University of Reading

Coming and going: the Great Gate of Peterborough Abbey as a zone of interaction

Book or Report Section

Accepted Version

Mahood, H. (2019) Coming and going: the Great Gate of Peterborough Abbey as a zone of interaction. In: Baxter, R., Hall, J. and Marx, C. (eds.) Peterborough and the Soke. Art, Architecture and Archaeology. Routledge, pp. 200-213. Available at https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/72981/

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See Guidance on citing.

Publisher: Routledge

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the End User Agreement.

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

University of Reading

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

Coming and Going: The Great Gate of Peterborough Abbey as a Zone of Interaction

Harriet Mahood

This paper considers the great gate of Peterborough abbey within the wider context of medieval ecclesiastical gatehouses in England; examining the reasons behind its siting, its functions, and its use by the abbey and the town's inhabitants. To this end, the role of the porter is discussed before considering the particular chronology of Peterborough Abbey's gatehouse and its function. Throughout, comparisons are drawn with the abbeys of Reading and Abingdon due to the similarities between these two abbeys and Peterborough. These comparisons raise questions concerning Peterborough Abbey, and are used to suggest some conclusions that may be drawn regarding Peterborough's gate complex as a zone of interaction between the monastic community and those outside of it.

THE gate of Benedictine Peterborough abbey now known as the 'Norman Gateway' continues its medieval function as the main entrance to the abbey from the town. This discussion will consider the abbey's history up to the dissolution by focussing principally on the abbey's interaction with the world via the gatehouse complex and how this interaction developed, and was managed. The gatehouses of medieval monasteries are usually discussed in isolation however by the 12th century the gatehouse was often part of an entry complex including chapels, prisons, hospitals, guesthouses and almonries. Within this complex, the gatehouse had an important role to play, and one that was laid out in the Benedictine rule. The gate and its keeper are referred to in Chapter 66 which states that 'At the gate of the monastery' there is to be 'a wise old man, who understands how to give and receive a message, and whose years will keep him from leaving his post' who was to have 'a room near the gate, so that those who come may always find someone to answer them'.[1] The 'gate of the monastery' referred to was interpreted as the gate that granted primary access to the world outside of the monastic precinct. These portals are generally referred to as the 'great' or, 'outer' gates of a monastery and are usually situated to the west of the church. Monasteries often had multiple entrances however, as illustrated by the Benedictine abbey of Bury St Edmunds which had four entrances into its precinct. However, even when multiple portals are present, the entrance to the west of the church is generally considered to be the main gate and usually, although not always, named as such. An example of a-typical naming can be seen at Norwich where the gate opposite the church's west end is called the Erpingham Gate, named

after Thomas Erpingham who was responsible for its construction in the 15th century. The other primary entrance from the town to the abbey's precinct at Norwich is the Ethelbert Gate a little south of the Erpingham Gate, erected by the townspeople.

Benedict's vision for a monastic porter was one of an older monk wise enough to make judgements about visitors, and unlikely to become restless whilst on duty. What is important to take note of when considering this early and important document for monasticism is that Benedict did not specify the location of the main entrance to the monastery, or how the gate was to be operated and have its security kept. This omission is largely responsible for the great variety in the nature of both porters and gatehouses in the Middle Ages; the other factor of course being the monastic order to which a house belonged.

Regarding Peterborough's porter, regrettably little is known. His role may have been detailed in the monastery's 14th century customary, however only parts 1 and 3 of this survive and the focus is upon the liturgy of the abbey rather than its operation.[2] Comparisons with other Benedictine porters do suggest that by the late 12th century, the porter was likely to have been a lay person. The total absence of mention of the porter in Archbishop Lanfranc's late 11th century constitutions for English monasteries for example is suggestive of this. If an ecclesiastical porter was deemed to have been necessary, it is reasonable to expect Lanfranc to have outlined his role. More specific evidence occurs in 1202, when Andrew de Scaccario became porter for life at Abingdon abbey, while a charter from late 12th century Shaftesbury Abbey, although a nunnery, confirmed Thomas, son of Robert (the previous porter) to the post.[3] Both examples are lay appointments and their appointments were clearly not temporary solutions; indicative perhaps of a national, and possibly international, change amongst Benedictine monasteries towards employing members of the laity to this post.

