

The Austin Friars in Pre-Reformation

English Society



**Anik Laferrière
Keble College
University of Oxford**

Thesis and abstracts submitted
in part fulfilment of the regulations
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the
Faculty of Theology and Religion
at the University of Oxford
Trinity Term 2017

Table of Contents

Abstract	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Abbreviations	ix
Introduction.....	1
I. Existing Scholarship on the <i>Ordo Eremitarum Sancti Augustini</i>	6
II. Sources and Methodology	10
III. Thesis Structure	15
IV. Significance	19
Chapter 1: Augustinian Beginnings	21
I. Origins.....	22
Foundation of Ordo Eremitarum Sancti Augustini.....	22
Migration of the Ordo Eremitarum Sancti Augustini to England.....	26
II. Practice	30
The Monastic Rule.....	30
Daily Life and Practice.....	33
III. Self-Definition.....	42
European Augustinian Tradition	42
Conflict with the Austin Canons in England.....	48
Conclusions	52
Chapter 2: Augustinian Religion	54
I. Capgrave and Bokenham in the Augustinian Order.....	54
II. Hagiographies of Augustine	60
III. The English Augustinian Life.....	72
Augustine and Monica	72
Augustine the Preacher, Priest, and Bishop.....	81
Augustine's Devotional Practices	85
Conclusions	87
Chapter 3: Augustinian Pastoral Care	92
I. Augustinian Preaching	95
Preaching Licences	98
Noteworthy Sermons.....	106

Episcopal Appointments	109
II. Augustinian Religious Economy	112
Funerary Services	112
Letters of Confraternity and Indulgences	117
Guilds	131
International Network	134
III. Antifraternalism	139
Tensions with Secular Clergy	139
Lay Antifraternalism and Tensions over Sanctuary	144
Conclusions	150
Chapter 4: Augustinian Influence in Secular Society	153
I. Literary Patronage	155
The Manoeuvrings of John Capgrave	155
Clare's Influence and Osbern Bokenham	170
II. Political Patronage	179
Richard III and the Austin Friars	183
The Advent of the Tudors	186
III. Religious Patronage	194
Notable Burials and Bequests	194
Burials at Austin Friars London	204
Conclusions	212
Chapter 5: Augustinian Dissent	215
I. Monastic Flux	217
The Problem of Apostasy	217
Administrative Corruption and Behavioural Scandals	224
II. Lollardy	231
III. Reform	238
The Observant Movement	238
Evangelicalism and the Henrician Reforms	242
IV. Fraternity	264
Conclusions	267
Conclusion	270
Bibliography	277

Primary Sources.....	277
Cambridge.....	277
Edinburgh	277
London.....	277
Oxford.....	279
Printed Primary Sources	279
Secondary Sources	287
Online Databases.....	310

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.

Acknowledgements

It is through a project such as this that we discover the immense support and guidance offered by those closest to us. The intellectual debts which I have accrued throughout this degree are of such magnitude that my words here can be but an imperfect offering in comparison. In the first instance, I am principally indebted to my two supervisors, Prof. Diarmaid MacCulloch and Dr Jonathan Arnold, for their ceaseless efforts on my behalf and their mentorship throughout my graduate studies. Any successes here are the result of their diligence, creativity, and remarkable breadth of knowledge. It was as their pupil that I discovered how to be guided by the faint, yet persistent, voices of the past, and for their relentless demands that I be better, more thorough, more imaginative, I am immeasurably grateful. Second only to my supervisors is Dr Sarah Apetrei, possibly the most formative influence during my time as a young scholar. Her guidance and tuition shaped my outlook on historical enquiry and I am continually in awe of her intellectual prowess and kindness.

The generosity of many people has made this dissertation possible. Foremost, I must thank the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, whose doctoral funding permitted me to stay in Oxford for my studies. I am also indebted to the Clarendon Fund, who financed me throughout my MPhil and the first two years of my DPhil, in addition to the Canadian Centennial Scholarship Fund, the Oxford Theology Faculty Studentships, and the Crewdson Trust, without whom, I would have been unable to complete my research. I would also like to extend my gratitude to numerous academics, who offered advice throughout the duration of my research: Sarah Foot, Mishtooni Bose, Simon Horobin, Gervase Rosser, Simon Gaine, and Andrew Hope all provided me with incisive criticisms and suggestions regarding my work, without which, my dissertation would be much poorer. Furthermore, I would like to thank the Austin Friars at Clare Priory, particularly Fr David Middleton, for having warmly welcomed me into their home. I am incredibly appreciative of the instruction of both Prof. Johannes Wolfart and Prof. Greg

Fisher, under whose mentorship at Carleton University I began the intellectual journey that led me here.

I must, of course, thank my parents, Dianne and Claude Laferrière, for their never-ending support throughout my studies. They always taught me the value of learning and curiosity along with the importance of intellectual inquisitiveness, ideas which I have found persuasive ever since. Furthermore, I must acknowledge my gratitude to my sister, Carolyn Laferrière, along with her husband Clifford Robinson. Sisterly love is unparalleled, and there is no friendship like that of a sister.

Good friends can make even the most momentous of tasks surmountable. I am so deeply indebted to a myriad of close friends for their ceaseless support and encouragement throughout the research and composition of this project. I shall always think fondly of the endless hours I spent with (the soon-to-be Dr) Marius Ostrowski, over black coffee or English ale, discovering our common intellectual interests and discussing the ever minute details of our lives, no matter how insipid. I eagerly await the day of our adjoining offices, so that our fondness for optimal caffeination and minimal productivity might continue. So too must I recognise the herculean efforts of the ever-fascinating and insightful Dr Megan Dent (first known to me as Megan Kearney), for whose love and friendship – above and beyond anything that I might have expected or deserved – I am eternally grateful. Special mention must also be made of Aaron (and of course, Rapha) Dale, my adoptive English family. If I left Oxford with only your friendship, it will all have been worthwhile.

To countless others – Kiran Stallone, Zoë Wallace, Ruth Spencer Jolly, Lizzie Moore, Meredith McLaughlin, Stefan Saftescu, Matthew Schrecker, Djurre de Waard, Kylie Crabbe, Sarah Leeser, Tom Fedrick-Illsley, Spence Weinreich, Dan Borvan, Tim Zakian, Alessandro Simari, Glen Wright Colopy, Anika Weber, Henrik Hannemann, Andy Warrington, Lynn Edwards, and the rest of my Keble family: my experience here at Oxford was immeasurably enriched for having known you. You are all wonderful and kind friends, for whom I am exceedingly appreciative. I am also thankful to Chelsea Carley and Kate MacGillivray, for visits with them punctuated this degree with immense nostalgia, and I hastily awaited the

next visit each time I returned to the United Kingdom. So too must I thank Dr Nicholas Wright, for much encouragement throughout many years of my graduate studies.

To the inimitable, and newly minted Dr, Andrew Whatcott: any success I might have, present and future, is as much yours as it is mine. I might never have found the resilience to complete the latter stages of this project without your persistent encouragement and confidence. With the closing of our graduate work at Keble College, I look forward to our coming adventures, with better company than I could have ever imagined.

Lastly, to my future self: may this volume remind you of your tenacity and your refusal to be defeated by seemingly impossible challenges. This degree was rife with personal and academic complications, none of which you allowed to prevent you from achieving your goal. No matter the difficulties, you persist.

Abbreviations

<i>AAug</i>	<i>Analecta Augustiniana</i>
<i>ABR</i>	<i>American Benedictine Review</i>
<i>AFH</i>	<i>Archivum Franciscanum Historicum</i>
<i>ALBRA</i>	<i>Archives London British Records Association</i>
<i>Annals</i>	C.H. Cooper and J.W. Cooper, <i>Annals of Cambridge</i> (Cambridge, 1842-53), 5 vols.
<i>AJ</i>	<i>Archaeological Journal</i>
<i>ArchivRef</i>	<i>Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte</i>
<i>Aug</i>	<i>Augustiniana</i>
<i>AS</i>	<i>Augustinian Studies</i>
<i>A&M</i>	John Foxe, <i>The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online (1583 edition)</i> (Sheffield, 2011). [http://www.johnfoxe.org]
<i>Bibl.BH</i>	Thomas Tanner, <i>Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica qui in Anglia, Scotia et Hiberia ad saeculi XVII initium floruerunt...</i> (London, 1748)
<i>BL</i>	British Library
<i>Bodl.</i>	Bodleian Library
<i>BN</i>	Bibliothèque Nationale
<i>BP</i>	Bibliothèque Publique
<i>Boase</i>	C.W. Boase and Andrew Clark, <i>Register of the University of Oxford, 1449-1571</i> , Oxford Historical Society, 1, 10-12, 14 (Oxford, 1885), 2 vols.
<i>BRUO</i>	A.B. Emden, <i>A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to AD 1500</i> (Oxford, 1959), 3 vols.
<i>BRUC</i>	A.B. Emden, <i>A Biographical Register of the University of Cambridge to 1500</i> (Cambridge, 1963)
<i>Bull.OESA</i>	Lorenzo Empoli, <i>Bullarium Ordinis Eremitarum Sancti Augustini</i> (Rome, 1628)
<i>CartCl</i>	Cartulary of Clare: London, British Library MS Harley 4835.
<i>CAugCl</i>	<i>The Cartulary of the Augustinian Friars of Clare</i> , ed. Christopher Harper-Bill, Suffolk Record Society, Suffolk Charters, 11 (Woodbridge, 1991)
<i>CCC</i>	Corpus Christi College

<i>CCM</i>	<i>Cahiers de civilisation médiévale</i>
<i>CCR</i>	<i>Calendar of Close Rolls, AD 1227-1509</i> , ed. Henry Churchill Maxwell-Lyte et al. (London, 1902-1963), 61 vols.
<i>CDOESAP</i>	<i>Codex Diplomaticus Ordinis Eremitarum Sancti Augustini Papiae</i> , ed. R. Maiocchi and N. Casacca 1 (New York, 1943), 3 vols.
<i>CHR</i>	<i>The Catholic Historical Review</i>
<i>CHRC</i>	<i>Church History and Religious Culture</i>
<i>Chron.Maiora</i>	Thomas Walsingham, <i>The St Albans Chronicle: The Chronica Maiora of Thomas Walsingham</i> , ed. and trans. John Taylor, et al. (Oxford, 2011)
<i>CIM</i>	<i>Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous (Chancery), Preserved in the Public Record Office</i> (London, 1916-2003), 8 vols.
<i>CLR</i>	<i>Calendar of Liberate Rolls, Preserved in the Public Record Office</i> (London, 1916-1964), 6 vols.
<i>CopeDialogi</i>	Alan Cope and Nicholas Harpsfield, <i>Dialogi Sex contra Summi Pontificis, Monasticae Vitae, Sanctorum, Sacrarum Imaginum Oppugnatores et Pseudomartyres</i> (Antwerp, 1573)
<i>Corp.Ref.</i>	<i>Corpus Reformatorum</i> , ed. C.G. Bretschneider et al. (Halle, 1834-), 101 vols.
<i>CPR</i>	<i>Calendar of Patent Rolls, Preserved in the Public Record Office, AD 1216-1582</i> , ed. Henry Churchill Maxwell-Lyte et al. (London, 1901-), 74 vols.
<i>CPRGBI</i>	<i>Calendar of Papal Registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland</i> , ed. W. H. Bliss and J. A. Twemlow (London, 1893-1960), 14 vols.
<i>CR</i>	<i>Chaucer Review</i>
<i>CSP:Spain</i>	<i>Calendar of State Papers Spanish</i> , ed. P. de Gayangos et al. (London, 1862-1954), 15 vols.
<i>CT</i>	<i>Concordia Theological</i>
<i>CTG</i>	John Gough Nichols et al., <i>Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica</i> (London, 1833-43) 8 vols.
<i>CUA</i>	Cambridge University Archives
<i>CWM</i>	Thomas More, <i>Complete Works of Thomas More</i> (New Haven, 1963-1997), 15 vols.
<i>Dd</i>	Rome, Archives of St Monica's, <i>The Registers of the Priors General of the Augustinians</i>
<i>DR</i>	<i>Dublin Review</i>
<i>DugdaleM</i>	William Dugdale, <i>Monasticon Anglicanum or the history of abbies, and</i>

other monasteries, hospitals, cathedral and collegiate churches in England and Wales. ... Collected and published in Latin by Sir W. D. and now epitomised in English, ed. B. Bandinel, J. Caley, R. Dodsworth, H. Ellis (London, 1817-30), 6 vols. in 8 pts.

<i>DugdaleW</i>	William Dugdale, <i>The Antiquities of Warwickshire</i> (Didsbury, 1973)
<i>EcHR</i>	<i>The Economic History Review</i>
<i>ELH</i>	<i>English Literary History</i>
<i>EME</i>	<i>Early Modern Europe</i>
<i>EMS</i>	<i>English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700</i>
<i>Epist.Acad.</i>	<i>Epistolae Academicae Oxoniae</i> , ed. Henry Anstey, Oxford Historical Society, n.s. 26 (Oxford, 1898), 2 vols.
<i>Fasc.Ziz.</i>	<i>Fasciculi Zizaniorum magistri Johannis Wyclif cum tritico</i> , ed. Walter Waddington Shirley (London, 1858)
<i>FEH</i>	Henry Cotton, <i>Fasti Ecclesiae Hibernicae</i> (Dublin, 1850), 3 vols.
<i>FS</i>	<i>Franciscan Studies</i>
<i>GCL</i>	<i>The Great Chronicle of London</i> , ed. A.H. Thomas and L.D. Thornley (London, 1938)
<i>GraceBookB</i>	<i>Grace Book B</i> , ed. Mary Bateson, Cambridge Antiquarian Society (Cambridge, 1903-05)
<i>GraceBookG</i>	<i>Grace Book G</i> , ed. William Searle, Cambridge Antiquarian Society (Cambridge, 1903-05)
<i>HBC</i>	E.B. Fryde et al., <i>Handbook of British Chronology</i> , 3 rd ed. (Cambridge, 1996)
<i>Hier.Cath.</i>	<i>Hierarchia Catholica Medii Aevi</i> , ed. Konrad Eubel (Regensberg, 1898), 9 vols.
<i>Hist.Angl.</i>	Thomas Walsingham, <i>Historia Anglicana</i> , ed. Henry Thomas Riley, Rolls Series, 28:1 (London, 1863-64), 2 vols.
<i>HJ</i>	<i>Historical Journal</i>
<i>HL</i>	<i>Huntington Library</i>
<i>HR</i>	<i>Historical Research</i>
<i>IndexBS</i>	John Bale, <i>Index Britanniae Scriptorum: John Bale's Index of British and Other Writers</i> , ed. Reginald Lane Poole (Woodbridge, 1990)
<i>JEH</i>	<i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>
<i>JECS</i>	<i>Journal of Early Christian Studies</i>

<i>JEGP</i>	<i>Journal of English and Germanic Philology</i>
<i>JMH</i>	<i>Journal of Medieval History</i>
<i>JR</i>	<i>Journal of Religion</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>KASRB</i>	<i>Kent Archaeological Society Record Branch</i>
<i>Kirk.Norw.</i>	John Kirkpatrick, <i>History of the Religious Orders and Communities, and of the Hospitals and Castle, of Norwich</i> , ed. Dawson Turner (Yarmouth, 1845)
<i>LincolnWills</i>	<i>Lincoln Wills Registered in the District Probate Registry at Lincoln</i> , ed. C. W. Foster, Lincoln Record Society. 5, 10, 24 (Lincoln, 1914), 3 vols.
<i>Logge</i>	<i>The Logge Register of Prerogative Court of Canterbury Wills 1479-1486</i> , ed. Lesley Boatwright, et al., Richard III Society (Knaphill, 2008), 2 vols.
<i>LP</i>	<i>Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII: preserved in the Public Record Office, the British Museum, and elsewhere</i> , ed. J.S. Brewer and R.H. Brodie (London, 1862-1932), 28 vols.
<i>LQ</i>	<i>The Lutheran Quarterly</i>
<i>LSE</i>	<i>Leeds Studies in English</i>
<i>LT</i>	<i>Literature and Theology</i>
<i>MBS</i>	<i>Monumental Brass Society</i>
<i>MCS</i>	<i>Medieval Church Studies</i>
<i>MH</i>	<i>Medievalia et Humanistica</i>
<i>MHE</i>	<i>Miscellanea Historiae Ecclesiasticae</i>
<i>MLN</i>	<i>Modern Language Notes</i>
<i>Monum.Franc.</i>	<i>Monumenta Franciscana</i> , ed. J.S. Brewer and Richard Howlett, Rolls Series, 4:1 (London, 1858-1882), 2 vols.
<i>MP</i>	<i>Modern Philology</i>
<i>MS</i>	<i>Medieval Studies</i>
<i>Munim.Acad.</i>	<i>Munimenta Academica, or, documents illustrative of the academical life and studies at Oxford</i> , ed. Henry Anstey, Rolls Series, 50 (London, 1868), 2 vols.
<i>NM</i>	<i>Neuphilologische Mitteilungen</i>
<i>NorwichCCD</i>	<i>Norwich Consistory Court Depositions, 1499-1512 and 1518-1530</i> ; ed.

- E.D. Stone and B. Cozens-Hardy, Norfolk Record Society, 10 (London, 1938)
- ODNB* *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*
- OESA* *Ordo Eremitarum Sancti Augustini*
- ParlR* *The Parliament Rolls of Medieval England, 1275-1504*, ed. Chris Given-Wilson (Woodbridge, 2005), 16 vols.
- PL* *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Latina*, ed. Jacques Paul Migne (Paris, 1844-64), 221 vols.
- PMLA* *Proceedings of the Modern Languages Association*
- PP* *Past and Present*
- PSIA* *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology*
- Reg.Chich.* *The Register of Henry Chichele, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1414-1443*, ed. E.F. Jacob and H.C. Johnson, Canterbury and York Society, 42, 45-47 (Oxford, 1937-47), 4 vols.
- Reg.Flem.* *The Register of Richard Fleming, Bishop of Lincoln, 1420-1431*, ed. N.H. Bennet, Canterbury and York Society, 73, 99 (Oxford, 1984), 2 vols.
- RivistaIt* *Rivista di storia della chiesa in Italia*
- Rot.Norm.* *Rotuli Normanniae in Turri Londinensi asservati: Johanne et Henrico Quinto Angliae Regibus*, ed. Thomas Duffus Hardy (London, 1835)
- RothSources* Francis Roth, *Sources for a History of the English Austin Friars* (Leuven, 1958-61)
- RothEAF* Francis Roth, *The English Austin Friars: 1249-1538*, Cassiciacum, 6 and 7 (New York, 1961-66), 2 vols.
- RuleAug* *The Rule of Saint Augustine: Introduction and Commentary*, ed. T. van Bavel and trans. Raymond Canning (London, 1984)
- SCH* *Studies in Church History*
- Script.IMBC* John Bale, *Scriptorum illustrium maioris Brytanniae catalogus* (Farnsworth, 1971), 2 vols.
- SIQR* *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*
- SP* London, The National Archives, *Records assembled by the State Paper Office, including papers of the Secretaries of State up to 1782*, SP 1-7
- SRS* *Somerset Record Society*
- StowAE* John Stow, *The Annales, or a Generall Chronicle, of England, begun first by maister Iohn Stow* (London, 1615)

<i>StowSL</i>	John Stow, <i>Survey of London</i> , ed. Henry B. Wheatley (London, 1956)
<i>StP</i>	<i>Studies in Philology</i>
<i>StrypeEM</i>	John Strype, <i>Ecclesiastical Memorials, relating chiefly to religion, and the reformation of it, and the emergencies of the Church of England, under Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Queen Mary the first</i> (London, 1721), 3 vols.
<i>StrypeMP</i>	John Strype, <i>The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker, the first Archbishop of Canterbury in the reign of Queen Elizabeth</i> (Oxford, 1821), 3 vols.
<i>SudburyWills</i>	<i>Wills of the Archdeaconry of Sudbury, 1439-1474, Wills from the Register 'Baldwyne'</i> , ed. Peter Northeast, Suffolk Records Society, 44 (Woodbridge, 2010), 2 vols.
<i>TCBS</i>	<i>Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society</i>
<i>TCL</i>	Trinity College Library
<i>Test.Cant.</i>	<i>Testamenta Cantiana: a series of extracts from fifteenth and sixteenth century wills relating to church building and topography</i> , ed. Leland L. Duncan and Arthur Hussey (London, 1906-7), 2 vols.
<i>Test.Ebor.</i>	<i>Testamenta Eboracensia, or, Wills registered at York: illustrative of the history, manners, language, statistics, etc. of the province of York, from the year MCCC downwards</i> , ed. James Raine and John William Clay, Surtees Society, 4, 30, 45, 53, 79, 106 (London, 1836-1902), 6 vols.
<i>Test.Vet.</i>	<i>Testamenta Vetusta: illustrations from wills, of manners, customs, etc., from the reign of Henry the Second to Queen Elizabeth</i> , ed. Nicholas H. Nicolas (London, 1826), 2 vols.
<i>Top.Hist.Norfolk</i>	Francis Blomefield, <i>An Essay Towards A Topographical History of the County of Norfolk</i> , ed. Charles Parkin et al. (London, 1808), 11 vols.
<i>TNA</i>	The National Archives
<i>TRHS</i>	<i>Transactions of the Royal Historical Society</i>
<i>TSAS</i>	<i>Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological Society</i>
<i>UL</i>	University Library
<i>VCH</i>	<i>The Victoria History of the Counties of England</i> , ed. W.H. Page et al. (London and Oxford, 1900-)
<i>WA</i>	<i>Weimarer Ausgabe</i>
<i>Weev.AF</i>	John Weever, <i>Antient Funeral Monuments, of Great Britain, Ireland, and the Islands Adjacent</i> (London, 1767)
<i>WillsHusting</i>	Reginald R. Sharpe, <i>Calendar of Wills proved and Enrolled in the Court of Husting, London, A.D. 1258-1688: preserved among the archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall</i> (London, 1889-90), 2

vols.

<i>YAJ</i>	<i>Yorkshire Archaeological Journal</i>
<i>YASRS</i>	<i>Yorkshire Archaeological Society Records Series</i>
<i>YATJ</i>	<i>Yorkshire Archaeological and Topographical Journal</i>
<i>YCR</i>	<i>York Civic Records</i> , ed. Angelo Raine and Deborah Sutton, Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 98, 103, 106, 108, 110, 112, 115, 119, 138 (Wakefield, 1939-78), 9 vols.
<i>16CJ</i>	<i>Sixteenth Century Journal</i>

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?¹

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.

² F.X. Martin, "The Augustinian Observant Movement" in *Reformbemühungen und Observanzbestrebungen im spätmittelalterlichen Ordenswesen* (Berlin, 1989), 325-345 at 327-28; *idem*, "The Augustinian Order on the Eve of the Reformation" *MHE*, 2 (1967): 71-104 at 72-73.

providing vernacular translations of the Bible in Germany, France, and England.³ 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 Henrician 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

³ 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.⁴ They do appear in substantial studies on monasticism – if perhaps briefly – in works such as David Knowles’ magisterial study of English monasticism,⁵ Frances Andrews’ *The Other Friars*,⁶ as well as studies on the mendicant houses of London by Jens Röhrkasten and Nicholas Holder.⁷ 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.⁸ 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

⁴ Key studies of the Franciscans are: Paul Sabatier, *Vie de saint François d’Assise* (Paris, 1931); *idem*, “L’Originalité de Saint François d’Assise,” *Franciscan Essays I*, ed. Paul Sabatier et al. (Aberdeen, 1912), 1-17; John Moorman, *A History of the Franciscan Order from its Origins to the Year 1517* (Oxford, 1968); *idem*, *The Sources for the Life of S. Francis of Assisi* (Manchester, 1940); Kajetan Esser, *Origins of the Franciscan Order* (Chicago, 1970); Duncan Nimmo, *Reform and Division in the Medieval Franciscan Order: From St Francis to the Foundation of the Capuchins* (Rome, 1987); Malcolm Lambert, *Franciscan Poverty: The Doctrine of the Absolute Poverty of Christ and the Apostles in the Franciscan Order 1210-1323* (New York, 1998); J. Jörgensen, *Den hellige Frans af Assisi* (København og Kristiana, 1907); english translation by T. O’Conor Sloane, 2nd edn. (New York, 1913); T. Desbonnets, “Recherches sur la Généalogie des Biographes primitives de Saint François,” *AFH*, 60 (1967), 273-316. Significant studies relating to the Dominicans are as follows: Beryl Formoy, *The Dominican Order in England before the Reformation* (London, 1925); William Hinnesbusch, *The History of the Dominican Order* (New York, 1973); *idem*, *The Early English Friars Preachers* (Vatican, 1951); R.F. Bennet, *The Early Dominicans* (Cambridge, 1937); Bede Jarrett, *The English Dominicans* (London, 1921).

⁵ David Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England* (Cambridge, 1948-59), 1:199-204, 2:148-151; David Knowles and R. Neville Hadcock, *Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales* (London, 1953), 200-203.

⁶ Frances Andrews, *The Other Friars: The Carmelite, Augustinian, Sack and Pied Friars in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 2006), 69-172.

⁷ Jens Röhrkasten, *The Mendicant Houses of Medieval London, 1221-1539* (Münster, 2004), 15, 54-56, 72, 80, 81, 100, 104, 105, 132, 149, 155, 158, 159, 162, 167, 170, 177-180, 205-208, 222, 229, 242, 276, 299, 317, 318, 327, 345, 352, 368, 388, 399, 445, 470, 493, 494, 510, 518, 531, 537, 574, 628; Nicholas Holder, *The Medieval Friaries of London: a topographic and archaeological history, before and after the Dissolution* (PhD diss., University of London, 2011), 140-175.

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.⁹ 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.¹⁰ 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,¹¹ 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,¹² has examined the European OESA within the papal-political or intellectual

⁹ See David Gutiérrez, *Die Augustiner im Spätmittelalter, 1357-1517* (Würzburg, 1981), 196-214 and *idem*, *Die Augustiner vom Beginn der Reformation bis zur katholischen Restauration, 1518-1648* (Rome, 1975), 8-18.

¹⁰ Heiko Oberman, "The Shape of Late Medieval Thought: The Birthpangs of the Modern Era," in *The Pursuit of Holiness in Late Medieval and Renaissance Religion*, ed. Charles Trinkaus and Heiko Oberman (Leiden, 1974); *idem*, "Headwaters of the Reformation: Initia Lutheri–Initia Reformationis," in *Luther and the Dawn of the Modern Era*, ed. Heiko A. Oberman (Leiden, 1974), 40-88; *idem*, "Tuus sum, salvum me fac: Augustinreveil zwischen Renaissance und Reformation," in *Scientia Augustiniana: Studien über Augustinus, den Augustinismus und den Augustinerorden*, ed. C. P. Mayer and W. Eckermann (Würzburg: 1975): 3-25; *idem*, *Masters of the Reformation: The emergence of a new intellectual climate in Europe* (Cambridge, 1981); A. Damasus Trapp, "Hiltalinger's Augustinian Quotations," *Aug*, 4 (1954): 412-449; *idem*, "Augustinian Theology of the 14th century," *Aug* 6 (1956): 146-274.

¹¹ This is discussed in Alister McGrath, *The Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 2004), 107-109.

¹² See Eric Saak, *Creating Augustine: Interpreting Augustine and Augustinianism in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2012); *idem*, "Religio Augustini: Jordan of Quedlinburg and the Augustinian Tradition in Late Medieval Germany" (PhD diss., the University of Arizona, 1993); *idem*, "Quilibet Christianus: Saints in Society in the Sermons of Jordan of Quedlinburg, OESA," in *Models of Holiness in Medieval Sermons*, ed. Beverly Mayne Kienzle, et al. (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1996); *idem*, "The Reception of Augustine in the Later Middle Ages," in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, ed. Irena Backus (Leiden, 1997); *idem*, "The Creation of an Augustinian

circumstances of fourteenth-century Pavia, seeing the conflict with the Canons Regular as the defining feature of the Augustinian order.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.¹⁴ There have been only two prominent studies of the English Austin Friars, those of Aubrey Gwynn and Francis Roth.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

Identity in the Later Middle Ages," *Aug*, 49 (1999): 109-164, 251-286; *idem*, "Milleloquium Sancti Augustini," in *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Allan D. Fitzgerald (Grand Rapids, 1999), 563; *idem*, *High Way to Heaven: The Augustinian Platform Between Reform and Reformation, 1292-1524* (Leiden, 2002); Meredith Gill, *Augustine in the Italian Renaissance: Art and Philosophy from Petrarch to Michelangelo* (New York, 2004).

¹³ See pages 42-43.

¹⁴ *RothEAF*, 1:7.

¹⁵ Aubrey Gwynn, *The English Austin Friars in the Time of Wyclif* (London, 1940); *RothEAF*, 2 vols.

Karen Winstead.¹⁶ 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.¹⁷ 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.

¹⁶ For Capgrave, see: Karen Winstead, *John Capgrave's Fifteenth Century* (Philadelphia, 2007); *eadem*, "Piety, Politics, and Social Commitment in Capgrave's Life of St. Katherine," *MH*, 17 (1990): 59-80; *eadem*, "Capgrave's Saint Katherine: The Perils of Gynecocracy" *Viator* 25 (1994): 361-376; *eadem*, "John Capgrave and the Chaucer Tradition" *CR* 30 (1996): 389-400; *eadem*, *Virgin Martyrs: Legends of Sainthood in Late Medieval England* (Ithaca, 1997). For Bokenham, see: Simon Horobin, "A Manuscript Found in the Library of Abbotsford House and the Lost Legendary of Osbern Bokenham" *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700* 14 (2008): 132-164; *idem*, "Politics, Patronage, and Piety in the Work of Osbern Bokenham" *Speculum*, 82 (2007): 932-49; *idem*, "'Speaking and Writing in Suffolk speech': the language and dialect of Osbern Bokenham" in *Be laurer of oure Englische Tonge*, ed. Marcin Krygier and Liliana Sikorska (Frankfurt, 2009), 9-19; Sheila Delany, *Impolitic Bodies: Poetry, Saints, and Society in Fifteenth-Century England. The Work of Osbern Bokenham* (Oxford, 1998).

¹⁷ *RothEAF*, 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 tradition 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 antifraternial 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

¹ Saak, *High Way to Heaven*, 5; David Gutiérrez, *The Augustinians in the Middle Ages*, 27.

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.

⁵ William Courtenay, *Schools and Scholars in Fourteenth Century England* (Princeton, 1987), 72. The Austin Friars' involvement in preaching and pastoral care is discussed extensively in Chapter 3. See pages 101-161.

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

⁹ For the historiography of the OCarm, see Richard Copsey, "Simon Stock and the Scapular Vision" *JEH*, 50:4 (1999): 652-683.

¹⁰ Gutiérrez, *The Augustinians in the Middle Ages*, 24, 39.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 30.

¹² Gwynn, *The English Austin Friars*, 12-13.

¹³ A.G. Little and R.C. Easterling, *The Franciscans and Dominicans of Exeter* (Exeter, 1927), 7.

