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Abstract

This study examines the role of the Austin Friars in pre-Reformation English society, as distinct both from the Austin Friars of Europe and from other English mendicant orders. By examining how the Austins formulated their origins story in a distinctly English context, this thesis argues that the hagiographical writings of the Austin Friars regarding Augustine of Hippo, whom they claimed as their putative founder, had profound consequences for their religious platform. As their definition of Augustine’s religious life was less restrictive than that of the European Austin Friars and did not look to a recent, charismatic leader, such as Dominic or Francis, the English Austin Friars developed a religious adaptability visible in their pastoral, theological, and secular activity. This flexibility contributed to their durability by allowing them to adapt to religious needs as they arose rather than being constrained to what had been validated by their heritage. The behaviour of these friars can be characterised foremost by their ceaseless advancement of the interests of their own order through their creation of a network of influence and the manoeuvring of their confrères into socially and economically expedient positions.

Given the propensity of the Austin Friars towards reform, this study seeks to understand its place within and interaction with English society, both religious and secular, in an effort to reconstruct the religious culture of this order. It therefore investigates their interaction with the laity and patronage, with heresy and reform, and with secular powers. It emphasises, above all, the distinctiveness of the English Austin Friars both from other mendicant orders and from the European Austin Friars, whose rigid interpretations of the religious example of Augustine led them to a strict demarcation of the Augustinian life as eremitical in nature and to hostile relations with the Augustinian Canons. Ultimately, this thesis interrogates the significance of being an Austin Friar in fifteenth- or sixteenth-century England and their role in the religious landscape, exploring the exceptional variability to their behaviour and their ability to take on accepted forms of behaviour.
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Introduction

When we consider the actions of Martin Luther, on that fateful day in October of 1517 when he sent northern Europe into a flurry of chaos over his religious propositions, we think of his theological milieu, the failures of the late-medieval Church, and the advent of humanist thought as the most formative factors in his innovative Reformation discovery. And yet, in spite of the wealth of study into the life of Luther, the historical community has neglected Luther's early religious life. In particular, we have failed to consider the impact of his religious formation, specifically his monastic formation, on his later religious career. Within the plethora of biographies of Luther, Luther's membership to the Ordo Eremitarum Sancti Augustini (henceforth OESA), or the Augustinian Hermits, is only ever but briefly mentioned as an interesting side note and usually to indicate some especial relationship of Luther with the theology of his order's putative founder, St Augustine of Hippo, in the construction of his sola fide. And yet, surely we must recognise the profound formative effect that Luther’s monastic context must have had on him; it was as an Augustinian that Luther produced his famous tract against indulgences, and as an Augustinian that he made his evangelical discovery. Perhaps Erasmus laid the egg that Luther hatched, but what if the Augustinian order was the nest?²

The Augustinian order, led by Luther and the Antwerp Augustinians, was represented in the Protestant Reformation in numbers hugely disproportionate to its small size. Martin Luther, Wenzeslaus Link, Johann Lang, Gabriel Zwilling, Richard Nangle, the Antwerp Augustinians, including Jakob Propst and Hendrik van Zütphen, Jean Chatelain, Michel d’Arande, Agostino Mainairdi da Piemonti, Guilio della Rovere, Ambrogo da Milano, and Nicolo da Verona are but the most prominent evangelicals who began their religious careers as Augustinian Hermits.² So too was it the Augustinians who showed initiative in

---

¹ VCH: Cambridgeshire, 2:287-290. For a discussion of this adage, see Charlotte Methuen, Luther and Calvin: Religious Revolutionaries (Oxford, 2011), 43.
providing vernacular translations of the Bible in Germany, France, and England. This participation in the theological innovation of their confrère raises questions of Augustinian fraternity; is it significant that many of the earliest and strongest voices for evangelicalism sprung from Luther’s own monastic order? And how curious that this group, seemingly predisposed to issues of reform, was the only mendicant order directly founded by a pope, but which simultaneously housed voices so vehemently opposed to the papal office.

In England, the Austin Friars, as they were known there, produced Robert Barnes, the only truly theologically Lutheran reformer in Henricia England. Moreover, Miles Coverdale was renowned as a translator of the Bible and eventually became Bishop of Exeter. George Browne, the astute institutional reformer who cultivated deeply beneficial relationships with Thomas Cromwell and the Crown, functioned as a general visitor to the mendicant houses in the years leading up to their dissolution, and later (unsuccessfully) transposed his evangelical vision to Ireland, whilst there as Archbishop of Dublin. That three of the most prominent English reformers, along with numerous others accused of reform-related heresies, originated within this order, is significant. The religious activity of the Austin Friars in the years leading up to the Reformation demands our attention.

There are important questions to be asked regarding the place and role of the Austin Friars in pre-Reformation English society and the contribution of that monastic culture to the religious changes of the sixteenth century. The monastic formation of theologians from religious orders was seminal to the development of their thought and devotion, even for theologians who later turned to evangelicalism and abandoned their monastic affiliations. Investigations into Protestant reformers originating from the same monastic order, thus, must be situated within their own monastic contexts; in order to understand the evangelicalism – and consequent rejection of their Augustinian community – of Robert Barnes, George Browne, and Miles Coverdale, we must first understand how they experienced their lives as Austin Friars. How did their religious and social experiences as

---

*As Francis Roth observed, the Austin Friars took an active role in the translation of Scripture with Martin Luther in Germany, Julian Macho and Peter Farget in France, and Miles Coverdale in England. RothEAF, 1:439.*
Austin Friars inform their later evangelical careers?

There are numerous studies to be conducted from this standpoint, given the proliferation of different religious orders in the later Middle Ages and the breadth of monastic experience. Studies interrogating the education, scholastic and Latinate culture, geographical dispersion, economic standings, and literary production of various monastic orders would all contribute to our understanding of the lived experience of religious professionals on the eve of the Reformation. Examinations into the differing emphases in devotion and practice between regular orders and mendicants would deepen our understanding of the nuances of monastic life. Comparative studies between religious orders regarding certain aspects of monastic life might be particularly useful, in that they would lend some insight into the distinctiveness of some orders in discrete venues.

This particular study, however, is confined to the English Augustinian order in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Given the propensity of the Austin Friars towards reform, this study seeks to understand its place within and interaction with English society, both religious and secular, in an effort to reconstruct the religious culture of this order. By examining this order’s role in pre-Reformation English society and its interactions with its counterpart in Europe, this study explores the way this order fit into society and shaped their origin story in a specifically English context. Where possible, the order is presented in comparison to other orders of friars and regular orders; there is much to be drawn here from secondary literature on individual religious orders, such as the work of James Clark on the Benedictine order, J.C. Dickinson on the Regular Canons, or Frances Andrews on the lesser known mendicant orders. There are, however, limitations to this; there is relatively little study of monastic orders in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century England against which to compare my own discussion of the Austins, with the majority of the attention directed towards the orders in the High Middle Ages, and often towards the Dominicans and Franciscans in university life. Studies of fifteenth-century England, such as Eamon Duffy’s *Stripping of the Altars*, largely neglect the importance of monasticism within the religious landscape; as in that example, monasticism has generally failed to gain traction as a subject
within revisionist scholarship of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in England. Nonetheless, with the wealth of scholarship focused on earlier English monasticism, we might build up a picture of the characters of different religious orders, against which the Austins can be put into relief.

Given my goals of understanding the place of the Austins within English society, this is not a theological study. There may be interesting analyses to be done of the peculiarities of the Latinate culture and theological schools of the English Augustinian order, although the extant theological voices from within this order are scanty. John Waldeby, John Capgrave, and John Bury are the most conspicuous in this sphere, but the infuriatingly fragmentary evidence attesting to the theological characteristics of the Austin Friars makes wide-ranging conclusions about the order difficult to assert. The sermons of Waldeby, the biblical exegeses of Capgrave, and the anti-Pecock writing of Bury may not be enough to understand the theological and scholastic tendencies of the Austins holistically, even if supplemented with our knowledge of some Austin libraries from the work of Neil Ker. In fact, without greater evidence suggestive of cohesiveness within Augustinian academic theological study, we may be restricted to theological studies of individual Austins if we seek to investigate the Latinate culture of this order in England. These analyses would offer insights into their own approaches and preoccupations as scholars but would be largely detached from the intellectual context of their conventual community. Similarly, whilst a study of sermons, both Latin and vernacular, could certainly inform our understanding of the religious culture of the Austins, the evidence is insufficient for much analysis, with John Waldeby featuring as the primary figure once again. There are virtually no fifteenth-century sermons from the Austin Friars to speak of; Waldeby’s sermons predate this and belong to a different pastoral world, namely, the pre-Wyclif world of the mid-fourteenth century. The fifteenth century has simply not provided us with adequate evidence. We might study Waldeby’s sermon materials and preaching techniques, but we cannot extrapolate the preaching emphases of the whole order from his sermons. Moreover, these examinations of theological texts and sermons would inform our understanding of the
Austins within clerical, academic, and university life, rather than their role within English society, and thus, whilst they would be invaluable to other studies, necessarily lie outside the scope of this project.

Rather than investigating the Latinate culture of the Augustinian order, I seek to understand how the Austin Friars interacted with the laity and church around them, and with their counterparts on the Continent. Thus, in lieu of Latin theological texts, I have used the vernacular texts of the Austins regarding their own history as a starting point for examining their self-understanding, including their devotional priorities and their perceived place within English society and the greater Augustinian order. What did it mean to be an Austin Friar in fifteenth- or sixteenth-century England and what was their role in the religious landscape? How was being an Austin different from being a Franciscan, say, or a Benedictine? What about their religious life did they see as their inheritance from Augustine himself? Moreover, in what way did that Augustinian religious life contribute to shifting notions of sanctity in the turbulent decades after 1517? Ultimately, what did Austins see as significant about their religious affiliation and how did that membership affect how they interacted with the society around them?

This dissertation therefore seeks to understand the religious culture and role of the English Augustinian order in pre-Reformation society, with a particular focus from the fifteenth century onwards, in an effort to discern the distinctiveness and character of this ever-changing and fascinating group of friars. Although its main focus is the later period, it considers how the order arrived and set itself up in England, as that materially affected its later individual character within the wider European spread of the Austin Friars. It provides a necessary re-conceptualisation of the English Austin Friars and asks questions of Augustinian religion which have never been explored, particularly in their application to the plethora of Augustinian reformers in the sixteenth century. Whilst it does not claim to offer a causal relationship between its findings regarding an Augustinian culture and the activities of the English Reformation, this project does unearth elements of the social, devotional, and communal experiences of the Austin Friars that contributed to a platform
from which theological reform was possible.

I. Existing Scholarship on the *Ordo Eremitarum Sancti Augustini*

The Augustinian Hermits have suffered a certain degree of neglect in historical research, thanks to a wealth of interest in the numerically much larger regular orders, predominantly the Franciscans and Dominicans. They do appear in substantial studies on monasticism – if perhaps briefly – in works such as David Knowles’ magisterial study of English monasticism, Frances Andrews’ *The Other Friars*, as well as studies on the mendicant houses of London by Jens Röhrkasten and Nicholas Holder. Typically, the Augustinians are mentioned only insofar as they ratify the size and importance of the Friars Minor and Preachers by comparison.

Where there has been more extensive consideration of the OESA, it has been done almost exclusively by members of the order itself, who have tended to emphasise the historical demonstrability of the order’s descent from Augustine. Those histories that do present some scepticism about the alleged foundation by Augustine are still conducted primarily by contemporary Augustinians, and thus display considerable concern and

---


8 A good example of this approach can be seen in E. Foran, *The Augustinians from St. Augustine to the Union, 1256* (London, 1938), 141.
discomfort when treating the subject of the OESA in the sixteenth century. The lack of concerted attention to the Augustinian order by historians who do not have a religious interest in the history of Augustinians leaves substantial space for different methodological and interpretative frameworks in the study of the OESA.

Where the involvement of the Augustinians in the religious controversies of the late-medieval and early modern world has come to the fore, it has been in the work of Adolar Zumkeller and Damasus Trapp (both Augustinians) and Dutch historian Heiko Oberman. Their studies focussed on the intellectual origins of Luther’s Reformation discovery and they each posited the existence of a fourteenth-century school within the Augustinian order, referred to as either the schola Augustiniana moderna or the Augustinerschule, which was remarkable in its increase in erudition about the Augustinian corpus, greater precision in citations, and an exaggerated anti-Pelagianism. In spite of the many methodological problems in bridging fourteenth-century Augustinian theology with the thought of Luther, there have been few attempts to study the OESA within any other context, with the main point of interest being the soteriological inheritance of the OESA from the writings of Augustine. More recent scholarship, such as that conducted by Eric Saak and Meredith Gill, has examined the European OESA within the papal-political or intellectual
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circumstances of fourteenth-century Pavia, seeing the conflict with the Canons Regular as the defining feature of the Augustinian order.\textsuperscript{13} In spite of these important contributions, there has been a complete failure to investigate the religious culture of this order, both in Europe and in England. In order to understand the Augustinians, we must ask questions regarding how they defined themselves in apposition to Augustine’s religious example, how they viewed themselves as distinct from other religious orders, and how they interacted with the society around them, questions which have never been asked in scholarship.

Regarding the English province of the OESA, enquiry into the Augustinians, or rather, Austin Friars, has suffered from neglect because of the greater prominence of the German province of the OESA, to which Martin Luther belonged, but also because of the relative paucity of historical sources detailing the activity of the English Austins as a consequence of the destruction of provincial monastic records during the Dissolution of the Monasteries.\textsuperscript{14} There have been only two prominent studies of the English Austin Friars, those of Aubrey Gwynn and Francis Roth.\textsuperscript{15} The former ends its study in the fourteenth century, providing little or no context of the transformation of Augustinian life in fifteenth century England and analysing only the institutional mechanisms of the order. The latter, which includes an invaluable – yet far from exhaustive – compilation of sources referring to the English Austin Friars, remains the only real investigation into the English province of Austin Friars and has been treated as authoritative by more recent scholars, with little recognition and discussion of the omissions and flaws of its sourcebook.

Additionally, there has been some attention to individual Austin Friars who were significant for their literary or theological activity. This is mainly confined to two East Anglian Austins, John Capgrave and Osbern Bokenham, and they have been treated almost exclusively in literary analyses, such as the work of Simon Horobin, Sheila Delany, and
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\textsuperscript{13} See pages 42-43.

\textsuperscript{14} RothEAF, 1:7.

\textsuperscript{15} Aubrey Gwynn, \textit{The English Austin Friars in the Time of Wyclif} (London, 1940); RothEAF, 2 vols.
Karen Winstead. As valuable as these studies have been, by considering the texts produced by these two authors without a sense of the monastic environment in which they were created, they obfuscate some of the priorities of our Augustinian authors. When grounded within Augustinian religious culture, these texts take on new life and can lend us insight into the monastic formation of their authors.

Thus, the scholarship on the Austin Friars has, for the most part, been dominated by two trends: Augustinian tribalism on the one hand and literary analysis on the other. The literary studies have been deficient in their consideration of the monastic setting of the texts in question, and show little to no interest in Austins whose writings have not survived or who wrote nothing significant to speak of, but who may yet reveal to us the ways in which the Austins characterised their own Augustinianism. Conversely, contemporary Augustinians have been susceptible to propagating an image of the Augustinian order, which glosses over uncomfortable episodes in their history and trumpets the validity of the Augustinian life above all. As an Augustinian himself, Roth participated in this, seeking to underplay his order’s involvement in the reforms of the sixteenth century as an aberration from the norm. As a correlative to this, he devoted little attention to the fifteenth-century Austin Friars, characterising them as stagnant, as a way to explain the tumult and disarray experienced by the English Augustinians in the sixteenth century. This project will offer a timely revision to this view, which has gone uncontested for over fifty years, and seeks to delve into the lives and religion of the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Austins, when they have otherwise been shunted to the margins.


17 RothEAP, 1:104.
II. Sources and Methodology

Unlike the Dominicans and Franciscans, the Austin Friars looked to an ancient figure, Augustine of Hippo, in order to formulate their religious platform. Their interpretation of the legacy of their putative founder and how they differentiated themselves from others claiming Augustinian parentage speaks to their understanding of the validity of their way of life and of the mission of their order. In that vein, this project proceeds from the contention that the hagiographical and historiographical writings about Augustine by the English Austin Friars reveal important elements of the religious culture of the authors themselves, and of the monastic order of which they counted themselves as members.

Thus, the first portion of the methodology employed in this dissertation is the construction of the English Augustinian religious culture, abstracted from the writings of Austin Friars on Augustine. From devotional texts about Augustine, we can identify the religious priorities of the Austins and construct their notion of the ideal religious life, as expressed in the description of Augustine’s monastic profession and life. That the Augustinian order linked itself so vehemently and consistently to the religious example of Augustine is significant, and the way that Augustinianism is expressed in hagiographies of Augustine can lend insight into how the order attempted to emulate the example of their founder.

This thesis utilises the hagiographical texts of two Augustinian writers for this task: John Capgrave and Osbern Bokenham. As we shall see in Chapter Two, these two friars came from similar contexts; they both flourished in mid-fifteenth-century East Anglia and both studied at Cambridge at approximately the same time. We cannot establish that their voices were representative of the full spectrum of the Austin Friars, but we do know that they were towering personalities, aligned with key influential laypeople. Moreover, their positions within the order — Capgrave, for instance, was twice provincial prior — lent authority to their writings and their esteemed positions within the academic community would have added a prescriptivist tenor to their depictions of Augustine for their order. We cannot know the reception of these texts by other Austin Friars, but given the place of
Capgrave and Bokenham within their order, it is not unreasonable to treat their portrayals of Augustine as illustrative of the most sophisticated manifestation of Augustinian ideas about their founder and of accepted Augustinian wisdom on their putative founder. This does, of course, have the danger of treating the order as monolithic, but these texts nonetheless provide insight into contemporaneous ideas regarding Augustine of Hippo and offer sensitive considerations of his religious example. Their portrayals of Augustine differ considerably from the general medieval hagiographical traditional on Augustine, drawing out different emphases on the life of Augustine, pointing to the existence of a specifically English origin story for the Austin Friars. As two friars profoundly committed to the Augustinian order, they would not have presented their putative founder in a way which they felt was inauthentic and their writing elucidates something of the monastic culture that they were seminal in forming.

The second major undertaking of this thesis is to investigate how this reconstructed religious culture of English Augustinianism came to the fore in the religious landscape and society. What was the role of the Austin Friars in English ecclesiastical and secular society? Were the Austin Friars distinctive in their interactions with the laity through their pastoral care, patronage, and engagement with secular affairs? How did their daily practice, literary production, interactions with apostasy, heresy, reform, and monastic rivalries cement their role within the ecclesiastical landscape? Was their behaviour in these spheres reflective of and contributing to their religious culture as Austin Friars? Through a survey of the practices and foundations of the Austin Friars in this period, this dissertation examines what it meant to be an Austin Friar in late-medieval England, both theoretically and practically.

There are, however, serious difficulties in source material for this project. Given the paucity of writing by the Austins themselves which remain extant and the destruction of the Augustinians’ provincial records in the Dissolution of the Monasteries, there are relatively few sources which can form the basis of such an analysis. In order to overcome such obstacles, sources have been collated from a variety of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century texts,
primarily printed editions, in order to aggregate references to the Austins and draw upon what could be gathered together. I have used Roth’s invaluable source book as a foundation, primarily for his calendar of the entries within the Augustinian records in St Monica’s Rome referring to the English province. When I have made use of these records, because I have been unable to consult them myself, I have indicated in the footnotes that I know of their contents through Roth’s work.

I have, however, supplemented Roth’s initial work with a wide-ranging search for references to the Austin Friars in numerous other genres of texts. In the first instance, I have made use of official records, such as the Close and Patent Rolls, the State Papers, and the documents calendared in the *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, along with the Papal Registers and various papal bulls. This thesis has also used printed editions of civic records, such as Raine and Sutton’s nine-volume collection of records of York or Bateson’s records of Leicester. University records, such as Emden’s biographical registers of Oxford and Cambridge, Coopers’ *Annals* of Cambridge, Boase’s edition of Oxford records, and the Cambridge Grace books, have been invaluable in mapping out the career trajectories of numerous Austin Friars. Episcopal registers were also beneficial in this task, for they record the ordination and licensing of individual friars and help us to understand the spread and influence of friars in different areas of the country. Property records, such as the Cartulary of Clare, have also come into play here, particularly in the study of the influential Clare priory. Furthermore, records of heresy trials and some Wycliffite and antifraternal texts such as *Pierce the Ploughman’s Crede* have also been used, where possible, to understand the Austins’ engagement with heresy.

Another major body of source material was to be found in numerous printed collections of wills; in this instance, I have been forced to rely exclusively on printed collections given the unwieldy number of late-medieval wills resident in the local and national archives of England. This includes traditional collections such as the *Testamenta Vetusta* and *Testamenta Eboracensia*, in addition to abundant collections of wills from individual archives edited more recently. A possible way forward beyond this project would
be to study systematically and comprehensively the wills from a variety of regions, in order to examine the popularity of the Austin Friars as recipients of bequests in contrast to other religious orders, in the vein of Norman Tanner’s work on late-medieval Norwich. Whilst this would be a valuable endeavour, it is outside the scope and possibility of a doctoral study. Wills have contributed to my discussions of the religious economy of the Austin Friars, but also to considerations of influential patronage garnered by the friars. Letters of confraternity and indulgences are significant here too, showing important patronal relationships and the efforts of the Austin Friars in the penitential economy.

This thesis also makes use of the writings of fifteenth-, sixteenth-, and seventeenth-century historians and antiquarians, who reference the Austin Friars in their work. This includes historians and chroniclers such as John Strype, John Foxe, Thomas More, Raphael Holinshed, Edward Halle, William Lambarde, William Worcester, and the author of the *Great Chronicle of London* (perhaps Robert Fabyan), alongside numerous antiquaries such as John Bale, Thomas Tanner, John Stow, John Leland, John Weever, and William Dugdale. I have also used the works of monastic historians like Joseph Pamphilus, Dominico Gandolfo, and Thomas Walsingham. Moreover, the work of modern historians has also been useful; the *Victoria County History*, in the first instance, laid the groundwork of the regional picture of the Austin Friars. The works of other eighteenth- and nineteenth-century historians such as Henry Anstey, Henry Cotton, Konrad Eubel, Anton Höhn, and Thomas Madox have contributed to deepening the picture of the Austin Friars.

I have, of course, relied on the texts of the Austin Friars themselves whenever possible; the hagiographies of Augustine mentioned earlier by John Capgrave and Osbern Bokenham were the foundation of this analysis of Augustinian culture, but they are by no means the only texts consulted. The historical works of John Capgrave, primarily his *Abbreviacion of Cronicles, Liber de Illustribus Henricis*, and *Ye Solace of Pilgrimes*, were of significance for the construction of the history of the Austins and for Capgrave’s influential patronage. One must consider Bokenham’s overtly political works when discussing the engagement of the Austin Friars with secular affairs. Their hagiographical works –
Bokenham’s *Legendys of Hooly Wummen* and *Legenda Aurea*, and Capgrave’s *Life of St Katharine, Life of St Norbert*, and *Life of St Gilbert of Sempringham* – lend insight into their religious priorities and also into their network of patrons. In writing his *Gladius Salomonis* against Reginald Pecock, John Bury cultivated influential patronage and placed the Austins on the national stage for dispelling heresy. Bernard André’s *De Vita atque Gestis Henrici Septimi Historia*, in his capacity as official Tudor historiography, is once again important for our understanding of the political engagement of the Austins and interactions of the order with the Crown. The writings and correspondence of Robert Barnes, Miles Coverdale, and George Browne have been paramount in analysis of the reform of the Austin Friars in the sixteenth century; in this analysis the monumental *Acts and Monuments* of John Foxe has been essential to the building of our picture of these Austins, supplemented by the *Letters and Papers* and *State Papers*. Although Foxe’s work carries with it substantial interpretative difficulties, as shall be seen in Chapter Five, it nonetheless provides portrayals of Austins engaged in reform not found elsewhere. I have, wherever possible, situated these writings within their textual environment, referencing contemporaneous texts, such as Lydgate’s ‘advice for princes’ texts, anti-Wycliffite works, or other hagiographical works, in order to show the distinctiveness (or lack thereof) of the Augustinian textual production.

This study focusses only on the Austin Friars of England; there were interesting and significant Austin convents elsewhere in the British Isles, particularly in Ireland, but their religious culture and practice must be examined in a different study. Whilst this study is directed towards all of England, the life of the order and its main dynamism came from London and East Anglia. A general profile for the Augustinian order can, in the first instance, be drawn out from the *Victoria County History*, which shows clearly that the main activity for the order originated from the east and southeast of the country. Moreover, the infrequency with which the *Victoria County History* is able to comment on the fifteenth-century activities of the Austin Friars underlines the difficulty in source material for this period; the sources for the English Austin Friars are primarily centred around these two loci.
and typically speak to earlier medieval life, rather than the period with which we are concerned here. My further investigations have confirmed the profile borne out by that general picture; the majority of the Austins who feature in this piece were therefore from East Anglia or London, but this is reflective of the how the sources in England present themselves, rather than a methodological choice. Moreover, this probably represents the original reality: that our sources are so skewed towards London and East Anglia suggests that the order was most active and lively there.

Reflecting the history of the Austins themselves, this study closes with the Dissolution of the mendicant houses in 1538 and 1539, when the Austins themselves dispersed as their order ceased to exist in England. In seeking to understand the religious culture of the Austin Friars and their place in society leading up to the Henrician Reforms, I have considered sources beginning with the opening of the fifteenth century. An exception to this is the discussion of the origins of the Augustinian order and its expansion to England; here, I have considered the foundations of individual priories because the patronal relationships established at foundation often continued to have bearing even in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and because they attest to the pre-existing role of the Austins in English society. This discussion shows us how some of the peculiarities of the Austin Friars developed, and thus, it is significant to see how later Austins navigated those tensions and refashioned their origin story within a specifically late-medieval English context. This chronological period brings difficulties of source material with it, as discussed above. And yet, it is imperative that we investigate the pre-existing monastic culture of the Austin Friars leading up to the reforms should we wish to contextualise the thought of reformers like Barnes, whose early career developed within that environment.

III. Thesis Structure
This thesis proceeds with five main chapters. The first chapter discusses Augustinian beginnings and the foundation of the OESA, focussing on their origins, practice, and self-definition. This chapter confronts the conflict of the Austin Friars with the Canons Regular,
in both Pavian and English contexts, and examines the communal narratives constructed by the Austins to defend their Augustinianism. It contextualises the following discussions on Augustinian religious culture and their social role, and emphasises the lack of consistency in the Augustinian life.

The second chapter discusses the historiographical and hagiographical writings on Augustine, their alleged founder, produced by the English Austin Friars. Thus, it examines primarily John Capgrave’s *Life of Saint Augustine* and Osbern Bokenham’s *Legenda Aurea*, in addition to Capgrave’s *Abbreviacion of Cronicles* and his sermon on the twelve orders of Augustine, for their depiction of Augustine’s religious exemplarity. It contrasts the example abstracted from these texts with the *Vitae Augustini* written by the European Augustinians of the fourteenth century. Whilst the European Augustinians had presented a strictly demarcated picture of Augustine’s religious example a century earlier, Capgrave and Bokenham opened up his religious activity to a variety of interpretations that were not restricted to his eremitical lifestyle. Similarly, their depiction of Augustine opened up their relationship with other orders claiming his parentage, incorporating the Gilbertines, Canons Regular, and Norbertines into Augustine’s legacy in a manner inconceivable to the Augustinians in mainland Europe.

The third chapter discusses the relationship of the Austin Friars with the laity and their involvement with parochial life on a local level. Using testaments, records of donations, and reports of interactions between the friaries and the laity as its primary sources, this chapter investigates how the Austin Friars competed with or supported parish life. It emphasises the plastic nature of the religious platform of the Austin Friars that allowed them to be flexible regarding the ministerial and pastoral needs of individuals. Rather than adhering to what had been sanctioned by their heritage, the Austin Friars were able to react and relate to religious needs as they arose and could respond to changing needs of a particular locality.

The fourth chapter is an analysis of the activity of the Austin Friars within the sphere of secular powers. It examines the friars’ relationship to specific English monarchs
during this period of instability through their written support, their function as ambassadors or agents of the Crown, and their housing of graves of politically problematic figures. This chapter underlines the ability of the Austin Friars to place themselves in beneficial positions and to secure powerful patronage.

The fifth chapter deals with the religious culture of the Austin Friars with a view towards their interaction with heresy, apostasy, reform, and vigilance regarding behaviour and everyday practice. This section investigates complaints of behavioural issues at various Austin houses, particularly in London, and reports of problematic friars, including apostates, those who turned to Lollardy, and those who heralded reform in early modern England. Whilst this section touches on the Observant movement, Observance was not a feature of Augustinian life in England, and thus, this section discusses why Observance failed to gain traction on English soil. This chapter argues that the Austin Friars embraced a certain degree of religious diversity in part because of the less restrictive definition of Augustinian religion, creating space for those amongst the Austin Friars to investigate reform without abandoning their Augustinian membership. Moreover, this chapter speculatively points to possible instances of Augustinian fraternity, which persisted in spite of the religious destruction of the sixteenth century.

This thesis concludes by demonstrating that the manner in which the English Austin Friars wrote about Augustine points to a mutable attitude towards the legacy of Augustine, which would have been impossible in the strict delineation of his character in the work of earlier European Augustinians. Approaching the conflict with the Canons Regular over Augustinian parentage with a conciliatory tone, the English Austin Friars were less restrictive in their interpretations of the example of Augustine than their European confrères, who saw him specifically as the saint who perfected the monastic life by combining the apostolic and eremitical lives. Other aspects of the Augustinian life thus came to the fore, creating a lack of consistency and uniformity throughout the English province. Without a narrow prescription of the Augustinian way of life, the behaviour of these friars can be characterised foremost by their creation of a network of influence and the
manoeuvring of their confrères into socially and economically expedient positions.

This flexibility within their concept of Augustinianism would have been impossible amongst the European Augustinians, who had dealt with the instability of Augustine’s example by codifying their religious platform. Whereas the strict definition of Augustinianism in Europe ultimately resulted in the appearance of an Observant movement, motivated by a desire to adhere strictly to the eremitical example of Augustine, in England, a flexible understanding of the life of Augustine negated any such need. As a correlative to this, the lack of Observance in part ushered in the order’s demise in England: with no central check on their changing monastic trends and priorities, the Austins opened their order up to criticisms regarding practice, wealth, and theology. The advent of Protestantism provoked disparate responses from the Austins, who ranged from conservatives to translators of Scripture; that diversity was symptomatic of their larger monastic culture, which allowed for variety in religious practice.

As a consequence of this flexibility in religious platform, the English Austin Friars were connected more so by their adaptability to their environment, variety in practice, and expedient social roles. There is, visible within this order, a trend of religious variance, from the eremitical nature of certain houses such as Woodhouse to the reputed worldliness of the London convent in the 1520s, mirroring the diversity of their origins. They employed a variety of methods by which to propagate their order and actively sought influential patronage. Individual Austin Friars appear scattered throughout court and the households of the powerful, thereby safeguarding the interests of their order and the legacy of Augustine. In that vein, it was entirely possible for starkly different and even contradicting theological opinions to exist within the same group. Whereas many Austin Friars of Clare became involved with Lollard groups of Essex, Capgrave always spoke vehemently against Oldcastle; similarly whilst George Browne signed the Act of Supremacy for the Austin Friars, John Stone was martyred for his opposition to the king’s claim to be the head of the church.
IV. Significance

This thesis emphasises above all the durability and adaptability of the English Austin Friars and their ability to survive in spite of theological disagreements, instability of regime, anti-fraternalism, reductions in recruitment, and difficulties in ecclesiastical approbation. It explores the exceptional variability to their behaviour and the ability of the Austin Friars to fit in with other orders and take on accepted forms of behaviour. Whilst the Austin Friars, ultimately, fell to the same fate as the other English monastic orders – dissolution – their resilience within the late-medieval English church was remarkable and is worthy of exploration.

This thesis takes an innovative approach to the subject of monasticism, seeing rivalries between religious orders and hagiographical writings on monastic founders as suggestive of profound monastic characteristics that should not be ignored. It reconstructs the culture of an order that was of remarkable significance for the reception of the Reformation in the first generation, to investigate what they saw as essential to their own Augustinianism. It is predicated upon the idea that the monastic formation, education, and community of many theologians were seminal to the development of their thought and devotion, and thus, investigation into Protestant reformers who were formerly Austin Friars must be situated within their own monastic context. We should not expect those mendicant cultures to have evaporated easily or quickly, even though other historians have neglected the profound monastic heritage of reformers such as Martin Luther, Robert Barnes, and Miles Coverdale. Moreover, this project seeks to redress the imbalance in the study of the late-medieval English Church: whilst historians such as James Clark have written sensitively on monastic preaching and scholarship, monasticism infrequently appears in studies which cross over the period boundary between late-medieval and early modern.

Since the OESA has suffered neglect within the study of both monastic and English history, this dissertation fights against that emphasis by demonstrating that the English Austin Friars were distinct both from other contemporaneous mendicant orders and from their European confrères. By beginning the task of contextualising Augustinian
evangelicals and thinking about disparities and congruities of monastic cultures and their place in society, this thesis poses questions regarding the significance of being an Austin Friar in late-medieval and early modern English society. Additionally, it contributes to our picture of the late-medieval Church, seeing the religion of the fifteenth century as neither idealistic nor corrupt, and neither stagnant nor especially vibrant. The Austin Friars in fifteenth-century England helped to shape the society which both embraced their innovative theological ideas and which, ultimately, called for their destruction; we cannot divorce them from the Church around them, but we must also recognise their membership to the community of Austin Friars and their role within the Church and English society as such. This dissertation is perhaps the first to do so, to see the actions of Barnes, Coverdale, Browne and others as deeply implicated within their own monastic community; to be an Austin Friar was to be both different and similar to other friars, and in this project, I seek to understand what that means.
Chapter 1: Augustinian Beginnings

This chapter examines the expansion of the Augustinian order into England and the diversification of its religious culture as a result of its transition from mainland Europe to the British Isles. It is divided into three main sections: the first discusses the Italian origins of the OESA, which is then contrasted with the narratives told by the Augustinians in mainland Europe and the Austin Friars in England. The second discusses the nature and development of Augustinian practice, looking to the Regula Sancti Augustini as instrumental to the strong identification of the OESA with Augustine and as central both to its links to the papacy and to its regional variety in practice. Lastly, the third section investigates the monastic rivalry, which precipitated the active self-definition of the OESA as distinctly “Augustinian.” Thus, it discusses the OESA’s altercation with the Augustinian Canons Regular over rights to Augustine’s alleged relics in fourteenth-century Italy and the translation of that conflict to fifteenth-century England.

Whilst providing the historical context to the formation of the OESA, this chapter emphasises the lack of consistency within the Augustinian order. It points to fundamental tensions within the OESA, which are difficult to resolve: its eremitical roots versus its mendicant lifestyle; its adoption of Augustine’s monastic rule to provide legitimation but lack of official daily practice; close ties with the papacy but a remarkable number of Augustinians involved in anti-papalism and evangelicalism in the sixteenth century. These tensions are, ultimately, symptomatic of their establishment and development: as a conglomeration of many smaller monastic groups, the Augustinians can be known, above all, for their variability and adaptability, and, as will be seen throughout this thesis, for the plethora of their interpretations of their own Augustinianism. Their lack of a uniform lifestyle led to diversity in their practice and theology and occasioned a crisis in self-definition in the face of monastic rivalry.
I. Origins

*Foundation of Ordo Eremitarum Sancti Augustini*

The OESA was founded by Pope Alexander IV's bull *Licet Ecclesiae Catholicae* on April 9, 1256, following discussions initiated by the pope between disparate communities of hermits, primarily the Tuscan Hermits of St Augustine, who had been united by Innocent VI in 1244.1 Alexander IV’s bull united five eremitical groups under what is known by the OESA as the Grand Union, or *magna unio*,2 placing them under the *Regula Sancti Augustini* and decreeing that they wear a black habit and hood, with a leather belt.3 The union also moved the eremitical communities into the cities,4 and the Hermits therefore came to adhere to the two cardinal features of thirteenth-century mendicancy, that is, intellectual prominence in the universities, as well as preaching to the laity.5

The Augustinians themselves traditionally maintained that their order found its origins with the monastic communities of Augustine himself, claiming that Augustine established communities of hermits in Tuscany during his sojourn in Italy, and that their lifestyle could therefore be traced back to Augustine and Alypius.6 Although there is general consensus that this “alleged continuity is indemonstrable,”7 internal Augustinian scholarship often risibly claims, as in the work of E.A. Foran, that there is “no question regarding the Augustinian claims to their distinct title of Hermits of St Augustine, or to their continuity from the early African Hermits.”8 The Augustinians were certainly not alone in exaggerating the antiquity and prestige of their origins; in comparison to the
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2 This is in contrast to the initial unification of 1244 of the Tuscan Hermits, which is known as the *parva unio*, or small union.
3 Gwynn, *The English Austin Friars*, 12.
4 Andrews, *The Other Friars*, 69.
6 The Augustinian Hermits in fourteenth-century Italy and Germany posited that Augustine lived with a community of hermits in Italy for up to two years, for whom he composed the *Regula Sancti Augustini*. They claimed that Augustine was introduced to the eremitical life by his mentor St Simplicianus, the successor to St Ambrose as Bishop of Milan, and then went on to establish eremitical communities in Italy, which he saw as ideal religious communities. See pages 43-48.
7 Gutiérrez, *The Augustinians in the Middle Ages*, 1.
8 Foran, *The Augustinians from St. Augustine to the Union*, 141.
Carmelites, who made grand claims that they were founded by Elijah himself on Mount Carmel and used St Simon Stock as a key religious exemplar, the historiographical suppositions of the OESA seem almost reasonable.\(^9\)

The five communities united in 1256 were small eremitical groups in Tuscany living under the *Regula Sancti Augustini*, comprised of the Hermits of St Augustine of Tuscany, the Williamites, the Bonites, and the Hermits of Brettino.\(^10\) The Tuscan Hermits had been organised into formalised communities by the Fourth Lateran Council and formed the basis of the inchoate OESA. All groups had lived in eremitical communities and thus the OESA maintained eremitism as its mode of religious profession and life alongside its new calling to mendicancy.\(^11\)

This new order developed a central governing system by means of a general chapter every three years and an annual provincial chapter, which elected the prior generals and prior provincials, respectively.\(^12\) This was the same system used by other mendicant orders, which maintained this international system;\(^13\) each house was subject to periodic visitation and for the most part, convents were comprised of at least twelve friars.\(^14\) The Austins and Carmelites started off primarily in remote areas, but they soon followed the example of the Dominicans and Franciscans, who had set up their first houses in university towns, episcopal centres, and commercial towns.\(^15\)

In the thirteenth century, the OESA was divided into thirteen provinces and by 1329, it had expanded to twenty-four.\(^16\) All Augustinian houses within Scotland, Ireland, and England were part of the English province, which had five limits, managed by the vicar
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\(^11\) Ibid., 30.

\(^12\) Gwynn, *The English Austin Friars*, 12-13.


provincial: Cambridge, Oxford, Lincoln, York, and Ireland.\footnote{Little and Easterling, The Franciscans and Dominicans of Exeter, 7.} This is mirrored by the correlative limits or visitations in other English mendicant orders; the limits for the Dominicans were Oxford, Cambridge, London, and York, and eventually Exeter was made into a fifth.\footnote{Ibid., 201.} The Franciscans, comparatively, maintained seven: London, Cambridge, Oxford, Newcastle, York, Worcester, and Bristol.\footnote{Ibid.} The Carmelites had only four, namely, London, Norwich, Oxford, and York.\footnote{Ibid., 202.}

The population sizes of the mendicant orders varied greatly throughout England; the Franciscans were the most numerous, with a population of approximately 1600 in 1300, increasing to 1700 by 1348, and down to a thousand by 1500.\footnote{Ibid.} In 1260, there were approximately 900 Dominicans and their numbers rose to about 1500 in 1300, almost matching the Friars Minor.\footnote{Ibid.} They likewise increased to roughly 1700 before the Black Death but their numbers decreased rapidly, with 1200 in 1450 and only 800 by the time of their Dissolution.\footnote{Ibid., 201.} The Carmelites were of similar size to the Austins; they had about 700 members in 1300, 500 in 1450 and only 300 at the time of their Dissolution.\footnote{Ibid.} The Austins claimed approximately 500 members in 1300 and had an increase to 700 before the Black Death.\footnote{Ibid.} They had 550 members by 1450 and, like the Carmelites, had only around 300 members at the time of their Dissolution.\footnote{Ibid.}

The papal curia played an important role in the organisation of the OESA; firstly, in its official recognition of the hermits as a unified order of Augustine, and secondly, in its appointment of Cardinal Annibaldi as the cardinal protector of the order in 1244, when the order consisted of the Tuscan Hermits. Cardinal protectors originated with the Franciscan

\footnote{RothEAF, 1:45. He uses London, BL MS Harl. 6033 fol. 57r as the documentation for the English limits and adds the possibility of a fifth English limit, Ludlow, which was mentioned in that manuscript, but nowhere else.}
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\footnote{Ibid.}
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order, but the Austins were relatively precocious in their appointment of a cardinal protector, as the Dominicans did not receive one until 1376. These cardinals were ambassadors for the papacy and devoted to maintaining the orthodoxy of the order. In the case of the Austins, one of Annibaldi’s notable achievements was the institutionalisation of the papal liturgy for the OESA, intertwining the order as deeply as possible with the papacy through a series of grandiose papal exemptions, which facilitated their expansion outside of Italy.

Such favour from the papal office is an element of the symbiotic relationship between the Roman curia and the OESA; given that they were founded by papal fiat, the legitimacy of the Augustinians was dependent on the reciprocal legitimacy of the papal decree that had consolidated their order. The OESA wrote extensively on the authenticity of papal power during the political disputes between secular authorities and the papacy during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Giles of Rome, James of Viterbo, Augustinus of Ancona, Alexander of San Elpidio, William of Cremona, Bartholomew of Urbino, John Hickley, Thomas Winterton, Augustinus Favoroni of Rome, William Becchi of Florence, Paul of Rome, and Domenico of San Severino were all Austins who publicly defended papal power, an astonishing collection of theologians given the OESA’s small numbers. As Eric Saak has astutely observed, it is extremely significant that of the most extreme papalists in the fourteenth century, only Henry of Cremona was not an Austin Friar.
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28 Ibid.
29 Ibid., 9.
34 Saak, *High Way to Heaven*, 72. Saak takes this list of the four most extreme papalists from this period from the work of Brian Tierney, who argues that Henry of Cremona, Giles of Roma, Augustinus of Ancona and James of Viterbo are the most extreme papalists of this period. See Brian Tierney,
The foundation, expansion, and approved activities of the Austins were directly overseen by the papacy or cardinal protector, which buttressed their development in exchange for vocal support for papal jurisdiction. The Austin Friars maintained links to Rome that were not seen in many other orders, links which came to influence the theological, pastoral, and political affairs of the Austin Friars in England. The irony and indeed puzzle in those strong links with the papal office is that the papacy’s greatest nemesis, Martin Luther, originated from precisely this order of friars.

Migration of the Ordo Eremitarum Sancti Augustini to England

Henry III welcomed and offered protection to the Tuscan Hermits, the forerunners of the OESA, to England in 1249, but they must have already been there in the previous year, when the first foundation at Clare was established. This is largely supported by the Chronicle of London, whose author placed the entry of the Austins into England to 1250, and John Bale, who claimed in the sixteenth century that the migration into England occurred in 1252. The Austins were the last of the mendicants to arrive in England; the Dominicans first arrived in 1221, the Franciscans in 1224, and the Carmelites in 1240. Annibaldi was important for this the transition to the British Isles, as he was present at the English Court from 1243 to 1259, and thus in a position of greater influence in England than he would have been from the Continent. In fact, two of the earliest Austin foundations,
Clare and London, both happened at times when Cardinal Annibaldi was influential in England and were founded by men close to the king. Richard, Earl of Gloucester, who established Clare priory, was one of the king’s most experienced diplomats, whilst Humphrey de Bohun, Earl of Essex, Constable of England, who made the foundation in London, was a blood relative of the monarch and in fact one of the godfathers of his son and heir.\textsuperscript{41} There is likely also merit to Francis Roth’s argument that these proto-Austins, i.e. the Tuscan Hermits who travelled to England from Italy \textit{before} their formal union into the OESA in 1256, made easy headway into the English religious climate given the strength of the eremitical tradition in England and Henry’s positive attitude towards mendicants.\textsuperscript{42}

John Capgrave’s \textit{Abbreviacion of Chronicles} has often served as the basis for the early history of the English Austin Friars,\textsuperscript{43} which claimed initial foundations at “Surek” (of unknown location), Clayhanger in Middlesex, Clare, Sittingbourne (otherwise known as Shamele in Canterbury), and Woodhouse, although only those at Clare and Woodhouse came into fruition.\textsuperscript{44} Whilst Capgrave was correct in asserting that foundations at Surek and Clayhanger never occurred, there was one at Sittingbourne, although it was dissolved a year after its initial establishment in 1255, and thus it is unlikely that Capgrave would have been aware of it.\textsuperscript{45} There is corroborating evidence for an early foundation of Clare Priory in

\textsuperscript{41} \textit{RothEAF}, 1:19. Clare’s history is clear from the Cartulary of Clare (C\textit{AugCl}), which includes hundreds of property deeds and can be used effectively to trace the establishment of the convent. Humphrey of Bohun’s foundation of the house at London is documented by a later source, namely, \textit{StowSL}, 114.


\textsuperscript{43} Francis Roth relied on Capgrave’s account of the Austin Friars in England as authoritative, frequently without any kind of external, corroborating evidence, which has resulted in consistent disagreement with David Knowles on the dating of the early Augustinian foundations in England. For example, Capgrave argued that Giles of Rome, the \textit{doctor fundatissimus} of the OESA, was fundamental to the Austins’ move to the British Isles (John Capgrave, \textit{John Capgrave’s Abbreviacion of Chronicles}, ed. Peter Lucas (Oxford, 1983), 119). This claim was made from Giles’ \textit{De Regimine Principium}, which Capgrave believed was dedicated to the Earl of Gloucester (it was in fact dedicated to Phillip the Fair of France; see Aegidius Romanus, \textit{De Regimine Principium} (Venice, 1524)). Giles’ birth in 1243 makes this timeline completely impossible, and thus we ought to be skeptical of Capgrave’s historical claims.

\textsuperscript{44} Capgrave, \textit{Abbreviacion of Chronicles}, 119.

\textsuperscript{45} See A. Hussey, “Kent Chantries 3,” \textit{KASRB}, 12 (1936), 291 for the history of this hermitage. See \textit{CPR} 39 Henry III (1247-1258) [1255], 397 (membrane 15) for the permission sought to establish the order in Sittingbourne in 1255.
1248, and potentially for the convent of Woodhouse to 1250, which is mentioned by William Dugdale in the sixteenth century. There is no documentation for the Surek establishment mentioned by Capgrave, but there are records for the other early houses at Clayhanger in Middlesex, Sittingbourne in Kent, Leicester, and Ludlow. Some other early Augustinian foundations occurred at London, Shrewsbury, Oxford, Huntingdon, Tickhill, and York. The house at King’s Lynn appeared first in 1276 in the will of Adam de Geyton, and an early sixteenth-century manuscript preserved in the library of the College of Arms placed the foundation of York to 1272.

By about 1330, the Austins had twenty-two houses in England and five in Ireland; by 1387, the number of convents was between thirty-eight and forty-four. Other locations included Norwich, Cambridge, Northampton, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Penrith, Warrington, Grimsby, Orford, Berwick-upon-Tweed, Winchester, Kingston-on-Hull, Gorleston (Little Yarmouth/Southtown), Bristol, Boston, Canterbury, Dartmouth, Droitwich, Stamford, Stafford, Rye, Atherstone, Newport (Wales), and Thetford. Several foundations were attempted in the southwest, and although the house at Bristol flourished, the convents at Tavistock, Barnstaple, Dartmouth, Devizes, and Sherbourne all failed or never came to
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46 See CAugCl, nos. 4, 7, 10, 11, 25, 198 (pp. 28-31, 38-39, 108), for the deeds of the initial property endowment. It outlines the founders of the priory from the de Clare family, but also notes a gift of land from the members of John Wiburg’s family, for whom the Austins were to say mass in perpetuity (CartCl AE (25) fol. 12v or CAugCl, 38-39).
47 Knowles, The Religious Orders in England, 2:201, idem, Medieval Religious Houses, 200-2; RothEAF, 1:358. William Dugdale placed the establishment of the convent at Woodhouse to 1250, but there is nothing to substantiate this claim. See DugdaleM, 6:3,1599.
48 RothEAF, 1:22. There is also archaeological evidence at the establishment at Ludlow; for a summary of this evidence, see B. Botfield, “On the discovery of the remains of the Priory of Austin Friars at Ludlow”, Archaeologia 39 (1863): 173-188 at 183; RothEAF, 1:22; James Irvine, Handbook to Ludlow: Containing a Descriptive Account of Ludlow Church (Ludlow, 1865), 139 and Botfield, “Austin Friars at Ludlow”, 182. For the foundation of the priory at Sittingbourne/Shamele, see Hussey, “Kent Chantries 3,” 291. See RothEAF, 1:281 for Roth’s argument on Leicester, although he did admit that the first document referring to an Austin convent at Leicester appears only in 1304 (see Mary Bateson, Records of the Borough of Leicester (London, 1899) 1:371).
49 StowSL, 114; CLR 51 Henry III (1260-1267) [1267], 285 (membrane 4); as noted by Knowles, the convent in Shrewsbury appears in official documentation only in 1298. See Knowles, Medieval Religious Houses, 202.
50 H. Harrod, Report on the Deeds and Records of the Borough of King’s Lynn (King’s Lynn, 1874), 35.
51 CTG, 4:75-6; see RothSources, 15 (D 21), who listed this manuscript as London, College of Arms MS L 8.
52 These numbers have been collated from the dating of Augustinian foundations in both Roth and Knowles’ studies.
fruition.\textsuperscript{53} Moreover, the houses at Northallerton, Barnard Castle, and Coventry either failed or were not properly established in the first place.\textsuperscript{54} The distribution of these convents strongly favours the southeast and east of the country; although we find Austin friaries peppered throughout the country, it was predominantly in East Anglia and its environs where they flourished. London, Yorkshire, and Shropshire were other areas in which Austin Friars were numerous, but the convents at Clare, Huntingdon, Lincoln, Norwich, Lynn, Cambridge, Grimsby, Orford, Gorleston, Boston, Stamford, and Thetford attest to their prominence in the east. The number of affluent market towns in East Anglia due to a flourishing textile economy and the proximity to ports facilitating lucrative trade with the Low Countries would have been made East Anglian towns receptive and supportive of mendicant friars, who depended on local financial support to survive.\textsuperscript{55}

Austin friaries were founded primarily in the second half of the thirteenth century and the first few decades of the fourteenth, with a few exceptions: several friaries were established in the 1530s, when Observant Franciscan houses were surrendered either to the Conventual order or to the Austin Friars. There was a huge variety in location, from the metropolis of London or Norwich, with extreme competition in terms of other religious houses and numerous parishes, to towns of moderate size, like King’s Lynn, Thetford, Grimsby, or Stamford, to small villages like Atherstone, where the Austins’ only competition was the Mancetter parish church and the nearby Cistercian abbey of Merevale. At the extreme was the Austin convent at Woodhouse: one of the earliest foundations, this convent was established purposefully in a rural, extra-parochial area, where the friars could live in an eremitical fashion, in the way the proto-Austins had done. This hermitage was never moved into a town and maintained its remote location until its closure in 1538; unlike other friaries, this community kept fifty acres of land to support the friars in the absence of alms.\textsuperscript{56}

The contrast between this rural and eremitical establishment, with abundant land, with the

\textsuperscript{53} RothEAF, 1:242, 266, 330, 342.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., 1:242, 265, 307.
\textsuperscript{56} VCH:Shropshire, 2:98.
The friary in London, which possessed only its precincts in the Broad street ward, is striking.

Moreover, we find a large disparity in incomes of Austin friaries; the location in London had an annual income of over fifty-seven pounds at the time of its dissolution, whereas the small house in Atherstone had an income of only thirty shillings a year. The friaries were rarely founded by a single benefactor and typically accrued messuages and land from a variety of patrons, such as the friary in Droitwich, which received an initial donation of land from the high-ranking Thomas Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick, but was only firmly established with the additional donations of land from Thomas Alleyne of Wyche, John Dragoun of Wyche, John Bush, and William Mercer. This is but one example of the Austins receiving support from the rural land-owning aristocracy in tandem with less influential and wealthy families in their surrounding environs; priories like the one at London were also testament to benefaction from urban, rather than rural, patrons. The exception to this was the convent at Clare, which was founded by Richard de Clare, Earl of Gloucester, and continued to receive land and benefaction from his family throughout the later Middle Ages. Its chief relation was to the castle of the Earls, rather than the relatively small town which was also ancillary to the castle, and whose growth postdated the foundation of the friary. Whilst we find other families with long-established links with individual Austin priories, like the de Bohuns and the London establishment, the ancestral links maintained by the Clare Austins were particularly strong. As we shall see in later chapters, the degree to which the friars at Clare provided religious service and dynastic propaganda for their founding family was exceptional amongst friars; this type of behaviour was far more typical of landed monasteries, which had religious duties to the family of their founding benefactors.

II. Practice

The Monastic Rule

The institution of the *Regula Sancti Augustini* as the prescriptive text outlining the

---

57 *VCH: Warwickshire*, 2:106.
expectations for the practice and daily life of the Austin Friars was a practical consideration by Alexander IV in his establishment of the OESA, reinforcing pre-existing ties with Augustine from the Tuscan Hermits and ensuring a certain level of orthodoxy. George Lawless, one of the foremost scholars of the texts now known as the *Regula Sancti Augustini*, cited Luc Verheijen as the man who resolved this textual labyrinth of 274 manuscripts, containing a total of 317 texts. Even though Verheijen has compiled the many manuscripts into one authoritative text, there remains significant difficulty in realistically identifying Augustine as the author, given that he is only mentioned as the author of a monastic rule over a century after his death. Augustine alluded nowhere to his composition of a monastic rule, nor is a comparable text listed in Possidius’ *Indiculus*, his catalogue of Augustine’s writing. Possidius’ *Indiculus* is far from exhaustive, and so, whilst his and Augustine’s silence does not conclusively demonstrate that Augustine did not compose the *Regula*, it is corroborated by Possidius’ silence in his hagiography of the bishop saint, barring a possible allusion discovered by Verheijen.

There has been considerable debate on the compositional dates of the feminine and masculine versions of the *Regula*, but I am only concerned here with the masculine version, as that is the text central to the Austin Friars. All the Augustinian authors in question here – Luc Verheijen, Tarsicus J. van Bavel, George Lawless, Raymond Canning – summarily dismiss the possibility of an earlier feminine version. This feeds into an unacceptable bias in their work, namely, the desire to prove – as our medieval Austins did! – that Augustine wrote the *Regula* specifically for their community, with adaptations for other communities made only after the fact.


Lawless, *Monastic Rule*, 65; Augustine is identified by name as the source of this text is in the compilation of monastic rules by Eugippius of Lucullanum (c.465-c.539), an admirer of Augustine from Naples and the biographer of Saint Severinus of Noricum. The *Rule of Eugippius* survives in Paris, BN, MS Latinus 12634.


R.J. Halliburton, however, (the only non-Augustinian here), more plausibly argued that on the basis of this evidence alone, we cannot claim Augustine as the author of the *Regula*. (“Review of La Règle de saint Augustine by Luc Verheijen” *JTS*, 19 (1968): 657-663 at 661), and recognised that Verheijen, along with T. van Bavel, Lawless and Arbesmann, his Augustinian confrères, made leaps of logic had been made in order to ensure that Augustine could be maintained as the author of the monastic rule.
It is sufficient, however, to remember that the Austin Friars themselves, as is made clear by their hagiographies, resolutely considered Augustine to have been the author of the text. Rather, the issue on which they focus time and again in their histories of the OESA is not whether the Regula was written by Augustine, but whether Augustine gave his rule to the Hermits or to the Canons Regular. The Austins firmly placed the composition of the monastic rule at Augustine’s establishment of his community of hermits, which they typically identified as Centumcellae in Tuscany, thereby refuting the claim that the Regula had originally been written and presented to the Canons Regular.

The Regula Sancti Augustini, in its masculine version codified by Verheijen, is both short and imprecise; as Tarsicus van Bavel has stated, “its principal purpose is to offer some important thoughts which can provide inspiration,” rather than to legislate all aspects of the religious life of a community. It is primarily based around Acts 4: 31-35, particularly 32b, 32c, and 35b, which detail the ideal of the Jerusalem community. It thus has a concentrated emphasis on good community life, which, according to the Regula, is nothing but the practice of love and living together in one mind and heart with God. Ironically, there is an almost total absence of remarks about an ascetical lifestyle; where there are pronouncements, they are about the virtues of community living, rather than self-denial. Within the community, what an individual needed should have been given to him, rather than an equitable distribution. Its firmest requirements are that its readers pray at the

As Halliburton rightly points out, this textual parallel indicates only that Possidius was aware of the text, or was familiar with the author of the text, but not necessarily that Augustine himself was its author. Lawless calls the parallel “powerfully suggestive” and a “significant scriptural find”, and displays surprise that scholars such as Halliburton have called into question its validity. (Lawless, Monastic Rule, 129).

These claims will be examined later in this chapter. See pages 45-46.

This will be discussed on page 46.


The verses of note are (32b) “No one claimed that any of their possessions was their own”, (32c) “they shared everything they had”, and (35b) “it was distributed to anyone who had need.”

van Bavel, “Introduction”, 7. For “living in one mind and heart with God”, see RuleAug, 1.2; “Before all else, live together in harmony, being of one mind and one heart on the way to God. For is it not precisely for this reason that you have come to live together?” And again at 1.8: “You are all to live together, therefore, one in mind and one in heart and honour God in one another, because each of you has become his temple.”


RuleAug, 1.5: “One must indeed have regard for their frailty by providing them with whatever they need, even if they were formerly so poor that they could not even afford the very necessities of life.”
ordained times of day and that the *Regula* itself be read once a week, “as in a mirror, you will be able to see in it whether there is anything you are neglecting or forgetting.”

Alexander IV initially instituted the *Regula Sancti Augustini* for the OESA at the request of the Tuscan Hermits during the unification in 1256, since Innocent VI had established it for them during their own union in 1244. The *Regula* was a popular choice for many religious orders and was claimed by the Canons Regular as well as the Dominicans; its concision and slight prescriptive elements allowed for flexibility and variation. Dominic chose it for precisely this reason; it was vague enough for it still to be applicable to a mendicant order, allowing the friars freedom of movement and permitting mendicant poverty. Furthermore, Dominic had had extensive experience with it previously; as a Canon before his foundation of the Dominican order, he had himself lived under the *Regula Sancti Augustini*. Due to this flexibility, the Austin Friars, like the Dominicans, developed their own conventions, institutionalised in their own constitutions.

*Daily Life and Practice*

The *Constitutions of Ratisbon*, the earliest extant Augustinian constitutions, which were ratified at the Chapter of Ratisbon (Regensburg) in 1290, were the most significant factor governing the daily practice of the Austin Friars. The fifty-one chapters of the *Constitutions* detail the expectations of daily life, including matters such as the responsibilities of the prior, the admission and formation of novices, and the general regulations of the convents. According to Jordan of Quedlinburg, the *Constitutions* were particular to Augustinian customs, but a comparative reading of them shows them to be

---


heavily derivative of analogous constitutions of the Premonstratensian and Dominican orders.\textsuperscript{76}

The \textit{Constitutions} regulated life for the friars, including in the prescription of requisite punishments for specified transgressions, which typically included flagellation, fasting, and incarceration within the monastic prison,\textsuperscript{77} and thus comprised of more formal instructions for the every day life of the friars. They required the friars to go to confession at least once weekly,\textsuperscript{78} stipulated the minimum requisite number of times to receive communion,\textsuperscript{79} and laid out the format of divine worship.\textsuperscript{80} The Divine Office was a central and recurrent feature of the daily life of the Austin Friars; it began with Matins at midnight, and the friars chanted Lauds at dawn when they awoke, after which there was the conventual mass, to which everyone was obliged to attend.\textsuperscript{81} After lunch was Vespers, and the evening meal was followed by compline.\textsuperscript{82} This kind of regulated schedule was typical of all religious orders and the Austin’s daily routine was not dissimilar from that of the Dominicans. Compline was the central point in the Dominican liturgy, which completed the day and attendance at which was mandatory.\textsuperscript{83} The rest of their day included a variety of masses and components of the office at prime, tierce, sext, and nones, which varied in time depending on the season, followed by sung compline.\textsuperscript{84}

Meat was forbidden to the Austins by the \textit{Constitutions}, although priors were allowed to permit sick or elderly friars or those completing hard manual work to eat meat. Archaeological records from the Austin friary at Leicester, however, show that the Austin
Friars – at least there – consistently ate meat, as well as shellfish and fish.\textsuperscript{85} Eggs, cheese, and milk were always permitted, whilst the friars otherwise maintained a strict fast from the beginning of November till Christmas, as well as during Lent.\textsuperscript{86} This diet was mirrored by the Dominicans, whose diet consisted primarily of porridge, oats, and bread from barley or peasemeal, in addition to fish and eggs.\textsuperscript{87} Beer was permitted they could also partake in fruit, eel, goose-meat, and wine on feast days.\textsuperscript{88} Although there were initial restrictions against eating meat, as with the Austins, there was considerable relaxation of this statute in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{89}

The moderately austere diet of the Austins, however, stands in marked contrast to that found in Benedictine priories in the country. As Barbara Harvey's study of Westminster Abbey's Benedictine community shows, the monks there were accustomed to an unusually high volume of food each day, which closely resembled an upper-class diet.\textsuperscript{90} There was a generous allowance of bread, fish, and meat, along with milky foods such as cheese and custards, and an allowance of a gallon of ale a day.\textsuperscript{91} James Clark has similarly noted a rich diet in the Benedictine priory at St Albans in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, with some monks even taking their meals away from the refectory,\textsuperscript{92} something that would have been in contravention of Augustine's \textit{Regula}.

Novices needed to be at least fourteen years old in order to enter,\textsuperscript{93} although that age was dropped to eleven following the onset of the Black Death in 1348, due to the marked

\textsuperscript{85} Jean Mellor and Terry Pearce, \textit{The Augustinian Friary in Leicester: Excavated 1973-1978} (Leicester, 1982), 16. The excavations there discovered a plethora of animal bones from beef, mutton, pork, and venison, suggesting that these cuts of meat were a part of the friars’ typical diet. Oddly, given the nearby river there was a relative scarcity of fish bones in comparison to the profusion of animal bones. Oyster, cockle, mussel, and whelk shells were also found in abundance.

\textsuperscript{86} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{88} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{89} Bennet, \textit{The Early Dominicans}, 150; Hinnebusch, \textit{The Early English Friars Preachers}, 247.


\textsuperscript{91} Ibid., 70-71.

\textsuperscript{92} James Clark, \textit{A Monastic Renaissance at St Albans: Thomas Walsingham and His Circle}, c.1350-1440 (Oxford, 2004), 19, 23.

\textsuperscript{93} Courtenay, \textit{Schools and Scholars}, 73.
drop in the population of OESA communities. In other orders, recruitment age was higher: the Dominicans were not to receive novices younger than eighteen, with strict punishments outlined in the chapters of 1272 and 1283 for those who recruited younger novices, and in 1402, the Dominican prior at Lancaster ordered that the age of admittance be changed to twenty-one. The Black Monks recruited novices from the age of fifteen onwards, although there were many new monks already in their twenties and with significant education, and therefore they proceeded through the initial stages quickly.

During the yearlong novitiate, Austin novices were taught how to follow the Regula and were given the option, at the end of the year, to leave the order if they desired. After this novitiate, the novice professed to God, Mary and the prior and thus became a fully professed member of the OESA.

