. 57). The decayed chapel here & its appurtenances are given as concealed in a return of Nov. 3, 1585 (Exch. K. R. Spec. Comm. 3296). (3) As "decayed" occurs concealed in a return of Aug. 31 1586. Belonged to the Knights of St. John (Exch. K. R. Spec. Comm. 3296). (4) In a return of Aug. 25, 1585, property in Westoe, called the "Lady-lands", given for a priest to celebrate mass etc. in the chapel of Westoe occurs (Exch. K. R. Spec. Comm. 3296). The chapel or church of St. Hild, South Shields, was often called the chapel of Westoe (cf. S. S. 29, p. 234). cf. furthermore the 1545 will of a S. Shields man which mentions the altar of the Virgin in the church (Wills & Invs. III, p. 5). (5) On Mar. 17 1585 the waste gild here was granted out by the Crown (Arch. Acl. 2nd ser. IX, p. 25).

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents onwards	Incumbent 1548, Pension
Staindrop (contd)	Chantry chapel of St. Katharine in Hilton nr. Walkerfield (1)	£1.5.0.				1535 John Marshall	
	Property for Obits & Lights			£1.1.0			
Stainton							
Stanhope	Chantry-chapel of St. Botolph in Frosterley	£2.4.8	a) £2.1.8 b) £1.17.2	a) £2.1.8 b) £2.0.8		1535 Ralph Morgan 1546 Roger Rawe	William Chapman continued as incumbent at stipend of £1.16.2. (2)
	Chapel of St. John, Weardale		£2.0.0.	£2.0.0	£7.6.8		Edmund Mainard continued as incumbent at stipend of £2 (3)

(1) This chapel has been confused by Surtees etc. with the chapel of Hilton in Monkwearmouth. In 1535 the chaplain's stipend was paid by Durham Priory (Valor V, p.302), & the fee, reduced to 20/-, was continued by the Dean & Chapter (S.S.143, p.57). Note that in the Treasurers' Books, 1557 & on, the fee was paid to the Crown because of the dissolution of the chapel, which was referred to as the chapel of Hilton near Walkerfield" (D. & Chap. Treas. Bks.) Re this chapel cf. Arch. Ael. 3rd Ser. XIII, p. 72-8. (2) Aug. Off. Cont. Warrant, No.9. The chapel did not survive for long. (3) ibid.

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548 Pension
Stanhope (contd)	Chantry of our Lady			10/10	£8.8.0		None
Stockton	Stipendiary Service or perpetuity in Stockton chapel		£4.10.0	a) £4.14.10 b) £4.13.4			Thomas Salvin Pension £4
	Lands for a light			a) 5/- b) 4/6			
	The Chapel				Lead c. 2½ fother 2 bells (1)		
Stranton	Chantry-chapel of St. Cyprian on the Sands in Seaton Carrowe (2)						
Tanfield	Lands for a lamp			5/-			
Trindon							

(1) The inclusion in the 1548 certificate, & therefore in the Brief Certificate made Temp. Philip & Mary, of the lead & bells of the chapel itself, illustrates the attempt of the Crown to obtain possession of it, as well as of all its revenues. It survived, however (cf. S.S. 97, p. 146, 155; etc.) (2) Property belonging to it occurs as concealed in a return of August 25, 1585 (Exch. K. R. Spec. Comm. 3296). It must be distinguished from the chapel of Seaton-Carrowe, which was dedicated to St. Thomas à Becket (Surtees III, p. 130-2).

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1538 Pension
Washing-ton	Stipendiary Service (1) Money for a light			1/8	13/4		Not named
Whick-ham	Chantry-chapel of S.S. John Baptist & Evangelist in Farnacres with Frereside chapel in Tanfield (2)	a) £18.13.4 b) £17.13.2	a) £31.13.0 b) £23.2.10	a) £19.3.4 b) £17.7.6	2 chalices. 2 bells in Rem- acres. 1 bell in Frere-side (3)	1535 Richard Greathead & Roland Forster. 1546 Claud Rent & Robert Chaytonor Claxton (4)	Claud Rent. Pension £5 (5) Robert Claxton. Pension £5
Whitburn							

(1) William Philip of Usworth bequeathed £12 for a priest to serve for 3 years, ending May 3, 1548, so at the survey only 13/4 of this sum had not yet been paid to the stipendiary (S.S. 197, p. 157). Note that in the 1548 certificate 13/4 is given as the yearly value of the service. (2) Frereside or Friarside chapel, Farnacres was founded to a hospital, was united to Farnacres chantry in 1439. Farnacres was founded for two chaplains (Surtees II, p. 243). In 1535 the value of Frereside chapel alone was £2.13.4. (3) Alexander Pringell, the Crown grantee, answerable for these appurtenances. (4) Robert Claxton was collated by the Bishop on Sept. 1, 1538 (T.R. No. 157). (5) He was granted another pension in 1548 as a Prebendary of Chester College (Exch. K.R. Accounts etc. Bdle 75, no. 11, m. 1.)

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Stock etc.	Incum- bents 1535 onwards	Incum- bent 1548. Pension
Whit- worth							
Whorl- ton							
Winstan							
Witton							
Gilbert							
Witton							
le Wear							
Wolsing- ham	Gild of our Lady (1)						

(1) In a return of Feb. 12, 1572, some of its property was said to have been concealed since the dissolution of the gild (Exch. K. R. Spec. Comm. 3296) Mention of this also occurs Oct. 17, 1493 (Randall IX).

II. The Table for Northumberland.

a) Contents:- The items given for chantry foundations in this county are similar to those given for Durham with some slight variations. The absence of the "Valor" returns means that only the net value as given in the "Liber valorum" can be shown, and as no Brief Certificate containing details of stocks of money, lead etc. made in Mary's reign exists, details of plate and goods of each chantry as appearing in the 1548 certificate are given. It has been necessary in this table to omit the names of parishes in which endowments for chantries etc. are not known to have existed in 1535 or later, because the comparative scarcity of sources dealing with such foundations, and the poverty of many of the churches and people, means that the larger proportion of the parishes of the county fall within this group⁽¹⁾

b) References:- Values and names of incumbents in 1535 are taken from "Valor Ecclesiasticus" V, p.327-30; in 1546 from Augmentation Office Chantry Certificate 18, nos.1-50; and in 1548 from Surtees Society Publications 22, Appendix VII. Pensions are taken from the Brief Certificate for Northumberland made in 1548, in the Augmentation Office, Chantry Certificate No.94, as the pensions there given correspond exactly with those given in the enrolment of warrants,⁽²⁾ and it has the additional advantage of containing the stipends assigned to schoolmasters and assistant priests⁽³⁾

(1) It is perhaps not out of place to note here that although it is stated in Arch.Ael.4th Ser.X,p.211, and therefore also in N.C.H. XIV, p.382, that a chantry probably existed in West Lilburn church or chapel in Eglington parish, it has not been thought wise to include it in the table. The assumption of its existence is based upon an inventory of the goods of the church given in S.S.97,p.159. This inventory, however, has no connection with the chantry certificates but comes from a bundle of inventories of Church goods, and should probably be taken in connection with the inventories of Church goods in Northumberland given S.S.97, p.164 ff'ing: cf.References in S.S.97,p.159,164.

(2) Exch.K.R. Accounts, etc. Bdle 75,no.24.

(3) These also appear in Aug.Off.Continuance Warrant No.20.

Parish or Parochial Chapelry	Chantries, Guilds, services, etc.	Value in 1535 by the "Valor Ecclesiasticus."	Value in 1546 by the Chantry Certificate	Value in 1548 by the Chantry Certificate	Plate, goods, etc. by the 1548 Chantry Certificate	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent in 1548, with Pension, or Promotion
Alnwick	Chantry of the Virgin (1)	£10.0.6		a) £12.3.4 b) £ 8.3.4	No plate. No goods		William Hudson, Pension £4. Thomas Thompson, Stipend as school-master £4.1.8.
	Chantry in the Castle (2)	£15.0.0	a) £15.13.4 b) £14.13.2	a) £15.13.4 b) £14.13.2	Plate 14 ozs.	1535 John Rawlinson, William or Reynoldson, & Roger Gledeley or Robert Beadnell (3)	William Harrison, Richard Raynolde or Reynoldson, & Roger Beadnell. Pensions £4.13.4. each

(1) Founded for two priests who taught in a Grammar & a Song School. For dedication cf. Tate II, p. 71-2; & Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 1715. (2) Founded for three priests (Tate II, p. 67), & therefore sometimes, as in 1546, called three chantries. (3) Valor V. p. 37.

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Plate etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548, Pension
Bamburgh	Chantry of Thomas Dughan (1) Chantry of St. Oswald in the Castle (2)						
Bedlington.	Stipendiary service in the chapel of Cambois		5/4	5/4	6 ozs. Plate		Hugh Errington
Berwick	Chantry of our Lady & St. Katharine (3)		a) £9.14.10 b) £7. 2. 2	a) £6.0.10 b) £5.4.10	No plate No goods	Thomas Wilson (4)	Lambert Clerk. Stipend as Assistant Priest £5.4.10

(1) After the dissolution its property in Fowberry came into the possession of the Vestry (N.C.H. I, p. 89, 106, 129-31). (2) This chantry only occurs in the 1548 Brief Certificate, from which the above particulars are taken. It probably survived in 1548. (3) Called the chantry of Our Lady in 1546 & 1548, but occurs with the double dedication in a survey of 1562, in which also the chantry of St. Katharine & the chantry of Our Lady occur alone. Probably St. Katharine's was annexed to our Lady's chantry (cf. Scott, "Berwick", p. 457, 460-1). (4) cf. by the 1562 survey William Wilson is said to hold some property as heir of his brother Thomas Wilson, late incumbent of the chantry of Our Lady & St. Katharine (Scott, p. 460).

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Plate etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548, Pension
Berwick (contd)	Stipendiary Service of the Rood Mass or Jesus Mass (1)		£1.12.4	a) £1.10.0 b) £1.3.4	No plate No goods		Not named
	Rents belonging to the Church from the "Gallet" fishery in the Tweed (2)			£1.1.8			
Bywell St. Peter	Chantry of St. John the Baptist (3) Lands of the Church (5)			£4.5.0 (4)	7 ozs.		John Eltringham, Pension £4.5.0.

