

ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
YORK CIVIC TRUST

THE MEDIEVAL REGISTERS
OF
CANTERBURY AND YORK

by

E. F. JACOB



ST. ANTHONY'S HALL PUBLICATIONS No. 4

ST. ANTHONY'S HALL PUBLICATIONS

price 2/6 each

(An annual subscription of 5/- covers the two titles published a year)

- No. 1 St. Anthony's Hall: A History and a Prospect
by the Rev. Dr. J. S. Purvis.
- No. 2 The Archives of York Diocesan Registry
by the Rev. Dr. J. S. Purvis.
- No. 3 The Beginnings of the Parochial System
by Canon G. W. O. Addleshaw.
- No. 4 The Registers of York and Canterbury: Some Points of
Comparison
by E. F. Jacob.
- No. 5 The Council of the North (to be published January 1954).
by F. W. Brooks.

The titles of succeeding booklets will be announced from time to time.

Annual subscribers will be sent each booklet as it is published. Orders should be sent to St. Anthony's Press, 46-47 Chancery Lane, London, W.C.2.

The emblem on the outer cover is a copy of the central boss in the roof of St. Anthony's Hall, and represents the pig traditionally associated with St. Anthony the Hermit

E. F. JACOB

THE MEDIEVAL REGISTERS
OF
CANTERBURY AND YORK

Some Points of Comparison



ST. ANTHONY'S PRESS - - LONDON

FIRST PUBLISHED 1933

THE MEDIEVAL REGISTERS OF CANTERBURY AND YORK

SOME POINTS OF COMPARISON

DURING the years of my association with the Canterbury and York Society I have sometimes had cause to compare the two existing sets of archiepiscopal registers, hoping that, in the interests of administrative history, someone more skilled than I would be led to a full-length discussion of the subject. I have accordingly put down here some of the notes I made in case they may be of use. The differences between the northern and southern forms of registration find their origins in the history of the two provinces: clearly we cannot understand the registers without knowing something about the organizations behind them, and obviously this knowledge cannot be conveyed in the brief paragraphs that follow, but a beginning may be made. The administrative history of the Church, regular or secular, is as exacting as the history of the royal organs of government; it is a fruitful subject, and, moreover, a practical means of introduction to the working of the medieval canon law. Within the general framework of that law, local custom and local administrative tradition gave a life and character of its own to the ecclesiastical province and its dioceses. A comparison of two provincial organizations may reveal facts of significance to the general historian as much as to the specialist.

The provincial organization is best studied in the register of the Archbishop, where such a record survives. Now this is a source which must be approached from the standpoint of those who compiled it, and the questions we ask of it must be questions which those medieval clerks could understand. The remarks that follow are intended to show the sort of business with which they were familiar. Categories rather than detail are discussed; the scale, I know, is too small, and every passage needs amplifying and elucidating with examples. These the reader may learn to extract for himself, when he goes to the *ipsisima verba*.

I. REGISTERS IN GENERAL. The register of an Archbishop or bishop is the official record of his administration. It contained such of his *acta* and his correspondence as his 'family' or officers thought necessary to commit to writing. Pastoral, diocesan and provincial administration was dependent on an efficient chancery (we will call it 'office'), where documents relating to the rights and possessions of the see or the archdiocese were carefully preserved and the acts of the chief pastor were set down in

1. Cf. R. C. Fowler, *Episcopal Registers of England and Wales* (S.P.C.K., Helps for Students of History Series); C. R. Cheney, *English Bishops' Chanceries, 1100-1250*, (Manchester, 1950).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
H. MORLEY AND SONS LTD.
PETERGATE, YORK

the language of ecclesiastical law. The two men who, besides the clerks employed as scribes, mainly frequented the office and used the records most often were the Registrar himself, who was responsible for compiling the register, and the Official, who was the chief legal functionary in the diocese. Physically, the register was not a bound volume, but, in the first instance, a number of pells or skins fastened together to make a roll. In the second half of the thirteenth century, though Lincoln had rolls from 1258 - 1300, it came to be a collection of parchment *quaterni*, or quires, assembled more or less according to the type of business transacted, units of which might even be taken from place to place by the registrar, when he journeyed with his master. The quires were written up periodically from drafts (in the case of out-letters) or from originals received.