One would have been expected to have completed primary and secondary education prior to entering the order (although these standards were lax after the Black Death), and for those training in philosophy at a studium particulare (a regional school), at least three years of study were required, although this was often extended to five or even six years. The OESA used the commentaries and guides of Giles of Rome, Gerard of Siena, Thomas of Strasbourg, and Paul of Venice in their philosophical training; this choice of commentaries is likely to have been the only major divergence from the philosophical education of other mendicants. In addition to studia particularia, there was a studium provinciale in each province, at which students were tested before progressing to a studium generale.

Those prepared for higher study would spend five years studying the Bible and Lombard's Sententiae; one year of that study would be spent at a studium generale.

94 Andrews, The Other Friars, 121.
95 Formoy, The Dominican Order in England, 40.
96 Hinnebusch, The Early English Friars Preachers, 266.
97 Parkin, The Friars Preachers in Lancashire, 3.
98 Clark, A Monastic Renaissance at St Albans, 15.
100 Andrews, The Other Friars, 122.
101 Ibid.
102 Courtenay, Schools and Scholars, 73.
103 Ibid.
concursium or provinciale, with the rest spent at a studium generale ordinis at a university convent.105 After at least three years at a university, the student would earn a lectorate, which qualified him to teach at any school belonging to the order, except for universities.106 After achieving the lectorate, the student could progress to a baccalaureate, although this was rare since the university baccalaureate program admitted only one student per order each year.107 This demand was greatest at Paris, where the best students were sent, such as Gregory of Rimini, the most famous Augustinian theologian save Giles of Rome, who had to lecture for twelve years before being admitted to the baccalaureate.108 Oxford and Cambridge were both studia generalia for the Austins, as they were for other mendicants and there are countless examples of Austins being sent to either university, typically for three years, to study theology.109 At Oxford, university-wide theology lectures and examinations were held within the convent of the Austin Friars until 1480, when the university built a separate Divinity School that could accommodate such events.110 It is perhaps significant that until that time, the Austin friary at Oxford was, if only for practical purposes, the centre of theological learning there.

From Neil Ker’s studies of medieval English libraries and the Oxford Medieval Libraries of Great Britain online project, it is possible to know the contents of some of Austin libraries.111 It is the Cambridge library for which we have the most information, which boasted an impressive array of theological texts, including seven texts from Thomas Aquinas.
The library contained numerous texts from Augustine, although primarily theological and exegetical texts such as his *Ennarrationes in Psalmos*, *De Verbis Domini*, and *De Civitate Dei*, rather than his *Confessiones*. They also had other typical theological texts: William of Ockham’s *Summa Logicae*, Isidore of Seville’s *Etymologiae*, Gregory’s *Homiliae* and *Moralia in Job*, Robert Holcot’s *Super Librum Sapientiae*, and Jerome’s *Prologi in Bibliam*. In the usual fashion, they had numerous commentaries on Peter Lombard’s *Sententiae*, including those done by Alexander of Hales, Giles of Rome, and Hannibaldus de Hannibaldis (an Italian Dominican from the thirteenth century). The library contained other texts, which were not unusual, but slightly more distinctive, such as texts by Henry de Suso, a Dominican student of Meister Eckhart, by Thomas de Ringstead, a Dominican from Shrewsbury in the fourteenth century and a popular theological authority, a text concerning canon law by Jean Lemoine (also known as Johannes Monachus) from thirteenth-century France, and Peter of Abano’s thirteenth-century philosophical commentary on Aristotle. It is also interesting that they had a copy of Thomas Bradwardine’s *De Causa Dei*; Heiko Oberman and Damasus Trapp’s famous studies of the *Schola Augustiniana Moderna* connected the fourteenth-century Augustinians with the predestinarian theology of Augustinian Gregory of Rimini and English theologian, Thomas Bradwardine.¹¹² This library also contained a copy of Jacobus de Voragine’s *Legenda Aurea*, a standard text but significant here since it was the basis of Osbern Bokenham’s hagiography, examined in the next chapter. Significant here also is the number of manuscripts they possessed of Giles of Rome, the most celebrated Augustinian theologian and given the title of the order’s *doctor fundatissimus*; the only authors from whom they had more texts were Thomas Aquinas and Augustine himself.

We know little of the contents of other Austin libraries, but we have some insight into those at York, London, Oxford, Lincoln, Newcastle, Grimsby, Warrington, and Droitwich. There are rather fewer theological works in these libraries, but they include
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numerous legal texts, such as William of Pagula’s *Oculus Sacerdotis*, a manual for priests, and the *Hostiensis super quartum decretalium*. There were also poetical texts, such as William of Nassyngton’s *Speculum Vitae* and John of Hauville’s *Architrenius*; historical texts, such as a *Miscellanea Historica*, a *Catalogus et historia regum Angliae*, the histories of the Frankish Freculphus Lexoviensis; along with musical theory writings, namely, Guido’s *De Arte Musica* and Theinred of Dover’s *Tractatus de Musica*. The London house had a copy of Ranulph of Higden’s *Polychronicon*, the text which formed the basis of Osbern Bokenham’s *Mappula Angliae*, written at Clare; the manuscript was one of many donated to the library by the Austin John Lowe, who was a member of the London friary before he was appointed bishop of St Asaph. The Droitwich house had two books of sermons, attesting to the interest of the Austin Friars in preaching and pastoral care. Significantly, the Oxford convent had a copy of the Augustinian *Constitutions* and the Droitwich convent possessed several works by Augustine, including the *Confessiones*, marking their familiarity with Augustine’s own words about his life. The foundation at Newcastle owned a collection of saints’ lives from the twelfth century, in which can be found Possidius’ account of the life of their founder, Augustine. The small friary at Little Yarmouth was reputed to have had one of the most important libraries in the province; it was alleged by William Worcester’s *Itineraries* and the eighteenth-century *Dictionarium Angliae Topographicum et Historicum* to have contained precious and rare works, including beautifully illustrated missals, a Gospel dating from the tenth century, and Greek manuscripts also from the tenth century.113 The collection of manuscripts had been gathered together by the prior of the convent John Brom in the reign of Henry VI.114

The OESA developed academically much in the same way as other mendicant orders, and although they were not as prominent in the universities as were the Franciscans or

114 Lambarde, *Dictionarium Angliae Topographicum et Historicum*, 136; for a reference to Brom as prior see Dd 4 fol. 136 (consulted via RothSources, 303-4, D 734), where he is permitted to be free from cure of souls.
Dominicans, they boasted several well-respected theologians. The contents of the university libraries of other mendicant orders reveal a slightly different emphasis in theological training; both the Dominicans and the Franciscans in both Oxford and Cambridge showed a marked preference for late-medieval theology produced by their own order. Whilst this was also true for the Austins, who kept many manuscripts of the work of their famed theologian, Giles of Rome, the degree to which this was done by the two larger orders is noteworthy. The Dominicans at Oxford and Cambridge had a high proportion of texts from Dominican theological writers, such as Rainerius of Pisa, John of Freiburg, Nicholas of Gorran, Bartholomew of San Concordio, and English friar Richard Fishacre, in addition to the numerous manuscripts of works by their most famous theologian, Thomas Aquinas. Their texts from non-Dominican authors tended to be patristic or early medieval texts, from authors such as Caesarius of Arles, Anselm, Gregory the Great, and Bernard of Clairvaux. The Franciscans mirrored these emphases; they owned texts from continental Franciscan writers such as Bonaventure, Duns Scotus, Antonius Andreas, Nicholas of Lyra, Pelbartus Ladislaus of Temesvár, and Matthaeus of Boulogne, along with those by English Franciscans John Pecham, William of Occam, Nicholas of Occam, Richard Connington, William Woodford, and even Robert Grosseteste (not a Franciscan himself, but deeply implicated with Oxford Franciscan theology). Although they kept more Franciscan texts, they did also have books by Dominicans Thomas Aquinas, Hugh of St Cher, Nicholas of Gorran, and Reginald of Piperno. They also possessed traditional theological texts from Augustine, Gregory, Bernard, Boethius, Isidore, and Eusebius, alongside some classical authors such as Vergil and Aristotle. By contrast, there are few remaining texts from the Cambridge and Oxford Carmelite communities; we know of only four manuscripts, one from Haly Abenragel, an Arabic astrologer from Tunisia; a medical text on women; a martyrology; and Jerome on the Gospel of Matthew. We know much more from their London convent,

but this collection shows little preference for Carmelite theologians.\textsuperscript{118} Other than a text by Carmelite John Baconthorpe, this library contained works by Martin of Opava, a Dominican from Poland; Peter Aureolus; Ivo of Chartres; Ralph Niger; Freculphus; John Cassian; Clement of Llanthony; Rabanus Maurus; Bernard of Clairvaux; Jerome; and Hugh of St Victor.

The libraries of the Dominicans and the Franciscans show the Austin libraries to be unremarkable, with a comprehensive coverage, from early Patristic texts to more modern theological commentaries. We might tentatively suggest that the Austin libraries displayed a great variety in genre of text, perhaps slightly more than the Dominican and Franciscans who tended to prefer recent scholastic theology produced by members of their own order. The number of continental texts at each of these libraries suggests frequent international traffic in books and ideas, although the \textit{ex libris} inscriptions for the majority of these manuscripts suggests that they were owned by English friars studying at the universities, rather than foreign friars who had come to England to study. It is significant to remember, however, that the secular orders far surpassed the mendicant orders in library contents; whereas we have a record of 68 manuscripts belonging to the Austins, 45 to the Carmelites, 120 to the Dominicans, and 238 to the Franciscans, for the Canons we have records of 670 texts and the number of manuscripts for the English Benedictines numbers in the thousands.

Despite being considered a mendicant order, these libraries were filled with manuscripts owned personally by friars, rather than by the convent as a whole. In Cambridge we find manuscripts owned by friars Adam Stockton, Thomas Swillington, Robert Mendham, Henry Stockton, Adam Denton, John Taylor, John de Clare, Ralph Pakenham, John Necton, John Toneys, John Bury, Edmund Bellond (the infamous prior of London discussed in later chapters), and John Longspey. Other libraries included manuscripts owned by friars John Bury, John Banard, John Denton, John Daniel, John Lowe (the Bishop of St Asaph, and later of Rochester), Jacob Andrew, Thomas Wyman, Edward Soppeth, Richard Strynger, Thomas Penketh (the eventual prior provincial and

extoller of Richard III), and John Erghome. Evidence such as this of individual ownership runs counter to the mendicant ideal and suggests that the Austins took a lax approach to the maintenance of poverty, perhaps seeing it as an exhortation to moderation.

The obscurity of the *Regula* precipitated a crisis of Augustinian religion and heritage. Why did the Austin Friars maintain links with an eremitical lifestyle that they did not practice and that was not avowed in Augustine’s own monastic rule? Forced to delineate who they were in relation to Augustine, his followers, and to a broader concept of Augustinianism, the Austin Friars defined their order, lifestyle, and religion in conjunction with how they defined the person and influence of Augustine. This self-definition became necessary with the advent of monastic competition and transformed with the inroads of antagonism with the Austin Canons Regular.

III. Self-Definition

*European Augustinian Tradition*

The Augustinian Hermits found themselves implicated in a long, vitriolic dispute with the Augustinian Canons Regular from 1327, when Pope John XXII’s bull *Veneranda Sanctorum* granted the Hermits the right to share the services at San Pietro in Ciel D’Oro and the custody of the relics of Augustine housed there. San Pietro was a house of Augustinian Canons Regular in Pavia, a Ghibelline commune, which had, until that point, enjoyed sole possession of the monastery and the body of Augustine. The bull decreed that the Canons were to receive the Hermits with good will and share their house with them until the Hermits were able to complete their own.

The Canons Regular were displeased with this development, particularly over the shared custody of Augustine. The Commune of Pavia called it a useless *novitas*, and even Jordan of Quedlinburg recognised it as unusual. The conflict escalated as the two orders disputed who had the right to say mass on the feast day of Augustine, to receive offerings,

---

119 *CDOESAP*, 14 (31-33).
121 See *CDOESAP*, 11 (26-28); Saak, *High Way to Heaven*, 164.
122 Jordan of Quedlinburg, *Liber Vitasfratrum*, 1,18 (74-76).
and to hear confessions, and thus there were both devotional and economic aspects to the acrimony. John XXII, in a ridiculous attempt at compromise that was bound to lead to conflict, gave the Canons priority in pastoral care, but ordained that the two orders were to split all income. The income of the Canons was unceremoniously halved and their unique access to the body of Augustine rescinded.

It was within this setting that the Hermits engaged in an apologetic campaign defending their Augustinian roots and way of life, the texts of which explicate their views on their origins and how their order fit within the larger framework of monasticism and Christendom. Here, one first encounters the OESA’s articulation of itself of the true and only sons of Augustine, excluding all other religious orders from any claim to genuine Augustinianism. These texts, the anonymous *Vita Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi* written between 1322 and 1331, the anonymous *Initium sive Processus Ordinis Heremitarum Sancti Augustini* of 1330, Nicholas of Alessandria’s *Sermo de beato Augustino* from the mid-1330s, Henry of Friemar’s *Tractatus de origine et progressu Ordinis fratum heremitarum sancti Augustini et vero ac proprio titulo eiusdem*, written in 1334 at the end of his career, and Jordan of Quedlinburg’s *Vita Sancti Augustini* from the late 1330s, codified the intricacies of Augustinian life. This collection of writings about

---

126 The manuscript for this text is Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, MS Plut. 90 Sup. 48, fols. 57v-62v. The text can be found in the edition Balbino Rano, “Las Dos Primeras Obras Conocidas sobre el Orígen de la Ordén Augustiniana,” *AAug* 45 (1982): 331-376, from 337-351.
127 The manuscript for this text is Prague, Clementum, Metropolitan Chapter Library, MS Metr. Kap. 812, fols. 35v-40r. The text can be found in the edition in Balbino Rano, “Las dos Primeras Obras Conocidas sobre el Orígen de la Ordén Augustiniana,” *AAug*, 45 (1982): 331-376, from 352-76. This tentative dating is supplied by Saak (*High Way to Heaven*, 201), who uses Nicholas of Alessandria’s involvement in the proceedings between the Canons and Hermits as the motivation behind his authorship.
129 The manuscript for this text is Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, MS 251, fol. 1rb-104v and can be found printed in Saak, *High Way to Heaven*, Appendix D, 774-810. See R. Arbesmann, “Jordanus of Saxony’s *Vita S. Augustini*: The Source for John Capgrave’s *Life of St. Augustine*,” *Traditio* 1 (1943):
the life of Augustine and his monastic foundations, originating from the OESA over a span of twenty years in the fourteenth century, which I refer to as the ‘Augustinian Tradition,’ represent a culmination of the views of the Hermits on the religious character of their putative founder and of the origins and mission of their own communities.

The narratives of the foundation of the OESA contain many variations, but generally, the first four texts are relatively comparable whilst the fifth, Jordan of Quedlinburg’s text, is substantially different. This is likely the result of the choice of source material used by the authors, given the rich tradition of hagiographies of Augustine. The first four texts were based primarily around the hagiographies of Augustine written by Possidius, Jacobus of Voragine, and Philip of Harvengt. Jordan of Quedlinburg, however, stated that his goal was to follow the words of Augustine himself as closely as possible, and therefore made use primarily of the Confessiones and the pseudo-Augustinian Sermones Ad Fratres in Eremo, supplemented by the texts of Philip of Harvengt, Possidius, and Datus of Milan. Jordan’s narrative therefore takes on a markedly different form from the other four, which use the Confessiones rather sparingly and focus much more on Augustine’s life after the composition of his autobiography.

The anonymous Vita Aurelii Augustini Hippomensis Episcopi was likely written sometime between 1322 and 1331, and is a narration of Augustine’s life and collections of passages from religious sources praising Augustine. The tensions with the Canons Regular are already clear, which can be seen in a comment that the Canons professed the Rule only ex devotione, finding their origins with St Rufus in eleventh-century France. The author inserted the episodes connecting Augustine to monasticism, the first of which is of

341-355. There has been some debate regarding the date of authorship of this text, with Hümpfner assigning it a date of 1319-1322 (Winfridus Hümpfner, “Introduction,” in Jordani de Saxonia Liber Vitasfratrum, ed. Winfridus Hümpfner and Rudolph Arbesmann (New York: 1943), i-xci at xxiv) whereas Walsh has argued for the late 1330s, as it was at that time that Jordan was working with Henry of Friemar (Katharine Walsh, “Wie ein Bettelorden zu (s)einem Gründer kam. Fingierte Traditionen um die Entstehung der Augustiner-Eremiten,” in Fälschungen im Mittelalter (Hanover, 1988): 5:585-610). Her date has largely been found more acceptable.

130 Saak, High Way to Heaven, 781.
132 Saak, High Way to Heaven, 189.
133 Ibid., 352.
Augustine’s baptism, at which he and Ambrose spontaneously compose the *Te Deum Laudamus* in alternating verse and in which Augustine dons a monastic habit, signifying that Augustine’s conversion to Christianity was simultaneously a conversion to eremitism. In the second, Augustine and his friends discover an eremitical community in Tuscany and decide to live there; it is for this specific community that Augustine composed his Rule. Lastly, a monastery founded by Augustine in Valerius’ garden after his ordination is also mentioned.

The same author likely composed the next text, the *Initium sive Processus Ordinis Heremitarum Sancti Augustini*, around 1330. This text provides more biographical information about Augustine than the previous, particularly about the composition of the *Regula* and his early forays into asceticism. The author also devoted more time to the proliferation of Augustinian orders; he used Jerome’s *Vita Sancti Pauli Primi Eremitae* as his point of departure to argue that any form of eremitical practice finds its origins and religious example directly with SS Paul of Thebes and Antony, and likened the founders of religious orders to the Old Testament patriarchs, with Augustine representing the figure of Noah. By discussing monasticism in this context of the inter-connectedness of different ascetical traditions, the author was able to locate Augustine and the OESA within a wider tradition of eremitism.

The author asserted that Augustine’s foundation of a monastery in Italy “reveal him most clearly not only to be the father of the hermits, but truly to have been a hermit

---

135 Ibid., 341.
136 Ibid., 348.
139 Rano, “Las Dos Primeras Obras,” 345-6. “Per Noë, qui archam Domini, ut salvaretur genus humanum, intravit, beatus Augustinus intelligitur, qui, intrans Dei Ecclesiam, humanum genus ab hereticis liberavit. Cui sunt tres filii: Sen, qui nominatur interpretator; Cam, calidus; Iaphet, latitudo. Per quos triplex genus Augustinum sequentium designator. Nam per Sen intelliguntur canonici regulares, qui sub eius regulam militant. Per Cam, qui ex amoris calore vitam et regulam Augustini sequuntur. Sed per Iaphet, fratres isti heremite, qui ex quo ad terras venerunt exemplo sancte vite et scientie claritate multiplicati mundum comprehendunt.”
himself.”  The beginnings of plausible connections of Augustine with the Augustinian order were starting to emerge, with emphasis on an Italian foundation, which could then serve as the forerunner of the disparate eremitical groups that were unified by Pope Alexander IV in 1256. This second foundation of the order – its *status modernus* as opposed to *antiquus* – is characterised with the scene of Alexander’s vision of Augustine: Augustine appears to the pope with a small body and a large head, which Alexander interprets as Augustine exhorting him to unite his religious followers.

Nicholas of Alessandria’s *Sermo de beato Augustino* was written precisely when the Hermits and Canons were in conflict over their origins and the relics of Augustine. In Nicholas’ framework, Augustine passes through four phases. Firstly, he encounters the eremitical life through Simplicianus whilst in Milan; secondly, he experiences this lifestyle firsthand by spending two years in the eremitical community of Centumcellae. Thirdly, he establishes the community in the garden of the bishop Valerius in Hippo; and fourthly, once he became a bishop, he founds many more monastic communities. According to Nicholas, Augustine brought the eremitical lifestyle specifically to the Italian community at Centumcellae, as Augustine came across those hermits whilst travelling back to Africa and there composed his monastic Rule. From this point on, claimed Nicholas, “they have been called the eremitical brothers of St Augustine because of that Rule, since they were first only called hermits.” Thus, in this framework, Augustine’s monastic rule qualified their eremitism and adapted it specifically to the Augustinian way. Nicholas also used Alexander IV’s vision of Augustine as proof of their descent from the Church Father. According to

---

144 *Ibid.* “Et ex tunc vocati sunt fratres heremite Augustini ratione regule date qui prius heremite tantummodo dicebantur.”
145 The *Sermo*’s account of this scene can be found in *ibid.*, 372: “Tempore Innocentii quarti prior generalis fuit frater Aiutus de Garfagnana. Tempore Allexandri quarti, frater Philippus de Parrana. Quo tempore beatus Augustinus dicto pape Allexandro in visione apparuit grandis capite, sed membris exilis, ut ipse Papa testatus est, ex quo motus fuit dicto nostro Ordini unire plures alios Ordines qui errant aliqualiter heremite, scilicet britones et sabarios, inter quos multi sic uniti errant in marchia Anchonitana, guillermitas et jambonitas.”
Nicholas, other orders who used the *Regula* could rightly be called his brothers, but only the Hermits, who were born immediately from him, could be called his sons.\(^{146}\)

Henry of Friemar’s *Tractatus de origine et progressu Ordinis fratrum heremitarum sancti Augustini et vero ac proprio titulo eiusdem* was composed in 1334,\(^{147}\) and follows the narrative established by Nicholas of Alessandria, using some passages verbatim, including an excerpt from Joachim of Fiore to portray the OESA as a fulfilment of Joachimist expectations and a citation from Nicholas describing the stay of St Francis at an Augustinian hermitage.\(^{148}\) As far as the Grand Union of 1256, Henry included an account of Alexander’s vision of Augustine strikingly similar to the one in the *Sermo* (itself based on the one found in the *Initium*), highlighting Henry’s familiarity with the work of Nicholas of Alessandria.\(^{149}\)

Lastly, Jordan of Quedlinburg’s text was written in the later 1330s.\(^{150}\) Jordan, unlike the previous four, used the *Confessiones* as his main source for his life of Augustine, and therefore made no claims of monastic communities founded by Augustine in Italy, speaking directly only to his communities in Hippo.\(^{151}\) Jordan’s argument as to the Augustinianism of the OESA is rather subtler than that of the previous four authors; for Jordan, it is not necessarily foundation by Augustine that it is essential for their Augustinianism, but rather their subscription to the religious lifestyle practiced by Augustine. Jordan’s text is the apogee of the European Augustinian texts that see

---

\(^{146}\) *Ibid.*, 363. “Fratres eius dici possunt omnes illi qui sub regula ipsius novos Ordines construxerunt. [...] Sed nos sumus filii immediate ab eo geniti, ideo plene portamus signum ipsius, scilicet habitum quo usus fuit statim post conversionem.”

\(^{147}\) Henry of Friemar, “Tractatus,” 90-121.

\(^{148}\) *Ibid.*, 112. “Circa quod tempus beatus Franciscus cum dictis fratribus habitavit; et quidam asserunt, quod fuerit frater dicti ordinis in loco sancti Jacobi de Aquaviva iuxta Pisas.”

\(^{149}\) Henry’s account of the vision is as follows (Henry of Friemar, “Tractatus,” 103): “Nam tempore Alexandri pape IV, ut ipsemet testatus est, beatus Augustinus eidem in vision apparuit grandis quidem capute sed membris exilis. Ex qua vision tamquam divino oraculo ipse papa commonitus univit fratibus eremitis sancti Augustini plures alios ordinis similiter in eremis habitantes, mandans ipsis ut, quicumque ex eis essent idonei ad fructificandum in populo per doctrinam verbi divini, quod illi deherent in civitatis habitare et exemplari vita ac salutary doctrina simulque confessione PROVIDA DEI POPULUM IRRIGARE ALIS FRATIBUS NIHILOMINUS SECUNDUM DISPOSITIONEM PRIORIS GENERALIS IN EREMO REMANENTIBUS, MUNIENS EOS PRIVILEGIIS ET GRATIS TALI STATUI CONGRUENTIBUS. In qua quidem vision beatus Augustinus aperte ostendit se esse verum caput et verum patrem huius ordinis et per consequens ipsos fratres esse veros filios et vera membra ipsius.”

\(^{150}\) Hümpfner, “Introduction,” xxiv; Walsh, “Wie ein Bettelorden zu (s)einem Gründer kam,” 5: 599.

\(^{151}\) Arbesmann, “Jordanus of Saxony’s *Vita S. Augustini*” 345.
Augustine’s own religious practice as central to their lifestyle and to their claims of genuine Augustinianism.

The Augustinian Tradition described here displays the exclusivity of the Hermits’ claim to Augustinianism; their statement that they were the only and true sons of Augustine implied that no other Christian group had a right to participate in the Augustinian lifestyle. The conservatism of the Hermits thus confined Augustine’s influence, collapsing it into the eremitical example, removing aspects of Augustine’s own narrative about his life that spoke to different genres of religious experiences.

**Conflict with the Austin Canons in England**

If the conflict with the Canons Regular in Pavia was the impetus behind the Augustinian Hermits’ definition of their religious life in fourteenth-century Italy, what implications does that conflict have for the Austin Friars in England a century later? Whilst there was undoubtedly some monastic rivalry between the English Austin Friars and Canons, the literary efforts of John Capgrave contributed to tempering the quarrel. Emphasis on the exclusivity of the OESA’s claim to Augustine is simply not seen within Capgrave’s work and pains are made to rehabilitate the strained relationship with the Canons. It could be argued that Capgrave’s efforts are evidence of tension between these orders, which necessitated action on his part, but the lack of corroborating contemporaneous evidence pointing to hostility suggests that Capgrave’s main focus was the lingering tension from the Pavian conflict.

The best evidence for the English context of this conflict is in the *De Vita Evangelica* of Geoffrey Hardeby, a respected Austin theologian who lived from 1320 to 1385. His treatise is in part a response to claims put forward by the Austin Canons regarding which order had genuine recourse to Augustine, arguing that the OESA was indeed justified in its claim that Augustine was its founder.\(^\text{152}\) Aubrey Gwynn used Hardeby’s treatise as evidence for the *De Vita Evangelica*, see Katharine Walsh, *The De Vita Evangelica of Geoffrey Hardeby, O.E.S.A (c.1320-c.1385): a study in the mendicant controversies of the fourteenth century* (Roma, 1972). See also Gwynn, *The English Austin Friars*, 94.
for the depth of the acrimony in England between the orders; according to Gwynn, this
treatise was

of interest as showing that the rivalry between the Austin Canons and Austin
Friars was as acute in England as it was in France and Italy, where the two
orders were never weary of asserting their rival claims to the honour of so
great a founder.\textsuperscript{153}

Hardeby wrote this text in response to two pieces of writing in defence of the Canons
Regular, one (now lost) by an anonymous doctor, and the \textit{De Statu Sui Ordinis}, written by a
Canon.\textsuperscript{154} However, Hardeby’s tone in the last three chapters of the \textit{De Vita Evangelica},
wherein he addressed the rivalry with the Canons, is much less vitriolic in tone than the
Augustinian Tradition. Whereas the European Augustinians mocked any possibility of the
Canons Regular having been founded by Augustine, pointing instead to their establishment
by St Rufus in eleventh-century France,\textsuperscript{155} Hardeby treated his opponents courteously,
ending his treatise with an appeal for forgiveness should he have offended any canons.\textsuperscript{156}

The conflict resurfaced in the fifteenth-century in a manuscript composed by John
Strecche,\textsuperscript{157} a Canon from Kenilworth,\textsuperscript{158} and the prior at Brooke in Rutland from 1407.\textsuperscript{159}
The manuscript of note here, is a miscellany, composed at a similar time.\textsuperscript{160} In this
miscellany, the first few entries are about the Augustinian Canons, including verses against
the Austin Friars for their claims regarding their legacy from Augustine.\textsuperscript{161} Strecche was
concerned with Augustine’s foundation of the Canons, arguing that the OESA was not
established by him directly.\textsuperscript{162} Another manuscript features a contemporaneous exposition of

\textsuperscript{153} Gwynn, \textit{The English Austin Friars}, 94.
\textsuperscript{154} Oxford, Bodl. MS Digby 113, fol. 105r for Hardeby’s statement regarding his intended audience.
\textsuperscript{155} Arbesmann, “\textit{The Vita Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi},” 352; Rano, “Las Dos Primeras
Obras,” 369-70.
\textsuperscript{156} Oxford, Bodl., MS Digby 113, fol. 117r. Translation is from Gwynn, \textit{The English Austin Friars}, 95.
\textsuperscript{157} London, BL MS Add. 38665, fols. 5r-14v.
\textsuperscript{158} Geoff Hilton, \textit{John Strecche, Canon of Kenilworth: the life and times of a medieval historian
(Kenilworth, 2004), 9.}
\textsuperscript{159} Harry Sunley and Norman Stevens, \textit{Kenilworth, the Story of the Abbey (Kenilworth, 1995), 34. See
VCH: Rutland, 161; Frank Taylor, \textit{The Chronicle of John Strecche for the Reign of Henry V (1414-1422)
(Manchester, 1932), 4.}
\textsuperscript{160} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{161} Hilton, \textit{John Strecche Canon of Kenilworth, 7; London, BL MS Add. 38665, fols. 5r-14v. The
miscellany contains verses against Austin Friars (fols. 5r-14v), a list of Augustinian priors (fols. 15r-18v), and
chronicles of some Augustinian chapters (fols. 19r-32v).
\textsuperscript{162} Strecche states, on fol. 5v, “Augustinus pater numquam fueris heremita.”
the Augustinianism of the Austin Friars, in response to the claims made by the Canons.\textsuperscript{163} The verses against the Canons are a direct excerpt from Henry of Friemar’s \textit{Tractatus} rather than an original composition.\textsuperscript{164}

The largest source of evidence for the fifteenth-century situation between the English Austin Friars and Canons is the collected works of John Capgrave, the sometime prior provincial of the Austin Friars and prior of the convent at King’s Lynn. His exposition of the relationship is visible predominantly in his hagiographical works, which, with the exception of his \textit{Life of Saint Katharine}, are all about the lives of founders of Augustinian orders. Capgrave’s \textit{Life of Saint Augustine}, supplemented by his \textit{A Treatise of the orders under the Rule of Augustine},\textsuperscript{165} in which he discussed the institution of the twelve religious orders that followed Augustine’s monastic rule, his \textit{Life of Saint Gilbert},\textsuperscript{166} and his \textit{Life of St Norbert},\textsuperscript{167} reveals the degree to which this conflict had tempered.

In his exposition of the life of Augustine, Capgrave described Augustine gathering several clerics to live with him in a canonical lifestyle, maintaining a monastic life but still catering to the needs of the laity and the parochial community.\textsuperscript{168} Capgrave was explicit that it was this community from which the Canons originated and contravened the earlier claim that the Canons, in finding their origins with St Rufus, had no connection with Augustine at all. In his \textit{Treatise}, Capgrave maintained that the Canons did originate with the Church Father, only to be reformed later by St Rufus.\textsuperscript{169}

\textsuperscript{163} London, BL MS Harley 2386, fols. 60r, 62r-64r.
\textsuperscript{167} John Capgrave, \textit{The Life of St. Norbert}, ed. Cyril Lawrence Smetana (Toronto, 1977). The original manuscript can be found in San Marino, HL, MS HM 55.
\textsuperscript{168} John Capgrave, \textit{Life of St Augustine by John Capgrave}, ed. Cyril Lawrence Smetana (Toronto, 2001), 59.
\textsuperscript{169} \textit{Ibid.}, 146-147. The five Pavian texts repeatedly claimed that the Austin Canons Regular were, in fact, founded by St Rufus in France in the eleventh century, and thus had no legitimate claims to Augustinianism. For example, see Rano, “Las Dos Primeras Obras,” 341 and 369-70.
This may be an effort on the part of Capgrave to rehabilitate the relationship between the two Augustinian orders and to stem some of the acrimony over the legitimacy of their respective Augustinianism. This desire is clear from his description of the foundation of the Hermits in the same text:

And þis Iudas eke may be referred on-to þoo heremites þat Seynt Augustin mad ny iij jere be-for þat he was bishop at Ypone, and mad þere chanones. This mater is proued with grete euydens in þe book whech I mad to þe abbot of Seynt Iames at Northampton in Latin, whch boke I named Concordia, because it is mad to reforme charite be-twix Seynt Augustines heremites and his chanones.170 [emphasis mine]

Capgrave made reference here to a text, no longer extant, the Concordia, dedicated to the abbot of the community of Canons Regular in Northampton, in which he apparently wrote extensively on the origins of his own order and of the Canons.171 Whereas the Hermits discounted all canonical claims to Augustinian heritage, Capgrave saw a legitimate place for them within the family of Augustinian monasticism.

Capgrave's positive engagement with the lives of the founders of the Premonstratensians and the Gilbertines, the male component of which belonged to the Canons Regular, displays a willingness to cooperate with other orders that followed the Regula Sancti Augustini and to foster a cross-monastic sense of the Augustinian religion. His Life of St Norbert was commissioned by John Wygenhale, the Premonstratensian abbot of West Dereham, Norfolk, and completed in 1440,172 and the Life of St Gilbert of
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170 Capgrave, “A Treatise of the Orders under the Rule of St Augustine,” 145-146.
171 Bale recorded in his Index having seen a copy of the Concordia in the library of Thomas Keys (IndexBS, 188) and noted the intended recipient as John Watford, the abbot of the Canons Regular at St James, Northampton. There is little documentation of John Watford, and his connection to Capgrave is uncertain, although they may have been students at Cambridge together, even though there is no obvious record of him in A.B. Emden’s BRUC. Watford, alias Margyory, was elected prior of St James on 16 July 1430 (CPR 1429-36 [1430], 68), and remained in that position until his death in 1445. See VCH: Northampton, 2:147.
172 There has been considerable debate surrounding the date of this text, with Peter Lucas arguing that it was completed in the early 1420s (Peter Lucas, “On the Date of John Capgrave’s Life of St Norbert” The Library 3 (1981): 328-30). In Capgrave’s Treatise, he stated that he would not discuss the Premonstratensian order since he had done so elsewhere, in a life of St Norbert, their founder, which had been composed “in English to the abbot of Derham that deyid last.” (Capgrave, “A Treatise of the orders under the Rule of Augustine,” 147). With the additional evidence of a testament from a John Wygenhale, alias Saresson, dated to 1461 and probated in 1462, Lucas concludes that Wygenhale cannot have been the originally intended recipient of the text even though he was named in the epilogue, since he was not the recently deceased abbot of West Dereham at the time of the composition of the Treatise in 1422. Joseph Gribbi refutes this claim and argues that the testament in question belongs to a different John Wygenhale, who was a secular priest of noble birth and not a
Sempringham was composed in 1451 at the behest of Nicholas Reysby of Sempringham, head of the English Gilbertines.\textsuperscript{173} That Capgrave composed Lives of founders of two rival Augustinian orders speaks to his desire to rehabilitate the relationship of the Austin Friars with their fellow monastic orders.

Capgrave’s attitude to the Canons Regular represents a stark change from the harsh polemic of fourteenth-century Pavia. The acrimony was much more subdued in fifteenth-century England, attested by fewer, but more conciliatory, texts discussing the rivalry. Those texts that did promote hostility relied almost entirely on the Pavian compositions, and it was only Capgrave who made any reconsiderations of the issue and he directed the Austin Friars towards a more mollifying stance, recognising a legitimate place within Augustinian spirituality for the Canons. Even Geoffrey Hardeby, whose writing Aubrey Gwynn used as a clear indication of canonical-fraternal hostility, was consciously more agreeable than any of the writings involved in the Pavian conflict.

Conclusions

The ambiguity surrounding the religious culture of the Austin Friars mirrors the variability of their foundation and religious inspiration. The Austin Friars were an amalgamation of small and disparate eremitical groups united under a notoriously elusive and concise monastic rule and transplanted from their hermitages into cities as mendicants. They needed a definition of their religious platform in the face of monastic rivalry and attempts by the institutional church to curtail the proliferation of religious orders. Their humble origins lacked the religious gravitas to persuade others of their antiquity, and so they expanded

---

\textsuperscript{173} See page 50, note 166.
upon their historiography, clarifying their connection to Augustine and codifying the nature of their own Augustinianism. Many of the tensions visible within the lifestyle and development of this order are the result of nebulous beginnings, an unclear mission, and a monastic rule that served as an inner spiritual guide rather than as a prescriptive outline for daily practice.
Chapter 2: Augustinian Religion

John Capgrave’s *Life of St Augustine* and Osbern Bokenham’s *The Lyf of Seynt Austyn the Doctour*, taken from his translation of the *Legenda Aurea*, are the only extant texts from the English Austin Friars detailing the life of Augustine of Hippo, their order’s putative founder.¹ These two texts thus provide unique insight into the English Augustinian religion with regard to their order’s relationship to the life of Augustine of Hippo and to their monastic origins. Within these texts, Capgrave and Bokenham detailed their expectations of the religious life of their monastic order by recounting the life of the paradigmatic Augustinian himself and thus wrote in consideration of their own monastic origins.

The character of Augustine constructed by Capgrave and Bokenham represents an intriguing compilation of medieval literature on Augustine, unlike any other in early- to late-medieval hagiography of the Church Father.² Capgrave and Bokenham emphasised the aspects of Augustine’s life that they found most compelling, and built an ideal ‘Augustinian’ life by showcasing the religious preferences of the saint as analogous to the monastic lifestyle of the authors’ own community. Whilst the European Augustinians maintained a strict definition of Augustine’s religious example as uniquely eremitical, Capgrave and Bokenham highlighted different aspects of Augustine’s life, de-emphasising the significance of his eremitical lifestyle. The English Austin Friars were open to a variety of interpretations of the life of Augustine and his monastic legacy, not erasing aspects of his life in order to stress the establishment of his monastic communities.

I. Capgrave and Bokenham in the Augustinian Order

A line from Capgrave’s *Life of St Katharine* makes his birthplace clear, stating that “my

¹ Capgrave’s *Life of Saint Augustine* can be found in London, BL MS Add. 36704, fols. 5r-45. This text is bound with Capgrave’s *Life of St Gilbert of Sempringham* and *A Treatise of the Orders under the Rule of St Augustine*, drawn from a sermon given by Capgrave at Cambridge in 1422. Bokenham’s translation of the *Legenda Aurea* is found in Edinburgh, Advocates Library, MS Abbotsford, fols. 170v-174v.

² As we shall see, Capgrave and Bokenham’s hagiographies differ not only from existing Augustinian hagiographies of Augustine, but also from those of Possidius, Jacobus de Voragine, Philip of Harvengt, and others.
cuntre is northfolke, of the town of lynne," and his name may refer to Copgrove, a small village in the West Riding. He was born in 1393, given his reference in his *Abbreviacion of Chronicles* to his birth in the seventeenth year of Richard II’s reign. Capgrave was likely ordained to the priesthood in either 1416 or 1417, and shortly after his ordination, he was sent to study at the *studium concursorum* of the order in London. In 1422, he moved to Cambridge for his baccalaureate once the prior provincial had appointed him as a lector. Capgrave was undoubtedly successful in his studies, given his later reputation for learning: Bale, Leland, and Pamphilus all tell us in the same words that he stuck to his books “like a limpet to its rock,” a phrase used as well by Capgrave himself in his description of fellow Augustinian Henry of Friemar. Capgrave stayed in Cambridge at least until 1429 to complete his *Super libros Sententiarum*, *Determinatio theologicae*, and *Ad positiones erroneas* (all now lost), as well as four volumes of commentary on the book of Kings, which he dedicated to his prior provincial from 1425-1433, John Lowe, later bishop of St Asaph.

In 1440, Capgrave wrote the *Life of St Norbert*, and the following year, he attended the laying of the foundation stone of King’s College Cambridge, founded by King Henry VI himself. Around the same time he completed his (now lost) *Concordia or De Augustino et sequacibus*, wrote the *Life of St Katharine* in 1445, and wrote his *De Liber Illustribus*.

---

7 Dd 4, fol. 55r (consulted via RothSources, 298 (D 720)).
Henricis, dedicated to King Henry VI, in 1446.\textsuperscript{14} Capgrave’s pilgrimage to Rome, funded by Sir Thomas Tuddenham and related in his Ye Solace of Pilgrims, likely took place in 1450.\textsuperscript{15} The year following, he wrote the Life of St Augustine and the Life of St Gilbert of Sempringham.\textsuperscript{16}

In 1453, John Capgrave was elected Prior Provincial,\textsuperscript{17} and was unanimously re-elected two years later.\textsuperscript{18} In 1462, he produced his Abbreviacion of Cronicles, the first history of England written in the vernacular, and specifically in the dialect of Norfolk.\textsuperscript{19} He also wrote three treatises, De Fidei Symbolis, Commentarius in Actus Apostolorum, and Commentarius in Apocalypsim S. Ioannis, dedicated to well-known humanist Bishop William Grey.\textsuperscript{20} Capgrave’s early biographers make mention of other works which no longer remain extant: Commentarius in Leviticum, Numeros, Deuteronomium, historiam Josuae, Judices et Ruth, Psalterium, Ecclesiasten, Isaiam, Danieleam, XII Prophetas minors, IV Evangelia, Epistulas canonicas; De Illustribus viris OESA, Orationes ad clerum, Sermones

\textsuperscript{14} For the Concordia, see De Meijer, “John Capgrave,” 414. See also Leland, Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britannicis, 2:454: “Vita divi Augustini, ad Ioannem Cauterofordum, abbatem fami Ioannis, quod Avonae mediterranea celebre est.” In the prologue to the Life of St Katharine in Osbern Bokenham’s Legendys of Hooly Wummen (ed. M. Serjeantson (London, 1938), 173-74), he states: “My fadrys book, Maystir Ioon Capgrave, Wych that but newly compylyd he.” The Life of Katherine is after that of Mary Magdalene, which he composed in 1445 for the Countess of Eu (see ibid., 136, 139), so Capgrave probably wrote his soon before, given the phrase “newly compylyd.” See also Peter Lucas, From Author to Audience: John Capgrave and Medieval Publication (Dublin, 1997), 141. In regards to the Liber de Illustribus Henricis, the last historical event mentioned in this work is the visit of King Henry VI to Lynn, August 1446. De Meijer (“John Capgrave,” 417) supposes that since Capgrave does not mention the death of Duke Humphrey (February 1447) that it must have been completed before then.

\textsuperscript{15} The evidence for Tuddenham’s sponsorship of Capgrave can be found in Capgrave’s Ye Solace of Pilgrimes. In his prologue, Capgrave dedicated the text to “all men of my of my nacioun þat schal rede þis present book and namely on to my special maystr sir thomas tudenham undyr whos procecioun my pilgrimage was specialy sped [...]” (John Capgrave, Ye Solace of Pilgrims, ed. C.A. Mills (London, 1911), 1-2.) Furnivall thought Capgrave went to Rome between 1422 and 1437, but since the discovery of Ye Solace of Pilgrimages in the Bodleian Library, this supposition is no longer tenable. See Capgrave, Ye Solace of Pilgrims, xv.

\textsuperscript{16} De Meijer, “John Capgrave,” 424.

\textsuperscript{17} Dd 6, fol. 16r (consulted via RothSources, 333; D 826).

\textsuperscript{18} Edmund Colledge, “John Capgrave’s Literary Vocation,” AAug, 40 (1977): 187-95 at 189. Capgrave’s re-election is clear from an entry in Dd 6, fol. 16r (consulted via RothSources, 333; D 826).

\textsuperscript{19} De Meijer, “John Capgrave,” 434.

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., 431; De Fidei Symbolis is in Oxford, Balliol College, MS 189 and Oxford, All Souls, MS XVII; In Actus Apostolorum is also included in Oxford, Balliol College, MS 189.
per annum, Lecturae scholasticae, Ordinariae disputations, and Epistulae ad diversos. John Capgrave died in 1464 and was buried at his home convent at Lynn.

Osbern Bokenham was born in 1393, since in his Legendys of Hooly Wummen, which he began in 1443, he wrote that he was fifty years of age. Given his statement that he was born somewhere with “an old priory of blake chanons,” he probably grew up in Old Buckenham in the south of Norfolk, complete with a house of Austin Canons. Bokenham, often referred to as magister, must have completed a doctorate in theology at Cambridge, since he referred in his Legendys of Hooly Wummen to the intellectuals “at hoom at Caunbrygge.” He returned to his home priory of Clare after his studies and was there by 1438 at the latest. In 1443, he began writing the Legendys of Hooly Wummen, which was published in 1447, followed by his translation of Claudian’s De Consulatu Stilichonis between 1445 and 1454, and his Dialogue betwix a seculer asking and a frere answering at the grave of Dame Johan of Acres at Clare in 1456. He also translated Ranulph Higden’s Polychronicon into English, which he entitled the Mappula Angliae, in the 1440s.

Bokenham wrote exclusively in Middle English, in both verse and prose, and from the

22 Pamphilus, Chronica Ordinis Fratrum Eremitarum Sancti Augustini, 83r; Dominico Gandolfo, Dissertatio Historica de Ducentis Celeberrimis Augustinianis Scriptoribus (Rome, 1704), 209; Luigi Torelli, Secoli Agostiniani (Bologna, 1675), 7:314.
23 Bokenham, Legendys of Hooly Wummen, 187-91, 248: “And thane the yeer of grace a thowsend treuly/ Foure hundryd and als thre and fourty/ In the vigylyr of the Natyuyte/ Of hyr that is femme of virgynyte/ The seuenete day euene of Septembre”; “Wych lachesys hath twynyd ful verry s fyfty.”
24 Bokenham refers to his place of birth when discussing the relics of St Margaret, one of which he claims was located at the priory of his hometown. Mary Serjeantson, “Introduction,” in Bokenham, Legendys of Hooly Wummen, xiii; Legendys of Hooly Wummen (Prologue), 135-37; “Of thys holy maydyn, for euene by/ Wher I was born, in an old priory/ Of blak Chanons hyr oo foot is [...]”
26 Bokenham, Legendys of Hooly Wummen, 207.
27 Dd 5, fol. 24r (consulted via RothSources, 323; D 789).
28 The manuscript itself claims it was written in 1445, although subsequent scholarship by John Watts argues that it must have been composed in the following decade. See John Watts, “De Consulatu Stiliconis: texts and politics in the reign of Henry VI,” JMH 16 (1990), 251-266.
29 The original manuscript for this text can be found in the Clare Roll MS, now London, College of Arms, MS Muniment Room 3/16. Here, I have made use of the following edition: Osbern Bokenham, “The Dialogue at the Grave of Dame Johan of Acres, Reascribed to Osbern Bokenham,” in Clare Priory: Seven Centuries of a Suffolk House, ed. K. Barnardiston (Cambridge, 1962): 63-69.
dedications of his texts it is clear that he accrued a far-ranging and influential network of patronage. His texts were all left anonymous by him, barring Thomas Burgh’s inclusion of his name against his wishes, and the spelling out of his name with the first letter of each chapter in the *Mappula Angliae*. In 1461 and again in 1463, he was chosen as a vicar general for provincial chapters and appeared as a signatory and witness on a document of the priory at Clare establishing a chantry for Henry and Isabel Bourchier as a demonstration of gratitude for their generous donations of land to the priory. He died after 1469, when he is mentioned in a will and which is his last appearance in records.

Bokenham travelled substantially, even more so than Capgrave. The prior general of the order gave him permission in 1423 to visit Rome on pilgrimage, and in the prologue to his *Life of Margaret*, he referred to the “the laste tyme I was in Italye,” implying he had been there at least twice. We know from his *Legendys of Hooly Wummen* that he also went on pilgrimage to St James in Compostela. In the prologue to his *Life of Margaret*, he spoke of having gone to Venice five years previously, recounting a distressing experience of having been driven into a swamp in Venice. Whilst he was twice vicar general at his order’s chapters, he was not involved in the administration of his province like Capgrave. He produced no Biblical commentaries as Capgrave had done, preferring instead to translate Latin hagiographies into Middle English. His works demonstrate a reverence for the vernacular, as he invoked his “Suthfolke speche” and his works are predominantly devotional, exalting the lives of saints whose examples he found significant or appealing for patronal support.

---

31 Dd 6 fol. 17r and 18v (consulted via *RothSources*, 345, 351; D 861, 876); *CartCl JK* (191), fol. 57r; *CAugCl*, 105.
33 Dd 4 fol. 124r (consulted via *RothSources*, 301-2; D 728).
35 *Ibid.*, 139-40; “My ladyis preyere I assentyd to/ Of my symplyling cunning aftyr þe myht/ Vp condycyoun þat she me wolde respyt/ Of hir ientyllnesse tyl I acomplysyd/ My pylgramage hade, wych promysyd? I to seynt Iamys wyth hert entere/ Had to performe þe same yere/ Yere to purchase thorgh penitence/ Of my oolde synnys newe indulgence [...]”
36 *Ibid.*, 159-166; “Not mykyl past, yerys fyue/ Whan lytyl from venyse me dede dryue/ A cruel tyraunth in-to a fen/ Owt of a barge. And fyue mo men/ Wher I supposyd to haue myscheuyd/ Had not me the grace releuyd/ Of god, be the blyssyd medyacyoun/ Of thys virgyne, aftyr myn estimacyoun.”
Bokenham and Capgrave represent a narrow cross-section of the English Austin Friars, both originating within East Anglia and writing in the mid-fifteenth century. Their voices and representations of Augustine both stem from the same intellectual, cultural, and textual environment and cannot be assumed to be representative of Austins in other areas of the country or different decades, particularly in the early sixteenth century, when the circumstances were substantially different. And yet, they are the only extant voices attesting to the significance and complexity of Augustine for the English Augustinian order. Moreover, we do know that they were towering personalities within the English Augustinian order; indeed, the most significant Austin personalities of late-medieval England. Their literary output was unparalleled by any other Austin Friar in pre-Reformation England; even the famous sixteenth-century reformer Robert Barnes produced only four texts, in comparison to the dozens alleged to have been written by Capgrave. Furthermore, Capgrave was a figurehead of his province, as a renowned theologian, author, prior of King's Lynn and twice unanimously elected prior provincial. Bokenham, too, was frequently involved in the administration of his own priory and of his province, featuring as one of the most prominent minds of his age. Capgrave was the only Austin of his age to receive royal patronage and both he and Bokenham were recipients of impressive noble patronage, with Bokenham developing the most exalted circle of female patronesses in Suffolk of his time. Capgrave's literary pursuits were recognised to such a degree by his order that he was granted his own scriptorium.37 Bokenham was at the forefront, not only in his order, but also in the whole country, of developing female hagiography; in this regard, he was not even challenged by the exceptional John Lydgate. As we shall see, Bokenham developed formidable connections with the family of Richard, Duke of York, securing a place for his priory on the political stage. That both Capgrave and Bokenham wrote in the vernacular is important: it was a way by which they aligned themselves with key influential laypeople.

These two friars were exceptional. They were exceptional amongst Austin Friars,

but they were also important on the national stage; their voices held weight throughout
their order and their esteemed positions lent authority to their texts. We might thus infer a
prescriptive tenor in their texts on Augustine; an exhortation to their contemporaries to
think about Augustine in the way they, their order’s leading intellectuals, had done. Their
confrères would have looked upon their words as definitive or canonical, in the wake of their
resounding literary, religious, political, institutional, and intellectual successes. We might
thus proceed to evaluate their portrayals of Augustine knowing that whilst they stood at the
apex of the order, they were remained illustrative of that tradition, if perhaps of the most
sophisticated version. Both Capgrave and Bokenham spoke repeatedly of their religious
profession as following the example set by Augustine and of Augustine as their religious
father;\(^{38}\) how they portrayed Augustine held religious significance for their mission as
Austin Friars.

II. Hagiographies of Augustine

These two texts were composed in an environment in which new hagiographies of Augustine
were comparatively uncommon; in hagiographical terms, late-medieval England saw a
proliferation of legendaries and devotion to virgin martyrs, rather than to traditional saints
like Augustine. Bokenham’s *Legenda Aurea*, in which his life of Augustine appears, was but
one legendary amongst many based on Voragine’s famous text of the same name; Bokenham’s
text was predated by the anonymous *Gilte Legende* from 1438 and followed by

\(^{38}\) Bokenham wrote of Augustine as “*so wurthi a fadyr* and *soo profound a doctor*, [emphasis mine]
whom “*alle cristene peple wurshipyn bothe religious and clerkys.*” (MS Abbotsford, fol. 174v).
Bokenham continued, stating that “*his doctrine ys instrucyyoun of alle feythfull men*” and that “*his lyf
forme and reule of alle religious men and the *singular myrour of oure religioun.*” [emphasis mine]
(*ibid.*) Capgrave, at the end of his *Augustine* (BL MS Add. 36704, fols. 5r-45r), similarly spoke of the
duty to worship Augustine. At fol. 45r (John Capgrave, *Life of St Augustine by John Capgrave*, ed.
Cyril Lawrence Smetana (Toronto, 2001), 76; henceforth, all reference to this text will be from this
dition), he stated: “Thus endith þe lyf of þis glorious doctoure whom all Cristen men ar bounde to do
worship, most specialy clerkys and lerned men þat haue grete stuf oute of his bokes to her lernyng.”
Earlier on the same folio, he wrote: “Thus hath he left in erde his holy footstepps. Many men &
women of his religioun taute he his doctrine. He hath left eke grete instrucyioun to þe church in
tresoure of his bokes, þat þouȝ his body be drawe from us, jet his spirit abideth with us.” [emphasis mine].
William Caxton’s version from between 1483 and 1527.\textsuperscript{39} The late thirteenth-century \textit{South English Legendary} remains extant in over sixty manuscripts, attesting to its immense popularity.\textsuperscript{40} The role of women in hagiography, whether as consumers, patrons, or subjects, saw a marked increase in late-medieval England, a trend in which both Capgrave and Bokenham were significant participants, as we shall see below. In late-medieval England, numerous lives of saints Katharine, Margaret, and Juliana, and of continental female saints such as Elizabeth of Hungary, Mary of Oignies, Christina the Marvellous, and Catherine of Siena were produced.\textsuperscript{41}

Given the absence of other late-medieval English hagiographies of Augustine, we might think that Augustine, as an institutional figure, was a significant move away from the hagiographical tastes of the period. And yet, our two Austins were still participating in the literary and hagiographical trends of fifteenth-century England. They were writing in Middle English, increasingly the language of choice in England for hagiographical texts, and Bokenham produced his entry on Augustine within a legendary typical of the period. Moreover, Capgrave participated in the trend of monastic historiography, in composing his \textit{Augustine, Norbert, and Gilbert}.\textsuperscript{42} John Lydgate, the esteemed Lancastrian poet and monk from Bury St Edmunds, was an important precursor to Capgrave here: he wrote the \textit{Lives of SS Edmund and Fremund} for William Curteys, the abbot of Bury St Edmunds, extolling the life of the abbey’s patron saint, and the \textit{Lives of SS Alban and Amphibal} for John Wheathampstead, the abbot of St Albans.\textsuperscript{43} Lastly, both Capgrave and Bokenham’s wider corpus of hagiography, but particularly Capgrave’s \textit{Life of St Katharine}, follow two other late-medieval English literary trends: they are longer than earlier medieval hagiographies and display significantly more attention than was previously customary to history and

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., 959-61.
\textsuperscript{42} See page 50, notes 165-167.
\textsuperscript{43} Martin Heale, \textit{The Abbots and Priors of Late Medieval and Reformation England} (Oxford, 2016), 94.
secular affairs.\textsuperscript{44}

This is not to suggest that their considerations of Augustine existed without precedent. They wrote their hagiographies of Augustine within a long-standing tradition of texts devoted to the Church Father, much larger than the Augustinian Tradition. Augustine’s own writing about his life, the \textit{Confessiones}, served as the basis for much of the hagiography surrounding his character in the Middle Ages. Following the \textit{Confessiones}, Possidius Bishop of Calama documented Augustine’s life in the fifth century in his \textit{Sancti Augustini Vita Scripta A Possidio Episco}, in which he presented the saint as the rational and episcopal Christian thinker that came to be commonplace in hagiographies of Augustine.\textsuperscript{45} With the establishment of canonical orders, Augustine found renewed popularity amongst hagiographers, with Philip of Harvengt producing in the twelfth century the most extensive account of the saint’s life since Possidius, after his predecessor Peter Comestor hailed Augustine as a renewer of the apostolic life earlier that century.\textsuperscript{46} Philip presented Augustine as the perfect embodiment of the canonical religion, much in the way that the Augustinian Tradition treated the saint as the paradigmatic hermit. Benedictine Rupert of Deutz also composed a \textit{Vita Augustini} in the twelfth century and Dominican Bernard Gui produced a legendary entitled the \textit{Speculum Sanctorale}, in which he included an entry on the life of Augustine.\textsuperscript{47} In his \textit{Legenda Aurea}, Jacobus de Voragine focused on Augustine’s personal devotion and virtues,\textsuperscript{48} and although not strictly a hagiographical text, Petrarch’s \textit{Secretum} made incisive commentary in the fourteenth century on Augustine’s

\textsuperscript{44} Echard and Rouse, \textit{The Encyclopedia of Medieval Literature in Britain}, 960.
\textsuperscript{45} PL 32: 33-66.
\textsuperscript{47} J.C. Dickinson, \textit{The Origins of the Austin Canons and their Introduction into England} (London, 1950), 65; Sherry Reames, \textit{The Legenda Aurea: a Reexamination of its Paradoxical History} (Madison, 1985), 40, 136. The manuscripts for these two texts can are Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, MS 9368, fols. 73v-81v (Deutz) (see John H. van Engen, \textit{Rupert of Deutz} (Berkeley, 1983), 47) and Paris, BN, MS Latin 5406, fols. 155v-163r (Gui) (I have not consulted these manuscripts).
peregrinations and journey to conversion.\textsuperscript{49} Capgrave and Bokenham’s texts on Augustine, then, were in conversation not only with the Augustinian Tradition, but also with a centuries-long tradition of devotion to the Church Father.

Capgrave’s \textit{Life of Saint Katharine} that has garnered significant attention, due to its unusual portrayal of the martyr as a preaching woman of remarkable erudition.\textsuperscript{50} Ranging in focus from Capgrave’s stylistic tendencies,\textsuperscript{51} to his Chaucerian inheritance,\textsuperscript{52} his use of source material,\textsuperscript{53} his relationship to other hagiographers of Katharine and other virgin martyrs,\textsuperscript{54} and to the religious implications for female education as portrayed in the personage of Katharine,\textsuperscript{55} studies of the \textit{Katharine} far outnumber those of Capgrave’s \textit{Life of Saint Augustine}, which are limited to four articles in addition to the introductions provided


by Cyril Smetana and J.J. Munro in their editions of the text. Whilst the articles by George Sanderlin, Rudolph Arbesmann, and Jane Fredeman are invaluable, Smetana’s bias against Capgrave’s concern with female spirituality, discussed below, and Liliana Sikorska’s fundamental misunderstanding of Capgrave’s text serve to obfuscate Capgrave’s motivations. Because Sikorska fails to consider Augustinian theology on original sin and grace, she claims (as the main thesis of her article) that the purpose of Capgrave’s inclusion of Augustine’s sins as a young man was to give “its subject a more life-like dimension of character,” rather than as a theological statement about the nature of grace and human dependence on God. By comparing Capgrave’s text only to the Confessiones instead of seeing it in its context of Augustinian hagiography of the Middle Ages, she also falsely asserts that Capgrave is primarily interested in Augustine’s knowledge over his experience, an emphasis that is much more strongly seen in the Augustinian Tradition. Without this consideration, Sikorska misrepresents Capgrave’s intentions, and without any real warrant presents him as engaging in “nascent Protestantism.” Bokenham’s works have been studied primarily by Sheila Delany, Cynthia Turner-Camp, and Simon Horobin, who examine his hagiographical works, often in connection to his alleged Yorkist sympathies and network of patrons.

Capgrave’s Life of St Augustine does not include any reference to a compositional date, but it is mentioned in his Gilbert and therefore must have been composed sometime

---


57 Sikorska, “Medieval Confession Manuals,” 238.

58 Ibid., 248.

before 1451.\textsuperscript{60} It exists in two manuscripts; the first, at the British Library, also contains the \textit{Gilbert}, but was probably originally written as two separate manuscripts around 1461.\textsuperscript{61} The second is also housed at the British Library, and was written not long after 1451 but was badly damaged by the Cottonian fire in 1731.\textsuperscript{62} The text has been of interest in linguistic studies, as Capgrave’s language is an amalgamation of linguistic features common in documents of Lynn and of forms more common to London.\textsuperscript{63}

In the prologue, Capgrave stated that he wrote \textit{Augustine} not for his own order, but at the request of a gentlewoman born on the feast day of St Augustine.\textsuperscript{64} “A noble creature, a gentill woman”, he wrote:

desired of me with ful grete instauns to write onto hire, that is to say to translate hir treuly oute of Latyn, the lif of Seynt Augustyn, grete doctoure of the cherch. [...] Sche desired eke this lif of this seynt more than ony othir for sche was browt forth into this world in his solempne feste.\textsuperscript{65}

This woman commissioned him in particular, he wrote, because “sche desired this thing of me rather than of another man because that \textit{I am of his profession}, for sche supposed verily that I wold do it with the bettir wil.”\textsuperscript{66} [emphasis mine] His profession as an Austin served as a privilege in understanding the life of Augustine.

Although Capgrave said that he translated this text “treuly oute of Latyn,”\textsuperscript{67} Munro identified the author as Capgrave himself, given that no corresponding Latin \textit{Vita Augustini} corresponding could be found.\textsuperscript{68} In 1943, however, Arbesmann and Sanderlin both (and, apparently, independently) identified Jordan of Quedlinburg’s \textit{Vita Sancti Augustini} as the main source for Capgrave’s composition, thereby repudiating Munro’s assumption about the

\textsuperscript{60} Cyril Lawrence Smetana, “Introduction,” in \textit{Life of St Augustine by John Capgrave}, ed. Cyril Lawrence Smetana (Toronto, 2001), i-x at v.
\textsuperscript{63} Smetana, “Introduction,” ix.
\textsuperscript{64} Arbesmann, “Jordanus of Saxony’s \textit{Vita S. Augustini},” 348.
\textsuperscript{65} Capgrave, \textit{Life of St Augustine}, 15.
\textsuperscript{66} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{67} Ibid.
text’s authorship. The text largely follows Jordan’s, even though it cannot be called a faithful translation, as there are a number of short additions and five entire chapters that are the work of Capgrave himself. Jordan’s text is not the only source material utilised by the English Austin, as he also cited Augustine’s *Concessiones* and *De Beata Vita*, Isidore of Seville’s *Etymologiae*, and the pseudo-Augustinian *Sermones ad fratres in eremo* and *De Vita Christiana*.

Smetana argues that since “Capgrave’s Augustine was prepared for a literate but not scholarly, noblewoman, it called for clarity and simplicity of language.” He claims that “Capgrave’s additions can be attributed to his desire to suit his work to the ‘gentill woman’ at whose request he prepared it.” Smetana attributes the additions of personal information about the characters and the amplification of the role of Monica, Augustine’s mother, to a desire to suit his readership, and deems these additions to be “humanising for the female audience,” a phrase repeated elsewhere uncritically, particularly by Liliana Sikorska. There is some truth in Smetana’s analysis of Capgrave’s intentionality, as Capgrave was aware of the limitations of his readership, simply in that he provided an English translation of a Latin story. Capgrave’s choice of the vernacular was practical since his reader lacked training in Latin and since the laity was gaining unprecedented access to theological texts. Moreover, noble and gentlewomen were coming to play a much larger part in the consumption of religious texts, with Bokenham’s texts as the best examples;

---

74 *Ibid.* Liliana Sikorska paraphrases Smetana’s claim, stating that Capgrave’s additions had a “humanizing effect on the material presented.” (Sikorska, “Medieval ‘manuals of sins’ and their Literary (Re)Readings”, 240.) By not accounting for Smetana’s Augustinian bias, Sikorska unwittingly propagates the traditional Augustinian narrative, which has seen little value in Monica’s experiences and contributions to the life of their founder. This contradicts her later assertion that the motivation behind Capgrave’s inclusion of Monica was to accentuate Augustine’s sinfulness by demonstrating the pain his behaviour caused his mother.
Capgrave’s commission by a local noblewoman and his use of the vernacular is part of this trend.