(1) In 1546 the service is said to be for the support of the Jesus Mass, but in 1548 for the support of the Rood Mass priest. The 1548 certificate gives details of the qualities of the incumbent, but does not name him. (2) Retained for the use of the Church, according to the survey of 1562 (Scott, p.429) (3) In the patronage of Durham Priory & then of the Dean & Chapter (S.S.143, p.31). (4) Value not given in copy of this certificate in S.S.22, but this is its value by the copy of the certificate in the Newcastle Public Library & by the 1548 Brief Certificate. (5) Lands to the value of 40/- yearly late belonging to the church are given as concealed in a return of April 14, 1569 (Exch.K.R.Spec.Comm.1715).

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Plate etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548 Pension
Bywell St. Peter (contd.)	Stipendiary service in Whittonstall Chapel (1)						
Corbridge	Chantry of our Lady		a) £4.14.1 b) £4. 5.8	a) £4.15.9 b) £5.19.4	No plate No goods		Ralph Ellingham. Pension £3.19.4.
Ellingham	Chantry of St. Thomas (2) Stipendiary Service of the Lady Mass priest (3)						
Embleton	Chantry-chapel of Our Lady in Brunton (4)	£4.11.5	a) £4. 7.5 b) £3.19.3			1546 Thomas Hedley	Thomas Hedley Pension £3.19.3.(5)

(1) By a return of May 13, 1575, property given for the maintenance of a priest in Whittonstall chapel & occupied by George Cowper, curate there, occurs as concealed. On June 22, 1575, the property was granted out by the Crown (Exch.K.R.Spec.Comm. 2884, N.C.H.VI, p.200, 203). (2) Lands belonging to it were leased by the Crown on June 8, 1569. It also occurs in 1500, etc. (N.C.H.X, p.197). (3) In a return of June 17, 1575, property in "Eltringham", given for the maintenance of the Lady-priest in "Eltringham" church occurs as concealed (Exch.K.R.Spec.Comm.2884). Probably Ellingham intended, cf. in 1333 there was a chapel of St. Mary in Ellingham (N.C.H. II, p.277). (4) In the 1546 certificate the chantry is unnamed, but is said to be in the church. (5) In Pole's book only, where there is a note that his pension was lately paid under the Duchy of Lancaster (Exch.K.R.Misc.Bk.31).

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Plate etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548, Pension
Ford	Chantry of St. Margaret (1) Chantry-chapel of the Virgin in Etal (2)			£4.0.0.			John Hogeson Pension £4
Halt-whistle	Chantry or gild of St. John (3)						
Heddon on the Wall	Chantry-chapel of the Close House (4)						
Hexham	Chantry of our Lady (5)		a) £6.2.5 b) £5.1.9	a) £4.12.0. b) £3.16.2		1546 John Patison	John Patison Pension £3.6.8.
	The Rood Chantry (6) Edward Herri-son's Chantry (6)						

(1) Occurs in the Brief Certificate, from which the above particulars are taken. Also mentioned in some Ministers' Accts. of 1565-6 (N.C.H.XI, p.360). (2) Founded in the 14th century. Edward VI granted out property here, said to be late of a chantry of our Lady, but the reference is probably to this chantry-chapel (N.C.H. XI, p.111.). (3) cf. in 1601 Sir John Forster conveyed to John Ferwick property in Haltwhistle, late of this chantry or gild (Hodgson II, vol.3, p.456). (4) At the dissolution, in 1548, its lands are said to have been granted by the Crown to the Radcliffes (N.C.H. XIII, p.73-4). (5) Not named in 1546; appears, not in the 1548 certificate, but in the Brief Certificate of that year. (6) These 2 chantries, as well as the chantry of Our Lady, appear in a survey of Hexhamshire made in 1547 (N.C.H.III, p.79).

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Plate etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548, Pension
Holy Island	Chantry of Our Lady		Nil (1)		No plate. No goods		
St. John, Lee	Lands for a lamp in St. Oswald's Chapel, Cocklaw (2)						
Long Benton	Chantry of Our Lady	£1.15.0	a) £1.14.2a) b) £1.10.8b)	£1.18.6 £1.15.0	No plate No goods	1546 Cuthbert Bayley or Bayliff	Cuthbert Bayliff. Pension £1.15.0.
	Chantry - Chapel of Our Lady in N. Weetslade (3)	£1.12.0	20/-	£1.6.8	No plate		None at present
Long Horsley	Lands for two lights			5/-			
Mitford	Stipendiary service or perpetuity		16/4	17/- (4)	No plate No goods		None at present

(1) Its lands & tenements are stated to have been in great ruin & decay for ten years; the evidences to be in the custody of "Our George Dynes." (2) Occur as concealed in a return of May 13, 1575 (Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 2884). (3) Dedication only given in the "Valor", which does not, however, distinguish between this chapel & the chantry in the church. (4) It is stated that the churchwardens use the income for the repair of the church.

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Plate etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548. Pension
Mitford	Land for a light (1)			1/-			
Morpeth	Chantry of our Lady (2)			£4.0.0	No plate No goods	1536. Richard Marshall (3)	Thomas Jackson. Pension £4
	Chantry of our Lady in All Saints Chapel.	£4.5.6.	a) £4.4.2. b) £3.11.9	a) £4.11.2 b) £4.2.6	Plate 9 ozs. No goods	1546 Richard Raye	Richard Raye. Pension £4.2.6.
	Stipendiary service at the chantry of Our Lady in All Saints Chapel (4)		£6.8.2.	£6.12.10	No plate No goods	1485-1539 John Anderson (5)	Thomas Husband. Stipend as school-master £6.12.10.

(1) 1 acre in Newton Underwood in the tenure of Richard Gray. (2) The stipend of the incumbent paid, before 1536, by Newminster Abbey (Hodgson II, vol. 2, p. 391) and afterwards by the King's Receiver (1548 certificate). (3) Aug. Off. Misc. Bk. 281, fol. 23a. (4) The certificates of 1546 & 1548 give rise to a good deal of confusion about this & other Morpeth chantries. The incumbent of this foundation, termed a stipendiary service in 1548, was charged by indenture of 1541/2 with the duty of keeping a Grammar School. From the indenture it appears that the priest's service was attached to the chantry of Our Lady, yet in the 1546 certificate the master is given incumbent of the chantry of All Saints in All Saints Chapel (cf. Hodgson II, vol. 2 p. 507-8, 397-9). (5) cf. ibid. p. 399.

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Plate etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548 Pension
Morpeth (contd)	Another chantry in All Saints Chapel (1)	£4.1.6	£4.14.2	£4.13.8	Plate 12 ozs.	1546 Thomas Leighton	Richard Lancaster. Pension £4.13.8
	Rent for a light (2)			4d			
Netherwitton	Chantry of St. Giles (3)	£3.8.8	a) £3.5.2 b) £2.16.10	a) £3.4.0 b) £2.15.10	No plate		Mathew Swan Pension £2.15.10.
Newburn	Free Chapel in Denton (4)			Nil	Plate 9 ozs.		
	Property of the church (5)						

(1) In the 1546 certificate called another chantry of the Virgin, but perhaps really dedicated to All Saints (cf. Valor) or perhaps the Chantry or gild of St. George which occurs 1529 & 1531 (Welford II, p.114, 125; Hodgson II, vol.2, p.391).

(2) From the lands of John Reed. Perhaps the light of St. Peter which was, by the bye-laws of 1527, to be supported by the Weavers' Company. Note also the orders of 1523 of the Smiths, Sadlers & Armourers provide for the upkeep of St. Loy's gild & light in the church, (Hodgson II, vol.2, p.430-1). (3) Chantry not named in 1546. (4) Not stated to be in Newburn in the 1548 certificate, but cf. N.C.H. XIII, p.132-3. It belonged, with the manor, to Tynemouth Priory (ibid. & p.192). (5) Given as concealed in a return of April 14, 1569, where it is valued at 20/- yearly (Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 1715).

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Plate etc.	Incumbents onwards	Incumbent 1548 Pension
Newcastle, ST. Nicholas	Chantry of SS. John Baptist & Evangelist (1)	£5.0.0.	a) £7.7.10 b) £6.17.0	a) £7.7.6 b) £6.16.8	Plate 16½ ozs.	1546. William Clerke	William Clerke. Stipend as Assistant Priest in St. Nicholas £6.16.8.
	Chantry of St. Katharine A. (2)	£5.12.10	a) £6.15.2 b) £5.10.4	a) £6.19.4 b) £5.13.8	No plate	1536. John Lawes (3) 1546 William Johnson	William Johnson. Pension £5
	Chantry of St. Katharine B.	£3.13.0	a) £3.14.8 b) £3.7.3	a) £3.15.0 b) £3.7.7	Plate 11 ozs.	1546 Edward Waller	Edward Waller Pension £3.7.7.
	Chantry of SS. Peter & Paul (4)	£4.7.4	a) £4.8.4 b) £4.4.7	a) £4.19.4 b) £4.4.7	Plate 15 ozs.	1546 Edward Fyffe	Edward Fyffe Pension £4.4.7.
	Chantry of our Lady A.	£5.5.0	a) £5.16.10 b) £4.14.4	a) £5.18.10 b) £4.16.4	Plate 22 ozs.	1546 Robert Baker	Robert Baker. Stipend as Assistant priest in All Saints £4.16.4.

(1) According to the Brief Certificate charged with a distribution of 10d in alms.
(2) Stated in the Brief Certificate to pay 13/4 to the poor of the almshouse of Overton. (3) Occurs in a deed (Welford III, p.51), but uncertain to which chantry of St. Katharine he belonged. (4) Called the chantry of St. Peter in 1546.

