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The time is well past when the Middle Ages could be viewed as one undifferentiated historical period, suffused perhaps with a romantic rosy glow. In Lincolnshire, as elsewhere, the passing centuries saw much change, though not always the progress depicted by Whig tradition. The fate of the religious is a vivid illustration of this. Two vignettes drawn from the fenland house of Crowland show the transformation which took place between its first association with the spiritual life and the later years of its existence.

At the beginning of the eighth century, the fens presented an inhospitable landscape of tangled alders and scrubby undergrowth. Islands scattered here and there were surrounded by black oozy waters, drifting mists and all pervading damp. It was a lonely, ominous countryside, full of nameless terrors, where men felt closer to the elemental forces of God and demons than to their fellow men. All this and more is evoked by Felix, monk and hagiographer, writing before 749.1 He recounts the story of Guthlac, a young nobleman of twenty-six, who clung precariously to life in this hostile environment for fifteen years until his death in 715. Guthlac’s struggles epitomise the fervent piety which attracted men and women all over Christendom to the most unwholesome places they could find. He lived, with two even more youthful companions and later a clerk, clad in animal skins on a punishing diet of bread and muddy water. His battles with tormenting devils, while reminiscent of the epic combat of pagan heroes and of St Antony his desert prototype, also witness more practically to the dangers of malaria. As was so often the case, extreme privation acted as a magnet to society at large and soon his dearly bought solitude was disrupted by streams of visitors seeking healing and counsel.2 After his death, others were lured by the miraculous properties of his corpse, so that his tomb became the nucleus and inspiration of the later monastic community.3 It is unlikely that worship continued undisturbed by the Viking invasions, if indeed it was ever as formally established as the later monks liked to think. The monastery known to the post-conquest period was a product of the tenth-century monastic revival.4 Nevertheless, Guthlac’s reputation remained sufficiently potent to inspire a magnificent twelfth-century visual narrative of his life, now preserved in the British Library.5

The odour of sanctity surrounding Crowland was not perpetual however. By the fifteenth century, Guthlac’s world was a distant memory. Even the landscape had altered beyond recognition. The alders and islands still existed, but tamed. For two or three centuries past the waters had flowed in man made dykes, draining the land for cultivation.6 Well frequented paths led from one settlement to another. It was along one of these between Moulton and the monastic grange of Brotherhouse in 1429 that an aged monk journeyed, like his saintly predecessor, with two servants. As they walked beside the Lodedyke, they met a fellow churchman, a priest from Moulton also accompanied. On this occasion veneration was the last sentiment in evidence. The two parties surveyed each other suspiciously and angry, offensive words were bandied on the subject of trespassing. Finally, the monk despite his cloth and age, found himself tossed into the fen, to make his escape trembling and exhausted on the far side.7 Clearly the spiritual environment had undergone changes as radical as those to be seen in the countryside. This reversal of feeling was not peculiar to Crowland Abbey, nor even to Lincolnshire houses as a whole, but the confined area of one county provides a suitable context in which to examine the phenomenon and explain why enthusiasm for those cloistered apart from the world in a life of prayer turned eventually to enmity.

As it happens, the fens like a watery Athos saw the fullest flowering of the whole tenth-century revival. The black monk abbeys of Crowland, Thorney, Ramsey, Peterborough and Ely were all founded within a few years of each other and in close proximity.8 If Crowland was the only one actually located within Lincolnshire, some of the others held extensive estates there. Peterborough in particular enjoyed substantial holdings, notably nineteen estates given by the family of Brand, its last Saxon abbot. The chief of these lay well inside the county at Fiskerton and Scotter, and some as far north as Manton and Wallot-on-Humber.9 Most of Ramsey’s estates were to the south of Lincolnshire, but the monks had property at Cranwell, Dunstable, Old Sleaford, Quarriington and Threkingham in 1086, while Thorney Abbey acquired a cell at East Deeping, together with small endowments nearby, soon after.10