His composition in Middle English also speaks to the aim of providing theological instruction to the laity in an environment of Arundel’s Constitutions and Lollardy, in which vernacular theology was regarded as increasingly subversive. Whilst this will be discussed more fully later, it is significant that Capgrave’s vernacular works are restricted to hagiography, which was seen as a genre for which the vernacular was appropriate. This was but one of many ways to reconcile the vernacular with theology in this period; Nicholas Love, authorised by the church hierarchy, adopted a plain style focussing on the suffering of Christ, Lydgate made use of a florid and embellished style in stark contrast to the unornamented style of Lollard texts, and Pecock utilised plain prose lacking affective techniques, all to contrast their writing with controversial Lollard texts. For Capgrave, hagiography was a venue in which it was acceptable to engage in theological exploration in the vernacular and he made some sophisticated theological arguments within this genre, as will be seen in his Augustine but also in his Katharine.

Smetana’s claim is reductive of Capgrave’s own intentions in assuming that Capgrave’s own views are lost amidst an attempt to simplify and ‘humanise’ for a less than capable readership. Since Smetana sees Capgrave’s focus on Monica as an assumption that the female audience would have been interested in her, he neglects to notice that Capgrave elsewhere favoured the religious experience of Augustine’s mother, such as in his Abbreviacion of Cronicles, where he stated that “Augustin converted fro his errore onto the feithe” because of, in the first instance, “the prayer of his modir.” Smetana’s desire to remove any significance to the presence of Monica within the narrative may stem from his own affiliation with the Augustinian order, which, particularly in the Augustinian Tradition, has had a tendency to diminish the salience of Monica’s religious example within

---

79 Capgrave, Abbreviacion of Cronicles, 66. This text can be found in manuscript form in Cambridge, UL, MS Gg.4.12 and Cambridge, CCC, MS 167.
We must attribute some agency to Capgrave's own literary decisions: whilst it is certainly true that he was writing for a female audience, we can be assured that he would not represent Augustine in a way that he felt was not accurate or genuine.

Osbern Bokenham's *Lyf of Seynt Austyn the Doctour* is less well known than Capgrave's text, which has been published in two editions and come to the notice of some scholarship, albeit only in the last few years. A recently discovered manuscript from the library of Abbotsford house now in Edinburgh’s Faculty of Advocates' Library containing a Middle English legendary has undergone analysis by Simon Horobin in 2008, who convincingly establishes the legendary's authorship by Osbern Bokenham. Horobin links it to Bokenham's allusions in his *Mappula Angliae*, a translation of Higden's *Polychronicon*, to a legendary compiled of a translation of the *Legenda Aurea* along with several other English saints' lives, which scholarship had hitherto been assumed lost. Bokenham stated in his *Mappula*:

> For as moche as in the englische boke the whiche y have compiled of legenda aurea and of oþer famous legends at the instaunce of my specialle frendis and for edificacioun and comfort of alle tho þe whiche shuld redene hit or here hit, is oftene-tyme in lyvis of seyntis, Of seynt Cedde, seynt Felix, seynt Edward, seynt Oswald and many oþer seyntis of Englonde, mencyon made of dyuers partis, plagis, regnis & contreis of this lande Englonde, þe wche, but if þey be declared, byne fulle harde to knowene.  

The Abbotsford manuscript, which was purchased by Sir Walter Scott in 1804 for £15.15s, is a relatively good match in content for Bokenham's missing text.

Carl Horstmann, the Victorian editor of the *Mappula Angliae*, initially suggested that the translation to which Bokenham was referring was the *Gilte Legende*, as its completion in 1438 and its use of a false modesty literary trope – the author refers to himself as a 'synfulle wreche' – are appropriate for Bokenham. The *Gilte Legende* is a fairly close translation of

---

80 The five fourteenth-century texts detailing Augustine's life and foundation of the OESA omit the role of Monica in Augustine's religious journey, a theme maintained by Augustinian historians today, such as Smetana. See pages 43-48 for the discussion of the Augustinian Tradition.
83 Ibid., 139.
84 Carl Horstmann, “Mappula Angliae,” 2-3. The statement in question from author of the *Gilte Legende* is the following: “And also here endith the lives of seyntis that is called in Latynne *Legenda Aurea* and in Englisshe the Gilte Legende, the which is drawen out of Fresshe into Englisshe the
Jean de Vignay’s *Légende Dorée* (1333-40), rather than a translation of Jacobus of Voragine’s initial *Legenda Aurea* from 1267, and its title is taken from the colophon to the Bodleian MS Douce 372, as per the suggestion of Auvo Kurvinen, as opposed to *The Golden Legend*, which refers to Caxton’s version. It exists in eight manuscripts, three of which – BL Add. MS 11565, BL Add. MS 35298 and Lambeth Palace Library MS 72 – contain added material, adding up to twenty-one extra lives, referred to by Manfred Görlach as the *Additional Lives*. Most of these additional lives are of English saints and their main source is the *South English Legendary*. S.M. Jeremy erroneously attributed the *Gilte Legende* to Bokenham and investigated its relationship to Caxton’s *Golden Legend* in four articles.

Whilst the Abbotsford manuscript does not give any indication as to its authorship, Simon Horobin, to date one of the few scholars to examine the manuscript in any detail, argues persuasively for attribution to Bokenham, incorporating the major structural

89 As noted by Horobin (“The Lost Legendary of Osbern Bokenham”, 135), the only possible indication of ownership in the manuscript is the inscription *Iohn Iobson* in a sixteenth- or seventeenth-century hand.
90 The two other scholars to study this text are Karen Winstead and Alice Spencer. Both fall within the remit of literary studies, and Spencer’s work in particular lacks suitable awareness of the religious priorities of the author. For example, Spencer claims that Bokenham’s inclusion of the incorruptibility of the bodies of female saints is, in fact, his assertion of an incorrupt, feminised vernacular, a claim which completely neglects the fact that not only does Bokenham speak of the incorruptibility of male saintly bodies, and that such an argument serves to establish the subject’s membership to the communion of saints, thereby making intercessory prayers to him/her effective. See Alice Spencer, *Language, Lineage, and Location in the Works of Osbern Bokenham* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 2013), 57-58. See also Winstead, “Osbern Bokenham’s ‘Englishe boke,’” 67-87.
differences between the Abbotsford text and the *Gilte Legende*. This independence is essential, as Bokenham’s other writings reveal him to have been unfamiliar with the *Gilte Legende*. Horobin also established the independence of the Abbotsford manuscript from the *Gilte Legende* through lexical and syntactical means; he demonstrated the *Gilte Legende*’s provenance from the *Legende Dorée* by showcasing the large number of French words, whereas the Abbotsford manuscript contains many more words derivative of Latin.

The Abbotsford manuscript includes the lives of Felix and Cedd, mentioned by Bokenham in the *Mappula*, and whilst it does not contain lives of either Oswald or Edward, Horobin conjectures that they may have been contained on the missing leaves, which are located at the corresponding spots in the calendar of lives. Moreover, nine of the entries in verse are also included in Bokenham’s *Legendys of Hooly Wummen*, and whilst the dedications of these entries as found in the *Legendys of Hooly Wummen* are missing in the Abbotsford manuscript, the texts themselves are sufficiently similar to suggest the same author. As the *Legendys of Hooly Wummen* is certainly a product of Bokenham, this is the strongest argument for ascribing the Abbotsford manuscript to him.

The Abbotsford manuscript contains 218 extant folios in parchment, with double columns of 56 lines and a nineteenth-century list of contents. The script, borders and initials, along with linguistic tendencies, place the manuscript as of East Anglian provenance, as the
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91 Horobin’s analysis of the Abbotsford MS shows that the calendar of entries follows that of the *Legenda Aurea* rather than that of the *Gilte Legende*, and many of the lives found in verse in the Abbotsford MS appear in prose in the *Gilte Legende*, in contrast to the *Legenda Aurea*. He also notes the compositional differences between the *Lives of St George* found within the texts, which are strongly indicative of an independent translation of the *Legenda Aurea*, rather than dependence on the *Gilte Legende*. See Horobin, “The Lost Legendary of Osbern Bokenham,” 136-139.

92 As mentioned earlier, Horobin suggests that Bokenham was unfamiliar with the *Gilte Legende*. This is corroborated by Görlach who pointed out in 1972 that Bokenham’s *Katharine* relies on the *Legenda Aurea* version, without access to the Conversion texts used by Capgrave in his *Life of St Katharine of Alexandria*. The *Gilte Legende* entry on Katharine also contains the Conversion episode, so Bokenham is unlikely to have known it (Görlach, *Studies in Middle English Saints’ Legends*, 85). For Capgrave’s source materials for his *Katharine*, see Kurvinen, “The Source of Capgrave’s Life of St. Katharine”, 268-324.


94 The *Life of Seynt Felix* and the *Life of Seynt Cedde* can be found in the MS Abbotsford, fols. 38v and 70v-71v, respectively.

95 Horobin, “The Lost Legendary of Osbern Bokenham,” 139.

96 The lives that appear in both collections are Lucy, Agnes, Agatha, Dorothy, Margaret, Mary Magdalene, Christina, Faith, and the 11000 Virgins. See Horobin, “The Lost Legendary of Osbern Bokenham,” 140.
style of the manuscript resembles closely that of other manuscripts from Suffolk. According to Horobin, the Abbotsford manuscript may be connected to another of Bokenham’s works, BL Add. MS 11814, his translation of Claudian’s *De Consulatu Stilichonis*, which explicitly states composition at Clare. Based on the script, cadel initials, and linguistic evidence, Horobin identifies the first scribe of the Abbotsford manuscript as the same one of Add. MS 11814, thus placing the composition of the Abbotsford manuscript also at Clare. That Bokenham may have had his own workshop at Clare priory is not unprecedented; Peter Lucas has shown that many of Capgrave’s own manuscripts were produced in his own workshop at Lynn priory, where he was based. Given Capgrave and Bokenham’s similar education and literary repute, it is possible that Bokenham was afforded similar writing conditions as Capgrave.

It is difficult to ascertain the familiarity of Capgrave and Bokenham with the Augustinian Tradition discussed in the previous chapter. Capgrave’s choice of Jordan of Quedlinburg as his source marks his knowledge of at least that text. His inclusion of an entry on Henry of Friemar in his *Liber de Illustribus Henricis* would suggest that he likely knew of the *Tractatus* as well, although he did not mention the *Tractatus* in his list of texts composed by Henry. In the case of Bokenham, there is no evidence linking him with any of the texts in question, but since both he and Capgrave were highly educated, it is likely that they would be familiar with texts so integral to their order’s self-understanding. Additionally, if Capgrave was familiar with the work of Jordan of Quedlinburg, it is almost certain that Bokenham would have been as well; the two friars were educated to the same

---

97 The linguistic analysis can be found in Horobin, “The Lost Legendary of Osbern Bokenham,” 135. Horobin relies upon *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English*, ed. A. McIntosh et al. (Aberdeen, 1986), 4:185, for this distribution. He identifies forms such as *yafe* and *youen* as past participles for *to give* and *biforne* and *toforn* for *before* as typically East Anglian. He also makes special mention of the form *youyn* for *given*, which is indicative of a specifically Suffolk origin. Regarding the style of the manuscript, see Horobin, “The Lost Legendary of Osbern Bokenham,” 153.


degree at the same time at the same university and thus must have received a very comparable education. Our records of Augustinian libraries contain no entries regarding the texts of the continental tradition, but the Cambridge priory, at which both Capgrave and Bokenham studied, possessed a copy of Jacobus de Voragine’s *Legenda Aurea*. Moreover, the convent at Droitwich possessed a copy of Augustine’s own *Confessiones*; whilst neither of our two friars were members of this priory, this manuscript suggests that the order in England was familiar with this text.

Not only is the historiographical and hagiographical writing of Capgrave and Bokenham divergent from the traditional narrative of the origins of the OESA, but the character of Augustine constructed in these texts speaks to a fundamentally different conception of the religious mission of the order. Through examination of the differences between Capgrave and Bokenham and their predecessors, one may begin to understand what made the English Austin friars distinctive from their European counterparts.

### III. The English Augustinian Life

#### Augustine and Monica

Throughout the *Confessiones*, Augustine’s mother Monica is the only woman to be referred to by name, appearing at every important stage in Augustine’s life as a constant source of spiritual guidance in his decisions. Whilst her actions have often been characterised as interfering, Augustine’s acclamations of her religious goodness depict a woman who had a

---

102 According to Dd 4 fol. 75v (consulted via RothSources, 298; D 720) Capgrave’s first appointment in Cambridge was to study theology for one year before his baccalaureate in 1422. How long Capgrave spent at Cambridge is a matter of debate, with de Meijer placing the completion of studies in 1425 and Seymour in 1427. See Alberic de Meijer, “John Capgrave, O.E.S.A.” *Aug*, 5 (1955): 400-40 at 410; Seymour, *John Capgrave*, 214. Regardless, he assuredly completed his doctorate, as is evident from Dd 4 fol. 106 (cited in De Meijer, “John Capgrave, O.E.S.A,” 410). There is less documentation regarding Bokenham’s education, but given his East Anglian origin, he almost certainly would have studied at Cambridge over Oxford or Paris. Bokenham is often referred to as “magister”, so he must have completed a doctorate. Roth noted that he must have finished his studies by 1427, as he is referred to as “magister” in a testament dated to 26 April 1427 (Reg.Chich., 2:369), so the two likely studied together.

significant role in his religious formation.104 Whereas the Augustinian Tradition effaced Monica’s role, both Capgrave and Bokenham preserved her significance in her son’s life and thus their portrayals of Monica represent a substantial deviation. In the Augustinian Tradition, the deletion of Monica was a way for the Hermits to omit a problematic element to Augustine’s life, namely, a childhood and young adulthood filled with spiritual wanderings and religious doubt.105 Monica’s character in the Confessiones functioned as a foil for Augustine’s doubt and represented an uneducated, irrational path to God that contrasted strongly with Augustine’s philosophical need to understand the divine. By omitting her character, the authors were able to gloss over troublesome episodes of Augustine’s faith wavering and examples of a woman surpassing their founder in religious excellence.

By contrast, both Capgrave and Bokenham portrayed Monica as deeply invested in Augustine’s acceptance of Christianity. This inclusion served to diversify Augustine’s religious experience, as the presence of Monica facilitated inclusion of episodes of Augustine’s childhood and adolescence – neglected by the European Hermits – as well as of the vision at Ostia. Such scenes offered a venue for Augustine to come to know God in a way that differed from the intellectual and ascetic way in which the European Hermits depicted Augustine seeking the divine. As Kim Power has noted of the Confessiones, Monica came to represent an alternative model of spirituality that caused Augustine to reconsider the place and value of philosophy,106 which is applicable to Capgrave and Bokenham’s reinclusion of her.


105 For a fuller exposition of this argument, see Anik Laferrière, “The Doubting Augustine: The Deletion of Monica from Fourteenth-Century Vitae Augustini in the Augustinian Order of Hermits” SCH, 52 (2016): 150-163.

Furthermore, the inclusion of Monica legitimised female spirituality for the Austin Friars. By including the religious successes of a woman, both authors validated piety that differed from the educated and intellectual path, a devotional mode inaccessible to most women of the time. Late-medieval East Anglia boasted a vibrant environment of female spirituality with such female mystics as Julian of Norwich and Margery Kempe. Margery Kempe, in particular, was active in the first few decades of our two Austins' lives, and was reported to have had one of her episodes of rapturous weeping at the priory of Austin Friars in Lynn. According to the *Book of Margery Kempe*, the lachrymose scene was incited by the preaching of an Austin Friar about the passion of Christ. Whilst a Grey Friar was sceptical of her devotion, the Austin Friar is depicted as respectful of Margery’s experience of Christ. Perhaps encouraged by their knowledge of Margery Kempe, these two authors found validity within Monica’s mystical experiences and included those scenes within their narratives. In doing so, they expanded the concept of Augustinian religion and validated female spirituality at the same time.

Capgrave and Bokenham’s emphasis on Monica might be part of the burgeoning cult of St Monica in the fifteenth century, particularly within the Augustinian order in Italy. The rediscovery of Monica’s alleged remains in Ostia in April of 1430 and the translation of her relics to San Trifone in Rome sparked the growth of her cult, particularly within Italy.

---

107 Joel Rosenthal states that “there are many reasons to argue that, for women, the religious life and opportunities of fifteenth-century East Anglia (the diocese of Norwich) can be seen as a silver, if not quite golden age.” (“Local Girls Do It Better: Women and Religion in Late Medieval East Anglia” in *Traditions and Transformations in Late Medieval England*, ed. Douglas Biggs et al. (Leiden, 2002): 1-20, at 1). Whilst there are problems with approaching East Anglian late-medieval religion as cohesive, there are good reasons for seeing this community as one of vitality and flourishing of religious women. For instance, the number of female religious was higher than elsewhere in England, and those religious houses were rarely the centres of scandal. Two female mystics, Julian of Norwich and Margery Kempe, were the apotheosis of this trend of female spirituality outside of the cloister, and enjoyed both repute and suspicion for their religious experiences. The surge of hagiography of women – particularly in the work of Osbern Bokenham in his *Legendys of Hooly Wummen* – extolled female virtue and found a place for women within the notion of sanctity. Whilst there is much work to be done to problematise generalised assumptions regarding late-medieval East Anglian female spiritualities, there are many indicators that these women often fought against the threat of invisibility and participated in a vibrant community. See also Roberta Gilchrist and Marilyn Oliva, *Religious Women in Medieval East Anglia: History and Archaeology, c. 1100-1540* (Norwich, 1993), esp. 13-22.

and the refashioning of her image in hagiography and iconography.\textsuperscript{109} At this point, the OESA began to include Monica in significant iconography of Augustine’s life, such as Ottaviano Nelli’s narrative cycle in the choir of the Sant’ Agostino church in Gubbio and the fresco series by Benozzo Gozzoli in Sant’ Agostino in San Gimignano, which included Monica in five of the seventeen scenes.\textsuperscript{110} The General Chapter of the Augustinians held at Montpellier in 1430 decreed that every church of the order should have an image of Monica and in that same year, Pope Martin V issued a bull authenticating Monica’s body and placing it in the custody of the Augustinians.\textsuperscript{111} Furthermore, although the order received formal papal approval for the creation of a female third order in 1399, the Augustinians only established this community after the translation of Monica’s body in 1430, linking Monica to female Augustinian devotion.\textsuperscript{112} Although there were significant precedents to these developments, such as the inclusion of Monica’s feast day into the Augustinian calendar in 1387,\textsuperscript{113} the proliferation of the cult of Monica occurred predominantly in the middle of the fifteenth century, with the foundation of the altar dedicated to her in the 1440s at the church of Santo Stefano in Venice as the earliest site of her cult outside of Rome, the location of her tomb monument.\textsuperscript{114}

The cult of Monica fulfilled two main functions for the Augustinians: not only was she the focus of female Augustinian devotion, but she was also utilised by the order in an attempt to resolve the growing conflict over the Observant movement. In Andrea Biglia’s \textit{Ad fratrem Ludovicum de ordinis nostri forma et propagatione} from the early 1430s,\textsuperscript{115} the friar from the Observant convent in Lecceto recounted the translation of Monica and gave a

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{110} Holgate, “The Cult of Saint Monica in Quattrocento Italy,” 183.
\bibitem{111} \textit{Ibid.}; \textit{idem}, “Santa Monica, Venice and the Vivarini,” 164.
\bibitem{112} \textit{Idem}, “The Cult of Saint Monica in Quattrocento Italy,” 177.
\bibitem{113} \textit{Ibid.}, 182.
\bibitem{114} \textit{Idem}, “Santa Monica, Venice, and the Vivarini,” 180.
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highly partisan account of a sermon by Martin V exhorting the two factions of Augustinians – Observants and Conventuals – to put aside their differences and recognise Monica as the spiritual mother to them all. In the wake of the dispute over Augustine’s own relics, the body of Monica was fastidiously documented and authorised by the Augustinians and the papacy, and in addition to strengthening the order’s connection to Augustine, the cult of Monica in Rome and Venice served to recruit laywomen to the order.

However, whilst the rediscovery of the body of Monica was put to political and religious use by the Augustinian order in Italy, her cult was significantly less prominent elsewhere and there is no evidence to show that its popularity was mirrored in England, especially in the 1440s and 1450s, when Capgrave and Bokenham were writing. Moreover, as Ian Holgate argues, in their attempt to incorporate Monica into their history, the Augustinians in Italy overwhelmingly presented her as literate, authoritative, and controlled, depicting her as bestowing the monastic rule and as the source of discipline. This presentation of Monica in the mode of her son, the rational, erudite theologian, is at odds with the work of both Capgrave and Bokenham, who presented her spirituality differently. Furthermore, the absence of a female Augustinian third order from England obviated the need to use her image in the recruitment of laywomen to their community, and thus it is difficult to see Capgrave and Bokenham as participating in the same trend as their contemporaries in Italy. Neither should we connect Capgrave and Bokenham’s writings on Monica to the flourishing cult of virgin martyrs, increasingly popular in late-medieval England. As Karen Winstead has shown, fifteenth-century English hagiographers preferred virgin martyrs to all other genres of female saints, with most legendaries from this period containing more accounts of virgin martyrs than all other female saints combined. Indeed, making the stories of these martyrs applicable to a lay audience, fashioning them more like

117 Holgate, “The Cult of Monica in Quattrocento Italy,” 191.
120 Holgate, “The Cult of Monica in Quattrocento Italy,” 191.
121 Andrews, The Other Friars, 134.
prosperous wives, seems to have been preferable to composing hagiographies of married female saints.\textsuperscript{123} Bokenham and Capgrave’s focus on Monica then, who was neither a virgin nor a martyr, cannot be part of this specific emphasis on female spirituality in England and thus we must consider the two authors’ inclusion of her in their hagiography as deliberate, connected neither to contemporary European Augustinian spirituality nor to hagiographical emphases of the region.

In Capgrave’s text, the majority of his deviation from Jordan of Quedlinburg’s original text can be found in the first five chapters of his work, where he elaborated heavily on the character of Monica. The presence of Monica in this section, focusing on Augustine’s family and his early life, is overwhelming. Capgrave introduced her with the following:

His modir hith Monica. Sche was a Cristen woman fro hir childhold, and norchid in þe best condicione and moost plesaunt to God and to man. Sche had moo childyrn þan him as it semeth be his writing in his Confessiones.\textsuperscript{124}

From the outset, it is clear that Monica’s primary attribute was her Christianity, as he constantly referred to the religious encouragement given to Augustine by his mother.\textsuperscript{125} Whilst Capgrave presented Patrick, Augustine’s father, as hot-tempered and violent, Monica is so kind of spirit that even Patrick could not be angry with her.\textsuperscript{126} Such was her peers’ amazement at her ability to avoid beating from her husband, that she taught her friends how to keep the peace of the household and to escape their husbands’ wrath.\textsuperscript{127} Monica

\textsuperscript{123} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{124} Capgrave, \textit{Life of St Augustine by John Capgrave}, 18-19.
\textsuperscript{125} A few examples of Capgrave’s obsession with the exhortations of Monica to her son are as follows: Capgrave, \textit{Life of St Augustine}, 23: “But his modere with ful sad cuntenauns forbade him alle suspicous cumpayny”; \textit{ibid.}, 21: “He seith þat sche trauayled for hem neuly ageyn as often as sche say hem do ony þing which was ageyn þe pleasauns of oure lord þat is to sey it greued hir as mech whan sche say hir childryn trespass onto oure lord as euyr it greued when sche bare hem bodily”; \textit{ibid.}, 24: “His modir whan sche herd þat he was falle onto þis heresie sche wept and sorowid more hertly þan women do þat folow here childyrn to þe graue and witþ many menes and many exhortaciones was bisi nyth and day to bryng him fro þis mischel”; \textit{ibid.}, 24-25 which describes the scene of the Wooden Ruler and the bishop coming to Monica; \textit{ibid.}, 28: “But þou he were absent sche prayed for him deuly, þat oure lord schuld send hir ioye of hir son. For in þis mater sche had more sorrow for him þan euyr sche had to bring him forth onto þe world. Every day sche offered for him at þe aueter; everie day sche gaf elmesse. Twyse on þe day went sche to cherch, not for to telle veyn tales, but for to here tydyngis of oure lord of heuene in deuoute sermons, or ells for here diu[n]e seruyse, þat God schuld accept hir prayers which were principali for þe goostly helth of hir son Augustin. Be hir prayers Austyn is now rered fro his seknesse”; \textit{ibid.}, 30: “Than sche sent praieres onto heuevene with grettir bisinesse þan euyr sche ded, þat oure lord schuld hast þis matere & make brith þe þirknesse of Augustines soule.”
\textsuperscript{126} Ibid., 20.
\textsuperscript{127} Ibid., 20.
handled day-to-day difficulties, such as when her servants spoke poorly about her, with ease and patience.128

Capgrave emphasised that Monica’s faith and concern for the soul of her son was constant. In the scene of the wooden ruler, in which Monica had a vision of a young man who told her not to weep for her son, for wherever she was, there he would be also, Capgrave stressed her faith as clairvoyant.129 Capgrave also included the scene of Monica weeping for Augustine to be told by the local bishop that “it is impossible þat a child whech hath so many teres wept for him schuld perisch.”130 He used Monica’s prayers as a tool to foreshadow Augustine’s eventual conversion, as they are shown to be instrumental in Augustine’s life, as when “be hir prayeres Austyn is now rered fro his seknesse.”131

Capgrave’s Monica was present at the two most salient religious experiences of Augustine’s life. After his conversion by reading in the garden of Valerius, Augustine entered into a house associated with Monica in order to tell her of the experience. Capgrave wrote:

Into þe house þei go both. Þere þei fynde þe blessed woman Monicha, þe modir of Augustin. Þei told hir al þis processe, þat sche whech had be in so mech sorrow for hir son schuld haue part of his new ioye. Sche þankid God with ful humbl hert þat oure lord had graunted hir hir long desire & mech more þat sche desired. For not only he had brout him to purpos to be a Cristen man, but he had stered his hert to despise al þis worldly plesauns.132

Capgrave implicated Monica’s prayers that she might see Augustine as a Christian man into the motivations behind this scene; he implied that God was listening to her prayers all along and that she was somehow the impetus behind Augustine’s eventual turn to Christianity. She shared in this experience with him, as he and Alypius rushed to tell her about their conversion before anyone else.

Capgrave also included the vision at Ostia, a scene omitted by the Augustinian

---

128 Ibid., 20-21.
129 The episode of the Wooden Ruler originates in Augustine, Confessions, 31 (3.11.19). It has been the subject of extensive analysis by Leo Ferrari (“Monica on the Wooden Ruler,” 193-205; idem, “The Dreams of Monica in Augustine’s Confessions” AS, 9 (1979): 3-17).
130 Ibid., 25.
131 Ibid., 28.
132 Ibid., 36.
Tradition, but which was the pinnacle of Augustine’s own narrative. Capgrave described the scene as follows:

So upon a day as his moder a

and he stood lenyng out a wyndow and lokyng into a gardeyn whech longid onto her in fer fro pres of puple, þus alone þei too talked ful sobirly of þe euyrlestyn lif whech is ordeyned for blessed soules. Thei talked so long þerof, and lyft up her hertis in contemplacion of þat holy place, þat þei had forget in maner þis world and alle erdly þing, so were þei rauyschid with her holy wordis. Thei stood stille both a grete while and þout swech þingis as þei coude not vttyr, and eke ageyn in her holy comunicacion þei felle.  Tho saide sche onto hir son swech maner wordis: ‘Son, as to my part, I telle I haue no delectacion in no manere þat is in þis world. What I schal do in þis world, or why þat I am here so longe, I wote not verily. Sumtyme I desired to abyde þat I schuld se þe a trew Cristen man or I deyid. God hath graunted me þat and mech more, for I se þe nowt only a Cristen man, but I se þe a special seruant of God, for þou hast despised alle worldly felicite.’

It is significant that it is his mother, and not any of his monastic colleagues, with whom Augustine underwent this mystical experience, since it implies that Augustine’s monasticism was not the height of his religious career. After this union of minds, Monica died in peace knowing that her son’s soul has finally and irrevocably been saved. Augustine’s respect for her is summed up well in Capgrave’s description of his last eulogy to her after her death, where he spoke of her as having constantly had the sacrifice of Christ in mind.

Bokenham similarly acclaimed the character of Monica. His descriptions of Monica characterised her as deeply holy and the first mechanism by which Augustine is introduced to God. In contrast to Augustine’s father, whom Bokenham described as a heathen and who prevented Monica from baptising Augustine as a young child when he is ill, Monica was a constant force pushing Augustine towards Christianity. Bokenham remarked how Augustine “drinkyn yt [the name of Christ] in from hys modrys brest”, who was “a cristene woman and an holy.”

Bokenham included many of the same scenes as Capgrave regarding Monica. He treated at length the episode of Monica exhorting her friends to maintain peace in their

133 Ibid., 46.
134 Ibid., 47-48.
135 Edinburgh, Faculty of Advocates, MS Abbotsford, fol. 171r.
households in order to escape assault by their hot-tempered husbands, and also included the scene of the wooden ruler. Bokenham’s implied that her prayers are somewhat the cause of his eventual salvation: “thourgh the merite of hir preyers and the prechyng and the hooly exortacios of seynt Symplician hir sone was convertid and made a perfite cristen man.” [emphasis mine] Monica, wracked with anxiety after Augustine had left for Italy without her, followed him there and rejoiced that he had rejected Manichaeism at last.

Bokenham portrayed Monica as a woman who had always known God, even as a child when “rather by god she was made subiect to hir fadir and modir than by hir fadir and modir to god.” He described her as “fastenyd and nailed on the crosse with criste” and wrote that “she have contynnelly the passion of criste in hir mynde.” Her mystical experiences came to the fore, as Bokenham embellished her life not only with the vision at Ostia, but other miracles as well. According to Bokenham:

the seid hand maiden of criste shuld receiven the sacrament of cristis precious body she was so rapt with the spirite of compuncccion and devocion that she was seen lyfted up a cubite from the erthe and notwithstondyng that she was wone to be moste quyete cried moste swetely and seid fflye we to heven flye we to heven with which crie she replenisshid and fulfilled Austyn hir sone and al the meyne of hir housholde with an inestimable ioye and gladnesse seeing the grete grace of compuncycon and of devocion that god had shewid in hir.

With the inclusion of this scene, Bokenham cemented the success of her religious endeavours, for in spite of her womanhood and lack of education, it was Monica, not Augustine, who knew God intimately and experienced proximity to him. This is corroborated further by the vision at Ostia, shared with her son, which forms the apex of her religious career. Soon after the joint experience, she died peacefully at Ostia, knowing she was never far from God.

The extent to which Bokenham and Capgrave saw Monica as a spiritual guide for

136 Ibid., fol. 101v.
137 Ibid., fol. 171r.
138 Ibid., fol. 101v.
139 Ibid., fol. 101v.
140 Ibid., fol. 101v.
141 Ibid.
142 Ibid., fol. 102r.
143 Ibid., fol. 171v and 102r.
Augustine is significant for their view of the ideal religious path; if Augustine, the example of their own religion, was inspired and guided by Monica, how Monica’s devotion functioned was correspondingly important. Her piety was one of meekness – a term also used by Capgrave and Bokenham when describing the hermit Simplicianus, Augustine’s mentor in eremitism – and simplicity, despising wealth and pomp, and intuitively gravitating towards God, rather than seeking an intellectual understanding of the divine. Whilst perhaps accommodating a female audience as Smetana has suggested, this inclusion of Monica diverges considerably from the Augustinian Tradition, which erased her almost completely from Augustine’s life.

**Augustine the Preacher, Priest, and Bishop**

With the OESA’s adoption of mendicancy in the thirteenth century, the Austin Friars took on areas of ministry that had not previously been part of their organisation’s mission. The Augustinian Tradition was, ultimately, unsuccessful in reconciling a picture of Augustine as strictly eremitical – in order to justify the inclusion of the word *eremitarum* in their order’s title – with the realities of mendicant living. In England, Capgrave and Bokenham wrote about their putative founder as a bishop, pastor, and preacher. They exalted his efforts in his parochial community, rather than seeing him uniquely as a contemplative. This Augustine engaged in what the friars perceived as the perfect combination of the contemplative and active lives, uniting together both ascetism and contemplation of God with active ministry.145

---

144 Bokenham referred to Monica, in *ibid.*, fol. 101v, as ‘mekely’ answering her hot-tempered husband. Capgrave did not explicitly refer to Monica as meek, but made repeated mentions of her gentleness, modesty and obedience. See Capgrave, *Life of St Augustine*, especially at 20, where he described her ability to keep the peace within her household, in spite of her irascible husband. ‘Meekness’ is predominantly used by Bokenham, particularly in his descriptions of the holiness of Simplicianus. Simplicianus exhorts both Augustine and Victorinus to the ‘mekenesse of Crist’ (see Edinburgh, Faculty of Advocates, MS Abbotsford fol. 171r); Augustine prays meekly to God when begging for conversion (*ibid.*, fol. 171v), and his asceticism is described as a form of meekness twice (*ibid.*, fol. 172r and 172v). Capgrave also used the term meekness for description of the holy life, particularly in Capgrave, *Life of St Augustine*, 53 when Augustine writes to priests to tell them to be like his hermits, that is, meek of heart. Similarly, Simplicianus exhorts Victorinus to the meekness of Christ at *ibid.*, 33.

In Capgrave’s *Life of Saint Augustine*, Augustine’s vocation as a pastor is particularly conspicuous. In Capgrave’s telling, the bishop Valerius noted “†e grete desire þat [Augustine] had to preche †e word of God”, and was grateful “†at God schuld send him swech a man þat myth edifie his puple both with exaumple and doctrine.” Capgrave also noted that Valerius permitted Augustine to preach in his church, in his presence, in contravention of what most bishops would do, primarily because Augustine’s sermons were compelling to an extent unachievable by Valerius himself. Capgrave presented his preaching as a constant feature throughout Augustine’s time as a bishop, emphasising that “with grettere auctorite and more feruent loue he prechid þe word of God, nowt only in his owne diosise but where euyr he was reqwyred; most specialy where heresie regned, þidir went he to defende þe feith.” This was a man whose concern for the laity took him to wherever his sermons could be of use, even outside of the diocese for which he was responsible.

Augustine’s own zeal for preaching was mirrored in the design of his monastic communities in Hippo. Capgrave’s Augustine allowed the hermits trained in divinity to preach and saw as their main goal the spiritual guidance of the laity. According to Capgrave, he “ordeyned þat þei [the hermits] schul preche þe word of lif onto þe puple and bring trew soules be here gode ensaumples to him þat mad al of nowt.” Capgrave clarified that it was only those hermits who were sufficiently educated in theology who are permitted to preach in this way; he stated several times that it was only “þoo which were lerned in diuinite and custumablely vsed in good lyf,” who had permission and the authority to preach to the laity. Capgrave’s emphasis on the importance of preaching contrasts with the eremitical life, which demanded that its adherents live in seclusion away from society. Augustine’s community bears more resemblance to a group of medieval friars
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146 Capgrave, *Life of St Augustine*, 55.
147 *Ibid.*; “Wherfore he graunted Augustin leue ageyn þe custom of þe cherchis of Affrik to prech in þe church in his presens, flor which þing many oþir bischoppis gruchid ageyn þis new custom. Be he rowt not ne sette no pryse be swech gruching tongis, þe whilis þat Augustin supplied swech good werkis which he coude not do himselue.”
150 *Ibid.*. See also: “þo prestis which were wel lerned men had leue to preche […]” (*ibid.*).
than it does to hermits, with Capgrave invoking the friars’ capacity to hear confessions and absolve sins, stating: “behold who þai deme þe erde and bynde it & lose swech as þei wil euyr with þe fauoure of God.” Capgrave’s use of the phrase *binding and loosing* makes explicit reference to the clerical powers of absolution and speaks directly to contemporaneous conflicts about the right of fraternal priests to preach and hear confessions.

Bokenham’s Augustine too is emphatically engaged in preaching and spiritual guidance. Bokenham portrayed Augustine as an active and fervent fighter of heresy, who converted many back to the faith with his preaching. “Of many cherchis,” according to Bokenham, “he was preyid to comyn and prechyn there the wurde of god and many men convertyd from here errour.” He emphasised that Augustine’s sermons held a corrective power, substantiated by his report of a Manichee hearing him preach.

Whereas in Capgrave’s text, Augustine’s preaching is primarily tied to his episcopal office, Bokenham’s references to his sermons appear in the context of theological debate. These two emphases reflect the reality of mendicant preaching in late-medieval England; licensing of friars for preaching by the local bishop was contingent on sufficient education and approval at the provincial chapter. Bokenham and Capgrave’s underlining of the academic qualifications necessary for preaching – as per Augustine’s organisation of his monastic community in Capgrave’s work and the academic benefits of preaching, namely, the destruction of heresy, made evident by Bokenham – is topical given their late-medieval context. The restrictions of the anti-Lollard legislation of 1409 under Archbishop Thomas Arundel regarding the content of sermons and preaching regulations speak to the widespread preoccupation with the Lollard heresy and the role of preaching in combating those ideas.

Moreover, the depiction of Augustine not just as a preacher, but also specifically as a
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151 *Ibid*.
152 Edinburgh, Faculty of Advocates, MS Abbotsford, fol. 173r.
153 *Ibid*.
bishop preacher, is significant for the late-medieval Austin Friars. There were, within this period, many Austin Friars who were appointed as bishops, with Robert Waldeby ascending all the way to the archbishopric of York, and thus the appropriateness of the episcopal life would have been a salient point for Austin Friars. Episcopal appointment was by its very nature a rejection of the mendicant lifestyle, which demanded the ability to move from town to town, spreading the word of the gospel, and called for poverty and humility. That both Capgrave and Bokenham took the time to consider Augustine’s own activities as a bishop – neglected by the Augustinian Tradition – reflects contemporaneous anxieties about the effects of episcopal appointments on the Augustinian lifestyle. Depicting Augustine as a successful bishop and preacher cemented for the Austin Friars the possibility that the episcopal life was not threatening to the mendicant status of the friars.

Furthermore, Capgrave and Bokenham’s concern with Augustine as a preaching bishop suggest that they were cognisant of wider concerns about episcopal duties of preaching. Their confrère John Bury of Clare had publicly involved himself in this controversy in his Gladius Salomonis, which served as the official response to Reginald Pecock’s The Repressor of Overmuch Blaming of the Clergy, likely composed after 1459. The text has traditionally been dated to 1457, but Bury stated that he composed the text after he had been elected as prior provincial, which happened on 5 August 1459. The dedicatory epistle to the text shows that Bury composed it at the behest of Thomas Bourchier, Archbishop of Canterbury, and brother-in-law of Isabel Bourchier, Bokenham’s famed patroness. Only the first part of the text has been preserved and it is an answer to Pecock’s exaltation of human reason over Scripture as a moral guide. Bury sought to present thirteen conclusions opposing those of Pecock regarding matters, such as whether it
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155 See page 107 for information about Robert Waldeby.
156 Only the first half of the text remains extant, which can be found in Oxford, Bodl., MS Bodley 108. Excerpts were published in an appendix to Churchill Babington’s edition of Pecock’s Repressor of Over Much Blaming of the Clergy (London, 1860): 567-613. For the controversy surrounding Pecock see V.H.H. Green, Bishop Reginald Pecock (Cambridge, 1945) and E.F. Jacob, “Reynold Pecock, Bishop of Chichester” in E.F. Jacob, Essays in Later Medieval History (Manchester, 1968): 1-34.
157 Dd 6 fol. 17r (consulted via RothSources, 342; D 854).
158 See Pecock, Repressor of Over Much Blaming of the Clergy, 572.
was the office of Scripture to found governments, acts, and laws; whether moral teaching would remain as before if Scriptures were burnt; and whether Scripture existed before Abraham. Bury did not address the issue of the duty of preaching and pastoral care of bishops in his *Gladius*, as the issue was topical about a decade earlier.

Around the time of the creation of both Capgrave and Bokenham’s hagiographies, however, in the late 1440s and 1450s, the foremost issue concerning Pecock’s divisive ideas was his opposition to the necessity and importance of episcopal preaching. Bury’s reply to Pecock, although later and responding to different theological points, demonstrates the likelihood that the educated members of the Austin Friars would have been aware of the controversy surrounding Pecock’s claims, since Bury was educated to the same degree as Capgrave and Bokenham. It is probable that Capgrave and Bokenham’s writing about bishops would reflect those anxieties about preaching and their depiction of Augustine as engaging in this practice must be viewed, to some degree, within this context.

**Augustine’s Devotional Practices**

As Augustine’s life was the model that the OESA strove to imitate, how Capgrave and Bokenham depicted Augustine’s devotion is important for understanding their religious practice. Capgrave depicted Augustine as preoccupied by sin, thereby emphasising the necessity of grace in order to overcome that sin, a motif missing in the Augustinian Tradition. Capgrave described the lack of innocence in children, underlining that they are capable of sin from birth. He wrote that:

```
Comounly childyrn of þis age [in infancy] be clepid innocentis, for þei lack vse of resound to discerne vice fro vertu. But of þis age and of synnes do in þis age Seynt Augustyn makitʒ open confession in þe first book of þat matere, where he seith þat sum childyr þat can not speke þei can loke angrily on hem þat greve him, and with hands and teth proferen in manere of a veniauns.
```

---

163 Bury appears to have studied at Oxford, in spite of originating from East Anglia, likely because he was already in London in 1417, at which point, he was transferred to Oxford for his studies. See *BRUO*, 1:323. He is referred to as a master in 1462 (and many times after that date) in Dd 6 fol. 17v (consulted via *RothSources*, 347; D 867) and the composition of his *Gladius Salomonis* would have necessitated sufficient theological education.
This is stressed again when Capgrave added the scene of the stolen pears from the *Confessiones*, absent from Jordan’s text. According to Capgrave,

> He [Augustin] schryvyth him also þat in þis age he ded many insolens *more for vanite pan for need*, and in special of an appil tre þat stood fast by his faderes vyne on anoþir mannes lond. Of which he makith grete consciens because þat he myþ haue had bettir appillis in his faderes possession, and eke for whan he had þese appelles he ete hem nawt but þrew hem onto hoggis.165 [emphasis mine]

This scene epitomises the childish sinfulness described by Augustine; without any need or even desire for the fruit, he stole them simply for the sake of the theft. In the same vein, Capgrave was sure to mention Augustine’s concubine, a figure mentioned in none of the five continental texts examined above.

Bokenham was similarly concerned with Augustine’s sins as a younger man, and thus also with the consequential conversion under the fig tree. He cited Augustine’s prolonged association with Manichees, his stealing of a neighbour’s fruit as a child, and youthful gluttony as evidence for his peregrinations.166 According to Bokenham, once Augustine read Paul’s epistle to the Romans, upon hearing the famous ‘take and read’, suddenly “alle the thirk clowdys of doute vanysshid awey from hym.”167 It was the recognition of his sinfulness and worthlessness that filled the scene leading up to the conversion, which served Bokenham’s purposes by putting Augustine’s later saintly achievements into sharp relief.

Bokenham’s views on the nature of Augustinian asceticism are clear in this text, as he repeatedly emphasised Augustine’s insistence on moderation, rather than on extreme self-denial. When describing Augustine’s clothing, Bokenham wrote that “Hys clothynge hys hosyn and hys shoon and his othere ornementys were neythyr to shynynge ner to abyect, but of moderat and conpetent habite.”168 Similarly, he provided caveats for dieting, arguing that it should not compromise health, and that one should view eating and drinking as a kind of

166 Edinburgh, Faculty of Advocates, MS Abbotsford fol. 172r-v.
Bokenham wrote that “wyn he [Augustine] had aluey at his table”, but that “he usid yt sohyrly aftyr the counsel of poule to Timothee.” Bokenham warned of the dangers of gluttony, but used Augustine’s example to show that excess – either in indulgence or in asceticism – was unwise. Bokenham’s concern with Augustine’s diet is paralleled by Augustine’s avoidance of women; Bokenham discussed at length Augustine’s rules not to dwell with any women, even his sister, and not to speak to a woman without a third party present. This concern regarding the danger of female presence is not unprecedented; Augustine’s own theology was deeply suspicious of sexuality, and therefore also of women, and this is reflected in his desire to avoid their temptation.

Conclusions

The writings of Capgrave and Bokenham on the origins of the OESA and the life of its founder represent a move away from the Augustinian Tradition. The Augustinian Tradition presented an Augustine abstracted to such a degree that elements, which were paramount to the Confessiones, such as Augustine’s conversion by grace or the mystical vision at Ostia that he shared with his mother, were nowhere to be found. Both Bokenham and Capgrave’s Augustine are a return to the Confessiones in that regard; he wanders in his youth and experiences the frustration of waiting for divine grace to turn him towards God. He has a loving relationship with his mother, and grieves intensely at her death. He is plagued by his sins until he is miraculously converted, at which point he becomes a fervent champion of Christian orthodoxy. The two friars navigated their way through the texts of Augustine, Possidius, Jacobus of Voragine, Philip of Harvengt, Petrarch, and others to describe an Augustine that was uniquely English and Augustinian, rather than the paradigmatic convert, bishop, canon, or theologian.

One may see the English texts as an acceptance of the multi-faceted nature of the life of Augustine. Capgrave and Bokenham allowed for Augustine to have undergone a variety
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169 Ibid., fol. 172v.
170 Ibid., fol. 172r.
171 Ibid.
172 Ibid., fol. 172v.
of religious experiences and the re-inclusion of Monica within the English portrayal aided this diversification. Monica’s faith is very different from Augustine’s, for she does not understand complex theological arguments, yet loves God regardless. Her religion is based on faith rather than intellectualism, and is categorically part of the world, not an escape from it as the eremitical life. A married woman with temporal aspirations for her son, it is she with whom Augustine experiences his vision of the divine at Ostia. Monica was a character who complicated the Augustinian Tradition; she led a religiously successful life in a manner diametrically opposed to that of the Augustinian order, and thus, Capgrave and Bokenham’s inclusion of her indicates that they, unlike the five European authors, did not find her religious success to be a complication for their own religious culture.

The move into the cities that came with the Grand Union in 1256 marked a distinct change in the mission of the OESA. That tension between its eremitical heritage and mendicant present is resolved in the Augustinian Tradition by the inclusion of a scene of Pope Alexander IV’s vision of Augustine, exhorting him to unite the disparate communities of eremitical Augustinians. Henry of Friemar in particular, stressed the physical membership of the Hermits to Augustine’s body, casting their community as a *corpus Augustini*. Henry described the scene as follows:

> For in the time of Pope Alexander IV, as he himself attested, Augustine appeared to him in a vision with a large head but small limbs. From that vision, just as if from a divine oracle, the pope, having been exhorted, united many other Orders living similarly in hermitages to the eremitical brothers of St Augustine, confiding in them that, whoever amongst them would be suitable to bear fruit in the people by teaching of the divine word, *that they should live in the city and irrigate the people of God with their exemplary life and sound teaching together with provident confession*, nonetheless for the other brothers remaining in hermitage according to the disposition of prior general, strengthening them with privileges and favours for those agreeing with such a status. In that vision, St Augustine openly revealed himself to be the true head and the true father of that order and by consequence, those brothers to be the true sons and true limbs of him.173 [emphasis mine]

---

173 Henry of Friemar, “Tractatus,” 103: “Nam tempore Alexandri papae IV, ut ipsomet testatus est, beatus Augustinus eidem in visione apparuit grandis quidem capite des membris exilis. Ex qua vision tamquam divino oraculo ipse papa commontitus univit fratribus eremitis sancti Augustini plures alios ordinis similiter in eremis habitantes, mandans ipsis ut, quicumque ex eis essent idonei ad fructificandum in populo per doctrinam verbi divini, quod illi deberent in civitatibus habitate et exemplari vita ac salutari doctrina simulque confessione provida dei populum irrigare alii fratribus nihilominus secundum dispositionem prioris generalis in eremo remanentibus, muniens eos privilegiis et gratiis tali statui congruentibus. In qua quide visione beatus Augustinus aperte ostendit se esse
Henry was explicit in connecting the literal, corporeal implications of this vision to the claims of parentage by the Hermits; according to Henry, because Augustine was the true head of the body of Augustinians, he was also their true father. A union of Augustine’s religious followers completed his body, adding a physical dimension to the Hermits’ relationship to the Church Father. This imagery legitimised Alexander’s decision to unite the communities and move them into cities with the express purpose of disseminating proper Christian teaching.

In the English texts, however, a corporeal relationship with Augustine does not mediate the tension between the *status antiquus* and *modernus* of the OESA. The actions of Alexander IV affirmed, for Capgrave, the truth in his order’s claims to Augustinianism; by including the scene of Alexander’s vision, Capgrave emphasised the agency of Augustine in the order’s second beginning. In his *Abbreviacion*, he wrote:

> In the same tyme Seynt Austen appered onto Alisaundre the pope with a grete hed and a lytil body; and the pope inqwired whi he appered soo. Augustin seid, for his succession were not called to dwelle in the cité and townes, as were the Prechoures and the Menoures. And non the pope mad a bulle, in which we had leue to dwelle in citées, and gyue ensuample of good lyf.\(^{174}\)

The vision of Augustine here served more explicitly to explain the change in lifestyle of the Hermits and attribute that change to Augustine rather than to place Augustine at the second formation of the order. In Bokenham’s account, however, this scene is omitted altogether; what was such a pivotal episode in the Augustinian Tradition finds little recognition or salience in the English texts here.

Mendicant historiography and hagiography of monastic founders like these texts are attempts to codify a religious platform, to isolate key moments in the life of the founder which can serve as exemplary for his followers. This was also the case for the Franciscans; although they had a founder in more recent memory, the reiterations of the life of Francis from the two texts of Thomas of Celano, Bonaventura’s *Legenda Maior*, the *Legenda Trium
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Sociorum, the Fioretti, and more, show that the Franciscans were trying to work out the essential aspects of Francis’ life and his viewpoint on key issues such as poverty, scholarship, and mystical devotion related to the appearance of the stigmata. Tension between the papal office and mainstream Franciscans associated with Brother Elias on the one hand and the zelanti, advocating complete corporate poverty, on the other can be inferred from these texts, as the authors present their view of the Franciscan ideal. Dominican hagiography, conversely, was significantly less plagued by controversy, as the administratively gifted Dominic had clearly laid out his expectations for his order in terms of lifestyle, mission, and ethos.

Another significant goal of texts of this kind is to legitimise the origins and antiquity of an order. The Austins in Europe certainly achieved this with their focus on Augustine interpreting an ancient eremitical tradition originating with Paul of Thebes and Antony. The Austins in England did this by focusing on Augustine himself as their founder. The Carmelites were the most successful at this task, in placing their origins with Elijah himself and legitimising their association with the Virgin Mary through a vision of Simon Stock of Mary bestowing upon him the Carmelite scapular. Elijah functioned as an ideal founder for the Carmelites not only because of his association with Mount Carmel, but also because he had been the exemplary monk for the first few centuries of Christianity, and thus, the Carmelites tried to appropriate much of Christian history as their own. These texts all authenticate the legitimacy and antiquity of the establishment of their order and associate it with as significant a religious figure as possible. They used hagiography of their founder to discern their ideal life and to determine the standards and expectations of their religious profession.

Whilst we cannot know the extent to which Capgrave and Bokenham were representative of his English brethren in the fifteenth century, as Austins who found remarkable success within the order, their views on the foundation of the OESA and its

relationship to other monastic groups must not have been wholly different from those around them. Capgrave and Bokenham’s Augustine is one who represents a remarkable return to origins, a renewed interest in the writing of Augustine himself, and the religious lifestyle championed in that writing. Thus, an Augustine who brought forth such variegated forms of religious experience opened up a diversity of paths to his followers. This multiplicity of interpretation gave room for exploration of religious practice, the variety of which will be explored in the following chapters.
Chapter 3: Augustinian Pastoral Care

Financially reliant on donations, the Austin Friars characteristically lived in cities or towns, envisioning their mission as one of spreading the word of God and offering spiritual care for laypeople.\(^1\) Whilst bound within the regional limit of their convents for preaching and begging for alms and therefore not totally itinerant in their preaching, the Austins were willing to travel great lengths in order to achieve sufficient education, or to aid their confrères in preaching, an attitude which attests to the importance of mobility to their order.\(^2\) However, whilst urban lay communities may have been at the heart of mendicancy, the catch-all nature of the Austin Friars described in the first chapter alerts us to the extreme variability in their mission.\(^3\)

Some convents of Austin Friars, particularly the house in London, very much subscribed to the urban lifestyle of the other fraternal orders. At another extreme was the convent in Woodhouse, which maintained its eremitical roots, remaining protective of its isolation, and thus engaging in pastoral care in a manner rather different from the members of other convents.\(^4\) The isolation of the Austin house at Woodhouse from any established towns or cities meant that it was one of the few to retain elements of eremitism, the way of life associated with the Tuscan Hermits of St Augustine, the forerunners of the OESA. It was one of the very few Augustinian convents not to be moved into a town to fulfil mendicant preaching once the Austins embraced their fraternal status, and thus it

---


\(^2\) The section below on the international network of the Austin Friars, of which they made use for sharing the workload of preaching to the international community in London, discusses this propensity for mobility amongst the Austin Friars. There is an important distinction to be made here; whilst housed at a particular convent, a friar was not permitted to seek patronage or alms outside of his limit. Friars routinely moved from convent to convent however, generally by petition to the general or provincial prior, particularly for their education. For an example of internecine conflict over the limit between convents, and therefore the regions wherein friars could preach and beg for alms, see L. Redstone, “Suffolk Limiters” *PSIA* 20:1 (1928): 36-42, esp. at 36. See pages 131-137.

\(^3\) See pages 29-30 for a discussion of the variety of Augustinian foundations in England.

\(^4\) See *RothEAF*, 1:359. There is circumstantial evidence pointing to the possibility that this house was the home for some time to William Langland, reputed author of the famed *Piers Ploughman*, as this priory was the closest geographically to his birthplace, and therefore was a likely spot for his early education. See John Corbett, “William Langland – poet and hermit,” *TSAS* 57 (1961): 224-30 and *VCH: Shropshire*, 2: 95-98.
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maintained its remote location and eremitical practices to an extent unparalleled by other Austin convents. Thus, since the interactions of the Austin Friars with the laity are at the heart of their religious platform as friars, it is crucial that we be cognisant of the variation in those relationships.

This chapter will analyse the documentation of the preaching and pastoral care of the Austin Friars in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in order to examine how they provided religious services to their local communities and whether their actions supported the kind of religious life they championed in their portrayals of Augustine. How were the Austin Friars’ activities within their local communities reflective of their religious culture as followers of Augustine? Were there instances of antifraternalism directed at the Austin Friars and if so, how did they respond? What was the role of their pastoral care in society? How did they interact with the communities of lay people around them on whom they depended and to whom they offered religious services?

It is important to remember that the nature of pastoral care itself skews its documentation; ordinary sermons and cure of souls would not have been recorded unless it was exceptional or defective in some way, or caused serious tensions with the parochial clergy. Moreover, the strict meaning of pastoral care is not applicable to most of the activities reviewed in this chapter because the engagement of the friars with the laity tended rather towards the provision of specific spiritual services and progressively towards those that were in themselves remunerative, or promised recurrent business. Moreover, our evidence shows us noteworthy instances of routine preaching, such as in the household of

---

5 Guy Geltner defines “antifraternalism” as opposition to the friars in their early phase (1220-1400) “driven by competition over material and political resources as as by envy, a feeling aroused especially among monks and clergy members, members of the church whose income and status the mendicants threatened most.” See G. Geltner, The Making of Medieval Antifraternalism: Polemic, Violence, Deviance & Remembrance (Oxford, 2012), 5. I am using the phrase here to mean simply opposition to the friars, whether clerical or lay in origin, and in whichever phase of mendicant history. Whilst Geltner is correct in asserting that antifraternal behaviour largely occurs in the early phase of mendicant history, the concept applies to much of the behaviour in the fifteenth century that will be discussed in this chapter, and thus, I feel it is appropriate to use this term. The term has been similarly used by G. Dipple for discussion surrounding sentiments towards the friars during the Reformation. See G. Dipple, Antifraternalism and anticlericalism in the German Reformation: Johann Eberlin von Gunzburg and the Campaign against the Friars (Aldershot, 1996), especially at 4 for Dipple’s use of the term “antifraternalism.”
the third Duke of Buckingham, whose records survive only because of his arrest for treason, attainder, and the confiscation of his property by the Crown: they remain accidentally preserved in the National Archives.\(^6\) We must be cognisant of this distortion; the daily interactions of Austin Friars with the local laity is not entirely accessible through written sources and we should not infer from the documentation of a few sermons patronised by the wealthy that all of Augustinian preaching functioned in the same way. Similarly, our sources overrepresent the services performed by the Austin Friars in their care for the dead; testamentary evidence by its very nature only reports financial transactions between the laity and the Austin Friars regarding funerary and expurgatory services, or at the very least, the testator's intentions about such services.

The fact that there are documented altercations over the division of labour between the secular clergy and the Austin friars suggests that it was both effective and popular, as do the OESA's records of income from indulgences in the sixteenth century.\(^7\) They used their sermons to influence the wealthy and relied upon the laity's image of them as a religious elite in order to drive this symbiotic economy.\(^8\) This is not distinctive to the Austin Friars; even the Franciscans, who held much stronger views on the value of poverty, found ways to legitimise their sale of pastoral care. Although the Franciscan order had been split since its beginning over the extremity of poverty, the friaries made income off leasing the messuages within their precincts and from their religious services.\(^9\) Some friaries had as much as forty-three acres with large annual incomes, with the Franciscans at London receiving over fifty-five pounds a year.\(^10\) Although their land was held in trust, changes in standards of living strained their income as the Middle Ages went on and there is evidence

---

\(^7\) See pages 120-129 for a discussion on indulgences and 137-142 for instances of conflicts with the secular clergy.
that friars began to receive individual bequests.\textsuperscript{11} The Dominicans took a very different view to poverty, but perhaps more similar to the Austins, seeing poverty as a means to strengthen their preaching.\textsuperscript{12} The Dominicans owned their own properties until 1216, when they gave up this right, but they never employed intermediaries, as did the Franciscans.\textsuperscript{13} There certainly were regulations surrounding the use of money, as every brother who used funds had to give an account of it to his prior,\textsuperscript{14} but they never enforced strict poverty as was emphasised by certain Franciscans.

There were economic realities with which all orders needed to reckon and pastoral care was one way in which the friars did so. That the Austins participated in accepted fraternal behaviour puts their abnormal activity into sharp relief; where they deviated from typical mendicant pastoral care can reveal to us their distinctiveness from other friars. Those distinctive elements will be expounded in this chapter; from their use of the \textit{Scala Coeli} indulgence to their care of the international community in London, the Austins diverged from their otherwise typical mendicant pastoral care in a multitude of significant ways.

\textbf{I. Augustinian Preaching}

In spite of Capgrave and Bokenham’s concerted efforts to show that preaching was an integral element to the life prescribed by Augustine, there is fairly scant documentation of the sermons of the Austin Friars in late-medieval England. The apex of their activity in preaching in England had been reached in the previous century, with active and respected preachers such as Geoffrey Hardeby, John Waldeby, and William Flete. The most famous of these three is John Waldeby, not to be confused with fellow Augustinians (and probably relations) Simon Waldeby and Robert Waldeby, who was also Archbishop of York from 1396-98. Collections of his homilies reveal him to have been both an accomplished theologian and

\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Ibid.}, 55.
\textsuperscript{13} Hinnebusch, \textit{The Early English Friars Preachers}, 236.
\textsuperscript{14} Bennet, \textit{The Early Dominicans}, 148.
a preacher able to make his ideas accessible to members of the laity. Waldeby left several collections of sermons, some of which were written specifically for his students. Waldeby’s sermons must have been exceptionally popular, since he related in the prologue to his treatise on the Creed that since his sermons drew such large crowds, he needed to move from the convent of York to the less busy house at Tickhill in order to write. Moreover, he was well regarded by the famous abbot of St Albans, Thomas de la Mare, even teaching the abbot about preaching techniques and dedicating sermons about the Creed to him. Waldeby’s best known work was his *Novum Opus Dominicale*, a sermon cycle for each Sunday gospel of the year. His sermons follow the typical scholastic structure except that he peculiarly and consistently divided the thema first into two, and then into three, the parts of which form the basis of the sermon. His prolific use of anecdotes is another peculiarity of his, in both the main text and in the margins, adding in as many amusing examples as possible.

William Flete was a famous ascetic who travelled from England to spend most of his career in the famous hermitage at Lecceto, which became the centre of Augustinian Observance, and was a spiritual advisor to Catherine of Siena. His most famous sermon was about Catherine, composed in 1382, two years after her death, presenting her as a typical female ascetic, but also as a preacher, supporter of the papacy, opponent of heresy,
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17 Ibid., 40.

18 Ibid.

19 Ibid., 41.

20 Ibid., 43.

21 Ibid., 44.


and a writer. He presented an account of her transformative experience at communion, portraying her as a *mediatrix*, unusual for a female saint. This is an important precedent for John Capgrave’s later hagiography of a different St Catherine, which, as we shall later discover, created a remarkably unusual representation of a female saint. Geoffrey Hardeby was another celebrated theologian, who preached in defence of the mendicant orders, recorded in his *Liber de Vita Evangelica*. After an attack against the mendicants at the University of Oxford in 1360, he amended the *Liber* to include his demonstration that Augustine did, in fact, live as a hermit, serving as his apology for the OESA against the Canons.

The fifteenth-century Austin Friars were without such illustrious preachers and thus superficially reflect what many have seen as the dullness of the fifteenth century, or what Francis Roth rather woodenly characterised as a “stagnant” phase of the OESA’s history. Indeed, the evidence suggestive of extensive or innovative preaching on the part of the Austin Friars is slim. What we do know about their preaching is that the General Chapters of the order in 1486 and 1491 directed every friar who acted as a confessor to have a copy of Antoninus of Florence’s *Summa Confessionalis* or a similar guide for confession. There is no evidence to suggest that any English Austin community owned this text, although they did have a variety of other preaching and confession manuals. Moreover, preaching was restricted to those with academic degrees, with particularly prominent sermons reserved to those friars who were at least cursors, that is, those theologians working under the lector or

24 Ibid., 205.
25 Ibid., 206.
26 See pages 161-162 and 228-229.
29 See the seminal article by David Lawton, “Dullness and the Fifteenth Century” *ELH* 54 (1987): 761-799 for the thesis that characterises the fifteenth century literary tradition as a sterile elevation and imitation of Chaucer.
30 RothEAF, 104. “All English religious life was at a standstill. Stagnant would be the right word.”
31 Ibid., 200.
master of theology in a *studium*.32

**Preaching Licences**

Just as the anti-Lollard legislation of 1409 instigated a climate of censorship over vernacular texts,33 so too did it encourage the practice of preaching licences, which effectively policed the content of sermons.34 Travelling preachers were examined and approved by the local bishop prior to teaching and friars needed approval from their own superior before approaching the bishop for a licence.35 These licences lasted for a year and were valid only for the diocese in which they were issued; similarly, a change of bishop – whether by translation or death – voided all previous licences.36 Extant preaching licences granted to the Austin Friars are scarce. This could perhaps reflect an exemption of the Austin Friars enabling them to undertake ordinary parish preaching without going through the formal licensing process, but there is no evidence of such an exemption. Episcopal registers are of only limited utility to the study of friars as the mendicant orders were exempt from episcopal oversight, but they do, however sparsely, provide some documentation of friars licensed to preach and hear confessions. Of the examples of licences that do remain, we hear of approximately twenty-five Austins in this period formally licensed.

