The London Bridge House, c.1209-1554: A Case of Civic Growth and Religious Transition in Late Medieval London

by

Emmamarie C. Haasl

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(History)
in the University of Michigan
2022

Doctoral Committee:

Professor David J. Hancock, Co-Chair
Professor Theresa Tinkle, Co-Chair
Professor Emerita Caroline M. Barron, University of London, Royal Holloway
Professor Emeritus Steven Mullaney
Professor Paolo Squatriti

Emmamarie C. Haasl

ehaasl@umich.edu

ORCID iD: 0000-0001-5444-9469

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated in memory of my grandparents, especially Mary Kate Lavery Micklewright (1936-2019) and Joe Haasl (1919-2021), who taught me about perseverance on life's journey.

Acknowledgements

In the process of researching and writing this dissertation, I have become deeply indebted to the many people who supported me along the way. First and foremost, I would like to join a long line of scholars in expressing profound gratitude for the unparalleled support and guidance that I received from my mentor and advisor, Professor Caroline Barron. Without the immeasurable gift of her wisdom, knowledge, time, and patience, I would never have been able to complete this dissertation.

I would also like to extend my gratitude to my advisors at the University of Michigan, Professors David Hancock and Tessa Tinkle, for supporting me through challenging times and believing in my ability to complete this project. My gratitude as well to professors Paolo Squatriti and Steven Mullaney, for their feedback as part of my committee; and to professors Powel Kazanjian, Helmut Puff, Valerie Kivelson, Hussein Fancy, Paula Alvarez, Marty Pernick, and Ray Van Dam for supporting me at key junctures during my University of Michigan journey.

I would like to acknowledge the support and invaluable feedback that I received from the incredible community of scholars that attended the bi-weekly informal medieval and Tudor London seminars led by Caroline Barron, especially during our pandemic Zoom sessions, as well as those who attended the annual International Bridge Group symposia organized by David Harrison and Jana Gajdosova. Special thanks to Clive Burgess, Martha Carlin, Dorian Gerhold, Jenny Stratford, Richard Asquith, Mark Whelan, Maggie Bolton, Doreen Leach, and David Harrison for their assistance in locating sources and for insights and feedback on my project.

I would like to acknowledge the support of the staff at the Institute for Historical Research (IHR), who provided a safe haven during many months of the pandemic; the archivists at the British Library, National Library at Kew, and, in particular, the London Metropolitan Archives, who provided invaluable assistance in accessing and navigating their medieval archives; the University of London, Royal Holloway, for sponsoring me as a guest researcher from 2019 to 2021; the financial support from Rackham Graduate School, the University of Michigan history department, and the Schallek Award of the Medieval Academy and the Richard III Society; the staff at International Lutheran Student Centre, Newman Centre, and Pickwick Hall in London; and the parish communities of St Mary's, St Etheldreda's, and St Joan of Arc's.

I could not have managed the stresses of this journey without the deep friendship and endless support of my "sisters," Kate Madison and Essie Ladkau. For their love, friendship, and support, I am profoundly grateful to my London pandemic family, including Irene Pronesti, Giulia Marinos, Tyler Inberg, Sana Gul, Pablo Ignacio Mancilla, and Chaelin Kim; my Michigan family in Ann Arbor; my friends and colleagues, Farida Begum, Timnet Gedar, and Liz Kamali; my Carleton mentors, Bill North, Serena Zabin, and Susannah Ottaway; Maggie and Martin Forester and Ruth and Padraig Gallagher, who offered me a home away from home during my time abroad; my Aunt Audrey and Uncle Don; my dear friends, Diane Walters, Deidre Knight, and Lee Conrads; my sister, Mary; and my partner, Samson.

And finally, my unending gratitude to my parents, who believed in me from the start. Thank you for everything.

Table of Contents

List of Appendices

List of Abbreviations

BL	British Library
BHEC	Bridge House Estates Collection, CLA/007, London Metropolitan Archives
Bridge Accounts	Bridgemasters' Annual Accounts and Rentals, 1404-1568, CLA/007/FN/02/001-008, Bridge House Estates Collection, London Metropolitan Archives
Bridge Rolls	Bridgemasters' Account Rolls, 1383-1404, CLA/007/FN/01/001-017, Bridge House Estates Collection, London Metropolitan Archives
Chancery Debts	Court of Chancery: Extents of Debts, C 131
Chancery Certificate	Court of Chancery: Certificates of Statute Merchant and Statute Staple, C 241
Chancery Misc	Court of Chancery: Ecclesiastical Miscellanea, C 270
Chancery Pleadings	Court of Chancery: Early Pleadings and Proceedings, C 1
CPR	*Calendar of Patent Rolls. Henry III-Edward III* (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1893-1913)
Exchequer Deeds	Court of Exchequer: Ancient Deeds, E 43
HR	Husting Roll
Journals	Journals, Court of Common Council, COL/CC/01/02-03, London Metropolitan Archives
LBA, LBB, etc	*Calendar of Letter Books, Preserved among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London, 1275-1498, Books A-L*, ed. R.R. Sharpe (London, 1899-1912)
LMA	London Metropolitan Archives

LR	Large Register of Deeds, CLA/007/EM/04/001, Bridge House Estates Collection, London Metropolitan Archives
DP	Original Deed, Deed Portfolios, CLA/007/EM/02/A-K
PCC	Prerogative Court of Canterbury
SR	Small Register of Deeds, CLA/007/EM/003/A, Bridge House Estates Collection, London Metropolitan Archives
TNA	The National Archives, Kew
Weekly Accounts	[Bridgemasters'] Weekly Payments, 1404-1555, CLA/007/FN/03/001-009, Bridge House Estates Collection, London Metropolitan Archives

Abstract

Between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries, the London Bridge House institution, which managed the constant upkeep of the sole stone bridge in the City of London, underwent extensive internal changes. It gradually transitioned from being a religious foundation, dedicated to the pious work of maintaining the bridge, to becoming a civic enterprise mostly under the auspices of the urban government. Previous scholarly work has situated the movement of society and institutions towards secularization, or profanation, to a large extent within the aftermath of the large-scale sixteenth-century religious reformations. This study complicates that perception by considering the transformations that occurred within the Bridge House in the preceding three centuries. It does this by analyzing long-term trends that emerge from the extensive Bridge House records, as well as surviving London wills. This includes the evolution of the role of the bridgewarden, trends in giving practices, and the changing place of the chapel within the Bridge House institution.

This dissertation found that in each of these cases, records demonstrate that the place of religion and civic authority within the institution changed dramatically over time. Bridgewardens, who oversaw the Bridge House management, went from being clerical men who served for short periods of time in the thirteenth century to being wealthy Londoners, many of whom belonged to the City's mercantile elite, who acted as long-term administrators for the term of their lives. London Bridge went from receiving many small monetary bequests from a broad swath of individuals, including men and women, as well as intergenerational pairs, to

maintaining an expansive landed endowment, accompanied by occasional large-scale bequests from men holding high civic office. The format of bequests also changed, increasingly leaving property and money to the Mayor and Commonalty for the maintenance of the bridge, instead of to the Bridge House directly. These bequests ceased requesting the prayers of brothers and sisters praying for the benefactors of the bridge, who disappeared from the bridge records by the early fourteenth century. By the mid-fourteenth century, individuals who mentioned the bridge in their wills increasingly designated the Bridge House in a back-up administrative capacity to manage a chantry if the designated original legatees failed to fulfill their obligations. Meanwhile, the St Thomas Becket chapel on the bridge, the last vestige of the early religious foundation, gradually became more of an independent entity, having limited association with the Bridge House that it used to represent.

These findings suggest that the place of religion within society, and within urban institutions in particular, was being renegotiated in significant ways during the later medieval period. They complicate existing scholarship that places the secularization, or profanation, of religious institutions in the aftermath of the religious reformations of the sixteenth century. The findings of this study suggest that urbanization and civic growth may have played key roles in changing the place of religion within society prior to the sixteenth century and raise questions about how this may have played out within other late medieval urban institutions.

Chapter 1 Introduction

Between the thirteenth and eighteenth centuries, an institution known as London Bridge House managed the constant upkeep of the sole medieval stone bridge over the Thames within the city of London. This institution, situated to the south of the river in Southwark, underwent a series of transformations during this period, from its foundation as a religious establishment in the thirteenth century, to its gradual incorporation into the civic infrastructure in the sixteenth century. This dissertation examines the relationship between Londoners and London Bridge House and the changes it underwent between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries.

By the fifteenth century, the London Bridge House was responsible for the pilgrimage site of the chapel on the bridge; multiple storehouses; numerous properties on the bridge and around London; a large permanent workforce for the maintenance of these properties and the bridge infrastructure; and property-based relationships with various religious houses in the region. The administration of the Bridge House, housed within a collection of buildings in Southwark to the south of the bridge, linked all these associations together to maintain the bridge, fulfilling one of the seven acts of corporal mercy by caring for travelers, as it had since its foundation two centuries earlier.[1]

---

[1] An example of this can be found in a papal bull issued by Pope Clement IV in 1267, which allowed a forty-day indulgence from purgatory for those contributing to a certain bridge over the Leve in Montpellier, which would be seen at judgement as a deed of mercy. Marjorie Nice Boyer, *Medieval French Bridges: A History* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Medieval Academy of America, 1976), 49-50.

By the fifteenth century, however, the Bridge House no longer housed brothers and sisters dedicated to praying for the benefactors of London Bridge as it once had, and the institution was no longer governed by clergy. The bridge chapel, while flourishing, was a vestige of the earlier broad religious foundation. Its eventual dissolution in the sixteenth century represented a final step in a much longer and nuanced transition for places of religious significance in the late medieval urban landscape. For London Bridge, this transition occurred gradually and ultimately led to the bridge becoming part of the broader management of the municipality, no longer affiliated with its religious origins. This dissertation considers these late medieval transitions as early manifestations of what we would today understand as secularization.

This introduction discusses the contributions this study makes to scholarship on the City of London and urban history, the study of medieval bridges and London Bridge more particularly, as well as the study of the growth of secular and civic institutions in the later Middle Ages and the secularization that resulted. It argues that the study of the management and communal support for London Bridge between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries evokes a parallel case study of the development of the city government in London around the same time. In doing so, it emphasizes how the expansion of city government influenced wider societal changes in the relationship between religious and secular authorities.

1.1 The study of London and medieval urban life

As the pre-eminent city in England, in both wealth and population, London has always held special interest for historians. In the late nineteenth century, most historians focused on the role that London played in national events.[2] Reginald Sharpe's *London and the Kingdom* is a prominent example of this late nineteenth-century scholarship. This interest in the political history of London led to the publication of many calendared volumes of civic documents, including the Husting Court wills, the Plea and Memoranda Rolls, and the City Letter Books, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[3] It also led to the publication of numerous London chronicles.[4] The interests of historians at the time, who worked on these volumes, have in many ways continued to shape the way in which the history of medieval London has been

[2] Reginald R. Sharpe, *London and the Kingdom: A History derived mainly from the archives at Guildhall in the custody of the Corporation of the City of London, Volume 1* (London: Longmans, Green & Co, 1984).

[3] Reginald R. Sharpe, editor, *Calendar of Wills Proved and Enrolled in the Court of Husting, London: Part 1, 1258-1358* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1889); Reginald R. Sharpe, editor, *Calendar of Wills Proved and Enrolled in the Court of Husting, London: Part 2, 1358-1688* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1890); Reginald R. Sharpe, editor, *Calendar of Letter Books of the City of London: A, 1275-1298* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1899); Reginald R. Sharpe, editor, *Calendar of Letter Books of the City of London: B, 1275-1312* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1900); Reginald R. Sharpe, editor, *Calendar of Letter Books of the City of London: C, 1291-1309* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1901); Reginald R. Sharpe, editor, *Calendar of Letter Books of the City of London: D, 1309-1314* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1902); Reginald R. Sharpe, editor, *Calendar of Letter Books of the City of London: E, 1314-1337* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1903); Reginald R. Sharpe, editor, *Calendar of Letter Books of the City of London: F, 1337-1352* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1904); Reginald R. Sharpe, editor, *Calendar of Letter Books of the City of London: G, 1352-1374* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1905); Reginald R. Sharpe, editor, *Calendar of Letter Books of the City of London: H, 1375-1399* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1907): Reginald R. Sharpe, editor, *Calendar of Letter Books of the City of London: I, 1400-1422* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1909); Reginald R. Sharpe, editor, *Calendar of Letter Books of the City of London: K, Henry VI* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1911); Reginald R. Sharpe, editor, *Calendar of Letter Books of the City of London: L, Edward IV-Henry VII* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1912); A.H. Thomas, editor, *Calendar of the Plea and Memoranda Rolls of the City of London: Volume 1, 1323-1364* (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1926); A.H. Thomas, editor, *Calendar of the Plea and Memoranda Rolls of the City of London: Volume 2, 1364-1381* (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1929); A.H. Thomas, editor, *Calendar of the Plea and Memoranda Rolls of the City of London: Volume 3, 1381-1412* (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1932).

[4] H.T. Riley, editor, *Munimenta Gildhallae Londoniensis: Liber albus, Liber custumarum, et Liber Horn*, vol. II, Rolls Series 12:1 (1860); John Stow, *A Survey of London*, edited by H. Morley (London, 1890); T. Stapleton, editor, *Liber de Antiquis Legibus*, Camden Society 34 (1846); H.T. Riley, editor, *Chronicles of the Mayors and Sheriffs of London 1188-1274* (London, 1863); W. Stubbs, editor, *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, Rolls Series, 76:1 (London, 1882); James Gairdner, editor, *The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the Fifteenth Century*, Camden Record Society 17 (London, 1876); Charles Lethbridge Kingsford, editor, *Chronicles of London* (Oxford, 1905).

written. For instance, Sharpe's calendar on the Hustings Court wills omits many of the details of religious bequests, leading to their neglect by early historians.

In the early twentieth century, historians turned their attention to the structural and constitutional histories of the city, looking at the formation of municipal governments.[5] These studies relied heavily on chronicles, charters, and records such as the Domesday Book, which were already in print. They pointed to the role of trade in the formation of urban spaces and debated the role of the Norman Conquest and the communal movement on the continent in precipitating these changes. More recently, historians of urban institutions in England have engaged in comparative studies with similar cases on the continent, which have shown similarities in the role of private associations like guilds in representing citizens and the gradual diminishing of external authorities including the Church.[6]

In the post-war period, social and economic historians turned their attention to the histories of trade and population, which relied heavily on an analysis of statistical data. In 1948, Sylvia Thrupp published her highly influential book *The Merchant Class of Medieval London*, 1300-1500, which explored the social context of London merchants.[7] Thrupp used a remarkable collection of sources, including civic records, royal documents, financial accounts, as well as literary sources to situate the lives of London's merchants within the city's history. She also

[5] D.M. Palliser, "Introduction," in *The Cambridge Urban History of Britain: Volume 1: 600-1540* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); James Tait, *Medieval English Borough: Studies on its Origins and Constitutional History* (Manchester: University of Manchester, 1936); Carl Stephenson, *Borough and Town: a study of urban origins in England* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Medieval Academy of America, 1933).
[6] Keith Lilley, "Institutional Urbanism," in *Urban Life in the Middle Ages 1000-1450* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 42-74; Susan Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe, 900-1300* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), 155-218; Rodney H. Hilton, *English and French Towns in Feudal Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 128.
[7] Sylvia Thrupp, The Merchant Class of Medieval London, 1300-1500 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1948).

explored their role in the city's government and the power wielded by the men who were able to obtain particular offices.[8]

In 1963, Gwyn Williams published a pioneering study, *Medieval London: Commune to Capital*, that used royal records and administrative records of the city to trace the emergence of urban structures in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.[9] Significant for its early application of a social history approach, his book shifted studies from a focus on the institutions towards the role of significant families in shaping the offices of the city and the commercial interests of Londoners.

In the 1970s, projects such as the "Social and economic survey of medieval London," led by Derek Keene, emphasized the importance of micro-histories within urban studies to shed light on the complex cultural and economic features of early London.[10] In his own work, Keene explored new ways of understanding the population of London, the urban environment, and topography, including studies of London's hinterland, bringing London history into dialogue with other disciplines, like archaeology.[11] In the 1980s, Betty Masters brought new light to the financial affairs of medieval London through her interrogation of the Chamberlain accounts, of which only a few survive from the sixteenth century.[12] Masters discussed the surviving annual

---

[8] Ibid, 53-102.
[9] Gwyn Williams, *Medieval London: From Commune to Capital* (London: The Athlone Press, 1963); Christopher Brooke, *London 800-1216: The Shaping of a City* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1975). Christopher Brooke also contributed significant scholarship on the growth of city government. His study considers the place of the church in medieval London to a greater degree than Williams'.
[10] Matthew Davies and James Galloway, "Preface," in *London and Beyond: Essays in honour of Derek Keene*, edited by Matthew Davies and James Galloway (London: Institute of Historical Research, 2012), vii-viii.
[11] Derek Keene, "Shops and shopping in medieval London," in *Medieval art, architecture, and archaeology in London*, edited by Lindy Grant (New York: Routledge, 1990), 29-46; Derek Keene, "Medieval London and its region," *London Journal* 14, no. 2 (1989), 99-111.
[12] Betty Masters, editor, *Chamber Accounts of the Sixteenth Century* (London: London Record Society, 1984); Betty Masters, *The Chamberlain of the City of London 1237-1987* (London: Corporation of London, 1988).

accounts of London Bridge as an similar form of documentation of the financial life of the medieval London, although the medieval Bridge House maintained a level of independence from the civic government.

The work of Caroline Barron has been likewise significant in shaping our understanding of the growth of London's civic government. Barron emphasized the remarkable strength of these institutions, which allowed them to survive the tumultuous years of the sixteenth century. Her interrogation of these institutions and their development paid keen attention to the internal and external actors and the influence they exerted on the institutions in which they participated. For instance, she interrogated the tensions that emerged at different points within the leadership of the city, including the attempts by Ralph Holland, a tailor, in the 1430s and 1440s to rise to the mayoralty despite his sympathies with the artisanal class, and the prevention of this by members of more prominent crafts.[13] The publication of her magisterial work on London in the later Middle Ages in 2004 was indicative of trends within the field.[14] While it provided a close reading of the growth of London institutions, her work also brought into greater focus the ways that individual and collective action of Londoners played a role in shaping civic government. She emphasized the process through which self-government evolved, considering the actions and intentions of individual men who held office.

In the last twenty to thirty years, there has been a greater emphasis on everyday aspects of medieval urban life. Recent historians have become much more aware of the role people

[13] Caroline Barron, "Chapter 11: Ralph Holland and the London Radicals, 1438-1444," in *Medieval London: Collected Papers of Caroline Barron* (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2017), 335-360; reprinted from, Caroline Barron, "Ralph Holland and the London Radicals, 1438-1444," in *A History of the North London Branch of the Historical Association, together with Essays in Honour of Its Golden Jubilee* (London: The Historical Association, 1970), 60-80.
[14] Caroline Barron, *London in the Later Middle Ages: Government and People 1200-1500* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

played in regulating urban communities in the Middle Ages and the constant renegotiation of power. This has coincided with a wealth of new publications of original source material by the London Record Society, which publishes one volume of records relating to London history each year. Their 1995 volume, discussed later in the introduction, made selections of the London Bridge accounts accessible in print for the first time.[15] Other recent volumes include the church records of St Andrew Hubbard Eastcheap, c.1450-c.1570, and the Pinners' and Wiresellers' Book, 1462-1511.[16]

Historians have also redirected their focus towards other aspects of regulation within the City, including the role of leadership within guilds and parishes. Derek Keene has drawn attention to the politics and influence of guild associations in the urban environment.[17] This shift embraced close studies of several artisanal and merchant's guilds, including the Tailors, Mercers, Drapers, and Carpenters.[18] There has also been renewed interest in the study of prominent ecclesiastical institutions within and near London, and the influence and role they played in city life.[19] These studies have recognized that the complex system of governance in London was in

---

[15] Vanessa Harding and Laura Wright, editors, *London Bridge: Selected Accounts and Rentals, 1381-1538* (London: London Record Society, 1995).

[16] Clive Burgess, editor, *The Church Records of St Andrew Hubbard, Eastcheap, c1450-c1570* (London: London Record Society, 1999); Barbara Megson, editor, *The Pinners' and Wiresellers' Book, 1462-1511* (London: London Record Society, 2009).

[17] Derek Keene, "English urban guilds, c.900-1300: the purposes and politics of association," in *Guilds and association in Europe, 900-1900,* edited by Ian Anders Gadd and Patrick Wallis (London: Centre for Metropolitan History, University of London, 2006).

[18] Matthew Davies and Ann Saunders, *The History of the Merchant Taylors' Company* (Leeds: Maney Publishing, 2004); Anne Sutton, *The Mercery of London: Trade, Goods and People, 1130-1578* (New York: Routledge, 2005); Eleanor Quinton, "The Drapers and the drapery trade of late medieval London, c.1300-c.1500," Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of London, 2001; Doreen Leach, "Carpenters in medieval London c.1240-c.1540," Unpublished PhD dissertation, Royal Holloway, University of London, 2017.

[19] Caroline Barron and Matthew P. Davies, *The Religious Houses of London and Middlesex* (London: Institute of Historical Research, 2007). See also, Christine Fox, "The Royal Almshouse at Westminster c.1500-c.1600," Unpublished PhD dissertation, Royal Holloway, University of London, 2012; Ann Bowtell, "A Medieval London Hospital: Elsyngspital 1330-1536," Unpublished PhD dissertation, Royal Holloway, University of London, 2010; Marie-Helene Rousseau, *Saving the Souls of Medieval London:*

many ways fundamentally interconnected with such institutions. This dissertation engages with this aspect of urban history by considering the impact of the London Bridge House, an early religious institution that played a role in shaping the nascent civic government and ultimately became part of it.

1.2 General studies on medieval bridges

The upkeep and management of medieval bridges developed distinctive patterns, which was, for much of the Middle Ages, intrinsically perceived as pious work. Bridges were vital to travel during this period, and many of bridges accompanied settlements, including, most notably, the London Bridge, which marked the largest settlement in the British Isles. The study of medieval bridges and their patterns of upkeep moved into modern historians' agenda in 1976 with the publication by Marjorie Nice Boyer of a history of medieval French bridges. Boyer traced the origins of bridge building as a pious work on the continent. She drew on medieval chronicles, cartularies of religious establishments that had responsibilities towards bridges, lawsuits, governmental documents including tax levies, and the financial accounts for bridges, including those at Albi and Orleans.[20] From these documents, she argued that the notion of the bridge as an object of charity emerged in the eleventh century as part of the Peace of God movement.[21] This developed in the twelfth century into the idea of the *opus pontis* as a charitable corporation to administer bridge property.[22]

Perpetual Chantries at St Paul's Cathedral, c.1200-1548 (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2011).

[20] Marjorie Nice Boyer, *Medieval French Bridges: A History* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Medieval Academy of America, 1976), 9.

[21] Boyer, *Medieval French Bridges*, 32. Boyer's discussion of the charitable framework of bridge maintenance on the continent has informed the context for framing this project.

[22] Ibid, 39.

Nearly thirty years later, David Harrison followed up this work with a major study of bridges in medieval England. Although chiefly concerned with the architectural side of medieval bridge building, Harrison described the system of local obligations that contributed to bridge maintenance in the Anglo-Saxon period, which was enforced by local kings. The breakdown of this system through the granting of exemptions led to the increase of charitable organizations and tolls as an alternative means of maintaining bridges.[23] Harrison acknowledged that London Bridge has often been identified as the epitome of English medieval bridges, and asserted that, contrary to criticisms historians and antiquarians have leveled at its architecture, it was a great feat of engineering given the challenges of a tidal river.[24] His study recognized the widespread use of bridge wardens or bridge masters to manage bridge repair and highlights how the particular challenges of London Bridge site made constant work of bridge wardens paramount.[25] Alan Cooper followed Harrison's work with a complementary study of the changing financial responsibilities toward bridges in the early and high Middle Ages. It further addressed the use of charity as an alternative to earlier obligations during the twelfth century and noted the significance of London Bridge being the first bridge in England to be supported by a permanent charitable endowment.[26]

---

[23] David Harrison, *The Bridges of Medieval England: Transport and Society 400-1800* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004), 186-94.
[24] Harrison, *Bridges of Medieval England*, 150-1.
[25] Harrison, *Bridges of Medieval England*, 159-62.
[26] Alan Cooper, *Bridges, Law and Power in Medieval England, 700-1400* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), 106-119.

1.3 Historical studies of London Bridge

London Bridge played a vital role in facilitating trade and travel in southern England and was crucial to the growth and maintenance of London. It also kept a significant archive that survives from the late twelfth century. As will be discussed in more detail below, documents include ten portfolios of deeds for property given to the bridge trust; two registers of containing copies of these deeds, compiled in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; and a combination of annual and weekly financial accounts recorded by the bridgewardens and audited by the City, which survive largely uninterrupted from 1381.[27] Surprisingly, these expansive archives have been relatively understudied by historians. London Bridge has not been entirely neglected, however.

The earliest account of the history of London Bridge was published by an antiquarian, Richard Thomson, when the original stone bridge was demolished in 1827. [28] Thomson went on to become the librarian of the London Institution from 1834 to 1865. He presented his account as a conversation between two antiquarians, Barbican and Postern, in a tavern overlooking London Bridge. Their conversation meandered through eight hundred years of London Bridge history, incorporating anecdotes from various chronicles, and referring to various civic records and manuscript sources then held by the British Museum.[29] However, Thomson's principal aim was

[27] Deed Portfolios, CLA/007/EM/02/A-K, BHEC, LMA; Small Register of Deeds, CLA/007/EM/04/003/A, BHEC, LMA; Large Register of Deeds, CLA/007/EM/04/001, BHEC, LMA; Bridgemasters' Account Rolls, 1381-1398, CLA/007/FN/01-016, BHEC, LMA; Bridgemasters' Annual Account and Rental, 1404-1568, CLA/007/FN/02/001-008, BHEC, LMA; Weekly Payments: 1st Series, 1404-45, CLA/007/FN/03/001-004, BHEC, LMA; Weekly Payments: 2nd Series, 1505-38, CLA/007/FN/03/006-008, BHEC, LMA; Weekly Payments: 3rd Series, 1552-55, CLA/007/FN/03/009, BHEC, LMA.
[28] [Richard Thomson], *Chronicles of London Bridge* (London: D.S. Maurice Fenchurch Street, 1827), viii-ix.
[29] Citations for many of these sources are embedded in the text.

to entertain his audience by narrating a series of tales about London Bridge and lament its demolition, so his chronicle offered little analysis of the bridge's history in context.

The building of bridges in nineteenth-century London sparked more sustained interest in local bridge history. Seventy years later, during the building of the Tower Bridge, Charles Welch, the librarian of the Guildhall Library, wrote a detailed study of the new bridge within the history of London bridges more generally. Welch drew on Thomson, as well as original documents from the London Bridge accounts. His book recognized the development of the London Bridge House alongside the bridge itself, including the houses on the bridge and the accompanying bridge workforce. However, since Welch does not include citations, it is difficult to substantiate and follow up on the sources for claims he makes.[30]

Nearly a century after Thomson's chronicle, on the one hundredth anniversary of the demolition of old London Bridge, Gordon Home, a landscape artist and writer, published a "new history of the old Bridge," entitled *Old London Bridge* (1931). He framed his work as an update on Thomson's one-hundred-year-old study, incorporating some new material and correcting common misunderstandings about the now absent original bridge, including its dimensions and the location of the chapel.[31] Home chronicled the history of the original bridge from the thirteenth through seventeenth centuries and concluded with a discussion of its decline. He drew heavily on nineteenth-century calendars of royal and civic records, which had been published after Thomson's account, in addition to chronicles and small selections from the annual accounts. However, Home's footnotes are sometimes incomplete or include substantial errors.[32]

[30] Charles Welch, *History of the Tower Bridge, and of other bridges over the Thames built by the Corporation of London* (London: Smith, Elder and Co, 1894), 29-122. His appendixes, on the other hand, do include some citations.
[31] Gordon Home, *Old London Bridge* (London: John Lane the Bodley Head Limited, 1931), viii-x.
[32] For instance, on page 65, Home cited a passage in the *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, dating a grant for bridge tolls to Chester on July 6, 1281. In the footnote, he listed "p. 1281" as the page number for this

More recently, the publication of *London Bridge: 2000 years of a river crossing* by the Museum of London Archaeology Service (MoLAS) introduced an integrated archaeological investigation of the history of London Bridge.[33] This collaborative study, led by Bruce Watson, Trevor Brigham, and Tony Dyson, traced a chronological narrative of London Bridge from a different angle. The study incorporated stratigraphic analysis, finds analysis, and tree-ring analysis, as well as documentary analysis. It focused chiefly on the archaeological evidence and the material aspects of the crossing at London, starting well before the stone London Bridge was built in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. The study provides up-to-date archaeological information about the location and structure of the medieval London Bridge.

While most of the voluminous records of the administration of the medieval bridge have never been published, the London Record Society did publish a volume containing a selection of from the bridge accounts and rentals between 1381 and 1538, as mentioned above. The 1995 volume, edited by Laura Wright and Vanessa Harding, includes accessible transcriptions and translations of five years' worth of annual accounts from the bridge records, with the individual selected years spaced out at approximately forty-year intervals.[34] Wright and Harding provided an overview of the information included in annual and weekly accounts from different periods

record, which at first seems as if the year has simply been substituted in as the page number. However, the royal court was not in Chester in July of 1281. Through consultation with the *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, it emerges that they had been in Chester in July of 1282, however, and the passage in question was recorded on July 6, 1282; this passage appears on page 30 for the *Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward I, AD 1281-1292*. In another footnote on the same page, Home listed "p. 1282" as the page number for a reference in the *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, when he should have referred to page 23 of the same volume as above. These are not the only errors of this nature to occur in *Old London Bridge*. Home, *Old London Bridge*, 64-5; H.C. Maxwell Lyte, editor, *Calendar of Patent Rolls: Edward I, AD 1281-1292* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1893), 23, 30.

[33] Bruce Watson, Trevor Brigham, and Tony Dyson, editors, *London Bridge: 2000 years of a river crossing* (Lavenham, Suffolk: Lavenham Press, 2001), xvi-xvii.

[34] The specific years are selected based on various criteria, including survival and the inclusion of events of interest. They include the annual accounts for 1381-2, 1420-1, 1461-2, 1501-2, and 1537-8, as well as rentals for the corresponding years for which they survive.

within their introduction and also outlined the scope of the workforce and properties that appear in those accounts.[35]

Recently, historians have begun to use the rich archives of London Bridge to produce shorter, more circumscribed studies that consider specific aspects of the bridge's history. For instance, the volume *'Bring furth the pagants'* includes a chapter by Caroline Barron on pageantry on London Bridge during the fifteenth century.[36] Another study by Vanessa Harding considered how familial and apprentice-based links may have influenced employment within the London Bridge workforce in the fifteenth and early sixteenth century.[37] More recently, Dorian Gerhold published an in-depth study of the houses located on London Bridge between the thirteenth and eighteenth centuries, tracing the construction and management of these medieval properties.[38] John McEwan provided a recent close study of the religious and charitable role played by the London Bridge in thirteenth-century London.[39]

In the past twenty-five years, the chapel on London Bridge has also attracted the attention of musicologists and art historians. In his 1995 unpublished master's thesis, Richard Lloyd considered the rise of polyphony in the chapel on London Bridge during the fifteenth century and

---

[35] Vanessa Harding and Laura Wright, editors, *London Bridge: Selected Accounts and Rentals, 1381-1538* (London: London Record Society, 1995), x-xxvii.
[36] Caroline Barron, "Pageantry on London Bridge in the Fifteenth Century," in *'Bring furth the pagants': Essays in Early English Drama presented to Alexandra F. Johnston*, edited by David Klausner and Karen S. Marsalek (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007).
[37] Vanessa Harding, "Sons, apprentices and successors in late medieval and early modern London: the transmission of skills and work opportunities," in *Generations in Towns: Succession and Success in Pre-Industrial Urban Societies*, edited by F.E. Eliassen and K. Szende (Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2009), 153-168.
[38] Dorian Gerhold, *London Bridge and its Houses, c.1209-1761* (London: London Topographical Society Publications, 2019).
[39] John A. McEwan, "Charity and the city: London Bridge, c.1176-1275," in *Medieval Londoners: Essays to mark the eightieth birthday of Caroline M. Barron*, edited by Elizabeth A. New and Christian Steer (London: University of London Press, 2019), 223-44.

traces the employment of clerks at the bridge chapel.[40] In 2009, Christopher Wilson published a study on the rebuilding of the chapel on London in the late fourteenth century and the role played by Henry Yevele, who financed and directed the rebuilding while also acting as bridgewarden. In it, he examined the potential for an architect to act as civic benefactor.[41]

1.4 Expansion of civic and secular control of religious institutions

Between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries, the London Bridge House underwent several striking changes that ultimately transformed it from an independent religious foundation into a civic enterprise, under the authority of the mayor and aldermen. This transformation represented a process of secularization, in which an institution that had a religious foundation became part of the civic government.

This process was not unique to London Bridge. As the civic government expanded and gained greater autonomy, it increasingly took control of institutions that operated within the city, many of which had been founded under religious authority. Another example of this occurred with the hospital of St Mary of Bethlehem, or Bethlem. The hospital was founded in the twelfth century by Simon fitzMary as a link between England and the Holy Land and given a religious endowment.[42] In 1346, letters were issued under the common seal of London, taking Bethlem under the patronage and protection of the mayor and aldermen of the City of London.[43] This

[40] Richard Lloyd, "Pre-Reformation Music in the Chapel of St Thomas the Martyr, London Bridge," Unpublished MMus thesis, Royal Holloway, University of London, 1995.
[41] Christopher Wilson, "L'architecte bienfaiteur de la ville. Henry Yevele et la chappele du London Bridge," *Revue de l'Art* 166, no. 4 (2009): 43-51. My thanks to Christopher Wilson and Caroline Barron for making an English translation of Christopher Wilson's article available to me.
[42] Jonathan Andrews, Asa Briggs, Roy Porter, Penny Tucker and Keir Waddington, *The History of Bethlem* (London: Routledge, 1997), 25-27.
[43] *LBF*, 154, fn. 1, 163.

included an agreement that the City would be allowed to elect two aldermen in connection with the maintenance and governance of the hospital. Thereafter the City played a role in the administration of its revenues and properties.[44] By the time of the 1403 visitation, Bethlem no longer housed brothers and sisters and the care it afforded patients was increasingly secular, offered by individuals who were not members of religious orders, or indeed even clerical.[45] This was not the only case where religious organizations underwent internal reconfigurations in part due to changing oversight.

In the last thirty years, historians' debates around the state of the late medieval English church have dramatically changed. From the 1960s to the 1990s, the dominant account of the English Reformation was A.G. Dickens' *The English Reformation* (1964), which situated the English reforms of the 1530s and 1540s as an integrated and widespread popular movement that occurred in concert with similar movements on the Continent.[46] Revisionist historians in the 1990s, including Eamon Duffy and Christopher Haigh, challenged this interpretation dramatically by presenting an alternative depiction of the vibrant traditional lived religion in the later Middle Ages.[47] They argued that, contrary to previous thought, the medieval church was alive and well, and that the English Reformation represented a significant disruption imposed from above. This interpretation has been complemented by numerous studies of the late medieval parish and other ecclesiastical institutions.[48] Clive Burgess, for instance, argued in his recent

---

[44] This is discussed at some length in Andrews, et al, *The History of Bethlem*, 55-7.
[45] Caroline Barron, *London in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 292.
[46] A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation* (London: Batsford, 1964).
[47] Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400-1580* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992); Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).
[48] Clive Burgess, "Time and Place: The Late Medieval English Parish in Perspective," in *The Parish in Late Medieval England*, edited by Clive Burgess and Eamon Duffy (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2006); David Harry and Christian Steer, *The Urban Church in Late Medieval England: Essays in Honour of*

monograph that the late medieval parish church may have benefited from an institutional vitality and popular commitment rarely equaled since.[49]

The late medieval church was a dynamic institution. While devotion within parishes was flourishing during this period, the place of religion within civic institutions such as hospitals and bridges was shifting. The present study considers this phenomenon, arguing that the line between the religious and secular was being renegotiated in the centuries prior to the Reformation. A form of secularization thus emerged earlier than traditionally discussed. Institutions like hospitals and bridges, this study argues, were undergoing what C. John Sommerville termed "profanation." That is, they were, as spaces formerly regarded as sacred, being removed into the domain of the profane, "outside the temple."[50]

Historians have traditionally discussed secularization as a paradigm that emerged in the aftermath of the sixteenth-century religious reform movements. This partially has to do with contemporary usage of terms. Usage of the terms "secular" and "religious" in the modern sense is anachronistic when discussing the later Middle Ages as these words have taken on many new connotations in the past four centuries. During the medieval period, "secular" was used to refer to members of the clergy who lived "in the world" as opposed to monastic seclusion.[51] The *Oxford English Dictionary* makes note of a related usage, slightly closer to the modern

---

Clive Burgess (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2019); Marie-Helene Rousseau, *Saving the Souls of Medieval London: Perpetual Chantries at St. Paul's Cathedral, c.1200-1548* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011).

[49] Clive Burgess, *'The Right Ordering of Souls': The Parish of All Saints' Bristol on the Eve of the Reformation* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2018).

[50] C. John Sommerville, *The Secularlization of Early Modern England: From Religious Culture to Religious Faith* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 5.

[51] "secular, adj. and n." OED Online. June 2021. Oxford University Press. Medievalists, including Clive Burgess, have recently noted the expansion of the secular branch of the medieval church in the two centuries before the Reformation, in the form of secular religious foundations, such as colleges of priests. This is a different phenomenon from the concept of secularization discussed here, which is based on our modern understanding and refers to the removal of religious affiliation. Clive Burgess, *'The Right Ordering of Souls': The Parish of All Saints' Bristol on the Eve of the Reformation* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2018), 46-54.

understanding of the word, which referred to the activities belonging to the world, "civil, lay, temporal." This usage, which dates to the late thirteenth century, nevertheless had ties to the authority of the church. The *OED* cites the most frequent appearance of this usage as referring to the secular arm (Latin, *brachium seculare*) of the Church, which referred to the civil power that could be invoked by the Church to punish offenders. The first definite usage of the term secular in English to refer to literature, history, art, or education not "concerned with or devoted to the service of religion" appears in the early sixteenth century.[52] This was the first time that the word was used to invoke the concept of the profane. However, if one considers secularization as the renegotiation of boundaries between sacred and secular affiliation, this process can be seen significantly earlier.

The question of how to characterize the conflict of authority and influence of religious and non-religious authorities applies to many different transitions of the premodern period. For instance, given the overlapping nature of these spheres, Sommerville questioned whether it would be better to understand the transition of power around the Papacy in the twelfth century as a secularization of the religious sphere or a sacralization of the secular.[53] In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the process of removing sacred associations from institutions like the Bridge House, which was founded on the principle of caring for wayfarers as one of the seven acts of mercy, or like livery companies, many of which originated as religious guilds, can be seen as part of the creation of the category that we now call the secular.

In the last couple of decades, historians have engaged in a greater in-depth interrogation of pre-modern religion and the debate surrounding the secularization paradigm. The examination has required recognition of the extremely diffuse and contradictory elements embedded in

---

[52] Ibid.
[53] Sommerville, *The Secularization of Early Modern England*, 6–7.

secularization theory. In the late 1990s and early 2000s, opposing sides of the secularization debate came into pointed contention. On one hand, the sociologist Rodney Stark argued strongly that the entire concept of secularization was fundamentally flawed, because it was challenged by recent resurgences in religious belief and church attendance.[54] However, by characterizing current trajectories in religious practice as simply a continuation of the religious transformations of the sixteenth century, Stark obscured shorter-term transformations and suggested a unidirectional trajectory, which disregarded the continuous renegotiation of the place of religion within society. On the opposite side of the debate, Steve Bruce asserted that widespread decline of religious social significance and communal support during the early modern period fundamentally and permanently damaged the plausibility of religious beliefs.[55]

The disagreements about the validity of the secularization paradigm highlighted the wide divergence that exists between different models and definitions associated with the phenomenon. Philip Gorski contextualized these divergences by outlining the differences between conceptions of the secularization paradigm put forward by sociologists and historians in the past hundred years.[56] Gorski identified four separate frameworks that scholars have applied to secularization – disappearance, decline, privatization, and transformation.[57] The disappearance and decline frameworks, which propose that religion is being gradually supplanted by science and scientific rationalism, simplify complex developments by making them unidirectional and teleological. However, the privatization and transformation frameworks recognize that religious shifts that

---

[54] Rodney Stark, "Secularization, R.I.P.," *Sociology of Religion* 60:3 (1999): 255–57.
[55] Steve Bruce, *God Is Dead: Secularization in the West* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2002), 30.
[56] Philip S. Gorski, "Historicizing the Secularization Debate: Church, State, and Society in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe, Ca. 1300 to 1700," *American Sociological Review* 65:1 (February 2000): 138; Philip Gorski and Ates Altinordu, "After Secularlization?" *Annual Review of Sociology* 34 (2008): 55-85.
[57] Ibid., 140–42.

occurred in the early modern period triggered more nuanced processes of redefinition in which public and private and religious and secular spheres were and are repeatedly renegotiated.[58]

Historians have often fundamentally tied the concept of secularization to discussions around the pluralization of beliefs during the sixteenth-century religious reformations in Europe and the subsequent Enlightenment.[59] This framework does not sufficiently recognize the significant influence that other late medieval transitions, like urbanization and the expansion of civic government, had on the renegotiation of understanding of sacred and secular sphere and authority. The influence of these other social transitions can be seen in the growth of a more secular framework of governance in the century preceding the large-scale religious movements of the sixteenth century. The isolation of religious elements within the formerly religious establishment of the London Bridge House is only one example of this.

1.5 Argument of the present historical study

With these works of scholarship in mind, this dissertation argues that a form of secularization, or profanation, had already emerged in the later Middle Ages, prior to sixteenth-century religious reformations, as civic governments gained greater authority over a myriad of institutions, including former religious foundations. This profanation can be best understood as a

[58] Thomas Luckmann's interpretation of the gradual privatization of religion, with its emphasis on individualization, offers a more complex nuanced vision, which leaves room for an ongoing process of redefinition. Talcott Parsons' proposed understanding of secularization as a process of transformation, in which the public and private, religious and secular spheres are more differentiated on an institutional level, opens the door to further discussion about the localized, communal impact of institutional change. Thomas Luckmann, "Shrinking Transcendence, Expanding Religion?" *Sociological Analysis* 50 (2): 127-38; Talcott Parsons, Social Systems and the Evolution of Action Theory (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1977).

[59] Philip S. Gorski, "Historicizing the Secularization Debate: An Agenda for Research," in *Handbook of the Sociology of Religion*, edited by Michele Dillon (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 111-3.

process of differentiation. The boundaries between sacred and secular were already being renegotiated prior to the religious upheaval of the sixteenth century. This form of profanation should be understood in the context of other changes in the later Middle Ages, including urbanization. In decoupling religion from certain activities and institutions, people altered the place of religion in society.

