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PREFACE

The modern study of the minster and collegiate church of Westbury-on-Trym began in the early twentieth century. Rose Graham gave a concise account of its history in the *Victoria County History of Gloucestershire* (1907). Alexander Hamilton Thompson (himself a Bristolian) delved more deeply in the course of his study of the parish of Henbury (1915), and the Revd H. J. Wilkins published a series of pamphlets on the subject from 1909 to 1920, as well as a volume of materials for the history of the college from the late twelfth to the mid sixteenth centuries (1917). All these authors did important work, but during the hundred years or so since they wrote, more material relating to Westbury church has become available. A fuller understanding has developed both of its locality and of the religious history of medieval England of which it formed part. The site of the college was excavated by the City Museum, Bristol, under the direction of Michael Ponsford in 1968–70, and detailed studies have been published of the ‘North Almshouse’ and the burial crypt of Bishop Carpenter by James Russell. All this makes it an appropriate time to write a fresh account of the subject, encompassing its documentary and architectural sources. Westbury has had an association with several leading figures of English history: St Oswald in the tenth century, St Wulfstan in the late eleventh, Godfrey Giffard in the late thirteenth, and John Wycliffe and John Trevisa in the fourteenth. Its reconstruction by John Carpenter in the fifteenth made it an outstanding example of the collegiate churches founded in England during the later middle ages. The volume that follows aims to supply a fuller account of these and other matters, in such a way as to provide material for the history not only of Westbury but of the wider English Church up to the Reformation.

Part II of the present work was undertaken by Jon Cannon and the rest of it by Nicholas Orme. We are grateful to all who have assisted us at Westbury. The vicar and staff of the church enabled our access to every part of it and to the remains of the college building. Michael Ponsford and James Russell gave us unstinted advice from their knowledge of the site, and both commented on our text to its great advantage. They have put us deeply in debt to them by generously making available copies of cartographic materials and by contributing ten of the maps and plans in the volume. Mike Rouillard drew the other maps and plans, and produced the final versions of all the cartography. A number of scholars have given us generous advice and help on particular topics, including Roger Bowers, Nicholas Brooks, Susan J. Davies, Miriam Gill, John Goodall, Richard Halsey, Michael Hare, Pamela King, Phillip Lindley and John McNeill. Any faults in the volume are wholly our own. We would also like to
express our gratitude to the staff of the National Archives, the Bodleian Library Oxford, Bristol Central Library, Bristol Digitisation Bureau, Bristol Museum and Art Gallery, Bristol Record Office, Gloucestershire County Record Office, the National Monuments Record Swindon, the National Trust Archives Swindon, the Society of Antiquaries of London, and Worcestershire County Record Office, as well as to Mr Rob Petre, archivist of Oriel College Oxford, and Dr David Morrison, librarian of Worcester Cathedral. John and Pippa Wickson provided kind hospitality during a research visit to Worcester. Finally it is our pleasure to acknowledge the encouragement and support of Dr Peter Fleming, Dr Joe Bettey, and the Bristol Record Society, and the generosity of the Marc Fitch Fund in making a grant towards the costs of the cartography and illustrations.

We dedicate this volume to Michael Ponsford and James Russell in appreciation of their work on the archaeology and history of Westbury-on-Trym.

Nicholas Orme and Jon Cannon
March 2010
PART I: HISTORY
Fig. 1  The parishes of Westbury and Henbury.
FROM THE ORIGINS TO 1280

From the Romans to the Ninth Century

Westbury-on-Trym is a suburb of Bristol: an adjunct of a great city and a prosperous and desirable place to live. Its history too has been one of proximity and prosperity, as far back as Roman times. The terrain around it ranges from hills inland to flat estuarial land beside the Rivers Severn and Avon, some of which was anciently saltmarsh. This gave it a variety of natural resources, described by Bishop Wulfstan of Worcester in 1092 as ‘woods and open country, fields and pastures, waters and fisheries’.¹ By the twelfth century there was even vine growing, and in 1149 Bishop Simon of Worcester granted a fifth of the tithes of the vines to the sacrist of Worcester Cathedral.² Hunting and wild-fowling are mentioned in 1463.³

The area has never been an important centre of administration, trade, or communications, but it has always been close to places that were (Fig. 1). In Roman Britain it lay near the port of Abonae, identifiable with Sea Mills on the River Avon.⁴ From here a road led northwards through Henbury to Gloucester and the Midlands, while another stretched eastwards towards Bath and London. Westwards one or more ferry passages took traffic across the River Severn from Abonae and its district to Sudbrook, Monmouthshire, and thence to the Roman town of Venta, now Caerwent. The ferries may have operated from Abonae itself or from Redwick or Aust Cliff further north.⁵ Aust Cliff in particular, seven and a half miles north-west of Westbury, has revealed traces of Roman occupation,⁶ and it has been conjectured that Aust might represent a lost Roman place-name Trajectus Augustae (‘the passage of Augustus’).

After the evaporation of Roman power in Britain in the early fifth century, the Westbury area probably formed part of a native British kingdom until the victory of

¹ See below, p. 15.
³ Below, p. 83.
the West Saxons over the Britons at Dyram ten miles east of Westbury, which is said to have taken place in the year 577.\textsuperscript{7} That event did not bring the area into the West Saxon kingdom, however. Instead Westbury and its neighbourhood passed into the territory of the Hwicce, a people who occupied Gloucestershire, Worcestershire, and south Warwickshire. The Hwicce had their own kings by the late seventh century, but during the eighth these rulers came under the domination of the kings of Mercia further north, and by about 800 the Hwicce were subsumed into a unit of that kingdom.\textsuperscript{8} Under the Hwicce and the Mercians the Westbury district lay in a strategic corner between the Severn and Avon. It provided these kingdoms with access to the Bristol Channel and to south Wales, and also lay close to their border with the lands of the West Saxon kings, who ruled Somerset south of the Avon. In the early tenth century western Mercia was united with the West Saxon kingdom, and this event was soon followed by the growth of a town at Bristol by a major crossing point over the Avon. Westbury now adjoined an important centre of population and trade and, when English rule was established over south Wales in the twelfth century, the ferry route at Aust Cliff became again a well-used link between southern England and Wales, although in medieval times this route crossed to the Beachley peninsula in Gloucestershire and thence to Wales via Chepstow.

The early written history of the Westbury area exists only in Anglo-Saxon charters, some of them preserved in much later texts. These are chiefly texts produced in the interests of the bishops and clergy of Worcester and are therefore susceptible of having been edited or invented to support their claims to the area. The earliest charter represents itself as having been issued between 697 and 699 by Æthelred, king of Mercia, granting thirty hides (\textit{cassati}) of land at Henbury and Aust to Offfor, bishop of Worcester, and the church of St Peter at Worcester (Worcester Cathedral).\textsuperscript{9} The charter exists only in a much later (seventeenth-century) transcript. This does not rule out its authenticity, but most of the eight surviving charters attributed to Æthelred (relating to four different monasteries) have dubious features, making it unclear how often he actually issued such documents and how frequently they were produced in later times to support a belief or tradition to that effect.\textsuperscript{10} The bishop and his church certainly came to hold Henbury and much of Aust by about the year 800, but whether Æthelred’s was the original and substantive grant is a matter for debate. If it was, it came very early in the history of the diocese of Worcester, which had been established as recently as 680 to provide religious oversight of the territory of the Hwicce. Offfor was only the second bishop. The grant, if true, would represent an initiative by Æthelred of Mercia to exert his authority over the Hwicce, a previously separate people, by forging a link with their bishop and making (or validating) a grant of property in the furthest south-west corner of their territory. From the bishop’s point of view it would have given him a base from which he could supervise that end of his diocese.

\textsuperscript{8} On the people and kingdom, see Della Hooke, The Anglo-Saxon Landscape: the kingdom of the Hwicce (Manchester, 1985).  
\textsuperscript{10} S 70–77; Finberg, ECWM, nos 1–2 p. 31, nos 5–6 p. 32, nos 195(1), 197–9 pp. 86–7, no. 427 p. 147.
The evidence for Worcester’s links with the Henbury area is not much stronger for most of the eighth century. In 794 the bishops of Worcester produced a charter which they claimed had been granted to them by another king of Mercia, Æthelbald who reigned from 716 to 757, giving them five hides (manentes) of land at Aust. This claim may be true, or the charter may have been manufactured to suit the circumstances of 794. A second eighth-century charter has been linked with Henbury, but may probably be discounted. This one is datable between 757 and 774 and records a grant by a certain Abbot Ceolfrith of twenty hides (manentes) of land at Heanburu and four hides (cassati) at Sture in the province of Usmere to the church of Worcester and its bishops. Usmere is Ismere in north Worcestershire and had belonged to Ceolfrith’s father Cyneberht, while Heanburu is the original form of Henbury in the same area as well as of Henbury. Some historians have preferred the latter identification, but the grounds for this are outweighed by the fact that Henbury would require Ceolfrith to have held property in two widely separate places. Hanbury seems more likely, since it (like Henbury) belonged to the bishops of Worcester in later times. Only when we reach the 790s does the evidence for the bishop of Worcester’s tenure of land in the Henbury area become secure. This is the result of a dispute between Bishop Heathured of Worcester and a courtier of King Offa of Mercia named Bynna, described as ‘the king’s companion’. Bynna was charged with having taken the five hides of land at Aust that King Æthelbald had allegedly given to Worcester earlier in the century. Heathured took what he claimed as the charter to the regular synod of the English Church held probably in 794 at Clofesho, a still unidentified place, and gained the judgment of King Offa and of the whole synod in his favour. The record of the judgment is the first definite proof that the bishops of Worcester held land in the Henbury region, and we can probably add Henbury to Aust by this time in view of the bishops’ forthcoming connection with Westbury, to which we now turn.

The earliest charters that mention Westbury also survive from the 790s. One, issued by King Offa between 793 and 796, granted land to Æthelmund, his servant (minister), in the form of fifty-five hides (cassati) of land at Westbury (Uuestburg) ‘in the province of the Hwicce’ and ‘near the river which is called Avon’. The land was to be free of all obligations except the three common duties of military service, bridge-building, and fortress-building. Another charter, granted by Offa in the same span of years, gave sixty hides (manentes) of land at Westbury and twenty at Henbury to Worcester (meaning the bishop and the church). This second charter claimed that the

---

11 Finberg, *ECWM*, no. 19 p. 35, deduced from S 137.
12 S 1411; Finberg, *ECWM*, no. 28 p. 37.
13 S 89; Finberg, *ECWM*, no. 211 p. 91.
14 A view held by Finberg, *ECWM*, p. 37, and Patrick Sims-Williams, *Religion and Literature in Western England 600–800* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 149, 162. Professor N. P. Brooks observes to me that Finberg was probably influenced by the inclusion of the charter under Gloucestershire in the tenth-century *Liber Wigorniensis* which may not have been a correct attribution, and Sims-Williams by the hideage, but this tended to be estimated in multiples of five anyway and actually differs in the version of the charter preserved in British Library Cotton MS Nero E 1 f. 587.
15 S 137; Finberg, *ECWM*, no. 48 p. 42.
16 In writing what follows, we are grateful to Michael Hare for allowing us to see a draft of his unpublished paper on ‘Deerhurst’s Earliest Patrons: Æthelmund and Æthelric’.
17 S 139; Finberg, *ECWM*, no. 49 p. 42.
land had formerly been granted by King Æthelbald to Eanwulf, grandfather of Offa. It provided that the grant should be free of the performance of duties except for some specified provisions of food for the king, and should take effect only after the deaths of Offa and his son Ecgfrith – events that both occurred in 796. If each of these charters were to be taken as genuine, it would appear that Offa conveyed different parcels of land at Westbury to two different parties: Æthelmund and Worcester, but Patrick Wormald has pointed out that the grant to Worcester is recorded only in an eleventh-century cartulary of that church, and has suggested that it may have been produced by the bishop of Worcester as part of a dispute about Æthelmund’s property which arose soon after 800. Given the possibility of the grant by Æthelbald to Eanwulf and the more certain grant by Offa to Æthelmund, it looks likely that Westbury (as opposed to Henbury and Aust) was in lay hands up to 800 and that, if it had a church by this date (a matter to which we shall come), the church originated as the creation of a lay family rather than that of the bishops of Worcester.

The acquisition of Westbury by the bishops is more certainly linked with a sequence of events in the early 800s. By 804 Æthelmund, the recipient of Offa’s grant at Westbury, had been succeeded by his son Æthelric. Æthelric was an important landowner whose property included not only Westbury but lands at Bromsgrove (Worc.s.), in the Stour valley (Gloucs. and Warws.), and at Over (Gloucs.) opposite Gloucester across the Severn. In a charter issued in 804, he tells us something about the circumstances in which he possessed his property. His kindred had granted it to him (or recognised his right to it), and he held a charter giving him title to it. In order to confirm his rights, he took the charter to a synod presided over by King Cenwulf of Mercia and Archbishop Æthelheard of Canterbury, and the synod agreed that he was free to dispose of his lands as he wished. Æthelric accordingly issued a fresh charter in the manner of a will to take effect when he died. In this he assigned his property at Bromsgrove to pass to a certain Wærferth for life and afterwards to the church (meaning the bishop and cathedral) of Worcester. His Stour lands were promised to the minster of Deerhurst (Gloucs.), and Over to the minster of Gloucester. Finally he dealt with ‘Westminster’, by which he meant Westbury, and ‘Stoke’, which may have signified Stoke Bishop near Westbury or Stoke Gifford four miles north-east of it. These two estates involved a more complicated arrangement. They were to belong to his mother Ceolburh for her life, and to revert to the church of Worcester after her death, so ‘that on this account she [Ceolburh] may while she lives have there protection and defence against the claims of the Berkeley people’. Berkeley was the site of a minster of nuns (perhaps even a double house of nuns and monks), and it is probable that Ceolburh is identical with an abbess of that name who died in 807 and

---

20 Æthelmund may be the ealdorman recorded in the Anglo-Saxon chronicle as having been killed in battle at Kempsford, Gloucs., in 802 (The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, trans. Whitelock and others, p. 38).
21 Michael Hare suggests Stoke Prior (Worc.s.) as a further possibility, in view of Æthelric’s widely scattered estates. However Stoke Bishop seems very likely, as it was close to and closely linked with Westbury.
22 S 1187; Finberg, ECWM, no. 53 p. 43; trans. Whitelock, English Historical Documents, i, 512–13.
was subsequently said to have been abbess of Berkeley.\footnote{An abbess named Ceolburh died in 807 and is later said to have been abbess of Berkeley (\textit{The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle}, trans. Whitelock and others, p. 39; Florence [\textit{recte John}] of Worcester, \textit{Chronicon ex Chronicis}, ed. B. Thorpe, 2 vols (London, 1848–9), i, 64).} We shall shortly encounter the Berkeley minster in possession of lands in Stoke Bishop, and King’s Weston in Henbury parish was later part of the hundred of Berkeley.

A nobleman normally passed his property to his children and to his wife (if she was still alive) for the duration of her life. The terms of Æthelric’s charter suggest that he had no surviving wife or children, and that his mother was his only close relation. He evidently felt an obligation to give her some property if she outlived him – this would enable her to live in more dignity and comfort even if she were a nun – but he was concerned about what might happen to the property after he died. Given the social conditions of the day, as soon as it passed to Ceolburh it might be taken by the family that controlled the minster of Berkeley (which may have been her own family) or by the minster clergy, on the grounds that she was a sister of Berkeley church. This might happen even while she was still alive. Æthelric wished to avoid this outcome and looked to the bishop of Worcester to protect his mother’s possession of the property in return for inheriting it and the church of Westbury after her death. His foresight that Berkeley might challenge his arrangements was shrewd and was duly confirmed. In 824, when it is to be inferred that he and his mother were dead, the Berkeley minster contested the right of the bishop of Worcester to the possession of Westbury and its land. The bishop, Heahberht, took the charters relating to the property to the synod at Clofesho, where the archbishop and the synod agreed that Heahberht, who now held the ‘minster’ (i.e. Westbury), the land, and the deeds, should swear the land into his own possession: in other words proclaim his legal rights in a public ceremony. The swearing was to be carried out at Westbury (again referred to as ‘Westminster’) thirty days after the synod of Clofesho, and a note on the charter states that ‘at the oath at Westminster there were as many as 50 priests and 10 deacons and 160 other priests’ – a crowd of clergy doubtless convoked by the bishop to affirm his possession.\footnote{S 1433; Finberg, \textit{ECWM}, no. 62 p. 45; trans. Whitelock, \textit{English Historical Documents}, i, 516–17.} If Wormald’s surmise is correct, this dispute may have prompted the production of documents in Worcester’s favour such as the grant ascribed to Offa.

The cumulative evidence of the early charters suggests that the bishops of Worcester came to hold property in and around Henbury, possibly by the 690s but not certainly until the 790s. By about 800 they had a sufficient presence there to impress Æthelric with their ability to look after his church of Westbury. According to their own records they came into possession of land at Westbury from King Offa in the 790s, but it may be that this possession was more truly the result of Æthelric’s conditional bequest of 804 which became effective only between then and 824, that Westbury was previously in the hands of lay nobility, and that its church was founded by these nobility. In later times, Henbury and Westbury each had a separate church, only about a mile apart, and each church had a separate parish, which is consistent with their having been two estates once held by different owners. A church may have existed at Westbury by 757, if we can accept the tradition of Æthelbald’s grant to Eanwulf and if ‘bury’ may be interpreted to mean a monastery, a matter examined below. There was definitely a church by 804 when Æthelric’s charter calls it a minster,
‘Westminster’, a term repeated in the settlement of 824 but not found subsequently. ‘Minster’ was the Anglo-Saxon word for a monastery, and the church at Westbury either originated as one or became one by 804. Like other monasteries of this period, it would have been ruled by an abbot and staffed by clergy who said the monastic office (the round of daily services) and probably shared a good deal of their life, for example in a communal refectory and dormitory. They would also have been the subject of some oversight from their patron: the original owner of the property or his successor, Æthelric’s family at first and later the bishops of Worcester.

This brings us to the meaning and significance of the names ‘Westbury’ and ‘Westminster’. The word ‘bury’ derives from the Anglo-Saxon burh which had the primary meaning of a fort, but it could also mean a fortified house and Professor John Blair has pointed to several cases where it was used of minsters. These include not only Westbury but Fladbury, Glastonbury, Malmesbury, Tilbury, and Paulesbyri – an old name of St Paul’s Cathedral, London. We do not therefore need to postulate a fort at Westbury, such as a prehistoric hill-fort. Westbury could have originated in the sense of a fortified house or a minster, hence the possibility that the minster may be traceable back to the mid 700s although it is not clearly mentioned as such until 804. The ancient site of the minster lay, broadly speaking, in the vicinity of the present-day parish church. This vicinity contains two significant areas (Fig. 2). The first is an elevated site defined on the north by a steep bank or cliff beside the River Trym, containing the present-day church and churchyard. The second is a roughly triangular site west of the church and below it, bounded by Church Street, High Street, and the river. In the fifteenth century this lower site included the residential college building of the clergy of Westbury church (ST 573774), and in modern times it was bisected by a new thoroughfare, College Street.

Excavations by Bristol Museum on the lower site in 1968–70, within what was later the building of the college, revealed evidence of occupation in the late Anglo-Saxon period (Fig. 5). Traces were found of one or more timber structures, several burials, and at least two possible graves from which bodies may have been removed for reburial. This seems to point to the presence of an Anglo-Saxon church on the lower site: a church that was either the original minster or a subsequent rebuilding of it. Eventually a church was built on the upper site where it stands at present. The earliest surviving remains of this church date only from about 1200, but it is possible that the late-medieval layout of its east end – including an apse and a crypt chapel – represents an attempt to preserve the footprint of a building older than the Norman Conquest (Figs. 4 and 10). If there were two churches, one could have supplemented the other, have replaced it, or both. Replacement is perhaps the more likely, because although two bishops of Worcester, Oswald in the 960s and Wulfstan in the 1090s, tried to convert Westbury partly or wholly into a community of monks, there is no evidence that this involved the building of a secondary church. No church appears to have stood on the lower site after about 1100 since there is no subsequent record of such a structure there, but vestiges of its presence may have remained for some time.

---

28 On the evidence for two possible early churches, see below, pp. 113–24.
afterwards, perhaps in the form of a burial ground. A reference of 1293 to three chapels ‘in the cemetery’ which were apparently in danger of being used as dwellings suggests the lower site rather than the higher one. The lower site also seems to have been the residential location of the clergy of Westbury throughout the middle ages, since there is no record or trace of houses for them on the higher site around the present church.\(^{29}\) It is possible that their residences on the lower site were arranged around an older cemetery.\(^{30}\)

The significance of the name of the bury and minster as ‘west’ is a difficult matter. Blair has observed that some other minster churches had ‘directional’ names of this kind (notably Westminster, Middx.) but that they lay in the south-east of England, making Westbury anomalous in this respect.\(^{31}\) The name makes no sense in relation to Henbury, the other chief local centre, from which Westbury lies south-east. A. H. Smith proposed that Westbury was so called because it lay west of the Roman road from the Bristol area to Gloucester, a suggestion which assumed that this road followed the modern A38 which passes east of Westbury.\(^{32}\) While a Roman road on this line cannot be ruled out, the only such road attested at present ran from Sea Mills via Cribbs Causeway to Almondsbury, leaving Westbury to its east,\(^{33}\) but in any case a larger context than a road seems appropriate for a place of such importance. Other explanations may be offered, but none of them can be proved. If ‘bury’ meant only a house, Westbury may have been the most western residence on the properties of Æthelmund and Æthelric. If it meant a minster and in its form ‘Westminster’, ‘west’ may have related to a minster further east. There was one at Old Sodbury, Gloucs., twelve miles east-north-east of Westbury, which supported a religious community under the authority of the bishops of Worcester by 775, but little is recorded about it.\(^{34}\) Bitton, Gloucs., eight miles south-east of Westbury, had a church with land in 1086 which may have been a former minster.\(^{35}\) Slightly further away was Bath in Somerset, the site of a minster of nuns closely linked with the Hwicce, the bishop of Worcester, and King Offa.\(^{36}\) Old Sodbury and Bitton were probably too small to act as reference points for Westbury, but Bath’s territory or sphere of influence may have been sufficiently large and close to do so.

A fourth possibility is that Westbury was regarded as the most westerly minster of a wider area. This area may have been the estates of Æthelmund and Æthelric, the latter of whom had a close connection with the minster of Deerhurst and perhaps with other minsters.\(^{37}\) It could even have been the lands of the Hwicce as a whole, since Westbury is indeed the furthest minster west in this respect, lying slightly beyond latitude of Berkeley, its nearest competitor in that respect. Of course we cannot rely on the Hwicce having being aware of something that rests on modern geographical
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\(^{29}\) For further discussion of the lower site, see below, pp. 113–15.

\(^{30}\) See below, p. 36.


\(^{34}\) S 1446; Finberg, *ECWM*, no. 25 pp. 36, no. 64 p. 46, no. 89 p. 52.


\(^{36}\) S 51; S 1257; Finberg, *ECWM*, no. 28 pp. 95–6; cf. pp. 163, 173.

\(^{37}\) S 1187, where he discusses the possibility of being buried at Deerhurst.
reckoning. But if ‘west’ may be extended to include the south-west, Westbury would have been perceptibly the furthest minster in that direction and the nearest to the Bristol Channel that led to the western seas and western side of the British Isles.

**Oswald and the Tenth Century**

During the ninth century, minsters in England underwent change from the pressure of Viking raids or from the preference of their inmates to live more individually. By the tenth, virtually all had modified the monastic way of life. Minster clergy now often occupied separate houses, held personal shares of the community’s property (later known as prebends), and sometimes married with the result that they passed on their house and prebend to a son. In the tenth century, however, more settled conditions allowed a revival of the monastic life in England in the form of stricter communities of celibate monks. This set up a sharper division than had existed previously between monks on the one hand, living in a more enclosed and communal way, and those at first called ‘clerks’ and later ‘canons’ who led a more open and individual life on the lines depicted above. These two competing kinds of religious life were to have much significance for those who ruled and staffed the church of Westbury between the middle of the tenth and the middle of the twelfth centuries. Was it to evolve as a monastery or as a house of clerks and canons?

Only one document throws light on Westbury during the later ninth century: a charter of Æthelred, ealdorman of Mercia, in 883 involving the minster of Berkeley. Æthelred purchased twelve hides of land at Stoke Bishop from Berkeley in exchange for a grant of privileges and a sum of money. In turn he granted the land to Cynwulf son of Ceoluht for three lives, with the proviso that the property should then revert to the church of Worcester. The boundaries of the property are defined in a supplement to the charter written in English. How far the charter (which survives in the archives of Worcester) has been adapted in later times to serve the purposes of that church remains, as usual, a difficult question, but charter and boundaries together cast light on three strands of the church history of Westbury although they do not mention that church as such. First, the boundaries show that the Stoke estate consisted of two parts: a butterfly-shaped portion between Westbury and Clifton, including Redland, and a separate portion at Shirehampton. Both these areas are later recorded as having belonged to Westbury parish, Shirehampton forming a detached part or ‘tithing’ of that parish, and the charter helps to explain its incorporation in the parish (Fig. 1). Secondly, the charter points to the continuation of Berkeley’s claims in the Westbury area well after the Clofesho adjudication of 824, and thirdly it shows how Church property, in this case that which Berkeley owned or claimed, could pass into the hands of powerful noblemen and thence to their supporters, albeit through what was nominally a long lease.

---


None of this tells us about the Westbury minster, however. Its history remains obscure from the 820s until the 960s, when it reappears in the very different context of the monastic revival. One of the pioneers of this revival was Oda, archbishop of Canterbury 941–58, who embraced the monastic life at Fleury-sur-Loire in France and sent his nephew Oswald there in about 950 for the same purpose. Oswald came from a prominent family of Anglo-Danish extraction which included Os cytel, archbishop of York 956–71. After Edgar became king of all England in 959 and began to give favour to monks, he promoted Oswald be bishop of Worcester in 961. Together with Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury from 959, and Æthelwold, bishop of Winchester from 963, Oswald became a leader in the restoration of monastic life to some of the cathedrals and minster churches of England. In due course a Life of him was written by Byrhtferth, monk of Ramsey Abbey, Hunts., in about 997–1002. It contains valuable material about Westbury, no doubt because some of the senior monks of Byrhtferth’s day had entered the monastic life there before moving to Ramsey, and could supply him with reminiscences.

According to Byrhtferth’s Life, Oswald made friends in about the 950s with a young man from Winchester called Germanus, who also took monastic vows at Fleury. When Oswald became a bishop, clergy began to come to him who wished to live as monks, so he sent for Germanus and gave him the task of teaching them. Soon there were more than twelve such men including a ‘venerable priest’ named Eadnoth (known as Eadnoth Senior), as well as some children [parvulis], meaning ‘oblate boys’ offered by their families to become monks. Oswald placed them all ‘in a certain parish called Westbury’, and supplied them with drink, food, and clothing.

This, we should note, was the first monastic community to be founded in England during the monastic revival, and its foundation took place a few months after Oswald’s arrival at Worcester early in 961, probably in the same year. Byrhtferth states that the monks carried out divine services in a (or the) church there in the monastic manner, and spent the rest of their time rehearsing hymns and reading. He also mentions men who were not monks. ‘For the external affairs of the monastery they [the monks] appointed what the apostle [Paul] calls “men of little account” [contemptibiles], who knew nothing of divine services and were unable to perform them, making the appointment out of kindly concern so that “idleness which is inimical to the soul” should not afflict them.’

Who were these men? It seems unlikely that they were lay servants, since one would hardly bother to attribute liturgical ignorance to such people. They could have been monastic recruits found wanting in abilities, but if so it is odd that their
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40 On Oswald, see St Oswald of Worcester: life and influence, ed. N. P. Brooks and C. Cubitt (London, 1996), and ODNB article by N. P. Brooks.
44 Ibid., pp. 70–1, quoting 1 Corinthians chapter 6 verse 4. The translation is by Michael Lapidge, but I have inserted the phrase ‘men of little account’ in place of his ‘contemptible persons’, as being closer to the meaning of the Latin text of Corinthians.
knowledge is called into question rather than their aptitude to learn. Another possibility is that they were clergy who, in Byrhtferth’s view, were both ignorant of the liturgy and incapable of executing it properly: in other words the clerks of Westbury minster. Such a view of clerks would have been natural to a monk writing in the late tenth century, when the two kinds of religious life were well differentiated and monks took a superior view of their own kind. If so, the passage would mean that the clerks continued to exist alongside the monks, taking little or no part in church services but undertaking tasks that may have included ministering to the laity or dealing with secular matters. The monks, however, were in overall charge in Byrhtferth’s view. The presence of clerks alongside the monks is perfectly feasible. Some would probably have been in possession of the church in 961. A similar joint arrangement was made by Oswald at Worcester Cathedral, where he introduced monks alongside the clerks whom he found there, rather than evicting the clerks to make room for the monks as Æthelwold did at Winchester. At Worcester Oswald even built a second church so that each community had its own place of worship. Byrhtferth does not specify this at Westbury, but he may allude to a division of resources when he emphasises the fact that the bishop provided the monks’ supplies, rather than saying that they came from the church’s own endowments. This implies that they were sent from his estate at Henbury, and that the Westbury lands and tithes continued to be held by the clerks.

The Westbury monastery is mentioned by two other writers, but at a much greater distance of time. Eadmer of Canterbury, who wrote a revised Life of Oswald in the early twelfth century, thought that Oswald made Germanus both head (praepositus) and teacher (instititor) of the monks there. The ‘Book of Benefactors’ compiled later in that century at Ramsey Abbey, Hunts., to which the Westbury monks transferred themselves, differed in saying that Germanus acted as prior (prior), teaching the monks monastic discipline, while Eadnoth Senior was praepositus in charge of matters of organisation. But in the event the monks did not stay at Westbury for long: Byrhtferth says for ‘four or more years’. During the 960s Oswald was offered land at Ramsey with endowments for a monastery by Æthelwine, a wealthy English nobleman. Eadnoth Senior was sent to Ramsey to supervise the construction of temporary buildings to house a community, and Oswald duly led the Westbury monks there himself. They took possession of the place on a 29 August, probably in 965 or 966, and (according to the Ramsey tradition) Germanus and Eadnoth Senior shared authority as they had done at Westbury. Oswald continued to promote monasticism in his diocese after the foundation of Ramsey, notably at Winchcombe, Gloucs., where he placed Germanus as head of a group of monks in about 970. Byrhtferth believed that the bishop eventually ruled seven such communities, founded by himself or other people. But the Life of Oswald makes no reference to monks remaining at Westbury after the move to Ramsey and, although it is dangerous to argue from silence, the omission must be significant. Byrhtferth had a good knowledge of Worcester diocese, including the monasteries at

Evesham and Pershore. He would not have ignored the later existence of monks at Westbury since their house would have been regarded as Ramsey’s sister (if not its mother) and as one of Oswald’s enduring achievements. This makes it safe to say that the Westbury monastery ended with the move to Ramsey. A joint arrangement with the clerks may not have worked well, deterring Oswald from repeating it. Moreover conditions became less favourable to monasticism in Gloucestershire in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries. In or after 975 an important Mercian nobleman named Ælferth ejected Germanus and his monks from Winchcombe, and later traditions credited Ælferth with similar actions at Evesham and Pershore. The Winchcombe monks returned to Ramsey and Germanus spent some time at Fleury before rejoining them. His last known promotion was to be abbot of Cholsey, Berks. in the early 990s and he probably died in or soon after 1013.

Wulfstan and the Eleventh Century

In the absence of monks, it seems most likely that Westbury remained in the hands of clerks alone from the 960s until the second half of the eleventh century. Some contextual factors may be mentioned in support of this view. The church, as we shall see, held lands and was therefore capable of sustaining a group of clerics. The bishops of Worcester owned the church and stood to gain by appointing clergy to serve it. Any Westbury clerks are likely to have held pieces of the church’s property on an individual basis, making it difficult to dislodge them, and (if the charter of 883 can be trusted) at least part of the shape of the parish continued in being. But no direct light is shed on Westbury from Byrhtferth’s time until that of Wulfstan, bishop of Worcester from 1062 to 1095, who gives a brief account of its history in a charter which he issued in 1092. In the charter Wulfstan claimed that Oswald constructed the church and enriched it with lands, wealth, and monks serving God. Afterwards (presumably following Oswald’s death), the church was ‘devastated by pirates [i.e. the Danes] and destroyed by age and by the negligence of its heads [praepositorum] ... The land that belonged to the church was ensnared and snatched away by laymen’. Wulfstan’s account is amplified by Hemming, a monk of Worcester who also wrote in the 1090s and asserted that up to that time ‘there did not remain in it [i.e. the church of Westbury] save one priest alone, who rarely carried out the office of divine service’. A third tradition, recorded by William of Malmesbury in the twelfth century, said that Wulfstan found the church ‘half ruined, and the roof half gone’.

There is no reason to doubt that the church of Westbury may have gone through a troubled period after Oswald’s death. England suffered further Viking raids and
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49 Ibid., pp. 100–1, 112–13.
invasions from the 990s until the 1010s, royal government was disrupted at times in this period, and it would have not have been difficult for powerful lay people to make encroachments on the church’s property. We have already encountered Bynna’s seizure of the bishop’s estate at Aust in the eighth century, and there is a mysterious (if authentic) grant of six hides of land at Aust Cliff by King Æthelred the Unready to the abbot of Glastonbury between 979 and 997. If what Hemming says is true, Westbury, shorn of much of its land, declined into a mere parish church served by a single priest. Wulfstan’s charter of 1092 sought to solve the problems of Westbury by granting the church and its property to Worcester Cathedral to be a daughter house for monks of the cathedral. This reflected his sympathies which, like Oswald’s, were those of a convert to monasticism. Born at Itchington, Warws., he began his adult career as a clerk of Bishop Brihteah of Worcester and as rector of Hawkesbury, Gloucs., before becoming a monk of Worcester Cathedral, rising to be its prior in about 1055 and its bishop seven years later. His Westbury project also coincided with the beginning of the second and greater monastic revival in England which followed the Norman Conquest and extended into the thirteenth century.

Ostensibly therefore Wulfstan’s conveyance of Westbury to Worcester reflected the fact that he found the church in an unsatisfactory state and decided that it would function better with monks under the control of Worcester, a major monastery. A problem with accepting this explanation at face value is the length of time that he took to deal with Westbury: thirty years after becoming bishop and not very long before his death in 1095. Admittedly he seems to have spent a good deal of time in sorting out the local situation. His charter of 1092 claims that he had applied himself to repairing the church and to regaining its property: ‘part of the aforesaid land recovered by lawful right, part redeemed at the price of my own money’. It is possible, however, that this recovery involved not only property held by lay people but by clerks of the church. If Westbury was staffed by a body of clerks throughout the tenth and eleventh centuries, as we have suggested, it may have taken Wulfstan decades before they died or until he could buy out their claims, allowing him to resume control of what they had individually held of the church’s property. Their number may have been depleted as much by Wulfstan as by lay encroachments, and the single priest have been retained deliberately to provide pastoral care for the people of Westbury. A further possibility is that Wulfstan was not simply led in what he did by affairs at Westbury but by events at Worcester Cathedral towards the end of his time as bishop. A new Norman prior, Thomas, was in charge from 1080, Norman monks were being admitted, and there may have been tensions between them and the English monks of the community. Wulfstan may have sought to soothe the situation by moving some of the English to Westbury. The monks who came were certainly led by an English prior, Coleman, who is known to have had reservations about the Normans and later wrote a Life of Wulfstan in English. This motive does not rule out the

54 S 1780; Finberg, ECWM, no. 133 p. 62; discussed by Lesley Abrams, Anglo-Saxon Glastonbury: church and endowment (Woodbridge, 1996), pp. 50–1.
55 On Wulfstan, see Emma Mason, St Wulfstan of Worcester c.1008–1095 (Oxford, 1990), ODNB article by idem, and Julia S. Barrow and N. P. Brooks, St Wulfstan and his World (Aldershot, 2005).
other; Wulfstan may have thought Westbury better served by monks of Worcester and an appropriate place for monks of English birth.

His charter of 1092, dated 8 September, conveyed the church of Westbury to Worcester with a substantial amount of property, specified as consisting of

two and a half hides and one virgate [virgam] in Westbury, part also of the land which includes the circuit of the said monastery, part also of the wood of Ashgrove [Æscgraf], and 12 acres of meadow:
two and a half hides and 28 acres of land in Henbury and in Charlton and in Wica;
the churches of Henbury and Stoke with all tithes both of crops and of cattle or draught animals;
one and a half hides in Berwick;
one virgate in Haseldene;
all this with woods and open country, fields and pastures, waters and fisheries.

The property was granted ‘to Christ, Mary, and all the apostles’, and a curse was invoked on anyone who infringed the grant. This is the earliest precise account of the property of Westbury church, but it does not explain how many of the church’s former possessions were comprised therein and whether Wulfstan supplemented them. The property consisted partly of land in Henbury parish (including Ashgrove, Berwick, and Charlton) and Westbury parish (including Haseldene), and partly of the parish churches of Henbury, Stoke, and Westbury. Stoke in this case cannot be Stoke Bishop, which did not have a church in medieval times, but is Stoke Gifford which formed part of the hundred (or secular district) of Henbury, indicating a former link with that place. Its church passed into lay hands not long after Wulfstan’s time.

A grant of a parish church conveyed the power to appoint its clergyman or men and (in the case of an ecclesiastical body) the right to take the profits of the church such as the tithes and offerings made in the church’s parish. Such a grant would also have included any chapels subordinate to the church, so we need not expect Wulfstan’s charter to mention the chapels of Aust, Compton Greenfield, and other places that are known to have existed in the parishes of Henbury and Westbury in later times and may have done so as early as 1092. Nor did the charter concern itself with the running of the three parish churches. It would have been understood that Worcester would own them, that its monks would say daily services in Westbury church, and that it would appoint at least one clergyman in each parish church to lead worship for the parishioners and minister to them in such matters as baptisms, marriages, and burials.
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58 Now Ashgrove Wood south of Henbury near its parish boundary with Westbury (ST 560 782); H. J. Wilkins, *The Perambulation of the Ancient Parish of Westbury-on-Trym, 1803* (Bristol, 1920), p 12. The place is mentioned as Asshgrove in Henbury parish in 1497 (WCM, A 6(i) f. 117r-v).
59 Probably Wick northeast of Henbury.
60 *Haseldene* appears in the Stoke Bishop charter of 883 (S 218; Harmer, *Select English Medieval Documents*, pp. 20–2, 53–4). It lay in the Cran Brook valley on the boundary between Redland and Horfield (ST 5875 approx.).
62 See below, pp. 41–2.
The Twelfth Century

Wulfstan’s attempt to make Westbury into a monastery was as short-lived as Oswald’s. It may have lasted for scarcely more than four years. Wulfstan himself died on 20 January 1095, and his successor Samson, who was consecrated on 8 June 1096, retracted the grant to the monks at an unknown date no later than his death on 5 May 1112. The evidence for the retraction comes from William of Malmesbury, who got his information from the monks of Worcester and, being a monk himself, sympathised with their resentment at Samson’s behaviour. In one version of his book The Acts of the Bishops of the English People, written between 1125 and 1140, William portrayed the bishop as a man of contradictions who expelled the monks whom Wulfstan had planted at Westbury and tore up their title deed. On the other hand, he would come back from London with precious objects to adorn their church of Worcester. Sometimes he would treat them well, and at other times harry them like a brigand. He was a glutton, known as ‘The Great Maw’, who died of obesity.63 In a revised and toned-down version, William admitted that Samson did his monks no injury apart from robbing them of Westbury and tearing up Wulfstan’s holy charter. He died at the place where he had done this wrong, that is to say at Westbury.64 The monks of Westbury must have returned to Worcester, for we know that Coleman died there in 1113.65

Samson came from the aristocracy of Normandy and belonged to a dynasty of important clergy.66 His brother Thomas was the first Norman archbishop of York. Samson himself had been married in earlier life and had two sons and a daughter, one son, Thomas, also becoming archbishop of York and the other, Richard, bishop of Bayeux. His earlier life included spells as a clerk in the chapel of William the Conqueror and as a canon of Bayeux Cathedral, treasurer of that church, and possibly its dean. He was a widower by the time he was given the see of Worcester, but was ordained priest only the day before he was consecrated as bishop. This background explains why he would have been sympathetic to clerks and priests who lived in the everyday world, the kind of people who had run Westbury church before Wulfstan’s reorganisation. At the same time, as William of Malmesbury conceded, he was not wholly hostile to monks, so the question arises why he put an end to Wulfstan’s Westbury monastery. His probable motive was that restoring the clerks of Westbury would allow him to employ them as staff in his household and administration. In dioceses such as Hereford and Wells, the bishops could use the canons of the cathedral church in that way, but this resource was lacking when the cathedral was a monastery as it was at Worcester, because monks were circumscribed in what they could do. The bishops of Worcester came to hold the patronage of about twenty parish churches in and outside the diocese, and they paid some of their clerical servants by appointing them to these churches.67 But further posts of this kind were useful, especially since
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64 Ibid., i, 440–1; ii, 201.
66 On Samson, see ODNB article by Mary Bateson and Marios Costambeys, and English Episcopal Acta, 33, pp. xxxvii-ix.
67 There is a list of the churches, dated 1435–45, in British Library, Cotton Charter IV.11.B.
(as we shall see) Westbury could be run by a single clergyman while the rest of his colleagues gave most of their time to the bishop.

Samson has left no charter setting out how the restored group of clerks was to operate, and he may never have made one. If such a charter had existed by the 1290s, it would surely have been collected by Godfrey Giffard, bishop of Worcester, who copied other early Westbury documents into his episcopal register at that time. Perhaps Samson simply relied on local tradition and left the church and clergy to work as they had done before Wulfstan’s time. His silence, however, makes it hard to reconstruct the way that Westbury functioned in the twelfth century. All that we possess from this period are four charters collected by Giffard and two among the records of Worcester Cathedral. The earliest of these is a grant by Bishop Simon, Samson’s successor, one who governed the diocese from 1125 to 1150, in favour of Hugh son of Gervase whom the bishop described as ‘my clerk’. In the grant, made between 1125 and 1141, Simon gave Hugh ‘the lands and tithes in Saltmarsh [Saltemers] which Gervase held of me, [free?] of geld and of aids and works and all other exactions’. The properties consisted of

one hide and thirty acres in Westbury;
one hide and the men living there in Charlton;
ten acres of meadow in Apeldresham [Ableton in Redwick];
all the cultivated land [culta] called Goderingehella;
one man and his land in Kedemuta;\footnote{An unknown place, unlikely – given the spelling – to be interpretable as Cattymouth, as suggested by A. Hamilton Thompson, ‘Notes on the Ecclesiastical History of the Parish of Henbury’, \emph{TBGAS}, 38 (1915), p. 103, and copied by \emph{English Episcopal Acta}, 33, p. 80. Two outlying detachments of Westbury parish may be vestiges of the Ableton and Kedemuta properties (below, p. 37), but the locations and name-forms present problems.}
wholly free from all service to me and exaction except for 18d. to be paid to the farm of the manor;
all the tithe of Saltmarsh;
one third of that of all my demesne and the lands of my men, free and villein;
all the tithe of the land of Alwin the chaplain and all other things that owe tithes;
the whole tithe of hay of my demesne which I conceded to the church of Westbury.

The grant concludes by saying that it was made ‘for the service of God and St Mary and the holy apostles in the church of Westbury’ – a similar phrase to that of Wulfstan’s charter and likely to indicate the dedication of Westbury church as it was understood to be in the twelfth century.\footnote{\textsc{History} 17

\footnote{WRO, Reg. Giffard, f. 278v, printed in \emph{English Episcopal Acta}, 33, pp. 80–1.}

\footnote{Hamilton Thompson, ‘Notes on Henbury’, pp. 102–4.}

\footnote{Ibid., pp. 105–6.}

\footnote{An unknown place, unlikely – given the spelling – to be interpretable as Cattymouth, as suggested by A. Hamilton Thompson, ‘Notes on the Ecclesiastical History of the Parish of Henbury’, \emph{TBGAS}, 38 (1915), p. 103, and copied by \emph{English Episcopal Acta}, 33, p. 80. Two outlying detachments of Westbury parish may be vestiges of the Ableton and Kedemuta properties (below, p. 37), but the locations and name-forms present problems.}

\footnote{WRO, Reg. Giffard, f. 278v, printed in \emph{English Episcopal Acta}, 33, pp. 80–1.}

\footnote{Hamilton Thompson, ‘Notes on Henbury’, pp. 102–4.}

\footnote{Ibid., pp. 105–6.} Alexander Hamilton Thompson, the first historian to make a serious study of this document, considered that the properties mentioned therein formed the nucleus of what became the common endowment of the dean and canons of Westbury. He regarded Alwin the chaplain, Gervase, and Hugh son of Gervase as precursors of the later deans of Westbury.\footnote{Hamilton Thompson, ‘Notes on Henbury’, pp. 102–4.} In his view these properties were subsequently shared by the dean and canons through a division which he ascribed to Bishop Giffard between 1268 and 1291.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 105–6.} Thompson probably thought that the properties were too widely

scattered to form one cleric’s holding, and he certainly believed that the later canons did not hold individual properties but were paid from a common fund. In fact they held portions of land or tithes very similar in nature to what Simon gave Hugh, and there are problems in equating Hugh’s grant with what eventually belonged to all the Westbury clergy. The list of lands in Westbury and Charlton is smaller than in Wulfstan’s charter, and no mention is made of the churches of Westbury or of Henbury which belonged to Westbury subsequently. Moreover although Simon’s grant is so specific about properties, it makes no reference to Aust, Henbury, Holley, and Lawrence Weston – places from which the clergy of Westbury gained some of their income in later times. A more likely explanation is that Hugh received a prebend or portion of the endowments of Westbury church: what later became the prebend of Godringhill, named after a lost place-name which actually appears in the grant. By 1291 Godringhill was worth more than the other prebends except for that of the dean, and this could well be the description of its rights and revenues, unless part was subsequently removed for other purposes.

Furthermore there is an indication that Hugh was not the only cleric holding property at Westbury in the second quarter of the twelfth century. This appears in the next surviving document, also issued by Bishop Simon, this time in favour of the monks of Worcester Cathedral and preserved in its cartulary. The editor of the cartulary, R. R. Darlington, pointed out that the properties it mentions were not included in a list of the possessions of Worcester that Simon confirmed to the monks on 26 January 1149, and suggested that the Westbury grant was therefore made between that date and Simon’s death on 20 March 1150. By the grant Simon gave to the monks the church of Westbury with all its appurtenances, namely

the chapel of St Werburgh on Henbury Hill;
the chapel of Compton [Greenfield] to which Bertran the clerk proved title in the
general synod at Worcester;
and with the possession which belonged to Ailwin the chaplain, which Pagan the
clerk redeemed from Engelbert by the favour of his wife and with the assent of Simon his heir, as is attested by the charter of the aforesaid Pagan;
and with the acres which Engelbert devised to the church of Westbury on the day of his death.

Simon concluded his grant by observing that he made it because there had been monks in Westbury serving God in the times of Bishops Oswald and Wulfstan, ‘and Bishop Samson afterwards turned them out less prudently than was proper’. The first two of these properties are certainly different from those mentioned in the grant to Hugh, and the fourth may be different too, supporting the view that Hugh’s possessions did not include the whole of the Westbury property.

Simon’s grant to Worcester has puzzled historians. Why should the bishop have returned Westbury church and some of its property to the monks, when he had previously made a grant of other property to Hugh son of Gervase? One explanation
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72 Below, p. 37.
offered is that if the grant was indeed made in the last year or so of the bishop’s life, it might have been an act of contrition in a last illness.\textsuperscript{75} Two other charters in the Worcester cartulary represent Simon, while nearing his end, restoring to the monks the church of St Mary-le-Strand, London, which he had previously given to a clerk named Hugh, brother of Bertran.\textsuperscript{76} Another view is that all three of these charters are suspicious and were produced by the monks of Worcester to support their claims to the churches involved.\textsuperscript{77} It seems unlikely, however, that the monks would have wholly invented the Westbury charter with its precise yet limited details. If they wished to recover Westbury, why did they not mention other properties such as those that had been granted to Hugh? Moreover the invention would need to have been made fairly quickly, since all the properties mentioned in the Westbury charter figure in a list of the possessions of Worcester Cathedral which Pope Alexander II confirmed to them between 1159 and 1163.\textsuperscript{78} These two points strengthen the case for Simon’s grant being genuine. But unless it was wholly an act of reparation without regard for its earthly consequences, it is hard to explain why he was willing to give up property that could be used to support his own clerks, or how he envisaged the arrangement working. If the monks took over Westbury church, they might well have refounded Wulfstan’s monastery or, at the very least, have competed for the revenue of the church with its existing clergy, weakening the usefulness of these clergy to future bishops. In the end the problem did not arise because the monks of Worcester never gained permanent control of the Westbury properties. They probably planned or tried to, because Hugh went to the trouble of securing a confirmation of his grant from Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury, at some date before 1161.\textsuperscript{79} But despite the presence of Simon’s charter in the Worcester archives and the inclusion of the properties in Pope Alexander’s confirmation, there is no evidence that the grant was ever effective.

Since, then, it is hard to impugn the charter in its details as compared with its purpose, it seems reasonable to accept that there was a clerk named Bertran who had claims to Church property in Westbury. He lived after the time of Alwin or Ailwin the chaplain who was also mentioned in the grant to Hugh, and he must therefore have been a contemporary of either Gervase or Hugh and therefore an additional Westbury cleric. In 1298 two of the Westbury clergy, the dean and the holder of the prebend of Holley, claimed the joint right to nominate chaplains to serve the chapel of Compton Greenfield, so Bertran with his link to that chapel could well have been the occupant of property that eventually descended to one or other of these clergy.\textsuperscript{80} Pagan the clerk might have been a successor of Bertran or the holder of a third Westbury post. Dimly a sense is beginning to emerge that Westbury was staffed by more than one priest or clerk at a time during the first half of the twelfth century. Alwin the chaplain appears to have been the first in chronological order, perhaps in Samson’s time; could he have been the priest described by Hemming? Gervase seems to have succeeded Alwin, and Hugh son of Gervase was presumably the child of that Gervase, pointing to a hereditary succession of a kind that is often found in minsters of the eleventh and

\textsuperscript{75} \textit{English Episcopal Acta}, 33, p. 77.
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid., pp. 78–9; \textit{Cartulary of Worcester}, ed. Darlington, pp. 40–2.
\textsuperscript{77} \textit{English Episcopal Acta}, 33, p. 77.
\textsuperscript{78} \textit{Cartulary of Worcester}, ed. Darlington, p. 47.
\textsuperscript{79} Reg. Giffard, f. 278v.
\textsuperscript{80} Reg. Giffard, p. 498.
twelfth centuries. If Hugh son of Gervase was the same as Hugh brother of Bertran whom Bishop Simon made rector of St-Mary-le-Strand, then Bertran would be another member of the family.

There are also intimations that these men were not simply clergy of Westbury but members of the bishop’s household and administration. This is clearest in the case of Hugh, whom Simon described as his clerk. A chaplain named Alwin witnessed a charter of Bishop Samson between 1100 and 1108, a date that would fit Alwin of Westbury, and his fellow witnesses were Ailric the archdeacon and Frederic the bishop’s chaplain, implying that he was a clerk in the bishop’s service. Bertran is not otherwise recorded in the service of the bishops, but two men named Pagan were close to Bishop Simon. One, described as ‘my chaplain’, can be dated to about 1141, and the other, entitled a clerk, to about 1150. It may be that, by 1150, we are already in the situation that will become familiar in the later thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, wherein some Westbury clergy were working for the bishop. A further intriguing possibility – it can be no more – is suggested by the appearance of a certain Frid’ the dean (decanus) who is listed among the witnesses to Simon’s charter to Hugh, where he occurs after the prior of Worcester and the archdeacon but before the dean of the college of Warwick. Most deans who appear in twelfth-century episcopal documents are rural deans, but in this case the term could relate to the dean of Westbury’s community of clergy – a post that may also have carried the duty of being rural dean in what we shall argue was an ecclesiastical peculiar. And if Frid’ was Bishop Simon’s chaplain Frederic (also spelt as Frideric), it would have been appropriate for such a man to be rewarded with a prebend of Westbury and the leadership of its clergy.

The next information about the church comes from the end of the twelfth century in the form of a grant by Bishop Henry de Sully (1193–5) to William de Chaisna, ‘canon of the church of Westbury’, giving him ‘the lands and tithes in Saltmarsh which were held by Hugh son of Gervase’. William probably bore the Norman surname Chesney. The grant survives only in an abbreviated copy in Bishop Giffard’s register, but the list of properties that it awarded William can be recovered from a confirmation of the grant which he obtained soon afterwards from Pope Celestine III on 19 February 1195. Celestine ratified Henry’s grant to William, now called ‘de Cheni’ (also readable as ‘de Chein’), in respect of

82 Ibid., pp. 44, 46, 69.
83 Ibid., pp. 33, 42, 48.
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86 English Episcopal Acta, 33, p. 205 (index entries).
88 On the basis of the possible Chein spelling in the papal document, it has been suggested that the name should be expanded to Cheinesham, and that William is therefore identical with Master William of Keynsham, canon of Chichester Cathedral 1204–1237 and, or, with Master William of Keynsham, canon of Wells Cathedral 1209–46, for whom see J. Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1066–1300, ed. Diane E. Greenway and others, in progress (London, 1968– ), v, 73; vii, 47. But the forms, taken together, point to Chesney, and there is nothing to link William of Keynsham with Westbury.
one hide of land in Charlton and another hide in Westbury; ten acres of meadow in Spelderham [sic. for Apeldresham i.e. Ableton in Redwick]; the cultivated land which is called Gudheryenghull with a dwelling house [or tenement: masnagio]; the third part of the whole tithe of Saltmarsh both of the demesne and of the tenements of free men and rustics [i.e. villeins];
the whole tithe of hay in Saltmarsh; with the rest of the appurtenances of the same prebend, as you possess them justly and without controversy.

The properties resemble those granted to Hugh son of Gervase but the tithe in Saltmarsh is reduced to one third, and the thirty acres of land in Westbury are omitted along with the one man and his land in Kedemuta and the tithe of the land of Alwin the chaplain.

Hamilton Thompson saw this document, like that of Hugh, as including most of the property of the clergy of Westbury, and therefore regarded William as another precursor of the later deans of the church. However Henry’s grant describes William merely as a ‘canon’, and the pope’s document uses the word ‘prebend’, suggesting that the papal administration regarded William as holding a portion of the property of the church rather than the whole of it. More solidly, the earlier objection to Hamilton Thompson’s view holds good in this case too: that the papal confirmation does not convey enough of the later property of the college. It looks as if William’s grant was also that of the prebend of Godringhill, and that the dwelling house or tenement mentioned may have been the residence belonging to the prebend, near Westbury church. That William felt a need to gain ratification of the grant from the pope suggests that the monks of Worcester tried, or were feared to be ready to try, to enforce their claims following the death of Hugh. Evidently they were thwarted in this respect.

The Thirteenth Century to 1268

With the ratification of 1195, the twelfth-century charters cease and only four or five records of the church and clergy of Westbury are available for first two thirds of the thirteenth century. The earliest of these is to be found in the surviving fabric of the church itself, namely in the two arcades that separate the nave from the north and south nave aisles. These are likely to date from the first or second decades after 1200 and may have been added to a church that originally consisted simply of a nave with a long chancel terminating in a three-sided apse like that of the present church. The south aisle still has three lancet windows of the thirteenth century at its west end and three large sedilia with a piscina at the east end, pointing to an altar nearby. Although nave aisles were common in ordinary parish churches, their presence on a substantial scale at Westbury implies a wish to frame the building in a manner appropriate to a collegiate body. The context of this building work is uncertain. A link has been suggested with the grant of 1195 but the latter contains no hint of a refoundation of

the church or college. Rather, one would expect the bishop of Worcester to have taken part in any scheme of rebuilding because he had far greater wealth for the purpose than the clergy of Westbury. As the diocese was vacant from 1200 to 1214 and had two short-term bishops for the next four years, the most likely person to have been involved is Bishop William of Blois who had a relatively long period in office from 1218 to 1236.

The first document to throw light on the college after 1200 is a statute made by William’s successor Walter de Cantilupe, who ruled from 1237 to 1266; its date is not known more precisely. It has survived only because it is quoted in a document issued by Bishop Godfrey Giffard in 1293, which is itself confined to a copy in the register of Bishop William Whittlesey in 1367. The statute lays down that canons who do not keep residence for at least a month every year, either continuously or discontinuously, are to be fined; this may have been a single pronouncement or part of a longer one. Evidently there were clergy in the plural at Westbury by 1266 at the latest: clergy living under rules of some kind (hence the term ‘canons’) as opposed to parish clergy. Giffard strengthened the Cantilupe statute in 1293, as we shall see, and in doing so he mentions what appears to be a Westbury tradition rather than his own innovation. This was that one canon should be a subdeacon, one a deacon, and the other four priests. Giffard ruled that any holder of a canonry who was not resident had to provide a deputy cleric of the same status to do his duties. No document was apparently known to Giffard setting up this arrangement, but it is likely to have originated in the late twelfth or early thirteenth centuries when the celebration of masses became more common in churches. Compared with the single priest of the 1090s, an expectation had evidently developed that most of the clergy would be priests, possibly taking turns in saying a daily or weekly mass with the assistance of the deacon and subdeacon.

Shortly after the middle of the thirteenth century we encounter the first names of canons since William de Chaisna. On 26 June 1257 Pope Alexander IV issued an order for the induction of Gregory of Naples to the prebend of Westbury which had been illegally held by Matthew Vulcan. How Vulcan, whose name seems to be Italian, appeared on the scene is unknown; perhaps there was a connection with Henry III’s plans to make his son Edmund king of Sicily which were in train after 1254. It looks as if Bishop Cantilupe was unable to remove Vulcan and had to seek the pope’s authority to do so. The price for this may have been to allow the pope to make an appointment, or else the pope may have been validating a choice by the bishop or by Henry III. Gregory is unlikely to have come to Westbury since he was active on the Continent, where he later became archdeacon of Cotentin and dean of Bayeux in Normandy. Already a Westbury post was seen as a suitable reward for a grandee who would not keep residence. A probably more typical canon of the mid thirteenth century was Peter of Bristol, who appears in one of the documents about Westbury collected by Bishop Giffard. Peter, one of the bishop’s penitentiaries (confessors with special
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powers), resigned ‘the prebend of Westbury annexed to the deanery of the same place’ in 1265, and Bishop Cantilupe appointed Stephen de Gnounshale (surnamed from Gnosall, Staffs.) to replace him on condition that Peter received a pension of £5 per annum from the prebend while he lived. Peter and Stephen are therefore the earliest known deans of Westbury. The slightly coy reference to their office may be a sign that the deans, at this date, did not have much more right or power than the rest of the canons. They were in effect first among equals, endowed with a prebend like the other canons, but (as we shall see) in the course of time and because so few canons kept residence, the deans came to acquire a higher status as clergy who were normally in residence and in charge of affairs at Westbury.

How, then, had Westbury developed by the time that Godfrey Giffard became bishop of Worcester in 1268, the bishop under whom the church’s constitution and affairs become fairly clear for the first time? This chapter has argued in favour of the continuous existence of a group of ‘secular’, meaning non-monastic, clergy during the twelfth century and possibly as far back as the tenth. The holding of prebends by these clergy may well be traceable to the first half of the twelfth century and certainly existed by the middle of the thirteenth. Unfortunately the historic number of Westbury clergy – six – is not chronologically significant. Religious houses tended to be organised in twelves or multiples or fractions thereof, and one can only say that if the number six does not point to a date, it does not exclude one either. Minsters at Bedford and at Bridgnorth, Shropshire, had six clergy by the middle of the twelfth century. More certainly there was a strong link between the clergy and the bishop, shown by the grants to Hugh and William and the appointments of 1265. Some Westbury clergy may have succeeded by hereditary descent in the early twelfth century, but as clerical marriage came under increasing disapproval during that century, it is probable that all appointments of Westbury clergy were eventually made by the bishop: say by about 1200. This in itself may have led to more regulation about how many clergy there should be and how they should engage in worship together, hence the requirements for a subdeacon, deacon, and priests. At the same time the wish of bishops to use the Westbury posts to fund their servants or others whom they wished to favour meant that the clergy were often active elsewhere, and by Cantilupe’s time their periods of residence were set at a very low level.

To conclude, it is unlikely that Giffard or even Cantilupe inaugurated the group of six clergy – a dean and five canons – that was characteristic of Westbury from the 1280s onwards. More probably they inherited such a group. Exactly when it emerged in that form is a question that cannot yet be answered precisely, but the fact that William de Chaisnais is named as a canon by 1195 suggests that a group of some kind was in existence by the end of the twelfth century.
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Godfrey Giffard and his Reforms

On 23 September 1268 a new bishop of Worcester was consecrated in the person of Godfrey Giffard, a man who was to have a major impact on the affairs of Westbury for the next three decades. He was a substantial figure in several respects. The son of Hugh Giffard, constable of the Tower of London and guardian of the future Edward I, he was brought up in the household of Henry III from an early age in the company of important and influential people. His elder brother Walter became archbishop of York, and his sisters abbesses of Shaftesbury and Wilton. When Walter and Godfrey gained MA degrees at Oxford in 1251, the king dispatched three deer for their graduation feast. Godfrey acquired a series of Church benefices as well as posts in the royal administration that made him chancellor of the exchequer in 1266 and chancellor of England from 1267 to 1268. He served as bishop of Worcester for over thirty-three years, longer than anyone else in the middle ages, and was the first to keep a register of his activities so that we know far more about them than those of his predecessors. He also grew to be wealthy, especially after the death of his brother, some of whose properties he inherited. As bishop, Giffard was active and forceful. He tried to exert control over Worcester Cathedral and the other religious houses of his diocese while resisting the authority of his own superior, the archbishop of Canterbury. This led to disputes, but Giffard was more than merely a fighter. He had spiritual interests, becoming a trustee of the Dominican Order of friars in England, and was received into the Franciscan Order in 1279, one of the most humble and self-denying branches of the clergy.¹

It is not surprising that Giffard turned his attention to Westbury, a church that he evidently saw as ripe for development. This led him to find out as much as he could about its constitution and possessions, and it is to his researches that we owe four of the twelfth-century documents that we have encountered, as well as two of Bishop Cantilupe.² He may have found the church building satisfactory, since he does not


² Reg. Giffard, pp. 4, 317; English Episcopal Acta, 33, pp. 45, 128
seem to have carried out major alterations of the earlier thirteenth-century work, but he regarded it as poorly equipped for worship. On 4 October 1270 he ordered its clergy to provide a specified list of vestments, altar linen, processional candlesticks, books, and utensils by the following Easter to replace the inadequate ones that they used. Significantly he required them to obtain an ‘ordinal’ (a book of rules about the daily services) following the ‘Use of Sarum’, in other words the usages of Salisbury Cathedral. These usages came to be generally followed in southern England during the later middle ages, and Giffard was relatively early in enforcing them at Westbury. It was a sign that he wished the college to perform its worship in the mainstream of good practice.\(^3\)

We have argued that Giffard inherited a church staffed by a dean and five clergy known as canons or prebendaries (holders of prebends). Technically a canonry was a post and a prebend its means of support. During the fourteenth century men were sometimes appointed to a canonry of Westbury without a prebend, giving them membership of the church with the intention that they would succeed to a prebend as soon as one became available. Normally, however, every canon held a prebend and was therefore a prebendary, and for consistency the latter word will be used in the rest of this book except for those few canons who never gained prebends. Giffard appointed both deans and prebendaries, although the earliest reference him doing so in his register is not until 1286, halfway through his time in office.\(^4\) Since many of the men he appointed were his officers or holders of other benefices in the Church, they often spent little time at Westbury and were inclined to overlook their duties there. In an ordinance that he issued on 23 October 1293, Giffard complained that he had drawn their attention to this without success. Although they received the revenues of their prebends, they neither visited the church at least once in the year (as Cantilupe had stipulated) nor provided vicars (i.e. deputy clergy) to fill their places, with the result that the church was destitute of ministers. Strangely, this ordinance is not recorded in Giffard’s register and survives only in a copy made by a later bishop, William Whittlesey, in 1367.\(^5\)

Giffard laid down in his ordinance that each absent prebendary in future should provide a vicar dwelling constantly at Westbury and attending the ‘hours’ (the eight daily acts of worship), the mass, and other services. All the vicars were to take an oath to keep residence before the dean at the beginning of the year, and although they might be absent for brief periods due to emergencies, any prebendary whose vicar was away for a long time was to appoint a substitute. Prebendaries who had recently joined the church as part of Giffard’s scheme to enlarge its membership, to which we shall come, were allowed a year in which to find a vicar. Otherwise, if a prebendary failed to engage a vicar for half a year he was to be suspended from office, and if for a whole year to be excommunicated. Those who failed were also to be fined, as Cantilupe had ordered in the past. Giffard fixed the fines at four marks (£2 13s. 4d.) in the case of a priest vicar, £2 in that of a deacon vicar, and £1 6s. 8d. in that of a subdeacon vicar. These were apparently annual sums and were to be adjusted
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according to the length of time involved; the money was to be paid into the common fund of the college. The bishop, however, reserved the right to dispense clergy from the duty of residence and from the penalties arising thereby.

Having dealt with the issue of non-residence, the ordinance set out to regulate some other matters. The vicars were to follow the rules of the choir and to aid one another. They were to be subject to the authority of the dean, who had the right to punish them. The dean and prebendaries were recognised as owning the church of Henbury, which by implication included its revenues apart from those that were allocated to the support of the parish priest of Henbury, also known as a vicar. The dean was to have charge of the discipline of the Henbury vicar and of the affairs of his parishioners, and this was to extend to the chaplain and people of Aust. Finally the bishop turned to the chapels of St Peter, St George, and All Saints which lay in the cemetery of Westbury church. They were not to be used for profane purposes or as private houses, but honoured and made freely accessible to faithful people at reasonable times. It looks as if these were ancient chapels which had become disused; we have already raised the possibility that one or more of them went back to Anglo-Saxon times.

The Attempt to Enlarge the College

Giffard was not content to keep Westbury working on its traditional scale but aimed to increase its staffing. 6 The earliest hint of his plans comes in a letter of 12 January, probably 1284, sent to him by a cleric named John de Butterleye, who was staying in Rome to transact business for Giffard at the papal court. The bishop seems to have asked the pope to make him, the bishop, an official member of the chapter of Westbury. This was a right of bishops in their cathedrals. The pope replied with a less formal permission for Godfrey to be present in the church and at chapter meetings. 7 Godfrey did not receive John’s letter explaining this until the end of November, after which he replied expressing his surprise at the pope’s proposal, ‘for we wished to do this by proper authority’. He ordered Butterleye to make further requests to the pope on his behalf. He wanted the church of Bishop’s Cleeve, Gloucs. which belonged jointly to him and to the monks of Worcester, to be given to him solely. He desired to have a prebend of Westbury granted to himself and his successors in perpetuity, an alternative way of giving him formal membership of the church. He asked for all the parish churches in the patronage of the bishops of Worcester to be made prebends of Westbury. Such an arrangement would mean that the bishops would continue to appoint clergy to these churches, but the clergy would no longer act as rectors of their parishes. Instead, they would be attached to Westbury, part of the income of their churches would be paid to them to support them in this role, and part would be assigned to a vicar in each parish to do the clergyman’s duties there. The result would be to add a good deal of money to the resources of Westbury church, although the money would remain in the hands of the individual clergy rather than the dean and chapter in common and would come at the expense of the bishopric of Worcester.

6 There is a good account of Giffard’s project for Westbury in Davies, ‘Studies in the Administration of the Diocese of Worcester’, pp. 382–405.
rather than of Giffard himself. To encourage Butterleye in pursuing these requests, Godfrey informed him that he was making him rector of Badminton, Gloucs.8

We do not know the pope’s reaction to these proposals, but it appears that Giffard gained none of the requests that he had sought. If he had done so, he would certainly have reported the fact in the controversies that were to follow. Faced with indecision or refusal, he decided to carry out his plans unilaterally, and as the churches in his patronage became vacant he began to alter their status to make them prebends. He did this to Bredon, Worcs. on 10 October 1287,9 and to Bishop’s Cleeve on 23 March 1288.10 During the latter year the bishop’s registrar copied into his register the ancient charters of Westbury that have already been mentioned.11 The monks of Worcester Cathedral viewed these actions with alarm, although we do not have evidence of their feelings until 1289. It was arguable that the churches in the bishop’s gift, about twenty in number, belonged not only to him but to the church of Worcester, meaning the monks, but Giffard either failed to consult them or, finding them obstructive, proceeded without their consent. The monks had the right to institute clergy to parish churches in the diocese when the bishopric was vacant. Turning the bishop’s churches into prebends would make these churches subject to Westbury at all times, so the monks would lose their right in these cases – a point of status rather than of finance. More cogently, the monks may have feared that Giffard was setting up a rival cathedral. The neighbouring diocese of Bath and Wells had two cathedrals, one monastic and one of canons, and so did the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield. These double arrangements had been finalised fairly recently (Coventry and Lichfield in 1228, Bath and Wells in 1245), and it may have seemed that a third such scheme was in prospect.

Giffard certainly wanted to make himself a member of the chapter of Westbury and to enlarge the number of prebendaries. But there is no evidence that he thought of founding another cathedral. His document about the residence of the Westbury clergy lacks any hint of such a plan. It did not provide for the kinds of officers typical of cathedrals at that time (a precentor, a chancellor, and a treasurer) or permanent vicars such as cathedrals had, as opposed to vicars appointed by the prebendaries on a casual basis. Giffard is more likely to have aimed at creating the kind of large collegiate church that the archbishops of York possessed at Beverley, Ripon, and Southwell, or the bishops of Exeter at Crediton, Glasney, and later Ottery St Mary. Such churches were not competitors with the diocesan cathedrals, but provided canonries and prebends with light duties for clergy whom the bishop could use for diocesan tasks. To succeed with his Westbury scheme, however, Giffard needed the co-operation of the monks of Worcester. They were his cathedral chapter and it was still the convention that a bishop consulted his chapter when making major decisions and that the chapter endorsed his decisions. He needed to soothe their fears with diplomacy and perhaps rewards, but unfortunately for his Westbury plans he fell out with them about other matters, making them even harder to win over.

The history of the relationship between the two parties was a complicated one, the bishop’s side of which is recorded in his register and the monks’ in their chronicle. On
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18 September 1288 Giffard held an ordination of clergy in Westbury church. His register mentions the fact only baldly, but the chronicle of Worcester Cathedral reveals that it led to a row with the monk who acted as the cathedral’s precentor. This monk turned up at the ordination to call out the names of those to be ordained, a privilege claimed by the cathedral. The archdeacon of Gloucester, John d’Evreux, who was the bishop’s nephew, disputed this claim: probably because the task was done by archdeacons in other dioceses. There was a confrontation which ended with the precentor being ejected from the chancel of Westbury, protesting that he would appeal on behalf of his church. By Christmas 1288 the dispute had widened to include the bishop’s rights over the cathedral. Technically he was the abbot, while the prior of the cathedral whom the monks elected to rule them was his deputy, but in practice the prior and monks were largely autonomous and (like large wealthy bodies of clergy everywhere) they disliked being subject to external control.

When the bishop turned up at the cathedral on 23 December to hear the new monks make their professions of obedience to him as abbot, one of the senior monks, Stephen de Wotton, presented Giffard with letters inhibitory, forbidding him to exercise power in the cathedral while the monks made an appeal to the archbishop of Canterbury about the issues between them. Nonetheless the bishop proceeded to the chapter house where the monks were assembled, and declared his intention of presiding at the daily chapter meeting as, in principle, he had a right to do as abbot. The prior replied ‘It does not belong to you, Father’. The bishop asked him, ‘Have you not made a profession [of obedience] to me?’ The prior said defiantly, ‘No, but to God and the Church’. Stephen then repeated the monks’ appeal against anything that the bishop should do against their customs. On 14 January 1289 the bishop returned to the chapter house to exert his authority. This time he was met at the door by the prior, who told him ‘Lord Father, enter in the name of the Lord according to the agreement and according to what you and your predecessors have done formerly’. The bishop would not come in on these terms, and announced his own intention of appealing. However on reflection he decided to make peace, perhaps in order to play a longer game. Two days later he sent representatives to the monks, conceding that their spiritual rights should return to what they were on 17 September (the day before the row at Westbury church), that the ancient agreement between the bishop and monks should stand, and that all legal actions should be terminated. He also sent a gift of 40 marks (£26 13s. 4d.).

If the monks were mollified by Giffard’s concession, they did not reciprocate by withdrawing their own legal actions. During the previous autumn, 1288, the bishop had created two more prebendaries: one of Kempsey, Worcs. on 11 September, and one of Withington, Gloucs. on the 23rd. The monks had appealed to the pope, Nicholas IV, and on 17 April 1289 Nicholas issued a papal bull appointing three judges – the abbots of Reading and Wigmore and the precentor of Wells Cathedral – to hear the monks’ complaint that the churches of Bishop’s Cleeve, Bredon, Kempsey,
and Withington, as well as Weston-on-Avon, Warws., had been removed from their control against their wishes.\(^\text{17}\) The bull was improperly sealed, so the judges refused to accept it, and another was issued on 1 June, naming new judges: the bishop of London, the abbot of Reading, and Goffredo de Vezano, a papal clerk who was living in London. This new bull included an allegation that Giffard had made the parish church of Budbrooke, Warws. into a prebend of the collegiate church of St Mary, Warwick.\(^\text{18}\) On 30 August the bishop of London and the abbot of Reading delegated the case to the archdeacon of Berkshire who declined to be involved, after which it passed to the archdeacon of Oxford and the rural dean of Evesham. They summoned the parties to Reading Abbey on 10 February 1289, but no further record survives of the proceedings.\(^\text{19}\)

Next Giffard tried to bring pressure to bear from the court of Edward I. On 7 March 1290 he brought letters to Worcester Cathedral from the king, queen, and other magnates, asking the monks to confirm the annexation of the churches as prebends of Westbury.\(^\text{20}\) The monks in turn appealed to the king, and certain of their influential friends procured them a summons to attend the king’s council on 23 May. Our only account of the council’s proceedings comes from the monks and represents their view of what took place. The monastic representatives explained the damage that they would bear if the churches were made into prebends, and read out Wulfstan’s charter of 1092 with its curse on those who took Westbury from Worcester – a dramatic but hardly relevant piece of evidence! The king came into the meeting to be briefed, and the monks withdrew for a time. When they were recalled, the chancellor of England (Robert Burnell) began to outline the king’s will in a lukewarm way but the king interrupted to say, ‘I will make the churches into prebends if you will, but I do not want to damage your church. Do what shall seem expedient to us.’ The earl of Gloucester supported the monks by arguing that ‘the churches belong to the barony [i.e. the endowment of the bishopric]; therefore the status of the churches cannot be changed, any more than the barony can.’ Somebody else turned the discussion to the growing number of papal appointments to cathedral and college prebends, alleging that all but five of those of Lincoln were held by ‘Romans’, as was the archdeaconry of Worcester. The result, he claimed, was that posts that ought to belong to the king during vacancies of bishoprics fell into the hands of the pope. This was a red herring. The king would have filled vacant prebends of Westbury when the bishopric was vacant in the same way that he filled the bishop’s vacant parish churches at that time, but it was the kind of thing that people say at committee meetings when they want to frustrate a decision. In the end the council appears to have been unwilling to make a judgment one way or the other. It probably suggested that the two sides should work out a compromise.\(^\text{21}\)

The papal appeal, then, came to nothing and the involvement of the crown likewise. But the bishop did not give up. On 8 March 1290 he appointed a prebendary of Hampton-on-Avon (now Hampton Lucy), Warws.,\(^\text{22}\) and at about the same time he

---

\(^{17}\) Ibid., p. 362.

\(^{18}\) Reg. Giffard, p. 363, where the name is transcribed as ‘Wodebroc’.

\(^{19}\) Ibid., p. 364.

\(^{20}\) Annales Monastici, iv, 500.

\(^{21}\) Ibid., 501.