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Plate etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548.
New-castle, St. Nicholas (contd)	Chantry of our Lady B. (1)	£5.6.8.	£5.6.8.	£5.6.8.	No plate No goods	Richard Bell	Pension
	Chantry of St. Thomas	£4.2.2	a) £4.12.6 b) £3.12.9	a) £4.13.4 b) £3.12.7	No plate	1546 Charles Newton	Charles Newton. Pension £3.11.11
	Chantry of St. Margaret	£5.4.6.	a) £5.8.0 b) £4.13.10	a) £5.8.0 b) £4.13.10	Plate 8 ozs.	1546 John Cowper	John Cowper Pension £4.13.10.
	Chantry of St. Cuthbert	£5.10.2	a) £7.3.2 b) £5.14.1	a) £7.3.2 b) £6.0.9.	Plate 15 ozs.	1546 Ralph Watson	Ralph Watson. Pension £5
	Chantry of St. Loy (2)	£4.8.0.	a) £4.10.0 b) £4.1.2	a) £4.10.0 b) £4.1.1	No plate	1546 Thomas Hallyman.	Thomas Hallyman. Pension £4.1.2.
	Chantry of St. Anne in the Chapel of St. Thomas the mason the Tyne Bridge (3)	£4.15.6	a) £4.17.0 b) £4.7.5	a) £4.18.0. b) £4.7.5	Plate 14½ ozs	1546 Richard Soughley or Softeley.	Richard Soughley. Pension £4.7.5.

(1) According to the 1546 & 1548 certificates the revenues of the chantry had been detained by the Carrs since Feb. 4, 1536, i.e. even before the death of Richard Bell the incumbent. Evidently by a mistake called the chantry of St. Margaret the Virgin in the "Valor". (2) In 1546 the incumbent said to be non-resident, but to employ a priest in his place. (3) In 1548, by a mistake, said to be in the parish church.

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Plate etc.	Incumbents	Incumbent
New-castle, St. Nicholas (contd)	Chantry of our Lady in the chapel of St. Thomas.	£4. 3. 6	a) £5. 2. 6. b) £4. 3. 1	a) £5. 4. 0 b) £4. 4. 8	Plate 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ ozs.	1535 onwards 1546 John Lisle or Littell	1548. Pension John Lisle. Pension £4. 5. 2.
New-castle, All Saints.	Gild of the Corpus Christi (1) Chantry of St. Thomas	£4. 7. 8	a) £4. 8. 4 b) £3. 19. 6	a) £4. 8. 4 b) £3. 18. 6	Plate 14 ozs.	1546 William White	William White. Pension £3. 18. 6
	Chantry of Our Lady	£3. 3. 4	a) £4. 5. 10 b) £4. 0. 6	a) £4. 12. 6 b) £4. 0. 6	Plate 13 $\frac{1}{2}$ ozs.	1539 & 1546 Robert Manners (2)	Robert Manners. Pension £4. 0. 6.
	Chantry of St. John the Evangelist	£3. 12. 5	a) £4. 15. 4 b) £3. 15. 9	a) £4. 16. 0. b) £3. 7. 1	Plate 22 $\frac{1}{2}$ ozs.	1541 David Keylor (3) 1546 John Mosgrope	Anthony Hogeson (4). Pension £3. 7. 1.

(1) cf. 1539 John Blakton, a former Mayor, left 2/- each to the six priests of this gild, who were to bear his body to the grave (S.S. 116, p. 164). (2) cf. Welford II, p. 197. (3) ibid. p. 205. (4) His name also appears as Anthony Hixson, Hexham, & Houghton.

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Plate etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548.
New-castle, All Saints (contd)	Chantry of St. Katharine	£5.18.10.	a) £5. 3.8. b) £4.5.10	a) £5.10.0. b) £4.10.0	Plate 24 ozs.	1546 Miles Swalwell	Miles Swalwell. Stipend as Assistant Priest in St. Johns £4.10.0.
	Chantry of St. Peter (1)	£6. 0. 0	a) £6. 0.0 b) £5. 8.0	a) £6. 0.0 b) £5. 8.0	No plate	1546 William Teasdall	William Teasdall. Pension £5
	Chantry of St. Loy	£3. 0. 0	a) £3. 8.4 b) £3. 2.4	a) £3. 9.8 b) £3. 2.8	Plate 14½ ozs.	1546 William Brown	William Brown. Pension £3.2.8.
	Chantry of St. John the Baptist (2)	£5. 6. 8	a) £7.15.8 b) £5. 6.6	a) £7.18.8 b) £5. 6.8	No plate.	1546 William Hixson	William Hixson. Pension £5
	Altar of the Trinity (3)				No Goods		

(1) In 1546 the revenue said to be payable from the property of the hospital of St. Katharine, or Maison Dieu. (2) Called the chantry of SS. John the Baptist & Evangelist in the 1546 certificate. Stated in the Brief Certificate to be charged with a payment of 2/10 to the poor of Ward's Hospital. (3) Maintained by the Trinity House brethren. The altar was perhaps not endowed & only served on special occasions. In 1547 they sold some of the plate used at it. They also had a chapel (Welford II, p.79, 251, etc; Brand II, p.322)

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Plate etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548.
New-castle, All Saints. (contd)	Free chapel of St. Lawrence, Byker (1)	£3.0.0 (2)	a) £3.0.0. b) £2.14.0	a) £3.0.0 b) £2.14.0	No plate No goods	1533 Leonard Myers	Pension £2.14.0
	Free chapel of St. Anne, Byker (3)						
	Chantry of our Lady	£4.3.4	a) £4.4.4 b) £3.16.0	a) £4.7.8 b) £3.19.4	No plate	1546 Edward Scott	John Miller-son. Pension £3.19.4
New-castle, St. John	Chantry of the Trinity.	£5.9.2	a) £5.13.4 b) £5.2.5	a) £5.14.4 b) £5.3.5	No plate	1546 Bartram Bertley	Bartram Bertley. Pension £5
	Chantry of St. Thomas	£4.2.6	a) £4.3.0 b) £3.12.9	a) £4.6.4 b) £3.16.1	No plate	1546 John Rage	John Rage. Pension £3.16.1.
	Chantry of St. John the Evangelist	£4.9.0					

(1) Stated in 1546 to be founded partly to harbour the sick and wayfaring. Myers held the chantry for life by a grant to him from the Earl of Northumberland, dated Aug. 12, 1533, & confirmed by the Court of Augmentations on Feb. 12, 1542 (cf. 1546 certificate). In 1548 it was stated that no service was held there. (2) Not in Valor V, but this is its "Valor" value by the 1546 certificate. (3) cf. the 1548 Inventory of the goods of chantries etc. gives the goods of "The chantry of St. Anne in Saint Allhallows" which probably means this chapel (S.S.22, p.xci; cf. also N.C.H.XIII, p.257). Note that Welford (II, p.255) makes this inventory refer to St. Anne's chantry in ^{the} Tyne Bridge chapel.

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Plate etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548. Pension
New-castle, St. Andrew.	Chantry of our Lady & St. Thomas (1)	£4.14.0	a) £6.12.10 b) £5. 0. 3	a) £5.17.4 b) £5. 5.4	No plate	1525 & 1546 John Sadler (2)	John Sadler as Assistant in St. Andrews £5.5.5.
		£3. 3.2	a) £4.2.10 b) £2.18.5	a) £3.5.10 b) £2. 1.5	No plate	1546. Davy Simpson	Thomas Welshe. Pension £2.1.5
	Free chapel of our Lady in Jesmond (3)			£2.0.0 (4)	No plate No goods	1526 William Welton (5)	William Welton. Pension £2
Norham	Stipendiary service at Our Lady altar			£2.2.4	No plate No goods		George Johnson. Pension £2.2.4.
	Chantry in the Castle	£4.0.0	a) £4. 2.0 b) £1.12.0	a) £4.11.4 b) £4. 3.4	No plate No goods		Roland Pratt. Pension £4.3.4

(1) Generally called the chantry of Our Lady, but John Sadler is given as incumbent of the chantry of St. Thomas in the Brief Certificate & Continuance Warrant (Aug. Off. Cont. Warrant No.9). cf. also in a return of April 14, 1562, on concealed property he is said to have occupied property late of St. Thomas, chantry & a house late of the chantry of the Virgin (Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 2952). Evidently the two had been annexed. (2) Welford II, p.87. (3) In 1548 it is stated that the incumbent is non-resident & that no services are held. (4) Value not in S.S.22, but in the Newcastle Public Library copy of the certificate, & in the Brief Certificate. (5) Welford II, p.90. Only his surname is given in 1548.

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Plate etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548. Pension
Ovingham.	Chantry of our Lady (1)					1538 Robert or Roger Swinburn (2)	
	Chantry-chapel of the Virgin in Prudhoe Castle					1538 Robert or Roger Swinburn (2)	
	Chantry-chapel of St. Thomas à Becket in Prudhoe village (3)	£8.0.0.	a) £8. 9.10 b) £7.13.10	a) £8.16.6 b) £8. 0.0	No plate	1538 Robert or Roger Swinburn (2). 1546 Robert Whitehall.	George Robinson. Pension £6 (4)
	Stipendiary service in the Chantry chapel of the Virgin, Ovingham (5)		a) £1.19.10 b) £1.18. 2	16/8	No plate No goods		John Dixon. Pension 16/8

(1) Property late of this chantry was granted out by the Crown Dec. 22, 1590 (N.C.H. XII, p. 75). (2) N.C.H. XII, p. 72. (3) Called two chantries in 1535 & 1546. In 1546 the incumbent was non-resident, but employed a priest in his place. (4) Instituted Sept. 12, 1547 (Randall X, p. 288). (5) Stated in 1546 to be half a furlong from the parish church. Note that in N.C.H. XII, p. 72, the entry concerning John Dixon, the Lady-priest in 1548, is taken as referring to the chapel in Prudhoe Castle because the entry is headed "Prudhoe". The Brief Certificate, however, which often corrects the mistakes & omissions of the 1548 certificate, shows that he served in "the chapel of Ovingham".

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Plate etc.	Incumbents onwards	Incumbent 1548. Pension
Ovingham (contd)	Lands for the Lady Light (1)			1548			
Ponteland	Stipendiary service at the altar of Our Lady (2)			£1.6.6.	No plate No goods		Edward Allanson Pension £1.6.6.
Rothbury	Stipendiary service at the altar of Our Lady (3)			3/10	No plate No goods		None at present
Stannington	Two free chapels (4)						
	Stipendiary service at the altar of Our Lady (5)		a) £1.6.8 b) £1.5.8	a) 18/4 b) 17/4	No plate No goods		None
	Land for a light (6)			4d			

(1) Given as concealed in a return of June 4, 1591 (Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 3054).
(2) Only the Christian name of the incumbent is given in the 1548 certificate, but his full name as well as the name of the service appears in the Brief Certificate.
(3) The revenues are stated in 1548, to be employed by the churchwardens for the repair of the church. For dedication of a return of May 13, 1575, where property of the service is said to be concealed (Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 2884). (4) Occur in a return of Apr. 14, 1569, as concealed. They are said to belong to St. John's Hospital in the lordship of Warkworth (Exch. K.R. Spec. Comm. 1715). (5) Revenues stated in 1548 to be used by the churchwardens for repairs of the church. The Brief Certificate implies that there was an incumbent of this service. (6) One acre in the tenure of William Moreton.

