Architecture and Environment: St Benet's Holm (Norfolk) and the Fashioning of the English Monastic Gatehouse

by Julian Luxford

This article analyses the gatehouse of the wealthy Benedictine abbey of St Benet's Holm in Norfolk, one of the set-pieces of English monastic architectural patronage in the fourteenth century. The ruinous condition of this building, and its sequestered location, means that it has attracted little scholarly attention in the past, and the neglect has been exacerbated by the presence of a brick windmill-tower superimposed on its remains four centuries after the gatehouse was built.[1] This forced marriage, at once preposterous and compelling in effect, has absorbed most of the attention paid to the site, and because what is left of the gatehouse's main façade is embedded within the mill-tower, and thus difficult to photograph, its artistic uniqueness and quality of execution have been concealed. There has hence been no serious attempt to investigate or contextualize it (Figs **1**, **2**).[2]

Yet it is possible to recover the structure's appearance, and – as this article aims to show – understand how it related both to other buildings of its type and its broader historical and ideological environments. While the gatehouse was roofless by 1594, most of its upper storey survived long enough to be sketched in the early eighteenth century.[3] The sketches then taken, of which there seem to have been at least three (though only one survives), served as the basis for engravings of the external and internal façades, plus a simple ground-plan, published in 1723 by the Society of Antiquaries of London (Figs **3**, **4**).[4] Of the two engravings of the external façade, the oblique view based on the surviving sketch by a perceptive antiquary named John Kirkpatrick better represents the existing fabric, and is

consequently more reliable than that which shows the façade front on (Fig. **5**).[5] No sketch of the internal façade survives, and the engraving of this elevation is the unique witness to the appearance of the upper storey. The combination of standing remains and antiquarian record permits an almost complete reconstruction of the original building (Figs **6-10**), conjectural in only minor respects.

The following study combines exploration of context and structure with iconographic analysis and the investigation of meaning in an attempt to show how an integrated approach a building of this sort can bring one closest to understanding it as it was understood in the Middle Ages. It is also intended to suggest that these aspects of the gatehouse are all constituents of it, and that the building is incongruous in historical terms if segregated from the aesthetic and intellectual environments from which it arose. Accordingly, it begins with questions of historical context, moves on to investigation of the building's structure, and concludes with consideration of its functions and iconography. No component of the analysis is meant to be privileged. Its substance and organisation are intended to bring to light all aspects of the building of obvious interest to current scholarship in a way that is historically rooted and gathers momentum. The rehabilitation of an exceptional structure in a remarkable environment for state-of-the-art building should become progressively clear. Ultimately, although the class of building to which it belongs had no contemporary parallels outside Britain, the quality and sophistication of the gatehouse of St Benet's Holm mean that it is of interest in the general context of European Gothic architecture. This fact deserves emphasis at the outset.[6]

Contexts, architectural and institutional

2

As backdrop to this study, rather than its main object, the gatehouse's architectural context needs to be addressed first. The building can of course be understood according to style and type. The latter is more important for the purposes of this article, because it relates more plainly to the impetus under which the gatehouse was conceived. From the point of view of style, the monks and their architect produced a prime example of the English Decorated, a phenomenon mainly discussed with reference to the design and furnishing of churches, but equally applicable to buildings of this order. Holm's gatehouse is exemplary in the nature and overall effect of its ornamentation, which brings together a variety of Decorated leitmotivs (for example, ogee arches, dying mouldings, horizontal bands of small-scale enrichment, heraldry, crenellations, combat imagery), and also in its tendency to the architectural syncretism – here military, domestic and ecclesiastical – that the ornamented gatehouses of the fourteenth century are in general so well placed to illustrate.[7] Its typology is a less straightforward matter. The category 'monastic gatehouse' has never been successfully articulated in either formal or historical terms.[8] Basic medieval distinctions between gates within precincts (*portae interiores*) and through precinct walls (*portae exteriores*), as well as the forms, functions and designations that existed under both headings, remain essentially unrecognized. Gates erected on granges and other enclosures outside the main monastic precinct, which like the principal entrances to important monasteries could be described by contemporaries as 'great', further complicate the idea of what a monastic gate was.[9] In addition, of course, secular churches could have multiply and grandly gated precincts as readily as monasteries (Wells Cathedral is a particularly assertive example). In fact, as recent work by John Goodall on the relationship between major monastic gatehouses and castle architecture shows, these buildings can be profitably discussed in broader terms; sufficiently broad, perhaps, to extend to all sorts of architecturally defined entrances.[10] The word *porta* is, after all, used interchangeably for gates, porches and church portals in medieval sources.

It would be a mistake, however, to deny that the ornamented gatehouses added to English monasteries during the later Middle Ages had a distinctive presence. Although not as clearly characterised in terms of design or function as a church or castle, their rapid proliferation alone distinguishes them as a class. This is not to say that they emerged from nowhere, as has sometimes been thought.[11] Important monasteries had incorporated entrance-buildings of appropriate stature since the Norman period, and probably earlier; for example, Crowland Abbey in Lincolnshire had a 'magna porta' in the tenth century, Evesham Abbey in Worcestershire possessed an entrance of the same description before 1100, and Henry of Blois built 'a beautiful external gate of squared stones' at Glastonbury during his abbacy there (1126–71).[12] Such records, and major twelfth-century gatehouses surviving at Bristol (lower storey), Bury St Edmunds (St James's tower) and Canterbury Cathedral (the lower storey of the Green Court gate), demonstrate continuity of the type across the central and later Middle Ages. From *c*. 1300, however, the enthusiasm for this type of building seems to have accelerated, and it is obvious that the surviving examples responded to one another. This is particularly striking during the fourteenth century. The main exterior gatehouse of Peterborough Abbey was remodelled between 1302 and 1307, at which time an even grander entrance to St Augustine's Abbey at Canterbury was underway (both monasteries were licensed by the king to crenellate their gatehouses in 1308).[13] These were followed by the construction of major gatehouses at Kirkham Priory in Yorkshire (between *c*. 1300 and 1315, a remodelled Romanesque structure), Norwich Cathedral Priory (the Ethelbert gate, completed in 1316 or 1317 and also a remodelling), Butley Priory in Suffolk (*c*. 1320–30), St Benet's Holm (from 1327), Bury St Edmunds (begun 1327, completed after 1353), Evesham Abbey (licence to crenellate gate issued 1332), Battle Abbey in Sussex (licence to crenellate precinct issued 1338), Whalley Abbey in Lancashire (licence to crenellate monastery issued

1348), Worcester Cathedral Priory (possibly begun in the 1340s; licence to crenellate precinct issued 1369), Worksop Priory in Nottinghamshire (early to mid-fourteenth century), St Albans Abbey (the *Porta Magna*: licence to crenellate precinct issued 1357), Pentney and Thetford Priories in Norfolk (late fourteenth century), Thornton Abbey in Lincolnshire (licence to crenellate gate issued 1382, with a second licence granted in 1389), Bridlington Priory in Yorkshire (licence to crenellate monastery issued 1388), and Ely Cathedral Priory (the *Porta*, begun in 1397).[14] The senior clergy of these houses, all either Benedictine or Augustinian (with the exception of Cistercian Whalley), were well-travelled, sophisticated, intensely status-conscious and, to varying degrees, wealthy. Along with their convents, they shared common responsibilities and were subject, with local fluctuations, to the same sorts of ideological, social and financial pressures. Various networks for exchange of ideas and information existed between them, beginning with the systems of capitular legislation and visitation instituted by both orders in the thirteenth century, and including the migration of monks and canons between houses, letter-writing and the sharing of chronicles, and in some cases the meeting of superiors or their proxies at Church councils and parliaments.[15] Thus, even if the visible similarities between gatehouses were to be ascribed to the untrammelled agency of architects (of itself a highly improbable idea), there could be little doubt that the impetus for this building activity was imitative and rooted in common patronal awareness of the status-enhancing potential and functional desirability of a particular type of structure.

While emulation did not usually result in homogeneity in English fourteenth-century architecture, the variety among these gatehouses is remarkable, and richly suggestive of the enthusiasm with which their designers exercised their imaginations. It is impossible to plot a straightforward formal genealogy of these buildings. Clearly, the variety has as much to do with a desire to express institutional individuality as with the conditions imposed by finance

and the nature of available sites. It is epitomized by the four main East Anglian examples

listed above (at Norwich, Butley, Holm and Bury), which were planned within twenty years

of each other. The architect at Norwich extensively refaced a structure whose essential form,

including the provision of a single gate-arch, was predetermined (Fig. **11**). One of his

innovations was to face the upper level of the exterior with dummy windows in flint

flushwork, including prominent circular motifs in the attic storey of the public façade.[16] This

idea appealed to the canons of Butley and their architect, who incorporated grander versions

of the flushwork motifs into the external and internal façades of their own gatehouse (Fig.

12).[17] However, the form and embellishment of Butley's gate, which was a new build rather

than a remodelling, is otherwise very different: it has high, vaulted wings and a recessed

external façade which incorporates a pedestrian passage as well as a central portal. This

façade is ostentatiously distinguished by a vast panel containing thirty-five coats of arms,

with a further shield above the pedestrian entrance. The gatehouse at St Benet's Holm is

completely different again. Also a new build, its structure and turreted external elevation are

based on those of the great gatehouse at St Augustine's Abbey at Canterbury, but its

embellishment is indebted in important ways to Norwich's Ethelbert gate, too, and it also

incorporates unique features, particularly the raised flint panels discussed below. The

convents of Holm and Bury St Edmunds were sufficiently well-acquainted to have known

each other's strategies for building and observed the progress and results of these; yet the

fourteenth-century gatehouse at Bury is once more strikingly different, and equally unlike

those at Norwich and Butley (Fig. **13**).[18] Outstandingly, where the other East Anglian

monasteries developed a distinctive aesthetic based on the decorative combination of pale

freestone and the black flints indigenous to the region, the monks of Bury had their gatehouse

entirely faced with freestone, to vaunt their wealth and dignity, or else to correspond to the

revetment of their abbey church and the pre-existing gate immediately to the south. The

sculptural emphasis is correspondingly greater: the gate's external façade has niches for monumental statues at three levels rather than one, and, as at Holm, a signature motif, here a six-pointed star – perhaps intended to symbolize the Trinity – of a type found in early fourteenth-century English window-tracery and manuscript illumination.[19]

As suggested, the varied character of these buildings both corresponded to and accentuated the individuality of the monasteries they announced. In England, as on the continent, the mutual aspects of Benedictine and Augustinian existence in the later Middle Ages were everywhere conflated with perceptions of institutional uniqueness, enduringly expressed in historical writing, cartularies, the designs of conventual seals, and the composition and iconography of architecture and art. While the surviving documentation from Holm does not reveal a local patriotism as strong as that of (for example) Glastonbury or St Albans, it clearly reflects a distinctive identity. At one level, the chronicles and annals produced at the abbey around the turn of the fourteenth century show the monks' interest in situating their affairs and the personalities of their abbots in the stream of national and international events.[20] At another, surviving cartularies and muniments from the house expose the depth of their integration with the history, society and landscape of northern and eastern Norfolk, where almost all of their property lay.[21] The remarkable site of the abbey, so different from that of other large Benedictine houses, must have helped to cultivate this identity (Fig. **14**). It is a crescent of land thirty-eight acres (approximately fifteen hectares) in extent, bounded on the west by a river (the Bure). In the later Middle Ages it was surrounded at all other points by marshland. Originally, from the ninth century (and according to medieval belief since 633), it had served as a retreat for hermits, a function to which it was perfectly suited.[22] After the existing community was converted into an abbey by King Cnut around 1019 – giving it the royal and Anglo-Saxon status in which so much monastic pride was later invested – the site

was developed, but it was always vulnerable to inundation, and a heightened sensitivity to flooding is reflected in the monks' writing.[23] The uncultivated nature of this location probably determined the abbey's unusual dedication to St Benedict, who had himself sought the ascetic seclusion of the wilderness before turning to the coenobitic life.[24]

As the architecture of the gatehouse shows, geographical remoteness and a property portfolio of unusually local character for a prosperous monastery did not result in cultural isolation.[25] There were in fact many channels by which information and influence could travel to and from the abbey. Transactions between the abbot and convent and one William, goldsmith of Constantinople, in the thirteenth century, indicate the cosmopolitan aspect of even deepest Norfolk.[26] Holm's reach was sufficient to obtain sources of national and international news, including such detailed sources as the thirteenth-century *Chronica Majora* of Matthew Paris and the *Flores Historiarum*, the latter of which was copied by its monks in the 1320s.[27] Their surviving manuscript of this chronicle is prefaced with nine leaves of excerpts from the *Mirabilia urbis Romae* (and other sources), which begin not with the usual prefatory chapter on that city's foundation but with those describing its walls and gates.[28] 'De portis urbis Rome' is the first heading in the manuscript, followed by a list of fifteen of these buildings ('porta Appia', 'porta aurea', 'porta viridis', etc.): evidence of enthusiasm for exceptional gates at Holm which is relevant to the context of the monks' patronage whether or not they understood their own gatehouse in any direct relation to those of Rome.[29] Broader, more enduring cultural influences flowed from the city of Norwich, some eleven miles south-west, where Holm had extensive property and business interests, and to which its abbot and officials often travelled. By 1300, Norwich was one of the three largest cities in England, and a major centre of artistic production. As noted, Holm also had close ties to Bury St Edmunds in Suffolk, by some distance the wealthiest, most artistically glorious monastery in East