\(^{22}\) Reg. Giffard, pp. 367, 370–1, 492.
turned the church of Hartlebury, Worcs. into a prebend although he later revoked the change. 23 Blockley, Gloucs. formerly Worcs. was similarly converted on 10 Dec 1291, 24 and Hanbury, Worcs. on 5 November 1292. 25 Meanwhile Giffard tried once more to win over the monks. On 7 November 1290 he carried out a formal visitation of the cathedral in state, although he caused offence by bringing a far larger number of horses than custom allowed and by establishing himself in the prior’s chamber. He asked the monks to seal their consent to the linkage of the bishop’s churches with Westbury, again without success, and on the fourth day of the visitation he withdrew, in anger according to the monastic chronicler. 26 In the following year, 1291, he made a further attempt to negotiate. The chancellor of England, Robert Burnell, who was also bishop of Bath and Wells, acted as a mediator and it was agreed that all legal actions between Giffard and the monastery should be suspended until the end of October that year. 27 However the question of Westbury was expressly set aside from the agreement, so it remained unresolved and by 1295 both parties were seeking new solutions. The monks appealed to the archbishop of Canterbury, and on 2 January 1295 the archbishop’s official summoned the bishop to answer their complaint about the prebends. 28 Six days later, with singular lack of tact, two monks of Worcester visited Giffard at his castle of Hartlebury, where he was lying ill in bed, to serve notice of their appeal. 29 Later that year the monastic chronicler noted the death of Peter de Escote, whom Giffard had made prebendary of Hanbury, at Anagni in Italy on 7 August while promoting the matter of the prebends before the pope. 30 The monks’ appeal to the archbishop was heard on 2 November 1295 by the archbishop’s legal deputy, the dean of the Court of Arches in London, and four of the monks gave evidence about the prebends. 31 On 5 January 1296 the court heard from the bishop’s representatives. 32 The monastic chronicle is silent about the outcome, but it appears that this time Giffard gained a decision in his favour because the bishop’s register includes a document of appeal by the monks against the judgment. 33

By 1296, however, Giffard was losing the impetus to pursue his project. The illness noted above was part of a gradual decline of his health during the last years of the 1290s. There is no record of him appointing a prebendary to any of the disputed parish churches after Peter de Escote at Hanbury in 1292. In 1299, when the bishop’s staff made a detailed survey of the property of the bishopric in the so-called ‘Red Book of Worcester’, they described Westbury church in its historic form as containing six prebends. 34 A last gleam of light falls on the struggle in 1301 when the archbishop of Canterbury, Robert Winchelsey, exercised his right to make a visitation of Worcester

23 Ibid., pp. 370, 455.
24 Ibid., p. 407.
25 Ibid., p. 427.
26 Annales Monastici, iv, 503.
28 Ibid., p. 454.
29 Ibid., p. 518
30 Ibid., p. 523.
31 Ibid.
32 Ibid., p. 525.
33 Reg. Giffard, p. 492.
diocese.\textsuperscript{35} Giffard, now elderly and blind, opposed the visitation, but it went ahead. The archbishop found much to criticise and sent Giffard a list of thirty-eight complaints, to which the bishop responded.\textsuperscript{36} The eighth complaint, presumably voiced by the monks, charged Giffard with having converted the greater churches in his patronage to be prebends without the consent of the prior and cathedral chapter of Worcester. Giffard replied that he had wished to make certain churches prebendal but said that he tried to discuss the matter with the monks, not wishing to proceed without their approval. When he found that he could not make any progress, he had given up his plans, ‘reflecting that he was able to do nothing’, although, as he pointed out, litigation on the matter was still pending in the courts of the pope and the archbishop.\textsuperscript{37} By the end of his life therefore (he died on 26 January 1302), Giffard had abandoned his Westbury scheme to all intents and purposes. The monks had not been able to stop him carrying out his plan, but they had foiled his hope of making it legally binding. The king would not get involved and the bishop never succeeded in gaining the pope’s approval. The college entered the fourteenth century as a church with a dean and five prebendaries, as it had been before.

\textbf{The Deans of the College}

The survival of bishops’ registers from Giffard’s onwards, in a virtually complete series up to the Reformation, allows us to feel more confident that we know about the bishops’ involvement with Westbury in the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries than in earlier times. Yet, if the registers can be trusted, this involvement amounted to little more than the appointment and admission of deans and prebendaries, and even these were not always recorded. Only one bishop in the early fourteenth century is known to have involved himself with the college in any other way. This was Thomas Cobham (in office from 1317 to 1327), who issued a commission on 29 October 1319, possibly to the dean, ordering him to warn the prebendaries to bear the burdens incumbent on them by reason of their prebends ‘according to the force and effect of the ordinances governing the church and their prebends’.\textsuperscript{38} Cobham’s commission was probably prompted, as in Giffard’s time, by non-residence, failure to appoint vicars, and perhaps a lack of responsibility in maintaining the fabric of the church and the prebendaries’ houses. He intervened again on 11 September 1321, apparently to reissue Giffard’s ordinance of 1293, but the document by which he did so does not appear in his register. We know of it only through a quotation from it by Bishop Whittlesey in 1367, in circumstances that will be outlined later.\textsuperscript{39}

In an absence of any internal college records, the institutional life of Westbury can be glimpsed only through fragments of information, chiefly the appointments of clergy. The dean was the head of the college. There was a fairly rapid turnover of deans, eleven between 1290 and 1390, of whom only Richard de Cornwayle stayed

\textsuperscript{36} Reg. Giffard, ff. 471r-473r; Reg. Giffard, pp. 547–52.
\textsuperscript{37} Reg. Giffard, f. 471r.
\textsuperscript{38} Reg. Cobham, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{39} Reg. Whittlesey, f. 1r; Wilkins, \textit{Was John Wycliffe}, pp. 14, 22.
for a long period: from 1362 to 1386. Discounting him means that the average period of tenure was little more than seven years. It may be that the office with its dignified title and nominal charge of a collegiate church was more attractive in prospect than it turned out to be in practice. The deans appear to have been expected to keep residence, although no statute survives to this effect, and generally seem to have done so. Their house is likely to have been located on the lower site west of the church, and it may well be represented by a group of buildings that are known to have existed between the late thirteenth and mid fifteenth centuries on the site of the later college, immediately south of the River Trym (Figs. 2, 8–9).40 Anecdotally we hear of Dean Simon witnessing a charter at Bristol in 1274, Richard de Cornwayle inducting prebendaries in the 1360s, and Alexander Bagenham requesting burial in Westbury church in 1414.41 When Dean William de Oxon wished to be non-resident for a period in 1336, he felt it wise to apply to the bishop for permission, and was allowed little more than four months.42 Dean Adam de Aylineton, who sought a longer absence in 1333, had to make an application to the pope, and fact that he gained an award of two years must have owed much to the support of the bishop who wanted his assistance elsewhere.43

Residence was necessary because the dean had several local duties. In the first place he was responsible for the worship and business of the college. Giffard gave him power over the vicars who probably constituted the majority of the resident clergy for most of the time. When new prebendaries were appointed, the dean inducted them (or those who stood proxy for them) to their stalls, in a formal act of admission.44 He would also have presided at chapter meetings, but these may have been rare or attenuated. The college had little property to manage outside the Westbury area until the middle of the fifteenth century, and the absence of the prebendaries must have left many administrative and disciplinary decisions in the hands of the dean alone.45 His second duty was to have charge of parish affairs in a wide area including Henbury and Aust (Fig. 1). In practice this area fell into two distinct parishes: Henbury (including Aust, Charlton, King’s Weston, Lawrence Weston, and Northwick), and Westbury (embracing Stoke Bishop, Redland, and the outlying tithing of Shirehampton). In Henbury the dean had only a supervisory role since the vicar of Henbury dealt with the day-to-day worship and pastoral care of that parish, but in Westbury the dean was the incumbent of the parish and had to run it personally or through a chaplain whom he privately employed. In 1439 the deanery was classified by the pope as a benefice with a cure of souls, meaning a responsibility for the spiritual life of its parishioners.46 A third task was to undertake commissions for the bishop in the diocese. Cobham, for example, employed the dean to deal with an attack by a

41 Cartulary of St. Mark’s Hospital, Bristol, ed. C. D. Ross, Bristol Record Society, 21 (1959), p. 46; below, p. 00; Lambeth Palace Library, Reg. Arundel, ii, f. 202r.
42 Reg. Montacute, p. 47
43 Jean XXII: Lettres Communnes, xiii, 12; CPL, ii, 396; Reg. Orleton, p. 195.
44 See below, p. 47.
45 The college possessed a seal, however, copies of which are known from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (W. de G. Birch, Catalogue of Seals in the Department of Manuscripts, British Museum (London, 1887), p. 799 no. 4298).
46 CPL, ix, 39.
layman on a clerk, to enquire into the ruinous condition of a chapel in Bristol, to settle
the claim of a clerk to a benefice belonging to Evesham Abbey, to recover property
stolen from the Knights Templars, and to represent the bishop at a council of the
Church in London.\footnote{Reg. Cobham, pp. 29, 39–40, 74, 98–9, 112.} Similar jobs were assigned by other bishops.\footnote{Many of these are usefully collected in H. J. Wilkins, Westbury College 1194–1544 (Bristol, 1917), pp. 39–62.}

A further responsibility was to exercise certain legal powers within the parishes of
Westbury and Henbury. Most parishes in medieval England were subject to diocesan
administration, which meant the bishop at the top, the local archdeacon beneath him,
and the rural dean of a group of parishes at the bottom. But parishes that belonged to
bishops, religious houses, or the king were often taken out of this system and made into
‘peculiar jurisdictions’ also known as ‘peculiars’, governed by these authorities or their
representatives. Hamilton Thompson believed that Westbury and Henbury were
ordinary parishes not peculiar,\footnote{Hamilton Thompson, ‘Notes on Henbury’, p. 117.} and his view receives support from the fact that they
usually appear in medieval lists of parishes as if they were normal parts of the
neighbouring rural deanery of Bristol. However Bishop Giffard’s ordinance of 1293
mentions the dean as having jurisdiction over the affairs of the parishioners of Henbury
and Aust,\footnote{WRO, Reg. Whittlesey, f. 1r; H. J. Wilkins, Was John Wycliffe, pp. 14, 22.} and the ‘Red Book of Worcester’ unequivocally describes Westbury in 1299
as ‘excerpted’ from the archdeaconry of Gloucester and therefore subject only to the
bishop.\footnote{The Red Book of Worcester, ed. Hollings, p. 457.} In 1455, when Bishop Carpenter issued new statutes for Westbury, he granted
the dean (or the subdean in his absence) ‘all the ancient jurisdiction which the dean and
prebendaries used to have by reason of their prebends, with all fees and profits’. The
statutes go on to mention the dean appointing an official with fees and a stipend to
exercise the jurisdiction there.\footnote{CPL, xi, 231.} An ‘official’, by the fifteenth century, meant a deputy
administrator in the Church with legal powers, and the statutes imply that the dean and
prebendaries had for long not merely claimed but held such powers, at least over the
lands belonging to their prebends but possibly more widely.

These powers are likely to have included the right to hold a court to correct moral
offences and to prove and administer wills in Westbury and perhaps Henbury,
separately from the jurisdiction of the archdeacon but ultimately under that of the
bishop. Supporting evidence for a jurisdiction over wills in Westbury parish comes
from a fifteenth-century register of wills of Worcester diocese, which includes a copy
of that of Thomas Mason, fellow of the college, who died in 1478. The text is followed
by a record of probate in Latin stating that the will was proved

\begin{quote}
before us, Master Vauce, dean of the collegiate church and college of Westbury,
 canonically having peculiar jurisdiction concerning the approval and registration of
 all wills of whatever kind arising within the parish of Westbury aforesaid,
 peacefully and unshakeably used and observed according to laudable custom from
time and through time of which the memory of mankind does not exist to the
 contrary'.\footnote{WRO, Register of Wills, i, f. 22v.}
\end{quote}
The record confirms the impression that the parish of Westbury was an ecclesiastical peculiar for some purposes even if it was not always recognised as such for others.

The Prebendaries of the College

The first definite evidence that the dean possessed five prebendaries as colleagues comes from 1291, although we have argued that this number was much older. Each prebendary received his income from a distinct prebend with its own particular endowments, and the prebends were identified at first by calling them after the man who currently held them or had last held them. In 1286, for example, Robert de Wych (also known as Robert Allot) was appointed to the prebend formerly held by John de Kirkby. Later, two other ways of identifying the prebends came into use. One was to name them after the geographical place where some or all of their endowments lay. This is first found in the case of the prebend of Aust in 1287, and was applied in due course to the other four: in alphabetical order Godringhill, Henbury, Holley or St Werburgh, and Lawrence Weston. Aust, Henbury, and Lawrence Weston exist as places to this day, but Godringhill and Holley have not yet been securely located. Alternatively prebends were denoted by the name of a previous holder who had been famous or long-lived. This was particularly so with regard to Godringhill, which came to be known as Wodeford, Trillek, or Bryan after Nicholas de Wodeford, John de Trillek, and John de Bryan. Holley, in similar manner, was often called Murimouth after Adam Murimuth, the chronicler, who held it up to 1337, or his relative Thomas Murimuth who followed him from 1337 to 1349. A scribe’s misspelling of Trillek as Trykhill in the fifteenth century was sometimes repeated by other writers, making it appear as if this was an alternative place-name of the Godringhill prebend.

The prebendaries’ duties are never fully explained in documents, but would have included attendance at the daily services in Westbury church in person or by deputy, participation in meetings of the college chapter, and a joint responsibility for the maintenance of the chancels of the churches of Westbury and Henbury. There was a hierarchy of rank to the extent that three of the prebendaries, by 1293, had to be priests or to be represented by deputys who were such. These three were the occupants of Aust, Henbury, and Holley, while Godringhill was assigned to a deacon and Lawrence Weston to a subdeacon. The prebendaries, as we shall see, held lands or tithes or both in the places from which they were named, but they did not usually have religious duties there, so that the prebendary of Aust, for example, had no relationship with Aust church or its parishioners since their care belonged to the vicar of Henbury.

56 Ibid., p. 334
57 Godringhill appears to have been a hill that was partly cultivated and therefore partly not (above, pp. 17, 21). King’s Weston Hill is a possibility, in view of the presence there in 1831 of small strips of land that were detached from Westbury parish (J. Marmont’s map, reproduced in H. J. Wilkins, The Perambulation of the Ancient Parish of Westbury-on-Trym, 1803 (Bristol, 1920)). Holley’s name may survive at Hollywood Hill, half a mile south of Compton Greenfield church over which Holley had claims. Westbury parish also owned detached portions of land near that hill in 1831 (ibid.).
58 Reg. Whittlesey, f. 1r-v; Wilkins, Was John Wycliffe, pp. 12, 15–18, 20, 23–5.
59 Below, p. 49. The only known exception is the claim of the prebendary of Holley to appoint the chaplain of Compton Greenfield (Reg. Giffard, p. 498).
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Fig. 2 Westbury-on-Trym in 1500.
practice the prebendaries were often absent from Westbury, as the ordinances of Cantilupe and Giffard make clear, but there must have been exceptions especially in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. Prebendary Josce witnessed a deed in Bristol in 1274, and Richard de Vienna and Robert le Wyse may have been resident in 1316.

At least two prebends, Godringhill and Holley, are recorded as possessing houses at Westbury, and it is probable that the other three were similarly endowed. References to the prebendal houses, however, survive only by chance and are consequently rare. In 1310 de Vienna gained a royal licence to re-route a way that led through his property, in 1339 the bishop allowed John de Trillek to have an private chapel in his dwelling, while in 1349 Ralph de Daventre complained of defects in the Holley residence which his predecessor Thomas Murimuth had failed to correct. The most likely location of the prebendal houses is the lower site west of the church and east of High Street, which we have postulated for the house of the dean (Fig. 2). That house seems to have faced inwards to the site, as if to a precinct, and a similar orientation might be conjectured for the prebendal houses. However a map of the lower site in 1792 shows that it then included two or three plots on the south and west sides containing houses that faced outwards to the surrounding streets. One of the houses on the west side encroached onto High Street, and might represent de Vienna’s or a successor of it, so it is equally possible that the prebendal houses looked out of the lower site and were accessed from Church Road or High Street. In 1789 an elaborate medieval chimney, possibly of fourteenth-century date, was observed attached to a house further out, probably at the junction of Passage Road and Trym Road. Whether this was the dwelling of a prebendary or that of a wealthy layman is not known.

Most of the names of the prebendaries are known after about the 1280s, but it is not always possible to attribute them to particular prebends, especially up to the middle of the fourteenth century. This is because the earliest records, which identify the prebend of a new cleric merely as having been held by his predecessor, often provide no grounds for identifying its geographical name, and it is sometimes difficult to trace the succession of the holders backwards or forwards to when that name is recorded. There are also a few cases of conflicting evidence, notably the royal taxation known as the Nonarum Inquisitiones of 1340, where two of the attributions of prebends appear to be at variance with other information. These conflicts could be reconciled if we supposed that the prebendaries moved from one prebend to another after they were first appointed. Such moves, however, seem to have been rare, perhaps because notionally – as we shall see – most of the prebends were of similar value. Only
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60 Cartulary of St Mark’s Hospital, Bristol, ed. Ross, p. 46.
61 Inquisitions... Relating to Feudal Aids, ii, 276.
64 Drawing by S. H. Grimm (British Library, Add. MS 1541, p. 48); I am indebted to James Russell for this reference. Mr Russell also points out the likelihood of a high-status building near the entrance to Henbury Road, reported in Bristol and Avon Archaeology, 18 (2001), p. 122, with a fuller report filed at the National Monuments Record Library, Swindon.
Godringhill was worth much more than the others, but the majority of the holders even of that prebend seem to have been appointed from outside rather than through internal promotion. ¹⁶⁶

Hamilton Thompson thought that the prebends were simply shares of a common fund held by the college as a whole, and that the place-names attached to the prebends were merely labels to identify them. ¹⁶⁷ This is not wholly correct: each prebend appears to have had certain properties that belonged to it alone. The properties are recorded only in the case of Godringhill, if the argument of the previous chapter is accepted that the grants by Bishops Simon and Henry de Sully refer to this prebend. ¹⁶⁸ In that case the income came partly from a group of lands including Godringhill which would have been let out for rents, and partly from the tithes of parts of the parish of Henbury. An additional perquisite was the right to have eight oxen grazing with the bishop’s oxen on a pasture at Stoke Bishop. ¹⁶⁹ In 1535 the prebends of Aust, Henbury, and Lawrence Weston consisted of a relatively small body of lands and some much more extensive tithes of corn and hay, but it is not stated where these resources came from, although the names of the prebends give clues. ¹⁷⁰ Holley’s alternative name of St Werburgh presumably meant that it owned the chapel of this name on the border of Henbury and Westbury parishes and the offerings made there, or else land or tithes in the vicinity of the chapel.

A detailed map of Henbury parish made in 1831 depicts over thirty scattered detachments belonging to Westbury parish, usually small and often consisting of one or two fields or simply strips in fields. They lay mainly in Henbury and Lawrence Weston, with one outlier in Crook’s Marsh and another near Bilsham on the parish boundary. ¹⁷¹ These detachments have been explained as representing the glebe of Henbury church, but although Henbury parish was technically under Westbury’s control, it was not usual for such a relationship to lead to the removal of a glebe from a parish. ¹⁷² Rather, the detachments may be the imprint of the prebendal lands sited in Henbury parish. All five prebends took their names from within that parish or had property or claims to property there, and it is likely that their lands in Henbury would have become attached to Westbury parish because the prebends belonged to Westbury church. If this interpretation is correct, the detachments may have formed parts of the endowment of the prebends of Henbury and Lawrence Weston, and possibly of Godringhill and Holley. ¹⁷³ That would leave Aust, perhaps, to have been largely
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¹⁶⁶ Internal movement is recorded in the case of John Trillek and Maurice Wynter, and just possibly Henry de Cokham and Richard de Thornerton (below, pp. 208–10, 221).
¹⁶⁷ Hamilton Thompson, ‘Notes on Henbury’, p. 104.
¹⁶⁸ See above, pp. 18, 21.
¹⁷¹ J. Marmont’s map of 1831, reproduced in Wilkins, The Perambulation of... Westbury-on-Trym. One is reminded of the lands in Ableton and Kedemuta mentioned in 1125–41 in association with Godringhill (above, p. 17).
¹⁷² Wilkins, The Perambulation of... Westbury-on-Trym, pp. 14–15. When a parish was appropriated to a religious house, it was usual for the glebe to be assigned to the parochial vicar or leased out, not transferred to the religious house. Moreover the vicar of Henbury had rights over the chapel and chaplain’s house at Aust, and these do not appear as a detachment of Westbury.
¹⁷³ The prebendary of Henbury was in dispute with the vicar of Henbury over £10 13s. 4d. in 1435, evidently arising from lands or tithes in that parish (CPR 1429–36, p. 432).
financed from tithes, while Holley and probably the dean’s prebend would have resembled Godringhill in having some property in Westbury parish. It is not impossible that certain of the lands or tithes in the latter parish were shared in common by the dean and prebendaries and that Hamilton Thompson was right to that extent. The college certainly had a common fund, since Bishop Giffard ordered fines for non-residence to be paid into it in 1293.74 The dean and canons may also have shared the produce of a home farm, such as was very commonly attached to a religious house. Court Farm, a little west of High Street, would be a good candidate for such a farm.75

The principal and most often consulted source for the value of the prebends is the valuation of Church benefices in England made on behalf of the pope in 1291, the so-called ‘Taxation of Pope Nicholas’. This estimated the income of the dean’s prebend and that of Godringhill at £10 6s. 8d. each per annum, and that of the other four prebends at £6 13s. 4d. each.76 The valuation of 1291 was used for taxation purposes by the pope and the king of England until the Reformation, in the form of a levy of one or more tenths of the income (respectively £1 0s. 8d. and 13s. 4d.). Its figures are therefore correct in respect of the taxation paid by the English clergy but not in terms of the real annual value of their benefices which was underestimated throughout the kingdom by as much as a half or more of true income levels.77 This can be shown in the case of Westbury College by the fact that Thomas Orleton the prebendary of Godringhill, who was old and ill, resigned his prebend in 1332 after negotiating a pension of £20 per annum with his successor.78 Even if we allow for the fact that the successor expected Orleton to die in the near future, it looks as if this prebend was worth at least twice the value ascribed to it in 1291, and that the incomes of the deanery and Godringhill were therefore over £20 each and those of the other prebends over £13 each.

These incomes would have fluctuated somewhat from year to year, depending on the yields of crops or the rents negotiated in leases, and in the long term there may have been more significant changes. The next evidence we possess comes from a list of benefices in the gift of the bishop of Worcester, compiled between 1435 and 1445 and including estimates of their values, estimates more credible than usual because they would not have been minimised to guard against future taxation. The list reckoned the deanery as worth 40 marks per annum (£26 13s. 4d.), Godringhill as £20, Aust as £10, Lawrence Weston as £6 13s. 4d., and Henbury as £5 6s. 8d. Holley is not given a value.79 These figures suggest that the deanery kept up its income while that of Godringhill declined a little from the level of the early fourteenth century and the other prebends more substantially. Such falls may reflect the Black Death of 1348–9 and subsequent visitations of the plague which caused the population to drop and left fewer people to pay tithes and to compete to rent land. In 1456 Godringhill was

74 Reg. Whittlesey, f. 1r-v; Wilkins, Was John Wycliffe, pp. 12, 20. Common funds at cathedrals and collegiate churches were divided in various ways: a cleric such as a dean might get a larger share, or shares be given only to resident clergy.
75 I am grateful to James Russell for this suggestion.
76 Taxatio Ecclesiastica, p. 220.
77 On this subject, see Graham, English Ecclesiastical Studies, pp. 271–301.
79 BL, Cotton Chart IV.11.B.
estimated as worth about £18⁸⁰ and by 1535 it had fallen further to £15 net, while Holley was valued in that year at £11 1s. 6d., and Aust, Henbury, and Lawrence Weston together at £25 6s. 8d., a little more than in the fifteenth century.⁸¹

Beneath the prebendaries came the vicars on whom, with the dean, the day-to-day worship in the college must have largely fallen. In addition the church would have employed a parish clerk or two to ring bells, dress altars, read the epistle at mass, serve the clergy who celebrated it, and accompany the dean at baptisms and other pastoral rites. Very little is known about either vicars or clerks until Bishop Carpenter’s reorganisation of the college in 1455. The vicar of Canon Robert de Wych is mentioned being ordained in 1289,⁸² but, as we shall see, there was only one vicar instead of five in 1367 and only two undoubted vicars in 1377 as well as two clerks who may have been vicars or parish clerks.⁸³ It was a shortcoming of Giffard’s ordinance of 1293 that although he made the vicars subject to the dean’s control and tried to ensure that they were always in post, neither he nor any bishop until Carpenter gave them security of tenure or regular incomes. They were simply appointed and paid by their absent prebendaries on a temporary basis like curates. In contrast the vicars of cathedrals and large collegiate churches formed permanent bodies with their own endowments, irrespective of whether their canons were resident or not, enabling them to acquire a sense of community and eventually their own buildings.

In consequence the vicars’ life at Westbury lacks record. One presumes that they were paid wages in cash and either lived in the houses belonging to their prebendaries or took private lodgings if those houses were unavailable. It is possible that the fines with which Giffard threatened the prebendaries for not appointing vicars in 1293 were based on what he considered that they should receive (£2 13s. 4d. for a priest, £2 for a deacon, and £1 6s. 8d. for a subdeacon),⁸⁴ but if so, such wages were on the low side. In 1287 the bishop of Exeter fixed the wages of priests assisting as parish chaplains at £3.⁸⁵ After the Black Death of 1348–9 wages and prices rose, and in 1362 Parliament set the annual payments for chantry priests at £3 6s. 8d. and for parish chaplains at £4.⁸⁶ It is a moot point to which group the Westbury vicars would have been held to belong. For what it is worth, John de Bryan, a non-resident prebendary of Godringhill, claimed in 1366 that he paid £5 to his vicar at Westbury: a man who by statute had only to be a deacon but was likely, by that time, to have been a priest.⁸⁷ A further rise in clergy wages was sanctioned by Parliament in 1414: to £4 13s. 4d. for chantry priests and £5 6s. 8d. for parish chaplains, and these sums may be a rough guide to what Westbury vicars were paid in the early fifteenth century.⁸⁸
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⁸⁰ CPL xi, 120.
⁸¹ Valor Ecclesiasticus, ii, 433.
⁸³ Below, pp. 47, 49.
⁸⁴ Reg. Whittlesey, f. 1r-v; Wilkins, Was John Wycliffe, pp. 12, 20.
Worship in the College and Parish

The furnishings and worship in Westbury church during the later thirteenth and fourteenth centuries can only be conjectured from what is known of churches generally. The chancel and the nave would have been separated by a screen, as was the custom in all religious houses and parish churches by about 1300. The screen (a stone or wooden structure) would have been topped by a loft or gallery supporting a rood: a large image of Christ on the cross. The chancel contained the high or principal altar at the east end, and Giffard’s list of the goods that the church should possess in 1270 included a pyx to hang above this altar. A pyx was a small locked capsule containing a consecrated wafer, another universal object of veneration in churches. It was customary to place images of the church saint and the Virgin Mary by the high altar, probably at the north and south ends respectively.89 We have seen that Wulfstan’s charter of 1092 implies the dedication of Westbury church to ‘Christ, Mary, and all the apostles’.90 By 1297, however, this had been changed or rationalised into the Holy Trinity, which remained the principal dedication for the rest of the middle ages.91 Westbury may well have displayed an image of the Trinity in the chancel like that which appears on the college seal used after the mid fifteenth century. The image shows God the Father as a seated man holding a small Christ on a cross, accompanied by a dove.92

The western end of the chancel would have included stalls for the canons. Deans of foundations usually occupied the westernmost stall on the south side of the chancel, and the other prebendaries (or their vicars) presumably sat two on his side and three on the north side, but the order of precedence is not known. The lesser clergy dressed in cassocks and surplices, and the prebendaries (when they attended) wore hoods on their shoulders called almues, lined with grey martens’ fur with the animals’ tails hanging down. The almuce was a mark of status confined to canons of cathedrals and colleges, and the memorial brass of Prebendary Henry Sampson (died 1482) shows him wearing one.93 Giffard’s ordinance of 1293 required the clergy to say the ‘hours’ (the eight daily services which took place at intervals from mattins in the early hours of the morning till compline in the late afternoon) and, as we have seen, he intended the material of the liturgy to follow the Use of Sarum. There are indications that he expected services to be done with some grandeur. His instructions to the college to get liturgical books mentioned antiphonals, graduals, psalters, and tropers, all works with musical notation to allow the singing of the services to plainsong. His list of vestments specified three for Sundays and three for festivals, evidently envisaging the celebration of mass on these days by a priest, deacon, and subdeacon, but this practice was probably older than Giffard since the prebends were originally allotted to men of each of these grades. During the fourteenth century polyphony or harmonised music

89 Councils and Synods II, ed. Powicke and Cheney, ii, 1006.
90 Above, p. 15.
91 CPR 1292–1301, p. 271; cf. Lambeth Palace Library, Reg. Arundel, ii, f. 202r; CPL vii, 322; ix, 59. The image on the west face of the tower, now interpreted as a bishop, may once have been that of the Trinity. However, SS Peter and Paul are also mentioned in the fifteenth century (below, pp. 79, 91).
92 Birch, Catalogue of Seals in the...British Museum, p. 799 no. 4298.
began to make its way into churches, but Westbury lacked the human resources to do much if anything of that kind. Only after Bishop Carpenter’s reorganisation of the college in 1455 were there enough clergy with a sufficient range of voices to tackle such music effectively.

The nave of the church would have accommodated the parishioners of Westbury, since the church was also a parish church and the dean had the cure of souls. One of the items that Giffard ordered to be provided was a lamp to light the way when carrying the eucharist to the sick. In some collegiate churches like Crediton, Devon, the chancel and high altar were reserved for the college of clergy, and a separate parish altar was provided for parishioners in front of the screen. In other such churches, the high altar was both that of the college and parish. No document is known defining the arrangements at Westbury, which may mean that chancel and high altar served both college and parish so that the rights of the two parties did not need to be demarcated. Images would have been displayed in the church for the veneration of the laity, and there was apparently at least one altar in the nave area: in the south aisle where the sedilia for an altar have survived. There may have been guilds of parishioners in support of particular images, but no details of any guilds are recorded. Mother churches like Westbury with daughter churches in their parish usually required those who worshipped in the latter to attend the mother church on certain days of the year, such as the patronal festival. The people of Henbury, Aust, Lawrence Weston, Northwick, and other outlying areas may have come to Westbury for the purpose from time to time. Rogation week, six weeks after Easter, was also a time for church communities to get together. On the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of this week, followed by the Thursday which was Ascension Day, it was customary to go in procession around a parish and the processions often went from the chief parish church to outlying chapels, a different chapel on each of the days concerned.

The chapels are a topic in themselves, because the parishes of Westbury and Henbury came to include about twelve at one time or another alongside the two parish churches (Fig. 1). Medieval chapels were of three kinds: chapels in private houses, chapels serving outlying communities, and chapels venerating Christ or a saint. All three were found in the two parishes, although it is not always easy to classify them. The bishop’s manor at Henbury had a private chapel from early times; when he was in residence, he and his household would have used it for worship as well as for legal proceedings and ordinations. Two more chapels are recorded in the first half of the twelfth century: St Werburgh on Henbury Hill, between Henbury and Westbury, and Compton Greenfield. Compton, as has been mentioned, became a subject of dispute in 1298 when two of the clergy challenged the claim of the local landowner, Sir Richard de Grenville, to appoint its chaplain. They evidently lost this contest because

---


by 1321 Compton was recognised by the bishop as a distinct benefice with its own ‘rector’ appointed by a private patron, and its territory eventually became a small independent parish.\(^9\) Henbury and Westbury parishes were divided for secular purposes into districts known as ‘tithings’, and some (but not all) of these acquired chapels for the use of their inhabitants.\(^{10}\) Lawrence Weston is first recorded in 1274 as ‘Weston St Laurence’, indicating the presence of a chapel by that time,\(^{11}\) and there was another at King’s Weston by 1345.\(^{12}\) Aust’s chapel may date back to the twelfth century although it is not mentioned until 1377,\(^{13}\) while the three chapels in Westbury churchyard occur in Giffard’s ordinance of 1293.

Northwick had a chapel before 1370. In that year it was stated to be ruined, but the bishop (William Lenn) allowed the inhabitants of Northwick, Redwick, and Bilsham to use it and to maintain a priest there to say a ‘low’ mass (without embellishments) and the services of matins and evensong. However the people of the district remained bound to attend the parish church of Henbury on Sundays and festivals unless prevented by difficulties of travel, and to pay their tithes and offerings to that church.\(^{14}\) A priest is recorded at Northwick in 1377.\(^{15}\) When Bishop Carpenter codified the rights of the vicar of Henbury in 1463, he referred to the chapel of Lawrence Weston as being dedicated to St Laurence and to those of King’s Weston and Northwick as honouring St Thomas, probably Becket in which case they dated from after 1170.\(^{16}\) There was a chapel on Durdham Down by about 1480\(^{17}\) and another at Shirehampton by 1510.\(^{18}\) Durdham’s was dedicated to the Holy Cross. More shadowy are the chapels of St Lambert and St Blaise. The former stood at the top of Blackboy Hill on the border of Westbury and Clifton parishes, or just inside that of Clifton. The latter is first recorded on Christopher Saxton’s map of Gloucestershire in 1577 but is likely to be a pre-Reformation foundation that gave its name to Blaise Hill in Henbury.\(^{19}\)

Not every chapel had a full-time priest. Lists of clergy in 1377, 1419, and 1532–41 indicate that Aust normally had a permanent chaplain, Northwick usually, and Shirehampton by the 1530s. The chaplain of Aust was paid by the vicar of Henbury
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\(^{9}\) *Reg. Cobham*, pp. 175, 236, 242; *Reg. Bransford*, p. 391. There continued to be a tithing of Henbury parish called Compton, distinct from Compton Greenfield parish. The modern dedication of Compton Greenfield church is to All Saints.

\(^{10}\) Henbury eventually had nine tithings (Aust, Charlton, Compton, Henbury, King’s Weston, Lawrence Weston, Northwick, Redwick, and Stowick) and Westbury four (Redland, Shirehampton, Stoke Bishop, and Westbury).


\(^{13}\) TNA, E 179/58/5.

\(^{14}\) WRO, Reg. Lenn, f. 41v.

\(^{15}\) TNA, E 179/58/5.

\(^{16}\) *Reg. Carpenter*, i, ff. 228r-229v, printed in H. J. Wilkins, *The Disagreement between the Dean and Chapter of Westbury and the Vicar of Henbury* (Bristol, 1909), pp. 11–31. The suggested site of King’s Weston chapel is ST 542 775.


\(^{18}\) TNA, PROB 11/16, f. 288r. In the early nineteenth century the chapel was dedicated to St Michael.

and the other two by local people. The remaining chapels may have been open for private worship and the veneration of an image, but their religious services were probably infrequent. When these occurred, they would have been led by the dean or the vicar of Henbury or by priests hired with their permission for the occasion.

Deans and Prebendaries of the Fourteenth Century

To appreciate the kinds of men who became deans and prebendaries in the fourteenth century, we need to understand the system by which they were chosen. The patron of Westbury church, meaning the person with the right to appoint its clergy, was the bishop, who ‘collated’ them, a term meaning that he both selected and ‘instituted’ or ‘admitted’ them to office, unlike most parish clergy whom he instituted but did not select. On being collated, clergy took an oath of obedience to the bishop, after which they went to the college and were inducted by the dean, a ceremony that centred on placing them in their stall in church and perhaps in their seat in a chapter house. It was permissible to send a proctor or representative to be collated or inducted, so that a cleric did not need to attend in person. When the bishopric was vacant, the king had the right to nominate to vacancies in the college, the act of institution being then done by the prior and monks of Worcester. A good many royal appointments are recorded from 1317 to 1395 but not before or after those dates. It is possible that this reflects some loss of documentation, but the crown was particularly active in trying to gain control of Church patronage in the fourteenth century and not only during vacancies of bishoprics. In or before 1347 Bishop Bransford gave the king one or more nominations of prebendaries, irrespective of a vacancy, and in 1378 when two popes began to struggle for recognition in Europe, Urban VI, who was acknowledged in England, granted Richard II two nominations in every cathedral and collegiate church, which the king duly made.

A third source of appointments was the pope. We have seen that he nominated Gregory of Naples to a prebend in 1257, and he may have done so in the case of another foreigner, Peter Vigerii who occurs in 1284. The heyday of papal appointments to Westbury, however, was the fourteenth century, as it was in England generally. During this period the pope claimed the right to ‘provide’ (meaning to appoint) any clergy he wished to benefices that were normally in the gift of a bishop, cathedral, or monastery, as a result of which the papal court came to be petitioned for ‘provisions’ by clergy seeking such benefices. Since there were not many vacant benefices at any time, the pope ‘reserved’ future vacancies for candidates by granting what were known as ‘reservations’ or ‘expectations’. It was then the recipient’s duty to await a vacancy and press his case for institution with the bishop on the basis of the papal grant. The intervention of the papacy in this way was welcomed by some

---

111 Once, in May 1325, the monks of Worcester Cathedral exercised the bishop’s right, although the bishop was resident in the diocese (WCM, A 5, i, f. 118v; Liber Albus, ed. Wilson, p. 79 no. 1053).
112 CPR 1345–8, p. 417.
people. The universities sent lists of deserving clergy to the papal administration, but
the crown and the aristocracy in England disliked the intervention because they were
accustomed to lobby the higher clergy for benefices on behalf of their own friends and
relations. Parliament passed legislation in 1351 and 1390 to restrain papal provisions,
and this was used by the crown not to stop them altogether but as a bargaining counter
in Anglo-papal relations. Sixteen papal provisions and reservations of posts at
Westbury are recorded between 1317 and 1395, and there were probably more since
the records of grants by Pope Urban VI (1378–89) are defective. Six of the sixteen
were effective and ten ineffective. The college in the fourteenth century was therefore
staffed by a mixture of episcopal, royal, and papal appointments, the bishop making
most of them but probably sometimes promoting men suggested by the king or the
local aristocracy.

A fourth means of acquiring a Westbury post was through an exchange of benefices
with another clergyman. A dean or prebendary might swap places with a prebendary
of a cathedral or of a different collegiate church, or with a parish rector or vicar. One
motive for this may have been a wish to move to another part of the country, or in the
case of somebody holding several benefices to concentrate them in the same region.
Another may have been economic: to raise money by giving up a wealthier benefice
for a less wealthy one in return for a financial consideration, or alternatively to invest
money by going in the opposite direction. Since the payment of money for benefices
constituted the crime of simony, such trading was rarely acknowledged or
documented. Exchanges of this kind were at their most popular in England during
the fourteenth century and the beginning of the fifteenth. It is not clear why this was
so, since they were less common before and afterwards, and it is surprising that
patrons of benefices tolerated the practice to the extent that they did since it delayed
their right of making the next appointment. The earliest recorded exchange of the
deanery of Westbury took place in 1322 and there were eleven others up to 1432. The
first such case involving a prebend occurred in 1309 and there were twenty-one more
until 1455. Some clergy made a career through exchanges. Robert Wartes acquired the
deanery in this way in 1386 and left it likewise four years later, as did John Ryder
(1405–9) and John Kyngton (1409–12). Even Alexander Bagenham, who got the
deanery by exchange in 1412 and died requesting burial in the church in 1414, might
well have thought of moving on had death not overtaken him.

The fact that prebendaries could be appointed by different people sometimes led to
clashes over appointments. Some of those who gained papal reservations found it
impossible to enforce them because a vacancy in the bishopric allowed the king to
make a nomination, an intervention too powerful to oppose. There were other disputed
appointments in the 1370s and 80s, when the king (or at least his officers) made grants
to prebends that were already occupied. One such example relating to John Wycliffe
in 1375 will be considered later. Another concerned Richard Wyche, nominated to
Holly in 1387 of which Thomas de Maddynge was already the occupant. The most
contentious case was that of Thomas Butiller, a royal clerk and eventually the
archdeacon of Northampton. He had a claim to Godringleigh by 1387, but was
challenged by at least five other contenders for the prebend before and after he gained
it. At least three of his rivals went to Westbury and tried to seize the prebend, causing
violence that will be narrated presently.115 Various explanations are possible for such

disputes. Sometimes two or more clergy held papal reservations of prebends, causing struggles when a vacancy occurred. The prebends of Godringhill and Holley had variant names, which may have made people believe that there were more prebends than really existed. The years 1387 to 1390 were also a time of political disturbance, when Richard II’s government was taken over by the five great lords known as the Appellants, and this may have led to competing claims under royal and Appellant patronage.

There was a difference between the men who became deans and those who held prebends. The office of dean, with its cure of souls and obligation of keeping residence, did not attract the kind of cleric who was a royal servant, a nobleman, the holder of cathedral canonries and dignities, or a future bishop. Its occupants tended to have been parish rectors or vicars, or became so later on, and came from the middle ranks of the clergy. Most were non-graduates, although a few were described as magister which originally denoted a master of arts but later came to be used of people who had merely followed some university studies or claimed to have done so. There were only two notable deans before the middle of the fifteenth century: John de Stratford and William de Edyndon, but each of these had fleeting terms of office if indeed they ever arrived. Stratford was a doctor of civil law from Oxford who went on to be bishop of Winchester and archbishop of Canterbury. He was collated as dean by Bishop Maidstone in December 1316 but left by the end of the following month, implying that he or the bishop thought better of the appointment. Edyndon came to the deanery by exchange in July 1335. He had been a clerk in the household of Adam Orleton, bishop of Worcester, and was destined to become bishop of Winchester and chancellor of England. But he too lasted less than three months, if indeed his exchange took effect.

The prebendaries were a more varied group than the deans, reflecting the different agencies that led to their appointments: popes, kings, bishops, or exchanges. Since they were not required to keep residence as long as they provided vicars, they and those who appointed them could regard their prebends mainly as an additional source of income. Canon law allowed a cleric to hold a prebend and a parish without any need for permission, and it was not difficult to get a papal licence to hold more than one prebend or parish together, especially if one was of noble birth, a university scholar, or in the service of the pope, the king, or a bishop. Many of the prebendaries, as one would expect, had links with the bishops of Worcester who paid or rewarded them through such posts. Some were archdeacons, vicars-general, or other diocesan officers, while others were relatives of the bishops like William Greenfield, Thomas Orleton, and Thomas Sneynton. Royal appointments, either directly or through lobbying the bishops, introduced royal servants such as Walter de Wetwang (1344–7), treasurer of the wardrobe; Walter de London (occurs 1349), secretary, confessor, and almoner of Edward III; and Geoffrey Melton (1389–1411), physician of Richard II. Several prebendaries are referred to as king’s clerks. Aristocratic influence is sometimes perceptible too, notably in the case of the Berkeley family, barons of Berkeley, who held property at Lawrence Weston in Westbury parish. Three

116 Below, p. 195; biographies in Emden, BRUO, iii, 1796–8, and ODNB.
117 Below, p. 195; biographies in Emden, BRUO, iii, 1796–8, and ODNB.
members of the family gained prebends between 1324 and 1331, and Lord Berkeley was at least peripherally involved in the attempt of John Trevisa (yet to be described) to follow in their path.

Virtually all the prebendaries were Englishmen. In the thirteenth century there were the three foreigners whom we have already encountered, together with Richard de Vienna and John d’Evreux, who were both associates of Bishop Giffard and, in the latter case, his nephew. Later, in the period of papal provisions, Bernard Rycherii (1357–9) came in by exchange and three others of the same period (William de Savinhaco, Raymund de Sancto Claro, and John Lambert) were nominated to prebends but seem not to have gained possession of them. Men from the Continent were more likely to hold prebends of English cathedrals, since these had greater value than those of Westbury. The most eminent prebendaries, in terms of their later careers, were the eight men who became archbishops or bishops, all before 1350: John de Kirkby (occurs 1286), of Ely;119 William Greenfield (occurs 1291), of York;120 William de Melton (occurs 1308–9), of York;121 William de Airmyn (1317), of Norwich;122 James de Berkeley (1324–7), of Exeter;123 John de Trillek (1329–c.1344), of Hereford;124 Richard de Bury (1331–3), of Durham;125 and Reginald de Bryan (1347–9), of St David’s and Worcester.126 With them should be mentioned four notable scholars: Bury, also a great bibliographer; Adam Murimuth the chronicler (occurs 1337);127 John Wycliffe the theologian (c.1366–84); and John Trevisa the translator (a claimant, 1389–90); the latter two of whom will now be considered.

**John Wycliffe**

The only bishop of the later fourteenth century who is known to have involved himself with Westbury in a significant way is William Whittlesey, who came to Worcester from Rochester in 1364 and moved to Canterbury in 1368. He had studied to a high level at Cambridge, graduating as a doctor of civil and canon law, and had gained experience as an administrator for the archbishop of Canterbury before his promotion as bishop.128 At some time between 1364 and 1367, Whittlesey found or was told that affairs at Westbury were in an unsatisfactory state. Most of the prebendaries were neither resident nor paying vicars to take their places. He made enquiries as to how far their duties were defined by statute, and found two relevant documents: Giffard’s ordinance of 1293 and Cobham’s of 1321. These may have been preserved at the
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119 Below, p. 202; biography in *ODNB*.
120 Below, p. 204; biography in *ODNB*.
121 Below, p. 205; biography in *ODNB*.
122 Below, p. 206; biography in *ODNB*.
125 Below, p. 208; biographies in Emden, *BRUO*, i, 323–6 and *ODNB*.
college, since neither appears in the bishops’ registers. On 16 April 1367 Whittlesey wrote to the dean of Westbury about the situation.\textsuperscript{129} The transcript of his letter in his register gives the year as 1366, and this date has been reproduced by all the twentieth-century scholars who have studied the matter. In fact the date is followed by the statement that it was in the fourth year of the bishop’s translation (which ran from 28 June 1366 to 27 June 1367), and this receives support from the fact that one of the prebendaries involved in the affair, William de Hindeley, did not acquire his prebend until 22 September 1366. The date of Whittlesey’s letter, and the proceedings to which it gave rise, is therefore 1367; perhaps a minim has disappeared from the date, which should originally have ended ‘vij’.\textsuperscript{130}

Whittlesey’s letter included a transcript of Giffard’s ordinance of 1293, to the effect that each prebendary should appoint a vicar within six months. It concluded by telling the dean, Richard de Cornwayle, to report the names of those who were absent without appointing vicars, the length of time involved, and whether they had taken an oath to keep the statutes and regulations of the church. The dean replied on 27 June with a report on each prebendary. The senior of the five, John de Bryan of Godringhill, who had held office since 1349, had not resided for the previous five years and had not maintained a vicar for the last four of them. Roger de Otery of Lawrence Weston, the next senior, who got his post in 1361, had neither kept residence nor paid a vicar since his admission. Richard Michel of Holley, who had been admitted in 1362, had never resided and had failed to keep a vicar for the last year. John de Wynkele of Aust – a misspelling of the name of the famous scholar John Wycliffe – had not resided since he was admitted (this was probably early in 1366). He too had not maintained a vicar for the last year. Finally William de Hindeley of Henbury, the most recent recruit who came in 1366, had failed to reside but had paid a vicar for the last six months. The dean had not inducted Bryan or Otery to their prebends because they preceded his arrival at Westbury, but he had inducted Wycliffe in person and Michel and Hindeley by proxy, and an oath had been sworn on each occasion to observe the statutes, customs, and observances of the college.\textsuperscript{131}

It took only a day for the dean’s report to reach the bishop, who was staying at his manor of Alvechurch, Worcs. As soon as he received it, on 28 June, Whittlesey ordered the dean to cite all the canons who were non-resident and at fault in not providing vicars to appear before the bishop (wherever he might be) within twenty days of the citation to show cause why they should not face the sequestration of their prebends.\textsuperscript{132} The sequel to this order appears to have been a further letter that appears in Whittlesey’s register. It is undated but seems more likely to have followed the process of 1367 than to have preceded it. In it the bishop instructed the dean to sequestrate the revenues of the prebends of Westbury until the deficiencies in their holders’ obligations had been met.\textsuperscript{133} Sequestration was a step short of deprivation; it

\textsuperscript{129} Reg. Whittlesey, f. 1r-v; Wilkins, \textit{Was John Wycliffe}, pp. 10–18 (English translation), 18–25 (Latin).
\textsuperscript{130} Orme, ‘John Wycliffe and the Prebend of Aust’, pp. 144–52. An additional point in favour of 1367 is that the memory of the dean (who had been admitted in 1362) went back five years.
\textsuperscript{131} Reg. Whittlesey, f. 1r-v; Wilkins, \textit{Was John Wycliffe}, pp. 15–17, 23–5.
\textsuperscript{132} Reg. Whittlesey, f. 1v; Wilkins, \textit{Was John Wycliffe}, pp. 17–18, 25.
\textsuperscript{133} Reg. Whittlesey, f. 11r-v; Wilkins, \textit{Was John Wycliffe}, 43–4 (English translation), 44–6 (Latin).
meant only loss of revenues not of status and seems to have had its effect. Unless the bishop backed off, which appears unlikely since he remained at Worcester until October 1368, the prebendaries must have complied in appointing vicars, since all five of them were still in office by the date of the bishop’s departure except for Hindeley who had exchanged with another cleric.

The facts that Wycliffe possessed the prebend of Aust and was found wanting in the performance of his duties have aroused much interest. At the beginning of the twentieth century he was still regarded with veneration as a reformer of the medieval Church, ‘the morning star of the Reformation’. The discovery in about 1900 that he held not only a parish benefice but a prebend of Westbury revealed that he was one of the ‘pluralist clergy’ (holders of more than one benefice) whom people associated with those abuses.134 It also turned out that he acquired the prebend of Aust by a grant from Pope Urban V. The University of Oxford submitted to the pope a list of clergy who deserved to receive papal provision to benefices, and Wycliffe was included with a request for him to be given a canonry of York Minster. When the papal administration dealt with the petition on 24 November 1362, however, it awarded Wycliffe only a canonry of Westbury, with reservation of a prebend when one became vacant.135 This meant that he became a titular canon immediately, but had to wait for a prebend to be available and for formal admission to it by the bishop before he could draw on its revenues and assume its rights and responsibilities. It is not known for certain when the vacancy occurred because the bishops’ registers are not uniformly efficient in recording admissions to benefices. However, Wycliffe’s last known predecessor as prebendary of Aust was Henry de Cokham or Cookham who was also chancellor of Chichester Cathedral, and who was replaced in that office in March 1366.136 It looks as if Cokham died at the beginning of that year, since there was no reason for him to resign his chancellorship, in which case Wycliffe would have succeeded to Aust at the same time, early in 1366. He was certainly holding the prebend by the following June, a year before the dean compiled his report. A cleric who acquired a benefice through a papal grant was required to pay annates to the papal treasury, a sum equal to one year’s income of the prebend as valued in the taxation of 1291. Wycliffe’s liability to pay the sum of £6 13s. 4d. was duly noted in the accounts of the papal tax collector in England, and the sum was followed by a repetition of the amount, probably signifying that it had been paid. There is no indication that it had not been.137

Some of the historians who have written about Wycliffe’s tenure of the prebend, and his shortcomings as reported by the dean in 1367, have misunderstood the nature of his duties.138 As we have seen, the prebendaries did not necessarily have religious

---

135 Ibid.; CPP, i, 390.
obligations in the places after which their prebends were named. Aust had a chapel but it was legally a chapel of ease to Henbury, a parish church belonging to the dean and canons of Westbury collectively. The prebendary of Aust had no individual responsibility for the chapel building, its chaplain, its worship, or the pastoral care of its district, which belonged to the vicar of Henbury. Wycliffe’s functions as a prebendary, like those of his colleagues, related primarily to Westbury, where, jointly with the dean, they were rectors of the parish and charged with the duties already described in this chapter. There is no reason to suppose that he ever visited Aust, although he certainly went to Westbury church to be inducted. His tenure of the prebend was fully legal and his failings therein were moderate by the standards of his day. Wycliffe was a senior scholar at Oxford in an age when such men were often financed by holding prebends and parishes, frequently holding more than one at a time. His sole identified fault at Westbury was not to maintain a vicar for twelve months from 1366 to 1367. If, as seems likely, he came to Westbury in the early months of 1366, it would appear that he employed one up to June of that year but was deficient thereafter.

Some sympathy may be appropriate. If Wycliffe inherited a vicar who later left or died, he himself as a resident of Oxford would have had difficulty in locating a replacement in Gloucestershire. He would probably have depended for the purpose on a local agent who may have been ineffective or unsuccessful. There is much to be said for the view of H. J. Wilkins in 1915 that vicars would have been hard to find in the 1360s, when the decline in the number of chaplains who worked for wages after the Black Death of 1348–9 was exacerbated by the second epidemic of plague in 1362. Wycliffe was less culpable than Bryan and Otery, who had avoided their duties for most of the last five years, and the dean and bishop were not free of blame. The dean had tolerated the situation throughout that period, and the bishop was in his fourth year when he took steps to amend it. Nor was it the last occasion on which the dean or the prebendaries were found wanting in doing their duties. Ten years after Whittlesey’s intervention, the clerical poll-tax of 1377 provides a further opportunity for verifying the personnel of the college. In that year Richard de Cornwayle was still dean, and he was accompanied by two chaplains and two clerks. The staffing was therefore certainly short by one chaplain, and although the two clerks may have represented the deacon and sub-deacon prebendaries, the likelihood is that one or both of them were parish clerks, and that the deficiency may have risen to two or three vicars from among the five prebendaries.

There was one further dispute about Wycliffe’s prebend. On 28 January 1371 Pope Gregory XI reserved him a prebend of Lincoln Cathedral on condition that he resigned from Westbury when he secured it. Later, on 26 December 1373, the pope agreed to change the condition and allow him to keep Westbury along with the Lincoln prebend, but Wycliffe was never able to gain the latter. The next we hear about Wycliffe and his Westbury prebend is that on 6 November 1375 he took the precaution of obtaining a royal ratification of his possession of it. The motive for this becomes manifest
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when we learn that, twelve days later, his prebend was granted by the king to a certain
Robert de Faryngton.\footnote{Ibid., p. 195.} There may have been doubts about the legitimacy of
Wycliffe’s tenure of Aust. The entry about his annates in the accounts of the papal tax
collector, Arnald Garnerii (1371–9), states ‘It is said that he never had confirmation
from the Lord Gregory [i.e. the current pope]. However he possessed it before his
promotion, from the time of the Lord Urban [the previous pope].’\footnote{Accounts Rendered by Papal Collectors, ed. Lunt and Graves, p. 494.} Gregory’s promise
of the prebend of Lincoln on condition of resigning Westbury, although subsequently
amended, may have been another factor. Wycliffe was becoming unpopular in some
circles by 1375 because of his criticisms of the Church, so it is not impossible that
people who disliked him persuaded the king’s officials that the prebend was available
for a fresh royal appointment. Nevertheless, as we have seen, several such disputes
took place in the late fourteenth century, and other prebendaries of Westbury
experienced similar problems without being Church reformers. The Faryngton grant
must have caused trouble for Wycliffe, but he was able to take effective counter-
measures since the grant was revoked on 22 December 1376 after the intervention of
his patron, John of Gaunt.\footnote{CPR 1374–7, p. 393.} Almost certainly he continued to hold the prebend of
Aust until he died on 31 December 1384, for its next known holder, Richard de la
Felde, was nominated by Richard II on 31 May 1384 to have the next vacant canonry

John Trevisa and the Struggle for Godringleh

The other famous name to be associated with a prebend of Westbury in the late
fourteenth century is that of John Trevisa. Like Wycliffe he became a participant in a
dispute: in his case about the right to hold a prebend rather than the duties arising
thereby. Trevisa was a Cornishman, born in or soon after 1340, who took the degree
of MA at Oxford and became vicar of Berkeley, Gloucs. in about the early 1380s.\footnote{On Trevisa, see Emden, BRUO, iii, 1903; D. C. Fowler, The Life and Times of John Trevisa, Medieval Scholar (Seattle and London, 1995); and ODNB.} While holding this post he was employed by Thomas Lord Berkeley, the local
magnate, to translate Latin texts into English, notably two standard works of
scholarship: the Polychronicon or history of the world by Ranulf Higden and De
Proprietatibus Rerum by Bartholomew the Englishman, one of the major
encyclopaedias of the later middle ages. Trevisa is thus an important figure in the
growing use of the English language for literary works, and a contemporary of
Chaucer in this respect. He also wrote a Dialogus in which he discussed and expressed
his support for the translation of Latin works into English. On 5 November 1390,
when Trevisa was about to make a journey overseas and applied for the king’s
permission to appoint attorneys to manage his business in his absence, the royal grant
to that effect called him vicar of Berkeley and canon of Westbury.\footnote{TNA, C 76/75 m. 10.} The grant has led
to historians regarding Trevisa as a prebendary of the college; in fact he was not.
The story of Trevisa and his prebend is a complicated one. It began in 1387 with the making of claims to Westbury prebends by several people in circumstances that are not wholly clear. Since the diocese was not vacant at this time, the likelihood is that the claimants had been granted papal reservations of these prebends, the grants of which are largely missing from the records of Pope Urban VI, 1378–89. On 28 September 1387 four men secured royal ratifications of their status as prebendaries of Westbury. One, Richard de la Felde, was already in possession of Aust while another, John Barell, was on the point of filling Lawrence Weston after the death of Roger de Otery. The remaining two were Thomas Butiller, claiming the prebend of John de Bryan, meaning Godringhill, and Richard Wyche, aspiring to hold the prebend of Thomas de Maddynge, in other words Holley. In their cases the prebends were not vacant. Bryan had held Godringhill since 1349 along with the rectory of Bishop’s Hatfield, Herts., where he spent most of his time. Butiller’s request for a royal ratification may have been prompted by a rumour of Bryan’s death, by a belief that his tenure was unlawful for some reason, or merely by a wish to establish his rights before Bryan died (the old prebendary was at least in his sixties). Rival claimants might well contest the prebend once it was vacant. Bryan, not surprisingly, was alarmed by Butiller’s action and prepared to defend his position. On 16 January 1388 he wrote in French to the prior of Worcester Cathedral, asking for a copy of the document recording his institution to the prebend. The institution had been carried out by the prior and monks in 1349 when there was no bishop. Bryan explained that he had lost the original document in a fire that had occurred in a chamber above the doors of Bishop’s Hatfield church. The prior produced a replacement, and Bryan’s letter and the document were copied into the register of cathedral business.

Trevisa now appeared on the scene as another claimant to Bryan’s prebend. In 1389 the dean of Westbury, Robert Wattes, complained in a petition to the crown that he had been the victim of two serious assaults. He alleged that on 25 May 1388, John Poleyn, a squire of Thomas Lord Berkeley, came to Westbury by night with armed men, besieged him in his house, broke open the doors, and entered his chamber. He was taken from bed, dragged outside, assaulted, and imprisoned until, in fear of death, he promised to give the intruders all his movable goods to save his life. Wattes did not identify a motive for this attack, but it looks as if Poleyn was putting pressure on the dean to support a claim by Trevisa to Bryan’s prebend or punishing him for refusing his support. This explanation is suggested by the fact that Wattes’s petition went on to outline a second attack to which he had been subjected. On this occasion, 12 February 1389, John Trevisa and other armed men allegedly forced their way into the dean’s house (apparently when he was absent), assaulted his servants, and took away goods to the value of £40. The dean appealed to the king’s council for a remedy, arguing that he could not have justice under the ordinary procedures of the law.
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because Poleyn was such an active maintainer of quarrels and was encouraged by the great lords of the countryside.\textsuperscript{152}

Wattes’s complaint was backed by another cleric, Thomas Coue, who maintained that he was the prebendary of Wodeford (also spelt as Wodeforde and Wodford in the relevant documents). This, of course, was one of the alternative names of Godringhill, making Coue a third contender for that prebend. He also petitioned the crown in 1389, accusing John Trevisa (spelt Trevysa) and John Poleyn of having ‘raised the whole country for fifteen leagues around by sounding horns’. On 16 February 1389 they came to Westbury with 300 or more men armed with habergeons, pikes, swords, bucklers, drawn bows, and arrows ‘in the manner of an insurrection’, and entered the church. Finding Robert Banak, Coue’s vicar, occupying his master’s stall and robed for divine service, they dragged him by the legs and feet to the door of the church, tearing his clothes. Then they beat Walter and Thomas, Coue’s servants, drawing blood from Walter and polluting the church so that no divine service or sacraments had been performed there since. They also seized two other servants, William Colerne and John Rothewell, and brought them with Banak to Berkeley Castle where they kept them for a half day and a whole night. From there the three men were taken to Gloucester gaol and imprisoned for ten days or more until they were set free at the order of the king. Meanwhile the assailants entered the grounds belonging to the prebendary at Wodeford and still occupied them by force, despite the king’s command to the sheriff that no men should go to Wodeford in arms to break the peace. To this the assailants said that they would submit to no one except John Poleyn, their master. Coue too appealed for a remedy to the king, on the grounds that Poleyn was encouraged by ‘great lordship and alliance’ and was a common maintainer of quarrels.\textsuperscript{153}

Some of these details can be confirmed. On 2 March 1389 the king wrote to the sheriff of Gloucester ordering him to free on bail Robert Danok (\textit{sic}), William Colerne, and John Rothewell who were currently in his prison. The king said that he had commanded Thomas Lord Berkeley to cause proclamation to be made at Wodeford forbidding men to go there in arms to break the peace. Berkeley had arrested the three men and sent them to Gloucester gaol. They were now ready to defend themselves against any charges against them.\textsuperscript{154} A similar order was made on 23 March for another chaplain, John Dyer, also in prison, bail for him having been provided by two clergy including Trevisa, and the sheriff of Gloucester was ordered to make a similar proclamation about breaches of the peace in Wodeford, Westbury, and elsewhere.\textsuperscript{155} David Fowler, who printed the relevant documents, thought that the Wodeford to which they referred was the place now known as Woodford near Berkeley and that it was part of the property of the prebend at issue, but the college of Westbury is not known to have held property there. Rather, Wodeford seems to be used as an alias of the prebend of Godringhill, as if it were a place-name or as a name that described the prebend’s property. The location of the dispute was more probably confined to Westbury church and the surrounding area.
The next that we hear of the business is a partial transcript of legal proceedings in the records of the Court of King’s Bench in London. According to this, Thomas Lord Berkeley and his associates, sitting as justices of the peace (one assumes in Gloucestershire), heard an accusation that Robert Taillour, chaplain (presumably an alias of Robert Banok), William Colerne, and John Rotherwell, with others unknown, armed themselves at Berkeley on 23 February 1389 and forcibly entered the church of Westbury, the place of habitation of Master John Trevisa, canon of the church and prebendary of Wodeford. The intruders remained in the church for a day and a night and insulted John Boteller, Trevisa’s steward and servant, scaring local people so much that no one was brave enough to stay in his own house. This was done at the order and incitement of Dean Wattes, who supported them with arms. Subsequently the king decided that the matter should be settled in his presence, and accordingly (probably on 8 May 1389) Taillour, Colerne, and Rotherwell came into the Court of King’s Bench to refute the allegations. Unfortunately the record ends without giving their evidence or the court’s judgment, but it looks as if they were exonerated, because that spring or summer John Poleyn was imprisoned in the Tower of London by a royal order. He remained there until 19 October when he was freed on bail of £200 after swearing an oath on the gospels to behave peaceably towards Wattes and Coue in future.

That was not the end of the story, however. In the spring or summer of 1389 a fourth cleric, Geoffrey de Melton, appeared in pursuit of the prebend of Wodeford. He was an Oxford MA like Trevisa and a physician with court connections which enabled him to gain a royal ratification of his tenure of the prebend on 8 July 1389. He appears to have made his way to Westbury in an attempt to gain physical possession of the prebendal property. Together with a layman, perhaps his servant, he was arrested by the sheriff of Gloucestershire for breaking the king’s proclamation already mentioned against breaches of the peace in the vicinity, and they too were confined in Gloucester gaol. From there Melton secured a royal order on 23 August freeing him and his companion on bail and requiring anyone with a complaint against them to raise it before the king’s justices. Later, on 21 February 1390, Dean Wattes and two other men gave sureties that they would do no harm to Melton, implying that Melton (like Trevisa) had put pressure on Wattes to induct him and that Wattes may well have been responsible for getting the sheriff to arrest Melton.

The legal documents fail to record the whole of the dispute. They were concerned with the keeping of the peace not with the claims to the prebend, although the claimants probably hoped to discredit their opponents through their allegations and with the help of the law of the land. The claims to the prebend belonged to the bishop to judge, but the register of the contemporary bishop, Henry Wakefield, contains no record of such an adjudication. If it occurred, it may have been made in the bishop’s court whose archives have not survived. Nevertheless the main features of the affair can be reconstructed. Both Butiller and Trevisa appear to have tried to claim the
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Godringhill prebend while Bryan was still alive, or to position themselves to obtain it as soon as he died. Notwithstanding their actions, it seems likely that Bryan held on to his prebend until his death in the winter of 1388–9, probably in about February 1389. Bryan’s death raised the heat of the dispute. Butiller consolidated his claim by gaining a royal grant of the prebend (as opposed to a ratification of possession) on 26 February 1389. He does not figure in the events at Westbury, but was evidently aware that he had rivals there because he secured a further ratification of his tenure on 16 August 1389. Coue, on hearing of Bryan’s death, attempted to seize the prebend in February 1389 by sending a vicar to sit in the prebendary’s stall and servants to take over its house and endowments. Trevisa may have made similar arrangements, and his supporters responded to Coue’s intervention by evicting Coue’s vicar and servants, and sent them, with the connivance of Lord Berkeley, to Gloucester gaol. Coue’s men were able to clear themselves of the charge of violence and Trevisa’s ‘hitman’, Poleyn, was imprisoned instead, after which Melton appeared on the scene and was promptly arrested.

The outcome of it all was that Butiller got possession of Godringhill, probably because of his links with the king’s court and the consequent royal orders in his favour. He held it until his death in 1402 although he continued to experience challenges to his possession. Melton failed in his bid but (having similar ties with the court) gained a different prebend, Aust, a few years later. Coue and Trevisa lacked the political connections of the other two, and neither secured a prebend of Westbury although vacancies came up in the 1390s. Trevisa was still calling himself a canon in 1390, but there is no evidence that he ever gained more than this titular foothold in the college, and much as we might like to do so, we cannot therefore count him as one of its substantive members.
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FROM 1400 TO 1476

Westbury in the Early Fifteenth Century

The history of Westbury College during the fourteenth century is primarily one of its personnel, as we saw in the previous chapter. A college that had been once been a piece of local patronage in the gift of the bishops of Worcester became, for a time, an object of interest to the pope and the king, leading to the appointment of many prebendaries who had little connection with Worcester diocese but were or became men of some national standing. But this change of profile was not matched in constitutional terms. The college in 1400 scarcely differed in functions from how it had operated in Giffard’s time. It was still served by a dean and, if the prebendaries did their duty, by five vicars, which gave it a little more status than a mere parish church. A taxation list of clergy in 1419 shows that, for once, there were five chaplains ‘celebrating in the collegiate church of Westbury’, probably as vicars.1 But none of Giffard’s successors enlarged or improved the foundation in a significant way. Their interventions were concerned with making it work in the ancient manner.

The college continued in its traditional form in the early fifteenth century. No great change is visible in the appointments of deans. There were ten of them between 1400 and 1450, still holding office for fairly short periods. Only two, David Bradewell and John Kemeys, managed ten years or more, and only these two appear to have been graduates: Bradewell an MA and Kemeys a bachelor of canon law. In general the deans were typical of the rectors and vicars of their day, and usually came from and went to other parish benefices. The appointment of prebendaries, on the other hand, differed after 1400 to the extent that it largely returned to the hands of the bishops of Worcester, as had been so before 1300. No papal provision is recorded after 1395 due to the declining power of the popes after the Great Schism.2 The same year marked the end of royal grants, although the presence of royal servants shows that the crown or its officers continued to have an influence on some of those whom the bishops appointed. Exchanges too were becoming less common, and only three are recorded in the fifteenth century: two of prebends in 1417 and 1455 and one of the deanery in
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1491. This did not make a great difference to the type of men promoted to prebends, who resembled their fourteenth-century predecessors in being men of middle or upper ranking within the Church, some of them graduates, some of them holders of prebends at cathedrals, who were given a Westbury prebend by the bishop, either on his own initiative or at the request of other people. Bishop Richard Clifford promoted Nicholas Herbury and Richard Clifford, who were both his relatives. Richard Holme was a royal servant: warden of King’s Hall, Cambridge, and an envoy to foreign countries on behalf of Henry IV and V, while John Stokes was a chancery official who also went on embassies for Henry V and VI.

The fourteenth century may have left little mark on Westbury’s constitution, but it was an important period of development for collegiate churches elsewhere in England, and for notions of how such churches should operate. Giffard was not far out in his own day in planning a college with a large number of prebendaries but little local structure except for hired vicars, although even then it was more usual to place the vicars on a permanent basis. By 1400, however, a substantial number of newer collegiate churches had been founded. Some were university colleges while others were located in the provinces such as Ottery St Mary, Devon (1337), Newark College, Leicester (1353–4), Winchester College, Hants. (1382), and Maidstone College, Kent (1395). Further examples of the second group would shortly appear at such places as Fotheringhay, Northants. (1411), Higham Ferrers, Northants. (1422), Tattershall, Lincs. (1439), and Eton, Bucks. (1440).

These colleges were not uniform in all respects but they tended to have similar features. Their founders gave them codes of statutes, regulating their life in more detail than had been the case in the older minsters. They were staffed not merely by deans and canons but by minor clergy – vicars, chantry priests, clerks, and choristers – who received regular salaries and lived and ate in common premises. Greater emphasis was placed on worship, so that the minor clergy performed the daily services with more elaboration and the chantry priests celebrated intercessory masses at side altars. Education was often provided in song and grammar, sometimes only for the junior members of the college but in certain places for outsiders without charge, as was the case at Higham Ferrers and Eton. Frequently care was offered to the elderly or infirm through the inclusion of an almshouse, usually for men. Architecturally the churches of these colleges were built in up-to-date styles, and the accommodation of their members evolved from the traditional hamlet of houses in which the clergy dwelt separately to integrated collegiate buildings where they lived together, buildings often laid out in quadrangular form.

As these institutions spread, they made the older minsters like Westbury look out-of-date and inadequate. One bishop modernised a minster: Grandisson of Exeter at Crantock, Cornwall in 1351. He abandoned the struggle to make its prebendaries keep residence, and taxed their prebends to support a small body of resident clergy: a dean.
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four priests, two clerks, and two or three boys. Such a small project in a remote place is unlikely to have made much impact outside Cornwall, but it anticipated what was to happen at Westbury on a larger scale.

John Carpenter

The transformation of Westbury into an up-to-date collegiate church was carried out by John Carpenter, bishop of Worcester from 1443 to 1476. Much is obscure about his origins. According to the writer Thomas Fuller (died 1661), he was born at Westbury, but Fuller’s statement was carelessly based on a speculation by Francis Godwin in 1616 that he might have been born there. No knowledge of his place of birth appears to have survived into the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries, and his family has yet to be identified.

It was probably at least a moderately wealthy one: that of a burgess in a town, a substantial yeoman farmer, or even a minor gentleman. The wealth of such a family or its link with a person of wealth was needed to send Carpenter to a grammar school and to support him at university during the four years that it took him to graduate as a BA and to qualify for the college fellowship that he later held. But his family did not apparently figure much in his later life. He did not promote other clergy with his surname, and his will does not mention any kinsmen unless his sole lay executor, Thomas Arnold of Cirencester, fell into that category. In later life Carpenter adopted a coat of arms: ‘paly azure and gules; on a chevron argent three crosses croislet gules; in chief a mitre or’. Coats with similar charges were assumed by families in Bristol, Gloucestershire, north Somerset, and London, but it is not clear how far he modelled his arms on theirs or they on his. A Bristol or Westbury connection would explain his interest in Westbury College and his decision to be buried there, and a John and a Roger Carpenter were tenants of the manor of Stoke Bishop in about 1410. The surname was a common one, but there are other pointers to an origin in Bristol or its neighbourhood, as we shall see.

John Carpenter first appears in documents as a fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, in 1417. Since fellows of the college were meant to be bachelors of arts, he must then have been aged about twenty-two, making his birth year 1395 or thereabouts. This conjecture is supported by the fact that he was ordained priest in 1421, for which men had to be aged at least twenty-four. Some colleges awarded their fellowships to people
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of particular regions but those of Oriel were unrestricted, so it is difficult to link his choice of the college (or its of him) with the place that he came from. Carpenter's career at Oxford was a successful one, pointing to his talents as a scholar, administrator, and colleague. He became dean of Oriel in 1425 and the fellows elected him as provost, head of the college, in 1428. He occupied the post for seven years, after which he received a further accolade in being elected to lead the university as its chancellor. He held the office by February 1438 and resigned a year later. Meanwhile he gained a series of degrees: MA, BD, and DD, and took holy orders concluding with that of priest.

Like many scholars who studied for higher degrees, Carpenter acquired benefices in the Church to support his expenses. The first, the rectory of St Mildred, Oxford, came to him in 1422 by gift of Richard Fleming, bishop of Lincoln, a former Oxford student and later the founder of Lincoln College. His next benefice is more intriguing: a prebend of St David’s Cathedral, Pembrokeshire, which he was holding by 1426 and (exchanging prebends twice) continued to hold until 1437. The bishop of St David’s responsible for Carpenter’s appointment was Benedict Nichols (in office from 1418 to 1433), who figures in a curious remark in a grammatical miscellany compiled by Thomas Schort, a young adult student in Bristol in about 1430. The remark states, ‘Whom it befalleth [i.e. to whom does it befall] to find poor scholars to school but the bishop of St David’s, holiest of creatures?’ It looks from this as if Nichols had connections with Bristol and was well-known for helping its scholars. A link between Carpenter and the Bristol area is also suggested by his third benefice, the rectory of Stanton Prior, Somerset, a few miles south-east of the city, to which he was appointed in 1426 by the monks of Bath Abbey.

Men with doctors’ degrees often found employment with the king, or at this time with those who managed the government on behalf of the young Henry VI. Carpenter was described as a king’s clerk and chaplain to the king in 1430, and went on the expedition of that year that took Henry to France to be crowned as its king in Paris. He stayed in France until at least February 1431 when he attended the trial of Joan of Arc at Rouen. His links with the crown duly led to a royal grant on 17 March 1433 of the mastership of the hospital of St Anthony’s Hospital, Threadneedle Street, in the city of London. This post was his principal appointment for the next ten years and must have occupied much of his attention. St Anthony’s was a thirteenth-century foundation, formerly under French control and staffed by brothers of the Order of St Augustine who ministered to the sick and poor. As with some other hospitals, changes of circumstances made it less effective in its traditional role by the fifteenth century and ripe for development in new directions. Carpenter seized the opportunities that this situation presented, despite some opposition. He was not a member of the
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Order and in 1438 there was an attempt (probably by the French mother house) to persuade the pope to oust him, but he remained in charge until 1443 and steered the hospital out of the Order to become a foundation for secular clergy, in effect a collegiate church. In this respect his work anticipated what he was to do at Westbury.

Carpenter transformed the clergy of the hospital into a group of priests, clerks, and six choristers with an instructor to teach them. A mass of Our Lady was instituted on Saturdays, probably with polyphony, and John Benet, very likely the composer of that name, was appointed in 1443 as the instructor. In 1434 Carpenter gained papal permission to procure relics of saints from Cologne; these were almost certainly relics of St Ursula and the Eleven Thousand Virgins who were believed to have been martyred at Cologne and whose bones were discovered in an ancient cemetery. A confraternity of friends of the hospital was founded or revived with a grant of papal privileges in 1441, and in the same year a grammar school was founded on the premises. This school was the first of its kind in the capital to offer education free of fees, and its establishment must have required careful negotiations. The Church authorities in London had hitherto sanctioned only three public grammar schools, each of which charged fees, and the consent of the bishop, Robert Gilbert, would have been necessary for a fourth. Carpenter’s standing and the king’s own interest in schools (represented by the foundation of Eton College in 1440) may have helped in this respect, and in 1441 Gilbert sanctioned the appropriation of revenues from the London city church of St Benedict Fink to pay the salary of the grammar master. This endowment made St Anthony’s into one of the city’s most successful grammar schools until well into the sixteenth century.

Carpenter’s involvement in London affairs led to a relationship with another John Carpenter, the common clerk of the city corporation and a leading spirit in the government of the city. The two men may even have been related. When our John Carpenter acquired the manor of Theobalds in Cheshunt, Herts., in 1411 as an endowment for St Anthony’s, the common clerk assisted him in the process, and when the latter died in 1442 he named the future bishop as the supervisor of his executors. The common clerk himself had been one of the executors of Sir Richard Whittington and William Bury, citizens and mercers of London who died in 1423. On their initiative or his own but using their money, he was responsible for setting up the Guildhall Library, a pioneering institution of its kind, in or shortly before 1425. It was linked to the college of priests attached to the Guildhall, the centre of city government, and consisted of a collection of chained volumes, chiefly Latin works of theology, which were available to the public although in practice most of the users were probably local clergy or trainee clergy. Two priests were paid to look after the
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library, and we are told that the place was visited by students who wished to be educated in holy scripture. The foundation received several gifts of money and books during the fifteenth century, and it functioned until the Reformation. Here, as with the foundation of St Anthony’s choir and school, we can see a likely influence on the projects that Carpenter was to carry out when he was bishop of Worcester.

His promotion to that office came on 20 December 1443, nominally by papal provision but actually at the request of the now adult Henry VI, reflecting Carpenter’s service and standing in royal circles. He was consecrated at Eton, the king’s new collegiate foundation, on 22 March 1444 and enthroned at Worcester Cathedral on 24 December. His term as bishop lasted for over thirty-two years and was exceeded by only two of his predecessors: Wulfstan by a few months and Giffard by two years. Apart from his first few years in office when he was frequently away and appointed a vicar-general to carry out his responsibilities, he was often resident and almost constantly involved in the maintenance and development of the Church in his diocese. His routine work is recorded in his large two-volume bishop’s register, still extant at Worcester, but Carpenter was far from being a routine bishop. He was unusual for his day in holding a diocesan synod, as a result of which he issued injunctions for his parish clergy. These covered such matters as the leasing of benefices, the employment of priests from other dioceses, and the use of accurate service-books. The clergy were also encouraged to enforce the Church’s marriage laws on unmarried couples, and to get their churchwardens to collect and distribute charity to the poor.