From the friaries at Atherstone, Shrewsbury, Warrington, and Stafford, three friars were licensed in 1404: John Wyche, John Suelston, and Robert de Rutlurr.37 Another three, William Lorund, John Shypton, and Nicholas Spynk, were licensed the following year.38 Richard Kemp was licensed in 1406 for two years and an additional four – Banastre Geoffrey,
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32 Ibid., 201.
33 This thesis was famously argued by Watson in “Censorship and Cultural Change,” 822-864, especially at 826.
34 See ibid., 828. Pecham’s *Syllabus*, part of the educational drive of the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, defined the minimum theological knowledge for the parishioner. Arundel’s controversial *Constitutions* of 1409 inverted this relationship, and defined the tenets of Pecham’s minimum requirements as the *maximum* knowledge befitting a layperson. The content of sermons, therefore, was restricted to the points included in Pecham’s *Syllabus*.
36 Ibid., 114.
37 Lichfield, Register of John Burghill fol. 152r (consulted via RothSources, 280; D 690).
38 Lichfield, Register of John Burghill fol. 156r-157r (consulted via RothSources, 280; D 690).
John Guldecar, John Combe, and John Bray – received their licences in 1407.\textsuperscript{39} In 1409, Thomas Bramble received a licence to preach in the diocese of Lincoln.\textsuperscript{40}

John Sokou, an Austin Friar at Bristol and a lector in theology, was licensed to preach in the diocese of Bath and Wells in 1445, along with his fellow Austin Thomas Abendon.\textsuperscript{41} Similar cases include Richard Frere and Robert Bamborough, who were both licensed in 1510.\textsuperscript{42} Whilst his preaching licence no longer exists, Thomas Radcliffe, an Austin Friar originally from Leicester, but who trained at Oxford, was a celebrated preacher when he was Bishop of Dromore, in reality suffragan Bishop in the diocese of Durham.\textsuperscript{43}

A more interesting example is William Bircheley, Austin and doctor of divinity. Bircheley was appointed to hear the confessions of those in the king’s army overseas and to grant absolution even in reserved cases, which would typically require absolution from a bishop.\textsuperscript{44} This same friar preached in Norfolk before the king on Ash Wednesday in 1413, in a church of one of his order’s supposed rivals: the Premonstratensians.\textsuperscript{45} This willingness to share church space with another Augustinian order attests to the easing of tensions between the Augustinian orders in England, in stark contrast to the European context.\textsuperscript{46} Both this sermon and Bircheley’s license to hear confessions for the king’s overseas army are significant instances of noteworthy patronage and political alignment, which will be discussed further below.\textsuperscript{47} Bircheley had a reputation for orthodoxy; in 1415, it is to him that the problematic apostate, Hugh Tirynpton, an Austin Friar of Lincoln, was to be

\textsuperscript{39} Lichfield, Register of John Burghill fol. 155v-157v (consulted via RothSources, 280; D 690).
\textsuperscript{40} Lincoln, Register of Repingdon, fol. 39 (consulted via RothSources, 278; D 682).
\textsuperscript{41} The Register of Thomas Bekynton, Bishop of Bath and Wells 1443-1465, ed. Henry Churchill et al., SRS 49-50 (1934-35): 46.
\textsuperscript{42} Dd 11 fol. 60v (consulted via RothSources, 398; D 1004); Richard Frere was appointed a lector in London three years later in 1513: Dd 11 fol. 119 (consulted via RothSources, 401; D 1012).
\textsuperscript{43} John Nichols (The History and Antiquities of the County of Leicester (London, 1815), 1.2:300) referred to Radcliffe as a celebrated preacher because of a reference in the Bibl.BH, 693. John Bale also referred to a Thomas Radcliffe, but suggested that he was active in the mid-fourteenth century. Bale was likely mistaken because there are no reports of a Thomas Radcliffe within the Augustinian archives to a Thomas Radcliffe in the fourteenth century, whereas there are several in the fifteenth (Script.IMBC, 1:463). Because of the independent documentation of a Thomas Radcliffe in the fifteenth century, it is probably fair to assume that the preacher of whom Bale had heard tales was this same one from Leicester (for his appointment as Bishop of Dromore see CPRGBI 8:661 and 674).
\textsuperscript{44} BRUO, 3: 2156; Reg.Chich., 4:184.
\textsuperscript{45} TNA E 101/406/21, fol. 19r; BRUO, 3: 2152.
\textsuperscript{46} See pages 42-43 and 48-52.
\textsuperscript{47} See page 104.
delivered following his arrest.48

Other preaching licences are testament to the mobility and international connections of the Austin Friars. Foreign friars John Frederici, Nicholas Stemmen, and Geoffrey Pierre of Bayeux were all approved by the general chapter in Rome to preach and hear confessions in London in 1427, 1458, and 1519 respectively.49 This was part of the particular mission of the London convent of Austins; they provided religious services, including confession and sermons, to the international mercantile community there, mostly of Italian or Flemish origin.50 This was a unique service offered by the Austins, and the licences of these three friars was part of their efforts to provide pastoral care to that mercantile community in their own languages.

Several English Austins were licensed to preach and hear confessions in Italy, to which the English province maintained particularly strong links. John Whyte (who had been ordained as a priest in Leicester in 1425)51 was licensed in 1431 along with Richard Spink to hear confessions in either the eremitical convent at Woodhouse or one of the reformed convents in Italy for three years.52 Whyte, who was sent to Rye four years later, was granted leave to visit friends in Rome, so it is reasonable to think that he decided to spend that time in an Observant convent in Italy rather than at Woodhouse.53 John Adkok was licensed to preach and hear confessions in London in 1515, but was placed in Siena only a week later.54 John Towne of Canterbury was licensed to preach in Lent 1527,55 and was notable primarily for his involvement in the skirmish in Canterbury in 1525 over sanctuary rights.56 His life is a repeated witness to the international nature of his order; he was licensed to preach upon his return to England from France and he was given leave to return

49 Dd 4, fol. 222r (John Frederici; consulted via RothSources, 308; D 747); Dd 6, fol. 220v (Nicholas Stemmen; consulted via RothSources, 340; D 851); Dd 13, fol. 92v (Geoffrey Pierre of Bayeux; consulted via RothSources, 411; D 1029).
50 See pages 131-137.
52 Dd 5, fol. 19r (consulted via RothSources, 313; D 760).
53 Dd 5, fol. 21v (consulted via RothSources, 317; D 771).
54 Dd 12, fol. 33r, 35v (consulted via RothSources, 403; D 1016).
55 Dd 15, fol. 127v (consulted via RothSources, 433; D 1064).
56 This incident will be discussed later on in the section on lay antifraternalism. See Canterbury, City Archives, MS Bunce fol. 99r-v (consulted via RothSources, 429; D 1053). See page 146.
to France to resume his studies at Paris after Easter. This was not his first trip abroad; in 1520, the general chapter requested that he be placed in Venice. This is the same John Towne who, as will be discussed below, was twice the prior of the house in Shrewsbury, at a time when it had fallen into particular disrepute: both in 1529 and again in 1537. The abject poverty of the Shrewsbury friars at that time stands in stark contrast to the travel and protracted studies of Towne’s earlier career as an Austin.

These licences attest to the mobility of the Austin Friars; they willingly travelled abroad in order to serve the Augustinian and lay communities, seeking placement where the need was greatest. That someone like John Towne was sent abroad on at least three different occasions suggests that the international network of Augustinians was complex and extensive, with strong links between London and France or Italy. These licences cannot tell us much about the nature of the preaching done by the Austins, other than that there was a presumed level of orthodoxy to their theological content. What is clear is the willingness to move convents so as to provide adequate pastoral care where it was most needed, so as to serve local interests.

Although our documentation of Augustinian preaching is slight, the number of licences is reflected in the similar situation of other orders. For example, although preaching was the main activity of the Dominicans, there remains only one licence for the Dominicans at Lancaster in all of the fifteenth century, that of Richard Peckhard, and only two more for all of Lancashire. Comparatively, there were ten for the Dominicans in fourteenth-century Lancashire. Preaching was one of the main religious priorities for the Dominicans and in England, preaching against the Lollard heresy was a main concern. Once a friar was chosen as a preacher, he was relieved of all administrative duties so that he

57 Dd 15, fol. 127v (consulted via RothSources, 433; D 1064).
58 Dd 13, fol. 159v (consulted via RothSources, 414; D 1032).
59 See pages 224-225.
60 Parkin, The Friars Preachers in Lancashire, 9.
61 Ibid., 10.
might focus on his preaching. The Constitutions of the Dominicans, although based around those of the Canons Regular, replaced any canonical emphasis on labour with instructions on preaching, and preachers, who had to be at least twenty-five years old, received three years of education in theology before they were qualified to preach.

Some of the most celebrated Franciscan preachers came from the Observants, although the Conventuals also excelled. We find several preaching licences for them in the 1440s and 50s, and numerous mentions in wills of annual Franciscan sermons in parish churches within their limits, particularly in Batley and Leeds. They visited all the parishes within their boundaries each year, but also preached in public places, as they did on the grounds beside the castle in Lincoln in 1270. There is evidence for early tension with parish priests over this practice, as Bishop Grosseteste complained in the thirteenth century that some rectors refused to admit friars into their parishes and in 1267, Archbishop Giffard exempted certain parishes from their preaching regions because of tensions with the clergy there. Their commitment to preaching, however, generally won them the support of bishops, who saw them as supplements to the secular clerics; furthermore, the Franciscans typically also acted as confessors to enclosed communities of nuns. They used the Franciscan *Fasciculus Morum* as a sermon guide; it was divided into seven parts, each treating a particular vice and its corresponding virtue. The Franciscans made use of *exempla* frequently in their sermons, much more so than the Dominicans, but examples of their sermons are sparse; for example, only three from all of thirteenth-century England survive.
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71 Little, *Studies in English Franciscan History*, 141-42.
By contrast, the Black Monks were responsible for substantial pastoral care and their sermons, whether in parish churches or in the cloisters, were a constant feature of the monastic experience.\textsuperscript{73} The monks made lay education one of their priorities and the convents were centres of learning and preaching. They delivered sermons at funerals, ordinations, at the admission of laypeople into confraternity, and at religious feasts.\textsuperscript{74} Their focus on preaching was connected to their cultivation of monastic learning and lay education, and thus, had a different focus and intention from that of the Austins.

The only potentially Augustinian sermon collection, in English or in Latin, from the fifteenth century onwards is a book of sermons that belonged to the Droitwich convent. This manuscript was written in 1404 and was in the possession of Austin Friar John Banard, who was chancellor of Oxford from 1411-22.\textsuperscript{75} There is no indication, however, that the sermons were written by Austin Friars, merely that they were in the possession of the Austins in Droitwich; in fact, there is indication that at least one of the sermons was written by the Carmelite Paul Parden.\textsuperscript{76} This collection of sermons, relatively unusual for its usage of English verses, contains three different manuscripts with sermons and discussions of theological matters.\textsuperscript{77} The authors used English verses to establish the specific sermon’s moral in a proverb-like form,\textsuperscript{78} and their interest in English translation of Latin verses may point to an emphasis of Augustinian preaching on the significance of the vernacular, seen later in the work of John Capgrave and Osbern Bokenham. Nonetheless, Banard’s possession of this collection shows that sermon composition was not merely a component of pastoral care for the Austins, but also a significant constituent of their academic lives. The academic nature of sermons is also shown by a fifteenth-century Austin who offered up a sermon at St Paul’s Cross as part of his academic requirements.\textsuperscript{79}

We can identify some influences on the sermons of the Austins by the pastoral guides

\textsuperscript{73} Clark, A Monastic Renaissance at St Albans, 33, 61.
\textsuperscript{74} Ibid., 61.
\textsuperscript{75} Wenzel, Latin Sermon Collections, 190.
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{78} Ibid., 72.
\textsuperscript{79} Wenzel, Latin Sermon Collections, 310.
kept in their libraries. Other than the Droitwich sermons, there are six texts which were owned by the Austins associated with pastoral care: Thomas of Chobham’s *Summa Confessorum* (at the Cambridge friary),\(^8\) Gregory’s *De Cura Pastorali* (also in Cambridge),\(^8\) a book of sermons by Nicholas of Aquavilla (Grimsby),\(^8\) Henry of Segusio’s *Super Quartum Decretalium* (Oxford),\(^8\) William of Pagula’s *Oculus Sacerdotis* (York),\(^8\) and an English version of William of Nassington’s *Speculum Vitae* (York).\(^8\) Chobham’s *Summa Confessorum*, written in 1220 in England, was an extensive preaching textbook with a thematic structure and the first major medieval attempt to incorporate classical rhetorical techniques into preaching.\(^8\) It was a pioneering text and influential for the genre of pastoral guides,\(^8\) popular with priests because it offered a comprehensive guide for the sacrament of confession, in comparison with older texts that considered a smaller selection of topics and dealt with penance less extensively.\(^8\) Its prominence in the world of preaching manuals was surpassed only with the appearance of William of Pagula’s *Oculus Sacerdotis* in the fourteenth century.\(^8\) Chobham was the connecting link between traditional preaching and the new school of English pastoral manuals, represented by the *Oculus*, which combined the modern theology of Albert, Aquinas, and Peter of Tarantaise with English ecclesiastical legislation.\(^8\)

The Austins’ usage of both Chobham’s guide and William of Pagula’s *Oculus Sacerdotis* suggests that they employed innovative preaching techniques or kept informed of new pastoral guides. Pagula’s text was divided into two halves; the first, based largely on Chobham’s work, was a manual for confessors, dealing with the intricacies of confession and
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how to interrogate the penitent, along with canonical information, such as penances prescribed by canon law and sins that require absolution from a bishop. The second concerned the duties of the parish priest in lay instruction regarding practical matters such as sexual morality, problems in marriage, child-rearing, annual confession, and tithe-giving. The *Oculus* is interesting in that it lacks the emphasis on the obligation of restitution in the cases where the sinner has caused harm, such as in the works of Henry of Segusio (Hostiensis), and on the interrogation of the classes. William of Nassington’s *Speculum Vitae*, used by the York Austins, is much more fixed within the tradition of class criticism, and is part of the medieval tradition of ethical and psychological doctrine. The Middle English religious poem concerned the seven petitions in the Lord’s Prayer, the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, the seven deadly sins and seven cardinal virtues, and the seven beatitudes and their corresponding seven rewards.

Furthermore, we find in the Grimsby convent a book of sermons from the fourteenth-century Italian theologian Nicholas of Aquavilla. The manuscript is dated to 1417 and was owned by the prior, John Daniel. At the Oxford house, John Lowe, later to become bishop of St Asaph and then of Rochester, owned the Hostiensis manuscript, a canonical legal text useful for penance, and in Cambridge there was a thirteenth-century manuscript of Gregory’s *De Cura Pastorali*, owned by a provincial prior named John of Clare. These texts round up an eclectic collection of pastoral texts and preaching guides. These choices seem to be particular when considered against the other mendicant orders; the Dominicans seem to have preferred John of Freiburg, Yves of Chartres, and Peter of Poitiers (curiously, they also

92 Ibid., 198.
94 Ibid.
95 Pantin, *The English Church in the Fourteenth Century*, 228.
96 Ibid.
98 Daniel was the prior until at least 1419, when he requests aid from the secular arm for the arrest of the apostate Fr John Heton. See London, TNA, Chancery Warrants series 1, C 81/1794.
had a collection of FitzRalph’s sermons). The Franciscans also used Yves of Chartres, along with Franciscan Pelbartus Ladislaus and the Dominican Johann Herolt.

**Noteworthy Sermons**

Some celebrated preachers amongst the Austin Friars gave sermons before the king or other members of the nobility. This service was provided overwhelmingly by the fraternal orders in the later Middle ages for remuneration and there is a long tradition of mendicants appealing to royalty for patronage for sermons, most recently outlined in Jens Röhrkasten’s magisterial study London friars. Röhrkasten mentions the Austin Friar Roger de Holcote, who preached before Queen Isabella in 1357, and John Fekenham, who preached at least twice in the court of Richard II, as examples of fourteenth-century friars catering to the spiritual needs of royalty. Roth drew attention to Edward II asking the Austin Friars for sermons in 1314 and to Edward III, who behaved similarly in 1346. Thomas Winterton, a renowned Austin theologian, preached before the king in 1390 and 1395. This was not unique to the Austin Friars, and all three other fraternal orders were involved in precisely the same activity.

This trend continued into the fifteenth century for the Austins as for others: Austins John Devyner, John Brynkeley, and Thomas Slymebrigg, are the first examples, preaching
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102 Ibid., 454; see London, BL, MS Cotton Galba E XIV m. 33, 34 (Holcote) and London, BL, MS Add. 35115 fol. 33r-v, 34r (Fekenham).
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105 See Röhrkasten, *The Mendicant Houses of Medieval London*, 454. Examples are Thomas de Rippes OFM, John Deping OP, Richard Lemster OCarm, to name but a few.
before Henry IV in 1403. Devyn received 11 shillings for his first sermon at the royal manor at Clarendon on February 2, and all three were paid an additional 26 shillings and 6 pence for preaching at different times during Lent at the manor of Eltham.\textsuperscript{106} John Brynkeley, who gave the sermon on Good Friday, had previously preached before royalty, giving a sermon to Richard II on Palm Sunday in 1393.\textsuperscript{107} As mentioned earlier, William Bircheley preached before the king on Ash Wednesday in 1413 as he had done previously in 1396, and was paid eleven shillings for doing so.\textsuperscript{108} In late 1428, Cardinal Henry Beaufort, Bishop of Winchester, along with two archbishops, the mayor of London, and Humphrey Duke of Gloucester, attended a sermon by an Austin Friar in London that was followed by a great procession.\textsuperscript{109}

Other examples include John Lowe, the provincial prior from 1427 to 1433 and later Bishop of St Asaph, then of Rochester, who assumed the office of confessor to the king in 1432, and left a whole book of collected sermons he had given to the king.\textsuperscript{110} Thomas Hervy preached before Henry VI on the second Sunday of Lent in 1451 and the third Sunday of Lent in 1452.\textsuperscript{111} He spoke before the king again in 1457, when he was a member of a committee considering methods by which to decrease the debts of the king.\textsuperscript{112} Hugh de Sunfeld preached to Henry VI in 1448 and received 20 shillings for the service.\textsuperscript{113} Early in 1521, another doctor in theology and the prior of the Austin friary in Bristol was paid six shillings and eight pence for a sermon before Edward Stafford, third Duke of Buckingham.\textsuperscript{114} That same year, an Austin Friar from Oxford preached before the Duke in Cirencester and was similarly compensated six shillings and eight pence for the service.\textsuperscript{115} He was paid the same again when he returned to Gloucestershire to preach at the ducal headquarters at Thornbury later that year; all this was on the eve of the Duke’s arrest on

\textsuperscript{106} London, TNA E 101/404/21, fol. 35v-36r. See also BRUO, 3:2156, 2170 and 2216.
\textsuperscript{107} London, TNA E 101/402/10, fol. 33v; BRUO, 3:2156.
\textsuperscript{108} London, TNA E 101/406/21, fol. 19r; BRUO, 3:2152.
\textsuperscript{110} Dd 5, fol. 19v (consulted via RothSources, 315; D 767); RothEAF, 1:202.
\textsuperscript{111} London, TNA E 101/410/6, fol. 34v; TNA E 101/410/9, fol. 37v; BRUO, 2:921.
\textsuperscript{112} CPR 35 Henry VI 1452-61 [1457], 339 (m. 6).
\textsuperscript{113} London, TNA E 101/410/1, fol. 23v; BRUO, 3:2219.
\textsuperscript{114} LP 3(1) no. 1285; SP 1/22, fol. 66r. He is referred to as ‘Friar Stephens’.
\textsuperscript{115} SP 1/22, fol. 68r.
charges of treason in May 1521. On the first Sunday of Lent in 1529, the prior provincial of the Austin Friars, William Wetherall, received twenty shillings for preaching before Henry VIII.

Other friars were also recruited for politically useful sermons. In 1234, a Dominican preached in favour of the Crusades to Richard, Duke of Cornwall, the king’s brother, and in 1235, there is evidence that the Dominicans were preaching for the Crusades in Wales. Henry III requested that the Dominicans send friars for preaching the Crusades in 1251 and again in 1255. In 1291, John Romain, Archbishop of York, called upon the Dominicans in his diocese for this purpose. In 1378, John of Gaunt requested that the Dominicans preach for him on his trip to France and John Deping, the prior of London, became a royal preacher in 1389 and in 1397 was rewarded with the bishopric of Lismore and Waterford. Dominican provincial Thomas Palmer preached for Richard II in 1384, 1389, and 1390, and before Henry IV in 1403. The next provincial, William Pickworth, also preached before Henry IV, as did his successor John Tille. Tille had previously functioned as a court preacher in 1393 under Richard II, but received a pay rise under Henry and was appointed his confessor. Amongst the Carmelites, Thomas Netter preached at the funerals of Henry IV and Henry V. The Franciscans sent many Oxford- and Cambridge-trained theologians to preach at court in the fifteenth century and they preached in royal chapels all the way up to the Dissolution.

The sermons of the Austins were a way in which they garnered influence and implicated themselves in the political world, in addition to gaining income. Edward II used the Austins for preaching in favour of his war efforts against the Scots and Edward III

---

116 Ibid.
117 LP 5 no. 685; SP 1/68 fol. 223r.
118 Gumbley, “As Preachers,” 152.
119 Ibid.
120 Ibid.
121 Ibid., 151.
122 Ibid., 150.
123 Ibid.
124 Ibid.
126 Robson, The Franciscans in the Middle Ages, 221.
recruited them for preaching in favour of his war against Philip IV of France. Thomas Penketh, as we shall see in the following chapter, preached the legitimacy of Richard III in 1484, and in 1534, Cranmer required that all orders of friars preach in support of the validity of the king’s new marriage and against the power of the bishop of Rome. These cases of eminent preaching speak to the ability of the Austins to marshal official favour. Whilst they may not have counted many famed preachers amongst their numbers, nor preached particularly remarkable theology, the Austins nonetheless used their sermons to align themselves with influential laity.

**Episcopal Appointments**

Elevation to the episcopate was topical for the Austin Friars of the fifteenth century, with numerous appointments, primarily at suffragan level. There were significant precedents for episcopal appointments amongst the Austin Friars in the fourteenth century, most notably Robert Waldeby, who rose to the archbishopric of York in 1396, and whose career was directed by his close ties to Richard II. Waldeby, a celebrated theological opponent of Wyclif and international scholar, having studied in Toulouse, first ascended to the episcopate in 1386, when Pope Urban IV made him bishop of Aire in France, perhaps in gratitude to his having served as the keeper of the seal for the seneschal in Aquitaine. Two years later, he was transferred to the archbishopric of Dublin, although remained an absentee for the duration of his appointment there, save for his travels there with Richard II in 1394. In 1395, he was transferred again, to Chichester this time, but for fewer than twelve months. In October 1396, he became Archbishop of York, succeeding Thomas Arundel, who had transferred to Canterbury. He remained in that position, second in the English ecclesiastical hierarchy only to Arundel, until his death in 1398, when he was interred in

---

128 See pages 180-82.
129 *LP* 7 no. 590; London, BL, Cotton MS Cleopatra E IV, fols. 14r-v.
130 *Fasc.Ziz.*, 286.
133 *Chron.Maiora*, 2:32-33; *HBC*, 239 and 282.
Westminster Abbey.

By contrast, the episcopal appointments of Austin Friars in the fifteenth century were nearly all at suffragan level. Only one Austin Friar of this period was appointed to an English diocesan bishopric: John Lowe. He was bishop of St Asaph in Wales from 1433 till 1444, after which he was transferred to the see of Rochester for the remainder of his life.\(^\text{135}\)

This was the smallest diocese in the province of Canterbury, with the smallest endowment, and was virtually a suffragan appointment in the county of Kent to the diocese of Canterbury. Many Austin Friars were appointed to Irish sees, or to notional sees in Asia associated with English dioceses. During this period, ten English Austin Friars and one European Austin Friar were appointed to Irish bishoprics, culminating with the notorious George Browne, made archbishop of Dublin of 1532,\(^\text{136}\) although Browne differs in having functioned as a metropolitan bishop there, whilst the rest were predominantly working in England. An additional six English Austin Friars were made nominal bishops of Asian dioceses in partibus infidelium, so as to be auxiliary bishops in their corresponding English sees. These included the famed Cambridge scholar Master Thomas Swillington, who, as the prior of the friary in Boston, was consecrated bishop of Philadelphia and served as suffragan in the diocese of Lincoln.\(^\text{137}\)

\(^{135}\) For Lowe’s appointment to St Asaph, see CPRGBI, 8:458. For his transfer to Rochester, see ibid., 9:433.

\(^{136}\) For George Browne’s appointment, see BRUO, 170. The other ten Austin Friars made bishops in Ireland are as follows: Robert de Aketon/Acton appointed bishop of Kildare in 1396, and was still there in 1404 (CPRGBI 5:623); Master Adam Payn from London appointed bishop of Cloyne on 26 July 1413 (ibid., 6:454); Thomas Ratkef/Radcliffe from Leicester elected to the see of Dromore on 2 February 1429 (ibid., 8:114); John Greny made bishop of Emly in 1447 (Hier.Cath. 2: 301); Herphardus/Certadus/Terquardus made bishop of Inis Catteigh on 21 February 1530 (RothEAF, 2:437); Gerald Caneton made bishop of Cloyne on 16 March 1394, and likely still there in the fifteenth century (CPRGBI, 4:102); John Rishbery made bishop of Emly on 21 April 1421 (HBC, 354); and finally a foreign “Simon” of the Austin Friars made bishop of Mayo on 4 September 1461 (CPRGBI, 12:126). This is likely the same as the Simon de Düren, mentioned by the HBC (367) as having been made bishop of Mayo on 12 August 1457, and may be the Simon de Brünn of the Bavarian province who came to study in Cambridge in August of 1419 (Dd 4, fol. 3r; consulted via RothSources, 288; D 713).

\(^{137}\) Thomas Swillington’s appointment to this position is evident from Hier.Cath., 3: 273. He is mentioned as Prior of OESA-Boston in a will by Stephen Wallnot of Boston in 1524 (LincolnWills, 1:135). His activities at Cambridge are recorded in GraceBookB, 2:68, 70, 71, 78. The five other foreign appointments are as follows: Henry de Winter appointed bishop of Harran (Caraciensis) in Armenia on 24 November 1400 (CPRGBI, 5:454); John of Norwich appointed episcopus Jerolamensis (it is unclear to which see this refers to, but the most plausible guess would be Jerusalem, or Jerosolymitanus, which would function as a suffragan appointment) on 2 December 1402 (ibid.,
The Austins were not unique in this and were far less prolific in the ecclesiastical hierarchy than the Dominicans. The number of English Dominicans who took up bishoprics is particularly striking, even though Dominic had himself refused several bishoprics on the principle that it would interfere with his religious profession. In the thirteenth century, ten English Dominicans were raised to the episcopate, including several suffragan titles, three bishops in Ireland (two of which were archbishops of Dublin), one in St Asaph, and Robert Kilwardby, who was appointed to the archbishopric of Canterbury in 1272. The Dominicans were particularly prolific in ecclesiastical ranks under the Plantagenets and received more episcopal appointments in England than all the other religious orders put together, save the Benedictines, who had the power to introduce their own members to the episcopate as they formed the chapters of many dioceses. Before their dissolution, twenty-four Dominicans became bishops of sees throughout the country and in Ireland, working as auxiliary bishops to English dioceses. In addition to an Archbishop of Canterbury, the Dominicans also claimed two Archbishops of Dublin, John Darlington and William Hotham, and Walter and Roland Jorz (who were genetic as well as religious brothers) each became the Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of Ireland. No fewer than seven Dominicans were appointed to the see of Llandaff and during the reign of Richard II, a particularly loyal royal benefactor to the order, nine dioceses were given to Dominicans, many of whom had been royal confessors.

The Franciscans had considerably fewer episcopal appointments, but could still claim giants such as John Pecham, Archbishop of Canterbury, who was an intellectual giant in
addition to a high-ranking ecclesiastic. Both Franciscans and Dominicans had hundreds of auxiliary bishops in the Middle Ages, with titular appointments in Ireland, Scandinavia, Russia, Asia Minor, and Palestine. It is significant, however, that comparatively few of these mendicant appointments occurred in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and so, the Augustinian order appears more typical when considered in that context. In fact, they far exceeded the Carmelite order, which was of a similar size to the Augustinian order, but whose episcopal appointments counted only Stephen Patrington, who was consecrated Bishop of St David's in 1415 and Bishop of Chichester in 1417. In that regard, although it was only John Lowe who held an English see, with seventeen additional Austin Friars functioning as auxiliary or Irish bishops, the Augustinian order was comparatively prominent in the church hierarchy, particularly given its small size.

II. Augustinian Religious Services

Funerary Services

The provision of funerary services by the Austin Friars is best examined through testamentary evidence. However, because of the unwieldy numbers of surviving fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century wills, I have relied exclusively on printed collections of wills from the appropriate time period. Collections of wills from East Anglia, London, York, and Lincoln are the most numerous, and whilst the sample of wills utilised here will not be wholly or comprehensively representative of the popularity of the English Austin Friars throughout the English province, it does point to some areas of interest that are worthy of discussion. As Robert Swanson has astutely phrased:

> Short of attempting a full analysis of late-medieval wills, the only feasible approach is anecdotal, recounting references and relevant testamentary provisions. Some hint at attitudes and appreciations, but usually the statements can only be taken as they stand, showing interest and concern but neither explaining nor validating.

---

Without a fully exhaustive study of all late-medieval English wills, the study of bequests to the Austin Friars here can necessarily only be impressionistic; they can suggest attitudes and trends but cannot provide definitive evidence for the Austins’ popularity. The wills themselves, however, present some additional distortion of which one must be cognisant; they unfairly represent the wealthy, particularly collections from the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, whose wills generally represent those with landed property in more than one diocese and thus bias the sample to an élite group of people. Wills also skew the evidence towards the cult of the dead and underrepresent other forms of transaction, which would not have necessitated documentation. And so, whilst wills give us valuable insight into the funerary services provided by the Austin Friars, they do not give us a holistic picture of the people served by the friars, nor of the breadth of services offered.

As expected, these wills overwhelmingly allocated money to the friars for the specific purpose of providing for mass(es) to be sung or prayers for the soul of the testator. This is part of what Galpern termed “a cult of the living in the service of the dead”, a phrase which has – as Robert Swanson rightly points out – become a cliché for analysis of the later Middle Ages, yet still bears significance for much of late-medieval devotion. Out of the approximately six hundred fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century wills discovered that contained bequests to the Austin Friars, the overwhelming majority – around three quarters – articulated monetary bequests for the Austin Friars only in conjunction with bequests to at least one other group of friars. Often these bequests will be for all four orders, or five if there was also a convent of Crutched Friars, in a city or town; this happened most frequently in London, where many people made sure to spread the money of their estate between the religious houses of friars. An example is the will of Thomas Warham, carpenter and citizen of London but also from Croydon, proved in 1481 in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury. In this will Warham stated: “I biqueth to every order of freres of London, that is to saie the

gray freres, the blak freres, the white freres, the Austyn freres and crossed freres, for to pray for my soule x s [shillings].”

In this example, and many others that take a similar form, the Austin Friars are not singled out for their sanctity or devotion to the pastoral care for the local community. Rather, what is expressed in this will is a recognition of the corporate religious merit of all orders of friars and that leaving money in a bequest for funerary masses to be said for one’s soul was an effective strategy for easing one’s soul’s journey through purgatory. This trend appears even in wills of relatives of Austin Friars; for example, whilst the brother of Osbern Bokenham left monetary bequests to the convent at Clare and also specifically to his brother and John Bury, he also left money to all orders of friars in Cambridge, thereby not favouring the Austin Friars there in any significant way. His bequest to his brother – ten shillings – was still for the express purpose of saying mass for his soul, and thus was an economic interaction and not an act of charity as one might have expected given the familial relationship.

This is a well recognised trend in late-medieval English wills; as Judith Middleton-Stewart noted in her study of Dunwich, Suffolk, single friaries were very rarely mentioned in wills and bequests typically were given in equal measure to all the neighbouring friaries. Moreover, in Dunwich, testaments left bequests to friaries far more frequently than to monasteries, a trend corroborated by Norman Tanner’s study of Norwich wills and Diarmaid MacCulloch’s study of Tudor Suffolk, as well as having been noted by Robert Swanson as applying to fifteenth-century testators throughout the country. Thus, whilst these wills recognise local popularity for friars in general, or at least the respect for the spiritual legitimacy of the friars, they are less helpful when analysing the Austin Friars specifically. What they do tell us is that the Austins were not exceptional amongst friars for their funerary services.

---

150 Logge, 1:120 (no. 30).
151 SudburyWills, 473 (no. 779).
These wills lend a bit of insight into which region was the most active for the Austin Friars: by far, the most popular houses to receive mention in testaments were those in East Anglia, although London is not far behind the convents of Clare and Thetford. From the wills examined, in addition to a collection of wills which do not specify which priory to which money is being left, there are twelve wills for the Austins in Boston, ten for Bristol, fifty-one for Cambridge, seventeen for Canterbury, an impressive one hundred and thirty-nine for Clare, eighteen for Grimsby, six for Huntingdon, six for Leicester, thirty-two for Lincoln, four for Little Yarmouth, eighty-seven for London, two for Ludlow, eleven for Lynn, fourteen for Northampton, forty-five for Norwich, ten for Orford, twenty-one for Oxford, nine for Rye, five for Shrewsbury, two for Stamford, one hundred and nine for Thetford, six for Tickhill, four for Warrington, three for Winchester, two for Woodhouse, and twenty-three for York. Altogether, the East Anglian convents, particularly Clare, Norwich, Thetford, and Cambridge, had documented popularity and the convent at London also attracted attention.

These survival rates are only of testaments that have appeared in printed collections and Norman Tanner’s study of the wills of late-medieval Norwich lends insight into more accurate numbers regarding the bequests left to the Norwich convent, a hub for burial of wealthy East Anglian families.¹⁵⁴ Forty-seven percent of lay wills from Norwich in this period left bequests to the Austins, which is the same experienced by the Carmelites and slightly more than the Franciscans and Dominicans, who each received forty-six percent. The support received by the friars far outweighed the lay support for the Cathedral priory, the most formidable but contentious religious body in the city, which received bequests from

¹⁵⁴ Some examples are: Sir Thomas de Hengrave of Mutford (Suffolk) and his wife (Kirk.Norw., 139); Sir Thomas Gyney (Top.Hist.Norfolk, 8:195-200); Sir John Gyney and his wife Dame Alice, and their son Roger (Top.Hist.Norfolk, 9:495-500); Richard Gybbes, John Peverell, Nicholas Botyld, John Holm and his wife Margaret, Thomas Wetherby, esquire of Carhowe [Carrow] and former mayor of Norwich, Margaret Whitefare (Kirk.Norw., 139-140); Sir Thomas Kerdeston (Top.Hist.Norfolk, 10:111-118); Thomas Wetherby, esquire and his wife Margaret (Kirk.Norw., 140-41); John Bacon, esquire and his wife Maude (ibid., 141); Dame Elizabeth Bigott, Margery Veer and her father John Fowler (ibid.); John Bernard, esquire (Top.Hist.Norfolk, 8:311-317); Alice Wychyngham and her husband Edmund Wychyngham, esquire (Kirk.Norw., 141); yeoman John Bulwarde, Robert Skelton; Edmund Southwelle, chaplain; John Brygham; Margaret Holonde; Margaret and John Yelverton (Test.Vet., 2:469-70); Thomas Smythe; Elianore Wyndham, wife of Sir Richard Scrope then of Sir John Wyndham (ibid., 2:470); Agnes Pye (NorwichCCD, no.125); Thomas Berney; Isabell Norwich (Kirk.Norw., 144); Richard Chrisøyne (ibid., 142); Katharine Heywarde (ibid., 143); Thomas, Lord Morley and baron of Rye in Hingham and his wife Lady Anne (Tanner, “Popular Religion in Norwich,” 37).
only thirty-five percent of lay testators.\textsuperscript{155} This is mirrored in Suffolk, as in Dunwich, testators were supportive of the Dominican and Franciscan houses in Dunwich, the Carmelite house in Ipswich, and the Austin houses at Little Yarmouth and Orford to the detriment of support for the nearby Norwich Cathedral and even for their local parishes and monasteries.\textsuperscript{156} Only nine percent of Norwich testators requested burial in friaries, low in comparison to Joel Rosenthal’s study of the wills of nobility, which shows that the percentage of nobles requesting burial in a friary was about fifteen percent.\textsuperscript{157} The percentage of testators leaving gifts to the friars, however, was considerable, surpassing London, where only thirty-six percent left bequests to friars.\textsuperscript{158} The friaries in Norwich and other Norfolk towns received substantial support and bequests from both urban and rural testators from a great range of social classes, whereas there was comparatively little support for monks outside of the upper classes, as the nobility and gentry often had familial connection with particular foundations.\textsuperscript{159}

Nonetheless, in Norwich, the Cathedral far overtook the Austins in terms of chantries, however, with twelve requested in this period, whereas the Austins received requests only for two, although this is more than the one at the Carmelites and none at either the Dominicans or Franciscans.\textsuperscript{160} At the Austin friary, significant chantries were established by Sir Thomas Kerdeston, who left three hundred marks for a perpetual chantry for himself and his wife in 1446,\textsuperscript{161} and by Sir James Hobart of Hales Hall by Loddon, sometime before 1516, who claimed in his will that he had already established a perpetual chantry at the Austin Friars church.\textsuperscript{162} Benedictine monasteries, particularly cathedral ones such as the convent at Norwich, typically far exceeded the number of chantries than was ever established at Austin friaries; Benedictines would establish chantry chapels for

\textsuperscript{155} Tanner, “Popular Religion in Norwich,” 334.
\textsuperscript{156} Middleton-Stewart, \textit{Inward Purity and Outward Splendour}, 58.
\textsuperscript{157} J.T. Rosenthal, \textit{The Purchase of Paradise: The Social Function of Aristocratic Benevolence}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} edn. (Abingdon, 2007), 84.
\textsuperscript{160} Tanner, “Popular Religion in Norwich,” 350-356.
\textsuperscript{162} Tanner, “Popular Religion in Norwich,” 356.
their founding family and benefactors, as well as diocesan bishops, often employing daily rotas for their maintainence. The Franciscans too, far surpassed the Austins in numbers of chantries, but with all classes represented, in contrast to the predominantly aristocratic benefactors of the Black Monks.

London was also popular for burials and of the two university houses, the Cambridge Austins attracted much more support than did their Oxford counterparts, although this could be because of the greater opportunities for conventual burial in Oxford, since there were two major monasteries and a nunnery there, in addition to its friaries. That the London house was popular should not be surprising; many members of the gentry and nobility traditionally went to London or Westminster regularly and thus developed connections with and left bequests to London religious institutions, including friaries. The Austin Friars in Lincolnshire also attracted substantial support, as did the friars in York. York boasted an impressive number of friars, with 157 friars in its four mendicant houses before 1337, which was a third of all friars in Yorkshire. In York, over forty percent of testators left bequests to the four houses of friars from 1531-38, attesting to the popularity of the friars right up until their dissolution. The houses in the southwest and northwest of the province, however, were sorely lacking for much financial maintenance. Whilst the mendicant orders in general were well represented in the west, with three Franciscan and two Dominican convents, the Austins had a presence only in Bristol. The prior of the house in Bristol, John Smith, is mentioned in 1533 in the records of the executors of Thomas de Berkeley, fifth Baron of Berkeley as having received a bequest from the baron.

**Letters of Confraternity and Indulgences**

164 Little, *Studies in English Franciscan History*, 27.
169 *LP* 6, no. 66; SP 2/n fol. 11r-12v.
The distribution of letters of confraternity was a crucial method by which the Austin Friars enabled members of the laity to participate in the collective spiritual merit of their order. These letters, issued by all mendicant orders, were popular in fifteenth-century England, and the Austin Friars were no exception. Given existing documentation from the general chapters of the Augustinian order enumerating how many letters the provincial priors were permitted to issue during their tenure, it is certain that those letters that do remain are only a fraction of those which would have existed.\textsuperscript{170} Investigated most thoroughly by Robert Swanson in 2002,\textsuperscript{171} mendicant confraternity is a field that is significantly hindered by patchy and anecdotal evidence. The practice of confraternity was closely associated with the business of indulgences, with a porous and fluid boundary between the two as both involved the exchange of spiritual privileges for monetary donations,\textsuperscript{172} which is why I have considered them together here.

The Lollard tract \textit{Pierce the Ploughman’s Crede} from 1394 characterised the Austin Friars as indiscriminately and aggressively selling their letters of confraternity, and specifically castigated the Austin Friars over other mendicant orders for this behaviour. The text’s Austin Friar character states:

\begin{quote}
We haue power of the pope purliche assoilen
All þat helpen our hous in helpe of her soules,
To dispensen hem wiþ in dedes of synne
All þat amendeth oure hous in money oþer elles,
Wiþ corne oþer catell or cloþes of beddes,
Oþer bedsys or broche or breed for our fode.
And ȝif þou hast any good & wīt þi-selfe helpen,
Helpe vs hertliche þerwiþe & here I vndertake,
\textit{Pou schalt ben broþer of our hous & a boke habben}
(At þe next chartiure) clereliche ensealed
\textit{And þanne oure prvounciall hap power to assoilen}
\textit{Alle sustren & breþeren þat bene of our order.}\textsuperscript{173} [emphasis mine]
\end{quote}

The extent to which this satirical text can be said to reflect the reality of the Austin Friars is

\textsuperscript{170} For example, see Dd 5, fol. 23v (consulted via \textit{RothSources}, 323; D 789). In this entry, the general prior licensed the provincial prior of England, William Wells Jr., to issue up to ten letters of confraternity during his three-year tenure in that office, so long as it benefitted the province.


\textsuperscript{172} \textit{Ibid.}, 121.

dubious, but it is interesting that the assertive peddling of letters of confraternity specifically by the Austins over other friars was a plausible theme for the author's reading public. Whilst we ought not to base our image of the indulgence trade amongst the Austin Friars on this partial witness, it gives insight into contemporary opinions regarding the involvement of the Austin Friars in this controversial practice.

The first surviving example of a letter of confraternity from the Austin Friars in this period is from 1400 in Shrewsbury, when the provincial prior, Thomas Winterton, offered confraternity to Robert and Margaret Cotwall.\(^{174}\) The letter, promising full participation into all the spiritual goods generated by the friars in all convents in masses, vigils, penitence, abstinence, preaching, and prayers, included an indulgence for 424 days as well as a later one issued by Pope Paul II of five hundred days for visiting the chapel of St Ositha, a royal virgin of the house of Mercia, in the Austin friary. This same formulary was repeated twice more in almost identical letters, both from 1481. Couples John and Elena Gryffith and John and Margaret Spenlove were offered the relationship by the prior of the Shrewsbury convent, with the letter to the Spenloves, like that to the Cotwalls, including an indulgence for 424 days.\(^{175}\) That the Austin Friars were elevating the cult of a local Mercian saint is evidence of their adaptation to regional needs in an effort to make themselves an indispensable part of the religious landscape.

Thomas Winterton issued another letter of confraternity in 1400 to married couple

---

\(^{174}\) Discussed in Hugh Owen and John Brickdale Blakeway, *A History of Shrewsbury* (London, 1825), 2:455 (the original letter of confraternity could not be located): "Frater Thomas prior provincialis ordinis fratrum heremitarum S Augustini in Anglia, dilectis sibi in Christo Roberto Cotwall et Margarete consorti sue orationes et quicquid hauriri valet dulcius de latere Crucifixi. Devotionem quam ad ordinem nostrum ob Dei geritis reverenciam, ut accepi, affectu sincere caritatis acceptans, Christoq. acceptabile fore credens, piis ipsam beneficiorum spiritualium vicissitudinis compensari; vos ad universa et singula nostri conventus, tam in vita quam in morte Recipio suffragia; plenariam vobis tenore prescencium participationem bonorum omnium concedendo, que per fratres dicti conventus in missis, vigiliis, jejuniis, antinentiis, predictionibus, et orationibus ceterisq. divinis exerciciis operaro dognabitur clemencia Salvatoris. Addens eciam de speciali gratia a nostris sanctis patribus omnibus fratribus et sororibus nostris tam vivis quam mortuis, viz. quatuor centum et viginti quatuor dierum ab illis dictis et confessis misericorditer a Domino relaxamus. Ac etiam si quis dare seu legare faciat aliqua bona vel ornamenta ad opus et sustentacionem capelle Sancte Si the ibidem constructe, habebit a Paulo papa Secundo quinque centum dies indulgentie. Eciam cum obitus alicujus vestrum in capitulo nostro provinciali fuerit nuncius, id pro vobis devote fiet quod pro fratribus nostris defunctis in communi ibidem consuevit. In cujus rei testimonium sigillum officii mei presentibus est appensum. Data in conventu nostro Salop Anno Dom. Millesimo quadringentismo."

\(^{175}\) Ibid.
John and Margaret Lowe. In 1404, the following provincial, William Wells, gave confraternity to William and Joan Makney in Oxford. The provincial Thomas Sharington offered confraternity to Robert and Isabelle Deyn at the Austin friary in Tickhill in 1427. William Wells Jr. issued letters to John and Juliana Morton in 1438 and Robert and Johanna Norys in 1440 at Cambridge when he was the provincial prior. A letter was given to Richard and Agnes Horton in 1442 in Northampton, and Thomas Smyth left thirteen shillings and four pence in his will for the friars at Clare for the express purpose of confraternity with them. His relationship with the Austins is attested only in his testament and the original letter of confraternity no longer survives, and thus we cannot know if confraternity was given to him only or also to his wife, as would have been typical. In that characteristic manner, the provincial prior in 1469 offered confraternity to married couple Thomas and Margaret Hurton at Thetford, in a letter signed by the prior of Thetford, John Potche. In 1475, the provincial John Bury gave this privilege to Thomas and Johanna Staunton on the feast of St Mary Magdalene at York, and in 1481, a letter was given to John and Alice Cleberi by the prior of Woodhouse. In 1493, it is made clear by the testament of William Poteman, an archdeacon of the east riding of Yorkshire, that he had been given a letter of confraternity by the York house of Austin Friars and thus was bequeathing them twenty shillings. Of all these examples, letters issued by the prior provincial promised participation in the spiritual benefits of the entire order, whereas those issued by priors of individual houses, which occurred less frequently, conferred the spiritual benefits generated by that particular house. Where the letter is signed by provincial and prior, as seen in the Thetford case, it is participation in the spiritual benefits of the entire order that was conferred, as the prior John Potche promised the Hurtons full participation.
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in the masses and devotion of the whole order in England.\textsuperscript{186}

The best example of a noteworthy patron occurs in Clare in 1445 with Katharine Howard, who was a literary patroness of the Austin Friars, financing Osbern Bokenham’s hagiographical work.\textsuperscript{187} Along with her husband, John Howard, the future Duke of Norfolk who was at the time working within the household of his cousin and Duke of Norfolk John Mowbray, she was offered confraternity with the priory at Clare in 1445.\textsuperscript{188} This was only a few years after her marriage to Howard; as the daughter of William Lord Moleyns of Stoke Poges and with the concentration of her husband’s estates around Clare, Stoke, and Sudbury, her family made for ideal patrons for the Austin friary at Clare.\textsuperscript{189} Katharine’s confraternity is a good example of the Austins both attracting and repaying their lay patrons with this spiritual service. 1445, when the Howards received their letter, was precisely when Bokenham was writing a \textit{Life of Saint Katharine}, dedicated to Katharine Howard, and thus the letter of confraternity can be seen as a direct exchange of goods. The Austins provided spiritual participation in the merit of their order, whilst the Howards supported the priory financially, allowing them to pursue their goals of devotional literature. This is much how Benedictines had used confraternity, issuing the privilege to the benefactors of their convents, maintaining the ancestral links of the monasteries with certain families.\textsuperscript{190} Notably, however, the Black Monks also used the practice for secular clerks who were employed to conduct the business affairs of the monastery, in a manner not done by any friars.\textsuperscript{191}

At the turn of the sixteenth century, however, instead of directing these letters to married couples who had served as patrons of a friary, the recipients of confraternity diversified and the Austins began to direct their letters to influential men, as opposed to married couples. For example, in 1500, the provincial William Galion offered confraternity
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\textsuperscript{190} See the example of St Albans in Clark, \textit{A Monastic Renaissance at St Albans}, 40.
\textsuperscript{191} \textit{Ibid.}, 18.
to the mayor of Canterbury, William Woode, and in 1511, the prior of York, John Tanfeld, established a yearly obit for Thomas Lord Darcy of Temple Hirst after Darcy had been granted confraternity. Darcy was entered in the martyrology of the house so that his name would be read out every Sunday and every friar of the house was obliged to keep his obit. The letter was endorsed by the provincial John Stokes (Sr.) and states that the friars, “willing and covering to recompense the said benyfices temporall,” must repay the knight for his “grete benyfices and manyfold Almus” with spiritual gifts.

Darcy was to emerge later as a religious conservative as the Reformation unexpectedly took over the world with which he was familiar. Whilst he maintained a successful career in the early sixteenth century as a courtier under Henry VII and as a military official under Henry VIII, his early vocal opposition to the religious changes of Henry VIII and his disastrous involvement in the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536-37 led to his attainder and execution as a traitor. This letter of confraternity, however, appears during the apex of Darcy’s political career, just after he became a member of the order of the Garter, was appointed as warden of the east marches, and obtained several offices in the West Riding, such as the stewardship of Pontefract, constableship of Pontefract and Knaresborough castles and stewardships of Snaith and Dunstanburgh. The Austins’ choice of men like William Woode and Thomas Lord Darcy reveals a subtle change in the aim of confraternity. Gradually, the Austins were moving away from using confraternity to express their gratitude to their local supporters and towards a system that allowed them to use confraternity to attract more noteworthy support, which might place them within important networks of influence.

This diversification in recipients was accompanied by a greater proliferation of these
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letters. Whereas in the first half of the fifteenth century, the general chapter of the Augustinians allowed for ten letters to be issued by a prior provincial during his three-year tenure,¹⁹⁷ in 1464, the provincial John Halam was permitted by the general chapter to issue fifty during his term as provincial, so long as they benefitted the province.¹⁹⁸ Whilst it is difficult to know if John Halam's behaviour here became the norm, this remains a noteworthy instance of the administration of the OESA exhorting its provincial priors to increase vastly the number of letters of confraternity issued.

There are only four extant examples of indulgences issued by the Austin Friars in the fifteenth century, three of which are from Shrewsbury and attached to letters of confraternity.¹⁹⁹ The fourth is from 1477, when Pope Sixtus IV granted an indulgence of seven years for those who visited the Austin friary in Huntingdon on the feast of the Holy Trinity and the Assumption.²⁰⁰ At the turn of the century, however, the Austin Friars began to issue indulgences separately from their letters of confraternity; the Austins found the practice of indulgences preferable to that of confraternity in the sixteenth century, perhaps because indulgences were more easily sold to larger groups of people and were significantly less regulated than were letters of confraternity, which were restricted in number by the prior general.

This impetus to increase their income is partially visible in an allegedly fraudulent indulgence sold by the Austins at the end of the fifteenth century. In 1494, John Morton, Archbishop of Canterbury, accused the Austin Friars of Cambridge of duplicitously granting a plenary indulgence for profit.²⁰¹ John Alcock, Bishop of Ely, investigated the matter and prevented the Austins from continuing to market the indulgence,²⁰² but the occurrence is testament to a growing concern amongst the Austin Friars for their financial welfare. The Cambridge house certainly appears to have been experiencing financial difficulties around
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this time; an entry in the *Grace Books* from the previous year alludes to necessary repair work to be done on the Austin Friary, which may have encouraged the friars there to acquire additional funds.\(^203\)

In 1516, Pope Leo X licensed the Austin Friars to begin an aggressive marketing campaign for indulgences by granting them a ten-year plenary indulgence on the Wednesdays of the four Ember weeks, from Ash Wednesday to the first Sunday of Lent, and from Palm Sunday to Easter Sunday inclusive, with the revenue to be divided equally between the curia and the Austin.\(^204\) Edmund Bellond, who was both the prior of London and the provincial prior, and Rafael Maruffo, the pope’s treasurer, rendered the indulgence.\(^205\) Remaining examples of this indulgence, one from Cornwall in 1518 and another from Oxford at about the same time, promise participation in the order’s spiritual works and funerary commemoration as spiritual benefits, and are signed by Edmund Bellond, as provincial prior.\(^206\) By promising participation in the spiritual merit of the order, these indulgences effectively usurped the purpose of letters of confraternity and were offered on a much larger scale, whilst confraternity was apparently reserved for super-patrons like Darcy.

The 1516 venture into indulgences was hugely successful, and the receipts kept by Edmund Bellond and Rafael Maruffo reveal that the friars’ high expectations had been warranted.\(^207\) Bellond recorded for the five years that the indulgence was offered, that is 1517 to 1521, the astonishing revenue of £1144 14s. 9.5d., which was just the fifty percent taken by the friars.\(^208\) It was precisely this kind of indulgence peddled by Johann Tetzel that caused such upset in the German Austin Friar, Martin Luther; in that case, the profit
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of the indulgences, to which Luther was famously opposed, was divided equally between the
construction of St Peter’s in Rome and to the debts incurred by Albrecht. The sheer scale
of this indulgence prompted acrimony within the order and the general prior cited Edmond
Bellond in 1522 for not having recorded all of the money collected for the indulgence,
insinuating that Bellond had kept much of it for himself.

Edmund Bellond had been embroiled in a vicious and prolonged scandal in 1520 over
the goods of a visiting Austin Friar, Sebastian of Venice, who was sent to London by the
prior general to collect taxes due by the English province to the general chapter. Sebastian
was involved in a dispute with two Florentine merchants living at Austin Friars London,
Giovanni and Bernardo Cavalcanti, and Bellond was accused of letting thieves into
Sebastian’s guest room to steal five hundred gold panni since he had been corrupted by the
influence of the Cavalcantis. This conflict continued for years, with accusations that
Bellond had been holding the office of prior unlawfully, spending money without the consent
of his fellow friars, wasting it (the prior general accused him, presumably sarcastically, of
uselessly turning square buildings into round ones), and stealing money from his own
convent. He resigned two years later, in November 1524, because of illness and his last
appearance in the Augustinian records is in a letter from early 1525 from the general prior
to the new prior of London, Gilbert Roos. Bellond’s other indirect legacy to the Austin
Friars is a scathing anonymous report of the behaviour of the friars in the London convent
whilst he was prior there, stating that the rules there were kept no more “than is in hell
among devils.” This angry and derisive report accused the friars of being drunks, inviting
prostitutes into their convent, disrespecting the mass, wasting money, holding private
parties, and drinking beer from ten in the morning until six at night. Whilst this report was
originally dated to 1534 by one of the editors of the Letters and Papers, it is much more
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likely to be from Bellond’s tenure there as prior, given the reference to the prior as an old man, which would make no sense in relation to George Browne in the 1530s.

The accusations of embezzlement indicate that Bellond’s accounts of the indulgence’s revenue might not even reflect the full amount gained from this venture. The huge success of this indulgence caused tension with the Guild of Our Lady in St Botolph’s, Boston, which had received papal grants from many popes from Nicholas V (1455-58) to Clement VII in 1526 to issue indulgences on a large scale. Their compotus book for the years 1514-25 shows the extent of this rivalry, with the Boston guild spending seventy-two shillings in 1517 on travel to see Cardinal Wolsey in order to lobby for the suspension of the Austins’ indulgence. In 1520, the guild secured the coveted perpetual Jubilee indulgence for visitors to its church in Boston, which was claimed to be the equivalent of visiting the limina of SS Peter and Paul in Rome, the rest of the seven principal basilicas, and the Santiago de Compostela pilgrimage. The guild’s venture at Boston is an extreme case of the mass sale of indulgences, spending £2100 for sending two delegations, one famously including Thomas Cromwell, to Rome between 1516 and 1520 in order to secure papal grants, and thus ratifies the large scale of the Austins’ indulgence by comparison. According to Robert Swanson’s calculations of their remaining extant account, the income of the Boston guild from the sale of indulgences was initially nearly £1000 in 1514-15, and peaked at £1550 for the years 1521-22, after which there was a small decline. The Augustinian indulgence campaign provided direct and viable competition to the peddling of indulgences by the Boston guild, thus inciting professional rivalry between them and the friars.

A letter of confraternity to the entire guild of St John’s in the parish of St Nicholas in Wakering, Essex for spiritual participation with the entire English province of Austin Friars was issued in 1526 by the provincial prior, William Wetherall. The letter, unusually a printed letter created specifically to be used in a routine fashion by the guild, rather than a
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form to be filled in with the pertinent names, promised members of the guild full access to
the pardons _a pena et culpa_ made available by the papal indulgence of 1516. It specified
that the profits were being directed towards the construction of Saint Peter’s in Rome and
the convents of Austin Friars in England. Nine years after Luther had been galvanised
into action by the theological implications of indulgences, the Austin Friars in England were
still capitalising upon the source of income provided by Pope Leo X’s bull.

It is significant that, in 1525, with all northern Europe in conflict over the results of
Luther’s protest, Gilbert Roos, the vicar general and prior of London, issued a formulary for
letters of confraternity, which significantly curtailed what was offered for confraternity.
This must have been done in reaction to the increasingly overstated promises made by the
Wakering letter of confraternity, promising full participation in the 1516 plenary indulgence,
rather than five hundred days of indulgence, which had previously been typical. Roos was
the prior of London immediately following the tenure of Edmund Bellond and thus his
release of this formulary was likely an effort to repair some of the damage done by his
disastrous predecessor.

The Austins’ involvement in the cult of _Scala Coeli_ was another mechanism by which
the Austins amassed income through their religious services. The rivalry with the guild of
Our Lady in Boston was aggravated by the Austin Friars’ encroachment upon this
indulgence that had previously been almost entirely exclusive to the guild: a deliberately
provocative move. The _Scala Coeli_ indulgence was tied to an altar at the Tre Fontane abbey
in Rome and dictated that a single mass said for an individual at this altar would
immediately release a soul from Purgatory. It took its origins from a legend of St Bernard,
which claimed that whilst celebrating Mass at this altar, St Bernard beheld a vision of

---

221 London, BL, Printed Books c 18 e 2 (16).
222 Ibid. “… ad ecclesiarum sancti Petri de urbe et conventualium fratrum augustinencium in Angliam edificacionem reparacionem et manutencionem…”
223 Dublin, TCL, MS A.5.3, fol. 194r (consulted via RothSources, 428-9; D 1052).
224 Swanson, _Indulgences_, 55.
angels on a ladder carrying souls from the flames of Purgatory into Heaven.\textsuperscript{225} Masses said at this altar were widely held to be particularly effective, securing the immediate release of a soul from Purgatory.\textsuperscript{226} According to the English guidebook \textit{Stacions of Rome}, “he that saythe a mase there wit good devossyon may brynge a soule out of purcatorry to hevyn & gretly helpe his frende that is alyve.”\textsuperscript{227}

This devotion originated in the mid-fourteenth century. The term \textit{Scala Coeli} was sufficiently established in 1380 to be a target of Wyclif when he wrote his treatise \textit{On Prelates}.\textsuperscript{228} Whilst many fifteenth century English wills exist detailing a desire for an executor to arrange for a mass said in his/her honour at the \textit{Scala Coeli} altar in Rome,\textsuperscript{229} the \textit{Scala Coeli} indulgence was transferred to an English chapel only in 1476, when Pope Sixtus IV granted it to the chapel of St Mary the Virgin of the Pew within the collegiate church of St Stephen in the Palace of Westminster.\textsuperscript{230} For many years, this indulgence was attached only to royal chapels. It was moved to St George’s chapel, Windsor and then back to Henry VII’s chapel at Westminster,\textsuperscript{231} and it was secured for the cemetery chapel at the Savoy in 1512, as detailed in Henry VII’s will.\textsuperscript{232} It then quite suddenly moved outside royal chapels, and a \textit{Scala Coeli} altar was established for the Guild of Our Lady in Boston sometime between 1511 and 1516, when it was first mentioned in a will.\textsuperscript{233} At this point, wills began to appear with requests for masses at other \textit{Scala Coeli} altars. One location was the London
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convent of the Crutched Friars, but otherwise the association with the OESA is startling: the Austin houses in Cambridge, Canterbury, Grimsby, King's Lynn, Lincoln, Northampton, Norwich, Oxford, York, and Thetford.

How the Austin Friars achieved this almost complete monopoly over this popular devotion, widely perceived as immediately effective in the salvation of a soul from the pains of Purgatory, is unclear, but it is reasonable to speculate that it was a result from their well-established connections with the papal curia. The Austin Friars appear to have capitalised here on those connections in securing the coveted Scala Coeli indulgence for a number of their convents, predominantly those within East Anglia and Lincolnshire, and thus placed themselves, once again, in direct competition with the prestigious guild in Boston. It is interesting that the early Henrician reformer who preached specifically against the Scala Coeli indulgence was Hugh Latimer. His close relationship with Robert Barnes whilst they were at Cambridge meant that Latimer preached in evangelical terms in the Cambridge Austin house on Christmas Eve in 1525, and thus he would have had first-hand experience of the famed Scala Coeli altar there. He and Barnes had switched pulpits, with Barnes preaching his celebrated sermon at St Edward's parish church, Cambridge, on that same day, so that Latimer might avoid episcopal control.
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237 Korey Maas, *The Reformation and Robert Barnes: History, Theology and Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, 2010), 14. John Foxe claims that this was done because Latimer had been banned by the Bishop of Ely from preaching in any university or parish church, whereas the priory of the Austin Friars was outside of episcopal control. Korey Maas argues that, more probably, this was done because of Latimer’s encouragement of Barnes’ evangelical preaching, given Latimer’s frequent praise of Barnes’ sermons.
The extent to which the Austins were involved in the sale of confraternity and indulgences was unremarkable: there are far fewer letters of confraternity and indulgences remaining than from the bigger mendicant orders, but a similar number to those remaining from the Carmelites. Curiously, it was the quasi-fraternal order of the Trinitarians that is best documented as a player in this industry, with the most remaining letters of confraternity. Moreover, the Austins were significantly less prolific than the Boston guild or St Anthony’s Hospital in London.

And yet, there are significant distinguishing characteristics. Whereas the Franciscans and Dominicans began launching substantial campaigns in the 1480s and just before, the Austins promoted their major plenary indulgence over thirty years later in 1516. The Franciscans began distributing significantly more letters of confraternity in 1479, after a papal bull granting them permission, and the Dominicans behaved similarly in 1485, after a licence from Pope Innocent VIII. This difference in chronology is important: when the other mendicant orders were involved in widespread campaigns marketing their religious services, the Austins were still diversifying their intended recipients of confraternity and increasing their production. Their engagement in similarly large scale campaigns was substantially later and coincided with their solicitation of Scala Coeli altars, meaning that Robert Barnes would have witnessed this institutional change in emphasis within his order during his early career. As seen, there were important precedents for this from the fifteenth century, but there is a marked contrast between the campaigns of 1516 onward from what came before. That Barnes would have seen this change first-hand may help to explain the vitriol of his backlash against clerical wealth. Furthermore, the acquisition of the Scala Coeli indulgence, likely an antagonistic move against the Boston guild, is another significant distinguishing characteristic. This was an indulgence that was particularly lucrative and
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the hold of the Austins over this practice is remarkable and attests to their ability to use their connections to supplement their income. They would have become known amongst the laity as the order that offered funerary services at desirable Scala Coeli altars, and thus found a unique place for themselves within the cult of the dead.

The sale of participation in the spiritual merit of the order, whether by confraternity or indulgences, increased rapidly and diversified as the fifteenth century came to a close. Relatively modest letters of confraternity issued to married couples who had been special patrons of their local Austin priory were replaced by grand plenary indulgences or letters of confraternity intended to attract the attention of wealthy, influential figures. The scale of their indulgences changed, from small indulgences of around five hundred days to huge, plenary indulgences, sold for exceptional profit. Whilst this evidence can only be anecdotal and thus we cannot make absolute statements regarding the indulgence trade amongst the Austin Friars, we should not ignore what is a clearly a trend towards increasingly greater involvement in the sale of spiritual merit. The evidence points to many instances of the Austins becoming involved within the indulgence trade to an extent previously unparalleled, and which likely caused concern to some of their members. Whilst this can only be speculative, and will be discussed in the final chapter, the culture created by this increased involvement in the peddling of spiritual works puts into relief the comments made by Augustinian evangelicals, such as Robert Barnes, in the sixteenth century. Gilbert Roos’ qualifications for what might be promised with a letter of confraternity in 1525 is clearly part of the same trend of concern over the growing practice of indulgences, as an attempt to mitigate the proliferation of the practice.

