

X

THE LANGLEY SURVEY OF DURHAM BISHOPRIC ESTATES, 1418–21

R. H. Britnell

A SURVEY of the estates of the bishopric of Durham commissioned by Thomas Langley in 1418 survives in paper book now in the Public Record Office.¹ Not having been edited and published, the survey is less well known than its surviving predecessors, Boldon Book and the Hatfield Survey, both of which have been in print for over a century. In 1857 the Surtees Society recorded its intent to print an edition of the Langley Survey which would “complete the series of early Durham Surveys”,² but in one hundred and thirty years no one has emerged to undertake the task. Maybe prospective editors have been deterred by the many similarities between the Langley Survey and the Hatfield Survey. When the new inquests were made most tenures were held on the same terms as before, so that the chief differences to be recorded were simply the names of current tenants. But the want of an edition may in fact have more to do with the very imperfect state of the survey. Comparison with its predecessors quickly demonstrates that large parts of the bishop’s estate are represented imperfectly or not at all, so that the survey’s representation of the bishopric under Thomas Langley is incomplete and unreliable.

The heading of the Langley Survey states that it is to include demesne lands, manors, rents and leases within the county of Durham and the wapentake of Sadberge.³ It should, by implication, have included all the manors within Chester Ward, Darlington Ward, Easington Ward, Stockton Ward and the wapentake of Sadberge—everything, in fact, which was in the Hatfield Survey. But of these divisions Stockton Ward and the wapentake of Sadberge are absent from the survey, which means that a proportion of the bishop’s lands yielding about 13 per cent of his income from manors and rents is wholly missing.⁴ That is not all, for the survey of Chester Ward is very defective; it includes the manors of Chester-le-Street, Framwellgate, Ryton, Whickham, Boldon and Whitburn with Cleadon, but omits Lanchester and all the estates in the north-western part of the ward. Both in Chester Ward and Darlington Ward there are serious gaps, often quite obvious, even in the record of some manors which were surveyed. Frequently an empty space or a blank page has been left for later use. Some pages have only a heading to designate their intended contents.⁵ Sometimes the clerk has made a marginal note of what is missing.⁶ Towards the back of the volume, too, there is a list of those estates which remained unsurveyed at some moment when the survey was still being taken seriously.⁷ Table 1 lists the major omissions of estates and tenures, identified by comparing the Langley Survey with the Hatfield Survey.

The imperfect state of the record is probably not the result of the loss of any better

TABLE 1. Principal Omissions from the Langley Survey
(estates wholly omitted are marked with an asterisk)

<i>Chester Ward</i>	
Chester-le-Street	appurtenant estates (Urpeth, Picktree, Pelaw, Pelton, Biddick), waste lands
Newton by Durham*	
Plawsworth*	
Framwellgate	waste lands
Gateshead*	
Whickham	exchequer lands
Washington*	
Great Usworth*	
Whitburn and Cleadon	free lands, waste lands
Waldridge*	
Kibblesworth*	
Edmondsley*	
Kepier Hospital lands*	
Lanchester*	
Benfieldside*	
Billingside*	
Pontop*	
Butsfield*	
Kyo*	
Broomshiels*	
Satley*	
Knitsley*	
Broom with Flass*	
Iveston*	
Colepike Hall*	
Hamsteels and Burnhope*	
Cornsay*	
Roughside*	
Witton Gilbert*	
Muggleswick*	
Bedlington*	
<i>Darlington Ward</i>	
Haughton le Skerne	about 480 acres of demesne land
Whessoe	all bond lands and cottages
Blackwell	over 50 acres of free land
Middridge	demesne lands, bond lands, cottages
Killerby	bond lands, exchequer lands, cottages
Ricknall*	
Redworth	waste lands
West Auckland	bond lands, waste lands
Bishop Auckland	many free lands, most demesne lands and exchequer lands, all waste lands
Coundon	over 300 acres of demesne lands
Escomb	waste lands

Newton Cap*
 Hunwick*
 Witton*
 Bishopley waste lands
 Wolsingham bond lands

Easington Ward

Cassop*¹
 Morton*¹
 Durham City*¹

*Stockton Ward**

*Wapentake of Sadberge**

¹ Cassop, Morton and Durham City are, however, included in the copy of the survey of Easington Ward in D.U.P.D. CC 220196.