The maintenance and management of medieval bridges, as discussed by Harrison and Boyer, was understood to have charitable associations and to benefit the soul. The religious origins of the London Bridge House have been readily acknowledged by historians who have written about the Bridge House documents, including Harding and Wright, and more recently by McEwan, who examined the thirteenth-century Bridge House institution. However, while some acknowledge the institution's religious origins, most historical studies of London Bridge disregard the complicated and extended process by which it shed those initial associations. Given its striking visual presence in the medieval London landscape, many historical studies of London Bridge focus principally on the physical bridge itself. However, old London Bridge can tell us far more about medieval London than we can learn from its impressive architecture.

This dissertation interrogates London Bridge as representative of a city in transition. It examines the renegotiation of the Bridge House from its origins as a fundamentally religious institution to one that acted as a branch of the civic administration, engaged with but at one remove from the urban religious landscape of chantries, parishes, and chapels. In doing so, this study asks what London Bridge can tell us about the changing dynamics between religious and secular authority in late medieval urban spaces. What role did London Bridge and the Bridge House play in the lives of Londoners? How and when did the city government take control of the running of London Bridge, and what did that mean for the religious origins of the Bridge House?

Did the bridge continue to play a role in the religious life of the city? How did Londoners view the Bridge House and the responsibility for the bridge's upkeep? In what ways did attitudes towards London Bridge change during the three centuries following the building of its first stone incarnation?

The transformation of London Bridge House did not happen in a vacuum. By examining the factors that altered the place of religion in the organization and redefined the expectations about responsibility for the bridge, this study endeavors to cast a new light on the potential impact of civic growth on other institutions related to public works. In doing so, it asks if and how the boundaries between sacred and secular were being more broadly redefined during the later Middle Ages and ultimately what can be learned from reexamining related instances of late medieval institutional change.

In attempting to answer these questions, this dissertation draws on not only the records of London Bridge itself, but also the records of the city's administration and, above all, the many wills which survive for medieval Londoners from the mid-thirteenth century onwards. Using these sources, it examines how and why medieval Londoners supported London Bridge, and what their changing attitudes tell us about the growth of secular urban government.

1.6 Historical Sources

This dissertation draws on several principal collections of sources. The central set of sources are those of London Bridge Estates itself, which are preserved and held at the London Metropolitan Archives (LMA). The sources from this collection that relate to the current study span the thirteenth century to the sixteenth century. Early records have a much sparser survival rate, however, and therefore the thirteenth and early fourteenth century bridge records frequently needed to be supplemented by other municipal records.

1.6.1 The records of London Bridge

1.6.1.1 Bridge Property Records

1.6.1.1.1 Original Deeds

The earliest records of the Bridge House Estate survive in the form of original deeds preserved by the estate dating from the end of the twelfth century, during the building of the first stone bridge in London. The records for the Bridge House Estates include ten deed portfolios (A-K) of between 61 and 112 deeds each, which largely date between the end of the twelfth century and the beginning of the sixteenth.[60] These are primarily original deeds, but also include among them copies of some relevant wills. Many of the original deeds that are extant in the deed portfolios were later copied into two registers compiled in the fifteenth and sixteenth century. Others appear not to have survived. Not all deeds are related to property being given or bequeathed to London Bridge.

1.6.1.1.2 Small Register of Deeds

In the fifteenth century, bridge scribes copied the contents of many of these original deeds into a common register, known as the Small Register of Deeds (hereafter the Small Register). Into this volume, they also copied miscellaneous bridge records, including a detailed list of the rental properties owned by London Bridge.[61] This register was initially compiled in the

[60] Deed Portfolios, CLA/007/EM/02/A-K, BHEC, LMA.
[61] Small Register of Deeds, CLA/007/EM/04/003/A, BHEC, LMA.

late fifteenth century, most likely around 1487.[62] However, it also includes several miscellaneous later entries dating from the early seventeenth century.

In addition to the Small Register itself, the LMA also holds a typewritten calendar of the Small Register dating from the twentieth century.[63] The calendar includes only the type of deed, the issuing and receiving individuals, and the kind of property being transferred. It does not include the dates of the documents, which appear sometimes but not always in the fifteenth century register, and the foliation listed is not always accurate in relation to the original register. It nevertheless allows for a useful overview of the deeds included in the register. Chapter 4 considers the 157 deeds listed in the Small Register, about half of the total number, that record direct gifts to London Bridge.

1.6.1.1.3 Large Register of Deeds

A second collection, known as the Large Register of Deeds, or the Large Register, was compiled in 1511.[64] Both registers include a combination of leases, grants, and wills, roughly numbering 300 deeds in total, and these deeds frequently appear in both registers, although there are some that are particular to one or the other. Most entries in the Large Register begin with decorative initial letters, which suggests that it may have been intended as a display copy, although most of the decorative work on these letters were never completed.

---

[62] Bridge Accounts, 1486-7, CLA/007/FN/02/004, f. 50v-51, BHEC, LMA. The most likely date for the compilation of the Small Register is around 1486-7, when the annual accounts recorded that Bavell, a stationer, was paid 8s for binding a book of account and "puttyng ynne dyvers stuffe in to the same boke." This is a different note than the usual record of clerks making a copy of the annual account.

[63] Calendar of Small Register of Deeds, CLA/007/EM/04/003/B2, BHEC, LMA.

[64] Large Register of Deeds, CLA/007/EM/04/001, BHEC, LMA. The Large Register was compiled in around 1511. This can be seen in annual account for 1510-11, when the bridge clerk recorded the payment of 6s 6d to a Thomas Symonds, stationer, "for binding & coveryng of a greate booke wheryn been conteyned divers & sundry accompts belonging to the works of the sayd bridge." Bridge Accounts, 1510-11, CLA/007/FN/02/005, f. 27, BHEC, LMA.

1.6.1.2 Bridgewardens' Accounts

The London Bridge House Estate was managed by two designated bridgewardens, elected annually by the commonalty alongside the city chamberlain and sheriffs from at least June 1319, when this practice was formalized in the charter issued by Edward II which regulated the way in which the City was governed.[65] The office of bridgewarden dated from the early years of the thirteenth century, a development that will be explored in greater detail in Chapter 2. In the early years, the title of warden or proctor of the bridge appears to have been used interchangeably before the records settled on bridgewarden as the standard term. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the term bridgemaster came into common usage and gradually supplanted that of bridgewarden. The term bridgewarden will be used for the purposes of this study, except when referring to records that use one of the other terms.

By 1319, elected individuals were forbidden by the city charter from holding any other municipal office during their tenure as bridgewarden. As part of their office, bridgewardens were expected to keep detailed financial accounts for the London Bridge House Estate, which were to be audited by the City.[66] These auditors were elected by the commonalty annually to audit the accounts at Michaelmas, with one account being kept by the City among the city muniments at the Guildhall and another being kept by the Bridge House.

---

[65] "Constitutions for regular government in the City of London," in *The historical charters and constitutional documents of the City of London*, edited by Walter de Gray Birch (London: Whiting, 1887), 49.

[66] Betty R. Masters, editor, *Chamber Accounts of the Sixteenth Century* (London: London Record Society, 1984), ix-xi. Masters discusses the annual audit of the chamberlain accounts in the fourteenth century, which parallels that which occurred for the bridgewardens' accounts and is documented in the Letter Books. Masters also notes that the bridgewardens' accounts are unique in that they are the only financial accounts for the city to survive prior to the sixteenth century, when the earliest chamberlain accounts survive from.

Unfortunately, the earliest bridgewardens' accounts were destroyed during the revolt in 1381. The bridgewardens' accounts survive with reasonable regularity thereafter, although there are some gaps in the records. These records include a combination of more informal weekly income and expenditure records and the formalized annual accounts that were audited at the end of the year.[67] However, these records are not uniform across this period, and the degree of detail, as well as the organization of the information included varies substantially, especially during the first eighty years of their survival between 1381 and 1460. Wright and Harding note that audits occurred less regularly than was intended well into the mid-fifteenth century.[68]

1.6.1.2.1 Weekly Accounts

The earliest surviving accounts are the bridgewardens' account rolls, which record weekly receipts and expenditure from 1381 to 1398.[69] They start with the receipt of rents from the Stocks Market,[70] where London's meat and fish markets were held, and tolls from carts and ships week by week over the whole year and then list the weekly payments made to bridge

[67] Vanessa Harding and Laura Wright, "Introduction," *London Bridge: Selected Accounts and Rentals, 1381-1538,* edited by Vanessa Harding and Laura Wright, (London: London Record Society, 1995), x-xxvii; Bridgemasters' Account Rolls, 1381-1398, CLA/007/FN/01-016, BHEC, LMA; Bridgemasters' Annual Account and Rental, 1404-1568, CLA/007/FN/02/001-008, BHEC, LMA; Weekly Payments: 1st Series, 1404-45, CLA/007/FN/03/001-004, BHEC, LMA; Weekly Payments: 2nd Series, 1505-38, CLA/007/FN/03/006-008, BHEC, LMA; Weekly Payments: 3rd Series, 1552-55, CLA/007/FN/03/009, BHEC, LMA.
[68] Harding and Wright, "Introduction," *London Bridge: Selected Accounts and Rentals,* xii-xiii. Harding and Wright note that wardens handled very large sums of money, ranging from £750 a year in the late fourteenth century to around £1500 in the mid-sixteenth century.
[69] Bridge Rolls, CLA/007/FN/01/001-016, BHEC, LMA.
[70] In May 1282, Henry le Waleys, mayor of London, dedicated several plots of land throughout the city to be built upon and let to individuals, with the rents to support the maintenance of London Bridge. One of these plots of land was near the parish church of St Mary Woolchurch. It became the Stocks Market, where fishmongers and butchers rented space to make their sales. Waleys' dedication of city property to maintain London Bridge occurred in the aftermath of the mismanagement of London Bridge Estates by the crown, which led to the collapse of five arches of London Bridge in January-February 1281. For further analysis of this transition in the management of London Bridge, see chapter 3. *CPR 1281-1292*, 10, 23.

employees, including unnamed chaplains and clerks on the bridge (listed quarterly), as well as the number of unnamed masons, carpenters, and other laborers paid each week.

The first surviving series of weekly records after the account rolls span 1404 to 1445 in four bound vellum volumes.[71] These accounts contain substantially more information than the rolls. Among other things, they include a detailed accounting of payments to named bridge employees, including masons, carpenters, daubers, tilers, and laborers. These weekly accounts also detail the tasks for which bridge employees received payment.

A series of weekly receipts organized similarly to those contained in the bridgewardens' account rolls from the late fourteenth century appear in volume one and two of the bridgewardens' annual accounts and weekly rental receipts, which cover 1403-21 and 1422-60 respectively.[72] There are several gaps within these records, including a one from early 1421 to late 1422 and another, larger gap between 1430 and 1435. While these volumes are listed by the LMA as part of the annual and rental receipts series, which are discussed further below, these two earlier volumes contain only simplified weekly receipts. They consist of an abbreviated version of the weekly records discussed above.

A second series of weekly accounts also survives from 1505 to 1538 in three volumes of more informal bound parchment.[73] A third series includes a volume spanning 1552 to 1555. These weekly accounts are organized primarily as notes. They do not include names of any

[71] Weekly Payments: 1st Series, 1404-45, CLA/007/FN/03/001-004, BHEC, LMA.
[72] Bridge Accounts, 1404-1460, CLA/007/FN/02/001-2, BHEC, LMA. While these volumes of records are filed among the annual accounts, they instead consist of weekly records, much like those that appear in CLA/007/FN/03. They do, however, appear on vellum, rather than parchment like the other weekly accounts. Therefore, they may represent an intermediary step between these two sets of documents. There are many corrections and notes in certain years, so it seems unlikely that this was the form of the official annual accounts that were audited at the end of the year.
[73] Weekly Accounts, CLA/007/FN/03/006-8, BHEC, LMA.

employees or specific projects, but merely list the amount to be paid to each mason, carpenter, or other laborer, along with the number of each that were employed that week.

Many of the weekly accounts include notations categorizing the casual receipts to the Bridge House as either from the Stocks, the passage of ships or carts, pre-mortem gifts of aid for bridge repair, legacies, oblations, or sales. Most entries for legacies and aid list the name of the benefactor attached to the gift, which makes it possible to construct a profile of the benefactors of London Bridge.

1.6.1.2.2 Annual Accounts

The formal annual bridgewardens' accounts, a clerk compiled after Michaelmas each year, only survive from 1461. These annual accounts are one of two copies so compiled each year, held by the London Bridge House; the other audited volume was held by the City in the Guildhall. The bridge clerk documents this practice in the account ending at Michaelmas 1491, noting the payment of £2 6s 8d to the clerk of the bridgeworks for fulfilling his office. The clerk received his reward "for writing and doubling of the bokes of this accompt wherof oon boke remayneth within the bridgehous And the other boke of the same remayneth in the chambre atte yeldehaule of London like as it hathe been allowed in yeris passed."[74]

The accounts survive largely uninterrupted after 1461. These accounts provide a detailed accounting of both the annual expenditure and income of the London Bridge House. They allow one to situate the bequests given to London Bridge within the broader context of how the institution functioned at that time.

The annual accounts are not uniform in the information they contain, and the location of certain information changes periodically. They generally start with information about rentals

[74] Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/004, f. 119v, BHEC, LMA.

held by the Bridge House Estates, including the names of occupants and their rental payments. They list receipts for the Stocks, the passage of carts and ships, and a detailed accounting of quit-rents maintained by the Bridge House.[75] This is then followed by a detailed record of costs accrued by restocking the storehouses and moving goods to and from these locations. The annual accounts then record the expenses of the chapel and the wages owed to their extensive workforce, followed by any additional payments to the administrative staff, including the bridgewardens themselves.[76]

The annual accounts include information different from the weekly accounts. Significant legacies are still listed towards the beginning of the annual accounts, although they disappear after 1484. Chantries and obits appear under quit-rents and necessary expenses, respectively.[77] However, there is limited information about when and how individual bequests were received.

1.6.2 Medieval wills

In addition to the records for London Bridge held at the LMA, this dissertation also makes substantial use of surviving London wills from the thirteenth through sixteenth centuries

---

[75] As part of London Bridge estate, certain properties, owned by various monastic institutions, were held in trust by the wardens of London Bridge. Rent derived from these properties were divided between the London Bridge House and the monastic house in question. London Bridge may have managed these properties for practical reasons, such as the location of the properties in question.

[76] Into the sixteenth century, bridgewardens received an annual reward of £10 for fulfilling their office. However, they also received allowances for other costs paid as part of their work in managing London Bridge property, including costs for horses required for travel to these properties. Also, fifteenth century accounts note the receipt of monies paid "for a repast made amonge officers and ministers of the bridge as it hath been used in tymes past." In 1491, the officers and auditors received 40s for this purpose. Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/004, f. 119v, BHEC, LMA.

[77] The section on quit-rents contained properties that the bridge managed, a portion of which was obligated to go towards the maintenance of a chantry, including the salary of the chantry chaplain. The bridgewardens maintained numerous quit-rent properties that included obligations toward various religious houses.

recorded in registers for Husting, Commissary, and the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, hereafter the PCC, as well as some recorded in the Archdeaconry and Consistory Court. It analyzes wills that belonged to individuals known to have been associated with London Bridge and considers the networks in which these individuals lived, as well as whether and in what way they remembered London Bridge in their bequests. In doing so, this analysis builds on recent scholarship on the study of medieval wills.

Surviving wills registered in London courts between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries provide crucial evidence about how Londoners interacted with London Bridge. Wills in the Middle Ages fell under the jurisdiction of church courts.[78] According to canon law, church courts had the right to grant probate, or the legal permission to administer a will, to designated executors. Church court registers, then, include transcripts of the last will and testament of individuals whose wills were proven in court. In earlier periods, a will disposed of land and buildings, while a testament disposed of personal property and money. However, by the thirteenth century, these two documents had largely merged into one, which dealt with both land and moveable goods.[79]

Medieval wills are often the only surviving records relating to individuals of the middling classes, and as such offer important insights into the pious and charitable giving practices of these individuals. Michael Sheehan's significant work, *The Will in Medieval England*, argued that the medieval will had an important role in extending greater proprietary and legal freedom to an ever-widening group of lay people.[80] However, it is important to bear in mind the limitations

[78] Lesley Boatwright, Moira Habberjam, and Peter Hammond, "Introduction," in *The Logge Register of Prerogative Court of Canterbury Wills, 1479-1486: Volume I*, edited by Lesley Boatwright, Moira Habberjam, and Peter Hammond (Knaphill, Surrey: Richard III Society, 2008), 4.
[79] Ibid, 4.
[80] Michael Sheehan, *The Will in Medieval England: From the Conversion of the Anglo-Saxons to the End of the Thirteenth Century* (Toronto: PIMS, 1963), 257.

inherent in these sources. Many wills have not survived, and those that have represent only a partial view of the testators' intentions. They do not address gifts that may have been arranged pre-mortem, either in person or through verbal instructions to executors, who often had wide-reaching discretionary power when it came to arrangements that would benefit the testators' soul.[81]

These limitations have been discussed at length by historians over the last thirty years, as the medieval will has become more central to our understanding of individuals in the later medieval period. Clive Burgess' seminal article on medieval wills as testamentary evidence brought to the fore not only the immense potential of wills for providing a window into the pious practices of medieval localities, to "prise the ranks of late-medieval society apart," but also the challenges posed by what they obscure, including the intervention of scribes and the frequent lack of documentation for comparative lifetime giving.[82] It is therefore often not possible to ascertain whether people may have had a long-term interest in a particular cause or institution. Such limitations have been kept in mind in assessing the evidence for this study, which incorporates supplementary references to giving within the London Bridge records while recognizing the gaps that nevertheless remain.

The wills used in this study are drawn from the following will registers. Many of these wills belonged to specific individuals mentioned in bridge records and were located using indexes and databases detailed below. In addition to this, several published collections of wills

---

[81] Clive Burgess, "Late Medieval Wills and Pious Convention: Testamentary Evidence Reconsidered," in *Profit, Piety and the Professions in Later Medieval England* (Gloucester: Alan Sutton Publishing Limited, 1990), 15-17; Richard Asquith, "Reconstructing Domestic Piety from Probate Inventories in pre-Reformation London," Presentation, Medieval and Tudor London Seminar, London, 23 July 2020.
[82] Clive Burgess, "Late Medieval Wills and Pious Convention: Testamentary Evidence Reconsidered," in *Profit, Piety and the Professions in Later Medieval England*, edited by Michael Hicks (Gloucester: Alan Sutton Publishing Limited, 1990), 14-33, especially 14-16.

from these registers have been analyzed as samples of wills from specific periods. This is detailed further below.

1.6.2.1 Husting Court

The Court of Husting was the oldest court of record within the City and operated as civil court for settling disputes between citizens. It proved and enrolled wills and other deeds, with wills recorded from 1258.[83] The original rolls and, later, volumes are held at the LMA, along with microfilm copies. The earliest enrollment of wills in the Court of Husting caused significant resistance from the Church since wills and testaments typically fell under the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts. However, property in London was held under burgage tenure, which granted Londoners greater freedom to alienate property outside of the traditional rules of inheritance, and to use property for investment and capital. Because of this, it became essential that the city have a written and authenticated record of property ownership and the complex legal disputes that regularly arose. In this context, the Court of Husting began to enroll deeds of London from 1193, with records for the Husting Court surviving from the mid-thirteenth century. The Church challenged this practice at the Council of Lambeth in 1261 and Council of London in 1262, requesting the imposition of penalties for those enrolling wills in lay courts. However, the Corporation of London requested and received confirmation from the king of the right to enroll wills in the court of Husting in 1268.[84]

---

[83] Husting Rolls, 1254-1478, CLA/023/DW/01/001-207, HR, LMA.

[84] Jamieson Weetman, "Testamentary Piety and Charity in London, 1259-1370," Unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 2003, 41-45. My thanks to Jamieson Weetman for sending me a copy of his DPhil thesis while the University of Oxford archives were closed during the pandemic.

Wills proved in Husting between 1258 and 1339 therefore chiefly involved land or other property in London, while testaments, involving moveable goods, continued to be enrolled in ecclesiastical courts as a compromise. However, in many cases, both the last will and testament were read together at the Court of Husting, with the scribe recording only burgage property. Starting in the 1330s, the Court of Husting began to include more information, including moveable goods and the place of burial.

The Court of Husting recorded fewer wills in the second half of the fifteenth century, as executors began to prove their testators' wills in other courts more frequently, particularly the Prerogative Court of Canterbury. This trend increased even further in the early sixteenth century, which limits the use of the Husting Court in tracing the patterns of benefaction in the period immediately prior to the Reformation. However, wills recorded in the Court of Husting nevertheless are extremely useful for assessing long term trends in prior centuries, when large numbers of wills were recorded there.

Prior to the mid-fourteenth century, the Court of Husting clerks only included a partial accounting of the wills that they enrolled. The Husting records frequently omitted information about burial and details pertaining to bequests that are not London property. Therefore, specific bequests are often abbreviated or not included altogether. The recording of wills proved in the Husting Court became much more comprehensive starting around 1340, when the court records begin to include the passages in which testators left their soul to God and arranged their burial, as well as a more thorough accounting of individual bequests.

R.R. Sharpe published the *Calendar of Wills Proved and Enrolled in the Court of Husting* in two volumes in 1889 and 1890. In his calendar, Sharpe summarized all wills that were enrolled in the Court of Husting between 1258 and 1685. This calendar has allowed widespread access to the Husting wills for over a century. However, Sharpe's calendar comes with significant limitations as well since it reflects the interests of one historian at the end of the nineteenth century. Sharpe did not, for instance, include the names of executors or witnesses, despite their inclusion in the Husting records from 1280.[85] He also omitted introductory clauses, which appear in the original records after the mid-fourteenth century. The calendar often omits the details of individual pious bequests, frequently only referring to such bequests collectively as general *pro anima* bequests. However, Sharpe did choose to include the details about familial bequests of goods and personal effects, which he deemed of interest in illuminating daily living. Despite its limitations, Sharpe's calendar offers a useful resource for identifying passages of interest that can then be located and analyzed in the original or microfilm version.

This dissertation draws on the wills of individuals who were known to be associated with London Bridge to determine the relationship these individuals had with London Bridge over time. The London Bridge records, discussed above, include the names of benefactors of London Bridge, as well as those otherwise strongly associated with the bridge, including masons and carpenters in the bridge's long-term employ. The digitalized version of Sharpe's calendar on British History Online has aided in the identification and retrieval of those wills that can be found in the registers for the Court of Husting.

1.6.2.2 Prerogative Court of Canterbury

The Prerogative Court of Canterbury recorded wills for individuals who held "bona notabilia," or personal estate of considerable value.[86] These were those who bequeathed more

[85] Weetman, "Testamentary Piety and Charity in London," 10.
[86] J. Challenor C. Smith, "Introduction," in *Index of Wills Proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, 1383-1558*, compiled by J. Challenor C. Smith (Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1968), vii.

than five pounds and held property in two or more dioceses, and therefore fell under the jurisdiction of the archbishop. The earliest surviving will to be proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, hereafter the PCC, dates from 1384. However, it is possible that the earliest of these wills, dating from before 1443, may have been proved in other church courts and only recorded in the PCC. J.C.C. Smith suggests in his index for the PCC that the court may not have become a fully independent court until this date.[87] The number wills recorded in the PCC register increased dramatically in the mid-fifteenth century.

The surviving PCC registers, which are kept at the National Archives in Kew, include full transcripts of wills. The earliest original PCC wills survive only from the end of the fifteenth century, with one from 1484 and additional ones surviving from 1496.[88] The jurisdiction of the PCC was much broader geographically than other courts included here, which means that some testators lived as far north as Lincolnshire, with clusters in other urban centers, such as Bristol.[89] It is therefore sometimes difficult to ascertain whether certain testators would have considered themselves to be Londoners.

The PCC wills have been digitally catalogued by the National Archives at Kew on their Discovery database. Through Discovery, it has been possible to locate numerous wills belonging to individuals known to be associated with London Bridge. These individuals include bridgewardens, masons, carpenters, chaplains, clerks, and various workers who appear in the bridge materials. In addition to this, the Richard III Society published a volume containing transcriptions and translations of 379 wills and testaments that appear in the Logge Register with

[87] Ibid, x.
[88] Ibid, xxv.
[89] Lesley Boatwright, Moira Habberjam, Peter Hammond, "Introduction," in *The Logge Register of Prerogative Court of Canterbury Wills, 1479-1486* (Knaphill: Richard III Society, 2008), 23.

the Prerogative Court of Canterbury between 1479 and 1486, which provides a readily accessible sample of PCC wills from the late fifteenth century.

1.6.2.3 Commissary Court

The Court of the Commissary of the Bishop of London, hereafter the Commissary Court, held jurisdiction throughout the city of London and its suburbs, as well as the deaneries of Middlesex and Barking.[90] The commissary-general was given full power over probate of wills. Wills enrolled in the Commissary registers survive from 1374, nine years before the earliest surviving wills recorded in the PCC registers. The Commissary recorded significantly more wills in the late fourteenth century than appear in the PCC.[91] It also contains wills for merchants and artisans of a more middling prosperity than the PCC, which makes it a significant resource in accessing the lives of average Londoners during the fifteenth century, particularly after the decline of wills in the Husting Court. The Commissary is also significant in that its registers are complete after 1374.

Marc Fitch published an index in two volumes for testamentary records proved in the Commissary Court from 1374 to 1488 and 1489 to 1558 respectively.[92] This index has made it possible to locate wills belonging to numerous individuals associated with London Bridge, despite the fact that there are no published registers of these wills. These individuals, identified through their appearance in the bridge archives, include bridgewardens and many other essential

---

[90] Richard M. Wunderli, *London Church Courts and Society on the Eve of the Reformation* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Medieval Academy of America, 1981), 12.
[91] Marc Fitch, "Preface," in *Index to Testamentary Records in the Commissary Court of London: Volume I, 1374-1488*, edited by Marc Fitch (London: The British Record Society, Limited, 1969), v.
[92] Marc Fitch, editor, *Index to testamentary records in the Commissary Court of London now preserved in the Guildhall Library, London* (London: H.M.S.O., 1969).

workers. Analyses of their wills at various points during this study helps to illustrate the relationship of these individuals to the bridge, based on whether they left bequests to it, and the networks of people around the bridge.

1.6.2.4 Archdeaconry Court

The jurisdiction of the Archdeaconry Court of London overlapped with that of the Commissary Court, as they were both church courts and covered a similar territorial jurisdiction. However, it included the wills of individuals further down the social scale. Most records for the Archdeaconry of London do not survive. The sole surviving medieval probate register includes copies of wills between 1393 and 1415.[93] These wills were indexed by Marc Fitch in 1979.[94]

1.6.2.5 Consistory Court

The Consistory Court of the Bishop of London had jurisdiction over the diocese of London, including the City of London, Middlesex, Essex, and part of Hertfordshire as an ecclesiastical court. It therefore had jurisdiction over the same areas as the Commissary Court, although the Consistory Court was a higher court, and therefore heard primarily civil suits.[95] Many of the testators who had their wills proven in the Consistory Court were clergy, although this was by no means exclusively the case. Richard Wunderli notes that we know little about the

---

[93] Robert A. Wood, *Life and Death: A Study of the Wills and Testaments of Men and Women in London and Bury St. Edmunds in the late Fourteenth and early Fifteenth Centuries* (unpublished PhD thesis, Royal Holloway, University of London, 2012), 12-13. Many thanks to Robert Wood for searching his database of Archdeaconry wills for references to the works of London Bridge.
[94] Marc Fitch, editor, *Index to testamentary records in the Archdeaconry Court of London now preserved in Guildhall Library, London* (London: The British Record Society, 1979).
[95] Wunderli, *London Church Courts*, 12.

general activities of this court, however, since so few of its records survive.[96] The earliest 245 surviving wills were published by the London Record Society in a 1967 volume, edited by Ida Darlington, which included wills enrolled between 1492 and 1547.[97]

1.7 Outline of the present study

The present study considers how the London Bridge House institution changed between the thirteenth and sixteenth century and how this reflects broader changes within society around the growth of urbanization and the expansion of civic and secular power. The chapters themselves are organized around particular aspects of the relationship between Londoners and the London Bridge House between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries. Therefore, each chapter considers specific though overlapping collections of surviving records that appear in the London Bridge House archive, held by the London Metropolitan Archive (LMA), and registers of London wills found in the LMA and National Archives at Kew, as discussed above.

Chapter 2 frames this central question with an analysis of the office of the bridgewarden during the thirteenth through sixteenth centuries. The office of the bridgewarden was reconceptualized several times to reflect broader structural transformations within the institution of the London Bridge. This occurred most notably at the end of the thirteenth century, when it was formalized in the city charter following royal interference in the bridge's finances, and the early fifteenth century, when the office became a long-term rather than annual position.

[96] Richard M. Wunderli, *London Church Courts and Society on the Eve of the Reformation* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Medieval Academy of America, 1981), 7.
[97] Ida Darlington, editor, *London Consistory Court Wills, 1492-1547* (London: London Record Society, 1967).

The institutional changes that occurred within the Bridge House arose alongside expanding municipal government in London. Chapter 2 draws on municipal records, like the City Letter Books, and royal documents, like the Patent Rolls, as well as the deeds and later annual accounts found in the Bridge House archive, to identify the names of 107 bridgewardens who held office between 1176 and 1554 and, where possible, to reconstruct their length of tenure, role within the institution, and relationship with London Bridge.[98] The patterns that emerge highlight the gradual differentiation that occurred within the leadership of the Bridge House, as the institution was stripped of clerical control and shifted into the hands of secular bridgewardens who could be more closely aligned with civic leaders such as the aldermen.

Chapter 3 takes a broader view of the London Bridge House by considering how ordinary Londoners perceived the institution at different points within the medieval life of the city. It analyzes how often and in what capacity the London Bridge House appears in several broad samples of London wills, including an analysis of all wills in Sharpe's calendar that mention London Bridge as a beneficiary. Such an analysis relies on an initial survey of Sharpe's calendar of Husting wills to identify wills that mention the bridge, followed by a more thorough consultation of the original wills as recorded in the Court of Husting. Although Sharpe's summaries of the wills are incomplete, Sharpe paid special attention to certain bequests, including those dedicated to the repair of highways and bridges, which makes this initial survey fairly comprehensive.[99]

The evidence examined in this chapter reveals a change in giving patterns to London Bridge. This included widespread giving of small monetary sums as pious bequests in the early

---

[98] See Appendix A, Wardens of the Bridge.

[99] Sharpe discusses the inclusion of such bequests and their origins as a religious duty in his introduction. "Introduction," in *Calendar of Wills Proved and Enrolled in the Court of Husting, London: Part 2, 1358-1688,* edited by RR Sharpe (London, 1890), xvi-xx.

fourteenth century, an increased reliance on the London Bridge House as a secondary manager of chantries in the fourteenth and early fifteenth century, and a gradual cessation of post-mortem gifts to the bridge, monetary or otherwise, by the end of the fifteenth century. An assessment of these giving patterns suggests the degree to which Londoners recognized the transformation of the Bridge House institution, from a religious institution to an administrative body that gradually became more closely affiliated with the civic government. Two collections of wills from the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries have also been used as points of comparison for the wills of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The analysis of widespread giving patterns among Londoners suggests the degree to which Bridge House shed its religious associations among the broader London population over several distinct periods of transition between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries.

In Chapter 4, the original deeds and registers of the Bridge House, together with the annual accounts, have been examined for evidence of bequests and gifts from Londoners which may not have been recorded in the surviving wills. These records also provide evidence of perpetual chantries and obits managed by the Bridge House in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, which were primarily maintained within parishes unaffiliated with the bridge institution. These sources provide evidence that the Bridge House continued to grow as an administrative body within the City more generally. The deed registers and annual accounts make it possible to trace the waning of London Bridge as a recipient of pious bequests, as well as the emergence of a sub-community around the chapel, which inherited many of the affiliations ascribed to the early Bridge House. They provide another layer to the differentiation developing within the Bridge House institution, whereby the broader institution stripped away its religious affiliations to become more closely aligned with the secular and civic government.

Chapter 5 focuses on the chapel on London Bridge itself, considering its development through the different incarnations of the Bridge House between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries: the early use of the chapel to house annual records, the refoundation of the chapel in the late fourteenth century under the leadership of Henry Yevele, mason, architect, and bridgewarden, and the expansion and growing independence of the chapel from the wider Bridge House institution in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. This chapter underlines the degree to which the sixteenth century chapel became its own entity, which took on many of the pious associations of the original Bridge House. This in turn allowed the Bridge House itself to gradually emulate the secular administrative functions of the civic government more closely, in the decades prior to the chapel's dissolution.

Chapter 2 Wardens of the Bridge

In 1176, a priest named Peter de Colechurch initiated the construction of the first stone bridge in London, becoming the first warden of London Bridge. By 1190, while the bridge construction was still underway, he had founded a fraternity dedicated to St Thomas Becket which was devoted to the upkeep of the bridge.[100] Bruce Watson has argued that Peter de Colechurch formed the first of a series of guilds to raise money to help finance the bridge "as a pious charitable work," by holding out prospects of spiritual reward.[101] This reflected the growing practice in England and on the continent for charity organizations to manage the construction and upkeep of bridges during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.[102]

The dedication of the fraternity and the bridge to St Thomas Becket was significant. Prior to his involvement with London Bridge, Peter de Colechurch had been priest for the parish where St Thomas Becket, eventually Archbishop of Canterbury, had been born and baptized. London

[100] Derek Keene, "Peter of Colechurch (d. 1205)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, published 23 September 2004.
[101] Bruce Watson, "Construction of Colechurch bridge," in *London Bridge: 2000 Years of a River Crossing*, eds. Bruce Watson, Trevor Brigham, and Tony Dyson (London: Museum of London Archaeology Service, 2001), 83. This supposition derives support from the existence, in the Pipe Roll of 1179-80, of five separate guilds of the bridge that were fined for being brought into existence without proper license. Historian George Unwin suggested that the existence of these unlicensed guilds demonstrate the existence of a growing system of independent organization amongst Londoners in the twelfth century. George Unwin, *The Gilds and Companies of London* (London: Methuen & Co, 1908), 47-8, 50-1.
[102] The growth and origin of this system of support will be discussed in greater depth at the beginning of chapter 3. David Harrison, *The Bridges of Medieval England: Transport and Society 400-1800* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004), 186, 190, 194, 207; Marjorie Nice Boyer, *Medieval French Bridges: A History* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Medieval Academy of America, 1976), 32; Alan Cooper, *Bridges, Law and Power in Medieval England, 700-1400* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), 109.

adopted the martyr as their patron saint in the late twelfth century, while the bridge was being built, and the saint became a powerful symbol of the association between London and Canterbury in the years the followed. Until the sixteenth century, the verso of the official City Seal featured Thomas Becket situated on an arch over the city, with an injunction "Cease not to protect me who gave thee birth."[103] This directly paralleled the seal for London Bridge, which likewise featured St Thomas Becket on an arch over the city.[104] Peter de Colechurch was buried in the St Thomas Becket chapel on the bridge after his death in 1205, and was replaced by Brother Wasce, thereby continuing the religious association of the Bridge House institution.[105]

The London Bridge House institution altered dramatically between the twelfth and sixteenth centuries. One constant for the institution was that it remained under the guardianship of one or more warden (*custos*) of the bridge works throughout. This chapter analyzes the changes that occurred to the office of bridgewarden by considering among other things, the individuals who occupied the office, the length and level of continuity in their tenure, and their relationships with each other and with the civic government. The patterns that emerge reflect larger transitions within the organization itself. Bridgewardens in many ways represented the physical embodiment of the face that the organization presented to London at large, and their lives reflect the ways that the Bridge House organization interacted with the City and its

[103] John McEwan, *Seals in Medieval London, 1050-1300* (London: London Record Society, 2016), 34-5.
[104] Ibid. In his catalogue of early London seals, John McEwan identifies two additional seals related to London Bridge, one the personal seal of Peter of Colechurch, which includes the legend "Seal of Peter Priest of London Bridge" and another, almost identical, which the legend "Seal of London Bridge." The first dates from c.1200 and the other between c.1176 and c.1205, within the lifetime of Peter of Colechurch. Both feature a man standing in full-length liturgical apparel. This reflects the close association between Peter of Colechurch and the bridge, as well as a recognition that early London Bridge was associated with the religious brethren of the Bridge House.
[105] Charles Welch, *History of Tower Bridge: and other Bridges built over the Thames by the Corporation of London* (London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1894), Appendix: Wardens of London Bridge, 251.

administration. The bridgewardens, like the Bridge House itself, gradually became more secular and administrative in nature.

Bridgewardens have been identified in several ways. Starting from 1381, most bridgewardens are identified directly in each year's accounts. Because the annual bridge accounts do not survive before 1381, earlier bridgewardens must be identified through references found in other records. Some of the earlier wardens are identified through the Large and Small Register of Deeds for the Bridge House, where they occasionally appear as recipients of various properties that were transferred to the landed religious endowment that supported London Bridge.[106] Individuals entrusted with London Bridge also appear on occasion in royal documents, including the Close Rolls and Patent Rolls, or municipal records, including the Letter Books. Previous partial lists of bridgewardens have assisted with the identification of these supplemental sources.[107] The names of 107 bridgewardens between 1176 and 1557 have thus been identified. Of these 107 bridgewardens, 51 have identifiable extant wills found in the Husting, Commissary and PCC registers.[108]

---

[106] SR, CLA/007/EM/04/003/A, BHEC, LMA; LR, CLA/007/EM/04/001, BHEC, LMA. For more on the Bridge House registers of deeds, see the introduction.

[107] Charles Welch, *History of Tower Bridge: and other Bridges built over the Thames by the Corporation of London*, (London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1894), Appendix: Wardens of London Bridge, 251-4; Caroline Barron, "The Government of London and its relations with the Crown 1400-1450," PhD Dissertation, University of London, 1970, Appendix 37, pp 600-1; John McEwan, "Charity and the city: London Bridge, c.1176-1275," in *Medieval Londoners: Essays to mark the eightieth birthday of Caroline M. Barron*, edited by Elizabeth A. New and Christian Steer (London: University of London Press, 2019), 223-244. Charles Welch's appendix covers bridgewardens between 1176 to 1881, although he did not document his references for them. His list is incomplete, leaving out any clergy who held the position of bridgewarden. He did, however, make note of those bridgewardens whose wills appear in the Husting Court. The list of bridgewardens from the appendix of Caroline Barron's dissertation covers the years 1404 to 1462. Table 10.1, in John McEwan's article on the early administration of London Bridge, covers the years 1176 to 1298. For a complete revised list of bridgewardens and their appearance in original records between 1176 and 1557, see Appendix A.

[108] The earliest surviving will is that of Gregory Rokesle (d.1290), the twenty-eighth named bridgewarden. In addition to these 51 wills, there is a deed found in the Large Register that records the legacy given to the bridge by Godard who was chaplain of the bridge, dated 1271, and another that notes a bequest given by Roger le Duc, a bridgewarden, in 1236.

2.1 The role of the bridgewarden

During the thirteenth century, the role of the bridgewarden remained somewhat undefined. The thirteenth century saw significant reconfiguration of civic authority.[109] Because the municipal government was still being established during and after the bridge's construction, the Bridge House was able to maintain a considerable sense of autonomy, at least initially. Tensions between Crown and City challenged that autonomy, however. In the late thirteenth century, the bridge estate became subject to outside jurisdiction. By 1270, Henry III had granted his queen, Eleanor of Provence "the custody of London Bridge with the liberties and other things belonging thereto … until All Saints and for six years afterwards."[110] Eleanor's influence continued into the reign of their son, Edward I. She persistently diverted the Bridge's revenues to her own purposes until shortly before the Bridge's collapse in the winter of 1280-1. This diversion of funds caused unrest among Londoners because the revenue that had been diverted consisted primarily of pious gifts or income from pious gifts given by men and women in the surrounding community for the benefit of their souls.

In January 1281, a mandate was issued by Edward I to all bailiffs, archbishops, bishops and other clergy for the protection of the keepers of London Bridge and their messengers collecting alms throughout the realm for the repair of the bridge, "which has fallen into a ruinous

[109] John instituted the mayoralty by royal charter in 1215, six years after the bridge was completed. Barron, *London in the Later Middle Ages*, 148; M. Bateson, "A London Municipal Collection of the Reign of John," *English Historical Review* 17 (1902), 480-511, 707-30; *Historical Charters and Constitutional Documents of the City of London*, ed. W. de Gray Birch (London, 1887), 19.
[110] *Calendar of Patent Rolls. Henry III, A.D. 1266-1272* (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1913), 459. The thirteenth-century Crown intervention into the affairs of the Bridge House will be discussed at greater length in chapter 3.

state, to the great danger of the almost innumerable people dwelling thereon."[111] It is significant that at this point, the king saw the bridge as located within the religious sphere and principally the responsibility of ministers of the church. This mandate was probably prompted by the collapse or imminent collapse of five arches of London Bridge, which was recorded in the *Annales Londonienses* by the chamberlain Andrew Horn. The *Annales* reported that the collapse occurred due to heavy frost between Christmas 1280 and the Purification on 2 February 1281.[112]

A year later, in February 1282, the king issued a mandate for the mayor of London to designate two or three discreet and lawful citizens of London to take tolls for the repair of London Bridge.[113] At the same time, Gregory de Rokesle, former mayor from 1274-1281 and 1284-85, requested that Roger de Norwod and John de Cobeham audit the account he had kept with Nicholas de Wynton during their term as wardens of the bridge, which began in 1275. This marked a transition towards the reclamation of London Bridge by Londoners. In the succeeding decades, the role of bridgewarden became an officially elected office, and bridgewardens gained greater autonomy and control over the Bridge House Estates. It was in the extreme circumstances around the collapse that the bridge trust finally became more formally established as an independent institution.