Further evidence for the porter's development occurs in Letter 28 of the famous 12th century correspondence between the Cluniac, Peter the Venerable and the Cistercian, Bernard of Clairvaux. Peter, in the letter, defends his order on twenty points of criticism from the Cistercians, including the choice of porter at Cluny.[4] He argues, against the *Rule of St Benedict*, that an older monk did not necessarily guarantee that a wise monk would be chosen. Additionally, Peter states that a layman was a suitable alternative to a monk, with the added incentive that a lay appointee prevented any of member of the community having to be absent from the cloister for extended periods of time; thus limiting the disruption to their

monastic observations.[5] In contrast, the Cistercian order did not appear to employ lay porters. When Abbot Stephen of Lexington visited Cistercian houses in Ireland in the 13th century, he actually ordered that any beds placed in the gatehouse for porters were to be removed, presumably as monk porters were spending too much time away from the cloister and becoming detached from the monastic life.[6]

Evidence for the chronology of the gates and main gatehouse complex at Peterborough come from the histories of Hugh Candidus, Robert Swaffham, and Abbot Walter Whittlesey. Candidus produced the earliest written history for Peterborough in the mid-12th century.[7] Sub-prior of the monastery, he was responsible for recording the abbey's history until 1177, after which Swaffham, then the abbey's cellarer, took over until 1246. Whittlesey later copied Swaffham's chronicle and continued it until 1321, from which date other documents, such as accounts, fill in the rest of the abbey's history.[8] Early evidence for the abbey's first main entrance comes from Hugh Candidus's account of the battle of Bulhithe gate, located in the south of the precinct, in 1070. That year, the abbey was besieged by Danes and the monks and people of the town shut the gate of the monastery and defended the abbey buildings against the attackers. Thus thwarted, the attackers, according to Hugh, 'set fire to the buildings which were next to the gate' and thus gained entrance to the monastic precinct.[9]

The attack is the first mention of the town of Peterborough. At this point in time, the town and the town's original parish church of St John are, according to early histories of the town and abbey, thought to have lain to the east and south of the abbey.[10] However this has yet to be confirmed or denied by more modern study. The physical development of the town is usually attributed to Abbot Martin de Bec (Peterborough's abbot between 1133 and 1155) who, according to Candidus, 'was always at work, in the church and other offices and in many places, and he changed the gate of the minster and the market and the hithe and the town much for the better, and set right many things.'[11] Under his abbotship and building scheme, the town's market is said to have been relocated close to the new monastery gates and the hithe (or wharf), moved adjacent to the bridge of the town.[12] Such manipulation of the urban landscape by a monastery is not unusual and a comparison with the Benedictine monastery of Reading is illuminating. In Reading, a long-running dispute with the townspeople of Reading ensued after the abbey attempted to move the marketplace to outside its gates. This was done as part of a larger power-play that had been ongoing between town and abbey over the control of the town's economy and the dispute culminated in the signing

of a ‘final concord’ in 1254. The concord restored the market to the townspeople’s preferred location in the town yet is demonstrative of urban manipulation by a resident monastery.[13]

It is to Abbot Martin de Bec that the changing of the abbey’s main entrance is attributed to, while his successor Abbot William Waterville (1170-1175) is credited with establishing the foundations for the chapel of St Thomas which lies north of the gate.[14] The actual construction of the gatehouse, the chapels of St Nicholas above the gate and St Thomas adjacent, and the hospital north of St Thomas, is attributed by the chronicler Robert Swaffham to Abbot Benedict (1177-1193), William’s successor.[15] When Abbot Martin moved the gate, presumably a temporary perhaps wooden gate was erected before Benedict’s stone version was constructed. The record for the construction of the gate and chapel of St Nicholas by Abbot Benedict includes the addition of the chapel and hospital of St Thomas to the project. This addition is a clear insertion into the original document and it can therefore be inferred that the chapel of St Thomas was not part of the original project’s plan. Yet, although of uncertain date, the insertion implies that the charitable activity of the abbey (evidenced by the hospital) did eventually shift with the movement of its main entrance from Bulhithe to west of the abbey and that this was later intended to be associated with the construction of the chapel of St Nicholas.

