HOSPITALITY IN A CISTERCIAN ABBEY: THE CASE OF KIRKSTALL IN THE LATER MIDDLE AGES

RICHARD JAMES ANDREW THOMASON

TWO VOLUMES
VOLUME ONE

Submitted in Accordance with the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Institute for Medieval Studies
University of Leeds
September 2015

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is his own work and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines hospitality as provided by Cistercian communities via a case study of Kirkstall Abbey (Leeds, West Yorkshire). It analyses the practices of hospitality as enacted at Kirkstall over a long duration of time, and the place that hospitality had in the life of the community. Hospitality is explored through four concepts: the host, the space(s) of hospitality, the guest, and the welcome. Defining these elements enables the study of how they are represented in a wide variety of archaeological and textual sources. Spiritual writings, documentary evidence, and archaeological evidence are brought together to form a holistic, unified interpretation of Cistercian hospitality in its historical and material contexts.

Chapter 1 is a study of Cistercians as hosts, and uses normative and spiritual texts to investigate how Cistercians conceived of hospitality within the framework of their observance. Chapter 2 analyses the spaces of hospitality with special reference to Kirkstall. In order to understand developments at Kirkstall more fully, a survey of Cistercian guest accommodation from the twelfth to sixteenth centuries is presented. Chapter 3 uses Kirkstall's small finds and documentary sources to examine the social status, personal identities, and gender of guests. Chapter 4 assesses the facilities provided within the guest house and what activities took place there, including provision of food. Ultimately it is argued that hospitality was a fully integrated component of Cistercian observance, which allowed monks to connect with the wider world in a practical way while upholding the tenets of their observance.

PREFATORY STATEMENT

This thesis was researched and written in parallel to, but separate from, the writing and production of an archaeological survey of Kirkstall Abbey's guesthouse (hereafter referred to as 'archaeological survey'). This statement is intended to clarify the relationship between the archaeological survey and the doctoral research. This archaeological survey remains in production and will not be published until late 2016 at the earliest.[1] It is being edited by Stuart Wrathmell (formerly of West Yorkshire Joint Services) and is intended to complete the re-assessment of Kirkstall's archaeology, the first stage of which was carried out in 1987.[2] As part of the archaeological survey, several specialist reports were commissioned, the coverage of which included the structural remains, small finds, animal bones, industrial waste, glass, and pottery. The intention behind the archaeological survey was to make the guesthouse assemblage more accessible to the scholarly community by publishing data which had been residing in archives for nearly twenty-five years. The production of the archaeological survey was in part prompted by the present doctoral research project, but there was no institutional association between the doctoral candidate and contributors to the archaeological survey. The candidate received no supervision during the period of research from any specialists associated with the archaeological survey. The doctoral candidate has, however, been fortunate to receive the goodwill of a number of the archaeologists involved, who have discussed their findings with the candidate. The candidate is especially grateful to Stuart Wrathmell, who provided technical drawings and advance drafts of the written specialist reports, the relationship of which to the present work is discussed below.

The doctoral research project was conceived and initiated without knowledge of the planned archaeological survey. Outputs associated with the archaeological survey were made available in stages from late 2012 through to early 2016, with the end date for the present doctoral programme being 30 September 2015. The schedule of the archaeological survey and the periods in which the subject matter of the chapters of this thesis was researched were not synchronised, and reports were often available to the candidate only after the candidate's

---

[1] The provisional bibliographical reference is Stuart Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2*, (forthcoming).

[2] Stephen Moorhouse and Stuart Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 1: The 1950–64 Excavations – A Reassessment* (Wakefield: West Yorkshire Archaeological Service, 1987).

own research had been carried out and the relevant chapter sections written.

Stuart Wrathmell's reports on the structural remains of the guest house were made available to the doctoral candidate in mid-2013, and provide the basis for discussion in chapter 2.7. A full draft of the report of the structural developments of the guesthouse, comprising chapters 1 to 3 of the archaeological survey, was made available to the candidate in November 2014, with chapter 2.7 of the present thesis being written after in 2015. The candidate has employed the chronology determined by Wrathmell in chapter 2.7. Discussion of the social significance of structural changes to Kirkstall's guesthouse, and all comparison made between Kirkstall and other Cistercian abbeys, is the work of the candidate alone. References made to Wrathmell's survey relate to physical description of features, interpretation of features, and dating, insights which in many cases were informed by Wrathmell's supervision of the excavations of the site.

The small finds report, produced by Holly Duncan, was made available in two stages, and aided research conducted for chapters 3.1 (dress accessories), 4.1 (domestic furnishings), and 4.3 (objects relating to activities). The first stage of the small finds report consisted of a digitised catalogue of all small finds, which included the small find number, physical description, measurements, probable date, and in some cases limited comment on comparisons or parallels with other objects from within the Kirkstall guesthouse assemblage or other sites in Britain. The digital catalogue was used to aid the digital archiving of objects now contained in the Discovery Centre archives on Carlisle Road, Leeds on the Leeds Museums and Galleries database. The small finds discussed in this thesis have been examined first-hand by the candidate, and any parallels confirmed through reference to secondary literature. The second stage of the small finds report consisted of a prose summary of the small finds organised by functional category, which highlighted the basic function of the objects, dates, and provided a fuller comparison with parallels from other archaeological sites than was contained in the digitised catalogue. A prose summary of dress accessories was made available to the candidate in November 2013, supplemented by a summary of the remaining small finds in December 2014. The historical contextualisation of the small finds and links made with social status is derived from research carried out by the candidate, as are all associations with pictorial and figural art. Tables compiling data such as physical dimensions of objects are the work of the candidate. Photos of objects were taken either by the candidate or by a Leeds Museums and Galleries intern supervised by the candidate (see Introduction). The results of this research were presented at the International Medieval Congress, University of

Leeds (2014).

The animal bones report was made available in two stages and concern the discussion contained in chapter 4.2. The first stage was made available in September 2012, which consisted of a database of guesthouse animal bones organised by taxa and and context, with an accompanying statement regarding the methodology. The second stage consisted of a prose summary of the results of taxonomic analysis and a discussion section, and was made available April 2013. The candidate conducted research into the place of meat in Cistercian observance during April and May 2013. The results of this research were presented at the International Medieval Congress, University of Leeds (2013). The discussion, written by Jane Richardson, makes comparison between the Kirkstall guesthouse assemblage and animal bone assemblages from other medieval religious sites in Britain, and provides some very brief mention of monastic diet.[3] The data for figures in chapter 4 have been drawn from Richardson's report. Richardson's discussion draws on published material which has been incorporated within the historiographical discussion in chapter 4.2 of the thesis. The analysis and arguments contained within chapter 4.2 rest in large part on textural evidence not used by Richardson.

The archaeological survey's intention was to make Kirkstall's archaeological data more widely available through systematic archaeological reports, and it is in this form that the candidate has benefited from the work carried out on it. The advance drafts of reports contained in the archaeological survey have been treated as any other secondary literature. The present thesis uses the results of the archaeological survey's reports as a platform for locating the guesthouse's archaeological data in its historical and socio-cultural contexts. In particular, the candidate's incorporation of primary textual, pictorial, and figural evidence in the discussion of Kirkstall's data has enabled the conclusions to extend beyond the scope of the archaeological survey.

---

[3] Based largely on Barbara Harvey, 'Monastic Pittances in the Middle Ages', in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition*, ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron, Medieval History and Archaeology, 2006, pp. 215–27; Julie Kerr, *Monastic Hospitality: The Benedictines in England, c. 1070–c. 1250*, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion, 32 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007).

CONTENTS

VOLUME II: LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Bernard, *Serm.* — Bernard of Clairvaux, *Cantica Canticorum: Eighty-Six Sermons*
Song of Solomon — *on the Song of Solomon*, trans. by Samuel J. Eales (London: Elliot Stock, 1895)

Cal. Pap. Reg. — *Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers Relating to Great Britain and Ireland: Papal Letters*, 10 vols (London: H.M.S.O, 1893).

Cant. Cant. 1–35 — *S. Bernardi opera, vol. 1: Sermones super cantica canticorum, 1–35*, ed. by Jean Leclercq, C. H. Talbot, and H. M. Rochais (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1957)

Cant. Cant. 36–86 — *S. Bernardi opera, vol. 2: Sermones super cantica canticorum, 36–86*, ed. by Jean Leclercq, C. H. Talbot, and H. M. Rochais (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1958)

CBK — *The Coucher Book of the Cistercian Abbey of Kirkstall in the West Riding of the County of York*, ed. by W. T. Lancaster and W. Paley Baildon, Publications of the Thoresby Society, 8 (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1904)

CCR — *Calendar of the Close Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office* (London: H.M.S.O, 1896–)

Dialogus miraculorum — Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum*, ed. by Joseph Strange, 2 vols (Cologne: J.M. Heberle, 1851)

Duncan, — Duncan, Holly B., 'Kirkstall Abbey Guest House: The Other
'Other Artefacts' — Artefacts', in *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2: The Guest House Excavations, 1979–86*, ed. by Stuart Wrathmell, Yorkshire Archaeology, 12 (Wakefield: West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service, forthcoming)

EO — *Les Ecclesiastica officia cisterciens du XIIème siècle: texte latin selon les manuscrits édités de Trente 1711, Ljubljana 31 et Dijon 114: version française, annexe liturgique, notes, index et tables*, ed. by Danièle Choisselet and Placide Vernet, La documentation cistercienne, 22 (Reiningue: Documentation cistercienne, 1989)

EYC — *Early Yorkshire Charters*, vols. I–III, ed. by W. Farrer (Edinburgh, 1914–16); vols. IV–XII, ed. by C. T. Clay, Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series, Extra Ser., 1–12 (Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 1935–65)

Fergusson, *Solitude* — Peter Fergusson, *Architecture of Solitude: Cistercian Abbeys in Twelfth-Century England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984)

'Foundation — Hugh of Kirkstall, 'The Foundation of Kirkstall Abbey', in
of Kirkstall' — *Miscellanea, 2*, trans. by E. Kitson Clarke, Publications of the Thoresby Society, 4 (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1895), pp. 169–208.

'Gazetteer' — Glyn Coppack, Richard Fawcett and David Robinson, 'A Gazetteer of the Cistercian Abbeys in Britain', in *The Cistercian Abbeys of Britain*, ed. by David Robinson (London: B. T. Batsford, 1998), pp. 63–205

Heads of Religious Houses	*The Heads of Religious Houses: England and Wales*, 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972–2008); vol. 1 (940–1216) ed. by David Knowles, C. N. L. Brooke, and Vera C. M. London; vol. 2 (1216–1377) ed. by David M. Smith and Vera C. M. London; vol. 3 (1377–1540) ed. by David M. Smith
Life of Aelred	Walter Daniel, *The Life of Aelred of Rievaulx, with the Letter to Maurice*, trans. by F. M. Powicke (London: Nelson, 1950)
Memorials of Fountains	*Memorials of the Abbey of St Mary of Fountains*, ed. by J. R. Walbran, J. Fowler, and J. T. Fowler, Publications of the Surtees Society, 42, 67, 130, 3 vols (Durham: Surtees Society, 1863 for 1862–1918).
NLT	Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Cîteaux, ed. by Chrysogonus Waddell, Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses, Studia et Documenta, 9 (Brecht: Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses, 1999)
PKAA	'Charters Relating to the Possessions of Kirkstall Abbey in Allerton', in *Miscellanea, 2*, by E. Kitson Clarke, ed. by F. R. Kitson, Publications of the Thoresby Society, 4 (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1895), pp. 42–59, 81–116
PL	Patrologia Latina
RB	*RB 1980: The Rule of St Benedict in Latin and English with Notes*, ed. and trans. by Timothy Fry (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1981)
Richardson, 'Animal Bones'	Jane Richardson, 'Kirkstall Guest House Animal Bones', in *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2: The Guest House Excavations, 1979–86*, ed. by Stuart Wrathmell, Yorkshire Archaeology, 12 (Wakefield: West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service, forthcoming)
Statuta	J. M. Canivez, *Statuta capitulorum generalium ordinis Cisterciensis ab anno 1116 ad annum 1786*, 8 vols (Louvain: Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique, 1933–1941)
Waddell, *Statutes*	*Twelfth-Century Statutes from the Cistercian General Chapter*, ed. by Chrysogonus Waddell, Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses, Studia et Documenta, 12 (Brecht: Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses, 2002)
Waddell, *Cistercian Lay Brothers*	*Cistercian Lay Brothers: Twelfth-Century Usages with Related Texts. Latin Text with Concordance of Latin Terms, English Translations and Notes*, ed. by Chrysogonus Waddell, Citeaux: Commentarii Cistercienses, Studia et Documenta, 10 (Brecht: Citeaux: Commentarii Cistercienses, 2000)
Wrathmell, *Guesthouse Excavations*	Stuart Wrathmell, ed., *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2: The Guest House Excavations, 1979–86*, Yorkshire Archaeology, 12 (Wakefield: West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service (forthcoming)
Yorkshire Deeds	*Yorkshire Deeds*, ed. by William Brown, Charles Travis Clay, and M. J. Stanley Price, Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Record Series, 39, 50, 63, 65, 69, 76, 83, 102, 111, 120, 10 vols (Leeds: Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 1909)

INTRODUCTION

The first impression of those approaching Clairvaux down the steep scarp was of God's presence in the little huddle of houses, for the dumb valley itself proclaimed, through the poverty and humility of the buildings, that of Christ's poor whose dwelling place they were. As further proof, in that very hive of activity, where none might be idle but each was busy at his appointed task, a midnight hush would greet the noontide visitor, broken only by work noises or the chanting of the office, as might be. This much-talked-of silence inspired such awe in laymen coming to the monastery that they were afraid to pass any remark that was not essential to their business, let alone a frivolous or improper one. There was a sense in which the solitude of that valley, strangled and overshadowed by its thickly wooded gills, 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 patterning their lives on his could be said to be living in a kind of love ordered by reason, the valley became a desert for each of the many men who dwelt there: for just as one undisciplined man is his own crowd even when he is alone, so here, thanks to unity of spirit and the rule of silence, in an ordered crowd of men the order safeguards the solitude of each man's heart.[1]

This portrait of Clairvaux is a summation of Cistercian hospitality. This passage describes how William of St Thierry (d. *c.* 1148), a Benedictine monk who later entered the Cistercian Order, came to the abbey and stayed there as a guest. In composing it, William was careful to note several significant aspects of the life and the atmosphere of the abbey. William describes the terrain, stating that he descended to the abbey down a 'steep scarp', and came to a place 'strangled and overshadowed' by vegetation, and thus depicts a wilderness, rather than the cultivated open-field farming prevalent at the time. He describes the abbey buildings, 'the little huddle of houses', and how they were constructed in a manner reflecting the monks' humility and simplicity. William describes the inhabitants of Clairvaux in a way that contrasts them with people of the world. The community is active, engaged, but working in harmony

---

[1] William of St Thierry, *Vita Prima*, 1. 8. 35, as translated in *The Cistercian World: Monastic Writings of the Twelfth Century*, ed. and trans. by Pauline M. Matarasso (London: Penguin, 1993), p. 31.

and in silence — an ideal portrait that projects the divine nature of Cistercian monastic life. William alludes to Benedict, one of the founding figures of coenobitic life in the West, likening where the Cistercians lived their 'hidden lives' to the cave where Benedict sought retreat before becoming father to a community of brethren. Nor does William omit guests, and describes how they could be so impressed by the atmosphere prevailing within the abbey that they restrained their own behaviour to accord with it.

William's account is carefully constructed in order to relate several ideal aspects about early Cistercian life, and should not be treated as a factual representation of conditions in the early twelfth-century communities. However, in this account many elements essential to understanding the nature of Cistercian hospitality are presented. One is the Cistercians themselves, and their regular observance and attitudes towards outsiders. A second is the material environment: the landscapes in which Cistercians lived, and the solitude that they sought there, or the abbeys that they inhabited, and what sort of buildings they constructed for themselves and for their guests. A third element is the guests: who they were, and what they sought at the abbey. A final element is the welcome that Cistercians offered their guests, what sort of hospitality they provided for them.

The aim of this thesis is to understand hospitality as provided by a Cistercian community via a case study of Kirkstall Abbey (Leeds, West Yorkshire). It achieves this by analysing the elements that William of St Thierry chose to emphasise in his description of Clairvaux. Each of these elements is studied utilising, where possible, evidence from Kirkstall in order to gain a holistic understanding of the provision and practices of a single site over a period of many centuries. The Cistercians, their abbeys, their guests, and the material and spiritual provision that they provided are all investigated as independent themes, before being brought together to assess how they interact and combine to constitute Cistercian hospitality.

0.1

HISTORIOGRAPHY OF HOSPITALITY

Hospitality is a trans-cultural social phenomenon that entails interaction of different parties. It has been a subject of interest to scholars from a number of different disciplines, whose research interests range across many different time periods, places, and cultures. Julian Pitt-Rivers's *The Fate of Schechem* and Marcell Mauss's *The Gift*, both historiographically influential studies, discuss hospitality (among other practices) as a form facilitating, and in

part constituting, gift-exchange and the maintenance of honour.[2] Meanwhile, more recently scholars have used hospitality to analyse the interaction of state structures and the individual, particularly in the context of acceptance or denial of foreign citizens ('aliens').[3]

An area where hospitality is particularly prominent is business and management studies, especially those intended to provide theoretical foundations to the practices of the hospitality industry, which includes modern institutions such as hotels, bars, restaurants, and holiday resorts. The methodologies from this discipline, however, are not usually appropriate to historical enquiry as they are intended to aid practice within the modern-day hospitality trade. An exception to this is the work of Conrad Lashley, whose work proposed that understanding the theory of hospitality is essential to generating engaging discourse on the subject.[4] However, the 'hospitality trade' literature on the subject remains at present restricted to the idea that discussion of hospitality is an expanded discussion of providing food, drink, or board.

Kevin O'Gorman's work on the transmittance and reception of ancient traditions of hospitality is an exception among management and business studies of hospitality.[5] O'Gorman has studied a number of different ancient texts to assess what constituted hospitality in different historical periods, including a discussion of the *Rule of Benedict*.[6] However, the texts are frequently divorced from textual traditions, and the level of historical contextualisation of the works frequently relies on outmoded historiographical interpretations. O'Gorman's timeframe is very broad, which means that analysis is often very perfunctory. The overall emphasis in O'Gorman's work is the relevance of these texts for understanding present day hospitality and how it has changed from ancient hospitality, rather than using as them an

---

[2] J. A. Pitt-Rivers, *The Fate of Shechem, Or, the Politics of Sex: Essays in the Anthropology of the Mediterranean*, Cambridge Studies in Social Anthropology, 19 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977); Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*, trans. by Ian Cunnison, rev. edn (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970).

[3] Mireille Rosello, *Postcolonial Hospitality: The Immigrant as Guest* (Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 2001); Georg Cavallar, *The Rights of Strangers: Theories of International Hospitality, the Global Community, and Political Justice since Vitoria* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002).

[4] The most thought-provoking are the edited collections of Conrad Lashley, which contains contribution from scholars working in other fields: *In Search of Hospitality: Theoretical Perspectives and Debates*, ed. by Conrad Lashley and Alison J. Morrison (Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 2001); *Hospitality: A Social Lens*, ed. by Conrad Lashley, Paul Lynch, and Alison J. Morrison, Advances in Tourism Research (London: Elsevier, 2007). See especially 'Toward a Theoretical Understanding', in *In Search of Hospitality: Theoretical Perspectives and Debates*, ed. by Conrad Lashley and Alison J. Morrison (Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 2001), pp. 1–17.

[5] Kevin O'Gorman, 'The Essence of Hospitality from the Texts of Classical Antiquity: The Development of a Hermeneutical Helix to Identify the Origins and Philosophy of the Phenomenon of Hospitality' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Strathclyde, 2008). Also see Alison Morrison and Kevin O'Gorman, 'Hospitality Studies and Hospitality Management: A Symbiotic Relationship', *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27 (2008), 214–21.

[6] O'Gorman, pp. 179–92.

entry point to the culture, customs, and values of past societies.

Hospitality has also been studied in the context of a number of different historical periods, each with a different objective. Steve Reece has studied the portrayal of hospitality in Homer's literary works, and how situations are manipulated for literary effect, while Stephen Pollington has drawn on episodes from the epic poem Beowulf to explore Anglo-Saxon feasting culture.[7] Ladislaus Bolchazy has focused on the way that Livy's discourse on hospitality was intended to cultivate a sense of humanity and civilisation.[8] Hospitality in a medieval historical context has been the subject of periodic investigation.[9] Catherine O'Sullivan has studied medieval Irish hospitality in the context of an honour society, influenced by both secular and religious traditions, while Alban Gautier has done similarly with Anglo-Saxon historical sources.[10]. Extremely valuable contributions to the study of hospitality in England have been made by Felicity Heal, who analyses the socio-political significance of hospitality from the fourteenth century to the seventeenth.[11] Heal does not, however, investigate the religious motivations in-depth; when she does discuss hospitality provided by the Church, it is in the context of episcopal rather than monastic institutions. These studies, presented as examples from a vast historiography, all make a study of hospitality, but in different ways and with different aims

Despite recognition of its importance as a monastic activity, the topic of monastic hospitality has rarely been studied. These are discussed in their relevant methodological sections in the following chapters, principally chapter 1 for historical analysis, and chapters two, three, and four for archaeological or material cultural studies. The most prominent scholar in Anglophone literature for monastic hospitality is Julie Kerr, who has conducted a thorough study of the Benedictines through their normative sources and extensive references in chronicles.[12] Kerr has studied Cistercians and Carthusians by a similar method, but not at

---

[7] Steve Reece, *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene*, Michigan Monographs in Classical Antiquity (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993); Stephen Pollington, 'The Mead-Hall Community', *Journal of Medieval History*, 37.1 (2011), 19–33.

[8] Ladislaus J. Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Early Rome: Livy's Concept of Its Humanizing Force* (Chicago: Ares, 1977).

[9] A summary of recent work given in Julie Kerr, *Monastic Hospitality: The Benedictines in England, c. 1070–c. 1250*, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion, 32 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), pp. 20–22.

[10] C. O'Sullivan, *Hospitality in Medieval Ireland, 900–1500* (Dublin, 2004); Alban Gautier, 'Hospitality in Pre-Viking Anglo-Saxon England', *Early Medieval Europe*, 17.1 (2009), 23–44.

[11] Felicity Heal, 'The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England', *Past and Present*, 102 (1984), 66–93; Felicity Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990); Felicity Heal, 'Food Gifts, the Household and the Politics of Exchange in Early Modern England', *Past and Present*, 199 (2008), 41–70.

[12] Kerr, *Monastic Hospitality*; Also Julie Kerr, 'Monastic Hospitality: The Benedictines in England, C. 1070–c. 1245', in *Anglo-Norman Studies, XXIII: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2000*, ed. by John Gillingham, - (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2001), pp. 97–114.

such length, and also covered secular practice of hospitality in the medieval period.[13] Emilia Jamroziak has utilised considerations of hospitality to discuss the usage of space within Cistercian monasteries.[14] Very relevant to the present study is Jutta Maria Berger's analysis of Cistercian hospitality, although she adopts a very different approach to that adopted in this thesis. Berger primarily analyses normative texts of the twelfth century, and argues that the Cistercians were highly restrictive in their provision of hospitality, such that it was only freely extended to Cistercians alone. Berger discusses the hospitable provision of the Benedictines and Augustinians as well, arguing that these orders had a much more liberal attitude toward hospitality provision.[15]

0.2
DEFINING HOSPITALITY

The great variety in approaches to hospitality as a subject of study brings a problem: what is hospitality, and how should it be studied? The problem of defining hospitality is evident even in the relatively small bibliography of the subject in a monastic context, and the definition is often tacitly assumed rather than stated explicitly. Julie Kerr states in the introduction to her study of Benedictine hospitality that 'the division between guests and visitors is rather hazy. Moreover, it is often unclear when charity should be distinguished from hospitality', although Kerr denies that alms distributed at the monastery gate constituted hospitality.[16] A complication in adopting such a clear-cut approach, is highlighted by Felicity Heal: '[s]ince the charitable provision made by the Church emanated from the household of the individual cleric or from a monastic establishment, the differentiation of entertainment and almsgiving was of little practical significance when the end purpose was the relief of material

---

[13] Julie Kerr, 'Cistercian Hospitality in the Later Middle Ages', in *Monasteries and Society in the British Isles in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. by Janet Burton and Karen Stöber, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion, 35 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2008), pp. 25–39; Julie Kerr, 'The Symbolic Significance of Hospitality', in *Self-Representation of Medieval Religious Communities: The British Isles in Context*, ed. by Anne Müller and Karen Stöber, Vita Regularis, 40 (Berlin: Lit, 2009), pp. 125–42; Julie Kerr, '"Welcome the Coming and Speed the Parting Guest": Hospitality in Twelfth-Century England', *Journal of Medieval History*, 33 (2007), 130–46; Julie Kerr, 'Food, Drink and Lodging: Hospitality in Twelfth-Century England', *Haskins Society Journal*, 18 (2007), 72–92.

[14] Emilia Jamroziak, 'Spaces of Lay-Religious Interaction in Cistercian Houses of Northern Europe', *Parergon*, 27 (2010), 37–58 (pp. 40–44).

[15] Jutta Maria Berger, *Die Geschichte der Gastfreundschaft im hochmittelalterlichen Mönchtum : die Cistercienser* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999).

[16] Kerr, *Monastic Hospitality*, p. 8.

need'.[17] Here, Heal regards monastic hospitality as an enactment of religious ideals, rather than a neatly classified instance of a social interaction. In Heal's view, hospitality includes distribution of alms because the practice derived from the church's impulse to care for the stranger, not because it had particular components of its provision that defined it as a form of hospitality. All the elements described by both the authors, such as alms, lodging, processions of welcome, or commensal practices recognisably pertain to hospitality, but the relationship between them is not explicitly given.

A solution to the problem is to identify the fundamental constituent elements of hospitality, these not necessarily being specific to a medieval monastic context. The first, and most obvious, is the guest. The second, and an essential implication of the first, is the host; there can be no guest without a host to extend a welcome to them. The welcome is the third element, and is generally defined as the acceptance of the host to enter into a relationship with the guest. The fourth essential element is that the guest and host need a space within which they can operate. The participants' relationship with the space is of paramount importance, as it determines their roles.[18] For a host to be able to extend a legitimate welcome to a guest, the host requires power and/or authority over that space. For their part, the guest will have no right to the space and they thus require a welcome to be granted to them. The definition therefore employed here is: hospitality is the welcome of a guest entity into a space by a host with the authority and/or the ability to do so, and the behaviour employed in the instigation, continuance, and cessation of such an instance. This definition emphasises the interplay between participants and their spatial context, while remaining open to the particular causal impulses of different cultural backgrounds.

While there are some areas where this definition can become entangled regarding Cistercian activity (these will be discussed later), for the most part its elements are readily identifiable in a Cistercian context. At a personal level, the abbot's role included executive power within the community; he had the power to extend a welcome or refuse entry to guests, though monasteries were a communal whole and so the collective brethren could also be considered the host. Similarly, power was deputed to others within the community, such as the porter or the hosteller. The welcome itself was a lengthy ritual process detailed extensively in both the Rule of Benedict and the Cistercian usages (discussed below). The space is the monastic precinct as delineated by the precinct wall or ditch, but for the ensuing

---

[17] Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England*, p. 226.

[18] Jacques Derrida, *Of Hospitality: Anne Dufourmantelle Invites Jacques Derrida to Respond* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000), pp. 60–61.

discussion, this refers primarily to the inner court and its boundary marker. As well, there were sub-divisions of the precinct, as delineated by the arrangement of the various buildings. It was the inner court, which was the particular dwelling-place of the brethren, and where the tight regulation of visitors was of the greatest importance. Similarly, it is this part of the monastic precinct with which the Cistercian book of usages, the *Ecclesiastica Officia*, is primarily concerned. The identity of the guest varied: they could have been ecclesiastics, secular and regular, laymen, noble and poor, and it is this variety that gives consideration of hospitality its value.

0.3

CHRONOLOGY

The issue of chronology in this thesis is important and requires some introduction. The chronological range of this thesis, termed 'the later Middle Ages', is *c.* 1200–*c.* 1539. The earlier of these dates is the approximate year of construction of Kirkstall's guesthouse, on which much of the study is focused. These dates are flexible, however. For example, evidence has been drawn from across the twelfth century, either to discuss the early history of Kirkstall, or to discuss Cistercian attitudes that developed during the first half of the twelfth century, particularly for chapter 1, which incorporates important spiritual writings of the early Cistercians. The later date of 1539 is when the community was disbanded during the Dissolution of the monasteries under Henry VIII and when monastic life at Kirkstall came to an end.

While the terminal date is 1539, the emphasis of this study of hospitality at Kirkstall is the centuries before this. While the end date of 1539 may imply that study is made of the Dissolution era, this is not the case. Monastic life at this time was coming under increasing scrutiny, which modified the way that communities behaved, particularly towards outsiders. Analysis of hospitality provided prior to the Dissolution would be a different kind of study to identifying the conception and practice of it in centuries beforehand, and it requires a different evidential basis and techniques of analysis: it is not, therefore, a feature of the present work.

Instead, this study aims to understand the practices of hospitality as they were enacted at Kirkstall over a long duration of time and the place that hospitality had in the life of the community, and it does so by utilising many different kinds of evidence. Naturally,

these kinds of evidence present different chronologies, and they do not always align closely. Spiritual writings, for example, are drawn primarily from the twelfth century (but are applicable to later periods as well); Kirkstall's documentary evidence dates largely from the late twelfth to early fourteenth centuries, while archaeological evidence from Kirkstall's guesthouse dates to the period of the thirteenth to sixteenth centuries. Meanwhile, the Cistercian General Chapter statutes date from the mid-twelfth century onwards, and have been used intermittently throughout the work (see below for an explanation of how they have been used). The limitations of different kinds of evidence have been explained in the relevant methodological section of the work, as well as their impact on conclusions drawn.

0.4
STRUCTURE OF THESIS

This is not an exhaustive treatment of every aspect of hospitality in a Cistercian abbey. Instead, priority has been given to those aspects that can be informed by evidence drawn from Kirkstall Abbey. Kirkstall is the case study in which the operation of wider themes can be explored and exemplified. Frequently this has necessitated detailed assessment of the context in which Kirkstall operated, either in terms of the Cistercian Order, or in terms of medieval social values with which Cistercian practices may be compared.

Four concepts identified above (the host, the guest, the welcome and the space) form the structure of this thesis, which is divided into four chapters, each treating a single theme. Chapter 1 is a study of the Cistercians as hosts, and uses normative and spiritual texts to investigate how Cistercians conceived of hospitality, and how it was integrated into their observance. This chapter makes use of Cistercian texts, especially normative texts, drawn from across the Order and different time periods; the conclusions can in theory be applied to any Cistercian house in the medieval period. Chapter 2, the largest of the four chapters, analyses the spaces of hospitality, with special reference to Kirkstall. In order to understand the developments at Kirkstall more fully, and provide a more detailed interpretation of Kirkstall's extant guest accommodations, it has been necessary to establish the archaeological context in a detailed manner. Therefore, chapter 2 includes a survey of guest accommodation in British Cistercian houses from the twelfth until the sixteenth centuries, the finds from which are then used to contextualise developments at Kirkstall. Chapter 3 concentrates on Kirkstall to identify guests of the community. The principal sources of evidence are small finds and

documentary sources, used to examine the social status and personal identities of guests; also included is an investigation of whether women used the guesthouse facilities. Chapter 4 assesses the facilities provided within the guest house and the level of comfort with which guests were provided, including the food consumed; the chapters also includes an assessment of small finds representing guests' activity in the buildings.

0.5

OUTLINE HISTORY OF KIRKSTALL ABBEY

The Cistercian abbey of Kirkstall is presently located on the A45, 3.5 miles from the centre of the modern city of Leeds, West Yorkshire, on the east bank of the River Aire (see fig. 0.1). As the crow flies, Kirkstall Abbey is located approximately 24 miles (38 km) southwest of York, 10.5 miles (17 km) northwest of Wakefield, and 15 miles (25 km) northwest of Pontefract. Kirkstall is located 20 miles (32 km) south of its mother-house, Fountains, and 22 miles (25 km) south of Ripon.

The abbey's history began in 1147 when it was founded by Henry de Lacy, Lord of Pontefract, in fulfilment of vow that he made while suffering from a grievous sickness.[19] The fledgling community was drawn from Fountains Abbey, North Yorkshire, and was placed under the rule of Alexander, a very able abbot.[20] The first site given to the community was Barnoldswick, in Lancashire. The site proved unfavourable for the monks, and while travelling on business for the community Abbot Alexander came across a valley that seemed very suitable for relocation. After some trouble with their claim to the new site, the community secured themselves and constructed the abbey buildings, which to a great extent were completed by the death of Alexander in 1182.[21] The remains of the buildings standing on the site today mostly date from the twelfth century.

The community received sufficient benefactions from local landholders and from

---

[19] The most detailed account of the honour of Pontefract, the secular tenurial unit in which Kirkstall lay, is Sarah Rose, 'Landed Society in the Honour of Pontefract, *c.* 1086–1509' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Lancaster, 2009). A more accessible version of Rose's argument is Sarah Rose, 'A Twelfth-Century Honour in a Fifteenth-Century World: The Honour of Pontefract', in *The Fifteenth Century, IX: English and Continental Perspectives*, ed. by Linda Clark (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2010), pp. 38–59.

[20] The most detailed survey account of the Yorkshire monasteries in this period is Janet Burton, *The Monastic Order in Yorkshire, 1069–1215* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

[21] Hugh of Kirkstall, 'The Foundation of Kirkstall Abbey', in *Miscellanea, 2*, trans. by E. Kitson Clarke, Publications of the Thoresby Society, 4 (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1895), pp. 169–208; Guy D. Barnes, 'Kirkstall Abbey, 1147–1539: An Historical Study', *Publications of the Thoresby Society*, 58 (1984).

people within patrons' (the de Lacys') affinity to establish itself as an institution of moderate wealth, which position it retained throughout the Middle Ages. Kirkstall's landholdings were concentrated in areas now occupied by modern-day Leeds, and to the west, north, and east of this zone.[22] The community underwent some tribulations in its history, notably the early loss of the grange of Micklethwaite, the greatest single source of income for the community, and only recovered it by holding it at a substantial fee farm from the king; a second major setback was the outbreak of sheep murrain that struck northern England in the late thirteenth century, which caused the wool market, upon which many Cistercian houses depended, to crash.[23] Kirkstall made a remarkable recovery by the fourteenth century, and the many extant charters dating from this time bear witness to close relationships between the monks and local society.[24] Although there were some minor clashes of rights regarding ministration to the laity, none of these disputes escalated, and relations with the ecclesiastical establishment can be characterised as amicable.

The middle of the fourteenth century is an obscure point in Kirkstall's history, and little evidence dates from that time. The Black Death no doubt disrupted the community: Abbot William Driffield died in 1349, although he had been abbot since 1318 and was probably advanced in years; Roger of Leeds is poorly attested, but ruled *c.* 1349, and the first occurrence of the next abbot, John Topcliffe of Thurkleby, is in 1354.[25] What records do exist indicate that the community was involved in some violent disputes, which have been used to negatively characterise the community in this period. The incidents cannot be properly contextualised, however.[26] As such, the record of Abbot John Topcliffe gathering five monks and a lay brother to extort the goods of a one Thomas Sergaunt should be used with great caution when trying to assess the relationship the community had with the surrounding locality.[27] There is only a single mention of the incident, and the reasons for Abbot John's actions and their results are not known. Documentation from Kirkstall remains sparse until the final decade of the fourteenth century, when more charters involving the abbey are given. The fifteenth century is similarly sparse in documentation: there is a surviving indulgence granting women access to the abbey church, which indicates that access was being sought,

---

[22] For the accumulation of estates by the community see Robert J. Wright, 'The Granges and Estates of Kirkstall Abbey in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Leeds, 2002).

[23] For the impact of the outbreak see Emilia Jamroziak, 'Rievaulx Abbey as a Wool Producer in the Late Thirteenth Century: Cistercians, Sheep, and Debts', *Northern History*, 40 (2003), 197–218.

[24] All these aspects are discussed in chapter 3 below.

[25] *The Heads of Religious Houses: England and Wales*, ed. by Vera C. M. London and David M. Smith (Cambridge: University Press, 2001), ii, p. 289.

[26] For instances see Barnes, p. 50.

[27] Barnes employed the word 'terrorize' (ibid.).

but there very little to contextualise this information.[28] Other documentation includes minor charters recording minor legal disputes, but there is nothing on the scale of the twelfth to fourteenth centuries, as well as some ecclesiastical documentation indicating that the archbishops of York visited.[29]

The sixteenth century is similarly poorly evidenced in terms of documentation, although recently study of the architectural developments has revealed that one of the last abbots, William Marshall (r. 1509–1528), was engaged in widespread renovation and renewal of the monastery's fabric, the most notable work being the raising of the crossing tower of the abbey church.[30] By the time of the Dissolution, the community was wealthy enough to escape the first round of suppressions, but on 22 November 1539, John Ripley and the brethren signed the deed of surrender, resigned the abbey's possessions to Cromwell's commissioners, and thus ended monastic life at Kirkstall. The monks were granted pensions and mostly settled in the locality, and Ripley was granted possession of the gatehouse as a dwelling.[31] Gradually, Kirkstall's buildings fell into disrepair and became a curiosity and tourist attraction. In 1890 Colonel John Thomas North bought the site at auction and donated it to the Leeds City Corporation (now Leeds City Council) to be preserved and made accessible to the public.[32]

0.6

SOURCES FOR KIRKSTALL ABBEY: DOCUMENTARY

The most important documentation for Kirkstall has been edited and published. William Dugdale has transcribed various documents relating to the abbey in his *Monasticon Anglicanum*, although most have since been re-published elsewhere.[33] E. Kitson Clarke has transcribed and translated the foundation of the narrative of the abbey, contained in Bodleian

---

[28] The presence of women within the abbey is discussed in chapter 3.3.

[29] Discussed in chapter 3.2.

[30] See Michael Carter, 'Abbot William Marshall (1509–28) and the Architectural Development of Kirkstall Abbey, Yorkshire, in the Late Middle Ages', *Journal of Medieval Monastic Studies*, 1 (2012), 115–42. The relevance of late-medieval architectural developments for hospitality are discussed in chapter 2.7.

[31] A. Lonsdale, 'The Last Monks of Kirkstall Abbey', in *Publications of the Thoresby Society Miscellany, 15*, Publications of the Thoresby Society, 53 (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1972), pp. 201–16.

[32] John Bilson, 'The Architecture of Kirkstall Abbey Church, with Some General Remarks on the Architecture of the Cistercians', in *Architectural Description of Kirkstall Abbey*, by William Henry St John Hope and John Bilson (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1907), p. 7.

[33] William Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum: History of the Abbies and Other Monasteries, Hospitals, Frieries, and Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, with Their Dependencies, in England and Wales*, ed. by John Caley, Henry Ellis, and Bulkeley Bandinel, rev. edn, 6 vols (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown et al., 1817), v, pp. 526–52.

Laud MS Misc. 722, fols 129–38.[34] This narrative was composed by Hugh of Kirkstall, the same author as the foundation narrative of Fountains, and covers the foundation and the lives of the first five abbots in detail. Thereafter the lives of the next nine abbots (1210–1284) are given; followed by the state of the monastery in the wake of the sheep murrain, and the recovery by 1301. The final entry is a letter of 1304 to the community from Abbot John of Birdsall (r. 1304–1314).[35]

Another major source used in this thesis are the charters. The biggest single archive is Lancaster and Baildon's edition of Kirkstall's cartulary,[36] which contains 436 deeds pertaining to the abbey and its affairs. These date from the foundation of the community to the middle of fourteenth century.[37] Witness-lists were omitted during transcription. An archive of sixty four deeds pertaining to Kirkstall's holdings in Allerton have been edited, which provide valuable evidence for Kirkstall's fourteenth-century socio-political relations, but some of the dates attributed to the deeds are in error.[38] A few additional deeds of Kirkstall have been published by the North Yorkshire Record Office.[39]

0.7

SOURCES FOR KIRKSTALL ABBEY: ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOURCES

Kirkstall's material culture and standing remains has been the topic of enduring interest for scholars.[40] Wardell's *Abbey Guide* has useful references to material culture, including an ampulla mould and seals of the abbey.[41] The earliest work on Kirkstall's material culture of major significance for this study is William Henry St John Hope and John Bilson's *Architectural Description of Kirkstall Abbey*, which gives a complete and detailed account of

---

[34] For bibliographical reference see above, n. 21.

[35] 'Foundation of Kirkstall', p. 170.

[36] National Archives, Duchy of Lancaster Misc. Books 7 (DL Misc. Bks 7).

[37] *The Coucher Book of the Cistercian Abbey of Kirkstall in the West Riding of the County of York*, ed. by W. T. Lancaster and W. Paley Baildon, Publications of the Thoresby Society, 8 (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1904).

[38] 'Charters Relating to the Possessions of Kirkstall Abbey in Allerton', in *Miscellanea, 2*, by E. Kitson Clarke, ed. by F. R. Kitson, Publications of the Thoresby Society, 4 (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1895), pp. 42–59, 81–116.

[39] *Monastic Charters and Other Documents Relating to Medieval Piety in the North Yorkshire County Record Office*, ed. by M. Y. Ashcroft and E. A. Jones, 2 vols (Northallerton: North Yorkshire County Council, 2009), I.

[40] A detailed historiography discussing treatment of Kirkstall's material culture is provided in chapter 3.1.

[41] James Wardell, *An Historical Account of Kirkstall Abbey, Yorkshire, Archaeological and Historical; with the Lives of Its Abbots, from the Foundation to the Dissolution of the House*, ed. by W. M. Nelson, 6th edn (Leeds: Samuel Moxon, 1890).

the abbey ruins.[42]

Systematic excavations with a clear research agenda (to find out about claustral life and determine structural phasing) were carried out between the years 1950 and 1964, funded by Leeds City Museums. The excavated areas included the south range of the cloister (the refectory, kitchen, meat kitchen), the southeastern area of the cloister garth, and the infirmary complex. Excavation continued for a period of fifteen years and the findings were published annually.[43]

Excavations began anew in 1979, and again in 1981 though to 1986. Under the management of West Yorkshire Archaeological Services, they focused on the guesthouse buildings, lying to the northwest of the main claustral complex. The excavation was the most extensive yet, with funding from the Manpower Services Commission (from 1981). Stephen Moorhouse and Stuart Wrathmell re-assessed the 1950–64 excavations, updating information on each excavated building.[44] The emphasis was on providing an interpretation that was consistent across all excavated areas and which integrated Hope's views of the architecture, all presented in one comprehensive survey.[45] The first section of the re-assessment is a structural survey of the excavated structures, building by building, identifying phases of development where possible; the second section is devoted to reports on the material types found within the abbey.

The present thesis has been researched in parallel (though not in collaboration) with Stuart Wrathmell's re-assessment of the guesthouse's archaeological data.[46] All excavated material and architectural phases have been analysed as part of this re-assessment, but are as yet unpublished. The author would like to thank Dr Wrathmell for making advance drafts of the work available. Reference has been made to drafts of the work; these references are given in the text where they have been used, but no page numbers can be given as yet. Chapter numbers have been given where possible, but these are subject to change. Also as part of the

---

[42] William Henry St John Hope and John Bilson, *Architectural Description of Kirkstall Abbey* (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1907).

[43] Although originally published individually, they were collated into three volumes, used here, with additional commentary: David Owen and others, *Kirkstall Abbey Excavations, 1950–1954*, PTS, 43 (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1955); David Owen and others, *Kirkstall Abbey Excavations 1955–1959*, PTS, 48 (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1961); Elizabeth J. Pirie and others, *Kirkstall Abbey Excavations 1960–64, with Appraisal of Results since 1950*, PTS, 51 (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1965). The individual reports are hereafter referred to without their containing volume.

[44] Stephen Moorhouse and Stuart Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 1 — The 1950–64 Excavations: A Reassessment*, Yorkshire Archaeology, 1 (Wakefield: West Yorkshire Archaeology Service, 1987).

[45] Kirkstall Abbey Excavations 1950–1954, 1st Report, p. 1.

[46] Please see the Prefatory Statement for further details of when the unpublished material was made available and how it has been used by the author in writing this thesis.

research into the material culture of Kirkstall Abbey two internships were established at Leeds Museums and Galleries, which saw many of Kirkstall's small finds digitally archived. The author would like to thank Rebecca Hirst and Dorian Knight for their aid with these objects.

0.8

OVERVIEW OF SPATIAL TOPOGRAPHY IN CISTERCIAN PRECINCTS

Throughout this thesis reference is made to the claustral arrangements of Cistercian abbeys and the guest range. A brief introduction to the spatial organisation typical of Cistercian abbeys is required to understand the principles driving the adoption of particular structural arrangements. The following overview is based on a hypothetical archetype of a Cistercian monastery. In reality, abbeys differed greatly and there were many points of divergence. The arrangements are similar enough, however, that the basic layout of a Cistercian abbey can be described.[47] The following description of the cloister can be applied in its entirety to Kirkstall (see fig. 0.3). The description begins with the cloister, at the heart of monastic life, and progresses gradually outwards toward the precinct boundaries.

Of prime importance to coenobitic life was enclosure, symbolised by the cloister.[48] Each range of the cloister had a different character. The north range was typically occupied by the church, and associated with divinity and spirituality. The east range contained the dormitory, associated with bodily rest, and the chapter house, associated with the community's administration. The south range was heavily domestic, containing the refectory, kitchens, and warming house. The west range was usually associated with the industrial use, and contained the monastery's cellars and housed the lay brethren.

The alignment of the church indicates the wider polarisation of space into profane

---

[47] For summaries linking the arrangement of buildings with the daily life and visual culture of Cistercian communities see Kinder, pp. 107–40, 217–21; Burton and Kerr, pp. 71–73; Jamroziak, *Cistercian Order*, pp. 164–72. For an introduction to the form of religious enclosures in Britain beyond the Cistercians, see Michael Thompson, *Cloister, Abbot and Precinct in Medieval Monasteries* (Stroud: Tempus, 2001). For more in-depth discussion of the role of the plan of St Gall in the medieval monastic conception of the cloister see Sternberg, pp. 113–30. The seminal work on the St Gall plan is Walter William Horn and Ernest Born, *The Plan of St Gall: A Study of the Architecture and Economy of and Life in a Paradigmatic Carolingian Monastery*, California Studies in the History of Art, 19, 3 vols (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979).

[48] An excellent summary of the layout of the claustral ranges is Kinder, pp. 131–40. For the eschatological meanings assigned to the various ranges of the cloister, see Megan Cassidy-Welch, *Monastic Spaces and Their Meanings: Thirteenth-Century English Cistercian Monasteries* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2001), pp. 58–71.

and sacred.[49] The church, on its east-west axis, had its sacred elements (altar, choir, presbytery) towards the east end. The west end of the church was conversely more profane, this being where the laity were located during services, whose role in the liturgy was that of witness. This graduated polarisation was adopted in the wider area surrounding the cloister, topography permitting, and was arranged on ideological grounds. Spiritual or community-focused aspects of monastic life were east of the cloister. For example, the cemetery typically lay east of the church or chapter house; or the infirmary, which was a place for purging bodily afflictions, to retire to through ill health, or for those approaching death.[50] To the west were elements linked with secularity. The lay brothers occupied the western claustral range and thereby adopted an intermediate position between the monks and the world to reflect their role within Cistercian life.[51] Moving outward from the cloister, the guesthouse typically lay west of the church, and then the main gatehouse, which regulated access to the court, beyond that.[52]

All buildings described so far lay within the inner court. The inner court could also contain many ancillary buildings such as mills, brewhouses, bakehouses, and butcheries, or other buildings that would support life within the abbey. A boundary enclosed the inner court, in early times a soft boundary such as a ditch, but later demarcated by a structure such as a wall.[53] At a point on the inner precinct boundary lay the main gatehouse, the principal point of ingress and egress for the abbey; it was envisaged that there would be only one such building, but given the need more could be erected. Buildings associated with industry, such as tanning or fulling mills (for the production of leather and wool, respectively) would typically lie in the area outside the inner precinct boundary, in the outer court, or an adjoining grange. The outer court was much larger than the inner court, and its boundaries would be less closely regulated than those of the inner court. In all, the abbey precinct was a concentrated contiguous area of land that contained all buildings essential to Cistercian observance, and many buildings that facilitated trade, industry, and supported limited agriculture.

---

[49] Maximilian Sternberg, *Cistercian Architecture and Medieval Society*, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 221 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2013), pp. 165–69.

[50] David N. Bell, 'The Siting and Size of Cistercian Infirmaries in England and Wales', in *Studies in Cistercian Art and Architecture, Vol. 5*, ed. by Meredith Parsons Lillich (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1998), pp. 211–37.

[51] Martha G. Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity: Cistercian Culture and Ecclesiastical Reform, 1098–1180* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1996), p. 101.

[52] Kinder, pp. 105, 369–70.

[53] For a description of precinct boundaries that includes their sociological importance for a Cistercian community see Cassidy-Welch, pp. 23–45. Also see chapter 2.3.

0.9

STATUTA AS HISTORICAL SOURCES

Statutes of the General Chapter have been used throughout this thesis, but an explanation of the manner in which they have been used is necessary to prevent confusion, especially when they are being employed alongside material cultural evidence. The General Chapter was a body which legislated on an issue brought to it by attending abbots but required a consensus for it be put into effect; it was unable to enforce a ruling arbitrarily, and the fact that a statute was issued does not necessarily entail its immediate adoption.[54]

Certainly, the system of visitation ensured that visiting abbots made earnest efforts at enforcement: a father-abbot was required to visit daughter-houses at least once a year, during which time he observed the daughter-community's behaviour, issued a corrective statement to the community, and, if warranted, related serious matters to the General Chapter.[55] Ultimately, however, the acquiescence of the visited community was required, as demonstrated by the difficulties faced by Stephen Lexington in the early thirteenth century. Several unpleasant experiences in Irish Cistercian houses instilled in Stephen the belief that it was not until the cultural outlook of the Irish changed would they be suited to embarking on the Cistercian monastic life. Any attempts to persuade through argument before this acculturation had taken place Stephen believed would be futile and so his recourse was to the virtual exclusion of Irish postulants.[56] Consensus rather than arbitrary imposition is similarly seen in the *Libellus Definitorum* compiled by Arnald Amaury in 1202, which was revised and reissued in 1220, 1237, and 1257.[57] Such alterations were the result of debates among Cistercian abbots active in their duties; they reflected existing practice and thoughts on how best to proceed, rather than judgments imposed by a detached council.

Since the statutes provide a readily accessible body of evidence on myriad topics from the late twelfth century onwards, they have been drawn upon throughout the thesis as has been deemed relevant. The statutes are excellent for providing specific points of information,

---

[54] Louis J. Lekai, 'Ideals and Reality in Early Cistercian Life and Legislation', in *Cistercian Ideals and Reality*, ed. by John R. Sommerfeldt (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1978), pp. 4–29 (p. 14).

[55] As prescribed by the *Carta Caritatis*: NLT, pp. 445–47.

[56] B. W. O'Dwyer, 'The Problem of Reform in the Irish Cistercian Monasteries and the Attempted Solution of Stephen of Lexington in 1228', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 15 (1964), 186–91; B. W. O'Dwyer, *The Conspiracy of Mellifont, 1216–1231: An Episode in the History of the Cistercian Order in Medieval Ireland*, Medieval Irish History, 2 (Dublin: Historical Association, 1970).B. W. O'Dwyer, 'The Impact of the Native Irish on the Cistercians in the Thirteenth Century', *Journal of Religious History*, 4 (1967), 287–301 (pp. 290–96).

[57] Brian Patrick McGuire, 'Constitutions and the General Chapter', in *The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*, ed. by Mette Birkedal Bruun (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 87–99 (pp. 95–96).

such as what officials there were in the monastery, or that illustrate attitudes towards certain practices within the Order. They have not been used to determine specific dating for the introduction or cessation of certain practices, or the dating of material culture, and the date of statutes adduced to the discussion should not be taken as such. Nor have the statutes been used in the belief that practice or incident described in them was brought to a satisfactory conclusion. Rather, the statutes have been used as an illustration of a widely held view among a significant portion of (anonymous) Cistercian abbots at a specific time; where the General Chapter has decreed that an abbey alter one of its buildings, for example, this can only be interpreted as an indication of the General Chapter's outlook at that time.

0.10
CONVENTIONS USED IN THESIS

Rule of Benedict, *Ecclesiastica Officia*, and Statutes

All references to the Rule of Benedict are given in the format '*RB*, x:y', where 'x' is the chapter number, and 'y' the clause; the numbering is taken from the most recent scholarly edition and translation of the *Rule of Benedict*.[58] References to the *Ecclesiastica Officia* are given in the format '*EO*, x:y', where 'x' is the chapter number, and 'y' the 'verse'; the numbering is taken from Choisselet and Vernet's edition of the *Ecclesiastica Officia*.[59] Statutes of the General Chapter are referenced in the format '[edition], [year]:[chapter number], e.g. Waddell, *Statutes*, 1190:1.[60]

Translations of Texts

All texts when quoted have been translated into English. Where there is no translator referenced the translation is the author's. The original language is quoted in full in footnotes when using

---

[58] The edition of the rule of Benedict used throughout is *RB 1980: The Rule of St Benedict in Latin and English with Notes*, ed. by Timothy Fry (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1981).

[59] *Les Ecclesiastica officia cisterciens du XIIème siècle: texte latin selon les manuscrits édités de Trente 1711, Ljubljana 31 et Dijon 114: version française, annexe liturgique, notes, index et tables*, ed. by Danièle Choisselet and Placide Vernet, La documentation cistercienne, 22 (Reiningue: Documentation cistercienne, 1989).

[60] The editions of statutes used throughout are: *Twelfth-Century Statutes from the Cistercian General Chapter*, ed. by Chrysogonus Waddell, Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses, Studia et Documenta, 12 (Brecht: Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses, 2002); J. M. Canivez, *Statuta capitulorum generalium ordinis Cisterciensis ab anno 1116 ad annum 1786*, 8 vols (Louvain: Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique, 1933). Note that Waddell's edition supersedes the first volume of Canivez, in which the dating of statutes is extremely problematic.

a foreign language (including Latin) edition; if the English of an English-language edition has been used only page references (or an appropriate alternative) have been given. For the *Ecclesiastica Officia*, the Latin is translated despite there being an English translation.[61] This is because this translation is both rare and introduces some problematic interpolations that modify the meaning of the text.

Measurements

For structures, all measurements are in metres to one decimal place. Where measurements have been converted from imperial to metric the imperial have been given in brackets immediately after. For small finds, all measurements are in millimetres, with imperial after if the measurement has been converted.

Small Find Numbers

The pending publication of a detailed report of all archaeology of Kirkstall's guesthouse has determined the referencing conventions employed in this thesis. This is the same notation as has been employed in the forthcoming published finds catalogue.[62] The numeric sequence used to archive the small finds of the 1979 excavation was not extended into the 1981 and future excavations, and numeration of finds was reset to zero in 1981. The 1981 and later excavations all employed continuous numbering. As a result, there is some duplication of small finds numbers. For economy of space and because fewer items derived from the 1979 excavation than later excavations, the year of excavation is specified only for the year 1979. For example, SF 79:1 would be the first small find from the year 1979, whereas SF1 would be the first small find from the year 1981 onwards. If a question mark ('?') is used as a prefix for a small find number, this indicates doubt of the attribution of its function (it does not indicate doubt over its finds number). For example, the notation '?SF 182', which relates to a fragment possibly deriving from a padlock from the 1981 or later excavations, conveys doubt over the attribution of its function.

---

[61] *The Ancient Usages of the Cistercian Order (Ecclesiastica Officia)*, ed. and trans. by Martinus Cawley (Lafayette, OR: Guadelupe, 1998).

[62] Holly B. Duncan and Stephen Moorhouse, 'The Small Finds', in *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 1: The 1950–64 Excavations – A Reassessment* (Wakefield: West Yorkshire Archaeological Service, 1987), pp. 120–48.

CHAPTER ONE

THE CISTERCIANS AS HOSTS

1.0
INTRODUCTION

This chapter investigates how observance and spirituality shaped the hospitality that Cistercian communities provided, including their conception of hospitality and what their duties to guests were. The first section of this chapter analyses the historiographical tradition of Cistercian hospitality and provides a summary of the protocol for receiving a guest as determined by normative sources. The rest of the chapter takes its structure from themes contained in chapter 53 of the *Rule of Benedict*. Four themes have been identified. First is the concept of 'Christ in the stranger' and its place in Cistercian observance. Second is the spiritual and practical provision that Cistercians furnished their guests. Third is how Cistercians differentiated between their guests and how this affected their obligations to them, for example to the rich, or to other religious. The fourth and final theme concerns interaction between Cistercians and guests, particularly maintaining solitude when providing hospitality. Each section takes the *Rule of Benedict* as its point of departure, which is set alongside the *Ecclesiastica Officia*. This protocol is then analysed for its spiritual significance in the Cistercian tradition. Ultimately, it can be seen that hospitality was fully integrated into Cistercian observance and that hospitable provision was an outward expression of spiritual progress.

1.1

HOSPITALITY IN A CISTERCIAN CONTEXT

Previous Approaches to Monastic Hospitality

While hospitality is often described as fundamental to monastic life, the reason for this being so, and why hospitable provision took the form it did, is rarely discussed. Knowles, in his survey of monasticism in England from the tenth to early thirteenth centuries, states that hospitality 'filled a considerable place in the daily life and economy of all monastic houses' and that 'monastic charity and hospitality were indispensable elements of the life of the times', but does not state how it formed part of their observance beyond referencing a normative source, Lanfranc's *Regularis Concordia*.[1]

More recently, scholars have similarly stated the importance of providing hospitality, and given instance of hospitable provision, but have not stated why this was so except obedience to chapter 53 of the *Rule of Benedict*.[2] Heale, in his edition of sources on late-medieval monasticism, states: '[o]f all the social services provided by religious houses, monastic hospitality was perhaps the most extensive', while also stating that it was 'costly and disruptive'.[3] Historians of lay patronage of monasticism, such as Susan Wood and Karen Stöber, have viewed hospitality in a similar light.[4] Certainly, the view society held of a community was a consideration. Baldwin of Forde, Archbishop of Canterbury (r. 1185–1190) and himself a Cistercian, faced criticism 1187 when he was warned by the community that were he to decrease expenditure on the (Benedictine) priory, the reputation of the house would fall.[5] However, viewing hospitality as prompted only by social obligations, rather than by religious observance, prevents any differentiation between monastic and lay providers of hospitality. Through such reasoning what made monastic hospitality unique is lost.

Other studies of monastic hospitality make extensive use of chronicle references.

---

[1] David Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England: A History of Its Development from the Times of St Dunstan to the Fourth Lateran Council, 940–1216*, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), p. 479.

[2] Emilia Jamroziak, 'Spaces of Lay-Religious Interaction in Cistercian Houses of Northern Europe', *Parergon*, 27 (2010), 37–58 (pp. 40–41); Emilia Jamroziak, *The Cistercian Order in Medieval Europe, 1090–1500* (London: Routledge, 2013), p. 108.

[3] Martin Heale, *Monasticism in Late Medieval England, c. 1300–1535* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009), p. 55.

[4] Susan Wood, *English Monasteries and Their Patrons in the Thirteenth Century* (London: Oxford University Press, 1955); Karen Stöber, *Late Medieval Monasteries and Their Patrons: England and Wales, c. 1300–1540*, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion, 29 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007).

[5] Julie Kerr, 'The Open Door: Hospitality and Honour in Twelfth / Early Thirteenth Century England', *History*, 87 (2002), 322–35 (p. 326).

Kerr's study of Cistercian hospitality, for example, provides many illustrative examples, but the impression is given that it is 'Cistercian' hospitality because Cistercians were providing it, rather than because its manner and substance sprang from Cistercian identity or observance.[6] David Williams addresses hospitality in a Cistercian context, and more broadly the interaction of lay people in Cistercian precincts, through similar use of documentary references to individuals explicitly described as guests.[7] Although these accumulated references range a broad chronological and geographical spectrum, the overall picture is fragmented. Indeed, documentary references to hospitality may well be unrepresentative of usual practice and 'that it was their rarity that earned them record'.[8]

Current difficulties of viewing "hospitality provided by monks" instead of "monastic hospitality" stem from lack of marrying practice with source of that practice. Factors prompting monastic hospitality were diverse, some of them not specific to the regular clergy. Kerr discusses general impulses toward hospitality in Benedictine communities, but it is clearly stated that many factors identified are not reserved only to the Benedictines or even to the monastic life, as lay people could be made equally aware of such justifications for hospitality or indeed already be prompted to hospitality by them.[9] For example, biblical texts such as Abraham or Lot's entertainment of angels could inform seculars as well as religious.[10] In the case of Lot, there are many themes at work in the narrative, which could be interpreted in many ways depending on the particular theological outlook of the reader or audience. Lot was not native to the city of Sodom in which he dwelt, and contravened the town's code of hospitality to offer a stranger shelter. The stranger in turn protected Lot when the citizens demanded that he hand them the stranger, and the angelic identity of the stranger was able both to give forewarning to Lot of the city's impending doom, and to punish the iniquity prevalent in the town. There is nothing making this narrative inherently applicable to monastic life, of whichever rule or observance, except that it is a biblical text that can

---

[6] Julie Kerr, 'Cistercian Hospitality in the Later Middle Ages', in *Monasteries and Society in the British Isles in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. by Janet Burton and Karen Stöber, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion, 35 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2008), pp. 25–39; Julie Kerr, *Monastic Hospitality: The Benedictines in England, c. 1070–c. 1250*, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion, 32 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), pp. 87–92, 107–10.

[7] David H. Williams, 'Layfolk within Cistercian Precincts', in *Monastic Studies: The Continuity of Tradition*, ed. by Judith Loades, 2 vols (Bangor: Headstart History, 1991), ii, 87–117; David H. Williams, *The Cistercians in the Early Middle Ages* (Leominster: Gracewing, 1998), pp. 117–42.

[8] David Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), iii, p. 129.

[9] Kerr, *Monastic Hospitality*, pp. 24–37.

[10] Gn. 18:1-33; Gn. 19:1-23. For greater historical and cultural contextualisation of problematic hospitality narratives in the Bible see Victor Matthews, 'Hospitality and Hostility in Gen. 19 and Judges 19', *Biblical Theological Bulletin*, 22 (1992), 3–11.

inform the practice of Christian ethics. Likewise, in the *Rule of Benedict* there is the explicit statement that the monastery should entertain strangers, but this is in reference to Matthew 25:35–45, a well known text and not uniquely monastic. The onus is therefore to identify how texts and narratives such as these were applied to monastic, and particularly Cistercian, life, to see in which contexts they occur, and what the likely interpretation of them was in the wider context of Cistercian theology and observance.

Sources for Cistercian Hospitality

Given that chronicle references to hospitality in Cistercian texts may not be representative of actual practice, and the lack of specificity when using biblical hospitality narratives, alternative sources need to be identified to locate hospitality within Cistercian observance. Cistercian textual sources explicitly treating hospitality are uncommon in the medieval period. The most relevant source material for assessing the place of hospitality in Cistercian life would be commentaries on the *Rule of Benedict*, but here the want of available manuscripts hinders execution of a comprehensive study. There are no modern editions of commentaries on the *Rule of Benedict* dating from the medieval period by Cistercian authors in Anglophone scholarship. The earliest known manuscript of a commentary is only now receiving scholarly attention.[11] For the present discussion a range of other commentary texts have been used, particularly instructive writers such as the ninth-century commentator Smaragdus, twelfth-century Hildegard of Bingen, and the thirteenth-century monastic theologian Bernard of Ayglerius.[12] While these authors are not Cistercian, they nevertheless discuss issues important for understanding interpretation of the *Rule* in a broader monastic context.

For discussion of Cistercian thought on hospitality it is necessary to explore a range of different spiritual texts. The texts used here form a variegated body of evidence, with each kind of text making a different contribution to overall understanding. Cistercian normative sources, especially the *Ecclesiastica Officia*, are relevant and useful, but where hospitality is mentioned it is regarding protocol, rather than underlying motive or rationale. Protocol itself can be informative, however, when viewed as having been a product of Cistercian

---

[11] The manuscript in question is Auxerre, Bibliothèque municiapale, MS 50; Jörg Sonntag, 'Commenting Heaven: The Pontigny Commentary on the Rule of Benedict', in *Cistercians, V: Imagery and Conceptualisation in Cistercian Thought* (presented at the International Medieval Congress, Leeds, UK, 2015); For discussion of a major post-medieval contribution to commentary on the Rule see Chrysogonus Waddell, 'Rancé as Translator of the *Rule of Saint Benedict*', *Cistercian Studies*, 17 (1982), 244–56.

[12] Smaragdus, *Smaragdi Abbatis Expositio in Regulam S. Benedicti*, ed. by Alfred Spannagel and Pius Engelbert, Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum, 8 (Siegburg: Franciscum Schmitt, 1974); Hildegard of Bingen, *Explanation of the Rule of Benedict*, trans. by Hugh Feiss (Toronto: Peregrina, 1998).

spirituality. Various Cistercian spiritual treatises contain passages or comments that are highly relevant for understanding their provision of hospitality, such as Aelred of Rievaulx's *Mirror of Charity*, or Bernard of Clairvaux's *De Diligendo Deo*.[13] While the focus of these works encompasses far more than hospitality alone, the theme of the nature and extent of social bonds has special relevance to hospitable provision in Cistercian communities. Specific to this study, the known contents of Kirkstall's library offer no further evidence, as none of the texts directly treats the Order's normative texts, observance, or spirituality.[14] Sermons form another relevant source for hospitality, and are particularly useful for their instruction on how precepts contained within, for example, biblical texts should be implemented in daily life.[15] The principal authors used here are Bernard of Clairvaux (d. 1153) and Guerric of Igny (d. 1157).[16] Most comments within these texts are made only incidentally while treating much broader or complex themes. Comments discussed here elucidate Cistercian attitudes towards the *Rule of Benedict*, the value they placed on hospitable provision, or the way that providing hospitality affected their daily life.

The Cistercian Protocol of Hospitality

A summary of Cistercian hospitality protocol is required before its deeper spirituality can be discussed. Cistercian usages were derived from two principal texts, the *Rule of Benedict* and the *Ecclesiastica Officia*. In the *Rule of Benedict*, when a stranger knocked at the gate, the porter was to say 'Deo gratias' or ask for a blessing, and admit them.[17] The porter would then notify the abbot, who would arrive himself, or perhaps depute monks to the task. All

---

[13] A critical Latin edition of the *Speculum caritatis* is available in Aelred of Rievaulx, 'De speculo caritatis', in *Aelredi Rievallensis opera omnia*, ed. by A. Hoste and C. H. Talbot, Corpus christanorum continuatio mediaevalis, 1 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1971); modern translations of the work are: Aelred of Rievaulx, *The Mirror of Charity*, trans. by Geoffrey Webb and Adrian Walker (London: A. R. Mowbray, 1962), although the editors have altered the chapter breaks in the text, and some translations depart substantially from the Latin; and Aelred of Rievaulx, *The Mirror of Charity* (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1990).

[14] N. R. Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books*, 2nd edn (London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society, 1987), p. 107. According to this list, Kirkstall was possessor of a late twelfth-century manuscript of Smaragdus, Bodleian Library, MS. e Mus. 195 (3608). This is, however, his *Diadema monachorum*, a didactic treatise interspersed with excerpts from patristic sources for the edification of monks, rather than his widely known commentary on the *Rule*.

[15] For a bibliography of the main Cistercian sermon writers (among other non-Cistercians) see Beverly Mayne Kienzle, 'The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon', in *The Sermon*, ed. by Beverly Mayne Kienzle, Typologie Des Sources Du Moyen âge Occidental, fasc. 81-83 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), pp. 271–323 (pp. 298–306).

[16] The Latin texts for Bernard's works have been taken from *S. Bernardi opera*, ed. by Jean Leclercq, C. H. Talbot, and H. M. Rochais, 9 vols (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1957). Guerric of Igny's texts are contained in Guerric of Igny, *Sermons*, ed. by John Morson and Hilary Costello, trans. by Placide Deseille, Sources chrétiennes, 166, 202, 2 vols (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1970). Helinand's writings are available in *PL*, 212, cols 481–720, but see Kienzle, p. 305 for where more modern editions may be found.

[17] *RB*, 66:3.

would incline their head or bow before the guest, to adore Christ in the stranger.[18] After being received, the monks and the guests would pray together, the kiss of peace would be given, and the guest would be read a passage from the scriptures.[19] The abbot would then wash the guest's hands, and finally the abbot and monks would wash the guest's feet.[20]

The Cistercians adopted all protocol of the *Rule of Benedict*, with certain refinements. Chapter 87 of the *Ecclesiastica Officia*, entitled 'On the Reception of Guests', is directly analogous to the chapter on the reception of guests in Benedict's *Rule*. It follows the same basic structure, detailing first when and by whom the guest should be received, before moving on to specifics of prayer and the provision of material comfort. Beyond the broad outline, however, the *Ecclesiastica Officia* goes into far more detail on the specifics of personal action, while omitting all aspects referring to the spiritual justification for receiving the guest and their identification with Jesus (discussed below).[21] In this way, the officials to whom the guest was to be announced varied according to what the community was doing at the time of arrival. If in Collations, for example, it was the person officiating rather than the abbot or prior who was to signal to the porter to send a deputy.[22] Other such practical advice is that if it should be dark, those sent to receive the guest may take a lit taper.[23] More personal protocol is given for the reception, in that it is specified that the monks lowered their cowls, and prostrate themselves on their knees before going to pray in the church.[24] The insistence on prostration was stricter than the *Rule*, which also gave a choice of bowing the head.[25] After prayer, as in the *Rule*, a passage was read to the guests and it was only after these formalities of welcome, spiritual and social, that guests were turned over to the hosteller to see to their material needs.[26] It is stated that the brethren should remain in the cloister, since only those deputed to receive guests were permitted any contact with them.[27]

The *Ecclesiastica Officia* and the Monastic Officials

The tendency of the *Ecclesiastica Officia* to clarify and expand upon the *Rule* also applies to

---

[18] *RB*, 53:3–7.

[19] *RB*, 53:8–9.

[20] *RB*, 53:12–13.

[21] See section 2 below.

[22] *EO*, 87:2. Collations was a daily reading from John Cassian's *Conferences*, or a similarly edifying text, and took place before Compline, the final office of the day.

[23] *EO*, 87:4.

[24] *EO*, 87:8.

[25] *RB*, 53:7.

[26] *EO*, 87:14–15.

[27] *EO*, 87:16. Discussed in section 5 below.

information regarding the duties and responsibilities of the monastic officials, and many figures gain much greater definition in the *Ecclesiastica Officia*, with the result that a cohesive administration of hospitality is created. However, the *Ecclesiastica Officia* is not simply an imitation of the *Rule* which rendered protocol greater detail. The two texts fulfil different functions. Some precepts of chapter 53 of the *Rule* are not repeated in the *Ecclesiastica Officia*, particularly those regarding motivation and spirituality. Significantly, there is no explanation of the motivation to provide hospitality, or to whom it must be provided more diligently, as there is in the *Rule*. There is no mention of Christ in the stranger, and all theological underpinnings are omitted. No mention at any point of receiving especially the poor and pilgrims is made, nor the different attitude towards guests that should be adopted based on their worldly or spiritual status.

The omissions in the *Ecclesiastica Officia* should not be taken to mean that Cistercians disregarded certain aspects of the *Rule*. The function of the *Ecclesiastica Officia* should be taken into account. It was a text to clarify protocol of the *Rule* and enable it to be applied to a Cistercian community as found in the twelfth century and later, to give further guidance in practical matters where the *Rule* left off. It may be assumed that the text of the *Rule* was known among the community from daily readings in chapter and that no repetition was needed. The emphasis in the *Ecclesiastica Officia* was to ensure the smooth running of the community by detailing the personnel responsible for admitting guests and providing basic instructions for their reception, while omitting any deeper reasoning for these rituals. There are also chapters of the *Ecclesiastica Officia* with analogues in the *Rule* concerning officials central to the provision of hospitality, particularly the monk-hosteller, the porter, and the abbot. In each case the *Ecclesiastica Officia* reveals specific issues in need of clarification, and shows how provision of hospitality was delegated to different parts of the community. The following discussion treats the monk-hosteller, the porter, and the abbot in turn, with priority being given to their roles in receiving and caring for guests.

The Monk-Hosteller

Protocol concerning the monk-hosteller is contained within chapter 53 and is clarified greatly within the *Ecclesiastica Officia*. The *Rule of Benedict* simply states that the guesthouse should be assigned to a brother 'whose soul is possessed of the fear of God', but does not clarify his duties beyond stating that 'adequate bedding should be available there [i.e. in the

guesthouse]'.[28] The *Ecclesiastica Officia* provides much greater detail than the *Rule* and and specifies duties such as overseeing washing the guests' feet, as being the monk-hosteller's responsibility. This is not only the *mandatum* conducted upon the arrival of a guest, but also on Maundy Thursday, when the poor were received into the cloister. Similarly, he was permitted to summon the cellarer should the *mandatum* need to be given when the brethren were asleep. The serving of the guests' meals was also entrusted to the monk-hosteller.[29] This precept, as well as being a practicality, built upon a common interpretation of the word *humanitas*, which the *Rule* states should be provided to guests.[30] The monk-hosteller perhaps had the special duty of giving the kiss of peace to guests, since he is specified to give the *pax* to brethren in the infirmary if none other should be present, but this also might simply reflect the hosteller's tendency to be outside the normal claustral routine and thus be available.[31] Another important clarification is to whom the monk-hosteller may speak. Within the guest range, he was permitted to speak to the lay brother hosteller and all eating and sleeping in the guesthouse, but beyond it, 'outside the gate', he was not permitted this freedom.[32] The *Ecclesiastica Officia* thus defined the sphere of operation for the monk-hosteller, as well as his principal duties, and clarified how his responsibilities interlocked with the community's other principal officers.

The Porter

Another official important for providing hospitality was the porter. Chapter 66 of the *Rule*, 'Concerning the Porter of the Monastery', states that a wise old man (*senex sapiens*) should be placed at the gate and that they should say 'Deo gratias' or 'Benedic' when a guest arrived.[33] In Benedictine communities, a layman was often hired to fulfil the porter's role, but it is clear from the inclusion of the porter's duties in the *Ecclesiastica Officia*, which applied exclusively to monastic brethren and did not include lay brethren or hired servants, that the Cistercian

---

[28] *RB*, 53:22: 'ubi sint lecti strati sufficienter'.

[29] *EO*, 92:14: '[q]ui si forte defuerit. ille qui hospitibus pacem dare debet. infirmis primum deferat. et sic ad communionem ordine suo accedant. et hoc tantum ad missam matutinalem'.

[30] *RB*, 53:9: 'omnis ei exhibeatur humanitas'.

[31] *EO*, 119:2: '[a]d ipsum vero pertinent quid vel quando comedant hospites. […] ad recetionem servire'; for more on material provision section 3 below and chapter 4.1–2.

[32] *EO*, 119:1: 'Monachus hospitalis potest loqui hospitali converso et omnibus hospitibus. et qui manducant vel dormiunt in hospitio: *extra portam vero neque cum hospitali converso. neque cum hospitibus loquatur.*' *Porta* might refer to a gate entering the guest's sub-enclosure within the inner court, but this is a more specific reference to potentially variable physical arrangements than is normally given in the *Ecclesiastica Officia*. What might perhaps be alluded to is a guesthouse near the gatehouse to the inner court, in which case guests beyond the confines would become the porter's responsibility.

[33] *RB*, 66:3.

porter was a professed monk. It is also stated in the *Rule* that the porter needed to know how to carry a message and that he could be given a young aide should he require one. The advice given in the *Rule* is bare considering all the potential situations associated with manning the gate of a monastery, but emphasises that a good porter is one who will not be tempted by the possibilities of his post.

Many of the Cistercian porter's duties as outlined in the *Ecclesiastica Officia* are a fuller elaboration of those stated in the *Rule*. The customary states that the porter is to say 'Deo gratias' for instance, but specifies further speech as well: 'wait for me here a little while until I have announced you to the abbot, and afterwards I will return to you'.[34] While this seems like mere common sense, the phrase ensures that the guest was not given access to the precinct until permission was granted by the proper authority, in this case the abbot, and that they were kept in a well defined liminal area. The process of informing the abbot was to be performed hastily, as the porter was given explicit permission to enter any area of the monastery in his search (barring the infirmary), and to point out his task to brother-religious if they should distract him.[35] This potentially lengthy process was repeated even for those known to the monks, thus emphasising the abbot's authority in granting admission and strengthening the liminal nature of the precinct boundary in the process.[36] Displaying humility was reinforced as in the *Rule*, as the porter was to prostrate himself when the guest left as well as entered.[37]

Additions and further detailing of the porter's duties are derived from particular points of Cistercian practice. Not mentioned in the *Rule* is alms-giving, for which purpose the *Ecclesiastica Officia* states that the porter should always have bread in his room.[38] To the same end, the porter should eat with the those who served the meals, collecting the leftovers for distribution to the poor afterwards, along with the cellarer's contribution.[39] The admission of women was expressly forbidden, and those travelling in their company were likewise denied entry; they were to be given food at the gate instead. Women from the neighbourhood

---

[34] *EO*, 120:7: '[e]xpectate me paululum hic donec vos abbati nuntiem. et postea revertar ad vos'.

[35] *EO*, 120:8: 'potest per omnes officas monasterii querere. except quod infirmitorium non intravit'; 120:9: 'et qualiter se agat cum ei fratres obviam venerint doceat'.

[36] *EO*, 120:12: '[q]uod si de vicinis vel notis aliquis ad portam venerit. postquam qui velit cognoverit. extra portam eum demorari faciat. donec ab abbaye quid de eo agatur agnoscat'.

[37] *EO*, 120:11: 'humiliet se ad eum eo modo quo ad ingressum diximus'.

[38] *EO*, 120:20: [p]ortarius vero debet habere panes in cella sua. ad distribuendum transeuntibus'.

[39] *EO*, 120:26–27: '[c]um servitoribus solet comedere. et solatium eius interim portam servare. et elemosinam transeuntibus dare. | Qui solet etiam vasa sua ad colligensa reliquias ciborum in coquina deferre. et pulmenta defunctorum et cetera que cellararius dederit in ipsis recipere'.

were not to be given anything at all.[40] Another theme was restriction of speech. There was a concern to preserve the peace and quiet of the cloister, and given the threat that the presence of outsiders posed to enclosure (as stated in the *Rule*), it had to be stated at every available opportunity that only necessary conversation was permitted. Hence the porter had his speech prescribed by the customary (as above), and at any other time he was not to speak; it was similarly so for the porter's aide.

The last significant aspect of the porter's duties was his observance of the canonical hours while attending the gate. If an office was being sung in the church when a guest arrived, the porter was to tell the arrival to wait until it was finished, and similarly when distributing leftovers he should have made sure he said at least 'a few moderate words' to complete the office.[41] There was a degree of flexibility accorded to the porter, in recognition of his time-consuming duties. If there were two masses on a given day he could choose which to attend, his aide attending the other.

For the porter, then, the following issues were given special emphasis: constant attendance at the gate, denying entry to an outsider unless they have express permission to enter, insistence upon silence and the distribution of charitable offerings to wayfarers or the poor, all the while upholding as much as possible his religious devotions.

The Abbot

A final figure important for a community's provision of hospitality was the abbot. In terms of development from the *Rule of Benedict*, not much is added to the precepts of the *Rule*. Chapter 56 of the *Rule* states that the abbot's table 'must always be with guests and travellers', and this is reiterated in the *Ecclesiastica Officia*, which stated that he is 'to take his meals in the guesthouse'.[42] The implications this pair of precepts holds for the location of the abbot's table is considered below in chapter two, but the abbot's duty to entertain strangers at mealtimes is wholly consistent. The abbot therefore had great responsibility in upholding the reputation of the monastery in the eyes of outsiders, as well as great temptation to his own person.[43] If

---

[40] *EO*, 120:18–19: '[s]ed nec qui cum mulieribus veniunt recipe. sed foris cum mulieribus victus datur eis. Vicinis vero mulieribus nichil ibi datur. nisi tempore famis si abbas hoc precipit'.

[41] *EO*, 120:15: '[q]uod si dum hora in ecclesia celebratur. hospes ad portam pulsaverit. more solito DEO GRATIAS et BENEDICITE dicat. et postquam receperit si necesse fuerit. dicat non esse ei consuetudinis dum hora celebratur loqui. rogans eum ut epectet donec ei post horam respondeat'; and 120:29: '[q]uam distributionem non debet propter subsequens opus dei dimittere. sed paucis utens verbis et moderatis. citius quod inceperat perficere'.

[42] *RB*, 56:1: '[m]ensa abbatis cum hospitibus et peregrinis sit semper'; *EO*, 110:11: '[i]n hospitio comedere'.

[43] For further discussion see chapters 2.6 and 4.2.

the community's abbot were absent, and there were no further abbot to take his place, then the prior of the monastery was to take up the duty of dining with guests.[44] The *Ecclesiastica Officia* does state some specific exception to the abbot's obligation to dine with guests. If, having been away, he returns to the monastery after Compline (and therefore after the final meal has been served) he should take his meal in the refectory, presumably not to disturb the peace of guests already in the guesthouse (that is, unless there are guests still requiring a meal as well).[45] For the abbot, as with the monk-hosteller and porter, the *Ecclesiastica Officia* serves to clarify basic protocol, particularly regarding timing and licence of action.

By building on the Benedict's precepts, the *Ecclesiastica Officia* offered a detailed and practical set of instructions on pursuing the Cistercian ideals of both providing succour to wayfarers and maintaining monastic peace and quiet. The fact that the customs contained no reference to specific spatial arrangements ensured that they could be followed at any house and not have to be amended to take into account local circumstances. The focus of the *Ecclesiastica Officia* is inward in that it rarely describes what the behaviour of the guest should be. Rather, it provides sustained, if laconic, instruction to ensure the community's continued performance of their regular activity in the face of potentially disruptive intrusions.

The protocol for receiving a guest comprises a basic summary of Cistercian attitudes towards hospitality, and an indication of the provision that they made for strangers in their precinct. However, there remain several issues for clarification, which are discussed through the remainder of the chapter. First is the precept of the *Rule* that stated that all guests should be received as Christ, what did this mean for Cistercians, and how it did it affect the hospitality they offered? Second is the spiritual and material provision that the Cistercians offered their guests: how was this affected by the spiritual nature of the monastic community? Third is how the Cistercians differentiated guests, and how this affected the kind of hospitality that they offered. Fourth, and finally, is the issue of maintaining solitude even when receiving guests .

---

[44] While this is not explicitly stated as a duty of the prior in the *Ecclesiastica Officia*, chapter 111:13–18 details the actions that a prior is not permitted to take in the absence of the abbot, and dining with the guests is not with them. Of all the officials, the prior would be best placed to represent the community due to his rank and position as abbot's deputy.

[45] *EO*, 110:15: '[c]um post completorium deforis venerit. in refectorio comedet nisi hospites assint'.

1.2

CHRIST IN THE STRANGER AND *CARITAS*

The chapter concerning the reception of guests in the *Rule of Benedict* begins with a profound spiritual and theological statement. The clause 'all arriving guests should be received as Christ' has great significance for how monks approached providing hospitality, how they treated guests, and how the place of hospitality in monastic life should be understood.[46] It provides a theological foundation with special resonance for monastic spirituality, and distinguishes monastic from lay hospitality.

Chapter 53 emphasises God's presence in the guest through two highly meaningful scriptural quotations that mutually reinforce one another and provide, almost in themselves, a cohesive theology to the hospitality of the *Rule of Benedict*. The first is from Matthew 25: 'I was a stranger and you welcomed me'; the second is from Psalm 47: '[w]e have received, oh God, thy mercy in the midst of thy temple'.[47] Any monk would have been familiar with these scriptural quotations their scriptural context and where they arose in the liturgy, as well as understanding the received tradition of interpretation of them, handed down from authorities such as St Augustine.[48] Some construction of the exegetical thought-world of Cistercian monks is therefore necessary to elucidate the importance that chapter 53 held for the provision of hospitality.

The Implications of Christ in the Stranger

The principle which the *Rule* provides for receiving guests as Christ derives from Christ's words to the disciples on the Mount of Olives, when He speaks regarding the Day of Judgement, when all people are divided into two groups, the damned and the saved.[49] When explaining why He has done so, Jesus cites as one of the reasons for setting apart the saved as being that they gave hospitality to strangers: 'I was a stranger, and you welcomed me'.[50] The *Rule* thus establishes the threat of damnation as an incentive to provide hospitality, which is a powerful motivation in itself, but this explanation does not suffice alone.[51]

---

[46] *RB*, 53:1: 'Omnes supervenientes hospites tamquam Christus suscipiantur'.

[47] *RB*, 53:1: '[h]ospes fui, et suscepistis me', referencing Mt 25:35; *RB*, 53:14: '[s]uscepimus deus misericordiam tuam in medio templui tui'.

[48] This idea is demonstrated with reference to Cistercian hagiographical texts by Chrysogonus Waddell, 'The Exegetical Challenge of Early Cistercian Hagiography', *Cistercian Studies Quarterly*, 21 (1986), 195–212, esp. pp. 206–07.

[49] Mt 25.

[50] *RB*, 53:1.

[51] Kerr, *Monastic Hospitality*, pp. 24–26.

The quotation from Matthew 25:35 was not intended only to cast fear of damnation over any monk about to receive a guest. Arguably more important to hospitality is that this principle of 'Christ in the stranger' provided an unknown stranger with a known and desirable spiritual identity (see fig. 1.1). Thus a stranger is given the same spiritual identity no matter their worldly status or character. Since Christ is a common link between all Christians, the *Rule*'s injunction ensures that a social and spiritual bond be established between the community and the guests, no matter who the guest is, or what condition they are in.[52] By imposing the identity of Christ on the guest, the *Rule* immediately thrusts provision of hospitality into the spiritual sphere not just by threat of eschatological punishment, but also by providing the chance for a monk to encounter Christ in the stranger. Ultimately, the concept of 'Christ in the stranger' gave the ostensibly external act of hospitality an inner spiritual meaning, allowing hospitable provision to take its place among steps of a monk's spiritual progress, and for the presence of God to be increased within a monk's life.

The precept that all guests should be received as Christ introduces a theological problem: how was Christ's identity imprinted upon the stranger? One theological basis is set forth by Bernard Ayglerius, Abbot of Monte Cassino (r. 1256–82). Bernard states that the initial appearance of a guest can be misleading and one cannot tell where Christ may be found: the seemingly rich may in fact be poor, that the host's treatment can actually modify the guest such that they are transformed into a vessel for Christ (*Christi* […] *habitaculum*) and that it is in this sense that Christ is received in the guest.[53] This imparts not only a great share of agency in the monks in resolving the superposition of identity (that of Christ's upon the unknown stranger), but also provides a theological basis for the monks to view their hospitable obligations as profoundly as any other aspect of their observance since it was an act able to bring a monk closer to God.

A problem with imprinting this understanding on Cistercian practice, however, is the chronology. Benard Ayglerius's theology of Christ in the stranger, however, comes after the composition of most Cistercian normative texts, such as the twelfth-century *Ecclesiastica Officia*. Bernard's ideas should not therefore be read into earlier Cistercian observance, and such elaboration is not readily apparent in the Cistercian theology of the stranger. The

---

[52] Damasus Winzen, 'Conference on the Reception of Guests', *Monastic Studies*, 10 (1974), 55–63 (p. 56), citing Mt 18:20: 'For when there are two or three gathered in my name, there I am in the midst of them'; and 1 Jn 4:16: 'God is charity, and he that abideth in charity abideth in God, and God in him'.

[53] Bernardus Cassinensis, *Expositio*, in *PL* 66, col. 751D: 'ignoratur in quo magis Christus suscipiatur; nonnunquam enim suscipitur pauper et egenus, qui prima facie creditur abundans et locupletatus; nonnunquam etiam susceptus cum humiliatate aedificatur suscipientium charitate, et induens animi lenitatem, et mentis privatur feritate, et per consequens Christi efficitur habitaculum; et sic in eo contingit suscipi Christum'.

Ecclesiastica Officia is silent on the point, but this text was used for defining protocol, not for spiritual instruction, as shown above.[54] References to providing hospitality in Cistercian texts do not elaborate a well-defined theology imparting Christ's identity onto the guest. It seems at first that for Cistercians, at least in the twelfth century, the intricacies by which a guest's identity was imbued with Christ did not need clarification. This would suggest that Cistercian thought on hospitality went only as far as the *Rule of Benedict*, and was underdeveloped as a field of thought.

The idea of the transformative power of the monastic presence for strangers is expressed elsewhere in twelfth-century writing on the *Rule*, such as in Hildegard of Bingen's *Explanation of the Rule of Benedict*. With less theological force than Bernard Ayglerius, Hildegarde states that the guests 'will be better for seeing their [the monks'] way of life'.[55] Although the statement is broad and ill-defined, it does provide some wider context to some statements from Cistercian writings, particularly that relating to *caritas*, which was similarly seen as having a transformative quality able to lead one towards God. When William of St Thierry visited Bernard of Clairvaux, who was at that time on account of his ill-health dwelling in a hut, apart from the rest of the community, he described the encounter in the following way: '[a]nd having entered that royal bedchamber, when I took in the dwelling place and the one dwelling there, I swear to God, the very house instilled me with such reverence, it were as though I approached the altar of God'.[56] It was not a specific ritual or action on Bernard's part that generated the reverence that William felt; it was merely his perception of the sanctity of the individual and place that made him aware of the spiritual significance of his own presence; this is likened to approaching the altar of God, recalling the sacrament of communion. Effectively, the sanctity exhibited by Bernard was readily perceptible by an outsider, and it conditioned William such that he became more receptive to the divine presence.

The idea that *caritas* was the force by which a stranger's identity was imprinted with that of Christ is upheld by the idea that *caritas* drew individuals to itself, no matter their worldly identity. As Aelred of Rievaulx states:

[C]harity, which – granted that other virtues may be strong too – should be present,

befits all things. More particular still, it is in itself also rest for the wearied, a dwelling

---

[54] See section 1 above.

[55] Hildegard of Bingen, p. 32.

[56] *Vita Prima*, VII. 33: '[i]ngressusque regium illud cubiculum, cum considerarem habitationem et habitatorem, tantam mihi, Deum testor, domus ipsa incutiebat reverentiam sui, ac si ingrederer ad altare Dei'.

place for the traveller, a wholesome light for the arriving guest, and a perfect crown

for the victor. For what is faith, but our vehicle, by which we are transported to our

homeland?'[57]

The imagery of the weary traveller is very fitting. Cistercian culture, which its particular emphasis on *caritas*, generated the perception (at least among Cistercian communities) that the monastery, as the *domus Dei*, was an especially apt place for bringing others into charity's embrace, by which their soul might be rested and restored. In hospitality, Aelred's thought was given outward expression. The next step is to show that *caritas* was a motivator for Cistercian hospitality, and in what ways.

Caritas as Motivation for Hospitality

As stated, *caritas* provided a rationale for governing the Cistercian conception of social engagement, as has been explored in a number of different social contexts by Martha Newman.[58] Stephen Harding (r. 1109–1134) enshrined this regard for *caritas* in the Order's collective identity at an early date by composing the *Carta Caritatis*, a constitutional treatise revised over the course of the twelfth century.[59] It was described as 'a sort of pruning hook, namely, to cut off the budding shoots of schism, which […] choke the burgeoning fruit of mutual peace'.[60] The treatise was intended to unite Cistercians through uniformity of observance and mutual support. Furthering this sentiment was the spirituality of St Bernard of Clairvaux (1090–1153), who wrote eighty-six sermons on the Songs of Songs. Bernard viewed this Hebrew love-poem as an allegory for the soul's desire for God, pursued through *caritas*. The exercise of *caritas*, understood as Christian love for God and humanity, was the means by which the soul was transferred into grace.[61] Such an opinion was shared by Ailred

---

[57] Aelred of Rievaulx, 'De speculo caritatis', I. 31. 1473–77: 'at caritas, quae, licet ut aliae virtutes virtutes sint, sit oportet in omnibus, specialius tamen ipsa et requies fatigato, et viatori mansio, et plena lux pervenienti, et perfecta corona victori. Quid enim est fides, nisi vehiculum nostrum, quo ad patriam vehimur?'

[58] Martha G. Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity: Cistercian Culture and Ecclesiastical Reform, 1098–1180* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1996), pp. 1–13. Also Mirko Breitenstein, 'Is There a Cistercian Love? Some Considerations on the Virtue of Charity', in *Aspects of Charity: Concern for One's Neighbour in Medieval Vita Religiosa*, ed. by Gert Melville, Vita Regularis, 45 (Berlin: Lit, 2011), pp. 55–98, which remarks (p. 83) that, in the Cistercian conception, *caritas* was equated with the highest kind of love in a social context.

[59] The dating of these documents is controversial. Waddell proposes that the primitive text was drafted and redacted during the period of the foundation of the first daughter-houses of Cîteaux (La Ferté in 1113, Pontigny in 1114, and Clairvaux and Morimond in 1115), but that the earliest known version is that confirmed by Calixtus II in 1119 (*NLT*, pp. 261–273).

[60] *Exordium Cistercii*, II. 12 (*NLT*, p. 402).

[61] Newman, *Boundaries of Charity*, pp. 82–89.

of Rievaulx, who treated the subject at length in his *Mirror of Charity*.[62] Concern with the nature of what *caritas* was, and how it governed social interaction, was therefore a major concern for Cistercian writers, and it is by applying ideas behind *caritas* to hospitality that a fuller appreciation of why Cistercians provided hospitality can be given, and how they described *caritas* as a force acting on them.

Throughout Cistercian literature and in the work of important authors in the Cistercian tradition, such as Bernard of Clairvaux and Aelred of Rievaulx, there is very little direct treatment of the theological concepts introduced in chapter 53 of the *Rule of Benedict*. However, this omission did not mean that the Cistercians had no rationale as to how they, as a community, were linked to the outside world and those who visited their abbeys as guests. This was achieved through their highly developed theology of *caritas*. One author who does much to explain the place of *caritas* in Cistercian observance, and Christian society more widely, is Bernard of Clairvaux. At various points in his writing, Bernard reveals something of how *caritas* may be applied to the social interaction involved in receiving guests and providing hospitality. When Bernard delivered one of his sermons on the *Song of Songs*, he concluded it in the following manner:

> Brothers, it is good that we spend time here, but harken, the evil of the day calls us forth. Since it is that these people, who we are told have presently arrived, compel us to break up what is pleasing, rather than finish our discourse. I myself shall go to the guests, to make sure that no aspect of the duties of the subject we are discussing, charity, is lacking, to make sure that it cannot be said of us: *For they say, but do not act*. Meanwhile, pray that God causes my mouth's willing offerings to act to your edification in these matters, and to the praise and glory of His name.[63]

This passage is a rare reference to live-action provision of hospitality. Here, hospitality intrudes on the daily routine of the community and forces a response from the monks. This strong sense of contextualisation means that the reference is valuable, and several points must be noted. The first is the sense that where Bernard and his community (perhaps the chapter house, or church, or cloister walk) are located is an ideal place, where spiritual matters

---

[62] Aelred of Rievaulx, *The Mirror of Charity*, ed. by Charles Dumont and trans. by Elizabeth Connor, Cistercian Fathers Series, 17 (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1990).

[63] *Cant. Cant. 1–35*, III. 6. 22–28 (p. 17): '[f]ratres, bonum est nos hic esse. sed ecce avocat nos diei malitia. Hi siquidem, qui modo supervenisse nuntiantur, gratum cogunt rumpere magis quam finire sermonem. Ego exibo ad hospites, ne quid desit officiis ejus, de qua loquimur, charitatis, ne forte et de nobis audire contingat: *Dicunt enim, et non faciunt*. Vos orate interim, ut voluntaria oris mei beneplacita faciat Deus ad vestram ipsorum aedificationem, et laudem et gloriam nominis sui'.

may be pursued in peace, safe from the 'evil of the day', thus setting up a contrast between the idealised monastery and the troubled external world. The second is that the guests are intruding on this ideal space, and that it prevents the more desirable engagement in spiritual discourse; the harmony of the ideal space is temporarily broken by external intrusion. Third is that the reason Bernard attributes to his tending to the guests is *caritas*, which cause, as discussed below, is one of the principal reasons that Bernard permits for breaking the contemplative state of life. The fourth, and most significant, is that it is this sense of *caritas* that prompts Bernard to receive the guests himself, and thus shows that Bernard is personally affected by *caritas*, and that the concept is not an abstract rationalisation carried out to justify and explain why Cistercians provided hospitality.

Bernard's statement ties into the wider self-perception of the Cistercians in relation to the ecclesiastical order as a whole. A trope within Cistercian literature is that the monastery is a marriage bed, an image drawn from the *Song of Songs*. As Newman has stated, in their own opinion the Cistercians 'lay in a bed of contemplation', but that *caritas* was the factor that prompted them to action outside the cloister.[64] In a material setting within the monastery the same was also true, and Bernard states that one of the causes of being pulled away from pursuit of divine things (in this case by the arrival of guests) is one's fellow man. In a line from his *De diligendo Deo*, Bernard iterates in a spiritual context the exact situation described as occurring in a material, earthly setting at the end of the sermon quoted above: 'the wicked world envies, the evil of the day disturbs […] and, what is more insistent than these, fraternal charity recalls'.[65] Bernard here states that it is society and an individual's obligation and natural inclination to tend to the needs of fellow human beings that limits the advancement of the professed contemplative into a heavenly life on earth. The guests in the passage represent the world disturbing the contemplation of the cloister, it is Bernard, as head and exemplar of the community, who has to handle their reception, and this is done because in Bernard's view *caritas* entailed physical as well as spiritual endeavour. For Bernard, the conclusion of a monk's progress into charity was a complete union with God. This entailed a complete effacement of self, and devotion to another, as stated in his *De diligendo Deo:* '[f]or, in a certain wondrous fashion oblivious of himself, and as it were utterly abandoning himself, he will wholly pass

---

[64] Newman, p. 114.

[65] Bernard of Clairvaux, *The Book of Saint Bernard on the Love of God*, trans. by Edmund G. Gardner (London: J. M. Dent, 1916), p. 101: 'invidet saeculum nequam, perturburat diei malitia […] fraterna revocat caritas', as translated in this edition.

on into God; and henceforth, joined to the Lord, will be one spirit with Him'.[66]

So far, *caritas* has been considered only as though it were an internal virtue cultivated by an individual. However, in Cistercian thought, *caritas* escaped being confined to people, and assumed an external existence reflecting the divine presence in the world. It was latent in all Christian people, but was also a latent bond that required only recognition and cultivation to unite the previously separate parties. For hospitality, the presence of caritas meant that individuals sought God in complete solitude, but could also find divine things in others; the attraction of hospitality was therefore the opportunity to increase *caritas* and discover divine qualities in the stranger. Bernard refers to *caritas* as a net, that binds people together:

> Indeed, the net of charity encloses all kinds of fishes within its wide folds in this life; where, conforming herself to all according to the time, and transferring the adverse and prosperous things of all into herself, and making them in some sort her own, she is wont not only to rejoice with them that do rejoice, but also to weep with them that weep.[67]

Bernard states that there is no barrier between the charitable monk's emotions and another's. This has great significance for hospitality, which is a bonding of two people by physical circumstance. The provision of hospitality viewed in this sense, then, is simply another instance of *caritas* at work, but this time in a materialised, rather than purely spiritual, interaction: Christ in the stranger allows the Cistercian monk to view an encounter with a stranger as an opportunity to encounter God.

The *Rule of Benedict*'s precept stating Christ to be in the stranger meant that the monastic community was able to approach hospitality as a spiritual as well as social encounter by giving a common and desirable identity to all guests. However, for Cistercians it was not merely fear of mistreating 'Christ in the stranger' that motivated them to provide hospitality. The concept of *caritas*, particularly well developed in Cistercian theology, provided an overarching rationale which accommodated the reception of the worldly stranger and of 'Christ in the stranger', and allowed for hospitality as a monastic activity. *Caritas* and the

---

[66] Bernard of Clairvaux, *On the Love of God*, p. 133: '[q]uasi enim miro quodam modo oblitus sui, et a se penitus velut deficiens, totus perget in Deum: et deinceps adhaerens ei, unus cum eo spiritus erit' (trans. Gardner).

[67] Bernard of Clairvaux, p. 135: '[s]iquidem in hac vita ex omni genere piscium intra sinum suae latitudinis caritatis rete concludit: ubi se pro tepore omnibus conformans, omniumque in se sive adversa, sive prospera trajiciens, ac sua quodammodo faciens, non solum gaudere cum gaudentibus, sed etiam flere cum flentibus consuevit' (trans. Gardner).

desire for union with God placed all people in a continuum, with divinity and spiritual existence at one end, and worldly identity and life at the other. The precept of the *Rule* stating that guests should be received 'as Christ' meant that the apex of this continuum was to be perceived by those following the *Rule* (Cistercian or not) as Christ, albeit a single individual might be more or less estranged from their own divinity through their manner of life. 'Christ in the stranger' was therefore not a complete superposition or effacement of an existing identity, but a realisation that a guest should be treated with regard to their latent and potential divine identity. For their part, Cistercians had already entered onto the process of transformation and spiritual self-cultivation that would lead them toward divinity; by recognising this in others and acting in a manner that made their own spiritual progress evident, the Cistercians were able to increase divine receptivity within a guest and thus induce greater spiritual awareness. The means by which Cistercians acted in a manner that addressed the spiritual identity of the guest is the topic of the next section.

1.3

SPIRITUAL AND MATERIAL PROVISION FOR GUESTS

The way in which the community acted has been shown in the previous section to have the capacity to alter profoundly the interaction and meaning of hospitality in monastic life. In the *Rule of Benedict* and the *Ecclesiastica Officia* there are some core precepts governing the protocol for receiving a guest. These relate to specific rituals that would allow a Cistercian community to bring a guest safely within the bounds of the monastery in a manner that maintained monastic peace and quiet, solemnity, and respected the status of the guest themselves. The rituals of welcome and the means provision given in these normative texts are general templates able to be carried out at any Cistercian abbey, and they stem directly from Cistercian observance, and therefore considered here as relating to the identity of Cistercians as hosts. Hospitable provision such as food, lodging, and entertainment, that relate to specific historical and material contexts are discussed in chapter two and three, with special reference to Kirkstall Abbey. While some rituals were modified with regard to the social status of the guest, these modifications were straightforward, and were once again normative, and so are treated as being related to the identity of Cistercian as hosts. For the incidence of guests at Kirkstall Abbey, their social status, and their activities in the precinct, see chapter three. What

follows is a description and explanation of some of the principal facets of hospitable provision indicative of monastic identity as detailed in normative texts.[68]

The Ritual of Welcome

The action that a guest would experience is the ritual of welcome by which they would be ushered into the monastery from beyond its confines. The bare protocol has been outlined previously in section one; what is described here is the manner of its execution and its underlying rationale. The *Rule of Benedict* states that monks should 'run to meet' guests.[69] The use of *occurrere* is a significant and omnipresent addition to the language of monastic hospitality because it denotes a more active role in the reception of guests. When the community recognises that there is someone in need of their hospitality, they are to go to meet them rather than wait for their arrival passively. This action displays willingness to act and diligence in carrying out charitable offices. The word *occurrere* is often consciously used in descriptions receiving guests. It is used, for example, when Walter Daniel describes Aelred's reception by the community at Rievaulx, immediately before his decision to enter a monastic life, 'the prior, guestmaster and porter run to meet' Aelred; they do the same the day after when Aelred, about to depart, returns to the monastery, although this time the three officials are accompanied by 'a plentiful crowd of the brethren'.[70]

The 'crowd' (*turba*) of monks who met Aelred recalls the tales of the reception of guests related in the *Historia Monachorum*, which text had much influence on chapter 53 of the *Rule of Benedict*.[71] In this work, the group with which the author travelled was met with monks of Nitria, who 'came running to meet us, singing psalms. For this is what they generally do with all their visitors'.[72] Similarly, Rufinus in Antioch in the late fourth century, recalling visiting the hermits in Egypt, stated that 'at once they poured out of their cells like a swarm of bees'.[73] The Cistercians, while adopting the vocabulary, did not mention this kind of liberal, outwardly affective reception in their legislation, and instead kept the number of

---

[68] Commentaries on the *Rule*, where employed, have been drawn from non-Cistercian writers due to the lack of available published commentaries on the *Rule* from Cistercian authors; see section 1 above. The best overall collection of commentary and elucidatory matter on chapter 53 of the *Rule of Benedict* is that synthesised by Migne, in *PL* 66, cols 0751B–0768B, used extensively in the following discussion.

[69] *RB*, 53:3: '[u]t ergo nuntiatus fuerit hospes, occuratur ei a priore vel a fratribus cum omni officio caritatis'.

[70] Walter Daniel, *The Life of Aelred of Rievaulx, with the Letter to Maurice*, trans. by F. M. Powicke (London: Thomas Nelson, 1950), p. 14: '[o]currit prior, hospitalis et portarius'; p. 15: 'occurrunt viro cum honore prior cum hospitum provisore, portarius et plurima turba fratrum'.

[71] See the index of patristic and ancient works reference in the *Rule* in *RB*, pp. 605–06.

[72] *Lives of the Desert Fathers*, trans. by Benedicta Ward, p. 77.

[73] Ibid., p. 3.

brethren deputed to meet a guest to a minimum (discussed below). Roles were assigned to the various officials, outside the duties of which they were not permitted to operate. In this way the Cistercians were much more specific in the arrangement of their community than the *Rule of Benedict*. In the model reception derived from the *Ecclesiastica Officia*, only three monks were required to receive a guest.[74] These were, in order of occurrence, the porter, one monk assigned by the abbot (or his deputy) to accompany the porter to receive the guest, and the guest master.[75] After the guest had been accommodated, the abbot would dine with the guest, but he was not necessary for their initial reception. The number of monks to receive a guest could be augmented as circumstances required. For example, the customary states that multiple monks should be assigned to receiving guests, but, during Collations at least (it is unclear whether this applies at other times as well), only one of them should accompany the porter.[76]

When paired with some statutes from the end of the twelfth century the figure of three monks to receive a guest becomes more meaningful. In 1190 a statute was prepared and subsequently published in 1191 forbidding outright purchase of lands.[77] However, communities without resources to support thirty monks and appropriate hospitality to guests besides, as well as a sufficient number of lay brothers sufficient to maintain the site, were exempt. The statute reveals that the number of thirty monks was perceived as a threshold below which a community was considered struggling. Hospitality was considered as essential activity of the community, even if below this threshold. If taken as a general lower limit in a 'model' community, then from the legislation it can be inferred that no more than ten per-cent of the community at the most had any reason to make personal contact with a guest. There would clearly have been exceptions to this statistic, such as those poor communities numbering less than thirty brethren, or communities receiving particularly high numbers of guests (perhaps at specific times). Nevertheless, it remains plausible to state that, from the Cistercians normative and legislative sources, the vast majority of Cistercian brethren would not have mixed with outsiders. Instead, the duties were concentrated into the hands of a very few individuals, a distribution of tasks fitting neatly with the Cistercian desire to rest in the

---

[74] For the summary of protocol see section 1 above.

[75] *EO*, 120:9; 87:2, 15; 119 *passim*.

[76] *EO*, 87:3: 'Abbas nanque quilibet in suo monasterio. portario suo aliquos quos ad hoc idoneos perspexerit designare debet'.

[77] Statute of preparatory commission is Waddell, *Statutes*, 1190:1: 'ab omni emptione terrarium et quarumcumque possessionum immobilium omnino abstineamus. […] Excipiuntur ab hac lege monasteria quorum facultates nondum sufficiunt ad sustendandum numerum triginta monachorum cum hospitalitate congrua et numero conuersorum ad situm loci sufficientium'; confirmed in 1191:3.

bridal chamber of the Lord in a state of contemplative leisure.[78]

The brethren deputed to receive a guest were to act with solemnity, while at the same there was to be no elaborate pomp and ceremony, especially where important personages were concerned. Here *occurrere* should be understood as prompt and deliberate action, such that a guest is not kept waiting, rather than as an excited rush towards a guest; it also means that meeting a guest should take precedence over the task in which the monks are engaged, as has been seen in the case of Bernard.[79] In the *Ecclesiastica Officia* there is a chapter entitled 'On the Procession of Bishops', detailing the protocol proper to receiving their own bishop, archbishop, papal legate, king, the pope, or the community's own abbot. This protocol includes detail of the physical disposition of the brethren in such an eventuality, and it is only for these individuals that the convent goes outside the monastery to receive a guest.[80] But this courtesy was only extended once, with the exception of the pope, and it was a grave offence were it to be done more often. This is shown in the case of the abbot of Revesby, Linconlshire, in 1246 (to choose an example not too far from Kirkstall), who was sentenced to twenty days outside his stall, three days in *levi culpa* and one in bread and water for receiving his bishop in procession for a second time.[81] The reason for this restriction is not given in the *Ecclesiastica Officia*, but a plausible explanation is that it was to maintain the gravitas of the occasion and minimise disruption to the community, while still showing a profound mark of respect.

