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TEXT
ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the architecture of Leicestershire churches within a period of c.1260 to c.1350. It is the result of a field study of nearly three hundred churches both within Leicestershire and the surrounding counties, in order to define stylistic similarities and differences.

Part of the work has investigated the question of whether the term 'Decorated' requires some re-definition. Chapter I establishes that very little writing before the 20th century examined the architecture of Leicestershire churches in any detail, and even subsequently, major research has been sparse. Having observed the early sources, it continues with a review of the current general literature. Chapter 2 submits that the term 'Decorated' - as currently defined - is too wide to cover the entire period under discussion. The term 'Geometrical' as applied to late 13th-century architecture, should not be used to define the Decorated style. Examples set out to justify the argument that some of the motifs found in 14th-century Decorated architecture did not exist in the later 13th century.

Since later chapters deal with dis-aggregated features, Chapter 3 commences with a set of case studies of the individual churches along the Wreake Valley, before moving on to discuss how the different elements of Decorated are applied to Leicestershire churches. The following two chapters examine the economic background to the mediaeval county and the practicalities of masons, quarrying and building practices. The amount of data collected - which appears in the Appendices - has led to the introduction of new ideas, namely, that basic elements were stock-piled, and that templates were of more limited use than has been previously supposed. The remaining chapters deal with individual features, including two major chapters on Windows and Arcades: that on Windows provides the first ever detailed classification of window types within the county, whilst that on Arcades reveals much new evidence on building practices.

Volume 1 contains the text, Bibliography and list of all churches surveyed; Volume 2 contains all illustrations, appendices and maps.
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INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

This thesis presents an analytical survey of the architecture of Leicestershire churches within a period between c. 1260 and c. 1350. This period is represented by a style which, since the early nineteenth century, has been known as Decorated.¹ Leicestershire has been chosen because it provides a fascinating opportunity to study Decorated architecture as applied to generally modest village churches, to test and to challenge some of the accepted opinions on Decorated architecture by examining a large number of examples, and, arising from this deliberately large sample, to discover more about building practices of the late 13th / early 14th centuries. Whilst the county contains a handful of outstanding churches, such as Gaddesby, Hallaton, Melton Mowbray and Stoke Golding, the majority are not 'text-book' examples, and, as the literature review in Chapter 1 will demonstrate, the county has not been well served by the majority of writers on English parish churches.

The motivation for producing such a study stems from a very long interest in church architecture. In 1954 I completed a chart containing pen and ink, water-colour sketches of every Anglican church in the Guildford Diocese, which has remained on permanent exhibition in the Cathedral, and which is now accompanied by an updated version which I produced in 2000. The original Guildford work was followed by one on similar lines for Hereford Cathedral in 1965.² Arising from these interests,

---

¹ Whether the term 'Decorated' may be applied correctly to the whole of the period c.1260 - c.1350, will be discussed fully in Chapter 2.

² Research has included teaching notes on all the churches in the Godalming Deanery of the Guildford Diocese, produced by the Guildford Diocesan Board of Education; research into a group of Romanesque churches in the Guildford area, and research into the late-mediaeval fittings of Hexham Abbey, leading to publication in an academic journal. My complete collection of church drawings has been accepted by the Central Council for the Care of Churches at Westminster, and
a new challenge has been provided by studying churches that are not part of my Surrey background, but which have developed as part of a more long-established and productive agricultural community. The research provides an opportunity for drawing new conclusions about a period of church architecture which is prolific throughout Leicestershire and which survives in schemes and additions of numerous different scales, types, qualities and geographical spread.

The survey is based on a field study of nearly 300 churches within the counties of Leicestershire, Warwickshire, Staffordshire, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, Lincolnshire, Rutland and Northamptonshire see (Maps 1 - 4). The basis for selection of virtually all Leicestershire churches containing Decorated work, together many examples from adjacent counties, is explained later in this Introduction. Reference to the complete lists of churches surveyed, to be found in Volume II, will enable the location of each church to be identified.

For this purpose, modern maps have been used as an aid to direct visitors.

Since it is frequently geological formations rather than county or diocesan boundaries that help to determine local styles, an authoritative view of the Decorated style within Leicestershire can only be achieved by establishing similarities and differences further afield. However, style within a county can also be influenced by its Diocesan cathedral, and in this respect, paradoxically, Leicestershire provides a valuable opportunity to study churches that are less likely to have been under immediate cathedral influence, since throughout much of the medieval period, the county formed the Archdeaconry of Leicester within the Diocese of Lincoln. Apart from its north-eastern area, much of Leicestershire is a considerable distance from Lincoln. In seeking wider external sources, whilst acknowledging those from

will eventually be placed in their archives.
Lincolnshire, account must also be taken of the West Country, East Anglia, the North and West Midlands, and particularly from Lichfield, which geographically, is close to Leicestershire. Furthermore, the possible influences of the 'Court Style' will need to be discussed. (see Chapters 1 and 2)

An important element of this thesis is to examine the Leicestershire architecture in relation to the approaches articulated in the existing literature, much of which tends to deal with the major examples, either as the subjects of scholarly monographs or as examples selected within general discussions of ecclesiastical architecture. I shall argue that the relationship between the architecture surveyed and some of the literature reviewed, demands a re-examination of the term 'Decorated'. The typological systems often deploy the term 'Decorated' to cover the whole of the period, c.1260 - c.1350, whereas the evidence gathered from my substantial number of site visits in Leicestershire will challenge the accepted scholarship, and suggest that the architecture of this period should be discriminated into two largely separate stylistic forms.

Demographic, logistical and liturgical requirements are also all relevant to a discussion of the application of Decorated work. The medieval economic background of Leicestershire will be considered in Chapter 4, and there will be discussion of the masons and quarries, the methods of providing the stone and transporting it, and such working practices as the use of templates and masons' marks in Chapter 5.

The existing scholarly literature can identify examples of national importance, which often help to provide a dateable framework for undated examples. The major buildings are often documented from primary sources; for example, the Building Accounts for the royal works of Henry III extend from 1220 to 1272 whilst the Fabric
Accounts for Exeter Cathedral cover the period 1299 - 1353. However, the smaller, less well-known buildings are often more difficult to tie to contemporary documentation. Although heraldry in windows and on tombs and masonry can help to identify patrons and suggest building dates, firm dating much before the 15th century of smaller village churches, such as those which are predominant in Leicestershire, is generally very difficult, due to the absence of pertinent documentary evidence. Even comparisons via typological evidence may not always provide indications of date - as I shall show - and may also be affected by later restorations: I have taken particular care to be cognisant of the restorations of the Victorian era.

The decision as to which churches fall within the survey period was initially based upon two sources: John Nichols', *The History and Antiquities of the County of Leicestershire*, and the relevant county volumes by Nikolaus Pevsner in *The Buildings of England* series. Nichols, of course, makes no reference to the term 'Decorated', since he was writing before the styles of English architecture had been categorised by Rickman,(1817) but he does provide external illustrations of nearly every church, the accuracy of which makes it possible, in many cases, to recognise what has come to be accepted as Decorated fenestration. Interestingly, Pevsner rarely refers specifically to 'Decorated', but every Leicestershire church which he suggested

---

might come within the relevant period of study has been surveyed, and only time
restrictions have limited the examples chosen from surrounding counties.

It should be stressed that it has been important to have researched a large
number of churches rather than a sample of perhaps just thirty or forty. Only by this
method of wider observation have coherent patterns emerged, from which reliable
conclusions may be drawn. Observation of a selected few churches would have thus
negated one of the main objectives of this thesis. I draw my deductions from a
detailed analysis, not only of fenestration and arcades, but also of the micro-
architecture, in the form of piscinae and sedilia. To provide this, every possible
example has required research. (Arguably, this has implications for church-oriented
studies elsewhere?)

This is not the first contribution to detailed ecclesiological surveys within
specific regions or counties, nor is it the first to deal with Decorated architecture in
such a context. However, by providing a typological analysis and classification,
rather than a social- architectural history, by suggesting new evidence on building
practices, (as will be set out in Chapters 5, 7 and 10), and by producing two different
types of case studies, it is hoped that the present survey will provide major insights
into important aspects of a particular period of church architecture within a single
county (but with implications for wider national trends).

Francis Bond's great studies from the early twentieth century, *Gothic

---

R. K. Morris, *Decorated Architecture in Herefordshire: A Study of its Sources, Workshops and
Anglia, 1975.
J. Maddison, *Decorated Architecture in the North-West Midlands: An Investigation of the Work of
Architecture in England, and English Church Architecture, progress from setting out the characteristics of the different periods of English Gothic architecture to separate chapters on piers, vaulting, fenestration, doorways, towers and spires, and concludes with moulding details.10 His many examples say nothing about internal details such as piscinae, sedilia, or wall-recesses, yet clearly there is a need to include all aspects of church architecture within a single period as they relate to a single county, whilst making necessary comparisons with some examples from neighbouring counties before general conclusions can be drawn.

My contextualising of specific details within a larger study, and my demonstrating of the huge variety of forms produced within the same approximate period, will question assumptions about typological 'evolution'. Thus, typology will play an important role in this thesis, and the model of evolutionary approach adopted by Bond will be critically scrutinised. A much more complex and subtle methodology is required.

I should identify that survey of such a large number of churches has made research into patronage through tombs, heraldry and stained glass impracticable. Mediaeval glass is rare in Leicestershire, the few surviving examples being of the 15th and 16th centuries. Whilst, in some cases, patronage may be inferred from the surviving early effigies, mainly of priests of unknown identity, there is nothing to provide conclusive evidence as, for example, there is at Heckington, in Lincolnshire. The large number of incised slabs and the few tombs displaying heraldry are, almost without exception, later than the study period of this thesis. The few instances where patronage may be ascribed are, not surprisingly, at the major churches, such as Melton Mowbray, Gaddesby and Stoke Golding, to which I shall subsequently refer.

METHODOLOGY

The benefits to be derived from such an extensive study of a single county mean that the reader can move from a general focus on English church architecture of the 'Decorated' style, to a new analysis of the ways in which small rural communities deployed that style, in the larger context of demographic and economic changes.

The first case studies set out at the beginning of Chapter 3 will deal with a single group of churches that lie within a total of eight miles along the valley of the River Wreake, namely, Melton Mowbray, Asfordby, Kirby Bellars, Frisby-on-the-Wreake, Rotherby, Brooksby, Hoby, Thrussington and Ratcliffe-on-the-Wreake. The intention here is to look at the aggregated architectural features together within each church, to compare ground plans, and to look for similarities of detail and possible influences. In addition, documentary evidence has been carefully scrutinised to try to sketch the social background to these sites, and to suggest possible patronage. This attempt to provide a socio-economic background of a few sites establishes a context and a contrast to the main emphasis of this thesis, which is to examine disaggregated architectural features in Chapters 6 to 15, the case studies here being focussed on the features rather than on the churches in which they may be found.

The working approach to every church, whether within the first or second groups of case studies, follows similar lines. First, every incumbent of the Leicestershire churches was contacted by letter, which set out precisely what I was hoping to do, and requesting permission to gain access to the church (over two-thirds of which were kept locked), and to enquire as to whether there would be any objection to internal photography. In nearly every case a favourable response gave details of key-holders who could be contacted. For the surveys, a check-list was
printed for every church, on which details could be inserted in the appropriate spaces (see Appendix I). Following a detailed external inspection resulting in written notes, and a photographic record, there followed a similar inspection of the interiors. Every pier and respond of each arcade was noted and listed in detail. Specially constructed callipers recorded the diameters of every pier, whilst a very large profile gauge reproduced the mouldings of many capitals and bases. From numerous capitals, full-size hard-board templates were cut out on a fine band-saw. This was in the hope that one might find evidence of precise replication, both within a single church, and perhaps between churches, thus suggesting the movement of a group of masons, as well as providing evidence of the use of templates, as might have been expected if mouldings were the 'signature' of medieval masons. Sectional drawings of a number of arcade profiles were made, but for the obvious reason that one could not use ladders or tower-scaffolds, these are not scale drawings. As with the drawings of door and window mouldings (which are also not to scale,) they serve, however, to illustrate the profiles of the moulding lines.

Doorways, which often have moulding patterns more varied than in windows, form part of the external survey, as do buttresses, with particular attention paid to their base mouldings and set-offs, together with aisle parapets and pinnacles, many of which form the subject of drawings. Fenestration, in Chapter 7, and Arcades in Chapter 10, form a major part of the disaggregated case studies. The analysis of fenestration according to tracery details, in Chapter 7, represents the first complete survey of late-13th and early-14th century window types for Leicestershire, and

---

important results relating to typology and chronology emerge from it, whilst the data on piers, capitals and arch spans shed new light on mediaeval building practices. Study of the micro-architecture, piscinae, sedilia, image niches, etc., together with decoration such as crockets and ball-flower, also formed an important part of each survey, such features being integral to much Decorated architecture. The complete photographic record amounts to nearly 4000 images from which, all chosen examples are in Volume II.

With major additions taking place within a relatively short period in a large number of churches, in the form of aisles, fenestration, occasionally towers, and, more particularly, spires, together with internal fittings, the visual data gathered are central to the arguments set out in the thesis. In discussing how these general forms apply to Decorated work within the county, questions can be posed by looking at a single church here.

Kirby Bellars church (Fig.A), consists of four main elements, a nave, south aisle, chancel, and a west tower and spire. The building immediately poses some elementary and some more sophisticated questions: What is the purpose of the nave? What is the purpose of the chancel? Why is a south aisle needed? Why are there blocked arches in the north wall of the nave? (Fig.B) What is the purpose of a piscina? (Figs. C) Who are represented by the two effigies in the south aisle? (Fig. D) Why are there niches on the front of the tower? (Fig. E) Why are there different styles of windows, as is evident in Figs A and B, and do the various details help us to date them? Are there signs of alteration within the church to accommodate a changing liturgy? Where does the church stand in relation to the village, and, therefore, which is the principal entrance? Is there significance in the name of the village? With the aid of ground plans, elevations, drawings and photographs, these are all questions to be
addressed in Chapter 3, together with subsequent chapters dealing with the more detailed external and internal surveys.

The raison d'être of this thesis is not to provide a social history of Leicestershire, but to set out a detailed analysis of all architectural elements of a single period within a single county and, therefore, to determine whether these architectural elements are in accord with current literature, and whether the term 'Decorated' may be applied correctly to the whole period of investigation. I shall discuss how demographic and liturgical requirements revealed themselves in small village churches, through structural alterations, the need for altars and the fittings necessary for the Mass, and the response to imagery, whilst the results were often the response from patronage. As will be seen in the case studies set out in Chapter 3, there is very little evidence from primary sources to attribute patronage. Similarly, the same sources provide only oblique references to the villages, by quoting land settlements and occasionally advowsons, neither of which are of immediate help in contextualising churches within their communities.

The study provides a number of new insights into building practices, particularly of windows and arcades, resulting from the considerable amount of data gathered on the many sites. Finally, from the results of the analyses, the thesis addresses the following questions: Is there a 'Leicestershire' style? What influences, if any, have come from outside the county? What contribution, if at all, did Leicestershire make to English 14th-century architecture? And finally, what contribution can this study make to the corpus of literature on English Decorated architecture?

In Chapter 1, the thesis provides a summary of the available literary sources and an introduction to the terminology. In introducing works on architects, masons
and mouldings, it assesses both primary and secondary sources relevant to the present work. Chapter 2, provides a more detailed discussion of some of the literature, examining the terminology in relation to the use of the terms 'Decorated' and the 'Court Style'. In informing and modifying what is known of the Decorated style, such questions as patronage and, in particular, the role of the Court, together with the demands of the liturgy are also discussed. The first section of Chapter 3 presents a series of case studies of the nine churches along the Wreake valley. The text, which gives architectural descriptions, and, where possible, the social context of each church, is supported by scale ground-plans and illustrations of the main architectural features. It poses some of the questions that are discussed in greater detail in subsequent chapters, notably those relating to building practices.

The first three chapters, therefore, set out the main aims of the thesis, the points for discussion, and the foundation upon which the discussion is based. In presenting the visual evidence and addressing the specific details, the remaining chapters establish the value of reviewing a large study sample in the form of a single county, using comparative examples from adjoining counties.

The first volume contains the main text, Appendices and Bibliography. Each Appendix contains data relating to a particular chapter. The second volume contains all illustrations and ends with a complete list of all churches surveyed and maps relevant to different chapters.

The question of mensuration has raised certain issues. Neither Imperial nor metric is entirely relevant to medieval building works; units of measurement were not those of today. The use of the Imperial measure may have been more applicable to the large spans between piers, but to maintain consistency, I have decided to work from metric data throughout.
The intention of this survey is not to provide a complete Gazetteer, although the need to discuss specific features may, at times, suggest this. Instead, it is the definition of certain characteristics that forms the basis for discussion, and which informs the reader whether there is a correlation between typology and chronology.
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CHAPTER 1 - ANTIQUARIAN, LATER AND MODERN SOURCES
CHAPTER 1

ANTIQUARIAN, LATER AND MODERN SOURCES

Although the critical findings of this thesis are based upon my personal analysis of every building selected within the study zone, extensive reference has also, necessarily, been made to the existing primary and secondary literature pertinent to 14th-century church architecture in Leicestershire.

PRIMARY SOURCES

The most important primary sources relating to the towns and villages, of which, the churches are the subject of this study, are to be found in the Calendars of Close and Patent Rolls, which, for this particular period of study, covering the years between c.1260 and 1350, can be found in the 22 volumes commencing 1259-61 (Henry III) to 1360-64 (Edward III), and the 22 volumes commencing 1258-66, to 1358-61, respectively, published by H.M.S.O. in the closing years of the 19th and the early years of 20th centuries. Study of these volumes, as well as the 13 volumes of the Calendars of Inquisitions ad Post Mortem, for the reigns of the three Edwards, provide a great deal of social and economic material, but nothing, I can stress, which bears directly on the specific focus of my thesis. I have, however, made use of the primary sources on occasion, for example, the references - which I shall cite in Chapter 3 - to important merchants in Melton Mowbray, can lead to informed speculation as to the patronage of the great re-modelling of that church in the 14th and 15th centuries. Otherwise, the general references, even to the villages of the Wreake valley churches (presented as case studies in Chapter 3, have thrown little light upon a specifically architectural focus. The following examples, which contain
references to three Wreake valley villages, serve to illustrate the type of material contained in these sources:

"... to the prior and convent of Laund by William, son of William le Clerk of 12 acres of land and 5 acres of meadow in Fryseby by Wrethek."\(^{12}\)

"To the sheriff of Leicester. Order to cause 600 quarters of wheat and beans provided by the sheriff of Lincoln in the parts of Melton Moubray [sic.] for the munition of Berwick-on-Tweed to be carried to Boston without delay."\(^{13}\)

"Brother William de Aumengl, master of the hospital of Burton St. Lazarus acknowledges that he owes to Roger Beler of Kirkeby £250."\(^{14}\)

Pertinent though such references are to general social and economic, as well as to local village history, they provide no unequivocal information relating to the specifics of architectural detail and building history of the churches which are the subject of this thesis. By contrast, some very useful primary sources relating to the church and priory at Kirby Bellars are to be found in the episcopal registers at Lincoln. These, outlined in Chapter 3, are of particular value, since they provide details of the foundations of the chantry, of the collegiate chapel, and of the erection

of the said chapel.\textsuperscript{15}

It would obviously be impossible, within the constraints of this thesis, to consider every aspect of the social, economic and political context within which the architecture could potentially be situated; it would require another type of study altogether. I hope, however, that the architecture explored will offer new routes into considering social and economic life in 14th-century Leicestershire.

ANTiquarian SOURCES

William Camden's\textit{ Britannia}, published in several editions from 1586, makes no useful reference to Leicestershire for the purposes of this study. The three-volume 1789 edition, enlarged by Richard Gough, contains few references to Leicestershire churches other than some descriptions of those within the town of Leicester. For example, writing of St. Mary de Castro, Gough states that:

"The south aisle [sic.] of it was built long before the main fabric, as it is said by John of Gaunt, and is supposed to be as large or broad as any side aisle in England.\textsuperscript{16}

(Although the details of the nave clerestory make it manifestly clear that the south aisle is a \textit{later} addition!) William Burton's\textit{ Description of Leicestershire, containing Matters of Antiquitye, History and Genealogy} of 1622, deals largely, as its title suggests, with families, their heraldry and tombs, providing nothing pertinent to a study of architectural details.\textsuperscript{17} Sir William Dugdale's\textit{ Monasticon Anglicanum}, published in three volumes between 1655 and 1673, whilst it contains little of relevance to the county churches, does offer details of the religious houses of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{17} W. Burton, \textit{A Description of Leicestershire, containing Matters of Antiquitye, Historye and Genealogy}, London: John White, 1622.
\end{itemize}
Leicestershire. The much enlarged, eight volume, edition of 1817 proves to be of some practical value, and I have made use of it where the information was relevant.18 For example, Dugdale notes that there is a survey of the contents at Kirby Bellars, then in the Augmentation Office, to which I shall refer in Chapter 3.19 Along similar lines, and drawing largely from Burton and Dugdale, is Tanner's *Notitia Monastica*, of 1695, with a second edition published by his brother in 1744.20 Again, its usefulness for this study is strictly limited.

In 1791, J. Throsby published his *Select Views in Leicestershire from Original Drawings, containing Seats of the Nobility and Gentry, Town Views and Ruins, Accompanied with Descriptive and Historical Relations.*21 Volume I contains seven plates of small vignettes of churches which are, unfortunately, untitled, and, where they can be identified, depressingly inaccurate.22 However, another section in Volume II, *The Supplementary Volume to the Leicestershire Views. A Series of Excursions in the Year 1790* is of more relevance.23 Although church architecture finds little discussion - usually we read no more than that such and such churches contain three aisles and two bells - there is a concentration on tombs, memorials and stained glass, such as was typical of 17th- and 18th- century antiquarian writers. There is also frequent mention of 'Catholic relics', namely, of piscinae, image niches, etc. Occasionally, Throsby offers specific detail; for example, he speaks of the nave at Eaton as being 'supported by Saxon arches', reminding us that he is writing before the classifications of the early 19th century.24 He is obviously attracted by the fine tower arch at Enderby, (which will be discussed in Chapter 10) says:

22 ibid, pp. 327-351.
24 ibid, p.165.
"...at the West end of it [the church] is a fine Gothic arch, supported by fluted pillars; the capitals adorned with vine leaves; the arch is decorated with figures of heads and the brute species."  

The first really valuable publication, however, one already referred to in my Introduction, is John Nichols's *The History and Antiquities of the County of Leicestershire*, published in eight volumes between 1795 and 1815. The illustrations of windows, mainly by Schnebbelie, but with contributions from Pridden, Glover and others, have proved remarkably accurate when compared with existing tracery details. Schnebbelie was one of a talented group of artists to have been employed by the Society of Antiquaries, at the recommendation of Richard Gough, whose 1789 edition of Camden's *Britannia* had been published by Nichols.  

Nichols provides simple descriptions of all the county churches, which today reveal that, in many cases, little has changed apart from the addition of some vestries, whilst in other instances there has been radical rebuilding, often of chancels. He gives no detailed architectural descriptions, since he was writing before the era of the 19th-century categorisations, but occasionally, he gives specific details of features, such as the triple sedilia in the chancel of St. Mary de Castro, or of the font at Knossington.  

Of the 19th-century works, Volume IX of John Britton's *The Beauties of England and Wales: or Delineations, Topographical, Historical and Descriptive*, contains some rather random observations on a few churches. As with previous writers, Britton gives no detailed descriptions, his architectural vocabulary still being rather unsophisticated, although he observes certain features, as, when writing of Hallaton, he says:

"In the chancel are three seats, gradually rising one above another; and in the south aisle are three others, of different shaped arches and ornaments."²⁹

He also makes such general observations as the fact that: "[...] the five hamlets of Burton Lazars, Eye Kettleby, Freeby, Sysonby and Welby are dependent on the town [Melton]."³⁰

John Flower's *Views of Ancient Buildings in the Town and County of Leicester*, which draws much from Burton and Nichols, serves only to remind us of how successive writers used to plagiarise earlier works.³¹ *A Topographical History of the County of Leicester*, (1831) compiled by the Reverend John Curtis, is based mainly on the Domesday survey, and discusses manors and advowsons. Whilst it contains no architectural references relevant to this thesis, it is a valuable source reader in that Curtis claims to have researched everything relating to Leicestershire parishes, from the Conquest onwards, and cites eleven primary sources from which he has drawn information.³² Burton Lazars is the sole Leicestershire church described by the Brandon brothers. Accompanied by a ground plan, two engravings and the principal dimensions, the terms, 'Romanesque', 'Norman' and 'Decorated' are used, indicating that by the 1840s, amongst architects, at least, such terminology was becoming accepted.³³ William White's *History, Gazetteer and Directory of the Counties of Leicester and Rutland*, published in 1877, is noteworthy in that the nomenclature of

²⁹ ibid, p.438.
³⁰ J. Britton, p.49.
³³ R. and J. A. Brandon, *Parish Churches: Being Perspective Views of English Ecclesiastical Structures*, London: George Bell, 1848, pp.111-112. One of the brothers, Raphael, was the architect responsible for several ecclesiastical works in Leicestershire, notably the tower and spire of Leicester Cathedral, 1861-2; the rebuilding of Humberstone church, 1875-8, with restoration work at Little Dalby church, 1851-2.
architectural styles has, by his time, become part of an accepted vocabulary.\textsuperscript{34} Writing on Arnesby, he uses the terms 'Norman, Early Pointed, Early Decorated and Perpendicular'.\textsuperscript{35}

**RECENT SECONDARY LITERATURE**

Of 20th-century publications, Charles Billson's *Mediaeval Leicester* (1920) records the twelve demolished churches and chapels in the town of Leicester, namely: St. Clement; St. Peter; St. Michael; Grey Friars; The Annunciation; the Chapel of St. John's Hospital; the Chapel of Wigston's Hospital; St. Leonard; St. Sepulchre; the chapel on the West bridge; St. John, Belgravegate, and Leicester Abbey.\textsuperscript{36} The accounts record advowsons, grants of land and tombs, but provide no information on the physical architecture of these churches.

Architectural sources relevant to this thesis date mainly to the 20th century, although reference will be made to Rickman's *An Attempt to Discriminate the Styles of Gothic Architecture*, first published in 1817.\textsuperscript{37} Its significance and relevance to this thesis will be made clear in Chapter 2. (Likewise, 19th-century articles will also be referred to in the relevant chapters.)

The *Victoria County History of Leicestershire* still remains incomplete, with five volumes published since 1907. For the purposes of this thesis, *Ecclesiastical History* in Vol.I. *Religious Houses*, and *Agrarian History* in Vol.II. and *Roads* in Vol.III, are relevant; also *Gartree Hundred* in Vol.V, which is the only Hundred of which details

\textsuperscript{35} ibid, p.124

Billson notes that: "The fine screen of oak [in Wigston's Hospital chapel] had been taken away during the early nineteenth century "restorations" and was put up in that year 1810 in Ockbrook Church near Derby." p.87.
of churches have been published. The scholarly approach to the churches is very different from that of the 18th and 19th centuries, and results from sound architectural and archaeological research of the type which this thesis also espouses. However, almost without exception, dates are not ascribed to any work before the 1600s - a reminder of the difficulty of finding documentation for mediaeval village churches, together with the fact that typology is not necessarily a guide to chronology, an important fact to be discussed in later chapters of this thesis. Instead, in the architectural analyses of churches in the Gartree Hundred, the terms '13th century' or '14th century' are regularly used in describing towers, naves, arcades, fenestration, etc.

The various volumes of Pevsner's The Buildings of England series are valuable resources, not least because of the sections on architecture in their Introductions, but also because of the analysis of each church within the main texts. Particular reference has been made to the volume on Leicestershire and Rutland, first published in 1960, with a second edition of 1984 revised in 1992 where, illustrating my point, when writing on piers in their Introduction, the authors give such detailed information as:

"In more than a dozen cases, following the pattern set at St. Mary, Leicester and led by the major churches of Melton Mowbray and Loughborough, octagonal piers are replaced by quatrefoil piers. At Thurmaston octagonal and quatrefoil piers alternate. There are various enrichments of the quatrefoil section, and these also follow E.E. [Early English] precedent: the deep hollows between the four lobes are not separated by angles or ridges from them (Eastwell,

Frisby), thinner shafts added in the diagonals (cf. E.E. above), fillets, keeling, etc.)

All these elements will be examined in Chapter 10.

Numerous articles on individual Leicestershire churches have appeared in the publications of the *Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological Society (T.L.A.S.*) and the subsequent (from 1955) *Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society (T.L.A.H.S.*) to which I shall make reference in later chapters. Occasionally, early articles on an individual church are supplemented by more recent research, as, for example, those on Gaddesby church.

As has been noted in the discussion on the Victoria County History and of Pevsner, the 20th-century publications, whilst using the nomenclature introduced during the previous century, reflect a more academic approach to the architecture of the churches which they discuss, and help to establish where major Victorian restoration or rebuilding has occurred. Of these, some of the more recent work has been carried out under the editorship of David Parsons and Geoffrey Brandwood, published by the Department of Adult Education at the University of Leicester, together with Brandwood's work, published by the Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society, and noted in my Introduction. This latter work is of particular value in summarising details of restoration works at the the majority of churches included in this survey.

Monographic approaches to individual churches range from A. J. Collett's
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Further reference to the latter paper will appear in the case studies in Chapter 3.
substantial guide to the church at Stoke Golding,\textsuperscript{43} to the church guides usually published to satisfy mainly local interest. Such guides would be more informative had many of their authors researched earlier sources, as did Collett, who drew some of his information from the work of John Weale.\textsuperscript{44} In total, ninety-five guides were personally purchased in the churches visited, but they are of varying substance and scholarship. Even recent extensive publications such as that on Melton Mowbray parish church, which is primarily a picture book of the Victorian stained glass windows, offers little historical insight.\textsuperscript{45} Since many church guides exclude details of authors and publication, and do not always cite their sources, they are acknowledged here, although all but the more substantial works are omitted from the Bibliography.

Several essays, papers and theses published in recent years have been relevant and helpful to this thesis, since they deal with aspects of Decorated architecture ranging from mouldings to ball-flower ornament, and from masons to working practices and influences. Of these, Eileen Roberts, writing on mouldings, has produced valuable diagrams showing the main moulding elements, and how some of them may be combined.\textsuperscript{46} This combination of elements from a general vocabulary of basic forms is pertinent to the present study, and poses questions about possible dating and authorship. Although her study deals mainly with Perpendicular mouldings in Hertfordshire, it is interesting to note that elements of some of these are present in those that I have drawn of the Wreake valley churches which are clearly not all Perpendicular churches. Richard Morris has published two substantial papers on mouldings, in the first of which he categorises five main moulding types. These are

reduced to several sub-groups spread over nine areas of the country, of which the Midlands are only lightly covered.\textsuperscript{47} In his second paper, Morris deals specifically with mullions, ribs, capitals and bases, and as he states: "This section is concerned primarily with the appearance of profiles which subsequently became common in the Perpendicular period."\textsuperscript{48} The word 'subsequently' is of significance for this present study of some Leicestershire mouldings, as will be demonstrated in Chapters, 3, 7, 8 and 9. Morris claims that his papers are no more, "... than a preliminary survey, ..."\textsuperscript{49} but, used in conjunction with that by Eileen Roberts, they have proved a valuable aid to research into Leicestershire mouldings. Richard Fawcett's unpublished thesis provides useful information on mouldings when dealing with some mediaeval architects working in Norfolk, whilst his publication on Sutton in the Isle of Ely, has also been helpful for my discussion on mouldings and window tracery.\textsuperscript{50} Further works by Morris which discuss mouldings, masons and working practices include \textit{Mouldings and the Analysis of Medieval Style},\textsuperscript{51} together with several works relating to Decorated architecture in Herefordshire.\textsuperscript{52} These, whilst not providing a template for the present thesis, have certainly provided a stimulus to produce a detailed architectural analysis for the churches of a single period within a single county.

Dealing more specifically with masons and architects and their work, numerous publications have been consulted. John Harvey's paper on "The Education
of the Mediaeval Architect", attempts to determine how master masons and carpenters were recruited, although his findings are restricted mainly to the major names, such as the Ramseys, the Hurlands and Yevele.53 Two works by Knoop and Jones examine the mediaeval mason, his status, conditions of employment and organisation of work. In the latter work, the authors quote illustrative documents in their second Appendix. These, however, illustrate once again the difficulty of documenting research, only two examples of which fall within the dates of my study period.54

L.R.Shelby has published two papers on masons, the second of which deals specifically with templates.55 In the latter paper, Shelby describes the modern methods of producing templates and posits that the procedure was the same for mediaeval masons. I shall challenge this argument when dealing with arcades in Chapter 10.

Veronica Sekules' paper on a local school of masons in Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire, in which she discusses sculpture in particular, seeks the authorship of churches. She posits: "Is it patron or rector, mason, or architect?" She affirms that no information is available from documents, and that deductions have to be made from a study of the buildings and "from information about benefactors and incumbents."56 The difficulty of finding primary evidence relating to small 14th-century village churches, particularly those devoid of mediaeval glass and tombs, remains considerable when compared with the material available for the research of 15th-century churches. Even where 15th-century glass, heraldry and tombs are in

place, there still remains much supposition.\textsuperscript{57} In her later thesis, Sekules discusses Heckington in which she makes comparisons with Sleaford and Newark and discusses patrons, 1189-1349; secular Lords, 1298-1340; benefactors of windows and Richard de Potesgrove, principal benefactor, rector and royal official.\textsuperscript{58} For primary evidence, she draws from the episcopal registers of Lincoln between 1299 and 1362, rather than from the Calendars of Close Rolls and Patent Rolls, and we remember that at Heckington, one is dealing with a church of national importance. In my case studies of the Wreake valley churches, the episcopal registers revealed information on the former Augustinian site at Kirby Bellars, the relevance of which will become apparent in Chapter 3, but they revealed nothing on architectural detail; moreover, the constraints on time and content would have made it impossible to have researched patrons, benefactors or priests, covering such a major survey.

Other publications on masons and building practices, to some of which I shall make further reference, have included those by L. F. Salzman, who deals with the organisation, regulation and wages of masons in his first four chapters;\textsuperscript{59} John Harvey, who discusses drawings, mouldings, theory and techniques;\textsuperscript{60} W. D. Wilson, who also discusses the Heckington Lodge of Masons;\textsuperscript{61} Alec Clifton-Taylor, who gives valuable information on the different types of masons, their tools and masons' marks;\textsuperscript{62} and Nicola Coldstream, who uses many illustrations from mediaeval manuscripts to depict building practices, for example, the thatching of unfinished

walls during winter.63

In addition to these publications on mediaeval builders and their techniques, some papers dealing with individual buildings outside Leicestershire, contain material pertinent to this thesis, include those on Ely, Wells, Lincoln, Patrington, London, (Old St. Paul's), Lichfield and Salisbury, including subjects ranging from polygonal forms to window tracery. (the relevance of these will become apparent in the main text).64

Other publications deal with particular aspects of Decorated architecture, of which, the most illuminating have been Nicola Coldstream's work on the Eleanor Crosses, Phillip Lindley's essays on Bishop de Luda's tomb at Ely and 14th-century work at Ely, and two works on Easter Sepulchres.65

This brings us to general publications on Decorated architecture. Some have provided material for discussion on nomenclature which I shall challenge in Chapter 2. Others deal with such varied topics as the functions of different architectural elements, and the micro-architecture of the Decorated style, all of which have a


bearing upon this thesis. Since the word 'style' appears regularly in this thesis, it is appropriate to consider what is meant by the term as used in an architectural context. It is the combination of features of artistic expression, thus, the ogee, crockets, flowing tracery and particular mouldings all contribute to what is known as the Decorated 'style'.

Geoffrey Webb in *Architecture in Britain: The Middle Ages*, published in 1965, has much to say about Westminster, its influence from French antecedents and contemporaries, and its decorative consequences, before discussing the 'Court Style'. The latter he characterises as the earliest phase of *Rayonnant* French Gothic, associated with Louis IX (1227 - 1270), most notably the Sainte Chapelle in Paris (1243 - 1248). It was, in his view, transmitted into England in the 1240s where elements appeared in Henry III's rebuilding of Westminster Abbey. Just how much English Gothic was influenced by *Rayonnant* is contentious, and will be discussed in the next chapter. Nowhere does Webb use the terms 'Rayonnant', 'Geometric' or 'Decorated', preferring instead, to cite dates where relevant.66 That the Sainte Chapelle was intrinsic to the formation of the Court Style, is clearly set out by Robert Branner,67 although he has little to say on its influence in England other than to refer to Westminster, Old St. Paul's and St. Stephen's Chapel, which comments are, however, pertinent to this thesis.68 Howard Colvin considers that the concept of a "Court Style" is: "... ill-defined and requires careful handling if it is not to degenerate into a mere cliche devoid of any real historical validity."69

Of more recent substantial works, Jean Bony's *The English Decorated Style*,

published in 1979, sets out the French Rayonnant system and its impact, particularly at Westminster and York. He views the English reaction as limited in accepting Rayonnant mainly as: "...a mixed package of recent Continental formulas." \(^{70}\)

He describes the chief features of Rayonnant as being the large windows, which, because of their size: "...destroyed the world of small-scale units which for the English was synonymous with the very concept of Gothicness." \(^{71}\) Bony discusses the Court Style in London and its transmission to the provinces, before dealing with the introduction of the ogee and the Decorated vocabulary in general, with particular reference to polygonal forms. He provides a substantial chapter on vaulting patterns, and ends his work by establishing the place of the Decorated style within the history of Gothic architecture. Throughout, Bony uses the term 'Rayonnant' extensively and refers to late-Decorated as 'Curvilinear'; nowhere does he use the term 'Geometric' for Decorated, other than to quote E. S. Prior (whose writing I shall discuss in Chapter 2). Instead, he prefers to talk of a 'first wave' of Decorated which is pre-ogee, and a 'second wave' which includes ogee and Curvilinear, (and which of course, leads back into the French Flamboyant Style).

Christopher Wilson's 1979 thesis on the origins of the Perpendicular style might seem to have little relevance to the present thesis; however, he establishes that many of the elements of Perpendicular architecture were in place well before 1360, and were derived directly from Decorated architecture. \(^{72}\) Wilson's book, *The Gothic Cathedral*, published in 1990, covers a much broader field than does Bony. He begins with the development of Gothic from Romanesque antecedents, with particular emphasis on Gothic in England. He reminds the reader that the Canterbury choir, of 1175-84, was a
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short-lived association with French Gothic, after which, Early English architecture followed a 'national' course, as exemplified by Wells, c.1180, Lincoln choir, 1192, and Salisbury, 1220, whilst the French influence was not to be re-introduced until Westminster in the late 1240s.73

In his Chapter 2, Wilson discusses the Rayonnant style and its application in France and Germany, before moving on to its effects in England, as expressed at Westminster, London, Exeter and York. He states that there was a steady increase in the employment of Rayonnant motifs, but that: "...their borrowings were virtually confined to tracery patterns and moulding profiles." He suggests that the Westminster Chapter House and York nave were less: "...an all-embracing architectural system than a repository of novel motifs."75 Nowhere does Wilson use the term 'Geometric', which might well have applied at Westminster and Lincoln. He discusses both Decorated and Perpendicular architecture, before dealing with the architecture of Central Europe, the Low Countries, France, Italy and Spain. Wilson's work is the most broadly European of the major sources studied, and, therefore, devotes rather less attention to English 14th-century architecture than does Bony. Both works deal exclusively with major churches.

Nicola Coldstream's book of 1994, The Decorated Style. Architecture and Ornament 1240-1360, complements those of Bony and Wilson, by dealing with every aspect of Decorated architecture and ornament, setting them within a social context. She discusses some of the misconceptions that have made an understanding of Decorated difficult, and states that:

"Although the Decorated style does not readily submit to any single scholarly category, it does make sense if it is examined from many

74 ibid, p.185.
75 Wilson, Gothic Cathedral, p.187.
points of view. Decorated buildings developed in response to the social, spiritual and intellectual preoccupations of the people who used them."76

With this in mind, Coldstream examines all of these aspects, imagery, relics, tombs, cults, heraldry and patrons, so that the reader is given much more than an architectural analysis. She does, however, suggest points that will need to be challenged, as, for example: "The Decorated period begins with Westminster Abbey."77 Her Chapter 2 is the main 'architectural' chapter in that it attempts to define the term 'Decorated' by establishing a more suitable nomenclature for the period of study, after examining the various terms in current use. The term 'Rayonnant', for example, does not appear until the Epilogue of Coldstream's book, where it is introduced by the statement that:

"Modern scholars [Coldstream does not say who] broadly define the court style as the strand that most consistently and closely reflected the influence of the French Rayonnant, particularly in the debt of Westminster Abbey to the Sainte-Chapelle."78

She discusses Westminster Abbey and the 'Court Style', with the point made that Rayonnant was not the exclusive preserve of the court. Rayonnant examples, such as Old St. Paul's and York Minster, she contends, owed nothing to court patronage, and it was ultimately through imagery rather than through architecture that the: "...courtly aspects of royal patronage were expressed."79 Coldstream reminds the reader that many patrons of the Decorated style were clerical rather than royal, and cites numerous examples. The style, she opines: "... was not the expression of kingly

77 ibid, p.23.
78 Coldstream, The Decorated Style, p.187.
79 ibid, p.191.
magnificence. It was the expression of religious devotion.\textsuperscript{80} The relevance of these three books will become apparent in the next chapter.

Paul Frankl, whose work \textit{Gothic Architecture} was revised by Paul Crossley in 2000, makes no reference to 'Geometric' or 'Decorated', but uses the term 'Curvilinear' and 'Rectilinear', the latter referring to Perpendicular.\textsuperscript{81} Frankl prefers to consider both of his terms as 'Late Gothic', which, he suggests, commenced with the tierceron ribs of the Wells Chapter House, begun in 1298.\textsuperscript{82} He claims that Perpendicular was created in 1292, the same year as Curvilinear, since both forms were present in St. Stephen's Chapel, Westminster.\textsuperscript{83}

Arnold Pacey's recent work, \textit{Medieval Architectural Drawing}, published in 2007, should also be mentioned.\textsuperscript{84} Although three of the chapters deal with carpenters, their drawings and marks, and the final four chapters post-date 1450, there are important and highly relevant chapters that deal with early architectural drawings, geometry, masons, carvers and their drawings for mouldings, sculpture and tracery. Some of Pacey's comments on masons' marks, templates and drawings are cited in the appropriate chapters of this thesis. In this review, it is sufficient to state that, apart from surviving evidence on tracing floors, most of the drawings are to be found on wall surfaces, as, for example, the Galilee porch at Ely, at Byland Abbey, in York and at Ashwell church in Hertfordshire. Pacey gives a comprehensive list of sites in his Appendix.

Finally, I shall cite some of the sources relevant to the architectural context of the liturgy and its performance; to the mediaeval attitude towards death and the life

\textsuperscript{80} ibid, p.192.
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\textsuperscript{83} ibid, pp.193-194.
hereafter, and to popular beliefs and the importance of imagery - all issues that need to be addressed as part of an understanding of the Decorated style.

Whilst Addleshaw and Etchells write mainly of the post-Reformation English Church, I shall refer to their opening section on *Pre-Reformation Church Interiors*.\(^{85}\) W. A. Pantin devotes the third part of his book on the 14th-century English Church to literature of the period.\(^{86}\) *The Use of Sarum* and *The Rites of Durham* provide helpful information on the liturgy and its application.\(^{87}\) Miri Rubin provides a comprehensive survey of Corpus Christi, the history of the Feast and its Eucharistic interpretations.\(^{88}\) Joseph Lynch devotes a chapter to the Sacramental life, the architectural context of which is addressed in this thesis.\(^{89}\) Allan Doig's *Liturgy and Architecture* closes with a chapter dealing with Gothic architecture as a context for the performance of the Latin liturgy.\(^{90}\)

Dealing with mediaeval attitudes towards imagery, various studies published between 1955 and 2004 have been informative, and will be referred to in the relevant chapters of this thesis.\(^{91}\) A single volume on Exeter Cathedral, which contains sections on Decorated Gothic architecture, on Furnishings and on Music and Ceremony, has also provided useful material relevant to this thesis.\(^{92}\)
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CHAPTER 2 - DEFINING THE DECORATED STYLE
CHAPTER 2

DEFINING THE DECORATED STYLE

INTRODUCTION

The rationale for this chapter is to examine the term 'Decorated', as applied to Leicestershire church architecture, in the context of the existing literary definition of the style. This is in order to determine whether the term may be applied usefully to the whole of the period c.1260 - c.1350, and to examine how the style evolved and when. To do this, I shall first examine the pertinent literature of the late 18th century, when there was obvious confusion in the minds of many writers as to how best to describe English architecture of the 10th to the 16th centuries. Moving on to the 19th century, I shall set out the first serious attempts at classification and the discussion, before considering more recent debate. This will lead to an appraisal of some specific buildings, most of which are major churches, although these contain basic elements which are to be found in many Leicestershire churches. The chapter will close with comment on the Court Style and patronage.

A general dissatisfaction with discussion of church architecture was apparent towards the end of the 18th century, when writers first began to press for a clear classification of English church architecture to end the existing confusion of terms. Until then, the term 'Saxon' was applied to anything which did not have a pointed arch, whilst 'Norman' was often used to describe what
would now be thought of as Gothic. As an example, I have already referred in the previous chapter to Throsby's comment about "Saxon arches" in the nave at Eaton. It is quite possible that he had read Nichols, who uses the same description of the three-bay arcades, but which are actually Transitional work of c.1180. Thomas Cocke reminds the reader that some 18th-century architects had little appreciation of what we now consider to be correct historical terminology, when he refers to James Essex's restoration at Ely, commenced in the late 1750s. He cites Essex's comment on the west tower as being: "[...] a very beautiful part of the Saxon tower rich in columns and Arches clearly intended to be seen."

In 1802, the problem was summarised by the Reverend John Milner: "[...] some ingenious and respectable writers of the present day, by way of exploding the term Gothic, make use of the word Norman, to signify the pointed style." 'Exploding', in this sense, suggests an attempt to classify the huge span of architecture that came between the end of the Western Roman Empire and the introduction by Inigo Jones, of Classical architecture into 17th-century England; everything, in fact, that had been considered barbaric, or 'Gothic', by the cognoscenti of the 18th-century Enlightenment, who had seen Burlington, Kent and the Palladians as the promoters of 'true' architecture. It was only from the middle of that century, the era of Walpole and 'Strawberry Hill', that interest developed in mediaevalism and the Gothic.

That writers were pressing for some clarification of nomenclature, is evident from such comments as those by Joseph Halfpenny, who, writing in 1800, says:

93 J. Throsby, Select Views, pp.327-351.
"The History of Gothic Architecture, in this Kingdom, being now undertaken by Gentlemen perfectly qualified for this investigation, the Public may hope, before long, to have its Principles as well understood as those of the Grecian. This will restore Gothic Architecture to that estimation to which it has so just a title."97

Among these ‘qualified’ writers was John Britton, who began to publish his The Architectural Antiquities of Great Britain from 1807, a complete five-volume edition appearing in 1835.98 Other writers made use of his attempt to classify the styles of Gothic into 1, Anglo-Saxon; 2, Norman; 3, Early English; 4, Ornamented English; and 5, Florid English.99

Various attempts had, therefore, been made by the early 19th century writers, but so far, they had not addressed the problems of nomenclature in a completely satisfactory manner. Pevsner comments that:

"These English publications of the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth century are without exception minor in scale and value, but in the aggregate they are significant ...."100

The architect, Thomas Rickman, established the nomenclatures that have remained the defining terminology of English Gothic architecture, in his work which ran through seven editions between 1817 and 1881.101 His An Attempt to Discriminate the Styles of Architecture in England, clearly describes doors, windows, arches, piers, buttresses, steeples, etc., for Early English, Decorated and Perpendicular Gothic.102

97 J. Halfpenny, Gothic Ornaments in the Cathedral Church of York, Privately printed, 1795.
99 G. Millers, A Description of the Cathedral Church of Ely, London: John White, 1808, p.17
101 ibid, pp. 28-29.
His arguments were soon challenged by later authors. Edmund Sharpe observed of Rickman's nomenclature:

"... had Mr. Rickman gone a step further and classed the whole of the buildings of pointed architecture, according to the forms of their windows, under four heads instead of three, he would have obtained a classification equally simple but more intelligible and consistent: he would have obviated much that is confused and indefinite."\(^{103}\)

In characterising the windows of the English Gothic period, Sharpe advocated four stages:

"We have 1st, those in which the lancet window only appears;
2ndly, those which contain windows having simple geometrical tracery; 3rdly, those which have windows of flowing tracery; and 4thly, those in which the leading lines of the window tracery are vertical and horizontal."\(^{104}\)

What is important, is that the general use of Rickman's term 'Decorated' embraces both Sharpe's 'geometrical' and 'flowing'. Sharpe proposed an alternative terminology to that of Rickman, namely, Lancet, Geometrical, Curvilinear and Rectilinear, for which he suggested approximate dates of commencement as 1190, 1245, 1315 and 1360 respectively.\(^{105}\) J.H.Parker supported Sharpe's consideration with clear descriptions of the evolution of window design. His study of the bar tracery of Westminster Abbey is critical for this present discussion, and his observations linking the introduction of bar tracery with the beginnings of the Decorated style will be re-
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examined later in this chapter.\textsuperscript{106} Having suggested an approximate date for the inception of Geometrical tracery, Sharpe notes the dedication of the high altar in the chapel of Merton College, Oxford in 1277. He observes that:

“"The date thus verified is of considerable interest and importance, being one of the turning points in the history of Architecture in this country. [...] The building [Merton College Chapel] is in the early Decorated style, with Geometrical tracery in the windows, which is commonly said to have been introduced into England after the commencement of the fourteenth century, although examples are known on the continent twenty or thirty years earlier. It now appears certain that it was adopted in England in the very beginning of the reign of Edward I [1272], and was therefore \textit{contemporaneous} with the erection of similar buildings in other parts of Europe."\textsuperscript{107}

Edward Prior, in 1905, includes assessments of both Rickman and Sharpe, highlighting their inconsistencies, particularly relating to both the terminology and chronology advanced by Rickman. Although he also questions the methodology by which Sharpe arrives at his classifications, Prior does consider the resulting terminology to be the more appropriate.\textsuperscript{108} Whether one agrees or disagrees with him, Prior does remind us that some fifty years after its introduction, Rickman’s terminology was still being challenged, and that the four-fold classification advanced by Sharpe was, he thought, to be preferred to Rickman's three-fold system. What is not in doubt is the fact that the general use of the term 'Decorated' has elided the clear distinction between 'geometrical' and 'flowing' or 'curvilinear'.

Since Prior’s publication there have been numerous other considerations of Decorated architecture, usually as part of a wider discourse on Gothic Architecture or English cathedrals. Of these, Christopher Wilson, in his book *The Gothic Cathedral*, 1992, suggests that the Decorated style applies between c.1300 and 1350, and that the ‘microarchitecture’ of the style was triggered by the English exposure to the French *Rayonnant*. This released the canopy-enriched details of French portal sculpture and flying buttresses, to appear in England as internal elevations, such as the stalls in the York Chapter House (which, in turn, led to the nodding ogee stalls of the Ely Lady Chapel and the north porch of St. Mary, Redcliffe), and where it was also to be seen in the Eleanor Crosses and in the details of St. Stephen's Chapel, Westminster.109

In stating that the Decorated style commenced c.1300, we may ask, how does Wilson deal with the years between the close of the Early English style, c.1260 and 1300? For this period, he devotes a section to the *Rayonnant* style in England, writing at some length on Westminster Abbey, but also discussing Lincoln, Exeter and York. Nowhere during this period does he use the term ‘Geometric’.110 Of the distinguishing features of Rayonnant, Wilson describes the use of graduated mullions and tracery in multi-light windows, where the size and complexity of mouldings vary according to the size of the unit within the window. In addition to increasing window size, in which bar tracery replaces plate tracery, where the window head was opened out into a series of cusped circles (a form of significance for my later discussion on Geometric), other features included increasing verticality and thinner vaulting ribs which could be more easily assimilated into the lateral elevations. Wilson cites the

110  ibid, pp.178 - 188.
mid 13th-century rebuilding of Suger's St. Denis as the seminal work, and Cologne Cathedral, begun in 1248, as the finest example of a Rayonnant church.\footnote{111}

Paul Frankl's \textit{Gothic Architecture}, revised by Paul Crossley in 2000, devotes a section to \textit{Curvilinear} and \textit{Rectilinear}, making reference to the Eleanor Crosses and St Stephen's Chapel. Frankl does not use the term 'Rayonnant' in his references to English Gothic, although the implication is there when he refers to the ogee forms in the Eleanor Crosses of the 1290s. These had first appeared, according to Frankl, at St. Urbain at Troyes, in 1262, itself a Rayonnant building. The fact that he does not use the term 'Geometric', but, acknowledges Sharpe, when he talks of the Curvilinear, seems to reflect an on-going instability of the terminology.\footnote{112} Whilst Crossley makes no reference to these points in his introductory commentary, perhaps his most valuable contribution is to be found within the 68 pages of comprehensive end-notes, which complement so much of Frankl's text.

The two most recent major works which are focussed on this particular discussion are Jean Bony's \textit{The English Decorated Style, Gothic Architecture Transformed, 1250-1350}, and \textit{The Decorated Style: Architecture and Ornament, 1240-1360} by Nicola Coldstream. The difference in their terminal dates may, again, indicate the elusiveness of Decorated terminology. Bony's significance for this study lies primarily in his understanding of the beginnings of that style:

```
“In the last quarter of the thirteenth century the course of Gothic architecture was altered within a few decades by a shift in artistic inventiveness that transferred the position of leadership from northern France, which had held it for generations, to England. [...] What
```
triggered that cycle of invention is in itself no mystery; as is well recognized, it all began with the impact on England of that most novel form of Continental Gothic which swept across Europe in the 1240s and 1250s, the ‘Rayonnant’ Style. Even the ambiguity of the concept of ‘Decorated’, which is made to cover two different formal vocabularies - first Geometrical, then Curvilinear - only underlines the fact that what is called Decorated denotes everything that developed in direct response to the introduction into England of Rayonnant forms."^{113}

Bony has acknowledged the potential importance of the Geometrical form in including it as a fundamental part of the Decorated vocabulary (although in a later chapter he would come to refer to Geometrical as “… the proto-Decorated of Northamptonshire…,” thus adding further to the confusion over terminology).^{114}

Bony's analysis of Rayonnant forms compares the rebuilding of the nave and transepts at St. Denis with the earlier work at Amiens, noting a marked increase of window to wall ratio and a reduction of pier diameters. This was an important development which he was able to demonstrate as being repeated in England:

“When it made its first appearance, soon after 1245, at Westminster Abbey, the Rayonnant did not arrive in a massive form as a complete vocabulary, but only as a collection of separate items in a mixed package of recent Continental formulas. [...] for the English, the true revelation had come from nothing more than the simplest and most obvious motif of the Rayonnant Style, the large traceried window.”^{115}

He thought it was, however, a gradual introduction. For example, the fenestration of

---

113  Bony, p.1.
114  ibid, p.9.
115  Bony, pp.2-3.
the French derived plan of the choir and chevet of Henry III’s work at Westminster, 1245 – c.1259, included the motifs of single heads with cusped roundels and paired lancets. The chapter house, c.1246 - 1250, with its large windows comprised two sets of paired lancets and cusped roundels beneath a single head, thus clearly aligning with Bony’s observations in relation to St. Denis.