Worcester was a wealthy bishopric and Carpenter had a surplus annual income of several hundred pounds. He used much of this for building. As well as reconstructing Westbury church, he spent £28 on the bishop’s palace at Worcester in 1460–1 and was later credited with having built the gatehouse of Hartlebury Castle, Worcs., another of his residences. He made a number of donations ranging from as little as 6s. 8d. to £6 13s. 4d. towards the rebuilding of parish churches in the diocese, as well as giving charity in modest forms to his tenants and to local communities for such projects as bridges and ferries. He also embarked on some impressive benefactions of his own. In addition to the reorganisation of Westbury which took much time and money, he founded two libraries to which we shall turn next, and he endowed sermons to be preached at Bristol, Worcester, and (for a limited period) at Keynsham in}


Somerset.\textsuperscript{35} He made substantial gifts to Oriel College. In 1451 he acquired Bedel Hall next to the college, and gave lands at Barling and elsewhere in Essex to St Anthony’s Hospital to maintain nine exhibitioners living in the hall and studying in the college.\textsuperscript{36} Later, in 1472, he made a bequest to Oriel of the manors of Dean and Chalford near Chipping Norton, Oxon.\textsuperscript{37} In 1483 the college undertook to use this endowment to maintain two fellows born in Worcester diocese, with the duty of praying for the souls of Carpenter, his friend and executor Henry Sampson (provost of the college and dean of Westbury), and their parents.\textsuperscript{38} A bequest to Balliol College, Oxford, is suggested by the former presence of Carpenter’s name and coat of arms in two windows of the college library.\textsuperscript{39} Finally, at the time of his death, he was planning a hostel for the unbefitted chaplains of Worcester: a building in the city where they could rent rooms and join in paying for meals, although it is not certain whether the hostel was ever established.\textsuperscript{40}

His most original projects were the libraries, which are worth exploring in more detail. One possible influence upon them, the Guildhall Library, has been mentioned. Religious dissent in Worcester diocese may have been another factor. This involved the followers of John Wycliffe known as Lollards, of whom Bristol contained a number in the early fifteenth century, their presence made easier by the large size of the city and the fact that it straddled two dioceses, since the suburbs south of the River Avon belonged to Bath and Wells. A trial of two Gloucestermen for holding heretical opinions in 1448 revealed the names of further Lollards in Bristol, and the same year witnessed the discovery of an elderly priest with similar views in the southern suburbs. Another man from that area was convicted in north Somerset in 1457.\textsuperscript{41} To an orthodox bishop like Carpenter, the way to combat Lollardy was through a well-educated body of clergy who could feed the truth to the laity by preaching and confessions. The friars had systems of education to enable them do this; the parish clergy did not, and Carpenter set out to make good the deficiency at Worcester, the centre of the diocese, and at Bristol. The libraries he created were not widely imitated, but they seem to have inspired one similar foundation by his Oriel contemporary and friend Walter Lyhert, bishop of Norwich, in the Carnary Chapel at Norwich Cathedral.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{35} Orme, \textit{Education and Society}, p. 214; below, p. 224. The two Keynsham sermons seem to have been funded by John and Edith Chaunceler of that place, and need not point to Carpenter’s origins there. They were to move, after a period, to St Augustine’s Abbey and St Mary Redcliffe church, Bristol (Reg. Carpenter, i–ii, 206v–207v).

\textsuperscript{36} \textit{Epistolae Academicae Oxon}, ed. H. Anstey, 2 vols, Oxford Historical Society, 1908, i, 307, 311, 328; \textit{VCH Oxfordshire}, iii, 120. The endowment failed to produce the expected income, and by 1505 there were only six exhibitioners.


\textsuperscript{40} Below, p. 242.


\textsuperscript{42} Nicholas Orme, \textit{Medieval Schools} (New Haven and London, 2006), p. 84; TNA, PROB 11/11, the will of James Goldwell.
Carpenter based his educational projects in two existing institutions: Worcester’s own Carnary Chapel, built over the charnel house of the cathedral cemetery, and the guild of Kalendars, based in a house next to the church of All Saints, Bristol. In 1464, with the consent of the patrons of each foundation, he established a library at both places consisting of chained volumes apparently of theological works. Records mention him spending £18 on building the Bristol library as well as £12 6s. 8d. on books the destination of which is not stated. The care of the libraries was given to the chaplain of the Carnary Chapel and to the prior or master of the guild of Kalendars, both secular priests. Statutes drawn up by the bishop laid down that each of these men in future should be a university graduate, preferably a bachelor of theology. They were required to open their libraries on weekdays from 10.00 until 2.00, expound obscure and difficult points of theology to readers, and deliver a theological lecture once a week. The first prior of the Kalendars under this scheme was John Harlow, an Oxford BD and follower of Reynold Pecock, bishop of Chichester. Pecock was a contemporary of Carpenter at Oriel, who was unjustly convicted of heresy in 1457 and forced to resign as bishop. Harlow shared in Pecock’s downfall and was barred from proceeding to the degree of DD, but Carpenter rescued him and brought him to Bristol. The Carnary Library remained in being until the Reformation. It was served by a succession of graduate chaplains, and weekly lectures were still being given there in 1539 when the foundation came to an end along with the monastic cathedral of Worcester. The success of the Bristol scheme is harder to gauge. A distinguished series of graduate priors led the guild of Kalendars in the second half of the fifteenth century, and the library seems to have been in existence in 1480. After 1500 the academic credentials of the priors were more varied, and evidence is lacking about their work. When information about the house was being collected in 1548, at the time that chantries and religious guilds were abolished by the government of Edward VI, no reference was made to the library or the lectures.

Unusually for a fifteenth-century bishop, Carpenter resigned his see shortly before his death. He was still in office on 8 June 1476, when his suffragan ordained clergy for the last time on his behalf, but he had ceased to be so by the following 15 July when a papal bull translated his successor, John Alcock, to Worcester from the see of Rochester. The motive for the resignation was probably age or ill health, since Carpenter’s will, drawn up on 20 October, describes him as ‘sick in body’. His will was made at the manor of Northwick, a manor north of Worcester that he had bought for himself, and he died there on the 20th or the following day. This can be demonstrated from a provision in the will for an ‘obit’ mass to be held at Westbury College on the anniversary of the date of his death or that of the next day, and from the later observance of this mass by both Westbury and Oriel colleges on 21 October.

43 On the Carnary library, see Orme, Education and Society, pp. 36–7, and on the Kalendars’ library, ibid., pp. 209–19.
45 Pecock also knew Carpenter the common clerk, and is mentioned in his will (ODNB, ‘John Carpenter’).
46 Reg. Carpenter, ii, f. 207r.
47 CPL xiii (part ii), p. 522.
48 Below, p. 241.
49 Oriel College, GOV 3 A12b; Valor Ecclesiasticus, ii, 435.
Coincidently that was the feast-day of St Ursula and the Eleven Thousand Virgins of Cologne, very likely the saints whose relics he had acquired at St Anthony’s Hospital.\(^{50}\) The bishop appointed three executors: two clergy, Henry Sampson and William Mogys, and one layman, Thomas Arnold, and his will instructed that, as soon as he was dead, his body should be taken to Worcester Cathedral where the ‘exequies’ (vespers and matins of the dead) were to be said, with a requiem mass on the following day. After this the body was to travel to Westbury, resting each night in a church or chapel on the way where the same rites were to be repeated. At Westbury it was to be buried ‘in the chapel of the Holy Cross in the crypt beneath the high altar of the collegiate church of Westbury’ (Fig. 10). The journey of the body was later depicted on a painted frieze in the chapel, of which the picture of the ceremonies at Worcester is best preserved. This includes a representation of the pall on the bishop’s coffin bearing the crosses croslet of the bishop’s coat of arms.

What is known of the chapel of the Holy Cross indicates that the bishop’s tomb in the chapel was intended to occupy a recess in the south wall and to display his effigy in the form of a cadaver or corpse lying naked on a shroud (Figs. 11–12; Plates VIII–XI). The cadaver was a favourite image of monuments in the fifteenth century, especially among rich ecclesiastics, to express their rejection of pomp and to teach onlookers to prepare for death.\(^{51}\) The effigy was planned to look towards the altar in the chapel, where Carpenter’s will endowed a daily mass to be celebrated for his soul. The antiquary John Rous of Warwick, writing in the 1480s, described Carpenter as ‘coruscating [i.e. sparkling] with miracles after his burial there [i.e. at Westbury]’. The clergy of the church are likely to have encouraged the growth of devotion to Carpenter, but no other details are forthcoming about a saint cult in his honour.\(^{52}\) The antiquary William Worcester who was writing about Bristol in 1478–80 does not mention a cult, and might be assumed to have done so if Carpenter’s tomb or church had been a significant place of pilgrimage. Nevertheless at some point the bishop’s effigy was moved from the chapel to the south side of the high altar in the chancel, where it now lies in a nineteenth-century tomb-chest; the translation had taken place by 1616, when Francis Godwin mentions the bishop as being buried in that location.\(^{53}\) Two different explanations may be offered for the rearrangement. If the bishop came to be venerated by pilgrims, his effigy (and presumably his body) may have been moved at any time between the 1470s and the 1530s to make it more accessible than was possible in the chapel, which had only a restricted access via a narrow stair from the church above. The chancel site would have been an honourable and visible alternative. If this was not the case, the removal must have taken place at or after the Reformation. Saint cults were forbidden in 1538, and masses for the dead ceased in 1549. One or other of these events would have brought about the closure of the chapel, but lingering respect for Carpenter’s memory may have encouraged the preservation of his effigy and possibly his body.  

\(^{50}\) Carpenter may have had a devotion to these saints; he consecrated an altar to them in Great Malvern Priory in 1460 (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 317r).  
\(^{53}\) Godwin, *De Praesulibus*, i, 519.
Carpenter’s will is a constitutional rather than a personal document. He made no bequests to individual people, apart from his servants (collectively described) and his executors. Even his legacies to institutions were limited to Worcester Cathedral, Westbury College, Oriel College, and three other churches. Apart from giving directions about his funeral and burial, the will was chiefly concerned with the bishopric of Worcester, the Westbury project, and one or two other schemes. In respect of the first of these, Carpenter gave his successors as bishops the manor of Northwick by Worcester which was his own acquisition, together with a sum of £100 and a mitre for them to use. The two latter items were to be restored at the end of each bishop’s period of office, so that they both remained available in perpetuity. To Westbury he gave some urban property in Worcester, and asked his executors to buy for the college additional lands worth £20 per annum to pay a chantry priest to celebrate a daily mass in his burial chapel and to make an allowance of 1d. per day to the six widows maintained by the college. He left a further sum of £100 to the college for the defence of its interests, again on condition that payments from it were restored to keep its value into the future. Finally he provided resources for the hostel for unbefriended chaplains in Worcester and for an annual sermon at the hospital of St Wulfstan in the city.

Wills are expressions of wishes not records of actions, and it does not follow that all these bequests were effective. The funeral probably took place as Carpenter wished, and his executor Henry Sampson is recorded transferring a substantial number of items to the university church of St Mary the Virgin, Oxford, in 1482, including several vestments, nine service books, and seven silver vessels and candelabras. The bishop’s anniversary was subsequently observed there. The order to the executors to buy lands for the college to the value of £20 per annum was slow to be implemented, perhaps because it was hard to find suitable properties for sale. In 1485–7 the dean and chapter of Westbury complained to the Court of Chancery that lands from Carpenter’s bequest had been purchased only to the value of £4 13s. 4d. By this time all the executors were dead, and they asked that Margaret the widow of Thomas Arnold, the last survivor, should answer in court for the uncompleted bequest. Two of the purposes of the £20 legacy – the maintenance of Carpenter’s chantry priest and the payment of 1d. to the six poor widows – were achieved by 1535, but whether they were financed from the legacy or by the college from its other revenues cannot be known. It is not impossible that one of the other college clergy celebrated the bishop’s chantry masses in the first instance.

Carpenter’s career can be summarised as that of a conscientious and active head of a college, hospital, and diocese. It is hard to discern the character of fifteenth-century bishops from their activities, which are all that are usually recorded, but Carpenter’s wish to be buried in a crypt chapel with little public access or view was unusual and self-effacing. His choice of a cadaver monument was an act of humility too, but less distinctively so, since it was adopted by several other bishops, senior clergy, and even a few laity. The themes of death and burial in his wall paintings were paralleled.

55 TNA, C 1/78/125.
56 Valor Ecclesiasticus, ii, 434–5
elsewhere in England, notably in the Dance of Death at Westminster Abbey. He was undoubtedly active in charitable works which, as we have seen, extended to the support of the clergy (including poor and elderly chaplains), boys and youths through education, poor men and widows through alms, and (on a smaller scale) many good local causes. It is easy to see why he might have come to be regarded as saintly, and Rous’s words to this effect deserve consideration since Rous lived in the diocese and wrote within a few years of the bishop’s death. In this respect we may add Carpenter to the long line of saintly English bishops: not only martyrs like Thomas Becket and Richard Scrope but ‘confessors’ who died peacefully such as Richard Wych of Chichester, Thomas Cantilupe of Hereford, William March of Wells, and (in the fifteenth century) Edmund Lacy of Exeter. Indeed Carpenter may have been one of the last bishops, and even one of the last people, to inspire a cult in England before the Reformation, since it is hard to think of later examples. Although Henry VI came to be venerated on a larger scale, he died in 1471, five years before Carpenter.

Much about Carpenter, on the other hand, was not unique to him but shared by his contemporaries. The 1440s and 50s, the adult reign of Henry VI, saw a significant number of charitable benefactions by the king and the members of his court. He used his own foundation of Eton College anticipated Westbury in being a college, school, and almshouse, albeit on a larger scale and in different proportions. Henry’s treasurer, Thomas Lord Cromwell, erected Tattershall College, Lincs. in 1439: another college, school, and almshouse that paralleled Westbury in adopting the unit of six for its clergy, clerks, and choristers. John Ferraby, controller of the royal household, endowed the grammar school of Chipping Campden, Gloucs. in about 1441, while Henry’s minister the earl of Suffolks set up a school and almshouse outside his residence at Ewelme, Oxon., in 1448–50. With regard to schools in particular, William Alnwick, bishop of Lincoln, was a co-founder of the grammar school of Alnwick, Northumberland in 1448, while John Chedworth, provost of King’s and Alnwick’s successor-but-one at Lincoln, established the grammar school at Cirencester, Gloucs. in about 1457. A third bishop, Thomas Bekynton of Bath and Wells, published statutes for the education of his cathedral choristers in 1459 and built them a new schoolroom above the cloisters, while a fourth, William Waynflete, bishop of Winchester, founded both Magdalen College, Oxford in 1458 which came to include a school and an almshouse, and an grammar school at Wainfleet, Lincs. in about 1464. Carpenter thus belonged to a culture that mixed piety with Church reform and educational benefaction, but this in no way lessens the credit he deserves for his own vision, care, and efforts to promote them.

Westbury College: the Reorganisation

Westbury was necessarily not an immediate priority for Carpenter when he was consecrated bishop. No documentary records for his activities there survive until the 1450s, although it is possible that he initiated minor building works or furnishings. During his first dozen years in office, he was closely involved with London and with

---

57 On what follows, see Orme, Medieval Schools, pp. 232–6.
parliamentary affairs, paying regular visits to the bishops’ manor of Hillingdon, Middx., and their house in the Strand, Worcester Inn. The earliest evidence that he had new plans for Westbury comes after the dean he had inherited, John Kemeys, died in the summer of 1451. On 10 September that year Carpenter replaced Kemeys with William Okeborne, who remained in office until his death close to Christmas in 1455. Okeborne played a cooperative part in forwarding Carpenter’s plans in the four intervening years. He was a master of arts and student of theology, probably of Oxford, and was unusual among recent deans in having such distinctions.\(^{58}\) His studious interests are attested by the four books that he bequeathed in his will: one to Oxford University, two to Westbury, and one to the Kalendars’ library – the latter a sign of his sympathy with another of Carpenter’s projects.\(^{59}\) He was also a clerical pluralist, something to which the bishop did not object in his deans. Okeborne held the deanship in tandem with at least one parochial benefice: possibly St Augustine’s, London and certainly Upminster, Essex, and he was in London when he made his will in 1455 since he asked to be buried in the hospital of St Katherine by the Tower.\(^{60}\)

Carpenter’s plans were maturing by 1453–4 when records begin to survive of payments by him towards rebuilding the college.\(^{61}\) By 13 June 1455 his plans were far enough advanced for him to issue new statutes. These claimed to have been drawn up with the consent of the dean and prebendaries, who formally approved them with the seal of the college on 22 June and sent them to the pope (Calixtus III) with a request for their confirmation. The pope obliged on 25 September. The statutes of 1455 are the only ones we possess from Carpenter’s time, but despite the care in getting them papal approval they appear to have been provisional ones. They were not transcribed into the bishop’s register and they contained a clause allowing him to correct, reform, declare, and interpret them and to make new ones. They represent an early point in his plans, when he had not begun to increase the college’s income and may not have envisaged how far his plans would evolve. In consequence they give only an outline of the staffing of the college, referring to a dean, prebendaries, vicars choral, clerks, boys, and other ministers, but without precise numbers. It was not unusual for founders to act in this way. William Wykeham appears to have issued statutes for Winchester College by 1373 which he revised in 1394 before issuing a final set in 1400.\(^{62}\) Carpenter may have intended to produce definitive statutes when his reforms were completed, but there is no certainty that he ever did so.\(^{63}\) He was still adjusting his plans at the time of his death.\(^{64}\)

In effect then the statutes represent only the first stage of Carpenter’s reform of Westbury college. They began by transferring the assets of the dean and prebendaries to the use of the college as a whole, and reducing the stipends of each of the six to a


\(^{59}\) TNA, PROB 11/4, f. 23r-v. The bequest to the Kalendars was *Parisiensis*: probably *De Virtutibus et Viciis* by William of Auvergne, or the similarly named *Summa de Viciis et Virtutibus* by William Peraldus, or the latter’s *Sermones de Dominicis et Festis*. For the Westbury books, see below, p. 94.

\(^{60}\) PROB 11/4, f. 23r-v.


\(^{63}\) Statutes are mentioned in 1482, but we do not know whether these were simply the version of 1455 (below, p. 87).

\(^{64}\) Below, p. 243 (e.g. the institution of his chantry priest and the payment of a daily allowance to the poor widows).
nominal £2 per annum. This was a large change in that, although the prebendaries had probably taken little part in college affairs, their posts now became almost wholly honorific. One of their number, John Ryvet, whom Carpenter had collated to Godrington in 1454, later challenged the statutes despite being listed among those who consented to them and swearing an oath to accept the reduction in his stipend. He appealed to the pope on the grounds that he could not maintain himself on a stipend of £2 and asked for the restitution of the whole prebendal income, which he claimed was worth £18. In 1456 the papal administration accepted the appeal, freed Ryvet from his oath, restored to him the income of the prebend, and granted him all the arrears that he was owed since his collation. As Ryvet lived for another eight and a half years, Carpenter’s reorganisation of the college’s revenues was deprived of £18 per annum of income for that period, although the appeal did not reverse the bishop’s statutes in other respects. 65 The statutes excepted the dean from the reduction of the stipends to the extent that he was eligible to receive a further sum of 6s. 8d. for every week in which he resided at Westbury. This allowed Carpenter to leave open his options in choosing future deans. He could appoint a dean of the traditional kind who would be usually resident, in which case that person could expect to earn a little less than £20 per annum, a reasonable sum for a parish clergyman but not an excessive one. Alternatively the bishop might engage a man of senior status with interests elsewhere who would supervise the college but visit it only occasionally. At least one of Carpenter’s appointments as deans, Henry Sampson (1459–69), was undoubtedly selected on that basis, and other such deans by Carpenter’s successors.

The statutes laid down that the dean, when present, was to retain the rule of the college and all the ancient jurisdiction belonging to the dean and prebendaries, including the appointment of a legal official to handle matters arising from this jurisdiction. The care of the parishioners of Westbury, however, was put into the hands of a new functionary, the subdean, chosen by the dean and nominated by him to the bishop for admission. The subdean was to be a priest, to be continually resident, to have a stall in the choir, to minister to the parishioners, and to join the dean and prebendaries as a member of the college chapter. He was to receive a salary of £10: not a great deal for the responsibility but possibly increased by meals within the college. The dean and subdean together were to choose another new officer, the treasurer, also nominated to the bishop for admission, and appointed by the bishop if the other two could not agree on a choice within a month. He too was to reside continually, to have a stall in the choir, and to be a member of the chapter. The treasurer had two responsibilities. He was to act as precentor in the choir, which would have involved directing the plainsong that was used there, and to pay the salaries of the dean, prebendaries, and subdean. Very likely, although the duty is not spelt out, he also kept accounts of income and expenses. His salary was £8, less than that of the subdean, but here too meals may have been envisaged. The first known subdean, Thomas Stephens, was collated by the bishop on 15 July 1456 and the first treasurer, Thomas Bailey, on the following 8 October. 66 On one occasion, in November 1498, there is a reference to a ‘second treasurer’. 67

65 CPL, xi, 120.
66 Reg. Carpenter, i, ff. 137v, 139v.
In the absence of any later statutes, our knowledge of the progress of Carpenter’s reforms comes from a variety of references in other sources. A schoolmaster was added to the college in 1463, following the appropriation of Clifton parish church to fund a grammar school; the first master, Roger Fabell, was licensed to take up office on 28 September that year.\(^{68}\) We shall examine the school later on; here it needs only to be said that all the known masters appear to have been priests and may well have been required so to be, in which case they too would have had a stall in the choir of Westbury. They were paid £10, the same as the subdean. The vicars choral are not normally called by that name after the statutes of 1455. Instead we encounter ‘fellows’, first mentioned by Carpenter in 1473 without a number, referred to by him in 1476 as ‘perpetual fellows’, and totalling six in 1498 when they were again accorded the word ‘perpetual’.\(^{69}\) The fellows appear to have resembled vicars choral in their duties. They were clergy, would have had seats in the choir of the church, probably sang the daily services there, and if priests (as they usually seem to have been) would have celebrated masses in the church. Who appointed them is not stated, but the dean is likely or perhaps the subdean in his absence. Carpenter may have chosen ‘fellow’ as a more appropriate title than ‘vicar choral’, since vicars were traditionally appointed by their prebendaries; furthermore the term ‘fellow’ was used by other founders of colleges in the fifteenth century. ‘Perpetual’ meant that they had security of tenure, rather than being hired and fired like curates and chaplains.

Sometimes, notably in university colleges, the fellows were members of the governing body, but in non-academic colleges like Westbury they were usually employees who received salaries but had little role in government. At the same time they were fellows because they lived in the same building and probably had meals there together. In 1535 they each received £7 6s. 8d. per annum.\(^{70}\) There were eight ‘vicars’ in the college in 1513, four fellows in 1532, six fellows in 1534, and eight fellows in 1535.\(^{71}\) This suggests that a group of six fellows was usually aimed at; the number eight may have included other permanent clergy such as the college treasurer and Carpenter’s own chantry priest.

In Carpenter’s will of 1476 the perpetual fellows were distinguished from another category of ‘stipendiary priests’ whose evidently ranked below the fellows because they were allocated a smaller payment for attending his anniversary rites.\(^{72}\) The term ‘stipendiary’ means ‘paid a stipend’ with an implication of not possessing permanent tenure, and these priests may have been envisaged as chaplains maintained by the college on a temporary basis, or privately funded chantry priests. They seem to be present in a list of the college clergy in 1498, because that list includes four chaplains over and above the statutory clergy of the college, and there were definitely four in 1532.\(^{73}\) There were also some men in minor clerical orders. Carpenter’s statutes envisaged ‘clerks’, and in 1455 Dean William Okeborne left each clerk 2d. to attend

---

\(^{68}\) *Reg. Bekynton, Bath and Wells*, i, 400–1.


\(^{70}\) *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, ii, 435.

\(^{71}\) Reg. S. de Gigli, f. 99v; WRO, ref. 802 (BA 2764), pp. 62, 101; *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, ii, 435.

\(^{72}\) Below, p. 243.

\(^{73}\) *Reg. Morton, Canterbury*, ii, 462; WRO, ref. 802 (BA 2764), p. 62. For a possible reason for their presence in 1532, see below, p. 99.
his funeral rites in the college. The clerks were of two kinds. As before there were one or more parish clerks to serve at mass, assist at baptisms, and ring bells. A single ‘holy water clerk’ is mentioned in Dean William Canynges’s will of 1474, two parish clerks in Carpenter’s will of 1476, and parish clerks in the plural (and therefore at least two) in 1497. Other clerks were singers, introduced by Carpenter not later than 1465–6 when he paid money to the subdean ‘for the clerks of the chapel’, a term meaning clerks who sang in a Lady chapel. In Canynges’s will, payments to those taking part in the dean’s funeral included four men who are listed after the college clergy and seem likely to have been clerks of a similar kind, since the holy water clerk is mentioned separately. The first named of the four, John Hampton, received a larger sum than the others, and he is probably identical with the composer of that name who was organist and teacher of the choristers of the Lady chapel of Worcester Cathedral from 1484 to 1521. That would make him a young man when he served at the college, and the most important musician known to have been employed there. By 1497 there were three clerks other than the parish clerks, and this was still the figure in 1535 when three ‘stipendiary clerks’ (clerici conducticii) received annual wages of £6 each. Here too ‘stipendiary’ suggests a lack of permanent tenure, but the clerks of 1535 were paid only a little less than the fellows, which supports the view that they were skilled singers rather than general assistants in church like the parish clerks.

Choristers were also foreseen in the statutes. They existed by 1474 when Canynges’s will mentions twelve of them. In 1535 they were said to have been instituted by Carpenter, and the college then spent £26 on their wages at the rate of £2 13s. 4d. each as well as paying 16s. 8d. for washing their clothes. They are likely to have sat in the front rows of the choir, six on either side of the chancel. Twelve choristers was quite a large group but the number is paralleled in some other collegiate churches and household chapels where resources were limited, since boys were cheaper to employ than adult singers. It is evident from the provision for clerks and choristers that Carpenter intended polyphony to be sung with the extended range of voices and larger number of performers that became popular in cathedrals, colleges, and great households after the middle of the fifteenth century. At Westbury, as elsewhere, it would have been chiefly performed in the Lady chapel in the form of a morning mass in her honour and an evening antiphon, executed by the clerks, the choristers, and possibly some of the fellows singing together in five parts. Arrangements would have been needed to teach the choristers polyphony and to rehearse the adult performers, but no records of this survive, nor, with the possible exception of Hampton, the names of those who carried out the duty. Westbury was not

74 TNA, PROB 11/4, f. 23r-v.
75 TNA, PROB 11/6, f. 127r; below, p. 243; Cartulary of St. Mark’s Hospital, ed. Ross, p. 120.
76 WRO, Comptotus Rolls of the Bishop, 92485.
77 TNA, PROB 11/6, f. 127r.
79 Cartulary of St. Mark’s Hospital, ed. Ross, p. 120.
80 Valor Ecclesiasticus, ii, 435.
81 PROB 11/6, f. 127r; below, p. 243.
82 Valor Ecclesiasticus, ii, 434–5.
the only church in the district to perform polyphony. In Bristol the parish church of All Saints, Bristol, was a leading centre of such music and St Augustine’s Abbey engaged in it on a modest scale, but its cultivation brought the college into the mainstream of late-medieval Church music and enabled it to play an adequate part in that respect.

The reform of the college involved much rebuilding at Carpenter’s expense. A sum of £290 14s. 3½d. is recorded being spent in 1453–4 and £256 6s. 7½d. in 1456–7. Major changes were made to Westbury church itself (Fig. 4). The chapel of Holy Cross beneath the high altar was created or adapted to become a burial chapel for the bishop. References to the south chancel chapel as a ‘new chapel’ of St John the Evangelist suggest that it was newly built by Carpenter to honour the saint whose name he shared (Plate XVI). In modern times this chapel has come to be known as ‘Canynges’s chapel’, but there is no evidence that William Canynges, dean of the college from 1469 to 1474, had anything to do with its construction or use. A north chancel chapel was similarly built or rebuilt. This is likely to have been the Lady chapel of which we read in documents, since we know that the church possessed such a chapel and the Virgin Mary was universally placed on the left or northern side of Christ on the rood screen as was St John on the southern side. There may have been a Lady chapel before Carpenter, since such chapels were common by the later middle ages, but the triplet of chapels dedicated to her, to John, and to the Cross looks like Carpenter’s idea and suggests a devotion to Christ on the cross that is also implied by his heraldic device of the cross crosslet. Turrets on the exterior walls of the church near the rood screen between the chancel and the nave gave stair access to the loft above the screen, and a south porch to the nave was available, as before, for the services of baptism and marriage. The porch was probably reconstructed at this time with a chamber above it, reached by a stair which also gave access to a wooden gallery within the porch and over its inner doorway (Plate II). The gallery is likely to have been used for liturgical purposes, such as the singing of Gloria, laus, et honor (‘All glory, laud, and honour’) by the choristers as the clergy returned to the church after the outdoor procession on Palm Sunday. Renewal of the church floor is implied by an account roll of the bishopric of Worcester in 1460–1, which mentions 10s. being paid ‘for the pavement in the church of Westbury at the order of the lord [bishop]’. One or two tiles bearing the bishop’s coat of arms are preserved in the chamber over the south porch. Attached to the church or elsewhere was a chapter house, mentioned in 1466, while a treasury containing two locked chests, is recorded ten years later.
A second construction project was undertaken for the accommodation of the clergy, probably by 1455. This was a new and impressive residential building north-west of the church and below it, on the ancient lower area by the River Trym, which has come to be known as the ‘college’, although in the middle ages that term meant the corporate body of clergy (Figs. 2, 13–14; Plates III, XV). The excavations of 1968–70 revealed that there had been an earlier building on the site, perhaps the house of the dean, and that this was demolished to make space for the new structure. The college was located against the north edge of the precinct, backing onto the River Trym: a location that enabled the disposal of sewage into the river. It was entered by a substantial gatehouse at the centre of the south range containing a vaulted ground-floor passage, still extant and decorated with the bishop’s arms. This led into a small quadrangle with ranges on all sides, two storeys high with cellars or undercrofts. The outer corners of the building and the mid points of the east and west ranges were embellished with round towers and there were battlements, so that John Leland, the Tudor antiquary who saw it in the 1540s, wrote that it looked ‘like a castle’. The lower area outside the college appears to have been surrounded by a walled precinct with an outer gateway, the latter first mentioned in 1466. This gateway probably lay on the south-eastern side of the precinct, so as to give a fairly direct access from college to church and probably to add dignity to the approach to both of them. In 1470 there is a reference to a ‘lower gate’ with a chamber over it called ‘the Register’s [i.e. Registrar’s] Chamber’ which may well be the same gate. If so, the word ‘lower’ may have distinguished it from an upper gate (not necessarily such an elaborate one) leading from Church Road into the upper churchyard.

Inside the college there are likely to have been individual chambers for the subdean, treasurer, fellows, and possibly clerks, with a common chamber for the choristers. That raises the question of the provision for the dean and prebendaries, who had hitherto possessed their own houses. These houses became the property of the college by the statutes of 1455, and it is not recorded whether they stayed in use by clergy. It is possible that a house was kept for the dean, but equally he may have been expected to live in the college to supervise its inmates, like the head of a university college. The fact that Dean Lyndsey (1479–88) built a house in Westbury on his own initiative seems to point towards the latter situation. A dean might have wished to live in more spacious quarters than in the college, but he was unlikely to have built a second deanery. Moreover Lyndsey gave his house to the fellows (probably for renting), so it was not necessarily available for subsequent deans. As for the prebendaries, it seems improbable that they continued to live in separate houses since they no longer owned them or necessarily had the resources to maintain them. The will of Prebendary Edmund Hecker (died 1467) mentions his chamber in the college with a bed in it, which suggests that any prebendary who chose to live or stay at Westbury was given a room in the same building as the rest of the clergy.

---
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Carpenter appears to have intended the occupants of the residential building to have meals together there. When Dean Okeborne died in 1455, he gave Westbury college ‘all my brass pots, all pans, dishes, and platters, with all instruments of cookery’, presumably for a kitchen. 100 The bishop himself bequeathed twenty-one items of silver plate to the college ‘to the intent that they may be served to honourable persons with them, when they shall come to the same college’. 101 In 1473, just before his death, Carpenter appropriated the church of Kempsy to Westbury and secured papal confirmation of the fact. 102 The appropriation was explained on two grounds, one of which was that the dean was responsible for keeping hospitality in the college and for the ‘commons’ (common meals) of the fellows and ministers of the college, as a result of which the revenues of Kempsy were being transferred to the dean ‘for the aforesaid reasons’. This indicates that the dean was to use part of the Kempsy money to provide meals, but unfortunately it is not possible to trace how this obligation worked in practice. In 1535, when the college revenues were described in detail in the royal survey of Church property known as the Valor Ecclesiasticus, the income of Kempsy (apart from some small deductions) was simply recorded as part of the dean’s salary, leaving it uncertain how much of the income (if any) was used by that time to pay for the clergy’s meals. 103 Nevertheless it is possible that some was still employed for that purpose, or that meals were instituted but paid for (partly or wholly) by the college members out of their stipends. A large room with four tall windows, appropriate for a dining hall, is known to have existed in the north range of the college, facing the Trym. If such a hall existed, it would have been organised on hierarchical lines. A high table at the principal end would have served for the dean, the chief officers, and any important guests. Lower tables would have accommodated the fellows, clerks, and choristers, and possibly visiting workmen.

Carpenter also extended the activities of Westbury church in new directions. The school was one of these; the maintenance of almsfolk another. The earliest group of the latter to be mentioned are five poor men referred to in 1466 and later increased to six. 104 They occupied a building described in that year as having been built at Carpenter’s expense on or near a plot of ground that he had bought from William Codder and which he identified as lying opposite the college gateway, doubtless the outer gateway. In 1468 the building was described as the ‘Almyshowse’ and in 1535 as ‘Christ’s Poorhouse’. 105 The bishop reserved the right to appoint the men of the almshouse during his lifetime, after which the responsibility was to pass to the dean and chapter. 106 By 1472, however, Carpenter appears to have granted the mayor of Bristol the power to nominate to one of the almssmen’s places, and this power was exercised periodically up to the Reformation. 107 The male inmates were expected to pray for the bishop and his successors, 108 and this probably involved attendance at
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worship in church. At Ewelme, a contemporary foundation, the almsmen had to attend all the services of the day which were arranged in three blocks: matins, prime, and hours starting at 6.00am, mass at 9.00am, and evensong, compline, and further prayers beginning at 3.00pm.\textsuperscript{109} In return the Westbury almsmen received, as well as their housing, cloth for their dress, food, firewood, and a monetary allowance. Adjacent to the almshouse was an enclosed garden in which they were allowed to enjoy the herbs and fruit that grew there and to keep any profits forthcoming from bees, honey, wax, apples, pears, or herbs.\textsuperscript{110} Their firewood came from Carpenter’s wood of Pen Park which he gave them the right to enter in July 1468 and to take five cartloads of coppice wood or brushwood annually.\textsuperscript{111} In the following year he procured them a supply of six quarters of wheat and two measures of peas per annum from the lands of Tewkesbury Abbey at Thornbury, Gloucs.\textsuperscript{112} By 1535 they also received from the hands of the college an allowance of 1d. per day apiece, £1 14s. 8d. per annum for barley to make ale, clothing every third year at a cost of £1 10s. 4d., and some other small distributions of money.\textsuperscript{113}

By 1472 there was a second group of almsfolk, six widows, probably appointed in the same way as the men. A letter of that date describes the widows as living ‘in a certain house adjacent to [the] collegiate church’, and states that one place in the almshouse was reserved for a woman nominated by the mayoress of Bristol in consultation with former mayoresses.\textsuperscript{114} In 1535 the widows received 1d. per day and other small allowances as the men did, together with clothing every third year costing £4 2s. 8d., but corn and barley for their bread and drink were supplied by the college at a cost of £4 2s. 8d. per annum.\textsuperscript{115} Whether they cooked and ate communally, and if so where, is not known. A third category of almsfolk is first mentioned in 1474 in the shape of six elderly priests.\textsuperscript{116} They formed an unusual element in an almshouse scheme of the fifteenth century, although some bishops had founded hospitals for infirm priests in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{117} It appears from Carpenter’s will that each was assigned a chapel in which to celebrate mass: presumably the Lady Chapel, the new chapel of St John, and any other places in the church that possessed an altar.\textsuperscript{118} Every priest received a salary of £4 13s. 4d. along with a ‘livery’ or clothing allowance, which cost £2 13s. 4d. in total and was also provided once every three years.\textsuperscript{119} No mention is made of where they lived or had their meals.

Two almshouse buildings are known to have existed near the church, but their relationship to the documentary evidence about the almsfolk is a complicated
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The written records, as we have seen, describe the men’s almshouse as lying ‘opposite the gate of the college’ and the women’s as ‘next to the collegiate church’. The next reference to almshouses, in 1712, refers to ‘two large houses by the churchyard for the use of the poor: one called the Almshouse, the other the Church-house’, and in 1796 ‘two work or poor houses’ are mentioned, one ‘on the north side’ and the other ‘on the west side’ of the churchyard. The two sites can be more precisely identified from a map of 1792 and from excavations carried out by Mr James Russell (Fig. 2). The ‘North Almshouse’ stood on an artificial terrace constructed half way down the steep slope or cliff that descends from the north side of the churchyard to the Trym. It consisted of a long narrow building of two storeys on a west-east alignment, partly reconstructed in 1804–6 as a row of eight cottages most of which were demolished in about 1850. It is conjectured that the upper storey of the building may have had access to the churchyard, close to the church. The ‘West Almshouse’ was built within the churchyard on its western edge and on a north-south alignment, with its north end close to the way leading from the churchyard entrance towards the church. It was destroyed soon after 1804.

The ‘North Almshouse’ occupied a damp north-facing site; nevertheless it was a site that required care and expense to build since it involved the construction of a terrace for the purpose. Its artificial location, substantial nature, and architectural features point to it being Carpenter’s creation, either for all the almshouse (men, women, and priests) or for some of them (men only, men and priests, or men and women). The building could be regarded as lying ‘opposite the college gate’, assuming the location of an outer gate towards the church, and the garden may have lain below the almshouse towards the river. Two explanations for the site might be offered: that it reflected a lack of available land or a wish to provide a building with ready access to the church. The latter explanation seems the more likely, since Carpenter is known to have given the college a pasture called Bishop’s Orchard next to the churchyard and containing four acres of ground. This pasture was probably identical with the land south of the churchyard, later known as the Connigre (rabbit warren). The north walls of the church contain two blocked doorways, one leading into the nave and the other into the north chancel chapel. If the upper storey of the almshouse communicated with the churchyard, these doorways could have provided access for almshouse to the nave and for priests to the east end of the church. Such access would have enabled the almshouse (and perhaps the elderly priests) to reach the church with ease if they were elderly or infirm, and at times of day (such as 6.00am for matins) when the churchyard was dark and possibly even shut to outsiders by means of a gate at the western entrance.

The ‘West Almshouse’ is less well recorded. It may have been a second Carpenter building, but it would be unsafe to equate it with the women’s almshouse ‘next to the collegiate church’ mentioned in the letter of 1472, since the letter was written from Bristol and could equally apply to the ‘North Almshouse’. Alternatively, if the ‘West Almshouse’ was identical with the ‘Church-house’ of 1712, it may have originated as
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a ‘church house’, in other words a building maintained by the parishioners of Westbury as a centre for parish social activities. Such houses were common before the Reformation and often stood on the edges of churchyards. After the middle of the sixteenth century their social activities tended to dwindle, and it is possible that the Westbury house was converted by 1712 to provide extra accommodation for poor people. That leaves uncertain the function of a third building, still standing outside the entrance of the churchyard, numbered as 38 Church Road, and now known as ‘Elsie Briggs House of Prayer’ (Fig. 2). This is a construction of Carpenter’s time or a little later, bearing a metal cross on its door (resembling the crosses crosslet on the bishop’s coat of arms) which has been interpreted as a reference to him. It was a detached building as far back as 1792 and probably always a dwelling house, but its function is not clear: whether private or linked with the church. If the latter, it may have accommodated a parish clerk or sexton in charge of the entrance into the churchyard.

What kind of foundation, then, did Carpenter create? The modern understanding of his intentions has been warped by the famous note made by John Leland on his visit to Westbury in the early 1540s, that ‘John Carpenter wished to assume the title that he should be called “bishop of Worcester and Westbury”’. This note was reproduced by Godwin and Fuller, generating a belief that Carpenter planned Westbury as a cathedral. Leland, however, was not making a careful judgment based on documentary research. He was recording a piece of local information or folklore as he often did on his travels: a tradition uttered nearly seventy years after Carpenter’s death. There is no evidence that Carpenter ever adopted, or sought to adopt, the title or function of ‘bishop of Worcester and Westbury’. The sole support for the theory is a single casual reference by the Bristol antiquary, William Worcester, in about 1480 to the ‘cathedral church of Westbury’. But Worcester too was jotting down notes. He may have written ‘cathedral’ for ‘collegiate’ as a mistake or as a joke. The evidence is far stronger that Carpenter did not intend to create a cathedral. If he had tried to do so, he would undoubtedly have aroused the hostility of the monks of Worcester as Giffard did, whereas his relationship with them was generally harmonious. He would have needed papal and royal approval, and there is no sign that he ever sought either of these. Most substantially, his constitutional arrangements for Westbury bore no resemblance to those of a cathedral. He did not make himself a member of the foundation as Giffard tried to do. He did not retain a body of active prebendaries like those of a cathedral, let alone increase their number. Instead he relieved them of most of their wealth. The officers he created – subdean, treasurer-cum-precentor, and schoolmaster – had their counterparts in secular cathedrals like Lichfield, Salisbury, and Wells, but these counterparts (apart from the schoolmasters) were far grander men with much larger powers and revenues. Carpenter’s posts were miniature copies, not full-scale reproductions. Everything about the organisation of Westbury – its fellows, school, and almsfolk – stamps it as being a typical college foundation of the fifteenth century, and that is how we should regard it.
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Visually his foundation lacked the integration characteristic of the greatest colleges of the later middle ages. Eton, Winchester, and the larger university colleges, were laid out compactly around courts or quadrangles, whereas the Westbury buildings were dispersed rather than contiguous, and occupied more than one location. The lower site held the residential quadrangle, the outer gatehouse, and probably other buildings or gardens now forgotten. The upper site contained the church, churchyard, and perhaps a church house, with the ‘North Almshouse’ occupying an intermediate place between the two sites. The disparate nature of the Westbury buildings partly reflected the hilly terrain, the historical past, and the tradition that collegiate churches were less secluded from the outside world than monasteries. Carpenter had to work within these constraints, and we should not necessarily judge his buildings as a provincial version of what elsewhere was done in more sophisticated ways. Several other colleges of the later middle ages, notably Higham Ferrers (Northants.), resembled Westbury in having scattered buildings, sometimes in more than one place, as indeed did the closes of cathedrals like Exeter, Wells, and Salisbury. And in making his clergy live inside a single quadrangle, controlled by gatehouses, Carpenter was fully in accord with the disciplinary ethos of the great collegiate churches of the fifteenth century.

**Westbury College: the Re-endowment**

The extent of Carpenter’s care and effort on Westbury’s behalf widens as we learn how his reorganisation was paid for. The ancient income of Westbury college was only about £80 per annum, according to the rough estimate of 1435–1445. This left available only about £30 after paying the dean, prebendaries, subdean, and treasurer the sums laid down in the statutes of 1455. With one exception, the rectory of Kempsey, Worcs., Carpenter did not copy Giffard’s attempt to convey to Westbury any of the churches belonging to the bishopric of Worcester, and even Kempsey was transferred very late in his life. Instead he increased the endowments of the college from his own resources, admittedly ones that came largely from his income as bishop. He also gained some important benefactions from other people, notably Edward IV (Fig. 3).

Carpenter’s own contributions to the endowments were lands, tenements, and a church, all bought for cash. The properties concerned were those that came onto the market or whose owners could be persuaded to sell them. In consequence of this they were widely scattered, so that a college whose interests had hitherto been confined to the Westbury district came to have possessions in other parts of the diocese and even outside it. Carpenter’s earliest purchase of which we know was some properties in the city of Worcester for which he paid £100 in 1456–7, a ratio of twenty-two times the annual income (the conventional price of property was twenty times). In about 1463 it is probable that he purchased the advowson (the right of patronage) of Clifton
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Fig. 3  The possessions of Westbury College in 1535.
church near Bristol from lay owners, and in that year he appropriated £10 per annum from its tithes to Westbury College to fund the schoolmaster. 131 This was followed by the manor of Upper Dowdeswell, Gloucs., bought from Richard Beauchamp in 1463–4 for £73 6s. 8d. Dowdeswell appears to have been in a run-down state which enabled Carpenter to acquire it for the bargain price of nine times the annual income, but he spent a further £40 15s. 6d. on building a sheepepote there and ridding the pastures of bushes, as well as £13 9s. 6d. on stocking the place with 164 sheep. Next came the manor of Gannow, Worcs., bought in 1467–8 for £53 6s. 8d., a ratio of sixteen times the income, and the manor of Barford, Warws., purchased in 1469–70 for £183 12s. 6d., a ratio of eighteen times. Barford had belonged to Richard Nevill, earl of Warwick (the Kingmaker), for whom prayers were said in Westbury, but it is not known to what extent Nevill allowed Carpenter to buy his property or whether Carpenter was a beneficiary of Nevill’s fall from power at about the time of the acquisition. The only inventory we possess of Westbury’s property – the valuation of the English Church carried out for Henry VIII in 1535 – lists numerous other manors and small properties in Gloucestershire, Worcestershire, and even Berkshire, several of which were probably Carpenter’s purchases. 132

The chief external benefactor was Edward IV, who took the throne from Henry VI in 1461. It says a good deal about Carpenter’s political acumen and tact that, having been appointed to office by Henry, he was not only tolerated by Edward but treated with a good deal of favour. Edward too was interested in colleges. His grandfather Edward duke of York had founded Fotheringhay, and he himself made substantial improvements to St George’s Windsor, Berks. He gave Carpenter three properties for Westbury, the quid pro quo being that the Westbury clergy undertook to pray for Edward and his family. The earliest of the gifts was the manor of Elmestree in Tetbury, Gloucs., made over to the college on 21 March 1464 in return for prayers for the king, his brother Edmund earl of Rutland, and their parents Richard duke of York and his wife Cicely. 133 Richard and Edmund were both killed at the battle of Wakefield in 1460. Elmestree had belonged to Fontevrault Abbey in France, but had been in lay hands earlier in the fifteenth century; it was worth £12 net per annum in 1535. 134 A year later, on 13 May 1465, the king added the hospital of St Laurence, Bristol of which he had become patron, the list of those to be prayed for now including his wife Elizabeth Wydeville and his ally Richard Nevill. 135 St Laurence was one of several hospitals that were closed or united to other religious houses in the fifteenth century, reflecting the disappearance of their original functions, in this case for lepers. 136 Westbury continued to maintain the premises, paying £2 to a priest to say mass in the chapel and making a small donation of 16s. to four poor people living there (in effect 4d. each per month). The residual value of the property in 1535, after deducting these expenses, came to £12 8s. 2d. 137
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The latest of Edward’s grants was that of the former priory of Astley, Worcs. It was conveyed to the college on 11 November 1469 ‘at the prayer of’ Thomas Bourchier, cardinal and archbishop of Canterbury whom one presumes that Carpenter had enlisted to support him. Astley had been the property of the French abbey of St Taurin, Normandy and came into the hands of the crown by the early fifteenth century like other such ‘alien priories’. The endowments were concentrated at Astley and consisted of the church, the priory site, and the manor. In 1535 the net income was £26 1s. 3¼d., and the college had the right of appointing the parish vicar. Altogether the three royal grants made a major addition to Westbury’s assets, increasing them by nearly £50 net per annum, and since the appropriation of Kempsey also involved prayers for the royal family, Westbury became something of a chantry for the House of York. The college received some donations of money or property from other people too, but these were generally small in scale and value. The most notable benefactor after the king may have been Richard Nevill, as has been suggested with regard to Barford. His name was mentioned in the grant of St Laurence, and although he later quarrelled with Edward and was killed at the battle of St Albans in 1471, he continued to be prayed for at the college until at least 1535. A further asset, procured by Carpenter in 1466, was a papal indulgence of a moderately substantial value by contemporary standards. It granted relief of penance worth five years and five Lents to those who visited the church of Westbury on the feasts of its spiritual patrons: the Holy Trinity, Peter, and Paul.

Carpenter therefore had a profound effect on Westbury by raising its revenues from about £80 at his arrival to about £284 (in the values of 1535) at the time of his death: a growth of over 200 per cent. If we exclude cathedrals, university colleges, and cathedral-like bodies such as Beverley, Ripon, and Southwell, the college was one of the dozen best endowed foundations of its kind in England by the end of the middle ages. The new acquisitions of property, including those of Edward IV, also gave the college four further churches. Clifton, obtained in 1463, was a small and relatively poor parish, and its resources after the appropriation of its tithes were sufficient only to maintain a chaplain, possibly chosen by the dean and chapter but paid by the ‘farmer’ who leased the tithes from the college. Barford church belonged to the monks of Evesham Abbey, but the dean and chapter of Westbury apparently gained the right to nominate a rector to the monks who then presented him to the bishop for institution. Astley brought with it a vicarage, to which the dean and chapter appointed clergy, three of whom between 1483 and 1492 had links with the college. The last and most valuable church to come to Westbury was Kempsey, Worcs., an ancient possession of the bishopric served by both a rector and a vicar. Carpenter
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appropriated the rectory to the college in 1473, just before his death, apparently with the consent of the monks of Worcester who were given a small pension from the rectory’s income.\textsuperscript{147} The rectory, worth £44 10s. net in 1535,\textsuperscript{148} became the college’s single most lucrative possession, but its resources were assigned to the dean alone to maintain the prayers for the royal family and, as already mentioned, to support his costs of hospitality, provide meals for the clergy, and make a small monetary distribution to them. He subsequently held the sole right to appoint the vicar of the parish.\textsuperscript{149}

\textbf{Westbury College at Work: 1455–1476}

Two other aspects of the college may be studied while Carpenter was bishop: the clergy of the institution and the impact of the college in its parish and on the neighbouring city of Bristol. Hardly any of the lesser clergy – fellows, clerks, and choristers – are recorded by name at this time, so we can only consider the deans, subdeans, and treasurers. Their names are preserved, as before, because they were formally admitted to office by the bishop and the fact entered into his register. As a learned man himself, Carpenter appears to have been anxious to employ men of learning in these posts. Of the two subdeans he appointed, one was an MA and the other described as \textit{Magister}. Of his four treasurers, one was an MA and one a bachelor of canon and civil law, while a third may have studied at Oxford.

The four deans whom Carpenter introduced after the death of Okeborne were all men of distinction, three of them academically so. John Blackman, who succeeded Okeborne on 3 January 1456 after a gap of several months (perhaps because the bishop sought other candidates), was a Somerset man who had held a fellowship of Merton College, Oxford, and graduated as MA and bachelor of theology. After resigning from Merton in 1443, he became a fellow of Eton College, where he came into contact with Henry VI who promoted him to be warden of King’s Hall, Cambridge, a university college closely linked with the crown and the chapel royal. He was still warden when he was appointed dean of Westbury and held the two offices in tandem for eighteen months until he resigned his Cambridge post. Blackman was widely read in theology and collected 66 books during his life, but while he was dean he discovered a vocation to become a monk of a contemplative kind. At the beginning of 1459 he left Westbury to enter the reclusive Carthusian Order at Witham in his native county, and subsequently wrote a well-known account of the life of Henry VI.\textsuperscript{150}

To follow Blackman, Carpenter chose Henry Sampson who was admitted on 20 January 1459 and held office for the next ten years. He too was a Somerset man who
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took the degree of MA at Oxford and became a fellow of Oriel College in 1435, the year that Carpenter resigned as provost, but since Carpenter remained at Oxford until 1439 their acquaintance must have dated from that decade. It became a close friendship. Samson officiated at Carpenter’s enthronement as bishop of Worcester, and the bishop made him rector first of Kempsey, then of the valuable church of Tredington, Worcs., and finally of Madresfield, Worcs. In 1449 Samson became provost of Oriel College, keeping Tredington and Madresfield in the meanwhile, and the deanery of Westbury became the fourth of his benefices because he did not give up the others. He cannot therefore have kept continuous residence at Westbury, but Carpenter tolerated this, as we have seen in the statutes, and the creation of the office of subdean provided for such a situation. One presumes that Carpenter valued Sampson for his administrative abilities and no doubt for his learning: Sampson is recorded giving three theological volumes to Oriel College. On resigning as dean in 1459, he was given the prebend of Godringhill and held it till his death in 1482. He was buried in Tredington church, where his memorial brass survives. 151

The next dean is the most famous holder of the office but an exception in the series of scholarly men. This was William Canynges: a leading Bristol merchant who caused surprise by becoming a priest towards the end of his life (Plate XII). 152 He was born in 1402 into a prosperous dynasty. His grandfather William was a wealthy clothier who was mayor of the city five times; his father John was mayor twice. William the younger became one of Bristol’s leading merchants in the 1430s, trading with Iceland, Scandinavia, Prussia, south-western France, and Spain in commodities that included fish, cloth, and wine. Later he built ships and provided transport for other merchants, the largest of his nine vessels – the *Mary and John* – being a monster of 900 tons that cost 4,000 marks to build (£2,666 13s. 4d.). 153 At the peak of his prosperity he employed over 100 men. He lived in a substantial house backing on to Redcliffe Street and facing the River Avon, which included a tower and four decorated bay windows. 154 Along with these successes came influence in local government. He was elected bailiff of Bristol in 1432, sheriff in 1438, member of Parliament three times (1439, 1450–1, and 1455), and mayor five times (1441, 1449, 1456, 1461, and 1466). Only as a dynast did he fail. Although he tried to establish his two sons William and John as country gentlemen and although they both married, both predeceased him, and after his wife Joan died in 1466–7 William’s interests turned more strongly to religion. Between 1466 and 1468 he endowed two chantry priests in his parish church, St Mary Redcliffe, Bristol, as well as increasing the endowment of two others of its priests and its three parish clerks.

According to later gossip in Bristol, William entered the Church because of a commandment that he should remarry, allegedly issued by Edward IV in 1467.
‘wherefore the said Canynges gave up the world and in all haste took orders upon him of the good bishop of Worcester called Carpynter, and was made priest and sang his first mass at Our Lady of Redcliff the year following’. An enigm atic note by William Worcester says that Edward IV ‘had 3,000 marks [£2,000] from the said William to have his peace’. Since William lent money to Edward at the start of his reign and his half-brother Thomas Yonge was a prominent supporter of the king’s family, neither the gossip nor Worcester’s comment are easy to explain. Canynges was certainly set on an ecclesiastical career by September 1467, and Carpenter showed him a good deal of favour in this respect which points to a long and close relationship between them. By that month Carpenter had made him rector of the parish church of St Alban, Worcester and during it he ordained him acolyte. The bishop then promoted him to the major orders of subdeacon, deacon, and priest between 12 March and 16 April 1468, justifying the comment ‘in all haste’, and on the day that he was ordained priest Carpenter gave him the prebend of Godringhill, after which Canynges relinquished St Alban. On 3 June 1469 he was collated as dean of Westbury and held office for just over five years. In 1472 Carpenter made him rector of Kempsey too, probably in preparation for its appropriation to the college.

Either Canynges himself or somebody else was subsequently uneasy about his sudden transition from mayor to priest. In 1469 he applied to the pope for a dispensation for having been made a priest de facto – presumably without having sought papal permission. Issues that needed adjudication were his former marriage and his presence as mayor in criminal courts at which punishments involving bloodshed had been delivered. It would have been well known that in 1461 he had been a member of a judicial commission headed by Edward IV himself which condemned to execution Sir Baldwin Fulford, a prominent supporter of Henry VI. In his application to the pope Canynges argued that he himself had never pronounced a capital punishment or voted for one, and his claim was accepted or his past condoned since the dispensation was granted, ratifying his priestly status and his tenure of the deanery. Nothing significant is known of his activities at Westbury, but it is a reasonable presumption that, unlike Sampson, he was often there, and this was certainly the case on 12 November 1474 when he made his will, five days before his death on the 17th. The will was witnessed by the subdean. He bequeathed £2 to the fabric of the church and 6s. 8d., to each fellow, 5s. to each chaplain and deacon, 3s. 4d. to each elderly priest, 12d. to each almsman and woman, and 8d. to each chorister in return for their attendance at his funeral at Westbury and at the taking of his body for burial at St Mary Redcliffe. Bequests to four other named men look like references to his household staff as dean, and he also left small sums to two named servants of the college and to the water bailiff of Westbury. He was buried with his wife in Redcliffe church.
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Canynges appears to have become infirm by the spring of 1473, and Carpenter (who was to die only three years later) seems to have feared that he himself might not be able to steer the appointment of a successor. It looks as if Carpenter sought to arrange the succession in favour of Robert Slymbrigge, a local man from Thornbury, Gloucs. Slymbrigge was a distinguished scholar who had studied canon law at Oxford and Bologna, gaining a doctorate at the latter, and Carpenter had given him patronage since 1465 including the prebend of Godringhill. On 24 March 1473 Slymbrigge gained royal permission to obtain a papal provision (a procedure now very rare except for bishops), and on 22 April 1473 the pope provided him to the deanery of Westbury when it next became vacant.161 This established the succession that Carpenter wanted, but as it turned out the bishop outlived Canynges and collated Slymbrigge on 5 December 1474.162 The sequel was not what Carpenter planned since, within two or three years, Slymbrigge resigned the deanery, although he lived for another twenty years and died in the diocese.163

Turning from the personnel of a religious house to its activities is difficult in medieval times unless there are chronicles, registers, or account rolls, all of which are lacking at Westbury. For the college’s links with its immediate locality, we have only a document of Bishop Carpenter issued on 15 September 1463 regulating its relationship with the church and vicar of Henbury – a relationship that Carpenter probably found it wise to define as part of his reconstruction of the college and its revenues.164 The document declared that Henbury church and its chapels were canonically united and appropriated to the dean and chapter of Westbury, in effect recognising their full power over the parish and resources of Henbury except for certain rights and revenues reserved to the vicar. The vicar was to own the vicarage house at Henbury and the adjoining land as well as the house and garden of the chaplain of Aust. He was to receive all the lesser tithes of Henbury parish: of mills, woods, fisheries, gardens, wool, animals, butter, cheese, and fruit, excluding the lands of the dean and chapter and trees in certain named woods. He was to have two thirds of all the tithes (including the great tithes of corn) of Crook’s Marsh (between Avonmouth and Severn Beach), the other third belonging to the college, and all tithes of pasture over which there had been disputes with the college, in return for paying the college 13s. 4d. per annum. In Charlton his rights were restricted to tithes of hunting and fowling.

The vicar was also confirmed as having all the offerings made in Henbury church and in the chapels of Aust, King’s Weston, Lawrence Weston, and Northwick, and all mortuaries (gifts made at death, conventionally a horse or a gown). A further source of income consisted of ‘procession and pentecostals’ from the chaplain and parishioners of Aust and Northwick: these were small sums of money customarily paid by households at Pentecost (Whitsuntide). The vicar had the right to appoint the parish clerks of Henbury and the dependent chapels. His revenues produced a
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substantial income, £30 in 1535, from which he was obliged to provide and pay a chaplain for Aust, maintain the chapel building there, and furnish chaplains for the other chapels at the cost of their congregations. Such chaplains (apart from Aust’s and Northwick’s) would not necessarily have been full time or resident; they would have been hired as needed, but the vicar was recognised as having the power to control who was employed and on what basis. The dean and chapter were made responsible for repairing the chancel of Henbury church, but the vicar was to pay one eighth of the cost. Since the document is concerned with the vicar’s rights, we are told very little about those of the college but it looks as if the main revenues enjoyed by the latter in Henbury parish were the lands of the prebends, the great tithes of corn minus two thirds of those of Crook’s Marsh, and perhaps some tithes in Charlton. That left Westbury parish, including Stoke Bishop and Shirehampton, in which the college would have received all tithes and where it also held some land.

Beyond Westbury and Henbury there was Bristol, which must always have been a potent influence on the college although it is only in the fifteenth century that some of the strands of the relationship may be dimly perceived from records. Carpenter envisaged a link between city and college when he awarded the nomination of two of the almsfolk to the mayor and mayoress; the almshouses were thus to cater for people from Bristol as well from Westbury. In turn the college clergy and servants would often have gone to the city for worship, shopping, or recreation. Three of the fifteenth-century deans referred in their wills to people whom they knew there. Alexander Bagenham (died 1414) was a friend of Belinus Nansmoen, a learned married man of St Mary Redcliffe parish. He made Nansmoen his executor and gave him legacies including a standard text of canon law; when Nansmoen made his own will he arranged for prayers for Bagenham’s soul. William Okeborne’s will (1455) mentioned the guild of Kalendars (to whose library he gave a volume), St Augustine’s Abbey (he had lent a medical book to the abbot), St Mary Magdalene’s Priory for nuns (he left them 6d. each), and St Mark’s Hospital (to whose prior he had loaned £20). He forgave the loan to the hospital in return for having an obit mass celebrated on the anniversary of his death, and appointed William Sutton, rector of St Werburgh, as one of his executors. John Lyndsey (died 1488) made donations to the four houses of friars in the city and to a godchild of his, the son of Edward Taylor of Bristol.

There was some corresponding awareness of Westbury in Bristol. The best example of it relates to the writer and pioneer topographer William Worcester, who was born in Bristol in 1415 but spent most of his life elsewhere, finally settling in Norwich. During the late 1470s he began to make the notes now known as his Itineraries, which included a detailed description of Bristol intended for a book, a map, or both. He visited Westbury on two of the occasions that he came to the city to make notes. In September 1478 he was at Tintern Abbey, Monmouthshire, and rode from there to
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Beachley, Gloucs., on Monday the 7th, crossing the River Severn by ferry to Aust Cliff. He probably stayed at Westbury or in its vicinity on Monday night, and heard divine service in the college on Tuesday the 8th, performing his usual practice of pacing the length of the church and noting the paces before continuing to Bristol.\footnote{Worcester, \textit{Itineraries}, pp. 36–7.} In 1480, again in September, he stayed in Bristol and rode out to Westbury College on Sunday the 10th to speak with John Griffyth of Bristol, a merchant ‘dwelling there’, a phrase which implies that Griffyth lived in or near the college as a boarder or a private resident.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 262–3.} It may have been on this occasion that Worcester again measured the church, now noting the width as well as the length.\footnote{Worcester, \textit{Topography of Medieval Bristol}, pp. 86–7.} He also recorded the ways that led from Bristol to Westbury. One of these left the city on the north side, up St Michael’s Hill and continued along what is now Whiteladies Road. Another, perhaps preferred because less steep, led from the east side of the city, passing the church of St James to follow the Gloucester Road and branching left to Westbury from there.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 98–101, 228–9, 328.}

Worcester’s liking for history, buildings, and topography was unusual, but his religious devotion was more typical of his times and there are signs that he was not the only Bristolian apart from Canynges who took an interest in Westbury church. A third was William Codder of the parish of St Nicholas, who may have originated in Westbury since he had owned the land which became the site of the men’s alms house.\footnote{Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 231r.} He bequeathed 40s. to the church in 1474 so that people there might remember his soul in their prayers,\footnote{PROB 11/6, f. 98e-v; \textit{Great Orphan Book}, ed. Wadley, p. 149.} and in 1535 the college was commemorating his death with an obit mass.\footnote{\textit{Valor Ecclesiasticus}, ii, 435.} A fourth, Thomas Hexton, granted the college a tenement in Arley, Worcs., called ‘Hexton’s Place’, in 1485 (after Westbury came into possession of the manor there), a grant that may have been for prayers although the college subsequently disposed of the property.\footnote{Birmingham City Archives, MS 3279/351481; \textit{VCH Worcestershire}, iii, 7.} A fifth, John Newland, abbot of St Augustine’s (1481–1515), is commemorated on a tile now in the care of Westbury church.\footnote{The incomplete tile bears his rebus (a nailed heart) and the N of his surname.} The college acquired some small assets in Bristol: a pavement and gate near the cemetery of All Saints church by 1491 and some land near High Street by 1525, and it is possible that these too were endowments for prayers.\footnote{Bristol Record Office, P/AS/D/NA 48, 58.} After Carpenter’s death, his miracles or the papal indulgence may have drawn people from Bristol to Westbury, while music in the form of the newly popular polyphony may have had the same effect especially on Sundays and at festivals.

Much remains hidden from us about the links between city and college, however, and it is as unwise to exaggerate them as it is to turn Westbury from a college to a cathedral. Bristol was well provided with churches and clergy: an Augustinian abbey, a Benedictine priory, four houses of friars, a nunnery, the hospital of St Mark, several
almshouses, seventeen parish churches, and some chapels.\textsuperscript{181} These provided religious devotees with daily services, images to venerate, sermons, indulgences, music, and clergy anxious to make personal links and to say prayers for the dead. Westbury, at a distance from the city, is likely to have received only a small proportion of the time and money that Bristolians gave to religion.\textsuperscript{182}


\textsuperscript{182} On this point, see also below, p. 103.
FROM 1476 TO 1544

The College Clergy

Carpenter did not regard the refoundation of Westbury College as complete at the time of his death in 1476. As we have seen from his will, he wished to increase its endowments. His chantry had not been established, and he planned to improve the allowances of his six poor widows. In as far as his project was ever formally concluded, this happened in 1482 when his successor, John Alcock, made an official visitation of the diocese. As part of the process Alcock arrived at the college on 29 March, probably while staying at Henbury, and met the dean and fellows in the chapter house on the following day. There 'he made wholesome exhortations to them for the good and healthy state of the said college'. In the following week, Holy Week, he consecrated holy oil in the church, and on Easter Eve he held an ordination there. Finally, on the Wednesday after Easter, 10 April, he again entered the chapter house, saw and read the statutes and ordinances which Carpenter had made for the college, and ratified them, sealing them with his great seal.1 We do not know whether these were Carpenter’s statutes of 1455 or a later and revised edition of them.

The college was so much Carpenter’s personal project that the bishops who followed him could not be expected to go on adding to its resources and functions. From Alcock onwards they did little more than appoint deans, canons, subdeans, and treasurers when necessary. Even their visits to Henbury and Westbury grew rare, especially during the years from 1497 to 1523 when Worcester had three Italian bishops in turn who served as agents for the English crown at Rome. By the time that Leland wrote in the early 1540s, the episcopal manor house at Henbury had fallen into ruin.2 For the sixty-eight years that remained of the college’s life after Carpenter’s death in 1476, it was largely obliged to make do with the endowments that he had given it. A small addition to these was made with a purchase of lands in or before 1497 from a gift of £60 by John Moore, prebendary of Godringhill.3 A more substantial one involved the acquisition of most of the income hitherto enjoyed by the
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vicar of Henbury. In 1510 the bishop of Worcester, Silvestro de Gigli, granted the next presentation to the post of vicar to the vicar-general of the diocese and two other men.\(^4\) Subsequently the post appears to have come into the possession of the college, with the result that its stipend was appropriated by the dean or the college, apart from the wages of a chaplain who performed the vicar’s duties. This arrangement is not known to have had official sanction until 1539 when the bishop, John Bell, formally collated the dean, John Barlow, as vicar of Henbury, but it must have raised the dean’s resources or those of the college by some £20 per annum.\(^5\)

The internal history of the college after Carpenter’s death is hard to reconstruct, given the lack of documents like those produced by his activities. The easiest topic to study is that of the eight deans who held office between 1476 and 1530, most of whom have left some evidence of their careers. The earliest was William Vauce. His appointment has not been recorded; it may have been made by Carpenter just before he died, by the crown during the vacancy that followed, or by the next bishop, John Alcock. Whichever is true, Vauce was one of Carpenter’s men, the last such dean. He came from Worcester diocese and had studied canon and civil law at Oxford. Carpenter promoted him to administrative posts soon after becoming bishop, making him a commissary-general in 1444, vicar-general in 1448, archdeacon of Worcester in 1452, and chancellor of the diocese by 1462. Vauce witnessed Carpenter’s will and must therefore have been present at the bishop’s deathbed.\(^6\) He occupied a number of parish benefices in the diocese, not to mention the precentorship of Lichfield Cathedral in 1472 and a canonry of Hereford Cathedral in 1476, so he resembled Sampson as a man with wide interests. Nevertheless he either died at Westbury or was brought there to be buried beneath an arch in the south wall of the new chapel of St John, after a term of office that cannot have exceeded five years and may have lasted for as few as three.\(^7\)

Vauce was followed by the first dean of the new foundation definitely appointed by another bishop. This was John Lyndsey, collated in 1479 by Alcock. Alcock was a Cambridge graduate and so was Lyndsey, rarely for Westbury in this respect. Lyndsey is a dean of whom we know more than usual, thanks to the survival of his will.\(^8\) It tells us that he was born in the parish of West Keal near Old Bolingbroke in Lincolnshire, and that his parents were buried in the church there. His birth can probably be dated to the second half of the 1430s. He read arts at Cambridge, took his MA in 1460, and gained a fellowship at Clare College which he kept until 1471, studying theology and graduating with a doctorate, which made him the first dean of Westbury to possess this distinction. He probably came to Alcock’s notice in that period.\(^9\) Lyndsey centred his life on the college since he held only two other benefices during his tenure, one of which was merely a chapel, and seems to have spent most of his time at Westbury. As we have seen, he built a new house there, possibly as a personal residence, and was a benefactor to the college in his will. He left the house to the fellows in return for
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holding an obit mass for his soul on the anniversary of his death, allowed them each to choose one of his lesser books, and bequeathed small sums of money to the college and to every one of its members. Other books were donated to Cambridge University, Clare College, and Ely Cathedral, along with money to Kempsey church tower and the poor of its parish. He asked to be buried before the altar of St Mary the Virgin in Westbury church ‘so that the priest celebrating there every day may stand upon my monument at the time of offering the Body of Jesus’, and directed that his name should be written by the altar so that the priest would remember to pray for him. These requests reinforce the sense of his attachment to the college, although he was dean for only nine years.

When Lyndsey died in 1488, the bishop of Worcester was Robert Morton, an Oxford graduate. Morton’s choice was Adam Redsheff, a Kentishman who had studied canon law at Paris and Louvain, gaining the degree of doctor. Redsheff kept close links with France thereafter. He held a rectory in the English enclave around Calais before coming to Westbury, and after being dean for three and a half years (1488–91), exchanged the post for a rectory in Calais itself. He was an untrustworthy man, if we can credit two petitions against him submitted to the Court of Chancery by Robert Wood, the treasurer of the college during Redsheff’s time in office. In the first petition, made in 1502–3, Wood asserted that he had lent Redsheff £33 6s. 8d. (fifty marks) from the college funds, of which Redsheff repaid only £8 3s. 4d. and refused Wood’s pleas to return the remainder. In the second, presented a year or two later, Wood returned to the matter but with a slightly different story. This time he claimed that he had lent Redsheff £25 (presumably the balance after the partial repayment), and that the former dean had promised to discharge the debt in cash or in cloth of arras of an equivalent value to hang in the choir of the college. We are not told how Redsheff replied to these charges, or what the court decided. The cleric with whom Redsheff exchanged the deanship in 1491 was William Cretyng, another Cambridge graduate but a less distinguished one than Lyndsey since he had taken only a bachelor’s degree in canon law before acquiring a parish benefice in Cambridgeshire, followed by the Calais rectory. He held the deanery of Westbury in tandem with a canonry of Windsor collegiate church, but the length of his time in office is obscure because the bishops’ registers are less thorough in recording institutions to benefices after about 1500. Cretyng did not die until 1519, but he resigned as dean between 1504 and 1509; how much time he spent at Westbury is unknown.

The deficiencies of the registers continue with respect to the next four deans. Under the three Italian bishops from 1497 to 1523, it is difficult even to be sure who appointed them. William Wydeslade appears as dean in 1509; his term of office is not otherwise datable but cannot have extended before 1504 or after 1511. Little is recorded about him beyond the fact that he was also rector of Freshwater on the Isle of Wight. By 1511 he had given way to Richard Gardener, an Oxford MA whose
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benefices included two parishes in Kent, one in Wiltshire, and a canonry of Salisbury Cathedral, so it is anyone’s guess what attention he gave to Westbury. Gardener left not later than 1518, the date of his death, and his next known successor, Thomas Hannibal, was in post by 1523. Hannibal had stronger local connections. A doctor of canon and civil law of Cambridge and Oxford, he had been vicar-general of Worcester diocese before serving as an envoy of Henry VIII at Rome between 1522 and 1524. From 1523 to 1527 he held the senior legal post of master of the rolls in London. His status in the diocese and with the crown is a sufficient explanation of how he came to be prebendary of Holley and later dean, but his other concerns suggest that the college may rarely have seen him. Hannibal must have resigned by 1528, when we encounter John Hewes as the last of the pre-Reformation deans. Hewes was a Gloucestershire man who had gained a fellowship of Merton College, Oxford, and taken the degrees of MA and DD. He too was a pluralist, holding the deanship with the posts of treasurer of Lichfield Cathedral and canon of Chichester Cathedral. His post at Chichester involved the duty of giving theological lectures. It is equally uncertain how much time he spent at Westbury before his early death in 1530, when he was in his late forties.

The days when the prebends were perquisites worth seeking or exchanging had ended in 1455. Thereafter their £2 stipends were scarcely worth having, but bishops went on collating clergy to them until the Reformation. One motive may have been to associate such clergy with the college as a kind of board of governors; another to give them status and the right to wear the honorific almuce. Some of those appointed may never have come to Westbury, but others sometimes did so. Edmund Hecker mentioned his bed and chamber in the college in 1467, and wished to be buried in its church. Ralph Hopwood was visiting or resident in 1534 when he acknowledged Henry VIII as head of the Church, and so was Thomas Barlow in 1539 when he journeyed from Westbury to Wales with his brother the dean. Both Barlow and John Kerell signed the document by which the college surrendered itself to the king in 1544. The prebendaries after Carpenter’s reforms, as before, were often men who enjoyed the bishop’s patronage or acted as his servants: Thomas Eggcombe, Edmund Hecker, Henry Sampson, and William Vauce. Later on we encounter Arnulf Colyns, commissary-general of the diocese from 1473 to 1486, Thomas Hannibal already mentioned, and John Bell, vicar-general and chancellor of the diocese from 1518 to 1522. Four prebendaries after Carpenter’s death went on to achieve high office: two as bishops (John Bell of Worcester and Richard Nykke of Norwich) and two as archbishops (John Alen and Hugh Inge, both of Dublin).

In the dean’s absence, the government of the college devolved on the subdean. He must have taken many routine decisions although the deans may have insisted on keeping control of patronage such as the appointment of fellows, schoolmasters, and
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almsfolk. The subdean also had the cure of souls: administering or supervising baptisms, confessions, marriages, and burials. Two surviving wills of Westbury laymen were witnessed by subdeans.\textsuperscript{23} There were about ten holders of the office from Carpenter’s first appointment until the dissolution of the college, and their academic qualifications were generally high. Seven were MAs, one was a bachelor of civil law, and one held the title magister, leaving only one whose university membership is unclear. A single subdean, John Rose, was deprived of office in 1534, a possible reason for which will emerge in due course.\textsuperscript{24} Two of his predecessors, Philip Hyet (1458–92) and John Wellow (1492–1515),\textsuperscript{25} served for long periods and died in harness, but most subdeans left after a few years for a parish benefice elsewhere. Thomas Stephens, the first to hold the office (1456–8), did the best in this respect, becoming warden (presiding officer) of Ottery St Mary collegiate church, Devon, while John Flooke (1534–5) moved to be head of Carpenter’s Bristol foundation, the guild of Kalendars.\textsuperscript{26}

The Life of the College

The college appears to have functioned in a broadly acceptable way during the sixty-eight years from Carpenter’s death to the dissolution of the foundation in 1544. Within the institution, the number of clergy was usually maintained at the levels that he had planned, showing that his endowment proved sufficient to sustain the college economically and his constitution effective in ensuring the replacement of staff. Outside the college in the parishes of Westbury and Henbury, taxation records of the period 1532–41 indicate that curates were employed at Henbury and Aust, as well as at Clifton which was a separate parish. Two of the local chapels – Northwick and Shirehampton – were served by chaplains paid for by neighbouring people, and there was a further chaplain in Henbury church (in effect the priest of a guild of parishioners), supported in a similar way.\textsuperscript{27} Taking into account the subdean’s responsibility at Westbury, it looks as if the worship and sacraments needed in the two parishes were provided to the extent that was normal elsewhere in England and required by the canon law of the Church.