It is important not to think of the register as the record of everything that passed through the hands of the Ordinary. What was written there represents only a selection from the documents that came the registrar's way. Registration was a comparatively late development in the work of the bishop's office. For years his *acta*, along with the subsidiary documents, had probably been preserved and filed separately. For most of the thirteenth century, lists of benefices, a certain amount of routine correspondence, documents connected with the bishop's finances and with the temporal administration like deeds, terriers, accounts and vouchers, were not enrolled nor recorded in any formal manner. An archbishop's register (need we say?), was not compiled for the benefit of historical students, but for the use of the permanent staff; and, it may be added, sometimes of the diocesan bishops. In 1469 Richard of Edenham, bishop of Bangor, sought and obtained Archbishop Bourghcier's permission to insert in his register, as a secure place of record, a papal bull permitting him to hold another benefice *in commendam* on account of the poverty of the archiepiscopal *mensa*.¹ With its clear marginal headings and (very often) its index, the register was written to be referred to on all sorts of occasions. At one of Archbishop Thoresby's visitations, a York chantry chaplain could not produce his letter of institution. The Official providentially broke in to say that he well recollected seeing the entry in the "Archbishop's register".² Sometimes it was searched or scrutinised at the command of the King, who, through his Justices, might be seeking information about the facts of a presentation.

In the earliest surviving registers, the rolls of Lincoln diocese or the roll of Archbishop Gray of York, the principal *actum* was the transaction by which a clerk was instituted to a living, that is, put in possession of the spiritualities of a benefice, a ceremony followed later, at the diocesan's mandate, by his induction at the hands of the archdeacon. Such entries tell us how he got that particular benefice, whether through collation by

1. Lambeth Palace Library, Reg Bourghcier, fo. 7; ed. Du Boulay, pp. 32 - 40.
2. York Diocesan Registry, Reg. Thoresby, fo. 105v.

the bishop, or at the presentation of a patron, or by exchange with a clerk in the same, or another, diocese. Thus the charters of institutions made by the bishop's or archbishop's chancery, as well as other business relating to the appointment of the clergy, were the first charge, so to speak, on the register.

But in addition to these documents of title there were also *memoranda* of various kinds; naturally the archbishop found it necessary to keep a record of letters to and from his diocesan bishops, to note the summonses he sent to the dean of the province for meetings of the Provincial Council, as well as any papal mandates or instructions which, as legate of the Holy See, it was his duty to communicate to his suffragans. Other material was, as will be seen, added, so that in both provinces of York and Canterbury the value, for contemporaries, of the pre-Reformation registers came to be threefold: in their origin act-books, they also became depositories of legal instruments affecting every aspect of diocesan life and of public relations with the suffragan of the province; and, from the point of view of those who compiled and used them for constant reference, they were precedent books supplying common forms of documents for use on future occasions.¹

The Archbishop was, and still is, a diocesan. His register therefore is a bishop's register with the addition of his acts and decisions as metropolitan and as legate of the Holy See. The amount of this extra-diocesan material included there varied in the two archdioceses according to the custom of the province, geographical circumstances and the character of the mother church. York was a secular foundation, Canterbury a monastic. At York the Archbishop was much concerned with the chapters or colleges of canons in the diocese, with his own (at the Minster), and with those of the collegiate churches of Beverley, Ripon and Southwell, and in his register a special section is normally devoted to them. At Canterbury, there were, of course, no prebends in Christ Church, and only a comparatively small number in the colleges of East Malling, Maidstone and Wingham, with which the Archbishop might reward his administrators. Juridically, York was more concentrated than Canterbury; in the southern province the provincial court was by 1279 transferred to London and met in St. Mary-le-Bow, while the consistory court remained behind and was held in the cathedral itself or went on circuit through the deaneries.² The prerogative jurisdiction for the insinuation and proof of testaments was divided between the City of London and Lambeth (the Archbishop's manor): but at York the *alma curia Eboracensis* was the court alike of the province and the diocese, representing the Court of Arches and the diocesan consistory rolled into one (to use Canterbury parlance), and had its personnel living close to the

1. A. Hamilton Thompson, 'The Registers of the Archbishops of York', *Yorkshire Arch. Journal*, Part 127 (Vol. xxxix), 259 - 60, here referred to as Hamilton Thompson.
2. B. L. Woodcock, *Medieval Ecclesiastical Courts in the Diocese of Canterbury* (1952), Bibliography of MS. sources, pp. 138 - 42.