Anglia. These connections were formed at an early date: it was generally believed, and is probably the case, that Bury was first constituted as an abbey in or around the year 1020 with monks from St Benet's Holm.[30] The confraternity that existed between these houses obliged their respective abbots to attend each other's elections, installations and funerals, and had extended to sharing books, ornaments and other resources from the earliest period.[31]

Indeed, a manifestation of the strength of this bond suggests a catalyst and date for the inception of Holm's gatehouse. In January 1327, the abbey at Bury was invaded and despoiled by laypeople in an event that attracted national attention. With the objects and muniments in his care stolen or destroyed, the sacrist, William Stowe, climbed over the precinct wall and fled to Holm, where he stayed for some weeks.[32] His account of sacrilege, destruction and theft must have been acutely disturbing, because his hosts had suffered local harassments of their own in the recent past, and were well aware of the destructive riots that had overwhelmed the cathedral priory at Norwich in 1272 (they included an account of them in one of their chronicles).[33] Later in the same year, Holm's newly appointed abbot, John of Aylsham, had a chance to observe the damage at Bury for himself. In November, Pope John XXII commissioned him to recover Bury's property and estimate its damages, which he assessed at the astronomical sum of £40,000. By this time, news must have reached Norfolk of the destructive riots which had taken place in other monastic centres during 1327, chiefly at Abingdon and St Albans.[34]

On 23 October 1327, Edward III granted the abbot and convent of Holm a licence to 'fortify and crenellate the site of their abbey with a wall of stone and lime'.[35] As the precinct was surely enclosed before this date, the licence must have answered a request to build a new wall, finished with battlements. There is no mention of a gate, as there is in some other

fourteenth-century licences; but the architecture and sculpture of the gatehouse at Holm belong stylistically to the 1320s and 1330s, and the structure was surely planned as the centrepiece of a new circuit of walls. Licences to crenellate are not necessarily reliable indicators of the dates of buildings: the fact that the great gatehouse at Peterborough was erected before receipt of such a licence has been noted above. In this case, however, anxiety generated by the chaos at Bury and the desire to assert local prerogatives which it produced are the most likely stimuli for the new work. The monks' preoccupation is reflected in the wording of the licence, which specifies that the new wall and its crenellation are for the fortification (*firmare*) of the monastery. Fortification was not usually mentioned in licences to crenellate, even when they were issued in the wake of destructive riots.[36] As for the organisation of the project, the months between January and October were presumably adequate to engage the calibre of architect the monks had in mind. The sort of man with the knowledge and ability to realize such a design could have been found in Norwich, London-Westminster or for that matter, Ely in Cambridgeshire. All of these centres contained workshops engaged on major, stylistically innovative architectural projects during the 1320s and 1330s.[37]

As a simultaneous build arising out of the same circumstances, the gatehouse is rightly considered together with the precinct wall and deep, water-filled ditch which encircled the abbey on all but its river side. The foundations of much of the wall survive, and, where they stand to any height, they are constructed of mortared flint pebbles, with split flints set into the faces to create the impression of a continuous and lustrous black band stretching around the monastery. This wall enclosed the entire site, including the riverfront, where it was punctuated by service-buildings: a document of 1602 estimates its length at 2000 yards (1828 metres).[38] The only substantial surviving section of precinct wall, some nine metres long and

incorporating the remains of a mural turret, is situated immediately west of the gatehouse (Fig. **15**). This probably does not belong to the wall licensed in 1327, and it is questionable whether it even follows that wall's line. It stands several metres forward of the gatehouse's façade, an aesthetically miserable arrangement which has nothing to recommend it unless one assumes an overriding desire to enclose every foot of available land. The design of the façade makes no allowance for the return of the precinct wall against it. Either the wall was originally returned against the porter's lodge on the south-west side of the gatehouse, in which case the standing section may follow its original line, or else what now exists was built to accommodate a later, slight expansion of the precinct.[39] As it stands, the surviving section of wall is slightly over three metres high, around sixty centimetres thick, and fortified with crenellations and slitted embrasures for defensive fire.

The gatehouse stands close to the river at the far north-west of the precinct (Fig. **14**). It was the only entrance of any architectural distinction in the walls, and appears to occupy the site of an earlier gate demolished when it was built. A postern seems to have straddled the ditch on the eastern side of the precinct, but no further evidence for gates has been found other than some references to the construction or repair of a cemetery gate ('porta cimiterij') in 1517–18, which must have stood within the abbey.[40] In a large urban monastery, more gates were required: Norwich, for example, had four in the fourteenth century, as well as several between the inner and outer precincts, while Bury was likened by the sixteenth-century poet and antiquary John Leland to 'a town in itself; so many gates has it'.[41] At Holm, the nature of the site made this both unnecessary and undesirable. Most of the abbey's goods came to it by water rather than land. The isolated prominence of the gatehouse within the precinct wall was further emphasized by its distance from the conventual complex, and the modest stature of the abbey church. In urban monasteries like Bury, Norwich and Peterborough, the external

façade of the principal gatehouse (or gatehouses) was set against a tantalising backdrop of monumental architecture, creating a juxtaposition which both dignified and subordinated it. This was not the case at St Benet's Holm, where the gatehouse was situated almost 300 metres from the west front of the church. This church occupied a site at most two metres higher than that of the gate, and its profile was relatively undistinguished. Like its East Anglian counterparts at Bury, Ely, Walsingham and Wymondham, it had an axial western tower and a second tower over the crossing. The approximate widths of these towers are recorded, and enough survives of the foundations of the western one to indicate its area, which was no more ambitious than many of the parochial towers in the area.[42] The roof-heights of the nave and presbytery, the latter rebuilt between 1257 and 1274, are likely to have been correspondingly modest, and the core of the conventual complex, which sloped away to the south and east of the church, cannot have been prominent from the western entry to the precinct.[43] It is possible that a freestanding chapel of ease dedicated to St Peter stood somewhere in the outer court of the monastery towards the gatehouse. A chapel or church of that dedication containing at least two altars is mentioned in late medieval wills, and is unlikely to have been located in the nave of the abbey church, because, as its remains show, this lacked aisles.[44] Still, the gatehouse must nevertheless have captured the whole attention of visitors approaching the monastery along the abbey causeway to the north-west: even when its portal stood open, it did not frame such a chapel, because there is no trace of a building of this description between the entrance and either the river or the ruins of the conventual church. Apart from the wall, its only adjuncts seem to have been a porter's lodge on the south-west side and whatever coventual buildings – their purpose and extent unknown – stood next to this.

Descriptive analysis

Holm's gatehouse is not aligned with its church, but oriented approximately north-west by south-east (Fig. **6**). Its external and internal façades are around ten metres wide, and the gate-hall is of similar depth, although the projection of turrets and buttresses adds almost three metres to its length. The portal of the external façade is slightly offset towards the north-east, suggesting that the front part of the building stands on the foundations of an earlier gatehouse (Figs **1**, **7**). Three transverse ribs connected by a short ridge-rib were applied to the intrados of the portal where it passes through the façade wall, and these have round bosses in the form of heads with gaping mouths at the intersections (Fig. **16**). The gate-hall behind was of two rectangular bays, each carrying a tierceron vault of the same design as those at Butley (Fig. **6**). Although these vaults are lost, some of the springers for them survive to indicate their original form. Deep, stepped buttresses supported the structure on three sides. At the south-east corner of the gatehouse, a stair built on sub-arches gave access to the first floor chamber. Little can be said of the interior of this chamber other than that it was generously lit by large, traceried windows and is likely to have had a roof of shallow pitch, as other gatehouses of this structural type do. Kirkpatrick's drawing shows that there was a doorway in its north-east angle letting into a helical staircase in the adjacent turret (Fig. **5**).

The design of the external façade corresponded, as noted previously, to an architectural type established by the great gatehouse of St Augustine's Abbey at Canterbury, with tall, octagonal turrets rising through two storeys framing a single entrance arch below, and an enriched combination of fenestration and image-niches above (Fig. **17**).[45] As such, Holm's gatehouse was the first adherent of what would become a highly influential model. At approximately seventeen metres, its turrets were about three metres lower than those of its exemplar, and are unlikely to have widened with height in the same way: this aspect of the St Augustine's design was generally eschewed by later architects. Yet the resemblance must

have been clear enough to anyone who knew both buildings, and a judicious, imaginative grasp of the potential for adaptation of the St Augustine's model was the Holm architect's fundamental achievement. Another shared feature is the division of lower and upper stories by multiple bands of small-scale ornament. At Holm, the broadest of these bands consisted of ogee quatrefoils with rosettes in the centre (Figs **7**, **18**, **21**). Short sections of this remain in place, but the upper bands, apparently consisting of a bead motif, foliate brattishing and small shields, are known only from the eighteenth-century illustrations.

The portal, which originally stood about five metres high at its apex (the sunken nature of the plinth suggests that the ground-level has risen about half a metre), is expensively treated (Figs **1**, **7**).[46] Its jambs have simple chamfers, but above springing-level there are four orders of archivolts, wave-moulded and separated from one another by three-quarter hollows. A series of writhing, grotesque figures, completely undercut, was carved to span the innermost hollow. All of these grotesques are damaged, and the lower ones, vulnerable to high-sided vehicles, have been broken off. The archivolts die straight into the jambs without capitals, as they do on the less elaborate (but also wave-moulded) arches at Butley. Above the level of the plinth, the turrets and narrow sections of wall that flank the arch are faced with a light-coloured stone, inset with oblong panels of precisely knapped flints. At the height of the spandrels this treatment is intensified by the introduction of panels of flints in raised stone frames that stand several centimetres proud of their settings (Figs **1**, **7**, **19**). There are eight of these panels, each approximately fifty centimetres square, on each pier, the inner ones folded into right-angles to follow the contours of the architecture. These large, conspicuous ornaments are unique to this building, and must have been understood to constitute one of its outstanding decorative features. A related interest in experimenting with raised motifs of this kind is detectable somewhat earlier in the rectangular panels, not filled with flints, on the

north side of Bottisham church in Cambridgeshire, a building designed in the early fourteenth century (Fig. **20**). But the relationship in this case is no more than idiomatic, and the closest parallels on a gate façade for Holm's flint and stone panels are the very different raised circular ornaments on the fourteenth-century gatehouse at Bury.

Holm's external façade is also unique in the imagery of its arch spandrels, although the general idea for their treatment came from the Ethelbert gate at Norwich (Figs **21**, **22**). An innovation of this earlier gatehouse – one in which the patrons evidently participated – was the filling in of the spandrels with sculpted combat iconography: a man holding a buckler and sword with a lion below him on one side facing a dragon with a bird beneath it on the other, all perched in trees and surrounded by vine-scroll ornament (Fig. **11**). The type and detail of this ensemble, and its arrangement above the entrance of a building burned in the riots of 1272, have been convincingly linked by Veronica Sekules to the prophecy of *Isaiah*, 14, 29– 31, which describes the burning of the gates and city of Philistia and the menacing winged serpent supposed to arise as a portent of this.[47] At Holm, the spandrels were also filled with combat imagery, but without historical reference, and with significant formal variations. The figures, each slightly under two metres high, have become hybrids: in the north-east spandrel, a man with a bald crown to his head has the left leg of a lion, and opposite him there is a lion which may have had the head and right arm of a man (though these features are now too weathered to tell). As at Norwich, they are embedded in foliage, but of a stringier sort which ultimately fuses with their bodies, so that the lion-hybrid's tail divides into two arabesque tendrils, and a vine grows out of the man-hybrid's heel. Although armed with bucklers and apparently engaged in combat – the man-hybrid aims a lance, and his opponent wields a falchion – their heads are turned outward so that they face the approach to the abbey. Both spandrels are damaged, but the man-hybrid, less exposed than its opposite number (the upper

half of which has suffered from its location next to an opening in the mill-tower), reveals its original quality in the subtle modelling and delicacy of its features (Fig. **23**). Stylistically, there is no very obvious resemblance between it and contemporary sculpture in Norwich, although, with the exception of the Ethelbert gate spandrels, the available comparisons (for example on the Arminghall arch, and in the cathedral cloister) are carved in higher relief and on a smaller scale.[48] The splayed-out hair, protuberant eyes and furrowed brow more nearly recall the sculpted figure of Jesse on the high altar reredos at Christchurch Priory in Hampshire (*c*. 1340–50), and the brow is also paralleled on an ornamental carved head on the north side of the surviving refectory of St Nicholas's priory at Great Yarmouth, which must have been carved in the 1320s or 1330s by someone associated with works at Norwich Cathedral.[49] The sculpture at Holm is of a similar order of quality, and as such it maintained the standards of its setting.