A little more can be said about the appearance and furnishings of Carpenter’s rebuilt collegiate church than in earlier times (Fig. 4). It would have resembled its fourteenth-century predecessor in having a high altar at the east end of the chancel and seating for the clergy further west. The altar would have been flanked by the images of those to whom the church was dedicated. In 1456 there is a reference to the dedication as St Peter but this was evidently an addition rather than a change, because from 1466 onwards the dedication is usually said to be to the Holy Trinity, Peter, and Paul.\textsuperscript{28} There was some coloured glass in the church, and an effigy of Carpenter could still
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be seen in one of the east windows in the eighteenth century. A rood-screen bearing a crucifix continued to divide the chancel from the nave, and the two chapels on either side of the chancel would have also been screened. These chapels – the Lady chapel and that of St John – would have contained images of the saints to whom they were dedicated. The image of Mary in the Lady chapel is mentioned in the will of Thomas Mason, fellow of the college, in 1478, and John Tillyng of Westbury who gave a silver ring towards the making of 'the tabernacle of Our Lady within the parish’ in 1510 may have been referring to this image (tabernacle implying a structure in which it stood) unless he was referring to a separate outdoor shrine. There were probably other images of saints in the church, but their identities have not been recorded.

The chancel would have housed the daily services (the divine office) as well as a high mass at the high altar at mid morning. The larger number of clergy would have required more seats in the chancel, especially if places were kept for the prebendaries, as well as benches for the choristers. Other masses would have been celebrated at the chapel altars by the fellows or elderly priests, probably from dawn onwards and to a larger extent than before the reforms of Carpenter. The mass in the Lady chapel is likely to have included polyphony, with prayers and polyphonic antiphons to the Virgin at other times of the day. The nave remained the place for the congregation to watch the chancel services, doubtless from benches by at least the late fifteenth century when these were common in churches. A pulpit is mentioned in 1497. This was especially used for the reading of the bead-roll at mass by the subdean on Sunday mornings, the bead-roll being a list of names of parishioners who had given money to have their names written on it so that prayers could be asked for their souls. The south porch, built or rebuilt by Carpenter (Plate II), would have provided shelter during the services of baptism, marriage, and the churching of women after childbirth, all three of which were rites which began outside the church before bringing the person or persons concerned into the building.

Westbury church, like all its siblings before the Reformation, was a place of funerals, burials, and the commemoration of the dead. Notable clergy and laity were buried inside the walls. The first group, on the basis of their wills, included Hecker who asked to be laid in the chancel, and Lyndsey and Mason who chose the Lady chapel. Vauce certainly reposed in the chapel of St John. The laity included Thomas Haynes, lord of the manor of Southmead (died 1509), while John Tillyng of Westbury (died 1510), Richard Barkeley of Stoke Gifford (died 1518), and John Large of Henbury (died 1542–3) all made wills requesting burial in the church, Barkeley stipulating the Lady chapel. Whether every fellow and chaplain was allowed such

29 H. J. Wilkins, Westbury College from aJ94 to 1544 A.D. (Bristol, 1917), p. 162, quoting Browne Willis, MS History of Cathedrals, i, p. 643, probably one of the Willis MSS in the Bodleian Library, Oxford.
30 WRO, Register of Wills, i, f. 22v; TNA, PROB 11/16, f. 288r.
31 Cartulary of St. Mark's Hospital, Bristol, ed. Ross, p. 120.
32 PROB 11/5, f. 176v; PROB 11/8, f. 134v; WRO, Register of Wills, i, f. 22v.
33 Cartulary of St. Mark's Hospital, Bristol, ed. Ross, p. 119. In 1712 Robert Atkyns referred to ‘an old statue in stone in the south aisle, for Dr Haines dean of the college’ (The Ancient and Present State of Glosstershire, p. 803). There was no such dean, so the tomb may have been that of, Dean John Hewes (died 1530) if buried in the chapel, or a member of the Haynes family (see the next note).
34 Bristol Record Office, HA, Haynes Family Papers; PROB 11/6, f. 288r; WRO, Register of Wills, ii, f. 55r; PROB 11/29, f. 146r. In addition a John Haynes of Westbury made a will in 1539 without specifying where he was to be buried (WRO, Wills, 1538 no. 130).
burials is not recorded. Lay people who did not pay for the privilege of lying indoors would have been interred in the churchyard, like John Edmunds of Westbury who asked for this in his will of 1537. There was eventually a chantry – an endowment for a priest to say a daily mass for dead souls – in Carpenter’s chapel of the Holy Cross, and John Moore’s benefaction of £60 in 1497 led to the foundation of another. His chantry did not involve the recruitment of an additional priest, however, since the college undertook to find one of its existing clergy to say the mass in the chapel of St John for the souls of Moore, his parents John and Katherine, and Dean Vauce who had presumably been one of his benefactors. The mass was to be offered in the name of the Trinity on Sundays, the angels on Mondays, the Holy Ghost on Tuesdays, a requiem mass on Wednesdays, Corpus Christi on Thursdays, the Holy Cross on Fridays, and the Virgin Mary on Saturdays. Particular Latin prayers were prescribed to be said at the masses, and an obit or anniversry mass was established to be celebrated by all the members of the college every 18 July for the souls of Moore and his circle.

By 1535 at least fifteen other obit masses were held annually to commemorate those who had given endowments of money or property for the purpose. Endowments were required because it was customary to pay each member of a church for attending an obit and to make a distribution of alms to the poor. The obits occurred in every month of the year except for December, January, February, and September, and involved payments ranging from 7s. to 20s., with a specially high sum of 26s. 8d. for the founder’s obit on 21 October. The most important people in the list were Edward IV and his family, followed by Richard Nevill earl of Warwick, Carpenter himself, and two deans: Vauce and Lyndsey. Beneath them came a prebendary (Arnulph Colyns of Henbury, died 1490), and a Church dignitary (William Mogys, died 1497, whom Carpenter had made rector of Hartlebury and who rose to be archdeacon of Stafford). Next in rank were three fellows of the college (Richard Cooke, Thomas Dauks, and Robert Wood) the latter two of whom were also treasurers, and after them William Lutte, referred to below. The remaining obits were founded by or for laypeople. One commemorated William Codder of Bristol who has already been mentioned, another William and Joan Alphort, and a third Thomas and Elizabeth Sibley. The latter couple were probably from Worcester since their obit involved an annual payment of 3s. 4d. to the Franciscan friars of that city. These were not necessarily the only obits in the college’s history. John Tillyng established one in 1510, funded from land he had leased from the bishop of Worcester, but it was not listed in 1535, because either the endowment had run out or it did not belong to the college.

35 WRO, Wills, 1538 no. 46.
36 *Cartulary of St. Mark’s Hospital, Bristol*, ed. Ross, pp. 118–121. The date chosen was St Arnulph’s Day, perhaps implying an intention to honour Prebendary Arnulph Colyns who had died in 1490, although he is not mentioned in this respect.
37 *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, ii, 435.
38 Biography in Emden, *BRUO*, ii, 1287–8. It is possible that Mogys was a prebendary of Westbury: Holley’s occupancy is unknown between 1476 and 1498. He witnessed Thomas Mason’s will at Westbury in 1478 (WRO, Register of Wills, i, f. 22v).
39 *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, ii, 433.
40 PROB 11/6, f. 288r; WRO, b 009 (BA 2636/37 (iii) 43806), f. 116r.
Beside the daily worship, the college’s senior members must have spent time in administration. Westbury now had more properties to be managed – 29 of them in 1535 – and more internal activities to be financed and recorded. No register of the college’s business survives, but some of the documents by which it leased lands from the bishops of Worcester are enrolled in the records of the bishopric and cathedral of Worcester. These included a pasture and wood in Henbury in 1497, similar lands at Pen Park in 1498, the manor of Whitstones near Worcester in 1509, and some properties in Stoke Bishop and Sea Mills in 1523. Most of the college’s own lands were farmed, that is to say leased to others for money for a period of years, probably to local gentry or other prosperous laymen. In certain places, however, the college employed a bailiff and sometimes also a steward to look after its manorial rights such as the holding of courts and the collection of revenues not covered by the farm. The college’s possessions at Astley, Kempsey, and St Laurence Bristol each had a steward and bailiff, and those of Godringhill, Aust (with Henbury and Lawrence Weston), Monyhull, and Westbury a bailiff alone. These officers were paid small salaries for what was part-time work or supplemented by perquisites. The college also had an overall financial organisation. By 1535 a local knight, Sir Nicholas Poyntz, was given an annual fee to act as the principal steward of the college, probably in part to gain a powerful ally: religious houses commonly retained influential men of the neighbourhood in this way. Two receivers were paid to supervise the income and expenditure of the Westbury properties, one in Gloucestershire and one in Worcestershire, and an auditor was hired to check their accounts. Internally the treasurer of the college is likely to have kept accounts of annual income and expenditure, running from Michaelmas (29 September) each year. This is suggested by the list of the payments of obits in 1535, which follows that calendar.

When not occupied with worship or administration, some of the clergy are likely to have spent time in reading or study, at least of a private and personal kind. The deans, subdeans, and schoolmasters were usually graduates, and one or two are recorded possessing books. Lyndsey owned several volumes, and his invitation to the fellows to choose from among his collection suggests that he thought them capable of profiting from reading. At least three books are recorded as belonging to the college as an institution. William Okeborne’s bequests to it in 1455 consisted of a medical treatise in English and a volume containing two works in Latin: the Sunday sermons of Jacopo da Varazzo (the author of The Golden Legend) and the Lenten sermons of John Felton, vicar of St Mary Magdalene, Oxford. The Latin volume survives among the books of Jesus College, Oxford, containing a Latin inscription stating that it was ‘formerly of the college of the Holy Trinity of Westbury’. In 1467 Edmund Hecker gave the college the Corpus Juris Civilis, the standard collection of Roman laws, so that a book collection must have existed in a chest or cupboard if not in a library room.

---

42 For lands leased by the college from the bishop, see WCM, A 6(i) ff. 117r-118r; A 6(ii) ff. 70r-v, 148r-v; B 322; and WRO, b 009 (BA 2636/37 (iii) 43806), ff. 115r-128v (Henbury), 186r-193v (Stoke Bishop). On Whitstones, see VCH Worcestershire, iii, 302.
43 Valor Ecclesiasticus, ii, 435.
44 TNA, PROB 11/4, f. 23r-v.
45 Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Jesus College 45.
46 TNA, PROB 11/5, f. 176v.
The members of the college apart from the clergy are shadowy figures. There were servants: Dean Lyndsey bequeathed 6d. each to those of the college, and a horse, a gown, and 6s. 8d. each to their counterparts in his own household. Their names are unknown, and so are those of most of the almsfolk except for the elderly priests.\(^{47}\) One of the latter was William Lutte, a former vicar of Castle Cary, Somerset, who retired in 1498 with a pension which he arranged to be paid at Westbury,\(^{48}\) and patient research would throw light on the previous careers of others. Three almsfolk – a man and two women – are mentioned being nominated by the mayor and mayoress of Bristol between 1472 and 1540,\(^{49}\) and a fourth, a hermit named William Lumbarde, gained special permission from the archbishop of Canterbury to enter the almshouse in 1535, although he was between fifty and sixty years old.\(^{50}\) Perhaps there was a prohibition on such admissions before the age of sixty. It is worth pointing out, before we conclude this review of Westbury’s internal affairs, that colleges were not always well-organised or harmonious places. Visitations by bishops of such places elsewhere sometimes revealed shortcomings in the observance of statutes, the performance of worship, the maintenance of buildings, and the behaviour of clergy.\(^{51}\) Colleges became involved in conflicts with other people or institutions, and traces of such disputes survive in Wood’s two lawsuits against Redsheff and, as we shall see, in one between Subdean John Rose and Treasurer Robert Wheteacre.\(^{52}\) Life at Westbury must have had its share of irritations as well as the shelter and companionship that the foundation provided.

The Grammar School

Schooling in the college deserves more attention than it is usually given. There were probably two schools, one of song and one of grammar, meaning the study of Latin. The song school would have been a small internal operation, perhaps organised in the church by one of the college fellows or clerks for the purpose of teaching the choristers plainsong and polyphony. The grammar school was a larger institution, intended by Carpenter for members of the college and for outsiders. The college members may have included the choristers, although it is not certain that such boys always learnt grammar as well as song, but the outsiders must have predominated. This was because the school offered free education, meaning free of fees. It was not the first free grammar school in Gloucestershire; others were founded at Chipping Campden, Newland (half-free), and Wotton-under-Edge before Westbury’s began in 1463, and a fourth, Cirencester, was in the process of gestation, but it was the earliest to operate in or around Bristol and the only one in that vicinity until the 1530s.\(^{53}\) This being the case, it may well have attracted scholars from the nearby city which lay a long walking distance away, but (as with most grammar schools of this period) there are no records of the names or numbers of pupils.

\(^{47}\) For the known names of elderly clergy, see below, pp. 232–5, and of almsmen, below, p. 237.
\(^{48}\) Regg, King and Hadrian, Bath and Wells, p. 22.
\(^{49}\) The Great Red Book of Bristol, ed. Veale, part i, pp. 70–3. For the names, see below, p. 237.
\(^{50}\) Faculty Office Registers, ed. Chambers, p. 23.
\(^{52}\) Below, p. 98.
To judge from the two or three grammar school classrooms of the fifteenth century whose dimensions are recorded, Carpenter would have been likely to provide a room measuring up to about 70–75 feet long by 20–25 feet wide (21–22 by 6–7 metres), with a master’s seat at the inner narrow end and benches for the pupils around the walls, facing inwards. The schoolroom may have been a free-standing structure or housed within the main college building; either arrangement is known in other places. Some grammar schools offered elementary teaching in reading and in singing plainsong; others expected their pupils to arrive having already mastered these skills. The main subject of teaching would have been the ability to read, write, speak, and understand Latin. How this was done at Westbury would have followed national practices, since there was no great difference between teaching in one region or school and another. The curriculum emphasised learning the paradigms of Latin nouns and verbs, understanding grammatical terminology, composing Latin (first short sentences, then longer passages of prose or model letters, and finally Latin verse), translating from Latin, reading Latin authors, and engaging verbally in conversations, debates, or orations. Up to about 1500 the school would have learnt medieval Latin and read medieval authors; after that date, it would have turned to reading classical Latin authors and to copying their usages and style.

Virtually all that we know about the grammar school are the names of some of the schoolmasters. Carpenter looked for a suitable teacher to start the school and persuaded Roger Fabell, rector of Beckington, Somerset, to take up the task. It is not clear how the two men knew each other. Fabell held the degree of ‘master of grammar’, a university qualification for schoolmasters, so he had probably once been a teacher, but since 1450 he had been a parish clergyman in Somerset although he had at least one private pupil. Carpenter persuaded Fabell’s bishop to allow him, on 28 September 1463, to leave his parish for four years to teach at Westbury, and Fabell’s teaching vocation remained strong enough to entice him to become schoolmaster at Osney Abbey, Oxford, in 1495 towards the end of his life. The salary offered by Carpenter was £10 per annum, the usual rate in country grammar schools during the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, although if it was supplemented by free meals and accommodation, it would been a more attractive arrangement than most. Three lists of the college clergy from 1532 to 1535 which arranged them in order of importance placed the schoolmaster next below the subdean, suggesting that he was the third person in seniority among those who were resident in the college.

This ranking reflected salaries, the subdean and schoolmaster being the highest paid members of the foundation apart from the dean.

55 On the curriculum, see ibid., pp. 86–127.
56 Biography in Emden, BRUO, ii, 663. It should be added that he was rector of Manningford Abbots, Wilts., resigning by September 1488 (Trowbridge, Wiltshire Record Office, Reg. Langton, Salisbury, f. 22r). His career suggests a strong Somerset connection, but the surname Fable was found in Hertfordshire in the 19th century, possibly indicating a London origin.
58 Ibid., i, 400–1.
59 Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 183v.
60 WRO, ref. 802 (BA 2764), pp. 62, 101; Valor Ecclesiasticus, ii, 435.
Five of Fabell’s successors at Westbury occur by name in documents. They were Nicholas Barbur (1498), John More (1513–15), Richard Brode (appointed in 1521), John Blount (1532), and John or Thomas Gold (1534–5). All are styled magister in the records in which they appear, which may or may not mean that they were graduates but probably implies some university study; Barbur and Brode, however, were definitely MAs. Barbur held the post of schoolmaster along with a prebend or portion in the parish church of Leigh near Worcester, a sinecure that may have been offered to tempt him to Westbury. Brode, who did not live long after his appointment, died in 1523 as vicar of Tytherington, not far from Westbury, so he either moved to that post from the schoolmastership or held both together. Blount may be identical with an Oxford BCL who held a benefice in Essex until 1529 and moved to another in Dorset in 1533. More and Gold have yet to be identified. To judge from the list, the school had a continuous existence and attracted men of acceptable qualifications, indeed of higher than average ones in the case of the two MAs. It would be good if we knew the names of some pupils and could reconstruct their careers, but evidence about them is elusive. When records of Carpenter’s St Anthony exhibitioners at Oriel College begin to survive in the early sixteenth century, they reveal that James Bond was nominated as one by Westbury College in 1533 and Thomas Watson likewise in 1539, while Thomas Abbot in 1541 and Thomas Lewys in 1543 were proposed by the dean of Westbury. Three of the four are difficult to trace, but Bond went on to become a fellow of Magdalen College, took the degrees of MA and BD, held benefices in Somerset, and ended his life as archdeacon of Bath. It is possible that these men were former Westbury pupils, but they may have been youths from elsewhere on whom the dean bestowed his patronage.

The Coming of the Reformation

The English Reformation is often regarded as beginning with the summons of the Parliament of 1529 which, by its end in 1536, had recognised Henry VIII as head of the Church of England and begun the dissolution of the monasteries. This starting date is close to the appointment of John Barlow as the last dean of Westbury in 1530. He held office throughout the major religious changes of Henry’s reign and lost it only when the college closed in 1544. Barlow’s parents, John and Christian, lived in Essex and had four sons, the eldest of whom, Roger, became a merchant, bought monastic lands in Pembrokeshire, and established himself there as a gentleman. The second son, William, entered the Order of Augustinian Canons at St Osyth Abbey, Essex, by 1516, and was promoted as prior of Havertonwest, Pembrokeshire, by

---

61 There is also a reference to an unnamed schoolmaster, possibly Fabell, acting for the bishop in establishing the almsfolk at Westbury on 8 Feb 1468 (WRO, Compotus Rolls, 92487).
63 Emden, BRUO, iv, 71.
64 Ibid., iv, 52–3.
66 Emden, BRUO, iv, 56.
67 Reg. Ghinucci, ii, f. 43v.
68 On the family, see ODNB, article on William Barlow by Glanmor Williams.
1534 through the good offices of Anne Boleyn, his patroness. A supporter of the Reformation, he aroused hostility in conservative Wales and moved by the autumn of 1535 to be prior of Bisham, Berks. He held that post only briefly, however, since his religious sympathies earned him an appointment as bishop of St Asaph in 1536, from which he moved to St David’s in the same year and to Bath and Wells in 1548.

William’s other brothers followed him into the Church. Thomas, who may have been the third son, acquired parishes in East Anglia beginning in 1519 and gained the prebend of Godrigingley in 1534, no doubt thanks to John who was then dean. He also picked up a prebend of St David’s Cathedral from William. John, perhaps the youngest son, is the only one of the four who is known to have studied at university. He became a scholar of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in 1517, migrated to Merton College as a fellow in 1519, and took his MA degree in 1521. He too joined the Boleyn connection, becoming chaplain to Anne’s father Sir Thomas Boleyn in 1528 and was later a member of Anne’s household. By 1531 he was a chaplain to Henry VIII and an agent in Henry’s project for a divorce from Katherine of Aragon. Meanwhile he began to obtain Church benefices, so that by the time he came to Westbury he was also rector of Monks Risborough, Bucks., and later held his post as dean with prebends of St David’s and Peterborough cathedrals and the archdeaconry of Carmarthen in St David’s diocese.

Shortly after his appointment as dean in 1530, John Barlow left Westbury to study at the university of Paris: whether arts, law, or theology is not known. In his absence the care of the college passed to the subdean, John Rose, who got into trouble over money. In a petition to the Court of Chancery submitted during the 1530s, Rose claimed that he borrowed £12 for the expenses of the college from the treasurer, Robert Wheteacre, and signed a memorandum acknowledging the loan. Later Wheteacre pursued him for the money and entered a plea of debt in the mayor’s court of Bristol, causing Rose to be arrested and forced to find sureties to repay the sum. Rose argued that the money was used by the college, and asked the court to summon Wheteacre for questioning. Meanwhile Barlow moved from France to Belgium, where he matriculated at the university of Louvain in 1532. In that year he met Louis de Helwighen, a member of the Emperor Charles V’s council of Brabant, and had supper with him in Louvain, prompting Helwighen to write an account of the meeting that includes the only description of what one of the Westbury clergy looked like:

He is a man of small stature with red hair, sober in eating and drinking, and of little conversation unless one speaks to him, saying among other things, with regard to recreations, that he did not know any music and scarcely any games.

They talked in French after supper (Barlow did not speak Flemish) about Henry VIII’s forthcoming divorce. Barlow spoke cautiously and without committing himself on the subject, very likely because he was in sympathy with Henry’s plans but mindful of the need to be discreet. Charles V, the lord of Brabant, was Katherine of Aragon’s nephew. 

---

69 TNA, C 1/879/46.
70 British Library, Additional MS 28585, f. 43r, summarised in LPFD, v, 500.
Barlow returned to Westbury not later than September 1534, perhaps because Henry’s marriage to Anne Boleyn in 1533 and Parliament’s repudiation of papal authority in the following year made it difficult for an Englishman to remain in the Netherlands. His return may have brought about the deprivation of John Rose as subdean in the spring of 1534: the latter’s government and financial dealings may not have been as innocent as Rose maintained. It is observable that the number of fellows in 1532 had fallen to four, although this may reflect a lack of authority by Rose to replace them. The rest of Barlow’s life appears to have been spent in England, where he resembled his brother in becoming a staunch adherent of the Reformation. This is manifest from his three surviving letters, all from the middle years of the 1530s. The first, dated 3 January, probably in 1535, was written to Thomas Cromwell, the king’s secretary, concerning the ‘papistical sect’ in Wales about which William Barlow (then prior of Haverfordwest) could provide more information and which included the bishop (Henry Standish) and the senior clergy of the diocese of St David’s. The second, written from Westbury on 31 March 1535, was addressed to Sir Edward Baynton, vice-chamberlain of Queen Anne’s household. It tells a similar tale of the troubles that William was having as prior by espousing the Reformation in a diocese where the bishop and his officers were hostile to it. John had written to Standish to ask him to appoint William as his suffragan bishop, but got no answer. Such a promotion, he told Baynton, would be ‘for the furtherance of God’s Word in those parts, which is obstructed by the bishop,’ and he suggested that Cromwell might sort the matter out.

In his last surviving letter, addressed to Cromwell from Westbury on 11 November 1536, John described a dispute that he was having with Lady Anne Berkeley of Yate, not far from Westbury. This redoubtable woman was the widow of Thomas Lord Berkeley (died 1534) and, in the words of the family historian John Smyth, ‘a lady of a masculine spirit, never wanting in matter of suit or discontent to work on’. Barlow had discovered liturgical books in the hands of her chaplain, Richard Norton, which still contained references to the pope, as well as a volume by Bishop John Fisher in defence of the pope’s supremacy. He had reported this to Cromwell who had referred the matter to the county authorities, but the books disappeared and the case could not be concluded. On 29 September 1536 (Michaelmas Day, a major festival and holiday), the dean rode to the quarter sessions at Gloucester by way of Yate, evidently to see what was going on there. He disturbed fourteen people playing tennis (an unlawful game) during the morning service in church, took some of their names, and intended having them punished at the sessions but desisted because there were Berkeley men in the jury. When Lady Anne heard of this, he alleged, she said that she wished he had

71 WRO, ref. 802 (BA 2764), p. 62. The presence of four stipendiaries in that year may mean that Rose hired temporary staff to fill the vacancies.
73 LPFD, viii, 181.
74 LPFD, xi, 418, transcribed in Wilkins, Westbury College, pp. 58–60.
been beaten up, declared she would have arranged it if she had known he was coming, and vowed she would ‘spit on his skirts’. She then caused him to be indicted before the king’s judges at Gloucester about the Norton affair and other matters, hence Barlow’s letter to Cromwell to clear himself and ask for the minister’s help.

Barlow’s letters leave no doubt of his active support for the Reformation and his attempt to build links with Cromwell, its leader in Henry’s government. He continued to take an interest in his brother’s diocese of St David’s, where his presence in 1536 caused the vicar of Tenby, Pembrokeshire, to accuse him of involvement in the treasons of Anne Boleyn who had recently been executed. The vicar’s incautious words enabled the dean to have him arrested and imprisoned in Llawhaden Castle. John was still spending time in Wales in 1539 when he and Thomas travelled there from Westbury in the company of George Constantine, a more radical Reformer and an acquaintance of the Barlows. The journey began on 19 August and ended on the 24th, taking the trio via Aust Ferry, Chepstow, and Brecon to Roger Barlow’s house at Slebech, Pembrokeshire. Three days after it ended, the Barlows reported Constantine to the authorities for holding suspect religious and political opinions, prompting Constantine to write a detailed and vivid account of their conversations to Thomas Cromwell in order to clear himself. It is evident from the account that Constantine had talked most indiscreetly about a number of sensitive matters. These included the king’s health, his future marriage plans, the downfall of Anne Boleyn, the resignations of the two most radical bishops (Latimer of Worcester and Shaxton of Salisbury), and the recent Act of Six Articles in which Henry VIII upheld a number of traditional Catholic doctrines and practices. Constantine had also expressed his doubts about Henry’s capability of writing the book against Luther which appeared under his name in the 1520s. John Barlow’s part in the exchanges, as in Louvain, was cautious. He largely confined himself to asking questions, while Thomas said nothing at all. The Barlows may have been astute in reporting Constantine, enabling them to reposition themselves as Henry’s religious policies moved in a conservative direction. But fear may also have been a factor, lest their conversation became known by other means, and they did no more to protect themselves than many of their contemporaries.

The dean’s religious views and absences do not seem to have affected the running of Westbury College. He was conscientious in maintaining the college staff. A taxation list of 1532 lists the dean, prebendaries, subdean, schoolmaster, four fellows, four stipendiaries, and the six elderly priests. A second list of 1534 is similar, apart from some changes of personnel and an increase of the fellows to six. In the autumn of the latter year, on 7 September, the Reformation came to Westbury with the requirement that the principal clergy of the college should subscribe their acceptance of Henry VIII as head of the Church of England. The relevant document survives
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81 Ibid., p. 101.
with the signatures of the dean, one prebendary, the subdean, six fellows, and two
whose posts are unknown. Once the king’s headship had been established, royal
commissioners made a new survey of the incomes of the clergy all over England in
1535, the first since the papal valuation of 1291. The intention of the survey, now
known as the Valor Ecclesiasticus, was that in future all clergy should pay an annual
tax of ten per cent of their incomes to the king (known as ‘tenths’), and a sum
equivalent to a whole year’s income (known as ‘first fruits’) whenever they took a new
benefice or office in the Church.

The account of Westbury’s income in the Valor included a complete list of the
college properties with their gross and net incomes, and estimated the college’s total
income at just over £328 gross and £301 net. The latter figure was later reduced to
£284. In fact the income may have been a little higher, since the 1535 survey was
slightly undervalued although not so greatly as in 1291. The Valor provides us with
another list of the Westbury clergy, still at full strength and recording the names of the
dean, prebendaries, subdean, schoolmaster, founder’s chaplain, eight fellows, three
clerks, and six elderly priests. Twelve choristers, six almsmen, and six widows are also
mentioned, but their names are not given. The salaries of each of the clergy are
specified. The dean received £2 for his prebend and £17 6s. 8d. for his residence (the
sum of 6s. 8d. a week laid down by Carpenter). This either reflected the fact that he
was truly present for the whole year or a custom that the dean should be paid the sum
whether or not he resided. The arrangement gave him just under £20, but he was also
credited with the net income of the church of Kempsey worth £44 10s., taking his
total income to £63 16s. 8d. Some of the money from Kempsey, however, may have
been used for providing meals in the college as Carpenter had intended. The other
prebendaries still received their £2 each, the subdean and schoolmaster £10 each, and
the founder’s chaplain, mentioned for the first time, £8. No reference is made to the
treasurer. The stipends of the fellows were £7 6s. 8d., the three clerks £6, the elderly
priests £4 13s. 4d., and the choristers £2 13s. 4d. The almsfolk’s allowances have
already been mentioned. The valuation permitted religious houses to deduct
administrative expenses and almsgiving from their incomes, hence the inclusion of the
almsfolk in the survey as well as the fees paid to the lay officers of the college.

Westbury, like other churches, would have felt some changes to its interior life
during the 1530s. A statute of 1536 which abolished all the remaining powers of the
pope in England effectively brought an end to indulgences, of which we have seen that
the college owned at least one. Two years later in 1538 royal injunctions
were issued to the clergy throughout the land forbidding the veneration of shrines and
images, the making of pilgrimages to such places, and the retention of any objects so
venerated. These measures would have affected any visits by people to Carpenter’s
tomb, to the images in the church, or to gain the benefit of the indulgence, but most
of the Latin liturgical texts remained in use as did the furnishings of churches as long
as they were not venerated. The exceptions were that references to the pope had to be
expunged from books – a point that Barlow would hardly have overlooked – and that

82 TNA, E 25/118.
84 Statutes of the Realm, iii, 663–6.
85 Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation, ed. W. H. Frere and W. M. Kennedy,
Alcuin Club 14–16 (1908–10), ii, 34–43.
images and commemorations of Thomas Becket were abolished. The latter change was less of a problem for Westbury than for the chapels at King’s Weston and Northwick if (as seems likely) they were dedicated to Becket; the crown’s solution to the problem was that they should be renamed in honour of Thomas the Apostle. More substantial changes to church services and furnishings were to follow in the reign of Edward VI, but since the college did not survive into that reign, it must have continued to perform the traditional Latin services in a largely unaltered way until its closure.

The Dissolution and Afterwards

In 1536 the crown began to dissolve the monasteries, a process that was completed in March 1540. Colleges in contrast enjoyed royal favour and seemed, for a time, to have a more secure future; indeed there were rumours in the autumn of 1538 that some abbeys might be turned into colleges. The monks of Evesham Abbey, Worcs., wrote to Thomas Cromwell to ask that their house might be one of those which the king proposed to alter into educational establishments, and the bishop of Worcester, Hugh Latimer, put in a plea on behalf of Great Malvern Priory, Worcs., as a place to be converted for teaching, preaching, study, and hospitality, asking ‘shall we not see two or three in each shire changed to such a remedy?’ 86 On 23 May 1539 a bill was hurriedly passed through both houses of Parliament authorising the king to establish an unspecified number of new bishoprics, cathedrals, and collegiate churches. 87 Its outcome was the alteration of eight monastic cathedrals like Worcester into communities of canons and minor clergy. Six former monasteries were converted into cathedrals of a similar kind, including St Augustine’s Abbey, Bristol and St Peter’s Abbey, Gloucester, while two others at Burton-on-Trent, Staffs., and Thornton, Lincs., were changed into collegiate churches. This process, which unfolded between 1540 and 1542, proclaimed that Henry VIII and his government still valued religious houses of the collegiate kind and saw them as having a worthwhile part to play in the life of the Church of England.

But the Reformation under Henry VIII was not a straightforward process. It veered between change and conservatism, depending on the king’s views, the influence of his courtiers, and the circumstances of the times. By 1540 the crown was used to taking religious property to finance its needs, and courtiers and others to lobbying the crown for such property. The expansive mood that created the new cathedrals soon changed. In 1541 two small colleges in Norfolk, Rushford and Thompson, were dissolved. In 1542 the axe descended on some more substantial foundations: Higham Ferrers, Northants. (a foundation that closely resembled Westbury), St Martin-le-Grand in London, Mettingham and Wingfield, Suffolk, and De Vaux College in Salisbury. There was a war with Scotland in that year, and one motive for these dissolutions may have been the need to raise money quickly. The next year 1543 was a year of peace and no college was suppressed, but 1544 saw a fresh outbreak of hostilities with France and it may be no coincidence that the dissolution of colleges started up again. This time it engulfed Arundel, Sussex, Lingfield, Surrey, St Mary in Norwich,

86 For these and similar requests, see LPFD, xiii part ii, 120, 360, 443; xiv, part i, 65.
87 Statutes of the Realm, iii, 728.
Warwick, and Westbury. The creeping process continued in the following year with Burton-on-Trent (the king’s own recent creation), Crediton and Ottery St Mary, Devon, and Wye, Kent. In 1546 the cathedral at Oxford was amalgamated with King Henry VIII College to make a new cathedral-college, Christ Church. Most of the remaining colleges were closed under Edward VI in the spring of 1548. All that survived thereafter were the cathedrals, the colleges of vicars choral attached to them, the university colleges, Eton and Winchester which had close university links, and the royal foundations of Westminster and Windsor. Later in the century a few foundations were revived: Manchester, Ripon, Southwell, and Wolverhampton.

This series of events shows that Westbury was not closed through bad luck or its own shortcomings: it would have been exceptionally fortunate to escape closure. There is no evidence that Dean Barlow played a significant part in its demise. Indeed when the payment from Tewkesbury Abbey towards the almshens’s food ceased in 1540 as a result of the abbey’s dissolution, he took the trouble to sue for the restoration of the payment in the king’s Court of Augmentations and got a decree in his favour on 6 May 1543 along with the unpaid arrears. He may not have had any great belief in institutions like Westbury by this time, but even if he had been supportive of its survival, he had a poor hand of cards to play in its defence. The creation of new dioceses of Gloucester and Bristol in 1541–2 cut off Westbury geographically from its ancient patron, the bishop of Worcester. The college had virtually lost its prebends in terms of their value, so it was of no interest in that respect to the crown or any bishop. Its more elaborate worship was now available at Bristol’s new cathedral, and its free education in grammar was obtainable from the new Bristol Grammar School founded by Robert Thorne in 1531 as well as from the cathedral’s own grammar school. As for its almshouses, the city had plenty of them. Westbury College could disappear without apparent loss to anyone.

Even so there is no sign that Westbury was marked down for closure as late as 20 October 1542, after the foundation of Bristol Cathedral and when some other colleges had already been dissolved. On that day Bishop Bell of Worcester granted the right to fill the next vacancy in the office of dean to Sir John Baker, chancellor of the Court of First Fruits and Tenths, and three other men. Baker, surely a man with his ear to the ground, would not have asked for such a grant unless the college had been expected to continue. The restoration of the Tewkesbury payment on 6 May 1543 should also be noted. It may be that what precipitated Westbury’s closure was the resignation of Bell as bishop of Worcester on 17 November 1543, leading to a vacancy that lasted until the confirmation of his successor Nicholas Heath on 20 February 1544. This removed the patron of the college (in Bell’s case a man of conservative leanings who might have obstructed attack), and enabled the crown to pounce, very likely at the instigation of those who sought to profit from the situation. Accordingly the college was visited by one or more representatives of Henry VIII, and the dean and chapter obediently surrendered their rights and possessions to the king on 18 February 1544. The surrender document was signed by Dean Barlow, his brother Thomas and

88 TNA, E 315/104 f. 19v.
89 WCM, A 7(i), f. 22r-v.
John Kerell as prebendaries, John Laurence the subdean, and John Farnwell and Thomas Lewis, fellows.  

A month later on 22 March the lands and advowsons of the college, other than Westbury church, were sold to Sir Ralph Sadler (or Sadleir) and his wife Ellen. Sadler paid a bargain price, 1,000 marks (£666 13s. 4d.), a mere two and half times the annual income rather than the twenty times that was the notionale sale price for property. The purchase involved some financial responsibilities, but its favourable terms reflected Sadler’s high standing with Henry VIII. A former pupil of Thomas Cromwell, he was the king’s principal secretary from 1540 to 1543 and master of the great wardrobe in charge of the finances of the royal household from 1543 to 1553. In 1544 he had recently been Henry’s ambassador to Scotland and then, when his negotiations there failed, a leader of a punitive expedition sent to Edinburgh in May of that year. He lived to the age of eighty at his principal property, Standon, Herts., and his effigy survives there on a magnificent tomb in the church. The college property was not his only acquisition. On 20 June 1547 the government of Edward VI granted him the nearby possessions of the bishops of Worcester, which the bishop had been forced to yield to the crown in exchange for other properties. This gave Sadler the manors of Henbury and Stoke Bishop, the rights appertaining to the hundred of Henbury, the two parks of Sneyd Park and Pen Park, and the advowson of Henbury church. For good measure he was also awarded the bishops’ mansion in the Strand, London, and the advowson of the nearby church of St Mary-le-Strand. He did not hold all the college properties for long, however. In 1546 he granted the rectory of Kempsey back to the crown, and in 1547 he sold the college’s possessions in Bristol and at Longborough to other purchasers, followed by the manor of Groveley in 1548 and those of Dowdeswell, Foxcote, Gannow, and Shell in 1549. He kept the possessions around Westbury, on the other hand, and retained the college buildings as a private house. The house continued to be used by his descendants until late August 1645, when it was set on fire by Prince Rupert as part of the defence of Bristol during the Civil War. The fire destroyed chests containing records of the estate, which probably accounts for the present-day absence of deeds or account rolls relating to the college.

Clergy (other than friars) who surrendered their houses to the crown during the late 1530s and the 1540s were normally granted pensions. There is no record of such grants to the Westbury clergy and they do not appear in the crown’s lists of clerical pensioners in Gloucestershire which included monks, nuns, and chantry priests. It seems unlikely that pensions were withheld, which raises the possibility that Sadler was expected to provide them in return for his advantageous purchase. If so, he may well have offered the clergy lump sums in settlement. Barlow received special

---

91 LPFD, xix part i, 175–6.
92 Biography in ODNB by Gervase Phillips.
93 CPR 1547–8, p. 258.
94 Ibid.
95 Ibid., pp. 200, 202, 375; CPR 1548–9, pp. 228, 375; CPR 1549–51, pp. 53, 57.
treatment. On 10 February 1544, a few days before the surrender, the king presented him to one of the new prebends of Bristol Cathedral and capped this on 20 June with the deanship of Worcester Cathedral. Since Barlow held on to the rectory of Monks Risbororough and the precentorship of Hereford Cathedral, he must have been a wealthy man in the 1540s and early 1550s. But he was too closely identified with the Reformation to be acceptable as a cleric when the Catholic Church was restored under Mary I in 1553, and he was deprived of his benefices soon afterwards. Since he is not recorded holding any posts after Mary’s death in 1558, it appears that he died in her reign. The only two prebendaries whose careers are known after 1544, Henry Jolyff and John Kerell (both probably Bell’s appointments), took an opposite path from Barlow in espousing Catholicism under Mary. Jolyff became dean of Bristol in 1554 and he certainly and Kerell apparently dissented when the Church of England was restored in 1559, since they were deprived of their benefices early in her reign, Jolyff ending his life in exile abroad. Between these extremes Thomas Lewis, one of the last fellows, adopted a more pragmatic attitude. He became vicar of Henbury in 1555 when Mary was queen, but complied with the Elizabethan regime and gained the incumbency of Horfield nearby in 1571.

The transformation of the Westbury area by the Reformation continued with the dissolution of the chantries in 1548 and the introduction of the Book of Common Prayer in 1549. These changes and the dissolution of the college did not affect the boundaries of the parishes of Westbury and Henbury, which remained as before. The vicars of Henbury went on serving their ancient territory (riddled with Westbury’s outliers) and enjoying their pre-Reformation stipend of £30 minus the duty of paying the chaplain of Aust. The chapels of Aust and Northwick survived, but not those of King’s Weston and Lawrence Weston, and the additional chaplain in Henbury church disappeared in 1548 when the endowment was seized as that of a chantry. Westbury parish retained the collegiate church as its place of worship along with the chapel of Shirehampton, but very little of its revenues remained to support a clergyman for the parish. Although Sadler and his successors received all the tithes of Westbury and Henbury, they merely paid the former subdean’s stipend of £10 per annum to a curate to undertake the parochial ministry. This stipend was still at the same, by now derisory, level in 1712, and was only increased through a mixture of royal and private benefactions seven years later. The ‘North Almshouse’ and the ‘Church house’ or ‘West Almshouse’ were eventually given to the parishioners of Westbury by Sadler’s grandson, another Ralph, in the early seventeenth century. It does not appear that any significant endowment survived to support their inmates, however, and the latter seem to have become dependent on poor relief provided by the parish authorities.

---

98 Emden, *BRUO*, iv, 26–7. He may have married under Edward, which would certainly have caused him to forfeit his benefices.
99 Biography in *ODNB* by T. Cooper and A. A. Chibi.
Reflections

Westbury’s minster and collegiate church lasted as long as most such bodies that had their origins in Anglo-Saxon times. Like some others of its siblings, it was resilient in surviving the Viking disturbances of the ninth century, the first monastic revival of the tenth, the renewed Viking onslaught of the early eleventh, and the second monastic revival of the late eleventh and twelfth. It continued partly because of the vested interests of its clergy, clinging on to their prebends, but from at least the time of Samson onwards it was useful to the bishops of Worcester and they helped to keep it in being. Its history, up to the 1450s, was not a glorious one. We cannot point to the likelihood of a very impressive liturgy, high spiritual life, great learning, or even much public benefit, although it must be admitted that we know very little of what went on. Nevertheless it provided financial support to a number of clergy, some of whom rose to hold high office in the Church and one, Wycliffe, to be a profound influence therein. In the fifteenth century it was sufficiently flexible as an institution for Carpenter to be able to transform and modernise it into a typical college of that period: maintaining daily services, celebrating masses for the dead, and providing a school and an almshouse. He gave it a solid foundation for the future with a much enhanced income, a larger church with several curious and not wholly explicable features, new residential buildings, and fresh charitable functions. These seem to have carried it forward with reasonable success until its end, and no doubt many children and almsfolk gained from what it offered them. The Reformation, however, involved too much covetousness of religious property and too little regard for late-medieval worship for most institutions like Westbury to escape closure. That it failed to do so was due to the spirit of the age rather than to any faults of its leaders and clergy.

105 It would be interesting to know if Westbury was visited by Edward Stafford, duke of Buckingham, and had any influence on his plan in 1514 to found a collegiate church at Thornbury, Gloucs., ten miles further north, staffed by a dean, subdean, eight priests, four clerks, and eight choristers — similar kinds of clergy to those of Westbury but differing in numbers (Cal. Charter Rolls 1427–1516, pp. 281–2). The foundation, to be sited near his house and next to the parish church, was never realised because of Stafford’s execution in 1521.
PART II: SITE AND BUILDINGS
Fig. 4 Westbury-on-Trym parish church.
INTRODUCTION

The Site and Buildings

Westbury-on-Trym lies on an old route that runs north from Bristol towards the south bank of the Severn in what was historically Gloucestershire. The road curves to the west as it descends towards the River Trym; the modern centre of the settlement lies here, just south of the river crossing. The historic buildings of the collegiate community at Westbury lie immediately to the east, at ST 573774 (Fig. 2). Here, on the flat floodplain of the Trym, stand the remains of the residential buildings of the clergy, now known as ‘the college’. The church, on the other hand, stands on the side of a hill about 80 metres (262 feet) further up the valley to the south east. The climb to it from the college is a gradual one, but to the north and east of the church the ground falls away steeply, and while the building itself occupies a reasonably flat shelf of land, its churchyard continues uphill to the south, enclosed by a larger open area. The surrounding district is today mostly built up, with housing stretching in all directions around the medieval remains and nearby village centre.

Several of the roads around the college and the church are ancient ones. In an estate plan of 1792 the college stands towards the northern side of a roughly triangular enclosure whose sides are between 120–170 metres (395–580 feet) in length, bounded by the roads known today as Trym Road, Church Road, and Westbury High Street. This forms a discrete entity; at that date and again in a sale plan of 1871 it was part of one estate, apart from a single plot in its south-west corner. Subsequent to this sale, College Road was constructed, running parallel with the college buildings and bisecting the triangle. Ignoring College Road, then, the college lay within a triangle of roads, around which both the Trym and the High Street appear to curve; the church lies beyond this, on higher ground outside the enclosure. This is thus a site with two foci, in which two standing medieval buildings are set: the college on the lower site, the church (and another pre-Reformation building, 38 Church Road) on the upper one.

1 Above, p. 3.
3 Ibid., pp. 17–33 at p. 31; James Russell, ‘Westbury College: a brief history’ (unpublished study, 2003), p. 3.
The church’s western tower faces directly down Church Road, making a striking impression. Within, the nave has a clerestory, including an eastern window over the chancel arch (Plate II), and three-bay arcades lead to north and south aisles, the former clasping one side of the tower, and the latter with a south door leading to a two-storey south porch. Chancel chapels sit either side of a chancel the east end of which has a three-sided apse; near the entrance arches to these chapels stand newel stairs, each enclosed in a turret. Beneath the apse is a crypt, currently accessed from the churchyard. The building as a whole is 35.81 metres (117 feet 6 inches) long and 17.14 metres (56 feet 3 inches) wide; the south side of the church has special prominence, with the nave south aisle some 1.60 metres (5 feet 3 inches) wider than the north one, and the south chancel chapel separated from the sanctuary by a three-bay arcade, while the north chapel is a bay shorter. A vestry stands to the east of it (Fig. 4).4

The basic fabric of the building is medieval. Stylistically it is mostly Perpendicular in character, the most obvious exception to this being the nave arcades, which have Early English details. Though most of the building’s medieval architectural details can be trusted,5 some are the results of Victorian intervention (Plates I, XVI). The pretty spirelet that decorates the tower is Victorian, as are the currents forms of the western and eastern arches of the north aisle, the chancel arch, and the vestry.6 The Victorians also made substantial changes to the upper part of the tower and the crypt. Other things have been lost: antiquarian engravings show a structure at the west end of the south aisle, clasping the tower in a manner comparable to, if a little shorter than, its northern counterpart. And there are within the church no surviving medieval fittings or glass, save for sedilia and a piscina at the east end of the nave south aisle, and a cadaver effigy in poor condition which lies within a nineteenth-century tomb chest between the chancel and the south chancel chapel. A stone statue sits in a niche on the west face of the tower; its head is modern. There is however an important lapidary collection of medieval tiles, worked stone and further pieces of sculpture, stored in the parvise above the south porch.7

4 Dimensions as given in Alfred Harvey, A Short Account of the Monastery, College and Church of Westbury-on-Trym (Westbury-on-Trym, c.1902), p. 24.
5 The principal pre-Restoration illustrations are Bodleian, MS Gough Somerset 2 (interior, dated 1747); Bigland’s Gloucestershire Collections, ed. Brian Frith, vol iv, Gloucestershire Records Series, 8 (1995), p. 1406 (exterior, c.1780); and BCMAG, M643 (also BRO, P/HTW/P/3 (d) I, (IP/3 (d) I), exterior before 1858 and probably before 1852 (below, p. 141, note 120). Other antiquarian prints that supply evidence of change are cited elsewhere: notably a detailed sketch made of the south aisle newel stair in 1789 (BL, Add. MS. 15,541, p. 5).
6 The latter may be on medieval foundations. For the arches, see BRO P/HTW/ChW/8 (e), dated 3 July 1852; the vestry, BRO P/HTW/ChW/8(f), dated 10 Dec 1852; and the spirelet, BRO P/HTW/Chw/8/e, dated 25 March 1864. The chancel arch is not directly mentioned in the documentation.
7 Locally known as the ‘muniment room’. The core of this collection – tiles, late medieval sculpture, and alabaster – was found in the crypt when works began on it in 1851–2; it was stacked there until H. J. Wilkins and Alfred Harvey moved it into display cabinets in about 1905, turning the parvise into a museum; it remains in these, but out of public view. To this material has presumably been added various architectural fragments recovered from the church over the years. An initial catalogue of this material has been largely compiled by James Russell, Report of Parvise Project, Westbury Church, 1974/5 (Westbury, 1975), hereafter referred to as BRO, P/HTW/X/13. The catalogue numbers in the report are cross-referenced to those given in an early twentieth-century catalogue by Wilkins, copies of which were in the parvise in the 1970s, although I have not been able to locate them. In the parvise, Russell’s numbers sit on cards adjacent to the material in the display cases; Wilkins’s numbers were affixed to the larger pieces, which are stacked loose, but most have fallen off.
This, then, is a parish church scaled building. In size it is comparable to, indeed perhaps a shade bigger than, the larger parish churches in the area: SS Philip and Jacob, St Peter, St Stephen, and Temple church in central Bristol for example, or Almondsbury, Henbury, and Portbury in the Bristol hinterland. At the same time it is outdone in both size and architectural ambition by, for example, Thornbury or St Mary Redcliffe, Bristol. Yet neither of these latter two churches was the seat of a religious community. Many of the archaeological and stylistic questions associated with Holy Trinity are likewise ‘parish church problems’ of the type encountered at a great many such structures: how to interpret irregularly planned areas, such as the west face of the tower or the east end; how to understand differences in detail between parts of the church that are stylistically works of a single era, such as the north and south nave arcades or the various Perpendicular windows.

But Westbury’s architecture also has some distinctive features. The crypt in its current form is anything but remarkable, but it is medieval in origin and the combination of an apse and a crypt is extremely unusual. Many details associated with this part of the building (including wall paintings discovered in 1852 but since whitewashed over, and the material in the lapidary collection), are distinctively designed and very well executed. The location of the sedilia and piscina in the nave south aisle is unusual too: these normally stand next to a high altar. Finally, the church also has an exceptionally high number of doorways, blocked, open or (in some cases) attested but now lost. Up to 29 can be identified, of which 23 are medieval.8

All these features need investigation; all beg the question of what aspects of the architecture of the church reflect its special status as a collegiate church in the patronage of the bishop of Worcester, and its unique history. A further key structure, the surviving college building, lies on the lower site. This substantial late-medieval residential building has been partially destroyed, yet remains a plain but impressive structure (Plate III). A gatehouse is a prominent feature, facing south onto College Road and a wide entrance arch, now blocked, leads to a two-bay rib-vaulted passage. A two-storey wing runs to the left (as one faces the gatehouse) to a corner turret topped by a spirelet with a distinctive concave curved profile. Further investigation reveals a matching turret further north, overlooking the Trym, and the footings of a north range running along its bank; a little way up the river, the base of a third tower can be seen, adjoining a wall of uncertain age.

In its original form the college was clearly a square structure built around a courtyard, with turrets on at least three of its four corners, and a high gatehouse (Fig. 14). The wing running to the left of the gatehouse was matched by an identical one to the right (now lost) to create the south-facing entrance range. The west wing is lost

---

8 Medieval doors are as follows: west door; tower newel door, and three above, plus blocked door to interior at ground level, keyed in with the newel itself; lost door from demolished west bay of nave south aisle to exterior; possible door from south aisle to demolished west bay, mentioned in 1868; porch inner and outer doors; four doors in porch newel stair, one now blocked and leading to the nave (there is possibly also a blocked opening facing west here, a window rather than a door); three doors in south chancel chapel newel turret; internal access from chancel to crypt, now lost; internal access from chancel to vestry (today a modern door); two doors in north aisle newel turret; and blocked doors to exterior at west end and east ends of north aisle. Nineteenth-century and modern doors (excluding modern partitions) include door from tower to toilets; blocked doors in north and south walls of tower at first-floor level; and external doors to vestry and crypt.
but its corner turrets survive; the north is marked only by footings, including the further turret, and the east has also disappeared. Although only part of the building now stands above foundation level, it was apparently a simpler structure than the church. Everything here is Perpendicular, with no obvious stylistic or structural disjunctures, the most distinctive features being the spirelets on the corner turrets. However, it suffered considerably in the centuries after the Reformation. Major changes were made to its roofs, windows, doors, and internal walls, and all but the surviving section was demolished in 1645 and 1967. It is nevertheless a rare survival from a kind of complex whose history is only now beginning to receive detailed scholarly attention: the residential buildings of a collegiate community.

Very little documentary evidence relates directly to the fabric of either building, at least before the fifteenth century. A church existed by 804, and in the late eleventh century, Bishop Wulfstan tells us that the church then standing was ‘constructed’ by the tenth-century bishop Oswald but later ‘devastated’ as a result of Danish attacks. This account should be treated with some caution, given that Byrhtferth’s older Life of Oswald makes no mention of building work. In 1092 Bishop Wulfsan also states that he ‘repaired’ the church, which William of Malmesbury, writing in the 1120s or 30s, alleges that Wulfstan had found ‘half ruined’. We cannot be certain that any of this refers to the current church (or indeed its site): nothing securely dateable there predates c.1200. The documents are silent between 1092 and 1460, apart from a couple of chance references under Bishop Giffard. His intervention of 1270 may have stimulated the creation of new fittings and furnishings, and he refers to neglected chapels dedicated to St Peter, St George and All Saints standing ‘in the cemetery’ in 1293. Then in 1460–1, 10s. was paid ‘for a pavement in the church of Westbury at the order of the lord [bishop],’ John Carpenter. In 1474 and 1497 the chapel of St John is described as new: this is the large south chancel chapel (now called St Oswald’s chapel). References to the Lady chapel, which must have been the north chancel chapel, are found in, for example, 1478, and the ‘crypt beneath the high altar’ was the chapel of the Holy Cross in 1476 when Bishop Carpenter willed that he be buried there and that it be the venue for daily chantry masses in his memory. There are no records of any other altars within the church, although the sedilia and piscina in the nave south aisle demonstrate that at least one other must have existed. Fittings and decorations are mentioned in 1491, 1497, and perhaps 1510, and a handful of burials in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Apart from the Carpenter tomb, the only one of these known to have been monumentally expressed was that to Dean Vauce, who was buried in an arch in the south chancel chapel, beneath a marble stone.

\[9\] Wilkins, Some Chapters, p. 32.


\[11\] Above, p. 70, below, p. 241.

\[12\] If it was the site of the Lady altar, this would raise the problem of the dedication of the altar on the north side of the chancel, traditionally the site of any Lady chapel.

\[13\] Cartulary of St. Mark’s Hospital, ed. Ross, p. 119.

\[14\] Citations for this paragraph and those which follow can be found in the appropriate chapters of Part I.
As to the residential buildings, a document of 1193–5 suggests the existence of separate prebendal houses; one of 1293 suggests a deanery. The Holley prebend certainly had a house associated with it in 1310, when a way required re-routing because of it; that of Godringhull included a private chapel in 1339. Bishop Carpenter transformed all this. Work on the college, meaning the residential building, is implied in 1455 and was definitely in progress by 1458. The structure was being lived in by 1467. By 1466 a separate building had been created for six poor men, identified as being near a gateway to the college. A little later we hear of a ‘lower gate’ with a chamber over it, which seems to been an outer gate in a circuit of walls between the almshouse and the college’s main residential building. There was also accommodation for poor widows by 1470–1, although its site is uncertain.

All these buildings have to be located in relation to the two surviving sites of the college. Clearly, the lower site has had a residential focus and the upper one an ecclesiastical focus, since at least the thirteenth century. But has this pattern always pertained? Have buildings on the lower site always remained within the boundary suggested by the modern street-plan? Was the church always as isolated as it appears? What were the nature and locations of the Anglo-Saxon church, the prebendal houses, and (later) the almshouses? Not all these questions can be answered, but an awareness of them is crucial as we study the buildings of Westbury’s collegiate foundation. Equally importantly, we should bear in mind that this was not a rich community nor an autonomous one. Large-scale architectural change would always have required the involvement of the bishops of Worcester.

THE ANGLO-SAXON AND NORMAN ERAS

The College Site

In 1968 and 1970, an archaeological excavation took place in the northern two-thirds of the area covered by the fifteenth-century college building (Fig. 5). Several phases of earlier construction were found, indicating continuous use for centuries before the current building was erected. Finds from the earliest of these included a stone ‘jetty’ and riverside wall, and, at around 15 metres (50 feet) to the south, evidence for a timber building or buildings. While not very regularly laid out, these included postholes and some half-a-dozen slots for timber joists running parallel to each other almost south-south west, but with their northern edges lining up almost due east-west. They extended about 1–4 metres (3–13 feet) before passing out of the area under excavation; further evidence may thus survive near and beneath the surviving fifteenth-century building. All this was overlain by later layers and thus could not be later than the twelfth century; some of the pottery associated with this phase could be

---

15 The dates of these references are 1193 or 1195 and 1265.
17 Some earlier evidence, Neolithic flints, Roman coins, and pottery, suggests that the Anglo-Saxons were not the first people in the area. Such finds could have been dropped by accident or moved here by the river, so are not discussed further here.
dated to the tenth or eleventh century. The construction style, too suggests an early date.\textsuperscript{18} It is worth emphasising that the focus of every subsequent structure found in 1968–70 also appears to be just to the south of the excavated area, beneath the entrance range of the college that stands, in part, to this day.

The early evidence from the site gives us no sense of its function, but does suggest that the excavated area was part of a larger complex. The stone riverside wall is not likely to have been built simply to protect a few sheds. However, the discovery of a single glass mount suggests there were people of some status, very possibly ecclesiastics, here. This attractive object, under 2 centimetres (0.8 inches) in diameter, is circular, with one side flat and the other side slightly domed, and decorated with delicate triskele whorls (Plate IV). A suggestion has been made that it was once set on a chalice or crozier.\textsuperscript{19} Furthermore, signs of human burial were found in an open

\begin{itemize}
\item By comparison with wares found beneath Bristol Castle (Michael Ponsford, private information).
\item BCMAG, BRSMG 67/1970, Q3536. The object is a dark brownish shade, giving it a gem-like appearance; the triskele spiral ornament is applied on the reverse, perhaps as a try-out, and then very finely around the curved front (CBA Groups 12 and 13 Archaeological Review 5 (1970), pp. 33–34, p. 30; Bristol
area, more or less respected by all subsequent phases of the site. A pit some three metres (9–10 feet) wide, enough to have contained eight bodies or so, lay about five metres (16–17 feet) from the timber buildings, rather to the west and a little nearer the river. It contained pieces of human bone, perhaps from two or three bodies, as well as part of a late Anglo-Saxon sprouted bowl, and had extended further west before later interventions destroyed it. Some six metres (19–20 feet) closer to the river again, a single grave contained a complete skeleton, as well as parts of another. The evidence has been interpreted as that of a late Anglo-Saxon cemetery, the remains of which were later relocated elsewhere, leaving (in the excavated area) a single grave undisturbed. With only one complete skeleton surviving, it is unwise to be too definitive, but the graves strongly imply a religious dimension to the college site, raising the possibility that a church or chapel stood there at some point.

All this is basically oriented parallel to the river, that is roughly west-north-west to east-south-east, like all the subsequent structures on the site. But the northern wall of the wooden structure to the south of the area may have lain closer to, in fact slightly north of, magnetic west-east, an alignment followed more emphatically by parts of most subsequent structures, as well as by everything on the upper site. In any case the current location of the college — and, presumably, the triangular enclosure in which it is set — is an ancient one, clearly with religious associations before the Conquest. It remains the only part of the site for which there is solid early evidence, although without proof of a church.

The Church Site

The upper, church, site contains the only Anglo-Saxon artefact still visible in Westbury itself: a slab which has been broken into two pieces and used to roof a small chamber at the base of the newel stair to the tower of the current church. Incised on it is a large cross with steps at the end of each arm (a ‘cross potent’). Some simple, volute-like scrollwork and a ‘rabbit’s head’ pattern decorate the blank area beneath the foot of this cross. Below the arms of the cross are outlined a series of simple shapes, apparently a kite-shaped shield, a sword, and another implement (an axe?). Two indentations sit

---

20 Michael Ponsford, private information. He described the pot as ‘a spouted bowl with zigzags on the shoulder for which there is no parallel’ and considered it to be part of the grave goods, left behind when the cemetery was cleared.

21 Below, p. 136.

22 Michael Ponsford, private information, suggests that this burial was the oldest, perhaps ignored when the cemetery was cleared because the mound above it had eroded away. He also speculates that the charnel material would have been relocated to the upper site, perhaps at the time of the thirteenth-century rebuilding, where it could have had some status as a relic of the old community. If so, this might suggest a reason for retention of the crypt as a charnel store associated with the ancient church, and in turn require the construction of a new charnel house when in the fifteenth century the crypt was converted into Carpenter’s burial chapel.

above the arms, and two more on the shaft of the cross itself. Allowing for a missing section around the break in the middle, the original artefact was probably about 1.8 metres (6 feet) long and 70 centimetres (2 feet 3 inches) wide.

This object is surely a grave slab; an interpretation of it by E. S. Lindley, based on a tracing, was published in 1960. This saw the cross as the primary decoration of the slab, with the implements as an addition. Although there was ‘no obvious parallel’ for the design of the cross, Lindley suggested that this part of the slab could be eighth-century, with the weapons added rather later (for ‘a Saxon thegn or Norman knight’). The two indentations above the arms were interpreted as matrices for two small late medieval brasses, a third layer of addition, while those on the shaft were seen as insertion points for carrying tenons or handles. In the tracing, the shapes above the arms do indeed look like brass matrices, complete with small holes for dowel pins; but this becomes very problematic when the stone itself is examined. These features are, like all the other markings on the slab, lines roughly incised in the surface, with no indication of an attempt to create an indented area, and it would be nonsensical to make dowel holes when one had not yet created the indentation into which the brass was to be set. The marks are thus rather hard to interpret, making the entire slab more unusual and throwing further into question its design, date and phasing. More convincing are the pit-like indentations in the cross-shaft: such holes are frequently seen in pieces of medieval masonry that had to be carried by hand for more than a few feet.

This part of the tower is probably the first of the Carpenter-era works at the church, and construction of the lower part of the newel stair must have been one of the first things to be done. Groundwork prior to construction could potentially have freed up material like this grave slab, but it is unlikely that anyone would bother to make carrying-holes were the slab to have been found so near its current location. They suggest that it was carried unbroken for some distance before being re-used. It thus could have been uncovered from the presumed cemetery at the lower site in the course of building the present college and carried here, perhaps because it was clearly suitable for the quick creation of a small flat ceiling that would need to support considerable weight. While the question of phasing and precise date should perhaps be left open, it seems reasonable to see this as an artefact from the Anglo-Saxon college site: one that indicates that the cemetery there included burials of high-status laymen. Once again, the weight of evidence points towards the late Anglo-Saxon (or perhaps early post-Conquest) period, although the possibility of an earlier date is not completely excluded.

The slab alone, then, tells us nothing definitive about the date of the church. However, there are other aspects of the building which must predate c. 1200, the oldest date (on the basis of style) for any of the current structure. Here the main standing evidence is at the west end of the nave, where two stretches of wall about 4 metres (13 feet) long connect the arcades to the tower. The walls are inclined inwards the further west they go, and run at noticeably different angles to each other. The most likely explanation for this feature is that the walls were necessary to connect the nave

---

25 For example, the upper sides of the bosses in the fifteenth-century Lady chapel at Gloucester Cathedral contain similar marks.
26 The north wall is perhaps a couple of degrees out of true, the south one perhaps double that.
Plate II

Holy Trinity church from the south-east, before restoration (reproduced by permission of Bristol Record Office)
Plate III

The surviving college building from the south-west (Jon Cannon)
Plate IV

Saxon glass mount discovered in the excavations of 1968–70 (photograph reproduced with the kind permission of Bristol City Museum and Art Gallery)
Capital of c.1200 from the south nave arcade of Holy Trinity, Westbury (Jon Cannon)
Plate VI

Windows in the south aisle: from left to right, c.1220, Carpenter Phase Three, and Carpenter Phase Two (Jon Cannon)
East wall of apse, with blocked east window to crypt chapel below and (far left) an earlier buttress (Jon Cannon)
Plate VIII

The interior of the crypt burial chapel in 1852, as depicted by Rev. H. W. Massie (The Society of Antiquaries of London)
Plate IX

The interior of the crypt burial chapel in 1852, as depicted by George Pryce (copyright 2009, Gloucestershire County Council)
Plate X

“PART OF THE FRESCO FOUND ON THE WALL OF BP. CARPENTER’S TOMB FROM A COPY BY F. W. SAVAGE, MADE AT THE TIME IT WAS DISCOVERED,” i.e. DURING THE RESTORATION OF 1851.

“THE FRESCOES FELL TO PIECES ON EXPOSURE TO THE AIR.”

COLOURS: GOLD, RED, BLUE AND BLACK.

Painting at the east end of the crypt tomb recess in 1852, as depicted by George Pryce (reproduced by permission of Bristol Reference Library)
The cadaver effigy of Bishop Carpenter, as depicted in c.1780 (reproduced by permission of Bristol Reference Library)
Plate XII

William Canynges as dean of Westbury: effigy in St Mary Redcliffe church, Bristol
(Jon Cannon)
Various sculptural fragments now in the parvise. Top, left and right: two parts of one gable; below it to left and right, fragments of screens or reredoses; central, large seated figure, perhaps a figure of Christ in Majesty; below it, smaller standing figure; bottom, statue bracket (Jon Cannon)
Plate XIV

Fifteenth-century alabaster figure, perhaps of St John the Evangelist, from Holy Trinity, Westbury (Jon Cannon)
Westbury College: entrance passage vault, with the arms of Bishop Carpenter (Jon Cannon)
Holy Trinity church, Westbury: the apse today, viewed from the newel stair in St John’s chapel. Bishop Carpenter’s tomb chest is on the right (Jon Cannon)
to a pre-existing structure on the site of the current tower; alternatively they may themselves be a poorly laid out rhomboid-shaped western end or narthex of a pre-thirteenth-century church. The structure on the site of the tower could have been Anglo-Saxon or Romanesque; however if the connecting walls are also ancient, their rhomboidal form is rather more suggestive of the former (the east end at Framlingham is an example). The pre-existing structure at the west end must, in any case, have been as wide as the current tower and at least as high as the current nave arcades.27

There is highly suggestive evidence at the east end of the church, too. Here, the polygonal apse with the crypt beneath it are in their current form structures of the fifteenth century to which major alterations, including a radical readjustment of the floor level, were made in the centuries after the Reformation. However the lowest stage of the north-west buttress of the apse, with its wide, smooth step-offs on all three sides (Plate VII), must predate the rest: it is not keyed into the walls either side of it and has a different design to the Perpendicular buttresses, with their smaller step-offs; it could date from the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries. The buttress sits at an angle, matching that of its south-western counterpart: it must have supported an apse of comparable dimensions to the current one. Given the impracticality of excavating a crypt beneath an existing structure, it seems reasonable to assume that the two go together or, at least, that the apse is later than the crypt. The implications of this for the later history of the building will be discussed further below.28 For the present it must be emphasised that a polygonal apse is an unusual form at any period, that for such an apse to have a crypt beneath it is rarer still, and that the Anglo-Saxon and early Romanesque eras are the only ones during which the combination of the two occurs with any kind of frequency. Indeed one engraving of the crypt even shows a blocked arch of possibly semicircular profile in the east wall (Plate IX). The evidence for polygonal apses and crypts in the architecture of these periods thus deserves review.

Apsidal east ends are commonplace in post-Conquest churches, and remained a standard plan-form well into the twelfth century. Most greater churches had them (the cathedrals of Peterborough and Norwich retain particularly well-preserved examples), and some 36 survive on English parish churches.29 These are almost without exception semi-circular in plan, and one possibility is that such an apse existed at Westbury, only to later be rebuilt in a polygonal form. Nevertheless it is interesting that Romanesque polygonal apses appear to be almost exclusively associated with the major eleventh-century, Wulfstan-era, monastic churches in the diocese of Worcester (Fig. 6). By 1092, when we know that Wulfstan was intending to monasticise the Westbury community, such apses were being or had been built in the transept chapels at Worcester Cathedral (from 1084), and around the high altars at Tewkesbury Abbey (1087) and St Peter’s Abbey, Gloucester (1089), now

---

27 There is a clear building break on both sides where the clerestory was added.
28 Below, pp. 128, 134, 158.
29 Standing examples in England, as cited by F. H. Fairweather, Aisleless Apsidal Churches of Great Britain (Colchester, 1933). His count increased to 102 when apses that were ruined, rebuilt, or known from antiquarian illustrations or archaeological investigation were included; there were a further 10 in Scotland (of which 4 survive) and one in Wales. A free text search of parish churches with medieval fabric in www.imagesofengland.org.uk (accessed October 2008) and cross-checked with entries in the Buildings of England and records in the NMR, revealed 35, confirming Fairweather’s count. Many more, of course, will originally have existed.
Westbury-on-Trym: Monastery, Minister, and College

Fig. 6 Churches with polygonal apses.
Gloucester Cathedral. Of these, both Worcester and Gloucester also had ambitious crypts. One parish church at least appears to have been influenced by these structures: late eleventh-century Dymock, Gloucs. which has been interpreted as having had a polygonal apse very comparable to that at Westbury. There is no evidence for a crypt here, however: indeed, it has proved impossible to find a lesser church of this period that is equipped with both an apse and a crypt.

A polygonal apse may have been built at Exeter Cathedral (after 1112), but thereafter they virtually vanish from Romanesque architecture, only re-emerging as part of experiments with the Gothic style towards the end of the century. The sole exception is again reasonably local: the circular church with a polygonal apse built inside Ludlow castle, at latest in the early 1150s. However, with no post-Conquest but pre-Gothic stonework known as Westbury (while both earlier and later material does exist), we should count out the period after c.1100 but consider a little further the possibility, that Westbury church was built, rebuilt, or adapted in the late eleventh century and that it was then given an apse and a crypt in imitation of other, much grander, monastic building projects in the diocese. As a parish church scale building with a polygonal apse and a crypt, the resulting structure would have been, as far as we know, unique for its era. In support of this date we know that both Wulfstan himself (in 1092) and William of Malmesbury (writing of Wulfstan in the 1120s) suggest that building work was required at the church. The problem is that we cannot


31 Dymock was rebuilt with a square-ended east end in the fourteenth century (N. Drinkwater, ‘The Parish Church of St. Mary, Dymock, Gloucestershire’, TBGAS, 69 (1950), pp. 78–90). Nikolaus Pevsner and David Verey, Gloucestershire, vol 2: The Vale and Forest of Dean, 2nd ed. (New Haven and London, 2002), are more cautious about the interpretation.


33 The concentration of post-Conquest polygonal apses in the Worcester see may itself be a response to Anglo-Saxon models. Wulfstan was famously a champion of pre-Conquest traditions, and several features of his cathedral – particularly the circular Chapter House – have been seen as attempts to represent aspects of the old cathedral complex in the new one. The recent suggestion by Christine Casey (The Buildings of Ireland: Dublin (New Haven and London, 2005), p. 331) that the polygonally-apsed crypt at Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin may date from 1074–84 and reflect the then bishop’s known strong connection with Worcester Cathedral could be used to suggest that Anglo-Saxon Worcester in turn had such a feature. At St Peter’s, Gloucester, it has even been speculated (by Eric Fernie) that the current crypt is itself late Anglo-Saxon, defining the form of the Norman choir above and making this the grandest of the Anglo-Saxon polygonal-apse-and-crypt combinations rather than an addition to the list of Normans examples.

34 Wulfstan tells us ‘I have studied to repair the church sited in the town which is called Westbury’ (studui reparare ecclesiam sitam in villa quae vocatur Westburia) (Hemingi Chartularium, ed. Hearne, p. 421; English Episcopal Acta, 33, pp. 80–1). The phrase implies a completed project, but might be taken to be non-architectural, indicating the church as an institution.

35 ‘Half ruined, and the roof half gone’ (William of Malmesbury, Saints’ Lives, pp. 120–3).
Fig. 7 Anglo-Saxon churches comparable with Westbury-on-Trym.
say what kind of works are being referred to: the documents could be describing anything from a re-roofing to a rebuilding. While it is possible, then, that Westbury church had an important late eleventh-century phase, the lack of physical evidence is a major issue.

What about the Anglo-Saxon period? Here, at least, evidence of pre-Conquest structures has been found at Westbury, though probably only from the lower, college site. Nevertheless, the evidence for the church site having an Anglo-Saxon origin is worthy of review, and while the results remain circumstantial they are considerably stronger than for the post-Conquest years. We have already noted that the form of the west end could suggest Anglo-Saxon work. With regard to the combination of a polygonal apse and a crypt, some very interesting patterns emerge (Fig. 6). In spite of the low survival rate of Anglo-Saxon churches, we know that apsidal east ends were common, and at least five known examples were polygonal: Canterbury Cathedral (western apse); Reculver, Kent; Deerhurst, Gloucls.; Brixworth, Northants.; and Wing, Bucks. Pershore Abbey, Worcs. and Wells Cathedral, Somt. may also have had polygonal apses. As to Anglo-Saxon crypts, at least twelve are known. The form of the sanctuary above is unknown or inconclusive for at least three of these, but about six had apsidal upper structures, of which two – Brixworth and Wing – were polygonal. In the West Country, Cirencester, too had a crypt, this time with a semicircular apse, while Wells Cathedral was perhaps similarly provided. Most of these were, by Romanesque standards, small structures; good comparators for the arrangements at Westbury.

Indeed, while the ancient elements of the Westbury crypt are largely known from antiquarian engravings of a ruined fifteenth-century structure, this building appears to have had several unusual features. A small opening connected the crypt to the high altar above, a very narrow entrance passage came in from the west, there was a ledge-like recess on the south side and perhaps a balancing feature on the north, and the semi-subterranean design caused the sanctuary floor above to be elevated above the rest of the church. All these are distinctive features of Anglo-Saxon or early Christian

36 One corrective to the generalisations argued for here is St Oswald’s, Gloucester, where an (eastern) crypt was added and a (western) apse demolished, probably in the ninth century (Heighway, ‘St Oswald’s, Gloucester’, pp. 12–15).

37 In some cases, the polygonal aspect was only visible on the outside: the interior was a semicircle. Another apsed Anglo-Saxon church is known in the vicinity: St Mary-le-Port, Bristol, although no crypt has been found and the form of the apse is unclear (L. Watts and P. Rahtz, Mary-le-Port, Bristol, Excavations 1962–3, City of Bristol Museum and Art Gallery Monograph, 7 (Bristol, 1985)).

38 H. M. Taylor, Anglo-Saxon Architecture, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1978), iii, 1028–30. For Canterbury, see Kevin Blockley and others, Canterbury Cathedral Nave: archaeology, history and architecture (Canterbury, 1997); for Pershore, Blockley, ‘Pershore Abbey’, pp. 1–52; and for Wells, Warwick Rodwell, Wells Cathedral: excavations and structural studies, 2 vols (Swindon, 2001), i, 114. The evidence is less clear for Wells than for Pershore. Illustrations in Richard Gem, St Augustine’s Abbey, Canterbury (London, 1997) posit polygonal eastern apses on the churches of SS Peter and Paul and St Mary, but this seems to be by inference from Canterbury Cathedral and Reculver.

39 Taylor, Anglo-Saxon Architecture, iii, 1014–1017; Heighway ‘St Oswald’s, Gloucester’, pp. 12–15. The remarkable crypt at Repton is not discussed in detail here as it lies within a square-ended east end, but it bears comparison to Westbury (and Wing) in several respects, not least because it raises the high altar above the nave and is lit by windows that peep above ground level: H M Taylor, St Wystan’s Church, Repton: a guide and history (Repton, 2002).

40 The only three-sided apse was at Wing. Canterbury Cathedral had a crypt beneath its eastern apse, which was probably semicircular; however the altar in its polygonal western apse was on an upper floor. At St Augustine’s, Canterbury the crypt was in the octagonal rotunda, a rather different idea.

crypts. All in all we have quite a strong circumstantial case for regarding the Westbury apse and crypt as having pre-Conquest antecedents. Indeed, associations of special age and sanctity would help explain the preservation of these features in subsequent centuries, when otherwise they were extremely rare.

If we accept the evidence at the west end of the nave and the form of the eastern apse at Westbury as indicative of pre-c.1200 features, we can then say something about the dimensions of the resulting church. The fixed points are the width of the apse which must be close to that of the current one, as must the location of the east wall, and the west wall of the nave which must mark the site of a structure: either a detached tower-like building, or the western wall of a church, or the western wall of its nave. This church would have been at least 30.5 metres (100 feet) long and 6.4 metres (21 feet) wide, perhaps with a further structure on the site of the current tower. In this situation the comparisons with post-Conquest buildings weaken further. Dymock is itself a contested example, while Worcester, Tewkesbury and Gloucester are enormous by comparison, their eastern apses surrounded by radiating side chapels, their crypts almost the size of a second church. The Anglo-Saxon parallels, however, almost invariably smaller in scale and simpler in form, are further strengthened. Here three examples are particularly instructive (Fig. 7). Brixworth (a church that was at one stage monastic, and had an externally polygonal apse and a ring-crypt), while significantly larger, is proportionately very comparable. Deerhurst (a monastic church with a polygonal apse) and Wing (a minster church with an externally polygonal apse and a crypt beneath) are almost identical in length and width to Westbury. With these two churches the main discrepancies relate to unknown features at the west end. If Westbury had no tower it would be of comparable length to Deerhurst; if Wing had no tower (the precise footprint of its west end is not known) it would be of comparable length to Westbury. Wing is a good comparator in other ways, too. Both it and Westbury had three-sided apses of comparable dimensions, with crypts beneath and dramatically raised sanctuary floors. Large Anglo-Saxon arched openings allow external light into the Wing crypt; these peep over the surrounding ground surface in a manner very like the late medieval east window at Westbury. In general we can say

---

42 Taylor, *Anglo-Saxon Architecture*, iii, 1014. This passage does not mention the ledge-like recess or recesses, more Continental features, though examples at Poitiers are illustrated: these *loculi* are classic features of early Christian crypts and catacombs. The dedication of the crypt chapel by 1476 to the Holy Cross would also have been possible in the late Anglo-Saxon period, although it was equally possible at later periods, and given the iconographical themes of the fifteenth-century church it may well have been a creation of Bishop Carpenter: below, p. 175.