Minster. In the time of John Nassington the house of the Official, its presiding officer, is found between two canon's houses in the precincts. Here too was the registry, not at Cawood or Bishopthorpe, although the register was frequently to be found with the Archbishop, and as in the case of Canterbury, many of the Archbishop's acts were dated from his manors. At York there was no separate provincial machinery for administration, nor any system of specialized seals. Geographically, the great diocese of York, with its archdeaconry of Richmond comprising north Lancashire and Westmorland, absorbed the greater part of northern England, and there were only three suffragan sees, Durham, Carlisle and Whithorn (*Candida casa*). Carlisle and Whithorn accepted the Archbishop's authority, but there is no parallel in the southern province¹ to the long intransigence of Durham which, after an embittered struggle in the second half of the thirteenth century with Archbishops Wickwane and Romeyn, particularly over the custody of the spiritualities when the northern see was vacant, succeeded in obtaining a substantial measure of independence. Archivally, York seems the richer, though with one significant exception: in the rolls and registers of Christ Church priory, now among the muniments of the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury, there is much important material for the growth of juridical procedure,² as well as for the *sede vacante* jurisdiction of the priory within the province, some of which is earlier than anything preserved in the diocesan registry at York.

II. THE ARCHBISHOP'S POWERS. Metropolitan authority was conferred upon the Archbishop by the Pope through the delivery of the *pallium*, the woollen scarf 'taken from the body of the Blessed Peter' (as the contemporary form for the delivery had it), and he was not fully Archbishop until he had received it at the hands of the Papal emissaries and had promised canonical obedience to the successor of the Apostle. This authority gave him: 1. The administration, throughout the province, of the spiritualities of the sees when they fell vacant. The Archbishop's claim to exercise this did not go unopposed in the thirteenth century and in certain dioceses was regulated by a composition or agreement between the Archbishop and the chapter of the cathedral church in question³ touching the appointment of the Archbishop's official or keeper in the vacant see. 2. The collation of those benefices in the vacant sees which normally were in the gift of the bishop: those usually in the bishop's collation by reason of the advowson belonging to the temporalities of the see passed, save in the case of Rochester and St. Asaph, into the hands of the king. 3. Certain functions and duties in the appointment of bishops,⁴ who had to make a profession of obedience to the metropolitan

1. Save, perhaps, Exeter.

2. E.g. the tutorial appeal. Especially notable are the Ecclesiastical Suit Rolls, nos. 1-40, and MS. D.8., a treatise on *uitio*.

3. The 'Boniface Composition' so called because reached between Archbishop Boniface of Savoy (1245-1270) and certain of the chapters.

4. Described by I. J. Churchill, *Canterbury Administration* (1933), I. 117.

before he released the spiritualities to them. 4. The right to visit the dioceses of his province, after he had first visited his own, to supersede all inferior jurisdiction while the visitation was in progress, and to receive procurations from those visited. 5. The presidency of his Provincial Council, and of the body which came to transact both taxational and strictly ecclesiastical business, and in the fifteenth century was completely identified with the Provincial Council,¹ namely Convocation. 6. Superiority in jurisdiction over the courts of his suffragans, a right mainly identified as relating to appeals rather than to first instance cases, and exercised in the provincial court, at York the Consistory, and at Canterbury the Court of the Arches; but as legate of the Holy See he had a direct and ordinary jurisdiction over all his ecclesiastical subordinates saving the exempt religious, *i.e.*, cases could come to his Audience by complaint as well as by appeal. 7. Proof of the testaments (wills) of persons in his province who held 'notable goods' in more than one diocese of the province: a right not established, in the case of Canterbury, without opposition on the part of the suffragans.² These powers have left their traces in the surviving medieval registers which may be listed as follows (all in MS. except where stated):—

CANTERBURY	YORK DIOCESAN REGISTRY.
(LAMBETH PALACE LIBRARY)	Walter de Gray (1215-1255). ed. J. S. Raine, <i>Surtees Soc.</i> LVI. (1872).
John Pecham (1279-1292). Printed (in part only) as <i>Registrum epistolarum Jobannis Pecham</i> , ed. C. T. Martin (Rolls Ser., no. 77); and by Cant. and York Soc., Part 1, 1908 and Part 2, 1910.	Walter Giffard (1266-1279). ed. W. Brown, <i>Surtees Soc.</i> CLX. (1904).
Robert Winchelsey (1294-1313). Ed. R. Graham, <i>Cant. and York Soc.</i> (1917-1952).	William Wickwane (1279-1285). ed. W. Brown, <i>Surtees Soc.</i> CXIV (1907).
Walter Reynolds (1313-1327).	John de Romeyn (1286-1296). ed. W. Brown, <i>Surtees Soc.</i> CXXII (1913).
Simon Islep (1349-1366).	Henry de Newark (1298-1299). ed. W. Brown, <i>Surtees Soc.</i> CXXVIII (1916).
Simon Langham (1366-1368). Ed. A. C. Wood, C. & Y. S., <i>in progress</i> (1953).	Thomas Corbridge (1300-1304). ed. W. Brown, <i>Surtees Soc.</i> Part I, CXXXVIII (1925); Part II, ed. W. Brown and A. Hamilton Thompson, <i>Sur- tees Soc.</i> CXL (1928).
William Whittlesey (1368-1374).	
Simon Sudbury (1375-1381).	
William Courtenay (1381-1396).	