Important though these early and rich houses were, their influence was out of all proportion to their numbers. In monastic terms, pre-conquest Lincolnshire like the whole of northern England was underdeveloped. With the exception of Crowland and perhaps Spalding Priory and its cell at Alkborough, all the houses sited within the county were of later foundation.11 Indeed monasticism in most of this area was not a living force until the twelfth century and the advent of the new orders of Cistercian monks, Austin and Premonstratensian canons and Lincolnshire’s own order founded by Gilbert of Sempringham.12

Some of these later foundations, like the Augustinian abbey of Thornton-on-Humber, succeeded in attracting great endowments, but already a significant change was evident.13 Whereas Anglo-Saxon benefactors were able and willing to give whole villages, sometimes several at a time, to their protégés, this was not true of their twelfth-century successors. We know very little about Thurketel, who refounded Crowland Abbey after the Scandinavian incursion, beyond the fact that he was a clerk and closely connected with the leading reformers, but he was able to give the abbey an initial endowment of six estates.14 This contrasts sharply with the poverty stricken birth of later Cistercian foundations. Alexander, bishop of Lincoln, gave such an exiguous, marshy site to the monks he had recruited from Fountains in 1137 that, after struggling for two years, they moved from Haverholme to Louth Park.15 A similar upheaval lay behind the early foundation of Vaudby, while the monks who settled at Kirkstead found it a ‘place of horror like a vast solitude’.16 Foundation endowments like the two hundred and forty acres given to Swineshead were bleak indeed when set against the magnificence of gifts to the black monks in the tenth and eleventh centuries.17 Nor did subsequent patronage repair initial deficiencies. The endowments of most twelfth-
century houses consisted of small, scattered tenements, unlike the consolidated manorial holdings of many earlier foundations.18

The Cistercians in particular actively embraced poverty, so it could be argued that the modest endowments of many twelfth-century foundations were the result of deliberate policy and implied no change in attitude towards the religious themselves. One could equally plausibly explain smaller endowments in terms of less affluent donors or a growing population beginning to press on finite supplies of land. For older houses, however, other factors too were at work. The very idealism of the new orders threw the wealth and display of their forerunners into high relief, with predictable consequences. Houses like Crowland no longer seemed to need or deserve such generous gifts. When William de Roumare, earl of Lincoln, offered the monks six bovates of land in Sibsey in the second half of the twelfth century, it was not due to admiration for their holiness, but the price of absolution for his son whose household had become embroiled with the abbots in an unfortunate incident during the civil war. Furthermore, by one means or another, the family had clawed the land back into its own hands by the end of the century.19

Changing fashions in piety were to carry lay patronage further from the enclosed religious with each generation. The popularity of the new orders did not last long. Only two out of the thirty-three houses belonging to them in Lincolnshire were established after 1200 and neither was typical of foundations made in the first flush of enthusiasm. West Ravendale grew from a church granted to the Breton house of Beaupré in 1202, while the Augustinian priory of Newstead by Stamford was converted from a pre-existing hospital founded by the Albini family, sometime before 1247.20 New foundations in the thirteenth century were reserved overwhelmingly for the urban based mendicants, whose desire to serve the community harmonised better with the needs of the time. Dominicans, Carmelites and Franciscans were all settled in Boston, Lincoln and Stamford in this period and the Franciscans also had a house in Grimsby by 1240 and another in Grantham by 1290.21 Older houses continued to attract gifts, but in the case of Crowland these had become worryingly small.22

By the later Middle Ages, the religious commanded even less popular support. The aspirations of an increasingly literate and self assertive laity now commonly focussed on the parish church, where the fruits of their patronage could be clearly seen. If, like Ralph de Cromwell, they were wealthy enough they might find a college or perpetual chantry. Religious houses only participated in this expression of late medieval piety where they proved suitable hosts for such foundations. Thus, by the fifteenth century, the ideal of an isolated life of prayer which had seemed so appealing in the insecure and apocalyptic atmosphere of the Dark Ages was manifestly inappropriate to a society which, despite devastating epidemic disease, was comparatively well ordered and sophisticated. The monk of Crowland was an anachronism and this contributed to the disrespect with which he was treated.