Although the gatehouse's upper storey cannot be reconstructed with complete confidence, the turrets and parapet between them are highly likely to have been crenellated, as they are at St Augustine's, and as the precinct wall was (Fig. **7**). The faces of the turrets probably had the same flint and stone rectangles found on the lower storey, and it is possible that they also displayed more of the raised panels (although none has been conjectured in the reconstruction drawings). Also unclear is whether arrow-slits of the sort represented in the less reliable of the eighteenth-century engravings actually existed, or were added by the illustrator for picturesque effect. In favour of their existence is the popularity of this motif in Decorated Gothic; in the gatehouse context, examples survive on the external façades at Bury and Thornton. What is not open to doubt is the existence of a large two-light window (the stubs of its tracery visible in Kirkpatrick's drawing) flanked by image-niches approximately three metres high. In the interstices between the heads of the window and niches were tall foliate

stems, perhaps intended for lilies, and circular propeller-like forms, both probably in flint flushwork. Lily stems are found in the same position on the fifteenth-century gatehouse of St John's Abbey at Colchester, while the propellers appear again in the heads of the flushwork windows on the external façade of the gate at Butley. The identity of the statues displayed in the niches is an important but obscure matter. An image of Christ was common in this position, because it implied the sacredness of a precinct and benefits of gift-giving through juxtaposition of a symbolic entrance (*John*, 10, 7–8, 9: 'I am the door') with a physical one. Fourteenth-century examples existed on the Ethelbert gate, at St Augustine's, Canterbury (an inhabited merlon rather than a niched sculpture), both of the west-facing gates at Bury, Kirkham (a Christ in majesty and a Crucifixion), Thornton, and probably, as part of a Crucifixion group, Butley.[50] Images of the Virgin Mary, institutional patron saints and founders are also associated with fourteenth-century gatehouses (just as they are in fifteenth-century ones). The great gatehouse of Evesham Abbey, directly contemporary with that of Holm, had 'stone statues of the blessed Virgin, St Ecgwine [the abbey's spiritual patron] and our royal founders'.[51] At Butley, monumental figures of armed knights with heraldic shields stood in niches on the central buttresses: one had a shield with the same heraldry as that over the pedestrian arch (a cross moline charged with a bendlet), and both must have represented important benefactors of the priory.[52] It would thus be reasonable to assign images of Christ, the Virgin Mary, St Benedict and King Cnut to the niches at Holm; although, as Christ was customarily shown in an axial position, he may have appeared, as at Canterbury, on one of the battlements.

It is characteristic of fourteenth-century East Anglian gatehouses that, while their internal façades are less ornate than their external ones, they are nevertheless richly treated. Holm, along with St Ethelbert's gate, those at Butley and Bury, and even lesser structures such as

the surviving gatehouse of *c*. 1320 at the Carmelite friary at Burnham Norton (Norfolk),
demonstrate the point.[53] The internal façade at Holm was extensively ornamented with
flushwork, statuary and heraldry, and the handling of its arch, which is not offset on this side,
is scarcely less elaborate than its outward-facing counterpart (although it lacks grotesque
carvings: Figs **8**, **24**). As is usually the case with the inner façades of conventional gatehouses,
the division between upper and lower stories was less emphatic than on the exterior. The
buttresses flanking the archway rose through this division, and carried image-niches with
cusped ogee heads and miniature vaults at both levels. Above the arch was a row of six stone
shields. Two more shields, bearing the arms of England and France in their pre-1340,
unquartered form survive in the spandrels of the arch, and the spaces above them are filled up
with raised flint panels of the type found on the external façade (Fig. **4**).[54] In the upper storey,
blind windows in flushwork flanked a centrally located, glazed window. This arrangement
was also chosen for the inner façades of the Ethelbert and Butley gates, but at Holm there
were two flushwork windows on either side of their glazed counterpart rather than one. The
wall was finished off with a band of elongated quatrefoils in lozenges and, in all probability,
battlements. The whole composition of this internal façade was framed by deep angle-
buttresses, with the doorway leading to the upper chamber tucked into the angle on the north-
east side and set within a freestone surround which had been removed before the antiquaries
could record it.

Although widely visible, the gatehouse's lateral elevations were not highly adorned. This was
normal for a type of building often flanked by ancillary structures, the only obvious exception
being the upper storey of Norwich's Ethelbert gate, whose embellishment is consistent with
its function as a chapel. Behind the turrets, the residual sections of wall at Holm are faced
with courses of flint cobbles mixed with bricks, with stone dressings only used for

weatherproofing. Where the facing has fallen off, the coursed brick and mortared brick-and-flint conglomerate of the wall-cores is revealed (Figs **2**, **25**). Kirkpatrick's drawing shows that the upper chamber was lit to the north-east by a two-light Decorated window positioned over, or slightly behind, the line of the precinct wall (Figs **5**, **9**). No masonry building stood against the gatehouse on this side, but on the south-west it was abutted immediately behind the turret by a structure approximately six metres deep, whose outer wall may have been contiguous with that of the precinct (Figs **2**, **10**). This has been demolished and its form and extent are unknown, but traces of the brick arches that connected it to the gatehouse are visible at two levels. A two-storey building would have exceeded the needs of the gate-keeper required by the *Rule* of St Benedict, and in all likelihood it served the abbey's almoner as well, although a separate facility for the distribution of alms, called St James's Hospital, existed about half a mile north-east of the gatehouse.[55] Its presence means that any window lighting the upper chamber on this side of the gatehouse (it seems reasonable to suppose there was one, particularly as this flank of the building received more direct sunlight) would have stood diagonally opposite its north-eastern counterpart.

Function and meaning

A large measure of the historical value of such a building should be sought in its aesthetic value alone. In the current case, to ignore or downplay the importance to its patrons of an entrance that was marvellous in its own right would result in an unbalanced idea of the gatehouse's purpose: if its design was portentous, it was also intriguing and beautiful. From the outset, the process of design cannot have been purely pragmatic, but must have been intrinsically gratifying to patrons and architect alike. Especially when newly built, with the sunlight glancing off its flints and its sculpture crisp and writhing with life, the building would have been enthralling to contemplate, particularly for its owners. Its size and form, the

variety and richness of its surfaces and the contrast it established with its green and watery setting all combined to make it so. The equivocal, struggling figures in the spandrels, examples of Henri Focillon's 'artificial humanity invented by fashion', may have been amusing in a way familiar from acquaintance with manuscript illumination and sculpted monuments such as the choir-stalls of Winchester cathedral and the tomb of St William at York.[56] The combination of freestone and flint exemplifies a contrast of pale and dark materials which had long been admired for its own sake in English architecture. In addition, the gate's external façade in particular corresponded to an interest which designers of Decorated style buildings had in indulging the viewer's sight and apprehensions of touch. While it is naturally difficult to divorce aesthetic response from interpretation, the conclusion that the gatehouse was admired for what it was as well as what it represented seems both natural and inevitable.

Obviously, however, the conception and function of the building were as firmly rooted in ideology as aesthetics. Those things which made it enjoyable to contemplate also helped to generate whatever meanings it had for its medieval observers. As represented here, these meanings were largely shared products of social and cultural conditioning, but it may as well be acknowledged that, as with any historic building, signification was conditioned *a priori* by situational and personal circumstances as much as broader ideological currents. In what follows, all of this must be considered axiomatic, even if it is undocumented. To state as much is simply to rehearse an assumption of recent medieval art and architectural history.[57]

The only documented medieval response to the gatehouse is found in one of the notebooks of William Worcestre, the fifteenth-century author and topographer. Worcestre often visited St Benet's Holm, where he had a private chamber, because it was the burial-place of Sir John

Fastolf (d. 1459), his erstwhile patron and employer. On one occasion, in 1477, he wrote a series of Latin couplets accusing the monks of ingratitude and parsimony in light of Fastolf's benefactions, which included a sumptuous chapel on the south side of their presbytery. He was also annoyed because his chamber had been given to someone else.[58] This poem was intended to epitomize conditions at the monastery, and all of the couplets are negative except the first, which is 'Porticum regale [/] Signum capitale' ('A royal gate [/] A capital sign'). After this, one reads only of filthy linen, unsalted cabbage, stony bedding, and other disagreeable things.[59] It is hard to interpret 'a royal gate' (or 'porch') as anything other than the monastery's entrance, which is here cast as a false witness to what awaited visitors in the guesthouse.

Assuming that it was not simply generated by sculptural or heraldic iconography, the concept of a 'royal' edifice provides at least some indication of medieval attitudes to the gatehouse. Worcestre had travelled the length and breadth of England and was very interested in architecture, so the building was regal in his estimation by national standards, even 150 years after its construction. While it would be impractical to cling too tightly to this scrap of text, Worcestre's judgement testifies to an effect which the building was designed to exercise on all non-monastic visitors, from the bishops of Norwich who came to audit and correct conventual behaviour to the local inhabitants who sought work or burial in the monastery, or indeed planned to assault it. A sense of how the building was understood can be had by considering the seigneurial, defensive and spiritual interests of its patrons. There is nothing unusual in these three frames of reference, or the methods used to address them in the following discussion: the novelty lies in their relation to a particular building and its cultural situation.

The gatehouse as an image of lordship

The erection of the gatehouse and precinct wall in the 1320s and 1330s can be seen as part of the convent's protracted process of designing itself into a landscape over which it experienced a powerful sense of dominion. This dominion was grounded in a distant, illustrious past and inflected by ideas of entitlement, responsibility, piety and community (many of Holm's monks had East Anglian toponyms, and it was in fact normal for a monastery to draw its recruits from the region in which it was located). It thus had sentimental as well as practical aspects, and communal life and religious observance depended on it entirely. As with any well-endowed house, architecture played a conspicuous part in the relationship between Holm and its lands. In particular, the abbey's manor-houses and granges, objects of unremitting expenditure in the later Middle Ages, functioned as its satellites, bringing the abbot and senior officials out into the landscape, and also serving monks of lesser status as places of recreation (as many as thirty-two members of Bury's convent were staying on their abbey's estates when the riot broke out in 1327).[60] Local churches expressed the relationship too: by the end of the Middle Ages, Holm's coat of arms was displayed on a bench-end at Horning, flanking the nave door at Catfield, and in stained glass at Tacolneston, Thurgarton, Catfield and Hoveton St John.[61] In this evocative and permeable realm the abbey had a special place, equivalent to the seat of a secular magnate; the magnate in this case being a mitred abbot and parliamentary lord spiritual. The equivalence was underlined by the common identification of a monastery with its ruler. While the abbot of Holm will have spent a good deal of time at his manor houses, the closest of which, Ludham Hall, was only a mile from the precinct, the institution that underwrote his dignity, and incorporated his state apartments, was the monastery itself.

From this context the gatehouse emerges as a sort of image, designed to represent both lordly entitlement and solicitude, located at the heart of utilitarian and symbolic dominion and erected, as it transpired, at the zenith of the abbey's prosperity (Fig. **7**). In size and detail it smacked of high self-regard and the warrant that the abbot and convent had for display. It also advertised firm, efficient management, influence over men and materials and the wealth to build on a grand scale. How much it actually cost, and whether the convent received any external benefaction towards it (as the monks of St Augustine's, Canterbury, did with their great gatehouse), are intractable matters.[62] It is highly likely to have consumed more than a year's income, estimated in 1291 at around £326: the sum of £115 8s. spent in 1316–17 finishing off the Ethelbert gate may be taken to indicate how much elegant flushwork and monumental sculpture could consume.[63]

Part of this assertion was armorial. All of the stone shields on the internal and external façades seem to have been sculpted with heraldry, as they are on the gatehouses at Kirkham and Butley, and their secular counterparts at Alnwick, Bothal, Lumley, Raby and other fourteenth-century castles in the north of England.[64] The governing idea, at least at Holm, was apparently to advertise social kinship with secular lords whose lands and influence were interspersed with those of the monastery, and thus to emphasize the type of person the abbot was and the quality of secular influence that underlay his and his convent's status. (The abbot also had heraldic glass in at least one of the windows of his hall, into which a shield with the Morley arms was inserted *c*. 1360.)[65] Whatever figurative expressiveness a crenellated tower decked with shields had – it could, for example, have evoked the embattled Tower of David, 'hung with a thousand bucklers' (*Canticles*, 4, 4) – was perfectly consonant with this ambition. Most of the arms recorded before these shields were lost in the eighteenth century belonged to magnates with extensive local interests.[66] The external façade displayed De la

Pole, Beauchamp, Clare, Valance, Warren, and a lion rampant of uncertain designation, perhaps Morley, whose arms were to be found on two vestments within the abbey church as well as in the window of the abbot's hall (Fig. **3**).[67] There were ten further shields whose heraldry is unknown. Internally, as well as the royal arms, Erpingham and Hastings were exhibited, along with a plain cross botonny which may have been intended for Edward the Confessor (an important early benefactor whose arms were also displayed in the gate-hall at Bury), and, again, an unattributable lion rampant (Fig. **4**). Direct patronage of the abbey is unlikely to have been a criterion of inclusion in this roll. Ties of history and kinship as well as practical social relationships underlie many of the armorials displayed on or within buildings, and also prayer-books, of the period. This is indicated at Butley, where very few of the coats of arms over the entrance of the gatehouse can be ascribed to benefactors.[68]