In summary, although there have been many useful discourses published by a wide variety of authors on terminology and descriptions of the Decorated style, one of the unresolved aspects includes the point at which a new style can be deemed to be established, rather than the transitional period during which it is formulated. Indeed, not all writers would appear to acknowledge periods of transition, yet, just as there was a Saxo-Norman overlap in the 11th century, and a Transitional period between Norman and Early English, towards the end of the 12th century, so there was a major transition from Early English to Decorated in the last decades of the 13th century. This transition did not receive full scholarly attention until 1936. In his book, *Mediaeval Styles of the English Parish Church*, F. E. Howard devotes a chapter to the transition from Early English to Decorated. He gives no dates, but suggests that this transition extended from approximately the middle until almost the end of the 13th century. Whilst he does not use the term 'Geometrical', he discusses the geometrical form of windows and refers to geometrical tracery.116

Whilst Rickman had proposed that Early English extended from 1189 to 1307, and that Decorated extended from 1307 to 1377,117 Prior had challenged this, suggesting that:

“… as applied between the 'Early English' and 'Perpendicular' it [Decorated] obtains too wide a stretch. However appropriate after

---
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1290, 'Decorated' has no meaning for what is the real mid-Gothic building, and its use has led to misunderstanding and a confusion of works distinct in date and inspiration.”118

Prior’s comments are of particular interest since they place some of the extant difficulties with both chronology and terminology in their historical context. In other words, for him, 'Decorated' only began c.1290 and the term was inappropriate before then.

Bony, however, places the emergence of the Decorated style at around 1250, and his approach is echoed to a certain degree by Coldstream. While making no reference to either 'Geometric' or 'Curvilinear', she similarly uses the term 'Decorated' to cover an entire period.

“The Decorated style encompassed the period from about halfway through the reign of King Henry III (reg 1216-72), to a similar point in the reign of his great-grandson, Edward III (reg 1327-77).”119

GEOMETRIC

It is time to re-evaluate 'Geometric' and to determine precisely its relevance to the Decorated style. It has been seen that several writers have stressed the importance of the evolution of window design to the definition of the Decorated style, and to help this discussion on re-evaluating Geometric and determining a starting point for Decorated, it is now time to examine a few major buildings in detail.

Salisbury cathedral, begun in 1220 and dedicated in 1258, with the exception of the tower and spire, is sometimes regarded as the perfect essay in Early English Gothic, although Peter Draper suggests convincing reasons for regarding it as an

118    Prior, pp.70-71.
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“architectural maverick.”120 Whilst the main body at Salisbury exhibits the grouped lancets which we have come to associate with Early English fenestration, the cloisters and chapter house, constructed between c.1263 and c.1284, demonstrate a transition, indeed, a ‘Westminster’ influence; the Westminster Chapter House, 1246 - c.1253, is clearly the model for that at Salisbury. The main body of the cathedral comprises paired or triple lights, generally separated by moulded shafts with each light set beneath a separate head. Where the lights are in pairs, as in the aisles, they are of the same height; where they are triple, the central light is taller; there is no decoration in the form of cusps. However, change is apparent at clerestory level in the outer ends of the transepts; the paired lancets are grouped beneath a single head which is now pierced with a quatrefoil, although there are still no cusps within the main lights.121

The fenestration of the cloisters and chapter house has moved a stage further. Four lights are grouped in pairs, each with a quatrefoil roundel, but now the two pairs are grouped beneath a much larger head containing a cinquefoil roundel, and, of key significance to the present discussion, the eyes within the roundels are no longer solid stone but are pierced.122 Here, are we looking at the culmination of Early English Gothic or the nascent Decorated? Acknowledging that these chapter house windows owe something to Westminster's Rayonnant, the evidence suggests that we are looking at something quite different from the Early English work exemplified in the main body of the cathedral. In other words, a clearly defined Geometric style, whether or not we wish to consider it as the transition between Early English and later (Curvilinear) Decorated a Leicestershire example of which, is the fenestration of the south aisle at Stoke Golding (Fig.3/77).

In addition to the separate and grouped Early English lancets and the
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Geometric cloisters and chapter house, at Salisbury, the Decorated tower and spire of c.1330-1350 means that within the same building, we have English Gothic architecture covering a period of 130 years. But what distinguishes the Decorated spire from the Early English main vessel or the Geometric work? There is the introduction of crocketed gables above the windows, as distinct from simple hood-moulds; there is a profusion of panelled, ribbed and crocketed pinnacles, as distinct from the plain ribbed pinnacles of the transepts and west façade, together with richly gabled bands of moulding to delineate the two additional storeys of the tower, and there are three richly moulded bands around the spire. In other words, whilst externally the 13-century works at Westminster and Salisbury clearly delineate the structure, the 14th-century work at Salisbury uses the structure as a stage on which to set lavish decoration (Fig.2.1). Whilst it is obvious that we are looking at a tower, the solid structure takes on the appearance of a light filigree work, and it is equally obvious that we are looking at something very different from the cloisters or chapter house. It seems unacceptable to define these all as 'Decorated'. The tower and spire are, I would argue, to be considered as a distinctly separate style from either Early English or Geometric; they are rightly accepted as Decorated.

At Lincoln, the Angel Choir of c.1256-1280 contrasts with the Early English nave of c.1240-1253. The nave makes use of the Early English delight in colour, by contrasting the dark Purbeck marble shafts in piers, triforium and clerestory, with the lighter ashlar. In addition to this colour, the Angel Choir introduces wall decoration in the form of trefoils in the arcade spandrels, with figurative carving in the triforium spandrels, and, perhaps most important of all, it moves from individual lancets to their grouping beneath circles. It is perhaps because of these details, that the Angel Choir at Lincoln represents a change of style; it reflects an intermediate but important
style from Early English. Again, I suggest that we are looking at neither Early English nor Decorated, but at Geometric. There is not yet flowing tracery, because there is still lavish use of the cusped roundel, but foliated capitals have developed somewhat beyond the stiff-leaf of St. Hugh’s choir of c.1200, and wall surfaces are now decorated with trefoils in the arcade spandrels and figurative sculpture in those of the triforium. Considering other examples, it is simply not possible to embrace the north transept at Hereford, c.1250 - 1268, with the Lady Chapel at Wells, c.1290 - 1320, any more than, in Leicestershire, one can the south aisle fenestration at Stoke Golding of c.1290 (Fig.3/20), with that of the chancel at Claybrooke of c.1340 (Fig.3/22), and refer to them all as 'Decorated'. I would therefore suggest a reclassification and a separation of the Decorated from the Geometrical, regarding the latter as c.1260 - c.1290 and the former as c.1290 - c.1360, accepting of course, that elements of Perpendicular were also appearing from the early 1300s. Typology alone presents a sufficiently strong case for accepting Geometrical as a distinct style that stands between Early English and Decorated.

THE Ogee

The essential difference between the Geometrical and Decorated styles is the move from window tracery alone to the introduction of such architectural features as the gable surmounting an arch, and crucially an arch of ogee form. The cusped circle, which terminated in groups of lancets and locked them together, gave way to the sinuous ogee, which opened the entire window to such flowing forms as mouchettes whilst reducing the lancets to a subordinate element of the whole. Whilst the cusped circle could not be used in the heads of piscinae or sedilia, the ogee, and in many
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cases the nodding ogee was ideal for such furnishing as well as for other micro-architecture such as image niches. Often these features were embellished with crockets, and the wall recesses in the Ely Lady Chapel (1321 - 1349) provide a perfect text-book of Decorated motifs. Such features, if on a more modest level, occur frequently at parish church level in Leicestershire. Bony states that,

“This new kind of curve [the ogee] was obviously the latest and most daring refinement of the Court Style in the early 1290s; and since the ogee was soon to become the point of departure for a whole cycle of stylistic developments, which marked a second stage - and the most radically novel - in the history of the Decorated Style, it is necessary to consider now the question of its origins [- -].” 125

If the ogee curve heralded new forms in architecture, what it replaced was also significant, as has been seen at Salisbury and Lincoln. I would suggest that, apart from the nave at York, 1291-1360, by the early 14th century, the Decorated style owed little to the Rayonnant. It had moved away from the Geometric, which was in fact the direct response to the Rayonnant, and developed with increasing vigour so that elements returned to France to influence the Flamboyant.

THE COURT STYLE

Numerous writers refer to a 'Court Style', and it is important to establish an understanding of this term in relation to a definition of 'Decorated'. Certain key buildings were commissioned by different monarchs, for example the rebuilding of the eastern limb of Westminster Abbey by Henry III; St. Stephen's Chapel, Westminster, and the Welsh castles by Edward I. All of these works are documented

125 Bony, p.23.
to the extent that, in most cases, we know the names of master masons and have building accounts. These all exhibit similar features of detail rather than structure. They include the change from plate tracery to bar tracery, in which the complete window head is opened out by means of cusped circles, with 'eyes' in the interstices. Such details may be found in two-light windows, as in the Westminster clerestory, and in large eight-light windows, as in the east window of the Lincoln Angel Choir. What is relevant to the present discussion is first, what were the influences that produced a recognizable Court Style, if indeed, such a thing existed? Second, did that Court Style permeate into other major buildings? And finally, was there an influence that was passed on from these into Leicestershire churches?

Nicola Coldstream states that:

"Modern scholars broadly define the court style as the strand that most consistently and closely reflected the influence of the French Rayonnant, particularly in the debt of Westminster Abbey to the Sainte-Chapelle, in Edward I's works of the 1290s [the Eleanor Crosses], and through St. Stephen's chapel, the proto-Perpendicular choir of Gloucester. In France, Rayonnant has been closely associated with the personal patronage of Louis IX [the Sainte-Chapelle], and as such regarded as the French court style. This naturally enhances the courtly claims of Rayonnant inspired works in England."

Royal associations are quite clear. The bar-tracery in the clerestory at Westminster almost certainly derives from that at Reims; both were Coronation churches. The
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concept of Henry III, Louis IX's brother-in-law, was not to build a chapel to house a relic of the Passion, but to provide a worthy burial place for his favourite saint, Edward the Confessor, and as such, Paul Binski posits that its purpose was unique and therefore not relevant to contemporary work.\textsuperscript{128} The Eleanor Crosses of Edward I are a response to the montjoies of Louis IX. Having assimilated certain French motifs in the second quarter of the 13th century, English architecture was quick to develop its own course, and there is no reason to consider the products of the late-13th century, and still less those of the early 14th century to have much, if any, affiliation with Rayonnant. What is important to recognise is the impact of a possible Court Style. Richard Morris is of the opinion that:

"... virtually every important Decorated feature radiates from the Court, in the sense that it originates there or is distributed from there. It is difficult to know how else one can explore the rapid and extensive spread of features like reticulated tracery or ball-flower ornament across England."

Howard Colvin, as we have seen in Chapter 1, introduces a note of warning concerning a 'Court Style', a term which was first introduced by Maurice Hastings in the Architectural Review of 1949.\textsuperscript{130} Colvin states that:

"If [...] the idea of a 'court style' is to have any real meaning, it must be demonstrated that the architectural taste of the court was in advance, (or perhaps, since courts are sometimes conservative places, in arrear) of the taste of the country as a whole, or at least that it was


marked by some characteristic idiosyncrasy: in short, that it had some aesthetic identity that can be singled out by the architectural historian."131

The assumption that 'royal' masons were concerned solely with the King's works and that they therefore had no dealings beyond the Court, is effectively challenged by Colvin, when he says

"... it is easy to exaggerate the role of the Crown as a patron of mediaeval craftsmen and to assume that because a man is referred to as, 'the king's mason' or 'the king's carpenter', he was a permanent employee of the court. Generally the term has no such significance, and only the granting of a title or office, or the payment of a regular fee, can prove that a craftsman was permanently retained. Even then, the king might have no monopoly of his services. In the reign of Edward III, the mason William of Wynford was retained simultaneously by the king and the dean and chapter of Wells."132

That masons engaged on non-royal works appear to have introduced ideas into the Court is suggested by Richard Morris, who says:

"Given the recurrence of certain features from St. Paul's in the court works of the 1290's, it is highly probable that the cathedral workshop proved valuable experience for masons who went on to work for the crown in the 1290's, such as Michael of Canterbury."133

From these two examples, and there are many others, it is evident that 'royal' masons
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were not exclusively servants of the court, and therefore, architectural concepts employed by these masons were also not the exclusive 'property' of the court. However, as Coldstream points out:

"That the king's works included foremost exponents of Decorated [remember that she considers the whole period 1240-1360 as Decorated] is undeniable, and reflections of them are found in buildings associated with men close to the king. [...] the nave of Lichfield and the [north] transept at Hereford, [were] both built by allies of Henry III, ... Whether there was a definable court style, however, is doubtful: once pursued, both the style and the court become elusive, ...

The suggestion that a 'court style' did not have a monopoly on distinguished masons or their ideas is further borne out by Bony, who, based upon his observation of tracery details which owed their origin to Saint-Urbain at Troyes, suggests that the new choir at Old St. Paul's (Fig.2.2), built in the 1270s, provided not only an opportunity to experiment with new ideas, but also demonstrated that the emphasis had shifted from Henry III's Westminster to London. He goes on to state that:

"At St. Paul's, the London masons had broken loose from the orthodox methods of designing employed by the preceding generation, it took a few years more, until the early 1280s, for all their efforts to crystallize finally into a style. And when that happened around 1285, this new London style had already become [...] the new Court Style."

If the term 'Court Style' is to be of use, it seems acceptable to argue that it was introduced into Paris by Louis IX, and by Henry III at Westminster, the Abbey clearly
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influenced the Geometric of the 1260s - 1280s. It seems equally acceptable that Edward I's work at St. Stephen's Chapel was the catalyst for the Decorated of the 1290s - 1360s. Of particular relevance to this discussion is Morris's comment that:

"... a considerable number of features derived from the London Court Style are to be found in provincial churches, even in areas that are generally regarded as stylistic backwaters."137

The nearest major Rayonnant/Geometric works to Leicestershire may be seen in the Angel Choir at Lincoln, the nave at Lichfield, the Chapter House at Southwell and parts of Grantham church. Geometric details may be seen in Leicestershire at Castle Donington, Stoke Golding, Barkby, Illston-on-the-Hill, Whitwick; it is surely unlikely that all these are the result of spontaneous genesis. In the Decorated, as distinct from the Geometric style, canopied image niches, such as those on the porches at Melton Mowbray and Scalford, and on the tower at Kirby Bellars, might well have been influenced by either the Eleanor Crosses or the Lady Chapel at Ely, whilst the polygonal buttresses at Melton Mowbray and Asfordby reflect the interest in such forms as exemplified in the Lady Chapel at Wells, and the north porch at Redcliffe.

In the absence of documentary evidence, suggested influences can be no more than informed speculation, however, as will be discussed in Chapter 4, Leicestershire was situated on, and close to major routes, which could only have aided the dissemination of ideas.

PATRONAGE

Brief consideration should also be given to how patronage may have affected the

---

dissemination of the Decorated style. It is important to remember that whilst this thesis is concerned with the Decorated style at parish church level, we cannot ignore the major sources of introduction and development of radical forms. These could only have reached remote village churches via the patrons and masons who had become familiar with them elsewhere. I will suggest in Chapter 3 that the major alterations at Melton Mowbray may have been the result of patronage by the wealthy wool merchants and Archbishop William de Melton. So far, in Leicestershire, there is no conclusive evidence that either the monastic houses were building patrons of the churches which they had appropriated, or that lords of the manors or any of the priests were. A. J. Collett provides an interesting but inconclusive discussion as to whether a member of the Campania or of the de Stoke families was the benefactor of the south aisle at Stoke Golding, as he posits that a member of the Culey family was benefactor at Ratcliffe Culey, since the Culey arms are to be seen on the north-east and south-east quoins of the nave of that church. Generally in Leicestershire, the lack of heraldic glass and tomb inscriptions prior to the 15th century, make it virtually impossible to ascribe patronage. With the exception of rare examples such as Stoke Golding, Gaddesby and Claybrooke, the architecture of the village churches does not suggest wealthy patronage; the county possesses very little to equal Heckington. It seems likely that it is only in connection with the more exceptional churches that particular patronage can be established, of which, Gaddesby is a case in point.

Alistair Mutch has provided a valuable case study by writing on the social and cultural context of this church. He cites local figures, Robert de Gaddesby, Roger Beler and Robert de Overton, who were involved in the machinations concerning the Earl of Lancaster - who was also Earl of Leicester - and Gaveston, Mortimer and the

Despensers. Robert de Gaddesby was steward of the Merton College estates at Kibworth Harcourt and Barkby, whilst Beler, a powerful local landlord, was to establish a collegiate foundation at Kirby Bellars. Both Gaddesby and Overton established chantries in Gaddesby church, Mutch argues that the gabled buttresses of the north aisle are a direct response to the earlier work of c.1296 at Merton.\textsuperscript{139} He goes on to suggest that the heads on label stops in the south aisle could include those of Gaddesby's parents, or Robert and Alice Overton; Edward III and Phillipa, and Robert and Matilda Gaddesby.\textsuperscript{140} The point of relevance to this thesis is the fact that the north aisle at Gaddesby almost certainly shares an affinity with the chapel at Merton College; whether the gabled buttresses and string-courses evident in other Leicestershire churches are a direct response, can be no more than speculation.

The requirements of the 14th-century liturgy upon Decorated architecture will be discussed in subsequent chapters. At parochial level at least, such requirements could mean that Decorated was perhaps seen as less of a structural form than an embellishment of an existing idea, introducing motifs rather than radical structural reform, although we should not ignore the important introduction of polygonal forms. The general vocabulary of such forms includes canopied niches and the octagons and hexagons implied within the cusping of window lights.

The desire in the 14th century to break up lines is perhaps the very essence of the Decorated style. The simplicity of vertical shafts, generally with large rolls and hollows, gave way to a multiplicity of fine lines with sharp edges and fillets, that produced delicate lines of shadow, which were interrupted by new motifs, - the ogee, cusping and ball-flower, so that the basic structure was subsumed by decorative
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The secular application of the style should not be overlooked, and it is nowhere better exemplified than in the Welsh castles of Edward I, constructed mainly between 1277 and 1323, which will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 6.

CONCLUSION

In discussing the literature relating to nomenclature, it has become apparent that, following the desire to classify Gothic architecture towards the end of the 18th century, the various attempts resulted in a confusion of terms which has continued to this day. The acknowledgement that the transition from Early English was at first influenced by the French Rayonnant, introduced under royal patronage, has tended to obfuscate the issue of English Gothic of the later decades of the 13th century. The argument is further complicated by those writers who use the term 'Decorated' to cover a too wide time span.

I have suggested that Sharpe's use of four terms, rather than Rickman's three, thus introducing the term 'Geometric', is more acceptable, and by discussing such works as the Angel Choir, Hereford, as well as Wells and, more particularly, Salisbury spire, it becomes apparent that one cannot place them all under the single heading of 'Decorated'. It was the Geometrical that introduced the cusped roundel into the window head, which was later to be developed in the Decorated into various forms, such as the East Anglian 'petal' motif; it was the Decorated and not the Geometrical that introduced the ogee and polygonal shapes.

Finally, how widely 'Court' motifs were disseminated, it is not possible to say with certainty, since there is clear evidence that 'royal' masons worked on many other sites, not least for clerical patrons. As Coldstream reminds us:  
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"The Decorated style ..... was not the expression of kingly magnificence. It was the expression of religious devotion."\textsuperscript{142}

I shall make clear in the next chapter, how this devotion was manifested in the architecture of the churches of Leicestershire, with more detailed discussion in Chapters 11 and 13.

\textsuperscript{142} Coldstream, p.192.
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THE APPLICATION OF DECORATED WORK TO LEICESTERSHIRE CHURCHES

INTRODUCTION

This chapter forms an introduction to the more detailed analyses of windows, arcades, chancel fittings, towers and spires, etc., to be found in Chapters 6 to 14. However, as was stated in the Introduction, since these chapters deal with disaggregated features, it is first helpful to give case studies of a few churches, so that they may be seen in their entirety. This chapter will, therefore, commence with a brief study of the nine churches that are situated along the valley of the river Wreake, from Melton Mowbray to Ratcliffe-on-the-Wreake, before moving on to discuss the ways in which Decorated work is manifested in Leicestershire churches. The value of studying a small group of churches all situated within close proximity, enables one to look for possible stylistic influences, and shared components which might indicate the interchange of templates.

The accompanying schematic ground plans which are distinct from those at the end of this chapter, are all to the scale of 1:10 and are intended to show only the internal areas of the main components. Other than the west porch and the central tower at Melton, areas shown with hatching are merely indicated but not measured. Similarly, buttresses are not indicated, and pier, window and door dimensions are not measured. Figures A to E, relating to Kirby Bellars church, may be referred to in the Introduction, those relating to the remaining churches of the case studies are to be found at the beginning of the remaining figures for this chapter. Since all the churches
are referred to by Nichols and Pevsner, these general references are given along with the name of each church as it is introduced.

All illustrations are intended to exemplify the varied forms of Decorated work to be found throughout the county, rather than to discuss typology in detail, whilst the occasional examples from neighbouring counties provide additional support to the discussion. At the end of the chapter, the illustrations are supported by a series of ground plans and side elevations, which show the gradual development of a typical village church between the 12th and late 14th centuries. These are not to scale, nor are they based on any particular Leicestershire church, but for each of the points introduced, a specific county example will be cited.

THE WREAKE VALLEY CHURCHES

A general observation is that this valley has been a fertile and productive region from very early times, and that the settlements which it supports were thriving communities. This is evident from the fact that the Domesday survey lists seventeen mills along the river Wreake and its main tributary the River Eye, which joins it near Melton, whilst today the remains of ridge and furrow cultivation are still evident along certain parts of the valley.

Melton Mowbray was the dominant market town at the head of the valley, as was Leicester at the southern end, shortly after the Wreake joins the river Soar. Melton was granted a market in the time of Edward the Confessor, and Domesday survey cites the town as being the only place in the county, other than Leicester, to be involved in trade, its merchants being accountable for "twenty shillings". All references to these villages in the Calendars of Close and Patent Rolls and in the
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Inquisitions ad Post Mortem have been carefully scrutinized; they deal with land owners, the apportioning of lands, manors, market produce, and occasionally, advowsons; but other than for the church and religious house at Kirby Bellars, they give no information on the churches, their builders or patrons, although some conclusions might be drawn in the case of Melton Mowbray.

(i) MELTON MOWBRAY

In the 14th century, an indication of the importance of Melton as a trade centre is gained from the numerous references to merchants, and in the 1340s in particular, to Walter Prest, who is referred to as "the king's merchant." His status becomes obvious from the fact that he was asked to pay £2100 to the attorney of the Earl of Derby, due formerly to the king, in order to release the Earl's jewels that had been pledged by the king in Flanders. In 1344, we learn that Prest was exporting wool from Bristol, London, Hull and Boston. It is hardly surprising that with merchants of the reputation of Prest and others, Melton should have acquired a church that reflected the town's status, and it is clear that the grandeur of the building owes much to the laity. There are no surviving records to determine whether the church reflects any influence from the Cluniac priory of Lewes, in Sussex, which held the advowson until the Dissolution.

St. Mary's church stands in the town centre, close to the market square and overlooking the main road to Burton Lazars, where the church has always been a chapel-of-ease to Melton, standing close to the site of what was the most important leper house in England, of the Order of St. Lazarus of Jerusalem, founded by Robert

---

148 C.C.R., Edward III, 1343-1346, p.410. (Sept. 1344, no details)
de Mowbray between 1138 and 1162.\textsuperscript{149} St. Mary's is in fact the largest church in Leicestershire, having an internal area of 873 square metres (Ground Plan A), and comprises a nave of six bays with quatrefoil piers, with side aisles, north and south transepts, which, most unusually for a parish church, have both east and west aisles, a central tower, chancel, a vestry or sacristy added to the north side of the chancel bearing the date 1532, and a large west porch. In the view of the church from the north-west, the proportions of the tower with its 13th- and 15th-century stages, are marred by the ugly stair turret. This was never completed, and internal evidence indicates that the intention was to carry it up further, where, no doubt, it would have received battlements and pinnacles (Fig. 3/1). The western arcades of the transepts have simple octagonal piers, whilst those of the eastern arcades are quatrefoil in form, perhaps to emphasise the importance of the altar areas into which they opened.

A nave, forming the main body of a church, accommodates the majority of the congregation; the side aisles provide additional congregational space and room for processions; the transepts provide space for additional chapels, and from the surviving evidence of piscinae - small basins over which the Eucharistic vessels are cleansed - there were at least five altars in the transepts at Melton. A chancel contains the main altar, and very often, furnishings associated with the Eucharist or Mass, namely a piscina and sedilia on the south side of the altar, the latter being seats for the celebrant and deacons, and an aumbry, which is a small cupboard in either an east or north wall in which the Eucharistic vessels were kept locked when not in use, as well as, often, the Reserved Sacrament. Very rarely was there an Easter Sepulchre, these usually being temporary wooden structures and which were used during the liturgy of the Passion of Christ. Occasionally, a low arched recess may be found in north or south

\textsuperscript{149} Pevsner, p.119.
walls of a chancel or aisles, either containing an effigy or, more commonly, empty. All of these features will be discussed in detail in later chapters. At Melton, any such fittings have either been destroyed or hidden by the Victorian panelling that now covers the lower walls of the chancel.

That there was a 12th-century church at Melton is evident from the Norman windows that light the ringing chamber of the central tower, just below the 13th-century bell stage, although the massive piers and arches supporting the tower are an Early English alteration. The only other survival of the 13th-century church is the fine inner west doorway, together with the spectacular lower bell-stage of the tower, which is possibly the finest example of Early English work in Leicestershire. With regard to the internal 13th-century work, Figs.3/2 and 3/3 show that the foliage above the keeled shafts of the crossing and on the capitals of the shafts of the west door is of similar date, although the latter details, with dog-tooth ornament between the shafts, are more developed. Why foliated capitals appear only on part of the south-west pier cannot be explained, although one might suggest that the incomplete work was due to an experiment or the lack of availability of a sculptor.

In the 14th century there was a major rebuilding, at which time the ground-plan of the church assumed very nearly its present dimensions. The capital mouldings of nave and transept arcades are very similar, although the transept voussoirs (Fig.3/4) have the usual Leicestershire plain chamfers, whilst those of the nave (Fig.3/5) have more sophisticated quadrant mouldings. It can be seen in Fig.3/4 how the voussoirs are an ill fit on the capitals - a feature common to many Leicestershire churches, and one that will be discussed in Chapter 10.

Entrances to churches are often decorated to reflect their degree of importance. At Melton, there are entrances to the north and south aisles as well as to the north and
south transepts, suggesting that provision was required for moving substantial numbers of people through the building, but to what purpose? With numerous altars, it might be supposed that some were used by Guilds, or even that relics were housed. That there were Guild chapels at Melton has become evident from the matter of 'Concealed lands'. In 1545, Government efforts were made to secure all property from dissolved guilds and chantries, however, various former guild properties in Melton, had been 'acquired' privately and still form what is today the Melton Town Estate. Apparently there were altars for the Guild of St. John and for Our Lady, as well as an altar to St. Nicholas. Where these chapels were is not recorded, but presumably they occupied certain bays in the eastern aisles of the transepts.150 The scale and decoration of the west porch are sumptuous; it is arguably the finest porch in Leicestershire. Comparison may be made between this fine doorway, with its shafts, ball-flower and trailing leaf (Figs.3/6 and 3/7), and the south door of the nave (Fig.3/8).

The west porch is simply butted against the west buttresses of the nave, without any bonding in of the stonework (Fig.3/9). It originally contained an altar, as may be seen from the piscina in the south wall (Fig.3/10). Presumably, this would have been placed against the wall on the right-hand side of the inner door. It is possible that masses were celebrated within the porch, specifically for those travelling to Burton Lazars, with the Host being shown or offered through the small window beneath the string-course, also in the south wall (Fig.3/11). The fact that there are four of these windows, may have enabled groups of people to observe the Elevation. Within the porch are two magnificent image niches on either side of the Early English west door, and there is clear evidence that these Decorated features, with their vaulted ceilings, nodding ogees, cusps and pinnacles, replaced earlier ones that were part of

the original 13th-century scheme. This can be seen by comparing Figs. 3/12 and 3/13. Immediately to the right of the niche in Fig. 3/12 can be seen the scar of a former niche (Fig. 3/13), which commences at the end of the original string-course. I shall discuss details of the external niches and pinnacles of the west porch in Chapter 13. Pevsner dates this porch to c.1320 - 1330, which might suggest Walter de Melton as patron.\footnote{151} He was rector of Melton between c.1280 and 1316, and from 1316 until 1340 was Archbishop of York, and although no documentary evidence links him with the porch, this must surely be a prime example of ecclesiastical patronage.

The details of fenestration at Melton may not be completely authentic following major restorations by G. G. Scott between 1854 and 1856, and between 1865 and 1872,\footnote{152} although some, at least, are in accord with the illustration in Nichols. The north and south windows of the chancel are new,\footnote{153} and others windows have been tampered with.

"Windows florid with cuspings, and certainly of a more pleasing aspect, have been substituted for the large north and south ones, which were originally without a single cusp; [...........] the north and south and west, the three largest windows in the church, are now all of the same commonplace interlacing design."\footnote{154}

Although the authenticity of some windows is doubtful, three examples of which I feel confident (Figs. 3/14-3/16) are introduced, since they demonstrate patterns of tracery that can be found in many 14th-century examples within the county. Their details raise several important questions that will be dealt with more fully in Chapter 7. These include the question of typology and chronology. At Melton, the aisles in

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
  \item 151 Pevsner, p.318.
  \item 152 Brandwood, p.110.
  \item 154 ibid, p.286.
\end{itemize}}
which these windows are situated, are clearly part of a major 14th-century rebuilding, yet there are elements in Figs.3/15 and 3.16 which suggest Geometrical work because of the circular features. It is true that the central ogee and reversed mouchettes in Fig.3/16 are not 13th-century features, but the shafts with capitals are; thus, we have a mixture of typological features. There is also a mixture of relative chronologies when looking at the un-cusped intersecting window in Fig.3/14. Such details are a reminder that the absolute dating of windows becomes difficult when there is evidence that tracery elements of typologically different phases, such as intersections, roundels, ogees and mouchettes, can all be included within a single building period. This must emphasise that basic elements remained common over a very long period. Examination of the mouldings also reveals that their typology does not necessarily 'progress' with chronology. Fig.3/14 has the plain chamfer moulding, common to many windows over a long period, whilst Figs.3/15 and 3/16 reveal the more complicated mouldings associated with the 14th century. But, observe that these mouldings are around the window heads only, and die back into plain chamfers, probably suggesting that different masons were responsible for heads and tracery. These points will be discussed in Chapter 7.

The final additions to St. Mary's take the form of the clerestory which surmounts the nave and transepts with a total of 48 windows, together with the upper bell-stage of the tower. All of this Perpendicular work may be coeval with the north vestry/sacristy which is dated 1532 at its east end. Although strictly outside the brief of this thesis, such major work is, again, evidence of the huge prosperity of the town based largely, though not exclusively, on wool.
(ii) ASFORDBY

Asfordby, on the north side of the river, lies just over a mile to the south-west of Melton, and All Saints church stands close to the village centre. The church (Ground Plan B) comprises a nave with side aisles, north and south transepts, with a western aisle to the south transept, a chancel - all Decorated work, with a Victorian vestry and organ chamber (Fig.3/17). Perpendicular work consists of the nave clerestory and a fine west tower, with a recessed, crocketed spire. A rare feature for Leicestershire is the vaulting inside the tower (Fig.3/18).

The patron of Asfordby was the Bishop of Lincoln but we can really learn little or nothing from early records concerning either the village or its church in the 14th century.

At the west end of each aisle rises a pinnacle with image niches (Fig.3/19) and these, though not as fine as the examples on the west porch at Melton, perhaps owe something to Melton for their origin. The examples at both churches share the same polygonal form, with gables, crockets and a finial, whilst polygonal buttresses also appear on the south transept at Asfordby. (The empty niches are a reminder of the periods of iconoclasm in the 16th and 17th centuries).

The buttresses at the east end of the chancel have gabled set-offs rather than the more usual sloping variety, although the purpose remains the same for either type, namely, to throw off water, thus preventing damaging penetration of the stone-work. It can be seen how the buttresses rise from a broad plinth which provides a firm foundation for the support, whilst a decorative refinement is the string-course running beneath the windows and around the buttresses (Fig.3/20).

Inside the church, in the north-east corner of the south aisle, a short flight of

---

156 Brandwood, Bringing them to their knees, pp.72-73.
stairs is contained within the arcade wall. This once led up to a rood-loft, a feature common to most churches before the Reformation (Fig.3/21), whose purpose was to accommodate singers and musicians on festive occasions; and to support the Rood, the group of Christ on the Cross, with the figures of Mary and John on either side. Rood-lofts were supported on a screen, which formed the barrier between the laity in the nave and the priests in the chancel. Lofts and Roods were destroyed at the time of the Reformation, although the supporting screens were supposed to remain.158

Asfordby has a three-stall sedilia with a piscina in the south wall of the chancel (Fig.3/22). The 14th-century design is apparent from the ogee heads of the sedilia. In the opposite wall are two features obviously designed as a single unit (Fig.3/23). At the top is an aumbry, whilst beneath is a rare example of what is possibly an Easter Sepulchre, or Tomb of Christ, the purpose of which is made clear in Chapter 12.

External decorative elements in the form of ball-flower may be seen above the clerestory windows (Fig.3/24) and around the inner door of the south porch, where they are linked by a trailing moulding (Fig.3/25). These examples remind us that the same decorative elements were often in fashion for a long time; the ball-flower around the south door is part of the 14th-century work, whilst that on the clerestory is 15th century, although the two forms differ very slightly.

(iii) KIRBY BELLARS159

The east end of St. Peter's church, Kirby Bellars, stands close to the southern bank of the river Wreake, with its southern aspect facing the village. Some illustrations may be found in the Introduction (Figs. A - E), and in this chapter from

Figs, 3/26 - 3/31. The fact that the churchyard is roughly circular denotes a site of considerable antiquity, possibly a pagan or much earlier religious site, in use long before the present church was built.\textsuperscript{160} Ground Plan C reveals that the church has a west tower and spire, a nave with south porch and aisle, and a chancel. (Fig.A). Kirby shares with Asfordby the unusual feature of a vaulted interior to the tower. That the church had a north aisle is evident from the blocked arcade (Fig. B). Pevsner informs us that this aisle was demolished in 1690.\textsuperscript{161} Possibly, this is due to the enclosures which took place increasingly from the late 15th century through until the 18th century. It may also have had associations with the Augustinian house that was dissolved in the 16th century. If there were a decreasing population, it would have been easier to remove part of a church than to face the expense of continued maintenance; moreover, the spoil provided a useful source of building material for other purposes.

A good example of a piscina is set into the south-east corner of the south aisle at Kirby (Fig.C), where we notice the typical ogee and crocket work of the 14th century. Adjacent to this piscina are two recesses in the south wall, containing the effigies of a knight and a lady, almost certainly, according to Pevsner, those of Roger Beler II and his wife.\textsuperscript{162} (Fig.D). Beler was the son of Roger Beler (I) who established a chantry and priory (See below). The placing of tombs close to an altar was considered important, whereby the symbolism of the deceased being as close to God as possible was obvious.

On the west face of the tower are three image niches, again, very typical of 14th-century work, with their nodding ogees, crockets and pinnacles (Fig. E).

\textsuperscript{161} Pevsner, p.191.
\textsuperscript{162} ibid, p.192
size and detailing of the niches indicate a hierarchy, with the lower and larger niche providing a setting for the most important figure, perhaps of Our Lady or the patronal saint.

The 13th-century south arcade, contrasts with its blocked 14th-century north counterpart, and displays a progression of detail from west to east, a feature that has been noted in numerous churches. The western pier is a simple octagon with nail-head and dog-tooth ornament (Fig.3/26), the central pier becomes more elaborate in section, being square with demi-shafts on each face (Fig.3/27), whilst the eastern pier has multi-shafts with annulet rings, clearly in imitation of Purbeck marble shafts (Fig.3/28). This progression is surely to produce a visual and mental image of the increasing importance of the building as one approaches the east end.

A sectional illustration of the south arcade also reveals a common structural procedure, namely that the chief mouldings face into the nave; the side facing the aisle is less elaborate, almost certainly, a saving of cost (Fig.3/29).

Comparison of the two windows in the south aisle indicates a possible re-siting of material. In Fig.3/30, the three-light window retains sufficient of the brown marl-stone, to indicate that it was all originally of that material, but what of the window in Fig.3.31? It is clearly a later Perpendicular window with its machicolated transom, and the whole window with its surround is of fine limestone set into the earlier 14th-century work. I suggest that this window, which seems totally out of context with the remaining fenestration, has been re-used following the dismantling of the priory: indeed, the haphazard arrangement of the ashlar courses, suggests that this is a reconstruction. Even so, it will be seen that jamb and mullion mouldings are identical in both windows, a reminder that there was not necessarily a 'cut-off' point in
moulding typology.

It has already been noted that the south arcade is 13th century, but what is not clear is whether the present aisle is also 13th century, or whether it was widened in the 14th. As I shall discuss shortly, the fact that Beler 'constructed' a chantry chapel in that aisle may mean no more than that he made the necessary provision, which would appear to have included the piscina in Fig.C of my Introduction, together with the twin recesses for the eventual accommodation of Beler effigies (Fig.D). However, examination of the south doorway suggests a rather clumsy re-siting of the arch, which rises from jambs, the mouldings of which, do not agree with those of the voussoirs (Fig.3/32). Comparison of the 13th-century doorway can be made with its 14th-century counterpart in the north wall, carefully re-set after the demolition of the north aisle (Fig.3/33), whilst the somewhat haphazard re-setting of the south door suggests that the aisle was enlarged in the 14th century.

This brings us to the point of discussion concerning Kirby Bellars and its priory. Roger Beler and later, his son Roger (II) were lords of the manor and wealthy and influential land-owners in and around Kirby, and there are numerous references to them in the Calendars of Close and Patent Rolls. In 1316, Roger Beler had set up a chantry for:

"[...] a chaplain to celebrate divine office in the chapel of St. Peter. Kirkeby, for the soul of the said Roger and the souls of Alice his wife and his ancestors and successors, [...] Such chaplain and his successors to find another chaplain to celebrate divine service in the church of the same town of Kirkeby."163

An important paper on Kirby Bellars church and priory cites three documents in the

---
   (9, Ed.II, March 10, Clipstone, 1316.)
episcopal registers of Lincoln, which provide much information relating to the site.  

Hamilton Thompson writes that:

"[the college] of Kirby Bellars came into being at first as a chantry of two priests, and was shortly afterwards augmented on a much larger scale. It was founded, however, not in a chapel attached to a parish church, but in the chapel of a neighbouring manor house, and although the existing parish church was appropriated to the college and became to some extent an annexe to it, the college was not transferred to it, nor was the parish church the church of the priory to which the college gave place. [...] the wardenship and the twelve chaplains at Kirby Bellars were separate freeholds, and their patronage was divided among a number of persons sole and corporate."  

That the church and chantry foundations were separate sites, seems evident from the following statement in the foundation charter at Lincoln.

"[...] because the chapel and the parisioners who dwell about the chapel are at no small distance from the parish church, so that it is with difficulty that on ordinary days they are able to hear their masses in the same church, and because many strangers pass by the same chapel which is situate on the high road, [the main route from Melton to Leicester] I will that every day the same warden shall take advantage of the hour at which most of the dwellers in the neighbourhood and of the

(i) Foundation of the Chantry of Kirby, 1316, (Reg.III, ff.211-213.)
(ii) Foundation of the Collegiate Chapel, 1319, (Reg.III, ff.340-344.)
(iii) Erection of the collegiate chapel of the Blessed Peter at Kirkeby super Wrethek into a conventual church, together with the appointment of the prior of the same, 1359-1360, (Reg.IX, ff.372d-373d.)

165  *T.L.A.S.*, XVI, p.140.
passers by should in his opinion be at their mass, and he shall celebrate
at such an hour, except on those days in which he ought to be at matins
and hours in the parish church ...." 166

The same charter goes on to stipulate that:

"[...] to the honour of the parish church of Kirkeby, which has the right
of baptism, I will ordain that the said warden of the chapel of St. Peter,
together with the chaplain who dwells with him, and so all the wardens
that shall be in succession, shall on all greater double feasts and on
every Sunday, be in the same parish church with the rector or his priest
[...]." 167

Evidence for some work involving the south aisle at the church becomes clear from
the following statement in the foundation charter for the collegiate chapel.

"[...] the said warden's fellow is bound every day to celebrate mass of
the Annunciation of the blessed Virgin in the parish church of Kirkeby
in the chapel of blessed Mary and St. John Baptist which I [Roger
Beler] have constructed on the south side of the church [...]." 168

Although several of the documents quoted above seem to indicate two separate
buildings and sites for the parish church and the collegiate chapel, the survey in the
Augmentation Office provides a substantial list of 'Ornaments of the church'. It lists
those taken from the Quire, St. Andrew's Chapel, the Lady Chapel, the body of the
Church and St. Thomas's Chapel. The list includes pavements, glass and, 'A grett yron
bonde about the founder's tombe' in the Quire. 169 These details suggest that, if this is
an inventory of the collegiate chapel rather than of the church, it was quite a

166 ibid, p.156, (Reg.III, ff.211-213.)
substantial building. On the other hand, with the exception of Melton Mowbray church, comparison of the ground plans of the Wreake Valley churches demonstrates that Kirby Bellars was unusually spacious, and with its original north aisle, it could well have accommodated a number of chapels. Documentary evidence, therefore, suggests that there was a parish church with a chantry chapel and a separate collegiate chapel on a different site, yet nothing survives to indicate the precise location of the different chapels or of the founder's tomb; the sole surviving evidence is of Beler's chantry chapel located in the present south aisle of the parish church. This is, unhappily, inconclusive.

(iv) FRISBY-on-the-WREAKE170

The church of St. Thomas of Canterbury, Frisby-on-the-Wreake (Fig.3/34), which stands on the north side of the village and south of the river, comprises a west tower with the Perpendicular addition of a bell-stage and recessed spire; a nave, with north and south aisles; a chancel - rebuilt in 1848171- and a south transept with, as at Asfordby, a small western aisle. The north aisle extends into an eastern chapel (Ground Plan D). The church is clearly of Norman origin, having two blocked windows visible from within the very thick walls of the tower base, and re-used corbels set beneath the hood-moulds on both arcades (Figs. 3/35 and 3/36). The advowson was held by Launde Abbey.

Of outstanding merit are the south windows to the transept and its aisle (Figs. 3/37 and 3/38). The former displays a suggestion of 'flowing' tracery virtually unequalled in the county, whilst the latter displays a central 'petal' feature that is reminiscent of some tracery patterns to be found in East Anglia. Lack of documentary

171 Brandwood, p.88.
evidence makes it difficult to account for such exuberance in a small village church.

Nichols refers to the Stump Cross, which is in the parish, and which still stands on the Leicester road, as being a resting place for pilgrims travelling from the north-east Midlands to Launde. Did the church, which was on the same route, contain an effigy of Becket which attracted special attention? The internal walls of the south transept have been plastered so that there is now no evidence of sedilia, piscinae or aumbries. What is a mystery is how, chronologically, the roof of the Decorated transept cuts into a window of the Perpendicular clerestory, as may be seen on Fig.3/34. An explanation might be that the transept roof was originally hipped. The square-headed east window of the transept is unusual, though not the sole example within the county, in having double ogees rising up into mouchettes (Fig.3/39), whilst the east window of the north chapel suggests Perpendicular work, with its sub-divided mullions (Fig.3/40).

On either side of the latter window are fine image niches (Figs.3/41 and 3/42). These differ in detail, for reasons which I shall discuss in Chapter 13. It is apparent that the northern (left-hand) niche (Fig.3/41) has provision for lights at the top left and at the base. The bracket at the base takes the form of a serpent's head; which suggests that the niche was for the figure of Our Lady, who is sometimes depicted standing on a serpent's head. As with the transept windows, these unusually fine features suggest that the church at Frisby attained an importance beyond the needs of the villagers alone. The fact that the village lay on a route to the Augustinian priory of Launde, which held the advowson, suggests that there was perhaps patronage from that source, although there is no documentary evidence to support such a claim.

---

Standing on the north side of the single street through the village and south of the river, All Saints church, Rotherby, comprises a nave, chancel, south aisle and tower standing within the west end of that aisle (Ground Plan E). With the exception of the tower, the church is wholly Decorated, including the clerestory (Fig.3/43). There is some evidence that the church once contained a north aisle, as can be seen from the moulded 'set-off' beneath the clerestory (Fig.3/44), but unlike Kirby Bellars and Ratcliffe-on-the-Wreake, no blocked arcade survives. However, there is clear evidence, as at Frisby, of the church's Norman foundation, with the internal outline of a window set in the west wall (Fig.3/45). William the Conqueror gave the manor of Rotherby to his nephew, the Earl of Avranches, whom he created Earl of Chester.

Of particular interest is the mass of masonry at the junction of the chancel arch and the south arcade. This is probably a fragment of the east end of the original Norman nave, and that when the south aisle was added, the 14th-century arcade was constructed outside the nave wall (Fig.3/46). As at Kirby Bellars, the inner mouldings of the arcade are more elaborate than those facing into the south aisle (Fig.3/47).

The Perpendicular tower, one of a group in north-east Leicestershire, could not be built against the west end of the nave, due to a steep bank. The solution was, therefore, to construct it inside the west end of the aisle. It stands against the Decorated clerestory, thus blocking its south-west window, and it has its own east and north arches, the latter standing against the earlier western arch of the arcade. The clerestory is one of few in the county to have two-centred rather than square-headed windows. The two windows in the west wall are Perpendicular insertions coeval with the building of the south-west tower. The modest size of the church and, more

particularly, that of the adjacent church at Brooksby, suggests that both settlements were never more than small communities.

(vi) BROOKSBY\textsuperscript{175}

The church of St. Michael, Brooksby (Fig. 3/48), consists of a west tower with a Perpendicular recessed and crocketed spire, and a nave a chancel, with no division between the two (Ground Plan F). The church has all the appearance of being a private estate chapel, and indeed, it stands in the grounds of Brooksby Hall, a large 17th-century house with 18th- and 19th-century additions, now Melton/Brooksby College. The principal entrance is on the south side of the nave, whilst the present smaller north entrance, still suggesting the original private entrance from the Hall, attests to the fact that the village, which stood south of the river and which has now entirely disappeared, lay to the south of the church.

Brooksby was the seat of the Villiers family since at least 1235, and the church contains a fine monument to Sir William Villiers\textsuperscript{176} and his wife Ann, both of whom died in 1711.\textsuperscript{177}

Architecturally, the church is undistinguished. There is a good two-light reticulated window with quadrant moulding, in the base of the tower (Fig.3/49). The tower itself is set off-centre to the nave, which suggests, perhaps for boundary reasons, that it was a later 14th-century addition to what may have been a small Norman chapel, though no 12th-century work has so far been identified. The north-west tower buttress has ball-flower decoration around the gabled head (Fig.3/50).

\textsuperscript{177} Pevsner, p.114.
(vii) Hoby

All Saints' church, Hoby (Fig.3/51), stands in a commanding position on the north side of the village centre which overlooks the river to the south (Ground Plan G). It is mainly a 14th-century building, with west tower and short, recessed spire, nave with north and south aisles, and a chancel that was rebuilt in 1863, and furnished with quite fine Arts and Crafts fittings in 1905, which, however, obliterated the piscina, aumbry and two-seat sedilia referred to by Nichols. The clerestory is a Perpendicular addition. As was noted at Kirby Bellars, there appears to be a deliberate progression of arcade style, starting with octagonal piers at the west, and changing in the east, to shafts against octagonal piers with concave mouldings between the shafts (Fig.3.52). Of the two windows illustrated, the east window of the south aisle, though rebuilt, exhibits typical 14th-century mouldings (Fig.3/53), whilst the intersecting east window of the rebuilt chancel indicates that the much-weathered original jamb mouldings have been faithfully reproduced (Fig.3/54).

(viii) Thrussington

Holy Trinity, Thrussington, stands close to the river on its south and is situated at the eastern end of the village (Fig.3/55). It comprises a Perpendicular west tower, nave with north and south aisles and a chancel (Ground Plan H). Former roof lines against the east wall of the tower, suggest that there was a narrower nave originally. When this was widened in the 14th century, the ridge line was moved to the south, before the present higher Perpendicular clerestory was added (Fig.3/56). Evidence of the original east end of the nave is apparent, as at Rotherby, with the south arcade.

179 Brandwood, p.93.
180 ibid, p.93.
constructed outside the nave wall (Fig.3/57). The small tower appears to have been constructed partly over the west end of the earlier nave, and extending westwards from it. The evidence may be seen in Figs.3/58-3/59. The stair turret in Fig.3/58 marks the west end of the nave and corresponds with the moulding line to be seen just above the south aisle roof in Fig.3/59, and where, also, the building break between nave and south aisle is clearly visible. This suggests that the original west end was towerless, but almost certainly had a bell-cote. The stairs would have ascended to a small chamber containing an opening giving onto the interior of the nave - a not uncommon feature of some Leicestershire churches. Through this, the sexton could watch for the Elevation, and thus ring the Sanctus. Such a feature would have been obliterated when the tall Perpendicular tower arch was inserted.

(ix) RATCLIFFE-on-the-WREAKE\textsuperscript{183}

The church of St. Boltolph, Ratcliffe-on-the-Wreake, stands on rising ground on the north side of the river, with the village lying mainly to the east (Fig.3/60). The church comprises a Perpendicular west tower with recessed, crocketed spire, a nave and chancel, with evidence of a former north aisle (Ground Plan I). There has been much restoration.\textsuperscript{184} Detail of the spire reveals the typical Perpendicular style of lucarne, with crocketed gable and angular rather than two-centred openings; features that will be discussed further in Chapter 6 (Fig.3/61). In Fig.3/62 may be seen the Perpendicular arcade to the former north aisle, whilst the chancel displays a simple three-stall sedilia and piscina (Fig.3/63). In the north wall of the chancel lies the effigy of bishop, who, from a description beside the tomb, is said to be Thomas de Ratcliffe, bishop of Dromore in Ireland and an Augustinian canon of Leicester Abbey,

\textsuperscript{184} Brandwood, p.116.
who died before 1389. (Pevsner makes no reference to the effigy.) As with other
Leicestershire effigies, that of the bishop protrudes from within the arched recess,
which measures 2180mm x 1170mm at the apex, and is 280mm deep.

ANALYSIS

In seeking a common authorship among a group of churches in such close
proximity, mouldings, ground-plans, architectural details, possible working practices
and patronage all come under scrutiny. The sketching of 74 window and door
mouldings of the Wreake Valley churches, might be expected to produce clear
evidence of movement of the same mason or masons between them.

Eileen Roberts states that the importance of mouldings lies in the fact that they
"recover lost working drawings of the Middle Ages", since templates were cut from
the patterns drawn by architects. All mouldings are composed of certain basic
elements, and these are indicated in Fig.3/64. Combinations of these elements can
produce an almost limitless variety of mouldings. However, only three moulding
types were common to more than one church in the Wreake group, and none was
common to all nine. These are shown in Figs.3/65 - 3/66., and it will be seen that in
every one, some or other of the basic elements illustrated in Fig.3/64 occur. All other
mouldings were different, although the same moulding often appeared more than once
within a particular church. This was the case at Thrussington, where moulding types
A and B are almost standard throughout. However, Brandwood informs us that in the
general restoration of 1877, the north aisle was rebuilt and three new windows were

185 E. Roberts, 'Moulding Analysis and Architectural Research: the late Middle Ages', A.H.,
Vol.20, 1977, p.5.
Whilst it is advantageous to make detailed measured drawings, time limitations have meant that all
drawings for this and subsequent chapters are free-hand and not to scale; they are intended simply
to indicate moulding profiles.
inserted in the south aisle.\textsuperscript{186} As will be demonstrated in Chapter 10, that pier and respond details very rarely were the same, so with jambs and mullions, the moulding details are often quite different. Since they are also frequently different from the mouldings of window heads, this suggests, although I have not so far encountered any written observation on this point before, that jambs, mullions and heads may have been the responsibility of different masons, certainly where more complicated mouldings are used. The remarkable variety of mouldings used in this small group of contemporaneous churches suggests that templates were not transferred from one church to another, although it is possible that they may have been used to reproduce identical mouldings in the same church. However, as I shall make clear in Chapters 7, 8 and 10, even when mouldings appear to be the same, close inspection reveals that they are rarely identical, as may be seen in the two drawings of pier capitals at Frisby (Fig.3/66), which demonstrate yet another example of the variety to be found in Decorated detail. The similar, but subtly different capital mouldings alternate between the north and south arcades, so that the identical mouldings appear diagonally opposed, a feature noted in some other Leicestershire arcades.

Study of the ground plans and of the architectural details leads to some unexpected conclusions. With the exception of the remarkable church at Melton Mowbray, there is a similarity of ground plans between the village churches along the Wreake valley. Looking at the combined lengths of naves and chancels reduced to round figures, Brooksby and Rotherby measure approximately 19 metres; Asfordby, Frisby, Hoby and Thrussington measure 23 metres; Kirby 24; and Ratcliffe 25 metres. Of nave widths, Asfordby, Frisby and Thrussington average 4.5 metres; Hoby and Rotherby 5.5 metres; Brooksby and Ratcliffe 6 metres, with Kirby at 8 metres.

\textsuperscript{186} Brandwood, p.126.
With the exception of Hoby, where both aisles are just over 4 metres wide, in all other cases the south aisle is slightly wider than the north aisle. Chancels also provide interesting data, those at Hoby and Rotherby measure 9 x 4.5 metres; those at Asfordby, Frisby, Ratcliffe and Thrussington average 10 x 4 / 4.5 metres; whilst Kirby measures 10 x 6 metres.

In looking for a reason why many of these dimensions fall within fairly close parameters, the evidence of Norman work at Melton, Frisby and Rotherby has been noted. It is more than likely that the other churches stand, at least in part, on Norman foundations. The measurements suggest that there was an accepted module for a chancel, and indeed, for a two-cell Norman church. For priests to perform their Eucharistic duties, a nominal space would have been desirable in the chancel, as for the accommodation of the residents of an average 12th-century village, there was in the nave. If there was an accepted module, it is natural that masons working within a given locality, would set out very similar ground plans. Additional 14th-century aisles would, of course, stand on virgin soil, and whilst their width could be random, their length would have been subject to those of the nave.

If the similarity of modules does not necessarily imply the same masons, the architectural details may do so. It has been noted that at Kirby Bellars and Hoby, there is an almost identical 'progression' of arcade detail, each commencing at the west with an octagonal pier, then moving on to shafted piers. Equally, there is a similarity of window tracery, which also suggests quite strongly that the same masons were at work.

Patrons and master masons would naturally look at nearby churches. Melton shares the rare distinction of having aisled transepts, but not far away, both Asfordby and Frisby have a single aisle to their south transepts, again, a rare feature in small
village churches. Again, this suggests work of the same masons, or at least, there is clear evidence of a familiarity with local building works. Vaulting is rare in Leicestershire, yet there are two examples of tower vaults in close proximity, at Asfordby and Kirby Bellars. Whilst the former is a Perpendicular tower, Kirby is not, and the vault is almost certainly a later Perpendicular insertion by the same masons.

As the addition of aisles to six of these churches testifies to much 14th-century building activity, so the addition of towers and spires is witness to a surge of activity in the later 14th and 15th centuries. There are Perpendicular towers at Asfordby, Rotherby, Thrussington and Ratcliffe, with an additional bell-stage at Melton, and there are Perpendicular spires at Asfordby, Brooksby and Ratcliffe. Again, the close proximity of all these churches suggests work by the same masons, who perhaps progressed from one site to the next, as was the case with the great tower-building phase in Somerset.187

These villages are much too close together for there to have been quite separate and independent masons working at similar periods. W. G. Hoskins reminds us that "In Leicestershire and Lincolnshire, the villages were often less than a couple of miles apart, and the Scandinavian settlement [as is evident in the Wreake valley] later added to the [Anglo-Saxon] 'congestion'."188 The conclusion has to be that, in spite of the absence of identifying masons' marks, the combined works at these Wreake villages may well have occupied the same group of masons over a period of time. How could they all have worked at the same time on different churches? The answer is that they did not. The drying, and consequently the shrinkage rate, of mediaeval lime mortar was a slow process, and sufficient time had
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to be allowed before striking the centering beneath arcade arches.\textsuperscript{189} This meant that whilst the drying process took place at one church, work could potentially be in hand at another.

**ADDITIONS AND ENLARGEMENTS**

Having discussed a small group of Leicestershire churches, it is time to examine in more general terms the reasons for, and the manner in which building works of the late 13th and early 14th century were applied within the county, before presenting the detailed analyses, which form the remaining chapters of this thesis.