Source: PRO, SC12/21/29; *Bishop Hatfield's Survey*, ed. W. Greenwell, Surtees Society xxxii, Durham, 1857.

manuscripts. The surviving version seems to represent the only state in which the survey was preserved. An extract of the material relating to free tenures in the Langley Survey made in the early seventeenth century, cites folio numbers which correspond to those of the surviving record, implying that the existing manuscript was the one used for the purpose.⁸ By implication there was no better version of the survey available then, and this strengthens the case for supposing that, for some reason, the survey had been abandoned in an incomplete state.

By far the most satisfactory section of the survey is that for Easington Ward, and this was the only part of the survey reliable enough to be of any practical value. The few omissions from the survey here are to be explained by the leasing of whole manors and boroughs so that the bishop's men were no longer concerned in detail with locally collected rents. The coroners accounted for £76 6s. 2d. from Durham City in both 1416–17 and 1418–19, which implies that the bishop's rents there had been leased for a period of years.⁹ The village of Cassop, with all lands and rents, had been leased to John Ivesley and Henry of Hetton for six years from 2 February 1413, and again to John Ivesley alone for three years from 11 November 1419, and this lease had delayed the surveying of the manor.¹⁰ Morton, too, was leased from 11 November 1415 for four years to two men, each responsible for half the rent, and again from 11 November 1419 for three years to three men, each responsible for a third.¹¹ Otherwise the survey of Easington Ward will bear comparison with that in the Hatfield Survey. It is no coincidence, therefore, that this section alone survives in a separate fair copy written into a paper booklet.¹² The fact that this latter document is later than the main survey can be demonstrated from a number of details. For example, John Smyth's tenure of half a messuage and a bovate of land in Sherburn is recorded by an insertion in the full version of the Langley Survey but it is included in the original text of the separate survey of Easington Ward.¹³ And in copying the list of cottagers in Sherburn the clerk created a muddle which can only be explained by reference to the sequence of tenants in the full survey.¹⁴ In making the copy some material was included which is not to be found in the original survey, notably the

survey of properties in Durham city, the survey of the manor of Cassop, still on lease to John Ivesley, and a brief note on the manor of Morton.¹⁵

On the date which heads the record, 15 August 1418, Thomas Langley was in Durham,¹⁶ and this was surely the date when the survey was commissioned. It cannot possibly be a date at which the survey was considered complete. For a top-ranking administrator like Langley it was perhaps sufficient justification for a new survey that the last one was now over thirty years old. The bishop's mind had maybe been brought round to considering the question by the exceptional spate of land transfers on his estates in the previous year. There was a severe epidemic of plague in Durham and its environs in the year 1416–17,¹⁷ and the effects of this upon the occupation of the land are shown by a simple count of the number of *dimissiones* and *novi redditus* recorded in the court books (Table 2). The movement of these figures roughly indicates the number of changes which would have been needed to update a perfect survey from year to year, and 1416–17 stands out as the busiest year for the courts up to this point in Langley's pontificate. The exact use to which a new survey might be put is not very clear, and may not have been clear to Langley.

TABLE 2. Dimissiones and novi redditus recorded in the halmote books for the bishop of Durham's manors, 1407–21

Year of Langley's pontificate ¹	Year	No.
1	1406–07	146
2	1407–08	133 ²
3	1408–09	177 ²
4	1409–10	160
5	1410–11	177
6	1411–12	155
7	1412–13	135
8	1413–14	179
9	1414–15	175
10	1415–16	152
11	1416–17	235
12	1417–18	121
13	1418–19	107
14	1419–20	151
15	1420–21	151

¹ 8 August–7 August

² The last round of court sessions for Thomas Langley's second year was held late, and so fell within his third year. The figures for these sessions (42 *dimissiones*) have been placed within the second year rather than the third to avoid distortions of the figures.