In December 1298, the mayor, aldermen, and commonalty agreed that the chamberlains, the wardens of London Bridge, and "all others who render accounts to the City" should do so twice a year, in the first week of Lent and the early autumn.[114] In this way, the role of bridgewarden developed in a manner parallel to that of other civic offices. The reign of Edward I

---

[111] *CPR 1272-1281*, 422.
[112] *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II, Vol. 1: Annales Londonienses and Annales Paulini* (London: Longman & Co, 1882), 89.
[113] *CPR 1281-1292*, 10.
[114] *LBC,* 30-1. By 1381, from which time the bridgewardens' accounts survive, the accounts had been reduced from being rendered semi-annually to annually, starting and concluding at Michaelmas.

was a significant time for the formalization of the civic government, and this had an impact on the management of the Bridge House, despite its relative independence as an institution. Bridgewardens appear to have rendered their accounts both more frequently and more irregularly in the early fourteenth century than they eventually did in the surviving accounts starting in the 1380s, when they rendered them annually at Michaelmas. For instance, William Jurdan and John le Benere rendered a single account covering over two years, which ran from Pentecost in 1298 to midsummer in 1300.[115]

This same period also saw further delineation around the roles of the principal three city officers, the common clerk, the chamberlain, and the recorder. The latter office developed alongside the emerging legal profession within the City at the end of the century, with the office appearing in 1298 and first being named in 1304.[116] The late thirteenth and early fourteenth century saw a significant increase in the production of formal written records in the London civic government more broadly. The office of the recorder held responsibility for running the Husting court, which was the civic court of record and kept account of deeds pertaining to lands within the city.[117] The significance of the recorder's office rose in tandem with that of the common clerk, who played a key role in the creation and safekeeping of the City's records, and the chamberlain, who managed the City's finances.[118] It was within the context of the growth of these civic offices that the office of the bridgewarden and their responsibilities in rendering accounts to the City became more formally understood.[119]

---

[115] *LBC*, p. 70.
[116] Barron, *London in the Later Middle Ages*, 173-188.
[117] Ibid, 128-9.
[118] Ibid, 186-7, 176-7. One of the most well-known common clerks, John Carpenter, compiled the *Liber Albus*, which recorded the city's custumals, in 1419.
[119] In addition to the formalization of these higher offices, the growth of the city also prompted the development a system of wards to manage more local concerns. Each of the twenty-four wards had its own alderman, clerk, and other staff, which by the early fourteenth century were keeping their own

As the civic government underwent further crystallization, offices with civic authority became more delineated as having separate roles. This also affected positions that were tangential to the central government, like that of the bridgewarden. In July 1300, the mayor and aldermen agreed that John le Benere and William Jurdan should be "quit of all tallages and all offices of the City so long as they remained Wardens of the bridge."[120] This represented a significant departure from earlier practice, when individuals such as Michael Tovy or Gregory le Rokesle held the role of mayor and bridgewarden simultaneously. In November 1311, John de Wymondeham and Thomas Prentice were elected bridgewardens, and therefore "elected officers of the City" by the commonalty, with the assent of the mayor and aldermen.[121] From this point on, it became common practice for the mayor, aldermen, and commonalty to elect the bridgewardens, although the timing each year appears to still be somewhat irregular. For instance, it was in late January 1315 that Henry de Gloucestre and Anketyn de Gisors were elected wardens of London Bridge by the mayor, John de Gisors, the aldermen, sheriffs, and commonalty, thereby replacing Thomas Prentice and John de Wymondeham.[122]

The affiliation between the Bridge House and other centers of religion, starting with Peter de Colechurch and extending through the thirteenth century, is highlighted by the number of people who appear in the records as keepers of the bridge during the bridge's early years who were also priests, brothers or chaplains. Thirteenth century documents identify individuals who were entrusted with the bridge variously as proctor (*procuratores*) or warden (*custos*), suggesting

extensive records. The requisite restructuring of city government to manage the affairs of a growing population likely informed aspects of the reestablishment of the Bridge House institution in the late thirteenth century. Williams, *Medieval London from Commune to Capital*, 80-1.

[120] *LBC*, p. 72.

[121] *LBD*, p. 275.

[122] *LBE*, p. 41.

that there may have been at least two separate roles in the early years.[123] While those named as proctors were more likely to be members of the clergy, this was not uniform. For instance, on 28 May 1298, Robert de Wethernghey, chaplain, William Jurdan, and John le Benere were sworn to guard London Bridge and faithfully receive and render accounts for the same.[124] There is no distinction made in this entry between these three individuals, which is unusual since there are no other known records that list three individuals as coequal wardens. The specification that Robert de Wethernghey was a chaplain might suggest that he held the role of proctor, although how this role differed from the role of warden is unknown. However, a deed recorded in the Large Register of Deeds, dated July 1306, records the transfer of property from Henry Tonkes to Gilbert Cros and a Sir Robert of Wetherstrete who are listed specifically as both being wardens of London Bridge.[125] It is likely that this is the same individual; his identification here as a warden suggests that either there were in fact three wardens in 1298, or that he held both the post of proctor and warden at different times. It suggests that the roles may have been more fluid in these early years. It is likely that the responsibilities ascribed to the more formal role of bridgewarden starting in the fourteenth century were distributed among several individuals, variously identified as proctors and wardens, in the thirteenth century.

In his charter for the regular government of the City of London, dated 8 June 1319, Edward II specified that London Bridge, with its rents and profits, was to be kept by two "honest and sufficient men of the city, other than the aldermen" who would be selected by the

[123] For the purposes of this study, both the proctors and the wardens of the bridge will be discussed.
[124] *LBB*, 216. Thomas Romein, an alderman, was at the same time sworn as "coadjutor" to oversee this, without rendering account.
[125] LR, CLA/007/EM/04/001, no. 48, BHEC, LMA.

commonalty annually and made answerable to that commonalty.[126] The stipulation, that the "bridgemasters" be individuals not otherwise occupying civic office, seems to have been an extension and formalization of the common practice in the preceding two decades.[127]

The earliest surviving oath of office for wardens of London Bridge was recorded by city officials in Letter Book D which was compiled around the same time as the charter that established elections for bridgewardens. It appears twice in this volume, once in French on a flyleaf in the front of the volume and once in English in the middle of the volume. Both times, the oath appears in a much later hand, likely dating from the late fifteenth century. In it, wardens of the bridge swore to "wel and lawfully serve the Cite of London in the offis of the Warden of the Brigge of the same Cite" by managing the properties of the bridge. [128] It is therefore likely that by the late fifteenth century the role of the bridgewarden had been recognized by officials of the City of London as being an office of the City, through which individuals served not just the semi-independent institution of the Bridge House, but also the interests of the City itself.

The oath of bridgewarden was recorded in the Letter Books alongside other oaths for city officials that were added over time. It was included with oaths taken by sheriffs, mayors, recorders, and aldermen, as well as oaths for less obvious civic officers such as bedels, searchers of vintners, and valets of sergeants.[129] A nearly identical list of oaths for civic officials appears in the *Liber Albus* costumal, which was compiled by John Carpenter when he was common clerk of

---

[126] "No. XXII: Constitutions for the regular Government of the City; granted by Edward II," in *The Historical Charters and Constitutional Documents for the City of London*, edited by Walter de Gray Birch (London: Whiting & Co, 1888), 49.

[127] Ibid, 46. In the same charter, Edward II also confirmed the annual election of the mayor and aldermen by the citizens of the City "according to the tenor of the charters of our progenitors."

[128] *LBD*, f lxxxvb; Welch, *History of Tower Bridge*, Appendix II: The Oath of the Wardens of the Bridge, 255.

[129] *LBD*, flyleaves A-F.

London in 1419, when Richard Whittington was mayor.[130] Carpenter included oaths for eighteen of the twenty-four civic officials that appeared in the compilation of oaths in Letter Book D. However, he did not include the oath taken by bridgewardens in his custumal. This notable exclusion suggests that the office of bridgewarden did not come to be seen as a civic office of the city until sometime during the fifteenth century, between the time that Carpenter compiled the *Liber Albus* in 1419 and when the oath for bridgewarden was added to Letter Book D in the late fifteenth century.

The wardens also swore to use any profits from bridge property to repair and sustain the same, to purchase any necessary supplies, and audit the Bridge House annual accounts. The oath specifies that they should "make no byldyng of newe rentes or tenements … withowte lycence, assent, and consent of the mayr aldermen and comyn councell of the seid Cite."[131] This passage makes it clear again that the work of the bridgewardens fell under the oversight of higher municipal offices in the City of London. The annual accounts, which survive from 1381, detail the extensive work that this entailed, including traveling to Depford, Stratford, and Lewisham to survey and repair the bridge's properties there.[132]

2.1.1 Thirteenth century wardens

In the thirteenth century, before this vast network of properties had been fully established, the office appears to have been short-term, passing back and forth between several

[130] Henry Thomas Riley, editor, *Liber Albus* (London: Richard Griffin and Company, 1861), 265-276.
[131] Ibid, 256.
[132] One example of this occurred in 1511, when the bridge scribe noted that 52s 2d had been paid to the wardens for the costs expended in viewing and overseeing the reparations of the "livelode" belonging to the bridge in Stratford, Depford, Lewisham, and other places in the country. Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/005, f. 28r, BHEC, LMA. For more on the growth of the role of bridgewardens during the fifteenth century, see pages 65-73 in this chapter.

individuals at any given time. Thirty-five names appear in the records that can tentatively be identified as belonging to individuals who served as either warden or proctor of London Bridge prior to 1300. Eight of these individuals are identified solely by their first name, which makes it difficult to trace them further in the city records.[133] Eleven of the thirty-five known bridgewardens, or nearly a third, were priests, brothers, or chaplains.[134]

Six bridgewardens in the thirteenth century also acted as London mayors, and at least eleven were elected sheriff. These men were members of London's highest class, frequently having gained their freedom into the city as part of high-earning occupational guilds such as those of the goldsmiths or mercers. The office of mayor was itself fairly new at the time, having first been established in 1190, and formalized by royal charter in 1215.[135] During the thirteenth century, the office was filled by members of a select number of families, often for multiple years at a time, who had previously held the office of sheriff. The office of mayor was filled through election, although who precisely participated in these elections varied throughout the thirteenth century as the city's population rose rapidly and the original open election model became impractical.[136] The overlap between bridgewardens and those occupying the highest civic offices reflects the concentration of power within the hands of relative few Londoners in the thirteenth century. The men who held these offices were prominent individuals who were used to managing large amounts of money. Some of them may have been offered the office of warden by the

[133] For instance, a 1213 deed lists an unspecified Geoffrey and Martin as proctors of the bridge. "Mortgage by Henry de Arches and Margaret his wife to Geoffrey and Martin, proctors of London Bridge," LR, CLA/007/EM/04/001, p. 160, no. 141, LMA; Welch, *History of Tower Bridge*, Appendix: Wardens of London Bridge, 251.
[134] See Appendix A: Bridgewardens, c.1176-1557.
[135] Barron, *London in the Later Middle Ages*, 308-11, 147-9.
[136] Ibid, 147-8.

Crown, as Brother Wasce, the king's almoner, had been in 1205. However, the exact method of appointment in these early years remains unclear.

Early wardens of the bridge may have used their office as a means of amassing influence or reinforcing their authority. As noted above, it was not uncommon for one man to hold both the office of bridgewarden and mayor at the same time. Gregory de Rokesle, who requested that his accounts be audited during the debacle of the bridge collapse, is the most prominent example of someone who held the position of mayor and bridge warden simultaneously. Indeed, it appears to have been through his influence as mayor that Rokesle was able to secure the return of the Bridge House properties to the control of the Bridge House after the interference of the Crown during the 1260s and 1270s.[137] The management of the Bridge House, in its earliest years, appears to have been divided between members of the clergy on the one hand and the individuals who made up London's growing municipal government on the other. The frequency with which the Bridge House changed hands and its unfortunate loss of financial autonomy to the crown leading up to its 1281 collapse suggests that during the early years the organization oscillated between attempting to maintain its independence and being drawn into the growing civic bureaucracy. The Bridge House institution only became more stable in the aftermath of the bridge's collapse.

The wills for three lay bridgewardens from the first century of the Bridge House survive. The first belonged to Gregory de Rokesle, a goldsmith who served as both mayor and bridgewarden in the late 1270s and early 1280s; he died in 1291. As noted above, he played a role in petitioning the Crown to transfer the bridge foundation properties back to the Bridge

[137] Welch, *History of Tower Bridge*, Appendix: Wardens of London Bridge, 251; Barron, *London in the Later Middle Ages*, 315; Husting deed, CLA/023/CP/04/003 m. 5, HR, LMA.

House in 1280, as well as reestablishing the auditing of accounts.[138] The other two surviving wills belonged to Edmund Horn, who served as bridgewarden in the early 1290s and died in 1296; and Thomas Cros, who served as bridgewarden intermittently in the 1280s and 1290s, served as sheriff in 1286-7, and died in 1298.[139] Neither Rokesle, Horn, nor Cros left any bequests to London Bridge. The general absence of bridge bequests among the early bridgewardens perhaps reflects the division of their interests among multiple civic institutions.

This does not mean early bridgewardens were entirely indifferent to the Bridge House. While the corresponding wills do not survive, the Large Register and Small Register of Deeds contain copies of deeds denoting legacies received from two earlier bridgewardens, Roger le Duc and Godard the Chaplain. The earlier of the two, Roger le Duc, served as bridgewarden alongside Serlo Mercer in the early 1220s. Both men would also eventually serve as mayor. Roger le Duc followed his tenure as bridgewarden by serving as sheriff from 1225-7 and mayor from 1227-31. Within the deed, dated 1236, the executors of the will of Roger le Duc concede annual rents worth 21s 8d located on the bridge to the work of London Bridge and the brethren of the same bridge, enjoining them to pray for his soul and the soul of all the faithful dead.[140] This suggests that in the early thirteenth century, when the bridge was newly built, those members of the civic government who supervised the bridge saw it as a worthy pious investment.

Godard the Chaplain appears as the receiving bridgewarden on several deeds between 1258 and 1264. Another deed recorded his legacy to the Bridge House and provides insight into

---

[138] *Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward I, AD 1281-1292* (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1895), p 10-11; Barron, *London in the Later Middle Ages*, 320-1. For further discussion of the reclamation of the bridge properties by the Bridge House in the 1280s, see chapter 3.
[139] Will of Thomas Cros, 1299, CLA/023/DW/01/28, no 6, HR, LMA; Will of Edmund Horn, 1296, CLA/023/DW/01/26, no 12, HR, LMA.
[140] SR, CLA/007/EM/003/A, no 30, f 19, BHEC, LMA; LR, CLA/007/EM/04/001, no 244, f 233, BHEC, LMA.

the organization of the early Bridge House institution. It was dated 14 November 1271 by James the Chaplain, then warden of the bridge, and the brethren of the bridge.[141] The deed confirmed that Godard ordained in his final will that the warden of the bridge, brethren of the same, and their successors were to sustain in perpetuity a chaplain to celebrate for his soul and the souls of the faithful dead in the chapel on the bridge and a deacon to serve in the same chapel.[142] The wording used in the deed, which not only definitively identifies James the Chaplain as warden but also includes the brethren of the bridge in the injunction to maintain the chaplain and deacon in the chapel, suggests that at this time, the Bridge House still housed brothers and sisters praying for the benefactors of the bridge and remained under religious governance.

In the deed, James the Chaplain recorded Godard's legacy of twenty marks and annual rents of 47s 4d in London and its suburbs to be used for the utility of the said bridge. He noted Godard's stipulation that two shillings out of the rents going to London Bridge should be given to the prior and convent of the new hospital of St Mary without Bishopsgate. This reflects an early example of a quit-rent offering, whereby the endowment from a property given as a pious gift was divided between two or more religious institutions.[143] It further confirms the pious nature of early gifts to the Bridge House. The deed also recorded that Godard had appointed a chaplain of the bridge, Reginald, as one of his three executors, along with Master John de Braynford, clerk, and Matilda Graspoys.[144] The inclusion of a chaplain of the bridge among Godard's executors reflects the interwoven nature of the religious community around the Bridge

[141] James the Chaplain is likely the same individual as James of St Magnus, who appears in other deeds as warden between 1271 and 1273. This suggests that James may have been affiliated with St Magnus the Martyr, the parish located just north of the bridge.
[142] SR, CLA/007/EM/003/A, no 2, f 13, BHEC, LMA; LR, CLA/007/EM/04/001, no 571, f 281, BHEC, LMA.
[143] For further discussion of quit-rent properties, see chapter 4.
[144] Ibid.

House in these early years. This is in stark contrast with the representation of the Bridge House that appears within the records of the fifteenth or even the fourteenth century.

2.1.2 Fourteenth-century developments

The 1319 charter of Edward II, as noted above, stipulated that bridgewardens were to be elected by the London citizenry and to refrain from holding other civic offices during their tenure. In the succeeding century, the individuals who occupied the office appear to have become more local. During the fourteenth century, acting bridgewardens continued to occupy the office sporadically, passing the position back and forth among a handful of individuals over the course of a decade or more. The longest gap between terms that appears in the records was accorded to Anketyn de Gisors, who served in 1315 with Henry de Gloucester, and again with Robert Swote in 1332-5. In between these years, he served as an alderman, first for the ward at Aldgate, just to the east of Lime Street, and subsequently for the Vintry Ward, along the Thames to the west of the Bridge Ward.[145] In this case the role of bridgewarden appears to have been simply a temporary office, neither more nor less desirable than other possible civic offices.

It was also notable that after 1306, there were no longer any bridgewardens who were also members of the clergy. Scholars, including Arthur Leach and John Miner, have noted that the expansion of the almonry grammar schools that accompanied cathedrals in the early fourteenth century made literacy increasingly available to lay scholars as well as those seeking to take orders. The impact of this was exacerbated by the widespread reorganization of the secular clergy, which resulted in the establishment of large numbers of colleges, many of which likewise

[145] *LBD*, fo. 1 b; Welch, *History of Tower Bridge*, Appendix, 251-2.

maintained grammar schools. In addition to providing Latin instruction to clerks of the college, they also extended similar instruction to any others who wished to benefit from it.[146] Jo Ann Hoeppner Moran has argued that the increase in lay literacy led to increased lay involvement in education, including an increase in lay foundations of colleges.[147] This increase in lay literacy, however, also increased the ability of lay individuals to participate in roles within local government and the kind of management involved in the London Bridge House. It therefore makes sense that there was a shift towards an increasingly secular administration within the institution in the fourteenth century.

There were also comparatively fewer individuals who used the position of bridgewarden as a stepping-stone to other municipal positions of authority in the fourteenth century when compared with the thirteenth century. It is possible to identify thirty-one individuals who served as bridgewarden during the fourteenth century from Bridge House deeds, royal documents, and civic records. Of these, only two were also elected mayor, and another served as sheriff. Seven served at one point as aldermen. The 1319 charter, however, would not have allowed them to hold more than one office at a time. As with Anketyn de Gisors, individuals frequently alternated between holding the offices of bridgewarden and alderman, suggesting that one office did not necessarily serve as a stepping-stone to the other.

There were occasional exceptions to this pattern of tenure. John Lovekyn acted as bridgewarden in 1339 and 1342, was elected sheriff in 1342-3, and eventually became mayor, serving 1348-9 and 1358-9.[148] James Andreu, a draper, served as bridgewarden in 1350, before

[146] John Nelson Miner, "Schools and Literacy in Later Medieval England," *British Journal of Educational Studies* 11, no 1 (1962), 19-22.
[147] Jo Ann Hoeppner Moran, *The Growth of English Schooling, 1340-1548: Learning, Literacy and Laicization in Pre-Reformation York Diocese* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1985), xv-xvi.
[148] LR, CLA/007/EM/04/001, p. 67, no. 55, BHEC, LMA; Barron, *London in the Later Middle Ages*, 330; Welch, *History of Tower Bridge*, 252.

becoming mayor in 1367.[149] These two may well have viewed the office of bridgewarden as an opportunity, like the office of sheriff, to establish themselves as capable of taking on significant responsibility within the civic arena. Alan Gylle, by contrast, served as sheriff in 1324-5, and then acted as bridgewarden for an extended period, appearing as bridgewarden in records from 1339, 1342, 1344-5, and 1348-9.[150] Unlike the others, Gylle appears to have occupied the office of bridgewarden uninterrupted for ten years, making him a precursor to what became a common trend in the fifteenth century, treating the office of bridgewarden as a long-term career position.

Seventeen bridgewardens' wills survive from those who served during the fourteenth century. These bridgewardens were much more likely than their predecessors to belong to crafts or trades that clustered in the neighborhoods around London Bridge. This pattern in occupation suggests that these individuals may have had a greater investment in the local community around London Bridge. Five of them were fishmongers, which was a common trade near the bridge given its proximity to one of the three principal fishmarkets, located at the bridgehead.[151] Two were grocers and two others were cordwainers; there was also an apothecary, a clerk, a draper, a vintner, a chandler, a mason, and a goldsmith. Of these seventeen individuals, nine of them left explicit bequests to London Bridge in their wills.

Matthew de Essex, an apothecary, Robert Yon, a fishmonger, and John Vivian, a cordwainer, each appear briefly in the records as bridgewardens in the late 1310s and early 1320s, around the time of the formalization of the charter. All three died in the early 1320s, when large bequests to London Bridge were still limited, and each chose to focus their pious bequests

[149] Will of James Andreu, 1374, CLA/023/DW/01/102 (171), HR, LMA; Barron, *London in the Later Middle Ages*, 332.
[150] LR, CLA/007/EM/04/001, p. 33, no. 20, BHEC, LMA; LR, CLA/007/EM/04/001, p. 620, no. 647, BHEC, LMA; Welch, *History of Tower Bridge*, 252.
[151] Justin Robert Colson, *Local Communities in Fifteenth Century London: Craft, Parish and Neighborhood* (PhD Dissertation, Royal Holloway, University of London, 2011), 169-72.

elsewhere. Matthew de Essex left property for a perpetual chantry in the parish of St Mary of the Arches, and John Vivian left property for the maintenance of a chantry in the parish church of All Hallows with three chaplains. These wills also establish how intertwined these families at the top of London society were. Interestingly, Matthew de Essex named John Lovekyn, future bridgewarden and London mayor, as one of his principal executors.[152] John Vivian, on the other hand, requested that William de Rokesle and Sarah de Rokesle, Gregory de Rokesle's son and daughter-in-law, be among the principal recipients of the chantry prayers at All Hallows, likely due to having been his executor.[153] Whether these interconnections were attached to their service with London Bridge or merely a result of a shared elite status within the city remains uncertain, but later wills suggest that the London Bridge community increasingly became a platform for professional and personal networks in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

The bridgewardens' wills from the second half of the fourteenth century demonstrate a renewed trend in giving to London Bridge as a focus for pious benefaction. That they viewed their donations to the Bridge House as a charitable act is very clear based on how and where in their wills these individuals recorded these bequests. For instance, Robert Swote, a fishmonger, established a chantry in his home parish of St Magnus the Martyr, the local parish church for London Bridge, and left his wife Agnes his shop and tenement in the parish. He then went on to detail his various pious offerings, including bequests of three shillings and four pence to each of the four orders of friars in London. He concluded this section by making bequests to both the works of St Paul and the works of London Bridge, of three shillings four pence and eleven pence respectively.[154] The pairing of bequests to St Paul and London Bridge was quite common during

[152] Will of Matthew de Essex, 1324-5, CLA/023/DW/01/053 (129), HR, LMA.
[153] Will of John Vivian, 1321-2, CLA/023/DW/01/050 (55), HR, LMA.
[154] Will of Robert Swote, 1353, CLA/023/DW/01/083 (59), HR, LMA.

the fourteenth century, which confirms the association at the time of London Bridge with other sites of civic religion.

Richard Bacoun, a fishmonger who served as bridgewarden from 1357-62, left a monetary bequest to the Bridge House organization in his 1363 will. However, his bequest was substantially larger. Bacoun likely died relatively young, leaving behind four underage children, Thomas, Simon, William, and Margaret, to be raised by his wife Juliane. However, despite his early demise, Bacoun made a point to designate several tenements to be sold, with the resulting money to be received by London Bridge up to one hundred marks.[155] The remainder, he stipulated, was to be spent on masses for his soul and all Christian souls, suggesting that his bequest to London Bridge was likewise pious in nature.

Henry Vannere, a vintner, and John de Hatfeld, a chandler, served as bridgewardens together in 1352, and both left bequests specifically to the chapel on the bridge. When Henry Vannere died in 1354, he left extensive bequests for his home parish of St Martin of the Fields, establishing a chantry, and leaving a bequest to the poor at the hospitals of St Bartholomew in Smithfield, St Mary without Bishopsgate, St Thomas in Southwark, and St Giles without Holborn.[156] He followed this by leaving bequests to the works of St Paul, the works of London Bridge, and the works of the priory of Holy Trinity within Aldgate. After leaving extensive bequests to his son William, daughters Margaret and Elizabeth, and wife Johanne, Vannere concluded his will by requesting that a mass be said for his soul in the St Thomas chapel on London Bridge, bequeathing an additional eleven pence to them for that purpose.[157] Like Swote's, Vannere's bequest to the works of the bridge, situated as it was between bequests to

[155] Will of Richard Bacoun, 1363, CLA/023/DW/01/091 (127), HR, LMA.
[156] Will of Henry Vannere, 1354, CLA/023/DW/01/082 (60), HR, LMA.
[157] Ibid.

two works devoted to churches, clearly had pious intentions. Vannere reaffirmed this intention when he bequeathed money specifically to the chapel on the bridge.

John de Hatfeld had a much longer tenure as bridgewarden. After serving with Vannere in 1352, he went on to serve with Richard Bacoun from 1357-62.[158] Like Vannere, he left extensive bequests to London Bridge and its chapel, although he situated several of these bequests as conditional upon certain circumstances. After asking to be buried under the stone in the church of St Benedict in Gracechurch where his first and second wives, Isabelle and Emma, lay buried, Hatfeld requested that his son John, called Montagu, John de Pountefreit, junior, John de Gailee, and Roger Leycestre, manage properties to support a chantry in the same church for the soul of John de Stevenheche, his own soul, the souls of Isabelle and Emma, the souls of his father and mother, and all the faithful dead. If they failed to maintain the said chantry, he asked that the properties be placed in the hands of the mayor and commonalty of London to sustain a chantry in the chapel of St Thomas the Martyr on London Bridge, to be held in trust by the wardens of London Bridge.[159]

Hatfeld also mentioned London Bridge in his property bequests to his three children, John, Dionisie, and Thomas, and their lawful heirs. In each case, he stipulated that if the principal heir of that particular property did not have lawful heirs, the property was to be passed on to each sibling and his or her heirs in turn. In each case, if none of his children had lawful heirs, the property was to be given over to the works of London Bridge to sustain the bridge and its chapel (ad opus et sustentacione predicte pont' et capello).[160] The repetitive way that Hatfeld included both the London Bridge House organization and its chapel in his list of heirs underlines

---

[158] LR, CLA/007/EM/04/001, 96, f. 374 no. 444, BHEC, LMA; LR, CLA/007/EM/04/001, 173, f. 586 no. 599, BHEC, LMA; Welch, *History of Tower Bridge*, 252.
[159] Will of John de Hatfeld, 1363, CLA/023/DW/01/091 (125), HR, LMA.
[160] Ibid.

his recognition of its place as a significant spiritual and communal centerpiece in fourteenth century London.

In May 1393, the bridgewarden's accounts noted the additional payment of two shillings weekly for a chaplain celebrating mass for the soul of John Hatfeld, indicating that the bridgewardens had seized the property from the parish for failing to maintain the chantry.[161] Richard Lloyd, an historian of musicology, has argued that this addition of John Hatfeld's chantry in the chapel on London Bridge may have triggered the growth of polyphonic music in the chapel.[162] On 8 April 1394, Thomas, the youngest of John Hatfeld's three children, issued a quitclaim to John Hadlee, then mayor, to the commonalty, and to Henry Yevelee and William Waddesworth, in their capacity as bridgewardens, for a tenement in the parish of St Benedict in Gracechurch, recognizing the transfer of the property.[163] This transfer of property denoted the point at which the mayor and commonalty would have taken over the maintenance of property from the original legatees.

It became increasingly common in the late fourteenth century for bridgewardens to rely on London Bridge as secondary recipient for bequests to safeguard the proper fulfillment of their bequests. John de Coggeshale, a cordwainer who served as bridgewarden with Henry Yevele between 1368 and 1378, likewise left extensive property to London Bridge and its chapel should the primary recipient of his gift fail to maintain a chantry in his home parish. He specified that his wife Johanne receive his lands and tenements in the parishes of St Margaret in Bridgestreet, St Botulph next to Billingsgate, and St Andrew Hubbard next to Eastchepe for life, provided that

[161] Bridge Rolls, 1393, CLA/007/FN/01/012, m. 8 (xxxii) , BHEC, LMA.
[162] Richard Lloyd, "Pre-Reformation Music in the Chapel of St Thomas the Martyr, London Bridge," MMus Dissertation, Royal Holloway, University of London, 1995, 17-19.
[163] *LBH*, 411. This appears to have been an acknowledgement of the transfer, which at that point had already occurred.

she maintain a chantry at the altar of St Peter in the church of St Margaret for his soul, that of his father Thomas, his mother Anna, his late wife Juliane, and the souls of the faithful departed. Following her death, he indicated that those properties were to go to the rector at St Margaret's, Robert Sprotburgh, and his successors to that post, to maintain the chantry. If they defaulted, the property was to go to London Bridge to maintain two priests for a chantry in the chapel on the bridge.[164] Unlike the case of John Hatfeld, there is no indication in the records that Coggeshale's property defaulted to London Bridge. However, the increasingly common practice of designating London Bridge as a secondary legatee to manage defaulting chantries suggests that the Bridge House was gradually becoming recognized as more of an administrative safeguarding body. This was in marked contrast to earlier bequests that explicitly requested prayers directly from men and women praying at the Bridge House.

The last two decades of the fourteenth century also marked a significant shift in the place of the chapel within the larger Bridge House institution, a movement instigated by the actions of one of its bridgewardens. Henry Yevele, who was a mason and architect, as well as bridgewarden, undertook a comprehensive rebuilding of the Thomas Becket chapel on London Bridge between 1387 and 1396. Yevele has a unique legacy as not just a bridgewarden but also one of the premier architects in England in the late fourteenth century. He first appeared in the city records in February 1356 as one of the City's twelve most skilled masons, selected by his fellow masons, when the mayor, Simon Francceys, and the aldermen ordained articles to manage the trade.[165] By 1360, he had been granted the office of "disposer of the King's works pertaining to the art of masonry in the Palace of Westminster and the Tower of London," receiving wages

[164] Will of John Coggeshale, 1384, CLA/023/DW/01/114 (39), HR, LMA.
[165] John H. Harvey, *Henry Yevele c. 1320 to 1400: The Life of an English Architect* (London: B.T. Batsford Ltd, 1944), 21.

of 12d a day.[166] He managed and contributed to a remarkable number of building projects over the second half of the fourteenth century, which have been well documented by historians. Alongside his position as royal architect, he also maintained a thirty-year tenure in the office of bridgewarden, starting in 1365.[167]

Yevele financed much of the rebuilding of the chapel on London Bridge himself, although direct documentation for his financial contributions has not survived. The annual bridgewarden's accounts include references to the purchase of supplemental materials, including stone from Kent, as well as payments made for the construction of buttresses for the west façade and the upper vault.[168] The historian Christopher Wilson notes that the costs found in the annual accounts would have been much more extensive if Yevele had not been financing much of the rebuilding project and keeping separate accounts.[169]

There is considerable documentation of the appearance of Yevele's chapel, which was a masterpiece of Perpendicular architecture. Yevele had amassed considerable wealth through his service to the crown, a fact attested to by his extensive property ownership, documented by John Harvey.[170] His primary residence lay within the parish of St Magnus the Martyr, just to the north of London Bridge, where he requested burial. His choice to invest extensive funds into rebuilding the chapel on London Bridge suggests the profound significance of the chapel within

[166] Harvey, *Henry Yevele*, 22.
[167] Ibid, 28; DP, CLA/007/EM/02/G/076 & 079, BHEC, LMA. Unlike the case of civic offices, there was nothing to prohibit Yevele from holding both the position of royal architect and that of bridgewarden simultaneously.
[168] Bridge Rolls, CLA/007/FN/01/008, m. 8, xxiv, BHEC, LMA; Bridge Rolls, CLA/007/FN/01/012, m. 7, xxiii, BHEC, LMA.
[169] Christopher Wilson, "L'architecte bienfaiteur de la ville. Henry Yevele et la chappele du London Bridge," *Revue de I'Art* 166, no 4 (2009): 43-51, especially 48-50. My thanks to Caroline Barron for providing me with an English translation of Christopher Wilson's article on the architect as civic benefactor.
[170] Harvey, *Henry Yevele*, 45-7.

the local community. In rebuilding the chapel, Yevele endowed this central piece of the London Bridge community with renewed visibility, at the same time that the acquisition of residual bequests like that of John Hatfeld were expanding the services offered within the chapel. By showcasing the bridge chapel, Yevele renewed the symbolic connection between London Bridge and one of the City's most prominent patron saints, who appeared on both the City Seal and the seal for the corporation of London Bridge.[171]

The rebuilding of the chapel was Yevele's most significant gift to London Bridge, and one of the few recorded large-scale bridge projects completed during a sponsor's lifetime. However, it was not his sole contribution, as he left additional bequests to London Bridge in his will. Yevele directed his wife Katherine to establish a chantry at the altar of the Blessed Mary in the church of St Magnus with two chaplains to pray for his soul, that of his late wife Margaret, his mother and father, his brothers and sisters, Edward III, Sir John de Bello, John Haket, and the faithful dead. He specified that after her death the properties supporting the chantry were to go to the wardens of the church. If they were to default on their obligations, the properties were to go to the mayor or wardens of the bridge for the use and sustaining of the bridge, as well as to support two chaplains celebrating in the chapel on the bridge.[172]

Henry Yevele was by far the longest serving bridgewarden up until this point. His tenure represented a movement towards the longer-term associations of later bridgewardens with London Bridge. He also had significant affiliations with his fellow bridgewardens, including John Lovekyn, from whom he purchased property listed in his will, and John Clifford, the chief mason of the bridgeworks, with whom he purchased extensive property during his life and who

---

[171] Elizabeth New, "'Protect me who gave thee birth': Thomas Becket on medieval London seals*," London and Middlesex Archaeological Society Transactions* 71 (2020), 203-7. For further discussion of the symbolic importance of Thomas Becket to London, see chapter 5.
[172] Will of Henry Yevele, 1400, CLA/023/DW/01/129 (7), HR, LMA.

he listed as one of his principal executors. At the same time, Yevele represented one of the last instances of a bridgewarden who was firmly rooted in the local community around the bridge, something the wardens of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were much less likely to be.

2.1.3 The fifteenth-century mercantile shift

During the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, London citizens took significant steps towards expanding the mercantile capabilities of their city. One of these steps was the construction of the Custom House in the 1370s and 1380s, to allow for the weighing and processing of wool in a single centralized location at the port of London.[173] Another was the effort of the mayor and aldermen to establish a market house at Blackwell Hall in the 1390s.[174] These efforts resulted in a consolidation of mercantile control and wealth among a subset of the London elites. The late fourteenth century was also a time during which upwards of thirty craft associations drew up ordinances and submitted them to the mayor and alderman for ratification and enrollment.[175] These ordinances allowed for the expansion of self-government. They were followed by further civic ventures, including the rebuilding of the Guildhall from 1411 and the creation of a market and storehouse at Leadenhall around the same time.[176]

Thomas Badby served as bridgewarden for six years in the 1430s and 1440s. Like many of the bridgewardens in the preceding years, Badby worked as a fishmonger in the area around London Bridge. He served with William Whetenhale, a grocer, from 1433 until 1438, when

---

[173] Barron, *London in the Later Middle Ages*, 52-3. This was undertaken by a combined effort between a London grocer, John Chircheman, and the Crown. The Crown, in addition to the civic government, had a vested interest in the expansion of the economic infrastructure of London, since it frequently called upon London for financial assistance in the form of taxation, loans, or gifts.
[174] Ibid, 53-5.
[175] Ibid, 207.
[176] Ibid, 54-6.

Wetenhale was elected as alderman in Farringdon Ward Within.[177] He then served with Richard Lovelas until 1440. However, unlike his predecessors, whose aspirations may have been more within civic government, Badby seems to have been oriented towards his trade guild and the mercantile interests that accompanied them. He appears frequently in the Chancery records as a creditor.[178] He also held membership as a merchant in the Company of the Staple at Calais, which held, among others, a total monopoly on the export of wool from England.[179] In addition to his involvement as a merchant of the Staple and a bridgewarden for London Bridge House, he also appears to have acted as warden for the fishmonger's guild at one time, based on a Chancery suit from the 1430s disputing the execution of the will of John Perveys, an alderman and fellow fishmonger.[180] As became common for bridgewardens in the fifteenth century, however, Badby did not leave anything to London Bridge.

Nicholas James, an ironmonger, alderman, and fellow bridgewarden, who served the Bridge House from 1419 to 1421, named Thomas Badby as one of his two executors, along with William Wilford, in November 1434, while Badby was serving as bridgewarden.[181] Badby's

---

[177] Bridge Accounts, 1423-60, CLA/007/FN/02/02, BHEC, LMA; Journals, COL/CC/01/03, fo. 170, Corporation of London Collection, LMA; Beaven, *Aldermen of the City of London*, 145-152.

[178] There are at least six cases tried in Chancery in which Thomas Badby was the purported creditor requesting repayment. It is likely that more may exist. Writ of Debt, Creditor Thomas Badby, 26 Nov 1433, C 131/229/28, Court of Chancery: Extents of Debt, TNA; Writ of Debt, Creditors Thomas Badby, Thomas Barnwell, and Robert Rykedon, 29 Jan 1420, C 241/213/21, Chancery Certificates, TNA; Writ of Debt, Creditor Thomas Badby, 17 Feb 1430, C241/223/21, Chancery Certificates, TNA; Writ of Debt, Creditors Thomas Badby, Robert Page, and William Beaufitz, 24 Nov 1432, C 241/225/49, Chancery Certificates, TNA; Writ of Debt, Creditor Thomas Badby, now deceased, 15 Nov 1448, C 241/235/130, Chancery Certificates, TNA.

[179] The Exchequer accounts record a payment of £21 15s 7½ d by the Staple at Calais to Thomas Badby in 1443. Denture of the Staple at Calais to Thomas Badby, merchant of the said Staple, 1443, E 43/754, Exchequer Deeds, TNA.

[180] Bernewell v Berbyng, 1432-1443, C 1/9/281, Chancery Pleadings, TNA.

[181] This may not have been harmonious arrangement, as Thomas Badby appears twice in the Chancery records defending against complaints filed regarding his role as Nicholas James' executor. In one Chancery record, Isabel Elmebrygge, the daughter of Nicholas James, issued a plea of debt against Thomas Badby, her father's executor, for money left to her by him. Will of Nicholas James, 1434, PROB

appointment as James' executor suggests that the Bridge House continued to have a significant role in contributing to local personal and mercantile networks. In his own will, moreover, Thomas Badby included bequests for commemoration in his own parish of St Margaret's for the soul of Nicholas James, beyond the commemorations at St Botolph's that James requested in his will, along with prayers for the souls of his wife, Agnes, his father Robert, and his mother Joanne.[182] Badby also left six silver goblets to another Nicholas James, perhaps the son of his deceased friend and colleague, and a silver goblet to John Speldsell, who was a clerk of the bridge of London.

In the years following Yevele's rebuilding of the bridge chapel, there was a distinct decline in pious bequests to the London Bridge House recorded in wills. Thomas Badby belonged to the St Margaret Bridgestreet parish, just north of the bridge, and he left many of the same local pious bequests as his predecessors, including for the hospitals of St Thomas in Southwark and St Bartholomew in Smithfield, the leprosarium at Loke, and to the fabric of the St Paul Cathedral. A bequest to the fabric of the Bridge House is therefore conspicuously absent.

Thomas Badby and his fellow bridgewarden, William Wetenhale, faced several challenges during their tenure as bridgewardens, and their response to those challenges suggests a new approach to the office. Badby and Wetenhale were first elected to the office of bridgewarden on 21 September 1434. Nine months later, on 27 July 1435, Wetenhale and Badby acquired a deed from the City, held under the Common Seal, declaring that they would receive repayment for any outlay they made on behalf of the bridge during their term in office, due to the

11/3/248, PCC, TNA; Writ of prohibition, 1437, C 270/27/15, Chancery Misc, TNA; Rows v Badby, 1433, C 1/12/125, Chancery Pleadings, TNA.
[182] Will of Thomas Badby, 1445, DL/C/B/004/MS09171/004, f. 169v, Commissary, LMA.

bridge's "ruinous condition."[183] Despite efforts to secure the structure, the Southwark side tower and two arches collapsed during the second week of January 1437, causing the bridgewardens to bring in the carpenter William Crofton to manage up to 29 additional carpenters and 33 additional laborers needed for the initial rebuilding process over the succeeding three months.[184]

In July 1437, Badby and Wetenhale received a loan of 250 marks from William Estfeld, Robert Large, John Bacon, and John Levyng, presumably to aid in the ongoing efforts to repair the bridge's structure.[185] However, in 1440, the Commons petitioned the Mayor and Aldermen to have this sum of 250 marks repaid to the City and requested that special auditors be appointed to audit the accounts of William Wetenhale. They disputed Badby and Wetenhale's claim for the repayment of £609 5s 6d, "for it is supposed verraily by the grete part of us comones that of thilke DXIX li v s vi d which the said Wetenhale and Badby axen of the brigge shuld be founde but litell due to hem or nought."[186]

The conflict between Wetenhale and Badby and the City continued for another ten years beyond this challenge. In December 1447, Wetenhale was judged to owe money to the bridge and have been negligent in his role as bridgewarden. After this initial ruling, Wetenhale and Badby petitioned the chancellor regarding the promise made by the mayor and aldermen to repay them for excess costs in repairing the bridge. In November 1450, Nicholas Wyfold, the mayor, and the commonalty, assigned rents received from property belonging to the bridge to be given to Wetenhale for five years in repayment. This was then instated in February 1451, over fifteen

[183] *LBK*, 191; Caroline Barron, *London in the Later Middle Ages: Government and People 1200-1500* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 51.
[184] Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/03/004, f. 218v, 219v, 220v, 228v, BHEC, LMA. For more on the rebuilding process, see chapter 3.
[185] *Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls [Volume 4] A.D. 1413-1437*, edited by A.H. Thomas (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943), Roll A 64, p 298.
[186] *LBK*, 248.

years after Badby and Wetenhale made their own initial contributions to shoring up the failing bridge.[187]

The dispute between Wetenhale and Badby and the City points to the complicated relationship between the Bridge House and the City in the fifteenth century. Bridgewardens during this period managed the largest property estate in the City, which gave them great responsibility and access to significant funds. In moments of crisis, however, they could be held in suspicion of abusing their power by civic officials, a group of men to which they both belonged and from whom they were held apart. Wetenhale's involvement in the dispute around the bridge badly damaged his standing within the city government, and he was removed from office during his tenure as alderman.

The existence of annual accounts from 1381 onward shows that individuals held the post of bridgewarden for more regular periods of time. There were twenty-eight men who served as bridgewardens at some point during the fifteenth century. Of those, only two, William Sevenoke, a grocer, and Thomas Cook, a draper merchant, served as London mayor in the years after they served as bridgewarden. Two others, William Chichele and William Wetenhale, both grocers, were elected sheriff after they had served as bridgwarden, suggesting these four may still have used the office of bridgewarden as a stepping-stone to higher office within the municipal government. Fewer bridgewardens also eventually served as aldermen. The trend of remaining in the post for extended, unbroken periods of time continued. Of the twenty-eight men who served as bridgewarden during the fifteenth century, only seven served interrupted terms

[187] *LBK*, 332. My thanks to Caroline Barron for sending me an early draft of her article on William Wetenhale.

with a year or two of intermission between service periods. Ten served uninterrupted terms of five or more years.[188]

The average number of years of serving as bridgewarden was quite high overall, especially among those who served in the second half of the century. Nine bridgewardens served for ten or more years, two of whom, John Whatele, a mercer, and Thomas Cook, a draper merchant, served for fifteen or more years. Eight bridgewardens served terms of between five and nine years, and eleven served for one to four years. The average number of years of service per warden over the fifteenth century was just under seven years. These extended tenures represent a further step towards the practices of the sixteenth century, when individuals frequently stayed in office until they were no longer able to perform their duties.