The most obvious reason for the enlargement of churches in the 14th century is demographic. During the 12th and 13th centuries, the population of the country in general had been rising, and thus, until the agrarian crisis of the early 14th century, followed shortly afterwards by the Black Death, there had clearly been a need for increased congregational capacity in all but the most remote communities.\textsuperscript{190} However, there had to be reasons other than purely demographic. The practice of Marian devotion had been increasing during the 13th century, so that, well before its close, major churches and a great many parish churches required a particular space in which the special services in honour of Our Lady could be performed. The concept of Purgatory was not new in the late 13th century, and minds had become more concentrated on the sanctity and theatre of the Mass, as well as upon Purgatory. Richard Morris reminds us that both the eucharistic doctrine as set out at the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, and the formal institution of Corpus Christi in 1264, were brought to the attention of much wider audiences through the preaching of the new


mendicant orders. In addition, the natural extension of the living praying for each other, to that of the living praying for the dead, came from the belief that such prayers would ease and hasten the passage of the deceased through Purgatory; the whole concept of chantries was based upon this belief. Joseph Lynch states that whilst:

“There was no official teaching on purgatory until the Council of Florence [1438-45] [...] popular faith in purgatory had long preceded precise theological definitions about it.”

The popular understanding of the 14th-century disasters as punishment for sin would certainly have motivated an interest in chantries, as also, the financing of lavish improvements to their churches by those who could afford it, might have eased some consciences. Taking all of these facts into consideration, it is obvious that not only had the demographic change to be catered for, but additional altar space was required to accommodate the recitation of chantries, to provide Lady chapels, as well as often for dedicatory saints.

The provision of additional accommodation could be solved in several ways. The lengthening of a nave was generally not an acceptable solution, because of either a west tower, or the requirement to demolish and rebuild a chancel. However, a single example of this arrangement has come to light at Swinford, in Leicestershire, with a 14th-century extension by one bay to the east of the 13th-century nave. Occasionally a nave was extended to the west to provide a link with a tower that had been built previously, or, as is the case at Ashby Folville, the nave was extended in the 14th century with a further west bay, and then a tower subsequently added. Since a tower added at the west end of a church exerted considerable pressure over a relatively
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small area, it was often prudent to allow time for any settlement, by building it clear of existing work, rather than to risk rupturing the joint between tower and nave.

The more practical solution was to construct an aisle, or aisles alongside the nave. Such work had several advantages. It made the central vessel more accessible, since entry could be from both sides, rather than having the congregation packed against an outer nave wall; it provided flexibility for accommodating processions as well as additional congregation, and it provided areas for additional altars and chantry chapels.

The establishing of chantries, which at the lowest level simply required a priest and an altar, and at the highest could require specially enclosed spaces in the form of 'cages', often set within aisle arcades, or as larger spaces within aisles, required building expansion which might have been on a reduced scale if it were only to cater for slightly larger numbers.194 Either way, the provision of additional altars, the evidence for which remains in the form of numerous piscinae, required building extension. Without such, the only space available would have been on either side of the western face of a chancel arch, generally against the rood screen. An altar in such a position formerly existed against the west face of the chancel arch on the south side of the complete 14th-century aisleless church at Ratcliffe Culey, and for which a piscina still survives (Fig. 3/67).

The building of aisles could be effected with minimum disturbance to the congregation. By constructing an arcade alongside the outer wall of a nave, and by building a lean-to roof, the whole extension could be complete before the nave wall was taken down. There is clear evidence for this practice in the south aisles at Rotherby (Fig. 3/46), and at Thrussington (Fig. 3/57), where the east end of the original

194 Roffey, p.16.
nave walls may be seen standing just within the present south arcade. The disadvantage of such a practice would have been the necessity of building of a new roof to cover the wider span of the nave. Various examples of different roof lines survive on the west walls of towers, such as at Thrussington (Fig.3/56).

The introduction of aisles meant less direct light into the nave, and so clerestories were introduced. Whilst many are of the Perpendicular period, often associated with the construction of rood-lofts and stairs, there are numerous examples in Leicestershire of Decorated clerestories, some with square-headed windows, as at Kimcote (Fig.3.68), although two-centred clerestory windows are found occasionally, as at Slawston (Fig.3.69). The square-headed window is the logical progression from the two-centred type, since it can make full use of the restricted height of a clerestory thus providing maximum light. The cusped ogee lights of many of these remind us that not all square-headed windows are Perpendicular, although such forms are to be found repeatedly in Perpendicular clerestories. At both Kimcote and Slawston, the wall-plate line of the original nave may be seen, and we note that these are clerestories raised not on arcades, but on existing nave walls without aisle extensions, giving a two-tiered effect; this is a method of introducing additional light into naves that may be found in a number of the county churches. Many clerestories have lower pitched roofs, as may be seen from the scars of earlier roof lines surviving on the east walls of towers. This may have been the result of an economy in the use of materials; as the lower ends of rafters tended to rot where they overhung wall plates, they could be re-used but at a lower pitch simply by sawing off the rotten ends.

Another means of adding aisles was to construct piers and arches within an existing nave wall. Such would have been the practice at St. Mary de Castro, in Leicester, when the south aisle was added in the 13th century, and where the 12th-
century arcading, together with two windows, survives in the clerestory above. The process would have involved the removal of small sections of wall at a time to allow for the insertion of individual voussoirs, whilst pier stones would gradually have replaced vertical sections of wall. This method would have maintained the overall integrity of the wall, which could thus have provided centering for the new arches, and support on either side of the new piers. In the west bay of the south arcade at Ashby Folville may be seen the head of a later 14th-century arch beneath a plain chamfered early 14th-century example (Fig. 3/70). Although this is clearly a re-modelling of an earlier aisle, this does show how centering was used in ‘reverse’ as well as in the more conventional manner.

In Leicestershire, there are examples of later arcades standing on the lower courses of what were possibly the original nave walls, as at Gaddesby, where the piers of the north arcade stand on what is in effect a sleeper wall (Fig. 3/71). A similar example may be seen at Desford (Fig. 3/72). This form of addition provided a more substantial compressed foundation for an arcade, rather than on individual pier foundations set in virgin soil. It may well be the latter arrangement that has given rise to the numerous arcades that lean outwards, following the additional weight of a clerestory being imposed. At Hose, it may be seen how the north arcade has had to be supported by a transverse arch. Whilst the capital still tilts, the pier and base have been rebuilt on the vertical. (Fig. 3/73) Since practically all nave roofs are of the tie-beam variety, the question of lateral thrust from a vault does not arise.

The provision of aisle space does not mean that we are necessarily observing an original aisle in every case. It might be supposed that a Transitional or Early English arcade is leading into a late 12th- or early 13th-century addition; however,
there is evidence that aisles were sometimes widened, retaining the earlier arcade, but with new 14th-century outer walls and fenestration. An interesting example of this is at Hallaton, where a lavish 14th-century enlargement of the north aisle is simply built over the earlier 12th-century aisle (Fig.3/74). Here, on the west wall, can be seen the original roof line of a narrow aisle coeval with the west tower and both of the same rubble construction; the larger 14th-century addition in fine ashlar is simply butted against and over the earlier work. Similarly, at Stonesby, the original roof line of a very narrow north aisle survives against the east wall of the present aisle, whilst the complete south aisle at Knossington (Fig.3/75), preserves its original narrow width, although the fenestration is part of Blomfield’s restoration of 1882. The widening of a narrow earlier aisle may have been not simply to accommodate growing numbers, but also to provide space for processions, and the only way to process around a church was by means of aisles.

Quite often, new work was not bonded into existing walls. At Evington, the west end of the large north aisle is butted up against the north east tower buttress (Fig.3/76). Here, the line of the buttress, rising from a large splayed base, can be seen against the jamb of the window at the end of the 14th-century aisle. Further examples may be seen at Melton Mowbray, where the west porch is built against the buttresses at the west end of the nave (Fig.3/9), and at Newark in Nottinghamshire, where the south aisle, for which there is documentary evidence of its commencement in 1312, adjoins the 13th-century tower (Fig.3/77). However, the most bizarre example must surely be the 15th-century south porch at Newark which cuts one of the south aisle windows in half (Fig.3/78).

It may be seen that none of the new work is bonded in. This suggests that
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careful attention had been paid to the foundations of extensions, to avoid fractures or settlement, although without excavation, it is impossible to verify such a statement.

There are several examples, mainly in the south-west of the county, where an aisle is almost as wide or even wider than the nave, giving the appearance of a church with twin naves. At Stoke Golding, the large south aisle with its variety of windows with Geometrical tracery virtually doubles the internal space of the church (Fig.3/79).\textsuperscript{197} In Fig.3/80, can be seen the high quality of this late 13th-century aisle, with its elaborate base mouldings, gabled buttresses where the sides slope upwards to give the upper sections the appearance of substantial pinnacle bases, the quatrefoil parapet and the Geometric windows.

At St. Mary de Castro, in Leicester, the late 13th-century south aisle is wider than the nave, having been added to accommodate a parish congregation in what had already been a 12th-century collegiate foundation attached to the castle.\textsuperscript{198} Here, the aisle is virtually a complete church even with separate access via a south wall stair turret to its own rood-loft. Other examples of the ‘double-nave’ effect may be seen at Broughton Astley, Nailstone and Thurlaston (Map 5). Gaddesby has a large north aisle, a complete 14th-century enlargement, of a smaller aisle of which the 13th-century arcade survives, and we find similar work at Evington. These large additions could sometimes be enlargements of existing aisles, but were occasionally the result of a chantry foundation. Three such examples are documented; at Sapcote, a college of chantry priests was established in the north aisle on May 5th, 1361,\textsuperscript{199} at Kirby Bellars, a chantry college was established in 1319, and in 1359, the college was re-

\textsuperscript{199} ibid, pp.211-212.
founded as an Augustinian priory. A college was founded at Nosely in 1274, for which Pevsner suggests that the aisleless chapel, which now serves as the private chapel to the house, was complete by c.1305.

Not all Leicestershire aisles are complete Decorated work, where buttresses, external mouldings, pinnacles, battlements and fenestration are clearly the product of one building period, as in the north aisle at Gaddesby. Fewer still suggest that they are the product of a complete 14th-century rebuilding of nave and aisles, as at Swepstone (Fig. 3/81). Occasionally, as I shall make clear in Chapter 7, there are examples of windows where the typology and chronology do not agree; a window of earlier typology has been introduced into a wall that is clearly later, suggesting the influence of a particular patron. Whilst no documentary evidence has so far come to light in Leicestershire to explain this apparent confusion of styles, there is considerable evidence for patrons having instructed builders to copy a particular detail from another building. To quote just two examples from Harvey, he informs us that:

"William Humberville, master mason in 1369-79 for the building of the library of Merton College, Oxford, journeyed to Sherborne, Salisbury, Winchester and London, 'with the purpose of viewing the library of the reaching Friars' to get ideas, [...] In 1450, Roger Growden was instructed to view the steeples of Callington in Cornwall, Buckland, Tavistock and Ashburton and to use the best of them as a pattern for the tower of Totnes parish church."

Where both north and south aisles exist, which is the case in very many Leicestershire churches, as a general rule, the north aisle is slightly earlier. The
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evidence for this may be seen in the capitals, and sometimes in the pier profiles. Nail-head, where it exists, tends to be in north arcades, though not exclusively; mould lines around abaci are generally more profuse in south arcades, and whilst the ubiquitous double-chamfered arches abound throughout the county, often hood-moulds and head stops are more detailed on south arcades.

There are logical reasons for the different dating between north and south arcades. The building of a north arcade was less disruptive, because a south door, usually the main entrance, and often with fine detail, did not have to be disturbed and reset. Furthermore, the removal of a south nave wall could reduce the amount of direct sunlight into the central vessel - a situation that could be remedied by the insertion of larger Decorated windows into a south aisle wall, as well as by the introduction of a clerestory.

The disparity of dates between north and south arcades could also be the result of simple economics. Fund-raising no doubt could take some time, particularly when an aisle was to be the result of parochial needs rather than the donation of a wealthy private patron; time could necessarily elapse between the completion of one aisle and the commencement of the other, and a building lapse of no more than thirty years could make all the difference to moulding profiles and tracery details. Whilst all these suggestions are feasible, there is no documentary evidence to provide support in the case of modest village churches.

LIGHT

The question of natural light in medieval churches may be considered under two headings, of general light and focussed light. It was of course necessary to admit as much light into the body of a church as was possible, with services being timed to
hours of natural light. The introduction of clerestories brought direct light back into naves that had been darkened by the addition of aisles, and with these came more elaborate timber ceilings with carved bosses that were lit by light reflected upwards from lead aisle roofs through the clerestory windows. It is probably too much to assume that the 14th-century builders were aware of Abbot Suger’s writings on the Dionysian theory of light, (a concept that is clearly set out in the Erwin Panofsky’s Introduction to his work on Abbot Suger. ) Nevertheless, the impact of a flood of light from windows that appeared to float overhead would not have been lost on the imagination; such an effect may be clearly seen from the array of forty-eight Perpendicular clerestory windows to the nave and transepts at Melton Mowbray. By the late 13th and early 14th centuries, it was possible to increase window areas. With the technical advances offered by grouping lancets under single traceried heads, through the Geometrical and later Decorated architecture, window areas increased enormously, but there remains the question of focussed light. The sun could throw a spotlight onto a special area such as an altar, an image, a wall painting or even a tomb. We find in the county that south-west windows in chancels regularly tend to be larger than the remaining south windows to provide additional light to the priest, whose stall was, and still is, in the south-west corner of the chancel. However, Bloxham makes a persuasive case for the smaller window that is sometimes introduced beneath a larger south-west chancel window, and often called a 'low-side window', to have served as a confessional used by friars.

Still dealing with the question of light, we frequently find a larger window in the south-east corner of a south aisle, to throw additional light upon a side altar. Thus,
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at Diseworth (Fig. 3/82), the lean-to roof of the south aisle was removed and the walls raised to allow for a much larger south-east window. The original roof line can be seen just above the earlier east window. Even at Ratcliffe Culey, previously mentioned, the south-east nave window is larger than its contemporaries in order to light the altar that stood against the south respond of the chancel arch, as is indicated by the surviving piscina.

The introduction of clerestories overcame the loss of direct light into naves following the addition of aisles and we might consider a possible explanation for the unusual number of nave walls that contain two tiers of windows, that is a clerestory with no aisle. A simple explanation applies to churches that had an aisle that has subsequently been demolished, where the two-storeyed effect comes from the surviving original clerestory windows and the fact that the original aisle windows have been reinstated within the blocked arcade. A double tier of small windows will weaken a wall far less than very large single windows, and an explanation could be that if local builders were employed they may have lacked the skill and confidence to handle large openings. It also follows that if a nave wall had to be raised to provide a clerestory above a single aisle, the opposite wall also needed to be raised to provide support for the raised roof. The following four examples will illustrate some of these points. At Thorpe Langton (Fig.3/83), a clerestory was added, probably in the mid-14th century, to run the entire length of nave and chancel; a clear break in the building line is discernible. At Peckleton (Fig.3/84), the south aisle was raised, and the contrast between the Perpendicular addition and the existing Decorated window is marked. Whilst the whole wall is of random rubble, the break between the building lines is still noticeable. At Broughton Astley (Fig.3/85), a ‘twin-nave’ church, where both vessels are of the same height, the clerestorey is not an afterthought. However, there was a
Perpendicular remodelling of the nave, and the fenestration is all part of the same programme. Since all these windows replace earlier, and almost certainly smaller examples, the odd placement of the clerestory windows is due to their being supported above solid wall rather than earlier and existing openings (Map 6).

CHANCELS

Continuing the discussion on the various reasons for the introduction of Decorated architecture into Leicestershire, our attention now turns to chancels and chancel chapels. Chapels, where they existed, were also generally on the north side and sometimes took the form of chantry chapels or mortuary chapels, as for the Skeffington family at Skeffington. Chancels open into such chapels generally through a single arch, the details of which are usually similar to those of a north or south arcade. In lean-to chapels, Decorated windows are often restricted in size in the east walls, and the majority of examples appear to contain Reticulated tracery. Where large east windows exist, they have often been emasculated because of a lowering of the roof pitch, as at Barkby and Lockington; these will be discussed in Chapter 7. South chancel chapels tend to be less common than those on the north side, because of the practical reasons of obstructing a priest’s door or light to his stall, as well as interference with piscinae and sedilia. In any case, the north side of a main altar was the favoured burial position, where one hoped to be seated at the right hand of God.

Chancels, by virtue of the fact that their maintenance was the responsibility of the priest and not of the laity, generally retain earlier features than many congregational areas, and so replacement windows in the Decorated style were often restricted to east and south walls, leaving earlier windows in north walls, such as the Norman window at Fenny Drayton (Fig.3/86), where even the scar of a shaved-off
pilaster remains, together with some of the masonry.

Only rarely is a chancel a complete 14th-century rebuilding, such as at Claybrooke (Fig.3/87), or Arnesby. Looking at two more examples, Cotterstock in Northants (Fig.3/88), and Car Colston in Notts (Fig.3/89), it can be seen that often these total rebuildings dominate the rest of the church. Cotterstock was founded as a chantry college in 1338 by John Gifford, who had been steward of Queen Isabella’s lands beyond the Trent; a reminder that all such foundations and their lavish buildings were the result of wealthy and influential patronage.206 The whole essence of a complete 14th-century chancel is one of magnificent scale and proportion; of light, and surely when originally glazed in coloured glass, of heavenly light. Added to these features, we find micro-architecture in the form of image niches, sedilia and piscinae, so that the whole ensemble is conceived as a Gesamtkunstwerk. Everything emphasised the fact that the priestly order moved in a completely different world, far superior to that of the laity. Further examples emphasise an important point that appears to have been overlooked in much discussion on parish church architecture. Byfield in Northamptonshire, (Fig.3/90); Chacombe, in the same county (Fig.3/91), and Sibthorpe in Nottinghamshire, (Fig.3/92), together with examples 3/87 - 3/89, all demonstrate a unity of window design. In each, the tracery is consistent, whereas that in individual windows inserted into aisle extensions, etc., is frequently varied within the same wall. Nicola Coldstream's statement that: "Its [Decorated] buildings are not structurally uniform. Indeed, many of them are extensions to earlier structures that dictate their proportions."207 requires some qualification. Yes, this is true in many instances where aisles have been added, and the proportions are partly dictated by the existing nave, but where chancels have been totally rebuilt from ground level, this is
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not true. A complete Decorated parochial chancel designed by a master-mason/architect is conceived as a unified whole, and, moreover, there appears to be no evidence of typologically inconsistent windows. The work would obviously have been approved by the patron, but details were not left to the imagination of individual masons. It is therefore important to distinguish between Decorated ‘architecture’ when conceived as a total rebuild, and Decorated ‘improvement’ which may mean no more than the insertion of a larger window or two. The north aisle at Swepstone (Fig.3/81), and the chancel at Claybrooke (Fig.3/87), belong to the former category, whilst the south aisle at Diseworth (Fig.3/82), belongs to the latter.

One might have hoped to discover the authorship of at least some of the more important Leicestershire churches. In 1998, John Harvey produced a list of mediaeval parish churches by known craftsmen, but out of sixty examples, only one county church, St. Martin, Leicester, now the cathedral, is mentioned, where he states that “Wright the mason” was responsible for an aisle, c.1545-46. It is significant that only three churches in Harvey’s list date from before 1366, and are therefore within our period, reminding us that apart from the royal works of Henry III and the Edwardian castles, building records at parish church level are virtually non-existent. However, research for this study has produced an interesting discovery. Jean Bony states that:

"Lichfield bears a Ramsey signature in the form of a motif of quatrefoils in bands right round the windows of the choir clerestory. This is a motif also found at Penshurst Place, which is considered a Ramsey work of the 1340s."  

This work may be seen at Lichfield in Fig.3/93, but what has not been

---

209 Bony, p.61.
observed either by Bony, or any other writer, is the clear evidence of William Ramsey at work at Ulverscroft priory (Fig.3/94). Comparison of the quatrefoil banding in the window embrasures at both sites makes it difficult to think otherwise. Although Pevsner describes these details in the windows of the south choir wall, he ascribes no authorship. 210

More commonly in Leicestershire, where chancels exhibit 14th-century work, it is in the micro-architecture which has been added to an earlier interior, in the form of image niches, piscinae and sedilia. Similarly, we find many examples of low, shallow wall recesses, generally in north chancel walls, with either trefoiled or cinquefoiled arches, and sometimes beneath crocketed gables, a few of which retain effigies. Whether these served simply as tomb recesses or also as Easter sepulchres, will be discussed in a later chapter.

In addition to the demographic and liturgical needs of the late 13th and early 14th centuries, the processes of dilapidation should also be taken into account. The ingress of water is one of the quickest means by which buildings decay, through the introduction of both wet and dry rot. By their nature, churches are tall buildings where regular inspection of drainage channels would not have been easy. The constant seepage of water does not take long to cause serious damage: at Lowesby in north-east Leicestershire, the regular dripping of water through an aisle roof has not only rotted a hole through the pew beneath, but also through the floorboards under the pew.

A church dating from c. 1240 could be in an advanced state of decay if neglected for a period of seventy years of even less, and if major work was necessary by the early 14th century, it would obviously not have been carried out in the Early English style. Records indicate instances of Leicestershire spires being struck by

---
210 Pevsner, p.415.
lightning, where even partial collapse through a roof could require rebuilding. St. Mary de Castro is only one of numerous examples.\footnote{211 T. Doughty, \textit{The Parish and Collegiate Church of St. Mary de Castro, Leicester: History and Guide}, Leicester: Desktop Publishing, 2005, p.9.} Other examples of lightning strikes are noted by Brandwood at Birstall (1827), Brooksby (1881), Cold Overton (1900), Coleorton (1821), and Kings Norton (1850).\footnote{212 Brandwood, pp.77, 79, 82 and 97.} With the exception of the spire at Kings Norton, which was never rebuilt, all of these spires were rebuilt or repaired.

Disturbance to foundations can cause rapid decay: the church at Freeby has suffered subsidence on the north side, to the extent that within only the last five years tracery has fallen out of windows and the church has had to be closed.

**COLOUR**

Colour is another important aspect of the application of Decorated work in the county to consider. From surviving examples, it is clear that colour was used extensively in the pre-Reformation church, such as the early 13th-century Ladder of Salvation and the Last Judgement on the west wall at Chaldon, in Surrey;\footnote{213 I. Nairn and N. Pevsner, (rev. B. Cherry), \textit{The Buildings of England: Surrey}, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1971, p.140.} the late 14th-century Christ in Judgement with the Works of Mercy and Deadly Sins, on the west wall at Trotton, in Sussex;\footnote{214 I. Nairn and N. Pevsner, \textit{The Buildings of England: Sussex}, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965, p.356.} and the 15th-century Last Judgement above the chancel arch at St. Thomas’s, Salisbury.\footnote{215 N. Pevsner, \textit{The Buildings of England: Wiltshire}, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963, pp.397-398.} Such examples remind us of the huge losses following the Reformation and the English Civil War; the extensive use of colour in English churches was not to be experienced again until the era of High Victorian Anglicanism, with such great works as Hascombe, in Surrey, and Highnam, in Gloucestershire. At Cold Overton (Figs.3/95 and 3/96), and at Freeby (Fig.3/97),
traces of colour survive on the 14th-century walls, although we should be cautious of assuming that mural decoration is necessarily contemporary with the walls. Caiger-Smith attributes a date of c.1300 to the Cold Overton examples, which depict the Assumption, St. John the Baptist, St Catherine, the Nativity and the Burial of the Virgin.\textsuperscript{216} The example at Freeby shows a series of crocketed ogee canopies within an ogee-headed embrasure, both of which are surely contemporary. At Lutterworth (Fig.3/98), a Last Judgement appears above the chancel arch, ascribed by Pevsner to the 14th century,\textsuperscript{217} and by Caiger-Smith to the, more likely, 15th century. A similar 15th-century mural appears in the north chapel at Great Bowden (Fig.3/99). Both examples depict Christ seated on a rainbow.

The 14th-century south arcade at Orton-on-the-Hill (Fig.3/100), retains interesting painted decoration, whilst a reminder of the rich colouring of rood screens may be seen at Kimcote Fig.3/101). Here, fragments of the original screen with reticulated tracery, now fitted into the tower arch, still show traces of gold adhering to the red primer.

The stone surround to a former retable survives at the east end of the north aisle at Arnesby (Fig.3/102), as yet another reminder of the importance of didactic and decorative art throughout the period. The survival of mural decoration also reminds us that the interior walls of churches were plastered unless constructed of fine ashlar, as at Claybrooke. The habit of stripping walls was one of the less commendable habits of Victorian ‘restorers’, and Brandwood cites 103 county churches where the walls were stripped between 1840 and post-1914, including those of uncertain date.\textsuperscript{218}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[217] Pevsner, p.300.
\item[218] Brandwood, 'To Scrape or not to scrape?', \textit{T.L.A.H.S.}, Vol.LXIV, 1950, pp.73-77.
\end{footnotes}
GROUND PLANS

To complete this chapter, I have produced a series of ground plans and elevations to illustrate the development of Leicestershire churches during the 14th century. Probably many churches began as simple two-celled buildings in the 12th century (Figs.3/103 and 3/104) such as Worthington, where original windows still survive in the north wall. In the 13th century (Figs.3/105 and 3/106), towers were generally added, of which there are numerous examples, as at Tilton-on-the-Hill. Sometimes, a 12th-century chancel was extended, as at Worthington, incorporating simple Early English lancets, or in other instances a transept may have been added on either the north or south sides. The arch leading into a former south transept at Slawston now forms the surround to a window (Fig.3/107). The addition of an aisle, usually first on the north side, has previously been referred to at Hallaton (Fig.3/74), which, as we have seen, also provides an excellent example of the later widening of an aisle. In Fig.3/108 we can see how the north aisle opens into an earlier transept, where the original joint between nave and transept survives as a small wall section rather than as a pier; such an arrangement survives at Barkby. The extended chancel retains original lancet windows in the north and east walls, but a larger window, with bar tracery, has been inserted on the south side to give more light to the altar. It may be seen that the original 12th-century priest’s door survives; fragmentary remains may be seen in the south wall of the chancel at Lockington (Fig.3/109). In Figs.3/110 and 3/111, major Decorated work has taken place in the form of a large, embattled south aisle with porch, as at Swepstone, together with a remodelling and further enlargement of the chancel, with quatrefoil parapet, image niches within the buttresses and crocketed pinnacles. The total rebuilding of the chancel at Claybrooke
contains many of these elements (Fig. 3/112).

Finally, in Figs. 3/113 and 3/114 we have the Perpendicular addition of a further bell-stage with recessed spire, as at Waltham-on-the-Wolds, and a clerestory, of which there are numerous examples throughout the county, generally associated with the provision of stairs to a rood-loft, as at Cosby (Fig. 3/115).

CONCLUSION

To conclude, the Geometrical and Decorated styles provided for demographic needs, and they could enable wealthy patrons to provide displays of piety in more splendid surroundings. Here, we might consider fashion and rivalry. Hubris was not confined to a later period with Boston ‘stump’ or Somerset towers; it was certainly present in the greater Decorated chancels of the East Midlands and East Anglia. The Decorated style catered for changing liturgical needs through its micro-architecture and by the introduction of larger, strategically placed windows and it could be required in the practical maintenance of a church. In the next chapter, the economic situation within the county will be examined briefly, to see how the underlying economic circumstances facilitated, or hindered church building in the 14th century.
CHAPTER 4 - THE ECONOMY OF LEICESTERSHIRE
CHAPTER 4

THE ECONOMY OF LEICESTERSHIRE

First, it is necessary to establish the existing lines of communication which could have brought wealth and building materials into the county (Map 7). Following this, an understanding of market centres and their relevance, not only to inter-county trade, but ultimately for European trade, is important, as is a study of the demographic changes within our period. The sphere of influence of the religious houses within Leicestershire cannot be ignored, still less can the impact of natural disasters such as famine and plague, or the effects of enclosures. This is not intended to be a detailed economic survey, but rather, it tries to address the manner in which the economy could have affected church building in the later 13th and early 14th centuries.

Dealing first with communications, although there are no major rivers in Leicestershire, the Wreake, Sence and Soar all drain north-westwards into the Trent, whilst those closer to the southern border, such as the Welland, Avon and Swift, drain east and south into Northamptonshire. The river Soar may have been navigable as far up as Leicester, as would, perhaps, the lower reaches of its tributary, the Wreake. This would have given access to the much larger river Trent, and from thence into the Humber. Since the sources of the southern rivers are mainly close to the county border, it is difficult to determine how navigable those upper reaches were, and present day rates of flow and depth may not have been the same in the 14th century. Edwards and Hindle indicate the major English rivers that were known, from documentary evidence, to have been navigable, but point out that it does not mean
that other rivers were not navigable. According to the evidence, Leicester and most of the county is shown to have been approximately 15 miles from known navigable rivers.\textsuperscript{219} The water-borne transport of merchandise would have been fairly simple; the more difficult transportation of heavy building stone will be addressed in Chapter 5. Though the rivers were small, they still required bridges. We are told that:

“When all the medieval references to Leicestershire bridges are collated we get an overwhelming impression of the vigorous developments which took place during the reign of Edward I. By the 14th century the records refer most frequently to measures necessary to repair bridges already existing.”\textsuperscript{220}

Turning to roads, it is evident that the county was fairly well provided by the 14th century. Watling Street, which connected London with the legionary fortress at Chester, formed much of the southern boundary of the county, and passed only twelve miles south of Leicester. The Fosse Way, which connected the Cotswolds with Lincoln and Yorkshire, passed directly through Leicester, whilst the major north-south route of Ermine Street lay a little to the east of the county boundary.

Sir Francis Hill relates how:

“By the fourteenth century, the Ermine Street had been superseded by the old North Road, whose main points from London, were Waltham Cross, Ware, Royston, Huntingdon, Wansford bridge across the Nene, Stamford, Grantham, Newark, and so north to Doncaster.”\textsuperscript{221}

The track roads from both Grantham and Stamford followed mainly high ground before dropping down into Leicester, in the middle of which triangle was the

\textsuperscript{220} Victoria History of the County of Leicestershire, Vol.V., p.69.
important town of Melton Mowbray, which has held market rights since 1077. Another important track was Sewstern Lane, often known as The Drift. This formed much of the border between Leicestershire and Lincolnshire, and was used as a drove road well into the 18th century.

Coventry, the great central crossing point in mediæval England, had a direct route from Leicester, which because of the routes that lay close to, and through it, was well connected for trade, particularly with the port at Boston which was important for the export of Leicestershire wool.

If the network of communications was reasonable, what of the markets that were linked by them? Records indicate that by 1350, forty-four places in Leicestershire and Rutland had market rights. The survival of market crosses on what are now attractive village greens, such as at Hallaton, are a clear indication that such places were once commercial centres for the surrounding area. Whilst the exchange of local produce in the numerous markets may not have contributed to the financing of church enlargement, the trading of corn and wool over much wider areas, together with the income from rents must certainly have done so. As the peasant economy grew in so far as many families began to produce more than was required for their own needs, in the form of dairy produce, etc., the markets became of vital importance, and it was peasants as well as landlords who were able to trade beyond just the local markets. Christopher Dyer informs us that:

"Niches in the market could be occupied by peasants. Demesnes tended to concentrate on the staple, bulky products such as grain, wool and livestock. This left the peasants to cater for steady demand for the

224 R. Millward, p.56.
smaller and more troublesome items, such as poultry, eggs, fruit and vegetables, honey and wax.\textsuperscript{225}

If more land could be brought into production and thus, to accommodate more peasants, then rental income increased, and it could have been the combination of this revenue together with the profits from the trade in corn and wool that produced the disposable income to enable church extensions.

It is not easy to assess the impact of the religious houses, which with the exception of Leicester Abbey, were all fairly minor. With almost total loss of sites apart from Ulverscroft and Launde, it is virtually impossible to assess any architectural influence, but I am inclined to believe that far more influence came into the county via the sources quoted in my Introduction, than came from the religious houses within. Hilton is of the opinion that:

“[...] there is no reason to suppose that Leicestershire’s monastic estates had any great influence on the county’s economic structure.”\textsuperscript{226}

That the religious houses would have traded in grain and wool seems certain since the greater part of monastic wealth lay in around seventy parishes, accounting for perhaps 70,000 acres.\textsuperscript{227} There is very little evidence that any church building benefited from monastic patronage, whilst records from our period are virtually non-existent. Numerous charters have been reproduced of between 1140 and 1265, mainly regarding grants of land, but do little to enlighten us about the economy of the Abbey.\textsuperscript{228}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{228} J. Story, J. Bourne and R. Buckley, (eds.), \textit{Leicester Abbey}, Leicester: The Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society, 2006, pp.234-287.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Matthew Paris records that even by 1258, poor harvests had driven up prices to four or five times their normal level.\textsuperscript{229} Further bad summers produced similar effects in the early 14th century. The Lay Subsidy of 1334 gives us some idea of the economic situation within the county, although this comes after the periods of famine during the earlier part of the 14th century. The town of Leicester had an assessed wealth of £267 compared with that of £1,100 at Boston, £359 at Stamford and £293 at Grantham. The tax assessment for Leicestershire increased from approximately 15 shillings per square mile in 1225 to 18 by 1334.\textsuperscript{230} It cannot be assumed that this necessarily reflected a booming economy; remembering that between 1277 and 1295, Edward I was engaged upon a huge and expensive campaign of castle building in north Wales, that was dependent upon taxes and the impressment of a large labour force from most English counties.\textsuperscript{231} This period also saw the continuation of successive famines resulting from poor harvests, which were in turn due to bad summers and intensive land working which was impoverishing the soil, with the result that there was a high mortality rate amongst a population that had increased considerably towards the end of the 13th century.

How could the massive wave of church enlargement during the late 13th and early 14th centuries, as is evident in Leicestershire, have been supported both financially and logistically? Finance could have come mainly from the land-owners, who benefited particularly during adverse times by increasing prices as demand rose. However, I suggest that much work may well have been carried out v by local villagers. In between ploughing, sowing and harvesting, apart from animal husbandry,

there would have been little to do on the land. During the summer, oxen would have been available to haul stone from quarries; whilst farm labourers could have helped prepare foundations, and unfinished walls could have been thatched to prevent damage from winter frosts. In 1282-83, Edward I had impressed large numbers of diggers from the Midland counties for the early stages of his castle-building campaigns in north Wales. Although there is no documentary evidence to suggest that it was the case in Leicestershire, there is no reason to suppose that diggers could not have been equally employed in church enlargements in their home villages. Furthermore, in a period of religious fervour, the labourer would have been as mindful of preparing for the after-life as would the wealthy patron who could finance the building of a chantry aisle. Thus, he would have been exhorted, if not willing, to participate in a venture that would benefit the whole community as well as his soul. In addition to church-ales, there were various forms of fund-raising, and although those quoted by Abbot Gasquet are dated slightly later than the period under discussion, there is no reason to suppose that similar measures did not obtain in the fourteenth century. Labourers, used to heavy manual work on the land, could well have performed some unskilled tasks, whilst those skilled in crafts other than masonry should not be overlooked; the pit-sawyers and craftsmen who could produce the materials to construct a cruck-framed dwelling, or the box-framed version with its king or crown-post roof, would certainly have been involved in similar roof constructions for churches. Finally, does a study of the economy help to date the Decorated work in Leicestershire? The increase in population would certainly have encouraged church enlargement, conversely, it is unlikely that churches would have been enlarged during
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a major crisis such as the Black Death. The intermittent famines may have had less of an impact, given that many building projects may have continued over a period, and were no doubt abandoned and re-started as conditions improved, although many simple aisles could have been completed within a single season. Whilst some thoughts in these final paragraphs are conjectural, there are supporting precedents. For instance, a modern example of a lengthy building break may be found at Guildford, where the building of the cathedral was abandoned from 1940 until 1952, due to the Second World War and its aftermath. Economic factors in Leicestershire would seem to suggest that most building was carried out in the more favourable periods between the famine years, when prices were high, and incomes were therefore good and before many sections of society were reduced by the pestilence.

In the absence of any records of county building contracts for the period, conclusions can only be based on economic and stylistic evidence. The latter, suggests that a great deal was in place by the beginning of the 14th century, by which time there had been a demographic increase, which required additional accommodation. The agrarian crisis of the early 14th century, followed by the pestilence, must certainly have had a depressing effect upon church enlargements, although other counties suffered equally. Why then, does the Decorated style in Leicestershire not equal that of Lincolnshire or Northamptonshire?

The lack of fine building stone is only part of the answer; not all counties recovered from the disasters of the 14th century either as quickly, or to the same level of prosperity. There are very few examples of outstanding and lavish building works within the county such as would have been funded by those who emerged relatively unscathed by economic disasters, and who in fact, may well have benefited from them. Such evidence does not suggest there having been a vibrant economy in
Leicestershire. If this supposition is based upon the architectural evidence, which reflects the economy, whilst it was certainly more successful than that of Surrey, it could not compare with those of East Anglia or Lincolnshire, and yet, as has been noted, Leicestershire was not geographically remote; it was at the centre of major routes and therefore presumably accessible to external influences. The stylistic evidence of Geometric work in the county would seem to indicate that a great deal of enlargement and rebuilding had taken place earlier than the lavish Decorated examples to be found in some of the adjacent counties. I suggest that the prosperity that came with the recovery of trade by the early 15th century, came too late for church building in Leicestershire; such prosperity as there was did not invite wholesale rebuilding. At the most, such work was confined to the additions of clerestories and rood stairs, with a few modest towers or additional bell-stages. The two major 15th-century towers at Church Langton and St. Margaret’s, Leicester, still do not compare with Isle Abbots or Huish Episcopi, in Somerset, although Church Langton is certainly comparable with some of the fine East Anglian towers, whilst the huge clerestory of forty-eight windows around the nave and transepts at Melton Mowbray, reflecting the prosperity of a flourishing market town, does not rival that of the cloth merchants of Lavenham.
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MASONS AND QUARRIES

Before discussing masons, quarries and working practices, a first consideration must be the geology of Leicestershire and its immediate environs. Examination of Map No. 8. shows the geology of the relevant part of eastern England with county boundaries superimposed. As a continuation of the Cotswolds, two bands of limestone run from south-west to north-east; band A is oolite, the finest of building limestones, which runs east of the county, and this is followed to the west by a parallel band B, of lias. This is the band that runs down through most of eastern Leicestershire, and which is often called marlstone, or ironstone. It is the predominant church-building material in that part of the county, and it will be seen from surviving evidence that compared with oolite, it is a friable stone which assumes a variety of hues from light to very dark brown, due to the presence of iron oxides which darken on exposure.\(^{234}\) The lias occasionally exposes a somewhat better quality of limestone which appears as Blue Lias, the most famous of which is Ham Hill stone, quarried in Somerset; however, there is a small outcrop in Leicestershire near Melton Mowbray. Moving westwards through the remainder of the county, New Red Sandstone is encountered, or Keuper marl, as it is often called; a material that is not even as durable as lias and much of which is overlain by a thick layer of Boulder Clay, making it too deep for extraction. A small area to the north-west of Leicester consists of very ancient igneous rocks, producing granites in the form of syenite and diorite. The ragged ‘crazy-paving’ effect of the reddish/pink granite from Mountsorrel, which

weathers very little, is hardly attractive and seems to have been used mainly in 19th-century rebuildings, as at Barrow-upon-Soar, or the re-facing of the south aisle at Barkby. This same region also produces slate, which has been used to good effect as elegant and finely incised head-stones in many Leicestershire churchyards.

It will be seen from Map No. 9. that the finest limestone quarries are just to the east of the county in Lincolnshire, Rutland and Northamptonshire, producing fine quality ashlar mainly for Perpendicular additions, generally in churches in eastern Leicestershire. These include the towers at Freeby, Sproxton, Stonesby and Melton Mowbray, and the spires at Branston, Brooksby and Queniborough, to name only a few. That they form a group, suggests ready access to quarries, and stylistically, the possibility of a 'school' of masons. Although, as Perpendicular additions, they are beyond the remit of this thesis, I consider them too important to ignore, since they form, what I believe to be, the only clear evidence of a 'school' operating within the county. (Map 10)

A.K.Wickham suggests that whilst there is no documentary evidence for the theory of groups of masons in Somerset, nevertheless, a classification of the superb towers within that county indicates that there could have been as many as eight groups based on stylistic evidence.\(^{235}\) With regard to Decorated work, such evidence is more difficult to detect in Leicestershire, mainly because of inferior stone and the subsequent need for restoration, but my theory concerning a 'school' responsible for Perpendicular tower additions will be addressed in the next chapter.

It is interesting to speculate why fine ashlar rarely appears in Leicestershire much before the later 14th century, and most commonly in Perpendicular towers, which certainly created new demands. Improving road conditions must have had a

bearing, but I suggest that whilst local masons would have been familiar with working the marlstone in their immediate neighbourhood, they lacked both the knowledge and ability to work the much finer limestone used by masons, who almost certainly were based at, and who travelled out from, the famous quarries at Weldon. Clipsham, Ancaster, Ketton and Casterton on the limestone belt.\textsuperscript{236} There is a considerable difference between the hammered marlstone and the finely-sawn limestone, as is evident from the generous mortar joints of the former and the almost imperceptible joints of the latter.

Much of the walling in Leicestershire churches is of random rubble, as at Thornton (Fig.5/1), where only the buttresses and dressings are finely worked, and here, they appear to be original. As has been noted, much less common is coursed ashlar, as seen at Ravenstone (Fig.5/2), but even here, the 14th-century work does not have the very fine mortar joints associated with the later Perpendicular work. Of unusual interest is a small group of churches in the south of the county constructed of irregular shaped ‘pebbles’, which are more likely the result of glacial deposits than of river-bed material. At Peatling Parva (Fig.5/3), this material can be seen together with the pink sandstone of western Leicestershire, and more particularly of Warwickshire.

The degree to which the marlstone weathers may be seen in Figs. 5/4 and 5/5. Many Leicestershire churches give the impression that buttresses, string courses and dressings for windows and doors were of finer quality oolite, leaving the more friable marlstone for walls. I think that frequently this was not the case, and what we see now is a restoration of the most badly weathered details. On the towers at Grimston (Fig.5/4), and at Kirby Bellars (Fig.5/5), it will be seen that the entire structures are of marlstone, the exception being the Perpendicular addition to the top of Grimston.

tower. Examination of the lowest window in the tower at Kirby Bellars, reveals that
the whole window, including tracery is of the same stone; the windows above have
been restored, and it is obvious where stone replacement has been carried out in the
buttresses. How then, does one account for the fine ashlar at the base of the tower at
Harby? (Fig. 5/6) Lower courses of stonework degrade more quickly due to splashing
from rain-water, and at Harby, these have been replaced in an otherwise marlstone
tower. The same effect can be seen on any stone frontage to a busy road, where the
lowest courses are now badly eroded by the effects of passing traffic splashing water,
particularly from salted roads. At Branston, (Fig. 5/7) the contrast between the 13th-
century tower and its Perpendicular parapet, pinnacles and crocketed spire is
immediate. This suggests that by the later 14th-15th century, there were the necessary
funds to transport fine stone over greater distances, and probably over better roads,
and with the fine stone, came a generation of more skilled masons.

If the majority of 14th-century works were constructed wholly of the local
marlstone, it seems likely that fine oolite was used from the first for buttresses and
dressings of Perpendicular additions. At Rotherby (Fig. 5/8), where the Perpendicular
tower was inserted into the west end of the Decorated south aisle, there is work of
lighter oolite which looks wholly original although the pinnacles are now missing.
Similarly, at Beeby (Fig. 5/9), the same pattern of building applies. Here, a major
Perpendicular re-building commenced at the west end, where the lowest stage of the
tower, which is set within the nave, and the ends of the aisles are all constructed in
fine ashlar. The spire, which would have rivalled that at Queniborough, and possibly
the pinnacles were never completed. The high quality of coursed ashlar may be seen
in the Perpendicular south porch at Sproxton (Fig. 5/10), although we should be
mindful that Henry Woodyer was responsible for rebuilding in 1882.\textsuperscript{237} Fine coursed ashlar can also be seen in the stately tower at Freeby (Fig.5/11).

Whilst a knowledge of the actual quarrying processes is not essential to this study, certain important points need to be addressed. Knoop and Jones state that quarries were important nurseries for stone-workers in the Middle Ages, a fact that is supported by the large number of 13th and 14th-century masons who bore the names of quarrying places, for example, Edmunde Corfe at Westminster in 1292 and Peter de Barnack at Leicester in 1325.\textsuperscript{238} The authors make the point that there was probably no demarcation between the categories of masons in the mediaeval period, stating that:

“[... ] we have come across several instances of quarriers being promoted to be layers (\textit{cubitores}) as well as of layers being promoted to be hewers (\textit{cementarii}). [...] When in the same accounts [Beaumaris and Caernarvon] we find examples of hewers (\textit{cementarii}) working in the quarry as cutters (\textit{taylatores}) preparing ‘coynes of ashler’, of layers (\textit{cubitores}) working in the quarry as scappplers (\textit{batrarii}) and of a quarrier ‘digging and breaking stone’ [...] we feel that the boundaries between one stone working occupation and another was by no means rigid, and that the conversion of a skilled quarrier who worked with an axe and hammer, into a rough mason who also worked with an axe and hammer, could not have been un-common in the days before gilds (if such ever existed in country districts).”\textsuperscript{239}

Norman Davey states that there were two grades of masons, the cutters, who

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{237} Pevsner, p.383.
\item \textsuperscript{238} D. Knoop and G. P. Jones, \textit{The Mediaeval Mason}, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967, pp.67-68.
\item \textsuperscript{239} ibid, p.70.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
could work and carve the fine grained limestone or sandstone (freestone), in which case they were referred to as freemasons, to distinguish them from the cutters who worked the much harder stones, and there were the layers (cubitores) who were often referred to as rough masons. The cutters, or freemasons, might also be referred to as ‘banker masons’ since they worked their stone on a banker, or bench (French: banc.)

With reference to monastic quarries, L.F. Salzman states that:

“When these were not available or were insufficient it was open to the builder either to buy or hire a quarry for his operations, or to buy his stone from quarries that were run as commercial speculations. When there were quarries in the neighbourhood it was simple to acquire one, the same men being employed first as quarriers and then as masons, but if the stone had to be brought from a distance, it was more usual to buy it ready cut.”

There is no reason to believe that Salzman’s statement did not obtain with regard to the sourcing of stone for smaller church extensions. The opening up of a small local quarry is likely to have been on the land of the lord of the manor, who in many cases would have held the advowson of the church in question. If, as many were, the advowson was held by a religious house, the probability is that a monastic quarry could have been sourced.

Consideration should now be given to the whole question of transportation of such a heavy material. It is a well established fact that the cost of transport doubled for approximately every twelve miles that stone was carried from the quarry. Both Knoop and Jones, and Salzman cite numerous examples of carriage costs between the
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13th and 15th centuries, although these relate mainly to major works in the form of monasteries, cathedrals and castles. With such a high cost of transport, it is obvious that stone would be sourced from as near as possible to the building site, particularly if relatively small amounts were required such as for the addition of an aisle. If stone had to be transported over any distance, it would have been worked as near as possible to a finished size at the quarry, to avoid un-necessary carriage costs. A small quarry could supply a number of building works within an immediate area, and the area of rising ground as one approaches Thorpe Arnold from Melton Mowbray, with its uneven ridges and hollows, suggests just such a site. It should be emphasised that many quarries, other than the major centres of fine ashlar production, were quite small. Depending upon the quality of the stone, a fairly substantial excavation of a cube of eight metres will produce five hundred and twelve cubic metres of stone and given that the majority of church walling was hammered rubble, there would have been little waste; furthermore, from the data gathered, the average Leicestershire pier contains rather less than a cubic metre of stone. From these details, it becomes obvious that unless masons were transporting fine quality ashlar from a major quarry, the local workings for an additional aisle would have been quite small.

I have already discussed the communications in Leicestershire in Chapter 4, and it is virtually impossible now to determine what use, if any, the river systems were, bearing in mind that they all flow the wrong way so far as transport from quarries is concerned. Alec Clifton-Taylor states that flat-bottomed boats were used to transport huge quantities of stone into East Anglia. However, there are many references to land carriage, again in Knoop & Jones, and Salzman.
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244 Knoop and Jones, pp.45 - 47 and Salzman, p.351.
The logistics of carriage are important; who were the carriers, what were the methods of haulage and what represented a typical load? The carriers were mainly local people whose time, beasts and waggons were hired. Thus we read that:

“[...] at Huntington, Herefordshire, in 1371-2, the reeve recorded that more ploughing services than usual were required, ‘because the lord’s oxen were occupied in hauling wood and stone for work at the castle.’”

Similarly, we are informed that:

“When Totnes Church was being rebuilt in 1450 it was agreed that every parishioner who had a horse should use it to carry the smaller stones up from the river. [...] At Exeter in 1393 we find 3,417 horse loads of stone bought, for £15. 14s. 6d.

The methods of haulage used either oxen or horses, both of which had certain disadvantages, depending on conditions. Oxen are excellent for heavy haulage, particularly in wet conditions, but tend to slip on hard, dry surfaces, whereas horses can break down completely in heavy mud. A team of oxen can comfortably haul a load of two tons but are very slow, whilst, “[...] a good cart-horse in the fourteenth century was seemingly capable of hauling over a ton on his own.”

From the data gathered during my survey of churches, the volume of an average pier, containing less than a cubic metre of stone and not including bases or capitals, gives a weight of approximately a ton; this is based on the knowledge that limestone averages around one and a half tons per cubic metre. It will be seen therefore, that taking into account, pier stones, capitals, bases, voussoirs, walling and
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window dressings, transport in terms of number of loads would not have been excessive, but sufficient to encourage the sourcing of stone as locally as possible.

The remarkable consistency of pier dimensions and arcade spans in a large number of Leicestershire churches (which will be discussed in further detail in Chapter 10) invites certain questions about masons and quarry methods. With regard to piers of octagonal section, of which there are very many in the county, repeatedly, they have dimensions of 480mm or 520mm, as indeed there are many arch spans constantly approaching 3.50m. It is surely too much of a coincidence that the builders of 14th-century arcades should have adopted closely similar measurements over much of the county in so many cases. What this suggests to me is that there was an accepted norm for basic elements such as pier stones and voussoirs. Whether this resulted from the use of templates it is now impossible to tell; since the angle of the plain chamfer on a voussoir is the same forty-five degrees as that on a stone forming part of an octagonal pier, a simple shift-stock would have sufficed, and as will be seen, the majority of Leicestershire piers are octagonal, whilst arcade mouldings are predominantly plain chamfers. It might be assumed that templates would have been necessary for bases, capitals and window mouldings, but my research demonstrates that at parish church level, the re-use of templates on different sites, and even within the same church, appears to be extremely rare, thus contradicting what L. R. Shelby has to say.

“ - the relatively elaborate modern process of producing a series of drawings before the templates are made for the masons could easily have been abbreviated in the Middle Ages by the one man - the master mason - who passed all of these steps through his own mind’s eye. The
important question, therefore, is not whether some mediaeval master masons produced the modern sequence of drawings and templates but, rather, whether they could and did produce the templates without the sequence of drawings. The overall weight of evidence [...] suggests that the latter was very often the case. [...] masons’ templates, rather than architectural drawings, were the primary instruments by means of which mediaeval architects - that is, master masons - transmitted their architectural forms to the masons who executed the forms in stone.”

If this appears to contradict my previous statement, it should be noted that where there has to be consistency, as in the repetition of mould forms in major buildings, this can only be achieved by the use of templates; in this thesis small village churches are being examined, where multiple repetition does not arise. It is true that a template ensures consistency, but as I shall demonstrate shortly, the consistencies within Leicestershire church details do not rely absolutely on templates. For window mouldings and tracery they may be necessary, as well as for elaborate arcade profiles such as Stoke Golding, but only to provide consistency within a given building. *I have found no evidence for mouldings that are identical in both profile and size in different churches*, in other words, I believe that templates were not ‘shared’ between churches. Where tracery details appear to be identical, and these are very rare, they are copies. They may even have been the work of the same masons, but different dimensions preclude the use of identical templates. There are many examples of base mouldings, string-courses and mullions that are very similar, simply because they formed part of the general vocabulary of 14th-century detail. Where templates were used, it was doubtless in the construction of major buildings, where,

though the templates themselves may not have survived, there is documentary evidence for their manufacture. Salzman quotes work at St. Stephen’s Chapel, at Westminster Abbey and at Ely, for wood, nails and canvas for making ‘moulds’, but he also refers to the use of parchment. The word ‘moulds’ might therefore apply either to templates or to full-size measured drawings. Colvin also uses the term 'moulds' when he cites:

"On 27 May, 1331, Master Thomas of Canterbury returned to his post as master of the masons and resumed his work in preparing the moulds in the tracing house."

In considering the consistencies that might not rely upon templates, only eighteen of the churches surveyed, have piers of consistent dimensions within one aisle, and of these, only three are consistent in both aisles and these are mainly 19th-century rebuildings. Where consistency occurs in considerable numbers is in the form of pier dimensions which fall into groups of 300mm, 400mm and up to 600mm in diameter. Such groups are randomly spread throughout the county. Consistency also occurs in the numbers of pier courses in relation to height, the average number being seven, and also in the numbers of voussoirs, an average being eleven to each intrados. However, what is remarkable is that there is no correlation between pier height and arcade span; between arcade span and the number of voussoirs, or between pier diameter and height. The apparent standardisation of pier stones and voussoirs, implies not only that there was an accepted norm, as has been suggested, but that such basic units were stock-piled even perhaps in small, local quarries, that could have supplied a number of churches within a very small area. The Wreake valley, for

249 The collection of templates stored at York is 19th century.
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example has ten churches all within a line of eight miles and all containing 14th-century work.

Salzmann comments on, “- quarries that were run as commercial speculations.”\(^{252}\) whilst Knoop and Jones speak of: “-the establishment of recognised standard sizes in rough-dressed and finished stone, which could be prepared either at the quarries or in masons’ workshops for distribution over a wide area.”\(^{253}\) These observations suggest quite clearly that basic elements such as pier stones and voussoirs were ‘stock-piled’ in some quarries. Bearing in mind that for this thesis, nearly three hundred churches have been surveyed, all of which lie within a relatively compact region, and all of which bear evidence of rebuilding/enlargement within a period of only a few decades, the commercial possibilities of supplying several churches with basic ‘mass-produced’ items from within a given quarry would have been most attractive. This repetitive work could have been carried out in quarries by semi-skilled labourers so that the products were available to any church that was contemplating the addition of an aisle.

Moving to examine inconsistencies between elements that are nevertheless frequent, we find many examples of arches that do not fit their capitals; these often come to the very limit of the abaci and in some cases slightly overhang or have been shaved back to fit. I think this does not suggest an attempt to construct an arcade on earlier piers; what it does indicate is that there has been inadequate consultation between the quarry-men producing and supplying the voussoirs and the mason responsible for the individual capitals, and thus, there is an inconsistent standard that would not be apparent in higher quality work.

There are constant inconsistencies in the details of capitals. Whilst at first

\(^{252}\) Salzmann, p.20.

\(^{253}\) Knoop and Jones, p.70.
glance an arcade may appear to have identical capitals, close examination reveals inconsistencies which could not have resulted from the use of templates. Sometimes it is no more than the absence of a single mould line, or a variation in depth of a particular moulding. What this suggests is that whilst a basic design was produced for an octagonal capital for a particular arcade, the individual mason produced his own version of that design with very minor differences of detail.

There is a similar inconsistency in window details. By far the most common window types in the county are intersecting and reticulated, but a great many intersecting windows have no cusps, for which high quality workmanship would not have been required, although a degree of skill was certainly required for the setting out of a reticulated window. However, the fairly regular absence of cusping in individual lights, may well be a Lincolnshire influence, which will be discussed later in the relevant chapter. Generally, where window tracery is of a high quality, the entire window is above the ‘average level’ with fine outer mouldings, and often internal shafts. The perfect little north aisle at Swepstone is of high quality, with refined inner and outer window mouldings, a very superior north door with ogee hood mould and finial. Today, the outer appearance cannot compare with some of the examples cited from surrounding counties, but we do not know how magnificent its appearance may have been when new, allowing for extensive weathering of a more friable stone.