Source: PRO, Durh 3/14, fos. 35–570v.

The paper book containing the survey is made from two batches of paper, apart from two odd sheets. The greater part of it uses an Italian paper with a bell watermark, folded into two gatherings.¹⁸ The final eleven folios use some smaller sheets of a northern French paper with a dolphin watermark, except for a single sheet

of German paper which is used to make the central fold.¹⁹ These last sheets are the earliest part of the document. They toured round with the halmote court circuit during the latter part of August 1418, and were used for miscellaneous notes relating to halmote business. The earliest such notes are from North Auckland on 17 August and the latest are from Framwellgate on 8 September in the same year.²⁰ The survey of Sherburn was copied on to these same sheets, presumably because no volume had yet been specially prepared. This explains why pages of mostly irrelevant material are bound in with the survey and why Sherburn appears way out of sequence at the end of the volume. Presumably the survey of Sherburn was the first to be completed. It can be dated after 30 August 1418, when Thomas Robinson took up a cottage and garden which had once been Sybil Webster's,²¹ but before 17 March 1419, when Nicholas Lyndeley surrendered two bovates to John Huchonson.²² It must have been shortly after this that the rest of the present paper book was made up to receive the survey. The survey of Bondgate, the bond tenements belonging to the manor of Darlington, was probably compiled by 10 March 1419, and this was entered at the beginning of the new volume.²³

However, comparison between the details of the survey and the books kept by the bishop's halmote courts shows that the survey was still being compiled all through 1419 and well into 1420. Thomas Daniell's message and bovaté at Haughton-le-Skerne implies a date after 8 March 1420 for the list of bondlands there.²⁴ The occurrence of Robert Sandreson's message and two bovates among the bondlands of Burdon suggests that the list was compiled after 14 March 1420.²⁵ Amongst the bondlands of Cockerton the listing of Elena Johnson's message and bovaté and Thomas Pygot's message and two bovates shows that the list must have been compiled sometime after 26 July 1420.²⁶ The survey of Framwellgate, so its heading states, was finalized on 26 August 1420. At Easington the list of free lands and exchequer lands had been compiled between 30 August 1418, when John Tomson took up a cutilage in the old hallgarth, and 10 November 1419 when Richard Knagg surrendered a cottage there.²⁷ But the account of demesne lands and bond lands in Easington was added only after 25 October 1420, when the demesne was leased to William Hull and others.²⁸ It was probably shortly after this that the survey was abandoned.

The surviving fair copy of the portion of the survey relating to Easington Ward was made in 1421 or soon after. Isabella de Claxton, whose lands in Easington are recorded in the Langley Survey,²⁹ died on 1 February 1421.³⁰ At an inquest held in Durham on 5 May that year her son William was found to be next heir, and it is he who is shown holding her lands in the survey of Easington Ward.³¹ It was perhaps in the course of compiling the copy of the survey for Easington Ward that the references to Isabella de Claxton were amended to William de Claxton in the original survey.³² The survey of Durham, which is unique to this copy, must date from some time after 15 March 1420 because it includes Isabella Fenrother's garden by Kingsgate which she only took up as a piece of waste land on that day, with an undertaking to pay 6d. a year rent from 20 March 1421. An allowance of time for the clearing of the land and the creation of a garden will explain why she was to hold the land a year without paying rent.³³