¹⁴ Beryl Formoy, *The Dominican Order in England before the Reformation* (London, 1925), 5.

¹⁵ Kenneth Rowlands, *The Friars: A History of the British Medieval Friars* (Sussex, 1999), 51.

¹⁶ Gwynn, *The English Austin Friars*, 13.

provincial: Cambridge, Oxford, Lincoln, York, and Ireland.¹⁷ 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.¹⁸ The Franciscans, comparatively, maintained seven: London, Cambridge, Oxford, Newcastle, York, Worcester, and Bristol.¹⁹ The Carmelites had only four, namely, London, Norwich, Oxford, and York.²⁰

The population sizes of the mendicants 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 1500.²¹ In 1260, there were approximately 900 Dominicans and their numbers rose to about 1500 in 1300, almost matching the Friars Minor.²² 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.²³ 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.²⁴ The Austins claimed approximately 500 members in 1300 and had an increase to 700 before the Black Death.²⁵ They had 550 members by 1450 and, like the Carmelites, had only around 300 members at the time of their Dissolution.²⁶

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

¹⁷ *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.

¹⁸ Little and Easterling, *The Franciscans and Dominicans of Exeter*, 7.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ Rowlands, *The Friars*, 86.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 201.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Ibid.*, 202.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Ibid.*

order,²⁷ but the Austins were relatively precocious in their appointment of a cardinal protector, as the Dominicans did not receive one until 1376.²⁸ These cardinals were ambassadors for the papacy and devoted to maintaining the orthodoxy of the order.²⁹ In the case of the Austins, one of Annibaldi's notable achievements was the institutionalisation of the papal liturgy for the OESA,³⁰ intertwining the order as deeply as possible with the papacy through a series of grandiose papal exemptions, which facilitated their expansion outside of Italy.³¹

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.³² 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 Favaroni 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.³³ 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.³⁴

²⁷ Stephen Forte, *The Cardinal-Protector of the Dominican Order* (Rome, 1959), 10.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 9.

³⁰ *RothEAF*, 1:191; see also Gutiérrez, *The Augustinians in the Middle Ages*, 109.

³¹ Gutiérrez, *The Augustinians in the Middle Ages*, 100-101. See *Bull.OESA*, 44 for the text of *Sacer Ordo Vester*.

³² Saak, *High Way to Heaven*, 5.

³³ See Aegidius Romanus, *Giles of Rome on Ecclesiastical Power: The De Ecclesiastica Potestate of Aegidius Romanus*, trans. R.W. Dyson (Suffolk, 1986); Alexander de Sancto Elpidio, "De Ecclesiastica Potestate" in *Bibliotheca Maxima Pontifica*, ed. J.T. Rocaberti (Rome, 1698): 1-40; Augustinus de Ancona, "De Vita et Operibus Augustini de Ancona, O.E.S.A." *AAug* (Rome, 1953); Guillemi de Villana Cremonensis, *Guillemi De Villana Cremonensis O.S.A. Tractatus Cuius Titulus Reprobatio Errorum*, ed. Darach Mac Fhionnbhairr (Rome, 1977); James of Viterbo, *De Regime Christiano: A Critical Edition and Translation*, trans. R.W. Dyson (Leiden, 2009).

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.³⁵ 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 established³⁶ This is largely supported by the *Chronicle of London*, whose author placed the entry of the Austins into England to 1250,³⁷ and John Bale, who claimed in the sixteenth century that the migration into England occurred in 1252.³⁸ 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 1240.³⁹ 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.⁴⁰ In fact, two of the earliest Austin foundations,

Origins of Papal Infallibility, 1150-1350: a study on the concepts of infallibility, sovereignty and tradition in the Middle Ages (Leiden, 1972), 6.

³⁵ Links with Rome are discussed on pages 25-26, 131-37.

³⁶ *CPR* 33 Henry III 1247-1258 [1249], 49 (membrane 3): "Rex omnibus etc. Sciatis quod fratres heremitarum ordinis sancti Augustini venientes in Angliam Rex suscepit in protectionem et defensionem et bene placet ei quod in terra sua morentur et quod eis bene fiat a quibuscumque. In cujus etc. Teste ut supra. Dat. Windsor die tertia Septembris [1249]."

³⁷ *GCL*, 11: "the yere of oure Lord anno MCCL beganne de ordre of the Frers Augustyns."

³⁸ *Script. IMBC*, 1:303: "Eo Anno, quo Augustiniani fratres ex Italia in Angliam venerunt, scilicet anno Domini 1252, incepit magna pestilentia Londini et duravit per totum regnum a festo S. Michaelis usque ad festum D. Petri ad vincula, proxime futurum."

³⁹ Little and Easterling, *The Franciscans and Dominicans of Exeter*, 5.

⁴⁰ Annibaldi can be placed in England by the following entries in the Patent Rolls and Close Rolls: *CPR* 27 Henry III 1232-1247 [1243], 400 (membrane 17d); *CCR* 31 Henry III 1242-1246 [1246], 493 (membrane 13); *CPR* 35 Henry III 1247-1258 [1250], 81 (membrane 14); *CPR* 35 Henry III (1248-1252) [1251], 101 (membrane 6); *CCR* 35 Henry III (1247-1251) [121251], 566 (membrane 2d); *CPR* 39 Henry III (1248-1252) [1255], 414, (membrane 7); *CCR* 40 Henry III (1254-56) [1256], 406 (membrane 13d); *CCR* 42 Henry III (1256-1259) [1258], 253 (membrane 4); *CPR* 42 Henry III (1248-1252) [1258], 628 (membrane 9); *CPR* 43 Henry III (1258-1266) [1259], 52 (membrane 8d).

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.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 *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.⁴²

John Capgrave's *Abbreviacion of Cronicles* has often served as the basis for the early history of the English Austin Friars,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.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.⁴⁵ There is corroborating evidence for an early foundation of Clare Priory in

⁴¹ *RothEAF*, 1:19. Clare's history is clear from the Cartulary of Clare (*CAugCl*), 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, *StowSL*, 114.

⁴² R.M. Clay, *The Hermits and Anchorites of England* (London, 1914); *RothEAF*, 1:19.

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 *doctor fundatissimus* of the OESA, was fundamental to the Austins' move to the British Isles (John Capgrave, *John Capgrave's Abbreviacion of Chronicles*, ed. Peter Lucas (Oxford, 1983), 119). This claim was made from Giles' *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, *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.

⁴⁴ Capgrave, *Abbreviacion of Chronicles*, 119.

⁴⁵ See A. Hussey, "Kent Chuntries 3," *KASRB*, 12 (1936), 291 for the history of this hermitage. See *CPR* 39 Henry III (1247-1258) [1255], 397 (membrane 15) for the permission sought to establish the order in Sittingbourne in 1255.

1248,⁴⁶ and potentially for the convent of Woodhouse to 1250, which is mentioned by William Dugdale in the sixteenth century.⁴⁷ 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.⁴⁸ Some other early Augustinian foundations occurred at London, Shrewsbury, Oxford, Huntingdon, Tickhill, and York.⁴⁹ The house at King's Lynn appeared first in 1276 in the will of Adam de Geyton,⁵⁰ and an early sixteenth-century manuscript preserved in the library of the College of Arms placed the foundation of York to 1272.⁵¹

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.⁵² 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

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.⁵³ Moreover, the houses at Northallerton, Barnard Castle, and Coventry either failed or were not properly established in the first place.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.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.⁵⁶ The contrast between this rural and eremitical establishment, with abundant land, with the

⁵³ *RothEAF*, 1:242, 266, 330, 342.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 1:242, 265, 307.

⁵⁵ Christopher Harper-Bill, "Introduction" in *Medieval East Anglia*, ed. Christopher Harper-Bill (Woodbridge, 2005): 1-10 at 6.

⁵⁶ *VCH:Shropshire*, 2:98.

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.⁵⁷ 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 Alleyn of Wyche, John Dragoun of Wyche, John Bush, and William Mercer.⁵⁸ 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.

⁵⁸ VCH:Worcestershire, 2:173-4.

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*,⁵⁹ cited Luc Verheijen as the man who resolved this textual labyrinth of 274 manuscripts, containing a total of 317 texts.⁶⁰ 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.⁶¹ 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.⁶² 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.⁶³

⁵⁹ 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.

⁶⁰ George Lawless, *Augustine of Hippo and his Monastic Rule* (Oxford, 1991), 65. See Luc Verheijen, *Règle de Saint Augustin*, (Paris, 1967), 1:17-24; *idem*, *Nouvelle Approche de la Règle de Saint Augustin* (Bégrolles-en-Mauges, 1980).

⁶¹ 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.

⁶² Gerald Bonner, *The Monastic Rules of Saint Augustine* (New York, 2004), 24.

⁶³ Lawless, *Monastic Rule*, 129. Lawless argues that Possidius uses a paraphrase of Acts 4: 32-35 that comprises the verses 32b+32c+35b, a scriptural discovery made initially by Verheijen. Verheijen had noted that Augustine cited Acts 4:32-35 on numerous occasions, but that the sequence was cited only twice in other patristic literature: the Possidius line and in the *Regula* (Lawless, *Monastic Rule*, 129 and Verheijen, *Règle de Saint Augustin*, 2:89-95). Verheijen thus suggested that Possidius knew the *Regula* and that it was written by Augustine. Rudolph Arbesmann, a fellow Augustinian, supported Verheijen's claim in 1970, stating that "Verheijen is quite justified, it seems to us, in seeing in this striking parallel a close connection between the text of the *Rule* and Augustine's lay-monks at Hippo." (Rudolph Arbesmann, "The Question of the *Regula Sancti Augustini*" *AugSt*, 1 (1970), 237-261 at 260). 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 Augustin* 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,⁶⁴ 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.⁶⁵

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,"⁶⁶ 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,⁶⁷ 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.⁶⁸ 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.⁶⁹ Within the community, what an individual needed should have been given to him, rather than an equitable distribution.⁷⁰ 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).

⁶⁴ These claims will be examined later in this chapter. See pages 45-46.

⁶⁵ This will be discussed on page 46.

⁶⁶ T. van Bavel, "Introduction" in *RuleAug*: 3-8 at 7.

⁶⁷ 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."

⁶⁸ 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."

⁶⁹ van Bavel, "Introduction", 7.

⁷⁰ *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.”⁷¹

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 1244.⁷² 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.⁷³ 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.⁷⁴ 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.⁷⁵ According to Jordan of Quedlinburg, the *Constitutions* were particular to Augustinian customs, but a comparative reading of them shows them to be

Again at 5.1: “It does not make any difference whether you get back the same clothes you handed in or something that has been worn by another, provided that no one is denied what he needs.”

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 8.2.

⁷² Gutiérrez, *The Augustinians in the Middle Ages*, 27. See *Bullarium, Ordinis Eremitarum Sancti Augustini: Periodus Formationis*, ed. B. van Luijk (Würzburg, 1964), 33: “Exhibita siquidem nobis vestra petitio continebat, quod cum Regulam B. Augustini vobis concedendam duxerimus, ut a vobis et successoribus vestris perpetuis futuris temporibus observetur.”

⁷³ R.F. Bennet, *The Early Dominicans* (Cambridge, 1937), 39.

⁷⁴ Gutiérrez, *The Augustinians in the Middle Ages*, 55-56. Jordan of Quedlinburg confirmed this in his *Jordani de Saxonia ordinis Eremitarum Sancti Augustini Liber Vitasfratrum*, ed. Rudolph Arbesmann and Winfridus Hümpfner (New York, 1943), 2:14.

⁷⁵ Gutiérrez, *The Augustinians in the Middle Ages*, 57-58.

heavily derivative of analogous constitutions of the Premonstratensian and Dominican orders.⁷⁶

The *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,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,⁷⁸ stipulated the minimum requisite number of times to receive communion,⁷⁹ and laid out the format of divine worship.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.⁸¹ After lunch was Vespers, and the evening meal was followed by compline.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.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.⁸⁴

Meat was forbidden to the Austins by the *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

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 58. See Jordan of Quedlinburg, *Liber Vitasfratrum*, 467.

⁷⁷ Gutiérrez, *The Augustinians in the Middle Ages*, 92. See Andrews, *The Other Friars*, 95-97 regarding the Augustinian Constitutions of Ratisbon. For the Constitutions themselves, refer to the following edition: *Las Primitivas Constituciones de los Agustinos (Ratisbonenses del año 1290)*, ed. I. Arámburu Cendoya (Valladolid, 1966), 142 (Chapter 43) for specific punishments.

⁷⁸ *Las Primitivas Constituciones*, 43-45 (Chapter 8).

⁷⁹ Gutiérrez, *The Augustinians in the Middle Ages*, 111; chapter 10 of the Constitutions states that religious who were not priests were to receive Communion on the principal feast days and several Sundays, a total of 15 times per year, which by 1348 came to be increased to 17 times (*Las Primitivas Constituciones*, 48).

⁸⁰ Gutiérrez, *The Augustinians in the Middle Ages*, 110.

⁸¹ *RothEAF*, 1:193.

⁸² *Ibid.*

⁸³ William Hinnebusch, *The Early English Friars Preachers* (Rome, 1951), 219-220.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 226.

Friars – at least there – consistently ate meat, as well as shellfish and fish.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.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.⁸⁷ Beer was permitted they could also partake in fruit, eel, goose-meat, and wine on feast days.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.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.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.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,⁹² something that would have been in contravention of Augustine's *Regula*.

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

⁸⁵ Jean Mellor and Terry Pearce, *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.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

⁸⁷ Wilfred Parkin, *The Friars Preachers in Lancashire: 1260-1990* (London, 1991), 11.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

⁸⁹ Bennet, *The Early Dominicans*, 150; Hinnebusch, *The Early English Friars Preachers*, 247.

⁹⁰ Barbara Harvey, *Living and Dying in England 1100-1540: The Monastic Experience* (Oxford, 1993), 34, 71.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 70-71.

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

⁹³ Courtenay, *Schools and Scholars*, 73.

drop in the population of OESA communities.⁹⁴ In other orders, recruitment age was higher: the Dominicans were not to receive novices younger than eighteen,⁹⁵ with strict punishments outlined in the chapters of 1272 and 1283 for those who recruited younger novices,⁹⁶ and in 1402, the Dominican prior at Lancaster ordered that the age of admittance be changed to twenty-one.⁹⁷ The Black Monks recruited novices from the age of fifteen onwards,⁹⁸ although there were many new monks already in their twenties and with significant education, and therefore they proceeded through the initial stages quickly.⁹⁹ 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.¹⁰⁰ After this novitiate, the novice professed to God, Mary and the prior and thus became a fully professed member of the OESA.¹⁰¹

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.¹⁰² 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.¹⁰³ In addition to *studia particularia*, there was a *studium provinciale* in each province, at which students were tested before progressing to a *studium generale*.¹⁰⁴

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.

⁹⁹ Joan Greatrex, *The English Benedictine Cathedral Priories: Rule and Practice, c. 1270-1420* (Oxford, 2011), 94.

¹⁰⁰ Andrews, *The Other Friars*, 122.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰² Courtenay, *Schools and Scholars*, 73.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁴ Gwynn, *The English Austin Friars*, 26.

concursum 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.

¹⁰⁵ Courtenay, *Schools and Scholars*, 74.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 75.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 76.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁹ For example: Dd 4 fol. 2v, 5r-6r, 6v, 7r, 17r-17v, 18v, 40v, 64v, 104v, 146r, 178r; Dd 5 fol. 19v, 91r; *Boase*, 1:4, 12, 16, 19, 22, 23, 30, 49, 76, 80, 94, 124, 146, 147, 159, 166, 170, 184 (consulted via *RothSources*, 288-293, 304-6, 314-16, 341-42, 411-13, 434-36451 (D 713, 736, 739, 766, 770, 852, 1030, 1069, 1103)).

¹¹⁰ Anthony Wood, *Survey of the Antiquities of the City of Oxford in 1661-66*, ed. Andrew Clark, Oxford Historical Society, 15, 17, 37 (Oxford, 1889), 2:450.

¹¹¹ Neil Ripley Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: a list of surviving books*, 2nd edn (London, 1964), 24 (Cambridge), 52 (Clare), 59 (Droitwich), 93 (Grimsby), 125 (London), 133 (Newcastle-upon-Tyne), 139 (Norwich), 143 (Oxford), 194 (Warrington), 218 (York); Andrew Watson, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: a list of surviving books; supplement to the second edition* (London, 1987), 8-9 (Cambridge), 14 (Clare), 16 (Droitwich), 45 (Lincoln), 48 (London), 71 (York); University of Oxford, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain* [<http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk>], accessed 26 July 2017. The following discussion is based on the lists compiled from these sources.

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 Iob*, 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

¹¹² Heiko Oberman, *Archbishop Thomas Bradwardine: A Fourteenth-Century Augustinian* (Utrecht, 1958), 28-48; A. Damasus Trapp, OSA, "Augustinian Theology of the 14th Century," *Aug*, 6 (1956): 146-274; *idem*, "Hiltalinger's Augustinian Quotations," *Aug*, 4 (1954): 412-49.

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

¹¹³ S.C. Cockerell, *The Gorleston Psalter, Described in Relation to Other East Anglian Books of the Period* (London, 1907), 6; William Lambarde, *Dictionarium Angliae Topographicum et Historicum* (London, 1730) 136; William Worcester, *William Worcestre's Itineraries*, ed. John Harvey (Oxford, 1969), 375.

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.¹¹⁵ 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).¹¹⁶ 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.¹¹⁷ We know much more from their London convent,

¹¹⁵ Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*, 24, 142; Watson, *Supplement to the Second Edition*, 8, 52.

¹¹⁶ Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*, 23-4, 141-42; Watson, *Supplement to the Second Edition*, 7, 52.

¹¹⁷ Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*, 24, 142; Watson, *Supplement to the Second Edition*, 52.

but this collection shows little preference for Carmelite theologians.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 *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

¹¹⁸ Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*, 124-5; Watson, *Supplement to the Second Edition*, 48.

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.¹¹⁹ 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.¹²⁰

The Canons Regular were displeased with this development, particularly over the shared custody of Augustine. The Commune of Pavia called it a useless *novitas*,¹²¹ and even Jordan of Quedlinburg recognised it as unusual.¹²² 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).

¹²⁰ Saak, *High Way to Heaven*, 126.

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.¹²³ 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.¹²⁴

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 1331,¹²⁵ the anonymous *Initium sive Processus Ordinis Heremitarum Sancti Augustini* of 1330,¹²⁶ Nicholas of Alessandria's *Sermo de beato Augustino* from the mid-1330s,¹²⁷ Henry of Friemar's *Tractatus de origine et progressu Ordinis fratrum heremitarum sancti Augustini et vero ac proprio titulo eiusdem*, written in 1334 at the end of his career,¹²⁸ and Jordan of Quedlinburg's *Vita Sancti Augustini* from the late 1330s,¹²⁹ codified the intricacies of Augustinian life. This collection of writings about

¹²³ Saak, *High Way to Heaven*, 164.

¹²⁴ Sharon Dale, "A House Divided: San Pietro in Ciel d'Oro in Pavia and the Politics of Pope John XXII," *JMH*, 27:1 (2001): 55-77 at 56.

¹²⁵ The manuscript for this text is Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, MS Plut. 90. Sup. 48, fols. 1r-13r. See R. Arbesmann, "The *Vita Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi* in Cod. Laurent. Plut. 90 Sup. 48," *Traditio* 18 (1962): 319-55, at 320.

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 Origen de la Orden 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 Origen de la Orden 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.

¹²⁸ Saak, *High Way to Heaven*, 209. The manuscript of Henry's text is Verdun, BP, MS 41, saec. 14. It has also been printed in an edition by Rudolph Arbesmann: This text is also found in an edition: Henricus de Frimaria, "Tractatus de origine et progressu Ordinis Fratrum Heremitarum Sancti Augustini," ed. Rudolph Arbesmann *Aug* 6 (1956): 90-145.

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,¹³⁰ 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 Datius of Milan.¹³¹ 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 Hipponensis Episcopi* was likely written sometime between 1322 and 1331,¹³² 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.¹³³ 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 (Winfriedus Hümpfner, “Introduction,” in *Jordani de Saxonia Liber Vitasfratrum*, ed. Winfridus Hümpfner and Rudolph Arbesmann (New York: 1943), i-xcii 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.

¹³¹ Arbesmann, “Jordanus of Saxony’s *Vita S. Augustini*,” 345.

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.¹³⁴ 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.¹³⁵ Lastly, a monastery founded by Augustine in Valerius' garden after his ordination is also mentioned.¹³⁶

The same author likely composed the next text, the *Initium sive Processus Ordinis Heremitarum Sancti Augustini*, around 1330.¹³⁷ This text provides more biographical information about Augustine than the previous, particularly about the composition of the *Regula* and his early forays into asceticism.¹³⁸ 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.¹³⁹ 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

¹³⁴ Arbesmann, "The *Vita Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi*," 340.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 341.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 348.

¹³⁷ Rano, "Las Dos Primeras Obras," 336-37.

¹³⁸ Saak, *High Way to Heaven*, 196.

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.”¹⁴⁰ 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.¹⁴¹ 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.¹⁴² 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.¹⁴³ 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.”¹⁴⁴ 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.¹⁴⁵ According to

¹⁴⁰ Rano, “Las Dos Primeras Obras,” 340. “Et multa alia dicit, que manifestissime ostendunt eum non tantum heremitarum patrem, verum etiam ipsum heremitam fuisse.”

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 206.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 205.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, 367.

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 Aitutus 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 aliquantulum 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 fratribus eremitis sancti Augustini plures alios ordines 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 habitare et exemplari vita ac salutary doctrina simulque confessione provida dei populum irrigare aliis fratribus 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 Humpfer, "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.¹⁵² Aubrey Gwynn used Hardeby's treatise as evidence

¹⁵² 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.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 *De Statu Sui Ordinis*, written by a Canon.¹⁵⁴ However, Hardeby's tone in the last three chapters of the *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,¹⁵⁵ Hardeby treated his opponents courteously, ending his treatise with an appeal for forgiveness should he have offended any canons.¹⁵⁶

The conflict resurfaced in the fifteenth-century in a manuscript composed by John Strecche,¹⁵⁷ a Canon from Kenilworth,¹⁵⁸ and the prior at Brooke in Rutland from 1407.¹⁵⁹ The manuscript of note here, is a miscellany, composed at a similar time.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.¹⁶¹ Strecche was concerned with Augustine's foundation of the Canons, arguing that the OESA was not established by him directly.¹⁶² Another manuscript features a contemporaneous exposition of

¹⁵³ Gwynn, *The English Austin Friars*, 94.

¹⁵⁴ Oxford, Bodl. MS Digby 113, fol. 105r for Hardeby's statement regarding his intended audience.

¹⁵⁵ Arbesmann, "The *Vita Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi*," 352; Rano, "Las Dos Primeras Obras," 369-70.

¹⁵⁶ Oxford, Bodl., MS Digby 113, fol. 117r. Translation is from Gwynn, *The English Austin Friars*, 95.

¹⁵⁷ London, BL MS Add. 38665, fols. 5r-14v.

¹⁵⁸ Geoff Hilton, *John Strecche, Canon of Kenilworth: the life and times of a medieval historian* (Kenilworth, 2004), 9.

¹⁵⁹ Harry Sunley and Norman Stevens, *Kenilworth, the Story of the Abbey* (Kenilworth, 1995), 34. See *VCH:Rutland*, 161; Frank Taylor, *The Chronicle of John Strecche for the Reign of Henry V (1414-1422)* (Manchester, 1932), 4.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁶¹ Hilton, *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).

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.¹⁶³ The verses against the Canons are a direct excerpt from Henry of Friemar's *Tractatus* rather than an original composition.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 *Life of Saint Katharine*, are all about the lives of founders of Augustinian orders. Capgrave's *Life of Saint Augustine*, supplemented by his *A Treatise of the orders under the Rule of Augustine*,¹⁶⁵ in which he discussed the institution of the twelve religious orders that followed Augustine's monastic rule, his *Life of Saint Gilbert*,¹⁶⁶ and his *Life of St Norbert*,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.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 *Treatise*, Capgrave maintained that the Canons did originate with the Church Father, only to be reformed later by St Rufus.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶³ London, BL MS Harley 2386, fols. 60r, 62r-64r.

¹⁶⁴ This section is made up entirely of portions of Henry's work, namely, sections 1.12-17 (Henry of Friemar, "Tractatus", 90), 1.61-66 (92), 1.66-68 (*ibid.*), 2.121-127 (97), 3.38-55 (99), 3.71-80 (100-101), 3.83-90 (101), 3.120-131 (103), 3.145-149 (145), 4.19-26 (106), 4.83-85 (108-109), 4.98-110 (109-110), 4.111-114 (110), 4.114-117 (110), and 5.51-54 (112) of his *Tractatus*.

¹⁶⁵ John Capgrave, "A Treatise of the Orders under the Rule of Augustine," in *John Capgrave's Lives of St. Augustine and St. Gilbert of Sempringham, and a Sermon*, ed. J.J. Munro (London, 1910), 145-148, and London, BL, MS Add. 36704.

¹⁶⁶ John Capgrave, "Life of St Gilbert," in *John Capgrave's Lives of St. Augustine and St. Gilbert of Sempringham, and a Sermon*, ed. J.J. Munro (London, 1910), 61-144; London, BL, MS Add. 36704; and London, BL, MS Cotton Vitellius D XV.

¹⁶⁷ John Capgrave, *The Life of St. Norbert*, ed. Cyril Lawrence Smetana (Toronto, 1977). The original manuscript can be found in San Marino, HL, MS HM 55.

¹⁶⁸ John Capgrave, *Life of St Augustine by John Capgrave*, ed. Cyril Lawrence Smetana (Toronto, 2001), 59.

¹⁶⁹ *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 ȝere be-for þat he was bischop at Ypone, and mad þere chanones. This mater is proued with grete euydens in þe book whеч I mad to þe abbot of Seynt Iames at Northampton in Latin, whеч 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*

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 Englisch 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 Gribbin 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.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

canon, and thus that the original date of 1440 is to be maintained (Joseph Gribbin, *The Premonstratensian Order in Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge, 2001), 157, 248). The *VCH* placed the death of the abbot of West Dereham John Saresson alias Wygenhale in "about 1455", which is a better fit with the testament of 1461, than with Gribbin's suggestion of 1440. The date provided by the *VCH* is based on the mortuary roll produced by the abbey of West Dereham at around that time in honour of the death of Wygenhale (*VCH: Norfolk*, 2:414-418). If the *VCH* and Lucas are correct in conflating the two Wygenhales, he would also have attended the University of Cambridge in the 1420s, and thus likely would have met John Capgrave, and possibly Bokenham, whilst there. It is entirely plausible that there could have been two abbots at Dereham called Wygenhale, as it is clearly a territorial name in religion rather than a secular name; there were several large villages in Norfolk called Wiggenhall only a few miles from West Dereham.

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,”³ and his name may refer to Copgrove, a small village in the West Riding.⁴ He was born in 1393, given his reference in his *Abbreviacion of Cronicles* to his birth in the seventeenth year of Richard II’s reign.⁵ Capgrave was likely ordained to the priesthood in either 1416 or 1417,⁶ and shortly after his ordination, he was sent to study at the *studium concursorium* of the order in London.⁷ In 1422, he moved to Cambridge for his baccalaureate once the prior provincial had appointed him as a lector.⁸ 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,”⁹ a phrase used as well by Capgrave himself in his description of fellow Augustinian Henry of Friemar.¹⁰ Capgrave stayed in Cambridge at least until 1429 to complete his *Super libros Sententiarum*, *Determinationes 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.¹¹

In 1440, Capgrave wrote the *Life of St Norbert*,¹² and the following year, he attended the laying of the foundation stone of King’s College Cambridge, founded by King Henry VI himself.¹³ 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*

³ John Capgrave, *The Life of St Katharine of Alexandria*, ed. C. Horstmann (London, 1893), 16.

⁴ M.C. Seymour, *John Capgrave* (Brookfield, 1996): 195-256 at 207. Regarding Capgrave’s name, refer to A.H. Smith, *The Place Names of the West Riding of Yorkshire* (Cambridge, 1961) 5:90, and George Redmonds, *Yorkshire West Riding* (Chichester, 1973), 123; neither list the name Capgrave nor is it recorded in by R.A. McKinley, *Norfolk and Suffolk Surnames in the Middle Ages* (London, 1975) or D.M. Owen, *The Making of King’s Lynn: A Documentary Survey* (London, 1984), 221-227.

⁵ Alberic de Meijer, “John Capgrave, O.E.S.A.” *Aug 5* (1955): 400-40 at 402. See John Capgrave, *John Capgrave’s Abbreviacion of Cronicles*, ed. Peter Lucas (Oxford, 1983), 203.

⁶ John Capgrave, *Liber de Illustribus Henricis*, ed. F.C. Hingeston (London, 1858), 127.

⁷ Dd 4, fol. 55r (consulted via *RothSources*, 298 (D 720)).

⁸ De Meijer, “John Capgrave,” 409.

⁹ *Script. IMBC*, 1:582; John Leland, *Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britannicis*, ed. A. Hall (Oxford, 1709), 2:453; Joseph Pamphilus, *Chronica Ordinis Fratrum Eremitarum Sancti Augustini* (Rome, 1581), 83r.

¹⁰ Capgrave, *Liber de Illustribus Henricis*, 181.

¹¹ Seymour, *John Capgrave*, 214; De Meijer, “John Capgrave,” 411-412.

¹² *Ibid.*, 413.

¹³ Capgrave, *Liber de Illustribus Henricis*, 133.

Henricis, dedicated to King Henry VI, in 1446.¹⁴ Capgrave's pilgrimage to Rome, funded by Sir Thomas Tuddenham and related in his *Ye Solace of Pilgrims*, likely took place in 1450.¹⁵ The year following, he wrote the *Life of St Augustine* and the *Life of St Gilbert of Sempringham*.¹⁶

In 1453, John Capgrave was elected Prior Provincial,¹⁷ and was unanimously re-elected two years later.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.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.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*, *Danielem*, *XII Prophetas minores*, *IV Evangelia*, *Epistulas canonicas*; *De Illustribus viris OESA*, *Orationes ad clerum*, *Sermones*

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 fani Ioannis, quod Avonae mediterraneae celebre est." In the prologue to the *Life of St Katharine* in Osborn 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.

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 proteccioun my pilgrimage was specially 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.

¹⁶ De Meijer, "John Capgrave," 424.

¹⁷ Dd 6, fol. 16r (consulted via *RothSources*, 333; D 826).

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).

¹⁹ De Meijer, "John Capgrave," 434.

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 disputationes, and Epistulae ad diversos.*²¹

John Capgrave died in 1464 and was buried at his home convent at Lynn.²²

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.²³ Given his statement that he was born somewhere with “an old priory of blake chanons,”²⁴ he probably grew up in Old Buckenham in the south of Norfolk, complete with a house of Austin Canons.²⁵ 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.”²⁶ He returned to his home priory of Clare after his studies and was there by 1438 at the latest.²⁷ 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 1454,²⁸ and his *Dialogue betwix a seculer asking and a frere answering at the grave of Dame Johan of Acres* at Clare in 1456.²⁹ He also translated Ranulph Higden’s *Polychronicon* into English, which he entitled the *Mappula Angliae*, in the 1440s.³⁰ Bokenham wrote exclusively in Middle English, in both verse and prose, and from the

²¹ De Meijer, “John Capgrave,” 437.