The function of the gatehouse's upper chamber must originally have influenced attitudes to the building in general. In particular, its relation to the local exercise of power will have been strengthened if this chamber served as a courtroom, or if it was set aside for the abbot's personal use. A curial function is often envisaged (if less often documented) for the chambers over grand gates: the relatively small size of Walsingham's fifteenth-century gatehouse has thus been explained by the fact that the priory was not in control of the local court.[69] Upper chambers might also house chapels: this was true of Norwich's Ethelbert gate, other Benedictine examples at Durham and Peterborough, and at least two Cistercian ones, at Beaulieu and Whalley.[70] Holm's gatehouse is unlikely to have had a chapel in it, for the simple reason that it is not appropriately oriented. This does not mean, though, that the presence of a court can simply be assumed. At Eynsham (Oxfordshire), the chamber over the gate was described in the 1360s as the abbot's without qualification.[71] This may be taken to suggest that it served various purposes, something no doubt common to chambers known to

have hosted courts. The most that can be said is that a grand, well-lit room in such a superior setting would have been appropriate for the abbot's use, whether curial or not, and for the accommodation of important visitors (accommodation was a function of raised gatehouse chambers elsewhere[72]). Its elevation and the window in its external façade also permitted a view along the causeway leading to the precinct, so that in times of expectancy, whether festive or ominous, it must have served as a distinguished watching chamber. In this sense, the gatehouse was the eye of the monastery as well as its mouth: indeed, viewed as an expression of architectural and social quality, it was the abbey's face, moved outward from the west end of the church – the traditional site of the grand façade – to the key strategic point in the precinct walls.[73]

The gatehouse militant

Charles Coulson, who has produced the only sustained analysis of the subject, has discussed the balance between 'physical power' and 'moral deterrence' in the defensive capabilities of the kind of building done at Holm in the 1320s and 1330s.[74] According to him, crenellated walls and gates expressed the spiritual and temporal strength of a religious institution in 'metaphysical' terms, and this was their major contribution to ecclesiastical security. They also provided a measure of physical protection against enemies undaunted by their symbolism, but the precinct of a religious house was too large, and the resources within it too limited, to resist sustained assault. Points of Coulson's analysis are contestable: his claim that monasteries did not usually possess arms for defence, or monks personal weapons, is contradicted by much later medieval evidence, while the assertion that building crenellated walls and gates symbolized a prelate's arrival within an elite social category is vulnerable to the objection that such individuals and the products of their patronage were representatives of self-consciously ancient establishments.[75] In the round, however, his view of ecclesiastical

fortification as primarily symbolic in nature and pre-emptive in effect is compelling. One validation of it is the sackings at Bury, Abingdon, Norwich and elsewhere. Bury had a grand gatehouse and high crenellated wall before it was attacked in 1327, but these did not save it; and the predecessor of the Ethelbert gate at Norwich, clearly a large structure, was also burned in 1272. Another is the relative ease with which anyone choosing to bypass a monastery's gates could climb over its precinct wall: as contemporary evidence from Bury, Canterbury and the nunnery at Thetford in Suffolk shows, a couple of ladders and an accomplice is all that was needed.[76]

While Holm's gatehouse is implicated in this general picture, it is possible to be more specific about its defensive function. To start with, the external façade, with its marks of religious and temporal power, would presumably have curbed impending transgression as effectively as that of any later medieval monastic gate, despite the fact that some of the more bellicose devices available to the architect were not incorporated (Fig. **7**). Apart from its crenellations, and perhaps some arrow-slits in its turrets, it lacked patently defensive features like the portcullises at Bury, Battle and Peterborough, or the machicolation of the cemetery gate at St Augustine's, Canterbury. Possibly, the three open-mouthed vault bosses within its portal were supposed to suggest murder-holes, but the fact that they could only be seen from within the doors weakened whatever monitory value they were intended to possess (Fig. **16**). (Another explanation is that they are simply a humorous play on the idea of the 'mouth' or 'door' of the monastery.)[77] However, the gatehouse's external sculpture must have been thought to constitute a defence of sorts, as well as a statement of quiddity and purpose. The heraldry suggested the level of support which the abbey might summon in times of need, and the monumental carved figures could in any situation have assumed the status of supernatural defenders who implied the awful spiritual consequences of unwarranted entry. As well as

deterring human miscreants, it is likely that these images were understood to obstruct the evil spirits associated by tradition with thresholds and boundaries, and confronted directly by the monks in their annual rogation rituals (25 April and the three days before Ascension Day).[78] Such spirits, and particularly the Devil, were represented in visible form by the model or painting of a dragon which the monks processed around their precincts on these occasions: surviving sacrists' rolls from the abbey include payments for carrying it, and for the gloves needed by its bearers.[79] An image of a shrine was also carried on these occasions, representing the relics of the saints which deflected evil spirits.[80] The gatehouse's spandrel sculptures more permanently expressed this contest for the threshold, and as such have counterparts in the wild men and angels battling dragons commonly placed on gates and church porches at the end of the Middle Ages (Figs **21**, **22**).[81] The defence, in other words, was not just inertly symbolic but also actively apotropaic, and set up against two species of malign agency. This idea, which has transhistorical and transcultural dimensions, has been explored in the context of the iconography of city gates in medieval Italy.[82] (Julian Gardner brings it to bear, for example, on images such as that of St Michael vanquishing a dragon which was carved on the Porta Appia in Rome in 1327.)[83] It is equally relevant to understanding the defensive utility of ecclesiastical gatehouses.

Another element of the gatehouse's moral deterrence may be sought in negative or otherwise threatening attitudes to Benedictine monasticism, both actual and perceived. The concept at stake is that the gatehouse and precinct wall were understood by the monks to demonstrate a militant loyalty to their way of life and patron saint, in part by symbolising the ideal of enclosure present in the Benedictine *Rule*. From the thirteenth century, the Franciscans in particular wrote and preached against property ownership and the derogation from traditional standards of observance in orders like the Benedictines and Augustinians. In doing so they

had the letter, and to some extent the spirit, of the *Rule* on their side: St Benedict's vision for his monks was one of poverty and humility, and he deprecated the ownership of unnecessary property. Their ideas and rhetoric were coloured by questioning of Church endowment and founders' rights at the highest levels of secular government.[84] The physical attacks on monasteries that occurred during the later Middle Ages, not entirely local in their motives (if not specifically anti-monastic, either), must have seemed to the monks to represent a demotic manifestation of these attitudes. One avenue of reaction was to emphasize the royal support monasticism had traditionally enjoyed, as Holm's monks did by mounting the arms of England and France on their gatehouse. Another lay through the pen. During the first half of the fourteenth century, a monk of Bury St Edmunds wrote a treatise on the origins of Benedictine monasticism which justified its contemporary status with reference to biblical precedents (he claimed, for example, that John the Baptist, Christ and the apostles were proto-monks) and the necessity of property ownership to the maintenance of religion. This text was widely copied and adapted in Benedictine houses over the following century.[85] Whether or not it made its way to Holm (it probably did), it was generated by and expressive of beliefs which the abbot and convent there must have shared.

St Benet's Holm can fairly be described as a bastion of St Benedict, by virtue of its profession, dedication, and the special devotion these things appear to have inspired. As a matter of course, the abbey sealed its documents with the image of Benedict, enthroned and holding a book symbolic of the *Rule*.[86] Its monks, and those of Ramsey in Cambridgeshire, whose abbey shared Holm's unusual dedication, wrote a book of their own containing miracles of their titular saint: a fragment of their work survives in a late fourteenth-century chronicle manuscript from Bury, headed by the information that 'the original was written in full at the monasteries of Ramsey and St Benet's Holm'.[87] Special pittances were distributed

by the sacrist on the feasts of Relics, the Assumption of the Virgin Mary, St Benedict, and his sister, St Scholastica. Because Scholastica was a titular patroness of all Benedictine nunneries, the distinction of the latter two feasts may have related to the monks' order-consciousness as well as their piety.[88] Another symptom of order-consciousness is contained in a remarkable, carefully presented list of all the English Benedictine houses, male and female, copied around 1300 into a manuscript of a chronicle written at the abbey.[89] The monks also possessed two chasubles, a benedictional and a chalice that had belonged to Dunstan, the sainted paragon of the English Benedictines.[90] These indications of enthusiasm and attitude suggest that the gatehouse was planned in a spirit of professional and devotional chauvinism, perhaps as part of a more sustained anti-reformist politics.

If anything, the circumstances in which the building was conceived support this idea. Insofar as the attack on Bury in January 1327 was ideologically motivated, there was a clear sense in which it extended to institutions observing the same customs and standards. The reasons for which Bury was resented were in essence those for which Holm might also be attacked, and among these the monastic status was inseparable from ideas about lordship, legal control, and religion more generally. At this point, the aggregation of symbolic and physical defence surfaces again. The ultimate consequences of such an attack were the invasion of the precinct, murder of the monks and desecration of their sanctuary. With this in mind, the monastery was fortified (the word used in the licence to crenellate) with a wall, ditch and gatehouse to repel acts of violence for the short period it would take for help to arrive, the commitment of the aggressors to falter, or, at last resort, the monks to escape with their treasures by river or across the marshes. Of course, as with any defensive buildings, those at Holm could only function with the aid of men who would reinforce the doors, repel ladders and parry whatever blows were aimed at them. Supported in this way, the gatehouse seems to have been tolerably

efficient. Evidence for this is contained in the documents of an inquisition held to determine

responsibility for crimes committed in Norfolk during the Peasants' Revolt of 1381. Three

indictments presented at nearby Horning mention assaults on Holm, the most serious of

which occurred on the night of 23 June.[91] It is said that, under cover of darkness, William de

Kymberle, the abbot's carter ('carectaris abbatis') – who must have been as familiar with the

gatehouse as anyone – led around 400 armed men to the head of the abbey's causeway, where

they besieged the monastery for the entire night ('dictum monasterij per totam noctem illum

obsederunt'). Their intention was to ambush and kill the abbot, all his servants (probably

meaning his lay officials rather than the monks) and the bishop of Norwich if they should

find them there, contrary to the peace and dignity of the king. When they arrived, the abbot

and monks were at matins: oppressed by the fear of death ('metu mortis dimiserunt'), they

armed themselves and kept watch over, protected and defended their monastery throughout

the night ('armauerunt et pro totam noctem illos vigilauerunt ad monasterij suum predictam

custodiverunt et defenderunt').[92] There is nothing in any of the documents to suggest that the

aggressors gained entry to the monastery.

An attack of this sort was perhaps expected, because other miscreants had blockaded

('assidiauerunt') the monks and their manors three days earlier and (it was testified) burned

all of their customals, rentals, court rolls and other muniments. A justice of the peace resident

at the abbot's manor in Potter Heigham had also been murdered.[93] For its part, the actual

siege, such as it was, probably occupied only a few hours, because the men presumably

dispersed at daylight to avoid recognition.[94] Whatever the precise nature of the events

recorded in the indictments, the gatehouse withstood the challenge. While the building itself

is not mentioned in the documents, it is stated that the attack took place at the head of the

causeway ('capud calcetis monasterij'), which is where the gatehouse stood, and the only

point around the precinct where 400 men, or even a lesser number, could have congregated (Fig. **14**). This effort of resistance gave the monastery a reputation as a defensive stronghold, or at least augmented an existing reputation. According to the St Albans chronicler Thomas of Walsingham, in the following year another rebellious group 'contemplated seizing the abbey of St Benet of Holm secretly, as it seemed to them that it would be a strong fortification' (*fortis municio*).[95] In the fifteenth century, Sir John Fastolf had sufficient faith in Holm's security to keep gold coin worth over £2000 there.[96] Eventually, when the Elizabethan topographer William Camden visited the site, he encountered a legend that the abbey – 'which seemed a castle rather than a monastery' – had been successfully defended against William the Conqueror.[97] In the generation and maintenance of this reputation the gatehouse and walls had a large stake.