The survival of the religious from previous ages would not have mattered had they not been so deeply entrenched and powerful in the community. Few villages escaped their network of landownership and some had several ecclesiastical landowners to contend with.23 Where chuchmen controlled large amounts of land, the social consequences were profound. A comparison of the estates belonging to Peterborough Abbey in Lincolnshire, as recorded in Domesday Book, with those of approximately the same value belonging to Guy de Craon there suggests that more villeins and fewer sochmen might be found on church estates, even where the lay lord was one of the most prosperous newcomers.24 Strong seignorial pressure from the church in a region of unusual peasant freedom was unlikely to make for harmonious relationships. It is interesting in view of this that there was relatively little unrest specifically associated with religious houses in the county at the time of the Peasants' Revolt in 1381.25 Certainly bondmen on the estates of the Hospitaliers refused to perform their services in 1381 and three years later the prior of Tunstall complained that his bondmen had banded together in resistance.26 Yet sporadic incidents of this sort in Lincolnshire contrast sharply with neighbouring East Anglia, scene of so many disturbances.27 In many areas, the worst trouble centred on rich recently established houses like St Alans or Bury St Edmund's.28 Crowland Abbey and Spalding Priory were the only houses of similar stature in Lincolnshire and Crowland at least did not escape unscathed, although nothing happened immediately nor on its Lincolnshire manors. In 1383 a rebellion broke out in Wellingborough, where a gang of bondmen forced an entry into the abbots' close and besieged him and his servants, threatening to burn down his house.29 All the few houses suffered to some extent, some during the thores of the revolt itself. Henry Knighton suggests that the abbots of Peterborough would have been slaughtered by his tenants but for the timely intervention of the bishop of Norwich and an armed posse.30 At Elly, a mob marched on the cathedral before releasing all the prisoners from the bishop's gaol. Rioting also led to the destruction of records on the bishop's manor at Balsham and the prior's manor at West Wratting.31 The abbots of Ramsey were terrorised into provisioning rebels en route to the north and clearly anticipated trouble from his own men though none is recorded.32 The abbot of Thorney also took precautions against revolt in 1381 and in 1390 was forced to act against bondmen who had formed leagues to resist services and customs on his most important demesne manors.33 It is noticeable, however, that despite the involvement of the few houses, none of these incidents took place within Lincolnshire. Why dealings between lord and peasant stopped short of violence inside the county, when feelings were so inflamed elsewhere is not entirely clear. Perhaps local traditions of freedom succeeded in moderating the actions of landlords who were oppressive in other areas. Much may also have been due to the late foundation of many Lincolnshire houses. With more fragmented endowments than the pre-conquest monasteries, they probably found it correspondingly less easy to impose on customary freedom and so provided little cause for their tenants to revolt.

The injurious effects of ecclesiastical landownership in Lincolnshire cannot be wholly discounted however. The Cistercians, whose work as colonisers contributed significantly to the economic development of the region, often achieved this progress at the expense of the peasantry.34 Villagers were uprooted from the land given to Revesby Abbey in Revesby, Thoresby and Sydesby in the 1140s and R. A. Donkin suggests that granges belonging to Kirkstead and Vaudey may also have been created at a cost of depopulation.35 Compensation was offered to those affected by the foundation of Revesby, but there was little choice about moving from the land.36 A former monk of Clairvaux claimed that the Cistercians 'frightened the poor and drove them from the land' and this was as true of medieval Lincolnshire as anywhere else.37 Where tenants were not subjected to ruthless eviction, they might still find their manor sucked into centralised enterprises with tentacles stretching out far beyond the confines of the county. Famous in this respect
was the *Bidentes Hoylandie* sheep flock run by Crowland from c. 1276. Estates as far afield as Northamptonshire and Cambridgeshire operated as one unit with those in the fens, as described separately from the rest of the abbey’s activities. Agriculture in general was organised in such a way as to reserve the rich marshland for grazing, while upland manors largely grew the grain for which they were better suited. Impressive though such co-ordination of resources is in administrative terms, it is hard to believe that it did not at times impinge on local freedom of action.