Strikingly, these increasing numbers did not result in a corresponding increase in bequests to the Bridge House. In fact, after Henry Yevele rebuilt the chapel in the late fourteenth century, bequests by bridgewardens to London Bridge all but stopped appearing in their wills. There was a single exception to that rule - John Clifford, a mason who served for a single year in 1399, at the time of Yevele's death, and died in 1417. John Clifford previously served as the chief mason for the London Bridge House workforce, which may have influenced his gift. He also served as one of the executors for Henry Yevele. Clifford asked to be buried in St Olave's in Southwark, one of the two closest parishes south of the Thames, and owned extensive property on London Bridge itself, which is evident from his inclusion of these properties among those dedicated to maintaining a chantry in his home parish. He also requested that on the day of his obit, the works of London Bridge receive six shillings and eight pence to pray for him.[189] A

188 Bridge Accounts, 1403-1422, CLA/007/FN/02/01, BHEC, LMA; Bridge Accounts, 1422-60, CLA/007/FN/02/02, BHEC, LMA; Bridge Accounts, 1461-84, CLA/007/FN/02/04, BHEC, LMA; Bridge Accounts, 1484-1509, CLA/007/FN/02/04, BHEC, LMA.
189 Will of John Clifford, 1417, PROB 11/2B/159, PCC, TNA.

century later, the Bridge House accounts still regularly recorded the ongoing observance of John Clifford's obit.[190]

It is possible to identify the companies of sixteen of the twenty-eight fifteenth century bridgewardens. Unlike the previous century, when locally situated fishmongers predominated, the majority of the bridgewardens from this period were grocers, ironmongers, or merchants. Of the sixteen, four were grocers, three were ironmongers, three were draper merchants, and one was a mercer. Among them as well were a baker, a skinner, a yeoman, a tailor, and a fishmonger. The distribution suggests that as the position had grown more established, those who sought the office of bridgewarden might have belonged to a wealthier subsection of London society. The occupations of the bridgewardens were also representative of companies that were on the rise in the fifteenth century, as trade companies negotiated for further influence within the civic government. The standing of these individuals within the civic government may also have influenced their willingness to serve longer, more permanent terms.

The earliest extant account, from 1381, noted that the wardens received an annual stipend of £10 each.[191] In the early sixteenth century, the annual base fee of £10 remained the same. This was the same annual fee received by those who held the offices of chamberlain and common clerk.[192] However, the wardens also each received a further £10 as reward for "theyre attendaunce and good provysyon doon in their offyce."[193] The more detailed accounts from the early sixteenth century also note that the wardens received a stipend of twenty shillings each for their clothing and forty shillings each to keep the horses they needed for travel to the outlying

[190] "For the obites of John Fekenman John Clyfford and Cristyan Mallyng like as it is conteyned in their Testaments. Sum xxxv s x d." Bridge Accounts, 1502, CLA/007/FN/02/004f. 224v, BHEC, LMA. For more on the obits maintained by London Bridge, see chapter 4.
[191] Bridge Roll, 1381, CLA/007/FN/01/001, m. 1r, BHEC, LMA.
[192] Barron, *London in the Later Middle Ages*, 176, 185.
[193] Bridge Accounts, 1511, CLA/007/FN/02/005, f. 33r, BHEC, LMA.

locations where the Bridge House owned properties.[194] The travel, for “vewyng the livelode belonging to the sayd bridge … at Stratford Depford Leueshm and other places in the countrey” and “oversyng the the reperacions of the same lyvelode,” also merited repayment to the bridgewardens, a cost that varied from year to year. In a particularly busy year, when such travel occurred “many tymes,” bridgewardens could be reimbursed for as much as fifty-two shillings and two pence, as they were in 1511.[195] These additional responsibilities suggest that the focus of bridgewardens shifted away from the religious origins of the Bridge House as the organization became more of a civic enterprise with commercial aspirations, no longer acquiring property through pious bequests but instead seeking to expand its ties through trade routes in the London hinterland.

Moreover, by the late fifteenth century, outgoing bridgewardens were permitted to owe debts to the Bridge House, sometimes for several years afterward. There were three principal ways that these debts were owed: “desperat det,” in which wardens were charged in arrears for themselves and their renters; obligations, whereby former bridgewardens owed obligations through sureties; and ready money, in which former bridgewardens owed money more generally.

For instance, in the account ending in 1492, the clerk noted that Edward Stone and Peter Caldecote owed £53 6s 6d ob in “desperat det,” which had been charged “in tharrerages” as in accounts passed.[196] Edward Stone and Peter Caldecote had served together in 1473-4.[197] The clerk also noted that Harry Bumpstede, who had last served in 1485, along with “his suerties,” owed eleven obligations totaling £71. William Galle and Harry Bumpstede owed £48 6s 1d in

[194] Bridge Accounts, 1502, CLA/007/FN/02/004, f. 225r, 226v, BHEC, LMA; Bridge Accounts, 1511, CLA/007/FN/02/005, f. 28v, 33r, BHEC, LMA.
[195] Bridge Accounts, 1511, CLA/007/FN/02/005, f. 28, BHEC, LMA.
[196] Bridge Accounts, 1492, CLA/007/FN/02/004, f. 132r, BHEC, LMA.
[197] See Appendix A.

“redy money” for their time being wardens, from 1476 to 1485, and Simon Harris and Christopher Eliot, who served together from 1490 to 1492, owed £210 11s 11d ob in “redy money.”[198] The allowances made for these debts suggests that bridgewardens were permitted to use the bridge money they had access to for their own purposes, as long as they paid it back. They also show how dramatically the role of bridgewarden had shifted during the forty years since the mayor settled with William Wetenhale for the personal money he invested in bridge after its collapse. Rather than being a potential cause of financial loss, the office of the bridgewarden had become a possible source of outside revenue.

These outside usages of Bridge House funds did not apply to the bridgewardens alone, however. The account ending in 1511 noted that William Melbourne, the former Chamberlain of the City, owed £912 8s ob to the Bridge House, which had been lent to him by successive bridgewardens between 1497 and 1509, presumably for the use of the City.[199] By lending money to the City, bridgewardens further differentiated the Bridge House from its previous role as a religious institution. They more closely aligned the Bridge House with the secular and civic interests of the City, possibly exerting influence on the spending of the City at large. This would significantly shape the role of the sixteenth century bridgewarden.

2.1.4 The career bridgewarden

In September of 1539, Thomas Crull recorded his final will and testament. He had, at that point, been bridgewarden for the London Bridge House for nine years and was beginning his tenth and final year in that capacity, a year that would be cut short by his death the following

[198] Ibid.
[199] Bridge Accounts, 1511, CLA/007/FN/02/005, f. 34r, BHEC, LMA.

July. In his will, Thomas Crull recorded extensive and specific bequests to the parish of St Magnus the Martyr by the bridge.[200] This included five tapers at the high altar and a further eleven tapers to be distributed to various alters within the parish church of St Magnus, including "twoo to the chapell of our blessed lady." It is possible that this referred to the chapel on London Bridge, formerly dedicated to Saint Thomas Becket, which had been rededicated as the lady chapel in 1538, a year prior, due to the king's attack on the popular cult of the Thomas Becket.[201]

In the preceding years, the chapel on the bridge had become increasingly reliant upon St Magnus the Martyr, its parish church, for clerks and priests to keep its operations running, after the staff in the chapel had dropped from nine to two.[202] Crull bequeathed to his wife Margaret the lease he has purchased of a "ten*emen*t as yet to be bilt / that shal stond on the chapell syde of london Brigge," anticipating it construction alongside the religious structure so prominent in the London urban landscape.

Thomas Crull left the responsibility of carrying out his will to be shared between his wife, Margaret, and Robert Draper, goldsmith of London, who for nine years had been "with [him] one of the wardens of the brigge howse." If Margaret was unable to pay his debts, Robert Draper was instructed to take the task upon himself. Likewise, while Thomas Crull made Margaret his principal executrix, he also instructed his "singuller and faithfull lover and Frend to assiste her Master Robert Draper of London." For his aid in this, Thomas bequeathed to Robert

---

[200] Will of Thomas Crull, PROB 11/28/158, PCC, TNA.
[201] Bridge Accounts, 1539, CLA/007/FN/02/006 f 259v, BHEC, LMA. For more on the dissolution of the cult of Thomas Becket, see Robert E. Scully, "The Unmaking of a Saint: Thomas Becket and the English Reformation," *The Catholic Historical Review* 86:4 (2000), 579-602.
[202] In 1538, the traditional annual staff of three chaplains and six clerks abruptly fell to a single priest, Sir John Pate, and the head clerk John Ferrys, who after twenty-eight years of managing the work of four or five other clerks, suddenly had to contend with running the chapel on his own. Bridge Accounts, 1539, CLA/007/FN/02/006 f 259v, BHEC, LMA. For a further discussion of the decline of the chapel, see Chapter 5.

"a chalys with a patent ... both of Sylver and gilt ... and a prymar booke with David Psalter therin / writt in vellem /and lynnyd with gold and bordyd / with a clapsse of latyn."[203]

When Thomas Crull died, the Bridge House was reaching a significant turning point. The former St Thomas Becket chapel on the bridge had been diminished by the recent royal proclamations against the saint's cult, which had for many years been deeply embedded in London life, a stopping place for prayers for safe travel for nearly all who passed it entering or leaving the city. The chapel no longer supported nearly a dozen clerks and priests as it has done traditionally for many decades prior, instead relying heavily on a single priest and clerk.[204] While Londoners may have had some sense by that point of the precarious position the chapel held, they nevertheless continued to recognize its significance in the urban landscape. The Bridge House organization continued to foster significant bonds among colleagues and within commercial networks, both personal and collegial, such as that so clearly referenced between Thomas Crull and Robert Draper in the former's will. These bonds reflected the deep roots of the London Bridge association and the tight knit collective it had fostered over many years.

By the sixteenth century, the role of the bridgewarden had become a permanent, long-term position for nearly everyone who chose to serve in this capacity. The number of identifiable bridgewardens decreased from thirty-one in the fourteenth century, to twenty-eight in the fifteenth century, to twenty-one in the sixteenth century. Only five of those twenty-one served for less than five years. Of the twenty-one, only one, William Campeon, had an interrupted term, leaving his post in 1522 only to return in 1525 for a five-year encore. The average number of years of service for each warden had increased a full four years in comparison with the fifteenth

[203] Ibid.
[204] Bridge Accounts, 1539, CLA/007/FN/02/006 f 284 r, BHEC, LMA. For further discussion of the state of the chapel in the 1530s and 1540s, please see chapter 5.

century, to just under eleven years. Twelve of the twenty-one served for ten or more years, with a remarkable six of those serving upwards of fifteen years. Four served between five and nine years and five served for one to four years.

Even more striking, however, was the frequency with which these individuals chose to remain in their post until death. Of the bridgewardens in the fifteenth century whose death dates can be determined, only one, Henry Julyan, appears to have died in office. The fifteenth century bridgewarden died on average nearly twelve years after he had left the position. By contrast, ten of the thirteen wardens whose death dates were identifiable died either while still in the post or within a year of leaving it. The other three left the position three, five, and ten years before their deaths, respectively, although among these three only one, Simon Rice, had served more than two years.[205] This tendency to remain in the role of bridgewarden for life indicates that the position had evolved to the point that it was seen as a respected and elevated position in its own right and no longer seen as a stepping-stone to more prestigious roles.

As the position became more established and elevated as an office, the individuals who were drawn to the position correspondingly came from a wealthier and more elite group within London. It is possible to identify the occupation of seventeen of the twenty-one bridgewardens for the sixteenth century. During the previous century, as mentioned above, there were four grocers who acted as bridgewarden, at least three of whom appear to have used the position of bridgewarden as a stepping-stone to higher office within the municipality. This aligns with the character of the grocers' guild at that time, which had become one of the most prominent guilds

[205] Of the three, only Simon Rice, a mercer, both served a significant period of time and left office with any extended period remaining to him afterwards. He served as bridgewarden from 1512 to 1524 and died in 1534. Bridge Accounts, 1509-25, CLA/007/FN/02/05, BHEC, LMA; Will of Simon Rice, 1534, PROB 11/25/184, PCC, TNA.

in London starting in the late fourteenth century.[206] In the sixteenth century, another five grocers held the position of bridgewarden. However, none of them used the position of bridgewarden to seek higher office. In fact, four of them remained in office until their death. Marketing trades, including haberdashers, also gained significant prominence during the sixteenth century, and they were likewise represented amongst the sixteenth century bridgewardens. Two haberdashers, a bowyer, a leather seller, a stationer, a draper, a fishmonger, and a mercer all held the office at one point during the sixteenth century. Two bridgwardens were identified as gentlemen in their wills, signifying their elevated financial position, and another was identified as a goldsmith.[207]

Of the fourteen bridgewardens who died between the start of the sixteenth century and the 1550s, when the bridge chapel was dissolved, it is possible to identify will records for twelve individual wardens. Two of those, however, only list the date of probate. The ten remaining wills do not include the kinds of bequests to the Bridge House that were seen in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, with one exception. Several included references, as in Crull's will, to connections between bridgewardens, which suggests that the bridge continued to play a role in establishing networks among London's elite. While the bridge was largely absence among their bequests, bridgewardens continued to leave extensive pious bequests especially directed toward more traditional sixteenth century religious establishments, including hospitals, convents, and monasteries. It was also common for bridgewardens to request temporary obits or chantries at their home parishes.

---

[206] Barron, *London in the Later Middle Ages*, 230.

[207] One of the gentlemen, Robert Draper, who served from 1530 to his death in 1547, is elsewhere identified as belonging to the goldsmiths' guild. He divided most of his property between his wife, Elizabeth, his three sons, Henry, John, and William, and his two daughters, Bennet and Elizabeth. Interestingly, among these extensive properties are a number of lands and tenements in Depford, where many of the Bridge House properties were located. This correlation between property locations was quite common in sixteenth century bridgewardens' wills. Will of Robert Draper, 1547, PROB 11/31/536, PCC, TNA.

The mercer Robert Weston, who died in 1501, for instance, left extensive pious bequests to institutions both within and without London. He requested several priests be designated to pray for his soul in the years following his death, including one for three years at his home parish of St Mary Woolnoth beside the Stocks and another at the parish church of Bradwell in Oxfordshire.[208] Weston left gifts to several significant religious establishments within the City of London, as well, including to the master and brethren at the hospital of St Thomas Acon and the prior of the hospital of St Mary Spital, to remember his soul. He did not mention London Bridge, although he did leave £4 to amend the highway between Ipswich and Norwich, "for the case of the people by those weyes goyng and ryding and for the relief and comfort of my soule." This passage is notable in its acknowledgement that the mending of roads continued to be seen in the early sixteenth century as an act that could benefit the soul.

The one exception to these general patterns of giving was the will of William Maryner, a salter who died in 1512 after serving as bridgewarden for ten years. Among his bequests to numerous fraternities located variously throughout the City at St Giles Cripplegate, St Sepulchre without Newgate, St Margaret at Westminster, and St Dunston the West, Maryner also left 6s 8d to the fraternity of Our Lady and Saint Thomas that was founded in the parish of St Magnus.[209] Furthermore, following his admonishment that his property be distributed in works of mercy and other alms and deeds of charity most pleasing to God, he specified that his brewhouse tenement called the "hert upon the hope" be given to the keepers and masters of the guild of Our Lady and St Giles in the parish of St Giles with the obligation that they maintain an obit on his behalf. If

[208] Will of Robert Weston, 1501, PROB 11/12/283, PCC, TNA. This was likely his family's place of origin, as he also requested that prayers be said there for his mother, father, uncle, grandfather, grandmother, brethren, and sustren. He also left bequest to his four children, including his daughter, who was in the convent of St Helen, and his three sons, two of whom were underage.
[209] Will of William Maryner, 1512, PROB 11/17/188, PCC, TNA.

they were to default, he bequeathed the brewhouse to “the maisters of the Bridgehouse of the citie of London for the tyme being and to their successors” to maintain the property and keep the obit in the church of St Giles. The format of this secondary bequest reflects most closely similar bequests given by bridgewardens in the fourteenth century, when the Bridge House had begun to be seen as an administrative safeguarding institution. Maryner’s decision to include a bequest to the fraternity of St Thomas, which was linked with St Magnus and the bridge chapel, paired with his use of the Bridge House as a safety net to ensure the maintenance of his obit, suggests the growing duality of the Bridge House institution. Increasingly, the religious association of the bridge chapel was aligned with the local parish church of St Magnus, and the Bridge House itself operated as an administrative branch of the civic government.

The Bridge House organization underwent the culmination of several long-term transitions during the sixteenth century. Among the most prominent was the final dissolution of the chapel on the bridge in 1553 and 1554, during the upheaval of the Reformation and Marian Restoration. The event itself took place over a decade and a half, starting when the chapel was stripped of its dedication to St Thomas of Canterbury and had its staff cut from nine to two in 1538, and concluding in 1554, when the Bridge House renovated the chapel as a rental property.[210] The impact of the prolonged transitional period is hinted at in the will of Thomas Crull who composed his will in the final years of Henry VIII just prior to the reign of the ultra-Protestant Edward VI. In his will, Crull left extensive bequests to six different altars within the

[210] For a more in-depth discussion of the impact of the Reformation on the Bridge House, see chapter 4. Bridge Accounts, 1537, CLA/007/FN/02/006 f 230 v, BHEC, LMA; Bridge Accounts, 1539, CLA/007/FN/02/006 f 284 r, BHEC, LMA; Bridge Accounts, 1554, CLA/007/FN/02/007 f 416 r, BHEC, LMA; “’Prohibiting Unlicensed Printing of Scripture, Exiling Anabaptists, Depriving Married Clergy, Removing St. Thomas a Becket from Calendar,” in *Tudor Royal Proclamations,* 275-6.

purview of the St Magnus the Martyr parish, including, possibly, the newly minted chapel of Our Lady on the bridge itself, which would be dissolved within the succeeding decade.

Bridgewardens' wills from the sixteenth century reflect the continued importance of pious bequests, although those bequests increasingly targeted fraternities located within parishes and large-scale religious institutions within the city, such as hospitals, priories, monasteries, and convents. They also highlight the continuing strength of the networks and personal links established by the London Bridge House organization. This can be seen through Crull's request that Robert Draper, goldsmith and his long-term fellow bridgewarden, his "singluller and faithfull lover and Frend," assist his wife in paying his debts and executing his will.[211]

2.2 Conclusions

The London Bridge House organization went through many internal transitions over its long tenure. Its early years saw the institution struggle to maintain its independence from London municipal government, as both separately strove to establish their authority and significance in a bustling urban landscape. This was apparent in the way that the original leadership of the priests and brothers gradually gave way to the management of civic officials elected to other offices. Once the Bridge House organization had reasserted its freedom in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, at the significant cost of the bridge's 1281 collapse, it continued attract significant bequests for both the monastic Bridge House and its chapel, located on the bridge. Over the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, however, the emphasis shifted away from the

[211] Will of Thomas Crull, PROB 11/28/158, PCC, TNA.

organization's religious foundation towards its other, more commercial roles as employer and branch of the civic government.

The transformation of the Bridge House organization can be traced, in part, by examining the lives of its bridgewardens, who represented the physical embodiment of the face that the organization presented to London at large. Over these four centuries, the position of bridgewarden went from being an occupation for a member of the religious community in its earliest years, to a side responsibility for men in high civic office, to a separate position that offered a stepping-stone to public office, to a middling position of influence, and finally to a permanent position in its own right. The bridgewardens represent the class of people who found themselves most attracted to the London Bridge House organization in each period, as both an institution and a vehicle for social and economic mobility. It is thus possible to trace its journey from its foundational religious roots to its eventual importance within the urban commercial and civic landscape. The gradual differentiation that occurred within the institution, as it became more closely aligned with the civic government, reflects a form of secularization whereby the early influence of the religious foundation of the Bridge House was increasingly isolated within specific facets of the broader organization and no longer represented within its leadership.

Chapter 3 London Bridge in London Wills

In the year ending at Michaelmas 1251, Michael Tovy and Robert de Basing, wardens of London Bridge, received John fitz Matthew and Juliana his wife into the London Bridge House as members of the brothers and sisters of the bridge for the remaining duration of their lives. In joining the brotherhood of the bridge, John fitz Matthew and Juliana left their goods and the rents from their tenements to London Bridge. They received a respectable chamber within the enclosure (camaram honestam infra clausum nostrum) where they were allowed a servant, one mark annually for garments, and vowed to be faithful, honest, and reverent (fidelitatem honestam & reverentiam) as befitting religious men.[212] The deed noting John fitz Matthew and Juliana's entry into the brotherhood of the bridge represents one of hundreds of deeds from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, preserved by the London Bridge House, that established the London Bridge's religious landed endowment. It also offers a key insight into the structure of the early Bridge House.

In the thirteenth century, the Bridge House institution operated largely as a religious association of brothers and sisters. The practice of establishing charity organizations to support the upkeep of bridges emerged on the continent in the eleventh century.[213] David Harrison has discussed the preceding Anglo-Saxon practice of maintenance, which focused on a system of local obligations, but this system became less effective due to exemptions granted by local

---

[212] DP deed, 1251, CLA/007/EM/02/A/051, BHEC, LMA.
[213] Marjorie Nice Boyer, *Medieval French Bridges: A History* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Medieval Academy of America, 1976), 32.

leaders as signs of favor. The task of maintaining bridges sometimes fell to local hospitals or other ecclesiastical institutions, such as the Old Harnham Bridge in Salisbury, which was entrusted for a time to the Hospital of St Nicholas. However, London Bridge was the first bridge in England to receive its own religious endowment.[214]

The Bridge House appears in its earliest iteration to have imitated the society of brothers of the bridge (*fratres donati*) founded by St. Benezet to build the Pont-Saint-Benezet over the Rhone at Avignon in the late twelfth century.[215] In both cases, lay men and women dedicated themselves to the management of property for the maintenance of the bridge. Marjorie Boyer has noted the parallel language used in deeds of gift to an *opus pontis* and other religious houses like convents. In both cases, gifts were dedicated "to God and to the fabric" of either the bridge or other religious institution in question.[216]

There are limited sources pertaining to London Bridge that survive from the thirteenth century, but those that do reflect a very particular view of London Bridge as a work of piety towards which individuals could contribute for the benefit of their souls. This is evident in the corrody deed of John fitz Matthew and his wife Juliana, described above, who were admitted into the Bridge House accompanied by vows to behave as befitted religious men. Such a document establishes the Bridge House as a religious institution during the mid-thirteenth

---

[214] This became much more common in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. For instance, Rochester Bridge received its own endowment when it was completed in 1387. David Harrison, *The Bridges of Medieval England: Transport and Society 400-1800* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004), 186, 190, 194, 207; Alan Cooper, *Bridges, Law and Power in Medieval England, 700-1400* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), 109. For further discussion of London Bridge House as a thirteenth century charitable enterprise, see John A. McEwan, "Charity and the city: London Bridge, c.1176-1275," in *Medieval Londoners: Essays to mark the eightieth birthday of Caroline M. Barron*, edited by Elizabeth A. New and Christian Steer (London: University of London Press, 2019), 223-44, especially 223-6.
[215] Members were living communally in the "domus operis pontis Rodani" by 1187. Boyer, *Medieval French Bridges*, 39-40.
[216] Ibid, 39.

century. However, surviving wills from the mid-thirteenth century onwards are essential for constructing the changing view of London Bridge in the years that followed. This chapter analyzes the trends in giving to London Bridge that emerge from extant London wills within the context of London civic history to chart the changing relationship between Londoners and their bridge.

3.1 London Bridge in London wills

3.1.1 A view from the Husting Court, c.1258-1477

The Court of Husting was the oldest court of record within the City of London. During the thirteenth century, the growth of London's population meant that the former methods of arbitration, such as the more informal folkmoot, were no longer viable.[217] This precipitated the growth of new systems of governance, including the standardization of wards within the city and the institution of a court system, including the Husting Court.[218] In its early years, the Husting Court operated as civil court for settling disputes between citizens, especially those pertaining to land. Wills were recorded in the Husting rolls starting in 1258 and early records focused primarily on land or other property in London.[219] The number of wills recorded in the Husting Court declined dramatically in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, which limits their use in tracing the patterns of benefaction in the period just prior to the Reformation, although it has great use in assessing long term trends in prior centuries.

[217] Barron, *London in the Later Middle Ages*, 127-8.
[218] Ibid, 121-9.
[219] During the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, some testators wrote separate wills, pertaining to land bequests, and testaments, pertaining to chattels, with only the former recorded in the Husting court, while the latter was recorded in ecclesiastical court records, which do not survive prior to the fourteenth century. Weetman, "Testamentary Piety and Charity in London, 1259-1370," 42-5.

Prior to the mid-fourteenth century, the Court of Husting clerks only included a partial accounting of the wills that they enrolled. The Husting records frequently omitted information about burial and details pertaining to bequests that were not London property. Therefore, specific bequests are often abbreviated or excluded altogether. Wills enrolled in Husting become much more comprehensive starting around 1340, when the court records begin to include the passages in which testators left their soul to God and arranged their burial.

The Calendar of Wills compiled and published by R.R. Sharpe in 1889 and 1890 provided an entry point for locating the wills analyzed in this chapter. Sharpe's Calendar includes summaries for all wills enrolled in the Court of Husting between 1258 and 1688. These summaries, while incomplete, pay special attention to certain bequests, including those dedicated to the repair of highways and bridges, which Sharpe discussed in his introduction.[220] Therefore, for this study, the calendar was used to identify testators that listed London Bridge as a beneficiary in their wills. The relative wills were then consulted using the original roll for the Court of Husting to acquire the details of the relevant individual bequests.

The earliest will enrolled in the Husting Court to mention London Bridge appears in 1258, seven years after John fitz Matthew and his wife Juliana joined the brotherhood at the Bridge House, and around the same time as the earliest surviving records for the court. The last appears in 1477, seven years before the last individual benefactor appears in the annual bridgewarden's accounts.[221] During the intervening two hundred years, the Common Clerk recorded extensive and varied bequests to London Bridge in the Husting rolls. These bequests

---

[220] "Introduction," in *Calendar of Wills Proved and Enrolled in the Court of Husting, London: Part 2, 1358-1688,* edited by RR Sharpe (London, 1890), xvi-xx.

[221] It is possible that at this point, Londoners deemed that London Bridge no longer required these types of post-mortem bequests and instead could be financed by its endowment and smaller in person gifts given in the chapel on the bridge, although this possibility will be discussed more in depth later in the chapter.

changed in form and substance over time. The patterns that appear in these wills reflect the changing perceptions that Londoners held of the London Bridge House over the course of the thirteenth through fifteenth centuries.

Bequests that appear in the Hustings Court wills primarily took two forms. The first form was that of a monetary bequest of anywhere between three pence, like Adam Maniman in 1310, and one hundred marks, which Richard Bacon, stockfishmonger and former bridgewarden, gave to London Bridge in 1363.[222] These were largely straight forward, unconditional bequests of a sum of money, and they comprise almost four-fifths of the gifts that appear in Husting wills (191 out of 244). The average bequest amounts to just over ten shillings. Of the 191 wills, 142 of them bequeathed between three pence and one mark, and the remaining 47 bequeathed a higher sum. Many of the earliest bequests were for much smaller amounts. These smaller amounts are largely reflective of what Samuel Cohn described as the "mendicant spirituality" of the thirteenth and early fourteenth century. This model involved many small pious and charitable bequests to numerous recipients.[223] This general pattern of giving changed in the mid-fourteenth century, in aftermath of the Black Death, as testators became more likely to give fewer bequests per person, but of larger value. These larger bequests often included a requirement to memorialize the testator in some way.

This general pattern of benefaction is reflected in the bequests that were left to London Bridge. Bequests from the late fourteenth century on were more likely to be non-monetary bequests. These mostly took the form of property to be added to the bridge's endowment, held in trust to contribute to the maintenance of London Bridge. Fifty-three wills bequeath or potentially

---

[222] Will of Adam Maniman, 1310, CLA/023/DW/01/038, no. 88, HR, LMA; Will of Richard Bacon, 1363, CLA/023/DW/01/091, no. 127, HR, LMA.
[223] Samuel K. Cohn, *The Cult of Remembrance and the Black Death: Six Renaissance Cities in Central Italy* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1992), 18, 25.

bequeath property to London Bridge. Of these fifty-three, only nine of them left property to London Bridge outright. The remaining forty-four left property to London Bridge in the case of a contingency, if the original legatee, oftentimes a parish church, failed to carry out the conditions of the bequest by maintaining a chantry, or in the absence of heirs. This is significant as it suggests that as Londoners shifted towards these larger scale bequests, London Bridge was not at the forefront of their minds as a religious institution in need of bequests. Rather, it was increasingly seen as an administrative institution, which could be relied upon for the management of bequests primarily directed elsewhere.

Of the 245 individuals whose wills were proven in the Husting Court who left a bequest to London Bridge between 1258 and 1477, twenty-six, or approximately ten percent, were women. This is reflective of the ratio of male-to-female will survivals more generally. Of the 245 individuals who left bequests to the bridge, 107 did not list a specified occupation, and a further 14 were listed only as widows. Of the remaining 124 individuals, 21 of them, or around one fifth, were identified as fishmongers or stockfishmongers. This makes sense, as fishmongers frequently lived in the neighborhoods just north of the bridge in the fourteenth century and would have had a vested interest in activity occurring on the Thames due to their occupations. During this same period, the mayor Henry de Waleys granted the London Bridge House control of the Stocks as a form of additional income while confining the sale of meat and fish to this location, thus requiring fishmongers and butchers to pay rent to them.

In addition to the twenty-one fishmongers who left bequests to the bridge, eleven benefactors of the bridge identified themselves as skinners, a further ten as drapers, nine as mercers, six as goldsmiths, and four vintners. Four testators among the Husting wills identifed themselves as belonging to religious life, including one canon minor, one chaplain, and two rectors,[224] and a further four identifed themselves as clerks. This suggests while those located near the bridge may have been the most frequent givers, wealthier Londoners also took an active interest in the maintenance of London Bridge.

3.1.1.1 Late thirteenth century context

Between 1258 and 1299, the Husting Court recorded only four bequests to London Bridge. This amounted to a fraction of one percent of the total surviving Husting wills for this period (662). Two of these were monetary bequests of between six and seven shillings. The other two were bequests of property to maintain chantries. This period of limited giving to London Bridge was followed by a marked and sustained increase in giving in the early fourteenth century, which will be examined more in depth shortly. To understand this sudden spike in giving, it is important to contextualize Londoners' relationship with London Bridge and the growth of civic identity in the late thirteenth century.

London Bridge and the endowment that supported it exchanged hands several times in the late thirteenth century. The most radical example of this comes from usurpation of the landed endowment by the queen, Eleanor of Provence, in the 1270s, as mentioned in chapter 2. However, the earliest evidence of royal intervention in the control of the bridge's finances occurred in May 1250, when Henry III instructed W. de Haverhull, the king's treasurer, Peter le Blund, the constable of the Tower of London, and Arnald Geraudun, the king's chamberlain, to take the City of London and London Bridge into the hands of the king and the Exchequer for an

[224] These individuals had been affiliated with numerous locations. They included: Martin Elys, canon minor of St Paul; Humphrey the Chaplain, who was rector of the church of St Mary atte Nax; Ralph de Cantebrige, who was rector of Suththo in the diocese of Lincoln, although he owned property in the parish of S. Vedast; and William de Bredstrete, who was rector in the parish of Malling, in county Kent.

unspecified period of time.[225] This seizure may have proceeded in part from the king's frustration with the unwillingness of London merchants to offer him a loan relating to his war in France.[226] Three years later, in July 1253, the king issued orders of protection for the "brethren of the bridge of London, their men, lands, goods, rents and possessions, and their messengers, collecting alms for the maintenance of themselves and the bridge."[227] Gordon Home argued that this passage suggested that, three years on, the king was continuing to deprive London Bridge of its endowment, forcing the brethren of the bridge into poverty.[228]

In November 1265, three months after the battle of Evesham, in which Londoners joined in a revolt against royal authority, the endowment of London Bridge transferred possession again, this time for a term of five years, to the master and brethren of the hospital of St Catherine by the Tower of London, with instructions that they apply the rents and tenements owned "to the repair of the bridge." The brethren and chaplains ministering in the chapel of St Thomas upon the bridge were to fall under their administration.[229] By September 1270, the king had granted the keeping of London Bridge to his queen, Eleanor of Provence, with all its liberties, for six years ("Whereas the king lately granted to his consort Queen Eleanor the keeping of the bridge of London").[230] However, in his chronicle, Arnold fitz Thedmar indicated that Eleanor may have received custody of the bridge after the battle of Evesham.[231] It is likely that she exerted her influence over the bridge while it was under the nominal control of the hospital of St Catherine by the Tower, since the hospital was under the patronage of the queens of England.

---

[225] *CPR 1247-1258*, 65.
[226] Gordon Home, *Old London Bridge* (London: John Lane the Bodley Head Limited, 1931), 52-3.
[227] *CPR*, 213.
[228] Home, *Old London Bridge*, 52-3.
[229] *CPR 1258-1266*, 507.
[230] *CPR 1266-1272*, 459.
[231] Arnold fitz Thedmar, *Chronicles of the Mayors and Sheriffs of London 1188-1274*, edited by H T Riley (London: 1863), 146-7.

In his chronicle, Fitz Thedmar reported that Eleanor had had custody for six years already in 1271, during which time she had removed the wardens appointed by the citizens and replaced them with wardens she selected. Her deputy wardens "collected all issues of the rents and lands of the said bridge, converting the same to I know not what uses, but expending nothing whatever upon the repairs of the said bridge."[232] By alienating London Bridge's endowment from its intended use, the king meted out punishment against the City of London for its disloyalty at the Battle of Evesham. Due to the bridge's disrepair, Eleanor relinquished her custody briefly in 1271, and two Londoners were elected as wardens, according to previous practice, on 1 September 1271. However, she took the bridge back into her custody fifteen days later.

The king, now Edward I, only finally granted control of London Bridge back to the City in May 1275, a transfer that was recorded in the Husting rolls.[233] This transfer noted that Gregory le Rokesle, then mayor, had convinced the king of the necessity of returning custody of the London Bridge endowment to the City for the utility of the city and the bridge, to be managed by two wardens elected by the commonalty as before.[234] Gregory le Rokesle and Nicholas de Wynton were then dually elected and managed the assets of London Bridge until at least 1281. By securing the bridge endowment for its intended purpose, Rokesle ensured the repair of one of the City's most valuable economic resources.

[232] Ibid, 147. In the Hundred Rolls, multiple wards complained about the mismanagement of the bridge custody at the hands of Eleanor. *Rotuli Hundredorum Temp. Hen. III Ed Edw. I.*, ed. W Illingworth (London: Record Commission, 1812), m. 14, 420. Cite also Anne Bottell article.
[233] Deed, 1275, CLA/023/CP/01/003, m. 5, Common Plea Rolls, LMA. John McEwan argues this transition was significant in that the civic government took control rather than the brethren of the bridge. John McEwan, "Charity and the city: London Bridge, c.1176-1275," in *Medieval Londoners: Essays to mark the eightieth birthday of Caroline M. Barron*, edited by Elizabeth A. New and Christian Steer (London: University of London Press, 2019), 238-9.
[234] Deed, 1275, CLA/023/CP/01/003 m.5, Common Plea Rolls, LMA.

In January 1281, however, a mandate was issued by Edward I to all bailiffs, archbishops, bishops and other clergy for the protection of the keepers of London Bridge and their messengers collecting alms throughout the realm for the repair of the bridge, "which has fallen into a ruinous state, to the great danger of the almost innumerable people dwelling thereon."[235] By early February, five arches of London Bridge had collapsed. This was recorded in the *Annales Londonienses*, which reported that the collapse occurred during a period of heavy frost between Christmas 1280 and the Feast of the Purification on 2 February 1281.[236] A year later, the king issued a mandate requiring the mayor of London to designate two or three discreet and lawful citizens of London to take tolls for the repair of London Bridge.[237]

With the endowment finally freed from royal interference, the civic government moved to further supplement London Bridge with financial resources to support repair and maintenance. This was a notable departure from the previous religious endowments given to the bridge. In addition to the tolls being taken on the bridge, in May 1282, Henry le Waleys, mayor, and the commonalty of London, dedicated plots of land throughout the city to be built upon and let to rent for the maintenance of London Bridge. Among these was one "near the church-yard wall of Wolchurch on the north side, in the parish of Wolchurch" which would become the Stocks Market, where fishmongers and butchers rented space for the sale of fish and meat.[238] Waleys also dedicated two additional plots of land near the churchyard of St Paul's. In the same vein, between June 1282 and April 1284, on at least four different occasions civic authorities record that the penalty for failure to comply with a contract resulted in a fine to be paid to the fabric of

---

[235] *CPR 1272-1281*, 422.
[236] *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II, Vol. 1: Annales Londonienses and Annales Paulini* (London: Longman & Co, 1882), 89.
[237] *CPR 1281-1292*, 10.
[238] Ibid, 23.

London Bridge.[239] The last two decades of the thirteenth century, therefore, was marked by the intentional expansion of Bridge House assets by London mayors. At the same time, the original association of brothers and sisters of the bridge appears to have become less prominent and gradually disappeared from the records altogether.

The late thirteenth century saw the Bridge House move under greater control of the civic government. After the disastrous period between 1265 and 1275, during which Eleanor of Provence assumed control of and misappropriated funds from the bridge endowment, the city was once again formally granted the ability to elect its own bridgewardens. This practice appears to have been largely in place by 1298, when the city scribe recorded stipulations for bridgewardens to render accounts to the City.[240] In his charter for the regular government of the City of London, dated 8 June 1319, Edward II specified that London Bridge, with its rents and profits, was to be kept by two "honest and sufficient men of the city, other than the aldermen" who would be selected by the commonalty and made answerable to that commonalty.[241] His stipulation, that the "bridgemasters" be individuals not otherwise occupying civic office, appears to have been an extension and formalization of the common practice in the preceding two decades.[242] Wardens became both more local to the bridge and, perhaps, more invested in the work of the Bridge House within the community. It is likely that the renewed acquisition of the bridge endowment and the election of bridgewardens led Londoners to take on a greater sense of

---

[239] *Calendar Letter Book A*, 52, 53, 56, 157; *Calendar Letter Book C*, 121, 130.

[240] *Calendar Letter Book C*, 30-1. The reestablishment of the office of bridgewarden during this period is discussed further in chapter 2.

[241] "No. XXII: Constitutions for the regular Government of the City; granted by Edward II," in *The Historical Charters and Constitutional Documents for the City of London*, edited by Walter de Gray Birch (London: Whiting & Co, 1888), 49.

[242] Ibid, 46. In the same charter, Edward II also confirmed the annual election of the mayor and aldermen by the citizens of the City "according to the tenor of the charters of our progenitors."

ownership of the bridge, leading to higher numbers of bequests in the earliest part of the fourteenth century.

3.1.1.2 A significant rise in giving, c.1300-1316

Starting in 1300, the Husting Court recorded a sharp and sustained increase in bequests to London Bridge, which lasted until 1316. During these years, no fewer than 124 Husting wills mention a specific monetary gift to the bridge. This amounts to over twenty-two percent of the total wills recorded during in the Husting Court during these sixteen years. It also comprises over half of the Husting wills that mention London Bridge in the two hundred and nineteen years between 1258 and 1477, which suggests that the early fourteenth century marked the most sustained interest in London Bridge by the widest spread of Londoners. The percentage of wills that leave bequests to London Bridge is augmented substantially if the wills considered are limited to those that left cash bequests. A 1977 study by Harry Miskimin that considered common legacies left by Londoners noted that of the 278 wills recorded in Husting between 1301 and 1310, only 103 of them left monetary bequests and 70 of those 103 left monetary bequests to London Bridge.[243] Therefore, almost seventy percent of wills leaving monetary bequests left something to London Bridge.

This strikingly high rate of giving raises the question of what influences were at work to persuade Londoners to remember London Bridge in their wills in such high numbers. A careful examination of the original wills suggests that someone other than the testators themselves may have had a hand in facilitating many these bequests. The vast majority of these 124 wills, 113 of

[243] Harry Miskimin, "The Legacies of London: 1259-1330," in *The Medieval City*, edited by Harry Miskimin, David Herlihy, and A.J. Udovitch (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977), 222-3.

them, record the gift to London Bridge as the last bequest in the will. This much can be seen in Sharpe's calendar and might be attributed to an organizational pattern implemented by the clerk transcribing the wills into the Husting rolls. However, when considering the original wills, it becomes apparent that this may be indicative of more direct intervention.

Rather strikingly, in 45 of these wills, the bequest to London Bridge seems to have been added later, after the rest of the will had been recorded. In many of these cases, the bridge bequest appears in a different hand or was recorded using a smaller script. In seven wills, the bequest to London Bridge appears after the date or a record of disputes that occurred when the will was being proved. Perhaps the mayor and aldermen may have intervened with the court, requesting that bequests to London Bridge be granted where executors had latitude in dictating what "charitable works" received testators' monetary gifts. The Common Clerk, who recorded wills in the Husting rolls, may have played a role in securing additional funds for the bridge where such latitude existed. Such an intervention would indicate an unusual level of interest on the part of the civic government to reclaim London Bridge for the City after the events of the late thirteenth century. It also suggests the degree to which giving to the bridge was intertwined with city developments and the growth of civic identity in the later thirteenth century.

3.1.1.3 The mid-fourteenth century

After 1316, bequests to London Bridge became much less frequent, although they by no means disappeared. Between 1317 and 1376, 66 individuals who had their wills enrolled in the Husting Court left bequests to London Bridge, an average of slightly more than one per year. This amounts to less than four percent of the wills proven in the Husting Court during these years, a striking divergence from the preceding two decades.

Between 1317 and 1376, bequests to London Bridge in wills proved in the Husting Court mostly appear in the middle of the will, often among bequests to parish churches. Thirty-one of these 66 bequests were both preceded and succeeded by gifts to either parish churches or hospitals. It is likely, therefore, that bequests to the bridge during this period shared similar connotations as these more manifestly pious bequests, despite the fact that, by the mid-fourteenth century, London Bridge House no longer housed brothers and sisters of the bridge and was increasingly aligned with the civic government through the elections of bridgewardens alongside the chamberlain and sheriffs.

Most of the bridge bequests in the third quarter of the fourteenth century were accompanied directly by bequests to the old work of St Paul's, which appears to have held a similar place in the public consciousness as a representative of the intersection between urban life and religion. Two wills during this period specifically request that revenues from the sale of property be divided between the work of St Paul's and London Bridge. The second most common accompanying bequest was to the hospital of St Thomas of Acre. St Thomas of Acre, which was established in 1228 on the site of St Thomas Becket's birth, was another significant foundation dedicated to the City's patron saint, like the chapel on London Bridge.[244]

The continued association of the bridge with charitable works is further underlined in two wills from the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries which were not included in this data set as they did not explicitly mention London Bridge, but which nevertheless designated gifts to bridges more generally. In 1374, Adam Fraunceys, mercer, stipulated that his executors distribute the revenue from the sale of his property to the Mayor and Recorder to be used in charitable works, including the celebration of masses, marriages for poor girls, prisons, hospitals,

[244] John Jenkins, "Thomas Becket and Medieval London," *History* vol 105, issue 369 (2020), 659-60. The significance of the Thomas Becket association will be discussed at greater length in chapter 5.

religious houses, and the repair and maintenance of bridges.[245] In 1419, William Middleton, grocer, similarly left money to Rochester Bridge as well as in charitable works in repairing and sustaining roads and bridges in the country where it was most needed.[246] These bequests demonstrate that while pious bequests to London Bridge in particular may have declined, the association between bridge maintenance and charitable giving continued.

