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This thesis examines the Carthusians in Great Britain and Ireland from an archaeological standpoint and highlights the role of the lay brother in the everyday life of the charterhouse.

Using the case studies of Witham Charterhouse and Hinton Priory, the layouts of the lay brothers’ complexes are explored through geophysical survey and comparison with Carthusian material culture assemblages from other British charterhouses. This method of investigation provides a singular view of the lay brother in medieval society and for the first time proposes a layout of an English Carthusian lower house.

The thesis begins with an introduction to the topic and gives an overview history of the Carthusians in Great Britain, before discussing in more detail areas of the charterhouse complex - the cell, church and cloister. Following this is a discussion of everyday life for the monks and lay brothers, exploring various facets including death and memory. The thesis then moves on to investigate the wider landscape of the monastery complex, and how the local area was exploited and utilised by the Carthusians. The monks’ and lay brothers’ interactions with secular society are considered through excavated assemblages from a number of charterhouses, which also demonstrates specific occupations for each of the inhabitants. The final chapter of the thesis presents the results of resistivity and magnetometer surveys at the two Somerset charterhouses and provides an interpretation of these results. It is concluded that it is not currently possible to
identify the Carthusian lay brother as archaeologically distinct as there are not sufficient assemblages to provide an accurate understanding of the differences in monastic and lay objects. More research is therefore required before the lay brother can be properly understood.
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Introduction

Only those who have experienced the solitude and silence of the wilderness can know what benefit and divine joy they bring to those who love them…

There, for their labour in the contest, God gives his athletes the reward they desire: a peace that the world does not know and joy in the Holy Spirit.

*St Bruno to Raoul le Verd*.

The need for solitude fuelled the unique lifestyle of the Carthusian Order. This ideal was incorporated into the founding institution at La Grande Chartreuse, as seen by the above letter, and promulgated throughout the Carthusian Order, which, out of all the monastic orders, carried the need for isolation to the extreme. However, their existence would have been impossible without a select group of men known as lay brothers, to enable this life of silence and solitude. Despite the lay brothers’ invaluable contribution to the Order, they have been overlooked in both historical and archaeological studies: an imbalance this thesis seeks to redress.

\footnote{Lettres des premiers chartreux I, 71}
1.1 Aim of the Thesis

As stated above, this thesis aims to examine the role of the lay brother in Carthusian communities. To achieve this aim, this thesis will examine the monastic houses of the Carthusian Order in Great Britain and Ireland, combining a wide range of information to give context for the archaeological evidence that follows. This thesis will provide a historically contextualised study of the Carthusian lay community, achieved through two research questions:

1. Is it possible to identify the lay brethren as an archaeologically distinct element of the community?

2. How was the lay brothers’ precinct arranged and organised?

This research will examine the material remains, the surviving documentary sources, previous excavations, and available cartographic data to understand how the lay brothers shaped their landscapes and environments. These research questions will be answered using previously excavated material assemblages and new geophysical surveys at the two key sites of the corries at Witham and Hinton Charterhouses.

1.2 Structure of the Thesis

This introduction provides a brief overview of the Carthusian Order and examines the previous archaeological research that has been conducted on the British and Irish charterhouses. Following this, the second chapter presents an overview of the history of each of the eleven British and Irish charterhouses. Chapter Three assesses the daily life of a member of a Carthusian community, and investigates
in greater detail the patronage and benefaction of the charterhouse, especially as concerns the role of the Carthusians in lay burial and commemoration. This is followed by an examination of how the Carthusians interacted and exploited their local landscape and a discussion of how archaeological surveys can be used to enhance an understanding of the monastic environment (Chapter Four). Chapter Five focusses on the architecture and layout of the areas of the monastery which were frequented by the monks, including an overview of the excavations and archaeological research previously conducted. Although the lay brothers are the primary focus of this thesis, an understanding of the monks’ areas of habitation is important as it provides context for later discussion of material culture. Furthermore, little is currently known about the layout of the lay brothers’ precinct, so it is beneficial to use the layout of the upper house as a starting point. The excavated material culture from charterhouses in England is evaluated in Chapter Six, and this chapter also presents a discussion on the difference between the material assemblages of monks and lay brothers, as well as how the charterhouse assemblages compare to other English monastic houses of different orders. Chapter Seven discusses the areas of habitation for the lay brothers and, in particular, those houses where a separate complex was provided for them. This section discusses the results of geophysical surveys conducted at Witham Friary and Hinton Friary, the only two separate complexes for lay brethren in Great Britain and Ireland, and suggests a layout for the medieval lay precinct, the first study to have done so. Lastly, the thesis will be concluded, and the results collated evaluated, with some suggestions as to what future research
could provide.

1.3 Methodology and Approach

This thesis uses a variety of techniques to research the Carthusian Order, including documentary sources, previous research, material culture and primary geophysical research. This combination of sources is vital to achieving a truly interdisciplinary approach, and providing as full an investigation as possible. The primary geophysical research was conducted at Witham Friary and Hinton Friary, using resistivity and magnetometry survey. Prior LiDAR analysis and research into the previous archaeological studies conducted at the sites supplemented the geophysical surveys. The material culture was used to examine how the lay brother can be identified as archaeologically distinct from the monk, based on assemblages from four excavated charterhouses, and was further utilised to establish interactions between the religious and secular communities. Finally, documentary sources were used as a mode of contextualising archaeological findings, examining how the Carthusians were treated during the Dissolution and how this was recorded in official government documents and letters.

1.4 Data Set and Chronology

The sites included in this study are all those from Great Britain and Ireland\(^2\) (fig. 1.1), and were selected based on regionality, rather than the provinces they were

---

\(^2\) As concerns the location of the houses within the Carthusian provinces, all the English charterhouses were included in the *Provincia Anglie*, but the house at Perth was first attached to the *Provincia Picardie*, then from 1456-1460 became part of the English Province. Since this move was somewhat unpopular, the house then moved to the *Provincia Gebennensis*, where it remained until the Reformation (Fawcett and Hall 2005, 49).
assigned to by the Carthusian Order. The reason for the dates chosen is that it encompasses the foundation of the first charterhouse at Witham in 1178 (fig. 1.2), up until the formal suppression of the Perth Charterhouse in 1569. These dates do not in all cases account for post-Dissolution activity at the sites, although this is addressed where necessary. The two key research sites are Witham Friary and at Hinton Friary, both in Somerset, and the first two English charterhouses. These were chosen for further archaeological research as they are the only two Carthusian ‘lower houses’ known to have existed in Britain, and therefore give a

---

3 ‘Friary’ here does not refer to the religious houses of Friars, but is an anglicisation of ‘frèrie’, meaning a house of brothers. This will be explained in further detail on page 64.
singular opportunity to examine the lay brethren.

1.5 A Brief History of the Carthusian Order

The beginnings of the Carthusian Order lie within a broader phenomenon of twelfth-century religious revival. Their reversion to the early Christian hermitic lifestyle was not unique, being contemporary with the Camaldolese (f. c.1012) and the Vallombrese (f. c.1036), all three of which addressed an increasing disenchantment with the current monastic lifestyle and challenged the existing Benedictine monasticism. These three orders were part of the ‘New Hermits’, along with the Grandmontines (f. 1076), the Cistercians (f. 1098), the Tironensians (f. 1109), the Savignacs (f. 1112), and the Premonstratensians (f. 1121) (Leyser

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Foundation Date</th>
<th>Founder</th>
<th>Dissolution Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Witham</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td>Henry II</td>
<td>15 March 1539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinton</td>
<td>1222</td>
<td>William Longespée</td>
<td>31 March 1539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilnalahanin</td>
<td>1249</td>
<td>Richard de Burgo</td>
<td>1321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauvale</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>Nicholas de Cantelupe</td>
<td>18 July 1539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>Sir Walter Manny</td>
<td>10 June 1537 (formally suppressed 15 November 1538)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>Michael de la Pole</td>
<td>9 November 1539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>William la Zouche / Richard II</td>
<td>16 January 1539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axholme</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>Thomas Mowbray</td>
<td>18 June 1538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Grace</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>Thomas Holland</td>
<td>18 December 1539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheen</td>
<td>1414</td>
<td>Henry V</td>
<td>20 August 1539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>1429</td>
<td>James I (of Scotland)</td>
<td>9 August 1569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.2: Charterhouses founded in Great Britain and Ireland, with their foundation and dissolution dates and founders.
1984, 113-118). In contrast to traditional hermits, the New Hermits saw solitude as excluding secular society, not fellow religious, and thus sought to create communities of hermits (Monti 2003, 245). In this sense, the Carhusians, Camaldolese, and Vallombrese most similarly mirror each other, living in individual cells and coming together for worship, while the day-to-day running of the house was left to the lay brothers (Monti 2003, 246-247). The over-arching aim of the New Hermits was to relive the *vita apostolica* (life of the apostles) and the *vita primitiva* (the early Church) (Leyser 1984, 26). In this way, they hoped to counter the lax lifestyle that had come to be associated with monasticism.

The Carhusian Order was founded in 1084 by St Bruno, who decided to take up the solitary life permanently after spending some months in a remote hermitage. With six companions, he travelled to the wilderness of the Chartreuse mountains, near Grenoble, arriving in June 1084. The site chosen for the new hermitage was in the centre of a valley, and surrounded by high cliffs, making it particularly inaccessible to outsiders and thus ensuring the monks’ solitude (Jotischky 1995, 42; fig. 1.3). The monastic precinct was called the ‘desert,’ drawing directly upon the experiences and teachings of the first Christian hermits (Brantley 2007, 33; Gilbert 2014, 378).

The monks’ cells were situated slightly higher up the mountain than the lay-brothers’ quarters, hence earning the names ‘upper house’ and ‘lower house’. The lay-brethren enabled the monks’ way of life, providing food and fuel and working the land around the monastery. The lower house also functioned as a gatehouse, so that any visitors to the charterhouse had to be received there first
Communal Solitude

This further increased the monks’ inaccessibility and ensured that unwelcome or unexpected visitors would not disturb their silence. From the beginning, the Carthusian monks relied on lay brothers and hired servants to provide for the community through growing food, tending livestock, and maintaining the smooth running of the house; indeed two of the first companions, Andrew and Guarin, are noted as being lay brethren (Thompson 1930, 7).

The distinctive Carthusian layout, a central cloister surrounded by individual cells, began to emerge in around 1104, as extensions were made to the first two charterhouses, and the way of life was consolidated (Aston 1993, 141). Guibert de Nogent, who visited La Grande Chartreuse in 1112, described thirteen monks living around a central cloister, each with their own cell, where they worked, slept and ate (Bruce 2007, 158).

Until 1115, only three charterhouses existed: La Grande Chartreuse in

Figure 1.3: La Grande Chartreuse, the motherhouse, situated near Grenoble, France. Image source: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grande_Chartreuse#/media/File:La_Grande_Chartreuse.JPG [Last accessed 21.11.2017]
France, and La Torre and St-Stephen-in-the-Wood in Italy\(^4\), which Bruno founded while acting as an advisor to Pope Urban II (Rowntree 1981, 3). Between 1115 and 1116, six new charterhouses were founded: Portes (1115), Saint-Sulpice en Bugey (1115), Meyriat (1116), Les Écouges (1116), Durbon (1116) and La Sylve-Bénite (1116) (Coppack and Aston 2002, 17). These new houses stimulated the expansion of the Carthusian Order in Europe, and by 1200, 37 houses had been established in France, Italy, England, Slovenia, Spain and Denmark (Braunfels 1972, 117; fig. 1.4). By 1521, at the Order’s peak, there were 195 Carthusian houses across Europe, having expanded into countries including Germany, Sweden, Hungary, Belgium and Switzerland. Each of the houses belonged to one of eighteen provinces from which visitors were chosen to report on the condition of the relevant houses to the General Chapter, and ensure that capitular decrees were enacted (Knowles 1955, 135).

### 1.6 Primary Written Sources

The Carthusian Statutes or Consuetudines Cartusiae\(^5\) (hereafter C.C.) were based on St Bruno’s ideals of desert solitude but were enhanced with Guigo I’s\(^6\) own experiences of living as a hermit in the Carthusian Order, and his own thoughts on solitude (Hogg 2014, 35; Ritchey 2014, 171). The Statutes were initially written as a set of guidelines for the six new houses established in 1115-

---

\(^4\) These two foundations were at some point amalgamated into one community under the name of Serra San Bruno (Rowntree 1981, 3).

\(^5\) All references to the Carthusian Statutes come from the 1984 Cerf edition. This edition has transcribed the 1121-1128 Carthusian Statutes. References from the later Statutes (1510 edition printed in Basel) are stated.

\(^6\) Guigo I was the fifth prior of La Grande Chartreuse, from 1109 to 1137.
Figure 1.4: The Charterhouses established in Europe before 1200
1116 so they could continue Bruno’s vision. The further editions gave additional information, reflecting current issues within the Order.

The Statutes covered a range of topics, designed to answer any queries members of the Carthusian community may have about how to conduct themselves, and also instructing them on how the divine office should be carried out. It is in the Statutes that specific instructions regarding the community began to coalesce, such as the number of occupants, limited by Guigo to thirteen monks and sixteen lay brothers; the maximum number which could be supported without asking for alms (C.C. 7:1-2). As a historical reference, the Statutes provide a vital source of information as to how the charterhouse was intended to be run. This set of rules influenced the construction and design of the charterhouses, ensuring solitude for the inhabitants, which has an important bearing on research into the architecture of Carthusian buildings.

The Chartae of the General Chapter, on the other hand, records the proceeds of the annual meeting at La Grande Chartreuse of the Carthusian Order. As a documentary source, it is invaluable. It lists the obits for every monk or lay brother who died that year, as well as the visitors to each province, and short reports from each charterhouse. To supplement the Statutes, it also gives ordinations which lay out explicitly how the rule is to be applied, often in answer to queries from different houses, or where the statutes do not address specific issues. The Chartae make it possible to track the most important issues for the Carthusian Order from

---

7 The first edition of the Statutes was that written by Guigo I, the Carthusian Statutes, completed in 1127. Following this, three further revisions were compiled, the Antiqua Statuta in 1259-1271, the Nova Statuta in 1368, and the Tertio Compilatio in 1509. This last revision is considered the most complete, and the edition published in Basle in 1510 (Universitätsbibliothek Basel AK VI 21) is used as the basis for today’s Statutes (Introduction to Coutumes de Chartreuse 2001, 125).
1217 into the eighteenth century and understand how they dealt with crises such as the epidemic diseases and famines.

1.7 Previous Archaeological Research

Sir William Henry St John Hope (1854-1919) was one of the most important influences in monastic archaeology in England. He undertook excavations and academic research at many monasteries, including Mount Grace Priory (1905), and the London Charterhouse (published posthumously in 1925). The excavation at Mount Grace Priory allowed Hope to complete a plan of the building phases of the charterhouse, which consequently shaped the study of the earliest phase of research on the Carthusian houses in England. His work, however, is wholly surpassed by Coppack and Keen’s forthcoming monograph Mount Grace Priory: the excavations of 1957-92, which provides much more detail from the excavations and long-running research they carried out. Likewise, some of Hope’s work on the London Charterhouse has been superseded, first by Knowles and Grimes’ (1954) post-war excavation, and later by Barber and Thomas’ 2002 monograph on excavations at the site, although Hope’s publication still stands as a beneficial source of documentary evidence relating to the charterhouse, as it gives transcriptions of the Charterhouse Register, documenting the early history of the monastery.

At the same time as Hope’s studies, Beauvale Charterhouse was excavated by Du Boulay Hill and Gill (1908). The study revealed four cells, the church, little cloister and some other conventual buildings. The reconstruction was based
upon Hope’s 1905 study of Mount Grace, providing a detailed plan of one cell and illustrating the partitions within the cell (Du Boulay Hill and Gill 1908, 75). Their detailed large-scale plan, also inspired by Hope’s Mount Grace publication, illustrated the excavated areas as well as conjectural structures.

The only Irish charterhouse, Kilnalahanin, was similarly the subject of a number of scholarly articles at the beginning of the twentieth century, but little has been written concerning the charterhouse since, and it is still relatively obscure. W. H. Grattan Flood (1907, 304) described the situation of the house’s foundation and its location in the diocese of Clonfert, and was, in fact, the first to publicise the site as one of particular historical significance. The paper was rather short and gave the most basic facts concerning the monastery, and in 1909, J. P. Dalton attempted to build upon Grattan Flood’s work. Dalton (1909, 13) investigated the archaeology of the site much more thoroughly, indicating that due to later usage of the monastery as a Franciscan house, and more recently as a cemetery, the ground plan cannot be traced.

During the post-War period, Hinton Priory, in Somerset, was owned by Major Philip Fletcher, who was able to conduct his own excavations in the walled garden and the area around it, completing the first full excavation of the cloister and cells of any British or Irish charterhouse. The first report (Fletcher 1951) describes in detail the excavations from 1950 up to the point of this interim publication and makes some comparisons with the London Charterhouse and Parkminster, particularly the carved letters above each cell door (Fletcher 1951, 163). The additional report published in 1958 discussed the general layout of the
house, as a complete plan could now be established (Fletcher 1958).

The late 1960s to late 1970s saw somewhat of a resurgence in Carthusian interest, with two substantial excavations carried out as well as an extensive academic study. Excavations at Witham Priory were conducted in 1965-9 by P. Barlow and R. Reid. The subsequent report, published in the *Proceedings of the Somerset Archaeological and Natural History Society* in 1990, describes the excavations, as well as illustrating the artefacts found on the site (Burrow and Burrow 1990).

The charterhouse at Coventry was studied at a similar time, from 1968-1987 by Iain Soden. This excavation was slightly less ambitious than that at Witham but achieved excellent results, and the subsequent plans are very useful for understanding the architecture, as Soden (1995) ensured that each of the stones and the bricks in walls were drawn in the plan and included in the report. Compared with the report from Witham or some of the early excavations, this gives a much better idea of the ground plan as excavated.

Although unexcavated, the charterhouse at Sheen, in Richmond, was thoroughly studied by John Cloake (1977). Working backwards through estate maps, documentary sources, and historical descriptions, Cloake was able to illustrate how the monastic complex at Sheen evolved from a fifteenth-century Carthusian house to being part of the Royal Gardens of Richmond in 1771 (Cloake 1977, 158-160, 182; fig. 1.5). With a full survey of the area, it would be possible to match up Cloake’s conjectural plan with geophysical results, which may reveal new features. The Bradford geophysical survey (Gaffney 1997) covered only the
Figure 1.5: Cloake’s (1977) conjectural plan of Sheen Charterhouse in the fifteenth Century
area near the King’s Observatory, to the north of the precinct, but unfortunately, given the area’s current usage as a golf course, it is unlikely that a full geophysical survey will be completed in the near future.

In the early 1990s, the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England (RCHME) undertook surveys of eight of the British and Irish charterhouses, examining all but London, Hull and Kilnalahanin. The importance of these surveys is that they combine not only archaeological information but also geographical, topographical, historical and cartographic sources. In combination with the geophysical surveys carried out by Geophysical Surveys Bradford (GSB) under the same project, each site is provided with a well-rounded base from which to attempt further research.

The geophysical surveys have not yet been re-evaluated in light of new survey techniques and equipment, but the original results still provide an excellent view of the sites and have revealed much that was missed in earlier excavations. GSB enhanced the data in a number of ways, to reveal as many of the features of the site as possible, using detailed relief plots, grey-scale plots and colour plots. Their interpretations are also a useful addition to the data, as it provides context for the results and their consequent plots.

The most recent publication on the subject, Glyn Coppack and Mick Aston’s 2002 book Christ’s Poor Men was the first study that successfully amalgamated the known archaeological information about the English charterhouses. However, it only discussed the English houses, despite Aston’s original goal to also investigate

---

See Chapter 3 for further discussion of the surveys at Witham and Hinton
Kilnalahanin and Perth (Aston 1993; 1997). An important point to note is that the publication also looks solely at the monks’ environment and there is little discussion of the lay brethren and their place in the order.

Evidently, then, the Carthusians have been subject to some archaeological examination. However, these investigations have been somewhat sporadic, and there has been no attempt to amalgamate the data to gain better insight into the Carthusian Order as a community, rather than as distinct monasteries. Previous studies at the two main research sites of Hinton and Witham will be discussed in further detail in chapter 5, which will provide context to the rest of the content of that section.

1.8 Conclusion

This thesis will contextualise the role of the lay brethren in the Carthusian Order based on documentary research and new archaeological surveys. Previous research has established layouts of the main charterhouse complexes and fully established the history of the Carthusian Order in Great Britain and Ireland but is clearly lacking a discussion of the lay brethren and their impact within the communities. This thesis will, therefore, highlight the role of the lay brother and investigate the lower house, which was solely inhabited by the lay brethren. Having outlined the current archaeological understanding of the Carthusians in Great Britain and Ireland, and given a brief history of the Order, the following chapter will investigate the foundation of the Carthusian Order in England, and will briefly discuss the history of each house before examining the effect of the
Reformation on the Carthusians, and the aftermath of the Dissolution of the Monasteries.
The Carthusians in Great Britain

The Carthusian Order’s isolated nature lent itself to the small communities it nurtured, ensuring that silence and solitude could be maintained. Their presence in Great Britain and Ireland continued this tradition; only nine houses were established in England, and one each in Scotland and Ireland, compared with 87 in France and 43 in Italy during the medieval period (Maisons 1913-1919). This chapter will provide a brief history of each charterhouse, giving background for later discussion of archaeological and material remains at the sites.

This chapter will begin with the establishment of the first charterhouse in England, at Witham in 1178, and discuss the foundation of the remaining ten houses sequentially to the last house at Perth, Scotland, providing a brief overview of the history of each house, and their characteristic properties. This will be followed by a discussion of the English and Scottish Reformations, and their effects on the Carthusians. The Dissolution of the Monasteries warrants careful examination, as it has a significant bearing on the archaeological remains of the charterhouses, depending on who purchased the property following the Dissolution. Finally, there is a brief examination of the Marian Counter-Reformation, and the re-foundation of the Carthusians in England, before the Order’s permanent expulsion from the country, and the final appropriation of the charterhouses for secular use.
2.1 Hugh of Lincoln and the first English foundation: 1178-1221.

Witham was the last of three penitential monasteries, founded in 1178 by Henry II to expiate his role in the murder of Thomas Becket; it was also the sole Carthusian foundation. A site was chosen in the Royal Forest of Selwood, in Somerset, and was established by a monk and two lay brothers from La Grande Chartreuse. It is reported that Henry did little to aid the foundation of the Charterhouse at Witham\(^1\) (Hallam 1977, 114). Although he gave the monks his own land, the current inhabitants were not removed, and no provision of shelter was given to the monks. This caused tension between both parties, which would not have been helped by the language barrier. The first prior was unable to manage the difficulties he faced, and so returned to the mother house (Appleby 1962, 212). The second prior sent to establish the house died only a few months after he arrived\(^2\), and so the first charterhouse in England remained unestablished, its monks living in mud huts, and without a church (\textit{Magna Vita} II, v; Appleby 1962, 212).

It was thus not until 1179 that the charterhouse could be adequately founded, when the procurator\(^3\) of La Grande Chartreuse, Hugh was sent for (Leyser 1987, 5). Hugh arrived at the priory in 1180 and began removing the tenants of the land (\textit{Magna Vita} II, v; Coppack and Aston 2002, 28). With the king’s

---

\(^1\) The reported role of Henry II and Hugh of Lincoln in the establishment of Witham Charterhouse is discussed in further detail in Chapter 4 (see 4.1).

\(^2\) The exact date of his death is unknown, though it must have been between 1178 and 1180. Much of what is understood about the early days of Witham Charterhouse is taken from the \textit{Magna Vita}, which is undated.

\(^3\) The procurator was the monk in charge of the lower house, who led the lay brothers’ worship.
authority, he offered the tenants emancipation of their servitude to Henry II or alternative accommodation similar to that they had lost (Farmer 1989, 10). Hugh also persuaded the king to provide further funds to aid construction of the site, as the Pipe Rolls from 1179 to around 1186 show payments for clothing of the brethren, sowing land, and for the building of the church and other structures (Pipe Roll Society vol. 30, 4, 11, 96; vol. 31, 109, 115; vol. 32, 27, 112, 141; vol. 33, 74, 122; vol. 34, 173; vol. 36, 135; vol. 37, 187). Unlike other English houses, such as Hinton, under Hugh’s strict guidance the monastery never expanded but maintained an apostolic number of monks, twelve plus a prior, and around sixteen lay-brethren to take care of the day-to-day running of the house (Coppack and Aston 2002, 30).

2.2 Expansion and Royal Benefaction: 1222 - 1500.

Following the foundation of Witham in 1178, expansion throughout Great Britain and Ireland was slow. In 1222, the second English house was founded by William Longespée, the illegitimate son of Henry II and half-brother of Richard I and John (Strickland 2010, para. 1). A site in Hatherop, Gloucestershire was initially given to the community but, finding the location unsuitable, the monks petitioned to be moved, and Longespée’s widow, Ela Countess of Salisbury, offered them her manors of Hinton and Norton St Philip in exchange for the original site (Coppack and Aston 2002, 31).

Isolated in Somerset, Hinton and Witham remained the only charterhouses in England for over 100 years. However, in Ireland Richard de Burgo established a
Carthusian house in 1249 named Domus Dei (House of God), or Kilnalahanin, near Loughrea, in Co. Galway (Grattan Flood 1907, 307). The house never flourished - in 1307, a tax survey valued the house at only £6 13s. 4d. - and this remained the only charterhouse in Ireland (Gray 1959, 45). Eventually, the house was suppressed by the Carthusian General Chapter in 1321⁴, and by 1340 it had been abandoned completely (Gratton Flood 1907, 306-3-9; Dalton 1909, 25). The Franciscans took up the abandoned buildings, adapting and renovating the existing fabric, and so the ruins that remain on the site are Franciscan, not Carthusian (Gray 1959, 38).

Edward III granted the licence for a charterhouse in Exeter (Coppack and Aston 2002, 33), but nothing ever came of this proposal, and so it was not until 1343 that the third English house, Beauvale was founded. Situated near Greasley in Nottinghamshire, the priory sat on the edge of what is now called Abbey Wood, with plentiful supplies of fresh water from a nearby spring. Nicholas de Cantilupe was responsible for this foundation of twelve monks and a prior, also endowing them with a significant amount of land and the right to quarry stone for the buildings (Du Boulay Hill and Gill 1908, 68-69).

The early charterhouses were typically characterised by having separate upper and lower houses, as at La Grande Chartreuse. The correrie (lower house) at Hinton was located a few miles to the east, at a site which is now merely called ‘Friary,’ a corruption of frèreie, or where the lay brethren resided (Coppack and Aston 2002, 15). Similarly, at Witham, the local village of Witham Friary is so

---

⁴ On the suppression of Kilnalahanin the English priors were ordered to extract whatever rents and money they could from the house, as it was useless to the Order. ‘De domo Hiberniae extrahant quidquid poterunt in redditibus et pecunia Priores Angliae, cum sit inutilis Ordini’ (MS. GC 1, 82)
named because the parish church was formerly the chapel of the lay brethren (McGarvie 1989, 11).

After the Black Death in the mid-fourteenth century, there was an upsurge in the number of Carthusian houses established. This is reflected by a phase of urban constructions, a relatively obscure concept at the beginning of the Order, as in general, the Carthusians sought isolation and austerity, away from the distractions of ordinary society. These urban houses also combined the upper and lower houses, manipulating and adapting the traditional layout of the monks’ house to accommodate the lay brethren into the general charterhouse. At the London Charterhouse, each cell was sponsored by a different benefactor or benefactress, as the founder, Sir Walter Manny, died before the buildings could be completed (Knowles and Grimes 1954, 24-25; Wines 2008, 63-70). Sponsoring a cell performed a similar function to sponsoring a chantry chapel; the inhabitant of the cell was bound to pray for the souls of the benefactor and his or her family in perpetuity, ensuring their smooth passage to heaven. The impact of lay benefaction will be discussed in greater detail in chapter 3 (see 3.6).

After the establishment of the London Charterhouse in 1370, two other urban foundations quickly followed; Hull in 1377, and Coventry in 1381. Less is known about the Hull Charterhouse than other English Carthusian foundations, both archaeologically and historically. It was situated on the northern side of the city, outside the walls, and founded by Michael de la Pole, who dedicated it to St Michael (Hull City Council 2010, 4). De la Pole’s father, William, had intended to found a house for the nuns of St Clare, but following his death, his son
Michael altered the bequest to endow the Carthusians instead. As at the London Charterhouse, a number of the cells were endowed by wealthy local nobles. For example, John Colthorpe, mayor of Hull in 1389-90, sponsored a cell before his death in 1394, ensuring prayer in perpetuity for the souls of himself and his family (Lister 1924, 113; Page 1974, 191). The house was dissolved in 1539, and some of the buildings destroyed, but the most considerable destruction came in 1642 when the remaining buildings were demolished before the second siege of Hull in the English Civil War (Hull City Council 2010, 4). Sir John Hotham blew up the remains of the charterhouse to remove any potential cover for the attacking Royalists (Evans 2018, 129). Consequently, there are no upstanding remains, and the precinct has long since been built over.

The Coventry Charterhouse, situated on the banks of the River Sherbourne to the south of the city, was founded by William, Lord Zouche of Harringworth, but when he died in 1382, the foundation stone of the church was laid by Richard II in 1385 (Soden 1995, 5). As the buildings were left incomplete, local notables contributed not only to the building of cells but also to the church, cloister, supplying the library and enabling the construction of fishponds, which will be further discussed in chapter 3 (Soden 1995, 6-7; see section 3.6). Benefaction at the Coventry Charterhouse continued throughout its existence, but at the time of the Valor Ecclesiasticus (vol. 3, 53-54), the house was still valued below the £200 threshold required to stay in operation, and it only managed to avoid suppression through a favourable review of being ‘in virtue, contemplation and religion excellent’ (Edwards 1946, 116). The house was, however, later dissolved
in 1539 with the other charterhouses (TNA E 322/63).

By the end of the fourteenth century, charterhouses were once again being built in the countryside, and Axholme and Mount Grace Priory were established within a year of each other (1397 and 1398 respectively). Axholme was situated on the Isle of Axholme in northern Lincolnshire, on the site of a chapel to the Virgin Mary and was endowed for twelve monks and a prior, with some lay brothers to assist (TNA E 135/2/24, ff. 2, 8). The prior of the house at the time of the Dissolution was Augustine Webster, notably one of the three Carthusian monks who was executed when he failed to acknowledge Henry VIII as the Supreme Head of the Church of England, and refused to denounce the Pope (TNA SP 1/92, ff. 26-35; BL Cotton Cleop. E/VI, f. 231).

Mount Grace Priory, near Northallerton in North Yorkshire, was founded by Thomas Holland, Duke of Surrey, in 1398, and was initially designed for a prior and twelve monks, although it was later expanded to accommodate a further six monks (Coppack and Keen in press). A number of the monks were imprisoned for failing to swear the oath of supremacy in 1534 and in 1539 the house was surrendered, having been valued at £323 2s. 10½d. in the Valor Ecclesiasticus (Vol. 5, 84-85). Today, the priory is the best-preserved site of all the charterhouses in Great Britain and Ireland.

The last charterhouses to be established before the Reformation were also among the richest. Sheen Priory, in Richmond, was founded by Henry V in 1414, with the intention to house 40 monks, exceeding the standard apostolic number (Cloake 1977, 150). It would seem that, through its foundation, Henry V was
attempting to expiate his father’s sins for the role he played in the murder of Archbishop Scrope and the alleged murder of Richard II (Bernard 2012, 200). The Sheen Charterhouse was actually built for just 30 monks, reducing the original design, but this did not impact the wealth of the house. (Malden 1967, 89). Despite only being established the previous century, at the Dissolution the house was valued at £800 5s. 4½d. in the Valor Ecclesiasticus (Vol. 2, 51-54) and the prior was awarded a pension of £133 6s. 8d., more than some monasteries were worth (TNA E 315/234, f. 3b). The implications of royal patronage for the monastery cannot be understated. Beckett (1992, 11) suggested that the foundation at Sheen was ‘designed to place the monarchy at the spiritual centre of English life’, and the endowment made by Henry V would appear to agree with this. In total, over a series of three separate charters, around £900 was given to the new charterhouse, as well as an annual allowance of 2 tuns of wine, fishing rights on the Thames, and exemption from taxation (Hogg 2016, 50; Beckett 1992, 59). As Hogg suggests (2016, 50), the fishing rights would have been particularly important, as fish was one of the most costly outgoings for the Carthusian communities.

The Sheen Charterhouse was also closely linked with nearby Syon Abbey, a male and female Bridgettine house across the Thames, and there are many records of books and treatises written by the Carthusians for the nuns at Syon. These include the first English translation of Imitatio Christi (GUL Hunter MS 136), which was written in the early sixteenth century by William Darker for Elizabeth

---

5The procurator’s accounts for the London Charterhouse for 1492 list fish as the most expensive outgoing, totalling £104 17s. 8½d. of the annual total for the house of £588 12s. 10d. (Hogg 2016, 50).
Gibb, the abbess of Syon (Herbert McAvoy 2004, 227; Patterson 2011, 137). The Sheen Charterhouse was the only Carthusian monastery to be re-founded by Queen Mary I (Haigh 1993, 226).

The only Carthusian house to be founded in Scotland, the Perth Charterhouse, was another royal foundation, in this case, that of James I of Scotland, who established the house in 1429. The house was designed for twelve monks and a prior and was first endowed with 200 marks (Ferguson 1910-11, 183; Beckett 1988, 2). The charterhouse was also intended to function as the king’s mausoleum, and this is where he was buried in 1437, following his assassination, and his wife, Queen Joan was buried next to him in 1445. Sister to Henry VIII and wife of James IV, Margaret Tudor was also buried at the charterhouse after her death in 1541 (Fawcett and Hall 2005, 48).

2.3 The Carthusians during the Reformation: 1518-1569

From the late fifteenth century there had been concern throughout the country as to the condition of the monasteries, and in 1518 Cardinals Wolsey and Campeggio began pressing for a reformation of the religious houses, using visitations to highlight where changes could be made (Bernard 2011, 394). The opposition from a minority of religious orders to Henry’s divorce from Catherine of Aragon solidified the need for reformation, as they were seen as challenging the King’s authority. Two monks of the London Charterhouse, the prior John Houghton, and the procurator Humphrey Middlemore, were jailed in the Tower of London
in 1534 with Sir Thomas More and Bishop John Fisher\(^6\) (TNA SP 3/4 f. 141; TNA SP 3/7 f. 17), for failing to acknowledge the succession. Houghton opined that it was not his place to discuss the affairs of the king, although he was unable to understand how a marriage that had been lawful for so many years and had been sanctified by the church could now be annulled (Chauncy 1550, sig. M3v; Whatmore 1983, 27; Gray 2013, 1). Both later agreed to the act ‘as far as it might be lawful’ and were released from the Tower by the end of May that year (Bernard 2005, 161).

Bernard (2011, 396) describes the compilation of the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* between 1535 and 1536 as aiming to ‘provide a body of information on which taxation could be based and to assert royal authority’. Thomas Cromwell, the chief minister to Henry VIII from 1532 to 1540 appointed a number of commissioners by letters patent to survey ecclesiastical buildings and land, under the premise of calculating tax liability under the First Fruits and Tenths statute\(^7\), but in reality, the survey served many different purposes (Hoyle 1995, 294; Solt 1990, 32; Heal 2003, 143; Bernard 2011, 396). The commissioners were charged with examining each monastery for morality and quality, indicating where reforms might be considered, and required the monks to acknowledge the royal supremacy over the pope (Hoyle 1995, 294). In April 1535, the priors of the London, Beauvale and Axholme Charterhouses, John Houghton, Robert Lawrence, and Augustine

---

\(^6\)More and Fisher were arrested in 1534 for their objection to both the Act of Succession, illegitimising Katherine’s daughter Mary, and the Oath of Succession, which required renunciation of foreign authorities (the pope), and annulled Henry and Katherine’s marriage following its reinstatement by Pope Clement in 1534. Both men were beheaded in 1535.

\(^7\)The First Fruits and Tenths Act of 1534 forbade the payment of ecclesiastical taxes to the papacy, redirecting them to the crown (Maitland 1941, 511).
Webster presented themselves to Thomas Cromwell to plead for exemption from the Oath of Supremacy, with the hope that they could swear an oath more acceptable to the ideals of the Order (Whatmore 1983, 39-40; Bernard 2005, 162). They were immediately arrested and taken to the Tower of London. Under interrogation, the priors stated that they could not accept Henry as the Supreme Head of the Church of England, asserting that there was only one Church, which was that led by the pope, and so they were arrested (fig. 2.1) (TNA SP 1/92, ff. 26-35; Bernard 2005, 162). On 4 May 1535 at Tyburn, the three priors were hung and ‘while they were still alive the hangman cut out their hearts and bowels and burned them. Then they were beheaded and quartered, and the parts placed in public places on long spears’ (L&P Hen. VIII, viii, 661).

The *Compendium Compertorum* for the Northern Visitation recorded the visitations of Doctors Richard Layton and Thomas Legh in the diocese of York, Coventry and Lichfield and listed those monks from each monastery who confessed to immoral conduct or other notable crimes (Shaw 2003). Though Hoyle (1995, 295) suggests that the visitations were conducted in order to garner the ‘most salacious and outrageous allegations of monastic ill-discipline, immorality and superstition,’ Bernard (2011, 398) asserts that there appears to be no consistent campaign of ‘black propaganda,’ and in 70% of the surveyed monastic houses, no monks admitted to criminal or immoral acts. The only charterhouse that was
Figure 2.1: The martyrdom of John Houghton, Robert Lawrence and Augustine Webster. Vincent Carducho was commissioned by the Cartuja de Santa María de El Paular, in Madrid, to create a series of paintings depicting the story of the Carthusians to hang in the cloister. Martirio de los priores de las cartuja inglesas de Londres, Nottingham y Axholme. Vincente Carducho, 1626-1632. Museo National del Prado, Madrid, Spain.
recorded in the extant Compendia was Mount Grace⁸, which lists Thomas Barker and Richard Davis as wishing to leave the religious life (TNA SP 1/102, f. 16).

The results of the Valor Ecclesiasticus led to discussions in Parliament as to what could be done to reform the monasteries and culminated in the Dissolution of the Lesser Monasteries in 1536 (Bernard 2011, 399). However, of the 419 houses valued under £200, only 243 were suppressed, indicating that the goal was reformation, not the wholesale dismantling of the religious orders (Bernard 2011, 400). A change in the attitudes of Henry VIII and his councillors seems to have come following the Pilgrimage of Grace in the Autumn of 1536, which directly challenged the king’s authority, and led to some abbots being executed as an example to others. Furthermore, two monks of the London Charterhouse, John Rochester and James Walworth, who had been sent to the Hull Charterhouse, were condemned on charges of treason, likely as a reaction to the Pilgrimage of Grace. The two men were executed in May 1537. A total of eighteen Carthusian monks were executed between 1535 and 1541, to serve as an example for any other monastic communities failing to cooperate with the Crown. In Europe, this treatment of holy Catholic men provoked outrage, and demonstrates quite how significant the dissent of the Carthusian martyrs was⁹.

---

⁸ Legh also visited Hull, but no record exists in the Compendium Compertorum. This information is garnered from a letter written to Cromwell dated 10 February 1536, which reads ‘I have been at Mountgrace and Hull, and find them there and in all other places ready to fulfil the King’s pleasure’ (TNA SP 1/102, f. 22). The charterhouse at Axholme was intended to be visited, but Legh instead sent a servant to deliver and receive the signed documents acknowledging the Royal Supremacy. The proctor of the monastery informed Cromwell of the situation in a letter dated 15 January 1536 (TNA SP 1/101, f. 85).