The chapel of St Nicholas above the gate, this chapel next appears in the records when it was fenestrated by Abbot Robert de Lindsey in the early 13th century. Robert was responsible for glazing the windows of the monastic church along with three windows in the chapel of St Nicholas.[16] To the south of the gatehouse lay the medieval prison whose position is confirmed through a series of sanctuary cases from the early 14th century. In 1304, two prisoners escaped from the prison to the south of the gatehouse, and claimed sanctuary at the chapel north of the gatehouse.[17] Then again in 1305, a parson who had been convicted of theft, escaped the prison armed with a sword and claimed sanctuary in St Thomas’s.[18] The distance between the prison and the chapel was, and is, a very short distance to cross; thus making an escape in order to gain sanctuary both desirable and easy for the inmates of the prison once they had escaped.

The gatehouse structure today features portals in the north and south walls of the gatehall (the passage through which traffic passes on the ground floor). In the south, the portal grants entrance to a stairway which leads upwards towards the surviving upper storey of the gatehouse and the roof. The upper storey contains a chamber that is still referred to as

the St Nicholas chapel and was last used for storing cathedral documents. The upper storey of the building was radically changed in the 1790s when the upper storey was substantially reduced in height and the current structure reflects this change.[19]

The north of the gatehouse is now occupied by a private company, and in 1922 was referred to as a residence. Originally, the chapel of St Thomas to the north of the gatehouse would have straddled the precinct boundary with the chapel's nave lying on the west, or town-facing, side of the gate and therefore accessible from the town and from 'outside' of the precinct. Unfortunately, the nave of the chapel was dismantled in the early 15th century to provide rubble for the rebuilding of the town's parish church of St John. However, in addition to this entrance from the town to the chapel, it is possible that there was also a secondary entrance from the north of the gatehall. Evidence for this practice can be seen through comparison with the plan of Abingdon Abbey's gatehouse. At Abingdon, the northern wall of the gatehouse grants direct access, via a door, to the church of St Nicholas adjacent. This entrance afforded access to those already over the gatehouse's boundary and thus within the abbey precinct (i.e. they had gained access to the gatehall). It is likely to have been used by the priest of the church. If Reading's gate complex is also compared to those of Peterborough and Abingdon an important feature of both these gatehouse chapels is clearly notable. Each chapel straddles the boundary between the town and abbey, with the chancel in the abbey precinct, and the nave in the 'town'. At Abingdon, the entrance from the gatehouse to the church is clear. The priest of the church, or permitted others, could enter from within the precinct while the congregation entered from outside the precinct, via the church's west end. This situation was likely repeated at Peterborough and Reading, as suggested by their near identical position across the boundary and the proximity of the gate's gatehall.

The gatehouse entry complex will now be examined thematically, examining the different functions of interaction afforded by the gate and its associated buildings, beginning with the issue of jurisdiction and administration. A charter of 664, although generally accepted as a post-conquest forgery, granted the abbot and monks, among others, the rights of soc and sac, tol and theem, infangtheof, utfangenthef, and hamsocna.[20] These rights, granted by the monarch, entitled the abbey to the income from juridical profits, commission from any cattle and goods sold, the right to pursue and hang thieves within and outside the monastery's lands, as well as handle matters of burglary. Near identical rights were also granted to Reading abbey in its 1125 foundation charter.[21] The Peterborough Chronicle records that the abbot's judicial rights were disputed in the 13th century by the sheriff of Nottingham. This

dispute resulted in Edward I's interference in the matter and confirmation of the abbot's rights in 1275 which supported the abbot's rights regarding the prison wherever it was located.[22] That the abbot's rights in the matter were defended demonstrates clearly the monastery's, and the abbot's, desire to maintain its, and his, judicial powers.

Regarding the location of the abbot's court, in the early 13th century it is referred to as being held 'at the great gate of Burgh'.[23] Confirming where medieval courts were held is very difficult due to their flexible nature, however an example of a court held in the upper storey of a gatehouse, although not a chapel, can be seen at Christ Church Canterbury's Green Court gatehouse where a court was held in the Aula Nova with a prison in the undercroft.[24] Chapels being used as courts are an easier case to argue and the *The Act book of the ecclesiastical court of Whalley* provides some evidence for this. This source covers the years 1511 to 1538, and records that the court not only met in Whalley parish church but, sometimes, in the chapel of St Michael at Clitheroe Castle.[25] Similarly, the 15th century heresy trials of Lollards in the Norwich diocese took place primarily in the chapel of the bishop's palace in Norwich.[26] It should be noted that both these examples are of ecclesiastical courts, which would perhaps be expected to meet in a church. Ecclesiastical courts had a very different remit to secular courts yet these examples are still intriguing as evidence for the suggested location of abbatial courts.