1. On the use of the terms *Provinciale Concilium* and *Convocatio* see E. W. Kemp, 'The Origins of the Canterbury Convocation', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. III, No. 2 (Oct. 1952), 132-143.

2. Particularly in Archbishop Pecham's time. Cf. D. Douie, *Archbishop Pecham* (1952), pp. 195-201.

CANTERBURY.

- Thomas Arundel (1396-7, 1399-1414).
 Henry Chichele (1414-1443).
 Ed. E. F. Jacob, C. & Y. S. (1938-48), 4 vols., vol. 2 with H. C. Johnson.
 John Stafford (1443-1452).
 John Kemp (1452-1454).
 Thomas Bourgchier (1454-1486).
 Ed. F. R. H. Du Boulay C. & Y. S., Part 1 (1953).
 John Morton (1486-1500).
 William Warham (1503-1532).

YORK

- William Greenfield (1306-1315).
 ed. W. Brown and A. Hamilton Thompson, Surtees Soc. CXLV (1928); CXLIX (1934); CLI (1936), CLII (1938), CLIII (1940).
 William Melton (1317-1340).¹
 William la Zouche (1342-1352).
 John Thoresby (1352-1373).
 Alexander Neville (1374-1388).
 Thomas Arundel (1388-1396).
 Robert Waldby (1396-1398).
 Richard Scrope (1398-1405).
 Henry Bowet (1407-1423).
 John Kempe (1425-1452).
 William Booth (1452-1464).
 George Neville (1465-1476).
 Laurence Booth (1476-1480).
 Thomas Rotherham (1480-1500).
 Thomas Savage (1501-1507).
 Christopher Bainbridge (1508-1514).
 Thomas Wolsey (1514-1530).

III. CONTENTS AND ARRANGEMENT OF THE REGISTER. While it is scarcely possible to draw up a standard list of the normal contents of a fully developed archiepiscopal register, it may be found useful to enumerate the main categories found in the northern and the southern types and to compare the treatment of the material found in them.²

The CANTERBURY registers have the following :

- Documents connected with the postulation, consecration and entronement of the Archbishop, with the reception of the *pallium* from Rome, and with Papal mandates for obedience addressed to the suffragans and to the tenants of the see.
-
- The unprinted (as well as the now printed) registers have been drawn upon by James Raine (the younger) in *Fasti Eboracenses: Lives of the Archbishops of York*, by W. H. Dixon, ed. and enlarged by J. R., Vol. i. (1863), and *Historical Papers and Letters from the Northern Registers*, ed. J. R., Rolls Ser., 1873. The *Fasti Eboracenses* goes no further than Thoresby; the latter has letters from Arundel and Bowet.
 - Based on Miss Churchill's list in *Canterbury Administration* i. 8, with variations and amplifications.

- Documents relating to the provision and consecration of, and promises of obedience made by, newly appointed or translated suffragans of the province.
 - Commissions issued by the Archbishop to his spiritual and temporal officers; to lawyers, to hear cases that have reached the Archbishop's court, and to other clerks, in a large variety of judicial or quasi-judicial matters. These commissions frequently form part of a large miscellaneous section, *de diversis litteris*, which includes mandates, licences, dispensations, appointments (*præfessiones*), letters' dismissory, in fact the main routine business of the diocese.
 - Institutions, exchanges and other documents relating to the appointment of the clergy.
 - The registers of the Archbishop's Official or Keeper of the spirituality in the vacant sees.
 - Metropolitan visitations and inquiries, both in the secular church (through the rural deaneries) and in religious houses not exempt from the Archbishop's jurisdiction.
 - Papal bulls and privileges; letters to and from the Roman Curia; communications from the Papal Penitentiary.
 - Convocations and ecclesiastical councils. Towards the end of the fourteenth century these entries in the Canterbury register develop into narrative minutes of the councils, giving the day-to-day *acta*. This section contains the certificates of the grant of taxation made to the clergy by the king; the Archbishop's constitutions; and from the time of Archbishop Arundel until 1439, proceedings against clerks suspected of heresy.
- Important material for the history of English participation in the General Councils of the fifteenth century is also included here.
- Ordination lists. Ordinations were held either by the Archbishop or by assistant bishops commissioned for the purpose.
 - Ordinations of vicarages, together with revision of ordination compositions necessitated by the circumstances of the vicarages. Such ordinations had, by the statutes of Otto and Ottobono, to follow the appropriation of a benefice by a religious house or collegiate body.
 - Royal writs and prohibitions. These served both as memoranda and as formulæ for the benefit of the registrar when similar cases arose.
 - Testaments. The insinuation and proof of testaments, commission of administration to executors, and the hearing of their final account and their discharge, were claimed by the Archbishop, in virtue of his Prerogative, in the case of all holding 'notable' goods in more than one diocese of the province.