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Plate etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548 Pension
Stannington (contd)	Money for a prest (1)			£6.0.0			
Warkworth	Chantry-chapel of Our Lady (2)		£2.1.0	£3.12.9	No plate No goods		Not named
	Chapel of St. Mary Magdalen outside the town (3)						
	Hermitage of the Trinity (4)					1531-7 George Lancaster (5)	
	Chapelton Coquet Island (6)					1539 Thomas Bennet (6)	
	Lands for the Rood Light			12/4			

(1) This money is stated to be occupied by the poor of the parish by way of Prest.
(2) Stated in 1546 to be near the parish church, so perhaps the chapel adjoining the church mentioned in N.C.H. IV, p.195, which was perhaps connected with Durham Priory's cell in Warkworth. Details are given about the incumbent in 1548, although he is not named. (3) Belonged to Durham Priory. Still existed 1536-9 (N.C.H.V, p.121-3; S.S.58, p.305; S.S.103, p.667). (4) In the 16th century the Earl of Northumberland was patron and paid the hermit a fee of £31.6.8. (N.C.H.V, p.134-5). (5) Connected with Tynemouth Priory's cell. Before the dissolution of the Priory the chaplain was paid £10 yearly, by ancient grant of an Earl of Northumberland, but Thomas Bennet, by the Ministers' Accounts of Mich.1538, did not receive this fee, but had a lease of the island from the Crown, as well as a pension, probably as a monk (Gibson I p. 229, 233).

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Plate etc.	Incumbents 1535 onwards	Incumbent 1548. Pension
Whelpington	Stipendiary service at the altar of Our Lady (1) Land for a light (3)		£1.5.2	£2.7.2 (2)	No plate No Goods		George Hyndmers. Pension £2.7.2
Whittingham	Chantry of St. Peter (4)			1/-			
Widdrington	Chantry of the Trinity (5)	£10	a) £10.4.2 b) £9.4.0	a) £10.4.0 b) £9.4.0 (6)	Plate 6 ozs.	1546. John White & Edward Thompson	Thomas Hedley. Pension £4.12.0. Edward Thompson Stipend as Assistant priest £4.12.0.

(1) Service not named in the 1548 certificate. It is there stated that for the past 30 years John Fenwick had detained property in Framlington given to it, worth 20/- yearly; & that £10 of Elizabeth Fenwick's bequest of £20 to the service remained in the possession of the Vicar & churchwardens. (2) Erroneously entered as £2.7.0 in S.S.22; but cf. copy of the certificate in the Newcastle Public Library & pension. (3) One acre. Note that Hodgson (II, vol.1, p.207) gives an account of "Willows Chapel" in this parish, which evidently refers in reality to the chantry of St. Giles in Netherwitton. (4) N.C.H.XIV, p.491. Robert Collingwood of Eslington, by will of June 12, 1556, left property for a chantry—probably this one (Wills & Invs. I, p.147-8) which must therefore have survived or been refounded. (5) Founded for 2 priests (cf. 1546 certificate). (6) Inclusive of £3.6.8. given yearly for the meat & drink of the incumbents by Sir John Widdrington "as he alleges".

Parish	Chantries etc.	Value 1535	Value 1546	Value 1548	Plate etc.	Incum- bents 1535 onwards	Incum- bent 1548 Pension
Widdring- ton (con)	Chapel in Chibburn (1)						

(1) The preceptory here belonged to the Hospitaliers of Mount St. John. It appears from Ministers' Accounts of 1540 & 1550 & that a chaplain was still employed in the chapel here (Arch. Acl. 2nd Ser. pt. 17, p. 113-4; pt. 46, p. 274).

III. Colleges of Durham County.

In order to complete the tables showing certain details of the foundations dissolved in 1548, by reason of the Chantry Act of 1547, such facts as are available to show the condition of the colleges of Durham are given in a brief form in the following pages. Unfortunately the sources are very meagre, and vary for the different colleges, and an additional and serious drawback exists in the disparities in the information given in these sources. The pensions warrants give certain men as prebendaries, that is to say Lancelot Joblen, John Killet and William Knage of Lanchester, who do not appear as such in the 1548 certificate; (1) and on the other hand ten men occur as prebendaries in the certificate but not in the pensions returns (2). This last fact is partly accounted for because two of them, Cuthbert Marshall and Richard Cliff, were immediately promoted by the Crown; some of them, moreover, probably were never granted pensions, and others may, like John Killet, have had special warrants separately enrolled, which perhaps have been lost. (3) Again a Robert Rede occurs as a minister of Staindrop in the accounts of the Receiver-General of the North of 1548-9, and a William Harding as a minister of the same college in the pensions warrants, although their names do not appear in the certificate. Finally certain men who in the warrants are given as the ministers serving certain prebends, appear in Pole's book as themselves prebendaries. (4)

(1) Note, however, that in the accounts of the Receiver-General of the North, 1548-9, Joblen & Knage occur as ministers (Minis. Accts. 2-3 Edw. VI, No. 698, fol. 27). In the pensions returns of 1552-3 the three occur as prebendaries.

(2) i.e. in Lanchester College, Richard Cliff, John Greathead, Robert Davell, Reginald Hindner, William Wille; in Chester College, John Crawforth, Cuthbert Marshall, Richard Ferrer; in Auckland College, Nicholas Lantall and Henry Aglionby; in Norton College, Robert Philips.

(3) In this case they must have died or been promoted by the King before the pensions returns of 1552 & 1553 were made. They do not appear as in receipt of pensions in the accounts of the Receiver-General of the North of 1548-9, but Killet's name does not appear here, also, although it does in Pole's book.

(4) In Lanchester College Nicholas Burnhope is given in the warrants as minister of the prebend of Medomsley, but in Pole's book as Prebendary of Medomsley; similarly George Gale of Lanchester College, John Marshall, Richard Adthey, and John Smithers of Chester College are given in Pole's book as prebendaries instead of ministers.

Pole's book, however, is not always reliable on such matters; sometimes the prebend and college of the pensioner, as in the case of William Carter of Darlington College, was not entered at all; and Edward Natress, a prebendary of Auckland College, was entered as if still receiving his pension although he had died in 1549.(1) On the whole, therefore, it seems wisest to rely chiefly upon the information contained in the 1548 certificate and the pensions warrants of that year.(2) Recourse has also been had, because of the deficiency of the information contained even in these sources, to the records of the "Valor Ecclesiasticus", the pensions return of 1552, and of the "Clavis Ecclesiasticus" of Bishop Barnes. In dealing with Staindrop, which is considered more fully in the chapter on hospitals, details have only been entered of the priests and clerks belonging to the foundation. Details of appointments made by the continuance warrants are given in the footnotes.

References:- Values given for 1535 are taken from the "Valor Ecclesiasticus", vol.V, p.311-12, 314-6, 318, 326. The net values of the prebends in that year are obtained by the deduction of the stipends payable to the ministers. Unless otherwise expressly stated in the footnotes the names of the deans, prebendaries and ministers are taken from the 1548 certificate (given in S.S.22, appendix VI) and the pensions warrants (Exch.K.R.Accounts, etc. Bdle.75, no.11); the warrants shew to which prebends the prebendaries and ministers were attached, and, generally speaking, the names of the ministers are only obtainable from them, or from the accounts of the Receiver-General of the North for 1548-9 (Minis.Accts. 2-3 Edw.VI, No.698).

(1) Exch.K.R. Accounts, etc. Bdle 76, No.13, p.18b.

(2) In one case, however, there seems to be a mistake in the warrants. Amongst the prebendaries of Auckland a Richard Robson as 1st prebendary of Eldon is entered as granted a pension of £1.2.8., and later on a Richard Robinson as prebendary of Eldon is said to have been granted a pension of £6. Probably, therefore, this Richard Robinson was really a minister for one of the prebends of Eldon; the largeness of his pension suggests this, and whereas 4 prebendaries of Eldon had already been entered, only 3 ministers of these prebends had been. Richard Robson, the prebendary, had evidently died long before 1552, but Richard Robson or Robinson the grantee of a pension of £6 occurs in the pensions returns of 1552 & 1553. Note, that in the 1548-9 accounts of the Receiver-General of the North Edward Natress is given twice as a prebendary of Auckland - in the second instance

which also supplies other useful information.

his pension is said to be 22/4 which was approximately that of Richard Robson, the prebendary; in these accounts Robson's name is only given once, so the second entry of Natress' name is evidently the result of a mistake. It is possible also that the warrants enter certain men of Lanchester as prebendaries who were really only ministers, cf. above p.271.

(1)

AUCKLAND COLLEGE

Prebend etc.	Gross Value 1535	Net Value 1535	Prebendary, etc. 1548	Pension of Prebendary etc. (3)	Minister 1548	Stipend of Minister 1535	Pension of Minister
The Deanery	£101.0.0.	£100.7.2.	Robert Hindmer (2)	£50.0.0.	Edward Greathead (4)	£4.13.4	£4.13.4
Auckland & Binchester	£9.6.8	£2.13.4.	William Franklin	£1.14.8.	William Parker	£6.13.4	£5. 0.0
2nd Auckland	£8.13.4	£2. 0.0	Anthony Bellasis (5)	£1. 2.8	Roland Henkingsopp	£6.13.4	£5. 0.0
1st Eldon	£8.13.4	£2. 0.0	Richard Robson (6)	£1. 2.8	Thomas Key (7)	£6.13.4	£5. 0.0
2nd Eldon	£10. 0.0	£3. 6.8	John Greathead	£2. 6.8	Richard Holmes (7)	£6.13.4	£5. 0.0
3rd Eldon	£8.13.4	£2. 0.0	Leonard Melmerby (8)	£1. 2.8	Edward Cockerell (7)	£6.13.4	£5. 0.0
4th Eldon	£8.13.4	£2. 0.0	John Philipson	£1. 2.8	Richard Robson or Robinson (7)	£6.13.4	£6. 0.0

(1) There may have been a song school attached to the College, cf. Valor V.p.315.
 (2) He became dean in 1541 (T.R.No.182). (3) Aug.Off.Misc.Bk.247, No.10. He was also appointed vicar of Auckland in 1548 at a stipend of £20 (Aug.Off.Cont. Warrant No.9). (4) Paid by the Dean to officiate in the Bishop's chapel at Auckland. (5) He obtained this prebend in 1541 (T.R.No.189). (6) He became prebendary Oct.31, 1545 (T.R.No.255). (7) The pensions warrants do not show to which of the four prebends of Eldon he was attached. (8) Appointed prebendary May 7, 1547 (T.R.No.254).