The locating of a court within a chapel naturally reinforced and imbued the legal judgement of the court with heavenly judgement, as well as practically providing a space for this event. Similarly, gates themselves have a long association with justice, making the gatehouse a logical location for a court. Biblically, there are numerous biblical references to justice being dispensed at in this location: 'Then all the people that were in the gate, and the ancients answered…' (Ruth, 4.11); 'Hate evil, and love good, and establish judgement in the gate' (Amos, 5.15); and 'The shall take him and bring him to the ancients of his city, and to the gate of judgement' (Deuteronomy, 21.19).[27] This topic has already been explored within the case study of Canterbury Cathedral by Peter Fergusson in his 2011 book *Canterbury Cathedral Priory in the Age of Becket*.

The locating of these offices (the prisons and possibly courts) in the abbey's gatehouse complex, and the imposing architecture of the gate and the west front beyond, would have impressed upon members of the laity required to attend court that they were firmly within the abbey's territory. This impression was utilised to other ends as well,

including those relating to the provision of charity. The construction of the hospital north of the chapel of St Thomas was discussed earlier and there are several references to the sisters that ran this hospital, with the earliest reference to them occurring in the early 15th century.[28] Unfortunately, the buildings north of the gatehouse have been subsequently rebuilt and altered leaving us with little evidence of what the hospital would have looked like. Again though, there are strong parallels between Peterborough, Reading and Abingdon, all of which featured hospitals on their boundary.

Abingdon's hospital, south of the gate (and on the town's side) had been founded, or re-founded, under Abbot Vincent c. 1130 to care for six poor.[29] The abbot was responsible both for appointing the head of the hospital and for expelling inmates. It is believed to have been staffed by a combination of lay-brothers and lay-sisters.[30] At Reading, the abbey directly funded the hospital at its gates, with the almoner responsible for paying the priest of the church of St Lawrence adjacent which was attended by the hospital's inmates. Reading's almoner's book, dated to the late 12th to 13th century, records 26 poor men resident at the hospital, with an additional 13 provided with daily alms.[31] The identities of the inmates at Peterborough is not clear, however comparisons with Reading and Abingdon suggest that the hospital may have served a number of permanent residents, almsmen or women. The chapel of St Thomas would have been used by Peterborough's hospital inmates who in turn were 'maintained from the alms' of the monastery. Evidence for the support through alms is suggested by the same note that refers to the sisters of the hospital. It in turn, also refers to the commemoration of abbey benefactors by the inmates of the hospital.[32]

When the abbey's main gate was moved from Bulhithe to opposite the west front of the church, the focal point for pilgrims and paupers seeking assistance from the abbey would have also changed. The giving of alms was connected with the practice of the mandatum, the ritualised washing of feet which echoed Christ's washing of the feet of his disciples; a humbling ritual, layered with care and devotion to fellow Christians. The first part of the Peterborough customary documents the practices of Palm Sunday, when three 'aged and good poor men' were to be brought inside the abbey, presented with alms, and have the mandatum administered to them.[33] The importance of this ritual to the brethren is evident from the early 14th century Peterborough psalter which features several images of the mandatum being performed.[34] Unfortunately, the second part of the customary, which may have shed light on the daily Maundy, is missing. A comparison with Abingdon is useful here however, considering the other similarities previously mentioned. At Abingdon, the abbey

admitted lay people daily, with the abbey's chronicle recording that three poor men were to be chosen at the gate each day to receive alms and the mandatum.[35] A similar practice may have been conducted at Peterborough.

That alms were supposed to be distributed at Peterborough is clear, albeit indirectly, from a visitation conducted in 1432 which records that alms were being kept and consumed by the brethren rather than distributed.[36] Alms would have been distributed by the monastic almoner, who, in this activity, replaced the porter in the role of intermediary between monastery and laity. Although the role of the almoner is not recorded in the Rule of St Benedict, the post was a common feature of Benedictine monasteries. In fact, David Knowles argued that this role was firmly introduced to England following the reforms brought to England post-conquest.[37] Evidence that the porter's charitable role had been subsumed by the almoner is clear through comparisons drawn with Cistercian monasteries, where it is the porter, who remains a monk, who continues to distribute the monastic alms. An example of this distribution can be seen at Clairvaux where it is the porter who feeds the daily poor from 2 copper pots in 1226.[38]