The order of the items varies with the register. One of the difficulties likely to confront the less experienced reader of the unprinted Canterbury registers is the lack of page headings and the way in which the quires or gatherings have been put together. He will soon find that marginal headings are a clearer guide than anything written at the top of the page. The majority of the archiepiscopal registers of Canterbury begin with the heading (1) above, and continue with the new archbishop's commissions to his officers, clerical and lay, followed by a miscellaneous assembly of diocesan and provincial material, called in Winchelsey's register 'diverse littere et communes'. But this category may be dispersed piecemeal about the register, interlarding and sometimes intruding upon the gatherings devoted to a special topic. Thus in Archbishop Courtenay's register the *Diverse littere* (unheaded) begin on fo. 3v. and continue till fo. 25, where the registrar has inserted material relating to the Blackfriars Council (1382) and to the Wycliffite heresy at Oxford. The miscellaneous letters then start again and persist until the convocation section (fo. 73); but even this latter section is by no means compact, since Courtenay's first two convocations (St. Frideswide's, Oxford, 18 November 1382 and London, 6 January, 1383) are to be found on fos. 33, 36, 36v. In Islep's register, the letters to and from Rome are not segregated as they are in Winchelsey (fos. 304-343v.) but included among the *diverse littere* (fos. 9-72).

Archbishop Bourghier's register lacks the formal first section, but goes straight to commissions, which have to be supplemented by a section brought in from 'Morton II' that includes gatherings from the registers of Morton, Deane, Bourghier and Courtenay. The commissions are followed (fos. 13-30) first by the *acta* of Convocation, next by the Archbishop's administration of the see of Exeter during the vacancy in 1455 (fos. 31-37), and thereafter by a large section of commissions of testamentary administration (fos. 37-58). The main register of Institutions and Exchanges is on fos. 59-133. Here again is clear evidence that we must not look for a stereotyped order of business.

The metropolitan visitations are, however, always immediately recognisable, though the injunctions to monasteries made as a result of the *detecta* are sometimes to be found among the miscellaneous letters. In some cases these visitations assume large proportions, as in Courtenay, where documents relating to the Archbishop's struggle with the see of Exeter over the right of visitation swell the section to nearly forty folios (86-124v). *Testamenta*, the registers of the keepers in the vacant sees, and the Institutions and Exchanges present no difficulty in recognition. In the Canterbury registers entries about the Archbishop's own temporal jurisdiction are rarely segregated. Commissions to the parkers, warreners, foresters, gate-keepers and so forth occur in the miscellaneous or commissions section,¹ but finance was normally excluded and must have been the subject of records kept separately, by the Treasurer of

1. E.g. *Reg. Chichele*, IV, 4, 5, 6, 36, 97-8, 245-6, 294-5.

his Wardrobe,¹ while the deeds and the territorial transactions were likewise preserved apart. Only rarely one finds an enumeration of his territorial rights, such as the *Rotulus hundredi de Borgham et parcium hundredi de Borgham* (Islep, fo. 96), enumerating all the villis on the Archbishop's Kentish estate. A contrast with York in this respect will be evident from No. 7. below.

Each register reveals a number of hands, but only occasionally is the identity of the scribe betrayed where a notary records his own presence by the words 'et me X notario publico', followed by his mark. In the case of Canterbury the registrars make their contribution plain. William Hornby states (Courtenay, fo. 1) that he had 'written the register of the same lord Archbishop at different times and places for the greater part with my own hand and had it written by others and so made it public (*publicavit*)'; Henry Penwortham, the Archbishop's scribe before he became registrar, can be traced in many places throughout Chichele's register. He is not active in the section of Institutions and Exchanges, but in the minutes of Convocation and in many formal deeds his hand is clearly apparent.