⁹ A later letter from Dr Ortiz to Empress Isabella tells that the ‘heads of the holy cardinal of Rochester, the holy Thomas More, and another holy Carthusian Martyr were set up at the gate of London. Rochester’s head was always fresher, although the others were turning black’ (BL Add. MS 28588, f. 47).
Despite the fate of the eighteen Carthusian monks who had refused to swear the Oath of Supremacy, there was still much disinclination to surrender the monasteries when the time came. At Hinton, in Somerset, the requirement that the charterhouse should be voluntarily surrendered led to the monks dissenting by claiming that the monastery was not theirs to give but a house of God (Bettey 1989, 88). Horde, the prior, eventually surrendered Hinton in 1539, insisting that if the commissioners ordered him to surrender, he would but ‘otherwise his conscience would not suffer him willingly to give it over’ (TNA SP 1/142, f. 155).

At those houses where the prior had been executed in 1535 (London, Beauvale and Axholme), the commissioners found the communities pliable to their demands, most probably due to the forced appointment of a prior who could be relied upon to surrender the house quietly. However, the monks were not always in agreement; two monks and a lay brother from Axholme took it upon themselves to write to the prior of Sheen Charterhouse complaining of their prior’s willingness to accept the suppression of the monastery (BL Cotton Cleop. E/IV, f. 113). The outcome of this complaint is unknown since no return letter from the prior of Sheen survives.

The Reformation in Scotland, and consequently, the closing of the Scottish monasteries did not immediately follow the Dissolution of the Monasteries in England. Although James V was advised by Henry VIII to follow the same pattern as himself, reaping the wealth of the monasteries to benefit the royal exchequer, James refused to betray the Pope and the Catholic Church, so instead the monasteries slowly declined (Hamilton Papers I, 29-33; Greene 1992, 181).
This decline was primarily due to the situation south of the border, as Scotland was partly influenced by the actions in England, as can be seen in recruitment to monasteries; no new monks were received in Scotland from 1560, and the remaining inhabitants of the houses died off (Barrell 2000, 245).

The decline was also due to the Scottish practice of installing ‘commendators’ in place of abbots or priors. The commendators were essentially administrators, and usually had strong links to powerful noblemen, abusing their position of power to redirect monastic funds to the lord without paying any duties (Greene 1992, 181; Barrell 2000, 247). Thus the monasteries slowly disintegrated, their incomes having been stolen. The consequences of this were that by the time of the Reformation, only a few genuine monks were still in office, rather than a commendator, although one of these was Adam Stewart, the prior of the charterhouse at Perth (Cowan 1982, 34).

However, in May 1559, John Knox, the leading figure of the Scottish Reformation, preached in St John the Baptist’s church in Perth, inciting the congregation gathered there (‘The Lords of the Congregation of Jesus Christ’) to strip the altars of the church and attack religious idols (Reid 1973, 31). The congregation then proceeded to sack the priories and the charterhouse of the town (Reid 1973, 31). Donaldson (1960, 7) has noted that the charterhouse was attacked only because of its location within the burgh, and because the other friaries were being sacked, not because it was necessarily corrupt. Despite this, the charterhouse was spared complete destruction; although the interior fittings were completely cleared, the main fabric of the house remained, and it was not
formally suppressed until 1569 (Cowan 1982, 190).

2.4 The Aftermath of the Dissolution and the Re-use of Carthusian Buildings

Following the Dissolution, and under a cloud of discontent, some Carthusian monks including Maurice Chauncy, fled England towards the end of 1546 (Thompson 1930, 496). The monks fled to the charterhouse of Val de Grace of Bruges, in the Netherlands, where they renewed their professions as Carthusians, and to where a number of other English Carthusians also escaped over the next couple of years (Thompson 1930, 498).

The charterhouse at Sheen had been sold to Edward Seymour, Jane Seymour’s father in 1542, who began the conversion of the former monastic buildings into a manor house (Coppack and Aston 2002, 145). However, in 1550, he was deprived of his position as Lord Protector of England under Edward VI, and in January 1552 was executed for felony, so the remodelling was never completed (Coppack and Aston 2002, 145). On the accession of Mary I in 1553, a number of monasteries were refounded, including the charterhouse at Sheen (Thompson 1930, 504-505; Haigh 1993, 226). Maurice Chauncy was named Prior of the refounded charterhouse, and fifteen former Carthusians joined Chauncy to reestablish the Carthusian presence in England (Knowles 1959, 223).

---

10 Maurice Chauncy (c.1509-1581) was a monk of the London Charterhouse, who swore the Oath of Supremacy in 1535, thereby avoiding the fate of many of the other London monks. After the Dissolution, Chauncy fled to Bruges with many other English Carthusians. When Mary I reinstated Sheen Charterhouse in 1555, Chauncy returned and was made prior, although this was short lived. Elizabeth I’s accession to the throne in 1559 exiled the monks once again, and they returned to Bruges, where Chauncy was made prior in 1561. Chauncy wrote of his experiences of the Dissolution in Historia aliquot nostri saeculi Martyrum in Anglia (Mainz, 1550), which offers an eyewitness account of the horrors which befell the London Charterhouse. The volume was intended to inform the rest of the order of the fate of his fellow monks (Sargent 2004).
charterhouse was, however, short-lived, as it was once again suppressed when Elizabeth I ascended the throne on the death of Mary in 1559 (Coppack and Aston 2002, 145). The re-suppressed monks returned to Belgium, where they were again welcomed into the community at the charterhouse of Val de Grace (Thompson 1930, 511). By 1568, they had found a separate residence in Clare Street, Bruges, where the English Carthusians settled in a charterhouse they named Sheen Anglorum, and this house of exiles remained extant until the eighteenth century (Brantley 2007, 44; Thompson 1930, 512).

The post-Dissolution activity at the charterhouses, the discussion of which will follow, gives essential context as to the impact on the buildings and the survival of material culture. Where at Sheen the monks left to be replaced by secular inhabitants and then returned, the material remains will likely reflect in some ways these changes, especially as secular construction had begun before the monks returned. If demolition occurred after the suppression of a house, it tended not to be the complete destruction of the building but instead aimed at making the buildings uninhabitable, so that the monastic community could not return (Doggett 2001, 166). This included removing lead from the buildings, as it was a valuable commodity that could be sold on. Archaeologically, this leaves evidence in the hearths that were used to melt down the lead before it was removed from the site.

The ways in which the charterhouses were rebuilt for new uses varies, but all the charterhouses had some part of them converted into a residence by the end of the seventeenth century (Coppack and Aston 2002, 137). At Hinton,
the monastery was sold to Sir Walter Hungerford, but when he arrived at the property, he found that the surveyor, Sir Thomas Arundell had taken it upon himself to demolish and remove most of the fabric of the church (Guinn Chipman 2013, 20; Coppack and Aston 2002, 139). It then passed through many hands, but eventually, at the end of the sixteenth century, a house was built against the northern precinct wall, overlooking the old monastic precinct (Thompson 1896, 344). Similarly, at Witham, Ralph Hopton, who acquired the house after its suppression, converted and adapted the existing fabric of the conventual buildings to the north of the cloister into a manor for himself (Wilson-North and Porter 1997, 83).

The London Charterhouse, perhaps because of the difficulties the monks had caused the Crown and its position in the capital, remained in the ownership of the Royal Commissioners, and Henry VIII granted a licence on 12 June 1542 to John Bridges and Thomas Hale to use the church to store the king’s nets, hales and pavilions (TNA E 315/235, f. 115b). The Venetian Bassano family of instrument makers is also known to have lived in some of the old cells before they were sold to Sir Edward North in 1545 (Lasocki 1985, 117). North built himself a mansion following the general layout of the charterhouse, and the cloister garth remained (Harrison 1991, 5; fig. 2.2). After North’s death, the house was bought by Thomas Howard, 4th Duke of Norfolk and second cousin of Queen Elizabeth I. Howard continued the remodelling of the charterhouse, renaming it Howard House, and on his death, it passed to his son.

The oddly high survival rate of the buildings at Mount Grace Priory is due
Figure 2.2: The layout of North’s post-Dissolution mansion. The original cloister can be seen clearly as the ‘Master’s or Inner Court’. (Harrison 1991, 3)
wholly to Sir James Strangways, who acquired the property in 1541 (Coppack and Aston 2002, 143). He already had a sufficiently large house, and so had no desire to convert the monastic buildings; his only interest was the land attached to the monastery (Coppack and Aston 2002, 143). It was not until 1653 when Thomas Lascelles bought the priory that the Guest House was converted into a house, but mostly, the monastery was untouched (Coppack and Aston 2002, 143). Strangways was not the only new owner who became the absentee landlord of a monastic estate, utilising the land only for the income it could provide (Doggett 2001, 168). In these cases, the surviving structures were often plundered for building materials by locals, as the stone could be burnt for lime, and turned into mortar, or simply reused to build houses.

2.5 Conclusions

This chapter has provided contextual information that allows for greater understanding of the situation of the English Carthusian communities during the medieval period. The efforts of Hugh of Lincoln were crucial to the success of the community at Witham, and in cementing the Carthusian Order in England. Though the first foundation at Witham was slow to flourish, by the beginning of the fifteenth century, a total of eleven charterhouses had been founded, culminating in the royal foundations of Sheen and Perth. The suppression of the monasteries resulted in a sudden end to Carthusian monastic life, and the partial destruction of some of the Carthusian houses, and the later sale of the properties to secular owners. Most were later converted to residences.
Though the post-Dissolution activity of the charterhouses is not explicitly addressed within the scope of this thesis, there are significant benefits to be gained from understanding the ways in which structural changes were made, giving insight into the historical footprint of the buildings and helping to refine interpretations of medieval material culture. This knowledge is vital for archaeological investigation, as it has a crucial bearing on how much information can be gleaned from the material culture and building earthworks\textsuperscript{11}. Furthermore, the preservation of the sites depends on the ways in which the new owners chose to use them, Mount Grace, for example, is the best-preserved charterhouse because the secular owner had no use for it, and left it to decay. The following chapter will explore the inner charterhouse complex, making specific reference to Hinton and Witham Charterhouses, and discussing in further detail the areas of the church, cloister and cell.

\textsuperscript{11}The material culture of the charterhouse is discussed in further detail in chapter 6.
Church, Cloister, and Cell: The Inner Charterhouse Complex

The previous chapter explored the history of the Carthusian Order in Great Britain, from its humble beginnings in the late twelfth century to the lavish construction of Sheen Charterhouse in the early fifteenth century, the eventual dismantling of the Order in the British Isles and the appropriation of its buildings. This chapter focusses in detail on those areas of the monastery which were most frequented by the monks, and puts in greater context the material culture previously discussed. Where the monks spent almost all of their time either in the cell or the church, with the cloister acting as an access route between these two buildings, it is advantageous to examine these areas in greater detail, investigating both the architectural and archaeological aspects. This chapter further aims to explore how the inner complex was accessed by the monks and lay brothers, evaluating the privacy of certain areas and how accessible these areas were. The architectural styles utilised by the Carthusians will also be discussed, using Nagel’s (2015) phasing method for French and Italian charterhouses. This will allow for a better understanding of charterhouse planning and the homogeneity of layouts across Europe.

This chapter will first examine the charterhouse complex as a whole, discussing the layout and use of the buildings within the precinct, including how
specific areas of the monastery were accessed. This will lead into an overview of previous excavations at Carthusian sites, evaluating how useful these exploratory studies are for understanding the charterhouse and its inhabitants, as well as highlighting pertinent areas for further discussion within the scope of this thesis.

To place the excavations in context, an investigation of three of the main structures of the charterhouse will be considered: the church, the cloister, and the cell. These specific studies consider the evolution of these monastic structures, as well as their use and comparative sizes between monasteries.

3.1 Overview of the Charterhouse Complex

The charterhouse took much inspiration from the Desert Fathers (Dunn 2003, 3), and for MacCulloch (2009, 391), the Carthusian Order was a reinvention of the Eastern monastic tradition. This reinvention is manifested in the importance of seclusion to the monks, seen as essential to monasticism, and through the silence that follows seclusion, an attainment of inner peace and stillness, allowing communion with God (Dixon 2009, 59; Belisle 2003, 57; 90). Isolation was not necessarily synonymous with closed off; France (1996, 26) asserted that solitude allowed the monk to be open to God, and to influences that are unavailable to lives in the secular world. Silence was crucial for prayer, but also for listening and reflection with God (Belisle 2003, 100). The layout of the charterhouse complex was structured in order to guarantee isolation and seclusion for the monks. This isolation-focussed architecture demonstrates a specific building plan and forethought as to the landscape of the surrounding area to ensure the monks
could be as well provided for as possible.

Dimier (1999, 186-188) identified that architecturally, the charterhouse was divided into three main areas, the first consisting of the cloister and cells, second, the communal buildings, the church, refectory, chapter house and kitchen, and finally the maintenance buildings, including the stables, granges, and workshops. This simple method of categorising the buildings of the charterhouse indicates the level of privacy, decreasing as one leaves the great cloister, travels through the communal buildings, and enters the area of the maintenance buildings.

Del Espino Hidalgo and García Fernández (2014) researched zoning in charterhouses in greater detail as a method for investigating how members of the community could access various areas of the monastery. They found that the rules which govern the Carthusian way of life could determine the shape of the charterhouse, as a certain level of isolation needed to be achieved by a series of walls which prevented access to certain persons (Del Espino Hidalgo and García Fernández 2014, 3). In common for all charterhouses was a layout where the monks’ housing and conventual buildings were arranged around the Great Cloister. These zones constituted the ‘silent’ areas. The lay brothers’ housing, workshops, guests’ housing and what Del Espino Hidalgo and García Fernández (2014, 4) term the ‘public area’ can be grouped as non-silent service areas. The monks’ housing was largely separated (with a few exceptions) from the non-silent area by the conventual buildings, which reduced the amount of disruptive noise that could be heard by the monks in their cells. Del Espino Hidalgo and García Fernández’s model is illustrated in figure 3.1, as applied to the charterhouse at
Figure 3.1: Zoning plan of Mount Grace Priory, based on the methodology of Del Espino Hidalgo and García Fernández (2014). (Map after Historic England)
Mount Grace. The zoned layout shows how the laity and visitors were kept as separate as possible from the monks, by means of the inner court, lesser cloister, and great cloister, in which access could be strictly regulated. Though similar to the plan described by Dimier (1999, 186-188), Del Espino Hidalgo and García Fernández increased the complexity of the charterhouse zones, including guest housing, and areas such as the inner court which could in some cases be accessed by the laity. This method of classification accounts for visitors to the charterhouse and housing for the lay brothers (which is neither a communal building nor situated around the great cloister) and identifies more specifically where various types of buildings were situated in the complex.

In a further investigation into the charterhouse layout, Elke Nagel (2015) identified an architectural pattern at charterhouses in France, Italy, Switzerland and Germany, based upon the dates that they were built, which grouped them into six phases (fig. 3.2). Nagel’s phases can also be used to categorise the British and Irish charterhouses. The earliest house, Witham, fits into the Consolidation phase, defined as houses founded between 1115-1203. These houses were characterised by a small overall size, and often narrow shape due to the topography of the landscape ruling the design of the monastery (Nagel 2015, 11; 23). There are strong similarities between Witham and La Verne, France, both excellent examples of this narrow design, and the houses maintained an apostolic 12 cells (fig. 3.3). Hinton and Kilnalahanin belong to the second phase, that is, the First Adaption Phase, comprising charterhouses founded between 1203-1340. This phase features a more flexible plan and organic layouts, with less pragmatic alignment of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Example house</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Foundation Phase** (1084-1115) | • Remote, inhabitable landscape  
• Layout follows topography of landscape                                      | La Grande Chartreuse                               |
| **Consolidation Phase** (1115-1203) | • Small overall size  
• Pragmatic alignment of conventual buildings  
• Long narrow layout          | La Verne, Portes,  
**Witham**, Saint-Hugon                           |
| **First Adaption Phase** (1203-1340) | • Remote location  
• More organic layout, less pragmatic  
• Flexible approach to planning | Pomiers, **Hinton**,  
**Kilnalahanin**, Firenze  
**Galluzo**                                           |
| **First Representation Phase** (1340-1408) | • Increase in patronal influence  
• Intentional design for whole layout  
• Regularly sized cells and gardens  
• Extra buildings to screen cloister | Villeneuve-lès-Avignon,  
Pontiagnano, Basseville,  
**London**, **Beauvale**, **Hull**,  
**Coventry**, **Axholme**,  
**Mount Grace**                                    |
| **Second Adaption Phase** (1450-1498) | • Externally visible churches  
• Large guesthouses  
• Wide-spread layouts | Padova, church of Pavia                            |
| **Second Representation Phase** (1585-1633) | • Complex baroque layout  
• Decorative elements  
• Larger cloisters and cells | Lyon, Bosserville                                  |

Figure 3.2: Nagel’s (2015) phasing of medieval to early modern charterhouse constructions, with the addition of how British and Irish charterhouses fit into the categories. The names for the phases were coined by Nagel, and are representative of architectural changes seen in charterhouses surrounding La Grande Chartreuse.
Figure 3.3: Layouts for the Charterhouse at La Verne (left) and Witham (right), both houses of the Consolidation phase. (La Verne: after Nagel 2015; Witham: Burrow and Burrow 1990). Both houses feature long, rectangular cloisters, and are pragmatic in their alignment of conventual buildings.
convventual buildings (Nagel 2015, 13). The Certosa di Firenze Galluzo, Italy, and Hinton Charterhouse share a number of similar features, the square cloister, an increased number of cells, and more oddly-shaped cell gardens (fig. 3.4). The great majority of the British charterhouses (Beauvale, London, Hull, Coventry, Axholme, Mount Grace) belong to the First Representation Phase, founded between 1340-1408. Nagel (2015, 16) characterises these houses as those that were accompanied by founders’ wishes, and thus became more externally visible, with a complex layout and an obviously intentional design from the outset. The French house of Villeneuve-lès-Avignon demonstrates this design, featuring a precinct wall, similar to that of London Charterhouse, which indicates the growing popularity of the Carthusians, and their need to maintain solitude from the secular world (fig. 3.5). Although this method of phasing building styles can be useful for the charterhouses, Nagel only examined houses close to La Grande Chartreuse, in Eastern France, Southern Germany, Switzerland and Northern Italy. In trying to adapt this method for the English houses, some issues occur. First, Sheen and Perth do not fit into Nagel’s phasing system, as she did not consider any building activity that took place between 1408 and 1450, and yet, Sheen was built in 1414, and Perth in 1429. Nagel’s next phase (Second Adaption Phase) began in 1450 (Nagel 2015, 19), but based on the characteristics of this phase, including a large, externally visible church, castellated walls, and grand gatehouses, the last two of the British charterhouses would appear to be more in keeping with the First Representation Phase, as previously discussed (Nagel 2015, 16; 19). The Second Adaption Phase includes houses such as the Certosa di Pavia, built by the Visconti
Figure 3.4: Layouts for Hinton Charterhouse (right) and the Certosa di Firenze Galluzo (left), houses of the First Adoption Phase. (Hinton: after Fletcher 1958; Firenze: after Nagel 2015).
Figure 3.5: The charterhouses of Villeneuve-lès-Avignon (bottom) and London (top), houses of the First Representation Phase. (London: after Barber and Thomas 2002; Villeneuve: after Nagel 2015).
family of Pavia, and featuring a spectacular church façade (fig. 3.6). These phases can show strong homogeneity amongst charterhouse building plans, but there are flaws in the method if one is to use it for houses across Europe. That there is a definite pattern to the architectural design indicates an evolution of a Carthusian layout that could be applied to different environments, but which maintained basic similarities. It is also worth considering the different needs and styles of the countries in which these houses were built. A house in northern England, for example, is going to require a greater degree of shelter from wind, rain and snow than a contemporary house built in southern Italy, and this is demonstrated in the difficulty of fitting each house into Nagel’s phasing.

The walls of the monastery fulfilled both a spiritual and psychological
role in Carthusian life. Their main function was obviously to physically delineate space, and for the external precinct wall, to keep the monastic complex secure (Popović 2007, 52). Psychologically, however, the walls represented an exclusionary boundary of the ‘other,’ ensuring secular persons could not invade the monastic space, but also ensuring the monks’ seclusion (Dey 2004, 358; Horn 1973, 15). The external wall protected the monastery as a whole, a second wall screened off access to the chapter house, church, refectory and other conventual buildings (Bales 2001, 264). Guests to the house would have likely been given access to the church, but would not have been allowed to enter the Great Cloister.

At the London Charterhouse, the guest accommodation was located in the Little Cloister with the lay brothers’ quarters, where they could visit the church, but were highly restricted in their movement towards the monks’ cells. The chapter house, church and refectory themselves acted as a barrier to the cloister and monks cells, whose walls protected their inhabitants (Bales 2001, 264).

This demarcation between secular and religious was also represented through the senses. The burning of incense in the church, for example, which Hamilton and Spicer (2005, 7-8) have suggested ‘set the divine apart from the smells of the world,’ also constituted a sacrificial offering that could drive away evil spirits from the church. Bad smells were associated with the Devil and Hell, whereas pleasant smells evoked good things, so the use of incense to fill the church with a sweet odour became symbolic of sanctity, prayer and the divine (Woolgar 2006, 118-119). Likewise, the ringing of church bells was seen to drive away demons, and signified to all those in hearing range of the sound of sacred
events, such as the elevation of the host during Mass (Hamilton and Spicer 2005, 8). Within the charterhouse, the day was punctuated by bells as signals for the beginning of each of the religious offices, and for the laity in the local area, therefore defined sanctity and devotion of the monastery in contrast to the secular world. Hamilton and Spicer (2005, 7) also suggested that bells were intrusive, and were illustrative of one monastic house’s control over a particular area, in this case, the Carthusian desert.

Spiritually, walls and boundaries signified the intentional withdrawal from the secular world to solitude, the communal isolation of the Carthusian Order (Webb 2007, 12). However, the charterhouse was not isolated only in this way, the monastery as a whole was divided from the secular world, the monks were isolated from the rest of the lay community, and finally, each individual monk was isolated from each other (Del Espino Hidalgo and García Fernández 2014, 2). This can be seen as a series of increasingly smaller concentric circles of access, with the individual monk central, as seen in figure 3.7.

With concern to the secular world, the laity were always prevented where possible from visiting the charterhouse. Charters of La Grande Chartreuse indicate that women and armed men were prohibited from entering the Carthusian desert, and a guard house was built at the entrance to the desert to ensure that no unwanted visitors could enter the site (Dubois 1965, 189). The Carthusian Statutes (21:1) also specifically prohibited women from the monastery, stating ‘We do not allow women to enter our boundaries at all, knowing that…[no man] could escape the caresses and cunning of women’. With the Carthusians’ need
for solace, allowing lay persons into the charterhouse invaded that silence, and prohibited the proper conduct of the monks’ religious devotion.

To investigate how easily people could gain access to various spaces within a cell, Nicola Aravecchia (2001) used Space Syntax Analysis to investigate the fourth-century hermitages at Kellia in Lower Egypt. Space Syntax Analysis is a technique which analyses the configuration of space and can be used to create access plans that show how many rooms or areas one must pass through to reach a specific location (Hillier 2014, 19; 21; Aravecchia 2001, 29). The diagrams created from this method illustrate the flow of people through a building, and the relative difficulty of access is measured by depth, that is, the number of steps it takes to reach each room (Richardson 2003, 374-375). Often, those rooms with a higher depth measurement are of high value or status, but the direction of
access as well as number of access points can also denote its status or function (Fairclough 1992, 353). A room with few access points is likely to be more secluded than one which can be entered from more than one room. For the Carthusian Order then, this method can be used to demonstrate the level of isolation each individual monk was afforded, according to the depth measurement of each individual cell. Any potential journey would have also been regulated by locked doors or guarded entranceways, which forbade certain persons from entering the most isolated areas of the monastery (Aravecchia 2001, 30). The tool is often used in town planning, where it can analyze how pedestrians navigate urban transportation systems, but also access routes through museums and shopping malls. In archaeology, the method has been applied to a range of different sites, but has rarely been used to examine medieval monasteries.

In order to demonstrate a number of possible Carthusian configurations using Space Syntax Analysis, three access plans have been created, one for Mount Grace Priory, a rural house, one for London Charterhouse, an urban house, and one to demonstrate access within the cell. These three plans offer the opportunity to examine issues of control and seclusion in the charterhouse. The plans for London and Mount Grace indicate a high level of regulated access to the cells. At Mount Grace (figs. 3.8, 3.9), a visitor would be required to pass through the outer court, gatehouse, inner court, little cloister, a passageway, and the great cloister before reaching only the door of a monk’s cell (cells 1-15, 22-23). Based on the

---

1 These plans are based on Aravecchia’s (2001) methodology for justified access plans of Qusur el-‘Izeila 23 at Kellia. Each space (building, open area, passage) is represented by a box labelled with its name. Access routes from each space are indicated by a line leading to the next space.
Figure 3.8: The layout of Mount Grace Priory, indicating drainage routes and numbered cells. (After English Heritage).
Figure 3.9: Space Syntax Analysis access plan for Mount Grace Priory, a rural charterhouse.
access plan, this constitutes a depth measurement of 8 spaces and interestingly, although to be expected, the prison\(^2\) is the most inaccessible, with access only via the Prior’s cell. Within the monks’ cells (figs. 3.10, 3.11), further restriction is encountered; the oratory is the most regulated area. That it was the place for silent and private prayer agrees wholly with its seclusion, as the most holy area of the monk’s cell. At the London Charterhouse (figs. 3.12, 3.13), an urban site, a similar level of restriction was ensured, with a gatehouse restricting access from the West Smithfield cemetery to the Carthusian inner court. From the inner court it was possible to reach one of the chapels of the church, that of St Anne and the Holy Cross, a western extension of the nave, which allowed women to be able to hear mass, but prevented them from entering the church proper, as there was no access to the church from the chapel (fig. 3.11) (Barber and Thomas 2002, 32). This chapel was consecrated in 1405, but within a few months, women had been excluded from it by the 1405 Carthusian Visitation (St John Hope 1925, 43; TNA LR 2/61, ff. 12v-13). Men were still allowed to attend the monastic church, however. This chapel was located by excavation in the period following the Second World War, proving that an eastern wall was built to segregate the women from the rest of the monastic church.

The application of Space Syntax Analysis to a medieval monastery has

\(^2\) The prison was used to hold Carthusian monks who were not conforming to the order, and the miscreant monk would often be sent to a different charterhouse. The Chartae of the General Chapter tells of a monk from the Hull Charterhouse who had been imprisoned at La Grande Chartreuse for a number of years by 1423, and the prior of Hull was urged to travel to the motherhouse to collect the monk (LPL MS 413, f. 48v; Hogg 1987, 64). By 1425, the monk was still languishing in prison, and the prior of Hull had been threatened with reduced rations of beer and wine if he did not collect the prisoner and pay the cost of keeping him there (LPL MS 413, f. 58r; Hogg 1987, 65).
Figure 3.10: The layout of Cell 13 at Mount Grace Priory, an example of the monks’ cells. This illustration shows the bricks found *in situ* during excavations at the site, and indicates the division of space within the cell. (After Coppack and Keen forthcoming, fig. 4.77)
Figure 3.11: Space Syntax Analysis access plan of a Carthusian cell, based on cell 13 at Mount Grace Priory
Figure 3.12: Layout of the London Charterhouse (after Barber and Thomas 2002, 38-39).
Figure 3.13: Space Syntax Analysis access plan of the London Charterhouse, an urban Carthusian monastery.
illustrated how useful the tool can be in exploring accessibility in a religious institution. Though some of the results were unsurprising, such as that the cell was one of the most heavily guarded areas of the monastery, the method indicates that in both urban and rural settings, access to even the little cloister was restricted, and external visitors would not have been able to easily enter buildings such as the church or chapter house.

3.2 Previous Excavations and Resistivity Surveys

This section will highlight the two charterhouses that are the focus of this thesis, Witham and Hinton, and where possible, focus on the friaries of these houses. As these two monasteries were the only British charterhouses to feature separate upper and lower houses, they offer a singular opportunity to examine the layout of the friaries, and give a background to the primary research conducted in the course of this thesis which will be discussed in greater detail in chapter 7. Though a brief discussion of previous archaeological work at the charterhouses was discussed in chapter 1, a more in-depth exploration of previous scholarship is vital to inform further investigation. The assertions made by late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century historians are able to give meaning to anomalies in resistivity plots and have also informed later discussions of the sites.

3.2.1 Witham Charterhouse

In 1918, the Dean of Wells, Rev. Armitage Robinson suggested that the site of the charterhouse may lie where the Wyndham Mansion had once stood, based on his
study of the Foundation Charter of Witham Charterhouse and a Perambulation made in 1244 (Armitage Robinson 1918, 15, 24). Specifically, the phrase *ad parcum monachorum ipsorum*, which appeared to relate to the field named ‘New Building Ground’ in a sale map of 1813 (Armitage Robinson 1918, 24).

Until 1890, it was believed that the church at Witham Friary was the centre of the main charterhouse, rather than the chapel of the lay brothers. Henry Gee (1890) first noted that the word ‘Friary’ reflects the use of the area for the frères, asserting that the site belonged to the lay brothers, not the monks. This theory was further promulgated by Cook in 1904, who noted that the name of Witham Friary comes from the French frèrie, and had been corrupted in various forms, Frery, Frary, over the years (Cook 1904, 24). Cook (1904, 25) also documented the only other remaining Friary building, the dovecote, which was discovered in 1902 when it was turned into a parish room, and the plaster was chipped off to reveal the nesting holes for the monastery’s birds. This building is currently used as the office of an architectural firm, but the nesting holes can still be seen (fig. 3.14).

From Gee (1890), Cook (1904) and Armitage...
Robinson’s (1918) assertions T. F. Palmer was able to identify parch marks in the grass at Witham Hall Farm, which appeared to form a quadrangle and what he defined as a number of small rooms (Palmer 1921, 91). In 1921, a group led by Palmer conducted a small excavation consisting of two trenches cutting into the edges of the quadrangle (Palmer 1921, 91). The investigation uncovered the wall foundations, roof tiles, and glazed floor tiles, some in situ, which may have been the remains of the cloister alley (Palmer 1921, 92). Nothing else was recovered, and no further attempts were made by the party to excavate the site, but the excavation did confirm the view that the field held the remains of the Carthusian monastery.

Based on Palmer’s findings, the Wells Archaeological Society conducted an excavation on the site from 1965 to 1969. Using the evidence from the 1921 excavation and aerial photographs, the flat rectangular area in the field was thought to be the cloister garth, and thus, the first trenches were concentrated on understanding these features (Hogg 1977, 123; Reid and Barlow 1966, 6-7). This was somewhat complicated by the almost continual occupation of the site from the monastic period until the early nineteenth century, where the destruction and decay of post-Dissolution structures obscured the original monastic remains (Hogg 1977, 123). In addition, the finds from the excavation indicate this occupation also, including a wine flagon fragment with the arms of the Wyndham family, thirteenth-fourteenth century floor tiles, a silver sixpence dated to 1572, a silver penny dated circa 1300, a halfpenny from 1672 and a post-medieval glass bottle seal with the initials W. H., thought to belong to a member of the Hopton family.
Figure 3.15: Plan of twentieth century excavations at Witham Charterhouse, and the inferred location of the cloister alley. The location of buildings in 1812 is also displayed. (Burrow and Burrow 1990, 146).
The 1966 excavation consisted of a total of 24 trenches, as well as a number of sondages (fig. 3.15) (Burrow and Burrow 1990, 149). All, with the exception of one, were focussed on the northern part of the cloister and conventual buildings, with the remaining trench used to establish the southern limit of the cloister alley.

The subsequent excavation report (Burrow and Burrow 1990, 179) notes the odd shape of the inferred cloister location, with its ‘dog leg’ in the north-eastern corner, but describes it only as ‘unusual’, and does not suggest that perhaps the excavators had been wrong in their assumption (fig. 3.16). In fact, the interpretation shows that largely, the location of the cloister alley is built on conjecture. None of the other British charterhouses had a cloister with an odd corner such as this, and as it has been shown previously that the Carthusians maintained a consistent building style and plan, it is unlikely that the inferred location of the cloister is correct.

The earthwork survey (fig. 3.17) carried out by the RCHME gives a good overview of the site, and shows clearly the site of the cloister as a large, flattened, rectangular area of land, south of the railway line. The conventual buildings to the north appear as a number of small linear earthworks, and the site of the Beckford mansion to the south of the charterhouse site is also visible as an irregular shaped earthwork, although the other post-Dissolution buildings do not appear to have manifested as earthworks. There is also some evidence of the garden created during the occupation of the site by the Wyndham family, in the linear earthworks leading to the east, away from the railway.
Figure 3.16: Detail interpretation of the 1965-1969 excavations at Witham Charterhouse. The location of the cloister alley is largely inferred. (Burrow and Burrow 1990, 166)
Figure 3.17: The earthwork survey conducted by the RCHME as part of the Carthusian Monasteries Project. (RCHME 1994).
GSB (Gaffney 1994) utilised the earthwork survey to target the area of the cloister and the buildings to the north of it for resistivity survey (figs. 3.18, 3.19). These surveys enabled correction of some of the inaccuracies of the 1965-1969 excavation, including the odd ‘dog leg’ part of the cloister (fig. 3.20). The Church was found to be located in the northern part of the cloister, joining this corner. This amendment gives the shape of the cloister a more conventional, rectangular shape, as would be expected (Gaffney 1994, 2).

3.2.2 Hinton Priory and Friary

No excavations have been conducted at the lower house of Hinton, at Friary, but in the 1950s Hinton Priory was investigated by the then owner, Major Philip Fletcher. He and his sons excavated the site over a series of summers from 1950 to 1959 and were able to uncover the majority of the area of the cloister and surrounding buildings. By 1959, the entire layout of the priory buildings surrounding the cloister had been located (fig. 3.21) (Fletcher 1958), allowing it to be compared to other sites such as Mount Grace Priory in North Yorkshire. This comparison established that archaeologically, the split houses (separate upper and lower houses) do differ from the joined houses (monks and lay brothers housed in the same complex), in the size of the buildings, and the size of the priory overall. As studies in the layout of charterhouses were in their infancy at the time, the result was of vital importance, with accurate evidence to determine the size and shapes of various buildings of the priory.

At Hinton, the geophysical survey conducted by GSB largely confirmed
Figure 3.18: The results of the resistivity survey conducted by Geophysical Surveys of Bradford at Witham Charterhouse (Gaffney 1994)
Figure 3.19: Interpretation of the resistivity survey at Witham Priory, with the RCHME earthwork survey added (Gaffney 1994)
Figure 3.20: The resistivity survey conducted by GSB, with trench locations, excavated remains and inferred location of the cloister (after Gaffney 1994, Burrow and Burrow 1990)
Figure 3.21: The layout of Hinton Priory as excavated by Major Fletcher in the 1950s (Fletcher 1958).
what Fletcher had excavated in the 1950s (fig. 3.22). The advantage of the resistivity survey over the excavation, however, was that it was able to be conducted inside the walled garden, the centre of the cloister, revealing what appears to be the paths or small walls of a post-Dissolution garden (Gaffney 1995b, 1). It is likely that this is contemporary with the manor house, as immediately after the Dissolution, the cells were utilised for housing livestock (Fletcher 1958, 76-77). The survey was also able to shed light on the areas of land north of the refectory and chapter house, revealing a complicated series of linear features, which appear to indicate the northern buildings of the little cloister. Similarly, the area immediately to the north-east of the chapter house appears to feature some sort of rectangular buildings (Gaffney 1995b, 2), which may have been joined to the chapter house during the life of the priory. The data was somewhat distorted by modern constructions, such as driveways, and water pipes, as well as the use of the site in the past as an orchard (fig. 3.23) (SRO DD/FL/8), but overall the general overview of the priory has been well maintained. The Friary was not included in the survey project.

The most recent investigative work at Friary was completed in October 2012, by the Bath and Camerton Archaeological Society (Hawke 2015). The research comprised a small-scale resistivity survey on the area immediately to the east of a house known as Woodman’s Cottage and produced some interesting results (Hawke 2015, 4). The field where the survey was conducted is known locally as ‘Church Field’ (Hawke 2015, 2), and it is for this reason that the investigation was targeted in this area. In the northern part of the survey area, two large areas
Figure 3.22: Resistance survey conducted by Geophysical Surveys of Bradford at Hinton Priory (Gaffney 1995).
of very high resistance were located, both on an east-west alignment, the most northerly area having a long, linear shape, in keeping with the design of a simple Carthusian church, as at Witham Friary (fig. 3.24). As this survey did not cover the whole area available, and the processing makes the plot difficult to read, the site at Friary has been resurveyed as part of this thesis, and the following sections have been researched in order to provide some context to the features identified on the subsequent resistivity plot.

Figure 3.23: The area of Hinton Priory shown to be in use as an orchard in a 1785 map of the Hinton Abbey Estate (SRO DD/FL\8) Photo: Author 2017.
Figure 3.24: Results of the resistivity survey conducted at Witham Friary by Sophie Hawke in 2012 (Hawke 2015).
3.3 The Carthusian Church: Use, Expansion and Decoration

The church was used only for Matins and Vespers on a daily basis, and also for Mass on Sundays and festival days. The rest of the night offices were celebrated individually in the cell. As a result of this, the Carthusian church was small and sparsely decorated, styled more like a parish church than that of a monastic house (Coppack and Aston 2002, 47).

The Carthusian church, in its simplicity, was always rectangular shaped, at least in its original form (Vrána 2006, 77). What can be reconstructed of the church at Witham is demonstrative of this (fig. 3.25), and likewise the still extant lay brothers’ church at Witham Friary is a simple single-aisled building with an apsidal chancel. The church at Hinton appears to have had no modifications made to it during its life as a religious site, and retained the most original form of all the English charterhouses (fig. 3.26) (Coppack and Aston 2002, 49). Commonly, extensions were made to the nave as this allowed the accommodation of more people, or more chapels, facilitating increased lay benefaction. The church at Beauvale Charterhouse was expanded within a generation of its foundation, indicating changing needs either of the monastic community or of its lay patrons (fig. 3.27) (Coppack and Aston 2002, 50). Coppack and Aston (2002, 51) have suggested that the expansion of the church at Coventry (fig. 3.28) (an addition of 13.4m to the east) was prompted not by the increased needs of the monastic community, but by the augmentation of patronage as well as offering space for burial within the church. At Coventry, 41 inhumations were excavated during archaeological investigations (fig. 3.29). Coppack and Aston (2002, 53) reasoned
Figure 3.25: Basic layout of the church at Witham Priory (After Coppack and Aston 2002, 48).

Figure 3.26: Layout of the church at Hinton Priory (After Coppack and Aston 2002, 49).
Figure 3.27: Layout of the church at Beauvale Charterhouse (After Coppack and Aston 2002, 50).

Figure 3.28: Layout of the church at Coventry Charterhouse (After Coppack and Aston 2002, 55).
that expansion in all the later English charterhouses was in order to create space for lay burials, meaning that more reliance and influence was placed upon the lay benefactors and patrons of the charterhouse than may have been deemed suitable by the Carthusian Order. Further to this is the evidence of the inventory recorded by Drs. Thomas Legh and Francis Cave in 1539 during the Dissolution (TNA E 117/12/22). The items taken from the church include a ‘vestment of white velvet wythe an Angel of Gold embroidered and set wythe pearls’ (TNA E 117/12/22) and a large amount of plate which exceeds that which was thought to be proper according to the Carthusian Statutes (C.C. 40:1), and again indicates the degree to which the laity were involved in the daily running of the charterhouse, as these were more than likely given as gifts, rather than bought by the monks themselves (Coppack and Aston 2002, 53).

The increase in chapels outside the chancel was promoted by the desires of the laity to have masses said for the dead and by the increased desire for burial within the monastic church. At Mount Grace, three side chapels were established in expansions to the church (fig. 3.30), described as burial chapels by Coppack and Aston (2002, 58), which featured a tomb and at least one altar. While two of the chapels were accessed from the nave, the last was accessed only via the presbytery, which may indicate a higher status individual. Certainly, burial in the monastic church was restricted to those individuals who were willing to provide a substantial donation in return for the privilege (Coppack and Aston 2002, 68). As has already been discussed, the London Charterhouse expanded their church to the west in order to include a chapel for solely female visitors. The evidence
Figure 3.29: Layout of burials in the church at Coventry Charterhouse (After Coppack and Aston 2002, 66).