3.1.1.4 Contingency bequests

Among the Husting Court wills that mention London Bridge, contingency bequests became by far the most common form of bequest after the last quarter of the fourteenth century. This is to say, those testators who mentioned London Bridge often left property to the bridge contingent on the inability of the primary designated beneficiary to either receive the bequest or maintain certain conditions tied to the said bequest. Therefore, the bridge in many cases became a secondary or even tertiary beneficiary in the wills in which it appeared.

Giving practices in the late fourteenth century, after the Black Death, increasingly reflected the growth of a memorializing spirituality, which saw testators leave larger bequests of property to a smaller number of religious institutions, who were meant to memorialize the testator.[247] This in part explains the increase in property bequests. It is significant, however, that such bequests were often not directed towards London Bridge as a primary beneficiary. Rather, the bridge institution was seen as an administrative safety net for bequests left to other religious institutions.

---

[245] Will of Adam Fraunceys, 1374, CLA/023/DW/01/103 (79), HR, LMA.
[246] Will of William Middleton, 1419, CLA/023/DW/01/149 (53), HR, LMA.
[247] Cohn, *The Cult of Remembrance*, 18.

The use of different models of giving to London Bridge was fairly consistent before and after the mid-fourteenth century. Among those Husting Court wills that mention London Bridge, there were only four simple monetary bequests that occurred after 1384. Likewise, early bequests very rarely employed the contingency bequest model, with only a couple of exceptions. The earliest of these was Roger of Essex, who in 1298 bequeathed property to London Bridge should his servant Ode, the original legatee, not have heirs.[248] This case, however, differed from later ones, in that the gift to the bridge was not secondary to a gift to another religious institution. Overall, London Bridge was listed as a secondary or tertiary recipient in 44 of the 245 wills, which makes up nearly one fifth of the Husting wills in this data set.

The most common form of contingency bequest stipulated that should the original legatee default on a condition for the bequest, most commonly in maintaining a chantry in a parish church, the Bridge House was to see that the chantry was maintained in their stead. In 32 cases, the testator required London Bridge to maintain a chantry in turn, as a condition of receiving the bequest. Among these 32 testators, fourteen asked that any chantry maintained by London Bridge be moved to the chapel on the bridge, while the remaining eighteen asked the work of the bridge to maintain a chantry in the original parish church. This latter arrangement would have created a great deal of work for the London Bridge House, but evidently the bridgewardens did maintain long-term chantries in multiple churches throughout the city.[249]

The increasing affiliation between London Bridge and the city government in the late fourteenth century can be seen in alterations to the format of bequests in the period. Starting in 1390, it becomes common to find that instead of bequests being left directly to the work of London Bridge, they are instead left to the bridgewardens to be held in the name of the mayor

[248] Will of Roger de Essex, 1361, CLA/023/DW/01/027 (23), HR, LMA.
[249] This will be addressed further in chapter 4.

and commonalty of the City. Significantly, in seven fifteenth-century wills, gifts are left directly to the mayor for London Bridge without mention of the bridgewardens, as in Herry Jordan's will from 1468, which stipulated that should the original legatee default, the property would be directed "to the maire and comonaltie of the said citie of london for the brigge."[250]

Most contingency bequests to London Bridge stipulated that the bridgewardens maintain a chantry in place of the one that the previous legatee had failed to maintain. However, in twelve cases, the default bequest to London Bridge does not appear to require that London Bridge maintain a chantry or obit as required of the original legatee. This suggests that act of maintaining London Bridge itself could have a comparable benefit to the testator, regardless of the maintenance of a chantry. This benefit may have been related to the maintenance of bridges as a pious act, or may have been more indirect, in that it benefited the City.

3.1.1.5 Bequests from the late fourteenth and early fifteenth century

By the early fifteenth century, monetary bequests in wills had become much less common. However, the decay and partial collapse of the bridge in the 1430s temporarily altered this trend. The city scribes recorded reports made by William Whetenhale and Thomas Badby, then bridgewardens, that the bridge was "in ruinous condition" on 27 July 1435.[251] The situation had further deteriorated by early January 1437, when the tower at the south end of London Bridge collapsed along with the nearest arch. On 12 January 1437, the weekly bridgewardens' accounts record payments for carrying stones to the broken tower as well as payments to fourteen additional carpenters beyond the three who received a regular salary from the Bridge

[250] Will of Herry Jordan, 1468, CLA/023/DW/01/190 (1), HR, LMA.
[251] *LBK*, 191; Caroline Barron, *London in the Later Middle Ages: Government and People 1200-1500* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 51.

House. Tellingly, most of these fourteen additional carpenters received payments for five days and four nights labor on the broken bridge, which reveals the urgency of the crisis.[252] The following week, on 19 January, in addition to the influx of carpenters, the weekly accounts note the temporary employ of thirty-three additional laborers who worked up to ten days and seven nights in the preceding two weeks. They also include seven additional laborers whose payments were issued per tide, suggesting they may have been involved in the rebuilding and reinforcement of the piers and starlings at the base of the fallen arch.[253] By the week of 26 January, William Crofton, then warden of the carpentry, had been appointed as a secondary head carpenter in charge of repairs.[254] He continued to manage between 29 and 13 carpenters weekly in the rebuilding effort until 30 March, when he was paid 60 shillings for the building of the new bridge.[255]

The collapse of two arches of the bridge in January 1437 temporarily renewed interest in support for the upkeep of London Bridge and elicited donations from civic officials. London Bridge likewise received £20 from the will of alderman John Welles when he died in 1442.[256] This made him one of only four individuals who bequeathed a sum of money to London Bridge in the Husting Court after 1376. Other large gifts appear in wills registered at other courts, such as that of Robert Large, mercer and former mayor, who left 100 marks to London Bridge in his will registered at the Prerogative Court of Canterbury in 1441.[257] By the fifteenth century, crisis

[252] Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/03/004, f. 218v, BHEC, LMA.
[253] Ibid, f. 219v.
[254] Ibid, f. 220v; Doreen Leach, "Carpenters in Medieval London, c.1240-c.1540," Unpublished DPhil thesis, University of London, Royal Holloway, 2017, 31, 191. Doreen Leach noted that William Crofton was Warden of the Craft and responsible for the Account Book for the Company of Carpenters in the late 1430s. Thus the collapse of the bridge appears to have drawn in the involvement of the leadership of the City's livery company for carpenters.
[255] Ibid, f. 228v.
[256] Will of John Welles, 7 June 1442, CLA/023/DW/01/171 (2), HR, LMA.
[257] Will of Robert Large, 11 April 1441, PROB 11/1/89, PCC, TNA.

for the bridge appears to have chiefly concerned men who held prominent positions within the civic government. This suggests that the maintenance of the bridge was increasingly becoming enmeshed with the City's expanding oversight.

Several wills in the later fifteenth century took on slightly different formats. As stated above, multiple wills left money directly to the Mayor for London Bridge, in cases where parishes defaulted on maintaining chantries, seemingly bypassing the bridgewardens. Other bequests related to London Bridge likewise emphasized benefits to the City. In 1458, William Stafford, acting as the sole surviving trustee of John Reynewell, late Alderman, fulfilled the latter's wishes by leaving eight pounds a year to the City to pay for the passage of individuals entering London by the great gate on London Bridge or the drawbridge, in lieu of tolls.[258] While Reynewell's will itself does not survive, it is nevertheless possible to trace his more particular intentions to assist local tradesmen with the costs of tolls. He specifies that his gift was meant to benefit Englishmen and not foreigners.[259]

Wills from before the mid-fourteenth century appeared to treat London Bridge as a locus of urban religion, locating bequests to the bridge alongside bequests to parish churches. However, later bequests framed gifts to London Bridge differently. Instead, they appear to give greater importance to the practical benefits of London Bridge in civic life. In considering wills proved in the Husting court, it appears that the association between the bridge and pious giving had decreased significantly. By the end of the fifteenth century, this association perhaps had

[258] Will of William Stafford, 1458, CLA/023/DW/01/207 (31), HR, LMA.
[259] John Reynewell died intestate in 1445, and it seems that his will of 1443 nevertheless took affect at that time. For a further discussion of William Stafford's will of 25 October 1458 and its roll in fulfilling his duty under Reynewell's will, see Stephen Freeth and John Schofield, "John Reynewell and St Botolph Billingsgate," in *Medieval Londoners: Essays to mark the eightieth birthday of Caroline Barron*, edited by Elizabeth A. New and Christian Steer (London: University of London Press, 2019), 265-9.

largely retreated to the chapel on London Bridge and the in-person lifetime giving that took place there.

3.1.2 Other registers

By the late fifteenth century, relatively few wills were being recorded in the Court of Husting, as executors began to prove their testators' wills more frequently in other courts, such as the Prerogative Court of Canterbury. This limits how useful the Husting Court is in tracing patterns of giving in the early sixteenth century, despite its use for determining patterns in earlier centuries. The last Husting Court will to mention London Bridge was dated 1477. However, given how few wills were being recorded in the Husting Court by that time, this discontinuance of bridge bequests there did not necessarily preclude bequests to London Bridge continuing to appear in other registers. It was therefore necessary to examine data sets from other registers in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries to ascertain whether Londoners had indeed ceased to leave bequests to London Bridge.

3.1.2.1 Logge Register of Prerogative Court of Canterbury Wills, 1479-1486

The Prerogative Court of Canterbury managed the probate for wills of wealthier testators, who bequeathed more than five pounds and held property in two or more dioceses. This included a significant number of individuals who may have identified as Londoners based on their most common place of residence. The earliest surviving will to be proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury was recorded in 1384. The number of testators who proved wills through this court increased dramatically in the mid-fifteenth century, at the same time that numbers were decreasing in the Husting Court. A volume of those wills registered at the Prerogative Court of

Canterbury between 1479 and 1486 was published in 2008. The wills in this volume, the Logge Register, form a data set against which the trends in the Husting Court can be tested.[260]

Of the 379 wills recorded in the Logge Register between 1479 and 1486, 150 of them were for individuals who identified themselves as "of London" or "of Southwark," or who requested burial in a London parish. The wills of these individuals were therefore assessed as a counterpoint to the wills that appeared in the Husting Court. Of the 150 testators, nineteen were women and 131 were men. Of these only one, a mercer named John Don whose will was proven in 1480, included a specific bequest to London Bridge. He left £4 6s 5d "toward the sustenation of London Brigge" by the oversight of his executors.[261] This unusual sum could perhaps have represented a debt that John Don owed to London Bridge.

The general lack of bequests to London Bridge that appears between 1479 and 1486 reaffirms the giving pattern in the Husting Court wills, suggesting that by the late fifteenth century it was much less common to leave bequests to London Bridge in testamentary wills. This suggests that Londoners no longer viewed London Bridge as in need of testamentary bequests and that it had become independent based on the accumulated endowment that the Bridge House then maintained. This does not mean that the bridge no longer received gifts of any kind. However, later gifts appear to have been given in person in the chapel, much like tithes given in parish churches, and names were often not attached to them.[262]

Four wills in the Logge Register - the same John Don, Stephen Chirche, stockfishmonger, John Haynes, draper, and John Fyssher, mercer - left specific bequests to the Rochester Bridge in Kent. The development of Rochester Bridge and its endowment mirrored that of London Bridge

---

[260] Lesley Boatwright, Moira Habberjam, Peter Hammond, eds., *The Logge Register of Prerogative Court of Canterbury Wills, 1479-1486* (Knaphill: Richard III Society, 2008).
[261] Will of John Don, 1480, PROB 11-7-14, PCC, TNA.
[262] For a further discussion of these gifts, see chapter 5.

in many respects, although was established a century later. [263] The continued cultivation of its endowment at this point, when it had slowed for London Bridge, therefore makes sense. Another will, that of William Cardemaker, grocer, left a bequest to the bridge of Severn in Bridge North, while the wills of Richard Rawson, mercer and alderman, and John Teryngham senior, esquire, left bequests to Fery Bridge and Catelforth Bridge in Yorkshire, and bridges in Newport, Olney, Lathbury, Sherinton, Lynford and Larke, respectively. Nine others more generally requested that the repair of broken bridges be included among the charitable works contributed to by the residue of their estates. Therefore, a total of sixteen wills in the Logge Register mention the repair of bridges among the acts of charity and piety to be supported in their wills, although only one of these explicitly mentioned London Bridge. This suggests that the maintenance of bridges may have continued to have charitable associations, although the Bridge House itself had ceased to be regarded as a religious association and was no longer a primary recipient of such bequests.

Of those included in the Logge Register, ten individuals also left bequests to the Salve Regina fraternity dedicated to Our Lady and Saint Thomas the Martyr, which was located at St Magnus and the chapel of London Bridge. Two of those individuals were parishioners of St Margaret Bridgestreet, seven were members of St Magnus the Martyr, and one did not specify where she would like to be buried. These bequests suggest that local devotion to St Thomas Becket remained strong at the end of the fifteenth century. However, this devotion no longer seems to have been tied to the support of London Bridge. Rather, the chapel seems to have existed in closer relation to the local parish than to the bridge, as it had in its earlier years.

[263] While smaller and less well-endowed, the construction and independent endowment of the bridge at Rochester in the mid-fourteenth century nevertheless comes closest to resembling that which occurred in London a century earlier. For more on Rochester Bridge, see Nigel Yates and James M. Gibson, editors, *Traffic and Politics: The Construction and Management of Rochester Bridge AD 43-1993* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1994).

The Logge Register thus confirms the general trends seen in the Husting wills. London Bridge no longer received pious post-mortem bequests from wills, although the general association between piety and bridge maintenance seems to have remained, as seen in more general bequests. Moreover, devotion to St Thomas Becket and the chapel no longer seems to have been explicitly linked with the London Bridge House.

3.1.2.2 Consistory Court Wills, 1492-1547

The Consistory Court of the Bishop of London had jurisdiction over the diocese of London, including the City of London, Middlesex, Essex, and part of Hertfordshire as an ecclesiastical court. A volume published in 1967 includes 245 wills proved in the diocese of London by the Consistory Court between 1492 and 1547, with the vast majority coming from the beginning of the sixteenth century. [264] These wills provide another data set of London wills as a point of comparison to wills proved in the preceding centuries in the Husting Court. Of these 245 wills, 29 belonged to women, while the remaining 216 belonged to men. Many of the wills belonged members of religious life, who were identified variously as priests, clerks, vicars, parsons, and chantry priests. In the case of 93 wills, the testator was identified as a member of the clergy.

Wills proved in the Consistory Court were less likely to include the expansive religious bequests that appear in wills proved in the Husting Court or the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, perhaps due to the limited means of many of the testators. They also were much less likely to leave bequests to broader, city-wide organizations or projects, preferring where they did mention

[264] The volume includes a single will that dates from 1492, while the remaining 244 wills date from between 1514 and 1547. *London Consistory Court Wills, 1492-1547*, edited by Ida Darlington (London: London Record Society, 1967), 1.

religious bequests to focus almost entirely on the local parish.[265] Of the 245 wills included in the volume, only nineteen left a bequest to St Paul's, listed in many cases as the "mother church." In only three cases did the testator leave money for the mending of highways, and none of the wills mentioned gifts to London Bridge. The volume of early sixteenth-century Consistory Court wills therefore further confirms the fact that by the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century, London Bridge was no longer the recipient of post-mortem bequests.

3.2 Conclusions

Between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries, the management and structure of the London Bridge House changed dramatically. It accumulated significant wealth during this period, which influenced the perception of the institution held by Londoners more generally. One place where this changing perception is most accessible is in the extensive wills that survive. By considering broad samples of wills, it is possible to chart, in part, the evolving relationship between Londoners and their bridge, a bridge which represented, in turn, collective urban religion, commercial possibility, and a link to the world beyond.

By supporting London Bridge in the early fourteenth century, Londoners were able to reclaim control and ownership of their city. In the later fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, as the London Bridge House emerged as a steady and enduring administrative presence within the city, Londoners turned to it as a reliable manager for their properties after their deaths. At times of crisis, London Bridge was able to rely on Londoners to shore up its resources and come to its aid. Throughout these fluctuations, Londoners and London Bridge necessarily fostered a

[265] This may also be reflective of more general early sixteenth century trends.

symbiotic relationship, in which the fortunes of Londoners were tied inescapably to the fortunes of the bridge. Because of this, the changes in Londoners' perception of London Bridge also reflected changes in their perception of the city and their perception of themselves. The bridge thus gradually came to represent a part of the secular administration of the City, until the initial association of brothers and sisters of the bridge no longer had a place in its public representation.

Chapter 4 Benefactors of the Bridge

By the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the London Bridge House had expanded its sphere of influence to encompass various sectors of the London population. This included approximately three dozen workers, many of them masons and carpenters, who were regularly employed by the Bridge House to manage the upkeep of the bridge and its properties, as well as a half dozen administrative workers who oversaw the buildings and their records. Another six to seven clerks and chaplains maintained services in the bridge chapel. However, as this chapter will show, despite their ties to the Bridge House establishment, few of these workers left bequests to the bridge. The long-term practice of establishing pious gifts for London Bridge and in turn receiving prayers as a "benefactor of the bridge" had declined dramatically by the start of the fifteenth century.

Despite this trend, some monetary bequests did continue to be recorded in the annual accounts. These gifts increasingly came from wealthier Londoners, often those associated with the civic government. This reflected the growing perception of London Bridge as a civic enterprise, one that was tied to the economic and administrative growth of the city government. By the late fifteenth century, the Bridge House had also become a more direct financial resource, benefiting both bridgewardens and the city government itself, to whom it lent money.

In establishing the Bridge House as an increasingly prominent local property owner, the bridge administration commissioned the compilation of a Register of Deeds in the late fifteenth century.[266] The Small Register (as it is known to distinguish it from the grander Large Register, commissioned in the sixteenth century) recorded the properties owned by the bridge and how they came to be part of the Bridge House endowment. This register makes evident the striking contrast between the kinds of pious bequests that made up the bridge endowment in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and the financial gifts from citizens that were recorded in the annual accounts during the fifteenth century.

Tracking the various benefactions made to the establishment of London Bridge from the thirteenth through sixteenth centuries requires attention to different kinds of source survival from each period as well as a recognition of the ways in which the institution itself adapted to the growth of the municipality of which it was a part. During its first century, the London Bridge House, like many emerging religious houses, relied on property bequests to establish a landed religious endowment, many of which were tied to prayers for the souls of benefactors. However, by the fifteenth century, the Bridge House endowment appears to have become largely self-sustaining. As established in chapter 3, later bequests relied on the Bridge House in an administrative capacity, to make sure chantries established at parishes elsewhere in London were maintained. The rise in monetary post-mortem bequests, given largely by members of the London civic elite, was particularly noticeable during periods of crisis for the bridge. The increased involvement of the civic elite in the maintenance of the bridge suggests the growing affiliation of the institution with the city government.

[266] Bridge Accounts, 1486-7, CLA/007/FN/02/004, f. 50v-51, BHEC, LMA. The most likely date for the compilation of the Small Register is around 1486-7, when the annual accounts recorded that Bavell, a stationer, was paid 8s for binding a book of account and "puttyng ynne dyvers stuffe in to the same boke." This is a different note than the usual record of clerks making a copy of the annual account, which suggests that it might be related to the creation of the Small Register.

Through the thirteenth through sixteenth centuries, different groups of individuals had a strong interest in seeing London Bridge maintained. Examining patterns of benefaction towards London Bridge highlights the shift from smaller monetary gifts offered by both men and women for the maintenance of the early religious Bridge House to the much larger gifts given to the bridge in the fifteenth century, mostly by men in the civic elite. This chapter, then, considers which groups of Londoners took primary ownership of London Bridge at points in time, and how that was shaped by the growth of a stronger more central civic government by the fifteenth century.

This chapter brings together several bodies of sources to create a demographic profile of groups of individuals who left bequests to the Bridge House during several periods and outline the forms their offerings took. The sources derive from five particular groups: deeds included in the Small Register of Deeds that include gifts to London Bridge, wills for individuals who appear in the annual bridgewardens' accounts in the late fourteenth to late fifteenth centuries, wills of known bridgewardens from the thirteenth through sixteenth centuries, wills of key employees from the fifteenth through sixteenth centuries, and wills of those whose chantries and obits were known to have been maintained by the bridgewardens into the sixteenth century, up until the eve of the English Reformation.[267]

[267] As discussed previously, the movement known as the English Reformation encompassed several transitional periods spanning the 1530s and 1540s. The London Bridge House assisted in the maintenance of several perpetual chantries and obits that were affected by the 1546 and 1548 chantry commissions and the 1548 dissolution of the chantries, which was one such transitional period. References within this chapter to the impact of the Reformation on chantries therefore relate to these dissolutions in the late 1540s. C.J. Kitching, *London and Middlesex Chantry Certificate, 1548* (London: London Record Society, 1980), ix-xv.

4.1 Deeds in the Small Register

The Small Register of Deeds for London Bridge, which was compiled in the late fifteenth century, contains over three hundred deeds spanning from the first quarter of the thirteenth century to the fifteenth century, with additional extracts and notes added in the early seventeenth century. These deeds were compiled out of order, and in many cases, without including dates, which makes them difficult to catalogue. Numerous deeds also relate to transfers of property between individuals unconnected to London Bridge. Many of these properties eventually made their way into the hands of the Bridge House, and these earlier deeds appear to have been recorded as a means of establishing previous ownership.

The London Metropolitan Archives holds two calendars for the Small Register, one handwritten and the other a typescript copy, which were compiled by Helena M. Chew, most likely in the 1970s. These calendars identify the type of deeds represented in each case, along with a brief description. These were useful in identifying and cataloguing the deeds that were directly related to the transfer of property to the Bridge House. Among the over three hundred deeds recorded in the Small Register, there are 157 deeds that record the direct transfer of property to London Bridge in some capacity.[268] These include 85 grants and 41 quitclaims, as well as nine wills, eleven will extracts or notes on wills, six confirmations, two releases, two demises, and one covenant. Quitclaims were often tied to obligations towards other religious houses. They established the London Bridge House as the primary owner of the property, responsible for its maintenance, while stipulating that a portion of the income from the rental

[268] The applicable deeds were intially identified with the aid of the Calendar of the Small Register of Deeds held by the London Metropolitan Archives. Calendar of Small Register of Deeds, CLA/007/EM/04/003/B1, BHEC, LMA; Calendar of Small Register of Deeds, CLA/007/EM/04/003/B2, BHEC, LMA.

would be given to a religious establishment identified in the quitclaim. In the early years, this seems to have tied the Bridge House to a network of religious houses, although later the connection became more purely administrative.

Most of the deeds included in the register date from the thirteenth century, although some date from the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. These early gifts came from a wide spread of individuals, both men and women. During the thirteenth century, the City government was only slowly becoming more formalized. This involved the gradual consolidation of power from many hands into a few. At the start of the century, the City was governed by the more inclusive democracy of the folkmoot, which permitted any freeman to participate. By the late thirteenth century, however, the growth of the population rendered this kind of governance impractical, and London was increasingly governed by a smaller number of individuals elected by their respective wards. In the fourteenth century, the City formed a court of common council as a representative body, made up of two to six men elected annually from each ward.[269]

The more inclusive nature of the early civic government may have played a role in the diversity of those who are identified as giving to the bridge in its early years. In only seventy-two percent of deeds recorded in the Small Register (113 of 157) was the giver an individual man.[270] This meant that a significant proportion of those who contributed to the Bridge House were women. The deeds also reflect the communal nature of establishing the landed endowment for the bridge in its early years, given that numerous grants involved more than one giver.

[269] Barron, *London in the Later Middle Ages*, 127-133.
[270] In two of these cases, two individuals are listed as giving to the bridge. In one case the pair are cousins, and in the other the relationship is unspecified.

In eight percent of the deeds (13 of 157), the deeds listed two givers of which one was male and another female. In twelve of these cases the pair was made up of a husband and wife.[271] One quitclaim identified a father and daughter pair, a Ralph de Berkinge, cornmonger, and his daughter Christina, as the ones designating land and a house within the parish of St Olave to be kept by the bridgewardens.[272] Like many of the deeds in the Small Register, this quitclaim was undated. However, it includes Godard the Chaplain, who served as a proctor of the bridge between 1258 and 1264, as one of the witnesses, so it likely came from around that time.

In almost twenty percent of the deeds (31 of 157), the giver was an individual woman. Fourteen of these women were identified explicitly as widows, while another six were identified as daughters. In three cases, the individual confirming a transfer of property to London Bridge was identified as a wife, which suggests that the Bridge House may have attracted independent gifts from women whose husbands were still alive. In two cases, two or more women jointly granted property to London Bridge. In one case, two sisters, Alice and Christina, the daughters of Eldred, jointly gave land to the masters and brothers of the bridge for the benefit of their souls.[273]

---

[271] Grant from Alexander and Matilda Palmer, SR, CLA/007/EM/04/003/A, f. 28v, no 87, BHEC, LMA; Covenant from Henry and Dionisia Poteman, SR, CLA/007/EM/04/003/A, BHEC, f. 15, no 12, LMA; Quitclaim from John and Cecily Erneis, SR, CLA/007/EM/04/003/A, f. 50, no 237, BHEC, LMA; Grant from Ralph and Rose of the Garden, SR, CLA/007/EM/04/003/A, f. 33, no 121, BHEC, LMA; Quitclaim from Richard and Margaret of St Albans, SR, CLA/007/EM/04/003/A, f. 44v, no 212, BHEC, LMA; Quitclaim from Richard and Margery de Benstede, SR, CLA/007/EM/04/003/A, f. 46v, no 221, BHEC, LMA; Grant from Roger and Hergonilda Waleys, SR, CLA/007/EM/04/003/A, f. 18, no 24, BHEC, LMA; Grant from Walter and Clarice de Suthflete, SR, CLA/007/EM/04/003/A, f. 20v, no 37, BHEC, LMA; Quitclaim from William and Emma de Boxlee, SR, CLA/007/EM/04/003/A, f. 14v, no 8, BHEC, LMA; Grant from William and Margery de Welcomes, SR, CLA/007/EM/04/003/A, f. 27, no 77, BHEC, LMA; Grant from William and Berta White, SR, CLA/007/EM/04/003/A, f. 40, no 176, BHEC, LMA; Quitclaim from Richard and Juliana de Warwick, SR, CLA/007/EM/04/003/A, f. 16, no 15, BHEC, LMA.

[272] Quitclaim from Ralph and Christina de Berkinge, SR, CLA/007/EM/04/003/A, f. 33, no 121, BHEC, LMA. Like many of the deeds in the Small Register, this quitclaim is undated. However, it includes Godard the Chaplain, who served as a proctor of the bridge between 1258 and 1264, as one of the witnesses.

[273] Quitclaim from Alice and Christina, daughters of Eldred, SR, CLA/007/EM/04/003/A, f. 42v, no 198, BHEC, LMA. This deed can be dated to 1248-49 based on the mayor and sheriffs listed.

Another deed recorded the sale and confirmation of a shop to the bridge and the proctors of the same by a widow, Godlina, and her three daughters, Matilda, Gumulda, and Cecilia.[274] These joint offerings by multiple members of the same family in the thirteenth century suggest that perhaps by giving to the bridge, people saw themselves establishing a collective legacy that would outlive them.

The deeds recorded in the Small Register demonstrate that a broad swath of Londoners in the thirteenth century contributed to the establishment of a religious endowment for London Bridge, for their City as well as for their souls. Women as well as men played a significant role in building a landed religious endowment for the early bridge. Furthermore, giving to the bridge was not always the act of a single individual. Givers included pairs from more than one generation, which posits the possibility that giving to London Bridge may have been seen as an opportunity to create a legacy. The diversity of those contributing to the early property endowment for the bridge is in marked contrast to the fifteenth century, when gifts were largely limited to members of the civic elite.

4.2 Bequests recorded in the Annual Accounts, c.1381-1483

The annual bridgewardens' accounts recorded the financial acquisitions and expenditures of the London Bridge House. They included a record of a variety of monetary gifts, both post-mortem and lifetime, as well as, frequently, the name of the donor. An analysis of the bequests recorded in the annual accounts and the corresponding wills of the testators named demonstrates the degree to which many fifteenth century gifts to the bridge were tied to specific events,

[274] Grant from Godlina, widow of Ralph Partrich, and daughters, SR, CLA/007/EM/04/003/A, f. 19v, no 33, BHEC, LMA.

particularly the collapse of two arches of the bridge in 1437, and that a limited number of Londoners continued to mention London Bridge by name in their wills into the fifteenth century.

The bridgewarden's accounts include the names of 118 benefactors who left gifts to London Bridge between 1381 and 1483. Until 1460, these bequests appeared in the more informal weekly records, designated as either "legat" for legacy, or "elemosina" for alms. However, those listed as alms are, at times, evidently also post-mortem bequests, based on the context in which they were listed. It is possible that in those cases, the benefactor independently arranged for a gift to be given to London Bridge and it was only received after they had died. Of these 118 gifts, 84 appear to be from bequests designated in the benefactor's will, and 34 appear to be lifetime bequests, or monetary gifts made during the donor's lifetime.

It has been possible to identify the wills of 22 of the 84 individuals named in the annual and weekly accounts as leaving post-mortem bequests to London Bridge.[275] One of these wills only recorded the date of probate for the will and has therefore been discounted. Of the remaining 21, five wills were recorded in the Commissary Court, one was recorded in the Husting Court, and a further eleven were recorded in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury. This distribution is further evidence that by the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, gifts to the

---

[275] The wills for many of these individuals have proved challenging to find. For instance, not all the benefactors listed in the accounts were from London, and over a fourth of the postmortem bequests (24 of the 84) came from individuals identified in the annual and weekly accounts as being from Essex. Few Essex wills from this period have survived, and none of those that do appear to belong to these individuals. It is unclear why so many postmortem bequests came from Essex, although an assessment of purchases made by London Bridge in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries show that much of the elm wood being purchased was being brought in from county Essex. It is possible that the bridge's network of suppliers were encouraged to support the Bridge House. The Bridge House also owned property in Stratford, which resulted in regular visits by bridgewardens to oversee its maintenance. This, too, may have been a factor in the interest of individuals from Essex. Bridge Accounts, 1510-11, CLA/007/FN/02/005, f. 24-25v, BHEC, LMA.

bridge were more likely to come from wealthier testators. Of these 21 individuals, two were women and nineteen were men.

In fourteen of these 21 wills, the testator explicitly listed London Bridge as the designated recipient of a monetary gift. It is worth noting that in seven benefactors' wills London Bridge was not listed as a beneficiary. This indicates that degree to which executors played a role in directing legacies to London Bridge. Of those seven, three of them were proved between 1444 and 1457, in the years following the collapse of the southernmost arch of London Bridge.[276] This suggests that the need for funds to finance the repairs provided incentive for civic officials to court executors into directing money that testators left to unspecified "charitable works" towards the ongoing rebuilding efforts. Three other wills where London Bridge was not listed directly were dated from an earlier period, between 1391 and 1412, and one dated from 1484.

An investigation of the wills that correspond to individuals who are listed as benefactors in the annual accounts does confirm that several the bridge's post-mortem benefactors in the fifteenth century specifically designated bequests in their wills to London Bridge. The fourteen wills that specified bequests to London Bridge fell into three main categories.

In the three wills dating from the late fourteenth and very early fifteenth centuries, the bridge bequests were very straightforward, requesting simply that the designated monetary bequest be directed to the work of London Bridge.[277] In this regard, these bequests had a similar format as the bequests that were recorded in the Husting Court in the early to mid-fourteenth century and match this earlier style of giving, with amounts of up to 13s 4d being offered. The

[276] For a further discussion of the 1437 bridge collapse, please see chapter 3.
[277] Will of Richard Lyons, 1379, DL/C/B/004/MS09171/1, f. 79v, Commissary, LMA (appears in the annual accounts in 1388); Will of Andrew Pykeman, 1391, PROB 11/1/41, PCC, TNA (appears in annual accounts in 1392); Will of John Walcote, 1408, DL/C/B/004/MS09171/02, f 123 & 124v, Commissary, LMA (appears in annual accounts in 1408).

bequests to London Bridge frequently appeared alongside other pious bequests, including the work of St Paul's. The regularity with which bequests to London Bridge and the works of St. Paul's appeared side by side suggests that these two civic religious institutions may have been viewed in a similar light by Londoners in the early fifteenth century.

Between 1442 and 1458, a further eight benefactors explicitly mentioned London Bridge.[278] These testators were much more specific in their gifts in the aftermath of the partial bridge collapse that had occurred in 1437. Six of these eight benefactors specifically designated their gift as being for the reparation or amending of London Bridge, which suggests that while the majority of the immediate repair work occurred within three months of the collapse in January 1437, Londoners were shaken by the event and continued to perceive their bridge as in need of more significant repair.

The early to mid-fifteenth century was a time in which the City of London undertook several major and costly civic ventures. Among them were the establishment of Blackwell Hall as a market for cloth, the rebuilding of the Guildhall starting in 1411, and the development of Leadenhall as a market, storehouse, chapel, and school.[279] These projects reflected increased economic regulation by the civic government, as well as the visual elevation of the City's seats of governance. These prominent civic projects inspired extensive giving from London's elite as a means of elevating individual status and addressing civic need. Increasingly, the concerns of London Bridge appear to have fallen under the same category.

Bequests given to London Bridge during the years of the mid-fifteenth century were correspondingly larger than those from the start of the century, with the designated gifts ranging

[278] This accounts for nine of the fourteen wills, as Robert Large's 1441 will was registered with both the Commissary Court and the Prerogative Court of Canterbury.
[279] Barron, *London in the Later Middle Ages*, 53-56.

on the low end from 40 shillings from John Knot, a tailor, in 1448, to 300 marks given by Robert Large, mayor from 1439-40, between 1441 and 1444.[280] The majority of these gifts were for sums of upwards of ten pounds and were given by individuals who, like Robert Large, held prominent positions within the civic government. In one case, in 1458, a benefactor, Stephen Forster, specified that his gift was to be used to purchase stone for a new building being built where London meets Southwark, a reminder that twenty years on from the partial bridge collapse, rebuilding on the southern part of the bridge was still being done.[281]

The remaining two wills, dated 1474 and 1481, reverted to earlier form, designating their gifts for the fabric or work of London Bridge without explicitly mentioning repair work. The annual bridgewardens' accounts do not record postmortem bequests to the Bridge House after 1484, and with only one exception, mentioned below in the section on the bridgewardens, no later bequests have been found in the course of this study.

An assessment of the wills of individuals listed as benefactors in the annual accounts suggests that Londoners in the early to mid-fifteenth century continued to leave bequests specifically to London Bridge, although the bridge also received bequests through the intervention of executors, who allotted the bridge a portion of the money meant for charitable purposes. It highlights the degree to which specific prominent events, including the partial bridge collapse in 1437, were key in attracting gifts to London Bridge in the mid-fifteenth century. The gifts in response to the partial collapse, moreover, came disproportionately from men who held prominent positions in civic government, which reflects a growing sense of civic ownership over the bridge and its alignment with projects related to civic identity.

---

[280] Will of John Knotte, 1448, DL/C/B/004/MS09171/04, f. 227, Commissary, LMA; Will of Robert Large, 1441, PROB 11/1/89, PCC, TNA.
[281] Will of Stephen Forster, 1458, PROB 11/4/294, PCC, TNA.

4.3 Bridgewardens' Bequests

There are 107 individuals who appear in records between 1176 and 1557 as holding the position of proctor or warden of London Bridge, starting with Peter de Colechurch.[282] The first of these for whom it is possible to locate a surviving will is Gregory de Rokesle, who appears as a bridgewarden around the time of his mayoralty from 1274-82, and whose will was enrolled in the register of the Husting Court in 1290.[283] Gregory de Rokesle was the thirty-first identifiable individual to hold the role of bridgewarden. He played a significant role in securing the return of bridge endowment to London Bridge during his tenure as mayor. Of the 80 individuals who are known to have been bridgewarden between 1281 and 1557, 51 have extant wills.[284]

An analysis of the patterns of giving among these men shows that while fourteenth century bridgewardens occasionally gave to the bridge, later bridgewardens were much less likely to do so. Conversely, the longer-term bridgewardens of the fifteenth century rarely if ever gave to the bridge, despite the fact that they appear to have devoted much more of their lives to the bridge works. Of the 51 surviving wills only eleven explicitly mention London Bridge as a legatee. Eight of these belonged to bridgewardens who served in the fourteenth century, despite the fact that a greater number of fifteenth century bridgewardens' wills survive. Furthermore, of

---

[282] There are few discernable differences between the role of warden of the bridge and role of proctor of the bridge, apart from the fact that the latter only appears in the thirteenth century. Several individuals are identified as warden in some documents and proctor in others. For the purposes of this discussion, therefore, the term bridgewarden will be applied to all those identified as either proctor or warden. For a full list of known bridgewardens, their years of service, and their wills, see appendix A.

[283] DP deed, CLA/007/EM/02/G/028, BHEC, LMA; Will of Gregory de Rokesle, 1290-1, CLA/023/DW/01/20, no 57, HR, LMA.

[284] Another two, Christopher Elyot, who served from 1490 to 1509, and Thomas Bullesdon, who served from 1492 to 1493, have extant probate records, which do not include bequests and therefore have been excluded. (Another seven wills are extant for bridgewardens from the latter half of the sixteenth century, which are not in the purview of this study, and thus are also excluded.)

the eleven who mentioned the bridge, only four included outright monetary bequests to the London Bridge House (or the chapel on London Bridge, in one case) with no contingencies.

The first of these was William Jordan (d. 1303), who served as bridgewarden from 1298 to 1300. William Jordan left a simple monetary bequest to London Bridge of six shillings and eight pence.[285] Like many wills containing bridge bequests between 1300 and 1316, this bequest to the bridge was added in smaller script at the end of his will, which suggests it may have been in part a result of encouragement of the city officials in the aftermath of the late thirteenth century bridge collapse.[286]

Robert Swote (d. 1353), a fishmonger who served as bridgewarden in 1336-7, also left a simple monetary bequest to London Bridge, of twelve pence.[287] Henry le Vanner (d. 1354), a vintner who served as bridgewarden alongside John "le Chandler" Hatfeld in 1353-4, also left a similar monetary bequest to the bridge. However, he specified, unlike the others, that the twelve pence he left for London Bridge was to be directed to the chaplains celebrating in the chapel of St Thomas on London Bridge.[288]

These three early monetary bequests were quite modest. However, the last monetary bequest from a bridgewarden stands out dramatically in this regard. Richard Bacoun (d. 1363), a stockfishmonger, who served as bridgewarden alongside John Hatfeld from 1355-63, after the death of Henry le Vanner in 1354, left the remarkable sum of one hundred marks to the work of London Bridge, drawn from the sale of properties.[289] This striking sum may be indicative that

---

[285] William Jordan, 1303, CLA/023/DW/01/32, no. 109, HR, LMA.
[286] For further discussion of bequests to London Bridge in early fourteenth century Husting wills, see chapter 3.
[287] Robert Swote, 1353, CLA/023/DW/01/83, no. 59, HR, LMA.
[288] Henry le Vanner, 1354, CLA/023/DW/01/82, no. 60, HR, LMA.
[289] Richard Bacoun, 1363, CLA/023/DW/01/91, no. 127, HR, LMA. It is possible that Richard Bacoun may have borrowed money from the bridge, like later bridgewardens would do on a regular basis, and that this large gift represented repayment.

Richard Bacoun may have borrowed money from the Bridge House, as fifteenth century bridgewardens frequently did in later years. Perhaps, then, the sum may have been a repayment instead of a gift.

The remaining seven wills for bridgewardens that include bequests to London Bridge relate to the maintenance of a chantry, obit, or the payment of a quit-rent, which included an obligation to another religious institution. Most of these specify that London Bridge should take over certain religious obligations, like maintaining a chantry, for a deceased family member if a parish or fraternity failed to fulfill the conditions of the bequest. The earlier ones were more likely to request that, should that happen, the chantry was to be moved to the chapel on London Bridge, while later cases were more likely to ask London Bridge to maintain the chantry in the original location in an administrative capacity.

Henry de Gloucester (d. 1332), a goldsmith who served as bridgewarden in from 1315 to 1318, left two shops with forty shillings annual quit rent to the fabric of London Bridge after the death of his daughter, on the condition that they continue to give a mark to the prioress and convent of St Helen. The pairing of this gift with an obligation to a religious house suggests that it was charitable in nature. In addition to this, he also left four additional quit rents of six shillings and six pence, two shillings, and another two shillings, to the fabric of London Bridge outright.[290]

John de Hatfeld, also known as John le Chandler, was one of the longer serving bridgewardens in the fourteenth century, serving from 1353 to 1363. At his death in 1363, he left property to London Bridge only if the parish of St Benedict of Grascherche failed to maintain a chantry in their parish. Should that happen, he specified that the mayor and commonalty was to

[290] Henry de Gloucester, 1332-3, CLA/023/DW/01/60, no. 152, HR, LMA.

maintain a chantry in the chapel of St Thomas the Martyr on London Bridge instead, with the remaining proceeds from the property to the use and sustaining of London Bridge.[291] In this case, he also left a half mark to the wardens of London Bridge for their labor to oversee the chaplains and maintain the property and chantry. The parish of St Benedict ultimately did fail to adequately maintain the chantry for John Hatfeld's soul, as the bridgewarden's accounts recorded a new payment of two shillings received in May 1393 to pay for a chaplain celebrating mass for the soul of John Hatfeld in the chapel on the bridge.[292] A year later, in April of 1394, Thomas Hatfeld, John Hatfeld's youngest son, issued a quitclaim to the mayor, commonalty, and the bridgewardens for a tenement in the parish of St Benedict in Gracechurch, acknowledging the transfer of the property.[293] This was, however, one of the rare occasions in which the Bridge House was called upon to fulfill their role as default manager for chantries that had been neglected by parishes.[294]

John de Coggeshale (d. 1384), a corder who served as bridgewarden from 1370 to 1375, left property to his wife Johanne to maintain a chantry at the altar of St Peter in St Margaret on Bridgestreet and provide an annuity to the Carthusian priory. After her death, if the parish failed to maintain the chantry, he specified that the property was to be transferred to the mayor, commonalty, and wardens of London Bridge and their successors to maintain the bridge, and to the wardens of the bridge to maintain two chantry chaplains in the chapel of St Thomas on the bridge instead and provide an annuity to the Carthusian priory as before.[295] In the event, this

[291] John le Chandler Hatfeld, 1363, CLA/023/DW/01/91, no. 125, HR, LMA.
[292] Bridge Rolls, CLA/007/FN/01/012, m. 8 (xxxii), BHEC, LMA.
[293] *LBH*, 411.
[294] Another point of interest is that the annual and weekly bridge accounts for the first half of the fifteenth century do not include records pertaining to the quit-rents, and by the time that the quit-rent records once again survive, in 1460, the Bridge House no longer appears to have been maintaining John Hatfeld's chantry. When and why it was discontinued is difficult to discern.
[295] John Coggeshale, 1384, CLA/023/DW/01/114, no. 39, HR, LMA; also in the Large Register of Deeds.

transfer was never made necessary. The 1548 chantry certificate, which compiled a list of chantries being maintained on the eve of their dissolution by royal commissioners, recorded the continued receipt of £13 10s 4d from lands and tenements to maintain two chaplains at St Peter's altar to pray for the soul of "John Coggeshall."[296]

During the last two decades of the fourteenth century, mason and bridgewarden Henry Yevele gave extensively to London Bridge, in large part through his efforts to rebuild the chapel on London Bridge, a project that he also financed in large part.[297] In addition to this project, he also left property to his wife Katherine on condition that she maintain two chantry chaplains to celebrate at the altar of the Blessed Mary in the parish of St Magnus. If the parish failed to maintain the chantry after her death, the property was to go to the mayor and commonalty for the use and sustaining of London Bridge and to maintain two chaplains instead in the same chapel on the bridge which Yevele rebuilt.[298] As with Coggeshale's bequest, it is evident that the Bridge House never needed to step in, since according to the chantry certificate, St Magnus was still receiving £12 annually from lands and tenements to maintain two chaplains to pray for the soul of a "Henry Eveley."[299] Yevele also separately left money to the Salve Regina fraternity in St Magnus, dedicated to the Blessed Mary and St Thomas the Martyr, which was also still being maintained when the chantry certificates were recorded in 1548, on the eve of the Reformation.