The gatehouse as portal of Heaven

The tendency of medieval monks to conceptualize the spaces and buildings of their precincts in symbolic and allegorical terms is witnessed by many written sources. Not all houses yield evidence of such thinking, but for several reasons it can be considered a pervasive aspect of monastic ideology. For one thing, it was rooted in the Bible, particularly the Epistles, Canticles and Apocalypse, and in Christ's references to himself as the stone which the builders rejected (*Matthew*, 21, 42), Temple of Jerusalem (*John*, 2, 19–21) and door of the sheepfold (*John*, 10, 7–8, 9).[98] It is also present in the Benedictine *Rule*, where the monastery is variously associated with the Lord's tabernacle (*Psalms*, 14[15], 1), his temple, and the house built upon a rock mentioned in the Sermon on the Mount (*Matthew*, 7, 24–25).[99] Allegorical explanation of architecture and church ornaments was common in hagiography, letter and sermon-writing and historiography.[100] For monks and secular clerics alike, it was a familiar aspect of the liturgy which regulated and justified their vocation. The Ascension Day

rites at Norwich, for example, involved two brethren singing the respond *Viri galilei* at the Ethelbert gate, after which the whole convent processed through the precinct to the church. In the biblical passage from which *Viri galilei* is taken (*Acts*, 1, 11–12), the apostles are told to return from Olivet to Jerusalem, where they dwell together: the priory was thus equated with the holy city and the monks with the apostles. On Palm Sunday, the same procession imitated Christ's passage through the gate of Jerusalem shortly before his crucifixion.[101] Such concepts must have encouraged even uninspired monks to think imaginatively about the architecture that was always with them. Naturally, this thought was not a constant or for that matter dominant factor in a monk's relationship to his surroundings. It is highly unlikely, for example, that most imagined either the New Jerusalem or the Temple of Solomon each time they entered their church or cloister. However, it is clear enough that the detailed, emotive processes of planning and executing important buildings, not least gatehouses, often involved pious reflection of this sort. The Cistercian abbey of Kingswood in Gloucestershire (dedicated, like all houses of the order, to the Virgin) offers a striking example of this. Here, architecture and sculpture were amalgamated on a grand scale to express the idea that entering the monastery was like passing through the door to salvation opened by Christ's incarnation (Fig. **26**).[102] Monumental images of Gabriel and Mary, the latter incorporating a dove, were placed on either side of the gate-arch, the central window had a mullion sculpted to represent a lily in a pot and a head of God the Father turned towards the Virgin, and a Crucifixion was set on the gable above.[103] This is an example of the effect of allegory on architectural design on an unusually large scale. Others have been noted previously in the spandrel sculpture of the Ethelbert gate and the images of Christ installed above the arches of gates elsewhere.

For present purposes, the relevant strands of this thought are those which associate what in medieval documents is called the *claustrum* (that is, either the whole monastery or the cloister as an epitome of it) with Paradise.[104] Of equal and concomitant importance is the description of the walls and gates of Heaven in chapter 21 of the *Apocalypse*, and its Old Testament antecedents, particularly *Isaiah*, 54, 12 ('I will make thy bulwarks of jasper, and thy gates of graven stones, and all thy borders of desirable stones'). The equation of monastery and Heaven was so familiar that, like the habit of referring to monastic churches as *domus Dei*, it passed into everyday use.[105] A chamberlain's roll of 1374–75 from Durham, for example, accounts for 'the repair of the wall around paradise', referring to a garden within the monastery, while at Glastonbury 'paradise' was used collectively of the abbey's lands.[106] Its theoretical basis was contained in expository texts commonly represented in monastic libraries. Durandus of Mende's *Rationale divinorum officiorum* stands out among these for its popularity with the English Benedictines and closeness in date to the period in which Holm's gatehouse was built (the text's final redaction emerged between 1294 and 1296).[107] Two sections of its first chapter (1, 42–43) are devoted to the symbolism of the monastery, whose church is said to be the Church Triumphant, cloister the celestial Paradise, work-places the heavenly mansions declared by Christ in *John*, 14, 2, refectory love of prayer, and so on.[108] These are topoi of which Holm's monks cannot have been ignorant, even if loss of the abbey's library means that ownership of such texts cannot be confirmed.[109] Their influence is imaginatively represented in the gatehouse itself, whose appearance was calculated to emphasize the exceptional status of what it guarded. The raised panels of flint flanking the head of the portal are particularly revealing of this (Figs **7**, **19**). These ornaments intrigued Nikolaus Pevsner (the only previous writer to comment on them), who called them 'almost Renaissance in character'.[110] He was evidently thinking of flat rustication of the sort used in the Middle Ages as well as the Renaissance, on, for example, the city gate built by Frederick

II at Capua between 1234 and 1240.[111] However, the position and treatment of the motifs make it unlikely that rustication was what the gatehouse's patrons and architect had in mind. Rather, their intention seems to have been to suggest jewels in raised mounts of the sort found in medieval *ars sacra*. Flints were well chosen for this purpose, because, when freshly split, their lustrous, slightly uneven cores shimmer and sparkle in direct light. At Holm they would have caught the oblique rays of the setting sun.

This conceit advertised the relationship of earthly and heavenly gates with special clarity, by associating the gatehouse with the description of a New Jerusalem built of gold and precious stones in *Apocalypse*, 21, 11–22. As an artistic response it is unusual but not unprecedented. Allegorical expressions of the concept to set beside Holm's gatehouse are found in the stone inlays commissioned in the 1360s and 1370s by Charles IV for the walls of several chapels in and around Prague, most famously those of the Holy Cross at Karlštejn castle and St Wenceslaus in the cathedral. In these cases the exposition is more direct for incorporating some of the types of stone (amethyst, jasper, sardonyx) mentioned in the Bible, but less so for being internally located.[112] The strength of expression at Holm lies altogether in the display of the panels on the exterior of the monastery's public and ceremonial entrance. Elsewhere, representations of celestial buildings as different in provenance and date as the mosaics of the triumphal arch of Sta Maria Maggiore in Rome (*c*. 432–40), a thirteenth-century Tuscan panel painting of the Annunciation now in Pisa, and the miniatures showing the descent of the Heavenly Jerusalem in the Paris, Morgan and Oxford Apocalypses (all illuminated in southern England between *c*. 1250 and *c*. 1260) include gates and walls encrusted with jewels that parallel the effect sought at Holm (Figs **27**, **28**).[113] An example which is closer to Holm in terms of provenance (made in London or Norwich, almost certainly for use in a Benedictine monastery) and date (*c*. 1310-20) is the remarkable image in the Dublin

Apocalypse, where the architecture of Heaven is set with red, blue and green gemstones (Fig. 29).[114] Three other English Apocalypse manuscripts made in the same region and period (the Lambeth, Metz and Gulbenkian Apocalypses) show the walls of heaven studded with framed squares or rectangles of explicitly similar appearance to the motifs displayed on Holm's gatehouse. In these cases, the figures represent the gates of heaven, which are described as pearls ('margaritae') in *Apocalypse*, 21, 21 (Fig. **30**).[115] In one other case, that of the Crowland Apocalypse, which was made in East Anglia around 1330, the scene in which the angel shows the heavenly Jerusalem to St John is dominated by a crenelated building with sixteen rather than twelve of these motifs, each of them square, with a white border framing a black centre (Fig. **31**).[116] Here the artist has conflated the identity of the gates and jewels described in the text in a way both pictorially and numerically evocative of Holm's gatehouse, which also has sixteen of the motifs on its external façade. In light of this manuscript's date and provenance, the resemblance is close enough to suggest the possibility of a direct association.

The native appeal for monks of the imagery of Apocalypse 21 was amplified by texts like Prudentius's *Psychomachia*, the Apocalypse commentaries of Bede, Berengaudus and Haimo of Auxerre, and the *Glossa ordinaria*, all of which were well represented in English Benedictine houses.[117] In varying degrees of detail, these develop the eschatological meanings of the celestial buildings and their precious stones. For example, Berengaudus's text interprets the New Jerusalem as the eternal glory of the saints, its surrounding wall as Christ, and its twelve gates as the apostles and their teachings. The precious stones are said to stand for the persons of the Trinity, the virtues, and various classes of virtuous, redeemed people, while the pure gold and (*sic*) clear glass of the city's streets represent the immaculate minds of men and angels.[118] A copy of this work, at least, survives from Holm (now Longleat

House, MS 2), and the monks are also known to have possessed Robert Grosseteste's commentary on the pseudo-Dionysius's *Celestial Hierarchies*, which draws on the list of gems in *Apocalypse*, 21, 18–20 to explain the brilliance of the angels.[119] Grosseteste's is one of several imaginative responses to or amplifications of this material by English authors.[120] Others are found in the verse life of St Edith of Wilton by Goscelin of St Bertin (*c.* 1080), a remarkable letter written by the twelfth-century Benedictine Osbert of Clare in which Bede's explanation of the heavenly stones is embroidered, and the Englishman Thurchill's vision of Heaven as reported under the year 1206 in the *Chronica Majora* of Matthew Paris, another work known at Holm.[121] On reaching the end of his journey through Purgatory, Thurchill 'went through an extremely beautiful gate, ornamented with gems and precious stones', on the other side of which he was immersed in the glories of Paradise.[122] This encapsulation of biblical and patristic imagery is a close cultural relation of the gatehouse.

Conclusion

Architectural iconography is a notoriously problematic subject, whose difficulties are increased when, as at St Benet's Holm, its objects are undocumented.[123] Even where their nature can be determined, the historical effects of iconographic meanings like those identified here are bound to remain largely indistinct. In any case, the complexity of process out of which Holm's gatehouse arose, and the social diversity and protraction of the building's reception, unite with the competing considerations of pragmatism and idealism that naturally arise where the purpose of religious architecture is investigated to make identification of a primary meaning a futile object. Historians of medieval architecture rarely enjoy the luxury of unmediated insight into either patronal motives or contemporary public opinion, and are required instead to base judgements about intention and value on what is known of context. Accordingly, the gatehouse has been considered here with close reference to the institutional,

environmental and social relations of its patrons. It inevitably emerges from this as both product and revelation of a cultivated but defensive monasticism, as a representative of a period in English Benedictine evolution that was itself substantially conditioned by non-monastic influences. This perspective has the advantage of emphasising the building's conceptual sophistication, and, in the process, better accounting for its catalysts, uses and reception than a study rooted uniquely in structure and formal taxonomy could.

Yet while this analysis has culminated in arguments about symbolism, the high artistic value of the gatehouse deserves commensurate emphasis. To the extent that it is symptomatic of broader ideas and impulses, this value can be identified as essentially extrinsic. In terms of such physical attributes as size, ornamentation and the exhibition of ingenuity, the building ranks alongside any monastic gatehouse built in medieval England. Its contribution to knowledge of its own formal and stylistic categories, and the history of English fourteenth-century architecture more generally, explains the attention given in this study to structure and design. The recovery and contextualisation presented here provide points of reference for further exploration of a type of building whose formal and iconographic richness, historical eloquence and geographical circumscription are equally remarkable. In its play of miniature and monumental, dark and light, recession and projection, artifice and realism, and other qualities, the gatehouse also possessed an intrinsic value, which crystalized in its enigmatic but indubitable power to excite emotional and aesthetic response in its medieval beholders. The intimations of this power that survive in a ruin so largely divorced from its historical and architectural settings are ultimately the strongest testimony to the building's original glory.

Notes

[1] Notes made *c*. 1770 date the mill's construction *c*. 1730: Norwich, Norfolk Record Office [hereafter NRO], MS Rye 3:2 (eighteenth-century antiquarian collections), p. 490.

[2] The main source worth noting is Tim Pestell, *St Benet's Abbey: A Guide and History* (Norwich, 2008), pp. 7–12, where an impressionistic reconstruction of the monastery is presented. This guidebook gives a good general account of the abbey. Others are Francis Blomefield, *An Essay Towards a Topographical History of the County of Norfolk*, 2nd edn, 11 vols (London, 1805–10), XI, p. 55; Edgar Philip Loftus Brock, 'The Abbey of St. Benet's at Holm', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 36 (1880), pp. 15–21 (pp. 18–19); Joan M. Snelling, *St. Benet's Abbey, Norfolk*, rev. William Frederick Edwards (Norwich, 1983), p. 7; Roland W. Morant, *The Monastic Gatehouse and Other Types of Portal of Medieval Religious Houses* (Lewes, 1995), pp. 86, 91, 183; Nikolaus Pevsner and Bill Wilson, *The Buildings of England. Norfolk 1: Norwich and North-East* (New Haven and London, 1997), pp. 561–62; Anthony Emery, *Greater Medieval Houses of England and Wales 1300-1500*, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1996–2006), II, p. 142. An unpublished description is 'The Abbey of St Benet at Holm, Horning, Norfolk: An Archaeological and Architectural Survey by the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England', ed. Peter Topping (s.l., 1994), pp. 27–36.

[3] Kew, The National Archives [hereafter TNA], E167/1607, m. 4 (survey of 1594, mentioning 'a gatehouse uncovered').

[4] First accessibly published in *Vestusta Monumenta quae ad rerum Britannicarum memoriam conservandam* (London, 1747), pls 13, 14.

[5] NRO, MS Rye 17:6 (eighteenth-century antiquarian collections), p. 1.

[6] The aesthetic development of later medieval gatehouses in continental Europe, and also parts of the Islamic world, mainly involved civic or palatial gates. These could be highly ornate, but there is no close parallel between them and later medieval English ecclesiastical gatehouses.