'Courtesy of Love' and 'Fitting Honour' in the *Rule of Benedict*

Once a guest had been received there would be a member of the community to meet him 'with all the courtesy of love'.[82] But what 'courtesy of love' entailed depended largely on the status and expectation of the guest, and this could change the importance of the ritual greatly. An abbot washing the feet of a noble or bishop was a lesser inversion of the social order than the washing of the unknown poor. As well as a non-material component, the provision of hospitality had equally essential physical elements, summed up in the phrase 'proper honour must be shown to all'.[83] The word 'proper' (*congruus*) is not treated by commentators of the *Rule* as being related to the guest's identification as Christ, which would imply that all guests should receive the same provision. There was not a sense of social equality accompanying

---

[78] Newman, p. 107.

[79] See section 2 above.

[80] *EO*, 87:11: '[s]ciendum autem quod ad nullum recipiendum vadit conventus. nisi ad proprium episcopum et archiepiscopum. et sedis aspostolice legatos. et regem. et domnum papam. et proprium abbatem'.

[81] *Statuta*, II, 1246:34.

[82] *RB*, 53:3: 'occuratur ei […] cum omni officio caritatis'.

[83] *RB*, 53:2: 'omnibus congruus honor exhibeatur'.

the universality of the provision of hospitality, and provision varied according to how the monks gauged the guest's worldly status. Instead, 'proper' material provision is interpreted by commentators variously as meaning either the motivation of the monks, the expectation of what they should provide, or, more commonly, how they should scale their material provision according to the worldly status of the guest. Thus Smaragdus states that 'every humility' is so termed because it is 'full and perfect, not feigned, but pure-hearted', and related it to 'the provision of food and drink and all things appropriate to them'.[84] Meanwhile, Bernard Ayglerius stated that for each social rank and vocation, there was a different manner of reception, and it was considered 'proper' when administered 'according to the quality of the person received, and appropriate in the display of respect'.[85] The word *humanitas* took on a technical nature when it was applied to food, and was especially significant when it came to the issue of whether the consumption of meat was permitted or not.[86] The provision of food is a very important topic for the Cistercians and is discussed in full in a later chapter.[87] Although the *Rule of Benedict* did not state so explicitly, there was a consistent interpretation that *humanitas* concerned the varied provision of goods pertinent to easing the material needs of guests, and this was a factor to be enthusiastically adopted by the Cistercians in the development of their hospitality structures within the precinct as well as the comforts which they provided.

The variety of hospitable provision was a feature of Cistercian houses as well, even though references to it are sparse and embedded in longer narratives not directly concerned with discussing hospitality. Sometimes the variety in provision is shown in a negative light, but at others it could form part of the highest praise of Cistercian monks. A good example comes from Fountains Abbey, near Ripon in North Yorkshire. The *Narratio de fundatione* of Fountains presents hospitality towards guests as a criterion for gauging the quality of abbots, and many are noted with this virtue. A particularly expressive example is the testament to Abbot Robert of Pipewell, who built the third (and largest) guest hall, and was noted for his munificent provision of hospitality and diligent use of resources in charitable works. He is described as being 'merciful to the poor, liberal to all. He took the utmost care in tending the poor, receiving pilgrims, and showing fitting honour to guests; he was a comfort to the

---

[84] Smaragdus, p. 281, line 6.: 'plena atque perfecta, non ficta sed de corde puro'; p. 281, lines 17–18: 'exhiberi oportet in cibi et potus et omnium illis competentium administratione'.

[85] Bernardus Cassensis, in *PL* 66, col. 754C: 'ut secundum qualitatem susceptae personae sit et condescendentis in honoris exhibitione'.

[86] For meat-eating and the provision of food, see chapter 4.2 below.

[87] See chapter 4 below.

weak, while he was accustomed to obtain very diligently, according to the form of the Order, what the brethren required'.[88] This description employs terms explicitly referencing the *Rule of Benedict*, thus emphasising Robert's close observance of its precepts while showing the value of this way of life to wider society, while also implying that it is characteristic Cistercian behaviour by the (very ill-defined) phrase 'according to the form of the Order'. Fountains at this time had three known guest halls, suggesting that each was able to cater to different guests in different ways.[89] The description of distinct groups benefitting from Robert's diligence indicates that they were considered as being separate when benefitting from Cistercian provision ('the poor', as contrasted with 'guests', for example). The phrase 'fitting honour' (*congruum* […] *honorem*) employs the same vocabulary as the *Rule of Benedict*, indicating that interpretations of the words in the *Rule*, with all their connotations, were deemed appropriate for describing a virtuous Cistercian abbot.

Practical Care of guests

As well as showing deference when admitting a guest and ensuring that they were given treatment befitting their status, the Cistercians carried out certain acts to reinforce their humility and exalt the spiritual society within the monastery. For hospitality, the most prominent of these acts was the *mandatum*, the ritual footwashing of guests and the poor, which includes a scriptural reference with great implications for understanding the self-conception of life within monastic communities based on the *Rule of Benedict*, as well as for the nature of hospitable provision.

In the *Rule of* Benedict, once the community washed the guests' feet, they were to say 'we have received, O Lord, your loving kindness, in the midst of your temple', a sentence known as the *Suscepimus*.[90] This is a reference to Psalm 47 (Vulgate numbering) and was said when the maundy, the ritual foot-washing of the guests, was completed. This speech is prescribed in the *Ecclesiastica Officia* to be said by those performing the Maundy,

---

[88] '*Narratio de Fundatione Fontanis Monasterii in Comitatu Eboracensi*', in *Memorials of the Abbey of St Mary of Fountains*, ed. by John Richard Walbran, Publications of the Surtees Society, 42 (Durham: Surtees Society, 1863), pp. 1–129 (p. 114): '[...] misericors in pauperes, liberalis ad omnes. Summa illi cura de pauperibus confovendis, de peregrinis suscipiendis, congruum hospitibus exhibere honorem, infirmis solatia, fratribus vero solito diligentius, secundum formam ordinis, necessaria procurare'.

[89] For the guest accommodation at Fountains and its development over time, see chapter 2.3–6.

[90] *RB*, 53:14: '[s]uscepimus, Deus, misericordiam tuam in medio temple tui', drawn from Ps 47:10. The textual variant 'aestimavimus, Deus […]', found in the text of the *iuxta Hebraicum* psalter, is closer to the Hebrew original. The writers considered in this discussion were more familiar with the Gallican psalter and were writing for an audience largely ignorant of Hebrew. See David J. Ladouceur, *The Latin Psalter: Introduction, Selected Text and Commentary* (Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 2005), pp. 7–11.

and represents a complete adoption in Cistercian usage of the protocol given in the *Rule of Benedict*.[91]

The content of psalm 47 is highly relevant to the situation in which the *Suscepimus* is said. The psalm is a thanksgiving to God for the establishment of the church and the sanctuary it offers against the powers of the world: it describes the strength of its construction, the fear the city of God inspires in oppressors beyond the walls, the prosperity of its citizens, and its perpetual legacy There are two main issues crucial to understanding the relevance of the *Suscepimus* for monastic, and specifically Cistercian, hospitality. The first is that by iterating it the brethren are stating that they dwell within the city of God (*civitas Dei*), that is, the monastery is equated with the sanctuary offered by God against the kings (*reges*), representing earthly might, who gathered outside the walls of the city and trembled in wonder.[92] The 'holy mountain' of psalm 47, where the city of God is located and where God himself is said to dwell, is recalled in the *Prologue* to the *Rule of Benedict*, when the rhetorical question is asked to the listener, 'Lord, who will dwell in your tabernacle, and who will rest on your holy mountain?'; the implication is that those leading the monastic life are to dwell within the city.[93]

Meanwhile, the pilgrims arriving at the *civitas Dei*, who see the same city as do the kings, offer thanks for its sanctuary. This duality of perception is perfectly suited to the *Rule*'s distinction between the poor and the rich, with the greater spiritual benefit lying with reception of the poor.[94] Thus arises the idea that the monastery is a place where hospitality is provided according to the customs of divine, not human, society. This means that Cistercian provision of hospitality was not intended to cater to human needs as distinct from God, but to extend the presence of God in the world by treating those entering His 'city' according to what was demanded by heavenly society.

The perception of the monastery as *civitas Dei* has special resonance for the Cistercians, both in terms of the historical development of the Cistercian Order and with special relevance to the Cistercians' rhetoric of spirituality that developed over the course of the twelfth century.

---

[91] *EO*, 107:5: 'ante hospites dicant SUSCEPIMUS DEUS et cetera'.

[92] Ps 47:5–7: 'quia ecce reges congregati sunt venerunt simul ipsi videntes sic obstipuerunt conturbati sunt admirati sunt horror possedit eos ibi dolor quasi parturientis'; '[f]or lo, the kings were assembled, they passed by together. They saw it, and so they marvelled; they were troubled, and hasted away, fear took hold upon them there, and pain, as of a woman in travail'.

[93] Ps. 47:2: 'Magnus Dominus et laudabilis nimis, in civitate Dei nostri, in monte sancto ejus'; *RB*, Prol.: '[s]ed interrogemus cum propheta Dominum dicentes ei: Domine, quis habitabit in tabernaculo tuo, aut quis requiescet in monte sancto tuo?'.

[94] Although based on the Hebrew text, see comments on Psalm 48 (47) in Peter C. Craigie, *Psalms, 1–50*, Word Biblical Commentary, 19 (Waco, Tx: Word Books, 1983), pp. 353–54.

The idea of special exemption from the surrounding world is a fundamental distinguishing feature of early Cistercian history, embodied in the granting of the 'Roman privilege' by Calixtus II, supposedly in 1119, which freed the Cistercians from all temporal and episcopal oversight saving that of the pope. The topic of this grant has been the subject of intense debate within Cistercian historiography.[95] Briefly summarised, the argument revolves around the nature of the development of the Cistercian *ordo* over the course of the twelfth century, and the point at which its administrative institutions gained coherency. Waddell's new edition of the narrative and legislative texts demonstrates that the Order's governmental machinery developed over the course of the twelfth century, rather than, as implied in Canivez's edition of the statutes of the General Chapter, that it operated in a mature form from *c.* 1134. Meanwhile, Berman contends that the Cistercian narrative was a historicised invention of *c.* 1160, intended to project the claims of the Cistercians into the past to legitimise and consolidate the corporate identity of the rapidly growing Order.[96]

Despite controversies over chronology, the centrality of the concept underlying certain privileges, and their enthusiastic adoption and enforcement by Cistercians from the late twelfth century onwards, make them relevant here.[97] The most prominent for the present discussion is that the *Suscepimus* recalls in the minds of all familiar with the psalm the *reges* beyond the walls of the city of God, and the safety of those within. In Cistercian history, the special protection afforded to the Order by the pope, which freed the Cistercians from secular exactions, recalled God's special protection of the citizens of the psalm, since in both cases the superlative power took action to protect those entrusted to his charge.[98] The result was that hospitality could be granted to guests on the Cistercians' own terms, while fewer demands could be made of them directly.[99] The monks performing the maundy thus expressed thanks

---

[95] The main works in which this debate is contained are Constance H. Berman, *The Cistercian Evolution: The Invention of a Religious Order in Twelfth-Century Europe* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), esp. pp. 46–92. Waddell's extended criticism of Berman's argument may be found in Chrysogonus Waddell, 'The Myth of Cistercian Origins: C. H. Berman and the Manuscript Sources', *Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses*, 51 (2000), 299–386. A critical review of Waddell's edition is Christopher Holdsworth, 'Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Cîteaux: A Review Article', *Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses*, 51 (2000), 157–66. Further commentary may be found in: Constance Bouchard, 'Waddell, Ed., Narrative and Legislative Texts', *The Medieval Review*, 7.05.03.12 (2005); Constance H. Berman, 'Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Cîteaux: A Response to Bouchard's Review (TMR 05.03.12)', *The Medieval Review*, 05.07.01 (2005). A broad summary of the position of the debate at present, and its value in terms of current historiography trends is given in Jamroziak, *Cistercian Order*, pp. 19–25.

[96] Berman, *Cistercian Evolution*, pp. 46–92.

[97] Jamroziak, *Cistercian Order*, p. 14.

[98] Ps 47:2: 'Deus in domibus eius agnitus est in auxiliando'; 'in her houses shall God be known when he shall protect her'.

[99] Although indirect pressure could be exercised to ensure the Cistercians' acquiescence, as happened in many cases with the provision of meat to guests. See chapter 4.2 below.

for being granted an opportunity to act with charity, and thereby act as though in the city of God.[100] The psalm verse encapsulates the nature of the hospitality offered by the monastic community. Washing the feet of the poor, enacted in defiance of social etiquette of the secular world, exhibited evidence of charitable action on the part of the monks, and is a prefiguration of heavenly society on earth. The final verses of the psalm, unsaid by the community but surely understood in their absence, ask that God make his home in Israel, so that future generations will understand the faith and perpetuate it. The implication was that practising the maundy reinforced the idea of God's presence within the monastery, as well as making God's society accessible to others.

A number of Cistercian writers associate the imagery of psalm 47 with the reception of strangers in sermons. Bernard of Clairvaux, Helinand of Froidmont, and Guerric d'Igny all discuss this verse, as does Thomas of Cîteaux in the early sixteenth century.[101] These writers often discussed the verse in its liturgical context, the Feast of the Purification of Blessed Mary, or Candlemas, an occasion on which, fittingly, guests were permitted within the church .[102] This ceremony commemorates the first entry of Mary with the infant Jesus after His birth, this being the first time that Jesus was introduced with solemn procession into a place of worship: Simeon the Just receives Him, in the presence of Anna the Prophetess.[103] The reception of guests bears a symbolic similarity to the reception of the infant Jesus, as the *Rule* emphasises the idea of 'Christ in the stranger'. Both situations are considered therefore as the induction of outside divinity into a holy place, and reunion with God the Father. The importance of this ceremony for understanding attitudes toward hospitality is heightened when considering that it is one of the few instances in the *Ecclesiastica Officia* noting the presence of guests (*hospites*) in the monastery, to whom the sacristan distributes candles

---

[100] The concept is excellently laid out in the context of early Christian theology in Rowan A. Greer, 'Hospitality in the First Five Centuries of the Church', *Monastic Studies*, 10 (1974), 29–48 (pp. 44–48).

[101] Bernard of Clairvaux, 'Sermones in nativitate domini', in *PL*, CLXXXIII, Cols 0115B – 0130B, v; Bernard of Clairvaux, 'Sermones in Cantica Canticorum', in *PL*, CLXXXIII, Cols 0785A – 1198A, XXXIII; Bernard of Clairvaux, 'Sermones in purificatione Beatae Mariae', in *PL*, CLXXXIII, Cols 0365C – 0372A, I; Guerric of Igny, pp. 306–21, 340–55, sermons for the Purification of Mary I and III, respectively; Helinand of Froidmont, 'Sermones', in *PL*, CCXII, Cols 0481C – 0720C, in purificatione Beatae Mariae, VI.

[102] Terryl N. Kinder, *Cistercian Europe: Architecture of Contemplation*, Cistercian Studies Series, 191 (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 2002), p. 175; Maximilian Sternberg, *Cistercian Architecture and Medieval Society*, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 221 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2013), pp. 179, 185.

[103] Lk 2:22–35.

as part of the celebration.[104] Reference to the *Suscepimus* is therefore linked to the monks' conception of receiving Christ in the stranger, introducing a new individual to the city of God, and demonstrating the manner of life there. It was no coincidence that on the inner walls of Cleeve Abbey's gatehouse there was painted a mural of the Virgin and Child, as this formed a fitting symbolic reminder of Christ's first reception into *civitas Dei*, a guest's first visual impression of divine hospitality, and which underpinned the spiritual nature of hospitable provision in a Cistercian monastery.

Burial as Hospitality

Another form of hospitable provision with a strong practical element, but which also emphasised the spiritual basis of the Cistercian abbey, was death. Death in monastic life was not seen as an end: on the contrary, it was seen as an entrance into the individual's new life for which their monastic duties had prepared them.[105] This idea is similar in form to Patrick Geary's assertion that '[d]eath marked a transition, a change in status, but not an end'.[106] Prayers continued to include a deceased benefactor as much as when they had been alive.[107] Were they granted burial, they would not only have given property to the monastery in the role of benefactor, but the monastery will have reciprocated by giving them a place in their cemetery usually confined to their own brethren, a relationship suggesting an active interaction with the dead. This was a recognised form of strengthening a relationship with a religious house.[108] The appreciation of a deceased's remains and the level of engagement with them is demonstrated by the Cistercian Abbot John of Ford's description in the late twelfth century of the bloody brawl between the Cluniac monks of Montacute (Somerset) and the

---

[104] *EO*, 47:5: 'Interim secretarius suo adiutus solatio. et quibus a priore iussum fuerit. reliquas candelas monachis et noviciis ac conversis laicis. familie etiam atque hospites si affuerint distribuat'. Another occasion for which guests are noted is Palm Sunday, when they might receive palms handed out during Terce: see *EO*, 17:4: 'Moxque secretarius cum *solatio suo et quibus a priore issum fuerit*. ramos benedictos monachis ac noviciis distribuat: reliquam partem fratribus laicis et familie ac hospitibus si affuerint porrigat'. Two lamps in the church may be lit specifically for the guests' benefit at the discretion of the abbot on the following occasions: Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, all solemnities of Holy Mary, the Nativity of St John the Baptist (24 June), the Feast of Sts Peter and Paul (29 June), the solemnity of St Benedict (11 July), All Saints (1 November), and the dedication of the abbey church: *EO*, 67:3, 6.

[105] Kinder, *Cistercian Europe*, pp. 365–67.

[106] Patrick J. Geary, *Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994), p. 2.

[107] A point that caused difficulties when seeking new benefactors: see Benjamin Thompson, 'Monasteries, Society and Reform in Late Medieval England', in *The Religious Orders in Pre-Reformation England*, ed. by James G. Clark (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2002), pp. 165–96 (pp. 179–80).

[108] Emilia Jamroziak, 'Making and Breaking the Bonds: Yorkshire Cistercians and their Neighbours', in *Perspectives for an Architecture of Solitude: Essays on Cistercians, Art and Architecture in Honour of Peter Fergusson*, ed. by Terryl N. Kinder, Medieval Church Studies, 11; Studia et Documenta, 13 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), pp. 63–70 (pp. 68–69).

parishioners of the church of Haselbury (Haselbury Plucknett, near Montacute).[109] When the renowned recluse Wulfric of Haselbury died in 1154, the monks of Montacute, who had given Wulfric his daily sustenance and shared confraternity with him, demanded that Osbern, priest of Haselbury and Wulfric's close friend, give up the body. Accompanied by soldiers, the Cluniacs seized the corpse. However, Osbern gathered villagers to stop the theft, and the ensuing skirmish was only quietened by the arrival of the bishop. Although the Cistercian monks were not involved in the fighting directly, viewing the scene through John's eyes and considering the phrases used to describe the friendship between the Cistercians and Wulfric leaves no doubt as to their affection for him and the sanctity which his corporeal remains had for them. William, the hosteller of Forde Abbey, was with Wulfric in his final moments, while John describes Wulfric's corpse as being a 'sacred treasure', a 'sacred bundle',[110] and later as 'a holy and precious treasure'.[111] The description of this episode indicates the strength of sentiment which could characterise Cistercian friendship in death.

The idea that warmth of feeling persisted after death is mirrored elsewhere. Abbot Aelred of Rievaulx quoted Cicero when saying that for those enjoying friendship 'the absent are present, the poor are rich, the weak are strong, and — even more difficult — the dead are alive'.[112] Repeated burial bequests were often made by several successive generations of the same family, as well as several benefactions made by individuals insisting upon burial in a religious house, similarly suggests that strong personal bonds continued beyond the point of death.[113] The same elements constituting hospitality in life are therefore present in the reception of remains for burial: the personal bond was established, the welcome extended, and the space opened to an outsider, or guest.[114] The difference was that the welcome was now extended to a person's remains rather than their animated form. Just as a humble greeting and an edificatory reading were characteristic of monastic hospitality, so too was burial.

The Cistercians allowed for the possibility of burying those who had not established a lasting relationship with them as well, and this should be seen as being characterised by the same warmth and *caritas* as were other personal engagements. The burial of guests formed

---

[109] Cassidy-Welch, *Monastic Spaces*, pp. 230–31; the most recent edition is John of Forde, *The Life of Wulfric of Haselbury, Anchorite*, Cistercian Fathers, 79 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2011) (for the dispute, pp. 211–12).

[110] John of Forde, *De vita beati Wulrici anachoretae Haselbergiae*, in *Wulfric of Haselbury, by John, Abbot of Ford*, ed. by Maurice Bell, Publications of the Somerset Record Society, 47 (London: Somerset Record Society, 1933), pp. 127 (William's death-bed parting), 128 (Wulfric's body). : 'sacro […] thesauro'; 'sacram glebam'.

[111] '[S]acrum et pretiosum thesaurum'. Ibid., p. 129.

[112] Aelred of Rievaulx, *Spiritual Friendship*, II. 13. Cicero's statement is in his *Laelius de Amicitia*, VII. 23.

[113] Wardrop, *Fountains Abbey*, pp. 273–74.

[114] For an explanation of these terms see Introduction, 0.2.

a constant in Cistercian legislation, and is included in the earliest *capitula*, though it was given a very Cistercian flavour by the protocol dictated in the *Ecclesiastica Officia*.[115] Just as there is a chapter detailing the reception of guests, there is a chapter detailing the burial of guests in which a lesser version of their own burial rights are performed (for example, said in plain chant, not sung).[116] Obligations to guests did not cease upon death, but did change in nature: for example, the sustenance now offered was purely spiritual in the form of the *Requiem Aeternam*, the mass for the dead, where before it might have been food and drink.[117] By prescribing this practice, the Cistercians expanded greatly upon Benedict's *Rule*, which merely states that monks are to bury the dead.[118] In putting liturgy and ritual to burial of guests, the Cistercians imprinted their own form of spirituality on this 'good work'. There was an element of practicality to burial of guests, since it could be troublesome to arrange safe transport of the body to another cemetery, but the ceremony surrounding a guest's burial is an indication that it was conceived as a definite component of Cistercian ritual and not merely formulated on an *ad hoc* basis. With the duties of the porter and the monk-hosteller, codified provision was ensured to fulfil the 'tools for good works' detailed in chapter 4 of the *Rule*, namely 'relieve the lot of the poor' (for the porter), 'visit the sick' (for the hosteller, who had oversight of the infirmary for guests), and to 'bury the dead' (which would be attended by all the community).[119] We should not, therefore, assume that hospitality was limited to the same considerations we attribute to it now, and death and burial are topics which require a broader perspective in order to be appreciated as having been a widely understood component of hospitable provision.[120]

1.4

THE WORLDLY IDENTITY OF GUESTS

The nature of chapter 53 of the *Rule of Benedict*, with its spiritual emphasis, says little on the worldly identity of guests. The emphasis was on stating what the community had to do to

---

[115] Jackie Hall, 'The Legislative Background to the Burial of Laity and Other Patrons in Cistercian Abbeys', *Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses*, 56 (2005), 363–72 (pp. 364–65).

[116] *EO*, 101: 'Quo modo hospes sepeliatur'; 101.8.

[117] *EO*, 101.10.

[118] *RB*, 4.17.

[119] *RB*, 4:14–16: '[p]auperes recreare […] infirmum visitare, mortuum sepelire'.

[120] Paul Koudounaris, *The Empire of Death: A Cultural History of Ossuaries and Charnel Houses* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2011); Roberta Gilchrist and Barney Sloane, *Requiem: The Medieval Monastic Cemetery in Britain* (London: Museum of London Archaeology Service, 2005), p. 7.

receive them in the broadest possible terms, rather than providing an exhaustive list of each type of guest and proper treatment for them. Chapter 86 of the *Ecclesiastica Officia* ('On the Procession for Bishops', discussed below) states special reception protocol for important guests, but nowhere are the processes explicitly stated which determined a person's social status. It is clear that special provision was made in some cases, since it is stated that guests are forbidden to process through the cloister and to hear sermons in chapter, unless the guest were 'so revered a personage to whom it befits this to be permitted'.[121] Elsewhere it is stated 'but if it is such a person whom it befits neither to announce or to remain there, he [the porter] should permit him to enter and go whither he desires'.[122] That is, there were certain kinds of people requiring formal announcement. Likewise, the precept implies that there were people classified as guests able to pass through the 'control point' of the gatehouse (perhaps messengers with news, or tradesmen).[123]

Although there is no authoritative protocol for determining status in known Cistercian sources, it can be surmised that the porter's common knowledge and perception would be an important factor. Certainly, the clothing and equipment on a guest's person would help distinguish them, as would their purpose for visiting the abbey (few noblemen would have made deliveries of goods, for example).[124] Some people would have been known to the porter on a personal level, perhaps from local lay settlements, or even from within the community. Such a circumstance was the flight of novices from the community. It was at the gatehouse that a prodigal novice had to make satisfaction if he wished to return; he was not entitled to enter into the cloister as he had spurned the community and was no longer part of it. After satisfaction had been made he was permitted to enter chapter, and thence was put on probation.[125] The duty of sorting guests had great implications for the rest of the stay within the precinct and the provisions that would be made available to them as part of their welcome. The guests' purpose was a factor as was their social status. The practice of grading guests at the gate is that to which Gerald of Wales makes reference when he protests that he is not to be accorded the respect due to an archdeacon or archdeacon-elect when visiting Strata Florida, due to his falling foul of the abbot of Whitland, to whom the abbot of Strata Florida

---

[121] *EO*, 17:25: 'Et sciendum quod ad processiones que fiunt per claustrum non liceat hospitibus incedere. nec ad sermones in capitulum intrare: nisi aliqua fuerit tam reverenda persona cui hoc permitti deceat'.

[122] *EO*, 120:13: '[s]i autem talis fuerit quem nec nuntiare nec ibi remanere deceat: intrare et quo voluerit ire permittat.'

[123] Ibid.

[124] For an analysis of the surviving dress accessories from Kirkstall Abbey and identification of guests see chapter 3.1 below.

[125] Waddell, *Statutes*, 1190:6.

was filiated.[126] The rich would be provided with a different sort of welcome and have more varied and generally greater entitlements than the poor, although both were recipients of the community's hospitality.

Guests Receiving Special Treatment

In a manner appreciative of the ways of the world, the *Rule* anticipates the response that the presence of wealthy guests might elicit from the community: 'our very awe of the rich guarantees them special respect'.[127] The Cistercians privileged some guests with special treatment, these being the figures in society of the highest status and influence, either in secular or spiritual terms. The kinds of people granted exceptional treatment are enumerated in chapter 86 of the *Ecclesiastica Officia*, 'On the Procession for Bishops': 'it should be known that the convent goes to receive no-one, except its own bishop and archbishop, and legates of the apostolic see, and the king, and the lord pope, and their own abbot'.[128] Here 'goes to receive' means procession, whereby the community assembled before the monastery doors in a line flanking the route of entry, and the honoured guest passed between them. Then, the guest leading, the procession entered with the community in the same order as at mass. The importance of the bishop's procession was that it engaged all the community, drawing them away from their appointed tasks, and thus went far beyond the normal attention a community provided to guests.

The motivation for monastic communities to receive wealthy or influential guests has recently received some comment that undermines the spiritual aspects of the activity to a great extent. Specifically, hospitality is sometimes described as being provided to the rich in hope of a remunerative counter-gift.[129] However, the link between hospitality and benefactions should not be overstated, as Jenkins's analysis of King John's pattern of benefaction of Cistercian houses demonstrates.[130] While King John was a noted persecutor of the Cistercians during the interdict, it should be remembered that before his heavy exactions he had been a 'special friend' of the Order . Jenkins has analysed John's itinerary to find when he stopped at

---

[126] Gerald of Wales, 'De Menevensi Ecclesia Dialogus', in *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*, ed. by J. S. Brewer, 8 vols (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1863), III, 101–373 (p. 201).

[127] *RB*, 53:15: 'nam divitum terror ipse sibi exigit honorem'.

[128] *EO*, 86:11: '[s]ciendum autem quod ad nullum recipiendum vadit conventus. nisi ad proprium episcopum et archiepiscopum. et sedis apostolice legatos. et regem. et domnum papam. et proprium abbatem'. Also discussed in Sternberg, p. 154.

[129] Kerr, *Monastic Hospitality*, pp. 43–48; Jamroziak, *Cistercian Order*, p. 109.

[130] James Jenkins, 'King John and the Cistercians in Wales' (unpublished PhD thesis, Cardiff University, 2012), pp. 136–40, 220–26, and app. 5 on p. 301.

Cistercian abbeys, and noted each stay where John made a benefaction. Out of eleven visits, only three resulted in a benefaction (one at Bindon, two at Waverley); one was the restoration of all Cistercian lands that John had appropriated during the interdict.[131] Thus, at least in the case of King John, who made frequent and unaccustomed claims on Cistercian hospitality, the presence of a powerful nobleman did not entail patronage on an equally noble scale.

The idea that hospitality was given in order to receive a countergift is also challenged by considering a host's duties in the context of secular courtly culture . Social etiquette demanded that a host bestow gifts upon his guests, as much as the other way around, to show liberality and 'worship'. The higher up the social scale one was, the costlier the gift had to be to make an impression. Considering that wealthy guests were the individuals most likely to make a benefaction, the remunerative qualities of any grant would have been offset by customary counter-gifts.[132] An excellent example comes from a Benedictine context, at St Albans, Hertfordshire, when Henry VI visited during the Christmas period from 1433 to 1434. The royal visit, which had been announced by royal decree, was viewed as an expense to be met, and the chronicler intended it as a mark in the abbot's favour that he did not stand on precedent and deny his obligation to such an unaccustomed imposition. The monastery buildings had to be renovated, supplies readied, servants and household suitably clothed, and throughout the stay 'the abbot on repeated occasions appeased the king with various lavish presents, at one time of swans, pheasants, partridges, and other game, and at another time of pickerel, pikes, eels and other fish in no small number'.[133] The giving of food gifts was an act of patronage by a superior, but here it was to reinforce the abbot's 'worship' as host, and on a scale that would impress the king and his court.[134] The abbot of Kirkstall, Ralph Haget (r. 1182–1190/1) experienced costly gift-giving, when, in an attempt to recover the confiscated grange of Micklethwaite, he had given King Henry II various sacred vessels and text of the gospels; Ralph was disappointed in his hopes and the community thought poorly of his misplaced generosity.[135] The idea of monastic communities providing hospitality to lobby for favours or extraordinary patronage must therefore be tempered by the high expenditure required to make the monastic party register in the affections of the would-be benefactors, as

---

[131] Jenkins, p. 301.

[132] These are themes thoroughly explored in Felicity Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990); Arnoud-Jan A. Bijsterveld, *Do Ut Des: Gift Giving, Memoria, and Conflict Management in the Medieval Low Countries* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2007).

[133] As cited and translated in Heale, p. 192.

[134] Felicity Heal, 'Food Gifts, the Household and the Politics of Exchange in Early Modern England', *Past and Present*, 199 (2008), 41–70 (pp. 57–60, 64–67).

[135] 'Foundation of Kirkstall', pp. 182–83.

well as the highly speculative nature of the pursuit.[136] It is more probable that where hospitality did result in benefactions, that both entertainment and gifts were exchanged on more modest scales, and were the result of closer relationships between monastic communities and their benefactors.[137]

Domestics of the Faith: Religious Guests

In the *Rule of Benedict* it states that a fitting honour should be shown 'especially to those who share our faith [*domesticis fidei*] and to pilgrims'.[138] With reference to the *Rule* alone, what *domesticis* signifies is unclear. Literally meaning 'domestics' or 'householders', the term could originally have referred to baptised Christians of whatever status, but this generality is not in keeping with its pairing with 'pilgrims'. It is far more probable that 'domestics' is intended to denote individuals of religious vocation, perhaps priests, evangelists, or those fulfilling an apostolate requiring travel, or, in Benedict's time for example, it could have been used to differentiate Catholics from Arians.[139]

The Cistercians are clear on what constituted 'domestics', which they interpreted as a technical term meaning members of their own religious order and specific inclusions from beyond it. This is shown by several statutes. A good example dates from 1226, when the abbot of Himmerod Abbey in the southern Rhineland complained that several sick lay brothers (members of the monastic community with more menial duties) of his community had not been received charitably by the abbot of Schönau, Baden-Württemberg; the abbots of Eberbach, Rhineland, and Villers-Betnach, Moselle, were ordered to investigate ensure that the charity of the order to domestics (*domesticos*) does not grow lukewarm.[140] Here, lay brothers are equated with the 'domestics'. It may also be commented on here that 'charity' signifies the reception and housing of non-community religious, and could be considered a form of hospitality. In 1281 this charity was extended outside the Cistercian Order: 'so that according to the Apostle we may be held to hospitality of all and especially domestics of the faith, the General Chapter orders and appoints that brothers of the Premonstratensian Order

---

[136] Stöber, p. 75.

[137] As is argued below in chapter 3.2.

[138] *RB*, 53:1: 'maxime domesticis fidei et peregrinis'.

[139] On this point see *RB*, pp. 256–57; Adalbert de Vogüé, 'The Meaning of Benedictine Hospitality', *Cistercian Studies*, 21 (1986), 186–94 (pp. 191–92); Terrence Kardong, 'To Receive All as Christ', *Cistercian Studies*, 19 (1984), 195–207 (p. 204).

[140] *Statuta*, II, 1226:16.

should be received charitably when they stop at our abbeys'.[141] Immediately afterwards in 1282 it was reiterated that any persons of the (Cistercian) Order should be received charitably and given at least one day's worth of provision should they require it, 'so that we may be held according to the apostolic word, to practise the offices of charity liberally, in common to all, and especially to brethren and domestics of our Order'.[142]. It is not clear whether the Premonstratensians were included as 'domestics' because of similarities in observance, but given that no other order is extended the term it would suggest as such. The term *domesticis* of the *Rule*, then, was taken by Cistercians to mean religious rather than secular individuals, and primarily Cistercians. The case for the definition is strengthened by considering the accompanying vocabulary. It is unlikely that the term *domesticus* is intended to convey merely a household servant in the purely secular sense of household labourer since there is explicit reference to *caritas*, a highly spiritually charged word, alongside *domesticus*, and the reference to the vocabulary of the *Rule of Benedict* would be obvious. Rather, it is preferable to see the term *domesticus* as signifying one who is closely related to a Cistercian community, or who has a special vocational link with them, but who had not actually sworn their vow of stability with that community. It can therefore be seen as signifying a special bond between religious, although the difference in the welcome that these guests would have received is not stated in the statutes, only that it should be charitable.

Abbatial Visitation

There were issues more fundamental to the operation of an abbey when receiving fellow religious. That given greatest attention in constitutional texts is how to receive fellow Cistercian abbots, which receives sustained treatment. The reception of Cistercian abbots is treated in Raynard's customary, in the *Exordium Cistercii*, as well as in the later *Carta Caritatis Prior*, and therefore is an early and consistent concern. Since there can only be one ruling monk in a community at a given time, there are clear issues of conflicting authority caused by the guest-abbot's presence. This was especially so for Cistercian communities, as the annual journey made to Cîteaux to attend the General Chapter placed heavy demands upon abbeys situated on nodal points in the logistical network (and more than any other,

---

[141] *Statuta*, III, 1281:25: '[i]tem, cum secundum Apostolum ad hospitalitatem omnium et maximes domesticorum fidei teneamur, statuit et ordinat Capitulum generale, quod fratres de Ordine Praemonstratensium cum ad abbatias nostras declinaverint, caritative recipiantur, et eidem liberaliter et honeste ministretur'.

[142] *Statuta*, III, 1282:4: 'ad exhibenda liberaliter caritatis officia, iuxta verbum apostolicum, communiter omnibus et maxime fratribus ac domesticis Ordinis nostri teneamur'.

Cîteaux itself).[143] To resolve this potential issue the Cistercians turned to chapter 61 of the *Rule*, 'The Reception of Visiting Monks', where it is stated that they should be admitted freely, providing that they do not make excessive demands on the host house. The *Rule* also catered for the eventuality that visiting monks may have helpful suggestions for the house and that these can be heeded if they are wise.[144] This latter precept can be seen as the seed for the advanced form of visitation and inter-house logistics in the Cistercian familial networks, though in all but a vague similarity of sentiment the Cistercians by far exceeded anything that the *Rule* ordained.[145]

Clarification of abbatial duties while multiple abbots were present forms a recurrent theme in Cistercian legislation. A good example is the determination of who was to entertain guests in the guesthouse, the duty being an obligation indicating dominance. Precedence was given to guest-abbots rather than the abbot of the house, as another way of expressing humility.[146] The abbot of the house still attended to guests at mealtimes however, and only when he was absent would the most senior of the guest-abbots (that is, the abbot of the eldest foundation) take his place. The task of eating with outsiders involved a careful balancing act: on the one hand, a religious superior involving himself in too lavish a welcome would face accusations of laxity in observance; one keeping aloof from society might acquire a reputation for providing a hostile reception.[147] For example, the Cistercian Abbot Gervase of Louth Park died in the mid-twelfth century lamenting his self-indulgence because he had eaten too much and well with guests while his community ate their basic conventual fare.[148] Yet the role was required and it was seen as central to how the community responded to the presence of guests in all twelfth-century Cistercian legislation, as the abbot was the public face of the religious house; it may be that the abbot's conduct at table was seen as a vital part of representing the community to the wider world, hence the limitation on visiting abbot's assuming the domestic abbot's place.[149]

---

[143] *Codification de 1202*, v. 1, 4. Restrictions on how many monks can be brought with abbots to Cîteaux begin with *Instituta*, XLIV in *c.* 1147 and are reiterated thenceforth: *NLT*, pp. 344–45.

[144] *RB*, 61:1–7.

[145] The form of visitation is given in Christopher Harper-Bill, 'Cistercian Visitation in the Later Middle Ages: The Case of Hailes Abbey', *Historical Research*, 53 (1980), 103–114, with numerous examples. For the language, cf. *RB*, 61.1–4 and *Codification de 1202*, VII. 2.1–3, esp. 3: '[p]rouideat nichilominus uisitandus ut secundum formam ordinis uisitatori obediens et deuotus existat. et ad emendationem domussue quantum poterit tanquam domino rationem redditurus intendat'.

[146] *Summa Cartae Caritatis* [*SCC*], VI. 2 (*NLT*, p. 407); *Carta Caritatis Prior* [*CCP*], IV. 3 (*NLT*, p. 445); *Codification de 1202*, VII. 2.

[147] See the comments of Pseudo-Macharius above, n. 17.

[148] Kerr, *Monastic Hospitality*, p. 40; Williams, II, pp. 93–94.

[149] *RB*, 64:3–6.

Abbatial visitations required further legislation to ensure their smooth execution.[150] The Cistercians elaborated protocol detailing to whom the abbot conducting visitation could speak, where he could talk to them, and what sort of information the brethren should give, and even that the brethren should be briefed properly by their own abbot beforehand. The emphasis was always to give the visitor ample room to ascertain more sensitive information. In such a way, if the visiting abbot was already interviewing two monks and a third should arrive, the third was not permitted to join the others. In terms of hospitality, this inverted some of the usual relationships. Through accepting the visiting abbot, the abbot of the house ceded authority in many areas; a necessary part of the welcome was an acceptance by the domestic abbot of the limitation of his power. Nevertheless, this concern was never relaxed in legislation. For visitation to be effective rigid discipline was required and the point was reiterated in every recension of the prescriptive constitutional documents throughout the twelfth century.[151] Efforts to minimise disruption when entertaining a visiting abbot were evidently successful, as they induced Pope Innocent III to replicate Cistercian practice for the Benedictines at the Fourth Lateran Council (1215). The constitutional texts and legislation therefore acted as a supplement to the *Ecclesiastica Officia*, covering areas unforeseen by or unsuitable for the latter. They provided guidelines for forms of hospitality arising from the realities of Cistercian governance and needs such as travel: all situations arising from a Cistercian house's place in its wider social, political and geographical contexts.

Receiving Candidates for Profession

The reception of new vocations was a unique case in monastic hospitality, as it resulted not in accommodation of an outsider, but complete conversion of an erstwhile guest to being a member of the host community.[152] First, the candidate was not admitted at all for 'four or five days', to test their patience, and then only to the guesthouse where they would have to remain for a few days more.[153] It might be that during this time the vocation may exhibit the qualities that would make him a worthy member of the Cistercian Order, as Aelred did when he 'greatly edified the brethren in the guesthouse by the humility with which he prostrated himself at the feet of all, the fervent charity with which he burned to serve them, the wisdom

---

[150] *Codification de 1202*, VII. 2.

[151] *SCC*, III. 2–3 (*NLT*, p. 404); *CCP*, IV. 2–3 (*NLT*, p. 445); *Instituta Generalis Capituli*, LXXXIX (*NLT*, p. 457); *Codification de 1202*, VII. 2.

[152] This process is treated in relation to the spatial arrangement of Cistercian houses in Megan Cassidy-Welch, *Monastic Spaces and Their Meanings: Thirteenth-Century English Cistercian Monasteries* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2001), pp. 33–34.

[153] *RB*, 58:1–4.

with which he talked to them so effectually of the divine commands'.[154] Finally the candidate would be transferred to the novices' room (*cella noviciorum*), although even here was not considered one of the community: after two months he would be read the *Rule*, and be told: 'if you can keep it [the *Rule*], then come in. If not, feel free to leave'.[155] Progress into the community was thus represented by the building to which the candidate was allocated, and entering the monastery was equated with entering into the community. In effect, they were a guest until their status was changed by being accepted as a novice .

1.5

HOSPITALITY AND SOLITUDE
IN CISTERCIAN ABBEYS

The *Rule of Benedict* makes clear that complete isolation from the world is not possible since guests 'are never absent from the monastery'.[156] At the same time, pursuit of communal life away from the world at large is the very basis of the *Rule*, and there are many precepts regulating and minimising a monk's connection with the outside world. There is therefore an apparent dichotomy between openness and enclosure that hospitality exposes, suggesting a deep-rooted tension at the heart of the *Rule of Benedict*, and therefore also in Cistercian observance. The tension between the two opposing goals required resolution if the *Rule* was to be kept in its entirety. The *Rule* achieves a level of harmonisation by emphasising the spirituality of hospitality so that it can be accommodated within the wider spiritual scheme of Christian ethics. Spiritual emphasis is reinforced by the placement of the chapter on receiving guests immediately after the chapter describing the church of the monastery and behaviour inside it, linking the reception of guests to the heart of the monastic enterprise. The church is the place of the *opus dei*, the fulcrum about which the monastic community operates independent of the world, while the reception of guests concerns the maintenance of hospitable provision for the wider Christian community. But the tone of the *Rule* changes in Chapter 53, which can be divided into two sections, distinguished by the nature of their content. The first section describes the ideal, affective reception by the monastic community, and the second

---

[154] *Life of Aelred*, p. 16; Cf. *EO*, 102:6: '[e]t responso a conventu AMEN : inclinet recedens ad hospitium'. Chapter 102 is entitled 'On Novices' (*De noviciis*), this verse comes after the novice is first introduced to chapter after making his petition to join the community.

[155] *RB*, 53:5,10: 'si potes observare, ingredere; si vero non potes liber discede'.

[156] *RB*, 53:16: 'numquam desunt monasterio'.

prescribes practical measures to keep guests out of contact with the brethren.[157] Kardong has explained this juxtaposition of precepts as a result of adopting the sentiment of eremitic life as practised by the desert fathers, while attempting to safeguard this in a coenobitic context, but his conclusion remains more a rationalisation, rather than a resolution that draws on the fundamental unity of the *Rule*.[158] The *Rule* directed its adherents along 'the path of God's commandments', ensuring that there must be a fundamental unity behind all its various precepts.[159] This requires that the apparent tension between solitude and reception of guests be addressed.

Separation of Guests and Community in the *Rule of Benedict*

As stated previously, providing hospitality could be a beneficial act aiding a monk's spiritual progress, and the concept set forth in the *Rule*, that by receiving a guest a monk received Christ, made for powerful motivation to engage with wider society.[160] However, chapter 53 of the *Rule* concludes with a precept indicating a contrary view of hospitality, which states that monks should not speak to guests, and, if they are approached, that they should explain their reticence before continuing their duties.[161]

The significance of this is that, aside from those deputed to receive guests, the community did not interact with outsiders, and were separated at any time other than their initial meeting.[162] To clarify the insistence on separation and its purpose it is helpful to consider the wider context of monastic rules at the time of the creation of the *Rule of Benedict*. De Vogüé, in his discussion of the *Rule of the Master* and its relation to that of Benedict points to a clear difference in approach: the *Rule of the Master* is concerned with protecting the community from those who might be thieves by keeping them away from the community's lodgings and under permanent surveillance, while the *Rule of Benedict* is concerned with not letting the guests disrupt the observance of the monks. The former looks disapprovingly on the outside world; the latter looks with paternal concerns on the foibles of the community.[163]

Alongside separation of people was separation of facilities. The brethren were to

---

[157] *RB*, 53:1–15 (affective reception); *RB*, 53:16–24 (practicalities).

[158] *RB*, 53, notes on p. 255; Kardong, 'To Receive All as Christ', pp. 195–207.

[159] *RB*, Prol.: 49: 'curritur via mandatorum Dei'.

[160] See section 2 above.

[161] *RB*, 53:23–24: '[h]ospitibus autem cui non praecipitur ullatenus societur neque colloquatur; sed si obviaverit aut viderit, salutatis humiliter, ut diximus, et petita benedictione pertranseat, dicens sibi non licere colloqui cum hospite'.

[162] See section 1 above.

[163] *La Règle de Saint Benoît*, ed. by A. de Vogüe and J. Neufville, Source Chrétienne, 181; Série Des Textes Monastiques d'Occident, 49, 7 vols (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1972), VI, pp. 1269–1279.

keep their usual diet when a guest was in the house, and the kitchens servicing the brethren and the guests ought to be separate (*super sit*) so that a continual influx of outsiders did not disturb the monastic routine.[164] Separation between guests and community was reinforced by silence. Members of the community, excepting those with duties concerning guests, were not to speak with guests and were to remain humble in their presence.[165] It should be noted that any communication between the brethren was performed through 'signs' (*signa*) rather than speech. The intended result was that silence prevailed at all times except where absolutely necessary, thus keeping monastic-external interaction in keeping with chapter 6 of the *Rule* ('we condemn vulgarities and idle gossip and things giving rise to laughter at all times everywhere in the cloister').[166] This separation and allocation to separate parts of the precinct is a necessity, as stated in *Rule of Benedict* for the house of God, which should be 'in the care of wise men who will manage it wisely'. The precept is articulated in spatial terms by Hildemar, who states:

> [L]ay men are able to stay up till midnight, to talk, to make merry, and monks must not, they are rather to keep silent, and to pray; therefore the dormitory of those guest monks is next to the church', but if it is not, then 'the house of God is not served wisely by wise men'.[167]

The guidelines governing interaction with guests was not limited to concern about the integrity of an individual monk's observance, but was associated with the scheme of the entire claustral complex. The wise superior extended the precepts of the *Rule* by using them to inform the precinct's physical layout and further limit the interaction of community and guests.[168]

These considerations, regardless of their intentions, suggest that the reception of guests and the welcome that they experienced was a cold affair. How then the warmth of *caritas* emphasised earlier and the full range of hospitable provision be reconciled with the fact that so few Cistercian monks appear to have had anything to do with providing hospitality?

---

[164] See chapter 4.2 below.

[165] *RB*, 53:16–18, 23–24.

[166] *RB*, 6:8: '[s]currilitates vero vel verba otiosa et risum moventia aeterna clausura in omnibus locis damnamus'.

[167] Hildermar, in *PL* 66, col. 766B: 'laici possunt stare usque mediam noctem, et loqui, et jocari, et monachi non debent, sed magis silentium habere, et orare: ideo juxta oratorium illorum monachorum hospitum est dormitorium [...] Quod si dormitorium monachorum hospitum non est juxta oratorium propter orationen faciendam, sed cum laicis; tunc domus Dei non sapienter a sapientibus ministratur'.

[168] For hospitality and spatial arrangements, see chapter 2 below.

Reconciling Solitude and Hospitality

Crucial to understanding how provision of hospitality was made integral to Cistercian observance, with its focus on withdrawal and contemplation, is what a medieval monk would have appreciated in the term 'active life' (*disciplina actualis*). The clear modern distinction between an 'active life', which emphasises exercising apostolic virtues in the world and finding salvation through external acts of charity, and the 'contemplative life', which emphasises inner spiritual progress and union of the soul with God pursued in solitude, is an anachronism imposed on medieval texts. De Vogüé has addressed the issue with reference to patristic literature, particularly John Cassian's *Conferences*. This has great relevance to understanding Cistercian monasticism, since the text was well-known within the Order: it was not only vaunted in the *Rule of Benedict*, but also formed part of a Cistercian novice's instruction, and was read daily during Collations, held before the office of Compline.[169]

In addressing the issue of what is meant by 'active life', Adalbert de Vogüé explores the writings of John Cassian and identifies an interpretation focusing on practices that purified the soul and prepared it for union with God.[170] External and practical acts of charity according to Cassian were only to remedy injustices of this world resulting from sinful human conduct, and were an aid in attaining salvation, but would be useless in the heavenly society of eternal life. The contemplative, meanwhile, had already attuned his soul to the divine order (from which would stem external acts of charity, since the two are not mutually exclusive) and was able to attain, in part, knowledge of God, which was of eternal benefit. Cassian's view helps resolve the tension between isolation of the community from guests and providing open-handed charity to a great extent. Hospitality in the *Rule of Benedict* greatly emphasises humility in the face of the stranger and plenitude of provision, thereby encouraging complete humility, charity, effacement of one's own needs, avarice, and anger.

---

[169] *RB*, 73:5; Janet Burton and Julie Kerr, *The Cistercians in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2011), pp. 15, 108.

[170] Adalbert de Vogüé, 'The Rule of Saint Benedict and the Contemplative Life', *Cistercian Studies*, 1 (1966), 54–73 (pp. 55, 59–60, 66). John Cassian, *Collationes XIII*, ed. by Michael Petschenig, Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, 13 (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2004), 1. 10: 'And of this the Blessed Apostle also clearly speaks, when he says that "bodily exercise is profitable for a little: but Godliness," by which he certainly means love, "is profitable for all things, having the promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come." This clearly shows that what is said to be useful for a little, is not to be practised for all time, and cannot possible by itself alone confer the highest state of perfection on the man who slaves at it' […] For what you call works of religion and mercy are needful in this life while these inequalities and difference of condition still prevail; but even here we should not look for them to be performed […] As long, then, as this inequality lasts in this world, this sort of work will be needful and useful to the man that practises it, as it brings to a good purpose and pious will the rewards of an eternal inheritance: but it will come to an end in the life to come, where equality will reign, when there will be no longer inequality'.

All these are virtues which, in Cassian's interpretation of the active life, furthered one's ability to engage in divine contemplation. What constituted an 'active life' is explicitly discussed by Bernard in sermon 46 of his *Sermons on the Song of Songs*. Migne in his edition of this text deftly summarises the sermon by providing the title: 'Of the state and composition of the entire Church; also, how through the active life, which is performed with obedience, one may arrive at the contemplative'.[171]

In this sermon, Bernard references the Bride, who, unable to contain her longing, remarks on the glorious décor of the chamber and invites the bridegroom to share his own bed with her. The Bride is the soul, the Bridegroom Christ, and the bed consciousness of one's own nature.[172] Bernard interprets the apparent presumption of the Bride as arising from the complete alignment of her desires with the Beloved's. She is entitled to her action:

> For indeed she believes that she is not to be kept from her spouse's bed, nor from his rest; she is accustomed to seek always those things, not those that are her own, but those that belong to him'.[173]

Bernard goes on to state that this act of inviting the bridegroom is often too rash and premature among monks, whose souls are not only unfit for receiving God, but would offend by their own polluted nature: 'and do you force his entering toward yourself, while you foul yourself with the filth of such vices?'[174] The remedy for Bernard was to extirpate all trace of vice from one's consciousness: 'assuredly, that first you should purify the conscience of every stain of anger and argument, and dissension, and spite'.[175] Works of external charity aid bringing this about and are prescribed: 'surround yourself with the flowers of good works, whatever they

---

[171] *PL*, 183, cols. 1004A–1008B; title at 1004A: 'De statu et compositione totius Ecclesiae. Item, quomodo per activam vitam, quae sub obedientia agitur, perveniatur ad contemplativam'.

[172] Bernard interprets the bed (*lectus*) earlier in the sermon (XLVI. 2. 17–19; p. 56) differently, because he refers to it in the context of the structure of the Church and the wider world: '[e]t in Ecclesia quidem lectum in quo quiescitur, claustra existimo esse et monasteria, in quibus quiete a curis vivitur saeculi, et sollicitudinibus vitae'; 'and, in respect of the Church, I consider the cloisters and monasteries to be the bed on which one is rested, in which life is lived free of the cares of the world, and the worries of life'. This interpretation is recast for the individual monk later in the sermon (XLVI. 6. 11–15; p. 59) when he says: '[m]iror valde impudentiam aliquorum, qui […] audent nihilominus ad tam foedum conscientiae suae lectulum omni orationum instantia totius puritatis Dominum invitare'; 'I marvel greatly at the shamelessness of some, who […] dare nonetheless to invite the Lord of complete purity to so foul a bed of their conscience with every instance of their prayers'. On Bernard's shifting imagery, see Newman, p. 108.

[173] *Cant. Cant. 36–86*, XLVI. 4. 2–4 (p. 57): '[n]ec enim se sponsi contubernio aut quietis ejus putat arcendam consortio, quae semper non quae sua, sed quae illius sunt, quaerere consuevit'.

[174] *Cant. Cant. 36–86*, XLVI. 6. 20–21 (p. 59): 'et tu ad te compellis intrare, tantorum sordens spurcitia vitiorum?'

[175] *Cant. Cant. 36–86*, XLVI. 7. 1–3 (p. 60): '[p]rofecto ut primo quidem emundes conscientiam ab omni inquinamento irae, et disceptationis, et murmuris, et livoris'.

are, and of praiseworthy endeavours'.[176] For Bernard, the only reason to go forth from the 'bed' of monastic contemplation was to aid others: '[f]or this is better, to rest and be with Christ. But it is necessary to go forth for those who need saving'.[177]

The significance of this text is that the 'active life', according to Bernard, has as its ultimate goal the purification of the monk's consciousness for the reception of Christ. External acts are worthy, but because they cause inner purification when properly executed, not because they in themselves are goal to be pursued. Bernard's description wholly accords with Cassian's interpretation of what constitutes the 'active life' and affirms that external acts form a step in a ladder to engage in true contemplation.

This interpretation of 'active life' was not communal, but related to an individual's action. The community facilitated hospitable provision, but not all members of the community had to be engaged in it. An individual monk had to provide hospitality by exercising all relevant virtues for it to be of spiritual benefit, but he would not halt his spiritual progress were if no opportunity for him to exercise hospitality arose. Opportunities to provide hospitality were not therefore essential steps in a monk's spiritual development, and communities did not have to find opportunities to show hospitality as a way of developing brothers. When hospitality was sought from the community, however, provision had to be made in its fullest and most spiritually advantageous capacity. The idea is exemplified by the following passage from Conrad of Eberbach's *Exordium Magnum*, in which Bernard of Clairvaux gives a eulogy for his cellarer, Gerard:

> And so, finally: in the prudence of his answers, and in the grace given to him from
> on high, he used to see to those within the monastery and outside it, such that
> almost nobody whom Gerard had already met needed me. And he met those who
> arrived, placing himself before them, so they would not intrude upon my leisure.
> […] [H]e was not bereft of the courtesies of love. Who left him empty handed? If

---

[176] *Cant. Cant. 36–86*, xlvi. 7. 4–5 (p. 60): 'circumdare tibi flores bonorum quorumcumque operum et laudabilium studiorum'. A variant reading of *operum* is *actuum*, which is more fitting when the clause is read in light of *vita activa*.

[177] *Cant. Cant. 36–86*, xlvi. 1. 10–12: 'hoc enim melius, quiescere et cum Christo esse; necessarium autem exire ad lucra propter salvandos'.

rich, he took away advice, if poor, some relief.[178]

Bernard, as abbot, held the ultimate duty of caring for guests, but in most cases this could be safely deputed to Gerard, who had the necessary expertise in dealing with practical matters. The 'courtesies of love' is a direct quotation of the *Rule* and signifies that Gerard provided hospitality in strict accordance with its precepts, a sentiment strengthened by Bernard's reference to Gerard seeing to both rich and poor. Bernard was free to concentrate on his 'leisure' (*otium*), meaning prayer, meditation, and care of the brethren, where otherwise the responsibilities of his office would compel him to handle worldly affairs.

The apparent paradox that exists in Cistercian spirituality, that fervour of charity and unity of Christ in the stranger with God as the proprietor of the monastery on the one hand, and the rigid separation of guests and community on the other, is dissolved. Those best suited to providing hospitality and handling guests would be thus appointed to do so. Not being appointed was not recognition of a spiritual or personal flaw to be overcome, so much as a non-factor, since it would not necessarily restrain a monk's journey to dwell in God.

1.6

THE CISTERCIANS AS HOSTS: CONCLUSIONS

A Cistercian community's observance greatly affected the nature of the hospitality it provided. The Cistercians adopted the *Rule of Benedict* as the basis of their observance, but their overriding insistence on *caritas* enabled them to infuse it with a powerful spiritual dimension. The Cistercians applied the notion of *caritas* that ran through much Cistercian literature, spiritual and legislative, to show how a monk could provide hospitality to lay people, monks, and other Cistercians, as part of their spiritual progress. The paradox between the desire for solitude and the worldly engagement that hospitality seems to entail is rendered void. By spiritualising the guest, whoever they may be, through the concept of Christ in the

---

[178] Conrad of Eberbach, *Exordium Magnum Cisterciense, Sive Narratio de Initio Cisterciensis Ordinis*, ed. by Bruno Griesser (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1961), III. 1 (p. 150) '[i]ta denique in prudentia responsionum suarum, et in gratia data sibi desuper, et domesticis satisfaciebat et exteris: ut pene me nemo requireret, cui prior forte Gerardus occurrisset. Occurrebat autem adventantibus, opponens se, ne meum otium incursarent. […] [E]t officiis charitatis non deerat. Quis vacua recessit ab eo manu? Si dives, consilium: si pauper, subsidium reportabat.

stranger, the Cistercians turned hospitality into a tool of their observance, which had at its heart the goal of union with God. This does not mean that the Cistercians made hospitality necessary to achieve that union. The strength of community, moulded by *caritas* and set into a legislative framework by the *Carta Caritatis*, ensured that all aspects of providing hospitality were to some extent communal. There was no single figure within a Cistercian community who provided all aspects alone. The task was shared between a few individuals, who each took charge of their respective sphere, and who occupied only a small portion of the community. Others would be drawn upon as required, but otherwise hospitality was not an object of immediate concern for the majority of the Cistercian community.

A relative paucity of legislation and treatises on hospitality marks Cistercian culture during the medieval period. This has been interpreted previously as indicating coldness in their provision of hospitality, especially in comparison with other religious orders . However, if one looks to Cistercian spiritual writings, especially sermons, the overarching theology of hospitality as expressed in the *Rule of Benedict* can be traced. Cistercians issued few statutes on *caritas* or the provision of hospitality because it was not the right forum to do so. Hospitality was a part of the spiritual cultivation of the self and so found a more fitting home in sermons, which enabled preachers to reinforce the spirituality of hospitality and imprint biblical narratives on the action of receiving strangers. This idea was enacted in reality by rituals of welcome and charity, such as the *mandatum*, that showed reverence to Christ in the stranger. By these means hospitality and personal interaction with strangers was transformed into a heavenly engagement and obtained a spiritual dimension of a magnitude equal to other areas of Cistercian monastic life.

CHAPTER TWO

SPACES OF HOSPITALITY
IN A CISTERCIAN ABBEY

2.0
INTRODUCTION

Chapter 2 moves from the Cistercian hosts, who provided hospitality, to the spaces in which they provided it. The chapter begins with a historiographical discussion of approaches to Cistercian architecture and material culture, which identifies key implications for how space should be treated in a Cistercian context and stresses external factors as essential when evaluating the spatial topography of Cistercian abbeys. In section 2 the landscape surrounding the monastery, the precinct boundaries and the gatehouse are considered from the perspective of an outsider approaching the house, with specific reference to evidence from Kirkstall. In sections 3 to 6, a survey of guest accommodation within Cistercian houses in Britain is carried out, which pays close attention to the chronology of structural developments within Cistercian monasteries during the medieval period, from the mid-twelfth to the early fifteenth centuries. This chronological survey reveals the Cistercians' changing attitudes toward hospitable provision. Section 7 consists of an account of the structural arrangements of Kirkstall's guesthouse as determined by recent re-assessment of its archaeological and architectural data. The account of the structural arrangements at Kirkstall in section 7 is then placed in the wider context of the Cistercian Order, as determined by the survey conducted in sections 3 to 6, thus enabling assessment of how Kirkstall conformed to wider trends in guest accommodation.

2.1

SPACE IN CISTERCIAN ARCHAEOLOGY
AND HISTORIOGRAPHY

Of all the parts which belonged to a complete monastic establishment the secular or semi-secular buildings are those which have been the most completely destroyed. […] Whatever the cause, the detached and subordinate buildings were among the first to disappear, so that the ordinary knowledge of monastic architecture is confined almost to the dispositions of churches, chapter-houses, refectories, and the other buildings grouped round the cloister. Guest-houses, with their chamber and stables, the true inns of the middle ages, are very rare.[1]

These words of G. Y. Wardle, written in the late nineteenth century, highlight how scholarly interest in monastic precincts has been shaped by extant ruins. Until very recently, Wardle's view remained applicable to the dominant view of Cistercian architectural scholarship, in which surviving buildings were considered the sum of Cistercian architecture and therefore the most indicative of Cistercian identity. This chapter argues that analysis of non-claustral buildings, traditionally neglected in studies due to their adjudged lack of architectural merit, reveals important ideas of how Cistercians constructed material environments to interact with wider society.

British archaeologists and architectural historians have a long tradition of studying Cistercian sites, and reports of excavations have been a regular feature in the regional antiquarian and archaeological societies' journals as well as periodicals with broader coverage.[2] Cistercian archaeological studies had begun in earnest in the mid-nineteenth century, and Edmund Sharpe in 1874 published his two-volume study of Cistercian architecture, which drew on many Cistercian sites in France.[3] Study of Cistercian archaeology became more detailed and thorough at the end of the nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries with John Bilson,

---

[1] G. Y. Wardle, 'The Gatehouse Chapel at Croxden Abbey', *Archaeologia*, 49 (1886), 434–38 (p. 437).

[2] See C. Gerrard, *Medieval Archaeology: Understanding Traditions and Contemporary Approaches* (London: Routledge, 2003), chps 1–3 for a survey of the tradition of medieval archaelogical site analysis up to 1945.

[3] Edmund Sharpe, *The Architecture of the Cistercians*, 2 vols (London: [s.n.], 1874).

Harold Brakspear, and William H. St John Hope.[4] Bilson and Brakspear both produced solid architectural analyses of the sites that paid great attention to the formal details of the structures. Although exceeding the 'ordinary knowledge' (that is, 'common knowledge') of which Wardle wrote, Bilson tended towards surveys of abbey churches, often to the extent that accounts of the cloister and its buildings were brief by comparison or entirely omitted; especially so when the latter had not been fully excavated. This served to reinforce the primacy of the church as an indicator of Cistercian identity. Such is the case with Brakspear's account of the architecture of Hailes 'Abbey', which is devoted entirely to the church.[5] Studies of sites such as Cwmhir, Strata Florida and Strata Marcella, conducted by Stephen Williams, also gave priority to churches.[6] One reason is that churches were visually the most imposing edifices in a medieval monastery, and great expense was lavished upon their construction. The quality of the workmanship meant that often they survived when lesser buildings did not, while their rich architectural schemes have proven a rich vein for continued study. Churches thus made good tourist attractions, for which reason these monuments had often been conserved. This was especially when the Chief Inspector for Ancient Monuments was Sir Charles Reed Peers, who had great personal interest in monastic architecture.[7] The study of churches, at sites where they remained, overshadowed study of claustral and outer buildings until the later twentieth century. In many cases, the claustral buildings had survived to a greater or lesser extent, but they were not deemed as rewarding to discuss as the church.

While churches occupied more space in scholarly accounts than claustral buildings, this bias should not be overstated. Some of Brakspear's work is better balanced, such as his account of Waverley Abbey, where the account of the church still takes pride of place and is the most detailed, but all major buildings are treated in turn.[8] Another important figure

---

[4] Gerrard, pp. 46–55; John Bilson, 'The Architecture of Kirkstall Abbey Church, with Some General Remarks on the Architecture of the Cistercians', in *Architectural Description of Kirkstall Abbey*, by William Henry St John Hope and John Bilson (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1907); Harold Brakspear, 'Pipewell Abbey, Northamptonshire', *Associated Architectural Societies' Reports and Papers*, 30 (1909), 299–313; Harold Brakspear, *Tintern Abbey, Monmouthshire* (London: H.M.S.O., 1934).

[5] Harold Brakspear, 'The Architecture of Hayles Abbey', *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society*, 24 (1901), 126–35.

[6] Stephen Williams, 'The Cistercian Abbey of Strata Marcella', *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 5th ser., 9 (1892), 1–17; Stephen Williams, 'The Cistercian Abbey of Cwmhir, Radnorshire', *Transactions of the Society of Cymmrodorion*, 1894, 61–98; Stephen Williams, *The Cistercian Abbey of Strata Florida: Its History and an Account of the Recent Excavations Made on This Site* (London: Whiting, 1889).

[7] Gerrard, pp. 59–60.

[8] Harold Brakspear, *Waverley Abbey* (London: Surrey Archaeological Society, 1905). Also Harold Brakspear, 'The Cistercian Abbey of Stanley, Wiltshire', *Archaeologia*, 60 (1907), 493–516, which is largely dependent on the remains as excavated.

is Hope, with whom Brakspear collaborated.[9] Hope was a prolific surveyor and rendered balanced interpretations of claustral complexes, evidence permitting, rather than equating an abbey church with the abbey in its entirety; his account of Kirkstall not only surveys all principal claustral areas in a systematic fashion but contains correct re-interpretations of several structures which remain valid today, including Kirkstall guesthouse, which was previously thought to have been a mill.[10] Hope treated each structure in turn in his reports. A structure had a function assigned to it on the basis of the architectural and archaeological features discovered, which method is exemplified in his account of Kirkstall's standing remains. Although some of Hope's interpretations are now discredited, and his excavations irreversibly destroyed stratigraphic relationships, which went unrecorded, he provided the fullest account of many monastic buildings until they were reassessed in the late twentieth century.[11]

Although the Victorian archaeologists paid close attention to formal details, they rarely detailed the relationship between structural arrangements adopted by the monks and their mode of life. Linking architecture and observance became the subject of many twentieth-century Cistercian architectural studies, which had some characteristic subjects of analysis. Church ground plans were prominent, and much attention was paid to whether the 'Bernadine plan' was followed at Cistercian sites. This was a theory developed by Karl-Heinz Esser, who posited that Cistercian churches had a specific plan developed at Clairvaux when Bernard was abbot.[12] The design particularly concerned the eastern end, the chevet and transept chapels, which had squared outer walls. This plan's dissemination was, according to this view, facilitated by administrative coherency of the Order, as described in the *Carta Caritatis*, and by communicative channels such as those enabling attendance at the General

---

[9] For example, Harold Brakspear and William Henry St John Hope, *Jervaulx Abbey* (London: Kell, 1905). For the two archaeologists' professional activity see Glyn Coppack, *Book of Abbeys and Priories* (London: B.T. Batsford; English Heritage, 1990), pp. 22–31.

[10] William Henry St John Hope and John Bilson, *Architectural Description of Kirkstall Abbey* (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1907). The full account of the interpretation of the guesthouse and ancillary buildings of the inner court is provided in Stuart Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2*, (forthcoming), chp. 1.

[11] Particularly regarding buildings east of the cloister, such as the so-called 'visiting abbot's lodging': see section 7 below.

[12] Karl-Heinz Esser, 'Les fouilles à Himmerod et le plan bernadin: XXIVe Congrès de l'Association bourguignonne des sociétés savantes (8e Centenaire de la mort de saint Bernard)', in *Mélanges Saint Bernard* (Dijon: Marlier, 1953), pp. 311–15; H.-P. Eydoux, 'Les fouilles de l'abbatiale d'Himerod et la notion d'un plan bernardin', *Bulletin monumental*, 111 (1953), 29–36. This idea was then maintained and propagated by later scholars: Anselme Dimier, *L'art cistercien: France* (Saint-Léger-Vauban: Zodiaque, 1962); Anselme Dimier, *L'art cistercien hors de France* (Saint-Léger-Vauban: Zodiaque, 1971); Georges Duby, *Saint Bernard: l'art cistercien* (Paris: Arts et Métiers Graphiques, 1976); Roberto Cassanelli, *The Cistercian Arts: From the Twelfth to the Twenty-First Century*, ed. by Terryl N. Kinder and Roberto Cassanelli, McGill-Queen's Studies in the History of Religion, 2nd Ser., 71 (Ithaca, N.Y.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2015).

Chapter. Significantly, it contributed to the notion that Cistercian identity was in part constituted by formal details of material culture, and supported the idea that aspirations to absolute uniformity of practice pervaded the Order. This was later reinforced by the 'ideals and reality' interpretation of Cistercian history. The 'ideals and reality' became an interpretative paradigm that underpinned much scholarship on the Cistercian Order, argued most forcefully by Louis Lekai.[13] Lekai surveyed Cistercian history from inception to the modern period and argued that it should be understood in terms of whether communities adhered to or departed from the ideals (supposedly) established by Abbot Stephen Harding (r. 1109–1134). Lekai perceived an early flourishing of Cistercian life in the twelfth century, followed by stagnation in the thirteenth, and decline in the fourteenth. Lekai argued that local exigencies ('reality') caused communities to depart from Cistercian ideals, especially in the mid fourteenth century, and came to the conclusion that the history of the Order in the medieval period was one of decline. The 'ideals and reality' paradigm had great impact on archaeological and architectural studies of Cistercian houses. It was assumed that Cistercian legislation established ideals to be implemented in reality, and departure from them indicated losing Cistercian identity. In any aspect of Cistercian life that had a material component, be it landscape or material culture, there remained a sense that Cistercian identity could be determined by degree of adherence to standards laid down by the General Chapter.[14]

This interpretation of Cistercian history was attractive to scholars because it provided a methodology that could be applied to any area of Cistercian life; it also helped establish a clear narrative of growth, fulfilment, and decline.[15] The 'ideals and reality' paradigm was influential among archaeologists and architectural historians in particular because it provided clear criteria to evaluate the subject material. However, this rigid conceptual framework was unable to account for change over time except in terms of 'decline'; nor was it able to render an adequate account of variation even during the alleged 'Golden Age' of the twelfth century.[16] Accordingly, subsequent interpretations of Cistercian material culture became more nuanced. Recognition of variance in Cistercian architecture across Europe led to regional analyses that sought instead of complete uniformity a 'Cistercian spirit' that arose from their observance,

---

[13] Louis J. Lekai, *The Cistercians: Ideals and Reality* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1977).

[14] Set in an economic context by Richard Roehl, 'Plan and Reality in a Medieval Monastic Economy: The Cistercians', in *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1972), IX, 83–113. Also see Constance Brittain Bouchard, 'Cistercian Ideals versus Reality: 1134 Reconsidered', *Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses*, 39 (1988), 217–31, which concludes that rapid departure from legislation is a fiction created by early Cistercians whose practices were never in accord with the supposed 'ideals'.

[15] Emilia Jamroziak, *The Cistercian Order in Medieval Europe, 1090–1500* (London: Routledge, 2013), p. 2.

[16] An outspoken example of this is Colin Platt, 'Relaxation of the Rule: The Architecture of Late Medieval Monastic Houses', *History Today*, 35.7 (1985), 21–26.

and that this 'spirit' is reflected in the architecture. This re-oriented view permitted for different interpretations of the term *forma ordinis* (literally, 'form of the Order') without being considered as a deformation of a universal idea. The term *forma ordinis* is referred to often within Cistercian legislation, particularly statutes reprimanding communities for acting against it in terms of buildings and architecture, but it is never explicitly defined.[17] Such was one theme of Peter Fergusson's *The Architecture of Solitude*, in which the Cistercian churches of the late twelfth century are presented as a novel interpretation of a Cistercian aesthetic.[18]

Scholars have since deepened analysis of monastic space by applying methodologies more sensitive to the thought-world of the inhabitants. This accompanied simultaneous movement away from the 'ideals and reality' paradigm in other fields of Cistercian scholarship, for example Emilia Jamroziak's study of the social networks of Rievaulx Abbey.[19] In architecture, Peter Fergusson and Stuart Harrison's study of Rievaulx discusses the significance of architectural elements and structural arrangements in monastic life, for example the upper story of the refectory representing the *cenaculum* in which Jesus ate with the apostles at the Last Supper.[20] Other scholars' approaches utilise anthropological theory, such as Megan Cassidy-Welch, who identifies constituent 'spaces' of Cistercian abbeys that held various meanings for the community and fulfilled various roles in the community's life and observance.[21] This is done be re-creating from textual sources the Cistercians' thought-world, and then overlaying this mental imagery on the monastic buildings, thereby creating a phenomenological account of the site as the monks perceived it. The most recent contribution to this historiographical approach, by Maximilian Sternberg, is discussed in detail below. The result is an account of the material environment of several different Cistercian abbeys, unified by the shared perceptions of the monks inhabiting them.

This trend in re-interpreting architecture and material culture by taking into account the meanings that Cistercian communities themselves attributed to them has important implications for understanding spatial arrangements of hospitality. The idea of uniformity in

---

[17] Another prominent contribution to this subject is David M. Robinson, *The Cistercians in Wales: Architecture and Archaeology 1130–1540* (London: Society of Antiquaries of London, 2006), pp. 3–15. An excellent survey of how Cistercian aesthetics were incorporated in their material culture is Terryl N. Kinder, *Cistercian Europe: Architecture of Contemplation*, Cistercian Studies Series, 191 (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 2002).

[18] Peter Fergusson, *Architecture of Solitude: Cistercian Abbeys in Twelfth-Century England* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1984), pp. 69–90.

[19] Emilia Jamroziak, *Rievaulx Abbey and Its Social Context, 1132–1300: Memory, Locality, and Networks*, Medieval Church Studies, 8 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005).

[20] Peter Fergusson and Stuart Harrison, *Rievaulx Abbey: Community, Memory, Architecture* (New Haven, CT; London: Yale University Press, 2000), pp. 148–49.

[21] Megan Cassidy-Welch, *Monastic Spaces and Their Meanings: Thirteenth-Century English Cistercian Monasteries* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2001).

Cistercian monasteries has been a commonplace in historiography since J. T. Micklethwaite's article on the 'Cistercian plan', which aided Hope, Brakspear and Bilson in formulating the Cistercian typological precinct.[22] Micklethwaite's argument insisted upon a common form. Where the common form was not followed, the difference was explained in terms of deviation. This model plan contained:

> [C]ertain Cistercian peculiarities […] and these are so constant that one may recognise a Cistercian abbey from the ground plan alone, and that they were made to special wants. Sometimes we may discover what such a want was, and why it caused a deviation from the normal plan.[23]

Such a view would struggle to make sense of the Cistercian abbeys of fifteenth-century England in any but condemning terms.

Understanding of spatial organisation within Cistercian monasteries has undergone a shift alongside architecture, from a hard thesis of outward uniformity, to a nuanced appreciation that takes into account adaptation. As stated, figures such as Hope and Brakspear capitalised upon the formulation of a definite plan to allow them to identify structures within the precinct, which, according to their annotated ground plans, appeared complete (for Kirkstall, an excellent example, see fig. 0.3). However, subsequent scholarship has re-opened interpretations of some buildings, and thus has drawn attention to the methodology of assigning functions to buildings. For example, Jackie Hall has raised doubts regarding functions attributed to buildings by Hope, such as the so-called visiting abbot's lodging. One of the sites that Hall discusses is Kirkstall, with regard to which Hall questions Hope's application of the label 'visiting abbot's lodging' to a first-floor hall adjoining the abbot's lodging at Kirkstall (fig. 0.4). Hall remarks that function is not as fixed as scholars of Hope's time portrayed: 'the probable fluidity of abbots' chambers has only recently been grasped, and the notion that chambers may have had many different uses, or existed for a range of occupants, is not yet fully explored'.[24] There is little evidence to support so specific an

---

[22] J. T. Micklethwaite, 'Of the Cistercian Plan', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, 7 (1882), 239–58. Sternberg states that the first to propose an 'ideal plan' was Anselm Dimier in 1947, but this is incorrect: Maximilian Sternberg, *Cistercian Architecture and Medieval Society*, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 221 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2013), p. 113, n. 2.

[23] Micklethwaite, p. 242.

[24] Jackie Hall, 'East of the Cloister: Infirmaries, Abbots' Lodgings and Other Chambers', in *Perspectives for an Architecture of Solitude: Essays on Cistercians, Art and Architecture in Honour of Peter Fergusson*, ed. by Terryl Kinder, Cîteaux: Studia et Documenta, 13; Medieval Church Studies, 11 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), pp. 199–211 (p. 200; also see p. 206 for Hall's criticism of Hope's labelling of ground plans.).

attribution, the interpretation being supposition derived from knowledge of documentary evidence without any firm links between the two. The case of Kirkstall highlights a much broader issue: the labels that made Victorian plans so concise have in fact masked issues that still need debate. Beside reinterpretation of claustral arrangements, the field of enquiry has been broadened to include much greater areas of Cistercian space, and research has now incorporated inner courts, outer courts, and entire monastic estates into consideration of the spatial and structural makeup of the monastery.[25]

An area receiving attention only recently in monastic architecture and archaeology is the issue of lay-monastic interaction. It has long been recognised that monasteries played a vital role in the life of their surrounding society, through political activity, administration of charity, hospitality, networks of benefaction, trade, industry and even through transforming the landscape to accommodate their needs.[26] However, awareness that the Cistercians interacted with society in the material setting of their own abbeys is less widespread, and much architectural analysis is still carried out on the assumption that construction and decoration was carried out by Cistercians and for themselves alone — any outsider who experienced a Cistercian abbey in person was entirely incidental, and their presence had no bearing on the rationale or maintenance of that environment. Excluding social and cultural stimuli in this way makes it difficult to rationalise architectural developments after the twelfth century, particularly the construction campaigns witnessed in Cistercian abbeys in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, such as that leading to the construction of Abbot Marmaduke Huby's imposing tower on the western end of the abbey church at Fountains.[27] Monasticism in the late Middle Ages was still an important part of the ecclesiastical establishment: to appreciate architectural change in terms that support this view, therefore, requires consideration of how wider society viewed and treated them.

For monastic material culture studies, scholarship has recently begun a paradigmatic shift towards recognising the value of external, or secular, appreciation of the art and architecture of late-medieval monasticism. In older views, monks (Cistercians in particular) were accused of becoming indistinguishable from their secular contemporaries, which was treated as another

---

[25] For example: *The Archaeology of Rural Monasteries*, ed. by Roberta Gilchrist and Harold Mytum, B.A.R. British Series, 203 (Oxford: Tempus Reparatum, 1989); *Advances in Monastic Archaeology*, ed. by Roberta Gilchrist and Harold Mytum, B.A.R. British Series, 227 (Oxford: Tempus Reparatum, 1993); *L'espace cistercien*, ed. by Léon Pressouyre (Paris: Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques, 1994).

[26] Summarised recently in Janet Burton and Julie Kerr, *The Cistercians in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2011), pp. 189–201.

[27] Michael Carter, 'The Tower of Abbot Marmaduke Huby of Fountains Abbey : Hubris or Piety?', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, 82 (2010), 269–85.

symptom of decline: chapter four of Coppacks's *Fountains Abbey*, for example is entitled 'the softening of Cistercian ideals'.[28] More recent scholarship, however, has viewed the resurgence of artistic expression among monastic communities not as secularisation or compromise of ideals, but as a conscious effort to reform the outward character of monasticism to render it relatable to contemporary society.[29]

Emphasising interaction as necessary for a community's prosperity would appear to contravene the Cistercian tendency towards isolation. Early in Cistercian history, in 1133/4, legislation insisted upon physical separation from lay dwellings, and '[n]o monasteries of ours are to be built in cities, castles, or rural domains'.[30] The *Instituta*, which date from 1147 or later which are revisions of the early *Capitula*, adds that abbeys should be built 'in places far from human habitation', to emphasise that solitude was the essence of the precept.[31] To ensure independence from any surrounding settlement, fledgling Cistercian communities had to have the basic structure necessary to their observance. As such '[a] new abbot is not to be sent to a new place […] without having first constructed these places: oratory, refectory, dormitory, guest quarters, gatehouse'.[32] In terms of how this affected a site's development, maintaining seclusion demanded constructing buildings that regulated precinct boundaries and were dedicated to use by outsiders, namely the gatehouse and the guesthouse. In short, buildings that implied the presence of outsiders in the precinct ought to have been present

---

[28] Colin Platt, *The Abbeys and Priories of Medieval England* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1984), pp. 209–18; Glyn Coppack, *Fountains Abbey* (London: Batsford and English Heritage, 1993), pp. 55–77; A recent survey of Cistercian art, Diane J. Reilly, 'Art', in *The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*, ed. by Mette Birkedal Bruun (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 125–39 (p. 129) supports the older approach when she states (in reference to seals): '[a]s elaborate as those used by non-Cistercian religious and nobles, they signaled that the Cistercian Order had definitively joined the artistic mainstream'.

[29] The most recent and comprehensive analysis of late-medieval Cistercian art production is Michael Carter, 'The Art and Architecture of the Cistercians in Northern England in the Late Middle Ages, C. 1300–1539' (unpublished PhD thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London, 2013), pp. 53–58. Also see Julian M. Luxford, *The Art and Architecture of English Benedictine Monasteries, 1300-1540 : A Patronage History*, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion, 25 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005); Martin Heale, 'Mitres and Arms: Aspects of the Self-Representation of the Monastic Superior in Late Medieval England', in *Self-Representation of Medieval Religious Communities: The British Isles in Context*, ed. by Anne Müller and Karen Stöber, Vita Regularis, 40 (Berlin: Lit, 2009), pp. 99–121; Carter, 'The Tower of Abbot Marmaduke Huby', pp. 284–85; Carter, 'Art and Architecture of the Cistercians', pp. 98–147; Julian M. Luxford, 'The Construction of English Monastic Patronage', in *Patronage: Power and Agency in Medieval Art*, ed. by Colum Hourihane, Index of Christian Art Occasional Papers, 15 (Princeton, PA: Princeton University and Penn State University Press, 2013), pp. 31–53.

[30] '*Capitula*, cap. 8: 'In civitatibus, castellis, villis, nulla nostra costruenda esse cœnobia': critical edition Waddell, *NLT*, p. 187; translation, p. 408.

[31] *Instituta*, I: 'In ciuitatibus, castellis, uillis, nulla nostra construenda sunt cenobia, sed in conuersatione hominum semotis'; Waddell, *NLT*, p. 325; translation, p. 458. Waddell gives 1157 as the *terminus ante quem* for his edition, but incorporates material up to c. 1179. See *NLT*, pp. 299–318, (summary on p. 318).

[32] 'Non mittendum esse abbatem nouum in locum nouellum […] nisi prius extructis his officinis: oratorio, refectorio, dormitorio, cella hospitum, et portarii'. Critical edition found in *NLT*, p. 187, dated by Waddell to 1133/4 (see p.175). Translation on p. 408.

in a Cistercian abbey from the very beginning. Any view of Cistercian spatial topography that ignores this permeability, or even that states architectural developments intended for conspicuous display to be a corruption of 'ideal' austerity, omits a major factor of Cistercian observance.

As abbeys grew, regulation of boundaries was divided among increasing numbers of structures: perhaps a *capella extra portam*; the gatehouse with its attendant vestibules for receiving with no reason to enter the claustral buildings; the guesthouse; the church; and the abbot's lodge, should the visitor merit an audience. All these buildings had potential roles in the reception of visitors. As Jamroziak has shown, many different claustral buildings could also be used as spaces for guests to communicate with the community. Even a privileged space such as the chapter house could be used for political and ecclesiastical meetings, although in Cistercian houses this typically was only in exceptional circumstances, when influential personages were involved and when gravity of events demanded, such as the gathering of nobles to give fealty to Alexander II.[33] Thus the reception of guests in Cistercian houses was not confined to the gatehouse or guesthouse prescribed for new communities, but extended throughout the precinct, creating complex patterns of spatial topography. Spatial patterns altered over time in accordance with the attitudes that the Cistercians took towards the world at large, and grew increasingly sophisticated as communities adopted new modes of interaction with society. Identifying these patterns of spatial organisation, and appreciating them as a valid response to circumstances in which communities found themselves, reveals important ideas about the place and provision of hospitality in Cistercian observance during the later Middle Ages.

Recent Re-Interpretation of 'Cistercian' Architecture

A significant recent contribution to the discussion of Cistercian architecture and its place in Cistercians' relationship with wider society is Maximilian Sternberg's *Cistercian Architecture and Medieval Society*.[34] Sternberg offers a significant contribution to historiography of Cistercian architectural studies, and highlights the dominance of post-Second World War scholars' views and how they have affected appreciation of Cistercian architecture.[35] Sternberg

---

[33] Emilia Jamroziak, 'Spaces of Lay-Religious Interaction in Cistercian Houses of Northern Europe', *Parergon*, 27 (2010), 37–58, esp. pp. 47–48. For contrast with Benedictine appreciation of the chapter house, see Julie Kerr, *Monastic Hospitality: The Benedictines in England, c. 1070–c. 1250*, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion, 32 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), p. 172.

[34] Sternberg.

[35] Sternberg, pp. 1–48.

argues against the idea that Cistercian identity was constituted by immutable abstract ideals. He instead emphasises the relational links that Cistercian architecture had with wider aesthetic culture, and makes comparison with modes of engagement that the Cistercians had with wider medieval society, such as learning, preaching, and support of ecclesiastical institutions, as studied by, respectively, Jean Leclercq, Berverley Kienzle, and Martha Newman.[36] For Sternberg, Cistercian architecture cannot be read correctly when taken out of its medieval architectural context: Cistercian identity only emerges from architecture though comparison with surrounding traditions.[37] Architectural minimalism, which for Fergusson was the product of the Cistercians' desire for solitude, was only one aspect of the Cistercian aesthetic, which should be placed alongside an outward looking architectural scheme that modified the Cistercians' relations with wider society.

Sternberg views Cistercian architectural expression as one facet of a greater medieval cultural whole, and it was in part constituted by the other elements of that cultural whole. According to Sternberg, the notion of a timeless, minimal decorative scheme is an anachronistic imposition of the twentieth century. The relativity of Cistercian architecture in turn implies presence in the world, rather than separation from it. In this way architecture was a means for Cistercians to negotiate their role in the constitution of medieval Christian society and culture. There were elements of 'extra-mural' orientation latent within Cistercian decorative schemes, which became more explicit and common after the twelfth century. Sternberg illustrates his argument by sustained references to architectural features that are only comprehensible if they are understood as being intended for secular as well as Cistercian monastic consumption. An example is the decorative scheme of St Obazine's (d. 1159) tomb at Obazine Abbey, Limousin, which dates to *c.* 1260–1270.[38] The monument depicts choir monks separated from, but sheltered under the same roof as, groups of lay brothers, nuns, and lay people: it symbolises Cistercian conceptions of role of their Order within Christian society. Thus the idea that the Cistercians compromised their ideals by admitting ostensibly secular architectural features is problematic, because these features were already embedded within Cistercian architecture — 'the world' had been a part of Cistercian precincts since the inception of the Order.

---

[36] Jean Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture*, 3rd edn (New York: Fordham University Press, 1982); Beverly Mayne Kienzle, *Cistercians, Heresy, and Crusade in Occitania, 1145-1229: Preaching in the Lord's Vineyard* (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2001); Martha G. Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity: Cistercian Culture and Ecclesiastical Reform, 1098–1180* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1996).

[37] Sternberg, pp. 75–110.

[38] Sternberg, pp. 123–28.

Sternberg's account of how Cistercian architecture and structural arrangements were modified as a result of lay presence within the precinct has great importance for the present discussion. In his reading of Cistercian architecture, Sternberg moves from the gatehouse to the church via the narthex, demonstrating how the architectural and structural arrangement were created with the intention of conveying messages to seculars.[39] Emphasis on 'access and incorporation' within architecture had a material impact on the design and construction of Cistercian abbeys, even in such supposedly isolated areas as the eastern end of the church:[40]

> Burial practices and their related *memoria* culture were a significant influence on the design of abbey churches. Relations with other social spheres and the need for monastic self-representation to the wider society were thereby driving forces of architectural change, not only in the west end of churches, but also in the east.[41]

There is no reason that this sentiment should not a principle for other architectural and spatial developments elsewhere in the precinct. In particular, this approach should be adopted when considering how hospitality affected the material environment of Cistercian abbeys. Sternberg has observed an oversight in the historiographical tradition, which this chapter addresses:

> While our knowledge of the scope of the Cistercians' social relationships has steadily grown, we have generally neglected not only to ask where these interactions took place, but also how monastic settings were tailored to accommodate these relationships and their related events.[42]

Seculars visited parts of the monastic buildings, including those thought of as being the most secluded, for a number of reasons. Areas that were intended for guests would be developed in such a way that the architecture, aesthetic, and arrangement of space would communicate the 'message' most relevant to the nature of the accustomed activity. An abbot's lodging, for example, visited by high-status outsiders for tenurial negotiations might cultivate an image of authority and lordship through the display of heraldic or militaristic schemes, thus projecting the community as well-founded, authoritative, and capable of providing good lordship to its dependents — notions that would be respected by a secular landholder. Depriving the abbot

---

[39] Sternberg, pp. 131–80.
[40] Sternberg, p. 131.
[41] Sternberg, p. 189.
[42] Sternberg, p. 114.

of such a space would inhibit their ability to discharge their duties.[43] Such 'messages' were not a sign of the changing nature of monastic observance, or related to a shift in the personal religiosity, rather they were used to facilitate a community's dealings with the world. It is from this perspective that the material environment and structural arrangements of Kirkstall Abbey and Cistercian sites more widely have been approached here.

2.2

LANDSCAPE, BOUNDARIES, AND CISTERCIAN HOSPITALITY

In section 1 the spaces of hospitality are discussed which a guest would have encountered when visiting a Cistercian precinct, beginning with the approach to the precinct, which takes into account the landscape surrounding the abbey, and finishing with the gatehouse. The guesthouse is the subject of subsequent sections. Section 1 makes special reference to the evidence, architectural and documentary, from Kirkstall, although other houses from across Britain have been used to elucidate obscure points. Each space is treated in turn as a guest would have encountered it, starting with the landscape surrounding the abbey. For each space, its function and how it was constituted (in terms of boundaries and features or furnishings) is considered, how a guest might have viewed and used it, and how it would have interacted with surrounding spaces.

Landscape and Cistercian Hospitality

Before the guest ever set foot within the monastic enclosure proper, they would already have received numerous signs embedded within the landscape that they were making a transition from 'the world' to a place of religious life. Cassidy-Welch has demonstrated the role of transition through liminal spaces (the guesthouse, noviciate, brethren's dormitory) with reference to vocations entering the novitiate and subsequently joining the monastic community.[44] A similar process underlies the transition of an outsider becoming a guest of the community: they must pass through the landscape, outer structures, main gatehouse, and be welcomed with prayer before being accepted as a guest and directed to the guesthouse.

---

43 Hall, 'East of the Cloister', p. 211.
44 Cassidy-Welch, pp. 32–35.

The role of the landscape as a monastic construction is significant for hospitality because it helped define the edge of 'monastic' space, and therefore the limits over which a monastic community was able to provide hospitality: a person or persons could not become guests unless they were first in a space in which monks were able to control the means of providing a welcome.[45]

Choice of site for an abbey was a significant factor in whether a community would flourish or not, and could take multiple attempts to get right. The community of Kirkstall as presented in the foundation narrative provides a good example. The literary nature of the source means that it cannot be taken only as chronological narrative, and consideration of the text reveals concerns deeply embedded in the Cistercian communal outlook. Kirkstall's community was first established at Barnoldswick in Lancashire, which for three reasons the monks are said to have abandoned: inclement weather ruined any arable farming begun in the surrounding countryside; local bandits plundered the community's goods; and the local parishioners interfered with the monks' activities.[46] This narrative can be viewed as a threefold set of causes representative of three fundamental factors acting contrary to the monks' enterprise.[47] The inclement weather indicates that the land was not viewed as a land of plenty, able to be cultivated into the paradisiacal habitation which they had hoped the abbey and its lands to be; the plunderers represent the untoward attraction which a monastic habitation could attract, the advantage which could be taken of the peaceful community when surrounding society coveted what they had, as well as presenting the community as a persecuted group in the manner of Israelites, or Christians in the late Roman Empire; and lastly the parishioners' close habitation prevented the monks from engaging in the quiet contemplation which was the basis of their professed way of life — the desert that they sought was in fact inhabited.[48]

---

[45] Newman, pp. 67–82, links land tenure and transformation to Cistercian *caritas*. For studies of land development by Kirkstall's community, see Robert J. Wright, 'The Granges and Estates of Kirkstall Abbey in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Leeds, 2002); Robert Wright, 'Gift, Exchange and Purchase: Consolidation and Land Usage on the Estates of Kirkstall Abbey', *Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses*, 54 (2003), 55–83; Robert Wright, '"Casting down the Altars and Levelling Everything before the Ploughshare"? The Expansion and Evolution of the Grange Estates of Kirkstall Abbey', in *Thirteenth Century England IX: Proceedings of the Durham Conference, 2001*, ed. by Michael Prestwich, Richard Hugh Britnell, and Robin Frame (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), pp. 187–200.

[46] Hugh of Kirkstall, 'The Foundation of Kirkstall Abbey', in *Miscellanea, 2*, trans. by E. Kitson Clarke, Publications of the Thoresby Society, 4 (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1895), pp. 169–208 (pp. 175–76).

[47] Janet Burton, *The Monastic Order in Yorkshire, 1069–1215* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 118–19.

[48] For the Cistercian conception of the desert in spiritual texts, in particular as an attempt to validate coenobitic life in the face of eremitic practice, see Thomas J. Renna, 'The Wilderness and the Cistercians', *Cistercian Studies Quarterly*, 30 (1995), 179–89.

This last cause is particularly pertinent to hospitality, and highlights very strongly the need for a Cistercian community to maintain the integrity of their boundaries. The foundation narrative, written at the beginning of the early thirteenth century by Hugh of Kirkstall, a monk of Fountains, states that:

> [T]here was a church at Barnoldswick, very ancient and founded long before [...]
> On feast days parishioners met at the church according to custom, and became a
> nuisance to the monastery and the brethren there residing. Desiring therefore to
> provide for the peace and quiet of the monks, the abbot it may be with some want of
> consideration, pulled the church down to its foundations, in the face of the protests
> of the clerks and parishioners.[49]

The dispute arose out of close proximity, as it was the physical presence of the parishioners that aggravated the monastic community, along with the attendant invasion of sound into the monastic precinct as well. The integrity of the monastic community was not in the control of the community, as the reference to the parishioners assembling customarily means that the monks were not instituting any of the services, nor were they able to dictate the occasions when services would be held in line with their own custom. The abbot's efforts to assert control over the space, namely by demolishing the church, only drew the community into a protracted legal dispute. It was considered 'a pious thing and worthy of favour, that a church should fall provided an abbey be constructed in its place, so that the less good should yield to the greater', at least in the pope's eyes.[50] The damage, however, had been done, and the problems of living with a nearby ecclesiastical centre were highlighted in the earliest years of the community's existence. Contest over space and the inability of the monks to control activity within it was one of the deciding factors in the decision to move from Barnoldswick to Kirkstall, and, perhaps in an effort to justify the community's action, it was certainly the factor that elicited the most detailed description from the author of the foundation narrative.

The episode involving the parish church thus highlights the need for distance from surrounding society in the Cistercian view. The theme of antagonism resonates with other Cistercian texts, in which there was also great emphasis that Cistercian communities should

---

[49] 'Foundation of Kirkstall', pp. 174–75: '[f]uit autem ecclesia Bernolfwick antiqua nimis et ab olim fundata [...] Conuenerunt parochiani ad ecclesiam de more diebus festis cum presbitero et clericis et erant molesti monasterio et fratribus commorantibus, volens igitur abbas quieti monachorum et paci prouidere licet minus consulte, a fundamento ecclesiam ipsam euertit reclamantibus clericis et parochianis'. Quoted text as translated by Kitson Clarke.

[50] 'Foundation of Kirkstall', pp. 175–76.

seek out 'the desert' to be isolated from society. The historical writing of the monks of this period, usually consisting of foundation narratives and *exempla* detailing the good conduct of earlier monastic communities, emphasise greatly the need for a suitably uninhabited place, which is devoid of the trappings of civilisation as recognised at the time.[51] The common topoi for an archetypal Cistercian site are: that it is a place without prior human habitation, except perhaps a few individuals pursuing an eremitical life, which establishes it as place suited to religious life; that the natural resources have the potential to support a fledgling community; that these resources have in no way been exploited; and, finally, that the area is not desired by nearby communities.[52]

All these themes are evident in the foundation narrative of Kirkstall Abbey. In the narrative the first abbot, Alexander, came across the site of Kirkstall while he was conducting some business for the house.[53] He found a 'wooded and shadowy valley',[54] a place unfit for human habitation, but upon considering the 'pleasant character of the valley and the river there flowing past, and the wood adjacent as being suitable for the erection of workshops [...] it seemed to him that the place was fit for building an abbey upon it'.[55] The elements that made Kirkstall so suitable in Abbot Alexander's eyes have now largely been covered with centuries of urban development. However, recent research into pre-modern maps detailing the local area has revealed something of the environment that surrounded the abbey. An estate map of the Earl of Cardigan's holdings around Kirkstall, from 1711, depicts a screen of woodland that existed during the monastic occupation time called Hawksworth Wood. By the time this map was made the wood was probably greatly reduced in comparison with the twelfth century, but its presence is nevertheless affirmed. The wood lay on a rise north and east of the abbey buildings and, significantly, straddled the main approaches to the precinct (fig. 2.1).[56] Hugh of Kirkstall states that keeping the wood in this location was a conscious policy on the part of Abbot Alexander, who is described in the foundation narrative in the following way: '[s]o diligently did he guard the ample woods that he had acquired under the favour of God for the benefit of those who were to follow him, that from them he took no material for building, but brought all together from other sources'. Here, Alexander is

---

[51] Burton and Kerr, pp. 56–59.

[52] See especially the discussion of the topoi of Kirkstall foundation narrative in Elizabeth Freeman, *Narratives of a New Order: Cistercian Historical Writing in England, 1150–1220* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), pp. 138–46.

[53] Burton, *Monastic Order in Yorkshire*, p. 225.

[54] Hugh of Kirkstall, p. 176. The words as written are 'memorosam et umbrosam'. Kitson translates as 'wooded', which must take the 'nemorosam' in place of 'memorosam'.

[55] 'Foundation of Kirkstall', p. 177. Trans. Kitson.

[56] Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2*, chp. 1.

described as instituting a policy of preserving the surrounding land in its primitive state, although his purpose could also be interpreted as being to guarantee a supply of resources to his successors, as well as a desire to maintain a visual screen.

The possibility that Alexander actively maintained the environment as part of a constructed landscape should not be discounted, however, given the peculiar emphasis that this notion receives in Cistercian writings of the twelfth and early thirteenth century. The *Exordium Parvum*, a composite text bringing together many documents and writings of the early Cistercians, promoted a sense of wilderness throughout the Order, as it was part of the standard compilation of the Cistercian customary.[57] Chapter three of the *Exordium Parvum* described how monks left Molesme and 'eagerly headed to the desert-placed called Cîteaux. This place, situated in the episcopate of Chalon, and rarely approached by men back in those days because of the thickness of grove and thornbush, was inhabited only by wild beasts'.[58] The imagery is contained within William of St Thierry's description of Clairvaux, which he stated was 'strangled and overshadowed by its thickly wooded hills'. Hugh of Kirkstall was very much continuing a tradition by employing the same language.[59] The motif is also prominent in Cistercian historical writing from elsewhere in Yorkshire. The theory of a carefully selected and/or constructed landscape can also be found in Walter Daniel's *Life of Aelred*, in whose work it is stated that the abbey shared both the characteristics of the valley and the woods: '[h]igh hills surround the valley, encircling it like a crown. These are clothed by trees of various sorts and maintain in pleasant retreats the privacy of the vale, providing for the monks a kind of second paradise of wooded delight'.[60]

To the characteristic overgrown state of the original site can be added a dramatic topography, constituted of mountains terrain, hills and valleys, or water features, all of which inhibited access to the site. Such is witnessed in the foundation narrative of Fountains Abbey, written by the same author as the Kirkstall narrative: 'a place uninhabited by every past generation, strewn with thorns, between the slopes of mountains and the crags jutting out here and there; it seemed more fit for lairs of savage beasts rather than human usage'.[61] Again

---

[57] Critical edition of the *Exordium Parvum* available in *NLT*, pp. 232–59.

[58] As translated by Waddell, *NLT*, p. 421; for the Latin, ibid.: 'ad heremum quæ Cistercium dicebatur alacriter tetenderunt. Qui locus in episcopate Cabilonensi situs, et pro nemoris spinarumque tunc temporis opacitate accessui hominum insolitus, a solis feris inhabitabatur'. Waddell dates chapter three of the *Exordium Parvum* to a time shortly before 1147 (*NLT*, p. 230–31).

[59] William of St Thierry, *Vita Prima*, trans. Matarasso, p. 31.

[60] *Life of Aelred*, p. 12.

[61] *Memorials of Fountains*, 1, p. 32: 'locum a cunctis retro seculis inhabitatum, spinis consitum, et inter convexa montium et scopulos hinc inde prominentes; ferarum latebris quam humanis usibus, ut videbatur, magis accomodum.'

with Meaux Abbey, to which site the first abbot, Adam, came and contemplated 'the place, strewn with woods and bushes, girt with waters and marshes, and also, for the produce of its lands, fertile in respect of its soil'.[62] The topography of Kirkstall similarly played into these characteristics of Cistercian landscapes. Terryl Kinder has drawn attention to the nature of the topographical situation of the Cistercian as contemporaries commonly perceived it in the medieval period, namely that Bernard's followers favoured valleys.[63] A particularly favoured setting for a Cistercian abbey was a location within a valley. This preference was dominant in Yorkshire. Rievaulx Abbey, as the name suggests, is located on the northern banks of the River Rye (fig. 2.2). The site of Fountains Abbey today retains something of its valley-bound nature, although the site was heavily landscaped in the eighteenth century, which has altered its aspect; the gatehouse was located at the same level as the claustral buildings which meant that a guest would not 'descend' as William of St Thierry did at Clairvaux.[64] A site little altered from the monastic period is that of Valle Crucis in Denbighshire, Wales (fig. 2.3).[65] The abbey would have been approached from the south-west, where the visitor would have entered the valley from the south; the abbey can still be seen to have been enclosed by the valley sides to the east and west of the site. At Kirkstall, the monastic inner gatehouse (the present-day Abbey House Museum) is situated on a rise located to the north and west of the claustral area, thus conforming to the tendency for the abbey itself to lie in an obscured or inaccessible position, as defined by the landscape.

The landscape and the natural features of the landscape of a Cistercian abbey were an important part of influencing how any outsider coming to the house might perceive the community dwelling there. Passing through these preliminary boundaries meant that one was moving within the monks' domain, an area in which they had legitimacy of action, and where behaviour ought to be conducted in accordance with the form of religious life pursued there, as William of St Thierry felt when he visited Clairvaux.[66] Impressions made on people approaching the site could then be reinforced by the architecture and decorative scheme of the abbey buildings, not least the gatehouse and abbey church.[67]

---

[62] *Chronica Monasterii de Melsa*, i, pp. 76-77. '[C]ontemplatur locum nemoribus et frutectis consitum, aquis et paludibus cinctum, ac frugi terrarium, gleba fecundum'.

[63] Kinder, p. 81; Sternberg, p. 41.

[64] Coppack, *Fountains Abbey*, pp. 103–08.

[65] The post-monastic history of Valle Crucis is markedly better documented than the earliest centuries of Cistercian occupation and has been captured in several paintings of the site. See D. H. Evans, *Valle Crucis Abbey*, rev. edn (Cardiff: Cadw, 2008), pp. 14–17.

[66] See William of Thierry's quotation, cited on p. 1.

[67] Rochelle L. Rowell, 'The Archaeology of Late Monastic Hospitality' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of York, 2000), pp. 47–49, 52–58.

One such marker of approaching the abbey precinct would be the outer gatehouse. The outer gatehouse was not 'monastic' in that religious observance was maintained in the structure. Instead, it was operated in service of the monastery, but not necessarily by a member of the community. This was unusual for Cistercians, whose porters were monastic brothers, but had precedent among the Benedictine, who more frequently employed lay porters, including for the main gate of the abbey.[68] Some late evidence comes from Fountains Abbey, where in 1512, an agreement was made between the abbot and Robert Dawson and Elle his wife whereby the latter two would reside in the outer gatehouse, though there are no remains of this building.[69] The late date may not represent arrangements of earlier centuries (particularly the twelfth and thirteenth), since monastic communities were typically much in the sixteenth century and more open to engaging external labour for functions that would probably have been performed by one of the community. Manning an outer gatehouse would have been a task very suited to a lay brother in the earlier period, but a lay person would not be problematic in such a position. There was little danger of activity in the outer gatehouse disrupting the community, nor was it a place where charity would be administered, since this was an obligation of the monastic brethren and carried out at the main gatehouse guarding the inner enclosure. It is similarly so with alternative entrances to the abbey. At the outer gatehouse, a hypothetical visitor to the abbey was at this point in a liminal zone, with indications of the monastery's presence, but without sense of the sacred experienced within the monastery's inner confines.

The Gatehouse Complex at Kirkstall

Having passed through the landscape of the abbey, an individual would have encountered the outermost of the monastic constructions — the main gatehouse. Although not extensively studied, the gatehouse is better understood than many non-claustral monastic buildings.[70] Peter Fergusson has studied the gatehouse as a distinct component within the Cistercian precinct, with its own arrangement, architecture, and discrete functions, but his corpus of

---

[68] Rowell, pp. 60–62; Kerr, pp. 70–71.

[69] 'An Agreement of Robert Dawson and Ellen His Wife, to Keep the West Gates of the Abbey of Fountains', in *Memorials of the Abbey of St Mary of Fountains*, ed. by John Richard Walbran, Publications of the Surtees Society, 42 (Durham: Surtees Society, 1863), pp. 235–39.

[70] The standard reference work for gatehouses Roland W. Morant, *The Monastic Gatehouse and Other Types of Portal of Medieval Religious Houses* (Sussex: Book Guild, 1995). For Cistercian houses, the most focused study is Peter Fergusson, '"Porta Patens Esto": Notes on Early Cistercian Gatehouses in the North of England', in *Medieval Architecture and Its Intellectual Context: Studies in Honour of Peter Kidson*, by E. Fernie and P. Crossley (London: Hambledon, 1990), pp. 47–59.

data was small. Fergusson's analysis consists of references to documentary evidence revealing activities conducted within the gatehouse, and, secondly, a description of similarities in plan between northern Cistercian houses, notably Fountains, Roche, and Furness.[71] Fergusson has noted that the Cistercian gatehouses were manifestly different from the more visually imposing structures found in established Benedictine communities, but this interpretation has since been challenged.[72] An exhaustive guide of gatehouses is Roland Morant's survey of monastic gatehouses and portals in Britain, which includes a gazetteer of all known extant remains.[73] Morant focuses on establishing typologies and classifying gatehouses according to their structural form and alignment, although little is offered in the way in which they facilitated interaction with the monastic community. Rochelle Rowell has conducted an analysis of British monastic gatehouses in light of Morant's typology and has paid close attention to alignment of the structure in relation to the church's western façade and how this affected a visitor's perceptions of the buildings and the community who occupied the site, but these cannot be utilised to identify characteristics of any single religious order since her data includes examples from all major orders.[74] Jackie Hall has surveyed surviving Cistercian guesthouse chapels in Britain, and has observed that they display many different forms, cannot neatly be grouped into a single Cistercian typology, and need to be studied individually to understand their role in the life of the monastic community.[75]

Most recently, Maximilian Sternberg has considered the gatehouse in relation to the Cistercians' need to permit access to the precinct, and in his analysis the inclusivity of the architectural arrangements is emphasised over any isolating message conveyed by the buildings.[76] Sternberg's analysis treats the gatehouse as one stage in the progress of a guest within a precinct towards the church; he recognises that there was provision for many different kinds of activity at the gatehouse, but maintains that it was liminal area. The gatehouse formed a significant point of transition, but ultimately reinforced the overall monastic spatial scheme laid out in concentric and increasingly exclusive areas of the precinct, providing different areas of segregation.