Active landownership as opposed to rentier policies had other drawbacks too. It meant less land available for renting. This was a matter of some importance in districts like Elloe in which population pressure began to force the peasantry to drain their fen pasture for arable. As pasture became even more scarce, their eyes turned hungrily to the luxuriant, untouched supplies surrounding Crowland itself. From an early date, the tension engendered by this tantalising pastoral wealth gave rise to open conflict.

The most spectacular and well-known outbreak occurred in 1189, when the peasants of Elloe staged a ‘sit-in’ in the Crowland precinct which interestingly bears the classic hallmarks of peasant invasions at other times and places. Trouble began when the nobles tried to prevent the men of Holland from pasturing their cattle and impounded those animals found trespassing. In retaliation, an armed band gathered, broke into the precinct and divided the pasture up between the village contingents. Each group of villagers camped on its own allocation, and for a fortnight, dug curvatures, cut down Alders and pastured their beasts until word came that the abbey had secured royal assistance.

Sporadic raids and acts of vandalism in the following centuries show that the conspicuous contrast between monastic plenty and peasant deprivation provoked enduring resentment. In 1328, the men of Moulton, Weston and Spalding sabotaged a sewer near the grange of Brotherhouse causing damage to 500 acres of meadow and pasture. Shortly before the 1429 incident, the men of Moulton and Weston again entered the precinct, destroying a fishing shed and plundering nets. The first continuator of the Crowland Chronicle, with pardonable exaggeration, described them as ‘ravening dogs with minds boiling with rage’ who savaged everything in sight.

Meanwhile, the men of Spalding conducted a similar raid on the abbey’s private fishery in the Welland and then invaded another part of the precinct.

So valuable had the fenland become and so obscure the boundaries between different holdings that good relations between fellow landlords were also undermined. The invaders of 1189 were adamant that they had acted on the instigation of their lords. Local figures like Fulke de Oury, Conon son of Ellis and Thomas of Moulton were all implicated. The monks of Crowland also seem to have lived in an almost constant state of warfare, legal or actual, with the powerful lords of Deeping. A dispute over common pasture was settled peacefully in the courts in 1233, but all too often action was taken into their own hands. The most serious instance of this occurred in 1391 after a long and bitter quarrel over boundaries. The almoner of Crowland was set upon at dusk and taken captive. Although he was released unharmed, he had been threatened with repeated duckings, frighten and humiliated. Laymen were also involved and suffered worse. Crowland boatmen were beaten up and the men of Spalding, their allies on this occasion, were manhandled. Eventually feelings ran so high that someone was murdered. The monks were not passive in the face of these attacks. Although they feature as innocent victims in their own accounts, independent records suggest that they had few qualms about returning violence in kind. In 1333, the sheriff of Lincolnshire forbade the monks of Crowland and Spalding to gather armed gangs to terrify the populace and attack the property of the Wake family while Thomas Wake of Liddes was away in Scotland on the king’s business. Whatever the rights and wrongs of each incident, it is clear that for much of the century before 1429 near anarchy had reigned in the fens and that the religious were so deeply involved that their reputation was thoroughly compromised.

Their credibility was further eroded by internece dispute. The monks of Spalding had been party to the invasion of 1189, when the conspirators actually plotted in a barn belonging to the prior. The worst excesses of ecclesiastical rivalry over fen pasture took place over the county boundary however. In 1335, the fenlanders witnessed the uncivilising spectacle of Abbot Reginald of Thorney, his monks and henchmen, together with the prior of Ely, advancing on Ramsey Abbey land with banners flying as if they were marching to war. Together the raiding force broke into houses belonging to the abbey, turned their animals on to Ramsey pasture, cut down and carried away trees, assaulted the abbot of Ramsey’s men and stole his goods. Forthwith the abbot retaliated with a vicious attack on the village of Whittlesey where both Thorney and Ely held manors. In the ensuing sack, large numbers of livestock belonging to the two houses were burned to death. Altogether it is not difficult to imagine how monks became unpopular in the fenland.