From the manuscript of the Langley Survey it is possible to make some tentative observations about the way in which it was prepared. The heading of the survey shows that its compilation had been committed to the bishop's steward (Sir Ralph Eure) the constable, chancellor and receiver of Durham (William Chaunceller), the treasurer of the household (John Newton), three other leading clerks (John Thoralby, Richard Buckley and William Mablethorp) and a notary (Robert Frend).³⁴ This team included all five of the bishop's auditors and a clerk who was to become a sixth auditor in the course of the year 1419.³⁵ But the extent of the individual responsibility assumed by these senior officers and councillors of the bishop is difficult to envisage; not all were equally engaged in the task, and most of the seven central ministers of the bishop mentioned had no more than an ultimately supervisory role. Had more of them taken an interest the work might have been better done. The wide difference in quality between the different wards of the Palatinate—the total omission of Stockton Ward, the virtual completeness of Easington Ward—implies that the collection of information needed to complete the survey was put in the first instance into the hands of the coroners, the only officers of the bishopric whose responsibilities were defined by ward boundaries.³⁶

Another feature of the making of the survey is apparent from the handwriting in which it is composed. Both the Langley Survey and the separate survey of Easington Ward are predominantly in the same hand. But there are a number of instances in which the record of free lands and exchequer lands was written at a different time from that of bond lands and demesne lands, to judge from differences of pen, ink, neatness, and sometimes differences of hand.³⁷ These details imply that on many manors at least the material relating to bond tenants was entered separately from the material relating to free tenants and tenants of exchequer land. The administrative reason for this is not hard to guess. The organization of rent collecting on the bishop's estates depended upon a distinction of office between the coroners, who were responsible for the collection of free rents and exchequer rents, and the manorial collectors who were responsible for bond rents and rents of demesne lands on each manor. Different sets of accounts were compiled annually for the two types of revenue. The make-up of the Langley Survey would be explained if the details relating to different types of rents sometimes became available at different times.

The early seventeenth-century clerk who copied extracts from the Langley Survey noted that "this survey & rentall was taken [by] seuerall jurries sworne and impannell for euery seuerall towne and village as it doth appeare by the peface and beginings of euery townshipp conteyned & specified in the sd booke of survey".³⁸ It is true that many of the accounts of individual manors in the Langley Survey are preceded by a list of jurors, whose number varies considerably.³⁹ In most cases the list is clearly an insertion; the survey was compiled by the bishop's officers and then local juries from each manor were empanelled to swear to its veracity, and at that point the jurors' names were written somewhere near the head of the rentals for their respective manors. These juries do not correspond to any of the lists of presentment juries known from the halmote books during the period when the survey was being drawn up—the juries empanelled for the survey were characteristically larger. Presumably, then, vetting the survey was not a matter of halmote court business. The date of the

jurors' oaths is unfortunately not recorded except in the case of the Framwellgate survey of 26 August 1420.⁴⁰ At Burdon and Chester-le-Street the jury lists was evidently added at the same time as the lists of bond tenants, and presumably indicates that the surveys of these manors were deemed complete.⁴¹ Many of the surveys have no jury lists. This suggests that some of the formalities were never completed, no doubt because the survey had been abandoned.

There remains the task of explaining why the officers of the bishop's estates, having been committed to the making of a new survey, should have allowed the venture to founder. Nothing in the bishop's own career would have made the project any more or less desirable in 1421 than it had been in 1418. Nor was there any crisis in the administration of the episcopal estates. Sir Ralph Eure, the steward, died sometime before September 1422,⁴² but he was in sufficiently good health to be presiding over halmote courts as late as 6 March in that year,⁴³ and the survey had already been abandoned by then. There is in any case no reason to suppose that the success of the project depended upon his life and health in any particular way.