Figure 3.30: Layout of the church at Mount Grace Priory (After Coppack and Aston 2002, 58).
for additional chapels within the monastic church is indicative of how reliant the community was on lay benefaction, as the churches were expanded substantially in order to accommodate the desires of the laity, and not for the benefit of the monks. The chapels of St Michael and St John the Baptist, and St Jerome and St Bernard were founded by Sir John Popham in 1453-4 at the London Charterhouse, in order that he might ensure a perpetual chantry for himself, as his tomb was also placed opposite the figure of St Michael in the chapel of St Michael and St John the Baptist (Knowles and Grimes 1954, 57-58). Popham was accepted into the fraternity of the charterhouse in 1460, which increased the spiritual benefits available to him after his death in 1466 (TNA E 326/8775; Rowntree 1981, 378).

In the charterhouses inhabited by both monks and lay brothers in the same complex (all those founded after Hinton in 1222), there was a necessity to share the monastic church for worship. In these cases, a choir screen divided the nave, segregating the quire monks from the lay brothers (Lindquist 2003, 181; Soden 2001, 161). This method of separating the monks and lay brothers seems to have ceased after the foundation of Beauvale Charterhouse, when the division between the two areas was created by a transept passage in the nave (Coppack and Aston 2002, 51). Later churches also sectioned off the presbytery or chancel with a pulpitum (Rodwell 2012, 164).

3.4 The Cloister

The cloister acted as an area of mediation, dividing the areas of habitation and the conventual buildings, but also connecting these areas via the cloister walk
(Irvine 2011, 42). Kinder (2002, 131) described it as a ‘cross-roads of the inner abbey’, providing access to various different parts of the monastery. The cloister garth was also often used as the monastic cemetery (fig. 3.31), making it a place of remembrance as the monks would have to pass through it every day. It is for this reason that many lay benefactors requested to be buried under the cloister walk, it being the closest location to the monastic cemetery, and with the belief that resting beneath the paving where the monks walked every day would provide them with greater spiritual assistance in their journey to heaven. Excavations at London Charterhouse just after the Second World War (Knowles and Grimes 1954, 46) revealed memorial slabs in the cloister walk, with settings for brasses, which was later suggested by Barber and Thomas (2002, 25) to indicate burial beneath the floor of the cloister alley. Without the name brasses, it would be very difficult to discover the names of the deceased at the London Charterhouse, but the necrology of Nieuwlicht Charterhouse in the Netherlands, which lists the location of all burials in the monastery, includes members of the laity who were buried in both the Great and Lesser Cloisters (den Hartog forthcoming). An example from the necrology reads:

next to the Sacrist’s cell, Jacob Sloyer, once a citizen of Utrecht, was buried beneath the stone, he has an engraving in the wall above him. With him in the same tomb is buried John Sloyer, his son, and his wife; after this, before the door of the Sacrist, Henry Sloyer and his daughter Joan Sloyer, then John Sloyer, son of Henry Sloyer.3 (van Hasselt 1886, 370; own translation)

The necrologies of the English charterhouses do not survive, but the example from Nieuwlicht indicates strong ties with the local community, especially since

---

3 ‘juxta cellam sacriste, Jacobus Sloyer, quondam civis Trajectensis sub petra tumulatus existit, habens sculpturam in pariete supra se. Apud quem in eodem sepulchro postea sepultus est Johannes Sloyer, filius eius, et uxor eius; postea, ante januam sacriste, Henricus Sloyer et filia Johannis Sloyer; deinde Johannes Sloyer, filius Henrici Sloyer.’
Figure 3.31: Paintings of La Grande Chartreuse (left) and the Charterhouse at Durbon (right), showing the claustral cemeteries (Paravy 2010, 38, 43).
a number of deceased members of the same family were buried in the same area of the cloister alley, acting almost like a family burial plot or mausoleum.

For the Carthusians, the size of the cloister was determined by the number of cells that needed to be accommodated around it. As Coppack and Aston (2002, 97) noted, Mount Grace’s cloister for 17 monks was twice the size of the cloisters at Fountains and Rievaulx, which accommodated at least 100 monks, simply because each of the cells and gardens needed space around the cloister. The size of the cloisters at the British and Irish houses comparatively accommodated between 12 and 30 cells. Sheen was the largest, and the original intention was to build a house for 40 monks, but the monastery was actually constructed for 30. As it was difficult to alter the layout of the cloister after its construction, where there was a need for more cells, some more interesting solutions had to be created. At Mount Grace, cells 22 and 23 were located on the first floor above cellars along the southern cloister walk. Neither had a garden, and were much smaller than the original cells (Coppack and Aston 2002, 83). Likewise, at Hinton Charterhouse, cells 10 and 11 were created by splitting one cell in half, and cell 15 was added to the north west corner of the cloister (Fletcher 1958). These additions show that although the prescribed number of monks was 12, the monasteries were obviously sufficiently popular to require further cells to be added, especially the cells at Mount Grace, which were so small that there was no space for a work room or private cloister, and they were timber framed (Coppack and Aston 2002, 83).

The cloister stood at the heart of the monastery, from which all of the most
important buildings for religious life could be reached. The cells were situated along three sides of the cloister, and the remaining range housed the other essential conventual buildings - the church, refectory, chapter house, library and often, the prior and sacrist’s cells. This was almost an extension of the idea of the cell, furnishing it with everything a monk could need so he would not need to leave it unnecessarily. Likewise, the cloister housed all the buildings required, so that the monk would not need to depart from the sheltered area into the noise and bustle of the outside world (Kerr 2009, 21).

Bales (2001, 265), who researched spatial interactions at La Certosa di Calci in Pisa, Italy, noted that the Carthusian cloister with the central communal cemetery represented for the monks ‘the heavenly Jerusalem or paradise’. Likewise, the Great Cloister is referred to in the Nieuwlicht necrology as Magna Galilea, and the Lesser Cloister as Parva Galilea (van Hasselt 1886, 370; 379), in clear reference to the Sea of Galilee, where many of Jesus’ miracles occurred⁴. The appropriation of this name for the cloister suggests that it was indeed seen as a paradisiacal environment for the monks, from which one had access to their own miniature paradise - the cell.

3.5 The Cell

The Carthusian cell was built on two floors, the ground floor housing the bedroom, oratory, study and living room, with a workshop on the first floor. Excavations at

⁴ On the shores of the sea of Galilee, Jesus fed the five thousand (Matthew 14: 13-21), walked on water (Matthew 14: 22-33), and appeared to his disciples for the third time following his crucifixion (John 21:1-3).
Mount Grace Priory (Coppack and Keen forthcoming) found evidence for sockets cut into the stone walls which would have held the stairs leading to the first floor. The cell was bounded by a small garden where the monks could grow vegetables and herbs, and gave them access to the outdoors. Food was provided through an L-shaped hatch in the cloister wall, where a lay brother would place meals, along with any other necessary items requested by the monk that day (Brantley 2007, 37). This set up was exactly like the design of the fourth-century hermitages at Kellia, with the exception that these cells were conjoined, and arranged around a central cloister, instead of being placed haphazardly without specific design as at Kellia (Signori 2014, 33). Cells of different charterhouses, particularly those in England, tended to be of the same size (fig. 3.32); while this comparison can only be made from excavated houses (therefore excluding Axholme, Sheen, Perth, Kilnalahanin and Hull), there seems to be no discernible difference in the size of cells from houses with 12 monks to those with 24. The cells at London (a double house), for example, were approximately $6m^2$ internally, in a $14m^2$ garden, and at Mount Grace, the cells were approximately $6.4m^2$ internally in a $14.5m^2$ garden. Beauvale and Coventry featured similarly sized cells and gardens\(^5\). This is therefore, consistent with the assertion made by Coppack and Aston (2002, 47), and discussed above\(^6\), that the size of the cloister was altered in order to accommodate the size of the cells, not vice versa. There is however, considerable difference in the layout of the interior cell building. Beauvale and Mount Grace

\(^5\)Beauvale’s cells were around $7m^2$ internally in a $13m^2$ garden, and Coventry’s were approximately $6m^2$ internally in a $12.5m^2$ garden.

\(^6\)See section 3.4 on the cloister for discussion on relative sizes.
Figure 3.32: Comparison of Carthusian cells (After Coppack and Aston 2002, 75; Barber and Thomas 2002, 19).
share an almost identical layout, similar to that of London’s cells, and not too far removed from the cells at Coventry. This style features a large living area, with one or two smaller rooms leading off from it, and a corridor or lobby separating the internal rooms from the cloister wall. Hinton’s layout however, favours one larger main room, with an L-shaped pentice adjoining a lobby area. Although the cell divisions were not established at Witham, it is likely that they were similar to those at Hinton. The cells presented here are representative layouts, and there was of course variability from one cell to the other, which may have been affected by the position of the cell around the cloister, or the period of time it took to build all of the cells.

An adherence to solitude was maintained by ensuring that no two individual cells were conjoined, safeguarding against any contact between the monks outside sanctioned hours. As the cell was usually situated in the corner of the square garden, this meant that some cells, such as Cell 8 at Mount Grace Priory, featured two passageways from the cell to the garden, and in order to maintain seclusion, the cell had to be placed central to the garden, rather than in a corner (fig. 3.33) (Thompson 1930, 175). There were a few differences between the cells of the monks and those of the lay brothers. First, the lay brothers were not always provided with a garden, their role in the monastery often being too prohibitively time-consuming for gardening. Likewise, the lay cell only contained a single floor, without the provision of an upper workspace, as they worked in the offices and workshops of the monastery, and they were not required to remain in their cells. From the surviving lay brothers’ cells at Mount Grace Priory (cells 16-
it would appear that otherwise, they were designed in a similar way to those of the monks, with a three-roomed floor, and a latrine placed at one corner of the garden (Coppack and Aston 2002, 113). The lay brothers’ cells were arranged around the lesser cloister at Mount Grace, where they were segregated from the monks and also so that they could also reach the workshops and offices easily.

Each cell was identified by a letter, a practice taken from the Desert Fathers, and documented in the London Charterhouse Water Supply map, which labels each cell A-Z, with one unlettered cell (Sargent and Hennessy 2008, 180). The letter was carved into the cell’s door frame, and was enhanced by the addition of a devotional verse (fig. 3.34) (Coppack and Aston 2002, 74; Sargent and
Sargent and Hennessy (2008, 182-183) have suggested that this demarcated the cell boundaries, and made the cell a devotional object in its own right. As the monks walked along the cloister walk to church of an evening, or met in the cloister on a Sunday, the verses would be a devotional reminder of the importance of the cell. The use of letters also anonymised the inhabitant of the cell, identifying them only by their abode rather than their person, and meant that any requests for items made could be signed with the letter of his cell (Brantley 2007, 37; Sargent and Hennessy 2008, 180).

The provision of a garden for each monk meant that they were able to grow their own vegetables and herbs to supplement the meals brought to them by the lay brothers. There were no official guidelines as to what could be grown
in the garden, or how the monks were to organise the space (Ritchey 2014, 194), and Ritchey (2014, 194) has suggested that this lack of guidance meant that the monks could cultivate the gardens into a true wilderness. In those charterhouses founded in cities, this may have meant that they could escape from the busy surroundings outside the monastery walls. The cell gardens at Mount Grace Priory and Coventry have been excavated, which showed that although no suggestions were given as to how the garden should be presented, the monks obviously took time to make the garden a pleasurable location, with raised beds and walkways. At Coventry Charterhouse, excavations revealed a stone-lined well in the garden of Cell 3, and in Cell 1’s garden, a line of edge-set ceramic tiles, which look to have lined a garden bed (fig. 3.35) (Soden 1995, 61-62; Moorhouse 1991, 114).
The gardens at Mount Grace featured drainage channels, paths laid out with lines of stone and provided evidence of deep-rooted plants (fig. 3.36) (Coppack and Aston 2002, 89-90). An area of the garden of Cell 10 was also suggested by the excavators to have been a grassed area, where one could look out onto the decorative garden (Coppack and Aston 2002, 90). MacCulloch (2014, 99) described the garden as a paradise, and perhaps, therefore, the decorative nature of some of the gardens pursued this ideal. Fruit pips and stones recovered from London Charterhouse have led to a suggestion that the monks may have been growing these in their cell gardens. Certainly there was an apple orchard just south of the charterhouse, but plums, sloes and cherries could have been cultivated in the gardens (Barber and Thomas 2002, 67). This would be consistent with the deep-rooted plants observed to have been grown at Mount Grace.

### 3.6 Conclusions

Seclusion was a key element of Carthusian observance. The charterhouse walls demarcated specific areas that could be accessed by different members of the community, and restricted the access of visitors to the site. Smells, sounds and light also contributed to this setting apart of the monastic community from the local laity, by demonstrating their devotion to the divine. Lay benefaction was a great influence on the charterhouse; the evolution of the Carthusian church was due largely to the desires of the laity for prestigious burial locations, rather than the needs of the monks. This demonstrates that despite the solitary nature of the Carthusians, in many cases they were reliant on secular society for benefaction,
Figure 3.36: Plans of excavated gardens in cell 9 (top) and cell 10 (bottom) (Coppock and Aston 2002, 90-91).
like any other monastic community. The secular benefaction of the charterhouses is also illustrated in the claustral burials at Nieuwlicht, which were recorded in the monastic necrology. These different examples of lay interaction indicate that the charterhouse was increasingly receptive to the desires of their patrons, especially where women were eventually allowed to be buried in the cloister. The lay benefactors also expected a certain level of commemoration, which was manifested through the claustral plaques and the additional chapels.

The previous excavations and research conducted at Witham and Hinton charterhouse illustrate how an understanding of the relationship between the monks and lay brothers has evolved, from confusion as to the site of Witham Charterhouse, to the discovery that the monks and lay brothers lived in separate complexes. The layouts produced from these investigations also provide vital background information to the primary research to be discussed in chapter 7, and highlighted where further research is required. The following chapter investigates daily life in the charterhouses, highlighting how the inhabitants interacted with and used the buildings to ensure their ascetic way of life.
Daily Life in the Charterhouse

The greatest part of a Carthusian monk’s day was spent alone in the confines of his cell. Only on Sundays or Feast Days were the community allowed to come together and speak to each other. However, to understand how the surrounding landscape and buildings were used, the activities conducted by these monks throughout both a normal day and a feast day deserve consideration. This is equally true for the Carthusian lay brethren. Although they did not spend their days alone in the cell, their time was subject to a similarly strict schedule of prayer, interspersed with manual labour which was vital to the everyday running and maintenance of the charterhouse.

The aim of this chapter is to give a complete understanding of the minutiae of Carthusian daily life, so that following chapters can build on and implement this knowledge into investigating the built environment. The following chapter will examine the life of a Carthusian through six different aspects. First the differences between a monk’s and lay brother’s day will be discussed, as well as a brief overview of how the day was divided into different occupations. Following this, the main themes of the day will be extrapolated and scrutinised through the categories of prayer and spiritual exercise, manual works, and meals. These sections will consider the Carthusian liturgy, and the Carthusian Statutes in

---

1 See section 1.6 for an explanation of the Carthusian Statutes
particular, as vital pieces of evidence for understanding the structure of the day, discussing the implications for both the monks and the lay brothers. This will lead into a discussion of the importance of silence in the charterhouse, investigating how this affected the monks and the lay brothers differently, and when it was implemented. The spiritual benefits of silence and solitude will also be considered here. Finally, the rituals and devotional practices associated with death in the charterhouse will be assessed. This will comprise not only the death of monks and lay brothers, but also lay donors and benefactors, and the obligations placed on the Carthusians by secular patrons. Discussion here will be based in part on the evidence of medieval wills, to investigate how the laity placed their faith in the hands of the Carthusian monks.

4.1 The Daily Schedule

The Carthusian day was organised around the monastic offices - periods of worship at specific times throughout the day. The schedule of the charterhouse and the timings of the monastic offices are illustrated in the table below (fig. 4.1). In between these periods of worship, the monk or lay brother also conducted spiritual exercises or manual works, which will be discussed in the course of the chapter. For the monks, only three of the monastic offices were said communally in the church, where though they were meeting together, communication was forbidden (Thompson 1930, 25). All other offices were conducted alone in the small oratory that was provided within the cell. The lay brothers were led in worship
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Monks</th>
<th>Lay Brothers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>Matins of the Blessed Virgin in Cell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.30</td>
<td>Matins in Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Lauds in Church</td>
<td>Private Devotion in Cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lauds of the Blessed Virgin in Cell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>Prime in Cell</td>
<td>Prime in Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spiritual Exercise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>Adoration in Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>Conventual Mass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>Private Mass in Cell</td>
<td>Terce in Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terce in Cell</td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading, Study, Manual Labour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>Sext in Cell</td>
<td>Sext in Cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>None in Cell</td>
<td>None in Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manual Labour, Study</td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30</td>
<td>Vespers of the Blessed Virgin in Cell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>Vespers in Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>Prayer, Reading</td>
<td>Vespers, Supper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>Compline</td>
<td>To Bed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1: The daily schedule for both Carthusian monks and lay brothers. After Thompson 1930 and ‘Un Chartreux’ 1984, 46.
in the church for all of their offices (C.C. 42). The manual work they conducted in between worship would have differed depending on their occupation\textsuperscript{2}.

The daily schedule ran thus: at around 11 pm, a bell was rung to wake the monks and signal to them that they should begin the Matins of the Blessed Virgin, which were said in the cell. When completed, they silently walked to the church, where Matins was continued and in which the lay brothers joined, finishing at around 3 am. At this point, the monks remained in the church, and moved on to the worship of Lauds, after which they returned to their cells to sing the Lauds of the Blessed Virgin. The lay brothers returned to their cells after Matins, where they said private devotions in their mother tongue, as they tended to be uneducated in Latin. At 6 am, the monks sang Prime in their cells, and the lay brothers returned to the church, to be led in prayer by the Procurator. Between Prime and Compline, the monks conducted spiritual exercises, or manual labour, during which their thoughts were to be directed towards God at all times. The lay brothers spent the majority of the day engaged in work which benefitted the community, such as animal husbandry, cooking or making bread. At about 11 am, after Sext was said in the cell, the monks ate their only meal of the day. Following Compline at 6 pm, the monks retired to bed. The timings of the day varied slightly depending on the time of year. In the summer, a siesta was added in the middle of the day, to account for the early sunrise and late sunset (C.C. 29). Equally, during the winter, the monks had an additional meal in the late afternoon to early evening (C.C. 33:4). Sundays were again a different schedule,

\textsuperscript{2} Chapter 4.3 discusses occupations, and the classes of lay brothers in further detail.
which will be investigated in the following section.

4.2 Prayer and Spiritual Exercises

The offices celebrated in the cell were known as the lesser offices and were conducted in the small oratory that was provided to each monk. Guigo I, the compiler of the Carthusian statutes in 1116, believed that solitary worship was a vital part of coming closer to God, and promoted ‘mystical ascent’ in a way that could not be achieved as a community (Ritchey 2014, 171). These offices were marked by the ringing of the monastery bell, signifying the beginning and end of the worship period. Those offices conducted in the Church (Matins, Lauds, Mass and Vespers) were chanted in their entirety, although the melody was simple as the monks did not meet together to practice the chants (Lambres 1970, 17; Brantley 2007, 36). Dependent on the organisation of the house, that is whether the upper and lower houses were conjoined, the lay brothers may have joined the monks in the church for worship. In this case, the choir was split by a screen which delineated the area for the monks from that for the lay brothers (Brogden 1941, 7). Although the monastic offices were always conducted in Latin, the lay brothers were taught what to say or do at specific times during the service, so that although they may not have understood the language being used, they could participate as fully as possible (Villabos-Hennessy 2008, 168). They were also

---

3 Guigo I (1083-1136) was the fifth prior of La Grande Chartreuse, elected in 1109. It was he who compiled the Carthusian Statutes, giving guidelines to other charterhouses between 1121 and 1128, and also wrote the Meditations, which outline his beliefs in solitary life. He was a contemporary of Bernard of Clairvaux and Peter the Venerable, both of whom exchanged letters with Guigo, and the former also visited La Grande Chartreuse in the 1120s. (Les Méditations, SC 308; Introduction to Coutumes de Chartreuse 1984, 13-16)
required to learn the Paternoster and the Ave Maria (C.C. 43).

Where half of the Carthusian community was likely to be unversed in Latin, the Procurator led the monastic offices for the lay brothers. All of the lay brothers’ worship was undertaken in the church, and they would imitate the genuflections and movements made by the Procurator (C.C. 42:1). The lay brothers’ statutes from Sheen Charterhouse (transcribed by Pask Matthews, 1930, 1931) give specific instructions as to how many Paternosters the lay brothers were to say, which ones with genuflection, and at what times. This allowed the lay brother to participate in the monastic offices without needing a full understanding of Latin. For the 50 psalms chanted by the monks at Vigils, the lay brothers instead said Paternosters (Pask Matthews 1930, 211-212; C.C. 43:2). The statutes also ensured that even if the Procurator was absent, the lay brothers could still worship: they should say three Paternosters and Ave Marias with genuflection for each of the offices (Pask Matthews 1930, 217).

As the laity and lay brothers were taught the required liturgical passages, rather than reading them, it is a common belief that they were unable to engage properly with and understand the religion to which they adhered (Dauphin 2001-2002, 58; Gottschall 2014, 9; Baldwin 2016, 44). However, Madigan (2015, 300) argues that the capacity to listen and retain knowledge was far greater than our abilities today, and some lay folk were able to recite great passages of the Bible and religious literature. In this sense, through what Swanson (1995, 79-80) called ‘passive literacy,’ the illiterati were able to gain the same understanding and knowledge by listening to religious readings as they would from reading
the Bible. ‘Illiterate’ in a medieval understanding may also have meant unable to read and write in Latin, rather than being unversed in the vernacular language (Bäuml 1980, 238). Caie (2004, 128) cites examples of widowers joining religious orders during and after the Black Death, who are labelled ‘illiterate’ due to their lack of Latin knowledge. Lay people were not expected to be as well versed as the clergy in religion, and although some may have wished to devote themselves further to devotional study, those who did not would not be sinning; it was enough to be present at church, and to follow the mass (Tanner and Watson 2006, 400). By the late fourteenth century, a number of instructional pamphlets, such as the Lay Folks’ Mass Book (Lydgate n.d.), were circulating amongst the laity. These guides showed the common people how to navigate the rituals of the Mass, which prayers to use and the actions of the clergy which indicated various parts of the Mass (Swanson 1993, 79).

In the early days of the Carthusian Order, Mass was only taken on vigils and feasts, in keeping with how the Desert Fathers were thought to have worshipped, and lay brothers were only allowed to take communion once a month (Lockhart 1985, 38; King 1955, 19). It was thought that too many Masses (and therefore opportunities to be amongst other monks) would be a distraction from a monk’s relationship with God (C.C. 14:5). Guigo I emphasised that the Carthusian vocation was to solitude and silence, insisting ‘we believe that nothing is more laborious in the exercises of regular life than the silence of solitude and rest’, and cited the example of Jeremiah from the Bible4 (C.C. 14:5). In Guigo I’s Praise of

4 Jeremiah 15:17, ‘I did not sit in the company of revellers, nor did I rejoice; I sat alone, because your hand was upon me, for you had filled me with indignation.’
the Solitary Life (C.C. 80), he writes that in the Bible, Jacob sends his family away in order to be alone, and it is only in this way that he can see God face to face, emphasising how important it is for the Carthusian monk to avoid all temptation to leave his cell unnecessarily. Despite this, after 1222, a daily conventual Mass was established, and the 1259 Statuta Antiqua fixed this in the daily schedule (King 1955, 20).

On Sundays and Feast days the normal schedule of the day was changed slightly. Following Prime, instead of the usual spiritual exercises, the monks held chapter and then gathered in the church for the blessing of holy water, which the lay brothers also participated in (C.C. 7:3-4). After this, they sang Terce, and celebrated the Mass, except during Advent and Septuagesima (C.C. 7:5). The Mass was followed by a short interval where the monks took the holy water back to their cells, and then returned to the church to sing Sext, later proceeding to the refectory to eat dinner together, albeit in silence (Thompson 1930, 37; C.C. 7:8). Immediately after dinner, the monks congregated in the church to say None, and the community was finally allowed to break their silence when they came together in the cloister to talk about ‘useful things’, and to ask the Sacristan for supplies such as ink, quills, parchment, and books to be read or copied (C.C. 7:9). On Sundays, the monks ate a second meal after Vespers.

The monastic liturgical calendar for all orders was split up into different levels of feast days, which dictated how the feast was to be celebrated. The most

5 Genesis 32: 22-24, ‘The same night he arose and took his two wives, his two female students, and his eleven children, and crossed the ford of the Jabbok. He took them and sent them across the stream, and everything else that he had. And Jacob was left alone.’
6 Here, ‘useful’ refers to spiritual importance, not utility
important were solemnities, which celebrated important events in the life of Jesus or his mother Mary, as well as other important saints or mysteries of faith such as the Trinity (Liturgy Office, 13). Beneath solemnities were feasts, which were further split into Feasts of Twelve Lessons, and Feasts of Three Lessons, the former being the more important (Liturgy Office, 13). Feasts celebrated lesser events in the life of Jesus, Mary or an apostle, or were used to commemorate major saints. Lesser saints were commemorated by memorials, the lowest ranking of feast days (Liturgy Office, 14). The community was only allowed to meet together and converse on Sundays, chapter feasts and solemnities. The number of chapter feasts and solemnities was restricted. By the end of the fifteenth century, only 54 were celebrated by the Carthusian Order (Brogden 1940, 10). This ensured that the monks were not obligated to leave their cells too often, which as already discussed, was to be avoided where possible.

To further emphasise the monks’ devotion to austerity and a clear path to God, the church was sparsely furnished, ‘in the Church we do not have ornaments of gold or silver, with the exception of the chalice and reed which are used for taking the Lord’s Blood. We do not have wall hangings or carpets’ (C.C. 40:1). The empty church ensured that the monks could not be distracted from the task at hand. This was a clear distinction between the Carthusians and other monastic orders, who, especially at the Dissolution, were accused of their wealth and opulence, not befitting ones who had given themselves over to a life
of poverty. When the Carthusian monks were not at worship, they were instructed to conduct themselves in spiritual exercises (C.C. 29:3). These exercises would have been activities which strengthened a monk’s spiritual resolve, such as reading and studying devotional texts (Cunningham and Kusukawa 2010, xiv). The statutes indicate that each monk was permitted to borrow two books from the library at a time for personal reading and for copying (C.C. 28:3). A number of Carthusian monks wrote their own devotional texts, which were subsequently circulated throughout the Carthusian Order and secular society. One of these was *The Quadripartite Exercise of the Cell*, written by Adam of Dryburgh, a monk of Witham, which instructed the Carthusian monk on the importance of solitude in the cell and the four parts of religious exercise: ‘reading, meditation, prayer and action’ which would bring him closer to God (Pat. Lat. 153, col. 828C). He further expounded on being cautious in speech, even when the monks are allowed to talk, and avoiding ‘foolish, false, and quarrelsome words’ (Thompson 1930, 358). Texts such as this emphasised to the monk the spiritual importance of their silent life, and how they could become closer to God. However, they also functioned as an important tool for members of secular society who wished to reach the divine and attain spiritual salvation (Schirmer 2005, 349).

---

7 The vestments of the church are discussed in further detail in chapter 5 (see 5.3), with evidence from the inventory taken at the Dissolution. Allen (2012) has discussed the decorative Carthusian misericords in Italy, and while the misericord definitely forms part of the Carthusian liturgy, they would not necessarily be decorated. Without any surviving examples from England, it is impossible to ascertain the level of decoration, if any.

8 See Chapter 6 for further discussion of the material culture of reading and writing in the charterhouse.
4.3 Manual Works

The role of the Carthusians in circulating devotional material was inextricably linked to manual labour; a compulsory part of the daily schedule that ensured the monks would not become idle. This was also called purposeful work, as the activities conducted were intended to be useful to the community in some way, rather than manufacturing something for its own sake. This understanding had its roots in scripture, Colossians 3:23-24 reads: ‘whatever you do, work heartily as for the Lord and not for men, knowing that from the Lord you will receive the inheritance as your reward.’ This activity was also seen as vitally important in the battle against the Devil and to avoid the temptations that arise through idleness (Gilchrist 1995, 157). Hanna (1994, 92) further identified that labour provided ‘spiritual excellence’ for an eremitical lifestyle, preventing one from lapsing into a fantasy world, as is possible when in permanent isolation.

A significant number of Carthusian monks worked as copyists, or were involved in book manufacture in some way, as Guigo I writes: ‘we teach copy work to nearly everyone we receive, if possible’ (C.C. 28:2). Each cell was equipped with all items needed to function as a one-person scriptorium (Gilbert 2014, 371). Furthermore, writing and copying gave the monks an outlet which could not be provided in speech: ‘by our hands we preach the word of God, as we cannot by our mouths’ (C.C. 28:3). In this way, the Carthusians could reach the outside world, and be of spiritual benefit to secular society through their writing. In a number of cases from the Sheen Charterhouse, a Carthusian monk copied,

---

9 This refers to Jesus’ temptation by the Devil in the desert: ‘Then Jesus was led up by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted by the devil’ (Matthew 4:1).
or translated devotional texts into English for the nuns at Syon Abbey, across the Thames, as already noted above (see section 2.2; Bodl. MS Laud Misc. 517; GUL MS. Hunter 136). Most importantly, in manual labour the monk was to turn his thoughts always to God, no matter what vocation he chose, and the labour itself should be for the glorification of God alone (Bellitto 2001, 79).

Adam of Dryburgh’s *The Quadripartite Exercise of the Cell* emphasised this train of thought, and further gave advice to the monk, noting that manual labour prevents idleness (which is hostile to the soul), and provides useful recreation (Pat. Lat. 153, col. 881B). By keeping the body busy, the mind was free for contemplation and prayer (Caner 2002, 40; Leyser 1984, 56; Jasper 2004, 27). According to Adam, the work to be done was at the discretion of the prior, and could include binding, illumination, copying, correction, or adornment of books (Pat. Lat. 153, col. 881D). This is significant in that the work the monks were doing was not fuelled by their own desires, but by the needs of the monastery, and they were at all times serving a greater good. It also suggests that although the monks were specifically trained in copying, they could in some cases turn their hand to another facet of book manufacture, when needed.

The type of work a lay brother may have been tasked with was dependent on the specific type of lay brother. There were four classes of laity in the charterhouse: the *conversi*, the *redditi*, the *donati*, and the *mercenarii*. The differences were in the types of vows the brother took or their ties to the charterhouse. The *conversi* were, essentially, lay monks, and could be seen as the ‘true’ lay brother. They took religious vows, wore habits (although in brown, not white), were
restricted to the charterhouse in their movements, and spent their days largely in silence, though continued to conduct tasks such as cooking and baking within the precinct (Thompson 1930, 41-47). The redditi and donati were largely similar, with a few slight differences. The redditi took vows like the conversi, and wore the same habit but were distinguished by not having beards (Thompson 1930, 124). They conducted obediences (manual labour) as the conversi did, but tended to handle the external affairs of the monastery and would go out to the granges. The donati were the oblates of the Carthusian Order; they were not professed members of the community, but by choice gave themselves to the service of the charterhouse through a civil contract instead of vows (Thompson 1930, 123). They were also allowed to leave the monastic precinct, and like the redditi were in charge of external affairs. The mercenarii were hired, secular labourers, who worked the land of the granges under the leadership of the donati or redditi (Thompson 1930, 115).

For the lay brothers, therefore, much of their time was taken up by manual labour, although this was not restricted to one vocation. Some of these vocations would have been solely the domain of the conversi, whereas others could have been taken on by the redditi or donati, such as those which required leaving the charterhouse, generally concerned with livestock or agriculture. The Statutes (46-50) list five different vocations as possibilities for the lay brother: the cook, baker, shoemaker, master of agriculture and master of shepherds. By the end of the fifteenth century, when the Lay Brothers’ Statutes for Sheen (BL Add. MS 11303) were written, this list had expanded to ten different jobs. These were a cook for
the upper house, a butler for the upper house, a cook for the lower house, a baker, shoemaker, smith, gardener, carpenter, master of husbandry, and master of shepherds (Pask Matthews 1930, 222-226; 1931, 112-116). Not only do the statutes list these jobs but they also give specific counsel to the reader as to how these occupations were to be carried out, and how the holder should comport themselves whilst in those roles. For example, the gardener was the keeper of the garden and of the bees and was given a special house where he could keep tools and seeds. He was to weed the herbs and dress the garden and was given help when needed. Where there was no gardener, the cook was to take on this role (Pask Matthews 1931, 113-114). Similarly, the baker was provided with a suitable amount of grain for the year and was charged with drying and grinding it into flour. He was excused from Matins on baking days, and was also in charge of sprinkling holy water around the lay brothers’ cells, which was carried from the upper house (Pask Matthews 1931, 112). The obediences of the lay brothers were vital in keeping the monastery running, rather than as an exercise to avoid idleness, but they were equally expected to turn their thoughts to God throughout their work and understand that their work too, was for the glorification of God, in the maintenance of a religious house.

4.4 Meals

From examining manual labour, discussion now turns to the food and drink of the monastery. The Carthusian view of food tended towards seeing it as only a necessity, rather than a luxury or something to be enjoyed (Jotischky 2011, 43).
It sustained life, but that was its sole purpose. This perspective has its origins in the early Christian hermitic lifestyle, and especially the Desert Fathers (Jotischky 2011, 98). Their belief was that in depriving the body of food and sleep to a certain degree, the body and mind could be separated, and thus one could more closely commune with God (Dunn 2003, 16). This was supported by passages in the Bible such as Luke 6:25, which reads ‘woe to you that are full now for you shall be hungry’ and Luke 12:22-23: ‘do not be anxious about your life, what you will eat, nor about your body, what you will put on. For life is more than food, and the body more than clothing.’ The Desert Fathers further believed that abstaining from meat would inhibit certain desires in the body, such as hunger and lust, which were a further barrier to divine salvation (Dauphin 2001-2, 58).

Likewise, the Carthusian monk abstained from meat completely, eating a pescatarian diet (Hogg 1991, 11). When the Consuetudines were written in the early-twelfth century, the monks fasted three times a week on Monday, Wednesday and Friday, eating only bread and drinking only water, with salt allowed if desired. This was later reduced to fasting once a week (Hogg 2014, 38). On Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays, the monks cooked their own vegetables, which consisted of a mixture of green beans, peas and broad beans, with raw herbs and fruit when available. Wine was provided by the cook, but was always watered down, and was to be drunk only with dinner and supper (Hogg 1991, 12). In 1250, the General Chapter decided that preparing meals was cutting into the monks’ prayer time too much, and therefore they would only prepare their own meals once a month (Boutrais 1934, 180). However, the practice was
abolished altogether a few years later in 1276, and the monks relied entirely on the lay brothers to bring them their meals (Boutrais 1934, 180). From 1259, the Carthusians were allowed a pittance, which was a bequest of food provided by patrons, on Mondays and Wednesdays, which were two of the three fasting days (Harvey 2006, 218). This usually consisted of two eggs or the equivalent per monk, per pittance, which would be added to the normal meal of soup and vegetables (Hogg 1980, 134). Gradually, the pittance was expanded to two eggs plus the equivalent of fish or cheese, although the General Chapter in 1413, 1426 and 1448 gave ordinations that the size of the pittance should be controlled, as certain monasteries were allowing the monks too much food (Hogg 1980, 134). During Advent, however, the monks were not allowed to consume any dairy products, and therefore cheese and eggs were removed from the pittances. On Sundays after Supper, the monks received a small tort of black rye bread, which as a cheaper and coarser alternative to wheat bread, served to remind them that they were Christ’s Beggars (Thompson 1930, 38; Brown 2011, 144). A document dated to 13 October 1535 (TNA SP 1/97, f.132) describes the daily meal of the Carthusians at London between Sunday 10 October and Wednesday 13 October, during the charterhouse’s occupation by the king’s commissioners:

Sunday at dinner: every monk had furmentye, a hot pie of lampreys, and three eggs; the lay brothers, salt fish and cheese. Monday: monks and lay brothers alike had pottage of herbs, plenty of Suffolk or Essex cheese, and three eggs. Tuesday: furmenty, oysters, and a piece of ling for each monk and lay brother. Wednesday: pottage of herbs, a great whiting, and two eggs; for the lay brothers, pottage, oysters, and a whiting to each man.

Ling and whiting were both cheap, white ocean fish, similar to cod, and salt fish was preserved cod or herring, also a cheap commodity. Pottage was a thick stew or
soup made by boiling vegetables, and ‘furmenty(e)’ was made by boiling cracked wheat, to which milk was added, and then sometimes spices and currants, similar to a sweet porridge. However, the lamprey, a fish similar to eels, although not in the same family, were widely eaten by the upper classes during the Middle Ages, and thus suggest an occasional luxury on the part of the monks, perhaps for the Sunday feast. Lampreys do, however, live in rivers and ponds, so could have been easily cultivated by the monks, although no record exists to suggest this.

In the cloister wall of each cell, there was an L-shaped hatch where the monks received their meals and pittances each day. The hatch was so shaped to ensure that there was no contact between the monk and the lay brother delivering the food. Behind the cell, the monks were provided with a small garden, where they could grow vegetables and herbs for themselves to supplement their meals, but they also had covered walkways to allow them to take exercise (Jotischky 2011, 98; 132). Additionally, in the cell was a piped supply of fresh water, which the monks could use for cooking, cleaning, and drinking (Coppack and Aston 2002, 117). At sites such as Mount Grace, the water was sourced from springs in the hillside to the east and piped through well houses to each of the cells (Coppack and Keen forthcoming, 472). This ensured a pure source of water, which would be safe to drink, and fulfilled the needs of the monks’ ascetic fasting days, when only water was permitted.

When a monk was ill, he still abstained from meat, which was unlike any other religious order (Henisch, 1976, 2; Gribbin 2001, 200). Even in those orders that forbade the consumption of meat, this rule did not apply to the sick (Harvey
Because of this avoidance, the majority of the Carthusian monks’ protein was gained from fish. The excavations at Mount Grace Priory found a large amount of fish remains in the kitchen and south-west cloister area (the servery for the refectory), which reveal somewhat the nature of the Carthusians pescatarian diet (Irving and Jones forthcoming, 551).

Fish remains were recovered from all monastic occupation phases at Mount Grace, and are representative of kitchen processing waste. In many cases, the articulated skeleton was collected, indicating that fish were being brought to the site whole, and prepared in the kitchen (Irving and Jones forthcoming, 564). The species of fish consumed at the priory varies across the three phases of occupation, but there is an overall predominance of eel, haddock, whiting and herring, all of which are marine species (Irving and Jones forthcoming, 562). Although this may appear odd, given that Mount Grace had a well-stocked series of fishponds within its precinct, and it was 30 miles from the sea, Harvey (1993, 47) has already shown that marine fish were the typical species consumed by not only monastic communities but also upper-class domestic households. Cod and herring in particular formed the bulk of the fish consumed, whether fresh or preserved, throughout the country in the Middle Ages (Serjeantson and Woolgar 2006, 107). Bond (1988, 74) found that at Bromholm Priory in Norfolk, 17% of the food expenditure was on herring. As Bromholm was a Cluniac house, and the inhabitants would have also therefore eaten meat, one could expect a higher percentage of fish consumption from a Carthusian house. Gribbin (2001, 201) has suggested that the fishponds’ supply of freshwater fish were a luxury,
perhaps eaten on feast days, but generally regarded as an emergency store of food, rather than everyday sustenance. The monks at Mount Grace, therefore, were purchasing fish from a nearby port, as the community at Fountains Abbey purchased fish from Yarm (Irving and Jones forthcoming, 562).