Much of the hostility facing Crowland, as with other rich fen houses, can be ascribed to the wealth they acquired early in their existence and the peculiar nature of their environment. Poorer houses elsewhere in the county might be expected to have enjoyed happier relations with their neighbours. This was not always the case however. Laymen were extremely sensitive to land passing into ecclesiastical hands, no matter how needy the recipient. Moreover, poverty could engender attitudes quite as grasping as those of the wealthy. A dispute involving the abbey of Louth Park indicates just how emotive the issue of land could be.

In 1342, Sir Henry le Vavasour gave his manor of Cockerington to the abbey, thereby disinheriting his family. Quite possibly the abbot had played unscrupulously on his fears of hell since the matter was arranged in haste on his deathbed, when his judgement could well have been impaired. The abbey naturally claimed that he was in full possession of his senses and that the plan had been conceived long before. The family could not accept this however, even though seisin had passed safely to the feoffees who were to convey the estate to the abbey shortly before le Vavasour’s death. His widow Constance and son Henry led an attack on the abbot’s close at Louth in order to steal his muniments, thereby weakening his case, and assaulted him in the process. He in turn, engineered the kidnapping of Constance and made free of her goods. When the warring parties were finally prevailed upon to do battle in more orthodox surroundings, Constance produced *inter alia* the wild accusations that it was the hand of her husband’s corpse which had been set to the seal on the deed of enfeoffment and that the abbey had won the estate by fraud. There can be little doubt that this was untrue. Other witnesses overwhelmingly supported the abbot and argued that the legal niceties were correctly observed. Yet, although ill-conceived, Constance’s opposition to the grant is a vivid if extreme illustration of the passions roused by injudicious religious benefaction. Doubtless the loss was the harder to bear when those deprived were also out of sympathy with the recipient.
Purchase by religious houses was even more disquieting to the laity than continuing gifts. From the mid-thirteenth century, wealthy houses began to compensate for their waning allure by this means. Prior John the Almoner of Spalding spent the enormous sum of over one thousand four hundred and fifty pounds on property between 1253 and 1274. While he bought land in a whole series of places, Crowland concentrated its efforts predominantly in one. A manor was purchased in Gedney in the words of the author of the *Vita Abbatum* ‘through immense expenditure of money and burdensome dispute in the royal courts’. Altogether three manors were acquired in the village and the combined estate had become the most valuable of all Crowland's possessions at the Dissolution. The abbot also gained complete control over the village of Baston, where the abbey had held an estate since its early years, when he bought out Henry de Beaumont in 1407. At the other end of the county, the abbey of Thornton-on-Humber was equally busy. The canons paid two hundred and forty one pounds for an estate in 1269, but reserved their greatest outlay until the end of the century, in 1292 Henry de Lacy, earl of Lincoln, was licensed to sell him his manor of Hulton-by-Killingholme for one thousand and four pounds and a year later he paid a further one thousand marks for *Inkelmore in Marsland* near Swinefleet. Canon Foster observed when editing the feet of fines for the county between 1242 and 1272 the amount of land passing into church hands. A practice confined to a few houses only.

Contemporaries believed that large scale buying on the part of ecclesiastics had wider implications than the disappointment of heirs, grievous though this was. They were particularly worried about the military implications of old established knightly families falling on hard times and being driven from the land. Many of John the Almoner's purchases for Spalding were from vendors of this sort. Sir William le Moine, for example, who sold land in Spalding, Pinchbeck and Whaplode was in debt to the Jews and had suffered misfortune consequent on backers the wrong side in the Barons' Wars before he sold out to the priory. For others too recourse to moneylenders was the first step towards an ecclesiastical takeover. Kirkstead, Bollington and Greenfield all bought up estates mortgaged to the Jews, thus dispossessing the original tenants. In 1279, the Statute of Mortmain expressly forbade further acquisition of any kind by churchmen. In justification, its drafters cited the danger to the country arising from the withdrawal of knight service and the loss of feudal incidents suffered by lords who acquired undying ecclesiastical tenants. It is arguable how realistic some of these fears were, but there can be no doubt that they were sincerely held and added yet more weight to the fast accumulating distrust of the religious.