High quality work is quite understandably associated with wealthy patrons, whether monastic or civil. The Perpendicular re-modelling of the 14th-century nave piers at Ashby-de-la-Zouch, is obviously the result of Hastings influence from the nearby castle. Using a different stone from that of the Decorated arcades above, the old capitals have been reduced, and castellated abaci fitted in four sections around the
core, whilst the trefoiled heads of the panelled piers are simply eight sections fitted beneath the abaci. The octagonal panelled piers are a casing of the original work, and such was not uncommon in the late 14th century; there is the great example of Wykeham’s nave at Winchester encasing the original Norman piers.

It seems likely that the frequent use of ironstone resulted from small quarries being opened up in close proximity to the building site. It was not uncommon for a building to be constructed from materials virtually on site; even today, the bricks which form Guildford Cathedral were made from the clay of Stag Hill, on which the cathedral stands; medieval practices provide many examples of church bells being cast in pits within the church-yard. A local quarry could have been worked by local labour, the operarii, over-seen by the master mason in charge of the building who provided the templates from which the labourers produced voussoirs and pier stones.

Peter Stanier informs us that:

“Most quarries were opened and worked for specific purposes; they were re-opened only for repair work or building extensions. The quarries were leased, purchased or occasionally given. Wells Cathedral, for example, leased quarries at Doulting in Somerset, for 20s per annum in 1457-8 and 1480-1.”

The example quoted, draws upon a major building, for which building accounts survive. Unfortunately, for the ordinary village church, they do not, unless we find the occasional reference to a wealthy patron funding a chantry aisle, or new chancel. In Salzman’s informative list of building contracts in Appendix B of his work, the first to deal specifically with a church is for the complete rebuilding of the chancel at Sandon in Hertfordshire, in 1348; contracts for ecclesiastical work are confined more to the
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15th and 16th centuries. So the conclusions drawn from the visual evidence, are that most 14th-century additions to Leicestershire churches, did not require highly skilled workers, or top quality stone, for the obvious reasons of finance, and that it was mainly the larger towns, such as Loughborough, Melton Mowbray, Hinckley and Ashby-de-la-Zouch, that could afford the more refined and elaborate arcade mouldings, or quatrefoil piers that we see in place, and which could also afford the heavy cost of transporting stone from more distant quarries. Sadly, little evidence remains in the county of the religious houses, but these would certainly have employed craftsmen of superior skill, many of whom may have worked permanently on their respective sites, in much the same way in which many cathedrals maintain permanent workshops. It may well have been some of these masons who were able to undertake quality work in neighbouring churches. Evidence of the quality of work in the religious houses does survive in the examples that appear to have been re-sited following the Dissolution. A window in the south aisle at Kirby Bellars is of a quality that is superior to its neighbours (Fig.3/31), and moreover, the window and its stone surround is of a completely different stone and quality from the rest of the wall in which it is placed. We find a similar example with a huge window in the south wall of the nave at Saltby, and there are others. A chantry foundation of 1319 at Kirby became an Augustinian priory in 1359. This could indicate the source of the south aisle window, whilst the Saltby window could have come from the nearby Premonstratensian site at Croxton Kerrial.

The question of masons’ marks should now be addressed. These are the marks, possibly for personal identification, that were used by the bankers. However, there remains some confusion as to the types of mark and their purpose. Salzman, referring

255 Salzman, pp. 413 - 582.
to masons’ marks, states that of these, “- much, including some fanciful nonsense, has been written.”\textsuperscript{257} Alec Clifton-Taylor reminds us that there could be confusion with quarry marks, “- which indicate the quarry of origin, the cubic content of the block and sometimes the natural bedding planes.”\textsuperscript{258} There could also be confusion with the code marks of fixer masons.\textsuperscript{259} Although masons’ marks do not usually appear on the exposed surface of a building, at Gaddesby, a remarkable number survive on the external walls; Pevsner claims them to be the “greatest assemblage of masons’ marks in a Leicestershire church.”\textsuperscript{260}

Since no building contracts appear to have survived for 14th-century work in Leicestershire, and therefore, since it appears to be impossible to connect a particular mason with his mark and with the quarry, at the moment to pursue such a line of investigation is not immediately productive for the purposes of this thesis. A detailed study of masons’ marks throughout the county, as indeed, one of moulding types, could form the basis of separate and valuable theses.

Reference has previously been made to the large numbers of masons and carpenters impressed for the building of the Edwardian castles in north Wales (Fig.6/12).\textsuperscript{261} Colvin makes the point that:

"The importance of impressment as a vehicle of architectural influence may indeed have been considerable."\textsuperscript{262}

With the exception of Caernarfon, the completion of all these between 1277 and 1301 would have released a similar number, allowing for deaths and accidents, who would have been seeking employment, at exactly the time that much Decorated building

\begin{itemize}
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work was gathering momentum. Colvin provides much information on the craftsmen and on the logistics of the building operations, but virtually nothing on architectural detail, yet a study of the castles reveals much that is to be found in Decorated architecture. The significant point is that it does not seem to have appeared earlier than elsewhere. For example, the trefoiled wall arcading in the chapel at Beaumaris is of the mid-1290s, later than that at Lincoln, contemporary with that at York, whilst the crocketed and canopied image niche on the King’s Gate at Caernarvon, of c.1321 is typical of similar works of that period.

It may be asked, whether the master mason James of St. George, who died in 1309, was responsible for architectural details emanating from north Wales? I think not; the Rayonnant influence was already in place at Westminster and it was to continue in the nave at York in 1291, contemporary with the Eleanor Crosses. It was surely the ‘court style’ of Henry III and Edward I that gave detail to the military aspect of the designs of James. Nicola Coldstream reminds us that:

“Many of the ornamental characteristics that became general in the Decorated style appeared early in the royal works, from repeated motifs to window-tracery designs, heraldry and the dominating presence of angels. The sunk chamfer and wave mouldings, and the ogee curve, were developed by masons who worked for, among others, Edward I, just as the rectilinear designs that were to develop into the Perpendicular style were refined by masons who worked for Edward III.”

It was therefore a development of fine mason-craft gained from the experience of working on such superb buildings, rather than from fresh ideas of detail that the
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returning masons to their home bases gave to the great wave of 14th century building and rebuilding, and it is not unreasonable to assume, that many who would have worked together on a castle site, might well have returned home to work as small itinerant bands, or at the very least, might have influenced their sons to continue many of the details with which the fathers had become familiar. Whilst there appears to be no documentary evidence to suggest a connection between masons working on Edwardian castles and those employed in Leicestershire, evidence does indicate that such connections existed elsewhere. Joseph Bettey cites a document of c.1316, in which Nicholas de Derneford petitioned Edward II for payment of arrears due for his work at Beaumaris Castle, stating that he had previously worked at: "St Augustine's, Bristol, at Burton on Trent and at Repton priory." Since Burton and Repton are in close proximity, and neither is far from the Leicestershire border, I think it unlikely that masons similarly employed in Wales may not have worked within the county.

265 J. Bettey, St. Augustine's Abbey, Bristol, Bristol: The Bristol Branch of the Historical Association Local History Pamphlets, No.88, 1996, p. 12.
CHAPTER 6 - TOWERS AND SPIRES
CHAPTER 6

TOWERS AND SPIRES

The previous chapters have dealt with general points relevant to a study of Decorated architecture in Leicestershire churches. In dealing with towers and spires, this is now the first of a series of chapters that will address specific details. Because much larger units are being dealt with than, for example, sedilia or windows, it is inevitable that there will be a need to refer to an individual tower more than once in order to discuss different features, since a 13th-century tower may well have an additional 14th or 15th-century bell-stage or spire. It is the architectural development of these, that is the concern of this thesis rather than the aesthetic appearance of a complete ensemble.

Having first considered the purpose of towers and spires, and their application to Leicestershire churches, the development of spires from the broach variety to the ribbed, crocketed examples, often added in the 15th century, will be examined. Although this is primarily a study of 14th-century work in the county, it is impossible to ignore examples that clearly indicate an earlier core, or indeed, incorporate later developments. Following on from this, there will be discussion of such details as lucarnes and wind-holes, before turning to parapets, battlements, corbel-tables and pinnacles again, features that will take us from the 13th into the 15th centuries. Looking further into small details, bell-stage windows will be considered with reference to the possible influence of what I shall call the ‘Lincolnshire splay’, together with ball-flower ornament and wall-arcading. Following this is the important consideration of Perpendicular additions to towers, of which Leicestershire can
demonstrate numerous examples. An examination of tower buttresses, stair turrets, and the few examples of later additions of towers to naves, with the consequent problem of settlement, will bring the chapter to a close.

Francis Bond devotes two separate chapters to towers and spires in which he deals with the positions of towers, their construction, a classification of spires, window tracery, elevation and perspective and spire construction, but, as with so many aspects of Leicestershire churches, the county is ignored apart from a passing reference to Market Harborough.\(^{266}\) Similarly, the substantial section in F. H. Crossley’s work, whilst dealing with tower design and county types, gives little attention to the Midlands and none to Leicestershire.\(^{267}\) It is likely, therefore, that this chapter provides the first ever detailed analysis of the 14th-century towers and spires of the county, together with their decorative features.

It may be argued that a natural progression for this particular study might have been upwards from base-mouldings to spires. I have decided upon the chosen format because it is easier for the reader initially to become familiar with the larger elements before concentrating on small details such as base mouldings, which are not immediately apparent to the casual observer. I prefer to use the term, ‘bell-stage’ windows rather than to use the word ‘belfry’, which in correct Anglo-Saxon terminology has nothing to do with bells. In referring to ‘bell-stage’ windows, I imply the top-most windows in a tower.

It is to be expected that with the oolitic limestone belt running through the East Midlands (see Map 8), Leicestershire should provide many and varied examples of stone spires, features which are shared with the neighbouring counties of Warwickshire to the west, Northamptonshire to the south, Rutland and Lincolnshire to


the east, and Nottinghamshire to the north. These stone spires are in direct contrast with examples in the chalk, flint and wooded counties, where, for example, the more modest spires of Surrey, Sussex and Hampshire, tend to be timber-framed, covered with wooden ‘shingles’, or in rare cases with lead, as at Godalming in Surrey and East Meon in Hampshire.

Whilst the towers and spires of Leicestershire do not compare generally with the grandest English examples, their study provides a good example particularly of the development of spire design from broach to those that are recessed, ribbed and crocketed, and it will be seen that there is clearly a development rather than a co-existence of different types. Although the towers range from the 13th to the 15th centuries, with few exceptions, nowhere was the 14th century a great tower-building era. However, the 14th century saw major contributions in the form of spires which similarly, range from the 13th to the 15th centuries, and here, Leicestershire may claim distinction with the nationally important 14th-century broach spire at Market Harborough (Fig.6/12).

FUNCTIONS

Towers provide accommodation for bells, but the different modes of ringing a bell have a direct bearing upon the design of the structure. The simplest method of ringing is where the bell is fixed in a stationary position and is ‘clocked’ or struck with an external hammer; this exerts no force upon the structure. As soon as a bell is mounted on bearings that enable it to be swung, destructive forces can come into play. From very early times, swinging bells were mounted, first with a half-wheel, which enabled the bell to be swung through a limited angle, and then with a full wheel, which enabled full-circle ringing, associated with the art of change-ringing, peculiar
to England. Although they would not have been swung in full circle, the abbey at Crowland in Lincolnshire had a peal of bells by c.960. Change-ringing did not become popular until after our period of study in the late 16th / early 17th century, but even the earlier method of swinging bells through 180 degrees or more, still required a very substantial structure to house them. A bell swinging through 180 degrees, exerts a lateral force equal to three times its weight, and a downward force equal to four times its weight, and for this reason, bell-frames were supported on substantial beams, but the actual frame in theory never touched the tower walls, because of the battering-ram effect. Similarly, bells were generally hung to swing in opposite directions, north-south and east-west, to help counter the effects of lateral thrust.

In addition to housing bells, towers can also act as buttresses, particularly at the west end of a church, where arcades, though buttressed by the solid north and south walls of a chancel, can ‘drift’ to the west where there may be less support. A tower and spire could demonstrate prosperity and hubris; we have only to think of Boston, in Lincolnshire, at 288 feet, the tallest English tower, or of the great 15th-century Somerset towers, which are sometimes taller than the total length of the church, whilst in Leicestershire, there is the grand 15th-century upper stage to the central tower at Melton Mowbray. Already a fine 13th-century example, the addition reflected the prosperity of a wealthy market town, and was part of the same project which introduced the great clerestory of forty-eight windows to the nave and transepts.

A spire, in addition to being an intentional landmark, serving as a guide to travellers, could act as a damper, since the bells at the top of a tower became, in

effect, lower in the total structure; the tendency for tower movement was reduced by the additional weight of the spire. The lucarnes in a spire served a dual purpose: the spire acted as an additional resonating chamber and the sound could escape from lucarnes as well as from bell-stage windows; in addition, lucarnes served the important function of reducing wind resistance as well as ventilating the spire interior and preventing damaging condensation.

DEVELOPMENT

The earliest spires are of the broach variety, most of which pre-date the development of the recessed spire, although the broach was a structural feature that was not completely abandoned. In the broach spire, the square top of the tower converts to the octagonal spire by means of broaches at the four corners. Whilst the four cardinal faces are supported by the tower walls, the four angle faces are supported by squinches. These are bridges thrown diagonally across each tower corner internally, and to avoid having flat areas on top of each tower corner, a tapered, triangular element is constructed, with the apex reaching up a short way to the centre of the four subsidiary spire faces; in effect, the top of the tower is converted into an octagon internally, which, in addition to supporting the spire, helps tie the four tower walls together.

The simplest form of broach spire may be found at Horninghold (Fig.6/1). The lower stages of the tower form part of the 12th-century church, of which a fine south doorway survives, re-set in the wall of the later south aisle. The bell-stage and spire form a later 13th-century addition. However, the broach spire is a type not exclusive to the 13th century. An example at Ravenstone (Fig.6/2) is clearly late 13th or early 14th century. The evidence for this is the single light ogee bell-stage window, together
with an ogee image niche on the west face of the tower, the latter not visible in the illustration. Both spires have slightly stepped broaches, whilst Horninghold has a string-course encircling the spire just below the lucarnes. This is a feature shared by the Early English broach spires at Hallaton (Fig.6/6) and Thorpe Langton (Fig.6/8), and by the Decorated spire at Slawston (Fig.6/3), but which is not exclusive to Leicestershire.

Although the heights of broaches vary, they seem to be consistent in their variety. For example, some extend only to a point approximately level with the base of the lowest lucarnes, as at Slawston (Fig.6/3); some extend to a point level with the base of the lucarne gable, as at Muston (Fig.6/4), whilst others extend to a point level with the apex of the gable of the lowest lucarnes, as at Oadby (Fig.6/5).

A group of Leicestershire broach spires have pinnacles set on the base of the broaches - with a not altogether pleasing result aesthetically. These may be seen at Slawston (Fig.6/3), at Hallaton, Great Easton and Nailstone, where the stumps survive, and where complete pinnacles survive at Thorpe Langton, Husbands Bosworth, and at Muston (Fig.16/4), which latter example has panelled and crocketed pinnacles, suggesting some Perpendicular remodelling coeval with the north porch. With the exception of Nailstone, all of these are in the east of the county, forming a fairly close group geographically. Indeed, the details of clasping buttresses, bell-stage windows and corbel-tables at Hallaton, (Fig.6/6) and Great Easton, (Fig.6/7) in particular, suggest the same hand in design; I shall return to these details later. Certainly there is a group sharing common features if not the same work force. However, this use of broach pinnacles is not exclusive to Leicestershire: stumps survive at Crick in Northamptonshire, whilst complete pinnacles may be seen at Brixworth and at All Hallows, Wellingborough, Northamptonshire, and at Olney,
Buckinghamshire. It may be that the use of pinnacles on broaches was a direct development from the use of pinnacles on pre-broach spires, for example, the early 13th-century spires at Christ Church Cathedral\textsuperscript{271} and Witney\textsuperscript{272}, in Oxfordshire, each have substantial pinnacles to mask the angles from square tower to octagonal spire.

In Leicestershire, the earliest of these pinnacled spires may be Thorpe Langton, (Fig.6/8), judging from the very simple mouldings to the bell-stage and lucarnes, suggesting a date not later than c.1240, whilst Hallaton (Fig.6/6) and Great Easton (Fig. 6/7), with their dog-tooth ornament, may be dated to around 1260. That these three examples are Early English work is quite clear from the style of the bell-stage windows. However, Muston, (Fig.6/4) because of its trilobe lucarne tracery and bell-stage tracery appears to be the latest of the group, and may be early-14th century: the panelled pinnacles would seem to be a Perpendicular addition coeval with the north porch and clerestory.

Since the broach spire is not exclusive to Leicestershire, there are obvious similarities that cross county boundaries. For example, examination of the fine spires at Gaddesby (Fig.6/9), within the county, and Greetham in Rutland, (Fig.6/10) reveals very close similarities in the triple sets of lucarnes on the cardinal faces, the corbel-tables and the small finials on the apex of the broaches, suggesting that as with the general vocabulary of motifs within the Decorated style, so there was one particular to spires. That the broach spire, as a structural feature was not entirely abandoned after the late 13th / early 14th century, is evident at Blaby (Fig.6/11), where there is a recessed Perpendicular spire with broaches set behind a parapet. The four tiers of

\textsuperscript{271} R.C.H.M.E., \textit{An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in the City of Oxford}, London: H.M.S.O., 1939, Plate 86.
\textsuperscript{272} J. Sherwood and N. Pevsner, \textit{The Buildings of England, Oxfordshire}, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974, Fig. 31.
decorative heads are unique in Leicestershire, but these may well date from the partial rebuilding of the spire in 1857.\textsuperscript{273}

Certainly the finest broach spire in the county is that at Market Harborough (Fig.6/12). This is ribbed and crocketed with two sets of lucarnes on the cardinal faces, and the tower and spire together form one of the most perfect compositions of 14th-century work in English architecture. Much of the stately effect is produced by the ‘batter’ of the buttresses, a device rarely found elsewhere in the county. Until the introduction of Perpendicular towers in the 15th century began to phase out spire building, broach spires were very typical of the major stone areas of central England, and it was convenience as much as aesthetic considerations that led to the introduction of the recessed spire during the 14th century. Initial building and later maintenance of a spire is considerably easier and cheaper when scaffolding can be erected within a tower parapet, rather than from the ground.

Moving on to recessed spires, where over fifty examples have been noted during this survey in Leicestershire, and which are listed in the analysis at the end of this chapter, the majority are plain with neither ribs nor crockets, although both Ibstock (Fig.6/13) and Stoke Golding (Fig.16/14) have small roll mouldings on the spire angles, and I shall discuss other similarities later on which suggest that both spires are the work of the same hand. One other example of a roll-moulding has been encountered on the spire of St. Mary de Castro, Leicester (Fig.6/59), but outside the county similar examples exist at Peckleton, Lincolnshire, and at Gedling and Newark in Nottinghamshire. The particular style of the lucarnes on the recessed, fully ribbed and crocketed spires, of which there are at least a dozen examples, indicate that these are predominantly late 14th- early 15th- century Perpendicular work. Of these, the

\textsuperscript{273} G. K. Brandwood, p. 78.
tall, slender spire at Queniborough is without doubt the finest example (Fig.6/15), although the 15th-century spire at Bottesford is the tallest in the county at 207ft.

There remains a group of three small churches near Melton Mowbray that have saddle-back towers, at Brentingby, Sysonby and Welby. Brentingby (Fig.6/16), now converted into a private dwelling, has the most detailed tower with moulded shafts to the corners of the bell-stage, an image niche above the western bell openings, and a spirelet on top of the gable. Sysonby, because of a general restoration in 1892 has no distinguishing features. Although some of the fenestration at Welby is clearly a later Perpendicular insertion, all three single-cell churches suggest a 13th-century foundation. Here, we have the interesting situation of three churches which share the common feature of saddle-back towers, all of which were once chapels-of-ease to Melton Mowbray parish church, and which may therefore have been the work of the same masons, with the exception of the bell-stage at Brentingby. This, unlike the other two churches, is not constructed of the local stone, but of a finer quality ashlar.

A single example that is completely alien to the county types is the bell turret at Cadeby (Fig.6/17). This has a tile-hung timber-framed turret with a pyramidal cap, that is far more common in Surrey and Sussex. Although it was impossible to examine the timber structure internally, it may be assumed that church and turret are contemporary, particularly since Nichols illustrates a very similar turret.

**LUCARNES**

Having already discussed the purpose of lucarnes and wind-holes, they may now dealt with in more detail. The majority of Leicestershire spires, in total nearly
forty, have lucarnes on the four cardinal faces, whilst sixteen have them on alternate faces, a feature more common to Northamptonshire. A fine example of the former type may be seen at Kirby Bellars (Fig.6/18). This Decorated spire of c.1300 or perhaps a little later, has three sets of lucarnes, the lower two sets having trefoiled pairs of lights beneath a central quatrefoil, whilst the upper set have single lights; all have stepped gables. The difference in building stones is noticeable; almost without exception, Leicestershire spires tend to use a better quality limestone than the more friable local marlstone used for towers. This may also suggest that in many cases, towers and spires were not completed in one operation, whilst the typological evidence for later additions of some bell-stages and spires will be dealt with shortly.

Of the type with lucarnes on opposing faces, a typical example is Nailstone (Fig.6/19). Here, are two sets of two-light lucarnes having simple ‘Y’ tracery without cusps, crockets or finials; we note the stumps of the broach pinnacles. If we take the Nailstone example and add trefoils to the lights, turn the opening above them into a quatrefoil, and add crockets and a finial, there is the progression into the 14th-century work at Nevill Holt (Fig.6/20). From this, with only slight variation, we move into the early Perpendicular of Sapcote (Fig.6/21), where the encircled quatrefoil of Nevill Holt now becomes a quatrefoil between mullions. Finally, the lucarnes become very angular, the arch of the individual lights becomes a gable, giving a very sharp definition to the intersecting tracery of the lower lucarnes, and the quatrefoils become elongated, as at Queniborough, where the ultimate recessed Leicestershire spire design is revealed with ribs and crockets (Fig.6/22). Here, the spire is almost certainly contemporary with the Perpendicular clerestory and roof.

Wind-holes are mostly quatrefoil in form, as at Ab Kettleby (Fig.6/23), although the late 13th /early 14th-century spire at Barkby (Fig.6/24), has the most
distinctive set in the county. Here, two collars sit around the spire, the lower having blank quatrefoils on either side of an opening on each spire face; the upper having a single opening to each face.

In some spires the wind-holes appear to have been blocked. Those on the recessed, crocketed 14th-century spire at Hungarton (Fig.6/25) contain tiny openings in cross-shaped form, whilst the spire at Barkestone (Fig.6/26) has none at all, suggesting a formidable confidence in its ability to withstand high gales. Since there is no record of the spire having been rebuilt, we may assume that this rare example, with neither lucarnes nor wind-holes, is original.

CORBEL TABLES

Looking now at corbel-tables, parapets and battlements, the first of these details is generally the earliest, since corbel-tables are found mainly beneath broach spires of the 13th century, but not exclusively so, and as will be seen, they are relevant to later developments. C. Edson Armi informs us that:

“The corbel table usually is defined or understood as a decorative series of small arches resting on corbels. Joseph Puig i Cadafalch and Arthur Kingsley Porter, the pioneering experts on early-eleventh-century architecture in southern Europe, considered the corbel table exterior decoration. and specialists continue to accept this ornamental interpretation. [...]Given the corbel table’s reputation, historians studying its origins not surprisingly have isolated it as a separate decorative device and discussed it apart from construction, structure and articulation.”

In considering how some of these points may apply to the following

Leicestershire examples, although corbels have been in general use since the 11th century, the county examples date mainly from the 13th century and begin to phase out during the early 14th century.

Separate corbels as distinct from a series of small arches, appear to have been in use for some time during the 13th century. Comparison of Thorpe Langton (Fig.6/27), with the lower bell-stage at Melton Mowbray (Fig.6/28), reveals very similar corbels. Whilst the details of the lucarnes and bell-stage at Thorpe Langton suggest an early date, as has been stated previously, the richly moulded windows at Melton, with shafts and dog-tooth ornament suggest a later date of around 1260. The corbel-table at Thorpe Langton supports a broach spire, but whatever termination there was to the 13th-century tower at Melton was removed when an additional bell-stage was added in the 15th century. Since the tower is rectangular, it would seem unlikely, though not impossible, that there was formerly a broach spire. What is noticeable at Thorpe Langton, is that the broach spire overhangs the tower faces apart from the corners, where the clasping buttresses give the effect of recessed panels for the bell-stage windows. The overhang would have thrown rain water clear of the upper walls at least. The corbels provide additional support to the spire base, since they would be cantilevered out from the tower walls, and by taking the downward pressure of the spire beyond the main walls, lateral thrust would be reduced. What might be seen as a short step in development from the separate corbels just discussed, would have been to link them together by some form of arcading, such as the trefoil arcading at Hallaton (Fig.6/6), and the semi-circular arcading at Great Easton (Fig.6/7), whilst the trefoil form appears also on the 13th-century tower at Austrey, in Warwickshire (Fig.6/29). All of these examples support an over-hanging broach spire, and it is obvious that they satisfy a constructional purpose as well as an
aesthetically pleasing junction between tower and spire. However, it is not safe to assume that there was a logical progression from separate to arcaded corbels; of the two early spires in Oxfordshire previously referred to, Witney has separate corbels, whilst the slightly earlier one at Christ Church cathedral has arcaded corbels.

That arcaded corbel-tables continued throughout the 13th century is certain, as may be seen from the example at Barkby (Fig.6/30). In Leicestershire this arcading eventually becomes reduced to a frieze, no longer supported on corbels, which are now moved to a separate element above the frieze: the two might be said to co-exist. Of the three following examples, the frieze at Oadby (Fig.6/31) is possibly the earliest, being late 13th or very early 14th century. At Oadby, the corbels supporting the broach spire above the frieze are of a type common throughout the county, where they are frequently used as stops to windows and arcades, but here it is the concave moulding with corbels rather than the frieze that supports the spire overhang.

What has now happened is that the earlier arcaded corbel table has become two distinct elements which are reversed in position. The corbel table survives in a reduced form, because eventually it has to support the much lighter weight of a parapet following the introduction of a recessed spire, whilst the arcade becomes a decorative frieze beneath the corbel table. Probably contemporary with the work at Oadby is the frieze at Knighton (Fig.6/32), where an additional bell-stage and spire were added above during the 14th century. The ball-flower decoration above the frieze marks the commencement of the 14th-century work. It is impossible to say what the original cornice above the frieze was like, but the present ball-flower work seems to be part of the upper stage project judging from the much finer mortar joints. A similar frieze may also be seen at Stoke Golding (Fig.6/33), with ball-flower decoration above. Virtually identical with the work at Stoke Golding are the friezes at
Wigston, All Saints and Ibstock. At Stoughton, may be seen a similar frieze (  

It is worth noting that the arcaded corbel-tables and friezes that have been discussed might be seen in the context of work at Lincoln and Southwell. Beneath the south aisle parapet of the Angel Choir at Lincoln, c.1256-1280\textsuperscript{277} is the example shown in Fig.6/34. At Southwell (Fig.6/35), the Chapter House was commenced c.1288,\textsuperscript{278} where the frieze bears a similarity of detail with those at Stoke Golding and Knighton, whilst the flat profile of the frieze at Lincoln bears comparison with all three Leicestershire examples quoted.

A few county churches have corbels displaying figurative features. There is an assortment of faces beneath the broach spire at Muston (Fig.6/36), whilst the 14th-century tower at Harby (Fig.6/37), has an assortment of ball-flower, faces and creatures, reminding us that the essence of the Decorated period was one of variety. Finally, at Cold Overton, and unique to a Leicestershire tower, are the remarkable figures at the base of the tower, to be seen in Chapter 9 (Figs.9/15 and 9/16) which are complemented by a similar assortment of grotesques around the parapet (Fig.6/38).

**PARAPETS**

It follows that all recessed spires have enclosing parapets, and the majority of these are of the embattled type, without pinnacles or decoration other than simple mouldings.

Only four of the county churches have plain, un-embattled parapets, such as that on the simple 14th-century tower at Stapleton (Fig.6/39). Of the embattled type, the 14th century work at Nevill Holt (Fig.6/40), is a good example. Very similar in


detail is the parapet with crocketed pinnacles at Branston (Fig.6/41), which, with the spire, is a late-14th century addition to the 13th-century tower. A similar example may be seen on the Perpendicular tower at Saxelbye, (Fig.6/42) where there is the addition of a quatrefoil frieze set in an ‘X’ form, the more common form having the quatrefoils set within squares, as on the Perpendicular stage added to the tower at Waltham-on-the-Wolds (Fig.6/43).

The fine 14th-century tower at Oakham, in Rutland (Fig.6/44), provides a distinctive and unusual parapet that is pierced with broad ogee openings. Similar work may be seen on the contemporary tower at nearby Whissendine (Fig.6/45). The relevance of these two towers to Leicestershire is that at Burrough-on-the-Hill (Fig.6/46), the same style may be seen, although here the openings form a continuous arcade and have ball-flower ornament. Although the tower has been substantially rebuilt\(^{279}\), the parapet details are still the same as those shown by Nichols. Given that Burrough is quite close to Oakham and Whissendine, there must surely have been inter-action between the three churches, certainly with regard to parapet details. Parapets with quatrefoil openings appear at Stoke Golding (Fig.6/33) and at Ibstock (Fig.6/47). Comparison of these two, where both examples had lost their pinnacles by the time of Nichols, suggests that they are exactly contemporary and are the work of the same hand. The arcading, corbel-tables and setting of the quatrefoils within square panels are identical; the single difference being that the Ibstock parapet was provided with a central pinnacle. Since the spire at Stoke Golding was taken down during World War II to remove an obstacle to a nearby airfield, we cannot be sure that all details of the parapet are original\(^{280}\). The pinnacles on Leicestershire towers tend to be fairly modest in size, some being little more than stumps. Whilst the majority are

\(^{279}\) G. K. Brandwood, p.83.

crocketed, it is mainly those that are Perpendicular additions that are panelled, as at Melton Mowbray (Fig.6/28).

The large pinnacles to be found on flying buttresses of great churches have a clear constructional purpose in acting as a heavy counter-weight to direct the lateral thrust of the flyer downwards through the buttress. Tower pinnacles, being generally lighter in construction, do not need to fulfil such a function. However, they can serve as a counter-weight which helps tie the four tower corners together, and particularly so where recessed spires are concerned. Certainly Leicestershire has nothing to compare with the ambitious display to be seen at Kings Sutton, in Northamptonshire (Fig.6/48).

BELL STAGE WINDOWS

The application of shafts to bell-stage windows may be seen in fewer than a dozen Leicestershire churches, but these range from the 13th to the 15th centuries. On the towers at Hallaton (Fig.6/6), Great Easton (Fig.6/7), Melton Mowbray Fig.6/28), and Barkby (Fig.6/30), all previously noted, there are lateral attached shafts with capitals and bases. Those at Hallaton and the lower bell-stage at Melton Mowbray having annulet rings, whilst the central shafts at Hallaton, Barkby and also at Thorpe Langton (Fig.6/.3), are polygonal. Polygonal also are the central shafts of the windows at Gaddesby (Fig.6/49), but these have added interest in that all of the outer mouldings are concave in profile, a rare feature found only elsewhere in the county at Arnesby. On the slightly later tower at Wigston, All Saints (Fig.6/50), the bell-stage windows have some concave mouldings and, apart from the transom, share identical details with those at nearby Humberstone, suggesting the same hand. The windows at South Croxton (Fig.6/51), with triple shafts suggest a late date, judging by the
castellated transoms, perhaps the mid-14th century.

As will be seen in Chapter 7, it was the introduction of the ogee at the end of the 13th century, that began to define Decorated as distinct from Geometric work. To insert a quatrefoil into the head of a window can lead to a natural ogee form within the heads of the main lights. Comparison of the simple ‘Y’ tracery in the lower half of the bell-stage at Knighton (Fig.6/52), with the ogee tracery at Stoke Golding (Fig.6/14), indicates how the insertion of a large quatrefoil determines the ogee form of the main lights, but in the case of Stoke Golding, the elongated quatrefoil has slightly deformed the symmetry of the ogees. Still further are they deformed at Ibstock (Fig.6/47). It is only by placing the quatrefoil either within a circle or ‘equilateral’ form that the perfect ogee head is contrived, as at Husbands Bosworth (Fig.6/53). Although bell-stage windows are almost without exception of two lights, considerable experimentation and variety is apparent in Leicestershire Decorated work. An alternative to the ogee form was a development of the ogival head with the introduction of a separate trefoil element, beneath the head of each light, thus giving a trilobe, whilst the main ‘Y’ tracery allowed for a trefoil or quatrefoil within the main head, as in the lucarne at Muston (Fig.6/36), and at Oadby (Fig.6/5). Heads of lights do not necessarily have to be of ogee form in order to support a quatrefoil. At Nevill Holt (Fig.6/40), there are semi-circular heads. Rarely are lights arranged separately as at Brentingby (Fig.6/16), where each light contains a trefoiled ogee beneath a trilobe. Rarely also are pairs of lights given separate heads, occurring only on the late 13th-century towers at Arnesby (Fig.6/54), and Illston-on-the-Hill (Fig.6/55), the latter having very fine mouldings, the inner ones terminating in a mere suggestion of ogees.

Moving on to consider the ‘Lincolnshire splay’, this forms a deep, stepped base to the actual louvres, as exemplified at Ewerby, Lincolnshire (Fig.6/56).
Although such examples are not as prolific in Leicestershire, there are at least a dozen such examples in the county, such as may be seen at Great Bowden (Fig.6/57), in itself, an interesting tower with substantial octagonal pinnacles and cross-shaped slits in the battlements.

The use of ball-flower ornament will be discussed in more detail in later chapters, but its use is not uncommon on towers, though not exclusively on 14th-century examples. Whilst the ball-flower may be thought of as the 14th-century ornament par excellence of the West Midlands, notably at Hereford and Ledbury, it would seem to have appeared quite early in Leicestershire, reminding us that ornament such as nail-head, dog-tooth and ball-flower cannot be restricted purely to Transitional, Early English or to Decorated; Looking at Great Easton (Fig.6/7), above the arcaded corbel table, there is ball-flower at the base of the broach spire. How can such a detail be reconciled with the Early English windows beneath, with their dog-tooth ornament? Allowance must always be made for a building 'break'; there is no evidence that tower and spire were carried up in one continuous operation, and a break of only a decade or two would have been sufficient to allow the introduction of a new motif. Nevertheless, at Great Easton, a study of the masonry does not suggest a building break, but rather a continuous, if perhaps, slow programme. This interesting example is a reminder that the restrictions of dates and periods are far less important than an understanding of development and fusion of style and decoration. Although ball-flower is used on some Leicestershire towers beneath the cornice, there is no example where it is used on the vertical edges, as at Crick, in Northamptonshire (Fig.6/58).

WALL ARCADING
There are only four examples in the county of blind wall-arcading on either side of bell-stage windows. The late 13th-century tower of St. Mary-de-Castro (Fig. 6/59), has simple lancet arcading with shafts, capitals and bases, whilst the 14th-century tower at Whitwick (Fig. 6/60), has two-light arcading with ogee heads. Here, the bell-stage is set back and divided by shallow buttresses, a novel arrangement, unique in the county. The third example may be seen in the 15th-century upper bell-stage at Melton Mowbray (Fig. 6/28), where the twin bell openings with their mullions and transoms, are repeated in blind arcading on either side; these are probably contemporary with similar work at Loughborough. In connection with wall-arcading, consideration should be given to the tower at Whissendine (Fig. 6/45). Here, the large bell openings have restricted the wall-arcading to very slender elements almost squeezed up against the buttresses. What makes this Rutland tower important is that its particular 14th-century arrangement clearly leads the way for the Perpendicular stages at Melton Mowbray and Loughborough. It may also be argued that the tall bell-stage windows may herald the later, but similar Perpendicular work at Wrington and Evercreech in Somerset.281

Having noted some Perpendicular examples of additions to earlier Leicestershire towers, it is interesting that, almost without exception, these are set back from the main faces of the earlier towers. This can be seen at Melton Mowbray (Fig. 6/28), at Thurnby, (Fig. 6/61) and at Sproxton (Fig. 6/62). Melton and Sproxton have clasping buttresses, whilst those at Thurnby are diagonal. Reducing the thickness of the tower walls obviously lessens the additional weight; probably an important consideration, particularly with central towers such as Melton and Thurnby. In all three examples, the use of a fine light-colour limestone is noted. Before the tower at

Melton was re-faced, the lower bell-stage was of ironstone. This contrast between ironstone and fine quality ashlar limestone is particularly marked with the fine Perpendicular tower at Pickwell (Fig.6/63). Again, the tall bell-stage windows are either a harbinger or a local variety of the more fully developed Somerset examples.

Although buttresses serving as main wall supports will be discussed in Chapter 9, consideration is here given to tower buttresses, stair turrets and tower additions. Buttresses strengthen a tower and reduce the need for such thick walls, thus reducing the overall weight; they are therefore a cheaper method of construction. The difference becomes obvious between a very thick Norman wall, having shallow buttresses that are little more than pilasters, and the much lighter wall of the 14th century, often with deep buttresses. However, as buttresses became deeper, it was not necessary to continue upwards with the same depth, since the object was to concentrate thrust and divert it downwards into a solid base. As the buttress reduced in vertical stages, a method of throwing off rain-water was devised, by means of sloping or gabled set-offs. Francis Bond reminds us of the reasons for altering the angle of set-offs on the higher levels of buttresses, although such an arrangement has not been immediately apparent on Leicestershire examples.\(^{282}\) The majority of towers have angle buttresses, that is, separate buttresses on the north, west and south faces, the east face being buttressed by the nave, although the few exceptions to this arrangement will be examined shortly. The number of set-offs varies, but in most cases there is a set-off incorporating a string course around the tower just below the bell-stage as at Muston (Fig.6/64), together with set-offs and string courses defining each stage of the tower, as at Kegworth (Fig.6/65), although here, instead of the more normal final set-off, the buttress terminates with a trefoiled gable, a feature that is

\(^{282}\) F. Bond, p.361.
common to aisle buttresses on many Leicestershire churches. We have already encountered clasping buttresses, which are those that are wrapped around the tower angle. As has been noted, these are often part of Perpendicular additional stages, as at Melton Mowbray (Fig.6/28), although there are examples where angle buttresses turn into clasping buttresses on the final stage, such as the 14th-century tower at Humberstone (Fig.6/66). At Leire, the clasping buttresses finally turning diagonal (Fig.6/67), a feature shared by one or two churches in that area. Thurcaston (Fig.6/68) provides a rare example of buttresses that have been enlarged. The shallow clasping buttresses have had additional diagonal supports added at the south-west and north-west angles. It can be clearly seen how the base mouldings are different, and the explanation for this work is that it is coeval with the Perpendicular additional bell-stage placed on top of the early 13th-century tower.

A substantial number of towers have diagonal buttresses on the west face, with angle buttresses on the south-east and north-east faces, as at Bitteswell (Fig.6/69). The diagonal buttress tended to supersede the angle buttress during the 14th century, because structurally it performed better, and economically it was cheaper in materials and labour. This is not to say that both types did not continue in use together, neither should it be assumed that because we are dealing with Decorated architecture, buttresses necessarily became more elaborate; a rare example of decoration may be seen on one of the west buttresses of the tower at Market Bosworth (Fig.6/70), where a crocketed gable is supported on heads. Very few towers are un-buttressed, but of these, the 13th-century tower with its Perpendicular upper stage at Wyfordby (Fig.6/71), is a good example, unfortunately marred by the power cable connected to it.

Few Leicestershire towers have stair turrets; most stairs are contained within
an angled recess within the tower interior. These tend to be mainly in the south-west corner and are not obvious externally, other than by occasional slit windows against an angle buttress. Of the few Leicestershire examples, the most remarkable is that at Buckminster (Fig.6/72), where the late 13th-century tower stands midway between the south aisle and the south chancel chapel. The huge stair turret commences in the north-east corner with an opening that no longer gives access to stairs. This so-far unexplained opening, which is too small to have been a door, opens into a deep, vaulted recess that is rib-vaulted and shows signs of blocking off (Figs.6/73 and 6/74). Access to the tower is now via a splendid 15th-century newel turret within the south-east corner of the nave, which would also have given access to a rood loft. A more conventional but shallow stair turret may be seen at St. Mary de Castro (Fig.6/75), but that, as often happens, breaks the symmetry of the tower windows and arcading, as at Arnesby. There are not enough Leicestershire examples to be able to claim a ‘Leicestershire type’, in the way in which there is a clear ‘Devon type’ with stair turrets so often placed mid-wall. The nearest single Leicestershire example to a ‘mid-wall’ stair may be seen at the redundant church at Edmondthorpe. Here a semi-circular turret is built onto the south wall, placed slightly off-centre to the east, to accommodate the original bell-stage window of the 13th-century tower. It continues part of the way up the side of the additional 15th-century stage.

Finally, we may consider the addition of later towers built separately and then joined to naves. In Chapter 3, the subject of adding towers to west ends and the problems of settlement was referred to. It follows that beneath the west end of a nave, the ground will become consolidated. If a tower is then added, its east face will be on such ground whilst the west face will be on new unconsolidated ground. The outcome can be that the tower will settle towards the west with the sort of results that can seen
be at Pinchbeck, in Lincolnshire (Fig.6/76). To avoid this, towers were sometimes added free-standing from the west end of the church and then linked up later, after time had been allowed for any settlement. Such an example exists at Harby, with its 14th-century west tower. In Fig.6/77, it can be seen that the north-west quoin of the nave has had a north-facing buttress added on, thus filling the space between the west wall and the diagonal buttress of the tower. Looking now at the internal south-west angle of the nave (Fig.6/78), the diagonal tower buttress projects into the west end in a position that is matched exactly by its opposite diagonal buttress, the outside of which has been seen in the previous picture. It would seem that at Harby, the tower was therefore built close to the west wall, which eventually was removed and the nave incorporated into the tower. That the result of not doing this could sometimes lead to settlement and rupture, may be seen at Grimston (Fig.6/79), where the tower to the left of the picture has clearly settled by several inches, resulting in a misalignment of mouldings.

CONCLUSION

It has been demonstrated how spires developed from the 13th-century broach variety, through the recessed and sometimes ribbed and crocketed version of the 14th century, which continued into the 15th century, the difference in style being marked chiefly by the change in lucarne tracery. Similarly, we have noted the changing treatment at the base of spires, from the corbel-table associated with the broach spire, which then developed from arcading to frieze. The coming of the recessed spire necessitated the parapet, which itself developed from simple battlements to pierced openings of various types, often coupled with the introduction of pinnacles. Whilst bell-stage windows cannot offer the scope for elaborate tracery such as we have found in large aisle windows, nevertheless, we have noted the development from simple ‘Y’
tracery, often associated with 13th-century dog-tooth ornament, to the use of the trefoil and quatrefoil increasingly associated with the use of the ogee throughout the 14th century. Further development has taken us into proto-Perpendicular work of perhaps the mid-14th century, with the introduction of the transom and also the mullion at the head of lights. Whilst Perpendicular windows can be inserted into earlier aisle walls, with towers, such 15th-century work has generally taken the form of a complete additional bell-stage, often with a spire. Towers do not require the large fenestration as of an aisle, and whilst often the oldest remaining part of a church, any additions can only go upwards. Such alterations are not always as immediately apparent or dateable as a complete new aisle or chancel; as has been previously noted, Pevsner very rarely ascribes a date and certainly not to towers. The architectural historian is dependent upon stylistic evidence, or documentary evidence, which is rare before the 15th century.
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WINDOWS - Introduction

The intention of this introduction is to set out examples of a few of the window types that are later to be discussed in detail, since the chapter forms a major part of the present study. Much has been written and said about window tracery since the 19th century, and it is very largely its application, or lack of it, that has determined the nomenclature of English Gothic styles, therefore the term ‘tracery’ needs to be defined. An examination of the origins of the decorative forms used within window heads provides the necessary definition.

At Salisbury, where the main body of the church was erected between 1220 and 1266, the majority of the Early English lancets appear in groups of two or three, and have no decoration other than shafts, bases, rings and capitals; in other words, decoration is applied to the jambs but not to the heads. However, plate tracery appears in the clerestory and gable windows at the north and south ends of the transepts: simple roundels with quatrefoils, placed between the paired heads, whilst the rere-arches of the gable windows are provided with cusps. This feature also appears within the gable windows of Bishop Northwold’s presbytery at Ely, dedicated in 1252, where the rere-arches are provided with more elaborate cusping, although the lancet heads are still without cusps.

Whilst not forgetting the ascetic Cistercian influence on structural Early English Gothic, particularly in the Province of York, it is a fact that as soon as lancets were grouped together beneath a single head, something had to be done about the blank space/spaces created within the head, to achieve an aesthetically pleasing result. The five stepped lights in the east window at Gaddesby of c.1260 (Fig.7/1), overcome
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the problem in a novel way, as does the famous seven-light east window at Ockham, in Surrey, by carrying the lights right up into the main window head. More usually, a pair of lancets of equal height are placed beneath a single head, which is pierced. A very simple quatrefoil appears as plate tracery at Peatling Magna, (Fig.7/2), which, at Church Langton (Fig.7/3), is set within a roundel. Here, the flat effect of the surrounding stone is reduced somewhat by the introduction of 'eyes' in the form of three-sided chamfers. The interesting example at Church Langton might be seen as a transition from plate to the bar tracery, developing typologically into the example which may be seen at Kimcote (Fig.7/4), where the window adopts a more unified whole.

The treatment of window heads in this manner is not peculiar to England; it became part of a general vocabulary of a mid-13th century style, which did not rely simply on Cistercian influence. Bar tracery, where the head of the window is opened out to reduce the solid mass of masonry, as in Fig.7/4, may be found at Reims, 1212-1241284, Amiens, commenced 1220285, and the eastern limb of Westminster, 1245-1259286. It is generally accepted that bar-tracery was introduced into England with the commencement of Henry III’s rebuilding at Westminster in 1245, although there is now discussion as to the validity of Henry of Reyns and the Reims connection, as there is concerning Westminster’s leading role287, but Christopher Wilson has shown clearly that Westminster owes something to French influence and to Reims in

---

Villard was working on the building site at Reims between 1225 and 1235, p.17.
His elevations of the chevet are reproduced on Plates 60, 61, (fol.30 verso and 31)
His side elevations are reproduced on Plate 62, (fol.31 verso)
particular for fenestration\textsuperscript{288} What is now recognised as a slightly earlier example of bar tracery, is to be seen on the west front of Binham Priory, in Norfolk. Pevsner suggests that it dates from the period 1226 - 1244, when Richard de Parco was prior.\textsuperscript{289} A print by John Conley showing the complete tracery appears in Dugdale’s \textit{Monasticon}.\textsuperscript{290}

An alternative arrangement of the roundel or quatrefoil is reached when the heads of individual lights are carried up higher into the main window head, giving us ‘Y’ tracery; here, the central roundel is replaced by a diamond figure. At Hose (Fig.7/5), the un-cusped variety contrasts with Ab Kettleby (Fig.7/6), which has cusps throughout. However, the idea of cusped roundels within the main heads of windows tends to predominate, and in the next examples, at Castle Donington (Fig.7/7), and at Stoke Golding (Fig.7/8), the larger windows with more than just paired lancets, lend scope for more ambitious treatment. Now, more roundels can be introduced and the windows take on an even more unified appearance than does that in Fig.7/4. The use of bar tracery elements confirms that we are looking at tracery, but at Geometrical tracery, and consideration of the nomenclature leads to a further examination of Sharpe, who makes the point that Rickman admits traceried heads with foliated circles into his definition of Early English, but appears: “ - to have been at a loss to know where to draw the line between Early English and Decorated work.”\textsuperscript{291}

I suggest that 'the line' is when lancets were grouped beneath a single head, but \textit{only when the head was pierced}, thus giving us plate and bar tracery; at such a point we move from Early English into a new phase, Geometrical. Certainly, I find myself

in agreement with J. C. Cox when he says:

“It is much to be wished that antiquaries, ecclesiologists, and church architects would agree to make a general use of such a term as GEOMETRICAL as applicable to the period when formal window tracery began to be used, when Early English had almost come to a close, and before Decorated had begun. As it is, writers and expounders of Gothic architecture are for ever confused and not infrequently contradictory in nomenclature about the close of the thirteenth century. It is comparatively simple to insist upon the definite use of the phrase Geometrical as applicable to the time between 1250 and 1290.”

I suggest that the key words in this statement are: “formal window tracery”. At Peatling Magna and at Church Langton, as much as at Salisbury, we are not looking at formal tracery; at Castle Donington, and Stoke Golding, and in the chapter houses at Westminster and Salisbury, we quite definitely are. Having acknowledged in Chapter 2 that there is usually an overlap that covers the transition from one major style to another, I am of the opinion that in fenestration there was little transition. The Geometrical tracery at Stoke Golding, (Fig.7/8) bears no relation to the earlier separate lancets at Salisbury, even though the latter are grouped beneath a single hood-mould. This is a completely new form which does, however, indicate a development from Bony's Westminster Rayonnant, but it is a development which then departs from French influence and proceeds along English lines; it is not a development that continues, as Bony suggests, to owe allegiance to the Rayonnant.

To refer to this new development in fenestration as Decorated has now been long
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accepted, but to refer to it as *Geometrical* is correct both typologically and chronologically.

Before leading into a detailed analysis of window types, the following observations may be made. From a survey of a large number of Leicestershire churches, 31 main window groups have emerged, and these may be categorised into 88 sub-groups, reminding us that the essence of Decorated was variety rather than uniformity. This survey takes us beyond the embryonic stages of plate and bar tracery, and examines how the basic units were to be incorporated alongside later motifs, following the introduction of the ogee and its varied potential. Whilst only one example of each sub-group will be illustrated, a complete list of all windows in their respective categories appears in a separate list at the end of the chapter.

The main groups have been determined by the overall features, such as intersecting, reticulated, square-headed, etc. The sub-groups are the result of a close study of the small differences within each main group. For example, within the square-headed group there are cusps to the main lights only, as at Great Bowden (Fig.7/9), on the inner and outer curves of the ogees, as at Mowsley (Fig.7/10), or the lights and heads are fully cusped, as at Loddington (Fig.7/11). Within the reticulated group, there are circular cusped reticulations, as at Wymondham (Fig.7/12), and elongated cusped reticulations, as at Oadby (Fig.7/13), whilst in the intersecting group, there are no cusps at all, as at Lutterworth (Fig.7/14) or the lights and interstices are fully cusped, as at Broughton Astley (Fig.7/15).

The two most common types of window found throughout the county are (i) intersecting and (ii) reticulated, the latter being perhaps the most common type in Decorated architecture generally. Here, a problem arises in where to place intersecting if we are considering a *development* of window tracery. Whilst it is acceptable to
place reticulated, because of its use of the ogee, in the early 14th century, and therefore to consider it as not belonging to the earlier Geometrical phase, intersecting tracery, with its absence of cusped roundels can scarcely be called Geometrical. To infer that intersecting tracery is therefore earlier than Decorated, may not be correct. The moulding forms of many intersecting windows clearly place them within the 14th century. Structurally, the intersecting window would have been cheaper to produce than would reticulated tracery; the setting out is much simpler and a less skilled mason could have produced it. I think the absence of ogees in intersecting tracery does not necessarily indicate an earlier date; similarly the absence of cusped roundels does not imply a later date; the two forms co-existed.

In considering the tracery of windows, allowance has to be made for any possible tampering during restoration, and whilst in many cases the external evidence suggests a new window, there is often much to indicate that it is an original work that has been authentically restored. Since it is the external stonework that degrades, replacement generally does not extend right through the window. Discussion with Mr. Damon Ayer, a mason from Lincoln Cathedral workshop, makes clear that mullions and tracery, where possible, are cut back only to the plane of the glass, although one should still be wary of major Victorian rebuildings rather than of conservative restorations. The latter process, where sympathetically addressed, leaves original mouldings on the interior jambs, mullions and tracery, and it is from a close study of these details that we may determine as to whether the work is original. Whilst internal mouldings have been carefully noted, because of light conditions, nearly all illustrated examples are external.

What is fundamental to issues of typology is the need to explain the survival
of original windows which disturb the chronology within a wall that is clearly the result of a single brief building period. In the north aisle at Barkby (Fig.7/16), is a window of Geometrical tracery, in \( c.1280 \) style, but it is set in an aisle whose structure and all other window tracery suggests a date of not earlier than \( c.1310 \). A feasible explanation is that the patron, who was often the lord of the manor, may have admired an earlier window in another church and given instructions for a copy to be made. As has been noted in Chapter 5, there is documentary evidence for patrons instructing masons to copy work from other sites. From such evidence, it is clear that what may strike us as anachronistic did not necessarily concern either patrons or builders.

The south aisle windows at Stoke Golding, whilst all late 13th-century Geometrical in form, exhibit three different variations of tracery in so far as the manner in which lights and circles are grouped. Such variation could again be at the wishes of the patron, but was more likely the result of masons wishing to provide variety and to avoid the repetition that was to become prevalent in the 15th-century fenestration of many East Anglian and Cotswold ‘wool’ churches. If Exeter could provide a magnificent variety of window tracery ranging from Geometric to tri-radial head and Reticulated, first in the choir, completed \( c.1304 \), and then in the nave, completed \( c.1340 \), why should not a parish church, if there was adequate funding? This emphasises yet again that variety rather than uniformity is one of the most important features of Decorated architecture.

**ANALYSIS OF WINDOW TYPES**

Whilst this chapter introduces the details of window tracery from the earliest plate tracery through to proto-Perpendicular details in typological sequence, it does not necessarily provide an absolute chronological progression, since there is not the supporting documentary evidence and, secondly, windows of what may be thought of
as earlier and later types, can be contemporary within the same wall. Figs.7/17 - 7/212 provide a substantial visual record of the minute changes of detail within the 31 given groups, which fall under each main heading; the remaining examples (Figs.7/213 - 7/222), close the chapter with details of window mouldings.

**PLATE TRACERY**

At Great Bowden (Fig.7/17), there is a simple two-light window, mistakenly called bar-tracery by Pevsner.²⁹⁴ Here, there are cusps neither to the lights nor roundel, whilst the mouldings are a simple chamfer, but there is an attempt to relieve the solid stonework at the head of the mullion and on either side of the roundel with shallow chamfered incisions. The treatment of these interstices, or eyes, was to become of increasing importance in the development of tracery. This example demonstrates the move from separate lancets of the earlier 13th century to the grouping beneath a single head, and may be dated probably little later than c.1240.

**BAR TRACERY**

The logical design progression from Plate Tracery may be seen at Ashby Folville (Fig.7/18), where there is a clear attempt to relieve the solidity of the window head by opening out the roundel so that the moulding runs into the head of the two lights; cusps are introduced into the lights, together with a quatrefoil within the roundel. The eyes are now cut more deeply, thus again, reducing the solidity, a detail that is repeated within the eyes of each individual cusp. This example is stylistically more advanced than Fig.7/17, and the window at Illston-on-the-Hill (Fig.7/19), is still more so. The more elegant mouldings consist of roll and concave, and although the
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overall design is little different from that in Fig.7/18, the quality of the mouldings and
of the internal shafts places this window nearer to the end of the 13th century, c.1280.
If, *stylistically* these three examples indicate a progression, *structurally* they do not.
However, at Frolesworth (Fig.7/20), an ogee is introduced, both into the main heads
and in the quatrefoil. Whilst the absence of a hood-mould is no indication of date, the
presence of the ogee suggests a date of shortly before 1300. Paul Crossley is of the
opinion that the ogee first made its appearance in northern Europe in the 1280's and
1290's. 295

**Y - TRACERY**

Examination of the window at Castle Donington (Fig.7/21), may pose the
question when does Plate Tracery become Y - Tracery, since there are two lights
surmounted by a quatrefoil within a roundel. The answer is that the solid head has
now completely disappeared, whilst each light is continued up higher to share the
*same arc* as that of the main window. As with the majority of windows of this type,
there are no cusps to the lights, obviously requiring less complicated and therefore,
less expensive work. Nevertheless, the form is a conceptually traceried opening,
unlike the Early English lancets to be found in some Leicestershire churches which,
therefore, are not the concern of this thesis. Typologically, the fine mouldings at
Castle Donington suggest a date of the early 1300’s. At Norton-juxta-Twycross
(Fig.7/22), badly weathered cusps may be seen in the head, but of more significance
is the wave moulding within the jambs. This typical feature of the Decorated period
did not appear before the 1280’s, according to Richard Morris. 296 Harry Forrester
states that the wave moulding belongs essentially to the early part of the 14th
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295 P. Crossley, 'Salem and the Ogee Arch', *Architektur und Monumentalskulptur des 12 - 14
296 R. Morris, 'The development of later Gothic Mouldings in England, c.1250-1400', *A.H. Pt.1,
century. I think Morris is a little early with his dating, and am inclined to agree rather with Forrester.