**Guilds**

The primary encounters with guilds by the Austin Friars were overwhelmingly of renting out space to these guilds and providing funerary services to deceased members. This was primarily with occupational as opposed to religious guilds, although not exclusively. In 1410,
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the members of a local York guild founded the chapel of St Katharine in the Austin Friary and paid for masses to be said daily for their confraternity. Their choice of the Austins for this chapel perhaps is related to the order’s reputation for devotion to this saint; as we shall see, both Capgrave and Bokenham write significant hagiographies of this saint later in the century. In 1493, again at York, the Austin Friars and their prior William Bewick mediated a dispute between the guilds of weavers and cordwainers in their church. Bewick also signed a contract in 1487 with the Carpenters' Guild: the friars, in return for the donation of two messuages, promised to sing two trentals each year for the souls of the members of the guild, each for ten shillings, and one trental for each member after death, for five shillings each. The Shearmen's Guild used the Austin Friary in London as a meeting place in 1452, and the Pewterers' Company used the dining hall of the London priory of Austin Friars on numerous occasions from 1465 to 1486, at which point the Pewterers completed a hall of their own. The Guild of Waterbearers, one of the poorest groups of labourers, also used their convent, when they had their ordinances confirmed there. This is countered by their relationship with the Drapers, evident in the will of William Calley, master of the Drapers' Company, which provided money for the company to keep an obit at Austin Friars London in 1516. The Drapers' extreme wealth is certainly a counterpoint to the poor Waterbearers, and demonstrates the diversity in patrons of the Austin Friars.

Furthermore, the Austin Friars in Canterbury were hosts in 1518 to the Guild of the Assumption of Our Lady of the Crafts and Mysteries of the Shoemakers, Curriers, and Cobblers of the City of Canterbury, which required that its members attend high mass there on the feasts of the Assumption, St Crispin and St Crispinian (the patron saints of cobbler), and offer one pence at each mass, in exchange for masses to be said for their deceased.
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brothers. In 1523, another company of shoemakers entered into an agreement with the local Austins whereby they paid the community ten shillings annually in exchange for prayers for their deceased members. In 1525, the Guild of Weavers in Newcastle required its members to attend mass on the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross at the convent of the Austin Friars there.

In contrast, there are rather fewer recorded instances of interactions with religious guilds. The register of the Corpus Christi Guild in York from 1461 shows that several Austin Friars – Robert Kettel, John Wharrom, John Homolton, John Suthwelle, William Bewick, John Bedforth and John Penrith – were members of this guild. The convent at Clare was mentioned in a will associated with the village’s significantly named Guild of St Augustine in 1488. In 1491, the German fraternity of the Holy Blood of Wilsnack, which had previously been founded in the Crutched Friars church in London, was refounded in the London church of Austin Friars and had its ordinances confirmed there. That this German fraternity decided to relocate to the premises of the Austin Friars should not surprise us; as we shall see later, the Austin Friars maintained connections with the international community in London and strove to provide adequate pastoral care to that community, although the Crutched Friars also took an active role in this endeavour. The convent at Canterbury, in addition to hosting the Cobblers’ Guild, was also associated with the Brotherhood of St Erasmus, as is made clear by the 1524 will of William Fiernour, which left tapers to this fraternity in OESA-Canterbury.
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The services provided by the Austins varied from the letting of friary space to the confraternities in question to the performance of masses for guild members to actual membership to those organisations, as is seen in the Corpus Christi Guild example. It is important to note here, as Justin Colson has argued, that guilds meeting in friaries as opposed to parish churches, by enrolling their ordinances in the commissary court, required additional legal foundation because they functioned outside of the conventional ecclesiastical structure.\textsuperscript{258} This process was more costly and so we might think of it either as a sign of dissatisfaction with the parish, as Susan Brigden has suggested, or of the popularity of the friars, for which Colson advocates.\textsuperscript{259}

\textbf{International Network}

The truly distinctive character of the Augustinian pastoral care appears primarily in London, where the Austin Friars took up, in a way not done by any other religious order, the cure of souls of the international community in London. Perhaps because of its strong ties to Rome – as discussed earlier, the Augustinians more than other clerics defended and the right of the papal office to have primacy over temporal rulers\textsuperscript{260} – the church of the Austin Friars attracted the majority of the foreign merchants in London. A Milanese merchant in his journal attested to this in 1516, where he noted:

\begin{quote}
The third church [of London is] the Augustinians where all the foreigners go to Mass and Vespers, for if they were to go to other churches they would be very badly received, and thus all go to the Augustinian and \textit{not to other churches} ... the English do not go to the Augustinian [but] from time to time, though rarely, they occasionally meet in this place.\textsuperscript{261} [emphasis mine]
\end{quote}

The international character of this priory had persisted since at least the fourteenth century, when, in the Peasant Revolt of 1381, thirteen Flemings were dragged out of the church and
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The property within the friary itself was home to several wealthy Italian merchants, such as the Bardis and Cavalcantis, as well as from time to time ambassadors Eustace Chapuys, De Puebla, and Du Bellay. They even rented out rooms to international thinkers, such as Erasmus, who stayed there in 1511 and neglected to pay his bill. From 1523, an increasingly notable tenant was Thomas Cromwell, who surely significantly is one of the few politicians of Tudor England to have spent a substantial period living abroad. There was a chapel within the church of the Austin Friars established by the Florentine community in 1509 dedicated to the city's patron saint, John the Baptist, and the area surrounding the Austin Friars property came to be known as an Italian community. Their links with the Italians were so strong that at the general chapter of the order in 1519 in Venice, it was three Italian Austins who represented the English province. As a result of this strong connection with the international community in London, the Austin Friars took up the responsibility of providing spiritual care for those foreign merchants who would otherwise not have a place in which to worship and receive the Eucharist. Their church was known to be welcoming to the foreign communities in London, as can be seen in a letter from the Spanish ambassador De Puebla in 1496, where he referred to the church of the Austin Friars as “the most public place in the whole of England, and frequented by all foreigners.”

These links can be seen in the documented relationships between Austins and Italian merchants and bankers. Philip de Albertis, a Lombard living in London and member of the fellowship of the Albertini, was involved in the financial affairs in 1408 and 1409 of numerous Austin Friars in Norwich and London. The Albertis were particularly prominent

---
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papal bankers at this time, which involved the transfer of money leaving England for the papacy and vice versa, and in the transfer of money by clerics.\textsuperscript{269} Philip de Albertis was a participant in this business, when, in November of 1408, he transferred a hundred shillings to Friar William of the Norwich convent, and a further seven marks to Friar Alexander Trous of the same convent.\textsuperscript{270} In April of 1509, he transferred Adam Payn, John Gryffyn, and Thomas Godhyve of the London convent twenty-five marks, followed by a substantial gift of ten pounds to Richard Boteler of the same convent in April of that year.\textsuperscript{271} In October of 1409, he transferred fifteen pounds to the Austin Friar Richard Blake of Oxford.\textsuperscript{272} His sustained business with the Austin Friars suggests at least a professional relationship between the Austins and the Florentine community in London, and prolonged financial support from Italy. Two English friars, Thomas Radcliffe and Richard Kersey, developed a close relationship with merchant Ubertinus de Bardis, a Lombard residing in London, as is clear by de Bardis’ gift of five marks to each of them in 1429.\textsuperscript{273}

The examples of European friars travelling to London in order to preach and offer pastoral care are plentiful. In 1425, Jerome of Viterbo came to London for this purpose.\textsuperscript{274} A friar from Saxony was incorporated into the London convent in 1419,\textsuperscript{275} and the friar Matthew of Prussia completed one of his academic tracts whilst staying in the London convent in 1444.\textsuperscript{276} As seen earlier, John Frederici, an Austin Friar studying at Oxford, went to London during Lent and the long vacation of 1427 so that he might preach and hear confessions of both the Germans and the Flemings.\textsuperscript{277} Nicholas Stemmen, a friar from Saxony who had already completed his lectorate, came to London in 1458 to preach.\textsuperscript{278} In 1468, two friars from Germany, Nicholas Arnoldi, and William de Massa, went to London to
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preach,\textsuperscript{279} as did the Italian Austin, Master Donatus de Ugolinis in 1471.\textsuperscript{280} The London convent routinely accepted four foreign friars every three years; prior generals renewed this privilege several times, particularly at the end of the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{281} On one occasion this privilege was extended to another Augustinian house: in 1427, the Austin house in Northampton was permitted to accept six brethren from each ultramarine province in 1427 so as to maintain sufficient numbers.\textsuperscript{282}

The numbers of foreign students sent either to Cambridge or Oxford to complete academic degrees contributed to the international nature of the Austin Friars in England. Whereas there was only one \textit{studium generale} for the Austin Friars in all of mainland Europe – the University of Paris – the English province had two, and thus received far more students from other provinces than did the European provinces. Friar Henry Offenburger from the province of Rheno-Suebia was sent to Cambridge to obtain his magisterium in 1413,\textsuperscript{283} and Henry de Volkmaria from Saxony was a lector at Oxford in 1419.\textsuperscript{284} John Bernardi of Rheno-Suebia was sent to study at Oxford for three years in 1419, as was John of Appoldea of Saxony.\textsuperscript{285} Simon de Brünn from Bavaria was sent to Cambridge in 1419 and John Frederici, as seen above, went to Oxford in 1427.\textsuperscript{286} James of Salza from Cologne went to Oxford in 1433 and Richard of Ghent, also from the province of Cologne, went to Cambridge in 1433.\textsuperscript{287} Peter Cleyber of Lauingen, of the Rheno-Suebia province, obtained his lectorate at Oxford in 1424 and French friar Beltrand Tresnault was sent to England to study in 1476.\textsuperscript{288}

The Austins were certainly by no means the only mendicant order with strong international links. Mendicant orders were, by the very nature of their governing system,
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international organisations, as they had a central government based around their prior
general (or minister general, as they were called in the Franciscan order) and general
chapter.\textsuperscript{289} Furthermore, the English Dominicans in particular regularly functioned as
foreign ambassadors, strengthening their links with the Continent, particularly under
Edward I.\textsuperscript{290} For example, the Dominican Cardinal Jorz was sent to Italy as a papal legate
in 1310, at the time of Avignon papacy.\textsuperscript{291} The Franciscans, rather than maintaining
professional links with Europe in the way of the Dominicans, had considerable numbers of
foreign friars in their English province. The Greenwich Observant friary was initially
composed of almost entirely foreigners and there was a peak of foreign Franciscans in
England between 1410 and 1480.\textsuperscript{292} These friars originated predominantly from Germany
and the Low Countries and we find them scattered all over the province.\textsuperscript{293} For example, in
the diocese of Bath and Wells under Bishop Thomas Bekynton, from 1443-1465, we find that
approximately fifty percent of the Franciscans ordained, from their houses at Bristol,
Bridgwater, and Dorchester, were foreigners.\textsuperscript{294} Whilst these orders of friars each carved
out ways to maintain their connections with Europe, no other monastic house in London, or
anywhere else in the country, catered to international mercantile community in the way
done by the Austin Friars. Although the Greenwich Observants also had high numbers of
international preachers, the Austins developed relationships with the mercantile community,
much of which was situated within their own precincts, and consistently provided church
space and pastoral care to that community, including the German guild of the Holy Blood of
Wilsnack that was mentioned earlier.\textsuperscript{295} Of only three international guilds in late-medieval
London, one was situated at this priory, renowned for its care of the alien community.

Because of the international nature of their congregation, the London friary was a
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hub for these European Austins. Foreign students who went to either Oxford or Cambridge were transferred to the London convent out of term time so as to hear the confessions and preach to the international community there. Thus, the Austin Friars made use of their own international network so as to serve better their London congregation; Lombard, Fleming, German, and Italian Austin Friars came to London to offer spiritual guidance to parishioners of their own language and provenance. This is of considerable significance; like the Scala Coeli indulgence, this aspect of their pastoral care utterly set the Austin Friars apart from other mendicant orders. They were the only friars who could supply pastoral care, whether in giving sermons, hearing confessions, or providing burials, in the various languages of the international community there. Whilst this may have initially developed organically, given the order’s strong ties to Rome, it evolved into a way that the Austins could capitalise upon a gap in the penitential economy and develop ties with an influential community. This worked reciprocally as well; those English Austin Friars who travelled in Europe were expected to say mass and hear the confessions of the English merchants there who did not understand the local language, as is seen in the case of Richard Clay, OESA, who heard the confessions of English merchants in Prussia and Livonia in 1402.\(^\text{296}\) The international character of the English Augustinian order, particularly at London, is an important distinguishing factor, which comes to the fore, as is discussed in later chapters, in their dealings with secular authorities and in their relationship with evangelicalism in the sixteenth century.

### III. Antifraternality

**Tensions with Secular Clergy**

Since all orders of friars had been hugely successful in universities, much of the tension between mendicants and secular clerics occurred within the university context of the theological debates surrounding the legitimacy of the friars. The largest and most serious university dispute concerning the Austin Friars occurred at Oxford in 1438, after Philip
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Norris, a doctor in theology there, heavily criticised the friars in similar terms to those of William of St Amour and Richard FitzRalph in the previous century. Members of the University of Cambridge protested on May 8, 1438 about his criticisms of the mendicant orders, but the University of Oxford continued to support him and provide space for him to voice his views. The provincials of the four mendicant orders, Philip Boydon, William Lyndwood, John Kennyngale, and Thomas Gorston, lent their support to the appeal from Cambridge, urging that Norris’ views be curtailed. Later that month, an Austin Friar and fellow doctor, William Musilwyk, publicly accused Norris of heresy and excommunicated him before John Stafford, bishop of Bath and Wells and chancellor of England. Musilwyk was a friar originating from Atherstone, who had been ordained as a priest twenty years earlier in 1419. The Oxford proctors proceeded to suspend Musilwyk for the breach of university regulations and deprived him of the right to wear his doctor’s biretta. The house of Austin Friars there was also suspended because of its unwavering support for Musilwyk, and was rescued only when Humphrey Duke of Gloucester threatened the university with withdrawal of his patronage if it did not remove the fines and suspensions from both the friary and Musilwyk, after which the university complied. Oxford saw a recurrence of this tension twelve years later when, in 1450, when another theologian, John Norris, was forced by the Chancellor Gilbert Kymer to do public penance for having assaulted an Austin Friar, Thomas English.

The Austin Friars often found themselves in contention with the secular clergy regarding each other’s respective privileges to sell and perform religious services. Eleven folios of the Register of John Burghill of 1404, detailing a prolonged dispute between the Austin Friars of Atherstone and William Brinkelowe, the rector of Mancetter, is the most
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telling source for understanding the hostility between the Austin Friars and the parish clergy.\textsuperscript{302} This dispute was brought to the attention of the curia, which issued a mandate to John Burghill, Bishop of Lichfield, to summon the friars, pastor, and any others concerned in order to mediate the conflict.\textsuperscript{303} Brinkelowe’s complaints about the Austin Friars primarily centred on their provision of funerary services and burials of parishioners, accusing the friars of actively soliciting funerals, and on the distribution of alms, claiming that the friars were unduly retaining portions of fees from funeral masses, burials, and tithes. Brinkelowe complained that the friars were burying parishioners in their church or churchyard, when they were due to be buried in the parish cemetery, and that they were saying the funeral services in their own church when such rites ought always to have been performed in the parish church. Moreover, he claimed that without the necessary authority, they also issued absolution and administered sacraments to the laity and unfairly recruited people to attend mass at the friary over the parish church by establishing pews and images of SS Peter and Paul. It would appear that the Austin Friars had set up images of these saints within their church in an effort to rival the parish church, which had an existing devotion to its patron saint, St Peter.\textsuperscript{304} This is a significant example of the Austin Friars attempting to gain popularity over the local parish priest and establish advantage for themselves, even if the method was deceitful and unscrupulous.

The arbitration ruled largely in favour of the pastor, requiring the friars to give an additional portion of their funerary income, tithes, and rent to the parish, forbidding any solicitation for burials, and restricting the location of the funeral masses to the parish. Children might only be buried in the friary if members of their family had been interred there, and the pastor’s restrictions on the number and date of services offered by the friary were upheld. The friars were, however, allowed to keep the entire fee for an anniversary, if requested by relatives, but not the immediate family, and were permitted still to distribute
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blessed bread in the form of small hosts, since it was an Augustinian custom. Another
concession to the friars was that they could keep their images of Peter and Paul above the
high altar under the condition that an explanation that these were not the patron saints of
the friary be given from the pulpit. The pews were allowed to remain as well, but needed to
be reduced in size so that they were not larger than pews in other Augustinian churches in
England.

The rural context of the parish of Mancetter is significant here; whereas in London,
the existence of hundreds of parish churches meant that a friary church was just another
church among many, in this single parish, the nearby Austin friary presented genuine
competition that could threaten the rector’s ability to make an income and tend to his
congregation consistently. The Austin house at Atherstone was at this point, a recent
foundation, having been established only in 1375, at which point the initial agreement set
out in Burghill’s register was established. This contract had stipulated that the Austin
Friars be exempt from tithes on payment of 20 s. a year, and thus the friars sought to
establish precedents in their favour so that they might assume a quasi-parochial role in this
small parish.

Other small conflicts of this nature occurred. In 1400, the investigations of the
Archbishop of Canterbury into the Austin convent in Orford reflected tensions regarding
burial rights between the secular clergy and the friars, although the episcopal register does
not specify what the friars’ violations were. In 1421, John Ixworth, rector of the parish
curch in Boston and master of theology, complained to the Roman curia that all four orders
of friars inflicted injuries on him, against Boniface VIII’s Super Cathedram. The
reference to Super Cathedram implies that Ixworth felt that the friars in Boston were
encroaching upon his provision of pastoral care, with conflicts likely over lucrative burial
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rights and division of tithes. It was this particular point over burial rights that drove a conflict in 1532, when six London Austin Friars were involved in a physical altercation with the priests in St Dunstan’s in the East over the rights to burial of a foreigner that had died there.\textsuperscript{311} The London Austins would have felt that, given their reputation for caring the international community, they had the burial rights over foreigners who died within the city, whilst the clerics of St Dunstan’s likely argued that since the death had occurred within the boundaries of their parish, it was for them to perform the burial.

Tensions with the secular clergy were to be expected, given the goals of Augustinian religion as preaching, pastoral care, begging. The friars were by their very nature an infringement upon the livelihood of parish priests and threatened not only their source of income but also their social position and their self-esteem. These conflicts manifested when there were questions over who had the right to the donations of the parishioners, whether in the form of tithes or burial fees. The Austins’ relationship with the parish clergy was in keeping with mendicant-secular relations commonplace for the time. The Dominicans repeatedly ran into conflicts with the secular clergy, particularly in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, typically over the rights to preach and hear confessions.\textsuperscript{312} In particular, at Oxford in 1228, they experienced a serious dispute with the Canons Regular over alms and offerings made to the friars from parishioners of St Aldate’s, which belonged to the canons.\textsuperscript{313} There was another significant conflict in 1259 with the Canons Regular at Dunstable, who opposed the Dominican foundation there.\textsuperscript{314} English bishops, however, recognised the value of the friars, employing them in their dioceses, with only two recorded instances of English bishops coming into conflict with the preaching friars.\textsuperscript{315} The Franciscans also incurred hostility from secular clerics over burial rights and pastoral care. In particular, they experienced a violent conflict with the cathedral canons in 1302 in Exeter over the burial of Sir Henry Ralegh, who had requested burial in the Franciscan church. His
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body was forcibly removed from the friary and interred within the cathedral after the dean had demanded that the body be presented for mass within the cathedral.316

The skirmish at Atherstone is a particularly striking example of duplicitous behaviour on the part of the Austin Friars in an effort to promote the interests of their own community. The comparative cases of the Dominicans and the Franciscans show this kind of dispute not to be exceptional; the rights to pastoral care, whether that be hearing confessions, preaching, or burial rights, impacted the potential income of the parochial clergy, and thus, the friars represented a viable threat to parish priests. And yet, the examples of documented conflicts of the Austins with secular clerics are relatively few; the dispute at Atherstone is rather exceptional, with only two other instances of a similar conflict in the fifteenth century and one in the sixteenth. In spite of these occasional clashes, the Austins managed to live relatively harmoniously with the neighbouring clergy.

**Lay Antifrernalism and Tensions over Sanctuary**

Scholarship has generally not focused much on the violence suffered by friars due to the outbreak of antifrernal sentiments in the late Middle Ages, emphasising instead the erudite academic attacks on the legitimacy of fraternalism.317 Guy Geltner’s work is the primary corrective to this trend, and although he recognises that physical assaults on friars were extreme and thus limited, they remain an important aspect of mendicant history.318 Whilst Geltner concludes that these assaults were, ultimately, relatively uncommon and based more so on perceived threats to social order than on any coherent ecclesiology,319 they were nonetheless evocative displays of tension within the community.

The first instance of discernible antifrernalism amongst the laity against the Austin Friars in this period occurred during a violent outbreak in Stamford in 1416.

---

Reports of the event remark that two men, Henry Wolsey and Nicholas Grene, broke into the houses of Austin Friars and Friars Preacher and proceeded to assault the friars there. Two Dominican victims are named, John Leveryngton and William Spenser, and it is reported that the two agitators pulled down the walls of the Austin friary and beat the friars until they feared for their lives. The Austin Friars in Cambridge experienced similar antagonism in 1416, when officials from the university complained to John Duke of Bedford that the mayor, John Bilney, accused the prior of the Cambridge convent, Thomas Cressale, and a friar from the same house, Henry Stockton, of breaking into the home of Robert Hierman with the intent of killing him. Bilney subsequently arrested the two Austins. This conflict may have had resonances with recurring town and gown rivalries, as the Austin Friars were a significant community within the academic sphere in Cambridge. This rivalry was reignited much later in 1524 when the vice chancellor of the university excommunicated the town mayor, who was later forced to do public penance in the church of the Austin Friars for having maintained his jurisdiction over the liberties of the university and refusing to submit to command of the vice chancellor.

A fifteen-year old, Richard Norman, killed an Austin friar in Lichfield in 1435, after the friar had cornered him into a room, insulted him, and struck him on the head with the butt of a knife. Norman drew his own knife and wounded the friar in the throat in an attempt to defend himself against the attack. Norman later became a Benedictine monk and did penance for this act in Rome, which is why we know about it. Whilst this incident is certainly evocative, there is no reason to think that the acrimony was a result of antifraternalism rather than stemming from a conflict between two individuals. This is strengthened by Norman’s later profession as a Benedictine; surely, if the conflict were driven by anticlerical tensions, a later religious profession would be out of character. There was also a violent outbreak in Grimsby in the reign of Henry VII, when some of the
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inhabitants of the town attacked the friary, perhaps for economic reasons, and were promptly ordered by the king to cease.\footnote{VCH:Lincolnshire, 2:218.}

There are also some gentler disputes, generally concerning property or bequests. In Leicester in 1443, Sir Robert Moton sued Christopher, the prior of the Austins, and his community over the enfeoffment of the Peckleton Manor and other lands.\footnote{London, TNA, C 1/15/125.} In Stamford in 1447, ten acres of land, which the Austin Friars claimed had been given to them by the prior of Sempringham, were seized by the escheator after Sempringham’s original title to the land was questioned.\footnote{CPR 25 (part 2) Henry VI 1446-1452 [1447], 79 (m.8).} After appeal to the king, they were allowed to keep the land because of their poverty.\footnote{Ibid.} Two years later, the Austin Friars in York were in dispute with Elaine Gare, the wife of Thomas Gare. Thomas had bequeathed the friars one hundred marks, but his wife refused to uphold the obligation. Cardinal John Kempe Archbishop of York heard the friars’ appeal under the claim that they were so poor that they could not repair their dormitory without this donation.\footnote{J.S. Purvis, “Monastic Chancery Proceedings” YASRS 88 (1934): 1-183 at 159.} In 1452, the friars ended up suing the Gare family over this bequest.\footnote{London, TNA, C 1/18/87.} In 1492, there was a dispute between Thomas Isaac, the prior of the Austins, and Thomas Dunton, over the legality of the Austin messuages in Lynn.\footnote{London, TNA, REQ 2/2/112.} In 1502, there was a dispute between the Austins in Winchester and Thomasyne Lonee, who was the executrix of her first husband Leonard Nicholasson’s will, over the destruction of a bond amongst Nicholasson’s papers.\footnote{London, TNA, C 1/266/27.} In 1518, William Manne, the prior of the friary in Ludlow, brought a legal complaint against the sheriffs of London, particularly William Herry, who owed money to the community.\footnote{London, TNA, C 1/567/18.} These disputes seem to be evidence of petty conflicts, which one would expect to find in any venture with the exchange of money, rather than avid instances of tensions between the lay community and the friars.

More frequent, however, are local conflicts over the rights to sanctuary; the Austin
Friars preserved the right of an individual to sanctuary in their churches, in a century when canon lawyers and the papal curia were exhorting English kings against showing much respect for the traditional right to sanctuary when pursuing criminals.\textsuperscript{333} Although both canon and common lawyers agreed that no one could forcibly be removed from a church against his or her will, by the time of Henry VIII’s break from Rome, he had restricted the right of sanctuary so heavily that only those who had committed relatively innocuous offences could claim it.\textsuperscript{334} The Austin Friars, however, upheld this somewhat impolitic policy, with four primary instances of sanctuary in this period. The rights of sanctuary allowed anyone convicted or suspected of a felony to seek refuge in a church where no one could remove or attack him/her, lest they suffer excommunication and severe punishment. After forty days, the suspect was obliged either to leave the kingdom or submit to the king’s court.\textsuperscript{335} The Austins were not the only order to maintain this custom; the Carmelites accepted Juliana Helwenham, who admitted to having received her husband into their home when he was guilty of homicide, in order to give her time to secure pardon.\textsuperscript{336} Sanctuary traditions were upheld in many monastic houses in the north of England; as early as 1070, a chronicler from Durham described Anglo-Saxon law that forbade the removal of fugitives of the sanctuary of religious houses.\textsuperscript{337} Symeon of Durham, in the twelfth century, gave more details, invoking a tradition of sanctuary begun by St Cuthbert.\textsuperscript{338} The tradition outlined by Symeon is remarkably similar to what was codified into law in the late twelfth century regarding sanctuary, even though practices in the south had previously differed considerably.\textsuperscript{339}

In 1453, Thomas Foster sought sanctuary in the Augustinian convent in Clare, which was violated by the coroner of Essex, John Bamburgh. Bamburgh invaded the church

\textsuperscript{333} Karl Shoemaker, \textit{Sanctuary and Crime in the Middle Ages} (New York, 2011), 152-53.
\textsuperscript{334} Ibid., 170.
\textsuperscript{335} Ibid., 110.
\textsuperscript{336} Ibid., 133-34.
\textsuperscript{337} Ibid., 106.
\textsuperscript{338} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{339} Ibid., 107.
and threatened him.\textsuperscript{340} The bishop of London, Thomas Kempe, condemned the coroner’s deeds and allowed the prior of Clare, James Exall, to proceed with canonical punishment.\textsuperscript{341} In 1472, there was a particularly dramatic incident in Shrewsbury, when a man attempted to claim sanctuary in the Austin convent there.\textsuperscript{342} Angry burgesses sought to drag him out of the church, and, in self-defence, an Austin Friar killed a man during the fracas. The king sided with the friars, intervening to punish the violation of sanctuary rights, but since the friars subsisted off local alms, a great deal of reconciliation was necessary before the friars could return to life as normal. This happened a year later when, by royal decree, the Bishop of Carlisle and Thomas Mynde, the Benedictine Abbot of Shrewsbury, paid for the reconsecration of the Austins’ church.\textsuperscript{343} Henry VII jailed Thomas Thwates, the prior of Austin Friars Oxford in 1489, John Cope, his subprior and Stephen Curtes, an Austin bachelor in theology at the university there, for protecting an alleged thief in their church.\textsuperscript{344} In 1505, a felon sought sanctuary in the Austin friary in Rye for eight days and in 1525, a woman similarly claimed sanctuary in the Austin friary of Canterbury.\textsuperscript{345} The prior, William Mallom, and brothers Valentine Bawmere, William Wanford, John Towne, and George Brewer helped her to get to their church and resisted the attempts of the coroner, William Milys, to enter and arrest her, fighting him off with knives and clubs.

Of the instances of lay antifraternalism reported here, only one, wherein the Austin and Dominican friars of Stamford where attacked in 1416, suggests any real antipathy towards friars. Significantly, it was not directed solely at the Austins; that the Dominicans equally felt the brunt of this attack suggests that its motivation was opposition to the friars as a whole rather than specifically to the Austin Friars. The Dominicans had experienced this kind of animosity before, and in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, we find several

\textsuperscript{340} CartCl SN (183) fol. 55v.
\textsuperscript{341} RothEA F, 1:208.
\textsuperscript{343} VCH:Shropshire, 2:97.
\textsuperscript{344} Epist.Acad., 2:558-63.
\textsuperscript{345} Leopold Amon Vidler, A New History of Rye, (Sussex, 1934), 49; Canterbury, City Archives, MS Bunce fol. 99r-v (consulted via RothSources, 429; D 1053).
cases of townspeople bringing grievances against the preaching friars. Moreover, in 1344, their convent in Derby was robbed of sixty pounds worth of goods and the friars where beaten by the thieves. The Franciscans too had been victims to hostility from neighbouring townspeople when in 1430, they were excluded by the laity in Babwell, near Cambridge, after one of the friars had been accused of having an affair with a married woman. The friar, who had been on pilgrimage to Bury St Edmunds, was assaulted by the husband of this woman and subsequently called upon the friars of Bury for aid, who supported him.

The Benedictines, given their frequent economic control of towns, more frequently came into conflict with the laity than did any of the orders of friars. As they possessed large estates and held the accompanying rights and privileges, they had considerable influence over their local laypeople. In the case of the abbey at St Albans, the interactions between the monks and the laity were often violent, with four rebellions occurring in 1290, 1326, 1381, and 1424. These tended to occur during moments of heightened poverty and in St Albans no monks were ever killed, but on each occasion the aggressors broke into and ransacked the convent. Monks elsewhere, at Norwich, Westminster, Abingdon, and Bury St Edmunds, were not so lucky; monks at each of these convents were killed in similar skirmishes. The monks at Crowland also experienced heightened violence in the second half of the fifteenth century, when the townspeople took issue with the precincts of the monastery and its lordship over contested areas.

In the case of the Austin Friars, antifraternalism appears to have been predominantly an issue with the clergy, rather than with the laity. Other than the attack
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346 Formoy, *The Dominican Order in England*, 42.
351 Clark, *A Monastic Renaissance at St Albans*, 34.
alongside the Dominicans, these cases – such as the arrest of Austin Friars in Cambridge or the incident of Richard Norman – can largely be explained by other factors, such as town and gown rivalries, or personal conflicts. Rather, the most impassioned instances occurred when the right of sanctuary was invoked, wherein the Austin Friars could be seen as taking sides in local disputes, even whilst providing what could also be regarded as a service to the community.

In spite of the flourishing genre of antifraternal literature, there are few instances that suggest any real tension between the laity and the Austin Friars. Their encroachment into clerical territory by offering pastoral care to the laity caused tensions with the local clergy, rather than with the local lay communities that supported them. Whilst we cannot know if the absence of reports of genuine antifraternal violence against the Austin Friars is reflective of an absence of sources or of truly harmonious relationships with the laity, there is nothing to suggest that there was much antifraternalism directed towards the Austins.

**Conclusions**

The Austin Friars in general behaved much as did other groups of mendicants in late-medieval England. They marshalled their religious services, that is, funerals, burials, absolution, and penance, for financial gain within a religious economy that quantified spiritual merit and thus created the environment in which religious professionals could offer their services for a fee. That the Austin Friars made full use of this system did not necessarily negatively impact the fulfilment of their spiritual ideals but places them squarely within the fraternal environment of the later Middle Ages. These activities were widespread amongst all friars and the extent to which some friars may have manipulated the system for financial gain was satirised in the plethora of antifraternal literature in the fourteenth century. This was true for all friars, not just the Austins, and the fact that the sale of their religious services was so lucrative is indicative that they were prospering within that climate.

The Austin Friars were distinctive, however, in how they resolved that tension
around communal poverty and participation in the economy of piety. Their portrayals of Augustine did not touch in the slightest on this complicated topic of fraternal poverty, but instead focused simply on an ascetic lifestyle, placing moderation – avoidance of extremes whether in indulgence or asceticism – at the forefront. Because of this, there was no tension in the retaining of communal property and of some individual property as well, as is clear by the extensive number of reports from general chapters, which divided an individual friar’s property between the convents at which he resided after his death.355

The Austin Friars were distinctive in their pastoral care and relationships with the laity in several ways. Indeed, in the post-1400 period, the Austins were not engaged in pastoral care per se, but rather looked, increasingly and opportunistically, towards the provision of a range of remunerative spiritual services, such as letters of confraternity, indulgences, and funerary services. Moreover, the Austins identified several areas within the religious landscape and penitential economy that were not adequately addressed, and thus, they could provide valuable services in these areas that clearly met a felt need. Their provision of pastoral care in a variety of languages to the international mercantile community of London is the most significant of these, and the Austins were indispensable in this service. By securing the coveted Scala Coeli devotion, the Austins once again could offer a unique religious service, unparalleled by any other religious order. They capitalised upon their connections at the Roman curia for procuring valuable indulgences such as this, and their 1516 plenary indulgence, and were recognised by political powers so various as Edward Duke of Buckingham and as Thomas Cromwell for their preaching talents. Their pastoral care sat at the conjunction of their everyday and political interests; whilst it was the way in which they knew and interacted with the laity, it was also their livelihood and the way in which they made influential connections. Moreover, the emphasis on that pastoral care was mutable, and came, in the sixteenth century, to encapsulate primarily the

355 For example, when there was dispute in 1514 over to which Austin convent Friar John Tonesys’ possessions would be assigned after his death, the prior general decided that they ought to go to the convent in London. How this concept of personal property was resolved within the context of mendicancy is unclear. See Dd 12 fol. 26v (consulted via RothSources, 403; D 1015).
advancement of the order’s own interests. Whilst all orders were complicit in this kind of behaviour, it is interesting that as the fifteenth century came to a close, the Austins abandoned previous practices, such as small letters of confraternity, for much larger scale enterprises, such as plenary indulgences. As we shall see in the fifth chapter, this is significant for understanding the evangelical statements of Austin reformers in the sixteenth century; Barnes’ statements about clerical wealth come into sharp relief when considered against the background of his own order’s money-making efforts within the sphere of pastoral care.

The catch-all nature of the Austin Friars allowed them to adapt to local needs and take advantage of local markets, such as their venture into the spiritual care of the international community in London. Their pastoral care was a way in which the Austin Friars could strive to imitate their founder and participate in their local communities, whilst securing patronage and prosperity for their order. By offering unique and valued religious services, the Austin Friars imbedded themselves healthily into the communities around them.
Both political and financial support was an integral aspect of the everyday existence of the Austin Friars. In that vein, this chapter investigates the activity of the Austin Friars within the complex network of secular authorities and powers during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, with particular attention to their cultivation of influential patronal relationships. What role did the Austin Friars assume in secular society and how was their religious culture affected by their relationships with influential laypeople?

Insufficient attention has been paid to the engagement of the religious orders within the conflict typically referred to as the “Wars of the Roses”, in spite of the wealth of study on this period, with no monograph-length study concerning the role of religious professionals during this turbulent period. It is natural that the bulk of the research concerns the economic, dynastic, and military aspects of the hostilities, yet the complete absence of investigation into the effect of the conflict on the religious orders and the political engagement of the friars during the latter half of the fifteenth century is striking, pointing to a possibly fruitful area of research.

Comparably, scholarship on the Austin Friars has entirely overlooked the order’s presence within the world of secular powers, or has cast them as politically neutral, as Jens Röhrkasten has done. The primary interest in the involvement of the Austin Friars in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century secular affairs has been in studies of Capgrave. The
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1 The work of the greatest historian of this period, K.B. McFarlane, stands as the apex of research into the Wars of the Roses. Whilst his number of publications was relatively small, limited to his Ford Lectures from 1953, published as The Nobility of Later Medieval England (Oxford, 1973), and his monograph Lancastrian Kings and Lollard Knights (Oxford, 1972), his student G.L. Harriss published several of his essays posthumously. His students have propagated his theses concerning the absence of distinction between traditional feudalism and what has been termed ‘bastard feudalism’, a term initially posited by Charles Plummer in his edition of Sir John Fortescue’s Governance of England (Charles Plummer, “Introduction” in John Fortescue, The Governance of England, ed. Charles Plummer (Oxford, 1885), 1-106 at 15). McFarlane remains so influential primarily because he was one of the first historians to study the fifteenth century in its own right, rather than as a transitional period either of decline, or of leading to something greater (namely, the religious reform in the following century).

2 Röhrkasten, The Mendicant Houses of Medieval London, 547. He suggests that there are no implications of political partisanship in the interment of high-profile prisoners in the church of the Austin Friars in London, and that the monarchs viewed the priories as politically neutral territory.
prevailing opinion of Capgrave's activity has been to emphasise disloyalty; this stems from Victorian historian F.J. Furnivall's description of him as a flunkey, thanks to Capgrave's dedication of his *Abbreviacion of Cronicles* to Edward IV, after his previously professed loyalty to the Lancastrian house. There has been some effort in recent years to rehabilitate Capgrave's character, as both Peter Lucas and Karen Winstead have suggested that Capgrave simply changed his opinion of Henry VI in the intervening years between his *Liber De Illustribus Henricis*, which he wrote for Henry VI, and his *Abbreviacion of Cronicles*, which he composed for Edward IV. More realistically, Joni Henry has argued that Capgrave's transition was more likely a manoeuvre to maintain good standing for his order and reflects the need of his order for royal patronage. This rehabilitation is by no means universal, as in 1996, M.C. Seymour harshly criticised Capgrave's dedication to Edward IV as a “nauseating performance” and cast his actions as morally deplorable. Furthermore, the studies of Bokenham by Sheila Delany, Simon Horobin, and John Watts point to the Yorkist agenda of this Austin Friar at Clare, Suffolk. Whilst invaluable in their findings, these studies focus only on one individual Austin Friar and lose sight of the order as a whole.

Studies of the Austin Friars have thus been deficient in their disregard of the engagement of the Austins with the world of secular powers and the integration of those actions into their religious culture. This chapter redresses this imbalance and contributes to a fuller sense of the social role of the Austin Friars in late-medieval England through an analysis of their behaviour in the public, civic sphere. Whilst the actions of these friars may
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6 Seymour, *John Capgrave*, 223. His admonition of Capgrave’s dedication to Edward IV is as follows: “This preface [...] is a nauseating performance. Politic submission is always contemptible. For a man of 68, without the hostages of family and fortune, to allow cowardice, vanity, and self-interest to displace self-respect and conscience (for a religious mindful of many past favours, one would think, sharper than for most) this was abject.”
appear anecdotal to the historian of the political conflicts of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, they are integral to our understanding of the place of the Austin Friars in secular society. This chapter will therefore analyse the three main spheres in which the Austin Friars sought influential patronage from secular powers: the literary efforts of Austin writers to attract financial patronage and political protection; explicit cases of political patronage, such as chaplaincy appointments, monetary donations by the Crown, and sermons sponsored by the Crown; and significant religious patronage, primarily in the provision of burials and care for the dead, particularly the politically charged burials at the London priory.

I. Literary Patronage

*The Manoeuvrings of John Capgrave*

Capgrave’s involvement with the world of secular powers began at the start of his theological career when he sought to secure the prestigious patronage of the ‘good duke,’ i.e. Humphrey Duke of Gloucester, Protector of the young Henry VI after the death of his brother King Henry V.8 Traditional scholarship on Capgrave has seen the friar as a loyal servant of Humphrey, as can be witnessed in the work of Alberic de Meijer, who interpreted Capgrave’s dedications as proof of genuine patronage.9 This patronage has recently been put into question by Alessandra Petrina in her volume on the Duke of Gloucester,10 arguing that Capgrave was seeking the protection of this famous literary patron but was too late in doing so. According to Petrina, the Duke had lost interest in Capgrave’s biblical commentaries in favour of the historiographical works of John Lydgate and translations of Classical texts into the vernacular. Seeing little evidence of genuine patronage, Joni Henry reiterated Petrina’s argument in 2013.11

Capgrave’s relationship to the Duke of Gloucester can be examined most clearly
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8 G.L. Harriss, “Humphrey [Humphrey or Humphrey of Lancaster], duke of Gloucester [called Good Duke Humphrey] (1390-1447), prince, soldier, and literary patron” *ODNB* [http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2167/view/article/14155].
through his literary dedications. Capgrave wrote positively about Humphrey, to whom he had given the title of quasi fundator of the order in 1440, until Queen Margaret of Anjou and the Earl of Suffolk effectively extinguished Humphrey’s influence in 1445. Once established as a theological scholar at his home priory in Lynn, Capgrave dedicated his commentaries on Genesis, Exodus, 1 Kings, 1 Samuel, and the letters of Paul to the Duke. He compared the Duke to an earlier holder of the noble title of Gloucester, Richard of Clare Earl of Gloucester and, in a useful historical coincidence, reputed founder of the first Augustinian priory in England. Capgrave depicted the relationship as an ancestral one, invoking a previous holder of the Gloucester title as sufficient reason for Humphrey to support the Austin Friars, the same Earl of Gloucester which another Austin Friar, Osbern Bokenham, later used to claim support from Richard of York.

Whilst Capgrave wrote favourably about Humphrey in his Liber de Illustribus Henricis, the relationship between the two is not as straightforward as De Meijer depicted, nor as antagonistic as Petrina argues. The Commentarius in Genesim depicts Capgrave presenting the treatise to the Duke personally at Humphrey’s residence in Woodstock, but by the time of his Commentarius in Exodum, written for and dedicated to the Duke about a year later, the tone changed to one of disillusionment, as noted by Peter Lucas. The lack of clarity surrounding this potential patronage complicates Capgrave’s relationship to the royal family, but it is significant that the Duke was instrumental in the resolution of the conflict
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12 Seymour, John Capgrave, 24.
13 Ibid., 15, 24.
14 Oxford, Oriel College, MS 32.
16 Manuscript now lost.
17 Manuscript now lost.
18 Manuscript now lost.
19 The preface to the Commentarius In Genesim has been edited and printed in Seymour’s treatment of Capgrave, at 239-40. “For in these [annals] I found it written that, in the year of our Lord 1248, the order of the hermits of St. Augustine was founded in England by Richard of Clare, son of Gilbert of Clare, and Earl of Gloucester. Since, therefore, we have been led into this land of plenty by your glorious ancestors, I, the very least of all the order, dedicate this my work, to him who is our general founder, so that if any things herein shall be found catholic and supportive of the faith, he may be regarded not only as our founder, but also our protector.” Translation by Joni Henry in her article “Capgrave’s Dedications” at 748.
20 See pages 170-71.
21 Winstead, Capgrave’s Fifteenth Century, 5.
22 Lucas, From Author to Audience, 293.
at Oxford in 1438 when the Austin Friars spoke against Philip Norris.\textsuperscript{23} Moreover, an entry in the Papal Registers shows that the Duke’s personal chaplain was himself an Austin Friar named John South.\textsuperscript{24} Thus, whilst the Duke’s patronage may not have been as extensive as De Meijer assumed, it is mistaken to claim, as Petrina has done, that there was no genuine patronal relationship to speak of.

It is important to note, however, that the Duke maintained patronal relationships with other religious orders. The best known example is the Duke’s famous relationship with John Wheathampstead and the Benedictine abbey in St Alban’s (not least because of his plans for burial there), but there are others, such as the Franciscan Thomas Joyes, who spent many years in his service.\textsuperscript{25} Moreover, he financially supported numerous works of court poetry, favouring in particular translations of classical works into English, with the Benedictine monk of Bury St Edmunds, John Lydgate, who wrote his \textit{Fall of Princes} under the patronage of the Duke from 1431-39, as his most famous client.\textsuperscript{26} This text, which will be discussed further below, was a translation of Boccaccio’s \textit{De Casibus Virorum Illustrium} and is a good example of Lydgate’s engagement with the Latin-based humanism of the continent.\textsuperscript{27} Humphrey was also a patron to Thomas Hoccleve, who wrote his \textit{Series} for the Duke from 1419-21. Hoccleve’s work was a translation of portions of the \textit{Gesta Romanorum}, including the ‘Tale of Jereslaus’ Wife,’ a dialogue on how to die well, and the ‘Tale of Jonathas.’\textsuperscript{28} The work as a whole, making use of narrative as its primary mode, was centred on issues surrounding confessions and penitence and thus was a combination of Hoccleve’s (and Humphrey’s, by extension) humanist, literary, and theological interests. Although many of Capgrave’s exegetical works were dedicated to the Duke, Humphrey’s more extensive patronage of poets like Lydgate and Hoccleve show that his interests had turned to texts which engaged with the relatively new Italian humanism, and perhaps away from
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\textsuperscript{25} Robson, \textit{The Franciscans in the Middle Ages}, 218.

\textsuperscript{26} James Simpson, \textit{Reform and Cultural Revolution} (Oxford, 2004), 57.


the conservative and traditional biblical commentaries that Capgrave was producing.

Capgrave also dedicated several theological works to prominent churchmen such as John Lowe OESA, bishop of St Asaph,29 William Grey, bishop of Ely,30 John Watford, abbot of St James abbey,31 John Wygenhale, abbot of West Dereham,32 Nicholas Reysby, master general of the order of Sempringham,33 and John Kemp, archbishop of Canterbury.34 Whilst these texts obviously do not give insight of Capgrave’s involvement in the secular community, they do speak to his ability to cultivate influential connections through his literary pursuits. This is corroborated by the relationship of one Austin from Clare, John Bury, with Archbishop Bourchier, as he wrote the Gladius Salomonis, a tract against Reginald Pecock, at the request of the archbishop.35

Capgrave’s impressive list of patrons also included Sir Thomas Tuddenham, who paid for Capgrave to make a pilgrimage to Rome from 1449 to 1451, in order to gather information about the city for his pilgrim’s guide to Rome.36 Capgrave has traditionally been linked to the Lancastrian cause because of this association with Tuddenham,37 as his patron was famously executed when he was arrested for treason by the new king, Edward IV, in 1462. Tuddenham, along with his associates, such as John Heydon of Baconsthorpe, exerted a considerable degree of influence in Norfolk in the 1440s whilst in the service of William de la Pole, Earl of Suffolk. Scholars have traditionally seen this period as a

29 Capgrave dedicated his commentaries on 2 Samuel and 2 Kings to John Lowe (now lost), as mentioned by Capgrave in the preface to his In Genesim (Oxford, Oriel College, MS 32, fol. 1v).
30 Oxford, Balliol College, MS 189; Oxford, All Souls College, MS 17.
31 Lost, but known from Capgrave’s reference to it in his Treatise (Capgrave, “A Treatise of the Orders under the Rule of Augustine,” 146-47) and from Bale in IndexBS, 188.
32 San Marino, Huntington Library MS HM 55; John Capgrave, The Life of St. Norbert.
33 London, British Library, MS Add. 36704; Capgrave, John Capgrave’s Lives of St. Augustine and St. Gilbert of Sempringham, and a Sermon, 61-144.
34 Lost, but known from Script.IMBC, 1:582-83.
36 John Capgrave, Ye Solace of Pilgrimes: a Description of Rome, circa A.D. 1450, ed. C.A. Mills (London, 1911), 1-2: “On to all men of my nacioun that schall rede this present book and namely on to my special maystr is Thomas tudenham undyr whos proteccioun my pilgrimage was specially sped I recomende my simpilnesse praying hem of paciens in the redyng that thei take no hed at no craftly langage where non is but at the good entent of the maker.”
usurpation of local power by Suffolk and his circle, largely based on the image presented by the Pastons of having been on the wrong side of Suffolk in a region where he and his associates were extremely powerful.\textsuperscript{38} Christine Carpenter, however, reminds us that whilst it was true that Tuddenham, reviled by the Pastons, exerted formidable control over East Anglia, he was a loyal and long-standing officer of the Duchy of Lancaster prior to Suffolk’s ascent and that Suffolk’s dominance in the region can largely be attributed to the incompetence of the Duke of Norfolk.\textsuperscript{39} Helen Castor, relying on her PhD thesis which predated the publication of Carpenter’s book, has also contributed to the rehabilitation of Tuddenham, arguing – much like Carpenter – that Tuddenham’s circle had influence with deeper roots than their association with Suffolk, since their prominence in the region survived Suffolk’s decline.\textsuperscript{40} Even more strongly, John Watts has argued for the legitimacy of Suffolk’s influence, claiming that his service to the Lancastrian Crown required the strong exercise of lordship that was rightfully his and that the ability to make decisions, in the absence of an independent royal will, was largely in Suffolk’s hands.\textsuperscript{41} At the time of Tuddenham’s patronage of Capgrave, Suffolk had yet to lose political influence and Tuddenham still controlled numerous offices in East Anglia, since he was the keeper of the great wardrobe, had been named to the peace commission in Norfolk, and had been appointed with Suffolk as the chief steward over the northern region of the duchy of Lancaster.

Capgrave’s \textit{Liber de Illustribus Henricis}, dedicated to Henry VI in 1446, is significant for our consideration of his positioning within the court and the world of secular affairs. This text, a compilation of lives of notable Henries, both English and European,\textsuperscript{42} functions as a ‘mirror for princes’ text, a genre typically associated with Lancastrian-sponsored poetry.
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\textsuperscript{41} John Watts, \textit{Henry VI and the Politics of Kingship} (Cambridge, 1996), 199.

\textsuperscript{42} Capgrave, \textit{Liber de illustribus Henricis}, 1-4.
The ‘mirrors for princes’ tradition comprises texts concerned with the education of the prince or king and with advice and instruction regarding the practicalities of kingship. As argued by John Watts, these texts were “aimed at kings and noblemen, and their commonest aim was to popularise opinion on the mores and practices of personal lordship.” John Lydgate and Thomas Hoccleve, the two most prominent Lancastrian authors in this tradition, used these texts to exhort certain virtues to the king or prince, so as best to advance the common interest. Whereas traditional constitutional histories have depicted the English monarchy as a distribution of power shared between the king and people, in Watts’ formulation, the king was the embodiment of the realm, and thus enjoyed a monopoly of power. Within that framework, ‘mirror for princes’ texts become significant in the direction and education of that all-important royal will, which was the only means of representing the body politic.

Hoccleve and Lydgate’s main works within this genre, the *Regement of Princes* written in 1410-12 and the *Fall of Princes* from 1431-39, were heavily reliant on their predecessor John Gower’s *Confessio Amantis*, an English and Latin poem rededicated to Henry IV after its initial composition for Richard II. The poem focuses on the requirements of kingship along with the dangers of corruption and division. Gower’s later *In Praise of Peace* was more straightforwardly pro-Lancastrian and more propagandistic than the *Confessio*, whose praise of Henry IV was relatively sparse. Hoccleve’s *Regement of Princes*, written for the future Henry V, is conventionally seen as following Gower in producing conservative Lancastrian propaganda. Larry Scanlon has argued that Hoccleve reinforced Lancastrian monarchical authority in this text and Derek Pearsall has suggested that the *Regement* was centred on a representation of Henry as the ideal future king. Conversely, Nicholas Perkins has argued in his authoritative study of the text that Hoccleve

was not merely “a cog in Henry’s formidable propaganda machine,” but rather a strong voice within the ‘mirrors for princes’ genre, attempting to teach rulers the virtues necessary for good governance. As part of this tradition, Hoccleve used the examples of past kings as either “models to emulate or disastrous failures to avoid.” This is supported by the arguments of Watts, who saw works of political counsel as serving primarily to educate and direct the royal will. The Regement was based on a Latin work of the same name, De Regimine Principum, by the most famous theologian and political thinker of the Augustinian order: Giles of Rome. Giles wrote this tract for Philip the Fair (IV) of France in 1285, which stands somewhat in contrast with his later De Ecclesiastica Potestate, written in 1302 for Boniface VIII against the same Philip. Nonetheless, Giles’ first work focused, like Hoccleve’s Regement, on the virtues and vices in governance, the duties of a ruler, and the concerns of the state. Based in Aristotelian ethics, Giles’ work was a defence of strong rule and a warning against tyranny.

The historical and poetical works of John Lydgate, the monk from Bury St Edmunds, have similarly been characterised, as Shannon Gayk has argued, “as the poster child of fifteenth-century orthodoxy.” The poet, grouped with John Gower and Geoffrey Chaucer by George Ashby in the 1470s as one of the “primier poetes of this nacion,” contributing to the development of the vernacular, joined the Benedictine order in the late fourteenth century. His association with the Lancastrians began with his Troy Book, dedicated to the future Henry V, begun in 1412 and finished in 1420. Paul Strohm characterised the monk as consistently advancing the interests of Henry V and later his son, arguing that Lydgate’s
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54 Ibid., 89.
55 Shannon Gayk, Image, Text, and Religious Reform in Fifteenth Century England (Cambridge, 2010), 84.
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Siege of Thebes can be identified with Lancastrian ambitions in France.\(^{58}\) James Simpson’s authoritative study of Lydgate in his Reform and Cultural Revolution, however, presents a much more nuanced image of the monk, arguing that both the Siege of Thebes and the Troy Book display anti-imperialistic attitudes, exhorting the king away from the dangers of war.\(^{59}\) The Siege of Thebes was likely written after the death of Henry V in 1423 given its prescient warnings against fighting between brothers, probably reflecting the power struggles between Humphrey Duke of Gloucester and John Duke of Bedford during the minority of Henry VI.\(^{60}\) According to Simpson, whilst Lydgate was certainly an “official poet” and the author of choice for the Lancastrians, he did not produce propaganda, but rather wrote carefully admonishing texts, exhorting the ruler to heed prudential counsel.\(^{61}\) Scott Morgan Straker has similarly argued that it is erroneous to assert Lydgate’s complicity in the aggressive Lancastrian agenda, given his criticisms of that agenda.\(^{62}\) These persuasive arguments are supported by Watts’ characterisation of ‘mirror for princes’ texts; they served not simply to encourage the ruler to listen to advice, but to educate the prince on the virtues necessary for good governance and to develop the independent royal will.

Lydgate continued this line of instruction during the minority of Henry VI, when, as Maura Nolan and John Watts have argued, the ideology of kingship as being wholly representative of the body politic could not be sustained given the reliance of the royal will on conciliar rule.\(^{63}\) Lydgate’s Fall of Princes, completed in 1438 under the patronage of Humphrey of Gloucester, is his work most consistently associated with the ‘mirrors for princes’ format, providing exempla encouraging princely virtues and intended for the education of the young Henry VI.


\(^{60}\) Simpson, Reform and Cultural Revolution, 56.

\(^{61}\) Ibid.


\(^{63}\) Watts, Henry VI, chapter 2, 196; Nolan, John Lydgate and the Making of Public Culture, 19.
Furthermore, his *Lives of SS Edmund and Fremund* was written between 1434 and 1436 for the abbot of Bury St Edmunds, William Curteys, and dedicated to Henry VI after his visit to the abbey in 1433. It has been characterised by Karen Winstead and Katherine Lewis as providing an example of good governance for the young king, and thus is also a ‘mirror for princes’ text.\(^6^4\) This text, associating good governance with sanctity in the saintly king Edmund, was unprecedented in medieval England.\(^6^5\) Based on Anglo-Norman and Latin models of St Edmund, it is concerned with the governance of Edmund, a young king, and draws attention to the importance of heeding counsel, showing the hero to have been, above all, prudent.\(^6^6\) His piety contributed to his good governance, but did not stop him from engaging in aristocratic pastimes, nor in his secular duties.\(^6^7\)

Lydgate’s *Lives of SS Edmund and Fremund* is innovative; it engages in princely advice, showing good governance as intimately entwined with piety and sanctity. Edmund’s saintly qualities are those that contributed to his good governance, namely, prudential wisdom, willingness to listen to advice, and the defence of the Church. Lydgate portrayed Edmund as suppressing Lollardy, which, as argued by Rebecca Pinner, should not be read as an error or anachronism, but as a way for Lydgate to make the *exemplum* of Edmund more applicable to the young Henry.\(^6^8\) Moreover, Lydgate emphasised the youth of Edmund, crowned at fifteen, showing that Edmund could be a good and wise ruler in spite of his age.\(^6^9\) Dedicated to the young king, Lydgate’s text made clear that the example of Edmund was a model for Henry to follow, not only as a king, but specifically as a child king. Lydgate’s position as a clerk and as an officially sponsored voice for the Lancastrian added clerical and political authority to his counsel, educating Henry in the way to good kingship. As Anthony Bale has shown, Lydgate’s *Edmund* put Bury St Edmunds on the national stage by incorporating Lancastrian concerns with religious ones and connecting the monastery to


\(^6^5\) Winstead, *Capgrave’s Fifteenth Century*, 121.


\(^6^7\) *Ibid*.

\(^6^8\) Rebecca Pinner, *The Cult of St Edmund in Medieval East Anglia* (Woodbridge, 2015), 99.

\(^6^9\) *Ibid.*
London by way of his miracle stories.\(^70\)

Lydgate’s ‘mirror for princes’ texts provide the model for John Capgrave’s political writings during the reign of Henry VI. Two of Capgrave’s texts follow this format of princely advice: his *Life of Saint Katharine*, composed in 1445, and his *Liber de Illustribus Henricis*, completed in 1446 and dedicated to Henry VI himself. His *Katharine* is of significance for its portrayal of saintly rule; unlike Lydgate’s *Edmund*, Capgrave stressed the inappropriateness of saintliness for a ruler, providing a starkly different model for Henry to avoid.

Karen Winstead’s studies of Capgrave’s *Katharine* convincingly argue that Capgrave shows Katharine, whose character is strikingly similar to the portrayal of Henry VI in the *Liber De Illustribus Henricis*, to have been ineffective as a ruler, showing that sanctity was detrimental to both Henry and Katharine’s ability to rule.\(^71\) Integrally to this project, Capgrave expanded the early sections of his life of Katharine in order to reinforce her ruling position after the death of her father, King Costus of Alexandria, and devoted much more space than was usual to her discussions with the philosophers regarding the necessity of marriage. Rather than providing a saintly and kingly model for Henry to follow, as Lydgate did with Edmund, Capgrave presented Katharine as a laudable saint, but a deficient ruler. In stark contrast to Edmund, her sanctity impedes her ability to rule well, since she refuses to marry, devotes too much time to religious learning rather than to her secular duties, and is neither a strong military leader nor a consistent disciplinarian. Like Henry (and Edmund), Katharine was a young ruler and like Henry, she was born to a ruler famous for his military achievements and came to power during a time of economic downturn, threats from abroad, and territorial losses.\(^72\)

The similarities between Katharine and Henry make tangible Capgrave’s admonitions to the young king; Katharine is criticised for her excessive clemency and her

\(^{70}\) Anthony Bale, *St Edmund, King and Martyr: Changing Images of a Medieval Saint* (Woodbridge, 2009), 156.


\(^{72}\) *Ibid.*, 368.
failure to attend to her secular responsibilities. In his chapter on Henry VI in the *Liber de Illustribus Henricis*, Capgrave portrayed Henry as virtuous in many of his pursuits; like Katharine, he was accomplished in his learning and appeared to have embraced virginity, in spite of his married state. Henry had married Margaret of Anjou in 1445, but by 1446, there were rumours circulating of his celibacy, with a London draper prosecuted for having suggested that the lack of a royal heir was due to the king’s avoidance of sex.\(^{73}\) Capgrave suggested that Katharine’s pursuit of sexual virtue was done in disregard for her temporal duties, neglecting the necessity of an heir;\(^{74}\) the reader is left to infer whether that also applied to Henry. Henry, like Katharine, was criticised for issuing too many pardons, even for serious crimes;\(^{75}\) moreover, Katharine’s lords repeatedly assure her that travelling throughout her realm and presiding over meetings of the council were imperative to good governance, and Henry failed to fulfil this basic function of his rulership.\(^{76}\) Whilst the _Katharine_ on its own is a remarkable piece of hagiography, when considered alongside the political context of Capgrave in 1445, the year of its composition, and alongside the ‘mirror for princes’ tradition, the text makes strong statements on the nature of good governance.

Capgrave’s *Liber de Illustribus Henricis* is a more straightforward piece of princely advice. It offers _exemplos_ of past rulers as models to follow, showcasing their virtues and successes. Most significantly, it describes the exploits of the previous Lancastrian kings, Henry IV and V, detailing their military successes and strong leadership. Within the entry on the recipient of the text and sitting king, Henry VI, Capgrave made concealed criticisms of the king, expressing opposition to his inaction regarding defence of the French territories, a sentiment shared by the Duke of Gloucester.\(^{77}\) Capgrave lamented the decline of the English navy, stating that “we, [...] who used to be the conquerors of all nations, are now

---

\(^{73}\) Winstead, *John Capgrave’s Fifteenth Century*, 156.


\(^{77}\) The duke’s position on the defense of the French territories may have been the cause for his alienation from the king and arrest in 1447, along with his subsequent, rather suspicious death. He had written to the king opposing his release of the Duke of Orléans from captivity and exhorting the king to remember his oath to the Crown of France. *Letters and papers illustrative of the wars of the English in France during the reign of Henry the Sixth, King of England*, ed. Joseph Stevenson (London, 1864), 2b:447. See Winstead, *John Capgrave’s Fifteenth Century*, 154.
being conquered by all nations.”78 The entry on Henry VI reads more like hagiography than a biography of a monarch, extolling Henry’s piety and his imitation of the saints.79 Capgrave also praised Henry IV and Henry V for their religious devotion, but only in conjunction with their leadership, prudence, and military success.80 He lamented that Henry had not taken up their example, exclaiming “What does it avail us to read of the example of these illustrious men, and not to imitate them?”81

In spite of these increasingly straightforward criticisms, there was a royal visit to Capgrave’s home priory in Lynn later in 1446 and the king took the friary under his special protection.82 Five years earlier, in 1441, Capgrave had visited King’s College, Cambridge for the laying of the foundation stone, likely after having been invited there as a nearby theological scholar.83 Both the *Katharine* and the *Liber* were commentaries on the efficacy of Henry’s rule, portraying Henry as possessing saintly virtues, such as virginity and learning, which were undesirable in a ruler, forcing him to abandon his temporal duties for spiritual ones.

The change in tenor from Lydgate’s *Lives of SS Edmund and Fremund* to Capgrave’s *Life of St Katharine* and his *Liber de Illustribus Henricis* originates in the timing of these texts; Lydgate wrote during the minority of Henry VI, when there was still the possibility for him to be an effective ruler as an adult. Henry’s minority concluded in 1437, yet he continued to rule alongside a royal council, until its dissolution beginning in 1444; his authoritative conciliar government was highly unusual given the ideology surrounding the

---


79 Winstead, *John Capgrave’s Fifteenth Century*, 155. For example, see the comparison to Nicholas the Confessor in Capgrave, *Liber de Illustribus Henricis*, 126.


81 Capgrave, *Liber De Illustribus Henricis*, 135: “Quid nobis prosunt exempla horum illustrium virorum legere, et non imitari?”


royal will. As John Watts has argued, that men who subscribed to the ideal of an absolute monarch actively took steps to limit the freedom of the king is telling; this contravened the usual accepted forms of government and suggests the absence of an effective and independent royal will. By 1445, when Capgrave was writing the *Katharine*, the royal council had effectively been dismantled and the government had transitioned to royal rule; Suffolk had become prominent within the royal household, and began to exercise the lordship of the king. He developed a following amongst the leading magnates, upon which his lordship seems to have been based, and thus, this lordship was still essentially conciliar and dependent upon the assent of these magnates.