The substitution of the almoner for the porter in distribution of charity necessarily resulted in the locating of the almoner's office, usually, within the entry complex of the monastery. For example at St Albans, according to the chronicler Walsingham, when the great gate was rebuilt by Abbot Thomas de la Mare after the destruction of its predecessor in 1363, the almonry was also rebuilt within the gate's vicinity.[39] At Canterbury, the almonry was located to the west of the green court gatehouse, on the town's side of the gate.[40] The provision of charity was closely associated with monasteries and the gatehouse complex catered to this expectation. This expectation was met with direct, yet negotiated, and managed interaction with the laity by the abbey. At Peterborough, the almonry remained in the south suggesting that while the focus had shifted to the main gate, the abbey's southern entrance was still important. It is not certain whether the almoner dispensed charity at the southern or western gate. It is suggested here that distribution occurred at the western gate, due to the presence of the hospital in this complex. The hospital would have in part fulfilled the same duty that the alms did and it would be logical that the charitable activities of the monastery would be concentrated in one location.

The final form of interaction between religious and laity performed at Peterborough's gatehouse complex was the parochial and spiritual function offered by the abbey. This

interaction commonly manifested itself in chapels and churches with connections to the monastery and in this respect, Peterborough is particularly unusual as it features two chapels; St Nicholas in the gate, and St Thomas, adjacent. Between 1321 and 1328, almost 150 years after its construction, a grant was made by the abbey for a priest to be appointed to the chapel of St Nicholas to celebrate the divine offices of an unidentified man called Simon, '…for his soul and the souls of his ancestors and kinsmen and of all the faithful departed.' Alms were also to be given annually to the poor, at the abbey's expense. This Simon had put aside 300 marks to ensure the maintenance of this chantry, and the grant notes that a monk could replace the secular priest if the abbey was unable to afford or appoint one.[41] The abbey appears to have quickly taken advantage of this caveat. By the 1360s, references in the abbey's customary are made to the singing of vespers in the chapel of St Nicholas on St Nicholas's Day, and the cellarer is recorded as celebrating mass in the chapel every Sunday.[42] Beyond these references, and the fenestration of this chapel by Abbot Robert de Lindsey, little is known about the operation of this chapel. This is the case for the majority of chapels and churches found at the gates of ecclesiastical institutions, and has been discussed by Peter Fergusson and Jackie Hall.[43] What is clear is that chapels at, or in, the gate typically served a variety of functions and were highly flexible: They were spaces in which the laity could be received either as guests or pilgrims; or used as parochial spaces to serve the local lay populous. St Nicholas's pre-chantry usage could perhaps be suggested through a comparison with Norwich's Ethelbert gate in the 13th century where the upper chapel was dedicated to St Ethelbert and, according to the antiquarian Blomefield, served as a parish church.[44] Determining the exact function of these chapels is problematic yet it is possible that St Nicholas may have served some parochial function. However it is more likely that it was simply a chapel on the edge of the precinct in which the laity could receive blessing without having to enter the monastic church. The laity received in this chapel may have been those who did not wish to, or were not permitted, to worship at St Thomas's. This function, and the presence possibly elite worshippers, may explain the rather grand window installed by Abbot Robert de Lindsey in the early 13th century which can be viewed in drawings made shortly before the destruction of the upper storey in the 1790s.[45]

A little more is known about the chapel of St Thomas adjacent. As mentioned earlier, the chapel appears to have been founded for the hospital. A charter copied in Swaffham's chronicle details that under Abbot Andrew at the end of the 13th century, the chapel was granted to 'God and our almoner to have and to hold for ever for the use of the hospital'.[46]

The hospital and chapel of St Thomas were clearly under the almoner's jurisdiction, and part of the abbey's charitable activities. This same charter goes on to state that upon feast days, worshipers were only to go to St John's parish church, not St Thomas's, 'to the injury of the church of St John'. Those that were sick however, were permitted to make oblation in St Thomas's with a third of this going to the abbey's sacrist, and two thirds to the chaplain of St John's parish church. For the rest of the year, any donations to St Thomas were to go directly to the chapel as were any pilgrim donations or bequests in wills. What this document suggests is that there was a degree of financial competition between the parish church and the chapel. It also hints at the usage of the chapel. It may have been built for the hospital, but clearly it was being used by pilgrims and the local laity too.