Despite the prevalence of marine fishes, the evidence of the fish remains indicates that the monks consumed a wide variety of species, including turbot and sturgeon. Shellfish were also highly represented, with mussel shells found in the highest numbers, followed closely by oyster shells, which is in keeping with assemblages from other monastic sites nearby, such as Kirkstall Abbey (Irving and Jones forthcoming, 565; Moorhouse and Wrathmell 1987, 152). Documentary evidence from the Benedictine St Swithun’s Priory in Winchester shows purchase of oysters a regular occurrence, and that of mussels, cockles and whelks less so (Bond 1988, 79). Remains of freshwater fish, mostly of the Cyprinidae family (different species of carp) were recovered at Mount Grace, although not in similar amounts to the marine fish (Irving and Jones forthcoming, 559; 564). This is in line with the prevalent theory that freshwater fish were kept for special occasions, and were cultivated in the monastic fishponds (Irving and Jones forthcoming, 559). Carp appears to be the principal stock kept in fishponds, due to easy maintenance, as well as good nutritional value (Bond 1988, 93). One of the most interesting conclusions arising from Irving and Jones’ (forthcoming, 567) discussion of the Mount Grace piscatorial assemblage is understanding what constitutes ‘fish’ to the Carthusian community. In the kitchen, across all three phases of occupation, fragments of seal bones (*Phocidae*) were found
(Irving and Jones forthcoming, 567). Although monastic rules generally forbade the consumption of quadrupeds, the Carthusians did not eat fowl either, but it would appear that marine mammals were suitable for consumption under the very broad category of ‘fish’. These types of marine life may also have been restricted to consumption on special occasions or feast days only, as only six fragments of seal skeleton were recovered, and therefore does not represent a major part of the everyday Carthusian diet. The market at Coventry is reported to have sold porpoise among other fishes, suggesting that it would been available to the Carthusians there, and was not necessarily an unusual foodstuff (Dyer 1988, 30). The case at Mount Grace was not isolated. Bernáldez Sánchez and Bazo Carretero (2013) in a zooarcheological study of the charterhouse of Santa Maria de las Cuevas in Seville found remains of shells from freshwater turtles. In total, 54 complete or partial shells of *Mauremys leprosa* (Spanish pond turtle) and *Emys orbicularis* (European pond turtle) were recovered from a sixteenth-century layer in the prior’s cell (Bernáldez Sánchez and Bazo Carretero 2013, 2578). The authors suggested that the shells were evidence of the prior entertaining guests, as the assemblage was isolated within the monastery, which seems a reasonable assumption, and demonstrates the importance of ensuring guests were fed and treated in a manner befitting their station whilst staying in the community.

**4.5 Silence**

Silence and solitude were the cornerstones of Carthusian life. Through silence, one could commune with God, and hear His word; it was not intended to isolate,
but to provide the opportunity for reflection and to strengthen one’s faith (Belisle 2003, 100). Nissen (2008, 210) has noted that although the Carthusians were seeking seclusion from the outside world, their ‘solitude was not void’, it was communion with God, a ‘solitary togetherness’. At a time where people tended to always be in a group, and seeking solitude could be seen as a sign of lunacy, the Carthusians made silence a safe haven, rather than a threatening position where one was subject to the wiles of mystical creatures who roamed the wilderness (Nissen 2008, 205). Where the Cistercians and Cluniacs used sign language to communicate with one another, the Carthusians refused to utilise any alternative method of communication (Gilbert 2014, 371). The community was warned against idle chatter, meditating on how each and every careless word spoken would be accounted for on the Day of Judgement (MacCulloch 2014, 99).

The importance of silence was highlighted in the Statutes of the Carthusian Order, where Guigo wrote of the inextricable link between a monk and his cell: ‘the cell is necessary to his salvation and life, as water is to fish and the shepherd to his sheep’ (C.C. 31:1), suggesting that the Carthusian monk would not manage well outside the cell, and further emphasising the need to be ensconced in solitude. This refers to the words of St Anthony the Hermit, who wrote of the solitary life in the 4th century: ‘Fish, if they tarry on dry land, die: even so monks that tarry outside their cells or abide with men of the world fall away from their vow of quiet’ (Waddell 1962, 81). The cell was uniquely the monk’s domain, no one, save the prior (and only with express permission) was to enter a monk’s cell, thereby preserving the solitude of the eremitic lifestyle. The cell functioned not
only to ensure silence for the monk, but as a boundary of separation from the outside world, which could distract from the overall goal of communing with God. In theory, there was very little contact with secular society, although urban charterhouses such as London likely felt obligated to maintain a level of secular patronage and involvement due to the situation of their foundation\(^{10}\) (Luxford 2011, 267). However, the Statutes of 1259 maintain that external solitude was only the first step. Internalised solitude, or purity of heart, allowed God to permeate all areas of the monk’s life, and encouraged him to pursue endeavours only if they glorified God (Statuta 4.2).

As already noted in discussing the schedule of Sundays and feast days, the monks were allowed to break their silence when they met together in the cloister to speak on important spiritual subjects, avoiding the aforementioned careless words. The rule of silence applied to all members of the charterhouse, including the lay brothers. There were certain instances when members of the community could communicate. For example, when two or more monks were working on the same manuscript, they were permitted to speak briefly in reference to the work (C.C. 32:1). The lay brothers were bound to keep silence completely from Compline in the evening to Prime the following day, and the conversi who were appointed to an obedience were allowed to talk amongst themselves ‘of profytable & necessariye thynges’, or to the brother in charge, but were forbidden from speaking with the monks, any secular visitors, or brothers from another

\(^{10}\)As each cell had been founded by various secular benefactors, and the charterhouse relied on lay patronage, the laity appear to have been allowed a greater level of access to the London Charterhouse than in other English Carthusian houses.
obedience (Pask Matthews 1930, 220-221; C.C. 45). They were further bound to remain silent during meal times and on Sundays and feast days, much like the monks (Pask Matthews 1930, 220). As will be discussed in the following section, the silence of the monastery could be broken in times of grief.

4.6 Death and Memory

When a member of the Carthusian community was dying, the prior, with some other monks, laid him on a bed of consecrated ashes, and all the monks gathered together to say a litany (C.C. 13:2). When the man had died, he was washed and clothed, then laid on a bier and carried into the church, where the community continued the psalmody (C.C. 13:3-5). If there was time to celebrate the Mass first, the burial would take place that day, if not, on the following day. On the day of the burial, the monks were not required to keep to their cells or their silence, but came together in consolation, and took two meals together (C.C. 14). The grave of a monk was marked with a simple wooden cross, with no name to indicate who lay there\textsuperscript{11}. It is possible however, that a record of the order of burials in the monastic cemetery was kept by the prior, as was the case at Nieuwlicht Charterhouse in the Netherlands (den Hartog forthcoming). The date of the monk or lay brother’s death, with his name would be written into the martyrology, a book which contained the feast days of the saints (C.C. 14:2). Following the burial, a daily Mass was said for the next thirty days in the individual cells of the monks, and a conventual Mass would be said on the yearly anniversary of his

\textsuperscript{11} See fig 3.31 for examples of Carthusian graves.
death (Thompson 1930, 40). Guigo states that both monks and lay brothers were treated the same in death, there was no difference in the liturgy or actions of the day, only the garments of the deceased were different (C.C. 14:3).

The first thirty days after death were the most important for prayer, as this time was seen as when the soul was in greatest desperation and most likely to be influenced by the Devil (Finucane 1981, 45). The prayers said after death were seen to speed the soul to heaven, and ensured that the spirit would be at peace as soon as possible. Prayers and good works done on earth could temper the fires of purgatory, and shorten the time the soul spent there, both before and after death\(^\text{12}\) (Kreider 1979, 41; Rousseau 2011, 3). Marshall (2002, 7) summarised that as the dead did not ascend directly to heaven, but lingered, purging their sins, those remaining on earth therefore felt an obligation to ease the deceased’s suffering in Purgatory.

As Purgatory was such a terrifying prospect for medieval society, great store was set by the intercession of religious persons in praying for souls both deceased and living. The enclosed religious orders in particular were seen as having the most effective intercessory powers, and increasingly following the Black Death, the Carthusians, due to their austere lifestyle, became patronised by a greater number of lay persons. A cursory glance at the data collected from wills (fig. 4.2) shows that there was a sharp spike in the number of bequests to charterhouses between 1325 and 1399, which may be attributed to the

\(^{12}\) A sermon written by John Fisher in 1532 stated that ‘the fyre of Purgatory is more grevous than any maner of payne that can be sene in this worlde, or felte, or yet thought.’ (Fisher 1532, sig. C2). However, the deceased’s stay in purgatory could be shortened: ‘But every daye of penaunce that is done here shall stande there in sted of an hole yere’ (Fisher 1534, sig. A2)
Figure 4.2: Graph illustrating the increase in the number of bequests to charterhouses between 1200 and 1539.
change in devotional practices post-Black Death. In patronising or founding a charterhouse, the lay person often stipulated specific conduct of the monks, such as praying for certain souls, saying a particular number of Masses or other spiritual duties. For a number of the post-Black Death charterhouses, such as London, the monastery was founded not by one single person, but by a syndicate of persons, each founding one or more cells. Wines (2008, 70) has suggested this was a ‘cost-effective’ method of ensuring intercession by the Carthusians, without spending a great deal. However, there were other reasons for founding a Carthusian cell. The prayers of the Carthusians were seen to be the most effective means of intercession, and their austerity therefore attracted the wealthiest benefactors (De Weijert 2015, 261). Across Europe, charterhouses were founded by royal and wealthy benefactors, marking the value placed on the solitary life of the Carthusian (MacCulloch 2014, 115). Three of the British charterhouses were founded by royal patrons: Witham, by Henry II, Sheen by Henry V, and Perth by James I of Scotland. Bernard (2012, 190) has also highlighted the opinion of Henry VII, who believed that the Carthusians’ austerity exceeded that of any of the other orders, a ‘spiritual aristocracy’. The cell essentially functioned as a chantry chapel, the inhabiting monk bound to say Mass for the soul of the founder in perpetuity. When the monk died, another would take over the intercessory prayers. Stöber (2007, 16) noted that the rising cost of intercession prevented many members of the public from founding a whole monastery, but the donation of one cell gave the benefactor the same benefits without the high price. Their donation meant that their names would be written in the necrology
of the house, which recorded the gifts donated (De Weijert 2011, 147). De Weijert (2015, 264) noted that every charterhouse would have been required to keep a necrology, but none of the British or Irish charterhouses’ necrologies are known to have survived. The example from Nieuwlicht in the Netherlands demonstrates how the record was kept, and gives an inventory of the liturgical vessels among other items that were donated to the house, not only on the death of a donor, but also during their lifetime (De Weijert 2011, 160). Bijsterveld (2007, 189) asserted that donations to monastic houses constituted a ‘spiritual trade,’ the donor being compensated with divine rewards for giving alms. A biblical verse reiterates this, reading, ‘And everyone who has left houses or brothers or sisters or father or mother or children or lands, for my name’s sake, will receive a hundredfold and will inherit eternal life’ (Matthew 19:29).

Analysis of a number of wills written during the late Middle Ages from across the country shows that people were specifying the types of intercession they required on their death. This ranges from a simple Mass or obit (taking place on the anniversary of death) to trentals (a series of thirty Masses) and Placebo and Dirige, specific parts of the Office for the Dead (Swanson 2009, 362-363; Duffy 2005, 368-369). Not only were the types of intercession specified, but some more wealthy patrons required the Carthusian monks to say 1000 Masses immediately following their death, in the belief that this would limit the amount of time spent in purgatory. Specific types of intercession allowed members of lower social groups to have access to spiritual intercession, and gain association with a religious house (Brown 2003, 123). Where it was possible to purchase a
single obit or mass, this type of salvation became more accessible to those who would otherwise have had no memorial. Interestingly, of the wills analysed, the will of John Hayne, dated 28 August 1493, gave 3s. 4d. to ‘Frary’ (Somerset Wills 311-312). This would be either Witham or Hinton Friary, coming from the Somerset Wills, but no other examples currently exist exhibiting a specific bequest to the Carthusian lay brothers rather than to the charterhouse as a whole. Unfortunately, the will did not specify what the lay brothers were to do with the money given to them, it may have simply been a gift, but was more likely a request for them to pray for his soul in some manner.

Analysis of wills further indicates the familial ties which may have influenced the decision to leave bequests to the Carthusians. The de la Pole family (fig. 4.3) were frequent donors to the Hull Charterhouse. Michael de la Pole, 1st Earl of Suffolk founded the charterhouse with the money put aside by his father, William de la Pole (1302-1366) for a religious foundation. Both William and his wife Katherine were buried in the charterhouse, Katherine’s will stipulating that she was to be buried in the choir of the church (Test. Ebor. I, 119). Michael’s sister, Blanche, married Richard le Scrope (1327-1403), who gave 10 marks to the house on his death (Test. Ebor. I, 272-278), and his brother, John, gave £20 for improvements to the building when he died in 1405 (Test. Ebor. I, 338-339). Other members of the family continued to patronise the Hull Charterhouse; both of

13 The part of the will dealing with ‘Frary’ reads: ‘to be buried at the entrance of the cloister of the house of the BM of Wytham in Selwode, of the Carthusian Order. To the principal Carthusian House in France 6s. 8d. To the house of Wytham 40s with a silver goblet. To the church of Frary 13s 4d if it be possible, otherwise 6s 8d. To the servants of the house Whitham 14s’ (Somerset Wills, 311-312). This establishes definitely that he intended the bequest to the lay brothers, and not to one of the houses of Friars in nearby Bristol or Bridgwater.
Figure 4.3: The de la Pole family tree, fourteenth-fifteenth centuries.

* See Mowbray/Holland Tree for further details of Elizabeth de Mowbray’s family.

= Benefactor of Hull Charterhouse

* = Benefactor of Hull Charterhouse
Figure 4.4: The Mowbray-Holland Family Tree, fourteenth-fifteenth centuries.

Richard FitzAlan, 10th Earl of Arundel (1306-1376)

Eleanor of Lancaster (1318-1372)

Richard FitzAlan, 11th Earl of Arundel (1346-1397)

Thomas Holland, 1st Duke of Surrey (1374-1400)

Thomas de Mowbray, 1st Duke of Norfolk (1366-1399)

Elizabeth de Bohun (1350-1385)

Elizabeth FitzAlan (1372-1425)

Humphrey de Bohun (1341-1373)

Joan FitzAlan (1347-1417)

Alice FitzAlan (1350-1416)

Henry IV (1367-1413)

Mary de Bohun (1368-1394)

Richard FitzAlan, 11th Earl of Arundel (1346-1397)

Thomas Holland, 2nd Earl of Kent (1350-1387)

Joan FitzAlan (1347-1417)

Humphrey de Bohun (1341-1373)

Alice FitzAlan (1350-1416)

Henry IV (1367-1413)

Mary de Bohun (1368-1394)

Elizabeth de Mowbray (1350-1385)

Henry V (1387-1422)

1 son, 1 daughter

Robert Howard (1398-1436)

Margaret (1391-1459)

John de Mowbray, 2nd Duke of Norfolk

John Howard, 1st Duke of Norfolk (1425-1485)

John de Mowbray, 2nd Duke of Norfolk

John Howard, 1st Duke of Norfolk (1425-1485)

John Howard, 1st Duke of Norfolk (1425-1485)

Elizabeth de Mowbray (1372-1425)

Katherine (b. 1410)

Elizabeth (b. 1411)

Isabel (b. 1415)

= Founder/Benefactor of Hull Charterhouse

= Founder of Mount Grace Priory

= Founder/Benefactor of Axholme Charterhouse

= Founder of Sheen Charterhouse

* See Longespée Tree for further details of Holland’s family.

* Se de la Pole Tree for further details of Elizabeth de Mowbray’s family
Michael and Katherine’s sons, and two of their grandsons either gave money for trental masses or requested burial in the church (Test. Vet. 189-190; Test. Ebor. I, 372-373; North Country 8-9; 50-1). This familial tie to benefaction of a particular house can be seen also in the Mowbray family (fig. 4.4). Thomas de Mowbray, 1st Duke of Norfolk, and father-in-law to Michael de la Pole, 3rd Earl of Suffolk, founded the Axholme Charterhouse, and his son John continued to patronise it, requesting burial in the church on his death, and for the bones of his father (who had died and was buried in Venice) to be returned to the charterhouse (North Country 36-39; Archer 2008). The earliest example of familial benefaction is from Henry II’s foundation of Witham Charterhouse; his illegitimate son, William Longespée founded the Hinton Charterhouse, with his wife Ela, 3rd Countess of Salisbury (fig. 4.5). Their youngest son Nicholas, bishop of Salisbury, left 10 marks to the house on his death in 1297 (Eng. Epis. Acta 37, 515-519). However, there was not always a continued loyalty to a particular house. None of the families of the founders of Beauvale, Coventry (fig. 4.6), Mount Grace and Sheen chose to leave bequests to those houses on their deaths. This of course does not mean that the families did not make donations during their lives, but as the necrologies of the British houses do not survive, it is difficult to establish patronage during the lives of the donors. As Bernard (2012, 200-201) also noted, descendants of founders in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were increasingly unlikely to continue patronage of a specific house, and monastic foundations were decreasing.
Figure 4.5: The Longespée Family Tree, twelfth-fourteenth centuries

Idoine de Camville
- William II Longespée (1209-1250)
  - 2 sons, 1 daughter
    - William III Longespée (1228-1257)
    - Maud de Clifford (1234-1285)
      - Margaret, 4th Countess of Salisbury (d. 1309/10)
      - Alice, 4th Countess of Lincoln; 5th Countess of Salisbury (1270-1348)
- Richard
  - Nicholas (d. 1297)
    - 6 daughters
    - Emmeline Ridelsford
  - Stephen Longespée (1216-1260)
    - * Roger la Zouche
    - Ela Longespée (1244-1276)
  - * Thomas Holland, 2nd Earl of Kent (1350-1397)

Henry II of England (1133-1189)
- Ida de Tosny (d. 1181)
  - Ela, 3rd Countess of Salisbury (1187-1261)
  - William Longespée, 3rd Earl of Salisbury (1176-1226)
  - William II Longespée
    - 2 sons, 1 daughter
      - William III Longespée
      - Maud de Clifford
        - Margaret, 4th Countess of Salisbury (d. 1309/10)
        - Alice, 4th Countess of Lincoln; 5th Countess of Salisbury (1270-1348)
- Henry de Lacy, 3rd Earl of Lincoln (1251-1311)
  - Alice, 4th Countess of Lincoln; 5th Countess of Salisbury (1270-1348)

* See Mowbray/Holland Tree for further details of Holland’s family.
* See La Zouche/Cantilupe Tree for further details of La Zouche’s family

- = Founder of Witham Priory
- = Founder/Benefactor of Hinton Priory
Figure 4.6: The La Zouche-Cantilupe Family Tree, twelfth-fifteenth centuries

Marcelin Braci (c.1163-1232)

William Cantilupe (1159-1239)

Eustachia FitzHugh (c.1249-c.1300)

Nicholas (c.1191-1266)

2 sons, 2 daughters

William II Cantilupe (1185-1251)

Millicent de Gournay (1189-1239)

William (1216-1254)

Eva de Braose (c.1228-1255)

Nicholas, 3rd Baron Cantilupe (d.1355)

William, 1st Baron Cantilupe (1262-1309)

Eve de Boltby (c.1263-c.1313)

Joan de Littlebury (d. 1362)

William, 4th Baron Cantilupe (c.1330-1375)

Millicent (1250-1299)

Eudo la Zouche (1244-1279)

Joan Inge (1290-c.1359)

Maud Lovell (1280-1346)

Eon la Zouche (1298-1326)

William la Zouche, Archbishop of York (1299-1326)

William, 2nd Baron Cantilupe (1293-?)

Nicholas, 2nd Baron Cantilupe (d.1355)

William, 1st Baron Cantilupe (1262-1309)

Eve de Boltby (c.1263-c.1313)

Joan de Littlebury (d. 1362)

William, 4th Baron Cantilupe (c.1330-1375)

Millicent (1250-1299)

Eudo la Zouche (1244-1279)

Joan Inge (1290-c.1359)

Maud Lovell (1280-1346)

Eon la Zouche (1298-1326)

William la Zouche, Archbishop of York (1299-1326)

William, 2nd Baron of Harringworth (1317-1382)

William la Zouche, 2nd Baron of Harringworth (1317-1382)

William la Zouche (1325-1380)

Agnes Margaret de Drayton (c.1341-1391)

William III Zouche (1340-1396)

Margaret Burgh (d. 1451)

John la Zouche (1383-1445)

Eva de Boltby (c.1263-c.1313)

William, 1st Baron Cantilupe (1262-1309)

Nicholas (c.1191-1266)

2 sons, 2 daughters

William II Cantilupe (1185-1251)

Millicent de Gournay (1189-1239)

William (1216-1254)

Eva de Braose (c.1228-1255)

Nicholas, 3rd Baron Cantilupe (d.1355)

William, 1st Baron Cantilupe (1262-1309)

Eve de Boltby (c.1263-c.1313)

Joan de Littlebury (d. 1362)

William, 4th Baron Cantilupe (c.1330-1375)

Millicent (1250-1299)

Eudo la Zouche (1244-1279)

Joan Inge (1290-c.1359)

Maud Lovell (1280-1346)

Eon la Zouche (1298-1326)

William la Zouche, Archbishop of York (1299-1326)

William, 2nd Baron of Harringworth (1317-1382)

William la Zouche, 2nd Baron of Harringworth (1317-1382)

William la Zouche (1325-1380)

Agnes Margaret de Drayton (c.1341-1391)

William III Zouche (1340-1396)

Margaret Burgh (d. 1451)

John la Zouche (1383-1445)

*See Longespée Tree for further details of Holland’s family.
# Se de la Pole Tree for further details of Elizabeth de Mowbray’s family

= Founder/Benefactor of Beauvale Charterhouse

= Founder of Coventry Charterhouse
Of the 184 wills analysed in the course of this thesis\textsuperscript{14}, 29 also requested burial in the church or cloister of the charterhouse\textsuperscript{15} (fig. 4.7). Burial in the cloister (which was the monastic cemetary) was forbidden by the twelfth-century statutes, but the Carthusian General Chapter had agreed that founders and prelates of the house could be buried there (Luxford 2011, 265-266). Evidence from the Nieuwlicht necrology also indicates that non-Carthusian burial did occur within the monastery (De Weijert 2015, 266). The burials were likely to have been in the alley of the Great Cloister, rather than the garth itself, but this location placed the deceased in a location that the monks walked through everyday, where they could be reminded to pray for the dead (De Weijert 2015, 267). By the end of the sixteenth century, the London Charterhouse was burying other individuals as well; Luxford (2011, 268) has suggested that there must have been at least 100 ‘non-Carthusian burials in the church, cloister and chapter-house’. Although no evidence has been found to prove this happened at other charterhouses, requests were made in wills to be buried at the charterhouses of Hull, Mount Grace, Witham and Axholme (North Country 8-9, 36-39, 50-51; Reg. Test. II, 211b; Somerset Wills 41-42; Test. Ebor. I, 119, 325-327; Test. Ebor. II, 166; Test. Ebor. IV, 172-173; Test. Ebor. V, 155-157, 271-272; Test. Vet. 189-190). Only monks and lay brothers could be buried in the Great Cloister garth, and this was further segregated at Nieuwlicht to partition the monks and conversi, buried to the south, from the donati, buried to the north (De Weijert 2015, 266). The church served as a

\textsuperscript{14} See appendix for full details of wills examined in this thesis.  
\textsuperscript{15} A full list of burial requests to charterhouses can be found in: Rowntree 1981, 369-372
Figure 4.7: Graph illustrating the number of recorded burial requests made to charterhouses from 1200 to 1539.
burial location for the most important benefactors, namely the founders and their families, but the chapel, chapterhouse, Great Cloister alley and Little Cloister accommodated all other non-Carthusian burials (De Weijert 2015, 266). The segregation of men and women is highly visible in the claustral burials here. De Weijert (2015, 267) found that within the Great Cloister alley, of the 140 burials, 100 were men, and only 40 women. Conversely, in the Little Cloister, 74 burials were female, and only 14 male. This is one of the ways that the charterhouse was able to accommodate women when they were technically excluded from the charterhouse (De Weijert 2015, 267). The Little Cloister was the most public area, and therefore did not necessarily contradict the rule. When the rule was later relaxed, women were able to be buried in the Great Cloister. Analysed wills also showed that of the 184 bequests made to the English charterhouses, 87% were from male benefactors (fig. 4.8). Similarly, 83% of the burial requests made were from men, which indicates that women were less likely to propose burial in the charterhouse and when they did, most commonly it was because their husbands were already buried there.

Donations to the charterhouse were also taken during the life of the donor. Tiles recovered from the Coventry Charterhouse indicate an important political situation that was evolving at the time of the charterhouse’s foundation in 1381. Of the 382 decorated tiles that were recovered, 20% were armorial, and thus represented a specific person or family, which as Soden (1995, 163) rightly points out, this is a high percentage given that very few (if any) people other than the monks would have seen these tiles. Although an odd method of memorial and
Figure 4.8: Graph illustrating male and female bequests to charterhouses from 1200 to 1539.
benefaction, the tiles may have fulfilled a similar function to the claustral burials at Nieuwlicht, whereby the monks were reminded to pray for their souls as they walked around the cloister. Among others, represented in these tiles are John Burghill, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield from 1398-1414, and John Onley, the Mayor of Coventry in 1396 and 1418 (fig. 4.9) (Soden 1995, 103-104). It is thus evident that from its foundation, Coventry was regarded as an important religious house, worth investing in. In addition to this, three of the Lords Appellant\textsuperscript{16} are represented in the heraldic tiles of the charterhouse: Thomas de Beauchamp, Henry Bolingbroke and Thomas de Mowbray. Thomas de Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick (1369-1401) gave £20 for the construction of cell 7, and is represented in seven of the recovered tiles (fig. 4.10) (Soden 1995, 103). The marriage of Henry Bolingbroke (the future Henry IV) to Mary de Bohun in 1381 is seen in 23 commemorative tiles of differing designs (fig. 4.11) (Soden 1995, 103). Lastly, 7 tiles featured the arms of Thomas de Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk and also the founder of Axholme Charterhouse (fig. 4.12) (Soden 1995, 104). That the Lords Appellant chose to patronise a religious house that Richard II claimed to have founded, indicates the political (albeit inadvertent) role of the Carthusians in the late fourteenth century.

\textit{4.7 Conclusions}

The daily life of the Carthusian was one of routine, following strict and austere

\textsuperscript{16} The Lords Appellant were five nobles who in 1387 sought to restrict Richard II’s rule and to compel the king to agree to a trial of five of his favourite courtiers, which resulted in the Merciless Parliament of February 1388 (Tuck 2011, para. 1). For further discussion of the Lords Appellant and their role during the reign of Richard II, see: Goodman, A. 1971. \textit{The Loyal Conspiracy: the Lords Appellant under Richard II}. London: Routledge.
Figure 4.9: Heraldic tiles of John Burghill, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield (1398-1414) (left), and John Olney, Mayor of Coventry (1396 and 1418) (right) (Soden 1995, 103-107).

Figure 4.10: Heraldic tiles of Thomas de Beauchamp (Soden 1995, 103-107)

Figure 4.11: Tiles commemorating the marriage between Henry Bolingbroke (later Henry IV) and Mary de Bohun (Soden 1995, 103-107).
rules which allowed the inhabitants of the house to commune individually with God. This life of austerity was represented by sparsely decorated buildings that demonstrated the community’s dedication to a life of poverty. The lay brothers too, were subject to a strict ordering of time, and restrictions on when they could and could not speak. The *conversi* in this way were essentially unprofessed monks, and the occupations which were available to them provide context for the recovered material culture associated with lay areas of the monastery, such as the kitchens, stables, workshops and lay cells. That the Carthusian monks were involved in book manufacture is also represented in the material culture assemblages of book fittings, writing implements and illumination materials\textsuperscript{17}. The ways in which the Carthusians were governed by these rules, and how it affected their access to, and interaction with, the buildings around them are of vital consideration before understanding the built environment of the charterhouse, which will be examined in chapter 5.

\textsuperscript{17}The material culture is further discussed in chapter 6

Figure 4.12: Heraldic tile of Thomas de Mowbray, 1st Duke of Norfolk and the founder of Axholme Charterhouse (Soden 1995, 103-107).
Understanding the circumstances of death and memory at the charterhouse means that the archaeology can be better contextualised. The Nieuwlicht necrology, for example, allows individual burials to be named, and indicates how claustral burials, both monastic and lay, were zoned. This, and the evidence from English wills gives insight to familial benefaction, and the ways in which a patron may feel tied to a specific religious institution due to the circumstances of their ancestors’ benefaction. The evidence from English wills also shows that altered devotional practices after the Black Death were in part manifested in an increased number of bequests to charterhouses. Men were six times more likely than women to leave bequests to the charterhouses in their wills, and nearly 5 times more likely than women to request burial in a charterhouse. Lay benefaction also influenced the structural expansion of the monastery, and therefore provides the opportunity to examine the archaeological footprint of these changes.

The following chapter examines the world outside the monastery walls, and discusses how topographic analysis can be used to assess the influence of the Carthusian communities on the local environment. This study lays the groundwork for further archaeological investigation of the two case studies.
The Wider Landscape of the Carthusian Precinct

The local environment of the charterhouse was of great importance for the Carthusians, to whom the wider landscape outside the monastery walls was known as the desert. Dunn (2003, 3) suggests the desert as the location of true religion, where poverty and silence were the most important aspects of life. Biblical references to the desert or wilderness invariably describe it as a frightful place, ‘...the great and terrifying wilderness, with its fiery serpents and scorpions and thirsty ground where there was no water...’ (Deuteronomy 8:15); ‘He shall dwell in the parched places of the wilderness, in an uninhabited salt land’ (Jeremiah 17:6); ‘who led us in the wilderness, in a land of deserts and pits, in a land of drought and deep darkness, in a land that none passes through, where no man dwells?’ (Jeremiah 2:6). These images reinforced the understanding that the monks were sacrificing their lives to live in isolation, with the faith that it would bring greater salvation on the Day of Judgement. The wilderness was a common theme in monastic life, particularly for anchorites and hermits. Dyas (2005, 21) illustrated the importance of this theme in that it evoked a ‘sense of alienation and deprivation, of struggle for survival, of being on a dangerous spiritual knife-edge posed between the horror of eternal condemnation and the hope of redemption’. In this way then, the silence and isolation of the charterhouse challenged the
monks to confront their situation in order to become closer to God.

Where the previous chapter dealt with daily life within the charterhouse, this chapter will examine the various ways in which the Carthusians interacted with, and exploited, their local environment and landscape. To this end, the discussion will begin with an investigation into why specific sites were chosen for the foundation of the charterhouses, and the typical location of the monastery. This will lead into an overview of Carthusian water management, and how the presence of water could affect the siting of a charterhouse, as well as the ways in which the Carthusians exploited water sources to fulfil their needs. Following this, the LiDAR data available for each of the sites will be examined, with an explanation of the technique and the interpretation of data. This section will also discuss how the landscape could affect solitude and the significance of the wilderness at Carthusian sites. Linked to the topography of charterhouses is the influence of the Order on the land, specifically for industries such as mining, fishing and animal husbandry, which will be investigated in greater detail. Finally, the estates of each Carthusian house will be mapped, illustrating the breadth of land ownership, and leading to a discussion of the significance of land benefaction and how Carthusian land ownership could increase their influence on the lay population in the country.

5.1 Siting of the Charterhouse

The solitude of the Carthusian precinct created the illusion of a desert wilderness, which indicates the importance of the idea of isolation, as suggested by Arnold
This was reinforced by foundation stories which bolstered a myth that the monks were living an entirely isolated life, fleeing to the desert from the evils of the world. The myths provided a common theme that connected the community together and helped to delineate their lives from other religious or lay groups (Remensnyder 1995, 3). This was a phenomenon experienced across many, if not all, medieval religious orders. Janet Burton’s (2006, xxxiii) introduction to Byland and Jervaulx’s foundation histories reported that Cistercian narratives follow typical conventions, emphasising a strong spiritual leader in the abbot, the encounter of a desert or wilderness site, and how the monks overcome their struggles through divine intervention. This formula can be similarly applied to Carthusian foundation histories, evidenced through Adam of Eynsham’s description of the establishment of Witham Priory. He discusses how Henry II offered the Carthusians a site in the Royal Forest of Selwood which was in his control entirely, and which he could therefore empty of inhabitants for the religious community (a desert or wilderness site). The king, however, was not forthcoming with funds to build the monastery (a struggle), and when Hugh of Avalon arrived from La Grande Chartreuse (a strong spiritual leader), the monks were living in huts (another nod to the desert site). The monks overcame their struggle through the leadership of Hugh, who ensured a steady stream of funding for the construction of the site, through his intellect and spiritual faith (Magna Vita II, vi).

The theme of isolation and solitude is prevalent throughout the foundation stories of the Carthusians, which refers back to the original flight to the desert
by the Desert Fathers. The silence of the Carthusians also evoked the ‘horror of solitude,’ but was not unique to the Carthusian Order, being a cornerstone of the Rule of St Benedict, and as such, a key element of monastic life in general (Milis 1992, 138). Within the Cistercian Order also, this concept persisted, encapsulated by William of Thierry describing Clairvaux:

There was a sense in which the solitude of that valley, strangled and overshadowed by its thickly wooded hills, in which God’s servants lived their hidden lives, stood for the cave in which our father St Benedict was once discovered by shepherds — the sense in which those who were patterning their lives on his could be said to be living in a kind of solitude. They were indeed a crowd of solitaries. Under the rule of love ordered by reason, the valley became a desert. (Vita prima Bernardi trans. Matarasso 1993, 31).

The solitude of an uninhabited location was ideal for the charterhouse in the same way as it was for the Cistercians. In this place they could challenge their faith in the same environment (as they saw it) as Jesus had when he was tempted by the devil in the wilderness.

The monks had a number of requirements for the location of the charterhouse. In order to create the ‘desert’ required, a site had to be found which could be cleared of people in order to afford the monks the solitude they desired. Dixon (2009, 55) highlighted three main factors in creating solitude: geographical isolation, silence, and social isolation. The rural Carthusian desert fulfilled all of these ideals, and the individual cells furthered silence and social isolation. This was the case at Witham, as previously discussed, where the Carthusians had sufficient space to create an inhospitable landscape to call their wilderness (Coppack and Aston 2002, 27). Alexander of Lewes, who joined the community whilst Hugh of Lincoln was prior, disliked the silence and successful isolation of
the area so much that he described it as ‘a place of horror and empty solitude’ (quoting Deuteronomy 32:10), and promptly deserted the Order\(^1\) (*Magna Vita* II, xi).

The sites were not chosen randomly. Often, as is the case for many monastic establishments, the charterhouse was founded at an already religious site. Witham was given a church originally owned by the Augustinian canons at Bruton, the London Charterhouse was established around Sir Walter Manny’s chapel for the plague dead, and the priory at Axholme was established on the site of a pre-existing chapel to the Virgin Mary, known as the ‘Priory in the Wood’ (TNA E 135/9/15, f. 8). Though Dixon (2009, 55) suggested that solitude requires geographical and social isolation, Merton (1999, 96) wrote, ‘as soon as a man is fully disposed to be alone with God, he is alone with God no matter where he may be — in the country, the monastery, the woods or the city’. This understanding meant that the Carthusians could still maintain their solitude even though they were situated in a busy, noisy city; geographical isolation was not necessarily a requirement in the cases of the urban charterhouses.

A number of charterhouses were built in cities during the Middle Ages, despite the crowded topography of these areas. London (1370), Amsterdam (1392), Venice (1422), Florence (1345), Cologne (1334), Paris (1257), Perth (1429), and Antwerp (1324) are just a few of the cities whose inhabitants included Carthusian monks. By and large, their precincts tended to be situated outside the city walls, a nod to the desired isolation of the Order, but also likely due to the crowded urban

\(^1\) ‘*locum hororidis et vastae solitudinis*’ (*Magna Vita* II, xi)
space. By the time these monasteries were founded, space inside the city was at a premium, and thus the only spaces really available for the charterhouses were outside the city walls (Brown 1985, 79; Johnson 2014, 176). The charterhouses at London, Paris, Perth, and Cologne were established on the edge of the city proper and were slowly subsumed into the urban environment over the years through population increases and the natural expansion of the cities. The houses at Hull and at Coventry were founded just outside the city, which gave them slightly more privacy and isolation than that of London, for example, but the influence of the locality on the monastery was still evident. The bequests of land and property, as will be examined later in this chapter, illustrate strong regional ties to specific city-based charterhouses, indicating the Carthusian influence on the local laity, and equally the reciprocal influence on the monastic community itself. Excavations at London Charterhouse (see Chapter 6 for more detail) found material culture which suggested that local people were allowed entry to at the very least, the outer court (Barber and Thomas 2002). It would be fair to suggest that neighbouring religious houses would also be of influence to the charterhouse, particularly in cities. The London Charterhouse was situated next to the Priory of St John of Jerusalem and St Mary’s Clerkenwell to the west, and the Priory of St Bartholomew-the-Great and St Bartholomew Spital to the south (fig. 5.1). The water supply had to be run through the land of St John’s, for which an agreement was arranged. The monks at Mount Grace maintained spiritual ties with the Cistercians of Jervaulx, as did the Charterhouse at Axholme with Roche

---

2 See Chapter 3 for discussion of lay benefaction and influence.
Figure 5.1: The London Charterhouse in the context of other religious houses.
Abbey, and the Sheen Charterhouse with the nuns of Syon (Cross 2008, 231), whereby devotional texts were exchanged, and discussion of common religious themes held via letters. In the case of one George Lazenby, a monk of Jervaulx, the refusal of the monks of Mount Grace to agree with the King as Supreme Head of the Church inspired him to do the same, resulting in his execution for treason in August 1535 (Cross 2008, 231).

Though the ideal location for the charterhouse was a rural area, devoid of people, and in an inhospitable environment, it was by no means the typical location. As Foreville (1973, 19) asserted, both Witham and the French charterhouse at Liget were surrounded by inhabited areas, despite attempts to clear the area, as it was impossible to close off the religious community entirely from the secular world. The forest areas which they inhabited became the desert, ‘Europe’s version of the Hebraic desert wilderness’ (Schama 1996, 227), and provided the monks with an environment in which they could further withdraw from the world, becoming closer to God (Arnold 2013, 46-47). It was impossible to cut the community off entirely from society, especially in locations where the laity had previously occupied the area. This was the situation at the London Charterhouse, where there was much public opposition to the foundation of a monastery in an area that was considered to be a public open space, and where the laity believed they had the right to attend the church and visit the cemetery (Barber and Thomas 2002, 70; Knowles and Grimes 1954, 21-22). The church of St Mary without Aldersgate, or the Pardon Chapel, was established by Sir Walter Manny to serve the plague cemetery, and was, therefore, considered a
public building which should not have restricted access (Harben 1918). When the land of West Smithfield was given to the monks to build their charterhouse, the Pardon Chapel was appropriated as the church of the monks, preventing lay access. Likewise, the burial places of members of the local community became equally restricted, causing upset to the locality.

Solitude and isolation were not the only advantages of a woodland retreat. Schama (1996, 227) notes that from at least the seventh century, the siting of a monastic house in forested areas stemmed from a need to ‘take advantage of the thriving natural economy’, and not necessarily to withdraw from the secular world, although this was not discouraged. The theory that a monastery could be sited based on the proximity of natural resources is evidenced in the Carthusian use of water within the monastery, as will be discussed in the following section.

5.2 Water Management

Related to the choice of location for the charterhouses, is how the Carthusians utilised nearby resources, and more specifically, water sources. The singular layout of the Carthusian house and the necessity of providing fresh water to each of the cells meant that many of the Carthusian sites were chosen for their good water supply and drainage. For example, Witham Priory sat between the River Frome and another tributary, which allowed it excellent access to fresh water, but also provided a method of drainage for the site (Coppack and Aston 2002, 30).