At York the scheme of registration is different in several important aspects: but one preliminary point may be noted. Contrary to the practice in the Canterbury registers, the series contains a *Sede Vacante* Roll (Vol. 3, c. 1310) and the register for the vacancy following an Archbishop's resignation or death may be bound up with the register of the late prelate. Here are the main differences:—

1. The institutions, exchanges and other abundant material relating to the benefices and their incumbents are grouped together under the five archdeacons, York, Cleveland, Richmond, the East Riding and Nottingham. To this the Arundel register (1388-1396) is an exception. These archdeaconry sections contain the bulk of ordinary diocesan business arranged chronologically.

This raises the question of the position of the archdeaconry of Richmond. As Professor Hamilton Thompson pointed out,² in spite of the archdeacons of Richmond being in many respects exempt from the control of the archbishops of York, the archdeaconry was not wholly extra-diocesan.³ Not only in acts for the performance of which episcopal orders were necessary, but in some other matters, such as

1. The system is outlined in F. R. H. Du Boulay, 'Archbishop Cramer and the Canterbury Temporalities', *English Historical Review* LXXVII (Jan., 1952), 23-5.
2. 'The Registers of the Archdeacons of Richmond', *Yorks. Arch. Journal*, nos. XXX (1931), XXXII (1935).
3. *Ibid.*, no. XXV (1920), 129f. For the agreement between Archbishop Melton and his archdeacon Robert Wodehouse, cf. J. S. Raine, *Historians of the Church of York* (Rolls Ser.) iii, 248-50. The archbishop reserved to himself and his successor the liberty of holding visitations and inquiries at suitable times in the archdeaconry 'which is in and of his diocese': *Y.A.J.* XXXV. 137. The archdeacon's position was 'all but episcopal'.

the grant of licences for private oratories and the appointment of commissions for the reconciliation of places polluted by sacrilege, the archbishop exercised a jurisdiction concurrent with that of the archdeacon. The archdeaconry had its own register, mainly the register of the vicar-general (for the archdeacons were generally absent), surviving examples or abstracts of which show that the chief business was institutions and inquiries into the right of presentation to vacant benefices, commissions for carrying out exchange, and the proof of wills in the court of the archdeaconry.

2. Special sections are devoted to the archbishop's jurisdiction of Hexham, St. Oswald's Gloucester,¹ Lanham and Southwell, along with the provostry of Beverley and the spiritualities of Howdenshire and Allertonshire. In the Canterbury registers there is no special section for the Archbishop's peculiars, and the commissions to their deans come under general business.
3. As far as, and inclusive of Zouche (1342 - 1352), there is a separate section for the officiality (*officialitas Eboracensis*), giving a large number of documents that are circular letters and notifications to the clergy as a whole as well as letters relating to consistory court business. The officiality was the permanent element in the diocesan organization, more permanent indeed than the vicar-general; the Official, besides presiding over the Court of York, was the Archbishop's chief executive officer, to whom all mandates affecting the diocese as a whole were sent. He acted like the Bishop of London in the southern province in transmitting to the clergy the Archbishop's summons to convocation or his directions for special prayers; in seeing that the taxation promised is paid to the exchequer by certain dates, in publishing papal bulls or parliamentary writs or the directions of the king for enquiries to be made, e.g., into aliens holding benefices.² The Official might have to sequester the property of testators,³ exercising the same sort of jurisdiction as the commissaries of the Prerogative in the southern province; he had to publish sentences of excommunication,⁴ communicate the Archbishop's instructions about dress,⁵ issue monitions on the subject of visitation,⁶ or proceed against rectors for repairing the chancels of their churches, or for non-residence.⁷ The work naturally ran in administrative families like those of Pickering or Nassington, men trained in canon law and accustomed to specialist administration.

1. Particularly in *Reg. Corbridge*, ii, 35f.
2. E.g. *Reg. Romeyn*, i, 22 - 3, 33, 35, 37, 38, 44 - 5. For Papal bulls, cf. *Reg. Greenfield* i, 112, and Professor Hamilton Thompson's remarks on the officiality, *ibid.*, i, xxii - xxiii.
3. E.g. *Reg. Romeyn*, i, 19.
4. *Reg. Greenfield*, i, 134.
5. *Ibid.*, i, 138: sisters in nunneries to wear white veils to distinguish them from nuns who wore black ones.
6. *Ibid.*, i, 144.
7. *Reg. Corbridge*, i, 15.