At Kirkstall, there are several features indicating that the gatehouse served numerous functions. The gatehouse, like the guesthouse and abbot's lodging, usually consisted of

---

[71] Fergusson, 'Early Cistercian Gatehouses'.

[72] Fergusson, 'Early Cistercian Gatehouses', pp. 58–59; Sternberg, p. 137.

[73] Morant, pp. 137–201.

[74] Rowell, pp. 41–63.

[75] Jackie Hall, 'English Cistercian Gatehouse Chapels', *Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses*, 52 (2001), 61–91.

[76] Sternberg, pp. 135–47.

numerous apartments, each dedicated to a discrete purpose, but coming together as a coherent whole in order to fulfil the community's needs in that area of the precinct. It was envisaged that the typical Cistercian monastery would ideally have only one gatehouse, as demonstrated by a late statute dating from 1472. In this case, the abbot of Eberbach (Rheingau, Germany) was ordered upon pain of excommunication to block all gates leading into the abbey except one, to prevent 'malign activity'.[77] Thus the main gatehouse, dealing with most of the arrivals in the precinct would have multiple entrances for incoming traffic, rooms or porches for arrivals awaiting entry, chapels for divinities, and a place to shelter the monastic porter and his aide or those assigned to them, and to host administrative or legal gatherings.[78] Here the principal features of the gatehouse at Kirkstall and an interpretation of them in light of the insights of recent historiography are provided.

The remains of Kirkstall's gatehouse have been described by St John Hope as part of his architectural survey, which was based on his excavations in the late nineteenth century (fig. 0.5).[79] The complex measures 16.6 metres (48 feet) from its northern to its southern side and contained a two-bay vaulted area 7.9 metres (26 feet) in depth. The whole lay on a northeast-southwest axis.[80] The gatehouse's inner face, therefore, does not look directly towards the claustral buildings, but towards a zone west of them, occupied by the guest range (see fig. 2.4).

This alignment is different to the general trends of monastic guesthouses of Britain as determined by Rowell, who states that gatehouses located at a distance of greater than fifty metres from the church were aligned so as to look towards the church, with the result of impressing the spiritual nature of the institution upon someone entering through the gate passage.[81] However, the majority of gatehouses constituting the data from which Rowell forms her conclusions were not Cistercian, which has an impact upon any general interpretation. Indeed, Rowell acknowledges that the Cistercians are a special case in that they had a sustained preference for the pitched gable type of gatehouse over the other forms (which type can be

---

[77] *Statuta*, v, 1472:17: 'Quamquam monasterium Eberbacense hodiernis temporibus, ut pie creditur, in sacrae religionis observantia satis floreat, quia tamen pluralitas portarum in ipsum monasterium ingressum et ab eo egressum undequaque patentium malignare volentibus faciliter praebere posset opportunitatem, praesens generale Capitulum huiusmodi malignandi occasionem et opportunitatem amputare cupiens, districte praecipit et mandat abbati et conventui eiusdem monasterii […] omnes monasterii portas lapidibus claudant et obstruant, una sola, per quam publicus ingressus in monasterium pateat, dumtaxat derelicta'.

[78] Fergusson, 'Early Cistercian Gatehouses', p. 56; David H. Williams, *The Cistercians in the Early Middle Ages* (Leominster: Gracewing, 1998), pp. 117–18.

[79] Hope and Bilson, p. 10.

[80] Hope and Bilson, p. 10.

[81] Rowell, pp. 54–55.

witnessed at Kirkstall), despite their architectural innovations on other buildings.[82] Kirkstall's alignment can be taken as being part of a scheme preventing direct access to the cloister, instead directing guests through boundary markers within the precinct itself and areas dedicated to the reception of outsiders. This arrangement helped the community regulate access to the various areas of the precinct by drawing immediate attention of a guest away from the cloister, a place of ultimate seclusion.

The gatehouse would have been located on one of the precinct boundaries, which would be delineated by the presence of a precinct wall, or, in the early phases of occupation of a site, at least by a 'soft' barrier such as a ditch or hedge.[83] The statute regarding Eberbach Abbey, stated that the gates should be blocked up with stones.[84] Such an example comes from Clairvaux, where Bernard was reluctant to move to a new site because 'there were no woods surrounding the site, to make an enclosure'.[85] In 1212 the abbot of Abbaye des Chateliers, Île de Ré (Charente-Maritime) was reprimanded for arranging the boundaries of his abbey so near to the claustral precinct that women were able to approach the abbey buildings; it was deemed sufficient to plant a hedge to prevent such unwarranted access.[86] The ideal boundary, therefore, was not merely symbolic, but one reinforced by physical barriers preventing entry.

There would be few breaks in this curtain, and of these the inner gatehouse was the grandest and most important for interaction with the outside world.[87] For some abbeys it must have been common for tavern owners or local residents to ply trade with anyone passing through. A statute of the General Chapter 1182 relaxed its former ban on the sale of wine on tap (*ad brocam*) in the vicinity of Cistercian gatehouses, upon the condition that it was forbidden for any of the monastic community to even enter the building.[88] However, the number and kind of buildings permitted to be outside this boundary was strictly regulated and subject of the approval of the General Chapter, and English houses were singled out for their custom of siting stables outside the confines of the precinct, which was thought to

---

[82] '[O]nly the detailed and examination of a Cistercian gatehouse, determining its intended original character as well as any changes to that character, will provide some answers': Rowell, pp. 57–58. Rowell proceeds to analyse the gatehouse at Stoneleigh Abbey (pp. 101–52), but this is not with reference to building campaigns elsewhere in the precinct and the questions posed earlier are left unanswered.

[83] Fergusson, 'Early Cistercian Gatehouses', p. 47.

[84] See note 77 above.

[85] *St Bernard of Clairvaux: The Story of His Life as Recording the Vita Prima Bernardi by Certain of His Contemporaries, William of St Thierry, Arnold of Bonnevaux, Geoffrey and Philip of Clairvaux, and Odo of Deuil*, trans. by Geoffrey Webb and Adrian Walker (London: A. R. Mowbray, 1960), p. 87.

[86] *Statuta*, I, 1212:64.

[87] At Kirkstall there are also the remains of the Vesper gate, set in the wider context of the precinct in Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2*.

[88] Waddell, *Statutes*, 1182:6; confirmed 1183:14.

encourage illicit activity; they were ordered to be brought within the confines of the precinct.[89]

The gatehouse fulfilled a basic role as a point of control for the community, where an arrival could be brought into the precinct in a contained and controlled manner by means of a series of ritual actions. These ritual actions had the purpose of ensuring the spiritual purity of the newcomer so that they could be brought into unity with the monks, as described in the previous chapter.[90] In practical terms the gatehouse could offer protection to the community from violent external intrusion, although it could not have deterred any determined aggressor.[91] Examples confirming the transition from the secular world to a place of religion, already indicated by the landscape in which the abbey was located, were the words which the porter spoke upon hearing a guest knock upon the door: 'thanks be to God'.[92]

As prescribed by the *Ecclesiastica Officia*, the porter should pray with a guest to ensure their spiritual purity, for which a gatehouse chapel was well suited. The gatehouse chapel was located away from the claustral complex, and because guests were not admitted to the precinct proper there was no chance of interference with claustral life.[93] The gatehouse chapel became increasingly important in Cistercian communities during the later Middle Ages, when increasing spiritual provision for the laity was available in them. This increased provision was sometimes not viewed as positive by the secular clergy: at Kirkstall, the community was reprimanded by Archbishop Greenfield in 1313/4 for admitting 'parishioners of Leeds and others of their affinity to ecclesiastical sacraments within the chapel above the gate'.[94] The physical remains of the chapel is evidenced only sparingly at Kirkstall. On the western side of the gatehouse complex there were the bases of two staircases uncovered which lead to a first floor. It is probable that this first floor contained a chapel dating from at least the early fourteenth century (discussed below). The presence of religious space would enable the monks to provide spiritual provision to supplement the practical care provided at the gatehouse.

Croxden's gatehouse range, dating from the abbacy of Walter (r. 1242–1268) deserves special mention. Although demolished in 1884, Wardle saw the former complex first-hand, which consisted of the gatehouse and an eastern room, thought to be a chapel.[95] Wardle describes the chapel as having a western doorway leading to the gatehouse, from which is

---

[89] *Statuta*, I, 1220:30.
[90] See chapter 1.1 above.
[91] Rowell, pp. 52–53.
[92] *EO*, 120:3: 'Deo gratias'.
[93] Aside from Wardle's article cited earlier (note 1, above), the most focused archaeological synthesis of gatehouse chapels is Hall, 'English Cistercian Gatehouse Chapels'.
[94] *Reg. Greenfield*, II, p. 177, no. 1047.
[95] Wardle.

inferred that the function was to provide a divine space to seculars, such as labourers and visitors. Most interesting is his description of the wall paintings: sacramental texts in scroll cartouches either side of the east window; an image the Virgin and Child on the south wall between the first and second windows (later white-washed and painted with black and buff designs); the Apostles' Creed in scroll cartouche between the second and third windows also on the south wall; on the next wall space on the south was written the Lord's Prayer in a scroll cartouche; and on the western wall was an image of Death holding a shovel standing on a grave. This last image has much relevance given the presence of a graveyard very nearby, abutting the south wall of the chapel (now the church). Wardle's reckoning of a mid-thirteenth-century date for the gatehouse agrees with the chronicle evidence. The western room of the gatehouse range is described according to tradition as a stable-block, but it could equally have been an infirmary or guesthouse.

The gradation of guests at the gatehouse is represented in the architecture of the gatehouse itself, with multiple access routes and adjoining chambers that would have been for the use of guests and the porter himself. The vestibule at Kirkstall Abbey was 26 feet deep, affording ample room for the assembly of a party of people under cover from the elements, or for people to reside if they were afforded no further access to the abbey (perhaps if they were women or children, or the local poor seeking alms). The area for sheltering guests before they were granted access to the precinct is twice the size of any shelter on the inner side of the gate, suggesting that the monks were accustomed to handling groups of people at the gate itself, rather than permitting them entry to the inner court. At the southern of this vestibule was a wall with two entrances: one was wider and for mounted guests and vehicles; a second was provided for those on foot. High status guests would arrive on horseback, and at least in the fifteenth century mounts could be stabled within the guesthouse complex itself.[96]

On the eastern side of Kirkstall's gatehouse were several doors leading to side chambers. Unfortunately, these were not excavated as part of the nineteenth-century excavations and the surrounding buildings have not been plotted. However, in deeds granted to the abbey in the early fourteenth century by the local benefactor William Mauleverer it is revealed that the grants had been made 'as a subsidy for the alms of the poor of Christ at the gate', showing that there was charitable distribution made in the gatehouse complex.[97] Secular infirmaries, or hospices were a common feature of Cistercian gatehouse complexes as revealed by documentary references to care provided, but do not commonly survive; one is attested at

---

[96] See section 2.7 below.
[97] William Mauleverer's are discussed in chapter 3 below.

Warden *c.*1180; at Furness *c.* 1190, and at Fountains in 1199.[98] It is highly probable that the surrounding chambers formed part of a 'poor' guesthouse or almshouse providing a space for this charity to be performed.

Rowell has noted that a fundamental distinction to be made between an almshouse and guest accommodation is the point of entry, namely whether the building was accessed from inside or outside the precinct boundary.[99] The guest master of Stürzelbronn Abbey (Lorraine) was reprimanded by the General Chapter for permitting access to the poor from outside the boundary to the hospital (presumably located near the gatehouse) and the chapel within it. It was expressly decreed that 'entrance to the chapel from the outside should be prevented', and that the poor should be lodged not in the hospital, but in the guesthouse (*hospitium*) which had been built for the purpose.[100]

The 'poor' guesthouse's existence can be inferred from other evidence. For Kirkstall, Stuart Wrathmell has brought attention to some suggestive architectural features.[101] Features uncovered in the excavations of the late nineteenth century lead away from the church towards the old gatehouse, the present museum. However, these features, which form a line which looks like a wall, do not lead directly to the gatehouse, but point just east of it, implying that there was some sort of structure connected with the gatehouse.[102] This area would have formed an ideal location for an almonry, or "poor" guesthouse.

These features of the gatehouse complex indicate that this was not simply a liminal area or a point at which the enclosing, isolating boundary of the precinct wall was punctured. The facilities on offer at the gatehouse also, as Sternberg recognises, facilitate permeability. More than this, however, the gatehouse complex is an area in its own right, in which hospitality could be provided and received, without reference to other areas of the precinct.[103] The gatehouse was not merely a waypoint, passed through by a guest on their way to the inner court. For many guests and visitors of an abbey, the gatehouse might be all that they see and experience, particularly for the poor or those without any call to visit the church. The gatehouse accordingly needed the ability to cater to these individuals, so that the porter, his aide, and any lay brethren or servants assigned to him, were able to not only prevent

---

[98] See references in David H. Williams, *Cistercians in the Early Middle Ages*, p. 119.

[99] Rowell, pp. 72–74.

[100] *Statuta*, I, 1205:16.

[101] The following has been drawn from unpublished work by Stuart Wrathmell: Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2*, chp. 1.

[102] Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2*. Also see the reconstruction of the Valmagne Abbey in Sternberg, p. 134, fig. 35, which similarly projects a dividing wall between the gatehouse, guesthouses, and the claustral area, although this is an extrapolation of the standing remains.

[103] Kinder, p. 369.

overwhelming numbers of individuals into the precinct, but also to fulfil the precepts of the *Rule* regarding guests themselves, without recourse to any other member of the community or area of the precinct.

The facilities that made a gatehouse into a self-reliant complex have very rarely survived to any extensive degree, but an indication of Kirkstall's arrangements is provided by evidence from Cleeve Abbey in Somerset. The abbey has been the subject of many investigations, antiquarian and modern.[104] Cleeve's gatehouse is an excellent example of a late Cistercian guesthouse and demonstrates continued concern with how the community presented itself to the outside world. The fabric dates from the thirteenth century, with elements from the fourteenth, but Abbot William Dovell (r. 1507–1537) rebuilt the upper storey and remodelled the façade in the early sixteenth century. The gatehouse has chambers only accessible from the outside, perhaps for distribution of alms. An attitude of external charity is reinforced by an inscription found on a square tablet beneath the gatehouse window which reads 'Porta patens esto | Nulli clauderis honesto'. 'DOVELL' is inscribed in Gothic capitals across the gate arch, referring to Abbot William Dovell (r. 1507–1537) who restored the ailing structure.[105] An abbot late in Kirkstall's history, William Marshall (r. 1509–1527) was likewise interested in

---

[104] Relevant accounts, in chronological order: E. C. MacKenzie Walcott, 'Old Cleeve Abbey', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 1876, 402–19, esp. pp. 410–12; Edmund Buckle, 'The Buildings of Cleeve Abbey', *Proceedings of the Somersetshire Archaeological and Natural History Society*, 35 (1889), 83–120, esp. pp. 84–86, 99–119; J. R. Bramble, 'The Abbey of Cleeve', *Proceedings of the Somersetshire Archaeological and Natural History Society*, 52 (1906), 46–51; C. T. F. Gibbs, 'Cleeve Abbey, Washford, Som.', *Transactions of the Somerset Masters' Lodge, No. 3746*, 5 (1931); Francis C. Eeles, 'Cleeve Abbey: Recent Discoveries', *Proceedings of the Somersetshire Archaeological and Natural History Society*, 77 (1931), 37–47, esp. pp. 41–42, 44; J. B. Ward Perkins, 'A Late Thirteenth-Century Tile-Pavement at Cleeve Abbey', *Proceedings of the Somersetshire Archaeological and Natural History Society*, 87 (1941), 29–55; J. B. W. Perkins, 'A Late Thirteenth-Century Tile-Pavement at Cleeve Abbey', *Proceedings of the Somersetshire Archaeological and Natural History Society*, 87 (1942), 39–55; Nikolaus Pevsner, *The Buildings of England: South and West Somerset.* (London: Penguin Books, 1958), pp. 126–28; R. Gilyard-Beer, *Cleeve Abbey, Somerset* (London: H.M.S.O., 1959), esp. pp. 23–29; this is revised in R. Gilyard-Beer, *Cleeve Abbey, Somerset*, 2nd edn (London: H.M.S.O., 1990); Fergusson, *Solitude*, pp. 119–20; Robert W. (Robert William) Dunning, 'The Last Days of Cleeve Abbey', in *The Church in Pre-Reformation Society: Essays in Honour of F. R. H. Du Boulay*, ed. by C. Harper-Bill and C. M. Barron (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1985), pp. 58–67; Christopher J. Guy, 'Excavations at Cleeve Abbey, 1979', *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History Society*, 132 (1988), 89–93; J. G. McDonnell, *Analysis of Plaster Samples from Cleeve Abbey, Somerset* (English Heritage Research Department, 1990) <doi: 10.5284/1033890>; John Allan, 'Cleeve Abbey: The Pottery', *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History*, 142 (1999), 41–75; David M. Robinson and others, *The Cistercian Abbeys of Britain: Far from the Concourse of Men* (London: Batsford, 1998), p. 87; Christopher J. Guy, 'The Excavations at the Reredorter at Cleeve Abbey, Somerset', *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History*, 142 (1999), 1–40; J. Harcourt, 'The Medieval Floor-Tiles of Cleeve Abbey, Somerset', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 153 (2000), 30–70; Stuart Harrison, *Cleeve Abbey, Somerset* (London: English Heritage, 2000); M. Watts and P. Weddell, *Summary Report: Archaeological Observations and Recording During Condition Survey Repairs to Cleeve Abbey, Washford, Somerset* (Exeter Archaeology, 2001); Richard W. Parker, Tony Ives and John Allan, 'Excavation and Building Study at Cleeve Abbey, 1995–2003', *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History*, 150 (2007), 73–167; M. F. R. Steinmetzer, *Archaeological Monitoring at Cleeve Abbey, Washford, Somerset. Exeter Archaeology* (Exeter Archaeology, 2009) <doi: 10.5284/1004104>.

[105] Robinson and others, p. 86.

promoting an image of strength to the wider community, as witnessed by the heightened crossing tower on Kirkstall's church, which bears Marshall's initials.[106] Conspicuous display of the abbot's name and associating him with the wider world through the alms distributed at the gate is a prominent trend in late-medieval Cistercian architecture, and emphasises the abbot's public role; the fact that his name was on the main gatehouse would mean that it was communicated to the wider world who would not be granted entrance beyond.[107]

Kirkstall's gatehouse, although not surviving to the extent of Cleeve or Croxden, accords with structural features of other Cistercian gatehouses. There is sufficient extant fabric to indicate that it fulfilled all the functions that could be expected of it. It operated as the main entrance into the precinct, regulated access, acted as a point for charitable provision, and had facilities for religious services. Many would progress no further into the precinct, but for those who did, after they had been formally welcomed, would be 'taken to the guesthouse, or presented to the hosteller'.[108] These words of the *Ecclesiastica Officia* stop short of describing what the *hospitium* was. The form that guest accommodation adopted and what it meant for Cistercian hospitality is the subject of section 2.

2.3

HOSPITALITY AND THE USE OF SPACE
IN CISTERCIAN ABBEYS IN THE LATER MIDDLE AGES

Once inside the gatehouse, a guest would have access to the inner court surrounding the claustral complex, but they would not have free access to all areas.[109] Specific areas intended for guests are not stated in Cistercian legislation, and the subject requires further investigation to clarify where in the precinct a guest might have resided. This section analyses the development in the use of space for hospitality within Cistercian abbeys in Britain throughout the medieval period, starting from the mid-twelfth century and continuing up to the dissolution

---

[106] Michael Carter, 'Abbot William Marshall (1509–28) and the Architectural Development of Kirkstall Abbey, Yorkshire, in the Late Middle Ages', *Journal of Medieval Monastic Studies*, 1 (2012), 115–42 (p. 118, fig. 2).

[107] Michael Carter, 'Cistercian Abbots as Patrons of Art and Architecture: Northern England in the Late Middle Ages', in *The Prelate in England and Europe, c. 1300–c. 1560*, ed. by Martin Heale (Woodbridge: York Medieval, 2014), pp. 215–39 (p. For example of similar practices, see); for the abbot's increasingly public role see Emilia Jamroziak, 'Cistercian Abbots in Late Medieval Central Europe: Between the Cloister and the World', in *The Prelate in England and Europe, c. 1300–c. 1560*, ed. by Martin Heale (Woodbridge: York Medieval, 2014), pp. 240–57.

[108] *EO*, 87:17: '[d]einde ducatur ad hospitium. vel presentetur hospitali'.

[109] Rowell, p. 9.

era in the early sixteenth century. The themes explored here are: what arrangement guest accommodation took, how this arrangement changed over time, and how this affected the Cistercians' provision of hospitality.

There were eighty-six male Cistercian religious houses before the Dissolution in England, Scotland and Wales.[110] The vast majority of these had been founded (although not necessarily settled in their ultimate location) in the twelfth century; the thirteenth saw the establishment of many more, but thereafter new foundations tailed off so that Edward III's foundation of St Mary Graces, London, in 1350, was the last before the English Reformation in the early sixteenth century.[111] Over the course of the centuries from the Dissolution little has survived of the outer buildings, and at some sites there are few standing remains at all. To address the current lack of understanding of guesthouses this section analyses all sites of male Cistercian houses with extant remains of structures associated with guest accommodation.[112]

Cistercian Guest Accommodation: A Neglected Topic

The historiography of Cistercian architecture and archaeology has developed in many important areas during the course of the long twentieth century, as discussed previously. The typical structural arrangements of Cistercian monasteries were uncovered in the nineteenth century, and have since been added to more recent studies. Cistercian architecture, once thought of as being tied to a specific Cistercian ideal, is now perceived as a product of Cistercian observance. Cistercian architecture is now recognised as changing in accordance with the needs of the community, to look both outwards to the world, as well as expressing inner spirituality. These themes are essential for understanding the structural arrangements of Cistercian guest accommodation, to which they shall now be applied.

A significant omission of current scholarship is the lack of a detailed account of the development of Cistercian guest accommodation. There are very few synthetic accounts, and most archaeological and architectural accounts of specific guesthouses are dispersed in

---

[110] Numbers derived from Robinson and others, p. 3.

[111] This excludes the St Bernard's College, Oxford, which Archbishop Chichele of Canterbury founded for Cistercian scholars in 1437/8: W. H. Stevenson and H. E. Salter, *The Early History of St John's College, Oxford*, Oxford Historical Society, New Ser., 1 (Oxford: Oxford Historical Society, 1939), pp. 14–16; an edition of the deeds of foundation may be found at pp. 67–72.

[112] There is a problem of definition of 'guest accommodation' as will be discussed later. Buildings usually termed 'abbot's lodgings', far more numerous than those termed 'guesthouses' are not covered in their entirety. All sites with detached guesthouses have been studied.

literature from the past century and a half.[113] Where a synthesis has been offered, there is no systematic account of the chronology of its development and how it changed over time, or why. Sternberg, who has given the most thorough treatment of an outsider's perspective of Cistercian abbeys, barely mentions the guest accommodation.[114] The most detailed archaeological studies of Cistercian guesthouses in Britain are Buckfast Abbey in Devon, Kirkstall Abbey, Stoneleigh Abbey in Warwickshire and Tintern Abbey in Monmouthshire.[115] Of these, Kirkstall is the best understood; a description of the development of its architecture and arrangement is provided in section 3, along with a discussion of how this reflects wider changes within the Cistercian Order in late-medieval England.[116] Rowell's analysis of the problems of archaeological evidence for guest accommodation in the precinct led her to some very insightful observations about the form and layout of guesthouses, but her data include a great number of sites of different religious orders, which means that the ways that structural arrangements revealed a specific religious order's identity are obscured.[117]

Guesthouses were required by both the *Rule of St Benedict* and the Cistercians' own legislation, but specific arrangements were left to the abbot's discretion. The abbot's choice was influenced by some practical limitations, such as the money he could reasonably afford to spend on it, or the physical topography of abbey site. Despite this caveat, the form of Cistercian guesthouses is highly indicative of a community's attitudes toward the provision

---

[113] Synthetic discussion of the archaeology of monastic guesthouses is very sparse, even when evidence form all orders are considered together. Brief mentions are made in L. H. Butler and Chris Given-Wilson, *Medieval Monasteries of Great Britain*, pp. 31–36. Also J. Patrick Greene, *Medieval Monasteries* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1992), pp. 154–57, but his observations are derived entirely from Kirkstall and Tintern. Some Scottish references are given in Richard Fawcett, *Scottish Architecture: From the Accession of the Stewarts to the Reformation 1371–1560* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press and Historic Scotland, 1994), p. 123. Welsh Cistercian guesthouses are considered in Robinson, *Cistercians in Wales*, pp. 160–63. Some observations drawn from across Europe may be found in Kinder, pp. 369–70. The most wide-ranging and sensitive to life within the monastic enclosure of all major religious orders is Rowell, pp. 70–80.

[114] Sternberg, pp. 137, 144–45.

[115] S. W. Brown, 'Excavations and Buildings Recording at Buckfast Abbey, Devon', *Proceedings of the Devon Archaeological Society*, 46 (1988), 13–89; Stuart Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey: The Guest House – A Guide to the Medieval Buildings and to the Discoveries Made during Recent Excavations*, 2nd edn (Wakefield: West Yorkshire Archaeological Service, 1987); Rochelle L. Ramey, 'An Archaeology of Hospitality', in *Stoneleigh Abbey: The House, Its Owners, Its Lands*, ed. by Robert Bearman (Stoneleigh: Stoneleigh Abbey and the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, 2004), pp. 62–81; but also see Rowell's PhD thesis chapter on the same subject: Rowell, pp. 101–52; Paul Courtney, 'Excavations in the Outer Precinct of Tintern Abbey', *Medieval Archaeology*, 33 (1989), 99–143. There are some issue with Courtney's phasing of the architectural developments that render his interpretation of arrangement problematic; my thanks to Dr Stuart Wrathmell for making me aware of these.

[116] At the time of writing, Kirkstall's guesthouse is the subject of a major collaborative report, and the writer would like to thank Dr Stuart Wrathmell for his continual support and advice regarding the architecture of Kirkstall's guesthouse and the archaeology of the precinct more widely. The forthcoming publication is Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2*.

[117] Rowell, pp. 70–84.

of hospitality, as it was the abbot who *ex officio* oversaw the building programme.[118] Like the gatehouse, the guesthouse is better understood as a cluster of buildings, with a number of associated domestic and ancillary buildings, with communal areas, private chambers, outside courts and a number of different points of access. The term 'guesthouse' has been retained here for convenience. The *Rule* merely says that the guests' cell should have beds laid out satisfactorily and that there should be a separate kitchen for the guests.[119] The guesthouse is not described in the *Ecclesiastica Officia*, and indeed the practical provision received very little treatment at all. Consideration of the material culture thus provides evidence where written sources are lacking, and reveals an important fixture within Cistercian abbeys.

Sites Used and Basis for Inclusion

Of all British Cistercian abbeys, only one quarter, approximately, have some form of remaining fabric that may be classified as guest accommodation, although in some of these cases the attributions are tenuous. Irish abbeys have not been included.[120] While many sites contain structures that, in plan, look similar to guest accommodation, it is only where there is a high probability that they were used as guest accommodation that they have been included for discussion here.[121] All sites with guesthouses in the 'standard' position (detached from and located west of the cloister) have been considered, and those that provide relevant evidence over many centuries have been prioritised. For example, Buckfast has a well-understood guesthouse, but also has evidence of later modifications and additions to its guest

---

[118] The abbot would often delegate supervision of the construction project to a monastic official (for example, the master of works), a skilled lay brother, or even an external lay architect: see Peter Fergusson, 'The First Architecture of the Cistercians In England and the Work of Abbot Adam of Meaux', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 136 (1983), 74–86, for a classification of who built the initial conventual buildings of some English sites.

[119] *RB*, 53.

[120] For these, the basic point of reference is Roger Stalley, *The Cistercian Monasteries of Ireland: An Account of the History, Art, and Architecture of the White Monks in Ireland from 1142–1540* (London: Yale University Press, 1987).

[121] A complete list of Cistercian sites considered here is, in alphabetical order ('?' preceding a name indicates a doubtful attribution): Buckfast (Devon); Buckland (Devon); Cleeve (Somerset); Coggeshall (Essex); Croxden (Staffordshire); Cymer (Gwynedd); Flaxley (Gloucestershire); Forde (Dorset); Fountains (North Yorkshire); Furness (Cumbria); Jervaulx (North Yorkshire); Kirkstall (West Yorkshire); Melrose (Roxburghshire); ? Netley (Hampshire); Robertsbridge (Chichester); Roche (South Yorkshire); ? Sawley (Lancashire); Stoneleigh (Warwickshire); ? Stratford Langthorne (Greater London); Tintern (Monmouthshire); Valle Crucis (Denbighshire); Waverley (Surrey); ? Whalley (Lancashire). Also see the list provided in Rowell, p. 12, which lists twenty-five sites. As Rowell states (p. 11), there is a 'lack of secure criteria for the form and function of visitors' accommodation', which leads to certain discrepancies between the present list and Rowell's. All sites with extant 'guesthouses' in the sense of detached accommodation are in accordance, but Rowell includes Baysdale (Cistercian nunnery), Buildwas, Hailes, Kirklees (Cistercian nunnery), Netley, Newminster, Rievaulx and Robertsbridge seemingly on the basis of their abbot's lodging. Rowell includes only English sites, but does not give a basis for her classification.

accommodation. However, this survey does not consider every potential structure within a Cistercian precinct that might potentially have been put to use for hospitality. Where abbot's lodging are of sufficient size to entertain outsiders, they have been considered, particularly those dating from the fourteenth century and later, when abbot's lodgings increased in size and quality of furnishings. The introduction and subsequent development of the abbot's lodging is a complex topic deserving detailed further research, and is not treated here apart from where the building's function overlaps with hospitality. Infirmaries have not been included, except where there is the possibility of conversion to a hospitality function. Based as it is upon archaeological interpretation, there are some sites that are highly problematic, and 'our modern hypotheses as to the uses of a particular room are often far less reliable than we would like to believe'.[122] Further, the dating has been taken as interpreted in secondary literature rather than primary survey due to restrictions on time and access to sites. Nevertheless, enough extant and understood material culture remains to conduct an analysis of the physical arrangements that Cistercians adopted to provide hospitality from the twelfth to the sixteenth centuries. The resultant analysis provides an extensive body of information, reaching across Britain and through almost four centuries, generating the first synthetic account of Cistercian guest accommodation.

Chronological Division of Survey

The number of sites involved in the survey requires a meaningful way to organise the data and render it in a useful way. To this end, the following survey is divided into three chronological phases. Each chronological phase is determined by the structural arrangements adopted for guest accommodation. The boundaries of these chronological phases are not absolute, but are provided as a guide based on the aggregate of dates from well-understood sites, and in reality their limits overlap. The first chronological phase lasts the mid-twelfth century, which is the date of the earliest guesthouses in Britain with extant remains, until the end of the thirteenth century. Sites from this phase exhibit a clear tendency towards detached construction or modification of guesthouses typically (but not always) located to the west of the cloister. The second phase lasted for the duration of the 'long' fourteenth century, blending with the end of the first phase and the third phase. Sites from the second phase exhibit the tendency of developing multiple areas within the precinct to accommodate guests. The third and final phase lasts from approximately the beginning of the fifteenth century up until the Dissolution

---

[122] Kinder, p. 359.

of the monasteries in the sixteenth. Each of these chronological phases is treated in turn.

2.4

SEGREGATION: EARLY CISTERCIAN GUEST ACCOMMODATION (C. 1150–1300)

Discussed below are several examples early Cistercian guest accommodation, which should be read with reference to the overview of the spatial organisation within Cistercian precincts provided in the introduction.[123] Each abbey is treated in turn. The key features noted in this phase guest accommodation are: basic details about the religious house; the date of their creation or modification; their physical attributes, such as size and layout; whether they exhibit any notable features; and how they interact with surrounding structures. These cases are then synthesised to show how they represent the community's attitude towards receiving guests. The features that characterise the structural arrangements of this period are a marked tendency to isolate the guest range from the claustral complex, and for there to be no other guest accommodation with the precinct for entertaining guests, thus emphasising the solitude of the brethren.

Buckfast

Interest in Buckfast's history was reignited when a Benedictine community of exiled French monks re-occupied it in the mid-nineteenth century and raised the present buildings on the foundations of the medieval Cistercian complex.[124] Buckfast contains an excellent extant example of a twelfth-century Cistercian guesthouse, which, in terms of extant superstructure, far surpasses Kirkstall. Buckfast was an Anglo-Saxon Benedictine foundation, which had been reformed as part of the Sauvignac affiliation in 1136, coming into the Cistercian Order when Sauvigny was affiliated to Clairvaux in 1147.

Buckfast's guesthouse was excavated in 1988 and its development has been traced in

---

[123] See Introduction, 0.8.

[124] Adam Hamilton, *History of St Mary's Abbey of Buckfast in the County of Devon, A.D. 760–1906* (Buckfastleigh: Buckfast Abbey, 1906), pp. 212–20.

detail (fig. 2.5, fig. 2.6, fig. 2.7, fig. 2.8).[125] The structure has been dated by stylistic comparison of the building's internal arrangements, which indicates that it was roughly contemporaneous with the comprehensive rebuilding of the claustral ranges during the later twelfth century, and was therefore built by a Cistercian community.[126] The guesthouse lies west of the cloister. It comprised a rectangular aisled hall to the north (24.9 × 10 metres externally) and detached services to the south (11 × 3.8 metres externally).[127] The hall was divided internally, into a northern third and southern two thirds. Few floor layers survived undisturbed, and no small finds were found belonging to this phase.[128] The claustral buildings demonstrated remarkable uniformity in their stratigraphy and fabric, suggesting one principal phase of development. The cloister also has characteristic Cistercian features, such as the lay brothers' dormitory on the western range, suggesting that construction began after the house became Cistercian.[129]

The guesthouse is assumed to be part of this phase of development, and therefore to date to the latter half of the twelfth century, although no clear stratigraphic relationship links the two areas of the site. In the late twelfth or early thirteenth century a rectangular building was constructed to the north, thought to be a cellar.[130] The guesthouse very probably saw use by prominent guests at this time, since Buckfast attracted some notable visitors. Edward I visited Buckfast on 8–10 April 1297, after Forde (1 April), the Bishop's palace at Clyst, Exeter and Ilsington (7 April), 'probably on his way to Plympton Priory'.[131] The second phase of the guesthouse dates to the first half of the fourteenth century, and was built on the foundations of the first structure, indicating that the facilities were completely replaced. The whole building measured 38 × 13.5 metres externally, with walls up to 1.2 metres thick and standing 6 metres in height in places.[132] The principal entrance was in the southeastern corner of the main hall, and there was a laver immediately east of the services passage doorway on the south wall.[133] A two-storey chamber block was located at the northern end of the hall,

---

[125] J. Brooking Rowe, 'On Recent Excavations at Buckfast Abbey', *Transactions of the Devonshire Association*, 16 (1884), 590–94; John Stéphan, *Buckfast Abbey: A Short History and Guide* (Buckfastleigh: Buckfast Abbey, 1958), p. 29; C. Norris and D. Nicholl, *Buckfast Abbey: A Pictorial Survey* (Buckfast: Buckfast Abbey, 1960), pp. 3–4; Nikolaus Pevsner, *Buildings of England: Devon*, 2nd edn, 1989; Robin Clutterbuck, *Buckfast Abbey: A History* (Buckfast: Buckfast Abbey Trustees, 1994); Brown (see note 115 above for full reference). For the history of the re-population of the site see Hamilton, pp. 221–28. The physical information conveyed in the following two paragraphs has been drawn from Brown's report, and whose chronology of the site has been adopted here.

[126] Brown, pp. 35–36.

[127] Brown, pp. 35–36.

[128] Brown, pp. 35–36.

[129] Brown, p. 67.

[130] Brown, pp. 26–32.

[131] J. Brooking Rowe, Contributions to a History of the Cistercian Houses of Devon (Plymouth: W. Brendon, 1878), p. 74; Clutterbuck, p. 12.

[132] Brown, p. 36.

[133] Brown, p. 47.

measuring 9.7 × 10.3 metres, and had adjoining garderobes to the northwest and southwest; the internal arrangements are unknown.[134] A buttery and pantry were located at the south end of the hall, with a chamber over.[135] Given the striking similarities that the overall layout has with Kirkstall, it may be that entranceways were located in a similar position at the latter site. Buckfast's guest accommodation was extensively modified in later centuries and is discussed in section 2.6 below.

Coggeshall

Coggeshall was a Sauvignac house founded in 1140 through the patronage of King Stephen and Queen Matilda and has been studied by archaeologists principally because of its early and complete brickwork.[136] While the fact that Coggeshall was constructed in brick is significant for architectural history, it is not the focus of the present discussion. Two buildings may be considered hospitality structures, the guesthouse and the abbot's lodging, both dating to *c.* 1190.[137]

The function of guest accommodation has been attributed to an irregularly aligned building to the southeast of the east range, along the bank of the River Blackwater (fig. 2.11). The fabric is flint-rubble and brick core with brick dressings. The building measures 7.62 × 4.88 metres (25 × 16 feet) approximately. There were doors in westernmost side of the north and south walls, in line with one another, probably a porch for the southern door; there were four lancet windows along both the eastern and western walls. Brick-lined recesses lie between the windows and beneath them, as well as in the north and south walls, formed a total of fourteen seats. The presence of the watercourse helps explain the building's unusual position.

Excavation of the floor layers revealed five distinct layers, showing alterations, which include stables and kitchen. An explanation of the change could be that access to the abbey was changed from the Colchester Road, lying east of the precinct, to a path to the west when

---

[134] Brown, p. 48.

[135] Brown, p. 36.

[136] Relevant accounts, in chronological order: E. L. Cutts, 'An Architectural Account of the Remains of Coggeshall Abbey', *Transactions of the Essex Archaeological Society*, 1 (1858), 166–85; *An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Essex*, RCHME, 4 vols (London: H.M.S.O., 1916), III, pp. 166–67; F. G. Beaumont, 'The Remains of Coggeshall Abbey', *Transactions of the Essex Archaeological Society*, new ser., 15 (1921), 60–76 (esp. pp. 61–63, 66); Nathaniel Lloyd, *A History of English Brickwork* (London: H. G. Montgomery, 1925), p. 4, and illust. on pp. 104, 283; J. S. Gardner, 'Coggeshall Abbey and Its Early Brickwork', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 3rd ser., 18 (1955), 19–32 (esp. pp. 25–27); Nikolaus Pevsner, *Buildings of England: Essex*, rev. edn (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965), pp. 251–52; Fergusson, *Solitude*, pp. 120–21; Robinson and others, pp. 88–89.

[137] Gardner, p. 25; *An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Essex*, III, states *c.* 1200.

the new gatehouse was erected. The gatehouse chapel, nearly a hundred metres to the west of the church dates to *c.* 1223. The abbot's lodging had windows similar in construction to those of the guesthouse and on the first floor there was a chapel, indicated by a piscina and recess for a crucifix flanked by a pair of lancet windows, again similar to the guesthouse. The gatehouse is 13.11 × 6.10 metres (43 × 20 feet), similar in size to the abbeys at Kirkstead (Lincolnshire) and Furness (Cumbria).

The arrangements at Coggeshall are problematic. Assessment of spatial arrangements rests on whether the 'guesthouse' was really such, rather than being an official's chamber or similar. Abbot Ralph (r. 1207–1218) mentions a guesthouse in his history of Coggeshall, when Brother Robert, the lay brother acting as aide to the monk hosteller, made arrangements to entertain a group of Knights Templar (as they were dressed) in the abbot's private quarters; the knights seemed phantasmal, as no-one but the lay brother had seen them.[138] The lay brother's search for the guests is suggestive of Coggeshall's physical infrastructure:

> But the brother, when he had entered the hall, could not find the guests whom he had left there just a little while before. He went into the inner chambers, and into other lodgings, but found not one of them at all. And soon he left, and went out through the court, running about hither and thither, asking those he met about these men. And one stated that he saw these men going toward the church, and that they had hastened to the cemetery of the brethren. When this had been told to him he quickly directed a messenger to go there: the messenger found no-one. And when the doorkeepers were asked about such guests, they stated that they had seen no such men using that door to go either inside or outside. And who these men were, and how they had arrived, or departed, remains unknown to this day.[139]

The story reveals many aspects. It implies that the abbot had already moved to separate quarters. The progression through the rooms described in the passage also supports the identification of a guesthouse. The lay brother had returned from the abbot, whose lodging was nearby. He went into the 'inner chambers' (*interiora cubicula*), which may be those adjoining the

---

[138] Ralph of Coggeshall, *Chronicon Anglicanum*, ed. by J. Stevenson, Rolls Series, 66 (London: Longman, 1875), pp. 134–35.

[139] Ralph of Coggeshall, pp. 134–35: '[f]rater vero aulam ingrediens, hospites illos quos ibidem paulo ante dimiserat, minime repperit. Intrans autem in interiora cubicula et in alia diversoria, neminem eorum prorsus invenit. Moxque egressus et per curiam huc illucque discurrens, obvios quosque de talibus viris sciscitatur. At unus testatus est quod hujusmodi viros viderit ad ecclesiam tendere, et ad cœmeteria fratrum properasse. Quo cum nuntium celeriter direxisset, nuntius neminem repperit. Janitores autem de hujusmodi hospitibus interrogati, nullos tales viros vel ingressos vel egressos per januam illa die fore asserebant. Qui vero isti viri fuerint, vel quomodo advenerint, vel qua discesserint, usque hodie incognitum manet'.

northeast of the abbot's lodging. When the lay brother left, he went out through the 'court', which could be the space immediately south of the infirmary, or perhaps even the cloister (though the word *claustrum* would be expected). The guests had been seen moving towards the brothers' cemetery, and monastic cemeteries typically lay to the north, northeast, or east of the church — at Coggeshall it could have been immediately to the east of the chapter house, or north of the east end of the church, given the restrictions the River Blackwater imposes. The doorkeepers, presumably watching the doors to the church, stated that they saw no-one moving in either direction. It would be unusual were the monastic cemetery accessible directly by guests without moving through the west end of the church. Ultimately, the account fits the extant remains and, while ambiguous, supports the attribution of the guesthouse.

If the structure is a guesthouse then Coggeshall is an important site for the development of Cistercian spatial arrangements. The buildings represent very early links between abbatial structures and guest accommodation, a step not taken in most abbeys until the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and not given explicit form until the fifteenth. Expedience was a factor, as the presence of a watercourse offered an easy way of installing superior facilities to service guest accommodation, as was done at Fountains. Were the guesthouse built in a more usual location for this period, between the church and the gatehouse, it would have necessitated installing drains for plumbing. Another reason may be that there was another road entering the site early in the abbey's history that determined the location of the guesthouse.

A change of the main point of access to the abbey may also explain the location. The abbot's lodging and guesthouse were constructed together, *c.* 1190. The gatehouse, of which the chapel survives, was constructed *c.* 1223, and is situated such that it implies that the abbey was accessed from the west. It may be that the guesthouse was built at a time before this shift in direction of access, and would therefore conform to the idea that the guesthouse was an intermediary zone between gatehouse and cloister, albeit one that had joined with the abbot's lodge.

Fountains

Fountains is an important site for considering guest accommodation due to its excellent extant

fabric, including two guesthouses of first-floor hall type. [140] As well, its status as mother-house to Kirkstall means that arrangements adopted at Fountains potentially had an influence on Kirkstall. A detailed description is provided here due to the exceptional nature of the remains. Abbot Richard of Clairvaux (r. 1150–1170) began their construction in the 1160s and they were subsequently developed throughout the monastic period of occupation of the site. Both guesthouses lie on the bank of the River Skell, immediately southwest of the cloister (fig. 2.12). The easternmost guesthouse has remains of masonry patterning, which brought the internal decorative scheme in accordance with that of the rest of the abbey, including the church, the inner parlour, warming house, lay brothers' refectory, and the claustral laver (including the towel recess). [141]

The first guesthouse to be constructed was that nearest the western range of the cloister, begun after the fire in 1147 had destroyed the claustral ranges then built. [142] The building was six bays' length, all vaulted. There was a central row of piers of two different designs: the first, constituted by the northern two, have engaged shafts only at their base and top, while the column was circular in section, the capitals are simplistic compared with the other columns; the second group, constituted by the southern three piers, are octagonal at their base and made of eight engaged shafts. [143] The original doorway to the eastern guesthouse was in the northwestern corner, in the western wall, and three windows are visible in the eastern wall, one to each bay bar the third bay. No windows remain in the western side of the hall; the fifth bay contains a door that may originally have been a window. [144] Most of the western wall was obscured by a stair leading to the first floor, probably of wood since there is no evidence of stone having been keyed into wall. [145] At the south end of the hall the western half of the bay has a door leading to a wooden platform with a pentice over the river. The garderobe lies covering southwestern angle of the hall, overhanging the River Skell, and is divided so

---

[140] The most important survey of Fountains' archaeology and architecture is Glyn Coppack, *Fountains Abbey: The Cistercians in Northern England* (Stroud: Tempus, 2003). This is a revision of Coppack, *Fountains Abbey*. Other relevant accounts of Fountains's architecture structural remains are: R. Gilyard-Beer, *Fountains Abbey, Yorkshire* (London: H.M.S.O, 1970); Peter Leach, Nikolaus Pevsner and John Minnis, *Buildings of England: West Yorkshire —Leeds, Bradford, and the North* (London: Yale University Press, 2009), pp. 255–70; Fergusson, *Solitude*, pp. 38–48, 126; Robinson and others, pp. 111–15.

[141] David Park, 'Cistercian Wall Painting and Panel Painting', in *Cistercian Art and Architecture in the British Isles*, ed. by Christopher Norton and David Park (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), pp. 181–210 (p. 185).

[142] William Henry St John Hope, 'Fountains Abbey', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, 15 (1900), 269–402 (pp. 275–76). Hope's observations of the guesthouse are detailed and remain valid, and it is from his report that the following physical description has been drawn.

[143] Hope, 'Fountains Abbey', p. 388.

[144] Hope, 'Fountains Abbey', p. 389.

[145] Hope, 'Fountains Abbey', p. 390.

that the eastern garderobe is accessed from the solar, and the western from the ground-floor hall.[146] The contrast in architectural detailing between the northern and southern ends of the hall, the easy access to the solar, together with the fact that the main entrance was at the northern end suggests that there was some differentiation of function, or at least gradation in prestige of the space. The southern end had access to the latrines and (later) the solar, as well as enjoying higher-quality furnishings, making probable the interpretation that this was the dais end of the hall, reserved for elite guests.[147]

The first-floor solar was built 'somewhat later'; not enough remains to show how it was divided.[148] When first constructed it was a single chamber, from windows in the north with a circular window in the centre of the gable. Fireplace and windows to correspond with arrangement of the hall below are presumed. The southern end contained a large window, and in the western half of the southern bay there was the door into the garderobe. The western wall contained the doorway leading from the external staircase, and perhaps more windows. Hope gave the following description:

> In the thirteenth century some modifications were made in the solar, probably by Abbot John of Kent [r. 1220–1247], most likely in the way of division. At that time a fireplace was inserted in the north gable, the round window blocked up, and the flue carried across it to a short circular chimney shaft capping the gable. The making of this fireplace also involved the blocking up of the window to the south of it.[149]

A third guest hall of seven bays' length, measuring approximately 22 metres north-south and 40 metres east-west, has been detected through ground-penetrating radar survey.[150] This was constructed probably during the abbacy of Robert of Pipewell (r. 1170–1180) along with the lay brothers' infirmary; the dating is suggested by the spacing of the piers and supposition that the elevation would by necessity have taken a Romanesque form.[151] There are two projections on the external face of the east wall that have been interpreted as pilaster buttresses. The westernmost wall is thicker than the others, perhaps because a fireplace and chimney were added. There are two stone fragments, interpreted as constituting the leg for a table.[152]

---

[146] Hope, 'Fountains Abbey', p. 390.

[147] Coppack, *Abbeys and Priories*, p. 105—07.

[148] Hope, 'Fountains Abbey', p. 390.

[149] Hope, 'Fountains Abbey', p. 390.

[150] Keith Emerick and Kate Wilson, 'Fountains Abbey: Some Interim Results of Remote Sensing', *English Heritage Conservation Bulletin*, 18 (1992), 7–9.

[151] Emerick and Wilson, p. 8.

[152] Emerick and Wilson, p. 9.

Ultimately there were three guesthouses to the southwest of the cloister, used contemporaneously, all very near or adjacent to the River Skell. In the later Middle Ages they had been altered so that the halls of the two southernmost buildings were turned into discrete chambers, care being taken to provide fires, latrines and external access to each room.

Furness

Another strong example of the early Cistercian layout for guest accommodation is Furness Abbey, Cumbria (formerly Lancashire; fig. 2.15).[153] Furness began as a Sauvignac house founded in 1124 by Stephen, then Count of Boulogne and Mortain, who later became king (r. 1135–54), at Tulketh, near Preston (Lancashire). The community moved in 1127 to its site at Barrow-in-Furness. The house was endowed early with extensive lands near the abbey itself, including all the forest of Furness, Ulverston, and Walney Island. The community enjoyed substantial wealth throughout the Middle Ages as well as the attentive royal patronage, which aided Furness's tenurial domination of its surrounds. Furness vied with Waverley for precedence in the Cistercian Order. Furness was the older foundation but was of Sauvignac affiliation, but Waverley (founded 1128), being the first Cistercian house in England, maintained its precedence.[154]

The topography of the site at Furness restricted building, but the arrangement of the buildings remains in keeping with other sites and ensured that an outsider passed through concentric zones of increasing levels of exclusivity.[155] Approached from the north (from Dalton), the path to the claustral complex passed through the gate in the outer precinct wall. A *capella extra portam* (dated to the mid-fourteenth century) lay immediately east. The path led to the main gatehouse accompanied by a penticed wall to the east, and passed through

---

[153] Relevant discussion of architecture and structural remains are: William Henry St John Hope, 'The Abbey of St Mary in Furness, Lancashire', *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society*, 16 (1900), 221–302; William Henry St John Hope, *The Abbey of St Mary in Furness, Lancashire* (Kendal: T. Wilson, 1902), although this is now obsolete regarding the guesthouse; J. C. Dickinson, 'Furness Abbey: An Archaeological Reconsideration', *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society*, 67 (1967), 51–80; J. C. Dickinson, 'Furness Abbey', *Archaeological Journal*, 127 (1970), 267–69; J. C. Dickinson, *Furness Abbey* (London: English Heritage, 1989), which is a revised edition of his earlier 1965 H.M.S.O. survey; 'Gazetteer', p. 119; Stuart A. Harrison and Jason Wood, *Furness Abbey* (London: English Heritage, 1998); Hall, 'East of the Cloister', pp. 203–04.

[154] 'Houses of Cistercian Monks: The Abbey of Furness', in *A History of the County of Lancaster*, ed. by William Farrer and John Brownbill, 8 vols (London: Victoria County History, 1908), II, 114–31 (p. 114); Edmund King, 'Stephen of Blois, Count of Mortain and Boulogne', *English Historical Review*, 115 (2000), 271–96 (p. 279); Janet Burton, 'Furness, Sauvigny, and the Cistercian World', in *Jocelin of Furness*, ed. by Clare Downham (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2013), pp. 7–16.

[155] Dickinson, 'Furness Abbey: An Archaeological Reconsideration', p. 52. The description of Furness's physical remains conveyed in these four paragraphs has been drawn from Dickson's reassessment.

the gatehouse, consisting of a two-bay vaulted porch and a hall, with chambers either side. (fig. 2.16) East of the gatehouse lay a large guest hall and a kitchen.[156] A two-storey chamber block constituted its southern end. In the area north of the church two sets of foundations were found at different depths, the earlier dating from the late twelfth century.[157] These foundations were thought to be the remains of guesthouses. The earliest foundations had a west-facing doorway, the base of which was carved with cable moulding. On the doorsill a nine men's morris board was etched.[158] The porch led into a courtyard, only the south border of which was found.[159] The porch and east wall of the courtyard was moved eastward in the early fourteenth century, when the floor was laid three feet higher than that previous.[160] The (putative) guesthouse was therefore in operation throughout the thirteenth century.

On the south side of the courtyard were two square chambers of unknown function, but which could be for guests or corrodians. The eastern chamber measured approximately 7 × 8 metres, the western 7 × 9.8 metres. A thickening of the wall at ground level on the south side of the south wall of these chambers might be an external staircase, indicating that the chambers had a first floor as well. South of this putative guesthouse is another building.[161] It dates to the late fourteenth century, is aligned north-south, having two doorways in its southern wall, one of which leads to an external spiral staircase. Adjoining this structure is a porch around the entrance to the abbey cemetery, northeast of the church. The form of these chambers makes them suitable for guest accommodation.

The arrangements at Furness look irregular at first glance because a guest would enter the church via the (normally restricted) north door. Closer examination shows that they reinforce enclosure. A guest approaching from the gatehouse to the north would move southwards, towards the north wall of the north transept. The putative guest range, consisting of buildings containing hall and chambers, and very suitable for accommodating guests, was positioned between the cloister and the guest, thereby shielding the church from direct approach. Furthermore, a wall formed a boundary between the cemetery northeast of the church and the path leading to the abbey from the north. The overall layout emphasises segregation, with the gatehouse on the periphery regulating access, supported by the guest chambers which kept guests from needing to enter the claustral area.

---

[156] Dickinson, 'Furness Abbey: An Archaeological Reconsideration', p. 64.
[157] Dickinson, 'Furness Abbey: An Archaeological Reconsideration', p. 60.
[158] Dickinson, 'Furness Abbey: An Archaeological Reconsideration', p. 60.
[159] Dickinson, 'Furness Abbey: An Archaeological Reconsideration', p. 60.
[160] Dickinson, 'Furness Abbey: An Archaeological Reconsideration', p. 60.
[161] Dickinson, 'Furness Abbey: An Archaeological Reconsideration', p. 60.

Jervaulx

Jervaulx was founded by tenants of Alan of Brittany, Count of Richmond at Fors (in Wensleydale) in 1145, who gave land to Sauvignac monks who for unknown reasons were in the area.[162] The General Chapter of Sauvigny refused to subject the new community to its immediate affiliation, and instead assigning it to the community recently established at Byland, also a Sauvignac house at that point. The community was taken under comital patronage by Alan's son, Conan, who moved it to Jervaulx in 1156, where the community stabilised and began building up its estates, which were focused on Wensleydale, Swaledale, and Nidderdale.[163]

At Jervaulx there are the remains of two structures in the area west of the western claustral range that were constructed mainly in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries (fig. 2.17).[164] The northernmost was probably a guesthouse for elite guests, but only a length of the western wall and a wall running perpendicular to it (east-west) remains. The layout is reminiscent of north-south aligned hall, probably vaulted, which had services at the southern end (either a kitchen, or a buttery-pantry arrangement). The southern chamber could also have been a solar. There are the remains of a door jamb supporting an arched doorway at the northern end of the remaining western wall. The southernmost structure is the lay brothers' infirmary, with the latrines, which connect the infirmary to the lay brothers' dormitory, abutting the northern end. Of the second structure only the western wall remains, with slight masonry fragments indicating where the south end was. Although the exact internal arrangements are not precisely determined, the presence of a main hall and chambers, potentially services or solars, means that the structures would make suitable guest accommodation.

Looked at in plan, Jervaulx conforms to the first phase's spatial arrangement of increasingly exclusive zones of access. The gatehouse to the north regulated access to an inner enclosure north and west of the cloister and church, wherein lay guest accommodation. There was no reason for the guest to enter further, reinforcing notions of segregation of people within the precinct.

---

[162] For the full foundation narrative see Philip of Byland, *The Foundation History of the Abbeys of Byland and Jervaulx*, ed. and trans. by Janet Burton, Borthwick Texts and Studies, 35 (York: Borthwick Institute, 2006).

[163] Burton, *Monastic Order in Yorkshire*, pp. 194, 199.

[164] Relevant accounts of architecture and structural remains are: Brakspear and Hope; Nikolaus Pevsner, *Buildings of England: Yorkshire — North Riding* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966), pp. 203–05; Fergusson, *Solitude*, pp. 84, 129; Robinson and others, pp. 128–29; M. Jecock, *Jervaulx Abbey, Richmondshire, North Yorkshire*, 1999, pp. esp. 13–15, 34, 36, 39–41; Hall, 'East of the Cloister', pp. 204–06.

Overview of Early Cistercian Guest Accommodation

The structural arrangements that the Cistercians adopted for the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries follow a similar pattern. The guesthouse was constructed in conjunction with other hospitality structures so that a series of zones were created that allowed the community to regulate access to the inner court, and thence to the cloister. The guesthouse typically lay between gatehouse and church, or next to a main route into the monastery. This arrangement obtains at Buckfast, Fountains, Furness, and Jervaulx, as shown above, all dating to the twelfth century. Further examples may be found at Kirkstall, Waverly (*c.* 1200; fig. 2.18),[165] and Tintern (fig. 2.19, fig. 2.20, fig. 2.21).[166] Possible examples come from Sawley in the 1170s;[167] and Croxden and Robertsbridge in the mid to late thirteenth century.[168] The most problematic example is Coggeshall, which had guesthouse east of the cloister, near the abbot's lodging, which became more common in the fourteenth century. This may have been due to presence of a road in the abbey at the time that they were constructed, in which case it would fulfil the same function of shielding the cloister, as at other sites.

This common arrangement of gatehouse, guesthouse, and cloister, forming concentric zones, may be characterised as segregation. It reinforced separation between guests and community by interposing distance between the two. In a typically arranged Cistercian house, east of the cloister was for the community, the western range for the lay brethren, and the western side of the inner court for guests creating three distinct zones (demonstrated with reference to Fountains in fig. 2.13). The western range was a bulwark for the cloister, and presented a physical and symbolic barrier to outsiders.[169] In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries it was populated by lay brethren, whose role was oriented towards secular activity. In many Cistercian abbeys, including Kirkstall, a wall cut off the western range from the cloister, thus creating a lane. This has been interpreted as a lay brothers' yard, or 'cloister'

---

[165] Brakspear, *Waverley Abbey*, pp. 75–77; Fergusson, *Solitude*, pp. 153–54.

[166] Courtney.

[167] Fergusson, *Solitude*, pp. 143–45; Robinson and others, p. 170; Glyn Coppack and Colin Hayfield, 'Sawley Abbey: The Architecture and Archaeology of a Smaller Cistercian Abbey', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 155 (2002), 22–114 (p. 104); Glyn Coppack, '"According to the Form of the Order": The Earliest Cistercian Buildings in England and Their Context', in *Perspectives for an Architecture of Solitude: Essays on Cistercians, Art and Architecture in Honour of Peter Fergusson*, ed. by Terryl N. Kinder, Cîteaux: Studia et Documenta, 13; Medieval Church Studies, 11 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), pp. 35–45 (p. 42).

[168] For Croxden: G. M. Hills, 'Croxden Abbey and Its Chronicle', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 21 (1865), 294–315 (pp. 294–98, 312); Peter Ellis, 'Croxden Abbey, Staffordshire: Report on Excavations, 1956–57 and 1975–77', *Journal of the Staffordshire Historical and Archaeological Society*, 36 (1997), 29–51 (pp. 32–33, 35, 36, 42, 48); also see fig. 4b on p. 35, fig. 8 on 42; Jackie Hall, 'Croxden Abbey: Buildings and Community' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of York, 2003), I, pp. 28–29. For Robertsbridge: Fergusson, *Solitude*, pp. 140–41; Robinson and others, p. 164.

[169] Newman, p. 101.

and underscored the physical separation of the community from the 'outer' zones.[170] Each zone had all that it required in terms of water supply, sanitation, and ancillary buildings for the preparation of food or for sleeping. The structural arrangements obviated the need for passage between different zones. This accords with the precepts of the *Ecclesiastica Officia*, which assign specific roles and spheres of influence to officials and community members, and is an exaggerated structural expression of the *Rule of Benedict*'s precept to keep facilities separate.[171] It also supports the idea of Cistercian architecture in the twelfth century as promoting 'solitude'. This does not mean that hospitable provision was poor, certainly not in terms of the standard of accommodation assigned to guests, but it did ensure solitude for the community. The concern to provide well-equipped facilities grew out of the care Cistercians took to provide hospitality: it demonstrates interaction with wider society, albeit in a form not necessitating personal interaction. It was this willingness to interact with wider society within their precincts that helped to determine the structural arrangements adopted in succeeding centuries, as detailed below.

2.5

TRANSITION: CHANGING APPROACHES TO HOSPITALITY (*C.* 1300–*C.* 1400)

The next period of development of Cistercian guest accommodation began during the later thirteenth century, and continued through until about the end of the fourteenth. It consisted of guest accommodation shifting from the western side of the precinct into areas previously exclusive to choir monks, typically by the construction of a hall near or joined onto the abbot's lodging.[172] The pattern is confused by the appearance of many other chambers around the monastery the function of which is difficult to determine, but two important structures exhibit change: the western range and abbot's lodging.

The Western Range and Enclosure in Cistercian Abbeys

One feature of great importance is the purpose to which the western range was put. If a guest

---

[170] Fergusson and Harrison, pp. 56–58; David Robinson and Stuart Harrison, 'Cistercian Cloisters in England and Wales', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 159 (2006), 131–207 (p. 154); Cassidy-Welch, pp. 168–75.

[171] See chapter 1.5.

[172] Hall, 'East of the Cloister', p. 211.

required access, passage into the cloister was usually via a ground-floor corridor running east to west across the width of the western range, as at Kirkstall (fig 2.4). From here, a guest would walk along the southern range of the cloister until reaching a passage leading eastwards to the area of the abbey containing the abbot's lodging and its ancillary buildings.[173]

How open this passage actually was is a matter for debate. In 1217 the matter was raised in the General Chapter and the following statute was given:

> Because the tranquillity of enclosures (*claustralium ... tranquilitas*) is disturbed by the abundance (*frequentia*) of seculars, it is appointed that there should be two people who take turns to sit at the doors of the cloister, who should endeavour diligently to send away seculars desiring entry; and they should abstain from the canonical hours: while one of them is absent, the other should remain in the cloister, and meanwhile they should be freed from labour.[174]

This statute suggests a number of important points. First, it states that tranquillity is desired state of the cloister, as the first phase's arrangement promotes. Second, it reveals that there were enough guests to disrupt the pattern of claustral life, and it must be remembered that the majority of the monastic day outside the canonical hours was lived in the cloister.[175] Despite the language, this need not mean that crowds of people were entering the precinct, but it was a persistent enough problem to prompt the General Chapter to act. Third, the mention of doors reveals that the passage could be closed although perhaps not locked during the day.[176] Fourth, it caused the community to draw more of their community into maintenance of boundaries. In effect, this statute created a new minor post within the monastic community's hierarchy, although it does not state to whom they are subordinated. This would have altered Cistercian practice so that it more closely resembled the Benedictines, in whose customaries the position of keeper of the parlour is noted.[177] This statute suggests strain on the spatial segregation that Cistercians relied upon to maintain 'tranquillity', and was introduced to make good a defect in the provision of the *Ecclesiastica Officia*. The Benedictines, who customarily had their guest accommodation located in the western range or a building adjoining the cloister, had already made provision for it.

---

[173] Rowell, pp. 82–83.

[174] *Statuta*, I, 1217:7.

[175] Burton and Kerr, pp. 103–108, 117–121.

[176] E. M. Thompson, *The Customary of St Augustine's, Canterbury, and St Peter's, Westminster*, Henry Bradshaw Society, 2 vols (London: Henry Bradshaw Society, 1902), II, p. 158, ln. 36–p. 159 ln. 4, as cited in Kerr, p. 61.

[177] Kerr, pp. 76–77 and 69; also see p. 69, n. 147 for references.

The role of the western range within Cistercian precincts is one that becomes increasingly problematic after the twelfth century. As stated, it was the more 'worldly' of the ranges and was used for such functions as storage of the community's provisions in the *cellarium*, the lay brothers' refectory as well, with the accommodation of the community's lay brethren on the first floor. There would also be rooms such as a parlour in which conversations pertinent to monastic administration were permitted. At Kirkstall, there was an outer parlour that was entered from the north, that is, from the area lying immediately to the west of the western end of the church; members of the community were able to access this room via a doorway connecting the parlour with the northern end of the western walkway of the cloister.[178] There was another parlour for the community's use located on the eastern range of the cloister as well, again emphasising the duplication of facilities to prevent disruption to the brethren.[179]

The arrangements that this statute describe changed later in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries with the decline of the lay brethren. The use to which spaces that they had formerly occupied were put is not clear. Buildings such as the lay brothers' range or the lay brothers' infirmary would have made ideal candidates for conversion to hospitality, as they were situated on the western portion of the precinct and intended to accommodate large numbers of people. Reception areas in the western range or very nearby were common in Benedictine houses, for example Battle Abbey in *c.* 1200.[180] Below are some examples that show how conversion of the western range could be used after the disappearance of the lay brethren.

Croxden

At Croxden there are some buildings the function of which is not determined for definite, but could potentially be guest accommodation; they are dated to the fourteenth century (fig. 2.22).[181] Directly east of the eastern range is a large rectangular building, 'Building 1', arranged on a north-south axis. There are some stone table legs between two responds forming the eastern side of southernmost-but-one bay, indicating that it was intended for the

---

[178] Hope and Bilson, p. 56.

[179] Burton and Kerr, pp. 73, 117.

[180] Rowell, p. 80; Harold Brakspear, 'The Abbot's House at Battle', *Archaeologia*, 83 (1934); J. N. Hare, *Battle Abbey: The Eastern Range and the Excavations of 1978–80*, Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England, Archaeological Report, 2 (London: Historic Buidings and Monuments Commission for England, 1985), p. 12.

[181] The most comprehensive and detailed analysis of Croxden is Hall, 'Croxden Abbey'.

reception of people, the identity of whom has not been determined.[182] There is dispute over the attribution of the buildings in his area of the precinct. Ellis has raised doubt over Lynam's statement that Building 1 was the thirteenth-century infirmary, and suggests that it was the abbot's hall, dated to the fourteenth century, with the abbot's private chamber over the chapel at the centre of the eastern wall.[183] Pottery finds from the eastern end of Building 1 include sherds from 5 jugs and 2 bowls, and a skillet handle, reflecting the consumption of food and drink in this area. Similar ceramic evidence was also found in nearby areas. As well, a tile from Building 1 displayed the Beauchamp family arms, indicating that the interior was intended to be viewed, though whether by members of the community or outsiders is unknown.[184]

Another potential guest structure is 'Building 2' to the southeast of Building 1, possibly of the first-floor hall type, although the formation of the window suggests only a ground floor with a two-storey western solar block.[185] It is aligned north-west to south-east, is divided along its length by three pillars which form four bays (rib-vaulted) and a western fifth bay of two floors which was partitioned; it dates from *c.* 1335/6 and built by Abbot Richard Shepished (r. 1329–?1368).[186] A spiral staircase is situated in the northwestern corner; west of this was a main doorway leading either to the infirmary cloister or the principal cloister. Much of the east, south and west walls remain. An internal spiral staircase is worked into the northwestern quoin-stones. The western bay was partitioned subsequent to construction, and the ground floor was paved with rough flagstone. The eastern room had a stone bench along the south wall and a hooded fireplace in the centre of its eastern wall — an exceptional arrangement, as in-wall flues were usually constructed in side walls.[187] The surviving window's size suggests a later date than that of Building 1.[188]

Both Building 1 and Building 2 were connected via a covered walkway (either timber penticed or stone vaulted) leading (moving east to west) around the eastern side of the monks' latrines and along the eastern face eastern claustral range, linking with the slype that lead into the cloister.[189] In this way Building 2 (the putative guest hall) formed part of network of the conventual buildings through its fabric, and was also linked to the services at the southeastern corner of Building 1. The walkway was glazed, and a glass shard was

---

182 Ellis, p. 38 and fig. 4b.
183 Ellis, p. 48.
184 Ellis, pp. 44–46.
185 Hall, 'Croxden Abbey', p. 88.
186 Ellis, p. 33 and fig. 4b.
187 P. A. Faulkner, 'Domestic Planning from the Twelfth to the Fourteenth Centuries', *Archaeological Journal*, 115 (1960), 150–83 (p. 178).
188 Ellis, p. 48; Hall, 'Croxden Abbey', pp. 86–88.
189 Ellis, p. 36.

found of twelfth- or thirteenth-century type.[190] While it is clear that the structure east of the cloister were intended for the reception of groups of people in a domestic setting, it is not clear who the identity of these people were from the finds in the structures, or from the form of the structures, but both buildings, particularly Building 2, have the potential to be guest accommodation. If one of these buildings was the abbot's lodging, it was of a size suitable for the entertainment of guests.

A guest house is mentioned in Croxden's chronicle, and whether the guest house remains are extant or not rests on interpretation of a short passage: the 'Botelston' house (*domus*), completed under Abbot John of Billesdon (r. 1284–1293), collapsed 'from the church up to the guest hall' in 1369.[191] This is usually taken to mean the western range, but it could be a freestanding structure. Hall has observed that it was constructed using great timbers and disproportionately more roof shingles than the other claustral ranges.[192] The ground floor of the structure acted as a cellar, but the first floor may have acted as a guest hall, certainly after the Black Death when the number of lay brothers most probably declined. All but three 'couples' (three pier pairs, or two bays) collapsed and required rebuilding in 1368.

Cleeve and Rufford

Conversion of the western range in lodgings is witnessed in the fifteenth century, indicating that a transition had taken place. At Cleeve Abbey (Somerset) during the abbacy of David Juyner (r. 1435–1487) the western range was extensively reworked at a time approximately contemporaneous with the south range chambers and hall (fig. 2.23). The northern and southern ends of the range were reconstructed in stone and extended eastwards onto the cloister walk to support first-floor extensions. The north end contained a chamber, the south a kitchen to serve the hall; the chronology of changes is obscured by post-Dissolution alterations, however.[193] At Rufford Abbey (Nottinghamshire) all that survives of monastic buildings above ground is the western range. In the fifteenth century the northern end of the range was vaulted, possibly to support first-floor accommodation for the abbot, although this attribution is not definite.[194] Although both these do not confirm the presence of guests in the

---

[190] Ellis, p. 42 and fig. 8.5.

[191] '[C]ecidit ab ecclesia usque ad hostium aule': Hall, 'Croxden Abbey', I, pp. 28–29.

[192] Hall, 'Croxden Abbey', pp. 28–29.

[193] Buckle, pp. 113–15; Gilyard-Beer, *Cleeve Abbey, Somerset*, pp. 23–29.

[194] Robinson and others, p. 168; Christine McGee and Joanne Perkins, 'A Study of the Cistercian Abbey at Rufford, Nottinghamshire', in *Southwell and Nottinghamshire: Medieval Art, Architecture, and Industry*, ed. by Jennifer S. Alexander, British Archaeological Association, Conference Transactions, 21 (Leeds: British Archaeological Association, 1998), pp. 83–92.

western range, they do demonstrate that it was converted to higher standard accommodation.

Roche

Evidence for changes to the western range is also found at Roche. In the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century the lay brothers' infirmary (a thirteenth-century structure) was converted into lodgings (fig. 2.24).[195] Much fabric remains at a low level of elevation. The building's layout made it extremely suitable for such a conversion, and the basic arrangement of a three-aisled hall (running north to south), divided internally into three bays in the northern apartment resembled purpose-built Cistercian guesthouses closely. There is a screen at the southern end of this structure, probably to form the services with a solar over; this block southern block has foundations of two different dates, suggesting change in function. The hall's east and west walls each had fireplaces, but when the southwestern section of the hall was partitioned off to form two discrete chambers the section of the fireplace remaining in the hall was blocked up.[196] The northern wall abuts the brook on the latter's southern side, the space over the brook being formed into latrines. Given that the lay brother's infirmary had been converted, it can be assumed that the lay brothers no longer required the latrines for their exclusive use — similarly with the lay brothers' refectory in the southern section of the western range north of the brook.

Flaxley

The development of the western range is difficult to trace due to lack of surviving examples. An important survival is Flaxley Abbey, where the western range remains in excellent condition (fig. 2.25).[197] Here, the fabric was converted during the fourteenth century, perhaps because of Edward III's visits to the abbey: a suggestive reference to hospitality at Flaxley is made in 1353, when Edward granted to Flaxley a yearly payment of £36 9s. 1d. in recompense for the depredations of his woodland beasts on the abbey's lands, and 'our various and frequent

---

[195] Nikolaus Pevsner, *Buildings of England: Yorkshire — The West Riding*, ed. by Enid Radcliffe, rev. edn (London: Penguin, 1974), pp. 414–17; Robinson and others, p. 167; Hall, 'East of the Cloister', p. 201.

[196] Alexander Hamilton Thompson, *Roche Abbey, Yorkshire*, Ancient Monuments and Historic Buildings Series (London: H.M.S.O., 1954), p. 15.

[197] J. H. Middleton, 'Flaxley Abbey: The Existing Remains', *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society*, 6 (1881), 280–83; F. H. Crawley-Boevey, 'Flaxley Abbey', *Archaeological Journal*, 77 (1920), 445–47; F. H. Crawley-Boevey, 'Some Recent Discoveries at Flaxley Abbey, Glos., and Their Relation to Mr. Middleton's Plan Made in 1881', *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society*, 43 (1921), 57–62.

sojourns'.[198] The building in which Edward lodged is not certain, but a good candidate is the western range.

The western range is a first-floor hall of five rib-vaulted bays, the southernmost two being latrines, built *c.* 1200. The building was traditionally known as 'the Abbot's Lodge', although it was recognised in the nineteenth century that it fulfilled hospitality functions as well due to the nature of the abbot's office.[199] The decoration may be representative of its use: the cornice and the corbels were embattled, both reminiscent of military architecture.[200] The first-floor chamber at the southern end of the western range underwent modification at some point during the fourteenth century. Four arrow-slit windows of probably twelfth-century date (judging from style) were discovered in the south wall of the chamber. The installation of two larger windows of probable fourteenth-century date indicate that the room had been repurposed for habitation, as does the insertion of a fireplace.[201] This was probably due to the decline in the lay brethren after the Black Death, though this chronology is speculative. The upper floor of this range was used as the guest quarters.[202] The exact function of the chambers in the western range cannot be ascertained definitely, but as accommodation it would have been high quality.

The significance of Flaxley is that it provides a potential path of modification for western ranges after the decline of the lay brethren during the fourteenth century. The conversion of the western range removed the mediating space between the secluded eastern locales (in a typical Cistercian arrangement) reserved to choir monks and the western areas open to outsiders. The lay brethren, instituted to facilitate the community's activities in the wider world, were no longer present to act as a barrier. The western range instead became a place of hospitality wherein seculars could be housed, breaking the neat scheme of tripartite segregation commonly found in the spatial organisation of Cistercian precincts of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. At Flaxley, major change within the community had opened space within the precinct, which was then used to facilitate greater provision of hospitality.

---

[198] '[V]arios et frequentes accessus nostros': A. W. Crawley-Boevey, *The Cartulary and Historical Notes of the Cistercian Abbey of Flaxley, Otherwise Called Dene Abbey, in the County of Gloucestershire* (Exeter: William Pollard, 1887), p. 116.

[199] Middleton, p. 281.

[200] Middleton, p. 282.

[201] F. H. Crawley-Boevey, 'Some Recent Discoveries at Flaxley Abbey, Glos., and Their Relation to Mr. Middleton's Plan Made in 1881', p. 59.

[202] Robinson and others, p. 109.

Fountains

The abbot's lodging was first constructed in the 1160s under Richard of Clairvaux (r. 1150–1170). It was modified under Walter Coxwold (r. 1316–1336), who converted the cellar into a prison of three cells, enlarged the first-floor accommodation by removing a partition and added a chamber (10 × 10 metres) in the monks' latrine, which adjoined the lodging on the latter's western side (fig. 2.14). Fireplaces and latrines were added. For context, the size of Coxwold's hall was equivalent to that at Byland, slightly larger than Kirkstall's and much larger than that of Jervaulx.[203] It was perhaps Abbot William Gower (r. 1369–84) who added the first floor to the infirmary cloister walk that linked the lodging to the new chapel over the chapter house via first-floor galleries and perhaps the Chapel of Nine Altars as well.[204] The development of the abbot's lodging is not a sweeping architectural gesture, but it provides indication that there was a growing emphasis on the reception of guests there, as indicated by the enlarged reception hall and provision of fireplaces. The link to the chapel would facilitate religious provision for high-status guests as well as the abbot himself — this was a feature that the guesthouses at Fountains lacked, as was the case at Kirkstall. The abbot's lodging was being developed parallel to the guesthouses, which were having boundary walls added and extra chambers installed, either for monastic officials, as increased guest accommodation, or possible for corrodians.[205] The abbot's lodge at Fountains was developed in the fifteenth century, and is discussed below.

Furness

The development of the abbot's lodging at Furness follows trends seen elsewhere. The old infirmary was converted in the early fourteenth century into the abbot's lodging (fig. 2.15).[206] The hall, previously of five bays, was later vaulted in ten compartments, resting on four central columns.[207] The first-floor hall was extended to the west by the erection on the ground floor of four arched buttresses. There was similar expansion to the east, with the arches being set into the rock of the adjacent cliff, which had three divisions: a solar measuring 12.2 × 7 metres (40 × 23 feet), a chapel measuring 11.6 × 4 metres (38 × 13 feet) and another chamber

---

[203] Coppack, *Fountains Abbey*, pp. 100–01.

[204] Coppack, *Fountains Abbey*, pp. 75, 77.

[205] Coppack, *Fountains Abbey*, p. 63.

[206] The following information is from Hope, 'Furness Abbey', pp. 290–97; Some of Hope's observation are criticised and amended in Dickinson, 'Furness Abbey: An Archaeological Reconsideration', pp. 58–59. Hall remarks that the infirmary may in fact have been an abbot's lodging from the beginning: Hall, 'East of the Cloister', pp. 203–04.

[207] Hope, 'Furness Abbey', pp. 290, 292.

measuring 7 × 4.3 metres (23 × 14 feet).[208] All these protruded from the south wall of the ground floor hall in order to provide access to the first-floor garderobe. The first-floor hall was screened at the north in the usual manner of an elite domestic structure. Access to this hall was altered in the fifteenth century, to allow for a new chamber where the previous stairs entered the hall.[209]

There were living quarters on the first floor of the north end of the infirmary, which lay to the southeast of the kitchen. These were reached by an internal stairway and consisted of: two chambers over the infirmary chapel; a lobby and another chamber of the kitchen and buttery; a gallery and perhaps an oratory above the kitchen passage. A potential use for such quarters would be housing corrodians, monastic officials, retired abbots, or even guests.

A quadrangular block measuring 15.2 × 13.4 metres (50 × 44 feet) lay east of the dormitory. It was divided into two chambers. The north was larger and had stair in the north-east corner to the first floor. The southern chamber had a bench along the length of its southern wall, and a fire place at the eastern end.[210] Hope states that this may have been the visiting abbot's lodging, but this is speculative and it could easily have been used to receive guests.[211]

The arrangements at Furness are an excellent example of how the use of space changed. New, spacious areas were added that could be used for a variety of purposes, but they are arrayed around the abbot's lodging and provide ample space for the reception and lodging of assemblies of guests.

Jervaulx

Jervaulx had a particularly well-developed complex south-east of the cloister. The attribution of this complex of buildings has been re-evaluated by Hall, who argues that functions attributed to the structures by Hope and Brakspear, while precise, mask the ambiguity of the arrangements. Hall has raised the possibility what Hope and Brakspear labelled the infirmary could in fact be the abbot's lodging. The infirmary had two-floors and an adjoining chapel (fig. 2.17). The fact that the ground floor had a fireplace, indicating domestic use rather than storage, and the transomed and traceried windows on the first-floor indicate high status.[212] Further east was a later addition, a first-floor hall lying east-west, 12.6 × 5.5 metres (41 ×

208 Hope, 'Furness Abbey', p. 292.
209 Hope, 'Furness Abbey', pp. 293–94.
210 Hope, 'Furness Abbey', p. 299.
211 Dickinson, 'Furness Abbey: An Archaeological Reconsideration', p. 59.
212 Hall, 'East of the Cloister', p. 205.

17 feet). The structure dates to the fourteenth century, and was could easily have acted as a reception for guests.[213] The lodging marked 'infirmarer's lodging' is later and dates to the sixteenth century. Hall proposes that the infirmary did not lie in this complex at all, but was located further east, in an area now devoid of any fabric except the base of the main drain.[214] Jervaulx's arrangements are intricate and not entirely determined, but the facilities were such that guests would easily have accommodated there.

Melrose

An early example of a large abbot's hall, described as the 'magnam cameram abbatis que est super ripam aque' in the *Chronicle of Melrose*, was built in *c.* 1246 by Abbot Matthew (r. 1241–1261).[215] The hall measured internally approximately 23 × 10 metres (76 × 33 feet), and is therefore approximate to Kirkstall's early hall (fig. 2.26). At the eastern end of the south wall was an entrance, which was tiled, indicating a porch.[216] There is ambiguity in the interpretation this building. An updated ground plan (1962 and later) shows that it was an aisled hall, with two rows of pillars forming a central nave and two side aisles.[217] The structure delineated is of five bays' length, with two lines of central pillars dividing the width into a central nave and two side aisles; this would make it a hall of the type seen at Fountains and Kirkstall. Meanwhile, the *Royal Commission* survey highlights three buttresses on the external face of the eastern gable wall, positioned so as to carry the thrust of internal vaulting, suggesting that it was of the first-floor type of hall found at sites such as Fountains, and is more usually associated with abbatial lodgings. An explicit reference to the relation between structural form and status is found in the chronicle of St Albans, which states that the new guest hall may be called 'royal' hall because it is vaulted, and of double arrangement (that is, with two-storeys).[218] Whichever form the building had, it demonstrates the centrality of the abbot to provision of hospitality, and the melding of abbatial quarters with guest accommodation.

---

[213] Coppack, *Fountains Abbey*, pp. 100–01.

[214] Hall, 'East of the Cloister', p. 205.

[215] *The Chronicle of Melrose: From the Cottonian Manuscript, Faustina B. IX in the British Museum — a Complete and Full-Size Facsimile in Collotype*, Studies in Economics and Political Science, 100 (London: Percy Lund Humphries, 1936), p. 122.

[216] Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland, *An Inventory of the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Roxburghshire*, 2 vols (Edinburgh: H.M.S.O., 1956), II, p. 287.

[217] Marguerite Wood and J. S. Richardson, *Melrose Abbey*, rev. edn (Edinburgh: H.M.S.O., 1981).

[218] Thomas Walsingham, *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani a Thomas Walsingham, Regnate Ricardo Secundo, Ejusdem Ecclesiae Prae Centore, Compilata*, ed. by H. T. Riley, Rolls Series, 4, 3 vols (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1867), I, p. 314; Kerr, p. 80.

In the fourteenth century a hall was added to the western range, which lay on a perpendicular axis to its adjoining building; this would normally be interpreted as either a lay-brothers' infirmary or latrines, but given the late date it is possible that it could represent a conversion to guest accommodation. The latter interpretation would depend to which side of the Black Death the modification was dated, but it is supported by the later insertion (but still within monastic occupation) of an oven in the southern half of the *cellarium*, suggesting the installation of a kitchen to serve guests.[219]

Tintern

The development of Tintern's abbot's lodging is well understood and has been set forth recently (fig. 2.20).[220] The lodging was built in the early thirteenth century, and consisted of a smaller chamber with a fireplace and a larger chamber to the east. This lodging was superseded by the construction of a great hall, *c.* 1330–50. The hall lay on a north-south axis immediately northeast of the *camera*. Only ground-floor rooms survive, but they are highly decorated, with moulding round the entrances and superior buttresses, indicating considerable financial investment. The abbot's own chamber block abutted the hall's eastern midway along its length, lying east-west; it had two floors and chapel at its southeastern corner. A porch lay immediately north of where the north wall of the abbot's chamber block joined the eastern wall of the hall; this had an impressive door facing east, towards the river. It is possible that it contrived to impress guests arriving from a landing at the river.[221] That guests arrived from this direction provides much greater justification for the location of the quarters, but as shown by developments elsewhere this need not be the sole cause. Overall, Tintern's abbot's lodging was fully equipped to entertain high-status guests easily, while others would still be able to lodge in the guesthouse located west of the church.

Overview of Transitions in Cistercian Guest Accommodation

The transitional phase is difficult to detect and interpret. Its principal feature is altered use of space, where areas previously dedicated to the community are re-purposed to be areas suited to receiving outsiders. The evidence in many cases is ambiguous: it is difficult to know which changes represent a fundamental shift in function, and which merely elaborate on previous

---

[219] Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland, ii, p. 286.

[220] The following information has been drawn from O. E. Craster, *Tintern Abbey, Monmouthshire* (London: H.M.S.O., 1956), esp. pp. 5–7, 18–19; Robinson, *Cistercians in Wales*, pp. 280–83, 287; David M. Robinson, *Tintern Abbey*, 5th edn (Cardiff: Cadw, 2011), pp. 64–65.

[221] Robinson, *Tintern Abbey*, p. 64.

arrangements; analysis is also marred by poor survival rates in the case of the western range.

Although slim, there is evidence that the western range in Cistercian was re-used as accommodation, and at Flaxley there is the plausible suggestion that the king inhabited it when visiting. The reason for conversion of the west range should be sought in the changing socio-economic climate and makeup of the community, in particular the declining lay brother. At Meaux Abbey the decline is well documented: ninety lay brothers in the thirteenth century, seven a century later, and none after the Black Death. As James France has shown, there were many reasons for the decline, including the shift from direct exploitation of estates to leasing, the growth of town which drew great population, the advent of the friars, and socio-economic conditions such as the Great Famine of 1315–1317 and the Black Death.[222] During the thirteenth century the economic networks of Cistercian abbeys were changing in nature, with increasing number of leases meaning a corresponding decrease in direct management of estates. The call for lay brothers to supervise estates in the abbey's interests slackened as a result.[223] The Black Death drastically reduced all monastic populations, and reinforced a pre-existing trend of declining numbers particularly among lay brethren.[224] Monasteries were, in effect, under-populated considering the numbers that buildings were intended to house. The western ranges were no longer needed for the lay brethren, and could be more usefully turned into accommodation for menial servants, hired employees, or lower-order guests, or converted into good quality accommodation for monastic officials or guests.[225] The decrease in the number of lay brothers was noted by the General Chapter as early as 1274, when the following statute was published:

> Since at the present time the Order is suffering much need of lay brethren, and it
> is proper that lay brethren be engaged in better and more respectable business, it
> is permitted by the authority of the General Chapter that those who desire should
> cause to serve in their kitchens as servants lay men who are not of doubtful character,
> but are of good repute and respectable living.[226]

---

[222] James France, *Separate but Equal: Cistercian Lay Brothers, 1120–1350*, Cistercian Studies, 246 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012), pp. 306–15.

[223] France, pp. 306–08; Robert Wright, 'Casting down the Altars', p. 121, estimates an average of three lay brothers per grange at Kirkstall, which could only mean a supervisory, rather than labouring, role.

[224] Burton and Kerr, pp. 158–60.

[225] Rowell, p. 80.

[226] *Statuta*, III, 1274;12: '[c]um praesenti tempore Ordo multam patiatur penuriam converorum, et ipsos conversos maioribus et honestioribus negotiis deceat occupari, permittitur auctoritate Capituli generalis ut qui voluerint in coquinis per servientes laicos non suspectos, sed bonae famae et conversationis honestae, sibi faciat deservire'.

The statute shows not only the recognition within the Cistercian Order that their communities were changing, but also that lay people were potentially replacing individuals who were previously professed members of the community. Lay servants were not bound to live the communal life as laid down in the *Rule of Benedict*, *Ecclesiastica Officia*, and the *Usus Conversorum*, the lay brothers' usages. Such individuals were not required to sleep in a common dormitory in the abbey, which meant that there would be more space for the community to re-purpose as it deemed appropriate.

On the other side of the cloister, the most readily identifiable development is the addition of extra halls near the abbot's lodge, or the expansion of the abbot's lodge to include such a hall. This process becomes more explicit in the fifteenth century and later. The exact function of abbot's lodgings is not always clear in the long fourteenth century, but it is evident that they were becoming larger. The increase in size and scale indicates that it was no longer reserved for the abbot alone. Halls were added in or near the abbot's lodging at Croxden Fountains, and Tintern Abbey, and many other sites, all in the early fourteenth century.

The changes are made easier to detect by improvements in facilities provided, which during the thirteenth century led to an increasing number of self-contained chambers. These typically consisted of an antechamber, included a fireplace, and a bedchamber either adjacent or over.[227] In many respects, these chambers appear as diminutive abbot's lodgings. Their function has been debated, and it could be that these were indeed the lodgings of officials, such as the prior, cellarer, sacrist, or visiting abbots.[228] Certainly there would have been many abbots travelling through the country in the late summer and early autumn, travelling to the General Chapter and back. A third possibility is that these small chambers represent provision for corrodians.[229] Architecturally speaking, the functions of these rooms are indistinguishable and cannot be determined without either detailed textual evidence or small finds to provide information regarding the occupants' identity.

It must be emphasised that guesthouses continued to be developed in parallel with

---

[227] Bell observes a differentiation in terminology in Cistercian statutes, where *cella* denotes a partition screen within a larger room, while *camera* is a whole room. These structures would be considered, and indeed are often termed, *camerae*. David N. Bell, 'Chambers, Cells, and Cubicles: The Cistercian General Chapter and the Development of the Private Room', in *Perspectives for an Architecture of Solitude: Essays on Cistercians, Art and Architecture in Honour of Peter Fergusson*, ed. by Terryl N. Kinder, Cîteaux: Studia et Documenta, 13; Medieval Church Studies, 11 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), pp. 187–98 (p. 191).

[228] Hall draws attention to the label 'Visiting Abbot's Lodging' provided on the ground-plans produced by Hope and/or Brakspear, and the unlikelihood of such a well-furnished room being reserved for an individual present for only a few days each year. Kirkstall's 'visiting abbot's lodging' is detailed in Hope and Bilson, pp. 40, 42–43; Hall, 'East of the Cloister', p. 206 and n. 25; Bell, pp. 189–90.

[229] For corrodians at Kirkstall, see chapter 3.2.

new hospitality structures, and the fourteenth century is a time when guest facilities were updated to have the same or superior features as buildings intended for the community. Such developments are witnessed at Kirkstall; at Waverley, where a chamber and porch were added in the fourteenth century;[230] at Buckfast; and Tintern, where a chamber block was added south of the hall in the fifteenth or early sixteenth century.[231] The creation of new facilities did not mean obsolescence of the old, and in most cases the space dedicated to receiving outsiders markedly increased. The financial investment in infrastructure was similarly great. Some structural developments, such as the increasing desire for private chambers, were due to the influence of secular domestic architectural trends, and not therefore born of a desire to provide good hospitality. The subdivision of infirmaries is a good example, although adoption of individual cells may have been due to the influence of religious Orders such as the Carthusians.[232] However, it should be noted that communal structures, such as the dormitory, were not often modernised, and when they were, alterations might fall under the scrutiny of the General Chapter.

The principal feature during this second phase is that areas demarcated for secular use had been extended, and it was the abbot who now had adequate facilities for receiving guests as well as the guest master. The tripartite division of guests, lay brethren and choir monks no longer had clear expression in the structural arrangements (demonstrated with reference to Fountains in fig. 2.14). Structural development was in part driven by the desire to augment guest facilities and hospitable provision. It was the abbot who assumed greater involvement with outsiders, and it was the portion of the precinct dedicated to his use that saw the clearest development. In essence, the role of the abbot as intermediary with the wider world received material expression in the infrastructure and he was being given facilities enabling him to negotiate.

2.6

ABBATIALISATION: LATE-MEDIEVAL CISTERCIAN GUEST ACCOMMODATION (*C.* 1400–1540)

The transitional phase of the long fourteenth century presents many new arrangements,

---

[230] Brakspear, *Waverley Abbey*, pp. 76–77.
[231] For Tintern, see Courtney, pp. 125–26.
[232] Coppack, *Fountains Abbey*, p. 97.

but the direction they were taking is obscured by the myriad possible function and uses to which the buildings might have been put. Buildings constructed from the late fourteenth century onward help elucidate matters. The confusion over the function of the rooms being built on the eastern side of the Cistercian precinct is given much greater clarity by the more substantial constructions of the fifteenth and especially the sixteenth centuries. During this period, Cistercian abbeys had adapted to the new socio-economic environment and were at greater liberty to invest in architecture reflective of contemporary needs. Accordingly abbots enjoyed much greater freedom to construct architecture in keeping with the aesthetic culture of wider society.[233]

This phase of development has been dubbed "abbatialisation" because it displays a number of traits that pertain to the abbatial office. An important aspect witnessed in this phase of guest accommodation is the investment in improving the abbot's lodgings. The case of Forde is particularly striking, but the trend manifests in many poorer houses too. In some cases, this mean reorganising the spatial organisation of the claustral complex so that the scheme of segregation established in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was no longer viable. Rather, the emphasis was on the abbot's duty to receive and handle guests while they were within the precinct, as laid down in the *Rule of Benedict*.[234] In some cases structural re-arrangement is accompanied by aesthetic innovations that were intended to proclaim the abbot's status to wider society, such as coats of arms.[235] In essence, abbots were beginning to approximate more closely the means of social semiology employed by seculars, particularly bishops, which would emphasise their ties to an institution or peer group.[236] The "abbatialisation" of guest accommodation should be viewed in the context of a prominent recent trends in research into late-medieval monasticism, which has highlighted the patronage that abbots bestowed on their own houses,[237] the growing sense of distance between abbot and community,[238] and the interposition of between community and wider society.[239] These

---

[233] Thomas Coomans, 'Cistercian Architecture of Architecture of the Cistercians?', in *The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*, by Mette Birkedal Bruun (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 151–69 (pp. 159–60).

[234] *RB*, 53:3 and 56.

[235] In particular, see Heale, 'Mitres and Arms: Aspects of the Self-Representation of the Monastic Superior in Late Medieval England'.

[236] For late-medieval episcopal practice, C. M. Woolgar, 'Treasure, Material Posessions, and the Bishops of Late Medieval England', in *The Prelate in England and Europe, c. 1300–c. 1560*, ed. by Martin Heale (Woodbridge: York Medieval, 2014), pp. 173–90.

[237] This and the following two studies are all from the same volume, and are highly complementary: Carter, 'Cistercian Abbots as Patrons'.

[238] Martin Heale, 'Monastic Attitudes to Abbatial Magnificence in Late-Medieval England', in *The Prelate in England and Europe, c. 1300–c. 1560*, ed. by Martin Heale (Woodbridge: York Medieval, 2014), pp. 261–76.

[239] Jamroziak, 'Between Cloister and World', esp. 242–44.

trends are witnessed in the physical structure of the abbot's lodging, a brief review of which up to the thirteenth century will now be made.

Development of the Abbot's Lodging

The abbot's lodging had begun to appear as early as the mid-twelfth century, when Abbot Aelred of Rievaulx had the 'Long House' constructed so that when his illness would have otherwise confined him to the infirmary, he could instead stay closer to the brethren.[240] The majority of Cistercian houses did not build such a lodging until the end of the twelfth-century, although by the middle of the thirteenth it was a fairly common feature. The most common place for the abbot's lodging in the precinct was southeast of the cloister. It varied in size, from being a simple bi-partite structure in plan perhaps with a first-floor chamber, to having multiple chambers on as many three floors.[241]

The abbot's lodging was intended as a dedicated space where the abbot could conduct the business of his office and discuss business, politics and spiritual matters with guests, while causing minimal disruption to the choir brethren.[242] It was not, however, intended to duplicate the function of the guest range and act as accommodation for the duration of the stay. This is demonstrated by a statute of 1206, which describes how the abbot of Pairis Abbey (Orbey in Haut-Rhin, Alsace) had been using his chamber (*camera*) as both guesthouse (*hospitium*) and infirmary, besides using it himself.[243] It is possible that the abbot was attempting to impress his guests, or that he simply did not see the need to separate these functions into discrete areas. That the abbots was also charged in the same statute with keeping peacocks (a symbol of vanity) within the cloister, and had received a novice accustomed to eating three meals a day, suggests strongly that he was prone to ostentation and conspicuous consumption.

This statute represents the outlook of an earlier period. In the late twelfth century a process of change began that saw the structure evolve to match more closely the abbot's hospitable duties. Development of the abbot's lodging often occurred in the late fourteenth century, and was very common in the fifteenth. Only a summary of changes is given here;

---

[240] Fergusson and Harrison, pp. 128–29.
[241] Kinder, pp. 355–59.
[242] R. Gilyard-Beer, *Abbeys: An Introduction to the Religious Houses of England Wales*, An Illustrated Guide to the Ancient Monuments, 7, 2nd end (London: H.M.S.O., 1958), p. 31; Coppack, *Abbeys and Priories*, p. 76. The one deed making reference to the abbot's lodging at Kirkstall is just such an occasion.
[243] *Statuta*, I, 1206:72

a thorough study of abbot's lodgings is still required.[244] Priority is given here to those with earlier extant guest accommodation, as this allows the structural changes to be seen more clearly.

The fourteenth century was an important period for the reorganisation of Cistercian communities, just as it was for wider society. Any development in monastic life must be set against the period's dramatic socioeconomic backdrop, although the specific ways in which cultural outlook of religious in the late fourteenth century and after was affected is a topic requiring closer attention, particularly with regard to the religious' perception of secular society.[245] But the crises of the fourteenth remains a useful chronological marker, although ill-defined. There a couple of basic points to be made. The first is the fall in population. With the agrarian crisis of 1315-1317, the Black death of 1348–50, the subsequent epidemics of 1360–62, 1367–69, 1373–75, 1379–83, 1389–93, 1400 (and more besides), at the local or national level, there were few people in the monasteries, and fewer guests to visit them.[246] One estimate of mortality among the religious is as high as 50%, though aggregates should be used with caution.[247] The Cistercians' response to a fall in new vocations, which was due to increasing competition among other religious orders as well as widespread mortality, was to lower the period before which a novice might make their profession to enter the Order.[248] There was great variation in mortality around England and the experiences of the post-Black Death period, but the fall in population and the dramatic changes to the patterns of the labour market saw a marked change in the makeup and outlook of religious community.[249]

One prominent aspect is the change to the sorts of alterations made to the guesthouses as built in the years before the full impact of the socio-economic crises made themselves felt. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, broadly defined, the trend was to increase the capacity on a pattern such that larger households could be supported, with an emphasis

---

[244] The best dedicated discussion of Cistercian abbot's lodgings is David H. Williams, 'Cistercian Abbots' Houses in Medieval Britain', *Cistercium Mater Nostra*, 4 (2010), 37–49. Although I am aware of Ramey Rochelle, 'Abbot's Lodgings of the Cistercian Order in the Late Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries' (unpublished MA thesis, University of York, 1996), due to its bibliographical obscurity it came to my notice too late for inclusion in this thesis.

[245] Though see C. Harper-Bill, 'The English Church and English Religion after the Black Death', in *The Black Death in England*, ed. by W. M. Ormrod and P. G. Lindley (Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1996), pp. 79–123.

[246] Ian Kershaw, 'The Great Famine and Agrarian Crisis in England, 1315–1322', *Past and Present*, 59 (1973), 3–50 (p. 11); Jim Bolton, '"The World Upside down": Plague as an Agent of Economic and Social Chance', in *The Black Death in England*, ed. by W. M. Ormrod and P. G. Lindley (Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1996), pp. 17–78 (pp. 22–30).

[247] David Knowles and R. Neville Hadcock, *Medieval Religious Houses, England and Wales*, 2nd edn (Harlow: Longman, 1971), p. 47.

[248] Harper-Bill, pp. 96–97.

[249] Bolton, pp. 77–78.

on their hierarchy of that household: there would be the solar for the lord, the dais where he would sit at meals, the rest of the household would be arrayed and housed in degrees of decreasing importance from his 'high' point, with lowest serving-hands being housed and fed the furthest from him. The model was essentially unitary, with one elite chamber that would have the best facilities. In the fifteenth century, however, building schemes had shifted so that comfort would be afforded to a more individuals, but typically at the expense of housing as many occupants in the accommodation.[250] This trend has been noted in secular residences, the cause of which is stated as being 'the shift in income distribution and [...] the balance of power between lords and tenants which followed the fourteenth-century plagues'.[251] The guest accommodation, as argued in section 7, was built on a secular pattern, and thus it was natural for Cistercian guest accommodation to follow secular trends. In this way there were a greater number of chambers enjoying the same level of withdrawal from the central public space, conferring greater prestige on those occupying them, as well as the community able to provide them.[252] For structural reasons a fireplace was not always placed in a newly partitioned chamber, but it was a common feature that had, according to Dresbeck, 'widened the gap between social groups' by allowing persistent occupation and performance of task irrespective of the climate: because segregated spaces could be heated, there was less need to congregate around a communal fire.[253] The greater number of chambers was linked to emerging habits that called for more personal surroundings to live 'life on a different scale', including holding conversations with a carefully selected audience, or to discuss business too sensitive for public debate.[254] The main chambers that had existed from the thirteenth century, however, would be large enough to grant audiences of many people, and should not be considered as being the sole reserve of those for whom the size and grandeur of the room would indicate.

The difference in the level of comfort is accompanied by a change in the location of

---

[250] Glyn Coppack, 'The Planning of Cistercian Monasteries in the Late Middle Ages: The Evidence from Fountains, Rievaulx, Sawley and Rushen', in *The Religious Orders of Pre-Reformation England*, ed. by James G. Clark, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion, 18 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002), pp. 197–209 (pp. 200–02).

[251] Diana Webb, *Privacy and Solitude in the Middle Ages* (London; New York: Hambledon Continuum, 2007), p. 103.

[252] Webb, p. 108.

[253] LeRoy Dresbeck, 'The Chimney and Social Change in Medieval England', *Albion*, 3 (1971), 21–32 (p. 22) <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/4048469>.

[254] Martin Hansson, 'The Medieval Aristocracy and the Social Use of Space', in *Reflections: 50 Years of Medieval Archaeology, 1957-2007*, ed. by Roberta Gilchrist and Andrew Reynolds, The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monographs, 30 (Leeds: Maney, 2009), pp. 435–52 (p. 442); Shannon McSheffrey, 'Place, Space, and Situation: Public and Private in the Making of Marriage in Late-Medieval London', *Speculum*, 79 (2004), 960–90 (p. 976) <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0038713400086607>. See the case of Miles de la Haye in chapter 3.2 for an example a carefully selected location, though it was not 'private' in the sense of being personally intimate. Also see chapter 4.3 for the kind of activity that might use these chambers.

the guest accommodation. While existing guest accommodation built in previous centuries continued to be used as such, either for prominent guests or for corrodians, for example, in the later medieval period a phenomenon occurs whereby the abbatial lodging became associated with other hospitality structures, either by exerting a pull on them and drawing them, as it were, closer to itself, or by the abbatial lodging being constructed closer to the area previously associated with secular affairs. A radical change of structures and their location did not occur at all Cistercian sites, as funds or the lack of a substantial need to change the existing facilities might inhibit development, but the common course is evident. The abbatial lodging as described above, usually a two- or possibly three-storey building with a nearby chapel was complemented by the construction of a first-floor hall, which would typically have an undercroft and perhaps an antechamber. These halls were not necessarily domestic — in fact, there is much to suggest that they were fulfilled a role of a kind of 'function room', or venue for business rather than any permanent domestic purpose.

One indicator of the function of the room was how the doorways were set and how access to them was provided. Architectural embellishment would not be wasted on doorways to service chambers, or which would lead to an area of the precinct dedicated to agricultural use of for maintenance (such as pasture, industrial building, or a sluice for the main drain). The grandest designs were reserved for the principal entranceways to be used by the visiting courts on a regular basis, and it is a safe method of determining the 'facing direction' of the building, and how it helped define the spaces intervening buildings. The largest entrances were typically on the ground floor and led into a hall, and had roll-moulded jambs and perhaps carved arches or decorated lintels. Although they were not perhaps remarkable for the aesthetic flair that could mark the principal doorways, efforts were made to distinguish the small service entrances from those that would have been used by the 'people of substance'.[255] Whereas a service entrance would be strictly functional, and be roughly dressed and small, the doorways which led into a main bed chamber would have at the least well dressed stone, usually chamfered (a simple form or architectural elaboration), perhaps with a square lintel or an arch (pointed or Romanesque). Overall, however, the effort expended on doorways was not great for the guest accommodation: there was far more concentration upon the main entrances to the abbey, for example the gatehouse and the west end of the church in this regard, these forming the principal developments during the building campaigns of some abbots. The 'facing direction' of the hall(s) constructed near abbots' lodgings suggest that they

---

[255] Margaret Wood, *The English Medieval House* (London: Ferndale Editions, 1965), pp. 122–36.

were built with the abbot's house in mind.[256]

There were other links being made between these structures as well. In the early period, during the late twelfth and the thirteenth centuries, the only substantial buildings (i.e., not those of industrial purpose) were the infirmary and perhaps the abbot's lodging. The multiplication of chambers, halls, and other rooms meant that there was a lot more physical infrastructure to be taken into account, and it was often the case that there developed a substantial network of walkways, which sometimes through their alignment and orientation grew into a secondary, or 'infirmary', cloister. These walkways would be paved with flagstones, although very common was the use of ceramic floor tiles which were also commonly used inside the conventual buildings. The walkways would be covered, either through a stone-vaulted roof or by a timber pentice roof, which would be supported by posts or stone pillar on the cloister side and worked into stone on the building's side. These walkways would often have been glazed, and so would have been entirely weather-proofed. The walkways, once constructed, linked the eastern side of the monks' dormitory, abbot's lodging, the infirmary, the infirmary kitchen, and any other halls that had been built in the vicinity into a single infrastructural network.[257]

It is unlikely that structures continued in the same function after the dramatic reduction in numbers and the simultaneous adoption of different living practices. The imposition of corrodians, the construction of self-contained chambers, and the changes in lifestyle suggest that there was a certain level of movement about the precinct, and the space which previously had been so rigid were re-negotiated so as to remain in step with the needs as seen by the abbots and communities of the time.

Buckfast

Vigorous oversight by Buckfast's abbots in the late fourteenth century and after raised the profile of the abbey. Notable abbots were Robert Symon (r. 1356–1395), William Paderstow or Slade[258] and John Kyng (r. 1465–*c.* 1498).[259] For the conventual buildings, the precinct remained substantially the same in plan until the Dissolution.[260] Abbot Symon conducted a

---

[256] For a discussion of the importance and orientation of porches, especially with reference to abbots' lodgings, see Rowell, pp. 82–84.

[257] For Kirkstall, see Hope and Bilson, p. 42. For Fountains, see above, p. 116.

[258] The documentary record is confused, Paderstow ruled from 1400, Slade was succeeded in 1415.

[259] The fifteenth-century documentary record is confused for Buckfast, whose abbot's regnal dates are ill-defined. *The Heads of Religious Houses: England and Wales*, ed. by David Knowles and others, 3 vols (Cambridge: University Press, 1972), III, pp. 273–74.

[260] Rowe, 'On Recent Excavations at Buckfast Abbey', pp. 592–93; Brown, p. 74.

strenuous building campaign in the late fourteenth century, and Abbot Slade another in the fifteenth. The badge of the Pomeroys, a red lion rampant, was carved on the buildings before the Dissolution, indicating strong links to a prominent local family.[261] In 1350 a weekly fair was granted to the abbey, suggesting a greater influx of people. The fair may have prompted further development of the abbey's hospitality structures, as well as providing greater revenues to fund the building work.[262]

The prosperity and prestige resulted in increased building. An exceptional survival is the abbot's tower, which is in excellent condition.[263] It is of either late fourteenth- or fifteenth-century date, and is located on the southwestern corner of the western range. It contained three chambers, one on each storey, each with its own fireplace and access to garderobe. The tower was embattled. Tower construction was a feature of late Cistercian buildings projects, and it is a theme that occurs in many locations where there was wealth to invest in building works.[264]

At Buckfast a third phase and final phase of development in the guest accommodation saw the addition of a new wing on the southeastern corner of the existing guest hall, of late-fourteenth or fifteenth-century date (fig. 2.5).[265] This was a two-storey structure which lay on an east-west axis, measuring 18.8 × 7.4 metres externally.[266] It had three ancillary chambers on the ground floor, and a large hall over. Three windows in the north wall lit the hall, and one in the eastern end of the south wall. The wall has remains of plaster, perhaps indicating that it was white washed, as at Fountains. The western end of the first floor was poorly lit, suggesting a storage function or similar; it was possibly screened off, but no trace of partitions survive. There was fireplace in the south wall, and jambs showing through the plasterwork indicate that it was hooded; it was 0.6 metres deep and externally buttressed.[267] A Purbeck marble shaft was recovered from the building, suggesting that it was elaborately decorated. A hole in the eastern flue wall indicates a point to place a suspension iron bar for hanging vessels or similar. The first floor hall was accessed from the south by an external pentice staircase.[268]

---

[261] Rowe, *Cistercian Houses of Devon*, p. 57.

[262] Rowe, *Cistercian Houses of Devon*, pp. 75–76.

[263] Rowe, 'On Recent Excavations at Buckfast Abbey', p. 594, suggests that it was for the master of the lay brethren. This must be incorrect, since by the time it was constructed the lay brethren were no longer a significant part of the community.