The Carthusian Order was unique in its method of distributing water to the monastery, as their liturgy stipulated fasting on bread and water only, instead
of the ale traditionally drunk by monks (Coppack and Aston 2002, 117). This meant that a source of fresh water had to be located close to the house, and often had a vital bearing on the choice of location of a site. A nearby spring could provide potable water for drinking, but also had to be sufficiently strong that enough pressure could be built up to transport the water to and throughout the monastery. With the introduction of individual garderobes in each cell, there also needed to be a method of flushing, whether by diverting a stream or by the use of another spring. The systems were not always integral from the beginning; at Mont-Sainte-Marie in Gosnay, France and Mount Grace Priory, at least partial water management systems were included in the original building plans, but the charterhouse in London utilised wells for fresh water for 60 years until a spring was found, and always used cesspits for waste disposal (Bonde and Maines 2012, 633; Coppack and Aston 2002, 124; Bowlt 2003, 121). Likewise, the earlier houses at Hinton and Witham had piped systems added later, although they were sited close to rivers for waste disposal. The differences in the topography of each site and the access to water had a bearing on the layout of each house. Although every charterhouse was built on the same basic layout, they were altered depending on their situation. Consequently, the cloister could be located in any direction relative to the church, and the claustral layout did not need to remain square. The ability to provide water to each cell had a huge bearing on how the house was built.

At London, the water supply was also routed to secular establishments. A contemporary water supply plan from 1430 indicates that after supplying the
charterhouse, water was pumped to four taverns outside the precinct walls, and the springs also supplied the nuns at St Mary Clerkenwell (Greene 1992, 115; Magnusson 2001, 18, CM MP/1/14a). Furthermore, the supply required an agreement from the house of St John of Jerusalem at Clerkenwell, to allow the pipes to be run across their land, indicating a level of inter-monastic discussion and interaction. The level of complexity placed upon a piping and drainage system illustrates the importance of water to the Carthusian Order for maintaining solitude and preventing any need to leave the cell. A similar situation is found at Mount Grace Priory, where the water was supplied by three spring houses set into the hills surrounding the priory. Each of the springs supplied a different area of the priory via lead pipes and settling tanks, ensuring a clean source of water that had not been compromised by waste products (Magnusson 2001, 60). This meant that the priory had one source for drinking water, one for flushing the drains which ran under the monks’ latrines, and one which fed the fish ponds and drove the mill (Coppack and Aston 2002, 30). Coppack and Aston (2002, 30) have suggested that this continuous supply of water so close to the monastery was one of the prime reasons why the site was chosen, as often water was piped over some distance in order to ensure a fresh source.

5.3 Topographic Analysis: Using LiDAR to assess landscape changes

Topographic analysis of the Carthusian sites can give greater detail as to the landscape surrounding the monasteries. LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) data can be used to reveal archaeological features, in the same way that
earthwork surveys do, but at a much faster speed. LiDAR will be discussed here to analyse the potential of the Carthusian sites for further archaeological exploration, highlighting areas that are likely to yield interesting geophysical and archaeological results.

Airborne LiDAR is a remote sensing technique that uses a laser beam to scan the topography of a landscape (Airborne Laser Scanning - ALS), detecting measured variations in height (Devereux et al. 2005, 651). In archaeology, the technique can be used to calculate heights and to reveal landscape features that are invisible in aerial photographs (Crutchley and Crow 2009, 4-5). The best available LiDAR data for the case study sites is currently at 1m resolution.

There are some points to be aware of when using LiDAR data. Paramount is that LiDAR visualisations are still only visualisations, and cannot replace a physical field assessment, as LiDAR can only record limited types of archaeology (Doneus et al. 2008, 891). The data created by LiDAR must be field-verified, and should not be used as the sole method of investigation (Fisher et al. 2017, 3). It is also important to stress that LiDAR investigations can only show above-ground anomalies. It does not detect buried features, and therefore cannot be used in the same way as geophysical surveys.

For the Carthusian sites, the best techniques for visualising the landscape were determined to be the Cluster and Swiss Hillshades, as these methods illustrated the widest range of features, and utilised both directional and complex illumination. Cluster hillshading is a method of relief shading which provides definition to small-scale features through differential lighting across
Figure 5.2: Swiss Hillshade and Cluster Hillshade LiDAR at the site of Witham Friary. The church (red) and dovecote (blue) are outlined.
a landscape (Veronesi and Hurni 2015, 121). This makes it a useful tool for identifying archaeological areas of interest, which tend to be small-scale. Swiss hillshading uses a blue to yellow colour ramp to differentiate between areas of lower and higher terrain (Pingel and Clarke 2014, 228; Kennelly 2008, 569, 575; Jenny and Hurni 2006, 198-200). This gives emphasis to ridges and valleys, and can highlight major topographic features. The combination of both visualisation techniques allows for a more complete view of the landscape, maximising the number of features that can be highlighted.

For the site of Witham Friary, there were no visible features (fig. 5.2). This is likely due to the spatial resolution of the LiDAR data, at 1m resolution, it is not detailed enough to pick up on such small-scale features, especially in a built up area such as the village is. Equally, as there are only a few small open areas of land, it is possible that even a higher resolution LiDAR dataset would not be able to reveal any pertinent features.

The LiDAR visualisations for Witham Charterhouse (figs. 5.3, 5.4), on the other hand, depict a number of interesting features. The central cloister is prominent, and as can be seen from the Swiss hillshade, the southern part of the cloister was ploughed at some point, which explains why the previous geophysical survey had difficulties identifying features in this area of the site. When viewed in this way, it is possible to make connections between the alignment of the cloister with the alignment of an outer boundary, which may delineate the precinct of the upper house.

By overlaying the geophysical survey undertaken by GSB on top of the
Figure 5.3: Cluster Hillshade LiDAR for Witham Charterhouse. The eastern and western edges of the cloister are circled in green.
Figure 5.4: Swiss Hillshade LiDAR for Witham Charterhouse. The location of the cloister is outlined in dark blue, and evidence of later ploughing is highlighted in light blue.
LiDAR data (fig. 5.5), it is possible to identify a number of further features. Where resistivity survey located the area of the cloister garth (also visible in the LiDAR), it was also possible to pick out the cloister walk from a large amount of high resistance material revealed there. The edge of this material correlates with linear features in the LiDAR, which seem to delineate the edge of the cloister walk where the doors to the monks’ cells would have been. Parallel to this, the LiDAR has also revealed the back wall of the monks’ cells, which indicates the length of each cell. Previously, only one cell in the north west corner had been excavated, and the resistivity survey was able to distinguish only a few cells on the western side of the cloister. There is some correlation between the earthworks to the north east of the cloister and the results revealed by resistivity survey, but largely, any topographic remains of the conventual buildings have been destroyed.

On a wider scale, there are a number of earthworks which can be attributed to the landscaping of the site in the seventeenth to eighteenth centuries to create a formal garden for the mansion built by Wyndham in the mid-seventeenth century3 (fig. 5.6). The Wyndham mansion itself is difficult to identify but would appear to have reused the area of the conventual monastic buildings as its footprint. The Beckford mansion on the other hand, is clearly visible in the LiDAR to the south west of the main priory site, with what may be a formal garden to the south of the earthworks, although it also appears that efforts were made to join the Beckford mansion to the formal gardens of the Wyndham mansion, based on the long linear earthwork features in the LiDAR data.

3 See Chapter 7 for further discussion of the post-medieval remodelling of Witham Charterhouse (section 7.2)
Figure 5.5: GSB Survey overlain on Witham Charterhouse LiDAR
Figure 5.6: LiDAR with location of post-Dissolution buildings added.
The LiDAR data for the site of Hinton Priory (figs. 5.7, 5.8) shows well the features which geophysical survey also locates. It is possible to identify the outer south and eastern walls, and part of the western outer wall, as well as a number of dividing walls indicating the extent of each cell. The linear shape of the earthworks to the west of the priory may indicate historic field boundaries, especially as a number of the linear features run perpendicular to the current hedgerow. However, this is the area of the monastic fish ponds, so it is possible that the linear features represent irrigation channels or the fish pond boundaries. To the south east of the priory site, a long curving feature seems to represent a dried-up river bed, which likely fed into the River Frome, to the east of the priory. This would have been a convenient location for any waste water from the Priory to empty, where it would be quickly and easily carried away.

In combining the LiDAR data for the priory with the resistivity survey results conducted by Geophysical Surveys of Bradford (fig. 5.9), the earthworks correlate well with the resistivity anomalies. The LiDAR also indicates a number of features outside the range of the resistivity survey, particularly the linear features on the eastern and southern extents of the survey. These may indicate the presence of an external boundary wall, especially as the features run parallel with the known outside walls of the cells. A linear feature to the north of the main priory site may also be identified as the northern extent of the priory buildings, but this is not certain, although it does match with a linear feature located by resistivity survey.
Figure 5.7: Cluster Hillshade LiDAR at Hinton Priory and Friary. The priory is outlined in pink, and the friary in yellow.
Figure 5.8: Swiss Hillshade LiDAR for Hinton Priory and Friary. The priory is outlined in pink, the friary in yellow.
Figure 5.9: LiDAR with the Hinton Priory GSB survey
The LiDAR data for the site at Hinton Friary provides a better overview of the area than the corresponding data for the Witham Friary site (fig. 5.10). It is possible to identify a number of interesting features in the area of the hamlet. The eastern-most field contains a number of parallel, linear features, which likely represent ridge and furrow from previous ploughing efforts. To the west are many short linear earthworks, which likely represent geological features, due to the steep angle at which this area lies. The area in the middle surrounding Woodman’s Cottage has revealed more short linear earthworks, which may be representative of buried monastic buildings. This area has been surveyed as part of the current research, and so the LiDAR data will be assessed with the resistivity and magnetometer results to provide an overview of the remaining features at the site.

Only three of the other British and Irish charterhouses are suitable for any analysis employing LiDAR, Sheen Priory, in Richmond, Axholme Charterhouse, in Lincolnshire and Mount Grace Priory in North Yorkshire. The reasoning behind this is that for Beauvale, no LiDAR data is available and in Hull, London, Coventry, and Perth, the sites of the charterhouses have been built over, so no earthwork data remains to be examined. Finally, the site of Kilnalahanin in Co. Galway was reused by the Franciscans only 80 years after its foundation as a charterhouse, and therefore the remaining earthworks relate to the Franciscan occupation of the area, not the Carthusian.

For Sheen Priory, the site has become rather confused after its conversion to a golf course in 1892, but a rectangular feature visible on both Swiss and Cluster
Figure 5.10: Cluster Hillshade LiDAR at Hinton Friary, with interpretation.
Figure 5.11: Cluster Hillshade LiDAR at Sheen Charterhouse. The possible location of the north east corner of the charterhouse complex is circled in pink. The conversion of the site to a golf course in the late 19th century has obscured any possible earthworks.
Figure 5.12: Swiss Hillshade LiDAR at Sheen Charterhouse. The possible location of the north east corner of the charterhouse complex is circled in pink. The conversion of the site to a golf course in the late 19th century has obscured any possible earthworks.
Hillshades to the south of the site may represent the remains of the cloister (figs 5.11, 5.12). Both visualisations have also picked up what may be the boundary wall for the inner court, running N-S to the east of the site. It is difficult to pick out any other potential archaeological features, due to later land use.

In 1977, John Cloake created a conjectural plan of Sheen Priory, which, when digitised, can be placed as an overlay to the LiDAR data. On its own, it is not particularly enlightening, although it does give an idea of the scale of the monastery in the fifteenth century (fig. 5.13). The addition of the interpretation from the GSB geophysical survey (Gaffney 1997) shows some details of Cloake’s plan match up with buried remains, but largely there are no earthwork remains to support either plan (fig. 5.14). The reuse of the site as a golf course has likely flattened any earthworks which could have been visible, and immediate post-Dissolution occupation of the site by Lord Lisle is likely the cause for the scant buried remains (Gaffney 1997, 2).

At Axholme (figs. 5.15, 5.16), it is possible to distinguish the back walls of the monastic cells, as they back onto the watercourse running around the site. The earthworks for other conventual buildings north of the cloister may also be identified, although the exact layout of these is undetermined. By layering the resistivity interpretation from the GSB survey (Gaffney 1995a) over the data (fig. 5.17), it is possible to identify a potential cloister garth and a continuation of the moat-type watercourse running north around the cells. The earthworks are, however, sparse, and although the LiDAR here is an interesting addition to other data, it could not be used as a sole prospection technique, as has been already
Figure 5.13: Swiss Hillshade LiDAR with Cloake’s (1977) conjectural plan of Sheen Charterhouse
Figure 5.14: LiDAR data with GSB interpretation and Cloake’s (1977) conjectural plan at Sheen Charterhouse
Figure 5.15: Cluster Hillshade LiDAR for Axholme Charterhouse. The western range of cells is outlined in orange.
Figure 5.16: Swiss Hillshade LiDAR for Axholme Charterhouse. The southern and western ranges of cells are outlined in orange.
Figure 5.17: Swiss Hillshade LiDAR with GSB interpretation overlain
observed at Witham and Hinton. Likewise, the LiDAR data available for Mount Grace Priory (fig. 5.18) is able to provide an interesting view of the landscape and topography surrounding the house, but the resolution is not high enough to give more pertinent results regarding buried features relating to the monastery itself. This method of investigation does allow for an understanding of how the Carthusians exploited the land, such as how water was re-routed around the monastery, which will be discussed in further detail in the following section.

5.4 The Influence of the Carthusians on the Local Landscape

The first and most obvious influence of the Carthusians on the landscape was their clearance of the area surrounding the monastery. In order to create the isolation they desired, at Witham, the forest of Selwood had to be emptied of its inhabitants, who were compensated with land in North Curry, near Taunton (C. Wells, 352-353). This occurred within various religious orders in England, who were given licenses to assart land, which made it suitable for cultivation (Burton 1994, 237). In Nottinghamshire, Barley (1957) investigated the case of the Cistercian Rufford Abbey, whose land clearances led to the desertion of three villages, all the inhabitants being resettled elsewhere. This illustrates the power of the monasteries, and the importance they placed on keeping their lands free of lay interference.

The Carthusians’ exploitation of land reached further than simply removing local inhabitants from the area of the charterhouse. Both of the Somerset charterhouses owned granges in the Mendip Hills, for Witham at Charterhouse-
Figure 5.18: Cluster and Swiss Hillshade LiDAR at Mount Grace Priory. The great cloister is highlighted in red, and the gatehouse is circled in green.
Figure 5.19: Copy of a medieval drawing of the Mendip hills, including Greenore and Hydon Grange (circled in red) and Lachemere Pond (circled in blue) which Hinton Priory owned a lease for (Gough 1967).
on-Mendip, or Hydon Grange, and for Hinton, the sites at Green Ore and Whitnell (fig. 5.19). The land at Charterhouse-on-Mendip had been mined for lead by the Romans (Fradley 2009), and in 1283 the Carthusians were granted the right to work all lead mines they found on their land, and to keep any profits arising from them (TNA C66/102, m.11), although there is scant evidence to suggest that the Carthusians ever explored this industry (Aston 2000, 148). The charterhouse in Nottinghamshire, Beauvale, leased out a coal mine they owned in Newthorpe from 1380 (Bond 2004, 341), which contradicts the desire of the Order to remain outside secular landholdings and tenancies.

The grange held at Charterhouse-on-Mendip was also used to keep sheep, although more is known about Hinton’s granges. The Carthusians owned two sleights at Green Ore, and one at Whitnell, in the Mendip Hills, where they kept flocks of sheep (Brett 2012, 148). By 1538, when the prior of Hinton, Edmund Horde, sold the lease on the land to his brothers Robert and Alan, they also took on 400 sheep, although it was noted that the sleights could hold up to 1200 beasts (Brett 2012, 148). Indeed, in a 1577 dispute, one of the witnesses, a 92-year-old man, who remembered the last three priors of Hinton, recorded that the Carthusians were keeping 1000 sheep in a sleight on Mendip during the early sixteenth century (Dunning 1991, 39). The meadows at Green Ore were also used to produce hay, stored in barns at the grange, as was St John’s Meadow, owned by the London Charterhouse from 1376 (McLean 1981, 51; Barber and Thomas 2002, 68). Hay was used as a fuel, as well as to feed livestock, and to fill the mattresses of the monks and lay brothers. Not all of the charterhouses farmed
their own lands, however. The charterhouse at Coventry was granted an indult in April 1419 to let their land to lay farmers without requiring diocesan licence (Cal. Pap. Reg. VII, 141). The London Charterhouse owned an orchard nearby as well as a kitchen garden and fishponds, despite their city-based location. Following the suppression of the London Charterhouse, two of the commissioners, Thomas Legh and Richard Layton supervised the removal of property from the monastery and its reallocation to secular persons. This included:

to the King’s gardener for his garden at Chelsea all such bays, rosemarie grafts, &c. as were meet for his Grace’s garden…To Mr. Richard Cromwell’s gardener, all such bay trees and grafts…Dr. Billowse’s servant had two carload of hay…Sold and delivered to Mr. Pickering by Dr. Cavys commandment all the wheat and malt in the house…To the cater of my lord Privy Seal’s house three baskets of herbs…To the King’s gardeners out of the orchard of the Charterhouse 3 tree grafts of all sorts…in all 91 trees…Delivered to Mr. Semer and Mr. Smyth…last 200 carps…Delivered to Foyerwyll pond to Dr. Layton 100 carps for the King’s store…Delivered to Dr. Layton…a bundle of rosyers. (TNA SP 1/139, ff. 148-152)

Evidently then, the location of the charterhouse did not mean that the monks and lay brothers had to rely entirely on local produce and merchants to keep the house. They were at least semi-self-sufficient, having a fishpond, orchard and a seemingly large herb garden which would supplement their simple diet.

As the Carthusians were keeping sheep, they also needed to sell the wool somewhere. As early as 1225, the priory at Hinton had been granted permission to hold a yearly fair in Norton on the feast of St Philip and St James (30 April, 1 May, 2 May) (Brett 2002, 167; TNA C53/46A, m. 6). A total of eight grants were made to the priory concerning fairs and markets until 1353, including a weekly market on Fridays and Tuesdays, and another yearly fair on the day of the Decollation
of St John the Baptist, 29 August (Brett 2002, 167; TNA C53/73, m.7; C53/80, m.15; C53/130, m. 17; C53/132, m.5; C53/133, m. 19; C53/138, m. 4). On the 27 April each year a cloth fair was held in Norton St Philip, selling woollen cloth in the churchyard and linen cloth in the George Inn (Dunning 1983, 40; Gazeteer of Markets & Fairs, Somerset). The George Inn still stands in Norton St Philip, three miles south of the priory. Interestingly, the last charter made, in 1353, allows the May fair to be extended to five days instead of three (TNA C53/138, m. 4). That the charterhouse requested licence to hold a fair demonstrates a certain level of secular involvement and an understanding of the needs of the local community. Though the fair allowed the priory to sell the wool that was cultivated by the lay brothers at their granges, the impact of two large markets a year for the area should not be underestimated. The fairs continued despite the disruption caused by the Black Death at the end of the 1340s (Brett 2002, 167). The fairs were well known, and the priory was able to make good profits, as they charged 4d. per pack of linen cloth stored at the George Inn, on top of the profits from the fairs themselves, which were taken by the prior (Brett 2002, 172; Williams, Penoyre and Hale 1987, 317); the profits amounted to 60s. per annum as recorded in the Valor Ecclesiasticus in 1535 (Brett 2002, 172). Williams, Penoyre and Hale (1987, 317) noted that Somerset traded a considerable amount of wool and cloth in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries to nearby ports such as Bristol, Southampton and London for export to the Flemish and Italian cloth markets, and therefore the Inn at Norton was well situated to take part in this trade. The George Inn also functioned as a stopping place for visiting merchants and travellers who could
not be accommodated at the priory, which must have become an issue by 1375 when the Inn was built (Bond 2004, 264).

Due to their position in the Royal Forest of Selwood, the Carthusians at Witham were given special privileges by the crown. In 1251 notice was sent to ‘all foresters, verderers and other bailiffs and ministers of the forest’ that the charterhouse was ‘quit for ever of regard’ (TNA C66/62, m. 1). This grant was repeated in 1534, when the liberties of the charterhouse at Beauvale was in question, and so the prior of Witham, Richard Peers, made clear that the Carthusians had been given the right by Henry II and Henry III to ‘franc-plege, wayf and strey, blodwyte’ and that ‘alle the kinges dere that come within our boundes we have hunted and kylled’ (TNA SP1/86, f.57). The Carthusians at Hinton were also given free warren in their lands by Henry III in 1259, allowing them to kill any game which they hunted in the forest (TNA C53/49, m.1). This exemption really only applied to the lay brothers, who would be the ones doing the actual hunting. The lay brothers at Hinton were also granted permission to tan hides at the Friary and sell them, after disputes had arisen between the Carthusians and local tradesmen over the price of the hides and the wages that the Carthusians were paying to secular workmen (TNA C66/254, m. 19).

The Carthusians used their complex knowledge of water management systems to divert rivers in order to flood fishponds near the charterhouses. Before 1232, dams were built over the River Frome to create fishponds at Witham and to serve a mill, and from 1525 Hinton owned a lease on a pond called Lachemere, which was stocked with bream, tench, perch and roach (Dunning 1991, 38;
Coppack and Aston 2002, 30). Even the London Charterhouse had a fishpond nearby which apparently yielded 300 carp per year (TNA SP1/139, ff.148-152). As was discussed in Chapter 4, however, the ponds seem to have kept fish for emergencies, or special occasions, as the accounts for the London Charterhouse in 1492-3 indicate purchases of large amounts of sea and river fish (Barber and Thomas 2002, 61), and the lease for Hinton’s fish pond states ‘for the comfort and sustentacion off them and their successor in tyme commyng… [in case they] myght have noo Fysshe from the seey’ (TNA STAC 2/32/42).

5.5 Carthusian Estates

The types of land that the Carthusians were given varied, including granges, tenements, churches and alien priories as well as some urban properties in various cities. A cursory look at the estates of each house shows that Sheen (fig. 5.20) and London (fig. 5.21) were patronised far more than any of the other houses, and owned property across the country. At other houses, such as Beauvale (fig. 5.22), Hinton (fig. 5.23), Witham (fig. 5.24) and Hull (fig. 5.25) there are indications of a strong regional tie to their lands, likely given as part of the original endowment, or given by local benefactors. The three remaining English houses, Axholme (fig. 5.26), Coventry (fig. 5.27), and Mount Grace (fig. 5.28), owned property that was more dispersed and located further afield from their own precinct. Axholme’s properties were mostly located around Coventry. This spread of properties does seem to have caused some problems for the English charterhouses, as notes from

---

4 Alien priories were small religious institutions that were directly controlled by foreign religious houses.
Figure 5.20: Map of estates owned by Sheen Charterhouse
Figure 5.21: Map of estates owned by London Charterhouse
Figure 5.22: Map of estates owned by Beauvale Charterhouse
Figure 5.23: Map of estates owned by Hinton Priory
Figure 5.24: Map of estates owned by Witham Charterhouse
Figure 5.25: Map of estates owned by Hull Charterhouse
Figure 5.26: Map of estates owned by Axholme Charterhouse
Figure 5.27: Map of estates owned by Coventry Charterhouse
Figure 5.28: Map of estates owned by Mount Grace Priory
the General Chapter in 1425 indicate that the province was ordered to consolidate their estates, in keeping with the customs of the order (Hogg 1987, 65; LPL MS 413, f. 58r), although this never actually came to fruition, and many of the houses continued to hold land and parishes despite the rulings of the Consuetudines and the General Chapter. The earlier houses, Witham and Hinton, appear to have kept to the statutes more stringently than later monasteries.

The Carthusian Order was also granted a number of alien priories when the monks of these houses were expelled in 1378\(^5\), and their lands were given to other religious institutions, which was completed during Henry V’s reign in 1414. The Carthusian Statutes (41:1) gave specific instructions as to the ownership of property, which reads ‘the inhabitants of this place [the charterhouse] can possess absolutely nothing outside the limits of our desert. Namely, neither fields, nor vineyards, nor gardens, nor churches, nor cemeteries, nor oblations, nor tithes, nor anything of that sort’. This was obviously ignored by the fourteenth century when charterhouses in England began to be endowed with large areas of land. Coppack and Aston (2002, 26) asserted, however, that the priories could own only as much land as was needed to support themselves, and any surplus crops or goods should be donated to local religious houses in need. For Hinton and Witham, the original endowment gave them only the original manors of their precincts, whereas the houses established from Beauvale (1343) onwards, are given much larger holdings. Dependent on the land they were given, they

\(^5\) In April 1403, Beauvale Charterhouse was granted the alien priory of Bonby in Lincolnshire, which was a cell of St Fromond Priory in France. The grant included the possessions of the priory, including the rectory of the parish church, pensions of 13s. 4d. of two churches and the advowson of a further three churches (TNA C 66/369, m. 31).
were able to increase their influence in the area. As has already been discussed, Beauvale owned a number of coal mines, which were given to them as part of the original endowment, and allowed them to lease them to lay miners creating a new stream of revenue for the charterhouse. The house at Sheen is somewhat of an exception. As a royal foundation of Henry V, it was endowed with a great number of manors and churches from its establishment, with few later additions (Jurkowski and Ramsay 2007, 486-491).

Rosenwein (1989, 38) noted that secular benefactors often gave land, and particularly churches, to monastic houses because it ensured remembrance after their death. They would be buried in the monastic cemetery and would be memorialised in the masses for the dead, but the foundation (and therefore giving of land) of monasteries also functioned as a status symbol for many elite patrons (Milis 1992, 32). The fact that a charterhouse could be easily founded by more than one person (as exemplified at the London Charterhouse), lent itself to the popularity of the order by the laity in the later Middle Ages, as it allowed those lay persons unable to found a whole monastery to still reap the benefits of a founder. Duby (1962, 174) also postulated that the reason for gifting land to a monastic order was in to expiate one’s sins; ‘an act of piety deserving salvation’. This theory has already been referred to in Chapter 4, with the discussion of wills, but the gift of land represents a much larger commitment to a religious order, and therefore with the expectation of a larger return, such as burial in the monastic cemetery and perpetual remembrance.

Those who gave land to the charterhouses, such as Hugh de Cressy of
Selston, and his wife Cecilia, did so with the expectation of a return, in this case, they gave the gift of the manors of Kimberly and Newthorpe to Beauvale, on condition that Hugh would receive a pension of £7 10s. during his life from the priory, or should his wife Cecelia survive him, she would receive £4 11s. (BL Add. MS 6060, f. 32). Likewise, Henry de Lacy, 3rd Earl of Lincoln gave the hamlet of Midford to the charterhouse at Hinton in 1275, on the proviso that the monks would pray for his soul (Feet of Fines, 237). This case, however, indicates familial ties, as Henry was married to Margaret Longespée, the great-granddaughter of William and Ela Longespée, who founded Hinton Charterhouse. As has been indicated in Chapter 4, familial connections were often factors in the benefaction and patronage of a particular religious order or monastic house, and this was no different for the Carthusian Order.

5.6 Conclusions

The desert wilderness of the Carthusians was a clear barrier to the outside world, whether the house was situated in a city, on its fringes, or nestled in an uninhabited valley, and was bolstered by foundation stories which gave credence to their origins, tradition, and daily practice. For the rural houses, the availability of natural resources was of vital consideration, and the water management could alter the layout and orientation of the monastic complex. The provision of water and removal of waste can be explored further in the archaeological record; fragments of lead pipe were recovered from the London Charterhouse, and the drainage channels behind the cells and Mount Grace Priory are still visible. The
topographic analysis examined in the course of this chapter has demonstrated that earthworks related to resource management and building remains can be identified through LiDAR data, and how this method is useful for viewing a large area of land quickly. In order to give a more accurate understanding of the landscape, the resolution of the LiDAR data would need to be greater than 1m, as currently, the results for the friary sites, and Witham Friary in particular cannot be used to increase knowledge of these areas.

In addition to the bequests which were discussed in the previous chapter, benefaction of land was another method utilised by the laity to ensure safe passage for their souls after death. Further, the exploitation of this land provides an interesting view of the relationship between the Carthusians and their secular patrons, as each impacted on the other, in particular through wool fairs held by Hinton Priory and the income the monks gained from rents on mines and land. That the Carthusians were able to grow food and herbs, and cultivate livestock and fish meant that they did not need to rely solely on local produce⁶, and therefore decreased the amount of secular interaction that was required. The sheep sleights and granges of Witham and Hinton on the Mendip Hills have never been archaeologically investigated as concerns the monastic occupation of these areas, although this would increase understanding of the agricultural business of the communities, and may give insight into the lives of the lay brothers who maintained the granges.

⁶This self-reliance is not a uniquely Carthusian attribute, all monastic houses grew crops and tended livestock, but within the realm of Carthusian isolation, being able to avoid secular interaction made self-sufficiency an even more desirable objective.
The following chapter will examine the archaeological material recovered from three key sites, and compare assemblages in order to address how the lay brother can be identified as archaeologically distinct from the monk. This will also discuss what the material culture can demonstrate about the lives of inhabitants of the monastic landscape.
Material Culture of the Charterhouse

This chapter discusses material culture excavated from English charterhouses, and how this evidence can be used to gain a better understanding of the religious men who inhabited these monasteries. The study of material culture recovered from excavations at charterhouses allows for insight into a peculiar environment. The nature of the monks’ cells, encircled by high walls, made them particularly isolated, enclosed areas, providing excellent conditions to examine one particular individual’s possessions at one point in time: the eve of the Dissolution. This opportunity is unparalleled elsewhere, as the walls allow for a minimal migration of materials from one distinct area to another (Coppack 2008, 174). At no other monastic site is it possible to investigate the personal preferences of one specific person, especially in comparison to other individuals in close proximity. This singular setting allows for a study of the occupation of the last inhabitant of each cell at the Dissolution and sheds light on some of the activities of the Carthusians in the 1530s.

The aim of this chapter is to assess the material culture of five English charterhouses in order to understand their utility in investigating the monks and lay brothers themselves. This chapter is divided into two parts. The first part will compare material culture recovered from Mount Grace Priory with excavated assemblages from London, Coventry, Hinton and Witham to assess
the similarities and differences, and what conclusions may be drawn from this evaluation. This section will investigate the types of ceramics used by the monks, whether domestic or imported and the importance of other small finds located within individual cells. This discussion will also introduce documentary evidence for personal belongings, as a method of identifying items that may be expected to be found within the cell. The remainder of the chapter is devoted to examining how the lay brother can be researched through material culture, and what insight this brings as to the living standards of those men compared to the Carthusian monks. To this end, three categories of finds have been analysed: pottery, items relating to book manufacture, and dress accessories. This is in no way an exhaustive list, and does not include all the items recovered from the sites, but allows for a detailed discussion of the main types of materials excavated from the charterhouses, and the occupations of the inhabitants.

The three categories of material culture were selected because their functions encompass a number of different areas of monastic life. The ceramic evidence addresses not only food and cooking, but also the furnishing of the cell, as well as the networks of consumption available to the charterhouse. Largely, the pottery has been examined as a whole, rather than on a cell-by-cell basis, as many of the cells featured very few ceramic finds, so it was more appropriate to discuss the entire assemblage. The items related to the creation of books are concerned with the manual labour of the monks, the inter-monastic channels of communication, and how the monks were able to influence secular life through their religious writings. Finally, the dress accessories can be used to infer social
status, conspicuous consumption and the material environment of not only the monks and lay brethren who inhabited the charterhouse, but also their secular visitors.

6.1 A Comparative Study of Monastic Material Culture recovered from English Charterhouses.

Mount Grace Priory is one of the most fully excavated charterhouses in England and therefore provides an excellent case study to examine the material culture. As the assemblage is so rich, and can give so much information about the monastic occupation of the site, the Mount Grace finds will be used to drive the discussion throughout this study. Prior to Coppack and Keen’s excavations, Sir William St John Hope conducted archaeological investigations at the site in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century (Hope 1905, 271). These investigations only partially excavated some of the cells, and so they cannot be taken as representative of the whole assemblage, as finds excavated by Hope were not included in Coppack and Keen’s study (Coppack and Keen forthcoming, 100), and will not be considered in this current investigation.

In order to establish how typical Mount Grace was for an English charterhouse, the material culture has been compared with other excavated houses at London and Coventry, founded in 1371 and 1385 respectively. Looking again at the categories of ceramics, writing implements, and dress accessories, it will be possible to assess these cell assemblages for similarities between the houses. The two Somerset houses, Witham and Hinton have also been integrated into the
discussion, providing a rounded view of the furnishing of the cell. However, for the site at Hinton Priory, unfortunately, no trace remains of any material culture. The excavation reports written by Major Philip Fletcher (1951, 1958) make no note of any finds other than worked stone, and his correspondence with the Ministry of Works equally offers no contributions to an understanding of the material culture (TNA, WORK 14/2006). This is disappointing, and no archive is mentioned where items may have been deposited. It must be surmised that any objects that had been found are now lost or remain in a private collection.

Figure 6.1: Chart showing the percentage of domestic and imported ceramics excavated at Mount Grace Priory.
6.1.1 Ceramic Cooking and Dining Vessels

The ceramic evidence from Mount Grace has allowed for accurate dating of each cell or area of excavation. In total, 4137 sherds were excavated, representing a minimum of 1651 vessels (Coppack and Keen forthcoming, 528). The great majority of the pottery sherds recovered are of domestic wares, with imported goods making up only 17% of the total (fig. 6.1). Within these broad categories are a wide range of fabrics, from plain utilitarian vessels to the more decorative items for display. For analysis of fabric types, the sherds excavated have been grouped into four categories, illustrated in figure 6.2.

The distribution of the ceramics was well spread across all of the cells and the rest of the site. No one cell boasted a particularly high percentage of any one group of fabrics. It should be noted, however, that Cell 8 was more thoroughly excavated than any other, and provides a better view of the construction of the cell and build up of materials. The domestic wares cover a large range of fabrics, and represent the majority of the sherds excavated, from particularly local styles, such as Brandsby-type ware and Humber ware, to fabrics like Midlands Purple, which were manufactured at other English kiln sites. The fabric types excavated from Mount Grace Priory show that domestic wares by far represented the greater part of the total assemblage. This is to be expected, since the vessels were cheaper and more readily available than those that required importation. Certainly, Ryedale wares made up the great majority of jugs excavated from the site. For other vessels, pancheons were mostly of early sixteenth-century Sandy ware, and mugs were of Cistercian ware or German stoneware. Cooking pots were largely made
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domestic Wares</th>
<th>Imported Coarsewares</th>
<th>Imported Stonewares</th>
<th>Imported Tin-Glazed Earthenwares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gritty wares</td>
<td>Low Countries Red</td>
<td>Siegburg</td>
<td>South Netherland Maiolica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandsby types</td>
<td>Pisa Slipware</td>
<td>Langerwehe</td>
<td>Pisa Maiolica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough wares</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raeren</td>
<td>Valencia Lusteware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humber wares</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beavais</td>
<td>Columbia Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Gritty wares</td>
<td></td>
<td>Westerwald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hambleton wares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryedale wares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Humber wares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-medieval Orange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-medieval Sandy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands Purple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands Yellow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cistercian wares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cistercian copies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversed Cistercian wares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudor Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire wares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.2: Types of pottery excavated at Mount Grace Priory according to categories
of local gritty wares and these vessels would have fulfilled more than one type of function. They were likely used for not only cooking, but also storage of foodstuffs and other functions outside of the kitchen (Willmott 2018, 698). Accordingly, the majority of the ceramic fabrics represented at Mount Grace were not indicative of any particular high status, including the imported goods. German Stoneware such as Raeren, Langerwehe and Siegburg was mass-produced and traded across Europe in the sixteenth century, being a cheap, hardwearing material, and which was already flooding the market of north-west Continental Europe (Gaimster and Nenk, 1997, 173; Hurst, Neal, and van Beuningen 1986, 176). The fabric was one that could have been found in any status household during that period and does not represent a luxury item (Roebuck, Coppack, and Hurst 1987, 18). The mugs, in particular, were especially cost-effective compared to their wooden counterparts (Courtney 1997, 98). Despite this, imported stonewares made up 14.38% of the vessels or 591 sherds. This is likely due to its renown as being cheap and hardwearing, as well as being impervious to liquids, unlike coarsewares. The imported coarsewares and tin-glazed earthenwares were not as popular. This may be due to expense, or simply that the fabrics were not as popular or as easily available in Northern England at the time.

Equally, the presence of South Netherlands Maiolica and other tin-glazed earthenwares, albeit in small portions, are of similarly modest standards, which would have been relatively easily available and cheap (Hurst 1999, 91; 95). The two-handled South Netherlands Maiolica flower vase was the most popular vessel of this fabric. Some featured monograms reading ‘IHS’, suggesting that
they may have been used for private devotion, explaining their presence in the cells of the Carthusian monks (Hurst, Neal, and van Beuningen 1986, 117; Hurst 1999, 91; 95).

Only the Valencia lustreware, of which 2 sherds were found in cell 8, suggests a slightly higher level of status. This was an admired vessel fabric, manufactured in rich blues and copper tones, and made by Islamic craftsmen in Valencia and Andalusia between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries (Henisch 1976, 171). Gaimster and Nenk (1997, 175) have suggested that this type of luxury ware was a status symbol, indicating perhaps that this was a gift from a lay patron. It has been noted, however, that it would be rather archaic to own a Valencia dish in the 1530s, as it was supplanted by Netherlands tin-glazed ware, suggesting this was a vessel that had been passed from monk to monk and well looked after (Roebuck, Coppack and Hurst 1987, 20).

Furthermore, the presence of Columbia plain earthenware was also rather unusual. This is a Spanish fabric, which was issued to Spanish sailors, and was quickly imported to the Caribbean and wider Spanish colonies. It is the second most common fabric found on Spanish shipwrecks and in North American colonial settlements, rarely occurring on English sites (Marken 1994, 139; Deagan and Cruxent 2002, 153). At Mount Grace, a bowl and a dish of this fabric were recovered from the garden of cell 8, and are thought to have been deposited at the Suppression (Coppack and Keen forthcoming, 166-167). The presence of Columbia plainware and Valencia lustreware indicate that the monk who was in possession of these vessels had direct contact with Spain, either via a Spanish visitor, or
because he was himself Spanish (Roebuck, Coppack, and Hurst 1987, 20). The deed of surrender holds the signatures of all the monks present at the dissolution of the monastery, and none appear to be of Spanish heritage, indicating other links to Spain (TNA E 315/234). Coppack and Keen (forthcoming, 520) have further postulated that the presence of these vessels indicates Mount Grace’s high status within the monastic landscape. However, their presence may also be evidence of a network of both monastic and lay contacts for Mount Grace. Both Doyle (1989a, 130) and Cariboni (2013, 47) have noticed that by sending monks from current monasteries to found new ones, or to help those in difficulty, close-knit networks were forged that allowed channels of trade to open up. Certainly, monks from the Low Countries were sent to found Sheen Charterhouse, and following the Dissolution, the remaining Carthusian monks fled back to the Low Countries where they established the charterhouse of Sheen Anglorum (Doyle 1989a, 130).

The circulation of texts discussed by Doyle (1989a) also includes individuals at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge who were recipients of Carthusian-manufactured texts, as well as other lay people. As it has been established that there was already a flourishing book network, there seems no reason to exclude the trade or gifting of ceramic items from these social networks, and a number of charterhouses had been founded in Spain by the time of the Dissolution in the 1530s.

The suggestion that these ceramics were not being imported specifically to Mount Grace, but were instead being brought with the monks themselves as they relocated to the North Yorkshire priory from elsewhere is not impossible.
There are many records of English monks staying in Europe and vice versa. One Dan Henry was professed at Bruges, but died at Hinton in the late-fifteenth century (Thompson 1930, 284); Dan Richard Dixton of Axholme was also a monk of Hinton, stayed at Mont-Dieu and died at St Martin’s in Naples in 1473 (Thompson 1930, 286) and in 1429 Dom John Joliis was sent from Beauvale to the Charterhouse of the Holy Spirit at Gosnay in France (Thompson 1930, 287). Despite the restrictions on the monks owning personal property, certain items for furnishing the cell would have likely been maintained and used by one person, and therefore transferred with the monk.