[7] On cross-fertilisation in Decorated Gothic see Geoffrey Webb, *Architecture in Britain: The Middle Ages* (Harmondsworth, 1956), pp. 163–64; Jean Bony, *The English Decorated Style: Gothic Architecture Transformed 1250–1350* (Oxford, 1979), pp. 19–25; Nicola Coldstream, *The Decorated Style: Architecture and Ornament 1240–1360* (London, 1994), pp. 35–52; Paul Binski, 'The English Decorated Style: Problems and Possibilities', in *Bilan et Perspectives des Etudes Médiévales en Europe*, ed. Jacqueline Hamesse (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1995), pp. 313–28. A forthcoming book by Paul Binski will be a major addition to this literature.

[8] For acknowledgement of the problem see Peter Fergusson, 'The Greencourt Gatehouse at the Cathedral Monastery of Christchurch, Canterbury', in *Das Bauwerk und die Stadt: Aufsätze für Eduard F. Sekler*, ed. Wolfgang Böhm (Vienna, 1994), pp. 87–97; idem, ' "*Porta patens esto*": Notes on Early Cistercian Gatehouses in the North of England', in *Medieval Architecture and Its Intellectual Context: Studies in Honour of Peter Kidson*, ed. Eric Fernie and Paul Crossley (London, 1990), pp. 47–59.

[9] See, for example, *Lateinische Schriftquellen zur Kunst in England, Wales und Schottland vom Jahre 901 bis zum Jahre 1307*, ed. Otto Lehmann-Brockhaus, 5 vols (Munich, 1955–60), I, p. 581 (no. 2197).

[10] John Goodall, *The English Castle* (New Haven and London, 2011), pp. 274–76; idem, 'The English Gatehouse', *Architectural History*, 55 (2012), pp. 1–23 (pp. 7, 14–19): the latter is essential for understanding the morphology of later medieval gatehouses in general.

[11] See, for example, Michael Thompson, *Cloister, Abbot and Precinct in Medieval Monasteries* (Stroud, 2001), p. 110: 'The "great gate" (*magna porta*) seems to have been a late medieval invention'.

[12] *Lateinische Schriftquellen*, I, pp. 312, 506 (nos 1156, 1868); *Chronicon abbatiae de Evesham*, ed. William Dunn Macray, Rolls Series 29 (London, 1863), xliv n. 1; *The Chronicle of Glastonbury Abbey*, ed. James P. Carley, trans. David Townsend (Woodbridge, 1985), p. 166 ('portam exteriorem speciosam ex lapidibus quadris').

[13] For licences to crenellate English monastic precincts and gates see Charles Coulson, 'Hierarchism in Conventual Crenellation: An Essay in the Sociology and Metaphysics of Medieval Fortification', *Medieval Archaeology*, 26 (1982), pp. 69–100 (pp. 93–95). For the build-dates of Peterborough's gate see *Lateinische Schriftquellen*, II, pp. 342, 343 (nos 3512, 3516).

[14] Kirkham's gate is usually dated to the 1290s, but its window tracery seems too advanced for this: Glyn Coppack, Stuart Harrison and Colin Hayfield, 'Kirkham Priory: the Architecture and Archaeology of an Augustinian House', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 148 (1995), pp. 55–136 (pp. 107–08).

[15] On these systems see *Documents Illustrating the Activities of the General and Provincial Chapters of the English Black Monks 1215–1540*, ed. William Abel Pantin, 3 vols, Camden Society, 3rd ser. 45, 47, 54 (London, 1931–37); *Chapters of the Augustinian Canons*, ed. H. E. Salter, Oxford Historical Society 85 (Oxford, 1922).

[16] On the Ethelbert gate see particularly Eric Fernie, *An Architectural History of Norwich Cathedral* (Oxford, 1993), pp. 178, 180–82; J. T. Macnaughton-Jones, 'Saint Ethelbert's Gate, Norwich', *Norfolk Archaeology*, 34 (1966), pp. 74–84; Christopher Wilson, 'The Origins of the Perpendicular Style and Its Development to circa 1360' (doctoral thesis, University of London, 1980), pp. 174, 179–80, 383 n. 13.

[17] For Butley, see James G. Mann, 'Butley Priory, Suffolk', *Country Life*, 73 (1933), pp. 308–14; William Douglas Caröe, 'The Later History of the Priory and the Gatehouse', *Archaeological Journal*, 90 (1933), pp. 229–41; Nikolaus Pevsner and Enid Radcliffe, *The Buildings of England. Suffolk* (New Haven and London, 2002), pp. 155–57; Emery, *Greater Medieval Houses*, II, pp. 53–56.

[18] On Bury's gatehouse see, briefly, Joan Evans, *English Art 1307–1461* (Oxford, 1949), p. 114; Arthur B. Whittingham, 'Bury St. Edmunds Abbey: The Plan, Design and Development of the Church and Monastic Buildings', *Archaeological Journal*, 108 (1951), pp. 173–83 (p. 186); idem, *Bury St Edmunds Abbey* (London, 1992), p. 24; Webb, *Architecture in Britain*, pp. 163–64; Pevsner and Radcliffe, *Suffolk*, pp. 138–39; Goodall, *The English Castle*, pp. 274–75.

[19] See for example John Goodall, 'A Study of the Grotesque 14th-Century Sculpture at Adderbury, Bloxhall and Hanwell in Its Architectural Context', *Oxoniensia*, 60 (1995), pp. 271–332 (pp. 291, 295, 318–19 and n. 79); Sydney Carlyle Cockerell and Montague Rhodes James, *Two East Anglian Psalters at the Bodleian Library, Oxford* (Oxford, 1926), pl. X; Lucy Freeman Sandler, *Gothic Manuscripts 1285–1385*, Survey of Manuscript Illuminated in the British Isles 5, 2 vols (London, 1986), I, ill. 83.

[20] The main locally composed chronicle is printed in *Chronica Johannis de Oxenedes*, ed. Sir Henry Ellis, Rolls Series 13 (London, 1859), pp. 1–287; see also *Flores Historiarum*, ed. Henry Richards Luard, 3 vols, Rolls Series 95 (London, 1890), I, pp. xxii–xxiv, xxv; II, pp. 22, 52, 53, 56, 62, 70, 81, 92, 98, 143, 170, 196, 211, 223, 378, 414, 477; III, pp. 17, 19, 23, 24, 46, 64, 112, 117. The *Chronica*, composed *c.* 1292, survives in two copies, and an independent set of annals also exists (*Chronica Johannis de Oxenedes*, pp. 291–315). For a further foundation-history see Tom Licence, 'Suneman and Wulfric: Two Forgotten Saints of

St Benedict's Abbey at Holme in Norfolk', *Analecta Bollandiana*, 122 (2004), pp. 361–72 (pp. 370–72).

[21] Godfrey Rupert Carless Davis, *Medieval Cartularies of Great Britain*, rev. edn (London, 2012), pp. 99–100; *Calendar of Charters and Rolls Preserved in the Bodleian Library*, ed. William H. Turner (Oxford, 1878), pp. 239–50; NRO, DN/EST 1-14 (medieval account rolls of St Benet's Holm), 100. On the main surviving cartulary, now London, British Library [hereafter BL] MS Cotton Galba E.II, see *St. Benet of Holme 1020–1210*, ed. James R. West, 2 vols, Norfolk Record Society 2, 3 (Norwich, 1932).

[22] Tim Pestell, *Landscapes of Monastic Foundation: The Establishment of Religious Houses in East Anglia* c.*650–1200* (Woodbridge, 2004), pp. 143–46; Tom Licence, 'The Origins of the Monastic Communities of St Benedict at Holme and Bury St Edmunds', *Revue Bénédictine*, 116 (2006), pp. 42–61; idem, 'Suneman and Wulfric.' The foundation-date of 633 is recorded in later medieval lists in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 329, fol. 217r; Trinity College MSS R.5.33, fol. 13v; O.2.21, fol. 213v; London, BL MS Additional 39758, fol. 2r; Oxford, Bodleian Library [hereafter OBL], MS Gough Essex 1, fol. 13v.

[23] For example, *Chronica Johannis de Oxenedes*, pp. 270–71; *Flores Historiarum*, III, p. 23.

[24] *Early Christian Lives*, ed. and trans. Carolinne White (Harmondsworth, 1998), p. 168; James G. Clark, *The Benedictines in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 2011), pp. 10–11.

[25] *St. Benet of Holme 1020–1210*, II, pp. 198–208; *English Monastic Estates, 1066–1540: A List of Manors, Churches and Chapels*, ed. Maureen Jurkowski, Nigel Ramsay and Simon Renton, 3 vols (Kew, 2007), II, pp. 339–43 (local concentration of Holm's property).

[26] 'Willielmo, aurifabro de Constantinopoli': see BL, MS Cotton Galba E.II, fols 220r-221r. The Augustinian priory of Walsingham was also involved in these transactions. Although undated, one of the four charters mentions Abbot Robert of Holm and Prior William of Walsingham, a combination only found between 1237 and 1251.

[27] BL, MS Royal 14.C.VI. The section from 1305 to 1322 is based on annals from Tintern abbey in Monmouthshire, but is likely (for reasons not relevant to the current discussion) to have been written at Holm. For the existence of other chronicles at the abbey see *Chronica Johannis Oxenedes*, pp. viii–x; *Flores Historiarum*, I, pp. xxiii–iv; Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England* c. *440 –* c. *1307* (London, 1974), pp. 402–03.

[28] The purpose of adding these extracts at the beginning was presumably to increase the general usefulness of the chronicle without going to the trouble of interpolating the information into the main text.

[29] BL, MS Royal 14.C.VI, fol. 1r. Compare *The Marvels of Rome: Mirabilia urbis Romae*, ed. and trans. Francis Morgan Nichols, 2nd edn (New York, 1986), pp. 4–6 (listing seventeen gates).

[30] *Chronica Johannis de Oxenedes*, pp. 18–19; *Memorials of St. Edmunds Abbey*, ed. Thomas Arnold, 3 vols, Rolls Series 96 (London, 1890–96), I, p. 359; III, pp. 1–3. There is some scholarly disagreement over actual events: see Licence, 'The Origins of the Monastic Communities'.

[31] *Chronica Johannis Oxenedes*, p. 19; *Memorials of St. Edmunds Abbey*, III, pp. 2–3, 36–38; Antonia Gransden, 'The *Cronica Buriensis* and the Abbey of St Benet of Hulme', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 36 (1963), pp. 77–82.

[32] *Memorials of St. Edmunds Abbey*, II, pp. 330–31; III, pp. 39–41.

[33] *Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward II. A.D. 1313–1317* (London, 1898), pp. 496–97 (abbot's property and servants attacked, 1316); *Flores Historiarum*, I, p. xxii; III, pp. 24–25 (account of riot at Norwich). On the latter see also *Chronica Johannes Oxenedes*, pp. 240–42, 247–48.

[34] *Memorials of St. Edmunds Abbey*, III, pp. 41–48; Gabrielle Lambrick, 'Abingdon and the Riots of 1327', *Oxoniensia*, 29 (1964), pp. 129–41; *Gesta Abbatum monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. Henry Thomas Riley, 3 vols, Rolls Series 28 (London, 1867–69), II, pp. 158–61, 175–77.

[35] TNA, C66/168 (Chancery records, 1327-28), m. 13: 'Concessimus et licencia dedimus […] Abbati et conuentui sancti Benedicti de Hulmo quod ipsi situm suum Abbatie predicte muro de petra et calce firmare et kernellare'.

[36] See for example TNA, C66/173 (Chancery records, 130-31), m. 6 (Abingdon abbey, 1330); C66/275 (Chancery records, 1367-68), m. 22 (Shaftesbury abbey, 1367).

[37] Arthur Whittingham ascribed the design of the gate at Holm to the Norwich-based architect William Ramsey: A. B. Whittingham, 'The Ramsey Family of Norwich', *Archaeological Journal*, 137 (1980), pp. 285–89 (p. 289). But this attribution, which is not supported by any evidence, is unsafe.

[38] Cited in NRO, MS Rye 3:2, p. 495. For standing remains of the walls see 'The Abbey of St Benet at Holm, Horning', pp. 13–14.

[39] The low return wall shown in the antiquarian illustrations was evidently a post-medieval structure.

[40] For the postern see 'The Abbey of St Benet at Holm, Horning', p. 6. Payments 'pro facture portis cimeterij' are recorded in OBL, Norfolk Rolls 79 (sacrist's account-roll), mm. 1, 2.

[41] Roberta Gilchrist, *Norwich Cathedral Close: The Evolution of the English Cathedral Landscape* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 47–55; Montague Rhodes James, *On the Abbey of S. Edmund at Bury* (Cambridge, 1895), p. 126.

[42] William Worcestre, *Itineraries*, ed. John H. Harvey (Oxford, 1969), pp. 224–29, 234–35 (dimensions of the towers and other buildings).

[43] A sixteenth or early seventeenth-century drawing in BL, Cotton Nero D.II (fol. 314r), used as the basis of descriptions of the conventual church in previous publications on Holm, is in fact unrelated to the monastery.