43 Dimensions of width (internal, across nave) include Westbury: 6.4 metres (21 feet); Brixworth 9.2 metres (30 feet 2 inches); Deerhurst 6.4 metres (21 feet); Wing 6.45 metres (21 feet 2 inches); and those of length, Westbury: tower 5.3 metres (17 feet 6 inches), nave 16.15 metres (53ft); chancel 14.32m (47ft), total external 35.8m (117ft 6in); Brixworth tower and turret 7.08m (23 feet 3 inches), nave 18.18 metres (59 feet 8 inches), presbytery 9.60 metres (31 feet 6 inches), chancel 5.7 metres (19 feet 3 inches), total about 48.8 metres (160 feet); Deerhurst tower 15.02 metres (15 feet 6 inches), nave and presbytery 18.13 metres (59 feet 6 inches), chancel 5.71 metres (18 feet 9 inches), total (external) about 32 metres (105 feet); Wing nave 18.6 metres (61 feet), chancel 6.09 metres (20 feet) but originally 8.53 metres (28 feet), total (external, but original west end not known) about 26.2–27.12 metres (86–89 feet) (Taylor, *Anglo-Saxon Architecture*, 1, 108–114, 193–209, 669–672). Pershore, like Canterbury, Wells and Cirencester, was rather bigger: around 8.2 metres (26 feet 11 inches) wide internally (Blockley, ‘Pershore Abbey’, pp. 10–12).
that the dimensions and design of the crypt and apse at Westbury have more in common with the architecture of the Anglo-Saxons than that of any ensuing period, and that other features of the building may also have Anglo-Saxon origins.

On the current evidence, we can only take the discussion a little further. We can, however, say that the upper site looks like an addition to the lower one. At first glance the documentary evidence suggests certain points at which a church might have been built on the upper site: as a result of Oswald’s attempt at reform, say, or in response to the Viking threat (the upper site being rather more defensible, at least from the river, than the lower one). But neither of these takes us very far. Oswald’s settlement at Westbury was very brief and Byrhtferth would have been likely to mention a new church had one been constructed. We know nothing about what was destroyed in the Viking attacks. Given that we are talking about a foundation that had, by the Norman Conquest, been in existence for some three hundred years, the history of pre-Conquest church building on the two sites could itself have been complex. Anglo-Saxon religious sites are known for their additive nature, with churches, chapels, towers and other structures being added and sometimes later conjoined in a variety of ways. At Westbury the evidence for a site with more than one structure in it is strengthened by the thirteenth-century report of three apparently neglected chapels in the cemetery, at least one of which could have been on the lower site.

There are, however, various oddities in the laying out of the present church which are very suggestive of an additive building history (Fig. 4). The chancel, for example is at a significant angle to, and rather wider than, the nave. This might imply that it predates the nave, which would then have had to be inserted between the chancel and the narrow structure at the west end of the church. These could then have originated as separate buildings, arranged axially; they need not be of the same date. The south aisle and north aisle seem certain to be part of the building’s c. 1200 rebuilding; the nave cannot be definitively dated, although it too may be of c. 1200. Arguments in favour of an earlier date for the nave would include the proportions of the building as a whole, which, as we have seen, compare well to those of Anglo-Saxon churches, and the archaeological complexities in the area where nave, chancel, nave south aisle and south chancel chapel join. The latter are hard to interpret, but may have causes that lie early in the history of that part of the building. A very tentative picture begins to emerge of a chapel-sized building with a polygonal apse and a crypt, with a separate tower to the west of it, just possibly conjoined before the Conquest by the insertion of a nave. In this model, the ‘chapel’ (which might, given its size and the presence of

44 See above, p. 11.
45 Sometimes these were arranged axially, as at Glastonbury and St Augustine’s Abbey, Canterbury. Sometimes, too, the resulting churches stood parallel to each other, as at the Old and New Minsters, Winchester. Oswald’s tenth-century reforms at Worcester resulted in a church of St Mary being built for his monks near to the existing church of St Peter, which was served by a community of clerks. Late ninth- and tenth-century interventions at (for example) Old Minster, Winchester and St Augustine’s Abbey, Canterbury, joined separate buildings together to create complex ‘great churches’. For further examples see Rodwell, Wells Cathedral, i, 115–6.
46 These were dedicated to St George, All Saints, and St Peter; no dedication precludes Anglo-Saxon origins. Given that we know there was a church at Westbury in 1092 with a dedication that included St Mary, probably that on the upper site, one might speculate that the chapel dedicated to St Peter, at least, was on the lower site.
47 Below, pp. 129, 153, 158. Was there, for example a porticus here?
the crypt, have had a pronounced commemorative function) seems likely to be the oldest element in the pattern. One is tempted to compare the crypt, at least, to those at Brixworth, Wing, Cirencester, Hexham, Ripon, and Repton, suggesting a pattern of seventh/eighth century Mercian crypt-churches, reflecting ideas that had spread south from Northumbria. But we are moving well beyond evidence that is in itself circumstantial.48

The reconstruction of the Westbury site before about 1200 is thus dependent on slender evidence. The lower site remains the focus of physical finds; the post-Conquest period remains archaeologically ‘quieter’ than the Anglo-Saxon one. Neither the upper or lower sites can yet definitively be claimed for any pre-Conquest church, although a good case can be made for each, and the outlines of a building of Anglo-Saxon origin, perhaps a chapel and bell-tower, and possibly a relatively ambitious church, may just be traceable in the current church at Westbury. On balance, and in summary, we can say that by the early thirteenth century Westbury was a site with two foci, both of which may well have contained a church or chapel; and that the church on the upper site deserves to be considered for addition to the ever-increasing list of English churches where archaeological and contextual analysis suggests the retention of the proportions and form of an Anglo-Saxon predecessor; or failing that, as a very unusual work of the 1090s.

THE THIRTEENTH-CENTURY REBUILDING

The Church

On entering the nave of Westbury church, one is faced by two three-bay arcades. Both have circular columns, but in other respects their designs are different. The south arcade (Plate V) has simple bell capitals, but the abaci are octagonal; small sprigs of simple, rather bulbous stiff-leaf foliage sit on their corners, acting as a visual bridge between circle and octagon. Larger sprigs act as corbels to the drip course of the arch, which is otherwise plain: two orders of chamfers.49 There are small differences of design between each capital. The piers of the north arcade are noticeably slimmer, the moulding of the bell capitals more refined. These are plain and circular, apart from one, the second from the west, which has a small row of nailhead running round its abacus. The arches above again have two chamfers and a drip course, again supported by a knob of stiff leaf foliage, this time only on the side facing into the nave. This time the foliage is more complex and more typical of its type.

48 The closest comparators to the crypt are Repton and Wing, themselves the two best preserved Anglo-Saxon crypts outside the early examples at Hexham and Ripon. Functions have been proposed for each: a royal burial place that became a shrine (Repton, see Taylor, St Wystan’s Church, Repton, pp. 19–20), and a noble mausleum (Wing), though Gem, All Saints Church, Wing, p.3 does not appear to endorse this.
49 Although all these details seem to be reliable, BRO, P/HTW/X/13, D3, originally from the parvise collection and suggested by James Russell as a fragment from a capital, appears to be one of these label stops, suggesting that some have been replaced.
Differences of design, sometimes considerable, are very often encountered in the parish church arcades of this period. They raise the question of whether we are witnessing two teams of masons working in an uncoordinated manner, or whether the church was dramatically increased in size twice over a comparatively short period. The plan of the church (Fig. 4) suggests the latter is the case at Westbury. The south aisle is almost as wide as the church itself; the north aisle is much narrower and looks very much like the later of the two initiatives. Moreover the stylistic differences between the arcades support the view that the north arcade is a decade or more later than the southern one. This may mean that works began merely as an extension of an existing church, or that a rebuilding was begun but lay incomplete for a decade or two. The latter appears to have been the case, for in spite of its earlier arcade, much of the south aisle appears to date from c.1220. Indeed it is the focus of the thirteenth-century evidence in the church. All that remains of the thirteenth-century north aisle is a single label stop, reused on the aisle’s north-east window. As to the nave, it must either be contemporary with the south aisle, and designed to join together two formerly-separate structures; or the traces of its Anglo-Saxon predecessor were lost in the rebuilding.

The thirteenth-century elements visible inside the south aisle are three sedilia with a piscina, two windows, and four roof corbels. The sedilia are finely moulded, if not in the top rank of execution, with the rich combination of rolls and fillets typical of the period. A drip mould runs continuously over the arches, starting and finishing with a sprig of stiff leaf. The columns separating the stalls have a very pronounced fillet on each face which also runs up the extrados of the bell capitals. The piscina has a smooth, capital-free arch, emphasising the linear qualities of the deep mouldings. All this is typical of west-country work of the period, seen for example at the cathedrals of Wells (from 1175) and Llandaff (1193–1218). The curved backs of the stalls are another clue, very close to the scooped reverses to the blank arcades of the Wells Cathedral north porch (completed before 1207) or the late Romanesque stalls in the chapter house of St Augustine’s Abbey, Bristol (now Bristol Cathedral; c.1160). All this could be of any date from the 1190s to the 1220s.

The west window of the south aisle is a large, stepped triple lancet, of a kind very widely used and rarely securely dated. A wide date range might run from the 1190s (early examples are at Lincoln Cathedral, from 1192) to the development of tracery from c.1240, but the form is most ubiquitous in the second and third decades of the thirteenth century. It sits on a contemporary string course that runs all along the aisle’s south and west walls. It is simply detailed, with a drip mould and stiff leaf stops;
however, as the window was walled up in the fifteenth century and only unblocked after 1852, it is unwise to trust anything but the overall form.54 More interesting is the window immediately east of the south porch: a very large, wide single lancet with simple but emphatic cusping in the window head (Plate VI). That this cusping is not the result of nineteenth-century restoration is demonstrated by a pre-restoration engraving at the Bristol Record Office (Plate II).55 The window is best related to the lancets, also unusually broad, adopted throughout the post-1175 Wells Cathedral; however, the emphatic cusping suggests a date firmly in the thirteenth century.56 Finally, when the roof was reconstructed in the fifteenth century, four roof corbels were retained. These are rare survivals and their design is interesting in that it imitates the kind of wall shafting used in churches with high vaults: each is carved in imitation of a pair of tiny attached shafts, each with its own very simple bell capital, supported by crudely rendered stiff leaf. That above the lancet window has short shafts and instead a rather weed-like piece of foliage (the relationship to stiff leaf is in this case a distant one); it curves to one side and supports a small figure, probably a woman, holding a small object, perhaps intended to be St Mary Magdalene.57

More susceptible to dating is the south door, now the inner door of the south porch, and the prominent niche above it. These are the grandest surviving features of the thirteenth-century church; they may also be among the last structures to have been completed. The current porch is fifteenth-century, and as it has had to be built around the adjacent single lancet window, it seems unlikely that the Early English designers intended to erect one. The door and the niche above it were recarved in the 1840s. An engraving of 1849, however, appears to show their pre-restoration state. The detailing is identical, excepting that there are no stiff-leaf stops to the drip mould of the niche, a feature echoed in the external drip moulds of the nearby thirteenth-century windows.58 The door has a good quality Early English design, with two orders of stiff leaf capitals supported by shafts of polished marble.59 Each of these orders carries an identical moulding of some sophistication, and the inner, third order of this moulding is allowed to run through the entire course of the arch with no superimposed columns, the kind of twist characteristic of West Country work of this era.60 Again, particularly close comparisons can be seen at Wells Cathedral, in the door linking the south-west tower to the cloister and also the side doors of the west front. All have three orders, the inner one with continuous mouldings; unlike the

54 BRO, P/HTW/ChW/8(f), dated 10 December 1852.
55 BRO, P/HTW/P/3 (d) I (below, p.141, note 120 for a discussion of dating); the same print is BCAGM, M643. Bigland’s Gloucestershire Collections, ed. Frith, iv, 1406, shows Perpendicular tracery here, but is demonstrably incorrect about several other details.
56 The possibility that the cusping is a result of restoration after 1852 is discussed on p. 141, note 120.
57 A good photograph is held by NMR, Westbury-on-Trym, ‘red box’, E. Fawcett, 20 Aug 1942 or 1945. See also BRO, P/HTW/EG/Ph/3.
58 ‘Report of the Committee’, Report of the Bristol and West of England Architectural Society (1849), illustrations facing pp. 21, 26 (iii). This article was perhaps published to mark completion of the work.
59 The question as to whether this is Purbeck limestone, Blue Lias, or something else is not worth pursuing as the present shafts are surely nineteenth century.
60 Comparable work of this period can be seen, for example, at Berkeley (west door) and Bristol (St Mary Redcliffe inner north porch, SS Philip and St Jacob, and the former refectory door of St Augustine’s, now in the car park of Bristol Cathedral). Comparisons were also made with Cowley, Gloucs., Clutton, Somt., and St Cuthbert’s, Wells, Somt., by Andor Gomme, Michael Jenner, and Bryan Little, Bristol: an architectural history (Ashgate, 1979), pp. 20–1.
Westbury example, the moulding changes for this inner order: perhaps the Westbury door could then be seen as an advance on these. The Wells doors are contemporary with the post-Interdict restarting of work on the west front there, c.1220. Even more diagnostic is the trefoil-headed design of the niche, with more continuous moulding, a drip course, and a semicircular underlying arch-form. This very distinctive motif is almost identical to the arches that are the signature feature at Bishop Jocelin’s palace at Wells, also seen in associated structures such as the south-east door in the south range of the Wells cloister. Very comparable motifs can be seen at several points in the Wells west front: the closest is probably a blocked arch at roof level where the west cloister walk abuts the south tower. There are no firm dates for the Bishop’s Palace beyond its construction under Bishop Jocelin (1206–42), but the close connection with designs on the cathedral west front again suggests a date after c.1220.

More traces of the period can be seen outside Westbury church. The base of an early thirteenth-century pilaster buttress has survived at the south-western corner of the south aisle; traces of another can be seen on the aisle’s south wall. And finally, there is the north-western buttress of the apse (Plate VII). The emphatic step-offs on all three sides of this clearly predate the fifteenth century. The possibility that they are early fourteenth-century will be discussed below. However, while they are generally more characteristic of the Decorated style, three-sided step-offs should not be counted out as possible Early English features: examples, albeit different in detailing, include the upper parts of the transept buttresses at Salisbury.

The evidence is not conclusive, but given the scale of activity in the western half of the building, and the survival (as we shall see) of fragments of Early English stone furnishings, it would be odd if the east end was not rebuilt at this time. If we ignore the undated buttress and the possibility of an Anglo-Saxon building, this east end need not have been long or apsidal: in other words it could have been more typical of the era. Alternatively, an older east end might have been retained when the western half of the church was rebuilt. This would itself be remarkable in an era when east ends where everywhere being renewed. Or we can accept the apsidal east end and crypt as thirteenth-century, in which case they become crucial elements of a near-complete rebuild. This, too, would be most unusual. The abandonment of the Romanesque semicircular apse for the square-ended English gothic east end in the decades leading up to c.1220 almost takes the form of a national movement. To take the cathedrals as a sample, by 1220 old apsidal east ends had been or were being replaced by squared-off new east ends or eastern chapels at, for example, Durham (eastern chapel, later moved to the west end, c.1160–75), Wells (after 1175), Chichester (after 1189), Winchester (underway in 1202), Hereford and Lichfield (neither securely dated), and Salisbury (from 1220), joined, from 1224, by Worcester. Indeed no thirteenth century rebuilding of a cathedral east end included an apse. The plan likewise became de rigueur on smaller churches.

---

61 Sampson, Wells Cathedral West Front, especially pp. 28, 38; Rodwell, Wells Cathedral, p. 145.
63 Below, p. 134.
There are exceptions: the polygonal apse on St Hugh’s Choir at Lincoln Cathedral (after 1192) is a near-unique example on a greater church. The earlier curved apse at Canterbury Cathedral (after 1174) was built on the retained lower parts of the Romanesque previous building; that constructed a decade or so earlier at York awaits full examination in print. A little later, a handful of polygonal apses can be associated with buildings that had royal patronage such as the new Lady chapel at Westminster Abbey (1220), and probably that at Windsor Castle (c.1240) both later rebuilt and both perhaps by the same masons. A chevet (a polygonal apse ringed by smaller polygonal apses, a French form) was begun at Westminster Abbey later in the 1240s, too late to be of concern here. Perhaps the influence of Windsor accounts for the sole known Early English parish church with a polygonal apse, in this case also rib vaulted, at Tidmarsh, Berks. However there is again a local exception to the rule: Pershore Abbey, Worcs., in the same diocese as Westbury, with an unusual stretched-polygon eastern apse (but a square-ended Lady chapel), work on which had already been begun when a fire occurred in 1223. It has been argued that the same mason then built the east end at Worcester Cathedral, begun by Bishop William of Blois in 1224. There, as we have noted, the Romanesque apse was demolished in favour of a squared-off design; the crypt was abandoned at the same time.

Construction of crypts, like that of apses, was also increasingly being avoided. While existing crypts were extended at Canterbury Cathedral from 1174 and Winchester Cathedral around 1202, both perhaps because of their historic associations, others, including that at Worcester Cathedral, appear to have been abandoned. The only new structure on a cathedral to be given a crypt was the square-ended eastern chapel at Hereford. A handful of parish churches have crypts known to be of the twelfth or thirteenth century; none is apsidal, although the remarkable mid twelfth-century crypt with late twelfth-century octagonal western extension at Berkswell, Warws, is a reminder that polygonal and circular plans were being experimented with in other ways. Like the apsidal east end, then, crypts remain an...
exception to the rule. Clearly, if the apse is thirteenth century, it – and the crypt beneath it – would be forms that demanded explanation.

We have enough fixed points to be able to suggest an overall design for the early thirteenth-century church. It seems to have inherited a structure at its western end, although what form this took and whether it was rebuilt or not we do not know. It clearly had two aisles, with the southern begun ten years or more before the north. As the sedilia can only have been adjacent to a major altar it seems likely that the south aisle ended with a wall roughly where the arch to the south chancel chapel now stands. If the aisleless chancel, with its three-sided apse and crypt beneath, reflects the thirteenth-century plan it was exceptionally long: almost another church. Of the other alternatives, preservation of a more ancient apse would be equally interesting. Both options would surely reflect the chancel’s status as the main focus of collegiate worship at Westbury. This, in turn raises the issue of the sedilia and the width of the south aisle: perhaps this area was set aside for a special altar. The high rate of survival of early thirteenth-century detailing in the south aisle, and the distinctive handling of the Perpendicular work there, are also indications that the area had some separate significance. The most obvious explanation for this would be that a parish altar was located here, which might in turn have implied some lay responsibility for its maintenance; however, there is no evidence for separation between the activities of the college and the parish at any period at Westbury. As it is unlikely that the south aisle would have had sedilia and the collegiate community not, the prebendaries probably had grander sedilia in the sanctuary; one might also expect an altar and a piscina in the nave north aisle. There is in the parvis lapidarium a good capital of this era, with bell moulding and a fine row of nailhead, probably from a stoup or a piscina drain. A comparable, but unfinished capital was found during the excavations of 1975–88. It seems that further good-quality thirteenth-century furnishing indeed existed at Westbury.

67 Lesser church crypts of the gothic era, while rare, are a complex subject and under-investigated; their function and date is rarely certain, and the archaeological issues raised by unravelling each given example are daunting. The current study therefore focuses on those which lie beneath an apse, though other examples are occasionally mentioned where relevant. As an idea of the scale of the subject, the listed buildings descriptions (by no means complete in this matter) mention 46 medieval parish church crypts in England, not all at the east end and several clearly a side-effect of a fall in the land. Many of these are not dated, but one (St Mary-le-Bow, London) is late eleventh-century, four (including Berkswell), twelfth-century, five thirteenth-century, nineteen fourteenth-century, and four fifteenth-century.

68 There is archaeological evidence to support each of the three possible forms for the eastern wall here. The wall on the north side of the arch is angled, interpretable as the trace of another apse. That on the south side contains a disjuncture low down, arguably the base of a flat thirteenth century eastern wall later rebuilt, while high up in the fifteenth-century newel turret in the chapel to its east there are remnants of very thick walling, from which a case could be made for a former eastern chapel. Given the complexities of this part of the church, it is also possible that the sedilia was placed here temporarily when building work began, or was relocated here at a later date; in either situation it could conceivably, though rather oddly, have been left unused as the building grew.

69 Above, p. 41. Bryan Little, 1250 years at Westbury-on-Trym: 717–1967 (Westbury, 1967), p. 17, suggested that the entire south side of the church was collegiate and the parish occupied the nave and chancel, thus explaining the scale of the south door and of additions here in the fifteenth century. However, the very long chancel – at the latest a work of the early fourteenth century – and the lack of any evidence for a separate parochial function argue against this.

70 BRO, P/HTW/X/13, D1. It is hollowed out on top and James Russell notes lead-lined sockets for attachment on the reverse; D2, not seen in the present survey, is a keel-moulded shaft ring of the same era.

From the location of the buttress bases on the south aisle, we can also suggest that the church was ringed by broad lancets like that which survives in the south aisle, perhaps on a rhythm of two windows/buttress/two windows/buttress. One might imagine these continuing around the apse, if the church had one, and of course stepped lancets at the east and west ends of the aisles, of which the example in the south aisle survives. The repetition of wide, simple windows would have made this church visually distinctive; the more so if it had a long, apsed east end; however, it was not exceptionally ambitious in scale or quality. Indeed, of nearby works of the same era, that at Henbury is of comparable scale and distinctiveness, Portbury has a comparable arrangement of sedilia, and the chancel at Almondsbury is arguably more remarkable and ambitious. Where the Westbury details are dateable, they suggest works that began around 1200, to be expanded or continued with some vigour sometime around or just after 1220. It is therefore possible that the extension or rebuilding of Westbury was begun just before 1200 but left unfinished when the see fell vacant in that year, and likely that Bishop William of Blois restarted works, resulting in the north nave arcade, the south door, and much else that survives. Blois certainly rebuilt the east end of his own cathedral church on a grand scale. Worcester Cathedral was rededicated in 1218.\textsuperscript{72} works on its new east end then began in 1224.

Artistically, however, and even allowing for the existence of an apse at Pershore and the possible workshop connection between there and Worcester, it is Wells Cathedral rather than Worcester that appears to be the source of ideas at Westbury.\textsuperscript{73} This may be a simple result of local workshop practice, as it is known that there were strong connections between the Wells masons and the Bristol area.\textsuperscript{74} But it is also possible that the works at Wells were an influence on the decision to rebuild at all. Wells was, after all, by far the nearest important community of clergy, with a strong connection to its bishop.\textsuperscript{75} At Wells an important Anglo-Saxon church had survived the eleventh and twelfth centuries intact; completion of the replacement for this church was just getting under way when Westbury was rebuilt. Perhaps, if they kept or rebuilt an eastern apse, those responsible at Westbury were following Wells’s celebrated lead in retaining references to their Anglo-Saxon origins. There, in 1196, it was decided to keep the eastern chapel of the former cathedral, rebuilding much of it to form a new Lady chapel by the cloister.\textsuperscript{76}

The College Site

The excavations of 1968–70 found two phases of buildings on the college site between the proposed Anglo-Saxon layer and the Carpenter era.\textsuperscript{77} The earlier of these (Fig. 8),

\textsuperscript{72} At this point, it is said, SS Oswald and Wulfstan were added to the existing dedications of SS Mary and Peter; if so, this is a sign that Blois and his community took an active interest in their own history.

\textsuperscript{73} Stylistically neither the early gothic work at the west end of Worcester’s nave, nor at its new east end of 1224, nor at the new east end at Pershore appears to have had any impact at Westbury.

\textsuperscript{74} Jerry Sampson has speculated that many Wells masons came from Bristol rather than vice versa (Wells Cathedral West Front, pp. 86–90).

\textsuperscript{75} By the 1220s Wells had effectively won back its role as the seat of a bishop, lost to Bath in 1090.

\textsuperscript{76} At Wells these are many (Rodwell, Wells Cathedral, passim).

\textsuperscript{77} Ponsford, ‘Excavations at Westbury College’, pp. 24–6.
to be discussed here, is slightly better dated, if less substantial. Although very little pottery was recovered, it included some Ham Green ware that can be placed in the late twelfth or early thirteenth centuries, suggesting a rough correspondence with the period when the church was rebuilt. Discoveries also included the first known stone structures on the lower site, and one carved capital which is very similar to those at the church.

At this period the riverside wall was augmented, pushing the river edge slightly to the north. A wall was built over the site of the timber buildings to the south, and the area between this and the river was cobbled over. The evidence is thus effectively a snapshot of a cobbled, open area more-or-less overlying the previous space, with its burial ground. The capital, found reused near a step in the north-west corner of the site, is particularly informative. It is a stiff-leaf capital of good quality, with a triangular form that suggests it was once in or on a corner, suggestive of a small cloister or a

---

78 Michael Ponsford, private information.
blank arcade. It compares very well with the restored capitals on the south door of the church, dated above to c.1220.79

The capital cannot have come from far away, and thus demonstrates the existence of a high-status stone building in the immediate vicinity. Documentary evidence of the community at this point, fragmentary though it is, makes it clear the community operated a prebendal system, and these works might well be seen as part of a modernisation of the complex or one of the houses within it. It is in the course of the twelfth century that we see the grand secular cathedral complexes emerge as large, more-or-less planned closes, with individual prebendal houses spread out across a large area.80 The residential buildings at Westbury, then, could have provided separate accommodation of above-average status for up to six individual prebendaries and their (small) households, of which the current finds may be one; indeed it may well be that this building was that of the dean. Only he was sufficiently resident to make provision of a separate house on such a scale essential. Given the form of the more ambitious works that took place here in the fourteenth century, the remains of this structure might be expected to lie beneath the surviving college or College Road. It might also be the case that any surviving Anglo-Saxon cemetery was moved (or part-moved) at this point, making way for the cobbled area and emphasizing the pre-eminence of the upper site as the focus of worship. Certainly, by the end of the thirteenth century, the three enigmatic chapels ‘in the cemetery’, were in danger of losing their original function. Any one of these could have been in a remnant burial ground on the lower site; indeed the fact that the bishop was particularly concerned about them being used as private houses might suggest that this was the case.81

THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

The Church

There is no definitive evidence for structural changes to the church between the completion of the early thirteenth-century rebuild and the works of Bishop Carpenter in the fifteenth century. However a strong case can be made for a fourteenth-century building phase, confirmation of which would transform our understanding of the building and its significance. We certainly know of smaller scale works. A new floor was installed somewhere in the church, evidenced by a single ‘Wessex school’ tile,

79 BCAMG, BRSMG 159/1970, Q255.1.
80 The early history and evolution of the residential buildings of secular religious communities in England remains under-investigated. Certainly by the time the cathedral close was laid out at Salisbury, from 1220, it comprised individual houses; the comparable complexes at Lincoln and Wells probably emerged in their current form during the twelfth century. If, as has been argued by Blair, The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society, pp. 361–7, the clergy of such communities had separate sources of income from a very early period, this arrangement may not have been new. The alternative, a communalised quasi-monastic model, could then have been restricted to attempts at reforming such communities (for example at Wells under Bishop Giso, 1061–1088). It emerges again when cathedral vicars began to build separate accommodation complexes, the earliest of which were at late thirteenth-century Lincoln and York (Hall and Stocker, Vicars Choral at English Cathedrals, pp. 76–97, 147–63).
81 Above, pp. 26, 36.
preserved in the parvise collection. It depicts two addorsed birds inside a ring; between them is a small lily or fleur-de-lis. It is a design that has been found in several places, especially in the West Country. Early examples from the royal tile kiln at Clarendon Palace have been dated to the 1240s-50s, although the motif was common into the fourteenth century. Placed early, this tile could suggest a terminus ante quem for the completion of the thirteenth century rebuild. It is happier in the later thirteenth century, after 1270, when Bishop Giffard ordered the upgrade of many of the church’s furnishings. And finally, although here the date is rather late, it could just be positioned in the first decade or two of the fourteenth century. In any case a tiled floor is not evidence of building work, although such expensive decorative features often mark the completion of a building project and are unlikely to be initiated when one is being planned.

Further fixtures on the church site, works of some quality, were being installed in the fourteenth century, if two approximately 0.28–0.30 centimetre (11–12 inch) fragments of pinnacles (held in the lapidary collection) and a piscina drain (reused as flooring in the south chancel chapel newel stair) are anything to go by (Plate XIII). We cannot be certain that the pinnacles are very old: their stonework is exceptionally crisp and clean and they could be Victorian. However their carver followed medieval methods, judging by the marks of a mason’s laying-out on the base of each piece, and as we also do not know of any lost Victorian fitting or tomb of this character or scale, they are here treated as original features. Again, therefore, we have the possibility that stonework from a group of furnishings was freed up in the fifteenth century when the south wall of the chancel was demolished. The piscina drain is simple but well carved, in a quatrefoil pattern. The pieces of pinnacle are first-rate: finely carved fragments of micro-architecture, including little gables supported by tiny beasts, with blank tracery beneath. The gables have crockets and finials, and further crockets run up the stumps of spirelets beyond, the whole composition being angled so that the two traceried corners face the viewer. That they are Decorated rather than Perpendicular is clear from the character of their blank tracery, which features a stretched trefoil above a cusped panel with a dagger-like top, and their playful interest in corners and acute angles. In scale and quality they compare, for example, with the micro-architecture on the west front of
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83 A brief discussion is in ibid., which cites similar tiles at the abbeys of Keynsham, Somt. and St Augustine’s, Bristol. The national evidence is in Elizabeth Eames, Catalogue of Lead-Glazed Earthenware Tiles ... at the British Museum, 2 vols (London, 1980); the west-country evidence is given by idem, ‘The Tile Kiln and Floor Tiles’ in Clarendon Palace, ed. James Robinson and Elizabeth Eames (London, 1988), pp. 127–167, and Barbara Lowe, Medieval Floor Tiles of Keynsham Abbey (Keynsham, 1978). The form is not necessarily a west-country one or restricted to tiles. Eames cites a tile from Ulverscroft, Notts. (Catalogue, no. 2659) and mid thirteenth-century painted versions of the pattern can be seen in the clerestory of West Walton church, Norfolk.
84 Eames, Catalogue, no. 1988.
85 In contrast the roof corbels in the south aisle could date from this period, too, but sit happier early in the century.
86 BRO, P/HTW/X/13, D8–10. One of these three, from a larger pinnacle and with much simpler detailing, is probably fifteenth-century (below, p. 168).
87 Alfred Harvey, ‘Recent Discoveries at Westbury-on-Trym Church’ Proceedings of the Clifton Antiquarian Club, 4 (1904–8), pp. 204–7.
Exeter Cathedral (nearing completion in 1348). They could be from a tomb chest, sedilia, or piscina, and dated c.1320–50.

Was building work going on in the church itself at this time? The strongest candidate is the tower arch, with its very emphatic lancet profile, and long, smooth run of capital-free wave mouldings. It is very close to the famous work in the east end of St Augustine’s Abbey, Bristol (after 1298 or after 1307). The west door and the simple, trefoil-headed niche above also fit this period well; indeed it is arguable that the tower west window, whose detailing could be characterised as ‘early Perpendicular’, is part of the same phase; here, perhaps c.1350. The work, however, lacks absolutely diagnostic stylistic evidence. And the highly atypical nature of architecture in the Bristol area at this time militates further against secure dating. Decorated motifs such as capital-free arches with shallow, smooth wave mouldings – especially on towers (for example St Mary-le-Port, St John, and St James, all city churches in Bristol) – can survive in otherwise Perpendicular buildings. ‘Perpendicular’ tracery can appear exceptionally early, for example at St John, St Mary Redcliffe, and of course St Peter’s Abbey, Gloucester, the latter in the 1330s. Nevertheless, the emphatic lancet and distinctive detailing of the tower arch would be exceptional for any period after the thirteenth century were it not for those in the east end of St Augustine; the pier bases of the tower arch, too, are close to those in that church. All these features differ in character from the fifteenth-century rebuild. The likelihood that the tower is a two-phase structure is confirmed by the fact that the west window has either side of it a fifteenth-century string-course, which it interrupts.

The suggestion may be made that the present tower was begun in the mid fourteenth century and perhaps not completed. This may also account for the fact that the composition of the tower’s west front is rendered off-centre by the newel stair, which is a fifteenth-century addition. It may also explain why the first act of the fifteenth-century masons was to complete the tower, rather than, as would be usual, to rebuild the east end. This is the earliest evidence in the fabric for a tower at Westbury, although we have discussed above the possibility that there was a structure, perhaps a tower, at the west end of the church before the c.1200 rebuilding.

Given a likely fourteenth-century date for the lower part of the tower, then, we should look again at the apse. Here, the three-dimensional step-offs of our pre-Carpenter buttress fit an early fourteenth-century date very well; such forms are typical of buttresses of the period (Plate VII). This would suggest a polygonal apse in the Decorated style, itself a much likelier prospect for the 1300s–1320s than the 1200s–1220s (Fig. 6). Polygonal plans were being experimented with in many places,
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89 The dating is hotly debated: see articles by Christopher Wilson and Jon Cannon in Medieval Art, Architecture and History at Bristol Cathedral, ed. Jon Cannon and Beth Williamson (Leeds, forthcoming), and Richard Morris, ‘European Prodigy or Regional Eccentric? The rebuilding of St Augustine’s Abbey church, Bristol’ in Almost the Richest City: medieval art and architecture in Bristol Cathedral, ed. Laurence Keen (Leeds 1997), pp. 41–56.
90 Bristol-influenced examples include the parish churches at Tidworth and Urchfont, Wilts. An instructive example of the change in buttress design between c.1200 and c.1300 can be seen outside the Lady chapel and chapter house complex at Ripon Minster, Yorks.: buttresses with front-facing step-offs of c.1200, extended c.1300, but now with three-sided step-offs.
for example in the apsed east end-cum-Lady chapel nearing completion at Lichfield Cathedral in 1322; the stretched-octagon of the Lady chapel at Wells Cathedral, complete by 1326, or the decision of the 1330s to rebuild the choir of St Peter’s Abbey, Gloucester in a form that retained something of its apsidal form by canting the great east window outwards. The specific form of a three-sided apse remained unusual, however, and did not extend to lesser churches. Yet, as is the case in the eleventh (and to a lesser extent the thirteenth) centuries, the exceptions are highly suggestive and not very far away. These are the parish churches at Madley and Marden, Herefs., both with three-sided polygonal apses; the former was under way in 1318, and, remarkably, included a crypt. There are many fourteenth-century lesser church crypts of various descriptions, but there appear to be no others beneath a church that is or was apsidal. Indeed Madley joins Brixworth, Westbury, and Wing as quite possibly the only lesser churches in England known to have had both a polygonal apse and a crypt.

If the east end is fourteenth-century, what does this suggest for the structure that preceded it? We have explored various options for this, from the Anglo-Saxon to the thirteenth-century, but if the apse was a purely fourteenth-century initiative, it suggests a desire in the fourteenth century to significantly enlarge and aggrandise the collegiate choir, although the dates suggested are rather too late for Bishop Giffard’s failed attempts to expand the community. The creation of a crypt, too would remain in need of explanation, although charnel material might have been thrown up if the new east end was substantially longer than the old one. The explanation also does not account for the parallels between the apse-and-crypt and Anglo-Saxon work, although the evocation of past styles is something of an architectural theme in this period. It is rather suggestive that our possible fourteenth-century phase seems to be focused on the very two areas – the eastern and western extremes of the church – where archaeology suggests we can see most clearly the traces of a previous structure.

The reason for hesitancy about dating the Westbury apse to the Decorated period – most likely starting with the apse in the 1310s or 1320s, with the tower still underway in the middle of the century – is the slightness of the evidence. The lower part of a single buttress, lacking well-preserved detailing of any era, seems a dangerously limited structure from which to build a case for an important Decorated east end. The case is stronger for the tower arch, west door, and other features; it also seems that at least one ambitious fitting, represented by the pinnacle fragments, was installed in the church at this time. The evidence for a ‘Bristol school’ east end, tower (perhaps unfinished), and other fittings thus cannot quite be proved. On the lower site, however, impressive works were certainly underway in the broad period between the later thirteenth century and early fifteenth century. Whether this in turn strengthens the case for a fourteenth-century phase at the church is another open question.

---

91 The crypt beneath was retained, too, though; there is no evidence that it was still being used. This work is of course Perpendicular in style, but contemporaries would have seen these new forms as variants of ever-inventive Decorated practice.

92 Various details of the Madley crypt, especially the narrow entrance passages, suggest Anglo-Saxon practice. The transeptal Lady chapel at Patrington, Yorks. ER, is also apsidal. At least two roughly contemporary castle chapels in the west Midlands (Goodrich, Herefs. and Berkeley, Gloucs.) also had apsidal chancels, the former built into a turret. The subject of apsidal castle chapels deserves study of itself; the form may always have been more common, partly because such buildings often had twelfth-century origins, and partly because of the form of the turrets in which they could be located.

The College Site

The site around the later college was the scene of ambitious building work at some point in the century and a half between c.1250 and c.1400 (Fig. 9). Very little pottery evidence was found for this, the last pre-Carpenter phase, but the finds of stonework were, though fragmentary, of good quality and reasonably dated to the fourteenth century. This, then, is the first period since the Anglo-Saxon era that the scale of works on the lower site may have outstripped those at the church. At this point the riverside was given a third, very substantial, layer of supporting walling, continuing

---


Architectural fragments at BCMAG include BRSMG 67/1970, Q108.1, the most dateable piece, a fragment of ogee-moulded mullion; Q108.2, an undated piece of stone, dressed on three sides and slightly curved; BRSMG 159/1970, Q159.2 an undated piece of moulded mullion; and Q229.1, an undated dressed stone perhaps with some colour.
a process that had, since the Anglo-Saxon era, moved the edge of the river significantly northwards. The cobbled area now became a courtyard, with ranges of buildings to the west, south, and east. Immediately to the west (and providing a final date for the abandonment of the burial ground, which it cuts into) a large pond was dug; its L-shaped plan and the lack of any fish bones within it suggested that this was as much ornamental as practical. All this implies a building of real status, and the stonework suggests this, too. The eastern range included a detached kitchen with several ovens, a spit-base, and a huge oolitic limestone water cistern. A drainage channel ran west across the site, leading into the pond. Again, as with all the other periods, the most substantial accommodation appears to be on the south side, beneath the surviving college building.

The precise dimensions of this complex are unclear: the north and east ranges were fixed, but the extent of the pond is not known, while most of the south and western ranges also fell outside the excavated area. Nevertheless, the building found seems to have been a house with a hall and a courtyard; it was probably only two-thirds smaller than the Carpenter-era buildings. Once again, given its scale, and the low level of residency at Westbury, this building is best identified as the deanery. Its orientation is interesting, with most walls running parallel to the river, but some ‘north-south’ ones (particularly in the southern range, where there were more existing foundations to deal with) more closely reflecting the ‘second orientation’ of the site, running a little north of due east. It is tempting to see a pattern in the documentary evidence, suggesting building works at other prebendal houses at this time: it seems that works were either completed or required at the houses of the Holley and possibly the Godringhill prebends in 1310, 1339, and 1349. These are chance survivals of information, but there is tantalising antiquarian evidence that could be linked to one of these structures. An illustration of 1798 shows a very high status chimney on a house in the area; the chimney top has unusual and sophisticated polygonal detailing, very like fourteenth-century Bristol work. It has been suggested that this stood on a site on the north side of the Trym just after the High Street crosses that river. The possibility thus arises that at least one of the prebendal houses stood outside the enclosure, which might in turn explain the need to re-route a highway around the house of the Holley prebend in 1310.

To conclude, the fourteenth century, broadly defined, is a frustrating period in the story of Westbury’s architecture, with much that is highly suggestive, even important, but little that is definitive. The suggested works at both college and church are rather
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96 The thirteenth-century evidence neither precludes nor proves a courtyard-style building before this.
97 Michael Ponsford, private information. The debris from excavating the pond was spread near the site of a timber shed, which may have been a builders’ workshop.
98 This was perhaps some three tons in weight (Michael Ponsford, private information).
99 Michael Ponsford, private information. It seems likely that the water originated in a leat taken from the river and flowing in from the east.
100 Above, p. 115.
101 Above, p. 36.
102 BL, Add MS Add. MS. 15,541 (Samuel Grimm’s topographical drawings), vol v (1789), fig. iv, entitled ‘An Old House with a Curious Chimney at Westbury on the Passage Road’. Passage Road is the continuation of Westbury High Street after it crosses the Trym. The White Lion Inn stood on the east side of the road immediately north of the river, after which there was open country, and the topography of the lane to its rear in the 1792 map (Wilkins, Some Chapters, facing pp. 24–5) compares well with that in Grimm’s drawing.
too late to be associated with Giffard’s expansion of the college, but they do appear to be approximately contemporary with each other.

THE FIFTEENTH-CENTURY REBUILDING

The Western Parts of the Church

By the Reformation, the church appeared substantially as it does today, that is Perpendicular throughout, with only the nave arcades, sedilia and south door standing out as obviously of a different era from the rest. The rest of the building had been rebuilt or remodelled. However, there are many differences in detail between the various parts, and stylistic analysis alone, given that many aspects of the Perpendicular style remained unchanged between the late fourteenth and early sixteenth centuries, might suggest a piecemeal transformation over a considerable period of time. In fact this was not the case. Almost everything was done in twenty or thirty years, from the mid-1450s to the early 1480s, with Bishop Carpenter as the initiator and principal patron. The appearance of today’s church, however, would have come as a shock to Carpenter and his clergy. It is (in medieval terms) a shell; the apse is the main part of the structure to catch the modern eye. Yet even here the original arrangement of this part of the church was very different from that of today, and the east end as a whole was the setting for high-quality fittings and decorations. The fragmentary surviving evidence, which we will review, allows us to demonstrate this, and to go some way towards reconstructing its appearance.

The tower was the first part of the church to be reconstructed. We have suggested that much of the lower two stories of this structure is of fourteenth-century date and that as it was unusual to start major works at the west end of a church, it is possible that the tower remained unfinished, resulting in an eyesore that needed to be dealt with expeditiously. Perhaps, too, at this stage Carpenter did not have a clear idea of how far he would take reconstruction of the church. Accordingly, under his authority, the buttresses and newel stair (the latter including in its ground floor the Anglo-Saxon gravestone noted above) were added or rebuilt, and the tower extended upwards. It seems that the fifteenth-century masons decided to centre the windows and niche in the upper part of their tower’s western face on the retained fourteenth-century elements below, thus creating a building that is markedly off-centre. They also added a string course to the lower stage of the tower, with the result that the west window appears to break through this non-existent ‘storey’. The resulting structure had four storeys externally but three internally. The lower two levels of its western face included the probably Decorated west door, with the simple, cusped niche and possibly early Perpendicular west window above. The fifteenth-century upper two levels had, sitting on the second string course, a small but elaborate Perpendicular

103 Above, pp. 115, 134. The previous location of access to upper parts of the tower is unclear, but the off-centre composition of the current structure suggests the newel stair was not expected to be on a western corner.
104 The string courses clasp all sides and run continuously around the newel stair; they are broken by the buttresses.
niche, containing a good-quality statue (all but the head is medieval)\textsuperscript{105} and a simple miniature vault; and two levels of two-light windows, with the newel stair a highly visible element on the southern corner. The building was topped with simple gargoyles, pinnacles and crenellations. The other three faces repeated the windows and string courses of these upper two stories. Sadly, the detailing of the upper two levels cannot be trusted. The unusual filled cusps of the belfry windows are a Victorian addition;\textsuperscript{106} so too is the elaborate, openwork spirelet on the newel stair, which has become an admired feature of the church.\textsuperscript{107} Most pre-restoration drawings show the newel stair as battlemented; none shows a spirelet.\textsuperscript{108}

The resulting tower is impressive in its height and proportions, yet extremely simple in its detailing. This is especially remarkable considering the elaborate standards set at fourteenth-century St Mary Redcliffe, Bristol, and the cathedrals of Wells and Worcester, grandly matched at St Peter’s Abbey, Gloucester, the latter started in 1450–7. These buildings influenced lesser churches throughout the area, and from the fourteenth century onwards.\textsuperscript{109} In Bristol, Temple church (c.1460) and St Stephen (c.1470) are city parish churches whose towers, albeit a little later, are far more elaborate than that at Westbury. Indeed a good Bristol comparator is an early one: St Peter, c.1400. This is part of a rebuild that is in other ways, too, reminiscent of Westbury. It is a building of considerable scale (the aisles reach as far east as the chancel and extended a bay west to clasp the tower), with simple Perpendicular detailing, an asymmetric tower frontage created by the preservation of a previous lower storey, and – relevant to the Westbury east end – a recherché attachment to bell capitals.\textsuperscript{110} It might be suggested that the same Bristol masons were at work here, but St Peter is dated to c.1400, presumably on the basis of its early-looking Perpendicular windows.\textsuperscript{111} That Westbury is a construction of the Carpenter era, however, is proved by the surviving medieval door to the newel stair at belfry level, the handle of which was originally set in a piece of ironwork of cross-crosslet form. Exactly the same motif, a reference to Carpenter’s coat of arms,\textsuperscript{112} is seen on the front door of 38 Church Road, which as we shall see is likely to also be his creation.\textsuperscript{113} It may be that much of

\textsuperscript{105} Below, p. 173.
\textsuperscript{106} For example BCMAG, K4816 (c.1820) and M46 show the windows on the north side blocked, or with only relict tracery. BL, Add. MS. 42,005, p. 58 (datable between 1787×1879 and probably 1851×1864) shows those to the west with a simple standard Perpendicular design. In other engravings (e.g. Bigland’s Gloucestershire Collections, ed. Frith, iv, 1406, and BCMAG, MS6) the tracery could be interpreted as Decorated, although it is equally likely that the distinction between straight-sided and curved-sided foiled openings was not significant to those who made these images.
\textsuperscript{107} Picturesque depictions of it, glimpsed across fields, became popular, for example BCMAG, M5021.
\textsuperscript{108} A faculty of 25 March 1864 talks of this along with the pinnacles, roof, and parts of the battlements as being ‘renewed’; the design adopted had been drawn up in 1851 (BRO, P/HTW/Chw/8 (e). Antiquarian drawings, including Bigland’s Gloucestershire Collections, ed. Frith, iv, 1406; BRO, P/HTW/P/3 (d) (undated but before restoration was complete); and BL, Add. MS. 42,005, p. 58 (dated as above, note 106), show a flat top with crenellations, sometimes with a small bell attached to them. BRO, P/HTW/P/3 (b), also undated, makes the turret look unfinished with a flat top and no crenellations.
\textsuperscript{109} Although the peak of this process appears to have come rather later in the fifteenth century (the crowning achievement, St Mary Magdalene, Taunton, Somt. is c.1488–1514), it begins with such later fourteenth-century buildings as St Cuthbert’s, Wells and Shepton Mallet, Somt.
\textsuperscript{110} Below, p. 152.
\textsuperscript{111} Andrew Foyle, Bristol (New Haven and London, 2004), p. 106.
\textsuperscript{112} Paly gules and azure, with a chevron argent, adorned with three crosslets, or, and a mitre, or, in chief.
\textsuperscript{113} Below, p. 177.
Carpenter’s works at Westbury were ‘branded’ in this way, in turn suggesting that the tower does not predate the beginning of wider changes in the college complex. It can be said to mark the beginning of the architectural impact of Carpenter’s reforms on the church itself.

Soon after the completion of the tower, a second phase of Perpendicular works began, still focussed on the western parts of the church. It included the extension of the nave north aisle a bay westwards so that it clasped the tower, bringing inside the building buttresses and string courses that were plainly intended to be external walls, and demonstrating that this phase was not anticipated when work on the tower was underway. Reconstruction of the phase as a whole is complicated by the changes made in the 1850s; however, by studying the documentation for this era and the archaeology of the church itself, it is clear that the main aim was to create a series of new spaces for liturgical and other activities, of which the western extension of the nave north aisle was a part. Indeed the entire nave north aisle was rebuilt, and a new single-bay north chancel chapel, the Lady chapel, created at its east end. The nave south aisle was also extended a single bay to the west, so that the tower was clasped by aisle extensions on both sides. A porch was placed around the early thirteenth-century south door. It is also possible that some of the windows in the nave south aisle were updated to match the new ones on the north side, though only one of the three surviving Perpendicular windows in this aisle is of this phase. An eastern extension to this aisle is also a possibility, though it will be argued below that this did not occur.

Identical window and buttress designs were employed throughout this second phase of the works. The windows have a simple Perpendicular three-light pattern of straight-sided reticulations, rather flat in its detailing. These occur throughout the nave north aisle, including its western extension, and into the first bay of the Lady chapel. There is one in the middle of the nave south aisle and another can be seen in the Vestry Hall, now the Parish Office, of the 1850s. This latter structure is said to have been built from the dismantled western bay of the nave south aisle, although its details do not match perfectly with the old work and their stonework seems entirely new. The windows of the north aisle are linked by a slim string-course, stretches of which have eroded or been chipped away. The walls have very simple bases and buttresses with two step-offs. Long attached shafts, intended to support pinnacles, rise from the tops of these buttresses. The pinnacles themselves, which would have greatly enhanced the profile of the church on the north side, are lost; a third pinnacle in the parvise (larger and more simply detailed than the fourteenth-century pair, and clearly the subject of external weathering) is probably not one of them. This buttress design is repeated on the corners of the lower part of the porch, where its former continuation upwards is interrupted by the later addition of the parvise; it

114 Clearly visible in the upper level of the modern parish rooms there.
115 We cannot know if there was formerly an altar at the east end of the aisle, though this seems likely. The existence of a Lady chapel is recorded by 1478 (above, p. 92).
116 An anonymous author states that ‘the windows and the battlements of this [the new Vestry Hall] were taken from the old skull-house’ (The Church Builder, nos 29–32 (1868), pp. 16–22 at p. 17). This article, referred to several times in the present account, is unattributed and aspects of what it says do not appear to have been seen at first hand. It contains several details not mentioned elsewhere, and is at once significant yet deserving of caution.
117 BRO, P/HTW/X/13, D8–10.
may have existed on the south aisle’s western extension, too. Many of these changes had specific functional intentions. There are two blocked external doors in the north aisle, one giving access to the Lady chapel and the other to the western extension. There is also an unusual arrangement of doors in the porch, to be discussed below, and the western extensions to the aisles were walled off from the rest of the church, forming separate rooms. This is not clear today because the extension to the north aisle is separated from the rest of the aisle by modern partitioning which in turn hides a nineteenth-century arch, while the west bay of the south aisle has been demolished, returning the wall line to its pre-fifteenth century position. To confuse matters further, there are blocked doors in the upper levels of the tower wall on both the north and south sides, suggesting that there was access to an upper level of these extensions; the date of these, then, needs to be established.

This complicated story can be unravelled by referring to two churchwardens’ faculty applications of 1852. The first, in July, outlines the applicants’ intention of ‘taking down the walls of the west end of the north and south aisles’ and ‘erecting stone arches in lieu thereof’, as well as to ‘erect new staircases with entrances through [the] tower’. The result would have been the opening up of both aisles internally to the west, leaving the western spaces separated from the rest of the aisles only by an arch. Work must have begun almost immediately, and the wall separating off the north aisle extension was removed, an arch put up in its place, and a door – now blocked – punched through the tower at an upper level. Proof that this area was separate from the aisle in the fifteenth century can be seen in its late medieval roof, which is largely intact and is (and must always have been, even before the Victorians replaced the dividing wall with an arch) separated by some distance from that of the rest of the nave north aisle. It was quickly realised, however, that the wall that divided the western extension on the south side from the south aisle retained a blocked thirteenth-century stepped lancet window. This stimulated a second faculty application in December, in which the applicants announced their intention of removing the western extension of the nave south aisle altogether and of ‘restoring the ancient early English triplet window which has been recently discovered beneath the plastering.’ The result, although it was not completed for several years, was that work on an another upper door into the tower, this time in the south wall, was halted, the doorway sealed up, the western bay demolished, and the lancets unblocked, returning the west bay of the south aisle to its pre-fifteenth century form.

---

118 BRO, P/HTW/ChW/8 (e), dated 3 July 1852. The aim was to increase the capacity of the church and create a new organ loft in the tower arch.
119 The Church Builder (1868), p. 17, describes the west bay of the south aisle as ‘now unroofed’, and says that the parish office-cum-vestry hall was constructed using the windows and battlements of this structure in 1858 (ibid., p. 22).
120 BRO, P/HTW/ChW/8 (f), dated 10 December 1852. The churchwardens must have had some inkling that this existed, because the July faculty refers to ‘opening two ancient windows, one at the west end of the south aisle’. It is not clear how they would have done this as they were also planning to demolish the wall that contained this window; perhaps at this stage only one part of the blocked window was visible. The fifteenth-century extension was not as wide as the aisle itself, and much of the southernmost of its three lancets may always have been in an external wall. Alternatively the faculty may be referring to the wide lancet just east of the porch, the history of which is confused by the disparity between the antiquarian images. Bigland’s Gloucestershire Collections, ed. Frith, iv, 1406, shows a narrow window with Perpendicular tracery in this location and the undated BRO, P/HTW/P/3 (d) depicts the window open and
The western extension of the north aisle, then, was functionally separate from the church and accessed by a door that faced the narrow north face of the churchyard. No records exist to establish the function of this opening, which is rather more unusual than that to the Lady chapel. Both it and the western extension must have been used by the expanding community, perhaps by the almsmen in particular. The scale of the extension suggests a specific function such as a chapter house, vestry, or storage space. The demolished western extension of the south aisle was also functionally separate, although rather different in design. It is known only from antiquarian drawings and engravings and from a single description of 1868, when part of it was still standing. While also built over the tower’s buttresses and string courses, it does not appear to have been as deep, wide, or high as its northern counterpart. The point at which it joined the nave south aisle appears to be marked by a stretch of patching below the stepped lancets of the aisle’s restored west window. This western room, separated from the church by the thirteenth-century west wall with its blocked lancets, was called the ‘charnel or bone house’ in 1852, and while nothing can be proved this may have been its original function. While its creation may have been necessitated by simple pressure on burial space in the churchyard, it is more likely to have been stimulated by works that required the removal of old interments, either because expansion to the church to the east was anticipated or because burials were revealed on the lower site as works on the college proceeded.

We can say a little about the original configuration of the south-western extension. In addition to the general exterior massing outlined above, the engraving by Ralph
Bigland of c.1780 shows, on the outside, a castellated string-course broken by a window and a corner buttress, both perhaps reflecting the design of the nave north aisle, although a later pre-restoration engraving shows a small gargoyle and no pinnacle to the corner buttress (Plate II). Bigland also indicates a door in the extension’s south wall, providing direct access from the churchyard. In addition, an 1868 account of the building’s internal arrangements describes a route linking the extension with the upper level of the south porch. There was certainly independent access to the church from the porch newel stair, and if there was also a door in the west wall of the nave, the description would fit. The author of this account also saw what he thought to be a piscina inside, although we cannot be sure this was not a stoup; there was also a ‘more recent’ altar tomb. Such western additions were not unknown in fifteenth-century churches. The aisles at St Peter, Bristol clasp the tower in comparable fashion, while at Beaminster, Dorset a narrow western aisle extension embraces the tower; it is said to have thirteenth-century foundations, to have been rebuilt in the fifteenth century, and was called the ‘Mort house’. Neither of these extensions appears to have been walled off from the church. At Westbury, in general, the new western spaces seem to have had practical functions, presumably associated with Carpenter’s reform and expansion of the college as a whole.

A liturgical function, however appears to have been the aim of the other main addition of this phase of works, the south porch. The building is plain, and only the lower two-thirds survive. Unlike all porches, this structure provided shelter – it is possible that the benches on the north and south walls reflect the original arrangement – and facilitated the celebration of baptisms and weddings. But the porch is also equipped with an unusual series of stairs and openings. A newel stair in the north-west corner leads to a door opening directly above the main south door, that is the space in front of the early thirteenth-century niche (Plate II). A short stretch of corbel table survives at the base of this door, and an engraving of 1849 suggests that this was matched on the east wall and that both corbel tables where once longer and more substantial. There is also a downward extension to the staircase, with a narrow blocked door that once led to the interior of the church; this is only now visible from within the newel stair. It reveals that this upper level once had access from within the church independently of the main south door, in spite of the fact the two openings are next to one another. The upper door in the porch must have provided access to a

---

127 BRO. P/HTW/P/3 (d) I; see above, p. 141, note 120 for a discussion of the dating.
128 Bigland’s Gloucestershire Collections, ed. Frith, iv, 1406.
129 The Church Builder (1868), p. 20: ‘A small door was also discovered in the skull-house, which opened to a staircase communicating with that which leads from the porch to the parvisse.’ There is no need for the two doors to have been functionally connected: they merely permitted access to both porch newel stair (the parvisse itself is a later addition) and the western extension from within the church. The staircase might merely have been necessitated by changes of level between the floor of the western extension and that of the nave south aisle.
130 The Church Builder (1868), p. 19: ‘in this bone-house is a piscina of this period, and an altar tomb of a later date’. Bigland’s list of tombs c.1780 does not appear to mention this.
wooden platform, whose use is most easily linked to Palm Sunday celebrations: it would thus be a kind of late medieval, parish-church-scale version of the choral spaces hidden in the west fronts of Exeter, Lichfield, Peterborough, Salisbury, and Wells cathedrals. The nearest surviving example of these unusual structures in lower-status churches is not far away on the Somerset side of the Avon, at Weston-in-Gordano, where comparable doors (but without independent access from inside the church) lead to a fifteenth-century wooden platform which, as at Westbury, cuts across the top of the south door. The Palm Sunday liturgy required the main door of the church to become the gates of Jerusalem, with choristers positioned ‘in a high place’ to sing before the doors open and admit the approaching procession. At Westbury the ability to access the gallery when the main door was closed was thus an added refinement.

Changes at the east end in this second phase were less dramatic. The current arch separating the north aisle from its chapel, the Lady chapel, appears to be a Victorian addition; its insertion is mentioned in a faculty of 1852 and it is not visible in a drawing of 1747. The chapel itself at this stage was probably just one bay long; the single surviving window here matches those in the nave north aisle. A new rood screen may have been anticipated; certainly, a large rood stair was constructed on the west side of the division between east and west ends here. It is possible that there was no other structural separation of the chapel from the aisle. Indeed it is also not impossible – although, because of the existing altar there, with its early thirteenth century sedilia, unlikely – that a balancing structure to the Lady chapel was also built at the east end of the south aisle as part of this phase. The assumption is that this Phase Two was carried out by a different team of masons than the tower, although with most of the fifteenth-century detailing of the latter lost, it is impossible to be sure. Both this phase and the tower share a certain simplicity of architectural approach, although this may be as much to do with the brief (and indeed the budget), which seems to be focused on very specific demands (complete the tower, provide new practically-focused spaces and access and a Palm Sunday platform in the porch) rather than the achievement of impressive artistic effects.

The Eastern Parts of the Church

Next a bigger leap took place. After another pause, a new team of masons with an architecturally more elaborate brief went to work on a wholesale upgrading and rebuilding of the eastern parts of the church. That this third phase postdates the

---

133 The original function of these is clearest at the cathedrals of Salisbury and Wells (Pamela Blum, ‘Liturgical Influences on the Design of the West Front at Wells and Salisbury’, Gesta, 25 (1986), pp. 145–50).
134 The Church Builder (1868), p. 20; ‘Proceedings at... Westbury-on-Trim’, TBGAS, 24 (1901), pp. 22–32; Harvey, A Short Account, p. 25. Harvey cites Weston-in-Gordano and says that three of four other examples are known to have existed in Somerset and another in Monmouthshire.
136 Bodleian, MS Gough Somerset 2, dated 1747. BRO, P/HTW/Chw/8 (e), dated 3 July 1852, mentions ‘constructing a new arch dividing the north aisle of the nave from the north chancel chapel in order to counteract the thrusting tendency of the chancel arch’. It was not unusual for late medieval churches in Bristol to have no structural division between east and west end.
completion of phase two is indicated by the decision at this time to extend the Lady
chapel by a second bay, creating in the process a two-bay arcade between chapel and
chancel. A vestry was then built along the remainder of the north wall of the chancel.137
Because this abutted the north-west buttress of the apse, this buttress was left in place
but the rest of the apse was demolished and rebuilt and the crypt beneath reconfigured.
Then there was a pause, and the south chancel chapel, St John, was added as a separate
initiative: the mouldings and forms of its windows are clearly by the same workshop
but it differs in detail from the rest of the renewed east end in several respects.

The masons working on this third phase adopted the same basic window tracery
pattern as those who had worked in the nave, but with much-refined levels of detail and
a greater willingness to vary their windows in specific circumstances. The basic pattern
– three lights with straight-sided reticulations – can be seen throughout the apse and in
the side windows of the side chapels. The nave south aisle has them too, but here the
reticulations are subdivided into paired cusped units (Plate VI). The east windows of the
side chapels are further refined: the four-light Lady chapel east window had a Tudor arc
and a simple arrangement of panel-like cusped units split into two by dividing arcs.
The six-light east window of St John’s chapel, the grandest in the church, is basically formed
from a paired version of the nave south aisle tracery pattern, placed beneath a depressed
four-centred arch; the main lights are headed by similarly lowered ogee arches. While
the short lengths of wall in the apse restricted the size and elaboration of the windows
there, the angles of the walls give an attractive triptych-like effect to the fenestration.
The tracery of the crypt east window is lost, but we know it had three lights (Plate IX).138

When these masons installed windows in the nave south aisle, they left untouched
one thirteenth-century window, the wide lancet just east of the porch, perhaps because
of its proximity to the porch itself. The other thirteenth-century window visible today
in this aisle had of course been blocked when the aisle extension was constructed.
They also used one Perpendicular window, the central one of the three, from the
previous phase. Perhaps this window came from the east wall of the Lady chapel (or
possibly the south aisle chapel), which must have been demolished when the chapel
was extended. The thirteenth-century pilaster buttresses on the nave south aisle were
likewise stripped away; their bases remain visible. As a result the church was made,
as it remains, effectively Perpendicular in external appearance, while retaining some
visual distinction between the nave south aisle and the east end.139

137 BRO P/HTW/ChW/8 (f), of December 1852, states that ‘since obtaining such faculty they [the
churchwardens] have discovered the foundations of a vestry at the east end of the north chancel and are
desirous of erecting thereon a vestry’. The current structure is apparently on these foundations. As a result
of this discovery the small window between vestry and chancel was reopened, though it has since again
been blocked. BRO, P/HTW/Chw/8 (e), of July 1852, mentions ‘opening two ancient windows one at the
w end of the south aisle and the other at the north side of the vestry room’, although the window under
discussion is on the south side. In any case small purpose-built vestries of this type are a reasonably
common feature in fifteenth-century churches; that at St John, Marlborough, Wilts. is comparable. St Peter,
Bristol had a two-storey version. It is also just possible that this was also not the first vestry on the site. The
presence of an existing structure here would help explain the preservation of the adjacent apse buttress.
Bishop’s Cannings, Wilts. is one thirteenth-century example.

138 George Pryce, Memorials of the Canynges Family (Bristol, 1854), facing p. 168.

139 Comparable refenestration to create an overall Perpendicular effect is commonplace, e.g. at Aldbourne,
Wilt. In several cathedrals, such as Winchester and Wells, Perpendicular tracery was systematically
inserted in surviving early window openings.
Throughout the works of this phase, the windows have drip-moulds and corbel stops of various designs. On the apse, St John’s chapel, and the nave south aisle these are square, mostly with simple foliage carved onto them; on the blocked crypt window they take a thickened, cusp-like form. The soffits of the windows, both inside and outside, are moulded, externally with a single, emphatic convex curve which breaks down into a series of tighter mouldings at the plane of the window and again at the plane of the wall.\textsuperscript{140} The mouldings generally have simple bases, too. While very comparable mouldings are, as with the tracery patterns, standard features of fifteenth-century windows,\textsuperscript{141} all this work is well-executed, and plainly more elaborate and (we can assume) expensive to produce than the windows of the previous phase. The source of freestone used also changes. A hard, white, possibly carboniferous and thus very local limestone is used for the dressings of the north aisle and western extensions, but this changes to a fine-grained yellowy limestone, perhaps from Dundry or an outcrop of Cotswold stone, throughout the east end. In other words, the stone came from further away, another sign that the budgets were less tight.

The apse is the most elaborately-articulated work of all (Plate VII). Buttresses and pinnacles, features not used elsewhere in phase three, stand on its corners. These buttresses have moulded bases and a single, three-sided step-off, imitating that of the retained older buttress. The step-offs carry attached pinnacles, behind which rises a pilaster-like form, broken up by a brief stretch of stringcourse, placed parallel to the top of the attached pinnacle. This is rather unusual and may reference older architecture, such as the shaft-rings of thirteenth-century columns, the stepped step-offs of thirteenth-century buttresses, or even the decorative strips on Anglo-Saxon buildings.\textsuperscript{142} Finally, the pilasters carry gargoyles where they cross the roof parapet, before supporting a second pinnacle which rises above the crenellations. There is a slight gable over the eastern wall, echoing those on the east walls of the aisle chapels. The eastern wall is also emphasised by the presence of the (now blocked) window to the crypt.

As part of the rebuilding of the apse, the crypt beneath it took its final medieval form as Carpenter’s burial chapel dedicated to the Holy Cross.\textsuperscript{143} Its east window is today, although blocked, its finest architectural feature; indeed it has probably always been the one emphatic external sign of the structure’s existence (Plates VII–IX). The principal survival internally is a tomb-sized recess in the southern wall with, immediately to its east, an arched recess with a shelf-like extension; the latter was originally perhaps a piscina or an aumbry.\textsuperscript{144} Both are currently plain, almost crude, with rough stonework and no mouldings or other attempts at architectural refinement.

\textsuperscript{140} This is simplified somewhat around the apse, where the width of the previous foundations might have restricted the width of the wall.
\textsuperscript{141} The two variations on three-light Perpendicular reticulations used at Westbury, including the soffit mouldings described here, are found in a great many churches of the period: there may be thousands in England.
\textsuperscript{142} It could thus be taken as evidence for the argument that the structure it replaced was a thirteenth-century apsidal east end or even that Anglo-Saxon fabric materia remained.
\textsuperscript{143} Carpenter’s will, below, p. 241.
\textsuperscript{144} The arch is about 2.2 metres long (7 feet) and 0.7 metres deep (2 feet 4 inches) (Russell, ‘Bishop Carpenter’s Crypt Chapel’, p. 15). The question of whether this originally contained a burial is discussed in C. S. Taylor, ‘The Grave of Bishop Carpenter’, \textit{TBGAS}, 25 (1902), pp. 294–5, which includes further material on the discovery of the tomb; the matter is resolved by Carpenter’s will.
The north wall contains a narrow ledge, approximately balancing the recess opposite. It may be a Victorian addition; the date of the wall as a whole is not clear.\(^{145}\) We have two reports of the crypt in 1852 and neither mentions it, although in 1868 a less reliable source described this wall as including a tomb recess.\(^{146}\) This feature is worth bearing in mind given that it is less usual for a burial such as Carpenter’s to be on the south, rather than the north, side of the altar.\(^{147}\)

The dimension of the crypt in its current form is approximately 4–5 metres (13–16 feet) square and 2.5 metres (8 feet) high, fitting entirely within the footprint of the apse above (Figs. 10, 11, 12).\(^{148}\) All the visible features that could predate 1851 have already been mentioned: from that year, work began on the installation of a large heating furnace, and associated ducts.\(^{149}\) As a result, our eyewitness accounts of 1852 are crucial sources of information about the crypt.\(^{150}\) When they were written, the space was already undergoing conversion into a heating chamber; it had been blocked up, its interior in ruins, and its existence unknown since at least the seventeenth century.\(^{151}\) The roof today features brick segmental tunnel vaults supported by iron joists, a type of vault common in Victorian industrial buildings; the west wall is new and stands a little east of its predecessor.\(^{152}\) The east wall, entirely blocking the old window, and the doorway in it (with steps for access outside), are also modern inventions, as are the upper parts of the south wall.\(^{153}\) The status of the north wall, as has been said, is not clear. Everything medieval can be dated to the Carpenter era; whether any fabric pre-dating this survives it is impossible to say. As has been made clear, we can assume the existence of a crypt at least since the date of the construction of the apse, and this is certainly pre-Carpenter.

The reports of the 1850s enable us to say more about the room. They each include an illustration of its interior, of which that by George Pryce is the more accurate.
Westbury-on-Trym: Monastery, Minister, and College

Fig. 10 Westbury-on-Trym parish church, east end.
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Fig. 11  Bishop Carpenter’s crypt chapel, looking east.
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Fig. 12  Bishop Carpenter’s crypt chapel, looking south.
This shows the three lights of the east window with a transom, below which it is blocked. Such an arrangement would have allowed space for an altar. The tomb recess had a low chamfered arch over it. The stumps of what are apparently thickly-moulded arches, two above the east window and one, lower and thicker, associated with the top of the tomb recess, suggest a tunnel vault, perhaps four-centred like the east window, and supported on transverse ribs. They also suggest that the vault was rather higher around the east window, and then splayed or stepped downwards, perhaps to let the maximum amount of light into the crypt while allowing the sanctuary floor to be a few feet lower. A vault that began above the peak of the east window would have raised the chancel floor almost to the sills of the sanctuary windows above. A blocked opening above the tomb recess, shown very differently in the two engravings, could be interpreted as allowing some degree of intervisibility or ventilation between the crypt and the chancel above. A drawing by another antiquary, W. H. Massie, shows a door to the west, although this is described as being in a ‘recent wall’; it suggests that access to the crypt was originally from the west, via a narrow passage descending from the floor of the church above (Plate VIII).

The Carpenter-era design of the crypt clearly had some distinctive features. Most significantly, it raises important issues for the relationship between crypt and chancel (Figs. 10, 11, 12). This is most visible in the crypt’s east window, which rises almost two metres (6 feet 6 inches) higher than the current Victorian vault. The floor of the chancel, even allowing for some stepping-down between this window and the crypt’s original vault, must thus have lain only a metre or so (3 feet 3 inches) below the base of the chancel windows. This in turn has implications for the high altar. Even today, steps climbing in total some 1.34 metres (4 feet 4 inches) are spaced out between the west door of the church and the sanctuary step. Much of this ascent is necessitated by the underlying lie of the land. However, although the ground surface starts to fall away as one enters the east end, the high altar is several steps higher again. This elevation must originally have been as much as 1.4–1.6 metres (4 feet 7 inches–5 feet 3 inches). The arrangement of crypt east window, upper windows, and vault thus seems designed to allow just enough space for the high altar to stand here, with its upper surface almost parallel with the sills of the apse windows. The result was a dramatic and unusual setting for the offices performed at the altar, one with implications for the decoration and fitting-out of the east end, to be discussed below.

---

154 Massie’s sketch was engraved for publication by an under-qualified draughtsman, while Pryce was a skilled artist in his own right (Russell, ‘Bishop Carpenter’s Crypt Chapel’, pp. 11–20). An illustration of the crypt with the furnace in it can be found in Wilkins, Some Chapters, facing p. 16; the original is BRO, P/HTW/P/4 (b).

155 Pryce, Memorials of the Canynges Family, facing p. 168. The lower half of the window, being subterranean, can surely never have been open.

156 Russell (‘Bishop Carpenter’s Crypt Chapel’, pp. 11–20) suggests that this would have descended from St John’s chapel, to avoid disrupting the choir. Such narrow approaches, also found at Madley, are a feature of Anglo-Saxon crypts (e.g. Hexham, Ripon and Repton). For a further discussion of the antecedents of these arrangements, see above, pp. 117–22.

157 Russell, ‘Bishop Carpenter’s Crypt Chapel’, pp. 16–17. There must have been at least 1.2 metres (3 feet 11 inches) between the current vault and the previous one.

158 Demonstrated in detail by Russell, ibid.

159 Below, p. 161.
Other unusual interventions, although less dramatic, were also made in St John’s chapel. The proportions of the arcade here, with its high four-centred arches and elegant wave-moulded piers on high bases, have been praised by several modern critics and indicate designers of some taste (Plate XVI). One thinks of other decoratively sparse but proportionally effective and even beautiful Perpendicular spaces such as the unfinished Lady chapel at Rochester Cathedral (underway in 1512–13) or the large south-eastern chapel at Bloxham, Oxon. (first half of the fifteenth century). There are various differences in design between the chapel and the rest of the renewed east end, including the provision of wall bases and string courses externally, a slightly shorter parapet, and internally an arcade of rather different design than that to the north chapel. Although clearly by the Phase Three masons, St John’s chapel must have been begun as a new initiative after work on the rest of the east end had been completed. Perhaps, during this period the vaulting and other structural changes in the crypt were underway. The new chapel was also clearly meant to have a spacious, impressive effect, coherent in itself at the expense of some inconsistencies with surrounding structures.

More distinctive are the very odd capitals to its arcade, the piled-up and rounded mouldings of which look rather as if the masons were copying Anglo-Saxon motifs. However bell capitals lived long in Bristol, when elsewhere the abaci of fifteenth-century capitals tend to be polygonal. They can be seen, for example in the later part of the crypt of St John’s church, c.1390, and in St Peter c.1400, and mouldings probably by the Westbury masons that are almost as odd can be seen in the tower arch at Aust. In other words, these capitals, although they remain unusual, have some roots in local contemporary practice, reducing if not quite eclipsing the sense that this is a deliberately archaising motif. Indeed they occur in a mildly less eccentric form in the arcade to the Lady chapel. That they are not reflected in the chancel arch is presumably because this dates in its current form from the nineteenth century.

The most unusual feature of the south chancel chapel, however, comes at its south-west corner, close to the nave south aisle. Here a second newel stair was built, like that in the north aisle presumably designed to access a screen loft, but here east rather than west of the arch to the nave aisle and also on an unusual scale (Plate II). The stairwell has chamfered corners externally (one might almost say it was apsidal) and is lit by two quatrefoil windows. High up in it, after the usual upper door, there is a short, steep flight of steps leading to a high, lobby-like room, the floor of which includes a recycled fourteenth-century piscina drain. This room is lit by a flat-topped two light window of some size. This room too has a doorway

---

161 It was probably rebuilt when the arch to its north was constructed (above, pp. 110, note 6; 144).
162 It is of a piece with St John’s chapel, the moulded base of which continues around it. The use of small openings to provide some light in such structures is common and can be seen locally at Almondsbury (quatrefoils again) and St Peter, Bristol. I cannot find any comparison for the upper room or the scale of its fenestration: the southern extension to the nave of SS Philip and Jacob, Bristol, very comparable in plan, is apparently a nineteenth-century porch.
163 Above, p. 133.
164 Harvey, ‘Recent Discoveries’, pp. 204–7, published when the space was newly discovered, having been bricked up for some time. Pre-restoration illustrations include BL, Add. MS 15,541, drawing 5, and BRO, P/HTW/P/3 (d) which shows the stairwell with the windows blocked.
looking into the upper part of the chapel, about 30cm (one foot) further east and placed significantly higher in the wall than its companion.\textsuperscript{165} As in the porch, then, and other parts of phase two, we are faced with an unusual arrangement of spaces and openings. It has been suggested that this was a vestry space,\textsuperscript{166} although that would present practical obstacles: the very narrow and steep final flight of stairs in particular would pose a challenge to a fully-vested priest. Secure storage, too seems unlikely, given the size of the windows and the fact that the very secure parvise was constructed soon afterwards. In any case both upper doors appear designed to give access to a screen loft, and their arrangement suggests that this was unusually broad and perhaps raised towards the east. The likelihood here, as in the porch, is that all this was designed with a liturgical use in mind: one is reminded of the fourteenth-century choir gallery in the Exeter Cathedral nave, or, even more relevant, the singing galleries, complete with shelves for liturgical books, built high up in the Lady chapel built from c.1468 at St Peter’s Abbey, Gloucester. Is it too fanciful to imagine that such raised locations, either hidden at the top of the newel stair or from the top of the screen itself, further enhanced the drama and decorousness of polyphonic singing? This, and the stair’s location on the eastern side of the arch to the nave aisle, give one the sense of a screen whose function was focused on enriching celebrations in, as well as enhancing the exclusivity of, the south chancel chapel. Presumably the rood screen proper ran across the north nave aisle and the nave, but no further.

There may have been practical considerations for this unusual arrangement, too, considerations that may also go some way to explain the fact that the arch to the south aisle is itself out of true, running several degrees off its proper north-south trajectory.\textsuperscript{167} This arch is something of a contrast to the situation in the north aisle, where no arch seems to have been built. It is not the only oddity in this area, as we have seen. The St John’s chapel arcade, the south nave arcade, and the chancel arch are tied together by an odd area of walling, some of which is cut back as it ascends; there are also inconsistencies on the south side of the arch.\textsuperscript{168} From the point of view of the fifteenth-century builders, all this allowed the new work to be built around the suggested altar at the east end of the nave south aisle; perhaps, too, the decision to create the large newel stair was taken after the north side of this arch had been laid out. It also left the chancel perhaps almost a metre (3 feet) wider than the nave. It would not have been impossible, providing one was happy to create new foundations for the apse, to build this a little wider than heretofore to the south side without disturbing the retained north-western buttress. However it is more likely that the previous chancel was on the same footprint as its predecessor. In any case, the masons could have entirely rebuilt this archaeologically confusing area.\textsuperscript{169} That they

---

\textsuperscript{165} Above the upper door, for reasons I cannot explain, the wall suddenly thickens (above, p. 123).