The lacunae from the survey do not correspond closely with tasks of particular size or difficulty. Stockton Ward, wholly absent from the survey, was the smallest of the wards, with a value to the bishop little more than half that of Easington Ward, the most completely recorded. The missing portion of Chester Ward was mostly made up of small settlements without bondland, whose recording could have presented few difficulties compared with those of the bishop's largest manors.⁴⁴ The omissions from incompletely surveyed manors suggest the same thing. For example, though the bond lands of Wolsingham are missing from the survey it is far from clear that there were any special problems. The collectors' accounts of 1413–14 show that Wolsingham then had thirty bovates of bondland which owed on average 3s. 10½d. of rent a year in addition to labour services.⁴⁵ Reality was admittedly more complicated than that; bovates at Wolsingham were unusually small, with only ten acres each, and they had become subdivided and amalgamated more than was usual on the bishopric estates, so as to lose much of their separate identity as tenures. However, the bondlands of Wolsingham were nearly always transferred in multiples of five acres.⁴⁶ The fragmentation of holdings was probably not much if at all greater in 1418 than at the time of the Hatfield Survey, which shows 35½ bond messuages and 330 acres of bond land divided between 31 tenants.⁴⁷ And the degree of fragmentation was less extreme and created less complexity than the large number of irregularly sized exchequer lands on the same manor, which occupy five pages of the survey.⁴⁸ Stanhope was exceptionally complex because of the large number of exchequer lands of irregular sizes there, but the survey for this manor is nevertheless complete.⁴⁹

The likeliest reason for the incomplete state of the survey is simple lack of enthusiasm on the part of the bishop's senior staff. The task of surveying the estates can never have been pushed very hard for the work to have taken so long and to have finished in such disorder, and the bishop was not at hand to object. Between September 1418 and March 1421 Langley's exceptionally heavy duties as wartime Chancellor of England had kept him away from Durham altogether, and pressure of business had presumably driven such details of estate administration to the back of his mind. By 1421, whether with or without his consent, his servants were able to let the

project drop altogether.⁵⁰ One can understand some of their coolness towards it to have arisen from a sense of wasted energy, since in 1418 a survey would not have been very useful for the collecting of the bishop's rents or for any other aspect of estate administration. The division of labour between collectors and coroners made a unified record of rents impractical. And then, too, the multiplication of leaseholds and precarious tenures in a period when it was often difficult to get tenants on the old terms made many of the traditional divisions between bond land, demesne and exchequer land redundant or problematic. In a period of declining estate income, a decline which the new survey was perhaps intended to arrest,⁵¹ the bishop's estate managers could not reckon on maintaining the old structure of the estates. They required flexibility to find tenants on the best terms, rather than static guidelines. They could manage without a survey, and it is noteworthy that no later medieval bishop seems to have thought it worthwhile attempting to make one. Unfortunate though it is for the historian that the Langley Survey is a wreck, its imperfect state is nevertheless a valuable indicator of the way in which the foundations of estate management were being shaken in the early decades of the fifteenth century.⁵²

NOTES

¹ PRO, SC12/21/29, referred to hereafter as LS. This record is referred to by the consistent set of folio numbers in pencil at the foot of each page. This numbering sequence is partly obliterated between fos. 4 and 17 by a more prominent but less satisfactory series of numbers.

² *Bishop Hatfield's Survey*, ed. W. Greenwell, Surtees Society XXXII, Durham, 1857, p. xi.

³ LS, fo. 2r.

⁴ Durham University, Department of Palaeography and Diplomatic (hereafter D.U.P.D.), CC 189782.

⁵ "Rykenhale" (LS, fo. 19r), "Neutoncap" (fo. 34r), "Hunwyk" (fo. 36v), "adhuc Hunwyk" (fo. 37r), "Wotton" (fo. 37v), "Cassehope" (fo. 74v), "Moreton" (fo. 75v).

⁶ E.g. "hic deficit" [part of demesne] (Haughton-le-Skerne, LS, fo. 7r), "deficient terre bonde cum operibus et cotagiis" (Whessoe, fo. 7v), "hic deficient diuersi liberi tenentes cum eorum seruiciis" (Blackwell, fo. 8v), "hic deficient terre dominice, terre scaccarii et extenta manerii" (Middridge, fo. 15v), "hic deficient terre bonde, scaccarii etc." (Killerby, fo. 17v), "deficient hic terre vaste" (Redworth, fo. 20r), "memorandum de vastis hic scribendis" (Escomb, fo. 33v).