Secular clergy also had reason to resent them. Their relationship snatched too much of 'haves' and 'have nots', with unbenefficed clergy and chantry chaplains especially scraping by on meagre livelihood. Even those fortunate enough to gain a living frequently saw much vital income from their parishes diverted to the coffers of institutions whose need for it was far less pressing. The worst drain occurred when a religious house assumed control of the tithes which would normally have fallen to the rector and provided for a vicar to serve the parish on a much reduced share. By 1291, Crowland had appropriated the rectories of Suttoner, Langtoft, Whaplode, Baston, Wellingborough and Oakington in this way, as well as receiving pensions and portions from a number of other churches. At least ten per cent of the abbey's revenue came from these sources and to this day a fine late medieval tithe barn stands in Wellingborough as testimony to local support of the monks. By 1500, nearly half of Lincolnshire's churches had been appropriated, leaving their fabric in a state of dilapidation and the parish clergy in many cases too poor to carry out their duties effectively or to secure an adequate standard of education for themselves. This in itself cannot have promoted mutual respect, but ill feeling often sharpened into open hostility over the precise apportionment of tithes between the appropriated rectory and the secular priest who did the work. At Sutterton this vicar was especially hard hit because his position was affected by reclamation. His share of the tithes included hay which was liable to disappear without compensation if the land was turned over to arable, since grain tithes were assigned to the rector. In addition to profits shorn directly from parishes, some houses also benefited indirectly by immunity from paying tithes on their demesne land. This was a particularly fruitful source of dispute between the religious and local incumbent. The rector of Bucknall, for example, made a spirited attack on Crowland's privilege in the early thirteenth century, although he lost his case. If at first sight it seemed strange that one churchman should have attacked another in 1429, the conflict of interest between the secular and regular clergy makes it only too comprehensible.

Property and privilege, whether its ownership or further acquisition, formed an impenetrable barrier to good relations between the religious and the rest of society. By the end of the thirteenth century, the wealthiest houses seemed to be greedily engrossing land at the expense of penurious knights and hungry peasants, not out of necessity or in the pursuit of holiness, but to fund ambitious building projects and provide delicate luxuries like rice pudding instead of bread and almond milk in Lent. By the late fourteenth century, the wealth of the older religious so dominated their image that they had become known as the 'possessors'. When radical spirits called for disendowment and prepared detailed plans for the redistribution of ecclesiastical wealth in 1410, the Carthusians were the only one of the enclosed orders held in sufficient respect to be exempt. Lincolnshire could only boast one such house; at Epworth on the Isle of Axholme. Reduced population pressure had ceased to make land such a vital issue to the peasantry by the time the monk of Crowland came to walk along beside Lodesdyke in 1429, but the legacy of bitterness among all sections of society attaching to religious ownership of land had come to colour irrevocably their attitude to the old orders.

Exceptional piety would have been required to offset the disadvantages under which the religious laboured by the later Middle Ages. The rigorous, eremitical nature of the Carthusian rule ensured this and accounts for their enduring place in popular affections. Inevitably this standard was beyond the reach of every religious, many of whom had scant sense of vocation. In wealthier houses an amiable clubbable atmosphere often prevailed. Frequent drinking parties were exposed at Thornton Abbey in 1440. Two years earlier, visitation of Spalding Priory showed the sacrist running a bar in the cloisters for the public while the younger monks roamed around outside unsupervised. Brother John Gratton was noted for harping on 'shelvy lusts' and Brother Roger Seyville for over-enthusiastic indulgence in female company. A visitation of Crowland shortly after the incident of 1429 suggests a similar departure from strict observance. Significantly the chantry of St Pega, Guthlac's sister, had fallen into decay. Poverty brought its own problems in train. In 1440, the bishop forbade Heynings Priory in the strongest terms to accept more nuns than its modest endowment could support or to demand payment for.
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