AUCKLAND COLLEGE (Contd)

Prebend etc.	Gross Value 1535	Net value 1535	Prebendary etc. 1548	Pension of Prebendary etc.	Minister 1548	Stipend of Minister 1535	Pension of Minister
Shildon	£8.16.8	£2.3.4	Lancelot Thornton (1)	£1. 5.8	Anthony Johnson	£6.13.4	£5. 0.0
W.Auckland	£8. 0.0	£1.6.8	Edward Natress	£3.10.0	George Hawden	£6.13.4	£3. 0.0
Hamsterley	£4. 6.8	£1.0.0	Nicholas Lenthall or Lyntall (2)		Mathew Naylor	£3. 6.8	£3. 0.0
Witton or Fitches	£4.13.4	£1.6.8	Henry Egliionby (3)		Richard Banks	£3. 6.8	£5. 0.0

- (1) Appointed prebendary May 7, 1539 (T.R.No.155).
 (2) Occurs as incumbent of this prebend in the "Valor". His name is accidentally given as Richard Lyntall in S.S.22, p.lxv.
 (3) Became prebendary May 28, 1544 (T.R.No.217; Randall XI, p.56)

CHESTER-LE-STREET COLLEGE

Prebend etc.	Gross value 1535	Net Value 1535	Prebendary etc. 1548	Pension of Prebendary etc.	Minister 1548	Stipend of Minister 1535	Pension of Minister
The Deanery	£41.0.0	£41.0.0	William Warren (1)	£18.9.0 (2)			
Lamesley	£10.0.0	£ 5.0.0	Claud Rent	£4.0.0	Thomas Story	£5.0.0	£4.0.0
Tanfield	£ 3.6.8		James Brack-enbury (3)	£1.0.0	Richard AdtheX		£2.0.0
Chester	£ 6.0.0	£ 4.0.0	Anthony Bellasis (4)	£3.0.0	John Smithers	£2.0.0	£2.0.0
Birtley	£ 3.6.8	£ 1.6.8	Richard Cliff (5)	£1.0.0	William Parker	£2.0.0	£2.0.0
Pelton	£ 5.6.8	6/8	Cuthbert Marshall	(6)	John Hurde or Hirde	£5.0.0	£5.0.0
Urpeth	£ 2.6.0	6/-	Richard Ferror or Farrowe (7)		John Marshall	£2.0.0	£2.0.0
Lumley	£5.16.8	16/8	John Crawforth (8)		Richard Norman	£5.0.0	£5.0.0

(1) He became dean in 1544 (Surtees II, p.144). (2) Aug. Off. Misc. Bk. 247, No. 21. In 1548 he was also assigned a stipend of £16 as vicar of Chester (Aug. Off. Cont. Warrant No. 9). (3) Appointed prebendary March 18, 1541 (T.R. No. 197). (4) Appointed prebendary August 1, 1530 (T.R. No. 75). (5) Appointed prebendary May 7, 1539 (T.R. No. 156). (6) No pension, but in 1548 he was assigned a stipend of £8 as assistant in Chester parish (Aug. Off. Cont. Warrant No. 9). (7) Appointed prebendary March 6, 1542 (T.R. No. 203). (8) Appointed prebendary 1541 (T.R. No. 190).

(1)

DARLINGTON COLLEGE

Prebend etc.	Value 1535	Prebendary etc. 1548	Pension of Prebendary	Ministers of the College	Pension of Minister
The Deanery	£36.13.4.	Cuthbert Marshall	(3)	William Simpson	£4.0.0
Blackwell	£ 5.0 .0.	John Hewes	£1.10.0	Thomas Richardson	£4.0.0
Newton	£ 5. 0.0	William Carter(4)	£1.10.0	Anthony Wilde	£2.0.0
Cockerton(5)	£ 5. 0.0	Robert Bushell(6)	£1.10.0	Marmaduke Fairbarn	£3.0.0
Prestgate or Rawe (7)	£.1.13.4	Simon Binks (8)	£1.13.0 (9)	Robert Warde William Thompson	£3.0.0 £3.0.0.

(1) There may have been a song school attached to the college (cf. Valor V, p.316), & the master of the grammar school of All Saints chantry was Thomas Richardson so this school was probably connected with it also (cf. S.S.22, p.1xx). (2) It is impossible to show which of these ministers were supported by the dean and which by the prebendaries as the pensions warrants give no help here. (3) No pension, but in 1548 he was appointed vicar of Darlington at a stipend of £16 (Aug. Off. Cont. Warrant No.9). (4) Appointed prebendary, April 22, 1542 (T.R.No.198). (5) The incumbent of this prebend was also chaplain of Badlefield chapel in Darlington. (6) Appointed prebendary November 9, 1541 (T.R.No.191). (7) The holder of this prebend acted as a second chaplain in Badlefield chapel. (8) Appointed prebendary September 23, 1545 (T.R.No.237). (9) According to Pole's book his pension was £1.13.4. (Exch. K.R. Misc. Bk. 31).

LANCHESTER COLLEGE

Prebend etc.	Value by the "Clavis Eccl." (1)	Net value 1535	Prebendary etc. 1548	Pension of Prebendary etc.	Minister 1548	Stipend of Minister 1535	Pension of Minister
The Deanery	£42.0.0 (2)	£40.0.0	Robert Hindmer (3)	£20.0.0 (4)	Robert Wright & 2 others (5)		
Ivestan	£ 5.6.8	£ 3.6.8	William Franklin	£ 3.0.0	Thomas Edgar	£2.0.0	£2.0.0.
Newbiggin	£2.10.0	10/-	Robert Davell (6)		George Gale		£2.0.0
Medomsley	£7. 6.8	£ 1.0.0	John Greathead (6)		Nicholas Burnhope		£5.6.8.
Butfield			Lancelot Knage				
Conside	£2. 0.0		Lancelot Joblen (7)				
Green-croft	£4.13.4	nil	Mohn Killet (8)				

(1) As the gross value of the prebends is not given in the "Valor", except in one case, the values of the "Clavis Ecclsiasticus" of Bishop Barnes, which seem to correspond with the gross values, are given here (cf. S.S. 22, p. 6-7). (2) In 1548 the deanery was said to be worth £40 (S.S. 22, p. lxxiii). (3) He became dean on April 2, 1532 (T.R. No. 20). (4) Aug. Off. Misc. Bk. 247, no. 11. (5) According to the 1548 certificate the dean paid three curates at Lanchester, Esh & Medomsley (S.S. 22, p. lxxiii). One of these three curates, as above, Robert Wright, who was curate of Medomsley (P.R.O. Dun. Interrog. & Depositions, Bdle I, no. 18). (6) Incumbent of this prebend by the "Valor" (Valor V, p. 314). (7) Given as minister of the prebend of Langley in the 1548-9 accounts of the Receiver General of the North (Minis. Accts. 2-3 Edw. VI, no. 698, fol. 27a). (8) Occurs in a special warrant of 1548 granting him a pension, Aug. Off. Misc. Bk. 247, no. 45.

LANCHESTER COLLEGE (CONT'D)

Prebend etc.	Value by the "Clavis Eccl."	Net value 1535	Prebendary etc. 1548	Pension of Prebendary etc.	Minister 1548	Stipend of Minister, 1535.	Pension of Minister
Wesh	£8.13.4	£3.6.8	Richard Cliff (1) William Knage	(2) £5.0.0	1548		
			Reginald Hindmer William Wille(3)				

(1) Became prebendary 1539 (Randall IX), & also occurs as occupant of this prebend in Aug. Off. Cont. Warrant No. 9. (2) No pension, but in 1548 made vicar of Lanchester at a stipend of £13.6.8 (Aug. Off. Cont. Warrant No. 9). (3) These two occur as prebendaries in the 1548 certificate (S.S.22, p. lxxiii), but it is impossible to say of which prebends they were occupants.

(1)

NORTON COLLEGE

(7)

STAINDROP COLLEGE

Portionary or pre- bendary	Value of por- tion 1535	Value of por- tion. 1548 (2)	Pension	Clerical Staff (8) Master Thomas or Will- iam Gurnard or Garnett (10) Chaplains or Ministers. William Colyer William Howsell	Annuity or stipend 1548 (9)	Annuity or pension assigned in 1548
Lancelot Thwaites (3)	£4.6.8	£6.0.0.	£5.0.0.		(11)	£10.0.0 (12)
Jerome Barnard	£4.6.8	£6.0.0	£5.0.0			
John Tun- stall (4)	£4.6.8	£6.0.0	£5.0.0		£6.13.4	£6.13.4 (13)
Nicholas Thornell (5)	£4.6.8	£6.0.0	£5.0.0		£6.13.4	£6.13.4 (13)
Anthony Salvin (6)	£4.6.8	£6.0.0	£5.0.0	John Turner	£6.13.4	£6.13.4 (13)

(1) In 1548 the prebends of this college were used as exhibitions at the Universities (S.S.22, p.lxix). (2) Values in 1548 taken from S.S.22, p.lxix. (3) Appointed prebendary March 1, 1539 (Randall IX). (4) Appointed prebendary Sept. 14, 1546 (T.R.No.248). (5) Appointed prebendary March 6, 1542. (T.R.No.202). (6) Appointed prebendary May 10, 1544 (T.R.No.216). (7) This college was really a hospital (cf. S.S.22, p.lxxiv-v); it may have had a song school attached to it (cf. ibid. p.3). (8) The poor inmates are considered elsewhere, cf. above, p.392-3. (9) Value of annuities in 1548 taken from S.S.22, p.lxxiv-v. Note that in 1535 there were six priests each paid £5 (Valor V, p.311). (10) Appointed master in 1547 (Randall IX). (11) In 1535 the master's salary was £13.6.8. (Valor V, p.311). (12) Aug. Off. Misc. Bk. 247, No. 29. In 1548 he was appointed vicar of Staindrop at a stipend of £20 (Aug. Off. Cont. Warrant. No. 9). (13) Exch. K.R. Accounts, etc. Bdle. 76, no. 13, p. 8b.