\textsuperscript{166} Harvey, ‘Recent Discoveries’, pp. 204–7.

\textsuperscript{167} Although Bodleian, MS Gough Somerset 2 (dated 1747) shows a semicircular arch here, this wide, fine arch looks very much of a piece with the rest of the detailing in St John’s chapel.

\textsuperscript{168} Above, p. 123.

\textsuperscript{169} In greater churches, sections of the (analogous) crossing piers have revealed a process of onion-like growth, with different arms of the church rebuilt at different eras without the crossing ever being taken down to foundation level. York Minster is one example (Sarah Brown, ‘Our Magnificent Fabrick’, York Minster: an architectural history c.1220–1500 (Swindon, 2003), pp. 197–200).
did not may reflect a desire to maximise space in all three areas: stall space in the choir, altar space in the nave south aisle, and space for screen and newel stair in St John’s chapel.

The final, fourth phase of Perpendicular works included the building of the south porch parvis and the raising of a clerestory in the nave, upon which was placed a new nave roof. Any roofs elsewhere in the church not already renewed would have been completed at this point, too. Once again the workshop changes: indeed the architectural work is rather uncertain in its execution, as if the masons involved were used to smaller-scale or domestic work. This project could have been begun during or after the completion of works on the east end, but it certainly post-dates the second phase of works, because it interrupts the south porch. The newel stair, constructed to provide access to the Palm Sunday gallery, was extended upwards, creating access to a new parvis storey.170 The parvis itself has three small rectangular windows with cusped heads171 and, in its north wall, a simple, wide fireplace with a Tudor arch. The clerestory windows are of two lights, and not very well executed; they vary slightly in their detailing and are set very low, rising directly from the roof of the adjacent aisles, making them near-invisible when outside the church; they are linked by a string course on the south side, but not on the north. Nevertheless the work again manages some special nods towards liturgy and iconography. There is an eastern window over the chancel arch, a feature normally associated with the grander churches of the era such as Chipping Norton, Oxon., or Northleach, Gloucs. Its tracery is a simple row of cusped Perpendicular lights beneath an oak lintel, and in addition the easternmost windows of the clerestory are slightly wider than the others, a feature seen around a century earlier at St John, Bristol.172 That on the north side, where there is no string course, is straight-headed, with two cusped and ogee-headed lights. That on the south side, however, is a replacement of after c.1510,173 for it interrupts the string course and has lights with uncusped semi-circular heads.174 These three eastern windows are thus contemporary with the clerestory and roof, but one was replaced, perhaps as a piece of maintenance, at a later date. All this must be designed to light the area around the rood; once again, cut-price ‘extras’ of a type normally associated with grander buildings were being added to the church.175

170 The demonstrations of this are outside (where the lower string course of the parvis interrupts the attached pilaster-like buttresses, which would otherwise have ended in pinnacles at parapet level, and the upper extension of the newel stair is stepped back slightly from the lower one) and inside (where the arch at the top of the door to the Palm Sunday gallery has been blocked and replaced with a lintel, making way for the parvis floor).
171 These cusps alone are of a brighter freestone; they may be Victorian insertions.
172 And at St Thomas, Bristol before rebuilding in the eighteenth century (Foyle, Bristol, p. 110–11).
173 By this date the influence of the Renaissance was making such emphatic use of semi-circular arches possible for the first time since the late twelfth century. Examples are common, including the outer south aisle at Tavistock, Devon, the south aisle of Constantine, Cornwall, or – nearer at hand – the large blank arches in the chancel at St Mary-de-Crypt, Gloucester, the latter attributed to 1461×1501 but, given the Renaissance influence of their wall-paintings and the moldings of the nave capitals, surely later. Indeed it is not inconceivable that a minor repair such as this was carried out after the Reformation, perhaps even as late as the post-Laudian or eighteenth-century fittings described below, p. 185.
174 That it is a replacement rather than an addition is revealed by its internal drip mould, which is identical to that of its partner on the north side.
175 Cartulary of St Mark’s Hospital, ed. Ross, p. 120.
The roofs, however, were of good quality. Today, several of the church’s roofs retain old timbers, often spliced with nineteenth-century material. This is most visible, because most accessible, in the roof of the north-west bay of the north aisle, which must have been installed soon after that part of the church was complete. The roof of St John’s chapel is currently particularly elaborate, with shield-carrying angels along the wall-plates, although much here seems to have been renewed. The nave roof, however, is original and in good condition, with simple pierced tracery in the spandrels above the tie beams and carved bosses, including four that are historiated. Their arrangement suggests a guiding rationality at work at a date when the locations and subjects of bosses, especially in parish-church scaled buildings, was often largely left to a carpenter’s whim. At the east end, an image of God the Father, crowned and blessing in an ogee niche, sits on the north side of the rood, facing on the south a resurrected Christ. At the far west, just before the tower arch, a Virgin and Child stand on the north side; the boss opposite shows either an angel with a scroll or a dragon with uplifted wings. Although very small, all four are delicate carvings of real quality, still retaining some of the elegance of International Gothic. All the other bosses are carved with foliage.

The cut-price workmanship of the structural elements of this fourth phase at first suggest rapid completion to a decreased budget, perhaps following Carpenter’s death. It must pre-date the sixteenth century, when one window had to be replaced. However the nave roof is a work of good quality, and stylistically of the fifteenth century, and it seems likely that this work followed the completion of the east end very closely. As building there drew to a close, a larger team of carpenters than previously required would have been needed to create a new suite of roofs, and crucially it seems that the masons who built the east end also upgraded other buildings in the territory belonging to Westbury church. At least one of these was then roofed by the carpenters of the Westbury nave, suggesting a planned series of events initiated during Carpenter’s episcopacy. Admittedly, survival rates for the churches and chapels belonging to Westbury are poor: only Henbury church and Aust chapel are substantially medieval. However, both these retain work by the masons of the Westbury east end. Some of these (such as the east window of the Henbury north chancel chapel, identical to that at Westbury, except for its hood mould which is instead identical to that of the Westbury crypt window) were clearly cut from the same templates. Apart from the implication, interesting in its own right, that Carpenter’s architectural interventions on Westbury lands extended beyond the college itself, these help date the last phase of works at Westbury. This is because Aust, which seems to have been virtually rebuilt at this time, has a roof which is clearly a slightly less elaborate version of that on the Westbury nave, with (for example) a very similar pierced-spandrel motif above the tie-beams. The building on which it sits is largely the work of the masons who produced

176 All of the roof corbels appear to be modern apart from those in the nave south aisle, which combine work of the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries. The female head in the parvise collection (BRO, P/HTW/X/13 D4) may have come from the nave or chancel.
177 See the discussion of iconography, below p. 175, and also BRO, P/HTW/EG/Ph/2.
178 Compton Greenfield retains a medieval tower and south door.
179 That Carpenter took a wider interest in building works is attested by his will and by other works cited in Part I. Miriam Gill (unpublished article) adds that contemporary depictions of Carpenter’s arms can be found at Alvechurch, Herdwick, Ripple, and Strensham, Worcs., as well as Balliol and Oriel Colleges, Oxford.
the Westbury east end and comparable works at Henbury, suggesting that works at Westbury, Henbury, and Aust must have gone on at about the same time. The latter two perhaps followed directly on from Westbury. This in turn greatly narrows the time-frame available for the construction of the Westbury parvise and clerestory: these may have been rushed, even as the east end was being completed, to ensure the carpenters could roof the nave while still on-site.

A Review of the Rebuilding Sequence

In summary, then, completion of the tower marked Phase One, the first of Carpenter’s works at the church. It contains a door the ironwork of which can be linked to him; it predates the other works in the western half of the church because the aisle extensions there clasp the tower in a manner that shows it was clearly not designed with their existence in mind. After this, Phase Two was begun: the extension of the western ends of both aisles, rebuilding of the nave north aisle with a single-bay Lady chapel at its east end and addition of a south porch. Operations then turned to the eastern half: that this was a new, third phase is clear, because it involved extending the recently-completed Lady chapel by a bay. The works in the western half resulted in a series of visually unremarkable but functionally specific spaces: the porch, with its liturgical platform; the west bay of the south aisle; a possible charnel house; the west bay of the north aisle; and a possible vestry or chapter room with external access, perhaps partly for Carpenter’s almshouse. It is also clear that the two phases are separate initiatives, the second clearly not anticipated when the first was under way. This pattern held true as works continued.

Phase Three comprised the lengthening of the recently-completed Lady chapel, the reconstruction of the chancel and the crypt chapel of Holy Cross, and the creation of St John’s chapel. Perpendicular windows were added to the nave south aisle. All this was carried out by a new team of masons, more capable and probably better-funded, than those of the previous works. The decision to add St John’s chapel, although clearly by the same masons, was an afterthought. It is possible that in the time gap between the completion of the chancel and the start of work on this chapel, works were underway such as vaulting the crypt. This phase included further additions that enriched liturgical practice, such as the newel stair in St John’s chapel with its upper room and double openings into the chapel itself. But the exclusive crypt chapel and its consequences for the high altar, which was raised almost parallel with the windows of the apse, were the most remarkable element of the design. The arrangement must have made the celebration of High Mass a grand but somewhat vertiginous affair. Finally, probably before the east end was finally complete, but again with a change of workshop, Phase Four resulted in the clerestory, the parvise over the porch, and the completion of roofs. The building was now ready for fitting out.

---

180 At Aust the tower parapet, chancel arch and a square-headed window in the nave are later; however the capitals of the tower arch are cousins of those in the Westbury east end, and the rest of the nave also very close to Westbury.

181 It is not impossible that some changes were made to the south side of the church, too: see above, p. 144.
What dates can we ascribe to all this? The most important documentary evidence is for the end of Phase Three. With St John’s chapel, the last work of that phase, ‘new’ in 1474, this phase must have been complete, at the latest, in the earlier 1470s. Working backwards, each phase seems to have been completed without major disjuncture; on a building of this scale, we can perhaps allow two to five seasons for each. But changes of workshop and brief separate the phases, and we must thus also allow a break of at least one season between them, and very probably more. That takes us to at least 1460 for the start of works. However we should not take the phrase ‘new’ too literally – St John’s chapel was again called ‘new’ in 1497 – and we have allowed the shortest-possible break between each phase. A more realistic estimate would put the start of works at some point in the 1450s.

Although little more than an informed guess, this dovetails well with our documentary evidence. Phase Two, the north aisle and the extensions at the west end, appears to have been necessitated by expansion of the community of clergy and perhaps specifically the construction of almshouses nearby. These are known to have been in existence in 1466. We also know that the college building was underway by the mid-1450s, giving us the first recorded date for Carpenter-era architectural work at Westbury. And as a general background, Carpenter expanded the community’s endowment, a process that helps date a period of active engagement with Westbury and which would have resulted in an ever-increasing source of funds from c.1455–c.1469; this included an indulgence for those visiting the church in 1466. Perhaps, then, Phases One and Two, which focussed on completing an unfinished tower and making rather practically-focussed additions to the church, can be seen as projects of the mid-1450s to mid-1460s; while the years c.1466–9 can be suggested as an important turning point. With the most important architectural and institutional changes at the college complete, attention now turned to the more ambitious and better-funded Phase Three, which included plans for Carpenter’s burial. Finally, we know that a pavement was being installed in 1460–1, although it is hard to know how to interpret this. Any new elaborate encaustic floor would have been in an eastern chapel, at this point suggesting the Lady chapel, and thus recent completion of Phase Two. This would move Phases One and Two firmly into the 1450s, and make the start date for Phase Three rather vaguer: almost anytime in the 1460s. However, with an episcopal contribution of just 10s., the document could be referring to plain tiling in any part of the building.

Taken together, then, we can place Phase One in the 1450s, perhaps around the middle of the decade and a little after works began on the college, with Phase Two in a broadly-interpreted 1460s and Phase Three in the later 1460s and early 1470s. Phases One and Two can thus be assumed to have overlapped to some extent with works on the lower site. Phase Four, which overlaps to some extent with Phase

182 Williams, *Chantryes of William Canynges*, p. 75; *Cartulary of St. Mark’s Hospital*, ed. Ross, p. 119.
183 Below, p. 241.
184 Above, p. 72.
185 Above, p.70.
186 Above, pp. 76–9.
187 For the dating of the college building, see below, p. 183.
188 Above, p. 70.
189 Below, p. 183.
Three, can in turn be placed in the early or mid-1470s. There is no reason why the roofs should not have been on, or ready to go on, around the time of Carpenter’s death, and the church made ready for fitting out. Everything structural, then, could have taken place during Carpenter’s episcopacy. But it becomes highly likely that completion of fittings and the decoration of the church was overseen by his executors. It is thus all the more interesting that they were of exceptionally high quality, and – as we shall see – that fitting out was only nearing completion in the early 1480s.

These works, though episodic, contain much that is unusual. Their starting place at the western end of the church is perhaps explained by the presence of an unfinished tower there, and a little later by a desire to adapt the building in quite specific ways as Carpenter enacted changes in the structure and liturgical life of the church community. Expenditure at this stage was focused on these practical requirements rather than aesthetic refinement. At the east end, however, the detailing, while not rich, is fine; the south chancel chapel and the apse-and-crypt relationship in particular suggest a really competent designer. Finally, the clerestory and parvise are almost rustic in their detailing, the last structural work of quality, perhaps being prepared as the clerestory was built, being the nave roof, although the quality level was retained as fitting out began. It is also worth noting, as we saw in the thirteenth century, the evidence that the nave south aisle had a significantly separate role. More thirteenth-century details (including roof corbels, a window, the sedilia and the south door) were preserved there than anywhere else; the east end of the aisle had to be worked around, in spite of the slightly bodged results; and the south face of the church was Perpendicularised in a different way to the north, with more elaborate windows in the nave south aisle than in St John’s chapel to its east, and a lack of buttresses and pinnacles along the entire south face of the church that must have been striking when the north side retained its pinnacles.190 The suggestion, once again, is that there was an altar here with some special significance.

Nevertheless, most of this can be matched or bettered by the larger local parish churches, almost all of which have good Perpendicular work, some of it, as we have seen, by the same masons. Late fifteenth-century buildings such as Thornbury, architecturally an outpost of the great ‘wool’ churches of the Cotswolds, are far more ambitious in overall scale, if less unusual when analysed in detail; while St Mary Redcliffe, complete in the late fourteenth century, outdid any parish church in the country. What sets Westbury apart, then, architecturally at least, are the various extra liturgical and practical spaces along with the apse-and-crypt. What context did the latter features have at the time? Plans for the Westbury east end were probably drawn up in the later 1460s. The polygonal apse was to see something of a rebirth in subsequent decades, but at this date the motif was still very rare, and largely focussed in the English Midlands (Plate 6). A collegiate church begun within Kenilworth Castle had one by 1399, as had Coventry Cathedral from at some point after c.1410.191 Both were presumably responses to the early fourteenth-century apse at Lichfield Cathedral.

190 Perhaps these were even taken down by the masons of Phase Three to ensure a better match with their own work.

191 Richard Morris, ‘The Lost Cathedral Priory Church of St Mary, Coventry’, in Coventry’s First Cathedral: the cathedral and priory of St Mary, ed. G. Demidowicz (Stamford, 1994), pp. 17–66. The cathedral chapter house also had a fourteenth-century polygonal apse; another example is at St Peter’s Abbey, Gloucester.
The three-sided apse of St Michael's, Coventry, very near the (lost) cathedral is thought to have been built following completion of the spire, that is at some point after c.1430. They two Coventry buildings were high-profile structures and could have influenced Carpenter or his masons. They almost certainly explain a crop of late-medieval apsed parish churches in the northern Midlands, of which that at Wrexham, Clywd (undated, but likely to be after a fire of 1457 or 1463) may be the first.

Quickly, however, further support for the form came from the royal court. When St George’s chapel at Windsor was reconstructed, from 1475, polygonal apses were a feature of its transepts; these might have taken their cue from the design of the chapel to its east, linked to St George’s and rebuilt as a Lady chapel from 1494–8 by Henry VII, at which point it had a three-sided eastern apse, perhaps replacing a thirteenth-century predecessor. Royal masons then repeated this principle on a spectacular scale when rebuilding the Lady chapel (Henry VII’s chapel) at Westminster Abbey, planned 1498–1502. Its apsidal form copies the apsed predecessor known to have been underway c.1220. It is thus impossible to say whether the church above the polygonal St Winifred’s Well at Holywell, Flints. (c.1500?), with an apsed east end and associated with Lady Margaret Beaufort, is an extension of the ‘Court’ or ‘Midlands’ apses; the two categories are not exclusive. Further apsed parish churches in the northern Midlands include Northwich, Cheshire, underway in 1498 and 1525, Middlewich, Cheshire, with aisles canted to west and east, c.1500, Barton-under-Needwood, Staffs. (1517), and Hornby, Lancs., in progress in 1524. The chapel around the Holy House at Walsingham, Norfolk c.1450–1470, had a half-decagonal eastern apse added to it a few years later, while the (now ruined) chapel of the Holy Trinity built by Lord Sandys at Basingstoke, Hants., was also apsed at both ends (1521, although the chapel of the Holy Ghost adjacent to it, also apsed, is undated). Both were perhaps influenced by nearby Windsor. Westbury is thus situated very early in a process during which the polygonal apse, though still rare, was used more widely than at any time since the eleventh century. The motif was still, in the 1460s, largely restricted to buildings in and around Coventry. Both as a rebuilding of an earlier apse and as a way of giving a certain ‘great churchness’ to smaller religious buildings, however, Carpenter’s choice of motif proved a prescient one.

Fifteenth-century crypts tended to be functional in nature: there were various burial chambers and undercroft-type structures, sometimes constructed in response to a natural slope beneath the east end. St Michael’s, Coventry was built on such a slope and had chapels or vestries radiating out from its apsed east end: they are above ground level, but below the floor level of the church itself. The vault beneath the tomb of Henry VII in his apsidal chapel at Westminster Abbey is a plain space, containing

193 For connections between late medieval Bristol and Coventry, see Gomme and others, *Bristol: an architectural history*, passim.
194 Above, p. 128; Tatton-Brown, ‘The Constructional Sequence’ , pp. 3–38. This building is now the Albert Memorial Chapel.
196 *VCH Lancashire*, viii (1914), pp. 191–201.
198 An early example of polygonal forms being used to give some distinction to the churches of smaller collegiate foundations can be seen in the tower at Fotheringhay, Nants. founded 1411.
the royal coffins. The cage chantry of Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, at St Albans Abbey (now the cathedral), commissioned in 1441–3 and complete by 1447, also has a subterranean vault, this time equipped with a painted crucifixion on its eastern wall facing the duke’s lead coffin. It may have inspired the chamber beneath the transept chantry chapel associated with the Kirkham family at Paignton, Devon (later fifteenth century). These are all burial chambers rather than chapels or crypts.

So although in the 1460s and 70s the building of polygonal apses, let alone with crypts, was no less unusual than at any other time since the Conquest, the appearance of both features at Westbury appears to relate to the unfolding narrative of Perpendicular architecture, a story in which grander parish churches, royal initiatives, and chantry chapels all play a role. It is thus worth situating the works at Westbury a little more widely in the architecture of the time. For example, the Bristol churches of St Nicholas and St John both had, from the fourteenth century, elaborate crypts used for burial by religious confraternities and for access from outside the city walls, on which both buildings stood. And there were other places where the high altar was deliberately placed in an artificially raised position: the grand parish church of Walpole St Peter, Norfolk, after 1423–5 and probably of the 1440s or 50s, had its high altar raised on a vaulted processional passage. Crucially, the high altar of Great Malvern Priory was raised on a curved platform in the fifteenth century, perhaps preserving a feature of the twelfth-century church. Bishop Carpenter would have seen the effect of this for himself when he consecrated the new east end there in 1460.

A wider interest in dramatising the setting of the high altar can be seen in the design of the great screens built at Winchester Cathedral (1470–90), St Albans Abbey (after 1476), and St Mary Overy, Southwark, now Southwark Cathedral (probably before 1528). Meanwhile, chantry chapels in general provide an example of the tension between exclusivity and visibility in late medieval architecture; and while the cage chantry was by this date the most explicit architectural expression of this, other variants do exist. One particularly relevant example is at Wells Cathedral, where Bishop Stillington demolished and rebuilt the ancient Lady chapel by the cloister as a grand chantry chapel between 1477 and 1486. This was the Anglo-Saxon structure preserved and reinvented from 1196 and added to piecemeal over the ensuing centuries.

The ideas afoot at Westbury, then, clearly met some of the concerns of contemporary architecture: a desire to give the character of a ‘great church’ to buildings that were otherwise not exceptionally grand in scale; an interest in new and

199 John Goodall and Linda Monckton, ‘The Chantry of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester’ in Alban and St Albans: Roman and medieval art, architecture and archaeology, ed. Martin Henig and Phillip Lindley (Leeds, 2001), pp. 231–56. Further references are in Miriam Gill, ‘Late Medieval Wall Painting in England: c.1330–c.1530’ (University of London, Courtauld Institute of Art, PhD thesis, 2002), pp. 429–431. Images such as the crucifixion in the St Albans chantry are part of a long tradition of painted (or sometimes carved) images on or near tombs in locations where few if any outsiders would ever see them. Examples include the fourteenth-century tombs of Bishops Stapeldon and Grandisson at Exeter Cathedral and the cadaver monument to Alice Chaucer (died 1475) at Ewelme, Oxon.

200 G. H. Cook, Medieval Chantries and Chantry Chapels (London, 1947), p. 66, which also cites an unrelated case, a fourteenth-century crypt beneath the transept at Rothwell, Notts. with a painted crucifixion marking the site of an altar.

201 Michael Ponsford, private information.

202 WRO, Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 317r. He would also have seen the now-demolished Lady chapel, raised over an early thirteenth-century crypt and accessed through narrow passages in the choir aisles.
exclusive ways of monumentalising the desire to enhance prayer for a dead patron; and a desire to enhance the setting of the mass. While the arrangement at Westbury is too early and unusual to be a simple derivative of any of the above, one can quickly see why Carpenter and his masons might have wanted to preserve the apse-and-crypt form of the church; indeed we have noted grander examples of several ideas — raised altars, high-up singing platforms — in local churches that predate or are almost contemporary with Westbury. Yet even here, Westbury is unusual. The crypt-and-apse arrangement may have been adopted partly for its relevance to prevailing cultural themes, but it is distinctive enough — and, in the story of the late medieval apse, early enough — to have required some other justification as well. As we have shown, it rebuilt a structure that had stood on the same site since at least the fourteenth century, and that may have had associations of greater antiquity. Even if its east window glowed with stained glass, and the tiling and glazing of the east end repeated the arms of Carpenter himself, the crypt itself can never have been visible in the manner of chantry chapels such as those of William Wykeham at Winchester Cathedral or Humphrey, duke of Gloucester at St Albans Abbey.

One intriguing comparator is the Red Mount Chapel at King’s Lynn, Norfolk, an octagonal structure of 1483–5 designed for access by pilgrims. This has a crypt-like lower chapel which was reached via a subterranean passage; the interior is roughly finished and contained a simple tomb-shaped recess. A chapel with a highly sophisticated fan-vaulted interior was added to the top of the building in 1505–6. There are many points of general comparison with Westbury, not least the contrast between the rough nature of the crypt’s internal architectural finish and the richness of the decoration of other parts of the building. All this raises the possibility that both buildings share iconographic and functional qualities. Meanwhile the raised high altar at Westbury must have had an impact on the furnishings of the church: any reredos here would have directly blocked the windows, which hovered directly behind the celebrant. Here, earlier Perpendicular attempts to create triptych-like east windows, most famously at St Peter’s Abbey, Gloucester, suggest something similar, but nowhere can the windows so completely have occluded the fittings of the altar itself. We are moving into the realms of fittings, decoration and iconography, which must now be considered.

**Fittings, Monuments, and Decoration**

The combination of apse and crypt, and the implications it has for the high altar, are without exact parallel in fifteenth-century architecture; indeed, as has already been argued, of all eras the Anglo-Saxon comes closest. But as we have seen, they are a
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203 For an overview with special attention to collegiate foundations, see Julian Luxford, ‘The Collegiate Church as Mausoleum’ in *The Late Medieval English College*, ed. Burgess and Heale, pp. 110–39.


205 Below, pp. 171–6. Even allowing for the vicissitudes of the ensuing centuries, it is hard to see how the Westbury crypt chapel walls can ever have been smooth ashlar, let alone richly articulated in the manner of most cage chantries; apart from anything else, the surviving paintings are themselves on a stone surface that is not especially smoothly-finished.
response – original certainly, rooted in the past arguably – to concerns that other patrons were exploring in the mid-late fifteenth century. And while the architecture today is good rather than extraordinary (although we might consider it more remarkable if the sanctuary floor was still raised within a few feet of the apse’s window sills) its decoration, insofar as it can be recovered, was of very high quality and considerable originality.

The main evidence for this comes in the crypt. Today there is nothing to be seen but some reddish bluses on the whitewash of the tomb recess, but in 1852 a rich scheme of paintings was uncovered by our antiquarian observers, only to be later covered again. Modern investigation confirms that the work was of a very high quality, and that significant areas survive beneath the whitewash. All three walls of the tomb recess were lined with fictive painted drapery, bearing at the east end (at least) a large depiction of Bishop Carpenter’s arms. Above this drapery, a dado-like strip variously estimated at 10–20 centimetres high (4–8 inches) contained an intricate series of images depicting Carpenter’s funeral procession, in which, according to his will, the bishop’s body was to be ‘carried from the said cathedral church to the said collegiate church at Westbury, so that on every night it rests in some church [or] chapel’, with solemn commemorations in the cathedral and masses at each stage thereafter.

The two best-preserved stretches of this in 1852 were a scene showing the coffin leaving the city gates of Worcester, on the east wall above the depiction of Carpenter’s arms (Plate X) and a smaller processional scene about two-thirds of the way down the recess towards the western end (Plates VIII, IX). In both, a cross-like form (it is very like a Tau cross), covered in the cross-crosslets of Carpenter’s arms, appeared amid a crowd of figures. In the first scene it was on its own, apparently carried aloft; in the second, it was carried on a horse-drawn cart. It appears to have been the pall of Carpenter’s coffin or perhaps another device associated his funerary rites. In the first scene the name was written above the city gate) was depicted as a many-towered walled city with spires and even an onion dome; in front of the gate (and with trees in the immediate foreground) a crowd of red-capped men stood beside the pall. These were perhaps the scarlet-robed ‘forty-eight of Worcester’, civic dignitaries known to have been present at the enthronement of Bishop Alcock.
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206 Massie, ‘Report of Meeting’, pp. 352–5, illustrations facing pp. 352, 353 and 354 (he identified the arms as those of Bishop Carpenter); Pryce, Memorials of the Canynges Family; and idem, Mortuary Chapel and Tomb, pp. 10–11. Miriam Gill found a coloured version of the latter pasted into a scrapbook in Bristol Central Library, 2638 (George Pryce, ‘Contributions to History and General Literature’ (1836–65), p. 129). A large lithograph of the image, created in 1925, is BCMAG, Mb 6282 and BRO, P/HTW/P 2/1–2. F. W. Savage made an independent drawing in 1852, reproduced in Wilkins, Some Chapters, facing p. 10.

207 Tobit Curteis, Holy Trinity, Westbury-on-Trym Bristol: technical survey and proposals of the crypt wall painting, WBT01 (Cambridge, Tobit Curteis Associates, 1997); BRO, P/HTW/EG/Chw/10 1747.

208 In black, red, and yellow, according to Massie, ‘Report of Meeting’, p. 353. Savage depicts small yellow motifs of scrolling foliage covering the drapery, and Pryce shows in one image a repeated green leaf-like pattern, and in another scrolls in gold and red with drapery of white and grey with a gold design. Curteis (p. 7) found the drapery decorated with red scrollwork on a yellow background, and the coat of arms very close to the Pryce depiction.

209 The former estimate is in Gill, ‘Late Medieval Wall Painting in England’, pp. 429–431, the latter in Curteis, Holy Trinity.

210 Below, p. 241.

Carpenter’s successor, whom they greeted outside the city’s northern gate.212 Black-hooded mourners or clerics surrounded the cross and the cart in the second scene, almost all of them looking to the left. George Pryce’s redrawing of this scene also shows a couple of houses, the only indication of the scene’s setting. His single coloured version of the image gives these red roofs, the only colours on a scene that may thus have been depicted in grisaille style.213 Hundreds more such figures, in a poorer state of preservation, were present in ‘group after group’ along the painted strip; presumably Westbury was depicted on the western wall.

The scenes, although small, were ‘elaborate and spirited, the features and expression of each countenance marked’;214 and recent analysis confirms the impression of high quality work. The colours involved included indigo (an early use of the pigment) as well as vermilion, red/yellow lead, yellow ochre, lead and lime white, carbon black, and gold leaf (on the mitre of Carpenter’s arms): a palette that has been described as ‘extremely fine and relatively costly’. No traces of varnishing were found.215 Such areas of rich and expensive decoration appear to have been the exception in the chapel, however; samples taken of the walls around the recess suggested simple pink or reddish colour washes on surrounding areas.216 It has been pointed out that the scale and intricacy of these images suggest connections with the traditions of manuscript illumination; certainly they play the kinds of visual games more usual in the personalised world of books of hours than on a chapel wall. They united painted depiction and the physical chapel itself in a striking way: the images preserve the process by which Carpenter’s body was moved across his diocese, with appropriate masses at each stage, a story whose final scene was the crypt itself, with Carpenter’s tomb within it. For the bishop’s body was ‘to be buried in the chapel of the Holy Cross in the crypt beneath the high altar of the collegiate church of Westbury… [with] one mass to be said daily in the aforesaid crypt for my soul and the souls of my parents and benefactors, to continue for future times perpetually’.217 Image and actuality were thus united, and the devotional process that began at Carpenter’s death was recorded perpetually within the walls of his tomb-recess, surrounding its end-point: the tomb itself. The devotional message was completed by the nearby altar to Holy Cross. The armorial-cum-christological decoration of the pall, integrating Carpenter’s personal identity and his devotional interests, adds a further twist.

Images of funeral processions are more common in France than in England, notably in the statuary by Claus Sluter on the tomb of Philip the Bold (d. 1411) at Dijon.218 English comparisons include the mourners or bedesmen found on tombs from the late thirteenth century onwards, the singing clerics painted on the tomb of William Mainwaring (after 1399) at Acton, Cheshire, and the carved chantry priests at the foot
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216 A limewash with particles of red ochre was found, and ‘loosely bound red ochre’ (ibid.). It was possible that these were a later addition.
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218 Gill, ‘Late Medieval Wall Painting’, p. 411.
of William Wykeham at Winchester. Particularly intriguing are the almsmen and women with beads specified for the cadaver tomb of Isabel Beauchamp, countess of Warwick (d. 1439), at Tewkesbury Abbey. Apart from the Dijon example, all these depict static mourners or celebrants, with no narrative content; none shows a funerary procession. Images of funerals appear to be equally unusual in manuscript illumination, although descriptions of funerals may have had some currency as a literary genre. If it is right that much of the painting was executed in grisaille style, than that, too is a sign of some Continental influence.

Whatever the case, the crypt’s form and decoration were highly unusual. Access to it can never have been easy even for those privileged enough to enter the choir; this, and its roughly-finished stonework, place it in contrast with the purpose-built chantries of the period whose diaphanous, traceried walls called attention to their interiors and invited the prayers of passers-by, lay or religious. It is as if the crypt is somewhere on a scale between cage chantry and mortuary chamber. The crypt chapel’s decoration, likewise, owes more to personalised devotional artworks than to the more didactic mores of most architectural polychromy. The ensemble perhaps belongs with other burial monuments intended only to be seen with difficulty, such as Alice Chaucer’s cadaver by the high altar at Ewelme, which lies within stone screening with its nose a few inches from a large, but near-invisible, painting of the Annunciation, St Mary Magdalene, and St John the Baptist. Only the elaborate nature of the crypt’s conception, and its impact on the form of the church – the latter making the most of an arrangement that must have already existed – hint that this self-effacing quality might be protesting itself rather too much, the kind of thing that might have tempted better-connected visitors, at least, to request a closer look. Any visitor permitted to enter the crypt, with its charged location beneath the high altar, distinctive decoration, (presumed) skeletal effigy and subterranean atmosphere could be forgiven a devotional and aesthetic reaction of above-average intensity.

The crypt was not the only part of the church to contain painted decoration. In 1908, the recently-reopened upper chamber of the newel stair in St John’s chapel was described as being ‘richly adorned with mural painting, which covered the jambs and soffits of the doorways’. There was bright red and green on the walls and more subdued colour in the door arches; one observer thought he saw wings or a series of angels. If such an apparently insignificant space was richly coloured – given the presence of the screen and the narrowness of the doors to the screen loft, this was never an area that could be easily seen from elsewhere in the church – it is not hard to believe that much of the east end was, too. Certainly, considerable amounts of polychromy survive on the statuary, architectural sculpture, alabaster, and tiles in the parvis lapidary collection. We must factor this material into our picture of the

219 Ibid., p. 430.
220 ‘And all abowt my tumbe to be made pore men and wemen in theire pore array, with their bedes in theire handes’ (Pamela King, ‘Contexts of the Cadaver Tomb in Fifteenth Century England’ (University of York, PhD thesis, 1987), p. 439). The tomb is lost. A later tomb featuring bedesmen is the Harrington monument in Cartmel Priory, Cumbria.
221 Only two are identified by Kathleen Scott, Later Gothic Manuscripts 1390–1490, 2 vols (London, 1996), and as they are historical or legendary scenes, neither can be said to have a commemorative function. Gill, unpublished article, cites the grisailles at Eton c.1486–7, Winchester c.1498–1525, and St Mark, Bristol c.1470–1535. However we do not know to what extent we can trust Pryce’s single coloured sheet.
222 Harvey, ‘Recent Discoveries’, p. 206.
church’s decoration; but before we do this, we should discuss the largest piece of medieval sculpture at Westbury: the cadaver effigy, which now stands in the eastern bay of the arcade separating the chancel from St John’s chapel (Plate XI).

The tomb is in poor condition and has clearly had a chequered history. It lies in a stone tomb chest supplied by Oriel College, Oxford in 1853 (Plate XVI), and in imitation of the medieval arrangement at, for example, Ewelme, it can only be glimpsed through the arches of this. The effigy, an emaciated naked figure, has tonsured hair and lies in a winding sheet with one hand pulled over its genitals, standard features on tombs of this nature. Its identity is suggested by the (today rather battered) crozier at its side; this is shown in much better condition in an illustration of c.1780, when the monument was already being said to represent Bishop Carpenter. There is no reason to question this attribution. The eighteenth-century engraving also shows headless and handless angels either side of the figure. That an accompanying image of the bishop in life was never intended is indicated by the presence of Carpenter’s crozier beside the cadaver. This was at this date a unique feature: four of the five known previous episcopal cadaver effigies were double tombs, showing the dead bishop beneath, without attributes but with an elaborate sculpture in full episcopal robes above. That attributed to Bishop Lacy (d. 1455) in Exeter Cathedral is a single figure, without attributes. It is one of only six or seven single cadaver effigies of any kind known before c.1480, surely the latest possible date for the Carpenter effigy. The only one of these to have any iconography beyond the simple depiction of a shrouded corpse was the lost tomb of Isabel Beauchamp at Tewkesbury.

Three English bishops, and a whole series of other senior churchmen, created single cadaver effigies after Carpenter’s death. These again are devoid of any clue to their earthly status apart from those of Bishop Fox (d. 1528) at Winchester Cathedral and Bishop Bush (d. 1554) at Bristol Cathedral, each of whom are accompanied by a mitre and a crozier. The possibility that Carpenter’s tomb influenced these is thus worth serious consideration, particularly in the case of the Bristol monument. In any case, the decision to include the crozier at Westbury was surely a deliberate attempt to
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225 Bigland’s Gloucestershire Collections, ed. Frith, iv, 1405–1416, especially pp. 1407, 1414: ‘the effigy of a naked man in stone without arms or inscription but is said to be intended for Doctor Carpenter, Bishop of Worcester, in 1443’.
226 For possible surviving heads of these, see below, p. 168.
227 Some antiquarians suggested that the cadaver was completed in Carpenter’s life with the intention of adding a ‘full’ effigy after his death, but King, ‘Contexts of the Cadaver Tomb’, does not cite any examples of such a practice.
228 A recent and local example was the double tomb to Bishop Beckington of Bath and Wells (died 1465) created in 1451 in a chantry chapel near the high altar of Wells Cathedral.
230 The discrepancy is because one, the Barnet tomb at Bury St Edmunds (c.1467), has an upper level with heraldry and inscriptions but no effigy.
231 We have already seen that her depiction of those praying for her was likewise unusual and relevant to Carpenter’s work at Westbury.
232 The tomb of Bishop Gardiner of Winchester (died 1555 but perhaps prepared c.1540) is the latest single episcopal cadaver; he reverts to form in having no earthly attributes.
233 The best list of known cadaver effigies is in King, ‘Contexts of the Cadaver Tomb’. She demonstrates that cadavers were individually commissioned, that is the various iconographic choices made were primarily those of individual patrons rather than evidence of workshops specialising in their production.
indicate the status of the man depicted, in spite of the fact that, unlike the majority of his episcopal peers, he was to be represented by a single effigy. A reminder of the high status of the individual commemorated was by no means incompatible with the message of such tombs: ‘As ye me se in soche degree, so shall ye be a nother day,’ as it is put on the cadaver brass of John Brigge at Salle in Norfolk (c.1430). The crozier in effect allows the key quality of the double tomb – the contrast of earthly status with that after death – to be reproduced in a single one.

Where was the effigy meant to be located? The empty tomb recess in the crypt chapel is a strong likelihood, given the lack of any other surviving medieval recess or plinth in the church, and the suitably funereal focus of the iconography there. The unusual decision to commission a single tomb rather than a double one may even be guided by this, given that it permits the monument to fit into a much smaller space. The paintings would then depict the progress of the body (and presumably associated rites), while the effigy would show the body itself, with the rites continuing at the adjacent altar until Judgment Day. The main objection to this view is that it would be very unusual indeed for such a monument to be placed where it was almost invisible. It was part of the function of such effigies that they became a visible presence in the church, where they benefited from the prayers of the community and marked the role of a rebuilder or re-founder. Also, it would be odd for the crypt to be completely destroyed, but the effigy within to be preserved and placed in a more public location. We do know, however, that post-Reformation burial vaults intruded on the crypt, and it is not impossible that the effigy was found and moved into the chancel at some point after it was installed.

Carpenter was described in the early seventeenth century as being buried on the south side of the choir. In 1788 the effigy was a bay west of its current location. In a pre-restoration depiction of the cadaver, of 1840, it lies raised on what looks like a post-Reformation plinth. It thus seems that the effigy has been in the chancel from an early period. It may thus be that the current location (or somewhere nearby) is that originally intended. This would reduce the problem of the effigy’s survival, although it raises the issue of the disappearance of its tomb chest. Lying between two major altars and presumably very close to the entrance to the crypt-chapel itself, (which would then have a simple inscribed slab or brass on its tomb chest), Carpenter’s cadaver would have had an appropriate level of visibility, albeit one coded in a visual language that was suitably dismissive of worldly achievements.

---

234 King, ‘Contexts of the Cadaver Tomb’, p. 20.
235 For examples of the use of tombs, including prayer by almsmen and bedesmen, see Phillip Lindley, *Tomb Monuments and Scholarship: medieval monuments in early Modern England* (Donington, 1976), e.g. p. 29.
236 *The Church Builder* (1868), p. 22: ‘part of the chapel had been filled with rubbish, the rest used for vaults’. *Bigland’s Gloucestershire Collections*, ed. Frith, iv, 1405–1416, mentions several tombs in the chancel, including large wall monuments (several of which are depicted in Bodleian, MS Gough Somerset 2 (dated 1747)), with inscriptions such as ‘near this place lieth’… suggesting the creation of burial vaults beneath. The earliest of these was dated 1668 and must have involved a particularly large intrusion into the crypt space, for it included several members of the same family.
237 Godwin, *De Praesulibus*, i, 519.
While the north side of the high altar is a more usual location for founders/rebuilders, the south side at Westbury would have provided a location one bay nearer the high altar and between two of Carpenter's most ambitious works. Nevertheless, the vision at work in the architecture and decoration of the crypt chapel is distinctive enough for the effigy, too, to have broken the usual customs for such objects. The question must remain unresolved, but it is worth bearing in mind a third possibility: that Carpenter intended the cadaver for the crypt, but that it was moved to the chancel within a few years of his death by the Westbury clergy who had reason to make something of the remains of their dead bishop. As we will see, the fitting out of the church was carried on into the early 1480s and with considerable energy; it would be quite possible for the community to have changed aspects of the brief in the course of this process.  

In any case Carpenter was not the only monumentalised burial at Westbury, although all the others have been lost. William Vauce (d. 1479), was described as buried 'in an arch on the south wall of the chapel beneath an marble stone,' a phrase that suggests an inscribed slab or a brass. No trace can be seen of this today, nor is it found in any antiquarian account. Bigland in c.1780 enigmatically depicts beneath his engraving of the Carpenter cadaver the effigies of a knight and a lady, probably both of fourteenth-century in date: either these have vanished or their ascription to Westbury is an error. An alabaster effigy of a priest at St Mary Redcliffe (Plate VII), a work of exceptional quality and interest known since 1608 as one of two effigies in the church to William Canynges (d. 1474), has often been said to have been brought from Westbury at some point. There is however no evidence for this, and the story should probably join the many other apocryphal associations of William Canynges with buildings in Bristol and its hinterland, such as the ascription of St Mary Redcliffe itself to him. At Westbury, for example, we have the tendency of antiquarian writers to call St John's chapel the 'Canynges chapel' without any evidence to that effect. Some of this supposition may be rooted in the fact that Canynges' funeral procession, like Carpenter's, went on a journey, in its case from Westbury to St Mary Redcliffe, with both communities involved in the resulting commemorations.

In addition to all this there is material in the lapidarium that could be associated with monumentalised burials. A good quality late medieval female head is one candidate, although it is a little flat and small to have been an effigy and may have

---

239 For an example of a community moving the monument of a high-profile deceased patron to a more appropriate and visible location, despite his stated wishes, see the discussion of the monument to the Black Prince at Canterbury in Christopher Wilson, 'The Medieval Monuments', in A History of Canterbury Cathedral, ed. Patrick Collinson and others (Oxford, 1995), pp. 451–510.

240 Cartulary of St. Mark's Hospital, ed. Ross, p. 119.

241 The lady appears to have something in her hands, perhaps indicating a heart burial (Bigland's Gloucestershire Collections, ed. Frith, iv, 1411).

242 Williams, Chantries of William Canynges, citing Camden, Britannia (London, 1607), i, 86, as does Pryce, Memorials of the Canynges Family, pp. 185–187. Both mention the story of the monument being originally from Westbury.


244 For example, in c.1780 (Bigland's Gloucestershire Collections, ed. Frith, iv, 1415).

245 Williams, Chantries of William Canynges, p. 75.
been a roof corbel. The two fourteenth-century pinnacles could be from an elaborate Decorated tomb recess; one might then link them with the fourteenth-century effigies shown by Bigland. And then there are two large and very fine fifteenth-century heads, 13 and 15.5 centimetres high (5.1 inches and 6 inches) respectively, and one piece of a carved hand with fingers bent, that is, holding something rather than in prayer. These pieces, comparable to each other in scale, are from an image that was far larger than any of the other sculpture in the parvise. Indeed they look like parts of the addorsed angels either side of the head of a lost monumental tomb: could they possibly be the heads shown as missing from the angels depicted on Carpenter’s cadaver in c.1780? The facts that they are in excellent condition and the effigy is not suggest an early separation of tomb and angels’ heads. This could have occurred during the period of iconoclasm when the crypt itself was probably destroyed. Whether or not the effigy was located there, pieces struck from it could have been deposited in the crypt; indeed they seem to have fared rather better in their hidden location than the cadaver of which they were perhaps a part.

All remaining material in the lapidary collection is fragmentary, and all of it is of good, sometimes outstanding, quality, and certainly (or in the case of the statuary almost certainly) of the fifteenth century: they can be taken as representing reredoses or other fittings and decorations from Carpenter’s east end (Plate XIII). The architectural fragments, some of which retain their polychromy, cannot be reduced to fewer than two, more likely three, fittings: perhaps two or three reredoses, or one or two reredoses and sedilia, or a reredos and sedilia. Only three pieces incontrovertibly belong together. They are parts of matching miniature canopies, with steep, curved gables, delicately cusped and crocketed; the two largest pieces show these were separated by micro-architectural pinnacles, containing the springings of miniature vaults. These sprang not from supports lower down but from foliage sprigs that curl under the bases of the pinnacles, meaning that these canopies were freestanding to the front. There is just enough curvature of vault and gable remaining to estimate an original span width of 18–20 centimetres (7–8 inches) for each arched gable; they were clearly part of a wider bay, perhaps of three gables, i.e. about 55 centimetres (21 inches) wide. Another possibly related fragment shows at least three fictive ribs meeting at a foliate boss. A deep shade of red applied to the ‘background’ helps the crockets of these pieces to stand out. It is typical of the surviving areas of colour. The pieces seem very good as the canopies of sedilia; alternatively each canopy may represent one niche in a reredos, which would in turn fit the widest piece of surviving statuary, which we will shortly discuss, reasonably well. A separate piece of stonework, polygonal and with simple rosettes and more fragments of colour, suggests a base for such a niche.
pieces could work as a delicately-panelled rear face to a composition of, say, two levels.  

The other fragments are harder to put together. They seem to be from a second structure: perhaps a screen and, or, another reredos (the latter seems more likely), which had elaborate openwork panelling, was in parts freestanding, and incorporated micro-architectural pinnacles. Some of these fragments are intriguing: these include, for example, a single piece of foliage covered in well-preserved gilding and a ‘fragment of an arch carved to represent drapery’. All of this work has certain design traits in common, in particular very refined detailing and a liking for rather elongated forms that must have given a considerable vertical emphasis to the resulting composition. A close, and once impressive, local comparison is the reredos at the east end of the north choir aisle in St Augustine’s Abbey, Bristol, undated and now badly damaged and overlain with later monuments. It is possible that both are the products of a local workshop specialising in such fittings whose other products are either lost or yet to be identified; the workshop’s distended, elaborate approach can be distinguished from otherwise comparable fittings in local churches, such as the elaborate reredos and nichework in St Mark’s chapel, Bristol. The Westbury fragments could, indeed, on stylistic grounds alone (and like those at St Mark) be dated after 1500, a period of particular refinement and inventiveness in architecture. But this is only a possibility. All the dateable fittings, such as the tiles, are emphatically of the Carpenter era, and without further evidence to the contrary these should remain Carpenter or immediately post-Carpenter installations.

In addition to these pieces of architectural sculpture, there are seven fragments of statuary, most of them torsos or parts of leg areas, from figures originally roughly

---

252 For example, ibid., C3 and A6 (which retain colour, the latter green with white flowers). C17 is a stretch of an ogee cusped arch, with a finial and surviving colour; the fine cusping and thin narrow form relate to the above canopy work but this piece was clearly set into a wall originally, as was the finial fragment, C21.  
253 These include ibid., C9, fragment from the upper parts of thin, finely-cusped panels; C18 and C19, two stretches of mullions, blank on the reverse; C3, C4, C14 and perhaps C15, more micro-architectural fragments, some of them designed to be seen from both sides. A miniature base is visible on C12, and a base and a capital on C3, with crockets rising near-vertically above; C14 has a finial and the springing for a panel. These suggest panels of comparable width and style, with fine micro-architectural details such as bases and capitals. Less easy to reconcile are C11, fragment of panelling with crocket and a cusp; and C13, top of a thin canopy with squareish crockets of different style to those discussed above. These two were grouped together by James Russell as parts of a larger, slightly less finely detailed ‘canopy II’ along with C10, another piece of niche head with step crockets, toy vaults and colour; and C20, fragment of micro-architectural crockets from the top of a largish pinnacle, perhaps compatible with Russell’s ‘canopy II’. One might add C15, another canopy fragment, with tiny capitals and bigger crocket.  
254 Ibid., D12. The gilded fragment is C16. There are also D11, ‘a small primitive head from an external pinnacle’, although it does not fit the surviving pinnacles; C25, an unidentifiable fragment suggestive of part of a rib or even an angel’s wing; C22, a ‘tracery fragment’; and C24, a ‘fragment of internal vaulting’. Among other more interesting fragments that cannot definitively be placed together are C2, a pendant head from a large canopy, with its face chipped away; C16, a single piece of foliage covered in well-preserved gilding; and C5, a big piece of moulding, the roll of which has an emphatically ogival section. James Russell has also recorded a badly defaced head with traces of yellow paint, perhaps with an attached column above, omitted from the catalogue; I have not seen this in the parvise.  
255 Russell compares the work to surviving fittings at Tewkesbury Abbey; the reredos in the Lady chapel at Wells Cathedral may also bear comparison.
60cm (2 feet) high (Plate XIII). They are rather worn, meaning that confident identification of some surviving forms is not easy. There are no heads; only one has a hand visible; two have bare feet. None appear to the current author to be broken parts of a single statue. The largest, or rather the broadest, is a single seated figure. The others are all standing; they appear to represent two sizes, perhaps from different orders of one reredos. The finest have a swaying elegance, suggestive more of the stylised S-curved stance of International Gothic than the weighty solidity of the sixteenth century. All these figures presumably originally carried an identifier: signs of two of these can be seen, only one of which bears further discussion. This is on the large, seated figure, a single battered upper torso raising both arms: the right hand holds an object with a square base, the other is only a stump, but the base of something perhaps associated with it can be seen on the chest area nearby. This figure could have been a central image, tentatively a Christ in Majesty. It would have fitted well beneath the broadest of the above stretches of canopy work. The suggestion then – hesitant though it is, given the fragmentary evidence – is of a single reredos, perhaps in two orders, with a central seated figure; alternatively the figures are from perhaps two different reredoses, each with rich stone niche-work.

Finally, there are the pieces of alabaster. Though fragmentary, these are clearly products of the best-quality producers of ‘Nottingham alabasters’, and two, including one near-complete figure in good condition, are not paralleled in any of the known alabasters of the era. Four others are too fragmentary to be discussed further. Another, rather larger, features some foliage or a finial rising in front of a battered stretch of moulding: this could be architectural imagery from some larger scene, but it could also perhaps be the top of a lily from an Annunciation, with the moulding behind representing a parapet in the House of the Virgin. Then there is a single head, with drapery or wings behind, against a green background: this looks very like an annunciating angel, although it could equally belong with the two most intriguing pieces. The first of these is a little image of a church. It comes complete with a ‘west front’, its twin windows just traceable; a ‘nave’ with a moulded parapet and widely-spaced crenelations, and to one side a carved ‘central’ spirelet topped by a cross. The second is a seated figure, perhaps once cowled (the head is missing), holding a long scroll in one hand on which the other hand writes with a pen. This attractive piece

256 BRO, P/HTW/X/13, B3–8, B8. B4 and B5 have bare feet. Russell interprets B3, ‘with belt at the waist’, and B4 as parts of the same statue. He likewise sees B6 and B7 as one figure, perhaps female, and B6 as comprising almost an entire figure excepting the feet, hands, shoulders and head; on the base of the latter an unidentifiable object is visible, with very well-carved folds of drapery falling from the shoulders and visible behind it. To the present author, the figures do not quite fit: the drapery folds do not match, or the resulting figure is too long. B10 is a fragment of drapery. Russell points out that the statues are covered in a layer of white, and may have been built into a wall at some point; he records patches of gold leaf on some.

257 BRO, P/HTW/X/13, B10.

258 The object would then be a book, and the left hand, oddly, raised in blessing. Or could it be a church (suggesting Oswald) or (less likely) a Trinity or God the Father?


260 They are BRO, P/HTW/X/13, A7 (a pinnacle from some larger scene); A2 (drapery, perhaps over a knee); and A3 and A5 (both drapery).

261 Ibid., A8, ‘badly defaced fragment’.

262 Ibid., A1.

263 Ibid., A6.
could be an Evangelist, a Church Father, or a Prophet, although none of the surviving alabasters depicting any such personages is in a comparable pose (Plate XIV). It could also have been a one-off image of a cleric displaying an iconographic ‘key’ to a scheme, though such a figure would be unlikely to hold a pen. Both pieces are unique among known alabasters and they may not belong together.

One potential line of enquiry, however, could be that the seated figure depicts St John the Evangelist on Patmos, and that this and the church both come from a series depicting either the Life or the Revelation of St John. These subjects, more common in the thirteenth century, had a brief flowering around 1400, for example in the bosses of the Norwich cloisters (1320s–1430s), the wall paintings of the Westminster Abbey chapter house (1375–1404, perhaps 1390s), the glazing of the east window at York Minster (1405–8), and the illuminations of the Sherborne Missal (1396×1407). The depictions of St John in these vary considerably, but at Westminster Abbey a seated, writing Evangelist can be seen in the lower corner of several images, sometimes accompanied by an angel; he is present in that showing the Seven Churches (Revelation, 1: 10–11), which also includes little images of the churches themselves. The main objection to such a proposal at Westbury is that one might expect an Evangelist to hold a book or chalice rather than a scroll. In any case the evidence is slight indeed. What can be said is that the subject of these sculptures was highly unusual. We know that the Nottinghamshire alabasterers took one-off commissions, and the surviving work in the crypt makes it clear that Carpenter was perfectly capable of specifying unique iconographic schemes.

We thus have indications of several reredoses, perhaps one or two of stone and one or two of alabaster, to locate within the church. Here, firstly, the Carpenter-era high altar can never have had a large reredos: almost any fitting here would have blocked the windows, which should themselves be seen as playing a reredos-like role. At
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264 Cheetham, Alabaster Images, passim.
265 The device is in any case commoner in the thirteenth century. Examples can be seen on the inner door of the north porch at Wells, and the north wall arcade of the Elder Lady Chapel at St Augustine’s Abbey, Bristol.
266 The church is too big to be an attribute held by a founder or donor, and I can find nothing similar in Cheetham, Alabaster Images.
267 At Norwich Cathedral, St John is often shown accompanied by an angel. The only scene where he is writing (or perhaps reading) rather than witnessing one of the events in the Revelation is in the south walk (1320s-40s), where he sits at a lectern (CSC1 in the numeration of Martial Rose, The Norwich Apocalypse (Norwich 1999)). In the west walk (1420–30) a church-like structure with a central tower is ‘the temple’ of Revelation 14: 14–17 (CWD5; Rose, The Norwich Apocalypse, (Norwich 1999), passim; Francis Woodman, ‘The Gothic campaigns’ in Norwich Cathedral, ed. Ian Atherton and others (London, 1996), pp. 158–96). At York, St John is frequently shown, but not writing, and the seven churches are depicted as angels in niches (Thomas French, York Minster: the great east window (Oxford and London, 1995), passim.). The Sherborne Missal shows him in the middle of seven similar niches, and in other images on the same page, seated at a desk, writing in a book (Scott, Later Gothic Manuscripts, ii, 45–60).
269 He is also shown with a scroll in the Hours of Catherine of Valois (1420×1437) (Scott, Later Gothic Manuscripts, ii, 213–15). It could also be countered that images of John writing on Patmos were unusual enough for some variation to be possible.
270 Such as that featuring the life of St James commissioned by the English priest John Goodyear for an altar at Compostella in 1456 (Cheetham, Alabaster Images, p. 4).
271 Even today lighting has had to be installed on the Victorian reredos, beneath the east window of the apse, so that its image of the Last Supper is legible in spite of the windows above.
best we can imagine a small alabaster retable here. Secondly, what we know of the
crypt decoration suggests that it was at once iconographically specific, of high quality,
and small in scale. There is in any case no space for a substantial stone structure. A
customised alabaster or group of alabasters is thus a good possibility here. However
the architects placed all the sills of the windows in the east end on the same levels as
those in the apse, creating – because the apse is set so high above the rest of the church
– substantial blank spaces above the altars of the side chapels. These would then
become good locations for large stone reredoses, or perhaps multi-layered
arrangements of alabasters. We have also noted the archaeological evidence for an
altar in the nave south aisle: any large reredos here would have been freestanding.
Could this perhaps explain the fragments of screenwork among the architectural
sculpture in the parvis?

In short we may be able to postulate stonework at four or five altars: Holy Cross
in the crypt (small reredos, perhaps alabaster), the Trinity in the sanctuary (small
reredos, perhaps alabaster), St John in the south chancel chapel (large reredos, perhaps
stone), St Mary in the north chancel chapel (large reredos, perhaps stone), and possibly
an unidentified dedication in the nave south aisle (large reredos?). This fits our general
analysis of the surviving material well, but contradicts the iconographic suggestions
resulting from it, which would posit alabasters of St John the Evangelist in St John’s
chapel, with a Marian subject in the Lady Chapel, and a large stone reredos featuring
God the Father or the Trinity on the high altar. The evidence cannot be taken any
further.272

The tiles in the parvis too are of exceptionally good quality.273 They are clearly of
the ‘Malvern school’ whose elaborate work often combines many tiles fitting together
to make large, repeated compositions with inscriptions and heraldry specific to the
church in which they were installed. Particularly good collections can be found at
Great Malvern Priory and St Peter’s Abbey, Gloucester. Among the most interesting
Westbury pieces are two central sections of a group displaying the arms of Bishop
Carpenter, presumably part of a many-tiled display.274 It is said that these were found
on the floor of the crypt in 1852.275 There is also a tile from a sequence displaying an
inscription with the arms of Abbot Newland (or Nailheart) of St Augustine’s Abbey,
Bristol, a great builder in his own right.276 Like Carpenter, Newland adopted arms
that incorporated a religious motif; his badge is seen in many places in the abbey and
its occurrence at Westbury is interesting but unexplained.277 Other tiles are more
purely decorative, but still include several elaborate grouped arrangements: at least

272 Another suggestions is that some of the stone panel work in the parvis was intended to support
the alabasters, although Cheetham, Alabaster Images, p. 3, makes it clear that all known settings for alabasters
were wooden.
273 Seven are illustrated and discussed in Harvey, ‘Sculptured Stone-work’, pp. 36–40.
274 BRO, P/HTW/X/13, T4 and T5, where it is implied that the Carpenter’s arms tiles are restored, although
they may just be exceptionally well preserved, and that they are from a four-tiled pattern. Harvey
(‘Sculptured Stone-work’) agrees with this, but it is surely an error.
275 The floor had been laid with encaustic tiles, many of them bearing the arms of Bishop Carpenter’ (The
Church Builder (1868), p. 22).
276 Harvey, ‘Sculptured Stone-work’, p. 40, gives the full inscription as Adjuva nos deus salutaris noster
et propter gloriam nominis tu domine libera nos, making this the second of the set. He cites three similar
sets made for St Augustine’s itself and dated 1481–1525.
277 Below, p. 174.
two were made up of as many as 16 tiles: to select one example, in this case from a four-tile group, we have a rose in a circle containing little floral paterae, with a green man in the spandrel. The presence of Carpenter’s arms on tiles is to be expected, but it is not clear whether they were visible in the church or in the more private world of the crypt.

This review of the lapidary material should be set in the context of what we know generally about the church’s fitting and decoration. Here we can assume that the church contained images of the Virgin and other dedicatees, and also that (given the scale of the newel stairs, especially that on the south side, and the provision of special windows at the east end of the clerestory) the church’s timber fittings, screens, and the rood itself are likely to have been of above-average magnificence. Choir stalls of comparable quality can be assumed, too. There was a pulpit by 1497 and perhaps an image of the Virgin in a tabernacle after 1510; the former may have been there for some time, but the latter, although certainly somewhere in the parish, need not have been at Westbury church itself. There are also tantalising references to a once-rich programme of stained glazing. In 1779, an observer reported that ‘the figures of St Augustine, St Gregory, and St Ambrose, with their names’ could be seen in the north window of the chancel: in other words Doctors of the Church filled one side of the ‘triptych’ of apse windows. The same observer saw a display of heraldry in the north aisle, though another commentator suggests that this was post-Reformation. A stray reference of the eighteenth century mentions a glazed image of Carpenter somewhere in the building. Finally, there is one remaining piece of statuary, outside the church and in situ, this is a good quality piece, stylistically reasonably comparable to the statuary in the parvise; it is often said to be an image of Carpenter himself. However a donor in such a location would surely be accompanied

---

278 BRO, P/HTW/X/13, T8. One sixteen-tile group has a dragon between part of a large quatrefoil and another circle with flowers, T6; another a ‘green lion’, perhaps one of an adored pair, in a similar circle, comparisons for which at Acton Court and Marlborough were put forward by James Russell, T9; then there is a large leaf in the spandrel of another circle-with-flowers, T7; part of a smaller circle with the mouth of a beast visible, T11; the foot of a leopard with a decorative feature beneath, T12; another shield, containing Instruments of the Passion arranged around a cross, the shield set within a quatrefoil (Harvey, ‘Sculptured Stone-work’, says this can also be found at Tewkesbury abbey), T2; another piece of a circle, T13, from a four-tile group; an unidentified pattern, T14; and a single smaller tile with a fleur-de-lis, T10. The latter example shows some similarity with late thirteenth-century tile patterns as well as fifteenth-century ones and its dating is thus less certain. Finally, there are five undated plain tiles, two with a black glaze, T15–19.

279 Parvise materials not mentioned in the foregoing account include BRO, P/HTW/X/13, a fragment of a gable end cross, identified by James Russell as thirteenth-century but surely Victorian, D5; a large stone mortar, D6; a large stone waterspout, D7; two ‘ball finials’ (or fragments from a post-Reformation monument?), D13 and D14; Victorian pinnacles one painted and gilded D15, D16, and D17; and 13 other post-Reformation fragments, most of them clay pipes but including three pieces from funerary monuments and two bowls, one seventeenth-century and found nearby and presented to the church in 1925, M1–M4.

280 Above, p. 92.

281 Rudder, *New History of Gloucestershire*, p. 803. BL, Add. MS 33,847, part ii, dates heraldic panels in the church to c.1568. It is possible that the Church Doctors were Laudian rather than medieval.

282 Above, p. 92.

283 On being told the image was of Carpenter, the clerk, a former mason, looked in a book ‘to see what kind of a head a bishop had, and I made him one and stuck it on!’; this took place ‘soon after my induction’ (Wilkins, *Some Chapters*, p. 16).
by a saint, especially given the rather studied self-effacement of Carpenter’s subterranean chantry chapel and memento morti effigy. An image of the Trinity seems more likely. If severely weathered, such an image could appear as a single figure today.

In summary, while we know little about the architecturally plainer areas in the west part of the church, the east end seems to have been very richly decorated indeed: on a grand scale around the high altar, with its striking setting, and side chapels; and with a distinctive twist in the crypt. Apart from the figure on the tower, all this is likely to date from a single fitting-out of the church after the roofs had been completed in the mid-1470s, although it might have been begun in the last year or so of Carpenter’s life and have been completed posthumously. Although the crypt was structurally isolated and could conceivably have been fitted out earlier – even within Carpenter’s lifetime – it seems even here that this was not the case. There is something inherently unlikely, even by medieval standards, about painting a funeral procession with such care when it had not yet occurred. There is also a towered structure on the far left of the image of Worcester in the crypt, separated from that city by trees. This may be the bishop’s manor at Northwick, north of Worcester, where Carpenter died, a detail that the bishop himself cannot have predicted when outlining his wishes for decoration of the chapel. Here the implication is a strong one that the brief came from Carpenter but was completed after his death. The wall paintings closely reflect the provisions of his will – they almost illustrate them – and the architecture of the crypt and its decoration are clearly part of a single conception. This is at once original and strongly suggestive of an iconographical intent, further implying that the patron rather than his master mason lies behind it. Such patrons could, as Isabel Beauchamp did at Tewkesbury, outline their wishes in some detail when drawing up a will, but Carpenter’s ideas could equally well have been transmitted verbally before his death or written up in some document that has been lost.

Figures in the community who had been close to Carpenter probably played a key role in ensuring that his wishes were followed, and here William Vauce is of interest. He witnessed Carpenter’s will, he became dean in 1476–1478, and his burial in Westbury church was also monumentally expressed. His tomb was in an arch of the south wall of St John’s chapel, perhaps suggesting some involvement in its building works. Vauce died in 1479, so it is all the more interesting to note that fitting out was still underway in the early 1480s. The installation of tiles would have been the last stage of such a project, and these cannot have been commissioned before John Newland became abbot of St Augustine’s, Bristol in 1481. Given this extended time frame, and the ambition of the fittings that resulted, it is tempting to speculate that

---

284 The tower lower niche is rather too small and too far from the above statue to have supplied this.

285 As an example of what was possible, Bishop Beckington of Wells had his cadaver tomb prepared well before his death.

286 Gill, ‘Late Medieval Wall Painting in England’, p. 429. The identification of these buildings with Northwick is made in Gill’s unpublished article; it is possible, however, that the building is merely a compositional device.

287 Cartulary of St. Mark’s Hospital, ed. Ross, pp. 118–121.

288 The tiling is clearly all of a piece and cannot be part of the documented new pavement of 1460–1, which as we have seen, if it was an elaborate work at all, is unlikely to have extended beyond one or two chapels, or to have survived the rebuilding of the east end.

289 Above, p. 172. Carpenter’s will was still being implemented in 1482 (above, p. 64).
some of them were a response by the Westbury community to an emerging cult at the
tomb, the subject of the intriguing report by John Rous (died 1491). Whether this
was the case or not, the community would surely have viewed Carpenter as a kind of
re-founder, and it would have been in their interests to make permanent and visible
the role of a bishop of Worcester who had selected their collegiate foundation as his
burial place.

The sense of a patronal hand shaping the overall scheme is strengthened when one
looks at the iconography of these works. It is tempting, for example, to see a certain
amount of planning in the dedications of altars. Notwithstanding the fact that altars
to the Trinity (the dedication of the church since at least 1297), the Virgin Mary (the
likely focus of the altar in the north choir aisle), and Holy Cross (if the latter predates
the Carpenter era) may have already stood in the church, one can perhaps see in these
the outline of an iconographic programme. By adding a balancing southern chapel of
St John to the northern one of St Mary, the side chapels reflect the respective
positions of their dedicatees as depicted at the crucifixion on the rood screen between
the two chapels. Meanwhile, to the east, the altar of Holy Cross in its subterranean
setting reflects the situation before Christ’s Resurrection; the high altar directly above,
site of the redemptive power embodied by the Eucharist, then has an highly
appropriate dedication to the Trinity, emphasising the risen Christ’s unity with God
in Heaven.

The setting in the crypt of Carpenter’s cadaver, both carved and actual, would thus
be highly appropriate for one who awaited bodily resurrection. It also raises questions
about the function of the crypt chapel. There are several Continental examples of
elaborate sculptural representations of the Resurrection being installed in pre-existing
crypts, some of which were ancient, in the course of the fifteenth century. The crypts
were then apparently used to symbolise the Tomb of Christ during Easter rituals. Could
Carpenter have been attempting such a thing? This would provide a function, as the
setting for an Easter Sepulchre, for the north wall of the crypt chapel, explaining why
Carpenter’s tomb is on the south rather than the north. The crypt, then, becomes an
image of the Tomb of Christ, incorporating space for an Easter Sepulchre. Not for the
first time, Carpenter seems aware of Continental developments at a time when there
was little foreign influence on English architecture. On the other hand one equally
might observe that Easter Sepulchres in England were normally placed in chancels.

So the underlying conception at Westbury church seems to have come from Bishop
Carpenter himself, especially with regard to the architectural and decorative
arrangements for his burial. St John’s chapel was perhaps a more corporately-focussed
space. The refounded college played a variety of roles: place of daily worship, site of chantry masses, home to a community, place of education, and almshouse. Carpenter was at once everywhere and nowhere in the resulting design. Much of the complex, from the ironwork on the doors to the tilework on the floors, reminded those who saw it to pray for his soul; yet his burial chapel managed to be almost invisible, while also underpinning the High Altar itself. The result was a remarkable ensemble, with dramatic architectural qualities and, quite possibly, a thorough synthesis of decorative, structural, liturgical, devotional, and iconographic concerns.

The College Buildings

The accommodation which Bishop Carpenter created for the members of his refounded community was every bit as substantial as that at their church. At least two structures were built on the upper site, around the north and west ends of the church,
one of which survives, while the lower site was reorganised with the construction of the building known today as the college, about one-eighth of which survives, and probably other buildings, including an outer gate-house.294

The surviving building on the upper site is number 38 Church Road (currently Elsie Briggs House of Prayer), which stands on the south side of the road and immediately west of the churchyard gates. This is a small-scale late-medieval hall-house, identified as a Carpenter-era structure by the iron cross crosslet on its door. In spite of having had an upper floor inserted and a post-Reformation cottage added to the west, it is substantially intact. Its frontage features square-headed one- and two-light windows and a single door with a four-centred arch. Inside there is a good late medieval roof with arched windbraces; it is especially well preserved in the central third of the building, into which the current chimneystack was later inserted. This area was originally the hall.295 The house was perhaps built as the residence of a parish clerk, gate porter, or some such figure; it would have usefully overlooked the gate in the college wall mentioned in contemporary documents,296 as well as the approach to the church. Indeed the almsfolk housed in the vicinity could not have left the area of the church without passing it.

There were also two structures now lost, both just inside the churchyard itself. One, which we have called the ‘North Almshouse’, stood parallel to the north side of the church, and was almost certainly an almshouse throughout its existence. Less is known about the other, the ‘West Almshouse’, which lay to the west of the church, parallel to the edge of the churchyard, with 38 Church Road immediately beyond. This was an almshouse in the eighteenth century, but we do not know if it had this function before the Reformation: it could, for example, have been a church house used for parish functions. It was demolished after 1804.297 One possibility is that the ‘North Almshouse’ was for the poor men and the western building was for the poor widows, both groups being mentioned in Carpenter’s time. Accommodation for poor widows certainly existed. It is first recorded in 1470–1, and described as ‘next to the collegiate church’, but this could relate to either site.298 Little is known of the nature of the ‘West Almshouse’, although archaeology must survive in the churchyard. A map of 1792 shows a structure about twice as long as the medieval part of 38 Church Road.299 Bigland’s view of c.1780 depicts the northern end of this building, with a gable; all the detail is in shadow.300 It was presumably a domestically-scaled structure, comparable in scale to 38 Church Road.

The ‘North Almshouse’ is called in a fifteenth-century document ‘The Almshouse’ and in a sixteenth-century source ‘Christ’s Poorhouse’.301 Part of the site was

---

294 On the history and usage of these buildings, see also above, pp. 73–5.
295 Elevations and sections by architects Ferguson Mann, Bristol, along with a redrawn plan of c.1925, can be seen in Hall, Elsie Briggs House of Prayer.
296 Above, p. 71.
297 Russell, ‘The North Almshouse’, pp. 14–25, describes its subsequent history and use as an almshouse (and perhaps for a period as a church house) until a new parish poor house was built in 1804.
298 The Great Red Book of Bristol, ed. Veale, iv, 72–73.
299 Wilkins, Some Chapters, facing p. 24–5, shows the site clearly. There is a small gap between 38 Church Road and the almshouse, which is depicted as only a little longer than that building.
300 Bigland’s Gloucestershire Collections, ed. Frith, iv, 1406.
301 Above, p. 72.
excavated in 1975–88. While this may have housed almsfolk of both sexes, or even the poor priests maintained in the college, it most certainly housed the six poor men, first heard of in 1466 when they were probably already living on this site, since Carpenter is described as having created for them a building opposite the gateway to the college. Creation of the 40–metre (131–foot) terrace on which this stood was a major undertaking, excavated into the side of the steep hill immediately north of the church. The resulting structure was comparable in length to the church, and presumably contained either communal accommodation or small independent dwellings, with perhaps a communal hall or kitchen. All of its ground-floor parts were linked by a rear passage, doors to which were discovered in the excavations; a single surviving window in the eastern wall indicates that there were simple square-topped Perpendicular windows on the lines of those at 38 Church Road and the college building itself. A survey of 1800 and the remains of a corner buttress demonstrate that the building had an upper floor. It is probable that from this, the churchyard (and, via the blocked door at the west end of the north aisle) the church itself could be directly accessed. There were few other medieval finds, but they included part of an unfinished thirteenth-century capital and fragments of human bone. It was thus suggested that the area had been used for burials and by stonemasons in the centuries before the almshouse was constructed.

Carpenter presumably intended the core of his religious community – certainly the subdean, schoolmaster, and fellows, probably the dean, and possibly an occasional prebendary – to live in the new college building, under construction on the lower site in the 1450s. The quadrangular plan of the resulting building is still visible when walking around the site today (Figs. 13, 14). The excavations of 1968–70 also revealed underfloor dividing walls that tell us something of the internal arrangements of the areas uncovered, that is the north wing, much of the west wing, and a little of the east wing. Half of the south wing survives, although its internal divisions have been radically altered in the intervening centuries; those of the adjacent gatehouse, however, are in reasonably good condition. Parts of the west range, too, existed until 1967 in a much-altered form, but today only the north-west corner turret remains above foundation level. The lowest courses of the north wing and north-east corner turret also survive. To build the college, the substantial late thirteenth- or fourteenth-century building previously on the site was demolished and the water feature to its west filled in; foundations had to be constructed here. The new building was about 36–7 metres (118–121 feet) square, with an internal quadrangle about 21 metres (69 feet) across. Its exterior walls had turrets on each corner, each boasting a spirelet, and a gatehouse in the middle of the southern, entrance range. The resulting building, while large, would have represented a considerable reduction in the space available to the prebendaries if

---

302 Russell, ‘The North Almshouse’, pp. 14–25. This building appears to have remained an almshouse continually until 1804, at which point it had been structurally unsound for many years; it was then gutted and a series of tenements constructed within the walls, demolished in turn in about 1850. The Vestry Hall, now Parish Office, was built in 1853.

303 Above, p. 72.


306 These finds also included six pieces of pottery dating from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries, two fragments of glazed (but not patterned) tile, and two further pieces of worked stone (ibid., pp. 14–25).

their houses were anything like that which preceded the current structure; whether this mattered to a largely non-resident community, assuming appropriate accommodation for any residents was potentially available, it is impossible to say.

The college (Fig. 14; Plates III, XV) was a two-storey structure apart from the four-storey gatehouse, possibly with undercrofts in some areas. A hall probably occupied the full height of its northern range. Gable scars on the gatehouse show that the roofs of the south range (at least) were much higher than they are now. These would potentially have formed an entire attic storey, and made the corner turrets and gatehouse rather less prominent than at present. The two surviving corner turrets, at least, held newel stairs or possibly latrines.308 There was also a fifth tower, where four garderobes were found; this stood in the western range. In addition to the stairs in the corner turrets, covered access was provided by a gallery (perhaps of wood), which extended along the west, south and east sides of the courtyard.309 A square stairwell block attached to the gatehouse provided access from this gallery to the interior of the college on two levels via blocked doors which can be seen in the surviving northern wall. The footings of similar stairwell blocks filled the east and west corners of the north range. These must have provided porches or access between the ranges, and it is possible that they included stairwells, too, with access both to the gallery and to the interior of the college buildings. The north-east porch and stairwell would then have connected the hall to the spaces to the east. These spaces may have included kitchens and other ancillary areas; alternatively, a chapel or prebendal accommodation (or indeed both) may have been located here.310 Certainly, drainage was provided for this part of the building, and the kitchens of the previous structure were in this general area. The hall itself took up about two-thirds of the north range and was lit by four large windows overlooking the Trym; these were later blocked, presumably after the Reformation.311 The north-west porch and stairwell linked the hall to the accommodation in the west range. On entering this range one arrived in a lobby or parlour with rooms either side, one of which (marked ‘dorter’ in the plan, although the area might also be thought of as a focus of higher status accommodation) had access to two of the four latrines. The other two latrines were accessed from a room which occupied the rest of the west range.

Study of the connection between the west range and the surviving part of the south range is confused by several factors. The west range itself was incorporated after the Reformation into a gentry house;312 between that house and the south range stood a smaller, separate house of eighteenth-century appearance which also incorporated...
parts of the college fabric. Much of the site of this was outside the area excavated in 1968–70, and is today occupied by a modern extension to the south range, marked as a thin solid line on the plan (Fig. 13). However the north wall of the south range steps back slightly from the plane of the courtyard where it abutted the west range, and the simplest explanation of this is that there was an internal wall at this point. As for the interior of the south range itself, not shown in detail on the plan, the upper floor is now a single open space, and the lower one has been newly subdivided in the last fifty years. Prior to this the range had been converted into two cottages, one slightly larger than the other; the location of the party wall between them can still be traced. It may mark an original internal division of the wing, the western part of which had its own access to the outside of the college via a doorway which has been unblocked and restored and through which the college is today accessed from College Road.