⁷ The list is headed "deficit" with no further comment. The places named are Coatham Mundeville, Ricknall, Coundon, Newton Cap, Hunwick, Witton, "Wodyngden", Ousterley ("Ous-

tre"), "Warlandfeld", Cassop, Morton, Durham, Stockton, Hartburn, Hardwick, Urpeth, Newton, Plawsworth, Boldon, Great and Little Usworth, Kibblesworth, Waldridge, Tanfield Lea, Chester-le-Street; LS, fos. 98, 99r. This is the list referred to in P. Dickinson and W. B. Fisher, *The Medieval Land Surveys of County Durham*, Durham University Department of Geography Research Papers, 2, Durham, 1959, p. 6.

⁸ D.U.P.D., HC M65, fos. 148–164.

⁹ D.U.P.D., CC 189809, 189782.

¹⁰ PRO, Durh 3/14, fos. 303r, 488v.

¹¹ PRO, Durh 3/14, fos. 355r, 510v.

¹² D.U.P.D., CC 220196. The first page of this document erroneously describes it as "Tempore Walteri Episcopi Dunelm' De Anno Domini 1388", in a fifteenth-century hand. This misled Lapsley, who also cites the volume with an erroneous reference number: G. T. Lapsley, *The County Palatine of Durham: A Study of Constitutional History*, New York, 1900, p. 331. The same error of dating occurs in *V.C.H. Durham*, III, London, 1928, pp. 23–4.

¹³ LS, fo. 96v; D.U.P.D., CC 220196, p. 22.

¹⁴ The list of cottagers in the survey of Easington Ward leaves blank the name of the tenant of a cottage which had once belonged to Thomas Neuburn: D.U.P.D., CC 220196, p. 23. From the main survey it is clear that a copying error has

occurred. The tenant was Alexander Milner. But the clerk has omitted another cottager, Thomas Robynson, and ascribed his cottage to Milner, so finishing up with one tenant fewer than he should have had: LS, fo. 96r. The same error occurs in the incomplete copy of the Sherburn rental in LS, fo. 65r, implying that this too is later than the full version of the rental on fos. 96r-97r.

¹⁵ D.U.P.D., CC 220196, pp. 1-3 (Durham city), pp. 25-6 (Cassop), p. 65 (Morton).

¹⁶ R. L. Storey, *Thomas Langley and the Bishopric of Durham, 1406-1437*, London, 1961, p. 233.

¹⁷ PRO, Durh 3/35, m. 10.

¹⁸ LS, fos. 2-51 comprise 25 sheets folded to form 50 folios. One folio has been cut out between fos. 43 and 44, but fo. 3 has been tipped in. The second gathering is fos. 52-94, comprising 20 sheets folded to form 40 folios, with fos. 69, 77 and 84 tipped in. For the bell watermark, see V. A. Mosin and S. M. Traljic, eds., *Filigranes des XIII^e siècles*, 2 vols., Zagreb, 1957, I, nos. 2901-47, pp. 322-6. The middle fold of the second gathering, fos. 72 and 73, is from a different batch of paper, probably Rhenish. The floral watermark is similar to G. Piccard, *Wasserzeichen—Blatt, Blume, Baum*, Stuttgart, 1982, no. 128, p. 59.

¹⁹ LS, fos. 95-105 comprise 5 sheets folded with another half sheet folded to make the narrow centre fold. The 5 whole sheets have a dolphin watermark, for which see Mosin and Traljic, eds. *Filigranes*, II, nos. 3660-2, p. 406. The central fold is a sheet of German paper with a unicorn watermark: cf. G. Piccard, *Wasserzeichen—Fabeltiere, Greif, Drache*, Stuttgart, 1980, nos. 1551-1625, pp. 249-61.