Fairly typical Y - Tracery may be seen at Peatling Magna (Fig.7/23), where there are no cusps at all and there is a simple roll-moulding, all probably of c.1300. Two variants follow; at Ibstock (Fig.7/24), there are cusps in the lights but not in the head, whilst at Stonton Wyville (Fig.7/25), the situation is reversed. Both windows share the similar concave mouldings, yet at Diseworth, (Fig.7/26) the elaborate cusping, with cinquefoiled ogee lights, is set within a plain chamfer. A significant point which emerges from these observations is that there is not necessarily a correlation between elaboration of mouldings and tracery.

GEOMETRICAL

As has been discussed previously, if the accepted terminology now thinks of Geometrical work as being the early stage of Decorated, it is a phase of sufficient importance to merit a distinct classification, but as we shall discover later in the chapter, not all windows with circles, etc., can be regarded as being Geometrical. Furthermore, there are very few Geometrical examples in Leicestershire, as the window analysis at the end of this chapter will indicate.

The window at Whitwick (Fig.7/27), has cusps throughout. The upper quatrefoil is not set within a circle, the mouldings are finely defined, but the ogee at the head of the central light means that we should be wary of the authenticity where a great deal of Victorian rebuilding has taken place.

SQUARE-HEADED WINDOWS

It is often assumed that the square-headed window belongs to the 15th century and later; this is not true. Several Decorated examples in Leicestershire display
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considerable variety within small details, as was suggested in the introduction. The advantage of the square-headed window is that a larger area of glass can be carried up much nearer to the wall-plate, thus affording maximum light. Moreover, the problem of a weaker structural lintel compared with an arch was reduced if there was a smaller mass to be supported above the window. These may well be reasons why such windows were much favoured in the relatively shallow walls of clerestories.

At Ravenstone (Fig.7/28), there is a simple two-light window with cusps. Unlike the majority of such windows, the heads of the lights are two-centred, as they are at Edmondthorpe (Fig.7/29), but here the mullions are carried up to the lintel and all the resulting spandrels are ‘blind’. The majority of square window heads are ogee in form, within which are numerous subtle differences.

In the next few examples, it can be seen that both two and three-light versions share the same details. Willoughby Waterleys (Fig.7/30), and Burrough-on-the-Hill (Fig.7/31), show cusps within the heads of the ogee lights and only on the sides of the inverted ogees beneath the lintels; there are no cusps on the lintel or within the spandrels. At Slawston (Fig.7/32), and Goadby Marwood (Fig.7/33), there is the addition of a single cusp in each outer spandrel, so that cusps now match on either side above and below each ogee, thus forming an inversion. At Loddington (Figs. 7/34 and 7/35), the inverted ogees now have cusps on all three sides, but none within the spandrels. A variety of mouldings is revealed in these six examples, with the plain or concave chamfer predominating.

Although there will be more to say later concerning reticulated windows, there are examples amongst the square-headed type. Again, by comparing the two and three-light versions, we find variety in the use of cusps. At Belton (Fig.7/36), and Knossington (Fig.7/37), there are cusps to the ogee lights, within the reticulations and
on either side of the inverted ogees, with none along the lintels. The change from the plain ogee style as depicted in Figs.7/30-35, to the reticulated ogee (Figs.7/36-39), does not necessarily suggest a progression of style. What is of greater importance is the fact that absolute consistency within the positioning of cusps, particularly in the areas above, the main window lights may well suggest the hand of the same mason at work in more than one church.

To complete the examination of square-headed windows, there are a few more specialised examples. At Kimcote (Fig.7/38), the heads of the ogees are carried up as tiny mullions, although the restoration of 1869 suggests that we should be wary, since Pevsner states that few windows here retained any surviving tracery before that date. The large four-light window at Great Bowden (Fig.7/39), shares similar details, although it is only the central mullion that is carried up to the lintel, no doubt to give support. With both of these windows, we may be looking at a Victorian rebuilding of 'proto-Perpendicular' work. Certainly more authentic and distinctive are the chancel windows at Edmondthorpe (Fig.7/40). Here, what are in effect, Y-tracery windows are set beneath square heads, with cusping that occurs only within the heads of the lights. The combination of roll and concave mouldings suggests an early 14th-century date.

The following four examples exhibit simple mouchettes. It was the ogee that gave rise to the mouchette, since at least one side of the latter form had to contain an ogee. At Cadeby (Fig.7/41), ogees are set beneath two-centred heads, whilst a similar version occurs at Great Bowden (Fig.7/42), but here the two-centred heads have become flattened by the lintel. Although the jamb mouldings are different, the cusping details are identical. A variation of, and possibly a development from
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the ogee form of the reticulation was the mouchette, as seen at Twycross (Fig.7/43). Comparison with Fig.7/36 demonstrates that the half-riculations at the sides of the Belton window have become, what are in effect, mouchettes at the sides of the Twycross window. At Somerby (Fig.7/44), the central quatrefoil is independent of the heads of the ogees, thus preserving proportion with the side mouchettes. The mouchette, which is an Islamic motif, was to play an increasingly important part in the development of the flowing tracery of the later Decorated period.

There is an interesting example of the conversion to a square-headed window at Stoke Dry, in Rutland (Fig.7/45). An earlier two-light window has been extended upwards, an alteration that is probably coeval with the late 17th-century west tower. The remains of the hood mould survive, as do the sunk quadrant jamb mouldings of the original window, before giving way to the plain chamfer of the extension, - a reminder that often the smallest details are of interest, but which can be easily overlooked! In similar vein, the three-light windows on either side of the south porch at Glaston, in Rutland (Fig.7/46), appear to be wrong when we examine the mouchettes above the outer lights. Although the symmetry is now marred by the later insertion of clerestory windows, it can be seen that the aisle windows actually form a matching pair on either side of the porch.

**RETICULATED WINDOWS**

The tracery of reticulated windows takes the form of a series of circles, the top and bottom of which are drawn out into ogee form, dictated of course by the ogee heads of the main lights. Similarly, the quatrefoils within each circle are formed from four circles, the upper and lower of which are produced into ogee points. The first two examples are similar in design but different in detail, as is found frequently in the county windows. The window at Garthorpe (Fig.7/47), has cusps only to the heads of
the three lights, whilst that at Gaddesby (Fig.7/48), also has them within the three reticulations, but only within the upper of the two side sets. The difference between mouldings is noticeable. Garthorpe, with its fairly thick quadrant mouldings is probably early 14th century, whilst the example at Gaddesby, which forms part of a very distinguished north aisle, (note the string-courses and ball-flower ornament, together with shafts and mouldings) is unlikely to be much before 1320. In both examples, the head of the upper circle merges into the main window head, whereas in the next four examples, there is a clearly defined ogee tip which rises up into the window head. At Kimcote (Fig.7/49), and at Ratby (Fig.7/50), all tracery details are the same, but jamb mouldings are quite different, with plain chamfers at the former and sunk quadrant at the latter. The example at Ashby Folville (Fig.7/51), has the minor variation of no cusps to the side sections of the head.

On the next three examples, there are variants of the upper central figure which divides, rather than meeting the apex of the main arch as a point. At Ibstock (Fig.7/52), the two reticulations are clearly formed from circles, whilst those at Rothley (Fig.7/53), have become elongated, and are similar at Measham (Fig.7/54), although the latter form mouchettes. The cusping details vary slightly in all four windows, as do the mullion mouldings; only at Ibstock and Rothley do we find the same plain chamfers. At Measham, there appears to have been some very clumsy rebuilding of the arch, since the quadrant moulding of the jambs merges into plain chamfers, and the arch is very ill-fitting beneath the hood-mould.

Of the larger reticulated examples, the east window at Broughton Astley (Fig.7/55), has the uppermost reticulations rising vertically into the window heads, whilst the east windows at Arnesby (Fig.7/56), and Kegworth (Fig.7/57), have the upper ones dividing on either side of the apex of the arch. Arnesby is one of the few
county churches with a complete Decorated chancel, which may be dated to c.1330.\textsuperscript{301} Perhaps it is only when larger windows of four or more lights are used, that the full extent of reticulation can be appreciated, with its net-like appearance and the desire to turn a somewhat monotonous feature into a more free-flowing design.

At Church Langton (Fig.7/58), and Mancetter, in Warwickshire (Fig.7/59), the upper reticulations rise into an ogee point beneath the apex. Again, caution is needed; Pevsner states that the east window of the chancel at Church Langton was "heightened" in 1865,\textsuperscript{302} whilst Brandon states that the chancel walls and window were "raised two feet",\textsuperscript{303} which is not the same thing. Pevsner also states that the east window at Mancetter is Victorian, yet there is no reference to this in the church guide.\textsuperscript{304} These two examples are a reminder of just how difficult it is for the architectural historian to be completely certain of the material under examination. However, I think it unlikely that the original tracery would not have been reproduced, a view that is shared by Mr. Damon Ayer. The two final examples are quite distinctive. At Muston (Fig.7/60), the central mullion re-appears beneath the apex, suggesting a 'proto-Perpendicular' form, whilst the west window of the north aisle at Evington (Fig.7/61), is like no other in the county. It is an odd mixture of trilobes, ogee heads, and reticulation, all covered with a profusion of ball-flower and crockets; internally there are shafts with foliated capitals. Since the aisle windows contain armorial glass of the Grey family, sub-tenants of Evington until 1491, it is suggested that the north aisle was built under their patronage in 1340.\textsuperscript{305} Once again, the jamb mouldings of these last seven examples vary considerably, from plain chamfer at
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INTERSECTING WINDOWS

These form the most common type of Leicestershire tracery, but again, there are many variants. The first two examples, Swepstone (Fig.7/62), and Wigston, All Saints (Fig.7/63), may appear to be identical in detail, with a total absence of cusps. The difference is in the jamb mouldings; at Swepstone, where the north aisle is distinguished in detail and one of the finer examples in the county, we find a concave moulding, whilst that at Wigston is a plain chamfer. Both windows may be dated to the early 1300’s. Of slightly later date is the example at Ibstock (Fig.7/64), where the richly moulded jambs are noteworthy, even though they produce a somewhat heavy effect in the mullions and intersects. It is noticeable that both Swepstone and Ibstock have the head-stops common to so much Leicestershire work.

Turning to the windows at Lockington (Fig.7/65), and Broughton Astley (Fig.7.66), at the former, there are cusps within the three lights only, whilst at the latter, they appear also in the interstices; both examples are again early 14th century and both exhibit different styles of jamb moulding. As with so many aspects of the Decorated style, moulding detail may have more to do with available finance than with chronological progression.

At Cold Overton (Fig.7/67), there is what must surely be a development in intersecting tracery. The cusping of the main lights has now been closed, thus introducing a subsidiary head; the cusping in the head of each light therefore becomes a trilobe. The absence of cusps to the three upper intersects concentrates the eye rather more on the three lights than upon a complete intersecting window.

It is very rarely that one can find identical windows in separate churches,
indicating either a clear influence of one upon the other, or evidence of the same
designer/mason. Pevsner does not make the point that in Derbyshire, the tracery
details of the east windows at Newton Regis (Fig.7/68), and Seckington (Fig.7/69),
agree in all respects. The central quadrilobe divides the windows into two main
intersects, which then sub-divide into four, before finally producing five separate
lights. The difference between a quadrilobe and a quatrefoil is that in the former, the
compartments are pointed, whereas they are segments of a circle in the latter.

The east window in the north aisle at Swepstone (Fig.7/70), illustrates a three-
light version, with cinquefoils, rather than trilobes in the main lights and cusping to
the intersects; here, the jamb mouldings have changed from simple concave to a wave
moulding. When compared with the west window of the same aisle (Fig.7/62), the
additional decoration often afforded to the east end of a church becomes obvious. The
five-light window at Stoughton (Fig.7/71), may be compared with Figs.7/68 and 7/69,
the difference being that the quadrilobes are now replaced by a cinquefoil within a
circle, and the trilobes are replaced by cinquefoils within the heads of the individual
lights. This window, which is typologically slightly earlier than that at Swepstone, has
elements of both Geometric and Intersecting tracery, indicating the co-existence of
the two forms; it is clearly earlier than some examples with circular motif, which will
be discussed shortly. Fig.7/72 is another example of the co-existence of window
types indicating the mixture of window types that was favoured in the Decorated
period. The reticulated and intersecting windows at Wykeham Chapel in
Lincolnshire, all belong to a single short period, since it was built in 1311, as the
private chapel for Prior Hatfield's house.\footnote{N. Pevsner and J. Harris, \textit{The Buildings of England: Lincolnshire}, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1995, p.794.} It is important to consider why, when
three windows in the illustration have intersecting tracery, one is singled out for
reticulated tracery.

An interesting theory is discussed by Georgina Russell, who suggests that where different donors have provided glass for a set of windows, the tracery is the same, in other words identical windows contain a series of sponsored works. Where individual donors have come forward, not in response to an appeal, they have wished for the windows to be individual.  

Moving on to a group of windows where the intersects are of an unusual ogee form, there is a marked similarity between the examples at Queniborough (Fig.7/73), and Edmondthorpe (Fig.7/74), whilst a very similar window, decorated with ball-flower, may be seen in the east end of the south aisle at Ashby Folville (Fig.7/75). The absence of cusping in the interstices at Queniborough contrasts with the more elaborate version at Edmondthorpe, where the outer interstices form interlocking mouchettes. Given the identical moulding forms and the close proximity of all three churches, it suggests work by the same hand. A more elegant form, and one which may more aptly be described as 'flowing', can be seen at Witherley (Fig.7/76), where the intersecting ogees rise to support a central octo-foil.

Two examples where the intersections produce semi-circular heads, may be seen at the adjacent Northamptonshire churches of Ringstead (Fig.7/77) and Raunds (Fig.7/78). The cusping details are almost identical, as are the jamb mouldings, but at Ringstead there is additional tracery to the sides of the main window head. One might imagine that the mason at Ringstead having looked at Raunds, had decided how his window could be ‘improved’. These windows, which are unlikely to have been before c.1320, both have the mouchettes, which are one of the main elements that gave rise to 'flowing', tracery.

SEGMENTAL WINDOWS

Windows with segmental heads may also be found with various differences in
detail, and although as a type, they are structurally more sound than the square-
headed window, they are not common generally.

The first four examples all have ogee lights, but at Orton-on-the-Hill
(Fig.7/79), the badly weathered quatrefoils in the head are separate from the ogees,
reminding us of the example at Somerby (Fig.7/44). However, at Muston (Fig.7.80),
the heads of the ogees form the lower part of complete circles containing quatrefoils,
whilst at the proto-Perpendicular two and three-light versions at Muston, (Fig.7/81)
and Stonesby, (Fig.7/82) the ogee heads are continued up vertically to enclose
trilobes. The jamb mouldings at Stonesby are more elaborate than those at Muston,
although both display a sunk quadrant.

Of the two remaining examples, both share slight similarities. The window at
Catthorpe (Fig.7/83), has two-centred outer lights, but these are most clumsily
contrived because the trefoils are deformed due to the arch spring having been taken
too high up the mullions; at Cold Overton (Fig.7/84), the whole arrangement is
worked out more carefully.

THREE-LIGHT WINDOWS WITH TALLER CENTRE LIGHT.

At Diseworth (Fig.7/85), and at Austrey in Warwickshire (Fig.7/86), there are
versions without and with cusps. Again, the question arises as to whether the contrast
is between that of work of the late 13th century and early 14th century, or does it
reflect patronage and funding? The answer could lie in both. At Diseworth, the walls
are mainly of random rubble, whilst at Austrey, we see coursed ashlar, always a sign
of quality and the finance to support it. At Fenny Drayton (Fig/7/87), what may be
seen as a simplified version of Fig.7/86 has ogee trefoils set within the heads.
THREE-LIGHT WINDOWS WITH SHORTER CENTRE LIGHT.

This type lends itself to a more ambitious treatment of the window head; it follows that if the centre light is shorter, a new motif has to be introduced to fill the space above, a circle being the logical form. At Gaddesby (Fig.7/88), there is a trefoil within the large central circle, and there is the added refinement of a moulded string-course which links the heads of the windows. At Goadby Marwood (Fig.7/89), the outer lights have trilobes set above trefoils, whilst the circle contains a mixture of alternate trilobes set within tri-radial heads and trefoils. The circular features in these windows lead us on to consider larger examples, which in some cases may possibly take us back to Geometric, but which certainly indicate that Geometric elements survived into the 14th century.

LARGE WINDOWS WITH CIRCULAR HEAD FEATURES

Examination of this group, will demonstrate that, increasingly, there tends to be not just a single feature relating to the apex of the main arch; often the subdivisions contain different features.

At Somerby (Fig.7/90), all four lights have trilobes, but the absence of the circle at the head causes some distortion to the quatrefoil. The sexfoils within circles are more comfortably arranged in the examples at Stoke Golding (Fig.7/91), and Illston-on-the-Hill (Fig.7/92). All three examples share concave jamb mouldings.

The close similarity between the east windows at Market Harborough (Fig.7/93), and Geddington in Northamptonshire (Fig.7/94), is striking, where the outer pairs of lights share identical details. The heads of the short central lights are treated differently, whilst the structure of the circular features is almost identical, although at Market Harborough, there are sub-cusps within the trilobes. I am of the opinion that the Market Harborough example reflects a Northamptonshire influence.
where, in general, window tracery is more ambitious than in Leicestershire, and where the fine quarries supported superior mason-craft; it is quite possible that this window may be the work of Northamptonshire masons. These two examples contrast with the windows at Ketton in Rutland (Fig.7/95), and Grantham in Lincolnshire (Fig.7/96). The west window at Ketton, although restored by Scott in 1861,\(^{308}\) almost certainly reproduces authentic details, with its shafts, trilobes, and the tri-radial features within the circle, a feature which appears in a more elaborate form at the west end of the south aisle of Gaddesby. The tracery details at Ketton perhaps suggest an early 14th-century date, whereas the example at Grantham, contemporary with the Lincoln Angel Choir, is of c.1280. The frequent use of circles makes this very much a Geometric window, as is the east window at Raunds (Fig.7/97), which bears close similarity. The introduction of three large Geometric windows into this point of the discussion, is to emphasise that the basic elements of a slightly earlier design could be carried on into the 14th century, even though the detail could be different, as may be seen from the remaining five examples. The two windows at Wigston, All Saints (Figs.7/98), and 7/99) whilst sharing circles, indicate how the opening out from four to five lights increases the space available for the circle. At Wigston, we need to be cautious, since much of the window tracery was replaced/renewed in the later 19th century, at the time when Wigston’s other church, St. Wystan, was being rebuilt.\(^{309}\)

**LARGE WINDOWS WITH NON-CIRCULAR HEAD FEATURES.**

At Rothley (Fig.7/100), the central feature takes the form of a large quadrilobe, with smaller ones on either side in the heads of the two main groups. The same may be seen at Stoke Golding (Fig.7/101), although the central feature has additional cusps. The window at Barkby (Fig.7/102), reveals complicated details

---

\(^{308}\) Pevsner, p.476
\(^{309}\) Brandwood, p.130
beneath the apex and in the two main heads, which at a quick glance, suggest Kentish tracery, although this is clearly not the case. The variety of heads in the remaining four examples range from a somewhat unsuccessful attempt at Gaddesby (Fig.7/103), where the elliptical figures in the two side heads do not quite work, because they need to rise from ogees rather than from two-centred heads in the four lights, although the shafts and mouldings indicate high quality work. At Sileby (Fig.7/104), we would have reticulated work but for the mullions rising into two-centred heads; at Appleby Magna (Fig.7/105), the result is achieved by having ogee heads to the lights, but with reticulations in the main heads of both windows. The problem facing master masons was how to be innovative and successful. The downward curves of the quatrefoil bases continue on either side to produce an unfortunate sagging transom effect at Sileby, whilst the central elliptical shapes at Appleby clash with the ogee reticulations on either side. The effect is equally unfortunate at Stoke Golding, (Fig.7/106) where the semi-circular head to each pair of lights, means that each side of an individual light does not describe the same arc.

So in discussing this particular group of windows, it can be seen that the setting out of some flowing tracery is not always satisfactory. It is perhaps only when we reach the final stages of Decorated, that the finest examples are found, more particularly in Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire, since there are few instances of true flowing tracery in Leicestershire.

**TWO-LIGHT Ogee WINDOWS**

In this group there are also numerous variations in detail, although there are certain similarities with the variations to be found in square-headed windows. At Orton-on-the-Hill (Fig.7/107), there are trefoiled lights with a quatrefoil within a circle, with blank eyes. Here, the design has almost returned to plate-tracery, the main
difference being the introduction of the ogee. A similar design may be seen at Heather (Fig.7/108), but here, the mouldings are quite different, having a thick roll compared with the much crisper concave moulding at Orton, whilst the corresponding outer edges are cut and moulded more deeply. An interesting variant occurs at Kegworth (Fig.7/109), where the window above the north porch has two-centred heads to the lights, but above them ogees rise up to form the circle containing the quatrefoil.

At Norton-juxta-Twycross (Fig.7/110), both quatrefoil and the trefoil heads have sub-cusps, whilst the outer sides of the lights are now glazed. Here, caution is needed, since Brandwood states that there was much rebuilding c.1841. Nevertheless, the county does contain some genuine examples of sub-cusps, as we shall discover.

At Belton (Fig.7/111), all parts of the window are now glazed, and the upper point of the quatrefoil divides just before reaching the apex; the hood-mould terminates in a small ogee, an interesting feature that will be encountered later. Thus, all six examples, whilst essentially similar in overall design, contain minor variations, although it will be noted that the sunk quadrant jamb moulding predominates. Ratcliffe Culey is the only Leicestershire church that is a complete Decorated building, that is, it is not an enlargement or alteration of an earlier structure. The simple design in Fig.7/112 rather belies the fact that this is an extremely important little church.

The two examples at Loddington (Fig.7/113), and Knossington (Fig.7/114), demonstrate diverse treatment of space at the head of the ogees. Once again, the basic design is very similar; both sets of lights have trefoiled ogees, whilst the central spaces are approximately oval; it is in the small detail that the variation occurs. At

310 Brandwood, p.113.
Diseworth (Fig.7/115), there is the setting of ogees beneath two-centred heads, and in the two final examples at Muston (Fig.7/116), and Car Colston in Nottinghamshire (Fig.7/117), again, the unusual feature of ogees set one above the other, are encountered.

It has already been seen how rarely windows in different churches match exactly, but at Muston, in Leicestershire, the windows are identical with the example at Car Colston, in Nottinghamshire. Both churches are close to the county border, and so there can be no question of spontaneous genesis here. Although the jamb mouldings and head-stops are different, the two examples are either contemporary and possibly the works of the same hand, or one is a copy at the request of a patron. The double ogees produce a form of mouchette, which leads into the next groups of windows, namely, those in which the mouchette becomes an increasingly important element.

**CONVERGING MOUCHETTES.**

Although passing reference has been made to mouchettes, it should now be established that it was this device which clearly heralded flowing tracery. The combination of ogees and mouchettes is a specific feature of later Decorated tracery, although such combination does not necessarily imply that we are looking at windows with flowing tracery. It was the use of mouchettes in a combination of different positions, converging, diverging, reversed and interlocking, that could produce true flowing tracery, for the finest examples of which, we need to look at Lincolnshire.

At Garthorpe (Fig.7/118), the two semi-circular heads provide the ogee sides to the mouchettes, which in turn produce the four-sided concave figure in between; the head of the window still contains the ubiquitous quatrefoil. The similar example at Orton-on-the-Hill (Fig.7/119), shows a refinement of detail, particularly in the
mouldings; now the central concave figure includes a quadrilobe. Whilst the mouchettes in these two examples terminate in points, some might call them daggers rather than mouchettes - in the next three examples, they assume the more commonly rounded end. At Norton-juxta-Twycross (Fig.7/120), the heads of the four lights produce up into an ogee, thus creating the concave sided ‘square’, and at the same time provide the ogee side for each mouchette. By examining Fig.126 it is possible to recognise at Norton the beginnings of flowing tracery, by seeing how the various elements combine to ‘flow’ through the window head. The window at Waltham-on-the-Wolds (Fig.7/121), has the same four-leaf pattern within the apex, but because the four mouchettes are in a more vertical position, making use of the arcs of the two main heads, they now produce a central reticulation within each pair, rather than the convex ‘square’. A similar result may be seen at Church Langton (Fig.7/122), where, because of the verticality of the mouchettes, it matters not whether they spring from ogee heads or two-centred heads, as at Waltham. At Stoke Golding (Fig.7/123), the window starts as a four-light version of the example at Norton (Fig.7/120), but the mouchettes rise into ogees to encompass an octo-foil figure. The extremely poor setting out of the tracery does little for its charm, and one wonders just what went wrong at either the building or restoration stages; certainly there is a hint of ‘drift’ towards the left of the deformed arch.

**DIVERGING MOUCHETTES**

The example at Barwell (Fig.7/124), is simply the reverse of Fig.7/119. To achieve the mouchettes, the mullion has to be continued up; thus, there is now no space for a concave ‘square’. Similar to the example at Barwell is that at Cold Overton (Fig.7/125), but it will be seen that areas between the cusps are reversed within the mouchettes. As with the examples of converging mouchettes, it can be seen
by comparing Figs.7/127 at Peckleton and 7/128 at Frolesworth, that once they have been moved to a vertical position, they can make use of the ogee heads of the lights, moreover, they lead to 'Perpendicular' verticality. The fine windows at Sileby (Fig.7/129), demonstrate once again, the desire for variety; whilst the details of the outer lights agree, those of the central lights are slightly different. The centre light at Frolesworth (Fig.7/130), is the same in design as that of the right hand window in Fig.7/129, but the outer lights have now reverted to the ogee sub-heads beneath trilobes, as we have seen in Fig.7/100. The windows with reticulations at Taddington, in Derbyshire (Fig.7/131), and Misterton (Fig.7/132), are identical in design, but not in detail, if we compare the cusps.

CONVERGING AND DIVERGING MOUCHETTES

It will be seen from the next four examples, that to achieve this result, the outer lights require semi-circular heads, whilst the central light requires an ogee. At Foxton (Fig.7/133), the mouchettes adopt the rounded form, whilst those at Stoke Golding (Fig.7/134), and Mancetter in Warwickshire (Fig.7/135), terminate in points. Once more we find the rare example of windows in different churches matching, where in the previous two examples they agree in every respect, even to cusping details; only the jamb mouldings are different. At Bilton in Warwickshire, (Fig.7/136), the mouchettes are more rounded in form, requiring the head of the central ogee to be continued up further before engaging with the converging mouchettes.

The question needs to be addressed as to why, in the few matching examples, jamb mouldings differ, when tracery does not, since this is a discussion that can be widened to embrace many more examples of similar window types but which vary in moulding details. It can be seen from studying the masonry of window heads, that
frequently that which is an integral part of the tracery is separate from that which forms the outer moulded head. For obvious reasons the window arch has to be constructed before the tracery can be inserted. I suggest that the same masons were not responsible for both, any more than I think that the same masons were responsible for pier capitals as well as for respond capitals, a matter to be discussed in Chapter 10. It is entirely feasible that jamb mouldings were, in many cases, conceived quite independently from tracery details, and that typologically it is possible to have mouldings that do not suggest the chronological progression which the tracery may indicate.

**REVERSED MOUCHETTES**

At Church Langton (Fig.7/137), the combination of central quatrefoil and reversed mouchettes creates the effect of a flower bud. Here surely, the mediaeval observations of nature, in the form of foliated capitals, crockets, etc., have now moved into window tracery. This effect is not reproduced at Hallaton (Fig.7/138), because there is no central mullion, whilst the eye is partly distracted by the Geometric elements of the circles within the heads of the side lights.

**INTERLOCKING MOUCHETTES**

Reversed and diverging mouchettes can be interlocked, as may be seen in the next three examples, although again, the combination of ogees and mouchettes used here, hardly contribute towards flowing tracery. The designs at Buckminster (Fig.7/139), and Heckington (Fig.7/140), are identical, but a slight difference in detail may be seen within the reversed mouchettes which at the latter, are more rounded in form. At Witherley (Fig.7/141), there is no mullion rising from the head of the central light, everything meets or springs from a central point at the tip of this two-centred light. The east window at Edmondthorpe,(Fig.7/142), might contain symbolism
within the feature above the central light. Placed above the main altar, the tracery above the central light suggests a richly decorated Cross.

**MOUCHETTES WITHIN CIRCLES**

The example at Queniborough (Fig.7/143), might suggest a late 13th-century Geometric window, were it not for the ogee at the head of the central light and the reversed mouchettes in the two circles. At Ratby (Fig.7/144), the three mouchettes within the circle rotate around a central circle, like a propeller. The window has reversed and converging mouchettes together with reticulations, but as with the previous example, it can hardly be called 'flowing'. There are four mouchettes in the circle at Chipping Warden in Northamptonshire (Fig.7/145), using basic 14th-century motifs of mouchettes and ogees, in different combinations. At Queniborough (Fig.7/143), the three lights are of equal height, but the central ogee forms part of *two circles*. At Chipping Warden, the central light is shorter than the outer lights and supports a *single circle*. To suggest a uniform height for the lights, ogees are introduced which support trilobes in the outer lights. This indicates yet again, that at parish church level, the Decorated style is represented more often by an assortment of motifs than by structural form. The small window high in the chancel gable at Woodborough (Fig.7/146), contains three mouchettes, thus, we have seen examples of two, three and four, but here, it is perhaps the Calvary set on the gable that is of particular interest. This is reminiscent, on a smaller scale, of a Calvary in the *enclos paroissial* of a Breton church.

**TRI-RADIAL HEAD. or SPHERICAL HEADS.**

The famous west window of the south aisle at Gadesby (Fig.7/147), contains three radial squares with cusps and sub-cusps. The whole ensemble is almost Plateresque and reminiscent of certain details at St. Mary Redcliffe, Bristol. The same
design occurs at Market Harborough (Fig.7/148), though on a less exuberant scale, and there are no sub-cusps. Yet another variety may be seen at Hallaton (Fig.7/149), where the jamb mouldings are identical with those in Fig.7/148. Where identical jamb mouldings are regularly encountered, I think this does not necessarily suggest templates, because of varying window dimensions, although from standard drawings for different mouldings, which became common to certain quarries, templates of the appropriate size could be made for an individual church.

Finally, the unusual window in the west wall of the north aisle at Thornton (Fig.7/150), contains a sexfoil within the triangle. Situated towards the east of the county, this window may reflect an influence from the nave clerestory at Lichfield.

CENTRAL 'PETAL' FIGURES

A group of windows share the design of a central ‘rose’ with five leaves or petals. This effect is achieved in most cases by having taller outer lights, whilst the central light requires an ogee. The example at Harby (Fig.151), provides a comparison with Crick in Northamptonshire (Fig.7/152). The 'petals' at Harby are cusped, whilst the outer lights have converging mouchettes supporting trilobes, whereas the 'petals' at Crick are uncusped, and their rounded form has caused some eccentric setting out of the two outer lights, whose heads are canted inwards. The remaining three examples, whilst all exemplifying the central ‘rose’ theme, demonstrate wide differences within the treatment of the side lights. The depressed heads at Holbeach in Lincolnshire (Fig.7/153), are surmounted by elongated quatrefoils; at Measham (Fig.7/154), there are tre-foiled sub-heads beneath trilobes, whilst the lavish window at Grantham in Lincolnshire (Fig.7/155), has reticulations, converging mouchettes and elongated quatrefoils. Whether any of the examples within this group may be considered as truly ‘flowing’ is debateable. There is a
tendency, particularly with Pevsner, to regard almost any window with mouchettes to be classed as ‘flowing’. This is not acceptable; many of the windows illustrated in this chapter contain a mixture of flowing elements, but they are compartmentalised, and it is surely only when one can trace a continuous movement through a design, that the tracery can be said to ‘flow’. I suggest that the petal motif became a fashionable advance on the circular arrangement for Decorated window heads. It would seem to have entered Leicestershire some time after the late 1320s, via Norwich and Ely. Petal tracery was introduced into the Norwich cloisters by John and William Ramsey, c.1324-6. 311 R. K. Morris also supports this view. 312

CIRCULAR WINDOWS

A very small group of such windows may be found within the county. At Nailstone (Fig.7/156), there is a multi-cusped example above the buttress on the west wall of the tower. Since the whole work is contemporary, it may be that the requirement for a buttress prevented the insertion of a more traditional type of west window. At Loddington (Fig.7/157), is an unusual quatre-foiled window above the south door within the porch, whilst a sexfoiled example may be seen on the tower at Illston-on-the-Hill (Fig.7/158). R. K. Morris speculates on the possible European influence of the Mendicants on circular windows in England, and goes on to say:

"[...] a revival of interest in circular windows took place in more than one area of England in the early 14th century, and that in most instances seems to be linked with an increase in the scale of nave arcades." 313

Although the three examples quoted are not related to nave arcades, windows at Empingham, Cottesmore and Tixover in Rutland contain windows in these positions.

**TRILOBES**

Although reference has previously been made to trilobes, further examples may be considered in more detail. The trilobe forms a decorative sub-head beneath a window light; in effect, the trefoil has been moved down from within the head, and a secondary element has been introduced. That this device was used over a period of time is obvious when we examine the first two examples, at Church Langton (Fig.7/159), and at Stoke Golding (Fig.7.160), both of which have Geometric elements. How well the tracery at the latter conforms to the original is debatable, since subsidence has required substantial rebuilding. In Fig.7/161, also at Stoke Golding, the circular element has been replaced by an elongated trefoil, which also appears at Ab Kettleby (Fig.7/162). In both examples the trefoils apparent in the two previous illustrations now assume ogee form. At Norton (Fig.7/163), the elongated trefoil is contained within a semi-circle, where all mouldings are crisply defined, although we should be wary of the 1841 rebuild.314

**HAUNCHED WINDOWS**

The few examples are mostly internal for obvious reasons. The widening of the window space, without distorting the arch, allowed more light within. At Lodddington (Fig.7/164), a plain chamfer surrounds the opening, whilst at Swepstone (Fig.7/165) there is a quadrant moulding. The only external example within Leicestershire comes from the bell openings on the tower at Broughton Astley (Fig.7/166). An explanation for this unusual feature is hard to find, since the work could have had nothing to do with light, and it would have had little effect on sound.

---
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KENTISH TRACERY

This motif of spiked quatrefoils or trefoils is not restricted to Kent, where it is most commonly found and probably first appeared as window tracery at Chartham c.1290. Examples are found in neighbouring counties, as at Winchelsea in East Sussex, and as far north as Whitby Abbey, but how the design was carried into the Midlands is an interesting question; it is very unlikely that so distinctive a design could be the result of spontaneous genesis.

Christopher Wilson states that:

"The earliest dateable Kentish tracery is the tomb of Bishop John de Bradfield at Rochester, who died in 1283."316

He goes on to say:

"The origins of Kentish tracery may be found in the metal and embroidery decoration of Old Testament figures in the south portals at Chartres, on the west front at Auxerre and on the west and south portals at Notre Dame."317

A possible route into the Midlands could have been through wool merchants travelling with their produce from Kent to the cloth towns of Yorkshire such as Halifax. Almost certainly, they would have passed through Stamford, if not Leicester itself, whilst the tracery could also have reflected the influence of royal masons working south of the Trent. Colvin informs us of numerous examples of royal works employing London masons in the Midlands.318 and attention has already been drawn to the work of William Ramsey at Ulverscroft.

317 ibid, pp. 29-30.
The chancel at Belgrave provides the finest of the few Leicestershire examples (Figs.7/167 and 168), where the first example contains sub-cusps. There are spiked quatrefoils in the east window at Stoke Golding (Fig.7/169), and the spectacular chancel windows at Sandiacre, in Derbyshire (Fig.7/170), have spiked trefoils and quatrefoils, the former set within ogee surrounds which give a pleasing undulating effect above the heads of the lights. Finally, at Old Arley, in Warwickshire (Fig.7/171), there is a spiked trefoil.

**HOOD-MOULD WITH Ogee HEADS**

A few windows in Leicestershire, and rather more in Northamptonshire and Warwickshire have these features, whereby the window itself retains a two-centred form, although the hood-mould is up-turned into an ogee. In Northamptonshire, this feature becomes eccentric, and both window and hood-mould are up-turned almost into a gable rather than a true ogee. At Appleby Magna (Fig.7/172), there is just the hint of an ogee whilst it becomes clearly defined in the chancel at Claybrooke (Fig.7/173). Here, the ogees are carried up into the moulded cornice and have small finials. In this view of the north side of the chancel, we see also an ogee-headed priest’s door beneath a four-centred arch, and the entrance into a former sacristy, of which the roof-line is still visible.

The fine little Decorated church at Ratcliffe Culey has already been referred to, and an indication of the attention to detail may be seen in the moulded hood-mould above the reticulated east window; this is complete with head-stops and finial (Fig.7/174). A similar feature occurs on the tower at South Croxton (Fig.7/175), where, but for the ogees, the shafts and capitals suggest an earlier typology. A variation may be seen at the former collegiate church of Astley, in Warwickshire (Fig.7/176), where the hood-mould is retained complete above the window, with a
separate ogee above. This particular feature surely demonstrates Lichfield influence (Fig.7/177), where the Lady Chapel of c.1310 has the same features. At Seckington, in Warwickshire (Fig.7/178), both window and hood-mould now terminate in a fairly pronounced ogee. Such exaggeration is also encountered in several instances in Northamptonshire, where it becomes almost a 14th-century 'Mannerism'.

A Lichfield influence has been referred to more than once in this thesis, and this is perhaps the stage at which there should be more positive discussion on the matter.

John Maddison raises several relevant points. First, he reminds his reader that Walter Langton, Treasurer to Edward I, Keeper of the Great Seal, and born in a Leicestershire village, was Bishop of Lichfield between 1296 and 1322. He goes on to say that since the Lichfield Diocese was adjacent to Edward's major campaign in north Wales, Langton would have been in a privileged position to have observed innovatory works and to employ highly skilled craftsmen. His palace, built within a fortified cathedral Close, finds parallels with the Edwardian towns of north Wales, and in fact, Maddison points out that:

"[...] Langton's residence made deliberate use of a vocabulary which had been employed by Edward at Caernarvon."  

Of relevance to Decorated work in Leicestershire, are elements taken from the Lichfield Lady Chapel, which was still incomplete in 1321. These include the north aisle parapets at Hallaton, various ogee hood-moulds, the sloping buttress returns at Cold Overton and Stoke Golding, and not forgetting Ramsey's work in Lichfield choir, reflected at Ulverscroft.
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CLERESTORY WINDOWS

The square-headed window is the form most commonly used in clerestories, for reasons previously stated, but in Leicestershire there are interesting examples of 14th-century pointed windows. At Knossington, all four windows are illustrated in Figs.7/179 - 7/182, to emphasise yet again the desire for variety in Decorated forms; this is in direct contrast with the ring of forty-eight windows at Melton Mowbray, where the 15th century clerestory, whilst flooding the church with light, becomes almost monotonous. At Knossington, the window details are all different, yet there is a pattern. The two at the east end (Figs.7/179 and 180), have lights with trefoiled semi-circular heads, whilst those at the west end (Figs.7/181 and 182), have trefoiled ogee heads, moreover, the tracery above the lights is different in all four examples. At Pickwell (Figs.7/183 and 184), all six clerestory windows, demonstrate that although some share the same design, they are placed at random. For example, the tracery used for the east and west windows in Fig.7/183, also appears in the west window in Fig.7/184. At Slawston, the heads of the paired lights are depressed (Figs.7/185 and 186), and the former has a motif which occurs in other examples. Looking at the examples at Stonton Wyville (Fig.7/187), and at Wyfordby (Fig.7/188), we are reminded of the minute differences in detail within square-headed windows; cusps appear in the central opening only at the latter.

At Coston(Fig.7/189), the clerestory with its segmental-headed windows may well be early Perpendicular; certainly the clerestory at Freeby (Fig.7/190), is contemporary with the fine Perpendicular tower. There is only so much that can be done with innovative decorative window heads, and in the last two examples, the ogee, the semi-circular head, the trefoil, quatrefoil and cinquefoil still find a place.

FLOWING TRACERY
Numerous references have already been made to flowing tracery, and it may be a matter of personal opinion as to when window tracery should be viewed as fully flowing. We know that the finest examples are to be found not in Leicestershire but in the adjacent counties, and that ogees and mouchettes do not necessarily constitute flowing tracery. The transporting of high quality stone from outside the county would have been a costly but necessary process, since the local marlstone which was generally hammered, would have been unsuitable for finely detailed working. The proliferation of small chancels, with inadequate wall space to accommodate large five, or six light east windows, would certainly have been a contributory factor, bearing in mind that all the finest Decorated examples of flowing tracery are in large windows, whilst the absence of a county cathedral to provide influence and impetus, could not have helped.

The two outstanding examples in the county may be seen at Frisby-on-the-Wreake (Fig.3/37) and at Thorpe Langton (Fig.7/191). Nichols's view of Thorpe Langton is taken from the north west, which thus gives no information on the chancel fenestration.321 Certainly, here is an approach to the Lincolnshire ideal. Note also, the addition of the clerestory, which runs the whole length of the church at Thorpe Langton as it does at Market Harborough.

CUT-DOWN WINDOWS

The most interesting example is in the east end of the north aisle at Barkby, where a large five light window with trilobes and what was obviously a circular central feature, has been cut down to accommodate a lower pitched roof. As has been previously noted, it was not uncommon to lower timber roofs as the ends gradually rotted where they overhung the wall plates. At Barkby, the effect can be seen both

---

externally and internally (Figs.7/192 and 194). The opposite effect seems to have occurred at Lockington (Fig.7/193), where the roof of the aisle has been lowered, but the apex of the window has been retained beneath a patching of lead. Other cut-down windows occur at Langham in Rutland and at Kings Sutton in Northamptonshire.

RE-USED WINDOWS

One of the most interesting examples may be seen at Eaton (Figs.7/195 and 7/196). Close examination shows this to consist of the right hand lights of a former four-light window; it is not the same as the arrangement that was seen at Glaston (Fig.7/46). At Eaton, the left-hand jamb does not run through in line as does that on the right, and the left-hand spandrel is the half-remains of a former central spandrel. Eaton is not far from the site of the Premonstratensian abbey of Croxton, and it is quite possible that the window was re-assembled from that site. The re-use of building materials is well known from the time of the Saxon re-use of Roman work onwards.

PROTO-PERPENDICULAR WORK

Finally, the embryonic development of Perpendicular work is evident in the increasing attention to verticality, for example, the sexfoils in the window head at Market Bosworth (Fig.7/197), are framed by vertical mullions. The two examples at Barkby (Fig.7/198), and Evington (Fig.7/199), are unusual, with the squaring of compartments. Some of the elements at Evington almost suggest an early essay in the Perpendicular, yet the moulded shafts and foliated capitals would seem to contradict such an hypothesis. It is not easy to dispel the thought that we may be looking at 18th-century Gothick, certainly the view in Nichols clearly shows the window as we see it today.322

At Fleckney (Fig.7/200), and at Kegworth (Fig.7/201), the upper mullions clearly define an increasing attempt at verticality. The mullions above the ogee heads at Nether Broughton (Fig.7/202), provide a similar emphasis, and here, is clear evidence that the dressings of the majority of windows would have been in the local marlstone. The deep weathering may suggest that this iron-based limestone is poor, although it has survived for seven hundred years! At Gaddesby (Fig.7/203), and Saxelbye (Fig.7/204), where both windows are identical in detail, the transoms indicate a radical shift of thought into the breaking up of areas into panels.

MOULDINGS

The study of mediaeval mouldings has become an increasingly important aspect of the architectural historian’s work. Whilst there is a great deal of research still to be carried out, sufficient work has been completed to make the task of dating a little easier. Obviously where clear documentary evidence survives for dating a particular building, the recording of its mouldings is both valuable and important, and from the research so far, it has become obvious that certain mouldings were in use over a long period, as were types of window tracery. R. K. Morris suggests that the single most important criterion acting as a consistent guide to styles distinguishing different masons, is the type of moulding.\footnote{R. K. Morris, Ph.D. thesis, p.25.}

I believe this to be only partly true, since the majority of the examples illustrated in both his thesis and papers, can also be found in Leicestershire, a county that he has not so far examined. Mouldings can only be dated by comparison with examples for which there is known dating; it does not follow that all mouldings of the same pattern occurred within a short time span, nor that they are by the same hand. However closely a particular master mason may have guarded his moulding design,
once it was in the public domain, there was nothing to prevent copying, and thus, its assimilation into the general vocabulary.

Although mouldings have been discussed throughout the chapter, some further points may be addressed. Many Leicestershire windows have internal shafts with capitals, although the former collegiate chapel at Noseley (Fig.7/205), has moulded bases without capitals. It is quite clear from a study of the window tracery that shafts do not always imply earlier 13th-century work. We may tend to think of shafts as being solely Early English, but their use continued throughout the Decorated style. They may be found at Gaddesby (Fig.7/206), at the great intersecting windows at Melton Mowbray and at some of the magnificent windows in Lincolnshire as well as on the tower at South Croxton (Fig.7/175). Internally, shafts usually supported a rere-arch with single or double roll-mouldings, complete with hood-moulds and stops, as at Peatling Magna (Fig.7/207). A variation of bases could be semi-octagonal rather than circular, as at Illston-on-the-Hill (Fig.7/208).

Of jamb and mullion mouldings, there are a few very high quality examples in Leicestershire, as at Kegworth (Fig.7/209), where hollow chamfers and fillets abound. At Lockington (Fig.7/210), the hollow chamfers, and filleted rolls of the window are separate from the outer sunk quadrant jambs, whilst at Orton-on-the-Hill (Fig.7/211), the coursed ashlar clearly does not 'read through' at the window head, and at Market Harborough, (Fig.7/212) the outer 'frame' moulding is less complicated than the inner 'window' moulding, although the stones 'read through' as far up as the window head. All of this suggests, once again, that perhaps the tracery within window heads was not worked by the masons who produced the jambs, etc.

Richard Morris identifies five main types of moulding, and the following ten drawings of window sections which are neither measured nor to scale, are intended to
illustrate the profiles of some Leicestershire examples. First, the Wave Moulding, which appears on the outer edges of a jamb at Lockington, (Fig.7/213). Morris suggests that this moulding originated in the Edwardian castles of north Wales in the 1280's.\(^{324}\) The moulding is not widely prevalent in Leicestershire, and tends to occur more on door jambs than on windows. The Sunk Chamfer is more common, and assumes several versions in the county. At Ibstock (Fig.7/214), it takes the form of a simple concave moulding, a sunk quadrant in fact. At Ibstock again (Fig.7/215), this sunk quadrant appears with a three-quarter roll moulding, whilst at Ravenstone (Fig.7/216), the sunk chamfer has a straight side, and we note a wave moulding at the outer edge of the jamb. Morris suggests that this moulding also originated in the Edwardian castles, and is therefore contemporary with the wave, hence the two used together at Ravenstone. Both types of moulding continued well into the Perpendicular style, particularly the wave.

The Ogee may be seen at Church Langton (Fig.7/217), whilst the Double-Ogee, rarely found in Leicestershire, occurs at Stathern (Fig.7/218). Morris states that the double-ogee:

"[...] relatively infrequent in decorated, [...] becomes one of the hallmarks of Perpendicular work."\(^{325}\)

He goes on to say:

"Its later popularity seems to derive from the acceptance in London and at the court in the 1330's and 1340's, through the work of the royal master mason, William Ramsey."\(^{326}\)

The Three-Quarter Hollow with Fillets occurs at Kegworth (Fig.7/219), The hollow has now become much deeper than a sunk quadrant and has small projecting fillets to

\(^{324}\) Morris, *A.J. Vol.XXI*, p.27.

\(^{325}\) ibid, p. 35.

separate it from neighbouring elements of moulding; it may also be seen at Measham (Fig.7/220). We note that at the former, there is a wave moulding on the outer edge of the jamb, whilst at Measham there is a plain quadrant. Morris states that this fourth type of moulding first appeared just before 1250 and was popular in the first half of the 14th century, continuing to be common in the Perpendicular period. Finally, the Undercut Hollow Chamfer may be seen at Castle Donington, (Fig.7/221). This is the reverse of the three-quarter hollow, and is really a three-quarter roll. It can be seen both at the outer jamb edge and also in the mullion. We are told that this moulding developed during the last two decades of the thirteenth century, and continued through to the Perpendicular period.

Sometimes a free-standing fillet is associated with the moulding. This may be seen at Ratcliffe-on-the-Wreake (Fig.7/222). What may at first appear to be a wave moulding is actually cut too deeply and conforms more to an undercut hollow chamfer.

CONCLUSION

The significant point to be drawn from this chapter is that of vocabulary, and the fact that it has been an accumulating vocabulary rather than one that has been periodically replaced. It is a vocabulary that has been applied to the basic form of a Gothic window, a form that crosses international, religious and secular boundaries. We find the 'Westminster clerestory windows' in public buildings in Siena as well as in magnificent 14th-century houses in the remote bastide of Cordes-sur-Ciel in the Tarn.

Unless a window was to be little more than an arrow-slit, it developed from

327 ibid. p.39.
328 ibid, p.45.
the single lancet into increasing numbers of lights which became grouped beneath a single head. The vocabulary has been the means by which all of these have been decorated. The cusp, the roundel, or oculus, and the shaft, were still capable of interpretation even after the ogee and the mouchette had been added to the vocabulary; the wave or sunk chamfer were not replaced by the double-ogee.

The use of this vocabulary is well illustrated by the rich variety of windows to be found in Leicestershire. We are reminded that elaborate mouldings and tracery details do not always go together; finance and priority are the two over-riding factors, and finance was a prime factor in the decision as to whether the local intractable marlstone was used, or a fine-grained oolitic limestone from a distant quarry. Moulding forms, therefore, do not provide typological precision, either absolutely or relatively, because expense was a key determinant, and some forms continued over a long period.

Although, as has been stated earlier, the examples illustrated in this chapter do not imply a natural progression in window tracery, since many forms, such as intersecting and reticulated, tended to be used together, nevertheless, it is obvious that a progression has been achieved between plate tracery and the window displaying ogees and interlocking mouchettes.

What is noticeable is that whilst these two individual types are well separated by time and style, the latter still makes use of some of the vocabulary of the former; cusps, quatrefoils, plain chamfers and two-centred arches continue to appear amongst ogees and mouchettes. To use a musical analogy, the twelve available semi-tones provided Palestrina and Elgar with the same vocabulary, even though the form in which they were used had changed considerably.
CHAPTER 8 - DOORWAYS
CHAPTER 8
DOORWAYS

In some respects, doorways afford the best examples for the study of the development of mouldings, since they continue in lines that are not interrupted by window tracery. They can sometimes provide the most elaborate part of the decoration of a village church, which is understandable, given that - as entrances - they are the one element that cannot escape attention. When the Romanesque arch, with its tympanum, often with didactic carving, gave way to the Gothic arch in the 13th century, there began a series of developments. Unlike those seen in windows, with their varied forms of tracery, these relied totally upon moulding forms and applied decoration. It is a fact that doorways often incorporated a greater variety of moulding types, a point noted by Eileen Roberts, (although her nomenclature tends to differ slightly from that of Richard Morris.)

There could be as many as four entrances to a church. A main west door, generally at the foot of a tower, which was usually reserved for processions at major festivals; the south door, which was the commonly used entrance; a north door, which in mediaeval times was known as the Devil’s door, and which was left open at baptisms so that ‘evil spirits’ could escape from the child, and a priest’s door on the south side of a chancel. In addition to the superstitious mediaeval belief, perhaps a more realistic use of a north door was for processions, which could leave by that door, process round the east end of the church, and re-enter by the south door, and a number of Leicestershire churches that have wider bays in the arcades opposite these doors will be noted in Chapter 10. There are also a number of churches where their physical position in relation to the village dictates that the main entrance has always been on

the north side. As for priests’ doors, it was through these that he could move in and out for the Mass, without having to pass through the communal area of the nave.

The examples that follow are stylistically sequential: this does not imply that they appear in chronological order. The simplest, though not the earliest porch, adopts the plain chamfer mouldings also seen in so many Leicestershire arcades, as at Muston (Fig.8/1). The mouldings of the opposing capitals are quite different - a feature also found in many arcades, - whilst two fleurons are placed beneath the abacus of the right-hand one. Pevsner claims, perhaps on the grounds of the fleurons, that this is Perpendicular work.\textsuperscript{331} Judging by the base mouldings of the porch, the work seems much nearer to earlier 14th-century work.

Shafted doorways form a group that extends from the 13th into the 14th centuries.
The south door at Gaddesby is mid-13th century work, judging from the annulet ring, the stiff-leaf capital and the typical Early English mouldings (Fig.8/2), but the fine west door at Empingham, in Rutland (Fig.8/3), also displays an ‘Early English’ feeling with its multiple shafts and rings. However, the ogees, finials and ball-flower are indicative of a later date, whilst the use of rings on shafts is in imitation of the Purbeck shafts to be found at Lincoln, of which See, Empingham was a peculiar.\textsuperscript{332}

The blocked north door at Witherley (Fig.8/4), introduces a fillet on the shafts which continues up around the outer moulding, which in turn is backed by an inner sunk moulding. The whole 14th-century ensemble is set within fine ashlar with two moulding courses at the base. Comparison of doorways at Litchborough, Northamptonshire (Fig.8/5) and Waltham-on-the-Wolds (Fig.8/6), reveals similarities; both employ deep roll-mouldings springing from the shaft capitals, but at

\textsuperscript{331} Pevsner, p. 327.
\textsuperscript{332} ibid, p. 465.
Waltham the shafts are filleted as they are at Arnesby (Fig.8/7). At Waltham and Arnesby, there are three orders of shafts, whilst the inner orders at Litchborough consist of roll mouldings.

The west door at Waltham was re-set following Sir G. G. Scott’s extension of the nave in 1850,\(^{333}\) whilst the shafts of the badly eroded west door at Arnesby have been replaced. All four examples show similarities within the mouldings and may be dated from the early 1300’s. The priest’s door in the spectacular chancel at Sandiacre, Derbyshire (Fig.8/8), can be dated to c.1342, resulting from the gift of the Bishop of Lichfield who held the prebend.\(^{334}\) Here, the deep rolls of the previous examples are reduced and the outer moulding takes the form of a wave.

In the next three examples, shafts have gone, but the roll mouldings continue, first quite plain at Austrey Warwickshire, (Fig.8/9) but more elaborately at Empingham, Rutland (Fig.8/10), and Bingham, Nottinghamshire (Fig.8/11). Fillets appear at Bingham and head-stops appear at Waltham, Sandiacre and Bingham, although only those at Sandiacre appear to be original.

The fine doorway in the early 14th-century church at Market Bosworth (Fig.8/12), still echoes the deep rolls encountered in some of the previous examples, but they are now widely separated by deep sunk quadrant mouldings. A point to notice with many of these doorways is the fact that the mouldings make use of light and shadow. Just as the fluting on a Greek column emphasises light and shadow, so do mediaeval mouldings, particularly where they are used abundantly, as in doorways.