However the main entrance to the complex, and its most architecturally impressive and best-preserved element, was the gatehouse. This has a vaulted entrance passage on its ground floor, which was originally entered through a four-centred arch, now much-renewed and filled in with glazing. The passage within is ceiled with a two-bay rib vault. The opening into the courtyard beyond it has a massive segmental-headed arch with two orders of chamfered mouldings. The rib vault is carried on polygonal moulded brackets; it has ridge ribs and cross ribs supported by very depressed four-centred arches, very plain for an era in which a lierne vault, or even a fan vault, would have been quite possible. There are stone bosses on the ridge ribs, all bar one of which carry foliage; the exception is the central boss, a well-carved representation of the Carpenter arms (Plate XV). The main bosses are today brightly painted; it has not been possible to establish on what basis the colours, clearly modern, were chosen. A blocked arched doorway on the west side of the passage leads into what may have been a porter’s room in the lowest level of the south wing. It is 81 centimetres (32 inches) above the current ground level of the gatehouse, which is itself about 107 centimetres (42 inches) below modern street level. This area was remodelled at some point after the Reformation. A wide opening has replaced the blocked door, leading to a short tunnel-vaulted undercroft, from which steps climb upwards into the ground floor of the college. All this is of uncertain date. The east face of the gatehouse, now an external wall, has a wide, blocked opening: perhaps a fireplace.

There are three levels of office-like rooms in the gatehouse above the entrance passage. They were reached via the gatehouse’s stairwell block, which also opened onto the courtyard gallery at ground-and first-floor levels. Access to the south wing

---

313 A blocked square-headed two-light window was revealed in an upper level during demolition and was photographed by James Russell in August 1970.
314 The plan, which focuses on excavated evidence, does not show this.
315 It is clearly marked on the plan by Burroughs and Hannam architects, 1964 (NTA, Box Wx00:05).
316 A sketch in London, Society of Antiquaries, R. Paul Collection, Gloucestershire H-Z 249C (dated 1893) indicates that the artist saw this door when it was blocked and considered it to be medieval. It has been suggested (Michael Ponsford, private information) that this door was used to dole alms, although this would be more likely to have been at an entrance on the perimeter of the enclosure.
317 The only other information on interior decoration at the college comes from J. R. Bramble, ‘Ancient Bristol Documents’, part viii, *Proceedings of the Clifton Antiquarian Club*, 2 (1891), pp. 152–6 at p. 154. He mentions in a footnote that in about 1879 he had seen a tile at the college ‘bearing the arms attributed to Edward the Confessor’.
318 Michael Ponsford (private information) suggests this as an alternative location for kitchens; given the changes on the west side of the gatehouse, it is also possible that this is not an original feature.
from here appears to have been via a south-facing door (now blocked) at first-floor level, which may have led to a passage. Above the second floor the stairwell narrows to a newel stair, allowing space for a further small room to fill the third floor of the stairwell block. The main rooms above the gatehouse are lit by windows: all are original openings, as can be seen when one studies the gatehouse’s south façade from the outside. Here, antiquarian illustrations, the most useful of which was done in 1893, show sash windows almost everywhere.319 However the drip moulds of all three windows on the gatehouse survived, along with one original two-light window on the second storey; the first-floor window is a restoration, that on the third still has its sash window in place. The parapet above these has a single empty niche, originally with the Carpenter arms set beneath it;320 there are crenellations, and gargoyles on the south-facing corners of the gatehouse and stairwell block.321 The rest of the south wing was not dissimilar in character to that of the other buildings under discussion: good, solid domestic architecture. All the surviving windows apart from those on the gatehouse are ashlar-sided single-light openings, though we know square-topped windows with dripmoulds, like those in the gatehouse, also existed.

All this is impressive, if stylistically sparse, compared to such contemporary gatehouses as Abbey House at St Augustine’s Abbey, Bristol (1481×1515), the plan of which is very similar, or the Bishop’s Eye at Wells (c.1460). Westbury’s building is sober, ‘like a castle’ as Leland put it in c.1540.322 Only the design of the circular corner turrets gives the structure a playful twist. Each is ringed by a smoothly-moulded parapet with very small and widely-spaced crenellations, through which pokes a short spirelet with a very pronounced concave curve, capped by a moulded finial.323 These features can be related to the tiled conical turrets known to have existed on late-medieval west country castles. One such example, now lost, is Farleigh Hungerford, Somt.; the gatehouse at Wolfeton House, Dorset is another.324 The ogival turrets on St George’s Windsor and several Tudor-era great churches, sometimes with carved imitation tiling, are another comparator. Other such details can be seen in carved and painted depictions of buildings. Examples at Westbury itself include the emphatic parapets and widely-spaced toy crenellations on the church in the parvise alabaster, and the exotically-shaped towers and spires in the crypt chapel image of ‘Worcetta’. While an exact comparator

319 The oldest, though least useful of these, is Bodleian, MS Gough Somerset 2 (dated 1747), which ‘reconstructs’ the wing running east of the gatehouse as a mirror image of that to the north, and is probably unreliable with regard to windows; an attached caption describes the gatehouse as being moated immediately outside and makes it clear that four round towers still stood. The most useful are R. Paul Collection, Gloucestershire H-Z 249C, 1893; detailed drawings showing the pre-restoration condition of the gatehouse and the south wing, and including a sketch that indicates some blocked medieval elements. Additional drawings include BL Add. MS. 42,020, f. 62 (Edward Blore, 22, ‘Houses’, dated c.1806×1879), showing the gatehouse; BCMAG, M3438, dated 1825, depicting ‘Part of the building now erected on the site of the deanery of Westbury’, a picturesque depiction of the north-west turret overlooking the Trym; and Pryce, Memorials of the Canynges Family, second page facing p. 110 (gatehouse) and p. 156 (entrance passage).
320 R. Paul collection, Gloucestershire H-Z 249C, 1893; the chevron in the arms is just discernible today.
321 One of which was replaced in 1989 (NTA, Box 1297–4 CIR 1161).
322 Above, p. 71.
323 A good measured drawing of the north-west turret (which has lost its finial) by architects Burroughs and Hannam is in NTA, Box Wx00:05, June 1969, remedial works, scheme 1.
324 Illustrated and discussed in Charles Kightly, Farleigh Hungerford Castle (London, 2006).
to the college turrets does not appear to have survived, it may well have existed.

The resulting complex has obvious sources in the ‘model’ plan for academic colleges probably established by Bishop Wykeham’s New College, Oxford (from 1380), Archbishop Chichele’s All Souls College (from 1438), and Bishop Fleming’s Lincoln College (founded 1427, much building work done by 1437) are particularly good comparators. As a former fellow of Oriel College (from 1417), provost there (1428–35), and chancellor of Oxford University (until 1439), Carpenter would have known such buildings well. It is not yet clear how many

325 For All Souls, with which comparisons are particularly strong, see Howard Colvin and J. S. G Simmons, All Souls: an Oxford college and its buildings (Oxford, 1989). Such comparisons include a rather staid stylistic approach, although Westbury is yet simpler; high rooflines (at All Souls later filled with rooms lit by dormer windows); the provision of vestibules for access in the corners of the quadrangle (that to the chapel had an upper storey and extended into the adjacent wing, a possible interpretation of such features at Westbury); and the possible placing of kitchens to the east of the hall and extending outside the quadrangle. Colvin also discusses the contrasting traditions of college design at contemporary Cambridge.

326 The form of the buildings at Oriel in the fifteenth century is not known. The college grew from various elements including Oriel itself, St Mary Hall, Bedel Hall, and (a little later) St Martin Hall. It may thus not have been a ‘model’ work of architecture, although it was rebuilt very much on the lines of All Souls in 1620–40.
colleges outside the new, academic foundations at Oxford and Cambridge might have had such up-to-date buildings by the early 1450s, but it cannot be doubted that Carpenter was here following an up-to-date model. Our first firm date for building work at the college is 1458. However it seems likely that construction was underway, or at least that serious preparations were in progress, in the mid-1450s. The will of Dean Okeborne (d. 1455) includes the bequest of his kitchen implements to the college, and Carpenter’s draft statutes of the same year are also unlikely to be greatly separated in time from the start of building work. One prebendary at least had a chamber in the new building by 1467, and the ‘North Almshouse’ existed in 1466. Works in general are thus unlikely to have continued beyond the later 1460s and were probably concentrated in the 1450s and earlier 1460s. The college building is thus roughly contemporary with the church’s western parts. Although both projects share a certain sparseness of detail, it is hard to find detailed points of comparison between them. It seems likely that a separate workshop, specialising in domestic buildings, was brought in to build the college and associated structures in one single campaign. When completed, the outline of Carpenter’s reforms would have been set in stone, an act in some respects as final as the issuing of statutes.

It seems possible that the entire enclosure was walled, although the wall running along the Trym immediately east of the college is probably not original. It has a small arched door in it which in 1747 led to a bridge. One of the two medieval records of an outer gate in this enclosure places it near the ‘North Almshouse’ in 1446; this, perhaps with a gatehouse over it, would have stood on the north side of what is now Church Road, not far from the west end of the church (Fig. 2). The new structures in this area meant that the lower and upper sites were less dislocated from each other than at any time before or since, and the arrangement of buildings and gates ensured that the movements of everyone in the community, from dean to almswomen, were focused on the church itself.

Or were they? There are hints of the sites of prebendal houses along the edge of, and even outside, the enclosure. The estate maps of 1792 and 1870 show a long, thin strip of buildings facing the High Street, perhaps suggestive of a pre-Carpenter prebendal house, and good quality stonework has been found in several buildings in the vicinity, in particular around the crossing with the Trym. Works in 1970 at the former White Lion Inn on Passage Road, the location suggested for the fine fourteenth-century chimney mention above, revealed stonework very like that of the fifteenth-century college. Excavations of 2001 at Trym Lodge, Henbury Road – another site very close to the Trym crossing – included pottery from Beauvais and Cologne, again implying high-status occupation in the medieval period. And at 45

327 Above, p. 71.
328 Carpenter selected an old site for his new structure, with the courtyard on the site of an ancient open space, and the entrance range on the site of the proposed former deanery, an area that has apparently been the site of a building since the Anglo-Saxon era.
329 Michael Ponsford, private information. Bodleian, MS Gough Somerset 2 (dated 1747) includes a statement by James Stewart that ‘a ditch runs along by the north side of it and passes under a stone bridge built at the west corner’.
330 Above, p. 71. The other reference is to a ‘chamber over the lower gate’ in 1470 (ibid.).
331 Wilkins, Some Chapters, facing pp. 24–5.
332 Above, p. 137; Michael Ponsford and James Russell, private information.
Church Road, not far from the present High Street, works of 1973 revealed a rectangular window like those in the college corner turrets and a well-moulded stone, although these may have been robbed from the college site. It is possible that some of these buildings originated as prebendal houses, perhaps rented out after Carpenter had all these structures brought under the control of the community as a whole. We also know that even after Carpenter’s reforms, Dean Lyndsey (1479–88) built a house in Westbury on his own initiative.

The Reformation and Afterwards

The Westbury foundation was dissolved in 1544 and it and its properties were sold to Sir Ralph Sadleir at the Reformation. The college building became a private residence before being slighted by the Royalist army of Prince Rupert in 1645 to prevent its being used by advancing Commonwealth forces. The east range, north range, and half the south range were left in ruins. Subsequent landlords converted the surviving part of the south range into low-status dwellings; the west range was re-invented, with much fabric remaining, as a late seventeenth or early eighteenth-century gentry house with fine staircases; this building featured some of the earliest use of brick in Bristol. By 1879 the remainder of the south range faced demolition. It was bought for use by the community in 1894 and given in 1907 to the National Trust, which today leases it to the parochial church council. However no use was found for the gentry wing, which had long been in decline. It was accepted into ownership by the National Trust in 1925 but by the 1960s was in a very poor state of repair. A proposal to demolish it, already under discussion, was implemented after fire damage in 1967. Subsequent site clearance and the construction of Westminster Court, the sheltered housing now occupying much of the site, gave the opportunity for the excavations of 1968–70 to take place. Meanwhile, the two almshouses at the upper site had been demolished after 1804. The site of the ‘West Almshouse’ was incorporated into the burial ground, while the Vestry Hall occupies part of the site of the ‘North Almshouse’, the rest of which has been divided between adjacent gardens. Number 38 Church Road remains in Church hands: it is owned by the diocese of Bristol and leased to a trust. The possibility that some of the former prebendal houses

333 Excavations at Trym Lodge, Henbury Rd, Westbury-on-Trym, 2000–1, Channel Archaeology (Bristol, c.2001).
334 James Russell, private information.
335 Above, p. 88.
336 A detailed history can be found in Wilkins, Some Chapters, pp. 17–33. Bramble ‘Ancient Bristol Documents’, pp. 152–6 provides more detail on the fire. Michael Ponsford’s excavations confirmed that most of the destruction took place as a single incident of the seventeenth century (Excavations at Westbury College’, pp. 33–34).
337 Photographs by Reece Winstone of the derelict, seven-bay Georgian house, including its fine seventeenth-and eighteenth-century staircases, are held at NMR, Rw 6673–78. A detailed measured drawing of a panelled timber fireplace is in R. Paul Collection, Gloucestershire H-Z 249C (‘Fireplace in W. Block first floor, Westbury College’, dated 1895).
or their plots may also have survived the Reformation is discussed above. As to the church, Reformation and post-Reformation iconoclasm, re-orderings of various eras, natural decay, and restoration work have wrought much change. The extent of this is emphasised when one notes what has been lost: all the medieval glass, almost all the fittings and decorations, all but one of the tombs, and the original chancel floor with the crypt vault below it. The destruction of the crypt was long imagined to have been the work of Prince Rupert’s army (that is, as much grave-robbing as conscious iconoclasm) but it has been suggested that the destruction took place under Edward VI. Certainly the elevated location of the high altar was not conducive to Prayer Book worship, which required the reduction of barriers between priest and congregation and the erection of a Communion table. This may explain the aggressive treatment of the crypt, and a cult associated with Carpenter’s tomb would have made the iconoclasts all the more thorough. The aim would thus have been to break up the crypt vault and collapse the choir (and possibly side chapel) fittings into the space beneath, before sealing the result with a new lower wooden chancel floor. Carpenter’s lead coffin and other items of value might have been sold, explaining the loss of his bones, which presumably simply joined the alabaster, tile, and building rubble generated by all this as part of a deep deposit on the crypt floor. Wooden fittings would have been burnt.

Much damage was also done in the restorations of 1851 and after, overseen by the vicar of Westbury, the Rev William Cartwright, and his architect, John Norton. By this time the church was crammed with box pews and donations boards. There was a seventeenth-century tester pulpit, and the chancel arch tympanum was filled with a massive scrollwork screen bearing the royal arms. The font was eighteenth century, probably c.1750. A sundial had been added to the newel stair, complementing the medieval mass dial already there. The tower windows, as we have seen, were mostly blocked or decayed. However the decision to reconstruct most of the crypt and to place heavy-duty heating equipment there (ducts for which also had to be excavated under the church) suggests that, even as they were installing neo-Gothic fittings, the restorers thought little of destroying battered medieval material. We do not know what remains, for example of effigies, were discarded during this process which lasted into the 1860s. Although the Carpenter cadaver was rehoused in a mediævalised altar tomb between the south chancel chapel and the chancel, the church’s only other

341 Contemporary documentation includes BRO, P/HTW/Chw/8 (e-f) (dated 1852–64). A detailed, if not entirely reliable, account is that in The Church Builder (1868), pp. 16–22; another is in Harvey, A Short Account. The works of H. J. Wilkins, also vicar of Westbury, fulminate against the actions of his predecessor.
342 Bodleian, MS Gough Somerset 2 (dated 1747) illustrates this.
343 It was described by A. C. Fryer, ‘Gloucestershire Fonts’, part xvii, TBGAS, 49 (1927), pp. 123–182 at p. 131, as a ‘small circular bowl … adorned with gadroon ornamentation’ on a vase-shaped stem, likewise covered in Classical ribbons, festoons and other motifs. The Church Builder (1868), p. 21, adds that it was ‘a sort of debased Roman urn.’
344 This circular dial divided into twenty-four segments is unlikely to be Anglo-Saxon (when dials have four or eight segments) or medieval (which are not circular) (R. A. Green, Sundials, Incised Dials or Mass Clocks (London, 1926)).
345 The resulting appearance of the crypt is illustrated in Wilkins, Some Chapters, facing p. 16. The original of this pen-and-ink drawing is BRO, P/HTW/P/4 (b) (dated 1907).
surviving major monument, that of Sir Richard Hill (died 1627) was moved, and several plaques known to have been in the church in c.1780 have disappeared. Some were used to line the floor of the crypt. A protective wall was put up to isolate the tomb from the ‘stoke-hole’, but later removed; the alabasters, tiles and sculpture were transferred from the crypt by Alfred Harvey into display cabinets in the parvise in about 1905. The reredos, pulpit, screens, font, stained glass and other fittings in the church are also works of the restorers. The result is a church that, today, and despite its venerable architecture, has a rather Victorian character (Plate XVI).

CONCLUSION

To sum up, the present-day church at Westbury probably originated as an Anglo-Saxon building, or perhaps two buildings, positioned just outside a religious enclosure that may have included an earlier place of worship. The outline of this Anglo-Saxon structure may possibly be traceable in aspects of the church today, especially at the extreme east and west ends and in its unusual combination of a polygonal apse with a crypt. Changes of unknown extent were made to this building after the Norman Conquest, but it was probably still standing in c.1200 at which point work began on what, from c.1220, became an effective rebuilding, one that perhaps preserved or echoed the form of the eastern and western extremes of the previous church. The nave may be a creation of this period, and the north and south aisles certainly are. Any Anglo-Saxon features to survive in these areas were swept away in the early fourteenth century, when work probably began on rebuilding the tower and, if this had not already occurred, replacing or updating the apsidal east end. The apsidal form, with a crypt beneath, was again picked up in the 1450s when Bishop Carpenter began his wholesale ‘Perpendicularisation’ of the church. This took place in four phases which included the completion of the tower, the creation of western extensions to both nave aisles, the addition of a two-storey porch and a northern Lady chapel, the rebuilding and enlargement of the east end (including a large south-east chapel), and the raising of a clerestory. Carpenter turned the crypt into his burial chapel and enriched the building with high-quality and distinctive furnishings and decorations. Building works were probably effectively complete at the time of his death, in 1476, but the furnishing of the building continued into the early 1480s.

This sequence of events is echoed on the lower site, where excavations have revealed Anglo-Saxon, post-Conquest, thirteenth-, fourteenth-, and fifteenth-century phases, all of them suggesting ecclesiastical use. A burial ground, and perhaps a place or places of worship, could have existed on this site and have survived into the


347 This was done in 1866, when Sir Richard’s mantled crest, helm and arms (still in the possession of the church) were hanging above the tomb (‘Proceedings... at Westbury-on-Trim’, pp. 22–32). An image of the monument in its original location, the former Lady chapel, is BCMAG, Mb 1988.

348 Wilkins, *Some Chapters*, p. 14. The full list of plaques and slabs in the church in c.1780 is given in *Bigland’s Gloucestershire Collections*, ed. Frith, iv, 1406, which also transcribes the donation boards.
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thirteenth century at least. The fifteenth-century phase was carried out by Bishop Carpenter in the 1450s and probably the 1460s. It swept away a reasonably high-status building that may well have been the deanery, replacing it with a residential college building, and providing an almshouse or almshouses and a dwelling house nearer the church. The dwelling house stands, as well as the gatehouse and part of the south wing of the college itself. The latter is a solid structure modelled on the latest collegiate buildings at Oxford. The sites of some pre-Carpenter prebendal houses may also be discernible in the landscape, not necessarily all within the lower site.

How do we assess the significance of what is now an over-restored building and a much disturbed landscape, home of an ancient community which, while never of enormous wealth or influence, made its place of worship something more than a parish church, if not quite a ‘great church’? First, Westbury is illustrative of the ways in which a community of limited means was given a church with a certain architectural distinctiveness, whether (in the thirteenth century) by imitating Wells Cathedral or (throughout many centuries) by preserving its apsidal plan. The many openings created in the fifteenth-century reinvention of the building are partly explained by this, too: there were many doors because there were many screens and several ancillary spaces. This was a building that was required, at least from the Carpenter era, to play a variety of roles, and in particular to be the setting for greatly-enhanced liturgical performances.

Secondly, the church building is highly informative about the issues involved in linking historical and architectural evidence. In some ways the discoveries are reassuring. The Carpenter-era records dovetail neatly with the architectural and archaeological evidence, and even earlier when we have no documentation to support the rebuilding of the entire church in the early thirteenth century, the architecture at least reassures us that we can link much of this to a known builder-bishop. It is then tempting to use our previous key figures, Wulfstan and Oswald, as stepping stones to the circumstantial evidence for works under either or both of these figures, but here there are several problems. The physical evidence suggesting a c.1000 church is arguably better than that for one after 1092 (where there is no structural evidence at all), but the reverse is true of the documentary material. And major unresolved questions include the question of the altar in the south nave aisle, for which there is no documentation whatsoever. If the nave had a parochial function separate from the collegiate one in the chancel, one would expect some record of the fact and the location of the most important altar in the western half of the church to be beneath the rood. In any case the unusual location of the sedilia needs explaining.

Thirdly, Westbury church is a reminder of the kinds of stylistic choices involved in the construction of a church. The early thirteenth-century builders apparently thought nothing of erecting arcades with different details to each other, and the fifteenth-century masons likewise. If there was a fourteenth-century phase, it suggests influence from the brilliantly individual milieu of Bristol Cathedral’s east end. The fifteenth-century Perpendicular work at Westbury is competent and polite rather than grandstanding – a display of decor, perhaps, because it was merely doing its job. It provided an effective setting for a exceptional set of fittings and painted decoration (much of it hidden from view) and an enhanced liturgical round. Yet the result was anything but subdued in its effect, and the decoration of the crypt and its architectural relationship with the apse were sophisticated and original. The fifteenth-century response to the apse and the crypt suggests the involvement of Carpenter as patron, and raises major questions. Was there a basement space, perhaps a chapel, that
functioned throughout the centuries of change described here? If not, where did Carpenter get his idea for one? Was the area associated with some special significance or antiquity, and if so, in what form did this survive? Apses are certainly a good way of giving low-cost distinction to a church, but at Westbury, at all periods, one gets the sense that something more was going on: that something about the form itself was deemed significant and worthy of preservation, even if the reason was forgotten, or the structure rebuilt.

Westbury also contributes significantly to the as yet unwritten history of the polygonal apse: a motif so rare that many surviving examples, from thirteenth-century Tidmarsh to fifteenth-century Windsor, have been suggested as inspired by pre-existing structures. It is an important issue but one containing significant methodological traps. To what extent did builders and patrons distinguish between polygonal, square, and circular building forms, let alone derive their polygons from an octagon, a hexagon, or a rhomboid? The temptation to explain every use of the motif in terms of a lost predecessor quickly leads one into circular logic. Yet while each era has its own microhistory for the motif – the eleventh-century diocese of Worcester, thirteenth-century royal Lady chapels, fourteenth-century delight in polygonal plans, and overlapping fifteenth-century chains of influence spreading out from Coventry and Windsor respectively – it is intriguing how strongly its distribution is focused on a broadly-defined English Midlands zone, from Berkshire to Gloucestershire, Cheshire to Derbyshire. It is worth considering whether these features were particularly popular in Anglo-Saxon Mercia, presenting a motif for subsequent generations to copy. Certainly Anglo-Saxon apse-and-crypt combinations, such as they are, fit this model. Indeed crypts deserve study in their own right, but their survival outside the realm of the ‘great church’ is so varied in nature and raises so many archaeological issues that this would be a major project indeed. At least at Westbury we can be confident that Carpenter was choosing to retain an existing arrangement, even if the dating of that arrangement and the significance of his decision can only be inferred; comparable stories may be waiting to be uncovered in other places. The possibility that the crypt was an image of the tomb of Christ, in particular, would be worth exploring in other comparable locations.

Finally, Carpenter’s arrangements defy easy categorisation. The crypt is more than a burial chamber yet is also not quite a ‘chantry chapel’, while his memorialisation has unique visual qualities. It was only part of a wide-ranging reform and expansion of what had hitherto been a very modest collegiate foundation. As such his works are richly illustrative of the complex world of late-medieval memorial practises, a world in which the question of the chantry and its architectural expression is but one aspect of a rich range of possibilities. Every such monument needs assessing for its relative levels of exclusivity or access, and for the way it sets the memorial interests of one individual within the other functions of the community of which it is a part.

Westbury College and its archaeology is also a reminder of how much work remains to be done on smaller medieval prebendal and collegiate churches and their complexes. A close analysis of other fifteenth-century foundations would doubtless

351 References to medieval texts that see no meaningful difference between such forms include J. Boüker, The Bishop’s Chapel of Hereford Cathedral and the Question of Architectural Copies in the Middle Ages, Gesta, 37/50 (1988), 44–54, and The Metrical life of St Hugh, ed. C. Garton (Lincoln, 1986), p. 57.
tell us more about likely internal arrangements of Carpenter’s college and its predecessors. The church, by contrast is a reminder of what can be achieved through analysis of the archaeological, documentary, and material record. Much more remains to be discovered, buried beneath earth, plaster and limewash. This potential stretches before us into the future.

Neither the carvings in the parvise nor the finer finds from the excavations are currently on public view. The latter are held in reasonable conditions, while each time the former are handled the traces of colour on them is at risk of deteriorating further. Considerable areas of wall painting may also survive beneath the whitewash in the crypt, yet conditions there are ‘extremely unstable and deteriorating’.353 While the exercise would be costly, it would be technically possible to reveal and conserve what remains of the crypt frescoes, display in the same space the fragmentary but beautiful objects in the parvise, and re-open the east window. The result would make the crypt into an eloquent and atmospheric small museum, a homage to one man’s piety in the later fifteenth century and to centuries of religious life at Westbury before him. It would be a reminder both of what has been lost, and what can be recovered.

353 Curteis, Holy Trinity, p. 2.
PART III: CLERGY AND ALMSFOLK OF

WESTBURY-ON-TRYM, 1100–1544
CLERGY AND ALMSFOLK OF WESTBURY-ON-TRYM, 1100–1544

The first person to list the Westbury clergy was H. J. Wilkins in his book *Westbury College 1194–1544* (Bristol, 1917). He catalogued each prebend and its prebendaries separately, but this procedure is sometimes dangerous because it is not always possible to know which prebend a cleric held, especially before the middle of the fourteenth century. The present list adopts broader categories: ‘deans’, ‘canons and prebendaries’, ‘subdeans’, ‘schoolmasters’, ‘treasurers’, ‘minor clergy’ (including all other clergy), and ‘lay almsfolk’. Each person’s name, with alternative spellings of the surname, is followed by a paragraph relating to his dates of tenure. When possible, a second paragraph presents concise information about him; where no source is identified, this information comes from standard reference books such as the modern editions of J. Le Neve’s *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicaec* and the printed volumes of papal and English public records such as the *Calendars of Patent Rolls*. Wilkins attempted a more comprehensive collection of data relating to each cleric, and his book is still worth consulting in order to supplement the biographical material given here.

The following abbreviations are used, along with those listed above (p. 00):

- x: an unknown date between two known dates
- adm: admitted, admission
- app: appointed (circumstances unknown)
- coll: collated, collation (appointment and institution by the bishop)
- comp: compounded (gave surety for paying first fruits)
- depr: deprived
- exch: exchanged, exchange
- induct: inducted, induction
- inst: instituted, institution
- nom: nominated, nomination
- occ: occurs
- poss: possibly
- prob: probably
- res: resigned
- sede vacante: as a result of the see being vacant
- vac: vacated (circumstances unknown)
When a cleric in the following lists is stated as occupying a particular prebend or office, he should be understood as holding it until he resigned or died, unless otherwise stated.

When clergy exchanged benefices in different dioceses, the exchange often took place on a separate date in each one. Where this happened, the name of the diocese is given in brackets after the date.

DEANS

For other possible early leaders of the church, see below under Canons and Prebendaries

Frid
Occ. 1125×1141 as ‘dean’, poss. of Westbury church, poss. an unrelated rural dean (English Episcopal Acta, 33, pp. 80–1).

If dean of Westbury, poss. identical with Frederic (Frideric), chaplain of the bishop (ibid., p. 205).

Peter de Bristol
Res. by 1 June 1265, the prebend ‘annexed to the deanery’, so presumably dean (English Episcopal Acta, 13, p. 45). Granted a pension of 100s. per annum from the prebend, 1 June 1265 (ibid.).

Mag. Penitentiary of the bishop.

Stephen de Gnoushale
Coll. by 1 June 1265, prebend of Peter de Bristol, so presumably dean (English Episcopal Acta, 13, p. 45).

Vicar of All Saints, Bristol in 1254; rector of Filton, Gloucs. (Wilkins, Westbury College, p. 63) Rural dean of Bristol in c.1255×1260 (Cartulary of St Mark’s Hospital, p. 90).

Simon
Occ. 25 March 1274 (Cartulary of St Mark’s Hospital, p. 46).

Stephen

John de Monmonth (Monemuth)


Richard de Hertherinton
Custody of the deanery committed to him 17 Dec 1289 (Reg. Giffard, p. 366).
Hugh de Carnaria

Gilbert de Kirkeby
Res. by 31 Jan 1317 (Reg. Maidstone, f. 50r). Prob. preceded John de Stratford who follows.

John de Stratford
Coll. 14 Dec 1316 (Reg. Maidstone, f. 49v). Vac. (if effective) before 31 Jan 1317 (ibid., ff. 49v–50r).

Nicholas de Gore
Mag. Later a canon and prebendary (see below).

Ralph de Lee (de Lacu)
Exch. c. Aug 1322 (Worcester diocese) with Nicholas de Gore; previously rector of Stisted, Essex (Reg. Cobham, p. 31).

Adam de Aylineton (Ailyneton, Alineton)
Occ. 22 Sept 1333, when granted a papal licence to be non-resident for two years, at the request of Bishop Orleton in whose service he was engaged (Jean XXII: Lettres Communes, xiii, 12; CPL, ii, 396; Reg. Orleton, p. 195). Exch. 3 July 1335 (Worcester diocese) with William de Edyndon for the rectory of Milton, Oxon. (Reg. Montacute, p. 31).

William de Edyndon
Exch. 3 July 1335 (Worcester diocese) with Adam de Aylineton; previously rector of Milton, Oxon. (Reg. Montacute, p. 31). Vac. (if exch. effective) by 26 Sept 1335 (see below, Stephen Baret).
Stephen Baret (Barret)
Described as ‘of Sparsholt’, Berks. in 1336 (Reg. Montacute, f. 22v).

William de Oxon
Exch. 21 June 1336 (Worcester diocese) with Stephen Baret; previously rector of Oddington, Oxon. (Reg. Montacute, pp. 45–6). Licensed to be non-resident 21 June 1336, until 1 November next (ibid., p. 47).

John de Wodehouse
Royal grant 2 June 1353, sede vacante (CPR 1350–4, p. 464).
Son of Philip de Wodehouse (ibid.). Poss. identical with John de Wodehouse, canon of York Minster 1339–1355; died by 1 July 1355.

John de Swynlegh
Royal grant 3 Feb 1362, sede vacante (CPR 1361–4, p. 162). However on 23 Dec 1361 he had received a royal grant of the prebend of Richard de Thornerton i.e. Henbury (ibid., p. 132) and was adm. 11 Feb 1362 to that prebend (Reg. Sede Vacante, p. 207), so the grant of the deanery may be a mistake and, if true, was short-lived (see below).
For further information, see below under Prebendaries.

Richard de Cornwayle

Robert Wattes

John Menhir (Menhyr)

John Beverley
Coll. and inst. 13 Feb 1393 (Reg. Wakefield, p. 123). Vac. by 10 June 1395 (see below, David Bradewell).
Prebendary of Henbury 1386–93 (see below).
David Bradewell (Bradwell)

John Ryder

John Kyngton alias Warwyk
Exch. 20 Dec 1409 (Worcester diocese) with John Ryder; previously rector of St Olave, Southwark, Surrey (Reg. Peverel, ff. 14v-15r). Exch. 30 June 1412 (Bath and Wells diocese), 4 July 1412 (Worcester diocese), with Alexander Bagenham for the rectory of Staple Fitzpaine, Somt. (Reg. Bubwith, Bath and Wells, i, 123; Reg. Peverel, f. 46v).
Poss. identical with John Kyngton, BCan&CL, chancery clerk and chancellor of Queen Joan of Navarre, died 1416; biography in Emden, BRUO, ii, 1075–6.

Alexander Bagenham

John Arondell
Coll. 17 Feb 1414 (Reg. Peverel, f. 63r).
Poss. identical with John Arundel, rector of Huntspil, Somt., 1416–54, in which case he may have res. Westbury on becoming dean of St George’s chapel Windsor, 1419. Died 1454. Biography in Emden, BRUO, i, 49.

John Powle
Exch. 9 Dec 1421 (Lincoln diocese), 20 Dec 1421 (Worcester diocese), with John Lowsby for the rectory of Holdenby, Northants. (Reg. Fleming, Lincoln, i, 72; Reg. Morgan, f. 7r).
Exch. the rectory of Holdenby for that of Stoke by Guildford, Surrey 1423 (Reg. Fleming, Lincoln, i, 72, 80).

John Lowsby
Exch. 9 Dec 1421 (Lincoln diocese), 20 Dec 1421 (Worcester diocese), with John Powle; previously rector of Holdenby, Northants. (Reg. Fleming, Lincoln, i, 72; Reg. Morgan, f. 7r). Till death; died by 7 Dec 1425 (Reg. Morgan, f. 36r).
Richard Elys
Coll. 7 Dec 1425 (Reg. Morgan, f. 36r). Exch. 9 Nov 1432 (Bath and Wells diocese) with William Towker, for the rectory of Sparkford, Somt. (Reg. Stafford, Bath and Wells, i, 130).


William Towker
Exch. 9 Nov 1432 (Bath and Wells diocese) with Richard Elys; previously rector of Sparkford, Somt. (Reg. Stafford, Bath and Wells, i, 130).

Previously also vicar of Clevedon, Somt., and rector of Frome St Quintin, Dorset.

John Kemeys
Occ. 18 March 1439, when granted papal licence to hold the deanery with a benefice having cure of souls (CPL, ix, 59). Till death; died by 10 Sept 1451 (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 95v).

BCanL. Not of noble birth (CPL, ix, 59).

William Okeborne
Coll. 10 Sept 1451 (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 95v). Till death; died 30 July×25 Aug 1455 (TNA, PROB 11/4, f. 23r-v).


John Blackman
Coll. 3 Jan 1456 (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 135r). Res. by 20 Jan 1459 (ibid., i, f. 149v).


Henry Sampson
Coll. 20 Jan 1459 (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 149v). Res. by 3 June 1469 (ibid., i, f. 240v).


William Canynges
Coll. 3 June 1469 (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 240v). Till death; died 17 Nov 1474 (Worcester, Itineraries, pp. 52–3).

A former wealthy married Bristol merchant and mayor of the city. Took holy orders after his wife’s death, and was promoted by Carpenter first as prebendary of Godringhill and later as dean. Biographies by James Sherborne, William Canynges 1402–1474 (Bristol, 1985), and ODNB.
Robert Slymbrigge


William Vauce
Poss. app. July×Sept 1476, in the vacancy between Bishops Carpenter and Alcock. Occ. 6 Apr 1478 (WRO, Register of Wills, i, f. 22v). Till death; died by 22 Aug 1479 (Reg. Alcock, f. 57r), prob. 19 July on which day his anniversary was later held in the college (Valor Ecclesiasticus, ii, 434).


John Lyndsey
Coll. 22 Aug 1479 (Reg. Alcock, f. 57r). Till death; died by 1 June 1488 (Reg. Morton, f. 24r), prob. 21 May 1488 on which day his anniversary was later held in the college (Valor Ecclesiasticus, ii, 434).

Fellow of Clare Hall, Cambridge. DD, Cambridge. Held parishes in Essex and Berks. before coming to Westbury. Gave books to his college and to the university. Biography in Emden, BRUC, p. 382, to be supplemented by his will, TNA, PROB 11/8, f. 134v.

Adam Redsheff
Coll. 1 June 1488 (Reg. Morton, f. 24r). Exch. 6 Nov 1491 (archbishop of Canterbury) with William Cretyn for the rectory of St Mary, Calais (Reg. Morton, Canterbury, i, 144).


William Cretyn (Creton)
Exch. 6 Nov 1491 (archbishop of Canterbury) with Adam Redsheff; previously rector of St Mary, Calais (Reg. Morton, Canterbury, i, 144). Occ. 31 May 1504 (Reg. S. de Gigli, f. 34v). Vac. by 13 Jan 1509 (see below: William Wydeslade).

**William Wydeslade**  
App. after 31 May 1504 (see above: William Cretyng). Occ. 13 Jan 1509 (WCM, B 822; A 6(ii) f.70r-v). Vac. by 8 May 1511 (see below, Richard Gardener).  
Rector of Freshwater, Isle of Wight, when granted permission by Pope Julius II to hold two incompatible benefices, 1503×1513 (CPL, xix, 533, 552).

**Richard Gardener (Gardiner)**  
App. after 13 Jan 1509 (see above, William Wydeslade). Occ. 8 May 1511 (Reg. S. de Gigli, f. 68r), 24 June 1513 (ibid., f. 90v). Poss. till death; died 2 June×7 Dec 1518 (Le Neve, *Fasti 1300–1541*, iii, 93).  

**Thomas Hannibal**  
Coll. perhaps after 1518 (see above, Richard Gardener). Occ. 28 June 1523 (WCM, A 6(ii), f. 148r-v; WRO, b009 (BA 2636/37 (iii) 43806, f. 186r-v); 5 Oct 1524 (Reg. Ghinucci, f. 17v). Vac. by 8 July 1528 (see below, John Hewes).  

**John Hewes (Huys)**  
Coll. after 5 Oct 1523 (see above: Thomas Hannibal). Occ. 8 July 1528 (Reg. Ghinucci, ii, f. 37r). Till death; died by 15 June 1530 (ibid., ii, f. 43v).  

**John Barlow**  

**CANONS AND PREBENDARIES**

**Alwin (Ailwin)**  
Chaplain holding property from the bishop of Worcester in Westbury, occ. before 1125×1141 (WRO, Reg. Giffard, f. 278v; *English Episcopal Acta*, 33, pp. 80–1).
Poss. identical with Ailwin the chaplain, prob. a chaplain of Bishop Samson, occ. 1100×1108 (English Episcopal Acta, 33, pp. 23–4).

**Gervase**
Clerk holding property from the bishop of Worcester in Westbury, occ. before 1125×1141 (WRO, Reg. Giffard, f. 278v; English Episcopal Acta, 33, pp. 80–1).

**Hugh son of Gervase**

**Bertran** (Bertrannus)

**Pagan**

**William de Chaisna** (Cheni or Chein)

Clerk of Bishop Henry de Sully 1193×1195. His surname is given as Chaisna in the original grant and Cheni or Chein in the confirmation. On the basis of the reading Chein (although that is not the form in the original grant), an identity has been suggested with William of Keynsham, Mag., canon of Chichester Cathedral 1197×1204–1237 and/or William of Keynsham, Mag., canon of Wells Cathedral 1209–46, but the surname looks more like the well-known Norman surname Chesney and there is nothing to link William of Keynsham with Westbury.

**Matthew Vulcan**

Said to have held the prebend illicitly, hence the deprivation.

**Gregory of Naples**

Mag. by 1257. Later archdeacon of Cotentin and dean of Bayeux, Normandy.

**Nicholas de Wodeford**

Josce (Josceus)
Occ. 25 March 1274 (Cartulary of St Mark’s Hospital, p. 46).

William le Rous (Russel)
Occ. 25 Aug 1280 (Reg. Giffard, p. 123). Vac. (as Russel) by 16 Apr 1290 (ibid., p. 369); prebend next held by John de Bereford (see below).

Peter Vigerii (de Vygerii)
Occ. 25 June 1284, when allowed to lease his prebend for three years for 48 marks (Reg. Giffard, p. 243).

John de Kirkby (Kyrkeby)
Res. by 25 Sept 1286, prebend subsequently held by Robert Allot alias de Wych (see below), on cons. as bishop of Ely, 22 Sept 1286 (Reg. Giffard, p. 294).
Bishop of Ely 1286–90. Died 1290. Biography in ODNB.

Robert Allot alias de Wych (Wychio)
Coll. 25 Sept 1286, prebend of John de Kirkby (Reg. Giffard, p. 294). In 1340 Wych’s prebend was said to be that of Richard de Thornerton who later held Henbury, but there is reason for thinking this a mistake and Wych’s prebend more likely to have been Lawrence Weston (see below, Richard de Thornerton). Allowed to lease his prebend to Nicholas de Wodeford for two years 28 Sept 1287 (ibid., pp. 313–14). Res. by 18 May 1314 (Reg. Maidstone, f. 7r).

Robert de Fangfes
Till death; made his will 2 March 1288 (Tues after St Matthias 1287: WRO, Reg. Giffard, f. 281r); died 7 March 1288 (WCM, MS F 160 f. 146v); prebend filled by Richard de Vienna 23 March 1288 (Reg. Giffard, p. 340); this was poss. the prebend of Holley (Nonarum Inquisitiones, p. 405).
Surname d from Fangfoss, Yorks. Archdeacon of Gloucester 1274–88. Also canon of Beverley Minster and Wells Cathedral. For his death date, see above.

Peter de Leycestre (Laicestria)
Clerk of Bishop Giffard occ. 1284–6, and steward of the lands of the bishopric. The occupant of numerous benefices, including (under Bishop Giffard) Bishop’s Cleeve, Gloucs., and Budbrooke, Warws., in the latter of which Giffard was alleged to have made him a prebendary of the collegiate church of Warwick but Giffard later revoked the grant (Reg. Giffard, pp. 169, 363). Fell into dispute with Giffard in 1287 and entered the royal administration, becoming a baron of the royal exchequer 1290–1303; subsequently in renewed dispute with Giffard over benefices that he held or claimed. Said in his papal dispensation of 1302 to hold the benefices of Hendon, Middx., Thornbury, Gloucs., and Wolhamcote, Warws., with canonries of Lichfield Cathedral and Warwick collegiate church. Biographies in Davies, ‘Studies in the Administration’, pp. 721–6, and Cartulary of Warwick, pp. 428–9.

Richard de Vienna
Coll. 23 March 1288, prebend of Robert de Fangefos (Reg. Giffard, p. 340). In 1340 Thomas Murimuth was said to hold this prebend, i.e. Holley (see below, Thomas Murimuth; Nonarum Inquisitiones, p. 405). Occ. 8 Sept 1310 (CPR 1307–10, p. 279) and 1316 (Inquisitions... Relating to Feudal Aids, ii, 276).


John de Stanewaye


John d’Evreux (de Ebroic)

Nephew of Bishop Giffard. Archdeacon of Gloucester 1288–94.

Ralph de Vasto Prato (Wasto Prato)


Walter de Berton


Thomas de Berton
Grant in commendam 15 Feb 1289, rectory of Bishop’s Cleeve, Gloucs. (Reg. Giffard, p. 357). Induct. 10 Dec 1289 as prebendary of Bishop’s Cleeve (ibid., p. 366).
Nigel le Waleys
Coll. 8 March 1290, prebend of Hampton-on-Avon i.e. Hampton Lucy, Warws. (Reg. Giffard, p. 367). Benefice re-coll. to him as a parish church, 24 May 1290 (ibid., p. 370). However, said to have been installed as a prebendary of Westbury 10 July 1290 (Annales Monastici, ed. Luard, iv, 502) and occ. 15 July 1290 as prebendary of Hampton, presenting a vicar to the benefice (ibid., p. 371). Prob. held the prebend until his death, prob. in the winter of 1292–3 (ibid., p. 492).


John de Bereford
Coll. 16 Apr 1290, prebend of William le Russel, i.e. le Rous (see above) (Reg. Giffard, p. 369). Said to have been installed as a prebendary of Westbury 10 July 1290 (Annales Monastici, ed. Luard, iv, 502). Occ. 1291 (Taxatio, p. 220). In 1340 Henry de Cokham was said to hold the prebend of John de Bereford (Nonarum Inquisitiones, p. 405), but Cokham is otherwise recorded as prebendary of Aust (see below, Henry de Cokham), and Aust seems still to have been occupied by Peter de Leycestre (see above) in Bereford’s time. The 1340 reference may have confused Henry de Cokham with Henry de Carleton (see below), in which case Bereford’s prebend would have been Lawrence Weston.

Physician in 1290; Mag. in 1291.

John de Rodeberewe
Coll. before 23 June 1290, prebend of Hartlebury, Worcs., but res. 3 July, prob. 1290. Coll. to benefice as a prebend revoked, 23 June 1290, and he was coll. to Hartlebury as a parish church (Reg. Giffard, p. 370). However, said to have been installed as a prebendary of Westbury on 10 July 1290 (Annales Monastici, ed. Luard, iv, 502) and described as a canon there not long before 7 Nov 1293 (Canterbury Cathedral Archives, Dean & Chapter, ESRoll/123). Coll. to prebend revoked again, 26 Dec 1293, and again coll. to Hartlebury as a parish (Reg. Giffard, f. 389r).


William Greenfield (de Grinefeud)


Peter de Escote

Walter de Wotton
Coll. 26 March 1304, Aust (Reg. Ginsborough, p. 133). Occ. 17 Oct 1305 (ibid., p. 26). Prob. till death; died by 22 May 1308, shortly after which William de Melton (see below) seems to have held Aust.


William de Melton (Melthom, Melthona)


William de Briston (Birstone)
Papal licence 21 May 1309 to hold a canonry of Westbury with other benefices (Regestum Clementis Papae V, Annum Quartus, p. 108; CPL, ii, 53). Similar licence 6 Jan 1314 (Regestum Clementis Papae V, Annum Nonus, p. 41; CPL, ii, 121). Till death; died 14 March/16 Nov 1317; prebend later held by William de Airmyn (CPL, ii, 141; CPR 1317–21, p. 49).


William de Lincoln
Exch. 3 May 1309 (York diocese) with William de Melton; previously canon of Beverley Minster, Yorks. (Reg. Greenfield, York, i, 32, 295). Prebend prob. Aust (see below, John de Hull). Res. 9 Dec 1311 on grounds of infirmity, while living or staying at Grimsby, Lincs. (Reg. Reynolds, p. 31).


John de Hull


John de Bloyou
Coll. 18 May 1314, prebend of Robert de Wych (Reg. Maidstone, f. 7r), poss. Lawrence Weston (see above, Robert de Wych). Exch. 3 Aug 1321 (Exeter and Worcester dioceses) with Robert de Langetone for a canonry of Exeter Cathedral (Reg. Stapeldon, Exeter, p. 213; Reg. Cobham, p. 31).

From Cornwall. Mag., later DCL, Oxford. Legal advisor to the prior of Worcester 1307–14. Official of the bishop of Worcester 1314–18; later transferred his work to Exeter diocese, where he held several benefices. Died 1328. Biography in Emden, BRUO, i, 205–6.
Thomas de Teffont (Teffante, Teffaunte)
Coll. 21 May 1314 (Reg. Maidstone, f. 7r).

Robert le Wyse alias de Gloucester (Glocestria)
Occ. 22 May 1315 (Reg. Maidstone, f. 28v), poss. Godringhill (see below, Thomas de Orleton). Res. by 26 Apr 1319 (CPL, ii, 185).

Robert de Hasele
Mag. Rector of Dyrham, Gloucs.

William de Airmyn (Ayremynne)
Royal grant 16 Nov 1317, prebend of William de Briston, sede vacante (CPR 1317–21, p. 49). Vac. by 15 Sept 1325 when consecrated as bishop.

Thomas de Orleton
Papal provision 26 Apr 1319, prebend of Robert le Wyse alias de Gloucester, poss. Godringhill in view of what follows (CPL, ii, 185; Accounts, ed. Lunt and Graves, p. 16). Exch. 15 July 1332 for Aust with John de Trillek (Reg. Orleton, p. 186), but poss. this exch. was not effective since he res. Godringhill to Trillek 22 July 1332, being old and sick, subject to a pension of £20 per annum for life (WCM, A 5, i, f. 151r).

William de la Mare (de Mari)
Bishop’s enquiry concerning proposed exch. with John de Hull, c.winter 1320–1, Aust (Reg. Cobham, pp. 27–8).

Robert de Langetone
Exch. 3 Aug 1321 (Exeter and Worcester dioceses) with John de Bloyou, poss. Lawrence Weston (see above, John de Bloyou and Robert Allot alias de Wych); previously canon of Exeter Cathedral (Reg. Stapeldon, Exeter, p. 213; Reg. Cobham,

Clerk of Queen Isabella.

**James de Berkeley**

Exch. 29 May 1324 (Worcester diocese) with Robert de Langeton, poss. Lawrence Weston (see above, Robert de Langetone); previously prebendary of the royal chapel of Hastings, Sussex (Reg. Cobham, p. 242). Vac. by 21 March 1327 (ibid., p. 247), a day before he was consecrated as bishop of Exeter.


**Walter de Islip (Islep)**

Vac. by 13 May 1325, prebend later held by Nicholas de Gore (WRO, A 5, i, f. 118v).


**Nicholas de Gore**

Coll. 13 May 1325, by prior and convent of Worcester Cathedral to whom the collation had devolved on this occasion, prebend of Walter de Islip (WRO, A 5, i, f. 118v). Mandate for induction same day (ibid.). Occ. 18 Nov 1329 (Reg. Orleton, p. 186).

Mag. Previously dean.

**John de Middeltone**

Exch. 23 June 1326 (Worcester diocese) with Robert de Hasle; previously rector of Otham, Kent (Reg. Cobham, p. 246).

Mag. Two men of this name had careers at about this time: biographies in Emden, BRUO, ii, 1275–6.

**John de Barneby**

Coll. 21 March 1327 (Reg. Cobham, p. 247), pres. to the prebend of James de Berkeley which was poss. Lawrence Weston (see above, James de Berkeley). If this is correct, Barneby held the prebend only briefly (see below, Eudo de Berkeley).

Mag. Clerk of the household of Bishop Cobham (Reg. Cobham, p. 247).

**Eudo de Berkeley**

Royal grant 17 Sept 1327, Lawrence Weston, sede vacante (CPR 1327–30, p. 166). Till death; died by 20 Aug 1328; prebend next held by Peter de Berkeley (Reg. Orleton, p. 50).


**Thomas de Askeby**

Occ. 22 Oct 1328, Aust (CPL, ii, 285); previous known occupant John de Hull, c.1320–1 (see above). Till death; died by 2 Dec 1329 (Reg. Orleton, p. 58).

Mag.
Peter de Berkeley
Coll. 20 Aug 1328, prebend of Eudo de Berkeley i.e. Lawrence Weston (Reg. Orleton, p. 50). Exch. 25 Apr 1331 (Lincoln and Worcester dioceses), with Richard de Bury for a canonry of Lincoln Cathedral; Berkeley also exchanged a canonry of Bosham, Sussex (Reg. Grandisson, Exeter, iii, 1284; Reg. Orleton, p. 97). Commissioned to exch. with Richard de Bury for prebend of Lawrence Weston, i.e. return of Berkeley to Westbury, 4 Oct 1331 (Reg. Orleton, pp. 68, 181), but this was not apparently effective.


John de Trillek
Coll. 2 Dec 1329, Aust (Reg. Orleton, pp. 58, 167). Exch. with Thomas de Orleton for a different prebend and inst. 15 July 1332 (ibid., p. 186). Recorded as receiving Godringleghill from Orleton, 22 July 1332, in return for paying him an annual pension of £20 for life (WCM, A 5, i, f. 151r). Godringleghill was sometimes named Trillek in later times. Res. not later than 29 Aug 1344 when consecrated as bishop of Hereford.


Thomas de Dumbleton (Dombletone)
Papal provision at king’s request 15 Jan 1331 (Jean XXII: Lettres Communes, x, 121; CPL, ii, 332). Later occupied Aust, but John de Trillek (see above) held this until 1332, so poss. the provision took effect only at that point. Exch. 13 Dec 1336 (Hereford diocese), 17 Dec 1336 (Worcester diocese), Aust, with Elias Waleweyn for the rectory of Stoke Edith, Herefs. (Reg. T. Charlton, Hereford, p. 83; Reg. Montacute, p. 55).


Richard de Bury
Exch. 25 Apr 1331 (Lincoln and Worcester dioceses), Lawrence Weston, with Peter de Berkeley; previously canon of Lincoln Cathedral; Berkeley also exchanged a canonry of Bosham, Sussex (Reg. Grandisson, Exeter, ii, 614; iii, 1284). Comm. to induct 27 Sept 1331 (Reg. Orleton, p. 97). Comm. to exch. 4 Oct 1331 with Peter de Berkeley for canonry of Lincoln Cathedral, i.e. return of Bury to Lincoln (ibid., pp. 68, 181). However, he apparently held a prebend of Westbury up to his cons. as bishop of Durham, 19 Dec 1333; it was filled 12 March 1334 (CPR 1330–4, p. 535).

Richard de Thormerton
(Tormerton)
Occ. 1 June 1332 (CPP, i, 10; CPL, iii, 76). Said to hold prebend formerly of Robert [Allot alias] de Wych 1340 (Nonarum Inquisitiones, p. 405). Royal ratification of tenure of prebend of Henbury 13 July 1350 (CPR 1348–50, p. 548). However William Uppedych and William de Longehechindon were said to hold Wych’s prebend in 1360 when Thormerton was prob. still a prebendary, so either he moved from that prebend to Henbury or the Nonarum reference is incorrect (compare Henry de Carleton, see below). It looks more likely that Uppedych and Longehechindon, and therefore Allot alias de Wych, held the prebend of Lawrence Weston. Died c. June 1361 (Le Neve, Fasti 1300–1541, i, 61; viii, 10; ix, 29), apparently still holding Henbury whose next occupant was prob. John de Swynleg, 23 Dec 1361 (CPR 1361–4, p. 132).

Surnamed from Farmington or Tormarton, Glooms. Mag. by 1342. Treasurer of Wells Cathedral, canon of Exeter Cathedral, and of Beverley Minster (McDermid, Beverley Minster Fasti, p. 63).

Henry de Carleton
Royal grant 12 March 1334, prebend held by Richard de Bury i.e. Lawrence Weston, sede vacante (CPR 1330–4, p. 535). Occ. 1340, when said to hold the prebend formerly held by Peter de Leycestre (Nonarum Inquisitiones, p. 405), but that prebend was Aust (compare another possible mistake in this document respecting Richard de Thormerton, above).

King’s clerk in 1334–7 (CPR 1330–4, p. 535; CPR 1334–8, p. 405). Canon of Wells Cathedral 1343.

Elias Waleweyn
(Walewayne, Walwayn)
Exch. 13 Dec 1336 (Hereford diocese), 17 Dec 1336 (Worcester diocese), Aust, with Thomas de Dumbleton; previously rector of Stoke Edith, Herefs. (Reg. T. Charlton, Hereford, p. 83; Reg. Montacute, p. 55). Prebend also referred to as that of Peter de Leycestre (TNA, C 85/163/29). Res. by 22 March 1338 (Reg. Hempnall, f. 15r).


Adam Murimouth
(Murymouth)
Res. by 2 Aug 1337, Holley alias St Werburgh (CPR 1334–8, p. 486). The prebend was later also known as Murimouth after him or Thomas Murimouth who succeeded him.

DCL, Oxford. Held many benefices, acted as an ecclesiastical lawyer and administrator, and wrote a chronicle of events up to his death in 1347. Biographies in Emden, BRUO, ii, 1329–30 and ODNB.

Thomas Murimouth
(Murymouth)
Royal grant 2 Aug 1337, Holley alias St Werburgh, sede vacante (CPR 1334–8, p. 486). Said in 1340 to hold the prebend formerly of Richard de Vienna (Nonarum Inquisitiones, p. 405). Till death; died some time before 12 Aug 1349 (Reg. Sede Vacante, p. 225). The prebend was later also known as Murimouth after him or Adam Murimouth who preceded him.

Canon of Wells Cathedral in 1340.
Henry de Cokham
Coll. 22 March 1338, Aust (Reg. Hempnall, f. 15r). Said in 1340 to hold the prebend formerly of John de Bereford (Nonarum Inquisitiones, p. 405), but Aust was held in Bereford’s time by Peter de Leycestre, so either Cokham moved prebends or the Nonarum was mistaken (compare above Richard de Thornerton and Henry de Carleton, and below William Uppedych and William Longechechindon). Vac. poss. early in 1366 (see below), and certainly by June 1366 when Aust was held by John Wycliffe (see below).

From Stratford, Essex. Mag., Oxford. Chancellor of Chichester Cathedral by 1344, prob. till death. He was replaced, very likely after a recent death, in March 1366 (Le Neve, Fasti 1300–1541, vii, 8). Biography in Emden, BRUO, i, 457.

William de Tikill
Papal provision 19 Apr 1344, prebend of John de Trillek, i.e. Godringhill (CPL, iii, 97). Prob. ineffective since Walter de Wetwang gained this prebend (see below).

Walter de Wetwang (Wetewang, Wytewang)
Royal grant 18 Aug 1344, prebend of John de Trillek (CPR 1343–5, p. 336); from other evidence this was the prebend formerly of Nicholas de Wodeford i.e. Godringhill. Royal grant 10 Feb 1345 to exch. this prebend with Edmund de Hauksgarth for the prebend of Skipwith in Howden collegiate church, Yorks., the Westbury prebend being in the king’s hands by a grant from Bishop Bransford (CPR 1343–5, pp. 431, 436). This exch. apparently failed in view of a commission of 20 Aug 1347 for Walter to exch. of this prebend with John de Melborn, canon of York Minster and prebendary of Wetwang (Reg. Bransford, pp. 138–9). Wetwang did not gain possession of the York Minster prebend either (Le Neve, Fasti 1300–1541, vi, 90), prob. due to his death which occurred by 30 Oct 1347 (ibid., pp. 327–8).

Surnamed from Wetwang, Yorks. King’s clerk in 1344. Canon of York Minster. Treasurer of the wardrobe of the king’s household at his death in 1347.

Edmund de Hauksgarth
Royal grant 10 Feb 1345 to exch. the prebend of Skipwith in Howden collegiate church, Yorks., with Walter de Wetwang for the prebend of Nicholas de Woodford i.e. Godringhill (CPR 1343–5, pp. 431, 436). This exch. apparently failed since Wetwang continued to hold the Westbury prebend (see above).

Simon de Briselee
Papal provision 17 July 1345, prebend of John de Trillek i.e. Godringhill (CPP, i, 99; CPL, iii, 204). Prob. ineffective since Walter de Wetwang (see above) continued to hold this prebend. However Simon occ. as canon and prebendary 23 June 1347 (CPP, iii, 240–1) and 10 Oct 1349 (CPP, i, 177; CPL, iii, 340), poss. having been adm. to a different prebend.


John de Melborn
Commission to exch. 20 Aug 1347, prebend of Walter de Wetwang i.e. Godringhill, with Walter de Wetwang for a canonry of York Minster and prebend of Wetwang (Reg.
Bransford, pp. 138–9). This may have failed due to the death of Walter de Wetwang (see above), but a ‘Master John’ is mentioned having held this prebend until his death in 1353 which might poss. relate to Melborn (see below, John de Bryan).

Poss. identical with John de Melbourn, Oxford student and rector of Witherley, Leics., occ. 1344–51, but this Melbourn was still alive in 1358; biography in Emden, BRUO, ii, 1255.

Reginald de Bryan (Briane)
Royal grant 20 Oct 1347, prebend of Walter de Wetwang i.e. Godringhill, the prebend being in the king’s hands by a grant from Bishop Bransford (CPR 1345–8, p. 417). Mentioned as canon with expectation of a prebend 17 Apr 1348 (CPL, iii, 268). Prob. res. possession of, or claim to, Godringhill on consecration as bishop 26 Sept 1349; prebend filled 29 Sept 1349 (CPR 1348–50, p. 403).


Walter de London (1)
Died by 25 Jan 1349, prebend unknown; succeeded by Raymund de Sancto Claro (CPP, i, 145, 199).

Secretary, confessor, and almoner of Edward III. Dean of Wells 1335–49. Biography in Emden, BRUO, ii, 1158.

William de Bysele
Papal reservation of a benefice in Westbury at the request of Oxford University 7 March 1349 (CPP, i, 177).

Clerk, of Worcester diocese, and MA (ibid.). Mentioned in Emden, BRUO, i, 336.

Ralph de Daventre
Occ. 12 Aug 1349, prebend of Thomas Murimouth i.e. Holley (Reg. Sede Vacante, p. 225). Said to have res. this prebend by 5 May 1350 (Accounts, ed. Lunt and Graves, p. 109), which is supported by the appointments of William de Savinhaco and William de Shrewsbury (see below). However Daventre continued to hold a prebend and both the last two appointments fell through, so his res. prob. had no effect. Planned an exch. by 26 Apr 1357 with John Lambert, canon of Lincoln Cathedral, but subsequently excl. 26 Apr 1357 in a tripartite process involving Bernard Richerii, holder of two sinecures in the diocese of Gerona, Spain, by which Daventre moved to Lincoln, Lambert to Gerona, and Richeri to Westbury (CPP, i, 294–5).

Canon of Lincoln and St Paul’s Cathedrals, and a holder of other benefices.

John de Bryan (Briane, Briene)
Royal grant 26 Sept 1349, prebend of Reginald de Bryan i.e. Godringhill, sede vacante (CPR 1348–50, p. 403). Adm. on this grant 29 Oct 1349 (Reg. Sede Vacante, pp. 238–9; WCM, A 5, i, f. 324r-v). Similar grant 20 Feb 1353, Godringhill, sede vacante (CPR 1350–4, p. 405). Adm. on this grant 4 Apr 1353, the prebend then said to be vacant by the death of ‘Master John’ (Reg. Sede Vacante, p. 200): compare John de Melborn (see above). Occ. 27 June 1367, when said to have been non-resident since at least 1363 (Reg. Whittlesey, f. 3r), and 16 Jan 1388 (WCM, A 5, i, f. 324r-v). Died
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(as a prebendary of Lincoln Cathedral) by 16 Feb 1389 (CPR 1388–92, p. 18), prob. still holding Godringleigh.


William de Shrewsbury (Salop, Shreuesbury, Shrovesbury)
Royal grant 30 Jan 1350, prebend of Olueye (or Olneye) i.e. Holley, sede vacante (CPR 1348–50, p. 466); also described as prebend of St Werburgh (Accounts, ed. Lunt and Graves, p. 109). Commission of inquiry by bishop as to whether prebend was vacant 12 Feb 1350 (Reg. Thoresby, f. 4v). Litigation about the royal grant mentioned 8 Feb 1351 (CPR 1350–4, p. 77), prob. because the previous prebendary Ralph de Daventre (see above) had not res. As Daventry’s prebend passed to Bernard Rycherii (see below) in 1357, Shrewsbury seems not to have gained it.

Archdeacon of Northumberland 1349–62 and of Shropshire 1360–79.

William de Savinhaco
Papal provision 3 May prob. 1350, St Werburgh i.e. Holley, without effect since the king appointed William de Shrewsbury (see above) sede vacante (Accounts, ed. Lunt and Graves, p. 109); moreover the prebend was already held by Ralph de Daventre (see above).

From the diocese of Lescar, France. Canon of Bayonne Cathedral. Provided to the archdeaconry of Carlisle and canonries in Chichester, Lincoln, and York Cathedrals without certainly gaining any of these posts.

Raymund de Sancto Claro
Papal provision 5 June 1350, prebend of Walter de London (CPP, i, 199). Poss. not effective, since the papal tax collector subsequently found no such prebendary at Westbury (Accounts, ed. Lunt and Graves, p. 109).

From the diocese of Cahors, France. Nephew of Bertrand de Aragone, papal man-at-arms (CPP, i, 199). Canon of Lichfield Cathedral 1358–65.

John Lambert (Lamberti)
Canon of Lincoln when planned exch. before 26 Apr 1357 with Ralph de Daventre for a canonry of Westbury; later made a different exch. to two sinecures in the diocese of Gerona, Spain, 26 Apr 1357 (CPP, i, 294–5).

Canon of Lincoln Cathedral c.1351–7.

Bernard Rycherii
Exch. 26 Apr 1357, by papal provision, prebend of Ralph de Daventre; Daventre moved to John Lambert’s canonry of Lincoln Cathedral and Lambert to two sinecures held by Rycherii in the diocese of Gerona, Spain (CPP, i, 294–5; Accounts, ed. Lunt and Graves, p. 135). Exch. 12 Dec 1359, Holley, with William de Navesby for a chantry in Louth, Lincs. (Reg. Bryan, f. 29r).
William de Navesby (Naveby)
Exch. 12 Dec 1359 (Worcester diocese), Holley, with Bernard Rycherii; previously chantry priest in Louth, Lincs. (Reg. Bryan, f. 29r). Exch. 14 Nov 1362 (London diocese), St Werburgh alias Holley, with Richard Michel for a prebend of St Paul’s Cathedral (Reg. Sudbury, i, 233).
Archdeacon of Chester 1348–85, and a holder of canonries in several cathedrals.

William Uppedych
Exch. 13 Apr 1360, prebend of Robert de Wych, with William de Longehechindon for the vicarage of St Nicholas, Bristol (Reg. Bryan, f. 28v). On the grounds mentioned above (see Robert Allot alias de Wych and Richard de Thormerton), Wych’s prebend seems likely to have been Lawrence Weston.
Rector of Shipton Moyne, Gloucs., which he exch. with the prebend 1360 (Reg. Bryan, f. 28v). Vicar of St Nicholas, Bristol, 1360–1. Died 1361 (Reg. Barnet, f. 6v).

William de Longehechindon
Exch. 13 Apr 1360, prebend of Robert [Allot alias] de Wych, with William Uppedych; previously vicar of St Nicholas, Bristol (Reg. Bryan, f. 28v). For the likelihood of this prebend being Lawrence Weston, see above, William Uppedych. Vac. prob. by Nov 1361 when Roger de Ottery was coll. to Lawrence Weston, or if the prebend was Henbury, by Dec 1361 when that was granted to John de Swynlegh.
Surnamed from Long Itchington, Warws.

Roger de Ottery
Coll. 10 Nov 1361, prebend of Richard de Thomerton i.e. Henbury (Reg. Bryan, f. 40r), but this is a mistake because he later claimed that he had held Lawrence Weston since his coll. (Reg. Langham, Canterbury, p. 45). Moreover John de Swynlegh (see below) was granted Thomerton’s prebend in Dec 1361 and his successors were definitely prebendaries of Henbury. Occ. 27 June 1367, when said to have been non-resident for five years (Reg. Whittlesey, f. 3v). Till death; died by Sept 1387 when succeeded by John Barell (CPR 1385–9, p. 361).

John de Swynlegh (Swynleigh, Swynley)
Royal grant 23 Dec 1361, prebend of Richard de Thomerton i.e. Henbury (CPR 1361–4, p. 132). Grant of office of dean 3 Feb 1362 (ibid., p. 162); poss. a mistake, or else in plurality. Adm. 11 Feb 1362, Henbury (Reg. Sede Vacante, p. 207). Exch. 22 Sept 1366 (London diocese) this prebend and a prebend of St Paul’s Cathedral with William de Hindeley for a prebend of St Mary-by-the Castle, Leicester (Reg. Sudbury, London, i, 251–2; ii, 153).
Archdeacon of Huntingdon 1362, poss. till 1386.

Richard Michel
Exch. 14 Nov 1362 (London diocese), 17 Nov 1362 (Worcester diocese), St Werburgh alias Holley, with William de Navesby; previously prebendary of St Paul’s Cathedral (Reg. Sudbury, London, i, 233; Reg. Barnet, f. 16r). Said on 27 June 1367 to have
been non-resident since his appointment (Reg. Whittlesey, f. 3r). Prob. till death; died by 1 Dec 1374 (CPR 1374–7, p. 46, where wrongly called Robert; Reg. Sede Vacante, p. 319).


John Wycliffe (Wiclif, de Wyclif, Wynkele)
Papal provision 24 Nov 1362, after Oxford University had requested for Wycliffe a grant of a canonry and prebend of York Minster, to a canonry of Westbury with reservation of a prebend when vacant (Urbain V: Lettres Communes, i, 412; CPP, i, 390; Accounts, ed. Lunt and Graves, p. 494). Poss. gained possession early in 1366 (see Henry de Cokham, above); certainly so by June 1366, Aust, since said on 27 June 1367 to have been non-resident and negligent in appointing a deputy for one year (Reg. Whittlesey, f. 3v). Papal grant 28 Jan 1371 of a canonry of Lincoln with reservation of a prebend when vacant, on condition of surrendering Aust (Lloyd, ‘John Wyclif’, pp. 388–94). Renewed papal grant 26 Dec 1373 of the Lincoln canonry, now to be held in tandem with Aust and Wycliffe’s other benefices (CPL, iv, 193). Royal ratification of tenure 6 Nov 1375, same prebend (CPR 1374–7, p. 121). The prebend was granted to Robert de Faryngton 18 Nov 1375 (see below), but this grant was revoked at the instance of Wycliffe’s patron, John of Gaunt, 22 Dec 1376 (ibid., pp. 195, 393). Till death; died 31 Dec 1384.

From Yorks. MA, later DD, Oxford. The famous theologian and reformer. Biographies in Emden, BRUO, iii, 2103–6, and ODNB.

Richard de Hamcotes
Papal provision at the request of Cambridge University 22 Feb 1363, canonry with reservation of a prebend when vacant (Urbain V: Lettres Communes, ii, 359; CPP, i, 407).


William de Hindeley (Hyndelee)
Exch. 22 Sept 1366 (London diocese) with John de Swynleigh, i.e. Henbury, together with a prebend of St Paul’s Cathedral: previously prebendary of St Mary-by-the-Castle, Leicester (Reg. Sudbury, London, i, 251–2; ii, 153). Said on 27 June 1367 to have been non-resident since his appointment (Reg. Whittlesey, f. 3r). Royal grant 3 Nov 1367 for exch. of prebend with William de la Dale for the rectory of Essendon, Herts. (CPR 1367–70, p. 19). Exch. accordingly 30 Nov 1367 (Worcester diocese) (Reg. Whittlesey, f. 16r).


William de la Dale
Richard de Scraptoft

Henry de Humbreston
Exch. 13 Dec 1368 (Worcester diocese), Henbury, with Richard de Scraptoft; previously prebendary of St Mary-by-the-Castle, Leicester (Reg. Whittlesey, f. 26v). Vac. by 27 Nov 1373 (see below, Richard Hunte).


John de Middeford

John de Northelingham
Papal provision to canonry with reservation of a prebend when vacant 1371×1379 (Accounts, ed. Lunt and Graves, p. 438). Prob. ineffective, since not subsequently found.

Edmund de Caldecote
Papal provision to canonry with reservation of a prebend when vacant 1371×1379 (Accounts, ed. Lunt and Graves, p. 451). Prob. ineffective, since not subsequently found.

Priest of Lincoln diocese. Poss. identical with Edmund Caldecote, Mag., who held benefices in Leics., Surrey, and Essex, and died 1395 (Emden, BRUC, p. 117).

Richard Hunte
App. after 13 Dec 1368 (see above, Henry de Humbreston). Occ. 27 Nov 1373 (Reg. Sede Vacante, p. 286). Exch. 15 Nov 1375 (Worcester diocese), Henbury, with Reginald de Hulton for the rectory of East Harling, Norfolk (Reg. Wakefield, pp. 1–2).

Thomas de Maddynge (Maddyngley, Madyngleygh)

King’s clerk. Canon of Wells Cathedral 1370–1417. Died 1417.
Reginald de Hulton (Hylton)
Exch. 15 Nov 1375 (Worcester diocese), Henbury, with Richard Hunte; previously rector of East Harling, Norfolk (Reg. Wakefield, pp. 1–2). Exch. 22 June 1379 with Thomas Baddeby for a canonry and prebend of Lincoln Cathedral (ibid., p. 18).
Canon of Lincoln Cathedral 1379–90 and of other cathedrals. Died 1390.

Robert de Faryngton
Royal grant 18 Nov 1375, Aust (CPR 1374–7, p. 195). The prebend was currently occupied by John Wycliffe (above), and the grant to Faryngton was prob. ineffective. It was revoked 22 Dec 1376 (ibid., p. 393).

Thomas Baddeby (Badby)
Exch. (as Thomas Baddeby) 22 June 1379 (Worcester diocese), Henbury, with Reginald de Hulton for a canonry and prebend of Lincoln Cathedral (Reg. Wakefield, p. 18). Vac. (as William Badby) by 10 Aug 1386 (CPR 1385–9, p. 203), unless William was a separate person who succeeded him.
Precentor of Lichfield Cathedral 1339–78. Canon of Lincoln Cathedral 1349–79.

Richard de la Felde
King’s clerk in 1384. Canon of Lincoln Cathedral 1390–1401. Died 1401.

John Menhir
Royal grant 1 Aug 1386, Henbury (CPR 1385–9, p. 200). Either ineffective or briefly held (see John Beverley, below).
King’s clerk. Later dean of Westbury (see above).

John Beverley
Later dean of Westbury (see above).

Thomas Butiller (Buteler, Buteller)
Royal ratification of tenure 28 Sept 1387, prebend formerly of John Bryan i.e. Godringhill (CPR 1385–9, p. 361). However John de Bryan was still legal occupant of the prebend at that time (see above) and it is not known on what basis Butiller claimed possession. The irregularity of his status allowed the appearance of other nominees or claimants to the prebend (Hugh Buckenhull, Geoffrey Melton, John Stacy, and John Trevisa, below), all of whom Butiller eventually defeated. Royal grant 26 Feb 1389, same prebend, prob. following Bryan’s death (CPR 1388–92, p. 18); further ratification of tenure 16 Aug 1389, same prebend (ibid., p. 10); prohibition against those challenging the king’s right of appointment and Butiller’s tenure 28 Apr
1395, same prebend \((\text{CPR 1391–6, p. 590})\); further ratification of tenure 8 Jan 1400, same prebend \((\text{CPR 1399–1401, p. 136})\). Till death; died by 14 July 1402, same prebend \((\text{Reg. Clifford, p. 59})\).


**Richard Wyche**

Royal ratification of tenure 28 Sept 1387, prebend of Thomas de Maddynge i.e. Holley \((\text{CPR 1385–9, p. 361})\). The latter remained a prebendary till 1393, however, so this grant prob. had no effect.


**John Barell**

Royal ratification of tenure 28 Sept 1387, Lawrence Weston, vacant by the death of Roger Ottery \((\text{CPR 1385–9, p. 361})\). Vac. no later than 12 Jan 1391 when the prebend was apparently held by Robert Churche (see below).

**Thomas Cove**

Occ. 16 Feb 1389, Wodeford i.e. Godringhill \((\text{TNA SC 8/84/4193})\). A claimant to this prebend which was successfully acquired by Thomas Butiller (see above).


**John Bryt**

Papal provision 20 March 1389, canonry of Westbury with reservation of a prebend \((\text{CPP, i, 571})\). This provision can have had no effect since the pope who granted it, Clement VII, was not recognised in England.

From Ossory diocese, Ireland \((\text{ibid.})\).

**John Trevisa**

Claimant by 12 or 16 Feb 1389, Wodeford i.e. Godringhill \((\text{SC 8/148/7355})\). Styled as a canon of Westbury 5 Nov 1390, prebend not stated but prob. as claimant to the same \((\text{TNA, C 76/75 m. 10})\), However Godringhill was successfully acquired by Thomas Butiller (see above), and there is no evidence that Trevisa gained possession of this or any other prebend.


**Geoffrey Melton**

Royal ratification of tenure 8 July 1389, Wodeford i.e. Godringhill \((\text{CPR 1388–92, p. 88})\). In dispute with the dean of Westbury 21 Feb and 23 Aug 1389 \((\text{CCR 1389–92, pp. 15, 150})\), prob. over his claim to this prebend which was successfully acquired by Thomas Butiller (see above). Royal ratification of tenure 27 Sept 1394, Aust \((\text{CPR})\).
1391–6, p. 503); ratification repeated 7 Apr 1400 (CPR 1399–1401, p. 138). Till death; died holding Aust by 25 March 1411 (Reg. Peverel, f. 33r).


**John de Clifford**
Occ. holding a papal provision to a prebend when vacant 9 Nov 1389 (CPL, iv, 345).


**John Stacy**
Royal grant 16 Sept 1390, Bryan i.e. Godringtonhill (CPR 1388–92, p. 303). The prebend was occupied by Thomas Butiller (see above), so this grant can have had no effect.

King’s clerk in 1390. Canon of Lincoln Cathedral 1387–94. Died 1394.

**Robert Church**
Royal ratification of tenure 12 Jan 1391, Lawrence Weston (CPR 1388–92, p. 363). Either his tenure was brief (see John Squier, below) or Squier was a claimant for the prebend. No holder of this prebend is subsequently recorded until Richard Twaytes (see below) in 1435.

**John Squier**
Royal ratification of tenure 14 Sept 1391, Lawrence Weston (CPR 1388–92, p. 476). Subsequent tenure unknown; no holder of this prebend is subsequently recorded until Richard Twaytes (see below) in 1435.

Described as ‘of Seinesbury’, i.e. Saintbury, Gloucs. (ibid.).

**Thomas Sneynton**
Coll. and inst. 15 Feb 1393, prebend of John Beverley i.e. Henbury (Reg. Wakefield, p. 123). Prob. vac. by 6 Apr 1395 (see Thomas Staunton, below).

Surname d from Sneinton, Notts. Prob. a relative of Bishop Wakefield (ibid., p. xxxiv). Ordained only to first tonsure when coll.