By 1402 however, the town's parish church of St John's had been rebuilt in its current position, opposite the abbey's gates. This was a move from the original location of the church. The parishioners of St John's were permitted to use the rubble from the old St John's, and from the nave of St Thomas's, to construct their new church. The chancel of St Thomas was saved from demolition and reserved 'in honour of St Thomas and for the sisters of the hospital and clerks of the almonry'. Additionally, Henry Beaufort, bishop of Lincoln, permitted St John's parishioners the use of St Thomas's chapel for their services whilst their new church was constructed, again demonstrating the flexible use of the chapel of St Thomas.[47] The chapel may have been built with a specific purpose in mind, yet there was an understanding that this was a flexible space that could accommodate hospital inmates to pilgrims, and even temporarily evicted parishioners.

Interaction is the theme of this discussion, and was also the raison d'etre of the gatehouse complex. The court and prison of Peterborough permitted the necessary interaction between abbey and laity in order to fulfil the abbey's judicial duties; the chapel of St Thomas and the hospital fulfilled the abbey's duty of Christian charity through the office of the almoner; while the chapel of St Nicholas permitted the laity the opportunity to receive blessings and later provided a location for chantry commemoration, as did the chapel of St Thomas to some extent. This interaction however, goes directly against what monasteries were being ordered to do in the 12th century when Peterborough's entry complex, and others, were being constructed.

The first Lateran Council in 1123 ruled on various aspects of monastic behaviour. Specifically, Canon 17 forbade monks from 'public penances', visiting the sick,

administering ‘extreme unction’ and singing ‘public masses’.[48] What these commands make apparent is that monks, in the eyes of the Church, were clearly not supposed to be associated with hospitals or pastoral care of the laity. These instructions were in turn enforced via a system of episcopal visitation. The mid-13th century visitation register of Eudes Rigaud, archbishop of Rouen for example, which, although covering Normandy, nevertheless provides anecdotal evidence for misdemeanours of ecclesiastical life and what the bishop’s particular concerns were.[49] In particular, Eudes instructed monasteries on numerous occasions that they were to hold copies not only of the rule of St Benedict, but also the statutes of Gregory IX (c. 1145- 1241). These statutes were written with the aim of reforming Benedictine monasteries and expanded upon certain aspects of monastic life. According to the statutes, monks were ordered to live communally, to eat meat only when sick, and not to have personal servants. Only alms were to be given to the laity and these were to be given in proportion to the house’s wealth. Monks were not supposed to speak to women when alone, and monks and abbots were never to stay overnight in a lay person’s house whilst within a single league of their monastery. These statutes were intended be read aloud once a year.[50] These are only a small selection of Gregory’s statutes but what they, and the preceding Lateran councils, illustrate is a wide concern for monks to be monks; cloistered away from society. However, this role was at odds with instructions for alms-giving, and the importance of Christian charity and care for the poor and sick.

By studying the gatehouse complex of a monastery, nuanced facets of the monastery’s history and its interaction with lay society can be revealed. The movement of Peterborough Abbey’s main gate to the west for example altered its interaction with the town. The buildings of the prison and chapel adjacent to the gate enforced and defined the monastery’s relationship with the outside world and the nature of this boundary; part judicial, part spiritual. The positioning of the chapel of St Thomas crossing the boundary of the monastery really emphasises this liminal role held by the entry complex. The chapel, and indeed the entire entry complex, was on the border of the secular and religious realms. That the abbey’s almonry remained in the south, despite the almoner’s duties at this gate, is very interesting considering the concentration of activities around the west gate. It indicates the continued importance of the southern gate to the monastery, particularly to the almoner.

The initial premise of this discussion was the consideration of the gatehouse complex as a zone of interaction. Yet, it is in fact a zone of compromise. 12th century gatehouse

complexes were the monastic compromise to reforms forcing them back to the cloister and out of lay life. As important institutions in the medieval landscape, and often granted judicial rights, these duties could not be shirked by monasteries. Yet by locating their courts, prisons, hospitals, chapels, and charitable activities within the gatehouse complex on the boundary, or across it as the discussed chapels were, the monastery was able to remain secluded and secure, whilst also permitting charitable and judicial activities to be fulfilled. Lateran I may have forbidden them from caring for the sick for example, but by locating a hospital run by lay staff on their boundary, the monks appropriated the 'credit' as it were, whilst refraining from contravening the council's decree. This dichotomy of purpose, that monks should care for the laity yet remain apart from the lay world was realised in the gatehouse complex. This entry zone allowed monasteries to establish a boundary of sacred and public space; to fulfil their contradictory roles; whilst also permitting them to (attempt to) maintain their cloistered life.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research for this article has been made possible by a studentship from the AHRC.