The example of Thomas Golwynne, a monk of the London Charterhouse, exemplifies this transferal of goods perfectly. Golwynne relocated to Mount Grace Priory in January 1520, and a document dated to the 25th of that month lists all the items which he brought with him (TNA SP 1/19, f. 169). The following passage refers to vessels he carried with him:

Be yt Remembyrd that I Dane Thomas Golwyne monke professyd of the howse of London hadde wt me by the lycens of the honorable Fader prior of the sayd howse of London Dan Wylliam Tynbegh: when I departyd from London un to Mownte Grace All these thinges under wrytten the xxv day of January in the year of owre lord ml cccccxix…

…Item a lytell brasyn morter wt a pestyll gven by the gyfte of a frende of myn
Item ij pewtyr dysshes ij sawcers an a podynger & a lytell square dysshe for butter
Item a new chafyng dysshe of laten gevyn to us and ij new tyne botylles gevyn by a kynsman of owrs
Item a brasyn chafer that ys to hete in water
Item a brasse panne of a galon gevyn to us lyke wyse…
…Item a dwbyll styll to make wt aqua vite that ys to say a lymbeke wt a serpentyn closyd both yn oon.
Although monks were prohibited from owning personal property, this does not seem to have been enforced quite as stringently as one might expect. Golwynne explicitly refers to items that have been given to him by lay patrons. ‘by the gyfte of a frende of myn’, ‘gevyn by a kynsman of owrs’. The vessels he brings with him - a pestle and mortar, dishes, saucers, podinger (poringer), butter dish, chafing dish, bottles, chafer, pan and a double still - are largely for cooking purposes, items one may expect to find in the cell. Golwynne does not specifically mention ceramic items, but as Henisch (1976, 174) and Brears (2012, 222) have suggested, often ceramics would not be seen to be worth noting, as largely disposable, they could be easily replaced and represented no great value for the owner (Hammond 1993, 103). The items listed are of the greater value, and it may have been that Golwynne would have been supplied with ceramic vessels when he reached Mount Grace, removing the need to carry them with him (Coppack and Keen forthcoming, 523). Largely the items are made of brass, spelled ‘brasse’ or ‘brasyn’, with the exception of the pewter dishes. These are not expensive materials, but they would be long lasting, not as fragile as ceramics. There was a ready market for these vessels at the Suppression, as the metal could be melted down, and this is most likely the reason why no examples of metal vessels were excavated from Mount Grace (Roebuck, Coppack, and Hurst 1987, 23).

It has been suggested by Coppack and Keen (forthcoming, 525-6) that the Carthusian monks would have been issued a standard set of ceramic items for their cell from a central store, which seems to be represented in the archaeological record by the high number of local wares such as Ryedale ware. This ware
constituted 31.8% of the total vessels excavated, and is by far the largest group of ceramics (fig. 6.3). This centralised distribution questions how far personal preference may be accounted for, if the monks were all provided with the same items. The theory of a central ceramic store is further exemplified by the chapter from the Carthusian statutes on the furnishing of the cell. This passage (C.C. 28.5) illustrates the items given to the monk for cooking and eating, to be kept for his own use:

...And since, like other necessary tasks which suit abjection and humility, we also make for ourselves our kitchen, the hermit is given two pots, two bowls, a third for bread or in its place a towel. A fourth bowl, quite large, is used for washing; two spoons, a knife for bread, a pot, a cup, a receptacle for water, a salt cellar, a small plate, two small bags for vegetables, a hand towel. For fire, two small logs, tinder, a flint, a stock of wood, and an axe. And for work, a curved axe...

Whether the vessels stated above would all be ceramic is debatable, as although it has been established that pottery made up a lot of tablewares, storage vessels, cooking pots and urinals, this evidence comes solely from the archaeological record, rather from any contemporary documentation (Roebuck, Coppack and Hurst 1987, 20). It is likely that some items would be wooden, being easier to produce quickly within the precinct. Certainly, the dishes would be wooden or metal, as ceramic dishes were not produced in England until the seventeenth century (Willmott 2018, 702).

Another passage in the Statutes reads ‘For all monks, but us especially, should certainly wear humble and used clothing, and everything else we use should be worthless objects, poor and meagre.’ (C.C. 28) It could be suggested,
based on this statement, that the ceramic products the monks owned not from the central store, were donated to the priory, likely from wealthy benefactors or patrons, and therefore there was no choice on the part of the monks as to what quality or quantity they were given.

Overall the ceramic assemblage from the site seems to fit with the norm for monastic sites in North Yorkshire. Comparison with the assemblage from Kirkstall Abbey, also in North Yorkshire, indicates that Mount Grace had a much wider range of wares. At Kirkstall, 98.67% of the excavated pottery was domestic (Moorhouse and Wrathmell 1987, 66-70), and of that, only 3.36% was non-local, coming from the Midlands, and the south-east (Moorhouse and Wrathmell...
There were also very small amounts of imported wares excavated from Kirkstall: stoneware constituted 1.16% of the assemblage, while tin-glazed earthenware was only represented by 0.17% of the 595 vessels (Moorhouse and Wrathmell 1987, 66-70). There was no imported coarseware. It should be noted, however, that the Kirkstall assemblage was located largely in service areas, as well as some pieces from the cloister and refectory, compared to the majority of Mount Grace’s pottery being situated in the cells.

Mount Grace’s wider assemblage may stem from the international nature of the order, the acquisition of items by individual monks from different locations, and the collection of pottery in one specific individual place, rather than communally, as in a conventional monastery. However, the large presence of Ryedale ware, a fabric local to Mount Grace, is highly suggestive of a central store of ceramics to supply the monks from. Every cell featured at least one sherd of Ryedale, and it is likely that this was a readily available, cheap fabric that the monks could easily get hold of. The ceramic evidence from Mount Grace indicates both its high status as a monastery, and its desires for austerity, an interesting combination, which demonstrates the varied and international nature of the charterhouse.

The pottery assemblage from the London Charterhouse was not quite as extensive as that of Mount Grace, and the excavation was not able to recover the whole site. Nonetheless, a large range of fabric types was located, utilitarian Borderwares being the most numerous, with some imported ceramics also (Blackmore 2000, 3). The most noticeable thing about the London assemblage is
the high number of local wares compared to Mount Grace (fig. 6.4). This is true for Coventry as well. At both sites, between 92% and 95% of the pottery consisted of local fabrics, compared to only 85% at Mount Grace. This may be explained by London and Coventry’s close proximity to a number of pottery centres, and therefore there was no need to import other fabrics (Goddard 2004, 58; Orton 1979, 358; Blackmore and Pearce 2010, 19-20, 235-236; McCarthy and Brooks 1988, 73). Soden (1995, 91) noted that at Coventry, a large proportion of tablewares and storage vessels in local fabrics were found in the cells, where these fabrics were not found elsewhere on the site. This suggests that the house’s central store of dining vessels were only of local fabrics, and an alternative, perhaps harder-wearing fabric was preferred for cooking vessels.

The site at Witham, on the other hand, produced few items which may be compared with the other assemblages. The pottery was very sparse, with only 39 fragments recovered (Burrow and Burrow 1990, 171). These were mostly jugs and cooking pots, and the majority of the sherds were recovered from trench XIII, which was the garden of the only cell excavated. The excavators decided that the small size of the assemblage did not justify further analysis, and so there is no information as to the fabric type of any of the sherds. The assemblage would merit reanalysis in comparison with other Carthusian sets of finds.

### 6.1.2 Writing and Book Manufacture Implements

Although a number of religious orders manufactured books both for their own and secular use, none surpassed the Carthusians in their circulation of texts,
Figure 6.4: Chart comparing the proportions of domestic and imported ceramics recovered from excavations at Mount Grace Priory, London Charterhouse, and St Anne's, Coventry.
extending their network beyond Britain, and conspicuous in their leading role in the manufacture of books (Doyle 1989b, 114). Six of the cells surrounding the Great Cloister at Mount Grace provided evidence for book manufacture within the charterhouse (fig. 6.5). Within these six cells, it is possible to identify five distinct occupations of the monks. In order to examine the material culture succinctly, this section will evaluate the finds within these occupations of scribe, corrector, illuminator, binder and printer.

Guigo I, the fifth prior of La Grande Chartreuse was a propagator of learning and book production. He ensured that in writing the Carthusian Statutes all those entering the house would be trained as scribes. The statutes outline the items a monk would be provided in his cell for book production: ‘And for writing: a writing desk, pens, chalk, two pumice stones, two inkwells, a knife, two razors to level the surface of the parchment, a punch, an awl, a lead weight, a ruler, a board for ruling the page, tablets, a writing stylus’ (C.C. 28:2). Guigo also discussed the spiritual benefits of the books, describing them as ‘immortal food for our souls’, (C.C. 28:3) and explained that as the monks are unable to leave the cell to conduct charitable works in secular society, this is their way of contributing to the spiritual well-being of the public: ‘Because we cannot preach the word of God by mouth, we may with our hands’. However, the Carthusians’ skill in book production cannot only be attributed to Guigo’s enthusiasm. There are other factors in this, including the growing desire by lay persons to have access to devotional texts, and the understanding that the laity were able to access religion by listening to these texts, of which more will be discussed in the
Figure 6.5: Layout of Mount Grace Priory, indicating cells 8, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14, where objects relating to book manufacture were recovered (Map after Historic England)
course of this chapter. The Carthusians were not the only order to produce books, but from the early thirteenth century, book production was not the main focus of other orders’ manual activity, and members of secular society began to work as scribes (Thomson 2008, 166). However, as Doyle (1990, 13) has stated, ‘the monastic order for which proportionately the most explicit evidence survives of book production by its members is the Carthusian’. Book production thus became an important element of Carthusian identity in Britain.

Although only 12 books have been linked by Ker (1964, 132) to Mount Grace, Doyle (1998, 122) notes that a further 106 books are known to be of Carthusian origin, but are yet to be assigned a house. This is due to a number of factors, including the movement of the monks across the country and continent, making it is often difficult to establish a place of origin, especially without an ex libris or scribe’s name. Furthermore, the Dissolution of the Monasteries meant that many books were lost, and as book lists for the English charterhouses have not survived, it is impossible to say how many may have been destroyed or taken to other charterhouses abroad following the suppression.

Figure 6.6: Example of margin pricking to guide ruled lines from BL Lansdowne MS 1201, f. 9r. This manuscript belonged to Sheen Charterhouse, and contains rules for the Carthusian Order. Image source: Author 2016
The production of books began with animal skins (sheep, goat, or calf) that had been stretched, scraped, and dried (Howsam 2016, 140). These skins were cut to the desired dimensions, and collected into sets of 4 sheets (8 pages) or 5 sheets (10 pages), to make a quire (Howsam 2016, 142-3). These quires were not constructed into a book, however, until the writing and illuminating was finished. First, margins were pricked onto the page to guide the rulings using a parchment pricker or awl (fig. 6.6). Next, lines would be ruled on the page, using a ruler and a writing lead. This ensured the writing would be straight and each line would be equidistant from each other. Though quills may have been used for writing (Thomson et al. 2008, 81), copper alloy pens are more likely. They could be used on parchment or paper, and were longer lasting than quills, and pens of...
this type dating to as early as the thirteenth century have been found in London excavations (Egan 1998, 271). In cells 10 and 11 a number of items definitely related to writing were recovered (fig. 6.7); pens, writing leads, graphite, and book mounts or clasps which may have been accidentally disposed of or which were scraps ready to be recycled and reused.

Ready-made inks were available to the charterhouses, but it is likely that the monks made their own ink, as a grinding stone was recovered from cell 12. If letters were to be illuminated, the scribe would leave space for these to be filled in, although there are many examples of where this did not happen such as the example of letters patent from July 1461 granting Hinton Charterhouse 50 marks annually (fig. 6.8) (TNA E 328/310). The scribe would then write out the text and may have highlighted capital letters in red, a process known as rubrication (fig. 6.9). Later readers often wrote notes in the margins also, as in this example from BL Harley MS 2373, f. 15v (fig. 6.10)

Although no specific cell for a corrector has been established, it is highly likely that one of the monks would have been responsible for correcting the
Figure 6.9: Examples of rubrication from BL Harley MS 237 f. 3r (above) and BL Add. MS 61823 f. 3v (left). The second example shows where the scribe has noted the letter to be added. These manuscripts were both owned by Mount Grace, the first featuring a variety of theological treatises and the second a copy of *The Book of Margery Kempe*. (Images sources: Author 2016)

Figure 6.10: Folio 15v from BL Harley MS 2373, where a reader has added notes to the margins of the manuscript. The Manuscript was made at Mount Grace Priory in around 1450 (Image source: Author 2016).
Figure 6.11: Examples of correction of manuscripts in red ink from BL Add. MS 37049, f. 10v (above left), BL Add. MS 61823, f. 19r (above right). (Images sources: Author 2016).

Figure 6.12: Manuscripts where space has been left for another monk to add the correct sentence. On the left (BL Add. MS 37049, f. 31r), the additions have been made in red, but on the right (BL Lansdowne MS 1201, f. 35r), the additions have been made in black ink, and in a distinctively different hand to the original scribe. (Images sources: Author 2016).
manuscripts before they were bound together. Examples from a Carthusian miscellany attributed to one of the Northern charterhouses (BL Add. MS. 37049) show a number of pages which have been corrected in red ink (fig. 6.11). In some cases, the scribe would leave space, perhaps where they were unsure of the correct translation, for the corrector to add the right sentence in, and this was also done in red (fig. 6.12). The scribe would have also been instructed to leave space for any decoration or illuminated letters (Morgan 2008, 93). Coppack (2008, 174) has already asserted that Cell 8 contained large amounts of scrap metal, likely ready to be melted down and recycled into new book fittings. Largely these scraps are of book mounts or clasps, but also present are the tongs or pliers (fig. 6.13) used to manipulate the metals, and a paint or inkwell which contained a red pigment of some sort, along with part of what may have been a pen. The presence of these last two objects suggests that the binder may have needed to do last minute correction.

Cells 12 and 13 contained items perhaps more associated with illumination (fig. 6.14), such as the oyster shell palettes, and the grinding stone, as well as finds such as tweezers, which may not be immediately obvious, but were used for placing gold leaf onto the page. Similarly, the writing leads recovered from cells 10 and 13 were likely used to trace the outline of figures or letters to be illuminated onto the page before colouring, or for ruling lines before writing (Morgan 2008, 92). The outlines being drawn, colour would have been added next, the inks held in oyster shell palettes, and white highlights were sometimes added to give depth to the image (Morgan 2008, 94). Finally, the outlines were redrawn
Figure 6.13: Items related to binding excavated from Cell 8 at Mount Grace Priory. 88 - pliers, 156 - part of a pen, 164 - paint or ink well. (Coppack and Keen forthcoming).

Figure 6.14: Objects associated with illumination excavated from cells 12 and 13 at Mount Grace Priory (Coppack and Keen forthcoming).

Figure 6.15: Lead-drawn illustration of Queen Elizabeth I, filling the ‘O’ of ‘omnibus’, never fully illuminated, from a document detailing the sale of granges owned by Hinton Priory (TNA CRES 38/514/6/1). (Image source: Author 2016).
in black ink, and detail added (Morgan 2008, 94). As with the spaces left by scribes for lines of text, some manuscripts were never fully illuminated, and were left with either a space or the empty lead-drawn outline on the page, such as in a document from December 1574, selling the granges previously owned by Hinton Charterhouse (fig. 6.15) (CRES 38/514/6/1).

The coloured inks found in the oyster shell palettes in cells 12 and 13 are indicative of some of the colours used to illuminate letters and images in the books they were producing. Both green and red pigments were found at Mount Grace (Coppack and Keen forthcoming, 233, 232), although the examples of illumination from a book copied at the London Charterhouse indicates a much wider range of colours (fig. 6.16).

The illumination completed, the quire would be passed to the binder, who collected all the quires together to bind them into one volume. The quires were sewn with a thick thread to straps of leather along the width of the spine (Gullick and Hadgraft 2008, 103). These straps were then attached to stiffened boards to make the cover, and then the whole volume was covered in leather, which was sometimes dyed (Gullick and Hadgraft 2008, 104). Fastenings may also have been added, which tended to be leather straps attached to a catch or clasp, or mounts
added to the covers, which prevented the leather from getting too worn (Gullick and Hadgraft 2008, 105). Not all manuscripts were bound, however. Some were attached to a simple parchment cover, or remained in loose quires. This may have allowed them to be more easily transported (Clemens and Graham 2007, 50).

A casting mould for gothic type was recovered from Cell 11, and suggests an attempt at printing (fig. 6.17). Experiments with the mould have proved that
it would have been possible to cast metal letters from it (Sessions 1983, 109), and the letter shapes are similar to that of handwritten documents of the period. The printing could not have been large scale, but it has been suggested by Coppack (2008, 176) that they may have been attempting to print letters of confraternity for secular visitors or benefactors. Handwritten letters are known to have been given out to members of the public (Coppack 2008, 176), but the evidence suggests that the monks of cells 11 and 14 were trialling printed letters of confraternity.

In addition to this, lead plaques were recovered from Cells 10, 11, and 14, with the raised retrograde phrase ‘iefus nazarenus’ (fig. 6.18), and it has been suggested that these are evidence of a different type of industry amongst the monks, and are related to the sale of indulgences. As Mount Grace lay on the pilgrim route between York and Durham, Coppack (2008, 176) has suggested that the monks may have been trying their hand at printing indulgences to sell to pilgrims staying in the guest house. The intercession of monks was highly valued, as evidenced in various royal foundations¹, and in the numerous bequests to the monks, so it is likely that this was a plausible and lucrative business (Hughes 1988, 76, 110). Sessions (1983) suggested that Mount Grace was the location of one of the first printing centres outside London and Westminster. However, as Coppack (2008, 176) clearly states, until one of these printed documents is discovered, this remains a theory.

The monks, as demonstrated by the material culture, were ‘producing books on an industrial scale’ (Coppack 2008, 175), likely to be distributed not

¹See Chapter 4 for discussion of the intercessory value of the Carthusians
only to other charterhouses but also to the secular world. Both Mount Grace and Beauvale copied religious literature for their secular patrons (Hughes 1988, 109), and at the foundation of the London Charterhouse in 1371, the bishop of London, Michael Northburgh, wrote to the houses at Witham and Hinton informing them that it was their duty ‘to teach and edify others’ (Hughes 1988, 108). In August 1532, John Houghton, the Prior of the London Charterhouse, wrote to the Cologne Charterhouse (who owned a printing press), ordering ten copies of the opera of Denys the Carthusian, and twenty copies of *De contemptu mundi* and *Scala religiosorum*, as the English Carthusians were unable to keep up with the public demands for these books (Jones and Walsham 2010, 121; Erler 2013, 127). Large (1975, 202) has suggested that Houghton had hoped that loaning copies of the works of Denys the Carthusian to members of the public would ‘prove conducive to the conversion of many who had fallen into heresy’. This may also, however, refer to the impact of hearing the books being read, and preaching on those topics. Although it is not stated, it must be assumed that these heretical persons must have been able to read at least basic Latin in order for the texts to have any effect on their spiritual health. Whilst the Carthusians did translate texts into the vernacular, such as the *Orologium Sapiencia*, it is unlikely that those ordered from Germany by John Houghton were printed in English (Brantley 2007, 53).

The Carthusians’ use of the vernacular in the great majority of their texts points to an ideal for greater accessibility of spiritual texts than using Latin, which isolated a large portion of the population. Vincent Gillespie (1989, 317) noted
a growing desire of the laity to read texts previously limited to the cloistered religious. He demonstrates this through the second translation into English of Thomas Kempis’ *De Imitacione Christi*, and Suso’s *Orologium Sapientie*, which were both made at the request of lay people (Gillespie 1989, 319). Key to this is also the realisation of the potential of devotional texts for lay audiences, and even those members of the clergy who were less literate (Gillespie 1989, 318). Even if the public were unable to read the texts, they were still able to access the divine by listening to someone else read the texts out loud, and so English translations were vital.

The assemblage of items relating to book manufacture is very interesting at Mount Grace Priory because they can be linked to several specific cells, allowing for an interpretation which places scribes, illuminators and binders in their own specific environments. The presence of printing materials adds a new facet of understanding, suggesting that the monks, perhaps inspired by the printing press recently installed at the Cologne Charterhouse, were pursuing a different type of industry, and manufacturing letters of confraternity. This illustrates their connection to the outside world despite their inability to leave the cell.

Comparison of writing implements between Mount Grace, Coventry, and London draw some interesting points. At London, only one find referred to as a ‘possible’ book clasp was located from the whole site (fig. 6.19) (Barber and Thomas 2002, 69). This very low
recovery rate may be due to excavation bias but is more likely to stem from the method in which the charterhouse was dissolved and subsequently re-used.

From 1535, the London Carthusians were under observation by the King’s commissioners, following the execution of John Houghton, the previous prior. For two years, members of the King’s court confiscated possessions of the monks and attempted to convert them to Protestantism (BL Cotton Cleopatra E/IV, ff. 42-43). It is possible that during this time, the number of books being produced, and therefore the number of writing implements required had significantly diminished, leading to a smaller archaeological record. The monks leaving the priory in 1537 also took the items of their cell with them, leaving only those tools which were of no further use (TNA SP 1/139, f. 148) As previously discussed, the monastery was later used as a store, and the cells were rented to families. This immediate reoccupation of the site, unlike Mount Grace, which was left derelict for many years, may have contributed to the low recovery of writing implements and book fittings.

Similarly, the charterhouse at Coventry yielded few writing implements or items related to book manufacture (fig. 6.20). Two stylus points or parchment prickers were found in the garden of Cell III and in the church (Soden 1995, 129). In the garden of Cell III was also a corner reinforcement piece for a book (Soden 1995, 129). Three other book reinforcement plates were found during the excavation, one within grave 37, which was located in the nave of the church (Soden 1995, 49, 73, 129). The only other item was a finely worked bone handle, thought to be part of a stylus or awl (Soden 1995, 126).
Figure 6.20: Items relating to book manufacture recovered from Coventry Charterhouse (Soden 1995, 128, 130).
Although not as low a recovery rate as in London, the finds from Coventry are still few. The item found within grave 37 likely belonged to a secular benefactor, as Carthusian monks tended not to be buried in the church, but in the garth of the great cloister. Coventry also had close relations with local society, much more so than Mount Grace. Without an excavation of the whole site, it is difficult to draw conclusions comparative to Mount Grace, as only four of the cells were excavated at Coventry. With the significantly reduced size of excavation, it is not surprising that fewer items relating to book manufacture were recovered.

At Witham Charterhouse, two mounts and a plate were recovered relating to book manufacture, all in copper alloy (fig. 6.21) (Burrow and Burrow 1990, 173). Although no writing implements were recovered, it is unlikely that the Witham monks were not involved in book manufacture. In fact the author of Liber de quadripartito exercito cellae, a treatise on the four-fold spiritual contemplation of the cell, was a Witham monk, Adam of Dryburgh (Herbert McAvoy 2011, 59-60; Thompson 1932, 483), and one of the most prolific Carthusian scribes, Stephen Dodesham began his profession at Witham (Doyle 1997, 96) so there must have

Figure 6.21: Book manufacture objects excavated at Witham Priory (Burrow and Burrow 1990, 174).
been some provision for writing, copying and binding.

6.1.3 Dress Accessories

The category of dress accessories refers here to items which are used both functionally in dress, such as pins and buckles, as well as those decorative items such as strap ends and mounts, which serve as a highly visible indicator of social status. The items are often made of metal, usually copper alloy or iron, but can be also be made from bone. This section will consider the dress accessories excavated at Mount Grace Priory by functional type, and relate them to available documentary sources, allowing for some reconstruction of monastic life at the priory.

Dress accessories can be interpreted as simply indicating the types of clothing worn by an individual, but on a more personal level, they indicate the status of that person, or the persona they wished to project. For monks, this may be characteristics such as humility, poverty, and modesty. Although items such as belt fittings could be highly decorative, dress accessories served a higher purpose in the ‘construction, maintenance and subversion of identity’ (Cassels 2013, 2). Despite being everyday items, the objects were symbolically significant, defining the socio-economic status of the wearer, at a time when these items were worn ubiquitously by all levels of society (Cassels 2013, 3-5).

At Mount Grace Priory dress accessories were recovered from the south west cloister range, the kitchen, and cells 8-12 and 14 (fig. 6.22). The location of these finds can be indicative of the status of the owner, as areas such as the kitchen would have been exclusively the environ of the lay brothers, and as such,
one can expect to recover items in keeping with the activities conducted here.

Buckles were attached to leather straps, and used to fasten articles of clothing. In some cases, buckles were also used on shoes (Egan and Pritchard 2002, 53). Egan and Pritchard (2002, 50) have articulated how difficult it can be to differentiate between buckles used for horse equipment, and those used for dress, as both categories use similar forms and materials. The buckle plate provided a more secure means of attaching the buckles to the leather strap (Egan and Pritchard 2002, 55). A single piece of metal would be folded around the frame of the buckle and attached to the strap with rivets (fig. 6.23). Where a plate was not used, the leather was folded back on itself around the frame, and secured with stitching (Egan and Pritchard 2002, 55). Aesthetically, the flat surface of the buckle plate could be decorated (Egan and Pritchard 2002, 56).

Similar to the buckle fittings, belt plates could be added to a leather strap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Buckle</th>
<th>Buckle Fitting</th>
<th>Belt Fitting</th>
<th>Lace Chape</th>
<th>Pin</th>
<th>Mount</th>
<th>Strap End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cell 8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell 14</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Cloister</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.22: Numbers of dress accessories excavated from different areas at Mount Grace Priory. (After Coppack and Aston forthcoming)
Figure 6.23: Different types of buckle, and how they were attached to straps (After Egan and Pritchard 2002, 51).

Figure 6.24: Structure of mount and attachment to leather or fabric (After Egan and Pritchard 2002, 162).

Figure 6.25: Different ways of finishing a lace chape (After Egan and Pritchard 2002, 282).

Figure 6.26: Different methods of manufacturing strap ends (After Egan and Pritchard 2002, 125).
for decoration. Mounts were further used in this manner, providing a means of decorative expression for the wearer. Mounts were often made from sheet metal, incised with designs, and attached using a rivet through the leather (fig. 6.24). As with the buckles, there is no way of differentiating between mounts that were used as dress accessories, and those used for furniture, book covers, horse harnesses or animal collars (Egan and Pritchard 2002, 162; Cassels 2013, 42).

Lace chapes, also known as points, or aiglets were tubes of metal attached to the ends of laces to prevent fraying and to facilitate threading through eyelets in clothing (Egan and Pritchard 2002, 281). They were manufactured from sheet metal rolled into tubes, with a straight seam down one side. There were a number of methods of finishing the chape, either with an edge-to-edge or overlapping seam, and a finished end or folded tab (fig. 6.25). Chapes would be used on shoelaces, but also on lacing for hose and dresses.

Pins were used widely in dressing ladies’ hair, but in a monastic setting, they would have been used to fasten pieces of clothing, for example to hold the edges of a gown around the shoulders (Egan and Pritchard 2002, 297). Thicker pins were also used to fasten heavy outer garments (Egan and Pritchard 2002, 297).

Strap ends were attached to the end of a belt strap. Manufactured from sheet metal, some were folded from a single sheet and attached with rivets, and some were made from two separate sheets, joined together with rivets (fig. 6.26). They protected the end of the leather or fabric strap, and prevented it from being worn away, whilst also facilitating it being passed through the buckle loop
(Cassels 2013, 36). Furthermore, they provided another space for decoration on the clothing (Egan and Pritchard 2002, 129)

The number of items recovered from Mount Grace Priory relating to dress is not vast. There may be some confusion with mounts which could be used both on belts or on books, as they are similar in size and shape, so cannot always be distinguished. A number of buckle fittings were recovered (fig. 6.27), as well as a large number of lace chapes (fig. 6.28) and pins (fig. 6.29). Belt fittings were similarly popular (fig. 6.30). Comparison with the religious sites assessed by Standley (2013, 12) shows that the assemblage is fairly average as concerns frequency of items. The great majority of items were manufactured from copper alloy which as a relatively cheap metal, Standley (2013, 17) suggests would be more suitable and in keeping with the ideals of humility and poverty. This was also in keeping with the Sumptuary Law enacted in 1363, which restricted the types of metals that could be worn by the lower classes, leaving copper alloy as suitably low-status material (*Statutes of the Realm* I, 380-382).

The inventory of clothes for Dan Andrew when he moved to Witham, is both useful on its own and in conjunction with the statutes (TNA E135/2/46). Dated to the reign of Henry VII, the inventory lists a habit, 5 kirtles, a cowl, and another of wool, a woollen shirt, 2 caps, a singlet, 2 lined coats, a pilcher, a pair of short hose, a pair of socks, and a shaving cloth. These are all common items to be owned by a monk of the charterhouse. The woollen shirt is likely the same as that in the statutes, a hair shirt.

Similarly, the statutes list cowls, socks, caps, pelisses and tunics (C.C. 28:1).
Figure 6.27: Buckle fittings excavated from Mount Grace (Coppack and Keen forthcoming).

Figure 6.28: Lace chapes excavated at Mount Grace (Coppack and Keen forthcoming).

Figure 6.29: Pins excavated at Mount Grace (Coppack and Keen forthcoming).

Figure 6.30: Belt fittings excavated at Mount Grace (Coppack and Keen forthcoming).
The shaving cloth may be a sort of face towel, but could refer to the sharpening strap for the razor. The statutes also list a belt and four pairs of shoes (C.C. 28:1), which have more lasting material elements in the archaeological record than the aforesaid items. Belt fittings such as strap ends and buckles were among the assemblage from Mount Grace, as were a large number of lace chapes from the ends of shoelaces or other lacing (Coppack and Keen forthcoming, 574-575).

The statutes specify that the Carthusian monk should wear ‘humble and used clothing’ and therefore no items of particular luxury (C.C. 28:1). Likewise, neither the assemblage nor Dan Andrew’s list gives any indication of high status items:

Imprimis iij habytes as they come by cowrse
Item ij newe stamyn shyrtes and j olde
Item ij newe stamyn colys and j olde
Item ij newe hodys and j olde
Item a new coote lynyde & an olde mantell
Item a wyde sloppe furryd to put over all my gere by the gyfte of my lady Conway
Item a newe cappe and an olde
Item a newe pylche of the gyft of Mr Saxby
Item an olde pylche. And iij payer of hosen
Item iij payer of new sokkes & ij payer of olde
Item iij olde syleces and a lumbare
Item a new payer of korkyd shone lynyd and j payer of doble solyd shone
Item a payer of blankettes & ij goode pylows and ij lyttle pylows & a koshyn to knele on
Item a newe mantell by the gyfte of syr John Rawson Knyght of the Roodes

(TNA E135/2/46)

The new items the monk brought with him, ‘ij newe stamyn shyrtes...’ do not denote any luxury. ‘Stamyn’ was a type of coarse worsted cloth, noted for being worn by ascetics (OED) and given as a suitable fabric in the Ancrene Riwle (BL
The combination of archaeological and documentary evidence allows for an excellent understanding of dress within the Carthusian world. The accessories’ importance as social indicators has here been put to use highlighting the humility and austerity of the wearer, in contrast to secular decorative items. That the monks were provided with specific items of clothing points to a strong homogeneity among the monks, opting for plain, coarse styles of dress that emphasise their adherence to the Carthusian life.

The comparison of dress accessories draws some different conclusions to that of book manufacture. Those found at the London Charterhouse all originate in the western part of the precinct, the inner court and service area. None of these items therefore can be said with any certainty to have belonged to the monks. It is unlikely that the monks would have visited this area of the precinct at all, and the finds are much more likely to have been the possessions of the lay brothers or secular guests, which will be discussed in due course. It was not unheard of for the London Carthusians to host a secular guest for a period of time. Indeed, Sir Thomas More lived at the charterhouse for four years (Barber and Thomas 2002, 71; Marius 1999, 34-35), and the Visitation of 1405 forbid preaching to the laity in the inner court (Hope 1925, 43), so the secular contribution to the archaeological record should not to be dismissed as ephemeral.

As none of the London dress accessories can be connected with the monks, it is not particularly suitable for comparison with the Mount Grace assemblage. The finds from Coventry however, were recovered from across the site, and
Figure 6.31: Dress accessories excavated from Coventry Charterhouse (Soden 1995, 132-137).
feature a wide range of accessories. These finds included a large amount of pins, as well as belt eyelets, strap ends, studs, buttons, and lace chapes (fig. 6.31) (Soden 1995, 129-138). Compared to Mount Grace the assemblage is small, yet the size of excavation was equally small, so this is to be expected. As at Mount Grace, the Coventry assemblage is largely made from copper alloy, which could be regarded as a cheaper and more readily available alternative to gold and silver, thus reflective of Carthusian ideals of austerity. None of the dress accessories were decorative, which is in keeping with the plain items seen at Mount Grace, and the theory that plain dress accessories were a method of increasing congruity amongst the monks.

The dress accessories recovered from Witham were again plain, as at Coventry and Mount Grace. As only one cell was excavated, this may explain the relatively low level of finds from this site, which consisted of a lace chape, mount, mount,

Figure 6.32: Dress accessories excavated from Witham Charterhouse (Burrow and Burrow 1990, 174).
strap end, and thimble (Burrow and Burrow 1990, 171-173; fig. 6.32).

6.1.4 Summary

Comparison of the five charterhouses has proved difficult in parts. Hinton Priory could offer no material culture evidence whatsoever, and Witham’s finds were scant. Both London and Coventry provided good, if small, assemblages to compare with Mount Grace which showed a number of similarities and differences between the urban and rural charterhouses.

For writing implements and book manufacture items, compared to the vast assemblage from Mount Grace, London and Coventry had very few items. This was due to a number of factors including re-use of the site, recovery bias and the size of the excavation, and meant that it was not possible to understand the occupations of the monks quite so vividly as at Mount Grace.

Overall the excavation and finds at Mount Grace greatly surpasses any other British Carthusian site, and owes this to the excellent preservation immediately following the Dissolution, as well as the whole site excavation. Although some comparisons could be drawn from the various assemblages, largely it was impossible to make refined conclusions due to the huge difference in the volume of the finds.

6.2 Material Culture of the Lay Brethren

So far, this discussion has focussed solely on the professed members of the monastery. However, the lay assemblages from excavated charterhouses therefore
should be investigated similarly, and where possible, in comparison with the monastic assemblages. Identifying the laity within the monastic precinct presents a new challenge, as there are no set rules as to what material items denote a lay brother as opposed to a monk. It may prove that there is no material difference between the two communities that lived in such close quarters, and that it is only through finds locations that one may make tentative assumptions about the ownership of these items.

Pursuing this theory, three excavated sites have made specific reference to the material culture of the lay brothers, Mount Grace and the charterhouses at London and Coventry, and it is these three sites that will form the basis of this investigation.

### 6.2.1 Mount Grace Priory

The excavation at Mount Grace examined the six cells surrounding the lesser cloister, which are known to have housed lay brothers in the sixteenth century, as well as the kitchen and area of the south west cloister (Coppack and Keen forthcoming, 388). Of the six cells excavated at Mount Grace, only one provided any material culture from its occupation, cell 20 (fig. 6.33). This comprised 104 sherds of pottery from a variety of domestic wares, and 25 sherds of Siegburg stoneware (Coppack and Keen forthcoming, 394-395). It is worth drawing some comparisons between the collections from cell 20 and that of the cells of the great cloister.

First, the range of pottery is immediately apparent as being much poorer
Figure 6.33: Layout of Mount Grace Priory, indicating location of lay cell 20. (Map after Historic England)
than that of the monks. Although a number of imported stoneware mugs were present, they were of one basic type, unlike the different varieties present within the monks’ assemblages. The Siegburg mugs represent the only items of imported pottery within the cell; the rest of the vessels are domestic wares, and produced locally. Although cell 20 produced vessels of the same fabrics as that of the monks’ cells, the number and variety of fabrics are much less than that of the monastic areas.

Comparison with some of the assemblages of other monks’ cells surrounding the great cloister shows that the materials excavated are of a similar quality to that of cell 20. The finds from cell 5, for example, comprised only 4 sherds of domestic wares, and 1 sherd of a Raeren mug (Coppack and Keen forthcoming, 130). Although this is not representative of the cell as a whole, it is a vital point to make as there are a variety of factors that affect the interpretation of an assemblage, and that recovery bias within each cell means that the interpretation of the material culture is subject to the contextual information provided by the accompanying report. It would appear that the lay brother’s cell does feature lesser quality materials than the majority of the monks’ cells.

6.2.2 The London Charterhouse

As members of the public were allowed entry to the outer court at the London Charterhouse, this means that the assemblage recovered from that area cannot be assured to be representative of only the lay brother. Barber and Thomas (2002, 30) noted that the refuse deposits excavated from buildings 1 and 2 and Open
Area 2 may have contained items dumped by local citizens as well as the material produced by the activity of the lay brothers. This makes it more difficult to define the difference between the secular items and those of the lay brothers, especially as the items owned by both parties were very similar.

Barber and Thomas (2002, 28) suggested that Buildings 1 and 2 and Open Area 2 would have served as the inner court of the charterhouse, where food preparation and storage was conducted, and where service functions were carried out. This would have included making habits for the monks, and other manual tasks vital for the upkeep of the monastery. As the lay brothers were in charge of receiving visitors, the inner court would have witnessed a greater level of lay influence and interaction, resulting in the mixed material culture already stated.

The material culture from these lay areas was characterised by a restricted range of pottery, mostly utilitarian vessels, charred grains, fruit seeds, and some interesting accessioned finds (Barber and Thomas 2002, 29). These items, in particular, illustrate the merging of religious and secular. Finds included a copper alloy
scabbard chape, decorative copper alloy pins, a double strap end, and a 30g lead weight (fig. 6.34) (Barber and Thomas 2002, 29). Although it is impossible to say for certain, the decorative pins were unlikely to have been owned by members of the Carthusian community. The scabbard chape, depending on whether it was intended to hold a sword or dagger, could be construed as of either religious or secular origin, as the lay brothers may have carried daggers, depending on their occupation.

Therefore, once again, it is difficult to interpret the lay brothers’ influence on the material culture of the London Charterhouse, as it is entwined with that of the secular visitors, and of the local citizens. The similarities in pottery types makes it impossible to distinguish between the two, and the few accessioned finds do little to help this confusion.

6.2.3 Coventry

At Coventry, no area specifically belonging to the lay brethren was excavated, but note was made that areas such as the kitchens would have predominantly been used by the laity, rather than the monks, and as such, personal items located in these areas may be supposed to be of lay origin (Soden 1995, 91). The charterhouse was not wholly excavated, but of the areas that were, the excavators noted a marked difference between the monks and lay brothers in their material culture (Soden 1995, 91). Particular fabric types and pottery forms were only found in certain areas. Tablewares were of local origin, and distribution was focussed on the cells, the fabrics being unique to those areas (Soden 1995, 91). The domestic, or
lay area, however, was characterised by a focus on storage and food preparation vessels, such as cisterns, jugs, and cooking pots (Soden 1995, 92). Largely these vessels were of Midlands Purpleware (Soden 1995, 92). This area did also feature a large amount of fine tableware, double that of the cells, suggesting more secular interaction, not unlike the situation at London (Soden 1995, 92). It is to be expected that service areas will feature large numbers of preparation vessels, and likewise, that the cells would feature vessels of consumption. However, as no lay cell was excavated at Coventry, it is impossible to make a more meaningful comparison.

As for the small finds, a number of iron items are strikingly obvious as belonging to the lay community of the monastery. A buckle from horse furniture, an animal shoe, and shears all point to some sort of animal husbandry, whereas the stonemason’s wedge and chisel point to masonry work, both types of manual work the lay brothers were involved in, contrasting with the items related to the monks’ work - largely related to book manufacture (Soden 1995, 139-140).

### 6.2.4 Documentary Evidence

As was possible with the material culture of the monks, there is some documentary evidence for material items relating to the lay brothers. The British Library manuscript Add. MS. 11303 contains a series of statutes for the lay brothers, specifically those who resided at Sheen. For the most part, the manuscript instructs the laity on how they should comport themselves during mass, their role within the Carthusian community, and rules for everyday life in the monastery. The passage on items for the cell reads:

> Other usuall or necessarie thynges belongynge eyther to table or other uses,
let be given eache one as ye Pryour shall iudge reasonable or nedfull, Let them fynallie kepe nothinge at all what so ever by them: But what they have with lycense (Pask-Matthews 1931, 120).