John Clifford (d. 1411), a mason who served as both chief mason for the Bridge House and bridgewarden in the early fifteenth century, left a rental to London Bridge, from which the

---

[296] C.J. Kitching, ed., *London and Middlesex Chantry Certificate, 1548* (London: London Record Society, 1980), 25.
[297] Christopher Wilson, "L'architecte bienfaiteur de la ville. Henry Yevele et la chappele du London Bridge," *Revue de I'Art* 166 (4): 43-51. My thanks to Christopher Wilson and Caroline Barron for providing me with an English translation of Christopher Wilson's article on the architect as civic benefactor.
[298] Henry Yevele, 1400, CLA/023/DW/01/129, no. 7, Husting, LMA.
[299] Kitching, *Chantry Certificate,* 15.

work of London Bridge was to receive six shillings and eight pence on the day of his obit.[300] Clifford held the role of chief mason for London Bridge in the years after Yevele's decease in 1400. A further discussion of this obit appears in the later section of this chapter on obits that London Bridge maintained up until the dissolution of the chantries in 1548.

John Herst (d. 1449), a skinner who served as bridgewarden from 1440 until his death nine years later, left property to his wife Agnes to keep a chantry at St Stephen Walbrook. After her death, if the parish failed to maintain the chantry, the property would default to the mayor and commonalty to sustain London Bridge and maintain the said chantry in its original location at St Stephen Walbrook.[301] The fate of this chantry is more uncertain, as it does not appear in the chantry certificate for St Stephen Walbrook.[302] However, there is also no indication in the bridge records that its management was taken over by the Bridge House. It is possible that Herst's chantry did fall into the hands of the Bridge House during the early part of the fifteenth century, during the period for which the quit-rent records do not survive and then, like John Hatfeld's chantry, it may have been discontinued for reasons unknown. Or it is possible that it was amalgamated with another chantry at St Stephen Walbrook and that the chantry certificate neglected to mention all of the beneficiaries for a particular chantry.

The final will to mention London Bridge appears unusually late. William Maryner (d. 1512), a salter who served as bridgewarden for eleven years from 1501 until his death, left a brewhouse called the Hert upon the Hope to the masters of the gild of Our Lady and St Giles in the parish of St Giles for their brethren, on condition they maintain an obit in St Giles. If they were to default, he left the brewhouse to the masters of the London Bridge House to maintain the

[300] John Clifford, 1411, PCC, PROB 11/2B/159, PCC, TNA.
[301] John Herst, 1447 CLA/023/DW/01/191, no. 15, HR, LMA.
[302] Kitching, *Chantry Certificate*, 18.

property and keep the obit in St Giles.[303] As with the chantries for Yevele and Coggeshale, the chantry for William Maryner appears to have remained under the management of the original parish church. The chantry certificate records the existence of lands and tenements given by a William Marryner, among others, which suggests that the parish succeeded in maintaining Maryner's chantry up until the dissolution.[304]

The bridgewardens were most likely to leave bequests to London Bridge in the fourteenth century, when half of those with surviving wills included London Bridge in their will. However, it was much less common than one might expect for bridgewardens who, by the fifteenth century, were devoting a large portion of their lives to maintaining London Bridge. As the wardenship of London Bridge became a lifetime position, it appears that wardens became less likely to mention London Bridge in their wills. This suggests that it had become less of a vocation by this point and more of a straightforward management job.[305]

The lack of later bequests indicates that the London Bridge House institution may have been seen as more of an independent, self-sufficient branch of the city management by the fifteenth century. Later wills that mention London Bridge were more likely to use the Bridge House as back-up management to maintain chantries. They were also more likely to be directed towards the mayor and commonalty for the maintenance of London Bridge, rather than the bridgewardens, which further suggests the merging of the London Bridge House with the civic government.

[303] William Maryner, 1512, PCC, PROB 11/17/188, PCC, TNA.
[304] Kitching, *Chantry Certificate*, 10.
[305] For further discussion of the changing role of the bridgewarden during this period, see chapter 2.

4.4 Key workers

By the fifteenth century, the London Bridge House had a large contingent of laborers who were employed full-time as part of its effort to maintain the bridge and the bridge properties that brought in a large portion of their income. In addition to the nearly three dozen laborers, including those specializing as carpenters, masons, tilers, sawyers, and daubers, the Bridge House also maintained a smaller contingent of key workers who had broader management responsibilities. Among them were the master mason and head carpenter, who oversaw the work of between four and ten other masons and carpenters at any given time. They also included the bridge toll collector, the rent collector, the porter of the Bridge House, and several bridge clerks, who managed the chapel. These individuals appear to have rarely left any bequests to the bridge.

It is more difficult to identify wills for key workers than for bridgewardens for several reasons. For one, the key workers were often less prominent Londoners and therefore fewer of their wills survive. For another, while many of them appear to have worked for the Bridge House for extended periods of time, they were less likely than bridgewardens to stay in their positions for life, which means that their disappearance from the annual accounts did not necessarily correspond to the general date of their deaths. Nevertheless, it is possible to identify the wills of twenty-two key workers from the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.[306] Of these, only three include any explicit mention of London Bridge.

The earliest of these, from 1413, belonged to the long-term master mason, John Clifford. However, Clifford also held the role of bridgewarden for a one-year interim period after the death of Henry Yevele. His role as master mason during Henry Yevele's tenure as bridgewarden, when the chapel was rebuilt, may have meant that he had a more significant position within the

[306] Five of these wills merely contain probate records.

institution. He was also unusual in that he established one of the later obits, which will be discussed further below.

The other two bequests from key workers both stemmed from individuals who had close association with the chapel on the bridge. One came from John Beller, who was a chapel clerk during the 1440s. In his will, dated 1462, Beller, who identified himself in his will as a stationer belonging to the parish of St Stephen Colmanstreet, specified that wanted 20d to be given to the "Chapell of London Brigge" and moreover that it was to be "delivered unto Sir William Cleyne priest of the same Chapell."[307] These specifications suggest that he maintained ties to the chapel on the bridge, despite having left his position as clerk there.

The second bequest to mention London Bridge came from Alice Holford, who served as toll collector from the death of her husband Nicholas Holford in 1434 until her own death twenty-one years later in 1455.[308] Her husband had served as both the head clerk in the chapel and the toll collector for over twenty years at the time of his death. Their two sons also served in the chapel. It is therefore unsurprising that Alice Holford would leave her missal book to the custody of the master and warden of London Bridge to remain in the chapel of the bridge for the divine services being said there for the souls of her and of her husband. However, she did specify that as a condition of this bequest the warden of the bridge transfer the rental of her tenement on London Bridge to her son Nicholas Holford during his lifetime. Otherwise, the missal book was to be returned to her son. Beyond this bequest, she also left ten marks sterling for a worthy and honest chaplain to celebrate divine service for her soul and that of her husband daily in the chapel on the bridge for one year following her death.

[307] Will of John Beller, DL/C/B/004/MS09171/05, f. 325v, Commissary, LMA.
[308] Will of Nicholas Holford, 1434, DL/C/B/004/MS09171/03, f. 390, Commissary, LMA; Will of Alice Holford, 1455, DL/C/B/004/MS09171/05, f. 166, Commissary, LMA.

It is worth noting that in all three of these cases, the bequest in question was not to London Bridge but rather to the chapel on the bridge, which appears to have become more independent of the Bridge House by the fifteenth century.[309] The time of pious bequests to London Bridge House appears to have passed.

4.5 London Bridge and Perpetual Chantries

At the time of the dissolution of the chantries in 1548, the London Bridge managed four perpetual chantries and three perpetual obits. None of these were maintained within the St Thomas Becket chapel on London Bridge, although it is evident that chantries were maintained in the said chapel at certain points in the bridge's history.[310] It is possible that short-term chantries located in the chapel on the bridge continued to be observed during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, although the annual bridgewardens' accounts did not mention them. By considering the circumstances around these long-term chantries and obits, it is possible to trace the Bridge House's shift towards a more persistent administrative role, in which they managed the transfer of money to fund the obits and chantries but left the more spiritual aspects of the job to the parishes where they were housed.

[309] For further discussion of the chapel and its place in the London Bridge House institution, see chapter 5.

[310] For instance, the chantry of John Hatfeld, which has already been mentioned, was maintained in the chapel on the bridge during the 1390s. Bridge Rolls, CLA/007/FN/01/012, m. 8 (xxxii), BHEC, LMA.

4.5.1 Chantries maintained by quit-rent

In the years leading up to the dissolution, the annual bridgewardens' accounts diligently recorded the maintenance by the London Bridge House of four chantries which were maintained by the revenues from quit-rent properties. At the start of the sixteenth century, London Bridge maintained an extensive collection of twenty-five quit-rent properties which brought them £33 6s 6d annually.[311] Quitrent properties were properties that included an obligation to a religious institution. Most of the quitrent properties maintained by the Bridge House required that the wardens give a certain portion of the rent they yielded annually to various beneficiaries such as the prior of St Mary Ovary in Southwark or the master at the hospital of St Thomas Acre.[312] The Bridge House were allowed to keep the remainder of the outgoing revenue from these properties for their own uses.[313] In the case of quit-rents that funded chantries, the Bridge House managed the property in question and transferred a portion of the revenue it yielded to pay the chantry priest praying in the given parish.

The earliest of these long-term chantries appears to be that founded by Ralph Dungeon in Saint Paul's Cathedral in the late thirteenth century. Dungeon was a canon at the cathedral and prebend of Islington.[314] According to historian Marie-Helene Rousseau, his chantry was organized by his will's executors. In his original will, dated February 1282, Ralph Dungeon left one hundred marks to go towards annual rents to pay for a chaplain saying services for his soul in St Paul's. Later in the will, he left ten shillings to London Bridge. His chantry, which consistently appeared in the annual bridge accounts up until 1548, consisted of one chaplain who

[311] Bridge Accounts, 1508, CLA/007/FN/02/004, 305r-305v, BHEC, LMA.
[312] Bridge Accounts, 1483, CLA/007/FN/02/003, 302v, BHEC, LMA.
[313] Bridge Accounts, 1492, CLA/007/FN/02/004, 124r, BHEC, LMA.
[314] Marie-Helene Rousseau, "Chantry Foundations and Chantry Chaplains at St Paul's Cathedral, London c.1200-1548," PhD Thesis, Royal Holloway, University of London, 2003, 222, 239, 263.

prayed at the altar of St Mary in the nave of St Paul's Cathedral. The annual bridgewardens' accounts noted the payment of ten shillings each year to the appointed priest, which came from a tenement that the bridge maintained near St Paul's Cathedral in the parish of St Nicholas Shambles.[315] In addition to its appearance in the bridge records, Ralph Dungeon's chantry, maintained in St Paul's Cathedral, also appears in the chantry certificate for London and Middlesex as a joint chantry with William Everdon, maintained by lands worth £8 12s 8d annually. This suggests that the chantry may have only been partially supported by the properties managed by the Bridge House, and also relied on additional funding from another source.[316]

The largest perpetual chantry managed by the London Bridge House was established on behalf of Roger Husbond in the mid-fourteenth century. His 1329 will, as recorded in the Husting Court, specified that his tenements in the parish of St Nicholas Shambles were to be sold by his executors, with the proceeds to be placed at the disposal of his brother, Nicholas Husbond, who was a minor canon of St Paul's Cathedral.[317] A license was purchased for 40 shillings by Nicholas Husbond on 16 May 1331 to allow chaplains John Ros and John Wauncy to enfeoff Agnes, daughter of Roger Husbond, and her husband Laurence Sely with a messuage in the parish of St Nicholas Shambles. This tenement, as one of those left by Roger Husbond in the care of his brother, was to be held by Agnes and Laurence Sely with successive remainders to Alice (also daughter of Roger Husbond), Nicholas Husbond, and the keepers of London Bridge,

---

[315] Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/004, 8r, BHEC, LMA.
[316] Kitching, *Chantry Certificate*, 55. Some chantries merged to maintain a single priest between them as the cost of maintaining a chantry increased.
[317] Will of Roger Husbond, 1329, CLA/023/DW/01/059 (35), HR, LMA. Husbond's will does not include instructions about the foundation of this chantry. The Husbond chantry is discussed by Christian Steer as a chantry maintained at St Nicholas Shambles. Christian Steer, "'To syng and dommeservyce': The Chantry Chaplains of St Nicholas Shambles," *The Urban Church in Late Medieval England: Essays in honour of Clive Burgess* (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2019), 462-4.

to maintain the bridge and find a chaplain to celebrate divine service daily for the soul of Roger Husbond at St Nicholas Shambles.[318]

The bridgewardens' accounts recorded the continued observance of the chantry for the soul of Roger Husbond at the altar of the Holy Trinity in St Nicholas Shambles up until the 1540s.[319] For its part, the Bridge House paid one hundred shillings to the chantry priest yearly drawing on the rent from a tenement held on Ivy Lane in the parish of St Nicholas Shambles, which had once been occupied by Roger Husbond's daughters. Christian Steer noted that this payment of one hundred shillings, or five pounds, became insufficient to support a chaplain saying daily divine service, so the parish topped up the endowment from church funds with quarterly payments of ten shillings from 1452 on. By 1548, the parish was supplementing the chantry with quarterly payments of fifteen shillings.[320] This suggests that the London Bridge House, while responsible for maintaining the chantry, may have partially shared duties with the church in which the chantry was maintained. When Nicholas Husbond died in 1346, a perpetual chantry was established in St Paul's Cathedral on his behalf, similar to the one established there for Ralph Dungeon, who was likewise one of the cathedral's minor canons.[321] This one, however, was not managed by London Bridge House.

A third perpetual chantry was founded at the parish of St Ethelburga in 1391 on behalf of Gilbert Marion. In his will, Gilbert Marion directed his executors to sell his property in the parish of St Ethelburga to fund his chantry in the same parish.[322] If the parish should default, the

---

[318] *CPR 1330-34*, 118.
[319] Bridge Rolls, CLA/007/FN/01/004, 7v, BHEC, LMA.
[320] Steer, "The Chantry Chaplains of St Nicholas Shambles," 462-3.
[321] Will of Nicholas Husbond, CLA/023/DW/01/074 (126), HR, LMA. This chantry is not discussed in the record of his will as it was recorded in the Husting Roll. It is possible that Husbond made the arrangements for this prior to his death.
[322] Will of Gilbert Marion, 1391, CLA/023/DW/01/120 (1), HR, LMA.

property was to go to the mayor and wardens of London Bridge in trust to maintain the chantry. He also requested the establishment of a chantry in St Laurence Pulteneye, with an additional tenement in the same parish to fund the same. This second chantry was likewise meant to be taken on by the mayor and wardens of London Bridge, if St Laurence defaulted. Both of these chantries followed the common pattern from the late fourteenth century of using the bridgewardens together with the mayor and aldermen, to ensure one's remembrance. While the second chantry does not appear in the annual accounts, on the eve of the Reformation London Bridge was paying 33s 4d to a chantry priest in St Ethelberga from rent received of a tenement adjoining the church called the Sign of the Angel.[323] The chantry certificate, while it did not mention Gilbert Marion by name, did record the existence of a chantry priest in St Ethelburga Bishopsgate, maintained by £1 13s 4d annually proceeding from a quitrent property called the Angel, paid for by the masters of the Bridge House.[324]

The final perpetual chantry maintained by the revenue from a quit-rent presents a rather intriguing mystery. The chantry in question appears consistently from the mid-fifteenth century, when the surviving annual bridgewardens' accounts begin to detail existing quit-rents. In 1483, as in previous years, the annual accounts noted that eight marks were to be paid to a chantry in St Olave in Southwark to pray for the soul of William Est, drawing on lands and tenements in the parish of St Dionisius. William Est served as the mayor's serjeants during the first decade of the fifteenth century.[325] His will was enrolled in the Husting Court in September 1421.[326] In it, William Est specified that his wife Alice was to maintain the chantry at first, and that in default the property was to go to the mayor and commonalty of the city and their successors for the use

[323] Bridge Accounts, 1545, CLA/007/FN/02/007, 79r, BHEC, LMA.
[324] Kitching, *Chantry Certificate*, 34.
[325] *LBI*, f vi, p 7-8. My thanks to Martha Carlin for her assistance with the mystery of William Est.
[326] Will of William Est, 1421, CLA/023/DW/01/150 (12), HR, LMA.

of London Bridge, on the condition that the wardens of the bridge were allowed to administer the estate and maintain the chantry. In specifying that the wardens were to maintain the chantry, William Est delineated between the ownership of the property on the one hand, and its use for pious purposes on the other, leaving the latter to the wardens.

Later in his will, he indicated that if the mayor and commonalty were to default on their obligation, the property was to be administered by the Chamberlain of the City, who was to maintain a chantry in the chapel of the Guildhall and devote the residue to the maintenance of the conduits of London. This directly parallels the wardens and the chamberlain as managers of property and chantries in home parishes and in chapels associated with civic government. It suggests that the Guildhall chapel may have played a similar role as that of the chapel on London Bridge, although it is worth noting that even when the wardens of the bridge were meant to manage the chantry, William Est did not ask that the chantry be moved to the chapel on the bridge.

However, unlike the other chantries discussed here, William Est's chantry was not maintained until the Reformation. It appears that at some point between when the bridgewardens' accounts for Michaelmas 1544 and 1545 were audited, someone went back through sixty years of bridgewardens' accounts to scratch out in whose name this chantry was founded and the location of the property that contributed to its upkeep.[327] In the bridgewardens' accounts compiled for Michaelmas 1544, the entry for this quit-rent reads, "To a preste [words

[327] This mirrors the way that mentions of Thomas Becket were assiduously removed from litanies of the saints in England in the late 1530s. However, the reasons for blotting out such a well-endowed chantry in 1545, three years ahead of the general dissolution of chantries, remains unclear. It raises the question of whether this action was taken because the memory of founder, William Est, was being targeted in some way. If this were the case, however, there are few clues to indicate why something like that might have transpired when it did.

scratched out] in the parishe of saint Olaves in Southwark for the sowl [words scratched out] of viij markes [words scratched out] for a yere ended at Mighelmas afore said."[328]

The following year, the bridgewardens' account recorded the Bridge House's contribution of the same sum, eight marks, to pay for a priest singing within the parish church of Saint Olave's in Southwark. However, instead of the peculiarly defaced entry that appears in all previous years' accounts, this record amended the previous specifications regarding a chantry to instead dedicate the same eight marks, "To a preste Syngyng the morowe masse within the parishe church of Saynt Olaves in Sothwarke for somuche as the workmen of the same do use to here and see the scarynge of the same masse yerely."[329] This rather remarkable entry appears in like manner thereafter. It suggests that the newly dedicated morrow mass was perpetuated to maintain a tradition within the parish at St Olave's, although the intended beneficiary of the original chantry seems to have been deliberately erased from the proceedings. It is unclear why this particular chantry was targeted in this way prior to the dissolution of the chantries.

4.5.2 Fifteenth century obits

The annual bridgewardens' accounts also recorded the maintenance by the Bridge House of three fifteenth century obits, to be celebrated annually, which were consistently recorded under the heading "expenses necessary."[330] These obits were, like the chantries discussed above, kept in the parishes where the testator was buried.

The earliest of these obits was founded on behalf of John Clifford, who took over the role of chief mason of the Bridge House after Henry Yevele died in 1400. Clifford's will, dated 6

[328] Bridge Accounts, 1544, CLA/007/FN/02/007, 61v, BHEC, LMA.
[329] Bridge Accounts, 1545, CLA/007/FN/02/007, 74r, BHEC, LMA
[330] Bridge Accounts, 1484, CLA/007/FN/01/004, 11r, BHEC, LMA.

August 1411, requested his burial in the church of St Olave's in Southwark in the chapel of the blessed Mary.[331] Clifford requested the establishment of an obit to be held before an image of the blessed Mary in the same chapel, to be maintained through the revenue from a new property on London Bridge. He also established a separate obit to be held at the London Bridge House itself. This was unusual at the time, as by the fifteenth century, most records refer to the works of London Bridge, rather than London Bridge House itself. He specified that the London Bridge House was to maintain the said obit for his soul.[332] While he did not explicitly request that London Bridge manage the obit held at St Olave's, his obvious association with both the London Bridge House and his dedication of their property for the maintenance of his obit seems to have led to the merging of these two obits.

The London Bridge House managed a second obit in the church of the Blessed Mary of Wolcherche for the soul of Cristina Mallyng, who was the widow of Thomas Cake called Mallyng, a mason. The bridgewardens recorded an annual payment of twenty shillings to the chantry priest saying prayers for her there. In her will, dated 4 May 1430, Cristina Mallyng requested that she be buried at the same church under the stone where her husband lay buried. Unlike the other beneficiaries of perpetual chantries and obits managed by London Bridge, Cristina Mallyng does not appear to have had a particularly close relationship with the London Bridge House. Rather, as many other testators recorded in the Husting court during the fifteenth century, she appears to have designated them as a routine contingency back up, should the initial recipients of her bequest default. She requested that the master or warden of the fraternity of St Giles maintain an obit for her. Should they fail to maintain said obit, she left the twenty shillings to the mayor for the use of the bridge, to maintain the obit in their stead, which evidently became

[331] Will of John Clifford, 1411, PROB 11/2B/159, PCC, TNA.
[332] Ibid.

necessary.[333] As with the chantry for Gilbert Marion, the chantry certificate recorded the obit for the soul of "Christian Maulen" with those held by St Mary Woolchurch. The chantry certificate noted that this obit was maintained by 13d 4d annually that was "paid by the masters of the Bridge House in London."[334]

The last perpetual obit maintained by the London Bridge House was founded by John Fekenham. In his will, dated 11 May 1436, the brewer John Fekenham requested burial in the chapel of the Blessed Mary in the church of St Clement by Eastcheap.[335] Like John Clifford before him, John Fekenham bequeathed tenements and land to London Bridge in his will. He also bequeathed land directly to the mayor, Henry Frowyk, and the commonalty for the use and sustenance of London Bridge, requesting that the chaplain of the chapel of St Thomas the Martyr upon the bridge celebrate for his soul in perpetuity, as well as his wife and, intriguingly, several additional unrelated individuals, including Richard who was King of England, Edward Roteler, knight, and Lady Anne his wife, Richard Storine and Alice his wife. In addition to this bequest, John Fekenham also explicitly requested the establishment of an obit, after the death of his wife, to be maintained by the master or warden of the work of London Bridge in the church of St Clement, with placebo and dirge and mass of requiem. Should the London Bridge fail to maintain this obit, it was to default to St Thomas the Martyr of Acon.

The wills of testators whose chantries and obits were being maintained by the London Bridge at the time of the dissolution show that while some individuals, like Cristina Mallyng, may have relied on the London Bridge House merely as an administrative body to manage an obit, others may have been invested in the institution and the spiritual benefits of contributing to

[333] Will of Cristina Mallyng, 1430, CLA/023/DW/01/160 (15), HR, LMA.
[334] Kitching, *Chantry Certificate*, 24.
[335] Will of John Fekenham, 1436, DL/C/B/004/MS09171/03, f. 462, Commissary, LMA.

its maintenance. The division of gifts to the chapel on the one hand and the Bridge House as administrator on the other in some cases suggests that the two were perhaps increasingly identified as two separate entities. The additional bequests left by John Clifford and John Fekenham to the chapel on the bridge and the London Bridge House suggest that while the fifteenth century London Bridge House had expanded its more secular interests, it continued to evoke for some an association with urban religion and spiritual well-being.

4.6 Conclusions

During the thirteenth through sixteenth centuries, the collective ownership of Londoners towards London Bridge shifted dramatically. During the thirteenth century, broad swaths of Londoners contributed towards the growth and establishment of a religious endowment for the London Bridge House, including intergenerational mother-daughter and father-daughter pairs. Twenty-eight percent of deeds included at least one female giver, and in nearly twenty percent of cases, the primary giver was female.

By the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the majority of benefactors of London Bridge appear to have been men, and men of a certain class. This may have been in part because many of the gifts from the fifteenth century emerged from the mammoth effort to rebuild London Bridge after its partial collapse in 1437, and therefore required gifts of substantial size, but the contrast with the response to the collapse in 1281 is striking. In the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century, the effort to rebuild was led by large numbers of men and women giving small monetary bequests in their wills, while the 1437 collapse triggered instead large-scale gifts from a few highly placed municipal leaders, including a mayor and several aldermen.

At the same time, bridgewardens and Londoners at large gradually retreated from postmortem giving to London Bridge, until such gifts appear to have almost entirely stopped by the end of the fifteenth century. This suggests that London Bridge was seen by Londoners increasingly as being established and self-sufficient, a reality confirmed by the reliance of testators in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries on the Bridge House as a back-up manager for chantries. When this established role in city life was shaken, as was the case in 1437, the individuals who stepped in were those established municipal figures whose status within the City required their financial support for its institutions. Their support of London Bridge therefore reflected the increased focus on the contribution by a certain sector of London citizens towards the City's common good.

Chapter 5 The Chapel on the Bridge

The chapel on the bridge, dedicated to St Thomas Becket of Canterbury, appears to have flourished in the early sixteenth century. The most detailed surviving records of the chapel, found within the annual accounts of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, paint a picture of a vibrant institution undergoing a revival. While a large part of its purpose was to serve a transitory population of travelers and pilgrims passing through, the chapel also was heavily rooted in the local London community. Located on a pier mid-way between Southwark and London, the late fourteenth-century structure supported regular services by a cohort of clerks and priests who lay at the center of a network of local participants. The chapel relied on a broad range of suppliers that remained remarkably consistent over the first half of the sixteenth century. The chapel also maintained a consistent internal staff. From 1508 until 1548, twenty-three men served at least one year as a clerk in the bridge chapel. For those twenty-one whose tenure fell fully within the period in question, the average tenure of one of these chapel clerks was just over six and a half years. Fifteen served for three years or more and eight of those served for upwards of five years. These men would have become common fixtures for those who visited the chapel.

The clerks had a range of duties that they had to fulfill. Their chief job was "serving and attending daily" at the chapel. This involved helping with daily mass, which is implied in the chapel record through the provision of "syngyng bredde by all the said tyme," often collected by one of the head clerks to give to wayfarers.[336] In addition to these responsibilities, they were also called upon to sing the placebo and dirge as part of the mass of requiem "for the sowlis of all the benefactours of the said bridge by iiij severall tymes" a year at the feasts of Saint Michael, Christmas, the Annunciation, and the Nativity of Saint John the Baptist.[337] On occasion, one or more of them would take on additional work for the chapel, such as washing or mending the chapel albs or surplices.

More often, these additional tasks were completed by local women, many of them related to the clerks themselves. Many of these women clearly lived on the bridge itself. The wife of Raynold Blake, the chapel's head clerk, carried out a vast array of duties over the years. However, some women appear to have taken more of a personal initiative to become part of the fabric of the bridge community. For instance, William Tanner served a brief tenure as a chapel clerk from 1513 to 1515. A year later, in the autumn of 1516, the wife of William Tanner first appears in the records as having taken on the washing of the "alterclothes towelles and syrplyces belongyng to the chapell."[338] She would continue to regularly take on those tasks until 1544, nearly thirty years later.[339]

The clerks were not the only ones performing services. Accounts regularly make note of a "singing childe" and sometimes singing men who served anywhere from three to thirty-three

[336] Harding and Wright, "Introduction," in *London Bridge*, xvi; Bridge Accounts, 1526, CLA/007/FN/02/006 f 16 v, BHEC, LMA.
[337] Bridge Accounts, 1519, CLA/007/FN/02/005 f 187 v, BHEC, LMA.
[338] Bridge Accounts, 1527, CLA/007/FN/02/006 f 37 v, BHEC, LMA.
[339] Around the same time, a John Tanner also appears in the records as a chapel clerk. He appears to have served the chapel from 1521-3 and 1525-7. It is possible that John and William Tanner are the same person, and that the scribe simply confused his given name in several of the records, in which case the wife of William Tanner would have overlapped with her husband for one year. However, given that "John Tanner" and the "wife of William Tanner" appear in the same year's record, side by side, this seems somewhat unlikely. More likely John and William Tanner were related and traded off working in the chapel during this period.

weeks out of the year.[340] Frequently, the inclusion of such additional members of the community came a significant time of the liturgical year. For instance, the account that runs from Michaelmas of 1524 to Michaelmas of 1525 makes note of the reward due to "a singeng man [for] servyng and attending in the seide chapell in Cristmas season and iij woks following."[341] These singing men and children often also played a role in one of the most important and special feasts hosted by the chapel on the bridge, the feast of the Translation of St Thomas Becket of Canterbury, on July 7.

The chapel on London Bridge, with its dedication to St Thomas Becket, was an essential part of the religious association of the bridge from the beginning. As discussed in chapter 2, Peter de Colechurch, who organized the building of the first stone bridge in London in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, had a close link to Thomas Becket, as the priest of St Mary Colechurch, where Thomas Becket had been baptized.[342] Caroline Barron has noted that the aftermath of Becket's martyrdom in 1170 and the significant early devotion to his cult may in fact have played a role in allowing Colechurch to organize such an expensive enterprise at that point in time.[343] Therefore, the significance of the St Thomas chapel was two-fold, both connecting the bridge to the patron saint of the City and representing the origins of its financial endowment.

However, despite the early significance of St Thomas Becket to the origins of London Bridge, the vibrant early sixteenth century chapel no longer had the same close ties with the

---

[340] Bridge Accounts, 1526, CLA/007/FN/02/006 f 16 v, BHEC, LMA; Bridge Accounts, 1525, CLA/007/FN/02/005 f 115 r, BHEC, LMA.
[341] Bridge Accounts, 1525, CLA/007/FN/02/005 f 115 r, BHEC, LMA.
[342] John Jenkins, "St Thomas Becket and Medieval London," *History* Volume 105, Issue 367, Special Issue: English Saints, 658; Derek Keene, "Peter of Colechurch (d.1205)," Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (Oxford 2004).
[343] Caroline Barron, *London in the Later Middle Ages: Government and People, 1200-1500* (Oxford, 2004), 50.

increasingly civic and secular institution. As this chapter shows, it had in many ways shed its earlier association with the Bridge House altogether. By charting the history of the chapel on the bridge and its gradual move towards an independent existence, this chapter exposes the degree to which this most significant vestige of the Bridge House's religious origins had in many ways become realigned with the local parish of St Magnus the Martyr. This has significant implications for understanding its ultimate dissolution in the 1550s following the English Reformation.

5.1 St Thomas Becket, London, and the bridge

The building of London Bridge had a significant impact not just on the city's physical structure, but also on the identity of its population. Both John Jenkins and Derek Keene have addressed the significant role played by the building of London Bridge in the formation London's sense of civic identity.[344] Jenkins highlighted the significance of the large-scale cooperation involved, as well as the role of London Bridge as the single largest landowner in the city.[345] Keene emphasized that the establishment of the Bridge House evoked a sense of collective authority of the citizens of London, which enabled them to assume responsibilities that had previously been exercised by the king's officials. While civic authority over the bridge was tenuous in the first century of the Bridge House, its establishment and growth by the early fourteenth century was closely linked to the growth of civic governance.[346] This can be seen through the parallel establishment of the office of bridgewarden at the same time as civic offices

---

344 Jenkins, "St Thomas Becket and Medieval London," *History* 105 (367) 2020, 658; Derek Keene, "London Bridge and the identity of the Medieval City," *Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society* 51 (2000), 146.
345 Jenkins, "St Thomas Becket and Medieval London," 658-9.
346 For more on the tenuous nature of the City's hold on London Bridge, see chapter 3.

such as those of recorder, chamberlain, and common clerk were becoming formalized in the late thirteenth century.

It is important to note, however, that the establishment of the bridge and growth of London's civic identity was inextricably tied to the foundation of the Bridge House as a site of pious benefaction. It was through the religious association of the bridge, after all, that the bridge was funded. The chapel on the bridge was at this point only one part of the much larger religious foundation around the bridge. The early Bridge House was centered on an almshouse where brothers and sisters of the bridge prayed for benefactors of the bridge, and its religious association is further demonstrated by the fact that nearly half of the known bridgewardens in the thirteenth century were clergy.[347]

The dedication of the chapel to the most significant London-born saint also played a role in the development of Londoners' sense of identity during this period. It was part of a larger movement to claim St Thomas Becket as the city's patron saint, along with St Paul, and therefore make him representative of the city itself. This can be seen in the appearance of St Thomas Becket on the reverse side of the early thirteenth century Seal of the City of London.[348] On the Seal, Becket is situated on an arch over the city with supplicants to either side. The association of Thomas Becket with London is further emphasized through the Latin inscription that appears on the Seal, in which the City itself enjoined the saint, "Cease not, Thomas, to protect me who brought you forth."[349]

---

[347] For more on this, see chapter 2.

[348] Jenkins, 656-7; Christopher Wilson, "L'architecte bienfaiteur de la ville. Henry Yevele et la chapelle du London Bridge." *Revue de l'art* 166 (2009), 51.

[349] Caroline Barron, "The political culture of medieval London," in *Political Culture in Late Medieval Britain*, edited by Linda Clark and Christine Carpenter (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2004), 113-4. Caroline Barron noted that through its seal, the city chose to represent itself through its patron saints, with St Paul on the obverse and Thomas Becket on the reverse. She also draws attention to the presence on the

The close alignment of London Bridge with the city of London can be seen through the striking parallel between the seals for the bridge and the city corporation. The first seal for London Bridge, dated to around 1200, showed a man standing in full liturgical apparel, confirming the institution's religious foundation. This first seal was nearly identical to the personal seal of the first bridgewarden, Peter de Colechurch, who was also a priest. The second surviving Bridge House seal, dated to between 1240 and 1256, closely mirrors the reverse side of the City Seal by showing St Thomas Becket on an arch or bridge over the river.[350]

The bridge chapel initially represented one part of a larger intersection between medieval urban religious practice and the bridge. However, as has been discussed in the preceding chapters, aspects of the religious foundation around London Bridge changed significantly between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries. By the end of the thirteenth century, clergy ceased to hold office as bridgewardens or proctors. In the mid-fourteenth century, direct monetary post-mortem pious bequests to London Bridge became more uncommon, and by 1480s, legacies to London Bridge appear to have stopped.

The exception to this pattern of benefaction was the chapel on London Bridge, which in the late fifteenth century began to employ increased numbers of chaplains and clerks. Not only that, but the celebration around the feast of the Translation of St Thomas Becket appears to have undergone a renaissance, with increased participation and collections, right up until the 1540s when it was removed from the liturgical calendar by Henry VIII. The chapel's expansion is not, however, necessarily inconsistent with the general transition of the Bridge House towards

---

seal of a representation of the city itself, as well as its citizens both lay and ecclesiastical, who appear as supplicants on either side of Thomas Becket.

[350] John McEwan, *Seals in Medieval London, 1050-1300: A Catalogue* (Woodbridge: London Record Society, 2016), 34-5.

becoming a secular and civic institution. To understand how these stories align, it is important to consider the bridge chapel both independently and in conjunction with the Bridge House.

The chapel on London Bridge underwent several dynamic changes. Over the course of three and half centuries, it housed a locked chest of Bridge House deeds and records, maintained multiple chantries within its walls, oversaw the management of chantries and obits held in several London parishes, hosted services held in the Dutch language for foreigners residing in the city, supported the growth of polyphonic music, and developed an elaborate service at the feast of the Translation for pilgrims departing from London for Canterbury. However, by the early sixteenth century, the chapel had in many ways taken on a life of its own. The bridge and its original religious foundation gradually became more incidental to the chapel's operation. This chapter will consider the changes and continuity in the operation of the chapel and its relationship with London Bridge.

5.2 The Annual Bridge Accounts

This chapter draws on the annual financial accounts of London Bridge, which survive from 1381, with only minor gaps thereafter. As laid out in more detail in the introduction, these accounts tracked the Bridge House's annual expenses, in the form of wages for its large permanent workforce and its officers, and the purchase of materials. They also tracked the Bridge House's income, through its extensive rental properties both on and off the bridge, the sale of goods from its storehouses, the stallage payments made by fishmongers and butchers to use the Stocks throughout the year, and the legacy bequests, gifts, and oblations collected in the bridge chapel. The information makes it possible to trace the operations of the chapel on London Bridge.

In its early years, the chapel of St Thomas Becket upon the bridge operated firmly within the broader financial structure of the London Bridge House. Legacies and gifts left to the chapel or the Bridge House, as well as oblations left within the chapel itself on feast days were all included and audited with the other payments made to the Bridge House from its rentals and building projects. There are, however, two possible periods that may be exceptions from this arrangement, which will be discussed later in this chapter. At least initially, however, the costs of the chapel were budgeted and paid for alongside the main bridge accounts.

5.3 Fourteenth century bridge chapel

Limited information survives on the life of the bridge chapel prior to the fifteenth century. An indenture between the outgoing and incoming bridgewardens regarding the goods held in the chapel is recorded in the City's Letter Book F, which offers a glimpse into the work being done there. The 1350 inventory includes twenty-two books, including three breviaries and gradals with notation, which indicates that there were sung services being held in the chapel. This is indicated as well by the presence of five choir copes. By the fifteenth century, there are records of the chapel maintaining two choir boys,[351] in addition to two chapel clerks, but it is unclear whether this was already the case in the mid-fourteenth century.

Also included in the inventory were four sets of vestments for weekdays, although only one set of vestments for Sundays and one for festivals. This seems to indicate that while there may have been multiple priests serving at the chapel, the main services were carried out by a single priest. Significantly, however, the chapel by this point maintained significant

[351] In the 1430s, this role was filled by the two sons of Nicholas Holford, who was the main chapel clerk and the toll collector for London Bridge. Weekly Accounts, 1434-5, CLA/007/FN/03/004, f. 153v, BHEC, LMA.

accoutrements to outfit the chapel for festivals and had also acquired multiple relics.[352] These included a piece of the Cross of Christ, a ring with the tooth of St Richard, and a crystal and purse which each contained additional relics. These were meant to be kept on the altar of St Thomas, for pilgrims who visited the chapel.

5.4 Operations of the bridge chapel

The earliest surviving bridgewardens account rolls for 1381 to 1404 do not record substantial information pertaining to those employed in the bridge chapel. They do record the weekly wages paid to four or five chaplains celebrating in the chapel on the bridge, which amounted to 2s 6d per chaplain per week from 1382.[353] Each chaplain would therefore have made nearly £7 per year, which would have been a living wage at the time. A chapel clerk, on the other hand, received a weekly wage of 15d, which means they would likely have had to take on additional work elsewhere. An additional 3d was set aside for bread and wine in the chapel. The chapel workers also received oblations at Christmas, one shilling each for the chaplains and 8d each for the chapel clerks.[354]

In his master's thesis, Richard Lloyd argued that the late fourteenth century was a period of significant growth for the bridge chapel, as they began to expand their repertoire to include polyphonic music.[355] There is a gap in the records between 1398 and 1404, after which the

---

[352] Letter Book F, COL/AD/01/006, Corporation of London Collection, LMA; "Inventory of Ornaments and Goods in the Chapel, 1350," in Charles Welch, *History of the Tower Bridge* (London: Smith, Elder and Co, 1894), 261.
[353] Bridge Rolls, 1381-2, CLA/007/FN/01/001-2, BHEC, LMA. This appears to have been a raise of a halfpenny from the previous year, when the weekly wage of chapel chaplains was two shillings and five and half pence.
[354] Bridge Rolls, 1381, CLA/007/FN/01/001 (xii), BHEC, LMA.
[355] Richard Lloyd, "Pre-Reformation Music in the Chapel of St Thomas the Martyr, London Bridge," Unpublished MMus thesis, Royal Holloway, University of London, 1995.

chaplains and clerks of the chapel are named and listed with their quarterly wages. Four chaplains each received 33s 4d per quarter, a slight increase from the weekly wage previously listed, and two chapel clerks each received 18s per quarter.[356]

The main celebration that occurred each year in the chapel on London Bridge, as mentioned above, occurred at the feast of the Translation of St Thomas Becket. Chaplains and clerks in the bridge chapel celebrated this feast on 7 July each year. St Thomas Becket had two feast days. His primary feast day was held on the anniversary of his martyrdom on 29 December. However, this feast day largely does not appear in the accounts. It is possible that this was the case because the summer date for the Translation better accommodated the use of the bridge chapel as a starting point for pilgrimage to Canterbury.[357] The only exception to this pattern occurred in 1419-20, when the chapel celebrated and collected alms on both the day of St Thomas the Martyr in December, when they collected three shillings and one pence, and the feast of the Translation in July, when they collected eight shillings and a halfpenny.[358]

5.5 Gifts in the chapel

Between 1381 and 1537, the annual accounts provide data for one hundred and thirty-three years out of one hundred and fifty-six. During the one hundred and thirty-three years, however, bridge clerks utilized diverse record keeping practices, which makes the data for those years that are available uneven. This will be addressed below. An analysis of gifts to the chapel during this period shows that the community readily responded to innovations within the chapel, including the reconstruction of the chapel in the late fourteenth century and the expansion of the

---

[356] Weekly Accounts, CLA/007/FN/03/001, f 1r, BHEC, LMA.
[357] Many pilgrim badges were embedded in the riverbed by the site of old London Bridge.
[358] Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/001, 82r, 84v, BHEC, LMA.

Feast of the Translation in the early sixteenth century. The chapel also received interest from people outside of London, suggesting that it deliberately catered to travelers as well.