[44] For St Peter's, called variously 'capella' and 'ecclesie', see NRO, Probate Registers Doke, fol. 118v (1439); Brossyard, fol. 54r (1457); Caston, fol. 229r (1484); Heywood, fol. 189r

(1529). No parish church is noticed in Martin Heale, 'Monastic-Parochial Churches in England and Wales, 1066–1540', *Monastic Research Bulletin*, 9 (2003), pp. 1–19, the most complete hand-list available.

[45] On this gate see Wilson, 'Origins of the Perpendicular Style', pp. 97–100; *Age of Chivalry: Art in Plantagenet England 1200–1400*, ed. Jonathan Alexander and Paul Binski (London, 1987), p. 339 (text by Christopher Wilson); Julian Luxford, 'The Great Gate of St Augustine's Abbey: Architecture and Context', in *Medieval Art and Architecture at Canterbury*, ed. Alixe Bovey, British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions 35 (Leeds, 2013), pp. 261–75.

[46] The leaves of the doors must have been of commensurate height. Each appears to have been hinged at two points on the inner face of the corresponding jamb.

[47] Veronica Sekules, 'The Gothic Sculpture', in *Norwich Cathedral: Church, City and Diocese, 1096–1996*, ed. Ian Atherton, Eric Fernie, Christopher Harper-Bill and Hassell Smith (London, 1996), pp. 197–209 (pp. 201–02); see also Alan Borg, et al., *Medieval Sculpture from Norwich Cathedral* (Norwich, 1980), p. 33.

[48] Philip Graham Lindley, 'The Arminghall Arch and Contemporary Sculpture in Norwich', *Norfolk Archaeology*, 40 (1987), pp. 19–43; Veronica Sekules, 'Religious Politics and the Cloister Bosses of Norwich Cathedral', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 159 (2006), pp. 284–306.

[49] The Christchurch priory Jesse is illustrated in Coldstream, *Decorated Style*, p. 54.

[50] The Kirkham Christ in majesty and Thornton Christ remain in place.

[51] *Chronicon abbatiae de Evesham*, p. 292: 'imaginibus etiam petrinis beatae Virginis, sancti Egwini et regum fundatorum nostrorum'.

[52] Eighteenth-century drawings of these images are in NRO, MS Rye 17:5 (eighteenth-century antiquarian collections), at pp. 41, 42.

[53] For Burnham Norton, see Nikolaus Pevsner and Bill Wilson, *The Buildings of England. Norfolk 2: North-West and South* (New Haven and London, 2002), p. 231.

[54] On the quartering of the English arms with those of France see Michael A. Michael, 'The Little Land of England is Preferred before the Great Kingdom of France: The Quartering of the Royal Arms by Edward III', in *Studies in Medieval Art and Architecture Presented to Peter Lasko*, ed. David Buckton and T. A. Heslop (Stroud, 1994), pp. 114–26.

[55] *RB 1980. The Rule of St Benedict in Latin and English with Notes*, ed. Timothy Fry (Collegeville, PA, 1981), pp. 287–89 (chapter 66); Fergusson, ''*Porta patens esto*'', p. 55. On St James's hospital see Claude J. W. Messent, *The Monastic Remains of Norfolk and Suffolk* (Norwich, 1934), p. 30; Pestell, *St Benet's Abbey*, pp. 21, 35.

[56] Henri Focillon, *The Life of Forms in Art*, trans. Charles Beecher Hogan and George Kubler (New York, 1989), p. 85 ('Fashion thus invents an artificial humanity'). For Winchester's stalls, designed *c*. 1308 by a Norfolk artist, see Charles Tracy, *English Gothic Choir-Stalls 1200–1400* (Woodbridge, 1987), pp. 16–24; on St William's tomb, made between 1317 and 1340, see Christopher Wilson, *The Shrines of St William of York* (York, 1977), pp. 11–17.

[57] For example, Michael Baxandall, *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth-Century Italy*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1991), 29–30; Paul Crossley, 'Medieval Architecture and Meaning: The Limits of Iconography', *Burlington Magazine*, 130 (1988), pp. 116–21 (p. 121); Willibald Sauerländer, 'Integration: A Closed or Open Proposal?', Barbara Abou-El-Haj, 'Artistic Integration Inside the Cathedral Precinct: Social Consensus Outside?', and Miriam Bedos-Rezak, 'Form as Social Process', in *Artistic Integration in Gothic Buildings*, eds Virginia Chieffo Raguin, Kathryn Brush and Peter Draper (London, 2000), pp. 3–18, 214–35, 236–48.

[58] *Paston Letters and Papers of the Fifteenth Century*, ed. Norman Davis, 2 vols (Oxford, 1971–76), II, pp. 354–56 (no. 727).

[59] Worcestre, *Itineraries*, pp. 2–3.

[60] *Memorials of St. Edmunds Abbey*, III, p. 39. Maintenance of manors and granges is recorded in almost all of the surviving account rolls from Holm.

[61] For the glass, all lost, see Blomefield, *Norfolk*, VIII, p. 178; IX, p. 292; NRO, MS Rye 17:4 (eighteenth-century antiquarian collections), fol. 6; BL, MS Harley 901 (later sixteenth-century heraldic collection), fols 71v, 107v; BL, MS Lansdowne 260 (late sixteenth-century heraldic collection), fol. 248. (I owe these references to David King.) The arms at Horning and Catfield survive. This is probably not an exhaustive list.

[62] *William Thorne's Chronicle of Saint Augustine's Abbey Canterbury*, trans. A. H. Davis (Oxford, 1934), p. 394.

[63] *The Early Communar and Pittancer Rolls of Norwich Cathedral Priory with an Account of the Building of the Cloister*, ed. Eric C. Fernie and Arthur B. Whittingham, Norfolk Record Society 41 (Norwich, 1972), pp. 33–34. The knowledge that £466 13s. 4d. was spent between 1360 and 1391 on the Cemetery gate at St Augustine's, Canterbury – a building of similar size, but altogether less ornate – is merely suggestive: Charles Cotton, 'A Contemporary List of the Benefactions of Thomas Ikham, Sacrist, to St. Austin's Abbey, Canterbury', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 37 (1925), pp. 152–59 (p. 158).

[64] Goodall, *English Castle*, pp. 266–68, 329–31. Images of gates displaying heraldic shields are also found in contemporary manuscripts: see for example Sandler, *Gothic Manuscripts*, I, ill. 36.

[65] TNA, C 47/6/1 (Court of Chivalry records, early fifteenth-century), m. 29 (nos 144-47).

[66] NRO, MSS Rye 3:2, p. 490; Rye 6:1 (eighteenth-century antiquarian collections)), pp. 84-85. For the manorial holdings of Beauchamp, Clare, Erpingham, Hastings and Valence in Norfolk see William J. Blake, 'Norfolk Manorial Lords in 1316', *Norfolk Archaeology*, 30 (1947–52), pp. 234–85 (pp. 265–86). At this time, however, the De la Poles had no Norfolk estates, and their arms were possibly added later.

[67] Correctly, the Morley lion would be crowned. For the Morley arms on two copes at Holm during the fourteenth century see TNA, C 47/6/1, m. 29 (nos 144-47).

[68] Mann, 'Butley Priory', p. 310. For prayer-book armorials in this light see Kathryn A. Smith, *Art, Identity and Devotion in Fourteenth-Century England: Three Women and Their Books of Hours* (London, 2003), pp. 29–31; Alexa Sand, '*Cele houre memes*: An Eccentric English Psalter-Hours in the Huntington Library', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 75 (2012), pp. 171–211 (pp. 188–89).

[69] John Compton Dickinson, *The Shrine of Our Lady of Walsingham* (Cambridge, 1956), pp. 78–79. See also John Caley, 'Copy of a Survey of the Priory of Bridlington, in Yorkshire, taken about the 32^d Year of Henry VIII', *Archaeologia*, 30 (1821), pp. 270–75 (p. 271); Peter Fergusson, 'Abbot Anselm's Gate Tower at Bury St Edmunds', in *Architecture, Liturgy and Identity: Liber Amicorum Paul Crossley*, ed. Zoë Opačić and Achim Timmermann (Turnhout, 2011), pp. 25–33; idem, 'Greencourt Gatehouse', p. 92; Coppack, Harrison and Hayfield, 'Kirkham Priory', pp. 110, 136 n. 58; Goodall, *English Castle*, p. 275.

[70] Blomefield, *Norfolk*, IV, p. 53; *Lateinische Schriftquellen*, I, p. 394 (no. 1452: Durham); II, p. 335 (no. 3481: Peterborough); Jackie Hall, 'English Cistercian Gatehouse Chapels', *Cîteaux: Commentarii cistercienses*, 52 (2001), pp. 61–92 (pp. 88–90: Beaulieu, Whalley).

[71] *Documents Illustrating the … English Black Monks*, III, p. 42.

[72] For example, at the Augustinian priory of Holy Trinity, Aldgate, London: see *Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward III., A.D. 1374–1377* (London, 1916), p. 82.

[73] For the Erpingham gate at Norwich (*c.* 1435) as a 'grander "west front"' to the cathedral see Gilchrist, *Norwich Cathedral Close*, p. 51.

[74] Coulson, 'Heirarchism in Conventual Crenellation', p. 75 *et passim*.

[75] Coulson, 'Heirarchism in Conventual Crenellation, pp. 70, 71, 76–77 (*arriviste* patronage), 90 (weapons). For weapons and armour in monasteries see for example Clark, *The*

Benedictines, pp. 275–77; Julian Luxford, *The Art and Architecture of English Benedictine Monasteries 1300–1540: A Patronage History* (Woodbridge, 2005), p. 143 and n. 203 (Glastonbury, Gloucester, Norwich, Peterborough); *William Thorne's Chronicle*, p. 612 (St Augustine's, Canterbury); *Gesta Abbatum monasterii Sancti Albani*, II, p. 159 (St Albans); Antonia Gransden, *A History of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds 1182–1256: Samson of Tottington to Edmund of Walpole* (Woodbridge, 2007), p. 38 (Bury).

[76] *Memorials of St. Edmunds Abbey*, III, p. 39 (1327); *William Thorne's Chronicle*, p. 465 (1330); *The Victoria History of the County of Suffolk: Volume II*, ed. William Page (London, 1907), p. 86 (Thetford, 1305).

[77] The Latin word *ostium* can of course signify entrance, door and mouth.

[78] Some idea of the activities on these occasions is provided by *The Customary of the Cathedral Priory Church of Norwich*, ed. John Basil Lowder Tolhurst, Henry Bradshaw Society 82 (London, 1948), p. 210. No customary survives for St Benet's Holm.

[79] 'Pro portacionem draconis diebus rogacionem' etc. Eighteen such records exist: NRO, DN/EST12/18-25, 27-29, 32, in each case on m. 1; NRO, DN/EST12/26, 30, both on m. 2; NRO, DN/EST12/100/1, m. 2; OBL, Norfolk Rolls 78, m. 1; OBL, Norfolk Rolls 79, 80, both on m. 2.

[80] A new shrine was made in 1378–79 at a cost of 6d. (OBL, Norfolk Rolls 78, m. 1). On relics as guardians of enclosure see for example Norman Hepburn Baynes, 'The Supernatural Defenders of Constantinople', *Analecta Bollandiana*, 67 (1949), pp. 165–77.

[81] For example, the angel and dragon combination in the spandrels of the late fifteenth-century gatehouse of St Osyth's abbey in Essex; the last of the great East Anglian monastic gatehouses to be built.

[82] It accounts for the iconography and location of the sculpted 'threshold guardians' found in Greece, Assyria, India and China: see generally Arnold van Gennep, *The Rites of Passage*,

trans. Monika B. Vizedom and Gabrielle L. Caffee (Chicago, 1960 [originally published in 1909]), pp. 21–25; also Arnold Walter Lawrence, *Greek Architecture*, rev. Richard Allan Tomlinson (London, 1983), p. 98; Paul Collins, *Assyrian Palace Sculptures* (London, 2008), pp. 30–33; Ananda Kentish Coomaraswamy, 'Early Indian Architecture, I: Cities and City-Gates Etc.', *Eastern Art*, II (1930), pp. 208–25 (pp. 215–19); Ann Paludan et al., 'China III: Sculpture', in *The Dictionary of Art*, ed. Jane Turner, 34 vols (London, 1996), VI, pp. 705–35 (pp. 712, 729–32). An apotropaic function has also been identified for English figure-sculpture of the early to mid-fourteenth century. See, for example, Rick Turner, et al., 'St Davids Bishop's Palace, Pembrokeshire', *Antiquaries Journal*, 80 (2000), pp. 87–194 (pp. 163–65).

[83] Julian Gardner, 'An Introduction to the Iconography of the Medieval Italian City Gate', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 41 (1987), pp. 199–213 (p. 208 *et passim*); Felicity Ratté, 'Architectural Invitations: Images of City Gates in Medieval Italian Painting', *Gesta*, 38 (1999), pp. 142–53 (p. 143 *et passim*).