Given that the lay brothers were provided with clothes from the monks’ hand-me-downs (Kerr 2009, 60), it may be assumed that any tablewares would also be second-hand, and therefore there was no specific list of items that the lay brother should have in his cell. This is, of course, assuming that the statutes applicable at Sheen were similar to those across the country. Should this be true, however, it may explain the some of the similar ceramic fabrics found in both the monks’ and lay brothers’ cells.

Those items they were allowed to keep ‘with lycense’ refers to the items specific to their occupation. These occupation-specific objects would very definitively distinguish monk from lay brother, as the monks would have had no part in these types of labour-intensive activities. The ironwork finds from Coventry above illustrates this distinction well. But equally, these items were located in areas of the monastery known to be frequented by the lay brothers, rather than the monks, such as the stables and other buildings of the inner court, so the distinction is also defined by its find location.

6.2.5 Summary

As has been demonstrated, the lay brothers can be much harder to identify as distinct in their material culture from the monks, or indeed from local citizens. The assemblages they produce are largely similar to that of the monks, and it is often only with the interpretation of find location that it is possible to make any
distinction between ordained and lay.

Where the small finds can be very useful in this regard is in understanding the occupations of the lay brethren. From the statutes, it is known that possible manual work for the lay brothers was varied, and therefore finds such as horseshoes, shears or kitchen equipment strongly indicate lay activity. These items are consistent with find locations, usually recovered from kitchen areas, stables and workshops, which would have been the typical daily environment of the lay brother.

As far as the pottery evidence is concerned, it varies between sites as to whether there is a marked difference between a monk and lay brother or whether they are largely similar. This is unique to each house, and is likely to be a result of their location in the country, having a bearing on how readily available different pottery fabrics and types were.

6.3 Conclusions

The singular nature of the Carthusian living conditions, where each cell was separated from the next by a high wall, has meant that a discussion of material culture from these sites can address each cell as a distinct assemblage, particular to one specific individual. This has led to a discussion of the occupations of the inhabitants, and the cross-European networks that may have been maintained by the monks.

From these discussions, it has been possible to establish a higher proportion of domestic ceramics in the city charterhouses, likely due to the local pottery
industry. Of the imported wares at Mount Grace, a few more exotic or high-status vessels may have indicated personal contacts in Europe, that the monk who owned these items was from that country themselves, or could be representative of gifts from benefactors. The high levels of similar, local wares indicated a central store of surplus ceramics which were provided to each new monk, or which could replace broken items. Those wares tended to be plain coarsewares.

For the lay brothers at Mount Grace, the pottery assemblage demonstrates that although they had a more restricted range of fabric types, the vessels themselves were not necessarily of a poorer quality than that of the monks. Finds of other materials were not recovered from the lay brothers’ cells, although items in service areas such as the kitchen would have been utilised by them. In some cases, as at London Charterhouse, the material of the lay brothers was mostly indistinguishable from that of the secular guests. With the exception of items such as a scabbard chape, there were no defining qualities that ensured an item could be established as belonging to a lay brother. At Coventry however, much of the iron finds could be positively attributed to the lay brothers, as they related to tasks, such as animal husbandry, that the lay brothers would have been involved in.

Uniquely, at Mount Grace, it was possible in a number of cells to identify the occupation of each individual. The material culture indicated activities related to book manufacture such as copying, binding and printing. The prominence of the Carthusians in writing is well known from documentary sources and these finds solidify that understanding. A large range of dress accessories was uncovered at
Mount Grace, mostly plain, copper alloy objects. This collection was in keeping with assemblages found at other sites, and was indicative of the avoidance of particularly luxurious or expensive metals, which would have been contrary to the practices of the Carthusians.

The following chapter will examine the other inhabitants of the charterhouse, the lay brothers. This will include a discussion of the author’s primary geophysical research conducted at the two Friary sites, and exploration of the layout of the lower house.
The Lower House: An Archaeological Investigation at the sites of Hinton and Witham Friary

Whereas the upper house protected the spiritual well being of the monastery, the friary, or lower house, kept the community running. The friary maintained a more outward-looking approach to society than the upper house, through necessities of trade, labour and hospitality. As will be discussed, not all charterhouses were split in such a fashion. In the mid-fourteenth century, the complex layout tended towards a combined house for both the monks and lay brothers, whilst still maintaining certain layers of isolation for the monks. As discussed in previous chapters (see Chapters 3 and 6), the lay brothers were carefully integrated into the charterhouse, ensuring separation in the church, but were provided with individual cells like the monks.

This chapter will examine the friary layout, focussing in particular on the split houses, and why the monastery was maintained in this way, although consideration will be given to later charterhouses too. Following a discussion of the buildings of the lower house and the access lay brothers could gain to various parts of the monastery, the two Somerset friaries will be examined as case studies. The chapter will culminate in the presentation of new geophysical survey data at the two Friaries with a discussion of the arising implications of this research and
the potential layout of the Carthusian lower house.

7.1 A Divided House

The necessity of splitting the monastery into two parts, one for the monks and one for the lay brothers, came about from the style in which the first charterhouse, La Grande Chartreuse, was constructed. Set in the middle of the Chartreuse mountains near Grenoble, the upper house, for the monks, was built higher up the mountain than the lower house, for the lay brothers. Although after an avalanche the upper house was relocated to be closer to the lower house, the names remained and persisted into the new foundations that were built across Europe. Apart from the locational value of this monastic layout, the spiritual ideals of the Carthusian Order were further served in that the lower house acted almost as a gatehouse for the upper house. Any visitors to the charterhouse would be directed first to the lower house, where they could meet with the procurator, who would refer them to the prior if necessary.

The division of the upper and lower houses meant that only certain buildings were situated in each. The buildings in the lower house were where the majority of the work took place: the kitchen, bakehouse, brewery, cheese house, granary, storehouses and laundry, but also the location for the more secular side of Carthusian living - the guest house and stables (Coppack and Aston 2002, 27). The lay brothers also had their cells here, and a chapel was provided for worship. When the houses became joined, those buildings previously located in the lower house moved to the inner court, and so the monastery still maintained
its zoned layout. This conjunction of upper and lower house was definitely in effect in Britain by the foundation of the London Charterhouse in 1371 (Barber and Thomas 2002, 16), but there is some uncertainty as to whether or not the charterhouses at Beauvale and Kilnalahanin founded a separate lower house (pers. comm. Glyn Coppack).

In addition to the service buildings of the lower house, charterhouses also relied on external granges as a source of income. Hinton Priory owned granges in the Mendip Hills, at Green Ore and Whitnell, whilst Witham owned one at Charterhouse-on-Mendip\(^1\) (Jurkowski and Ramsay 2007, 431-432; 439-440). Largely, these granges were used for sheep grazing, even though Charterhouse-on-Mendip had been used for mining lead since the Roman period and further charters were received in the twelfth-thirteenth century to mine lead (Fradley 2009, 10). The rights to mine coal were also rented out by the Carthusians at Beauvale in 1397 to William Monash of Costall for one of their granges at Kirkstall, in Yorkshire (TNA E 326/1782). The granges were maintained by a number of the lay brothers, as well as some mercenarii (hired labourers) working under their leadership. The granges likely served to supply their own houses with wool for bed coverings and clothing, and any surplus was sold. The charterhouses also made their own cheese from sheep’s milk, but there are no records to indicate whether surplus supplies were sold at markets.

As already stated, the lower house acted as a buffer between monastic and secular life. The Carthusians discouraged any guests from staying, although

\(^{1}\text{See Chapter 5 for further discussion of granges}\)
guest houses were part of the monastic complex. At Witham Friary, records from the bishop of Bekynton show that the monastic community requested permission to build a guest house at the lower house and to place a baptismal font in the chapel of the lay brothers (Reg. Bekynton, 315-6). The charterhouse at Mount Grace seems to have been built with a guesthouse already included, and it was this structure that was converted into a mansion house following the Dissolution and the sale of land to secular patrons (Coppack and Aston 2002, 143). While the Carthusians were staunchly vegetarian, they did not limit their guests to the same dietary restrictions. The contemporary water supply plan from London Charterhouse indicates a building called the ‘Flessche Kitchen,’ where meat was prepared (fig. 7.1) (CM MP/1/14a). The London Charterhouse was in a singular position, as the city location gave the community the opportunity for many more secular interactions than any of the other British Carthusian houses, likely due to how close the house was to other monasteries and residential areas, and its location in the middle of the West Smithfield Black Death cemetery. The presence of a separate meat kitchen may indicate that they were entertaining sufficient numbers of guests for this to become a necessity, and indeed, records from the General Chapter show that the London Charterhouse was reprimanded on more than one occasion for its lax appreciation for the Carthusian statutes, with monks eating and drinking with company in their cells (Bodl. Rawlinson MS D.318, f. 106 bis v).

The singular situation of a separate or distinct area for the lay brothers makes the investigation of the two Somerset correries particularly interesting.
Figure 7.1: Water supply plan from the London Charterhouse (CM MP/1/14a).
Although much has been written about the layout of La Grande Chartreuse, there is no certain evidence to indicate how the British lower houses were organised, and therefore the following research is of the utmost importance in understanding these sites.

### 7.2 Case Study 1 - Witham Friary

Witham Charterhouse is situated in North East Somerset, around 18 miles south of Bath (fig. 7.2). The sites of the *domus superior* and the *domus inferior* lie roughly a kilometre away from each other, the *domus superior* at Witham Hall Farm, and the *domus inferior* at Witham Friary. The charterhouse remains have been cut by the Great Western Railway, running through the northern conventual buildings (Wilson-North and Porter 1997, 82). The medieval fishponds of the charterhouse still remain to the west and are fed by the River Frome.

For the lower house, only the church and the dovecote remain, in the village of Witham Friary. A kitchen built of wattles was located to the west of the church, and nearby was the timber-built guest house (*Magna Vita*, 219). This was in the earlier phases of construction, as the *Magna Vita S. Hugonis*, from which the reference is taken, was written by Adam of Eynsham in the early thirteenth century. Wooden structures were normally connected with the oldest phases and replaced within the first few years of habitation (Coppack and Aston 2002, 28).

Prior to the foundation of the Carthusian community in Witham, the community of Augustinian canons at Bruton Abbey owned a chapel in the village of Witham Friary. The Bruton monks built the first church in around 1142, and the
Figure 7.2: Location of Witham Friary and Witham Hall Farm in relation to each other. © Edina Digimap 2017
Carthusians were granted it as part of the original endowment when they first arrived in 1178. They were, therefore, able to make use of the church while their own buildings were in construction (McGarvie 1989, 10; Hunt and White 1878, 24).

As part of the building effort, the Carthusians renovated the church under the leadership of the third prior, Hugh of Avalon, who arrived in 1180. The vaulted ceiling was added, the walls were thickened, and it became the chapel for the lay brethren of the priory (Hunt and White 1878, 26; Mayr-Harting 2011, 193).

Details of the everyday life of the monastery are scant, there are few extant documents that illustrate the situation of the priory. Consequently, it is not known exactly how the Black Death in the mid-fourteenth century affected the charterhouse. From the Patent Rolls, it can be inferred that a good many of the lay brethren had died, but there are no details concerning the monks. The community petitioned Edward III on 16 January 1354 and on 20 October, 1362, to allow them to bring in labourers from other parts of the country as the land was unworked and the harvest had not been gathered (TNA C66/239, m. 20; TNA C66/266, m. 7). The petition states that ‘their servants and household in the last pestilence died totally’ (TNA C66/239, m. 20) and ‘their servants and household almost wholly perished in the last pestilence’ (TNA C66/266, m. 7). They also petitioned to pay their labourers an elevated wage above that sanctioned by the Crown (TNA C66/246, m. 4).

The house was surrendered on the 31 March 1539 to the Royal Commissioners John Tregonwell and William Petre, who valued the house at
£227 1s. 8d. (Thompson 1896, 116; RCHME 1994, 2). After the Dissolution, the lay brothers’ chapel was maintained for parochial use by the local community, and with the exception of the flying buttresses, which were added in 1875, it retains the same characteristic simplicity of the Carthusian Order (fig. 7.3; Wilson-North and Porter 1997, 82; McGarvie 1989, 12).

### 7.3 Case Study 2 - Hinton Friary

The second case study focusses on Hinton Friary, the lower house of the second Carthusian priory constructed in England. As seen in the previous section, there are few remaining features of the friary at Witham. The friary at Hinton has not been wholly built over, and offers a singular opportunity to understand the layout of the lay quarters of a Carthusian house. With only a small amount of geophysical survey conducted on the site, and the land being largely undisturbed, there is potential for interesting results, which will shed new light on the life of a Carthusian lay brother. Hinton Friary (Monument No. 1030135) has only recently (December 2015) been recognised as the house of the lay brothers, highlighting the importance of this current research.

The precinct of Hinton is situated approximately 17.5 kilometres to the north of Witham Priory, near the village of Freshford, in North East Somerset (fig. 7.4). The sites of the Priory (NGR ST 77799 59160) and the Friary (NGR ST 78885 59189) are just over a kilometre away from each other, the Friary sitting on the west bank of the River Frome.

As at Witham, the Prior of Hinton petitioned Edward III in 1355, as their
Figure 7.3: Exterior and interior of the lay brothers’ church at Witham Friary. Image source: Author 2015.
Figure 7.4: The site of Hinton Priory and the village of Friary in relation to one another. © Edina Digimap 2017
lay brethren and servants had perished in the Black Death (TNA C66/246, m. 4). They needed permission to hire new labourers from outside the area of their jurisdiction and to pay them higher than normal wages. There are no documents recording the effect of the pestilence upon the monks.

It is likely that the friary had been abandoned by the end of the fourteenth century, and the lay brothers moved to the main house, reflecting the move to a combined upper and lower house at the London Charterhouse and subsequent Carthusian monasteries (Aston 1990, 14). By 1535, the monks were definitely leasing out the Friary site, as is recorded in the Valor Ecclesiasticus (vol. 1, 156), ‘Le Frary’ brought in rents of 63s.

7.4 Geophysical Survey

The geophysical surveys were conducted only on the lay brothers’ quarters, so only these areas will be discussed. The first method to be considered will be the resistance survey. The results of each site are presented separately, including an interpretation of the recorded features. After this, the results of the magnetometer survey at Friary are discussed, with an accompanying interpretation. This will finally lead to a summary interpretation of the sites overall, and how they can be compared to each other, including inferences which can be made on the layouts of the site from their respective results.

7.4.1 Witham Friary Earth Resistance Survey

The resistance survey undertaken on the site was not able to reveal a great
amount about the layout of the friary (fig. 7.5). As with the results of the LiDAR visualisations, previously discussed in chapter 4, the small open areas hindered the resistivity survey. Few anomalous features were recorded, and there were no real trends that indicated a wider context or layout for the upstanding buildings.

The only larger high-resistance anomaly revealed at Witham Friary was a rectangular feature, which likely resembles the remains of a building of some type, especially given its proximity to the medieval dovecote. The other areas of possible archaeological remains are not substantial enough to make any interpretation as to their original use, or their role in the layout of the wider complex. Since there is no apparent pattern or link between the areas of high-resistance features, it is impossible to even say if they are contemporary with the monastic occupation of the area. If a Friary layout could be constructed from other surveys or excavations, there would be potential to correlate the results of the resistivity survey with a floor plan, but as it stands, there is little remaining to make any accurate statements about the site.

7.4.2 Hinton Friary Earth Resistance Survey

As already noted, in chapter 3, a resistivity survey was previously conducted at Friary but covered only the area immediately around Woodman’s Cottage (Hawke 2015). This survey has informed the author’s research, and consequent resurvey of the site. The new survey has covered a larger area of ground in order to attempt to place into context the features already located. Re-surveying the area has also dealt with some of the issues of the previous survey, such as gaps in
Figure 7.5: Interpretation of resistivity survey conducted at Witham Friary
The most important results of the survey are presented here, with detailed interpretation to follow (fig. 7.6). There is very definitive evidence for the presence of the Friary in this area, although the survey was somewhat hampered by new fencing and property boundaries which prevented the collection of data for the south-east of the complex. Despite this, the resistivity survey has revealed the majority of the Friary complex, as well as confirming the location of a post-medieval building to the north of the monastic buildings (fig. 7.7).

The central area appears to be the main location for the Friary. There are a large number of linear features which all lie on an east-west alignment. The few modern features have been identified through comparison with aerial photographs from 1945 to 1968 (figs. 7.8, 7.9, 7.10). The photographs show a curved wall running from Woodman’s Cottage and leading towards the river, correlating with feature 1. The wall had been removed by the time of the 1968 aerial photograph, but the footprint of it is still visible. A line of trees is also visible in the 1945 and 1946 photographs in the same position as the modern feature labelled 2. Perpendicular to this tree line, another linear feature (3) represents a modern pipeline, which was installed by the current owners of Woodman’s Cottage. To the west of these features, two rectangular anomalies labelled 4 may be representative of a structure standing on a terraced area of the hillside. It seems unlikely that they are related to the monastic occupation, and more probably consist of the remains of a later agricultural building. At 5, there is a building which can be tied in with a map from 1785 of the Hinton Abbey Estate (fig. 7.11)
Figure 7.6: Resistivity survey results for Friary
Figure 7.7: Interpretation of resistivity survey data at Friary
Figure 7.8: Aerial photograph taken 13th June 1945, over the hamlet of Friary. Reference: RAF_106G_UK_376_RP_3084. (Supplied by Historic England Archive, Swindon).

Figure 7.9: Aerial photograph taken 14th January 1946, over the hamlet of Friary. Reference: RAF_3G_TUD_UK_25_V_5168. (Supplied by Historic England Archive, Swindon).
(SRO DD\FL/8). No name is given to the building on the map, so who the tenant was there cannot be traced. It may have been an agricultural building belonging to the estate. Like the features at 4, this structure may be of monastic date, but more likely represents the post-medieval phase of occupation.

The first feature which is relevant to the monastic occupation of the site is represented by a group of anomalous features labelled A, which are strongly indicative of a row of cells. The structure of the cell, with a small building and L-shaped garden, is identical to the cell layout of the Carthusian monks, as demonstrated by the geophysical survey conducted at Hinton Priory. At least three of these cells can be identified in the resistivity survey, but other adjoining cells may have been destroyed through subsequent land use. Opposite this range of cells, the group of features labelled B are perhaps indicative of another row of
commodal Solitude

Comparison with the layout of the corrierie at La Grande Chartreuse is useful here. At the corrierie a row of cells faces the cloister and a number of other buildings, with the church situated at one end, and an entrance way leading into the complex. This is very much in keeping with the evidence from the geophysical survey that a similar architectural style was being utilised at Friary. The feature marked C could be regarded as the entranceway leading towards the church. There is little evidence to suggest the location of the church, although it may be represented by the series of small linear features labelled D. Although some of the building styles of Friary are matched at La Correrie, some, such as the cell with the L-shaped garden, seem to have maintained the monastic style, as was used at Hinton Priory.
To the south west of this group of features, there is evidence for another group of buildings. Labelled E, these could represent workshops for the lay brothers, including the kitchen, bakehouse, and stables, or perhaps a guest house for visitors. Since the lay brothers were the first point of contact for anyone wishing to communicate with the monks, the guest house was maintained at the lower house.

The results of the resistivity survey suggest a good level of preservation for the walls of the Friary, as they produced high-resistance anomalies which were easily visible in the results plot. The complexity of some areas of the Friary makes interpretation difficult, although comparison with the layout of the corrière at La Grande Chartreuse is of help in this case. Unfortunately, where modern building works have been situated restricts the completeness of the survey, as some parts of the complex seem to run into private gardens.

7.4.3 Hinton Friary Magnetometer Survey

The results of the magnetometer survey are well correlated with the resistivity survey, and confirm some postulations made about the nature of a number of the features revealed by resistivity survey (figs. 7.12, 7.13).

At 1, the curved wall already located in the LiDAR data and resistivity survey is also visible through the magnetometer results. This is the same for the pipeline at 2, which was visible in the resistivity survey. The tree line has not been picked up by this survey.

For the monastic buildings, there are a number of features of interest.
Figure 7.12: Magnetometry results for Friary
Figure 7.13: Interpretation of magnetometry survey results
Firstly, at A, a number of short linear features which are in a similar placement to the location of the workshop buildings as revealed by the resistivity survey. At B, the grouping of linear anomalies again correlates with the features located by resistivity survey. The magnetometer has picked up on the location of walls where they have perhaps been robbed out, which is why they would not appear as strong anomalies on the resistivity survey. By utilising both techniques of prospection, it is possible to build up a more accurate view of the layout of the Friary. In the next section, the results of both these methods will be combined with the LiDAR data to yield the most pertinent information and begin to create a ground plan for the Friary.

7.5 Synthesis of Data

Combining the results of the techniques discussed in the course of this chapter provides an overview of a potential layout for the Friary at Hinton. Figure 7.14 illustrates the combination of LiDAR, Resistivity Survey and Magnetometer Survey interpretations. Ignoring the features that have been shown to be modern leaves a ground plan of the Friary during the monastic occupation. Three cells are well defined here, and whether there ever were more could only be established through an excavation of the site. The corrie at La Grande Chartreuse featured six cells in this area, but the monastic community there was considerably larger than that of Hinton, so this can perhaps be explained in this way. Excavations at the corrie of Liget in France (constructed at the same time as Witham) have shown that the lay brothers there slept in a dormitory, but there is no archaeological
Figure 7.14: Combined interpretation of Friary resistivity and magnetometry interpretations with LiDAR interpretation.
evidence to suggest this was the case at Friary (Dufaý 2014, 28).

A complex group of walls south of the cells becomes visible through this visualisation; likely service areas, such as the kitchens, buttery, and storehouses. The structure of the workshop area has also been extended through the combined interpretation of techniques, indicating a likely layout for the buildings, although not as clearly defined as that of the cells. Similarly undefined is the area to the east of the cells, which may represent the aforementioned dormitory. The western wall of this structure appears to create a boundary for the cloister, and given its location, could just as likely be interpreted as the refectory.

A potential layout (fig 7.15) can be constructed from the survey interpretations and comparative plans, but this would have to be ground-truthed through excavation. The layout suggests a similar architectural style to the corrière at La Grande Chartreuse, although the location of some buildings cannot yet be attributed to ground features. A combined interpretation of the data at Friary, in particular, has allowed all anomalous readings from the three data collation techniques to be collected together and demonstrates how the techniques both complement and enhance each other.

7.6 Conclusions

Investigation of Witham Friary and the Friary at Hinton through geophysical techniques has allowed for better understanding of the layout of the Carthusian corrière. Where the charterhouse complex was split into two precincts, the lower house served as a gatehouse and the majority of the work took place there.
Figure 7.15: Potential layout taken from survey data. Indicates location of cells, cloister and workshops.
Subsequently, buildings such as the stables, guest house, kitchens and brewery were all located within this complex. Though this has not been an exhaustive investigation, preliminary studies have been able to provide a potential layout for the site at Hinton. The resistivity survey results illustrated an east-west aligned complex, with three cells clearly visible on the northern side of the precinct. A series of buildings to the south are likely indicative of the service buildings and the location of the stables and guesthouse.

The resistivity survey at Witham Friary was unable to provide any useful results, and it is unfortunate that the location of the complex has been largely built over as the village has grown. However, it may be worth conducting a larger-scale magnetometer survey around the village to prospect potential outlying buildings. Now that a layout for the correrie at Hinton has been established, it may be possible to work off that to estimate locations for buildings at Witham, based on the location of the church and dovecote, which are still standing.

This study has shown the particular utility of combining a number of techniques in order to gain as full an understanding of the site as possible. There is much scope for further investigation of the Friary at Hinton to continue prospection on the site with a view to excavation. This would be the first excavation of a correrie in the United Kingdom, and would be instrumental in providing an understanding of the Carthusian lay brother.
Conclusions

This thesis aimed to examine the role of the lay brother in Carthusian communities, and did so by compiling the available archaeological data with documentary evidence to provide a historically contextualised study of the English, Scottish and Irish charterhouses. In particular, this research posed two principal questions: whether it was possible to identify the lay brethren as an archaeologically distinct element of the community, and how the lay brothers’ precinct was arranged and organised. The first question was addressed by analysing material culture assemblages from three English charterhouses, where specific lay areas could be identified, and the second question answered through topographic analysis and geophysical survey.

The conclusion will give a brief summary of the findings of this thesis, organised to address the original thesis’ aims and objectives. This will include an evaluation of the applications and implications of these results, before suggesting ways in which the study could be expanded for further research.

8.1 Can the Lay Brother be identified as archaeologically distinct?

The material culture evidence discussed in this thesis has demonstrated that contrary to an assumption that the lay brothers’ cooking and eating vessels would be of poorer in nature than that of the monks, there was no discernible difference
in the quality of the vessels found. Though there was an apparent restriction in
the range of ceramic fabric types used by the lay brothers at Mount Grace Priory,
there was variation in the quality of the monks’ assemblages also, some containing
a similarly small range of fabrics. The advantage of analysing Carthusian pottery
assemblages is that the cells ensure that each recovered collection refers to only
one individual. Unfortunately, there are no records to provide the names of the
inhabitants of each, which would enable greater exploration in detail of the lives
of the monks and lay brothers on the eve of the Dissolution. This discussion was
somewhat limited in that only one of the six lay cells excavated at Mount Grace
provided any material culture, and at neither London nor Coventry Charterhouses
were lay cells excavated.

Where areas of lay activity were excavated at the London and Coventry
Charterhouses, it was evident that some of the items recovered belonged to
secular guests. A scabbard chape, for example, found in one of the lay areas at
London Charterhouse, indicates lay interaction within the walls of the monastic
precinct. This prevented any accurate discussion of the assemblage relating to
the lay brothers, as it was impossible to differentiate. The finds from Coventry
were more distinctive, where iron horse material and shears obviously relates
to animal husbandry, just as the stonemason’s wedge and iron chisel provide
evidence of masonry work, but still, it cannot be definitively shown that this does
not indicate lay interaction, and one may just infer this conclusion.

In burial too, the lay brothers are indistinguishable. The Carthusian statutes
state that monks and lay brothers were treated exactly the same in death, the only
difference being the clothes they were dressed in. Where burial records survive, such as at Nieuwlicht Charterhouse, it is possible to identify specific individuals and their vocation, but none exist for the British and Irish charterhouses. The only burial segregation that seems to have been made at Nieuwlicht is between the monks and conversi, who were buried to the south of the Great Cloister, and the donati, who were buried to the north. Should the opportunity for archaeological exploration of an English Carthusian cemetery arise, it would be enlightening to investigate burial zoning in that context, and compare with the evidence from Nieuwlicht.

This study demonstrated that in making distinctions between monastic and lay populations in Carthusian houses, the find location of the material culture is crucial. Without the context of the recovery location, distinction between the two groups of men in the charterhouses is impossible, as there is little difference in the quality of material, especially ceramics. With no documentary sources to indicate what items each lay brother should be provided with in their cell, unlike the monks, this creates a further difficulty in understanding how the lay brothers can be distinguished in the archaeological record. This conclusion is, however, based on a small assemblage from only a few charterhouses, so further research should be conducted to compile a larger database of artefacts from more sites, which would produce more accurate results, and give a better understanding of the situation across Europe, rather than restricting the study to only England.
8.2 Layouts and Landscapes: Arrangement and Organisation

The discussion of the topography of the monastic precinct and wider landscapes has been an integral part of this thesis. The singular nature of the early charterhouses, where the monks and lay brothers were segregated into separate complexes has provided an opportunity to explore the arrangement of the lay brothers’ accommodation, and construct the first ground plan for an English Carthusian friary. This has a number of interesting implications for historical and archaeological scholarship of the Carthusians. First, the new Hinton Friary ground plan will begin further research and discussion into the archaeology of the site. The results of the resistivity survey were sufficient to create a conjectural plan of the site, and the magnetometer results added to this, revealing the location of at least three cells, as well as service buildings and other conventual structures. Further research here, especially with excavation, can ground-truth this plan, and provide material culture that gives a better understanding of the function of these buildings.

Second, as the only full layouts currently established in Great Britain and Ireland are of joined houses, where the monks and lay brothers lived together, the potential of Space Syntax Analysis has been restricted to this style of complex. The new Friary ground plan lends itself to better understanding how space was accessed by its inhabitants, and whether the levels of isolation and boundaries highlighted by the analysis carried out on the London Charterhouse and Mount Grace Priory are similar to that at Friary.

Should the lower houses at Beauvale or Kilinalahanin be located (if they
existed in the first place), the research conducted at Hinton Friary will provide
guidance for archaeological investigation at those sites. Though any ground plans
arising from that research would be unlikely to match that of Hinton, it would
be possible to identify similar features, and each site could inform research at the
others.

As it was not possible to gain good results from either the LiDAR data or
the geophysical surveys at Witham Friary, this creates another avenue for future
research. The recent increase in the use of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) as
a tool for archaeological prospection has shown that it is possible to create three-
dimensional models of a site, and the level of resolution for these is much higher
than that of the LiDAR available for Witham Friary. A 3D model created in this
manner, as it is a non-invasive method of prospection, may be able to give a better
understanding of the landscape of the current village, and identify earthworks
that may be pertinent to the monastic occupation of the area.

8.3 Interactions with the Secular World

Though the aim of this thesis was to examine the role of the lay brother, this is
inextricably linked with secular interaction, and therefore a discussion of the most
salient findings relating to this theme must be considered. The most obvious way
in which the secular world interacted with the Carthusians is in their benefaction
of the houses. As the prayers of the Order came to be seen as the most effective
method of spiritual intercession, donations of land and money constituted a
spiritual trade, whereby the benefactor would receive divine rewards after their
death. The expansion of the monastic churches at London and Coventry was in large part (if not the only reason) due to the need to append additional chapels where tombs could be placed. The will of Katherine de la Pole (1306-1382) (Test. Ebor. I, 119) indicated that she wished to be buried in the church at the Hull Charterhouse, next to the tomb of her husband, William (1302-1366), who was one of the co-founders of the monastery. Their children and grandchildren were subsequently buried at the charterhouse, and were continued benefactors of the Carthusian community there.

As this thesis has discussed, however, that it was not only the founders of charterhouses and their families who requested burial in the monasteries. A number of Lord Mayors of London, Mayors of Coventry and Hull, merchants and other noblemen also stipulated in their wills that they were to be buried in a charterhouse. Furthermore, the example of Nieuwlicht Charterhouse, where the necrology survives, has been used to illustrate how the Carthusians accommodated the laity. The necrology shows that the great cloister alley was reserved for male burials, where women could be buried in the little cloister, it being the most secular area of the monastic complex. The material culture gathered from London Charterhouse also showed that the laity were allowed access to the outer court, where a scabbard chape was recovered, and documentary evidence suggests that the Carthusians allowed entrance to the precinct as it lay in the midst of a Black Death cemetery.
8.4 The Role of the Lay Brother

The main topic for discussion throughout this thesis has been the role of the lay brother. The Carthusian Order recognised four classes of lay brother, the conversi, the redditi, the donati, and the mercenarii. Throughout this thesis, reference has been made to ‘the lay brothers,’ and in general, this has referred to the conversi, often seen as the true lay brother. The vocations available to the lay brother indicate the types of workshops that would have been necessary at the lower house or in the lay area of the charterhouse. Occupations such as baker, smith, and carpenter required specific tools and materials, and additionally, guest houses and stables were under the remit of the lay brethren. This knowledge therefore informs the types of material culture one would expect to find, should excavation uncover the area of service buildings within a Carthusian site.

An investigation into the food waste, where possible, would also make for an interesting study; the meals of the lay brethren were in some ways different to that of the monks. Records from the London Charterhouse in 1535 show that the lay brothers were provided with different foods on Sundays and Wednesdays, although they still did not consume meat, and maintained a pescatarian diet like the monks. If this, and other documentary sources could be accorded with archaeological data, it would be possible to augment our understanding of the Carthusian diet in the English Province, and how it differed from other monastic orders, if at all. The charterhouses also owned meadows, orchards, kitchen gardens, and fish ponds, all of which supplemented their diet, and reduced the amount of goods that needed to be bought from secular vendors. The granges on
the Mendip Hills held sheep sleights, and were worked only by lay brethren, and therefore the archaeological record for these sites can be assumed to hold only lay material culture. However, it would be impossible to differentiate between a Carthusian lay brother and a member of secular society through only the material culture.

Records for Hinton and Witham show that both houses were badly affected by the Black Death. At each, all of their lay brothers died, and they were required to request special dispensation to hire secular workers, and to pay them at a higher rate than normal. Where the lay brothers had greater secular interaction than the monks, they were at higher risk of contracting disease. There is further research to be conducted on the lay-monastic interactions among Carthusian communities, notably, the effect of country-wide epidemics such as the Black Death, later plagues, and famines, on the monastic population.

8.5 *Scope and Recommendations for Further Research*

As with any fixed-term research project, this thesis has had a number of time-constrained limitations. Within the three years, it was not possible to comprehensively compare the British and Irish sites with their European counterparts, especially as concerns material culture. Likewise, the timescale did not allow for an excavation of the site at Friary, so no ground-truthing of the potential layout could be attained. The layout constructed in this thesis, therefore, is based on the results of geophysical survey, and the ascribed room uses are conjectural based on comparison with the layout at Hinton Priory.
Permission has been given for excavation and the owners of the site are keen for investigation to continue. As concerns future research, this should be the first avenue of investigation as it is of primary importance for a fuller understanding of the site.

The geophysical survey at Witham Friary was constrained by the expansion of the village. The only open areas which could be surveyed were the churchyard, and the playground adjacent to the monastic dovecote. This limited the amount of information that could be gained from the survey, as the location of most of the lay brothers’ complex has subsequently been built over, or roads lain over it. Subsequently, the results of the survey that could be conducted showed very few features, and none that could be positively ascribed to the monastic occupation.

The analysis of material culture was also restricted as only three sites could be sufficiently discussed. Some sites remain unexcavated, and, therefore, have no assemblage of material culture (Sheen, Axholme, Hull, Kilnalahanin and Perth), and some of the excavated sites were only partially excavated, which included no lay areas, or the material culture recovered from the site is now missing or uncatalogued (Witham, Hinton and Beauvale). Furthermore, the excavation at Coventry Charterhouse was not as extensive as that of the London Charterhouse or Mount Grace Priory, and, therefore, the assemblage is smaller, which implicated the level of analysis that could be carried out. Continued research at Friary would allow for effective analysis and comparison of the material culture of the lay community with the monastic community, and would be the first (and likely only) excavation of a Carthusian correrie in Great Britain and Ireland. Further
to this study, an archaeological study of the Carthusian granges in the Mendip
Hills would be of great benefit in better understanding the material culture
or archaeological footprint of lay activity in Carthusian communities, and in
establishing whether different classes of lay brother can be distinguished in the
archaeological record.

The results of this investigation may lead to comparison with similar
European sites, which again, was not possible within this study. The European
sites and their material culture may reveal much about the architectural style of
the lay brothers’ buildings, and a comparative study of material culture from
excavated corerries would provide analysis of definitively lay assemblages,
where it is not always possible to differentiate between the monks and the lay
brothers. Witham Friary would also benefit from more in-depth archaeological
investigation, although excavation may not be possible given the nature of the
subsequent growth of the village, but prospection techniques such as ground-
penetrating radar may have application in a site such as this.
Bibliography

Primary Manuscript Sources

Bodleian Library, Oxford
MS. Laud Misc. 517. ‘The Manere of Good Lyvyng’

MS. Rawlinson D. 318, ff. 73-167. ‘Chartae of the Carthusian General Chapter’. 1411-1499.

British Library
Additional MS 6060. ‘Beauvale Chartulary’. 1486.

Additional MS. 11303. ‘Statutes to be observed by the lay Brethren of the monastery of Shene, in Surrey’. c. 16th Century.

Additional MS. 28588. ‘Correspondence with Charles V and his ministers’. August 1535 - June 1536.

Additional MS. 37049. ‘A carthusian miscellany of poems, chronicles, and treatises in Northern English, including an epitome or summary of Mandeville’s travels’. 1460-1500.

Additional MS. 61823. ‘The Book of Margery Kempe’. c. 1440.

Cotton MS. Cleopatra C/VI. ‘Ancrene Riwle; songs and prayers; a leaf from a Book of Hours’. 1200-1420.


Cotton MS. Cleopatra E/VI. ‘Papers relating to the Reformation’. 2nd quarter of the 16th century.


Harley MS. 2373. ‘Theological miscellany, including “The Cloud of Unknowing”’. 1450.

Cambridge University Library
MS. Ee.4.30. Walter Hilton, ‘Scale of Perfection’. c.1450-1500.

Charterhouse Muniments, Sutton’s Hospital
Glasgow University Library
MS Hunter 136. ‘Musica Ecclesiastica’. 1502.

Lambeth Palace Library
MS 413. ‘Records of the General Chapters of the Carthusian Order’ 1417-1481.

The National Archives, Kew.


CRES 38/514/6/1. ‘Somerset Estates - Green Ore and Whitnell’. 24 December 1574.


E 135/2/46. ‘Inventory of clothes sent from the Charterhouse, London to the Carthusian house of Witham (Somerset) for dan Andrew, and of those cloths he took with him when he left London’. 1485-1509.

E 135/9/15 ‘Copy of extract from the Valor Ecclesiasticus I. 361’. 1558-1603.


E 326/1782. ‘Mining lease by the Prior and Convent of Beauvale’. 20 January 1396/7.

E 328/310. ‘Letters patent, giving 50 marks annually to Prior and Convent of Locus Dei, Henton, co. Somerset’. 20 July 1461.


SP 1/92, ff. 26-35. ‘Carthusians and the Supremacy’. 20 April 1535.

SP 1/97, f. 132. ‘Fare of the monks and brothers at The Charterhouse’ 13 October 1535.

SP 1/101, f. 85. ‘Thomas Barnyngham, proctor and monk, to Cromwell’. 15 January 1536.

SP 1/102. ‘The Compendium Compertorum’. 4 February - 23 March 1536

SP 1/139, f. 148-152. ‘The Charterhouse’. 24 November 1538.

SP 1/142, f. 155. ‘Tregonwell and Petre to Cromwell’. 26 January 1539.


STAC 2/32/42. ‘Destruction of a fish pond at Emborrow’. 1509-1547.


Somerset Record Office, Taunton.

Universitatsbibliothek Basel
AK VI 21. ‘Statuta Ordinis Cartusiensis, a domno Guigone prior cartusie edita’. 1510.

Primary Printed Sources


Pask Matthews, C. 1930. ‘The Laye Bretherns Statutes (Shene).’ *Surrey Archaeological Collections* 38, 210-226.

Pask Matthews, C. 1931. ‘The Laye Bretherns Statutes (Shene).’ *Surrey Archaeological Collections* 39, 112-143.


Bibliography

Sutton.


Printed Secondary Sources


Aston, M. 2000. _Monasteries in the Landscape_. Stroud: Tempus

Aston, Mick. 1993. ‘The Development of the Carthusian order in Europe and Britain’. In M. Carver (ed). In search of cult: Archaeological Investigations in honour of Philip Rahtz. Woodbridge: Boydell, 139-151.


Farmer, D. H. 1989. ‘Hugh of Lincoln, Carthusian Saint’. In M. G. Sargent (ed). *De cella in seculum: Religious and Secular life and devotion in Late Medieval*
Communal Solitude


Gee, H. 1890. ‘The So-Called ‘Friary’ of our Somersetshire Charterhouses’. *Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries* 1, 129-133.


Bibliography


Lister, J. 1924. The Early Yorkshire Woollen Trade. Extracts from the Hull Customs’ Rolls, and Complete Transcripts of the Ulnagers’ Rolls. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press


Palmer, T. 1921. ‘The Site of Witham Priory or Charterhouse’. *Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries* 17, 90-92.


Roebuck, J., Coppack, G. and Hurst, J. G. 1987.‘A Closely Dated Group of Late


accessories, 1300-1700. Oxford University School of Archaeology Monograph 78. Oxford: School of Archaeology.