²⁰ LS, fos. 95r, 98r-105r.

²¹ LS, fo. 96r; PRO, Durh 3/14, fo. 467v.

²² LS, fo. 96r; PRO, Durh 3/14, fo. 488v.

²³ William Eseyby's 8 acres of exchequer land, recorded in the survey, were formally transferred to Richard Whitby on this day and the survey was corrected accordingly; LS, fo. 3r; PRO, Durh 3/14, fo. 484v.

²⁴ LS, fo. 6r; PRO, Durh 3/14, fo. 530v.

²⁵ LS, fo. 63v; PRO, Durh 3/14, fo. 534v.

²⁶ LS, fo. 11r; PRO, Durh 3/14, fo. 526.

²⁷ LS, fo. 52v; PRO, Durh 3/14, fos. 468v, 511v.

²⁸ LS, fo. 53r; PRO, Durh 3/14, fo. 553v.

²⁹ LS, fo. 52r.

³⁰ Storey, *Thomas Langley*, p. 261n.

³¹ Public Record Office, *Deputy Keeper's Report*, XLV, appendix 1, p. 178; D.U.P.D., CC 220196, p. 6.

³² LS, fo. 52r.

³³ D.U.P.D., CC 220196, p. 3; PRO, Durh 3/14, fo. 536v.

³⁴ LS, fo. 2r.

³⁵ Storey, *Thomas Langley*, p. 83.

³⁶ Storey, *Thomas Langley*, pp. 62, 69.

³⁷ Bishop Auckland (LS, fos. 24r-25r, 26v, 28r), Easington (fos. 52r-53r, 53r-54r, 54v), Wearmouth (fos. 55r, 55v-56v), Tunstall (fos. 57r, v, 57v-58r), Burdon (fos. 63r, v, 63v), Houghton (fos. 68r, v, 69r, v), Chester-le-Street (fos. 77r-78v, 78v-79r).

³⁸ D.U.P.D., HC M65, fo. 147.

³⁹ Darlington, 6 names (LS, fo. 2r), Haughton-le-Skerne, 4 names (fo. 6r), Blackwell, 6 names (fo. 8v), Cockerton, 6 names (fo. 10v), Heighington, 3 names (fo. 12v), Redworth, 4 names (fo. 19v), Coundon, 4 names (fo. 30r), Byers Green, 7 names (fo. 31v), Easington, 5 names (fo. 52r), Burdon, 3 names (fo. 63r), Ryhope, 6 names (fo. 71v), Chester-le-Street, 15 names (fo. 76v), Framwellgate, 12 names (fo. 80r), Whickham, 14 names (fo. 85r), Boldon, 12 names (fo. 88r), Whitburn with Cleadon, 14 names (fo. 91r).

⁴⁰ LS, fo. 80r.

⁴¹ LS, fos. 63r, v (Burdon); fos. 76v-79r (Chester-le-Street).

⁴² Public Record Office, *Deputy Keeper's Report*, XLV, appendix 1, p. 190; Storey, *Thomas Langley*, p. 102.

⁴³ PRO, Durh 3/14, fo. 584v.

⁴⁴ *Bishop Hatfield's Survey*, pp. 109-26.

⁴⁵ D.U.P.D., CC 188772.

⁴⁶ PRO, Durh 3/14, fos. 318v, 350, 358, 376, 386v, 409, 463v, 471v, 506.

⁴⁷ *Bishop Hatfield's Survey*, pp. 61-2.

⁴⁸ LS, fos. 44r-46r.

⁴⁹ LS, fos. 46r-50r.

⁵⁰ Storey, *Thomas Langley*, pp. 39-43, 233-4.

⁵¹ Storey, *Thomas Langley*, p. 70.

⁵² I am most grateful to Mrs. J. L. Drury, Dr. M. R. Foster, Mr. A. J. Piper, Mr. M. G. Snape and Professor R. L. Storey for their comments on earlier drafts of this paper.