The accounts that survive from the fourteenth century consist of parchment rolls, some of them fragmentary, that record weekly payments and expenses for the Bridge House. The accounts for these years do not mention alms given in the chapel at the feast of the Translation, although they do include the occasional mention of alms collected at the Feast of Easter or left within boxes in the bridge chapel.[359]

It was during this period that the bridge chapel was rebuilt between 1384 and 1397 under the guidance of Henry Yevele, the long-term bridgewarden and one of the foremost masons and architects in England at the time. The annual accounts record various supplies purchased by the bridge during this period as part of the rebuilding process. For instance, in March of 1389, the annual account rolls note the purchase of 20 newels of stone from Kent for the staircase being built in the new chapel.[360] In June 1396, the bridge clerk recorded the purchase of stone for the upper vault of the new chapel.[361] Christopher Wilson noted in his article on Yevele as architect that if the Bridge House taken on the rebuilding of the chapel on its own, the bridge accounts would have recorded a much larger number of purchases.[362] As it stands, it is not possible to know precisely what went into the rebuilding, since Yevele's records as the primary force behind the project have not survived.

---

[359] For instance, the week of the feast of Matthew the Apostle and Evangelist (21 September) in 1389, the bridge rolls recorded the collection of 5s in oblations left in the box in the chapel upon the bridge. Bridge Rolls, 1388-9, CLA/007/FN/01/008, BHEC, LMA.
[360] Bridge Rolls, CLA/007/FN/01/008, m. 8 (xxiv), BHEC, LMA.
[361] Bridge Rolls, CLA/007/FN/01/014, m. 9 (xxxviii), BHEC, LMA.
[362] Christopher Wilson, "L'architecte bienfaiteur de la ville. Henry Yevele et la chappele du London Bridge," *Revue de I'Art* 166 4 (2009): 43-51, especially 48-50.

Yevele's rebuilding of the chapel may have marked a significant transition in how the chapel operated and its position within the Bridge House organization. Certainly, there was a gap in recorded alms being left to the chapel. It is possible that this reconstruction process simply disrupted the regular services in the chapel, leading to the absence of oblations collected in the chapel, or that the feast of the Translation was not celebrated regularly at this time. It is possible that the chapel may have celebrated the feast of the Translation and collected oblations, but merely neglected to report them, finding internal uses for any oblations that it collected during this time, during the upheaval of the reconstruction.

The Bridge House accounts do record extensive bequests and legacies received during the fourteen years between 1381 and 1397 for which records survive. The fourteen surviving accounts record fifty-four separate legacies and six gifts where the individual was yet living. Of the fifty-four legacies listed in the account rolls during those years, twenty-two included the names of the legatee.[363] Although the accounts do not often designate what aspect of London Bridge would benefit from these gifts, many of these legacies and donations likely went towards the rebuilding of the chapel. This possibility is supported by two gifts recorded in 1388, in which Robert Langton gave forty shillings and John Gofayr gave six shillings and eight pence to benefit the work of the new chapel.[364]

The late fourteenth century may have been a period of transition for the chapel in another way as well. The relationship between chapel and the parish church of St Magnus the Martyr at the north end of the bridge was occasionally contentious in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. This appears to have been due to the chapel's reluctance to acquiesce to the parish interference,

---

[363] Chapter 4 discusses the surviving wills of those individuals listed as leaving legacies in the annual accounts.

[364] Bridge Rolls, CLA/007/FN/01/007, xxxix, BHE, LMA.

despite technically being within its jurisdiction as the nearest parish church. In the guild enquiry of 1388, St Magnus reported that it had united its Salve Regina fraternity with the fraternity of St Thomas, which had formerly been located in the chapel on London Bridge. The parish then used the united funds of these two fraternities to rebuild their church.[365] The chapel disputed this reallocation of funds. Another dispute occurred in 1425, when the bridgewardens contested efforts of the rector of St Magnus to interfere in the management of the chapel. This concluded in July, when the Common Council decided that the masters of the bridge should not be subject to the rector of St Magnus in respect the chapel of St Thomas on the bridge because the chapel was free and excluded from all subjection.[366] However, St Magnus continued to periodically assert interest in the funds raised by the chapel on the bridge.

Legacies that appear in the annual accounts between 1381 and 1483 can be divided into two distinct clusters, which suggests the shifting priorities of legatees. The first is significant in understanding the chapel. During this period, in the late fourteenth century, legacies consisted of many modest bequests, which may have been inspired by ongoing projects like the chapel reconstruction. These consist of the fifty-five legacies that appear in the accounts between 1381 and 1397. During several of these years, including 1386, 1389, 1391, and 1397, the bridge clerk recorded five or more legacies. Thirty-four of the legacies recorded in the late fourteenth century, or over sixty percent, were for amounts under one shilling. The exception to these modest bequests was Richard Lyons, a London parishioner of St James Garlickhithe, who in his 1379

[365] H.F. Westlake, *The Parish Gilds of Medieval England* (New York: Macmillan Co, 1919), 186.
[366] Journals, 6 July 1425, COL/CC/01/02-03, f. 45v, Corporation of London Collection, LMA. This was in response to a papal edict that granted the chapel independence from interference by the parish of St Magnus.

will designated that £10 should go to the work of London Bridge.[367] Removing this outlier from the calculations, the average legacy during this period was just under four shillings.

London Bridge was attracting legacies from well outside of London as well. Twenty-five of the fifty-four legacies recorded in the annual accounts, or almost half, came from individuals in Essex. This suggests that there may have been widespread interest in the new work occurring at London Bridge in the late fourteenth century. The concentration of gifts from one county raises the question of why so many individuals in Essex cared about London Bridge. Unfortunately, few wills from Essex survive for the period in which this concentration occurred, and none for named donors, so it is not possible to seek answers from them. The more detailed records from the later fifteenth century regularly describe trips by bridgewardens to purvey shipments of wood from Essex, as well as trips to oversee repairs to the bridge's properties in Stratford in Essex.[368] It might be possible that the regular presence of Bridge House representatives in Essex operating in this capacity may have encouraged more regular giving. Another possibility is that the St Thomas Becket chapel on the bridge may have been a regular stop for individuals traveling south from Essex to start their pilgrimage to Canterbury.

The record of modest legacies continued during the first two decades of the fifteenth century, after which there was an extended period in which no legacies appear in the accounts. In the mid-fifteenth century, a significant number of much larger bequests were recorded. This

[367] This amount was then received by London Bridge in 1388. Richard Lyons was unusual in that he rose from obscurity to achieve remarkable wealth. Will of Richard Lyons 1379, DL/C/B/004/MS09171/001, f 79v, Commissary, LMA; Bridge Rolls, 1388, CLA/007/FN/01/007, Feast of St John, BHEC, LMA; A.R. Myers, "The Wealth of Richard Lyons," in T.A. Sandquist and M.R. Powicke, eds., *Essays in Medieval History presented to Bertie Wilkinson* (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1969), 301-29.

[368] Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/004, f. 30v-31, 50, BHEC, LMA.

renewed interest corresponded with the fallout from the collapse of two arches of London Bridge in 1437 and does not appear to be in any way linked to the chapel.[369]

5.6 Alms given in the chapel

The annual accounts record oblations given in the chapel over the course of the year. These amounts are first recorded in 1387 and are not recorded more regularly until around 1409. In the nine years for which sums are recorded between 1387 and 1409, the chapel received an average of 8s 5d in alms per year. This amount would increase over the course of the fifteenth century. It remained steady initially. Between 1410 and 1429, the chapel received an average of 11s 2d, and between 1430 and 1449, it received an average of 12s 1d per year.[370]

Between 1415 and 1451, alms in the chapel were recorded as either having been received at the Feast of the Translation of St Thomas Becket on July 7 or from other sources, including other feast days throughout the year and the collection box in the chapel. A comparison between the two shows that on an average year the feast of the Translation attracted somewhat more alms than the rest of the services held at the chapel combined. In the thirty years between that 1415 and 1451 for which records survive, the chapel collected £18 5s 1d in alms in the chapel. Of that, £9 18s 8.5d, or 54 percent, came from the feast of Translation. The chapel, therefore, averaged a little over 12s in alms per year during this period, a small sum when compared to the legacies and donations being left to the Bridge House more generally. During that same period, the Bridge House annual accounts record £169 12s 8d in legacies and £10 in donations.[371]

---

[369] For more on the collapse in 1437, see chapter 2.
[370] Bridge Rolls, 1381-1397, CLA/007/FN/01/001-015, BHEC, LMA; Bridge Accounts, 1404-1460, CLA/007/FN/02/001-002, BHEC, LMA.
[371] Bridge Accounts, 1404-1460, CLA/007/FN/02/001-002, BHEC, LMA.

Nevertheless, the presence of this small but persistent stream of alms given in the bridge chapel indicates continued support for the chapel, both by locals and by individuals traveling through London.

The second half of the century saw a sharp increase in interest in the chapel from visitors. Between 1450 and 1469, the chapel received an annual average of £1 13s 9d, almost triple the average from the preceding twenty years. It received an average of £1 1s 6d per year between 1470 and 1489, which continued to be significant.[372] The increased interest in the chapel may have emerged from internal outreach. It is possible that this was a key turning point for the chapel, which from the late fifteenth century appears to have expanded its connections within the local community beyond the Bridge House.

For instance, in the annual accounts ending in 1469, the chapel, in addition to its usual alms, received 4s from a Franciscan friar for license to preach and hear confession in the German tongue ("lingue Thentonice").[373] That same year, the chapel also received from a "ducheman" 12d for the work of the bridge and £4 8s 4d for the purchase of a new pyx and chalice.[374] This has interesting implications about the chapel's relationship with the local community. As Martha Carlin has discussed, the dominant alien group in Southwark, south of the river, was the "Doche" (Germans or Lowlanders) from at least the fourteenth century as a result of London's expanding economy and trade connections.[375] This suggests that by the late fifteenth century, the chapel may have begun to intentionally cater to the religious needs of a broader cross-section of the local population.

---

[372] Bridge Accounts, 1423-1509, CLA/007/FN/02/002-004, BHEC, LMA
[373] Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/003, 164r, BHEC, LMA.
[374] Ibid.
[375] Martha Carlin, *Medieval Southwark* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1996), 149-50.

The chapel continued to host a friar in the chapel to hear confessions in German or the "duche tunge" for fourteen years, until 1483.[376] However, the chapel did not just rely on the Franciscans for this service. From 1471 to 1473, a Dominican friar heard confession in German, and in 1473-4, a Carmelite friar did so.[377] The extended length of time that these services were maintained by the chapel, as well as the diversity of those serving, suggests that the chapel may been serving a need in the community and that the Doche population may have developed an affiliation with the chapel during those years.

From 1490 to 1513, the chapel received an average of 19s 1d from alms given in the chapel. There is then a gap of nine years in the chapel records as recorded in the annual accounts, during which the chapel kept its own records relating to the oblations offered within the chapel, which do not survive. The implications of this will be discussed further below. Between 1522 and 1537, the Bridge House records an average of 13s 1d per year given at the chapel in alms, although by that point, the chapel may have been once again taking on a new role.

5.7 The Translation of St Thomas Becket in the chapel

During the early sixteenth century, the practice around the cult of Thomas Becket on London Bridge appears to have undergone a revival. The annual accounts during this period demonstrate a shift in the practices around the feast of the Translation. In the late fifteenth century, the annual accounts recorded the purchase of all manner of tapers for the chapel, including "candelles ayenst Cristmas Candilmas and for the pascal Judas candills and the seme light ayenst the Fest of the Translacion of Seint Thomas," as well as between six and nine

[376] Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/003, 326v, 343v, BHEC, LMA.
[377] Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/003, 207r, 223r, BHEC, LMA.

gallons of “lampe oyle expendyd in the lampe” in the chapel and “in the braunche hanging without the same chapel dore in the fest of the glorious translacion of Saynt Thomas of Canterbury.”[378] During the first decade of the sixteenth century, the feast of the Translation was mentioned more rarely.

This appears to have changed during the period from 1513 to 1522, when the chapel may have kept separate accounts from London Bridge. At that point, the bridgewardens’ accounts stopped explicitly recording oblations. However, the expenses section of the annual accounts did continue to mention the chapel, which suggested the gradual growth of devotional practices during the feast of the Translation. In 1514, the first year that Raynold Blake managed the bridge chapel oblations for the chapel expenses, the expenses section notes that the “prestys and clerkys” were given twelve pence “of a rewarde … in helping forth of the Quere within the sayd chapel in the fest of the Translacion of Seint Thomas of Caunterbury thys yere.”[379] The following year, in 1515, the accounts expand upon this, noting a payment of twelve pence to “divers other singing men and children singing in the said chapel in the day of the Translacion of Saint Thomas of Caunterbury.”[380] This thereafter became a regular yearly expense for the chapel.

The chapel continued to expand its appeal. In 1523, Raynold Blake, the clerk charged with keeping the chapel expenses until the previous year, paid for “mending of a relyk closed in sylver in the seid chapel.”[381] Two year later, the chapel paid an additional eight pence to participants in the celebration of the feast of the Translation who were responsible for “hanging up and taking downe of clothes of arras in the same chapel.”[382] In 1527, the chapel again

[378] Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/004, 198r, BHEC, LMA.
[379] Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/005, 104r, BHEC, LMA.
[380] Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/005, 126v, BHEC, LMA.
[381] Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/005, 271r, BHEC, LMA.
[382] Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/005, 315r, BHEC, LMA.

elevated its celebration of the feast of the Translation by bringing in another chaplain for two days during the vigil and day of the Translation, paying three shillings to the divers singing men and children in the chapel, and paying two shillings to hire a "clothes of Arras clothes of golde and sylke and for hangyng up and taking downe of the same within the said chapell in the feste of the Translatyon of Saint Thomas of Caunterbury."[383] The chapel also paid the wife of Thomas Turke twenty-three shillings and ten pence "for a pere of bryssell cloth cont' xlj elles for surplycs for syngyng men within the said chapell" at the feast of the Translation.[384]

At the same time, the accounts note additional payments to their wax chandler, Robert Grey, for making tapers for the high altar sepulchre before the statues of St Thomas and the Virgin Mary within the chapel. In 1529, having invested in the surplices for the men singing at the feast of the Translation, the chapel expanded its liturgy to include singing men and children at the Feast of the Nativity of Our Blessed Lady on the eighth of September in addition to the feast of the Translation in July, although oblations during this period continued to be directed overwhelmingly towards the feast of the Translation.[385]

5.7.1 The Feast of the Translation 1525: a community interlude

The chapel record for the summer of 1525 reports that the Bridge House owed 20d to the "diveris singeng men and children [for] singeng in the seide chapell in the Fest of the Translacion of Seinte Thomas of Caunterbury" and also "for hanging up and taking downe of clothes of Arras in the same chapel." This invokes the scene of these members of the surrounding area working together to decorate the chapel for their special feast and cleaning up

[383] Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/006, 27r, BHEC, LMA.
[384] Ibid.
[385] Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/006, 74r, BHEC, LMA.

afterwards. Perhaps for many of them, this was a yearly tradition, a time to gather on the bridge to perform for the pilgrims and other visitors who came from some distance to celebrate together. While this celebration would have certainly been an occasion that would have attracted many pilgrims, it likely included substantial local involvement as well.

Perhaps those in attendance that day might include some of the numerous residents of London who maintained a long-term business agreement with the Bridge House. Among them, perhaps, was Robert Grey, a wax chandler who first made tapers for the chapel in 1522, and would continue to provide wax, tapers, candles, and the Easter paschal light uninterrupted until 1543.[386] Many of the tapers, as the accounts make clear, were intended to sit before the "hygh aulter Sepulture before our Lady and Saynt Thomas" within the chapel, presumably to be lit by visitors passing through in supplication or during the mass.[387]

Perhaps also among those attending the feast of the Translation in 1525 was Walter Vanghay, the vintner who supplied the wine expended in the chapel in 1525-6 and again from 1528 to 1534, or one of the Atkynson family, either Robert, Thomas, or John, grocers who provided lamp oil for the chapel from 1523 until 1536.[388] The three Atkynsons are each listed three to five times each over the course of those thirteen years; both Robert and Thomas are identified as grocers, while John appears in the accounts as a "skynner."[389] Perhaps Thomas

---

[386] Bridge Accounts, 1524, CLA/007/FN/02/005, f 278 v, BHEC, LMA. Robert Grey, like many of the people providing goods for the chapel, lived locally in property owned by the bridge. He first appears in the housing records in 1523, living in a property on Paternoster Row, less than a mile from the London Bridge, where he stays for the duration of the time he provides wax to the chapel. In 1544, the year the chapel records fail to mention him, but instead report that it owed "Graies wife" for "newe making of thirteen poundes of waxe", the housing records report that "uxor Grey" paid the rent for the property on Paternoster Row. Bridge Accounts, 1544, CLA/007/FN/02/007 f 68 v, f 57 r, BHEC, LMA.

[387] Bridge Accounts, 1525, CLA/007/FN/02/006 f 16 v, BHEC, LMA.

[388] For instance, Bridge Accounts, 1529, CLA/007/FN/02/006 f 74 v, BHEC, LMA.

[389] Thomas and John Atkynson appear to alternate payments on a property worth £10 annually on the principal east part of the bridge from at least as early as 1515. Since all three men appear in the chapel records for providing the same item, lamp oil, it seems likely that regardless of different identifying

Smith, a local organmaker, was on hand to make sure that nothing went amiss with the organs. He had been called in several times over the years, most recently in 1523-4, "for mending and tewnyng of a peire of organs."[390] In 1529-30, the chapel would invest in a new set of organs, paying "John Howe the yonger" for "mendyng scoryng and newe settyng of a finall payer of organs in the vanite" of the chapel.[391] So greatly did the chapel value their new pair of organs that they would pay John Howe to visit the chapel in order to care for and maintain the organs nearly every year thereafter until 1543, a measure they had not taken prior to the new installation.

The Atkynsons were not the only family to have multiple members with connections to the chapel. Several family names appear repeatedly in the chapel records, and they do not always play the same role in their support of the chapel. For instance, a grocer by the name of John Nasshe provides the chapel with "two gallons … of oyle" for 2s 6d in 1523-4.[392] A few years later, in 1528, Robert Nasshe started his three-year tenure as a chapel clerk. It is unclear whether John and Robert were related, or whether Robert's involvement was influenced by John's several years previous. However, it is possible that it was, and the existence of multiple surname duplicates in the bridge records suggests that at least some were related and using the bridge association to forge advantageous ties.

Another, more likely name pairing appears among the clerks. John Ferrys, the chapel clerk who took over from Raynold Blake as head clerk in 1528, had the longest tenure of those clerks that appear between 1508 and 1548, at thirty-three years. Five years after he became the

---

professions, they all three were invested in their shop on the bridge. (Robert appears in the chapel records from 1523-6 and 1531-3, Thomas from 1526-31, and John from 1533-6.)

390 Bridge Accounts, 1524, CLA/007/FN/02/005 f 294 r, BHEC, LMA.

391 Bridge Accounts, 1530, CLA/007/FN/02/006 f 96 r, BHEC, LMA.

392 Bridge Accounts, 1524, CLA/007/FN/02/005 f 294 r, BHEC, LMA.

head clerk in the chapel on the bridge, he was joined by a "Bengeman Ferrys", another clerk who would have served under him. Benjamin Ferrys joined the chapel staff in 1533, twenty-one years after John Ferrys joined in 1512.[393] It is possible, and indeed reasonably likely, that Benjamin was a son or nephew of John Ferrys, intent on following his kinsman into a higher up position at the chapel on the bridge. The existence of these pairings suggests the construction of a chapel community that was supported by familial ties.

5.8 The new chapel: a changing landscape

Benjamin Ferrys would not eventually inherit John Ferrys' position as head clerk in the chapel of St Thomas of Canterbury upon the bridge. In fact, within six years of his first appearance in the accounts, the bridgewardens' accounts ceased listing the "chapel of Saint Thomas" among their financial records. Instead, beneath the familiar "Costes of the Chapell" heading, the scribes made careful note of the costs accrued by "our lady chapell uppon the brydge."[394] The previous year, 1538-9, had witnessed a drastic drop in the numbers of those ministering in the chapel; from a yearly staff of three chaplains and six clerks, the chapel suddenly only employed a single priest, Sir John Pate, and John Ferrys, who after twenty-eight years of working with four to five other clerks, abruptly had to contend with running the chapel on his own.[395]

The circumstances of the early English Reformation made the figure of St Thomas Becket particularly contentious. The cult of Thomas Becket readily portrayed his martyrdom as the result of his choice to side with the pope against King Henry II on the issue of the

[393] Bridge Accounts, 1534, CLA/007/FN/02/005 f 176 v, BHEC, LMA.
[394] Bridge Accounts, 1540, CLA/007/FN/02/006 f 284 r, BHEC, LMA.
[395] Bridge Accounts, 1539, CLA/007/FN/02/006 f 284 r, BHEC, LMA.

independence of the English church from royal intervention. This eventually led to Henry II having to do public penance for his role in Becket's death. After the dramatic break with the Roman Catholic Church engineered by Henry VIII in 1533, and the resistance which it encountered, the royal administration deliberately suppressed one of the most popular cults in England. This suppression began as early as 1536, and culminated in the November 1538 royal proclamation, when Henry VIII reframed Thomas Becket as "a rebel and traitor to his prince," and charged that he should no longer be "esteemed, named, reputed, nor called a saint" and that "his images and pictures through the whole realm shall be put down and avoided out of all churches, chapels, and other places."[396] The chapel on the bridge appears to have held its last celebration of the feast of the Translation in 1537, when they paid "certeyne men and childerne for synginge in the chapell upon Saynte Thomas daye."[397] The proclamation of 1538 affected many different religious communities, but it would have had a particular impactful for a community in which Thomas Becket held such a prominent role.

The bridge chapel therefore underwent several rounds of suppression, first being stripped of its primary dedication and then being stripped of its workers. In the absence of most of its chaplains and clerks, the core community around the chapel dwindled drastically. Instead of employing the traditional group of "singing men and children" to sing for the feast of the Translation of St Thomas, a practice that continued up until 1537, the newly dedicated lady chapel, divested of its usual priests, became the host for the choir of St Magnus parish, who sang evensong in the chapel at the time of "our lady fayre before the sayde mayore and his brethren"

---

[396] "'Prohibiting Unlicensed Printing of Scripture, Exiling Anabaptists, Depriving Married Clergy, Removing St Thomas a Becket from Calendar," *Tudor Royal Proclamations: Volume 1, The Early Tudors (1485-1553)*, Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin, eds. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1964), 275-6.
[397] Bridge Accounts, 1537, CLA/007/FN/02/006 f 230 v, BHEC, LMA.

in 1539.[398] The Bridge House owned a number of properties in St Magnus Parish, which was located immediately to the north of London Bridge. However, it became more closely affiliated with the local parish during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.

The chapel came to rely on St Magnus Parish in the aftermath of their reduction in staff, as the bridgewardens' accounts report. In 1541, the chapel again called upon the parish of St Magnus, this time relying on their "prests and clerks" to sing evensong in the chapel "upon the Nativite of our ladye before the lorde mayre and his bretherne."[399] The hosting of the mayor and aldermen at the chapel, at the entrance to the City, may be a reflection of the increased emphasis on pageantry and displays of civic pomp and circumstance in the sixteenth century, although its origins are unclear. By 1544, the bridgewardens' records for the chapel had begun to regularly note clerks and chaplains of St Magnus singing for the mayor on the bridge; these practices were carried out "as hath byn accustomed."[400]

It is uncertain whether the practice of hosting the mayor for the feast of the Nativity of Our Lady was a new practice or not. Certainly, several of the earlier records of payment to the "dyverse singin men and children" for the feast of the Translation of St Thomas also included reference to them singing for the feast of the Nativity of Our Blessed Lady. However, since no mention of the mayor's attendance exists prior to the removal of the feast of the Translation, it is possible that this was a new innovation. The practice can be read in part as an attempt to further integrate the chapel into the structure of the civic government. However, the necessary reliance of the chapel upon St Magnus to provide it with a choir and celebrants and the way that the practice seems to be a replacement for the celebrations at the feast of the Translation of St

[398] Bridge Accounts, 1539, CLA/007/FN/02/006 f 259 v, BHEC, LMA.
[399] Bridge Accounts, 1541, CLA/007/FN/02/007 f 122 v, BHEC, LMA.
[400] Bridge Accounts, 1544, CLA/007/FN/02/007 f 68 v, BHEC, LMA.

Thomas of Canterbury suggests that the later Henrician and early Edwardian reforms severely undercut the chapel's ability to serve the community as it previously had.

The early changes to operations were minimal, and on some level might even be attributed to briefer recording practices. For instance, the entries for Robert Grey, the waxchandler who lived on the bridge, and had been providing the chapel with various services since 1522, became much sparser in the mid-1530s. Entries beforehand described the precise use to which the wax candles provided would be put; the 1535-6 account, following precedent, reported that the Bridge House paid "Robert Graye" 2s 2d and 2s 6d respectively for making new and old wax "into sondry tapars for the high Alter the Sepulcre the lights befor the Image of oure Lady and saint Thomas within the chapell" and for "a pastall of his owne wax for the saide chapell."[401] Starting the following year, this detail is omitted; the account merely reports that the Bridge House paid Robert Gray "for makinge of waxe for the chapell".[402] The chapel records are simplified dramatically during the transition years; this might be coincidental, or may have reflected the reduced expenditure of the chapel.

As it happened, the changes in the chapel structure coincided rather closely with the gradual disappearance of many of the long-term suppliers of the chapel. This does not mean that there was a deliberate shift away from them any more than there had been in the past; the general composition of the suppliers shifted quite frequently, as people passed away and others moved in to take their place.[403] However, the period between 1543 and 1547 saw the disappearance of not

[401] Bridge Accounts, 1536, CLA/007/FN/02/006 f 215 r, BHEC, LMA. This may refer to a Paschal (Easter) candle, which the chapel acquired annually.
[402] Bridge Accounts, 1537, CLA/007/FN/02/006 f 230 v, BHEC, LMA.
[403] Bridge Accounts, 1529, CLA/007/FN/02/006 f 74 r, BHEC, LMA. Shifts among the internal staff in particular appear to have occurred in conjunction with the transfer of tenure for the head clerk. For instance, in the records for the year 1528-9, four new clerks appear: Robert Nasshe, William Carpenter, John Norman, and John Michelson. This was also the year that John Ferrys replaced Raynold Blake as head clerk.

just John Ferrys, but also John Hacker, the fishmonger who had provided lamp oil to the chapel since 1536 and Rauf Wyllott, the vintner who had been providing the chapel with wine since around 1534. In fact, by the time of the record for the first year of Edward VI, the only recognizable contributing member from before Hugh Bussenwell became the head clerk in 1543 was John Howe the organmaker, who had been paid for looking after the organs he had installed in 1530 almost yearly since then. In the year 1548, a "John Oughe", organmaker, was paid 3s 4d for "money by hym repayde unto a Joyner and porters for the taking downe of a paire of Organns in the Chappell".[404] Thus it was that less than twenty years after he installed the organs in the chapel on the bridge, John Howe oversaw their removal, a measure enacted within the context of a changed and reformed English church.

By 1551, only a single clerk remained in the chapel. Hugh Bussenwell worked forty-two weeks in 1551-52, 10 weeks in 1552-53, and then vanished entirely. On 20 January 1554, the Bridge House purchased supplies to renovate "the newe housse on the Bridge called the chapell."[405] Thereafter the chapel became a rental property much like the hundreds of other houses that existed on London Bridge.

5.9 Conclusions

The circumstances around the dissolution of the chapel on London Bridge reflected a new religious order where independent chapels, along with chantries, were no longer permitted to operate as they had previously. They marked a period as well of transition for organizations like the London Bridge, that had occupied a precarious middle ground as both religious and secular,

[404] Bridge Accounts, 1548, CLA/007/FN/02/007 f 180 r, BHEC, LMA. The spelling of the last name "Howe" varies considerably during the twenty years that he is paid for watching over the organs.
[405] Bridge Accounts, 1554, CLA/007/FN/02/007 f 416 r, BHEC, LMA.

broadly communal and insular. However, the Bridge House of the early sixteenth century had already shed nearly all the religious associations that were present when it was founded in the thirteenth century. The Bridge House had long since ceased to house an almshouse where brothers and sisters prayed for the benefactors of the bridge, and the bridgewardens were secular men, many of whom were London merchants. Moreover, in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century, London Bridge had ceased to attract bequests from Londoners, having established itself as a self-sustaining administrative institution with close ties to the civic infrastructure.

The chapel that conducted outreach into the community to host services by friars in the German tongue in the late fifteenth century and expanded its celebrations for the Translation in the early sixteenth century was becoming increasingly independent from the Bridge House. This transition is evident in the noticeable way that fifteenth century bequests distinguished starkly between pious gifts to the chapel and more administrative and civic based gifts to maintain the bridge. The movement towards keeping independent records from the Bridge House in the early decades of the sixteenth century are further evidence of the chapel's pseudo-parochial shift. The final dissolution of the chapel, then, may have marked a starker loss for St Magnus than it did for London Bridge. It marked a break within the religious culture of the city, but the Bridge House in many ways had long since shed its religious associations.

Chapter 6 Conclusion: The Bridge

> *It was the early hours of June 7, 2020, in a completely locked down London. After two months quarantining in a pod with six others in a hall for international graduate students in Bloomsbury, we had been informed that we would need to find new accommodation in the most difficult circumstances. Our little "found family" prepared to go separate ways. We stayed up into the wee hours of the morning talking, not wanting to let go. At three in the morning, someone realized that the sun would be rising over the Thames in an hour and a half.* Let's walk down to the river.
>
> *We were a little over two miles from St Paul's and Millennium Bridge, which was built by the Bridge House Estates in 2000. The city was preternaturally silent as we made our way through the deserted streets. I had made this walk many times before, so I took the lead. Down past the St John's Priory gate, built in the early sixteenth century, and the Jerusalem Tavern, housed on the ground floor of a 1720 goldsmith's house, where I lived for a summer while doing preliminary research. Past the London Metropolitan Archives, where I often spent three or four days a week before it closed abruptly in March 2020. Past Smithfield's Market and St Bartholomew's Hospital. To St Paul's Cathedral, and there, just beyond, the silvery footbridge over the Thames.*
>
> *The whole time we walked, we saw perhaps two or three other people. In a city like London, where the quiet hours invariably see late night revelers returning home, passing early risers heading into work, this was eerie. London felt like a ghost town, folded in upon itself. Holding its breath. Suspended in time. Between sleeping and waking. And a small group of travelers, far from home, wandering down to the Thames, to watch the sun rise and a new day begin.*[406]

There are many stories that can be told about London Bridge. The story of the London Bridge House found here is intertwined with the story of a city in transition. It starts with a City just recently granted permission to form a civic government, dedicating their new stone bridge and its chapel to one of their own, a recently martyred saint who they would also claim as their patron. It starts with people rallying around a religious institution; people donating land and

[406] Author's personal recollection, 23 March 2022.

tenements as legacies, individually and in multigenerational pairs, establishing the first landed endowment for a bridge in England and enjoining prayers for their souls; people retiring to the Bridge House to pray for its benefactors and vowing to act as befitted religious men, faithful, honest, and reverent; and people balancing management between clerical men and men with civic authority, until royal authority imposed itself.

The Bridge House went through many incarnations between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries, and meant many things to many different people, just as the City itself did. In the fourteenth century, it attracted many small monetary bequests in the decades after the major collapse in 1281, perhaps encouraged by a civic government eager to reassert independence after disastrous royal interference. The Bridge House adapted to civic growth by stepping in in an administrative capacity, taking on the role of manager and overseer of chantries, when parish churches might fail in their obligations to testators. City officials encouraged the expansion of the Bridge House's sprawling financial assets, and the Bridge House in turn managed storehouses that the city tapped into and employed a growing number of Londoners. For a time, the office of bridgewarden attracted men seeking to rise to higher civic office. This eventually gave way to men who saw oversight of the expansive financial resources of the bridge as a beneficial long-term position in itself.

The Bridge House faced challenges in the fifteenth century. When two arches collapsed in 1437, there were disputes about who should finance the rebuilding efforts. Rather than a flood of small monetary bequests by a diverse body of Londoners, as in the thirteenth century, the bridge attracted large bequests by a handful of individuals who held prominent roles in civic government. The City disputed requests by William Wetenhale for repayment of personal funds used to repair the bridge while he was bridgewarden. The St Thomas Becket chapel on the bridge, once central to the Bridge House institution, struggled with attempts at interference by the local parish church, St Magnus the Martyr, and charted its own path by taking innovative steps to cater to pilgrims and the largest local alien population, the Doche.

This story is one of constant renegotiation, the renegotiation of civic authority and of sacred and secular spaces of influence. It is informed by previous scholarly work on the growth of civic government, which recognizes both the remarkable strength of the institutions that developed in the late medieval period and the roles played by individuals who navigated them and influenced their paths. This story is situated within the context of the history of bridges and their deeply ingrained associations with piety and charitable giving during this time and the local symbolic representations of London Bridge in particular. And finally, it asks about what we can say in relation to ideas around "secularization" and "profanation," paradigms that are imbedded in historical narrative, associated with specific historical moments, and sometimes simplified into unidirectional movements.

The answer to that question is not simple, because like any other historical interpretation it deals with many complicated moments in time. The story of the Bridge House is a story of constant renegotiation. On a personal level, it has involved a constant renegotiation of expectations and changing circumstances. On an historical and institutional level, it involved a renegotiation of authority, of associations with piety, of the uses to which resources can be put. As this story shows, renegotiation around pious associations, for bridges or hospitals, was not limited to moments of large-scale reformation, but rather interwoven with parallel renegotiations around urban expansion and civic growth. Striking moments of abrupt upheaval, like the dissolution of chapels and chantries during the English Reformation, do not happen in a vacuum.

Instead, they might interrupt other, ongoing narratives of renegotiation. And so it was with the London Bridge House and the chapel on the bridge.

This study has examined the history of the Bridge House through several centuries, which has allowed it to piece together broad trends within the organization that occurred over time in a way that has not been done before. Previous studies, when they dipped into the rich archives of the Bridge House, have focused on more narrow windows of time. By considering the broader picture, it has been possible to see how different aspects of the Bridge House institution interacted with each other, as well as with the other civic and religious forces at play. The flood of small bequests in the early fourteenth century may have been in response to the partial collapse of the bridge in 1281 and the attempts by the City to formalize and reassert its authority. The move towards a more administrative function for the Bridge House in the fourteenth century was embedded in the expansion of civic government. This in turn influenced a decline in the associations of the Bridge House with piety, which led to a decline in bequests to the bridge, although the chapel continued to foster local religious interest. In this new context, the partial collapse in 1437 inspired a much different response, one where men from the wealthy civic elite played a primary role in financing the rebuilding process.

By taking the longer view, it is possible to recognize that the relationship between the Bridge House and its religious foundation changed dramatically long before the religious upheaval in the early sixteenth century that eventually dissolved its iconic chapel. The religious associations around locations such as bridges, especially well-endowed bridges like London Bridge, had receded. Looking at the chapel, it is clear that communal religious activity itself had not declined, but perhaps it had gone through a form of relocation, becoming more deeply embedded into chapels and parish churches. Sacred spaces were being renegotiated within the context of civic growth and transformation.

A study that extends over this many years must invariably lose some potential depth to achieve breadth. There are many different stories about the London Bridge House that can be told, and this only covers some of them. Future studies might go more in depth in investigating the footprint of the Bridge House storehouses, where material was shipped in from, who purchased items once they reached London, and the networks involved. There is more work that might be done on the web of individuals who were employed in some capacity by the Bridge House in the fifteenth century. There are also ways that the implications of this study regarding religious transition within late medieval civic spaces might be further explored. It could be fruitful to try to find parallel cases through the study of hospitals, guilds, and livery companies.

The story told here is one that recognizes that all stories are intertwined. Medieval London Bridge was embedded in a City facing many challenges and people from many walks of life who were constantly renegotiating how they understood the spaces they occupied. In that context, the bridge has meant many different things to many different people. This story explores just a few.

6.1 The London Bridge House in context

The transformation of London Bridge House did not happen in a vacuum. The management of other urban institutions experienced similar reorganizations and upheaval, both internal and external, during the thirteenth through fifteenth centuries. The increased authority of civic governance and conflicts between religious and secular authorities both played a role in reshaping perceptions of collective responsibility within these institutions.

For instance, in the fourteenth century, the City established significant authority over several leper hospitals located just outside of London. As with the Bridge House and the hospital of St Mary of Bethlehem, these institutions were founded in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries by pious patrons.[407] In 1354, the Mayor and Commonalty petitioned the King to allow them to elect two people of the City to act as wardens and oversee the running of the St Giles hospital.[408] Marjorie Honeybourne noted that the city-appointed overseers of the leper hospitals were frequently prominent lay Londoners, which represented a marked change from earlier form.[409] In 1375, the Mayor and Aldermen imposed an oath on the foremen at both the Lock and Hackney hospitals that they would prevent lepers from entering the City as another form of supervision.[410]

The changing perceptions around lay or religious responsibility for civic charitable provisions can be seen in the establishment and expansion of the Great Conduit, which transported water to Londoners from a reservoir in Cheapside. The project was instituted as civic charitable provision in the 1230s, located on the site of the twelfth century house where St Thomas Becket was born.[411] Overseen by a warden appointed by the City, it received funds from several places, including donations from foreign merchants, a tax on local tradesmen who used it, and pious bequests from Londoners.[412] It was significantly expanded in the 1430s through a combination of taxes and bequests, an initiative led by John Welles, who served as mayor in

---

[407] The Hospital of St Giles in Holborn was founded by Queen Maud in the first two decades of the twelfth century and given a religious endowment worth over £100. The leper hospital called the Lock in Southwark was likely founded in the twelfth century as well, and the hospital at Hackney followed in the late thirteenth century. Caroline Barron and Matthew Davies, editors, *The Religious Houses of London and Middlesex* (London: Centre for Metropolitan History and Victoria County History, 2007), 315, 175, 320.

[408] *Letter Book G*, 27-29.

[409] Marjorie Honeybourne, "The Leper Hospitals of the London Area," *Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeology Society* 21 (1967), 10-11.

[410] *Letter Book H*, 9.

[411] Derek Keene, "Issues of water in medieval London to c.1300," *Urban History* 28:2 (2001), 177-8.

[412] Barron, *London in the Later Middle Ages*, 255-7.

1431-2, and left a significant bequest to London Bridge after its collapse. The early fifteenth century saw a number of large-scale civic projects of this nature, in which members of London's elite and the civic government established recognition for themselves through building public works that might previously have fallen under religious sponsorship. This reflected a transference of perceived responsibility for civic upkeep.

These same changes in perceived responsibility are central to understanding other instances of bridge-building and maintenance during the twelfth through sixteenth centuries. In the twelfth century, the London Bridge House most closely modeled the fabric of the bridge organizations that accompanied Pont-Saint-Esprit and Pont-Saint-Benezet in Avignon. However, while these French bridges were established as charitable institutions, they faced challenges in basing bridge maintenance solely on pious donations. The bridge organizations encountered completing claims on charitable giving. At Pont-Saint-Esprit, the local monastery of St Pierre of Saint-Saturnin sought to access the alms given to the bridge by insisting in 1301 that the rectors of the bridge should render their accounts before him.[413] Tolls and taxation were increasingly used to supplement bridge maintenance costs.[414] By the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, bridges in the southern region of what would become France were managed through diverse means. Bridges at Albi, Agen, and Lyons were under the control of the town government, the one at Romans was under the authority of the chapter of St Bernard and the local commune, and the one at Orleans existed as part of an *opus pontis* with a large endowment, managed by men appointed by the governor of the duchy of Orleans and approved by an assembly.[415] Despite the growing use of tolls, both the pope and local bishops persisted as classifying bridge building as a

[413] Boyer, *Medieval Bridges*, 55.
[414] Ibid, 60.
[415] Ibid, 107.

work of charity to allow the receipt of legacies for good works.[416] Nevertheless, by the fifteenth century, bridges had increasingly become recognized as public property, which local governments were obligated to maintain.[417]

In many ways, the London Bridge House shared more in common with bridge establishments on the continent than with those in England. However, the transference of religious and secular authority and responsibility for bridge maintenance played a role in other bridgeworks in England as well, including that of Rochester Bridge. Unlike London Bridge, Rochester Bridge initially maintained aspects of an earlier Anglo-Saxon model of bridge maintenance that required local estates to maintain particular arches. When the stone bridge at Rochester was completed in 1391, over a century after the one at London, these estates became part of a commonalty responsible for electing wardens. The overseers of the building project, Sir John de Cobham and Sir Robert Knolles, however, also secured permission from the king to create a bridge establishment of 200 marks worth of property for the maintenance of the bridge.[418] Despite this, the fifteenth century wardens struggled to keep up with bridge repairs, resulting in multiple significant collapses.

This gap in leadership led to the increased participation of local religious authorities. The chaplains serving at the Rochester bridge chapel played a prominent role in securing donations for the bridge, sometimes traveling to speak with will executors in London.[419] Several bishops

[416] Ibid, 106-7. In 1308, Pope Clement V granted a 100-day indulgence to those who gave to the fabric of the bridge being built by Dominicans near Nimes. In 1350, the men of Agen petitioned the pope to make bridgebuilding and pilgrimages of equal spiritual merit.
[417] Ibid, 121.
[418] R.H. Britnell, "Rochester Bridge, 1381-1530," in *Traffic and Politics: The Construction and Management of Rochester Bridge, AD 43-1993*, edited by Nigel Yates and James M. Gibson (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1994), 50-3.
[419] Ibid, 85-6.

issued ecclesiastical dispensations for spiritual privileges that would accompany donations.[420] The archbishop of Canterbury increasingly took a leading position in managing the bridge's finances. By the 1470s, he had acquired significant authority in the matter, calling the meetings required to elect new wardens and receiving the audits for the accounts.[421] In the early sixteenth century, several of the wardens themselves were clergy, including the archbishop of Canterbury, Henry Dene, in 1502 and the prior of the monastery at Leeds, Richard Chetham, from 1506 to 1530. By 1535, however, the bridgeworks had reverted to lay hands, with landed gentry taking over management responsibilities.[422]

In each of these cases, the changing social and political realities of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries led to a transference of authority and responsibility in the management of significant public works. This involved a sometimes-tenuous relationship between religious and lay authorities and marked shifts in perceptions of what responsibility each had towards institutions that served the public good. The story of the London Bridge House and its transformation from religious institution to civic enterprise reflects the much broader story of a society undergoing an expansion of civic government and authority and the resulting negotiation between religious and secular spheres. By understanding the dynamics at work in this context, it is possible to reframe other instances of late medieval institutional development.

[420] Ibid, 85-6.
[421] Ibid, 96.
[422] Ibid, 108-9.

Appendices[423]

[423] Individuals listed in bold are those for whom extant wills have been identified. The first instance of their name in the appendices includes a footnote noting the location of the will in question, with their later appearances only being bolded, for reference.