[264] Fergusson, *Solitude*, pp. 115–16; Pevsner, *Buildings of England: Devon*, pp. 222–26; Robinson and others, p. 76; Anthony Emery, *Greater Medieval Houses of England and Wales, 1300–1500*, 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), III, p. 552.

[265] For the guesthouse, see section 2.4 above; Brown, p. 55.

[266] Brown, pp. 55–56.

[267] Brown, p. 56.

[268] Brown, pp. 57–58.

Access to the three ancillary chambers on the ground floor was from the south only; they did not connect to the earlier guest quarters.

These developments point to a substantial expansion of reception facilities, in which large sums were invested. It would have been in keeping with the prosperity of the abbey during this period. As well, Buckfast enjoyed close links with its community, which may have entailed that a greater number of high-status guests were entertained at the abbey. With the construction of the abbot's tower, a full transition in organisation of space for the reception of guests at the abbey was made. In the twelfth century the guesthouse was built contemporaneously with the claustral ranges; as they underwent modification so did the guesthouse. In the fourteenth century the addition of a hall provided a new high-status reception area, and in the fifteenth century there was a superior lodging to go with it. That the tower was built into the western range shows its conversion, and that it was repurposed to a hospitality function. In effect, the abbot had moved from one side of the cloister to the other, drawn there by the need to provide hospitality. The western and southwestern area of Buckfast's precinct was, in the fifteenth century, superbly well equipped for accommodating outsiders.

Buckland

Rowe gives a description of an interesting building (now called 'Tower Cottage'; fig. 2.27, fig. 2.28, fig. 2.29) to the west of what was the church, at the north eastern corner of a larger building:

> [W]est of this [the former church] is a building, which I think may be a porter's lodge, and perhaps a part of the entrance gate. It is now used with the stables. The window in front is really a blocked-up door-way, opening into a little hall or porch, lighted with a window on the north. Below is a cellar, with a window west, and opposite the window an entrance (now blocked up) to some place beyond. Over the little hall there is a room, reached by a newel staircase in the turret, and over this a platform. The platform on the top of the turret is reached by a continuation of the staircase.[269]

The later elements of this building Rowe attributed to the late fourteenth century. Copeland

---

[269] Rowe, *Cistercian Houses of Devon*, p. 21.

dates the tower to the fifteenth century, an interpretation since upheld.[270] The tower is nine feet square, with string courses decorated with square flowers, and is embattled.[271] The attribution of gatehouse to this building is incorrect, as shown by an agreement between a layman, Robert Derkeham, and the community whereby Robert was rendered £2 13s. 4d., a 'decent table', a 'furnished room over the west gate of the monastery' and a gown worth 12s., as well as an interest in a tenement elsewhere, each year for his service of teaching the four monks music and the organ, and assisting each day in choir.[272] The Office of Augmentations upheld the agreement on 18 December 1540 and Derkeham continued his life there even when the community was not resident to maintain him.[273] The tower's location suggests that it was the abbot's lodging. Again, a tower as the abbot's structure of choice for a new construction. It is more difficult to trace the structural arrangements at Buckland than it is at Buckfast, but the tower was meant to be seen and impress those coming to the abbey.

Cleeve

At Cleeve there are significant extant buildings in the western and southern claustral ranges with possible hospitality functions (fig. 2.23). The abbey buildings were renovated under Abbot William Dovell (r. 1507–1537), and comprise some of the latest monastic buildings in the country.

Cleeve's refectory was radically redesigned during abbacy of David Juyner (r. 1435–1487), dated by the extensive use of Perpendicular forms, and is an excellent indication of an architectural scheme desired by a Cistercian community of this date. Although maintained for the community's use, as at Forde, the lavish decoration and design form suggests that outsiders were intended to dine here.[274] The design of the later hall may have been influenced by the work of William of Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester, at Eton College and Magdalene College, Oxford.[275] The north-south frater of the thirteenth century was demolished, and all the south range except the westernmost chamber (a kitchen) was concerted into two fully self-contained chambers.

---

[270] Cynthia Gaskell Brown, 'Buckland Abbey, Devon: Surveys and Excavations 1983–1995', *Proceedings of the Devon Archaeological Society*, 53 (1997), 25–82 (p. 33). Brown states (p. 37) that the building was surveyed in 1995 through the auspices of English Heritage, but this survey has not to my knowledge been published.

[271] G. W. Copeland, *Buckland Abbey: An Architectural Survey* (Plymouth: [s.n.], 1953), p. 10.

[272] G. W. Copeland, 'Some Problems of Buckland Abbey', *Reports and Transactions of the Devonshire Association*, 85 (1953), 41–52 (p. 50).

[273] Rowe, *Cistercian Houses of Devon*, p. 13.

[274] Forde is discussed below.

[275] Buckle.

These apartments each consisted of two rooms (a living room and a bedchamber) separated by a passage; a fireplace in the larger room; and a garderobe. The westernmost of the two rooms was the greater, in size and quality of the furnishings, having roll-moulded jambs for the fireplace and two windows; it also contained the entrance lobby for the first-floor hall. There are some utilitarian features (such as an oven) that probably date to after the Dissolution. The eastern chamber was approximately half the size of the western, with only one window and rougher entranceways (possibly post-Dissolution). All the windows had tiled window seats. Both rooms were served by a laver on the external face of the north wall between the two chambers (that is, the centre of the south range); presumably the kitchen immediately to their west was for their enjoyment given that a first-floor kitchen of similar date was established in the southern part of the west range. The extensive provision of facilities suggests that either these were chambers for people of importance, such as visiting or retired abbots, or non-community members, such as corrodians.

The first-floor hall measures 15.55 × 6.75 metres, about a third of the size of Abbot Charde's hall at Forde, with a wagon-form timber roof, the principal ribs of which rested on carved angel corbels. All nine windows had tiled seats, and the hall contained a fireplace and pulpit for religious readings. A painting on the eastern wall depicts Mary and John. There is a mortared floor all across the first floor, but it is possible that there were once tiles in the hall. West of the hall, across the 'painted chamber' at the top of the stairs, was the abbot's lodging, which had its own staircase.

Melrose

In addition to the guest hall, a commendator's house was constructed in the fifteenth century (fig. 2.26). Commendation was disruptive practice whereby the papacy appointed their own (often highly unsuitable) candidate to abbatial office. The appointee could treat the office as a sinecure, taking the abbey's profits but not using them to the community's benefit.[276] It was perhaps Abbot Andrew Hunter (r. 1444–1471) who constructed the lodging, which was developed *c.* 1590 by the last commendatory abbot, James Douglas (r. 1569–1609,

---

[276] For the impact of commendatory abbots on Scottish monasteries, see Mark Dilworth, *Scottish Monasteries in the Late Middle Ages* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1995). For the impact that commendatory abbots had on Cistercian houses, see William J. Telesca, 'The Problem of the Commendatory Monasteries and the Order of Cîteaux during the Abbacy of Jean de Cirey, 1475–1501.', *Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses*, 22 (1971), 154–77; William J. Telesca, 'The Cistercian Abbey in Fifteenth Century France: A Victim of Competing Jurisdictions of Sovereignty, Suzerainty and Primacy', in *Cistercians in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. by E. Rozanne Elder, Studies in Medieval Cistercian History, 6 (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1981), pp. 38–58 (p. esp. 46–47).

d. 1620).[277] As in many cases of later adaptation, numerous chambers indicate multiple occupants in the building; it is probable that the commendator's guests were housed here. The fifteenth-century arrangement consisted of four chambers, two on the ground floor and two on the first, with hooded fireplaces in the lower set; an external pentice staircase and walkway to the first-floor apartments.[278] Douglas removed the pentice stairs and walkway, instead adding a new wing to the southeast corner that housed an internal staircase. The ground floor was re-partitioned to form a cellarage and kitchen. The first-floor chambers were re-arranged so that four chambers were formed, so that their partitions divided the first-floor space into four lateral segments; the northernmost had a fireplace in its internal wall, and two windows in the side walls, while the gable wall held a recess; the two central rooms, now merged, had been entered in the fifteenth century from the eastern pentice gallery, these were blocked to form (in the northern) a close garderobe and (in the southern) a cupboard, while both had fireplaces in the western wall; the southern chamber was too ruined to conduct a sound archaeological evaluation.[279]

A building west of the modern boundary wall has been suggested as being a modification of a monastic guesthouse, with the 'suspiciously thick walls' being cited as evidence of medieval habitation.[280]

Although an early and prestigious foundation which could count a saint among its past abbots (Waltheof, *c.* 1095–1159), Melrose suffered repeated devastations during the Anglo-Scottish wars, such as Richard II's devastating raid into Roxburghshire in 1385.[281] Later, the practice of papal commendations further burdened the community, but because of the strength of the abbot it makes the trend towards abbatialisation easier to identify. Material culture from Melrose indicates that it was connected to contemporary artistic trends. While Melrose was influenced by English practice in the late fourteenth century, by the mid-fifteenth its abbots looked to the Continent for their artistic influences. For example, Melrose modelled some its aesthetic features on the church of Dunis in Flanders, and imported woodwork from Bruges.[282] Papal indults granted to abbey in 1320 allowed the

---

[277] Marguerite Wood and J. S. Richardson, *Melrose Abbey*, rev. edn (Edinburgh: H.M.S.O., 1981); Richard Fawcett and Richard D. Oram, *Melrose Abbey* (Stroud: Tempus, 2004), pp. 197–202.

[278] Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland, II, pp. 287–88.

[279] Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland, II, p. 288.

[280] Fawcett, p. 123; Fawcett and Oram, p. 72.

[281] For Melrose's experience of the wars see Fawcett and Oram, p. 36–45; Richard D. Oram, 'Dividing the Spoils: War, Schism and Religious Patronage on the Anglo-Scottish Border, C. 1332–c.1400', in *England and Scotland in the Fourteenth Century: New Perspectives*, ed. by Andy King and Michael Penman (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), pp. 136–56 (pp. 142–50, 55, esp. 149–50).

[282] Fawcett, pp. 28–35; Wood and Richardson, p. 11.

widow of Sir Alexander Stewart to visit the abbey, presumably to visit her husband's grave there, indicating that access by women was still strictly controlled.[283] By 1427 the abbey was said to possess a notable collection of relics, and many pilgrims resorted there.[284] King James IV visited the abbey in 1502 and 1504, and caused a panel displaying his armorial device to replace that of Abbot William Turnbull (r. 1503–1507), suggesting that James desired to identify himself personally with the house.[285]

Forde

An outstanding example of what an abbot with substantial resources could do, Abbot Thomas Chard's constructions at Forde Abbey (Dorset; variously spelled 'Ford') looms large in late-medieval monastic architecture (fig. 2.30 and fig. 2.31). It is palatial in all respects, and outstrips the efforts of many contemporary secular edifices in the county: Pevsner described the building as being on such a scale as 'to justify the Reformation and Dissolution'.[286] Such views are now superseded by more constructive appreciation of late-medieval monastic architecture that takes into account the values of the society in which it was built.[287]

Nearing the Dissolution Abbot Thomas Chard's (r. 1507–1539) enthusiastic building campaign saw the erection of a magnificent abbatial residence (completed *c.* 1528) with an adjoining great hall abutting the north-western angle of the cloister, the latter lying to the north of the church.[288] The architectural style of Chard's hall used late perpendicular with an external frieze containing 'Renaissance' designs, this latter feature being in advance of any of the county's secular dwellings, and certainly not influenced by traditional Cistercian

[283] *Calendar of Papal Registers, Letters*, II, 1305–42, 208

[284] *Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland*, II, pp. 269–70.

[285] *Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland*, II, pp. 269–70.

[286] Nikolaus Pevsner, *Buildings of England: Dorset* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972), p. 210; Carter, 'Cistercian Abbots as Patrons', p. 215.

[287] G. M. Hills, 'Ford Abbey', in *Collectanea Archaeologica*, 2 vols, 1864, II, 145–59; Rowe, *Cistercian Houses of Devon*, pp. 171–92; F. W. Weaver, 'The Last Abbot of Ford', *Proceedings of the Somerset Archaeological and Natural History Society*, 37 (1891), 1–14; J. S. Udal, 'Notes on the History of Ford Abbey and the Families Who Have Possessed It since the Dissolution of the Monasteries', *Proceedings of the Somerset Archaeological and Natural History Society*, 43 (1896), 67–71; S. H. Heath, *The Story of Ford Abbey, from the Earliest Times to the Present Day* (London: F. Griffiths, 1911); Harold Brakspear, 'Forde Abbey', *Archaeological Journal*, 70 (1913), 498–99; C. Sherwin, 'The History of Ford Abbey', *Reports and Transactions of the Devonshire Association*, 59 (1927), 249–64; Alfred Clapham and A. R. Duffy, 'Forde Abbey', *Archaeological Journal*, 107 (1950), 119–20; David Knowles and J. K. S. St. Joseph, *Monastic Sites from the Air* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952), pp. 144–45; *An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Dorset*, Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments and Constructions of England, 5 vols (London: H.M.S.O., 1952), I, pp. 240–46; Pevsner, *Buildings of England: Dorset*, pp. 20, 40–42; Fergusson, *Solitude*, p. 125; Robinson and others, pp. 109–10; Emery, III, pp. 560–65.

[288] The date of Chard's hall and porch have had doubt cast on them because their style is such a departure from previous Cistercian practice (Prof. David Stocker, pers. comm.), but the evidence would indicate that it is monastic rather than post-monastic.

decorative schemes (figs 2.32 and 2.33). The frieze included such depictions as a bearded monster with a club and shield, mermen, sphinxes and winged monsters. Mermen also appear in a panel in the gatehouse. The panelled roofing was among the best in the county, alongside Forde's dormitory and refectory, Abbot Middleton's hall at Milton and the guest hall at Sherborne. Similarly, the porch through which Chard's hall was entered was lavish in its decoration, being of three storeys' height, with oriels on the upper two floors, embattled parapets and a fireplace on the interior of the first floor. Chard's initials and devices are carved in friezes in the first floor of the abbot's lodging in the dining room west of the great hall, as well as on face of the porch. The hall's size and grandeur could not have been reserved for the abbot's sole use, and guests would be entertained and lodged in this structure as well.

The gatehouse was built near the end of the fifteenth century, pre-dating the great hall and abbot's lodging. The stables were probably in the same location as the present seventeenth-century structure, to the north-east of the house, indicated by the presence of some re-set sixteenth-century roof beams.

The tower porch was built very soon after the introduction of the style in the late fifteenth century.[289] Chard's hall dispensed with any tradition of previous centuries and arranged the precinct according to a design informed by recent trends. The main plan was according to that of a great hall, with an elongated central area, open to the roof, acting as a grand reception area. On one side there were the abbatial lodgings, fully furnished, and on the other the apartments for guests. The hall was reached through the gatehouse, also constructed by Chard, which was an imposing three-storey tower with fireplace-equipped chamber running up its length. The decoration was distinctly novel in terms of what had gone before, and took its aesthetic schemes from Italian 'Renaissance' style designs rather than continuing the evolution of Gothic forms. That said, the architecture of the hall is typical of the domestic forms of English Perpendicular. The most important aspect of Chard's hall in terms of how it used space was that it complete overrode the spatial patterns that had been developed by progression over the previous four centuries of monastic life. The hall concentrated into one nucleated area functions that before had spanned the length and breadth of the monastic precinct. Hospitality, the access granted to guests, their reception, their accommodation, upkeep, was now entirely taken under the abbot's wing, and the need to operate in such a way under the conventions of the time wrought a dramatic evolution in how the Cistercian material environment was organised.

---

[289] Rowell, p. 53.

Fountains

Marmaduke Huby (r. 1495–1526) continued development of the abbot's lodging and added oriel windows, chimneys, refurbished the latrines, and commissioned reliefs to be sculpted — a panel depicting the Annunciation of the Virgin probably came from over the doorway.[290] The developments at Fountains are not of the same order as those at Buckfast, Buckland, or Forde, but there were other areas the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century abbots exerted themselves. Huby constructed the tower adjoining the northern transept of the abbey church as a conspicuous icon of his own devotion to the Holy Name of Jesus while continuing to develop other structures.[291] It was probably that Huby saw no need to make any further grand gestures by constructing more guest accommodation than was already there — the existing arrangements fulfilled the needs of his guests.

Cymer

Cymer was always a poor house, having to resist either dispersal by the General Chapter or being placed into royal receivership (fig. 2.34). There was a later resurgence of sorts, with Abbot Lewis ap Thomas (r. *c.* 1517–1537) acquiring a reputation for sound management, but the abbey's finances remained modest: at the Dissolution revenue was reckoned at £51 13*s.* 4*d.*[292] The strange claustral arrangement, which appears shifted to the east, is explained by the abandonment of the over-large initial presbytery in favour of a more modest church plan which omitted transepts. [293] The hall-houses of Merioneth are largely dated by dendrochronology to the fifteenth century, especially in the wake of Owain Glyn-Dŵr's rebellion, when the great hall became more prominent.[294]

At Cymer there is a well preserved stone-built farmhouse, called 'Y Fanner' ('The Banner'), to the west of the abbey ruins. The building dates to the monastic period and was made up of three principal components: a northern 'inner' chamber (not extant), the great hall to the south of the chamber, and a parlour or chamber west of the hall. The hall, 7.6 metres (25 feet) long, consists of four bays, demarcated by the crucks in the hall and rather

---

290 Coppack, *Fountains Abbey*, pp. 75, 77.
291 Carter, 'The Tower of Abbot Marmaduke Huby', p. 285.
292 *RCAHMCW: County of Merioneth* (London: H.M.S.O., 1921), p. 96.
293 J. Smith and L. A. S. Butler, 'The Cistercian Order: Cymer Abbey', in *History of Merioneth, Volume II: The Middle Ages*, ed. by J. B. Smith and L. B. Smith (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2001), pp. 297–325 (pp. 319–20); Robinson, *Cistercians in Wales*, pp. 237–39.
294 R. Sugget, 'The Chronology of Late-Medieval Timber Houses in Wales', *Vernacular Architecture*, 27 (1996), 28–35, 106–11 (pp. 32, 34); P. Smith and R. Sugget, 'Themes and Variations in Merioneth: An Essay on Vernacular Houses for Ron Brunskill', *Transactions of the Ancient Monuments Society*, 46 (2002), 55–82 (p. 56).

than any internal partition at ground level. The blackening of the roof beams and the fact
that the hall remained open to the roof demonstrating consistent use of a louvre opening and
a corresponding central hearth.[295] The roof of the house is a particularly fine late-medieval
example, the louvre opening making it exceptional on a county scale.[296]

Adjacent to the hall on the western side is a parlour, which could have been services,
or a chamber. Y Fanner is an 'end-passage house', as where there would be expected to be an
'outer' room south of the entrance passage there is an external stone wall: an analogy would
be the typical 'great hall' with the services shorn off. The parlour is an extremely unusual
feature for a hall house of this date — it was perhaps the abbot's own room, or in place of a
first-floor chamber usually provided in this level of accommodation.[297]

There are two principal indicators that Y Fanner was built as high-quality
accommodation, namely the excellent carpentry evident in the ornately cusped cruck trusses
and the size of the hall, which makes it the largest extant hall in Merioneth. The function of
the building could easily combine that of abbot's accommodation and guesthouse, especially
in a poorer abbey where there was not the wealth for construction of many buildings. There
are traces of another house not far from 'Y Fanner', which is bipartite in plan and two-
storeyed, but this is post-medieval.[298]

Valle Crucis

At Valle Crucis the evidence for guest accommodation forms part of the eastern claustral
range (fig. 2.35). The abbey buildings were never great in magnitude and there are notable
departures from the conventional Cistercian structural arrangements, although in other
respects the abbey was seen as rich: three later abbots of the house, Siôn ap Rhisiart (r. *c.*
1455–61), Dafydd ab Ieuan (r. *c.* 1480–1503) and Siôn Llwyd (r. *c.* 1503–27) oversaw a
revival of the abbey and under them it acquired a reputation for exceptional hospitality. The
praise came from celebrated bards, such as Guto'r Glyn and Gutun Owain, whose work paid
homage to the magnificence of the abbey's provisions and the quality of its lodgings.[299]

Probably in the abbacy of Dafydd ab Ieuan the northern half of the monks' dormitory
was appropriated by the abbot for his personal lodging and furnished with a fireplace in the

[295] P. Smith, 'Houses, C. 1415–1642', in *History of Merioneth, Volume II: The Middle Ages*, ed. by J. B. Smith
and L. B. Smith (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2001), pp. 422–506 (p. 247).

[296] Smith and Sugget, p. 58; D. H. Miles and D. Haddon-Reece, 'Welsh Dendrochronology Project',
Vernacular Architecture, 27 (1996), 106–17 (p. 109, n. 3).

[297] Smith and Sugget, p. 62.

[298] Smith and Sugget, p. 62.

[299] Robinson, *Cistercians in Wales*, pp. 153, 217–18, 287–293.

eastern wall, opposite the external doorway leading to the cloister. The lodging would have been reached via an external staircase leading from the cloister, which, as at Cleeve, would have disrupted any processional activity in the cloister. The southern end of this may have acted as guest accommodation or alternatively would have been used by any brethren who remained at the abbey. Either would signify rupture of monastic enclosure. At the same time that the dormitory was converted a second chamber was added on the first floor immediately to the east that also had a fireplace. 'The two rooms can only have served as the abbot's hall and chamber'.[300]

The porch on the western side of the western range was adder in the later medieval period, perhaps contemporaneous with the redeveloped chapter house. It suggests that efforts were made to improve the aesthetic impression when approaching the conventual buildings from the west.[301]

In 1234 the General Chapter reprimanded the abbot of Valle Crucis for permitting women to enter the precinct. Edward I's invasions in the late thirteenth century devastated some of the house's estates, as well as perhaps damaging the claustral buildings themselves, since the stonework bears conflagratory scarring and the community was awarded a sum of money after military activity had ceased, although this was a very small compared with, for example, Aberconway (£100) or the Bishop of Bangor (£250).[302]

Overview of Late Cistercian Guest Accommodation

The spatial topography of Cistercian precincts underwent great change during the four centuries between the Order's arrival in England and the Dissolution in the sixteenth century. The 'Cistercian plan' proposed by scholars of the nineteenth century inevitably altered as communities faced changing circumstances. The common view approaches Cistercian architecture and precincts as promoting solitude and detached contemplation. There has also been a tendency for scholars to prioritise structural arrangements of the twelfth century over later forms.[303] Taken together, this has encouraged a sense of viewing adaptation and change as irregularity, or deviation. Because architecture and structural arrangement has previously been viewed as linked to solitude and austerity, change in material environment have been viewed as indicators of decline in fervour observance, even decadence or needless

---

[300] C. A. R. Radford, *Valle Crucis Abbey* (London: H.M.S.O., 1953), p. 6.
[301] L. A. S. Butler, 'Valle Crucis Abbey: An Excavation in 1970', *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 125 (1976), 80–126 (p. 93).
[302] Radford, pp. 5–6.
[303] Including a recent archaeological account of monastic hospitality structures. See Rowell, p. 80.

extravagance.[304]

The solution to this interpretative issue has only recently been arrived at. The following quotation from Hills's architectural study of Forde Abbey provide a rare early attempt to reconcile the apparent problem:

> It is difficult to offer a conjecture as to the appropriation of this wing of Chard's work, as well as of the little chamber of his tower on the south, because, long before his time, the old rules for the arrangement of a Cistercian abbey had fallen into neglect and disuse by builders. A monastery, whether favoured with prosperity or struggling and sinking in adversity, would, in cases easily conceived, be compelled, from the necessities of expansion or contraction, to change its form. […] If his [Abbot Chard's] own lodging was to have been in any part of his new buildings he was so far adhering to primitive use as to keep the abbot in the western part, where, by the original rule, he was to live, and where his duty of attention to strangers arriving at the monastery required his presence. Indeed, his magnificent hall occupies the position frequently give from the first to the guests chamber in the larger monasteries.[305]

Hills's comments are the beginnings of an interpretation that treats change in Cistercian structural arrangements as being a result of the demands placed upon the community by their observance, rather than being in conflict with it. Viewing change merely as deformation of former ideals removes the validity of the Cistercian enterprise in late-medieval English society, despite tremendous activity on the part of communities demonstrating their continued importance. Rather, developments in structural arrangements must be seen as a response to communities' continual re-evaluation of how best to implement the precepts of the *Rule of Benedict* and the Order's own spiritual mission, as discussed in the previous chapter. Sternberg's work has shown that interaction with the world was a factor in determining architecture and structural arrangements. This is clearer nowhere than in the arrangements adopted for guest accommodation, which reveals that the Cistercians maintained a dialogue with the world that was given concrete form in their precincts.[306]

The preceding discussion has proposed a tripartite phased chronology of Cistercian hospitality structures. The first phase represents segregation of groups within the precinct; commonly this is given expression by siting the guest house on the western side of the precinct,

---

[304] Platt, *The Abbeys and Priories of Medieval England*, pp. 209–18.

[305] Hills, II, pp. 158–59.

[306] Coppack, 'The Planning of Cistercian Monasteries in the Late Middle Ages: The Evidence from Fountains, Rievaulx, Sawley and Rushen', p. 209.

while the community's locales are on the eastern side; the lay brothers' structures on the western range act as a mediating spatial zone, suited to their being members of the community, but with secular orientation. The first phase's characteristics are witnessed primarily through the twelfth century and into the thirteenth. The second phase is transitional, and represents an adaption of earlier structural arrangements to local circumstances. This might take the form of repurposing buildings no longer required for their original function, such as the lay brothers' dormitory. A common feature of the transitional phase is improvement of the abbot's lodging, which was frequently located to the east of the claustral range. This involved the creation of extra chambers and hall adjoining or near to the abbot's lodging, which facilitated the entertainment of greater numbers by the abbot, but in a space previously reserved for the community. The second, transitional, phase therefore blurred the scheme of segregation belonging to the first phase.

The third phase, dubbed "abbatialisation", witnessed a diversity of structural arrangements arise. The unifying feature of this phase is the rise in importance, scale, and visual grandeur of the abbot's lodging. If an abbot had the resources, the common course of action was to build a grand edifice that was designed to impress. Where resources were invested in guest accommodation, this would often lead to towers. At Buckfast, Buckland, and Forde towers were built that could house guests. This is not to say that guest accommodation was a priority in construction programmes of late-medieval Cistercian abbots. The abbey church's bell tower, visually imposing and highly audible, remained a major project in which to invest, and suitable means of demonstrating dedication to and the vitality of one's community. At Fountains, Huby put energy into his church tower, and thereby emphasised his devotion to the liturgy; at Kirkstall (discussed below) the guest house was modified when in the early sixteenth century Abbot William Marshall chose to follow a similar pattern to his father-abbot at Fountains and raise the height of the church tower. Even at poorer houses, many resources were invested in upgrading reception areas. The number of abbot's lodgings mean that all possible permutations cannot be described here, but it is clear that in the fifteenth century Cistercian abbots had great freedom to assess their needs and work towards meeting them.

The abbot's public role was therefore represented in concrete form through the structures dedicated for his use. The form of the tower was an introduction from secular domestic architecture. It was an expression of good lordship in secular architectural form, and intended to be read by seculars as a reflection of the strength and permanence of the

community; this was facilitated by locating towers where they would be seen or on buildings intended for secular use.[307] The abbot's lodging of this period often included space for the reception and even lodging of guests, and represents the abbot's close involvement in managing relations with wider society.[308]

This change was part of a wider trend of change in domestic arrangements. Homes of the elite gradually and consistently increased the number of chambers available for individuals and household officers.[309] The number of servants that an abbot would employ would also have an effect on the amount of space that he needed, and lay servants are recorded in accounts from the mid-thirteenth century onwards.[310] As an indicator, in 1381 the accounts of Sawley Abbey indicate the presence of approximately thirty-two monks, including the abbot and prior, and around forty-five servants.[311] The spatial topography of the first phase was in many cases completely overwritten during abbatialisation of hospitality structures, and segregation of guests and community was not reinforced by clearly defined boundaries. Stress was instead laid on defined but separate roles within the community, and solitude was ensured by equipping the abbot with all physical infrastructure required for providing hospitality to guests. During all phases of development, provision of hospitality in accordance with observance of the *Rule* determined the structural arrangements adopted. Cistercian communities' views on how best to implement chapter 53 altered over time, but its fulfilment was a constant factor in determining the layout of Cistercian precincts throughout the Middle Ages.

---

[307] Rowell, p. 84; Philip Dixon and B. Lott, 'The Courtyard and the Tower: Contexts and Symbols in the Development of Late Medieval Great Houses', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 146 (1993), 93–101 (pp. 95–97).

[308] Jamroziak, 'Between Cloister and World', pp. 242–44.

[309] C. M. Woolgar, *The Great Household in Late Medieval England* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999), pp. 47–61.

[310] David H. Williams, *Cistercians in the Early Middle Ages*, p. 124; Kate Mertes, *The English Noble Household, 1250-1600 : Good Governance and Politic Rule* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988), pp. 185–87; Richard Sugget, 'Living Like a Lord: Greater Houses and Social Emulation in Late Medieval Wales', in *The Medieval Great House*, ed. by Malcolm Airs and P. S. Barnwell (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2011), pp. 81–95.

[311] Thomas D. Whitaker, *The History and Antiquities of the Deanery of Craven, in the County of York*, 2nd edn (London: W. Edwards, 1812), p. 51.

2.7

THE DEVELOPMENT OF KIRKSTALL'S GUESTHOUSE
IN THE LATE MIDDLE AGES

Section 3 applies the findings of the chronological survey of guest accommodation to Kirkstall's guesthouse. Given the lack of existing analysis of monastic guesthouses, it has been necessary to establish as full context as possible for Kirkstall, achieved through reference to structures found at Cistercian sites elsewhere in Britain. This enables greater understanding into the developments at Kirkstall's guesthouse and the wider social trends that they represent.

Kirkstall's guesthouse has been the subject of recent re-assessment of its archaeological data.[312] The re-assessment involves the collaboration of scholars who worked at the site during the excavations in the 1970s and 1980s, and specialists consulted in areas such glass working and metallurgy (fig. 2.36). The pursuit of this research means that a detailed analysis of the architecture and structural arrangements of the guesthouse is not presented here.[313] Instead, priority is given to a discursive chronological summary of changes to the guesthouse, facilitating comparison with the tripartite phasing of Cistercian guest accommodation given in section 2. Discussion of the facilities offered to guests and the guests' activities are treated in chapter 4.

Dating Kirkstall's Guesthouse

There are two chronological limits for Kirkstall guesthouse. The earlier is the arrival of the monks at the Kirkstall site in 1152, while the lattermost is the dissolution of the house on 22 November 1539, after which any development cannot be said to represent monastic activity. Another well-established event is the construction of the first stone structure, that including the northern chamber (with solar over and adjoining garderobe), the main hall and kitchen. Kirkstall's guesthouse dates to the early thirteenth century. Beyond this, the dating becomes problematic. Many of the suggestions for dates of developments have come from stylistic comparison and can be advanced only in the most tentative fashion. Even in the absence of a definite chronology there is still value in determining the changing function of features in

---

[312] See Prefatory Statement and Introduction, p. 14.

[313] Throughout this section the result of Stuart Wrathmell's re-assessment of the data from the excavation 1979 and 1981–87 excavations has been relied upon I am greatly indebted to Dr Wrathmell for sharing his research and early draft so freely with me. Physical descriptions of features, functional interpretation of features, and chronology are the work of Dr Wrathmell. All comments on the social significance of structural features, the use of space, and historical contextualization are the author's own.

the guesthouse, as regardless of date they indicate the purpose for which the building was intended. According to the re-assessment of the structural arrangements, the first phase of activity pre-dates the erection of the first hall, but little can be said of this putative structure a representation of the community's attitudes towards hospitality. It cannot be confirmed as a guest house, although this would be probable (fig. 2.37, phase 1).[314] Discussion therefore begins with the second phase of development.

The Guesthouse in the Early Thirteenth Century

The guesthouse lay on a northeast to southwest axis directly west of the western end of the abbey church. It measures approximately 22.5 × 14.5 metres, and is of five bays (fig. 2.37, phase 2).[315] It would be here that the assembly would socialise, administer business, eat, and sleep, since halls were reserved for any single purpose at this time.[316] The northernmost bay had a fireplace installed in the centre of the northern wall. The internal arrangements are poorly evidenced and require working back from later arrangements to produce an assessment.[317] It is probable that there was a central hearth installed in the centre of the hall. This was a common arrangement and was present in the next phase of development. The entrances are assumed, judging from their later positions, to be immediately north of the partition of the south bay, contrary to what Hope believed.[318] The southernmost bay was partitioned off by a stone wall, and it is presumed that it acted as the services for the hall.[319] A separate bakehouse lay immediately to the southeast of the hall. A detached kitchen lay to the south of the hall and bakehouse, detached to prevent spread of fire. Such fires could break out at guesthouses, as Aelred of Rievaulx experienced before he joined the community there. Aelred, placing his faith in God, doused the fire with the cider that he was drinking.[320]

Kirkstall's early guesthouse was composed almost entirely of its hall, and judging from the features as far as they can be determined, was built according to a secular pattern of living. The great hall was the ubiquitous form of high-status dwelling in medieval society;

---

[314] Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2*, chp. 2.

[315] Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2*; Wrathmell, *The Guest House*, pp. 12–13.

[316] Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House: A Social and Architectural History* (New Haven, etc.: Yale U.P., 1978), pp. 30–50; Woolgar, *The Great Household in Late Medieval England*, pp. 59, 79–80. There are no substantial remains of furniture beside casket mounts recovered from Kirkstall's guesthouse, but examples of tables from Cistercian guesthouses (including Fountains) are noted in Hall, 'East of the Cloister', p. 10; Emerick and Wilson, p. 9.

[317] Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2*, chp. 2.

[318] Hope and Bilson, p. 60; Woolgar, *The Great Household in Late Medieval England*, p. 146.

[319] Hope and Bilson, p. 60.

[320] Woolgar, *The Great Household in Late Medieval England*, pp. 140–41; *Life of Aelred*, p. 77.

it was a social space that allowed a large number of people to gather for social or business engagements of varying levels of formality. The layout demonstrates that the monks envisioned housing groups of guests. The central hearth of the hall was such that it would offer the benefit of heat and light to the greatest number of people. During this period the status of these guests is unknown, and it cannot be determined whether it was constructed to house single large groups, or whether many small groups and individuals were intended to use the accommodation. The fireplace at the northern end suggests a partition for higher status members of the assembly, introducing the hierarchy into the layout, which foreshadows the next phase's developments.

Aisled halls are seen in earlier guesthouses but rarely later. Those of Buckfast and Tintern, and one at Fountains, are aisled halls, all dating to the late twelfth century or thirteenth century.[321] The first-floor hall type prevails in later centuries. One reason was the difficulty of developing aisled halls at a subsequent date. A central hearth's fire benefitted many people but needed venting, which placed restrictions on domestic architecture as it prevented the installation of a first floor.[322] Until the development of in-wall flues with associated fireplaces, which required both a sufficient thickness of the wall and the extra expenditure on stone, the simplest solution was to place a louvre in the roof immediately over the hearth.[323] The main difficulty that this caused was that the roof needed to remain open (that is, it could not be vaulted) but still bear the weight of rafters and roof. The simplest solution, that of raising vertical posts to support the tie-beams, reduced the usable space at ground level.[324] A prominent theme in the development of domestic architecture during the twelfth to fourteenth centuries was therefore the search for an open-roofed and affordable yet aesthetically pleasing roofing arrangement.[325] By the mid-fourteenth century the aisled hall had been rendered obsolete due to advances made in roofing, and it is only where old structures were adapted to present needs that the form persisted.[326] At this time there were no garderobes installed as part of the structure. Kirkstall's construction, then, was of its time, and was as on a par with provision made elsewhere, including Fountains, and able to accommodate large groups.

---

[321] Brown, pp. 35–36; Emerick and Wilson, pp. 7–9; Courtney, p. 124.

[322] J. T. Smith, 'Medieval Roofs: A Classification', *Archaeological Journal*, 115 (1958), 111–50 (p. 111).

[323] Private stoves did not enter into Cistercian legislation until the fifteenth century, although in the less austere setting of the guesthouse such comforts may have been adopted. Bell, p. 193; Woolgar, *The Great Household in Late Medieval England*, pp. 76–77.

[324] J. T. Smith, p. 140.

[325] J. T. Smith, pp. 121–28.

[326] J. T. Smith, p. 138.

The Guest House Developed

Numerous important facilities were added in the next phase of development (fig. 2.37, phase 3). A dedicated and discrete two-storey chamber block abutted the north of the hall, measuring 14 × 6.5 metres, constructed to accommodate high-status guests received by the community. Although the evidence is ambiguous, it is believed that the foundations of the early hall predate the construction of the solar block, which belongs to the next phase of development. This interpretation is supported by two pieces of evidence: a water pipeline diverted to make way for the solar block, and a stone feature that intruded in the space of the solar, but had no function there; it is thought that it was an external facing block of the northern side of the original hall.[327] Constructing the chamber block was contemporaneous with the rebuilding of the western wall of the eastern hall (i.e. the first constructed), the installation of the main drain, and garderobes that serviced both floors of the chamber block.[328] Building the solar therefore offered an opportunity to make improvements to facilities, which were carried out in a single phase of development.

At the southern end of the hall, the services were separated into a buttery and pantry, and a chamber was installed on the first floor. An extensive addition was the new western aisled hall. It was a lower standard than the first, and had a central hearth, but no garderobes, nor any chambers. Nevertheless, it also had a central hearth, signifying that it was a communal space for the congregation of guests. The addition of the second hall substantially increased the capacity of the guest quarters, but this does not signify that the status of these guests rose with the capacity. Rather, the arrangements indicate that the northern end of the guest range is dedicated to the most elite guests, while the southern end is dedicated to those of lesser status. The architectural developments suggest greater definition to a pre-existing pattern, which the fireplace in the northern wall of the phase two hall had suggested. Ultimately, the structural arrangements represented in concrete form the hierarchy of the medieval great household, with very few furnished in well appointed quarters, and the majority in communal living spaces. The additions to the guest range provided the monks with a level of provision suited to the expectations of even wealthy guests and their accompanying entourage, and thereby allowed them to furnish the 'proper honour' that the *Rule of Benedict* demands.[329]

The great hall was a place where the hierarchy of the medieval household was enacted in practice (fig. 2.39). The top table, located at the north end of the hall, would be laid across

---

327 Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2*, chp. 2.
328 Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2*, chp. 2.
329 *RB* 53.2: 'congruus honor'.

the hall's width rather than along its length, raised up on a dais for those seated there to look down upon the lower tables in the hall, which would have been arranged lengthways, either side of the fire.[330] The intention was to represent social hierarchy in physical form. Those highest in society were physically highest in the assembly. Such an ordering of position would be adopted at mealtimes as well as during formal audiences.

Space became increasingly privileged as one moved outside the hall. Personal space was a commodity bought by social eminence. It gave the ability to regulate access, to choose company, and therefore to bestow favour by granting audience. Such was the case for the main chamber at the northern end of the hall, furthest from the entrances to the guesthouse proper, and furthest from the utilities such as the kitchens and storerooms which were the workplaces of servants. The chambers, one on the ground floor and another directly above it, were more privileged by the addition of wall-mounted fireplaces and intra-mural flues. The technology of the wall-mounted fireplace had been in England since the Conquest, but it took time to be incorporated in domestic architecture. The earliest known instance is that at St Albans from the mid-thirteenth century.[331] Its introduction meant that fireplaces could be installed on multiple successive floors, but at the cost of fewer people being able to benefit from their heat and light. Only a few could be seated comfortably around such a feature, which would have been those commanding greatest respect in the household. Another feature of the main chambers was their direct access to the garderobes. Each chamber had a door leading out it western side directly to the privy. Flushed toilets were advanced domestic technology for the time. Henry III ordered the installation of such garderobes in his residences in *c.* 1227, not long in advance of when they were installed at Kirkstall; often garderobes were channelled into cesspits.[332] At a time when even royal residences were adopting the new adjoining garderobes, with all the wealth and access to novelties that the royal household had at its disposal, the guests at Kirkstall were provided with facilities scarcely seen in the secular world.

Chamber blocks of the kind built at Kirkstall date from the early twelfth to the late thirteenth century and are found in a wide range of contexts, including civil structures, castles and monasteries.[333] This type of structure was very adaptable: the undercroft could be used either to accommodate people, or to store the provisions consumed in the hall above.[334]

---

[330] Woolgar, *The Great Household in Late Medieval England*, pp. 146–47; Melitta Weiss Adamson, *Food in Medieval Times* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2004), pp. 156–58.

[331] Rowell, p. 88.

[332] Wood, pp. 378–79.

[333] Faulkner, pp. 151–59.

[334] For this point of interpretation, see Rowell's argument against the interpretation of first-floor hall being arranged according to a class-based division of the upper and lower hall in Rowell, pp. 74–78.

Its construction at Kirkstall suggests recognition of need for higher quality buildings to accommodate guests.[335] That the first floor hall was built after the aisled hall suggests that the status of guests coming to the abbey had risen accordingly, or that the community was able to divert more funds.

With the addition of the solar, garderobes, second aisled hall, and the expansion of the services, Kirkstall was now equipped with accommodation to provide lodging on a par with its mother-house, Fountains. Kirkstall had begun with an aisled hall, which was the fastest and simplest way of housing large groups of people. An aisled hall could still cater to people of status by partitioning bays of the hall. However, given the developments that were made, it appears that Kirkstall now needed to cater to provide people of status with superior lodgings. To achieve this, the community constructed a solar, which was an architectural form widespread throughout Britain during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. While retaining the aisled hall, which eventually became outmoded, the community of Kirkstall provided its guests with updated facilities such as garderobes, a second aisled hall, and expanded services. The addition of the second hall suggests an increase in number of guests, or the increase in provision to meet an already existing demand. No matter which interpretation is correct, the arrangements mark the period during which Kirkstall's guesthouse was able to accommodate the greatest number of people at any one time. After this phase, the overall capacity of the guest range was reduced, but with the advantage of being able to offer better facilities than before.

The Later Guesthouse

In the fifteenth century, the guesthouse was further developed so as to contain many more separate chambers, more comfortable furnishings, but a reduction in overall capacity (fig. 2.37, phase 4). Chambers were added over the services at the southern end of the hall, both with their own fireplaces and access to garderobes — an indication that they could be used as discrete living blocks, or chambers for guests less distinguished than those occupying the main chamber at the north end of the hall. These could feasibly be chambers for corrodians, although there is no documentary evidence connecting individuals to the building.[336] Whoever used them, the increase in number of discrete chambers was a trend seen throughout

---

[335] At Tintern it has been suggested that the hospitality function of the first-floor hall was superseded by the construction of the aisled hall, but there is no reason for the two being mutually exclusive, and is contrary to the general expansion of guest facilities in Cistercian houses: Courtney, p. 124.

[336] Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2*, chp. 2.

domestic architecture in the later Middle Ages.[337]

A major change to the provision of hospitality in guest range is witnessed in the conversion of the secondary hall, built to accommodate more guests in the thirteenth century, into a stables and smithy. During the late fourteenth to the early sixteenth century, there was a period when bell-casting in the main hall had further impact upon the ability to house guests, as this occupied room for the duration of the works, which might have lasted a matter of weeks. It is known from sparse documentary evidence that the hall remained in use for the reception of guests in the mid-fifteenth century, and the hearth, which had been removed for the bell-casting, was restored in its entirety and can be seen at the site today.[338] While it is tempting to link the bell-casting with William Marshall's raising of the crossing tower of the abbey church, it has to be asked why the casting had not taken place in the crossing of the church, a common practice.[339] The overall impression is that the guest range was used for hospitality, but that the nature of hospitable provision there had changed: now the guesthouse catered to fewer individuals who had fuller facilities, a trend in keeping with wider genteel society.[340] The arrangements suited to accommodating whole households are no longer present, and although households are known to have been present during this period, where they are lodged cannot be proven with reference to the guesthouse architecture alone.

The conversion meant a reduction in the capacity of the guest range to accommodate guests; those who did inhabit the chambers were probably higher status at this point. The smithy that occupied the southern hall contained a great deal of ironworking debris. Common finds from the smithy were 'bar stock', unshaped metal ready for working, and nails. The proximity to the stables, the guest accommodation, and the nature of the finds all suggest that iron working was on a small scale, and catered to shoeing horses, either for guests or abbey personnel (it cannot be determined which).[341] A point of comparison, although from a much earlier period, comes from Cluny, where the customary prescribed that horses of departing guests should be properly shod, and that the stabler had to have a hammer to hand for the

---

[337] C. Anne Wilson, 'From Mediaeval Great Hall to Country-House Dining-Room: The Furniture and Setting of the Social Meal', in *The Appetite and the Eye*, ed. by C. Anne Wilson, Food and Society, 2 (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1991), pp. 28–55; Woolgar, *The Great Household in Late Medieval England*, pp. 47–61.

[338] Holly B. Duncan and Stuart Wrathmell, 'Bell Moulds from Kirkstall Abbey, West Yorkshire', *Historical Metallurgy*, 20 (1986), 33–35; Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2*, chp. 2.

[339] Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2*, chp. 2.

[340] Woolgar, *The Great Household in Late Medieval England*, p. 68.

[341] David Starley, 'The Examination of Metalworking Debris from Kirkstall Abbey Smithy' (unpublished Archaeometallurgy Report 02.14, West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service, 2014).

task.[342] Stables are thought to have been in the guest range at Waverley, although not enough remains to analyse their structure or date.[343] At Kirkstall, the added feature of being able to stable their mounts close at hand, implying that those using this guest range might own horses too.[344] It is probable that stables lay close to the guesthouse before the western aisled hall was converted, although it cannot be confirmed archaeologically. The General Chapter in 1220 decreed that all English stables that are outside the gate should be brought inside it, as it was felt necessary to deprive lay brothers the opportunity of going outside the confines of the inner precinct, where they might do dishonourable things.[345]

Overview and Contextualisation of Kirkstall's Guesthouse

Kirkstall's guesthouse was like an island of secularity within the monastic precinct. It was laid out to accommodate a secular, not a monastic, rhythm of life.[346] Social hierarchy is implied by the provision of more and less accessible areas within the guest range. The most elite of the guests would have their own private chambers; the lower orders of the household would accommodate themselves in communal spaces. In the thirteenth and most of the fourteenth century the structural arrangements appeared like a simplified version of a noble household: the main hall had chambers radiating from it, with the main chamber located at one end and the services at the other. These structural arrangements could be used flexibly, and need not have catered to one household: they could have been utilised to cater to various social groups of differing status sharing the accommodation. The ability to accommodate so many people was removed with the conversion of the western aisled hall into a stables and smithy in the later Middle Ages. With the conversion, the overall standard of accommodation in the guest range was raised and the ability to accommodate fewer guests of high status in discreet chambers was improved.

One structural and spatial element conspicuous for its absence at Kirkstall is a chapel, especially given that Kirkstall was a religious institution. While this is not exceptional with regard to provision in other Cistercian houses, it remains an omission needing explanation.

---

[342] Kerr, p. 151, referencing to *Ordo Cluniacensis per Bernardum*, ch. 12, and Udalrici Consuetudines, cols 634–778 (775). referencing to *Ordo Cluniacensis per Bernardum*, ch. 12, and *Udalrici Consuetudines*, cols 634–778 (775).

[343] Brakspear, *Waverley Abbey*, p. 77.

[344] Note that Sawley provided 2.5 quarters of beans for horses of those conducting visitation in 1381. Whitaker, p. 51; Kerr, p. 149, also see p. 150, where it is stated that St Albans was able to accommodate three hundred horses. St Albans may be expained by its proximity to London.

[345] *Statuta*, I, 1220:30.

[346] Faulkner, pp. 152–54; Greene, p. 9.

This may be because high-status guests, of the kind that were the probable occupants of Kirkstall's guesthouse, were able to utilise the abbot's own chapel on the eastern side of the precinct. If they were unable to use the abbot's chapel, it might be assumed that they could be admitted to services held in the gatehouse, for which there is documentary evidence dating from the fourteenth century, and which would be in use right up to the Dissolution, as demonstrated by Dovell's investment at Cleeve. In some abbeys there was a link established between the abbot's lodging and a chapel, if a chapel was not incorporated within the lodging itself. At Fountains, for example, the abbot's lodging was linked to a chapel over the chapter house in the fourteenth century. At Kirkstall the abbot's chapel was conveniently located in the eastern compartment of his lodging, on the first floor, close at hand for anyone granted an audience in the abbot's chambers, or perhaps for whomever inhabited the chamber to the northeast of the abbot's lodging, marked as the 'visiting abbot's lodging' on Hope's plan (fig. 0.4).

Taken in isolation, the reduction in overall capacity of the guest range in the Middle Ages suggests that hospitable provision declined at Kirkstall. However, as the survey in sections 2–6 has shown, in the fifteenth century the guest range was not the only area within Cistercian abbeys in which hospitality was provided. When considering the context of developments in Cistercian houses across Britain, the reduction in capacity of the guest range and the lack of a chapel, rather that representing a decline in hospitable provision these changes may be taken to imply that provision had shifted to include other areas, such as the western ranges, as is the case at Buckfast, Buckland, and Flaxley.

At Kirkstall the change is difficult to trace because of the lack of secure dating of the structures around the abbot's lodging to the southeast of the cloister and ignorance of their purpose(s) (fig. 2.40). However, certain features are suggestive. The abbot's lodging is itself a very early example of its kind, and measured 8.8 × 5.6 metres (29 × 18.5 feet), making it of comparable size to the solar chamber in the guesthouse.[347] The elaboration of the complex of buildings near the abbot's lodging, and the infirmary occurs in the fourteenth century, including a first-floor walkway leading to the cloister passage, these being contemporaneous with transitional developments elsewhere. In the fifteenth century the guesthouse was greatly altered, thus accommodating fewer people, but providing superior facilities. During the same period the abbot's lodging received renovations, having its windows replaced and a large

---

[347] Hope and Bilson, p. 35, and n. 1.

fireplace installed.[348] Furthermore, the western range underwent modification in the fifteenth century, suggesting that it may have been open to outsiders as Flaxley was.[349] While Kirkstall cannot be said to unite the guest accommodation and abbot's lodging as somewhere like Forde does, this is to be expected of a house that did not have the same considerable funds to spare. In other respects Kirkstall follows the developments in hospitality structures found elsewhere, and demonstrated the parallel development of many different areas that suitable for the reception of guests. Kirkstall particularly resembles its motherhouse, Fountains, in this regard. With the modifications that Abbot William Marshall undertook in the sixteenth century, there is no doubt that the community at Kirkstall updated the physical infrastructure to meet changing expectations of hospitality.

2.8

SPACES OF HOSPITALITY: CONCLUSIONS

Hospitality is a social interaction that requires a space in which it may be enacted. Cistercian communities provided hospitality at the abbey, but the 'abbey' was conceived of as being constituted by different spatial zones, arranged to regulate access and to control the ingress of outsiders. The form that hospitality took and the people to whom it was granted depended in part on the spatial zone in which it was being distributed, and these spaces changed during the period of the twelfth to the sixteenth centuries.

When approaching the abbey there were characteristics in the landscape that promoted thoughts of 'wilderness' and isolation, whether or not an abbey was situated in a site remote from other settlements. At Kirkstall, surrounding woodland formed had been kept as a visual symbol of solitude and seeking the desert. Approaching the inner court, the stranger would encounter the gatehouse, which at Kirkstall probably had varied provision. The gatehouse could provide alms, religious services, limited lodging, and charitable care. If the guest were of superior status, or if they had business within the inner court, they would be accompanied by two monks and presented to the guest range.

The form that the guest range took underwent great change from the twelfth to the

---

[348] Hope and Bilson, pp. 35–37. Hope notes (p. 35, n. 4) that the embattled lintel on the fireplace is a later addition rather than a medieval feature: it is not therefore revealing of abbot's character.

[349] Hope and Bilson, p. 58; Stephen Moorhouse and Stuart Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 1: The 1950–64 Excavations – A Reassessment* (Wakefield: West Yorkshire Archaeological Service, 1987), p. 146; Carter, 'Abbot William Marshall (1509–28) and the Architectural Development of Kirkstall Abbey, Yorkshire, in the Late Middle Ages', p. 124.

sixteenth centuries. Rowell has described the development of Cistercian guest accommodation in the following way:

> [T]he Cistercians were certainly the most particular about the placement and arrangement of their buildings […] the Cistercians further distinguished themselves by constructing their abbot's lodgings to the south-east of the claustral ranges, and their guest houses to the west or north-west. This consistency in Cistercian planning began to relax only in the fourteenth century, […] but no alternative arrangement ever really took hold.[350]

The survey conducted in section 2 clarifies the development of Cistercian guest accommodation and lends it greater definition. While aware of change in guest accommodation, Rowell still characterises it as relaxing, implying a departure from a stricter former ideal. This however, can be replaced by a positive characterisation of changes, that emphasises the validity of arrangements at all points during the Middle Ages.

In first phase of development, during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, organisation of space reinforced segregation between guests, lay brothers, and monastic brethren. Segregation entailed provision for large groups of guests away from the cloister, in outward-oriented inner court; the lay brethren acted as a symbolic and practical division located on the western range, reflective of their *raison d'être*, and the lay brethren were in turn separated from the choir monks. The choir monks were located on the eastern side of the precinct, in the most secluded area. Kirkstall's guesthouse in the thirteenth century, during the first two phases of development, was built according to contemporary Cistercian ideas of providing for guests within the precinct, but maintaining separation from them — there was no need to engage in personal contact in order to provide good hospitality.

During the long fourteenth century, although the chronological limits are not absolute, the spatial scheme of segregation becomes confused. Changes in the makeup of Cistercian communities, especially the decline of the lay brethren, and the increasing engagement of the abbot with wider society, which resulted in enlargement and augmentation of his lodgings, meant that provision was now being made for lay people in areas previously reserved for the monastic community. This is followed at Kirkstall, albeit in a manner difficult to trace. The guesthouse continued to be developed in the thirteenth century, and in the fourteenth century areas to the east of the cloister were also being developed that could potentially be

---

[350] Rowell, p. 80.

used for the reception of guests. Confusion regarding the function of rooms is a problem of interpreting this phase of development, but Kirkstall appears to conform to trends found across the Order.

The final phase of development has been dubbed 'abbatialisation'. This is a crucial step in accounting for the structural arrangements characteristic of this period, which lasted the duration of the fifteenth century and up to the Dissolution. This phase of development is characterised by focus on and representation of the abbot's public role in the buildings used to receive and accommodate guests. In many abbeys, exemplified by Charde's hall at Forde, the abbot's lodge was used in conjunction with guest accommodation to provide hospitality, overwriting spatial schemes of earlier periods. By uniting the guest accommodation with the abbatial offices, the monastic community were thus shielded from intrusion by outsiders despite there being less physical separation to reinforce the solitude of the community. At Kirkstall, the guesthouse was developed such that fewer apartments were provided, but these were of higher quality. It is probable that other areas were utilised as guest accommodation, but this cannot be confirmed for definite. It is likely that the structural arrangements were similar to those at Fountains, which had reception areas for guests around the abbot's lodging east of the cloister, in simultaneous use with guest accommodation west of the cloister.

Kirkstall's guesthouse is representative of trends found throughout the Cistercian Order in Britain from the twelfth to early sixteenth centuries. The developments in structural arrangements, when viewed from the perspective of spatial organisation and intended usage, show that the community of Kirkstall were closely aligned with contemporary trends and kept their facilities in keeping with expectations of wider society. The earliest form of the guesthouse was modest when compared with Kirkstall's motherhouse, Fountains, but this was also a reflection of Kirkstall's lesser economic and socio-political status, a hierarchical relationship that continued throughout the Middle Ages. Despite substantial changes the guest accommodation offered, the emphasis was always on being able to provide dedicated, high quality accommodation to guests, the identification of whom is the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER THREE

GUESTS OF KIRKSTALL ABBEY

3.0
INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the social standing, personal identities, and gender of Kirkstall's guests. The evidence used in the analysis has in part determined this chapter's structure. Section 1 analyses the small finds, and investigates whether the assemblage from Kirkstall can be said to represent a given social status of guests at the abbey. Section 2 investigates the documentary evidence and asks what the personal identities of the guests were: their names, the areas from which guests came, what the nature of their relation with Kirkstall's community was, and whether any significance can be drawn from the fact that they attended the abbey. Section 3 investigates whether women were also among the guests at Kirkstall, or whether the earlier customs of the Cistercians prevailed into the later Middle Ages. To investigate the presence of women a mixture of small finds, normative sources and charter evidence has been considered. Each section contains methodological and historiographical discussions relevant to its theme and source material.

3.1
SOCIAL IDENTITIES OF KIRKSTALL'S GUESTS

The focus of this section is assessing what kind of people used the guesthouse at Kirkstall, and the kind of activities which were carried out there. This is done through study of small finds[1] uncovered during the guesthouse excavations (1979 and from 1981 to 1986) and setting

---

[1] Here, 'small finds' does not include architectural fragments, and ceramic evidence has not been surveyed. The volume of the ceramic evidence has caused it to fall beyond the scope of this study.

them in their socio-historical context. Ultimately, two essential components of hospitality, the guest and the space dedicated to their use, are illuminated more thoroughly, which reveals how the Kirkstall community's attitudes towards hospitality developed over the centuries.

Small finds can tell much of someone's occupation, their station in life, and the activities in which they were engaged. In theory, an entire set of a person's belongings could be reconstituted and a very detailed picture of them obtained. For Kirkstall, however, the turbulence during the dissolution of the house and later disturbance of the deposits means that individuals' own material collections cannot with conviction be discerned. The approach adopted here is more general, in that the assemblage is divided according to function and chronology, allowing a composite picture of guests and their behaviour to be drawn.

Small finds are an excellent complement to the standing remains and documentation, but it is important to recognise that they can be used independently of these types of evidence. Standing remains concern the delimitation and characterisation of space. Charting the change in the architecture and layout of buildings reveals how the principles of organisation of Cistercian precincts changed over the centuries, and, by implication, how attitudes towards personnel (religious or lay) developed as well. However, this approach leaves the hypothetical people populating these spaces undefined: architecture and architectural elements can indicate that a building was intended for use by a certain social group, but it does not confirm that it was so used. This problem is central to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries at Kirkstall, when corrodians, metalworking operations, and the stabling of horses all became prominent activities in an area that had been formerly dedicated to housing guests.[2]

In the respect that small finds provide information on people and their behaviour, they are related to documentary (that is, textual) sources.[3] There are important differences in what can be obtained from each. Documentary evidence gives information regarding personal identity (personal details, such as names, family, specific actions performed by people and reasons for them) and allows a personal narrative to be constructed. It is possible to study documentary evidence as a form of material culture rather than texts as well, and the role which (for example) physical copies of charters, cartularies, and chronicle manuscripts played in the life of a religious community should not be overlooked.[4] There remains the question of whether these documents represent the norms for the subjects of study (for example, people,

---

[2] As discussed in chapter 2.7.

[3] The principal discussion of the documentary evidence for Kirkstall Abbey and its relation to hospitality is presented below.

[4] Trevor Foulds, 'Medieval Cartularies', *Archives*, 18 (1987), 3–35.

activities, places). Documents were only created to mark significant events for which there was a perceived need for written record and are therefore exceptional by nature; attrition over the centuries has only exacerbated the problem. This can create problems when documentary references are used to derive norms of practice in daily life.

The situation can in part be remedied by the use of small finds. The small finds were similarly liable to attrition, but underwent very different formation processes that mean they can be used as evidence for much broader periods of time. Arguably, small finds are a much more satisfactory route to obtaining a detailed portrayal of the material world of medieval people. Often small finds have been used as an auxiliary to standing remains or documentary evidence, used in conjunction with them to either corroborate or deny attributions (e.g. of a building's function), or to ornament a textual account without adding any substance to the analysis (e.g. an illustrated history book). This greatly limits the contribution that they can make, however. The small finds provide an evidential record in their own right, which can be analysed for information independently, and subsequently placed into a wider historical context. Here, they are used to answer questions relating to identity of personnel and the usage of space.

Material Culture and Study of Kirkstall Abbey

The potential value of using small finds to study past people(s) and societies has long been recognised in archaeological practice, but the methodology underlying the analysis has undergone many significant developments. Some of the principal stages of material culture studies can be traced in the historiography of Kirkstall. The 'antiquarian-collector' era, before the rise of a distinct archaeological discipline as recognised today, is represented in the person of Ralph Thoresby (1658–1725). Thoresby was an antiquarian primarily, and interested in topography, lands and ownership of them, and objects of ancient origin or souvenirs from far-off places; in this respect he continued the topographical approach of antiquarians of the previous generation, notably William Dugdale (1605–1686). Thoresby made only brief mention of Kirkstall in his *Ducatus Leodiensis* (published 1715), but in the catalogue of his museum, appended to the *Ducatus*, a few items from the abbey are listed. These include the abbot of Kirkstall's drinking glass, salt cellar, and a seal ring found at the site.[5] Thoresby's aim

---

[5] Ralph Thoresby, 'A Catalogue and Description of the Natural and Artificial Rarities in This Museum', in *Ducatus Leodiensis: Or, the Topography of the Ancient and Populous Town and Parish of Leedes, and Parts Adjacent, in the West-Riding of the County of York, with the Pedigrees of Many of the Nobility and Gentry, and Other Matters Relating to Those Parts; Extracted from Records, Original Evidences, and Manuscripts*, ed. by Thomas Dunham Whitaker, 2nd edn (Leeds: Robinson Son and Holdsworth, 1816), pp. 40 (candlestick, glass, salt cellar), 44

in collecting these items and his treatment sprang from his personal connection with their place of origin rather than his desire to elucidate the 'antiquity' in which they were created and used: 'an innate Affection to the Place of my Nativity did more particularly fix upon the present Subject'.[6] Thoresby simply listed items, and did not or could not appreciate their historical setting. This was particularly so with objects of monastic provenance, which were perceived as testimony to the errors of the Catholic English church before its reformation, and given their own grouping in his catalogue, entitled 'Matters Relating to Romish Superstition'.[7]

Developing Thoresby's approach to material culture was James Wardell, an antiquarian active in the nineteenth century who was greatly interested in the borough of Leeds and its environs. In his work (not just those concerning Kirkstall in particular) Thoresby's homogenous 'antiquity' was divided into distinct periods, which displayed varying degrees of civilisation and savagery, until at last 'a brighter era dawns' whereby laws and liberty were able 'to raise this country to its present proud and elevated position'.[8] But the material culture of Kirkstall Abbey had no place in this scheme, and Wardell did not incorporate it into his narrative. Instead, brief mention of some objects found at the abbey were supplied at the end of Wardell's guide. A chess-piece is described,[9] as is a mould for lead *ampulla*, and a non-conventual seal ring.[10] In terms of the development of material culture studies, the conception of objects was not to reconstruct a historical period's life and practices, despite more advanced methodologies becoming widely known.[11] For example, in 1848 Christian Jürgensen Thomsen's *Guide Book to Scandinavian Antiquity* was translated from Swedish into English; the work was revolutionary in that it provided a methodology for relative dating of artefacts, and constructed a narrative of Scandinavian prehistory independently of textual evidence.[12] But such advances in methodology were not applied to Kirkstall, the literature on which focused on the romantic elements of its picturesque architecture; especially so when set

---

(stirrup), 48 (alabaster statues), 52 (seal ring), 74 (manuscript of foundation narrative), 104–05 (deeds), 111 ('Roman bricks' found at the abbey site).

[6] Thoresby, *Catalogue*, p. i.

[7] Thoresby, *Catalogue*, p. 50.

[8] James Wardell, *The Antiquities of the Borough of Leeds, Described and Illustrated* (Leeds: Moxon and Walker, 1853), pp. v–vii.

[9] Wardell refers to the work of Albert Way, 'Notice of a Singular Sculptured Object, Probably a Chess-Piece, Found at Kirkstall Abbey', *The Archaeological Journal*, 6 (1849), 170–72.

[10] James Wardell, *An Historical Account of Kirkstall Abbey, Yorkshire, Archaeological and Historical; with the Lives of Its Abbots, from the Foundation to the Dissolution of the House*, ed. by W. M. Nelson, 6th edn (Leeds: Samuel Moxon, 1890), pp. 33–37.

[11] Bruce Trigger, *A History of Archaeological Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 35–55.

[12] Trigger, pp. 73–79.

against the growing industrial presence of Leeds.[13] It would take another century for the finds from Kirkstall to be appreciated for more than simply their aesthetic and memorial value.

The next major study of Kirkstall, although largely unconcerned with the excavation and preservation of small finds, nevertheless links it to the development of archaeological theory. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, William Henry St John Hope and John Bilson adopted a typological approach to Kirkstall's remains: in their analysis, the 'Cistercian' plan and the definition of a typology were uppermost, while the monks themselves were largely absent.[14] This typology, developed mainly by Hope and Harold Brakspear with reference to many Cistercian sites (Stanley Abbey in Wiltshire, Pipewell in Northamptonshire, Tintern in Monmouthshire, Waverley in Surrey, Beaulieu in Hampshire, Jervaulx and Fountains in North Yorkshire, and Furness in Cumbria) remains the dominant interpretation today. It was an example of the culture-historical school of archaeology, and particularly architectural study, which traced the spread and development of aesthetic styles and linked this to a concomitant diffusion of people responsible for them, a model highly applicable to Cistercian expansion with its well-documented system of affiliation. For Bilson, the religious themselves were the agents of diffusion: '[t]his Cistercian influence, Burgundian in its origin, but assuming a very definite character of its own, is a factor of no small importance in the history of English architecture in the twelfth century'.[15] Bilson was sure, however, to recognise that it was the Burgundian roots of the Order, rather than its religious observance, which gave rise to the style. People, usage of space, and historical context had been displaced by formal analysis of architecture.

In the second quarter of the twentieth century people as well as architecture were again becoming the focus of study. Functionalist schools of archaeological thought and a shift towards understanding economic processes and patterns of habitation were particularly applicable to a monastic site, although discussion of Kirkstall's archaeology was not formulated in these explicit terms.[16] In particular, there was an emphasis upon studying

---

[13] For example, [Anon.], *A History of Kirkstall Abbey* (Leeds: s.n., 1797), p. esp. pp. 22–28; [Anon.], *History of Kirkstall Abbey, Yorkshire, Antiquarian and Picturesque, with Engravings from Original Drawings by W. Mulready* (Leeds: H. Washbourne, 1847).

[14] William Henry St John Hope and John Bilson, *Architectural Description of Kirkstall Abbey* (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1907).

[15] John Bilson, 'The Architecture of Kirkstall Abbey Church, with Some General Remarks on the Architecture of the Cistercians', in *Architectural Description of Kirkstall Abbey*, by William Henry St John Hope and John Bilson (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1907), pp. 74–75.

[16] David E. Owen, *Kirkstall Abbey* (Leeds: E. J. Arnold and Son, n.d.), esp. pp. 55–94; Victor Buchli, 'Introduction', in *The Material Culture Reader*, ed. by Victor Buchli (Oxford: Berg, 2002), pp. 1–22; Dan Hicks, 'The Material-Cultural Turn: Event and Effect', in *The Oxford Handbook of Material Culture Studies*, ed. by Dan Hicks and Mary Carolyn Beaudry (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 25–98 (pp. 30–38); Trigger,

technological achievement within cultures and thereby explain their interaction with their environment and neighbouring regions. Through David Owen, this aim was continued into the excavations carried out during the 1950s and 1960s, with much emphasis on uncovering hearths, metallurgical installations, and the water management system.[17] Small finds were carefully collected during the digs, but the chief use of the numismatic finds was for dating floor layers, while the ceramics, also used for dating, were looked to for the data which they could provide regarding trade, and their distribution through nearby counties. Small finds in terms of accessories, dress items, or metalwork objects were not closely studied, nor were they well represented in the reports: the copper-alloy finds, including 'taps [faucets], parts of clasps, fastenings, curtain rings, [and] belt buckles' are stated as indicating only that 'the monastic copper smith had plenty of work on his hands'.[18]

The deficit in coverage of the small finds was made good with their publication in catalogue form in 1987, but it was a summary of the assemblage rather than an analysis which was provided.[19] The finds from the guesthouse excavations are being treated in a similar manner at the time of writing, although the analysis is taken further with the explicit intention of identifying any finds which indicate the presence of both corrodians and/or women in the guesthouse during the monastic period.[20] At present, the only discussion of the small finds from Kirkstall guesthouse are those presented in the guesthouse guide book, which details a few buckles, strap ends, strap mounts, finger rings, a purse hanger, knife fittings and a brooch.[21] For the earlier assemblage, excavated from the claustral area, there was a problem of documentation and storage of the archive that saw many items lost or unable to be stratified; the resultant assessment of the assemblage's functional categories was greatly hampered as a result.[22] The guesthouse assemblage (the constitution of which is discussed in greater depth below) represents the best opportunity for assessing the historical patterns of use and habitation within a building critical to the Kirkstall community's relations with the

---

pp. 244–88.

[17] David E. Owen, 'Kirkstall Abbey Excavations: 1950–1954', 1955; C. M. Mitchell, 'Kirkstall Abbey Excavations 1955–1959', *Publications of the Thoresby Society*, 48 (1961); C. V. Bellamy, C. M. Mitchell and Elizabeth Pirie, 'Kirkstall Abbey Excavations, 1960–1964', *Publications of the Thoresby Society*, 51 (1965), 1–66.

[18] Owen, *Kirkstall Abbey*, p. 59.

[19] Holly B. Duncan and Stephen Moorhouse, 'The Small Finds', in *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 1: The 1950–64 Excavations – A Reassessment* (Wakefield: West Yorkshire Archaeological Service, 1987), pp. 120–48 (pp. 120–48).

[20] Holly B. Duncan, 'Kirkstall Abbey Guest House: The Other Artefacts', in *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2* (forthcoming). I am deeply indebted to Holly Duncan for sight of her typescript long before publication, and for the wealth of advice which she has provided regarding the finds from the guest and their excavation.

[21] Stuart Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey: The Guesthouse – A Guide to the Medieval Buildings and to the Discoveries Made during Recent Excavations*, 2nd edn (Wakefield: West Yorkshire Archaeological Service, 1987), pp. 27–30.

[22] Duncan and Moorhouse, p. 120.

outside world.

Small Finds in Monastic Archaeology

Kirkstall's small finds, therefore, are now being turned to study of the people, and how they interacted with their material environment. The placement of small finds in a historical setting is still at a basic level for Kirkstall, which is a characteristic reflective of monastic archaeology more widely. The use of small finds in reconstructing life within the monastic precinct is not well developed, due largely to a lack of viable assemblages, constraints on the excavations when executed (financial, or time, for example), or due to poor post-excavation care (such as problems in archiving). Another reason is that architecture and infrastructure has absorbed the vast majority of the attention paid to monastic sites, not least because the manner in which it is surveyed is repeatable (unlike contextual excavation); re-assessment of architecture is easier, and therefore the stimulus for debate is much greater.[23] The general lack of easy access to digital databases should also be taken into account, and indeed the Kirkstall archive is only now being entered into the database for Leeds Museums and Galleries as part of the present research.[24]

As a result, interpretation of small finds from monastic sites is left at too shallow a level. Objects are often presented as products of an activity known or suspected to have been conducted at the monastic site from documentary sources, or from consideration of the day-to-day needs of the community.[25] For example if there is a documentary reference to a forge, and slag and metalworking equipment being found in a given structure, the finds are used to support and further clarify information derived from the documents.[26] Similarly, if items are seen as having been part of monastic life by virtue of their presence at a monastic site, and there is no way to assess how exceptional the presence of an item is (both in relation to what was acceptable in monastic life, and to the frequency of the object's occurrence), the result is an amorphous and uncritical interpretation. Neither approach makes a dramatic contribution to interpretation of the life and people at the site, and lacks the ability to modify existing interpretations and narratives of monastic history.

---

[23] For a list of recent major projects within Britain and their contributions see C. Gerrard, *Medieval Archaeology: Understanding Traditions and Contemporary Approaches* (London: Routledge, 2003), pp. 189–90.

[24] As described in the introduction.

[25] As argued in Sally V. Smith, 'Materializing Resistant Identities Among the Medieval Peasantry: An Examination of Dress Accessories from English Rural Settlement Sites', *Journal of Material Culture*, 14 (2009), 309–32 (pp. 312–13).

[26] Rosemary Cramp, Gladys Bettess and Pamela Lowther, *Wearmouth and Jarrow Monastic Sites* (Swindon: English Heritage, 2005).

Such is often the case even with Anglo-Saxon monastic archaeology, in which a greater independence from the (often lacking) documentary evidence might be expected, and consequently a greater independence of a material-orientated methodology.[27] Discussion most commonly takes the form of a survey of finds (most common), but does not link the objects to their socio-cultural context, or perhaps even their archaeological parallels. Some recent examples of this lack of analysis include even well-researched sites as Monkwearmouth and Jarrow, St Mary Graces (London) and Stratford Langthorne.[28] For Stratford Langthorne there is a discussion of personnel within the precinct, but it relies heavily on documentary evidence. While the authors recognise that dress items found within monastic grounds 'may reflect chance losses by lay people passing through the precinct', largely on the basis that these items are of a higher quality than those found in burials of monks, the overall attribution of identity is uncertain. An example is a strap mount found in the northern transept of the abbey church, which was interpreted as part of a dress item, but the conclusion stated is too ambiguous to be of great benefit: '[it] could have come from the dress of a lay or religious person'.[29]

Recently there have been isolated studies of the material culture of monastic life. A recent example is the work of Glyn Coppack, who analysed the finds from the Carthusian house of Mount Grace (North Yorkshire).[30] Through careful retrieval methods, many items were recovered which might otherwise have been overlooked. The result was that a monastic book production centre was identified, with the function of many of the finds being made clear by considering the objects accompanying them. This method, unfortunately, cannot be applied to the guesthouse assemblage due to the disruption to the context. Nevertheless, Coppack's work shows how consideration of the small finds can illuminate an area of monastic life which is very poorly documented, and even alter the perception of a monastic

---

[27] Rosemary Cramp, 'Monastic Sites', in *The Archaeology of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. by David M. Wilson (London: Methuen, 1976), pp. 201–52 (pp. 219–20 (Tynemouth), 222 (Hartlepool), 227–29 (Whitby)); 'Medieval Britain and Ireland in 2009', *Medieval Archaeology*, 54.1 (2010), 382–429 (pp. 409–14). A possible exception to come is the work currently being undertaken at Lyminge, Kent.

[28] Jackie Keily and Geoff Egan, 'Non-Ceramic Finds', in *The Cistercian Abbey of St Mary Stratford Langthorne, Essex: Archaeological Excavations for the London Underground Limited Jubilee Line Extension Project*, by Bruno Barber and others, MoLAS Monograph, 18 (London: Museum of London Archaeology Service, 2004), pp. 149–56; Rosemary Cramp, John Cherry and Pamela Lowther, 'Personal Possession and Domestic Items', in *Wearmouth and Jarrow Monastic Sites* (Swindon: English Heritage, 2005), pp. 229–312; Ian Grainger and Christopher Phillpotts, *The Cistercian Abbey of St Mary Graces, East Smithfield, London* (London: Museum of London Archaeology, 2011).

[29] Keily and Egan, p. 92.

[30] Glyn Coppack, '"Make Straight in the Desert a Highway for Our God": The Carthusians and Community in Late Medieval England', in *Monasteries and Society in the British Isles in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. by Janet Burton and Karen Stöber, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion, 35 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008), pp. 168–79.

order perceived as the paragon of insularity. Another study is Pestell's analysis of Bromholm Priory, Norfolk, in which the objects are distinguished as being for either sacred or profane use, and which are then used to characterise the space in which these finds were uncovered. [31] At Bromholm the study is, most unfortunately, limited in its specificity, due to the paucity of standing remains. That an interpretation, even a narrative, of a site such as Bromholm can be made demonstrates the potential of analysing artefacts.

Pestell and Coppack's contributions are very significant, however, in that they prioritise function over material type. Such attention to function enables discussion of context in terms of life, people and activity. A good example of this is Smith's study of the expression of identity through the material culture of the medieval rural peasantry (although the material culture in this case is worked into a restrictive interpretative model, rather than being used to establish a narrative for itself). [32] Such contextualisation lifts the small finds from their current position as an auxiliary resource for the dating of archaeological features (for example, architecture), and places them at the centre of the research enquiry. Until as recently as twenty years ago, the majority of archaeological reports on sites did not employ objects to reveal information about people who used them; instead, small finds such as dress accessories were relegated to a specialist appendix, in which the potential of the finds was left unrealised. [33]

The problems of small finds in monastic archaeology can be summarised in the following way. Firstly, there is a small number of archives which store a substantial amount of archaeological data, and the databases of these objects are not easily accessible. Secondly, attention within monastic archaeology has been on architecture rather than small finds, with a consequent divergence from the goals typical of historical enquiry. Thirdly, although in recent excavations small finds have been included, with stratigraphic data where possible, only a small percentage has been published and so comparison across the growing corpus of material is made more difficult. Finally, the scope of analysis of small finds is kept at a descriptive level, and the questions that they are suited to answering remain largely unarticulated.

---

[31] Tim Pestell, 'Using Material Culture to Define Holy Space: The Bromholm Project', in *Defining the Holy: Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Sarah Hamilton and Andrew Spicer (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), pp. 161–86.

[32] Smith, 'Materializing Resistant Identities' (for full reference see note 25 above). For the discussion of what is meant by 'resistance' see pp. 310–13.

[33] For a polemical view on the role of finds specialists in the archaeological process and the production of reports see P. W. Blinkhorn and C. G. Cumberpatch, 'The Interpretation of Artefacts and the Tyranny of the Field Archaeologist', *Assemblage*, 4 (1998).

Historical Material Culture Studies and Small Finds

The study of objects has been advocated over the last decade as not only a means of supplementing documentary enquiry of the past, or only according to established archaeological methods, but as a foremost means of understanding unspoken expressions of culture and society forming the fabric of past existence.[34] Material culture studies as it exists today grew from an innovative heritage of inter-disciplinary cross-fertilisation between archaeological, anthropological, and sociological thought, and its focus oscillates somewhere between study of the material, cultural, and social, depending on the practitioner. Daniel Prown, a seminal author of the discipline, defined the discipline as: 'the study through artifacts of the beliefs – values, ideas, attitudes, and assumptions – of a particular community or society at a given time'.[35] The intellectual underpinnings of the discipline are still being formulated, and attempts are still being made to break out of self-location nearer or further from one of the three terms just mentioned. Ian Hodder, for example, emphasises the heterogeneity of 'entanglements' binding humans and things, and it is imbalance in the relationship between them that causes unpredictable contingencies to occur and new entanglements to arise.[36] Such a view promotes the world conceived as 'a mix of human beings and things, culture and matter, society and technology', with these terms evocative of the formative stages of material cultural studies.[37]

To complement such theoretical developments, there is now also much greater emphasis being given to the discipline's attendant methodologies and how to implement them at a practical level.[38] The ability for objects to be used as a way of augmenting historical knowledge is now widely appreciated, but the unique nature of different historical periods

---

[34] Karen Harvey, 'Introduction: Practical Matters', in *History and Material Culture: A Student's Guide to Approaching Alternative Sources*, ed. by Karen Harvey (London: Routledge, 2009), pp. 1–23 (pp. 8–13); Giorgio Riello, 'The Material Culture of Walking: Spaces of Methodologies in the Long Eighteenth Century', in *Everyday Objects: Medieval and Early Modern Material Culture and Its Meanings*, ed. by Tara Hamling and Catherine Richardson (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), pp. 41–55 (pp. 43–44); Anne Gerritsen and Giorgio Riello, 'Introduction: Writing Material Culture History', in *Writing Material Culture History*, ed. by Anne Gerritsen and Giorgio Riello (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), pp. 1–13 (p. 5).

[35] Daniel Prown, 'Mind in Matter: An Introduction to Material Culture Theory and Method', *Winterthur Portfolio*, 17 (1982), 1–19 (p. 1).

[36] Ian Hodder, *Entangled: An Archaeology of the Relationships between Humans and Things* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), p. 208.

[37] The most detailed commentary on the development of material cultural studies is Dan Hicks, 'The Material-Cultural Turn: Event and Effect', in *The Oxford Handbook of Material Culture Studies*, ed. by Dan Hicks and Mary Carolyn Beaudry (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 25–98, which displays the resonance of Hodder's terms.

[38] A highly accessible example being *History and Material Culture: A Student's Guide to Approaching Alternative Sources*, ed. by Karen Harvey (London: Routledge, 2009).

and the evidence, textual and material, available for them varies greatly.[39] Much of these discussions concern *c.* 1500 or later, this date being the commonly held starting-point of historical archaeology.[40] The great quantity of extant evidence, particularly for contemporary material cultural studies, permits combination of object, text, living testimony, and observation as part of a cohesive methodology for understanding humanity's experience of the world. In historical material culture studies, the various evidential strengths and weaknesses of each period, region, and field of research modify the methodologies that can draw plausible and meaningful conclusions. This is especially so for the much of the medieval period in England, where documentation treating objects, or portraying them via artistic means, is scarcer than, for example, Victorian England.[41] It is indicative that, of the full-length studies highlighted in a recent survey of material cultural studies, none is of the medieval period.[42] The Italian Renaissance is an exception, but, as Hamling and Richardson note, this is perhaps because the very weight of tradition of scholarly interest in masterworks of this period prompted a counter-thrust aimed at understanding the mundane as well as the exceptional or exquisite.[43]

While methodologies for the research into later periods, attuned to the sources as they are, cannot be applied in their entirety to counterpart medieval fields, the explorative and open-ended spirit of material cultural studies has infused study of the medieval period. An example of material culture studies' entrepreneurial approach is Sara Pennell's study of the kitchen and its contents in the early modern period, which emphasises the value of reinterpretation of seemingly understood objects and circumstances from different perspectives.[44] For Pennell, the hearth was not a place of seclusion where the wife was stowed to perform domestic duties, but a central space that 'contained within it the possibilities of transformation, but also of

---

[39] David Gaimster, 'Archaeology of an Age of Print? Everyday Objects in an Age of Transition', in *Everyday Objects: Medieval and Early Modern Material Culture and Its Meanings*, ed. by Tara Hamling and Catherine Richardson (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), pp. 133–43 (p. 143).

[40] Dan Hicks and Mary Carolyn Beaudry, 'Introduction: The Place of Historical Archaeology', in *The Cambridge Companion to Historical Archaeology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 1–9. The year also forms the mid-point in survey that does reach into the late Middle Ages: *The Age of Transition: The Archaeology of English Culture, 1400–1600*, ed. by David Gaimster and Paul Stamper, Oxbow Monographs, 98 (Oxford: Oxbow, 1997).

[41] For which, see Asa Briggs, *Victorian Things* (London: Batsford, 1988).

[42] See the studies mentioned in *Everyday Objects: Medieval and Early Modern Material Culture and Its Meanings*, ed. by Tara Hamling and Catherine Richardson (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), p. 1, n. 1. The studies with the earliest coverage are: Raffaella Sarti, *Europe at Home: Family and Material Culture, 1500–1800* (New Haven, CT; London: Yale University Press, 2004); Lena Cowen Orlin, *Material London, Ca. 1600* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000).

[43] Tara Hamling and Catherine Richardson, 'Introduction', in *Everyday Objects: Medieval and Early Modern Material Culture and Its Meanings*, ed. by Tara Hamling and Catherine Richardson (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), pp. 1–23 (p. 3).

[44] Sara Pennell, '"Pots and Pans History": The Material Culture of the Kitchen in Early Modern England', *Journal of Design History*, 11 (1998), 201–16.

transgression' (through preparation of food and domestic violence on the wife's part), and where the use of expert tools resulted in a 'communal female recognition of the importance of the hearth'.[45] For the medieval period, and branching into similarly expansive socio-cultural lines, Naomi Sykes has analysed the animal bones as a material cultural resource to demonstrate the social cohesion and hierarchy that surround the hunting of game.[46] Michael Carter has demonstrated how late-medieval Cistercians incorporated eschatological schemes into commissioned liturgical vestments, as well as how it would have been perceived by the congregation when worn.[47] A study with important implications for the present study is that of Ben Jervis, who has combined complementary forms of archaeological data from the Southampton excavations to investigate the enactment and maintenance of social identity.[48] The data include quantified animal bone assemblages, which have been assessed according to their contexts to indicate the diets of different social groups, and pottery, which has been subjected to formal and residue analysis to identify its function and circumstances of use. Ultimately, through use of combined forms of data Jervis is able to consider not simply diet or ceramic forms in isolation, but perceive the culture of usage, and instead discuss 'cuisine'.[49] All these studies place objects at the heart of analysis and work to identify the social bonds formed around them.

Material Culture and Kirkstall's Small Finds

Applying such wide-ranging methodologies to Kirkstall's guesthouse assemblage is problematic. In his discussion of material cultural methodologies, Giorgio Riello presents three main approaches which provide a neat classificatory frame for the methodology of this study. Riello entitles these variant approaches to material culture as follows: 'history from things', 'history of things', or 'history and things'.[50] The medieval studies previously cited may be best classified as 'history of things', which prioritises objects as another means of accessing

---

[45] Ibid., pp. 205, 208, 213.

[46] Naomi Jane Sykes, 'Taking Sides: The Social Life of Venison in Medieval England', in *Breaking and Shaping Beastly Bodies: Animals as Material Culture in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Aleksander Pluskowski (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2007), pp. 149–60.

[47] Michael Carter, 'Remembrance, Liturgy and Status in a Late Medieval English Cistercian Abbey: The Mourning Vestment of Abbot Robert Thornton of Jervaulx (1510–33)', *Textile History*, 41.2 (2010), 145–60.

[48] Ben Jervis, 'Cuisine and Urban Identities in Medieval England: Objects, Foodstuffs and Urban Life in Thirteenth- and Fourteenth-Century Hampshire', *Archaeological Journal*, 169 (2013), 453–79 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00665983.2012.11020921>.

[49] Jervis, 'Cuisine and Urban Identities', p. 475.

[50] The word 'thing' should be understood here in a technical sense: 'a thing is an entity that has presence […] it has a configuration that endures', with the added criterion that 'things bring people and other things together': Hodder, *Entangled*, pp. 7, 9.

deeper meaning in the historical past: 'the relationship between objects, people and their representations'.[51] Such an approach is not only possible, but would be extremely beneficial for a re-reading of medieval culture, as it has for other periods.[52] '[H]istory and things' juxtaposes objects with reference to an established historical narrative or interpretation with the aim of finding corroboration or disjuncture, with the emphasis that 'history and things' is not merely illustration of historical knowledge independent of the material record.[53]

Riello's 'history from things' is the most beneficial approach to Kirkstall's artefacts. In this approach objects 'are used as raw materials for the discipline of history and the interpretation of the past', and, by way of demonstration, Riello makes reference to the discovery of an eighteenth-century stomacher concealed within a chimney of a house.[54] Significantly, the stomacher that Riello analyses defies contextualisation through documentation, and it is this problem that complicates interpretation of Kirkstall's objects.[55] There is therefore a need to find alternative ways of assessing their social significance.

Difficulties are encountered with Kirkstall's dress accessories in particular. There are few syntheses of archaeological assemblages that enable Kirkstall's items to be set in a broader frame of reference. The work of David Hinton, and recent research carried out by Alex Cassels are two exceptions.[56] Hinton has synthesised the interpretation of objects stretching from the post-Roman period until the late fifteenth century, but Hinton's study resembles Riello's 'history with things', in that it is a discussion of a series of exceptional objects, or objects that have internal evidence that speak to their social significance.[57] This is naturally so, given the scope of the work, which encompasses all the British Isles, and the variety of assemblages from which Hinton is able to select objects. Cassels's study is closer to the scenario at Kirkstall, as the data employed by Cassels consists of base-metal objects, which require large quantities of data for meaningful conclusions to be drawn. However, many questions that Cassels bring to the data, such as modes of production or consumption, are not directly relevant to monastic

---

[51] Giorgio Riello, 'Things That Shape History: Material Culture and Historical Narratives', in *History and Material Culture: A Student's Guide to Approaching Alternative Sources*, ed. by Karen Harvey (London: Routledge, 2009), pp. 24–46 (p. 25).

[52] An effective case of this methodology being employed for the nineteenth century is Manuel Charpy, 'How Things Shape Us: Material Culture and Identity in the Industrial Age', in *Writing Material Culture History*, ed. by Anne Gerritsen and Giorgio Riello (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), pp. 199–221.

[53] Riello, 'Things That Shape History', p. 41.

[54] Riello, 'Things That Shape History', p. 25.

[55] Riello, 'Things That Shape History', p. 29.

[56] David A. Hinton, *Gold and Gilt, Pots and Pins: Possessions and People in Medieval Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); and Alex Cassels, 'Dress Accessories in England, A.D. 1200–1500: An Archaeological Study of Consumption' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sheffield, 2013).

[57] Such as the Sutton Hoo hoard, which is used for comparison of many objects (Hinton, *Gold and Gilt*, pp. 51–61), or inscribed brooches (ibid., p. 227).

hospitality, which must remain the primary focus of the assemblage given the building in which the items were excavated and the larger research questions of the present study.

The methodology for Kirkstall's dress accessories is derived from two basic principles. First, the guesthouse assemblage has not been approached with a social status already hypothesised. Studies of material culture often approach objects with a general understanding of where the object(s) were placed in relation to their social standing, even if that understanding is re-evaluated as a result of studying the object. Pennell's study of an early modern pastry cutter, for example, has highlighted the need to 'prioritise examination of the object as a fragment that has no pre-ordained context'.[58] Pennell accordingly emphasises a reinterpretation of the pastry cutter as an example of the material culture of women who lived, as textually based interpretations would have it, 'on the evidential margins of what we know as female gentility'.[59] Given that the purpose of studying these objects is to identify guests' social identities, assigning the hypothetical guests a social status would be detrimental in the extreme, and enquiry kept as sensitive to historical context as possible.

A second principle regards scope of enquiry. The only questions posed are those directly relating to assessing possible social status(es) associated with the artefacts, and Kirkstall's dress assemblage is not used an entry-point for wider exploration of medieval society and culture. Such issues as whether dress items had personal emotive value, magical significance, or were used as physical media in social relations, are not considered here.[60] Nor are these items studied with reference to consumption of goods or economy more broadly. For investigation of hospitality at Kirkstall, there are three areas of importance. The first is to assess the social standing of the people who would have used the dress accessories. The second is to establish the material environment of the guesthouse, and understand more about how its occupants experienced it. The third and final area is to understand what guests did while in the abbey, including eating. When set against the broader reach of this thesis, especially considerations of other material evidence for how hospitality was provided and the lack of any substantial material culture from other Cistercian guesthouses, the significance is magnified.

Not all objects excavated at the guesthouse further assessment of social identity.

---

[58] Sara Pennell, 'Mundane Materiality, Or, Should Small Things Still Be Forgotten? Material Culture, Micro-Histories and the Problem of Scale', in *History and Material Culture: A Student's Guide to Approaching Alternative Sources*, ed. by Karen Harvey (London: Routledge, 2009), pp. 173–91 (p. 188).

[59] Pennell, 'Mundane Materiality, or, Should Small Things Still Be Forgotten? Material Culture, Micro-Histories and the Problem of Scale', p. 185.

[60] For these areas, see Eleanor Rose Standley, *Trinkets and Charms: The Use, Meaning and Significance of Dress Accessories, 1300–1700*, Oxford University School of Archaeology Monographs, 78 (Oxford: Institute for Archaeology, University of Oxford, 2013).

By dividing the assemblage according to function, the most relevant kinds of items can be selected for study. The functional categories employed in this analysis are those used in the forthcoming publication on the guesthouse at Kirkstall (fig. 3.1).[61] These functional classifications can be grouped together more broadly into 'analytical categories' (those used to structure analysis) to answer the questions posed above. These analytical categories have informed the structure of the rest of this and the next chapter (fig. 3.2). Not all the potential paths of enquiry can be explored, and some have had to be omitted. A regrettable example is commercial activity, including how coins, jettons, and weights were used, which has the potential to change our appreciation of the guesthouse as a hospitality space. Such a topic must be left for future research.

For the link between an object and its social context to be established a comprehensive survey of the object is required.[62] Firstly, a detailed physical description of the object has been made, including any aesthetic features and its dimensions. Particular attention has been paid to diagnostic features that allow the identification of parallels at other sites. Where possible, dates have been assigned to the objects. This allows the chronological spread of the objects to be determined, and periods of high activity to be identified.

The basic approach regarding the identification of guests and their activity is as follows. The identity of the guests is determined as far as possible from items which can be tied to particular social groupings. By far the most promising of the functional categories relating to social identity is that of dress, to which category around four hundred items have been assigned. There are 302 dress accessories catalogued from Kirkstall guesthouse, and a non-ferrous assemblage of 9142 items.[63] This category also has the advantage of being represented in effigies and sculpture, pictorially in manuscript illuminations and paintings, itemised in documentary sources such as wardrobe accounts, and described in prose works (anecdotally or specifically, and often directly expressive of contemporary attitudes). By dating the objects (if possible) and studying the figural and pictorial evidence, an object's primary context of

---

[61] Stuart Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2*, (forthcoming).

[62] A complete survey of the finds is not presented here; for this see the forthcoming publication of the catalogue or the database of Leeds Museums and Galleries in Duncan, 'Other Artefacts'. At all points, those items studied by the author have formed the basis of discussion, except where these are no longer extant. The objects themselves are currently located in Leeds Museums and Galleries stores at The Discovery Centre, Carlisle Road, Leeds, LS10 1LB. The finds are accessioned under the following numbers (where 'XXX' represents variable numerics): LEEDM.D.2012.0035.001.XXX (metalwork); LEEDM.D.2012.0035.002.XXX (non-metals); LEEDM.D.2012.0035.003.XXX (stonework). The objects are referenced here according to their small finds number, given in the format 'year of excavation': 'finds number', where the year is expressed as a two-digit number: e.g. SF 79:137, indicating the excavation carried out in 1979, and small find number 137.

[63] Duncan, 'Other Artefacts'.

use can be assessed. Primary context of use is the establishment of 'the complete set' of items with which an object would have been associated. An example of assessing primary context would be a belt buckle frame, which would have required a strap to be attached, a pin to fix the strap in place, and perhaps strap loops to keep the excess length of strap from obstructing the wearer. A belt would be worn with some forms of dress, and not others, depending upon necessity and style as might be. By this method, the kind of attire typically worn with an object can be determined, and, by implication, an identification of the social status of the wearer.

The identification of the activity of the guests and the use of space is more straightforward. At the most basic level, the presence of an item used for an activity, for example a cooking pot, indicated that the activity was carried out there. But some categories demand closer analysis, particularly those relating to commerce, trade, writing and pastimes. These can be indicative of social status as well, the tools associated with these practices tend to be more dateable (for example, new issues of coinage, and aesthetic changes in book binders). These functional categories therefore pay greater dividends when compared with assessments of social status, and also when set in the wider context of what activity was being carried out across the monastery. The example of the cooking pot, for example, is not so banal when it can be said that the guesthouse was used to cook food for the guests and not the monastic kitchens, especially given the evidence derived from analysis of the animal bones.[64]

The final stage is to link these with what is known from the objects found in the monastic areas of the precinct, here drawing on the work of the excavations carried in the mid-twentieth century. Comparison between the ostensibly 'secular' nature of guesthouse and the 'religious' nature of the monastery will ultimately highlight how hospitality allowed the peaceful accommodation of the former by the latter.

Dating the Finds and Interpreting their Chronology

Because the guesthouse floor layers were disturbed during the digs of the late-nineteenth century, the stratigraphic data (though well-recorded) cannot be used to associate the finds with either ceramic sherds or architectural phases. As a result, the date-range of the finds is very broad. The date-range includes not only that of the guesthouse fabric itself (early thirteenth century to mid-sixteenth century), but also unquantified periods of time before the date of construction of the guesthouse on the one hand, and after the dissolution of

---

[64] See chapter 4.2.

the house on the other. It cannot be assumed that the finds represent the monastic period of occupation alone, as testified by the large amount of Victorian glassware found in the guesthouse. Reliance has therefore been placed upon formal and stylistic comparison with objects excavated from other sites which have been securely dated.[65] The dating is much less precise as a result, though can still reveal some trends in the data.

Much can be told of the usage of the guesthouse from dating the finds (fig. 3.3). The chronological distribution of the dress items indicates that the main periods of activity within the guesthouse were from the mid-thirteenth to the mid-fifteenth centuries (*c.* 1250 to *c.* 1450), with a few items pushing this range right up to, and quite possibly beyond, the dissolution of the house in 1539. Many of the buckles are decorated with knops and grooves, but have no plates, and can be dated broadly to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Others bear evidence of having once had integral plates and so are probably slightly later.[66] Some items are difficult to date due to their very utilitarian form; they lack distinctive diagnostic features and parallels are found from a number of variously dated deposits. Many of the buckles fall into this category, as do the buckle-pins which have become detached from their frames.[67]

There are some items, however, which were evidently tied more closely to contemporary fashions. These tend to be items which were highly visible and/or for a purely decorative purpose. Strap ends and strap mounts are very good examples, and some can be dated quite closely, such as a lobed strap mount with a cross-hatched decoration on its central plate (fig. 3.4),[68] or a silver strap-end with the peculiar feature of having a single rivet hole (most have at

---

[65] The main catalogues used in this comparative dating are: W. B. Ward Perkins, *London Museum: Medieval Catalogue* (London: H.M.S.O., 1940); J. Cowgill, M. de Neergaard and N. Griffiths, *Knives and Scabbards*, Medieval Finds from Excavations in London, 1 (London: H.M.S.O., 1987); Ian. H. Goodall, 'Iron Buckles and Belt-Fittings', in *Object and Economy in Medieval Winchester: Artefacts from Medieval Winchester*, by Martin Biddle and others, Winchester Studies, 7.ii, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 526–38; Geoff Egan and Frances Pritchard, *Dress Accessories, c. 1150–c. 1450*, Medieval Finds from Excavations in London, 3 (London: H.M.S.O., 1991); Sue Margeson and others, *Norwich Households: The Medieval and Post-Medieval Finds from Norwich Survey Excavations, 1971–1978* (Norwich: The Norwich Survey, 1993); *The Medieval Horse and Its Equipment, c. 1150–c. 1450*, ed. by John Clark, Medieval Finds from Excavations in London, 5 (London: H.M.S.O., 1995); Ross Whitehead, *Buckles, 1250–1800* (Witham, Essex: Greenlight, 2003); Patrick Ottaway and Nicola Rogers, *Craft, Industry and Everyday Life: Finds from Medieval York*, The Archaeology of York, 17 (York: Council for British Archaeology, 2002); Ian. H. Goodall, *Ironwork in Medieval Britain: An Archaeological Study* (London: Society for Medieval Archaeology, 2011); Grainger and Phillpotts, *St Mary Graces*. This last is less useful than the others due to its few illustrations; it is included primarily on the basis of it being a monastic, and more especially a Cistercian, site.

[66] A. R. Goodall, 'The Medieval Bronzesmith and His Products', in *Medieval Industry*, ed. by D. W. Crossley, Council for British Archaeology Research Reports, 40 (Council for British Archaeology, 1981), pp. 63–71 (p. 67).

[67] E.g. SF 8023, an oval-frame buckle with ornate knopped outside edge, the decoration of which was very common, and another buckle, SF 3972 (LEEDM.D.2012.0035.001.044).

[68] SF 2776 (LEEDM.D.2012.0035.001.045).

least two), an angled- and knopped outer end, and a crescent concave inner edge (fig. 3.5).[69] Both point towards the late-fourteenth century. The presence of dress items from across the later Middle Ages represents continuous usage of the guesthouse.

Some less obvious trends in the dating should be mentioned. The first is that some of the finds potentially date from the mid-twelfth century, and thus pre-date the construction of the guesthouse in the early thirteenth century; this point is not worth labouring, however, as otherwise their date-range falls comfortably within that of the construction of the stone guesthouse. While there are a few items, such as the buckles mentioned above, which span the 'busy' period of the later thirteenth to the earlier fifteenth centuries, it should be noted that the attributed date-ranges for a great many do not. In the case of the latter there is a clear dividing line which falls around 1350. This significance of this is twofold. Firstly, the years around the centre of the fourteenth century mark the onset of the Black Death in England, a devastation of the population and upheaval in many traditional patterns of life. Secondly, the discontinuity suggested by these items falls at time where, as presented previously, the construction and modification of Cistercian guesthouses was in a period of change.[70]

As a tentative hypothesis, therefore, it could be suggested that the influx of guests at this time dropped off (as might be expected), and rather than continuous usage of the guest facilities, there are in fact two periods of activity, with the items from the earlier half of the fourteenth century representing guests at the abbey before the Black Death, the items dated to the later fourteenth century representing those arriving at the abbey after the plague had abated. That a great number of dress items, many of them with decorative features, date from after the mid-fourteenth century suggests that there was no dramatic alteration to how the guesthouse was used and that it continued as a hospitality structure until the dissolution of the house.[71] What is not clear is whether this period of continuous usage was broken temporarily during this later period. Such a case may be when the eastern hall and kitchen were used to found bells for the church; the replacement of the hearth is suggested to have been a symbolic replacement linked to the guesthouse's obsolescence, but it could equally have been re-installed to restore its former functionality.[72] As well, it is uncertain whether these people were guests staying for short periods of time, or whether they were permanent

---

[69] SF 7037 (LEEDM.D.2012.0035.001.042).

[70] See chapter 2.2.

[71] E.g. the silver strap end (SF 7037) and some composite strap loops of intricate design which only occur in late-fourteenth-century and early-fifteenth century deposits (SF 1309 and SF 1797); see Egan and Pritchard, pp. 233–35 and fig. 150 (late fourteenth century); Ottaway and Rogers, p. 2903, no. 14389 (early to mid-fifteenth century).

[72] Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2*.

residents in the manner of corrodians (or indeed, whether they were part of the monastic community and using it as an extension of their claustral offices).

The Social Identity of the People at Kirkstall's Guesthouse

What is Meant by Social Identity?

In this analysis, the objects are used to distinguish different social groupings operating within the guesthouse range, viewed 'vertically' and 'horizontally'. 'Vertical' groupings are derived from a stratified view of medieval society (aristocracy at the top, peasantry at the bottom), which has the advantage of allowing for contemporary perceptions of social order, particularly those expressed in England in the sumptuary laws.[73] With reference to these laws, dress items are particularly valuable for assessing social status, as they were explicitly recognised as expressing such in medieval England. '[P]eople of various conditions wear various apparel not appropriate to their state', reads the 1363 sumptuary legislation, which goes on to list these states in ascending order of prestige: 'grooms', 'craftsmen', 'gentlemen', 'esquires', 'knights', and 'lords'; 'poor women' were distinguished from 'their ladies'; 'poor clerks' were said to presume to the clothing of 'kings and other lords'.[74] The legislation is problematic in that the classes which it sought to define had already become blurred in the eyes of the ruling elite, hence the need for legal articulation of class boundaries.[75] As well, the law was repealed in parliament in 1365, as it was found that the commonalty were 'severely aggrieved' by it; no doubt it was highly problematic to enforce as well.[76] But the value of the law is not as a measure of the extent and nature of royal and parliamentary power, but as a general indicator of social values, and it is very informative that such a hierarchy could be proposed as a valid descriptor of English society.[77] Regarding the interpretation of finds,

---

[73] S. H. Rigby, 'Introduction: Social Structure and Economic Change in Late Medieval England', in *A Social History of England, 1200–1500*, ed. by Rosemary Horrox and W. M. Ormrod (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 1–30 (pp. 3–6).

[74] W. M. Ormrod, ed., 'Edward III: Parliament of 1363, Text and Translation', in *The Parliament Rolls of Medieval England*, ed. by C. Given-Wilson and others (Woodbridge, Boydell: 2012), v, pp. 278–79.

[75] Possibly because the social gradations were a recent phenomenon: Peter R. Coss, 'Knights, Esquires and the Origins of Social Gradation in England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5 (1995), 155–78 (p. 173).

[76] W. M. Ormrod, ed., 'Edward III: Parliament of 1365, Text and Translation', in *PROME*, v, p. 286 (section 2): 'sont durement grevez par l'ordinance fait au darrein parlement'.

[77] Egan and Pritchard, p. 21; Maurice Keen, *English Society in the Later Middle Ages, 1348–1500* (London: Penguin, 1990), pp. 7–13; Frédérique Lachaud, 'Dress and Social Status in England before the Sumptuary Laws', in *Heraldry, Pageantry, and Social Display in Medieval England*, ed. by Peter R. Coss and Maurice Keen (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002), pp. 105–23 (pp. 119–22).

conclusions derived with regard to this hierarchical view incline towards the relative rather than absolute descriptors 'high status' or 'low status', but are tied more closely to a specific social status where possible. 'High status' is not equated with 'noble', which would be too restrictive a term, but more an ability to dispose of wealth, gifts, or property, and be in a position to negotiate the same.[78] The difference between a wealthy yeoman and a poor gentleman, can be very difficult to discern even among documentary references, and such haziness must be accepted as part of the methodology.[79] As Frederique Lauchaud has stated, 'while there is no doubt that dress in the middle ages was an expression of wealth and power, it may in fact have remained for a long time an ambivalent mark of social status'.[80] It is in this light that dress accessories are interpreted here.

Hinted at within this legislation is another way of dividing society. This is a 'horizontal' view of society which places greater emphasis on the different roles played by certain groups (for example, merchant, farmer, religious pilgrim). People's profession could be identified by their clothing, for example a university graduate (a 'poor clerk') in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries by his then-antiquated full-length robe, or a blacksmith (i.e. a craftsman) by his apron, at a time when there was little specialised clothing for tradesmen.[81] This approach has the advantage of allowing for a variety of interactions between different social groups to be perceived, rather than the strictly top-down or bottom-up view encouraged by a vertical partitioning of medieval society.

A crucial division to be made regarding people using the guesthouse range is that of gender. At all points the possibility of the presence of females receives special attention, as this represents a fundamental shift in how the monks interacted with the world. For Kirkstall this is marked by an indulgence granted in 1402 that permitted access for women to the church on 'certain days in the year' (these are not further specified).[82] This can be determined by some dress items, though most are unisex and it would be hazardous to draw too-clear a

---

[78] Given-Wilson presents the statistic that fewer than 0.2% of the population of England before the Black Death, and 0.5%–0.6% after were considered 'noble': Chris Given-Wilson, 'Rank and Status among the English Nobility', in *Princely Rank in Late Medieval Europe: Trodden Paths and Promising Avenues*, ed. by Thorsten Huthwelker, Jörg Henning Peltzer, and Maximilian Wemhöner (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2011), pp. 97–117 (p. 97).

[79] Given-Wilson, 'English Nobility', p. 117; Philip Morgan, 'Ranks of Society', in *The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, ed. by Ralph A. Griffiths (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 59–85 (pp. 83–85).

[80] Lauchaud, 'Dress and Social Status', p. 122.

[81] Françoise Piponnier and Perrine Mane, *Dress in the Middle Ages*, trans. by Caroline Beamish (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), pp. 50–51, 125–26.

[82] *Memorials of the Abbey of St Mary of Fountains*, ed. by John Richard Walbran and J. Fowler, Publications of the Surtees Society, 42, 67, 130, 3 vols (Durham: Surtees Society, 1863), pp. 205–06; a translation of this document is available in Martin Heale, *Monasticism in Late Medieval England, c. 1300–1535* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009), pp. 125–26.

distinction between 'male' and 'female' dress accessories. Some items relating to activity do represent a clearer divide, however, although these cannot be so easily tied to a particular social group (for example, thimbles, needle/needle cases, hair pins).

The perception gained from this analysis is not personal in the sense that we can tell who one individual was apart from another. Nor does the analysis reveal total numbers of people who might have been present, as there is no necessary correlation between number of guests and quantity of finds.[83] The information tells rather of the social identity, in that a social grouping might be evidenced, but details that allow distinction within that group are not given by the finds. Thus, a particular form of badge might suggest a particular group of people, but provides no biographical information to distinguish the hypothetical badge-wearer from any other individual. No matter which way 'social status' is identified, the information sought from these objects is to place their user or wearer in a broad social category, the status of which reflects upon the nature of the hospitality being provided by the community at Kirkstall.

The use of pictorial and figural evidence has methodological issues requiring further clarification. The principal uses of art and visual culture for the present discussion are twofold: to find artistic representations of archaeological data, and to see the objects with which these archaeological data are potentially associated. This means that the relationship between medieval artistic representations and medieval artefacts needs to be clarified if the two forms of evidence are to be used in association.

The use of effigies for the history of costume has a long pedigree. The media of effigies (stone, alabaster, brass, marble) have the advantage of depicting in great detail the costume of the figure, and consequently make excellent sources for seeing archaeological objects in their context of use. In the late nineteenth century, effigies were of interest principally for their armorial and genealogical information, which was seen to bolster documentary research. Many manuals were produced, which catalogued effigies, particularly brasses.[84] In these works, the dating of accompanying inscriptions (where present) were seen as being an infallible guide to chronology.[85] Eventually, the method's uncontroversial nature prompted

---

[83] Margeson and others, p. 1.