At Buckminster (Fig.8/13), rolls are eliminated and replaced by simple sunk quadrants, producing an effect that is aesthetically more pleasing than the plain chamfer seen in Fig.8/1. At Whissendine (Fig.8/14), every mould line within the arch

\(^{333}\) Brandwood, p. 128.
\(^{334}\) Pevsner, p. 313.
is continued down to the ground, broken only by capitals, which give the immediate impression of a shafted doorway. As in Fig.8/12 at Market Bosworth, the dramatic effect of shadow at Whissendine is noticeable, whilst the artificial perspective creates a feeling of recession into a much thicker wall. At Heather (Figs.8/15 and 8/16), the two quadrant mouldings are separated by a sunk quadrant, and the same arrangement obtains at Gumley (Fig.8/17), where, in spite of Bodley’s rebuilding of the south porch, the doorway looks original.335

Following the introduction of the ogee in the late 13th century, it is inevitable that the form should be used as much for larger architectural details as for the micro-architecture of sedilia and piscinas. At Seckington, in Warwickshire (Fig.8/18), the plain chamfer is produced up into an ogee, whilst the blocked north door in the fine 14th-century aisle at Swepstone (Fig.8/19), has an ogee hood-mould. It will be seen that the two pronounced rolls on either side of the deep concave formerly moved down to shafts with capitals; a disgraceful and clumsy ‘restoration’ has ignored this fact on the left-hand side. The priest’s door on the north side of the chancel at Claybrooke (Fig.8/20), has an ogee head complete with small supporting gabled buttresses and crocketed hood-mould. As has been noted previously, all the details of this chancel of c.1340, are of the highest quality, and provide the finest example in the county of the elaborate setting required for 14th-century eucharistic ritual. The west face of the tower at Byfield, in Northamptonshire (Fig.8/21), has a doorway richly embellished with ball-flower, pinnacles and crockets, and is obviously conceived as part of a total design of window and three image niches with nodding ogees, - an ambitious ensemble, probably of the second quarter of the 14th century.

To return in rather more detail to mouldings, we find, as Eileen Roberts

---
335 Pevsner, p.171.
suggested, an increasing mixture of moulding forms which surely emphasise the visual importance of entrances; such combinations are rarely found in arcade mouldings. The mouldings at Misterton (Fig. 8/22), and Pickworth, in Lincolnshire (Fig. 8/23), are quite similar, particularly with reference to the outer sunk quadrants which are almost wave mouldings. Both are north doors in 14th-century aisles, but they do not indicate shared templates, which would almost certainly have been made separately for each doorway.

The wave moulding is prominent at Queniborough (Fig. 8/24). Pevsner’s description of the north porch as having: “ - an arch and three sunk quadrant mouldings”\(^{336}\) is perfectly correct, but the terminology reminds us that the relatively recent interest in mouldings has not yet reached a widely accepted and standard vocabulary; for the moment they could equally be called wave mouldings. The close similarities between the architectural details of the Northamptonshire churches at Raunds and Ringstead, have been previously noted. The mouldings of the two porches (Figs. 8/25 and 8/26), also confirm the same. Whilst Queniborough has shallow mouldings, those at Raunds are quite deep, giving good lines of shadow; however the interest lies in the very subtle change, from what is probably a late 13th-century south porch at Raunds to what is clearly a 14th-century version at Ringstead. What are the differences? At Raunds the deep interstices between the pronounced filleted rolls have been replaced by shallow sunk quadrants, that are not the fully developed wave mouldings present at Ringstead.

Again, there are similarities between the doors at Misterton (Fig. 8/27) and Ewerby (Fig. 8/28) in Lincolnshire, although at the latter, the arch mouldings die into more simple forms at jamb level. What is perhaps significant is that elements of these

\(^{336}\) Pevsner, p.354.
mouldings, as with some discussed earlier, may be seen at triforium level in the Lincoln Angel Choir, completed shortly after 1280. It is not surprising that there is a Lincoln influence at Ewerby, a fine early Decorated church with broach spire and mainly reticulated tracery, but it is more difficult to be aware of any obvious Lincoln influence in Leicestershire. Perhaps certain door mouldings may provide a tenuous link.

An unusual example may be seen at Harringworth, in Northamptonshire (Fig. 8/29), where the early 14th-century opening appears to have been partially filled in by a later 15th century, four-centred arch. This work has been carefully contrived, because it will be seen that the capitals belong to the later work; in fact, everything below the larger arch has been replaced; the courses of stone run through. Perhaps the most obvious explanation is to have given support to what may have been a failing arch.

At Kimcote (Fig. 8/30), New Red, or Keuper sandstone is used\(^{337}\). This forms the segmental head to the north door as well as the buttress. Several churches in south-west Leicestershire make use of this stone from just over the border in Warwickshire.

The inner doorway to the south porch of the great Fenland church at Gedney (Fig. 8/31), shows very similar features to those at Ewerby; here also, the arch mouldings die away into the jambs. There could have been a practical reason for this; perhaps plain chamfers were less liable to damage than intricate mouldings.

The doorways so far discussed rely very largely on moulding variations to give them distinction, but there are also some with applied decoration. For example fleuron decoration may be seen at Sutton Cheney (Fig. 8/32), where the early 14th-

---

century priest’s door has shafts supporting a filleted roll, above which is a band of fleurons. Note the plain chamfer on the inner order. A later example occurs at Uppingham, in Rutland (Fig.8/33), where there are continuous mouldings with fleurons. This west door of the tower is set between several bands of moulding, the upper level forming a square hood-mould. At Ratby (Fig.8/34), the south door has a continuous band of fleurons around the arch alone, with plain chamfers on the jambs immediately beneath. The inner order has a continuous wave moulding. From these three examples we are reminded yet again of the variety within the Decorated style; a simple motif is used in quite different ways.

The only decorative soffit within a Leicestershire porch may be seen at Thurcaston (Fig.8/35). This panelled arch is late 14th century, and Perpendicular work rather than Decorated. It compares with the slightly earlier panelling within the west porch of the tower at Oundle, in Northamptonshire (Fig.8/36), where the cusped tracery within the ribbed panels surely foreshadows the eventual layout of fan vaulting, and compares also with the larger ribbed panelling in the west porch at Holbeach, in Lincolnshire (Fig.8/37). These examples indicate the desire to accord importance to main entrances, a practice in church architecture that was certainly important since Norman times. In as much as altar areas were often given added importance by string courses which were raised to higher levels, and often by windows with increasingly elaborate tracery, so with doorways, the faithful were reminded that they passed into a place set apart from the secular world. A particular reminder came in the form of the holy water stoup, of which, one of the very few surviving examples may be seen at Hungarton (Fig.8/38). In pre-Reformation times, all churches had a stoup at the entrance in which was holy water (water that had been blessed), mixed with salt. The sign of dipping the fingers and self-crossing was a re-
enactment of Holy Baptism.\textsuperscript{338} The stoup at Hungarton, in spite of its badly decayed state, is particularly fine, supported on a carved plinth and complete with a canopy. It is interesting to speculate as to whether part or the whole of this porch came from Leicester Abbey, following the Dissolution, since the church had been granted to Leicester Abbey as early as 1156.\textsuperscript{339} The porch is clearly a later addition, since it is not bonded into the walls of the south aisle, and the moulding details are generally much finer than any others in the church. An alternative consideration may be that the Abbey provided Hungarton with a new porch during the mid to late 14th century, although there is little or no firm evidence that the religious houses involved themselves in structural improvements to any of the county churches, even those which they had appropriated.

At Kegworth (Fig. 8/39), the north porch was demolished at an unspecified date, leaving the scar of the original roof line and the inner door, where the continuous mouldings take the form of a wave and sunk quadrant. It is interesting that whilst there are examples of many Leicestershire windows without hood-moulds, it seemed \textit{de rigeur} to include them even on internal doors, one of the few exceptions appearing at Kimcote (Fig.8/30), whilst another is the north door at Ratcliffe Culey (Fig.8/41).

The fine early 14th-century church at Swepstone (Fig.8/40), displays one of the very few examples of an ogee moulding. Nave and aisles are all of the 14th century. The internal moulding is a simple hollow chamfer.

The small and complete Decorated church at Ratcliffe Culey has the main entrance on the north. Both the smaller south door (Fig.8/41) and the main door


\textsuperscript{339} J. Story, J. Bourne, R. Buckle (eds.), \textit{Leicester Abbey, medieval history, archaeology and manuscript studies}, Leicester: The Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society, 2006, p.239.
(Fig.8/42), share identical mouldings, although the south door, which faces away from the village, and is therefore less important, is without a hood-mould.

The three final examples serve as a reminder of both the diversity and similarity of moulding lines. All three share an outer quadrant; all have slightly different hood-moulds. There are roll moulds at Harby (Fig.8/43), and at Finedon, in Northamptonshire (Fig.8/44), whilst Slawston (Fig.8/45), displays a sunk quadrant.

CONCLUSION

The greatest variety of mouldings is to be found not in arcades, scarcely in windows, but in profusion in doorways. They are without doubt the finest moulded forms throughout the county, although finely decorated, foliated capitals are almost non-existent. Shafted doorways eventually gave way to continuous mouldings, even though both forms co-existed for a time. Here, perhaps more than in some other architectural forms, templates must certainly have been used, though the visual evidence does not suggest that they were either shared or reused. The last three examples alone suggest that templates were the products for individual work, and not for repetition, at parish church level.
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CHAPTER 9

BUTTRESSES, PINNACLES, PARAPETS AND STRING-COURSES

Throughout much of this thesis, attention is drawn to the considerable variety of detail displayed within particular features. Although reference has been made to tower buttresses in Chapter 6, the concern here is with how the supports to the main body of a church are decorated, with particular attention to the treatment of set-offs. Other small, but no less important details that are often overlooked include pinnacles and parapets, and the decoration of these as well as of buttresses will be discussed. The accent given by string-courses to walls both internally and externally will be noted, before presenting a classification of base mouldings which, since they are generally continuous externally, include those of walls and buttresses.

BUTTRESSES

Many Leicestershire examples have gabled set-offs; there are generally fewer with simple sloping set-offs. A set-off is the top of each receding section of buttress as it rises. Each course forming either gabled or sloping set-offs overlaps that immediately beneath, in the manner of tiles. This is to throw off water rather than to allow it to penetrate the mortar joints. In most cases, the gable has a foiled edge projecting beyond the vertical face of the buttress. At Kegworth (Fig.9/1), the gable has a cinquefoil, and unusually, the buttress has a small sloping set-off just two courses down. At Orton-on-the-Hill (Fig.9/2), a trefoil rises into an ogee which is repeated immediately above, as part of the termination to the south aisle parapet. In both examples, the interstices of the cusps are chamfered, indicating that small moulding details often remained the same for both stone-mason and wood-carver, since exactly the same treatment may be found on stalls and screens.

Often, a lower set-off coincides with a string course, and because the face of
the buttress is widened at the lower stages, the base of the gable is able to run back along the sides as part of the string course. This is evident at both Osgathorpe (Fig.9/3), and at Cold Overton (Fig.9/4). At the latter, the cusps appear only in the upper gables, and whilst the lower gable bases link up, they do not, as is more usual, form part of the string course, which is lower down on the west face of the south aisle. A slightly un-balanced appearance results from there being only one pinnacle. This has ball-flower and distinctive panelling with pronounced corbels, the overall effect being similar to work on the north aisle at Gaddesby. At Belton (Fig.9/5), examination of the wall surface suggests that the gabled head has been lowered at some stage, almost certainly a saving of costs during repair work.

The next two examples indicate the advantage that fine ashlar provides. At both Empingham, in Rutland (Fig.9/6), and Leadenham, in Lincolnshire (Fig.9/7), the high quality limestone permits a more delicate carving with much crisper moulding, although we should take into account that it weathers better. There is no doubt that the details of the previous examples were also crisp, but bolder, when new. At Empingham, the sloping set-off is provided with a gablet, whilst the lower vertical edges of the buttress are chamfered beneath trefoiled stops. Whether these first seven examples demonstrate a chronological progression is debateable. There may be one or two decades difference within the early 14th century; what they clearly demonstrate is the remarkable advantage of fine stone, and the consequent skill of masons who were familiar with such quarries, compared with those who worked with lower grade materials. Similar to the example in Fig.9/6, the sloping set-off at Hose (Fig.9/8), also carries a gablet, but again, the contrasting stone has direct implications for the quality of detail. Of particular interest are the sloping set-offs at Stoke Golding (Fig.9/9). Whilst the lower gabled set-offs at Cold Overton (Fig.9/4) return horizontally, at
Stoke Golding, they rise from the lower gablets to embrace the upper portions of the buttresses, the south-east one of which still carries the stump of a pinnacle. The large string-course is not associated here with further buttress set-offs, which also is a common feature in Leicestershire. Whilst most buttress gables have lost definition through weathering, the example at Lockington (Fig.9/10), reminds us that the ridge generally terminated in a finial in the form of a fleur-de-lys.

Crockets and ball-flower appear on the head of a buttress on the mid 14th-century tower at the former Augustinian priory at Canons Ashby, Northamptonshire.340 (Fig.9/11) Here is evidence of the superior work of the religious houses, with fine coursed ashlar on very thin bedding planes, which very occasionally was reproduced at parish church level in Leicestershire, and mainly in Perpendicular tower work. More commonly, walls were of random rubble, as at Arnesby (Fig.9.12), where expense was lavished on the decoration of individual features rather than on the total concept. However, it should be noted that there was considerable restoration of the church in 1866-7, and the example may be no more than a good copy of the original.341 Even so, the example at Arnesby makes an interesting comparison with that at Navenby, in Lincolnshire (Fig.9/13). The individual crockets at Arnesby contrast with the continuous and tighter 'seaweed' form at Navenby, where the 14th-century chancel is one of the major contributions to Lincolnshire Decorated architecture.

At Hungarton (Fig.9/14), the south porch is Perpendicular work. Here, the fine diagonal buttress with its flared base moulding, engages with the porch moulding, and it is interesting that the first course of the buttress above the moulding is continued in ashlar along the wall. As was stated in the previous chapter, there are

341 *Brandwood*, p.72.
reasons for believing that this porch may have had some connection with the former Leicester Abbey.

The bases of the clapping buttresses of the tower at Cold Overton, are the most distinctive in the county (Figs.9/15 and 9/16). Although it is recorded that the tower and spire were rebuilt in 1900, following a lightning strike,\(^{342}\) they would not have required rebuilding from the base up. The details of the tower parapet were discussed in Chapter 6, and the base mouldings are no less remarkable, as these fascinating figures crouch on deep ogees and peer out from the upper astragal.

In considering base mouldings of buttresses, an attempt to categorize bases without suggesting a chronological order, has produced some material for discussion. Given the scale of the subject, time would not permit carefully measured drawings; the following figures are included simply to indicate profiles.

First, all buttresses stand on a plinth, which generally has a plain chamfered edge before rising to any detailed mouldings. Since the purpose of a buttress is obvious, it requires to stand on a fairly wide base in order to spread the load. Too small a foundation can cause a buttress to settle unevenly, in which case, it will tend to pull the wall out with it. The most common base moulding above the plinth has a concave form which splays out towards a roll along the lower edge.

**GROUP 1. Figs. 9/17-9/22** These have no astragal capping the top of the moulding. At Harston (Fig.9/20), a chamfer is introduced beneath the lower edge, whilst at Freeby (Fig.9/21), a more elaborate concave and chamfer may be seen. At Misterton, (Fig.9/22) this moulding type is moved higher and a second, deeper concave moulding with a chamfer is interposed between it and the plinth. This leads us to consider a few concave mouldings in

\(^{342}\) Brandwood, p.83
GROUP 2. Figs. 9/23 - 9/27 Here, a moulding line, or astragal, is introduced above the concave. The astragals are all different in form, as are the under-sides of the concave mouldings. The concave at Appleby Magna, (Fig.9/24) is set above the lower moulding, which is virtually an ogee and appears in the reverse order to that at Misterton, (Fig.9/22)

GROUP 3. Figs. 9/28 - 9/42 These examples all contain an astragal above the main concave moulding, but there are variations within the group, all of which are evident upon examination, without recourse to detailed description. For example, at Church Langton (Fig.9/30), a more elaborate moulding incorporates two concave mouldings and a chamfered astragal to the ogee, rather than the more usual roll. As was discovered with tracery, very rarely are windows in different churches identical; the same may be said for base mouldings, but at Lichfield cathedral (Fig.9/34), and at Sandiacre, in Derbyshire (Fig.9/35), the profiles are virtually identical. The link between the two buildings has already been established, thus, the reason for similarity is obvious, yet still, a single template could not have served.

GROUP 4. Figs. 9/43 - 9/49 Here, a separate and distinctive type of moulding comprises two concave mouldings set together. Again, there are variations; the upper mouldings at Kegworth, (Fig.9/47) Hawton, (Fig.9/43) Holbeach, (Fig.9/44) Sleaford, (Fig.9/45) and Heckington, (Fig.9/46) have a simple roll at the lower edges, whilst both mouldings at Welbourn produce an ogee (Fig.9/48).

GROUP 5. Figs.9/50 - 9/62 Another distinctive group have plain sloping bases which echo the normal set-offs on a buttress. They range from a very simple arrangement at Whetstone (Fig.9/50), to the elaborate form at Southwell Minster (Fig.9/57). In some instances, these may almost be seen as part of the plinth, for example at Thurcaston (Fig.9/62).
GROUP 6. Figs.9/63 - 9/68 The final examples are an indication yet again of the range of moulding types to be found, from the elaborate example at Empingham, in Rutland (Fig.9/64), to the very simple one at Hallaton, (Fig.9/68), and from the variety found at just one church, when we compare the mouldings at Gaddesby, (Figs.9/63 and 9/67); to the ‘brutalist’ at Barwell, (Fig.9/65).

What all of these examples demonstrate once more, is the considerable variety of mouldings common to the late 13th - 14th-century. As with windows and their tracery, there are definite design types, as there are basic moulding forms, but these forms appear to be used randomly and not in any particular vertical order. The concave form, with or without a roll was not the particular preserve of Decorated; such basic forms transcend national barriers and time scales. The cyma recta and cyma reversa, though used in different positions, were part of the vocabulary of ancient Greek decoration, and still appeared as Hogarth’s 'Line of Beauty' in the 18th century.

If there is one type that appears to be common to a particular area, it is those in Group 4, where the superimposed concave mouldings might be called a Lincolnshire feature, where all examples are part of fine early to mid-14th century churches. Certainly Hawton, (Fig.9/43) and Car Colston, (Fig.9/49) both in Nottinghamshire, are strongly influenced by Lincolnshire work, whilst Kegworth, (Fig.9/47) is not far south of the Nottinghamshire border.

Group 5 might also suggest Lincolnshire influence into Nottinghamshire, Fig.9/58 at Sibthorpe and Fig.9/61 at Gedling, but in all these instances, one has to be very careful to try avoid fitting the examples to the argument.

To conclude, as Richard Morris himself admits, a great deal more work has to be done in the field of mouldings. The most one can say is that, unlike the standardisation

common to many Perpendicular mouldings, there is a wide variety of forms within the Decorated style. Having established certain groups of base mouldings, again, I think it extremely unlikely that templates were used to repeat forms from church to church, a view that was discussed in more detail in the chapter on Masons and Quarries. What is entirely probable is that a basic design was copied for use elsewhere, but individual templates were made for each location, given the evidence of wide-ranging differences within the small details, e.g. the size of a chamfer beneath a roll or the profile and angle of a concave moulding.

**PINNACLES**

Turning to more elaborate buttress terminations and pinnacles, the interesting example at the east end of the south aisle at Misterton (Fig.9/69), has miniature diagonal buttresses on the upper stage, with gables as well as gables to the main faces, whilst the stage beneath has a trefoiled ogee with finial. Unlike the examples at Cold Overton (Fig.9/4) and the fragmentary remains at Stoke Golding, (Fig.9/9), the pinnacle at Sileby, (Fig.9/70) is set diagonally and rises from both angle buttresses. The panelling has triangular heads, and the whole feature is therefore almost certainly Perpendicular, probably coeval with the upper stage of the tower. The buttresses at the east end of the chancel at Stoke Golding (Fig.9/71) support large pinnacles, in front of which a gablet is constructed on a sloping set-off. Each face of the pinnacle is panelled with trefoiled heads and a quatrefoil beneath a crocketed gable, whilst above this, the pinnacle is richly crocketed and terminates with a finial.

A somewhat strange form of decoration appears on the stump of one of the pinnacles on the south aisle at Stoke Golding of c.1290 (Fig.9/72) Rising up the centre of each face is a combination of trailing leaf and ball-flower, now all much
decayed; on each corner foliage rises from a face, again, much decayed.

In considering the decorative details applied to various works of the early 14th century, we should be aware of those of the Eleanor Crosses, particularly of that at Geddington, (Fig.9/73) commenced shortly after 1294. Nicola Coldstream states that:

“"The Eleanor Crosses and the Westminster tombs [Crouchback, Aveline and William de Valence] were composed of all the motifs by which Decorated is defined, arch-and-gable arcading, pinnacles, foliage cresting and rosettes, miniature battlements, blind tracery, diaper, heraldry and figure sculpture capriciousness." 344

This is not to suggest that the Leicestershire examples are the result of royal work, but simply that there was a current vocabulary of basic motifs, which could be extended and elaborated by royal London masons who were familiar with French sources, and which could be disseminated by the Eleanor Crosses.

The ultimate development of these elements can be seen in the chancel pinnacles at Sandiacre, Derbyshire (Fig.9/74). Here, the crockets have become large and knobbly; instead of turning inwards towards the main structure, they project out and seem more in keeping with German 14th-century Gothic. This late Decorated work is due to Bishop Norbury of Lichfield, who was appointed to the Prebend of Sandiacre in 1342. 345

What is noticeable is that buttress heads and pinnacles bearing similar elements, but varying in detail, yet all within a relatively brief building period, appear to refer to the Eleanor Crosses. I suggest that this represents not so much a rapid development of Decorated architecture, but rather a quick assimilation of the latest fashion, where the necessary funding was available. Taking the analogy of modern car

344 Coldstream, 1994, p.42
fittings, specialist wheel types are available that will adapt to virtually any model, but not everyone can afford such conversions; the less expensive traditional style continues alongside the “cutting edge”. This is a reminder of the limitations of attempting a chronological analysis. Documentary evidence supports the knowledge that the Sandiacre pinnacles are later than the Geddington Cross, however, a lack of such knowledge does not necessarily make visual evidence unreliable, even though this is sometimes hampered by the lack of integrity, due to subsequent restorations.

PARAPETS.

Since the majority of roofs overhang the walls, they do not require parapets. The immediate problem created by a parapet is how to drain water off the roof. The construction requires a lead walk between the wall-plate and the parapet, and exit holes through the parapet to discharge the water, generally through over-hanging spouts or gargoyles. The over-hang is quite deliberately contrived to throw water clear of the foundations, and it is remarkable that so many have been smashed away and not always replaced by down-pipes. Such is the case at Gaddesby, where, along the south aisle, the water-spouts have been removed and less aesthetically pleasing replacements carry the water to drains (Figs.9/75 and 9/76). It will be seen that the fine parapet has stepped merlons above a continuous frieze, which is in turn supported on a band of trailing vine-leaf; certainly this is the most spectacular parapet in the county. Sadly the water-spout has been destroyed, and in Fig.9/76 only the feet survive of the crouching figure that sprang from the wall. A rare and complete example survives beneath the parapet at Tilton-on-the-Hill (Fig.9/77). Even this ferocious beast no longer serves a purpose, as may be seen from the drain-pipe emerging from the wall beneath. The blind quatrefoil arcading in the parapet, the
elongated reticulations in the window and the panelled pinnacle, all suggest a transition from Decorated to Perpendicular at Misterton (Fig.9/78). However, an interesting feature is the panelled ogee feature lower down the clasping buttress, which bears comparison with that at Misterton (Fig.9/69). Moreover, the mouldings above both examples are the same, yet comparison of the upper sections of both suggest that the pinnacle on the north side at Misterton is later than that on the south. On the north side, it may only have required a building break of a single season for the completion to have been carried out with differen

**STRING COURSES**

Many Leicestershire churches have internal string-courses. These, almost without exception delineate the bases of windows, particularly in aisles. What is important is that the majority step up as they approach the eastern end of the building. This simple device, together with image niches, sedilia and piscinas helps to compartmentalise and emphasise the sanctuary area, and thus, the significance of the Mass. Such a device may be clearly seen in the north aisle at Gaddesby (Fig.9/79). Where a string-course is continuous along the south wall of a chancel, and not merely a window sill, it naturally has to run along the top of the sedilia, as may be seen in Figs.11/23 and 11/25, at Castle Donington and Hallaton.

Externally, the string-course, more particularly on a chancel rather than an aisle, also emphasises the sanctuary area, as at Cossington (Fig.9/80). Here, it continues as a hood-mould over the priest’s door and then drops to run beneath the extended window in the south-west corner. Strangely, the hood-mould continues down on the right-hand side to a stop. One wonders if this is authentic or the result of
Goddard’s restoration in 1864.\textsuperscript{346} At Appleby Magna, (Fig.9/81) the string course forms a straight head above the priest’s door, and the movement is the opposite of that at Cossington; Appleby has no sedilia. In some instances, we find string-courses at two levels, as at Ashby Folville (Fig.9/82), part of a distinguished building, no doubt funded in part by the Folvilles, a notorious if wealthy family.

As with the majority of external string-courses, they embrace the buttresses and delineate the window bases. Such may be seen in the fine 14th-century north aisle at Normanton-le-Heath (Fig.9/83), where emphasis is given to the ogee-headed north door by not joining up with the hood-mould.

The internal string-course at Kegworth moves round a vertical filleted roll-mould on both the southern corners of the transepts (Fig.9/84). Exactly the same arrangement is repeated in the transepts at Melton Mowbray, and as has been stated previously, work may have been carried out at both churches simultaneously.

In chancels containing string-courses, the western ends terminated in elaborate stops. Whilst that at Kegworth is undoubtedly original (Fig.9/86), the example at the little church of St. Wystan, in Wigston (Fig.9/85) may be a 19th-century re-working, bearing in mind that the church had been converted into cottages at one stage.

\textsuperscript{346} Brandwood, p.84.
CHAPTER 10 - ARCADES
CHAPTER 10
ARCADES

This, together with Chapter 7 (Windows), deals with one of the two most important elements in a study of the Decorated style in Leicestershire, since the majority of additional building works in the late 13th century and first half of the 14th, took the form of aisles.

Few late 12th- or early 13th-century arcades survive, such as Hallaton, Allexton and Somerby; still fewer represent 15th-century work, such as Claybrooke. By far the greater number come from the Decorated period, and arcade mouldings of two plain chamfered orders predominate. What Pevsner constantly refers to as “standard Leicestershire” might suggest that this is a feature peculiar to the county; it is not. With the exception of the mainly Perpendicular areas, such as East Anglia, the plain chamfer may be found almost anywhere in the country.

There is relatively little variation in arcade mouldings, but this is not the case with the details of capitals and bases, on the contrary, they reveal an astonishing variety of detail. To perform their function in an aesthetically pleasing manner, capitals consist of three descending elements - abacus, bell and astragal - whilst bases rise from plinth to base. Within these confines, the opportunity for variation is almost limitless.

In Leicestershire, the most common section for a pier is octagonal, as at Long Clawson (Fig.10/1), although here there is the unusual variation of a circular abacus; generally the form was octagonal throughout. The opposite occurs at Wyfordby (Fig.10/2), when again, it is more usual to place a circular abacus on a circular pier and capital. Orton-on-the-Hill (Fig.10/3) is a typical example of what Pevsner terms, the “standard Leicestershire” arcade: octagonal piers, double-chamfered arches, and -
in the majority of cases - hood-moulds. Orton also displays an example of conge, where the outer arch moulding is not seated on the abacus but rises from a piece of masonry. Whilst not referring to any Leicestershire examples, Virginia Jansen discusses such features, which appear in various forms throughout the county.\cite{347} The most typical example of a Leicestershire arcade may be seen at Ibstock (Fig.10/4), which opens into a contemporary aisle complete with intersecting windows, and the refinement of an inner string-course, which latter is a fairly common feature within the county. This example also displays another fairly common feature of Leicestershire arcades, namely, the addition of a Perpendicular clerestory above the early 14th-century arcade; here the break in masonry types is particularly obvious.

If the octagonal pier predominates in the county, it is followed closely by the quatrefoil pier, and here we should remember that it was a form that went before and after the octagonal variety. Nicola Coldstream suggests that quatrefoil piers and bases with concave hollow mouldings, are a mendicant feature.\cite{348} It would be interesting to speculate whether the now destroyed houses of the Leicester Franciscans and Dominicans, founded in 1230 and c.1284 respectively, had any influence within the county.\cite{349}

The dog-tooth ornament on the north arcade at Sileby (Fig.10/5), suggests that it opened into an earlier aisle or, at least, one in which the fenestration was altered with the insertion of reticulated windows. The higher and wider eastern bay, suggests some form of earlier transeptal arrangement. If this is the case, here is an interesting example of a slightly later west-ward continuation of an arcade, which typologically, though not chronologically, employs the same moulding and decorative details; such

\begin{flushright}
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an arrangement is well known in the completion of the naves at Beverley and Westminster. There are other Leicestershire examples in which the eastern bay of an arcade suggests the entrance to a former transept. What may also be seen at Sileby is a commonly recurring feature of Leicestershire arcades, namely that the abacus appears to be too small to accommodate the arcade, indeed, in some cases the arcade actually protrudes slightly beyond the confines of the abacus. Similar misfits are recorded by John Blair, when discussing Purbeck marble shafts.350 This suggests that there may not always have been adequate consultation between the suppliers of the voussoirs and the masons responsible for the capitals, which lends weight to my theory in Chapter 5, that basic elements such as voussoirs were stock-piled. However, the arcade at Sileby, with its elaborate mouldings and use of dog-tooth ornament, indicates a date that is probably not later than c.1280, and thus earlier than the reticulated tracery in the aisle windows, whilst the north arcade at Somerby (Fig.10/6), is possibly a little earlier, c.1260, and its details are contemporary with those at nearby Whissendine, in Rutland. The piers are of more complicated section than at Sileby, consisting of four principal shafts, with minor shafts within the diagonals, and in spite of the lavish stiff-leaf carving, the arcade mouldings are restricted to the simple double chamfers. At Stoke Golding (Fig.10/7), the quatrefoil piers of even more complex section support the most lavish arcade in the county, the section of which consists of a series of filleted rolls; this is probably work of c.1260-80. The mouldings compare with the Early English work at West Walton in Norfolk.351 No records, as yet, have established beyond doubt who was the patron of such munificence in this small hill-top village.

351 G. Hutton and E. Smith, English Parish Churches, London: Thames & Hudson, 1952, Fig.79.
is the north aisle at Little Bowden (Fig.10/8). Here, there are no interstices between the four shafts, which are cut almost into three-quarter round, thus virtually creating the effect of individual shafts. This is another example where the arcade sits upon the limit of the abaci. If this example is possibly early 14th century, the arcade at Measham (Fig.10/9) exhibits details that are probably not much later. A number of the county churches, like Measham, contain quatrefoil piers with fillets which support capitals that are somewhat 'tight' in section, with only a slight increase in the diameter of the capital over that of the pier and with arcade mouldings of sunk quadrant form. If these are seen as a progression on the 'standard' arcade, the window tracery still suggests an early 14th-century aisle. By the early 14th century, the decorative use of Purbeck shafts had been in fashion for nearly a century and whilst major churches could finance the total cost of transporting a difficult material (the shafts were long because they were eventually set en delit), the small village church could afford to emulate this decorative form only in stone sourced more locally. The numerous Leicestershire arcades that are quatrefoil in form are of coursed masonry, but I think that the extensive use of Purbeck shafts elsewhere, which was not restricted solely to major 13th-century cathedrals and churches, was a feature sufficiently popular to have been replicated in the 14th century, though in different stone.

Whilst still retaining the double chamfer, the sole example of a soffit roll may be seen at Beeby (Fig.10/10), which is associated with the 14th-century re-modelling. At Broughton Astley (Fig.10/11), the double chamfer gives way to a single chamfer. Note here how ill-fitting the voussoirs are onto the abacus.

Although the majority of quatrefoil piers continue that profile into the capitals, there are exceptions. There are octagonal capitals at Great Glen (Fig.10/12), where the

main shafts have fillets and bells, which are not replicated in the smaller shafts within the diagonals. A similar arrangement at Wymondham (Fig.10/13) places the shafts diagonally, so that we read a square pier set diagonally with the edges at the cardinal points, with a shaft against each face. The eastern pier also supports a transverse arch by means of a correspondingly large, carved capital, that is out of proportion with the pier. This raises the question of how to merge mouldings at the difficult junction of arches meeting at right angles. At Barrow-upon-Soar (Fig.10/14), it is the chamfers of the main arcade on the right that dominate; at Loughborough (Fig.10/15), rather than using plain chamfers, the arch mouldings are different, filleted rolls predominating on the main arcade, quadrant on the transept, accompanied by a pronounced hood-mould and head-stop to mask the awkward transition.

A small group of churches in the south of the county exhibit continuous mouldings, a feature that is also found just over the borders of Northamptonshire and Warwickshire. At Misterton (Fig.10/16), plain chamfers are employed, whilst at Kibworth (Fig.10/17), there is a quadrant. This simple arrangement that dispenses with capitals, is, again, not peculiar to the county. It may also be seen in the nave arcade of the Augustinian priory at Llanthony, c.1180 - 1220353 and in much 14th-century German work.

There are several instances of Leicestershire churches being reduced in size by the demolition of a later aisle, or by collapse, as well as by the possible result of a community reduced by famine and plague, or displaced by enclosures. Such work often involved the filling-in of the arcade, as at Kirkby Mallory, where the arcade of the former north aisle may be seen externally.

Unusual examples exist of arches where the setting-out does not spring from

---

the abacus. At Ashby-de-la-Zouch (Fig.10/18), if the arch was extended down to achieve a true two-centred form, the spring would be almost half-way down the respond. If the intention of this Perpendicular re-casing was to appear to 'raise' the earlier arch, the original capitals may be buried further down inside the new responds. Because of the later work, this is not the same effect as that of the Hereford north transept.

**ARCADE SECTIONS**

The following eight illustrations give examples of different arcade mouldings which form the main exceptions to the 'standard Leicestershire' double chamfer. Since it was impossible to reach the arcades without a tower scaffold or ladder, the drawings are neither measured nor to scale; they are intended to portray the profile details.

In the tower arch at Market Harborough (Fig.10/19), on the east face (left-hand) there are alternating plain chamfers and quadrants, whilst on the inner, west face, one of the quadrants is replaced by a plain chamfer; this lower stage of the spectacular steeple dates from c.1300. The early 14th-century arcade at Measham (Fig.10/20), has identical mouldings on both north and south faces with two quadrants and a three-quarter hollow hood-mould. (See also Fig.10/9) An ogee moulding appears at Cossington (Fig.10/21), which is clearly a development from the quadrant moulding.

The transept arcade at Medbourne (Fig.10/22), displays small rolls at the soffit edges before leading into an ogee. At Sileby (Fig.10/23), an altogether more elaborate moulding appears in the south arcade; not only are there quadrants, but we find a beaked moulding. This work may be coeval with the lower late 14th-century stages of the west tower. At Cold Overton (Fig.10/24), there are rolls with fillets which produce hollow rolls on either side, and as is often the case, the element appears in a major
and minor form, the latter always occurring nearer to the soffit. Here, is the not unusual feature of the more elaborate mouldings facing into the nave, with a predominantly plain moulding facing into the aisle; a matter of labour saving and, therefore, of cost. At South Croxton (Fig.10/25), where, in most cases there would have been a plain double chamfer, relief is gained by a hollow chamfer on either side of the soffit. Finally, at Claybrooke (Fig.10/26), the wave moulding appears together with a hollow roll and quadrant. This arcade is Perpendicular, and reminds us that the individual moulding elements under discussion, were not restricted to the early 14th century alone. Whilst these ten examples suggest a variety of fine arcades within the county, they remain the exception among the large number of plain double-chamfered examples.

PIERS, CAPITALS AND BASES

Piers, capitals and bases should now be analysed in a little more detail, before considering the application of any carving. As already stated, the quatrefoil pier is quite common in Leicestershire, but not so the multi-shafted pier. A fine example of this appears in the south arcade at Freeby (Fig.10/27), and in many ways, this replicates the Early English form, with both base and capital mouldings following the profile of each shaft, and the whole pier set diagonally to the axis of the arcade. The main shafts at the cardinal points have fillets which continue above the astragal into the bell. The base mouldings are very similar in detail to the Early English 'water-holding' variety, therefore, whilst the design is typologically early, chronologically it is part of an early 14th-century church.

Scope for variety was also provided by the arrangement of joints between shafts. Most shafts were almost three-quarter round, and at Evington (Fig.10/28), they are spaced by a plain, flat element, and it is only the abacus and mouldings
immediately beneath that produce the complete quatrefoil.

The suggestion of a square with demi-shafts set against each face, is apparent at Wymondham (Fig.10/29), where the abacus, in the form of an irregular octagon, sits like a hat upon the capital.

It was noted at Freeby (Fig.10/27), that the fillet continues into the bell; this is unusual in Leicestershire, although common in Lincolnshire. At Kegworth (Fig.10/30), the fillet stops at the astragal. At Freeby, there is the exception to the rule, where the fillet rises into the bell.

Reference has previously been made to arcades that stand on the remains of earlier aisle walls, such as may be the case at Desford (Fig.10/31). The same may be true at Loddington (Fig.10/32), and Gaddesby (Fig.10/33), where some of the piers in both north and south arcades stand on sleeper walls.

There are a few examples of Perpendicular re-modelling of piers. At Broughton Astley (Fig.10/34), the arcade with quadrant moulding is clearly Decorated work, but two of the capitals have been reduced in order to produce flat panels with shallow motifs including quatrefoils. Of greater interest are the nave arcades at Ashby-de-la-Zouch (Fig.10/35), where the 14th-century arches rise from 15th-century panelled piers (the further arcade in the picture is that of an additional north aisle of 1878). At Ashby, the original capital has been reduced, and the entire pier re-cased so that the panelled pier with its castellated capital now encloses the original core; in the 'modernising', we are reminded of the Perpendicular enclosing of the Norman piers in Winchester nave.

Another re-modelling took place at Market Bosworth (Fig.10/36), where the nave piers and capitals which still support the 14th-century arcade, were reduced to a Perpendicular profile, with large shafts east and west, and additional semi-octagonal
projections with smaller shafts on the north and south faces. These shafts rise well above the main capitals to support the roof corbels. The conversion involved some quite remarkable work. Examination of the details at Market Bosworth, reveals that the hollow chamfer of the arcades above the main capital has been cut out and replaced by two larger stones comprising the upper part of the shaft and a tapered chamfer, which brings the line of the original chamfer down into the new semi-octagonal work. At the head of the shaft, the new capital has been let into the original face containing the existing hollow chamfers.

Moving on to consider the decorative details of capitals, it is sometimes assumed that nail-head and dog-tooth motifs are exclusively Early English decorations, but they may also be found in at least the early Decorated period. At Diseworth (Fig.10/37), the unusual hexagonal piers have nail-head decoration and there are also other examples throughout the county.

**FIGURATIVE AND FOLIATED DECORATION**

This appears on a number of capitals and responds, the earliest of which is at Lowesby (Fig.10/38). The 13th-century capital was re-used in the major Perpendicular rebuilding of the church, and depicts somewhat primitive stiff-leaf decoration surrounding heads. A combination of head, flower and a basic form of water-leaf, together with nail-head ornament, appears on a respond at Muston (Fig.10/39), which must be at the transition from Early English to Geometric, c.1270. At Burbage (Figs. 10/40 and 10/41), the fine shafted chancel arch has a variety of heads within the capitals. In spite of the damage to north and south faces to accommodate a former screen, various heads remain. The internal shafts to the east and west windows of the north aisle at Evington all have carved capitals of early 14th
century origin (Fig.10/42). The figures on the south-east respond at Belton (Fig.10/43), which seem to float towards each other, may be contemporary with those at Oakham (Fig.10/44). Figures carved on capitals may not always be contemporary with the capital; it may have been some time after completion of the structure that the figures were carved. As with all things, it would have been a matter of finance. The external sculpture above the west doors at Guildford Cathedral was not carried out until over forty years after the Consecration in 1961 of the completed building.

At Wymondham (Fig.10/45), a group of angels appears around the south east capital. One holds the sun and moon, whilst the others hold symbols of the Passion. A further example at Wymondham has heads beneath ball-flower ornament (Fig.10/46), which compares with one of the two examples at Wigston, All Saints (Figs.10/47 and 10/48). These may be contemporary with, or slightly later than those at Wymondham, but it cannot be assumed that this is the case by examining the moulding profiles; as will be discovered later in this chapter. Where there are stylistic similarities, it is still virtually impossible to 'read a progression'. Certainly ball-flower is evident, but even that does not narrow the dating down to within less than at least sixty years.

In addition to figurative carving, the county has some fine examples of the combination of figurative and foliated capitals, the most outstanding examples being in the south arcade at Stoke Golding (Fig.10/49), all of which are late 13th to early 14th century in date. Rather more restrained are the examples at Loughborough (Figs.10/50 and 10/51). The foliage on the chancel responds is more upright and less entwined, and there are figurative stops. More closely resembling the work at Stoke Golding, is the example in Fig.10/52, again from Evington. It can be seen how the detail of the angel wings at Loughborough and Evington are quite different from those in Fig.10/45 at Wymondham, although this does not necessarily indicate a
progression in style.

The Green Man appears in several Leicestershire churches, of which two examples are given. At Thurcaston (Fig.10/53), several of these pagan heads are linked, whilst at Belgrave (Fig.10/54), they peer out from among the ivy leaves. This 14th-century example provides an interesting contrast with the late 12th-century respond capital of the tower arch, in which the transition from water-leaf to stiff-leaf is apparent.

Turning finally to purely foliated capitals, it is possible to determine a more clearly defined progress. The unusual capital of the early 13th-century arcade at Saxelbye (Fig.10/55), bears horizontal leaves which reveal very little cutting back of the octagonal faces. Pevsner remarks that the leaves are: “still of a Norman type.”354 More realistic foliage begins to emerge in the later 13th century, as at Cold Overton (Figs.10/56 and 10/57). There is an under-cutting of the abacus, which allows the foliage to protrude, thus establishing the bell as an element that is visually separate from the abacus. As so often in Leicestershire, the details of responds and capitals differ; the knobbly and somewhat free-standing foliage at Cold Overton (Fig.10/56), compares with the rather tighter and more compact example in the respond in Fig.10/57. This is not to suggest a later date, but is due to the fact that capitals and responds were not necessarily the work of the same mason, in fact, it has been rare throughout the county to find pier and respond capitals responds that agree. Similar in style, and probably contemporary with Fig.10/57 is the example at Crick in Northamptonshire (Fig.10/58), where the stems all swirl to the left, although the foliage is under-cut rather more deeply than at Cold Overton. An interesting comparison may be seen in the next two examples, Ab Kettleby (Fig.10/59), and

354 Pevsner, p.368
Sibthorpe in Nottinghamshire (Fig.10/60). The details of stems and leaves are virtually identical and suggest the same hand. Both examples are hardly later than c.1260. At Sibthorpe, in spite of the fine rebuilding of the chancel in 1343 as part of a chantry college, the original 13th-century chancel arch has survived.

At Belgrave (Fig.10/61), although stems are still prominent, the compact close-knit form, that was to become a feature of later Decorated, is gradually emerging. We find the perfect comparison at Lichfield (Fig.10/62), at the junction in the north choir arcade between the stiff-leaf foliage of the 13th century choir and the dense foliage of the 14th century presbytery. Fig.10/60 is moving towards the former, whilst Fig.10/61 is moving towards the latter. The 'Lichfield' type appears in the most splendid tower arch in Leicestershire, at Enderby (Figs.10/63 and 10/64), which fortunately survived the dismal rebuilding of the rest of the church in 1867. The central quadrant moulding is flanked by pairs of rolls which contain a variety of ball-flower, heads and creatures. The richly foliated capitals are supported on shafts, some of which are filleted. Given that Lichfield was much closer than the diocesan cathedral of Lincoln, it is possible that there may be a connection between the two, but, as so often, there are no records to confirm such a theory.

Reference has previously been made to the fine arcade at Stoke Golding. Here, the foliage on the capital (Fig.10/65) provides a contrast with the examples at Lichfield and Enderby. It is not as compact, and suggests a rather more sophisticated version of that at Belgrave (Fig.10/62). There is a close similarity between the respond capital at Wigston, All Saints (Fig.10/66), and an arcade capital at Bingham in Nottinghamshire (Fig.10/67), where the reduction from octagonal face to carving is fairly shallow. Finally, the Early English arcade at Ratby (Fig.10/68), demonstrates another variant of Perpendicular alteration. The original moulding has been carved
into a series of fleurons, some of which are connected by trailing vine-leaf. By studying the profiles at the left and right, it can be seen that the original convex moulding has not received deep cutting.

Before completing this chapter with a more detailed look at capitals and bases, and an analysis of data, I shall discuss a few special examples. At Lowesby (Fig.10/69), the late 12th - early 13th century capitals have been re-used in the Perpendicular rebuilding of the south aisle. It can be seen that the capital is an ill fit on the octagonal pier, as is also the case in Fig.10/38). This misfit is attributable entirely to the re-use of earlier material, and is not for the same reason as the misfit between some voussoirs and abaci, which I believe to be due to stock-piling of voussoirs and lack of consultation between the masons who produced voussoirs and those who produced capitals.

At Long Clawson (Fig.10/70), we find the only example of a capital and base sharing the same moulding. Disregarding the plinth, the whole pier looks the same either way up, and is far from the “standard design” described by Pevsner. 355 At Ratby (Fig.10/71), the south eastern pier of the 13th century arcade reveals the spring of a transverse arch which, because of its position, was clearly not a chancel arch; there is now no visible matching scar on the north wall of the nave. Pevsner poses the interesting theory that there may once have been a screen of triple arches.356 If so, this may have been the only example in the county, and might have been similar to the surviving 13th-century example at Westwell in Kent.357 As such, we are reminded that the triple stone arch at the entrance to a chancel had very early origins; the pre-Conquest churches at Brixworth358 and Reculver359 and are just two examples of

355 Pevsner, p.278.
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357 Howard, Fig.77.
former screens.

The low south arcade at Ravenstone (Fig.10/72), has a distinctive profile. There is no true capital, and but for the insertion of a simple concave moulding, we might be looking at an example of continuous moulding. However, the hood-mould rises from a simple stop, which is part of the single stone that separate pier from arcade. The whole effect is clean and minimalist - a tribute to 14th-century invention.

By contrast, an extraordinary arrangement exists at Beeby (Fig.10/73), where both western responds have been raised by the addition of second capitals. A magnificent Perpendicular rebuilding was commenced right across the west end, embracing tower and aisles, together with the addition of the clerestory. However, the 13th-century origin of the church is clearly shown by the south doorway, and it would seem that the aisles were remodelled and raised during the 14th. In the raising of the piers, there is a clear difference in building stones visible; this was a not uncommon practice, the results of which may be seen as far afield at St. Cuthbert's, Wells and Chiddingfold, in Surrey. To retain the earlier west responds at Beeby, the capitals have been raised to accommodate the higher arcade. (Fig. 10/75) This situation is not matched at the east end, where arcades, chancel arch and chancel (before rebuilding in 1819) were all of a piece.

At Whetstone (Fig.10/74), the responds of a wide former chancel arch survive,
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although Pevsner questions whether it ever existed.\textsuperscript{363} Certainly the thrust from such an arch would have been considerable, and its removal may have been necessary. Any such problem would have been overcome by the re-modelling of the church, and insertion of a continuous roof in the 15th century. Finally, at Lockington (Fig.10/75), the responds of the chancel arch reveal a wave moulding with decorative stops just beneath the capital.

Having completed a general survey, we can now examine in more detail, the data relating to piers, capitals, bases and arcades may be examined in more detail, and from which, several important conclusions will be drawn.

PIERS

In the Appendix relating to this chapter may be found a collection of data from almost half of the churches surveyed relating to arcades in general. Arising from this, three very important points emerge, which have not been previously noticed. Looking first at piers, excluding their capitals and bases, whilst the greater number are octagonal in section, very few indeed are consistent in diameter within the same church. Only three of the churches surveyed have consistent diameters in all piers. At Coleorton, the diameters are 580mm x 580mm; at Swepstone, all piers have a diameter of 545mm x 545mm, and at Thrussington, they measure 470mm x 470mm. Such uniformity could be the result of rebuilding or restoration, which is noted to a greater or lesser degree at all three churches.\textsuperscript{364} However, it is unlikely that piers would have been tampered with other than in a total rebuild from the foundations up, which seems not to have been the case in these instances. Fifteen churches have consistent pier diameters within one aisle only. All piers come within four groups, of which only two churches, Knossington and Rearsby have pier diameters of between

\textsuperscript{363} Pevsner, p.420.
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385mm and 395mm. Nineteen churches come within a range of 405mm - 500mm, whilst thirty-five have piers within the range 505mm - 590mm. Finally, a group of eight churches are within the range of 600mm - 680mm. Such grouping clearly suggests that there was an acceptable standard for pier diameters, and excluding the few churches adopting the extreme ranges, there is no more than 185mm difference between the minimum and maximum dimensions of the two main groups. Although 185mm is quite a wide variation, it is still small enough to suggest that pier stones of a 'standard' size were worked in considerable numbers in the quarries. If the differences of diameter between piers within the same arcade are relatively small, those between one church and another are often greater, and of course, some piers are constructed of 'through' stones whilst others use pairs of 'half' stones laid in alternate directions. The differences in diameter are more likely due to the available sizes of stone between vertical splits in the bedding planes, rather than to specific design requirements by the master mason.

What is perhaps remarkable is the fact that there is no correlation between pier diameters, their height and arch spans. Hoby, with a pier diameter of 490mm, has a height of 2950mm, with an arch span of 2895mm. Horninghold, with a pier diameter of 595mm, has a height of only 1200mm but an arch span of 3075mm. It was noticeable that nearly all pier heights between capitals and bases, were easily measurable by standing on an adjacent pew. There are of course, piers that could only have been measured with access to a ladder, but even without this, the lack of correlation between diameters and arch spans was equally noticeable.

Although the optimum pier diameter in relation to arch span may have been determined empirically in the early stages, the freedom resulting from the introduction of the pointed arch was considerable. The semi-circular arch with its
keystone, exerted considerable lateral thrust, and it is hardly surprising that we find
the huge drum piers of Romanesque work, even though they are possibly over-
engineered. The Gothic arch with its more downward thrust can achieve wider arches
on more slender piers, which are only thrown from the vertical by uneven pressure
from one end, as may be seen in the south transept arcades at Melton Mowbray,
where the weight of the massive central tower has caused them to 'drift' to the south.

That clear rules of proportion were used is evident from the use of the Golden
Section, of designing *ad quadratum* and *ad triangulum*, and of the two forms of
mason's squares in use.\(^{365}\) The Golden Section divides a straight line so that:

".. the ratio of the whole to the larger part is the same as the ration of the
larger part to the smaller."\(^{366}\)

Whilst such rules were applied to major and royal
buildings, there is no reason to suppose that they did not apply to some extent to
minor village churches. We should remember that the additions of aisles, which form
much of the content of this study, were to simple naves that were either 12th - or 13th-
century work. A study of untouched two-cell Norman village churches, informs us
that they conform to an approximately average length, in other words, there could
have been an acceptable module that would accommodate the average village
congregation. With demographic change at the end of the 13th century, this module
could only be increased sideways without serious interference, because of western
towers and eastern chancels, and within the length of the original nave walls there
was an optimum number of bays, resulting in the fact that the greater number of
Leicestershire village churches have three-bay arcades. This also correlates with the
timber cruck or box-frame house, in the sense that for a given length there is a given
number of bays. The mediaeval builder clearly thought in terms of bays, whether in

\(^{365}\) B. G. Morgan, *Canonic Design in English Mediaeval Architecture*, Liverpool: Liverpool
University Press, 1961, Ch.5 and p.87.

wooden post and truss, or in stone with buttress and truss. However, a bay is not a unit of measurement and can vary from 4 ft 6 ins to 16 ft, according to R.T. Mason.\footnote{R. T. Mason, \textit{Framed Buildings of England}, Horsham: Coach Publishing, 1973, p.127.} Similarly, if we conform temporarily to Mason's use of imperial measure, the Leicestershire arcades surveyed contain bays of little more than 8 ft to over 13 ft. I suggest that so great a divergence, whilst not necessarily questioning the validity of a mediaeval concept of 'bays', does question the confidence of the particular builder in his ability to span a given distance.

If there is a wide divergence taking the data as a whole, patterns emerge within that whole. Far fewer churches have arches of a wide span; of the examples recorded, twenty-eight have spans of between 2235 mm and 3.0 m whilst only six have spans exceeding 4.0 m. Another six have what one may call random spans, where there is little or no uniformity within a single arcade. For example, at Barkby, the four-bay north arcade reads: 4115 mm, 3910 mm, 4215 mm and 4470 mm. Similarly the three-bay south arcade at Wanlip reads: 2895 mm, 2715 mm and 3075 mm. Bays took into account existing window and door positions; the builder would not start to construct a pier in an existing window position, he needed solid wall. If window and door positions were unevenly spaced, this could account for uneven bays. Other than this, it is difficult to explain these anomalies, which may be seen as the exception to the rule rather than negating the theory of 'modules' and 'bays'. It is evident that some churches, such as Barkby, have wider eastern bays, and this may be the result of earlier transepts before the addition of aisles. As was noted, when discussing towers and spires, it was not unusual to link a free-standing west tower to a nave by means of a shorter west bay, as at Gretton in Northamptonshire. What is noticeable is that many churches have a slightly wider bay immediately opposite a south and/or north bay. 
entrance. This is not a point that appears to have been picked up by previous writers, and yet the purpose must be obvious: namely, to have accommodated people processing abreast from the main entrances.

Another quite remarkable fact is that the number of voussoirs on either side of an arch does not appear to be related to the span. In more cases than not, the average number is twelve voussoirs to each side, suggesting yet again, that these basic elements were 'mass-produced' and obviously to a size and weight that could be handled conveniently on a scaffold. The fact that some arcades employ equilateral arches, whilst others introduce the drop arch, where the centres are still at the springing line, but are inside the two springing points, remains irrelevant to the number of voussoirs.368

The strikingly significant fact that emerges from a study of capitals, is that templates were not used, either for 'mass' production within a single church, or were used again in several churches. This is not to deny that a design would have been produced by the master mason, the basic profile of which was copied by individual masons, but close examination of capitals which at first sight appear to be identical, reveals very small differences within moulding lines, not to mention all the many that display wide differences, all of which indicates that a template would have served little purpose. Moreover, almost without exception, the capitals of responds are quite different from those of piers within the same arcade. Where the masons were not under the rigid control of wealthy monastic or cathedral patrons, there was obviously less requirement for uniformity, and indeed, this may well have given them scope for the individual freedom of design that is perhaps one of the most interesting aspects of the Decorated style in village churches. The water-leaf and stiff-leaf mouldings of
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some Early English capitals express individuality, as do the few examples of Decorated foliage illustrated in this chapter. What becomes obvious perhaps only after closer examination, is that simple moulded Decorated capitals also express considerable individuality.

As with variations in pier diameters, so there are variations in overall heights of capitals, the tallest being at Branston, 585mm, the shortest at Rothley, 240mm. Again, this is more likely due to the depth of the bedding plane, and stone was invariably laid in the direction of the bedding plane, rather than en delit as with Purbeck shafts. Much of the data gathered indicates that there were certain acceptable conventions. The astragal, or collar beneath the bell is frequently found to be between 30 and 45mm in thickness, and there is a general sense of proportion between elements such as bell and abacus. Capitals are formed from a collection of individual mouldings, the cavetto, cyma recta, cyma reversa, scotia, ovulo, scroll and torus, to name a few. It is the vertical order in which these basic mouldings are assembled, that provides the variety and individuality that makes categorisation a somewhat unnecessary exercise.

There is a similar difficulty in attempting to categorise pier bases. The plinths of many have been hidden or obscured by false floors raised to support pews, whilst moulding details tend to be more badly damaged than those of capitals, which are out of reach.

CONCLUSION

It has been seen that the Decorated arcade is formed generally of octagonal piers with arcades having two plain chamfers. Foliated capitals and richly moulded arcades are rare, reflecting the limited finance available. The data gathered has suggested three remarkable conclusions, namely first, that there is clearly no
correlation between pier diameters, their heights and arch spans; secondly the size of stones used both for piers and for voussoirs suggests stock-piling in the quarries; thirdly, the variety of capital forms appears to dismiss the theory of templates other than for the profile of an individual capital.
CHAPTER 11

PISCINAE, SEDILIA AND AUMBRIES

Piscinae, sedilia and aumbries are fittings associated with the Mass and therefore with altars. Often the only indication of the site of a former altar is the survival of a piscina, and of the three types of fitting discussed in this chapter, they are by far the most common, being the one most essential to the celebration of the Mass. A piscina, almost without exception placed on the south side of an altar, is simply a basin over which the celebrant may wash his fingers, and over which the sacred vessels may be washed. A drain hole in the centre of the basin would lead directly via the wall or floor into the churchyard, not only for the sake of convenience but also in order that any residue of the consecrated Elements might themselves be committed to consecrated ground.