NORTON COLLEGE (Contd)

STAINDROP COLLEGE (CONTD)

Portionary or prebendary	Value of portion 1535	Value of portion 1548	Pension	Clerical Staff	Annuity etc. 1548	Annuity etc assigned in 1548
Nicholas Lenthall	£4.6.8	£6.0.0	£5.0.0	John Clapham	£6.13.4	£6.13.4. (3)
Roland Swinburne (1)	£4.6.8	£6.0.0	£5.0.0	William Harding Robert Rede (4)	(4)	£5.0.0 (5)
Robert Philips (2)	£4.6.8	£6.0.0		Lay Clerks James Tenante Richard Gibson	£4.0.0 £5.0.0	£4.0.0. (3) £5.0.0. (3)

(1) Became prebendary 1531 (Randall IX). (2) Only his surname given in the 1548 certificate, but his whole name appears in the "Valor" (Valor V, p.318-9). (3) Exch.K.R.Accounts, etc. Bdle.76, no.13, p.8b. (4) Occurs only as a chaplain or stipendiary of the college in the 1548-9 accounts of the Receiver-General of the North in which it is said he received a stipend of £6.13.4. in this capacity (Minis.Accts.2-3, Edw.VI, no.698, fol.45a). (5) No pension, but in 1548 appointed assistant in Staindrop at a stipend of £6.13.4. (Aug.Off.Cont.Warrant No.9).

APPENDIX III

HOSPITALS OF DURHAM AND NORTHUMBERLAND WHICH HAD BEEN DISSOLVED BEFORE 1535.

The following is a list of hospitals which had ceased to exist as such by 1535.

In Durham County:-

1. Chester-le-Street, and St. Stephen's Hospital Pelaw. Founded in 1260, the last chaplain occurs in 1451. (1)
2. Darlington, Badele or Bathel Spital. Originally a lazaret house, became merely a free chapel (2) or chantry, as which it appears in the "Valor". (3).
3. Sedgfield hospital. According to the "Vita S. Godrici" founded 1195. Doubtful. (4)
4. Tanfield, Friarside Hospital or Hermitage. Founded 1312, in private patronage. (5) In 1439 Bishop Neville united this hospital, which by then seems to have become a chantry, to the chantry-chapel of Farnacres, in Whickham Parish (6), and its chapel is mentioned together with that of Farnacres in the inventory of 1555. (7)
5. Werhale. Founded 1265, the Bishop patron. (8)

In Northumberland County:-

1. Alnwick. St. Leonard's Hospital. Founded between 1193 and 1216 by Eustace de Vesey, and annexed to Alnwick Abbey temp. Edward III. Probably fallen into decay before the Reformation. (9)

(1) R.M. Clay, p. 289; Surtees II, p. 187.

(2) R.M. Clay p. 59 & 289.

(3) Valor V. p. 326.

(4) Clay, p. 289.

(5) *ibid.*

(6) Surtees II, p. 243-4.

(7) S.S. 97, p. 151.

(8) Clay p. 289.

(9) Tate "Alnwick" II, p. 41-2

2. Abribourn, St. Leonard's. Founded 1331, in private patronage (1).
3. Alwinton. Doubtful; apparently founded 1272 by Bishop Philip (2), and subordinate to the nunnery of Holystone (3)
4. Bamburgh - St. Mary Magdalen. Founded in 1256, the Crown being patron (4). It was a lazar house in the Spittle-gate, consisting of a master and brethren. By the time of Edward III it had fallen into disrepair, and in 1376 an enquiry was ordered concerning it (5). Its chapel was given to the Friars Preachers in 1382, when it had probably already come to an end. (6)
5. Bamburgh. St. John the Baptist, Warenford. Founded in 1253, in private patronage (7). A lazar house, the chapel attached to which was granted to the monastery of the Holy Cross at Clairlieu in Liège diocese; but not mentioned after 1317. The hospital itself came into the possession of the Dukes of Lancaster, and by 1406 was deserted, save for a hermit. (8)
6. Berwick - St. Mary Magdalen. Name of founder unknown. Last mentioned in 1395, though property which had belonged to it is mentioned after the dissolution. (9)
7. Berwick - Domus Pontis. A hospital dedicated to the Trinity at the Bridge End, the duty of the inmates being to pray for passengers. Mentioned in 1539, but may be the same as the house of the Trinitarian friars. (10)
8. Corbridge - Stagshaw Hospital. A lazar house. Founded in the 13th century, already languishing in the next century when an inquisition of 1373 showed that there was no chaplain. In 1375 it seems to have been made over to the chantry of the Virgin in the parish church, founded in the previous year. (11)

-
- (1) Clay, p.311
 - (2) *ibid.*
 - (3) Mackenzie II, p.39
 - (4) Clay p.311
 - (5) N.C.H. I, p.134-7
 - (6) Clay p.210
 - (7) Clay p.312
 - (8) N.C.H. I, p.261; Arch.Ael.4th Ser. III, p.xvi.
 - (9) Scott "Berwick" p.347
 - (10) *ibid.* p.350
 - (11) N.C.H. X, p.104, 193-4.

9. Embleton - Spitealdene. Mentioned 1314, possibly a lazar-house. (1)
10. Hexham - There was a pilgrims' hostel here founded in the fourteenth century. (2)
11. Mitford - St. Leonard's. Founded by William Bertram, the founder of Brinkburn Priory, for one chaplain or keeper. Its advowson was in the hands of the Percies of Athol in the fifteenth century, but in the sixteenth century all that remained of it was a tenement called "the Spitelhill or the Hospital of St. Leonard", belonging in 1536 to Newminster Abbey (3) and mentioned again in 1570. (4)
12. Morpeth - Catchburn, St. Mary Magdalen. First mentioned in 1282, probably built under the patronage of Roger, lord Merlay, the second of that name. Last mentioned 1346. (5)
13. Newbiggin-by-the-Sea. Founded in 1391, in private patronage. (6)
14. Norham - St. Mary Magdalen, Capelford. Founded 1333. (7)
15. Shipwash. A hospital here occurs 1379. (8)
16. Stannington. Hospital of the Hertford Bridge in Plessis. Founded in 1256 by one of the Merlays (9); was granted in 1267 by John de Plessis to Brinkburn Priory. In the time of Richard II already partly neglected. This the last mention of it. (10)
17. Tynemouth - Hospital of St. Leonard, dependent upon Tynemouth Priory. Small foundation with endowment of a little over thirteen acres. (11) Occurs in 1320.

(1) N.C.H. II, p. 70 ff. and Clay p. 311.

(2) Clay p. 311.

(3) Hodgson II, ii, p. 77; Aug. Off. Misc. Bk. 281, fol. 23a.

(4) S.S. 21, p. 200.

(5) Wallis II, p. 287; Hodgson II, ii, p. 427.

(6) Clay p. 312.

(7) *ibid* p. 311.

(8) Hodgson II, ii, p. 150-1

(9) Clay p. 311.

(10) Hodgson II, ii, p. 304, 307

(11) N.C.H. VIII, p. 259-60

17. Tynemouth - Hospital of St. Leonard (contd).
Contained in the lease of the site of the monastery of March, 1539, to Sir Thomas Hilton when it was referred to as "a house called Le Spyttel House, and a close of land there called Spytell Close." The Spital House and certain property which had evidently belonged to it occur in the Ministers' Accounts of 30-31 Henry VIII (1). From the way in which it is referred to it is clear that it had ceased to exist as a hospital for some time. In the latter part of the sixteenth century, however, its burial ground seems to have been still in use, for in 1603 a testator wished to be buried there or in the Priory church (2).
18. Warkworth - St. John the Baptist. Mentioned 1292. In a survey of 1537 a Spital is spoken of as having once existed here, (3) so it had evidently disappeared long before this date. It occurs again in a return of April 14, 1569, to an Exchequer Special Commission, when the jurors made depositions concerning a ferm-hold called the Spital, alias St. John's House, within the lordship of Warkworth. (4) It seems to have had some connection with Hulparke Priory. (5)
19. Wooler, St. Mary Magdalen. First mentioned 1288, and last mentioned 1490 when Sir John Conyers died seised of the advowson of a moiety of the hospital. (6)

(1) Gibson "Tynemouth" I, p.217-9.

(2) N.C.H. VIII, p.260. The editor states that certain facts indicate a connection between this hospital and St. Bartholomew's Priory; for example a list of religious houses under £200 in value in the time of Henry VIII gives the name of the nuns of Tynemouth, value £36.0.10. (Cleop.E.IV, fol.351a) This was, however, the net value of St. Bartholomew's itself in 1535 (Valor V, p.327), which was probably, therefore, intended, as it was omitted from the list.

(3) N.C.H. V, p.237, 239.

(4) Exch. K.R.Spec.Comm. No.1715.

(5) Clay, p.312.

(6) N.C.H. XI, p.292-3

APPENDIX IV

THE MASTERS OF DURHAM SCHOOL.

The following list of the masters and ushers of Durham School has been compiled chiefly, it will be seen, from the Treasurer's books in the Dean & Chapter Treasury.