Appendix A: Bridgewardens, c. 1176-1557

Year(s)	Bridgewarden(s)	Records
1176-1205	Peter of Colechurch	Close Rolls, 7 John, m.15
1205	Brother Wasce	Close Rolls, 7 John, m.15
1213	Martin Geoffrey	LR, CLA/007/EM/04/001/160/141
1220-1	Robert of Winchester Henry of St Albans	DP, CLA/007/EM/02/A/003
1220-1	Arnald the Chaplain	LR, CLA/007/EM/04/001/387/465
1222-5	**Roger le Duc**[424] Serlo Mercer	DP, CLA/007/EM/02/B/011
1226-7	Henry of St Albans William Aleman	SR, CLA/007/EM/04/003/A/17/21
1236-7	William Aleman	SR, CLA/007/EM/04/003/A/22v-23/48
1237-8	Serlo Mercer Robert the Chaplain	DP, CLA/007/EM/02/A/73
23 Sept 1232	Benedict Shipwright John Bulloc	*CPR* 1225-1232, p. 501
1240-1	Michael Tovy	DP, CLA/007/EM/02/B/064
1249-51	Michael Tovy Robert Basing	DP, CLA/007/EM/02/F/046 & CLA/007/EM/02/F/006
1255-6	Michael Tovy Stephen of Ostergate	DP, CLA/007/EM/02/B/039

[424] SR deed, CLA/007/EM/003/A, no 30, f 19, BHEC, LMA; LR deed, CLA/007/EM/04/001, no 244, f 233, BHEC, LMA.

1258-61	**Godard the Chaplain**[425]	LR, CLA/007/EM/04/001/593/607
1263-4	**Godard the Chaplain** Robert of Cornhill	DP, CLA/007/EM/02/A/022
1269-71	Thomas Chelke, chaplain	DP, CLA/007/EM/02/F/002
1269-71	William FitzRichard	DP, CLA/007/EM/02/A/061
1271	Brother John	DP, CLA/007/EM/02/F/032
1271-2	Stephen of Fulborn	DP, CLA/007/EM/02/C/014
1271-3	James of St Magnus	DP, CLA/007/EM/02/F/045 & CLA/007/EM/04/001/408/489
1274-5	Stephen of Fulborn	DP, CLA/007/EM/02/F/004
1275-6	**Gregory de Rokesle**[426] Nicholas of Winchester	Husting deed, CLA/023/CP/01/003, m. 5
1279-80	**Gregory de Rokesle** Nicholas of Winchester John the clerk Martin the Chaplain	DP, CLA/007/EM/02/G/028
1283-4	Martin the Chaplain Richard Knotte **Thomas Cros**[427]	DP, CLA/007/EM/02/B/042 & CLA/007/EM/02/F/003 (no Martin)
1294-5	**Edmund Horn**[428] **Thomas Cros**	LR, CLA/007/EM/04/001, p. 391, no. 470
28 May 1298	John le Benere **William Jordan**[429] Robert de Wethernghey, chaplain **(Thomas Romein**[430]**)**	*LBB*, p. 216

[425] SR deed, CLA/007/EM/003/A, no 2, f 13, BHEC, LMA; LR deed, CLA/007/EM/04/001, no 571, f 281, BHEC, LMA.
[426] Will of Gregory de Rokesle, 1290-1, CLA/023/DW/01/20, no 57, HR, LMA.
[427] Will of Thomas Cros, 1299, CLA/023/DW/01/28, no 6, HR, LMA.
[428] Will of Edmund Horn, 1296, CLA/023/DW/01/26, no 12, HR, LMA.
[429] Will of William Jordan, 1303-4, CLA/023/DW/01/32, no 109, HR, LMA.
[430] Will of Thomas Romein, 1312, CLA/023/DW/01/41, no 66, HR, LMA. Thomas Romein listed as coadjutor (?) alongside Wethernghey, Jurdan and le Benere to guard London Bridge, without rendering account.

1298-1300	John le Benere **William Jordan**	LR, CLA/007/EM/04/001 p. 392, no. 471; *LBB*, p. 70, 94
1304-5	John le Benere Gilbert Cros	*LBB*, p. 63 & *LBC*, p. 133; LR, CLA/007/EM/04/001 p. 549, no. 553
4 July 1306	Gilbert Cros Sir Robert de Wethersete	LR, CLA/007/EM/04/001 p. 48, no. 34 (both wardens)
1309	Gilbert Cros	LR, CLA/007/EM/04/001 p. 399, no 483
23 Nov 1311- 2 Feb 1315	Thomas Prentice John de Wymondeham John Burton (1311)	*LBD*, p. 275, fol cxl b & *LBE*, p 41, fol xxviii b (remove office)
2 Feb 1315	**Henry de Gloucestre**[431] Anketyn de Gisors	*LBE*, p 41, fol xxviii b
3 Apr 1318	**Henry de Gloucestre** Anketyn de Gisors	*LBE*, p 83, fol lxviii b
1319-20	**Matthew de Essex**[432] **Robert Yon**[433]	Welch, *History of Tower Bridge*, "Appendix I: Wardens of London Bridge," p. 251
21 Sept 1321	John Sterre **John Vivian**[434]	*LBE*, p 143-4, fol cxxi b
29 Sept 1321	John Sterre Robert de Piphurst	*LBE*, p 146, fol cxxiv
Feb 1324	John Sterre **Roger atte Vigne**[435]	*LBE*, p 189, fol cli b
22 July 1325	John Sterre **Roger atte Vigne**	*LBE*, p 149, fol cxxv
18 Oct 1325	John Sterre **Roger atte Vigne**	*LBE*, p 205, fol clxiii

[431] Will of Henry Gloucestre, 1332-3, CLA/023/DW/01/60, no 152, HR, LMA.
[432] Will of Matthew de Essex, CLA/023/DW/01/53, no 129, HR, LMA.
[433] Will of Robert Yon, 1321-2, CLA/023/DW/01/50, no 53, HR, LMA.
[434] Will of John Vivian, 1321-2, CLA/023/DW/01/50, no 55, HR, LMA.
[435] Will of Roger atte Vigne, 1336, CLA/023/DW/01/63, no 237, HR, LMA.

1326	John Sterre **Roger de Ely**[436]	LR, CLA/007/EM/04/001 p. 167, no. 148
22 July 1336	Alan Gille **Walter Neel**[437]	*LBE*, p 298-9, fol ccxlviii b
16 Dec 1336	Anketyn de Gisors **Robert Swote**[438]	*LBE*, p 296, fol ccxlvi (audit wardens) (*LBF*, p 16, fol ix b, 1339 also)
28 Oct 1337	**Henry Cros**[439]	*LBF*, p 2, fol i
1342	Alan Gille John Lovekyn	*LBF*, p 75, fol lxi & LR, CLA/007/EM/04/001 p 67, no 55
18 Oct 1345	Alan Gille	*LBF*, p 134, fol cxii & LR, CLA/007/EM/04/001, p 620, no 647
1348-50	Alan Gille **John Hardingham**[440]	LR, CLA/007/EM/04/001 p 33, no 20, 1349; *LBF*, p 227-9, fol cxcv
25 July 1350	John Lyttle **James Andreu**[441]	*LBF*, p 216, fol clxxxvi
2 Feb 1351	John Littel **James Andreu**	*LBF*, p 227-9, fol cxcv b
18 Oct 1353	**Henry le Vannere**[442] **John le Chaundeler (Hatfeld)**[443]	*LBG*, p 13, fol x b
1355-63	**Richard Bacon**[444] **John de Hatfeld**	*LBG*, p 37, 41, 44, 108-9, 127-8, 155 & LR, CLA/007/EM/04/001 p 374, no 444
1370-5	**John Coggeshale**[445] **Henry Yevele**[446]	DP, CLA/007/EM/02/G/076 & 079

[436] Will of Roger de Ely, 1349, CLA/023/DW/01/76, no 302, HR, LMA.
[437] Will of Walter Neel, 1353, CLA/023/DW/01/81, no 91, HR, LMA.
[438] Will of Robert Swote, 1353, CLA/023/DW/01/83, no 59, HR, LMA.
[439] Will of Henry Cros, 1348, CLA/023/DW/01/76, no 233, HR, LMA.
[440] Will of John Hardingham, 1352, CLA/023/DW/01/81, no 1, HR, LMA.
[441] Will of James Andreu, 1374, CLA/023/DW/01/102, no 171, HR, LMA.
[442] Will of Henry le Vannere, 1354, CLA/023/DW/01/82, no 60, HR, LMA.
[443] Will of John Hatfeld, 1363, CLA/023/DW/01/91, no 125, HR, LMA.
[444] Will of Richard Bacon, 1363, CLA/023/DW/01/91, no 127, HR, LMA.
[445] Will of John Coggeshale, 1384, CLA/023/DW/01/114, no 39; also Large Register of Deeds.
[446] Will of Henry Yevele, 1400, CLA/023/DW/01/129, no 7.

18 Feb 1383	**Henry Yevele**	*LBH*, p 212, fol clxii b
1383-8	John Hoo **Henry Yevele**	Bridge Rolls, CLA/007/FN/01/001-5
1388-97	**Henry Yevele** **William Waddesworth**[447]	Bridge Rolls, CLA/007/FN/01/006-15
1399	**John Clifford**[448] **Henry Yevele**	Welch, *History of Tower Bridge*, "Appendix I: Wardens of London Bridge," p. 252
1401	**William Chicheley**[449] Thomas Tenyele	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/03/001
1404-5	**William Sevenoak**[450] **John Whatele**[451]	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/001
1406-17	**John Whatele** **Henry Julyan**[452]	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/001
1417-8	**John Whatele** **William Weston**[453]	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/001
1418-20	**William Weston** **Nicholas James**[454]	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/001
1420-1	**William Weston** Richard Stile	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/001
1421-34	Robert Colbrok **William (John) Trynnell**[455]	1424-9, CLA/007/FN/02/002 lists William Trynell, & *LB I&K* list John Trynnell; then both list William

447 Will of William Waddesworth, CLA/023/DW/01/132, no 10, HR, LMA.
448 Will of John Clifford, 1411, PROB 11/2B/159, PCC, TNA.
449 Will of William Chicheley, 1427, CLA/023/DW/01/155, no 73, HR, LMA.
450 Will of William Sevenoak, PROB 11/3/589, PCC, TNA; also, Will of William Sevenoak, 1432, CLA/023/DW/01/161, nos 35 & 40, HR, LMA; Will of William Sevenoak, CLA/023/DW/01/162, no 7, HR, LMA.
451 John Whatele, 1425, CLA/023/DW/01/160, no 51, HR, LMA.
452 Will of Henry Julyan, 1416, DL/C/B/004/MS09171/002, f 352v, Commissary, LMA.
453 Will of William Weston, 1426, PROB 11/3/236, PCC, TNA.
454 Will of Nicholas James, 1434, PROB 11/3/348 1&2, PCC, TNA.
455 Will of William Trynnell, 1443, DL/C/B/004/MS09171/004, f 118, Commissary, LMA.

1434-8	**Thomas Badby**[456] **William Wetenhale**[457]	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/002
1438-40	**Thomas Badby** Richard Lovelas	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/002
1440-9	**Thomas Cook**[458] **John Herst**[459]	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/002
1449-56	**Thomas Cook** **Thomas Davy**[460]	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/002
1457-8	**Thomas Davy** Peter Aldfold	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/002
1458-9	**Thomas Davy** **Thomas Cook**	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/002
1460-7	Peter Aldfold Peter Caldecote	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/003
1467-8	Peter Caldecote **Richard Frome**[461]	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/003
1468-9	Peter Caldecote Peter Aldfold	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/003
1469-70	Edward Stone John Jurdan	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/003
1470-3	Peter Caldecote Edward Stone	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/003
1473-4	Edward Stone **Henry Bumpstede**[462]	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/003
1474-5	Peter Caldecote William Galle	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/003

[456] Will of Thomas Badby, 1445, DL/C/B/004/MS09171/004, f 169v, Commissary, LMA.
[457] Will of William Whetenhale, 1455, CLA/023/DW/01/185, no 23*, HR, LMA.
[458] Will of Thomas Cook, 1478, PROB 11/6/467, PCC, TNA.
[459] Will of John Herst, 1447, CLA/023/DW/01/191, no 15, HR, LMA.
[460] Will of Thomas Davy, 1478, PROB 11/6/452, PCC, TNA.
[461] Will of Richard Frome, 1481, DL/C/B/004/MS09171/006, f 324, Commissary, LMA.
[462] Will of Henry Bumpstede, 1491, DL/C/B/004/MS09171/008, f 26, Commissary, LMA.

1475-6	Edward Stone William Galle	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/003
1476-85	**Henry Bumpstede** William Galle	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/003-4
1485-7	William Galle Simon Harris	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/004
1487-90	Simon Harris John Tuttesham	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/004
1490-2	Simon Harris **Christopher Eliot**[463]	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/004
1492-3	**Thomas Bullesdon**[464] **Robert Weston**[465]	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/004
1493-7	Simon Harris **Christopher Eliot**	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/004
1497-1500	**Christopher Eliot** Edward Fenkyll	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/004
1500-1	**William Holte**[466] Edward Grene	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/004
1501-9	**Christopher Eliot** **William Maryner**[467]	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/004
1509-11	**William Maryner** Thomas Miles	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/005
1511-2	Thomas Miles **John Hyll**[468]	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/005
1512-22	**William Campeon**[469] **Simon Rice**[470]	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/005

[463] Will of Christopher Eliot, 1510, DL/C/B/004/MS09171/003(?), f 28v, Commissary, LMA.
[464] Will of Thomas Bullesdon, 1513, DL/C/B/004/MS09171/003(?), f 100v, Commissary, LMA.
[465] Will of Robert Weston, 1501, PROB 11/12/283 2, PCC, TNA.
[466] Will of William Holte, 1505, PROB 11/14/675, PCC, TNA.
[467] Will of William Maryner, 1512, PROB 11/17/188, PCC, TNA.
[468] Will of John Hyll, 1517, PROB 11/18/452, PCC, TNA.
[469] Will of William Campeon, 1531, PROB 11/24/152, PCC, TNA.
[470] Will of Simon Rice, 1534, PROB 11/25/184, PCC, TNA.

1522-4	**Simon Rice** **Thomas Carter**[471]	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/005
1524-9	**Thomas Carter** **William Campeon**	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/005-6
1529-30	**Thomas Carter** **Thomas Crull**[472]	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/006
1530-40	**Thomas Crull** **Robert Draper**[473]	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/006
1540-7	**Robert Draper** **Andrew Woodcock**[474]	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/006-7
1547-8	**Andrew Woodcock** John Sturgeon	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/007
1548-57	**Andrew Woodcock** Thomas Maynard	Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/02/007-8

[471] Will of Thomas Carter, 1530, PROB 11/23/323, PCC, TNA.
[472] Will of Thomas Crull, 1540, PROB 11/28/158, PCC, TNA.
[473] Will of Robert Draper, 1547, PROB 11/31/536, PCC, TNA.
[474] Will of Andrew Woodcock, 1557, PROB 11/39/423, PCC, TNA.

Appendix B: Chief Masons of London Bridge

From Weekly and Annual Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/03/001-4 & CLA/007/FN/02/001-6

Year(s) Head Mason	Name	Notes
1404-16	**John Clifford**[475]	Master Mason
1416-34	Richard Beek	Head Mason
1437-45	**John Catelyn, junior**[476]	Title not specified, but same duties
1461-81	Thomas Jurdan	Warden Mason
1482-86	Thomas Danyell	Apprentice to Thomas Jurdan 1461-4; Chief Mason 1482-6
1487-1513	Thomas Wade	Chief Mason
1517-43	**John Orgar**[477]	Chief Mason
1527-53	Thomas (William) Arnold	Chief Mason

[475] Will of John Clifford, 1417, PROB 11/2B/159, PCC, TNA. Obit.
[476] Will of John Catelyn, 1449, DL/C/B/004/MS09171/04, f. 271, Commissary, LMA. John Catelyn senior also served as mason for London Bridge from 1404 to 1424.
[477] Will of John Orgar, 1544, PROB 11/31/367, PCC, TNA.

Appendix C: Master Carpenters of London Bridge

From Weekly and Annual Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/03/001-4 & CLA/007/FN/02/001-6

Year(s) Head Carpenter	Name	Notes
1404-14	John Brewys	Head Carpenter
1416-18	William Clerk	Head Carpenter
1417-29	**John Neweman**[478]	Head Carpenter
1432-4	Henry Stone	Head Carpenter
1434-40	Robert Cherche	Head Carpenter
1445	**William Bolle**[479]	Head Carpenter
1461-6	John Forster	Warden of the Carpentry 1461-6
1467-72	Robert Wheteley	Master Carpenter 1467-71
1475-87	Walter Reeve	Warden of the Carpentry 1475-98
1488-92	Thomas Mannsy	Warden of Carpentry
1493-1500	Thomas Mannsy Walter Reeve	Co-wardens of the carpentry
1501	John Tidwey Walter Reeve	Co-wardens of the carpentry
1502-1530	**Humfrey Cook**[480]	Warden of the Carpentry 1502-13; Chief Carpenter of Bridgeworks 1517-28
1532-53	Richard Ambros	Chief Carpenter

[478] Will of John Neweman, 1435, DL/C/B/004/MS09171/04 f. 423, Commissary, LMA.
[479] Will of William Bolle, 1457, DL/C/B/004/MS09171/05, f 198v, Commissary, LMA.
[480] Will of Humfrey Cook, 1531, PROB 11/24/88, PCC, TNA.

Appendix D: Bridge Clerks

From Weekly and Annual Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/03/001-4 & CLA/007/FN/02/001-6

Year(s) Active	Name	Notes
1404	Richard Tewresle	
1432-9	John Spelesell	
1441	Robert Glome	
1445	John Parker	
1461-82	William Bouchier	
1485-87	John Peys	
1488	Watkyn Nele	
1489-1502	John Normanvyle	
1502-22	Walter Smith	
1527-32	**John Halmer**[481]	
1537-1550	Laurence Owin	d.1550

[481] Will of John Halmer, 1537, PROB 11/27/14, PCC, TNA.

Appendix E: Bridge Porters

From Weekly and Annual Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/03/001-4 & CLA/007/FN/02/001-6

Year(s) Porter	Name	Notes
1404-1413	John Atte Mere	
1429	John Hylton	
1432	Robert Basset	
1434	Adam Bronn	
1437-9	William Gill	
1440	**John Laurence**[482]	
1445	John Ridell	
1461-91	William Cramond	Keeper of the Bridgehouse, d.1491
1491-96	Thomas Maryot	
1497-1507	John Arnold	
1510-27	Thomas Chylde	
1530-47	William Hewett or Hughet	
1550-52	John Dombelow	

[482] Will of John Laurence, 1465, DL/C/B/004/MS09171/05, f 369, Commissary, LMA.

Appendix F: Rent Collectors

From Weekly and Annual Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/03/001-4 & CLA/007/FN/02/001-6

Year(s) Active	Name	Notes
1404-08	William Appulby	
1409-15	Ralph Stokes	
1416-21	William Aunger	
1424-30	John Berton	
1434-38	Robert Peny	
1439	Andrew Tye	
1440-42	Robert Glome	
1443	John Parker	
1445	**John Dey**[483]	
1461-66	William Grevy	
1467-71	Richard Parisshe	
1472-73	William Yonge Richard Parisshe	
1474	Thomas Aylove Robert Redmeridge	
1475-76	Richard Elryngton Robert Redmeridge	

483 Will of John Dey, 1463, DL/C/B/004/MS09171/05, f 336v, Commissary, LMA.

1477	Richard Elryngton John Samwell Robert Redmeridge
1478-82	John Samwell Robert Redmeridge
1483	John Samwell John Daweley Richard Paynell
1484	Robert Redmeridge Richard Paynell
1485-1531	Richard Paynell
1532-1537	Roger Mondy
1542-52	Richard Maunsell

Appendix G: Toll Collectors

From Weekly and Annual Bridge Accounts, CLA/007/FN/03/001-4 & CLA/007/FN/02/001-6

Year(s) Active	Name	Notes
1404-34	**Nicholas Holford**[484]	Also chapel clerk
1434-55	**Alice Holford**[485]	
1455-82	Thomas Ebmede	
1487-1526	John Hasteler	d.1526
1527	Raynold Blake	Also chapel clerk
1532-51	John Woode	
1552	Wood’s widow	

[484] Will of Nicholas Holford, 1434, DL/C/B/004/MS09171/03, f 390, Commissary, LMA.
[485] Will of Alice Holford, 1455, DL/C/B/004/MS09171/05, f 166, Commissary, LMA.

Bibliography

Manuscript Sources

London Metropolitan Archives, City of London

COL/AD/01/006	Letter Book F, 1337-1352, Corporation of London
COL/CC/01/01/02-04	Journals, Court of Common Council, 1422-1448
CLA/023/CP/01/003	Court of Husting Roll of Common Pleas, 1274-1275
CLA/023/DW/01/002-207	Court of Husting Roll of Deeds and Wills, 1254-1478
CLA/007/EM/02/A-K	Deed Portfolios, 13th-16th C, London Bridge Estates
CLA/007/EM/04/001	Large Register of Deeds, early 16th C, London Bridge Estates
CLA/007/EM/04/003/A	Small Register of Deeds, late 15th C, London Bridge Estates
CLA/007/FN/01/001-017	Bridgemasters' Account Rolls, 1381-1404, London Bridge Estates
CLA/007/FN/02/001-008	Bridgemasters' Annual Accounts and Rentals, 1404-1568, London Bridge Estates
CLA/007/FN/03/001-008	Weekly Payments, 1404-1538, London Bridge Estates
DL/C/B/004/MS09171/001-006	Registers of wills enrolled in the Commissary Court of London, 1374-1483

The National Archives, Kew

C 1	Court of Chancery: Early Pleadings and Proceedings
C 131	Court of Chancery: Extents of Debts
C 241	Court of Chancery: Certificates of Statute Merchant and Statute Staple

C 270	Court of Chancery: Ecclesiastical Miscellanea
E 43	Court of Exchequer: Ancient Deeds
PROB 11	Register of wills proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury (PCC)

Printed Primary

A Chronicle of London, from 1089 to 1483, written in the fifteenth century. Reprint. Felinfach: Llanerch Publishers, 1995.

Beaven, Alfred P. *The Aldermen of London*. London: Corporation of London, 1908.

Birch, W. de Gray, editor. *Historical Charters and Constitutional Documents of the City of London.* London: Whiting and Co, 1887.

Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II, Vol. 1: Annales Londonienses and Annales Paulini. London: Longman & Co, 1882.

Cheney, C.R., editor. *A Handbook of Dates: For students of British History*. *New Edition.* Revised by Michael Jones. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Darlington, Ida, editor. *London Consistory Court Wills, 1492-1547.* London: London Record Society, 1967.

Fitch, Marc, editor. *Index to Testamentary Records in the Archdeaconry Court of London now preserved in Guildhall Library London. Volume I, (1363)-1649.* London: The British Record Society, London, 1979.

Fitch, Marc, editor. *Index to Testamentary Records in the Commissary Court of London now preserved in Guildhall Library, London. Volume I, 1374-1488.* London: The British Record Society, Limited, 1969.

Fitch, Marc, editor. *Index to Testamentary Records in the Commissary Court of London now preserved in Guildhall Library, London. Volume II, 1489-1570*. London and Chichester: Phillimore, 1973.

Gairdner, James, editor. *The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the Fifteenth Century*, Camden Record Society 17. London, 1876.

Harding, Vanessa, and Laura Wright, editors. *London Bridge: Selected Accounts and Rentals, 1381-1538.* London: London Record Society, 1995.

Hughes, Paul L, and James F. Larkin, editors. *Tudor Royal Proclamations, Volume 1, The Early Tudors (1485-1553).* New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1964.

Jones, Philip E., editor. *Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls Preserved among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall [Volume 5] A.D. 1437-1457*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954.

Kitching, C.J., editor. *London and Middlesex Chantry Certificate 1548*. London: London Record Society, 1980.

Kowaleski, Maryanne, editor. *Medieval Towns: A Reader*. Plymouth: Broadview Press, 2006.

Latham, R.E. *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List from British and Irish Sources*. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Lyte, H.C. Maxwell, editor. *Calendar of Patent Rolls. Henry III, A.D. 1247-1258*. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1908.

Lyte, H.C. Maxwell, editor. *Calendar of Patent Rolls. Henry III, A.D. 1266-1272*. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1913.

Lyte, H.C. Maxwell, editor. *Calendar of Patent Rolls. Edward I, AD 1272-1307*. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1893.

Lyte, H.C. Maxwell, editor. *Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward I, AD 1281-1292*. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1895.

Lyte, H.C. Maxwell, editor. *Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward III, AD 1330-1334*. London: H.M. Stationary Office, 1893.

Masters, Betty R. *Chamber Accounts of the Sixteenth Century*. London: London Record Society, 1984.

Riley, H.T., editor. *Chronicles of the Mayors and Sheriffs of London 1188-1274*. London, 1863.

Riley, Henry Thomas, editor. *Liber Albus: The White Book of the City of London*. *Compiled A.D. 1419 by John Carpenter, Common Clerk. Richard Whitington, Mayor*. London: Richard Griffin and Company, 1861.

Riley, Henry Thomas, editor. *Munimenta Gildhallae Londoniensis: Liber Albus, Liber Custumarum, et Liber Horn. Volume III.* London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1862.

Sharpe, Reginald R., editor. *Calendar of Letter-Books preserved among the archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall. Letter-Book B. Circa A.D. 1275-1312*. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1900.

Sharpe, Reginald R., editor. *Calendar of Letter-Books preserved among the archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall. Letter-Book C. Circa A.D. 1291-1309*. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1901.

Sharpe, Reginald R., editor. *Calendar of Letter-Books preserved among the archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall. Letter-Book D. Circa A.D. 1309-1314*. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1902.

Sharpe, Reginald R., editor. *Calendar of Letter-Books preserved among the archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall. Letter-Book E. Circa A.D. 1314-1337*. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1903.

Sharpe, Reginald R., editor. *Calendar of Letter-Books preserved among the archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall. Letter-Book F. Circa A.D. 1337-1352.* London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1904.

Sharpe, Reginald R., editor. *Calendar of Letter-Books preserved among the archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall. Letter-Book G. Circa A.D. 1352-1374.* London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1905.

Sharpe, Reginald R., editor. *Calendar of Letter-Books preserved among the archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall. Letter-Book H. Circa A.D. 1375-1399.* London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1907.

Sharpe, Reginald R., editor. *Calendar of Letter-Books preserved among the archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall. Letter-Book I. Circa A.D. 1400-1422*. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1909.

Sharpe, Reginald R., editor. *Calendar of Wills proved and enrolled in the Court of Husting, London, A.D. 1258-A.D. 1688. Part II A.D. 1358-A.D. 1688. [Section I A.D. 1358-1410.]* London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1890.

Sharpe, Reginald R., editor. *Calendar of Wills proved and enrolled in the Court of Husting, London. A.D. 1258-A.D. 1688. Part II A.D. 1358-A.D. 1688. Section II 1410-1688.* London: 1890.

Smith, J. Challenor C., editor. *Index of Wills Probed in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, 1383-1558. [Volume I.] And now preserved in the Principal Probate Registry, Somerset House, London.* London: The British Record Society, Limited, 1893.

Smith, J. Challenor C, editor. *Index of Wills Proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, 1383-1558. Volume II. And now preserved in the Principal Probate Registry, Somerset House, London.* London: The British Record Society Limited, 1895.

Stapleton, T., editor. *Liber de Antiquis Legibus*. London: Camden Society, 1846.

Stow, John. *A Survey of London. Volume 1.* Edited by Charles Lethbridge Kingsford. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908.

Stow, John. *A Survey of London. Volume II*. Edited by Charles Lethbridge Kingsford. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908.

Stubbs, William, editor. *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II. Vol. 1: Annales Londonienses and Annales Paulini*. London: Longman & Co, 1882.

Thomas, A.H., editor. *Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls Preserved among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall [Volume 4] A.D. 1413-1437*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943.

Unpublished Theses

Barron, Caroline. "The Government of London and its relations with the Crown 1400-1450." Unpublished PhD dissertation. University of London, 1970.

Bowtell, Ann. "A Medieval London Hospital: Elsyngspital 1330-1536." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Royal Holloway, University of London, 2010.

Colson, Justin Robert. "Local Communities in Fifteenth Century London: Craft, Parish and Neighborhood." Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Royal Holloway, University of London, 2011.

Leach, Doreen. "Carpenters in medieval London c.1240-c.1540." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Royal Holloway, University of London, 2017.

Lloyd, Richard. "Pre-Reformation Music in the Chapel of St Thomas the Martyr, London Bridge." Unpublished MMus thesis, Royal Holloway, University of London, 1995.

Fox, Christine Fox. "The Royal Almshouse at Westminster c.1500-c.1600." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Royal Holloway, University of London, 2012.

Quinton, Eleanor. "The Drapers and the drapery trade of late medieval London, c.1300-c.1500." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of London, 2001.

Rousseu, Marie-Helene. "Chantry Foundations and Chantry Chaplains at St Paul's Cathedral, London c.1200-1548." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Royal Holloway, 2003.

Weetman, Jamieson. "Testamentary Piety and Charity in London, 1259-1370." Unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 2003.

Wood, Robert A. "Life and Death: A Study of the Wills and Testaments of Men and Women in London and Bury St. Edmunds in the late Fourteenth and early Fifteenth Centuries." Unpublished PhD thesis, Royal Holloway, University of London, 2012.

Secondary Sources (Published)

Andrews, Jonathan, Asa Briggs, Roy Porter, Penny Tucker and Keir Waddington. *The History of Bethlem.* London: Routledge, 1997.

Barron, Caroline. "Ralph Holland and the London Radicals, 1438-1444." In *Medieval London: Collected Papers of Caroline Barron*. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2017.

Barron, Caroline. *London in the Later Middle Ages: Government and People, 1200-1500.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Barron, Caroline. "Pageantry on London Bridge in the Fifteenth Century." In *'Bring furth the pagants': Essays in Early English Drama presented to Alexandra F. Johnston*, edited by David Klausner and Karen S. Marsalek. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007.

Barron, Caroline M. *The Medieval Guildhall of London*. Chichester: The Regnum Press, 1974.

Barron, Caroline. "The Parish Fraternities of Medieval London." In *The Church in Pre-Reformation Society: Essays in Honour of F.R.H. Du Boulay,* edited by Caroline M. Barron and Christopher Harper-Bill, 13-37. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1985.

Barron, Caroline. "The Political Culture of Medieval London." In *The Fifteenth Century IV: Political Culture in Late Medieval Britain,* edited by Linda Clark and Christine Carpenter, 111-134. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2004.

Barron, Caroline M., and Anne F. Sutton, editors. *Medieval London Widows, 1300-1500.* London: Hambledon Press, 1994.

Barron, Caroline, and Matthew P. Davies. *The Religious Houses of London and Middlesex*. London: Institute of Historical Research, 2007.

Bateson, M. "A London Municipal Collection of the Reign of John." *English Historical Review* 17:67-8 (1902), 480-511, 707-730.

Boatwright, Lesley, Moira Habberjam, and Peter Hammond. "Introduction." In *The Logge Register of Prerogative Court of Canterbury Wills, 1479-1486: Volume I,* edited by Lesley Boatwright, Moira Habberjam, and Peter Hammond. Knaphill, Surrey: Richard III Society, 2008.

Boffey, Julia, and Pamela King, editors. *London and Europe in the Later Middle Ages.* London: Short Run Press Limited, 1995.

Boyer, Marjorie Nice. *Medieval French Bridges: A History*. Cambridge, Mass.: Medieval Academy of America, 1976.

Brigden, Susan. *London and the Reformation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Brooke, Christopher and Gillian Keir. *London, 800-1216: The Shaping of a City*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1975.

Brown, Stewart. *The Medieval Exe Bridge, St Edmund's Church, and the Excavation of Waterfront Houses, Exeter.* Exeter: Devon Archaeological Society, 2019.

Bruce, Steve. *God is Dead: Secularization in the West.* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2002.

Burgess, Clive, editor. *The Church Records of St Andrew Hubbard, Eastcheap, c1450-c1570.* London: London Record Society, 1999.

Burgess, Clive. "Late Medieval Wills and Pious Convention: Testamentary Evidence Reconsidered." In *Profit, Piety and the Professions in Later Medieval England*, edited by Michael Hicks, 14-33. Gloucester: Alan Sutton Publishing Limited, 1990.

Burgess, Clive. *'The Right Ordering of Souls': The Parish of All Saints' Bristol on the Eve of the Reformation.* Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2018.

Burgess, Clive. "Time and Place: The Late Medieval English Parish in Perspective." In *The Parish in Late Medieval England*, edited by Clive Burgess and Eamon Duffy, 1-28. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2006.

Burgess, Clive, and Eamon Duffy, editors. *The Parish in Late Medieval England. Proceedings of the 2002 Harlaxton Symposium*. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2006.

Carlin, Martha. *Medieval Southwark*. London: Hambledon Press, 1996.

Carlin, Martha, and Joel T. Rosenthal, editors. *Medieval London: Collected Papers of Caroline M. Barron.* Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2017.

Christianson, C. Paul. *Memorials of the Book Trade in Medieval London: The Archives of Old London Bridge.* Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1987.

Cohn, Samuel K. *The Cult of Remembrance and the Black Death: Six Renaissance Cities in Central Italy*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1992.

Colson, Justin, and Arie van Steensel. "Cities and solidarities: Urban communities in medieval and early modern Europe." In *Cities and Solidarities: Urban Communities in Pre-Modern*

Europe, edited by Justin Colson and Arie van Steensel, 1-24. London and New York: Routledge, 2017. 1-24.

Cooper, Alan. *Bridges, Law and Power in Medieval England, 700-1400*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006.

Coster, Will, and Andrew Spicer, editors. *Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Davies, Matthew, and Ann Saunders. *The History of the Merchant Taylors' Company.* Leeds: Maney Publishing, 2004.

Davies, Matthew, and James A. Galloway, editors. *London and beyond: Essays in honour of Derek Keene.* London: Institute of Historical Research, 2012.

Davies, Matthew, and Andrew Prescott, editors. *London and the Kingdom: Essays in Honour of Caroline M. Barron. Proceedings of the 2004 Symposium*. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2008.

Dickens, A.G. *The English Reformation.* London: Batsford, 1964.

Duffy, Eamon. *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c.1400-c.1580*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992.

Ennen, Edith. *The Medieval Town*. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing, 1979.

Freeth, Stephen, and John Schofield. "John Reynewell and St Botolph Billingsgate." In *Medieval Londoners: Essays to mark the eightieth birthday of Caroline Barron*, edited by Elizabeth A. New and Christian Steer, 245-274. London: University of London Press, 2019

Gerhold, Dorian. *London Bridge and its Houses, c.1209-1761*. London: London Topographical Society, 2019.

Gorski, Philip S. "Historicizing the Secularization Debate: An Agenda for Research." In *Handbook of the Sociology of Religion,* edited by Michele Dillon, 110-122. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Gorski, Philip S. "Historicizing the Secularization Debate: Church, State, and Society in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe, c.1300 to 1700." *American Sociological Review* 65, no. 1 (February 2000): 138-167.

Gorski, Philip, and Ates Altinordu. "After Secularlization?" *Annual Review of Sociology* 34 (2008): 55-85.

Haigh, Christopher. *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Harding, Vanessa. “Sons, apprentices and successors in late medieval and early modern London: the transmission of skills and work opportunities.” In *Generations in Towns: Succession and Success in Pre-Industrial Urban Societies*, edited by F.E. Eliassen and K. Szende, 153-168. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2009.

Harding, Vanessa and Laura Wright, editors. *London Bridge: Selected Accounts and Rentals, 1381-1538*. London: London Record Society, 1995.

Harrison, David. *The Bridges of Medieval England: Transport and Society 400-1800*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004.

Harry, David. “Introduction: The Church and City in Late Medieval England.” In *The Urban Church in Late Medieval England: Essays in Honour of Clive Burgess. Proceedings of the 2017 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited by David Harry and Christian Steer, 1-16. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2019.

Harry, David, and Christian Steer, editors. *The Urban Church in Late Medieval England: Essays in Honour of Clive Burgess. Proceedings of the 2017 Harlaxton Symposium*. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2019.

Harvey, John H. *Henry Yevele c.1320 to 1400: The Life of an English Architect*. London: B.T. Batsford Limited, 1944.

Hilton, Rodney H. *English and French Towns in Feudal Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Home, Gordon. *Old London Bridge*. London: John Lane the Bodley Head Limited, 1931.

Honeybourne, Marjorie B. “The Leper Hospitals of the London Area.” *Transactions of the London & Middlesex Archaeological Society* 21 (1967): 1-64.

Jamison, Catherine. *The History of the Royal Hospital of St. Katharine by the Tower of London.* London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1952.

Jenkins, John. “Thomas Becket and Medieval London,” *History* 105, no. 369 (2020): 652-672.

Jordan, William Chester. *A Tale of Two Monasteries: Westminster and Saint-Denis in the Thirteenth Century.* Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2009.

Keene, Derek. “English urban guilds, c.900-1300: the purposes and politics of association.” In *Guilds and association in Europe, 900-1900,* edited by Ian Anders Gadd and Patrick Wallis. London: Centre for Metropolitan History, University of London, 2006.

Keene, Derek. “London Bridge and the identity of the medieval City.” *Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society* 51 (2000): 143-156.

Keene, Derek. “Medieval London and its region.” *London Journal* 14, no. 2 (1989): 99-111.

Keene, Derek. “Colechurch, Peter of (d. 1205), organizer of the rebuilding of London Bridge.” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 23 Sep. 2004; Accessed 10 January 2020. https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-5868.

Keene, Derek. “Shops and shopping in medieval London.” In *Medieval art, architecture and archaeology in London*, edited by Lindy Grant, 29-46. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Keene, Derek. “Issues of water in medieval London to c.1300.” *Urban History* 28, no. 2 (2001): 161-179.

Kingsford, Charles Lethbridge, editor. *Chronicles of London*. Oxford, 1905.

Lilley, Keith. *Urban Life in the Middle Ages 1000-1450*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.

Luckmann, Thomas. “Shrinking Transcendence, Expanding Religion?” *Sociological Analysis* 50, no. 2 (1990): 127-38.

Masters, Betty R. *The Chamberlain of the City of London 1237-1987*. Leeds: W.S. Maney and Son Limited, 1988.

Masters, Betty R. *To God and the Bridge: The Story of the City’s Bridges*. London: Loxley Brothers Limited, 1972.

McEwan, John. “Charity and the city: London Bridge, c.1176-1275.” In *Medieval Londoners: Essays to mark the eightieth birthday of Caroline M. Barron,* edited by Elizabeth A. New and Christian Steer, 223-244. London: University of London Press, 2019.

McEwan, John. *Seals in Medieval London, 1050-1300*. London: London Record Society, 2016.

Megson, Barbara, editor. *The Pinners’ and Wiresellers’ Book, 1462-1511*. London: London Record Society, 2009.

Miner, John Nelson. “Schools and Literacy in Later Medieval England.” *British Journal of Educational Studies* 11, no. 1 (November 1962): 16-27.

Miskimin, Harry A. “The Legacies of London: 1259-1330.” In *The Medieval City*. Edited by Harry A. Miskimin, David Herlihy and A.L. Udovitch. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1977.

Moran, Jo Ann Hoeppner. *The Growth of English Schooling, 1340-1548: Learning, Literacy and Laicization Pre-Reformation York Diocese*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.

Mullaney, Steven. *The Place of the Stage: License, Play and Power in Renaissance England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

New, Elizabeth A., and Christian Steer, editors. *Medieval Londoners: Essays to mark the eightieth birthday of Caroline M. Barron.* London: University of London Press, 2019.

Noorthouck, John. *A New History of London, including Westminster and Southwark*. London: R. Baldwin, 1773.

Palliser, D.M. "Introduction." In *The Cambridge Urban History of Britain: Volume 1: 600-1540.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Parsons, Talcott. *Social Systems and the Evolution of Action Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1977.

Ramsay, Nigel. "London. London Bridge, chapel of St Thomas." In *Hospitals, Towns, and the Professions*, edited by Nigel Ramsay and James M W Willoughby, 118-123. London: British Library, 2009.

Rappaport, Steve. *Worlds within worlds: structures of life in sixteenth-century London.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Reynolds, Susan. *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe, 900-1300.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Rosser, Gervase. *The Art of Solidarity in the Middle Ages: Guilds in England 1250-1550.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Rousseau, Marie-Helene. *Saving the Souls of Medieval London: Perpetual Chantries at St Paul's Cathedral, c.1200-1548.* Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2011.

Schofield, John. *London 1100-1600: The Archaeology of a Capital City.* Oakville: Equinox Publishing Limited, 2011.

Scully, Robert E. "The Unmaking of a Saint: Thomas Becket and the English Reformation." *The Catholic Historical Review* 86, no. 4 (2000): 579-602.

Sharpe, Reginald R. *London and the Kingdom. Volume I*. London: Longmans, Green & Co, 1894.

Sheehan, Michael. *The Will in Medieval England: From the Conversion of the Anglo-Saxons to the End of the Thirteenth Century*. Toronto: PIMS, 1963.

Smith, J. Challenor C. "Introduction." In *Index of Wills Proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, 1383-1558,* compiled by J. Challenor C. Smith. Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1968.

Somerville, C. John. *The Secularization of Early Modern England: From Religious Culture to Religious Faith.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Stark, Rodney. “Secularization, R.I.P.” *Sociology of Religion* 60, no. 3 (1999): 249–273.

Steer, Christian. "'To syng and dommeservyce': The Chantry Chaplains of St Nicholas Shambles." In *The Urban Church in Late Medieval England: Essays in Honour of Clive Burgess,* edited by David Harry and Christian Steer, 449-479. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2019

Stephenson, Carl. *Borough and Town: a study of urban origins in England*. Cambridge, Mass.: The Medieval Academy of America, 1933.

Sutton, Anne. *The Mercery of London: Trade, Goods and People, 1130-1578.* New York: Routledge, 2005.

Sutton, Anne F. *Wives and Widows of Medieval London*. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2016.

Tait, James. *Medieval English Borough: Studies on its Origins and Constitutional History*. Manchester: University of Manchester, 1936.

Thomson, Richard. *Chronicles of London Bridge*. London: D.S. Maurice, 1827.

Thrupp, Sylvia L. *The Merchant Class of Medieval London, 1300-1500*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1948.

Unwin, George. *The Gilds and Companies of London.* London: Frank Cas & Company Ltd, 1908.

Waldron, Jennifer. *Reformations of the Body: Idolatry, Sacrifice, and the Early Modern Theater*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Watson, Bruce. *Old London Bridge Lost and Found.* London: Museum of London Archaeology Service, 2004.

Watson, Bruce, Trevor Brigham, and Tony Dyson, editors. *London Bridge: 2000 Years of a River Crossing.* London: Museum of London Archaeology Service, 2001.

Webster, Paul. “The Cult of St Thomas Becket: An Historiographical Pilgrimage.” In *The Cult of St Thomas Becket in the Plantagenet World, c.1170-1220,* edited by Paul Webster and Marie-Pierre Gelin, 1-24. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016.

Welch, Charles. *History of Tower Bridge: and other Bridges built over the Thames by the Corporation of London.* London: Smith, Elder and Co, 1894.

Williams, Gwyn A. *Medieval London: From Commune to Capital*. London: The Athlone Press, 1963.

Wilson, Christopher. “L’architecte bienfaiteur de la ville. Henry Yevele et la chappele du London Bridge,” *Revue de l’Art* 166, no. 4 (2009): 43-51.

Wunderli, Richard M. *London Church Courts and Society on the Eve of the Reformation.* Cambridge, Mass.: The Medieval Academy of America, 1981.

Yates, Nigel, and James M. Gibson, editors. *Traffic and Politics: The Construction and Management of Rochester Bridge, AD 43-1993*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1994.