The historiography of Henry VI’s reign has typically utilised a timeline that suggests that after the king’s minority concluded around 1437, he functioned in a largely normal way until he came to be controlled by Suffolk in the mid-1440s. K.B. MacFarlane famously pointed to the inanity of Henry, referring to him as a “baby who grew up an imbecile.” Henry’s own contemporaries, including Capgrave’s short biography in his *Liber*, supported a portrayal of Henry as simple, foolish, and overly pious. Since MacFarlane’s comments, there has been less consensus on the personality of Henry VI, with B.P. Wolfe and R.A. Griffiths both arguing that the king was significantly more active than has been recognised. Specifically, Wolfe saw Henry as significant in domestic affairs and Harriss argued that he was important in the promotion of peace with France. Most recently, and
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84 John Watts astutely isolates the paradox to the minority and conciliar governments of Henry VI when considered alongside the ideology of the royal will as an embodiment of the common weal. See chapters 2 and 3 of Watts, *Henry VI and the Politics of Kingship.*
most persuasively, John Watts has argued forcefully that the king, both as a child and as a man, possessed little by way of ruling capacity.\textsuperscript{93} According to Watts,

there is evidence to suggest that the adult king was a man of little will and little judgment: enough evidence, indeed, to invite the suspicion that the few decisive policies of the period were the work of Henry’s counsellors, temporarily permitted (or driven) by circumstances to act firmly and unitedly in the king’s name.\textsuperscript{94}

In this framework, it is no longer necessary to see Suffolk as a “diabolical genius or a greedy courtier”;\textsuperscript{95} rather, he responded to a situation in which the lack of royal will and his service to the Crown required him to exercise a degree of lordship over an ineffective king.\textsuperscript{96} Capgrave’s exhortations to Henry thus take on more substance; in 1445 and 1446, the king was functioning under Suffolk and had failed to exercise his kingship in any substantive way. Capgrave’s attempts to show Henry examples of successful kings and to demonstrate the failings of his own reign through a hagiography of Katharine reflect the anxiety of the period over an ineffective king, foreign aggression, and a political vacuum following the death of Henry V.

Capgrave’s sustained efforts in directing and instructing the will of the king to what he believed was a more effective form of kingship speaks to his commitment of the ideology of kingship and his desire for a more functional government. Furthermore, his engagement in a culture of celebrity monks such as Lydgate writing for East Anglian nobility shows his awareness of the behaviour of other religious orders and is evidence for showing that the Austin Friars were good at fitting into the environment around them. Nonetheless, his criticisms of the king display disillusionment with the Lancastrian régime, and following Edward IV’s decisive victory at the Battle of Towton, Capgrave dedicated his history of England, the \textit{Abbreviacion of Cronicles}, to the new king in 1462. In the dedicatory address of this text, Capgrave wrote:

\begin{quote}
To my souereyn lord Edward be þe grace of God kyng of Ynglond and of Frauns lord of Yrland, a pore frere of þe heremites of seynt Austyn in þe
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{93} Watts, \textit{Henry VI}, 111.
\textsuperscript{94} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{95} Ibid., 199.
\textsuperscript{96} Ibid.
conuent of Lenne sendith prayer obediens subieccion and al þat euir be ony
deute a prest schuld offir onto his kyng.\textsuperscript{97}

Additionally, Capgrave cast the reign of Edward IV in theological terms and saw him as restoring, through God’s grace, the natural order upset by the Lancastrian deposition of Richard II. He described this relationship as follows:

Furthermore yet fynde I a grete conveniens in youre tytil, that ye be cleped Edward the Fourt. He that entered be intrusion was Herry the Fourte. He that entered \textit{by Goddis provision is Edward the Fourt}. [...] We trew louere of this lond desire this of oure Lord God, that al the erroure which was browte in be Herry the Fourte may be redressed be Edward the Fourte.\textsuperscript{98} [emphasis mine]

The language used by Capgrave here is particularly strong for a man who had previously written of Henry IV as succeeding to the throne by “election of the people” and depicted Richard II as cruel after having been led astray by evil advice.\textsuperscript{99} He had portrayed Henry IV as a deeply religious man, going on various pilgrimages, even to visit the body of Augustine himself in Pavia and to the Austin priory in Clare.\textsuperscript{100} By offering judicious flattery to whomever was the reigning monarch and writing using his own name, Capgrave navigated his order through the conflict and secured important political protection for the Austins. As a public figure, it was responsible of him to ensure stability and security for his order and not to implicate them in the turbulent period.

Capgrave’s portrayals of Katharine and Henry VI bear remarkable similarity. Whilst he depicted both as pursuing saintly virtues, in his hagiography of Katharine, Capgrave showed the saints (in this case, Katharine) to be unsuitable rulers due to their otherworldly pursuits. Capgrave made use of the ‘mirror for princes’ genre to voice his concerns over the performance of Henry VI and to redirect the king towards more acceptable forms of kingship. Like Lydgate, Capgrave made use of his clerical authority in his exhortations to the king, but seeing sainthood as inherently antithetical to the secular duties of a ruler. With the accession of Edward IV, he turned to a more conventional propagandistic style, extolling the

\textsuperscript{97} Capgrave, \textit{Abbreviacion of Cronicles}, 7.
\textsuperscript{98} Ibid., 9.
\textsuperscript{99} Capgrave’s entry on Henry IV states that “regnavit post Richardum Secundum, non tam titulo sanguinis, quam electione populo” (Capgrave, \textit{Liber De Illustribus Henricis}, 98) and that Richard was “consilio malo deceptus” (\textit{ibid.}, 101).
\textsuperscript{100} Ibid., 100.
virtues of the reigning king and excoriating the sins of the Lancastrians.

**Clare’s Influence and Osbern Bokenham**

Approximately fifty miles south of Capgrave’s convent in Lynn is the Augustinian priory of Clare, the home to the famous literary mind of Osbern Bokenham. Bokenham is renowned for his hagiographical *Legendys of Hooly Wummen*, following the post-Chaucerian style of composition akin to Hoccleve, Lydgate, Gower, and his fellow Augustinian, Capgrave. Unlike Capgrave, Bokenham was a precocious supporter of the House of York, setting the foundation in writing for the Duke's royal legitimacy.

Bokenham was a personal beneficiary of John Baret of Bury St Edmunds, called by Robert Gottfried a “successful clothier, landowner, financier and civic leader.” Bokenham was named in his will as an individual recipient, suggesting a personal relationship between the two and a familiarity with the élite of the neighbouring area of Clare. This is corroborated by Bokenham’s long list of literary patrons evident from his *Legendys of Hooly Wummen*, a compilation of eleven female saints’ lives, many of which are dedicated to specific women who had commissioned them directly from Bokenham. These patronesses included Katharine Howard and Katharine Clopton Denston, for whom he wrote a life of St Katharine, Katharine Howard’s daughter Elizabeth Howard de Vere, the Countess of Oxford, for whom he wrote a life of St Elizabeth, Katharine Clopton Denston’s daughter Anne, for whom he wrote a life of St Anne, Isabel Hunt, for whom he wrote a life of St Dorothy, and Agatha Flegge, for whom he wrote a life of St Agatha.

Bokenham boasted most of his patronage from Lady Isabel Bourchier, the countess of Eu. She lived in Clare Castle, just by the Austin priory, having married into the
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104 Ibid., 176.
influential Bourchier family, and was herself the sister of Richar Duke of York, and the
daughter of Richard Langley Earl of Cambridge, who was executed for treason by Henry V
after attempting to place Edmund Mortimer, his brother-in-law, on the throne.\textsuperscript{107} Isabel
sponsored Bokenham’s literary works, but along with her husband, was also a patron of the
whole friary. In 1455, her husband Henry Bourchier donated six acres to the Austins at
Clare,\textsuperscript{108} and in 1463, the Austins established a chantry for both Henry and Isabel.
Bokenham signed this document, which required the friars to sing masses for the Bourchiers
and the Duke of York.\textsuperscript{109} Three years later, Isabel and Henry Bourchier donated more land
to the Austins at Clare; this time it was a gift of twenty acres in the parish of Ashen.\textsuperscript{110} In
the prolocutory of his \textit{Life of St Mary Magdalene}, which he wrote at the behest of Isabel
Bourchier and which can be found in his \textit{Legendys of Hooly Wummen}, he recounted
the occasion at which Isabel requested this hagiographical work: he was attending a Twelfth
Night celebration held at her estate in 1445 when she commissioned the piece because of her
personal devotion to the saint.\textsuperscript{111} Bokenham described the celebration as jovial, pointing to
the revelling and dancing of Isabel’s four young sons and revealing that the guests were
dressed in their best clothes.\textsuperscript{112} This point is significant for elucidating the relationship
between the Clare Austins and the Bourchier family; not only were the Bourchiers religious
patrons of the Austins, but they were also social patrons, and perhaps even friends, of the
friars. Whilst Bokenham was being commissioned by Isabel at this point to undertake a
religious project for her, we cannot overlook that this was being done at a social gathering,
to which the Countess had invited him. Whilst this may have implications for the alleged
austere lifestyle and mendicant poverty of the Austins, we may count this genre of
socialising as another layer to their cultivation of influential networks.

\textsuperscript{107} \textit{Ibid}.
\textsuperscript{108} \textit{CartCl.}, JH (189) fol. 57r; \textit{CAugCl.}, 104.
\textsuperscript{109} \textit{CartCl.}, JK (191) fol. 57r; \textit{CAugCl.}, 105.
\textsuperscript{110} \textit{CPR} 6 (part 1) Edward IV 1461-1467 [1466], 520 (m.10).
\textsuperscript{111} Bokenham, \textit{Legendys of Hooly Wummen}, 136-138.
\textsuperscript{112} \textit{Ibid.}, 138. “I saye, whyl þis ladyis foure sonys ying/ Besy were wyth reuel & wyth daunsyng,/ And
þere mo in þere most fressh aray.”
popularity of virgin martyrologies in fifteenth-century England, in addition to providing the best evidence for the growing role of women in both the content and consumption of literary texts.\textsuperscript{113} Indeed, the female hagiographies for female patrons by other contemporaneous authors pale in comparison to the network cultivated by Bokenham. Regarding the popularity of virgin martyrs, Chaucer’s \textit{Life of St Cecilia} (in his \textit{Canterbury Tales}), Lydgate’s extremely popular – extant in fifty manuscripts – \textit{Life of Our Lady}, Capgrave’s \textit{Life of St Katharine}, and Hoccleve’s numerous poems for the Virgin Mary are other prominent examples. Moreover, Hoccleve’s \textit{Letter of Cupid}, a translation of Christine de Pizan’s \textit{Epistre au Dieu d’Amours}, a literary defence of women based on Boccaccio’s \textit{On Famous Women} and Chaucer’s \textit{Legend of Good Women}, is another witness to the increasing importance of women within the sphere of literary and religious texts. Lydgate’s dedication of his \textit{Life of St Margaret} for Anne Mortimer, Lady March, his \textit{Invocation to St Anne} for Anne of Woodstock, Countess of Stafford, his \textit{Virtues of the Mass} for Alice Chaucer, Countess of Suffolk, his \textit{Fifteen Joys of Our Lady} for Isabel Despenser, Countess of Warwick, his \textit{Guy of Warwick} for Margaret Beauchamp Talbot, Countess of Shrewsbury,\textsuperscript{114} and Capgrave’s dedication of his \textit{Life of St Augustine} for a local noblewoman were the most significant competing examples of female patronage of hagiography. Lydgate’s female network is remarkable in its influence, but Bokenham’s patronage by Isabel Bourchier, Elizabeth de Vere, Katharine Denston, Katharine Howard, Isabel Hunt, Anne Denston, and Agatha Flegge is unparalleled in its breadth and is significant for our understanding of the community surrounding the Austins at Clare. These women all lived within a sixteen-mile radius of the priory, knew each other, and constituted their own textual community, interacting with the same set of hagiographical pamphlets from Bokenham.\textsuperscript{115} Bokenham’s hagiography is exceptional in this regard, and in addition to Capgrave’s patronage of his \textit{Augustine} by a noblewoman and

\textsuperscript{113} Newhauser, “Religious Writing,” 45.

\textsuperscript{114} Simpson, \textit{Reform and Cultural Revolution}, 60; Jambeck, “Patterns of Women’s Literary Pastronage,” 246-7.

his composition of a *Life of St Katharine*, Augustinian hagiography and the order’s cultivation of female networks were distinctive.

The Bourchier family’s close relationship to the Austins at Clare is substantiated by the literary activity of another Clare friar; John Bury of Clare wrote the theological tract *Gladius Salomonis* for Thomas Bourchier, Archbishop of Canterbury, in opposition to the thought of Reginald Pecock. Bokenham elevated the status of his patroness in the prologue to the *Life of St Mary Magdalene*, where he emphasised that Isabel was of the same pedigree as the Duke of York. This lineage was noteworthy through their paternal grandmother, who was the daughter of the Spanish King Peter and brought the Spanish title to England when she married Edmund of Langley, the younger brother of John of Gaunt. According to Bokenham, this grandmother’s elder sister died without issue and thus the royal lineage continued through her own line of children. Within that framework, Bokenham argued that the Spanish throne ought to pass down to Richard, Duke of York. According to Bokenham:

```
Doun conveyid by the same pedegru
That the duk of yorck is come, for she
Hys sustyr is in egal degre,
Aftyr the dochesse of York clepyd Isabel,
Hyr fadrys graunhtdam, wych, soth to tel,
In spayn kyng Petrys dowtyr was,
Wych wyth a-nothir sustyr, so stood the caas,
The royal tylte of spayne to englond broht,
And, for the fyrste sustyr yssud noht
But deyid baren, al stood in the tothir,
By whhom the ryht now to the brothir
Of seyd dame Isabelle, to seyn al and sum,
The duk of yorck, syr Rychard, is come,
Wych god hym send, yf it be hys wyl.118
```

Bokenham misrepresented some genealogy here in order to strengthen the lineage of Isabel – and through her, Richard – by denigrating the line of her grandmother’s elder sister. King
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117 Delany, *Impolitic Bodies*, 21; *CartCl.*, JD (183) fol. 56r.
Pedro of Castile's two daughters both married English princes, but the elder, Constanza, married to John of Gaunt, certainly did not die without children as claimed by Bokenham. Rather, she bore two children, a son who died as an infant, and a girl, Catalina, who married Enrique III of Castile and Leon. Isabel, the younger daughter, married John of Gaunt's younger brother, Edmund of Langley, Duke of York, a marriage that was insisted upon by Edward III in order to ensure that the Castile claim stayed within the family. Their son was Richard, Earl of Cambridge, who clandestinely married Anne Mortimer, the marriage producing Isabel, along with Richard, Duke of York, who through his mother was also the heir to the Mortimer inheritance. Bokenham here was laying the foundation for Richard of York's possible claims to both the Spanish throne and the English one, via his lineage from both Edmund of Langley and Lionel Duke of Clarence (through the Mortimer line).

Two other documents extolling the lineage and virtues of the Duke of York surface from this time at Clare priory; whilst both are anonymous, Delany's ascription of the later of the two, the Dialogue at the Grave of Dame Johan of Acres, is uncontested, whilst the earlier composition remains shrouded in confusion. The Dialogue, a text recounting the lineage of Richard, Duke of York through a conversation held between a friar and secular priest at Clare, where two of Richard's prominent ancestors, Lionel, Duke of Clarence, and Joan of Acre, were buried, can only be the product of Bokenham. He was certainly the foremost scholar of his priory at the time, and his lyrical style and prowess makes him the likeliest candidate as author of this text.

The same is certainly true of the earlier text, a translation of Claudian's De Consulatu Stilichonis, but confusion surrounding the date of the composition of the text and of Bokenham's death has obfuscated the question of authorship. John Watts rejected attribution to Bokenham for the Claudian text, but he eliminated Bokenham as a possible
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119 Delany, Impolitic Bodies, 132.
121 Delany, Impolitic Bodies, 132.
123 Delany, “Bokenham's Claudian as Yorkist propaganda,” 83-96; Watts, “De Consulatu Stiliconis,” 251-266.
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The Middle English translation of Claudian’s De Consulatu Stilichonis is extant in only one manuscript,132 which includes several references to the Duke of York, comparing

125 CartCl., JK (191), fol. 57r; CAugCl., 105.
127 Watts, “De Consulatu Stiliconis,” 257.
128 Delany, “Bokenham’s Claudian as Yorkist propaganda,” 87-89.
129 Ibid., 92.
130 Ibid., 91.
132 London, BL MS Add. 11814.
him the soldier Stilicho, the subject of Claudian’s treatise.\textsuperscript{133} The piece is straightforwardly a ‘mirror for princes’ text, using the \textit{exemplum} of Stilicho as the ideal to which Richard ought to subscribe. Stilicho is presented as a capable leader, whose legitimacy – like Richard’s – is questioned because of his claim through a female line.\textsuperscript{134} In the third stanza, the author refers to Richard, wherein he makes the connection between Stilicho and York explicit. According to the text:

\begin{quote}
Marke stilichoes life whom peoplis preyed  
with what labouris of the regions wide  
And Rome hir selfe the consulat he vpreised  
\textit{ffor now the parlement pierys. where thei goo or ryde}  
\textit{Seyen the duke of yorke hath god upon his side}  
Amen. amen, blissed Ihesu make this rumour trewe  
And aftir feele peryles this prince with Ioie endewe.\textsuperscript{135} [emphasis mine]
\end{quote}

Bokenham’s reference to lords of parliament exclaiming that God was on the side of the Duke of York points to the support of the Austins at Clare for the Duke’s claim. If Delany’s date is correct, Bokenham’s treatise appears as a consolation to the Duke, encouraging him after his political hardships, exhorting ‘blessed Jesus to make the rumour of Richard’s rule true.’ Moreover, this dating would point to the diversity of the Austin Friars; whilst Capgrave, relatively close by at Lynn, was at this point exhorting the king to more effective kingship through his \textit{Katharine} and \textit{Liber}, Bokenham had turned to bolstering the ambitions of the king’s opponent. The date of 1445 would, however, be exceptionally precocious for a text of this kind, and Watts’ arguments regarding the compositional date are persuasive.

Bokenham’s third text, the \textit{Dialogue at the Grave of Dame Johan of Acres} “bitwix a seculer asking, and a frere aunsweryng”,\textsuperscript{136} was written in 1456 at Clare priory, at a more

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item Delany, “Bokenham’s Claudian”, 89.
\item As is discussed below, inheritance of titles through the female line was an issue of some debate in the fifteenth century. Richard’s lineage is attacked by Sir John Fortescue in his anti-Yorkist propaganda for passing through the female line at two separate instances. See Delany, “Bokenham’s Claudian”, 90.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
fitting time for a political statement of this kind. It explores the lineage of the renowned Joan of Acre, an early donor to the priory, and therefore also of the Duke of York, who was descended from Joan through Lionel of Clarence. The short poem finished with the exposition on Richard of York, whom it calls “this Prynce myghty”, and his children and wishes that God grant him victory over his enemies. It is significant that it is the friar, and not the secular priest, in this text who is knowledgeable about the esteemed lineage of the Duke of York, suggesting a relationship between the friary and the noble family.

The textual transmission of this text presents a complication in accurately assigning a date to its composition. The existing manuscript was reproduced in Dugdale’s *Monasticon* and later in Barnardiston’s study of Clare priory.\[137\] This manuscript carries with it a date of 1456, whilst the version that seventeenth-century antiquary John Weever reproduced in his *Antient Funeral Monuments* marks the date clearly as 1460. This may simply be a mark of carelessness of Weever, but it is also possible that there was a later, comparable text, possibly one that was kept in the church by the grave of Joan of Acre at Clare priory: a common practice at notable gravesites at the time, though survival rates are minimal. The change in date is a significant alteration; in 1456, fighting had only broken out the year previously at St Albans, but in 1460, York had returned to England after his previous defeat and become the Protector once again. In attempt to quash the forces of Margaret of Anjou and the nobles supporting her, trying to suppress his influence, York would die in the December of that year with his son Edmund, leaving his son Edward to claim his victory for him. The political landscape was drastically different in 1460, with the Yorkists not far from certain victory, whereas in 1456, the situation was far more doubtful.

Bokenham’s textual support for the Duke of York is marked by one additional factor. The dynastic conflicts of England were based around the legitimacy of matrilineal inheritance; the House of York had a better claim than the House of Lancaster to the throne through a female line, but it was unconventional for the title to be passed down that way.

Within this context, Bokenham wrote a legendary of female saints, at a time when female saints were considerably fewer than their male counterparts. Sheila Delany's argument that his hagiography, focusing exclusively on women, could reflect a political concern, is a good one.138 At a time when the place of women in society was at the crux of political conflicts of the fifteenth century, it is striking that a strong proponent of the House of York, and therefore of matrilineal inheritance, wrote extensively about female spirituality.

However, whilst we have ascribed his authorship to these three texts, Bokenham carefully left them anonymous. Although he made some rather serious political statements in these texts, by not attaching his name to them, he kept the Austins from being implicated too far in a potentially dangerous conflict. Moreover, there is little evidence to show that Richard of York actually offered Clare Priory much support at all; the only case in the property deeds of Clare that shows patronage by the Duke is documentation of a donation of land to the friars by Henry and Isabel Bourchier, which was merely licensed by Richard, given his inheritance of the honour of Clare.139 Bokenham's network of patrons gave him a base upon which to launch this political propaganda, ensuring an influential readership and thereby making his texts useful to the Duke. Anonymity allowed for him to seek out the Duke of York's protection whilst not jeopardising the standing of his order should Richard experience defeat.

The Austin convents in London and Norwich similarly boasted esteemed patrons and special relationships with particular families, such as the London Austins' relationship with the de Bohuns, but the extent to which Clare was associated with a particular aristocratic family is unparalleled. Richard Earl of Cornwall's thirteenth century foundation of a Cistercian abbey at Hailes is, perhaps, a similar example, with a long-standing tradition of patronage from the Earl's family, including the acquisition of a relic of Holy Blood. Moreover, Clare's association with a charismatic aristocratic woman, Joan of Acre, whom the Austins (particularly Capgrave and Bokenham) touted as a holy woman, had important

138 Delany, Impolitic Bodies, 144-159.
139 CartCl., JD (183) fol. 56r (CAugCl., 102); JG (186) fol. 56v (CAugCl., 104).
implications for the genre of literature produced there. It is no coincidence that it was this convent, famous for this woman’s burial, even though they were an exclusively male community, that was outspoken about the value of female spirituality and matrilineal descent.

II. Political Patronage

Mendicants have a long history of receiving royal patronage: the Dominicans were closely associated with the Plantagenets up until Richard II, and after the advent of the Lancastrians in 1399, it was predominantly the Carmelites who undertook spiritual guidance of the House of Lancaster. Bede Jarrett acknowledged the powerful influence of the Friars Preachers in the late thirteenth and fourteenth century, noting their aristocratic connections and activity in negotiating and advising, at which point the Austin Friars were predominantly outside the royal circle. In fact, formal appointments for the Austin Friar at court occur predominantly in the mid-fifteenth century under Henry VI and the nature of their political patronage diversified under other kings.

Four Austin Friars were the recipients of royal chaplaincies in the fifteenth century, placing them in positions close to those with considerable influence and securing valuable patronage and protection for their order. John South was the personal chaplain to Humphrey Duke of Gloucester from before 1446, when Humphrey petitioned the papacy to grant the friar permission to obtain a benefice. In 1457, John Tyson was appointed as personal chaplain to Queen Margaret of Anjou, and Thomas Hervei was appointed to give financial counsel to Henry VI. As chaplain to such an influential queen, integral to the unfolding of the conflict, it is only natural that Tyson would have been privy to some of the Queen’s decisions, and in the way of things, is likely to have been a source of counsel for her. Similarly, Hervei’s proximity to the king evinces a degree of influence he held at court and superficially appears to contradict the behaviour of Bokenham, who wrote in support of
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the Duke of York. Furthermore, John Bury, the author of the *Gladius Salomonis*, was granted a pension in 1458 by Henry VI for being “oon of the preests of our chapelle.”\(^{145}\)

An example of a different (and decidedly unusual) kind of political involvement can be found in William Gregory’s *Chronicle*. In this text, there is a record of an Austin Friar having been actively involved in the Battle of Blore Heath, an important turning point to success for the Duke of York, when Richard Neville defeated Lord Audley on 23 September 1459. According to the *Chronicle*:

> But the Erle of Saulsbury (Neville) hadde ben i-take save only a Fryer Austyn schot gonnys alle that nyght in a parke that was at the backe syde of the fylde, and by this mene the erle come to Duke of Yorke. And in the morowe they founde nothyr man ne chylde in that parke but the fryer, and he sayde that for fere he a-bode in that parke all that nyght.\(^{146}\)

If the *Chronicle* is accurate in this report, the actions of this particular friar signal a clear declaration of support for the House of York, or at the very least a strong relationship between the friar and someone involved in this battle. Given that the friar in question was not named in the *Chronicle*, he was likely a local friar of little renown, not known beyond his local community. We might assume that this friar was from Shrewsbury, the closest friary from Blore Heath at approximately forty miles away, even though only three years earlier, in 1456, there were only six friars there.\(^{147}\)

Although there is no documented patronage of this friary by Richard of York, the friars may have encountered the Duke on his visit to Shrewsbury in 1450 and thus lent their support to him.\(^{148}\) Alternatively, the friar could have come from the priory at Ludlow, slightly farther away from Blore Heath, but one of York’s main residences was located there.\(^{149}\) Regardless, this friar may be the exception to trend discussed above, with genuine political convictions rather than merely supporting the likely victor, but without more information, inferences are difficult to make.

\(^{145}\) London, TNA, PSO 1/20/1057.


\(^{149}\) Carpenter, *The Wars of the Roses*, 145.
The influence of the Austin Friars under the Plantagenets could never rival that of their most formidable mendicant competitor: the Dominican order. Henry III showed such favour to the Preachers that he even chose one as his personal royal confessor in 1256, an office that the Dominicans would hold for the next 143 years. Unsurprisingly, it was the Dominicans who supported Henry III, whereas the Franciscans backed the baronial cause. Both English kings and popes repeatedly used the Dominicans as diplomats and ambassadors, such as the cases in 1292, 1295, and again in the fourteenth century. Edward I, like his father, increased the presence of Dominicans at court, employing them predominantly for foreign relations. During his reign, two Dominicans, William Hotham and John Darlington, sat on the King’s Privy Council; one of these men, William Hotham, was also the Archbishop of Dublin and significant for negotiating for peace with France and in connection to the claims made on the Scottish throne after the death of Alexander III. Perhaps most significantly, Richard II was an especially generous and loyal benefactor to the Dominicans, making three of his confessors bishops and obtaining permission for himself and his chaplains to follow the Dominican breviary. Many Dominicans were supporters of Richard even after his deposition, for which several were imprisoned or executed.

After Richard’s deposition, Henry IV broke the 143-year continuous span of maintaining Dominicans as royal confessors. Both he and his son eventually chose prior provincials as confessors, but otherwise the Dominicans had little influence on the Lancastrians. The bulk of their role in royal life during the Wars of the Roses and Edward IV’s reign amounted to hosting a visit from the future Edward IV at their priory in Shrewsbury in 1460 and providing quarters for Elizabeth Woodville from
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1471 to 1473, when Edward was frequently absent.\textsuperscript{158} It was there that their son, Richard Duke of York, was born.\textsuperscript{159}

The Franciscans had a more measured influence during the Plantagenet dynasty; their main contribution to the royal household was their York priory acting as lodgings for royal visits to north in the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{160} In 1370, one was named confessor to Queen Phillipa and granted an annuity of forty marks and three years later, another Franciscan was a physician in the service of John of Gaunt.\textsuperscript{161} Under the Lancastrians, the Franciscans at Exeter were the recipients of numerous royal visits in 1413, 1426 and 1445, in addition to Sir John Fortescue staying there in 1433 and Lady and Lord de Ryvers in 1451.\textsuperscript{162} The Franciscan John Troyes spent many years in the service of Humphrey Duke of Gloucester, as was made clear when the Duke supported his application for a preaching licence in 1443.\textsuperscript{163} In 1454, Henry VI promised the Franciscans to introduce the Observant order into England,\textsuperscript{164} and Edward IV formally introduced the order into England in 1482 when he invited Observant Franciscans from Cologne to establish the order in his country.\textsuperscript{165} Comparatively, the Carmelites somewhat took over the role of the Dominicans as royal confessors under the Lancastrians, the most famous of whom was Thomas Netter, who was not only the confessor of Henry V, but also an ambassador for the king to Lithuania and Poland.\textsuperscript{166} Netter was their most prominent member in public life; he was appointed as a judge in Oldcastle’s trial, worked for conciliar authority at the Council of Pisa, preached at the funeral of Henry IV, performed diplomatic duties under Henry V, and accompanied Henry VI to France for his coronation in 1430.\textsuperscript{167}

When put in relief against a picture of mendicant influence in late-medieval
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English society, the Austins’ involvement in Lancastrian and Yorkist life may seem unremarkable. They lacked the influence of the Dominicans under the Plantagenets and their receipt of royal patronage under Henry VI was the height of their royal benefactions under the Lancastrians. In this way, they were comparable to the Franciscans and the Carmelites, who, in spite of a few notable instances, were also without noteworthy patronage from the royal household. Neither do we see any particular patronage from Edward IV in spite of the literary propaganda provided for the House of York by the Clare priory, perhaps largely due to Bokenham’s insistence on the anonymity of his texts.

**Richard III and the Austin Friars**

A prominent Austin Friar, Thomas Penketh, gave a notorious public sermon in 1484 extolling the virtues of Richard III. This virulent speech, which made its speaker the only Austin to bear mention in the Shakespearean corpus, appears also in Holinshed’s *Chronicles* and Thomas More’s *History of Richard III*. Penketh was remunerated £10 by the king for having publicly preached this sermon; his loyalty to the putative child-murderer was memorialised in Shakespeare’s *Richard III*, when, in Act 3, Scene 5, Richard says to Lovell and Ratcliffe:

> Go, Lovell, with all speed to Doctor Shaw.
> (to Ratcliffe) Go thou to Friar Penker. Bid them both Meet me within this hour at Baynard’s Castle.

It is this Doctor Shaw, the brother of the mayor of London Edmund Shaw, alongside whom Penketh made his famous sermon in 1484, attested in Thomas More’s *History of Richard III* and repeated in Raphael Holinshed’s *Chronicles*. According to More:

> Of spiritual men he took such as had wit, and were in authority among the

---

168 This speech, as will be discussed below, is attested in the Tudor histories by More and Holinshed. There are no Augustinian sources corroborating this claim, but there is no reason to suppose that More had invented the claim. Given Richard III’s relationship with other Austins, it is entirely plausible that he received support from Penketh, and the Austins’ lack of documentation is more likely to be the result of the paucity of Augustinian sources that ensued with the Dissolution. There is no evidence that More and Penketh knew each other (More was much younger than Penketh) and so it would be odd for More to invent the story about the friar without any motivation. Whilst More certainly embellishes the tale, it is probably fair to assume that Penketh had indeed made a sermon in favour of Richard III that gained some notoriety after his defeat to Henry Tudor.
people for opinion of their learning, and were not troubled with great scrupulousness of conscience. Among these was John Shaw, clerk, brother to the mayor, and Friar Penker, Provincial of the Augustine Friars, both Doctors of Divinity, both great preachers, both of more learning than virtue, and of more fame than learning. Before, they were greatly esteemed by the people, but after that never. Of these two, the one read a sermon in praise of the Protector, before the coronation, the other after, both so stuffed with tedious flattery, that no man’s ears could abide them. Penker in his sermon so lost his voice, that he was fain to leave off, and come down in the middle of his preachment. Doctor Shaw by his sermon lost his honesty, and soon after his life, for very shame of the world, into which he durst never after come abroad. But the Friar was troubled with no shame, so it harmed him the less.¹⁶⁹

More’s critical words of the two doctors supporting the Duke of Gloucester are part of the literary and epic quality to his tract, *History of Richard III*, written between 1512 and 1519 and published posthumously after his execution. In it, Richard appears as a self-serving tyrannical ruler, whose callous actions are reflected in the immorality of his supporters, in this case, Drs Shaw and Penketh. Such a characterisation is not unexpected from the pen of More, whose strong condemnation of Richard was par for the course given his role in propagating Tudor history.

John Bale similarly castigated Penketh for his loyalty to Richard III, stating that the Austins fell under the leadership of Penketh, as the Carmelites had done under Mylverton.¹⁷⁰ It is difficult to judge the veracity of Bale’s claim that the Austins suffered under the leadership of Penketh; Bale certainly exhibited prejudice against friars, likely as a result of his dissatisfaction with his former membership to their numbers. Additionally, Penketh was re-elected as prior provincial after this sermon was given, which must be a testament to his popularity within his own order.¹⁷¹ Penketh was re-elected in April of 1485, slightly predating the defeat of Richard by Henry Tudor, but his order’s confidence in him at this point counters the harsh claims of Bale.

Richard III courted the sympathies of several other Austins through pecuniary means, as he had done with Penketh. In 1483, the king gave the Austin Richard Blewet the

---

¹⁷⁰ Script.IMBC, 1:621. “Sub isto igitur Augustiniani in Anglia ceciderunt, sicut sub Myluertono Carmelitae.”
¹⁷¹ Dd 8, fol. 30v (consulted via RothSources, 372; D 941).
advowson of the parish of Pilham in north Lincolnshire, an action that makes him the only king to provide a member of the Austin Friars with such a grant. In the same year, he wrote to the nearby Austin priory in Tickhill, South Yorkshire, granting them an annual support of 5 marks for the duration of his life. On 24 June 1484, Richard III wrote to the friary in York, naming William Bewick, the prior of that convent, as surveyor of his plans to have personal living quarters built for himself in the priory there, due to his personal esteem for the prior.

It is likely that the donations from Richard III to these northern Austin priories were attempts to garner popular and religious support, but they also reflected that this was where much of his existing support came from. Richard was unlikely to have been recruiting support specifically from Austin Friars, but was rather gathering as much support as possible given his urgent need of some public approval after his unprecedented usurpation. During his trip in the north in 1483, he made a series of donations to a variety of religious groups and churches, in particular those with influential connections. Richard made considerable bequests to monasteries, parish churches, friaries, chapels, and chantries, during this period. His repeated visits to the Austin Friary at York, however, where he tended to stay when he was in the city, appear to be unique.

Benefactions to other religious institutions outweighed what was given to the Austins, but when considered against other mendicants, the Austins received comparable support. For instance, in 1483, he granted the Hospital of St John to the Franciscans at Dorchester, and in 1484, he engaged the Franciscans at Richmond to say a thousand masses for Edward IV’s soul. The Trinitarian Friars in Knaresborough received a

---
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benefaction similar to the annuity that the Austins were granted in Tickhill. He was a notable benefactor of the Durham priory during his visit there in 1484 and he gave Coverham Abbey near Middleham twenty pounds for the rebuilding of the church. He gave the church at Barnard Castle an initial grant of forty pounds, followed by another of a hundred marks and he engaged the nunnery of Wilberfoss near York for a chantry for the royal family. The grants at Barnard Castle and Coverham Abbey are far more considerable than what the Austins received, but they fared perhaps better than other friars, as the repeated hosts of Richard.

The Advent of the Tudors

With the accession of Henry Tudor, the Austin Friars were forced to adapt, cutting ties with the previous monarch and establishing new ones with the current king. Henry VII was consistent in treating the Austin Friars favourably: he had received communion in the Augustinian church in Atherstone before the Battle of Bosworth, and in 1498, he chose to stay at the Austin priory when visiting Lynn. The prior of the Austin house in York, William Bewick, who was personally solicited for support by Richard III, continued on in his position as prior for several years, at least until 1493, and possibly until 1506, and thus his involvement with the previous monarch must not have been a hindrance for his home priory. Furthermore, Henry’s eldest daughter Margaret stayed at the Austin priory in 1503, on her way to Scotland for her marriage.

It can only have helped the order in this transition that Bernard André, an Austin Friar from Toulouse, was appointed by Henry VII as poet laureate, royal historiographer,
and tutor to Prince Arthur. André began tutoring the young prince in 1496 and continued until sometime around 1500, based on his vague remarks in his De Vita atque Gestis Henrici Septimi Historia, which was the first attempt at forming the Tudor myth. Although Thomas More and Polydore Vergil were ultimately more successful in this task, it is compelling that an Austin Friar was instrumental in the development of Tudor propaganda. André was born around 1450 in Toulouse, where he joined the order, was well educated in classical literature and had earned the right to be styled doctor of both canon and civil law. The blind friar came to England late in 1485, soon after the victory of Henry Tudor, likely at the behest of his good friend Richard Fox, the bishop of Winchester. André received an annual pension of ten marks from the Crown from 1486 onwards and this was increased to a pension of twenty-four pounds in 1515, in addition to other smaller gifts, such as a New Year’s gift of a hundred shillings in 1501.

The De Vita recounts the events in the reign of Henry VII up until the suppression of the attempted coup of Perkin Warbeck, including the Anglo-French negotiations over the

191 The main source of this Tudor propaganda was Polydore Vergil (The Anglica Historia of Polydore Vergil, A.D. 1485-1537, ed. and trans. Denys Hay, (London, 1950)). Vergil became the royal historiographer after the dismissal of Bernard André by Henry VII from the same position; whilst André’s De Vita Henrici Septimi propagated the same elements of what was to become the Tudor history, his text must not have met the king’s standards, resulting in his history enjoying little success. Vergil, with a more nuanced and elegant style and intimate knowledge of Italian humanism, composed a more successful text, and along with More’s History of King Richard III, 58-9, 135, 234-5, laid the groundwork of the Tudor myth. Edward Hall and Raphael Holinshed, and even William Shakespeare, came to promote the Tudor Myth in their respective writings. See Edward Hall, The Union of the Noble Families of Lancaster and York (1550) (Menston, 1970), Raphael Holinshed, Holinshed’s Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland, (London, 1807-08), 6 vols.; Shakespeare, Richard III.
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control of Brittany, which took place in London in 1489-90. After discussing Warbeck, the narrative abruptly stops; this, plus the numerous blanks left throughout the text for additional information, leads the reader to presume that André never completed the text, likely the reason for Henry VII’s subsequent appeal to Polydore Vergil for a royal history. Nonetheless, André participated in the trend of courtly English literature from the late fifteenth century, which David Carlson has seen as promoting the political agenda of the Tudor state. The text is effusive in its flattery of Henry VII and it incorporates the major propagandist themes associated with the Tudor period: genealogy of the Tudor house, stressing its roots in ancient Britain; the union of the red and white roses through the marriage of Henry to his Yorkist wife; the confession of Perkin Warbeck at the gallows.

Henry VIII, more than his father, developed particularly strong, if contentious, relationships with Austin Friars, notably George Browne and Robert Barnes. Browne, the prior of London from 1532-36 and Archbishop of Dublin from 1536 till 1553, when he was deposed by Mary Tudor for having married, functioned as an agent of the Crown for much of Henry’s religious reforms. He developed into a loyal servant of Cromwell, becoming the mouthpiece for the legitimacy of the king’s new marriage and a general visitor to the mendicant orders along with the Dominican John Hilsey in order to enforce the Oath of Supremacy amongst the friars in 1534.

Browne initially met Cromwell at the convent of Austin Friars in London, where Browne was prior. In 1532, he and William Wetherall, the provincial, leased two messuages within the Austin Friars’ precincts to Thomas Cromwell for ninety-nine years. This lease of land is significant; at this stage of Cromwell’s career, as he developed the early stages of his personal agenda of religious reform, he went home every night to the Austin Friars. Browne’s relationship with Cromwell was clearly beneficial and he wrote in correspondence to Cromwell in 1534 that he had been awarded a doctorate at the University of Oxford out of
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their reverence for Cromwell. The year previous, in 1533, Browne had publicly preached in favour of the king’s new marriage and exhorted the congregation at the church of the Austin Friars in London to pray for the new Queen Anne; those listening to his sermon were so aghast and shocked by his recommendation that many left the church prematurely. Eustace Chapuys, who reported this scene to Charles V in 1534, alleged that Browne himself had performed the marriage of Henry and Anne and that his appointment as general visitor to the mendicant orders had been done as a reward for that service. Cromwell gave Browne and John Hilsey, the prior provincial of the Dominicans, the commission to visit all mendicant houses in England in 1534 with a view to make enquiries into their standards of living and their fealty to the king and to enforce the Oath of Supremacy. Interestingly, another agent in the Dissolution formed a relationship with an Austin; Richard Layton (also dean of York) was a friend and business associate of John Wygge, the prior of the Bristol Austins. This can be seen in a letter from priest Arthur Layton, asking the dean of York to keep Wygge as a good friend in his future business and put the prior under his protection.

As the prior of the single most important Austin house, that of London, Browne functioned as the representative of his order during Henry’s Great Matter and in 1534, signed, on behalf of his brethren, a declaration of obedience to both the king and new queen, stating the lawfulness of their marriage. Browne is erroneously listed on this document as the provincial of the Austins, when, in fact, it was William Wetherall who persisted in that role. In return for his obedience to the king, Browne was awarded with the archbishopric of Dublin in 1536 and continued to act as an agent of the Crown there.

The relationship between Robert Barnes and the English Crown, on the other hand, was both initially and finally an inflammatory one. Whilst Barnes was arrested for heresy and forced to escape to the Low Countries in order to evade execution, he always remained
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obedient to the English king, writing his two editions of *A Supplication Unto the Most Gracyous Prince Kyng Henry VIII*, and eventually being utilised by the Crown for his continental connections as an ambassador. When Barnes initially fled England after his first indictment for heretical thought, he sought refuge in Wittenberg with Luther and other reformers, which, along with his interest in German evangelical theology, made him an ideal candidate to negotiate England’s interests with the Germans and the Schmalkaldic League. His first task as an ambassador was to get Luther’s theological opinion on the king’s Great Matter, which, unfortunately for Barnes, was that the king would be more within his rights to take a second wife than to divorce the first. In December 1531, he was given a safe-conduct to return to England, as expressed in a letter from Eustace Chapuys to Charles V, and worked under Cromwell there. The extraordinary feature of this phase of his career is that he also operated as a diplomatic mediator with the English Crown on behalf of Germans. In 1535, the Duke of Saxony wrote to Henry VIII to tell him of Barnes’ service as an ambassador, as Barnes had been working as a negotiator for Lübeck and Hamburg from 1534-35 when Henry was possibly interested in joining the Schmalkaldic League, and there was the possibility of marriage with Anne of Cleves. In 1539, he continued to work as an ambassador for Henry, although this time to Denmark.

Like Browne, he developed a strong relationship with Cromwell, with his ultimate downfall and burning at the stake coinciding with the execution of Cromwell. Barnes’ relationship with Cromwell was the key behind his royal patronage; Barnes also received

---

206 The first edition of the *Supplication* was printed in 1531: Robert Barnes, *A Supplicatyon made by Robert Barnes doctoure in divinite unto the most excellent and redoubted prince henrye the eyght* (Antwerp, 1531). The second is from 1534: *idem, A Supplication unto the most gracyous prince H. the viij* (London, 1534), which has recently been printed in *A Critical Edition of Robert Barnes’ A Supplication Unto the Most Gracious Prince Kynge Henry the viij*. 1534*, ed. Douglas Parker (Toronto, 2008). Henceforth, all references to the *Supplication* will be from the Parker edition. For a discussion of the differences between the two editions of the *Supplication*, see W.D.J. Cargill Thompson, “The Sixteenth Century Editions of *A Supplication unto King Henry VIII* by Robert Barnes D.D.,” *TCBS* 3 (1960): 133-42.
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support from Cranmer and was for a brief period named as chaplain by Henry VIII.\textsuperscript{213} Indeed, it appears to have been Cromwell and Cranmer who were behind his appointment as intermediary between the English and Melanchthon in Wittenberg in 1535 and later that year, it is Cromwell who convinced Henry VIII to use Barnes to persuade Melanchthon to visit England.\textsuperscript{214} Barnes had been sent with royal letters designating him as the royal chaplain and although it is not clear if this ever came to pass, Barnes expressed his desire on numerous occasions to engage Johannes Cochlaeus in theological debate regarding the Royal Supremacy.\textsuperscript{215} Correspondence between Barnes and Cromwell demonstrates the depth of their relationship,\textsuperscript{216} with Barnes often seeking advice on whether he ought to write to the king and reporting news from mainland Europe, and Cromwell often recommending Barnes to the king.\textsuperscript{217} It was at Cromwell’s behest that Barnes produced a revised edition of the text in 1534 with the printer John Bydell in London, which would be more favourable to the king.\textsuperscript{218} Barnes likely first got Cromwell’s attention at the London priory of Austin Friars, in which he was serving a sentence of house arrest after his 1525 sermon, and his combination of expedient continental connections and theological viewpoints made him a useful agent for Cromwell’s policies.

Henry VIII, likely at the instigation of Stephen Gardiner, executed Barnes in 1540 for heresy.\textsuperscript{219} Although he came to a grisly end, Barnes was for a period an agent of Henry VIII in a very particular religio-political task, facilitating his foreign policy and informing his religious reforms. His downfall was linked to that of Cromwell and the disastrous
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\textsuperscript{218} Maas, \textit{The Reformation and Robert Barnes}, 27; Cargill Thompson, “Editions of A Supplication unto King Henry VIII,” 133-42 for a discussion of the changes of the revised edition, which largely amount to a qualification of Barnes’ two kingdoms theology so as to reinforce the position that the King had jurisdiction in doctrine and ecclesiastical affairs.
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marriage of Anne of Cleves with Henry, which Barnes assisted Cromwell in arranging, and was sealed by his own provocation of Stephen Gardiner. George Browne suffered a less extreme fate in his interactions with Henry VIII and Thomas Cromwell, finding for himself an archbishopric under the new Church, albeit one which brought him contention and deep frustration.

Thomas Cromwell was very much at the epicentre of the Crown’s relationship with the Austin Friars in the sixteenth century. Whereas before his rise to power, the Austins had secured varying degrees of financial patronage from the Crown, with Cromwell they fostered a more influential and deeply held relationship. Whilst the degree to which this relationship affected their propensity towards Cromwell’s agenda of reform will be discussed in the following chapter, it is extremely significant here for our consideration of the Austins’ involvement in the civic sphere. Their friendship, intellectual affinities, geographical proximity within the same space of land, and political symbiosis with Cromwell suggest an active political alignment of the order and a reliance on the patronage of this powerful politician.

These three Austins – André, Browne, and Barnes – were important personalities under the Tudors. Comparatively, the Carmelites seem to have been significantly less prominent and the Dominicans appear predominantly in the political sphere in opposition to the Tudors; John Payn, a former provincial prior and Bishop of Meath, crowned Lambert Simnel and his successor as provincial, William Richford, was alleged to have been involved in the conspiracy of Sir William Stanley. There were two Dominicans, however, whose relationship with Cromwell rivalled that of Browne and Barnes: Richard Ingworth, the erstwhile prior of King’s Langley and eventual Bishop of Dover, and John Hilsey, a
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provincial prior and visitor to the mendicant houses alongside George Browne.\textsuperscript{224}

Of all the mendicant orders, however, it was certainly the Franciscans who received the most patronage from the Tudors. Henry VII set up their first three Observant houses at Greenwich, Newark, and Richmond and later transformed three conventual houses – Canterbury, Newcastle, and Southampton – into Observant priories.\textsuperscript{225} Henry bequeathed to them considerable funds, giving them sixty-six pounds directly and two hundred pounds through the priory of Christ Church.\textsuperscript{226} Several were confessors to the queen, as Catherine of Aragon was a tertiary member of the order, as was Thomas More, who similarly had a Franciscan confessor.\textsuperscript{227} Moreover, John Kynton, a Franciscan at Oxford, wrote against Luther for the king in 1521,\textsuperscript{228} and the future Elizabeth I was baptised in one of their churches.\textsuperscript{229} By that time, that ceremony was a mark of Henry VIII’s anger with them, a deliberate slight. Their strong opposition to the Royal Supremacy and the king’s marriage to Anne Boleyn, however, shattered this close relationship with the royal household, as the king forcibly closed the Greenwich priory in 1534 and turned over the rest of the priories to the Austin Friars or Conventual Franciscans soon after.\textsuperscript{230}

The Observant Franciscans in particular held impressive influence in the secular sphere until their political suicide in opposing Henry VIII’s new religious policies, to which the Austins could not compare. They behaved much in the manner as the Dominicans, with a few towering personalities implicated in religious policies. That they were genuine competitors in this regard to the Friars Preachers is remarkable given their smaller size and the Dominicans’ previous dominance over the political sphere. It was, in fact, the Black Monks who were the greatest recipients of royal favour; the Crown was instrumental in the foundation and establishment of numerous Benedictine monasteries and two Benedictine houses, Westminster and Christ Church, were exceptional in their interment of royal
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Amongst mendicants, however, the degree to which the Austins behaved as political actors in the Tudor period is significant.

III. Religious Patronage

Notable Burials and Bequests

In addition to royal appointments and literary patronage, the Austin Friars sought influential connections in their provision of religious services to the social élite. Clare Priory, arguably the most influential priory in East Anglia given Bokenham’s network of patrons, housed the bodies of several significant figures. Clare Priory’s situation is interesting within the Augustinian province; its dynastic quality is unusual and stands it apart from most other friaries, Augustinian or otherwise, and its provision of burial space to the local nobility and gentry worked in tandem with the literary and political support explored above.

Landed abbeys or priories were typically dynastic, with long standing relationships between the monastic community and their founding patrons: as James Clark has elucidated, Benedictine monasteries were “the instrument of their proprietor’s financial, political, and strategic priorities.” In late-medieval England, if the office of superior was vacant, the lord could insist on the escheat of conventual income, could insist on the surrender of property at will, and could interfere in the monasteries’ own financial transactions. The monastery was obliged to assist and advise their seignior in disputes, whether territorial or political, and could claim seignorial authority over their own subordinates, claiming income and fines for formalities such as entry into tenancies and marriages. By contrast, friaries were decidedly not dynastic, situated in urban areas and eschewing formal ownership of property. The Clare Austins’ continued relationship with the surrounding nobility, including the political support offered by Bokenham, mirrored the dynastic association found at landed convents.

The burial of Joan of Acre in the chapel dedicated to St Vincent at the Clare priory,
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around which Bokenham’s *Dialogue* was based, was a significant way in which the Clare Austins provided a valuable service to their founding family. According to Capgrave:

> In this yere dame Jone Acris, the kyngis doutir, born in Acon in the Holy Lond, was weddid onto Gilbert, herl of Gloucetir, whch was a ful holy woman, for sche was biried in the Frere Austines at Clare; and aftir hir biring lii yere, at the desire of Dame Ysabel of Borow, sche mad hir bare, and sche was found hol in all membris: hir tets, whan thei were pressid with handis, the flesch ros up ageyn; hir eyeledes, left up, fel down ageyn. The clothis that were aboute hir, whech were dipped in wax and rosyn, thoo were roten, but the lynand cloth whech was next hir, that was dite with not craft, that was found clene and hool.\(^{235}\)

In Capgrave’s writing, although her clothes had deteriorated, her body and the linen next to her remained as they had done when she was alive, a sign of her sanctity. This claim is significant; Joan was an influential woman in her own right and a valuable patroness of whom the Austin Friars boasted, but her burial there as a *saint* (proved retrospectively by the state of her body) increased the status and prestige of the friary in a way that she as a noblewoman could not. The religious cachet surrounding her body was an opportunity for Capgrave to attract more patronage and extend their influence.

*Weever’s Antient Funeral Monuments* lists several other prominent burials there, including Joan’s son Edward Mount-Hermer, the Earl of Gloucester and Hertford.\(^{236}\) Buried there were also Lionel Duke of Clarence and Earl of Ulster. Lionel was the son of Edward III, and his heart was buried in Pavia by the reliquary of Augustine and his bones at the convent in Clare. The interment of his heart by the remains of Augustine can be counted as notable proof of his family’s devotion to Augustine, and thus in part explains their continued support of the Austins. His first wife Elizabeth de Burgh, noted patroness of the town and priory, and Richard Earl of Clare, from the family that had founded the priory itself, were also buried there.\(^{237}\) Bokenham’s *Dialogue* corroborates the report of these burials. Weever mentioned many others of both noble and gentle stock, such as a Dame Alice Spencer, Dame Eleanor Wynkepery and Lady Margaret Scrope,\(^{238}\) to name but a few. Of these, Margaret
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Scrope is particularly noteworthy; the daughter of Richard Scrope, she had married Edmund de la Pole, third Duke of Suffolk, in 1496. Henry VIII executed de la Pole in 1513 as a pretender to the throne, and the Crown paid the Franciscan priory without Aldgate to inter him after his death. One of his closest associates, Sir James Tyrell, discussed below, was buried himself within the London priory of Austin Friars after his own execution for familiarity with the de la Poles. The Tyrells had a known affiliation with the Austins, as several members of their family had been buried within their London church. Furthermore, that same priory accepted the body of Sir John Wyndham, executed alongside Tyrell for his support of the de la Poles. As the Duke of Suffolk was effectively the Yorkist heir at the time of his execution, it is only natural that it was the Austin friary with such close connections to the House of York that accepted his wife’s body in 1515 when she died.

The Norwich priory similarly boasted an impressive array of aldermen, esquires, knights, and noblemen buried within its church. Norwich, more than Clare, had a particular appeal for familial mausolea, as it is obvious from the extant wills that numerous families interred several of their members there. Weever’s evidence points to its popularity amongst the Bacon, Wychingham, and Morley families, all from central Norfolk near Norwich. Thomas Wetherby, buried in this priory with his wife Margaret, was the only Norwich mayor from the period whose will survives who requested a friary burial. One of the more influential figures buried there was Dame Elianore Wyndham, married first to Sir Richard Scrope of Bolton and then to Sir John Wyndham, the ancestor to the Earls of Egremont. Her will records her wish to be buried in the choir of the Austin church, beside the high altar; she also bequeathed to the friars a pair of chalices and left money for one friar to conduct a year-long chantry devoted to the souls of her and her husband. This relationship is an important one, since, as noted above, Elianore’s husband John Wyndham
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was eventually to be buried in the London priory of Austin Friars after his execution. Norman Tanner found that, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the Norwich Austins provided burial for four clerics (more than any other friary) and twenty-eight laypeople, compared to twenty at the Carmelite priory, thirty-nine at the Franciscan priory, and forty-five at the Dominican house. Tanner’s numbers may underestimate the number of burials in the friary, however, as Blomefield’s data flagged up sixty-three burials between 1400 and 1538.

There were two significant bequests at the Norwich Austin priory worth mentioning: those of Sir Thomas Erpingham and of Margaret Wetherby. In 1457, Margaret Wetherby, the wife of Thomas Wetherby, left a hundred marks to the Austin house for the express purpose of building the friars a new library. The new library was to commemorate both herself and her husband by including their names on all the stained glass windows and on each desk, in addition to the friars providing a priest for a chantry for them. The most considerable bequest occurred in 1419, when Sir Thomas Erpingham funded a grand eight-pane stained glass east window for the chancel, the dominant feature in this very grand building. The window featured the names and arms of knights from Norfolk and Suffolk since the reign of Edward III who had died without male issue. This commemoration of the surrounding gentry reinforces that the Norwich priory had a particular appeal to the neighbouring nobility and gentry; in addition to the grand window by Erpingham, there was also the arms of Sir John Fastolf in a window in the north of the choir.

The priories of Clare and Norwich demonstrate, more so than any other Austin houses, the seignorial nature of the relationship between the Austin Friars and the local nobility. At Clare, the land of the friary was part of the honour of Clare, held by a string of powerful figures, from the de Burgh family to Richard of York. The friars were the recipients of a long-established patronal relationship from the lords of Clare, and thus
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honoured those patrons with prestigious burial, asserting their social status as distinct from the local community. The friary at Norwich, although it was an urban friary unlike the rural, aristocratic establishment at Clare, exhibited a similar dynastic quality, housing the bodies of members of the local gentry and receiving consistent patronage from those influential families. The inclusion of coats of arms from local knights without male heirs is significant: such people were concerned that no-one would remember them in their home locations, whilst the communities of the friars would never die and so there would be a perpetual memory there. This, combined with the arms of Sir John Fastolf in the stained glass windows of the church, reinforced the associations of the Norwich Austins with the neighbouring gentry, even without the aristocratic connections of Clare.

Other friaries, too, received sustained support from certain families. Testamentary evidence from 1498 shows that Lady Anne Scrope of Harling, of Norfolk origins, though the widow of the northern peer Lord John Scrope of Bolton, was buried at the Thetford priory along with her grandmother Margery Tuddenham. This will demonstrates the familial connection between the Scropes and the Tuddenhams and links them with the friars; the number of Scrope burials in Austin friaries was prolific, and the link between Sir Thomas Tuddenham and the Austin John Capgrave is well attested given Tuddenham’s literary patronage of the friar. The will also indicates that Lady Anne Scrope herself was enrolled as a lay sister by the Austin Friars at Norwich, thus making her family’s connection to the order even more intimate.

The patronage described above is also visible in donations and bequests, particularly to the East Anglian priories. To give but a few notable examples, in Clare, Friar John
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Elinham was paid £6 for performing a yearlong chantry for Richard Barbor, and Friar Thomas Thweytes was paid £3 for six months of a chantry for the soul of Edmund Hoberd, buried in the south aisle of the church. In 1408, Henry IV alienated in mortmain two large plots of land for the Austin Friars in Thetford, since his father John of Gaunt had been the initial benefactor of the priory. John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, a remarkably influential benefactor, had established the friary there in 1387 with the donation of the initial site and he had the church and conventual buildings erected there at the entrance to the town. In 1413, Henry’s son Henry V donated more property to the Austins, this time the erstwhile hermitage of St John, because of the extreme poverty of the Austins. In exchange, the friars said three masses weekly for the king and his family. In 1454, twelve acres of land obtained from Thomas Mylde of Clare, esq., John Hatthe of Stoke Neyland, and Robert Sparwe were alienated in mortmain for the friars, in exchange for a daily mass for the donors and the Duke of York, who licensed the transaction. The priory at Lynn performed anniversaries for Henry IV and his mother in 1413 and in the same year, were hosts to the Duke and Duchess of Clarence, as the Duke was the son of Henry. The house obtained noteworthy patronage again in 1527, when the prior received sixteen shillings from Thomas le Strange. Both Mary and John Paston left money to the Austin Friars at Little Yarmouth; John Paston, acquainted with the Austin Clement Felmingham, left the friars 75 shillings for their next chapter, whereas Mary left 20 shillings to each of the friaries at Norwich and Yarmouth. Sir Robert Wingfield took on the patronage of the Austin Friars at Orford when, in 1509, Henry VIII granted him a rent for life there, payable by Lord Willoughby, and acquired by the Crown through the attainder of Edmund Earl of Suffolk.
As seen above, Margaret Wetherby, widow of Thomas Wetherby, former mayor of Norwich, left a hundred marks to the Austin Friars at Norwich for the construction of a library, asking that her and her husband’s names be commemorated in the windows. Sir Thomas Kerdeston left 300 marks to the friars at Norwich for a perpetual chantry for the souls of him and his two wives.

Whilst the situation in East Anglia is best documented, there are cases elsewhere in the country. In 1403, Edmund, the son of William Lord Stafford was buried in the Austin Friars church in Stafford after having been killed at the Battle of Shrewsbury. The priory at Warrington received a royal donation in 1410 and five years later they provided burial for Sir William Butler, lord of the manor of Warrington. In 1422, Sir John Bolde established a chantry there, enacted by lector and friar Nicholas Spink. In 1504, they performed a chantry for Sir Gilbert Southworth, whom they buried in their cemetery. The Butler family gave them ten marks in 1520. In 1415, the house at Bristol received significant bequests from the Countess of Salisbury and William Lord Botreaux. They performed two significant trentals in 1417 and 1436 for Richard Bruton and Edward Greyville, respectively. In 1495, they received two pounds from Jasper Tudor Duke of Bedford and uncle of Henry Tudor. In 1450, Sir Stephen Scrope, second Lord of Masham, left bequests to the Austin friaries in Hull and York. In Oxford, after Edmund Rede was received as founder in 1456, he granted the advowson of the church of St James in Werpleasgrave to the Austins. In 1487, Rede honoured this patronal relationship and requested a seven-year-
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long chantry and left the friars money to repair their church.\textsuperscript{276} William Waynflete left money to the Austin Friars at Winchester in 1486.\textsuperscript{277} In 1524, a husbandman of Rye paid for a new roof for the local Austin friary.\textsuperscript{278} The friary at York received considerable patronage from Richard III, as described above, and in 1527 they hosted the Earl of Nothumberland for a year and received four and half pounds for the service.\textsuperscript{279} These examples enumerate but a few of the endowments left to these friars; numerous requests for chantries and burial by the high altar display a reverence for the religious excellence of the friars, as the donors chose to entrust these friars, as opposed to their parish clerk, with the welfare of their souls. Families often made repeated donations to particular friaries and others carved out a spiritual relationship with the friars when they could afford to do so.

The Dominicans too attracted substantial financial support, with many of their friaries maintaining ancestral links in the way seen at Clare. The Dominican house at Lancaster received support primarily from the Stanley and Tarbok families,\textsuperscript{280} and in Exeter, the Courtenay family was a continued benefactor to the Dominicans there.\textsuperscript{281} The Courtenays owned lodgings in the friary precincts and the Earls of Devon repeatedly made use of the religious house as a meeting place, such as in 1447, when they held a conference with the mayor and local bishop.\textsuperscript{282} When Humphrey Stafford was made Earl of Devon in 1469 he visited the priory, as did his successor in 1471.\textsuperscript{283} Katharine Countess of Devon was also a benefactress, as was Elizabeth de Bohun Countess of Northampton in 1356.\textsuperscript{284} This house was also the recipient of significant support from local bishops, as John de Grandisson and Thomas Bytton, both bishops of Exeter, bequeathed money to the Dominicans.\textsuperscript{285} Familial ties are certainly evident in the burials at Dominican priories, such as the burials
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of Sir Thomas Harrington and his brother Richard at the Lancaster convent in the fifteenth century, since their ancestors were some of the main benefactors.286

There were four cases of noble families founding Dominican priories in England and the royal family was directly involved in the establishment of the Dominican convents at Bamburgh, York, Canterbury, Ipswich, Salisbury, Guildford, Chichester, Dunstable, and London.287 Noble benefaction was certainly an important element in the maintenance and foundation of many Dominican priories, such as when Hubert de Burgh, Earl of Kent, Sir Phillip Bassett, and the Countess of Warwick made donations to the London Holborn priory.288 Hubert de Burgh was buried in the choir of this church, which was the home to many important burials, including Queen Eleanor of Castile in 1290.289 The Oxford house received donations from Isabel Bolbec, Countess of Oxford, and John of Plessetis, Earl of Warwick, was a benefactor to the priory in Bristol.290 Wealthy townspeople or burgesses founded several priories and there is also evidence for significant episcopal investment and encouragement in the foundation of the houses at Boston, Lincoln, Carlisle, Chester, Derby, Exeter, and Winchester.291

The Franciscans, too, could boast impressive patrons. There was scarcely a house that did not receive significant royal benefaction, some of which included annual grants established by Henry III for the Franciscans at Berwick-on-Tweed, Oxford, and Cambridge.292 Episcopal wills frequently included legacies to the Franciscans, since the bishops welcomed them into their dioceses, and townspeople and citizens appear to have been similarly generous to the friars.293 They received a huge variety of legacies, from two hundred pounds in 1458 from William Cantelowe, alderman of London, for the repair of the

288 Ibid., 87.
289 Ibid., 44.
290 Ibid.
291 Ibid., 103.
293 Ibid.
church, to twenty pence. Legacies in money were prevalent over legacies in kind and all classes were represented, particularly the nobility and secular clergy. They maintained an extraordinary number of chantries, with the London house receiving an astonishing fifty-five pounds a year in income for funerary services. There were many lodgings for noble families in Franciscan friaries, such as the chambers for Sir Thomas Tyrell at Colchester and Lady Ewyngern at Coventry, in addition to bishop’s lodgings at Lichfield and a chamber for the king at Dorchester. The Carmelites were less prominent, but the house in London, founded by Edward I, was host to an impressive list of burials and was a significant part of the city. John Kemp, Archbishop of York and Cardinal protector of the Carmelites, frequently stayed at the convent in Aylesford, as did Thomas Bourchier when visiting nearby parishes. This house was noteworthy for maintaining ancestral connections, receiving patronage for generations from the family of the Lord Grey who was instrumental in the convent’s foundation.