[84] A particularly influential study of brasses was Herbert Haines, *A Manual of Monumental Brasses: Comprising an Introduction to the Study of These Memorials and a List of Those Remaining in the British Isles* (Oxford and London: J. H. and J. Parker, 1861). Also see Herbert Walter Macklin, *Monumental Brasses*, 7th edn (London: Swann Sonnenschein, 1890); Herbert Druitt, *A Manual of Costume as Illustrated by Monumental Brasses* (London: A. Moring, 1906); Frederick Herbert Crossley, *English Church Monuments A.D. 1150–1550: An Introduction to the Study of Tombs and Effigies of the Mediaeval Period* (London: B.T. Batsford, 1921).

[85] Haines, p. iii.

new methodologies to exploit this form of evidence.[86] By the mid-twentieth century the enquiry of effigial evidence (brass, stone, alabaster, or anything else) was taken up in new directions with the work of Lawrence Stone.[87] Stone emphasised the artistic style underlying the art and united effigial evidence with pictorial evidence, which permitted re-dating and reclassifying of effigies. Ultimately, Stone saw effigies as manifestation of a broader aesthetic culture that was a product of its cultural context, rather than simply being read for their chronological merit. With regard to dress, however, Stone believed that effigies were an accurate reflection of the fashions of the day: '[p]articularly during the period of rapidly changing fashions in costume [late-thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries], the engraver was bolder [than the sculptor] in depicting new details'.[88] Study of medieval funerary effigies and monuments has taken new directions, such as the importance of memory, or as expressions of dynastic continuity, which go beyond the monument as an object to investigate its context, the individuals and groups who commissioned, established, and viewed the effigies.[89] Behind these new objectives, recourse to monuments for information about medieval dress remains accepted, if not an actively pursed as a research agenda.[90]

Research into costume and dress is similarly well established using manuscript evidence, and this method has formed a staple of the history of costume to date from the central to the later Middle Ages.[91] For the twelfth century, manuscripts are a chief source, and persists, with incorporating more media, into the early fifteenth.[92] After *c.* 1450 the pictorial record becomes less reliable as an indicator of contemporary style, and greater attention has

---

[86] Very significantly, J. P. C Kent, 'Monumental Brasses: A New Classification of Military Effigies, c.1360–c.1485', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 12 (1949), 70–97.

[87] Lawrence Stone, *Sculpture in Britain: The Middle Ages* (Harmondsworth: Penquin, 1955).

[88] Ibid., p. 138.

[89] Nigel Saul, *Death, Art, and Memory in Medieval England: The Cobham Family and Their Monuments 1300–1500* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001); Michael A. Hicks and Michael Penman, 'English Monasteries as Repositories of Dynastic Memory', in *Monuments and Monumentality across Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Proceedings of the 2011 Stirling Conference* (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2013), pp. 224–38.

[90] Including the most recent historiographical contribution: Nigel Saul, *English Church Monuments in the Middle Ages: History and Representation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009). Saul does not infer status from costume, instead choosing to rely on epitaphs and documentary evidence to assess personal (rather than social identity, but discusses dress as reflecting contemporary fashion (for example, p. 250).

[91] See, for example, Cecil Willett Cunnington and others, *Handbook of English Mediaeval Costume.*, 2nd edn (London: Faber, 1969).

[92] Jennifer Harris, '"Estroit Vestu et Menu Cosu": Evidence for the Construction of Twelfth-Century Dress.', in *Medieval Art: Recent Perspectives. A Memorial Tribute to C. R. Dodwell*, ed. by Gale R. Owen-Crocker and Timothy Graham (Manchester, 1998), pp. 89–103 (pp. 90–91). Harris states: 'the dress in which the twelfth-century artist clothed his figures was usually contemporary, and, arguably, from direct observation', but does not state further reasoning or references. For the fifteenth century, see 'Dress and Illuminated Manuscripts at the Burgundian Court: Complementary Sources and Fashions (1430–1455)', in *Staging the Court of Burgundy: Proceedings of the Conference 'The Splendour of Burgundy'*, ed. by Sophie Jolivet and others (London: Harvey Miller, 2013), pp. 279–85; Anne F. Sutton, 'Dress and Fashions *c.* 1470', in *Daily Life in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. by Richard Britnell (Stroud: Sutton, 1998), pp. 5–26, (notes) 195–99 (pp. 6–9).

to be paid to the work's social context and artist's intention, although the realism of the Low Countries provides a relatively safe haven.[93]

More recently, emphasis on 'visual culture', as opposed to 'art history' has seen the use of images put to a similar use as effigies, with artefact, in this case an artistic representation, acting as conduit to the historical and cultural context.[94] While research into clothing is still to some extent determining what was worn, other discourses treat the artistic representation of clothing as a topic in itself, and analyse social themes. Gale Owen-Crocker has re-assessed the Bayeux tapestry and perceived a foreshadowing of the Normans' political domination over the Saxons expressed in their style of dress, while Margaret Scott has observed imagery of fashion reinforcing biblical narratives.[95] Cordelia Warr has conducted extensive study of the clothing of religious orders, and demonstrated the integral nature of the monks' habit to his social and religious identity with reference to documentary as well textual evidence, such as when a Cistercian monk is refused entry to paradise because he died without his scapula (over-garment).[96] The importance of reading an object itself, its form and function, must therefore be balanced with the intentions of those who created it, used it, and witnessed it.

Which Objects Indicate Social Identity at Kirkstall?

The principal object used to assess social identity are the dress accessories. Objects from Kirkstall classified as dress accessories are quite numerous. Around three hundred items have been so identified, including buckles, brooches, strap fittings, pins, purse fittings, and lace tags.[97] By reviewing manuscript illuminations, paintings, effigies and sculptures, these objects can be seen in their context of use, although they form only the starting point of an investigation. Other objects that provide clues as to the social condition of the people using the guesthouse range are suggested by the presence of toiletry items, some of which were costly and would not have been carried by people without disposable income. Similarly so with some items pertaining to armament; although daggers were standard tools, carried by

---

[93] Ibid., p. 7.

[94] *Thresholds of Medieval Visual Culture: Liminal Spaces*, Boydell Studies in Medieval Art and Architecture (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2012); Gerhard Jaritz, 'Social Grouping and the Languages of Dress in the Late Middle Ages', *Medieval History Journal*, 3 (2000), 235–59; *Images and Objects in Ritual Practices in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Krista Kodres and Anu Mänd (Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2013).

[95] Margaret Scott, *A Visual History of Costume: The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (London: B.T. Batsford, 1986).

[96] Cordelia Warr, *Dressing for Heaven: Religious Clothing in Italy, 1215–1545* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010), pp. 59–60; Cordelia Warr, 'The Devil on My Tail: Clothing and Visual Culture in the Camposanto Last Judgement', in *Medieval Clothing and Textiles, 11*, ed. by Robin Netherton and Gale R. Owen-Crocker (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2015), pp. 99–117.

[97] Duncan, table 2.

most people (and, indeed, a *cultellum* is one of the necessary items prescribed for monks in the Rule of Benedict), such items as a knuckle-guard were very much a secular item, indicating armour of some sophistication.[98]

The Intended Usage of the Kirkstall Guesthouse Dress Accessories

First to examine is for what purpose the dress accessories were intended, and consequently what this might suggest about the people lodging at the guesthouse. This includes determining whether the items were, in fact, used for dress. This latter point is not so clear-cut, as the form of the buckle might not change whether it was used as part of costume, horse furniture, or for another use. This can be achieved in part by considering the width of the straps.

Heavier usage, such as strain-bearing straps on bridle fittings, or for industrial or agricultural use (in connection with horse furniture), is largely denied by the diminutive size and increased level of decoration of the buckles and their attendant effects.[99] The sort of belt worn by an agricultural worker might be indicated in the depiction of a peasant labourer in the Luttrell Psalter, dated *c.* 1320–40 (fig. 3.6), which shows a large oval buckle, where the length of the oval is parallel with the length of the strap (as opposed to perpendicular, the common configuration).[100] Meanwhile, the silver colouring suggests iron or steel, a material suited to heavier ware. Care ought to be taken with this illumination, as it has elements of artistic licence: the purple tunic and crimson surcoat, not to mention the gloves, indicate that these are unrealistically costly garments, and suggests that the buckle might in fact be intended to depict silver — the overall effect could have been to depict the prosperity of Luttrell's lands, or simply to brighten the page aesthetically. Not all of the elements are fantastic, and the cut of the super tunic – above the knee with ample room for mobility around the arms – conforms to the demands of its function, as does the length of belt hanging from the waist. The form of the buckle (an elongated D-form, or possibly sub-rectangular) agrees with a form of iron buckle that was used from the Conquest onwards.[101] In form, rather than in colouring, therefore, this depiction would support the idea that larger buckles were used for

---

[98] *RB*, 55.

[99] Geoff Egan, 'Buckles, Hasps, and Strap Hooks', in *The Medieval Horse and Its Equipment, c. 1150–c. 1450*, ed. by John Clark, Medieval Finds from Excavations in London, 5 (London: H.M.S.O., 1995), pp. 55–61 (p. 55).

[100] Of the same form from Kirkstall, but smaller, very poorly preserved and of copper alloy is SF 4733.

[101] Ian. H. Goodall, 'Iron Buckles and Belt-Fittings', p. 530, nos. 1296 and 1298 (elongated D–form), p. 532, no. 1309 (sub–rectangular). Dates: no. 1296 is late fourteenth century; no. 1298 mid fifteenth to early sixteenth century; no. 1309 eleventh to thirteenth centuries.

heavier duty occupations.

There are few buckles from Kirkstall of a size approximating the 'Luttrell buckle', judging from its proportions relative to the rest of the figure, which suggests that the guesthouse buckles were used for gentler applications, most probably as dress items. Nearly all the buckles from Kirkstall accommodate a relatively thin strap, and certainly very few of them reach the threshold width required for a sword-belt (see fig. 3.7).[102] Straps (and buckles) on clothes would frequently be worn as belts (around hips on men and under the bust on women), and sometimes around the ankle or foot to tighten shoes or boots as shown in an effigy of King John carved *c.* 1240 (fig. 3.8). Generally, the straps were not thick in fashionable dress; the weight taken was minimal (a purse, and blade perhaps), and was intended to keep in otherwise loose garments so that movement and action was not unnecessarily impeded.[103]

Consideration of the finds with which some of the buckles have been found is enlightening, especially strap mounts. Mounts that were a rectangular or 'bar' shape would often fill the width of the strap, and can therefore give an indication of the straps width even though the strap is no longer extant (a buckle would not be used on a strap which is a greater width than the buckle itself). One of the largest buckles in the guesthouse assemblage would have accommodated a strap of width maximum 36mm, and was found in the same area and floor layer was a strap mount which, when set length-to-width with the strap (fig. 3.9), could easily have formed part of the same costume.[104] Similarly so with a bar suspension mount, often used to suspend purses or similar items, of width 15mm, and a buckle with a width of 18mm (fig. 3.10, fig. 3.11, fig. 3.12).[105]

Although there are depictions of thin belts with a size of buckle similar to those from Kirkstall being used as a sword belt, these images usually depict some highly elegant figure, perhaps of supernatural nature. This is the case with Hugo van der Goes's portrait of Margaret of Denmark, James III of Scotland's queen, with St George, which was painted between 1473 and 1478 (fig. 3.13).[106] Here, the figure of St George is equipped head to toe in full plate-mail, and beside his characteristic lance he carries a low-slung sword and scabbard, with a gilt strap, which is scarcely a finger's width, taking their weight. Such an item would be

---

[102] Egan and Pritchard, p. 35: 'it seems unlikely that, apart from sword-belts, any [straps] were wider than 60mm for most of the period [1150–1450]'.

[103] Ward Perkins, p. 271.

[104] The buckles is SF 2471 (LEEDM.D.2012.0035.001.220); the mount is SF 2566 (LEEDM.D.2012.0035.001.367). Both items are from grid reference A100 (east of solar), floor layer 178.

[105] The buckle is SF 1461; the mount is SF 1811 (LEEDM.D.2012.0035.001.311). Both items are from grid reference D2, floor layer 392.

[106] Margaret Scott, *A Visual History of Costume: The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (London: B.T. Batsford, 1986), p. 107, fig. 111.

unsuitable for any military engagement and could only have been made in reality by folding the leather double (or more) so that it would be able to take the weight; even this would be highly improbable.[107] In this picture, the belt is a show piece intended to emphasise the grace and nobility of the wearer.

The idea that thinner straps would not typically be put to such use is suggested by figural evidence elsewhere. On the effigy of Sir Humphrey Littlebury, at Holbeach in Lincolnshire (fig. 3.14), dating from 1360, is a buckle of a size more closely approximating those at Kirkstall. This buckle, while part of the waist-belt, is also connected to the sword-belt of much more substantial construction; there was some confusion over how to attach it, as represented by the Holbeach example, but the baldric was the most common.[108] From a similar period (1370) is an effigy of Catherine Mortimer, wife of Thomas Beauchamp, which shows the thinner belt-strap in the context of female dress; the size and form are similar to those at Kirkstall (fig. 3.15). This serves to underscore the notion that the buckles from Kirkstall should be associated with dress, and that the wearers were not engaging in heavy labour.

Some items can be associated with a specific purpose. Such is the case for a small annular double loop buckle from Kirkstall with a central bar, and which is angled in section (fig. 3.16).[109] Similar small annular buckles were often used either on shoes, boot straps, or around the feet or ankle in the case of armour. Several small annular buckles were found during the London waterfront excavations in deposits containing many objects associated with the cobbler's craft.[110] Small annular buckles can also be seen in their context of usage on effigies, for example that of the Later Hilton knight at Swine, North Humberside, formerly East Riding (fig. 3.17).[111] Rectangular buckles are seen around the ankles on an effigy of a knight at Furness Abbey, Cumbria, formerly Lancashire, perhaps indicating a form which later became obsolete.[112] Buckles used for affixing straps to armour plates or used as a hasps to keep plates fitted were often square, a clear example of which is seen on the effigy of the

---

[107] Egan and Pritchard, p. 37. See also p. 35: 'it seems unlikely that, apart from sword-belts, any [straps] were wider than 60mm for most of the period [1150–1450]'.

[108] Frederick Herbert Crossley, *English Church Monuments A.D. 1150–1550: An Introduction to the Study of Tombs and Effigies of the Mediaeval Period* (London: B.T. Batsford, 1921), p. 242.

[109] SF 79:280.

[110] Egan and Pritchard, pp. 2–3, referring to the Copthall Avenue (OPT81), Trig Lane (TL74), and Swan Lane (SWA81) sites.

[111] Pauline E. Routh, *Medieval Effigial Alabaster Tombs in Yorkshire* (Ipswich: Boydell, 1976), pp. 115–16, and p. 114, fig. 70.

[112] Crossley, p. 236.

Mirfield knight at Batley, West Yorkshire (fig. 3.18).[113]

Another factor supporting the argument that the Kirkstall buckles were principally used for dress is to see whether it has an offset bar or not (fig. 3.19). An offset bar meant that an attached strap or separate strap-plate sat flush with the rest of the frame, instead of protruding; a small consideration, but one which would greatly enhance the overall aesthetic given the belt's high visibility.[114] Of the frames with an offset bar, there are some which are much more elaborately decorated and represent gentle costume. For example an ornate buckle frame with grooved decoration, notch for pin and knops both for decoration and guiding the strap;[115] another has a bilobate notch which acted as both decoration and keeping the pin centred on the outer edge of the frame.[116]

It should be stated as a counterpoint that not all larger buckles indicate a lower status of wearer. Belts and buckles, as they often are in the present day, can be used as 'statement' items to reveal affiliations of the wearer, or show adherence to a popular fashion through decorative mounts.[117] Wide buckles in particular were popular for use with girdles for women's clothing in the fifteenth century, where a girdle would be used to gather in the *houppelande* under the bust.[118] Wide cloth textile girdles, and the difference in style between male and female dress more generally, are illustrated in a picture showing the granting of privileges to Ghent and Flanders (fig. 3.20). Here the women, who occupy the right-hand side of the picture, wear thicker belts, although the buckles are not clearly visible; the men, on the left, wear thinner belts which are heavily studded with mounts (and from which a dagger can be seen to hang).[119] Unfortunately, no traces of fabric have been recovered along with the buckles from the guesthouse, which would have given more information about the status, and perhaps the gender, of the wearer.[120] At Kirkstall, the dress accessory most tied to the feminine costume depicted here is the large rectangular buckle mentioned previously.[121] Ultimately, however the gender of the guests cannot be determined conclusively from their dress accessories.

---

[113] Routh, p. 22, fig. 7.

[114] There are eleven offset-barred buckle frames from Kirkstall guesthouse: SF 1461, SF 1792, SF 3879, SF 3972, SF 4033, SF 4120, SF 4316, SF 4733, SF 4816, SF 5057, SF 8023.

[115] SF 8023.

[116] SF 1792.

[117] Strikingly demonstrated in Annemarieke Willemsen, '"Man Is a Sack of Muck Girded with Silver": Metal Decoration on Late-Medieval Leather Belts and Purses from the Netherlands', *Medieval Archaeology*, 56 (2012), 171–202 (pp. 172, 187–99).

[118] Scott, *A Visual History of Costume*, p. 66, fig. 62; p. 67, fig. 63; p. 94, fig. 96.

[119] 'The granting of privileges to Ghent and Flanders', Anon. Flemish illuminator; The Privileges of Ghent and Flanders, Cod. 2583, f. 13. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna; Scott, *A Visual History of Costume*, p. 90, fig. 90.

[120] Egan and Pritchard, p. 35.

[121] SF 2471.

Seeing Dress Accessories in their Context of Use

The Kirkstall buckles are taken here, as a result of the above discussion, as representing dress items; the next stage is to consider with what sort of items they might have been associated. This is achieved by referring to contemporary figural and pictorial evidence, and locating items similar to the Kirkstall items in medieval representations of costume.

The date-range of the finds indicates that they were used as part of dress during the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries, and it is from this period that the figural and pictorial evidence has been drawn. There were some overarching changes to fashion that should be borne in mind viewing representations of dress. The mid- to late-thirteenth century style was characterised by the popularity of a long (knee- or ankle-length) *supertunica* or *surcoat*, and was the dominant trend before the 'tailoring revolution' of the fourteenth century (as in the case of King John's effigy, fig. 3.8). During the fourteenth century and beyond the silhouette was changed greatly by the introduction of ever shorter super tunics, the appearance of *houppelandes* (long over-robes which open from the front, worn for formal wear), the addition of padding to certain areas such as the shoulders and stomach in fashionable secular wear, and by allowing body-hugging forms to be made to measure with the aid of buttons to keep clothes in place.[122] While these outfits are not represented in the archaeological record at Kirkstall, the dress items are compatible with the different iteration of fashion. The following discussion suggests possibilities of associated items rather than drawing firm conclusions.

The easiest item to begin a reconstruction of costume is the belt or girdle and its attendant components, represented in the Kirkstall assemblage by buckles, buckle plates, buckle pins, strap ends, strap mounts, hooked tags, strap loops, and purse hangers. There are forty-one buckles in the guesthouse assemblage, which along with strap ends are often the most visible dress accessories on effigies and in paintings. Buckles were a ubiquitous item, owned by all but the very poorest classes of society throughout the medieval period. Their highly practical function meant that a certain basic form was demanded, and dating is rarely very closely defined.[123]

There are some items which can be matched by their form with effigial counterparts. An oval-framed lipped and notched buckle type from Kirkstall's guesthouse is the same form

---

[122] Piponnier and Mane, pp. 66–70, 79–81; Eleanor Rose Standley, 'Trinkets and Charms: The Use, Meaning and Significance of Later Medieval and Early Post-Medieval Dress Accessories' (unpublished PhD thesis, Durham University, 2010), pp. 8–9; Margaret Scott, *Medieval Dress and Fashion* (London: British Library, 2007); Scott, *A Visual History of Costume*; Cecil Willett Cunnington and others, *Handbook of English Mediaeval Costume.*, 2nd edn (London: Faber, 1969), pp. 42–133.

[123] Egan and Pritchard, pp. 21–22, table 1 and fig. 11.

as that found on many effigies (fig. 3.21 and fig. 3.22).[124] An earlier brass on which it is found is that of Sir Roger of Trumpington, in the Church of St Mary and St Michael, Trumpington (Cambridgeshire), although the example here is much wider and used for a sword-belt (fig. 3.23).[125] Also similar is the buckle seen on the brass of Sir Hugh Hastings in St Mary's Church, Elsing, Norfolk, dated to 1347 (fig. 3.24);[126] likewise the effigy of John, First Lord Willoughby, in St James's Church, Spilsby, Lincolnshire, dated to 1348.[127] Another buckle form from Kirkstall guesthouse represented on effigies is an undecorated oval frame buckle with a narrowed bar,[128] a like example (though of different size) is found on the sword-belt of Sir Miles Stapleton, as shown in his effigial brass (not extant) from Ingham Priory, Norfolk (fig. 3.25 and fig. 3.26), dated to 1364. The buckle is represented in secular civilian dress, rather than armour, on the monumental brass depicting an unknown man in the Church of St Thomas Becket at Hampsthwaite, Yorkshire, dated to 1360 × 1365 (fig. 3.27).[129] In this effigy the man is shown in a hooded mantle (which largely fell out of use by the end of the century), a tight-fitting super tunic buttoned all the way up the front; long tippets hang from the upper arms and are the stylised descendant of the long pendent cuffs of the late-thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. That this is highly fashionable dress is indicated not only by the tightness of the fit around the body and the lower arms (also buttoned), but the shortness of the tunic, a development which caused consternation among conservative commentators.[130] A partially obscured example of the D-form buckle is an effigy of a man in civil dress in St John the Baptist's Church, Shottesbrooke, Berkshire (fig. 3.28). These examples show that some of the buckles from Kirkstall were in widespread use, and could be used in conjunction with various dress configurations, civilian or military.

Other belt fittings that can be associated with figural and pictorial evidence are the strap mounts found in the assemblage. The sexfoil mounts (fig. 3.29) from the guesthouse are typical of those used on belts or other dress pieces, such as on a surcoat, as demonstrated by the effigial brass of Sir John D'Abernon (the Younger) at Stoke D'Abernon, Surrey (fig. 3.30). As well, a very common form of bar mount which adorned straps, belts and girdles through

---

[124] A couple of examples are in the Kirkstall guesthouse assemblage. The excavation and catalogue data of the best example has been lost; its accession number is LEEDM.D.2012.0035.001.044. Another example, with its bar missing and a less prominent lip, is SF 79:198.

[125] Crossley, p. 237.

[126] The buckle's excavation and catalogue data has been lost, its accession number is LEEDM.D.2012.0035.001.044. For the brass see Crossley, p. 241.

[127] Crossley, p. 215.

[128] SF 5057.

[129] Scott, *A Visual History of Costume*, p. 37, fig. 24.

[130] Scott, *A Visual History of Costume*, p. 37; Scott, *Medieval Dress and Fashion*, p. 97.

out the later Middle Ages, and which have been found in deposits dating from the eleventh century onwards in England,[131] can be seen decorating the shield-strap, sword-belt and waist belt on the late-thirteenth stone effigy of Sir Gerard de Insula, dated 1260 × 1270 (fig. 3.31 and fig. 3.32).[132]

The guesthouse dress accessories can therefore be associated with the mode of dress of the elite during the medieval period. The items readily identifiable in the assemblage can be seen in their context of use, associated with other items that constitute the complete dress of an individual. The people memorialised in the effigies, sculptures and monumental brasses were without question the elite of society. Not only did they have the wealth required to commission funerary monuments, but the commissions themselves show that the deceased took an active role in the socio-political networks created by active patronage of churches and ecclesiastical institutions, which in turn enabled their privileged interment. The dress represented on these monuments is likewise that of the higher social classes. It is possible to argue from this evidence that since the Kirkstall guesthouse dress items can be seen represented in the context of elite dress, the guests were therefore high-status individuals, that is, the knights and esquires of the 1363 sumptuary legislation.

However, it does not necessarily follow that, because members of the social elite wore the kinds of items found at Kirkstall, the guests at Kirkstall must have belonged to a privileged social group. In terms of their form, the buckles, mounts and strap ends from Kirkstall are typical of those which were widely used throughout the country, indicated not least by the geographical locations of the effigies discussed above. Regarding small finds themselves, parallels are found at London, Winchester, York, Wharram Percy, Beverley, and Norwich, all of which have been well excavated and are relatively well understood. Likewise, their chronological range spreads across the later Middle Ages and further. The sites mentioned were inhabited and used by people constituting the full social spectrum. Wharram was a 'rural peasant' site which was in decline by the late fourteenth century.[133] The Lurk Lane excavations were on the south side of Beverley Minster, a wealthy ecclesiastical institution. At York some of the finds parallel to Kirkstall objects originate from Bedern near the ecclesiastical site of the College of the Vicars Choral; others come from Bedern Foundry, a metalworking

---

[131] Represented in the Kirkstall guesthouse assemblage by SF 1422 and SF 4732; for dating trends see Egan and Pritchard, p. 26, fig. 13.

[132] Crossley, p. 208.

[133] *Wharram: A Study of Settlement on the Yorkshire Wolds*, ed. by D. D. Andrews and G. Milne, Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph Series, 8 (London: Society for Medieval Archaeology, 1979), pp. 9–16; Smith, pp. 317, 319–20.

site, in a time when founders and coppersmiths were of moderate affluence in urban life (although manufacturers handling only small dress accessories may have been involved with the clothing, rather than metalworking, trades).[134] The London excavations took place on sites which were in medieval times wholly various, some were perhaps inhabited by personnel sporting costly military wear, others were merely rubbish heaps unrepresentative of London's growing prosperity in the later medieval period.[135] Many items from Kirkstall have exact parallels from other sites, including those with more distinctive decoration. Such an example is a decorated buckle[136] which has two prominent protruding knops, and a distinctive deep groove where it joins the frame and grooves around the notch for the pin (fig. 3.33 and fig. 3.34). There is an exact parallel from Lurk Lane, Beverley (dated to *c.* 1290–1325);[137] a composite loop fastener from Kirkstall is of a type found at York (fig. 3.35 and fig. 3.36);[138] and an example of an arched pendent strap mount from Kirkstall is seen with many of the fittings it would once have had in the London assemblages (fig. 3.11 and fig. 3.12).[139] There are too many such parallels to list here, but that they can be found so readily is significant.[140] Nor can it be argued that these dress accessories indicate the presence of only one gender, as most items of this sort spanned the gender divide, as shown by the sculpture of a young woman by Roger van der Weyden from the late fifteenth century, which has a rectangular belt of reasonable width, a decorated strap end and floral strap mounts (fig. 3.37).[141] The Kirkstall guesthouse items should therefore not be seen as indicating either male or female guests, particularly in the fifteenth century.

The Kirkstall assemblage therefore represents an 'average' assemblage which cannot be tied to any particularly high or low social status on the basis of form or decoration; the range of potential associations of these items are simply too numerous. While decreasing the specificity of the conclusions, it at least indicates that the Kirkstall Abbey's guests were dressed in accordance with prevalent contemporary modes. Building on this point, it can be stated that a range of social statuses is what might be expected if one considers the function of the

---

[134] John Blair and Claude Blair, 'Copper Alloys', in *English Medieval Industries: Craftsmen, Techniques, Products*, ed. by Nigel Ramsay and John Blair (London: Hambledon, 1991), pp. 81–106 (pp. 96, 101).

[135] Egan and Pritchard, pp. 1–12.

[136] SF 8023.

[137] Alison Goodall, 'The Copper Alloy and Gold', in *Excavations at Lurk Lane Beverley, 1979–1982*, ed. by Peter Armstrong, D. H. Evans, and David Tomlinson, Sheffield Excavation Reports, 1 (Sheffield: Humberside Archaeology Unit, 1991), pp. 148–54 (p. 149), no. 590.

[138] SF 1797, the parallel is found in Ottaway and Rogers, p. 2903, no. 14389 and fig, 1477.

[139] SF 79:491; the parallel is found in Egan and Pritchard, p. 224, no. 1198.

[140] For these parallels see the individual records created on the digital museum catalogue (TMS) as part of this research.

[141] Scott, *A Visual History of Costume*, p. 94, fig. 96.

guesthouse, which was to provide accommodation for a household, rather than simply a few individuals. Prestigious guests would have been waited on by their servants and perhaps those of the abbey; the dress accessories may have been deposited by anyone within that household.

Comparison of Kirkstall Guesthouse Assemblage with other Sites

One intriguing point arising from analysis of the assemblages from the York excavations is the number of dress accessories as an indicator of the social status of the site. At York, four principal sites were investigated: the site of the Gilbertine Priory at Fishergate, tenements on Coppergate, the College of the Vicars Choral at Bedern, and Bedern Foundry. Of these, Coppergate was the most representative of urban life given the evidence of crafts, the continuity of its inhabitation, and its location; it also had the smallest proportion of dress accessories in relation to its non-ferrous metal finds at *c.* 5%. This was compared with the College of the Vicars Choral at Bedern, which had percentage of dress accessories in relation to the non-ferrous items of *c.* 35%, and Fishergate, which had 30%.[142] A higher percentage indicates an increased importance of clothing and display at the site, at the expense of trades, crafts, and animal husbandry. At Kirkstall's guesthouse, the percentage is 6.6% and so on a par with the 'urban' Coppergate rather than the religious and, it has been argued, high-status college at Bedern.[143] However, in terms of the actual numbers of dress items excavated, the Kirkstall guesthouse dress accessories are more numerous than even at Bedern, the most productive site in York (fig. 3.38). This presents a slightly confusing situation for Kirkstall guesthouse, in which the dress accessories are of a proportion akin to an urban secular settlement, but the number of finds puts it ahead even of a site such as Bedern, which was not only high status but also contained manufacturing installations.

A couple of factors must influence any interpretation of the data. Firstly, the guesthouse was used a few times as a place for metalworking, which may increase the size of the non-ferrous assemblage through off-cuts or fragments from manufacturing processes. These may alter the composition of the assemblage all the more given the confined space within which the work was carried out. Secondly, there was an enormous amount of lead window cames recovered as well as fragments of window glass, both of which are more representative of the site's turbulent end rather than any sustained industry carried out there. (Interestingly, without the window cames, window glass fragments and unidentified fragments of copper

---

[142] Ottaway and Rogers, p. 2987.
[143] For the status of the college see Ottaway and Rogers, pp. 3001–02.

alloy and lead, all of which are uncommonly numerous, the dress accessories constitute about 30% of the non-ferrous assemblage.) The most straightforward interpretation is that the guesthouse was occupied consistently by people of superior enough status that dress accessories were, firstly, an important part of their costume, and, secondly, readily deposited in the archaeological record; this accounts for the very high number of dress accessories found compared with other sites. When the type of finds in the non-ferrous assemblage is taken into account the statistics are not so anomalous, thus accounting for proportions of dress accessories to other non-ferrous finds.

A point raised by this comparison touches on the nature of occupation at the guesthouse. An establishment catering to many groups of people (individual travellers, small groups, or the peripatetic household of a nobleman) would inherently be more open to having items deposited in it from the frequent turn-around of personnel. The great many people accommodated in the guesthouse (if, for example, the archbishop's household was in residence), the brevity of a guest's stay, the practical difficulties of overseeing a travelling household, and the greater numbers of different individuals (each with their own sets of baggage) would combine to present much greater opportunities for loss of items than would a fixed set of permanent residents. These arguments point towards an institution regularly overtaken by periods of frenetic activity.

There are counter-arguments to this interpretation, however. One, of great importance for understanding the guesthouse, is that corrodians may have taken up residence within the guesthouse, which would quieten the image of a bustling residential centre. Another, a practical consideration, is that we must credit the medieval personnel with a due sense of care and that habitual travel (one assumes) would necessarily sharpen the ability to keep track of even extensive inventories; therefore, while the finds might have been deposited by a great number of visitors over the later medieval period, the dating of the finds could indicate discrete 'clusters' of depositions as well as a gradual accumulation within the archaeological record.[144] Whichever interpretation is closest, the central fact remains that the guesthouse attracted visitors able to sustain the loss of items, some very valuable, and enough visitors to make the dress assemblage of size greater than other high status sites, all within a very concentrated space.

---

[144] As Caple has noted for the medieval pin industry, in which sudden surges in numbers of pins in circulation are testified only in documentary, rather than archaeological, evidence. C. Caple, 'The Detection and Definition of an Industry: The English Medieval and Post-Medieval Pin Industry', *Archaeological Journal*, 148 (1991), 241–55.

Material Type of Dress Accessories as an Indicator of Status

Metal in the later medieval period was a valuable commodity, and, while becoming progressively cheaper in comparison with goods such as cereals, it could still represent a substantial financial investment.[145] Precious metals of course retained their value the best, but with base metals the case is not so clear – was there prestige associated with certain types of metal rather than others? For Kirkstall, the issue is whether the fact that the vast majority of the dress accessories are made of copper alloy implies the presence of a particular social group.[146]

Copper alloy is an easily cast and worked metal, but iron or steel and lead alloys were eminently viable alternatives among the base metals. The articles of the Girdlers' Guild, granted in 1344, state that 'no man of the said trade shall garnish […] girdles or garters, with any but pure metal, such as latten,[147] or else with iron or steel'.[148] This was reinforced in 1376 when a girdler was found dabbling in precious metals, and it was confirmed that any metal 'except iron, steel, or *latone* [latten]' was forbidden to a girdler.[149] Iron and steel were therefore equivalent to copper alloy in the context of dress accessories. In the fifteenth century lead was placed on the same footing, when 'three leather girdles, harnessed with tin and other false and worthless metals' presented to the aldermen of London were in fact thought to be 'very advantageous for the common people' and it was therefore agreed that William Stykeneye, who had made the items, 'might in future make all such kinds of girdles'.[150] The impact of this change in thought is witnessed by a trend which Egan and Pritchard identified from the London assemblages, that of the dramatic increase in the use of lead in creating buckles from 1300 onwards.[151] The trend is not replicated at Kirkstall: all but two of the buckles are made from copper alloy, a material which has potential for intricate mouldings and decoration.[152] The absence of ferrous or lead alloy dress accessories at Kirkstall is therefore a point requiring

---

[145] Robert Bartlett, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization and Cultural Change, 950–1350* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1994), p. 61.

[146] Duncan, table 2.

[147] Latten, a copper alloy of copper, tin, zinc and lead (this being the smallest component). See the technical appendix by Roger Brownsword in Blair and Blair, pp. 102–04; '[F]inest latten', used to construct Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick's tomb in the mid-fifteenth century, consisted of 86% Cu, 8.2% Zn, 3.6% Sn, 1.2% Pb (1% other). See Maria Anne Hayward, 'Latten', in *Encyclopedia of Medieval Dress and Textiles*, ed. by Gale R. Owen-Crocker (Leiden: Brill, 2012), p. 314 (p. 314).

[148] *Memorials of London and London Life in the XIIIth, XIVth and XVth Centuries, Being a Series of Extracts, Local, Social, and Political, from the Early Archives of the City of London, A.D. 1276–1459*, ed. by H. T. Riley (London: Longmans, Green, 1868), p. 216; Ian. H. Goodall, 'Iron Buckles and Belt-Fittings', p. 526.

[149] Riley, p. 399.

[150] Riley, p. 399; Egan and Pritchard, p. 18.

[151] Egan and Pritchard, pp. 18–21.

[152] One buckle, SF 79:236, has an iron bar but is otherwise copper alloy; the lead alloy buckle is SF 7233.

explanation.

The increasing occurrence of lower-quality lead alloy is associated with the increase in mass-production of dress accessories during the later fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when forms previously kept from those with lower incomes by their prohibitive cost became more widely available.[153] The London Guild of Girdlers' statutes denouncing the use of lead alloys in product manufacture certainly state that it was to the detriment of the art, and that it was undermining the integrity of the trade.[154] That lead alloy objects do not occur at Kirkstall's guesthouse in any number suggests one of three possible situations. It could have been that the influx of guests had ceased before cheaper forms of dress accessory became available (and therefore the buckles were used by people from an earlier rather than later period), but the presence of items from the later Middle Ages suggest otherwise. It is possible that those people who would have bought the cheaper accessories were not lodged in the guesthouse, instead being lodged near the gate house, in which case the issue has little bearing on interpretation of the guesthouse items. Thirdly, the guests could have been of a status by whom only copper alloy items were used, but they were present up to the dissolution of the house (and possibly beyond), perhaps indicating that they were more conservative consumers.

While the introduction of this 'undercurrent' of cheaper lead alloy does not categorically affirm the argument that copper alloy was associated with higher status, and that by implication Kirkstall's guests were high-status themselves, it is suggestive of that idea. As has been seen, a number of copper alloy objects similar to those from Kirkstall guesthouse have been found at ostensibly 'rural peasant' sites (for example, Wharram Percy), suggesting that they formed a common enough component of the labourer's material belongings.[155] Taphonomic processes may indeed obscure the picture here, but not all characteristics of an assemblage developed after deposition, and the numbers of items involved remain meaningful.[156] For the York excavations post-deposition attrition was not deemed to be the determining factor in the excavated assemblage, it instead being proposed that 'the difference in the ratio of ferrous to non-ferrous metals between Bedern and Coppergate may point to a functional difference between the ecclesiastical and secular site assemblages'.[157] That is, a

---

[153] Egan and Pritchard, pp. 18–21; David Hinton, 'The Medieval Gold, Silver and Copper-Alloy Objects from Winchester', in *Object and Economy in Medieval Winchester: Artefacts from Medieval Winchester*, by Martin Biddle and others, Winchester Studies, 7.ii, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 29–35 (p. 35).

[154] Egan and Pritchard, pp. 18–19.

[155] Smith, p. 317.

[156] Sally V. Smith, p. 323.

[157] J. Jones, 'Conservation Report', in *Craft, Industry and Everyday Life: Finds from Medieval York*, by Patrick Ottaway and Nicola Rogers, The Archaeology of York, 17 (York: Council for British Archaeology, 2002), pp. 2696–2701 (p. 2670).

greater proportion of copper alloy finds would suggest a more genteel occupation. Simply put, at richer and more prosperous sites more is deposited in the archaeological record, and at these sites a proportionally greater numbers of copper alloy items are usually found. Transferred to dress accessories, it would suggest that at Kirkstall guesthouse the poor are certainly not excluded from consideration, but it is more probable from the number of copper alloy items and their dating that it was occupied by people connected with longer standing methods of manufacture, and who were not swayed by the availability of cheaper products. It could also be argued that copper alloy objects might be a common element in the peasants' inventory, even if these objects represented a substantial investment on their own behalf, or that of their household or wider community (much like shared or communally-owned plough equipment).

Although the lowest rung of the social scale at which copper alloy dress accessories would have been found remains unclear, an indication of the upper limit which they might reach is suggested by the sumptuary law of 1363. In this legislation the use of precious metals was restricted to the very uppermost of society; anyone of the rank of esquire or gentlemanly rank with an annual income of £100 or less 'shall not wear adornments, crimpings or knickknacks, or any manner of apparel of gold, silver or precious stones';[158] copper alloy as a material therefore, was thought suitable by the peers and lords for people of lower, but still gentle, status.

Continuing with this sumptuary law, it states that 'esquires with up to £200 or more annually 'may take and wear […] belts and other apparel reasonably decorated with silver'.[159] Crossing the threshold of this income bracket did not mean immediately converting all one's belongings into silver. A small number of silver finds reflects that these items were more carefully looked after, re-used, and repaired, rather than that Kirkstall did not cater to higher-class guests.

A Singular Item: The Silver Strap End

It is fitting to end the discussion of dress accessories by considering the solitary item made of a precious metal.[160] This is a silver sheet-metal strap end with side strips (fig. 3.5).[161] It is

---

[158] W. M. Ormrod, ed., 'Edward III: Parliament of 1363, Text and Translation', in *PROME*, v, p. 278.

[159] Ibid.

[160] All other silver items are coins.

[161] Heather Cunningham, 'From St. Bernard to the Dissolution: Personal Possession and Public Austerity as Reflected in Small Metal Artifacts from the Houses of the Yorkshire Cistercians' (unpublished MA dissertation, University of York, 2010), p. 31 discusses this item but does not state the significance of its guesthouse provenance.

tongue-shaped with an angled end and single rivet below concave attachment edge. Judging by direct formal parallels, this form of strap-end had emerged by the mid-thirteenth century and continued in use into the mid to late fourteenth century, although the best parallel from the London excavations date from the late fourteenth century.[162] In this item, many of the themes discussed so far are drawn together neatly. It is clear that it would not be worn by anyone engaged in menial labour, not only because of the material but because of the width of the strap onto which it would have been attached. The width of the strap end conforms to the width of the narrowest buckles found at Kirkstall, reinforcing the interpretation of gentle applications.

The material type of this item is the most important element of the strap end. It is not highly decorated, nor is it of particularly intricate construction. Were it in copper alloy, it would be treated as a well-preserved but otherwise unexceptional item. The form is very much like that found at other sites in other metals. The silver, however, casts its wearer into the most prestigious bracket outlined in the late-fourteenth-century sumptuary legislation. Whether the object's owner was actually of squirely rank (or of the equivalent wealth for a merchant) is not known, but the pretensions to dominance through social display are clear. It could be argued from the plainness of the strap end, and indeed for such investment in an item one might expect greater decoration, that it was owned by someone of substantial but not superlative means, but this is speculation only. The fact that only one such item has been found testifies rather to the care which was taken with items made of precious metal, and it compares well with sites such as Coppergate in York (one silver-ring and one silver brooch) and Bedern (one silver finger-ring, two silver brooches and two of gold), which were more spatially extensive than Kirkstall guesthouse.[163] This strap end serves as a pinnacle of the Kirkstall dress accessories, and demonstrates the presence, in limited numbers, of the wealthiest degree of guest at the abbey.

Conclusion: Dress Accessories and Social Status at Kirkstall Abbey Guesthouse

Tying dress accessories to a social status is fraught with difficulties. Willemsen has noted that the ubiquitous and utilitarian nature of girdles, belts, and straps and their consequent use 'by all classes, sexes, and ages […] means that it does not seem possible to determine who wore an excavated or preserved girdle'; it would seem that disjointed buckles and strap fittings

---

[162] Egan and Pritchard, p. 138 Also see p. 143, no. 659, which is of copper alloy, but has the same features of concave end and single rivet hole.
[163] Ottaway and Rogers, p. 2988, table 315.

would seem even less reliable in providing an indication of their wearer's social condition.[164] Certainly, if recourse is made only to artwork, then the problems of artistic licence, and the agenda of the artist both render definition of 'reality' problematic. Reference to artwork is taken here only as a starting point, and analysis has been extended into the accompanying fields of consideration of the relationship between an item's form and its use, metallurgy, and inter-site comparisons of assemblages to identify relative trends in the frequency of occurrence of certain types of artefact.

The statements that can be said are severely limited in their specificity. However, some important statements can be made from consideration of the dress accessories alone. Firstly, the diminutive size of the buckles, combined with their comparatively high degree of decoration and offset bars, indicates a greater attention to appearance, and that they were more likely to be used as dress items. Thin girdles were a mainly (but not completely) male fashion of the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (women often being depicted having a length of cord being tied above one hip, with no buckle), and many such thin buckles were found in contexts accompanied by strap mounts of a width suitable for those buckles. The items appear to represent dress rather than, for example, casket fittings, therefore. The style of the items is wholly in accordance with the established style of the time, and there is no significant departure requiring comment. Furthermore, the introduction of cheaper dress accessories in the later fourteenth and fifteenth centuries did not alter the composition of the assemblage at Kirkstall, and the dominance of copper alloy items indicates a measure of aesthetic conservatism among the wearers.

The status of the guests as revealed by the dress accessories is one which ranges from those of poorer background, to those who were in the higher echelons of society, as gauged from the fact that the Kirkstall items are similar to those found at 'poor' sites as well as richly endowed funerary monuments. It would seem from a notable lack of large, heavy buckles used for more heavy duty purposes that the guests were engaged in more reserved activities, though this could include domestic chores as much as indicate genteel pursuits. Overall, the Kirkstall guesthouse compares favourably with other known wealthy and affluent sites, in both the frequency and type of finds, and that such a diversity can be found shows Kirkstall guesthouse to be a place where the social elites were entertained, most probably with their retinue in tow. Clear indicators of high social status are items such as the silver strap end, a valuable find for its indication of the presence of very wealthy people at Kirkstall, and which

---

164 Willemsen, p. 187.

serves to underscore the hierarchy of personnel in the guesthouse by acting as the apex of the assemblage. The dress accessories in this way reflect the variety found in the medieval household, which was the very institution the guesthouse was constructed to accommodate.

3.2

PERSONAL IDENTITIES
OF GUESTS OF KIRKSTALL ABBEY

Assessing the identity of the guests at Kirkstall is a multi-layered process. Using the architecture of Kirkstall's guesthouse gives an impression of the kinds of guests which the monks anticipated receiving, this being based on the notion that community wished and were expected to provide accommodation suited to the social status of the guest, and which the latter might customarily enjoy outside the precinct. Studied in this way, the architecture suggests that the brethren were aspiring to entertain people of the highest social status, who would be accompanied by their itinerant household with its various gradations of office and function. The architecture is reinforced by study of the small finds, which supports the image of the household, with more common finds relating to dress and domestic activity being 'crowned' by a few very high-status artefacts. The archaeology of the guesthouse, therefore, strongly supports its use by the statuses of guests for whom it was intended.

There remain some points for clarification, however. The haphazard and ill-understood nature of the deposition processes of the finds means that the society of which the finds are a remainder cannot be tracked through time; there is a single group of data which has to be applied to the entire lifespan of the guesthouse, namely from the early thirteenth to the early sixteenth centuries. We do not know, therefore, if there were periods of time during which the guesthouse was not in occupation, or, with the exception of when the main hall was converted to a bell foundry, whether the guesthouse retained its function as a guesthouse throughout the period. Related to these problems is how frequently the guesthouse was used. Another problem is that although a broad outline of the sort of guest is suggested by the material remains, their personal identity (as opposed to their social identity) is left unknown. It can be seen that the guesthouse was set up for a very particular section of medieval society, but what did this translate as in the context of Kirkstall Abbey? Was the community able to attract the wealthiest guests to use the facilities that they provided, or was it local landowners who benefitted from their hospitality?

These questions can be answered to some extent by the documentary evidence related to Kirkstall Abbey. The charters, archiepiscopal registers, and other incidental records allow certain individuals to be placed at Kirkstall Abbey at specific times. The documentary record is far from complete, and it is very much the case that it is chance survival and the exceptional nature of the guests' visits that determine the data available for study. However, there is enough evidence to build up a picture of a few individuals who made physical contact with the monks of the abbey, who as well as forming bonds of friendship were minded enough through affection or business to visit the abbey and meet with the monks in person. Acting in concert with the material evidence, the guests of Kirkstall Abbey can be rendered in the fullest impression, and linked indissolubly with the religious community that they supported.

Historiography

The identification of historical personages through the use of charters, registers, and administrative documents is a well-tried form of prosopographical research into monastic houses.[165] Such studies extend into Cistercian houses as well, including the prominent houses of Fountains and Rievaulx in Yorkshire.[166] The principal goal of such investigation is, firstly, to identify the personal connections of the community and see the social world in which they operated; then to assess the nature of the interaction between these benefactors (or otherwise) and the community, and then to determine how this nature changes over time, in relation to the development of the abbey as an institution, and also with reference to the wider currents of lay spirituality. The resultant web of social ties and networks identified are centred on the religious institution(s) under investigation, but they have been abstracted from it. There is little anchoring the society of the religious institution to the place of the institution in its material setting. The people, be they benefactors, litigants, clergy, neighbours or friends,

---

[165] Some major studies, in chronological order: Barbara H. Rosenwein, *Rhinoceros Bound: Cluny in the Tenth Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982); Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Sword, Miter, and Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980–1198* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1987); Barbara H. Rosenwein, *To Be the Neighbor of Saint Peter: The Social Meaning of Cluny's Property, 909–1049* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1989); Emma Cownie, *The Religious Patronage of the Anglo-Norman Aristocracy in England, 1066–1135* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1998); Burton, *Monastic Order in Yorkshire*; Stöber, *Late Medieval Monasteries and Their Patrons*; and most recently, for Wales, Karen Stöber, 'The Social Networks of Late Medieval Welsh Monasteries', in *Monasteries and Society in the British Isles in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. by Janet Burton and Karen Stöber, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion, 35 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2008), pp. 11–24.

[166] Bennett D. Hill, *English Cistercian Monasteries and Their Patrons in the Twelfth Century* (London: University of Illinois Press, 1968); Joan Wardrop, *Fountains Abbey and Its Benefactors, 1132–1300*, Cistercian Studies Series, 91 (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1980); Jamroziak, *Rievaulx Abbey*.

exist in an abstracted conceptual view rather than operating in a material environment, such as the monastery itself, the precinct, honorial courts, or local ecclesiastical buildings. For the most part, this materialised view is not required, as it is the fact of the connection that is significant more than the operation of this connection in terms of physical proximity. A benefactor can be removed from the institution by a great physical distance, but still consider themself connected to it, as supporting it, and hold their affections to remain with it. However, identifying a religious institution's social network in the abstract realm of patronage, benefaction, friendship, and tenurial and legal association is not enough to make the leap that these individuals were in any way associated physically with the site of the abbey, or made personal contact with the institution, its edifices, or its members.

The advantage of materialising connections found by prosopographical research is that it can then be located within a given place. The abstract web of social connections is anchored to the place where that connection is made physically manifest. Viewed in terms of the core components of hospitality outlined at the beginning, those of guest, host, welcome and space, the inclusion of the spatial element, namely where the document states an interaction to have occurred, fulfils the necessary components to discuss these social connections in terms of hospitality.

Aims and Methodology

The aim of this section is to identify persons, including their name and any biographical details able to be uncovered, who visited Kirkstall Abbey during the period of its occupation of the site in 1152 to the dissolution of the house in 1539. This is done by using charters associated with the abbey, archiepiscopal registers, noble itineraries, and other miscellaneous documents as a kind of composite "guest book" to see who physically arrived at the abbey, occupied its apartments, used its facilities, and met with the community or its representative(s). Ultimately, emphasising the practicalities of the documentary information provides fuller appreciation of the nature and rationale behind provision of Cistercian hospitality and the guests' personal history, connections, and intentions.

This 'localised' information (localised in the sense that it is derived by concentration on specific locale, this being Kirkstall Abbey here) allows slightly different questions to be asked of the social networks than would an all-embracing study. The first is to see who attended the abbey with whom, and whether there are any trends in the groups of individuals who were present at the same or a similar time. Another trend to be investigated is chronological, and

whether there were particularly active periods where guests arrived at the abbey. A third and final trend is intimately bound up with the nature of the source material — whether there were particular occasions which called for a pre-planned assembly of guests, or whether the gatherings were more opportunistic.

The Guests

The documents relating where a personage was can be used to construct a list of people who attended Kirkstall Abbey in person. Very little such documentation now survives, and there is nothing in the way of chronicle or other anecdotal evidence to supply the deficit. No financial accounts have survived for Kirkstall as they have for Beaulieu Abbey in Hampshire, Vale Royal in Cheshire, or Fountains.[167] Instead, the mundane documentation relating to ecclesiastical administration, royal or county government, and documentation arising from land tenure have been relied upon. This mixture of evidence reveals different sets of people, each representing the Kirkstall monks' different spheres of activity, although there is some overlap between them. The following discussion is structured primarily according to the sources, with the methodology of each source being discussed in the appropriate place.

Secular Clergy as Guests

The ecclesiastical documentation is intermittent. Although located within the Archdeaconry of York for purposes of visitations of the diocese, Kirkstall's exempt status meant that the archbishop had little power to involve himself in the affairs of the community. It was only when the monks infringed the rights and privileges of the secular clergy (either in sacramental terms, or control of their spiritualities and temporalities) that the archbishop was permitted to intervene. This sort of interaction does little to provide evidence for hospitality, however. One of the best aspects of ecclesiastical records is that they are very well recorded. The registers of the archbishops keep a complete record of their itinerary, with each entry being assigned a date specific to the day and a place where the bishop was located.

　　　The greatest strength of these records regarding hospitality at Kirkstall Abbey is the requirement that the archbishop inform the community in advance of their visit. Exemption from archiepiscopal oversight also meant that the archbishop was unable to claim provision

---

[167] *The Account-Book of Beaulieu Abbey*, ed. by S. F. Hockey, Camden Society, 4th Ser., 16 (London: Royal Historical Society, 1975); *The Ledger-Book of Vale Royal Abbey*, ed. by John Brownbill, Publications of the Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, 68 (Edinburgh: Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, 1914); *Memorials of the Abbey of St Mary of Fountains, Vol. 3*, ed. by John Richard Walbran and James Raine, Publications of the Surtees Society, 130 (Durham: Surtees Society, 1918).

for himself and his household as by right, but for the first perambulation of the diocese.[168] Kirkstall could not refuse this request, as it was a valued customary right, but it was required that the community be informed beforehand so that the necessary provisions could be gathered in anticipation. Thus Archbishop Thomas of Corbridge (1300–1304) issued a notice of first advent on 21 May 1301, for his arrival on the 20 June the same year;[169] Archbishop William Greenfield (1306–1315) issued notice on 15 May 1307 for his visit on 3 June;[170] Henry Bowet, meanwhile, gave ample warning as he issued notice on 15 March 1408 for a visit on 19 May;[171] Archbishop John Kempe (1425–1452) issued notice on 4 March 1440 and visited on 26 March.[172] It is unfortunate that there is no breakdown of the costs available, but it was thought that as little as two week's notice was sufficient. As seen from the architecture of the guesthouse, it was of an arrangement suited to accommodating a household, and would have had the basic provision on hand from the abbey's ancillary buildings and nearby granges, items such as bread, ale, vegetables, and preserved fish.[173]

Were the archbishop to stay again during the course of his rule the cost of his stay was to be borne by him rather than the community.[174] As such, there was no need to publicise his impending arrival, or to note his presence there except for the fact to note his location at the time when any business had been carried out while staying at the monastery. This is demonstrated by Archbishop Greenfield's itinerary, as he seems to have had a particular fondness for Kirkstall compared with the other archbishops. Aside from his first stay in 1307, he also stayed on 2 November 1310, and on 1 October 1313 Greenfield lodged at Kirkstall for the day after a protracted stay in Otley, On neither occasion is there any record of him having contacted the community prior to his arrival.[175]

While at the abbey the archbishop would continue to fulfil his administrative duties,

---

[168] *The Register of William Greenfield, Lord Archbishop of York, 1306–1315*, ed. by William Brown and A. Hamilton Thompson, Publications of the Surtees Society, 145, 149, 151–53, 5 vols (Durham: Surtees Society, 1931), II, p. xxii.

[169] *The Register of Thomas of Corbridge, Lord Archbishop of York, 1300–1304*, ed. by William Brown, Publications of the Surtees Society, 138, 2 vols (Durham: Andrews and Co., 1925), I, p. 51, no. 153.

[170] *The Register of William Greenfield, Lord Archbishop of York, 1306–1315*, ed. by William Brown and A. Hamilton Thompson, Publications of the Surtees Society, 145, 149, 151–53, 5 vols (Durham: Surtees Society, 1931), II, pp. 27–28, no. 717.

[171] 'Documents Relating to Diocesan and Provincial Visitations from the Registers of Henry Bowet, Lord Archbishop of York, 1407–23, and John Kempe, Lord Archbishop of York, 1425–52', in *Miscellanea, 2*, ed. by A. H. Thompson, Publications of the Surtees Society, 127 (Durham: Surtees Society, 1916), pp. 131–302 (p. 165).

[172] *Reg. Bowet and Kempe*, pp. 249, 256–57.

[173] For food served to guests see chapter 4.2.

[174] For a discussin of the archbishop's entitelements, see Hamilton Thompson's introduction in *Reg. Greenfield*, I, pp. 1–30.

[175] *Reg. Greenfield*, IV, p. 85, no. 1857; *Reg. Greenfield*, V, p. 29, no. 2429.

which may or may not include business related to the community. For example, Corbridge on his first visit leased a farm to the archdeacon of Nottingham;[176] while Greenfield issued a request to the king to release a prisoner who had been reconciled to the church.[177] However, Greenfield's third visit to Kirkstall may have been occasioned by the need to resolve an issue that had found the religious wanting and had embarrassed the archbishop. In the wake of the condemnation of the Templars in 1311 all repentant Templar brethren were to be dispersed among the religious and imprisoned there under guard.[178] Kirkstall had duly received Brother Roger of Sheffield 'to be kept in shackles, so that he does not leave the confines of your monastery by any means', but the duty was not relished and within a very short space of time he had escaped.[179] The letter containing the accusation stated this had occurred 'to the grave peril of our said venerable father'. One of the reasons why the monks had turned a blind eye, which is in essence the accusation faced by the monks, was that they had received no recompense for their trouble. The action carried out by Greenfield when he visited the third time was to determine the arrangements for conveying money by way of reimbursement to the religious responsible for the custody of ex-Templars. It can easily be imagined that the archbishop took the opportunity to investigate personally what had happened regarding the Templar, who was responsible, and how the situation had been resolved.

It should be noted that not every visit was burdened by official matters. When Archbishop Bowet visited Kirkstall there is no reference to any administrative activity taking place; 15 May in 1408 was a Sunday, but this did not hinder previous archbishops executing administrative tasks. It may have been a day given more to leisure than business, as there is a note appended to the entry in the register regarding the notice of the first visit stating 'let it be remembered that the said abbot has accepted his lord humbly and with due reverence, and has attended him with all his household [*familia*] in respect of fare for eating and drinking […] at lunch, and at dinner on the same day'.[180] Although the archbishop is never explicitly stated as having stayed for more than a night and a day at Kirkstall, Greenfield's last stay may have lasted as long as three days, as there is no location mentioned in his itinerary between the 1 October 1313, when he was at Kirkstall, and the 3 October, when he is stated to have been at Nostell Priory (the two are within a day's ride, being approximately twenty miles

[176] *Reg. Corbridge*, I, p. 219, no. 613.

[177] *Reg. Greenfield*, II, p. 30, no. 726.

[178] A. Forey, 'Notes on Templar Personnel and Government at the Turn of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries', *Journal of Medieval History*, 35 (2009).

[179] *Reg. Greenfield*, V, pp. 1–3. Discussed in detail below.

[180] *Reg. Bowet and Kempe*, p. 159.

apart). The archbishop's health had worsened progressively during his later years and his later perambulations became more protracted, which may account for the lack of a location on 2 October.

It has been stated that the guesthouse was built on a scale able to receive the great households of the time, but the size of travelling great households varied. While the lower orders of a visiting household may have received hospitality, they may not have received it in the same place, and certainly would not have been entitled to the same provision.[181] Christopher Woolgar, using diet accounts of late-medieval households, has estimated a number of ninety or more individuals for the period 1337 to 1338 for the household of Ralph of Shrewsbury, Bishop of Bath and Wells, eighty-two to eighty-three for Thomas Arundel, Bishop of Ely in 1380–81 and 1383–84, respectively, and a number of sixty-eight in 1459 for Thomas Bourchier, Archbishop of Canterbury.[182] The household of the visiting archbishop of York, based on these estimations, would have numbered in the dozens, although exact numbers cannot be known.

At Kirkstall, the timing of the structural developments is significant. It is in the late thirteenth century, when the secondary hall had been constructed as well as extra services buildings, that archbishops are recorded as staying, especially Archbishop Greenfield in the early fourteenth century. Archiepiscopal registers are valuable sources not only for demonstrating relations with the secular clergy, but also for demonstrating the fact that the highest tier of guest in terms of social status could be well accommodated. Bowet's letter to Kirkstall giving notice of his first advent is especially valuable for the fact that it mentions the guesthouse explicitly as a distinct feature of the abbey: 'we intend to detour to your house of Kirkstall, and will receive the provision owed by you for our use by reason of our first visit, and the guesthouse in your house at your cost'.[183] While the letter is composed according to a standard formula, it would hardly have been appropriate to specify buildings that did not exist or were known to have been converted. This suggests that the guesthouse remained in active use into the fifteenth century as well as being dedicated to external guests (as opposed to corrodians, see below). It would be unlikely that the guesthouse was large enough to house

---

[181] In the Beaulieu Abbey accounts reference is made to grooms of the stable under the guesthouse listing, which suggest that the lower ranking members of a household were treated separately. Where such individuals might have been housed before the construction of the stables as part of the guest range in the late fourteenth or fifteenth century at Kirkstall is not known. *The Account-Book of Beaulieu Abbey*, ed. by S. F. Hockey, Camden Society, 4th Ser., 16 (London: Royal Historical Society, 1975), p. 278.

[182] C. M. Woolgar, *The Great Household in Late Medieval England* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999), p. 12, table 1, and notes.

[183] *Reg. Bowet and Kempe*, p. 165: 'intendimus ad domum vestram de Kyrkestall' declinare, procuracionem a vobis racione primi adventus nostri nobis debitam, ac hospicium in vestra domo vestris sumptibus recepturi'.

both an archbishop's travelling household and established corrodians without causing some strain. The archiepiscopal registers therefore vindicate the community of Kirkstall in their efforts to entertain their guests and speak highly as to the quality of the reception that they enjoyed.

Secular Guests: Sources and Methodology

The most valuable documents for understanding the personal identities of guests at Kirkstall are the charters recording benefactions and legal suits involving the community. The crucial clause in the charters is the dating clause that states where the deed was given, and, in the later medieval period, on which date the transaction was carried out. For example, some of the dating clauses of charters give the information 'datum apud Kirkstalle', thereby locating the individuals necessary for the granting of the deed at Kirkstall when the deed was given. Many of these documents can be dated as well, if only broadly. The questions can then be asked of who specifically received hospitality by virtue of their presence at the abbey, and for what reason they attended the abbey in person.

This method is not without its hazards, however. Stenton raised the issue of treating the attestation clauses at face value with regard to the dating clause as problematic, as '[o]riginally, no doubt, the witnesses to a charter were present when it was executed […] [b]ut before the end of the twelfth century it was possible for a person to be asked by letter to attest a charter which had already been made'.[184] The phenomenon of absentee or post-facto attestation becomes most problematic for the great offices of state, such as that of the Great Seal discussed by Maxwell-Lyte, particularly from the middle of the reign of Edward III onwards, but there has been recent vindication of the dating clause as an indicator of personal presence.[185] These problems apply equally to using the witness-lists to identify the presence of individuals at Kirkstall, but none of the deeds investigated presents a situation which stretches the bounds of plausibility. Many of the deeds naturally involve people who by virtue of the landholdings or political position would be important to warranting the transaction, and are therefore included as a witness. These people were often local to the Leeds area, well within the catchment area of a day's ride. Convening at the place where the

---

[184] F. M. Stenton, *Transcripts of Charters Relating to the Gilbertine Houses of Sixle, Ormsby, Catley, Bullington, and Alvingham* (Lincoln: Lincoln Record Society, 1922), p. xxxi.

[185] Henry C. Maxwell-Lyte, *Historical Notes on the Use of the Great Seal of England* (London: H.M.S.O., 1926), pp. 234–37. Also see C. R. Cheney and Michael Jones, *Handbook of Dates for Students of English History*, rev. edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. xi. The dating clause has been rehabilitated in Dauvit Broun, 'The Presence of Witnesses and the Writing of Charters', in *The Reality behind Charter Diplomatic in Anglo-Norman Britain*, ed. by Dauvit Broun (Glasgow: University of Glasgow, 2011), pp. 235–90.

deed was given was likely the most convenient place to conduct the transaction in full view of the people whom it would affect; the dates on which the deeds were sealed likewise suggest a recurring annual rhythm to the conducting of business (namely early to mid-autumn, or around Easter), which coincide with the times of the year on which payments such as rents traditionally fell due.

Kirkstall's charters are fairly typical of those granted to religious houses during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Kirkstall's coucher book, however, is not as useful as it might have been regarding the present aims as few witness-lists and dating clauses are given (ideally both are required). The editors have conjectured that the surviving manuscript formed a kind of draft-book, a companion to a fuller and better compiled volume which would have acted as the principal point of reference by the community.[186] The clause looked for in the Kirkstall charters is 'datum apud Kyrkestall', which locates the party assembled to negotiate, make and witness the deed within the abbey precinct. This kind of evidence restricts our view of the guests to a very narrow cross-section of society, but there are points of broader significance that can be brought out of them. The problem of witness-lists and the fact of congregating at the abbey is elucidated by transcripts in the Kirkstall's cartulary of records concerning a particular assize held in the county court of York. Abbot William Driffield (r. 1318–1349) among others was accused of disseising Alexander Peitevin of lands and a mill in Headingley.[187] The abbot in defence asserted that these had been gifted to the abbey by John Scot of Calverly, to whom Alexander had quitclaimed them.[188] The abbot produced the deed detailing the plaintiff Alexander's quitclaim to John Calverley, which had been given on 27 May 1323 at Kirkstall, with named witnesses. Upon Alexander's assertion in court that the deed was a forgery, a day was appointed when all the surviving witnesses might assemble at the assize court and give testimony to the present that the quitclaim was actually made by Alexander at that time. Thomas le Wayt of Leeds, Thomas of Newton, William Scot of Newton and Michael Rouden, all named witnesses, duly gave testimony that the deed was in fact made by Alexander; thus was Alexander condemned to the custody of the marshal of the court. Were these witnesses not present at Kirkstall to see Alexander affix his seal, as he is stated to have done, the legal process would have been perjured in the extreme (and would

---

[186] *CBK*, pp. vi–viii.

[187] *CBK*, pp. 305–08, no. 397.

[188] Evidence for John of Calverly's gift survive as NA, C 143/159/19, which is a record of an inquisition *ad quod dampnum*, dating to 1323. Licence to acquire £20 worth of land in Headingley was sought by the community of Kirkstall in 1312, see *CBK*, p. 300, n. 1 (is this NA C 143/88/15, which is dated *c.* 1312). This licence was augmented in 1324 to the whole manor of Headingley, stated to be worth £8 (but the potential loss of services to the king required an inquisition); for which see NA SC 8/120/5963 and NA SC 8/120/5964.

no doubt have given grounds for further litigation).[189] The witness-lists studied have therefore been taken as given.

The specific points of information required from the deeds naturally reduce the number useful for the present enquiry. The development of diplomatic on private (that is, non-royal) charters did not develop consistent dating clauses until the end of the thirteenth century; the royal chancery had only adopted inconsistently at the end of the twelfth century. Witness-lists are much more common, and were included on deeds from the beginning of charters; given the lack of validity which these had when the named individuals died, however, means that when the deeds contained in Kirkstall's cartulary came to be transcribed there was little need to include the information. For present purposes the best deeds to use are those from the fourteenth century. The dating clause is usually included alongside a full witness-list by this point. As well, there are very full records given in the coucher book of the numerous legal cases in which the community became involved, which give further information on deeds, and particularly the logistics of their use (as in the case of the witnesses being called, given above). The combination of the number of records, the fullness of the information which they provide, and the variety of types of documentary record permit a case study of Kirkstall in early fourteenth century to be ventured, with the particular goal of identifying individuals who had close personal interactions with the abbey and can be proven to have visited there. With this achieved, individual people can be compared to see what place visiting the abbey, and therefore hospitality, had in personal interactions. After the period of the Black Death, which reached Yorkshire in 1349, the number of transactions recorded in the cartulary falls dramatically, and it is more difficult to form a clear idea of the tenor of the community's relations with its surrounding society. It may be assumed that many of the community would be familial relations of nearby landholders, and that amiable visits would take place as a result, but this cannot be quantified. Abbot John of Birdsall (r. 1304– c. 1314), for example, was of the Birdsall family who held land in Clifford, about 3 miles south of Wetherby, and a Thomas of Birdsall was presented by the community to Bracewell Church, near Barnoldswick, one of Kirkstall's oldest possessions.[190] Nearer the Dissolution, William

---

[189] Walbran supports the idea that it was the physical copy of the document that was given primacy, rather than its text. Walbran notes that papal bulls might be kept in a single Cistercian abbey, even though their content would apply to all Cistercian houses in England. The original document needed to be kept as valid legal proof. A bull of Innocent III, *Cum ordo vester*, is described as 'habetur apud Kirkestall sub bulla' in such a way; and Alexander IV's *Licet ad hoc* was described as 'originale est in Claravalle, et transcriptum sub manu publica apud Kirkestale': *Memorials of Fountains*, II, p. 63, n. 2 (continuing to p. 65).

[190] Barnes, p. 48.

Marshall can be confidently assigned to the Marshall family of Potter Newton.[191] There is a brief resurgence in documentation dating from 1390s regarding property in Allerton, and this is considered here, but thereafter the lack of documentation prevents meaningful analysis.

Secular Guests: Patrons

One set of individuals connected with the abbey that the documentation does little to elucidate is the presence of Kirkstall's patrons at the abbey. The only reference to the patron being at the site is in the foundation narrative of the abbey, which states that 'he [Henry de Lacy, the founder] had part in providing the buildings, laid with his own hand the foundations of the church, and himself completed the whole fabric at his own cost.'[192] There are no dating clauses on the deeds granted to Kirkstall by the patrons, as in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries this was not a conventional component of the diplomatic on private charters, and in the later thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the grants, exchanges, quitclaims and confirmations given by the patrons, such as the deeds connected with resolving the abbey's finances in the late thirteenth century, are given elsewhere. There are indications from analysis of the origins of the pot sherds found in the guest range which indicate a possible tie to the patronal estates which spanned the Pennines. The distributions are centred on two points: Pontefract in Yorkshire and Clitheroe in Lancashire.[193] Whitaker has given an account of the usual route taken by the Lacys from their lands in Yorkshire to Lancashire. It consisted of six main stages, with two rests: Pontefract to Rothwell, where many Lacy charters are dated; Rothwell to Bradford; over the moors of Luddenden; along the eastern extremity of the Long Causeway, by 'The Duke's Cross' in Cliviger; descent to the manor of Ightenhill, and rest; to Clitheroe; finally, through the trough of Bowland to Lancaster.[194] While the link is suggestive, it cannot be confirmed. In general, it appears that the very activity of the patrons in the high politics of the realm, such as military expeditions in Scotland or on the Continent, or in internecine conflict as during Edward II's reign, prevented any meaningful personal contact with the abbey, even if their status did confer prestige.

---

[191] Ibid. Also see A. Lonsdale, 'The Last Monks of Kirkstall Abbey', in *Publications of the Thoresby Society Miscellanea, 15*, Publications of the Thoresby Society, 53 (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1972), pp. 201–16 (pp. 205–12) for a list of monks in 1539, which includes some toponyms names associated with the locality (e.g. 'Gabriel Lofthouse'), but otherwise are too generic to specify).

[192] 'Foundation of Kirkstall', p. 180: '[i]pse edificijs prouidendis interfuit ipse manu sua ecclesie fundamenta iecit, ipse totam ecclesie fabricam impensis proprijs consummauit'.

[193] Wrathmell, *The Guesthouse*, p. 25.

[194] Whitaker, *History of Whalley*, p. 482 and n.

Secular Guests: Local Gentry

For the most part the documentation introduced figures of very local origins, as indicated by the toponyms (fig. 0.2).[195] Frequently attesting the Allerton deeds of the 1320s John Chamberlain, Thomas, and William Scot, all 'of Newton'; Thomas le Wayt, Hugh Picard and Roger, all 'of Leeds'; John Hunter and William Cowhird 'of Adel'; Thomas of Allerton; Robert of Horsforth; William of Killingbeck; William of Beeston; Henry of Killingbeck; and Robert of Gipton. The number of witnesses in these deeds is very consistent, usually at around six individuals. Areas not well represented, but which formed important manors, such as Headingley and Roundhay are those that for the most part were already dominated by Kirkstall's holdings. Headingley came under the purview of the Peitevin family, but they had quitclaimed large sections to the monks before this series of deeds.[196] Further flung individuals include John son of Michael of London attesting a deed in 1346[197] and the grantor Robert of Grimston in 1370,[198] but overwhelmingly both the grantors and witnesses are drawn from a community closely linked with the area covered by modern-day Leeds.

It is logical but unexceptional to state that Kirkstall's community hosted local elites on occasion, although it is worthwhile to confirm such assumptions through a review of the documentation. More instructive for the purposes of hospitality at Kirkstall is consideration of the nature of their interaction with the abbey and the reasons why they attended the abbey precinct. It is plausible to argue that the landholders attested these deeds at Kirkstall for purely pragmatic reasons: they had a stake in the tenurial makeup of the region, and they were bound by their own interests and those of their neighbours to maintain vigilance regarding the shifting patterns of tenure. Not to do so could lead to an ignorance of existing arrangements and, over time, a diminution of one's lands, rights, in the face of gradual (and perhaps unknowing) encroachment by others. Kirkstall Abbey, with its guesthouse, influence, and relatively central location was an eminently suitable venue for all parties concerned to assemble and discuss the business at hand. It was within easy reach of both all the lands mentioned in the deeds and all the individuals (grantors or witness), with a few exceptions such as those noted.

---

[195] The following names are drawn from *PKAA*, *passim*.

[196] For a useful summary of the abbey's principal benefactors and the location of their grants, see Robert J. Wright, pp. 87–88, fig. 2.1.

[197] William Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum: History of the Abbies and Other Monasteries, Hospitals, Frieries, and Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, with Their Dependencies, in England and Wales*, ed. by John Caley, Henry Ellis, and Bulkeley Bandinel, rev. edn, 6 vols (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown et al., 1817), v, p. 550.

[198] *PKAA*, p. 95, no. 42.

It must first be considered whether there are any factors of the arrangement described in these deeds that allow deeper appreciation of these individuals' relationship with the monastic community. A great many of the deeds are clearly business arrangements, such as quitclaims to land for a period of years, for which the abbot has paid money to the owner,[199] or a demise of land by the abbot in return for a fixed rent.[200] The latter case would make the recipient a tenant of the abbot, which may oblige him to be more active in the abbey's affairs. The reception offered to the guests here has more the nature of that shown to prospective clients, albeit individuals who were well known to the officials of the community. Sometimes these were of some social standing, as with the demise mentioned above, which was witnessed by a Sir Richard de Goldesburgh.

However, there appears to be a shift in the character of the deeds and the motivation behind their granting under Abbot William of Driffield (r. 1318–*c*.1349). One deed is exceptional for the gender of its grantor: Anabilla, wife of William Cowhird, arrived at the abbey in 1325 to make a donation in her widowhood.[201] A quitclaim of lands in Allerton Gledhow made to the abbey by Thomas of Allerton in 1335 seems business-like, although Thomas of Allerton appears in a great many deeds in the 1340s, particularly those of William Mauleverer (discussed below). He is witness to no fewer than eleven deeds regarding lands in Allerton given at Kirkstall, many of these grants being more clearly pious in nature.

A transaction deserving special mention is the absolution of Miles de la Haye, which contains many interesting details about what a guest might do while at the abbey and the reason for their attendance.[202] On 5 July 1336 Miles de la Haye, a tenant of the abbot of Fountains, arrived at Kirkstall Abbey, seeking absolution from the sentence of excommunication placed upon him for not paying fifteen shillings rent owed, then three years in arrears. Moreover, he performed his homage to the abbot of Fountains in the presences of numerous witnesses, including his own kinsmen, monks of Fountains, and monks of Kirkstall. The proceedings took place in the abbot's lodging (*in camera domini Abbatis de Kyrkestall priuata*). The deed is exceptional for its record of the specific building in which it took place, and is the only one to do so outside the archiepiscopal registers. As such, it is not clear whether the abbot's chamber was the usual locale for transacting business, or whether it was simply the most suitable place for resolving Miles's financial obligations as well as reconciling him with the church and

---

[199] *Yorkshire Deeds*, IX, p. 97, no. 243.
[200] *Yorkshire Deeds*, III, p. 70, no. 211.
[201] Discussed below, chapter 3.3.
[202] *CBK*, p. 4, no. 5.

absolving him of his excommunicate status. The presence of a chapel immediately adjacent to the abbot's lodgings may have been a significant factor when determining the location, especially since the statutes of the Order forbade that homage or fealty should be received at the altar, hence the need for a location suitable for all needs.[203] Cistercian abbots had been permitted by the General Chapter to absolve excommunicate guests in circumstances permitted by canon law (that is, ecclesiastical restriction could not be overwritten by a Cistercian abbot), and Miles's attendance put this licence into practice: he is described as having been absolved, but this would remain so only if he were to pay his instalment of rent on the feast of St Martin following.[204] The licence had given a potent instrument into the hands of Cistercian abbots which could induce visitors to make recourse to an abbey rather than a secular ecclesiastical institution, and it also emphasised the spiritual dimension of the hospitality which a Cistercian monastery offered, which sought spiritual unity and purity supplemented by material charity.

The named parties consisted of Miles himself, Robert Copgrave, the new abbot of Fountains (r. 1336–1346; he had been created abbot on the 17 May); William of Driffield 'then prior';[205] Henry de Beghal and John of Bolton, monks of Kirkstall; John de la Haye and Thomas of Tyresal; William de Massam, monk of Fountains; and William of Leeds, Kirktall's cellarer, who acted as scribe for the proceedings. The gathering represented a good mix of secular and monastic, it demonstrated Kirkstall's filiation ties, and shows that spiritual implications of Miles's conduct were taken very seriously as well. Had the document been of a more standard form, this latter component could easily have been obscured. Indeed, as the rubric for the deed is 'pro domo de Fontibus', implying that it was written in Kirkstall's cartulary on behalf of the abbey of Fountains, it could have been during a yearly visitation of a father-abbot to his daughter-house. This in turn raises a significant point: the movement of personnel and officials between Cistercian houses would have drawn the business to which they had to attend as well. Kirkstall was not simply hosting its father-abbot, but all his

---

[203] Waddell, *Statutes*, 1157:12; Hope and Bilson, p. 38.

[204] *Statuta*, II, 1239:5.

[205] This title is problematic. William of Driffield had professed obedience to Archbishop Melton (1317–1340) on 17 December 1318 (Heads, II, p. 289), but is here quite clearly described as prior. Three possibilities arise, none of which are entirely satisfactory. First, there could have been a prior with the same style as the abbot, although the grounds for confusion in the documentary record would have surely been recognised at the time. Secondly, there is the highly unlikely possibility that the title of 'prior' is a conscious mark of humility in the presence of William's father-abbot, and is intended to convey his subordinate status in the face of Robert Copgrave's authority. A third possibility is that the dating of the document is misleading, and that the events described happened before William's abbacy and the memorandum was composed in 1336, although the time lapse would appear to negate the need for a record having been made.

plaintiffs, tenants, and litigants who might need an interview with him. The community would therefore have many external parties within their precinct, all requiring different provision, material and spiritual, to cater to their needs. The monks of Fountains would be accommodated in the monastic dormitory, William of Driffield would presumably have ceded his quarters to Robert Copgrove, while Miles de la Haye and his kinsmen would have occupied the guesthouse. The significance here is the tying together of the many parts of the precinct, as outlined in the discussion of the Cistercian guesthouse above.[206] The monastic and secular find a shared space in the abbot's lodging, which at once accords with the abbot's role as father to his community and their representative to the outside world, and also legitimises his need for a separate chamber — Miles's absolution and tenure could not have been carried out in the monastic dormitory infringing the enclosure of the brethren.

A particularly instructive set of deeds also dating from William of Driffield's time are those granted to Kirkstall by William Mauleverer of Potter Newton.[207] There are three deeds: one in 1344,[208] another in 1345[209] and a last in 1346,[210] These deeds specify that the lease is given as a subsidy for the poor of Christ at the abbey's gate for a fixed term of years.[211] This form of deed was relatively common, although little record of such leases has survived for Kirkstall, probably because their temporary nature meant that they were not recorded in the cartulary. The 1344 deed is a lease for ten years of twenty-three and a half acres of land

---

[206] See chapter 2.3.

[207] There are two William Mauleverers, whose *floruit* dates overlap. The eldest is William Mauleverer whose putative dates are (birth) 1265 × 1270 to (death) ?1342 × ?1344; this William was married to Anastasia. The younger William, the elder William's son, was born c. 1296 and died 1349 × 1352; this William was married to Alice. The older William was replaced as coroner of Yorkshire because he was 'so sick and broken that he cannot discharge the duties of his office': see *Calendar of the Close Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward III, 1341—1343* (London: H.M.S.O., 1896), IV, p. 608, under date 20 November 1342. For reasons of the people with whom he is associated in these deeds relating to Kirkstall Abbey, and his involvement with deeds as late as 1349, the William of the deeds discussed here is presumed to be the younger of the two. This is confirmed in part by the presence of Robert, William's son in a deed given by Richard son of Richard Brown of Allerton, given at Kirkstall on the same day as William's final deed, on 11 November 1346. The elder William had no sons called Robert, who was the eighth son of nine children by Alice. See the Mauleverer family tree given in *EYC*, VII, p. 115, and comments on pp. 119–20.

[208] There are two extant copies of this deed, both in printed editions: 'Charters Relating to the Possessions of Kirkstall Abbey in Allerton', in *Miscellanea, 2*, by E. Kitson Clarke, ed. by F. R. Kitson, Publications of the Thoresby Society, 4 (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1895), pp. 42–59, 81–116 (pp. 86–7), no. 34. *Monastic Charters and Other Documents Relating to Medieval Piety in the North Yorkshire County Record Office*, ed. by M. Y. Ashcroft and E. A. Jones, 2 vols (Northallerton: North Yorkshire County Council, 2009), I, pp. 142–43.

[209] *PKAA*, pp. 88–89, no. 36.

[210] Two extant copies, both printed: *PKAA*, pp. 89–90, no. 37; Ashcroft and Jones, *Monastic Charters and Other Documents*, I, p. 143.

[211] The original deeds have been transcribed in *PKAA*, pp. 86–87, 89–90, nos. 34 and 37, but some lacunae obscure portions of the text. As well there are some mistakes in dating the charters by the editors (for example, no. 34, which is dated to Martinmas, but the date given is the sixth of the Kalends of November in the deed). For full copies of the deeds see those in the Mauleverer cartulary, which deed have been transcribed in full in Ashcroft and Jones, *Monastic Charters and Other Documents*, I, pp. 142–43.

in Allerton Gledhow; the 1345 deed is a repeat of the previous but replaces the period of lease with a term of twelve years; the 1346 is also a lease, this time for eight years, but of one culture of land in Moor Allerton.

Secular Guests: The Poor

The information in William Mauleverer's deeds regarding feeding of the poor at the gate corroborates some slim archaeological evidence for the existence of an almshouse near the gatehouse.[212] This introduces an otherwise unknown body of people receiving hospitality at Kirkstall and demonstrates that the *Ecclesiastica Officia* were being followed in practice: the porter was obliged to provide bread to passers-by, which in effect meant those coming to the abbey with the intention of receiving sustenance.[213] In times of famine people would turn to religious houses for succour, as is attested in stories of miraculously replenishing wheat to feed the poor at Heisterbach Abbey.[214] The areas in which the poor were received differed from those dedicated to wealthier guests, and Mauleverer's deed underlines the practice of grading guests upon entry, a process illuminated further by Gerald of Wales (*c.* 1146–1220 × 23), who was bitter at being forced into common lodging at Strata Florida Abbey. Gerald describes this hall as being occupied by 'common guests' (*hospites communes*), and refers to the din of the people (*strepitum popularem*).[215] Gerald's perception of differing social status is clear. When high-status guests arrived, they left their social inferiors behind them at the gate, the differing treatment being taken from the precept in the *Rule of Benedict*: 'proper honour must be shown to all'.[216]

　　　The reciprocal nature of religious benefaction meant that the alms distributed vicariously through the monks of Kirkstall would act to William's benefit.[217] It is particularly interesting that William chose Kirkstall as the recipient, or alternatively, that Abbot William of Driffield was able to promote his abbey to William in this way (it cannot be told from the deeds upon whose initiative the benefactions were made). David Postles has drawn attention to the idea that benefactions made for specific purposes signalled a desire on the grantor's part

---

[212] See chapter 2.1.

[213] *EO*, 120:18–20.

[214] For many examples of charity at the gate see David H. Williams, *Cistercians in the Early Middle Ages*, pp. 118–19.

[215] Gerald of Wales, 'De Menevensi Ecclesia Dialogus', in *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*, ed. by J. S. Brewer, 8 vols (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1863), III, 101–373 (pp. 201–02).

[216] *RB*, 53:2: 'ombnibus congruus honor exhibeatur'.

[217] The charitable relationship between rich and poor is described in Christopher Dyer, *Standards of Living in the Later Middle Ages: Social Change in England c.1200–1520*, rev. edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 234–57.

for distinction, as their benefaction, which not all were able to make, raised them above the usual parochial affiliation common to all lay people, as well as being made more efficacious because of the religious vocation and pious conduct of the monks themselves.[218] Echoing the point made previously, it also tells that the abbey was seen as a place of charity and that the poor habitually went to its gates for maintenance, as otherwise the income from the grant could not have been put into use. William's grant thus augmented the resources of the religious, enabling them to fulfil a particular aspect of their mission more effectively; the prayers of both the religious and the poor who received the alms prospered his own soul.

The deeds are also significant when set against their socio-economic context. The Black Death had not struck in England by this time, but the agrarian crises earlier in the century no doubt made the need for charitable provision more pressing, as did the raids of the Scots.[219] The campaign led by David II (1324–1371) into the North of England in 1346 may have concluded with a resounding victory for the English army at the battle of Neville's Cross, but the conflict with the Scots in years previous and immediately prior to the battle had resulted in widespread despoliation of goods, loss of victuals and destruction of crops.[220] All would result in a dispossessed body of people dependent upon the charity of others and it is probable that there was an influx of such refugees in Yorkshire at this time. Religious houses would form obvious havens to seek out, although this cannot be quantified and it may be that alms for the poor was simply a form of benefaction of personal significance for William.

That there are three deeds all for the same specific purpose suggests a good deal of commitment on William's part. It is not clear what prompted the supplements. It could have been William's desire from the beginning to provide the extra, but that he refrained initially out of financial considerations; it could have been that William was approached by Kirkstall's abbot, William of Driffield (r. 1318–*c.* 1349), who sought extra funds because of the demands placed on his community. Whichever interpretation is adopted, William's deeds demonstrate a constructive and collaborative approach between local landholders and the religious regarding the social problems encountered in the area.

The nature of the deed, and the fact that it was granted at Kirkstall Abbey, indicates that ultimately it resulted from William's religious convictions, and was personal to him. The

---

[218] David Postles, 'Small Gifts, but Big Rewards: The Symbolism of Some Gifts to the Religious', *Journal of Medieval History*, 27.1 (2001), 23–42 (pp. 24, 25, 27–28).

[219] Ian Kershaw, 'The Great Famine and Agrarian Crisis in England, 1315–1322', *Past and Present*, 59 (1973), 3–50 (pp. 15–16).

[220] *Chronicon de Lanercost, 1201-1346: E Codice Cottoniano Nunc Primum Typis Mandatum*, ed. by Joseph Stevenson, Maitland Club, 46 (Edinburgh: Maitland Club, 1839), pp. 346–47.

deed was granted for the term of his life, or for eight years, whichever was the greater. The subsidy was not perpetual, most probably as a result of not wishing to deprive his heirs. The relatively short term of ten years maximum and the provision in the event of his death before its completion suggests that William was conscious of nearing the end of his life, and that this was a gesture intended to shore up his good works while he was still able; this could have been through ill-health or old age, or a combination of the two. The likelihood of William's old age is supported by previous actions, as he had acted in the interests of the abbey before: in 1323 he was part of a jury for an inquisition *ad quod dampnum* which secured the valuable manor Headingley for the Kirkstall community;[221] and in 1337, when William participated in an assize called to determine the legitimacy of the community's claim to the same manor.[222] A third occasion was in 1344, when William swore in favour of the abbot of Kirkstall (William of Driffield) at an inquisition held to determine whether he was liable for paying revenues to Cistercian houses on the continent, a charge of which he was acquitted.[223] It is reasonable therefore to consider William in 1346 as being in his old age; he was certainly dead by 1352, when his wife is described in as a widow in the levying of a fine.[224] It may be of significance that John Chamberlain (*de Camera, Chaumberlyn*) was first witness in each of these deeds, and may have been part of William's household, or perhaps wider affinity, and a trusted advisor to William who was required for personal care and assistance; this would certainly be congruent with the picture of an ageing man of substance.[225] Although the charter itself was essentially an affair of business, and reads as such, the socio-economic context, the charitable gift, the late stage in his life, William's consistent support for the abbey in matters of law and the witnesses' presence at the abbey itself all point towards these deeds as being pious acts, ones which emphasised and facilitated the community's relationship with the wider world through the provision of hospitality.

The charters of Kirkstall from the earlier part of the fourteenth century therefore show a range of reasons why people would come to the abbey, even when looking at a brief chronological period. The people mentioned in the deeds considered here are overwhelmingly the local elite and formed a consistent circle of people, and it is difficult to imagine them not forming a bond with the monks over the years, especially given that abbot remained the

---

[221] *CBK*, p. 300, no. 392.
[222] *CBK*, pp. 309–10, no. 398.
[223] *CBK*, p. 315, no. 400.
[224] *EYC*, VII, p. 120.
[225] John Chamberlain only appears as a witness in deeds from 1344 to 1346, and only with William Mauleverer.

same person. These people, however, were not simply coming to the abbey as a convenient meeting place to transact their business. They were relating to the abbey on a spiritual as well as temporal level, and while there are many deeds whose diplomatic prevent any further appreciation of the religiosity underlying them, those from William of Driffield's abbacy are far more expressive. In them there are people who have concern for the plight of their own souls as a result of ecclesiastical censure or advancing age, or with the material support which the abbey offered to the less fortunate 'poor of Christ at the gate'.

Corrodians and Forced Hospitality at Kirkstall

A group of individuals quite separate from those visiting the abbey to show support in the community's endeavours were the corrodians, who were seen as doing the exact opposite. At Kirkstall these were individuals who had served in the royal administration and had been retired to a comfortable abode in order to live out their remaining years. It can be viewed as hospitality, but not of the sort envisioned by the Benedictine Rule. The corrodians were not part of the community (none at Kirkstall had taken monastic vows) and yet they were assigned all the provisions, and more, which a guest would have received. Generally, the level of provision for a corrodian would vary greatly depending upon the recipient's status, and a gentleman, for example, would be provided with more lavish fare and attire than would a retired domestic servant, and probably, than the Cistercian monks themselves.[226] It was imposed upon the community, and the usual extension of a welcome was somewhat strained by reason for this 'guest's' presence. Several corrodians had already been assigned to the community by royal decree: Thomas *Quatresouz* in 1305;[227] Roger de Kigheley in 1315;[228] John *le Keu* in 1324, who was to take up the pension which the then-deceased Thomas *Quatresouz* had left vacant;[229] and Richard de Troxford in 1339, although only until the king's arrival in England (the request is dated 4 May; Edward returned to England in the spring of 1340).[230] It is also recorded in the coucher book of Kirkstall that after these a certain Adam Merlin and John Attebroke held the same pension(s?) afterward.[231]

---

[226] J. H. Tillotson, 'Pensions, Corrodies and Religious Houses: An Aspect of the Relations of Crown and Church in Early Fourteenth Century England', *Journal of Religious History*, 8 (1974), 127–43 (p. 132).

[227] *CCR: Edward I, 1302–1307*, p. 313.

[228] *CCR: Edward II, 1313–1318*, p. 451.

[229] *CCR: Edward II, 1323–1327*, p. 176.

[230] *CCR: Edward III, 1339–1341*, p. 120. The request is dated at Berkhampstead and authorised by the privy seal rather than Edward himself; it is probable that it was a temporary arrangement pending the king's personal oversight.

[231] *CBK*, pp. 289–90, no. 384.

The community endured the burden for over half a century before making formal protest. The length of time is revealed by a plea contained in the coucher book addressed to Parliament, dated to a period 'after the concord of the kingdom and while the Duke of Lancaster was still living'.[232] This refers to Henry, first Duke of Lancaster, who died on 23 March 1361. Henry was a particularly important personage for Kirkstall, as the de Lacy estates, including the patronage of Kirkstall Abbey, had passed from Thomas of Lancaster to Thomas's younger brother Henry, third Earl of Lancaster, and thence to the latter's son. The *concordia* mentioned probably refers to the Treaty of Bretigny, which was enthusiastically received in the January Parliament of 1361 although it was not confirmed until the 24 October. It is unlikely to refer to the treaty signed with David II of Scotland in 1357. The date of the present petition is therefore January 1361, placing it within Abbot John Topcliff of Thirkleby's abbacy (r. *c.* 1354–*c.* 1369).[233]

Given the characteristic readiness of William of Driffield to vindicate his community's rights, it is strange to see no motion from him to inhibit the imposition of corrodians. This is especially so, given that opposition to corrodies by religious houses was voiced when they first began to be imposed regularly, at the end of Edward I's reign, but particularly in Edward II's.[234] One possibility, of course, is that William did make a complaint but no record of it survives, but this is at odds with the otherwise voluminous documentation associated with his abbacy and his willingness to pay to have his actions enrolled at court. It would be better to find an explanation rooted in the nature of William's rule and relationship with the royal court, therefore.

A few characteristics of Kirkstall Abbey as an institution in the early fourteenth century need to be considered. Firstly, Kirkstall was wealthy in comparison with many religious houses, although it was never of the first rank. It was far less well endowed than Fountains, but still able to command substantial revenues which placed Kirkstall in the king's eyes among the institutions with enough assets spare to make a measured contribution. The wealth of Kirkstall according to a valuation of 1288 was £186 9s. 5. 1½ d., which is a valuation based on Kirkstall's revenues at the peak of the wool crisis, which saw revenue plummet to £41 7s. 6d. when valued in 1287;[235] the papal *taxatio* of 1291 rendered the figure of £68 5s.

---

[232] 'Ista petitio fuit porrecta in parliamento post concordiam regni vivente adhuc Duce Lancastrie': *CBK*, pp. 289–90, no. 384.

[233] *Heads of Religious Houses*, II, p. 287.

[234] Tillotson, pp. 129, 135–36.

[235] Barnes, pp. 40–41; the values for the 1288 valuation have been drawn from Robert J. Wright, p. 239, which gives the values for Allerton, Armley, Bardsey, Bar Grange, Bramley, Brearey, Burley, Clifford, Compton, Cookridge, Dean Grange, Elam, Keighley and Moor Grange. For information on the valuation as a source,

8*d.*.[236] This latter is a re-assessment for purposes of taxation which reflected the impact of recent troubles, although it remained the rate of taxation well into the fourteenth century, as Abbot William was called to account in the county court at York why he had not contributed to the ninth and fifteenth based on this valuation (he had paid as a member of the clergy of York diocese).[237] The value of these lands was augmented through further grants and investments during the course of the early fourteenth century, including a startling recovery from debts incurred. Kirkstall was therefore thought able to sustain additional burdens. The valuations represent the lowest ebb of Kirkstall's fortunes, and even at this point it remained many times that of some of the religious houses which had corrodians imposed, such as the lowly Augustinian abbey of Wellow in north-eastern Lincolnshire. The community had been requested to maintain royal servants in Edward I's reign with an income of £67 2*s.* 5*d.*, this value not having been lowered on account of a socio-economic crisis.[238] Kirkstall, with its improved finances resulting from consistent and practical estate administration by a succession of abbots, was a prime candidate for the reception of royal servants.

Secondly, the abbots of Kirkstall had by virtue of their patronal family come into ever more worshipful socio-political circles. The twelfth-century founder, Henry de Lacy, Lord of the Honour of Pontefract (d. 1177) had been powerful, Henry V de Lacy (1249–1311) was one of the foremost magnates of the realm, Thomas of Lancaster was the king's mightiest antagonist, and Henry Duke of Lancaster not only held the estates of the Lancaster inheritance, but also enjoyed close friendship with the king. Moreover, the personal contact with the king, either by the abbot himself or through an attorney, was maintained during the late-thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. The manors of Bardsey and Collingham had already brought the abbots of Kirkstall within the orbit of the king by dint of their monetary value, and it was this connection only which could be contrived as linking Kirkstall to the monarch in a patronal bond in the plea submitted by Abbot John Topcliffe. Abbot Hugh of Grimston (r. 1289–*c.*1304) engineered a personal interview with the king resulting in the lucrative arrangement reached with their patron,[239] and William of Driffield was summoned

---

see ibid., p. 25. The valuation of estates for purposes of repaying loans has been drawn from 'Foundation of Kirkstall', p. 194.

[236] *Taxatio Ecclesiastica Angliae et Walliae, auctoritate P. Nicholai IV, circa A.D. 1291*, ed. by Thomas Astle, Samuel Ayscough, and John Caley (London: G. Eyre and A. Strahan, 1802), p. 325.

[237] *CBK*, p. 310, no. 399.

[238] Tillotson, p. 139; *VCH Lincolnshire*, II, pp. 161–63.

[239] Hugh of Kirkstall, pp. 191–92: '[Earl Henry] dolens fuit vt nobis graciam et licenciam impetraret cameram domini regis intrandi et cum ipso personaliter loquendi quod quidem cum magna difficultate concessum fuit et factum. Nos igitur cum socio nostro predicto coram domino rege venientes quid dicebamus et qualiter negocia nostra proponebamus non sufficimus ad presens scribere'.

to York to give counsel in 1319 along with other abbots of the major Yorkshire religious houses.[240] William also performed homage to Edward II in 1323 for his holdings in the castle and honour of Pontefract.[241] Finally, in a case involving Queen Isabella, Edward III's mother, the abbot was drawn into repeated and potentially antagonistic dealings with the upper nobility.[242] This last case revolved around a claim that Henry V de Lacy had unjustly deprived the community of an area of land known as the Blackburnshire wastes, consisting of forest and hunting land pertaining to the community's oldest estates in Barnoldswick. The estate had been inherited by Thomas of Lancaster, and granted by Edward III to Isabella his mother early in his reign. To reclaim the lands, the abbot had to track dramatic shifts in rights to and ownership of estates taking place among the higher nobility at this time, as well as push his community's claim amid often violent internecine conflict.

These examples demonstrate that the abbot of Kirkstall was personally known among the higher echelons, even if he did not command a great deal of influence at this level.[243] If he was to curry favour for his community's aspiration, it behoved him to accept impositions such as corrodians. Certainly the re-acquisition of the Blackburnshire wastes limited William's options. Were he to refuse the king relatively minor requests (in comparison), he would have risked alienating himself from the king, leading to difficulties when seeking redress against the hostility of the local sheriffs (as happened with the Scropes when they refused to restore lands to the abbot on Queen Isabella's behalf, for example). While counter-factual, this argument receives support by considering a religious house which did resist the king's imposition. Prior William Claxton (r. 1326–1344) of Norwich Priory, resisted the king's request and consequently was summoned to answer in court. When Prior Nicholas de Hoo again resisted in 1377, the prior was threatened with a fine of £100.[244] William's policy was to pursue further Kirkstall's fortunes in the law courts and he simply could not afford aggravating the parties upon whom he depended. Viewed in this way, receiving corrodians was simply part of the cost of advancing the fortunes of Kirkstall's community.

This policy, however, depended on the benefits outweighing the disadvantages: once actions in the various courts of the realm had ceased to be advantageous, and the abbot had withdrawn from this socio-political circle, corrodians were simply an extra burden. As well,

---

[240] *CCR: Edward II, 1318–1323*, p. 202.

[241] *CBK*, p. 362, no. 430, with the clause 'teste me ipso'.

[242] The case is long and the coucher book's record of it very repititious, highlighting the care taken to safeguard against any future dispute: *CBK*, pp. 319–39, nos. 406–08.

[243] For a contrary opinion, see Barnes, pp. 79–80, who argues that 'the abbot could not have been unduly distracted from the business of his house by affairs outside it'.

[244] Tillotson, p. 141.

the unopposed continuation of the practice for decades made it all the more expected that Kirkstall would receive corrodians to maintain: certainly no outcome (positive or otherwise) is heard of respecting Abbot John Topcliff's complaint and the practice continued into the fifteenth century.[245] A major factor that brought the issue to the fore would have been the Black Death, which from 1349 to 1351 ravaged the population of the West Riding.[246] At a time when the numbers of the community were declining rapidly (in 1381–82 there were only sixteen monks and two lay brothers), the obligation to provide for an individual imposed upon them from outside was all the more prominent.[247]

3.3
WOMEN IN THE GUESTHOUSE

Why would Women have been at Kirkstall?

A significant turning point in the way Cistercian communities interacted with the wider world was the introduction of legislation for the legitimate admission of women into the monastic precinct. In light of the traditional 'rise and decline' interpretation of Cistercian history, this opening of access is interpreted as a softening of the austere (and therefore superior) ideals of the Cistercian fathers. In some cases the presence of women within Cistercian precincts is put forward as very harmful to monastic observance, usually when such entry was prohibited and the transgression became the focus of an official enquiry.[248] A well-known case of this sort was the stay of Henry III's queen, Eleanor, at Beaulieu in Hampshire in 1239 with the infant prince Edward (the future King Edward I), which resulted in the deposition of both the prior and the cellarer by the General Chapter.[249] But in cases of legitimate entry the actual presence

---

[245] Barnes, pp. 52–53; Tillotson, p. 133.

[246] Barnes, p. 45. Barnes' assertion that the effects of the plague are witnessed by the quick succession of four abbots between the years 1349 and 1355 is incorrect: the table provided in his appendix (pp. 81–82) lists three abbots having died within this period, William of Driffield, 'Ralph', and Roger of Leeds. 'Ralph', however, does not exist in the source cited, and Roger of Leeds is named instead (*Cal. Pap. Reg.*, III, p. 375). The error has been rectified in *Heads of Religious Houses*, II, p. 289.

[247] *VCH Yorks.*, II, p. 144.

[248] For a great many such transgressions during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries see Williams, pp. 131–31.

[249] *Annales Monastici*, ed. by Henry Richards Luard, Rolls Series, 36, 5 vols (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1864), II, p. 337'[q]uam ob causam [...] prior et cellerarius depositi sunt, quia eorum permissione haec transgressio videbatur fulciri'; Julie Kerr, *Monastic Hospitality: The Benedictines in England, c. 1070–c. 1250*, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion, 32 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), pp. 8, 82, 153.

of women within the monastery, as opposed to merely their permission to enter, is unclear.

In 1402 the community at Kirkstall were granted permission to admit women on certain unspecified days of the year by their father-abbot, Robert Burley of Fountains (r. 1383–1410).[250] At first glance this is a momentous change for the community's relationship with the wider world, but closer study of the language of the document necessitates qualifications, namely with regard to the period for which the indulgence was valid, and to what extent access was granted. The indulgence is couched in decidedly reserved terms, and should not be taken as giving women right of entry to the precinct forever after: 'the entry of women […] we wish to tolerate for the time being'.[251] From this it appears that the indulgence was not granted in perpetuity, although there is no extant record of it having been revoked. The word 'tolerate' suggests that this is an exigency of the time, suffered but in no way accustomed. The only building to which access is permitted is the church, which necessarily would have involved passage through the gate house complex to the north-west as well.[252] The opening of the church to women does not therefore equate to the opening of the monastery; the focus was on the provision of a place of worship alone.

The guesthouse, however, occupies a middle-ground in the precinct, physically and conceptually, and is not truly of the claustral buildings in the way that, say, the refectory, infirmary or abbot's lodgings were. It is plausible that women may have been granted access to the guesthouse with a view to facilitating their worship in the abbey church; if the gate house formed part of their route of access, so too might the guesthouse. This hypothesis depends upon the interpretation of the word 'septa' as meaning either the enclosure or confines

---

[250] The full text of the deed may be found in *Memorials of Fountains*, I, pp. 205–06, which reads as follows: 'Universis ad quos presentes litterae pervenerint frater Robertus, abbas Monasterij beatae Mariae de Fontibus, pater abbas Monasterij beatae Mariae de Kyrkestall, ad plenariam jurisdictionem habens in eodem, Salutem et fidem credulam in subscriptis. Licet, per instituta nostri ordinis, ingressus mulierum infra septa Abbathiarum predicti ordinis, sub paenis gravibus sit prohibitus, nos tamen salutem animarum cupientes, quam tam viri quam mulieres indubie consequenter, qui ecclesiam dicti monasterii de Kyrkestall, certis diebus in anno, contigerit personaliter visitare, prout in quibusdam indulgenciis per papam Bonifacium nonum inde concessis planius est insertum ; ingressum mulierum, prescriptis diebus ad dictam ecclesiam solomodo, volumus pro tempore tollerare: Sic tamen quod ad nullas alias domos infra septa dicti monasterij, neque per abbatem neque aliquem monachum dicti monasterij introducantur, sub poenis in institutis sepedicti ordinis limitatis; quas videlicet poenas volumus et decernimus per presentes, tam abbatem quam monachos prefati monasterii, si in praemissis reperti fuerint culpabiles, irremissibiliter sustinere. In quorum omnium testimonium, sigillum nostrum praesentibus apposuimus. Data apud Monasterium nostrum de Fontibus, quinto die Marcii, anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo primo.' Nothing further is known of the indulges that Boniface granted. The *Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers, Relating Great Britain and Ireland, vol. 4: Papal Letters, A.D. 1362–1404*, ed. by W. H. Bliss and J. A. Twemlow, (London: H.M.S.O, 1902), contains no reference to Fountains or Kirkstall under the year 1401, nor is there any relevant reference to a similar indulgence being granted to Kirkstall or Fountains (the volume index provides the following references: pp. 50, 179, 356, 357, 507, but none is relevant).

[251] *Memorials of Fountains*, I, p. 206: 'ingressum mulierum [...] volumus pro tempore tollerare'.

[252] Ibid.: 'ad nullas alias domos infra septa dicti monasterij'.

demarcating the cloister, or the precinct boundaries.[253] The *Ecclesiastica Officia* would suggest the latter interpretation, which states women are not to be admitted at the gate.[254] Clearly the indulgence overrides the regulations described in the *Ecclesiastica Officia*, and the question therefore remains, were women staying at Kirkstall Abbey guesthouse in the later Middle Ages?

There is also the broader issue of the changing nature of Cistercian houses, where they became more involved in the spirituality of the nearby laity. The opening of churches to lay participants, the re-decoration of churches with the laity in mind, and the relics on display also served to emphasis this changing interaction. This indulgence bears testimony to the development of that interaction, and should not be seen as an isolated deed breaking with the established traditions of the Kirkstall community's modes of engagement with the laity.

A particular feature of the abbey that might have drawn female worshippers is a relic, the girdle of St Bernard. The girdle is known only from the commissioner's report from the time of the Dissolution, which gives the simple description 'for lying in'.[255] The girdle of St Bernard of Kirkstall holds implications connecting the monks with wider themes of female lay spirituality, particularly that of fertility and childbirth.[256] While the fact that the object is no longer extant means that close analysis of its form and characteristics cannot be investigated, the known details of its association within the monastery allow consideration of its wider significance. A girdle or belt was a trope of medieval symbolism which was seen to promote endurance of the difficulties and tribulations of pregnancy and childbirth.[257] Traditions of veneration might accrete around particular saints, or aspects of a saint's identity, associated with childbirth, such as the *Madonna del Parto* of late-medieval Florence.[258] In Cistercian houses the saints would be those emblematic of the Order, such as Mary (to whom every Cistercian houses was dedicated), St Bernard (adoptive founder of the Order), or St Aelred for English houses. Kirkstall was not alone in possessing such a girdle, and there was

---

[253] Conrad of Eberbach, *Exordium Magnum Cisterciense, Sive Narratio de Initio Cisterciensis Ordinis*, ed. by Bruno Griesser (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1961), pp. 168, 287. The instances of the word in these occasions imply the precinct boundary, but in both occasions it with reference to being out of reach of their brethren. Other references are to a priest's garden hedge (p. 315) and the cemetery boundary (p. 357).

[254] *EO*, 120:18: '[s]ed nec qui cum mulieribus veniunt recipi. sed foris cum mulieribus victus datur eis.'

[255] 'Henry VIII: 26–29 February 1536', in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, vol. 10: January-June 1536*, ed. James Gairdner (London, 1887), p. 142; Barnes, p. 86.

[256] See Marianne Elsakkers, 'In Pain You Shall Bear Children (Gen 3:16): Medieval Prayers for a Safe Delivery', in *Women and Miracle Stories: A Multidisciplinary Exploration*, ed. by Anne-Marie Korte, Studies in the History of Religions, 88 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), pp. 179-207.

[257] Carole Rawcliffe, 'Women, Childbirth, and Religion in Later Medieval England', in *Women and Religion in Medieval England*, ed. by Diana Wood (Oxford: Oxbow, 2003), pp. 91–117 (p. 107).

[258] Brendan Cassidy, 'A Relic, Some Pictures and the Mothers of Florence in the Late Fourteenth Century', *Gesta*, 30 (1991), 91–99.

the girdle of St Bernard at Meaux, the girdle of Aelred at Rievaulx, the girdle of St Mary at Calder in Cumberland.[259]

It is possible that by means of the girdle of St Bernard, Kirkstall's community had adopted a conscious policy of fostering piety among women in Yorkshire, which interpretation is consistent with the wording of the abbot of Fountains as stated in the text of the indulgence.[260] Certainly, there is literary evidence for self-cultivation of piety in high-status female contexts, including from Yorkshire, demonstrating the possibility of refined engagement with the spirituality exhibited by the Cistercians.[261] Such a relationship, but operating in the other direction, has been identified between the hermit Richard Rolle (1305×10–1349) and the Priory of Hampole, a female Cistercian house. At Hampole, the enclosed female religious actively sought spiritual nourishment from an external male authority, whereas at Kirkstall it would have been female outsiders seeking spiritual support from an enclosed male community. The activities of female Cistercians such as at Hampole may have inspired lay women to closer engagement with Cistercian institutions, and it is known that Hampole received donations from female benefactors.[262] It is possible, therefore, that there was a similar pious assocation with benefactors at Kirkstall Abbey.