HEADMASTERS OF THE SCHOOL

HENRY STAFFORD, who was master of Langley's grammar school, is given in a manuscript of Bishop Cosin as the first headmaster of the cathedral grammar school (1). It is doubtful, however, if the re-organization took place before the time of

ROBERT HARTBURN, the last master of Langley's grammar school. He became master of the re-founded school, and consequently his name does not appear on the warrants granting pensions to chantry priests in 1548. He was being paid a stipend by the Crown Receiver as master of the grammar school both in 1548-9 and in 1552 (2). A priest of the same name was a legatee by the will of 1560 of his brother, John Hartburn of Redmarshall (3), but by this date he must have been superseded by

WILLIAM THEWLES, who appears as master in the Treasurer's book of 1557-8. (4) At the visitation of 1559 he refused to sign the oath and was bound over in £40 to appear in London. According to a list of Recusants of about August, 1562, he was, by the Second Ecclesiastical Commission bound for his good behaviour in matters of religion, and restrained from Durham diocese (5).

THOMAS REVE is given as receiving his salary of £10 in the Treasurer's book which has been dated in a modern hand 1558-9. This would make him overlap with Thewles, whereas it is far

(1) V.C.H. I, p.375. (2) Minis. Accts. 2-3, Edw.VI, no 698. fol.44a; Exch.K.R.Accts. etc. Bdle,76, no.13, p.13a,21a.
(3) Wills & Invs.I, p.186. (4) D. & Chap. Treas. (5) S.P. Dom. Eliz. X, p.74. cal. S.P. Dom.VI, p.521-5.

more probable that he succeeded him in 1559. Actually, the book should probably be dated 1559-60. (1) He was still master by the book which is probably of the year 1565-6.(2)

ROBERT COOK, M.A. was master in 1568-9, and still held office in 1577-8 (3). He made his will in 1576, by which it appears that he had property in Yorkshire which he left to his wife for her to educate and care for their children. His will was proved in December, 1579. (4)

FRANCIS KAYE OR KEY appears as master 1579-80 and still in 1588-9.(5) Of Chester diocese, Ch.Coll.Camb. B.A., 1577-8, M.A. 1581. Ordained by Barnes deacon and priest 1584 (6), and in the same year became vicar of Heighington, of which the Dean and Chapter were patrons. He resigned from Heighington in 1593 to become Vicar of North Allerton, where he died in 1624.(7) He must have resigned from his position as master shortly before going to North Allerton, for

JAMES CAUFIELD or CALFHILL was already headmaster in August, 1592 (8). Of Middlesex, Ch.Ch.Oxon B.A.1583 & M.A. 1587 (9). Vicar of St. Oswald's, Durham, 1593-1602 (10). He resigned his headmastership in 1596 when, for some months, Robert Bolton, the undermaster, had charge of the school.

(1) Under the heading of "repairs to the church", the sacristan is often mentioned, and sometimes the early payments are made to the man who was evidently sacristan in the previous year, and all the later payments to the man who succeeded him. So in this particular book William Ball appears as sacristan at first & later Thomas Pentland: The book must really be of the year 1559-60, or later, and Ball would thus have been sacristan, 1558-9, and Pentland 1559-60, for William Hacford certainly held this office 1557-8: cf. Treasurers' Book, D.& Chap. Treas. (2) This book is dated in a modern hand as being between 1565-6 and 1567-8, and mentions at first William Smith as sacristan and later William Harding; which makes it likely that the book is really of the year 1565-6, for William Smith was certainly sacristan 1564-5, cf. Treasurers' Bks.D.& Chap. Treas. (3) *ibid.* A special commission addressed to the Bishop dated June 12, 1570, speaks of Thomas Reve as still being school master; in his return the Bishop pointed out that he had been replaced by Cook (Exch.K.R. Spec.Comm. 3265). (4) Wills & Invs. III, p.77-8. (5) Treas.Bks.D. & Chap.Treas; S.S.22, p.103. (6) Dun. School Reg. p.19. (7) Randall XI; Surtees III, p.306-7. (8) D. & Chap.Treas.Misc.Cart.3258. (9) Dun.School Reg. p.19. (10) Surtees IV, ii, p.82.

PETER SMART of Warwick. Ch.Ch. Oxon. B.A. 1589. M.A.1595
Became master in 1597.(1) A non-conformist, deprived in
1610 (2) when he was succeeded by

THOMAS INGEME THORPE who was already rector of Stainton (3).

UNDERMASTERS OR USHERS OF THE SCHOOL.

ROBERT RICHARDSON held this position 1557-8 (4). The name is too common to make identification at all certain in this case, but he is probably the man of this name to whom, together with three petty canons (5), on May 6, 1550, the Dean and Chapter made a lease of certain tithes (6). This does not necessarily imply he was a petty canon as he occurs nowhere else in this position, but does seem to suggest that he was already usher in 1550. There was more than one priest in the diocese of this name, but it is possible that it was he who was collated by the Dean and Chapter, June 29, 1557, to the chapelry of Whitworth, (7) and perhaps then moved to Redmarshall, where one of the same name was rector from 1558 (8) and was said to be sick at the visitation of January, 1579; (9) finally a Robert Richardson was buried at St. Mary-le-Bow in Durham on December 6, 1586. (10) If he had been the usher it would be only natural for him to be buried in Durham in the church where funerals of various of the petty canons and others of the cathedral staff are recorded (11).

THOMAS IVESON occurs as master in the Treasurers' books which should probably be dated 1559-60 and 1565-6. (12) Sanders in his "De Visibili Monarchia" gives him, as master, amongst those deprived for refusal to sign the oath, but Gee says that he cannot certainly be identified. (13) It appears from these books that he was usher of the school, but was not deprived.

(1) "Dun.School Reg." p.19. (2) *ibid.* p.3. (3) Surtees III, p.64. (4) Treasurers' Book, D.& Chap. Treas. (5) Henry Browne, John Byndley & William Smith - these all occur as petty canons, at anyrate in the Treasurers' Book of 1557-8. (6) D. & Chap. Reg.I, fol.142-3. (7) D. & Chap. Reg.II, fol.34b. (8) Surtees III, p.71. (9) S.S. 22, p.95. (10) D.N.P.R.S. Vol.27, p.120 (11) A Robert Richardson of Carlisle was ordained acolyte at Durham 1557; one of the same name was chaplain of Sherburn 1535, and was granted the advowson of the vicarage of Bishop-ton by the Master of Sherburn. (12) D.& Chap.Treas.re dates cf.notes under Thomas Reve. (13) Gee "Eliz.Clergy" p.234 & 268

He was also one of the two readers of the epistle and gospel in 1564-5, 1565-6, 1568-9; his name is also given in the book of 1569-70, but is crossed out and Christopher Green's written instead. (1) This suggests that he may have been involved in the 1569 rebellion.

ROBERT MURRAY held the office of second master in 1568-9. He also occurs minor canon in the books of the years 1565-81(2), and was vicar of Pitlington 1562-94.(3) He was buried at Pitlington, March 7, 1593/4. (4)

CHARLES MOBERLEY was undermaster by the books of 1569-70 and 1571-2, and occurs as one of the readers of the epistle and gospel in all the existing books from 1569 to 1589. (5) He became curate of St. Margaret's, Durham, in the course of the year 1568-9 (6), and resigned this curacy to become vicar of St. Oswald's in about 1574 (7); he was buried at St. Oswald's February 10, 1592/3, when he was aged 60 years. (8)

CHRISTOPHER GREEN - undermaster by the books of 1576-7 and 1580-1; he was also one of the readers by the books of 1569-70 and 1571-2 (9). He was curate of the chapel of St. Mary Magdalen, Durham, in 1578-9 (10); he was perhaps curate of the church of St. Giles in 1575 (11), and was also curate of St. Nicholas, Durham, 1578-9 (12). He was buried at St. Oswald's, November 21, 1582. (13)

CUTHBERT NICHOLL - second master in 1588-9. He was one of the readers by all the books from 1576 to 1589. (14) One of the same name was public notary in 1580. (15)

ROBERT BOLTON occurs as usher in a document dated in a modern hand 1594. (16) One of this name was curate of Denton from 1600 to 1640, when he died. (17)

GEORGE COCKNEGE. Ch.Ch.Oxon. B.A. 1605-6, M.A. 1609. Occurs undermaster 1603. (18)

(1) Treasurers' Books, D. & Chap. Treas. (2) Treasurers' Books, D. & Chap. Treas. (3) Surtees I, p.117. (4) Par. Reg. (5) Treasurers' Books, D. & Chap. Treas. (6) ibid. (7) Hutchinson's & Treasurers' book 1576-7. (8) Sharpe "Chronicon Mirabile" p.43; Par.Reg. (9) Treasurers' Books, D. & Chap. Treas. (10) S.S.22, p.47, 73, 96. (11) cf. Wills & Invs. III, p.72. (12) S.S.22, p.46, etc. (13) St.Oswald's Par.Reg. ed Headlam p.27. (14) Treasurers' Books, D. & Chap. Treas. (15) S.S.22 p.103. (16) D. & Chap. Treas. Misc.Cart.No.3354. (17) Surtees IV, p.6. (18) "Dun.School Reg." p.24.

AUTHORITIES.

Printed Sources.

- "Archaeologia Aeliana". Ser.I-IV. (1822, ff. Newcastle).
Baskerville G. "English Monks and the Suppression of the Monasteries". (1937).
Birt H.N. "The Elizabethan Religious Settlement." (1907).
Boyle J.R. and Knowles W.H. "Vestiges of Old Newcastle and Gateshead." (1890. Newcastle).
Brand J. "History of Newcastle", I. and II. (1789).

Camden Society Publications:-

- Misc.VI, "Life of Whittingham", ed. M.A.E. Green. (1871).
Misc. IX "Letters from the Bishops to the Priory Council", ed. M. Bateson . (1893).
Vol. 26, O.S. "The Suppression of the Monasteries", ed. T. Wright.
Vol. 42. O.S. "Machyn's Diary", ed. J.G.Nichols. (1848).
Vol. 11, 20. 2nd. Ser. "Wriothesley's Chronicle" I and II, ed. W.D. Hamilton. (1872-5).
Vol. 10, 3rd. Ser. "Collectanea Anglo-Premonstratensia" II, ed. Gasquet.