Monasteries, by contrast, typically had an official patron who was the heir of their original founder, for whom they would offer prayers and hospitality in return for protection and financial support. They might also offer dynastic histories for their founding family, such as the Tewkesbury Abbey Chronicle, which recounts the history of the Despensers and their connections to the abbey. The famous abbey at St Albans, home to Thomas Walsingham, received support from numerous magnates and noble families, such as the Earl of Warwick, Thomas Holland, Earl of Kent, Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland, and William Montague, Earl of Salisbury. Benedictine cathedral priories contained numerous
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tombs and chantry chapels for former bishops, and so their support from the ecclesiastical hierarchy was unparalleled. Benedictine monasteries were far more seignorial in nature than friaries ever would be, but the Austin establishment at Clare is a good example of the Austins participating in that sort of behaviour. The benefactors of the Austins were often not so esteemed as those of the Black Monks, or of the Dominicans or Franciscans, and yet they carved out a place for themselves within the religious landscape, particularly in East Anglia, where they were most prominent. The houses at Clare and Norwich were particularly successful in procuring patronage and maintaining influential connections, but these two convents are exceptional for the Austins. Elsewhere in the country, they were comparatively less prosperous in patronage, blending much more into the background of monasticism.

**Burials at Austin Friars London**

The priory of the Austin Friars in London was the site of many politically resonant burials, but a special group of them have a significantly different tenor from those traditionally associated with the Austins. Many prominent figures in the dynastic conflicts of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, either killed during the warfare or executed afterwards as traitors, were interred there. Christian Steer has systematically studied the burials of the medieval London friaries and compiled a list of over ninety significant burials within the church of the Austin Friars, using a sixteenth-century manuscript containing a genealogical list of those buried in London churches, printed in Stow’s *Survey of London*, together with two pre-Reformation manuscripts in the College of Arms. Although not analysed by Steer, the number of politically sensitive burials amongst this list of burials in surprising and demands attention.

Before examining these political interments at the London priory, it is worth noting that there were a generous number of other élite burials, particularly of those noble families
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that had been patrons to the house, in the manner that was typical for the Austins. Humphrey de Bohun, second Earl of Hereford and first Earl of Essex, is an obvious example of this trend, buried in the choir of the church in 1275; he was an early patron of the Austin Friars in London, funding major building work in the parish of St Peter-le-Poer in the 1250s for the establishment of the Augustinian friary. A century later, one of his descendants and another patron of the London Austins was buried there, again in the choir: Humphrey de Bohun, sixth Earl of Hereford and fifth Earl of Essex, who had funded major building work at the convent in 1354. The Bohuns had a long established relationship with the Austin Friars manifested in other ways; Lucy Freeman Sandler’s study of BL MS Egerton 3277, a fourteenth-century Psalter and Hours of the Virgin, shows that the Bohuns had employed a group of Austin Friars as illuminators and scribes, who completed their work at the Bohun residences.

Another example is the Daubeney family; the Daubeneys were a family originally from the Breton town of Aubigné, of changeable fortunes, finding their apex of influence during Henry VII’s reign when Giles Daubeney, having been made a baron, acted as Lord Chamberlain from 1495. John Stow counted Sir John Daubeney, who died in 1409, and his wife Dame Joan Daubeney as the two most prominent members of this family who were buried in the west wing of the church. Joan’s brother, William, son to Sir Roger Scrope, was also buried there and Stow mentioned another Sir John Daubeney and his son Robert, all buried in the west wing.

During the fifteenth century, the church of the Austin Friars became home to a string of politically charged burials, as many prominent figures in the conflict of the House

---

306 The documentation of the foundation of the London priory is fraught with ambiguity; it is John Stow who remarked that Humphrey de Bohun was responsible for establishment of the convent there (StowSL, 159-60), but John Capgrave, the order’s own historiographer writing in the 1460s, made no mention of the Earl, nor of the foundation of the London convent at all. There is no reason to doubt Stow in his stipulation here, but it is odd that Capgrave appears not to have known about the origins of the London house.
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of York with Henry VI came to find their final resting place there. This trend has two significant pre-fifteenth century precedents, which set the tone for Augustinian interment in London. The first, buried in the choir, is Sir Bartholomew Badlesmere, hanged and decapitated in 1322 by Edward II after his participation in the unsuccessful rebellion at Boroughbridge led by the Earl of Lancaster.\textsuperscript{310} The second, also interred in the choir, is Richard FitzAlan, Earl of Arundel, Surrey, and Warenne, brother to Thomas Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury.\textsuperscript{311} FitzAlan was beheaded in 1397 for plotting with the Duke of Gloucester against Richard II, as one of the Lords Appellant who condemned the favourites of the king, and subsequently was buried in Austin Friars London.\textsuperscript{312} In Edward IV's reign, the contentious burials included Sir Thomas Tuddenham, Capgrave's former patron, and John Vere, the twelfth Earl of Oxford, along with his son Aubrey, were carried and buried there after their beheadings in 1462.\textsuperscript{313} Convicted and executed alongside these three was William Tyrell of Gipping, Suffolk, who was also buried in the Austin church.\textsuperscript{314} All four were buried in the choir, except William Tyrell, who was interred in the western end of the nave.

These burials are all of considerable significance, for not only were these men politically problematic, but they had all also been connected to the Austins. Tuddenham financed Capgrave's literary pursuits and pilgrimage to Rome and the Veres had an Austin Friar as their personal confessor. William Tyrell's family had a long association with the Austins in London: his father, Sir John Tyrell, was buried there in the western end of the nave in 1437, as was his stepmother Katharine. His nephew William, who died at the Battle of Barnet in 1471, was buried in the central area of the nave with his wife Alianore Darcy.\textsuperscript{315}

\textsuperscript{310} Ibid., 175-77.
\textsuperscript{311} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{312} C. Given-Wilson, “Fitzalan, Richard (III), fourth earl of Arundel and ninth earl of Surrey (1346–1397), magnate” \textit{ODNB} [http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2167/view/article/9535?docPos=3].
\textsuperscript{314} StowSL, 177.
\textsuperscript{315} This burial is attested by William's father's will in 1477, which refers to his son and daughter-in-law's burial at Austin Friars London. See London, TNA, PROB 11/6/417, fol. 237r. C.R.B. Barrett, \textit{Essex: Highways, Byways And Waterways} (London, 1893), 150; Rosemary Horrox, “Tyrell family (per. c.1304–c.1510), gentry” \textit{ODNB} [http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2167/view/article/52799/?back=52799,27952].
William’s son, Sir James Tyrell, as we shall see below, was another political victim and buried in the same area of his church as his father, a significant and unparalleled occurrence. The Austins were not only receiving contentious figures, but they were also honouring long-held patronal relationships with the families in question.

William Tyrell’s nephew, also named William, is another interesting case. His burial at Austin Friars London participates in his family’s patronage of the Austins and, like his uncle, he was another political victim, having been killed on the battlefield at Barnet in 1471 in the service of Richard Neville. Interestingly, the Austins also interred another figure slain at Barnet, but from the opposing side: Humphrey Bourchier, mistakenly referred to as “lord Barons” (Berners) by Stow, who was buried in the choir. Humphrey Bourchier was the son of John Bourchier Lord Berners and nephew of Henry Bourchier, the famed patron of Clare priory. The Bourchiers were closely related to the House of York through Henry’s wife Isabel, and once Edward IV was secure in his kingship, he moved the tomb to Westminster Abbey, where it remains to this day. By providing burial for Humphrey, the Austins were honouring their established relationship with this influential family. Humphrey is not the only Bourchier interred in this church: his uncle, William Bourchier, Lord FitzWarine, was also buried in the choir of the Austin church late in 1471. Edward IV must have viewed the church of the Austin Friars as a safe resting place for the body of a politically sensitive figure, but his translation of the body to a more elaborate and esteemed location suggests that the church of the Austins was not the ideal place to bestow honour upon those who died in one’s service. Perhaps, whilst the Yorkist victory was still in question, it provided a safe location for such burials, housing many other similar figures. When Edward’s regime was more stable, he could move the body of one of his supporters to a more public and celebrated place.

Political burials continued after Edward’s death; in 1484, Richard III arrested and
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executed William Collingbourne and had him buried in the western side of the nave of the London church of the Austin Friars.\textsuperscript{319} In 1499, a group of six men recently executed by beheading by Henry VII was brought to Austin Friars London and buried there. These men had been involved in a conspiracy from 1491-97 to place Perkin Warbeck on the throne in place of Henry VII. Warbeck, a man from a mercantile family in Tournai, posed as the younger of Edward IV’s sons, Richard Duke of York.\textsuperscript{320} When his incursion failed to rally sufficient popular support and his invasion of England was defeated, he and his co-conspirators were imprisoned within the Tower and executed. Also beheaded and buried in Austin Friars London was Edward, the young Earl of Warwick, who had a genuine claim to the throne. The associates of the Earl, Thomas Astwood and Walter Blewet, gentlemen of London, John Fynche, haberdasher, and another character simply referred to as ‘long Roger’ were also beheaded and buried in the church of the Austin Friars.\textsuperscript{321} Walter Blewet likely would have been a relative of the Austin Richard Blewet, sometime prior of the Austin house in London, and recipient of donations from Richard III himself.\textsuperscript{322}

Henry VII’s fear of a political coup continued beyond the Warbeck conspiracy. He also executed Sir James Tyrell and Sir John Wyndham in 1503 based on their involvement in a supposed plot to wrest the throne from the Tudor family; they were subsequently buried in the western end of the nave of the church of the Austin Friars in London.\textsuperscript{323} Wyndham had been implicated in the supposed conspiracy of Edmund de la Pole, Earl of Suffolk, who allegedly attempted to claim the throne through his matrilineal descent,\textsuperscript{324} and was convicted of treason in 1502.\textsuperscript{325} Sir James Tyrell, a supporter of Richard III and one of his military leaders, was arrested in 1501 on many charges, which included association with Edmund de la Pole in 1499. Having been lured back to England from his current official position in Calais, he was convicted of treason at the London Guildhall, executed, and

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{319} Ibid.
  \item \textsuperscript{320} Michael Hicks, \textit{The Wars of the Roses: 1455-1485} (New Haven, 2010), 245.
  \item \textsuperscript{321} GCL, 290-91.
  \item \textsuperscript{322} London, BL, Harl. Ch. 111 C 23.
  \item \textsuperscript{323} GCL318-19.
  \item \textsuperscript{324} Hicks, \textit{The Wars of the Roses}, 252.
  \item \textsuperscript{325} James Taylor, \textit{The Shadow of the White Rose: Edward Courtenay, Earl of Devon: 1526-1556} (New York, 2006), 23.
\end{itemize}
subsequently buried in Austin Friars London. As discussed earlier, the Tyrells already held an exceptionally strong presence within this church and Wyndham’s second wife Elianore was herself buried in the Austin priory in Norwich and instituted a chantry for the souls of herself and her husband. The Austins fulfilled a dual role here; not only were they accepting contentious bodies for burial upon request of the Crown, but they were also maintaining their dynastic links with important families, even if certain members of those families had faced political ruin.

Such paranoia regarding dynastic security did not decrease with Henry VIII’s accession to the throne. In 1521, he executed Edward Stafford, the third Duke of Buckingham and the grandson of Humphrey Stafford, who was then buried in the western part of the nave of the Austin Friars. Stafford had a better hereditary claim to the throne than King Henry via various royal lineages; he was descended from two of Edward III’s sons, John of Gaunt, through the Beaufort family, and his youngest son, Thomas of Woodstock. He was accused and convicted of treason, and executed the day following his trial, on 17 May 1521. Henry’s decision to execute him was primarily from dynastic considerations, which would go on producing victims up to the execution of the Countess of Salisbury in 1541, by which time there was no Austin Friars church to receive her.

Of the London friaries, Blackfriars was far and away the most popular mendicant house for burials in London, with the Austins having similar numbers of burials to the Greyfriars and Whitefriars, but more than the Crutched Friars, and the Dominicans and Franciscans were the only two orders to obtain a royal burial. Jens Röhrkasten has stated in his magisterial study of the London mendicant houses that “only very limited significance can be attributed to the fact that the London convents sometimes served as burial places for

---

327 See pages 193-194.
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332 See StowSL, 313 and 339-44 (Blackfriars); 316-22 (Greyfriars); 310 (Whitefriars); 147-49 (Crutched Friars).
the victims of the political and military confrontations”\textsuperscript{333} since “the friary churches were rather regarded as a conveniently neutral ground where high-ranking victims of conspiracy and political plots could be laid to rest in an environment suitable to their social standing.”\textsuperscript{334} That he only cites burials from the Austin Friars is odd; surely, for this political neutrality to be a feature of London mendicancy it ought to be spread throughout the four orders. The occurrence of this phenomenon primarily in the Austin convent speaks to a uniqueness of the Austin Friars, rather than to mendicancy as a whole. Similarly, Christian Steer remarks that “the friaries were richly endowed with the remains of traitors.”\textsuperscript{335} However, Blackfriars can claim only three and Greyfriars four, whereas Austin Friars, with significantly fewer burials than either of the previous two friaries, can claim at least twelve. This would indicate, contrary to Steer and Röhrkasten’s contentions, that this is a characteristic of the Austin Friary, more so than of the other mendicant houses of London.

The key to understanding the Crown’s choice of the London Austin Friars in particular to host these contentious figures may be a recognition of both the duty felt by the Crown to provide adequate burial and of the nature of the congregation served by the Austin Friars there. The Crown needed to afford traitors of noble birth burial appropriate for their social standing; this is seen even in the case of Richard III, who was buried by Henry VII in a Franciscan convent in Leicester.\textsuperscript{336} Burial in a potentially neutral location like a friary was an appropriate way to inter a politically contentious figure. Specific to the Austin friary in London, however, was its spiritual care of the international communities in London, as it was known as an appropriate burial location for foreigners,\textsuperscript{337} in addition to its reputation

\textsuperscript{333} Röhrkasten, The Mendicant Houses of Medieval London, 547.
\textsuperscript{334} Ibid., 547-48.
\textsuperscript{335} Steer, “Royal and Noble Commemoration,” 135.
\textsuperscript{336} Ibid., 130.
\textsuperscript{337} Christian Steer writes in his article on the mendicant burials in London that both the Austin Friars and the Crotchted Friars appealed to foreign communities for burial, a thesis supported by Vanessa Harding, who states that the Austin Friars in London were popular for alien merchants. See Vanessa Harding, “Burial Choice and Burial Location in Later Medieval London” in Death in Towns: Urban Responses to the Dying and the Dead, 100-1600, ed. Steven Basset (Leicester, 1992), 119-135; eadem, The Dead and the Living in Paris and London, 1500-1670 (Cambridge, 2002), 125; and Christian Steer, “Royal and Noble Commemoration,” 117-42.
for providing pastoral care to the international community in London. The Austins famously afforded burial within the western wing of the nave to Guichard d’Angle, the Frenchman who was made Earl of Huntingdon in 1377 and was a tutor to the young Richard II. His tomb at Austin Friars London attests to its importance for the international community there, and also at a time when regional identities were solidifying, it was an appropriate resting place for a man with an ambiguous status, a foreigner with an ancient English noble title but no great English noble estates. John Stow also mentions a Sir Peter Garsiners from France, buried in the choir, as another foreign body within this church.339

This international aspect to the church of the Austin Friars London is pertinent. A church that promised a congregation with little interest in the dynastic wars of England was an ideal choice for the maintenance of political neutrality. Given Tudor paranoia regarding their shaky claims to the throne and fear of usurpation, the Austin Friars in London provided a location for the bodies of dynastic rivals out of sight from a local population who might wish to exalt their actions: it was overwhelmingly the German and Italian mercantile communities who worshipped there. It is perhaps for this reason that the church was a suitable resting place for Humphrey Bourchier, for a time. Edward wanted to lay to rest a faithful servant of his, who had died in the Yorkist campaign, in a place where he could trust that his political opponents would not disrespect the tomb. The Austin Friars provided this location, housing the bodies of numerous potentially problematic figures, guaranteeing respectful burial. Once Edward’s power was without question, he removed his supporter from this ambiguous place, and translated the body to one of the most socially esteemed spots possible, that is, in Westminster Abbey. When Bourchier’s status was still uncertain, it was the Austin Friars who could provide a decent burial worthy of his social standing, but there is no question that, by the mid-fifteenth century, this location was not the ideal burial setting for honouring a nobleman. Rather, it was a place in which the Austins dealt with

338 Guichard D’Angle, a patron of John of Gaunt and Earl of Huntingdon, was buried in the London house of the Austin friars, but his heart was interred in his home parish church in Angles-sur-l’Anglin in North-Eastern Poitou. See StowSL, 179.
339 StowSL, 160.
problematic figures for the king, and thus, whilst still a respectable place, it was filled with ambiguity.

Conclusions

This chapter considers the role of the Austin Friars in the secular machinations of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, suggesting that the Austin Friars were deeply involved in the political turbulence of this period, providing written propaganda, seeing to the management of the bodies of problematic figures, and even as acting as agents of the Crown, whether as a negotiator, ambassador or enforcer of religious policies. Their ability to flatter a new king and efface the memory of their support for his predecessor is likely indicative that their secular platform developed ad hoc as the situation changed. At many significant junctures in the dynastic conflicts of late-medieval England, the Austin Friars lurk in the background, whispering in the ears of the powerful.

Whilst much scholarship has demonstrated tacit approval of M.C. Seymour’s claim that “like all the friars, the Hermits were staunchly Lancastrian,”340 this chapter sees that characterisation of the Austin Friars as unsustainable. Older accounts of the Austin Friars as ‘flunkeys’, the phrase of the Victorian historian F.J. Furnivall in his study of Capgrave,341 are more accurate in their recognition of the flexibility of the loyalty of the friars in question, but hardly fair. Rather, the actions of the Austin Friars in the world of secular powers during this period are marked by pragmatism: their active solicitation of influential protection and patronage comes to the fore when their previous connections are destroyed due to the fluctuating political situation. Whilst it is possible to interpret some of the actions of these friars as ‘flunkeyism’, obsequiously catering to whomever proved the most powerful, this representation fails to consider the Austins’ need for patronage for their continued existence. The Austins were never political giants in the way that the Dominicans had been in the fourteenth century, but we nonetheless find them carving out a place for themselves within influential networks.

340 Seymour, John Capgrave, 32.
341 See page 151.
John Capgrave maintained significant patronal relationships with Henry VI, Humphrey Duke of Gloucester, Sir Thomas Tuddenhamp, and Edward IV. He took on a form of writing utilised by Lydgate and Hoccleve, the 'mirror for princes' genre, and used it in an effort to exhort the king to more appropriate royal virtues. Unlike Hoccleve and Lydgate, the timing of his writing shows his disillusionment with the rule of Henry VI, rather than the hope of an effective kingship after the minority. By making use of his clerical authority and taking on a genre established by other significant clerical figures, Capgrave demonstrated his adeptness at fitting in within the religious landscape, particularly within East Anglia, whilst voicing his political concerns. His *Life of St Katharine* and *Liber de Illustribus Henricis* follow Lydgate's model, but are distinctive in showing that saintly virtues cannot be reconciled with the temporal duties of a king. Osbern Bokenham also offered political commentary, but in this case, it was propaganda for the house of York, since his priory received continued support from this family as the honour of Clare had passed to Richard Duke of York. He tied the fortunes and history of his own priory to the house of York, thereby engaging his priory in a dynastic relationship with its founding family in a fashion exceedingly unusual for mendicants. He amassed an impressive network of East Anglian literary patrons, as the foremost writer of female hagiography for female patrons of his time, when the question of matrilineal inheritance was of considerable political significance. Later on, Thomas Penketh functioned as a mouthpiece for the legitimacy of Richard III, whilst his confrère Bernard André fulfilled a similar function for Henry Tudor, in the composition of Tudor historiography and propaganda. George Browne and Robert Barnes were adept and useful agents of the Crown in the sixteenth century. The Austins, particularly throughout East Anglia and London, maintained important relationships with influential families through their provision of burial and it is in this way that the London Austins were truly distinctive: they accepted, more than any other friars, the bodies of politically problematic characters. Often these political victims already had known associations with the Austins, although so too did they accept some without any established relationship with the Austins: Sir Thomas Tuddenhamp, John and Aubrey Vere, William and
Humphrey Bourchier, Walter Blewet, Sir James Tyrell, and Sir John Wyndham were all examples of victims with long-standing associations with the Augustinian order. The Austins used an arsenal of services to attract and maintain such important relationships, such as burial, literary dedication, supply of propaganda, diplomatic work, preaching, and even, as we saw with Bokenham and the Countess of Eu, socialising. The consistent variety in their interactions with secular powers is striking and it was with that variety that they navigated the political turbulence of the time.
Chapter 5: 
Augustinian Dissent

It was as an Austin Friar that Martin Luther composed his *Ninety-Five Theses* in 1517 and launched his campaign against the sale of indulgences, before moving on to make his Reformation discovery about the nature of salvation and humanity’s participation in that process. His crushing condemnation of indulgences and the late-medieval penitential system was met with support first and foremost amongst those of his own monastic order. The Augustinians in Antwerp, led by their prior Jakob Propst, defended Luther’s teachings as early as 1519 and provided the Reformation with its first martyrs in 1523, when their convent was dissolved and three of their friars, Heinrich Voes, Johann Esch, and Lambert Thorn were arrested and executed.¹ Brothers Martin Oudermerck, Adrian Borschot, and Hendrik van Zütphen were also amongst the number of Austin Friars in Antwerp who openly preached in defence of Luther’s teachings.

Given Luther’s membership to the Austin Friars and the disproportionately high numbers of early reformers from their order, the Austin Friars claim a prominent place in studies of early evangelicalism, both in a continental and British context, despite being the only religious order ever founded by a pope. Germany, France, England, Ireland, Italy and the Low Countries can all claim prominent reformers who originated as Austin Friars.² Not

---


² Martin Luther, Wenzeslaus Link, Johann Lang, Gabriel Zwilling, George Browne, Miles Coverdale, Robert Barnes, Richard Nangle, the Antwerp Augustinians, including Jakob Propst and Hendrik van Zütphen, Jean Chatelain, Michel d’Arande, Agostino Mainairdi da Piemonti, Giulio della Rovere,
only were the Austin Friars precocious in their evangelicalism, but they were also at the forefront of translations of Scripture into the vernacular in Germany, England, and France.\textsuperscript{3} In England, as I have already noted, the Austin Friars gave rise to the only truly theologically “Lutheran” reformer, Robert Barnes, raising questions about the Augustinian fraternity between the two theologians. Miles Coverdale and George Browne were but the two other Austin Friars most active in the Henrician reforms. The reform-minded efforts of these friars certainly follow the larger Augustinian trend of over-representation within early evangelical groups, but scholarship has been entirely deficient in contextualising such thinkers within their monastic setting and in interrogating the curious preponderance of reform-minded thinkers within the Augustinian order.

In that vein, this chapter situates the activities of these dissenting Austin Friars within the context that would have mattered most to them: their religious order. Were all Austin Friars satisfied with the religious life their order provided to them? How did their Augustinian context contribute to their ideas of reform? How were the evangelical statements of Barnes, Browne, Coverdale, and others representative of their Augustinian culture? These are questions which have never been asked by scholars, but which are essential to understanding the motivations behind the evangelicalism that occurred within the Augustinian order more generally, but also specifically in England.

This chapter will thus proceed with four main sections. The first examines rates of apostasy and censures of the behaviour of Austin Friars to gauge their levels of dissent or nonconformity in this period. The second is a treatment of Lollardy within the Augustinian order in this period, and the third an assessment of the occurrences of religious reform within the Augustinian order in England, including the Observant movement and those Austin Friars who were prominent reformers, conservatives, or heretics. The fourth and final section discusses the links between these Augustinian thinkers, be they conservative,

Ambrogo da Milano, and Nicolo da Verona are but the most prominent evangelicals who began their religious careers as Austin Friars.

\textsuperscript{3} The Austin Friars took an active role in the translation of Scripture with Martin Luther in Germany, Julian Macho and Peter Farget in France, and Miles Coverdale in England. See RothEAF, 1:439.
evangelical, or somewhere in between.

I. Monastic Flux

The Problem of Apostasy

Reports of apostate friars amongst the Austins are relatively constant throughout the late-medieval period, with a few periods of more numerous reports. This assessment necessarily casts a negative light onto the condition of Augustinian life in this period by considering only reports of problematic incidents within the order, as there would have been no need for official reports when behavioural standards were appropriate. Nonetheless, this style of enquiry can identify moments of heightened dissatisfaction and turbulence, which stand out from the norm. In the first instance, in the first two decades of the fifteenth century, there was a crop of cases of friars who claimed to have been coerced into making their profession into the order as children, and who wished to break those vows.

The first such example is an Austin named William Heydok of Norwich, who requested in 1402 that he be allowed to leave the Austin Friars and continue as a secular priest. According to Heydok’s charge, he was recruited into the OESA at the age of ten, and was fully professed by the age of eleven, an act that was clearly in contravention of the order’s stipulations that it not recruit novices under the age of fourteen (although this convention had been dropped to allow recruits as young as eleven after the outbreak of the Black Death). A year and a half after his profession, he obtained leave to go to university, and whilst there, was ordained as a secular cleric, in contravention of his mendicant vows. He sought leave to remain as a secular priest, claiming that his profession as a friar had been done against the will of his family and that he had been too young at the time to make an informed decision. A similar case occurs in 1424 when Louis Cren from Chichester accused the members of his home priory of having coaxed him into joining the Austin Friars
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4 CPRGBI, 4:352.
5 Andrews, The Other Friars, 121. Come 1402, however, monastic orders were once again required not to accept novices under the age of fourteen. See ParlR, 8:195-96.
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without the permission of his parents and without having a proper religious vocation. Cren claimed that he had long had the desire to leave the order, but feared doing so because of threats of physical violence. The incident is reported in the records from the general chapters, and the general prior approved his dismissal were it to prove truthful that his profession had been made under duress. Cases such as this are suggestive of difficulties in recruitment and decreased numbers, potentially following difficult periods of endemic disease in the late-fourteenth century or lack of interest in the monastic orders thanks to recurring anticlericalism, for example. Cases of duplicitous recruitment of children such as these may have been a method to deal with significantly declining numbers.

The motivations behind other cases of apostasy are more difficult to ascertain. The Austin Friar Hugh Tiryngton of Lincoln apostatised in 1415, at which time his fellow Austin Friar William Bircheley demanded his arrest. Tiryngton reappeared in 1424, when the general prior decreed that he must return to his province within the next month, or be arrested for his apostasy, after he had escaped by fleeing to Normandy. Tiryngton was not the only Austin Friar to flee to France; correspondence from John Duke of Bedford to Charles de Valois in 1429 made mention of an Austin Friar named Richard who, after apostatising, fled to France, where he was preaching in favour of the French, at a time when the English and French were jockeying over sovereignty. Others chose to stay in England; the prior of Grimsby John Daniel cited John Heton for arrest in 1419 after his apostasy, and Austins John Stanry and John Salderop arrested and punished their former confrères Robert Bedynghfield and Thomas Hasse in 1420. In 1415, the Austin John Paston made a petition to the pope for leave to become an Austin Canon. In 1424, Hugo Altoft escaped from his monastic prison, after having been incarcerated both for theft and apostasy; he claimed that he was unjustly accused and the prior general ordered that the provincial prior
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12 CPRGBI, 6:465.
re-examine the case. In 1430, the problem must have increased to such a degree that all sheriffs, mayors, bailiffs, and ministers were licensed by Henry VI to arrest any Austin Friars who had apostatised. The arrest warrant was concerned with those former friars itinerantly proceeding in secular habits, having abandoned their obedience to their religious superiors.

There are also cases that indicate some dissatisfaction with the Augustinian religious life itself. In 1424, the Austin Richard Lesyngham sought leave to become an anchorite and therefore to abide by a stricter religious lifestyle. Similarly, in 1434, the provincial John Lowe dismissed William Skeldynghop from the order; Skeldynghop had apostatised many times and sought leave to become a Cistercian, thereby leaving the Austin Friars for a stricter, and more isolated, contemplative life. There is also Richard Middleton, who unintentionally apostatised and left his province without permission; he had left in order to visit the body of Augustine in Pavia. He had failed to seek permission for this, but was subsequently pardoned by the general, with a salutary penance. Of a slightly different tenor, in 1419, Henry Colchester reconciled four apostates: William Gormechester, John of Orford, John Wetele, and Thomas Asche. Four years later, the provincial prior Thomas Sharington reconciled a further eight apostates; such high numbers of apostates and the order’s initiatives to reintroduce as many of them as possible is highly suggestive of a pervasive problem of apostasy, which might be attributed to some dissatisfaction amongst Austin Friars with the quality of religious life offered to them.

In 1456, the prior general wrote to the provincial, wanting to ensure that no
apostates were being promoted to any kind of position within the order, as this was in contravention of the Constitutions.23 Three years later, the newly elected provincial prior, John Bury, was granted the right to enlist the aid of the secular arm in the arrest and correction of Austin Friars who had left their convents,24 which might suggest that the problem was sufficiently significant to bear mention. Similarly, in 1463, the general prior granted the prior of London the right to incorporate four friars, specifying that they could not be former apostates.25 The following year, the provincial prior John Halam was granted the right to absolve apostasy however often he thought was fitting,26 and in 1472, there was a mandate to all sheriffs to arrest any apostate Austin Friars.27 Such records give little indication as to the actual incidence of apostasy within the Austin Friars, but the mandate for the arrest of any apostate Austin Friars in 1472 suggests that there had been difficulty in reprimanding the former friars.28

More concrete evidence, however, is extant from the 1470s and 80s. In 1472, the friars John Castor, Richard Boteler, and Adam Lowes left their priory in Huntingdon, stealing many of its belongings in the process.29 In that same year, friars Thomas Lumbard and Richard Baal also apostatised and were ordered back to their convents lest they face excommunication.30 In 1473 began the protracted search for friars Thomas Roysbych and John Alden who had stolen from their convent before apostatising.31 The provincial John Slolee attempted to apprehend them, with the intention of incarcerating them in a monastic prison, but by 1477, they had still not been arrested. At that point, the new provincial John
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23 Dd 6, fol. 16r (consulted via RothSources, 336; D 839).
24 Dd 6, fol. 17r (consulted via RothSources, 342; D 854).
25 Dd 6, fol. 18r (consulted via RothSources, 349; D 871).
26 Dd 6, fol. 18v (consulted via RothSources, 352; D 879).
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Bury recalled all apostates living outside their monastery and made special mention of these two, calling for their arrest.\textsuperscript{32} In 1486, there is the trial of William Herford, a friar who had left his convent to stay with his parents.\textsuperscript{33} The following year, the general prior absolved friar John Hebron for his previous apostasy, and in 1490, friar Thomas Burman is told by his prior that if he were to return to his home priory in Bristol and offer his obedience, he too could be absolved for his indiscretion.\textsuperscript{34}

In 1499 appeared a case strongly reminiscent of the cases in the early fifteenth century: the friar Nicholas Hyndy claimed that his mother sent him to the Austin convent in Yarmouth at the age of ten with the friar William Graunt, and was forced to make his profession under duress as he was threatened by Graunt with physical violence. He attempted to escape several times but his fellow friar Adam Doe forced him back to his convent. In 1499, he was cited for breach of his profession in the Norwich Consistory Court.\textsuperscript{35} Furthermore, Friar Thomas Stanley apostatised in 1515, and finally, Cornelius Collician left his monastery in 1519.\textsuperscript{36} Thomas Stanley must have been reconciled into the order, because the Duke of Buckingham paid him in 1521 as a member of the order for a sermon at Thornbury.\textsuperscript{37}

It is difficult to know how representative these individual cases were of the larger situation regarding apostasy. Apostasy was clearly a constant feature of the Augustinian order, with a peak in the second half of the fifteenth century, specifically in the 1470s and 80s. This analysis inevitably cannot be more than impressionistic; in addition to the negative nature of these reports, they are also found in the registers of the general priors in Rome and thus will be incomplete as there are many years for which the corresponding registers are missing.\textsuperscript{38} Because of this deficiency in source material, we may only infer
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larger trends, and propose that the preponderance of such reports from the 1470s onwards is highly suggestive of dissonance within the OESA at that time.

This evidence can be put into relief by some comparison with the rates of apostasy within other monastic orders. Donald Logan has undertaken the most complete study of apostasy in medieval England to date and although he relies on chancery warrants for the great seal for his evidence and does not make use of monastic records, his work provides an interesting statistical picture of monastic apostasy.\textsuperscript{39} Across all orders, Logan suggests that the overall rate of apostasy in this period might be somewhere between 3.6% and 7.3%,\textsuperscript{40} but this is highly conjectural as it relies on speculation regarding the overall population of the medieval monastic orders, in conjunction with the degree to which the records are incomplete or reflective of actual numbers of apostasy. He identifies the 1340s, 50s and 60s as decades of particularly high apostasy, but explains this trend by pointing to higher numbers of professed religious men during this time.\textsuperscript{41} He identifies another peak in the 1470s, with other high points in the fifteenth century as 1401-1410, the 1450s and 1460s.\textsuperscript{42}

When one looks at his numbers for the mendicant orders, however, the picture changes. Logan records only four apostates from the Dominicans in the fifteenth century, and all from the first half of the century.\textsuperscript{43} He identifies five for the Franciscans in the first half of the fifteenth century, and only one from after 1451.\textsuperscript{44} The Carmelites, however, one of the smaller orders, number far more apostates at this point than do the larger ones: Logan enumerates reports of six Carmelites apostatising from 1400-1450, and four from after 1451.\textsuperscript{45} The higher numbers of Carmelites could perhaps be attributed to a higher degree of austerity, which some members may have felt to be too onerous or difficult to follow. Additionally, Logan remarks on the overall low numbers of mendicant apostates.
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\textsuperscript{44} \textit{Ibid.}
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attributing this trend to the mendicant privilege to appeal directly to local royal officials, therefore bypassing central administration and documentation.\textsuperscript{46} Otherwise, these numbers would suggest that the mendicant orders suffered apostasy far more in the first half of the fifteenth century than in the latter end, in contrast to the Austin Friars. If anything, the Austins follow the larger trend of the cloistered monastic orders in that sense rather than the precedent set by mendicants; this might suggest that some problems faced by the Austin Friars in the fifteenth century were particular to them. Regardless, Logan’s study, whilst valuable and informative, is incomplete; he identified only five cases of apostasy for the Austin Friars in the fifteenth century, whereas I have isolated at least twenty-eight, excluding mandates for the arrest of all wandering Austin Friars. Thus, whilst Logan’s study should not be taken as authoritative, it can provide a template for our ideas regarding monastic and mendicant apostasy in the fifteenth century.

This analysis of apostasy has not included the extreme numbers of apostates in the very different circumstances of 1538 and 39, when all friars were forced to get dispensations from their orders to become secular priests, or flee, as Cromwell suppressed their convents through Bishop Richard Ingworth, John London, and other subordinates. As Logan pointed out, the Faculty Office records, which are complete, account for only 3781 dispensations, out of a speculated monastic population of about nine thousand and thus, huge numbers of monks and friars must have abandoned their communities without formal dispensation.\textsuperscript{47} Of course, many in these communities would have been sufficiently old that there was no need for formal dispensation, but apostasy, at this point, may have been the only option for many younger friars. Whilst they brought little revenue to the Court of Augmentations, Cromwell put their suppression in motion in an effort to sever ties to Rome, where the fraternal orders were centralised.\textsuperscript{48} At the point of their suppression in 1538, however, the friars had been experiencing such a profound lack of popular support, which, coupled with
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their lack of endowments or income, meant that many friars found themselves in abject poverty such as they had never experienced. Suppression accounts from the visitors, enumerate countless Austin friaries, amongst friaries from other orders, experiencing extreme poverty, such as the Austins in Stafford, Shrewsbury, Oxford, and Huntingdon. Apostasy and perhaps pre-emptive looting in the face of the coming dissolution, as we see at Oxford, may have felt like the only feasible option for many friars in those difficult years. Many such friars were in desperate search of dispensation and employment as secular priests, but those that could not acquire dispensation may have been forced to apostatise in great numbers to escape their unmanageable circumstances.

**Administrative Corruption and Behavioural Scandals**

Analysis of reports of disciplinarian controversies in this period reveals a similar picture to the one suggested by the above; as the fifteenth century came to a close, lack of discipline at particular convents or associated with specific priors became an increasingly recurrent issue. Earlier however, the recurrent issue is more so regarding sufficient recruitment, since we find three reports in the 1420s and 30s of the Austins, either province-wide or in individual priories, struggling to find sufficient numbers of novices. We might connect this trend to the one seen above, namely the forced profession of young novices by the Austins in the first few decades of the fifteenth century due to depressed numbers of recruits.

Censorious reports in the Augustinian records begin to appear in the latter half of the fifteenth century, at which point, there was a proliferation of complaints about the behaviour of specific Austin Friars and the general degradation of the standards of Augustinian life. Firstly, the prior of the London house in 1463 must have been deficient in

---

50 *LP* 13:2, no. 56.
51 *LP* 13:2, no. 88: Ingworth reports that at Shrewsbury there was only the prior and two Irish friars, but that the house was completely empty – no chalice, bedding, meat, bread, or drink to speak of.
52 *LP* 13:1, no. 1342.
53 *LP* 14:1, no. 348; London, BL, MS Cotton Cleopatra E IV fol. 248r.
54 In *LP* 13:2, no. 236 we hear of George Browne having looted the convent at Oxford.
55 Northampton in 1427: Dd 4, fol. 220v (consulted via *RothSources*, 308; D 747); English province in 1434: Dd 5, fol. 22r (consulted via *RothSources*, 317; D 771); Rye in 1439: Dd 5, fol. 24v (consulted via *RothSources*, 324; D 791).
his administrative duties, for the general chapter threatened him with excommunication should he not provide an adequate financial report for the previous year and the priors of Shrewsbury, Ludlow, Bristol, Stafford and Stamford, under pain of excommunication, were to send their taxes to the general prior.\footnote{Dd 6, fol. 18r (consulted via RothSources, 349; D 871).} Furthermore, the friars in London must not have been subscribing to the Constitutions, since the general prior ordered their prior to ensure that every friar attended conventual mass and vespers on each weekday and feast day.\footnote{Ibid.} In the same year, he expressed concern about papal privileges sought and obtained fraudulently, and in an attempt to reform this abuse, pressured priors to recall such exemptions when suitable.\footnote{Dd 6, fol. 19r (consulted via RothSources, 355; D 891).} This theme of abuse of privileges appears again in the accounts of 1469, when Thomas Penketh ratified the excommunication of the previous provincial, John Slolee, after he had failed to pay the requisite provincial taxes to the general chapter.\footnote{Ibid.} He was similarly tasked to extract sixteen ducats from John Halam, the provincial in office previous to Slolee, which had been intended to pay for the remodelling of the convent of Austin Friars in Rome.\footnote{Ibid.}

This was a recurrent theme for the Austin Friars; the English provincial priors regularly shirked their financial duties towards the general chapter, to the chagrin of the general prior, who often threatened them with excommunication should they not comply. Like Slolee and Halam, the provincial prior from 1486 to 1489 neglected to pay his dues to the general chapter for all three years of his tenure as provincial; he received a strongly worded exhortation from the general prior to make the deposit within the next month at the bank of Lawrence Lamellini and Ambrose Salvagi in London on pain of deposition.\footnote{Dd 8, fol. 31v (consulted via RothSources, 378; D 956).} The general prior cited the next provincial Robert Stokes for having fraudulently engineered his election for a second three-year term, and demanded proof for dispensation from the
requirement that the tenure of provincial priors be no more than three years. In 1510, the new provincial John Toneys was in contravention of the laws of the order by accepting the office without the approval of the general chapter, and thus had to surrender the office lest he be excommunicated. Similarly, in 1512, the general prior censured the English provincial for not having sent the dues of his province and warned him that should he not do so, he would be subject to punishment. The following year, he was threatened with excommunication for having delayed provincial chapters, thereby avoiding the official procedures of the order. In addition to neglecting to send the requisite fees, he had also not forbidden novices to wear the black habit, and thus many were mistaken for professed friars.

Such infractions become more and more common as the order progressed towards its dissolution, particularly under the leadership of the notorious Edmund Bellond. As discussed previously, Bellond’s tenure as provincial and prior of London left a legacy of embezzlement, theft, inappropriate lavishness of expenditure, and raucous behaviour, but he also contributed to this widespread trend of neglecting to send forth the provincial dues onto the general chapter. He was asked repeatedly to do so in 1519 and 1520, and he was similarly inattentive regarding the chapter acts, which he did not send to the general chapter for two years. It was common practice that after a provincial election, the new provincial requested confirmation of his position from the general prior, and Bellond was the primary offender in overlooking this requirement. When his successor William Wetherall was elected in 1520, it was reiterated by the general prior that should Bellond not provide the taxes from the previous two years within two months, he would face excommunication.
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There is language of reform in the correspondence between the general priors and the English provincials within this period, particularly in the sixteenth century. John Stock, the prior of Oxford in 1509, was requested to enforce reform, although there is no indication of why that was necessary. In 1510, John Toneys was elected as vicar general and tasked with instituting reform throughout the entire province. The provincial Hugh Harley was called upon to enforce reform in 1516, and in 1519, the notorious Edmund Bellond was warned by the general prior not to neglect the necessity of reform, since the order in England was being assaulted in many ways. This is a significant statement from the general prior here, relaying concern about the English province as a whole, expressing trepidation about the degradation of the religious life of the English Austins in multiple capacities, rather than a singular problem, which might be addressed directly. In 1520, the prior of Northampton John Hull had been deposed and was replaced by Gilbert Roos, because of accusations that the election of Hull had been fraudulent. The general prior exhorted William Wetherall, the new provincial, to direct his province to a more diligent observance of the Constitutions of the order and stressed the importance to direct his brethren to a holier life.

Within a year of his election of 1520, William Wetherall was told sharply by the prior general that his attempts to delay provincial chapters were unacceptable to the customs of the order. Wetherall had proposed to delay the next provincial chapter by an additional three years, based on expenses incurred in holding the chapter, and was told that under no circumstances, should the chapters be held so infrequently. As it turned out, eleven years later – in flagrant contravention of the Martiniana, which restricted provincial priorships to three years – Wetherall was still provincial and had reduced the frequency of provincial
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chapters to every seven years in collaboration with the late Cardinal Wolsey. Gabriel of Venice, the general prior in 1531, was shocked by Wetherall’s actions and accused him of having destroyed the freedom of the province with Wolsey’s help. The following year, Henry VIII granted the Austin Friars permission to utilise the dispensation they had received from Wolsey to hold their chapters only every seven years, and to elect their provincial prior at the same time, thereby extending the tenure of the prior from three to seven years. Since the provincial chapter was an important venue for discussion and regulatory administration, with Wolsey’s help, Wetherall successfully curtailed his province’s ability to debate the state of the Augustinian religion in England and silenced the voices of his confrères in their provincial administration.

Such language regarding reform and the importance of religious liberty suggests that the general priors of the OESA had recognised a deficiency, or at the very least, the potential for religious limitations, within the English province of Austin Friars. The provincial priors from 1459 onwards were almost all faced with a threat of excommunication from the general chapter, given their neglect for the administrative duties of their office, the Constitutions, their financial responsibilities, and the religious standards of their order. This trend is corroborated by complaints about particular Austin convents in the sixteenth century. The convent of Shrewsbury was experiencing unprecedented poverty when Ingworth arrived in August 1538: the entire friary was worth only 26 shillings, and was without any bedding, utensils, food, or drink. An outbreak of the plague in 1525 had dried up their source of alms, and the town therefore granted five pounds to the priory in 1528 because of their extreme poverty and an additional four pounds as late as 1537 for necessary repairs to the friary buildings, even though, as we shall see, the prior had been censured the year previously for embezzlement.
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From 1500 to 1538, the Shrewsbury Austin Friars had been involved in thirteen cases of public violence, thirteen further cases of trespassing or theft of goods, and twenty-six cases of debt,\(^85\) including an instance in 1530 when the prior William Man was involved in a physical fight with a former prior, John Towne.\(^86\) In 1536, the town burgesses accused the prior, Richard Alate, of selling off the goods of the house to one John Skinner and others, who had been removing stones from the building.\(^87\) They agreed that Alate “shal be comytte to warde unto such tyme he founde suerties to answere to the king’s consaille for such spoyle he hath made there […]”.\(^88\) Owen and Blakeley supposed in their nineteenth-century history of the town of Shrewsbury that this was the same prior that had been mentioned in a letter of Richard Devereux to Cromwell, which characterised the prior as “a man leke to be in a fransey”, under whose leadership the priory maintained a membership of only two other friars, both Irishmen, who were assigned back to Ireland by Bishop Ingworth as visitor in 1538.\(^89\) Ingworth dismissed the prior, whom he described as someone to whom no one would dare to lend anything, after having found the priory in utter ruin in September 1538, with not even a chalice to say mass.\(^90\) According to Ingworth, this prior was resistant to the suppression imposed on him, and came to London to sue for his house, and the two Irish friars disobediently remained in the country, receiving dispensation from Cranmer in September 1539.\(^91\)

Furthermore, the scandal at Austin Friars London in the 1520s under the leadership of Edmund Bellond attests to the visible change in the standards of religious life being kept there.\(^92\) In 1525, several Austin Friars were arrested and put in prison,\(^93\) and in 1527, reports of serious misdemeanours from the convent at Canterbury reached the prior general, 
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who wrote to the provincial William Wetherall, ordering him to restore order to the priory.\footnote{Dd 15, fol. 126v-127v (consulted via RothSources, 431-33; D 1064).} The general prior was concerned about reports that the friars in Canterbury – the main culprits were George Brum, John Parchar, and Gilbert Roos – were leaving the monastery without permission, exercising a cure of souls and sleeping outside the convent. They were also accused of frequenting taverns, drinking with laymen, gambling, and soliciting the business of prostitutes.\footnote{Ibid.} Such accusations are strongly reminiscent of the scathing report of the behaviour of the London Austin Friars from around the same time. The Canterbury friars were scolded for not participating in their convent’s communal meals and thus these friars were guilty of not valuing their community in the manner described by the Regula.\footnote{See page 32.}

Whilst we should be wary of narratives that cast monastic development in the years up until the Reformation as moments of decline and crisis, such incidents from within the OESA certainly point to an escalation of monastic conflict in the latter end of the fifteenth and early sixteenth century. This period witnessed a breakdown of their administrative and devotional expectations, which reached its culmination in the sixteenth century, when there were the most extreme cases of Austin Friars behaving in contravention to their professed monastic life. It is telling that in 1524, the Irish limit of the Austin Friars rejected obedience to the English province, perhaps not wanting to associate with the religious life pursued by many English Austins.\footnote{Dd 14, fol. 174r (consulted via RothSources, 426; D 1047).} The general chapter attributed this schism to the English provincial John Stokes’ lack of attention to his Irish brethren, not having held a visitation for two years, but it is important to contextualise this within the increasingly divisive English Augustinian life. Whilst the Observant movement took hold within Irish Augustinianism, thus attesting to, in some degree, the ascetical commitment of many Irish Austins, the English Austin Friars summarily avoided any possibility of Observance, thereby contributing to the burgeoning Irish monastic self-differentiation. Establishment as an Observant congregation put Irish Austin convents directly under the control of the
general prior, circumventing the English provincial administration, and thus the English Austin Friars’ participation in the degradation of their own communal life contributed to the political and social factors for which Irish Augustinians would have sought escape from English control.98

Narratives of decline or corruption amongst religious professionals in the century leading up to the Reformation have too often been teleological, casting the religious changes in the sixteenth century as inevitable given the waning of late-medieval religion. The Irish example suggests that in that case, this is misleading. And yet, we must recognise that the English Austin Friars were clearly experiencing difficulty in the maintenance of their religious life at the end of the fifteenth century and in the first few decades of the sixteenth and that strict adherence to the Constitutions was no longer paramount to their definition of the Augustinian life. At the same time I have previously pointed out their ambitious efforts at devotional fund-raising via indulgences, and the dissension that this provoked in the order.99

II. Lollardy

The order’s contact with Lollardy appears to have been relatively small; whilst there were several Austins in the fourteenth century who became prominent Lollards, such as Peter Pateshull,100 or who had a close relationship with Wyclif, such as those friars who argued in 1371 that the clergy ought to contribute to wartime costs,101 documented contact with Lollardy in the fifteenth century was scant. Formal communication with Lollardy was primarily relegated to Austin Friars acting as adjudicators in heresy trials; friars such as Richard Donnington,102 John Lowe,103 John Sturrey,104 Thomas Sharington,105 Thomas

99 See pages 115-129.
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Garston,\textsuperscript{106} Clement Felmingham,\textsuperscript{107} and Walter Thetford\textsuperscript{108} all participated in the judgment at a variety of trials of suspected Lollards. Austins did not confine their defence of official theology to examining Lollards: as seen earlier, John Bury, a high-ranking Austin Friar who was twice elected prior provincial (in 1459 and again in 1475),\textsuperscript{109} famously wrote his tract the \textit{Gladius Salomonis} against the allegedly heretical thought of Reginald Pecock in 1457.\textsuperscript{110} In comparison, the Dominicans were prolific in preaching against Lollardy, particularly in Oxford,\textsuperscript{111} with William Bottlesham, Robert Humbleton, and John Bromyard notable for their sermons defending orthodoxy.\textsuperscript{112} Thomas Netter, the famous Carmelite, was similarly devoted to defending orthodoxy, as evident in his \textit{Doctrinale Antiquitatum Fidei}.\textsuperscript{113} In 1413, Netter studied Wycliffe's works and in 1414, he was present at Oldcastle's trial.\textsuperscript{114} He was also present at William Whyte's trial in 1428.\textsuperscript{115} As shown in James Clark's study of St Albans, the Benedictines were also involved in the investigation of suspected Lollards, with their examinations becoming particularly frequent in the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{116} At St Albans, the abbot seized three people suspected of Lollardy, forcing them to submit to a public confession, and the abbey's book inventory shows the monks to have been reading anti-Wycliffite theologians.\textsuperscript{117}

Karen Winstead and Sarah James have posited that John Capgrave's vernacular hagiography – specifically his \textit{Life of Saint Katharine} – argued for the value of open theological discussion, presenting Katharine "deriding tradition and quoting Scripture like the stereotypical Lollard wife."\textsuperscript{118} Winstead points to the close cultural association of
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Lollardy with vernacular lay reading, directing our attention to instances where hagiographers such as John Lydgate changed typical hagiographical tropes so as to avoid any comparison with Lollards that might have arisen from the traditional depiction of saints as troublesome rebels who question religious authority. Whilst Capgrave did not make this explicit connection, Winstead and James are correct in characterising the concerns voiced by Katharine as being analogous to some expressed in Lollard literature. Winstead suggests that the rhetoric from the philosophers and Emperor Maxentius, with whom Katharine debates, mirrored the language used by the English Church to stymie the inroads of heresy, particularly in the context of religious images. She emphasises how Capgrave depicted Katharine as twice rejecting Maxentius’ offer of creating a statue of her, when this scene appears in no previous hagiography of Katharine, making her sound “remarkably like a Lollard iconoclast.” In Capgrave’s words, Katharine denounces pagan philosophers who contend that images are “but figures/ Representyng other manere thing,” recalling contemporary rhetoric about the validity of images in the face of Lollard attacks. Capgrave was not afraid to associate the word Lollard with a sympathetic Christian character, as the Virgin Mary tells Adrian the hermit, “though thei you calle lollard, wytche or elue/ Beth not dismayed.”

Whilst Winstead and James rightly interpret Capgrave’s emphasis on Katharine’s religious ideas as having strong parallels with contemporaneous Lollard discourse, they place too much stress on Capgrave’s proximity to Lollardy himself. Capgrave inveighed elsewhere against Lollards, particularly in his Life of St Augustine and his Abbreviacion of
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Chronicles,

which suggests that Capgrave found Lollardy theologically abhorrent. They do, however, rightly highlight that Capgrave’s concerns may have been more preoccupied with a desire for a climate of open religious discussion that was impossible in the wake of Arundel’s 1409 Constitutions. This is underscored by Capgrave’s Life of St Norbert, in which he exhorted his readers to “drede not þis dyuersite.”

Capgrave was a sensitive writer who understood the dangers of quelling theological discussion and his continued acclamation of Katharine’s learning, significantly taught by Adrian the hermit, a character who was a thinly-veiled Austin Friar,

extolled the value of lay learning and philosophical debate.

As mentioned previously, Capgrave’s choice of hagiography as the genre in which to make vernacular theological statements is a mark of his textual environment, in which vernacular theology was dangerous and potentially indicative of heterodox thinking regarding lay religious learning. In spite of concerns about Lollardy, hagiography remained an acceptable genre in which to write in the vernacular, given the attacks on the cult of saints launched by Lollard thinkers. Hagiographical texts, therefore, were a way by which Capgrave could discuss complex theological questions, even ones associated with Lollardy, such as the use of images in devotion, in the vernacular, thereby making his teaching accessible to the lay communities around him. In contrast, Lydgate navigated this difficult environment by fighting back against the deconstruction and simplification of prose effected within Lollard texts; Lydgate’s vernacular writing was acceptable under Arundel not because it did not discuss complex religious issues, but because its aureate and embellished style distinguished it from problematic Lollard texts.

Lydgate, unlike Capgrave, was reticent regarding Lollardy, never addressing the heresy directly, with the exception of encouraging Henry V to destroy those who threatened the Church in his Defence of Holy
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125 See Capgrave, Abbreviacion of Cronicles, 181, 185, 188, 191, 197, 203, 204, 205, 216, 218, 220, 239-241, 241-242, 243-244, 248, for Capgrave’s numerous castigations of Lollardy, famously calling Lollards “erroneous dogs” (ibid., 197). In his Life of St Augustine, he also makes reference to sexual impropriety rumoured to be prevalent within Lollard communities (Capgrave, Life of St Augustine, 45).

126 Capgrave, Life of St Norbert, 65 (line 1307); Sarah James, “Doctrye and studie,” 290.

127 Capgrave, Life of St Katharine, 174 (2.84), where Capgrave refers to Adrian as both a hermit and a friar, a confusion that applies only to Austin Friars.

The attacks by Lollards and the ensuing censorious efforts of the ecclesiastical hierarchy were a significant feature of the religious and intellectual environment of fifteenth-century England; authors sought to differentiate themselves from Lollard writers so as to avoid any suspicion, but they also struggled to navigate the uncertain attitudes regarding the vernacular in a century that saw profound projects of raising English to a language of the court, administration, poetry, and hagiography. Although there were significant literary contributions in the fourteenth century written in English, such as Chaucer’s works, John Gower’s *Confessio Amantis*, and William Langland’s *Piers Plowman*, to name but the most significant, the Lancastrians actively cultivated English poetry, with Lydgate as their poet of choice.¹³⁰ Both Henry IV and V encouraged the use of English as a mode for royal communication and for administrative purposes, when French had previously been the obvious selection for any secular literature.¹³¹ The right to use English for administrative purposes had been recognised in 1362 by parliament, but it was with the Lancastrians that it became much more prevalent, with Henry IV using English for his challenge to Richard II and Henry V using it for official documents after his victory in 1415 against the French at Agincourt.¹³² Poets patronised by the Lancastrians, namely Lydgate and Hoccleve, wrote predominantly in English, whilst their fourteenth-century predecessor John Gower wrote relatively sparingly in English.¹³³ This increase in the use of English in the fifteenth century meant that religious and political writers needed to confront the issue of Lollardy, as vernacular considerations of theology had the potential to arouse suspicion, partly because as yet the English language was at an early stage in developing a technical theological vocabulary. Capgrave’s choice of hagiography was one method to do so, in addition to his harsh statements against Lollardy in his *Abbreviacion of Cronicles*. Capgrave was just one of many voices speaking against Lollardy; Nicholas Love, the prior of

¹²⁹ Ibid.
¹³⁰ Ibid., 206.
¹³² Ibid.
Mount Grace Charterhouse, Yorkshire, was a far more conservative voice, defending the institution of the Church and arguing against Lollardy by using emotive language regarding the life and suffering of Christ in his *The Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesus Christ*. His text was sponsored by Archbishop Arundel himself, acting as an official alternative to the Wycliffite Bible.\(^{134}\) Thomas Hoccleve attacked the Lollards in his *Regement of Princes* and his *To Sir John Oldcastle*, from 1412 and 1415 respectively. The Carmelite Thomas Netter of Walden wrote his *Doctrinale antiquitatum fidei ecclesiae catholicae* in the 1420s, which stood as one of the most successful and comprehensives theological rebuttals to Wyclif in the fifteenth century.\(^{135}\)

Capgrave was certainly more ambiguous in his treatment of Lollard questions than theologians such as Netter or the officially authorised Nicholas Love; his treatment of Katharine’s iconoclasm makes the designation of Capgrave as a strictly conservative anti-Lollard thinker impossible. Whilst it would be incorrect to portray him as sympathetic to the heresy, his *Katharine* is a good example of his desire for a space for open theological discussion regarding some Lollard contentions – perhaps reclaiming what he saw as potentially commendable features of their dissenting culture. This is perhaps mirrored by Lydgate’s own ambiguous ideas regarding Lollardy; not only was his reticence in the face of the heresy comparatively unusual but, as argued by Shannon Gayk, his ideas regarding the usage of images as memory prompts for the laity mean that he cannot be marked as a straight-forwardly conservative religious thinker.\(^{136}\) Capgrave’s thoughts about Lollardy attracted a much smaller audience than did the conservative writings of Love and Hoccleve, as Love’s work in particular, popular amongst the gentry and upper classes, survives in over sixty manuscripts.\(^{137}\) Nonetheless, Capgrave’s *Katharine* attests to his attempts to address complex theological questions in a manner accessible to literate members of the laity.
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\(^{137}\) Newhauser, “Religious Writing,” 38.
In contrast with the literary work of the fifteenth century, sixteenth-century Austins came into closer contact with Lollard communities. Robert Barnes is the most obvious case here, as we can document his contact with Lollards on two main occasions. Barnes was associated with Lollards Lawrence Maxwell and John Stacy, who jointly sold to Richard Bayfield, a Benedictine monk of Bury St Edmunds, a Tyndale Bible and a copy of Erasmus’ Latin New Testament. Barnes was also acquainted with John Tyball and Thomas Hilles, two Lollards to whom he sold a copy of Tyndale’s English Bible whilst he was under house arrest in London. Tyball claimed that there was a merchant in Barnes’ room, attesting to the close links the London convent of Austin Friars maintained with the international mercantile community in London, and that he and Hilles had asked Barnes to write to Richard Fox, the curate of Steeple Bumpstead. According to Tyball’s confession, Barnes did indeed write to Fox, although we are ignorant to the contents of their communication.

Like Barnes, Miles Coverdale was also associated with the Lollard community at Steeple Bumpstead and was likely introduced to Richard Fox by Barnes, perhaps in his communication with the curate after his interaction with Tyball and Hilles. John Foxe reported that Robert Topley, an Austin Friar at Clare, had claimed that he had been personally converted by Coverdale himself, who had been preaching in a Lollard manner in Essex in 1528. Topley was the brother to fellow Clare Austin Thomas Topley who had been cited along with Austins William Gardiner and John Wiggen for having been converted by Richard Fox to Lollardy. According to Foxe, Coverdale had been living with the Lollard curate himself and had forsaken his friar’s habit for the garb of a secular priest. More verifiable is Coverdale’s interest in Lollard tracts themselves; around 1549, Coverdale published his edition of *Wyclif’s Wicket*, attesting to his interest in the ideas originating from this community.

The order’s contact with Lollardy was thus fragmentary and difficult to ascertain,
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and yet, documented interactions between Austin Friars and Lollards suggest a willingness from friars such as Capgrave, Barnes, and Coverdale to grapple with the theological and devotional quandaries posed by the Lollard community. How that enthusiasm for anticlericalism and other Lollard ideas became important for the Austins’ engagement with evangelicalism is not always clear, but remains significant for any study of Augustinian dissent.

III. Reform

*The Observant Movement*

The Observant movement, a reform-minded strain of mendicant ideals that took its inspiration from the Franciscan Spirituals, was a major voice of reform throughout the late-medieval world. Observant theologians spoke strongly about the need for a return to monastic antiquity, with an emphasis on strict austerity and extreme poverty. The marked absence of Observant congregations within the English Augustinian order is a key consideration regarding their impetus to reform and contributes significantly to the genre of reform introduced by the English Austin Friars in the sixteenth century. Originating and finding its support primarily within Tuscany, Augustinian Observance remained throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries an Italian phenomenon, ultimately failing to launch a significant challenge to the English Austin Friars’ growing preoccupation with their financial prosperity and their shift away from strict adherence to their constitutional regulations.

Augustinian Observance is integral to the understanding of the Austin Friars’ involvement in the Protestant Reformation, particularly on the Continent. Whilst not all Austin Friars who became reformers were affiliated with the Observant movement, the majority were either Observant themselves or tied to the influence of certain thinkers or convents which were strongly Observant.143 Similarly, the Catholic reformers of the Augustinian order – Bartholomew Arnoldi von Usingen, Johann Hoffmeister, Wolfgang

Laferrière 239

Kappelmaier, Konrad Treger, Giles of Viterbo, Girolamo Seripando, John Stone, Luis de Montoya, Tomàs de Villanueva, and Roger de Jonghe – were predominantly Observant friars. Francis Martin astutely interpreted this phenomenon when he stated that “Catholic and Protestant reforms were both products of the same movement”, pinpointing the paradox of Augustinian involvement with sixteenth-century religious change.

As a smaller and less influential order, the Augustinian Friars and their Observant reform have been overshadowed by studies of the Franciscan Observants in particular, but also by the Dominicans. Aside from the two authorities on the subject – Katharine Walsh and F.X. Martin – work on the Observant movement within the Augustinian order has been cursory and ill informed: Bert Roest’s chapter on Observant reform, often treated as the best English-language introduction and overview of the subject, contains but one paragraph on the movement within the Augustinian order. Comparably, whilst James Mixson claims that the Augustinians are “equally deserving of scholarly attention”, in the introduction to his edited volume on Observance, he includes only a brief paragraph on the Augustinians, replete with such errors as his claim that John Capgrave was an Observant friar.

Augustinian Observance found its origins in the late fourteenth century with Simone Fidati da Cascia, the fourteenth-century preacher, and William Flete, who lived as a spiritual advisor to Catherine of Siena in Lecceto, the saint who inspired the model of Observance for many friars both within and without the Augustinian order. As part of their commitment to a strict, austere, eremitical lifestyle, Augustinian Observant friars eschewed

145 Ibid., 329.
146 Fifteenth-century Franciscan Observance has been studied extensively by Ludovic Viallet in his Les sens de l’observance: enquête sur les réformes franciscaines entre l’Elbe et l’Oder, de Capistran à Luther (vers 1450-vers 1520) (Münster, 2013), which delves into the complexity of Franciscan reforms across Europe. It is significant that Luther, the best-known Augustinian Observant friar, is depicted here not as an Augustinian, but as a Franciscan Observant friar.
149 James Mixson, “Introduction” in A Companion to Observant Reform in the Late Middle Ages and Beyond, ed. James Mixson and Bert Roest (Leiden, 2015), 1-22 at 6.
exemptions from their Constitutions, since the cornerstone to their life was devotion to the common life, as expressed in the *Regula Sancti Augustini*. They reinvigorated interest in liturgical services, but expressed little interest in pastoral care and preaching. Contrary to the initial programme exemplified by Flete, Observant Austin friars were still actively engaged in the university setting, and Augustinian Observance become intimately tied to humanist learning, more so than any other order. Beyond such broad strokes, it can be very difficult to speak about the goals and ideas behind Augustinian reform in this period, given the source material’s limitations; as it consists mainly of the Augustinian registers, it is easier to speak of the institutionalisation of reform rather than the intellectual tradition behind it.

According to Francis Martin, “it is no great surprise, in view of the political and cultural developments of the fifteenth century, that the Augustinian Observants did not establish themselves in either France or England.” He similarly attributed the presence of Observance in Ireland to almost exclusively political factors, seeing the inroads of Irish Observance as a way for Gaelic friars to escape the jurisdiction of the English Augustinian province and appeal directly to the general chapter. Martin stated that “the reform in Ireland coincided with the decline of English authority in Ireland,” and emphasised the conflict between Gaelic and Anglo-Irish friars within the Irish limit as a key element to the spread of Irish Observance. He remarked that Gaelic friars tended to train in Italy, and thus transplanted the Italian reform movement to Ireland, whilst the Anglo-Irish friars typically trained at Oxford or Cambridge, and thus had little contact with reform.