Personal Adornment and the Female Presence

Given that the indulgence is the only documentary evidence dealing explicitly with the admission of women, other forms of evidence need to be introduced in order to address the question. The best resource in this regard is the small finds assemblage excavated in the

---

[259] For these references and more, see G. W. Bernard, *The Late Medieval English Church: Vitality and Vulnerability before the Break with Rome* (New Haven, CT; London: Yale University Press, 2012), p. 137.

[260] For a survey of the place of female religious in Yorkshire and its links to a wider culture of piety, see Janet Burton, 'Yorkshire Nunneries in the Middle Ages: Recruitment and Resources', in Government, Religion and Society in Northern England, 1000–1700, ed. by John C. Appleby and Paul Dalton (Stroud: Sutton, 1997), pp. 104-116 and Claire Cross, 'Yorkshire Nunneries in the Early Tudor Period', in *The Religious Order in Pre-Reformation England*, ed. by James Clark, Studies in the history Medieval Religion, 18 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002), pp. 145–54. For patronage of Cistercians in particular (though covering only the Low Countries and the long thirteenth century), see Erin Jordan, 'Gender Concerns: Monks, Nuns, and Patronage of the Cistercian Order in Thirteenth-Century Flanders and Hainaut', *Speculum*, 87 (2012), 62–94.

[261] Rowena E. Archer, Piety in Question: Noblewomen and Religion in the Later Middle Ages', in *Women and Religion in Medieval England*, ed. by Diana Wood (Oxford: Oxbow, 2003); Sarah Rees Jones and Felicity Riddy, 'The Bolton Hours of York: Female Domestic Piety and the Public Sphere', in *Household, Women, and Christianities in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, ed. by Anneke B. Mulder-Bakker and Jocelyn Wogan-Browne (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), pp. 215–60.

[262] Elizabeth Freeman, 'The Priory of Hampole and its Literary Culture: English Religious Women and Books in the Age of Richard Rolle', *Parergon*, 29 (2012), 1–25. For female Cistercian houses and the problems with their definition, see Elizabeth Freeman, '"Houses of a Peculiar Order": Cistercian Nunneries in Medieval England, with Special Attention to the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries', *Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses*, 55 (2004), 245–87.

guesthouse. Some reference has already been made as to whether items would have been used by men or women. Many dress accessories are, for purposes of interpretation, unisex, in that their aesthetic qualities can be associated with various masculine and feminine styles; there is no way at present to arrive at a definitive judgment using these items. Examples of such unisex items are girdles, belts and belt or strap fittings, brooches, finger-rings, buttons, clips, pendants and miscellaneous chains associated with dress accessories. Lace tags were used for tying items such as sleeves to the jerkin or attaching codpieces as well as lacing up bodices, not to mention shoes; they were used in male and female dress, therefore.[263] These items do not categorically deny the presence of women, but nor can they affirm it.

There are some items more closely associated with women rather than men, namely those which pertain to pieces of costume only worn by women, such as headdresses or veils, or associated with activities dominated by women in the medieval period. Items able to be associated more confidently with women are pins for dress items, toiletry accessories such as mirrors (though this, too, can be ambiguous), and craft items such as thimbles, needles, and needle-cases, which indicate textile working, a craft practised mostly by women in the domestic setting in the later Middle Ages.[264]

Pins form a singularly important point when considering the presence of women, as they are one of the few items which can confidently be assigned to female as opposed to male dress.[265] If they were part of dress, they would have been used in women's headdresses or veils. Pins might have been used by poor men in place of buttons as a means of fastening clothing, though this would have been through exigency rather than choice, and would not be in keeping with the high-status arrangement of the guesthouse at Kirkstall.[266] Fashions demanding extensive use of pins for fastening clothing, such as those of the Elizabethan period, belong to a period later than the Kirkstall assemblage.[267] The usual distinction made regarding pins are 'dress and hair pins', which are larger and fewer, and 'sewing pins', which are much smaller and far more numerous.[268] These attributions lend false clarity, however, as

---

[263] Egan and Pritchard, p. 285; Duncan, p. 13.

[264] Geoff Egan, *The Medieval Household: Daily Living c. 1150–1450* (London: H.M.S.O., 1998), pp. 255–56.

[265] Hinton, *Possessions and People*, p. 171.

[266] Martin Biddle and K. Barclay, 'Sewing Pins and Wire', in *Object and Economy in Medieval Winchester: Artefacts from Medieval Winchester*, by Martin Biddle, Winchester Studies, 7.ii (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 560–71 (p. 564).

[267] Jenny Tiramani, 'Pins and Aglets', in *Everyday Objects: Medieval and Early Modern Material Culture and Its Meanings*, ed. by Tara Hamling and Catherine Richardson (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), pp. 85–94 (pp. 87–89).

[268] Martin Biddle, 'Dress and Hair Pins', in *Object and Economy in Medieval Winchester: Artefacts from Medieval Winchester*, by Martin Biddle, Winchester Studies, 7.ii (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 552–60 (p. 552).

it is not absolutely clear to which purposes the pins were put, especially the latter. There are twenty pins or pin fragments in the guesthouse assemblage in varying states of preservation.[269] Two questions must therefore be asked: for what purpose were the guesthouse pins intended, and can those attributed a dress function be said to represent the presence of women within the guesthouse?

Discussing the 'dress and hair pins' first, the late-medieval examples were far finer and, usually, shorter than their early medieval predecessors, as well as bearing much less decoration.[270] Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-Norman pins could double as clothing fasteners (similar to a brooch) such was their sturdiness of construction, and they bore conspicuous fine filigree, niello decoration or wire patterning on the head. Late-medieval dress and hair pins might be more accurately described as hair pins, as their fine shafts did not have the strength for securing clothing, and their attribution is more secure. The examples for the guesthouse are very much of the late medieval type.[271] There are two clear examples of dress in the assemblage: a complete example with a length of 66mm and one lacking the head of 53mm.[272] Another possible example is represented by the head (no shaft extant) of 9.75mm diameter.[273] Using the ratios of the dimensions of head to shaft calculated by Biddle and Barclay, an estimate for the length of this pin can be determined.[274] The pin head has been tentatively identified as akin to Winchester Type E, a late-medieval phenomenon and characterised by proportionally very large heads, which has an average head to shaft ratio of 1:7.3; this gives an estimated length of shaft of 71.75mm. This gives a potential of three examples of pins with the characteristic length and form of dress accessories as opposed to craft use. Thus some of the pins are very strongly connected with usage in hair or headdresses (therefore indicating the presence of women), but they are few in number.

The function of the smaller 'sewing pins' is more doubtful. Caple connects the vast increase in scale of the pin industry with consumer demand, doing so by referring to household accounts of individuals such as the Duchess of Orleans in 1400, and noting the exceptional financial outlay on these items. Caple identifies this shift as a result of developments in female

---

[269] For the 1979 excavations the small find numbers are: 198, 204, 231, 461. For the 1981 and later excavations the small find numbers are: 452, 662, 919, 1213, 1235, 1236, 1794, 1861, 2048, 2321, 2827, 3215, 3231, 3651, 7618, 10388.

[270] Biddle, pp. 552–555.

[271] 'Type D' as categorised by Martin Biddle, a type dating from the twelfth to sixteenth centuries, and closest in form to the 'sewing pins'. Lengths range from 44mm to 106mm in examples from Winchester, with an average of 64.9mm. Biddle, p. 554.

[272] SF 1794 and 1236, respectively.

[273] SF 3215.

[274] Biddle, p. 553, table 75.

fashion, and thereby attributes a dress function to these pins.[275] Biddle and Barclay stress the multi-functional nature of pins, stating examples of their use in dress for the poor, female headgear, blankets, upholstery and tailoring (this latter being assigned to the nineteenth century).[276] Egan and Pritchard refer to pictorial and wardrobe accounts to attribute a dress function to pins, although this attribution only extends as far as pins with decorated heads (which are the type illustrated in their examples).[277] The pins from the York excavations have not been assigned a specific function.[278] For Kirkstall, the majority of the pins are of this small, multifunctional form; none has ornamentation or a glass head suggesting a display function. When used in dress, the drawn-wire pins would be used as a way to fasten lightweight garments for convenience, such as veils, headdresses, sleeves or possibly fastening collar hems and, later, ruffs; they would not be suited to taking great strain.[279] Paintings from the Flemish school, such as portraits by Roger van der Weyden (fig. 3.39, fig. 3.40, and fig. 3.41), clearly illustrate the use of pins: they are visible (very much so in fig. 3.39), but are few in number and used for utility rather than ornamentation; they are also not of great length, and approximate the 40–50mm length common to this period. The shorter Kirkstall pins, judging from the complete (although perhaps now fragmented) examples range in length from 30–45mm.[280] The lack of decoration on these items, which are of the standard wire-wound or solid heads, reinforces the notion that display was not a concern.[281] If these items were used by women, they would not have been spectacularly high-status individuals, and the guesthouse 'sewing pins' confine the wearer, whether male or female, to a more humble station.

Consideration of the distribution of the pins as excavated is suggestive. The majority of the pins were found in the area of the services at the south end of the primary hall, or in the kitchen yard abutting them to the south. No pins were found in the primary hall itself or the main chambers immediately to the north of it, although four were discovered in the area directly to the west of the solar, where the garderobe block was located. A scattering of pins was found in the open space immediately to the east of the primary guest hall, in an area ranging from that adjacent to the main chamber in the north to the services in the south; the

---

275 Caple, p. 243.
276 Biddle and Barclay, pp. 564–65.
277 Egan and Pritchard, p. 297.
278 Ottaway and Rogers, p. 2918.
279 Biddle and Barclay, p. 564, which cites Ben John's Tale of a Tub (1633) describing a rural man's pinned cuffs; Caple, p. 249; Margeson and others, p. 11.
280 Caple, p. 248.
281 Duncan, p. 15.

scattering stops when adjacent to the services. A few pins were found to the south-east of the guest range, on the roadway which swept past its southern side. The three larger 'dress and hair pins' discussed above were found in the area to the east of the solar and in the buttery/kitchen yard. The distribution is varied enough to permit analysis to see whether it presents a meaningful pattern.

The unifying element of this distribution pattern is that the deposits are all located within areas of utility. The roadway, points of access, services and garderobes are areas not associated with leisured occupation, but would have been those frequented by domiciles. The areas that were most heavily in use, and were productive of other forms of dress accessory, are conspicuously absent, such as the great hall. It would appear from the distribution that, were the pins to have been part of feminine dress and therefore indicative of women, the female presence was only among the domestic staff as opposed to guests of status. Pins lost while in transit to the guesthouse may have been worn by female guests accompanying men, but if so they deposited no pins indicating that they took advantage of the hospitality spaces of the guesthouse.

The case is strengthened by considering the fact that many other dress items were found within the primary hall, and it is therefore not the case that the distribution of the pins is representative merely of deposition and formation processes rather than being indicative of medieval usage. Items found in the area of the main chamber include a buckle plate,[282] a chain link,[283] and a finger-ring.[284] In the primary hall there were found a lace tag,[285] a strap loop,[286] a buckle,[287] and a jet mount,[288] while in the secondary hall were found a buckle,[289] strap mounts,[290] strap fittings,[291] buckle pin,[292] lace tags,[293] and a finger-ring.[294] These items can be securely attributed a dress function, but they cannot be said to indicate the presence of either gender as they are effectively unisex. The significance of this is that the distribution of the pins is not merely a product of deposition processes. The absence of pins from areas

---

[282] SF 6000.
[283] SF 7888.
[284] SF 226.
[285] SF 2184.
[286] SF 2322.
[287] SF 4120.
[288] SF 3296.
[289] SF 2220.
[290] SF 1642; 1824.
[291] SF 3642.
[292] SF 719.
[293] SF 993; 1543.
[294] SF 4821.

which nevertheless do have other kinds of dress accessories suggests that the people in these areas did not have pins as part of their costume; especially so when one considers that the small size and slight form of a pin is that much easier to mislay.

It should be noted that there is considerable overlap regarding the areas in which the dress accessories and the pins were found. The majority of the dress accessories were found in the services, kitchen yard, and in the areas immediately to the east of the primary guest hall. The overlap is especially clear in the area to the west of the garderobe block, where many dress accessories, including buckles, strap plates, strap ends, lace tags were recovered from the same layers as pins, or even from the same context.[295] The contextual information is merely circumstantial, however, as the vast majority of the guesthouse deposits are either disturbed or secondary. The overlap of the dress accessories whose function is securely attributed, together with the pins, strongly suggests that a dress function can be attributed to the latter as well. Whether these smaller pins indicate feminine dress is more debatable, as they could also represent the poorer classes among the visiting household. These individuals may or may not have been female as well, but the emphasis here is that they would have been carrying out domestic tasks (in which pins would have been useful) rather sporting the kind of costlier headwear or garments which required pins for support.

From consideration of the pins in light of their form and the items with which they are associated, it is highly likely that they were dress accessories, although the smaller pins were most probably multifunctional and a single attribution would be a classificatory falsehood. More problematic is associating the majority of the pins with female wearers; if they formed part of the poor man's dress to fasten clothing, then the presence of women is further obscured by the gender neutrality of the archaeological record. The larger pins enable the presence of women to be more confidently proposed however, as their sizes indicate that they would have been used more conspicuously.

Activities and the Female Presence

Turning away from using adornment to ascertain gender, it is possible that activities within the guesthouse indicate the presence of women. One such activity is textile working, which was until the eleventh century a female-dominated craft activity, carried out within the household

---

295 An example of one context is SF 79:198.1–3, consisting of a buckle, pin, and lace tag (respectively), all located in Area VIII, Layer 94. Another example is SF 79:204.1–2, a lace tag and pin, located in Area VIII, Layer 88.

and on a small scale.[296] With the growth of trade and industry from the late eleventh century onwards, there were many male professionals engaged in textile working, and male servants may have carried out routine repairs of clothing as the need arose. Certainly textile crafting as a trade involved men from the twelfth century (at least) onwards.[297] The presence of textile working items does not in itself indicate women, therefore, and questions need to be addressed regarding the status implied by the users of tools, the locations in which they were found, and the finds with which they are associated. The textile working assemblage is not large, consisting of two thimbles,[298] a possible needle-case,[299] a needle[300] and a possible half a spindle whorl.[301]

The thimbles from Kirkstall are made of copper alloy, which material began to be used regularly for these items in England from the fourteenth century onwards.[302] The indentations on SF 79:175 are not evenly spaced though they are arrayed in a sub-regular pattern, which indicates that they were hand-punched. The overall form is sub-hemi-spherical, indicating an earlier rather than later date of manufacture, that is, late-medieval rather than post-medieval.[303] The second thimble, SF 1004, is perhaps post-medieval due to its straight sides; the indentations are punched, but more regular than the first thimble.[304] The needle is shorter in length, thereby facilitating more intricate handling; it could have been used for more intricate textile work.[305] The diameter of the needle, though, is rather greater than is normal given its length.[306] The needle cannot be securely dated due to its very utilitarian form: a needle of similar size from Winchester dates to the early twelfth century; another far closer in form from Norwich dates to c. 1507.[307]

---

[296] P. Walton, 'Textiles', in *English Medieval Industries: Craftsmen, Techniques, Products*, by John Blair and Nigel Ramsay (London: Hambledon, 1991), pp. 319–54 (pp. 328, 346).

[297] Egan, *Medieval Household*, p. 7.

[298] SF 79:175 and SF 1004.

[299] SF 1658 (LEEDM.D.2012.0035.001.266).

[300] SF 1396 (LEEDM.D.2012.0035.001.231).

[301] ? SF 1443.

[302] Though the use of copper alloy for the 'tailor's' thimble (open topped) was known in the ancient world, well over a millennium before. H. Syer Cuming, 'On Thimbles', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 35 (1879), 238–42; Martin Biddle and Linden Elmhirst, 'Sewing Equipment', in *Object and Economy in Medieval Winchester: Artefacts from Medieval Winchester*, by Martin Biddle, Winchester Studies, 7.ii (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 804–17 (p. 804); Egan, *Medieval Household*, p. 265.

[303] Biddle and Elmhirst, p. 805.

[304] Biddle and Elmhirst, p. 805.

[305] Biddle and Elmhirst, p. 806.

[306] Egan, *Medieval Household*, pp. 268–69. The length of needles of 2.50mm diameter from the London excavations range from 76mm to 94mm. The shortest length needle in the London assemblages is 35mm, with a diameter of 1.65 × 1.50mm.

[307] Biddle and Elmhirst, pp. 813–14, no. 2510 (dated to c. 1110–c. 1130); Ottaway and Rogers, p. 3113, no. 14178; also see p. 2740, fig. 1347 (dated mid–fourteenth to early fifteenth centuries); Ian H. Goodall, 'Textile Manufacture and Needlework', in *Norwich Households: The Medieval and Post-Medieval Finds from*

The location of the finds associated with textile production are, apart from one thimble which is found in the north-west of the guesthouse range, all found within the vicinity of the services (specifically the buttery, on the western side) and the kitchen yard directly to the south of it. These are areas associated with domestic, menial activities, rather than the pastime of a gentle lady at leisure.[308] The thimble found in the north-western area, which incorporated the garderobe block, is in the same approximate location as a variety of items including dress accessories such as lace tags and fasteners, window fragments and cames, nails, and other unidentified fragments. In short, the items are too varied for any single explanation of medieval activity in this area to be proposed. Significant in consideration of the textile materials is the lack of any items which indicate 'industrial' production (sustained, and for commercial purpose), such as spindles, looms, or combs for carding wool; 'craft' production is therefore indicated (smaller scale, for domestic or local consumption). Again, the image of servants carrying out repairs or *ad hoc* sewing tasks is suggested.

How are these textile working items to be interpreted, and do they indicate the presence of women? At the College of the Vicars Choral at Bedern, York, has been noted that '[y]arn production and needlework are typically the skills of the medieval housewife and their presence […] may indicate that female domestic servants were working there'.[309] For Kirkstall, therefore, the few items related to textiles and the locations in which they were found suggest small-scale, infrequent use by lower status people. Their location conforms wholly with the location of the pins, which have been taken as dress items. A reasonable interpretation is therefore that there are grounds for viewing women as having been present, but these are not certain. Moreover, should women have been at Kirkstall's guesthouse, the items indicating either their presence, such as pins, or activities traditionally associated with women, such as needlework, place them within a servile rather than gentle stratum within the household.

Documentary Evidence for Women at Kirkstall

Another form of evidence are the charters recording benefactions to the community at Kirkstall. The clause looked for in the Kirkstall charters is 'datum apud Kyrkestall', which

---

Norwich Survey Excavations, 1971–1978, by Sue Margeson (Norwich: The Norwich Survey, 1993), pp. 182–88 (p. 187, no. 1452; dated to *c.* 1507).

[308] George Wingfield Digby, 'Technique and Production', in *The Bayeux Tapestry. A Comprehensive Survey*, by Frank Stenton (London: Phaidon, 1957), pp. 37–55 (pp. 43–44).

[309] Ottaway and Rogers, p. 2745.

locates the party assembled to negotiate, make and witness the deed within the abbey precinct. A woman named as the benefactor (as the primary donor, not as 'uxor eius' or equivalent where the grant could be given through the husband as a representative) or in the witness-list on a deed given at Kirkstall would indicate their presence within the precinct, as this would be necessary to make the dating clause and witness-list valid. Those named in the charters did not necessarily stay for any great length of time at the abbey, but they would most probably have required access beyond the gatehouse. Whether the women named in the charters used the guest range during their visit is uncertain, but given the force with which the 1402 indulgence restricts entry, and that the other locations in which a grant might have been made were the chapter house or the abbot's lodging, both of which are perilously close to the monastic dormitory, there is a reasonable case for proposing the guesthouse as a forum for conducting business. This idea is greatly reinforced by the items found within the guesthouse range which were suited to the preparation of, writing of, and sealing of deeds. Parchment has not survived, but lead points for lining it have, as have styli, seal matrices were found although are now lost, and a signet ring too. While no reference is made directly to the guesthouse, it was a fitting and well-equipped venue for pursuing abbey business.[310]

Disappointingly, the deeds contained within Kirkstall Abbey's cartulary no longer retain their witness-lists, presumably because they had lost their legal force by the time it was compiled in the early fourteenth century due to the death of the named witnesses. There are a few bundles of original deeds detailing witnesses, such as the sixty-four deeds relating to the abbey's possessions in Allerton (modern Chapel Allerton; which also incorporates Allerton Gledhow and Moor Allerton). The Allerton archive contains only one deed given at Kirkstall mentioning women by name. This is dated 4 April 1325 and is a grant of a moiety of a bovate in Allerton Gledhow by Anabilla, wife of William (whose toponym is unfortunately obscured by a lacuna).[311] But aside from this deed women are not prominent, and there is certainly not enough to locate them at Kirkstall in any significant number or as a regular occurrence.

However, the significance of Anabilla's deed is not in its representation of the frequency of women visiting Kirkstall. The deed is more interesting for its evidence that women engaged with the monastic community by making benefactions or conducting business while at the abbey in person. The dating clause does not specify any further where within the abbey

---

[310] The only building directly mentioned in the deeds is the *conventio* made between Miles de la Haye and the Abbey of Fountains in 1336, which states that it was made 'in camera domini Abbatis de Kyrkestall priuata': *CBK*, no. 5.

[311] *PKAA*, pp. 42–59, 81–116 (p. 81, no. 26). See above, p. 201.

precinct the transaction occurred, and remains a matter for speculation. The only deed to specify the building in which an activity is carried out is Miles de la Haye's solvency from his debts and sentence of excommunication in 1336, which was carried out in the abbot's private chamber (presumably referring to the reception room of his lodging). Other possible venues would have been a parlour in the western range, the guesthouse, or the gatehouse. The gatehouse is a particularly intriguing possibility, as here women could be received and provided for even by the precepts of the *Ecclesiastica Officia*. The gate house was not simply a small chamber next to a great portal into the precinct, but had many ancillary buildings and chambers about it, as indicated by the deeds granted by William Mauleverer, and, further afield, the striking architectural styles of many late-medieval gatehouses at religious sites (for example, the palatial and imposing edifice at Augustinian Thornton Abbey).

The contents of the deed do provide indication of how a local woman might interact with the community at Kirkstall. There is not a great deal to suggest that Anabilla's deed was out of purely a religious motivation; only that on the one hand there is no record of a counter-gift either in money, in kind, or in services, and on the other hand that the quitclaim was made in perpetuity, and so the land was alienated permanently. However, the deed does demonstrate that women could be seen in the company of the prominent men of the community when they gathered at the abbey. The witnesses to the deed include the knights Thomas of Swudlington, Roger of Leeds and William Gramary, as well as William Mauleverer (presumably the younger; he is as yet untitled but for his patronym). This said, it may have been Anabilla's position as benefactor which gave her special prominence, as well as the requirement of her presence to make the quitclaim, rather than through a proxy; certainly reference to her deceased husband William was deemed informative enough to note (although a lacuna in the manuscript has obscured her husband's toponym). Ultimately, wherever the deed was drawn up within the abbey, the deed shows the usual gathering of local worthies and interested parties for a transfer of lands or rights, but at the centre of this gathering is a woman with the ability and will to aid the abbey by contributing to its landed resources.

Conclusions

The 1402 indulgence allowed the entrance of women within Kirkstall's confines on certain days of the year; what is not clear is whether they were also permitted to the guesthouse as an intermediate point between the gatehouse and the church, and whether other rules regarding

provision of hospitality were similarly relaxed (short of offering overnight residence within the abbey grounds). The assemblage from the guesthouse presents very few items which can be assigned only to the female gender, as most are unisex and therefore make for an ambiguous interpretation; this includes most of the dress accessories. One type of item more closely bound up with female dress is the pin, of which there are many examples from Kirkstall. However, these are not the ostentatious 'dress and hair' pins of the pre-Conquest period, but rather the drawn-wire pins which were able to be produced in bulk to satisfy great demand. They could be used in various manners, including the fixing of badges and emblems to one's clothing, although there is evidence from accounts and contemporary portraits of pins being incorporated into female dress. The distribution of the pins suggests that should they have been used by women, then these women were servants rather than mistresses among the party of guests. Items indicating activities associated with a female presence are similarly few, and similarly located within the guesthouse. These items do not categorically determine whether it was either male or female domestics carrying out routine household tasks, but they were certainly not associated with the more privileged hospitality spaces of the main hall where one would expect business to be transacted and social functions to be staged, nor were they associated with the high-status chambers to the north of the hall.

With regard to the admission of women, it would appear that the indulgence granted by Robert Burley of Fountains did not signal an upheaval in how access to the monastic precinct operated. The entrance of women, as shown by the material culture of Kirkstall's guesthouse, did not automatically mean that they were welcomed into other areas of the precinct. The indulgence itself is couched in somewhat guarded language, and although it is tempting to view it as testimony to a shift in how the Cistercians interacted with wider society, this needs serious qualification. To append this document in support of a narrative describing the degradation of the boundaries between world and cloister would be a misstep. Rather, it shows the flexibility of the Cistercian community to cater to the laity's changing demands, but in a manner which upheld the integrity of their own observance. Some of their customs had to be overridden to achieve this, but ultimately the welcome to women, judging from Kirkstall's evidence, was extended only so far.

3.4

GUESTS OF KIRKSTALL ABBEY:
CONCLUSIONS

This chapter has utilised small finds (principally dress accessories) and documentary sources to identify the people who inhabited or made use of the guesthouse at Kirkstall Abbey. The small finds by their nature suggest the presence of people of moderately wealthy status (in that they could afford metal accessories), but differentiation between social statuses within this range is difficult. However, there are some sure indications that the guests of the highest status used the guesthouse, as indicated by the silver strap end. Such precious-metal finds are rare, and for one to come from so small a sized site as the guesthouse is telling. Set against the broad range of artefacts, a pyramidal structure of status is suggested, with few high-status artefacts at the top and many common artefacts below. It should be stated that these 'common' artefacts may still represent high-status individuals, as has been indicated by their placement in an art-historical context.

The small finds accord very well with the documentary evidence, which consists mainly of charters and archiepiscopal registers. The documentary evidence has been explored for evidence of the presence of people at the site of Kirkstall itself, rather than a broad analysis of Kirkstall's social network. This has greatly limited the number of applicable deeds, which date, for the present discussion, largely from the early fourteenth century, during which time Kirkstall was under the rule of an able administrator, Abbot William of Driffield. By their nature, these deeds indicate wealth, as charters were legal dispositions of properties or rights, and therefore indicate that the grantor was a landowner, or they derive from ecclesiastical administration such as the archbishop's household. The strongest evidence for individuals using Kirkstall's guesthouse comes from the local community, which is strongly evidenced by surviving charters.

The presence of women at the guesthouse has been investigated, but any conclusion regarding their presence must be inclined toward the negative. The small finds have the methodological issue of many items being effectively unisex, unable to provide information as to the gender of their former owner. Meanwhile, the number of applicable documentary sources, already of limited chronological span, is reduced dramatically due to women having less opportunity during this period to dispose of property or rights. Despite access to the church being granted to women, therefore, this did not correspond with a broader opening

up of the abbey. Provision for women appears to be have been for spiritual affairs alone.

A major problem for these documents as evidence for the presence of individuals using the guesthouse is that very few specify the guesthouse as the area of the precinct in which guests were entertained when they came to make their benefaction or conduct their business. The issue of what the guesthouse was used for, how guests employed their time there, as well as what facilities they were provided with, is the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE CISTERCIAN WELCOME

4.0
INTRODUCTION

The final aspect of hospitality is the welcome that Cistercians provided for their guests. As has been shown by analysis of the *Rule* and *Ecclesiastica Officia*, the use of space within the precinct, the small finds, and documentary evidence, there was a great range of people benefitting from hospitality at Kirkstall Abbey in a number of areas within the monastery. Variety of guests entailed variety in the provision made for them, be they material, such as food, drink, and lodging, or immaterial, such as the spiritual benefits of attending the abbey church. Not all guests would experience the same provision of hospitality. The reading of an edificatory text was as much a result of providing hospitality as serving food in the guesthouse, but each would be provided in set places at appointed times and have certain meaning attached them by both guests and their monastic hosts.

The details of some kinds of activity can be found in normative sources such as the *Ecclesiastica Officia*, but many points regarding what a guest might have done within the precinct remain poorly understood. Consuetudinary sources make for poor sources regarding guests' activities: their focus is on individual monks' responsibilities and defining the extent of action that should be taken in a given circumstance. The *Ecclesiastica Officia* stops short of describing what a guest is or is not to be provided with in the guest range, for instance, and there are no details regarding what they may or may not do when the abbot entertained them in his lodging; all that is stated is that a guest, after praying upon arrival, 'should be led to the guesthouse, or presented to the hosteller'.[1] However, what guests might do greatly affected the opinion that they formed of the community's hospitality. The freedom accorded to guests within the precinct was one of the hazards of hospitality that the monastic community had

---

[1]   *EO*, 87:15: '[d]einde ducatur ad hospitium. vel presentetur hospitali'.

to curtail in order for their observance to remain unimpaired.

At Kirkstall, it is clear from consideration of the spatial scheme of the precinct that the guesthouse was the principal area dedicated secular guests within the precinct boundaries (the gatehouse complex for present purposes being considered to be on the precinct boundary).[2] The replication of all amenities within the guest range, such as water supply, latrines, accommodation, and ancillary buildings, meant that in theory the guests had no reason to demand access to the claustral ranges. The intention to segregate guests meant that similarly the guests would pursue activities in isolation from the monastic community, safely away from where the brethren carried out their daily routine. Thus, while the activities in which a guest might engage were by no means limited to the guesthouse alone, it did form the principal living area for guests while they stayed at the abbey, whether they stayed for shorter (less than a day) or longer periods (overnight, or longer). The importance that the guesthouse held for accommodating guests, together with the quantity of excavated material culture from Kirkstall's guesthouse in particular, affords a rare opportunity to utilise material culture to investigate the inner workings of a very poorly understood part of the monastic precinct.

Historiography for Guests' Activities within the Precinct

Out of all the areas of monastic hospitality, the internal arrangement of and activity within the guest range is the least well evidenced and consequently the least understood by archaeologists and historians. Most analyses rely on incidental documentary references or anecdotes supplied by chroniclers. This reliance has two main problems. The first is how well these sources represent normal conduct within a monastery; the second is the way that composite accounts such as these divorce the resultant interpretation from their historical and material context.

Kerr has produced the most systematic account of the guests' range of activities within the precinct.[3] Kerr's study employs the detailed customaries of (principally) the abbey of Bury St Edmunds to examine the process and forms of the provision made for the guest, including by whom they were met, where they would be taken and when, where they would be seated at mealtimes and what they would be served, as well as considering the level of interaction permitted between the guest and the community. Kerr also considers the spiritual provision

---

2   See chapter 2.2.
3   Julie Kerr, *Monastic Hospitality: The Benedictines in England, c. 1070–c. 1250*, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion, 32 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), pp. 121–76.

made for guests, religious and secular, and the services that they would be able to attend at the abbey. Kerr's account is largely descriptive by nature of its consuetudinary source material, as archaeological evidence and material culture from the abbeys studied have not survived to a degree permitting in-depth analysis.

Kerr recognises difference between different religious orders. The Cistercians, for example, had been received at Bury St Edmunds up until the thirteenth century just as any other religious. However, an incident at this time caused a change in practice. Abbot John of Boxley (r. ?1216 × 1236) arrived at the abbey and greatly outstepped his entitlements as a guest, with the result that the customary was changed so that Cistercians were no longer permitted to reside in the monastic dormitory.[4] Similarly, the Cistercians and Cluniacs had a long-running debate about the exclusivity of their respective orders in receiving outsiders.[5] The idea of religious orders having different arrangements by virtue of their observance has also been highlighted by Rowell, who states that 'the Cistercians were certainly the most particular about the placement and arrangement of their buildings'.[6] Although this is with reference to the spatial organisation of the precinct and architecture of the monastic buildings, it is plausible that observance would have a similar impact on the material provision for guests. This was certainly the case for food, as will be discussed below, but the lack of archaeological data and systematic analyses of monastic guesthouses (of any order) masks the subtleties of variation in provision; the best that can be done at this point is to offer a material basis for a scholarly debate that has hitherto viewed the materiality of monastic hospitality through a documentary lens.

Sources and Methodology

The issues arising from archaeological data examined in this chapter relate to different aspects of Cistercian hospitality, and each section contains its own historiographical and methodological discussion. However, the present research has been enabled only by the work carried out by a number of specialist reports, and it is necessary to comment briefly on the

---

[4] *Heads of Religious Houses*, 1, p. 271, although the authors point out that this 'Abbot John' is probably in fact two individuals because a 'W.' occurs as abbot in 1224.

[5] Idung of Prüfening, *Cistercians and Cluniacs: The Case for Cîteaux*, trans. by Joseph Leahey, Jeremiah Francis O'Sullivan, and Grace Perrigo (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1977).

[6] Rochelle L. Rowell, 'The Archaeology of Late Monastic Hospitality' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of York, 2000), p. 80. Elsewhere (p. 57) Rowell identifies the Cistercians' propensity for a particular architectural form for their gatehouse.

work on which the present research has drawn.[7]

The objects from Kirkstall provide a strong basis for reconstructing the interior, although there are deficiencies in the archaeological record (lack of wooden artefacts, and poor condition iron finds, for example) and there is the serious caveat that Dissolution processes and nineteenth-century excavations may have skewed both the objects constituting the assemblage as well the distribution. Many objects represent human activity rather than furnishings, and are able to provide evidence as to what the occupants of the guesthouse did while there. The small finds have been extensively analysed and described by Holly Duncan as part of an ongoing re-assessment of the archaeology of Kirkstall's guesthouse.[8] Duncan's analysis is arranged according to functional category (for example, 'household') within which objects are grouped according to a narrower function (for example, 'lighting'); a description of the form of the objects is given, parallels with other sites where applicable, and a tentative dating where possible. The sheer number of the finds has prevented a detailed analysis of the whole assemblage. Instead, groups of objects have been prioritised which hold the best potential for understanding the nature of the guesthouse and activities within it. The animal bones have been analysed by Jane Richardson, and the fish remains by Deborah Jacques; the reports include a full taxonomy, discussion of distribution, and inter-site comparison.[9] These reports have been used extensively in the following discussion and replication of the information contained in them occurs only where it is relevant to the argument made; for full physical descriptions, dimensions and dating the information the finds catalogue should be consulted.

The discussion in this chapter extends the specialist analyses of the small finds and animal bones by placing them in the social context of the guesthouse and relating them to hospitality. Two principal questions have been asked of the material: what did the facilities implied by the presence of these objects mean for the occupants of the guesthouse, and what do they reveal about the occupants' actions? The evidence for the material environment and the behaviour within the guesthouse is compared where possible with monastic attitudes and provision to highlight similarities and differences between the guest range and the claustral

---

[7]   For details of the reports and their relationship to the writing of this thesis please see the prefatory statement.

[8]   Holly B. Duncan, 'Kirkstall Abbey Guest House: The Other Artefacts', in *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2: The Guest House Excavations, 1979–86*, ed. by Stuart Wrathmell, Yorkshire Archaeology, 12 (Wakefield: West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service, forthcoming) chp. 7.

[9]   Jane Richardson, 'Kirkstall Guest House Animal Bones', in *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2: The Guest House Excavations, 1979–86*, ed. by Stuart Wrathmell, Yorkshire Archaeology, 12 (Wakefield: West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service, forthcoming); Deborah Jacques, 'Kirkstall Guest House Fish Bone', in *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2*, by Stuart Wrathmell, forthcoming.

precinct. The discussion is concerned with three main areas of hospitable provision. The first is a summary of architectural features and finds relating to the interior arrangement of the guesthouse, with the aim of assessing at what social status the material environment was aimed. The second section treats a topic very important to any discussion of hospitality: the provision of food. The animal bones and the consumption of meat form the kernel of the discussion, particularly Cistercian attitudes towards the provision of meat and the change in attitudes over time. The third and final discussion asks what the guests did while at the abbey and the impact that these findings have on the role that the guesthouse played in the wider social, economic and political life of the abbey.

4.1

INSIDE KIRKSTALL'S GUESTHOUSE

Domestic Furnishings and Monastic Houses

The study of furnishings within the domestic setting has usually taken second-place to analysis of the organisation of space within buildings and its surrounds or its function.[10] This is especially true of medieval housing, for higher and lower status, religious or lay. Most studies taking into account the interior furnishings concern the post-medieval period.[11] The paucity of material evidence for any time before *c.* 1500 makes investigation into the internal setting before this date difficult. The moveable nature of items used for furnishing a house as well as sheer attrition means that a plausible reconstruction of the minutiae of the physical environment is very difficult to achieve.

A partial remedy to the lack of material evidence is the use of inventories, contained either in household accounts, or in wills for the dispersal of the deceased's goods. Inventories

---

[10]   Kate Giles, 'Vernacular Housing in the North: The Case of England', in *The Archaeology of Medieval Europe: Twelfth to Sixteenth Centuries*, ed. by Martin Carver and Jan Klápště, 2 vols (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2011), II, 159–76 (p. 171).

[11]   Although there is some degree of overlap with the Middle Ages in the following works, the emphasis is on the early modern period. N. W. Alcock, *People at Home: Living in a Warwickshire Village, 1500–1800* (Chichester: Phillimore, 1993); Alan Gore and Ann Gore, *The History of English Interiors* (Oxford: Phaidon, 1991); James Ayres, *Domestic Interiors: The British Tradition, 1500–1850* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003); *At Home in Renaissance Italy*, ed. by Marta Ajmar-Wollheim and Flora Dennis (London: Victoria and Albert, 2006); *Imagined Interiors: Representing the Domestic Interior since the Renaissance*, ed. by Jeremy Aynsley and Charlotte Grant (London: Victoria and Albert, 2006); *Approaching the Italian Renaissance Interior: Sources, Methodologies, Debates*, ed. by Marta Ajmar-Wollheim, Flora Dennis, and Ann Matchette (Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell, 2007).

provide a list of the more valuable or noteworthy items in a person's possession, although the lack of any detailed physical description or account of its precise function and placement within the domestic setting are obvious and severe drawbacks.[12] However, inventories provide a firm record of the existence of objects in a person's possession, and it is now recognised that there were many moveable pieces of furniture within a medieval household of status.[13]

The lack of evidence in the area extends to monastic houses as much as secular dwellings and has often hindered in-depth discussion of monastic daily life, especially in the context of hospitality. Analysis has therefore employed normative or anecdotal evidence, therefore. Such is the case with Julie Kerr's discussion of the reception of guests at Benedictine houses.[14] Monastic inventories have been well utilised in Rochelle Rowell's survey of hospitality structures; in her study there is greater attention to the material setting, but analysis is hampered by the lack of non-architectural material evidence.[15] The picture of the guesthouse interior remains a composite, and has not thus far been demonstrated with reference to material culture from a single site.

The Fabric of the Guesthouse

There are many objects that indicate the manner of construction of the guesthouse. A number of thackstones were found in two deposits, one to the east of the 'cellar' building in the southeast of the guest range, and another to the north of the western aisled hall. Stone tiles were also used in the construction of the main drain running through the range, so it is not immediately clear whether the excavated examples formed part of the roof or the water system. If they did form part of the roof, it would most probably have been in the later medieval period. As well as thackstones clay tiles were found in great number, with many of these coming from the ancillary buildings to the south of the eastern hall. It is probably that guesthouse was roofed with clay tiles at least in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, in a similar manner to the claustral buildings.[16] Some of the roofing consisted of lead in the form of flashing or cladding, as several fragments (some with nails *in situ*) were found. The extant architectural fragments do not include any notable features or mouldings.

---

[12]   Mark Gardiner, 'Buttery and Pantry and Their Antecedents: Idea and Architecture in the English Medieval House', in *Medieval Domesticity: Home, Housing and Household in Medieval England*, ed. by Maryanne Kowaleski and P. J. P. Goldberg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 37–65 (esp. p. 43).

[13]   Penelope Eames and Christopher G. Gilbert, *Furniture in England, France and the Netherlands from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Century* (London: The Furniture History Society, 1977), p. 239.

[14]   Kerr, *Monastic Hospitality*, pp. 121–22.

[15]   Rowell, pp. 85–92.

[16]   Duncan.

The stone used was Bramley Fall, the same as the main abbey buildings. The building was timber-framed and the walls above foundation level were effectively stone panels between timber crucks. The height to which they stood in stone is not certain and it is possible that the structure was half-timber.[17]

The use of stone for the fabric of the walls, especially after the eastern aisled hall had first been constructed, and the use of tiles and lead on the roof and (later) stone for the ancillary buildings represents a sustained investment of resources in the fabric of the guesthouse, although the initial outlay was relatively affordable. Timber-framed buildings would be quick to erect, and cruck construction certainly was favoured among the peasantry because of this, but the addition of the solar block and the construction of walls in stone would have prevented any air of poverty being associated with the facilities.[18] It is unlikely that the earliest iteration of the eastern aisled hall remained in its basic rectangular form for very long, as a short-cross penny of John/Henry III was found in the vicinity of the solar block, which coin is believed to have ceased circulation *c.* 1250, thus giving the *terminus ante quem* of the solar.[19] Meanwhile, the earliest phase of the eastern hall falls within the date range. *c.* 1200–*c.* 1230. The impression made is that the monks were concerned to established basic facilities so that hospitality may be offered as early as possible. The arrangement of these facilities was flexible enough that they could be easily developed soon afterwards by the addition of a more solidly constructed solar block.

Lighting the Guesthouse

Arranging for light within the guesthouse was required if was to be used as a venue for socialising or business. Given that the external walls have not survived beyond foundation level (the garderobes excepted) it is not possible to tell for certain where the windows were or how large they were. Glass sherds were found across the guest range, but the largest concentration was to the west of the eastern aisled hall, but this distribution may have been the result of post-Dissolution activity. The usual placement of windows in a great hall was

---

[17]   William Henry St John Hope and John Bilson, *Architectural Description of Kirkstall Abbey* (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1907), p. 60.

[18]   Christopher Dyer, *Standards of Living in the Later Middle Ages: Social Change in England c.1200–1520*, rev. edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 166, wherein is quoted a dispute dating from 1312 in Belper, Derbyshire, in which a new cruck-house is stated to cost £2; whereas a hall and chamber from a Northamptonshire manor in 1289 cost £12, though it is not clear whether this covered materials and/or labour (p. 80).

[19]   Duncan; M. Archibald, 'English Medieval Coins as Dating Evidence', in *Coins and the Archaeologist*, ed. by Patrick John Casey and Richard Reece, 2nd edn (London: Seaby, 1988), pp. 264–301.

raised from the ground, and placed in the centre of each bay of the hall, with a grander or perhaps decorated window marking out the 'high' end containing the raised dais that inevitably presided.[20] That the guesthouse was amply glazed is a certainty in the later medieval period. The majority of glass was unpainted, and where it was painted it was red-brown in colour. From fragments found, it is very probably that a trefoil motif was painted onto the glass, which pattern was popular throughout England; one sherd has a section of a foliate pattern that from parallels in Winchester suggests a fourteenth- or fifteenth-century date.[21] For artificial lighting, only one find is readily identifiable as a section of an oil lamp.[22] The absence of finds for artificial lighting should not be taken as an indication that the guesthouse was not lit when occupied: rush lights are only detectable if their holders are found, while candle sticks were removable and could easily be stripped along with other useful or valuable furnishings, and if candle holders had been made of iron they would have rusted in the soil so as to become unrecognisable.

Entranceways

The entranceways into the primary hall reinforced the social hierarchy built into the layout of the hall. Arrangements changed over time, but the basic arrangements of the primary hall after an earlier formative period (*c.* 1200–1230) remained very similar throughout the subsequent history of the guesthouse (*c.* 1230–*c.* 1539), and it is these arrangements that are described here. There were two doorways at the southern end of the hall, in the eastern and western walls respectively. It is probable that these led from the outside into a screened passage, which separated the services to the south from the social area of the hall immediately to the north. The screen itself would have been a semi-permanent wooden feature fixed into the ground by a series of vertical posts.[23] This screened passage was located furthest away from the northern end of the hall, where a raised dais was located, and further still from the chambers reserved for the most elite guests; it would have been most used by servants requiring access to the service areas. Another entrance was located to the north of the hall, in a passage formed from the screened-off northernmost bay of the main hall.[24] This provided direct access to the northern chamber block without having to move through the central hall,

---

[20]   Jane Grenville, *Medieval Housing* (London: Leicester University Press, 1997), pp. 112–13.

[21]   SF 5688.2. Duncan, chp. 7.

[22]   SF 79:200. Geoff Egan, *The Medieval Household: Daily Living c. 1150–1450* (London: H.M.S.O., 1998), pp. 129–30. The finds from London date to *c.* 1270–1450.

[23]   Kerr, *Monastic Hospitality*, p. 170. For moveable screens within monastic buildings, see Grenville, p. 113; Rowell, pp. 86–87.

[24]   Grenville, pp. 89–93; Gardiner, p. 60.

providing more discreet access for either the occupants of the chambers or their attendants (either business, social, servile or domestic).

Security in the Guesthouse

There are many items relating to locks from the guesthouse. Several iron items have been found that indicate the maintenance of security at Kirkstall, though not all of these would have been used on the main hall of the guests, and some of them may have been used on caskets or chests rather on doors.[25] Most of the items pertaining to security were found in the open area to the west of the primary hall and to the north of the secondary hall/smithy, and may have been used in conjunction with that building rather than the guest hall. The disruption to the stratigraphy in the nineteenth century prevents a judgement whether this distribution is meaningful, in which case it may represent the systematic dismantling of the building and confiscation of its contents at the dissolution, or it could represent bulkier finds re-deposited during the excavation of the guesthouse walls. The items include two lock bolts, one for use on a door,[26] one platelock for use on a casket or door,[27] seven items possibly part of padlocks,[28] three securely attributed keys and two putative keys identified from x-rays.[29] These items are extremely difficult to date due to their utilitarian nature, and can be dated only to the outer dates of the guesthouse itself (*c.* 1200 onwards). One iron key is of Goodall's type G2, the use of which began in the twelfth century through to the sixteenth, and peaked during the fourteenth century.[30] Of the padlocks, the smaller copper alloy type were probably used on caskets and judging from London examples date to an early rather than later period, namely the twelfth to thirteenth centuries; parallels from York in the

---

[25]   Duncan.

[26]   Both iron SF 5189 (for use with a door); SF 6920.

[27]   SF 6157.

[28]   The nature of the surviving evidence is speculative, mostly consisting of iron disks that are known to have formed part of padlocks in the medieval period: Egan, pp. 91–99. Copper alloy: SF 79:233 (small, probably for use on a casket); SF 4041. Iron: ?SF 182 (fragment of iron disk from padlock); SF 187 (iron disk from padlock); ?SF 451 (fragment of iron disk from padlock); ?SF 1121 (fragment of iron disk from padlock); ?SF 1245 (fragment of iron disk from padlock)

[29]   Copper alloy: SF 1127 (stolen). Iron: SF 73 (x-ray); SF 517 (x-ray); SF 519 (poorly preserved); SF 1066; SF 9657.

[30]   SF 9657; Ian. H. Goodall, *Ironwork in Medieval Britain: An Archaeological Study* (London: Society for Medieval Archaeology, 2011), p. 242, and p. 243, fig. 10.5. It should be noted that Goodall's chart showing the chronological frequency of keys type G2 begins in the eleventh century. However, it appears that no single example has been dated securely to the eleventh century, rather that a single key has derived from a context of possible eleventh-century date.

form of the stem of the key date to the twelfth century.[31] It is not possible from the evidence to state conclusively whether it was the guesthouse building or the guest's luggage that was furnished with these items, nor is it possible to state that the guesthouse was somewhere that required such security. If guests had travelled from afar then securing their belongings would have been an expedience of travel. Similarly, it is fair to assume that residences were locked at night to discourage thievery. In one tale related by Jocelin of Brakelond, onetime guest master of the abbey of Bury St Edmunds, he states that his abbot, Samson, while staying at a grange, heard a voice in the night telling him to wake up. When he went to the privy, he found a candle about to set light to straw. Had Samson not woken, all those sleeping in the building would have died, as the windows were barred and doors locked. This was on a grange building rather than within the main precinct, but the context suggests that locking the building was a matter of course at night time.[32]

Water in the Guesthouse

A major technological feature of monastic houses, and particularly Cistercian communities, was their command of hydraulic engineering.[33] Any community adhering to the *Rule of Benedict* was required to remain in the same location. In describing the different kinds of monks, the *Rule* states that gyrovagues are the most detestable, and links their peripatetic lifestyle to moral dissolution: '[they are] always wandering, never stable, serving their own desires and the enticements of their appetite'.[34] Stability and remaining on a single site was a fundamental characteristic of coenobitic lifestyle. This was the opposite of accepted practice for the lay elite, who would often own several residences and who, having exhausted the resources of one site, were able to move onto another.[35] The latter possibility was denied to monks who instead installed hydraulic systems capable of sustaining perennial habitation, by both supplying fresh water for use in the buildings and for flushing waste away. The result was that wealthy monastic communities often had more advanced plumbing arrangements than

---

[31]   Egan; Duncan; Patrick Ottaway and Nicola Rogers, *Craft, Industry and Everyday Life: Finds from Medieval York*, The Archaeology of York, 17 (York: Council for British Archaeology, 2002), pp. 2002, 2877. Padlock now accessioned as LEEDM.D.2012.0035.001.404.

[32]   Jocelin of Brakelond, *The Chronicle of Jocelin of Brakelond Concerning the Acts of Samson, Abbot of the Monastery of St. Edmund*, trans. by H. E. Butler (London: T. Nelson, 1949).

[33]   Glyn Coppack, *English Heritage Book of Abbeys and Priories* (London: Batsford, 1990), pp. 51, 95–99; Terryl N. Kinder, *Cistercian Europe: Architecture of Contemplation*, Cistercian Studies Series, 191 (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 2002), pp. 85–86.

[34]   *RB*, 1:11: 'semper vagi, et nunquam stabiles, et propriis voluptatibus et gulae illecebris servientes'.

[35]   Dyer, *Standards of Living*, pp. 99–100.

those enjoyed by secular counterparts even of comparable wealth.[36]

Water had many more applications within the monastic precinct than sanitation alone, such as land drainage, powering mills, and fishponds.[37] However, of these, it was water supply to the guesthouse that had the greatest impact on hospitality. The fact that the community needed water management systems for their own purposes did not lessen its impact on hospitable provision. It was usually only the main precinct that received such investment, though at wealthy houses cesspits might be upgraded to flushed drains, as occurred at Malham, a grange of Fountains Abbey, in 1257.[38]

Archaeology of Kirkstall's Water Supply

The water supply system has been recently re-assessed by Stuart Wrathmell, and raises some important points when considering the provision of water for guests. The essential points are summarised here in chronological order.[39] Kirkstall had two water supply systems (fig. 2.38) : the first was an open supply for the industrial buildings of the precinct; the second was piped and supplied the conventual buildings with water for domestic use (including latrines).[40] Although the abbey was located next to the River Aire, this water-source was not used, and it was decided best to divert the course of Hell Hole Gill, which ran from north-east to south-west through the western portion of Kirkstall's precinct. This water supply predated the guesthouse, but its course had to be altered when the chamber block was added to the northern end of the primary hall. A second water source was that running from Oil Mill Beck to the west through an artificial channel, or goit, over a mile in length.[41] The piped supply was probably sourced from somewhere to the west of the abbey within Hawksworth Wood, and directed to the inner gatehouse and then southwards into the cellarer's range.[42] The height

---

[36]   J. Patrick Greene, *Medieval Monasteries* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1992), p. 121.

[37]   A survey of water management in monasteries can be found in Coppack, pp. 81–92; Greene, pp. 109–32. A summary of research is available in James Bond, 'Monastic Water Management in Great Britain: A Review', in *Monastic Archaeology: Papers on the Study of Medieval Monasteries*, ed. by Mick Aston, Graham D. Keevill, and Teresa Hall (Oxford: Oxbow, 2001), pp. 88–136. For some examples of Cistercian houses across Europe with notable water supply systems, see Kinder, pp. 85–87.

[38]   James Bond, *Monastic Landscapes* (Stroud: Tempus, 2004), p. 116.

[39]   The following discussion of the archaeological remains of the guesthouse's water system has been summarized from *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2: The Guest House Excavations, 1979–86*, ed. by Stuart Wrathmell, Yorkshire Archaeology, 12 (Wakefield: West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service, forthcoming), chp. 2.

[40]   The clearest account of the archaeological data for Kirkstall water management system is contained in Wrathmell, *Guest House Excavations*, chps 1–3. Limited summaries are available in Stuart Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey: The Guest House – A Guide to the Medieval Buildings and to the Discoveries Made during Recent Excavations*, 2nd edn (Wakefield: West Yorkshire Archaeological Service, 1987).

[41]   Wrathmell, *Guest House Excavations*, chp. 1.

[42]   Wrathmell, *Guest House Excavations*, chp. 1.

difference between the source and the abbey buildings would have been approximately 61m OD (ordnance datum), and sufficient to provide water under pressure to all abbey buildings, including the guesthouse.

During Phase 1, which pre-dates the guesthouse, the piped water supply to the abbey ran from the north-west to the south-east through the area later occupied by the eastern aisled hall (fig. 2.37, Phase 1). During Phase 2, when the eastern hall was constructed, the existing piping line, which had lain in the area to the northwest of the guesthouse, was no longer used and was replaced by a supply line that came in from the south-west, reaching the guesthouse just south of the kitchen block, which lay immediately to the south-east of the hall (fig. 2.37, Phase 2). The piping that lay underneath the hall, however, remained *in situ*, and was connected to this new supply. The supply was extended so that it also ran from south to north along the exterior of the eastern wall of the hall, before turning westward across the northern end of the hall, in the area where the chamber block was afterwards constructed.

During the very intensive Phase 3, when the chamber block was constructed adjacent to the northern end of the eastern hall, the section of piping underlying it was removed, although the supply to the main hall remained (fig. 2.37, Phase 3). Then there is significant evidence that water was piped into the area of the hall. The section of piping that had previously gone around the northern end of the hall had been curtailed and a cistern was installed situated externally to the east of the northern end of the hall (fig. 2.37) There were no pipes or trench fills recorded during the excavations that lead from the cistern to the hall, meaning that they appeared to be disconnected. However, a trench (Trench 738) was recorded in the northern end of the hall that lead up to the very northern end of the hall's eastern wall; this strongly suggests that this was a threshold, since pipes were usually run under threshold stones for ease of access in case of modification and repair. This also strongly suggests that Hope's hypothesis of there being an entrance to the northern end of the hall is correct, although it is not clear whether it was to give access to the hall or instead into a screened lobby leading to the chambers; Hope believes that this northern bay had been converted into a discrete chamber.[43]

The garderobes were installed only in Phase 3, as part of the construction of the two-storey chamber block and installation of the new open drain running down the western side of the hall. Only the garderobes for the chamber block were constructed at this time. The garderobes for the western aisled hall were constructed in Phase 4, the final stage of

---

[43]   Hope and Bilson, pp. 60–61.

development (fig. 2.37, Phases 3 and 4). There were three cubicles, each with a stone ledge supporting a wooden seat directly over the main drain, and there was a front board closing off the drain (that is, a board at the back of the legs of the occupant).

Water Supply and Hospitable Provision

The provision of a piped water supply is highly relevant for hospitality, as the majority of the population did not have easy access to fresh water supplies during this period.[44] For many city-dwellers, the act of porting water could be harmful, as the quantity of water carried placed great physical strain on those who were tasked with fetching it.[45] From the early fourteenth century onwards, London, which had the greatest resources for constructing civic facilities in the kingdom, as well as other leading cities, were beset with quarrels over access to and use of water fountains as local citizens were in competition with tradesmen such as brewers.[46] Closer to Kirkstall than London, the city of Hull was engaged in prolonged discussions over who would fund and implement the water supply system to the city, from the late fourteenth century and into the fifteenth.[47] Nor was water habitually used for personal hygiene. Full-body baths were rare in the later Middle Ages.[48] King John had ten baths in six months, while Frederick II had a Sunday bath that was thought scandalous.[49] Water and bathing was perhaps more readily available in religious life, although private washing was viewed with suspicion and permitted normally only to the sick.[50] There is some indication that expectations of cleanliness raised in a Cistercian statute from 1439, which states that monks, unless very sick, should not have more than two baths a month, but what these baths entailed is not stated.[51] However, outside monastic institutions washing before meals was largely restricted to the nobility, for whom it was a mark of breeding.[52] The presence

---

[44]   For the most recent and cohesive survey of late-medieval urban developments, see Carole Rawcliffe, *Urban Bodies: Communal Health in Late Medieval English Towns and Cities* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2013), pp. 176–228, although beyond the Franciscans of Norwich (pp. 176–78), little note of the impact of religious houses is made.

[45]   Rawcliffe, pp. 212–13.

[46]   R. J. Magnusson, *Water Technology in the Middle Ages: Cities, Monasteries and Water-Works after the Roman Empire* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), pp. 139–45.

[47]   Rawcliffe, p. 181.

[48]   C. M. Woolgar, *The Senses in Late Medieval England* (New Haven, CT; London: Yale University Press, 2006), pp. 132–36.

[49]   Magnusson, p. 149.

[50]   *RB*, 36:8: 'Balnearum usus infirmis quotiens expedit offeratur: sanis autem, et maxime juvenibus, tardius concedatur'; Barbara Harvey, *Living and Dying in England, 1100–1540: The Monastic Experience* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), pp. 132–34.

[51]   *Statuta*, IV, 1439:96.

[52]   Magnusson, p. 153.

of a piped supply into the hall itself was a sign that the space was intended to be used by people for whom it was customary to wash before mealtimes, which would take place in the same space, namely the elite of society. As well, this supply was maintained throughout the existence of the guesthouse, indicating a continuity in the function of the building, as well as ensuring that the guesthouse retained its functional independence from the claustral precinct.

The re-routing of the main drain enabled the installation of garderobes. Garderobes were not a common feature of medieval residences until at least the late thirteenth century, and it was regarded as a notable lack in urban households in the fifteenth century.[53] Before this date garderobes were installed only in structures owned by the wealthiest secular households and in religious houses. The guesthouse garderobes were first installed in the chamber block in the later thirteenth century. When the second block was constructed, presumably to service the western aisled hall, not only could more guests be comfortably accommodated, but it would also have aided differentiation between facilities set aside for those of status and lesser ranks. The garderobes of the guesthouse were of a high standard. They utilised the well kept main drain to flush them and they were numerous enough to permit three simultaneous occupants (in the block adjoining the west of the solar block). Garderobes flushed artificially were not common in medieval England at the time of their installation at Kirkstall, and would have set the guesthouse hydraulic system on a par with the facilities of the best-endowed secular residences. An early reference to flushed sewage is from Mainz in 1184, when the floor of the bishop's residence collapsed, sweeping many people gathered in the hall into the river.[54] There were public privies in London by the fourteenth century, though these used the Thames for their away system, or one of its tributaries.[55] The provision of garderobes at Kirkstall in the thirteenth century offered a comfort rarely seen in the secular world, and did so only as a result of an extensive re-working of the water-supply system to make such provision possible.

Interior Decoration of the Guesthouse

Very little superstructure of the guesthouse now remains, making any comprehensive assessment of its decorative scheme impossible, although a few items indicate that the guesthouse had a high-status decorative scheme. Chief among these are three estoiles, large mounts that are currently interpreted as decorative wall or ceiling fittings, found in high-

---

[53]   C. M. Woolgar, *The Great Household in Late Medieval England* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999), p. 50; Rawcliffe, p. 143, n. 156.

[54]   Magnusson, p. 156.

[55]   Ibid.

status residences.[56] A parallel for the lead alloy examples comes from the chapter house of the Gilbertine Priory of St Andrews, Fishergate, York.[57] No great significance should be attached to the fact that both these sites are religious houses, as similar objects have also been found in secular residences such as Clarendon Palace, Wiltshire, a royal residence. Rather, the estoiles should be seen as a decorative feature suited to aristocratic tastes. The estoiles, which often bear evidence of gilding, would presumably have been set against a painted background to maximise the visual impact. No remains of a ceiling come from the guesthouse, and it is not clear how such a decorative feature would be affixed in a great hall which retained a functioning central hearth throughout the period of use; it may be that these items come from the solar block, particularly the upper room which would have been the sleeping chamber of the most elite guests. It is not certain what the paint scheme was, if there was one. The *Gesta Abbatum* of Thomas Walsingham, when recounting the additions that Abbot John II made in the early to mid-thirteenth century at St Albans, describes John causing the new guest hall 'to be painted most seemingly, and wreathed delicately with garland'.[58] Here, the 'garland' could be a part of a decorative scheme involving foliate mounts, an example of which was found in London.[59] The only evidence of a paint scheme at Kirkstall are a few fragments of plaster discovered on the interior face of the western wall of the northern chamber, which were once white but now blacked by exposure to the atmosphere.[60] This may indicate that the interior was whitewashed, perhaps in the faux-brickwork pattern common to the interior of many Cistercian houses.[61]

Inside the Guesthouse: Conclusions

This survey has considered the architecture and archaeology of a building for which there is almost no documentary evidence and, even though there is little superstructure remaining, the material evidence makes for a coherent body of evidence. The guesthouse from an early

---

[56]   Lead alloy: SF 2690, SF 2952; copper alloy: SF 3117.

[57]   For a lead alloy parallel, see Ottaway and Rogers, p. 2834, and p. 2833, fig. 1412, no. 15278.

[58]   Thomas Walsingham, *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani a Thomas Walsingham, Regnate Ricardo Secundo, Ejusdem Ecclesiae Prae Centore, Compilata*, ed. by H. T. Riley, Rolls Series, 4, 3 vols (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1867), i, p. 314: '[i]nsuper fecit eam, cum thalamo sibi collaterali, decentissime […] pingi, et deliciose redimiri'.

[59]   Egan, p. 62.

[60]   [n.a.], *The Excavation of the Guest House at Kirkstall Abbey: Interim Summary Report* (West Yorkshire Archaeological Service, 1979); [n.a.], *Kirkstall Abbey: An Interim Summary of the Excavations* (West Yorkshire Archaeological Service, 1980).

[61]   David Park, 'Cistercian Wall Painting and Panel Painting', in *Cistercian Art and Architecture in the British Isles*, ed. by Christopher Norton and David Park (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), pp. 181–210 (pp. 200–04).

point in its history was a building outfitted with high-status facilities. The building was initially a simple structure, but was subsequently developed to improve its quality. The earliest form of the eastern aisled hall was supplemented by the more sturdy construction of the solar block at the halls northern end. The guesthouse had glazed windows, some of them painted with decorative patterns; at night oil lamps would have been lit for the guests to supplement the light from the fire. The provision of water was a particular benefit, as this took advantage of the advanced hydraulic system that the monks of Kirkstall had installed. However, more than just diverting an existing water supply to the guesthouse as an after thought, the monks made the main drain integral to the guest range, thus extensively re-working their system in order to ensure a ready supply to the guesthouse. Although evidence for a decorative scheme is very slight, it suggests that the guesthouse was given a high-status secular aesthetic in line with aristocratic residences. At the same time as thought was given to the comfort of guests, the security of the guesthouse was not neglected and objects such as padlocks indicate that usual precautions were set in place to protect the guesthouse furnishings, the guests, and their belongings. Overall, it is evident that the monks of Kirkstall took considerable care to ensure that the fundamental needs of their guests were catered to as much as their cultural refinements, and that the guesthouse, and the eastern hall in particular, was a place worthy of receiving people of status in their accustomed manner. Indeed, in some respects the facilities exceeded what most would have had outside the monastery.

4.2

FOOD AND DIET WITHIN
THE CISTERCIAN PRECINCT

A significant part of the welcome that Cistercians offered their guests was food. Given the dominant historiographical interpretation, the treatment of this topic is of greater detail, both to add greater depth to existing appreciation of Cistercian diet, and to highlight the importance of attitudes toward meat-eating for Cistercian hospitality. While the full range of food that guests consumed cannot be reconstructed, at Kirkstall there are two animal bone assemblages, one from the monastic meat kitchen and another from the guesthouse, which together enable investigation of the single most contentious food group in Cistercian history and how it affected their provision of hospitality. The availability of this archaeological data enables a striking revision of an enduring historiographical interpretation, which places late-

medieval Cistercians in a more favourable light and which reflects well on the hospitality offered at Cistercian abbeys. This section first looks at the provision of food as part of monastic hospitality and the debates and interpretations surrounding meat-eating in the monastery. Some Cistercian writings are then discussed to establish Cistercian attitudes towards meat, and how it was permissible in certain circumstances. After, the legislative background to meat-eating is charted over the course of the twelfth to fifteenth centuries to establish a historical chronology of meat-eating within Cistercian abbeys. Finally, having established a full chronological context, Kirkstall's animal bones and their significance for understanding hospitable provision are discussed. Ultimately, it is argued that the provision of meat to guests was a result of concern to meet guests' expectations, while limiting the impact that the presence of meat in the abbey had on their observance.

Food and Monastic Hospitality

Food was an integral part of medieval hospitality culture, including monasteries.[62] The *Rule of Benedict*, chapter 53, states that: '[t]he divine law is read to the guest for his instruction, and after that every kindness [*humanitas*] is shown to him'.[63] In the writings of John Cassian the word *humanitas* is often used to indicate food, and it is in the sense of seeing to the guest's physical comfort that the word is meant in the *Rule*.[64] The provision of food was the final stage in welcoming a guest, after prostration before Christ in the stranger, prayer, the kiss of peace, and a scriptural reading. The *Ecclesiastica Officia* specifies that the monk-hosteller was to oversee when and how guests were provided with food.[65] Providing food to guests was therefore part of Cistercian monastic observance, as well as being a a cultural norm. But the *Rule* and the *Ecclesiastica Officia* are not explicit regarding what food should be provided, which leaves ample scope for variation according to the means and liberality of the monastic community. The potential variety in food provides an opportunity to assess the temperament of a monastic community towards their guests. The issue for the nature of Cistercian hospitality becomes not whether the *Rule* was being fulfilled, but how.

---

[62]   Studies on medieval commensality, particularly with reference to provision made in the great household, are: Felicity Heal, 'The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England', *Past and Present*, 102 (1984), 66–93; Felicity Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990); Woolgar, *Great Household*, pp. 136–65; Julie Kerr, 'The Open Door: Hospitality and Honour in Twelfth / Early Thirteenth Century England', *History*, 87 (2002), 322–35; Julie Kerr, '"Welcome the Coming and Speed the Parting Guest": Hospitality in Twelfth-Century England', *Journal of Medieval History*, 33 (2007), 130–46.

[63]   *RB*, 53:9: '[l]egatur coram hospite lex divina ut aedificetur, et post haec omnis ei exhibeatur humanitas'.

[64]   See notes to *RB*, 53:9.

[65]   *EO*, 119:2: [a]d ipsum vero pertinet [...] quid vel quando comedant hospites [...] ad refectionem servire'.

Many factors in the provision of food make it a relevant indicator of the nature of Cistercian hospitality. Some are tied to the broad cultural context of western medieval Europe. One such factor is the obligations of social privilege. It was incumbent upon the abbot, as *de facto* head of the household, to provide food to the fullest extent of their means and ensure that all in attendance at meals received their due.[66] Food was tied to social status, and its magnificence reflected a host's 'worship', their eminence and prestige, both within the household, and among wider society.[67]

There were limits to how the foodways of wider society pervaded monastic life given that every aspect of life was informed by the *Rule* and the Cistercians' own customs. Certainly there was some penetration, and it cannot be said that Cistercian communities enforced a complete embargo on customs laxer than their own observance within the bounds of the monastery, and this is evident even in the more strident precepts of their early legislation. The point to be maintained was no overlap between the behaviour of outsiders, that the kitchens of the monks (termed the abbot's kitchen in the *Rule*) and the guests should be 'separate'.[68] Such segregation has already been discussed in terms of hospitality protocol and spatial arrangements within the monastery, but it was maintained in daily mode of life as well.[69] The provision of food in Cistercian abbeys was therefore divided between guests and the community.

---

[66] Heal, 'The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England', p. 78; Kerr, 'The Open Door', p. 328.

[67] For some recent discussions of food and social status see the following, listed in chronological order of publication: Christopher Dyer, 'English Diet in the Later Middle Ages', in *Social Relations and Ideas: Essays in Honour of R. H. Hilton*, ed. by Trevor Henry Aston (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 191–216; Woolgar, *Great Household*, pp. 129–36; Roy Strong, *Feast: A History of Grand Eating* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2002), pp. 45–77; *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition*, ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron, Medieval History and Archaeology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), which includes a number of important studies for medieval diet including the following two items; D. Serjeantson, 'Birds: Food and a Mark of Status', in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition*, ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron, Medieval History and Archaeology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 131–47; C. M. Woolgar, 'Group Diets in Late Medieval England', in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition*, ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron, Medieval History and Archaeology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 191–200; Julie Kerr, 'Food, Drink and Lodging: Hospitality in Twelfth-Century England', *Haskins Society Journal*, 18 (2007), 72–92; Naomi Jane Sykes, 'Taking Sides: The Social Life of Venison in Medieval England', in *Breaking and Shaping Beastly Bodies: Animals as Material Culture in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Aleksander Pluskowski (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2007), pp. 149–60; Felicity Heal, 'Food Gifts, the Household and the Politics of Exchange in Early Modern England', *Past and Present*, 199 (2008), 41–70; Miriam Müller, 'Food, Hierarchy, and Class Conflict', in *Survival and Discord in Medieval Society: Essays in Honour of Christopher Dyer*, ed. by Richard Goddard, John Langdon, and Miriam Müller, The Medieval Countryside, 4 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), pp. 231–48; C. M. Woolgar, 'Food and the Middle Ages', *Journal of Medieval History*, 36 (2010), 1–19; Mark Hagger, 'Lordship and Lunching: Interpretations of Eating and Food in the Anglo-Norman World, 1050–1200, with Reference to the Bayeux Tapestry', in *The English and Their Legacy, 900–1200: Essays in Honour of Ann Williams*, ed. by David Roffe (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2012), pp. 229–44.

[68] *RB*, 53:16: '[c]oquina abbatis et hospitum super se sit'.

[69] See chapter 1, esp. 1.1 and 1.5, and chapter 2.1

Cistercians consciously made fuller provision for outsiders, but with the important qualification that the community, because of their religious vocation, should not aspire to superior food. That better fare was offered to guests is revealed by some early legislation. In the *Capitula*, which date from *c.* 1136/40, it was stated that only coarse bread made with bran ('panis grossus […] cribro factus') should be served to the brethren, but to guests, white bread ('[panis] guastellus').[70] The separation of the abbot and guests from the brethren also made possible the provision of different fare in the guesthouse without interfering with the monastic diet, or causing undue temptation. This is shown by the incorporation of the text of the *capitulum* just cited in the *Instituta* of *c.* 1147, but with significant additions. A rare and explicit justification of legislation, the text reads:

> Just as we avoid being found in disagreement in ecclesiastical and other observances,
> so too diversity in daily food provisions is to be avoided, lest the brethren, overcome
> by frailty of flesh or spirit, should begin to abhor bread that is coarse and desire a
> more delicate kind.[71]

The *institutum* shows explicit regard for integrity of observance, and that the presence of guests, with their different fare, could be a source of disruption. The relationship between monastic and hospitable fare thus forms excellent means of assessing how Cistercians fulfilled their duties as hosts, and how they identified themselves in contradistinction to the provision they made for others.

Sources and Approaches to Monastic Food

Not every topic related to food in the monastery is (or could be) treated here.[72] Instead, the line of enquiry has been narrowed with close regard to the difference between hospitable and monastic provision of food, and how each was incorporated within the framework of hospitality. The course of the following analysis has been determined partly by limiting factors of evidence, but also, more positively, by some significant historiographical areas needing

---

[70]   Waddell, *Statutes*, Capitula, xii (p. 513): [i]n uictu, preter hoc quod regula distinguit de panis libra, de mensura potus, de numero pulmentariorum, hoc etiam obseruandam: ut panis grossus, id est cum cribro factus. Vbi autem frumentum defuerit, cum sedthacio licet fiero. Que lex infirmis non tenebitur. Sed et hospitibus quibus iussum fuerit guastellus apponetur. Necnon et minutis semel in minutione libra panis albi fermentati.

[71]   *NLT*, *Instituta*, xiv, p. 462: '[s]icut in ecclesiasticis aliisque observationibus cavemus ne inveniamur discordes, sic etiam in victu cotidiano diversitas est cavenda, ne fratres carnis vel spiritus fragilitate victi, grossiorem panem abhorrere, et lautiorem incipiant desiderare'.

[72]   The most up-to-date and widest ranging survey of approaches to monastic diet is P. Patrick, *The 'Obese Medieval Monk': A Multidisciplinary Study of a Stereotype* (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2014), pp. 29–48.

investigation.

Full knowledge of what would have been served at mealtimes at Kirkstall, for the brethren or their guests, is not possible to attain. Evidence for monastic food is often derived from archaeological remains such as animal bones, preserved in waste deposits or in areas in which meat was consumed.[73] The archaeological record renders an incomplete picture of medieval diet since taphonomic processes have destroyed many data. Nor is the documentary record infallible, and there are foods used in meals that would come from, for example, gardens, which would were not entered into accounts.[74] Much food of this kind that would would have been served in the monastery such as various kinds of boiled vegetables and legumes and bread, and indeed would have formed the staple of the Cistercian diet, have not been recovered from Kirkstall's archaeological record.[75] These were extremely important food groups for monastic communities. Based on Westminster Abbey's kitchener's accounts, Barbara Harvey has calculated that bread, ale, and wine constituted 60% of a Westminster monk's daily calorific intake outside Lent and Advent, 71.5% in Advent, and 78% in Lent.[76] Kirkstall's evidence for bread and ale is non-existent in comparison, and, excepting the location of the buildings relevant for preparing these foods, the bakehouse (southwest of the guesthouse) and the malthouse (southwest corner of cloister), there is no known evidence from Kirkstall (fig. 0.3). Given the lack of documentary evidence, nothing as focused as Harvey's study of Westminster, or Slavin's study of Norwich Cathedral Priory can be replicated for Kirkstall and an alternative, non-documentary route is required.[77] A final caveat of documentary evidence is its specificity, which prevents any assumption that practices obtaining at one house necessarily obtained at another. Accounts of Cistercian

---

[73]   Terry O'Connor, 'Bone Assemblages from Monastic Sites: Many Questions but Few Data', in *Advances in Monastic Archaeology*, ed. by Harold Mytum and Roberta Gilchrist, B.A.R. British Series, 227 (Oxford: Tempus Reparatum, 1993), pp. 107–11; Terry O'Connor, *The Analysis of Urban Animal Bone Assemblages: A Handbook for Archaeologists*, Archaeology of York, 19 fasc. 2 (York: Council for British Archaeology, 2003), pp. 97–112.

[74]   Christopher Dyer, 'Gardens and Garden Produce in the Later Middle Ages', in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition*, ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron, Medieval History and Archaeology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 27–40 (pp. 27, 35–37).

[75]   For a survey of archaeobotanical remains from late-medieval Britain see L. Moffet, 'The Archaeology of Medieval Plant Foods', in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition*, ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron, Medieval History and Archaeology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 41–55. For monastic sites in particular, see Patrick, *'Obese Medieval Monk'*, p. 45, table 2.8.

[76]   Harvey, *Living and Dying*, p. 57, fig. 11.1.

[77]   P. Slavin, *Bread and Ale for the Brethren: The Provisioning of Norwich Cathedral Priory 1260-1536*, Studies in Regional and Local History (Hertford: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2012), esp. pp. 8–25, 140–72. For a broader survey of consumption of grain see D. J. Stone, 'The Consumption of Field Crops in Late Medieval England', in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition*, ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron, Medieval History and Archaeology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 27–40.

houses typically only cover a few years at a time, and mask trends caused by long-term socio-economic patterns. Beaulieu Abbey's accounts cover only the period 29 September 1269 to 28 September 1270, and Whalley Abbey's accounts similarly cover single years 1478, 1520, and 1521.[78] The food on offer in a monastery would have varied a great deal from house to house.[79] Such factors as the disposable revenue the community had at its command, the extent and nature of its estates,[80] whether benefactors gave to the community to fund alms to the community ('pittances'),[81] the size of the community and the people with whom it was in regular contact all affected the size and quality of meals.[82] Each house should therefore be taken on a case-by-case basis reflecting the evidential strengths of the religious house in question.

There are no known human remains from Kirkstall, which means that some promising areas of research cannot be pursued, in areas such as bioarchaeology, osteology, and stable isotope analysis.[83] Investigation into osteology, for example, has revealed much about the effects of monastic diet, its makeup, quality, and quantity, on monastic mortality. Patrick, referencing studies of other sites in Britain, concludes that 'monks had relatively high rates of obesity-related disease', an important conclusion for both understanding the affluence of monastic economy and the impact of religious vocation on the daily experience and physical well-being. Particularly, the relation of diet to DISH (diffuse idiopathic skeletal hyperostosis; a fusing of ligaments connecting vertebrae resulting in restricted movement of the spine) or other osteological pathologies holds great importance for understanding the physicality of the medieval religious vocation, its corporal impact, and potentially a distinctive physical

---

[78]   *The Account-Book of Beaulieu Abbey*, ed. by S. F. Hockey, Camden Society, 4th Ser., 16 (London: Royal Historical Society, 1975); 'The Whalley Abbey Bursars' Account for 1520', ed. by Owen Ashmore, *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, 114 (1963), 49–72 (pp. 49–53).

[79]   Kerr, *Monastic Hospitality*, p. 131.

[80]   Stephen Moorhouse, 'Monastic Estates: Their Composition and Development', in *The Archaeology of Rural Monasteries*, ed. by Roberta Gilchrist and Harold Mytum, B.A.R. British Series, 203 (Oxford: Tempus Reparatum, 1989), pp. 28–81; C. J. Bond, 'Production and Consumption of Food and Drink in the Medieval Monastery', in *Monastic Archaeology*, ed. by M. Aston, G. Keevil, and T. Hall (Oxford: Oxbow, 2001), pp. 54–87.

[81]   David Postles, 'Pittances and Pittancers', in *Thirteenth Century England IX: Proceedings of the Durham Conference, 2001*, ed. by Michael Prestwich, Robin Frame, and Richard Hugh Britnell (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), pp. 175–86; Barbara Harvey, 'Monastic Pittances in the Middle Ages', in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition*, ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron, Medieval History and Archaeology, 2006, pp. 215–27.

[82]   David Postles, 'Small Gifts, but Big Rewards: The Symbolism of Some Gifts to the Religious', *Journal of Medieval History*, 27 (2001), 23–42.

[83]   Recent scholarship is summarised in Naomi Sykes, 'Animals, The Bones of Medieval Society', in *Reflections: 50 Years of Medieval Archaeology, 1957-2007*, ed. by Roberta Gilchrist and Andrew Reynolds, The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monographs, 30 (Leeds: Maney, 2009), pp. 347–61. and Patrick, *'Obese Medieval Monk'*, pp. 37–47.

difference between medieval lay and religious life.[84] Stable isotope analysis, meanwhile, has been explored as a means of tracing the source of protein in the diet of medieval people, operating on the principal that certain diets of protein give rise to quantifiable and distinctive signatures when analysed in human remains.[85] Currently, there are methodological problems regarding interpreting sources of intake (meat, dairy, or fish) of carbon and the impact of the physical makeup of the environment, such as farming fertiliser, on nitrogen isotopes. The potential breadth of application to a wide variety of data means stable isotope analysis remains a highly viable pursuit for understanding diets of different social groups. The nature of Kirkstall's archaeological data, however, mean that another approach has to be adopted.

Patrick, in concluding her discussion of current approaches to monastic diet, states that variability in provision for monastic communities was an integral feature of the *Rule* and an enabler of over-consumption. Specifically, it is stated that:

> Abbots were […] willing to go to great lengths to be given dispensations from the *Rule*, and Pope Benedict XII in particular made concessions such as the sanctioning of consumption of flesh meat outside the refectory, which made deviation from the *Rule* acceptable.[86]

This quotation introduces a crucial element in appreciating consumption of food in the past: the attitudes of contemporaries toward food available to them, and their inclination or disinclination towards it. As outlined previously, food, particularly meat, was a reflection of social status and wider food culture, and in this quotation the fact of consumption of meat is taken as equating religious life with wider secular modes, to the detriment of monastic reputation. The view that Patrick expresses here is only a recent iteration of a historiographical

---

[84]   P. Patrick, 'Creaking in the Cloisters: Observations on Prevalence and Distribution of Osteoarthritis in Monks from Medieval London', in *Centre, Region, Periphery: Medieval Europe, Basel 2002*, ed. by G. Helmig, B. Scholkmann, and M. Untermann (Basel: Folio, 2002), pp. 89–93; Patrick, *'Obese Medieval Monk'*, pp. 49–56; summary of results pathological analysis at pp. 77–88.

[85]   For an introduction to stable isotope analysis, see M. A. Katzenberg, 'Stable Isotope Analysis: A Tool for Studying Past Diet, Demography, and Life History', in *Biological Anthropology of the Human Skeleton*, ed. by M. A. Katzenberg and S. R. Saunders (New York: Wiley-Liss, 2000), pp. 413–42. The method is based on identifying the ratio between different stable isotopes of an element within the same tissue (e.g. bone). The isotopes most relevant for medieval diet are carbon: $^{13}C/^{12}C$, or $\delta^{13}C$; and nitrogen: $^{15}N/^{14}N$, or $\delta^{15}N$. Gundula Müldner, 'Investigating Medieval Diet and Society by Stable Isotope Analysis of Human Bone', in *Reflections: 50 Years of Medieval Archaeology, 1957–2007*, ed. by Andrew Reynolds and Roberta Gilchrist, Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph, 30 (Leeds: Maney, 2009), pp. 327–46.

[86]   Patrick, *'Obese Medieval Monk'*, p. 47. Patrick here demonstrates the durability of this historiographical interpretation by making reference to C. Harper-Bill, 'The Labourer Is Worthy of His Hire? Complaints about Diet in Late Medieval English Monasteries', in *The Church in Pre-Reformation England*, ed. by C. M. Barron and C. Harper-Bill (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1985), pp. 95–107 (pp. 96–97).

interpretation that has a long past, one which overrides much of the texture characterising medieval religious life and its manifold expressions. The picture of the religious wilfully embracing meat-eating is outlined in great depth below, but there are some other inaccuracies that warrant comment. For example, the definition 'monk' is often silently extended to incorporate friars and canons, who had a fundamentally different role, spiritually and in relation to their mode of life in relation to society.[87] Similarly, after the strident invectives of the twelfth century between, for example the Cistercians and Cluniacs, differences between religious orders tend to be subsumed in historical analysis by more broadly founded criticism levelled by secular society at the religious order taken as a whole, and which has in turn been adopted as a historiographical truth.[88] Re-examination of the Cistercians in isolation therefore enable a firmer appreciation of a religious group united by a coherent and well articulated ideology.

In monastic contexts the consumption of meat was a particular point of contention. Barring luxuries such as spices imported from Asia or the Middle East, meat was the most expensive category of food to characterise the Western medieval diet and acted as a sure marker of social status, especially before the late fourteenth century.[89] Medieval dietetics ascribed certain beneficial properties to meat that made certain kinds particularly sought after, but it also came laden with various potential dangers to one's body and soul, and it is these that cause meat to occupy a prominent place in debates, medical or religious in nature, regarding religious observance.[90]

At Kirkstall Abbey there are two separate bone assemblages fully excavated and analysed, one from the monastic meat kitchen and another from the guesthouse, which are discussed at greater length after the cultural context has been traced. The zooarchaeological analyses of the guesthouse bone assemblages have been carried out by Jane Richardson (non-fish remains) and Deborah Jacques (fish remains) as part of the wider re-assessment of the guesthouse data and are summarised below.[91] Fish was often served to monks and guests alike,

---

[87]   See, for example, Patrick's account of 'monastic' diet, which discusses Augustinians on a par with Benedictines and Cistercians: Patrick, *'Obese Medieval Monk'*, pp. 11–13.

[88]   Discussed below.

[89]   Melitta Weiss Adamson, *Food in Medieval Times* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2004), pp. 93–95; Woolgar, 'Group Diets', p. 196; C. M. Woolgar, 'Meat and Dairy Products in Late Medieval England', in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition*, ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron, Medieval History and Archaeology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 88–101 (p. 92).

[90]   Adamson, pp. 224–26; Woolgar, 'Group Diets', p. 192; Woolgar, 'Food and the Middle Ages', pp. 95–96; Rawcliffe, pp. 232–34.

[91]   Richardson; Jacques, 'Kirkstall Guest House Fish Bone'.

especially on fast days when the consumption of meat was prohibited.[92] Fish bones, while recoverable, demand very exacting excavation methods. Fish bone evidence is usually partial or non-existent as a result.[93] Accordingly, '[t]he extent of fish consumption at Kirkstall cannot be evaluated given the small size of the assemblage and its poor provenance.'[94] Because of its lack of prominence in Kirkstall's archaeological record, and because of its uncontroversial position within medieval dietetics, consumption of fish is not a focus of the following discussion. Using the animal remains, the meat portion of the monastic and lay diets can be partially reconstructed and the contrasts between them assessed. This information can then be set against its ideological and, to some extent, its socio-economic context, thus providing information regarding the Cistercian community's attitude towards its treatment of guests, towards hospitality, and particularly how the consumption of meat can provide an impression of the nature of Cistercian religious observance at Kirkstall.

The problem of meat-eating for hospitality is as follows. In the twelfth century the Cistercian abbeys were vegetarian. No meat or animal fat was to be used in dishes anywhere within the monastery, except for the sick and hired workers, and thus guests were bound to abstinence from meat as much as Cistercian monks.[95] But by the end of the Middle Ages, this state of affairs had changed. There can be no denying that Cistercians ate meat more frequently in the fifteenth century compared with the twelfth, at least as far as the sources indicate. Meat-eating comes up more frequently in legislative sources, and dispensation from the *Rule* is permitted more often in later centuries. At Kirkstall, that a meat kitchen was built in the fifteenth century, and the presence of animal bones itself, indicates that wider trends had affected this community.[96] The presence of an animal bone assemblage from the guesthouse as well means that significant changes had taken place in how the community catered for its guests, but tells little of why, and investigation is required to clarify matters.

---

[92]   Christopher Dyer, 'The Consumption of Fresh-Water Fish in Medieval England', in *Medieval Fish, Fisheries and Fishponds in England*, ed. by Mick Aston, B.A.R. British Series, 182 (Oxford: Archaeopress, 1988), pp. 301–8; Anton Ervynck, 'Following the Rule? Fish and Meat Consumption in Monastic Communities in Flanders (Belgium)', in *Environment and Subsistence in Medieval Europe: Papers of the 'Medieval Europe Brugge 1997' Conference, 9*, ed. by Guy De Boe and Frans Verhaeghe (Zellik: Instituut voor het Archeologisch Patrimonium, Wetenschappelijke instelling van de Vlaamse Gemeenschap, 1997), pp. 67–81.

[93]   A. K. G. Jones, 'The Survival of Fish Remains at Monastic Sites', in *The Archaeology of Rural Monasteries*, ed. by Harold Mytum and Roberta Gilchrist, B.A.R. British Series, 203 (Oxford: Tempus Reparatum, 1989), pp. 173–84.

[94]   Deborah Jacques., 'Kirkstall Guest House Fish Bone'.

[95]   *Capitula*, XIII, in *NLT*, p. 188: '[p]vlmentaria intra monasterium sint semper et ubique sine carne, sine sagimine, nisi propter omnino infirmos et artifices conductos'; also see *Instituta*, XXIV, in *NLT*, p. 334: '[i]ntra monasterium nullus uescatur carne aut sagimine, nisi omnino infirmi et artifices conducti. Similiter et intra curte grangiarum, nisi propter easdem causas et etiam propter mercennarios [sic]'.

[96]   Stephen Moorhouse and Stuart Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 1: The 1950–64 Excavations – A Reassessment* (Wakefield: West Yorkshire Archaeological Service, 1987), pp. 33–40.

The relationship between the food for guests and the food for monks is not clear. It is not known which came first, meat being served to guests, or monks, or whether the development affected both groups with simultaneously. It not known also, whether there was a causal link between the two. As discussed below, the change to meat-eating, where scholars have delivered explicit judgment, is characterised as being detrimental to the community's religious vocation, and is a mark of approximating secular practice. But another interpretation, one of great significance for hospitality, is possible. Cistercian attitudes towards meat-eating, the provision of meat within Cistercian abbeys, and the changing attitudes towards meat is the subject of the rest of this section.

Monastic Meat-Eating: Perspectives and Debates

There are two phrases common in Cistercian legislation which neatly frame the historiography of Cistercian meat-eating: *in pane et aqua* and *esus carnium*. The first phrase, 'in bread and water', is a penalty found in Cistercian legislation levied on misbehaving monks, and it is given for all kinds of misdemeanours, including illegitimate consumption of meat.[97] 'In bread and water' therefore conveys austerity, deprivation, and a bare necessities mentality. 'The consumption of meat', meanwhile, is a phrase found in chapter 36 of the *Rule of Benedict*, in the context of allowing weak, ill, or infirm brothers extra sustenance to aid their recovery. *Esus carnium* is associated with dispensation from the *Rule of Benedict*, with relaxation, and easing the harshness of monastic life. These are contrasting states regarding monastic practice: one that emphasises austerity, and another that permits relaxation. The relationship between the two is revealed by an early piece of Cistercian legislation from 1158, which states that whenever a bishop forced a monk or lay brother to eat meat outside the infirmary, that monk or lay brother was to spend three days in bread and water as a result.[98] Thus was excess tempered by austerity. Here, 'bread and water' is the mirror of eating meat, the former being the mortificatory antidote to the laxity of the latter.

The ideological opposition between austerity and indulgence has been projected onto a chronological spectrum by much modern scholarship, the conclusions of which are

---

[97]   The Latin phrasing for this common punishment is 'tribus diebus in levi culpa una in pane et aqua'. *Levi culpa* is explained in *Instituta*, LXVII, in *NLT*, p. 357: those in *levi culpa* eat in a different place away from the other brethren, as designated by the abbot. When the other brethren go for their drink, those in *levi culpa* should go to the refectory after they take it (after the servers have taken their meal).

[98]   Waddell, *Statutes*, 1158:11: '[n]ullus abbas nostri ordinis uel monachus siue conuersus extra infirmitoria ordinis nostri carnes comedat. Quod si alicuius episcopi iussu indignation aut(em) etiam excommunicatione fecerit, pro singulis uicibus quibus cames comederit tres dies ieiunet in pane et aqua; 3et si abbas est in capitulo cistercii ueniam petat, si monachus uel conuersus in suo capitulo'.

relatively consistent. Many works exhibit implications, if not outright statements, that later medieval religious were diminished practitioners of the religious life compared with their forebears. The idea stems from the connection that sanctity can be gauged by outward action. The more rigorous the conformity to a given religious code, the greater the mark of sanctity. [99] Such is the fundamental criterion of analysis in the following studies.

David Knowles, who considered monastic diet in England from the tenth to the early thirteenth centuries, treated the issue of meat-eating with reference to the Benedictines.[100] His earlier ideas were later reworked and extended in his study of the monastic and religious orders of England; the Cistercians are mentioned but do not form the principal object of study.[101] David Knowles's account has been very influential. Knowles pointed to the fourteenth century as being a pivotal period that saw the monastic order in Europe take a turn for the worse. Regarding meat in monastic life, he perceived that 'changes were made in the tenor and structure of the [monastic] life which materially affected its character [including] the mitigation of the Rule in the matter of meat-eating'.[102] Knowles viewed the shift in diet as sitting alongside a range of other increasingly lax practices that, together, represented a softening of the monastic ideal, for the Cistercians as much as other major religious orders. Knowles did, however, pay close attention to the chronological framework of developments, which is lacking in many later surveys that adopt a more thematic approach considering types of food rather than when they were consumed.

Criticism of Knowles's work is easier given the progress made in monastic studies, but his overall interpretation of meat in monastic life has persisted. A seminal study of monastic daily life has been conducted by Barbara Harvey, which focuses on the wealthy Benedictine

---

99   Jean Soler, 'The Semiotics of Food in the Bible', in *Food and Drink in History*, ed. by Robert Forster and Orest Allen Ranum, trans. by Elborg Forster and Patricia Ranum, Selections from the Annales: Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations, 5 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979), pp. 126–38; David Moses, 'Soul Food and Eating Habits: What's at Steak in a Medieval Monk's Diet?', *Downside Review*, 436 (2006), 213–22; David Grumett, *Theology on the Menu: Asceticism, Meat, and Christian Diet* (London: Routledge, 2010).

100   David Knowles, 'Essays in Monastic History, 1066–1216, 7: The Diet of Black Monks', *Downside Review*, 52.150 (1934), 275–90; David Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England: A History of Its Development from the Times of St Dunstan to the Fourth Lateran Council, 940–1216*, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963).

101   Knowles, *Monastic Order*, pp. 456–65 (Benedictine), 461–62 (Cistercian); *The Religious Orders in England, Vol. 1: 1216–1340* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948), pp. 281–83; in *The Religious Orders in England, Vol. 3: The Tudor Age* (Cambridge: University Press, 1959) the references are scattered, but see Knowles's comments on Eynsham in 1517 on p. 64, pp. 112–14, 122 (Worcester Cathedral Priory), and p. 459 for general comments.

102   Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England, Vol. 3: The Tudor Age*, p. 459; Louis J. Lekai, *The Cistercians: Ideals and Reality* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1977); The 'decline and relaxation' theme is echoed in Harvey, 'Monastic Pittances', see esp. pp. 218, 221.

community of Westminster.[103] Harvey's analysis relies on the kitchener's day-book, surviving from the period 1495–1525. These accounts detail the kinds and quantities of meat served to the community on a daily basis, and they permit an exceptionally close view of the community's diet. A trend identified by Harvey is an increase in the variety of foods served to monks compared with their predecessors, as well as the different methods of preparing it. A marked transition that Harvey highlights is the incorporation of 'meat' into the monastic diet. Many dishes included elements of what would be considered meat in modern times, but in medieval alimentary culture the classification of certain animals or animal parts do not correspond with modern understanding of the terms.

The crucial words on which monastic classifications of 'meat' rested were found in the *Rule of Benedict*: '[t]he flesh-meat of four-footed animals, however, should be utterly abstained from by all when eating, except the feeble and the sick'.[104] Something such as offal, used in dishes such as 'umbles' (sheep intestines mixed with spices, breadcrumbs, and ale) for example, was considered as not constituting *carnes,* or flesh-meat, and was therefore permissible.[105] Harvey attributes the increased range of the monastic diet to an elaboration of the liturgical calendar, particularly the attendant periods of feast and fast, concession to the cooler climate of northern Europe, and as well to the increasing standards of living in late-medieval England that influenced the monastic precinct.[106] The detailed work on the accounts provided a forceful argument to support the picture of a corpulent monk, as the amount of food, even allowing for wastage and distribution of leftovers, meant that a sedentary man would be consuming more than a modern active, heavy man's recommended daily intake.[107] Harvey characterised the increased consumption of meat to be a series of 'unequivocal compromises' that marked departure from an affirmed ideal in the face daily reality.[108] Harvey ultimately came to the conclusion that the monks were prone to over consumption, probably obese, and in the matter of food undifferentiated from their secular counterparts in society.[109]

A more recent historical study by the Dutch scholar Jaap van Moolenbroek looked at Cistercian diet and alimentary culture in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries quite positively, but passed sweeping judgment on the later period, stating that:

---

[103] For diet, see Harvey, *Living and Dying*, pp. 34–71.

[104] *RB*, 39:11: '[c]arnium vero quadrupedum, omnino ab omnibus abstineatur comestio, praeter omnino debiles et aegrotos'.

[105] Harvey, *Living and Dying*, pp. 40, 58.

[106] Harvey, *Living and Dying*, p. 39.

[107] Harvey, *Living and Dying*, pp. 67, 70. Harvey allows for as much as 45% energy value of food not being consumed by an individual monk.

[108] Harvey, *Living and Dying*, p. 40.

[109] Harvey, *Living and Dying*, p. 38.

> The immense self-consciousness of the Cistercians gradually decreased [during the
> thirteenth century], and, as a result, the motivation for severe mortification. Then,
> of course, this straightjacket of a dietary regime was perceived as oppressive, and
> the thought that they were eating the food of the peasantry gradually became more
> intolerable to these men and women, at a time when members of their social class
> had increasingly luxurious food at their disposal.[110]

The wilful embrace of meat-eating reiterated by Patrick above can therefore be seen to have
it roots in the focused studies of monastic meat-eating, with the Cistercians here singled out
for laxity.

The view that meat-eating was a symptom of declining austerity, and a probable
mark of tempered sanctity, as a result now pervades more general accounts of religious diet.
Andrew Jotischky's study identifies how the changes in monastic diet were brought about
and represented changes within monastic life from the time of the Desert Fathers to the
end of the Middle Ages.[111] On the subject of meat, Jotischky, utilising Harvey's work, comes
to the conclusion that 'by the late Middle Ages, monks were no longer in any meaningful
sense eating according to the demands of the *Rule*', and describes the conventions that saw
the introduction of meat-eating as 'blatant abuses'.[112] Caroline Walker Bynum follows the
historiographical trend in her study of diet among female religious, which analyses the
ways in which diet was used as a marker of sanctity to express (and legitimise) rejection of
expectations placed upon women by contemporary social mores.[113] Bynum states that 'the
early austerity of many orders, such as the Premonstratensians and Dominicans, was later
relaxed, sometimes to be followed after hundreds of years by reform movements that returned
to the earlier strictness', citing the Trappist movement, that is, the Cistercians of the Strict

---

[110] Jaap van Moolenbroek, 'Een Monastiek Eetregime in de Twaalfde Eeuw En Dertiende Eeuw: De
Voorschriften van de Cisterciënzer Orde En de Exempels van Conradus van Eberbach En Caesarius van
Heisterbach', in *Wonderen Voor Alledag: Elf Opstellen over Godsdienst En Samenleving in de Middeleeuwen Door
Jaap van Moolenbroek Opnieuw Uitgegeven Bij Zijn Afscheid van de Vrije Universiteit*, ed. by Sabrina Corbellini
and others, Middeleeuwse Studies En Bronnen, 97 (Hilversum: Verloren, 2006), pp. 175–94 (p. 193): '[t]
oen ging natuurlijk ook het keurslijf van het eetregime knellen, en werd de gedachte dat men het voedsel der
boerenstand at in een tijd waarin de eigen standsgenoten steeds luxueuzer voedsel tot hun beschikking hadden,
voor deze dames en heren gaandeweg onverdraaglijker'.

[111] Kevin P. Roddy, 'Nutrition in the Desert: The Exemplary Case of Desert Eremiticism', in *Food in the
Middle Ages: A Book of Essays*, ed. by Melitta Weiss Adamson, Garland Medieval Casebook, 12 (New York:
Garland, 1995); Andrew Jotischky, *A Hermit's Cookbook: Monks, Food and Fasting in the Middle Ages* (London:
Continuum, 2011).

[112] Jotischky, p. 147.

[113] Caroline Walker Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women*
(Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).

Observance, as an example of the latter.[114]

A consistent interpretation of monastic meat-eating therefore emerges from the last sixty years or so of scholarship: monastic communities, Cistercians included, should have been a bulwark against an increasingly commodious lifestyle, but were found wanting. Over time, maintenance of monastic observance was eroded by temptations of daily existence, and monks failed to keep their desires within the *Rule*, and adapting interpretations of the *Rule* where necessary. However, this interpretation pays too little attention to the opinions of the historical agents themselves, and fails as a result to identify the causes for long-term change.

Cistercian Alimentary Culture and Attitudes toward Meat-Eating

Cistercian texts that discuss meat-eating and attitudes toward consumption of food more widely present a variety of views on meat-eating, which prevent simple characterisation of the Order's attitudes. That said, any discussion of Cistercian food must have as its backdrop the austerity of daily life characterising Cistercian observance. Luxuries taken for granted elsewhere in society had little place in the Cistercian cloister. Comforts such as the warmth of a fire, plush bedding and snug clothing for adverse weather had close attention paid to them: levels of austerity might change, but the transition was contested even when it was ultimately accepted.[115]

This attitude extended towards the consumption of food and drink, which in the twelfth century accorded strictly with the *Rule of Benedict*, with later accretions which themselves were remarked upon and normally contested. The basic provisions were laid down in chapter 39 and 40 of the *Rule of Benedict*. Every monk would have a pound of coarse bread made from bran each day and a measure of drink, consisting of about half a pint of wine or an equivalent drink. At meals there there would be two cooked *pulmenta*, which would have consisted of vegetables or fish, such as 'stockfish', salted herring that could be bought in bulk.[116] Fruit and legumes were frequent components of a meal. Benefactions could be made to communities to grant pittances on certain days, which might consist of cheese, or costlier fish such as salmon.[117] During Lent, foods included within the term *lactentia* – cheese, dairy

---

[114] Bynum, p. 42.

[115] David N. Bell, 'Chambers, Cells, and Cubicles: The Cistercian General Chapter and the Development of the Private Room', in *Perspectives for an Architecture of Solitude: Essays on Cistercians, Art and Architecture in Honour of Peter Fergusson*, ed. by Terryl N. Kinder, Cîteaux: Studia et Documenta, 13; Medieval Church Studies, 11 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), pp. 187–98.

[116] *RB*, 39: '[e]rgo duo pulmentaria cocta fratribus omnibus sufficiant'.

[117] For detailed studies of monastic pittances, see Postles, 'Pittances and Pittancers'; Harvey, 'Monastic Pittances'.

products, eggs, and all fish except herring – were forbidden. It may be assumed that such fare was also available for guests, but it was sparse in comparison with the diet of the social elite, who were habituated to consuming large quantities of meat.[118]

Cistercian Austerity in Food and Drink

It was held as a mark of sanctity when an individual would be able to deny themselves the comfort (and sometimes even the necessities) of meals at times outside, or to a more austere degree than, those that the Church established. It was in this vein that the Cistercians pursued their own dietary regime, adopted in conscious opposition to the prevailing customs of the Benedictine (especially Cluniac) communities of the late-eleventh and twelfth centuries, which were viewed as being grossly overindulgent in some cases, and certainly not conducive to the spiritual pursuits which formed the basis of monastic life. See, for example, Gerald of Wales's account of the meal served on the feast of the holy Trinity at Christ Church, Canterbury, in 1179, when there were sixteen dishes served, with so many delicacies that the general dishes were left untouched.[119] Some indulges would be more detrimental to spiritual endeavour than others: '[n]aturally all of us, as monks, suffer from a weak stomach,' says Bernard of Clairvaux, 'which is why we pay good heed to Paul's advice to use a little wine. It is just that the word *little* gets overlooked, I can't think why'.[120] Bernard's caustic tongue remained condescending even in his recognition that:

> Those who are able to live austerer lives should neither despise nor copy those who cannot. As for the latter, they should not be led by admiration for their stricter brethren to imitate them injudiciously: just as there is a danger of apostasy when those who have taken a more exacting vow slip into easier ways, not everyone can safely scale the heights.[121]

Bernard had a leaning towards ultimate indifference and absolute necessity regarding food, and, if 'those who cannot' is read in the context of religious life of the time and interpreted

---

[118] Woolgar, 'Group Diets', pp. 196–98.

[119] Kerr, *Monastic Hospitality*, pp. 128–29.

[120] Bernard of Clairvaux, *Apologia ad Guillelmum Abbatem*, IX, 21: 'Omnes nimirum, ex quo monachi sumus, infirmos stomachos habemus, et tam necessarium Apostoli de utendo *vino* consilium merito non negligimus, *modico* tamen, quod ille praemisit nescio cur praetermisso'. The translation is that of *The Cistercian World: Monastic Writings of the Twelfth Century*, ed. and trans. by Pauline M. Matarasso (London: Penguin, 1993), p. 51. Bernard here references 1 Tim. 5:23: '[n]oli adhuc aquam bibere, sed modico vino utere propter stomachum tuum, et frequentes tuas infirmitates'.

[121] Matarasso, p. 58.

as 'those in other religious orders', he identified this as trait of Cistercian life more generally.

St Bernard was an influential figure for all aspects of Cistercian life. He was thought to be a paragon of Cistercian observance and helped establish the culture of austerity among the Cistercians. Bernard's most outspoken discussion of food is that contained in his *Apology for Abbot William*, written in 1125.

> Oh how far we removed we are from the monks of St Anthony's day!' Indeed, when they used to visit one another for a time out of love, they would partake with such eagerness from one another the bread of souls, that, utterly forgetting bread for the body, they would pass the whole day or more with their bellies empty, but not their minds.[122]

Here, Bernard recognises a correlation between one's diet and one's personal sanctity; thus a laxity in diet was a symptom of inner failing, and a change in what one eats likewise affected one's spiritual state. Crucially, Bernard's words applied the high standard of the Desert Fathers to contemporary monastic life. But the practices that Bernard himself pursued were not for wholesale adoption by all monks. Bernard acquired chronic gastric problems because of his fasting during his noviciate, and he himself stated in the same work that 'not everyone can safely scale the heights'. Bernard was writing polemic to highlight contrasts between the Cistercians and Cluniacs, achieved by projecting St Anthony's fourth-century Egypt as the backdrop; scenery into which the Cistercians, with their rhetoric of deserts, austerity, and simplicity would fit m ore easily than the Cluniacs.

Abstention from food as mark of spiritual purity is set in the context of hospitality by the example of St Waldef, abbot of Melrose (r. 1149–1159). Waldef, despite being served ample amounts of fine food, chose not to touch it, to the wonder of his table fellows.[123] It was the abbot's duty to dine with guests, and the *Rule* also permits fasts to be broken on account of guests. Potential dispensation from the *Rule* did not mean that an abbot was obliged to indulge, and the ability to abstain even when in the presence of guests, was considered a praiseworthy feat. Waldef's *vita* is a good example because it was a text to be read primarily by

---

[122] Bernard of Clairvaux, Apologia ad Guillelmum Santi-Theoderici abbatem, 19. in *PL*, 182, cols 0909D–0910A, IX: 'O quantum distamus ab his qui in diebus Antonii exstitere monachi! Siquidem illi cum se invicem per tempus ex charitate reviserent, tanta ab invicem aviditate panem animarum percipiebant, ut corporis]cibum penitus obliti, diem plerumque totum jejunis ventribus, sed non mentibus transigerent'.

[123] Jocelin of Furness, 'Vita S. Waltheni Abbatis', in *Acta Sanctorum Augusti, Vol. 1: 1-4 August*, ed. by J. Carnandet (Paris: Victor Palme, 1867), p. 249D – 78E (p. 260D); Kerr, *Monastic Hospitality*, p. 127.

the monks of Melrose, rather than further abroad.[124] It thereby emphasises the good conduct expected of a Cistercian abbot. However, the undue reservation could meet with disdain, and the abbot of Balerne (Franche-Comté), who 'appeared to be depressed' ('viusus est contristari') at the arrival of the lord of Cîteaux, was punished for his morose attitude.[125] The episode established Cistercian austerity as a feature of their observance able to bring external favour on the Order, rather than, as some contemporaries would have it, as a lamentable lack of respect for their guests.

It was recognised that there were limits to a monk's tolerance. Caesarius of Heisterbach recounts the story of Baldwin, a knight who entered the Cistercian house of Riddaghausen. Baldwin deprived himself so severely of nutrients that he suffered permanent mental illness as a result, and in such a condition he would no longer be able to see to his own spiritual wellbeing.[126] Similarly, Bernard's poor physical condition was due in large part to extreme asceticism, and caused him to be offered dispensations, although these were ill-administered by an inept physician.[127] Bernard's own conduct, such as when he drank olive oil given to him as though it were water, indicated that he had become estranged from food. It was not outright rejection, rather a studied ignorance of what he regarded as fuel for the body. However, in the monastic outlook long-term physical decline held little importance when set against spiritual development, with the former being disregarded in favour of cultivation of spiritual virtues.[128]

The stories of Baldwin and Bernard indicate that harshness of diet was a hallmark of Cistercian life accepted by the novice upon entry into the Order, rather than a personal choice (with established lower limits) left to individual Cistercian monks. These remain extreme cases, and it is extremely unlikely that the majority of brothers followed their example. But the idea that their diet and ideas about the consumption of food differed from the rest of society (clearly the laity, but also other clergy, whether secular or regular) remains apparent, and this is confirmed when Cistercian abbots or monks fall into disrepute because of overindulgence. Just as abstention was a mark of sanctity, so was gluttony a vice that undermined the spiritual directive of Cistercian observance and the Order's reputation in the eyes of society.

---

[124] Helen Birkett, *The Saints' Lives of Jocelin of Furness: Hagiography, Patronage and Ecclesiastical Politics* (Woodbridge: York Medieval, 2010), pp. 220–25.