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 vighylyr of the Natyuyte/ Of hyr that is femme of virgynyte/ The seuene day euene of Septembre”; “Wych lachesys hath twynyd ful yerys 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 [...]”

²⁵ Serjeantson, “Introduction,” xiv.

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 Stilichonis*: 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.

³⁰ Sheila Delany, *Impolitic Bodies: Poetry, Saints, and Society in Fifteenth-Century England: The Work of Osbern Bokenham* (Oxford, 1998), 22.

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 Bouchier as a demonstration of gratitude for their generous donations of land to the priory.³¹ He died after 1469, when he is mentioned in a will and which is his last appearance in records.³²

Bokenham travelled substantially, even more so than Capgrave. The prior general of the order gave him permission in 1423 to visit Rome on pilgrimage,³³ and in the prologue to his *Life of Margaret*, he referred to the "the laste tyme I was in Italye,"³⁴ 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.³⁵ 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.³⁶ 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.

³² "Wills of the Archdeaconry of Sudbury, 1439-1471, Wills from the Register 'Baldwyne' Part 11: 1461-1474," ed. Peter Northeast and Heather Falvey, *Suffolk Records Society* 53 (Woodbridge, 2010), 473.

³³ Dd 4 fol. 124r (consulted via *RothSources*, 301-2; D 728).

³⁴ Bokenham, *Legendys of Hooly Wummen*, 108.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 139-40; "My ladyis preyere I assentyd to/ Of my sympyl 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,

³⁷ Peter Lucas, "A Fifteenth-Century Copyist under Authorial Scrutiny: An Incident from John Capgrave's Scriptorium" *Studies in Bibliography*, 34 (1981): 66-95.

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 instruccoun 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 edition), 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 footsteppis. Many men & women of his religioun taute he his doctrine. He hath left eke grete instruccioun to þe church in tresoure of his bokes, þat þouz his body be drawe from vs, zet his spirit abideth with us*.” [emphasis mine].

William Caxton's version from between 1483 and 1527.³⁹ The late thirteenth-century *South English Legendary* remains extant in over sixty manuscripts, attesting to its immense popularity.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.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 *Augustine, Norbert, and Gilbert*.⁴² John Lydgate, the esteemed Lancastrian poet and monk from Bury St Edmunds, was an important precursor to Capgrave here: he wrote the *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 *Lives of SS Alban and Amphibal* for John Wheathampstead, the abbot of St Albans.⁴³ Lastly, both Capgrave and Bokenham's wider corpus of hagiography, but particularly Capgrave's *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

³⁹ Sian Echard and Robert Rouse, *The Encyclopedia of Medieval Literature in Britain* (Oxford, 2017), 960.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 959-61.

⁴² See page 50, notes 165-167.

⁴³ Martin Heale, *The Abbots and Priors of Late Medieval and Reformation England* (Oxford, 2016), 94.

secular affairs.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 *Confessiones*, served as the basis for much of the hagiography surrounding his character in the Middle Ages. Following the *Confessiones*, Possidius Bishop of Calama documented Augustine's life in the fifth century in his *Sancti Augustini Vita Scripta A Possidio Episcopo*, in which he presented the saint as the rational and episcopal Christian thinker that came to be commonplace in hagiographies of Augustine.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.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 *Vita Augustini* in the twelfth century and Dominican Bernard Gui produced a legendary entitled the *Speculum Sanctorale*, in which he included an entry on the life of Augustine.⁴⁷ In his *Legenda Aurea*, Jacobus de Voragine focused on Augustine's personal devotion and virtues,⁴⁸ and although not strictly a hagiographical text, Petrarch's *Secretum* made incisive commentary in the fourteenth century on Augustine's

⁴⁴ Echard and Rouse, *The Encyclopedia of Medieval Literature in Britain*, 960.

⁴⁵ *PL* 32: 33-66.

⁴⁶ *PL* 203: 1205-1234; Eric Saak, "Augustine in the Western Middle Ages to the Reformation" in *Companion to Augustine*, ed. Mark Vessey (Oxford, 2012): 465-477 at 468.

⁴⁷ J.C. Dickinson, *The Origins of the Austin Canons and their Introduction into England* (London, 1950), 65; Sherry Reames, *The Legenda Aurea: a Reexamination of its Paradoxical History* (Madison, 1985), 40, 136. The manuscripts for these two texts can be found in Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, MS 9368, fols. 73v-81v (Deutz) (see John H. van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz* (Berkeley, 1983), 47) and Paris, BN, MS Latin 5406, fols. 155v-163r (Gui) (I have not consulted these manuscripts).

⁴⁸ Jacobus de Voragine, *The Golden Legend: Reading on the Saints*, trans. by William Granger Ryan and Eamon Duffy (Princeton, 2012), 502-517. Sherry Reames' book, *The Legenda Aurea: a Reexamination of its Paradoxical History*, 135-153 (for her account of the depiction of Augustine therein) remains the authoritative analysis and interpretation of the *Legenda Aurea*.

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

⁴⁹ Francesco Petrarca, *Petrarch's Secretum with introduction, notes and critical anthology*, ed. Davy Carozza and H. James Shey (New York, 1989).

⁵⁰ The most significant of the studies treating Capgrave this way are: Seymour, *John Capgrave*, 195-256; Edmund Colledge, "The Capgrave Autographs" *TCBS*, 6 (1974): 137-48; Peter Lucas, "John Capgrave, O.S.A. (1393-1464), Scribe and 'Publisher'" *TCBS*, 5 (1969): 1-35; *idem*, *From Author to Audience: John Capgrave and Medieval Publication*; Winstead, *John Capgrave's Fifteenth Century; RothEAF*; Jane Fredeman, "The Life of John Capgrave, O.E.S.A. (1393-1464)" *Aug*, 29 (1979): 197-237.

⁵¹ Jane Fredeman, "Style and Characterization in John Capgrave's *Life of St. Katharine*" *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 62 (1979-80): 346-87; Derek Pearsall, "John Capgrave's Life of St. Katharine and Popular Romance Style" *MH*, 6 (1975): 121-37.

⁵² Mary-Ann Stouck, "Chaucer and Capgrave's Life of St. Katharine" *ABR*, 33 (1982): 276-91; Karen Winstead, "John Capgrave and the Chaucer Tradition," 389-400.

⁵³ Auvo Kurvinen, "The Source of Capgrave's Life of St. Katharine of Alexandria" *NM*, 61 (1960): 268-324.

⁵⁴ Thomas Heffernan, *Sacred Biography: Saints and Their Biographers in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1988), 168-184; Katharine Lewis, *The Cult of St. Katharine of Alexandria in Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge, 1999); David Viera, "Parallels in Fifteenth-Century Hagiography: John Capgrave's *Life of St. Katharine of Alexandria* and Vincent Ferrer's Catalan Sermon on Santa Caterina" *Aug*, 51 (2001): 231-41.

⁵⁵ Sarah James, "'Doctryne and Studie': Female Learning and Religious Debate in Capgrave's *Life of St. Katharine*" *LSE*, 36 (2005): 275-302; Anke Bernhau, "A Christian *Corpus*: Virginity, Violence, and Knowledge in the Life of Saint Katharine of Alexandria" in *Saint Katharine of Alexandria: Texts and Contexts in Western Medieval Europe*, ed. Jacqueline Jenkins and Katharine Lewis (Turnhout, 2003): 109-130; Gail Ashton, *The Generation of Identity in Late Medieval Hagiography* (London, 2000), 1-40, 57-58, 87, 95-96, 122-123, 132, 142; Winstead, "Piety, Politics, and Social Commitment in Capgrave's Life of St. Katharine"; *eadem*, "Capgrave's Saint Katharine: The Perils of Gynecocracy"; *eadem*, *Virgin Martyrs: Legends of Sainthood in Late Medieval England*; Ian Johnson, "Auctricitas? Holy Women and their Middle English Texts," in *Prophets Abroad: The Reception of Continental Holy Women in Late-Medieval England*, ed. Rosalynn Voaden (Cambridge, 1996): 177-97; Paul Price, "I Want To Be Alone: The Single Woman in Fifteenth-Century Legends of St. Katharine of Alexandria," in *The Single Woman in Medieval and Early Modern England: Her Life and Representation*, ed. Laurel Amtower and Dorothea Kehler (Tempe, 2003): 21-39; Sarah Stanbury, "The Vivacity of Images: St. Katharine, Knighton's Lollards, and the Breaking of Idols," in *Images, Idolatry, and Iconoclasm in Late Medieval England*, ed. Jeremy Dimmick et al. (Oxford, 2002): 131-50; *eadem*, "Knighton's Lollards, Capgrave's Katharine, and Walter Hilton's 'Merk Ymage'" in *The Visual Object of Desire in Late Medieval England* (Philadelphia, 2008): 33-75; James Simpson, *Reform and Cultural Revolution* (Oxford, 2002), 383-457; Shannon Gayk, "'Ete this book': Literary Consumption and Poetic Invention in John Capgrave's *Life of St Katharine*" in *Form and Reform: Reading Across the Fifteenth Century*, ed. Shannon Gayk and Kathleen Tomy (Columbus, 2011): 88-109.

by Cyril Smetana and J.J. Munro in their editions of the text.⁵⁶ 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.⁵⁷ 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."⁵⁸ 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.⁵⁹

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

⁵⁶ Arbesmann, "Jordanus of Saxony's Vita S. Augustini"; Jane Fredeman, "John Capgrave's 'Life of St. Augustine'" *Aug*, 28 (1978): 288-309; George Sanderlin, "John Capgrave Speaks Up For the Hermits" *Speculum*, 18 (1943): 358-62; Liliana Sikorska, "Medieval Confession Manuals and their Literary (Re)Readings. The Case of John Capgrave's *Life of St Augustine* and John Lydgate's *The Pilgrimage of the Life of Man*" *Text and Language in medieval English prose*, ed. Akio Oizumi et al. (Oxford, 2005): 237-254.

⁵⁷ Sikorska, "Medieval Confession Manuals," 238.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 248.

⁵⁹ See Delany, *Impolitic Bodies*; *eadem*, "Bokenham's Claudian as Yorkist Propaganda," *JMH*, 22:1 (1996): 83-96; *eadem*, "The Friar as Critic: Bokenham reads Chaucer" in *Medievalitas: Reading the Middle Ages*, ed. Piero Boitani and Anna Torti (Cambridge, 1996): 63-79; *eadem*, "Matronage or Patronage? The Case of Osbern Bokenham's Women Patrons," *Florilegium* 16 (1999): 97-105; Horobin, "Speaking and Writing in Suffolk Speech"; *idem*, "The Lost Legendary of Osbern Bokenham"; *idem*, "Politics, Patronage, and Piety" *Speculum* 82 (2007), 932-49; Cynthia Turner Camp, "Osbern Bokenham and the House of York Revisited" *Viator*, 44:1 (2013): 327-352; Paul Price, "Trumping Chaucer: Osbern Bokenham's Katharine" *CR*, 36:2 (2001): 158-183; and Karen Winstead, "Osbern Bokenham's 'Englische boke': Reforming Holy Women" in *Form and Reform: Reading across the Fifteenth Century*, ed. Shannon Gayk and Kathleen Tomy (Columbus, 2011): 67-87.

before 1451.⁶⁰ It exists in two manuscripts; the first, at the British Library, also contains the *Gilbert*, but was probably originally written as two separate manuscripts around 1461.⁶¹ 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 1731.⁶² 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.⁶³

In the prologue, Capgrave stated that he wrote *Augustine* not for his own order, but at the request of a gentlewoman born on the feast day of St Augustine.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 any othir for sche was browt forth into this world in his solempne feste.⁶⁵

This woman commissioned him in particular, he wrote, because "sche desired this thing of me rather than of another man because that *I am of his profession*, for sche supposed verily that I wold do it with the bettir wil."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,"⁶⁷ Munro identified the author as Capgrave himself, given that no corresponding Latin *Vita Augustini* corresponding could be found.⁶⁸ In 1943, however, Arbesmann and Sanderlin both (and, apparently, independently) identified Jordan of Quedlinburg's *Vita Sancti Augustini* as the main source for Capgrave's composition, thereby repudiating Munro's assumption about the

⁶⁰ Cyril Lawrence Smetana, "Introduction," in *Life of St Augustine by John Capgrave*, ed. Cyril Lawrence Smetana (Toronto, 2001), i-x at v.

⁶¹ London, BL MS Add. 36704. See Seymour, *John Capgrave*, 254.

⁶² London, BL MS Cotton Vitellius D XV. See Seymour, *John Capgrave*, 254.

⁶³ Smetana, "Introduction," ix.

⁶⁴ Arbesmann, "Jordanus of Saxony's *Vita S. Augustini*," 348.

⁶⁵ Capgrave, *Life of St Augustine*, 15.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

⁶⁸ J.J. Munro, "Introduction" in *John Capgrave's Lives of St Augustine and St Gilbert of Sempringham and a Sermon*, ed. J.J. Munro (London, 1910), v-xxi at vii.

text's authorship.⁶⁹ 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.⁷⁰ Jordan's text is not the only source material utilised by the English Austin, as he also cited Augustine's *Confessiones* and *De Beata Vita*, Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae*, and the pseudo-Augustinian *Sermones ad fratres in eremo* and *De Vita Christiana*.⁷¹

Smetana argues that since "Capgrave's *Augustine* was prepared for a literate but not scholarly, noblewoman, it called for clarity and simplicity of language."⁷² 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."⁷³ 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.⁷⁴ 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.⁷⁵ 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;⁷⁶

⁶⁹ Capgrave, *Life of St Augustine*, 9. See Arbesmann, "Jordanus of Saxony's *Vita S. Augustini*," 341-353, and Sanderlin, "John Capgrave Speaks up for the Hermits," 358-362.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 349.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 348-52.

⁷² Smetana, "Introduction," ix.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, xi.

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.

⁷⁵ Richard Newhauser, "Religious Writing: Hagiography, Pastoralia, Devotional and Contemplative Works," in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Literature, 1100-1500* (Cambridge, 2009): 37-56 at 39.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 41.

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.⁷⁷ 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 Pecoock 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,⁷⁸ 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 conuerted fro his erreure onto the feithe" because of, in the first instance, "the prayer of his modir."⁷⁹ 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

⁷⁷ James Simpson, "John Lydgate," in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Literature, 1100-1500* (Cambridge, 2009): 205-216 at 214.

⁷⁸ Smetana, "Introduction," xi.

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.

Augustine's life.⁸⁰ 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 specielle 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, mencyoune made of dyuers partis, plagis, regnis & contreis of this lande Englonde, þe wche, but if þey be declared, byne fulle harde to knowene.⁸¹

The Abbotsford manuscript, which was purchased by Sir Walter Scott in 1804 for £15.15s,⁸² is a relatively good match in content for Bokenham's missing text.⁸³

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.⁸⁴ 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.

⁸¹ Carl Horstmann, "Mappula Angliae, von Osbern Bokenham," *Englische Studien*, 10 (1887): 1-34 at 6.

⁸² Simon Horobin, "The Lost Legendary of Osbern Bokenham," 135.

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 seintis that is called in Latynne *Legenda Aurea* and in Englisshe the Gilte Legende, the which is drawen out of Frensshe 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,⁸⁵ 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*.⁸⁶ Most of these additional lives are of English saints and their main source is the *South English Legendary*.⁸⁷ S.M. Jeremy erroneously attributed the *Gilte Legende* to Bokenham and investigated its relationship to Caxton's *Golden Legend* in four articles.⁸⁸

Whilst the Abbotsford manuscript does not give any indication as to its authorship,⁸⁹ Simon Horobin, to date one of the few scholars to examine the manuscript in any detail,⁹⁰ argues persuasively for attribution to Bokenham, incorporating the major structural

yere of oure lorde a MCCCC and xxxviii bi a *synfulle wrecche* [...]" [emphasis mine] *Gilte Legende*, ed. Richard Hamer and Vida Russell (Oxford, 2006), 2:1036.

⁸⁵ Auvo Kurvinen, "Caxton's Golden Legend and the manuscripts of the *Gilte Legende*" *NM*, 60 (1959): 353-75 at 354.

⁸⁶ Manfred Görlach, *Studies in Middle English Saints' Legends* (Heidelberg, 1998), 74.

⁸⁷ There are many manuscripts of the *South English Legendary*, which is available in an edition by Horstmann (*The Early South-English Legendary*, ed. Carl Horstmann (London, 1887)). A main study of this text is Pierce Butler, *Legenda aurea – Légende dorée – Golden legend: a study of Caxton's Golden legend with special reference to its relations to the earlier English prose translation* (Baltimore, 1899), which contains an analysis of the Latin, French, and English traditions. Other work on the text includes Auvo Kurvinen, *The Life of St Catherine of Alexandria in Middle English Prose* (DPhil diss., University of Oxford, 1959); Charlotte D'Evelyn's analysis in "Saints' Legends" in *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1500*, ed. John Edwin Wells et al. (New Haven, 1970), 2:410-457; Manfred Görlach, *The South English Legendary, Gilte Legende and Golden Legend* (Braunschweig, 1972), especially 9-12. The most recent edition of the *Gilte Legende* is the two-volume edition by Richard Hamer (Oxford, 2006).

⁸⁸ S.M. Jeremy, "The English Prose Translation of the *Legenda Aurea*" *MLN*, 59 (1944): 181-83; *eadem*, "Caxton's Golden Legend and Voragine's *Legenda Aurea*" *Speculum*, 21 (1946): 212-221; *eadem*, "Caxton's Golden Legend and De Vignay's *Légende Dorée*" *MS*, 8 (1946): 259-61; *eadem*, "Caxton and the Synfull Wretche" *Traditio*, 4 (1946): 423-428.

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 'Englische boke,'" 67-87.

differences between the Abbotsford text and the *Gilte Legende*.⁹¹ This independence is essential, as Bokenham's other writings reveal him to have been unfamiliar with the *Gilte Legende*.⁹² 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.⁹³

The Abbotsford manuscript includes the lives of Felix and Cedd, mentioned by Bokenham in the *Mappula*,⁹⁴ 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.⁹⁵ 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.⁹⁶ 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

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.

⁹³ Horobin, "The Lost Legendary of Osbern Bokenham," 138.

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.⁹⁷ 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.⁹⁸ 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.⁹⁹ 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.¹⁰⁰ 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.¹⁰¹ 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 *tofor* 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.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 151-53.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 153.

¹⁰⁰ See Peter Lucas, "A Fifteenth-Century Copyist under Authorial Scrutiny: An Incident from John Capgrave's Scriptorium" *Studies in Bibliography* 34 (1981): 66-95; *idem*, *From Author to Audience*, 37-68.

¹⁰¹ John Capgrave, *The Book of Illustrious Henries*, ed. and trans. F.C. Hingeston (London, 1858), 214. The original Latin is available in John Capgrave, *Liber de Illustribus Henricis*, ed. F.C. Hingeston (London, 1858).

degree at the same time at the same university and thus must have received a very comparable education.¹⁰² 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,¹⁰³ 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.

¹⁰³ Examples include: Robert Ottley, *Studies in the Confessions of St Augustine* (London, 1919), 5; Muriel Spark, "St. Monica," *Month*, 17 (1957): 309-320, at 310; Carl Levenson, "Distance and Presence in Augustine's Confessions," *JR*, 65 (1985): 500-512, at 505; Eric Ziolkowski, "St. Augustine: Aeneas' Antitype, Monica's Boy," *LT*, 9:1 (1995): 1-23 at 3.

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.

¹⁰⁴ The following works have attempted to rehabilitate the view of Monica in scholarship: Rosemary Radford Ruether, "Augustine: Sexuality, Gender and Women" in *Feminist Interpretations of Augustine*, ed. Judith Chelius Stark (Pennsylvania, 2007): 47-67; Anne-Marie Bowery, "Monica: The Feminine Face of Christ" in *Feminist Interpretations of Augustine*, 69-95; Leo Ferrari, "Monica on the Wooden Ruler" *AS*, 6 (1975): 193-205; Elizabeth Clark, "Holy Women, Holy Words: Early Christian Women, Social History, and the 'Linguistic Turn'" *JECS*, 6:3 (1998): 413-30; Virginia Burrus and Catherine Keller, "Confessing Monica" in *Feminist Interpretations of Augustine*, 119-45; Rosemary Rader, *Breaking Boundaries: Male/Female Friendship in Early Christian Communities* (New York, 1983); Silvia Benso, "Monica's Grin of Tension" *Contemporary Philosophy*, 15 (1993): 5-10. These scholars have focused on Monica's role as a spiritual guide, as an analogy for the Mother Church, her mediating function, and the redemptive powers associated with her tears.

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.

¹⁰⁶ Kim Power, *Veiled Desire: Augustine's Writing on Women* (London, 1995), 71-93.

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.¹⁰⁷ 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.¹⁰⁸ 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.

¹⁰⁸ *Book of Margery Kempe*, ed. W. Butler-Bowdon (New York, 1944), 207.

and the refashioning of her image in hagiography and iconography.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.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.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.¹¹² Although there were significant precedents to these developments, such as the inclusion of Monica's feast day into the Augustinian calendar in 1387,¹¹³ 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.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 *Ad fratrem Ludovicum de ordinis nostri forma et propagatione* from the early 1430s,¹¹⁵ the friar from the Observant convent in Lecceto recounted the translation of Monica and gave a

¹⁰⁹ Diana Webb, "Eloquence and Education: A Humanist Approach to Hagiography" *JEH*, 31:1 (1980): 19-39 at 21; Ian Holgate, "The Cult of Saint Monica in Quattrocento Italy: Her Place in Augustinian Iconography, Devotion, and Legend" *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 71 (2003): 181-206 at 181; *idem*, "Santa Monica, Venice, and the Vivarini" in *Art and the Augustinian Order in Early Renaissance Italy*, ed. Louise Bourdua and Anne Dunlop (London, 2007): 163-182 at 180; Allison More, "Dynamics of Regulation, Innovation, and Invention" in *A Companion to Observant Reform in the Late Middle Ages and Beyond*, ed. James Mixson and Bert Roest (Leiden, 2015): 85-110 at 108.

¹¹⁰ Holgate, "The Cult of Saint Monica in Quattrocento Italy," 183.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*; *idem*, "Santa Monica, Venice and the Vivarini," 164.

¹¹² *Idem*, "The Cult of Saint Monica in Quattrocento Italy," 177.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 182.

¹¹⁴ *Idem*, "Santa Monica, Venice, and the Vivarini," 180.

¹¹⁵ Andrea Biglia, "Ad fratrem Ludovicum de ordinis nostri forma et propagatione," ed. Rudolph Arbesmann, *AAug*, 18 (1965): 186-218.

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.¹¹⁶ 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,¹¹⁷ 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.¹¹⁸

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,¹¹⁹ 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.¹²⁰ 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,¹²¹ 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.¹²² Indeed, making the stories of these martyrs applicable to a lay audience, fashioning them more like

¹¹⁶ Webb, "Eloquence and Education," 21.

¹¹⁷ Holgate, "The Cult of Monica in Quattrocento Italy," 191.

¹¹⁸ *Idem*, "Santa Monica, Venice, and the Vivarini," 177.

¹¹⁹ More, "Dynamics of Regulation, Innovation, and Invention," 108.

¹²⁰ Holgate, "The Cult of Monica in Quattrocento Italy," 191.

¹²¹ Andrews, *The Other Friars*, 134.

¹²² Karen Winstead, *Virgin Martyrs: Legends of Sainthood in Late Medieval England* (Ithaca, 1997), 11.

prosperous wives, seems to have been preferable to composing hagiographies of married female saints.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 condicions and moost plesaunt to God and to man. Sche had moo childyrn þan him as it semeth be his writing in his Confessiones.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.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.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.¹²⁷ Monica

¹²³ *Ibid.*

¹²⁴ Capgrave, *Life of St Augustine by John Capgrave*, 18-19.

¹²⁵ A few examples of Capgrave's obsession with the exhortations of Monica to her son are as follows: Capgrave, *Life of St Augustine*, 23: "But his modere with ful sad cuntenauns forbade him alle suspicious company"; *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 childyrn trespass onto oure lord as euyr it greued whan sche bare hem bodyly"; *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 witȝ many menes and many exhortaciones was bisi nyth and day to bryng him fro þis mischef"; *ibid.*, 24-25 which describes the scene of the Wooden Ruler and the bishop coming to Monica; *ibid.*, 28: "But þouȝ he were absent sche prayed for him deuly, þat oure lord schuld send hir ioie of hir son. For in þis mater sche had more sorrow for him þan euyr sche had to bring him forth onto þe world. Euery day sche offered for him at þe auter; euery day sche gaf elmesse. Twyse on þe day went sche to cherk, not for to telle veyn tales, but for to here tydyngis of oure lord of heuene in deuoute sermons, or ells for here diu[in]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"; *ibid.*, 30: "Than sche sent praieres onto heuevene with grettir businesse þan euyr sche ded, þat oure lord schuld hast þis matere & make brith þe þirknesse of Augustines soule."

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 20.

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 which 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 "þe 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. Pere þei fynde þe blessed woman Monicha, þe modir of Augustin. Þei told hir al þis processe, þat sche which had be in so mech sorrow for hir son schuld haue part of his new ioye. Sche þankid God with ful humbil 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 and he stood lenyng out a wyndow and lokyng into a gardeyn wech longid onto her in fer fro pres of puple, þus alone þei too talked ful sobirly of þe euyrlestyn lif wech 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 þing 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 now nowt only a Cristen man, but I se þe a special seruant of God, for þou hast despised alle worldly felicite.'¹³³

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.¹³⁴

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."¹³⁵

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,¹³⁶ and also included the scene of the wooden ruler.¹³⁷ Bokenham's implied that her prayers are somewhat the cause of his eventual salvation: "*thurgh the merite of hir preyers* and the prechyng and the hooly exortacions of seynt Symplician hir sone was convertid and made a perfite cristen man."¹³⁸ [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.¹³⁹

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."¹⁴⁰ 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."¹⁴¹ 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 compuncion 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 meynye of hir housholde with an inestimable ioye and gladnesse seeing the grete grace of compuncyon and of devocion that god had shewid in hir.¹⁴²

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.¹⁴³

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. 171r.

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 eremitism¹⁴⁴ – 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 asceticism 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.

¹⁴⁵ Eric Saak, "Ex Vita Patrum Formatur Vita Fratrum": The Appropriation of the Desert Fathers in the Augustinian Monasticism of the Later Middle Ages" *CHRC*, 86:4 (2006): 191-228 at 213-214.

In Capgrave's *Life of Saint Augustine*, Augustine's vocation as a pastor is particularly conspicuous. In Capgrave's telling, the bishop Valerius noted "þe grete desire þat [Augustine] had to preche þe word of God", and was grateful "þat God schuld send him swech a man þat myth edifie his puple both with exauple and doctrine."¹⁴⁶ 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.¹⁴⁷ 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 eyr he was reqwyred; most specially where heresie regned, þidir went he to defende þe feith."¹⁴⁸ 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."¹⁴⁹ [emphasis mine] 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 custumably vused in good lyf,"¹⁵⁰ 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

¹⁴⁶ Capgrave, *Life of St Augustine*, 55.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*; "Wherefore he graunted Augustin leue ageyn þe custom of þe cherchis of Affrik to prech in þe church in his presens, ffor which þing many opir bishoppis grucchid ageyn þis new custom. Be he rowt not ne sette no pryse be swech grucching tongis, þe whilis þat Augustin supplied swech good werkis which he coude not do himselue."

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 58.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 56.

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."¹⁵¹ 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 preyd to comyn and prechyn there the wurde of god and many men convertyd from here errour."¹⁵² He emphasised that Augustine's sermons held a corrective power, substantiated by his report of a Manichee hearing him preach.¹⁵³

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 combatting those ideas.¹⁵⁴

Moreover, the depiction of Augustine not just as a preacher, but also specifically as a

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁵² Edinburgh, Faculty of Advocates, MS Abbotsford, fol. 173r.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁴ For the classic discussion of the censorship surrounding Arundel's Constitutions of 1409, see Nicholas Watson, "Censorship and Cultural Change in Late-Medieval England: Vernacular Theology, the Oxford Translation Debate, and Arundel's Constitutions of 1409," *Speculum*, 70:4 (1995): 822-864.

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.¹⁵⁵ 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 1459.¹⁵⁶ 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 1459.¹⁵⁷ 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.¹⁵⁸ 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.¹⁵⁹ Bury sought to present thirteen conclusions opposing those of Pecock regarding matters, such as whether it

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 Overmuch 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 Overmuch Blaming of the Clergy*, 572.

¹⁵⁹ James Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation in England: An Historical Survey* (London, 1908), 1:238.

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.¹⁶⁰ 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.¹⁶¹

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.¹⁶² 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.¹⁶³ 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 makitz 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 hem, and with hands and teth proferen in manere of a veniauns.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 239-40.

¹⁶¹ R.M. Ball, "The Opponents of Bishop Pecok," *JEH*, 48:2 (1997): 230-262 at 256.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, 231.

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.

¹⁶⁴ Capgrave, *Life of St Augustine*, 21.

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 þan for need*, and in special of an appil tre þat stood fast by his faderes vyne on anopir mannes lond. Of which he makith grete consciens because þat he myth haue had bettir appillis in his faderes possession, and eke for whan he had þese appelle 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 varysshid away 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 ornamentys were neythyr to shynyng ne to abyect, but of moderat and competent 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

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 23.

¹⁶⁶ Edinburgh, Faculty of Advocates, MS Abbotsford fol. 172r-v.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, fol. 171r.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, fol. 172r.

medicine.¹⁶⁹ Bokenham wrote that “wyn he [Augustine] had aluey at his table”,¹⁷⁰ but that “he usid yt sobyrlly aftyr the counsel of poule to Timothee.”¹⁷¹ 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.¹⁷² 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

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 ipsemet testatus est, beatus Augustinus eidem in visione apparuit grandis quidem capite des membris exilis. Ex qua vision tamquam divino oraculo ipse papa commonitus univit fratribus eremitis sancti Augustini plures alios ordines 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 habitare et exemplari vita ac salutari doctrina simulque confessione provida dei populum irrigare aliis 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 inquired whi he appered soo. Augustin seid, for his succession were not called to dwelle in the cités 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*

verum caput et verum patrem huius ordinis et per consequens ipsos fratres esse veros filios et vera membra ipsius."

¹⁷⁴ Capgrave, *Abbreviacion of Cronicles*, 122-23.

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.¹⁷⁵ 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

¹⁷⁵ Richard Copsey, "Establishment, Identity and Papal Approval: The Carmelite Order's Creation of its Legendary History" in Richard Copsey, *Carmel in Britain: Studies on the Early History of the Carmelite Order* (Faversham, 2004), 3:1-16 at 8.

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

¹ C.H. Lawrence, *The Friars: The Impact of the Mendicant Orders on Medieval Society*, revised edn. (London, 2013), 102.