As Bond notes, it was customary to have a single piscina until the mid-thirteenth century, although double piscinae, whilst not common, were introduced after this time and continued in use until the later fourteenth century. He suggests that following the Lateran Council of 1216, which defined the principle of Transubstantiation, whereby the consecrated Elements became the Real Presence, it became desirable for the celebrant to perform finger washing in a basin separate from that used for cleansing the sacred vessels, although he admits that the explanation: “- - requires a good deal of qualification.”369 There were, and are several ablutions during a Mass; after the censing of the altar, after the server had poured water and wine into the chalice, and following the Administration.

Some piscinae contain a small shelf above the basin, a credence, on which were placed the cruets containing water and wine. Credences are generally quite

small, because the cruets themselves did not need to be large; in the pre-Reformation church, it was the custom for the congregation to receive the Host only, and that, very irregularly. Communion at Easter was considered to be obligatory, whilst it was also recommended at Christmas and Pentecost.  

Since the piscina was an essential adjunct to the Mass, many examples would have been in place before our particular period of study. Although he does not ascribe dates, Bond cites forty English examples that are Norman in character. Study of the stylistic development of piscinae may be facilitated by comparing those to be found in chancels with those in aisles. As has been stated earlier, many aisles were introduced into Leicestershire churches during the 14th century, and there is often, though not always, a clear difference in style between a 13th-century chancel piscina and one in a 14th-century aisle. Nevertheless, the design of piscinae could be remarkably conservative, and by no means all 14th-century piscinae display the ogee form; there are numerous examples which suggest an early 13th-century origin, being a simple pointed opening with a plain chamfer, but set in what is clearly a 14th-century aisle. It is only when there was a complete rebuilding or building of a chancel, funded by a wealthy 14th-century patron, that the lavishly decorated combination of a piscina and three-stall sedilia may be found. The finest groups are in Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire and Nottinghamshire, although a few less elaborate examples may be seen in Leicestershire, such as those at Hallaton and Misterton, which will be discussed later in this chapter.

Sedilia are the seats, also placed on the south side of an altar, for the celebrant, deacon and sub-deacon, and therefore most commonly of three stalls, and used during the longer sung parts of the Mass, such as the Kyrie Eleison, Gloria in Excelsis and
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the Credo. They appear to be more common in Leicestershire and other midland counties than they are in southern counties such as Surrey and Sussex. Possible reasons for this are that much more Victorian rebuilding took place in the south, thus, often removing earlier features, and that the southern counties were relatively poor in building materials. There are many examples of sedilia in Leicestershire churches, and as with piscinae, the same criteria apply. 14th-century sedilia are more frequent in aisles than in chancels, and they are generally only found in chancels as part of a major rebuilding scheme, particularly where piscina and sedilia form a single group. Just as rood screens, pulpits and pews became the main focus of decoration in the 15th century, particularly in East Anglia and the West country, so combined sedilia and piscinae were often the fittings accorded the most lavish decoration in the 14th century.

Aumbries are the least common of the surviving fittings associated with altars. Few parish churches had vestries, and therefore accommodation for the communion vessels; as a result, these were often kept in a recess, generally on the north side of an altar, which had a door that could be kept locked. In the rare instances of an aumbry placed in the east wall beside an altar, it is possible that these may have served as reliquaries. Christopher Herbert suggests that they were multi-purpose storage cupboards:

"[...] whose location in the liturgical topography of churches was not necessarily significant."\(^\text{372}\)

He cites 126 lockers in four counties, only 45 of which were in the north walls of chancels.\(^\text{373}\) Because of their purpose as secure storage places, and since they played no part in the actual celebration of the Mass, they were generally simple in design,
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being mostly square in appearance, and were not accorded the decoration often given to piscinae and sedilia, although scarcely any original work survives to indicate the decoration of the doors and their hinges. Quite often, they were fitted with a wooden shelf, for which the supporting slots survive; other examples had a stone shelf. It may be assumed that the plain, square openings to be found in the north walls of chancels and aisles, or sometimes in their east walls, were originally aumbries. In some cases, the iron pivots survive, on which the doors were hung, together with the rebate into which doors closed, indicating the purpose of the recess. An interesting feature that survives within some Leicestershire piscinae and aumbries takes the form of deep vertical cuts scored in the sides or back of the structure. These have clearly been caused by the sharpening of blades, and whilst the popular theory that they were caused by sharpening arrow-heads may hold true on the exterior of some porches and window sills in the vicinity of Bosworth field, as at Stoke Golding (Fig.11/1), it is highly unlikely that any archer would sharpen arrow-heads within the altar area of a church. A far more plausible explanation is that these were caused by servers sharpening knives in order to cut the bread used in the Mass. Before the introduction of Communion wafers, bread was very much harder than some of today's products, and a sharp knife was necessary to cut up the small pieces required, and the marks surviving within some piscinas and aumbries are entirely consistent with many years of digging into a piece of stone for sharpening.

**PISCINAE**

Returning now to consider piscinae in greater detail, the problem of dating should first be addressed. One of the problems for the observer is that the eye is conditioned to accepting a single lancet, with or without a hood-mould and often
without inner cusping, as being early to mid-13th century, and therefore as being Early English; by their nature, most piscinae take the form of a single lancet. Garthorpe (Fig.11/2) is an interesting case: most of the work in the chancel, including the elaborate recess in the north wall (discussed in Chapter 12) is clearly 14th century. Externally the church gives the appearance of being 14th century with a 15th-century tower; however, the circular piers and abaci suggest a 13th-century origin. It is entirely possible that this very simple piscina with its plain chamfer is actually a survival within a 13th-century chancel, that was itself re-modelled rather than actively rebuilt during the following century. The fine piscina at Illston-on-the-Hill (Fig.11/3), with its shafts and simple capitals, clearly matches the late 13th-century chancel in which it is situated, and which also has shafted windows, yet the crude piscina at Blaby (Fig.11/4), is 14th century in form. Quality of workmanship is no guide to determining dates: it has been previously noted that the level of quality is the result of the skill and the funds available. Stylistic differences help to determine dates, but it would be simplistic to argue that the introduction of the trefoiled head at Blaby necessarily takes us into the 14th century; the trefoiled head was well established by the mid-13th century. Certainly the ogee-headed piscina in the south aisle at Whetstone (Fig.11/5), places it firmly in that century, and in fact a date of 1335 on a buttress near the porch is supposed to indicate the date of the aisle's foundation. Difference in style does not necessarily imply a chronological difference; in the chapel on the south side of the chancel at Ashby Folville (Fig.11/6), the cusping and slight ogee at the head of the sunk quadrant moulding all confirm that this is contemporary with a church containing much Decorated work. In as much as nail-head and dog-tooth ornament cannot be assigned solely to the 13th century, nor yet
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ball-flower exclusively to the 14th century, so it should be accepted that with piscinae, the plain chamfered lancet form, either with or without cusping, probably continued in some instances well into the early part of the 14th century.

Before moving on to look at examples that may be ascribed more securely to the Decorated period, the internal decoration of basins might be considered. Whilst many are simply a shallow depression with a drainage hole in the centre, quite a number have a moulded 'rose' with numerous flutings, as in the double piscina at Castle Donington (Fig.11/7).

The piscina in the south wall of the chancel at Glooston (Fig.11/8), displays several elements of the 14th century. Although the church was largely rebuilt in 1866-7, some details have been preserved. The trefoiled head of the piscina rises to a string-course, a feature of many 14th-century chancels, whilst there are foliated head-stops and a carved bracket supporting the bowl; the wooden credence shelf is probably a recent introduction. The structural form is not radically different from some examples already seen, but the style of the carved decoration places the work more firmly into the early 1300's than into the mid-1200's. Similarly, the example at Kibworth (Fig.11/9), with its traceried head above a cinquefoiled ogee, is clearly part of the Decorated work of the mid-14th century.

In considering the few Leicestershire piscinae that have gables, the two examples at Gaddesby, though similar in design, are different in detail. That in the south aisle (Fig.11/10), has shafts, capitals, a trefoil within the head of the gable, and damaged finial and head-stops. In detail it is somewhat more refined than the example in the north aisle (Fig.11/11), which lacks stops and finial although it has sub-cusps, yet the north aisle is a complete addition of c.1350, whereas the eastern end of the
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south aisle is somewhat earlier; it is only the western portion dating from the first quarter of the 14th century, that gives Gaddesby its particular fame. A possible explanation for this may be that the south aisle piscina was an insertion contemporary with the exuberant rebuilding at the west end. Of other gabled piscinae, that in the chancel at Saddington (Fig.11/12), has pinnacles with finials, and is the only example containing shields. These, from their much worn state, give no clue to authorship, and thus, to a date. As at Gaddesby, the south aisle at Stoke Golding is considered to be slightly earlier than the remodelling of the north side of the nave; Pevsner suggests a date of c.1260-90.376 The crocketed, cusped, double piscina suggests a date post-1300 (Fig.11/13). Taking into consideration all the elements of the south aisle, the outstanding, high quality arcade, where some of the foliage detail is distinctly more 14th than 13th century, and where some of the window tracery clearly takes us from Geometric late 13th to early 14th-century Decorated, the piscina might be placed in context by suggesting that the whole work is on the cusp of the century, and therefore very slightly later than the date ascribed by Pevsner, perhaps c.1310. Crocketed ogee piscinae exist at Wigston, All Saints (Fig.11/14) and at South Croxton (Fig.11/15), where both examples may date from the first half of the 14th century.

A few piscinae contain credences which are shelves set within a recess to contain the cruets which supplied wine and water for the chalice. Two fine examples exist at Buckminster (Fig.11/16), and at Norton-juxta-Twycross (Fig.11/17). Both are double piscinae; whilst the Buckminster example has separate credence compartments with pinnacles and damaged finials, the double piscina at Norton has a single credence beneath an ogee arch. Although Pevsner suggests that Buckminster is pre-1300,377 it may possibly be dated a little later to the early 1300s. At Norton, the
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church, with the exception of the tower, was almost entirely rebuilt c.1841.\textsuperscript{378} However, it seems likely that the piscina is original since it can have been of little use following the Victorian tampering with floor levels.

There remain three examples where the recesses associated with the piscinae may have been small credences or places for lights. At Claybrooke (Fig.11/18), the south aisle contains a plain trefoiled piscina with small recesses above; that to the west has an ogee head. Although the nave arcades at Claybrooke are Perpendicular, and the chancel is a complete and fine 14th century structure, this piscina would suggest being part of an earlier structure but for the ogee opening, which must at least date it to not earlier than c.1290. This is one of the examples of 'knife-sharpening' where the scoring may be seen clearly on the rear face. The second example is in Nottinghamshire at Barton-in-Fabis (Fig.11/19). Here, all three openings have ogee heads, the upper ones, as at Claybrooke, suggesting their purpose as credence shelves to have been far more likely than as light receptacles.

**SEDILIA**

Turning now to sedilia, these tend to display an even more interesting variety than do piscinae. Although sedilia follow much the same developments in design as may be seen in piscinae - the pointed arch being either with plain, unadorned chamfers, or with cusps, hood-moulds, crockets, or with any combination of these, and with similar details applied to ogee arches, with the addition of pinnacles, etc - other features might also be introduced. For example, the divisions between each sedile may be solid or detached from the rear wall by means of shafts or polygonal columns; vaulting ribs may be introduced; some examples are stepped towards the east to establish the hierarchy of the occupants, and more particularly, many of the
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14th-century examples are set within a panel thus forming a frame to the whole ensemble. As with piscinae it is not until the decorated ogee form is encountered, that we may be certain of being firmly in the 14th century. Even so, the use of the two-centred arch without the ogee continued well into the 14th century, as is confirmed by the details of the structures within which many examples are to be found. By way of introduction, we move from the simple Early English example in the chancel at Castle Donington (Fig.11/20), with its plain chamfers, heavy shafts and plain capitals, to what is perhaps late 13th - early 14th-century work in the chancel at Cold Overton (Fig.11/21). Here, is a roll-moulding together with hood-moulds and head-stops. In the south aisle at Hallaton (Fig.11/22), there is a 14th-century group of piscina and sedilia, all with ogee heads, and where the cusps in the spandrels reflect those within each sedile, but in reverse. This group, set within the 14th-century aisle is in direct contrast with the 13th-century group in the Early English chancel. At Thrussington, in what is now the vestry, is a two-stall sedilia with crocketed ogee heads (Fig.11/23), but as was suggested earlier, it is outside the county that one finds any truly outstanding examples, as at Sandiacre in Derbyshire (Fig.11/24).

Occasionally, sedilia were simply formed out of a window sill, the jambs being continued down below the base of the window. A particularly interesting 14th-century example survives at Aldwincle in Northamptonshire, which incorporates a small pillar piscina (Fig.11/25). Comparison of the sedilia at Lowesby (Fig.11/26) with those at Pickwell (Fig.11/27), suggests that both examples are near contemporary. However, it is unsafe to say that the Lowesby sedilia is later because of its rather more refined detail. Lowesby is mainly a Perpendicular remodelling of a late 13th-century structure; should it therefore be suggested that the sedilia, with its detached moulded shafts, is Perpendicular? Examination of the stonework suggests
that the voussoirs of the two eastern compartments have been cut down to accommodate the Perpendicular window in the south wall of the chancel. The coursed rubble construction, both behind and at either side of the sedilia, suggests that the whole work is part of a single operation, perhaps of c.1300. Pickwell is also largely a late 13th-century structure, apart from the Perpendicular west tower and the introduction of Decorated windows into the chancel. Here, plasterwork prevents our seeing the wall construction, but the broad, slightly depressed arches suggest a date very similar to the example at Lowesby. It could be argued, of course, that since each sedile has to accommodate the width of a body, the openings could not be narrow with acutely pointed arches, but at Pickwell, there is a feeling that where concave mouldings of window and sedilia are in accord, both were conceived as one. Even with the stepped example at Pickwell, both sedilia remind us of the nonsense of Victorian interference with floor levels, a situation which obtains much throughout the county.

An interesting and rare example survives in the north wall of the north aisle at Houghton-on-the-Hill (Fig.11/28). The surviving evidence suggests that here was a stepped three-stall sedilia until the introduction of the later window. The aisle with its quatrefoil piers may be dated from the first half of the 14th century, and the sedilia, This is the only Leicestershire example set in a north wall, because the arcade opposite leaves insufficient return wall. Here, unusually, the floor level appears to have been lowered, since it is now impossible to touch the floor when seated in the western sedile.

An example of the variety of decoration in mediaeval work may be seen at Rearsby (Fig.11/29). What appears to be a fairly simple three-stall sedilia with plain chamfers and hood-mould, is so until we examine the stops, all of which are different.
Those at the extreme east and west ends are each different (Figs. 11/30 and 11/31), whilst that between the east and central compartments takes the form of a cat's head (Fig.11/32), and that between the central and west compartments is foliated (Fig.11/33). Furthermore, it may be seen that the setting out of the hood-moulds is not quite accurate. Pevsner suggests that this is a 13th-century example which survives in a remodelled Perpendicular chancel. Obviously, the builders who introduced the later window have been careful not to tamper with the sedilia.

The stepped sedilia at Illston-on-the-Hill (Fig. 11/34) contains Early English characteristics such as the attached shafts with bases and capitals and the outer roll-moulding. When looking at the piscina (Fig.11/3), it was established that the chancel fittings are contemporary with the structure, which is probably of the last quarter of the 13th century. By comparing this example with that in the north chapel at Lubenham (Fig.11/35), details from both are present; the shafts with capitals and bases but with a convex rather than a roll-moulding, and there are now head-stops. Here, are the remains of what would have been a two or even three-stall sedilia. This example might provide us with a more positive date, because the north chapel was established as a chantry certainly by 1302:

“Jan. 1302, Roger archdeacon of Leicester was presented to the chantry of the blessed Virgin Mary of Lubenham.”

Once again, there is no distinct stylistic development within the three examples to allow positive dating, and it is only when documentary evidence affords the rare opportunity, as at Lubenham, that we can start to make comparisons that suggest dating for other examples. Yet at Lubenham, the documentary evidence is not proof that the sedilia is 14th century; The chantry may well have been set up in an
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existing chapel, rather than one that was purpose built, and the shafts and capitals of the sedilia certainly bear comparison with those at Illston, with which they are probably contemporary.

A group which seems to demonstrate more clearly the combination of Early English and Decorated elements, and the danger therefore of trying to segregate styles in the Rickman manner, is that in the chapel at Noseley (Figs. 11/36 and 11/37). The central shaft of the double piscina has an 'Early English' stiff-leaf capital; all heads have roll-mouldings; the shafts at the extreme ends of the sedilia have fillets, whilst the inner shafts are reeded, and the capital of the shaft between the two western-most stalls has the much tighter foliage which we associate with the Decorated style. A collegiate foundation associated with the house, was set up in 1274, and Pevsner suggests that the chapel was complete by c. 1305.\textsuperscript{381} On June 16th, 1306, land was granted to:

"[...] three chaplains celebrating divine service daily in the chapel of St. Mary in the manor of Noueslee, for the souls of Roger and his ancestors [...]"\textsuperscript{382}

Whilst the use of the trefoil was clearly established by the mid-13th century, the introduction of the ogee came towards the end of that century, and is more commonly associated with the following century. The example in the chancel at Somerby (Fig. 11/38), uses trefoils and shafts, but here, the concave moulding is introduced, with chamfer stops, whilst the ogee heads rise into finials. The change from convex to concave mouldings is often overlooked, but it is as important a development as is the introduction of the ogee. At Somerby, we see more than experimentation; a whole new style has been introduced even though it may use
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earlier elements; we are clearly looking at work that is post-1300, probably of the first quarter of that century. The figurative sculpture at the rear of the central sedile cannot be part of the original scheme, but suggests two fragments from grave slabs. These would probably have been inserted during the restoration of the chancel in 1883, and have no connection with the sedilia.383

In spite of the introduction of new elements, some of the earlier ones did not fall into disuse. At Burton Overy (Fig.11/39), simple detached polygonal shafts with neither capitals nor bases supporting cinquefoiled ogees with no hood-moulds are ascribed by Pevsner to the early 14th century.384 However, at Belgrave (Fig.11/40), the richly crocketed ogee arches are still supported on detached shafts with bases and capitals of a distinctly mid 13th-century type, where one might have expected the tight-knit foliated capitals more associated with the Decorated style, whilst at the rare Leicestershire example of a complete 14th-century church at Ratcliffe Culey (Fig.11.41), c.1340, there are no ogee arches, but polygonal shafts and cinquefoiled heads with sub-cusps. Moreover, the whole ensemble is set within a panel, which leads to consideration of such examples.

At Tilton-on-the-Hill (Fig.11/42), the three stalls are contained within a panel; there are no finials, which enables the cinquefoiled motif of the ogee heads to appear in reverse on the spandrels. At Belgrave (Fig.11/40), the piscina is set within its own panel, whilst the finials of the pinnacles and crocketed heads are placed within the concave moulding of the surrounding panel, giving the impression of a row of ball-flower or fleuron ornament. The most highly ornamented sedilia of this panelled type is that at Cossington (Fig.11/43). The depressed ogee heads rise into crocketed finials, whilst similar short pinnacles rise from heads-stops, but in between sit an array of
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extraordinary human and lion heads (Fig.11/44). All three examples may be dated to the early part of the 14th century, whilst what is probably the latest example in the county is that in the chancel at Market Bosworth (Fig.11/49). Probably contemporary with the 15th-century remodelling of the main arcades, this is a tall three-stall version with broad cinquefoiled heads and having a vaulted interior. Vaulting is rare within Leicestershire sedilia, occurring only at Market Bosworth, with a tierceron vault (Figs.11/45 and 11/46), and at Belgrave (Fig.11/47), with a simple quadripartite vault. The shattered fragment of the sedilia at the Augustinian priory of Ulverscroft also displays evidence of vaulting (Fig.11/48). The in-filling at the base of Ramsey's Perpendicular window above, and the clumsy patching in the central sedile, now makes it difficult to determine whether the sedilia have been cut down to receive the window, or whether both are part of the same scheme. Certainly, from surviving earlier evidence in the south wall, the Perpendicular windows are a later scheme, and I am inclined to think that the sedilia also pre-date Ramsey's work. The rear of the sedilia does not follow the normal straight form, but each compartment is concave. A similar, though not identical example exists at Willoughby Waterleys (Fig.11/49), which is unusual in having only two compartments.

The finest example of the few Leicestershire sedilia that have pinnacles may be found at Misterton (Fig.11/50). As has been seen before, comparison of detail is a reminder that for the very finest examples, we have to look outside the county; for example, the upper detail at Misterton (Fig.11/51), though fine, cannot compare with the quality of that at Car Colston, in Nottinghamshire (Fig.11/52).

That church fittings have not always served the purpose for which they were originally intended, may be seen from the example at Edmondthorpe (Fig.11/53). Here, the two-stall sedilia have been appropriated by the Reverend Peter Boundy,
rector from 1709-1730 and converted into an 18th-century monument. The early
13th-century trefoiled heads survive, as does the central capital and the side shafts
with their water-leaf capitals (Fig.11/54). A similar conversion has taken place in the
north chancel chapel at Lowick in Northamptonshire (Fig.11/55), where the piscina of
the 14th-century group has had a monument inserted.

**AUMBRIES**

As has been stated, compared with piscinae and sedilia, these features are,
for the most part, architecturally undistinguished. A very basic example survives at
Houghton-on-the-Hill (Fig.11/56), where aumbry, piscina and sedilia form a group in
the south-east corner of the chancel. Here is one of the rare instances of an eastern
aumbry, which, as has been previously suggested, could have contained a relic. The
slightly more elegant example in the south transept at Loughborough clearly reveals
the rebate against which the door would have closed (Fig.11/57), whilst the example
at Hose (Fig.11/58), where the entire arch is cut from a single stone, reveals a hood-
mould with defaced stops.

It may be seen how all three examples have a rebate against which a door could be
shut and locked, though, with the possible exception of Loughborough, none show
evidence of fixings for hinges.

**CONCLUSION**

In the survey for this chapter, it has been seen how piscinae and sedilia formed
a necessary part of the fittings of chancels and side chapels. Again, the difficulty of
positive dating for features of the Decorated style arises from the fact that the
elements used in so much parish church architecture were rarely at the cutting edge of
development. Whilst cathedrals and those churches that were the objects of royal or episcopal patronage could afford the latest in design, lavish, and therefore expensive detail for smaller fittings, such as those reviewed in this chapter, would have been beyond the means of the average village church. It is a fact that some of the finest elements of the Decorated style are revealed in the micro-architecture, but where funds are limited, so is the means of expression. The evidence shows that many 13th-century Leicestershire chancels were already equipped with contemporary Early English piscinas, and in some cases, sedilia; some elements of this stylistic tradition appear to have continued into the 14th century, notwithstanding the increasing use of the ogee and crockets.
CHAPTER 12 - WALL RECESSES
A relatively small proportion of the churches surveyed contain wall recesses, 47 in all, of which 37 are within Leicestershire. These include both empty recesses and those containing effigies or tomb slabs. The majority of these are sited within the north walls of chancels, some within the north walls of aisles, and a few in the south walls of aisles. Those in chancels are always close to altars, as are most of those in north aisles. With few exceptions, the recesses take the form of a low moulded arch within the thickness of the wall; the mouldings generally rise from ground level, and only rarely are there supporting shafts. Some have cusped arches, others have gables with crockets and finials, whilst a few terminate with ogees. With the exception of the external recess in the tower at Bitteswell, to be discussed later, all recesses are too shallow in depth to provide complete accommodation for an effigy, with nearly all of the surviving figures protruding onto the main floor space. This leads to the consideration as to whether these recesses served simply as burial spaces or whether they may also have performed another function.

Pevsner appears unwilling to commit himself to clear definitions, and when not ignoring recesses altogether, prefers to use the terms, “wall recess”, or “tomb recess”, and only rarely suggests the term “Easter sepulchre”. In considering this last term, Francis Bond states that:

“The ceremonies of the Easter sepulchre go back to a very early date, being mentioned in the Concordia Dunstani. the latest possible date for which is 988. A.D.[...]]The use of the sepulchre continued up to
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the Reformation and even a little later.\textsuperscript{387}

It is known from the \textit{Rites of Durham} that the ceremonies were very elaborate, for example, in the \textit{Visitatio Sepulchri}, on Good Friday:

"They laid the crucifix in the sepulchre very reverently together with another image of Christ, within whose breast was enclosed the Blessed Sacrament from the altar [the \textit{Depositio}] [...] On Easter morning, between three and four o'clock [...] they took the wonderful image of Our Savour [...] Having raised the image [the \textit{Elevatio}] upon an embroidered velvet cushion [...] [they] brought it to the High Altar and placed it in the middle.\textsuperscript{388}

Veronica Sekules is of the opinion that the \textit{Visitatio Sepulchri} was rare in England, and states that a permanent structure was not necessary for these customs.\textsuperscript{389}

When discussing the Easter Sepulchre on the north side of the Angel Choir at Lincoln, she relates it to the German models of the tomb of Christ, suggesting that here is the sole example in an English cathedral. She explains that because its position made it inaccessible to the nave congregation, its purpose was less to inspire popular devotion and rather more as a spiritual protector to a mortal grave, given its juxtaposition to the tomb of Remigius, Lincoln’s founding bishop.\textsuperscript{390} In describing the few permanent 'Easter Sepulchres' at Heckington, Navenby, Hawton, Sibthorpe and Patrington, Sekules observes that their construction coincided:

"[...] precisely when Corpus Christi veneration was taking hold in England.

[which] provides the explanation for the conversion of the Easter

\begin{flushleft}
\begin{footnotesize}
390 ibid, p.122.
\end{footnotesize}
\end{flushleft}
Sepulchre into a monument permanently visible in the chancels of these parish churches in eastern England."

Christopher Herbert states that:

"It was only in the thirteenth century, with the development of the Sarum rite, that the necessity for some kind of Easter Sepulchre in each church began to be widespread."

Disused, or destroyed during the iconoclastic period of Edward VI, Easter sepulchres were re-instanted by Queen Mary, only to be abolished during Elizabeth’s reign. Records exist of their being burnt, as at Winterton, in Lincolnshire in 1560; sold, as at St Laurence, Reading, in 1561, or even being used to make cupboards or hencoops. Such information makes it quite clear that many sepulchres were moveable wooden objects, and whilst such temporary structures could be disposed of quite easily, it remained more difficult and a probably pointless exercise to tamper with a recess that might have housed a wooden Easter sepulchre, but which was an integral part of the main structure, as is suggested by the surviving structures in Leicestershire. The fact that the majority of the Leicestershire examples are empty recesses would seem to support the view that the removal of effigies, if such features had been common, endowed the recess with an anonymity which would not give offence to the post-Reformation believer. However, effigies that survived were often defaced, as has happened to the priestly effigy at Heckington.

In considering whether some wall recesses served as Easter sepulchres, there can be little doubt as to the purpose of the famous early 14th-century stone groups at Hawton and Sibthorpe in Nottinghamshire, Heckington in Lincolnshire and Patrington in Yorkshire, together with other examples surviving in Bedfordshire,
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Norfolk, Oxfordshire and Warwickshire. If these were a response to the *Sarum* rite, the equally a response to the growing interest in the feast of *Corpus Christi*. The significance of these is that whilst they are totally different in form from all except one of the Leicestershire recesses, they are each associated with a founder’s tomb and face an elaborate sedilia and piscina on the south side of the chancel.\(^394\) To take one example, that at Sibthorpe (Fig.12/1). depicts the risen Christ holding the banner of the Cross, supported by censing Angels, whilst on either side of the small tomb recess, are groups of sleeping guards. The recess would have held only a small cross, perhaps that from the top of a processional cross; it is too small to have contained a large cross from a High Altar. However, it could also have accommodated the Reserved Sacrament, and this it could have done throughout the year rather than just once on Good Friday. The question arises as to why build an elaborate “sepulchre” for use only once a year unless the feature is to be perhaps the English equivalent of the German Sacrament House, and therefore used on a more regular basis, but in most cases a Pyx containing the Host (Reserved Sacrament), was suspended above the High Altar throughout the year, and was only removed for ‘burial’ on Good Friday.\(^395\)

To continue with the example at Sibthorpe, we must ask what of the low arched recess beneath the main group (Fig.12/2), a feature that is more common among the examples encountered in Leicestershire? Would such a recess have been very practical for a priest in full vestments to have to stoop low to place a Cross and a Host within? Many chancels had their floors raised during Victorian ‘restorations’ so that it is now impossible, in many cases, to assess the correct position of a recess relative to the original floor level, but of course the act of humility in bending low to a tomb, however impractical, would have been not without significance. In considering
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further as to whether these low recesses served as tombs, as Easter sepulchres, or as both, we have already mentioned that the latter were often moveable wooden constructions, which would have been assembled in much the way that we now produce a Christmas crib, and which was then stored away until the next Good Friday. However, Bond, in stating that the majority of sepulchres would have been temporary wooden structures, and that a special masonry structure was rare, goes on to say that a third type was: "a chest-tomb, or a canopied tomb with a flat upper slab, [which] was often utilised, on which to place the wooden framework." Numerous Leicestershire examples could have fulfilled this purpose and such tombs will be cited later in this chapter.

There survives only one example in Leicestershire of the Sibthorpe form of Easter sepulchre, at Garthorpe, now a redundant church (Fig.12/3). Above a low arched recess, made even lower by the Victorian raising of the sanctuary floor, is a gabled recess. The recess has a trefoiled arch with sub-cusps and central ogee, above which is a simple cable-moulding, no doubt intended to represent crockets, and there is a central finial. The gable, which also has a finial, is supported by pinnacles with finials which in turn are supported by heads. Pevsner refers to the group as an aumbry with a tomb recess, and not as an Easter sepulchre. However, Nichols clearly shows there to have been a small, separate recess to the west of the group. This may have been an aumbry but it has been destroyed by the later insertion of a window that is now blocked. It should be noted that the upper gabled recess and supporting arch bear a close similarity in form to the example at Sibthorpe. Bloxham, in a comprehensive section on Easter sepulchres, describes the Garthorpe feature in detail, stating that the low arched recess:
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“... appears to have been the receptacle for the Easter Sepulchre. Above this arch is a recess, [...] this appears to have served for the deposition of the pix [sic.] containing the host.” 399

The important Garthorpe example accords with Veronica Sekules’ comments that:

“ [...] the relationship between Christ’s tomb and his living body is made explicit and by implication so is the relationship between Christ’s living body and the sacrament for which the tomb/aumbry was intended at Easter.” 400

Turning from this single Leicestershire example, which might, with some certainty, be referred to as an Easter sepulchre, we should consider the possibility that larger wall recesses were designed to contain a tomb slab, effigy or brass. Christopher Daniell reminds us that:

“ [...] the east end of the church [...] nearest to the high altar [...] was the most [...] desirable, for burial] followed by the rest of the chancel, and then the nave.” 401

This is the position of most of our Leicestershire examples. The fact that raised floor levels may have destroyed more positive evidence of burials, does not mean that such was not the purpose of wall recesses, whilst the fact that surviving effigies, for the most part, protrude beyond the wall surface, can be explained by the fact that recesses could only be of a nominal depth, allowing for the overall thickness of the wall. Of the few surviving pre-15th and 16th century effigies in Leicestershire chancels, all are of priests. At Scraptoft, an effigy has survived but not the recess. To accommodate the 18th century Wigley memorials in the chancel, the effigy of a priest,

of c.1250 is now repositioned placed somewhat ungraciously on its side in the south wall of the chancel. Chancels being the prerogative of priests and not of the laity, it is logical that they should have been the main burial area for priests, and in Leicestershire, it is not, in general, until the 16th century that we begin to find chancels used as mausolea for the lay gentry and nobility, the outstanding Leicestershire example being the chancel at Bottesford.

Having discussed low arched recesses as being accommodation for tombs, together with the evidence for wooden Easter sepulchres, the possible connection between the two, namely that tomb recesses also provided space for temporary sepulchres, has already been mentioned, but there is also another possibility. Bond states that:

“Very frequently, however, the Easter sepulchre was placed on a stone chest-tomb standing in a canopied recess of the north wall of the chancel”

Referring to such tombs, Bridget Cherry makes the interesting observation that:

"Placed in a sanctified position in the chancel, and forming a centre of liturgical activity, the Easter Sepulchre tomb can also be seen as an alternative to the divisive tradition of the separate chantry chapel."

The arched recess and the chest-tomb are discussed by P. Sheingorn, when referring to these features on the north sides of chancels.

Thinking of the “tomb” symbolism of a low arched recess, a typical example containing the effigy of a priest, may be seen at Eastwell (Fig.12/4). Here, the figure, in full eucharistic vestments and holding a chalice, is set with the head beneath a
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nodding ogee with crockets and finial, and extends, as in so many instances, well beyond the depth of the recess. The recess itself has simple mouldings with a hood-mould (Fig.12/5), and terminates with short, somewhat clumsy pinnacles that are crocketed and have finials, the whole ensemble suggesting an early 14th-century date of c. 1320. Bearing in mind that the Christian faith is based upon the Resurrection of Christ and the hope thereof for believers, the acting out of the burial of Christ on Good Friday and the Resurrection on Easter Day was pivotal to the ritual associated with the Passion and Easter. To have retained the architectural feature of a wall recess solely for the re-enactment of an annual event, would seem to have been an extravagance; to have incorporated a liturgical function into a feature that was serving as a permanent setting for a founder's or benefactor's tomb, would have given point and purpose to the recess. The question then arises as to how could a wooden Easter sepulchre have been placed above an effigy? Quite simply by standing on legs in the form of a hutch, a method of construction still employed in many Christmas cribs. One of the liturgical benefits was that of visual contact during the Mass. The celebrant, deacon and sub-deacon would occupy the sedilia during certain sung parts of the Mass, and their gaze would be fixed on the wall-recess/Easter sepulchre immediately opposite. This could concentrate the mind and therefore prayers upon any occupant of such a tomb, which in turn would be beneficial to that occupant, and we should remember that the deceased figure in the 14th century would be far more immediate in the collective memory than it can possibly be to ourselves six centuries later. In addition to the visual aspect of the recess, there was also that of the High Altar to the right, and the Rood to the left of those sitting in the sedilia; all of these emphasising the essential elements of the Faith - the Passion, the Resurrection and the Transubstantiation of the Elements.
Possibly the earliest recess, judging from the plain mouldings, may be found at Somerby in the north aisle (Fig.12/6). Here, we find a single chamfer with no hood-mould, but it is of a type that is fairly common; identical examples may be seen in the north transept at Empingham in Rutland, and in the north aisle at Holbeach in Lincolnshire. Dating such examples is difficult; the north aisle at Somerby with its fine arcade of stiff-leaf capitals, may be compared stylistically with the nave capitals at Lincoln and with those at West Walton in Norfolk, where the arcades of both may be dated c. 1240, whilst the Empingham transept is also clearly 13th-century work, notwithstanding the Perpendicular re-modelling. The north aisle at Holbeach is 14th-century work, since the whole church was rebuilt between c. 1338 and 1360, the Bishop of Lincoln having acquired the advowson in 1332. This reminds us that architectural details often ran across what are considered to be ‘styles’ or ‘periods’; a single chamfer remains ‘style-less’ and what is more important, decoration or the lack of it always depended upon the money available.

Slightly later than Somerby, we find arched recesses in the north walls of the chancels at Buckminster and Ashby Folville; both have similar mouldings and have hood-moulds, the moulding profiles being similar to those at Eastwell, previously mentioned; as may be seen from the example at Buckminster (Fig.12/7), these recesses were very shallow.

Desford (Fig.12/8) has a very simple form of ogee set within the head of a double-chamfered arch with no hood-mould, suggesting a date of around 1300.

There are recesses with segmental arches with five cusps, the only Leicestershire example being in the north chancel wall at Arnesby (Fig.12/9), although a similar one may be seen at Lowick in Northamptonshire. At Arnesby, the
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side windows of the chancel have segmental heads above ogee lights, c. 1330, according to Pevsner, and with these, the wall recess is obviously contemporary.

Moving now to a group of more elaborate recesses, the earliest is possibly that in the north aisle at Wigston, All Saints (Fig.12/10), which Pevsner suggests may have been associated with the foundation of a chantry in 1301. Here, a finely moulded arch covers a moulded tre-foil opening, supported on corbel heads. Against the inner wall are the remains of a moulded string-course on which is seated an angel, the only figurative carving in any Leicestershire recess. There is a hood-mould which may originally have had head-stops. The moulding profile (Fig.12/11), may be seen to be much more elaborate than that at Eastwell, and at Wigston, we may well have an example of a space for the reception of an Easter sepulchre. The fairly low-relief slab may be that of the chantry founder, and since the recess does not rise directly from floor level, the height makes the whole feature more practical, if indeed it served the purpose of a sepulchre.

The most striking example of a wall recess in Leicestershire is that in the north wall of the chancel at Lubenham (Fig.12/12). Triple shafts support a richly moulded outer arch, whilst the inner arch of five cusps which terminate in heads, also rises from shafts. There is a gable with damaged crockets and a finial, supported on damaged pinnacles that rest on corbels. Nichols shows a stone seat within, and simply refers to the feature as a, “single stone seat” As may be seen from Fig.12/13, the mouldings are very fine. Whether this elaborate feature was part of the arrangements when a chantry chapel was set up on the other side of this north wall, cannot be said, but in that event, it must surely have been an opening between the two altars. The fact
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that the central shafts do not butt against the wall, but hide further mouldings, suggests that the wall is an infill. The chantry, which now serves as a vestry, is recorded by Nichols, who states:

“Jan. 1302, Roger archdeacon of Leicester was presented to the chantry of the blessed Virgin Mary in the parish church of Lubenham.”

The detail of the recess accords with this date, though strangely, no reference is made to the Lubenham chantry in the Reverend Mackenzie Walcott’s paper of 1878. If we are to look for a stylistic influence for this feature, which is unlike anything else in the Leicestershire churches surveyed, and is not likely to have been the inspiration of a local builder, we remember that Lubenham is right on the Northamptonshire border.

I think it possible that some elements may have been influenced by the Hardingstone Eleanor Cross of 1291, or the Geddington Eleanor Cross of 1294, each approximately twelve miles distant; the dates are possible. In other words, perhaps we are looking at a modest form of the ‘Court style’ at Lubenham?

At the redundant church of Edmondthorpe, is a fine gabled recess in the wall of the north aisle (Fig.12/14). The moulded arch sits beneath a richly crocketed gable with a finial, both of which rise from foliated corbels. The elaborate mouldings may be seen in Fig.12/15. and these suggest a date of the first quarter of the 14th century. At Owston, a former Augustinian priory, there remains a somewhat clumsy recess in the north wall of the north aisle (Fig.12/16). This retains what may have been a tomb chest - the top of which is just visible in the photograph - and the arch of which has large crockets supporting three slender pinnacles, that have crockets and finials, all of
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perhaps 1300, a date supported by the adjacent window tracery.

In the north wall of the chancel at Castle Donington, as at Eastwell, there is the effigy of a priest with the head beneath a nodding ogee, which Pevsner suggests to be c.1330. Unlike Eastwell, the arch contains a large and shallow trefoil (Fig.12/17). At Peckleton, in a similar position, lie the effigies of a knight and lady beneath a shallow ogee arch with large damaged cusps and a finial (Fig.12/18). Since the knight is in grey limestone and the lady in sandstone, they are clearly not a pair. Albert Herbert, in his paper

on the church, offers no more than the suggestion that the lady is of a later period, having not stated a period. In the south wall of the chancel and further west, - the sedilia being opposite the north recess - lies the figure of a knight beneath an un-cusped arch, but which has crockets and a finial above a very slight ogee.

At Barkestone, there is a very low recess in the north aisle which has a sharply pointed ogee with a finial. An effigy which protrudes into the aisle, is so tightly packed into the recess, that one wonders if this is its originally intended site (Fig.12/19). A much taller recess with a finial on an excessively tall ogee, may be found in the north aisle at Thurlaston (Fig.12/20). Since the church contains numerous Turville tombs, the latest being of 1653, Pevsner considers that the effigy within the recess is perhaps that of Hugh Turville, d.1340; a section through the moulding may be seen in Fig.12/21.

Two fine recesses may be seen in the north and south aisles at Church Langton, of which, only that on the south contains an effigy (Fig.12/22). Both have crocketed gables with finials, supported by a large round trefoil on the south, and a pointed one on the north recess, which has slightly more elaborate mouldings.
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(Fig.12/23). It seems that the effigy may not be contemporary with the tomb recess. The Reverend J. Hill, witnessed the excavation of a stone coffin from in front of each recess, claiming that these were the joint founders of the church, Sir William and Sir John Latimer. He states further that an effigy of Sir Richard Roberts was moved from a previous site and placed under the south recess. Stylistically, these recesses have something in common with the much more elaborate Alard tombs at Winchelsea in Sussex, 1310 and 1330. I have found no record of there having been chantry foundations at Church Langton.

What is possibly the latest in date is the grand recess that appears on the north side of the chancel at Great Easton (Fig.12/24). The arch, which is almost depressed, has fleurons, and rises to an ogee with crockets and elaborate finial. The remains of pinnacles stand on either side. The effigy of a priest lies on a raised shelf with an empty space beneath, possibly intended for a cadaver, although this would be an extremely early example if that were to be the case: sadly, there is insufficient detail to enable a firm dating. Nichols states that there are neither arms nor inscription, whilst Pevsner refers to it only as “late 14th century” Set in the centre of the rear wall is a damaged bracket that would have supported a figure, as at Wigston. From the detail, and more particularly from the form of the arch, the mouldings and ogee form are Decorated in detail, but there are very clear overtones of the Perpendicular. One might ascribe a date as late as 1380, not at all too late for Decorated, bearing in mind that the Neville reredos at Durham is of 1379, and the great east window of Carlisle of 1382.

A few examples remain to be considered. First, that in the north wall of the
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chancel at Cossington. Here, there is a fine cinque-foil ogee arch with sub-cusps, above which is a crocketed gable with finial (Fig.12/25). Within the recess is an alabaster tomb, which clearly is not contemporary; it is that of Matthew Knightley, Rector of Cossington from 1534, and who died in 1561. The canopied recess might be dated c. 1320, and again, there is an affinity of style with Winchelsea. 417 At the east end of the north aisle lies the early 14th-century effigy of a priest in vestments. Measurements indicate that this would fit precisely into the recess (Fig.12/26). It would seem that it was removed to make way for the later tomb chest, which could have served as a more suitable base for an Easter sepulchre, which function is suggested in the guide pamphlet to the church. Knightley’s death comes, of course, three years after the accession of Elizabeth I, but there is no reason to suppose that his tomb had not been made earlier during his lifetime; such practices were not uncommon.

At Peatling Magna, there is a trefoiled recess in the north wall, in front of which is a tomb chest to William Jervis, dated 1614, whilst in the north east corner of the chancel is the tomb chest of an earlier William Jervis, dated 1597. The arched recess, with its dog-tooth ornament, shafts and hood-mould, is clearly of the 13th century with a later coat of arms fixed above it (Fig.12/27). On the floor of the recess is an incised slab, probably the covering of a 13th-century benefactor and now virtually hidden by the 1614 tomb. The earlier tomb is placed in a position that often provided the base for an Easter Sepulchre, and instances are known where people have willed that this should be so. 418 Having placed the 1597 tomb in the favoured
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north-east position, it was convenient to place the later tomb as near to this as possible to the west of this.

Two external recesses survive in Leicestershire, the earlier one being on the same north wall that contains the putative Easter sepulchre shown in Fig.12/10, at Wigston, All Saints. The recess has a gable above an un-cusped moulded arch, with an inner arch rising from foliated corbels. The recess contains a shelf, but the memorial slab on the rear wall is very much later (Fig.12/28). The two recesses must be contemporary, whilst the exterior recess is designed as part of the ensemble, breaking through the string course beneath the windows on either side. This feature suggests that there could have been enactments in the church-yard, where the faithful also maintained a vigil from Good Friday until Easter morn. The other external recess, is much later; it is placed in the south wall of the tower at Bitteswell (Fig.12/29). It has a Perpendicular panelled soffit which is identical with that on the soffit of the chancel arch of the nearby church at Lutterworth; both examples suggest a late 14th century, if not early 15th century date. The purpose of the Bitteswell recess is uncertain, although it is deep enough to have contained an effigy.

Finally, we should consider the group of recesses, other than those previously mentioned, which are on the south side of some Leicestershire churches. These again range from the very simple chamfered arch, as found in the south aisle at Coston (Fig.12/30), to the elaborate cinque-foil arch in the south aisle at Goadby Marwood, which is complete with shafts, fleurons, haunched hood-mould and head-stops (Fig.12/31). Raymond Taylor suggests that this recess formerly held an effigy of William Maurewood, “who became Lord of Goadby in 1301, and who had this aisle built.”

There is a more recent, probably 19th-century infill/restoration at the rear of
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the recess, making it impossible to determine whether there was formerly a deeper opening which could have contained an effigy, moreover, Taylor does not support his suggestion for an effigy with any evidence.

There remains one final recess, and that is the large trefoiled recess in the south aisle at Gaddesby. This is a carefully contrived feature, as can be seen from the fact that the string-course is stepped around it. The hood-mould has a slight ogee leading into a finial. (Fig.12/32). The western section of this south aisle, in which the recess is situated, is one of the most lavish Decorated rebuildings to be found anywhere, and its importance extends far beyond Leicestershire. The church was granted to the Knights Templars of Rothley in 1306, and subsequently to the Knights Hospitallers, and whilst the east end of the south aisle is clearly 13th century, the Decorated western section, according to Pevsner, may be dated from chantry foundations of 1323 and 1333.

Some of the very low and slight arches to be found in a few north and south walls may have had a constructional purpose, being relieving arches beneath large and later windows introduced into the aisle walls and such may have been the purpose at Coston.

**CONCLUSION**

Throughout this chapter, there has been speculation as to the purpose of wall recesses; whether the surviving evidence draws the conclusion that they served as tombs for founders/benefactors; whether they served a dual purpose, or whether they were specifically Easter sepulchres. Evidence of the common use of wooden Easter sepulchres has also been cited, as has the provision of some chest-tombs to provide a base, but this does not provide a positive resolution to the purpose of the many wall
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recesses, either with or without effigies. Christopher Herbert is of the opinion that the idea of a tomb recess being appropriate as an Easter sepulchre, lacks plausibility.\textsuperscript{421} Furthermore, he says:

"The accumulation of evidence - liturgical, documentary and architectural, from the tenth century to the sixteenth - has pointed inexorably towards the conclusion that whereas \textbf{Temporary} Easter Sepulchres most certainly played a part in the religious, spiritual and cultural life of parishes in pre-Reformation England at Easter, \textbf{Permanent} Easter Sepulchres were (and are) very, very rare indeed."\textsuperscript{422}

A frequently overlooked and significant point, is also made by Herbert, when he suggests that the erroneous idea that permanent Easter Sepulchres were common in medieval England:

"[...] was largely the 'construct' of Pugin, the Cambridge Camden Society Ecclesiologists and their late nineteenth and early twentieth-century successors."\textsuperscript{423}

In sum, there is now no evidence that recesses may once have accommodated the temporary wooden sepulchres, or played a part in the \textit{Visitatio Sepulchri}, but their modest occurrence in Leicestershire, and their standardised form and position indicates that they held some significance in their day. The fact that they are all of 'body' length, as can be seen in the following data, gathered from a few of the examples, and therefore much larger and lower than would be necessary or convenient as a receptacle for the Host, clearly indicates an association with the dead.

It is thus difficult to disagree with Christopher Herbert's appraisal, and we should be
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wary of church guide-books that refer to all recesses as Easter sepulchres.
CHAPTER 13 - IMAGE NICHES AND BRACKETS
CHAPTER 13

IMAGE NICHES AND BRACKETS

In any survey of parochial ecclesiastical architecture it is easy to examine the visual aspect and forget the psychology that underlies it. An understanding of the attitudes of the Church and mediaeval society towards imagery enables the reader to appreciate the true significance of the fragments of niches and brackets now surviving in many of our churches. In an age before the advent of printing, written sources were precious and circulated amongst the few who could read them, and so were to be found mainly in religious houses and universities. That such sources were used by the priest-hood in instructing their congregations, is a view supported by Phillip Lindley, who states that:

“Preachers taught that God wrought miracles through the intercession of saints. The number of saints in late-medieval England dramatically increased, often to cater for specific ailments or requests. The most popular means of accessing saints’ intercession were through their relics or, more commonly, by devoutly praying before their images. [...] The appeal of images was made all the greater when they were as potently naturalistic as sculpture became in the later middle ages.”

Oral instruction was supported by visual images in stained glass, mural painting, stone and wood. These provided a permanent reminder of Church teaching, and it was only when some basic tenets of the Christian faith were abandoned or re-shaped, that imagery became the victim of iconoclasm.

Imagery performed several functions which could apply to parish as well as to

greater churches. The most common function was devotional, and Richard Marks citing Ringbom, says:

“Devotional images are simply distinguished from the liturgical and didactical compositions of ecclesiastical decoration by their intended functions in connection with private edification, prayer and meditation.”\(^{425}\)

Cult images, on the other hand, were related to specific sites associated with shrines and therefore pilgrimages, such as Walsingham or Canterbury, and thus applied less to parish churches, although occasionally, the relics of a local saint were venerated in a parish church as at Chittlehampton, in Devon, which housed the remains of St. Urith.\(^{426}\)

The concept of Purgatory, introduced in the 13th century, was one whereby it was believed that the passage of the soul through Purgatory could be eased and shortened through invocation to intercessors. J. T. Rosenthal states how:

“More and more of the church's efforts were devoted to teaching the living what they could do for the dead […] Popular religion largely focused on this one chapter in the entire corpus of Christian belief.”\(^{427}\)

In spite of the early introduction of this concept, I believe that it had only marginal relevance to the status of images and their supports, which latter, form the subject of this chapter. Nearly all documentary references to Purgatory in Eamon Duffy's book are either 15th or 16th century, perhaps partly because he is setting the scene immediately before the iconoclasm of the mid-16th century, but also because there is a dearth of pre-15th century records.\(^{428}\) Furthermore, the invocation Sancta [a Saint]

\(^{426}\) ibid, p. 199.
*Ora Pro Nobis*, which appears on a few surviving paintings, but more commonly on church bells, seeks intercession for the suppliant rather than for the dead. A chantry, which was a Mass for the dead, and hence for the ease of the soul through Purgatory, did not necessarily require the intercessory aid of an image.

I suggest that what was far more important was devotion to the Virgin, which became increasingly common throughout the 13th century, the earliest surviving *in situ* image of the Virgin and Child being in the form of a mural at Shelfanger, in Norfolk. c.1260-1280.\(^429\)

Leicestershire has the third highest percentage of Marian dedications amongst English counties;\(^430\) thirty-nine of the Leicestershire churches surveyed are dedicated to St. Mary, and in fact this relatively low proportion out of the large number of churches surveyed may be explained by the fact that the Virgin remained largely an image of *personal* devotion, whereas the patronal saint was the image of *parochial* devotion. Richard Marks reminds us of a mid 13th-century campaign to ensure that all churches were dedicated.

"Many churches remained undedicated in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and a legatine council held in London in 1237 decreed that all such buildings had to be hallowed within two years. [...] The Council of London spurred Bishop Robert Grosseteste into action: in 1238-40 he is chronicled as dedicating numerous churches in his Lincoln diocese."\(^431\)

One of the results of the London council may well have been the proliferation of virtually unknown saints, male and female, who are the dedicatees of so many Devon
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and Cornish churches, indeed, one such remote saint is even remembered in Leicestershire, at the church of St. Egelwin, Scalford. The inclusion of other saints, in addition to the patronal saint, enabled the faithful to open a path to God covering practically every eventuality of daily life, from travel to child-birth, and from plague to tooth-ache.

What Leicestershire does retain, is ample architectural evidence, in the form of niches and brackets, of the increasing veneration of images during the 14th century, even though the cult of images did not reach its highest level until the 15th century. By the 14th century, however, emphasis was beginning to shift from a need for mural aids for Biblical or doctrinal teaching, to a growing dependence upon the intercessory powers of the saints.

Freedberg reminds us of the words of Gregory the Great that:

"[...] when you see an image of Him you are inflamed in your soul with love for Him whose picture you wish to see. We do no harm in wishing to show the invisible by means of the visible."\(^{432}\)

The danger of such intercession was that it could be seen as idolatrous, and one that was to have disastrous consequences in the 16th and 17th centuries.

Whilst the 14th century came well before the periods of iconoclasm, the results of such destruction are obvious in many Leicestershire churches, with their empty niches and brackets. It is sufficient to say that the covering of murals, the extinguishing of lights, the destruction of images, stained glass and rood-lofts and the revision of the liturgy, have left so many of our mediaeval churches as pale images of their former glory; to experience
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'mediaeval splendour', one now has to visit some of the High Victorian Anglo-Catholic churches, as may be found in parts of London or Brighton.

If both primary and secondary sources lead to an understanding of the functions of imagery and mediaeval doctrinal practices, there is little documentary evidence to inform us as to how the parishioner of the late 13th and early 14th century responded. For such information we need to look beyond our period. Records from the pre-printing age which were, and still are in many cases, hand written, were church-wardens' records, and few give a more intimate insight into the religious observances of a small country parish than the quite remarkable accounts kept, not by the church-wardens of Morebath, but by the rector, Sir (Father) Christopher Trychay, between 1520 and 1574.433

The records of this north Devon parish give a clear insight into the importance of imagery and of the measures taken by the villagers to maintain the lights kept burning before the images. The different polychrome images in St. George's church are listed, and we are informed that lights were maintained before most of them.434 Similar lists are provided by Richard Marks,435 whilst a personal survey has revealed almost as many image niches and brackets in Oakham church, Rutland, as are recorded at the much smaller church at Morebath. Father Trychay's records also reveal the means of income and the persons responsible for maintaining the lights, as well as the sources for the materials.436

Although this valuable account records events over two centuries later than my own period of study, the surviving physical evidence in Leicestershire churches which I shall now review, suggests that the approach to imagery may have been very
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little different.

Since scarcely any Romanesque work survives in Leicestershire, it follows that the Biblical teaching that is common to tympana and some shafts is rare. There is the tympanum depicting St. Michael and the Dragon, now placed in the west side of the north porch at Hallaton, and the shafts forming the responds of the chancel arch at Stoke Dry, in Rutland, whilst other surviving tympana, such as that in the south door at Horninghold, have no figurative sculpture.

A few examples of the types of niches and brackets under discussion, and the various sites which they occupy, will serve as a general introduction. Commencing with external niches, the west front, generally of towers, often contains a niche which would almost certainly have held the figure of the dedicatory saint. Some niches take the form of a simple recess within the face of the wall, as on the tower at Slawston (Fig.13/1), where the trefoiled opening is set beneath a plain hood-mould with stops. If we examine the chamfer, we notice that the head of the trefoil terminates in a very slight ogee, an indication that the work may be c.1300. In contrast, other niches could project from the wall on a canopied bracket. The example on the tower at Norton-juxta-Twycross (Fig.13/2), almost certainly contains the vestiges of the original figure. The church is dedicated to the Holy Trinity; the figure which is in an advanced state of decay, makes it almost impossible to determine whether this was a Trinity; certainly there appears to be no trace of a crucifix. The canopy, with crockets and finial, is clearly later than the Slawston example, and may be dated c. 1320. Given the almost total destruction of imagery, we may wonder at the survival of this figure; however, such images could survive on a tower face, where the position was too high and difficult to reach.

On towerless facades, niches might be placed on either side of a west window,
as at Noseley Chapel (Fig.13/3). The window is a 15th-century insertion into the west wall of this former collegiate chapel that was completed c.1306.437 The trefoiled heads of the niches without ogees bear comparison with Slawston. It is interesting to note the coloured banding of limestone and ironstone, clearly a Northamptonshire influence.