[125] Waddell, *Statutes*, 1195:49.

[126] Janet Burton, *The Cistercians in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge : Boydell Press, 2011), p. 115.

[127] Matarasso, p. 30.

[128] William of St Thierry, *Vita Prima*, 1:7, in Matarasso, *Cistercian World*, p. 30. The term 'monastic' is used here in its restricted sense of coenobitic orders. The friars held a different view, based on the physical demands placed upon them by their itinerant preaching. See Montford, Angela, 'To Preach and to Pray: Considerations of Occupational Health in the Mendicant Orders', *Studies in Church History*, 37 (2002), 95–106.

A particular situation in which temptation presented itself to the abbot or his community and could become a recurrent cause of laxity was when guests were admitted to the guesthouse (in which the abbot was obliged to eat),[129] or perhaps even into the monastic refectory. This instance formed the basis for many denunciations of abbots by the General Chapter and in chronicles. Abbot Gervase of Louth Park (r. 1139–1147 × 1155) lamented that he had enjoyed finer fare in the guesthouse when his brothers had starved in the refectory, which highlights the issue of providing sufficiently for one's own dependents as well as outsiders.[130] There is the possibility that Abbot Gervase was employing hyperbole arising from his own austerity, and that the disparity between the communal and guest provision was not so very great. Abbot Hugh of Beaulieu was deposed by 1218 for conduct ill-befitting a Cistercian abbot, including having greyhounds on leashes at his table and wassailing with no fewer than three earls and forty knights.[131] In his list of offences it was his drinking games that took precedence, suggesting that it was not the company that Hugh kept that drew censure, but that he had undermined the solemnity of the monastic vocation in the eyes of outsiders.

The kind of hazards that hospitality presented is neatly presented in a tale recounted by Caesarius of Heisterbach.[132] The story details a newly elected abbot of Springiersbach Abbey in Germany, who is described in a vision as 'rekindling the extinguished tapers' of the community, a reference to the reforming practices he introduced.[133] The particular custom emphasised is complete abstinence from meat, by which all the community, all dependent nuns, and their provost were to abide. Later, during a feast to mark the entry of a secular woman into the community of nuns dependent on the abbey, the provost was seated next to a secular clerk who was served meat. Overcome with temptation, the provost dipped his hand into the dish and plucked out a morsel that he then swallowed whole. The morsel became stuck, and the provost would have suffocated but for the intervention of another monk who struck him on the back of his neck.[134]

The story makes explicit all the attitudes towards meat suggested in twelfth-century Cistercian legislation. First, of the reforming customs introduced by the new abbot, abstinence

---

[129] *EO*, 110:10.: '[i]n dormitorio iacere. in hospitio comedere'; and also 110:15: '[c]um post completorium deforis venerit. in refectorio comedet nisi hospites assint'.

[130] David H. Williams, *The Cistercians in the Early Middle Ages* (Leominster: Gracewing, 1998), p. 125.

[131] *Statuta*, I, 1215:48; Julie Kerr, 'Cistercian Hospitality in the Later Middle Ages', in *Monasteries and Society in the British Isles in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. by Janet Burton and Karen Stöber, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion, 35 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2008), pp. 25–39 (pp. 27–28).

[132] *Dialogus miraculorum*, I, IV. 89 (pp. 255–56).

[133] Ibid., p. 255: 'quod candela ardens praefatum monasterium intraret, quae suo lumine omnium fratrum candelas exstinctas, quas in manu tenebant, reaccenderet'.

[134] The fact that the one choking was cured by earthly, rather than divine, aid is uncommon in such stories.

from meat was a clear mark of a superior observance. Second, it was the abbot who initiated the reform and bound his new community to observe abstinence, thus emphasising that it was the abbatial office that formed the source for upholding observance. Third, it demonstrated the hazards that having outsiders who did not follow the same customs congregate with the members of the community who did — this works to reinforce the Cistercian policy of a precinct-wide ban on the serving of meat. Finally, the overall emphasis of the story is that it is a cautionary tale against temptation, which, once indulged in, could only be remedied by the support of a fellow religious. Thus the Cistercians did not adopt abstinence from meat in order to impose superior conduct on others, but to minimise opportunities that would compromise standards of observance for the community. The arbitrary quality of this policy had many opponents from outside the Order, however, and it was certainly seen as detracting from the hospitality that the Cistercians could offer to their guests.

Permissible Meat-Eating in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Cistercian Texts

So far, the consumption of meat has been presented as the opposite to the culture of austerity that Cistercian observance fostered, which seems to accord with the Rule of Benedict. The Rule's appear well defined. A healthy monk would not eat meat (of four-footed animals), but if a healthy monk did eat meat, then he would transgress the Rule and require and need correction, probably by being placed in bread and water. Hence, that meat-eating increased in later centuries has been interpreted as a symptom of decline. But the situation was not so clear defined, as can be seen from texts dating from a period when the Cistercians are usually perceived to have been in full ardour of observance and the austerity culture just discussed. This point can be illustrated with reference to Caesarius of Heisterbach's Dialogue on Miracles, a collection of exempla and miracles stories written *c*. 1220–35, and delivered in the form of a discussion between a monk and a novice. The following summarised narratives concern Cistercians specifically and reveal variety to the consumption of meat, which in turn aid re-opening the question of how meat-eating should be treated in Cistercian monasticism.

The first story concerns a lay brother who, exhausted by his daily duties, fell asleep during mass.[135] Prompted by a diabolic delusion, the lay brother cast himself on a lump of wood on the ground, and began chewing on it, with the sound of 'a mouse cracking a nutshell with its teeth'.[136] The noise was such that the monk administering Mass was unable

---

[135] *Dialogus miraculorum*, I, IV. 83 (p. 250): 'De converso in missa dormitante, qui lignum pro carnibus rodebat'.

[136] Ibid.: 'ut sonus muris testam nucis dentibus suis perforantis'.

to concentrate on his prayers, and he questioned the lay brother about it later, who said that he was eating a sumptuous plate of meat, as he thought at the time. The lay brother explained that he had been tricked by the Devil while snoozing, and deceived into eating bare wood, which bore his toothmarks. The point of the story is that hunger and appetite were constant reminders of physical weakness, and were able to strike at any time, especially when one's conscious, active guard was down. Cistercians were not immune to such temptations simply because of their observance, and it was only through conscious self-deprivation that abstinence would be maintained. The story emphasises the individual monk's experience and the trials of Cistercian life, and makes abstinence from meat a matter of conscience, rather than an abstract, corporate issue. The concept of conscience would become an important matter in Cistercian debates on meat-eating, as will be seen later.

The second story concerns an abbot induced to eat meat through the charity of a monk.[137] This monk had been ill, and was ordered to eat meat by the abbot to restore his health, thus putting the provision contained in the *Rule of Benedict*, that the weak may eat meat, into use. Unexpectedly, the monk asked that the abbot sit down and share his meal, to display the same charity that the abbot had. The abbot agreed and shared the meat. The next day, a man troubled by a demon entered the abbey church. The abbot, recalling charity shown towards him by the monk the day before, was able to cast out the demon possessing the man, which could not resist the abbot's charitable fervour. In this account, not only is meat-eating permitted, but is enabled through charity, a fundamental principle of Cistercian observance and spirituality. More, the charity that provoked the monk to invite the abbot to share his meat dish enabled further good to come about in the form of combating an unclean spirit. There are many such instances in these accounts where charity, purely intended, allows for conduct otherwise outside Cistercian observance.

The third story concerns the prior of Heisterbach and a monk called Godescalcus.[138] While having a meal at the abbey of Michaelsberg, in Siegburg,[139] the pair were served crabs. Godescalcus partook with enthusiasm, but the prior abstained after a single bite. After the meal, Godescalcus asks the prior why, since the crabs were so delicious. 'No wonder they were so good,' exclaimed the prior, 'since they were cooked so well in lard!'.[140] Godescalcus asked

---

[137] Ibid., II, x. 8: 'De abbate qui in caritate a monacho suo admonitus carnes comedit'.

[138] *Dialogus miraculorum*, I, VI. 4 (pp. 243–44): 'De Godescalco monacho, qui in Sigeberg artocrea sagamine decoctas simpliciter manducavit'.

[139] Rhein-Sieg-Kreis district, western Germany.

[140] *Dialogus miraculorum*, I, VI (pp. 243): '[r]espondit ille: Non mirum si valde erant bonae, qui valde bene errant sagiminatae'.

why the prior had not said anything to him; the prior simply stated that he did not want to deprive Godescalcus of his food.[141] The story is part of a wider group (*distinctio*) under the heading 'On Simplicity'. Godescalcus simply had not realised that he was actually partaking in what constituted a meat dish, and was not, therefore, at fault for having eaten it. This is another case where monks were able to eat meat without breaking their observance. In fact, the more estranged from their former appetites they became, the more liable they were to this sort of pitfall.

The final story to demonstrate the complexity of Cistercian attitudes toward meat-eating is an account of a Cistercian abbey oppressed by a local lord, and how a 'simple monk' brought back the monastery's herd by eating meat.[142] In the story, the community's herds have all been taken, the house impoverished, and the monks are at a loss as to how they should proceed. After taking council, the abbot decides that someone should go and ask for their herds back, and an 'old and most simple' monk is nominated.[143] The monk accepts and goes to the lord's castle, and is told by the abbot to take whatever he can get of the abbey's herds.[144] While there, he is invited to the meal. The monk is fully aware that the meat being served is from animals once belonging to the abbey. The monk tucks in, to the surprise of the lord, who asks him whether this is normal for a monk of the Order. The monk replied:

> When my abbot sent me here, he ordered me not to turn down anything of the herds that I might be able to get back. And since it is clear that the meat served here belonged to my monastery, and because I fear that nothing more will be given to me besides what I am able to take with my teeth, I eat on account of obedience, lest I return entirely empty-handed.[145]

This is a case where simplicity and obedience are combined such that although a monk is fully cognisant that he is eating meat, it is still within the bounds of his observance. Far from departing from the *Rule*, in his honest view, the monk obeyed it exactly.

These four colourful stories indicate that there is a whole array of different situations where a Cistercian monk could feasibly eat meat and not break observance. It was not simply

---

[141] Ibid.: '[e]go nolui vobis auferre cibum vestrum'.

[142] Ibid., I, VI. 2 (pp. 341–43): 'De simplici monacho, qui carnes in castro comedendo, pecora monasterii sui reduxit'.

[143] Ibid.: 'hominem senem et simplicissimum'.

[144] Ibid.: '[q]uicquid rehabere poteris, accipias'.

[145] *Dialogus miraculorum*, I, VI (pp. 244): '[c]um abbas meus huc me mitteret, praecipit mihi, ut quicquid ex pecoribus rehabere possem, accipere non recusarem. Et quia mihi timui nil amplius mihi fore restituendum, nisi quantum dentibus capere possem, comedi propter obedientiam, ne omnino vacuus redirem'.

the case, as the text of the *Rule of Benedict* implies, that meat-eating entailed transgression. Instances arose where not only was eating meat involved, but could actually be a part of one's spiritual development or enable other monastic virtues, such as obedience, to be exercised. Similarly, the extremes of bodily mortification as practised by St Bernard should not be taken as being representative. It is better take a broader view that considers evidence from across the Order, includes a large range of different people and circumstances, and extends across a broad chronological period. It is possible to chart such a history through use of the statutes, which cover the entirety of the Middle Ages, barring the Order's earliest years. The resultant discussion is chronological, and is covered in four stages, correlating broadly to the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, the mid-thirteenth to early fourteenth centuries, the mid- to late-fourteenth century, and the fifteenth century.

Meat-Eating, Cistercian Legislation, and Change

Maintenance of Abstinence from Meat-Eating

In the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, Cistercians faced criticism for the provision of food, but retained a solid stance of abstinence for all within the precinct (except in circumstances permitted by the *Rule*). Opposition to Cistercian provision of food introduces a new and vital factor in the cultural narrative of food within Cistercian history, that of the outsider. The examples of Cistercian practice cited previously are all derived from texts composed by Cistercians, and represent exposition of their observance through the means of hagiographical or historical writing. It accordingly is sympathetic towards Cistercian observance, which it taken for granted as being a valid and accepted practice. However, it became apparent that Cistercian observance was not acceptable to all those who received hospitality from the Cistercians, and the welcome that they received fell short of their expectations.

The principal criticism levelled at the Cistercians was the provision of meat within the monastery. Cistercian observance prevented any flesh-meat (*carnes*) from being consumed within the monastery, no matter where.[146] This included the guesthouse, or any other area

---

[146] 'The Instituta Generalis Capituli apud Cistercium', in *Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Cîteaux*, ed. by Chrysogonus Waddell, Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses, Studia et Documenta, 9 (Brecht: Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses, 1999), pp. 453–97. The lay brethren were also bound: *Cistercian Lay Brothers: Twelfth-Century Usages with Related Texts. Latin Text with Concordance of Latin Terms, English Translations and Notes*, ed. by Chrysogonus Waddell, Citeaux: Commentarii Cistercienses, Studia et Documenta, 10 (Brecht: Citeaux: Commentarii Cistercienses, 2000).

in which guests might be entertained. There were other regulations limiting consumption as well, such as no lard, cheese or eggs served on Fridays or on the Order's customary fast days, and in these injunctions it was made explicit that the guesthouse was included,[147] and also that nothing should be bought on a guest's account on any of the days on which Lenten fare was consumed.[148] Rather than appreciating their restraint, the Cistercians were criticised by the outspoken Gerald of Wales and Walter Map in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, but also by John of Salisbury for offering meagre fare to their visitors.[149] The latter, in his *Policraticus*, stated that it was 'foreign to all civility, not to say humanity' that the Cistercians did not offer their guests meat.[150]

But the Cistercians encountered difficulties when denying guests the kinds of food expected. It is here that the first signs of hospitality affecting provision within the precinct can be detected, and presents a counter to the assumption that it was a natural inclination toward laxity that saw successive generations of Cistercian monks eating meat. In some cases, meat was served to guests, but the transgressions were punished as a result. An example is the abbot of the Cumbrian monastery of Calder, who, in 1200, was deposed for insulting the archbishop of Canterbury, but who had marks of an evil character by the fact that he ate meat and lodged with seculars. Here, meat was associated with secularity and ribald conduct and consequently condemned.[151] Similarly the abbot of San Giusto, Tuscany, was deposed in 1202 for eating meat with secular clerks, among other offences.[152] In 1205 the abbot and officials of Mazières were placed in bread and water for one day because they permitted meat to be served to seculars outside the infirmary.[153] In the same year, the abbot of Bonmont was punished for serving meat to his bishop.[154] The punishment of any perceived infraction on the ban of meat-eating remained well into the thirteenth century. In 1225 there was the notable instance of the abbot of Pontigny, one of the chief Cistercian abbots, being reprimanded for not disciplining the abbot of Jouy Abbey (Yvelines, Île-de-France), who served meat to John

---

[147] *Capitula*, XIII, in *NLT*, p. 410.

[148] *Capitula*, XIV, in *NLT*, p. 410.

[149] Burton, p. 113.

[150] Kerr, *Monastic Hospitality*, p. 127; John of Salisbury, *Ioannis Saresberiensis Policraticus*, Corpus Christianorum, 118 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1993), II, p. 326.

[151] Waddell, *Statutes*, 1200/54. The abbot was possibly Abbot Walter, although the dating is unclear — Knowles, *Heads*, I, p. 129.

[152] *Statuta*, I, 1202:40, p. 282.

[153] *Statuta*, I, 1205:38, p. 315.

[154] *Statuta*, I, 1205/42, p. 316.

of Brienne, King of Jerusalem, and his family in 1225.[155] In all these instances, especially the latter two which were transacted inside Cistercian abbeys, the contact between monastic and secular produced undesirable clashes between accommodating secular conduct and adhering to the Rule. The attitude of the Order was uncompromising: if an abbot tried to provide good hospitality to guests by serving meat, consequences would have to be faced.

Contested Provision of Meat

A marked change comes over the legitimacy of eating meat in 1244 and is, again, a result of providing hospitality. In this year Cîteaux, the first abbey of the Order, received the king and queen of France (that is, Louis IX and his mother, Blanche of Castile, former wife of King Louis VIII of France) since they desired to receive the prayers of the Order during its General Chapter; they lodged and ate meat outside the abbey confines.[156] Although not within the abbey confines itself, and certainly not in the guesthouse or refectory, even the mere proximity of meat-eating to an abbey was odious to the Cistercians of the time. The General Chapter had in just the previous year punished the prior and cellarer of Stratford Langthorne, who had permitted a lord and his family to eat meat, not within the abbey, but at a nearby grange.[157] The reversal in such a short time no doubt set the example, despite the explicit (perhaps vain) statement that the General Chapter's welcome of Louis and Blanche was not to set a precedent.[158] A decade later in 1253 the abbot of Preuilly (Égligny, department Seine-et-Marne, France) was heavily punished for receiving the children of the king inside the boundaries of the abbey as well as permitting the consumption of meat there. The only reason that the abbot was spared deposition was 'the reverence and affection of the children of the said King himself'.[159]

 For the remainder of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century the

---

 [155] The 'King of Jerusalem' is not named in this statute, but it must be John of Brienne. Before his deposition at the hands of Frederick II in November 1225, John had spent much time touring the West, in the period leading up to his deposition in 1225, and his stay at Jouy would probably have been between late September 1224 to the summer of 1225. See Guy Perry, *John of Brienne: King of Jerusalem, Emperor of Constantinople, c. 1175–1237* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 122–35, esp. 128–29. In any event, the Cistercian General Chapter was held each year in September and therefore before Frederick assumed the title of King in November 1225 (Waddell, *Statutes*, pp. 37–38, and statute 1186:8, and notes).

 [156] *Statuta*, II, 1244:9.

 [157] *Statuta*, II, 1243:42.

 [158] *Statuta*, II, 1244:9.

 [159] *Statuta*, II, 1253:32: 'parcitur autem omnibus personis officialibus a depositione ob ipsius dicti regis liberorum reverentiam et favorem'.

prohibition on serving meat, to bishops,[160] those conducting visitation,[161] or mendicants[162] was upheld by the General Chapter. A complete reinforcement of the ban on meat-eating was re-issued in 1271 and 1289,[163] but the insistence intensified in frequency in the early fourteenth century, with statutes detailing the prohibition being promulgated in 1306, 1307, and 1311.[164] The instance of 1311 is particularly interesting as it invokes *conscientia* as a potential ward against misconduct, although the threat of excommunication is still imposed; *conscientia* was to become a sticking point in observance over a century and a half later.[165] Another point to be made regarding this spate of injunctions relates to the notice of first advent issued to Kirkstall by Thomas Corbridge in 1301, which stated that Kirkstall must provide 'what is owed at your own expense, for the consumption of meat or fish, as it pleases you'.[166] The reference to expense could be taken to indicate that the community was known to be suffering from financial difficulties and that the archbishop would be satisfied with cheaper food. However, Kirkstall's finances were restored from heavy debts by the year 1301, as revealed by a rental account detailing the value of the abbey's estates and cost was unlikely to be a major factor at this point.[167] It is more probable that the reference to expense is simple reiterating the archbishop's rights of first advent.[168] The archbishop's statement is suggestive that the archbishop was aware of the difficulties that a visiting prelate of status could cause, especially related to food, and that he pre-empted difficulties by emphasising his adaptability. Whether Archbishop Corbridge did this as a courtesy to Kirkstall because of their Cistercian observance, because he was not commanding on the subject of food, or out of recognition of the monetary situation of Kirkstall's community, cannot be confirmed. In 1319 the General Chapter again forbids meat to be served to seculars and prelates.[169]

These instances all serve to support the idea that the consumption of meat was not

---

[160] *Statuta*, III, 1280:6.

[161] *Statuta*, III, 1265:6.

[162] *Statuta*, III, 1285:8: '[…] ne alicui de Ordine Mendicantium carnes de cetero ministrentur […]'; though this was softened in the following year on account of the weakness of the friars; 1286:3: '[…] sic a debilibus et infirmis est misericorditer reiiciendum rigorem; rigorem diffinitionis anno praeterito editae de Ordinibus Mendicantibus in monasteriis monialium non suscipendis, duxit generalis Capituli gratia taliter mitigandum […]'.

[163] *Statuta*, III, 1271:73; 1289:7.

[164] *Statuta*, III, 1306:1; 1307:1; 1311:2.

[165] *Statuta*, III, 1311:2: '[c]ontravenientes poenas talibus constitutes teste conscientia sustineant, et nihilominus sub poena excommunicationis sicut prohibit Capitulum generale'.

[166] *Reg. Corbridge*, I, p. 51, no. 133.

[167] 'Foundation of Kirkstall', p. 203.

[168] *The Register of William Greenfield, Lord Archbishop of York, 1306–1315*, ed. by William Brown and A. Hamilton Thompson, Publications of the Surtees Society, 145, 149, 151–53, 5 vols (Durham: Surtees Society, 1931), II, p. xxii.

[169] *Statuta*, III, 1319:4.

supported by those in charge of Cistercian communities, since it must be remembered that the General Chapter was a body constituted by abbots of Cistercian houses from across Europe. Alongside these statutes lie those regarding the non-customary and extraordinary nature of pittances despite an apparent expectation for their distribution, as well as a number of statutes forbidding monks to eat meat while outside Cistercian houses. Both are too numerous to list in full here, although there is the informative example of Barberio, whose community was ordered to wipe clean its calendar because it had scheduled pittances into it, and the same for its martyrology and manuscript of the Rule.[170] The important idea to bear in mind is that throughout the legislation up to the early fourteenth century novel concessions were made only when the needs of outsiders were taken into account, either lay people or members of other religious orders. If members of the Cistercian Order ate meat, even if it had become a frequent practice in a given house, the people involved were seen as transgressing the tenets of Cistercian observance and duly punished. The fact that transgressions did occur does not invalidate the stance that the General Chapter took, which was to remain firmly opposed to consumption of meat on grounds of maintaining religious observance.

Papal Intervention and Legitimisation of Meat-Eating

The Cistercian Order had its 'vegetarian' status changed in 1335 by Pope Benedict XII's bull *Fulgens sicut stella*, also known as the *Benedictina*.[171] After this, meat-eating in Cistercian abbeys was legitimised in the infirmary and the abbot's lodging and forbidden everywhere else, but with the extremely vaguely defined concession that arrangements for preparation of meat could be modified according to the abbot's discretion 'for any justifiable reason',[172] and also that monks could be invited to the abbot's table and consume the meat there, as

---

[170] A typical example of eating abroad may be found in *Statuta*, III, 1324:11, p. 369. For Barbario, see *Statuta*, III, 1330:11: 'Item, cum insolitae et indebitae novitates sint non immerito ab Ordine abolendae, et maxime quae gastrimargiam et carnis curiositatem praetendere et sapere videntur, et ad notitiam Capituli sit delatum in capitulo de Barberio quoddam esse depictum calendarium, in quo loci conventus pitantiae fiendae certis diebus annotantur, praecipit Capitulum ut dictum calendarium penitus deleatur, martyrologio vel libro Regulae ubi voluerint, pitantiae dictae inscribantur, et ne alibi consimile attentetur, hanc praedictam inhibitionem seu ordinationem ad cetera Ordini monasteria generale Capitulum vult extendi. Esum autem carnium nullus de iure vel consuetudine audeat petere, nisi secudum quod distinction decime tertia de pitantia et potu expresse continetur, sub penis ibidem contentis irrefragabiliter incurrendis'.

[171] *Bullarium Romanum: Bullarum diplomatum et privilegiorum sanctorum romanorum pontificum Taurinensis editio locupletior facta collectione novissima plurium brevium, epistolarum, decretorum actorumque S. Sedis a S. Leone Magnus usque ad praesens*, ed. by Charles Cocquelines and others (Turin: Seb. Franco, Henrico Fory and Henrico Dalmazzo, 1859), IV, pp. 330–345. (Hereafter, '*Benedictina*'); Peter McDonald, 'The Papacy and Monastic Observance in the Later Middle Ages: The Benedictina in England', *Journal of Religious History*, 14 (1986), 117–32 (pp. 119, 122).

[172] : *Benedictina*, XXX (p. 338): 'aliquo rationabili causa'

the abbot was permitted to provide for these brethren 'the better and more fully'.[173] Yet the fact that meat-eating was permitted by apostolic decree does not mean that the diet of all members of the Cistercian Order suddenly became equivalent to the notoriously well-provisioned Benedictine abbeys such as Westminster.[174] The legitimisation of meat-eating in the abbot's chambers in particular was due to the particular role which the abbot performed in relation to the abbey's guests, namely entertaining and provisioning them. According to the *Ecclesiastica Officia*, the abbot was to eat in the guesthouse, not in the communal refectory. The guesthouse was where he had his table, which, as the *Rule* stated, 'should always be with guests'.[175] The abbot's lodging underwent a steady increase in size and importance as a place of hospitality during the thirteenth century, and by the time of the *Benedictina* many abbots had a sizeable set of chambers wherein they were able to contract business and provision their guests.[176] The concession to the abbot was, therefore, not a mark of increasing decadence, but a necessity of office, albeit one that carried with it the potential to disrupt the regular dietary observance of the community (hence the lengthy detail with which the punishments of irregular meat-eating are described in the *Benedictina*).

Devolution of Responsibility concerning Meat-Eating

After the *Benedictina* many further concessions are granted to allow abbots the ability to decide matters in the most expedient fashion. However, greater freedom did not mean that the Cistercians immediately shed their scruples and adopted the kind of diet of their secular counterparts, or indeed the technical definitions of meat and interpretations of the *Rule* as the Benedictines did.[177] Meat consumption remained an uneasy topic and the General Chapter continued making judgments concerning meat. While it is the case that in 1377 former legislation regarding meat-eating was revoked, this was not because standards were permitted to fall, but to recodify the legislation along simpler lines.[178] An interesting case highlighting the complexity of the issue of meat-eating among late-medieval Cistercians is presented by a statute of 1437.[179] The statute portrays a scene in which there are two factions within

---

[173] *Benedictina*, XXXI (p. 339): 'melius et plenius exhibere'.

[174] Cf. Harvey, *Living and Dying*, '[i]n the misericord, by 1500, a daily dish of beef seems to have edged pottage off the menu, and the beef was followed, every day, by two or three further dishes of boiled or roast meat'.

[175] *RB*, 56:1: '[m]ensa abbatis cum hospitibus et peregrinis sit semper'.

[176] See chapter 2.6.

[177] Harvey, *Living and Dying*, pp. 40–42.

[178] *Statuta*, III, 1377:1: '[…] pertimescens Capitulum generale nimia multiplicatione statutorum et inhibitionum ius multiplicari transgressiones et delicta […]'.

[179] *Statuta*, IV, 1437:45.

Cistercian communities, one that desired to eat meat, and another favouring abstention. The statute states that many scandals had arisen, whereby the refectory is 'almost deserted', but also states that 'many monks and lay brothers, who would freely abstain from meat completely if their meals were taken in the aforesaid claustral refectory, are compelled to eat meat'.[180] In particular, it is decreed that 'let none be invited to eat meat, or be sent outside the claustral refectory', which forces abstinence on those not supposed to eat meat, and prevents them from forcing others to eat meat against their will.[181] Statutes that are explicit about such issues, while few in number, reveal broader tensions within the order, and impair the validity of generalised statements about the state of observance in the Cistercian Order in the fifteenth century.

Alongside introducing the possibility of extra dimensions to the history of meat-eating and its introduction, the statutes of the fifteenth century confirm some reasons for its legitimisation. Hospitality is more frequently cited the cause of exemption. In 1413 the abbot of Altzella (near Nossen, Saxony, Germany) was granted permission to serve meat to guests because of the great number, and the lack of fish and other regular food.[182] In the same year the abbot of Bebenahusen (Baden-Württemberg, Germany) was granted permission to serve meat to the friends and supporters of the monastery, including the count of Württemburg with his entourage, recalling the deference shown to the King Louis IX of France in 1244.[183] In 1422, special exception is made on account of hospitality. In the first of two paired statutes related to meat-eating, legislation is relaxed, with reluctance, such that monk serving guests meat are no longer to be excommunicated, as was decreed in previous legislation from 1421.[184] In the second statute, the General Chapter revokes legislation regarding illegitimate meat-eating besides papal legislation.[185] This second statute is a definite concession, not attributed to any external influence but to 'human frailty'. But it also reveals that the Cistercian General Chapter had introduced more severe penalties of its own over and above those of the *Benedictina*, in turn demonstrating that the introduction of meat-eating continued to be contested by the highest Cistercian authority. Similar reiteration of the *Rule* and the *Benedictina* is made in 1437. In all these cases the official line varied somewhere between the legislation which had been provided in the *Benedictina* and something stricter. Where concessions were made, it

---

[180] Ibid.
[181] *Statuta*, IV, 1437:45: 'ad comendum carnes nemo invitus, aut extra refectorium mittatur claustrale'.
[182] *Statuta*, IV, 1413:43. The Latin name for the abbey in the statute is Vetus Cella.
[183] *Statuta*, IV, 1413:85.
[184] *Statuta*, IV, 1422:30.
[185] *Statuta*, IV, 1422:31.

was for the sake of hospitality and outsiders within the precinct.

Eventually, the General Chapter judged that devolution of authority in such localised matters was a more effective means of handling ephemeral and highly particular eventualities, such as receiving guests. In 1423 a plenary devolution is issued that permitted abbots to allow meat to their monks, nuns, confessors, and others on granges or other conventual places, but this was revoked in 1425 because it was found that many scandals had arisen.[186] The experiment indicates that the history of meat-eating in the Cistercian Order was not teleological: legislation was issued, tested, and evaluated in light of how it furthered or hindered monastic observance. In 1481 regulations were again proclaimed in a highly verbose document that went to great lengths to state the absolute necessity of the situation.[187] It placed ultimate choice on the matter into the abbot's hands:

> [S]o that they may be able have the power to arrange and see to the enjoyment […]
> of flesh-meat, without danger or injury to, or scruples of, anyone's conscience, on
> account of the lands, places, people, or associates.[188]

This statute was followed by a spate of statutes permitting dietary strictures to be relaxed on a guest's account.[189] A particularly articulate case dates from 1492, when the abbey of Maulbronn (Baden-Württemberg was permitted to serve its 'respectable, learned, noble and great guests' meat as on the accustomed days in the Order, 'without scruple of conscience', a phrase continuing a rhetorical theme begun almost two centuries before.[190] It is significant that this request came from the abbot of Maulbronn, which abbey had a particularly impressive abbatial residence.

---

[186]   *Statuta*, IV, 1223:43; 1425:69.

[187]   *Statuta*, V, 1481:61: An indication of the tenor of the document is its opening words: '[a]nimarum saluti sollicite invigilans […]'; '[w]atching worriedly over the salvation of souls […]'.

[188]   Ibid.: 'ita ut absque conscientiarum quorumcumque periculo, laesura seu scrupulis pro terrarum locorum, personarum, societatum, negotiorumve et temporum conditionibus et necessitatibus, ut dictum est, carnibus uti […] disponere seu dispensare possint et valeant'.

[189]   *Statuta*, 1486:74 (Eberbach); 1486: 75 (Heisterbach); 1486:76 ('Loco Maria moderno'); 1486:77 ('Uterina valle').

[190]   *Statuta*, VI, 1493:24: '[a]d humilem supplicationem abbatis Mulbronnensis praesens generale Capitulum dat, convedit et indulget, ut quoniam crebro hospites honesi, litterati, nobiles et magnates, qui non solum dicto monasterio Mulbronnensi, sed etiam toti Ordini sunt honori et adiumento, monasterium ipsum accedere et gratia hospitalitatis suscipi solent, possit sine conscientiae scrupulo idem abbas in mensa sua eisdem, ut praemittitur, hospitibus sic diebus in Ordine consuetis dare et impartire esum cranium, totiens quotiens eidem abbati vel in absenita eius, prior dicit monasterii, honestum et congruum visum fuerit'.

Meat-Eating in Cistercian Abbeys: Summary

In the historiography of monastic diet there has been little critical study of why meat-eating was introduced, or of how the religious themselves viewed the changes. There has been a tendency to view this change with a degree of inevitability, as a process that saw the religious grow increasingly apart from their forebears of an earlier age. This often seen as a mark of decline in religious life, but the evidence from the Cistercian Order demonstrated this view cannot be upheld in its current form.

Although diet is mentioned in recent accounts of monastic daily life, the questions of change in observance over time and how the religious themselves accounted for it is usually side-stepped by not taking into account the chronological framework of development.[191] For this, David Knowles's survey of religious life in England from the tenth to the early sixteenth centuries remains a valuable account because it reviews changes in monastic diet, principally for the Benedictines, although with reference to the Cistercians as well, across the entirety of the period covered in his studies. Knowles took a pejorative view of the introduction of meat-eating into religious life as a habitual and legitimised activity, with numerous comments indicating his view of the long-term change. For the period up until the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, 'a few monasteries […] held for long to the original observance and many preserved it unimpaired', writing with reference to the Benedictines.[192] For the Cistercians, their legislation is taken at face value and thus no meat is said to have been served, despite the insinuation of the 'baneful influence' of pittances into Cistercian houses.[193] During the late thirteenth through the fifteenth centuries meat-eating is presented as an inexorable relaxation of discipline, consisting of a series of concessions that became established custom and then received *post facto* sanction from ecclesiastical authorities.[194] The fourteenth-century is seen as the turning point for monastic life in general by Knowles: '[i]n the fourteenth century, however, changes were made in the tenor and structure of the life which materially affected its character [including] the mitigation of the Rule in the matter of meat-eating'.[195]

The practice of meat-eating had eluded reformers and gained wide support, despite

---

[191] Julie Kerr, *Life in the Medieval Cloister* (London: Continuum, 2009), pp. 48–55; Janet Burton and Julie Kerr, *The Cistercians in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2011), pp. 110–16.

[192] Knowles, *Monastic Order*, p. 462.

[193] Knowles, *Monastic Order*, pp. 642–43. The legislation referenced is the Instituta Capituli Generalis. Quotation from p. 643.

[194] Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England, Vol. 1: 1216–1340*, pp. 281–83.

[195] Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England, Vol. 3: The Tudor Age*, p. 459; Lekai, *Ideals and Reality*; The 'decline and relaxation' theme is echoed in Harvey, 'Monastic Pittances', see esp. pp. 218, 221.

an implied awareness that it was not beneficial to observance: '[b]y the fifteenth century the custom of meat-eating had hardened so much that even the reformers of 1421 let it stand in their programme, even adding economic to moral arguments in its favour'.

This last comment introduces the crucial quality of the self-reflection on change that is essential to explaining why these developments took place. This is vital if the view of a natural, if imperceptible and innocent, tendency towards laxity on the part of the community is to be replaced with an interpretation more sympathetic to contemporary attitudes. Throughout the legislation, the point which has caused the General Chapter to alter their practice is either superior ecclesiastical influence, namely the Pope, as in the *Benedictina* of 1335, or, more often and perhaps less dramatically, the pressure of outsiders entering Cistercian precincts and the demands of hospitality. The Cistercians had always been sympathetic to the need for compromise when people not familiar with their observance were involved. Caesarius of Heisterbach in the early thirteenth century gave the following exchange between the monk and the novice, the two narrative voices of his work:

> NOVICE: Do they not sin, who serve monks abroad meat, fat, or meat juice, and cheat them into eating it by some trick?

> MONK: They do not apparently sin, if necessity of hospitality compels them, or, what is more worthy, fervour of charity. Ignorance of sin excuses the one eating, or simplicity; the one serving, as I have said, charity.[196]

However, such compromise required close attention to morality to maintain integrity of observance. This is what the legislation was intended to promote, but the General Chapter, in maintaining integrity of observance, ran the risk of neglecting the *omnis humanitas* demanded by the *Rule of Benedict*. The theme of conscience highlights the spiritual threat that provision of hospitality meeting guests' expectations in the later medieval period entailed. The nuances and increasingly complex history of meat-eating in the late medieval period should be taken into account in any appraisal of a Cistercian site, particularly one with so much zooarchaeological evidence as Kirkstall Abbey, if a more accurate understanding of the

---

[196] *Dialogus Miraculorum*, I, VI. 2 (p. 343): 'NOVICIUS: Peccatne illi, qui monachis exeuntibus carnes, sagimen, vel ius carnium apponunt, et illos aliquo artificio ut comedant, decipiunt? MONACHUS: Non videnter peccare, si eos impellit necessitas hospitalitatis, vel, quod dignius est, fervor caritatis. Edentem excusat a peccato ignorantia, vel simplicitas; ministrantem, ut dixi, caritas'.

material evidence is to be achieved.

Faunal Evidence from Kirkstall Abbey

In her recent study of Kirkstall's animal bone assemblages, Richardson concluded:

> Analysis of the faunal remains from the Guest House at Kirkstall Abbey has revealed a meat diet dominated by domestic livestock with only the very rare inclusion of venison, hare, rabbit or pigeon. The meat tended to come from older animals that had previously been used for breeding, fleeces, milk or traction. The presence of older sheep, in conjunction with the 14th-century tally of Kirkstall's 4500 sheep and England's international reputation for wool production at this time, suggests that visitors to the Abbey dined on mutton from animals that had already provided a number of fleeces. Given that high-status indicators such as veal and lamb are comparatively rare and that exotica such as woodcock, swan or sturgeon are absent, it seems that the guests did not partake of the very best of available foods. Compared to an almost unrelenting diet of beef in the Abbey itself, however, they did at least enjoy a greater variety of meats. [197]

As Sykes has remarked, consumption of food at religious sites is subject to sometimes dramatic variations based on the religious ethos of the particular form of observance.[198] It is not to be expected that a group of individuals following the *Rule of St Benedict* would have the same diet as secular people of equivalent social standing, although such an argument has been put forward.[199] Sykes has also noted that there is great difficulty in getting a broad understanding of how observance materially affected consumption patterns between different religious orders because of the small corpus of assemblages that has so far accumulated.[200] The same is also true when differentiating between the consumption patterns of the different groups on the same site, as would have occurred on any religious site due to the great range of social statuses and the presence of guests. Much can be gained by applying the results of historical research, as well as combining wider varieties of evidence to interpret the zooarchaeological data. Kirkstall's assemblages therefore remain open for interpretation.

---

[197] Richard, 'Animal Bones'.
[198] Naomi Sykes, 'Animals, The Bones of Medieval Society', p. 356.
[199] Harvey, 'Monastic Pittances', p. 227.
[200] Naomi Sykes, 'Animals, the Bones of Medieval Society', in *Reflections: 50 Years of Medieval Archaeology, 1957–2007*, ed. by Andrew Reynolds and Roberta Gilchrist, Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph, 30 (Leeds: Maney, 2009), pp. 347–61 (p. 356).

What follows is a summary of Kirkstall's animal bone assemblages that formed Richardson's conclusion. First, the contexts of discovery are described, and then the species. Kirkstall's assemblages are then set in the context of data gathered from other sites. Crucially, the assemblages are then set against the historical context of Cistercian understandings to underpin the importance of hospitality for any interpretation of the zooarchaeological data.

Kirkstall's Animal Bone Deposits

The faunal data were excavated in two separate areas of the precinct. The earlier excavations, those of 1957–59, uncovered a very large deposit of animal bones near the meat kitchen, south of the southern claustral range, and these have already been employed in discussions of monastic diet.[201] The earlier excavations also uncovered many remains from the monastic refectory. The later excavations, those of 1979 and 1981 onward, were carried out in the guesthouse. There were fewer bones excavated in the guesthouse complex, but otherwise the assemblages offer many interesting points for comparison, especially in the light of their place of deposition. What follows is a brief summary of the finds from both areas of the precinct, and the principal points of information derived from subsequent analysis.[202]

The excavations around the monastic refectory and meat kitchen provide the larger of the two assemblages. There were two principal deposits, these being the earlier kitchen and its courtyard immediately to the south, both of which lay immediately to the west of the refectory on the south range. The second dump was that of the meat kitchen, which lay a short distance to the south of the warming house, and immediately to the south-east of the refectory. Specifically, the remains were excavated on the external side of its western wall and the adjoining open ground. The locations of the dumps can therefore be provided with a functional context: those found in the kitchen just off the south range was the earlier of the establishments, and was intended for preparing meals according to the earliest Cistercian

---

[201] Burton and Kerr, *Cistercians*, p. 113; Greene, p. 151.

[202] References to and analysis of the animal bones derived from the earlier excavations are published as annual reports for the Thoresby Society. For economy of space, the reports referenced here are those published every five years during the excavations. These five-year reports collected the annual reports from the previous five years within a single volume and revised their conclusions as appropriate, rendering them both more convenient and accurate. For locations of excavation and analysis see David E. Owen, *Kirkstall Abbey Excavations: 1950–1954*, Publications of the Thoresby Society, 43 (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1955), pp. 2, 7–8, 13, 20, 29, 38–39; C. M. Mitchell, 'Kirkstall Abbey Excavations 1955–59', *Publications of the Thoresby Society*, 48 (1961), pp. 1, 14, 27, 32, 35, 41–54, 64, 67–77, 98–100, 130–32; Michael L. Ryder, 'The Animal Remains Found at Kirkstall Abbey', *Agricultural History Review*, 7 (1959), 1–5; Michael L. Ryder, 'Livestock Remains from Four Medieval Sites in Yorkshire', *Agricultural History Review*, 9 (1961), 105–10; Stephen Moorhouse and Stuart Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 1: The 1950–64 Excavations – A Reassessment* (Wakefield: West Yorkshire Archaeological Service, 1987), p. 152. The guesthouse faunal data and analysis are due for publication in Jane Richardson, 'Kirkstall Guesthouse Animal Bone', in *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2*, ed. by Stuart Wrathmell (forthcoming), *passim*.

practices, while the meat kitchen was there to cater to subsequent additions to this fare, namely the preparation of meat.

Species Represented in Kirkstall's Claustral Complex

The species represented in the assemblages are relatively consistent. For the earlier kitchen, the principal species are oysters and mussels (more oysters than mussels), which were by far the most common and formed a layer 'several inches thick'; also represented, but much more sparingly, were oxen and sheep.[203] A horse was found buried within the refectory, though this cannot be dated exactly and most probably represents ritual interment rather than consumption; dogs and rats were likewise found, similarly these are thought to be later intrusions.[204] The courtyard south of the warming house and north of the meat kitchen had cockles and oysters, as well as oxen, sheep, horse and possibly red deer.[205] In the make-up of the mortar floor in the refectory there were found indications of pig, sheep and ox, in the form of molars found from these animals.[206] The ox molars could not be stratified due to later disruption.

In the meat kitchen there was a great variety in the species uncovered, and is important for its indications of the potential range of dishes served at Kirkstall. The animals represented in this assemblage are: (molluscs) oysters, cockles, mussels and whelks;[207] (piscine) salt-water fish, perhaps cod;[208] (avian) domestic fowl, ?pigeon, rook and jackdaw;[209] (mammals) ox, sheep/goat, pig, red deer, roe deer, fallow deer and rabbit.[210]

The largest deposit was that lying west and south-west of the meat kitchen, abutting the latter's western wall, which contained some species not seen inside the building.[211] The maximum depth of the bones in this area was three feet. While the stratigraphy was disturbed by nineteenth-century activity, the bone layer did increase in depth as it moved southwards towards the tarmacadam road, indicating the original contours, and furthermore a portion of the layer underlay a drain of fifteenth-century date.[212] The stratigraphy, therefore, is suggestive, if marred: the consumption of the animals whose remains are found here were probably being

---

[203] Owen, pp. 7–8.
[204] Owen, p. 8; Mitchell, pp. 14, 75.
[205] Owen, pp. 38–39.
[206] Mitchell, p. 14.
[207] Mitchell, p. 35.
[208] Mitchell, p. 42.
[209] Mitchell, p. 42.
[210] Mitchell, p. 42.
[211] Mitchell, p. 64.
[212] Mitchell, p. 67.

consumed at a time at least contemporaneous with the construction of the meat kitchen, probably before. The rate of consumption is unable to be stated with certainty, though the quantity and surviving original stratigraphy suggests that 'the bulk of this material [...] had unquestionably accumulated during the last fifty years or so of monastic occupation'.[213] The animals represented in the dump were: (molluscs) oysters and mussels, which were common across the area south of the cloister;[214] (piscine) (?) salmon, an unidentified fish much larger than cod; (avian) domestic fowl, duck (domestic and mallard), goose (wild, possibly some domestic), raven, jackdaw, heron, woodcock, black grouse, (?) kestrel and wood pigeon; (mammal) rabbit, rat, dog, ox, sheep, pig, red, roe and fallow deer, and horse.

A fourth area probably representing monastic consumption was the open ground south and west of the refectory. The species represented here were: (mollusc) oyster and mussel; (piscine) all of cod size; (avian) fowl, goose, duck, pigeon, and some possible wild species; (mammals) hare, horse, pig and sheep.[215]

Synthesis of Claustral Animal Bone Assemblages

The relative composition of the assemblages of the four areas described, those of the earlier kitchen, the meat kitchen, south-west of the meat kitchen and south-west of the refectory, all indicate an overwhelming presence of ox bones and molluscs.[216] Of the mammal bones, as much as 90% were ox, 5% sheep, 3% pig, and 2% deer (see fig. 4.1).[217] It is possible, through identification of epiphyseal fusion (or lack thereof) and dentition in the jaw bones, to arrive at a rough estimate of the age of the oxen (fig. 4.2),[218] sheep (fig. 4.3),[219] and pigs (fig. 4.4).[220] Study of epiphyseal fusion of the distal ends (those nearest the extremity of the limb) indicates stage of maturation up to adulthood (but cannot reveal age after this point), while

---

[213] Duncan and Moorhouse, pp. 39, 49.

[214] Mitchell, p. 64.

[215] Mitchell, p. 99.

[216] It should be stated that excavation methods would have a part to play in the current composition of the faunal assemblage; the soil was not sieved and so slighter fish bones, for example, may have been overlooked, Richardson, p. 3.

[217] Michael L. Ryder, 'The Animal Bones', in *Kirkstall Abbey Excavations, Eighth Report*, Publications of the Thoresby Society (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1957), pp. 67–77 (p. 70). Though cf. ibid., p. 43: '[t]he results obtained suggest that ox bones were nearly ten times more plentiful than sheep bones, and that the bones of other animals were present in quite small numbers, the relative proportions of which [...] are probably less accurate.'

[218] Ryder, 'The Animal Bones', p. 71.

[219] Ryder, 'The Animal Bones', p. 71.

[220] Ryder, 'The Animal Bones', p. 71.

the level of wear of an animal's rear molars indicates its age upon having reached maturity.[221] The ages of the oxen and sheep tended to fall from being mature to positively old, with over seventy percent at least five years old. It was mutton rather than lamb being consumed, and the beef, judging by the age, was more likely to be stewed than roasted, which was especially probable since the bones were found chopped or sawn at the ends, to enable the marrow to diffuse into the stew more easily.[222] The pigs consumed were young however, perhaps in some instances suckling pig, although this was a small component in the monks' diet judging from the rates of survival. Overall, the animal bones strongly suggest that there was a consistent diet of marine molluscs such as oysters and mussels (low-status foods) throughout the monastic period, while during the later period of monastic life, during the fifteenth century, the consumption of meat dishes was an established and frequent occurrence up until the Dissolution in 1539.[223]

The Guesthouse Assemblage

On the other side of the precinct, in the guest range, the taxonomic range is largely the same, though there is a significant discrepancy in the relative proportions of the different species.[224] The animals represented are: (piscine) cod, haddock, ling, thornback ray, and salmonid (possibly trout); (avian) domestic fowl and goose, buzzard, jackdaw, wood pigeon, tawny owl and turkey;[225] (mammal) cattle, sheep, pig, fallow, red and roe deer, and hare and rabbit. Of these the most statistically prominent are by far the cattle, followed by the sheep and then the pig bones.[226] Of the avian species, pigeon (*columba livia*) had many remains among the bird species, but these fragments were all found in the vicinity of the main hall, and for the remains of animals that were definitely consumed the majority of the bones were found in the services area. There are other species present in the assemblage, and it is highly unlikely that they all represent consumption; particularly problematic are the raven, jackdaw, tawny owl and wood pigeon specimens which are native to the abbey's environs and could be intrusive, but could conceivably represent hunted or trapped game. Dog and cat are present, and so is

---

[221] I. A. Silver, 'The Ageing of Domestic Animals', in *Science in Archaeology: A Survey of Progress and Research*, ed. by Don R. Brothwell and Eric S. Higgs, 2nd edn (London: Thames and Hudson, 1969), pp. 282–302.

[222] Owen, p. 38; Ryder, 'The Animal Remains Found at Kirkstall Abbey', p. 2.

[223] Adamson, p. 44; James Bond, *Monastic Landscapes*, p. 188.

[224] Richardson, 'Animal Bones'.

[225] The turkey fragments are post-medieval and do not reflect food served in the monastic guesthouse. Kristopher Poole, 'Bird Introductions', in, *Extinctions and Invasions: A Social History of British Fauna*, ed. by T. O'Connor and N. Sykes, (Oxford: Windgather, 2010), pp. 156–65 (pp. 161 and 164, table 11).

[226] Richardson, 'Animal Bones'.

rat. Amphibians only came from contexts associated with drainage, and it is likely that they are intrusive. [227] Overall, the impression given from these data is that the diet was more varied than was the monks', but but not extravagantly so and within a narrow spectrum of species.

An interesting point from the data for the guesthouse concerns the secondary hall (Area C), which possibly suggests that this hall was used for the lower orders of the visiting household (servants and the like) or individuals of lesser status.[228] The sample from the main hall seems slightly deficient, in that far fewer bones were collected than would be expected for the main hall, where feasting occurred. This might mean that rather than highlighting difference between areas, the secondary hall's assemblage more accurately represent patterns of consumption. This said, there are a number of factors forming an outline of the residents of this area of the guesthouse. The first is the prevalent animal type: for oxen, the secondary hall is the most populous area of the guesthouse range, and more ox bone fragments were found here than in the services area (594 to 538, respectively). Beef was therefore a prominent item on the menu.[229] The secondary hall also has the highest proportion of cattle remains relative to pig and sheep, indicating that it was the most common fare consumed in this area.[230] When it is considered that the ox is a large animal capable of feeding more people than a sheep or pig, there is a strong indication that a large number of people were being fed in this area; this indicates lower-status accommodation as privilege was typically furnished with personal space. A further point of information relates to the epiphyseal fusion data for the cattle: out of the three main areas where cattle remains occur (the primary hall, the services and the secondary hall), it is the secondary hall which has the oldest specimens on average: 90% were at least two years old, while 88.9% were at least three years old (only 60% had reached three to four years old in the services area). Likewise, dental wear on recovered jaw bones indicated that over half (52.6%) were mature to senile adults. It should be noted by way of counter-argument that the secondary hall has the largest sample of ox mandibles, and the range does include some prime oxen or younger (veal, as there are six mandibles belonging to oxen eighteen month old or younger). Unfortunately, this is unable to be compared properly with the primary hall due to its rather poorer-than-expected sample, but in terms of what was found in the services and what remained in the primary hall the picture is one where the

---

[227] Horse fragments are also found in large numbers, 118 in total, but Richardson explains that these represent one dismembered tibia (from the services) and one sawn metapodial (from the secondary hall). The former of these possibly indicates consumption of horse.

[228] This discussion draws on unpublished tabulated data from Richardson, 'Animal Bones', table 1.

[229] Richardson, 'Animal Bones'.

[230] Richardson, 'Animal Bones'.

older beef is sent to provision the guests in the secondary hall.

That there is a range of beef quality in the secondary hall is not troublesome: it can easily be envisioned that there was a corresponding range of residing guests, each entitled to a different level of fare by virtue of their status.[231] When considering that beef, '[b]eing the cheapest and coarsest meat available, was not regarded luxurious enough for the aristocratic palate' and that it was a food deemed by contemporary dietetics as being suitable only for people engaged in heavy physical labour, we acquire a picture of a rather less glorious assembly than might be inhabiting the guesthouse's solar.[232]

Some context regarding the comtemporary dietetical view of beef is provided by the Carthusian-apostate-turned-medical-doctor Andrew Boorde (*c.* 1490–1549), who would have had a good knowledge of monastic diet and contemporary medical theory. Boorde stated that Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk requested him to attend Henry VIII, which claim is not supported by royal accounts, but shows the social status of the clients to whom Boorde aspired. Boorde stated in his work *A Compendyous Regyment* in the early sixteenth century:

> Beefe is a good meate for an Englysshe man, so be it the beest be yonge, & that it
> be not koweflesshe; For olde beef and koweflesshe doth ingender melancolye and
> leporouse humoures. [233]

The guesthouse's beef, would have been more to Boorde's recommendation than the monk's own. Beef could be presented in a finer manner, but only with the addition of expensive spices, such as the abbot of Westminster served in his household at the beginning of the sixteenth century, but generally beef was associated with lower and middling sorts of people.[234]

Regarding the ageing of sheep, dentition indicates a cluster around 2–3 years old, while the bulk of the mandibles (thirty-four of fifty-two) indicate an age between four and eight years; it was mutton rather than lamb eaten, probably from sheep who had contributed

---

[231] Cf. the instance in which the disgruntled Gerald of Wales is assigned lodging in the lesser guesthouse, which he believes does not correspond with his social standing: Kerr, 'Cistercian Hospitality in the Later Middle Ages', p. 35.

[232] Adamson, p. 31.

[233] Andrew Boorde, 'A Compendyous Regyment, or, A Dyetary of Helth Made in Mountpyllier', in *The Fyrst Boke of the Introduction of Knowledge Made by Andrew Borde, of Physycke Doctor / A Compendyous Regyment; Or, A Dyetary of Helth Made in Mountpyllier / Berdes: A Treatyse Made, Answerynge the Treatyse of Doctor Borde upon Berdes*, ed. by Frederick James Furnivall (London: Early English Text Society, 1870), pp. 223–304 (p. 271).

[234] Harvey, *Living and Dying*, p. 51, n. 52.; *Two Fifteenth-Century Cookbooks*, ed. by T. Austin, Early English Text Society, Orig. Ser., 42 (London: Early English Text Society, 1888), p. 72.

numerous fleeces.[235] The possibility that older sheep being eaten was related the late-thirteenth-century murrain which afflicted Kirkstall's flocks cannot be proven, though the effect of wider factors cannot be discounted. At Bolton Priory, the accounts record a dramatic shift in consumption in response to the pressures of the agrarian crisis of the early fourteenth century.[236] Again, it is the secondary hall that furnishes the most mandibles, and these are all within a 2–8 year range.[237] The best represented age bracket is 4–6 years. Boorde's opinion of sheep was that:

> Mutton, of Rasis and Aueroyes is praysed for a good meate, but Galen dothe not laude it; and sewrely I do not loue it, consyderyng that there is no beest that is so soone infectyd, nor there doth happen so great murren and syckenes to any qyadrypedyd beeste as doth fall to the sheepe. This notwithstandyngee, yf the sheepe be brought vp in a good pasture and fatte, and do not flauoure of the wolle, it is good for sycke persones, for it doth ingender good blode.[238]

The comment regarding curing the sick is interesting, given the potential for other healing aspects of the monastic environment, such as music.[239]

The pig remains indicate that they were slaughtered young, and very rarely grew to be more than three years old. There is the possibility that suckling pig was consumed, but the sample from the primary hall is poor (only three fragments). Richardson observes a discrepancy in the age of the pig remains in that there were no mandibles of suckling age found anywhere in the guesthouse range, and proposes that these were brought onto the site from elsewhere; this would probably not be from the vicinity of the south range as proportionally few pig mandibles under one year's age were found, and would thus indicate that not only were the carcasses dressed when they reached the guesthouse, but they had been dressed before they had come into contact with any of the monastic cooks.[240]

The last general point of discussion for the guesthouse range is the distribution of body parts across the areas. The primary hall has consistently higher proportions of joint bones for all species than does the secondary hall, which suggests that roasted meat was

---

[235] Richardson, 'Animal Bones'.

[236] O'Connor, 'Bone Assemblages', p. 107; Ian Kershaw, *Bolton Priory: The Economy of a Northern Monastery, 1286–1325* (London: Oxford University Press, 1973).

[237] Richardson, 'Animal Bones'.

[238] Boorde, p. 272.

[239] Discussed in chapter 4.3 below.

[240] Richardson, 'Animal Bones'.

available in this area, as opposed to (in the case of cattle) a very high proportion of feet (in the secondary hall). Although still from mature cattle, roasting suggests a better quality cut and likewise a higher status consumer.[241] It should be noted that the vast majority of the cattle bones which Ryder analysed for the meat kitchen were sawn or chopped cannon bones, not meat joints. These bones had been butchered to prepare them for stewing.

Summary of Kirkstall's Animal Bone Assemblages

The principal points regarding the faunal data may be summarised in the following manner. The earlier monastic kitchen typically catered to seafood where food preparation involved non-vegetable components, such as mussels and oysters. The later monastic meat kitchen was overwhelmingly endowed with cattle bones, which, given the regard with which beef was held, suggests a restricted and moderate diet on the monks' part. Meanwhile, the guest range produced a greater variety of kinds of meat, although the assemblage was a relatively small sample in comparison with the meat kitchen. Nevertheless, it remains that there is more evidence proportionally speaking for superior cuts of meat having been consumed, as well as higher proportions of elite food such as venison, veal, and suckling pig.

Kirkstall Assemblages Compared with other Sites

When set in a wider context, these assemblages become very suggestive.[242] The proportions of species found in the guesthouse approximate closely those of other religious sites (fig. 4.6). All the sites considered follow the northern European trend of having beef, mutton and pork as the dominant forms of meat consumed.[243] The universal characteristic is that beef is the most consumed animal species relative to any other, with sheep the second, and pig the third. It should be noted that Kirkstall's meat kitchen, with 90% beef, has no parallel. For reference, in a comparison of sites in Britain carried out by Sykes, 58% of cattle were culled between the age range of 3–10 years.[244] What we can say from these data is that Kirkstall's guesthouse

---

[241] Reidar Bertelsen, 'Food in Northern Europe from the Thirteenth to the Sixteenth Century', in *The Archaeology of Medieval Europe: Twelfth to Sixteenth Centuries*, ed. by Martin Carver and Jan Klápště, 2 vols (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2011), ii, 126–32 (p. 127).

[242] The data is that presented in Richardson, 'Animal Bones', supplemented by Dyer, *Standards of Living*, p. 155.

[243] Bertelsen, 'Food in Northern Europe', p. 130.

[244] Naomi Jane Sykes, 'From Cu and Sceap to Beffe and Motton: The Management, Distribution, and Consumption of Cattle and Sheep in Medieval England', in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition*, ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron, Medieval History and Archaeology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 56–71 (p. 60), fig. 5.3. The sample size consisted of 3 rural, 21 urban, and 9 high-status sites.

was provisioned in a manner very similar to that of other religious houses; there is nothing unusual about the meat on offer there compared with other communities.

Far from being a mundane finding, this allows characterisation of Cistercian provisioning of the guesthouse as being on a par with the kind and quality of meat enjoyed at religious houses across the country and, very significantly, that the Kirkstall monks, who did not share this pattern of consumption, denied this to themselves. Although they were able to access better kinds of meat, Kirkstall's brethren instead put up with beef with only the occasional variation.[245]

Conclusions: Meat-Eating, Status, and Hospitality at Kirkstall

All the elements considered here – the makeup of Kirkstall's assemblages, the differences between them, and comparison with other sites – suggest that the community was exceptionally assiduous in their beef-eating. It appears to have been a conscious policy: it occurred over a long period of time, and beef was the largest meat component of their diet.[246] Meanwhile, the provision of meat in the guesthouse was much more in accordance with that of secular and non-Cistercian sites elsewhere in Britain. How to understand Kirkstall's animal bones, and what they mean for hospitality, requires careful contextualisation.

However, this view can be set in its proper place with regard to Kirkstall by two points of evidence. Firstly, the legislative background to meat-eating in the *statuta* of the Cistercian Order, and, secondly, consideration and comparison of the animal bone assemblage of the guesthouse. The legislative background of meat-eating repeatedly emphasises the issue of charity and hospitality as a legitimate basis for dietary adaptation. The need to accommodate guests according to their expectations is an obligation laid upon Cistercians by the *Rule of Benedict*. Having faced criticism for a cold welcome in the twelfth century, the Cistercian General Chapter was forced in the thirteenth century and later to grant concessions on an *ad hoc* basis, or risk giving offence to the uppermost sections of society, including royalty. Once the precedent had been set at Cîteaux itself, the practice became more frequent and widespread, with similar reasons of charity and hospitality being claimed. The debate was not settled even by the promulgation of the *Benedictina* in 1335, and 'conscience' remained a consistent ground for objection to offering meat within a precinct. The debate was not settled within the medieval period, and the statute of 1481 only settled the issue insofar as it

---

245 Cf. the conclusion given above Richardson, 'Animal Bone', given above.
246 Cf. O'Connor, 'Bone Assemblages', p. 108.

placed the matter into the abbot's hands and invested him with the responsibility to maintain the best course for his community. It removed possibility of reproach, but at the cost of introducing a fundamental element of variation within the Order. It must be stressed that a concession does not necessitate laxity on the part of the monks, particularly in situations were external parties were involved. In cases of hospitality, it was natural extension of the approach toward hospitality fostered by Cistercian notions of *caritas*.

The discovery of the large quantity of animal bones at Kirkstall abbey, both in the monastic meat kitchen and in the guesthouse, would at first sight suggest that the community had departed irrevocably from Cistercian practice of the twelfth century, and had sided with the faction within the Order supporting the consumption of meat. The characterisation of the community at Kirkstall is as a result negative and suggestive of cooling spiritual ardour.

It is against this backdrop that the two Kirkstall assemblages must be viewed. The assemblage of the monastic meat kitchen and the preponderance it shows for aged beef represents an attention to the wider debate within the Order. Eating aged beef was a compromise, as it provided sustenance without luxury or vanity. There could not be accusations of lofty living on a day-to-day basis, since, as Sykes notes: 'meat in diet, particular that of the lower classes, was centred on beef and mutton'.[247] The guesthouse assemblage, by comparison is more varied, though does not indicate frequent consumption of very high status meats, such as veal or venison, although these species are present.[248] The hospitable fare was better than monastic provision, but still within a relative humble spectrum. This is significant, given that the sample size is smaller and gaps in the representation of species might more readily occur. The bones themselves indicate more choice cuts, and some rich kinds of meat such as venison and suckling pig associated with high-status diet in the medieval period. That these were found in the guesthouse links them to the hospitality offered by the community. This fare was more commonly associated with the abbot's table than the communal refectory, and suggests that the abbot still held his table in the guesthouse as opposed to a separate chamber. By giving better quality and more varied provision to guests, the Cistercian community at Kirkstall can be seen to have abided by one of the chief reasons for the introduction of meat-eating into Cistercian observance in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, namely charity and hospitality. The practice had filtered through into habitual consumption by the community, but such fare would have compared poorly with the highly 'secularised' fare of the guesthouse.

---

[247] Naomi Jane Sykes, 'From Cu and Sceap to Beffe and Motton: The Management, Distribution, and Consumption of Cattle and Sheep in Medieval England', pp. 70–71.

[248] Naomi Jane Sykes, 'Social Life of Venison'.

The broader historical context supports this interpretation. The General Chapter showed itself to be a very conservative body by nature, and permanent concessions to meat-eating were only adopted in the face of persistence outsiders, or when given by a higher ecclesiastical authority, such as the pope. The issue of meat was still very much a contested issue. Ultimately, the consideration of the animal bone assemblages in relation to one another and the history of the Order emphasises the community of Kirkstall provided good hospitality that prioritised guests, while the monks for their part paid attention to the wider concerns of their order and, as it appears, tempered their consumption of meat with regard to the precepts of the *Benedictina* and the *Rule of Benedict.*

4.3

ACTIVITIES IN THE GUESTHOUSE

Objects and Guest Activity within the Guesthouse

The same methodological issues affecting analysis of the internal arrangements of the guesthouse also apply to the small finds representative of activities.[249] Activity within the monastic guesthouse remains poorly understood and its only illuminated by occasional references within the written record. The following account treats some of the objects relating to various areas of activity in order to assess how the guesthouse was used, and what role it played in the social life of the abbey. The objects have been grouped according to their functional category as determined in Duncan's classificatory scheme, although inevitably there is overlap reflective of the intertwined nature of many activities (see figs. 3.1 and 3.2). The objects are treated here as though they had been used in the general vicinity of their deposition, that is, that they were not brought over from the claustral ranges, and therefore that they are indicative of the behaviour of occupants of the guesthouse. The objects here are discussed in two broad categories. The first is that most commonly associated with the guesthouse and relates to the leisurely activities pursued there; the second, and perhaps the more significant relates to business and administration within the guesthouse.

---

[249] See chapter 3.1 above.

Guests at Leisure: Entertainment and Leisure

The staging of entertainment, musical or performative, within religious houses has been very sparsely treated. Sheila Lindenbaum has investigated monastic accounts to identify the variety of ways in which monastic communities put on entertainment for their guests.[250] Significantly, Lindenbaum attributes this feature of monastic life not to the relief of bored monks, but as a result of their obligation to provide the hospitality of which entertainment was one aspect, especially on occasions involving the local populace (it should be noted here that many of Lindenbaum's sources derive from urban religious houses, such as Bury St Edmunds, Westminster, or Worcester Cathedral Priory, whereas many Cistercian houses would not have been so intimately involved through physical proximity). Lindenbaum states that the occasions on which entertainment was engaged were the *seynys*, or periods of recuperation following a bloodletting, but also stresses the formal regulations governing the conduct of the monks, to prevent unbecoming conduct.[251]

The topic of games within the monastery remains, for the time being, a narrow field of study. Recent research by Jörg Sonntag draws attention to its wide-reaching relevance and anthropological and sociological significance.[252] Sonntag stresses the role of monasteries as a receptor of leisure pursuits of non-Christian and non-European cultures, particularly those of the Near and Middle East, and attributes to the religious the role of re-fashioning problematic cultural or religious elements in games so as to bring them into accord with Western monastic spirituality. Of particular importance is the distinction that Sonntag emphasises between games of chance, which are not acceptable for monks to partake in, and the games of knowledge, which could find a place within a contemplative framework (for example, 'heavenly chess', which used various astrological elements and involved a number of players and dice with numerological significance).[253] This distinction is significant, as it

---

[250] S. Lindenbaum, 'Entertainment in English Monasteries', in *Le Théâtre et La Cité Dans l'Europe Médiévale : Actes Du 5ème Colloque International de La Société Internationale Pour L'étude Du Théâtre Médiéval (Perpignan, Juillet 1986)*, ed. by Jean Claude Aubailly and Edelgard E. DuBruck, Stuttgarter Arbeiten Zur Germanistik, 213–14 (Stuttgart: H.-D. Heinz, 1988), pp. 411–21.

[251] Lindenbaum, pp. 416–17. Harvey, *Living and Dying*, pp. 96–99, discusses *seyneys* but says nothing regarding entertainment for recuperating monks.

[252] The issue has been the subject of recent research by Jörg Sonntag (Forschungsstelle für Vergleichende Ordensgeschichte, Dresden). Sonntag's research long-term research project was introduced in Jörg Sonntag, 'The Medieval Religious Life as Generator and Mediator of Entertainment Games in Medieval Society: Tension between Norm and Deviance', *Monastic Research Bulletin*, 15 (2009), 24–31; the earliest findings of the research are presented in Jörg Sonntag, 'Le Rôle de La Vie Régulière Dans L'invention et La Diffusion Des Divertissements Sociaux Au Moyen Age', *Revue Mabillon: Revue Internationale D'histoire et de Littérature Religieuses / International Review for Ecclesiastical History and Literature*, 22 (2011), 79–98.

[253] Sonntag, 'The Medieval Religious Life as Generator and Mediator of Entertainment Games', p. 27.

means that the presence of games was not necessarily detrimental to monastic observance.

While the evidence for guests at play at Kirkstall is not extensive, it is suggestive. Two main areas are represented: music and games. These are treated in turn, with the items being placed in their wider cultural context.

Evidence for music being played at Kirkstall consists solely of a worked bone tuning peg.[254] The peg is an example of an elongated Lawson Type A, a form used for tuning open-structure stringed instruments such as a harp, lyre, or lute. This type of tuning peg has parallels from London dating between the mid-fourteenth to the mid-fifteenth centuries and from York dating from the mid-fourteenth century or later.[255]

In terms of the kind of music played within the monastery, a distinction must be made between *haut* music and *bas* music. The former kind was made by using such instruments as trumpets and was the preserve of the lay gentry; the latter was played with stringed instruments and was deemed suitable for ecclesiastical lords, including the religious.[256] Instruments such as the harp especially were thought fitting for accompanying courtly feasts held within a monastery. The idea that music was a kind of psychosomatic therapy, a way of aiding a person's emotional state to promote physical restoration, was widely circulated by the late Middle Ages.[257] Music in institutions such as a religious house may have also been staged with the express purpose of aiding recuperation as well as complementing social occasions.[258] Music complementing a regimen involving frequent listening to the liturgy in the church was thought particularly beneficial, and at St Augustine's, Canterbury, the customary stated that in extreme circumstances stringed instruments could be played in the infirmary to aid a brother's health.[259] The guesthouse as a venue for medicinal therapy is an intriguing possibility. The guesthouse would have made a more suitable place for musical performance than the monastic infirmary, especially if the ailing person were a secular guest. Given the strict rules regarding what activity could take place in the infirmary, the more liberal atmosphere of the

---

[254] Duncan, p. 50.

[255] Egan, pp. 285–86.

[256] Lindenbaum, pp. 414–15.

[257] For the discussion of music and healing in the medieval West, see Christopher Page, 'Music and Medicine in the Thirteenth Century', in *Music as Medicine: The History of Music Therapy since Antiquity*, ed. by Peregrine Horden (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), pp. 109–19; Peter Murray Jones, 'Music Therapy in the Later Middle Ages: The Case of Hugo van Der Goes', in *Music as Medicine: The History of Music Therapy since Antiquity*, ed. by Peregrine Horden (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), pp. 120–46.

[258] See Peregrine Horden, 'Religion as Medicine: Music in Medieval Hospitals', in *Religion and Medicine in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Peter Biller and Joseph Ziegler (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2001), pp. 135–53 (pp. 140–43, 150); reprinted in Peregrine Horden, 'Religion as Medicine: Music in Medieval Hospitals', in *Hospitals and Healing from Antiquity to the Later Middle Ages* (Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum, 2008), chapter 4.

[259] Horden, 'Music in Medieval Hospitals', p. 148, also see the quotations of thirteenth-century texts on pp. 151–52.

guesthouse would enable the monastic community to provide music as part of its hospitable provision, but without breaking the enclosure of the brethren.

Staging musical performances was a common way to entertain guests, and the engagement of musicians a common expense on the host's part. While no documentation confirming the presence of musicians or their payment is known from Kirkstall, the Bursar's Book of Fountains Abbey, which dates from the mid-fifteenth century, details some players who were employed by the abbey for the purposes of entertaining their guests. For the period between 1456 and 1458, there are fifty-nine instances of Fountains Abbey paying for minstrels, strolling players, and fools.[260] The dates when they were in the abbey are not recorded, but this total averages at around two such performances a month, although the likelihood is that they would be more concentrated on special occasions, such as Christmas or Pentecost. It highly plausible that a similar practice to that of Fountains obtained at Kirkstall. There is no known record of aristocratic families sending minstrels to Kirkstall, and it is unlikely that the abbey had strong enough connections with the nobility to prompt such expressions of affinity, except those links, perhaps, which Kirkstall enjoyed by virtue of the standing of its mother-house, Fountains. Although a solitary item, Kirkstall's tuning peg, once set in a wider cultural context, not only suggests that the community followed late-medieval conventions of hospitality, but also that they conformed to ecclesiastical propriety.

Besides music, occupants of the guesthouse would have occupied their time playing games. A single bone die was found in the guesthouse, indicating that games of chance were played. Involvement in such games was frowned upon by the religious, as demonstrated by a letter from Francis, Cardinal-Priest of St Mark, in 1361, which stated that the community's superior should punish brethren who misbehaved according to the severity of their transgression; one of the illicit activities mentioned was gambling with dice or other such forbidden games.[261] Also representative of games are some gaming counters used for games of tables, an early version of backgammon and smaller tokens that may have serve as counters in games of Nine Men's Morris. A board for the latter was found in the form of an incised thackstone, deriving from a fifteenth-century deposit in the eastern hall.[262]

---

[260] *Memorials of Fountains*, III, pp. 17–19, 59–61, 111, 142.

[261] Sidney Oldall Addy, *Cartae Xvi. Ad Abbatiam Rupensem Spectantes. Hactenus Ineditae; XVI. Charters of Roche Abbey* (Sheffield: Leader and Sons, 1878), pp. 28–30.

[262] SF 10891; Harold J. R. Murray, *A History of Board-Games Other than Chess* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952), pp. 37–38.

Guests at Work: Business and Administration

As seen from the internal arrangements, the guesthouse was a lodging intended to accommodate guests according to their expectations. The facilities provided to them, the food, and the entertainment were on a par with what a high-status individual might enjoy anywhere outside the abbey. However, guests would often come to a religious house with specific business in mind, reflecting the community's position as a major landholder in the locality and, in comparison with the majority of the population in that locality, an institution of superlative wealth. Kirkstall, of middling wealth as far as Cistercian abbeys were concerned, was no exception. Through virtue of its tenurial interests and networks of patronage and benefaction, a great many of the local landholders had dealings with the monks.[263] The obligations and responsibilities engendered by Kirkstall's wealth and its socio-political dominance drew many people there as a convenient meeting-point, not least because the business transacted there concerned the community itself. It has been seen also how the archbishop would continue his routine administrative activities while staying at the abbey as a matter of course, whether it was relevant to the community or not.[264] Although the guesthouse is rarely referred to in documentation, it would, in theory, make a very suitable venue for transacting business. It was away from the cloister, and so would not be a cause of distraction for the community. It was large enough to house large numbers of people, who might be involved in debating the issues at hand or simply waiting their turn to bring their business to bear. It was also well equipped for providing the comforts that might be expected while business was being transacted, such as food and drink. Furthermore, the guesthouse was located next to a major roadway within the precinct that led from the gatehouse, and, in the later Middle Ages at least, was provided with its own stables.

Presented here is analysis of the items relating to literacy from the guesthouse, which has the aim of contextualising the finds to investigate what kinds of literary activity was carried out there. Studies of literacy, literate activity, and writing usually take one of three broad approaches. The first is archaeological, and is contained within a discussion of assemblages excavated from sites, and which emphasise identification and evaluation of the function of the objects.[265] The second approach is archaeological in that it treats manuscripts as a form of material culture. These studies may employ a more archaeological approach, and consider

---

[263] For the local landholders as guests, see chapter 3.2.

[264] See chapter 3.2.

[265] Martin Biddle, 'Writing Equipment', in *Object and Economy in Medieval Winchester: Artefacts from Medieval Winchester*, by David Brown, Martin Biddle, and others, Winchester Studies, 7.ii, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), I, 729–47; Egan, pp. 270–81; Ottaway and Rogers, pp. 2934–42; Duncan, chp.7.

the component parts of, for example, a book, such as its binding, boards, quires, and the parchment itself;[266] or they may take a palaeographical approach, and analyse the formation of text to investigate issues of scribal culture.[267] The third approach discusses the issue of literacy in relation to wider society and is less focused on the material culture.[268] The nature of Kirkstall's evidence means that the assemblage has to be interpreted with reference to people using the guesthouse, but without the concrete evidence for the literary output itself, as no manuscripts from Kirkstall state where they were produced within the monastery.[269] The objects from Kirkstall associated with business falls into two broad categories: the first pertains to writing and literacy,[270] and include all aspects of literate activity that have left material culture; the second pertains to commerce, which includes within it all objects relating to weighing, measuring, monetary transactions and economic activity. These shall be discussed in turn, with the assemblages compared with those present at other well-excavated sites.

There is a small but relatively well-defined assemblage representing literary activity from Kirkstall's guesthouse. The items include two book clasps,[271] a book mount,[272] a seal matrix,[273] two styli and a possible third,[274] three writing leads (two uncertain),[275] and a writing slate.[276] There are two further items whose attribution is uncertain: the first is possibly a lead

---

[266] The literature for this and the next approach is vast. Some important studies include: G. Pollard, 'The Construction of English Twelfth- Century Bindings', *The Library: The Transactions of the Bibliographical Society*, 15 (1962), 1–22; F. Bearman, N. Krivatsy and J. Mowery, *Fine and Historic Book Bindings from the Folger Shakespeare Library* (Washington, D.C.: Folger Library, 1992); J. A. Szirmai, *The Archaeology of Medieval Bookbinding* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999).

[267] Jeremy Griffiths and Derek Pearsall, *Book Production and Publishing in Britain 1375–1475* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Alexandra Gillespie and Daniel Wakelin, *The Production of Books in England 1350-1500* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

[268] Perceptive and wide-ranging surveys include: M. T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England, 1066–1307*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993); Nicholas Orme, 'Lay Literacy in England, 1100–1300', in *England and Germany in the High Middle Ages: In Honour of Karl J. Leyser*, ed. by Hanna Vollrath and Alfred Haverkamp, Studies of the German Historical Institute London (Oxford and London: Oxford University Press and the German Historical Institute, 1996), pp. 35–56; *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Vol. 3 : 1400–1557*, ed. by Lotte Hellinga and J. B. Trapp (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Christopher De Hamel, 'Books and Society', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Vol. 2, 1100–1400*, ed. by Nigel Morgan and Rodney M. Thomson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 3–21.

[269] A possible exception is the *CBK*, no. 4, discusses above in chapter 3.2, which details the lifting of a sentence of excommunication on Miles de la Haye in the abbot's chamber, but this record could equally have been written elsewhere after the transaction itself had occurred.

[270] Given under functional category 8 in the forthcoming finds catalogue, labelled 'communication'.

[271] SF 1774 and SF 5177.

[272] SF 3745. There is no description of this item in the present finds catalogue as it was stolen after excavation, but before cataloguing. It is therefore not discussed here.

[273] SF 1325.

[274] SF 5461, 9612. ?SF 79:505 is copper alloy rod, broken at one end, with a flat oblique terminal.

[275] SF 7986; ?SF 1832 is roughly semi-circular in section, broken one end, tapering at the other. ?SF 2853.2 is circular in section, broken one end, with the other tapering to a point, the tip of which is missing.

[276] SF 7330.

book mount,[277] the second is possibly a lead point.[278] Items not classified as pertaining to communications but of relevance to literate activity include a signet ring,[279] a needle or quill case,[280] and a goose bone that might have formed a quill pen. The locations of the finds present no readily intelligible pattern relating to their use, and are scattered throughout the guest range, both inside and outside the buildings, and extended to the roadway south of the guest range.[281]

It is best to approach this assemblage in manner representative of the usage of these artefacts (or putative usage). Considered in this way the items represent a middle to late stage of manuscript production. The early stages of this process, in which the vellum is prepared by being stretched and scraped, form part of an industrial process understandably carried out away from the guesthouse.[282]

The styli are important for their implication that wax tablets were in use.[283] The metal styli in particular would have been used to etch notes of an administrative nature on a wax table, or abbreviated prose to aid mental recall later on.[284] Bone styli were previously thought to have been used for ruling parchment, but are now more commonly associated with wax tablets.[285] At the guesthouse, the kind of activity suited to being recorded on a wax tablet for later drafting on manuscript would be receipts of goods, financial accounts, or tallies of various kinds.[286] Wax tablets by their nature imply a subsequent stage of literate activity, as the notation inscribed on the surface was only semi-permanent and would be drafted into a more formal document.[287] The dates of the finds by formal comparisons with objects from York and London are between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries, coinciding neatly

---

[277] SF 2609.

[278] SF 246.2.

[279] SF 1473.

[280] SF 1658.

[281] Duncan chp. 7.

[282] For the early stages of manuscript production and the archaeological evidence for them see Christopher De Hamel, *Scribes and Illuminators* (London: British Museum Press, 1992), pp. 3–20.

[283] Michelle P. Brown, 'The Role of the Wax Tablet in Medieval Literacy: A Reconsideration in Light of a Recent Find from York', *British Library Journal*, 20 (1994), 1–16 (p. 4).

[284] Clanchy, pp. 118–19; Élisabeth Lalou, 'Les Tablettes de Cire Médiévales', *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole Des Chartes*, 147 (1989), 123–40 (p. 131). Biddle and Hinton, 'Writing', in *Object and Economy*, II, p. 735.

[285] SF 5461, SF 9612 and ?SF 79:505. Richard H. Rouse and Mary A. Rouse, 'Wax Tablets', *Language and Communication*, Special Issue Transformations of the Word, 9.2–3 (1989), 175–91; Brown, p. 4. The styli are interpreted as parchment prickers in Biddle, 1, pp. 734–35. The change in interpretation of bone styli is noted in Egan, p. 272.

[286] Brown, p. 8. Though see C. M. Woolgar, *Household Accounts from Medieval England*, Records of Social and Economic History, 17–18, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1992). vol. 1, p. 8, which states that wax tablets should not be used for manorial records due to the potential for fraud.

[287] Brown, p. 7.

with the outer dates of Kirkstall's guesthouse.[288] Three wax tablets are associated with the prominent Cistercian abbeys of Cîteaux and Clairvaux, all of fourteenth-century date, and all bearing the impression of notations regarding accounts for the abbey.[289]

The Kirkstall styli do not imply that it was only abbey business being performed inside the guesthouse. Literate activity could have been carried out by scribes belonging to a visiting household or a clerk on behalf of another institution or master, for example. However, it must be remembered that the bulk of the surviving documentation that is dated at the abbey also concerns the monastic community, covering business such as rent payments or tenurial dealings.[290] The community would naturally take steps to preserve deeds related to their own concerns and activity, presenting an understandable bias in the nature of the extant documentation (excepting some archbishops' administrative business carried out during their stays at the abbey). It cannot therefore be known how much the abbey was used as a venue for transacting non-abbey business.

After negotiations and drafting of deeds had taken place, the next stage would be committing writing to parchment, should permanent record have been needed. No parchment was found in the archaeological record of Kirkstall's guesthouse. However, several lead points were found, which were used to mark out lines on parchment that aided a scribe to keep their script tidy. Knives and styli could also be used for this purpose, but these presented the risk of cutting through the parchment, and in the later Middle Ages lead points were generally preferred.[291] Writing leads survive from a great number and variety of contexts from the Middle Ages, and evidently served purposes beyond that of manuscript production, such as marking masonry during construction or development.

For writing, quill pens were the usual apparatus, although copper pens were an alternative.[292] Goose feathers were considered the best, in particular from fifth or sixth pinion from the left wing of the bird for a right-handed scribe.[293] Several goose bones have been found from the guesthouse, which indicate the presence of geese and entail the possibility that quills were made from the feathers. One find in particular fits the physical dimensions

---

[288] Egan, p. 272; Duncan chp. 7.

[289] Lalou, p. 137. The tablets are as follows: Cîteaux, bearing an account of the cost of almonds, of 1323–1324; Clairvaux, bearing abbey accounts, of 1320–1325; Clairvaux, bearing an unidentified account, of fourteenth century date.

[290] In addition to the charters discussed in chapter three, there are some extant documents relating to the economy of the house. See 'A Rent-Roll of Kirkstall Abbey', ed. by John Stansfeld, *Publications of the Thoresby Society*, 2 (1891), 1–21.

[291] De Hamel, *Scribes and Illuminators*, p. 23.

[292] For an example of a copper pen, see Egan, *Medieval Household*, p. 271, fig. 210, no. 898.

[293] De Hamel, *Scribes and Illuminators*, p. 29.

necessary to form a quill, although only the calamus, rather than the proximal umbilicus (which would have been sharpened to form a nib with a knife) or the rachis (to which the vane and barb feathers would have been attached) now remains. This is to be expected, as should a quill have been used in professional circumstances then it would quickly wear down. Thomas Becket, for instance, expected that a clerk taking dictation would need to have between sixty and a hundred quills sharpened beforehand in order to keep pace.[294] This rate indicates that such objects were not expected to last. Likewise, the rachis is very fine and may not have survived the rigours of the deposition and formation processes.

The fact that that there are items indicative of literate activity in the guesthouse does not necessarily mean that it was the guests who were carrying out that activity. As Holly Duncan remarks, the assemblage must be approached with caution since the turbulence of the Dissolution and the possibility of removal of items from the claustral precinct might mean that artefacts from the guesthouse are less representative of activity there than might first appear.[295] Equally, however, it must be entertained that it was not simply clerical visitors, such as the archbishop and his household, nor only Kirkstall's monks, who would be literate, even in the early years of the guesthouse. Secular clerks, whether churchmen or not, would be required in a nobleman's household. As well, there was no reason that a secular man of standing would not have learned his letters, and there are numerous mentions of lay *clerici* who evidently had enough literacy to earn this complimentary descriptor.[296]

That high status guests took part in transactions requiring literate individuals is strongly supported by the sigillographic items, even though these items themselves do nothing to prove the literacy of their owner. Although the current location of the seal matrix is not known, a rough sketch of its device was made in the finds catalogues drawn during the course of the excavations.[297] The device has three downward-pointing swords, that is, the Kirkstall coat of arms. However, this is would not have been the arms of the abbey during the medieval period, rather they would have belonged to the Peitevin family, tenants-in-chief of the patron, Henry de Lacy. Exactly to whom the seal matrix belonged cannot be precisely determined without the seal's legend but it is very doubtful that it would have been used by the abbey, as all known abbatial and conventual seals employ ecclesiastical rather

---

[294] This is mentioned in De Hamel, *Scribes and Illuminators*, though no references are given.
[295] Duncan, chp. 7.
[296] Clanchy, pp. 226–30.
[297] SF 1325. The seal matrix was separated from the assemblage and sent for analysis, but unfortunately was never returned. There are no known records of its previous curators.

than heraldic devices.[298] A signet ring bearing the letter 'N' in a circular field (fig. 4.7) was found in the vicinity of the services, although this cannot be associated with confidence to any single individual.[299] A signet ring may have been viewed as having greater authority than a free-hanging seal, of which the 'Peitevin' seal is an example.[300] It cannot be said for sure whom the initial 'N' signifies. Kirkstall Abbey has a few benefactors beginning with the letter, such as Nigel of Horsforth, who gave land in Horsforth *c.* 1200, which date is perhaps too early for this signet ring;[301] Nicholas of Rotherfield, who gave land in 'Wetecroft';[302] or, most probable of these, Nicholas Adamson of Yeadon, a chaplain, who gave lands in Pudsey in 1398, which would be a more likely date given the (broad) dating of the many small finds from the guesthouse;.[303] The presence of these items suggests the presence of elite guests, with either resources to form the substance of a negotiation, or the authority to transact business on behalf of someone with those resources.

When taken together, this assemblage represents all major stages of charter production. The process of making a grant through a charter was protracted, and involved calling together multiple witnesses and several points.[304] The preliminary negotiations required drafts of the final documents to be made, and a clerk would write these down in an editable form (such as on a wax tablet). Once the minutiae had been established (such as the boundaries of the land, the people acting as witness, etc.) the draft could be committed to parchment; once the final draft had been completed the document would be sealed. Many of the Allerton charters discussed in chapter three were given at Kirkstall Abbey, and although the location within the precinct is not specified, the guesthouse would have made the perfect venue for bringing together the individuals necessary for authorising and witnessing this kind of deed. The guesthouse had all the facilities for receiving a large group of people, and had chambers

---

[298] R. H. Ellis, *Catalogue of Seals in the Public Record Office: Monastic Seals, 1* (London: H.M.S.O., 1986).

[299] SF 1473.

[300] David A. Hinton, *Gold and Gilt, Pots and Pins: Possessions and People in Medieval Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p. 241.

[301] West Yorkshire Archive Service, Bradford, MS SpSt/4/11/66/4. Calendar available to view online at: <http://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/rd/395a5cf9-eecd-4464-8977-318886f3d6c9> [accessed 21 February 2016].

[302] *CBK*, p. 130, no. 180.

[303] William Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum: History of the Abbies and Other Monasteries, Hospitals, Frieries, and Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, with Their Dependencies, in England and Wales*, ed. by John Caley, Henry Ellis, and Bulkeley Bandinel, rev. edn, 6 vols (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown and others, 1817), v, p. 542, no. 38 (dated 16 February 1398) and no. 39 (dated 2 March 1398). Nicholas of Yeadon is also named as affixing his seal ('[i]n cujus, etc., sigilla partium alternatim apponuntur') in Walter de Calverley's confirmation of Nicholas's land, dated 20 September 1398: Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, v, p. 540, no. 39.

[304] Dauvit Broun, 'The Presence of Witnesses and the Writing of Charters', in *The Reality behind Charter Diplomatic in Anglo-Norman Britain*, ed. by Dauvit Broun (Glasgow: University of Glasgow, 2011), pp. 235–90.

for private conversations as well as halls for public debate; it was removed from the cloister, so repeated gatherings of great numbers of people would not disturb the brethren in the same way as if the chapter house (for example) were used.[305] The guesthouse would also be a superior venue to the gatehouse, where a large gathering might cause congestion or confusion. The abbot's lodging would make a suitable venue, but there was also the risk that large numbers of people would cause a breach of enclosure.[306] It should be noted that of the nine individuals mentioned in the deed concerning Miles de la Haye's excommunication, which was transacted in the abbot's chamber at Kirkstall, six were Cistercian monks, four from Kirkstall itself; the remaining three people being Miles himself, John de la Haye (presumably a family member); only one person's connection is not made clear. Enclosure in that instance was not at risk. Besides charters, the guesthouse would make an excellent venue for accounting when people came to pay rents that fell due on set terms of the year, or for other miscellaneous payments to the community.

Activities in the Guesthouse: Conclusions

Discussions of activities of guests within the monastery are usually derived from documentary sources pieced together to form a composite account. However, the end result rests on the presupposed forms of activity that would be carried out there. Kirkstall's guesthouse encourages the view that it was as much a place of business as it was place of rest. The archbishop of York, who is known to have carried on with his daily administration of the archdiocese while at Kirkstall, was in all probability only one of many who used the guesthouse for work. At the same time, leisurely pursuits were not absent, and there are no grounds for seeing the guesthouse infused with the austerity of Cistercian observance. Rather, an atmosphere of easy relaxation alternating with periods of administrative activity is suggested.

---

[305] The chapter house would make a very suitable venue for high-profile councils involving secular individuals, for example the gathering of nobles who gave their homage to King Alexander II of Scotland in Melrose's chapter house in 1216: Emilia Jamroziak, 'Spaces of Lay-Religious Interaction in Cistercian Houses of Northern Europe', *Parergon*, 27 (2010), 37–58 (pp. 48–49). As well, the chapter house would make a suitable venue for testaments involving miraculous events, or for the granting of confraternity, and they were only sacrosanct when a meeting of the community was in progress. See Kerr, *Monastic Hospitality*, pp. 170–73.

[306] See chapter 3.2.

4.4

A CISTERCIAN WELCOME: CONCLUSIONS

It is a point of great importance that the guesthouse was arranged so as to be able to be a suitable environment to cater to both work and leisure, as it enabled the community to focus its efforts in hospitable provision in one well-maintained area of the precinct. The investment in the facilities of the guesthouse and the development of its layout, especially the re-routing of the main drain to ensure a fresh water supply and waste disposal, created a well-furnished area of the precinct able to live up to and even exceed the expectations of high-status visitors. To complement the high-quality accommodation, the community of Kirkstall provided their guests with food that they largely denied to themselves, highlighting both their dedication to meeting guests' expectations as well as their adherence to the precepts of Cistercian observance. Lastly, the guesthouse was flexible enough to be able to act as a venue for a variety of forms of activity, business or leisure. Kirkstall has little in the way of documentary evidence to illustrate the processes that the small finds suggest. However, an episode from the continuation of Thomas Burton's *Chronicle of Meaux Abbey* supplies the lack. In the following quotation, the ratification of Abbot Thomas's election is recounted:

> And thus was it done, that our said abbot and all the other people rebelling against him congregated in the high chamber of the guesthouse at the same time. And there were various arguments, points, disputes, controversies, dissensions, and discords between the aforementioned Lord Thomas the abbot and the convent of our monastery on the one hand, and the aforementioned Alan and Richard Esk on the other, under shadow of the protection of the said abbots who had by that time returned. Many things were raised and left unsettled in their usual confrontational manner for a considerable length of time. At last, upon each and all preceding points, controversies, and disputes that had to be finished and with due end terminated, the aforementioned Lord Thomas, our abbot, and each member of the convent, reached a compromise in the presence of the said venerable abbots of the monasteries of Roche and Garingdon, and of the discerning man Edmund Fitzwilliam, the aforementioned householder of the most serene and noble lord, the Lord Duke of Aumale, and his seneschal in Holderness. And they promised and asserted in common faith to serve

and obey his ordination, to the praise and consent of them all.[307]

The guesthouse was a place where lay and religious could come together and debate freely, as the regulations imposing silence did not apply, and an area suited to accommodating large groups of people, so that the kind of assembly described in the passage could comfortably fit within the same structure. This extract accords with every aspect of the archaeological record from Kirkstall, and demonstrates that the guesthouse was a perfect venue for conducting such meetings, and it is highly probable that such activity occurred at Kirkstall. It was the adaptability of this area of the precinct that allowed the community to deflect potentially disruptive or intrusive behaviour away from the claustral ranges and ensure that monastic observance did not suffer, even as they provided a warm welcome to guests.

---

[307] Thomas of Burton, *Chronica monasterii de Melsa: a fundatione usque ad Annum 1396, auctore Thoma de Burton, Abbate. Accedit continuatio ad annum 1406 a monacho quodam ipsius domus*, ed. by E. A. Bond, Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores, 43, 3 vols (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1866), III, p. 264: '[s]icque factum est, ut dictus abbas noster et omnes alii eidem rebellantes in altam cameram hospitii insimul convenirent, ac super diversis altercationibus, articulis, litigiis, controversiis, dissensionibus ac discordiis, inter praefatum dominum Thomam abbatem et conventum monasterii nostri praefatosque Alanum et Ricardum Esk; sub umbra protectionis dictorum abbatum tunc reversos, motis et pendentibus indecisis, habita aliquamdiu altercatione, tandem super omnibus et singulis articulis, controversiis et litigiis precedentibus, diffiniendis et sine debito terminandis, praefatus dominus Thomas abbas noster ac conventus, et eorum singuli, in dictos venerabiles patres de Rupe et de Geridona monasteriorum abbates, et discretum virum Edmundum Fitzwilliam praefatum domicellum serenissimi ac nobilissimi domini, domini ducis Albemarliae, in Holderness senescallum, compromiserunt, promittentes et fide media astringentes parere et obedire ordinationi, laudo [read 'laudi'] et arbitrio eorundem.' It should be noted that the number and arrangement of the clauses in the Latin are probably intentional, to convey the length and intricacy of the proceedings.

CONCLUSION

Hospitality in the context of monastic life is a topic that has received insufficient attention. For the most part, historical and archaeological studies treat hospitality as a peripheral phenomenon of monastic life, worthy of mention due to the presence in the *Rule of Benedict* of a chapter on the provision of hospitality, but not warranting in-depth discussion.[1] Shortage of easily accessible and utilisable evidence has in part caused this omission, but a deeper seated factor is the perception that providing hospitality, which entailed monastic communities engaging with wider society, would not reveal significant insight into the fundamental operation of the monastic enterprise. As a result, monastic hospitality has been denied the attention that such an intricate social practice deserves.

Accounts of monastic hospitality have been largely limited to gathering isolated documentary references arising from highly variable chronological and geographical contexts. The underlying rationale and processes that enabled hospitality to be provided remain poorly understood. However, hospitality was an embedded feature of Cistercian life, inextricably linked to a host of ideas and activities that formed a Cistercian monk's mental landscape and everyday world. This study has revealed some of the fundamental concepts, people, and environments of hospitality and unites them within a framework emphasising the successful maintenance of Cistercian observance throughout the later Middle Ages, from the twelfth to the sixteenth centuries.

Cistercian Hospitality at Kirkstall Abbey: A Multi-Disciplinary Investigation

This study has pursued this diversity enquiry by using a range of sources. Each source type provides evidence for a single element of Cistercian hospitality which, examined together, complement one another to provide a holistic understanding of its practice. The *Rule of Benedict*, the *Ecclesiastica Officia*, four and a half centuries of statutes from the General Chapter, and legislative codifications, have been used to define Cistercian hospitality protocol. Spiritual treatises and sermons have been used to assess the spirituality of Cistercian hospitality,

---

[1] With two notable exceptions: Julie Kerr, *Monastic Hospitality: The Benedictines in England, c. 1070–c. 1250*, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion, 32 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007); Rochelle L. Rowell, 'The Archaeology of Late Monastic Hospitality' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of York, 2000).

while chronicle references have provided examples for comparison with normative values. Assessment of the archaeology of British Cistercian abbeys, both the standing remains and topography, has located the Cistercians and their guests in a physical environment. Material culture from Kirkstall's guesthouse, a rare example of such an assemblage, has been placed in its historical and contemporary cultural contexts for the first time since its excavation in the 1980s. Dress accessories, structural fittings, and material culture relating to pastimes and the conduct of business have been used to assess the social identities and gender of guests, as well as their activity while using the guesthouse. These sources have been brought together to illuminate the guesthouse at Kirkstall and understand the role it played in the life of the community.

Kirkstall Abbey is the principal point of reference throughout, but this investigation is not simply a case study. To complement the exceptional, yet uneven, evidence from Kirkstall, further information has been drawn from Cistercian houses across Britain (and beyond), ranging from the twelfth to early sixteenth centuries. A broader perspective has allowed contextualisation of Kirkstall's exceptional archaeological assets, to the mutual benefit of understanding the processes underlying provision of hospitality by Cistercian communities, and viewing arrangements at Kirkstall against the wider trends manifesting in Cistercian abbeys. The result is a varied insight into the role, meaning, and practice of hospitality within Cistercian life.

Cistercian Hospitality at Kirkstall: Summary of Findings

The four chapters of this thesis have each focused on a constituent element of hospitality that can be studied as a distinct theme, but must be appreciated as forming an integral whole. These constituent elements are the host, the guest, the space within which both convene, and the welcome process extended by a host to the guest. The host is the Cistercian community itself as constituted by its monks. The community, led by its abbot, had authority and legitimacy to dictate terms of access to its space, the monastery, as delimited by the precinct boundaries and made up of the various areas within them, especially the buildings of the claustral complex. The guest was a variable factor and included the full range of people constituting medieval society, though each kind of guest was provided with a different welcome, according to the *Rule of Benedict*'s precept: 'proper honour must be shown to all'.[2] The welcome included all material and spiritual elements of hospitable provision, such as food, prayer, business, or

---

[2] *RB*, 53:2: 'congruus honor exhibeatur'.

burial; this, again, was highly variable. Each element has been considered as far as possible as it occurred at Kirkstall Abbey.

Cistercians as Hosts

Fundamental to understanding Cistercian hospitality is how Cistercians identified themselves as hosts. A distinction must be made between the protocol of hospitality as defined from normative texts such as the *Ecclesiastica Officia*, and the spirituality enthusing these observances as drawn from the writings of authorities such as Bernard of Clairvaux or Aelred of Rievaulx. The protocol of Cistercian hospitality is straightforward to define because of the desire (at least by the late twelfth century) to implement a single code of usages throughout the order. These usages are embodied in the *Ecclesiastica Officia*, which specified further the practical arrangements as laid down in the *Rule of Benedict*, but retained enough generality so that they could in theory be applied to any Cistercian house. The role of the abbot, the porter, and the monk-hosteller are each treated and their responsibilities defined, along with other officials whose duties touch on hospitable provision. The *Ecclesiastica Officia* laid down a system that limited any single individual's extent of action. The porter was charged with receiving guests at the gate, but when that guest was taken to prayer he left the porter's charge. Similarly, when guests entered the *hospitium*, the monk-hosteller was bound to provide for them and permitted to talk to them, but elsewhere they were not his concern. Not every monk was involved in providing hospitality, but the community as a whole saw that guests' needs were met. It was a system that capitalised on the nature of communal life and minimised disruption to the claustral routine.

While the *Ecclesiastica Officia* is explicit in its precepts, it contains no comment on the rationale underlying Cistercian hospitality. The view of hospitality contained within the *Ecclesiastica Officia* is mechanical, an effective and logical elaboration of the *Rule of Benedict*, but devoid of the warmth that the *Rule* places at its heart. The *Rule*'s very first precept from chapter 53 is a profound spiritual statement elevating hospitality into the spiritual sphere and binding it to the core of monastic life: '[a]ll guests who present themselves are to be welcomed as Christ'.[3] Christ's identity was imprinted on the stranger. The concept of Christ in the stranger meant that no matter the guest's worldly identity, they were bound to the community by the monastic pursuit for union with God. To receive a guest was to receive Christ into the monastery.

---

[3] *RB*, 53:1: '[o]mnes supervenientes hospites tamquam Christus suscipiantur'.

Cistercians rarely treated hospitality as a distinct topic in their writings, but their thoughts regarding hospitality can be inferred from their views on the nature and role of *caritas* in society, upon which Cistercian theological and spiritual writing laid great emphasis. By understanding hospitable provision as an outward expression of *caritas*, the reception of strangers became another opportunity to exercise the virtue of love necessary for recognising the presence of God in the world, and not merely an obligation laid down by the *Rule of Benedict*. Hospitality was not only compatible with the solitude sought by Cistercians, but even rendered it beneficial to furthering a monk's spiritual progress. As depicted in Cistercian spiritual texts of the twelfth century, the Cistercian abbey was a place cut off from wider society, wherein the pursuit of God could be most effectively pursued. The monastery was the *civitas Dei*, kept by God against the storms of the world. Guests received within the monastery became citizens of the *civitas Dei*, and, due to their identification with Christ, were accorded a welcome that paid homage to the divine identity imprinted upon them. Focus on *caritas* and the needs of one's fellow man obliged Cistercians to draw away from contemplation of God alone, and reoriented their gaze toward society. Within a Cistercian abbey, the provision of hospitality was an opportunity to exercise *caritas* on a personal level. With such a spiritual impulse driving it, the apparent paradox between the desire for solitude and the need to provide a charitable welcome ceases to be. *Caritas* lifted hospitality onto a spiritual plane where it became an activity that enabled union with God and furthered a Cistercian monk's own spiritual development.

Spaces of Hospitality

Providing hospitality could be beneficial for a monk, but it was not essential spiritual progress. As the analysis of the *Ecclesiastica Officia* demonstrates, the organisational principles of Cistercian life emphasised the brethren's solitude by providing clear definition to individual monk's responsibilities. The organisation of personnel meant that most monks had no duties relating to hospitality, and could pursue the *horarium* unhindered. The physical arrangements of the buildings supported separation. These arrangements were especially prevalent and clear in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. During this period, Cistercian precincts exhibited a clear division between outsiders, lay brothers, and monks in a tripartite division, with each centred on the guesthouse, western range, and eastern range of the cloister, respectively. During the late thirteenth and through the fourteenth century, the layout of Cistercian precincts changed, and the guesthouse lost its monopoly on being the guests' abode within

the precinct. Abbots constructed halls near their lodgings to create spaces rivalling the guest range in their potential for accommodating guests, although in a previously secluded area of the precinct. The changes did not necessarily mean that the choir monks' solitude had been breached by the ingress of seculars. It was rather that safeguard against disruption by guests was provided by the intervention of monastic officials, particularly the abbot, rather than being enforced through stone barriers. Structural arrangements shifted during the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries so that the abbot assumed ever greater responsibilities regarding the entertainment of guests, to the extent that they constructed major new edifices to fulfil their duties. In some cases, such as Abbot Chard of Forde immediately prior to the Dissolution, these new constructions dwarfed former lodgings and re-wrote the spatial schemes of preceding centuries. The abbot in discharging his duties acted as a shield for his community and ensured its solitude. The words that Bernard of Clairvaux said to his brothers in the twelfth century, '*I* shall go out to meet the guests', were acted out by abbots in later centuries, as they developed the infrastructure of their abbeys to unite their own and the guests' lodging, where before it had been separate.[4] The *Rule of Benedict's* precept that the abbot and community meet the guest gained in the fourteenth century and after a physical basis.

Kirkstall's guesthouse reflects the earlier rather than later period of this chronology. The twelfth century structures at Kirkstall are remarkable for both their rapid construction (about thirty years, between 1152 and 1182) and intact survival. These earlier buildings received light alterations in the fifteenth century and later, but there there was no overhaul of spatial organisation around the claustral complex. The layout of Kirkstall's structures provided an exceptionally clear example of the scheme of segregation, except the abbot's lodging in the southeast of the precinct, which dates from the early thirteenth century. This was not the signal change that it could have been, since in the later thirteenth century the guesthouse received substantial additions to its facilities, which indicates that it remained the primary guest accommodation within the precinct. In the fourteenth century the diffuse pattern of buildings capable of hospitable function detectable in other Cistercian abbeys is also found at Kirkstall, with the construction of a hall near the abbot's lodging, which Hope labelled somewhat optimistically as the 'visiting abbot's lodging' — an error arising from the imposed ideal of Cistercian architecture.[5]

---

[4] *Cant. Cant.* 1–35, III. 6. 24 (p. 17): '[e]go exibo ad hospites'. See chapter 1, p. 54.

[5] William Henry St John Hope and John Bilson, *Architectural Description of Kirkstall Abbey* (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1907), p. 40.

In the fifteenth century, the guesthouse continued to be upgraded, and more chambers equipped with fireplaces. The second of the two halls constructed in the guest range was converted into stables and a smithy, greatly reducing the number of guests able to be accommodated there, but where they were lodged, or even whether such provision was still needed in the fifteenth century, is difficult to tell. One of the few documentary references to the *hospitium* of Kirkstall Abbey comes from Archbishop Henry Bowet, who issued a writ of *praemunire* declaring his intent to claim hospitality at Kirkstall in 1408, with the appended note stating that he was pleased with the welcome that he received. Such an explicit reference reveals that Kirkstall's accommodation was fit enough for the most senior clergy in the realm, but it cannot be taken as representative and poses further questions. An archbishop would have been accompanied by a sizeable household, but it can only be surmised where at Kirkstall they were accommodated. The western range of the cloister would have by this time be vacated by the lay brethren and would have been suitable for the task, but this is speculation only. Although Abbot William Marshall (r. 1509–28) followed the example of his mother-house by augmenting the abbey church's tower, none of Kirkstall's abbots had made the leap that others had by constructing a hall to accommodate both abbot and guests by the time of the Dissolution. It is probable that there was neither the wealth nor need for it, and that augmentation and adaption of existing structures was deemed sufficient for the demands placed upon the house.

Guests of Kirkstall Abbey

The last two chapters of this thesis concentrated almost exclusively on Kirkstall, in order to understand what hospitality engendered for the community there. Determining who the guests were is marred by problems of evidence. The architecture of the guesthouse suggests that it was intended for use by secular elites, as it followed contemporary trends with domestic housing elsewhere in the country in terms of its layout and facilities, but it is more difficult to support this argument with the small finds. The small finds deposited in the guesthouse are a good indicator of the normal usage of the site, rather than documentary references that tend to mark exceptional occasions. Small finds, however, come with methodological problems and are difficult to associate with any particular social status. The objects are difficult to date, and could theoretically come from any point between the mid-thirteenth and early sixteenth centuries.

The forms of the items are unable to clarify the guests' status. Kirkstall's copper alloy

dress accessories would not have appeared incongruous adorning a man of status of the later medieval period, but links between the objects and figural art are not conclusive because the objects themselves are ubiquitous. The form of dress accessories reached across the manifold gradations of social status, and belt buckles (for example) worn by rich and poor might not have been so very different. While the potential that the Kirkstall objects represent high status guests is there, it requires corroboration. There are few firm indications of high-status guests, and it is only the presence of rare items such as a silver strap end that indicate the presence of the wealthiest tier of guests at the site of guesthouse. Despite being made of precious metal, the strap-end is of the plainest character and while contemporary culture associated such items with the nobility, there is no clue as to who owned the item. A few other items suggest guests of martial or genteel background, such as the horse pendants, but these may indicate individuals of middling rather than high status, in the service of others of higher station. The assemblage of dress accessories comprises of a number of common items with a few that point to a higher status. The composition of the assemblage reflects the hierarchy of the medieval household, which the guesthouse had been equipped to accommodate.

Although Kirkstall has little extant documentation dating from the fifteenth century, a chance survival of an indulgence granted by the abbot of Fountains to permit women to enter the abbey church, is a marked development on twelfth-century practice.[6] If women were within the precinct, the possibility is raised that female guests were residing in the guesthouse or making use of its facilities as well. The presence of women is difficult to detect. Most items excavated are effectively unisex, such as dress accessories, which were for the most part were worn by both men and women. Hair pins or the kind mass-produced for a large market are items that can be most securely associated with women, but these were not located in areas of the guest range used for entertaining elite guests, such as the main (eastern) hall, or the chambers north of it. Rather, the pins were found in the service areas or on the approach to the guesthouse, suggesting a servile status for the people who wore or used them. The question of whether women received hospitality from Kirkstall's community in the guesthouse must be answered in the negative for lack of clear evidence.