Heartfelt thanks are given to work undertaken by Tim Halliday as his compilation and translation of vast swathes of the Latin material connect to Peterborough Abbey have proved invaluable. So too have his and Jackie Hall's interpretations of the precinct and its buildings.

[1] J. McCann ed., *The Rule of Saint Benedict in Latin and English,* trans. J. McCann (London 1952), 153

[2] London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 198A and 198B

[3] J. Stevenson ed., *Chronicon Monasterii De Abingdon*, 2 (London 1858), 116; N. Stacy, *Charters and Custumals of Shaftesbury Abbey, 1089-1216* (Oxford 2006), 46-48

[4] G. Constable, *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge 1996), 185-186

[5] G. Constable ed., *Letters of Peter the Venerable*, 1 (Cambridge 1967),75-76

[6] B. O'Dwyer ed., *Stephen of Lexington, Letters from Ireland, 1228-1229* (Kalamazoo 1982), 167-168

[7] H. Tebbs, *Peterborough, a History* (Cambridge 1979), 16

[8] K. Friis-Jensen and J. Willoughby, *Peterborough Abbey* (London 2001), xxii

[9] 'The Chronicle of Hugh Candidus, a monk of Peterborough' in T. Halliday, *Select Manuscripts relating to the Abbey and Cathedral of Peterborough: Transcriptions, Translations, and Notes* (Unpublished, Peterborough HER and Cathedral Library, 2009-2010), entry no. 3010; S. Gunton, *(Abridged) a History of the*

Cathedral Church of Peterborough, from Its Foundation, to the Present Time; : Containing the Manner in Which It Has Been Destroyed, Once by the Danes and Twice by Fire, and as Often Re-Edified, 5th edn (Peterborough 1795), 15

[10] Tebbs, *Peterborough* (as in n. 7), 24

[11] 'The Chronicle of Hugh Candidus, a monk of Peterborough' (as in n. 9), entry no. 3018, 3018 fn. 2

[12] J. Stevens, *The History of the Antient Abbeys, Monasteries, Hospitals, Catherdral and Collegiate Churches Being Two Additional Volumes to William Dugdale's Monasticon Anglicanum* (London 1722), 475

[13] C. Coates, *History and antiquities of the borough of Reading* (Reading 1802), 50; Slade, *The town of Reading and its abbey: 1127-1996* (Newbury 2001), 6

[14] 'The Chronicle of Hugh Candidus, a monk of Peterborough' (as in n. 9), entry no. 3020

[15] London, British Library, MS Add, 39758, fol. 20v.

[16] BL, MS Add, 39758, fol. 22; J. Britton, *The History and Antiquities of the Abbey, and Cathedral Church of Peterborough* (London: Londman 1828), 16, 54

[17] London, National Archives, MS Just 2/107, membrane 4A v.; 'Coroner's roll for Nassaburgh' in T. Halliday, *Select Manuscripts relating to the Abbey and Cathedral of Peterborough: Transcriptions, Translations, and Notes* (Unpublished, Peterborough HER and Cathedral Library, 2009-2010), Entry no. 3038, fn. 5

[18] R. Serjeantson and H. Longden, 'The Parish Churches and Religious Houses of Northamptonshire', *Archaeological Journal*, LXX (1913), 70, 217–452

[19] J. Carter, *The Ancient Architecture of England* (London 1795), 46

[20] C. Hart, *The Early Charters of Northern England and the North Midlands* (Leicester 1975), 55, 67, 111, 117

[21] London, British Library, MS Vespasian E, V, fol. 17

[22] T. Stapleton ed., *Chronicon Petroburgense* (London 1849), 21-22

[23] 'Extracts from the account rolls of the abbot's cellarers, made 141658 by brother Wermyngton and brother William Ufford' in T. Halliday, *Select Manuscripts relating to the Abbey and Cathedral of Peterborough: Transcriptions, Translations, and Notes* (Unpublished, Peterborough HER and Cathedral Library, 2009-2010), entry no. 3068