**Hugh Buckenhull**
Coll. and inst. 17 March 1393, Aust, replacing Richard Felde (Reg. Wakefield, p. 124); this was prob. contested by Geoffrey Melton (above). Inst. and induct. at an unknown date, Bryan i.e. Godringtonhill, but surrendered his letters of inst. and induct. 13 June 1396 and promised to make no further suit against Thomas Butiller (see above), holder of that prebend (CCR 1392–6, p. 516).

**Roger Tybryghton** (Tebrighton, Tibrighton)

Surname from Tibberton Gloucs., Shropshire, or Worcs.
Robert Whyteby (Witteby, Whytteby)

Robert Wavendon (Wavyngdon)
Exch. 21 Feb 1394 (London diocese), Holley, with Robert Whyteby; previously canon of St Paul’s Cathedral (Reg. Braybrooke, London, f. 120r). Till death; died by 25 May 1424 (Reg. Morgan, f. 27r).
Surname d from Wavendon, Berks., or Wandon, Herts.

John Ixworth
Occ. holding a papal provision to a canonry with expectation of a prebend 22 March 1395 (CPL, iv, 500).

Thomas Staundon (Standon)
Royal grant 6 Apr 1395, Henbury, sede vacante (CPR 1391–6, p. 559). Inst. 15 May 1395 (Reg. Sede Vacante, p. 361). Exch. 10 Sept 1396 (Bath and Wells diocese), 25 Sept (Worcester diocese), same prebend, with Thomas Marton for a canonry of Wells Cathedral (Reg. Tideman, f. 9v).
Prebendary of St Mary’s collegiate church, Warwick 1397 (Cartulary of Warwick, p. 446). Canon of Wells Cathedral 1396–1407, Hereford Cathedral 1396–1429, and St David’s Cathedral 1420–1. Died 1429.

Thomas Marton (Martyn)
Exch. 10 Sept 1396 (Bath and Wells diocese), 25 Sept Worcester diocese), Henbury, with Thomas Staundon; previously canon of Wells Cathedral (Reg. Tideman, f. 9v). Res. by 21 May 1398 (ibid., f. 32r). Royal grant 18 Sept 1402, Godringhill (CPR 1401–5, p. 121), but this prebend was occupied by Nicholas Herbury (see below) so the grant can have had no effect.
Canon of Wells Cathedral 1386–96.

John Hovingham
Coll. 21 May 1398, Henbury (Reg. Tideman, f. 32r). Royal ratification of tenure 18 Feb 1404, same prebend (CPR 1401–5, p. 305). Vac. by 22 June×15 Dec 1417, the date of his death (Emden, BRUO, iii, 2184). The next known holder of the prebend is Richard Holme (see below).
Nicholas Herbury
Coll. 14 July 1402, Bryan i.e. Godringhill (Reg. Clifford, p. 59). Royal ratification of
tenure 14 Oct 1402 (CPR 1401–5, p. 157), evidently to counter the grant to Thomas
Marton (see above). Exch. 15 Feb 1411 (Worcester diocese) with Richard Clyfford for

Richard Clifford (Clyfford)
Exch. 15 Feb 1411 (Worcester diocese), Godringhill, with Nicholas Herbury;
previously canon of the royal chapel of St Martin-le-Grand, London (Reg. Peverel, ff. 29v–30r). Exch. ratified by the bishop of Worcester, 30 Nov 1410, and by the dean of
St Martin-le-Grand, London, where Clifford held another canonry, 19 Jan 1411 (ibid.).
Exch. 26 Nov 1416 (Worcester diocese), 1 Dec 1416 (Canterbury diocese) with
Thomas Pellican for the rectory of Biddenden, Kent (ibid., f. 78–v; Reg. Chichele,
Canterbury, i, 153).
Relative of Richard Clifford, bishop of Worcester 1401–21. Held various canonries
and parishes until his death, 1422. Biography in Emden, BRUO, i, 441–2.

Walter London (2)
Coll. 25 March 1411, Aust (Reg. Peverel, f. 33r). Res. by 17 Oct 1431 (Reg. Morgan,
f. 94v).
From Upton-on-Severn, Worcs. Son of William London. Studied civil law at
Oxford. Master of St Wulfstan Hospital, Worcester. Died 1440. Biography in Emden,
BRUO, 1158–9.

Thomas Pellican
Exch. 26 Nov 1416 (Worcester diocese), 1 Dec 1416 (Canterbury diocese),
Godringhill, with Richard Clifford; previously rector of Biddenden, Kent (Reg. Peverel, f. 78–v; Reg. Chichele, Canterbury, i, 153). Exch. 8 Apr 1417 (Bath and
Wells diocese) with Walter Shiryngton for a canonry of Wells Cathedral (Reg. Bubwith, Bath and Wells, i, 279).
Canon of Wells Cathedral 1417–31.

Walter Shiryngton
Exch. 8 Apr 1417 (Bath and Wells diocese), Godringhill, with Thomas Pellican;
previously canon of Wells Cathedral (Reg. Bubwith, Bath and Wells, i, 279). Royal
ratification of tenure 28 Aug 1417 (CPR 1416–22, p. 128). Till death; died by 12
March 1449 (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 67r).
Canon of Salisbury Cathedral 1431–49 and of other cathedrals.

Richard Holme
Till death; died by 1 May 1424, Henbury (Reg. Morgan, f. 27r).
From York diocese. Warden of King’s Hall, Cambridge 1417–24. BCL, Cambridge. An envoy to foreign countries under Henry IV and Henry V. Biography in Emden,
BRUC, pp. 311–12.
Maurice Wynter
Coll. 1 May 1424, Henbury (Reg. Morgan, f. 27r). Res. 25 May 1424 (ibid.). Coll. 25 May 1424, Murimouth i.e. Holley (ibid.). Res. by 12 June 1448 (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 61v).

William Treverdowe
Coll. 25 May 1424, Henbury (Reg. Morgan, f. 27r). Res. by 4 June 1445 (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 19r).
Either from Cornwall in view of his surname (compare Trefrida in Jacobstow), or from Wales since he enjoyed the patronage of the Welsh bishop Philip Morgan. BCL. Rector of Walpole St Peter, Norf., from 1432. Canon of Chichester Cathedral in 1440.

John Cokkes (Cokkys)
Coll. 17 Oct 1431, Aust (Reg. Polton, ff. 94v-95r). Res. by 30 Apr 1447 (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 52r).

Richard Twaytes
Till death; died by 24 Sept 1435, Lawrence Weston (Reg. Bourghchier, f. 3r-v).

John Stokes (Stokys)
Coll. 24 Sept 1435, Lawrence Weston (Reg. Bourghchier, f. 3r-v). Res. by 7 June 1445 (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 20r).

Richard Crowner

Roger Malmesbury
Coll. 7 June 1445, Lawrence Weston (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 20r). Res. by 19 Sept 1472 (ibid., ii, f. 32v).

John Waynflete
Coll. 30 Apr 1447, Aust (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 52r). Res. by 22 Dec 1452 (ibid, f. 105r).

William Frome
Coll. 22 June 1448, Murimouth i.e. Holley (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 61v). Res. by 7 May 1463 (ibid., i, f. 180r).

**Richard Rowe**
Coll. 12 March 1449, Godringhill (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 67r). Till death; died by 23 May 1454 (ibid., i, f. 116v)


**Thomas Salthouse**

**John Ryvet** (Rivett)
Coll. 23 May 1454, Godringhill (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 116v). Till death; died by 27 March 1465 (ibid., i, f. 188r).


**John Wolston**

From Exeter diocese, where he worked as a legal officer and administrator, serving as its bishop’s proctor in Parliament, 1436 (*Reg. Lacy*, ed. Dunstan, v, 227).

**Thomas Eggecomb**
Coll. 15 Nov 1460, Henbury (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 156r). Till death; died by 1 March 1485 (Reg. Alcock, f. 155v).


**William Vauce** (Vaws).
Coll. 7 May 1463, Murimuth i.e. Holley (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 180r). Poss. vac. not later than July×Sept 1476, and certainly by 22 Aug 1479 when died as dean (see above).


**Edmund Hecker**
Coll. 27 March 1465, Godringhill (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 188r), 215r. Till death; died 1 Aug×7 Nov 1467 (TNA, PROB 11/5, f. 176v; Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 215r).

Registrar of the bishop of Worcester.
Robert Slymbrigge
Coll. 7 Nov 1467, Godringhill (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 215r). Res. by 16 Apr 1468 (ibid., i, f. 222r).
BCan&CL. Later dean; for his biography, see above.

William Canynges
Coll. 16 Apr 1468, Godringhill (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 222r). Res. by 3 June 1469 (ibid., i, f. 241r).
Later dean; for his biography, see above.

Henry Sampson
Coll. 3 June 1469, Godringhill (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 241r). Till death; died 17 Nov 1482 (Stephenson, p. 541); replaced 10 March 1483 (Reg. Alcock, f. 113v).
Previously dean; for his biography, see above.

John Sandeaker
Coll. 19 Sept 1472, Lawrence Weston (Reg. Carpenter, ii, f. 32v). Res. by 31 Aug 1475 (ibid., ii, f. 71v).

William Chokke
Coll. 31 Aug 1475, Lawrence Weston (Reg. Carpenter, ii, f. 71v). Res. by 29 May 1488 (Reg. Morton, f. 23v).

William Holden
MA. Almoner of William Waynflete, bishop of Winchester 1480–7. Biography in Emden, BRUO, ii, 947–8, where two people of this name may be the same.

John Moore

Andrew Benstede
Coll. 9 July 1483, Aust (Reg. Alcock, f. 117r). Res. by 19 Feb 1498 (Reg. G. de Gigli, f. 5v).

Arnulph Colyns
Coll. 1 March 1485, Henbury (Reg. Alcock, f. 155v). Prob. till death; died June 1490 (see below).
Richard Carpenter


Roger Braggis (Bragges)
Poss. app. soon after June 1490, Henbury, following the death of Arnulph Colyns (see above). Occ. 3 Nov 1498 (Reg. Morton, Canterbury, ii, 462). Vac. by 10 July 1515 when replaced, after death, as rector of Forton, Staffs. (Lichfield Record Office, B/A/1/14 (Reg. Blyth), i, f. 22v).


Hugh Inge (Ing, Yng)
Coll. 19 Feb 1498, Aust (Reg. G. de Gigli, f. 5v). Occ. 17 Apr 1508 (Regg. King and Hadrian, Bath and Wells, p. 128). Prob. vac. not later than 1512 when consecrated as bishop (see below).


Richard Nykke


Richard Bokett (Bukhett)
Prob. appointed soon after 18 Apr 1501, Murimuth i.e. Holley, on promotion of Richard Nykke as bishop (see above). Till death; died by 24 March 1514 (Reg. S. de Gigli, f. 117r).


John Nicholas (Nich’i, genitive case)
Prob. appointed in or soon after 1502, Godringhill, following the death of John Moore, AprxNov 1502 (see above). Till death; died by 18 Aug 1505 (Reg. S. de Gigli, f. 43v).

John Osborne (Osburn)
Coll. 30 Sept 1503, Lawrence Weston (Reg. S. de Gigli, f. 31r-v). Till death; died by 8 May 1531 (Reg. Ghinucci, ii, f. 47r).

**John Alen**
Coll. 18 Aug 1505, Godringhill (Reg. S. de Gigli, f. 43v). Occ. 19 June 1508 (CPL, xix, 497–8). Probably vac. by consecration as archbishop, 12 March 1530 (see below).

**Thomas Hannibal**
Coll. 24 March 1514, Murimuth i.e. Holley (Reg. S. de Gigli, f. 117r). Vac. by 5 Oct 1524, when he occ. as dean (Reg. Ghinucci, ii, f. 17v).
Later dean; for his biography see above.

**Thomas Wathell**
Coll. 8 May 1531, Lawrence Weston (Reg. Ghinucci, ii, f. 47r). Occ. 1535 (Valor Ecclesiasticus, ii, 435). Vac. not known.
Held rectories in Somt. 1510–33. Biography in Emden, BRUO, iv, 708.

**Christopher Vessy**
Poss. appointed 1530, Godringhill, if John Alen held it until then (see above). Occ. 1532, prebend not stated (WRO, ref. 802 (BA 2764), p. 62). However, evidently the unnamed prebendary of Godringhill who died by 12 Oct 1534 (Reg. Ghinucci, ii, f. 72r), since he is not mentioned in the taxation record of 1534 (WRO, ref. 802 (BA 2764), p. 101) whereas all the other prebendaries of 1532 were alive then and in 1535.
Canon and prebendary of St Patrick’s Cathedral, Dublin, vicar of Swords, and of other places in Ireland in 1533 (LPFD, vi, 192).

**Thomas Burley**

**William Burley**
Mag. Prob. a relation of the above.

**John Bell**
Occ. 1532, unnamed prebend but evidently Holley (WRO, ref. 802 (BA 2764), p. 62), 1535 (Valor Ecclesiasticus, ii, 435). Vac. c.17 Aug 1539 on consecration as bishop of Worcester (Reg. Bell, f. 9v and see below, John Marlowe).
Ralph Hopwood
Mag. in 1532. Licensed to treat for a pension (not this prebend) 29 Sept 1530 (Reg. Ghinucci, ii, f. 44v).

Thomas Barlow (Barloo)
From Essex. Mag. Younger brother of John Barlow, dean, and William Barlow, bishop of St Davids, Bath and Wells, and Chichester. Mentioned in William’s biography in ODNB.

John Marlowe (Marley)
Coll. 23 June 1540, Murimuth i.e. Holley (Reg. Bell, f. 9v). Prob. till death, Oct 1543 (see below, Henry Jolyff).

Henry Jolyff

John Kerell

SUBDEANS

Thomas Stephens
Coll. 15 July 1456 (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 137v. Res. by 3 July 1458 (ibid., i, f. 144v). Also treasurer (see below).
Philip Hyet  
Coll. 3 July 1458 (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 144v). Till death; died by 20 Oct 1492 (Reg. Morton, f. 49r).

  Mag.

John Wellow (Gwello, Wellywe)  


William Canynges (Canninges)  


John Farnewell  


John Rose  
Coll. 7 Oct 1530 (Reg. Ghinucci, ii, f. 44v). Depr. by 2 July 1534 (ibid., f. 68r).


Thomas Sergeaunt  


John Flooke (Fluke)  
Coll. 22 Dec 1534 (Reg. Ghinucci, ii, f. 72r). Res. by 21 Apr 1535 (ibid., ii, f. 74r).


Lewis Jones (Johns)  
Coll. 21 Apr 1535 (Reg. Ghinucci, ii, f. 74r). Vac. by 10 Sept Dec 1539 (Reg. Bell, f. 4v).

John Laurence (Lawrence)
Coll. 10 Dec 1539 (Reg. Bell, f. 4v). Occ. 7 Jan 1542 (TNA, PROB 11/29, f. 146r), and res. as subdean at surrender, 18 Feb 1544 (Eighth Report of Deputy Keeper, App. II, p. 48). For a contrary reference in 1541, see below, John Pollard.

Five men named John Laurence are listed in Emden, BRUO, iv, 344.

John Pollard
In an ecclesiastical court case of 9 May 1541, John Pollard, aged 26, is described as subdean of Westbury, and John Laurence, aged 49, as merely a priest (WRO, ref. 802 (BA 2764), p. 119); poss. a mistake in view of the other references to Laurence’s tenure.

A John Pollard is listed in Emden, BRUO, iv, 456.

SCHOOLMASTERS

Roger Fabell
Licensed by his diocesan bishop 28 Sept 1463 at the request of Bishop Carpenter to teach grammar at Westbury for four years (Reg. Bekynton, Bath and Wells, i, 400–1).


Nicholas Barbur
Occ. 3 Nov 1498 (Reg. Morton, Canterbury, ii, 462).


John More (Mor)
Occ. 1513 (Reg. S. de Gigli, f. 99v), 14 Sept 1515 (ibid., f. 140v).

Mag. in 1513–15.

Richard Brode


John Blount
Occ. 1532 (WRO, ref. 802 (BA 2764), p. 62). He is not designated schoolmaster, but occ. paying an appropriate amount of tax in the list of members of the college.

Mag. in 1532. Poss. identifiable with John Blunte or Blount, BCL, Oxford, vicar of Great Sampford, Essex 1524–9; rector of Chickerell, Dorset from 1533 (Emden, BRUO, iv, 52–3). These dates would allow a term of office at Westbury 1529–33.

John or Thomas Gold

Mag. in 1534. However, a Thomas Gowllde, of undefined status, signed the acknowledgment of the royal supremacy on 7 Sept 1534 (E 25/118).
TREASURERS

Thomas Bailey
Coll. 8 Oct 1456 (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 139v). Vac. well before Aug 1457 (see below, Thomas Stephens).
   Poss. identical with one or two men of this name in Emden, BRUO, i, 134.

Thomas Stephens
Res. by 18 Aug 1457 (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 143v).
   Also subdean; for his biography, see above.

James Verne
Coll. 18 Aug 1457 (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 143v). Vac. by 5 May 1462 (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 172r).

Henry Palmer
Coll. 5 May 1462 (Reg. Carpenter, i, f. 172r).

Thomas Daukys
Occ. c.6 Aug 1485 (Birmingham City Archives, MS 3279/351481), 3 Nov 1498 (Reg. Morton, Canterbury, ii, 462). If the 1485 date is correct, he was treasurer for two terms, separated by the incumbency of Robert Wood.
   Vicar of Astley, Worcs. (a Westbury church) 1483–90. Also or later a priest-fellow (see below)

Robert Wood (Woode)
Occ. 1 June 1488×6 Nov 1491, i.e. during the deanship of Adam Redsheff with whom he subsequently engaged in litigation (TNA, C 1/273/4, C 1/371/53). Also or later a priest-fellow (see below).
   Vicar of Astley, Worcs. (a Westbury church), 1490–2. A man of this name is listed in Emden, BRUO, iii, 2081.

William Lulle

Robert Wheteacre (Whitacre, Whytacre)
Occ. 1533×1538 (TNA, C 1/879/46).
   Also priest-fellow (see below, with biography).

Walter Colyns
Prob. adm. after 1534 (WRO, ref. 802 (BA 2764), p. 101). Occ. 1535, ‘chaplain of the founder’, but paid the salary formerly designated for the treasurer and therefore poss. holding the same office (Valor Ecclesiasticus, ii, 435).
MINOR CLERGY

—— de Bristol (Bristol)
Occ. 9 Apr 1289, when ordained while vicar of Robert Allot alias de Wych (Reg. Giffard, p. 328).

**John de Hoby**
Chaplain, poss. of Westbury, occ. 31 Jan 1317 when he witnessed the induction of Dean Nicholas de Gore (Reg. Maidstone, f. 50r).

**Richard de Evenlode**
Clerk, poss. of Westbury, occ. 31 Jan 1317 when he witnessed the induction of Dean Nicholas de Gore (ibid.).

**John de Wadyngton**
Occ. 1377, chaplain, prob. vicar (TNA, E 179/58/5).

**Maurice**
Occ. 1377, chaplain, prob. vicar (ibid.).

**John Hudenhull**
Occ. 1377, clerk (ibid.).

**John Cornysh**
Occ. 1377, clerk (ibid.).

**Robert Banak** (Banok, incorrectly Danok)

**John Dyer**
Occ. 23 March 1389, poss. claimant to be vicar to John Trevisa (CCR 1385–9, p. 665, printed in Fowler, John Trevisa, pp. 42–3).

**Thomas Leche**
Occ. 1419, chaplain, prob. vicar (E 179/58/10).

**William Aysschewyke**
Occ. 1419, chaplain, prob. vicar (ibid.).

**William Wyse**
Occ. 1419, chaplain, prob. vicar (ibid.).

**John Upton**
Occ. 1419, chaplain, prob. vicar (ibid.).
Thomas Loungen
Occ. 1419, chaplain, prob. vicar (ibid.).

John
Occ. 1430, chaplain of the prebend of Aust (unless this is a mistake for the parish chaplain of Aust) (E 179/58/5).

John
Occ. 1430, chaplain of the prebend of Henbury (unless this is a mistake for the parish chaplain of Henbury) (E 179/58/5).

Thomas Parker
Occ. 29 Sept 1465×28 Sept 1466, a chaplain at Westbury College (WRO, Comptus Rolls of the Bishop, 92485). Occ. 29 Sept 1467×28 Sept 1468 (ibid., 92487).

John Hampton
Occ. 12 Nov 1474, among members of Westbury college in the will of William Canynges, but not attributed to any office (TNA, PROB 11/6, f. 127r).

John Gardyner
Occ. 12 Nov 1474, among members of Westbury college in the will of William Canynges, but not attributed to any office (TNA, PROB 11/6, f. 127r).

Thomas Norman
Occ. 12 Nov 1474, among members of Westbury college in the will of William Canynges, but not attributed to any office (ibid.).

William Whetenhall
Occ. 12 Nov 1474, among members of Westbury college in the will of William Canynges, but not attributed to any office (ibid.).

William Clerk
Occ. 12 Nov 1474, parish clerk (TNA, PROB 11/6, f. 127r).

Thomas Mason
Died 1 Feb 1478×6 Apr 1478, fellow (WRO, Register of Wills, i, f. 22v).
Prob. from Bromyard, Herefs. Also rector of St Swithin, Worcester at his death (ibid.).

John Walkar
Occ. 1 Feb 1478, prob. a priest of the college when he witnessed the will of Thomas Mason (above) (WRO, Register of Wills, i, f. 22v).
Thomas Daukys (Dauks)
Occ. 1 Oct 1487, prob. fellow when an executor of the will of Dean Lyndsey (TNA, PROB 11/8, f. 134v). Occ. 28 Sept 1508, fellow (WRO, b 009; BA 2636/37 (iii) 43806, ff. 115r, 121r-v). Occ. 1513, vicar (Reg. S. de Gigli, f. 99v). Previously treasurer (see above). Poss. till death; prob. died on 19 March, the day on which his anniversary was later held in the college (Valor Ecclesiasticus, ii, 434).

Mag. in 1487 and 1513.

Robert Wood (Woode)
Occ. 1 Oct 1487, prob. fellow, when an executor of the will of Dean Lyndsey (TNA, PROB 11/8, f. 134v); 3 Nov 1498, perpetual fellow (Reg. Morton, Canterbury, ii, 462); poss. still c.1504–6 (TNA, C 1/273/4, C 1/371/53). Previously treasurer (see above). Poss. till death; prob. died on 27 April, the day on which his anniversary was later held in the college (Valor Ecclesiasticus, ii, 434)

William Lutte (Lutt)
Occ. 13 Oct 1498, as a prospective or present elderly priest in the college, when an arrangement was made for paying his pension there (Regg. King and Hadrian, Bath and Wells, p. 22). Not mentioned in the visitation of 3 Nov 1498, but founded an obit in the college to be held on 16 Aug (Valor Ecclesiasticus, ii, 435).


John Janyns
Occ. 3 Nov 1498, perpetual fellow (Reg. Morton, Canterbury, ii, 462).

Adam Wynhall
Occ. 3 Nov 1498, perpetual fellow (ibid.).

The surname was chiefly found in Middx. in the 19th century.

Philip Morys
Occ. 3 Nov 1498, perpetual fellow (ibid.).

John Carpenter
Occ. 3 Nov 1498, perpetual fellow (ibid.).

William West
Occ. 3 Nov 1498, perpetual fellow (ibid.).

Henry Jakes
Occ. 3 Nov 1498, chaplain or elderly priest (ibid.).

John Mylton
Occ. 3 Nov 1498, chaplain or elderly priest (ibid.).

Thomas Floude
Occ. 3 Nov 1498, chaplain or elderly priest (ibid.).
William Mylyn
Occ. 3 Nov 1498, chaplain or elderly priest (ibid.).

John Hulle
Occ. 3 Nov 1498, chaplain or elderly priest (ibid.).

Richard Cooke
Occ. 3 Nov 1498, chaplain or elderly priest (ibid.). Poss. till death; prob. died on 3 March, the day on which his anniversary was later held in the college (Valor Ecclesiasticus, ii, 434)

John Collys
Occ. 3 Nov 1498, chaplain or elderly priest (Reg. Morton, Canterbury, ii, 462).

Ralph Whitfare
Occ. 3 Nov 1498, chaplain or elderly priest (ibid.).

Henry Massingham
Occ. 3 Nov 1498, chaplain or elderly priest (ibid.). The surname was chiefly found in Norfolk in the 19th century.

William Wrangeford
Occ. 3 Nov 1498, chaplain or elderly priest (ibid.).

Robert Adams
Occ. 1513, vicar (Reg. S. de Gigli, f. 99v).
Mag.

John Staresmar
Occ. 1513, vicar (ibid.). The surname was chiefly found in the east Midlands in the 19th century.

Robert Farewell
Occ. 1513, vicar (ibid.). Vac. by 29 Sept 1518 (Exeter Cathedral Archives, VC/22261 m. 1).
From Exeter diocese. Ordained there in 1506–7, and returned there by 1518 as a vicar choral of Exeter Cathedral (N. Orme, The Minor Clergy of Exeter Cathedral: Biographies, Devon and Cornwall Record Society, new series, forthcoming).

Thomas Davis
Occ. 1513, vicar (Reg. S. de Gigli, f. 99v).

Richard Salforde
Occ. 1513, vicar (ibid.). The surname was found in Gloucs. and elsewhere in the 19th century.

Thomas Crokwell
Occ. 1513, vicar (ibid.).
Thomas Denys
Occ. 1513, (elderly) chantry priest (ibid.).

Thomas Mores
Occ. 1513, (elderly) chantry priest (ibid.).

John Sutton
Occ. 1513, (elderly) chantry priest (ibid.).

John Suivylhurst
Occ. 1513, (elderly) chantry priest (ibid.).

Thomas Gronow
Occ. 1513, (elderly) chantry priest (ibid.).
The surname was chiefly found in south Wales in the 19th century.

George Jonson
Occ. 1513, (elderly) chantry priest (ibid.), 1534 (WRO, ref. 802 (BA 2764), p. 101), 1535 (Valor Ecclesiasticus, ii, 435).

John Farnewell (Farnwell)
A man of this name occ. in Emden, BRUO, iv, 199. The surname was chiefly found in Notts. and Yorks. in the 19th century.

Christopher Damason
The surname was chiefly found in Middx., Surrey, and Yorks. in the 19th century.

Robert Wheteacre (Wheteaker, Whitaker)
Also treasurer (see above). Chaplain of Magdalen College, Oxford 1537; fellow 1542. MA, Oxford, 1540. Poss. later held benefices in Wilts. and Somt.. Biography in Emden, BRUO, iv, 620.

John Colyer (Colyar)

John Sydyet
John Wyght

James Colynson

John Lynet (-t)

Alexander Bosegrove (Bosgrove)

The surname occ. in Middx. in the 19th century.

Walter Garett

Richard Cooke

John Griffithe

Henry ap John

From Wales in view of his surname.

John Bradeley (Bradley)

John Arnold

Richard Hussey
Occ. 1534, prob. adm. in that year, fellow, since his name was added to the taxation list of that year (WRO, ref. 802 (BA 2764), p. 101), 7 Sept 1534 (TNA, E 25/118), 1535 (Valor Ecclesiasticus, ii, 435).
John Ellys
Occ. 7 Sept 1534, status unknown (TNA, E 25/118).

Thomas Gowlde
Occ. 7 Sept 1534, status unknown (TNA, E 25/118).
Poss. identical with John Gold, schoolmaster (see above).

Richard Dean
A man of this name occ. in Emden, BRUO, iv, 166.

John Styllard
The surname is found in Staffs. in the 19th century.

John Selman
This was a west-of-England surname in the 19th century.

Walter Colyns

John Milton
Occ. 1535, hired clerk (Valor Ecclesiasticus, ii, 435).

Richard Ellysworth
Occ. 1535, hired clerk (Valor Ecclesiasticus, ii, 435).

Richard Woode
Occ. 1535, hired clerk (Valor Ecclesiasticus, ii, 435).

John Laurence
Occ. 9 May 1541, priest (WRO, ref. 802 (BA 2764), p. 119).
Previously and later recorded as subdean (see above).

Thomas Lewis (Lewes)
LAY ALMSFOLK

**Thomas Hoby**
Occ. 20 July 1468 (WCM, A 6(i) f. 52r).

**James Rythok**
Occ. 20 July 1468 (WCM, A 6(i) f. 52r).

**David John alias Marchaunt**
Occ. 20 July 1468 (WCM, A 6(i) f. 52r).

**Grace Lukas**
Nom. 20 July 1472 (Great Red Book of Bristol, ed. Veale, part i, pp. 72–3).

**John Hull**
Nom. 1 Aug 1525 (ibid., pp. 70–1).
    Of Bristol.

**William Lumberde**
Dispensation to be adm. 4 Apr 1535 (Faculty Office Registers, ed. Chambers, p. 23).
    Aged between 50 and 60 in 1535.

**Alice Prought**
Nom. 3 Nov 1540 (Great Red Book of Bristol, ed. Veale, part i, p. 73).
APPENDICES
BISHOP CARPENTER’S WILL, 1476

A copy of Bishop Carpenter’s Latin will survives among transcriptions of documents at the end of a sixteenth-century register of rentals and leases of the property of the bishopric of Worcester (WRO, b 009 (BA 2636/37 (iii) 43806, ff. 294r-295v). It was presumably transcribed there because its bequests to the bishopric were relevant to the administration and defence of the property. The will is reproduced here, in translation, since its existence has not generally been known. One or two duplicated words have been removed, omissions supplied in square brackets, and corrections noted as footnotes. Paragraphing, punctuation, and the use of capital letters have been modernised to assist the reader rather than following the original.

[f. 294r] In the name of God, amen. The twentieth day of the month of October in the year of the Lord one thousand four hundred seventy six, I, John Carpenter, formerly bishop of Worcester, sound of mind and sane of memory although sick in body, compose, ordain, and make my testament or my last will in this manner. First, I bequeath and commend my soul to almighty God and my body to be buried in the chapel of the Holy Cross [in capella sanct’ crucis] in the crypt [cripta] beneath the high altar of the collegiate church of Westbury, Worcester diocese. And I will and ordain that the dean and chapter of the said collegiate church and college provide [inveniant] one mass to be celebrated daily in the aforesaid crypt [crippa] for my soul and the souls of my parents and benefactors, to continue for future times perpetually. And I will that my executors, immediately after my decease, cause and ordain my body to be carried to the cathedral church of Worcester, that there I may have my last farewell, [f. 294v] that is to say exequies and mass solemnly on the following day [crastino] as is fitting,¹ and as the prior and convent of the said church are bound by their written obligation sealed with their common seal, for which I will that the said prior and convent shall have £10 to be divided among the co-brethren and co-monks of the said church by the discretions of the prior and subprior. And I will that an honest sum of money be distributed to poor people of the city of Worcester on the said day after mass, according to the discretion of my executors. And I will that my executors cause my body to be carried from the said cathedral church to the said collegiate church of Westbury, so that on every night it rests in some church [or] chapel, and that I may have exequies and mass in every place of the removal of the same my body.

¹ MS vt dicet, probably for vt decet.
Also I give and bequeath to the fabric of the cathedral church of Worcester, two
fathers [forders] of lead. Also I give and bequeath to the reverend father and lord,
Lord John Alcocke, bishop of Worcester, my successor, and his successors of
Worcester, £100 of good and lawful money of England in the manner and name of a
fund [implementi] together with a mitre, which I will to remain to him and his
successors as bishops of Worcester, so that the said reverend father John, the present
bishop of Worcester, and all and singular his successors existing successively in their
times, shall take an oath at the time of receiving the said £100 that they will give up
and replace, and each of them will give up and replace, the same sum of £100 and the
aforesaid mitre, sufficiently repaired and maintained at their expense, at the time of
their decease or withdrawal from the said bishopric of Worcester or more speedily,
into the college of Westbury for the use of their successors as bishops of Worcester,
to be kept safely by the dean and chapter of the said collegiate church and college of
Westbury in a certain common chest locked with three keys, of which one shall remain
with the bishop of Worcester for the time being, and another with the prior of the
cathedral church of Worcester for the time being, and the third with the dean and
chapter of the said college of Westbury, and to be delivered again to the next bishop
of Worcester then coming when they shall be called on by him to do so.

Also I will, ordain, and dispose that my feoffees of and in my manor of Northwick
[Northwyke] with its appurtenances in the county of Worcester, which I formerly
purchased [perquisiui] from John Atwode, esquire, shall make a sufficient estate of
and in the aforesaid manor with its appurtenances aforesaid to the reverend father
John Alcocke, bishop of Worcester, when they shall be duly required by him to do so,
to have and to hold to him and his successors as bishops of Worcester for the use of
the episcopal table [mense episcopalis] there in perpetuity. Also I will, ordain, and
dispose that my feoffees of and in all those lands and tenements formerly acquired by
me from Thomas Littilton, justice of the lord king, lying in the street called le
Cokenstrete of the city of Worcester, which I formerly caused to be built anew, shall
make a good and sufficient estate of and in the lands and tenements with their
appurtenances to the dean and chapter of Westbury when they shall be required by
them to do so, to have and to hold to them and their successors in perpetuity, so that
any of the chaplains of the city of Worcester wishing to have chambers there and to
keep their commons together there may have those chambers and houses to their use,
provided that they pay to the said dean and chapter for the chambers as they may
agree with the same dean and chapter. And I will that the said dean and chapter cause
and ordain the master or warden of the Carnary [Carnarie] of Worcester, existing for
the time, or the rector of the church of St Helen, Worcester, whichever they think fit
[duxerint], to be chosen and ordained as principal and supervisor of the said chaplains
wishing to dwell in the said tenements. And in case that no chaplains come there
within two years after the date of the present testament to keep commons there and
that it seems to the bishop of Worcester that there is a likelihood that no others will
come, then I will that the dean and chapter of Westbury may dispose of the lands and
tenements for the profit of the said college.

2 MS prestentes, ‘taking’.
3 MS capellam for capellani.
4 MS que.
Also I will and ordain and I declare and dispose by this my last will that all and singular my feoffees of and in all my lands, tenements, rents, services, and possessions formerly acquired by me in the city and in the suburbs of Worcester and wherever existing within the realm of England make a good and sufficient estate of and [in] the same lands, tenements, rents, services, and possessions aforesaid to the dean and chapter of the collegiate church and college of Westbury aforesaid, when they shall be duly required to do so by them or by my executors, to have and to hold to them and their successors in perpetuity. Also I will, ordain, and dispose that my executors, as quickly as they conveniently may, shall acquire or cause to be acquired lands and tenements and rents, possessions, and services to the annual value of £20 to my costs and goods, and that they make or cause to be made from the said lands and tenements, rents, possessions, and services a good and sufficient estate to the aforesaid dean and chapter of Westbury, to have and to hold to them and their successors in perpetuity, so that the said dean and chapter shall provide and maintain one chaplain to celebrate divine [service] in the said collegiate church of Westbury and to celebrate mass daily in the crypt beneath the high altar of the said collegiate church where my body shall rest, praying especially for my soul and [the souls] of my parents and benefactors and of the benefactors of the said college, as is expressed above.

And I will that the said chaplain shall have annually for his stipend twelve marks and that the said dean and chapter and their successors shall hold my obit or anniversary annually in perpetuity in the said collegiate church on the day of my death if it may be done, or otherwise on the next day following that it may conveniently be done, repeating [decantando] the exequies of the dead and a mass of requiem on the following day in the most solemn manner that they may do, with honest and convenient lights burning with the ringing of bells as is befitting. And I will and ordain that the dean of the said collegiate church, if he shall be present at the said exequies and mass, shall have 20d., and that each of the canons of the said church who shall be present at the said exequies and mass shall have 16d., and each of the perpetual fellows of the said collegiate church 12d., and each stipendiary priest [presbiter conducticius] of the said college being present at the said exequies and mass 8d., and each stipendiary clerk 6d., and each of the two parish clerks 6d. for ringing, and each of the choristers of the said church 4d. And I will that the six elderly priests there shall say on the same day of my anniversary exequies and a mass of requiem on the following day in the chapels assigned to them there. And I will that each of them shall have 6d. And I will that the six poor men and six widows of my exhibition and foundation there shall be present in the collegiate church of Westbury aforesaid at the exequies and mass on the said day of my anniversary and that each of them shall have 4d. And I will that this distribution be made annually in perpetuity immediately after the mass of requiem on the day of my anniversary by the hands of the treasurer of the said college for the time being.

Also I will and ordain and dispose that the said dean and chapter, from part of the revenues of the said land and tenements and possessions of the annual value of £20 and to be acquired by my executors as mentioned previously, shall supplement and augment the maintenance of the six poor widows there of my exhibition, so that each of them shall have every day from henceforth in perpetuity 1d. Also I [give] and bequeath to the aforesaid dean and chapter of Westbury £100 in ready money so that they may have the same £100 for the defence of the said college and of the lands and tenements acquired by me for the said college and of the other rents and tenements
whatsoever belonging to the said college. And I will that the said sum of £100 shall be kept faithfully and wholly [f. 295v] and reserved in the manner of a fund in a certain chest of three keys lying in the treasury of the said college. And in case that any part of the said sum of money shall be expended in the defence of the said college, then I will that the treasurer of the said college shall restore and reintegrate it from the next moneys received, so that the said sum of £100 shall remain wholly restored, or at least be faithfully conveyed [and] restored by the aforesaid within a year from the time of the deduction [and] diminution of the same.

Also I give and bequeath to the aforesaid dean and chapter of Westbury one basin [peluem] of silver, with one ewer [lauacro] of silver, and one salt-cellar [salarium] of silver and gilt with a cover, and six plates [plateis], six pottingers [potigers], and six saucers [sawcers] of silver to the intent that they may be served to honourable persons with them when they shall come to the same college. Also I will and ordain that my feoffees of and in a certain tenement situated in the street called the Corveserestrete within the city of Worcester formerly acquired by me from William Pullesdon shall make a sufficient estate of and in the said tenement to the preceptor and co-brethren of the hospital of [St] Wulstan [Wolstani], Worcester, to have to them and their successors in perpetuity to provide one sermon to be preached within the said hospital in some convenient place every Wednesday [feria quarta] in Easter week in perpetuity

Also I give and bequeath and I will and ordain that my executors shall dispose and distribute to each of my chaplains being in my household [familia] at the time of my decease, some jewel or special gift according to the discretion of my executors, to pray for my soul and the souls of my benefactors. Also I give and bequeath and will and ordain that each of my temporal servants being of my household at the time of my decease shall have, in the name of a reward, their annual wage as they were formerly accustomed to receive it from me, beyond their wage of that quarter [of the year] in which I happen to die, but receiving nothing further in money, except that there may be provided a wage and reward to my chamberlains formerly living with me for their labours according to the discretion of my executors.

Also I give and bequeath to the fabric of the church of blessed Mary of Oxford, that is to say for the new building of the nave of the church there £20. Also I will that my executors warn and exhort the provost and scholars of the college of Oriel in Oxford to hold my obit or anniversary in the church of blessed Mary the Virgin in Oxford every year in perpetuity, for the observance of which I will that they may have a certain sum of money according to the discretion of my executors and a claim [exigensiam] on my goods after my debts and legacies have first been paid. Also I will and ordain that my executors shall labour with all diligence and effect for the establishment and safeguarding of the exhibition of those nine scholars in Bedel Hall [aula Bedelli], formerly founded by me, according to the form of my statutes produced in this respect. Also I give and bequeath to the fabric of the parish church of Powick [Powicke], Worcester diocese, 100s.

The residue of all my goods not bequeathed above, after my debts and legacies and funeral expenses have first been paid, I give and bequeath to my executors, that is to say Masters Henry Sampson and William Mogges, masters of arts, and Thomas Arnolde of Cirencester, whom I ordain, make, and constitute my executors by these

\footnote{MS aut, probably correctly ac.}
presents that they may faithfully and vigilantly dispose of the residue of my goods for
the health of my soul, as seems most expedient to them, and as they will respond for
the same to the highest Judge at the Last Judgment, as they are bound to do, and I give
and bequeath to each of them, my executors, for their labour, £20. In testimony of
which I have caused my seal to be attached to these presents, these being witnesses:
Master William Vauce, Master Robert Enkbarow, and Richard Clent, and others in
my manor of Northwick on the day and year written above.
THE PROPERTY OF WESTBURY COLLEGE IN 1535

The following account is translated from the Latin of the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* (ii, 432–5). Place-names have been modernised, surnames left in the original spelling. Sums of money, there sometimes given merely in shillings or pence, have been converted into pounds, shillings, and pence. At some point, the totals of expenditure and the tax to be paid on them were revised by those who drew up the accounts, leading to alternative figures in two places.

COLLEGE OF WESTBURY IN THE COUNTY OF GLOUCESTER

[p. 432] Value of all and singular the manors, lands, tenements, and possessions and other profits whatsoever, belonging both to John Barlo, clerk, dean there, and to the said college in common years.

RECTORY OF KEMPSEY in the county of Worcester, appropriated to the dean of the aforesaid college

Worth, from the farm of the rectory there thus let to farm, £46 13s. 4d. From the salt-boilery *bullaria salis* at Droitwich *Wyche*, per annum, £1. From an annual pension of the rectory of Compton, per annum, 6s. 8d. Total, £48.

From which, deducted in alms given to six poor men and six widows for buying salt by ordinance of the lord John Carpenter, formerly bishop of Worcester, founder of the said college, per annum, 4s. 4d.

And in money distributed as alms for the anniversary of the lord king Edward IV and the duke of York, father of the same, by order of the said founder, per annum, £1.

And in an annual pension paid to the bishop of Worcester for the aforesaid church of Kempsey, per annum, 6s. 8d.

And in an annual pension paid to the prior and convent of Worcester for the aforesaid church, per annum, 3s. 4d.

And in money paid as alms for the diet of six elderly priests, six poor men, and six widows twice in the year by ordinance of the aforesaid founder, per annum, 9s.
And for the fee of John Combe, steward there, 13s. 4d., and of William Veell, bailiff there, 13s. 4d., per annum, £1 6s. 8d.
Thus allowed, £3 10s.

And remains clear, £44 10s.

MANOR OF ASTLEY in the county of Worcester

Worth, from rents of assize [i.e. fixed rents] there, per annum, £18.
From the farm of the demesne land there, per annum, £12 5s. 2d.
Total, £30 5s. 2d.

From which, deducted for the fee of John Acton, steward there, 40s., and of John Combes, bailiff there, £1 15s., per annum, £3 15s.
And for the procuration of the lord bishop of Worcester there, per annum, 8s. 10¾d.
Thus allowed, £4 3s. 10¾d.

And remains clear, £26 1s. 3¼d.

MANOR OF DOWDESWELL in the county of Gloucester

Worth, from rents of assize of customary tenants there, per annum, £1.
From the rent of the farm of the manor there, per annum, £7.
Total, £8.

From which, deducted in rent paid to the lord of Guiting per annum, 8d.

And remains clear, £7 19s. 4d.

MANOR OF FOXCOTE in the county of Gloucester

Worth, from rents of assize of both free and customary tenants there, per annum, £1 3s. 6d.
From the rent of the farm of the manor there, per annum, £4 6s. 8d.
Total, £5 10s. 2d.

From which, deducted in rent paid to the lord of Guiting per annum, 8d.

And remains clear, £5 9s. 6d.

MANOR OF TURKDEAN in the county of Gloucester

Worth, from rents of assize there, per annum, £3 15s.
From the farm of the manor there, per annum, £4 13s. 4d.
Total, £8 8s. 4d.

From which, deducted in rent paid to the honour of Wallingford, per annum, 3s. 4d.

And remains clear, £8 5s.
MANOR OF SHELL in the county of Worcester

Worth, from rents of assize of customary tenants there, per annum, £1.
From the farm of the manor there, per annum, £5 13s. 4d.
Total, £6 13s. 4d.

From which, deducted in rent paid to [Lord] Bergavenny there, per annum, 1d.
And in rent paid to the lord of Grafton there, per annum, 3s. 4d.

And remains clear, £6 9s. 11d.

MANOR OF WORMINGTON in the county of Gloucester

Worth, from rents of assize there of both free and customary tenants, per annum, £4 18s. 7d.
From the farm of the manor there, per annum, £2 13s. 4d.
Total, £7 11s. 11d.

From which, in rent paid to the court of the lord king at Winchcombe, per annum, 3s. 4d.

And remains clear, £7 8s. 7d. [p. 433]

CITY OF WORCESTER

From rents of assize charged on lands, tenements, and gardens there, per annum, £5
Total, £5

From which, in rent paid to the lord bishop of Worcester there, per annum, 3s. 8d.
And in alms given to the Friars Minor there for the obit of Thomas Sybley and Elizabeth his wife, to be kept annually for ever, 3s. 4d.

And remains clear, £4 13s.

GANNOW in the county of Worcester

From rents of assize there, per annum, £1 1s. 6d.
From the farm of the demesne land there, per annum, £2 5s.
Total, £3 6s. 6d.

From which, in rent paid to the lord of Inkberrow, per annum, 1s.

And remains clear, £3 5s. 6d.

MANORS OF MONYHULL AND GROVELY in the county of Worcester

From rents of assize of free tenants there, per annum, 17s. 6d.
From the farm of the manor there, per annum, £15 10s. 3d.
From the capital messuage of Icknield Street [Ekelyngstreet], per annum, £4 1s. 6d.
From the farm of the pasture called Brander End [Branyrene], per annum, 13s. 4d.
Total, £21 2s. 7d.

From which, in rent paid to the manor of King’s Norton, per annum, £1 11s. 1d.
And in rent paid to John Middelmore there, per annum, 3s. 9d.
And in rent paid to John Slought there, per annum, 1s. 4d.
And in rent paid to John Lovecoke there, per annum, 1s. 5d.
And in rent paid to the bishop of Worcester for lands in Icknield Street, per annum, 14s. 6d.
And in rent paid to John Philipps there, per annum, 4d.
And for the fee of William Sparry, bailiff there, per annum, 13s. 4d.

And remains clear, £17 16s. 10d.

MANOR OF BARFORD in the county of Warwick

Worth, from rents of assize of customary tenants there, per annum, £7 19s.
From the farm of the manor there, per annum, £2 13s. 4d.
Total, £10 12s. 4d.

From which, in rent paid to the lord of Warwick there, per annum, 1s. 2d.
And in rent paid to the lord bishop of Worcester there, per annum, 2s.

And remains clear, £10 9s. 2d.

MANOR OF LONGBOROUGH in the county of Worcester

Worth, from free rent there, per annum, 5s. 9d.
From the farm of the manor there, per annum, £5 6s. 8d.
Total, £5 12s. 5d.

PAXFORD in the county of Gloucester

From the rent of a capital messuage there, per annum, £2 16s. 4d.
Total, £2 16s. 4d.

From which, in rent paid to the lord bishop of Worcester there, per annum, 12s. 2½d.

And remains, £2 4s. 1½d.

UPPER WICK [OVERWYKE] AND HENWICK in the county of Worcester

From rents of land in Upper Wick, per annum, £1 0s. 4d.
From rents of assize in Henwick, per annum, £2.
Total, £3 0s. 4d.

From which, in rent paid to the lord bishop of Worcester there, per annum, 13s. 2d.

And remains, £2 7s. 2d.
HANBURY AND BREDON in the county of Worcester

Worth, from rents of tenements in Hanbury, per annum, £112s. 4d.
From rents of tenements in Bredon, per annum, 14s. 9d.
Total, £27s. 1d.

From which, in rent paid to the lord bishop of Worcester for the lands in Hanbury, per annum, 5s. 8d.
And in rent paid to the lord of St John there, per annum, 4d.

And remains clear, £2 1s. 1d.

UPTON AND RYALL in the county of Worcester

Worth, from rents of tenements there per annum, £2.
Total, £2.

From which, in rent paid to the lord of Warwick there, per annum, 8s. 9d.

And remains clear, £1 11s. 3d.

RECTORY OF WESTBURY[-ON-TRYM] in the county of Gloucester

Worth, from the farm of the rectory there thus let to farm, per annum, £2217s. 8d.
Total as it appears.

MANOR OF HOLLEY in the county of Gloucester

Worth, from rents of assize there, per annum, £5 1s. 6d.
From the farm there, per annum, £6.
Total, £11 1s. 6d.
Total as it appears.

MANOR OF GODRINGHILL in the county of Gloucester

Worth, from rents of assize there, per annum, £10.
From the farm of the manor with the demesne land, per annum, £6.
Total, £16.

From which, for the fee of William Veele, bailiff there, £1.

And remains, £15. [p. 434]

HENBURY, LAWRENCE WESTON, AND AUST in the county of Gloucester

Worth, from rents of assize there, per annum, £3.
From demesne lands there, per annum, £2 14s.
From the farm of the tithes of corn and hay there, thus let to farm, per annum, £20.
Total, £25 14s.

From which, for the fee of Thomas Wright, bailiff there, 7s. 4d.
And remains clear, £25 6s. 8d.

REDWICK in the county of Gloucester

From rents of assize there, per annum, £4 5s. 10d.
Total as it appears.

MANOR OF WESTBURY[-ON-TRYM] in the county of Gloucester

Worth, from rents of assize of customary tenants there, per annum, £3 3s. 4d.
From the farm of the manor there, per annum, £2 6s. 8d.
From the farm of the demesne land in Redland [Thyredeland], per annum, £2 4s.
From rents of assize of lands and tenements in Canford, belonging to the same manor, per annum, £2 17s. 4d.
In total per annum, £10 11s. 4d.

From which, for the fee of William Vele, bailiff there, per annum, 13s. 4d.
And remains clear, £9 18s.

MANOR OF CLIFTON in the county of Gloucester

Worth, from rents of assize and the farm of the manor thus let to farm, per annum, £10.
Total as it appears.

OLD SODBURY in the county of Gloucester

Worth, from the rent of one capital messuage there, per annum, £3 6s. 8d.
Total as it appears.

MANORS OF ASTON TIRROLD AND NORTH MORETON in the county of Berkshire

Worth, from rents of assize of both free and customary tenants and the farm of the manor there thus let to farm to John Hilman by indenture, per annum, £12.
Total as it appears.

MANOR OF ELMESTREE in the county of Gloucester

Worth, from the farm of the manor there, per annum, £12.
Total as it appears.
BERWICK in the county of Gloucester

Worth, from the rent of assize of one capital messuage with the land belonging to it, per annum, £6 13s. 10d.
Total as it appears.

THE TOWN OF BRISTOL

Worth, from the rents of all lands and tenements there, per annum, £7.

From which, in rent paid to the church of St Michael there, per annum, 6d.
And in rent paid to the nuns of Blessed Mary Magdalene there, per annum, 10s.
And in rent paid to the lord of St John there, per annum, 1s. 4d.

And remains clear, £6 8s. 2d.

HOSPITAL OF ST LAURENCE NEAR BRISTOL in the county of Gloucester

Worth, from rents of assize there of both free and customary tenants there, per annum, £11 9s. 8d.
From the farm of the manor with the demesne land there, per annum, £4 10s. 4d.
Total, per annum, £16.

From which, in rent paid to John Mawdelen, per annum, 13s. 4d.
And in rent paid to Lord Warwick there, per annum, 2s. 8d.
And in rent paid to the prior of St James, Bristol, per annum, 3s.
And in rent paid to Lord Cobham there, per annum, 3s.
And in rent paid to John Syneg’r there, per annum, 6d.
And for the salary of one priest celebrating masses there by ordinance, per annum, £2.
And in alms given to four poor people there, per annum, 16s.
And for the fee of Robert Cocks, steward there, per annum, 13s. 4d.
And for the fee of Thomas Toker, bailiff both here and in Bristol, per annum, £1.

And remains clear, £12 8s. 2d.

PENSION FROM THE VICAR OF HENBURY

From the pension from the vicar of Henbury, per annum, 13s. 4d.

[TOTAL INCOME]

Total of all the value stated above, £328 10s. 8d.

From which, in various subtractions and deductions the particulars of which appear above, £27 1s. 10¾d.

And remains clear, £301 8s. 9¾d.

Remains clear, £284 2s. 1½d.
[FURTHER DEDUCTIONS]

From which, for the fee of Nicholas Poyntz, knight, steward there, £1.
Of John Cookyssey, receiver general in the county of Worcester, £3 3s. 4d.
Of Robert Cocks, auditor, £2.
And of John Farnwell, receiver in the county of Gloucester, per annum, £1.
[Total], £7 3s. 4d.

[ALMS]

And in alms given by ordinance of the said founder for the exhibition of twelve
choristers, of whom each of them receiving £2 3s. 4d. per annum, and thus, £26.
And in alms given by ordinance of the said founder to six poor men, of whom each
receiving £1 10s. 4d. per annum, at the rate of 1d. per day, and thus, £9 2s.
And for the livery [i.e. dress] of the same men by the alms of the said founder given
to them every third year, price £1 10s., and thus according to that rate per annum,
10s.
And in money paid by the alms of the said founder for six quarters and four bushels
of barley bought at the price of 5s. 4d. per quarter and delivered to the aforesaid
men for their drink, £1 14s. 8d.
And in alms given to six poor widows by ordinance of the aforesaid founder of which
each of them receiving £1 10s. 4d. per annum, at the rate of 1d. per day, £9 2s.
And in money paid by the alms of the said founder for the livery of the same [widows]
given to them every third year, price £2, and thus according to that rate per annum,
13s. 4d.
And in alms of the said founder for six quarters of wheat bought at the price of 8s. per
quarter and six quarters and four bushels of barley bought at the price of
5s. 4d. every year and delivered for making therewith the bread and drink of the
same widows, £4 2s. 8d.
[p. 435] And in alms of the aforesaid founder for washing the clothes of the aforesaid
choristers, men, and widows, per annum, 16s. 8d.
And in alms of the said founder for the livery of six elderly priests given to them
every third year by ordinance of the aforesaid founder, price £2 13s. 4d., and thus
according to that rate 17s. 9¼d., 17s. 9¼d.

And in money distributed as alms by ordinance for various anniversaries held every
year, as follows:
For the anniversary of Lord John our founder, held on the feast of the 1100 Virgins,
£1 6s. 8d.
For the anniversary of William Alphort and Joan his wife held on 23 October, 8s.
For the anniversary of Thomas Dauks held on 19 November, 13s. 4d.
For the anniversary of Richard Coke held on 3 March, 7s.
For the anniversary of William Moggs held on 11 March, £1.
For the anniversary of William Codder held on 16 March, 8s. 4d.
For the anniversary of Thomas Sibley and Elizabeth his wife held on 10 April,
8s. 6d.
For the anniversary of Richard Nevell, earl of Warwick, held on 14 April, 10s.
For the anniversary of Robert Wood held on 27 April, 8s. 6d.
For the anniversary of John Lyndesey held on 21 May, 8s. 3d.
For the anniversary of John Jonys held on 22 May, 9s. 4d.
For the anniversary of Ranulph Colyns held on the penultimate day of May, 8s. 6d.
For the anniversary of William Vauce held on 19 July, 10s.
And for the anniversary of William Lutt held on 16 August, 8s. 2d.
And thus in total [for the anniversaries], £6 14s. 7d.

And for the procurement of the lord bishop of Worcester, per annum, 17s. 9¼d.

[TOTALS]

Total of all the aforesaid allocations, £68 14s. 9½d.
And remains, £232 14s. 0¼d.

Tenths [i.e. royal taxation] thence, £23 5s. 4¾d.
Remains clear, £215 7s. 4d.
Tenths thence, £21 10s. 9d.

Whence, of the above £230 [sic] 14s. 0¼d.,

[STAFF AND STIPENDS]

John Barlo, clerk, dean of the said college with £17 6s. 8d. received from the college for his residence and £2 for his prebend, £63 16s. 8d.
John Bell, Thomas Barlo, Ralph Hopwood, William Burley, and Thomas Wathell, clerks, prebendaries of the said college of whom each of them receiving £2 per annum, and thus in total, £10.
Lewis Jones, subdean there, for his annual pension, £10.
John Golde, schoolmaster [(hy)podidascalum] there, for his salary, per annum, £10.
Walter Colyns, chaplain of our lord founder, for his salary, per annum, £8.
John Farnwell, John Colyar, Richard Hussey, Henry ap John, John Bradeley, Richard Dean, John Styllard, and John Selman, fellows of the said college, of whom each of them receiving for his salary £7 6s. 8d., per annum, and thus in total, £58 13s. 4d.
John Milton, Richard Ellysworth, and Richard Woode, hired clerks [clericos conductos] there, of whom each of them receiving for his salary £6, per annum, and so in total, £18.
Alexander Bosgrove, Richard Cooke, John Lynett, Walter Garett, John Arnold, and George Jonson, elderly priests on the foundation of the said college, of whom each of them receiving £4 13s. 4d., per annum, and thus in total, £28.

[Remaining clear to the] said college, £26 4s. 0¼d.

[TEWKESBURY ABBEY]

[p. 474] Money paid for six quarters of corn and two measures of peas annually, bought and delivered to the dean and chapter of the collegiate [church] and college
of Westbury for the use and utility of six poor people dwelling together in Westbury aforesaid, as sufficiently appears in the ordinance and foundation made thereupon of the reverend father John, bishop of Worcester, the date of which is the 4th day of May in the year of the Lord 1469, in ordinary years, £2 1s. 10d.
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Crowner, Richard, prebendary 221
Cynwulf, landowner 10
Dale, William de la, prebendary 214
Damason, Christopher, fellow 234
Darlington, R. R., historian 18
Daukys, Thomas, treasurer and fellow 93, 229, 232, 253
Daventre, Ralph de, prebendary 36, 211
Davis, Thomas, vicar 233
Dean, Oxon. 61
Dean, Richard, fellow 236
Deerhurst, Gloucs. 6, 9
Denys, Thomas, elderly priest 234
Dowdeswell, Gloucs. 78, 104, 247
Droitwich, Worcs. 246
Dumbleton, Thomas de, prebendary 208
Dunstan, archbishop 11
Durdham Down in Westbury-on-Trym 42
Dyer, John, chaplain 52, 230
Eadmer of Canterbury, monk 12
Eadnoth Senior, monk 11–12
Eanwulf, nobleman 6–7
Ecgfrith, king of Mercia 6
Edgar, king 11
Edmund, earl of Cornwall 22
Edmundes, John 93
Edward I, king 24, 29
Edward III, king 45
Edward IV, king 78–9, 81–2, 93, 246
Edward VI, king 103–4, 185
Edyndon, William de, dean 45, 195
Eggecomb, Thomas, prebendary 90, 222
Ellys, John, college member 236
Ellysworth, Richard, hired clerk 236, 254
Elmestree, Gloucs. 78, 251
Ely, cathedral 89
Ely, Richard, dean 198
Engelbert, landowner 18
Enkbarow, Robert, cleric 245
Escote, Peter de, prebendary 30, 204
Evenlode, Richard de, clerk 230
Evesham, Worcs., abbey 13, 33, 79, 102
Evreux, John d’, archdeacon and prebendary 28, 46, 203
exchanges of benefices 44, 55–6
Fabell, Roger, schoolmaster 68, 96, 228
Fangefos, Robert de, prebendary 202
Farewell, Robert, vicar 233
Farnwell, John, subdean and fellow 104, 227, 234, 254
Farnwell, John, receiver general (the above?) 253
Faryngton, Robert de, claimant to prebend 50, 216
Felde, Richard de la, prebendary 50–1, 216
Feltun, John, cleric 94
Fisher, John, bishop 99
Fleming, Richard, bishop 58
Fleury-sur-Loire, France 11, 13
Flooke, John, subdean 91, 227
Flode, Thomas, chaplain 232
Fowler, David, historian 52
Foxcote, Gloucs. 104, 247
Frederic (Frid’), bishop’s chaplain, possibly dean 20, 194
friars, orders of 24, 84–5, 248
Frome, William, prebendary 221–2
Fuller, Thomas, historian 57, 75
Gannow, Worcs. 78, 104, 248
Gardener, Richard, dean 89–90, 200
Gardyne, John, college member 231
Garett, Walter, elderly priest 235, 254
Garnaerii, Arnald, papal tax-collector 50
Germanus, monk 11–13
Gervase, possible prebendary 17, 19, 201
Giffard, Walter, archbishop 24, 36
Gigli, Silvestro de, bishop of Worcester 88
Gloucester 99–100
archdeaconry of 28, 33
gaol 52–3
minster later abbey and cathedral 6, 102, 134–5, 139, 172
Gloucester, Gilbert de Clare, earl of 29
Gloucester, Robert de – see Wyse
Gnoushale, Stephen de, dean 23, 194
Godringhill probably in Henbury 17–18, 21, 34
prebend and prebendaries of 17–18, 21, 34, 36–9, 44–5, 47, 51–4, 67, 81–2, 87, 94, 98, 113, 137, 250
Godwin, Francis, historian 57, 63, 75
Gold, John or Thomas, schoolmaster 97, 228, 254
Gowllde, Thomas, college member 236
Gore, Nicholas de, dean and prebendary 195, 207
Grafton, Worcs. 248
Grandisson, John, bishop 56
Great Malvern, Worcs., priory 63, 102, 172
Greenfield, William, prebendary 45–6, 204
Gregory XI, pope 49–50
Grenville, William, prebendary 45–6, 204
Gryffyth, John, merchant 85
Gronow, Thomas, elderly priest 234
Groveley, Worcs. 104, 248
Guiling, Gloucs. 247
Hamcotes, Richard de, claimant to prebend 214
Hampton-on-Avon now Hampton Lucy, Warws. 29
Hampton, John, musician 69, 231
Hanbury, Worcs. 5, 30, 250
Hannibal, Thomas, dean 90, 200, 225
Harlow, John, cleric 62
Hartlebury, Worcs. 30
Haseldene in Westbury-on-Trym 15
Hasele, Robert de, prebendary 206
Hauksgarth, Edmund de, claimant to prebend 210

Hawkesbury, Gloucs. 14

Haynes family 92

Heahtberht, bishop of Worcester 7

Heath, Nicholas, bishop of Worcester 103

Heathured, bishop of Worcester 5

Hecker, Edmund, prebendary 71, 90, 92, 94, 222

Hemming, monk 13–14

Henbury, Gloucs. 4–7, 9, 12, 15, 18, 32, 37, 41–2, 83, 92, 104

bishop’s manor and house 4–5, 7, 12, 41, 87

church and parish 15, 26, 32–4, 37, 42, 49, 83, 91, 104, 155–6

prebend and prebendaries of 34, 37–9, 47, 94, 250

vicarage and vicars of 32, 34, 37, 42–3, 49, 83–4, 88, 105, 252

Henbury Hill in Henbury 41

Henry III, king 22, 24

Henry V, king 56

Henry VI, king 56, 58, 60, 65, 78, 80

Henry VIII, king 90, 97–100, 102–4

Henwick, Worcs. 249

Herbury, Nicholas, prebendary 56, 220

Hetherington, Richard de, deanery custodian 194

Hewes, John, dean 90, 92, 200

Hexton, Thomas 85

Hillingdon, Middx. 66

Hilman, John 251

Hindeley, William de, prebendary 47, 214

Hoby, chaplain 230

Hoby, Thomas, almsman 237

Holden, William, prebendary 223

Holley probably in Henbury 34

prebend and prebendaries of 18–19, 34, 36–9, 44–5, 47, 51, 113, 137, 250

Holme, Richard, prebendary 56, 220

Hopwodd, Ralph, prebendary 90, 226, 254

Hovingham, John, prebendary 219

Hudenhull, John, clerk 230

Hugh brother of Bertran 19–20

Hugh son of Gervase, possible prebendary 17–21, 23, 201

Hull, John de, prebendary 205

Hulle, John, chaplain 233

Hull, John, almsman 237

Hulton, Reginald de, prebendary 216

Humbreston, Henry de, prebendary 215

Hunte, Richard, prebendary 215

Hussey, Richard, fellow 235, 254

Hwicce 4–5, 9–10

Hyet, Philip, subdean 91, 227

Icknield Street, Worcs. 248

indulgences 79

Inge, Hugh, prebendary 90, 224

Ickberrow, Worcs. 248

Ispil, Walter de, prebendary 207

Ismere, Worcs. 5

Itchington, Warws. 14

Ixworth, John, claimant to prebend 219

Jakes, Henry, chaplain 232

Janyns, John, fellow 232

John the Evangelist, saint 171–2

John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster 50

John, two such chaplains 231

John (Marchaunt), David, almsman 237

John, Henry ap, fellow 235, 254

Jolyff, Henry, prebendary 105, 226

Jonys, John 254

Jones, Lewis, subdean 227, 254

Jonson, George, elderly priest 234, 254

Josce, prebendary 36, 202

Kedemuta probably in Henbury 17, 21

Kemeys, John, dean 55, 66, 198

Kempsey, Worcs. 28, 72, 79–82, 89, 94, 101, 104, 246

Kempsford, Gloucs. 6

Kerell, John, prebendary 90, 104–5, 226

Keynsham, Somt. 60–1

Keynsham, William of, cleric 20

kings of England, patronage of 43, 45, 55

King’s Norton, Worcs. 249

King’s Weston in Henbury 7, 32, 42, 83, 101, 105

King’s Weston Hill in Henbury 34

Kirkeby, Gilbert de, dean 195

Kirkby, John de, prebendary 34, 46, 202

Kygton (Warwyk), John, dean 44, 197

Lambert, John, claimant to prebend 46, 212

Langetone, Robert de, prebendary 206–7

Large, John 92

Latimer, Hugh, bishop of Worcester 100, 102

Laurence, John, subdean 104, 228, 236
Lawrence Weston in Henbury 18, 32, 37, 41–2, 45, 83–4, 105
prebend and prebendaries of 34, 37–9, 47, 51, 94, 250
Leche, Thomas, chaplain 230
Lee, Ralph de, dean 195
Leland, John, antiquary 71, 75, 87, 181
Lenn, William, bishop of Worcester 42
Lewis, Thomas, fellow 104–5, 236
Leycestre, Peter de, prebendary 202–3
libraries 59–62
Lincoln, cathedral 49
Lincoln, William de, prebendary 205
Littleton, Sir Thomas, judge 242
London, Middx. 65–6
Guildhall Library 59–60
St Anthony, hospital 58–9, 61
St Mary-le-Strand, church 19–20, 104
Worcester Inn 66, 104
London, Walter de (d. 1349), prebendary 45, 211
London, Walter (fl. 1411–31), prebendary 220
Longborough, Worcs. now Gloucs. 104, 249
Longehechindon, William de, prebendary 213
Lovecoke, John 249
Lowsby, John, dean 197
Lukas, Grace, almswoman 237
Lulle, William, second treasurer 229
Lumberde, William, almsman 95, 237
Lutte, William, elderly priest 93, 95, 232, 254
Lyhert, Walter, bishop 61
Lyndsey, John, dean 71, 84, 88–9, 92–5, 199, 254
Lynet, John, elderly priest 235, 254
Maddyngle, Thomas de, prebendary 44, 51, 215
Madresfield, Worcs. 81
Maidstone, Walter, bishop of Worcester 45
Malmesbury, Roger, prebendary 22
Marchaunt, David – see John
Mare, William de la, prebendary 206
Marlowe, John, prebendary 226
Marton, Thomas, prebendary 219
Mary I, queen 105
Mason, Thomas, fellow 33, 92, 231
Massingham, Henry, chaplain 233
Maurice, chaplain 230
Mawdelen, John 252
Melborn, John de, prebendary 210–11
Melton, Geoffrey, prebendary 45, 53, 217–18
Melton, William de, prebendary 46, 205
Menhir, John, dean and claimant to prebend 196, 216
Mercia, kingdom and kings of 4–6
Michel, Richard, prebendary 47, 213–14
Middeford, John de, claimant to prebend 215
Middelmore, John 249
Middeltone, John de, prebendary 207
Milton, John, hired clerk 236, 254
Mogys (Mogges), William, cleric 63, 93, 244, 253
monasticism 8, 10–16, 18
Monmouth, John, deanery custodian 194
Monyhull, Worcs. 94, 248
Moore, John, prebendary 87, 93, 223
More, John, schoolmaster 97, 228
Mores, Thomas, elderly priest 234
Morton, Robert, bishop of Worcester 89
Morys, Philip, fellow 232
Murimuth, prebend of 34; see also Holley
Murimuth, Adam de, prebendary 34, 42, 209
Murimuth, Thomas de, prebendary 34, 36, 209
music – see polyphony 59
Mylton, John, chaplain 232
Myn, William, chaplain 233
Nansmoen, Belinus 84
Naples, Gregory of, prebendary 22, 43, 201
Navesby, William de, prebendary 213
Nevill, Richard – see Warwick, earl of
Newland, John, abbot 85, 172
Nicholas IV, pope 28
Taxation of (1291) 38, 48, 50
Nicholas, John, prebendary 224
Nichols, Benedict, bishop 58
Norman, Thomas, college member 231
Normans and Norman Conquest 14, 16
Northelingham, John de, claimant to prebend 215
North Moreton, Berks. 251
Northwick in Henbury 32, 41–2, 83, 91, 101, 105
Northwick, Worcs. 62, 64, 242
Norton, Richard, cleric 99–100
Norwich, Norf., library at 61
Nykke, Richard, prebendary 90, 224
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oda, archbishop</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offa, king of Mercia</td>
<td></td>
<td>5–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okeborne, William</td>
<td>dean</td>
<td>66, 68, 72, 84, 94, 183, 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Sodbury, Gloucs.</td>
<td>9, 251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offor, bishop of Worcechester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orleton, Adam</td>
<td>bishop of Worcester</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orleton, Thomas de</td>
<td>prebendary</td>
<td>38, 45, 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osborne, John</td>
<td>prebendary</td>
<td>224–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscytel, archbishop</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oswald, bishop of Worcester</td>
<td></td>
<td>8, 10–13, 18, 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otery, Roger de</td>
<td>prebendary</td>
<td>47, 49, 51, 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over near Gloucester</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Oxon.</td>
<td>Balliol College</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magdalen College</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oriel College</td>
<td>57–8, 61–2, 64, 81, 97, 165, 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Osney abbey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Mary Virgin, church</td>
<td>64, 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>university</td>
<td>80–1, 83, 88–90, 97–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxon, William de</td>
<td>dean</td>
<td>32, 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagan, clerk or clerics, possible prebendary</td>
<td></td>
<td>18–20, 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer, Henry</td>
<td>treasurer</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>papacy</td>
<td>19–22, 26, 28, 38, 43–4, 55, 59, 66–7, 72, 79, 82–3, 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taxation by</td>
<td>see Nicholas IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker, Thomas</td>
<td>chaplain</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paxford, Gloucs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pecock, Reynold,</td>
<td>bishop</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peculiar jurisdictions</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pellican, Thomas</td>
<td>prebendary</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen Park in Westbury-on-Trym</td>
<td>73, 104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershore, Worcs.,</td>
<td>abbey</td>
<td>13, 128, 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philipps, John</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poleyn, John</td>
<td>51–4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollard, John</td>
<td>possible subdean</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polyphony</td>
<td>59, 69–70; see also Westbury-on-Trym: church institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powick, Worcs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powle, John</td>
<td>dean</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pouytz, Sir Nicholas</td>
<td>94, 253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prought, Alice</td>
<td>almswoman</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pullesdon, William</td>
<td></td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey, Hunts.</td>
<td>abbey</td>
<td>11–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redland in Westbury-on-Trym</td>
<td>10, 32, 42, 251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redsheff, Adam</td>
<td>dean</td>
<td>89, 95, 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwick in Henbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>3, 17, 42, 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformation, English</td>
<td>97–106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard II</td>
<td>king</td>
<td>45, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodeberewe, John</td>
<td>prebendary</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roe, John</td>
<td>subdean</td>
<td>91, 95, 98–9, 227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherwell, John</td>
<td>52–3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rous, John</td>
<td>antiquary</td>
<td>63, 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rous, William le</td>
<td>prebendary</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowe, Richard</td>
<td>prebendary</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rural deans</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryall, Worcs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rycherii, Bernard</td>
<td>prebendary</td>
<td>46, 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryder, John</td>
<td>dean</td>
<td>44, 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rythok, James</td>
<td>almsman</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryvet, John</td>
<td>prebendary</td>
<td>67, 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Blaise in Henbury</td>
<td>chapel</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St David’s, Pembs.,</td>
<td>cathedral and diocese</td>
<td>58, 98–100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John (Hospitallers)</td>
<td>order of 250, 252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Lambert in Westbury-on-Trym, chapel</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Werburgh in Henbury, chapel and place</td>
<td>18, 34, 37, 41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prebend and prebendaries of – see Holley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadle(i)r, Sir Ralph</td>
<td>104–5, 184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salforde, Richard</td>
<td>vicar</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salthouse, Thomas</td>
<td>prebendary</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltmarsh in Henbury</td>
<td>17, 20–1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samson, bishop of Worcester</td>
<td>16, 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampson, Henry</td>
<td>dean and prebendary</td>
<td>40, 61, 63–4, 67, 80–1, 90, 198, 223, 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancto Claro, Raymund</td>
<td>claimant to prebend 46, 212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandeaker, John</td>
<td>prebendary</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarum, Use of</td>
<td>25, 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savinhaco, William</td>
<td>prebendary</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxton, Christopher</td>
<td>map-maker</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools</td>
<td>59, 65, 95, 103; see also Westbury-on-Trym: church institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schort, Thomas</td>
<td>cleric</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scraptoft, Richard</td>
<td>prebendary</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Mills in Henbury</td>
<td>3, 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selman, John</td>
<td>fellow</td>
<td>236, 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant, Thomas</td>
<td>subdean</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell, Worcs.</td>
<td>104, 248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirehampton in Westbury-on-Trym</td>
<td>10, 32, 42, 84, 91, 105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiryngton, Walter</td>
<td>prebendary</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrewsbury, William</td>
<td>claimant to prebend</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sibley, Thomas and Elizabeth 93, 248, 253
Simon, bishop of Worcester 3, 17–19, 37
Simon, dean 194
Simon, son of Engelbert 18
Slought, John 249
Slymbrigge, Robert, dean and prebendary 55, 83, 199, 223
Smith, A. H., on place-names 9
Smyth, John, historian 99
Sneyd Park in Westbury-on-Trym 104
Sneynton, Thomas, prebendary 45, 218
Southmead, Gloucs. 92
Sparry, William 249
Squier, John, claimant to prebend 218
Standish, Henry, bishop 99
Staneweye, John de, vicar 233
Stanton Prior, Somt. 58
Staresmar, John, vicar 233
Staundon, Thomas, prebendary 219
Stephen, dean 194
Stephens, Thomas, subdean and treasurer 67, 91, 226, 229
Stoke Bishop in Westbury-on-Trym 6–7, 10, 15, 32, 37, 42, 84, 104
Stoke Gifford, Gloucs. 6, 15, 92
Stoke Prior, Worcs. 6
Stokes, John, prebendary 56, 221
Stowick in Henbury 42
Stratford, John de, dean 45, 195
Styllard, John, fellow 236, 254
Suiylyhurst, John, elderly priest 234
Sully, Henry de, bishop of Worcester 20, 37
Sutton, John, elderly priest 234
Sutton, William, cleric 84
Swynlegh, John de, dean and prebendary 196, 213
Sydyet, John, stipendiary 234
Syneg’r, John 252
Taillour, Robert, chaplain 53
taxation, papal – see Nicholas IV
Taylor, Edward 84
Teffont, Thomas de 206
Tewkesbury, Gloucs., abbey 73, 103, 254–5
Theobald, archbishop 19
Thomas, prior of Worcester 14
Thompson, A. Hamilton, historian 17–18, 21, 37–8
Thormerton, Richard de, prebendary 37, 209
Thornbury, Gloucs. 73, 83, 106, 158
Tikill, William de, claimant to prebend 211
Tillyng, John 92–3
tithings 10, 42
Toker, Thomas, bailiff 252
Towker, William, dean 198
Tredington, Worcs. now Warws. 81
Treverdowe, William, prebendary 221
Trevisa, John, claimant to prebend 50–4, 217
Trillek, prebend of 34; see also Godringhill
Trillek, John de, prebendary 34, 36–7, 46, 208
Trykill, prebend of 34; see also Godringhill
Turkdean, Gloucs. 247
Twaytes, Richard, prebendary 221
Tybryghton, Roger, prebendary 218
universities 44, 48, 55, 57–8
Uppedych, William, prebendary 213
Upper Wick, Worcs. 249
Upton, Worcs. 250
Upton, John, chaplain 230
Urban V, pope 48, 50
Urban VI, pope 43–4, 51
Valor Ecclesiasticus 101, 246–55
Vasto Prato, Ralph de, prebendary 203
Vauce, William, dean and prebendary 33, 88, 90, 92–3, 167, 174, 199, 222, 245, 254
Veell, James, bailiff 247
Veele, William, bailiff 250–1
Verne, James, treasurer 229
Vessy, Christopher, prebendary 225
Vienna, Richard de, prebendary 36, 46, 203
Vigerii, Peter, prebendary 43, 202
Vikings 10, 13–14, 123
Vulcan, Matthew, prebendary 22, 201
Wadyngton, John de, chaplain 230
Walford 6
Wakefield, Henry, bishop of Worcester 53
Walewecn, Elias, prebendary 209
Waleys, Nigel le, prebendary 204
Walneford, Hugh de – see Carnaria
Warkar, John, possible fellow 231
Wallungford, Berks. 247
Warwick, Warws.
 collegiate church 20, 29, 103
earldom of 249–50, 252
earl of, Richard Nevill 78–9, 93, 253
Warwyk, John – see Kyngton
Wathell, Thomas, prebendary 225, 254
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