Consideration of the documentary evidence for Kirkstall confirms the presence of high-status guests at Kirkstall. The archbishops' records provide explicit references to the community providing hospitality to the highest tier of ecclesiastical guests, but they are very few. That archbishops were customarily entitled to only a single night's stay undoubtedly

---

[6] See chapter 3.3.

limited Kirkstall's attraction as accommodation. Beyond Kirkstall, the issue of the reception of ecclesiastical and religious guests in monasteries is important for understanding how religious communities maintained personal connections through transfer of personnel while still retaining a level of stability. Within the Cistercian Order, the network of hospitality that must have operated for abbots to attend the annual General Chapter and all its attendant practicalities and economic impact is a topic that would reveal much about the Order's appreciation of logistics, and how they maintained an advanced form of supra-national administration.

Of the patrons', the de Lacys and their heirs', presence at the abbey, little is known. It is probable that their activity on the realm's political stage precluded their close involvement with the monks. Not that this meant the patrons ignored them, as Henry III de Lacy's generous financial deal in 1287 century demonstrates. The agreement enabled the community to recover from crippling debt by 1301.[7] The bulk of information on outsiders at Kirkstall comes from charters, particularly those from the late thirteenth century onwards, when dating-clauses and witness-lists were consistently included in the diplomatic. The people named in charters given at Kirkstall Abbey are of gentry status, landholders within the area of Leeds and its surrounding settlements. These individuals formed Kirkstall's immediate socio-political network and were the chief body from which it received benefactions, managed its tenure of land, and transacted its business.

The Cistercian Welcome

The guesthouse was an excellent venue for local landowners to convene and negotiate, both with the community and other local elites away from the monastic brethren. The furnishings as they have survived indicate a decorative scheme associated with higher status domestic dwellings, such as the lead *estoilles* to decorate plastered walls. The provision of water was conscientiously maintained and improved throughout the centuries, with the provision of garderobes in the thirteenth century being an impressive benefit for guests, although the impression these would have made would have lessened in later centuries as domestic hydraulic facilities became more commonplace. While the exact food served to guests is not known, the provision of meat to guests was on a par with wealthy institutions elsewhere, and would have befitted the status of the local elites who dined there. The provision of meat was the cause of dispute within the Cistercian Order from the early thirteenth century onward, but

---

[7] 'Foundation of Kirkstall', pp. 194–98,

allowances were made in the case of hospitality and it was in this light that Kirkstall's animal bone assemblages should be viewed. Evidence for the guests' social activities is light, but there are indications of music and leisure activities being pursued. A well evidenced category of finds relates to writing and literacy. Styli used with wax tablets, lead to mark up parchment, and signet rings all point toward the conduct of business in the guesthouse. It is probable that the guesthouse was the venue for the community to treat with local elites at busy times of the year, such as Pentecost and Michaelmas, when rents fell due or leases required re-negotiation.

Kirkstall's Guesthouse as Exemplar

Kirkstall's guesthouse embodied the attitudes of the Cistercian Order towards hospitality in is position within the precinct and its internal arrangements. The community made full use of the facilities to entertain guests to accommodate them in comfort in a manner upholding the charity of the *Rule of Benedict*. In a letter to the community sent from Dover, the new abbot of Kirkstall, John of Birdsall (r. 1304–c. 1314) expressed great resolution in the face of the hazards that pursuing his abbatial duties entailed. He stated: '[k]now however for certain that if we do return, whosoever shall have been most humble in your common life, most active in work up to our return, he […] shall also be dearer to us and more beloved at all times'.[8] An abbot's concern for his community's health is an expected sentiment. But later in the letter, toward its end, Abbot John chose to commend himself to those whom he felt a special friendship: 'Greet our dearest friends William of Finchedon, John of Pudsey, Richard of Goldesborough, Adam of Hopton, William Lewenthorp, and our dearest friend William de Frank, and let some one expound this letter to him in our behalf'.[9]

These individuals, as far as is known, were laymen, not fellow religious. Little, unfortunately, is known of William Frank himself, but the Frank family remained involved with the community and were frequent testators in the fourteenth century.[10] More interesting is Richard of Goldesborough. He was a knight, and is found witnessing a deed given at Kirkstall in 1312, whereby Abbot John made a lease of land.[11] In many ways this simple transaction exemplifies the nature of hospitality as provided in the guesthouse at Kirkstall during the later Middle Ages. The abbot maintained personal and even affective relationships

---

[8] 'Foundation of Kirkstall', p. 207: 'Scitote vero pro certo quod si redierimus quiscunque fuerit humilior in conuersando, Solicicior in agendis vsque reditum nostrum graciam et mercedem ampliorem a deo percipiens etiam nobis erit carior et affectuosior omni hora'; translation as provided there.

[9] 'Foundation of Kirkstall', p. 208.

[10] See for example CBK, p. 310, no. 399 (dated to 1343); *PKAA*, p. 95, no 42, (dated to 1370) witnessed by a William Frank of a younger generation, and numerous deeds in the 1390s in *PKAA*, pp, 96–106.

[11] *Yorkshire Deeds*, III, p. 70, no. 211.

with the abbey's social network. Guests of the abbey would come for business, but friendship and leisure formed part of their experience of hospitality as well. The guesthouse enabled Kirkstall's community to maintain constructive interactions with secular society, and to take part in the activity of wider society, while not compromising their observance.

Cistercian Hospitality: Further Investigations

Where monastic hospitality has been treated by scholars, there has been little attempt to locate hospitality within the spirituality which gave rise to the monks' observance. The protocol of the monastic hospitality is well understood and easy to define because of the customaries that governed the vast majority of monastic activity. But why one set of customs emerged in the form that it did, or how a particular community's or order's observance determined the form of their usages, are not straightforward questions to answer. In some respects, the hospitality as provided by Cistercians is easier to define because of the widespread usage of the *Ecclesiastica Officia*. But demonstrating how this text embodies the Cistercians' fervent spirituality is no easy task. A required step is to understand in more depth and through a broader chronological and geographical spread of evidence, how the Cistercians approached interpersonal relationships with outsiders in terms of the individual and the community as a whole.

The usages of a monastic community – not only Cistercians, but Benedictines, Augustinians, Carthusians, Premonstratensians, and the rest – need synthesis with the writings and treatises produced by those order. In particular, references to hospitality in narrative sources need thorough contextualisation to prevent distortions of monastic practice. Some of the more well-known Cistercian writings have many more details regarding hospitality than is possible to uncover within the scope of this study. In particular, there is much more on receiving outsiders that could be gleaned from sermons and personal letters, of which there is an abundance. Sermons especially would make an excellent avenue of future research, not least because of their role in demonstrating how the high ideals of Cistercian spirituality can be put into practice on a day-to-day basis. Certainly, a fuller exploration of how the *Rule of Benedict* was interpreted by medieval Cistercians is needed, not least to place their account of the conduct imposed by the *Rule* in the continuum of Christian thought beginning in the early Church. That there is only a single known commentary on the *Rule* from the first two centuries of Cistercian history is a barrier, but there are many tacit references to the *Rule* in Cistercian literature that would form a corpus for viable study. The forthcoming edition of

the Pontigny commentary would surely spearhead such research.[12]

A further area that would help root hospitality in the monastic life outside the Cistercian Order would be a focused study of the theology of 'Christ in the stranger'. The idea is fundamental to hospitality in the *Rule of Benedict*, and so concerns a vast swathe of religious communities the length and breadth of Europe, from the sixth century to the present day. Such research would greatly add to understanding of hospitality as a spiritual as well as a practical activity. In the same vein such research would help to break down the common but overly simplified distinction made in modern scholarship between the active and contemplative life, and how the role and impact of each was appreciated in the medieval period. A more nuanced understanding would greatly benefit discussion of the 'social utility' of religious houses, particularly in the later Middle Ages, the period in which they have been looked upon with a somewhat dimmer light than the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It could be argued, for example that contemplative life incorporated apparently 'external', charitable actions such as hospitality, but with the primary aim of permitting the agent to enact a ritualised imitation of religious and spiritual role models such as Christ and the Apostles.

This study has laid the foundations for understanding Cistercian guest accommodation and how it interacted with other elements within the precinct. But there have been many questions raised which the evidence considered cannot presently answer. It is not known, for example, what the size of a visiting household typically was, and the amount of space that it would have required. It cannot be known from the structural evidence alone whether a single household was accommodated within a guest house such Kirkstall's, or whether there would be combinations of different parties of guests inhabiting the same quarters simultaneously. The accommodation of corrodians is another unknown factor. Long term inhabitants of abbey space, but not part of the monastic community, corrodians make determining the exact function of a space problematic. First floor halls were ideal for receiving guests, but they also often formed residences for individuals such as monastic officials or corrodians, who did not perform a public role as such. Another aspect of the use of space requiring clarification in further research is how certain buildings were used after the lay brethren had ceased to be make up a significant portion of the community. Was the western range given over to guest accommodation, and did Cistercian precincts more closely resemble their Benedictine counterparts? A final topic that would greatly benefit from analysis of structural remains and

---

[12] See chapter 1.1.

topography is charitable and spiritual provision from the monastic precinct. References are made to supporting the wider community by distributing alms or providing spiritual services in buildings such as gatehouses or chapels, but the way these were used and experienced is not well understood. Analysis of provision of charitable and spiritual hospitality would not only enrich our knowledge of themes such as the opening of Cistercians precincts to pilgrims and increasing numbers of lay worshippers, but also reveal how monastic communities interacted on a personal level with the largest portion of their guests, albeit that they may not have been granted access past the gatehouse.

Kirkstall's guesthouse is exceptional for the extent and variety of its small finds assemblage, and it cannot be assumed that it will be replicated elsewhere. More insights into guest identity and the guesthouse's interior furnishings would be gained by setting Kirkstall guesthouse's finds assemblage within wider trends in late-medieval British archaeological data, but this would be difficult to achieve until more discursive inter-site syntheses have been produced. More inter-disciplinary investigation using figural and pictorial art to place objects like dress accessories in their context of use will help establish connections between certain kinds or forms of artefact and the social status and gender of their owner. Further studies of this kind would also untangle methodological problems currently associated with using artistic representations to contextualise archaeological data. Another possibility of revealing the nature of hospitality is conducting a material cultural analysis of the social significance of the contrast in dress of guest and host. Cordelia Warr has conducted important research into how the clothing of the religious gave it social meaning. Warr's ideas could be extended by placing them in a hospitality context, juxtaposing lay and religious to consider how contrast in appearance derived from and allowed negotiation of social status, vocation, and hierarchy.[13] This would be especially interesting given the recent interest in the apparent secularisation of late-medieval abbots and theme of "abbatialisation" highlighted in this study in chapter two.[14]

A topic requiring further work more focused on Kirkstall is prosopographical study of documentary evidence relating to the abbey. Lack of documentation for the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries is Kirkstall's greatest historical weakness at present. A fuller exploration, collection, compilation, and analysis of Kirkstall's original deeds would permit

---

[13] Cordelia Warr, *Dressing for Heaven: Religious Clothing in Italy, 1215–1545* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010).

[14] See the studies in *The Prelate in England and Europe, c. 1300–c. 1560*, ed. by Martin Heale (Woodbridge: York Medieval, 2014).

a prosopographical analysis of the community's social networks and how they changed over time. Individuals who maintained particularly close connections to the community would be highlighted, and many deeds uncovered that would place known affiliates of the monks together, possibly even at the abbey itself. Pursuing further documentary research would at the very least allow some reconstruction of Kirkstall's socio-political history for the long fifteenth century and bring to light a number of personal identities active in the area, which would have relevance for the history of Leeds more widely.

While able to place individuals within the precinct, charters do not state where in the precinct these individuals convened. The one deed to state a building, that of Miles de la Haye from 1336, is exceptional for a number of reasons and cannot be called representative.[15] Given the numbers of secular individuals involved, their status, and the purpose of their visit, there are few suitable places within the precinct that could comfortably accommodate such gatherings. Alongside benefactor(s) and recipient(s), there were usually around six named witnesses of similar social standing. There would have been various unnamed parties as well, including any attendants these guests may have had. The group would quickly exceed a dozen or individuals, who would be involved in open discussion. Such activity was not conducive to claustral observance.

Cistercian Hospitality as Means of Cultural Transfer

Cistercian hospitality has relevance far beyond understanding monastic history alone. Hospitality is an act of social interaction and cultural transfer, which requires substantiation in many fields of study to be rooted in its socio-cultural and historical contexts. By taking the core principles of hospitality and using them as a framework for historical investigation, a holistic understanding of the medieval world is approached. Principles derived from anthropological and philosophical enquiry underlie and frame the evidence commonly used in historical and archaeological disciplines.

Study of hospitality ranges from practical to highly conceptual levels, from a personal to a societal scale, and from a synchronic understanding of a historical culture at a given point in time, to a diachronic appreciation of a culture in temporal flux. Hospitality considers the physicalities of life: the movements of the individual people involved, the words said, the objects handled and use, the manner in which they are dressed. Hospitality demands that these incidentals are set in the wider context of the life led by each party to give them meaning:

---

[15] *CBK*, p. 4, no. 5.

the social, religious, or political culture to which they belong, the economic structures of which they are part and which help determine what physical resources are available to them, or a code of life such as the *Rule of Benedict* which informed every aspect of the Cistercian enterprise. On a level yet higher, the mode by which hospitality was enacted can be set in its chronological continuum to see how the upholding of a tradition affected the manner of cultural exchange. The Cistercians always upheld the *Rule of Benedict*, but interpretations of the *Rule*, and the sociocultural values of wider society which informed these interpretations, and even passed judgment on them, changed through the centuries. Hospitality thereby provides an opportunity to see how the interaction between monastic and secular culture on a personal level was navigated in the context of changing social and cultural attitudes, and more broadly how the monastic enterprise changed while remaining dedicated to its central values.

Cistercian hospitality is an ideal entry point for further exploration of the medieval world, but the lessons the subject contains are not limited to a medieval context. In composing his description of Clairvaux, William of St Thierry left not simply an account of a single monk's appreciation of a few people attempting a new form of monastic life. William's words reflect the passage of an individual from one world to another, in which encountering a new form of life first-hand, seeing it lived out before his eyes, registered such an effect that he later decided to join that way of life. Hospitality was a key factor in his eventual conversion to the Cistercian Order. William was already a monk, and attuned to the spiritual currents of the time, but it was the physical proximity with the new community at Clairvaux that made the most lasting impression.

The implications for understanding the nature of how people of different cultures – religious political, or social – interacted are very broad. Hospitality permits study of how cultures, values, beliefs, and traditions can be transmitted through exchange with an 'outsider' on a personal, institutional, or even societal level. For example, the spread of Christianity in the late antique period was furthered by the hospitality granted to travelling preachers. In the modern era, an understanding of different religious and faith groups is promoted by visiting their sites of worship and sanctity, a mode of learning enabled by provision of hospitality. The willing provision of hospitality is essential if guests are to feel comfortable outside their accustomed habitude, and if the hosts are to maintain dialogue with society. Cistercian hospitality was the means by which outsiders were able to experience a form of life palpably different to their own, while the monks in providing a welcome participated in wider society

and performed actions beneficial to their spiritual progress. Hospitality was an opportunity for an encounter that, with careful management, worked to the benefit of all.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Aelred of Rievaulx, 'De speculo caritatis', in *Aelredi Rievallensis opera omnia*, ed. by A. Hoste and C. H. Talbot, Corpus christanorum continuatio mediaevalis, 1 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1971)

Addy, Sidney Oldall, ed., *Cartae XVI ad abbatiam Rupensem spectantes, hactenus ineditae; XVI Charters of Roche Abbey* (Sheffield: Leader, 1878)

Ashcroft, M. Y., and E. A. Jones, eds, *Monastic Charters and Other Documents Relating to Medieval Piety in the North Yorkshire County Record Office*, 2 vols (Northallerton: North Yorkshire County Council, 2009)

Ashmore, Owen, ed., 'The Whalley Abbey Bursars' Account for 1520', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire & Cheshire*, 114 (1963), 49–72

Astle, Thomas, Samuel Ayscough, and John Caley, eds, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica Angliae et Walliae, Auctoritate P. Nicholai IV, circa A.D. 1291* (London: G. Eyre and A. Strahan, 1802)

Austin, T., ed., *Two Fifteenth-Century Cookbooks*, Early English Text Society, Orig. Ser., 42 (London: Early English Text Society, 1888)

Bernard of Clairvaux, *Apologia ad Guillelmum Santi-Theoderici abbatem*, 19. in PL, 182, cols 0909D–0910A

——, 'Sermones in Cantica Canticorum', in *PL*, CLXXXIII, Cols 0785A – 1198A

——, 'Sermones in nativitate domini', in *PL*, CLXXXIII, Cols 0115B – 0130B

——, 'Sermones in purificatione Beatae Mariae', in *PL*, CLXXXIII, Cols 0365C – 0372A

——, *The Book of Saint Bernard on the Love of God*, trans. by Edmund G. Gardner (London: J. M. Dent, 1916)

Boorde, Andrew, 'A Compendyous Regyment, Or, A Dyetary of Helth Made in Mountpyllier', in *The Fyrst Boke of the Introduction of Knowledge Made by Andrew Borde, of Physycke Doctor / A Compendyous Regyment; Or, A Dyetary of Helth Made in Mountpyllier / Berdes: A Treatyse Made, Answerynge the Treatyse of Doctor Borde upon Berdes,* ed. by Frederick James Furnivall (London: Early English Text Society, 1870), pp. 223–304

Brown, William, ed., *The Register of Thomas of Corbridge, Lord Archbishop of York, 1300–1304*, Publications of the Surtees Society, 138, 2 vols (Durham: Andrews and Co., 1925)

Brown, William, Charles Travis Clay, and M. J. Stanley Price, eds, *Yorkshire Deeds*, Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Record Series, 39, 50, 63, 65, 69, 76, 83, 102, 111, 120, 10 vols (Leeds: Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 1909)

Brown, William, and A. Hamilton Thompson, eds, *The Register of William Greenfield, Lord Archbishop of York, 1306–1315*, Publications of the Surtees Society, 145, 149, 151–53, 5 vols (Durham: Surtees Society, 1931)

Brownbill, John, ed., *The Ledger-Book of Vale Royal Abbey*, Publications of the Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, 68 (Edinburgh: Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, 1914)

Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers, Relating Great Britain and Ireland, ed. by W. H. Bliss and J. A. Twemlow, 5 vols (London: H.M.S.O, 1893–1904)

Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office (London: H.M.S.O., 1891–)

Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum*, ed. by Joseph Strange, 2 vols (Cologne: J.M. Heberle, 1851)

———, *Dialogus miraculorum / Dialog über die Wunder*, Fontes Christiani, 86, 5 vols (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009)

———, *The Dialogue on Miracles*, trans. by H. von E. Scott and G. C. Swinton Bland (London: G. Routledge and Sons, 1929)

Canivez, J. M., *Statuta capitulorum generalium ordinis Cisterciensis ab anno 1116 ad annum 1786*, 8 vols (Louvain: Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique, 1933)

Cawley, Martinus, ed., *The Ancient Usages of the Cistercian Order (Ecclesiastica Officia)*, trans. by Martinus Cawley (Lafayette, OR: Guadelupe, 1998)

Choisselet, Danièle, and Placide Vernet, eds, *Les Ecclesiastica officia cisterciens du XIIème siècle: texte latin selon les manuscrits édités de Trente 1711, Ljubljana 31 et Dijon 114: version française, annexe liturgique, notes, index et tables*, La documentation cistercienne, 22 (Reiningue: Documentation cistercienne, 1989)

The Chronicle of Melrose: From the Cottonian manuscript, Faustina B. IX in the British Museum: A Complete and Full-Size Facsimile in Collotype, Studies in Economics and Political Science, 100 (London: Percy Lund Humphries, 1936)

Clay, Charles Travis, ed., *Early Yorkshire Charters, Vol. 7: The Honour of Skipton — Based on the Manuscripts of the Late William Farrer*, Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Record Series, Extra Series, 5 (Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 1947)

Cocquelines, Charles, Francesco Gaude, Luigi Tomassetti, and Luigi Bilio, eds, *Bullarium Romanum: Bullarum diplomatum et privilegiorum sanctorum romanorum pontificum Taurinensis editio locupletior facta collectione novissima plurium brevium, epistolarum, decretorum actorumque S. Sedis a S. Leone Magnus usque ad praesens* (Turin: Seb. Franco, Henrico Fory and Henrico Dalmazzo, 1859), IV

Conrad of Eberbach, *Exordium magnum Cisterciense, sive narratio de initio Cisterciensis ordinis*, ed. by Bruno Griesser (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1961)

Craigie, Peter C., *Psalms, 1–50*, Word Biblical Commentary, 19 (Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1983)

Crawley-Boevey, A. W., *The Cartulary and Historical Notes of the Cistercian Abbey of Flaxley, Otherwise Called Dene Abbey, in the County of Gloucestershire* (Exeter: William Pollard, 1887)

Dugdale, William, *Monasticon Anglicanum: History of the Abbies and other Monasteries, Hospitals, Frieries, and Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, with their Dependencies, in England and Wales*, ed. by John Caley, Henry Ellis, and Bulkeley Bandinel, rev. edn, 6 vols (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown et al., 1817)

Fry, Timothy, ed., *RB 1980: The Rule of St Benedict in Latin and English with Notes* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1981)

Gerald of Wales, *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*, ed. by J. S. Brewer, 8 vols (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1863)

Given-Wilson, C., and others, eds, *The Parliament Rolls of Medieval England*, (Woodbridge, Boydell: 2005–)

Guerric of Igny, *Sermons*, ed. by John Morson and Hilary Costello, trans. by Placide Deseille, Sources chrétiennes, 166, 202, 2 vols (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1970)

Helinand of Froidmont, 'Sermones', in *PL*, CCXII, Cols 0481C – 0720C

Hildegard of Bingen, *Explanation of the Rule of Benedict*, trans. by Hugh Feiss (Toronto: Peregrina, 1998)

Hockey, S. F., ed., *The Account-Book of Beaulieu Abbey*, Camden Society, 4th Ser., 16 (London: Royal Historical Society, 1975)

Hugh of Kirkstall, 'The Foundation of Kirkstall Abbey', in *Miscellanea, 2*, trans. by E. Kitson Clarke, Publications of the Thoresby Society, 4 (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1895), pp. 169–208

Idung of Prüfening, *Cistercians and Cluniacs: The Case for Cîteaux*, trans. by Joseph Leahey, Jeremiah Francis O'Sullivan, and Grace Perrigo (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1977)

Jocelin of Brakelond, *The Chronicle of Jocelin of Brakelond Concerning the Acts of Samson, Abbot of the Monastery of St. Edmund*, trans. by H. E. Butler (London: T. Nelson, 1949)

Jocelin of Furness, 'Vita S. Waltheni Abbatis', in *Acta Sanctorum Augusti, Vol. 1: 1-4 August*, ed. by J. Carnandet (Paris: Victor Palme, 1867), p. 249D – 78E

John of Salisbury, *Ioannis Saresberiensis Policraticus*, Corpus Christianorum, 118 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1993)

Kitson Clarke, E., ed. by F. R. Kitson, eds, 'Charters Relating to the Possessions of Kirkstall Abbey in Allerton', in *Miscellanea, 2*, by, Publications of the Thoresby Society, 4 (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1895), pp. 42–59, 81–116

Lancaster, W. T., and W. Paley Baildon, eds, *The Coucher Book of the Cistercian Abbey of Kirkstall in the West Riding of the County of York*, Publications of the Thoresby Society, 8 (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1904)

Letters and papers, foreign and domestic, of the reign of Henry VIII, Preserved in the Public Record Office, the British Museum, and elsewhere in England, ed. by J. S. Brewer, J. Gairdner, and R. H. Brodie, 21 vols (London: Longman, 1862–1910)

Luard, Henry Richards, ed., *Annales Monastici*, Rolls Series, 36, 5 vols (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1864)

Matarasso, Pauline M., ed., *The Cistercian World: Monastic Writings of the Twelfth Century*, trans. by Pauline M. Matarasso (London: Penguin, 1993)

Philip of Byland, *The Foundation History of the Abbeys of Byland and Jervaulx*, ed. and trans. by Janet Burton, Borthwick Texts and Studies, 35 (York: Borthwick Institute, 2006)

Ralph of Coggeshall, *Chronicon Anglicanum*, ed. by J. Stevenson, Rolls Series, 66 (London: Longman, 1875)

Riley, H. T., ed., *Memorials of London and London Life in the XIIIth, XIVth and XVth Centuries, Being a Series of Extracts, Local, Social, and Political, from the Early Archives of the City of London, A.D. 1276–1459* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1868)

Smaragdus, *Smaragdi abbatis expositio in regulam S. Benedicti*, ed. by Alfred Spannagel and Pius Engelbert, Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum, 8 (Siegburg: Franciscum Schmitt, 1974)

Stansfeld, John, ed., 'A Rent-Roll of Kirkstall Abbey', *Publications of the Thoresby Society*, 2 (1891), 1–21

Stenton, F. M., *Transcripts of Charters Relating to the Gilbertine Houses of Sixle, Ormsby, Catley, Bullington, and Alvingham* (Lincoln: Lincoln Record Society, 1922)

Stevenson, Joseph, ed., *Chronicon de Lanercost, 1201–1346: E codice Cottoniano nunc primum typis mandatum*, Maitland Club, 46 (Edinburgh: Maitland Club, 1839)

Theophilus, *De Diveris Artibus / The Various Arts*, ed. by C. R. Dodwell (London: T. Nelson, 1961)

Thomas of Burton, *Chronica monasterii de Melsa: A fundatione usque ad annum 1396, auctore Thoma de Burton, abbate. Accedit continuatio ad annum 1406 a monacho quodam ipsius domus*, ed. by E. A. Bond, Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores, 43; Rolls Series, 3 vols (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1866)

Thomas Walsingham, *Gesta abbatum monasterii Sancti Albani a Thomas Walsingham, regnate Ricardo Secundo, ejusdem ecclesiae prae centore, compilata*, ed. by H. T. Riley, Rolls Series, 4, 3 vols (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1867)

Thompson, A. H., ed., 'Documents Relating to Diocesan and Provincial Visitations from the Registers of Henry Bowet, Lord Archbishop of York, 1407–23, and John Kempe, Lord Archbishop of York, 1425–52', in *Miscellanea, 2*, Publications of the Surtees Society, 127 (Durham: Surtees Society, 1916), pp. 131–302

Thompson, E. M., *The Customary of St Augustine's, Canterbury, and St Peter's, Westminster*, Henry Bradshaw Society, 2 vols (London: Henry Bradshaw Society, 1902)

Thoresby, Ralph, 'A Catalogue and Description of the Natural and Artificial Rarities in This Museum', in *Ducatus Leodiensis: Or, the Topography of the Ancient and Populous Town and Parish of Leedes, and Parts Adjacent, in the West-Riding of the County of York, with the Pedigrees of Many of the Nobility and Gentry, and Other Matters Relating to Those Parts; Extracted from Records, Original Evidences, and Manuscripts*, ed. by Thomas Dunham Whitaker, 2nd edn (Leeds: Robinson Son and Holdsworth, 1816)

de Vogüé, A., and J. Neufville, eds, *La Règle de Saint Benoît*, Source Chrétienne, 181; Série Des Textes Monastiques d'Occident, 49, 7 vols (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1972)

Waddell, Chrysogonus, ed., *Cistercian Lay Brothers: Twelfth-Century Usages with Related Texts. Latin Text with Concordance of Latin Terms, English Translations and Notes*, Citeaux: Commentarii Cistercienses, Studia et Documenta, 10 (Brecht: Citeaux: Commentarii Cistercienses, 2000)

———, ed., *Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Cîteaux*, Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses, Studia et Documenta, 9 (Brecht: Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses, 1999)

———, ed., 'The Instituta Generalis Capituli apud Cistercium', in *Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Cîteaux*, Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses, Studia et Documenta, 9 (Brecht: Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses, 1999), pp. 453–97

———, ed., *Twelfth-Century Statutes from the Cistercian General Chapter*, Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses, Studia et Documenta, 12 (Brecht: Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses, 2002)

Walbran, J. R., ed., '*Narratio de Fundatione Fontanis Monasterii in Comitatu Eboracensi*', in *Memorials of the Abbey of St Mary of Fountains*, Publications of the Surtees Society, 42 (Durham: Surtees Society, 1863), pp. 1–129

Walbran, J. R., J. Raine, and J. T. Fowler, eds, *Memorials of the Abbey of St Mary of Fountains*, Publications of the Surtees Society, 42, 67, 130, 3 vols (Durham: Surtees Society, 1863)

Walter Daniel, *The Life of Aelred of Rievaulx*, trans. by F. M. Powicke (London: Nelson, 1950)

Webb, Geoffrey, and Adrian Walker, trans., *St Bernard of Clairvaux: The Story of His Life as Recording the Vita Prima Bernardi by Certain of His Contemporaries, William of St Thierry, Arnold of Bonnevaux, Geoffrey and Philip of Clairvaux, and Odo of Deuil* (London: A. R. Mowbray, 1960)

Woolgar, C. M., *Household Accounts from Medieval England*, Records of Social and Economic History, 17–18, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1992)

SECONDARY SOURCES

Printed Secondary Sources

Adamson, Melitta Weiss, *Food in Medieval Times* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2004)

Ajmar-Wollheim, Marta, and Flora Dennis, eds, *At Home in Renaissance Italy* (London: V & A, 2006)

Ajmar-Wollheim, Marta, Flora Dennis, and Ann Matchette, eds, *Approaching the Italian Renaissance Interior: Sources, Methodologies, Debates* (Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell, 2007)

Alexander, J. Y., and P. Binski, eds., *Age of Chivalry: Art in Plantagenet England* (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1987)

Alcock, N. W., *People at Home: Living in a Warwickshire Village, 1500–1800* (Chichester: Phillimore, 1993)

Allan, John, 'Cleeve Abbey: The Pottery', *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History*, 142 (1999), 41–75

Andrews, D. D., and G. Milne, eds, *Wharram: A Study of Settlement on the Yorkshire Wolds*, Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph Series, 8 (London: Society for Medieval Archaeology, 1979)

An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Dorset, Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments and Constructions of England, 5 vols (London: H.M.S.O., 1952)

An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Essex, Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of England, 4 vols (London: H.M.S.O., 1916)

[Anon.], *A History of Kirkstall Abbey* (Leeds: s.n., 1797)

[Anon.], *Kirkstall Abbey: An Interim Summary of the Excavations* (West Yorkshire Archaeological Service, 1980)

———, *The Excavation of the Guest House at Kirkstall Abbey: Interim Summary Report* (West Yorkshire Archaeological Service, 1979)

———, *History of Kirkstall Abbey, Yorkshire, Antiquarian and Picturesque, with Engravings from Original Drawings by W. Mulready* (Leeds: H. Washbourne, 1847)

Archibald, M., 'English Medieval Coins as Dating Evidence', in *Coins and the Archaeologist*, ed. by Patrick John Casey and Richard Reece, 2nd edn (London: Seaby, 1988), pp. 264–301

Austin, David, 'Private and Public: An Archaeological Consideration of Things', in *Die Vielfalt Der Dinge: Neue Wege Zur Analyse Mittelalterlicher Sachkultur. Internationaler Kongreß Krems an Der Donau 4. Bis 7. Oktober 1994*, ed. by Helmut Hundsbichler, Gerhard Jaritz, and Thomas Kühtreiber, Forschungen Des Instituts Für Realienkunde Des Mittelalters Und Der Frühen Neu-zeit, 3 (Wien: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1998), pp. 163–206

Aynsley, Jeremy, and Charlotte Grant, eds, *Imagined Interiors: Representing the Domestic Interior since the Renaissance* (London: V & A, 2006)

Ayres, James, *Domestic Interiors: The British Tradition, 1500–1850* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003)

Barber, Malcolm, *The Trial of the Templars*, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)

Barnes, Guy D., 'Kirkstall Abbey, 1147–1539: An Historical Study', *Publications of the Thoresby Society*, 58 (1984)

Bartlett, Robert, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization and Cultural Change, 950–1350* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1994)

Bean, J. M. W., 'Plague, Population and Economic Decline in England in the Later Middle Ages', *Economic History Review*, 15 (1962), 423–37

Bearman, F., N. Krivatsy, and J. Mowery, *Fine and Historic Book Bindings from the Folger Shakespeare Library* (Washington, D.C.: Folger Library, 1992)

Beaumont, F. G., 'The Remains of Coggeshall Abbey', *Transactions of the Essex Archaeological Society*, new ser., 15 (1921), 60–76

Bellamy, C. V., C. M. Mitchell, and Elizabeth Pirie, 'Kirkstall Abbey Excavations, 1960–1964', *Publications of the Thoresby Society*, 51 (1965), 1–66

Bell, David N., 'Chambers, Cells, and Cubicles: The Cistercian General Chapter and the Development of the Private Room', in *Perspectives for an Architecture of Solitude: Essays on Cistercians, Art and Architecture in Honour of Peter Fergusson*, ed. by Terryl N. Kinder, Cîteaux: Studia et Documenta, 13; Medieval Church Studies, 11 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), pp. 187–98

———, 'The Siting and Size of Cistercian Infirmaries in England and Wales', in *Studies in Cistercian Art and Architecture, Vol. 5*, ed. by Meredith Parsons Lillich (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1998), pp. 211–37

Berger, Jutta Maria, *Die Geschichte der Gastfreundschaft im hochmittelalterlichen Mönchtum : die Cistercienser* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999)

Berman, Constance H., 'Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Cîteaux: A Response to Bouchard's Review (TMR 05.03.12)', *The Medieval Review*, 05.07.01 (2005)

———, *The Cistercian Evolution: The Invention of a Religious Order in Twelfth-Century Europe* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000)

Bertelsen, Reidar, 'Food in Northern Europe from the Thirteenth to the Sixteenth Century', in *The Archaeology of Medieval Europe: Twelfth to Sixteenth Centuries*, ed. by Martin Carver and Jan Klápště, 2 vols (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2011), ii, 126–32

Biddle, Martin, 'Dress and Hair Pins', in *Object and Economy in Medieval Winchester: Artefacts from Medieval Winchester*, by Martin Biddle, Winchester Studies, 7.ii (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 552–60

———, 'Writing Equipment', in *Object and Economy in Medieval Winchester: Artefacts from Medieval Winchester*, by David Brown, Martin Biddle, and others, Winchester Studies, 7.ii, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), i, 729–47

Biddle, Martin, and K. Barclay, 'Sewing Pins and Wire', in *Object and Economy in Medieval*

Winchester: Artefacts from Medieval Winchester, by Martin Biddle, Winchester Studies, 7.ii (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 560–71

Biddle, Martin, and Linden Elmhirst, 'Sewing Equipment', in *Object and Economy in Medieval Winchester: Artefacts from Medieval Winchester*, by Martin Biddle, Winchester Studies, 7.ii (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 804–17

Bijsterveld, Arnoud-Jan A., *Do Ut Des: Gift Giving, Memoria, and Conflict Management in the Medieval Low Countries* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2007)

Bilson, John, 'The Architecture of Kirkstall Abbey Church, with Some General Remarks on the Architecture of the Cistercians', in *Architectural Description of Kirkstall Abbey*, by William Henry St John Hope and John Bilson (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1907

Birkett, Helen, *The Saints' Lives of Jocelin of Furness: Hagiography, Patronage and Ecclesiastical Politics* (Woodbridge: York Medieval, 2010)

Birrel, J., 'Procuring, Preparing, and Serving Venison in Late Medieval England', in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition*, ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron, Medieval History and Archaeology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 176–90

Blair, John, and Claude Blair, 'Copper Alloys', in *English Medieval Industries: Craftsmen, Techniques, Products*, ed. by Nigel Ramsay and John Blair (London: Hambledon, 1991), pp. 81–106

Blinkhorn, P. W., and C. G. Cumberpatch, 'The Interpretation of Artefacts and the Tyranny of the Field Archaeologist', *Assemblage*, 4 (1998)

Bolchazy, Ladislaus J., *Hospitality in Early Rome: Livy's Concept of Its Humanizing Force* (Chicago: Ares, 1977)

Bolton, Jim, '"The World Upside down": Plague as an Agent of Economic and Social Chance', in *The Black Death in England*, ed. by W. M. Ormrod and P. G. Lindley (Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1996), pp. 17–78

Bond, C. J., 'Production and Consumption of Food and Drink in the Medieval Monastery', in *Monastic Archaeology*, ed. by M. Aston, G. Keevil, and T. Hall (Oxford: Oxbow, 2001), pp. 54–87

Bond, James, *Monastic Landscapes* (Stroud: Tempus, 2004)

———, 'Monastic Water Management in Great Britain: A Review', in *Monastic Archaeology: Papers on the Study of Medieval Monasteries*, ed. by Mick Aston, Graham D. Keevill, and Teresa Hall (Oxford: Oxbow, 2001), pp. 88–136

Bouchard, Constance, 'Waddell, Ed., Narrative and Legislative Texts', *The Medieval Review*, 7 (2005)

Bouchard, Constance Brittain, 'Cistercian Ideals versus Reality: 1134 Reconsidered', *Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses*, 39 (1988), 217–31

———, *Sword, Miter, and Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980–1198* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1987)

Brakspear, Harold, 'Forde Abbey', *Archaeological Journal*, 70 (1913), 498–99

———, 'Pipewell Abbey, Northamptonshire', *Associated Architectural Societies' Reports and Papers*, 30 (1909), 299–313

———, 'The Abbot's House at Battle', *Archaeologia*, 83 (1934)

———, 'The Architecture of Hayles Abbey', *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society*, 24 (1901), 126–35

———, 'The Cistercian Abbey of Stanley, Wiltshire', *Archaeologia*, 60 (1907), 493–516

———, *Tintern Abbey, Monmouthshire* (London: H.M.S.O., 1934)

———, *Waverley Abbey* (London: Surrey Archaeological Society, 1905)

Brakspear, Harold, and William Henry St John Hope, *Jervaulx Abbey* (London: Kell, 1905)

Bramble, J. R., 'The Abbey of Cleeve', *Proceedings of the Somersetshire Archaeological and Natural History Society*, 52 (1906), 46–51

Breitenstein, Mirko, 'Is There a Cistercian Love? Some Considerations on the Virtue of Charity', in *Aspects of Charity: Concern for One's Neighbour in Medieval Vita Religiosa*, ed. by Gert Melville, Vita Regularis, 45 (Berlin: Lit, 2011), pp. 55–98

Briggs, Asa, *Victorian Things* (London: Batsford, 1988)

Broun, Dauvit, 'The Presence of Witnesses and the Writing of Charters', in *The Reality behind Charter Diplomatic in Anglo-Norman Britain*, ed. by Dauvit Broun (Glasgow: University of Glasgow, 2011), pp. 235–90

Brown, Michelle P., 'The Role of the Wax Tablet in Medieval Literacy: A Reconsideration in Light of a Recent Find from York', *British Library Journal*, 20 (1994), 1–16

Brown, S. W., 'Excavations and Buildings Recording at Buckfast Abbey, Devon', *Proceedings of the Devon Archaeological Society*, 46 (1988), 13–89

Buchli, Victor, 'Introduction', in *The Material Culture Reader*, ed. by Victor Buchli (Oxford: Berg, 2002), pp. 1–22

Buckle, Edmund, 'The Buildings of Cleeve Abbey', *Proceedings of the Somersetshire Archaeological and Natural History Society*, 35 (1889), 83–120

Burton, Janet, *The Monastic Order in Yorkshire, 1069–1215* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

Burton, Janet, and Julie Kerr, *The Cistercians in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2011)

Butler, L. A. S., 'Valle Crucis Abbey: An Excavation in 1970', *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 125 (1976), 80–126

Butler, Lionel, and Chris Given-Wilson, *Medieval Monasteries of Great Britain* (London: Joseph, 1979)

Bynum, Caroline Walker, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988)

Caple, C., 'The Detection and Definition of an Industry: The English Medieval and Post-Medieval Pin Industry', *Archaeological Journal*, 148 (1991), 241–55

Carter, Michael, 'Abbot William Marshall (1509–28) and the Architectural Development of Kirkstall Abbey, Yorkshire, in the Late Middle Ages', *Journal of Medieval Monastic Studies*, 1 (2012), 115–42

———, 'Cistercian Abbots as Patrons of Art and Architecture: Northern England in the Late Middle Ages', in *The Prelate in England and Europe, c. 1300–c. 1560*, ed. by Martin Heale (Woodbridge: York Medieval, 2014), pp. 215–39

———, 'Remembrance, Liturgy and Status in a Late Medieval English Cistercian Abbey: The Mourning Vestment of Abbot Robert Thornton of Jervaulx (1510–33)', *Textile History*, 41 (2010), 145–60

———, 'The Tower of Abbot Marmaduke Huby of Fountains Abbey: Hubris or Piety?', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, 82 (2010), 269–85

Cassanelli, Roberto, *The Cistercian Arts: From the Twelfth to the Twenty-First Century*, ed. by Terryl N. Kinder and Roberto Cassanelli, McGill-Queen's Studies in the History of Religion, 2nd Ser., 71 (Ithaca, N.Y.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2015)

Cassidy-Welch, Megan, *Monastic Spaces and Their Meanings: Thirteenth-Century English Cistercian Monasteries* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2001)

Cavallar, Georg, *The Rights of Strangers: Theories of International Hospitality, the Global Community, and Political Justice since Vitoria* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002)

Charpy, Manuel, 'How Things Shape Us: Material Culture and Identity in the Industrial Age', in *Writing Material Culture History*, ed. by Anne Gerritsen and Giorgio Riello (London: Blooms-bury, 2015), pp. 199–221

Cheney, C. R., and Michael Jones, *Handbook of Dates for Students of English History*, rev. edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Clanchy, M. T., *From Memory to Written Record: England, 1066–1307*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993)

Clapham, Alfred, and A. R. Duffy, 'Forde Abbey', *Archaeological Journal*, 107 (1950), 119–20

Clark, John, ed., *The Medieval Horse and Its Equipment, c. 1150–c. 1450*, Medieval Finds from Excavations in London, 5 (London: H.M.S.O., 1995)

Clutterbuck, Robin, *Buckfast Abbey: A History* (Buckfast: Buckfast Abbey Trustees, 1994)

Coomans, Thomas, 'Cistercian Architecture of Architecture of the Cistercians?', in *The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*, by Mette Birkedal Bruun (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 151–69

Copeland, G. W., *Buckland Abbey: An Architectural Survey* (Plymouth: [s.n.], 1953)

———, 'Some Problems of Buckland Abbey', *Reports and Transactions of the Devonshire Association*, 85 (1953), 41–52

Coppack, Glyn, '"According to the Form of the Order": The Earliest Cistercian Buildings in England and Their Context', in *Perspectives for an Architecture of Solitude: Essays*

on Cistercians, Art and Architecture in Honour of Peter Fergusson, ed. by Terryl N. Kinder, Cîteaux: Studia et Documenta, 13; Medieval Church Studies, 11 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), pp. 35–45

———, *English Heritage Book of Abbeys and Priories* (London: Batsford, 1990)

———, *Fountains Abbey* (London: Batsford and English Heritage, 1993)

———, *Fountains Abbey: The Cistercians in Northern England* (Stroud: Tempus, 2003)

———, '"Make Straight in the Desert a Highway for Our God": The Carthusians and Community in Late Medieval England', in *Monasteries and Society in the British Isles in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. by Janet Burton and Karen Stöber, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion, 35 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008), pp. 168–79

———, 'The Planning of Cistercian Monasteries in the Late Middle Ages: The Evidence from Fountains, Rievaulx, Sawley and Rushen', in *The Religious Orders of Pre-Reformation England*, ed. by James G. Clark, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion, 18 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002), pp. 197–209

Coppack, Glyn, and Colin Hayfield, 'Sawley Abbey: The Architecture and Archaeology of a Smaller Cistercian Abbey', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 155 (2002), 22–114

Coss, Peter R., 'Knights, Esquires and the Origins of Social Gradation in England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5 (1995), 155–78

Courtney, Paul, 'Excavations in the Outer Precinct of Tintern Abbey', *Medieval Archaeology*, 33 (1989), 99–143

Cowgill, J., M. de Neergaard, and N. Griffiths, *Knives and Scabbards*, Medieval Finds from Excavations in London, 1 (London: H.M.S.O., 1987)

Cownie, Emma, *The Religious Patronage of the Anglo-Norman Aristocracy in England, 1066–1135* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1998)

Cramp, Rosemary, 'Monastic Sites', in *The Archaeology of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. by David M. Wilson (London: Methuen, 1976), pp. 201–52

Cramp, Rosemary, Gladys Bettess, and Pamela Lowther, *Wearmouth and Jarrow Monastic Sites* (Swindon: English Heritage, 2005)

Cramp, Rosemary, John Cherry, and Pamela Lowther, 'Personal Possession and Domestic Items', in *Wearmouth and Jarrow Monastic Sites* (Swindon: English Heritage, 2005), pp. 229–312

Craster, O. E., *Tintern Abbey, Monmouthshire* (London: H.M.S.O., 1956)

Crawley-Boevey, F. H., 'Flaxley Abbey', *Archaeological Journal*, 77 (1920), 445–47

———, 'Some Recent Discoveries at Flaxley Abbey, Glos., and Their Relation to Mr. Middleton's Plan Made in 1881', *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society*, 43 (1921), 57–62

Crossley, Frederick Herbert, *English Church Monuments A.D. 1150–1550: An Introduction to the Study of Tombs and Effigies of the Mediaeval Period* (London: B.T. Batsford, 1921)

Cuming, H. Syer, 'On Thimbles', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 35 (1879), 238–42

Cunningham, Heather, 'From St. Bernard to the Dissolution: Personal Possession and Public Austerity as Reflected in Small Metal Artifacts from the Houses of the Yorkshire Cistercians' (unpublished MA dissertation, University of York, 2010)

Cunnington, Cecil Willett, Phillis Cunnington, Barbara Phillipson, and Catherine Lucas, *Handbook of English Mediaeval Costume.*, 2nd edn (London: Faber, 1969)

Cutts, E. L., 'An Architectural Account of the Remains of Coggeshall Abbey', *Transactions of the Essex Archaeological Society*, 1 (1858), 166–85

De Hamel, Christopher, 'Books and Society', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Vol. 2, 1100–1400*, ed. by Nigel Morgan and Rodney M. Thomson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 3–21

———, *Scribes and Illuminators* (London: British Museum Press, 1992)

Derrida, Jacques, *Of Hospitality: Anne Dufourmantelle Invites Jacques Derrida to Respond* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000)

Dickinson, J. C., 'Furness Abbey', *Archaeological Journal*, 127 (1970), 267–69

———, *Furness Abbey.* (London: English Heritage, 1989)

———, 'Furness Abbey: An Archaeological Reconsideration', *Transactions of the*

    Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society, 67 (1967),
    51–80

Digby, George Wingfield, 'Technique and Production', in *The Bayeux Tapestry. A
    Comprehensive Survey*, by Frank Stenton (London: Phaidon, 1957), pp. 37–55

Dilworth, Mark, *Scottish Monasteries in the Late Middle Ages* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh
    University Press, 1995)

Dimier, Anselme, *L'art cistercien: France* (Saint-Léger-Vauban: Zodiaque, 1962)

———, *L'art cistercien hors de France* (Saint-Léger-Vauban: Zodiaque, 1971)

Dixon, Philip, and B. Lott, 'The Courtyard and the Tower: Contexts and Symbols in the
    Development of Late Medieval Great Houses', *Journal of the British Archaeological
    Association*, 146 (1993), 93–101

Dresbeck, LeRoy, 'The Chimney and Social Change in Medieval England', *Albion*, 3
    (1971), 21–32 <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/4048469>

Druitt, Herbert, *A Manual of Costume as Illustrated by Monumental Brasses* (London: A.
    Moring, 1906)

Duby, Georges, *Saint Bernard: l'art cistercien* (Paris: Arts et Métiers Graphiques, 1976)

Duncan, Holly B., and Stephen Moorhouse, 'The Small Finds', in *Kirkstall Abbey,
    Vol. 1: The 1950–64 Excavations – A Reassessment* (Wakefield: West Yorkshire
    Archaeological Service, 1987), pp. 120–48

Duncan, Holly B., and Stuart Wrathmell, 'Bell Moulds from Kirkstall Abbey, West
    Yorkshire', *Historical Metallurgy*, 20 (1986), 33–35

Dunning, Robert W. (Robert William), 'The Last Days of Cleeve Abbey', in *The Church in
    Pre-Reformation Society: Essays in Honour of F. R. H. Du Boulay*, ed. by C. Harper-
    Bill and C. M. Barron (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1985), pp. 58–67

Dyer, Christopher, 'Gardens and Garden Produce in the Later Middle Ages', in F*ood in
    Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition*, ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and
    T. Waldron, Medieval History and Archaeology (Oxford: Oxford University Press,
    2006), pp. 27–40

———, *Standards of Living in the Later Middle Ages: Social Change in England c.1200–1520*,
    rev. edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)

Eames, Penelope, and Christopher G. Gilbert, *Furniture in England, France and the
    Netherlands from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Century* (London: The Furniture
    History Society, 1977)

Eeles, Francis C., 'Cleeve Abbey: Recent Discoveries', *Proceedings of the Somersetshire
    Archaeological and Natural History Society*, 77 (1931), 37–47

Egan, Geoff, 'Buckles, Hasps, and Strap Hooks', in *The Medieval Horse and Its Equipment,
    c. 1150–c. 1450*, ed. by John Clark, Medieval Finds from Excavations in London, 5
    (London: H.M.S.O., 1995), pp. 55–61

———, *The Medieval Household: Daily Living c. 1150–1450* (London: H.M.S.O., 1998)

Egan, Geoff, and Frances Pritchard, *Dress Accessories, c. 1150–c. 1450*, Medieval Finds from
    Excavations in London, 3 (London: H.M.S.O., 1991)

Ellis, Peter, 'Croxden Abbey, Staffordshire: Report on Excavations, 1956–57 and 1975–77',
    Journal of the Staffordshire Historical and Archaeological Society, 36 (1997), 29–51

Ellis, R. H., *Catalogue of Seals in the Public Record Office: Monastic Seals, 1* (London:
    H.M.S.O., 1986)

Emerick, Keith, and Kate Wilson, 'Fountains Abbey: Some Interim Results of Remote
    Sensing', *English Heritage Conservation Bulletin*, 18 (1992), 7–9

Emery, Anthony, *Greater Medieval Houses of England and Wales, 1300–1500*, 3 vols
    (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), III

Esser, Karl-Heinz, 'Les fouilles à Himmerod et le plan bernadin: XXIVe Congrès de
    l'Association bourguignonne des sociétés savantes (8e Centenaire de la mort de
    saint Bernard)', in *Mélanges Saint Bernard* (Dijon: Marlier, 1953), pp. 311–15

Evans, D. H., *Valle Crucis Abbey*, rev. edn (Cardiff: Cadw, 2008)

Eydoux, H.-P., 'Les fouilles de l'abbatiale d'Himerod et la notion d'un plan bernardin',
    Bulletin monumental, 111 (1953), 29–36

Farrer, William, and John Brownbill, eds, 'Houses of Cistercian Monks: The Abbey of
    Furness', in *A History of the County of Lancaster*, 8 vols (London: Victoria County
    History, 1908), II, 114–31

Faulkner, P. A., 'Domestic Planning from the Twelfth to the Fourteenth Centuries', *Archaeological Journal*, 115 (1960), 150–83

Fawcett, Richard, *Scottish Architecture: From the Accession of the Stewarts to the Reformation 1371–1560* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press and Historic Scotland, 1994)

Fawcett, Richard, and Richard D. Oram, *Melrose Abbey* (Stroud: Tempus, 2004)

Fergusson, Peter, *Architecture of Solitude: Cistercian Abbeys in Twelfth-Century England* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1984)

———, '"Porta Patens Esto": Notes on Early Cistercian Gatehouses in the North of England', in *Medieval Architecture and Its Intellectual Context: Studies in Honour of Peter Kidson*, by E. Fernie and P. Crossley (London: Hambledon, 1990), pp. 47–59

———, 'The First Architecture of the Cistercians In England and the Work of Abbot Adam of Meaux', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 136 (1983), 74–86

Fergusson, Peter, and Stuart Harrison, *Rievaulx Abbey: Community, Memory, Architecture* (New Haven, CT; London: Yale University Press, 2000)

Forey, A., 'Notes on Templar Personnel and Government at the Turn of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries', *Journal of Medieval History*, 35 (2009), 150–70

———, 'The Ex-Templars in England', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 53 (2002), 18–37

Foulds, Trevor, 'Medieval Cartularies', *Archives*, 18 (1987), 3–35

France, James, *Separate but Equal: Cistercian Lay Brothers, 1120–1350*, Cistercian Studies, 246 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012)

Freeman, Elizabeth, *Narratives of a New Order: Cistercian Historical Writing in England, 1150–1220* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002)

———, 'The Priory of Hampole and Its Literary Culture: English Religious Women and Books in the Age of Richard Rolle', Parergon, 29 (2012), 1–25

Gaimster, David, 'Archaeology of an Age of Print? Everyday Objects in an Age of Transition', in *Everyday Objects: Medieval and Early Modern Material Culture and Its Meanings*, ed. by Tara Hamling and Catherine Richardson (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), pp. 133–43

Gaimster, David, and Paul Stamper, eds, *The Age of Transition: The Archaeology of English Culture, 1400–1600*, Oxbow Monographs, 98 (Oxford: Oxbow, 1997)

Gardiner, Mark, 'Buttery and Pantry and Their Antecedents: Idea and Architecture in the English Medieval House', in *Medieval Domesticity: Home, Housing and Household in Medieval England*, ed. by Maryanne Kowaleski and P. J. P. Goldberg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 37–65

Gardner, J. S., 'Coggeshall Abbey and Its Early Brickwork', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 3rd ser., 18 (1955), 19–32

Gaskell Brown, Cynthia, 'Buckland Abbey, Devon: Surveys and Excavations 1983–1995', *Proceedings of the Devon Archaeological Society*, 53 (1997), 25–82

Gautier, Alban, 'Hospitality in Pre-Viking Anglo-Saxon England', *Early Medieval Europe*, 17 (2009), 23–44

Gerrard, C., *Medieval Archaeology: Understanding Traditions and Contemporary Approaches* (London: Routledge, 2003)

Gerritsen, Anne, and Giorgio Riello, 'Introduction: Writing Material Culture History', in Writing Material Culture History, ed. by Anne Gerritsen and Giorgio Riello (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), pp. 1–13

———, eds, *Writing Material Culture History* (London: Bloomsbury, 2015)

Gibbs, C. T. F., 'Cleeve Abbey, Washford, Som.', *Transactions of the Somerset Masters' Lodge, No. 3746*, 5 (1931)

Gilchrist, Roberta, and Harold Mytum, eds, *Advances in Monastic Archaeology*, B.A.R. British Series, 227 (Oxford: Tempus Reparatum, 1993)

———, eds, *The Archaeology of Rural Monasteries*, B.A.R. British Series, 203 (Oxford: Tempus Reparatum, 1989)

Giles, Kate, 'Vernacular Housing in the North: The Case of England', in *The Archaeology of Medieval Europe: Twelfth to Sixteenth Centuries*, ed. by Martin Carver and Jan Klápště, 2 vols (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2011), II, 159–76

Gillespie, Alexandra, and Daniel Wakelin, *The Production of Books in England 1350-1500* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011)

Gilyard-Beer, R., *Abbeys: An Introduction to the Religious Houses of England Wales*, An Illustrated Guide to the Ancient Monuments, 7, 2nd end (London: H.M.S.O., 1958)

———, *Cleeve Abbey, Somerset* (London: H.M.S.O., 1959)

———, *Cleeve Abbey, Somerset*, 2nd edn (London: H.M.S.O., 1990)

———, *Fountains Abbey, Yorkshire* (London: H.M.S.O, 1970)

Girouard, Mark, *Life in the English Country House: A Social and Architectural History.* (New Haven, etc.: Yale U.P., 1978)

Given-Wilson, Chris, 'Rank and Status among the English Nobility', in *Princely Rank in Late Medieval Europe: Trodden Paths and Promising Avenues*, ed. by Thorsten Huthwelker, Jörg Henning Peltzer, and Maximilian Wemhöner (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2011), pp. 97–117

Goodall, Alison, 'The Copper Alloy and Gold', in *Excavations at Lurk Lane Beverley, 1979–1982*, ed. by Peter Armstrong, D. H. Evans, and David Tomlinson, Sheffield Excavation Reports, 1 (Sheffield: Humberside Archaeology Unit, 1991), pp. 148–54

Goodall, Alison, 'The Medieval Bronzesmith and His Products', in *Medieval Industry*, ed. by D. W. Crossley, Council for British Archaeology Research Reports, 40 (Council for British Archaeology, 1981), pp. 63–71

Goodall, Ian. H., 'Iron Buckles and Belt-Fittings', in *Object and Economy in Medieval Winchester: Artefacts from Medieval Winchester*, by Martin Biddle and others, Winchester Studies, 7.ii, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 526–38

Goodall, Ian H., *Ironwork in Medieval Britain: An Archaeological Study* (London: Society for Medieval Archaeology, 2011)

———, 'Textile Manufacture and Needlework', in *Norwich Households: The Medieval and Post-Medieval Finds from Norwich Survey Excavations, 1971–1978*, by Sue Margeson (Norwich: The Norwich Survey, 1993), pp. 182–88

Gore, Alan, and Ann Gore, *The History of English Interiors* (Oxford: Phaidon, 1991)

Grainger, Ian, and Christopher Phillpotts, *The Cistercian Abbey of St Mary Graces, East Smithfield, London* (London: Museum of London Archaeology, 2011)

Greene, J. Patrick, *Medieval Monasteries* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1992)

Greer, Rowan A., 'Hospitality in the First Five Centuries of the Church', *Monastic Studies*, 10 (1974), 29–48

Grenville, Jane, *Medieval Housing* (London: Leicester University Press, 1997)

Griffiths, Jeremy, and Derek Pearsall, *Book Production and Publishing in Britain 1375–1475* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)

Griffiths, Ralph A., ed., *The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001)

Grumett, David, *Theology on the Menu: Asceticism, Meat, and Christian Diet* (London: Routledge, 2010)

Guy, Christopher J., 'Excavations at Cleeve Abbey, 1979', *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History Society*, 132 (1988), 89–93

———, 'The Excavations at the Reredorter at Cleeve Abbey, Somerset', *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History*, 142 (1999), 1–40

Hagger, Mark, 'Lordship and Lunching: Interpretations of Eating and Food in the Anglo-Norman World, 1050–1200, with Reference to the Bayeux Tapestry', in *The English and Their Legacy, 900–1200: Essays in Honour of Ann Williams*, ed. by David Roffe (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2012), pp. 229–44

Hall, Jackie, 'East of the Cloister: Infirmaries, Abbots' Lodgings and Other Chambers', in *Perspectives for an Architecture of Solitude: Essays on Cistercians, Art and Architecture in Honour of Peter Fergusson*, ed. by Terryl Kinder, Cîteaux: Studia et Documenta, 13; Medieval Church Studies, 11 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), pp. 199–211

———, 'English Cistercian Gatehouse Chapels', *Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses*, 52 (2001), 61–91

Hamilton, Adam, *History of St Mary's Abbey of Buckfast in the County of Devon, A.D. 760–1906* (Buckfastleigh: Buckfast Abbey, 1906)

Hamling, Tara, and Catherine Richardson, eds, *Everyday Objects: Medieval and Early Modern Material Culture and Its Meanings* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010)

———, 'Introduction', in *Everyday Objects: Medieval and Early Modern Material Culture and Its Meanings*, ed. by Tara Hamling and Catherine Richardson (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), pp. 1–23

Haines, Herbert, *A Manual of Monumental Brasses: Comprising an Introduction to the Study of These Memorials and a List of Those Remaining in the British Isles* (Oxford and London: J. H. and J. Parker, 1861)

Hansson, Martin, 'The Medieval Aristocracy and the Social Use of Space', in *Reflections: 50 Years of Medieval Archaeology, 1957-2007*, ed. by Roberta Gilchrist and Andrew Reynolds, The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monographs, 30 (Leeds: Maney, 2009), pp. 435–52

Harcourt, J., 'The Medieval Floor-Tiles of Cleeve Abbey, Somerset', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 153 (2000), 30–70

Hare, J. N., *Battle Abbey: The Eastern Range and the Excavations of 1978–80*, Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England, Archaeological Report, 2 (London: Historic Buidings and Monuments Commission for England, 1985)

Harper-Bill, C., 'Cistercian Visitation in the Late Middle Ages: The Case of Hailes Abbey', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 53 (1980), 103–14

———, 'The English Church and English Religion after the Black Death', in The Black Death in England, ed. by W. M. Ormrod and P. G. Lindley (Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1996), pp. 79–123

Harris, Jennifer, '"Estroit Vestu et Menu Cosu": Evidence for the Construction of Twelfth-Century Dress.', in *Medieval Art: Recent Perspectives. A Memorial Tribute to C. R. Dodwell*, ed. by Gale R. Owen-Crocker and Timothy Graham (Manchester, 1998), pp. 89–103

Harrison, Stuart, *Cleeve Abbey, Somerset* (London: English Heritage, 2000)

Harrison, Stuart, and Jason Wood, *Furness Abbey* (London: English Heritage, 1998)

Harvey, Barbara, 'Monastic Pittances in the Middle Ages', in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition*, ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron, Medieval History and Archaeology, 2006, pp. 215–27

———, *Living and Dying in England, 1100–1540: The Monastic Experience* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993)

Harvey, Karen, ed., *History and Material Culture: A Student's Guide to Approaching Alternative Sources*, Routledge Guides to Using Historical Sources (London: Routledge, 2009)

———, 'Introduction: Practical Matters', in *History and Material Culture: A Student's Guide to Approaching Alternative Sources*, ed. by Karen Harvey (London: Routledge, 2009), pp. 1–23

Hayward, Maria Anne, 'Latten', in *Encyclopedia of Medieval Dress and Textiles*, ed. by Gale R. Owen-Crocker (Leiden: Brill, 2012), p. 314

Heale, Martin, 'Mitres and Arms: Aspects of the Self-Representation of the Monastic Superior in Late Medieval England', in *Self-Representation of Medieval Religious Communities: The British Isles in Context*, ed. by Anne Müller and Karen Stöber, Vita Regularis, 40 (Berlin: Lit, 2009), pp. 99–121

———, 'Monastic Attitudes to Abbatial Magnificence in Late-Medieval England', in *The Prelate in England and Europe, c. 1300–c. 1560*, ed. by Martin Heale (Woodbridge: York Medieval, 2014), pp. 261–76

———, *Monasticism in Late Medieval England, c. 1300–1535* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009)

Heal, Felicity, 'Food Gifts, the Household and the Politics of Exchange in Early Modern England', *Past and Present*, 199 (2008), 41–70

———, *Hospitality in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990)

———, 'The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England', *Past and Present*, 102 (1984), 66–93

———. , ed., The Prelate in England and Europe, C. 1300–c. 1560 (Woodbridge: York Medieval, 2014)

Heath, S. H., *The Story of Ford Abbey, from the Earliest Times to the Present Day* (London: F. Griffiths, 1911)

Hellinga, Lotte, and J. B. Trapp, eds, *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Vol. 3:*

1400–1557 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

Hicks, Dan, 'The Material-Cultural Turn: Event and Effect', in *The Oxford Handbook of Material Culture Studies*, ed. by Dan Hicks and Mary Carolyn Beaudry (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 25–98

Hicks, Dan, and Mary Carolyn Beaudry, 'Introduction: The Place of Historical Archaeology', in *The Cambridge Companion to Historical Archaeology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 1–9

———, *The Cambridge Companion to Historical Archaeology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)

Hicks, Michael A., and Michael Penman, 'English Monasteries as Repositories of Dynastic Memory', in *Monuments and Monumentality across Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Proceedings of the 2011 Stirling Conference* (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2013), pp. 224–38

Hill, Bennett D., *English Cistercian Monasteries and Their Patrons in the Twelfth Century* (London: University of Illinois Press, 1968)

Hills, G. M., 'Croxden Abbey and Its Chronicle', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 21 (1865), 294–315

———, 'Ford Abbey', in *Collectanea Archaeologica*, 2 vols, 1864, II, 145–59

Hinton, David, 'The Medieval Gold, Silver and Copper-Alloy Objects from Winchester', in *Object and Economy in Medieval Winchester: Artefacts from Medieval Winchester*, by Martin Biddle and others, Winchester Studies, 7.ii, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 29–35

———, *Gold and Gilt, Pots and Pins: Possessions and People in Medieval Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)

Hodder, Ian, *Entangled: An Archaeology of the Relationships between Humans and Things* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012)

Holdsworth, Christopher, 'Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Cîteaux: A Review Article', *Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses*, 51 (2000), 157–66

Hoeniger, Cathleen S., 'Cloth of Gold and Silver: Simone Martini's Techniques for Representing Luxury Textiles', *Gesta*, 30 (1991), 154–62

Hope, William Henry St John, 'Fountains Abbey', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, 15 (1900), 269–402

———, 'The Abbey of St Mary in Furness, Lancashire', *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society*, 16 (1900), 221–302

———, *The Abbey of St Mary in Furness, Lancashire* (Kendal: T. Wilson, 1902)

Hope, William Henry St John, and John Bilson, *Architectural Description of Kirkstall Abbey* (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1907)

Horden, Peregrine, *Hospitals and Healing from Antiquity to the Later Middle Ages* (Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum, 2008)

———, 'Religion as Medicine: Music in Medieval Hospitals', in *Religion and Medicine in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Peter Biller and Joseph Ziegler (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2001), pp. 135–53

———, 'Religion as Medicine: Music in Medieval Hospitals', in *Hospitals and Healing from Antiquity to the Later Middle Ages* (Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum, 2008)

Horn, Walter William, and Ernest Born, *The Plan of St Gall: A Study of the Architecture and Economy of and Life in a Paradigmatic Carolingian Monastery*, California Studies in the History of Art, 19, 3 vols (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979)

Huthwelker, Thorsten, Jörg Henning Peltzer, and Maximilian Wemhöner, eds., *Princely Rank in Late Medieval Europe: Trodden Paths and Promising Avenues* (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2011)

Jacques, Deborah, 'Kirkstall Guest House Fish Bone', in *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2*, by Stuart Wrathmell, forthcoming

Jamroziak, Emilia, 'Cistercian Abbots in Late Medieval Central Europe: Between the Cloister and the World', in *The Prelate in England and Europe, c. 1300–c. 1560*, ed. by Martin Heale (Woodbridge: York Medieval, 2014), pp. 240–57

———, *Rievaulx Abbey and Its Social Context, 1132–1300: Memory, Locality, and Networks*, Medieval Church Studies, 8 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005)

———, 'Rievaulx Abbey as a Wool Producer in the Late Thirteenth Century: Cistercians,

Sheep, and Debts', *Northern History*, 40 (2003), 197–218

———, 'Spaces of Lay-Religious Interaction in Cistercian Houses of Northern Europe', *Parergon*, 27 (2010), 37–58

———, *The Cistercian Order in Medieval Europe, 1090–1500* (London: Routledge, 2013)

Jaritz, Gerhard, 'Social Grouping and the Languages of Dress in the Late Middle Ages', *Medieval History Journal*, 3 (2000), 235–59

Jervis, Ben, 'Cuisine and Urban Identities in Medieval England: Objects, Foodstuffs and Urban Life in Thirteenth- and Fourteenth-Century Hampshire', *Archaeological Journal*, 169 (2013), 453–79 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00665983.2012.110209 21>

Jolivet, Sophie, Hanno Wijsman, Wim Blockmans, Till-Holger Borchert, Nele Gabriëls, Johan Oosterman, and others, eds., 'Dress and Illuminated Manuscripts at the Burgundian Court: Complementary Sources and Fashions (1430–1455)', in *Staging the Court of Burgundy: Proceedings of the Conference 'The Splendour of Burgundy'* (London: Harvey Miller, 2013), pp. 279–85

Jolly, Penny H., 'Marked Difference: Earrings and "the Other" in Fifteenth-Century Flemish Art', in *Encountering Medieval Textiles and Dress: Objects, Texts, Images,* ed. by Désirée G. Kosling and Janet E. Snyder (New York: Palgrave, 2002), pp. 195–207

Jones, A. K. G., 'The Survival of Fish Remains at Monastic Sites', in *The Archaeology of Rural Monasteries*, ed. by Harold Mytum and Roberta Gilchrist, B.A.R. British Series, 203 (Oxford: Tempus Reparatum, 1989), pp. 173–84

Jones, J., 'Conservation Report', in *Craft, Industry and Everyday Life: Finds from Medieval York*, by Patrick Ottaway and Nicola Rogers, The Archaeology of York, 17 (York: Council for British Archaeology, 2002), pp. 2696–2701

Jones, Peter Murray, 'Music Therapy in the Later Middle Ages: The Case of Hugo van Der Goes', in *Music as Medicine: The History of Music Therapy since Antiquity*, ed. by Peregrine Horden (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), pp. 120–46

Jotischky, Andrew, *A Hermit's Cookbook: Monks, Food and Fasting in the Middle Ages* (London: Continuum, 2011)

Kardong, Terrence, 'To Receive All as Christ', *Cistercian Studies*, 19 (1984), 195–207

Katzenberg, M. A., 'Stable Isotope Analysis: A Tool for Studying Past Diet, Demography, and Life History', in *Biological Anthropology of the Human Skeleton*, ed. by M. A. Katzenberg and S. R. Saunders (New York: Wiley-Liss, 2000), pp. 413–42

Keen, Maurice, *English Society in the Later Middle Ages, 1348–1500* (London: Penguin, 1990)

Keily, Jackie, and Geoff Egan, 'Non-Ceramic Finds', in *The Cistercian Abbey of St Mary Stratford Langthorne, Essex: Archaeological Excavations for the London Underground Limited Jubilee Line Extension Project*, by Bruno Barber and others, MoLAS Monograph, 18 (London: Museum of London Archaeology Service, 2004), pp. 149–56

Kent, J. P. C, 'Monumental Brasses: A New Classification of Military Effigies, 1360–*c.*1485', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 12 (1949), 70–97

Ker, N. R., *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain : A List of Surviving Books*, 2nd edn (London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society, 1987)

Kerr, Julie, 'Cistercian Hospitality in the Later Middle Ages', in *Monasteries and Society in the British Isles in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. by Janet Burton and Karen Stöber, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion, 35 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2008), pp. 25–39

———, 'Food, Drink and Lodging: Hospitality in Twelfth-Century England', *Haskins Society Journal*, 18 (2007), 72–92

———, *Life in the Medieval Cloister* (London: Continuum, 2009)

———, 'Monastic Hospitality: The Benedictines in England, *c.* 1070–*c.* 1245', in *Anglo-Norman Studies, XXIII: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2000*, ed. by John Gillingham, - (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2001), pp. 97–114

———, *Monastic Hospitality: The Benedictines in England, c. 1070–c. 1250*, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion, 32 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007)

———, 'The Symbolic Significance of Hospitality', in *Self-Representation of Medieval*

Religious Communities: The British Isles in Context, ed. by Anne Müller and Karen Stöber, Vita Regularis, 40 (Berlin: Lit, 2009), pp. 125–42

———, '"Welcome the Coming and Speed the Parting Guest": Hospitality in Twelfth-Century England', *Journal of Medieval History*, 33 (2007), 130–46

Kershaw, Ian, *Bolton Priory: The Economy of a Northern Monastery, 1286–1325* (London: Oxford University Press, 1973)

———, 'The Great Famine and Agrarian Crisis in England, 1315–1322', *Past and Present*, 59 (1973), 3–50

Kienzle, Beverly Mayne, *Cistercians, Heresy, and Crusade in Occitania, 1145-1229: Preaching in the Lord's Vineyard* (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2001)

———, *The Sermon*, Typologie Des Sources Du Moyen âge Occidental, fasc. 81-83 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000)

Kinder, Terryl N., *Cistercian Europe: Architecture of Contemplation*, Cistercian Studies Series, 191 (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 2002)

Knowles, David, 'Essays in Monastic History, 1066–1216, 7: The Diet of Black Monks', *Downside Review*, 52 (1934), 275–90

———, *The Monastic Order in England: A History of Its Development from the Times of St Dunstan to the Fourth Lateran Council, 940–1216*, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963)

———, *The Religious Orders in England, Vol. 1: 1216–1340* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948)

———, *The Religious Orders in England, Vol. 2: The End of the Middle Ages.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955)

———, *The Religious Orders in England, Vol. 3: The Tudor Age* (Cambridge: University Press, 1959)

Knowles, David, and others, eds, *The Heads of Religious Houses: England and Wales*, 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972–2008)

Knowles, David, and J. K. S. St. Joseph, *Monastic Sites from the Air* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952)

Knowles, David, and R. Neville Hadcock, *Medieval Religious Houses, England and Wales*, 2nd edn (Harlow: Longman, 1971)

Kodres, Krista, and Anu Mänd, eds, *Images and Objects in Ritual Practices in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2013)

Lachaud, Frédérique, 'Dress and Social Status in England before the Sumptuary Laws', in *Heraldry, Pageantry, and Social Display in Medieval England*, ed. by Peter R. Coss and Maurice Keen (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002), pp. 105–23

Ladouceur, David J., *The Latin Psalter: Introduction, Selected Text and Commentary* (Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 2005)

Lalou, Élisabeth, 'Les Tablettes de Cire Médiévales', *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole Des Chartes*, 147 (1989), 123–40

Lashley, Conrad, Paul Lynch, and Alison J. Morrison, eds, *Hospitality: A Social Lens*, Advances in Tourism Research (Amsterdam; London: Elsevier, 2007)

Lashley, Conrad, and Alison J. Morrison, eds, *In Search of Hospitality: Theoretical Perspectives and Debates* (Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 2001)

———. , eds, 'Toward a Theoretical Understanding', in *In Search of Hospitality: Theoretical Perspectives and Debates* (Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 2001), pp. 1–17

Leach, Peter, Nikolaus Pevsner, and John Minnis, *Buildings of England: West Yorkshire — Leeds, Bradford, and the North* (London: Yale University Press, 2009)

Leclercq, Jean, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture*, 3rd edn (New York: Fordham University Press, 1982)

Lekai, Louis J., *The Cistercians: Ideals and Reality* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1977)

Lindenbaum, S., 'Entertainment in English Monasteries', in *Le Théâtre et La Cité Dans l'Europe Médiévale : Actes Du 5ème Colloque International de La Société Internationale Pour L'étude Du Théâtre Médiéval (Perpignan, Juillet 1986)*, ed. by Jean Claude Aubailly and Edelgard E. DuBruck, Stuttgarter Arbeiten Zur Germanistik, 213–14 (Stuttgart: H.-D. Heinz, 1988), pp. 411–21

Lloyd, Nathaniel, *A History of English Brickwork* (London: H. G. Montgomery, 1925)

Lonsdale, A., 'The Last Monks of Kirkstall Abbey', in *Publications of the Thoresby Society Miscellanea, 15*, Publications of the Thoresby Society, 53 (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1972), pp. 201–16

Luxford, Julian M., *The Art and Architecture of English Benedictine Monasteries, 1300-1540: A Patronage History*, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion, 25 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005)

―――, 'The Construction of English Monastic Patronage', in *Patronage: Power and Agency in Medieval Art*, ed. by Colum Hourihane, Index of Christian Art Occasional Papers, 15 (Princeton, PA: Princeton University and Penn State University Press, 2013), pp. 31–53

Macklin, Herbert Walter, *Monumental Brasses*, 7th edn (London: Swann Sonnenschein, 1890)

Magnusson, R. J., *Water Technology in the Middle Ages: Cities, Monasteries and Water-Works after the Roman Empire* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001)

Margeson, Sue, and others, *Norwich Households: The Medieval and Post-Medieval Finds from Norwich Survey Excavations, 1971–1978* (Norwich: The Norwich Survey, 1993)

Mauss, Marcel, *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*, trans. by Ian Cunnison, rev. edn (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970)

Maxwell-Lyte, Henry C., *Historical Notes on the Use of the Great Seal of England* (London: H.M.S.O., 1926)

McDonald, Peter, 'The Papacy and Monastic Observance in the Later Middle Ages: The Benedictina in England', *Journal of Religious History*, 14 (1986), 117–32

McDonnell, J. G., *Analysis of Plaster Samples from Cleeve Abbey, Somerset* (English Heritage Research Department, 1990) <doi: 10.5284/1033890>

McDonnell, John, *Inland Fisheries in Medieval Yorkshire, 1066–1300*, Borthwick Papers, 60 (York: Borthwick Institute, 1981)

McGee, Christine, and Joanne Perkins, 'A Study of the Cistercian Abbey at Rufford, Nottinghamshire', in *Southwell and Nottinghamshire: Medieval Art, Architecture, and Industry*, ed. by Jennifer S. Alexander, British Archaeological Association, Conference Transactions, 21 (Leeds: British Archaeological Association, 1998), pp. 83–92

McGuire, Brian Patrick, 'Constitutions and the General Chapter', in *The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*, ed. by Mette Birkedal Bruun (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 87–99

McSheffrey, Shannon, 'Place, Space, and Situation: Public and Private in the Making of Marriage in Late-Medieval London', *Speculum*, 79 (2004), 960–90 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0038713400086607>

'Medieval Britain and Ireland in 2009', *Medieval Archaeology*, 54 (2010), 382–429

Mertes, Kate, *The English Noble Household, 1250-1600: Good Governance and Politic Rule* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988)

Micklethwaite, J. T., 'Of the Cistercian Plan', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, 7 (1882), 239–58

Middleton, J. H., 'Flaxley Abbey: The Existing Remains', *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society*, 6 (1881), 280–83

Miles, D. H., and D. Haddon-Reece, 'Welsh Dendrochronology Project', *Vernacular Architecture*, 27 (1996), 106–17

Mitchell, C. M., 'Kirkstall Abbey Excavations 1955–1959', *Publications of the Thoresby Society*, 48 (1961)

Mode, Peter George, *The Influence of the Black Death on the English Monasteries* (Menasha, WI: George Banta, 1916)

Moffet, L., 'The Archaeology of Medieval Plant Foods', in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition*, ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron, Medieval History and Archaeology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 41–55

Montford, Angela, 'To Preach and to Pray: Considerations of Occupational Health in the Mendicant Orders', *Studies in Church History*, 37 (2002), 95–106

Moorhouse, Stephen, 'Monastic Estates: Their Composition and Development', in *The Archaeology of Rural Monasteries*, ed. by Roberta Gilchrist and Harold Mytum, B.A.R. British Series, 203 (Oxford: Tempus Reparatum, 1989), pp. 28–81

Moorhouse, Stephen, and Stuart Wrathmell, *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 1: The 1950–64 Excavations – A Reassessment* (Wakefield: West Yorkshire Archaeological Service, 1987)

Morant, Roland W., *The Monastic Gatehouse and Other Types of Portal of Medieval Religious Houses* (Sussex: Book Guild, 1995)

Morgan, Philip, 'Ranks of Society', in *The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, ed. by Ralph A. Griffiths (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 59–85

Morrison, Alison, and Kevin O'Gorman, 'Hospitality Studies and Hospitality Management: A Symbiotic Relationship', *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27 (2008), 214–21

Moses, David, 'Soul Food and Eating Habits: What's at Steak in a Medieval Monk's Diet?', *Downside Review*, 436 (2006), 213–22

Müldner, Gundula, 'Investigating Medieval Diet and Society by Stable Isotope Analysis of Human Bone', in *Reflections: 50 Years of Medieval Archaeology, 1957–2007*, ed. by Andrew Reynolds and Roberta Gilchrist, Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph, 30 (Leeds: Maney, 2009), pp. 327–46

Murray, Harold J. R., *A History of Board-Games Other than Chess* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952)

Newman, Martha G., *The Boundaries of Charity: Cistercian Culture and Ecclesiastical Reform, 1098–1180* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1996)

Nicholson, Helen J., *The Proceedings against the Templars in the British Isles* (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2011)

Norris, C., and D. Nicholl, *Buckfast Abbey: A Pictorial Survey* (Buckfast: Buckfast Abbey, 1960)

O'Connor, Terry, *The Analysis of Urban Animal Bone Assemblages: A Handbook for Archaeologists*, Archaeology of York, 19 fasc. 2 (York: Council for British Archaeology, 2003)

———, 'Bone Assemblages from Monastic Sites: Many Questions but Few Data', in *Advances in Monastic Archaeology*, ed. by Harold Mytum and Roberta Gilchrist, B.A.R. British Series, 227 (Oxford: Tempus Reparatum, 1993), pp. 107–11

O'Dwyer, B. W., *The Conspiracy of Mellifont, 1216–1231: An Episode in the History of the Cistercian Order in Medieval Ireland*, Medieval Irish History, 2 (Dublin: Historical Association, 1970)

———, 'The Problem of Reform in the Irish Cistercian Monasteries and the Attempted Solution of Stephen of Lexington in 1228', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 15 (1964), 186–91

Oram, Richard D., 'Dividing the Spoils: War, Schism and Religious Patronage on the Anglo-Scottish Border, c. 1332–c.1400', in *England and Scotland in the Fourteenth Century: New Perspectives*, ed. by Andy King and Michael Penman (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), pp. 136–56

Orlin, Lena Cowen, *Material London, ca. 1600* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000)

Orme, Nicholas, 'Lay Literacy in England, 1100–1300', in *England and Germany in the High Middle Ages: In Honour of Karl J. Leyser*, ed. by Hanna Vollrath and Alfred Haverkamp, Studies of the German Historical Institute London (Oxford and London: Oxford University Press and the German Historical Institute, 1996), pp. 35–56

O'Sullivan, C., *Hospitality in Medieval Ireland, 900–1500* (Dublin, 2004)

Ottaway, Patrick, and Nicola Rogers, *Craft, Industry and Everyday Life: Finds from Medieval York*, The Archaeology of York, 17 (York: Council for British Archaeology, 2002)

Owen, David E., *Kirkstall Abbey* (Leeds: E. J. Arnold & Son, n.d.)

———, 'Kirkstall Abbey Excavations: 1950–1954', *Publications of the Thoresby Society*, 43 (1955)

Owen-Crocker, Gale R., Brenda Bolton, and Christine Meek, 'Dress and Authority in the Bayeux Tapestry', in *Aspects of Power and Authority in the Middle Ages*, International Medieval Research, 14 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), pp. 53–72

Page, Christopher, 'Music and Medicine in the Thirteenth Century', in *Music as Medicine: The History of Music Therapy since Antiquity*, ed. by Peregrine Horden (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), pp. 109–19

Panofsky, Erwin, *Tomb Sculpture: Four Lectures on Its Changing Aspects from Ancient Egypt to Bernini* (New York: H. N. Abrams, 1992) <http://0-hdl.handle.net.wam.leeds.ac.uk/2027/heb.30524> [accessed 12 April 2016]

Park, David, 'Cistercian Wall Painting and Panel Painting', in *Cistercian Art and Architecture in the British Isles*, ed. by Christopher Norton and David Park (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), pp. 181–210

Parker, Richard W., Tony Ives, and John Allan, 'Excavation and Building Study at Cleeve Abbey, 1995–2003', *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History*, 150 (2007), 73–167

Patrick, P., 'An Archaeology of Overindulgence', *Archaeological Review from Cambridge*, 20 (2005), 98–117

——, 'Creaking in the Cloisters: Observations on Prevalence and Distribution of Osteoarthritis in Monks from Medieval London', in *Centre, Region, Periphery: Medieval Europe, Basel 2002*, ed. by G. Helmig, B. Scholkmann, and M. Untermann (Basel: Folio, 2002), pp. 89–93

——, *The 'Obese Medieval Monk': A Multidisciplinary Study of a Stereotype* (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2014)

Perkins, J. B. W., 'A Late Thirteenth-Century Tile-Pavement at Cleeve Abbey', *Proceedings of the Somersetshire Archaeological and Natural History Society*, 87 (1942), 39–55

Pennell, Sara, 'Mundane Materiality, Or, Should Small Things Still Be Forgotten? Material Culture, Micro-Histories and the Problem of Scale', in *History and Material Culture: A Student's Guide to Approaching Alternative Sources*, ed. by Karen Harvey (London: Routledge, 2009), pp. 173–91

——, '"Pots and Pans History": The Material Culture of the Kitchen in Early Modern England', *Journal of Design History*, 11 (1998), 201–16

Pestell, Tim, 'Using Material Culture to Define Holy Space: The Bromholm Project', in *Defining the Holy: Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Sarah Hamilton and Andrew Spicer (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), pp. 161–86

Perry, Guy, *John of Brienne: King of Jerusalem, Emperor of Constantinople, c. 1175–1237* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)

Pevsner, Nikolaus, *Buildings of England: Devon*, 2nd edn (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1989)

——, *Buildings of England: Dorset* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972)

——, *Buildings of England: Essex*, rev. edn (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965)

——, *The Buildings of England: South and West Somerset.* (London: Penguin Books, 1958)

——, *Buildings of England: Yorkshire — North Riding* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966)

——, *Buildings of England: Yorkshire — The West Riding*, ed. by Enid Radcliffe, rev. edn (London: Penguin, 1974)

Piponnier, Françoise, and Perrine Mane, *Dress in the Middle Ages*, trans. by Caroline Beamish (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997)

Pitt-Rivers, J. A., *The Fate of Shechem, Or, the Politics of Sex: Essays in the Anthropology of the Mediterranean*, Cambridge Studies in Social Anthropology, 19 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977)

Platt, Colin, 'Relaxation of the Rule: The Architecture of Late Medieval Monastic Houses', *History Today*, 35 (1985), 21–26

——, *The Abbeys and Priories of Medieval England* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1984)

Pollard, G., 'The Construction of English Twelfth- Century Bindings', *The Library: The Transactions of the Bibliographical Society*, 15 (1962), 1–22

Pollington, Stephen, 'The Mead-Hall Community', *Journal of Medieval History*, 37 (2011), 19–33

Postles, David, 'The Regular Canons and the Use of Food, *c.* 1200–1350', in *The Regular Canons in the Medieval British Isles*, ed. by J. Burton and K. Stöber (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), pp. 233–50

——, 'Small Gifts, but Big Rewards: The Symbolism of Some Gifts to the Religious', *Journal of Medieval History*, 27 (2001), 23–42

Pressouyre, Léon, ed., *L'espace cistercien* (Paris: Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques, 1994)

Prown, Daniel, 'Mind in Matter: An Introduction to Material Culture Theory and Method', *Winterthur Portfolio*, 17 (1982), 1–19

Radford, C. A. R., *Valle Crucis Abbey* (London: H.M.S.O., 1953)

Ramey, Rochelle L., 'An Archaeology of Hospitality', in *Stoneleigh Abbey: The House, Its Owners, Its Lands*, ed. by Robert Bearman (Stoneleigh: Stoneleigh Abbey and the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, 2004), pp. 62–81

Rawcliffe, Carole, *Urban Bodies: Communal Health in Late Medieval English Towns and Cities* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2013)

Riello, Giorgio, 'The Material Culture of Walking: Spaces of Methodologies in the Long Eighteenth Century', in *Everyday Objects: Medieval and Early Modern Material Culture and Its Meanings*, ed. by Tara Hamling and Catherine Richardson (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), pp. 41–55

———, 'Things That Shape History: Material Culture and Historical Narratives', in *History and Material Culture: A Student's Guide to Approaching Alternative Sources*, ed. by Karen Harvey (London: Routledge, 2009), pp. 24–46

Rigby, S. H., 'Introduction: Social Structure and Economic Change in Late Medieval England', in *A Social History of England, 1200–1500*, ed. by Rosemary Horrox and W. M. Ormrod (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 1–30

Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments and Constructions in Wales and Monmouthshire: County of Merioneth (London: H.M.S.O., 1921)

Reece, Steve, *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene*, Michigan Monographs in Classical Antiquity (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993)

Reilly, Diane J., 'Art', in *The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*, ed. by Mette Birkedal Bruun (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 125–39

Renna, Thomas J., 'The Wilderness and the Cistercians', *Cistercian Studies Quarterly*, 30 (1995), 179–89

Robinson, David M., *The Cistercians in Wales: Architecture and Archaeology 1130–1540* (London: Society of Antiquaries of London, 2006)

———, *Tintern Abbey*, 5th edn (Cardiff: Cadw, 2011)

Robinson, David M., and Stuart Harrison, 'Cistercian Cloisters in England and Wales', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 159 (2006), 131–207

Robinson, David M., and others, *The Cistercian Abbeys of Britain: Far from the Concourse of Men* (London: Batsford, 1998)

Roddy, Kevin P., 'Nutrition in the Desert: The Exemplary Case of Desert Ermiticism', in *Food in the Middle Ages: A Book of Essays*, ed. by Melitta Weiss Adamson, Garland Medieval Casebook, 12 (New York: Garland, 1995)

Roehl, Richard, 'Plan and Reality in a Medieval Monastic Economy: The Cistercians', in *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1972), IX, 83–113

Rose, Sarah, 'A Twelfth-Century Honour in a Fifteenth-Century World: The Honour of Pontefract', in *The Fifteenth Century, IX: English and Continental Perspectives*, ed. by Linda Clark (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2010), pp. 38–59

Rosello, Mireille, *Postcolonial Hospitality: The Immigrant as Guest* (Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 2001)

Rosenwein, Barbara H., *Rhinoceros Bound: Cluny in the Tenth Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982)

———, *To Be the Neighbor of Saint Peter: The Social Meaning of Cluny's Property, 909–1049* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1989)

Rouse, Richard H., and Mary A. Rouse, 'Wax Tablets', *Language and Communication*, Special Issue Transformations of the Word, 9 (1989), 175–91

Routh, Pauline E., *Medieval Effigial Alabaster Tombs in Yorkshire* (Ipswich: Boydell, 1976)

Rowe, J. Brooking, *Contributions to a History of the Cistercian Houses of Devon* (Plymouth: W. Brendon, 1878)

———, 'On Recent Excavations at Buckfast Abbey', *Transactions of the Devonshire Association*, 16 (1884), 590–94

Rowell, Rochelle L., 'The Archaeology of Late Monastic Hospitality' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of York, 2000)

Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland, *An Inventory of the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Roxburghshire*, 2 vols (Edinburgh: H.M.S.O., 1956), II

Rudolph, Conrad, ed., *A Companion to Medieval Art: Romanesque and Gothic in Northern Europe*, Blackwell Companions to Art History, 2 (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006)

Ryder, Michael L., 'The Animal Bones', in *Kirkstall Abbey Excavations, Seventh Report*, Publications of the Thoresby Society (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1956), pp. 41–55

——, 'The Animal Bones', in *Kirkstall Abbey Excavations, Eighth Report*, Publications of the Thoresby Society (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1957), pp. 67–77

——, 'The Animal Bones', in *Kirkstall Abbey Excavations, 1955–59*, Publications of the Thoresby Society, 48 (Leeds: Thoresby Society, 1961), pp. 41–53

——, 'The Animal Remains Found at Kirkstall Abbey', *Agricultural History Review*, 7 (1959), 1–5

——, 'Livestock Remains from Four Medieval Sites in Yorkshire', *Agricultural History Review*, 9 (1961), 105–10

Sarti, Raffaella, *Europe at Home: Family and Material Culture, 1500–1800* (New Haven, CT; London: Yale University Press, 2004)

Saul, Nigel, *Death, Art, and Memory in Medieval England: The Cobham Family and Their Monuments 1300–1500* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001)

——, *English Church Monuments in the Middle Ages: History and Representation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)

Scott, Margaret, *A Visual History of Costume: The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (London: B.T. Batsford, 1986)

——, *Medieval Dress and Fashion* (London: British Library, 2007)

Serjeantson, D., 'Birds: Food and a Mark of Status', in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition*, ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron, Medieval History and Archaeology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 131–47

Serjeantson, D., and C. M. Woolgar, 'Fish Consumption in Medieval England', in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition*, ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron, Medieval History and Archaeology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 102–30

Sharpe, Edmund, *The Architecture of the Cistercians*, 2 vols (London: [s.n.], 1874)

Shaw, Diane, 'The Construction of the Private in Medieval London', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies [formerly Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies]*, 26 (1996), 447–66

Sherwin, C., 'The History of Ford Abbey', *Reports and Transactions of the Devonshire Association*, 59 (1927), 249–64

Silver, I. A., 'The Ageing of Domestic Animals', in *Science in Archaeology: A Survey of Progress and Research*, ed. by Don R. Brothwell and Eric S. Higgs, 2nd edn (London: Thames and Hudson, 1969), pp. 282–302

Slavin, P., *Bread and Ale for the Brethren: The Provisioning of Norwich Cathedral Priory 1260–1536*, Studies in Regional and Local History (Hertford: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2012)

Smaragdus, *Smaragdi Abbatis Expositio in Regulam S. Benedicti*, ed. by Alfred Spannagel and Pius Engelbert, Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum, 8 (Siegburg: Franciscum Schmitt, 1974)

Smith, J., and L. A. S. Butler, 'The Cistercian Order: Cymer Abbey', in *History of Merioneth, Volume II: The Middle Ages*, ed. by J. B. Smith and L. B. Smith (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2001), pp. 297–325

Smith, J. T., 'Medieval Roofs: A Classification', *Archaeological Journal*, 115 (1958), 111–50

Smith, P., 'Houses, C. 1415–1642', in *History of Merioneth, Volume II: The Middle Ages*, ed. by J. B. Smith and L. B. Smith (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2001), pp. 422–506

Smith, P., and R. Sugget, 'Themes and Variations in Merioneth: An Essay on Vernacular Houses for Ron Brunskill', *Transactions of the Ancient Monuments Society*, 46 (2002), 55–82

Smith, Sally V., 'Materializing Resistant Identities Among the Medieval Peasantry: An Examination of Dress Accessories from English Rural Settlement Sites', *Journal of Material Culture*, 14 (2009), 309–32

Snyder, Janet E., 'From Content to Form: Court Clothing in Mid-Twelfth-Century Northern French Sculpture', in *Encountering Medieval Textiles and Dress: Objects,*

Texts, Images, ed. by Désirée G. Kosling and Janet E. Snyder (New York: Palgrave, 2002), pp. 195–207

Soler, Jean, 'The Semiotics of Food in the Bible', in *Food and Drink in History*, ed. by Robert Forster and Orest Allen Ranum, trans. by Elborg Forster and Patricia Ranum, Selections from the Annales: Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations, 5 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979), pp. 126–38

Sonntag, Jörg, 'Le Rôle de La Vie Régulière Dans L'invention et La Diffusion Des Divertissements Sociaux Au Moyen Age', *Revue Mabillon: Revue Internationale D'histoire et de Littérature Religieuses / International Review for Ecclesiastical History and Literature*, 22 (2011), 79–98

——, 'The Medieval Religious Life as Generator and Mediator of Entertainment Games in Medieval Society: Tension between Norm and Deviance', *Monastic Research Bulletin*, 15 (2009), 24–31

——, 'Welcoming High Guests to the Paradise of the Monks: Social Interactions and Symbolic Moments of Monastic Self-Representation according to Lanfranc's Constitutions', in *Self-Representation of Medieval Religious Communities: The British Isles in Context*, ed. by Anne Müller and Karen Stöber, Vita Regularis, 40 (Berlin: Lit, 2009), pp. 45–66

Stalley, Roger, *The Cistercian Monasteries of Ireland: An Account of the History, Art, and Architecture of the White Monks in Ireland from 1142–1540* (London: Yale University Press, 1987)

Standley, Eleanor Rose, *Trinkets and Charms: The Use, Meaning and Significance of Dress Accessories, 1300–1700*, Oxford University School of Archaeology Monographs, 78 (Oxford: Institute for Archaeology, University of Oxford, 2013)

Starley, David, 'The Examination of Metalworking Debris from Kirkstall Abbey Smithy' (unpublished Archaeometallurgy Report 02.14, West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service, 2014)

Steinmetzer, M. F. R., *Archaeological Monitoring at Cleeve Abbey, Washford, Somerset. Exeter Archaeology* (Exeter Archaeology, 2009) <doi: 10.5284/1004104>

Stenning, D. F., 'Early Domestic Cross-Wings', *Transactions of the Essex Archaeological Society*, 24 (1993), 118–21

Stéphan, John, *Buckfast Abbey: A Short History and Guide* (Buckfastleigh: Buckfast Abbey, 1958)

Sternberg, Maximilian, *Cistercian Architecture and Medieval Society*, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 221 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2013)

Stöber, Karen, *Late Medieval Monasteries and Their Patrons: England and Wales, c. 1300–1540*, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion, 29 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007)

——, 'The Social Networks of Late Medieval Welsh Monasteries', in *Monasteries and Society in the British Isles in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. by Janet Burton and Karen Stöber, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion, 35 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2008), pp. 11–24

Stone, D. J., 'The Consumption and Supply of Birds in Late Medieval England', in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition*, ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron, Medieval History and Archaeology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 148–61

——, 'The Consumption of Field Crops in Late Medieval England', in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition*, ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron, Medieval History and Archaeology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 27–40

Stone, Lawrence, *Sculpture in Britain: The Middle Ages* (Harmondsworth: Penquin, 1955)

Sugget, R., 'The Chronology of Late-Medieval Timber Houses in Wales', *Vernacular Architecture*, 27 (1996), 28–35, 106–11

Sugget, Richard, 'Living Like a Lord: Greater Houses and Social Emulation in Late Medieval Wales', in *The Medieval Great House*, ed. by Malcolm Airs and P. S. Barnwell (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2011), pp. 81–95

Sutton, Anne F., 'Dress and Fashions C. 1470', in *Daily Life in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. by Richard Britnell (Stroud: Sutton, 1998), pp. 5–26, (notes) 195–99

Sykes, Naomi, 'Animals, The Bones of Medieval Society', in *Reflections: 50 Years of Medieval Archaeology, 1957-2007*, ed. by Roberta Gilchrist and Andrew Reynolds, The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monographs, 30 (Leeds: Maney, 2009), pp. 347–61

———, 'From Cu and Sceap to Beffe and Motton: The Management, Distribution, and Consumption of Cattle and Sheep in Medieval England', in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition*, ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron, Medieval History and Archaeology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 56–71

Szirmai, J. A., *The Archaeology of Medieval Bookbinding* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999)

Telesca, William J., 'The Cistercian Abbey in Fifteenth Century France: A Victim of Competing Jurisdictions of Sovereignty, Suzerainty and Primacy', in *Cistercians in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. by E. Rozanne Elder, Studies in Medieval Cistercian History, 6 (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1981), pp. 38–58

———, 'The Problem of the Commendatory Monasteries and the Order of Cîteaux during the Abbacy of Jean de Cirey, 1475–1501.', *Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses*, 22 (1971), 154–77

Thompson, Alexander Hamilton, *Roche Abbey, Yorkshire*, Ancient Monuments and Historic Buildings Series (London: H.M.S.O., 1954)

Thompson, Michael, *Cloister, Abbot and Precinct in Medieval Monasteries* (Stroud: Tempus, 2001)

Tilley, Christopher, 'The Metaphorical Transformation of Wala Canoes', in *The Material Culture Reader*, ed. by Victor Buchli (Oxford: Berg, 2002), pp. 27–56

Tillotson, J. H., 'Pensions, Corrodies and Religious Houses: An Aspect of the Relations of Crown and Church in Rarly Fourteenth Century England', *Journal of Religious History*, 8 (1974), 127–43

Tiramani, Jenny, 'Pins and Aglets', in *Everyday Objects: Medieval and Early Modern Material Culture and Its Meanings*, ed. by Tara Hamling and Catherine Richardson (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), pp. 85–94

Trigger, Bruce, *A History of Archaeological Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)

Udal, J. S., 'Notes on the History of Ford Abbey and the Families Who Have Possessed It since the Dissolution of the Monasteries', *Proceedings of the Somerset Archaeological and Natural History Society*, 43 (1896), 67–71

Vogüé, Adalbert de, 'The Meaning of Benedictine Hospitality', *Cistercian Studies*, 21 (1986), 186–94

———, 'The Rule of Saint Benedict and the Contemplative Life', *Cistercian Studies*, 1 (1966), 54–73

Waddell Chrysogonus, 'Rancé as Translator of the *Rule of Saint Benedict*', *Cistercian Studies*, 17 (1982), 244–56

———, 'The Exegetical Challenge of Early Cistercian Hagiography', *Cistercian Studies Quarterly*, 21 (1986), 195–212

Walcott, E. C. MacKenzie, 'Old Cleeve Abbey', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 1876, 402–19

Walton, P., 'Textiles', in *English Medieval Industries: Craftsmen, Techniques, Products*, by John Blair and Nigel Ramsay (London: Hambledon, 1991), pp. 319–54

Wardell, James, *An Historical Account of Kirkstall Abbey, Yorkshire, Archaeological and Historical; with the Lives of Its Abbots, from the Foundation to the Dissolution of the House*, ed. by W. M. Nelson, 6th edn (Leeds: Samuel Moxon, 1890)

———, *The Antiquities of the Borough Leeds, Described and Illustrated* (Leeds: Moxon and Walker, 1853)

Wardle, G. Y., 'The Gatehouse Chapel at Croxden Abbey', *Archaeologia*, 49 (1886), 434–38

Ward Perkins, J. B., 'A Late Thirteenth-Century Tile-Pavement at Cleeve Abbey', *Proceedings of the Somersetshire Archaeological and Natural History Society*, 87 (1941), 29–55

Ward Perkins, W. B., *London Museum: Medieval Catalogue* (London: H.M.S.O., 1940)

Wardrop, Joan, *Fountains Abbey and Its Benefactors, 1132–1300*, Cistercian Studies Series, 91 (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1980)

Warr, Cordelia, 'The Devil on My Tail: Clothing and Visual Culture in the Camposanto Last Judgement', in *Medieval Clothing and Textiles*, 11, ed. by Robin Netherton and Gale R. Owen-Crocker (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2015), pp. 99–117

———, *Dressing for Heaven: Religious Clothing in Italy, 1215–1545* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010)

Watts, M., and P. Weddell, *Summary Report: Archaeological Observations and Recording During Condition Survey Repairs to Cleeve Abbey, Washford, Somerset* (Exeter Archaeology, 2001)

Way, Albert, 'Notice of a Singular Sculptured Object, Probably a Chess-Piece, Found at Kirkstall Abbey', *The Archaeological Journal*, 6 (1849), 170–72

Weaver, F. W., 'The Last Abbot of Ford', *Proceedings of the Somerset Archaeological and Natural History Society*, 37 (1891), 1–14

Webb, Diana, *Privacy and Solitude in the Middle Ages* (London; New York: Hambledon Continuum, 2007)

Whitaker, Thomas D., *The History and Antiquities of the Deanery of Craven, in the County of York*, 2nd edn (London: W. Edwards, 1812)

Whitehead, Ross, *Buckles, 1250–1800* (Witham, Essex: Greenlight, 2003)

Willemsen, Annemarieke, '"Man Is a Sack of Muck Girded with Silver": Metal Decoration on Late-Medieval Leather Belts and Purses from the Netherlands', *Medieval Archaeology*, 56 (2012), 171–202

Williams, David H., 'Cistercian Abbots' Houses in Medieval Britain', *Cistercium Mater Nostra*, 4 (2010), 37–49

———, 'Layfolk within Cistercian Precincts', in *Monastic Studies: The Continuity of Tradition*, ed. by Judith Loades, 2 vols (Bangor: Headstart History, 1991), II, 87–117

———, *The Cistercians in the Early Middle Ages* (Leominster: Gracewing, 1998)

Williams, Stephen, 'The Cistercian Abbey of Cwmhir, Radnorshire', *Transaction of the Society of Cymmrodorion*, 1894, 61–98

———, *The Cistercian Abbey of Strata Florida: Its History and an Account of the Recent Excavations Made on This Site* (London: Whiting, 1889)

———, 'The Cistercian Abbey of Strata Marcella', *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 5th ser., 9 (1892), 1–17

Wilson, C. Anne, 'From Mediaeval Great Hall to Country-House Dining-Room: The Furniture and Setting of the Social Meal', in *'The Appetite and the Eye': Visual Aspects of Food and Its Presentation within Their Historic Context*, ed. by C. Anne Wilson, Food and Society, 2 (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1991), pp. 28–55

———, 'Ritual, Form and Colour in the Medieval Food Tradition', in *'The Appetite and the Eye': Visual Aspects of Food and Its Presentation within Their Historic Context*, ed. by C. Anne Wilson, Food and Society, 2 (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1991), pp. 5–27

Winzen, Damasus, 'Conference on the Reception of Guests', *Monastic Studies*, 10 (1974), 55–63

Wood, Margaret, *The English Medieval House* (London: Ferndale Editions, 1965)

Wood, Marguerite, and J. S. Richardson, *Melrose Abbey*, rev. edn (Edinburgh: H.M.S.O., 1981)

Wood, Susan, *English Monasteries and Their Patrons in the Thirteenth Century* (London: Oxford University Press, 1955)

Woolgar, C. M., 'Food and the Middle Ages', *Journal of Medieval History*, 36 (2010), 1–19

———, *The Great Household in Late Medieval England* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999)

———, 'Group Diets in Late Medieval England', in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition*, ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron, Medieval History and Archaeology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 191–200

———, 'Meat and Dairy Products in Late Medieval England', in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition*, ed. by C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron, Medieval History and Archaeology (Oxford: Oxford University Press,

2006), pp. 88–101

———, *The Senses in Late Medieval England* (New Haven, CT; London: Yale University Press, 2006)

———, 'Treasure, Material Posessions, and the Bishops of Late Medieval England', in *The Prelate in England and Europe, c. 1300–c. 1560*, ed. by Martin Heale (Woodbridge: York Medieval, 2014), pp. 173–90

Woolgar, C. M., D. Serjeantson, and T. Waldron, eds, *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition*, Medieval History and Archaeology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)

Wrathmell, Stuart, *Kirkstall Abbey: The Guest House – A Guide to the Medieval Buildings and to the Discoveries Made during Recent Excavations*, 2nd edn (Wakefield: West Yorkshire Archaeological Service, 1987)

Wright, Robert, '"Casting down the Altars and Levelling Everything before the Ploughshare"? The Expansion and Evolution of the Grange Estates of Kirkstall Abbey', in *Thirteenth Century England IX: Proceedings of the Durham Conference, 2001*, ed. by Michael Prestwich, Richard Hugh Britnell, and Robin Frame (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), pp. 187–200

———, 'Gift, Exchange and Purchase: Consolidation and Land Usage on the Estates of Kirkstall Abbey', *Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses*, 54 (2003), 55–83

Unpublished Secondary Sources

Carter, Michael, 'The Art and Architecture of the Cistercians in Northern England in the Late Middle Ages, C. 1300–1539' (unpublished PhD thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London, 2013)

Cassels, Alex, 'Dress Accessories in England, A.D. 1200–1500: An Archaeological Study of Consumption' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sheffield, 2013)

Cunningham, Heather, 'From St. Bernard to the Dissolution: Personal Possession and Public Austerity as Reflected in Small Metal Artifacts from the Houses of the Yorkshire Cistercians' (unpublished MA dissertation, University of York, 2010)

Duncan, Holly B., 'Kirkstall Abbey Guest House: The Other Artefacts', in *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2: The Guest House Excavations, 1979–86*, ed. by Stuart Wrathmell, Yorkshire Archaeology, 12 (Wakefield: West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service, forthcoming)

Hall, Jackie, 'Croxden Abbey: Buildings and Community' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of York, 2003)

Jecock, M., 'Jervaulx Abbey, Richmondshire, North Yorkshire' (unpublished RCHME survey report, 1999)

Jenkins, James, 'King John and the Cistercians in Wales' (unpublished PhD thesis, Cardiff University, 2012)

O'Gorman, Kevin, 'The Essence of Hospitality from the Texts of Classical Antiquity: The Development of a Hermeneutical Helix to Identify the Origins and Philosophy of the Phenomenon of Hospitality' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Strathclyde, 2008)

Patrick, P., '"Greed, Gluttony and Intemperance"? Testing the Sterotype of the "Obese Medieval Monk"' (unpublished PhD thesis, University College London, 2005)

Richardson, Jane, 'Kirkstall Guest House Animal Bones', in *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2: The Guest House Excavations, 1979–86*, ed. by Stuart Wrathmell, Yorkshire Archaeology, 12 (Wakefield: West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service, forthcoming)

Rochelle, Ramey, 'Abbot's Lodgings of the Cistercian Order in the Late Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries' (unpublished MA thesis, University of York, 1996)

Rose, Sarah, 'Landed Society in the Honour of Pontefract, c. 1086–1509' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Lancaster, 2009)

Rowell, Rochelle L., 'The Archaeology of Late Monastic Hospitality' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of York, 2000)

Sonntag, Jörg, 'Commenting Heaven: The Pontigny Commentary on the Rule of Benedict', in *Cistercians, V: Imagery and Conceptualisation in Cistercian Thought* (presented at

the International Medieval Congress, Leeds, UK, 2015)

Standley, Eleanor Rose, 'Trinkets and Charms: The Use, Meaning and Significance of Later Medieval and Early Post-Medieval Dress Accessories' (unpublished PhD thesis, Durham University, 2010)

Wrathmell, Stuart, ed., *Kirkstall Abbey, Vol. 2: The Guest House Excavations, 1979–86*, Yorkshire Archaeology, 12 (Wakefield: West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service, (forthcoming))

Wright, Robert, 'The Granges and Estates of Kirkstall Abbey in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Leeds, 2002)