[24] P. Fergusson, *Canterbury Cathedral Priory in the Age of Becket* (London 2011), 88

[25] A. Cooke, *Act Book If the Ecclesiastical Court of Whalley* (Manchester 1901)

[26] The trial of Johannis Skylly de Flyxton in the bishop's palace chapel is one example of such a trial; N. Tanner, *Heresy Trials in the Diocese of Norwich, 1428-31*(London 1977), 9, 59

[27] *The holy Bible translated from the Latin Vulgate: diligently compared with the Hebrew, Greek, and other editions in diverse languages. And first published by the English College at Douay, Anno 1609. Newly revised and corrected, according to the clementin editon of the scriptures. With annotations for clearing up the Principal difficulties of Holy Writ…*, 1 and 4 (Edinburgh 1796), 506, 351 and 326-327,

[28] W. Mellows ed., *Peterborough Local Administration: Parochial Government before the Reformation; churchwardens' Accounts 14671573*, IX (Northamptonshire Record Society 1939), 18-20

[29] R. Barnes, M. Cox, E. Drury and P. Matin, *Abingdon Abbey, Its Buildings and History* (Abingdon 1993), 14

[30] A 1241 charter refers to lay sisters, Oxford, Bodleian, MS Lyell 15 fol. 104; C. Slade and G. Lambrick, *Two Cartularies of Abingdon Abbey*, Oxford Historical Society, New Series, I (1992), 221

[31]London, British Library, MS Add. 6214, fol. 21; B. Kemp, *Reading Abbey Cartularies*, Camden Fourth Series, (London 1986), 185

[32] *Henry of Pytchley's Book of fees*, ed. by W. Mellows (Northamptonshire Record Society 1927), 18-20

[33] Lambeth Palace, MS 198, fol.141v; S. Tholl, 'Life According to the Rule: A Monastic Modification of Mandatum Imagery in the Peterborough Psalter', *Gesta*, 33 (1994), 154

[34] Brussels, Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, MS 9961-62

[35] "Quotidie post Evangelium ad ostium monasterii tres pauperes, quos magis egere prospexerit, ad mandatum admittet", Stevenson, *Chronicon*,(as in n. 3), 405

[36] *Chronicon Petroburgense* (as in n. 22), 167-68

[37] D. Knowles, *The monastic constitutions of Lanfranc* (London 1951), 483

[38] A. Lester, 'Crafting a Charitable Landscape: Urban Topographies in Charters and Testaments from Medieval Champagne' in *Cities, Texts and Social Networks, 400-1500, Experiences and Perceptions of Medieval Urban Space*, ed. C. Goodson, A. Lester and C. Symes (Farnham 2010), 125-148

[39] Matthew Paris, *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. H. Riley (Rolls Series, III, 1869), 386.

[40] Fergusson, *Canterbury* (as in n. 24), 21

[41] *Henry of Pytchley's Book of fees* (as in n. 32), 14

[42] Lambeth Palace, MS 198A fol. 154; T. Halliday, *Select Manuscripts relating to the Abbey and Cathedral of Peterborough: Transcriptions, Translations, and Notes* (Unpublished, Peterborough HER and Cathedral Library, 2009-2010), entry no 3045, n. 2

[43] J. Hall, 'English Cistercian Gatehouse Chapels', *Cîteaux commentarii Cistercienses*, 52 (2001); P. Fergusson, ''Porta Patens Esto': Notes on Early Cistercian Gatehouses in the North of England', in eds. E. Fernie and P. Crossley, *Medieval Architecture and Its Intellectual Context* (London 1990), 47-59.

[44] F. Blomefield, *The History of the City and County of Norwich,* 4, part II (London, 1806), 53-55

[45] W. Sweeting, *The Cathedral church of Peterborough* (London 1911), 99

[46] *Peterborough Local Administration: Parochial Government before the Reformation; churchwardens' Accounts 14671573* (as in n. 28), 201-202

[47] Ibid, 220

[48] H. Schroeder, *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils: Text, Translation and Commentary* (St. Louis 1937), 177-94

[49] J. O'Sullivan ed., *The Register of Eudes of Rouen* (London 1964), XVIII

[50] O'Sullivan, *Eudes* (as in n. 49), 737-746