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.

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 antifraternality directed at the Austin Friars and if so, how did they respond?⁵ 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 "antifraternality" as opposition to the friars in their early phase (1220-1400) "driven by competition over material and political resources as well as by envy, a feeling aroused especially among monks and clergymen, members of the church whose income and status the mendicants threatened most." See G. Geltner, *The Making of Medieval Antifraternality: 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 antifraternality 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, *Antifraternality 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 "antifraternality."

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

⁶ Barbara Harris, *Edward Stafford: Third Duke of Buckingham, 1478-1521* (Stanford, 1986), 2.

⁷ See pages 120-129 for a discussion on indulgences and 137-142 for instances of conflicts with the secular clergy.

⁸ For the late-medieval economy of piety, see J.T. Rosenthal, *The Purchase of Paradise: Gift Giving and the Aristocracy* (London, 1972), especially at 12-13. As Michael Hicks observed, "it was a universal belief in late-medieval England that religious benefits could be bought." Michael Hicks, "The Rising Price of Piety in the Later Middle Ages" in *Monasteries and Society in the British Isles in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. Janet Burton and Karen Stöber (Woodbridge, 2008): 95-112 at 95.

⁹ A.G. Little, *Studies in English Franciscan History* (Manchester, 1917), 19.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 21-22, 26.

that friars began to receive individual bequests.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.¹² The Dominicans owned their own properties until 1216, when they gave up this right, but they never employed intermediaries, as did the Franciscans.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,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 *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.

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

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 55.

¹² Parkin, *The Friars Preachers in Lancashire: 1260-1990*, 232.

¹³ Hinnebusch, *The Early English Friars Preachers*, 236.

¹⁴ Bennet, *The Early Dominicans*, 148.

a preacher able to make his ideas accessible to members of the laity.¹⁵ Waldeby left several collections of sermons, some of which were written specifically for his students.¹⁶ 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.¹⁷ 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.¹⁸ Waldeby's best known work was his *Novum Opus Dominicale*, a sermon cycle for each Sunday gospel of the year.¹⁹ 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.²⁰ 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.²¹

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.²² His most famous sermon was about Catherine, composed in 1382, two years after her death,²³ presenting her as a typical female ascetic, but also as a preacher, supporter of the papacy, opponent of heresy,

¹⁵ His homilies can be found in Oxford, MS Bodl. Laud. Misc. 77 and MS Laud. Misc. 296. For discussions of Waldeby, see Margaret Morrin, *John Waldeby O.S.A., c. 1315 – c.1372: English Augustinian Preacher and Writer* (Rome, 1975); Yuichi Akae, *A Mendicant Sermon Collection from Composition to Reception: The Novum Opus Dominicale of John Waldeby, OESA* (Turnhout, 2015) and G.R. Owst, *Preaching in Medieval England: an introduction to sermon manuscripts of the period 1350-1450* (Cambridge, 1926), 65-66.

¹⁶ Siegfried Wenzel, *Latin Sermons from Later Medieval England: Orthodox Preaching in the Age of Wyclif* (Cambridge, 2005), 292.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 40.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 41.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 43.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 44.

²² See page 235. For discussions of Flete's career, see Gwynn, *The English Austin Friars*, 139-210; B. Hackett, *William Flete, OSA, and Catherine of Siena* (Villanova, 1992); *idem*, "William Flete and the *De remediis contra temptationes*" in *Medieval Studies Presented to Aubrey Gwynn*, ed. J.A. Watt et al. (Dublin, 1961), 330-48.

²³ Carolyn Muessig, "Catherine of Siena in Late Medieval Sermons" in *A Companion to Catherine of Siena*, ed. Carolyn Muessig et al. (Leiden, 2012), 203-226 at 204.

and a writer.²⁴ He presented an account of her transformative experience at communion, portraying her as a *mediatrix*, unusual for a female saint.²⁵ 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.²⁶ Geoffrey Hardeby was another celebrated theologian, who preached in defence of the mendicant orders, recorded in his *Liber de Vita Evangelica*.²⁷ 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.²⁸

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,²⁹ or what Francis Roth rather woodenly characterised as a “stagnant” phase of the OESA's history.³⁰ 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.³¹ 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.

²⁷ The best study of this text is K. Walsh, “The *De vita evangelica* of Geoffrey Hardeby OESA (c. 1320-c. 1385) a study in the mendicant controversies of the fourteenth century [part 1]” *AAug* 33 (1970): 151-261; *eadem*, “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 [part 2]”, *AAug* 34 (1971): 5-83.

²⁸ B. Hackett, “The Spiritual Life of the English Austin Friars in the Fourteenth Century,” *Sanctus Augustinus vitae spiritualis magister* (Rome, 1959), 2:421-92, esp. 2:443-50; *idem*, “Geoffrey Hardeby's *Quaestio* on S. Augustine as founder of the order of the Friars Hermits,” *Traditio Augustiniana*, ed. A. Zunkeller and A. Krümmel (Würzburg, 1994): 525-56.

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,

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*.

³⁵ Susan Wabuda, *Preaching During the English Reformation* (Cambridge, 2007), 113.

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 1407.³⁹ In 1409, Thomas Bramble received a licence to preach in the diocese of Lincoln.⁴⁰

John Sokour, 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.⁴¹ Similar cases include Richard Frere and Robert Bamborough, who were both licensed in 1510.⁴² 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.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.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.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.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.⁴⁷ Bircheley had a reputation for orthodoxy; in 1415, it is to him that the problematic apostate, Hugh Tiryngton, an Austin Friar of Lincoln, was to be

³⁹ Lichfield, Register of John Burghill fol. 155v-157v (consulted via *RothSources*, 280; D 690).

⁴⁰ Lincoln, Register of Repingdon, fol. 39 (consulted via *RothSources*, 278; D 682).

⁴¹ *The Register of Thomas Bekynton, Bishop of Bath and Wells 1443-1465*, ed. Henry Churchill et al., SRS 49-50 (1934-35): 46.

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).

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).

⁴⁴ *BRUO*, 3: 2156; *Reg.Chich.*, 4:184.

⁴⁵ TNA E 101/406/21, fol. 19r; *BRUO*, 3: 2152.

⁴⁶ See pages 42-43 and 48-52.

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

⁴⁸ *Rot.Norm.*, 1:xxix.

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.

⁵¹ *Reg.Flem.*, 2:109.

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.⁵⁷ This was not his first trip abroad; in 1520, the general chapter requested that he be placed in Venice.⁵⁸ This is the same John Towne who, as will be discussed below,⁵⁹ 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.⁶⁰ Comparatively, there were ten for the Dominicans in fourteenth-century Lancashire.⁶¹ Preaching was one of the main religious priorities for the Dominicans and in England, preaching against the Lollard heresy was a main concern.⁶² 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.

⁶² Walter Gumbley, OP, "As Preachers" in *The English Dominican Province (1221-1921)*, ed. Felix Couturier, OP (London, 1921):141-164 at 144.

might focus on his preaching.⁶³ The Constitutions of the Dominicans, although based around those of the Canons Regular, replaced any canonical emphasis on labour with instructions on preaching,⁶⁴ 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.⁶⁵

Some of the most celebrated Franciscan preachers came from the Observants, although the Conventuals also excelled.⁶⁶ 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.⁶⁷ 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 1270.⁶⁸ 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.⁶⁹ 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.⁷⁰ 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.⁷¹ 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.⁷²

⁶³ Hinnebusch, *The Early English Friars Preachers*, 284.

⁶⁴ Bede Jarrett, OP, "Their Ascetical Training" in *The English Dominican Province (1221-1921)*, ed. Felix Couturier, OP, (London, 1921): 113-140, 118.

⁶⁵ Bennet, *The Early Dominicans*, 80.

⁶⁶ Michael Robson, *The Franciscans in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 2006), 220.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

⁶⁸ Michael Robson, "The Franciscan Custody of York in the Thirteenth Century" in *The Friars in Medieval Britain*, ed. Nicholas Rogers (Donington, 2010): 1-24 at 14.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 15, 17.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 17, 24.

⁷¹ Little, *Studies in English Franciscan History*, 141-42.

⁷² H. Campbell, "Franciscan Preaching in Thirteenth-Century England: Sources, Problems and Possibilities" in *The Friars in Medieval Britain*, ed. Nicholas Rogers (Donington, 2010): 25-40 at 26, 40.

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.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.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 1411-22.⁷⁵ 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.⁷⁶ This collection of sermons, relatively unusual for its usage of English verses, contains three different manuscripts with sermons and discussions of theological matters.⁷⁷ The authors used English verses to establish the specific sermon's moral in a proverb-like form,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.⁷⁹

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

⁷³ Clark, *A Monastic Renaissance at St Albans*, 33, 61.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 61.

⁷⁵ Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, 190.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷⁷ Siegfried Wenzel, *Verses in Sermons: Fasciculus Morum and its Middle English Poems* (Cambridge, 1978), 92.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 72.

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),⁸⁰ Gregory's *De Cura Pastoralis* (also in Cambridge),⁸¹ a book of sermons by Nicholas of Aquavilla (Grimsby),⁸² Henry of Segusio's *Super Quartum Decretalium* (Oxford),⁸³ William of Pagula's *Oculus Sacerdotis* (York),⁸⁴ and an English version of William of Nassington's *Speculum Vitae* (York).⁸⁵ 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.⁸⁶ It was a pioneering text and influential for the genre of pastoral guides,⁸⁷ 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.⁸⁸ 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.⁸⁹ 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.⁹⁰

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

⁸⁰ Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*, 24.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

⁸² *Ibid.*, 93.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 143.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 218.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

⁸⁶ Margaret Jennings, "Introduction" in Ranulph Higden, *Ars Componendi Sermones*, ed. and trans. Margaret Jennings and Sally Wilson (Leiden, 1991): 1-23 at 4.

⁸⁷ F. Broomfield, "Introduction," in Thomas de Chobham, *Summa Confessorum*, ed. F. Broomfield (Leuven, 1968), xxiv-lxix.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, lxxv.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, lxx.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

how to interrogate the penitent, along with canonical information, such as penances prescribed by canon law and sins that require absolution from a bishop.⁹¹ 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.⁹² 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.⁹³ William of Nassington's *Speculum Vitae*, used by the York Austins, is much more fixed within the tradition of class criticism,⁹⁴ and is part of the medieval tradition of ethical and psychological doctrine.⁹⁵ 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.⁹⁶

Furthermore, we find in the Grimsby convent a book of sermons from the fourteenth-century Italian theologian Nicholas of Aquavilla.⁹⁷ The manuscript is dated to 1417 and was owned by the prior, John Daniel.⁹⁸ 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 Pastoralis*, 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

⁹¹ W.A. Pantin, *The English Church in the Fourteenth Century*, 2nd edn. (Toronto, 1981), 197-8.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 198.

⁹³ Michael Haren, "Social Ideas in the Pastoral Literature of Fourteenth-Century England" in *Religious Belief and Ecclesiastical Careers in Late-Medieval England*, ed. Christopher Harper Bill (Woodbridge, 1991): 43-58 at 48.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

⁹⁵ Pantin, *The English Church in the Fourteenth Century*, 228.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*

⁹⁷ Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*, 93.

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).⁹⁹ The Franciscans also used Yves of Chartres, along with Franciscan Pelbartus Ladislaus and the Dominican Johann Herolt.¹⁰⁰

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*.¹⁰¹ 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.¹⁰² Roth drew attention to Edward II asking the Austin Friars for sermons in 1314 and to Edward III, who behaved similarly in 1346.¹⁰³ Thomas Winterton, a renowned Austin theologian, preached before the king in 1390 and 1395.¹⁰⁴ This was not unique to the Austin Friars, and all three other fraternal orders were involved in precisely the same activity.¹⁰⁵

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

⁹⁹ University of Oxford, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*,

[http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/mlgb/?search_term=dominican&page_size=500];

[http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/mlgb/book/911/?search_term=dominican&page_size=500];

[http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/mlgb/book/3811/?search_term=%7B%22author_title%22%3A%20%22ivo%22%7D&field_to_search=multiple&page_size=500];

[http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/mlgb/book/4240/?search_term=%7B%22author_title%22%3A%20%22petrus%22%7D&field_to_search=multiple&page_size=500]; [http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/mlgb/book/5595/?search_term=%7B%22author_title%22%3A%20%22fitzralph%22%7D&field_to_search=multiple&page_size=500], accessed 7 November 2017.

¹⁰⁰ University of Oxford, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*

[http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/mlgb/?search_term=franciscan&page_size=500];

[http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/mlgb/book/908/?search_term=franciscan&page_size=500];

[http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/mlgb/book/1703/?search_term=franciscan&page_size=500];

[http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/mlgb/book/6810/?search_term=%7B%22author_title%22%3A%20%22herolt%22%7D&field_to_search=multiple&page_size=500], accessed 7 November 2017.

¹⁰¹ Röhrkasten, *The Mendicant Houses of Medieval London*, 454-55.

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).

¹⁰³ *RothEAF*, 1:202.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

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. Devyner 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.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 1393.¹⁰⁷ 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.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.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.¹¹⁰ Thomas Hervy preached before Henry VI on the second Sunday of Lent in 1451 and the third Sunday of Lent in 1452.¹¹¹ 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.¹¹² Hugh de Sunfeld preached to Henry VI in 1448 and received 20 shillings for the service.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.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.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

¹⁰⁶ London, TNA E 101/404/21, fol. 35v -36r. See also *BRUO*, 3:2156, 2170 and 2216.

¹⁰⁷ London, TNA E 101/402/10, fol. 33v; *BRUO*, 3:2156.

¹⁰⁸ London, TNA E 101/406/21, fol. 19r; *BRUO*, 3:2152.

¹⁰⁹ John of Amersham, *Annales Monasterii S. Albani*, ed. Henry Riley (London, 1870-71), 1:31.

¹¹⁰ Dd 5, fol. 19v (consulted via *RothSources*, 315; D 767); *RothEAF*, 1:202.

¹¹¹ London, TNA E 101/410/6, fol. 34v; TNA E 101/410/9, fol. 37v; *BRUO*, 2:921.

¹¹² *CPR* 35 Henry VI 1452-61 [1457], 339 (m. 6).

¹¹³ London, TNA E 101/410/1, fol. 23v; *BRUO*, 3:2219.

¹¹⁴ *LP* 3(1) no. 1285; *SP* 1/22, fol. 66r. He is referred to as 'Friar Stephens'.

¹¹⁵ *SP* 1/22, fol. 68r.

charges of treason in May 1521.¹¹⁶ 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.¹¹⁷

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.¹¹⁸ Henry III requested that the Dominicans send friars for preaching the Crusades in 1251 and again in 1255.¹¹⁹ In 1291, John Romain, Archbishop of York, called upon the Dominicans in his diocese for this purpose.¹²⁰ 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.¹²¹ Dominican provincial Thomas Palmer preached for Richard II in 1384, 1389, and 1390, and before Henry IV in 1403.¹²² The next provincial, William Pickworth, also preached before Henry IV, as did his successor John Tille.¹²³ 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.¹²⁴ Amongst the Carmelites, Thomas Netter preached at the funerals of Henry IV and Henry V.¹²⁵ 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.¹²⁶

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.*

¹²⁵ Margaret Poskitt, "Thomas Netter of Walden" in *Carmel in Britain: Essays on the Medieval English Carmelite Province*, ed. Patrick Fitzgerald-Lombard O.Carm (Rome, 1992) 2:166-170 at 166.

¹²⁶ Robson, *The Franciscans in the Middle Ages*, 221.

recruited them for preaching in favour of his war against Philip IV of France.¹²⁷ Thomas Penketh, as we shall see in the following chapter, preached the legitimacy of Richard III in 1484,¹²⁸ 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.¹²⁹ 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,¹³⁰ 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.¹³¹ 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 1394.¹³² In 1395, he was transferred again, to Chichester this time, but for fewer than twelve months.¹³³ In October 1396, he became Archbishop of York, succeeding Thomas Arundel, who had transferred to Canterbury.¹³⁴ He remained in that position, second in the English ecclesiastical hierarchy only to Arundel, until his death in 1398, when he was interred in

¹²⁷ *RothEAF*, 1:202.

¹²⁸ See pages 180-82.

¹²⁹ *LP* 7 no. 590; London, BL, Cotton MS Cleopatra E IV, fols. 14r-v.

¹³⁰ *Fasc.Ziz.*, 286.

¹³¹ *Hier.Cath.*, 1:72.

¹³² *Ibid.*, 1:229; E. Foran, "Robert Waldeby, OSA, Archbishop of Dublin 1390-95" *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* 17 (1921): 356-64.

¹³³ *Chron.Maiora*, 2:32-33; *HBC*, 239 and 282.

¹³⁴ *Hier.Cath.* 1:233.

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.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 1532,¹³⁶ 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.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 Ratkelf/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.¹³⁸ 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 1272.¹³⁹ 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.¹⁴⁰ Before their dissolution, twenty-four Dominicans became bishops of sees throughout the country and in Ireland, working as auxiliary bishops to English dioceses.¹⁴¹ 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.¹⁴² 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.¹⁴³

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

5:589); Robert Woodborn appointed bishop of Holar (Iceland) on 27 June 1441 (*ibid.*, 9:227); William Graunt appointed bishop of Paneas, Thracia and auxiliary bishop of Ely on 27 July 1513 (*Hier.Cath.*, 3:286); and Thomas Vivian appointed bishop of Megara (Achaia) in Greece and auxiliary bishop of Exeter in 1517 (*Hier.Cath.*, 3:240).

¹³⁸ Bennet, *The Early Dominicans*, 131.

¹³⁹ Hinnebusch, *The Early English Friars Preachers*, 426.

¹⁴⁰ Walter Gumbley, OP, "In Public Life," in *The English Dominican Province (1221-1921)*, ed. Felix Couturier, OP (London, 1921): 25-52 at 44.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 44-45.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*

addition to a high-ranking ecclesiastic.¹⁴⁴ Both Franciscans and Dominicans had hundreds of auxiliary bishops in the Middle Ages, with titular appointments in Ireland, Scandinavia, Russia, Asia Minor, and Palestine.¹⁴⁵ 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 1417.¹⁴⁶ 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.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁴ Martin Taylor, *The Greyfriars, Canterbury: the first Franciscan house in England* (Canterbury, 2003), 7, 10.

¹⁴⁵ Gumbley, "In Public Life," 49.

¹⁴⁶ Wilfrid McGreal, OCarm, *The History of the Friars Aylesford* (Aylesford, 1998), 14.

¹⁴⁷ R.N. Swanson, *Indulgences in Late-Medieval England: Passports to Paradise?* (Cambridge, 2007), 406.

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",¹⁴⁸ 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.¹⁴⁹ 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

¹⁴⁸ A. Galpern, "The Legacy of the Late-Medieval Religion in Sixteenth-Century Champagne" in *The Pursuit of Holiness in Late Medieval and Renaissance Religion*, ed. C. Trinkaus and H.A. Oberman, (Leiden, 1974), 141-76 at 149.

¹⁴⁹ R.N. Swanson, "Letters of Confraternity and Indulgence in Late Medieval England" *ALBRA* 25 (2000): 40-57 at 40.

gray freres, the blak freres, the white freres, the Austyn freres and crossed freres, for to pray for my soule x s [shillings].”¹⁵⁰ 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.¹⁵¹

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.¹⁵² 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.¹⁵³ 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 *Sudbury Wills*, 473 (no. 779).

¹⁵² Judith Middleton-Stewart, *Inward Purity and Outward Splendour: Death and Remembrance in the Deanery of Dunwich, Suffolk, 1370-1547* (Woodbridge, 2001), 57.

¹⁵³ Norman Tanner, “Popular Religion in Norwich with Special Reference to the Evidence of Wills, 1370-1532,” D.Phil diss., University of Oxford, 1974, 359-60; Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors: politics and religion in an English county, 1500-1600* (Oxford, 1987), 135; R.N. Swanson, *Church and Society in Late Medieval England* (Oxford, 1989), 298.

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 Cantebury, 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 Chrisoyne (*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.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.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.¹⁵⁷ The percentage of testators leaving gifts to the friars, however, was considerable, surpassing London, where only thirty-six percent left bequests to friars.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.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.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 1446,¹⁶¹ 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.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

¹⁵⁵ Tanner, "Popular Religion in Norwich," 334.

¹⁵⁶ Middleton-Stewart, *Inward Purity and Outward Splendour*, 58.

¹⁵⁷ J.T. Rosenthal, *The Purchase of Paradise: The Social Function of Aristocratic Benevolence*, 2nd edn. (Abingdon, 2007), 84.

¹⁵⁸ J.A.F. Thomson, "Piety and Charity in Late-Medieval London" *JEH*, 16:2 (1965): 178-95 at 189.

¹⁵⁹ Ralph Anthony Houlbrooke, *Death, Religion, and the Family in England, 1480-1750* (Oxford, 2004), 114.

¹⁶⁰ Tanner, "Popular Religion in Norwich," 350-356.

¹⁶¹ *Top.Hist.Norfolk*, 10:111-8.

¹⁶² Tanner, "Popular Religion in Norwich," 356.

their founding family and benefactors, as well as diocesan bishops, often employing daily rotas for their maintainence.¹⁶³ 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.¹⁶⁴

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.¹⁶⁵ 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.¹⁶⁶ 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.¹⁶⁷ 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.¹⁶⁸ 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.¹⁶⁹

Letters of Confraternity and Indulgences

¹⁶³ Greatrex, *The English Benedictine Cathedral Priories*, 19, 272, 321.

¹⁶⁴ Little, *Studies in English Franciscan History*, 27.

¹⁶⁵ Christine Carpenter, "Religion" in *Gentry Culture in Late-Medieval England*, ed. Raluca Radulescu and Alison Truelove (Manchester, 2005), 134-150 at 143.

¹⁶⁶ D.M. Palliser, *Medieval York: 600-1540* (Oxford, 2014), 152.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 252, 281.

¹⁶⁸ Katherine French, *The People of the Parish: Community Life in a Late Medieval English Diocese* (Philadelphia, 2001), 180.

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.¹⁷⁰ Investigated most thoroughly by Robert Swanson in 2002,¹⁷¹ 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,¹⁷² which is why I have considered them together here.

The Lollard tract *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:

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 bedys or broche or breed for our fode.
 And ȝif þou hast any good & wilt þi-selfe helpen,
 Helpe vs hertliche þerwiþe & here I vndertake,
Pou schalt ben broþer of our hous & a boke habben
 (At þe next chaptire) clereliche ensealed
And þanne oure prouinciall haþ power to assoilen
*Alle sustren & breperen þat beþ of our order.*¹⁷³ [emphasis mine]

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

¹⁷⁰ For example, see Dd 5, fol. 23v (consulted via *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.

¹⁷¹ R.N. Swanson, "Mendicants and Confraternity in Late-Medieval England" in *The Religious Orders in Pre-Reformation England*, ed. James Clark (Woodbridge, 2002), 121-141.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, 121.

¹⁷³ *Pierce the Ploughman's Crede*, ed. Walter Skeat (Oxford, 1906), 12-13, lines 318-329.

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 presencium participationem bonorum omnium concedendo, que per fratres dicti conventus in missis, vigiliis, jejuniis, anstinentiis, predicationibus, et orationibus ceterisq. divinis exercitiis 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 Sithe ibidem constructe, habebit a Paulo papa Secundo quinque centum dies indulgentie. Eciam cum obitus alicujus vestrum in capitulo nostro provinciali fuerit nunciatus, 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.¹⁷⁶ In 1404, the following provincial, William Wells, gave confraternity to William and Joan Makney in Oxford.¹⁷⁷ The provincial Thomas Sharington offered confraternity to Robert and Isabelle Deyn at the Austin friary in Tickhill in 1427.¹⁷⁸ 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.¹⁷⁹ A letter was given to Richard and Agnes Horton in 1442 in Northampton,¹⁸⁰ 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.¹⁸¹ 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.¹⁸² In 1475, the provincial John Bury gave this privilege to Thomas and Johanna Staunton on the feast of St Mary Magdalene at York,¹⁸³ and in 1481, a letter was given to John and Alice Cleberi by the prior of Woodhouse.¹⁸⁴ 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.¹⁸⁵ 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

¹⁷⁶ W.G. Clark-Maxwell, "Some Further Letters of Fraternity," *Archaeologia*, 79 (1929), 19-60 at 44.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁸ London, BL, Add. Charters 20599.

¹⁷⁹ Oxford, MS Bodl. 131 (S.C. 1999); London, BL, Sloane Charter 32, 28.

¹⁸⁰ London, BL, Add. Charter 6054.

¹⁸¹ *Sudbury Wills*, 70 (no. 121).

¹⁸² Thomas Martin, *The History of the Town of Thetford* (London, 1779), 197.

¹⁸³ London, BL, Harley Charters 111 C 23.

¹⁸⁴ W.G. Clark-Maxwell, "Some Letters of Confraternity," *Archaeologia*, 75 (1926), 179-216 at 211.

¹⁸⁵ *Test.Ebor.*, 4:81.

in the masses and devotion of the whole order in England.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.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 1445.¹⁸⁸ 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.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 *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.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.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

¹⁸⁶ Thomas Martin, *The History of the Town of Thetford* (London, 1779), 197.

¹⁸⁷ See page 169.

¹⁸⁸ *Report on the manuscripts of Lord de L'Isle and Dudley preserved at Penshurst Place*, ed. Charles Kingsford (London, 1925), 1:220.

¹⁸⁹ London, BL, Add. Charter 6054.

¹⁹⁰ See the example of St Albans in Clark, *A Monastic Renaissance at St Albans*, 40.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 18.

to the mayor of Canterbury, William Woode,¹⁹² 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.¹⁹³ 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.¹⁹⁴

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.¹⁹⁵ 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, constableness of Pontefract and Knaresborough castles and stewardships of Snaith and Dunstanburgh.¹⁹⁶ 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

¹⁹² Canterbury, City Archives, MS Bunce, fol. 93r (consulted via *RothSources*, 390; D 981).

¹⁹³ Discussed by Thomas Madox in his *Formulare Anglicanum* (London, 1702), 341.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁹⁵ For a discussion of the political environment surrounding Darcy’s conviction, see R.W. Hoyle, *The Pilgrimage of Grace and the Politics of the 1530s* (Oxford, 2001), 256-281.

¹⁹⁶ Darcy also held several other patents, such as for the captaincy, treasureship and chamberlainship of Berwick, stewardships over Westmorland’s and Sir Ralph Grey’s lands during minorities, and the chief justiceship of forests beyond the Trent. See Hoyle, *The Pilgrimage of Grace*, 256-281; *idem*, “Thomas Lord Darcy and the Rothwell tenants, c.1526–1534,” *YAJ*, 63 (1991), 85–107; M.L. Bush, *The Pilgrimage of Grace: a study of the rebel armies of October 1536* (Manchester, 1996), 85, 98, 100.

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

¹⁹⁷ Dd 5, fol. 23v (consulted via *RothSources*, 322-23; D 789).

¹⁹⁸ Dd 6, fol. 18v (consulted via *RothSources*, 352; D 879).

¹⁹⁹ See pages 116-117.

²⁰⁰ *CPRGBI* 13:2, 536.

²⁰¹ *Ely Diocesan Remembrancer* 49 (Cambridge, 1910), 29. The *Ely Diocesan Remembrancer* from 1908 till 1910 contains sections of the Ely episcopal registers, calendared by J.H. Crosby. John Alcock's registers from his time as Bishop of Ely can be found in Cambridge, UL, MS EDK G.1.6.

²⁰² *Ibid.*

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

²⁰³ *GraceBookB*, 1:64.

²⁰⁴ The letter from Leo X can be found in the Vatican, Bibl. Vaticana, MS Ferraioli 424, fols. 148r-149r (consulted via *RothSources*, 404-8; D 1020). See *LP* 2:2, no. 3767; *SP* 1/16, fol. 44r for Leo X's letter to Wolsey regarding the appointment of a banker responsible for the revenue gained in the sale of indulgences. The Vatican, Bibl. Vaticana, MS Ferraioli 424, especially fol. 148v (consulted via *RothSources*, 404-8; D 1020).

²⁰⁵ William Lunt, *Financial Relations of the Papacy with England 1327-1534* (Cambridge, 1962), 610.

²⁰⁶ Truro, Cornwall Record Office, MS AR 27/8 (I have not been able to consult this manuscript, but know of it through Swanson, *Indulgences*, 243) and Oxford, Bodl., MS Top Oxon d.238, fol. 6r.

²⁰⁷ *LP* 3:2, no. 2163, *SP* 1/24 fol. 85r.

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

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.²⁰⁹ 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.²¹⁰

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.²¹¹ 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),²¹² and stealing money from his own convent. He resigned two years later, in November 1524, because of illness,²¹³ 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.²¹⁴ 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."²¹⁵ 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

²⁰⁹ Heiko Oberman, *Luther: Man between God and the Devil* (New Haven, 1989), 188-89.

²¹⁰ Dd 14, fols. 90v-91r (consulted via *RothSources*, 421-22; D 1041).

²¹¹ Dd 13, fols. 154v-155r, 174v-175r, Dd 14 fols. 10v-11v, 46r, 57v, 90v-91r (consulted via *RothSources*, 413-15; D 1032; 416-17; D 1035; 421-22; D 1041).

²¹² Dd 14, fols. 90v-91r: "Mutans quadrata rotundis" (consulted via *RothSources*, 421-22; D 1041).

²¹³ Dd 14, fol. 182r (consulted via *RothSources*, 427; D 1049).

²¹⁴ Dd 15, fol. 45 (consulted via *RothSources*, 428; D 1050).

²¹⁵ *LP* 7, no. 1670; *SP* 1/88 fol. 105r.

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.²¹⁶ 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.²¹⁷ 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.²¹⁸ 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,²¹⁹ 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.²²⁰ 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

²¹⁶ H.F. Westlake, *The Parish Guilds of Medieval England* (London, 1919), 75.

²¹⁷ London, BL, MS Egerton 2886, fol. 101r.

²¹⁸ Swanson, *Indulgences*, 54.

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 122. The guild's records are found in London, BL, MS Egerton 2886.

²²⁰ *Ibid.*, 375.

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 1516.²²¹ 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.²²² 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.²²³ This must have been done in reaction to the increasingly overstated promises made by the Waking 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.²²⁴ 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.²²⁵ Masses said at this altar were widely held to be particularly effective, securing the immediate release of a soul from Purgatory.²²⁶ According to the English guidebook *Stacions of Rome*, “he that saythe a mase there witt good devossyon may brynge a soule out of purcatorry to hevyn & gretly helpe his frende that is alyve.”²²⁷

This devotion originated in the mid-fourteenth century. The term *Scala Coeli* was sufficiently established in 1380 to be a target of Wyclif when he wrote his treatise *On Prelates*.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 *Scala Coeli* altar in Rome,²²⁹ the *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.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,²³¹ and it was secured for the cemetery chapel at the Savoy in 1512, as detailed in Henry VII’s will.²³² It then quite suddenly moved outside royal chapels, and a *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.²³³ At this point, wills began to appear with requests for masses at other *Scala Coeli* altars. One location was the London

²²⁵ Nigel Morgan, “The Scala Coeli Indulgence and the Royal Chapels” in *The Reign of Henry VII*, ed. Benjamin Thompson (Stamford, 1995): 82-103 at 84.