The fine porch at Gedney in Lincolnshire (Fig.13/4) contains three niches. These are recessed as are the examples at Slawston and Noseley, but the canopies have ogees and finials. The south porch at Hungarton (Fig.13/5) has a small canopied niche with pinnacles, set above the hood mould of the door, the figure is obviously not original. What is interesting is the small recess to the east of the niche. Evidence, discussed in Chapter 8, suggests that this porch may have been brought from the dissolved abbey of St. Mary de Pratis, in Leicester. If it originally had an upper chamber, the aperture could have contained a light placed at floor level from within, or a relief of a kneeling donor.

Another external position for imagery was either within or on east gables. At Arnesby (Fig.13/6), there are the remains of a priestly figure, wearing a chasuble and in the act of blessing. This is in the gable of the east end of the chancel, although the canopy is clearly a modern installation.

Buttresses also provided sites for niches, as at Pickwell (Fig.13/7). All of the south aisle buttresses have these features, and they may have been part of the 15th-century building programme associated with the fine west tower. Certainly the crocketted and panelled pinnacles suggest 15th-century work, yet we are again reminded of the regular use of earlier elements by the trefoiled gablets and recesses. Amongst the finest buttress niches to be found in Leicestershire are those towards the

west end of the south aisle at Gaddesby (Fig.13/8). Here the niche has shafts with the high quality foliated capitals, supporting gables on three sides. Above the niche is a canopy with a nodding ogee, whilst everywhere there are crockets and finials. This work is comparable with that of the Lady Chapel at Ely, which may be dated c.1320-1340.

Whilst Leicestershire has no examples, imagery on spires was not uncommon. At Grantham (Fig.13/9) small figures are set beneath canopies at the apex of each broach on the 14th-century spire.

Turning to internal niches, as with external examples, similar forms may be found. Thus we find a plain recess within the wall, as at Empingham in Rutland (Fig.13/10). The simple, moulded ogee within the chancel has neither hood-mould nor cusps, whilst the more elaborate form with vaulted canopy and pinnacles at Pickwell (Fig.13/11), bears witness to the large scale of some images.

Occasionally, images were set within niches cut within a pillar, as at Whissendine in Rutland (Fig.13/12). Almost certainly an altar would have been set against the pillar, and the figure would have formed a reredos. This simple recess retains original colouring, whilst the two brackets were probably supports for lights.

Brackets were, of course, a much cheaper way of providing accommodation for images, and these, which are often only shattered fragments, survive in many churches. They were often supported by a figure, as at Langham in Rutland (Fig.14/13), where this example may be found on the south side of a former altar in the north aisle.

EXTERNAL NICHE

Returning to examine image niches in more detail, those on towers could take
various forms. Whilst the small niche set above the bell-stage windows in the gable of
the former church at Brentingby (Fig.13/14) has only a trefoiled ogee head, the
similarly small niche on the tower at Husbands Bosworth (Fig.13/15) has a cusped
ogee set beneath a crocketted gable, with supporting pinnacles. This form of an ogee
within a gable is also to be found in some piscinas, reminding us that the motifs used
in micro-architecture of the 14th century could apply equally to suit different
purposes. A simpler, if larger version of the Husbands Bosworth example, may be
seen at Arnesby (Fig.13/16). In both examples, the stonework is set into the main
structure and does not conform to the courses either of the ashlar in the former, or the
coursed rubble in the latter. At Arnesby, the edges of the vertical elements come out to
a point, a feature that we shall encounter shortly when discussing the image niches
associated with the west porch at Melton Mowbray. The sloping base at Arnesby,
would doubtless have contained a pedestal to support the image, both of which are
now long gone.

Some niches are grouped in threes on a few towers. Those at Oakham in
Rutland (Fig.13/17), have the simple chamfer mouldings with trefoiled ogee heads
beneath hood-moulds with stops and finials, and set within the tower face. Apart from
the introduction of finials and a more pronounced ogee, these openings are virtually
identical with the example at Slawston (Fig.13/1). The group at Market Bosworth
(Fig.13/18) is more elaborate, with brackets and nodding ogee canopies. Here, it may
be seen quite clearly, on the lower niches, that the shafts, at any rate, are an integral
part of the ashlar.

Where niches appear as a continuous triple group, comparison might be made
of the examples at Empingham in Rutland (Fig.13/19), and Market Harborough
(Fig.13/20). Both are vaulted, and whilst the Empingham group has only lateral
pinnacles supported on heads, with clustered shafts and foliated capitals, the Market
Harborough group has buttress pinnacles throughout, together with crocketted gables
with finials. Dating is problematical, but within the first quarter of the 14th century is
likely for both examples.

For an extensive display of image niches, we must go to Grantham in
Lincolnshire (Fig.13/21), where they are spread across the buttresses and walls of the
lower stages of the tower. That the construction period is 14th century is obvious from
the intersecting tracery and lavish use of ball-flower, yet the concept of a facade of
images could owe something to the screen wall at Wells or Salisbury, and we
remember that Grantham was a prebend of Salisbury.438

Dealing still with facades, the provision for imagery on porches takes various
forms. The south porch at Kibworth (Fig.13/22), has a cinquefoiled, crocketted ogee
niche, the base of which is supported on three heads, reminiscent of work we have
noted at Kirby Bellars. The gabled pinnacles stand above 'V' shaped shafts, which
latter appear to be a particular feature of some 14th-century niches. This may be
compared with that above the north porch at Foxton (Fig.13/23), which is all part of a
major Perpendicular rebuilding. The trefoiled head reminds us that such a motif really
belongs to no architectural style in particular; the simplest decoration that one can put
within a Gothic arch, other than a plain chamfer, is a pair of cusps, thus forming a
trefoil.

The, by now, familiar type of tall canopied niche, with supporting shafts and
pinnacles, appeared everywhere during the 14th century, both externally and
internally; it became as familiar a receptacle for imagery as the triple crocketted ogee
sedilia became an adjunct to the Mass. A pair of niches remain on the gatehouse at

438 M. Pointer, The Glory of Grantham: The Story of St. Wulfram's Church, Grantham:
Maxstoke priory in Warwickshire (Fig.13/24). Lights burning within the central window of the upper chamber would have drawn the attention of guests to the two images.

The shallow depth of many niches indicate that only the visible parts of the figures were detailed; there would have been little point in setting up complete figures that were not seen in the round.

A rare survival is the damaged Trinity set within the niche above the south porch at Welbourn in Lincolnshire (Fig.13/25). Here, the triple, vaulted canopy emphasises the Trinity, and in spite of the erosion, it is possible to see that a richly foliated base separates the two heads supporting the buttress pinnacles.

As with the gatehouse at Maxstoke, so the south porch at Misterton (Fig.13/26), reveals a niche on either side of the central window of the upper chamber. Although it is difficult to determine, due to weathering, the base ledges may have been decorated with vine-leaf. A more elaborate arrangement takes the form of three niches on the upper chamber of the south porch at Oundle, in Northants (Fig.13/27). Here, the ogee canopies are set beneath flat, castellated cornices, whilst the detail is typical of the decoration also found in wooden stall canopies. The vocabulary of Decorated was constantly reproduced in different media - stone, wood, metal, stained glass and fabric.

Where triple canopies survive, one can only surmise as to the hierarchy of imagery within them; possibly Christ in the centre, with the Virgin and patronal saint on either side. Alternatively, the three niches may have accommodated a Rood; in instances where the larger central niche, as at Empingham and Market Bosworth, would have allowed space for a Crucifix.

Two important Leicestershire porches illustrate subtle differences in
decoration. Scalford and Melton Mowbray are in close proximity, and there are
indications that both porches may be contemporary and from the same hands. At
Scalford, the south porch has niches above the door and within the side buttresses.
The three niches above the door (Fig.13/28) are set beneath canopies which are
nodding ogees. Above the central canopy is set a shallow gable containing a trilobe
decoration, which also occurs on all three canopies; there is also evidence of crockets
and finials. Beneath all three niches runs a line of moulding which, at first sight, may
appear to have been re-used material from elsewhere, because of the three unequal
lengths of stone. However, close examination reveals that the outer lengths of
decoration match and extend over the last section of the central stone and the right-
hand stone, whilst there is a different moulding which runs along much of the central
stone and extends slightly onto the end of the left-hand stone. Thus, mouldings and
niches form a symmetrical ensemble. It is when we come to examine the buttress
niches that we find completely different forms. The left-hand (West) niche (Fig.13/29)
has a nodding ogee canopy, which has a gable on the main face with crockets and a
finial. Above this rises a shallow trefoiled gable, similar to that above the central
niche over the main door, but with the addition of pinnacles, which are panelled and
set diagonally. Here also are crockets and finials. The right-hand (East) niche
(Fig.13/30) is less elaborate, having a nodding ogee, with crockets and finial, but
without a gable. Similarly, there is a shallow gable above the canopy, also with
crocks, but now with a trilobe and without pinnacles. Both niches have attached
shafts with remnants of bases and capitals. We have to ask whether the difference is
the result of accidental whim on the part of the mason or is this part of a more
purposeful scheme? I am inclined to think that it is not part of a whim or anything to
do with different masons, but that it had everything to do with variety as well as a
purposeful scheme.

Turning now to the grand west porch at Melton Mowbray, the finest porch in Leicestershire, and architecturally perhaps the finest feature of what is an impressive church, the image niches on the west front may bear comparison with any to be found in England. There are pairs on either side of the outer west door, which differ in size, style and decoration, although they form symmetrical pairs. If we examine the pair on the right-hand (South) side of the central door, the niche closest to the door (Fig.13/31) has a nodding ogee canopy with crockets and finial, with large carved lion heads supporting pinnacles set diagonally, each with crockets and finial, whilst between them rises a shallow gable, also with crockets and finial. The outer niche (Fig.13/32) has an internal height approximately half that of the example just described. Again, there is a nodding ogee canopy which rises into a large pinnacle with crockets and finial. There are also side pinnacles set diagonally, but these are more substantial. Both niches are vaulted (Fig.13/33), and, as has been noted on several previous examples, the supporting shafts are 'V' shaped, but at Melton they are richly diapered in form, similar to that on the pulpitum at Lincoln cathedral. The niches stand on a moulded string course. As at Scalford, we have niches different in form; the fact that the Melton examples, c.1330, are far richer in decoration does not mean necessarily that they are later because the Decorated style has 'progressed'. It is a question of the finance available, and Melton was obviously a prosperous market town, as may be seen from the major alterations carried out in the 15th century by the townspeople with the addition of the great clerestory of 48 windows above nave and transepts, and the final stage of the central tower.

Niches at east ends, either within a gable or set above it, are rare in the county, but in addition to the example already quoted at Arnesby (Fig.13/6), a figure survives
above the east gable of the north aisle at Evington (Fig.13/34). Here, the niche has gables on three sides which have crockets and finials. The whole feature is now badly weathered, and it is likely that other examples throughout the county have disappeared completely, given the exposed position and the considerable amount of rebuilding of gables that took place in the late 19th century.

There are several interesting examples of buttress niches throughout the county. We have already observed those on the south aisle at Pickwell (Fig.13/7), and as has been noted before, there is no obvious 'progression' in the style or detail. Whilst a trefoil may be the simplest way of decorating the interior of a head, it may occur with or without an ogee; it may also occur regardless of hood-moulds, gables, crockets or finials. The niche in the south-east buttress of the south aisle at Lutterworth (Fig.13/35), has a trefoil without hood-mould or any other decoration. That on the north-west buttress of the north aisle at Sleaford in Lincolnshire (Fig.13/36), also has a trefoil, but with a gable richly decorated with crockets, a finial and supporting heads. A niche within a buttress on the south aisle at Castle Donington (Fig.13/37), uses a simple concave moulding with a plain head beneath a plain shallow gable, but with an elaborately moulded pedestal. The two niches set in the south-east buttress of the south aisle at Coston (Fig.13/38), employ ogee heads, one quite plain, the other containing a trefoil, both with undecorated hood-moulds. The important decoration at Coston is not the niches, but the bands of trailing vine-leaf above the upper niche, and between the two, the latter band extends the length of the aisle both inside and out.

Having noticed the tower niche at Arnesby (Fig.13/17), the chancel buttresses of the superb Decorated chancel at Claybrooke (Fig.13/39) are also provided with sloping bases, but in this case the pedestals survive. Here, the trefoiled ogee, with its
richly carved head, is surmounted by a crocketted gable, but, as so often, we are reminded that the elements of the Decorated style did not mean conformity of use. Comparison with the example on the south porch at Welbourn in Lincolnshire (Fig.13/40), demonstrates that gables, crockets, ogees and pedestals are used, but in slightly different ways. At Welbourn there is a nodding ogee supported on moulded shafts with capitals, whilst the gable is supported on carved heads. The lavish use of decoration on both examples suggests that the necessary finances were equally available, but the Welbourn example is perhaps indicative of the generally superior Decorated work of Lincolnshire.

What has been observed from an examination of the most recent examples, is that by the late-Decorated period, of around 1340-50, the interiors of niches have become semi-circular in section; this is quite different from the earlier square form, as seen at Lutterworth (Fig.13/35). By constructing a semi-circular form which embraced the figure, a more even light would be reflected onto it, thus avoiding very deep shadows in the inner corners; this would have been an important consideration when all figures would have been polychrome.

Examples of niches on the diagonal buttresses of towers are fairly rare, only one example surviving in Leicestershire. This is at the base of the south-west tower buttress at Ashby Magna (Fig.13/41). Set low down immediately above the base moulding, this seems more likely to have been an image niche than either a light receptacle or a stoup, for which latter purpose it is much too low and not set at an entrance. In spite of the badly weathered condition, we can still make out that there was an ogee crocketted hood-mould. More complete examples survive at the top of the buttresses of the Perpendicular tower at Bilton in Warwickshire (Fig.13/42), where, by standing out on a pedestal and beneath a nodding ogee canopy, the figure
could have appeared as more rounded and realistic.

A few churches have large polygonal clasping buttresses which provide scope for imagery. We have already seen the example at Asfordby (Fig.13/9), whilst the main facade of the west porch at Melton Mowbray has also been discussed, but this porch terminates with large polygonal buttresses, both of which contain niches. These generally use the decorative forms to be found on the small, outer niches on the west face of the porch, yet again, there are very slight differences. The niche in Fig.13/32 is provided simply with cusps and a finial; the same features on the buttress niches (Figs.13/43 and 13/44) have panelling on the sides of the central pinnacles; moreover, the bases of these niches are supported on a mixture of heads and fleurons, suggesting, again, a hierarchy of images that differed from those on the porch facade.

The north aisle at Hallaton (Fig.13.45), terminates with a large polygonal north-east buttress that provides a complete gallery of niches. Above the niches are projecting shields with the arms of the Bardolf and Engaine families. Nichols informs us that there was a similar buttress that was demolished on September 7th, 1637, but does not inform us of its original position. The panelled pinnacles, together with the quatrefoil parapet suggest a late date, almost proto-Perpendicular, and whilst polygonal buttresses may be found on the Early English tower at West Walton, in Norfolk, the form is associated far more with the Perpendicular period. The influence for both Melton and Hallaton could have come from Sleaford, where the west ends of both aisles terminate in large polygonal buttresses (Fig.11/46).

To complete the survey of external niches, whilst Leicestershire has no examples of spire niches, important examples survive at Grantham in Lincolnshire.

---

439 G. F. Farnham, 'The Descent of the Manor', *T.L.A.S.*, Vol.XIII, 1923-24, pp. 144-151. This gives an account of the families with their pedigrees. Other than the fact that members of the Bardolph and Engaine families lived throughout the 14th century, there is little to provide dating for the north aisle.

(Fig.13/9), and at Gedling in Nottinghamshire (Fig.13.47), where they form terminations to the broaches, whilst those at Ketton in Rutland (Fig.13/48), stand simply on pedestals at the termination of the ribbed broach.

**INTERNAL NICHES AND BRACKETS**

As with external examples, a variety of forms make up the heads of niches, as may be seen in the next six examples. There is an ogee head in the south transept at Kegworth (Fig.13/49), whilst a tre-foiled head surmounted by crockets may be found on the north-west face of the chancel arch at Bottesford (Fig.13.50). This may have contained a figure of the Virgin, thus making one available for veneration by members of the congregation, for it was not unusual to have Marian images in both chancel and nave.441 The example at Gumley (Fig.13/51), is hollowed out of the eastern respond of the south nave arcade, and although it reflects nothing of architectural merit, it does retain much original colouring.

An fine example survives at Stockerston (Fig.13/52), where a stair turret was inserted in the north-east corner of the south aisle, giving access to a rood-loft. This is a Perpendicular addition, and the niche is placed immediately above the entrance to the stair. Given that the Rood would have comprised the usual three figures, one wonders whether this stair turret figure could have had some relevance to the Passion, such as a figure with the Five Wounds.

Whilst internal images tended to be associated mainly with altars, some were simply placed nearby in an east wall, whilst others formed a more integral part of the scheme. At Blaby (Fig.13/53), there survives a niche that was clearly associated with a reredos. In the south aisle, the two recesses are linked by hood-moulds, each with a

---
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finial, and terminal stops; the mouldings are the same throughout, and this side altar would have been dedicated to a particular saint; possibly it was a Lady chapel. There is now no evidence to indicate as to whether the larger recess contained a painting or figurative sculpture. In a similar way, there is a large recess in the east wall of the south transept at Langham in Rutland (Fig.13/54) is supported on either side by small cinquefoiled ogee recesses. The different styles might suggest different constructional periods, yet examination reveals that the stones read through, and the different elements of the ensemble are clearly contemporary. The central trefoiled arch must obviously have contained some form of reredos, but it is debatable as to whether the side niches were for lights or figures. From their scale, it seems most likely that they contained figures.

Of considerable importance are the remains to be seen at Claybrooke. Whilst the majority of niches are additions set into earlier walls, at Claybrooke there is the rare opportunity of examining a complete Decorated chancel; this is a total concept clearly based on the attitudes towards the faith and the liturgy in 14th-century England. On the north and south walls, between the windows were pinnacled and gabled niches, of which the scars remain following their destruction (Fig.13/55). Their positions have been further mutilated by the insertion of later mural tablets. At the east end of the chancel, niches were also arranged on either side of the window, and it may be seen how they were devised as part of the total ensemble where stops remain on part of the main window moulding (Fig.13/56). On all niches, fragments of internal colouring survive.

There are several examples of niches on either side of an altar which differ in detail, as has been observed at Frisby in Chapter 3. It might be considered logical to produce a matching pair; since this is not the case, an explanation needs to be sought
Examination of the two niches in the east wall at Marston St. Lawrence in Northants, is an example of this situation; the north niche (Fig.13/57) is more elaborately detailed than that on the south (Fig.13/58). That on the north has twin ogee gables, whilst that on the south has a single nodding ogee. Again, by comparing the two niches in the east wall at Grafton Underwood in Northants, the the northern one is more elaborate than that on the south. That on the north side (Fig.13/59) appears to have provision in the lower left corner for accommodating a light, if not in fact in the upper aperture, although at such a height, maintaining a light by means of a ladder would hardly have been convenient. The south niche (Fig.13/60), has no such provision, but we note the small window cut into the south wall to throw light directly onto the image. Does this suggest that perhaps some northern niches, and therefore their figures, were accorded a higher status, as indeed burial on the north side of an altar was considered to be? Richard Marks points out that a north niche was more important than that on the south; it contained the image of the patronal saint, whilst that of the Virgin was placed on the south if she was not the patronal saint, an arrangement which, apparently, could be traced back as early as 1240.\footnote{Marks, p.61} This establishes that different images were not all placed in niches of a standard pattern. By according each figure its own style of niche, even though the decorative differences may have been small, this surely gave an individual identity to that figure, whose setting could not be confused with that of a different image. This is surely the interpretation of Christ's teaching: “In my house are many mansions” (John, 14, v.2).

Before moving on to deal with image brackets, there is clear evidence of a niche that incorporates a light receptacle in the now redundant church at Blatherwycke, in Northants. (Fig. 13/61) There are gabled image niches on either side
of the chancel altar and each has a small light niche placed on the side nearest the east window. It is perhaps this example that resonates most strongly with Sir Christopher Trychay and the 'voices of Morebath'. Momentarily, we can look beyond the empty shell of a fragment of Decorated micro-architecture and visualise not just the colour and the lights, but the wardens, the sheep and the bee-hives that supported it all.443

Numerous Leicestershire churches reveal the scars of former image brackets, but few survive as more than badly damaged examples. The remains do not compare favourably with surviving examples in adjoining counties. Perhaps this may be attributed to the fact that it is obviously much easier to smash a small bracket off a wall than it is to in-fill a large image recess, but also we should remember that the county was very much a centre of Lollardy.444

In the north aisle at Edmondthorpe, both supporting head and bracket have been smashed (Fig.13/62). As supports for image brackets, carved heads abound in Leicestershire. Since they also appear as stops to the hood-moulds of many arcades, windows, piscinas and sedilia; as corbels supporting roof timbers and wall-plates and take the place of many arcade responds, they provide a valuable subject for a separate study. One such head may be found at Eaton (Fig.13/63), where a simple but cheerful face seems to express pleasure at the honour of supporting the particular image that is now lost. A more elaborate example survives at the east end of the south aisle at Stoke Golding (Fig.13/64). Here, as at Eaton, whilst the bracket itself has been destroyed, the supporting head survives, for the obvious reason that this did not form part of the 'idolatry'. It was figures that could be associated directly with 'idolatry' that were defaced, if they could not be removed entirely. The outstanding example of such iconoclasm is the de-facing of the figurative sculpture in the 14th-century Lady
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Chapel at Ely, but there are many others.

The fact that imagery spoke to all levels of society is reflected in the status of the figures that supported the brackets. At Leadenham, in Lincolnshire, we find a simple peasant supporting a bracket in the south aisle (Fig.13/65), whilst on either side of the altar at Woodborough in Northants (Figs.13/66 and 13/67), the brackets are supported by a king and queen. It is possible that perhaps the king supported the figure of Christ, or St Swithun, the dedicatory saint, whilst that of the queen supported the Virgin.

CONCLUSION

Having examined in Chapter 11, the fittings necessary to the priest and the Mass, in the form of piscinae and sedilia, this chapter has concentrated on fittings necessary, not to the exclusive performance of the liturgy, but to a mind-state that affected every believer in the 14th-century. As we have seen, the veneration of images was a natural part of the process of supporting daily life as well as preparing to die well, for which latter purpose there were specially prepared manuals - the *Ars Moriendi*. For imagery, it was natural that the aids to such a mind-state, one that we have now very largely forsaken, should be housed in forms that befitted their status. Many of the examples that have been discussed, remind us yet again, that the Decorated style is not a purely constructional form, any more than were the Early English or Perpendicular styles, but perhaps more than either of these, the Decorated was an all-embracing concept that was intended to take the mind into something far deeper than architecture.

---
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BALL-FLOWER AND TRAILING FOLIAGE DECORATION

Since the ball-flower ornament was used extensively, though not exclusively during the 14th century, it has sometimes come to be regarded as synonymous with the Decorated style, and we should consider the justification for its frequent occurrence.

For a long time, I have considered the shape to be that of a bell rather than a flower, and thus its description is a misnomer. It has been encouraging, therefore, to discover that Pamela Tudor-Craig shares a similar view. The generally accepted definition may be quoted as:

“An ornament or moulding in the form of a round flower with three petals forming the cup. It belongs to the Decorated period of English architecture.”

Tudor-Craig surely comes to a more accurate description, when she posits:

“Does it not more closely resemble that small circular bell with an opening admitting of holes not quite large enough to allow the little ball within it to escape, but intended to release its tinkle.” She concludes: “The high tinkle of the sanctus bell, in particular, rings out at the holiest moments in the Mass. The term ‘ball-flower’ is the product, like ‘stiff-leaf’, of the nineteenth-century classifiers. It is at least possible that the ‘ball-flower’ is in fact the bell.”

Whilst Rickman does not actually use the term ‘ball-flower’ the implication is clear when he states that:

“An ornament almost as peculiar to the Decorated style as the toothed

448 Tudor-Craig, p.18.
ornament to the Early English, is a small round bud of three or four leaves, which open just enough to show a ball in the centre; this is generally placed in a hollow moulding, and has a beautiful effect.\textsuperscript{449}

The bell of which Tudor-Craig writes but does not name, is the \textit{crotal}. These small bells have been in use throughout parts of Asia, India, China and the Near East for millenia, and are still used on the dress of dancers, as well as occasionally on horses.\textsuperscript{450} The many illustrations of these bells, generally associated with angels, which may be seen in mediaeval manuscripts, stained glass, paintings and wood-carving, clearly demonstrate that their use was common in the Christian Church, common, not just in the theory of theology but in practice, since they may be found alongside such well-known instruments as rebecs, psalteries, shawms and portative organs.

The many architectural examples vary from realistic representations of a crotal, with three apertures and the ball of the clapper in the centre, to somewhat nondescript globular features. Very frequently they are associated with trailing foliage, although the latter generally occurs as a separate band within an arch or along a wall-plate. This foliage, is occasionally called ‘sea-weed’ decoration, but the more common term is ‘vine-leaf’. The motif is also synonymous with the Decorated style, but is less common than ‘ball-flower’, and the two would be a permanent reminder of the Mass. The vine represents Christ’s words: “I am the True Vine.” (St. John, Ch.15, v.1) The wine representing Christ’s blood was elevated at the Consecration, to the accompaniment of the Sanctus bell, and the ringing of small bells within the sanctuary. Both ornaments may therefore be symbolically important, the bells (ball-flower) around doors and windows, emphasising not only the Mass, but a sense of

\textsuperscript{449} Rickman, p.82.
euphoria upon entering God’s house, and the vine, a reminder of the sacrifice of Christ.

Richard Morris makes several points in his paper:

"Ever since Rickman, ballflower has rightly been regarded as peculiar to the Decorated style just as dogtooth is to Early English."[...]
"Visually its purpose is not just to impress through ostentation, but to break up the lines of architecture and to dematerialize the fabric."[...]
"Whether it is a representational carving is unlikely ever to be proven, but analogies with foliage decoration, such as the stylized rosebud, or even with bells on animal collars are probably not far off the mark."[...]
"It should be realised that there is no intrinsic development within ballflower ornament to supply a scheme for dating."451

Morris suggests that the earliest appearance of ball-flower in England may have been in a lost Court work, such as Michael of Canterbury's Cheapside Cross. It then moved to his work at the Wells Chapter House, and thence to Hereford by c.1310452.

Certainly, the most prolific use of the ball-flower is to be found in the west Midlands, particularly in Herefordshire, where the great central tower of the cathedral is encrusted with them, whilst Ledbury and Leominster also provide fine examples. In seeking a source for Leicestershire ball-flower is not easy. It may have been introduced from the west Midlands, or from the east via Lincolnshire, or from both directions. The fact is that the lack of development in ball-flower, thus making it difficult to date, also means that there are no regional distinctions which help to

suggest a source.

The very nature of ball-flower indicates that such work was time-consuming and therefore an expensive exercise. The ornament had to be set within a sunk quadrant moulding, and the amount of stone that had to be reduced between each ‘flower’ was considerable. Almost certainly, the patron would decide on how heavily or lightly the amount of ornament was used, since there would have been a set price per length. According to Morris, a foreman-mason at Hereford Cathedral stated that it took him about three hours to carve a ball-flower, and this did not include preparation of the stone or the cutting of the moulding. This suggested the cutting of three ball-flowers in a working day.453

Turning now to some examples, a common place for the use of ball-flower decoration is on the underside of hood-moulds. At Willoughby Waterless (Fig.14/1), an intersecting window in the south wall of the chancel has rather poor representations, where somewhat meaningless balls with three holes, can scarcely be called either flowers or bells, and the central ball is almost non-existent. Nevertheless, such decoration clearly comes within the definition of ball-flower. It seems that there are basically two versions of ball-flower:- this ‘closed’ type, as found at Willoughby, whilst a more defined ‘open’ version exists on the great west window at Melton Mowbray (Fig.14/2). This is not a development, thus contradicting what I have previously said, but is clearly a reflection on the skill of the mason, and possibly of cost. At Melton, well defined balls sit independently within the centre of the enclosing ‘petals’, if one wishes to think of the motif as a flower, or more likely a clapper within the bell. In crotals, the clapper was attached to a small chain or rod, so that it did not fly out of the opening, or roll around like a pea in a whistle.

More elaborately decorated windows had ball-flower not only within the hood-mould but down the jambs, as at Whissendine, in Rutland (Fig.14/3). The square-headed reticulated window in the south aisle at Ashby Folville (Fig.14/4), has a profusion of the ornament on both jambs and hood-mould, again of the 'closed' type, and we see the same decoration extending along the wall-plate.

Both the intersecting window at Ashby Folville (Fig.14/5), and the ‘proto-Perpendicular’ window in the south transept at Langham in Rutland (Fig.14/6). As has been observed several times, decorative motifs and a particular typology could freely cross the artificial chronological boundaries established by 19th-century writers.

Of particular interest is the window in the south wall of the chancel of the little church at Shangton (Figs.14/7 and 14/8). There is trailing leaf ornament, now fragmentary, on the external hood-mould, and ball-flower around the rere-arch.

On two examples of doorways, at Medbourne (Fig.14/9) and Ringstead in Northamptonshire (Fig.14/10), each displays a single row of ball-flower the former being of the 'closed' type, whilst the 'open' type appears at Ringstead. It may be seen how easily this led to Rickman’s description,454 and could explain why, writing before the Oxford Movement of 1833-1845 and the introduction of High Anglicanism, any connection with bells might have been anathema.

The external use of ball-flower, other than as door or window decoration, may be seen in the next six examples. The former Augustinian priory, founded at Canons Ashby, in Northamptonshire c.1150 (Fig.14/11), has a fine 14th-century north-west tower where ball-flower appears on the chamfers of the bell-stage.

What may possibly be ball-flower, mixed with other motifs, survive in a badly eroded
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state beneath the tower parapet at Great Bowden (Fig.14/12). Rather more recognisable examples are set in a similar position at Eastwell (Fig.14/13). Here, the lip around the edges of the openings is pronounced, and given the proximity of Eastwell to Melton Mowbray, which has the identical form of ball-flower, we might assume that they are the work of the same hand.

Grantham, with its profusion of crockets on spire and pinnacles, is also well decorated with ball-flower, as may be seen from the bell-stage windows, but also on the parapet moulding where it continues around the base of the pinnacles (Fig.14/14). If ball-flower entered Leicestershire from Lincolnshire, the nearest influence for Melton would have been Grantham, which is only 15 miles distant. Ball-flower appears along the wall-plate of the north aisle at Edmondthorpe (Fig.14/15), and together with Asfordby, Ashby Folville, Easton, Gaddesby and Melton Mowbray, Edmondthorpe is one of a group of churches in the north-east of the county sharing this feature beneath parapets or roof lines. It is a motif that is certainly not prevalent in other parts of the county, and which is clearly not spontaneous genesis, but the ‘trade-mark’ of a particular mason or group of masons, perhaps copying at the request of some patrons. The inspiration may well have come from nearby Grantham.

Moving to three examples of internal decoration, we find 'open' type ball-flower around a capital at Thorpe Langton (Fig.14/16) and again on the remarkable chancel arch at Raunds in Northamptonshire (Fig.14/17); remarkable, because the thrust of the chancel arch against the apex of the aisle arch has to be taken by a large buttress inserted against its south respond. a clumsy, if ingenious arrangement. At Preston in Rutland, (Fig.14/18), the sill of the window to the east of the spectacular single sedile, has ball-flower of an elaborate form, in fact these are much closer to fleurons.

An example of how badly mediaeval features may be mis-read, is glaringly obvious in
the restoration of the east window of the north aisle at Oadby (Fig.14/19). On the upper right-hand section of the hood-mould, a mason, who obviously thought that ball-flowers were faces, has reproduced a ridiculous feature, which, combined with the trailing feature, looks like a tadpole (Fig.14/20)! What is of note, is the fact that here we have the same mediocre ball-flowers connected with simple trailing features as at Asfordby (Fig.14/12).

The final example of trailing, or continuous foliage may be seen at Coston (Fig.14/21). Here, the inner wall-plate of the south aisle has sections of foliated moulding, which have been poorly re-set. One might think that they have been installed from a different site, but comparison with the outer moulding, beneath the parapet of the same aisle (Fig.13/38), confirms that they are identical. This work may be compared with the equally lavish representation on the south aisle at Gaddesby (Fig.9/75).

**CONCLUSION**

We have seen what appear to be two types of ball-flower, what I have called the ‘open’ and ‘closed’ versions. The one is not an improved later version of the other, since the places where each occur are not necessarily later or earlier. The closed type is easier, and therefore cheaper to produce, in so far as less under-cutting is required, the clapper ball being non-existent as a separate feature. Could there be reasons for these differences other than economic? Quite definitely, the stone itself would have a bearing; some stones are more intractable, and it could depend upon whether the carving was done immediately or after the quarry ‘sap’ had dried out and the stone hardened. It could depend also on the skill of the mason; some of our examples have a distinctly rustic appearance compared with the professionalism of others. Ball-flower and trailing foliage were not mere decorative motifs, they were a further aspect of the
symbolism with which the 14th-century church was enriched.
CONCLUSION
CONCLUSION

This examination of the architectural details of a substantial number of parish churches within Leicestershire and the surrounding counties has enabled me to determine whether there was a relatively uniform building style within and across the period c.1260 – 1350. I have argued that whilst some writers regard the entire period as 'Decorated', and others subdivide it by considering 'Geometrical' as being the early stage before proceeding to a mature stage of 'flowing' Decorated, 'Geometrical' should be considered to be a distinctive style worthy of independent recognition. This is mainly because the various elements that clearly define 'Decorated', namely the ogee, crockets, mouchettes and ball-flower, do not appear before c. 1290, and, in the case of major churches, such buildings containing these motifs, and for which there is documentary dating, do not appear before that date. Early in this thesis, it was necessary to attempt a definition of the term 'Decorated' and to question whether the arguments set out in some of the existing literature on ecclesiastical architecture were in accord with the evidence gathered from my field surveys of nearly 300 churches.

The terminology in current use has gradually become part of the accepted vocabulary since Rickman and others produced the first serious classifications of English Gothic. As used by the early 19th-century writers, the term 'Geometric' may indeed ease us from Early English, and may therefore be considered by some as a transition into Decorated. In accepting that Geometric owes much to the Rayonnant, I do not agree with Bony that the Decorated as exemplified particularly in the second quarter of the 14th century, owes anything to this French style.

The introductory chapters established the foundations on which the practical surveys are based. The interpretation of Decorated architectural detail at parish church
level, based on the analyses of separate forms, resulting from the field studies, has, in some cases, challenged accepted thought. For example, the fact that the moulding evidence gathered from personal inspection suggests that templates appear not have been used for reproducing identical arcade mouldings within the same church, and, still less, within a group of churches. Templates may well have provided the masons with basic parameters within which they were expected to work. However, with few exceptions, the constant evidence of close similarity, but with the addition or omission of perhaps a single mould line, indicates that the use of a template as a mould would not have worked. As a consequence, mouldings will not by themselves - in this study area at least - indicate common authorship. This conclusion argues strongly against the view generally maintained and propounded in much of the literature, that templates, whilst essential aids to the accurate repetition of certain elements of work at cathedral level, were not so with regard to small village churches.

Some writers are cautious when ascribing dates without stating reasons, other than the lack of documentary evidence. Dating is not necessarily possible from a study of forms or details: for example, reticulated and intersecting tracery continued for a long period, as did the use of nail-head and dog-tooth ornament - an important reminder that typology does not always move hand in hand with chronology. In addition,, it would be correct to state that the recessed spire superseded the broach spire, but typologically it is not always possible to be certain of a 'progression' when it comes to recessed spires, with or without ribs, and with or without crockets. However, the fenestration of lucarnes provides an accurate guide to the transition from Decorated to Perpendicular, as, indeed, the additional Perpendicular bell-stages on a group of Leicestershire towers suggest an argument in favour of a 'school' of masons working within a distinct area. Even so, I have been wary of introducing the idea of
'schools' of masons; there is no secure documentary evidence for them, and the visual evidence rarely supports such a theory, whilst moulding evidence, as discussed above, does not prove common authorship.

Resulting from the detailed scrutiny of the field surveys has been the major discovery of the influence of William Ramsey at Ulverscroft Priory. The quatre-foil banding within the window embrasures of the choir clerestory which are identical with those in that of the presbytery at Lichfield cathedral, endorses the view of a Lichfield influence in the west of the county of Leicestershire, as well as the discovery of a hitherto unrecorded work by this important architect.

The use of smaller decorative motifs could create problems if one were seeking a Vasarian progression. It might be reasonable to assume that the corbel table and the arcaded corbel table gave way to the quatrefoil band beneath broach spires or tower parapets, but this would not necessarily be correct. Allowance must always be made for the spectacular example which, because of its 'cutting edge' individuality, establishes the more generally accepted form from which it breaks free, but for which, sadly, we have no details of masons' names or workshop.

I have pointed out the problems of typology in the fenestration of aisles in particular. The difference between relative position in typology and absolute date can be confusing. Whilst the arcade details of a given aisle may clearly suggest a 14th-century addition, the window tracery can sometimes suggest typologically earlier or later work. The fact that a window may be typologically of c.1320 does not necessarily mean that it was inserted then, and the huge variation of window types, often to be found in a single aisle wall, is clear evidence of this. I have shown that this could result from the whim of the patron or the mason, and there is no reason why an earlier form may not have remained popular within the vocabulary, as has become
evident from the use of nail-head and dog-tooth ornament. Furthermore, in most cases, there appears to be a clear distinction between a varied use of details in an architectural improvement, such as an aisle, and a unified total concept, in the total rebuilding of a chancel for example.

A significant discovery that has emerged from my study of window mouldings is that tracery heads, jambs and mullions may not necessarily be the work of the same masons; as with voussoirs and pier stones, jambs and mullions, which, unlike tracery, are not dependent upon window width, could have been stock-piled. A survey of the small group of churches along the Wreake valley (Chapter 3) disclosed a remarkable variety of mouldings. From a study of more than 70 window mouldings, very few were common to more than one church, but each was a combination of a few basic elements.

Leicestershire churches thus provide a varied pattern of mouldings, more particularly in doorways, and the collection of sectional drawings of these, together with arcades and windows, contained within this thesis, will present a useful contribution to the existing corpus of material.

That there was clearly a conceptual change from the Geometrical to the Decorated, is apparent in the micro-architecture of interior fittings. This development can be linked with the increasingly elaborate liturgy of the 13th - 14th centuries, associated not only with the Mass but also with the veneration of images. The fact that wall recesses were more likely to have covered founders' tombs than to have been Easter sepulchres, is demonstrated by the fact that the majority tend to be early in date; -i.e., -there are few examples of richly crocketed ogee canopies. Sedilia, on the other hand, could be quite elaborate structures, even in remote village churches. Increasingly, they were conceived as complete units embracing piscinae as well, and,
together with image niches, demonstrated the Decorated (hence the 14th-century) fascination with polygonal forms, together with the ogee.

In discussing the application of Geometrical and Decorated architecture to the county churches, the development of ground plans has shown that the greater number of church extensions within this period took the form of aisles, and, to a much lesser degree, mortuary/chantry chapels. The reasons for expansion have been discussed with particular reference to the economy of the period, and this has led to a consideration of building practices. It has become obvious from the field studies, that a large number of churches were making considerable demands upon quarries and masons within the comparatively brief period of a few decades. As already suggested, one of the major discoveries of this study has been that basic materials were almost certainly stock-piled. This conclusion has been based upon the evidence gathered from a large body of data relating to the sizes of voussoirs and pier stones which, together with details of arcade spans, suggests that there was a basic module for pier widths as well as for spans.

It is important to stress that the conclusions drawn here in this thesis would not have been possible from a survey of a mere handful of churches. Leicestershire contains few examples of first-rate Geometric or Decorated architecture, due, no doubt, to an overall lack of wealthy patronage. Where such exist, the quality of construction and detail of ornament provide work comparable with some of the best of English Gothic; one thinks of the aisles at Gaddesby and at Stoke Golding, of the steeple at Market Harborough, of the chancel at Claybrooke, and of the sheer scale of Melton Mowbray. With no mediaeval county cathedral to influence a local style, Leicestershire nevertheless contrived to establish an identity with its recessed spires and varied window tracery. Uniformity is apparent in the large number of double-
chamfered arcades; in the constant use of intersecting or reticulated tracery; and in the regular additions of Perpendicular clerestories. However, all these can scarcely be called a 'county' feature, since such details may be found throughout the Midlands and indeed much of the country. Leicestershire, and, to a greater degree, Northamptonshire, are areas of stone spires, as Surrey and Sussex are of timber, 'shingled' bell turrets, and it would be true to say that Leicestershire churches adopt a regional rather than a county identity. Little, if any, of its architecture has inspired the general literature on 13th- and 14th-century Gothic, but its use and interpretation of a recognisable vocabulary in the manner in which it presents the vernacular of that period, have made it a subject worthy of study.

Study of a county's churches as a group has made it possible to make a major contribution to the understanding of the 'Decorated' as a style; to the use of mouldings analysis as suggestive of an individual mason's 'style' or 'authorship'; to an understanding of the relationship between typology and chronology; and to the means by which churches were actually built in the late 13th and in the first half of the 14th century.

The conclusions drawn from this thesis indicate that there is much work still to be done in the study of mouldings, particularly in relation to the attempts to determine authorship. Future surveys of counties which, like Leicestershire, have no mediaeval cathedral, might prove equally rewarding in attempting to suggest sources of influence, whilst the gathering of window and arcade data over a much wider area could well produce results similar to those presented in this thesis, and thus establish firm conclusions relating to building practices.
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A LIST OF THE CHURCHES SURVEYED

Map 1. Churches surveyed in Leicestershire

H3. AB LETTLEBY, St. James.
I 7. ALLEXTON, St. Peter.
E5. ANSTHEY, St. Mary.
B5. APPLEBY MAGNA, St. Michael.
F8. ARNESBY, St. Peter.
G4. ASFORDBY, All Saints.
B4. ASHBY-DE-LA-ZOUCH, St. Helen.
G5. ASHBY FOLVILLE, St. Mary.
E8. ASHBY MAGNA, St. Mary.
E9. ASHBY PARVA, St. Peter.
D8. ASTON FLAMVILLE, St. Peter.
F5. BARKBY, St. Mary.
I 2. BARKESTONE, St. Peter and St. Paul.
F4. BARROW-UPON-SOAR, Holy Trinity.
C7. BARWELL, St. Mary.
G6. BEEBY, All Saints.
D4. BELTON, St. John the Baptist.
E9. BITTESWELL, St. Mary.
I 8. BLASTON, St. Giles.
I 1. BOTTESFORD, St. Mary.
I 2. BRANSTON, St. Guthlac.
C3. BREEDON-ON-THE-HILL, St. Mary and St. Hardulph.
H4. BRENTINGBY, (former church of St. Mary).
J8. BRINGHURST, St. Nicholas.
G4. BROOKSBY, St. Michael.
E8. BROUGHTON ASTLEY, St. Mary.
F9. BRUNTINGTHORPE, St. Mary.
J3. BUCKMINSTER, St. John the Baptist.
C8. BURBAGE, St. Catherine.
H5. BURROUGH-ON-THE-HILL, St. Mary.
I 4. BURTON LAZARS, St. James.
G7. BURTON OVERY, St. Andrew.
C7. CADEBY, All Saints.
C3. CASTLE DONINGTON, St. Edward, King and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Church Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>CATTHORPE, St. Thomas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>CHURCH LANGTON, St. Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9</td>
<td>CLAYBROOKE, St. Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 5</td>
<td>COLD OVERTON, St. John the Baptist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>COLEORTON, St. Mary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>CONGERSTONE, St. Mary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>COSSINGTON, All Saints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>COSBY, St. Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J4</td>
<td>COSTON, St. Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>COTESBATCH, St. Mary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>DESFORD, St. Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>DISEWORTH, St. Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>DUNTON BASSETT, All Saints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2</td>
<td>EATON, St. Denys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 7</td>
<td>EAST NORTON, All Saints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>EASTWELL, St. Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J4</td>
<td>EDMONDTHORPE, St. Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>ELMSTHORPE, St. Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>ENDERBY, St. John the Baptist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>FENNY DRAYTON, St. Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8</td>
<td>FLECKNEY, St. Nicholas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8</td>
<td>FOSTON, St. Bartholomew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G9</td>
<td>FOXTON, St. Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 4</td>
<td>FREEBY, St. Mary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4</td>
<td>FRISBY-ON-THE-WREAKE, St. Thomas of Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>FROLESWORTH, St. Nicholas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5</td>
<td>GADDESBY, St. Luke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 4</td>
<td>GARTHORPE, St. Mary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9</td>
<td>GILMORTON, All Saints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>GLENFIELD, (Old church)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>GLOOSTON, St. John the Baptist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>GOADBY MARWOOD, St. Denys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>GREAT BOWDEN, St. Peter and St. Paul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J8</td>
<td>GREAT EASTON, St. Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7</td>
<td>GREAT GLEN, St. Cuthbert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7</td>
<td>GREAT STRETTON, St. Giles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>GRIMSTON, St. John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G9</td>
<td>GUMLEY, St. Helen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 8</td>
<td>HALLATON, St. Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>HARBY, St. Mary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 2</td>
<td>HARSTON, St. Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>HEATHER, St. John the Baptist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>HEMINGTON (ruin).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>HINCKLEY, The Assumption of St. Mary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4</td>
<td>Hoby, All Saints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 8</td>
<td>HORNINGHOLD, St. Peter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>HOSE, All Saints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6</td>
<td>HOUGHTON-ON-THE-HILL, St. Catherine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6</td>
<td>HUNGARTON, St. John the Baptist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G10</td>
<td>HUSBANDS BOSWORTH, All Saints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>IBSTOCK, St. Denys.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7</td>
<td>ILLSTON-ON-THE-HILL, St. Michael.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>KEGWORTH, St. Andrew.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6</td>
<td>KEYHAM, All Saints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8</td>
<td>KIBWORTH BEAUCHAMP, St. Wilfrid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>KIMCOTE, All Saints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>KIRBY BELLARS, St. Peter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>KIRBY MUXLOE, St. Bartholomew.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>KIRKBY MALLORY, All Saints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 6</td>
<td>KNOSSINGTON, St. Peter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>LEICESTER, Cathedral.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>LEICESTER, St. Mary-de-Castro.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>LEICESTER, AYLESTONE, St. Andrew.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>LEICESTER, BELGRAVE, St. Peter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>LEICESTER, EVINGTON, St. Denys.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>LEICESTER, HUMBERSTONE, St. Mary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7</td>
<td>LEICESTER, KNIGHTON, St. Mary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>LEIRE, St. Peter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>LITTLE BOWDEN, St. Nicholas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>LOCKINGTON, St. Nicholas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 7</td>
<td>LODDINGTON, St. Michael.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>LONG CLAWSON, St. Remigius.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>LOUGHBOROUGH, All Saints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>LOWESBY, All Saints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G9</td>
<td>LUBENHAM, All Saints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>LUTTERWORTH, St. Mary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>MARKET BOSWORTH, St. Peter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>MARKET HARBOROUGH, St. Dionysius.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>MARKFIELD, St. Michael.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>MELTON MOWBRAY, St. Mary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>MISTERTON, St. Leonard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G9</td>
<td>MOWSLEY, St. Nicholas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 1</td>
<td>MUSTON, St. John the Baptist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>NAILSTONE, All Saints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G3.  NETHER BROUGHTON, St. Mary.
I 8.  NEVILL HOLT, St. Mary.
B5.  NORMANTON-LE-HEATH, Holy Trinity.
F10.  NORTH KILWORTH, St. Andrew.
B6.  NORTON-JUXTA-TWYCROSS, Holy Trinity.
H7.  NOSELEY, St. Mary.
F7.  OADBY, St. Peter.
A6.  ORTON-ON-THE-HILL, St. Edith.
C4.  OSGATHORPE, St. Mary.
I 6.  OWSTON, St. Andrew.
B5.  PACKINGTON, Holy Rood.
F8.  PEATLING MAGNA, All Saints.
E9.  PEATLING PARVA, St. Andrew.
D7.  PECKLETON, St. Mary.
I 5.  PICKWELL, All Saints.
G5.  QUENIBOROUGH, St. Mary.
E4.  QUORN, St. Bartholomew.
G4.  RAGDALE, All Saints.
D6.  RATBY, St. Philip and St. James.
B7.  RATCLIFFE CULEY, All Saints.
F4.  RATCLIFFE-ON-THE-WREAKE, St. Botolph.
B5.  RAVENSTONE, St. Michael.
G5.  REARSBY, St. Michael.
I 1.  REDMILE, St. Peter.
G4.  ROTHERBY, All Saints.
E5.  ROTHLEY, St. Mary and St. John the Baptist.
F8.  SADDINGTON, St. Helen.
J3.  SALTBY, St. Peter.
D8.  SAPCOTE, All Saints.
G4.  SAXELBYE, St. Peter.
H3.  SCALFORD, St. Egelwin.
G6.  SCRAPTOFT, All Saints.
I 4.  SEAGRAVE, All Saints.
G8.  SHANGTON, St. Nicholas.
D4.  SHEPSHED, St. Botolph.
B7.  SIBSON, St. Bartholomew.
F4.  SILEBY, St. Mary.
H7.  SKEFFINGTON, St. Thomas-a-Becket.
H8.  SLAWSTON, All Saints.
H5.  SOMERBY, All Saints.
G5.  SOUTH CROXTON, St. John the Baptist.
J3.  SPROXTON, St. Bartholomew.
C7.  STAPLETON, St. Martin.
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I 2. STATHERN, St. Guthlac.
I 7. STOCKERSTON, St. Peter.
C8. STOKE GOLDING, St. Margaret.
I 3. STONESBY, St. Peter.
H8. STONTON WYVILLE, St. Denys.
G7. STOUGHTON, St. Mary.
C7. SUTTON CHENEY, St. James.
B5. SWEPSTONE, St. Peter.
F10. SWINFORD, All Saints.
G9. THEDDINGWORTH, All Saints.
D6. THORNTON, St. Peter.
H4. THORPE ARNOLD, St. Mary.
H8. THORPE LANGTON, St. Leonard.
F4. THRUSINGTON, Holy Trinity.
F5. THURCASTON, All Saints.
D7. THURLASTON, All Saints.
F5. THURMASTON, St. Michael.
H6. TILTON-ON-THE-HILL, St. Peter.
B6. TWYCROSS, St. James.
D5. ULVERSCROFT PRIORY (ruin)
I 3. WALTHAM-ON-THE-WOLDS, St. Mary.
F5. WANLIP, Our Lady and St. Nicholas.
E7. WHETSTONE, St. Peter.
C5. WHITWICK, St. John the Baptist.
I 7. WIGSTON, All Saints.
I 7. WIGSTON, St. Wistan.
E8. WILLOUGHBY WATERLEYS, St. Mary.
B7. WITHERLEY, St. Peter.
E4. WOODHOUSE, St. Mary.
C4. WORTHINGTON, St. Matthew.
I 4. WYFORDBY, St. Mary.
F3. WYMESWOLD, St. Mary.
J.4. WYMONDHAM, St. Peter.

Map 2. Churches surveyed in Northamptonshire

X6 ALDWINCKLE, St. Peter.
X4 BLATHERWYCKE, Holy Trinity.
Q10 BYFIELD, Holy Cross
R10 CANONS ASHBY, St. Mary.
P12 CHACOMBE, St. Peter and St. Paul.
P11 CHIPPING WARDEN, St. Peter and St. Paul.
T6  CLIPSTON, All Saints.  
X5  COTTERSTOCK, St. Andrew/  
R7  CRICK, St. Margaret.  
T5  EAST FARNDON, St. Mary.  
W7  FINEDON, St. Mary.  
V6  GEDDINGTON, St. Mary Magdalene  
W6  GRAFTON UNDERWOOD, St. James.  
W7  GREAT ADDINGTON, All Saints.  
T6  HARRINGTON, St. Peter and St. Paul.  
W8  HIGHAM FERRERS, St. Mary.  
U8  HOLCOT, St. Mary and All Saints.  
S8  HOLDENBY, All Saints.  
P13  KINGS SUTTON, St. Peter and St. Paul.  
S9  KISLINGBURY, St. Peter and St. Paul.  
Q6  LILBOURNE, All Saints.  
R10  LITCHBOROUGH, St. Martin.  
W6  LOWICK, St. Peter.  
Q12  MARSTON ST. LAWRENCE, St. Lawrence.  
T10  MILTON MALSOR, Holy Cross.  
T8  MOULTON, St. Peter and St. Paul.  
R9  NORTON, All Saints.  
X5  OUNDLLE, St. Peter.  
X7  RAUNDS, St. Mary.  
X7  RINGSTEAD, St. Mary.  
V8  WELLINGBOROUGH, All Hallows.  
V8  WILBY, St. Mary.  

Map 2. Churches surveyed in Staffordshire  

K1  LICHFIELD, Cathedral.  
L2  TAMWORTH, St. Editha.  

Map 2. Churches surveyed in Warwickshire  

M4  ARLEY, St. Wilfrid.  
M4  ASTLEY, St. Mary.  
M2  AUSTREY, St. Nicholas.  
P7  BILTON, St. Mark.  
L5  COLESHELL, St. Peter and St. Paul.  
M3  GREN|DON, All Saints.  
P6  HARBOUROUGH MAGNA, All Saints.  
M3  MANCETTER, St. Peter.  
L5  MAXSTOKE, St. Michael.  
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O5  MONKS KIRBY, St. Edith.
M2  NEWTON REGIS, St. Mary.
L2  SECKINGTON, All Saints.
K4  WISHAW, St. Chad.
O5  WOLVEY, St. John the Baptist.

Map 3. Churches surveyed in Lincolnshire

CC6  ANCASTER, St. Martin.
AA7  BARROWBY, All Saints.
BB4  BRANT BROUGHTON, St. Helen.
CC10 CASTLE BYTHAM, St. James.
FF7  DONINGTON, St. Mary and the Holy Rood.
EE5  EWERBY, St. Andrew.
JJ9  FLEET, St. Mary Magdalen.
II9  GEDNEY, St. Mary Magdalen.
BB7  GRANTHAM, St. Wulfram.
EE6  HECKINGTON, St. Andrew.
EE6  HELPRINGHAM, St. Andrew.
II9  HOLBEACH, All Saints
BB5  LEADENHAM, St. Swithin.
BB1  LINCOLN, Cathedral.
CC3  NAVENBY, St. Peter.
DD7  PICKWORTH, St. Andrew.
GG9  PINCHBECK, St. Mary.
DD5  SLEAFORD, St. Denys.
FF9  WYKEHAM CHAPEL (ruin).
FF8  SURFLEET, St. Laurence.
EE7  SWATON, St. Michael.
BB4  WELBOURN, St. Chad.

Map 3. Churches surveyed in Rutland

AA11 COTTESMORE, St. Nicholas.
BB11 EMPINGHAM, St. Peter.
BB10 GREETHAM, St. Mary.
CC12 KETTON, St. Mary.
AA11 LANGHAM, St. Peter and St. Paul.
AA13 LYDDINGTON, St. Andrew.
AA11 OAKHAM, All Saints.
BB12 NORTH LUFFENHAM, St. John the Baptist.
AA12 PRESTON, St. Peter and St. Paul.
BB12 SOUTH LUFFENHAM, St. Mary.
AA13  STOKE DRY, St. Andrew.
AA13  UPPINGHAM, St. Peter and St. Paul.
AA10  WHISSENDINE, St. Andrew.

Map 4. Churches surveyed in Derbyshire

LL2.  BAKEWELL, All Saints.
NN1.  CHESTERFIELD, St. Mary and All Saints.
PP7.  SANDIACRE, St. Giles.
KK1.  TADDINGTON, St. Michael.

Map 4. Churches surveyed in Nottinghamshire

RR5  ARNOLD, St. Mary.
PP7  BARTON-IN-FABIS, St. George.
TT6  BINGHAM, All Saints.
TT6  CAR COLSTON, St. Mary.
RR6  GEDLING, All Hallows.
UU4  HAWTON, All Saints.
UU4  NEWARK, St. Mary Magdalen.
TT5  SIBTHORPE, St. Peter.
SS4  SOUTHWELL, Minster.
PP6  STRELLEY, All Saints.
RR5  WOODBOROUGH, St. Swithun.