4. *Capitula*, the part of the register containing material relating to the Minster itself, and the collegiate churches of Beverley, Southwell and Ripon, and the chapel of St. Mary and the Holy Angels. The Archbishop's letters to his own cathedral chapter are to be found here, as well as their missives and certificates to him on important occasions, as for instance, in the earlier stages of the Durham dispute (1281)¹ or the appointment of a dean (1310), when William Pickering was chosen in succession to the foreign provisor, Raymond de Got.² This is a very important section for the history of papal provisions in York and the colleges of the diocese (notably Southwell) as also for pluralists. The careers of non-resident royal administrators appointed to prebends find much illustration, from persons like the notorious Bogo de Clare onwards.
5. The York registers are particularly full of information about the Archbishop's temporal affairs. Two related sections comprise most of this material.
 - a. *Ballive* or the *registrum ballivorum*, which gives the Archbishop's correspondence with his secular officers, e.g., the bailiff of Hexham, whom Greenfield (22 May 1306) thanked for his assistance, expressing the hope that he will remember 'our indignance at the beginning of our episcopate', and send the rents of his bailwick to York by 31 May;³ or entries like his appointment of justices of assize or gaol delivery in the liberty of Beverley,⁴ or an exemplification of a verdict given by the jurors of Nottinghamshire in the reign of Henry II about the customs and liberties enjoyed by the Archbishop in that county from the time of Henry I.⁵ Into this section also went some of the correspondence with the bishop of Worcester about the liberty of Churchdown.⁶ In the Corbridge register, adjoining the section on the bailiwicks, the homage of Archbishop's tenants in the several areas of his jurisdiction is recorded for 1300; an act which in a number of cases was the occasion for further inquiry into the obligations of their tenures.⁷
 - b. *Intrinseca de camera*, from Gifford onwards. These are material from the Archbishop's wardrobe and household, particularly interesting in the case of Greenfield, who had to borrow heavily from the

1. *Reg. Wickwans*, pp. 5 - 8.
2. *Reg. Greenfield*, i, 45f. a notable entry giving the whole procedure of election. Raymond, Cardinal deacon of Sta Maria Nuova, held the deanery of Salisbury, 1310 - 1346.
3. *Reg. Greenfield*, i, 170. Minor details like the borrowing of 'a good or at least a competent stallion from the Prior of Hexham' are mentioned.
4. *Reg. Romeyn*, ii, 48, 53.
5. *Ibid.*, ii, 47 - 8.
6. *Ibid.*, ii, 65.
7. *Reg. Corbridge*, ii, 121f.; cf. *Kirby's Inquest* (Surtees Soc.), pp. 385 - 395, 403 - 406. The 1166 return of the military tenants of the old and new enforcement is in F. W. Farrer, *Early Yorkshire Charters*, i, 44 - 47, with the editor's note on the revenue of these lands. The whole extent of the Archbishop's fee is *ibid.*, i, 29 - 170.

Bellardi of Lucca in order to buy the temporalities of his see from John of Brittany, a creditor of the king, to whom they had been granted, and to satisfy the Papal Camera for the common and little services.¹ The Greenfield *intrinseca* are not exclusively financial; in the case of Melton, the *intrinseca* (fos. 1-65) are more uniform and are made up of more than 1300 entries. Those labelled *obligaciones* (bonds), *acquitancia*, *liberaciones* are primarily financial. Some documents are warrants to the Archbishop's household clerks and sergeants for the purchase of food; some record the appointment of receivers, bailiffs and stewards; about 700 of the entries are records of loans and gifts made by the Archbishop. These show Melton as a lender on a considerable scale, 'mostly to people resident in his diocese, though sometimes to persons in other dioceses of the northern province and even farther afield: loans to Yorkshire knights and barons, to Yorkshire abbeys and priories and secular clergy: to citizens of York, Hull, Beverley and Ripon; and to many of the Archbishop's numerous tribe of kinsmen. To his large clientele, the Archbishop made 388 loans, of which the principal amounted to £23,551 18s. 1½d.² These loans and the entries connected with them do not exhaust the *De intrinsecis camere*. In Melton there are instructions to his Receiver, Thomas de Cave, appointments of household officials, and a considerable number of royal writs; sales and purchases of land, and all the evidence of the administration of a considerable private estate.