²²⁶ Swanson, *Indulgences*, 55.

²²⁷ *The Stacions of Rome and the Pilgrims Sea-Voyage*, ed. F.J. Furnivall (London, 1867), 31.

²²⁸ *The English Works of Wyclif Hitherto Unprinted*, ed. F.D. Matthew (London, 1880) at 102: “Also prelatys disceyuen cristene men in faith, hope and charite bi here novelerie of massis at rome, at scala celi, and newe pardons and pilgrimages; for thei maken the peple to bileue or triste that if a prest seye a masse at scala celi for a soule it schal onoon ben out of purgatorie.”

²²⁹ For example, the will of Walter Dolman of Merston, Sussex from 1449 in “Transcriptions of Sussex Wills,” ed. R. Garraway Rice and W.H. Godfrey, *SRS* 41-43 and 45 (1937-41): 210-11, which pays for a man to go to Rome to do a trentall at *Scala Coeli*. See Diana Webb, *Pilgrims and Pilgrimage in the Medieval West* (London, 2001), 144-146 for other examples.

²³⁰ *CPRGBI*, 13:498.

²³¹ Swanson, *Indulgences*, 55.

²³² Eamon Duffy, *Stripping the Altars*, 376. See *CPRGBI*, 18:137-40.

²³³ Morgan, “The Scala Coeli Indulgence”, 91. As Morgan points out, in 1511, it was not mentioned among the privileges of the guild in a letter of admission of a guild member, so it must have been established after this time.

convent of the Crutched Friars,²³⁴ 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.²³⁵

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.²³⁶ 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.²³⁷

²³⁴ J.M. Hayden, "Religious Reform and Religious Orders in England, 1490-1540: The Case of the Crutched Friars" *CHR*, 86:3 (2000): 420-438 at 432.

²³⁵ For wills requesting services at an altar of *Scala Coeli* in an Austin convent, see the following examples: *Kirk.Norw.*, 145; Cambridge, CUA, Vice-Chancellor's Probate Register, Wills I (1501-58), fols. 32v-33r; *ibid.*, fols. 31v-32r; *ibid.*, fols. 34v-35r; R.M. Serjeantson and H.I. Longdon, "The Parish Churches and Religious Houses of Northamptonshire: Their Dedications, Altars, Images and Lights" *AJ* 70 (1913): 217-456 at 247 and 446; *Test.Cant.*, 66; Cambridge, CUA, Vice-Chancellor's Probate Register, Wills I (1501-58), fols. 35v-36r; *LincolnWills*, 1:100; *Test.Cant.*, 66; *LincolnWills* 1:106; H.J. Hillen, *History of the Borough of King's Lynn* (Norwich, 1907), 715; J. Raine, "Notices of Scoreby and the Family of Blake", *YATJ* 10 (1889), 87; Martin, *The History of the Town of Thetford*, 197; *LincolnWills*, 2:158-173; *ibid.*, 3:2-4; *ibid.*, 2:196.

²³⁶ For Latimer's sermon at Austin Friars Cambridge, see *Annals*, 1:334. For Latimer's preaching against the *Scala Coeli* devotion, see Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, 301 and *Sermons of Hugh Latimer*, ed. G.E. Corrie (Cambridge, 1844), 33-57, in which Latimer characterises the whole purgatorial system, but particularly the *Scala Coeli* indulgence, as a mechanism for the pope to acquire money greedily.

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.²³⁸ 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.²³⁹ Moreover, the Austins were significantly less prolific than the Boston guild or St Anthony's Hospital in London.²⁴⁰

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.²⁴¹ 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

²³⁸ For a discussion of the distribution of letters of confraternity and indulgences from the Franciscans, Dominicans, and Carmelites, see Swanson, "Mendicants and Confraternity," 125-130, 134-35; and Swanson, *Indulgences in Late Medieval England*, 142-48.

²³⁹ See Swanson, *Indulgences in Late Medieval England*, 147 for a discussion of the Trinitarians. Some examples are Oxford, Bodleian Library, Yorkshire Charter 65; Clark-Maxwell, "Some Further Letters," 193; London, BL, Stowe Charter 617.

²⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 135.

²⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 134.

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,²⁴² 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,

²⁴² See pages 238-260 for the discussion of evangelicalism.

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.²⁴³ 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.²⁴⁴ 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.²⁴⁵ The Shearmen's Guild used the Austin Friary in London as a meeting place in 1452,²⁴⁶ 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.²⁴⁷ The Guild of Waterbearers, one of the poorest groups of labourers, also used their convent, when they had their ordinances confirmed there.²⁴⁸ 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 1516.²⁴⁹ 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 cobblers), and offer one pence at each mass, in exchange for masses to be said for their deceased

²⁴³ *CPRGBI*, 6:221.

²⁴⁴ John Capgrave, *The Life of St Katharine of Alexandria*, ed. C. Horstmann (London, 1893); Osborn Bokenham, *Legendys of Hooly Wummen*, ed. M. Serjeantson (London, 1938), 173-201.

²⁴⁵ *YCR*, 3:186-87.

²⁴⁶ Justin Colson, "Alien Communities and Alien Fraternities in Later Medieval London" *The London Journal* 35:2 (2010): 111-43 at 113.

²⁴⁷ Charles Welch, *Welch's History of the Pewterers' Company* (London, 1902), 19, 26, 30, 31, 33, 36, 57, 58.

²⁴⁸ George Unwin, *The Guilds and Companies of London*, 2nd ed. (London, 1938), 108.

²⁴⁹ *WillsHusting*, 2: 622-23.

brothers.²⁵⁰ 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.²⁵¹ 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.²⁵²

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.²⁵³ The convent at Clare was mentioned in a will associated with the village’s significantly named Guild of St Augustine in 1488.²⁵⁴ 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.²⁵⁵ 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.²⁵⁶ 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.²⁵⁷

²⁵⁰ *VCH:Kent*, 2:201.

²⁵¹ Nichols, *History of Leicester* (London, 1815), 1.2:302.

²⁵² John Brand, *The History and Antiquities of the Town and County of the Town of Newcastle upon Tyne* (London, 1789), 349 and Eneas Mackenzie, *Historical Account of Newcastle-Upon-Tyne Including the Borough of Gateshead* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1827), 679-698.

²⁵³ *YCR*, 2:97; “The Register of the Guild of Corpus Christi in the City of York” *Surtees Society*, 57 (1872): 6-249 at 63, 67, 70, 73, and 82.

²⁵⁴ V.B. Redstone, “Extracts from Wills and Other Material Showing the History of Suffolk Churches, Chantries, and Guilds, Being an Appendix to the Article Published in the Proceedings, Vol. XII” *Suffolk Institute for Archeology and Natural History*, 23 (1937/8): 50-78 at 56.

²⁵⁵ J. Colson, “Alien Communities and Alien Fraternities,” *The London Journal* 35 (2010): 111-143 at 112; Gervase Rosser, *The Art of Solidarity in the Middle Ages: Guilds in England, 1250-1550* (Oxford, 2015), 106.

²⁵⁶ See pages 131-137 for a discussion of the international nature of the order.

²⁵⁷ *Test.Cant.*, 2:66.

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.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.²⁵⁹

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 rulers²⁶⁰ – 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:

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 *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.²⁶¹ [emphasis mine]

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

²⁵⁸ Colson, "Alien Communities and Alien Fraternities," 113.

²⁵⁹ *Ibid.*; Susan Brigden, "Religion and Social Obligation in Early Sixteenth-Century London," *Past & Present*, 103:1 (1984): 67-112 at 96.

²⁶⁰ See page 25.

²⁶¹ London, BL, MS Add. 24180, fol. 24r: "la terza li Augustini ove tutti li forestieri vano ad mesa et vespero et si andasino ad altra giesa seriano molto mal vedutti et perho vano tutti a dicti Augusttini et non in altri giese ... li Anglesi non vano in dicti Augusttini et hoc ordinarie pur aliquando sed raro conveniunt." Translation from Michael Wyatt, *The Italian Encounter with Tudor England: A Cultural Politics of Translation* (Cambridge, 2005), 148.

beheaded.²⁶² 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.²⁶³ 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.²⁶⁴ 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.²⁶⁵ 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.²⁶⁶ 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."²⁶⁷

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,²⁶⁸ was involved in the financial affairs in 1408 and 1409 of numerous Austin Friars in Norwich and London. The Albertis were particularly prominent

²⁶² *StowAE*, 288.

²⁶³ Erasmus, *Selections from Erasmus, principally from his Epistles*, ed. P.S. Allen (Oxford, 1908), 243; *idem*, *The Correspondence of Erasmus*, ed. R.A.B. Mynors et al. (Toronto, 1974), 25.

²⁶⁴ Du Bellay: *LP* 4:3, no. 202; Chapuys: *CSP:Spain*, 5:2, no. 29; Cromwell: *LP* 5, no. 1757; *SP* 1/73 fol. 133r; Du Puebla: *CSP:Spain* 1, no. 136.

²⁶⁵ Wyatt, *The Italian Encounter with Tudor England*, 142.

²⁶⁶ Dd 13, fol. 67r (consulted via *RothSources*, 410-11; D 1029).

²⁶⁷ *CSP:Spain* 1, no. 136.

²⁶⁸ The fellowship of the Albertini consisted of members of the Florentine mercantile family of the Alberti and its employees. See G.A. Holmes, "Florentine Merchants in London: 1346-1436," *EcHR*, 13:2 (1960): 193-208, at 193.

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.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 Troues of the same convent.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.²⁷¹ In October of 1409, he transferred fifteen pounds to the Austin Friar Richard Blake of Oxford.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 1429.²⁷³

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.²⁷⁴ A friar from Saxony was incorporated into the London convent in 1419,²⁷⁵ and the friar Matthew of Prussia completed one of his academic tracts whilst staying in the London convent in 1444.²⁷⁶ 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.²⁷⁷ Nicholas Stemmen, a friar from Saxony who had already completed his lectorate, came to London in 1458 to preach.²⁷⁸ In 1468, two friars from Germany, Nicholas Arnoldi, and William de Massa, went to London to

²⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 196.

²⁷⁰ CCR 2-14 Henry IV (Supplementary Close Roll 16) 1409-1413 [1408], 443 (m.4), 444 (m.4).

²⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 444 (m.4).

²⁷² *Ibid.*, 445 (m.3).

²⁷³ CCR 3-12 Henry VI (Supplementary Close Roll 18) 1429-1435 [1429], 378 (m.5).

²⁷⁴ Dd 4, fol. 178r (consulted via *RothSources*, 306; D 739).

²⁷⁵ Dd 4, fol. 5v (consulted via *RothSources*, 289; D 713).

²⁷⁶ Berlin, Staats Bibliothek, MS Latin 482, fol. 180v (consulted via *RothSources*, 326; D 800).

²⁷⁷ Dd 4, fol. 222r (consulted via *RothSources*, 308; D 747).

²⁷⁸ Dd 6, fol. 220v (consulted via *RothSources*, 340; D 851).

preach,²⁷⁹ as did the Italian Austin, Master Donatus de Ugolinis in 1471.²⁸⁰ 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.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.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 *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 1413,²⁸³ and Henry de Volkmaria from Saxony was a lector at Oxford in 1419.²⁸⁴ John Bernardi of Rheno-Suebia was sent to study at Oxford for three years in 1419, as was John of Appoldea of Saxony.²⁸⁵ Simon de Brünn from Bavaria was sent to Cambridge in 1419 and John Frederici, as seen above, went to Oxford in 1427.²⁸⁶ James of Salza from Cologne went to Oxford in 1433 and Richard of Ghent, also from the province of Cologne, went to Cambridge in 1433.²⁸⁷ 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 1476.²⁸⁸

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,

²⁷⁹ Dd 6, fol. 74 (consulted via *RothSources*, 355; D 890).

²⁸⁰ Dd 6, fol. 149v (consulted via *RothSources*, 357; D 897).

²⁸¹ Dd 8, fol. 31v (consulted via *RothSources*, 377; D 956).

²⁸² Dd 4, fol. 220v (consulted via *RothSources*, 308; D 747).

²⁸³ Anton Höhn, *Chronologia Provinciae Rheno-Suevicæ Ordinis F.F. Eremitarum S.P. Augustini* (Wurzburg, 1744), 98.

²⁸⁴ Dd 4, fol. 2v (consulted via *RothSources*, 289; D 713).

²⁸⁵ Dd 4, fols. 6r and 2v (consulted via *RothSources*, 288; D 713).

²⁸⁶ Dd 4, fols. 3r and 222r (consulted via *RothSources*, 288; D 713; 300; D 747).

²⁸⁷ Dd 5, fol. 19v; Dd 4 fol. 104r (consulted via *RothSources*, 314-5; D 766).

²⁸⁸ Dd 7, fols. 194r-v and 80r (consulted via *RothSources*, 362; D 912; 364; D 916).

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.²⁸⁹ Furthermore, the English Dominicans in particular regularly functioned as foreign ambassadors, strengthening their links with the Continent, particularly under Edward I.²⁹⁰ For example, the Dominican Cardinal Jorz was sent to Italy as a papal legate in 1310, at the time of Avignon papacy.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 1480.²⁹² These friars originated predominantly from Germany and the Low Countries and we find them scattered all over the province.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.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.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

²⁸⁹ Little and Easterling, *The Franciscans and Dominicans of Exeter*, 7.

²⁹⁰ Bede Jarrett, OP, *The English Dominicans* (London, 1921), 113; Hinnebusch, *The Early English Friars Preachers*, 471.

²⁹¹ Hinnebusch, *The Early English Friars Preachers*, 26.

²⁹² A.G. Little, *Introduction of the Observant Friars into England: a Bull of Alexander VI*, (London, 1941), 6, 8.

²⁹³ *Ibid.*

²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁹⁵ Colson, "Alien Communities and Alien Fraternities," 112; Gervase Rosser, *The Art of Solidarity in the Middle Ages: Guilds in England, 1250-1550* (Oxford, 2015), 106.

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 1402.²⁹⁶ 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. Antifraternalism

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

²⁹⁶ CPRGBI, 5:572.

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.²⁹⁷ The provincials of the four mendicant orders, Philip Boydon, William Lyndwood, John Kenyngale, and Thomas Gorston, lent their support to the appeal from Cambridge, urging that Norris' views be curtailed.²⁹⁸ 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.²⁹⁹ Musilwyk was a friar originating from Atherstone, who had been ordained as a priest twenty years earlier in 1419.³⁰⁰ 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.³⁰¹

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

²⁹⁷ *Reg.Chich.*, 3:275.

²⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹⁹ *Epist.Acad.*, 1:160-68; *BRUO* 2:165-66, 1331.

³⁰⁰ *The Register of John Catterick Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield 1415-1419*, ed. R.N. Swanson, Canterbury and York Society 77 (Woodbridge, 1990), 64 (no. 242). Musilwyk goes to the friary in Ludlow after the conflict (*CPRGBI* 9, 310) and is appointed to the vicarage of Aston, Birmingham in 1451 (*The Register of William Bothe, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield 1447-1452*, ed. John Condcliffe Bates, Canterbury and York Society 98 (Woodbridge, 2008), 16 (no. 63).

³⁰¹ *Munim.Acad.*, 2:306.

telling source for understanding the hostility between the Austin Friars and the parish clergy.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.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.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

³⁰² Lichfield, MS B/A/1/7, fols. 128r-139v (consulted via *RothSources*, 268-77; D 669-672).

³⁰³ *CPRGBI*, 5:539-40.

³⁰⁴ *VCH:Warwickshire*, 4:124-25.

blessed bread in the form of small hosts, since it was an Augustinian custom.³⁰⁵ 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 1375,³⁰⁶ at which point the initial agreement set out in Burghill's register was established.³⁰⁷ This contract had stipulated that the Austin Friars be exempt from tithes on payment of 20 s. a year,³⁰⁸ 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.³⁰⁹ In 1421, John Ixworth, rector of the parish church 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*.³¹⁰ 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

³⁰⁵ Francis Roth associates this with the custom of distributing bread in honour of the Augustinian saint St Nicholas of Tolentine. See *RothEAF*, 2:276.

³⁰⁶ *CPR* 49 (part 2) Edward III 1374-1377 [1375], 183 (m.17).

³⁰⁷ Lichfield, MS B/A/1/7, fols. 131r-134r (consulted via *RothSources*, 268-70; D 669).

³⁰⁸ *DugdaleW*, 2:1086.

³⁰⁹ London, Lambeth Palace Library, Register of Thomas Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury, fol. 99r (consulted via *RothSources*, 508; D 1170).

³¹⁰ *CPRGBI*, 7:177.

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.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.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.³¹³ There was another significant conflict in 1259 with the Canons Regular at Dunstable, who opposed the Dominican foundation there.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.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 Raleigh, who had requested burial in the Franciscan church. His

³¹¹ *Monum. Franc.*, 2:191; *LP* 5, no. 1454; *SP* 1/71, fol. 128v.

³¹² Little and Easterling, *The Franciscans and Dominicans of Exeter*, 21.

³¹³ Hinnebusch, *The Early English Friars Preachers*, 250.

³¹⁴ *Ibid.*

³¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 457.

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 Antifraternalism and Tensions over Sanctuary

Scholarship has generally not focused much on the violence suffered by friars due to the outbreak of antifraternal 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 antifraternalism amongst the laity against the Austin Friars in this period occurred during a violent outbreak in Stamford in 1416.

³¹⁶ Little and Easterling, *The Franciscans and Dominicans of Exeter*, 40.

³¹⁷ Aubrey Gwynn, "Archbishop FitzRalph and the Friars," 50-67; Walsh, *A Fourteenth-Century Scholar and Primate*, 349-451; Arnold Williams, "Relations Between the Mendicant Friars and the Regular Clergy in England in the Later Fourteenth Century", *Annuaire Mediaevale*, 1 (1960): 22-95; Alan Fletcher, *Preaching and Politics in Late-Medieval England*, 205-6, 272-8, 282-302; Scase, *Piers Plowman and the New Anticlericalism*, 15-46.

³¹⁸ Guy Geltner, "Mendicants as Victims: Scale, Scope and the Idiom of Violence" *JMH*, 36 (2010): 126-141 at 126-127.

³¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 141.

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.³²⁰ 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.³²¹ 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.³²²

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.³²³ Whilst this incident is certainly evocative, there is no reason to think that the acrimony was a result of antifraternality 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

³²⁰ *CIM*, 7:303, no. 535.

³²¹ *Annals*, 1:159-66.

³²² *Ibid.*, 1:310-11.

³²³ *CPRGBI*, 8:543.

inhabitants of the town attacked the friary, perhaps for economic reasons, and were promptly ordered by the king to cease.³²⁴

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.³²⁵ 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.³²⁶ After appeal to the king, they were allowed to keep the land because of their poverty.³²⁷ 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.³²⁸ In 1452, the friars ended up suing the Gare family over this bequest.³²⁹ 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.³³⁰ 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.³³¹ 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.³³² 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

³²⁴ *VCH:Lincolnshire*, 2:218.

³²⁵ London, TNA, C 1/15/125.

³²⁶ *CPR* 25 (part 2) Henry VI 1446-1452 [1447], 79 (m.8).

³²⁷ *Ibid.*

³²⁸ J.S. Purvis, "Monastic Chancery Proceedings" *YASRS* 88 (1934): 1-183 at 159.

³²⁹ London, TNA, C 1/18/87.

³³⁰ London, TNA, REQ 2/2/112.

³³¹ London, TNA, C 1/266/27.

³³² London, TNA, C 1/567/18.

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.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.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.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.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.³³⁷ Symeon of Durham, in the twelfth century, gave more details, invoking a tradition of sanctuary begun by St Cuthbert.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.³³⁹

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

³³³ Karl Shoemaker, *Sanctuary and Crime in the Middle Ages* (New York, 2011), 152-53.

³³⁴ *Ibid.*, 170.

³³⁵ *Ibid.*, 110.

³³⁶ *Ibid.*, 133-34.

³³⁷ *Ibid.*, 106.

³³⁸ *Ibid.*

³³⁹ *Ibid.*, 107.

and threatened him.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.³⁴¹ In 1472, there was a particularly dramatic incident in Shrewsbury, when a man attempted to claim sanctuary in the Austin convent there.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.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.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.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 antifraternism reported here, only one, wherein the Austin *and* Dominican friars of Stamford were 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

³⁴⁰ *CartCl* SN (183) fol. 55v.

³⁴¹ *RothEAF*, 1:208.

³⁴² "Letters of Prince and King" in H. Owen and J. Blakeway, *A History of Shrewsbury* (London, 1825), 2:457, 466.

³⁴³ *VCH:Shropshire*, 2:97.

³⁴⁴ *Epist.Acad.*, 2:558-63.

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.³⁴⁶ Moreover, in 1344, their convent in Derby was robbed of sixty pounds worth of goods and the friars were beaten by the thieves.³⁴⁷ 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.³⁴⁸ 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.³⁴⁹

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.³⁵⁰ 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 1424.³⁵¹ 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.³⁵² 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.³⁵³ 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.³⁵⁴

In the case of the Austin Friars, antifraternality appears to have been predominantly an issue with the clergy, rather than with the laity. Other than the attack

³⁴⁶ Formoy, *The Dominican Order in England*, 42.

³⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 42.

³⁴⁸ Jens Röhrkasten, "Friars and the Laity in the Franciscan Custody of Cambridge," in *The Friars in Medieval Britain*, ed. Nicholas Rogers, (Donington, 2010): 107-124 at 121.

³⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁵⁰ Martin Heale, *Monasticism in Late Medieval England, c.1300-1535* (Manchester), 202.

³⁵¹ Clark, *A Monastic Renaissance at St Albans*, 34.

³⁵² *Ibid.*

³⁵³ *Ibid.*; Barbara Harvey, *Living and Dying in England*, 6.

³⁵⁴ Heale, *Monasticism in Late Medieval England*, 204. See *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations, 1459-1486*, ed. N. Pronay and J. Cox (London, 1986), 166-9, 184-9.

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 antifraternel 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 antifraternel 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 antifraternelism 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 antifraternel 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 Toney's 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.

Chapter 4: Augustinian Influence in Secular Society

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,¹ 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.² The primary interest in the involvement of the Austin Friars in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century secular affairs has been in studies of Capgrave. The

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.³ 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.⁴ 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.⁵ 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.⁶ 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.⁷ 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

³ See F.J. Furnivall's introduction to Capgrave's *The Life of Saint Katharine of Alexandria*, ed. Carl Horstmann (London, 1893), v-xlvi at xv.

⁴ Peter Lucas, *From Author to Audience*, 261; Winstead, *John Capgrave's Fifteenth Century*, 15-16.

⁵ Joni Henry, "Capgrave's Dedications: Reassessing an English Flunkey" *StP*, 110:4 (2013): 731-61 at 733.

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."

⁷ Delany, *Impolitic Bodies*; *eadem*, "Bokenham's Claudian as Yorkist propaganda"; J. Watts, "De Consulatu Stiliconis: texts and politics in the reign of Henry VI" *JMH*, 16 (1990): 251-266; A.S.G. Edwards, "The Middle English Translation of Claudian's *De consulatu Stilichonis*," in *Middle English Poetry: Texts and Traditions*, ed. A.J. Minnis (York, 2001): 267-78; Horobin, "Politics, Patronage, and Piety," 932-949.

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

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>].

⁹ De Meijer, "John Capgrave," *Aug* 5 (1955), 400-440 and *Aug* 7 (1957), 118-48, 532-41.

¹⁰ Alessandra Petrina, *Cultural Politics in Fifteenth-Century England: The Case of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester* (Leiden, 2004), 340-343.

¹¹ Henry, "Capgrave's Dedications," 731-61.

through his literary dedications. Capgrave wrote positively about Humphrey, to whom he had given the title of *quasi fundator* of the order in 1440,¹² until Queen Margaret of Anjou and the Earl of Suffolk effectively extinguished Humphrey's influence in 1445.¹³ Once established as a theological scholar at his home priory in Lynn, Capgrave dedicated his commentaries on Genesis,¹⁴ Exodus,¹⁵ 1 Kings,¹⁶ 1 Samuel,¹⁷ and the letters of Paul¹⁸ 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.¹⁹ 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.²⁰

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,²¹ 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.²² 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

¹² Seymour, *John Capgrave*, 24.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 15, 24.

¹⁴ Oxford, Oriel College, MS 32.

¹⁵ Oxford, Bodl., MS Duke Humfrey b.1.

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.²³ Moreover, an entry in the Papal Registers shows that the Duke's personal chaplain was himself an Austin Friar named John South.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 service²⁵ 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 *Fall of Princes* under the patronage of the Duke from 1431-39, as his most famous client.²⁶ This text, which will be discussed further below, was a translation of Boccaccio's *De Casibus Virorum Illustrium* and is a good example of Lydgate's engagement with the Latin-based humanism of the continent.²⁷ Humphrey was also a patron to Thomas Hoccleve, who wrote his *Series* for the Duke from 1419-21. Hoccleve's work was a translation of portions of the *Gesta Romanorum*, including the 'Tale of Jereslaus' Wife,' a dialogue on how to die well, and the 'Tale of Jonathas.'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

²³ *Epist.Acad.*, 1:160-68; see page 137-138.

²⁴ *CPRGBI*, 9:571.

²⁵ Robson, *The Franciscans in the Middle Ages*, 218.

²⁶ James Simpson, *Reform and Cultural Revolution* (Oxford, 2004), 57.

²⁷ James Simpson, "John Lydgate," in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Literature 1100-1500*, ed. Larry Scanlon (Cambridge, 2009), 205-216 at 207.

²⁸ Ethan Knapp, "Thomas Hoccleve," in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Literature 1100-1500*, ed. Larry Scanlon (Cambridge, 2009), 191-204 at 199.

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 Bouchier, 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.

³⁵ Churchill Babington, "Introduction" in Reginald Pecock, *The Repressor of Overmuch Blaming of the Clergy*, ed. Charles Babington (London, 1860), 1:i-lxxxvi at xlix.

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."

³⁷ For example, see the introductions by Hingeston, Mills, and Furnivall in John Capgrave, *The Book of Illustrious Henries*, ed. and trans. F.C. Hingeston (London, 1858), xiii-xxii; *idem*, *The Chronicle of England*, ed. F.C. Hingeston (London, 1858), xi-xviii; *idem*, *The Life of St. Katharine of Alexandria*, ed. Carl Horstmann and F.J. Furnivall (London, 1893), v-xlvi; *idem*, *Johannis Capgrave Liber de illustribus Henricis*, ed. F.C. Hingeston (London, 1858), xi-lvii and Seymour, *John Capgrave*, 195-256.

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.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.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.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.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 *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,⁴² functions as a 'mirror for princes' text, a genre typically associated with Lancastrian-sponsored poetry.

³⁸ Christine Carpenter, *The Wars of the Roses: Politics and Constitution in England, c. 1437-1509* (Cambridge, 1997), 110. Examples are Winstead, *John Capgrave's Fifteenth Century*, 15; I.M.W. Harvey, *Jack Cade's Rebellion of 1450* (Oxford, 1991), 44; Josiah Wedgwood, *History of Parliament: biographies of the members of the commons house, 1439-1509* (London, 1936), 880-81.

³⁹ Carpenter, *The Wars of the Roses*, 110.

⁴⁰ Helen Castor, *The King, the Crown, and the Duchy of Lancaster: Public Authority and Private Power, 1399-1461* (Oxford, 2000), 159-60.

⁴¹ John Watts, *Henry VI and the Politics of Kingship* (Cambridge, 1996), 199.

⁴² Capgrave, *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.⁴³ 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.”⁴⁴ 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.⁴⁵ 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.⁴⁶ The poem focuses on the requirements of kingship along with the dangers of corruption and division.⁴⁷ 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.⁴⁸ 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.⁴⁹ Conversely, Nicholas Perkins has argued in his authoritative study of the text that Hoccleve

⁴³ Watts, *Henry VI and the Politics of Kingship*, 15 n6.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 15.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 23; Maura Nolan, *John Lydgate and the Making of Public Culture* (Cambridge, 2005), 14.

⁴⁶ Diane Watt, “John Gower,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Literature, 1100-1500*, ed. Larry Scanlon (Cambridge, 2009), 153-164 at 156-61.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 158.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 159.

⁴⁹ Nicholas Perkins, *Hoccleve’s Regiment of Princes: Counsel and Constraint* (Cambridge, 2001), 3.

was not merely “a cog in Henry’s formidable propaganda machine,”⁵⁰ 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.”⁵¹ This is supported by the arguments of Watts, who saw works of political counsel as serving primarily to educate and direct the royal will.⁵² 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.⁵³ 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.⁵⁴ 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.”⁵⁵ The poet, grouped with John Gower and Geoffrey Chaucer by George Ashby in the 1470s as one of the “primier poetes of this nacion,”⁵⁶ 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 1420.⁵⁷ Paul Strohm characterised the monk as consistently advancing the interests of Henry V and later his son, arguing that Lydgate’s

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 51.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁵² Watts, *Henry VI and the Politics of Kingship*, 23.

⁵³ Perkins, *Hoccleve’s Regiment of Princes*, 88.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 89.

⁵⁵ Shannon Gayk, *Image, Text, and Religious Reform in Fifteenth Century England* (Cambridge, 2010), 84.

⁵⁶ George Ashby, “Active Policy of a Prince in George Ashby’s Poems” in *George Ashby’s Poems*, ed. Mary Bateson, Early English Text Society, Extra Series, 76 (London, 1899).

⁵⁷ Simpson, “John Lydgate,” 205.

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.

⁵⁸ Paul Strohm, *England's Empty Throne: Usurpation and the Language of Legitimation, 1399-1422* (New Haven, 1996), 187 and *idem*, "Hoccleve, Lydgate, and the Lancastrian Court," in *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature*, ed. David Wallace (Cambridge, 1999): 640-6.

⁵⁹ Simpson, *Reform and Cultural Revolution*, 65, 105-6; *idem*, "Dysemol Daies and Fatal Houres: Lydgate's Destruction of Thebes and Chaucer's Knight's Tale" in *The Long Fifteenth Century: Essays for Douglas Gray*, ed. Helen Cooper and Sally Mapstone (Oxford, 1997), 15-33.

⁶⁰ Simpson, *Reform and Cultural Revolution*, 56.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² Scott Morgan Straker, "Propaganda and Intentionality, and the Lancastrian Lydgate" in *John Lydgate: Poetry, Culture and Lancastrian England*, ed. Larry Scanlon and James Simpson (Notre Dame, 2006): 98-128 at 121.

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.⁶⁴ This text, associating good governance with sanctity in the saintly king Edmund, was unprecedented in medieval England.⁶⁵ 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.⁶⁶ His piety contributed to his good governance, but did not stop him from engaging in aristocratic pastimes, nor in his secular duties.⁶⁷

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.⁶⁸ 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.⁶⁹ 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

⁶⁴ Katherine Lewis, *Kingship and Masculinity in Late Medieval England* (London, 2013), 151; Karen Winstead, *Capgrave's Fifteenth Century*, 121.