Where Martin’s analysis of Observance is deficient is in his failure to recognise the
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150 Roest, “Observant reform in religious orders”, 457. This is attested by the growing circle of humanists associated with a network of Augustinian Observants, such as Petrarch and Boccaccio, who were close friends and intellectual companions of many Augustinian Observant friars. The Augustinian Andrea Biglia’s treatise *Ad fratrem Ludovicum de Ordinis nostri forma et propagatione*, which he composed for a former student who had become an Observant Augustinian, is an interesting account of the confluence of humanist learning and Observance. See Andrea Biglia, “Fratris Andreae Mediolanensis ad fratrem Ludovicum de Ordinis nostri forma et propagation incipit”, ed. Rudolph Arbesmann, *AAug*, 28 (1965): 186-218.

151 Walsh, “The Observance: Sources,” 44-49.


close ties that the English Austin Friars maintained with the Italian Augustinian province. The London convent of Austin Friars was renowned for its connections with the international, and predominantly Italian, community, which must suggest English exposure to the Italian Augustinian ideas of reform. Many English friars, such as Thomas Penketh, studied in Italy, and ought to have transported Observant ideas back to England in the way done by the Irish. William Flete was not only English himself, but also kept in correspondence with the English provincial in 1380 in order to exhort him to his model of reform. Whilst England as a whole may have experienced political isolation in this period, its Austin Friars did not segregate themselves from their European confrères and forged links with Italy in a way unparalleled by any other monastic order in England; the numbers of foreign visitors to England was far greater than to the Irish province. In view of those realities, it is difficult to agree with Martin in his stipulations that England's political seclusion was responsible for the failure of Observance to make inroads within England.

Thus, the failure of Observance to take hold within the English province of Austin Friars must, to some degree, reflect an inappropriateness of the religious ideal advocated by Observant friars for the English context. The Observant Augustinian path and its prescriptive notion of Augustinianism was antithetical to the open and multifarious understanding of the Augustinian life maintained by the English, who never held a dogmatic understanding of Augustinianism as eremitical in nature. This helps to explain why Augustinian Observance never had success in England; there was no need to reclaim an ancient Augustinian path because the English Austins never advocated for that way of life in the first instance. This was not, of course, true for all friars; as we have seen, the Observant Franciscans retained considerable status and success within the English province. Their religious priorities, however, including the stringent commitment to corporate and
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individual poverty, spoke to a different religious history that lent itself much better than that of the Austins' to the emphases of the Observant movement.

The significance for the lack of Augustinian Observance in England lies in the monastic context of the English Austin Friars at the close of the fifteenth century. As can be seen above in the discussion regarding apostasy and behavioural censures, adherence to the Constitutions was of increasingly less importance and there is evidence of growing dissatisfaction within the order. The increasing frequency with which the general priors exhorted the provincial priors to reform attests to a growing frustration with the direction and aims of the English Austins. And yet, there is no evidence that any English Austins attempted to remedy these deficiencies with Observance; although this can only be speculative, this is highly suggestive of different religious aims of the English Augustinian and the Observant religious platforms.

Augustinian Observance, had it been successful in England, might have curbed some of these disciplarian problems, even though it would have transformed English Augustinian life beyond recognition. It would have forced the English Austins to confront the stipulations of their spirituality, lifestyle, goals, and priorities, and been fodder to that faction of Austins who took issue with the direction the province was taking. Whilst other conflicts surely would have arisen regarding the definition of Augustinianism exclusively as the eremitical life, the disagreement over such prolific participation in the penitential economy and inattention to the Constitutions would have been significantly alleviated.

**Evangelicalism and the Henrician Reforms**

In the absence of Observance, English Austins sought other avenues of internal reform. These responses were wide-ranging, spanning the spectrum of religious change in the sixteenth century. Within the Austin Friars, Robert Barnes, Miles Coverdale, and George Browne were the three most active voices for reform, each pursuing different genres of religious change. These are the best-known names of Augustinian evangelicalism, but there was a plethora of Austins who voiced concerns over the state of their order and who
championed theological ideas divergent from the mainstream religious orthodoxy.

Robert Barnes was by far the most prominent reformer originating within the English Austin Friars, although his influence was cut radically short when he was immolated in 1540 for heresy alongside William Jerome and Thomas Garrett and three conservatives executed for treason. Barnes’ career as a reformer was an enigmatic one, beginning with his incendiary sermon on Christmas Eve of 1525 in St Edward’s church in Cambridge, wherein he decried clerical wealth and after which he was arrested for heresy at the behest of Cardinal Wolsey. Barnes went from being arrested as a heretic to functioning as an ambassador for England during negotiations with the Schmalkaldic League and the composition of the Wittenberg Articles of 1536. How such an official role can have resulted from these inauspicious beginnings and yet still ultimately lead to his execution as a heretic is puzzling; Barnes frequently wrote in supplication to the English king, but his programme of reform was not always in line with the state-sponsored religious agenda.

Until relatively recently, analysis of Barnes’ life was done in an unabashedly Lutheran hagiographical fashion, emphasising Barnes’ inheritance and unwavering acceptance of Luther’s ideas. Neelak Tjernagel, Richard Glen Eaves, William Dallmann, Marcus Loane, and James McGoldrick are prominent examples of this trend, seeing Barnes as a loyal follower of Luther, ultimately unsuccessful only because of the unreceptive English climate. These studies exalt the Lutheran thought of Barnes and therefore downplay both his and Luther’s monastic formation as motivation for the ideas they held in common.

Extensive studies of his life have been completed elsewhere, most notably by Korey Maas, but supplemented by previous biographical work by J.P. Lusardi, Neelak Tjernagel,

N.H. Fisher, E.G. Rupp, Marcus Loane, Carl Trueman, and Charles Anderson, and thus an account of Barnes' theological career is unnecessary here. Most scholars have relied, at least to some degree, on the picture painted of Barnes by John Foxe in his *Acts and Monuments*, given the relative scarcity of sources detailing the life of Barnes. Foxe created the narrative of Barnes' life as one in which the friar was initially introduced to humanism in Louvain, which he then transported back to Cambridge, where he and his fellow Austins became interested in German theology as part of the White Horse Tavern group. Within that framework, Barnes entire career as a Lutheran theologian fits nicely into place. This teleological agenda, with the view to show that Barnes had always been inclined to Protestantism, continues to inform Barnes scholarship today, which focuses overwhelmingly on his debt to Luther.

As part of that inherited paradigm, Barnes' time spent as a student at the University of Louvain – notably whilst Erasmus was teaching there in the Collegium Trilingue – has typically featured as the instigation of his evangelicalism. Foxe was the first to make this connection, crediting Barnes with studying the works of Terence, Plautus, and Cicero at Louvain and thereafter introducing such works to the educational programme at
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160 One example is Gordon Rupp, who, in his *Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition*, unashamedly paraphrased Foxe in remarking that Barnes and Parnell returned from Louvain to Cambridge and “made it a circle of eager classical study and read Terence, Plautus and Cicero [the precise wording used by Foxe] to a group of students which included Miles Coverdale” (31-32).
Thus, a group of Austins – Robert Barnes, Thomas Parnell, Myles Coverdale, and Masters Coleman, Field, Burley, and Cambridge, along with “divers others” – participated in this new school of thought. The humanist method, which Barnes learnt whilst at Louvain, is the crucial factor here: by emphasising this methodology and the training in classical languages, Foxe suggested that Barnes was directed towards an evangelical study of Scripture from his studies at Louvain.

Foxe also pointed to Barnes’ involvement in the famous group of Cambridge scholars who regularly met at the White Horse Tavern to discuss German theology – derogatorily termed at the time ‘Little Germany’ – as a factor in Barnes’ evangelicalism. The significance of the White Horse Tavern group has been over-emphasised, yet Foxe’s account is the only source for the existence of this evangelical group, as part of his Protestant narrative designed to show discontent with traditional theology in Cambridge. We can, however, corroborate Barnes’ visit to the University of Louvain from both Augustinian and university matriculation records; after seeking permission to study abroad in December of 1520 at the University of Louvain, Barnes was given permission to do so by the general chapter in March of 1521, and matriculated there in May of that year. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that Barnes reappears in entries in the Cambridge Grace Books in 1522, when he
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161 A&M, 8:1216: “caused the [Cambridge Austin] house shortly to flourish with good letters and made a great part of the house learned,” drawing it out of its “barbarous rudeness.”

162 Two notable exceptions to this trend are Richard Rex and Diarmaid MacCulloch. Rex, in his monograph *Henry VIII and the English Reformation* (London, 2006) remarks that “the myth of the White Horse, embellished by successive generations of historians upon the flimsy basis of a passing and undated reference by Foxe to gatherings of ‘the godly learned in Christ’ at this and other places, distorts our picture of English Lutheranism in the 1520s” (140). Slightly anticipating Rex, MacCulloch stated in his biography of Cranmer that we need to treat the efforts of those who seek to retrospectively identify reformers as members of the White Horse circle with caution, remembering that it was built from a single reference in Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments* (Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven, 1996), 25.

163 It is curious that the most critically minded biography of Barnes, that of Korey Maas, still finds this account persuasive in spite of the lack of evidence. Maas fully admits that “Foxe remains the only source of information regarding the White Horse meetings,” but still maintains that “weight must certainly be given to his [Foxe’s] statement that the inn soon came to be known as the Cambridge ‘Germany’, undoubtedly referring to a common belief that the Luther affair was a prominent topic of conversation” (Maas, *The Reformation and Robert Barnes*, 11). Whilst I do not mean to suggest that this group of men did not know each other, or meet at this inn, we have accorded too much significance to this circle of theologians for Barnes’ own theology.

164 Dd 13, fol. 172r (consulted via *RothSources*, 414-15; D 1032) and Dd 14, fol. 20r (consulted via *RothSources*, 417; D 1035).

was incorporated as a bachelor, and then subsequently doctor in theology, for which he was confirmed by the general chapter in June of 1523. Barnes can only have been in Louvain for a year at most and such a short sojourn to the Low Countries is unlikely to have been the turning point in Barnes’ career as Foxe assumed, nor is there any evidence to suggest that Barnes ever actually met Erasmus whilst there. Additionally, the University of Louvain quickly condemned Luther’s attack on indulgences and maintained unquestionable orthodoxy in the face of emergent reform. We should be cautious against prematurely casting Barnes as an evangelical and seeing his early career in light of his later motivations.

In fact, Barnes’ seminal sermon at St Edward’s, Cambridge on Christmas Eve of 1525, demonstrates that his initial motivations stem directly from his monastic context, rather than experimentation with evangelicalism. Foxe’s account of Barnes’ career depicts the sermon as Barnes’ first foray into evangelicalism, after his conversion by Bilney. According to Foxe:

Barnes what with his reading, disputation & preaching, became famous and mighty in the Scriptures, preaching euer against bishops and hypocrites, and yet dyd not see hys inward and outward Idolatry, which he both taught and mayntained, till that good M. Bilney, with other [...] converted him wholy vnto Christ. The first Sermon that euer he preached of this truth, was the Sunday before Christmas day, at S. Edwardes church longing to Trinitie hall in Cambridge by the pease market.

Foxe argued that the sermon was distinctly evangelical in content, since its “theame was the epistle of the same sonday, Gaudete in domino &c. and so postilled the whole Epistle, folowyng the Scripture and Luthers postill.” Thus, in Foxe’s account, Barnes was clearly evangelical by this point, largely due to his association with the White Horse group, which can be seen in his use of Luther’s theology in his 1525 sermon.

We need not, however, rely on Foxe’s account of this sermon; one of Barnes’ later texts, his Supplication unto Henry VIII, which he released in two editions – the original in 1531 and a revised version in 1534, and so both produced after his flight from England –
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includes his own reflections on his heresy trial. In Barnes’ own framework, the sermon was a denunciation of ecclesiastical abuses and clerical avarice, but it included nothing that could have been considered doctrinally anathema to an alert theologian. There is no reason to doubt Barnes’ own account of this event; by the time he wrote about it in 1531 or 1534, he had already become a devoted Protestant and thus, if anything, would exaggerate his previous evangelicalism. Whilst he might have wanted to downplay his adherence to specifically Lutheran ideas in deference to Henry, elsewhere in the same text he openly avowed Lutheran theological points. And yet, Barnes wrote only of his exhortation to bishops and priests away from “damnable pompe and pryde,” seeing his own sermon not as an acceptance of that evangelical soteriology that he espoused in the same text, but as a criticism of clerical abuses.

In his Supplication, Barnes’ attacks were directed primarily towards bishops, but he saved criticism regarding temporal possessions for any priest who defended the wealth of the Church. He argued against pluralism, stating that he could never believe “that one man may be by the lawe off God a bysshop of ii or iii cyttys ye of an holle contry.” He also suggested that priests ought to keep fewer possessions and live more humbly. According to Barnes,

> It can not be prouyd by Scripture that a man of the churche shulde have so greate temporal possessyons but they will say if they had not so great possessions they could not kepe so many seruantis, so many dogges, so meny horsses as xi. or l. and mayntane so great pompe and pryde and lyve so diliciously. What heresy fynd you in this? Is it heresy to speke agenst youre horsses and youre houndes and youre abhominable lyuynge? And douteles I did not say but that you might haue possessyons but allonly I spake agenste the superfluousnes and the abuse of them.

Barnes was careful to distinguish himself from Spiritual Franciscans and their position on absolute poverty, maintaining that possessions in and of themselves are not abhorrent, simply the extent to which the clergy accrue them. He likened such greedy priests to Judas,
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stating that “they saye they be the successors of Christ and of his apostles but I se them follow none but Judas for they bere the pursse.”\textsuperscript{174} [emphasis mine]

Their greatest offence, however, was the sale of church services, noting that “they sel pardons and remyssions of synnes as openly as a cowe and an oxe is sold for thei never graunt them without monny.”\textsuperscript{175} [emphasis mine] Scathingly, Barnes remarked that “there ys no better marchandysse in chepesyde”\textsuperscript{176} and exhorted churchmen to offer these services without hope of remuneration. He chided priests for their lack of generosity, and the obvious avarice in their position on the ecclesiastical powers of binding and loosing, remarking that so often this “losyth a man out of his cote, yee and often tymes yt losethe from his wyffe, yee and the horsse out of the carte.”\textsuperscript{177} According to Barnes’ account of his preaching and arrest, he “damned in [his] sermon the Gorgious pompe and pryde of all exteryor ornamentys,”\textsuperscript{178} an assertion which was the impetus behind Wolsey’s suspicion of him. At his most inflammatory, Barnes stated: “I graunt that I dyd offend in callyng you ordinary bisshops for I shulde have callid you inordinate buchers,”\textsuperscript{179} playing on Wolsey’s parentage as the son of a butcher in Ipswich.

Barnes’ sermon was thus, by his own account, an incendiary criticism of the actions of many churchmen, including the notorious Cardinal Wolsey, who personally questioned Barnes on many of his points. Of course, by the time he was writing his justification of his sermon, Wolsey was dead and discredited, and an easy object of blame for traditionalists and evangelicals alike. However, at this moment of composing the \textit{Supplication}, Barnes was also a committed evangelical and the rest of his theological arguments within the same text are explicitly Protestant. It covers evangelical topics such as justification by faith,\textsuperscript{180} the bondage of the will,\textsuperscript{181} the importance of the availability of Scripture to the laity,\textsuperscript{182}
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utraquism, and a denunciation of the cult of saints. Nevertheless, in his description of his trial, Barnes made no effort to align the points made in his sermon with his present theological emphases, nor did he make any reference to Luther or his eventual conversion to evangelicalism.

Barnes did not excoriate clerical wealth indiscriminately, but merely castigated those churchmen whom he believed to be taking advantage of the laity in order to contribute to their own financial prosperity. As a correlative to this, Barnes presented himself as a poor man, content to have a poor living, but recognising the importance of preaching to the laity. Whilst at this point, Barnes can no longer be counted as an obedient Austin Friar, his picture of himself is not far from the ideal mendicant example: “I am a symple poure wretche and worth noo mans monny in the worlde,” he wrote. Churchmen, according to Barnes should “be content to haue but a pore lyuing,” and be “constrained oft tymis both to hunger to thrust and to suffer greate colde as Christ and his apostles were.” There are obvious Wycliffite overtones to this discussion, in addition to Barnes carefully exalting what can be essentially identified as the mendicant lifestyle, namely, a religious life of theological study, preaching, poverty, and asceticism, in the hopes of living as the apostles did.

Barnes’ Supplication formed part of a sixteenth-century tradition of religious prose texts dedicated to the king. Most famously, Simon Fish addressed his Supplication of Beggars to Henry VIII in 1529, exhorting the king to reform a church beset by wicked clergy, based on the allegation of clerical oppression of the poor. Fish’s text suggested that the poor were genuine beggars, powerless and impoverished, whilst false beggars, namely clerics, were strong and powerful. This text immensely appealed to public imagination, engaging with previous traditions of anticlerical literature seeking to problematise the extensive wealth of the secular Church, religious orders, and individual clerics. By proposing a
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specious amount of money raised by the mendicant orders – over £43 000 per annum – Fish emulated the *Lollard Disendowment Bill* of 1410 by attempting an economic audit of ecclesiastical income. The trope of supplication to the king was particularly useful here; his anticlerical project cleverly rested on the crown’s desire for increasing its income and Fish used Henry as the perfect foil against a scheming and manipulative clergy. Indeed, Barnes’ 1531 and 1534 editions of his *Supplication* reflect many of the themes of Fish’s text, which are themselves borrowed from William Tyndale’s *Obedience of a Christian Man*, written in 1528. It was Tyndale who initially rejected the claim that the kingdom of the clergy was superior to the temporal realm and who argued that the clergy had encroached within the secular sphere and were responsible for provoking disobedience. Barnes’ 1525 sermon did not venture into this sphere, but its statement against clerical wealth show his incipient disillusionment with the clergy and his later *Supplication* places him squarely within this deeply political textual tradition.

After Barnes, Miles Coverdale features as the most significant reformer originating from the Augustinian order in England. As one of Barnes’ colleagues at the Cambridge house of Austin Friars, Coverdale followed the footsteps of his erstwhile prior, whilst developing his own theological ideas. Most famous for his translation of the Bible into English – lying behind the Great Bible of 1539 – Coverdale was a colleague and friend of Tyndale. Much of his career was spent on the Continent, fleeing dangerous Henrician England at the end of 1528, though he ended up as bishop of Exeter in the Church of Edward VI and after further exile under Mary, was an honoured churchman under Elizabeth I.

The scholarship on Coverdale is considerably less extensive than on Barnes. The three major works on Coverdale are by J.F. Mozley, Henry Guppy, and William Dallmann,
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all significantly outdated.\textsuperscript{193} The scholarship is focused primarily – and perhaps rightly so – on his translation and publication of the Bible, which certainly has remained his most significant contribution to the English Reformation. For example, Mozley’s authoritative study of Coverdale has the Bible as the subject of all but two of the fifteen chapters.\textsuperscript{194} As with Barnes, there has been little attention given to his monastic background, with the emphasis placed on his relationship with Tyndale as the overarching motivation behind his reforms.

Coverdale’s theological works are few, as the majority of his works are translations of German evangelical texts. His Bible, published in 1535, could be regarded as part of the Augustinian trend of concern for accessibility of the Scriptures.\textsuperscript{195} Coverdale’s only original work was his defence of Robert Barnes’ public statement before his execution in 1540, against the criticisms of the traditionalist secular priest John Standish. This text is the clearest statement of Coverdale’s evangelicalism, defending his former prior’s Lutheran ideas and castigating traditional theology for its focus on works, saints, and the priesthood. This text reminds historians that we must consider Coverdale not only as a prolific translator, but also as an active reformer, with developing theological ideas.

Coverdale made the acquaintance of Cromwell before his flight to the Continent in 1528, as is demonstrated by correspondence between the two men, in which Coverdale requested that he be sent books to help with his studies, as he had begun “to taste of holy Scriptures” and was “set to the most sweet smell of holy letters, with the godly savour of holy and ancient doctors, unto whose knowledge [he] cannot attain without diversity of books.”\textsuperscript{196} In this letter, Coverdale recalled a meeting – or “godly communication” – he and

\textsuperscript{193} See J.F. Mozley, \textit{Coverdale and his Bibles} (London, 1953); Henry Guppy, \textit{Miles Coverdale and the English Bible, 1488-1568} (Manchester, 1935); and William Dallmann, \textit{Miles Coverdale: Bishop of Exeter, translator of the first complete English Bible, translator of works of Luther and others, translator of the first English Luther hymn-book, twice Lutheran pastor in Germany} (St Louis, 1925) for the major works on Coverdale.

\textsuperscript{194} Mozley, \textit{Coverdale and his Bibles}, 1-59 (chapters 1 and 2, which are the only sections concerned with Coverdale himself).

\textsuperscript{195} Martin Luther published the German Bible in 1522, whereas Julian Macho, a French Augustinian, had completed a translation of the Scriptures into French in the late 1480s.

\textsuperscript{196} \textit{Remains of Myles Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter}, ed. George Pearson (Cambridge, 1846), 490; \textit{LP} 5, no. 221; \textit{SP} 1/65 fol. 238r.
Cromwell had had with Thomas More at his house the previous Easter, beginning a patronal relationship with Cromwell, which was to benefit him greatly in the future regarding his Scriptural translations. According to Foxe, shortly before his departure in 1528, Coverdale was preaching in secular garb against forms of traditional religion such as auricular confession and the worship of images.

Coverdale, through his friendships with Heinrich Bullinger, John Calvin, and Conrad Hubert (the secretary to Martin Bucer), displayed a much stronger affinity to Swiss reform than was ever the case with Barnes, who, for the most part, maintained the theological assertions as presented by Luther. Not only was Coverdale committed to translating Bullinger’s works into English, but his continued correspondence with Calvin over the new English order of communion also suggests theological tendency towards Swiss reform. Moreover, his shock at Luther’s lambasting of the sacramental views of Zwingli and Oecolampadius supports the view that Coverdale held a Reformed view of the Eucharist, whereas his erstwhile prior Barnes had argued strongly in favour of the real presence. There is nothing, however, to suggest that Coverdale was harbouring evangelical ideas before he fled to mainland Europe, other than Foxe and Bale’s post facto assertions that the Austin friary in Cambridge had been a den of evangelicalism and humanism. His early concerns – a shared concern with Barnes regarding clerical abuses and the inappropriateness of clerical wealth, image worship, and auricular confession – along with the tradition that he maintained relationships with the community of Lollards in Essex, are highly suggestive of shared ideas with Lollard thinkers, rather than an early inclination towards evangelicalism.

The third reformer of the English Austin Friars is the much-maligned George Browne. Browne has often been characterised both as marginal to the English Reformation,}
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in spite of his involvement in the Dissolution of the Monasteries and as a moral reprobate, willing to do anything in order to further his personal interests. Browne has frequently appeared in histories of the Reformation in Ireland, given his position as the archbishop of Dublin, and was misrepresented by Robert Ware in the seventeenth century, from whom developed a tradition, in which Browne typically featured as the focus of confessional disagreements in Ireland. Brendan Bradshaw has given the best analysis of the existing portrayals of Browne and his contributions to evangelicalism in England and Ireland, and Diarmaid MacCulloch exposed the extent to which Ware’s forgeries are a misrepresentation of Browne. Bradshaw depicts Browne “neither as monster of vice nor a paragon of virtue” and argues that he is best thought of as an administrative reformer.

Browne’s involvement in English reform was heavily dependent on the relationship he established with Thomas Cromwell, who saw to the appointment of Browne as Archbishop of Dublin in 1536. After leasing property within the precinct of the London Austin priory to Cromwell, Browne came to be used by Cromwell as a pulpit propagandist, preaching the Royal Supremacy and the legitimacy of the king’s marriage to Anne Boleyn over several years. His appointment in 1534 as General Visitor to the mendicant orders was a practical and institutional contribution to the Henrician reform agenda. After his move to Dublin, his attempts at establishing reform in Ireland were notoriously unsuccessful, encountering resistance from the clerical élite within the English Pale and eventually compromising with this group after Cromwell’s downfall.

The fact that Browne’s major contributions to reform were at an institutional level
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led Brendan Bradshaw to argue that Browne’s reform activity was driven by his personal devotion to the Crown rather than deeply held evangelical ideas.\textsuperscript{210} James Murray has since questioned this view, suggesting that Browne had a strong attachment to the idea of Royal Supremacy, like many other clerics promoted to the episcopal bench by Cromwell.\textsuperscript{211} Murray persuasively demonstrates Browne’s ideological commitment to the doctrinal basis of the Royal Supremacy: not only did Browne preach to that effect, but in his correspondence to Cromwell, he also made repeated allusions to the partnership between the promotion of the supremacy and of the Gospel.\textsuperscript{212} In 1533, Browne had displayed his evangelicalism in a letter to Cromwell, asking him to act on behalf of a student, Robert Radcliffe. In this letter, Browne recommended Radcliffe because of his exceptional humanist and evangelical pursuits, corroborated by a letter from Radcliffe to Cromwell in which he displayed his knowledge of Hebrew.\textsuperscript{213} Furthermore, the traditionalist-minded Bishop of London John Stokesley complained to Cromwell in 1535 regarding Browne’s preaching of pernicious doctrine and his unusual fashion of commemorating the dead.\textsuperscript{214} Browne’s correspondence with Cromwell as the Archbishop of Dublin once again reveals his earnestness in the promotion of Cromwell’s religious programme.\textsuperscript{215} Whilst Browne certainly did not behave as a radical, continental reformer, there is persuasive evidence to suggest that his actions were ideologically motivated.

George Browne’s reforming activity in his English years was often done in conjunction with William Wetherall, the prior provincial of the Austin Friars in England from 1520 until the Dissolution in 1538 and 1539. In 1520, Wetherall requested confirmation as the prior provincial from the general chapter and was censured almost immediately for his lack of attention to the matter of Sebastian of Venice and Edmund
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Bellond, and for attempting to delay the provincial chapter by six years.\textsuperscript{216} With the help of Cardinal Wolsey, he threw the weight of the most powerful magnate in England behind his suppression of a change in provincial priors, staying on as provincial for almost twenty years.\textsuperscript{217}

Wetherall cannot be considered as a reformer in the strictest sense; he preached no evangelical ideas that we know of, nor is there any evidence of his involvement in institutional reforms. He did, however, outwardly supported the King’s break from Rome, and was the personal acquaintance of the London cloth merchant and notable evangelical Humphrey Monmouth. Monmouth was a known patron of many early evangelicals – most prominently William Tyndale and Robert Barnes\textsuperscript{218} – and Wetherall was significantly included in the list of religious men for whom Monmouth was a benefactor.\textsuperscript{219}

Edmund Bellond and Wetherall functioned as a team to maximise the profits gained from their plenary indulgence of 1516, which both of them marketed aggressively.\textsuperscript{220} It is perhaps this concern for financial prosperity that led him to allow Barnes to engage in the evangelical book trade. Barnes was selling copies of Tyndale’s English New Testament to Lollards whilst under house arrest at the London convent of Austin Friars, when it was Bellond there as prior and Wetherall as provincial.\textsuperscript{221} Such behaviour ought not to have been acceptable under Augustinian regulations concerning monastic imprisonment, but we might surmise that Wetherall and Bellond’s commodification of devotion led them to see Barnes’ commercial activity as within the bounds of acceptable behaviour.

Primarily concerned with the political and financial state of his order, Wetherall turned a blind eye to clear contraventions of the Augustinian Constitutions, such as the
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cases of Edmund Bellond and Sebastian of Venice, for which the general prior cited Wetherall repeatedly. The same occurred at Canterbury in 1527, when friars were accused of serious infractions. Wetherall had failed in his responsibility as provincial to step in and he was censured by the general chapter for failing to impose the necessary standards upon his brethren. Wetherall was in no way a reformer like Barnes, concerned about the religious state of his order; rather, he was happy to acquiesce in Henry’s wishes and use the religious services provided by his confrères for the accumulation of wealth. Wetherall represents, perhaps, the Austin Friar whom we might view with the most cynicism, as someone, like Bellond, motivated primarily by wealth. And yet, it is unlikely that Monmouth would have favoured him if that was the case, and so, we should allow for the possibility that Wetherall had genuine evangelical concerns.

The nexus of these reforms all centred on relationships with Thomas Cromwell; Cromwell transformed the London convent of Austin Friars into a hub of reform-minded, evangelical, and continental ideas. With his move there, possibly from as early as 1523, he seems to have developed influential relationships with key Austin Friars, harnessing their religious energies for his use. It is not surprising that it was the Austin Friars in London who hosted an esteemed German evangelical preacher, often thought to be Myconius, when he was in London in 1538 as part of the team from the Schmalkaldic League involved in royal theological discussions, preaching there at every feast day.

This is not to suggest that every dissenting Austin Friar in England in the sixteenth century had some connection to Cromwell. Many expressed evangelical views independently of any interaction with the politician, such as Francis Eliot, who was accused of heresy in 1536, after reports of his preaching against the utility of confession, purgatory, fasting,
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penance, and ember days.\footnote{225} There was also the group of friars at Clare discussed earlier who were cited for their Lollard theology.\footnote{226} In 1538, John Goodwin, who had been a student of Barnes’ at Cambridge and had helped Coverdale, Parnell, and others in defending their teacher and prior against charges of heresy,\footnote{227} was himself accused of heresy, after having preached in Northampton against transubstantiation.\footnote{228} Goodwin, the prior of the Austins in Northampton,\footnote{229} had a reputation as a thief; according to Dr John London, he confessed to have stolen over a hundred pounds of plate.\footnote{230} London referred to him as a great “dicer and reveler”, and included in his letter to Cromwell evidence of fraudulent receipts and bills of sale, which Goodwin had used to embezzle money from the priory. In 1527, the Oxford Austin Friar John Dayryke, alias Daywyke, was reported to have married a woman named Alice Crispe and maintained Lutheran opinions.\footnote{231} Lastly, John Hardiman, sometime student of Robert Barnes at Cambridge and the last prior of the convent at Cambridge, was prosecuted in 1540 under the Act of the Six Articles, and later married.\footnote{232} Hardiman had signed the surrender of his house with fellow Austins John Barber, Thomas Norley, and Thomas Watson,\footnote{233} and had been recommended by Hilsey to Cromwell as a studious man, of good conversation.\footnote{234} Hardiman was later mentioned by Foxe as the radical parson of St Martin Ironmonger Lane; according to Foxe, Hardiman preached openly against confession, ceremonies, and sacraments.\footnote{235} It was likely for these opinions that he was censured and deprived in 1541, but in 1560, come the accession of Elizabeth, he was appointed as one of the twelve prebendaries of Westminster.\footnote{236} He must have been too

\footnotesize

\footnote{225}\textit{LP} 11, no. 1424; \textit{SP} 1/113 fol. 89r.
\footnote{226} See page 234-5.
\footnote{227} A&M, 8:1217.
\footnote{228} E. Peacock, “Extracts from the Lincoln Episcopal Visitations in the 15th, 16th and 17th Centuries” \textit{Archaeologia} 48 (1884): 249-269 at 264.
\footnote{229} See their surrender in 1538, where Goodwin signs as prior (\textit{LP} 13:2, no. 704).
\footnote{230} \textit{LP} 13:2, no. 719; \textit{SP} 1/138 fol. 45r.
\footnote{233} \textit{LP} 13:2, no. 493; \textit{Faculty Office Registers 1534-1549}, 169 for dispensations for changes of habit; London, TNA, SC6-H8-7286 for surrender of house.
\footnote{234} \textit{LP} 13:2, no. 410; \textit{SP} 1/136, fol. 172r-v.
\footnote{235} A&M, 8:1228. See also Susan Brigden, \textit{London and the Reformation} (Oxford, 1989), 399.
\footnote{236} Benjamin Brook, \textit{The Lives of the Puritans} (London, 1813), 1:116.
radical for Elizabeth, however, as in 1567, he was deprived of his benefice after having been charged with breaking down altars and destroying ornaments belonging to Westminster.\footnote{Ibid.} This is a strange accumulation of friars, none of whom have any properly discernible connection to each other; their disparate involvement in evangelicalism attests to the variety of theological views espoused by the Augustinian order.

These friars were a small minority, when most stayed silent in the face of Henrician reforms. Some, in contrast, were voices for religious conservatism. John Stokes the younger might be the most notorious of these theological conservatives amongst sixteenth-century Austin Friars, indicted for his continued preaching against Matthew Parker in East Anglia, and known primarily from his role in the conviction of Thomas Bilney, one of the first cause célèbres of the Reformation. Stokes obtained a bachelor’s degree in 1517 at Cambridge,\footnote{GraceBookG, 160.} and was the prior of the convent in Cambridge – and therefore Barnes’ immediate predecessor – in 1521, when he was bequeathed money by Robert Reson to sing mass for a year at the Scala Coeli altar in the Austin Friars priory there.\footnote{Cambridge, CUA, Vice-Chancellor’s Probate Register, Wills I (1501-58), fol. 35v-36r.} Two years later, he obtained his doctorate alongside Robert Barnes,\footnote{GraceBookB, 2:104; Dd 14, fol. 129r (consulted via RothSources, D 1045).} and was incorporated into the University of Oxford in 1532.\footnote{BRUO, 170.} We first hear of Stokes as controversial in correspondence from Miles Coverdale to Thomas Cromwell from August of 1527, wherein he lamented the state of his priory at Cambridge, noting that one had been accused of homicide, another of heresy, and a third, namely, John Stokes, of theft.\footnote{LP 4:2, no. 3388. SP 1/44 fol. 34r.}

Stokes’ overtly conservative theological career began with his debate with Bilney in 1531. Foxe claimed that he stayed with Bilney in prison, disputing points of theology, until the writ arrived stating that Bilney was to be executed.\footnote{A&M, 8:1032; StrypeMP, 1:23 for his conference with Bilney.} This came after Stokes had been licensed to preach in February of 1526 by Bishop Cuthbert Tunstall as part of his campaign...
against heresy. In 1537 he was sent by the conservative bishop of Norwich, William Rugge alias Repps, backed by the religiously traditional Duke of Norfolk, to Clare to preach against Matthew Parker, who had been preaching evangelically as the dean of nearby Stoke College. He became a member of the Austin Friary at Clare, and began to preach in the parish church, stirring controversy over his negative remarks about Parker. Around the same time, he also began to preach at the Cluniac Priory at Thetford, a haven for conservative theology and the home of the family mausoleum of the Dukes and Earls of Norfolk.

Stokes had been officially trumpeting royal supremacy, but was also being used by Rugge to make the case for traditional religion against Parker. When news of his conservatism reached Cromwell via Richard Ingworth, Bishop of Dover, Stokes was imprisoned in the summer of 1538. Stokes was thoroughly frightened by the arrest, and later that year, wrote to Cromwell pleading for his clemency, promising that he had not preached anything inappropriate and that he would be more committed to proclaiming royal supremacy, begging for dispensation to change his habit to that of a secular priest. Furthermore, he suggested that he had come to Clare, not in order to antagonise Parker, but because the scarcity of preachers there compelled him to move back to his home and to be of service there. Cromwell released Stokes, likely after tense conversations with the Duke of Norfolk and in an effort to neutralise the growing conflict in the Stour valley, and Stokes went on to be prior of Clare, for which he dutifully signed the surrender within only a month or two in 1538.

He continued to enjoy powerful traditionalist backing in East Anglia,
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receiving his dispensation to hold secular benefices in 1544, and being installed as a prebendary in Norwich Cathedral by Bishop Rugge, from which he was only forced to resign as late as 1565, in a very different theological climate.

Stokes, in contrast to the numerous outspoken evangelicals from the Augustinian order, was the only conservative who made any significant impact on the religious turbulence of this period. Ultimately, he fell victim to the Cromwellian agenda, which saw him pitted against a famed evangelical preacher under the direction of influential conservatives in East Anglia. His run-in with Cromwell and Parker, whilst not resulting in a grisly end as it might have done, effectively silenced him as a champion of conservatism. This is one of the few instances during the English Reformation where a friar developed such an antagonistic relationship with a reformer. Perhaps the only adequate comparison is Hugh Latimer and Friar William Hubberdine in Bristol, although even this cannot match the intensity of the conflict between Parker and Stokes.

Stokes’ preaching is testament to how the Austin Friars used their sermons to garner the support of local élites and political powers. Stokes, initially backed by the conservative Bishop of Norwich and Duke of Norfolk, used his conservative preaching record to garner traditionalist support in the Stour valley. Moreover, Cromwell’s use of him as a mouthpiece for royal supremacy reveals an interesting facet in the Austins’ relationship with this powerful politician; Cromwell was well aware of the potency of the preaching of the Austin Friars and set about using it to his advantage, even if Stokes was perhaps an unwilling candidate.

Another Austin Friar who openly opposed the religious changes under Henry VIII was a friar resident at the convent in Rye; named as James by Sir Edward Guildford in a letter to Cromwell, this friar was arrested by the mayor and put in Guildford’s custody after
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having spoken seditiously against the King's new marriage in 1533. Friar John Stone is the other notable Austin Friar who stood in opposition to the Henrician reforms as a religious conservative. A friar from Canterbury, Stone refused to swear an oath avowing the Royal Supremacy during his convent's visitation in December of 1538, and thus was arrested by Ingworth for treason. Stone was imprisoned for a year and executed by hanging, disembowelling, and quartering for his refusal to acknowledge the King as the head of the Church.

Thus, the changing religious environment engendered a wide diversity of responses from the Austin Friars. Even the virulently reformist friars – Barnes, Browne, and Coverdale – all had strikingly different visions of religious reform. Moreover, their platforms of reform were by no means accepted whole-heartedly by the rest of their order; many of the Austins, like William Wetherall and Edmund Bellond, were themselves engaged in the system that allowed the order to exploit the penitential system, which men like Barnes found abhorrent. Others, like George Browne, sought influential patronage from the likes of Thomas Cromwell in order to achieve prosperity for himself and his confrères, whereas John Stone and the friar from Rye refused to abide by Cromwell's new religious policies.

We must remember that the majority of Austin Friars were experiencing inescapable and crippling poverty at the time of their suppression in 1538, and there was thus little defence they could mount to save their order from Cromwell; they were utterly lacking in influence and desperate for dispensation and employment. As such, the low numbers of Austins preaching conservatively are likely reflective of this weakness and lack of influence, and should not be taken as complacency on the part of the friars. Even Stokes, with the
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backing of the Duke of Norfolk, Bishop Tunstall, and Bishop Rugge, was still victim to the efforts of Cromwell in the destruction of the friaries.

The other conclusion to be drawn here is that the English Austin Friars were not inherently inclined towards Protestantism, in contrast to Foxe’s portrayals of Barnes and Coverdale. Austins from the same educational context, such as Barnes and Stokes, each came to radically different opinions, regardless of their monastic fraternity. Rather, the Austins who became Protestant typically were not so until they travelled to the Continent and encountered evangelicals there. The anxieties voiced by Austins in England were far more concerned with clerical wealth and clerical abuses, and whilst these concerns certainly reflect their worries about the Church as a whole, their specific monastic context, and the disputes within their order, helps us to understand why those anxieties came to prominence for them.

The Austins’ connection to evangelicalism, however, is significant when put into relief by comparison with other orders. Robert Barnes, Miles Coverdale, and John Bale are certainly the three most well known English friars who turned to evangelicalism and the Austins claim two of these three, with John Bale having originated in the Carmelite order. The Carmelites, an order of similar size, otherwise claimed few reformers, with comparatively little impact: John Barret, who was accused alongside Bale of heresy in 1536, John Bird, an evangelical preacher who married under Edward VI and was deprived of his benefices by Mary Tudor, John Hurleston, who was deprived of his benefice in 1554 for marriage, and Simon Clerkson, who had been similarly lost his benefice under Mary for having married. In terms of opposition to evangelicalism or the Henrician reforms, in comparison to John Stokes, John Stone, and the friar from Rye from the Austins, the Carmelites can only claim Laurence Cook, the last prior of Doncaster, who was executed for

258 Ibid., 49.
259 Ibid., 54.
his involvement with the Pilgrimage of Grace.\textsuperscript{260}

It was the Observant Franciscans who were the loudest voices against reform. John Forest, an Observant friar from Greenwich, was the only man to be burned as a heretic in Henrician England for traditional beliefs (as opposed to being charged with treason for adhering to the pope, like the Austin John Stone).\textsuperscript{261} He was later rumoured to have been a confessor to Catherine of Aragon, although, as Peter Marshall points out, there is no evidence to support this claim.\textsuperscript{262} Other Observants, Anthony Browne, John Waire, and a Friar Hemmysley, were executed for refusing the Oath of Supremacy.\textsuperscript{263} Friars Thomas Danyell and Henry Bukkery fled to Scotland for their loyalty to Rome and Newark Observants Hugh Payn and Thomas Hayfield fled to the Continent in 1534 for the same reason.\textsuperscript{264} William Peyto, one-time confessor to Catherine of Aragon, preached against the king’s marriage to Anne Boleyn in 1533 and was defended by his confrère John Elstow. Both were arrested and then banished.\textsuperscript{265} Richard Risby and Hugh Rich were executed in 1534 for having advised Elizabeth Barton.\textsuperscript{266} Numerous Observants were imprisoned for defending the papacy, such as Anthony Brookby, Thomas Cort, and Thomas Belchiam.\textsuperscript{267}

The Observants were also some of the strongest voices for reform, particularly in the earlier period. John Rix composed \textit{The Ymage of Love}, an evangelical tract, in 1525, which soon after received church censure, and he later translated a German evangelical work by Otto Brunfels and dedicated the work to Cromwell.\textsuperscript{268} Jerome Barlow and William Roy fled England in the mid-1520s to join Tyndale on the Continent and Roy was later burned in 1531 in Portugal.\textsuperscript{269} The last warden of the Greenwich priory, Hugh Glasier, received

\textsuperscript{260} \textit{Ibid.}, 57.
\textsuperscript{262} \textit{Ibid.}, 354.
\textsuperscript{263} Steck, \textit{Franciscans and the Protestant Revolution in England}, 170-71.
\textsuperscript{264} \textit{Ibid.}, 61.
\textsuperscript{265} \textit{Ibid.}, 40.
\textsuperscript{266} \textit{Ibid.}, 47-8.
\textsuperscript{267} \textit{Ibid.}, 67-72.
\textsuperscript{269} \textit{Ibid.}. 
patronage from Cranmer and was given a prebendary at Canterbury Cathedral in 1542.\footnote{Ibid., 46}

It was likely the Dominicans who produced the most voices active in this period, both for and against reform. Clement Thredar, Richard Clay, Robert Ward, Stephen Wilson, John Madowell, John Scory, James Cosyn, John Lawrence, John Reynolds, Maurice Griffith, John Hodgkins and William Grey were all Dominicans who were significant proponents of evangelical reform.\footnote{Rex, “The Friars in the English Reformation,” passim.} John Hilsey and Richard Ingworth were the two most important reformers from this English order. John Crayford, John Hopton, John de Coloribus, Edmund Harcock, Robert Buckenham, Richard Marshall, William Peryn, and John Pickering were amongst those Dominicans who were opponents of the Royal Supremacy and advocates of the traditional religion.\footnote{Ibid.} The Conventual Franciscans, too, were significant: their evangelical voices included Paul Luther, John Vyall, John Joseph, Edward Large, John Williams, Gilbert Berkeley, Thomas Kirkham, Guy Eton, Louis Wager, and John Cardmaker.\footnote{Ibid.} William Watts, Robert Thyxtyll, John Kington, William Call, John Arthur, Gavin Jones, Peter Lawrence, Giles Coventry, Alexander Barclay, Edmund Brygett, and Peter Brinkley make up the impressive list of Franciscans who opposed reform and championed traditional beliefs.\footnote{Ibid.}

The Austins cannot compete with these numbers of reformers who originated within the Dominican or Franciscan orders. Where they are significant, however, is in the impact of the reformers they did produce: Barnes, Browne, and Coverdale are of considerable importance for the playing out of the English Reformation and Barnes may be the single most influential and well known friar to become an evangelical in England, rivalled only by John Bale. The Austins were remarkable in the degree and influence of their reform, rivalling even the Franciscans and Dominicans in the impact of their reformers.

IV. Fraternity

Even throughout the drastic religious changes of the sixteenth century, we can identify
threads of the Augustinian culture that persist. Even when many of these reformers had ceased to consider themselves friars, relationships were maintained with the friars whom they had considered their religious brothers. The best example, unsurprisingly, is that of Robert Barnes. The most striking instance occurs in his 1534 edition of his Supplication. In spite of his strong evangelical ideas, Barnes chose to end his text with the clause “Wetheral provincial of the fryar austynes” in order to date the text.²⁷⁵ That he felt that reference to his order’s provincial prior was important in a text that disavowed traditional religion is suggestive of Barnes’ Augustinian formation in spite of his formal departure from the order. Not only had he not been living as an Austin Friar since his escape from house arrest, but also neither had he been residing in England for over five years by this point, making his identification not only with the Austin Friars but specifically the English Austin Friars remarkable.

Moreover, in his Supplication, Barnes curiously defended the burial practice of friars over the secular clergy; noting that rich men were buried in parish churches, Barnes maintained that the friars offered legitimate and adequate burial space to the poor.²⁷⁶ Perhaps most significantly, when he escaped from incarceration and fled to the Continent, he sought out Martin Luther, a fellow Austin Friar, even though at this point there is nothing to suggest that Barnes maintained any Lutheran positions. That relationship with Luther was a special one; when Barnes was executed in 1540, Luther composed a martyrlogy of him entitled the Bekenntnis des Glaubens which included Barnes’ final confession and Luther’s preface.²⁷⁷ Luther composed this genre of text exclusively for his fellow Augustinians, famously doing so for Hendrik van Zütphen, one of the martyred Antwerp Augustinians,²⁷⁸ in his 1525 text The Burning of Brother Henry.²⁷⁹

²⁷⁵ Barnes, A Supplication unto the most gracyous prince H. the viij, sig. PP2r.
²⁷⁶ Ibid., sig. H3r. “Also they curse them that be not buryed in their parysh church/ yt must be understond yff that they be ryche men/ for yf they be poore they may be buryed amonge the fryars.”
This impetus amongst Austin Friars to defend each other, even in the face of accusations of heresy, is attested elsewhere. When he was arrested for heresy, it was Barnes’ fellow Austins Miles Coverdale, John Goodwin, and Thomas Parnell who helped him to prepare his case. After Barnes’ death, it was Miles Coverdale who rushed to his defence against John Standish. Coverdale also maintained strong links with his former Augustinian life; he lived in the Augustinian convent in London in the late 1520s, but perhaps significantly moved back there in 1568; he and his wife lived in a house within the former precinct of the Austin Friars, at this point taken over by the Merchant Taylors. It is interesting that Coverdale should have desired to return to this site, long after the Austin Friars had been expelled.

Like Coverdale and Barnes, Browne sought out other Austin Friars even once an evangelical; after his installation as Archbishop of Dublin, he recommended to Henry VIII that his fellow Austin Richard Nangle, the vicar provincial of the Irish limit and key figure in the foundation of the Galway convent, be appointed as Bishop of Clonfert. Henry appointed Nangle as the bishop in 1536, and the Austin was consecrated the following June. In spite of his appointment, however, he failed to take control of his see, which had been in the possession of the papal appointee, Roland Burke, whom he feared given his strong political connections. Burke was the brother of the lord of Clanricade, and Lord Grey, Henry’s viceroy, abandoned the political conflict, eventually offering confirmation of Burke’s appointment. As a failed bishop of Clonfert, Nangle functioned from 1539 onwards as Browne’s suffragan bishop since Nangle could preach wherever knowledge of the Irish language was necessary. After his death, likely in 1541, the king officially recognised

---
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Burke as Bishop of Clonfert. We cannot dismiss as coincidental the fact that Browne chose an Austin Friar as his closest helper in instituting the Henrician reforms in Ireland.

The persistence of Augustinian fraternity must always remain speculative. Browne, Barnes, and Coverdale, the prime examples of this, were towering personalities who also worked with a myriad of theologians from entirely different religious backgrounds. Yet we should be conquisant that there were Austin Friars who chose to seek out other Austins, even after the order was dissolved or after they had decided to leave the mendicant life. Others wrote fervent apologies of the religious and theological ideas of their confrères, coming to the defence of their former brethren when necessary. We cannot say that the Austins maintained stronger relationships with their former brethren than they did with other theologians, but we can see hints of their former monastic profession peeking through their writings and behaviour once the English province of the order had been dissolved. We should not be surprised that their strong ideas regarding monastic life and Augustinian religion should have taken substantial time to subside.

Conclusions

This wide variety of reforms within the English Augustinian order is testament to the diversity of theological, devotional, and social priorities within the Augustinian order. This inconsistency was a fundamental part of their religious culture, taking its roots in their historic appreciation of open theological debate as witnessed in the writings of John Capgrave. How friars theologically opposed like Robert Barnes and John Goodwin could exist within the same order attests to their theological inclusivity. Both were reformers, but were on entirely different sides of the Eucharistic issue, a theological problem so significant for Barnes that he was involved in the arrest and execution of a fellow reformer, John Lambert, for his divergent opinions. In a similar fashion, John Stone and George Browne could both be Austin Friars; Browne sought out institutional and magisterial reform by cooperating with the Crown whilst Stone was executed for his refusal to abide by such plans.

Miles Coverdale and John Stokes, colleagues whilst at Cambridge, took their Augustinian training in very different directions. Stokes preached conservatively against the sermons of Matthew Parker and the Lollardy of Thomas Bilney, whereas Coverdale first converted other Austin Friars to Lollardy and then became the cornerstone of Augustinian Protestantism in England by producing the English Bible.

This may seem inconsequential; surely, one might argue, the mendicant orders should have been just as fragmented during this period of religious tumult as any other group. This, in fact, is the conclusion presented by Richard Rex in his valuable article on the participation of the friars in the English Reformation.\textsuperscript{287} And whilst this is certainly true, their participation within the theological debate was disproportionate to their size. It was perhaps the Observant Franciscans who were the loudest and earliest voices for evangelicalism in this period,\textsuperscript{288} but the consistent appearance of the Austin Friars throughout the Henrician reforms, lurking in the background to many of the crucial moments in Henry’s reforms, is noteworthy.

The Observance is clearly an integral element here and its absence from England helps to explain two phenomena occurring within the English Austin Friars. Firstly, the lack of systematic and institutional monastic reform led to a degree of dissatisfaction within the Augustinian order, which Observance might have helped to neutralise. Secondly, the absence of Observance helps to explain the lack of any real Protestant discourse amongst English Austin Friars prior to substantial contact with continental reformers. The agitation present amongst the Austins did not attack the legitimacy of Augustinian life, but rather suggested that the friars were not meeting the expectations of that life. When we analyse strong voices for Protestantism within their monastic context, we find them to have been motivated initially by their abhorrence of clerical wealth and not necessarily by stock evangelical concerns. The link here with Observance is that the major reformers from the

\textsuperscript{288} Ibid., 41.
Augustinian order all had fairly strong, tangible links with Observance.\textsuperscript{289} Without this basis, the English Austin Friars’ moves to reforms verged only into the realm of disillusionment with the avarice of their order and the slackening of their fellow Austins’ maintenance of the Constitutions.

\textsuperscript{289} Martin, “The Augustinian Observant Movement,” 327-28. The most prominent evangelicals from the Austin Friars are Martin Luther, Wenzeslaus Link, Johann Lang, Gabriel Zwilling, Richard Nangle, the Antwerp Augustinians, including Jakob Propst and Hendrik van Zütpfen, Jean Chatelain, Michel d’Arande, Agostino Mainairdi da Piemonti, Giulio della Rovere, Ambrogo da Milano, and Nicolo da Verona.
Conclusion

When Capgrave wrote his *Life of Saint Katharine*, he described his profession into the Augustinian order. “Owt of þe world to my profyte I cam,” he wrote, “on-to the þe brotherhood qwech I am inne.”¹ His entrance into this brotherhood required that he “follow þe steppes of [his] faders be-for, which *to the rewle of Austen wer swore.*”² [emphasis mine] What did it mean for him to follow in the footsteps of his Augustinian fathers? How was the *Regula Sancti Augustini* salient for him and his confrères? How did he and his fellow friars imitate Augustine and what did they consider important about being Augustinian?

This project began from initial interest in the overwhelming presence of the Austin Friars in the Reformation. Why was it that so many Augustinians seemed predisposed to evangelicalism? Did the order’s relationship to Augustine incline them somehow towards evangelical soteriology? And yet, the more I delved into the history and activity of the order, the more I was struck by its profound inconsistency; the Austin Friars professed such vastly disparate ideas of reform and monastic practice that often appeared to have no connective thread. Certainly, many turned to evangelicalism, but so too were many vehemently conservative. Some professed eremitical monasticism, whereas others sought mendicant preaching, or even disavowed asceticism altogether. Some supported papal policies and worked in close quarters with the papal office, and others spoke bitterly about the practices of the Roman curia. Most incomprehensibly, it baffled me how the only order founded by a pope and historically invested in the legitimacy of the papal office could come to produce such vehemently antipapal thinkers. How could I ever resolve these palpable tensions within the Augustinian order? How could we ever know if it meant anything significant to be an Austin Friar? How could such polarities exist within one order whilst maintaining a coherent sense of what it meant to be Augustinian?

And yet, their persistence in the Reformation, both in England and on the Continent, although it was the English context with which I was primarily concerned, continued to

¹ Capgrave, *The Life of Saint Katharine of Alexandria*, 16.
² Ibid.
intrigue me. Moreover, I realised that I had been asking the wrong questions about Austin Friars and the Reformation. Many, in the vein of Oberman, Trapp, and Zumkeller, have asked why Luther and others all sprang from the Augustinian order; all this achieves, I discovered, is to project the concerns of the sixteenth century onto the years preceding it, and thus to obscure the priorities of the Augustinians in the fifteenth century. This line of enquiry serves to direct our attention to the notable number of evangelicals amongst the Austin Friars, to those instances of anticlericalism, antifraternalism, and iconoclasm, and thus necessarily distorts the picture we have of the Austins by neglecting all those cases that do not contribute to evangelicalism, but which may have been just as significant for the friars at the time.

Rather, a more incisive question was regarding the monastic context of those reformers who had their origins in the Augustinian order. How can we make their theological ideas more intelligible by considering their monastic formation, which had thitherto been the single most important factor in their views on religion? How was the Austins’ role in both ecclesiastical and secular society important for their production of reformers? How did they shape their origin story in a specifically English context and what implications did that have for their religious culture? Once I understood what the Austin Friars might have thought was significant about membership to their order, about their foundation story, and about their role within the English landscape, I might explore how that religious culture played out in the religious changes of the sixteenth century.

The way to understand this Augustinian culture, I thought, must surely rest in their own writings on the religious example of their monastic founder; since the Austins connected their order to Augustine so self-consciously and made concerted efforts to show their order’s legacy from Augustine, it stands to reason that the way that they presented his life and actions must reveal their ideas regarding the ideal religious life. As the archetypal Austin Friar, Augustine, both in his life and in his Regula, was the mirror by which the friars fashioned themselves. Their notion of Augustinianism was to be found within the pages of Capgrave’s Life of Saint Augustine and Bokenham’s Legenda Aurea; there, the Austins
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expounded upon the elements of Augustine's life that they deemed to be most significant and exemplary, exhorting their confrères to follow in Augustine’s example.

Thus, in the preceding chapters, I have attempted to reconstruct the place of the Austin Friars in late-medieval England through an examination of their own portrayals of their monastic origins and of their interactions with religious and secular society. Whereas the Franciscans and Dominicans hinged their self-understanding on the example of a recent, charismatic founder, the Austins looked to a more distant example that they struggled to make relevant to their own setting. Augustine had lived in such a vastly different context from fifteenth-century England, but Augustine’s own Confessiones and the Augustinian Tradition propagated by the Augustinian order in Europe a century earlier had transmitted knowledge about his life to them. And yet, the Augustine Capgrave and Bokenham described was neither the character of the Confessiones, nor of the texts precipitated by the Pavian conflict over the relics of Augustine. This Augustine was one who could function within late-medieval English spirituality and whose example resonated with the ecclesiastical, social, political, and theological changes within England in the fifteenth century.

In that vein, the Austin Friars were not unlike the Carmelites, who creatively and assertively expounded their history in the wake of St Simon Stock and their foundation by Elijah.3 The Carmelites not only claimed that they had been founded by the biblical prophet, but after conflict with the Dominicans over the legitimacy of their claims of patronage by the Virgin Mary herself, they also increasingly disseminated histories of their order propagating the legend of St Simon Stock, the English Carmelite prior general, who allegedly had a vision of the Virgin presenting to him the Carmelite scapular.4 In a similar fashion, the Austins moulded, expanded, and abstracted the example of Augustine to give formal legitimacy to their order in the face of ecclesiastical councils and monastic polemic, but also to demarcate the parameters of their own religious platform. They wrote about Augustine

---
3 The best discussion of Carmelite historiography is in Copsey, “St Simon Stock and the Scapular Vision,” 652-683.
the preacher in a way not done by anyone else; their Augustine was also a bishop, priest, and theologian, and decidedly not a hermit. Where his monasticism came to the fore, it was in regards to the delights of communal living and an emphasis on moderation; isolation, the eremitical life, and asceticism, so prevalent in the Augustinian Tradition, did not make an appearance.

Rather, this Augustine shunned prescriptive monastic regulations, preferring instead to exhort his friars to foster brotherly charity and community, placing the needs of the community before all other concerns. The vision of monastic life presented by these texts stressed the importance of pastoral care, of preaching (specifically, licensed preaching), and of episcopal appointment. This Augustinian life was decidedly part of the world, an exhortation to mendicancy, rather than any glorification of the contemplative, ascetic, or eremitical lives. Moreover, this was a vision that acclaimed above all else the inclusivity of the spirituality of Augustine: from the affective devotion of Augustine’s mother Monica, to his utterly rational theological enquiry and exceptional preaching, these texts opened up the legacy of Augustine to a multiplicity of interpretations and gave the Austin Friars space for a huge variety in monastic practice. The vagueness of the *Regula Sancti Augustini* itself contributed to this nebulous sense of the appropriate religious life; there were so few practical instructions for the daily practice of the Austin Friars that extrapolation was a matter of course. Resilience and flexibility were the two characteristics paramount to the lives of Austin Friars and the vagueness and inconsistency of their manner of living were symptomatic of their delineation of the Augustinian platform.

This religious culture influenced the behaviour of the Austin Friars in a number of significant ways. Firstly, the lack of exhortations to austerity resulted in an acceptance of continued preoccupation with financial wellbeing. Whilst some may see this as a corruption of their mendicant principles, by taking advantage of a religious economy, the Austin Friars ensured the future of their order in politically and religiously turbulent times. The Austins were never ideologically married to the concept of absolute poverty and the perseverance of their communities necessitated the accumulation of financial support. They harnessed a
penitential system, already in place and clearly addressing the perceived needs of the laity, to their best advantage, leading the way in the expansion of the late-medieval industry of salvation in precisely the fashion that aroused the anger of Martin Luther. This is not to suggest that there were no instances of questionable behaviour; as is made clear by the examples of Atherstone Friary and of Edmund Bellond, this often extended into the sphere of manipulation and exploitation. Such behaviour progressed throughout the fifteenth century and reached its zenith in the early sixteenth, when the Austins rapidly experienced a crisis over the nature of the life they professed. That crisis was precipitated by this overwhelming preoccupation with the needs of the order, often encouraging neglect of the Augustinian Constitutions, and the radically different attitudes to the indulgence trade, which I have discussed.

Secondly, it contributed to their ability to adapt to regional needs with regard to their pastoral care and thus, they were able to embed themselves healthily within the devotional and religious landscape of late-medieval England. They were preachers, bishops, and confessors. They offered prestigious burial and chantry services and sold indulgences and confraternity in remarkable quantities. They offered almost exclusive access to the Scala Coeli indulgence. They delivered political sermons and were implicated in the burial of politically sensitive figures. They preached and heard confessions in the vernacular to foreign communities in London. They cultivated an impressive network of patrons – particularly female patrons – and offered princely counsel. They delivered whatever kind of pastoral care was needed, and maintained important patronal relationships with those families with influence.

Thirdly, since the Austin Friars did not promote the eremitical life as was done by the Augustinian Tradition, the Observance movement gained no traction in England. This eremitical ideal held little currency for the English Austins, who had never sought to promote that manner of religious life. Without Observance, they were unable to stem the monastic flux and crisis of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century and thus were made vulnerable to the polemic of Protestantism. Moreover, by allowing for such a wide variety in
monastic practice, the Augustinian platform in England was unable to provide any kind of reasonable check on the problematic practices becoming ever more prevalent in the sixteenth century, thereby permitting a certain amount of disaffection amongst its members, some of whom turned to Protestantism as a viable alternative.

With this project, we can begin to understand a little more about the religious landscape of England on the eve of the Henrician reforms; the Austin Friars were an important part of that landscape and evaluating their behaviour in the century leading up to the Reformation helps us to understand the evolving relationship between the laity and the clergy. As any project of this sort, however, it raises just as many questions as it answers. Why did the eremitical ideal, so pertinent for the European Augustinians, bear so little value for the English Austins? How did the laity define and think of the Austins, in contrast to how the Austins defined themselves? Was there a distinct religious culture for other mendicant orders and how did they interact with the Austins? We might speculate here as to some of the specific characteristics of other orders: the Trinitarians were prolific in the sale of confraternity, the Dominicans were exceptional statesmen, the Franciscans revered preachers, and the Observant Franciscans were prestigious royal confessors. The Carmelites, like the Austins, creatively asserted their religious history and antiquity in the face of monastic suppression, but given their use of the figure of Elijah in their historiography, they adhered much more closely than the Austins to an eremitical lifestyle. Studies into the particularities of other mendicant orders would affirm the distinctive characteristics of the Austins expounded here: their unique understanding of Augustine, with its combination of the seemingly contradictory mendicant and eremitical ideals; their extreme variability in lifestyle and income; their flexibility and adaptability in the face of differing local needs, not to mention their care for the international community in London, their specific use of Scala Coeli indulgences, their political burials, and their active participation in reform. In that sense, my study was just one of many that could have been conducted; such investigations could easily reveal to us salient elements of other orders who have traditionally been studied institutionally, rather than with an eye to their self-
definition, or of different elements of the life and social role of this order. From this study, we get a small sense of what Austin Friars understood to be the most significant aspects of their profession, and what they presented to the world as the Augustinian life. It was their flexibility that contributed to their durability by allowing them to adapt to religious needs as they arose rather than being constrained to what had been validated by their heritage.

The Augustinian order in England was one that pushed in so many different directions and defied simple definition. That houses such as the friary of Clare, with noteworthy aristocratic dynastic patronage and a flourishing of literary activity, and the isolated and impoverished community of Woodhouse could co-exist within the same order is astounding. This was a miscellaneous order with lasting diversity. With varied foundations and little by way of a prescriptive way of life, the Augustinian order pushed the boundaries of what could be considered Augustinian and grew in numerous different directions.

Ultimately, this project draws our attention to an interesting conundrum with regard to reformers in the sixteenth century who came from a monastic background: how is it that former monks and friars came to be so ardently disenchanted with their religious lives that they embraced a notion of reform that called for the destruction of their communities and way of life? And yet, the lives of Austins such as Coverdale and Barnes prove to us that the communal myths and cultures fostered by the mendicant orders were too strong simply to evaporate with the discovery of sola fide. Rather, they evolved and transformed under the umbrella of reform and developed into new ideas regarding the ideal religious life, whilst continuing to be informed by the mendicant ideas previously cultivated. How the Augustinian culture expounded within these pages persisted and continued to affect the theology produced by such thinkers is intriguing; even though the Austin Friars ceased to exist as an institution following Henry’s Dissolution, as individuals, they could not abandon what made them Austins. The bonds they maintained with their brothers were what made them Augustinian and that was all they had ever known.
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