*Unpublished Secondary Sources*


Appendix - Bequests to Charterhouses

These bequests are taken from a range of sources and cover the period from 1226 when William Longespée, the founder of Hinton Charterhouse died, up until 1538 when the Dissolution of the Monasteries closed down all the charterhouses. The information available from each bequest is variable, sometimes it is only known that the benefactor gave something to the house, but not what exactly. As very few documents relating to the day-to-day running of the English charterhouses exist, it is not possible to provide a fully comprehensive understanding of the benefaction of these religious institutions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>Proved</th>
<th>Bequest</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 Jan 1490</td>
<td>Richard Worsley</td>
<td>11 Feb 1490</td>
<td></td>
<td>£20 s for 2 trental masses, celebrated for my soul</td>
<td>Southwell 106-109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Jul 1377-1380</td>
<td>William Lord Latimer</td>
<td>28 May 1381</td>
<td>31 May 1381</td>
<td>£50 to pray for his soul</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. I, 113-116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jul 1381</td>
<td>Katherine de la Pole, wife of William de la Pole</td>
<td>28 Jan 1382</td>
<td>28 Jan 1382</td>
<td>to be buried in the choir of the church at Hull, which her husband built.</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. I, 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Aug 1400</td>
<td>Richard, 1st Lord Scrope of Bolton</td>
<td>30 May 1403</td>
<td>30 May 1403</td>
<td>10 marks</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. I, 272-278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Apr 1401</td>
<td>Lady Isabella Fauconberg of Cleveland, wife of Walter Fauconbergh</td>
<td>19 May 1401</td>
<td>1 Jul 1401</td>
<td>her best fur mantle</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. I, 282-283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Aug 1402</td>
<td>Sir John Depeden</td>
<td>19 Dec 1402</td>
<td></td>
<td>a board with a painted crucifix</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. I, 294-299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Apr 1403</td>
<td>William Hesfeld of Swyn</td>
<td>3 May 1403</td>
<td></td>
<td>to be buried in the sanctuary of the church at Hull, written in the charterhouse.</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. I, 325-327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Jul 1414</td>
<td>John de la Pole, cleric</td>
<td>1 Feb 1415</td>
<td></td>
<td>£10 to celebrate 2 trentals for his soul, his parents and all his deceased brothers</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. I, 372-373.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>Proved</td>
<td>Bequest</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Oct 1449</td>
<td>Lady Margaret de la Zouch, wife of John de la Zouch</td>
<td>23 May 1451</td>
<td>2 Dec 1451</td>
<td>6s. 8d. for an obit for her soul and her husband's</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. II, 153-157.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sep 1453</td>
<td>Robert Golding</td>
<td>17 Nov 1453</td>
<td></td>
<td>to be buried in the church at Hull. £4 for glass windows in the chapel of S. Trinity and chapel of S. Hugh.</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. II, 166.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Apr 1454</td>
<td>William Clyderhowe, merchant</td>
<td>2 May 1454</td>
<td></td>
<td>three trentals to be said at Hull</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. II, 171.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Dec 1451</td>
<td>Ralph, Lord Cromwell</td>
<td>4 Jan 1456</td>
<td>21 Feb 1456</td>
<td>one white vestment valued at £40</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. II, 196-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Nov 1467</td>
<td>Robert Est</td>
<td>26 Jan 1474-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6s 8d. to both (with letters of fraternity)</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. III, 159-160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Oct 1478</td>
<td>Lady Joan Ingleby, widow of William, soldier</td>
<td>31 Dec 1478</td>
<td></td>
<td>to be buried at MGP</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. III, 243.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>Proved</td>
<td>Bequest</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Jan 1491</td>
<td>Agnes Witham</td>
<td>4 Oct 1495</td>
<td>26s. 8d.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reg. Test. v, 468 b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Jun 1483</td>
<td>Christopher Conyers</td>
<td>1 Sep 1483</td>
<td>20s.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Test. Ebor. III, 287-293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Aug 1489</td>
<td>Robert Pinkney</td>
<td>17 Mar 1489-90</td>
<td>To pr. MGP 6s. 8d. to convent 6s. 8d. to sing Placebo and Dirige with one obit mass.</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. IV, 41-43.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Apr 1500</td>
<td>Thomas Darell of Sessay</td>
<td>18 Sep 1502</td>
<td>to be buried at MGP, also lands and tenemants in East Harlsey. 2 priest to pray for his souls for 7 years, 8 marks given annually.</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. IV, 172-173.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 May 1500</td>
<td>Edmund Thwaites of Lund, Esq.</td>
<td>3 Jul 1500</td>
<td>10 marks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Test. Ebor. IV, 175-177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Oct 1500</td>
<td>Dame Jane Strangways</td>
<td>3 Feb 1501-2</td>
<td>10 marks to pray for her soul and that of her husband who is buried there, also for an obit for her soul, her husband's soul and all christian souls, to be done within 10 days, and then after 1 year, and the years following. To Dan. Thurston at MGP 10s. to Dan Richard Methley at MPG 10s.</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. IV, 186-190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Oct 1502</td>
<td>Elizabeth Swinburne</td>
<td>18 Nov 1502</td>
<td>50 gold beads and 100 coral beads, with gold finery and 1 gold necklace, on condition that her mother and aunt are made sisters of MGP in perpetuity.</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. IV, 208.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Jul 1509</td>
<td>Alison Clark</td>
<td>7 Aug 1509</td>
<td>10 s for building of a glass window.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Test. Ebor. V, 4-5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Dec 1509</td>
<td>Sir John Gilliot</td>
<td>4 Mar 2017</td>
<td>20s. for 30 masses of requiem for his soul and all Christian souls</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. V, 12-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>Proved</td>
<td>Bequest</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 May 1515</td>
<td>Thomas Boynton</td>
<td>23 Apr 1523</td>
<td></td>
<td>6s. 8d.</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. V, 110-112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 May 1521</td>
<td>Ambrose Pudsey</td>
<td>20 Feb 1521-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>£5 for 5 trentals and 5 obits for his soul, and those of his mother and father.</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. V, 129-132.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Jul 1521</td>
<td>John Tong, bailiff of Burnholme</td>
<td>6 Aug 1521</td>
<td></td>
<td>6s. 8d.</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. V, 134-135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1522</td>
<td>Thomas Strangeways, knight</td>
<td>8 Oct 1525</td>
<td></td>
<td>to be buried at MGP, gift a horse and 40s for a brother to pray for his soul at MGP. 20s. for the pr to pray for his soul and all Christian souls. £40 p/a for a priest to sing at the Lady Chapel of MGP for 3 years</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. V, 155-157.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Sep 1523</td>
<td>Dame Joan Thurescrosse</td>
<td>22 Jan 1523-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>a standing piece of silver.</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. V, 170-172.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Mar 1527</td>
<td>John Chapman</td>
<td>7 Apr 1530</td>
<td></td>
<td>1000 masses to be said by Carthusians and Mendicants for his soul. 30s. to Hull for &quot;obsequis, missis et suffragis pro anima mea dicendis&quot; Mount Grace - 30s. for &quot;consimilibus missis, exequis et orationibus dicendis&quot; 20s to Beauvale for the same. 30s to Coventry for the same.</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. V, 240-245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Apr 1529</td>
<td>John Swift</td>
<td>5 May 1529</td>
<td></td>
<td>to be buried at Hull - 20s given. 30s for tombstone, 20s for a trental. Mass and Dirige on day of burial. Uncle was Ralph Smith, pr of Hull.</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. V, 271-272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Oct 1531</td>
<td>Sir William Bulmer the Elder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2s to every brother at MGP</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. V, 306-310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>Proved</td>
<td>Bequest</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Sept 1532</td>
<td>Robert Browne of Newark</td>
<td>16 Dec 1532</td>
<td></td>
<td>if will cannot be made, Pr. of Beauvale should sell his property, and distribute money for the benefit of his soul and for the people of Newark</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. VI, 29-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 1534</td>
<td>Henry Babthorpe, Esq., of Drax</td>
<td>24 Sept 1535</td>
<td>3s. 4d.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Test. Ebor. VI, 47-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Jul 1537</td>
<td>Christopher Stapleton, of Wighill, Esq.</td>
<td>29 Jan 1537-8</td>
<td></td>
<td>to pr. of MGP 20s.</td>
<td>Test. Ebor. VI, 66-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Apr 1393</td>
<td>Henry Wyvelescombe</td>
<td>19 Aug 1393</td>
<td></td>
<td>legacy</td>
<td>Bristol 35-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Jun 1514</td>
<td>Sir William Fewaren</td>
<td>21 Jun 1514</td>
<td>20s.</td>
<td></td>
<td>London Consist., 3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mar 1517</td>
<td>Sir John Graunte</td>
<td>6 May 1517</td>
<td>20s.</td>
<td></td>
<td>London Consist., 23-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 May 1518</td>
<td>Sir Thomas Everade</td>
<td>2 Jul 1519</td>
<td>20s.</td>
<td></td>
<td>London Consist., 47-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Oct 1537</td>
<td>Anthony Fitzherbert</td>
<td>26 Aug 1538</td>
<td></td>
<td>To MGP and Beauvale 40s. To all others 13s. 4d.</td>
<td>Derbyshire Rec. Soc. 26, 70-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Nov 1401</td>
<td>Thomas Tanner of Wells</td>
<td>12 Dec 1401</td>
<td>40s each &quot;to pray for my soul&quot;</td>
<td>Somerset 6-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Jul 1410</td>
<td>William Stourton</td>
<td>22 Sep 1413</td>
<td></td>
<td>burial in cloister, bequeath brass basin for washing feet</td>
<td>Somerset 41-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jul 1415</td>
<td>Michael de la Pole, 3rd Earl of Suffolk</td>
<td>25 Oct 1415</td>
<td>5 Nov 1415</td>
<td>body to be buried the church at Hull, between the tomb of his father and mother and the altar</td>
<td>North Country 8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 May 1429</td>
<td>John Mowbray, 2nd Duke of Norfolk</td>
<td>14 Feb 1432-33</td>
<td></td>
<td>buried in church at Axholme</td>
<td>North Country 36-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>Proved</td>
<td>Bequest</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Jan 1449</td>
<td>William de la Pole, 1st Duke of Suffolk</td>
<td>2 May 1450</td>
<td>3 Jun 1450</td>
<td>body to be buried at Hull, tombstone with his image and his wife beside him, so that the masses he has perpetually founded there may be said over his image.</td>
<td>North Country 50-51; Test. Vet. 256-257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Mar 1505</td>
<td>Lady Jane Hastings</td>
<td>7 Apr 1505</td>
<td></td>
<td>To Sheen, 40s. To London £3 6s. 8d. To MGP £13 6s. 4d. for a monk of MGP to sing for evermore for her soul, her husband’s soul, Ric. Pygote late husband, children and friends souls and all Christian souls.</td>
<td>North Country 73-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Sep 1505</td>
<td>Henry Skerne, of Waltham, Co. Lincoln</td>
<td>19 May 1506</td>
<td></td>
<td>13s. 4d.</td>
<td>North Country 79-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Aug 1537</td>
<td>George Talbot, 4th Earl of Shrewsbury</td>
<td>13 Jan 1538-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>40s each to say a solemn dirige and masse for his soul.</td>
<td>North Country 144-151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Sep 1538</td>
<td>Richard Belasyse of Henknoll</td>
<td>1 Jul 1540</td>
<td></td>
<td>20s to be praised for. 40s for four trentals of masses.</td>
<td>North Country 159-161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 May 1361</td>
<td>Michael de Northburgh, Archdeacon of Suffolk and Canon of S. Paul’s</td>
<td>13 Dec 1361</td>
<td></td>
<td>£2000 for the foundation of London Charterhouse, as well as basins for use at the altar, a silver vessel for containing the host, his best silver stoup for the holy water, with sprinkler, silver bell and all his rents and tenements in London</td>
<td>Hustig 61-62.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Feb 1372</td>
<td>Walter Bachiler, draper</td>
<td>7 Mar 1373-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>remainder to London Ch. in pure and perpetual alms</td>
<td>Hustig 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Jun 1374</td>
<td>Simon Bristowe, clerk</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td></td>
<td>diverse specific sums</td>
<td>Hustig 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Dec 1374</td>
<td>William Wolmerstey</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td></td>
<td>bequest to the religious men called &quot;Charters&quot; living at the new churchyard without Aldrichegate</td>
<td>Hustig 170-171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Jul 1375</td>
<td>Edelena Atte Legh, wife of Thomas, late “stokfishmongere”</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td></td>
<td>bequest to &quot;le Charthous&quot;. 3000 masses to be sung for the good of her soul within one month of her decease, and provision made for her funeral, observance of month’s mind etc.</td>
<td>Hustig 178-179.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>Proved</td>
<td>Bequest</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Feb 1376</td>
<td>Marie de Seintpol, Countess of Pembroc, Dame of Weiseford and of Montignac</td>
<td>26 Apr 1377</td>
<td>Bequests</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hustings 194-196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Apr 1377</td>
<td>Henry Frowyk, senior</td>
<td>31 May 1378</td>
<td>tenements in the parish of St Giles without Crepulgate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hustings 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Apr 1379</td>
<td>Adam Rous, Surgeon</td>
<td>25 Jul 1379</td>
<td>remainder to London Ch.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hustings 207-208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Dec 1380</td>
<td>John Aubrey</td>
<td>17 Mar 1381</td>
<td>to be buried in the London Charterhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hustings 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Jun 1380</td>
<td>Cecilia Rose, relict of Thomas Rose, clerk</td>
<td>27 Apr 1382</td>
<td>she leaves the reversion of certain rents for keeping obits for her soul, Thos. late husband, Edmund, their child and others.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hustings 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 May 1381</td>
<td>Felicia Peutry, relict of John</td>
<td>1 Jun 1383</td>
<td>to be buried in the church of LC, near the tomb of her late husband, leaves rents issuing from her tenement called “le holceler” in the parish of S. Margaret de Bruggestret, so that they observe her obit and the obit of her late husband on 5 June, with Requiem and Placebo and Dirige with music on the vigil of said day.</td>
<td>Hustings 233-234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Aug 1382</td>
<td>John de Guldeford, paneter</td>
<td>14 Jun 1383</td>
<td>10 silver marks for the maintenance of a special chantry priest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hustings 234-235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Feb 1382</td>
<td>Robert Atte Launde, Knight, citizen of London</td>
<td>20 Jul 1383</td>
<td>reversion of a shop in Chepe with solars in the parish of S. Vedast. £10. To be buried in the Charterhouse. £20 to buy a table for the high altar, painted with a kneeling image</td>
<td>Hustings 236-237; Reg. Courtenay, f. 209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Apr 1384</td>
<td>John de Heylesdon, mercer</td>
<td>18 Jul 1384</td>
<td>bequest to LC.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hustings 241-243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Sep 1384</td>
<td>John de Coggeshale, corder</td>
<td>6 Nov 1385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hustings 249-250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>Proved</td>
<td>Bequest</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Dec 1385</td>
<td>William de Walleworth, Knight</td>
<td>16 Jan 1386</td>
<td>remainder in case of default to LC for the maintenance of chantries, with power to his right heirs to enter in case of default. reversion of tenements in the parish of S. Christopher in Bradestrete, in return for their prayers</td>
<td>Hustings 251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 May 1388</td>
<td>Thomas Renham, goldsmith</td>
<td>27 Jul 1388</td>
<td>bequests to LC</td>
<td>Hustings 269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Jun 1390</td>
<td>John Clenhond</td>
<td>16 Jun 1393</td>
<td>bequests to LC</td>
<td>Hustings 300-301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Feb 1393</td>
<td>John Blakeneye, fishmonger</td>
<td>1 Jun 1394</td>
<td>to be buried in the church of LC, to which he leaves all his lands and tenements in the parishes of S. Nicholas Coldabbey and S. Mary Somerset, so that the monks say a weekly de Profundis for the good of his soul. Also £30 for the masonry of their new chapter house, with a vestment and chalice.</td>
<td>Hustings 309-310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 May 1393</td>
<td>William Kyng, draper</td>
<td>9 Nov 1394</td>
<td>bequests to LC</td>
<td>Hustings 312-313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Dec 1397</td>
<td>John Goldryng, chandler</td>
<td>22 Jan 1398</td>
<td>bequests to LC, for prayers and masses</td>
<td>Hustings 332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Dec 1397</td>
<td>John Norhampton, draper</td>
<td>12 Feb 1398</td>
<td>remainder to LC for pious uses for the good of his soul, and those of his family. On the day of his obit half a mark of silver is to be expended on a pittance for the convent, and each monk is to have half a pound of ginger. At every Lent, each monk is to have a pound of dates, a pound of figs, and a pound of raisins beyond his usual allowance.</td>
<td>Hustings 333-335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Apr 1396</td>
<td>Simon Wynchecombe, armourer</td>
<td>17 Nov 1399</td>
<td>bequests to LC</td>
<td>Hustings 340-342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Nov 1408</td>
<td>John Wodecok, mercer</td>
<td>27 Feb 1413</td>
<td>bequests to LC</td>
<td>Hustings 397-399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>Proved</td>
<td>Bequest</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Oct 1425</td>
<td>Margaret Comewaill, relict of Benedict, draper</td>
<td>14 Jul 1427</td>
<td></td>
<td>lands and tenements in the parish of S. Benedict in Langbourne Ward, so that they observe her obit as directed.</td>
<td>Hustings 441-442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Apr 1433</td>
<td>William Cambrugge, grocer</td>
<td>27 Dec 1431</td>
<td></td>
<td>remainder to John Mapelstede, pr. of LC and to the convent on condition that they pray for his soul and the souls of Johanna and Anne his wives, Luke his father, Alice his mother, and others.</td>
<td>Hustings 463-464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Jan 1437</td>
<td>Richard Osborn, Clerk of the Chamber of the City of London</td>
<td>28 Jul 1438</td>
<td></td>
<td>rents in the parish of S. Mary de Abbechirch, on condition they observe the obit of Johanna Blounde on the day of the exaltation of H. Cross [14 Sept], with Placebo and Dirige by note overnight and Requiem mass on the morrow.</td>
<td>Hustings 484-485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Mar 1445</td>
<td>William Estfeld, Knight, citizen and mercer, and Alderman of the City of London</td>
<td>27 Feb 1447</td>
<td></td>
<td>cask of Gascony wine</td>
<td>Hustings 509-511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Nov 1436</td>
<td>John Baron, talughchaundeler</td>
<td>29 Jan 1448</td>
<td></td>
<td>bequests to LC</td>
<td>Hustings 514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Feb 1456</td>
<td>William Farneham, sporier</td>
<td>23 May 1457</td>
<td></td>
<td>rent to LC for the purpose of keeping obit of John Courtenay, late Principal of “Furnyvale In” in Holborn.</td>
<td>Hustings 531-532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Feb 1456</td>
<td>William Aston, citizen and freeman of the City of London</td>
<td>24 Oct 1460</td>
<td></td>
<td>To Thos. Methley, pr. of Beauvale and the convent an annual rent of £10 6s. 8d from lands and tenements without Ludgate in the parish of S. Martin near Ludgate, charged with an annual payment of 7 marks to a chantry in the church S. Mary at Thyngden, where his daughter Agnes lies buried. In case of default, the rents should go to LC.</td>
<td>Hustings 542-543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Apr 1459</td>
<td>John Hatherle, Alderman, citizen and imonger</td>
<td>3 Feb 1466</td>
<td></td>
<td>tenements and wharf in Devillane in parish of S. Michael, Queenhithe for observance of his obit, also other tenements for maintenance of a chantry and for gits to the poor.</td>
<td>Hustings 552-553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>Proved</td>
<td>Bequest</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Apr 1462</td>
<td>Stephen Broun, grocer</td>
<td>3 Feb 1466</td>
<td></td>
<td>bequests to LC</td>
<td>Hustings 553-554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Aug 1461</td>
<td>William Gregory, senior, citizen and skinner</td>
<td>5 Oct 1467</td>
<td></td>
<td>annual rent of 13s 4d for the good of his soul.</td>
<td>Hustings 557-558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Jun 1472</td>
<td>John Bedham, fishmonger</td>
<td>10 Oct 1474</td>
<td></td>
<td>remainder to LC charged with the maintenance of lamps to burn by night and day over the tombs of Richard Clyderow and John Popham, knight, and the observance of an obit for the soul of William Baron.</td>
<td>Hustings 572-573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Jul 1478</td>
<td>John Leynham (Plommer), Knight</td>
<td>28 Feb 1480</td>
<td></td>
<td>to be buried in LC. bequests to LC. to Dan. John Walsyngham, pr of LC and the convent, tenements in the parish of &quot;Oure lady Fanchirche&quot;, charged with the observance of his obit and other pious and charitable uses.</td>
<td>Hustings 578-579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Nov 1479</td>
<td>Walter Patsyll, mercer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hustings II, 585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Feb 1485</td>
<td>Thomas Paddington, fishmonger</td>
<td>22 Jan 1487</td>
<td></td>
<td>legacy to LC</td>
<td>Hustings 588-589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Nov 1481</td>
<td>Bartholomew James, Knight, Alderman and late Mayor of the City of London</td>
<td>15 Oct 1498</td>
<td></td>
<td>bequests to LC, Sheen</td>
<td>Hustings 598-599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Feb 1508</td>
<td>James Fynche, sherman</td>
<td>5 Mar 1509</td>
<td></td>
<td>in case of default, 36 messuages and a wharf in the lane called &quot;Betteslane&quot; to go to LC for observance of an obit for the good of his soul, the souls of Elizabeth his late wife, and others.</td>
<td>Hustings 614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Oct 1508</td>
<td>Richard Chary, Alderman and freeman of the City of London.</td>
<td>10 Dec 1509</td>
<td></td>
<td>remainder to LC, so that the names of Robert and Margaret Rede be placed in the codex of the convent called &quot;le Martylage boke&quot; to be rememberd in prayers.</td>
<td>Hustings 614-615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>Proved</td>
<td>Bequest</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Apr 1509</td>
<td>John Hert, bruer</td>
<td>30 Sep 1510</td>
<td></td>
<td>in case of default, lands and tenements in the parish of S. James of Garlykhithe for maintenance of a chantry and observance of his obit.;</td>
<td>Hustings 616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Apr 1503</td>
<td>Thomas Thwaytes, mercer of London and burgess of the town of Calais</td>
<td>29 Jan 1515</td>
<td></td>
<td>to be buried in chapel of S. Jerome at LC, leaves all his jewels, and stuff of his chapel for use in chapel of S. Jerome, and leaves every brother of the house 12d. Also reversion of certain lands and tenements in the parish of Our Lady of Aldermary.</td>
<td>Hustings 621-622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Dec 1400</td>
<td>John Chelsey, canon of Wells</td>
<td>5 Aug 1401</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td></td>
<td>Somerset 5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Aug 1417</td>
<td>John Shirforde, canon of Wells</td>
<td>25 Oct 1419</td>
<td></td>
<td>all books at “Banewelle” to be delivered to LC to pray for his soul</td>
<td>Somerset 85-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Oct 1417</td>
<td>Richard Bruton, canon of Wells</td>
<td>7 Dec 1417</td>
<td>2s 6d</td>
<td>to each priest; 20d to each monk not a priest, 6s 8d to each of the communities</td>
<td>Somerset 87-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Oct 1423</td>
<td>Henry Russell</td>
<td>12 Dec 1423</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td></td>
<td>Somerset 110-111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Nov 1431</td>
<td>John Hertypole, rector of churches of Brigham (Cumb.) and Sandy (Beds.)</td>
<td>17 Nov 1432</td>
<td></td>
<td>£10 to pray for his soul and perform his obsequies, and to each priest ministering at obsequies 12d. and each clerk 6d</td>
<td>Somerset 135-137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Apr 1459</td>
<td>Robert Hungerford, knight, lord of Hungerford, of Heytesbury and of Hamelethe</td>
<td>14 May 1459</td>
<td>7 Jul 1459</td>
<td>5 marks to each.</td>
<td>Somerset 186-193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Apr 1467</td>
<td>Andrew Holes, Chancellor of the church of Sarum</td>
<td>25 Jun 1467</td>
<td>bequest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Somerset 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 May 1467</td>
<td>John Sparhawke, rector of parish church of Coldaston, in diocese of Worcester</td>
<td>9 Jun 1467</td>
<td>12d. to pray for his soul</td>
<td>Somerset 213-215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 May 1469</td>
<td>William Kayleway</td>
<td>1 Jul 1469</td>
<td>13s 4d</td>
<td>to pray for his soul</td>
<td>Somerset 218-219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>Proved</td>
<td>Bequest</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Mar 1472</td>
<td>John Sperhauke</td>
<td>4 Feb 1474</td>
<td>26s. 8d. to be distributed proportionally among the brethren. Let the prior have a double portion and they are to pray for his soul.</td>
<td>Somerset 222-225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Dec 1475</td>
<td>Richard atte Welle</td>
<td>5 Feb 1476</td>
<td>£20 to pray for his soul</td>
<td>Somerset 227-228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Jun 1484</td>
<td>Joan Mufeford</td>
<td>16 Dec 1484</td>
<td>One “maser” (murram) silver gilt</td>
<td>Somerset 250-251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Feb 1484</td>
<td>John Sampson</td>
<td>4 Mar 1484</td>
<td>to Edmund Storowr, pr. Hinton, £10; to each Carthusian house in England, 20s.</td>
<td>Somerset 252-253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Dec 1486</td>
<td>Richard Swan</td>
<td>30 Jan 1487</td>
<td>10 marks to pray for his soul</td>
<td>Somerset 261-262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Jan 1486</td>
<td>Thomas Mershe</td>
<td>27 Feb 1486</td>
<td>Bequest</td>
<td>Somerset 263-264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1490</td>
<td>Robert Saundre</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>100s.</td>
<td>Somerset 293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Aug 1493</td>
<td>John Hayne</td>
<td></td>
<td>3s. 4d.</td>
<td>Somerset 311-312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Jan 1496</td>
<td>Thomas Chaunceeler, citizen of Bath</td>
<td>9 Mar 1497</td>
<td>40s. to pray for his soul</td>
<td>Somerset 341-344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Feb 1502</td>
<td>Robert Pemberton, clerk</td>
<td>25 Oct 1505</td>
<td>To the prior and brethren of the Carthusian House of Witham 6s 8d.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Apr 1503</td>
<td>John Fox</td>
<td>5 Jul 1503</td>
<td>to be buried at the entrance of the cloister of the house of the BM of Wytham in Selwode, of the Carthusian Order. To the principal Carthusian House in France 6s. 8d. To the house of Wytham 40s with a silver goblet. To the church of Frary 13s 4d if it be possible, otherwise 6s 8d. To the servants of the house Whitham 14s.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>Proved</td>
<td>Bequest</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Jul 1503</td>
<td>John Compton, senior of Bekynton</td>
<td>27 Oct 1505</td>
<td></td>
<td>To the Carthusian House of Henton £10. To the Carthusian House of Wytham £10.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Feb 1505</td>
<td>Thomas Champeneys</td>
<td>6 Jan 1507</td>
<td></td>
<td>To the Charterhouse of Henton 20s. to pray for my soul and the souls of Thomas.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 92-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Mar 1506</td>
<td>Simon Grene</td>
<td>22 Oct 1509</td>
<td></td>
<td>To the prior and convent of the Carthusian house of Whitham for a like purpose [to pray and celebrate exequies and mass on the day of burial] 20s.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 98-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Dec 1507</td>
<td>William Champyon</td>
<td>29 Jan 1507</td>
<td></td>
<td>To the house of the Carthusians of Witham 40s. To the house of the Carthusians of Henton 40s.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 109-110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Sep 1508</td>
<td>Richard Webbe</td>
<td>24 Nov 1508</td>
<td></td>
<td>The great bell of Henton 20d.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Sep 1509</td>
<td>Walter Crossman</td>
<td>22 Oct 1509</td>
<td></td>
<td>Convent of Wytham a toon of wyn (A tun of wine?)</td>
<td>Somerset II, 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Jan 1510</td>
<td>John Rose</td>
<td>7 May 1511</td>
<td></td>
<td>To the Carthusian House of Henton 13s 4d.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Feb 1510</td>
<td>John Jeffereys alias Cockys</td>
<td>11 Apr 1511</td>
<td></td>
<td>To the Abbey of Henton 6s 8d.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 146-148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Jul 1513</td>
<td>William Woodward</td>
<td>1 Jun 1515</td>
<td></td>
<td>To the prior of the house of Henton and the convent 13s 4d to pray for my soul.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Nov 1515</td>
<td>William Baily alias Rawlyns</td>
<td>12 Feb 1515</td>
<td></td>
<td>To the charterhouse in Selwod 13s 4d.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 181-183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Aug 1519</td>
<td>John Joyce</td>
<td>19 Sep 1519</td>
<td></td>
<td>To the charterhouse of Witham 6s 8d. To the charterhouse of Henton 6s 8d.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Jan 1520</td>
<td>Thomas Tutt</td>
<td>16 Mar 1520</td>
<td></td>
<td>To the House of Charterhouse Wytham 20s. To the House of Charterhouse Henton 6s. 8d.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>Proved</td>
<td>Bequest</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Sep 1523</td>
<td>Richard Dyer</td>
<td>12 Oct 1523</td>
<td></td>
<td>To the Charterhouse Wytham to have a trentall songe for me 10s.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 222-223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Apr 1524</td>
<td>John Robyns</td>
<td>29 Apr 1524</td>
<td></td>
<td>To the two Charterhouses, Witham and Henton, 10s a pece.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 225-226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Oct 1525</td>
<td>John, Lord Zouche</td>
<td>29 Mar 1525</td>
<td></td>
<td>To the prior and covent of the Charterhouse of Wytham 20s.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 241-248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Oct 1526</td>
<td>Elizabeth Cayleway</td>
<td>30 Jan 1526</td>
<td></td>
<td>To the charterhouse of Wittam 6s 8d.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 257-258.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sep 1527</td>
<td>Joan Champneys</td>
<td>15 Nov 1527</td>
<td></td>
<td>To Maister Prior of the Charterhouse in Wytham 40s to be men overseer.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 262.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Mar 1528</td>
<td>Thomas Strete</td>
<td>3 Apr 1528</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charterhouse of Wytham 10s.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 May 1528</td>
<td>Philip Barnabe</td>
<td>26 May 1528</td>
<td></td>
<td>To the prior of Charterhouse a goblet of silver.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 273.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 May 1528</td>
<td>John Bampfelde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To the houses of Henton and Wyttam £10 each.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 273-274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Oct 1529</td>
<td>William Long</td>
<td>7 Jan 1529</td>
<td></td>
<td>To the churches of Westwode, Wenysley, Stook and Henton 3s 4d each.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 282-283.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Dec 1415</td>
<td>William Loryng</td>
<td>20 Mar 1415</td>
<td></td>
<td>I bequeath my three books, one “de meditacionibus Anselmi,” another “de meditacionibus Passions Christi,” and the other “de meditacionibus beat Bernardi” to the monks of the monastery of the Carthusian order in Selewode [Witham] to whose prayers I commend myself.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 316-318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Oct 1430</td>
<td>Reginald Brita</td>
<td>3 Aug 1434</td>
<td></td>
<td>To Sir Thomas Bernard, Prior of Henton, 6s. 8d. To the convent of the same house 10s.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 330-331.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>Proved</td>
<td>Bequest</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Sep 1432</td>
<td>Ralph Hunte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To the Prior and Carthusian convent of the House of God of Henton 20s., so that I and Isabella, my wife, may be admitted as a brother and a sister there, and that they may say placebo and dirige on the days of my burial, and obit and mass on the morrow for my soul and for all the faithful deceased. To the same prior and convent 20s for performing the office on the day of my anniversary as is above said.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 332-334.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Feb 1443</td>
<td>Thomas Sambrooke</td>
<td>10 Sep 1444</td>
<td></td>
<td>To the Prior and Carthusian house of Henpton to pray for me 20s.</td>
<td>Somerset II, 337-338.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Dec 1529</td>
<td>John Madley</td>
<td>29 Nov 1532</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior and Convent of Weytham 40s.</td>
<td>Somerset III, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Apr 1538</td>
<td>Andrew Luttrell</td>
<td>13 Jul 1538</td>
<td></td>
<td>To the Carterhouse in London 40s. for two solempe obites with two diriges.</td>
<td>Somerset III, 41-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Oct 1538</td>
<td>John Fitzjames</td>
<td>12 May 1542</td>
<td></td>
<td>To each of the Charterhouse Witham and Henton £3 6s 8d., to pray for me.</td>
<td>Somerset III, 48-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Nov 1371</td>
<td>Sir Walter Manny</td>
<td>13 Apr 1372</td>
<td></td>
<td>To be buried in the Charterhouse. A tomb of alabaster to be made with his shield of his arms, and a monk to pray for him.</td>
<td>Reg. Whittlesey, ff. 120b, 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mar 1381</td>
<td>Walter Mayn, moneyer at the Tower of London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To be buried in the cloister of the London Charterhouse</td>
<td>CCL I, f. 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Aug 1385</td>
<td>John Baron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To be buried in the house of the Carthusian Order in London</td>
<td>CCL I, f. 139b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1387</td>
<td>Katherine, widow of John atte Pole of London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To be buried beneath the western “hostium” of the Carthusian monastery near West Smithfield. Also 20 silver pounds and a vestment made of blood red silk and 100 solidos for a chalice</td>
<td>CCL I, f. 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Feb 1390</td>
<td>William Stowe of West Smithfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To be buried beneath the great door to the church of the Carthusians near London</td>
<td>CCL I, f. 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Owner Details</td>
<td>Bequest</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Apr 1419</td>
<td>Robert Manfield, provost of Beverley</td>
<td>£100 to found a cell for a monk to be built at the east end of the new chapel</td>
<td>To be buried at London, next to the grave of his wife.</td>
<td>North Country 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1419</td>
<td>Richard Clyderhowe, esquire</td>
<td>£10 for his burial</td>
<td>To be buried in the brethren church at London</td>
<td>PCC 59 Marche</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Oct 1435</td>
<td>Philip Morgan, bishop of Ely</td>
<td>£10 for his burial</td>
<td>To be buried beneath the church at London, next to where the body of Alice Clayton, late anchorite of London lies covered in earth.</td>
<td>Reg. Chichele 1, 454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Oct 1464</td>
<td>Robert Nanseglos of London, gentleman</td>
<td>£10 for his burial</td>
<td>To be buried in the cloister of the London Charterhouse, in front of the door to the choir. He gives £4 to the Charterhouse</td>
<td>PCC 11 Godyn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Nov 1465</td>
<td>John Payn of London, clerk</td>
<td>£4 to the Charterhouse</td>
<td>To be buried in the body of the church at London</td>
<td>PCC 1 Watys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Oct 1464</td>
<td>John Curtes, doctor of medicine</td>
<td>£4 to the Charterhouse</td>
<td>To be buried in the body of the church at London</td>
<td>PCC 1 Watys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Apr 1466</td>
<td>Dame Margaret Leyham</td>
<td>£40 for her burial</td>
<td>If she died within 7 miles of London, to be buried in the church of the Charterhouse, next to Sir John Leyham, also wishes prayers to be said for 7 years after her death, and also for the soul of her husband, father, mother and friends. Also bequeaths her great carpet to the Charterhouse to spread before the high altar.</td>
<td>PCC 6 Logge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Apr 1471</td>
<td>John Curtes, doctor of medicine</td>
<td>£4 to the Charterhouse</td>
<td>To be buried in the body of the church at London</td>
<td>PCC 1 Watys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Apr 1482</td>
<td>Dame Margaret Leyham</td>
<td>£40 for her burial</td>
<td>If she died within 7 miles of London, to be buried in the church of the Charterhouse, next to Sir John Leyham, also wishes prayers to be said for 7 years after her death, and also for the soul of her husband, father, mother and friends. Also bequeaths her great carpet to the Charterhouse to spread before the high altar.</td>
<td>PCC 6 Logge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Sep 1382</td>
<td>Dame Margaret Leyham</td>
<td>£40 for her burial</td>
<td>If she died within 7 miles of London, to be buried in the church of the Charterhouse, next to Sir John Leyham, also wishes prayers to be said for 7 years after her death, and also for the soul of her husband, father, mother and friends. Also bequeaths her great carpet to the Charterhouse to spread before the high altar.</td>
<td>PCC 6 Logge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Aug 1485</td>
<td>William Donyngton</td>
<td>£40 for her burial</td>
<td>If she died within 7 miles of London, to be buried in the church of the Charterhouse, next to Sir John Leyham, also wishes prayers to be said for 7 years after her death, and also for the soul of her husband, father, mother and friends. Also bequeaths her great carpet to the Charterhouse to spread before the high altar.</td>
<td>PCC 23 Logge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 May 1486</td>
<td>Andrew Baker, rector of Titchwell, Norfolk</td>
<td>£40 for her burial</td>
<td>If she died within 7 miles of London, to be buried in the church of the Charterhouse, next to Sir John Leyham, also wishes prayers to be said for 7 years after her death, and also for the soul of her husband, father, mother and friends. Also bequeaths her great carpet to the Charterhouse to spread before the high altar.</td>
<td>PCC 9 Horne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 May 1497</td>
<td>Richard Skipley, priest</td>
<td>£40 for her burial</td>
<td>If she died within 7 miles of London, to be buried in the church of the Charterhouse, next to Sir John Leyham, also wishes prayers to be said for 7 years after her death, and also for the soul of her husband, father, mother and friends. Also bequeaths her great carpet to the Charterhouse to spread before the high altar.</td>
<td>PCC 9 Horne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>Proved</td>
<td>Bequest</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Feb 1498</td>
<td>Richard Lessy, chamberlain to the pope</td>
<td>1 Oct 1498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PCC 25 Horne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Jul 1516</td>
<td>Elizabeth Skipwith</td>
<td>3 Dec 1516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PCC 25 Holder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 May 1517</td>
<td>Edmund Stephyns of London, gentleman</td>
<td>30 Jun 1517</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PCC 31 Holder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Dec 1518</td>
<td>Sir Robert Rede, Knight, chief justice of the Common Pleas</td>
<td>8 Jan 1518-19</td>
<td>Jan 1518-19</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCC 13 Ayloffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Jan 1524</td>
<td>John Sharp, priest</td>
<td>8 Feb 1524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PCC 30 Bodfelde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Jun 1524</td>
<td>Robert Langton, clerk, prebendary of Charminster and Bere in the Cathedral Church of Salisbury</td>
<td>9 Jul 1524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PCC 21 Bodfelde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Jul 1525</td>
<td>John Norborough of London, gentleman</td>
<td>16 Jul 1525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PCC 35 Bodfelde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Oct 1529</td>
<td>Richard Chaffe, merchant of the Staple of Calais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PCC 15 Jankyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1226</td>
<td>William de Longespée, Earl of Salisbury</td>
<td>7 Mar 1226</td>
<td></td>
<td>a cup of gold, set with emeralds and rubies; also a pix of gold, with xli s. and two goblets of silver, one of which \ is gilt; likewise a chasuble and cope of red silk, a tunicle and dalmatic of yellow cendal, an alba, amice, and stole; also a favon and towel, with all my reliques; likewise a thousand sheep, three hundred muttons, forty-eight oxen, and fifteen bulls.</td>
<td>Test. Vet. 49-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>Proved</td>
<td>Bequest</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 May 1372</td>
<td>John de Hastings, Earl of Pembroke</td>
<td>16 April 1376</td>
<td>17th August 1376</td>
<td>to the Charter-house, London, beyond Newgate, the remainder of the sumo of cccl. which I have in part granted to that house in fulfilment of a vow I made in Guienne.</td>
<td>Test. Vet. 87-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Jan 1446</td>
<td>Henry, Cardinal Beaufort, Bishop of Winchester</td>
<td>11 April 1447</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brother Richard Vyall, Prior of the Church of Witham, of the Carthusian to be an executor - bequeathed c l.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Oct 1480</td>
<td>Ann, Duchess of Buckingham</td>
<td></td>
<td>31 Oct 1480</td>
<td>I will that in all haste after my decease every priest in Sion, as also in the Charter House of London, and the Charter House of Shene, have each of them xx d. to pray for the soul of my most dear and best beloved husband Humphrey late Duke of Buckingham, my own good soul, and all my childrens’ souls, in five masses, to be said and sung by every of the said priests with five dirges for the said souls.</td>
<td>Test. Vet 356-357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>