⁶⁵ Winstead, *Capgrave's Fifteenth Century*, 121.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 125.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

⁶⁸ Rebecca Pinner, *The Cult of St Edmund in Medieval East Anglia* (Woodbridge, 2015), 99.

⁶⁹ *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.

⁷¹ Karen Winstead, "Capgrave's Saint Katherine: The Perils of Gynecocracy" *Viator* 25 (1994): 361-376.

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 *exempla* 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.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 157.

⁷⁵ R.L. Storey, *The End of the House of Lancaster* (New York, 1967), 37, 210-16.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 35-36; Winstead, "Perils of Gynecocracy," 367.

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

⁷⁸ Capgrave, *Liber de Illustribus Henricis*, 136: “[...] quoniam qui solebamus victores esse omnium populorum ab omnibus jam populis vincimur”; translation from Winstead, *John Capgrave’s Fifteenth Century*, 155.

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

⁸⁰ Winstead, *John Capgrave’s Fifteenth Century*, 159. See Capgrave, *Liber de Illustribus Henricis*, 108 for Capgrave comparing Henry IV to Solomon and 121 for an example of Capgrave using Henry V’s piety as part of his analysis of military victory.

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

⁸² *Ibid.*, 137.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 133.

royal will.⁸⁴ 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.⁸⁵ 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.⁸⁶ 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.⁸⁷

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.⁸⁸ K.B. MacFarlane famously pointed to the inanity of Henry, referring to him as a "baby who grew up an imbecile."⁸⁹ Henry's own contemporaries, including Capgrave's short biography in his *Liber*, supported a portrayal of Henry as simple, foolish, and overly pious.⁹⁰ Since MacFarlane's comments, there has been less consensus on the personality of Henry VI, with B.P. Wolffe and R.A. Griffiths both arguing that the king was significantly more active than has been recognised.⁹¹ Specifically, Wolffe saw Henry as significant in domestic affairs and Harriss argued that he was important in the promotion of peace with France.⁹² Most recently, and

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*.

⁸⁵ Watts, *Henry VI*, 124.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 195-9.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 196.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 123.

⁸⁹ K.B. MacFarlane, *England in the Fifteenth Century: Collected Essays*, ed. G.L. Harriss (London, 1981), 42.

⁹⁰ Watts, *Henry VI*, 103; Roger Lovatt, "John Blacman: Biographer of Henry VI" in *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Richard William Southern*, ed. R.H.C. Davis and J.M. Wallace-Hadrill (Oxford, 1981): 415-44 at 435; Bertram Percy Wolffe, *Henry VI* (London, 1981), chapter 1.

⁹¹ Wolffe, *Henry VI*, chapter 1; Ralph Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI: The Exercise of Royal Authority, 1422-1461* (London, 1981), 2-6.

⁹² Wolffe, *Henry VI*, passim; G.L. Harriss, *Cardinal Beaufort: A Study of Lancastrian Ascendancy and Decline* (Oxford, 1988), 295, 316-17.

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.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.⁹⁴

In this framework, it is no longer necessary to see Suffolk as a “diabolical genius or a greedy courtier;”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.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 *Abbreviacion of Cronicles*, to the new king in 1462. In the dedicatory address of this text, Capgrave wrote:

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

⁹³ Watts, *Henry VI*, 111.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 199.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*

conuent of Lenne sendith prayer obediens subieccion and al þat euir be ony
deute a prest schuld offir onto his kyng.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:

Ferthermore 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 *by Goddis provision is Edward the Fourt*. [...] We trew loueres of this lond desire this of oure Lord God, that al the erreure which was browte in be Herry the Fourte may be redressed be Edward the Fourte.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.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.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

⁹⁷ Capgrave, *Abbreviacion of Cronicles*, 7.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁹⁹ Capgrave's entry on Henry IV states that "regnauit post Richardum Secundum, non tam titulo sanguinis, quam electione populo" (Capgrave, *Liber De Illustribus Henricis*, 98) and that Richard was "consilio malo deceptus" (*ibid.*, 101).

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.¹⁰¹ 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."¹⁰² 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,¹⁰³ Katharine Howard's daughter Elizabeth Howard de Vere, the Countess of Oxford, for whom he wrote a life of St Elizabeth,¹⁰⁴ 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.¹⁰⁵

Bokenham boasted most of his patronage from Lady Isabel Bouchier, the countess of Eu.¹⁰⁶ She lived in Clare Castle, just by the Austin priory, having married into the

¹⁰¹ Osbern Bokenham, *Legendys of Hooly Wummen*, ed. Mary Serjeantson (London, 1938) and translated into modern English by Sheila Delany: Osbern Bokenham, *Legends of Holy Women*, trans. Sheila Delany (Notre Dame, 1992). Henceforth, all references to this text will make use of Serjeantson's edition, which maintains the original Middle English.

¹⁰² Robert Gottfried, *Bury St. Edmunds and the Urban Crisis: 1290–1519* (Princeton, 1982), 156.

¹⁰³ Bokenham, *Legendys of Hooly Wummen*, 126.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 176.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 158. See also Karen Jambeck, "Patterns of Women's Literary Patronage: England, 1200 – ca. 1475" in *The Cultural Patronage of Medieval Women*, ed. June Hall McCash (Athens, 1996), 228–265.

¹⁰⁶ Delany, *Impolitic Bodies*, 21.

influential Bouchier family, and was herself the sister of Richard 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.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 Bouchier donated six acres to the Austins at Clare,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 Bouchiers and the Duke of York.¹⁰⁹ Three years later, Isabel and Henry Bouchier donated more land to the Austins at Clare; this time it was a gift of twenty acres in the parish of Ashen.¹¹⁰ In the prolocutory of his *Life of St Mary Magdalene*, which he wrote at the behest of Isabel Bouchier and which can be found in his *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.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.¹¹² This point is significant for elucidating the relationship between the Clare Austins and the Bouchier family; not only were the Bouchiers 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.

Bokenham's female hagiography stands as the best example of the growing

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁸ *CartCl.*, JH (189) fol. 57r; *CAugCl.*, 104.

¹⁰⁹ *CartCl.*, JK (191) fol. 57r; *CAugCl.*, 105.

¹¹⁰ *CPR* 6 (part 1) Edward IV 1461-1467 [1466], 520 (m.10).

¹¹¹ Bokenham, *Legendys of Hooly Wummen*, 136-138.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 138. "I saye, whyl þis ladyis foure sonys ying/ Besy were wyth reuel & wyth daunsyng,/ And opere 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.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 *Life of St Cecilia* (in his *Canterbury Tales*), Lydgate's extremely popular – extant in fifty manuscripts – *Life of Our Lady*, Capgrave's *Life of St Katharine*, and Hoccleve's numerous poems for the Virgin Mary are other prominent examples. Moreover, Hoccleve's *Letter of Cupid*, a translation of Christine de Pizan's *Epistre au Dieu d'Amours*, a literary defence of women based on Boccaccio's *On Famous Women* and Chaucer's *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 *Life of St Margaret* for Anne Mortimer, Lady March, his *Invocation to St Anne* for Anne of Woodstock, Countess of Stafford, his *Virtues of the Mass* for Alice Chaucer, Countess of Suffolk, his *Fifteen Joys of Our Lady* for Isabel Despenser, Countess of Warwick, his *Guy of Warwick* for Margaret Beauchamp Talbot, Countess of Shrewsbury,¹¹⁴ and Capgrave's dedication of his *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 Bouchier, 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.¹¹⁵ Bokenham's hagiography is exceptional in this regard, and in addition to Capgrave's patronage of his *Augustine* by a noblewoman and

¹¹³ Newhauser, "Religious Writing," 45.

¹¹⁴ Simpson, *Reform and Cultural Revolution*, 60; Jambeck, "Patterns of Women's Literary Patronage," 246-7.

¹¹⁵ See the arguments of Richard Firth Green in "Textual Production and Textual Communities" in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Literature, 1100-1500* (Cambridge, 2009): 25-36 at 28-29.

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

The Bouchier 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 Bouchier, Archbishop of Canterbury, in opposition to the thought of Reginald Pecock.¹¹⁶ Thomas was the brother of Henry Bouchier, who, along with his wife Isabel, was Clare priory's closest connection to the Duke of York, who had inherited the Clare lands upon the death of the last Mortimer in 1425.¹¹⁷ 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 york 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 tytyle of spayne to england 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 seyde dame Isabelle, to seyn al and sum,
The duk of york, 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

¹¹⁶ Pecock, *The Repressor of Over much blaming of the Clergy*, 567-632.

¹¹⁷ Delany, *Impolitic Bodies*, 21; *CartCl.*, JD (183) fol. 56r.

¹¹⁸ Bokenham, *Legendys of Hooly Wummen*, 137 (lines 5006-19).

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.¹¹⁹ 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.¹²⁰ Their son was Richard, Earl of Cambridge, who clandestinely married Anne Mortimer, the marriage producing Isabel,¹²¹ along with Richard, Duke of York, who through his mother was also the heir to the Mortimer inheritance.¹²² 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.¹²³ 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

¹¹⁹ Delany, *Impolitic Bodies*, 132.

¹²⁰ Anthony Tuck, "Edmund [Edmund of Langley], first duke of York (1341–1402), prince", *ODNB* [<http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2167/view/article/16023?docPos=1>].

¹²¹ Delany, *Impolitic Bodies*, 132.

¹²² G.L. Harriss, "Richard [Richard of Conisbrough], earl of Cambridge (1385–1415), magnate", *ODNB* [<http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2167/view/article/23502>].

¹²³ Delany, "Bokenham's Claudian as Yorkist propaganda," 83-96; Watts, "De Consulatu Stiliconis," 251-266.

author because he erroneously assumed him to have died in 1447, when he believed the text to have been written in 1454-55.¹²⁴ However, Bokenham was alive still in 1463, as he signed a document for Clare priory in order to establish a chantry for Henry Bouchier and his wife Isabel at this time.¹²⁵ The mistaken date of Bokenham's death in 1447 comes from some rather shaky reasoning in Serjeantson's edition of Bokenham's *Legendys of Hooly Wummen*,¹²⁶ in which she assumed the text must have been published posthumously in 1447, since it contravenes Bokenham's instructions that it be left anonymous. Moreover, Watts dated the Claudian text to 1454-55 instead of 1445, as is stated in the manuscript, because he thought that 1445 was too early a date to expect Yorkist propaganda, and therefore believed the manuscript date to have been an error.¹²⁷ Delany argues for the original date by showing analogous events between Stilicho's actions in the text and Richard's in 1445,¹²⁸ and argues that the villain Rufinus that appears in Claudian's text represents Richard's adversary Moleyns.¹²⁹ She also cites several examples from the *Legendys of Hooly Wummen* of comparable language to the Claudian translation as evidence for her attribution.¹³⁰ A.S.G. Edwards agrees with Delany that the author could be Bokenham, but argues that the translation of the Claudian text was likely intended for potential supporters of the Duke of York rather than for the Duke himself, in order to gauge his popularity.¹³¹ Watts' arguments are the most persuasive; 1445 is exceptionally early to expect texts promoting the legitimacy of Richard of York's claim, but with proof that Bokenham was still alive at this point, the text – whether written in 1445 or 1454 – can be safely attributed to the Austin.

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

¹²⁴ Watts, "De Consulatu Stiliconis," 257.

¹²⁵ *CartCl.*, JK (191), fol. 57r; *CAugCl.*, 105.

¹²⁶ Serjeantson, "Introduction," i-lxxx; S. Moore, 'Patrons of Letters in Norfolk and Suffolk II,' *PMLA*, 28:1 (1913): 79-105 at 95, n2.

¹²⁷ Watts, "De Consulatu Stiliconis," 257.

¹²⁸ Delany, "Bokenham's Claudian as Yorkist propaganda," 87-89.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 92.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 91.

¹³¹ Edwards, "The Middle English Translation of Claudian's *De consulatu Stilichonis*," 274-75.

¹³² London, BL MS Add. 11814.

him the soldier Stilicho, the subject of Claudian's treatise.¹³³ The piece is straightforwardly a 'mirror for princes' text, using the *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.¹³⁴ In the third stanza, the author refers to Richard, wherein he makes the connection between Stilicho and York explicit. According to the text:

Marke stilichoes life whom peoplis preyed
 with what labouris of the regions wide
 And Rome hir selfe the consulat he vpreised
ffor now the parlement pierys. where thei goo or ryde
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.¹³⁵ [emphasis mine]

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 *Katharine* and *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 *Dialogue at the Grave of Dame Johan of Acres* "bitwix a seculer asking, and a frere aunsweryng",¹³⁶ was written in 1456 at Clare priory, at a more

¹³³ Delany, "Bokenham's Claudian", 89.

¹³⁴ 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.

¹³⁵ Stanza three (lines 15-21) of the prologue of *De Consulatu Stilichonis*, printed in E. Flügel, "Eine Mittelenglische Claudianübersetzung (1445) Brit. Mus. Add. MS 11814: I. Text," *Anglia*, 28 (1905): 255-299 at 256.

¹³⁶ 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.

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.

¹³⁷ *DugdaleM*, 6:1600. More recently, it was printed as “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.

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 Bouchier, 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.¹⁴⁰ 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,¹⁴¹ 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.¹⁴² In 1457, John Tyson was appointed as personal chaplain to Queen Margaret of Anjou,¹⁴³ and Thomas Hervei was appointed to give financial counsel to Henry VI.¹⁴⁴ 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

¹⁴⁰ Jarrett, *The English Dominicans*, 106.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 106-28.

¹⁴² *CPRGBI*, 9:571.

¹⁴³ *CPRGBI*, 10:177

¹⁴⁴ *CPR* 35 Henry VI 1452-1461 [1457], 339 (m.6).

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.

¹⁴⁶ “Chronicle of William Gregory, skinner” in *The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. James Gairdner (London, 1876), 204-05; see also Kenneth Hotham Vickers, *England in the Later Middle Ages* (London, 1950), 451.

¹⁴⁷ Owen and Blakeway, *A History of Shrewsbury*, 2:456.

¹⁴⁸ R. Griffiths, “Richard, duke of York, and the crisis of Henry VI’s household in 1450–1: some further evidence” *JMH*, 38:2 (2012): 244-256 at 246.

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.¹⁵⁰ Unsurprisingly, it was the Dominicans who supported Henry III, whereas the Franciscans backed the baronial cause.¹⁵¹ 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.¹⁵² Edward I, like his father, increased the presence of Dominicans at court, employing them predominantly for foreign relations.¹⁵³ 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.¹⁵⁴ 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.¹⁵⁵ Many Dominicans were supporters of Richard even after his deposition, for which several were imprisoned or executed.¹⁵⁶

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,¹⁵⁷ 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

¹⁵⁰ Formoy, *The Dominican Order in England*, 85.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 78.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*

¹⁵³ Hinnebusch, *The Early English Friars Preachers*, 471.

¹⁵⁴ Gumbley, "In Public Life," 26.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 41.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 42.

1471 to 1473, when Edward was frequently absent.¹⁵⁸ It was there that their son, Richard Duke of York, was born.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.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.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 1451.¹⁶² 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 1443.¹⁶³ In 1454, Henry VI promised the Franciscans to introduce the Observant order into England,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.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.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 1430.¹⁶⁷

When put in relief against a picture of mendicant influence in late-medieval

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 43.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁰ Little, *Studies in English Franciscan History*, 76.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁶² Little and Easterling, *The Franciscans and Dominicans of Exeter*, 25.

¹⁶³ Robson, *The Franciscans in the Middle Ages*, 218.

¹⁶⁴ Francis Borgia Steck, *Franciscans and the Protestant Revolution in England* (Chicago, 1920), 32.

¹⁶⁵ Taylor, *The Greyfriars, Canterbury*, 12.

¹⁶⁶ Poskitt, "Thomas Netter of Walden," 167-8.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

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.¹⁶⁸ 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

¹⁶⁹ Thomas More, *History of King Richard III*, ed. R. S. Sylvester (New Haven, 1963), 58–9.

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,¹⁷² an action that makes him the only king to provide a member of the Austin Friars with such a grant.¹⁷³ 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.¹⁷⁴ 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.¹⁷⁵

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.¹⁷⁶ Richard made considerable bequests to monasteries, parish churches, friaries, chapels, and chantries, during this period.¹⁷⁷ His repeated visits to the Austin Friary at York, however, where he tended to stay when he was in the city,¹⁷⁸ 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,¹⁷⁹ and in 1484, he engaged the Franciscans at Richmond to say a thousand masses for Edward IV's soul.¹⁸⁰ The Trinitarian Friars in Knaresborough received a

¹⁷² *CPR* 1 (part 5) Richard III (from Edward IV & V, Richard III 1476-1485) [1484], 463 (m.5).

¹⁷³ *RothEAF*, 1:125. An advowson does not imply any duty of pastoral care, simply the right to appoint an incumbent, but was a valuable prerequisite here.

¹⁷⁴ London, BL, MS Harley 433, fol. 28r. "To ye friers of Augustynes of Thichhill an Annuete of V marc of ye same lordship (Tickhill) during ye kinges lyffe."

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, fol. 179v.

¹⁷⁶ Charles Ross, *Richard III* (London, 1981), 151.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 130.

¹⁷⁸ Desmond Seward, *Richard III: England's Black Legend*, revised edn. (London, 1997), 26.

¹⁷⁹ Little, *Studies in English Franciscan History*, 21.

¹⁸⁰ Seward, *Richard III*, 93.

benefaction similar to the annuity that the Austins were granted in Tickhill.¹⁸¹ 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.¹⁸² 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.¹⁸³ 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,¹⁸⁴ and in 1498, he chose to stay at the Austin priory when visiting Lynn.¹⁸⁵ 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 1493,¹⁸⁶ and possibly until 1506,¹⁸⁷ 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.¹⁸⁸

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,

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁸² Ross, *Richard III*, 53, 151.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, 151.

¹⁸⁴ *RothEAF*, 1:125.

¹⁸⁵ Harrod, *Report on the Deeds and Records of the Borough of King's Lynn*, 112.

¹⁸⁶ In 1493, Bewick is documented as representing the priory again, but is not explicitly called the prior. See *ibid.*, 2:97.

¹⁸⁷ Bewick is documented as representing the priory again in 1506, with regards to the possessions of Thomas Lord Scrope, which were in his keeping. See Purvis, "Monastic Chancery proceedings", 151-52.

¹⁸⁸ John Brand, *The History and Antiquities of the Town and County of the Town of Newcastle-upon-Tyne* (London, 1789), 1:348.

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*,¹⁸⁹ which was the first attempt at forming the Tudor myth.¹⁹⁰ 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.¹⁹¹ 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.¹⁹² 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.¹⁹³ 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 1515,¹⁹⁴ in addition to other smaller gifts, such as a New Year's gift of a hundred shillings in 1501.¹⁹⁵

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

¹⁸⁹ D.R. Carlson, "Royal tutors in the reign of Henry VII," *16CJ* 22 (1991): 253-80 at 256. Bernard André, *Historia Regis Henrici Septimi, a Bernardo Andrea Tholosate Conscripta*, ed. James Gairdner, Rolls Series, 10 (London, 1858), 6-7: "Post igitur impetratam studiis meis quietam, quam per quattuor annos Arturo Walliae principi nobilissimo literatissimoque et praedicti regis [Henrici septimi] primogenito erudiendo impenderam, de vita atque gestis praefati iam principis genitoris excellentissimi scribere sum exorsus, anno videlicet gratiae quingentesimo supra mille, Beatissimi Papae Alexandri Sexti pontificatus anno decimo, et antememorati regis regni anno sextodecimo."

¹⁹⁰ London, BL, MS Cotton Domitian XVIII, fols. 126r-228r. For a discussion of the writings produced by André, see D.R. Carlson, "The writings of Bernard André (c. 1450-1522)," *Renaissance Studies* 12:2 (1998): 229-250.

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*.

¹⁹² Carlson, "The Writings of Bernard André," 230; see Dd 12 fol. 21v (consulted via *RothSources*, 403; D 1015) where André is thus styled.

¹⁹³ Carlson, "The Writings of Bernard André," 230.

¹⁹⁴ *BRUO*, 1:33.

¹⁹⁵ London, TNA, E 101/415/3, fol. 41r.

control of Brittany, which took place in London in 1489-90.¹⁹⁶ 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.¹⁹⁷ 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.¹⁹⁸ 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

¹⁹⁶ Antony Hasler, *Court Poetry in Late Medieval England and Scotland: Allegories of Authority* (Cambridge, 2014), 19.

¹⁹⁷ David Carlson, "Politicizing Tudor Court Literature: Gaguin's Embassy and Henry VII's Humanists' Response" *StP*, 85:3 (1988): 279-304 at 279.

¹⁹⁸ *LP* 5, no. 1028; *SP* 1/2, fol. 183r.

their reverence for Cromwell.¹⁹⁹ 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.²⁰⁰ 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.²⁰¹ 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.²⁰² 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.²⁰³

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.²⁰⁴ 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.²⁰⁵

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

¹⁹⁹ *LP* 7, no. 404; *SP* 1/83, fol. 33r-v.

²⁰⁰ *CSP:Spain* 4:2, no. 1062; *LP* 6, no. 391.

²⁰¹ *LP* 8, no. 121.

²⁰² *LP* 7, no. 587 (18).

²⁰³ *LP* 8, no. 540; *SP* 1/92 fol. 7r.

²⁰⁴ *LP* 7, no. 665 (1).

²⁰⁵ *Faculty Office Registers 1534-1549*, ed. D.S. Chambers (Oxford, 1966), 141.

obedient to the English king, writing his two editions of *A Supplication Unto the Most Gracious Prince Kyng Henry VIII*,²⁰⁶ 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,²⁰⁷ 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,²⁰⁸ 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.²⁰⁹ 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,²¹⁰ 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.²¹¹ In 1539, he continued to work as an ambassador for Henry, although this time to Denmark.²¹²

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 gracious 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.

²⁰⁷ Robert Barnes is discussed more fully on pages 238-246.

²⁰⁸ *LP* 10, no. 771; *Corp.Ref.* 3:60-65.

²⁰⁹ *CSP:Spain*, 4(2):337.

²¹⁰ *LP* 9, no. 468; *Corp.Ref.* 2:943.

²¹¹ *LP* 10, no. 528; London, BL, MS Add. 28588, fol. 228r; see Rory McEntegart, *Henry VIII, the League of Schmalkalden, and the English Reformation* (Woodbridge, 2002), 27-33, 35-42, 46, 104.

²¹² *LP* 14:2, no. 781; London, BL, MS Arundel 97, fol. 61v, 79v; *LP* 14:1, no. 955.

support from Cranmer and was for a brief period named as chaplain by Henry VIII.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.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.²¹⁵ Correspondence between Barnes and Cromwell demonstrates the depth of their relationship,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.²¹⁷ It was at Cromwell's behest that Barnes produced a revised edition of the text in 1534 with the printer John Byddell in London, which would be more favourable to the king.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.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

²¹³ Korey Maas, *The Reformation and Robert Barnes: History, Theology, and Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, 2002), 9.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 28-9.

²¹⁵ *LP* 9, nos. 153 (London, BL, MS Cotton Vitellius B XXII, fols. 127r -128v) and 543 (London, BL, MS Cotton Vitellius B XXI, fols. 120r-121v), letters from Barnes to Cromwell, relate Barnes' desire to debate with Cochlaeus.

²¹⁶ *LP* 9, nos. 153 (London, BL, MS Cotton Vitellius B XXII, fols. 127r -128v), 177 (London, BL, MS Cotton Vitellius B XXI, fols. 126r-v), 181 (*SP* 1/95 fols. 171r-v) and 543 (London, BL, MS Cotton Vitellius B XXI, fols. 120r-121v).

²¹⁷ *LP* 8, no. 892 (London, BL, MS Cotton Titus B I, fol. 475r).

²¹⁸ Maas, *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.

²¹⁹ *LP* 15, no. 498 (58).

marriage of Anne of Cleves with Henry, which Barnes assisted Cromwell in arranging, and was sealed by his own provocation of Stephen Gardiner.²²⁰ 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.²²¹

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,²²² 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.²²³ 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

²²⁰ Maas, *The Reformation and Robert Barnes*, 37-38.

²²¹ Bradshaw enumerates many difficulties faced by Browne in Ireland, namely, the rampant impoverishment of his see, the hostility of the clergy, and the lack of local administrative support. Brendan Bradshaw, "George Browne, First Reformation Archbishop of Dublin, 1536-1554" *JEH*, 21:4 (1970): 301-326 at 310.

²²² See pages 251-252.

²²³ Gumbley, "In Public Life," 43.

provincial prior and visitor to the mendicant houses alongside George Browne.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.²²⁵ Henry bequeathed to them considerable funds, giving them sixty-six pounds directly and two hundred pounds through the priory of Christ Church.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.²²⁷ Moreover, John Kynton, a Franciscan at Oxford, wrote against Luther for the king in 1521,²²⁸ and the future Elizabeth I was baptised in one of their churches.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.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

²²⁴ Richard Rex, "The Friars in the English Reformation," in *The Beginnings of English Protestantism*, ed. P. Marshall and A. Ryrie (Cambridge, 2002), 38-59 at 49-50.

²²⁵ Steck, *Franciscans and the Protestant Revolution in England*, 32.

²²⁶ Taylor, *The Greyfriars, Canterbury*, 12.

²²⁷ Steck, *Franciscans and the Protestant Revolution in England*, 33.

²²⁸ *Ibid.*

²²⁹ Taylor, *The Greyfriars, Canterbury*, 12.

²³⁰ *Ibid.*

dynasties.²³¹ 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."²³² 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.²³³ The monastery was obliged to assist and advise their seignior in disputes, whether territorial or political, and could claim seigniorial authority over their own subordinates, claiming income and fines for formalities such as entry into tenancies and marriages.²³⁴ 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,

²³¹ Julian Luxford, *The Art and Architecture of English Benedictine Monasteries, 1300-1540: A Patronage History* (Woodbridge, 2005), 152-53.

²³² James Clark, *The Benedictines in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 2011), 158.

²³³ *Ibid.*

²³⁴ *Ibid.*

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, wech was a ful holy woman, for sche was biried in the Frere Austines at Clare; and aftir hir biriing lii yere, at the desire of Dame Ysabel of Borow, sche mad hir bare, and sche was found hol in all membris: hir tetis, whan thei were pressid with handis, the flesch ros up ageyn; hir eyeledes, left up, fel down ageyn. The clothis that were aboute hir, wech were dipped in wax and rosyn, thoo were roten, but the lynand cloth wech 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

²³⁵ Capgrave, *Abbreviacion of Cronicles*, 130-31.

²³⁶ *Weev.AF*, 477.

²³⁷ *Ibid.*, 477-79.

²³⁸ *Ibid.*, 479.

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,²³⁹ 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.²⁴⁰ Furthermore, that same priory accepted the body of Sir John Wyndham, executed alongside Tyrell for his support of the de la Poles.²⁴¹ 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.²⁴² 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.²⁴³ 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.²⁴⁴ This relationship is an important one, since, as noted above, Elianore's husband John Wyndham

²³⁹ See pages 204-207.

²⁴⁰ See pages 204-205.

²⁴¹ See pages 205-207.

²⁴² *Ibid.*, 539. The Bacons were in Burnham Deepdale, the Morleys from Roydon, and the Wychinghams from the Eynesford Hundred.

²⁴³ Tanner, "Popular Religion in Norwich," 37.

²⁴⁴ *Test. Vet.*, 2:470.

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.²⁴⁵ 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 1538.²⁴⁶

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.²⁴⁷ 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.²⁴⁸ 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.²⁴⁹

The priories of Clare and Norwich demonstrate, more so than any other Austin houses, the seigniorial 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

²⁴⁵ Tanner, "Popular Religion in Norwich," 324.

²⁴⁶ *Top.Hist.Norfolk*, 4.2:85-91.

²⁴⁷ *Kirk.Norw.*, 140-41.

²⁴⁸ *Top.Hist.Norfolk*, 4.2:86-87.

²⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 4.2:90.

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,²⁵⁰ and the link between Sir Thomas Tuddenham and the Austin John Capgrave is well attested given Tuddenham's literary patronage of the friar.²⁵¹ 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.²⁵²

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

²⁵⁰ This list includes Lady Anne Scrope of Harling (widow of Lord John Scrope of Bolton), buried at Thetford and Elianore Wyndham (first married to Sir Richard Scrope of Bolton), buried at Norwich. Sir Stephen Scrope, second Lord of Marsham bequeathed money to OESA-Hull and York in 1450 (*Test.Ebor.*, 3:32), and Lord Thomas Scrope of Marsham bequeathed £4 6d 8s to OESA-York in 1495 (*Test.Ebor.*, 4:573). Some of his belongings are found to be in the possession of the Austin prior of York, William Bewick, several years later in 1506 (Purvis, "Monastic Chancery proceedings", 151-52). As stated by Weever, Lady Margaret Scrope was buried in Clare Priory.

²⁵¹ See Capgrave's *Ye Solace of Pilgrims*, which was made possible by Tuddenham's funding of Capgrave's pilgrimage to Rome in the Jubilee Year of 1450. Capgrave thanked Tuddenham in the preface to his pilgrim's guide. See Capgrave, *Ye Solace of Pilgrimes*, 1.

²⁵² "To the Austyn Fryers of Norwiche where I am suster XXs." *Test.Ebor.*, 4:151.

Elinham was paid £6 for performing a yearlong chantry for Richard Barbor,²⁵³ 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.²⁵⁴ 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.²⁵⁵ 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.²⁵⁶ 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.²⁵⁷ In exchange, the friars said three masses weekly for the king and his family.²⁵⁸ 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.²⁵⁹ 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.²⁶⁰ The house obtained noteworthy patronage again in 1527, when the prior received sixteen shillings from Thomas le Strange.²⁶¹ 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.²⁶² 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.²⁶³

²⁵³ Gladys Thornton, *A History of Clare, Suffolk* (Cambridge, 1928), 91.

²⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵⁵ *CPR* 9 Henry IV 1405-1408 [1408], 435 (membrane 24).

²⁵⁶ *VCH:Norfolk*, 2:435.

²⁵⁷ *CPR* 1 Henry V 1413-1416 [1413] 23 (membrane 19).

²⁵⁸ Thornton, *A History of Clare*, 91.

²⁵⁹ *CartCl.*, JD (185) fol. 56r; *CAugCl.*, 102.

²⁶⁰ Harrod, *Report on King's Lynn*, 104.

²⁶¹ *LP* 4:2, no. 3005.

²⁶² *The Paston Letters, 1422-1509 A.D.*, ed. James Gairdner (London, 1872-75) 3:284, 480.

²⁶³ *LP* 1:1, 2nd ed., no. 132 (6).