[84] William Abel Pantin, *The English Church in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1955), pp. 126–30, 165–81; idem, 'Some Medieval English Treatises on the Origins of Monasticism', in *Medieval Studies Presented to Rose Graham*, ed. Veronica Ruffer and A. J. Taylor (Oxford, 1950), pp. 189–215; Clark, *The Benedictines*, pp. 278–79, 304–06.

[85] Pantin, 'Some Medieval English Treatises', p. 194 (place and period of composition) *et passim*.

[86] Roger Ellis, *Catalogue of Seals in the Public Record Office: Monastic Seals, vol. 1* (London 1986), p. 79 and pl. 7 (no. M749).

[87] 'Incipit compendium de libello miraculorum sancti benedicti … cuius originale scribitur ad plenum apud monasterii Ramesis et sancti benedicti de hulmo': OBL, MS Bodley 240, p. 605. The account extends onto p. 606.

[88] NRO, DN/EST12/28, m. 1; NRO, DN/EST12/29, m. 1; NRO, DN/EST12/31, m. 1; NRO, DN/EST12/33, m. 3; OBL, Norfolk Rolls 79, m. 2. The pittances cost 9s. 4d. On St Scholastica as patron of nunneries see David Farmer, *The Oxford Dictionary of Saints*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1987), p. 380.

[89] BL, Egerton MS 3142, fols 82v-83v: printed in *Chronica Johannis de Oxenedes*, pp. 414–17.

[90] *Chronica Johannis de Oxenedes*, p. 294.

[91] TNA, KB9/116/1 (records of the Court of the King's Bench), mm. 44v, 97, 103.

[92] TNA, KB9/116/1, m. 103; see also Herbert Eiden, *'In der Knechtschaft werdet ihr verharren …' Ursachen und Verlauf des englischen Bauerenaufstandes von 1381* (Trier, 1995), p. 351.

[93] TNA, KB9/116/1, mm. 44v, 97; Eiden, *'In der Knechtschaft'*, pp. 337, 344–46.

[94] But William de Kymberle and six others were recognized, and de Kymberle later beheaded. Two of the muniment-burners were also executed, and their heads publicly displayed: TNA, KB9/116/1, mm. 44v, 103.

[95] *The St Albans Chronicle: I, 1376–1394. The Chronica Maiora of Thomas Walsingham*, ed. and trans. John Taylor, Wendy R. Childs and Leslie Watkiss (Oxford, 2003), p. 625.

[96] *Paston Letters and Papers*, II, p. 573 (no. 906); Colin Richmond, *The Paston Family in the Fifteenth Century: Fastolf's Will* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 69.

[97] '[V]t potius castrum quam claustrum videretur': William Camden, *Britannia, sive florentissimorum regnorum Angliae, Scotiae, Hiberniae, et insularum adiacentium ex intima antiquitate chorographica descripto* (London, 1586), pp. 267–68.

[98] For example, Psalms, 117[118], 22, 144[145], 12; Canticles, 2, 13-14 and 4, 4 and 7, 48, and 11-13; Isaiah, 28, 16; 1 Corinthians, 3, 9-15; 2 Corinthians, 5, 1; Ephesians, 2, 20-22; Colossians, 2, 7; Hebrews, 3, 1-6 and 9, 11; 1 Peter, 2, 4-8; Apocalypse, 21.

[99] *RB 1980*, 160, p. 258 (prologue, verses 22, 24; chapter 53).

[100] English examples up to 1307 are assembled in *Lateinische Schriftquellen*, III, pp. 95–115 (nos 5491–5547).

[101] *Customary ... of Norwich*, p. 211. The gate is not mentioned among the Palm Sunday customs (ibid., pp. 76–79), but the instructions for Ascension Day say 'And let there be a procession through cemetery, cloister and great gate, as on Palm Sunday' ('Et fiat processio per cymiterium et per claustrum et per magnam portam sicut in die palmarum').

[102] On the artistic expression of the Virgin as gate of Heaven – the concept manifested at Kingswood – see particularly Ernst Guldan, *Eva und Maria: Eine Antithese als Bildmotiv* (Graz, 1966), pp. 14, 16, 44–45, 105, 127–28, 199, 200, 211.

[103] Gabriel's image-niche was obliterated after the monastery's dissolution to make way for a (now vanished) external stairway. The Kingswood gate was built in the mid-fifteenth century: Emery, *Greater Medieval Houses*, III, pp. 110–11.

[104] There is a sizeable literature on this topic. Most of the ideas are summarized in Gerhard Bauer, *Claustrum Animae: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Metapher vom Herzen als Kloster. Band I: Entstehungsgeschichte* (Munich, 1973); Wayne Dynes, 'The Medieval Cloister as Portico of Solomon', *Gesta*, 12 (1973), pp. 61–69; Paul Meyvaert, 'The Medieval Monastic Claustrum', *Gesta*, 12 (1973), pp. 53–59; Christiania Whitehead, *Castles of the Mind: A Study of Medieval Architectural Allegory* (Cardiff, 2003), pp. 61–86; Mary J. Carruthers, *The Craft of Thought: Meditation, Rhetoric and the Making of Images, 400–1200* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 239, 272–75.

[105] For English Benedictine *domus Dei* see *Lateinische Schriftquellen*, I, pp. 196 (no. 714), 318 (no. 1178), 323 (no. 1195), 423 (no. 1559); II, 330 (no. 3461), 334 (no. 3480), 439 (no. 3891), 694 (no. 4873).

[106] *Extracts from the Account Rolls of the Abbey of Durham*, ed. Joseph Thomas Fowler, 2 vols, Surtees Society 99, 100 (Durham, 1898), I, p. 180 ('in reparacione muri circa Paradis'); Frederic William Weaver, 'Paradise', *Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries*, 11 (1906–09), pp. 252–53.

[107] For copies of Durandus's *Rationale* see *English Benedictine Libraries: The Shorter Catalogues*, ed. Richard Sharpe, James P. Carley, Rodney M. Thomson and Andrew G. Watson, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 4 (London, 1996), pp. 15, 274, 628, 669; *Dover Priory*, ed. William P. Stoneman, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 5 (London 1999), pp. 121, 127; *St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury*, ed. Bruce C. Barker-Benfield, 3 vols, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 13 (London, 2008), I, p. 314; II, pp. 1510–11, 1608–09; Neil Ripley Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books*, 2nd edn (London, 1964), p. 212 (Worcester Cathedral Library, MS F129: a fourteenth-century copy).

[108] *Guillelmi Duranti Rationale divinorum officiorum I–IV*, ed. Anselme Davril and Timothy M. Thibodeau, Corpus Christianorum 140 (Turnhout, 1995), pp. 25–26.

[109] Just eleven books are known from an original collection likely to have included hundreds of volumes: Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*, p. 102; BL, Cotton Vitellius D.IX, fols 5–22; *English Benedictine Libraries*, pp. 255–26 (memorandum of five titles made *c*. 1536–40).

[110] Pevsner and Wilson, *Norfolk 1*, p. 561.

[111] For Capua's gate see most recently Brendan Cassidy, *Politics, Civic Ideals and Sculpture in Italy* c. *1240–1400* (London, 2007), pp. 30–41.

[112] Jiri Fait and Jan Royt, 'The Pictorial Decoration of the Great Tower at Karlštejn Castle: Ecclesia Triumphans', in *Magister Theodoricus, Court Painter to Emperor Charles IV: The Pictorial Decoration of the Shrines at Karlštejn Castle*, ed. Jiri Fait (Prague, 1998), pp. 107–

205 (pp. 164–71); Christel Meier, 'Wände aus Edelstein und Gefäße aus Kristall', in *Die Parler und der schöne Stil, 1350–1400: europäische Kunst unter der Luxemburgern*, ed. Anton Legner, 3 vols (Cologne, 1978), III, pp. 169–88; Hana Šedinová, 'Symbolika drahých kamenů v kapli sv. Václava', *Umění*, 45 (1997), pp. 32–48.

[113] At Sta Maria Maggiore, Jerusalem and Bethlehem are presented as symbolic of the Heavenly Jerusalem, and their gates as the door of the sheepfold (i.e. Christ himself): *Die frühchristlichen und mittelalterlichen Mosaiken in Santa Maria Maggiore zu Rom*, ed. Heinrich Karpp (Baden-Baden, 1966), pls 27, 28. For the panel, see Bernhard Degenhart and Annegrit Schmitt, *Corpus der italienischen Zeichnungen 1300-1400, Teil I: Süd- und Mittelitalien*, 4 vols (Berlin, 1968), I, p. 19 (fig. 28). The Apocalypse images are Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 403, fol. 41v; New York, Pierpont Morgan Library MS M.524, fol. 20v; OBL, MS Auct. D. 4. 17, fol. 21v. On the manuscripts in general see Nigel Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts (2): 1250–1285*, A Survey of Manuscripts Illuminated in the British Isles 4 (London, 1988), pp. 63–66 (no. 103), 92–94 (no. 122), 113–14 (no. 131).

[114] Dublin, Trinity College MS 64, fol. 36r: see Sandler, Gothic Manuscripts, I, 52-3 (no. 46); Suzanne Lewis, 'Vision and Revision: On 'Seeing' and 'Not Seeing' God in the Dublin Apocalypse', Word and Image, 10 (1994), pp. 289-311 (pp. 307, 308-09).

[115] London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 209, fol. 38r; Lisbon, Museu Calouste Gulbenkian MS L. A. 139, fol. 74r. (The Metz Apocalypse is destroyed.) All three images are juxtaposed in Nigel Morgan, *The Lambeth Apocalypse: Manuscript 209 in Lambeth Palace Library. A Critical Study* (London, 1990), pl. 38. See generally idem, *Early Gothic Manuscripts*, pp. 70–72 (no. 108), 101–06 (no. 126), 108–10 (no. 128).

[116] Cambridge, Magdalene College, MS 5, fol. 38r: see Sandler, *Gothic Manuscripts*, I, pp. 101–02; eadem, *The Peterborough Psalter in Brussels and Other Fenland Manuscripts*

(London, 1974), pp. 62–63, 84. For a twelfth-century prefiguration of these motifs see Otto Pächt and Jonathan J. G. Alexander, *Illuminated Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. 3 British, Irish and Icelandic Schools* (Oxford, 1973), pl. XI (no. 110).

[117] See *Prudentius*, ed. and trans. Henry John Thomson, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA, 1949), I, pp. 336–43; *Patrologia Latina*, ed. Jacques-Paul Migne, 221 vols (Paris, 1844–55), XVII, cols 936–60 (Berengaudus); XCIII, cols 194–204 (Bede); CXIV, cols 745–50 (*Glossa ordinaria*); CXVII, cols 1191–1211 (Haimo of Auxerre). For English Benedictine copies of Apocalypse commentaries and [in square brackets] the *Psychomachia* see *Registrum Anglie de libris doctorum et auctorum verterum*, ed. Richard H. and Mary A. Rouse, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 2 (London, 1991), pp. 72 (two copies), 98 (nine copies), 156 (three copies), [159], 197 (five copies); *English Benedictine Libraries*, pp. 7, 58, 136–37, 180, [207: three copies], 241, 326, 428–29, 434, 439, 487, 488, 503, [520], 538, 547, 548, 635, [655], 672, 727, 739; *Dover Priory*, [p. 154]; *Peterborough Abbey*, ed. Karsten Friis-Jensen and James M. W. Willoughby, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 8 (London, 2001), pp. 48, [106], 179; *St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury*, I, p. 604; [II, p. 1392, 1393, 1394; III, p. 1713].

[118] *Patrologia Latina*, XVII, cols 947–49, 953–58.

[119] Michael A. Michael, 'An Illustrated 'Apocalypse' Manuscript at Longleat House', *Burlington Magazine*, 126 (1984), pp. 340–43; *English Benedictine Libraries*, p. 256; James J. McEvoy, 'Robert Grosseteste on the Celestial Hierarchy of the Pseudo-Dionysius: An Edition and Translation of His Commentary, Chapters 10 to 15', (doctoral thesis, Queen's University Belfast, 1967), pp. 203–07.

[120] For continental responses see Peter Dronke, 'Tradition and Innovation in Medieval Western Colour-Imagery', *Eranos Jahrbuch*, 41 (1972), pp. 51–106 (pp. 77–88); Meier, 'Wände aus Edelstein', pp. 185–87.

[121] *Lateinische Schriftquellen*, III, pp. 96–97 (no. 5494); *The Letters of Osbert of Clare, Prior of Westminster*, ed. Edward William Williamson (Oxford, 1929), pp. 148–53; *Chronica Majora Matthaei Parisiensis, monachi sancti Albani*, ed. Henry Richards Luard, 7 vols, Rolls Series 57 (London, 1872–83), II, p. 510; *Chronica Johannis de Oxenedes*, pp. ix–x; *Flores Historiarum*, I, p. xxiii.

[122] '[P]erverenrunt ad portam speciosissimam, gemmis ornatam et lapidibus pretiosus'.

[123] Crossley, 'Medieval Architecture and Meaning.'