Catholic Record Society:-

- Vol. 18. M.M.C. Calthrop on Recusant Rolls (1916).
Vol. 22. J.H.Pollen in Misc. XII (1921).
Clay R.M. "Medieval Hospitals of England" (1909).
Cole Henry. "Henry VIII's Scheme of Bishoprics" (1838).
Conyers-Surtees Herbert. "Histories of Durham Parishes" (1919-30.. Newcastle).
Cox.J.C. "Parish Registers of England" (1904).
" " "Churchwardens' Accounts" (1913).
Deputy Keeper's Reports - vols. 37, 44; 49.
Dixon. R.W. "History of the Church of England" I-VI (1877-1902).
Dodds. M.H. and R. "The Pilgrimage of Grace", I. and II. (1915. Cambridge).
Dugdale. W., "Monasticon Anglicarum" I-VI (1846)
Durham and Northumberland Parish Register Society (volumes published 1898-1918. Sunderland).
"Durham School Register", ed. Earle C.S. and Body L.A. (1912).
Eeles F.C. and Brown J.E. "Edwardian Inventories for Bedfordshire" (1905).
"Essays presented to R.L.Poolle" - G.Baskerville on "The Disposed Religious after the Suppression" (1927. Oxford).
Fowler J.T. "Durham University" (1904)

- Frere W.H. "Visitation Articles and Injunctions", I-III (1910).
 " " "The Marian Reaction in its relation to the English Clergy". (1898).
 Frere W.H. "The English Church under Elizabeth and James" (1911).
 Gairdner James, "History of the English Church in the Sixteenth Century" (1902).
 Gairdner James, "Lollardry and the Reformation" I-III (1908-11).
 Gasquet F.A., "Henry VIII and the English Monasteries". I and II (1893).
 Gee H., "The Elizabethan Clergy" (1898. Oxford).
 Gibson W.S., "History of the Monastery of Tynemouth", I and II (1846-7).
 Hodgson J. and Hinde J.H. "History of Northumberland" Pts. I-III (1827-58. Newcastle).
 Hutchinson W. "History of Durham" I-II (1785-94, Newcastle, Carlisle).
 Jessopp A. "Before the Great Pillage" (1901).
 Kennedy W.P.M. "Elizabethan Episcopal Administration" I-III (1924).
 Lapsley G.T. "The County Palatine of Durham" (1900).
 Laws A.R. "Schola Novocastrensis", I (1925, Newcastle).
 Leach A.F. "English Schools at the Reformation" (1896).
 Longstaffe W.H.D. "History of Darlington" (1854. Darlington).
 Mackenzie E. and Ross M. "View of the County Palatine of Durham", I-II (1834. Newcastle).
 Newcastle Records Series - vol.VII, "Northumberland and Durham Deeds" (1929. Newcastle).
 Northumberland County History, I-XIV (1893-1935. Newcastle).
 Owst G.R. "Preaching in Medieval England" (1926. Cambridge).
 Oxford Historical Society vol.XXXII - H.E.D.Blakiston, "Durham College Rolls" (1896. Oxford).
 Parish Registers of St. Oswald's, Durham, ed. A.W.Headlam (1891); Esh, ed. W.White (1896); Denton, ed. J.R.Walbran (1843); and Dinsdale, ed. J.W.Eastwood.
 Peacock E. "English Church Furniture" (1866).
 Pickthorn K. "Early Tudor Government" (1934, Cambridge).
 Proceedings of the Newcastle Society of Antiquaries. Ser.I-IV (1855 ff. Newcastle).
 Pullan Leighton, "The History of the Book of Common Prayer" (1900).
 Raine James, "North Durham" (1852).
 Reid R.R. "The King's Council in the North" (1921).
 Rymer, "Foedera", XV (1704 ff.).
 Savine A.N. "The English Monasteries on the eve of the Dissolution" (1909. Oxford).
 Scott J. "Berwick-upon-Tweed" (1888).
 Sharpe Sir Cuthbert, "Memorials of the Rebellion of 1569" (1840).
 " " "Chronicon Mirabile" (1841).

State Papers, etc:-

- "The Letters and Papers of Henry VIII" ed. Gairdner, vols. VIII-XXI, and Addenda.
State Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII, vol. I.
"Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council" ed. Nicolas, vol. VII.
"Acts of the Privy Council". New. Ser. III.
Calendar of the Patent Rolls. Edward VI, vol. V.
Calendar of State Papers Domestic vol. I, 1547-80. ed. Lemon.
vol. II, 1581-90. " "
vol. III, 1591-4. " Green.
vol. IV, 1595-7. " "
vol. V, 1598-1601. " "
vol. VI, 1601-3, with Addenda 1547-65, ed. Green.
vol. VII, Addenda 1566-79. ed. Green.
vol. XII, Addenda 1580-1625. ed. Green.

Sadler Papers vol. II:-

- "Statutes of the Realm" III and IV (1817-19).
Surtees Robert "History of Durham" I-IV (1816-40).
Surtees Society Publications (1835-1929, Newcastle, Durham, London) vol. 2, "Wills and Inventories" I. ed. Raine.
6, "Finchale Priory", ed. Raine.
9, "Hist. Dun. Scriptorum Tres", ed. Raine.
18, "Durham Household Book", ed. Raine.
21, "Depositions and Ecclesiastical Proceedings", ed. Raine.
22, "Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Bishop Barnes", ed. Raine.
29, "Inventories and Account Rolls of Jarrow and Wearmouth", ed. Raine.
38, "Wills and Inventories" II, ed. Greenwell.
44 and 46, "Memorials of Hexham" I and II, ed. Raine.
50, "Memoirs of Ambrose Barnes", ed. Longstaffe.
58, "Feodarium Prioratus Dunelmensis", ed. Greenwell.
66, "Newminster Chartulary", ed. Fowler.
84, "Churchwardens' Accounts", ed. Barmby.
91 and 92, "Yorkshire Chantry Surveys", ed. Page.
95, "Memorials of St. Giles', Durham", ed. Barmby.
97, "Inventories of Church Goods", ed. Page.
99, 100, and 103, "Account Rolls of Durham", ed. Fowler.
107, "Rites of Durham", ed. Fowler.

- 112, "Wills and Inventories" III, ed. J.C.Hodgson.
 137, "Early Newcastle Deeds", ed. Oliver.
 139, "Fasti Dunelonenses", ed. Boutflower.
 143, "Durham Cathedral Statutes", ed. Hamilton
 Thompson.

Tanner T. "Notitia Monastica" (1744).
 Tate G. "History of Alnwick", I and II (1866-9. Alnwick).
 Transactions of the Royal Historical Society. New Ser. XX,
 R.Reid, "The Rebellion of 1569" (1906).
 "Valor Ecclesiasticus" IV and V (1810 ff).
 Victoria County History of Durham I and II (1905-28).
 Waters R.E.C. "Parish Registers of England" (1887).
 Welford R. "History of Newcastle" II and III (1885-7).
 Westlake H.F. "The Parish Gilds of Medieval England" (1919).
 Wood N. "The Reformation and English Education" (1931).

Manuscript Sources.

I. In Durham.

Originals.

Durham Priory Registrum V.
 Dean and Chapter Register I and II.
 Dean and Chapter Treasurers' Books, 1557-89.
 Dean and Chapter Treasury Miscellaneous Charters.
 Durham College Account Rolls 1540-2.
 Bishop Barnes Register.

Copies of Originals.

Registers of Bishop Tunstall and Bishop Pilkington, ed.
 G. Hinde.

Randall Manuscripts. vols. VIII-XI.

The 1548 chantry certificate for Northumberland - in the
 Newcastle Public Library.

Parish Registers of Durham and Northumberland - transcripts
 by H.M.Wood, A.Edleston, E.Dodds, W.H.Bramwell,
 R.Peacock, H.Roberson, etc., in the Newcastle
 Public Library.

II. In the British Museum.

Harleian Manuscripts. vols. 539, 594, 600, 604-5, 608, 6969,
 7389.

Lansdowne Manuscripts vols. 7, 25, 64, 78, 980.

Cotton Manuscripts. Cleopatra E. IV.

Additional Manuscripts vols. 32657, 33207.

III. In the Public Record Office.

Exchequer Augmentation Office:-

Books of Warrants for pensions granted to monks (Misc. Books, 232, 234, 245, 246.)
Ministers Accounts for suppressed monasteries (Misc. Book. 281).
Chantry Certificate of 1546 for Durham and Northumberland (Certif. no. 18).
Chantry Certificates of 1548 for Durham and Northumberland (Certifs. nos. 17 and 62).
Brief Certificate of 1548 for Northumberland (Certif. no. 94).
Book of Warrants for pensions granted to Deans, etc. 1548 (Misc. Book 247).
Continuance Warrants of 1548 for Durham and Northumberland (Warrants nos. 9, and 20. e.f. Particulars for Grants to Schools).

Exchequer K.R.:-

Enrolments of pensions assigned to chantry priests, etc., of Durham and Northumberland in 1548 (Accounts, etc. Bundle 75, nos. 11 and 24).
Durham Pensions commission and return of 1552 (Accounts, etc. Bundle 76, no. 13).
Cardinal Pole's Pensions Book (Misc. Book 31).
Bishop Pilkington's returns to special commissions of 1570-1 concerning the payment of stipends assigned to priests, schoolmasters, etc, in 1548 (Special Comm. 3265).
Commissions and returns on concealed lands (Spec. Comms. nos. 672, 741, 752, 1715, 1733, 1742, 1752, 2884, 2952, 3054, 3296).

Exchequer L.T.R.:-

Recusant Rolls, Pipe Office Ser. 35-38 Elizabeth.

State Papers:-

Suppression Papers, Henry VIII, vol. 3.
State Papers, Henry VIII, vols. 96, 102, 108, 243.
State Papers Domestic, Elizabeth - vols. 10, 11, 14, 17, 20, 31, 34, 81, 89, 99, 103, 105, 130, 136, 148, 154, 181, 183, 187, 192, 219, 230, 233, 242, 244-5, 263.
State Papers Domestic, Elizabeth, Addenda vols. 20, 23, 32.

Records of the County Palatine of Durham:-

Bills and Answers, Bundle I.
Interrogatories and Depositions, Bundles I and II.
Inquisitions post mortem, Files 184, 191-2.

Special Collections, Ministers Accounts:-

Accounts of suppressed monasteries in Northumberland, 27-30
Henry VIII (nos. 7346-8, 7371-2).
Receiver-General of the North's accounts 2-3 Edward VI
(no.698).