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.²⁶⁴ Sir Thomas Kerdeston left 300 marks to the friars at Norwich for a perpetual chantry for the souls of him and his two wives.²⁶⁵

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.²⁶⁶ 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.²⁶⁷ In 1422, Sir John Bolde established a chantry there, enacted by lector and friar Nicholas Spink.²⁶⁸ In 1504, they performed a chantry for Sir Gilbert Southworth, whom they buried in their cemetery.²⁶⁹ The Butler family gave them ten marks in 1520.²⁷⁰ In 1415, the house at Bristol received significant bequests from the Countess of Salisbury and William Lord Botreaux.²⁷¹ They performed two significant trentals in 1417 and 1436 for Richard Bruton and Edward Greyville, respectively.²⁷² In 1495, they received two pounds from Jasper Tudor Duke of Bedford and uncle of Henry Tudor.²⁷³ In 1450, Sir Stephen Scrope, second Lord of Masham, left bequests to the Austin friaries in Hull and York.²⁷⁴ In Oxford, after Edmund Rede was received as founder in 1456, he granted the advowson of the church of St James in Werplesgrave to the Austins.²⁷⁵ In 1487, Rede honoured this patronal relationship and requested a seven-year-

²⁶⁴ *Kirk.Norw.*, 140-1.

²⁶⁵ *Top.Hist.Norfolk*, 10:111-118.

²⁶⁶ A Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts, in the British Museum: With Indexes of Persons, Places, and Matters (London, 1808-12), 1:471 (no. 902, 44).

²⁶⁷ William Beaumont, *History of Warrington Friary* (Manchester, 1872), 28, 30.

²⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 34-5.

²⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 55.

²⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 57.

²⁷¹ *Reg.Chich.*, 2:16 (consulted via *RothSources*, 283; D 697); *Test.Vet.*, 191-2.

²⁷² "Somerset Wills, 1383-1500" *SRS* 16 (1901), 88; *Somerset Medieval Wills*, ed. F.W. Weaver (London, 1901-5) 1:140.

²⁷³ *Somerset Medieval Wills*, 1:328.

²⁷⁴ *Test.Ebor.*, 3:32.

²⁷⁵ H.E. Salter, *The Boarstall Cartulary*, Oxford Historical Society, 88 (Oxford, 1930), 229, no. 634; Wood, *Survey of Oxford*, 2:455.

long chantry and left the friars money to repair their church.²⁷⁶ William Waynflete left money to the Austin Friars at Winchester in 1486.²⁷⁷ In 1524, a husbandman of Rye paid for a new roof for the local Austin friary.²⁷⁸ The friary at York received considerable patronage from Richard III, as described above, and in 1527 they hosted the Earl of Northumberland for a year and received four and half pounds for the service.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,²⁸⁰ and in Exeter, the Courtenay family was a continued benefactor to the Dominicans there.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.²⁸² When Humphrey Stafford was made Earl of Devon in 1469 he visited the priory, as did his successor in 1471.²⁸³ Katharine Countess of Devon was also a benefactress, as was Elizabeth de Bohun Countess of Northampton in 1356.²⁸⁴ 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.²⁸⁵ Familial ties are certainly evident in the burials at Dominican priories, such as the burials

²⁷⁶ *Some Oxfordshire Wills Proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, 1393-1510*, ed. J.R.H. Weaver and A. Beardwood (Oxford, 1958), 44-45.

²⁷⁷ *Logge*, 2:376-82 at 377 (no.350).

²⁷⁸ E.B. Poland, *Friars in Sussex* (Hove, 1928), 131.

²⁷⁹ *LP* 4:2, no. 3380 (9).

²⁸⁰ Parkin, *The Friars Preachers in Lancashire*, 16.

²⁸¹ Little and Easterling, *The Franciscans and Dominicans of Exeter*, 39.

²⁸² *Ibid.*

²⁸³ *Ibid.*

²⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

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 townsmen 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

²⁸⁶ Parkin, *The Friars Preachers in Lancashire*, 15.

²⁸⁷ Hinnebusch, *The Early English Friars Preachers*, 74-75.

²⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 87.

²⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 44.

²⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

²⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 103.

²⁹² John Moorman, *A History of the Franciscan Order: from its origins to the year 1517* (Oxford, 1968), 172.

²⁹³ *Ibid.*

church, to twenty pence.²⁹⁴ Legacies in money were prevalent over legacies in kind and all classes were represented, particularly the nobility and secular clergy.²⁹⁵ They maintained an extraordinary number of chantries, with the London house receiving an astonishing fifty-five pounds a year in income for funerary services.²⁹⁶ There were many lodgings for noble families in Franciscan friaries, such as the chambers for Sir Thomas Tyrell at Colchester and Lady Ewyngbern at Coventry, in addition to bishop's lodgings at Lichfield and a chamber for the king at Dorchester.²⁹⁷ 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.²⁹⁸ John Kemp, Archbishop of York and Cardinal protector of the Carmelites, frequently stayed at the convent in Aylesford, as did Thomas Bouchier when visiting nearby parishes.²⁹⁹ 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.³⁰⁰

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.³⁰¹ 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.³⁰² 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.³⁰³ Benedictine cathedral priories contained numerous

²⁹⁴ Little, *Studies in English Franciscan History*, 27, 40.

²⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 39.

²⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 26.

²⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 76.

²⁹⁸ Margaret Poskitt, "The English Carmelite Province, 15th century," in *Carmel in Britain: Essays on the medieval English Carmelite Province*, ed. Patrick Fitzgerald-Lombard, OCarm (Rome, 1992), 1:149-154 at 151.

²⁹⁹ McGreal, *The History of the Friars Aylesford*, 15.

³⁰⁰ Poskitt, "The English Carmelite Province, 15th century," 151.

³⁰¹ Heale, *Monasticism in Late Medieval England*, 169.

³⁰² *Ibid.*, 170.

³⁰³ Clark, *A Monastic Renaissance at St Albans*, 37.

tombs and chantry chapels for former bishops,³⁰⁴ and so their support from the ecclesiastical hierarchy was unparalleled. Benedictine monasteries were far more seigniorial 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.³⁰⁵ Although not analysed by Steer, the number of politically sensitive burials amongst this list of burials is 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

³⁰⁴ Greatrex, *The English Benedictine Cathedral Priories*, 19.

³⁰⁵ Christian Steer, "Royal and Noble Commemoration in the Mendicant Houses of London, c. 1240-1540" in *Memory and Commemoration in Medieval England*, ed. C. Barron and C. Burgess (Donington, 2010), 117-42 at 123.

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.³⁰⁶ 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.³⁰⁷

Another example is the Daubeney family; the Daubeney family 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.³⁰⁸ 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.³⁰⁹

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.

³⁰⁷ Lucy Freeman Sandler, *Illuminators and Patrons in Fourteenth-Century England: the Psalter and Hours of Humphrey de Bohun and the Manuscripts of the Bohun Family* (Toronto, 2014), 9, 138-40 (for images of Austin Friars in prayer within the manuscript), 197, 223, 280.

³⁰⁸ StowSL, 160.

³⁰⁹ *Ibid.*

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.³¹⁰ The second, also interred in the choir, is Richard FitzAlan, Earl of Arundel, Surrey, and Warenne, brother to Thomas Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury.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.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 1462.³¹³ Convicted and executed alongside these three was William Tyrell of Gipping, Suffolk, who was also buried in the Austin church.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.³¹⁵

³¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 175-77.

³¹¹ *Ibid.*

³¹² C. Given-Wilson, "Fitzalan, Richard (III), fourth earl of Arundel and ninth earl of Surrey (1346-1397), magnate" *ODNB* [<http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2167/view/article/9535?docPos=3>].

³¹³ *The Great Chronicle of London*, ed. A.H. Thomas and I.D. Thornley (London, 1938), 199.

³¹⁴ *StowSL*, 177.

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, *Essex: Highways, Byways And Waterways* (London, 1893), 150; Rosemary Horrox, "Tyrell family (*per.* c.1304-c.1510), gentry" *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,³¹⁶ 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.³¹⁷ 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 1471.³¹⁸ 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

³¹⁶ StowSL, 175-77; Christian Steer, "The Lorde Barons Slaine at Barnet Field," *Ricardian* 26 (2016): 87-98.

³¹⁷ Christian Steer, "The Lorde Barons Slaine at Barnet Field," *Ricardian* 26 (2016): 87-98.

³¹⁸ StowSL, 175-77

executed William Collingbourne and had him buried in the western side of the nave of the London church of the Austin Friars.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.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.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.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.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,³²⁴ and was convicted of treason in 1502.³²⁵ 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

³¹⁹ *Ibid.*

³²⁰ Michael Hicks, *The Wars of the Roses: 1455-1485* (New Haven, 2010), 245.

³²¹ *GCL*, 290-91.

³²² London, BL, Harl. Ch. 111 C 23.

³²³ *GCL* 318-19.

³²⁴ Hicks, *The Wars of the Roses*, 252.

³²⁵ James Taylor, *The Shadow of the White Rose: Edward Courtenay, Earl of Devon: 1526-1556* (New York, 2006), 23.

subsequently buried in Austin Friars London.³²⁶ 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.³²⁷ 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.³²⁸ 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.³²⁹ He was accused and convicted of treason, and executed the day following his trial, on 17 May 1521.³³⁰ 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.³³¹

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.³³² 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

³²⁶ Röhrkasten, *The Mendicant Houses of Medieval London*, 131.

³²⁷ See pages 193-194.

³²⁸ See Barbara Harris, *Edward Stafford*, 180-202.

³²⁹ *Ibid.*

³³⁰ *Ibid.*

³³¹ *Ibid.*, 206.

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”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.”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.”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.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,³³⁷ in addition to its reputation

³³³ Röhrkasten, *The Mendicant Houses of Medieval London*, 547.

³³⁴ *Ibid.*, 547-48.

³³⁵ Steer, “Royal and Noble Commemoration,” 135.

³³⁶ *Ibid.*, 130.

³³⁷ Christian Steer writes in his article on the mendicant burials in London that both the Austin Friars and the Crutched 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 Bassett (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.³³⁸ 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 Tuddenham, 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 Tuddenham, John and Aubrey Vere, William and

Humphrey Bouchier, 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

¹ Lambert Thorn was, in fact, executed several years after the death of his two confrères, in 1528, although all three were arrested at the same time. For the evangelical activities of the Augustinians at Antwerp, see Alphonsus de Decker, *Les Augustins d'Anvers et la Réforme* (Antwerp, 1884); M. Mélard, "Les débuts de la réforme à Anvers, 1518-1530," (PhD diss., Université de Liège, 1971-72), 130-137; Alastair Duke, "The Origins of Evangelical Dissent in the Low Countries" in Alastair Duke, *Reformation and Revolt in the Low Countries* (London, 1990), especially 15-16; Julius Boehmer, "De Beschaffenheit der Quellenschriften zu Heinrich Voes und Johann van den Esschen" *ArchivRef* 28 (1931): 112-133, at 130. As Brad Gregory notes in his article on martyrdom in the early Reformation, Observant Augustinian houses in Antwerp, Ghent, and Dordrecht were "among the first channels by which Luther's teachings reached the Low Countries." Brad Gregory, "Late medieval religiosity and the renaissance of Christian martyrdom in the Reformation era" in *Continuity and change: the harvest of late medieval and Reformation history*, ed. Robert James Bast et al. (Leiden, 2000), 379-399, at n.4 on 380. For the historical documents surrounding the closure of the Antwerp Augustinian convent, see *Corpus documentorum inquisitionis pravitatis neerlandicae*, ed. Paul Fredericq (Ghent, 1900), 4:136-39, 141-43, 156-59, 160, 163-72, 173-77, 183-84, and 191-92.

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, Guilio 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.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.

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.⁴ 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).⁵ 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

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 *ParIR*, 8:195-96.

without the permission of his parents and without having a proper religious vocation.⁶ 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.⁷ 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.⁸ 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.⁹ Others chose to stay in England; the prior of Grimsby John Daniel cited John Heton for arrest in 1419 after his apostasy,¹⁰ and Austins John Stanry and John Salderop arrested and punished their former confrères Robert Bedyngfield and Thomas Hasse in 1420.¹¹ In 1415, the Austin John Paston made a petition to the pope for leave to become an Austin Canon.¹² 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

⁶ Dd 4, fol. 158v (consulted via *RothSources*, 305; D 736).

⁷ *Rot.Norm.*, 1:xxix.

⁸ Dd 4, fol. 134v (consulted via *RothSources*, 303; D 732).

⁹ *Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London: King Henry VI*, ed. Reginald Sharpe (London, 1911), 92-105.

¹⁰ London, TNA, *Chancery Warrants for the Great Seal*, series 1, C 81/1794.

¹¹ Dd 4, fol. 18v (consulted via *RothSources*, 295; D 716).

¹² *CPRGBI*, 6:465.

re-examine the case.¹³ 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.¹⁴ 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.¹⁵ 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.¹⁶ 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.¹⁷ 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:¹⁸ William Gormechester,¹⁹ John of Orford,²⁰ John Wetele,²¹ and Thomas Asche.²² 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

¹³ Dd 4, fol. 157v (consulted via *RothSources*, 305; D 736).

¹⁴ CCR 8 Henry VI 1429-1435 [1430], 9 (m.18).

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 7:368.

¹⁶ Dd 5, fol. 21r (consulted via *RothSources*, 316; D 770).

¹⁷ Dd 4, fol. 97v (consulted via *RothSources*, 299-300; D 725).

¹⁸ Dd 4, fol. 4v (consulted via *RothSources*, 290; D 713).

¹⁹ Dd 4, fol. 7r, 54r, 73v, 106r (consulted via *RothSources*, 291; D 713); see also Dd 4 fol. 17v (consulted via *RothSources*, 295; D 716).

²⁰ Dd 4, fol. 54v (consulted via *RothSources*, 292; D 713).

²¹ Dd 4, fol. 64v (consulted via *RothSources*, 297; D 720).

²² Dd 4, fol. 54v (consulted via *RothSources*, 297; D 720); *The Register of Richard Fleming Bishop of Lincoln 1420-1431*, ed. N.H. Bennet, Canterbury and York Society 73, 99 (Canterbury, 1984), 2:91 (no. 491).

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

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).

²⁷ CPR 12 Edward IV (Edward IV and Henry VI 1467-1477) [1472], 328 (m.21).

²⁸ Priors of monastic communities typically requested assistance from the secular arm when the apostate in question resisted the exhortations of his community. Should the apostate have been excommunicate for more than forty days, the prior would send his name to the royal chancery and appear there requesting secular aid since the apostate had evaded all the efforts of the Church. The chancery would then issue a writ or commission to sheriffs and other royal officers for the arrest of the apostate. Christopher Harper-Bill, "Monastic Apostasy in Late-Medieval England," *JEH*, 32:1 (1981): 1-18 at 2, 4.

²⁹ Dd 7, fol. 16r (consulted via *RothSources*, 359; D 902).

³⁰ Dd 7, fol. 16v (consulted via *RothSources*, 359; D 902).

³¹ Dd 7, fol. 17r (consulted via *RothSources*, 360; D 904).

Bury recalled all apostates living outside their monastery and made special mention of these two, calling for their arrest.³² In 1486, there is the trial of William Herford, a friar who had left his convent to stay with his parents.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.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.³⁵ Furthermore, Friar Thomas Stanley apostatised in 1515, and finally, Cornelius Collician left his monastery in 1519.³⁶ 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.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.³⁸ Because of this deficiency in source material, we may only infer

³² Dd 7, fol. 18v (consulted via *RothSources*, 364; D 917).

³³ Dd 8, fol. 31r (consulted via *RothSources*, 374; D 947).

³⁴ Dd 8, fol. 32r (consulted via *RothSources*, 378; D 957).

³⁵ *NorwichCCD*, 1 (no.1; fol. 1r-2v).

³⁶ Dd 12, fol. 56r (consulted via *RothSources*, 403; D 1016); Dd 13, fol. 65r (consulted via *RothSources*, 410; D 1029).

³⁷ *LP* 3:1, no. 1285; *SP* 1/22, fol. 65r.

³⁸ Katharine Walsh, "The Observance: Sources for a History of the Observant Reform Movement in the Order of Augustinian Friars in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries" *RivistaIt* 31 (1977): 40-67 at

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.³⁹ Across all orders, Logan suggests that the overall rate of apostasy in this period might be somewhere between 3.6% and 7.3%,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.⁴¹ He identifies another peak in the 1470s, with other high points in the fifteenth century as 1401-1410, the 1450s and 1460s.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.⁴³ He identifies five for the Franciscans in the first half of the fifteenth century, and only one from after 1451.⁴⁴ 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 1451.⁴⁵ 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,

44. There is a gap for the years 1439-51, and in the early years of Giles of Viterbo's priorship in the sixteenth century.

³⁹ See F. Donald Logan, *Runaway Religious in Medieval England, c.1240-1540* (Cambridge, 1996), 74 for his sources.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 105.

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 241.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

attributing this trend to the mendicant privilege to appeal directly to local royal officials, therefore bypassing central administration and documentation.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.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.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

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 70.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 174. These records have been printed in *Faculty Office Registers 1534-1549*, by D.S. Chambers (Oxford, 1966).

⁴⁸ Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England*, 3:360.

their lack of endowments or income, meant that many friars found themselves in abject poverty such as they had never experienced.⁴⁹ Suppression accounts from the visitors, enumerate countless Austin friaries, amongst friaries from other orders, experiencing extreme poverty, such as the Austins in Stafford,⁵⁰ Shrewsbury,⁵¹ Oxford,⁵² and Huntingdon.⁵³ Apostasy and perhaps pre-emptive looting in the face of the coming dissolution, as we see at Oxford,⁵⁴ 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.⁵⁵ 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

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 3:366.

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.⁵⁶ 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.⁵⁷ 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.⁵⁸ 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.⁵⁹ 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.⁶⁰

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.⁶¹ 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

⁵⁶ Dd 6, fol. 18r (consulted via *RothSources*, 349; D 871).

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ Dd 6, fol. 19r (consulted via *RothSources*, 355; D 891).

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ Dd 8, fol. 31v (consulted via *RothSources*, 378; D 956).

Martiniana requirement that the tenure of provincial priors be no more than three years.⁶² In 1510, the new provincial John Toney 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.⁶³ 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.⁶⁴ The following year, he was threatened with excommunication for having delayed provincial chapters, thereby avoiding the official procedures of the order.⁶⁵ 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,⁶⁶ 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 1520,⁶⁷ and he was similarly inattentive regarding the chapter acts, which he did not send to the general chapter for two years.⁶⁸ 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.⁶⁹ 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.⁷⁰

⁶² Dd 8, fol. 33r (consulted via *RothSources*, 380-81; D 964); see Luigi Torelli, *Secoli Agostiniani* (Bologna, 1675) 6:482 for *Martiniana* requirements.

⁶³ Dd 11, fol. 42v (consulted via *RothSources*, 397; D 1004).

⁶⁴ Dd 11, fol. 82v (consulted via *RothSources*, 401; D 1011).

⁶⁵ Dd 11, fol. 133v (consulted via *RothSources*, 401; D 1012).

⁶⁶ See pages 121-123.

⁶⁷ Dd 13, fol. 119r (consulted via *RothSources*, 411; D 1029) and 121r (consulted via *RothSources*, 413; D 1032).

⁶⁸ Dd 13, fol. 116r (consulted via *RothSources*, 411; D 1029).

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁷⁰ Dd 13, fol. 129v (consulted via *RothSources*, 413; D 1032).

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 1509,⁷¹ was requested to enforce reform, although there is no indication of why that was necessary.⁷² In 1510, John Toney was elected as vicar general and tasked with instituting reform throughout the entire province.⁷³ The provincial Hugh Harley was called upon to enforce reform in 1516,⁷⁴ 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.⁷⁵ 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.⁷⁶ 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.⁷⁷

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.⁷⁸ 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.⁷⁹ 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

⁷¹ Anthony Wood, *Fasti Oxonienses*, ed. John Gutch (Oxford, 1790), 4.

⁷² Dd 11, fol. 5v (consulted via *RothSources*, 396; D 1000).

⁷³ Dd 11, fol. 56r, 60r (consulted via *RothSources*, 397-98; D 1004).

⁷⁴ Dd 12, fol. 74v (consulted via *RothSources*, 404; D 1018).

⁷⁵ Dd 13, fol. 92r (consulted via *RothSources*, 410; D 1029).

⁷⁶ Dd 13, fol. 175r (consulted via *RothSources*, 415; D 1032).

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

chapters to every seven years in collaboration with the late Cardinal Wolsey.⁸⁰ 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.⁸¹ 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.⁸² 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.⁸³ 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,⁸⁴ even though, as we shall see, the prior had been censured the year previously for embezzlement.

⁸⁰ Dd 15, fol. 181r (consulted via *RothSources*, 439; D 1078); *LP* 5, no. 980(3); Dd 13, fol. 141r (consulted via *RothSources*, 414; D 1032) for Wetherall's confirmation as provincial.

⁸¹ Dd 15, fol. 181r (consulted via *RothSources*, 439; D 1078).

⁸² *LP* 5, no. 980 (3).

⁸³ *LP* 13:2, no. 88.

⁸⁴ "The manuscripts of Shrewsbury and Coventry corporations, the Earl of Radnor, Sir Walter Corbet, bart., and others (15th Reprint, appendix x)," *Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts* 47 (London, 1897), 34; Owen and Blakeley, *History of Shrewsbury*, 2:458-9.

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 answeare 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,

⁸⁵ *VCH:Shropshire*, 2:95-98.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.* Towne was dispensed of his habit in 1538 (*Faculty Office Registers 1534-1549*, 164).

⁸⁷ Owen and Blakeway, *A History of Shrewsbury*, 2:459; *VCH:Shropshire*, 2:95-98.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

⁸⁹ *LP* 13:2, no. 92; London, BL, MS Cotton Cleopatra E IV, fol. 248r.

⁹⁰ *LP* 13:2, no. 88.

⁹¹ *LP* 13:2, no. 200; London, BL, MS Cotton Cleopatra E IV, fol. 319r; *Faculty Office Registers 1534-1549*, 494.

⁹² See pages 122-123.

⁹³ *Monum.Franc.*, 2:191.

who wrote to the provincial William Wetherall, ordering him to restore order to the priory.⁹⁴ 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.⁹⁵ 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*.⁹⁶

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.⁹⁷ 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

⁹⁴ Dd 15, fol. 126v-127v (consulted via *RothSources*, 431-33; D 1064).

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

⁹⁶ See page 32.

⁹⁷ Dd 14, fol. 174r (consulted via *RothSources*, 426; D 1047).

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 Sharnington,¹⁰⁵ Thomas

⁹⁸ F.X. Martin, "The Irish Augustinian Reform Movement in the Fifteenth Century," *MS* (1961), 230-264 at 241.

⁹⁹ See pages 115-129.

¹⁰⁰ *Hist.Angl.*, 2:157-59.

¹⁰¹ Parliamentary document printed in V.H. Galbraith, "Articles Laid Before the Parliament of 1371" *EHR*, 34:136 (1919): 579-82; original can be found in London, BL, MS Harl. 638, fol. 222r.

¹⁰² *BRUO*, 3:2170.

¹⁰³ *Reg.Chich.*, 3:167, 201; *Fasc.Ziz.*, 417.

¹⁰⁴ *Reg.Chich.*, 3:201.

¹⁰⁵ *Fasc.Ziz.*, 417.

Garston,¹⁰⁶ Clement Felmingham,¹⁰⁷ and Walter Thetford¹⁰⁸ 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),¹⁰⁹ famously wrote his tract the *Gladius Salomonis* against the allegedly heretical thought of Reginald Pecock in 1457.¹¹⁰ In comparison, the Dominicans were prolific in preaching against Lollardy, particularly in Oxford,¹¹¹ with William Bottlesham, Robert Humbleton, and John Bromyard notable for their sermons defending orthodoxy.¹¹² Thomas Netter, the famous Carmelite, was similarly devoted to defending orthodoxy, as evident in his *Doctrinale Antiquitatum Fidei*.¹¹³ In 1413, Netter studied Wycliffe's works and in 1414, he was present at Oldcastle's trial.¹¹⁴ He was also present at William Whyte's trial in 1428.¹¹⁵ 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.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.¹¹⁷

Karen Winstead and Sarah James have posited that John Capgrave's vernacular hagiography – specifically his *Life of Saint Katharine* – argued for the value of open theological discussion, presenting Katharine “deriding tradition and quoting Scripture like the stereotypical Lollard wife.”¹¹⁸ Winstead points to the close cultural association of

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*; *Heresy Trials in the Diocese of Norwich, 1428-31, from Westminster Diocesan Archives MS B.2*, ed. Norman Tanner (London, 1977), 103-5.

¹⁰⁸ *Fasc.Ziz.*, 417.

¹⁰⁹ Dd 6, fol. 17 for his first election. Dd 7, fol. 18r for his second election; this is confirmed by letters of confraternity that he signed as provincial, such as London, BL, Harley Charters 111 C 23.

¹¹⁰ Oxford, Bodl., MS Bodley 108.

¹¹¹ Formoy, *The Dominican Order in England*, 73.

¹¹² Gumbley, “As Preachers,” 144.

¹¹³ Poskitt, “Thomas Netter of Walden”, 166.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 167.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 168.

¹¹⁶ Clark, *A Monastic Renaissance at St Albans*, 34.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 249.

¹¹⁸ Winstead, *Virgin Martyrs*, 17.

Lollardy with vernacular lay reading,¹¹⁹ 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.¹²⁰ 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.¹²¹ 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."¹²² In Capgrave's words, Katharine denounces pagan philosophers who contend that images are "but figures/ Representyng other manere thing,"¹²³ 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."¹²⁴

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*

¹¹⁹ For the relationship between lay vernacular reading and Lollardy, see Margaret Aston, *Lollards and Reformers: Images and Literacy in Late Medieval Religion* (London, 1984), 193-217; Anne Hudson, *Lollards and Their Books* (London, 1985); Janet Coleman, *Medieval Readers and Writers, 1350-1400* (New York, 1981), 204-31.

¹²⁰ Winstead, *Virgin Martyrs*, 137.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 165.

¹²² *Eadem*, *John Capgrave's Fifteenth Century*, 67-68; Capgrave, *Life of St Katharine*, 289 (4.881-91), 351-55 (5.400-525).

¹²³ Capgrave, *Life of St Katharine*, 309 (4.1499-500).

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 191 (3.327-28).

Chronicles,¹²⁵ 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."¹²⁶ 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,¹²⁷ 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.¹²⁸ 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*

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.

¹²⁸ Simpson, "John Lydgate", 214.

Church.¹²⁹

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.

¹³¹ Simpson, *Reform and Cultural Revolution*, 56.

¹³² *Ibid.*

¹³³ Watt, "John Gower," 163.

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.

¹³⁴ Newhauser, "Religious Writing," 48; Kantik Ghosh, *The Wycliffite Heresy: Authority and the Interpretation of Texts* (Cambridge, 2001), 147.

¹³⁵ Margaret Harvey, "The Diffusion of the *Doctrinale* of Thomas Netter in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries," in *Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages*, ed. Lesley Smith and Benedicta Ward (London, 1992), 281-294 at 281; Kantik Ghosh, *The Wycliffite Heresy*, 20.

¹³⁶ Gayk, *Image, Text, and Religious Reform*, 84-85.

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.¹³⁸ 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.¹³⁹ 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,¹⁴⁰ 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 1528.¹⁴¹ 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.¹⁴² 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,

¹³⁸ Maas, *The Reformation and Robert Barnes*, 11; *A&M*, 8:1045-8 for Foxe's account of Bayfield.

¹³⁹ *StrypeEM*, 1:2, 55

¹⁴⁰ See page 131-137.

¹⁴¹ *A&M*, 8:1070.

¹⁴² *StrypeEM*, 1:2, 61; *LP* 4:2, no. 4218, 4242, 4254 (3).

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

¹⁴³ Martin, "The Augustinian Observant Movement," 325-345; *idem*, "The Augustinian Order on the Eve of the Reformation," 71-104.

Kappelmaier, Konrad Treger, Giles of Viterbo, Girolamo Seripando, John Stone, Luis de Montoya, Tomàs de Villanueva, and Roger de Jonghe – were predominantly Observant friars.¹⁴⁴ Francis Martin astutely interpreted this phenomenon when he stated that “Catholic and Protestant reforms were both products of the same movement”,¹⁴⁵ 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.¹⁴⁶ Aside from the two authorities on the subject – Katharine Walsh and F.X. Martin¹⁴⁷ – 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.¹⁴⁸ 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.¹⁴⁹

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

¹⁴⁴ Martin, “The Augustinian Observant Movement,” 328.

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.

¹⁴⁷ Walsh, “The Observance,” 40-67; Martin, “The Augustinian Observant Movement,” 325-345; *idem*, “The Augustinian Order on the Eve of the Reformation,” 71-104.

¹⁴⁸ Bert Roest, “Observant reform in religious orders”, in *The Cambridge History of Christianity: Christianity in Western Europe, c.1100-1500*, ed. Miri Rubin and Walter Simons (Cambridge, 2010): 446-457 at 449.

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.¹⁵⁰ 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.¹⁵¹

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."¹⁵² 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,"¹⁵³ 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

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 propagatione incipit", ed. Rudolph Arbesmann, *AAug*, 28 (1965): 186-218.

¹⁵¹ Walsh, "The Observance: Sources," 44-49.

¹⁵² Martin, "The Augustinian Observant Movement", 337.

¹⁵³ Martin, "The Irish Augustinian Reform Movement," 231.

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.¹⁵⁴ Many English friars, such as Thomas Penketh, studied in Italy,¹⁵⁵ 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.¹⁵⁶ 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.¹⁵⁷ 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

¹⁵⁴ See pages 131-137.

¹⁵⁵ G. Brotto and G. Zonta, *La Facoltà Teologica dell'Università di Padova* (Padua, 1922), 1:179-81, 203; Dd 7, fol. 17v (consulted via *RothSources*, 362; D 909).

¹⁵⁶ See Gwynn, *The English Austin Friars*, 193-210 for Gwynn's analysis of Flete's English correspondence.

¹⁵⁷ See pages 71-89.

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 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.¹⁵⁸ 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,

¹⁵⁸ Neelak Tjernagel, "Robert Barnes and Wittenberg" *CT*, 9 (1957): 641-653; *idem*, *Lutheran Martyr* (Milwaukee, 1982); *idem*, *Henry VIII and the Lutherans: A study in the Anglo-Lutheran relations from 1521 to 1547* (St Louis, 1965); Richard Glen Eaves, "The Reformation thought of Dr Robert Barnes, Lutheran chaplain and ambassador for Henry VIII" *LQ*, 28 (1976): 156-65; William Dallmann, *Robert Barnes: English Lutheran Martyr* (St Louis, 1997); Marcus Loane, *Pioneers of the Reformation in England* (London, 1964) and James McGoldrick, *Luther's English Connection* (Milwaukee, 1979).