6. Provincial business will be found mainly under the heading *De episcopis suffraganeis*, *Officialitas Eboracensis*, and in the records of Convocation. Under the first heading, in the register of the Archbishop's Official in the vacant sees, called in Romeyn *Registrum Litterarum de episcopis suffraganeis* and arranged chronologically rather than under sees, the relation of the Archbishop with his three suffragans can be traced. The most obvious topic will be the struggle with Durham³, which, however, cannot be fully appreciated from York registers alone;⁴ but there is also material for the less known see of Whithorn (*Candida casa*), which was claiming, in Romeyn's time, to appoint its own official during a vacancy and exclude the Archbishop's.⁵ The extra-diocesan officiality heading covering the period during which vacant sees were administered by the Archbishop, dates from Wick-

wane's time,¹ but does not occur in all the registers. At first sight the records of the York convocation appear an unsatisfactory feature of the registers, for only in two cases can anything resembling minutes be traced: the *acta* of the Provincial Council held for the trial of the Templars under Archbishop Greenfield, 9 June - 30 July 1291;² and the *acta* of Archbishop Kemp's Council, 29 July - 5 October 1426, held for the purpose of suppressing erroneous doctrine.³ Apart from these, the convocation entries mainly consist of the Archbishop's summons citing the royal writ directing him to convoke the clergy for the purpose of granting an aid, and the Archbishop's certificate of the grant made (or declined). The former generally appears in the *Officialitas* section under the appropriate year of the Archbishop. On the other hand there are instances, during the period of the General Councils, when the Archbishop acted either on a Papal mandate, or on his own initiative in the interests of reform, in summoning Convocation. The first of these is the assembly summoned on 7 July, 1408, on the initiative of the Cardinals before the Council of Pisa⁴; the second, the meeting held under Papal direction on 1 November, 1414, to appoint representatives to go to the Council of Constance, and to arrange a subsidy for their expenses⁵; and the last, the convocation of April, 1417, to discuss a letter sent by the Council of Constance, which does not, however, appear in Bowet's register.⁶

From Zouche onwards the registers contain *testamenta*, some of which have been published by the Surtees Society in the series of *Testamenta Eboracensia*. Far from all the testaments in the Archbishop's registers can have been surveyed for this collection, for the compilers also drew upon the registers of the York Consistory, upon those of the Dean and Chapter, and upon the early volumes preserved in the Principal Probate Registry in London. It has been pointed out that the later Surtees volumes rely largely upon the registers of the Dean and Chapter and the books in the Probate Registry, and much less frequently upon the archiepiscopal registers. Thus in Vol. III (1395 - 1489) there are but one testament from Reg. G. Neville and two from Reg. Rotherham; while in Vol. IV (1420 - 1508) there are eighteen from Reg. Rotherham and one from Reg. Bainbridge.⁷ Experience with the Canterbury registers suggests that the gap should not be left unclosed, particularly at the important pre-Reformation epoch.

1. *Reg. Greenfield*, iv, 234 - 7, 243.
 2. L. H. Butler, 'Archbishop Melton, his neighbours and his kinsmen, 1317-1340', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, ii (1951), 55.
 3. Especially in *Romeyn*, ii, 1071, (1292). In Neville (1374 - 1388), the *de Suffraganeis* is mainly concerned with the preliminaries of Neville's visitation of the vacant diocese of Durham in 1381, which, owing to the disturbed state of the country, was prohibited by the king's order: Hamilton Thompson, p. 254.
 4. Dr. Robert Brentano in his Oxford D.Phil. dissertation (1952) 'The Metropolitan Jurisdiction of the Archbishop of York (1279 - 1296)', has discussed the Durham material bearing on the dispute.
 5. *Reg. Romeyn*, ii, 117-20.

1. Hamilton Thompson, p. 249.
 2. Printed in *Records of Northern Convocation* (Surtees Soc., 1906), pp. 29 - 47.
 3. *Ibid.*, pp. 146 - 172.
 4. Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii, 306.
 5. Reg. Bowet, i, fo. 285. In the corresponding Canterbury register no record of Chichele's first Convocation survives.
 6. It is in the Durham register of Thomas Langley. Bowet's writ of summons is printed in *Records of the Northern Convocation*, pp. 135 - 7.
 7. Hamilton Thompson, p. 257.

The York registers therefore differ notably from their Canterbury contemporaries, in the use of the archdeaconries as categories for registering general diocesan business, in the amount of entries they contain of the collegiate bodies of the diocese, and in the information they provide about the archbishop's finances, and about the work of the Officiality. Their convocation material is more scattered and *acta* seldom occur. They are closely parallel with the Canterbury registers in many respects. in the testaments, in visitations, in reporting the acts of the Official in the vacant sees, in recording ordinations. Two (Zouche and Lawrence Booth) have sections dealing with convictions and purgations of criminal clerks; and the later medieval registers, particularly those of Savage and Bainbridge, are rich in documents recording the ordination and statutes of chantries.