N.H. Fisher, E.G. Rupp, Marcus Loane, Carl Trueman, and Charles Anderson,¹⁵⁹ 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.¹⁶⁰ 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

¹⁵⁹ The most authoritative of these are J.P. Lusardi's account, attached as an appendix to an edition of the works of Thomas More, and Korey Maas' study of the reformer. See J.P. Lusardi, "The Career of Robert Barnes" in *CWM*, 8:1365-1415 and Korey Maas, *The Reformation and Robert Barnes: History, Theology, and Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, 2010). See also: E.G. Rupp, *Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition* (Cambridge, 1966), 31-46; N.H. Fisher, "The Contribution of Robert Barnes to the English Reformation" (MA Thesis, University of Birmingham, 1950); Loane, *Pioneers of the Reformation in England*, 49-87; Carl Trueman, *Luther's Legacy: Salvation and English Reformers 1526-1556* (Oxford, 1994), 17-22, 156-165; Charles Anderson, "The Person and Position of Dr. Robert Barnes, 1495-1540: A Study in the Relationship between the English and German Reformations" (Th.D. Thesis, Union Theological Seminary, 1962). Some other books which deal superficially with the career of Barnes as an example of early English evangelicalism are: Carter Lindberg, *European Reformation* (Oxford, 1996), 311-313; Ian Hazlett, *The Reformation in Britain and Ireland* (London, 2003), 42; Euan Cameron, *The European Reformation* (Oxford, 1991), 281; Guy Bedouelle, "The Consultations of the Universities and Scholars Concerning the Great Matter of King Henry VIII" in *The Bible in the Sixteenth Century*, ed. David Steinmetz (Durham, 1990): 21-36; James Arthur Muller, *Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction* (London, 1926), 13-18, 83-94.

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).

Cambridge.¹⁶¹ 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,¹⁶² 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.¹⁶³ 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 1521,¹⁶⁴ and matriculated there in May of that year.¹⁶⁵ Nevertheless, it is worth noting that Barnes reappears in entries in the Cambridge Grace Books in 1522, when he

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).

¹⁶⁵ *Matricule de l’Université de Louvain*, ed. Edmond Reusens et al. (Brussels, 1903), 1:648.

was incorporated as a bachelor, and then subsequently doctor in theology, for which he was confirmed by the general chapter in June of 1523.¹⁶⁶ 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.¹⁶⁷ 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 [...] conuerted him wholly vnto Christ. The first Sermon that euer he preached of this truth, was the Sonday before Christmas day, at S. Edwardes church longyng to Trinitie hall in Cambridge by the pease market.¹⁶⁸

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*."¹⁶⁹ [emphasis mine] 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 –

¹⁶⁶ *GraceBookB*:2, 104; *GraceBookG*, 214; Dd 14, fol. 129r.

¹⁶⁷ Maas, *The Reformation and Robert Barnes*, 10.

¹⁶⁸ *A&M*, 8:1216.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

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.¹⁷⁰ And yet, Barnes wrote only of his exhortation to bishops and priests away from "damnable pompe and pryde,"¹⁷¹ 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."¹⁷² 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 xl. 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 lyuyng? And douteles I did not say but that you might haue possessyons but allonly I spake agenste the superfluusnes and the abuse of them.¹⁷³

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,

¹⁷⁰ Robert Barnes, *A Supplication unto the most gracyous prince H. the viij* (London, 1534), sig. I4v-O1r, the section on how "alonely faith justifieth".

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, sig. E3r.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, sig. G3v.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, sig. G4v.

stating that “they say they be the successors of Christ and of his aposteles but I se them follow none but Judas *for they bere the pursse*.”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*.”¹⁷⁵ [emphasis mine] Scathingly, Barnes remarked that “there ys no better marchandysse in chepesyde”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.”¹⁷⁷ According to Barnes’ account of his preaching and arrest, he “damned in [his] sermone the Gorgious pompe and pryde of all exteryor ornamentys,”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,”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 *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,¹⁸⁰ the bondage of the will,¹⁸¹ the importance of the availability of Scripture to the laity,¹⁸²

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, sig. H1r.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, sig. H3r.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, sig. H3v.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, sig. I1v.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, sig. H1v.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, sig. I4v-O1r.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, sig. U1r-Y1r.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, sig. Y4v-BB4r.

utraquism,¹⁸³ and a denunciation of the cult of saints.¹⁸⁴ 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 sympylle poure wretche and worth noo mans monny in the worlde,”¹⁸⁵ 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.”¹⁸⁶ 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.¹⁸⁷ Fish’s text suggested that the poor were genuine beggars, powerless and impoverished, whilst false beggars, namely clerics, were strong and powerful.¹⁸⁸ 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

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, sig. EE3v-HH1r.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, sig. HH1v-MM2r.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, sig. I2r.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, sig. A3v.

¹⁸⁷ Mike Rodman Jones, *Radical Pastoral, 1381–1594: Appropriation and the Writing of Religious Controversy* (Surrey, 2011), 53.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

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.¹⁸⁹ 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.¹⁹⁰ 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 1528.¹⁹¹ 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.¹⁹² 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,

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 54.

¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁹¹ Douglas H. Parker, *A Critical Edition of Robert Barnes' A Supplication Unto the Most Gracious* (Toronto, 2008), 350.

¹⁹² Brad Pardue, *Printing, Power, and Piety: Appeals to the Public during the Early Years of the English Reformation* (Brill, 2012), 117.

all significantly outdated.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.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.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.”¹⁹⁶ In this letter, Coverdale recalled a meeting – or “godly communication” – he and

¹⁹³ See J.F. Mozley, *Coverdale and his Bibles* (London, 1953); Henry Guppy, *Miles Coverdale and the English Bible, 1488- 1568* (Manchester, 1935); and William Dallmann, *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.

¹⁹⁴ Mozley, *Coverdale and his Bibles*, 1-59 (chapters 1 and 2, which are the only sections concerned with Coverdale himself).

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.

¹⁹⁶ *Remains of Myles Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter*, ed. George Pearson (Cambridge, 1846), 490; *LP* 5, no. 221; *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.¹⁹⁷ 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.¹⁹⁸

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.¹⁹⁹ 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.²⁰⁰ 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,

¹⁹⁷ It is worth noting that Coverdale actually said "Master More" in this letter to Cromwell and so it is possible that he was referring to Roger More, a member of the mercantile élite and friend to Cromwell, rather than Thomas More. Roger More's friendship with Cromwell is attested in *LP* 4:3, no. 5772; *SP* 1/54 fols. 234r-47r; *LP* 6, no. 1159; *SP* 1/79 fol. 73r; *LP* 10, no. 876 (7).

¹⁹⁸ *A&M*, 8:1071.

¹⁹⁹ Mozley, *Coverdale and his Bibles*, 10, 13. For Barnes, see Korey Maas, "Revisiting Robert Barnes on the Eucharist" *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, 72 (2008): 135-149.

²⁰⁰ *Script. IMBC*, 1:721; *A&M*, 8:1216.

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.²⁰¹ 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.²⁰² 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.²⁰³ Bradshaw depicts Browne "neither as monster of vice nor a paragon of virtue"²⁰⁴ and argues that he is best thought of as an administrative reformer.²⁰⁵

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 1536.²⁰⁶ 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.²⁰⁷ His appointment in 1534 as General Visitor to the mendicant orders was a practical and institutional contribution to the Henrician reform agenda.²⁰⁸ 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.²⁰⁹

The fact that Browne's major contributions to reform were at an institutional level

²⁰¹ For example, M.V. Ronan, *Reformation in Dublin, 1536-58* (London, 1926), *passim*, especially 1-128.

²⁰² R. Ware, *The Reformation of the Church of Ireland, in the life and death of George Browne* (Dublin, 1681), printed in London as *Historical collections of the church in Ireland* (London, 1681).

²⁰³ Brendan Bradshaw, "George Browne, first Reformation archbishop of Dublin, 1536-54," 301-326; D. MacCulloch, "Foxes, Firebrands and Forgery: Robert Ware's pollution of Reformation history," *HJ* 54 (2011): 307-46.

²⁰⁴ Bradshaw, "George Browne", 326.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 304.

²⁰⁶ *Faculty Office Registers 1534-1549*, 141; *LP* 10, no. 597(47).

²⁰⁷ James Murray, *Enforcing the English Reformation in Ireland: Clerical Resistance and Political Conflict in the Diocese of Dublin, 1534-1590* (Cambridge, 2009), 91-92; *LP* 6, no. 391; *LP* 8, no. 121.

²⁰⁸ Murray, *Enforcing the English Reformation in Ireland*, 92.

²⁰⁹ Henry Jefferies, *The Irish Church and the Tudor Reformations* (Dublin, 2010), 82.

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.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.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.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 Radcliff because of his exceptional humanist and evangelical pursuits, corroborated by a letter from Radcliffe to Cromwell in which he displayed his knowledge of Hebrew.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.²¹⁴ Browne's correspondence with Cromwell as the Archbishop of Dublin once again reveals his earnestness in the promotion of Cromwell's religious programme.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

²¹⁰ Bradshaw, "George Browne," 303-4.

²¹¹ Murray, *Enforcing the English Reformation in Ireland*, 93.

²¹² *Ibid.*

²¹³ *LP* Addenda 1:2, Appendix no. 5; *SP* 1/246, fol. 105r-6r; *LP* 6, no. 1676; *SP* 1/81 fol. 130r.

²¹⁴ *LP* 8, no. 1054; *SP* 1/94, fol. 87r-88v at 88r.

²¹⁵ *LP* 13:1, nos. 50, 1037, 1478; *SP* 60/7 fol. 68r.

Bellond, and for attempting to delay the provincial chapter by six years.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.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 Barnes²¹⁸ – and Wetherall was significantly included in the list of religious men for whom Monmouth was a benefactor.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.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.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

²¹⁶ Dd 13, fol. 129v (consulted via *RothSources*, 414-15; D 1032); Dd 13, fol. 141r (consulted via *RothSources*, 414-15; D 1032); Dd 14, fol. 10r (consulted via *RothSources*, 416-17; D 1035); Dd 13, fol. 175r (consulted via *RothSources*, 415; D 1032).

²¹⁷ Dd 16, fol. 8v (consulted via *RothSources*, 441-42; D 1083).

²¹⁸ *StrypeEM*, 1:2, 368-74 (at 372) includes Monmouth's will, which leaves £10 and a gown to Barnes and names him as executor. Barnes' former colleague Thomas Parnell witnessed it.

²¹⁹ *A&M*, 8:1021.

²²⁰ Formal documentation of this indulgence, as discussed in the previous chapter, shows that Bellond was primarily responsible for its sale. Surviving examples, however, such as the indulgence to the guild in Wakering, show Wetherall often issued this indulgence as well. See pages 121-125.

²²¹ *StrypeEM*, 1:2, 55.

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.²²² 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 1523,²²³ 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.²²⁴

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,

²²² Dd 15, fol. 126v-127v (consulted via *RothSources*, 431-33; D 1064). See pages 225-226.

²²³ Holder, *The Medieval Friaries of London*, 160; *SP* 1/29, fol. 120r, no. 122 which detailed Cromwell being a signatory to and one of the scribes for an inquest of wardmote for the Broadstreet ward, including Austin Friars, as though he were already living in the area from 21 December 1523. He was certainly there by 1524, at which point he can be securely placed in the parish of the Austin Friars, St Peter le Poer (*LP* 4:1, no. 393; *SP* 1/31 fols. 97-98). The first letter addressed to Cromwell at Austin Friars is from 1526: *LP* Addenda 1:1, no. 490.

²²⁴ *LP* 13:2, no. 232.

penance, and ember days.²²⁵ There was also the group of friars at Clare discussed earlier who were cited for their Lollard theology.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,²²⁷ was himself accused of heresy, after having preached in Northampton against transubstantiation.²²⁸ Goodwin, the prior of the Austins in Northampton,²²⁹ had a reputation as a thief; according to Dr John London, he confessed to have stolen over a hundred pounds of plate.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.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.²³² Hardiman had signed the surrender of his house with fellow Austins John Barber, Thomas Norley, and Thomas Watson,²³³ and had been recommended by Hilsey to Cromwell as a studious man, of good conversation.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.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.²³⁶ He must have been too

²²⁵ *LP* 11, no. 1424; *SP* 1/113 fol. 89r.

²²⁶ See page 234-5.

²²⁷ *A&M*, 8:1217.

²²⁸ E. Peacock, "Extracts from the Lincoln Episcopal Visitations in the 15th, 16th and 17th Centuries" *Archaeologia* 48 (1884): 249-269 at 264.

²²⁹ See their surrender in 1538, where Goodwin signs as prior (*LP* 13:2, no. 704).

²³⁰ *LP* 13:2, no. 719; *SP* 1/138 fol. 45r.

²³¹ *VCH:Oxford*, 2:143-48.

²³² Richard Rex, "The Friars in the English Reformation", in *The Beginnings of English Protestantism*, ed. P. Marshall and A. Ryrie (Cambridge, 2002), 38-59 at 48.

²³³ *LP* 13:2, no. 493; *Faculty Office Registers 1534-1549*, 169 for dispensations for changes of habit; London, TNA, SC6-H8-7286 for surrender of house.

²³⁴ *LP* 13:2, no. 410; *SP* 1/136, fol. 172r-v.

²³⁵ *A&M*, 8:1228. See also Susan Brigden, *London and the Reformation* (Oxford, 1989), 399.

²³⁶ Benjamin Brook, *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.²³⁷ 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,²³⁸ 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.²³⁹ Two years later, he obtained his doctorate alongside Robert Barnes,²⁴⁰ and was incorporated into the University of Oxford in 1532.²⁴¹ 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.²⁴²

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.²⁴³ This came after Stokes had been licensed to preach in February of 1526 by Bishop Cuthbert Tunstall as part of his campaign

²³⁷ *Ibid.*

²³⁸ *GraceBookG*, 160.

²³⁹ Cambridge, CUA, Vice-Chancellor's Probate Register, Wills I (1501-58), fol. 35v-36r.

²⁴⁰ *GraceBookB*, 2:104; Dd 14, fol. 129r (consulted via *RothSources*, D 1045).

²⁴¹ *BRUO*, 170.

²⁴² *LP* 4:2, no. 3388. *SP* 1/44 fol. 34r.

²⁴³ *A&M*, 8:1032; *StrypeMP*, 1:23 for his conference with Bilney.

against heresy.²⁴⁴ 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.²⁴⁵ 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.²⁴⁶

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.²⁴⁷ 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.²⁴⁸ 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 1538.²⁴⁹ He continued to enjoy powerful traditionalist backing in East Anglia,

²⁴⁴ London, London Metropolitan Archives, MS DL/C/330, fol. 134r; see Wabuda, *Preaching during the English Reformation*, 120.

²⁴⁵ See *StrypeMP*, appendix 7-8 (no.4); *Correspondence of Matthew Parker, D.D.: Archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. John Bruce and Thomas Perowne (Cambridge, 1853), 10-14 for Parker's warning letter to Stokes; see London, TNA, E135/8/39 for Stokes preaching at Clare.

²⁴⁶ *The Register of Thetford Priory*, ed. D.P. Dymond (London, 2015), 2:692.

²⁴⁷ *StrypeMP*, appendix 7-8 (no.4).

²⁴⁸ Cambridge, CCC, MS Parker 108, fol. 167r (art.36); *Correspondence of Matthew Parker, D.D.*, 14n.

²⁴⁹ *LP* 13:2, no. 935; *SP* 1/139, fol. 174r-v; *LP* 14:2, no. 113(3). Stokes was also the prior of the convent in Shrewsbury from 1532-35, where he was known under his family name *Halybread*, instead of *Stokes*, which refers to his birth near to Stoke by Clare. (*VCH: Shropshire*, 2:95-98; Shrewsbury, Shropshire Archives, Shrewsbury Borough Records, 1795).

receiving his dispensation to hold secular benefices in 1544,²⁵⁰ 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.²⁵¹

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.²⁵²

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

²⁵⁰ *Faculty Office Registers*, 241.

²⁵¹ Ralph Houlbrooke, "Refoundation and reformation, 1536-1628" in *Norwich Cathedral: Church, City and Diocese, 1096-1996*, ed. I. Atherton et al. (London, 1996), 507-539 at 513, n14.

²⁵² Martha Skeeters, *Community and Clergy: Bristol and the Reformation, c. 1530-1570* (Oxford, 1993), 39-44; Wabuda, *Preaching in the English Reformation*, 77; *LP* 6, no. 572; *SP* 6/3 fol. 56r.

having spoken seditiously against the King's new marriage in 1533.²⁵³ 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.²⁵⁴ 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.²⁵⁵

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

²⁵³ *LP* 1:1, no. 871; *SP* 1/238 fols.125r-6r; *LP* 6 no. 1329; *SP* 1/80 fol. 10r; *LP* 1:1, no. 879; *SP* 1/238 fols.155r-6r.

²⁵⁴ *LP* 13:2, no. 1058; *SP* 1/140, fols. 98r-99v.

²⁵⁵ For the most authoritative study of Stone, see Benedict Hackett, *Blessed John Stone, Austin Friar Martyr* (London, 1963), 1-19. It is important to remember, however, that Hackett completed this study in an effort to prove the sanctity of this friar, and thus emphasizes Stone's opposition to heretical religious changes in the face of persecution and, ultimately, execution. See *LP* 13:2, no.1058; *SP* 1/140, fol. 98r for Ingworth's letter to Cromwell identifying an Austin Friar of Canterbury as a traitor.

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 1536,²⁵⁶ John Bird, an evangelical preacher who married under Edward VI and was deprived of his benefices by Mary Tudor,²⁵⁷ John Hurleston, who was deprived of his benefice in 1554 for marriage,²⁵⁸ and Simon Clerkson, who had been similarly lost his benefice under Mary for having married.²⁵⁹ 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

²⁵⁶ Richard Copsey, "The English Carmelites at the Dissolution," in Richard Copsey, *Carmel in Britain: Studies on the Early History of the Carmelite Order* (Faversham, 2004), 3:327-340 at 327.

²⁵⁷ Rex, "The Friars in the English Reformation," 50.

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 49.

²⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 54.

his involvement with the Pilgrimage of Grace.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).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.²⁶² Other Observants, Anthony Browne, John Waire, and a Friar Hemmysley, were executed for refusing the Oath of Supremacy.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.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.²⁶⁵ Richard Risby and Hugh Rich were executed in 1534 for having advised Elizabeth Barton.²⁶⁶ Numerous Observants were imprisoned for defending the papacy, such as Anthony Brookby, Thomas Cort, and Thomas Belchiam.²⁶⁷

The Observants were also some of the strongest voices for reform, particularly in the earlier period. John Rix composed *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.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.²⁶⁹ The last warden of the Greenwich priory, Hugh Glasier, received

²⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 57.

²⁶¹ Peter Marshall, "Papist as Heretic: The Burning as Heretic, 1538" *The Historical Journal*, 41:2 (1998): 351-374 at 351.

²⁶² *Ibid.*, 354.

²⁶³ Steck, *Franciscans and the Protestant Revolution in England*, 170-71.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 61.

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 40.

²⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 47-8.

²⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 67-72.

²⁶⁸ Rex, "The Friars in the English Reformation," 41.

²⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

patronage from Cranmer and was given a prebendary at Canterbury Cathedral in 1542.²⁷⁰

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.²⁷¹ 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.²⁷² The Conventual Franciscans, too, were significant: their evangelical voices included Paul Luther, John Vvall, John Joseph, Edward Large, John Williams, Gilbert Berkeley, Thomas Kirkham, Guy Eton, Louis Wager, and John Cardmaker.²⁷³ 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.²⁷⁴

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

²⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 46

²⁷¹ Rex, "The Friars in the English Reformation," *passim*.

²⁷² *Ibid.*

²⁷³ *Ibid.*

²⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

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 martyrology 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 understand yff that they be ryche men/ for yf they be poore they may be buryed amonge the fryars.”

²⁷⁷ Martin Luther, *Vorrede Luthers zu Robert Barnes Bekenntnis des Glaubens* (WA 51: 449-451).

²⁷⁸ For more about van Zütphen, see Neil Lerous, *Martin Luther as Comforter: Writings on Death* (Leiden, 2007), 113; Brad Gregory, *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1999), 143-53; Peter Grell, “Scandinavia” in *The Early Reformation in Europe*, ed. Andrew Pettegree (Cambridge, 1992): 94-119 at 99; Alastair Duke, “The Netherlands” in *The Early Reformation in Europe*, 142-165 at 143-48.

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.²⁸⁰ 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.²⁸¹ 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.²⁸² 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.²⁸³ 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.²⁸⁴ After his death, likely in 1541, the king officially recognised

²⁷⁹ Martin Luther, *Von Bruder Henrico in Ditmar verbrannt samt dem sehnten Psalmen ausgelegt* (WA 18: 224-240).

²⁸⁰ Mozley, *Coverdale and his Bibles*, 28.

²⁸¹ R.D. Edwards, *Church and State in Tudor Ireland* (London, 1935), 55; Felicity Heal, *Reformation in Britain and Ireland* (Oxford, 2003), 192.

²⁸² *LP* 12:2 no. 1052; *SP* 60/5 fol. 112r; *LP* 13:1, no. 1420; *LP* 13:2, no. 40; *SP* 60/7 fol. 69r-v.

²⁸³ Henry Jefferies, "Nangle, Richard (d. 1541?), Church of Ireland bishop of Clonfert" *ODNB* [<http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2167/view/article/19738?docPos=2>].

²⁸⁴ *LP* 14:1, no. 303.

Burke as Bishop of Clonfert.²⁸⁵ 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 cognisant 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.²⁸⁶ In a similar fashion, John Stone and George Browne could both be Austin Friars; Browne sought out institutional and magisterial reform by co-operating with the Crown whilst Stone was executed for his refusal to abide by such plans.

²⁸⁵ *FEH*, 4:165-66.

²⁸⁶ John Davis, *Heresy and Reformation in the South-East of England 1520-1559* (London, 1983), 86.

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.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,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

²⁸⁷ Rex, "Friars in the English Reformation," 38-59.

²⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 41.

Augustinian order all had fairly strong, tangible links with Observance.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.

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 Zütphen, Jean Chatelain, Michel d'Arande, Agostino Mainairdi da Piemonti, Guilio 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, antifraternality, 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 hitherto 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

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.

⁴ *Ibid.*, esp. 665-66.

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.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Cambridge

Cambridge University Archives, Vice-Chancellor's Probate Register, Wills I (1501-58).

Corpus Christi College, MS 148.

Corpus Christi College, MS 167.

Corpus Christi College, MS Parker 108.

University Library, MS Gg.4.12.

University Library, MS Gg.6.20.

University Library, MS EDK G.1.6.

Edinburgh

Advocates Library, MS Abbotsford (no MS number).

London

British Library, MS Additional 11814.

British Library, MS Additional 24180.

British Library, MS Additional 28588.

British Library, MS Additional 35115.

British Library, MS Additional 35295.

British Library, MS Additional 36704.

British Library, MS Additional 38665.

British Library, Additional Charter 20599.

British Library, Additional Charter 6054.

British Library, MS Arundel 97.

British Library, MS Cotton Cleopatra E IV.

British Library, MS Cotton Domitian XVIII.

British Library, MS Cotton Galba E XIV.

British Library, MS Cotton Titus B I.

British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius B XXI.

British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius B XXII.

British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius D XV.

British Library, MS Egerton 2886.

British Library, MS Harley 433.

British Library, MS Harley 638.

British Library, MS Harley 2386.

British Library, MS Harley 4835.

British Library, MS Harley 6033.

British Library, Harley Charter 111 C 23.

British Library, Printed Books c 18 e 2 (16).

British Library, Sloane Charter 28.

British Library, Sloane Charter 32.

The National Archives, C 1/15/125.

The National Archives, C 1/18/87.

The National Archives, C 1/266/27.

The National Archives, C 1/567/18.

The National Archives, E 101/402/10.

The National Archives, E 101/404/21.

The National Archives, E 101/406/21.

The National Archives, E 101/406/21.

The National Archives, E 101/410/1.

The National Archives, E 101/410/6.

The National Archives, E 101/410/9.

The National Archives, PROB 11/6/417.

The National Archives, PSO 1/20/1057.

The National Archives, REQ 2/2/112.

The National Archives, SC6-H8-7286.

The National Archives, *Records assembled by the State Paper Office, including papers of the Secretaries of State up to 1782*. SP 1-7.

The National Archives, *Chancery Warrants for the Great Seal*. Series 1. C 81/1794.

Oxford

All Souls College, MS 17.

Balliol College, MS 189.

Bodleian Library, MS 131 (S.C. 1999).

Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 108.

Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 788.

Bodleian Library, MS Digby 113.

Bodleian Library, MS Duke Humfrey b.1.

Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 77.

Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 296.

Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 314.

Bodleian Library, MS Top Oxon d.238.

Oriel College, MS 32.

Printed Primary Sources

Aegidius Romanus. *Giles of Rome on Ecclesiastical Power: The De Ecclesiastica Potestate of Aegidius Romanus*. Translated by R.W. Dyson. Suffolk, 1986.

———. *De Regimine Principum*. Venice, 1524.

André, Bernard. *Historia Regis Henrici Septimi, a Bernardo Andrea Tholosate Conscripta*. Edited by James Gairdner. Rolls Series, 10. London, 1858.

Annales minorum seu Trium Ordinum a S. Francisco institutorum. Edited by L. Wadding et al. 2nd edition. Rome, 1731. 25 vols.

Alexander de Sancto Elpidio. “De Ecclesiastica Potestate.” In *Bibliotheca Maxima Pontifica*. Edited by J.T. Rocaberti. 1-40. Rome, 1698.

Ashby, George. “Active Policy of a Prince in George Ashby’s Poems.” In *George Ashby’s Poems*. Edited by Mary Bateson. Early English Text Society, Extra Series, 76. London, 1899.

Augustine of Hippo. *The Rule of Saint Augustine: Introduction and Commentary*. Edited by T. van Bavel and translated by Raymond Canning. London, 1984.

- . *Confessions*. Edited by J.J. O'Donnell. Oxford, 1992. 3 vols.
- Augustinus de Ancona, "De Vita et Operibus Augustini de Ancona, O.E.S.A." *Analecta Augustiniana*. Rome, 1953.
- Bale, John. *Scriptorum illustrium maioris Brytanniae catalogus*. Farnsworth, 1971. 2 vols.
- . *Index Britanniae Scriptorum: John Bale's Index of British and Other Writers*. Edited by Reginald Lane Poole. Woodbridge, 1990.
- Barnes, Robert. *A Supplicatyon made by Robert Barnes doctoure in divinite unto the most excellent and redoubted prince henrye the eyght*. Antwerp, 1531.
- . *A Supplication unto the most gracyous prince H. the viij*. London, 1534.
- . *A Critical Edition of Robert Barnes' A Supplication Unto the Most Gracyous Prince Kynge Henry the viij. 1534*. Edited by Douglas Parker. Toronto, 2008.
- Bateson, Mary. *Records of the Borough of Leicester*. London, 1899. 7 vols.
- Biglia, Andrea. "Fratris Andreae Mediolanensis ad fratrem Ludovicum de Ordinis nostri forma et propagation incipit." Edited by Rudolph Arbesmann. *Analecta Augustiniana*, 28 (1965): 186-218.
- Boase, C.W. and Andrew Clark. *Register of the University of Oxford, 1449-1571*. Oxford Historical Society, 1, 10-12, 14. Oxford, 1885. 2 vols.
- Bokenham, Osbern. *Legendys of Hooly Wummen, by Osbern Bokenham*. Edited by Mary Serjeantson. Early English Text Society, 206. London, 1938.
- . *Legends of Holy Women*. Translated by Sheila Delany. Notre Dame, 1992.
- . "The Dialogue at the Grave of Dame Johan of Acres, Reascribed to Osbern Bokenham." In *Clare Priory: Seven Centuries of a Suffolk House*. Edited by K. Barnardiston. 63-69. Cambridge, 1962.
- Book of Margery Kempe*. Edited by W. Butler-Bowdon. New York, 1944.
- Bullarium, Ordinis Eremitarum Sancti Augustini: Periodus Formationis*. Edited by B. van Luijk. Würzburg, 1964.
- Bullarium franciscanum Romanorum pontificum*. Edited by J. H. Sbaralea. Rome, 1759-69. 7 vols.
- Calendar of Close Rolls, AD 1227-1509*. Edited by Henry Churchill Maxwell-Lyte et al. London, 1902-1963. 61 vols.
- Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous (Chancery), Preserved in the Public Record Office*. London, 1916-2003. 8 vols.
- Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London: King Henry VI*. Edited by Reginald Sharpe. London, 1911.
- Calendar of Liberate Rolls, Preserved in the Public Record Office*. London, 1916-1964. 6 vols.

- Calendar of Papal Registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland.* Edited by W. H. Bliss and J. A. Twemlow. London, 1893-1960. 14 vols.
- Calendar of Patent Rolls, Preserved in the Public Record Office, AD 1216-1582.* Edited by Henry Churchill Maxwell-Lyte et al. London, 1901-. 74 vols.
- Calendar of State Papers Spanish.* Edited by P. de Gayangos et al. London, 1862-1954. 15 vols.
- Capgrave, John. *John Capgrave's Abbreviation of Chronicles.* Edited by Peter Lucas. Early English Text Society, 285. Oxford, 1983.
- . "A Treatise of the Orders under the Rule of Augustine." In *John Capgrave's Lives of St. Augustine and St. Gilbert of Sempringham, and a Sermon.* Edited by J.J. Munro. 145-148. Early English Text Society, 140. London, 1910.
- . "Life of St Gilbert." In *John Capgrave's Lives of St. Augustine and St. Gilbert of Sempringham, and a Sermon.* Edited by J.J. Munro. 61-144. Early English Text Society, 140. London, 1910.
- . *The Life of St. Norbert.* Edited by Cyril Lawrence Smetana. Studies and Texts (Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies), 140. Toronto, 1977.
- . *Life of St Augustine by John Capgrave.* Edited by Cyril Lawrence Smetana. Studies and Texts (Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies), 138. Toronto, 2001.
- . *The Book of Illustrious Henries.* Edited and translated by F.C. Hingeston. Rolls Series, 7a. London, 1858.
- . *Liber de Illustribus Henricis.* Edited by F.C. Hingeston. Rolls Series, 7. London, 1858.
- . *The Life of Saint Katharine of Alexandria.* Edited by Carl Horstmann. Early English Texts Society, 100. London, 1893.
- . *Ye Solace of Pilgrimes: a Description of Rome, circa A.D. 1450.* Edited by C.A. Mills. London, 1911.
- The Cartulary of the Augustinian Friars of Clare.* Edited by Christopher Harper-Bill. Suffolk Record Society, Suffolk Charters, 11. Woodbridge, 1991.
- A Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts, in the British Museum: With Indexes of Persons, Places, and Matters.* London, 1808-12. 4 vols.
- Chartularium universitatis Parisiensis.* Edited by H. Denifle and E. Chatelain. Paris, 1889-97. 4 vols.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Canterbury Tales.* Edited by Thomas Tyrwhitt. New York, 1855.
- "Chronicle of William Gregory, skinner." In *The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the Fifteenth Century.* Edited by James Gairdner. 204-5. Camden Society, n.s. 17. London, 1876.
- Codex Diplomaticus Ordinis Eremitarum Sancti Augustini Papiæ.* Edited by R. Maiocchi and N. Casacca. New York, 1943. 3 vols.
- Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae.* Edited by David Wilkins. 3 vols. London, 1737.

- Cooper, C.H. and J.W. Cooper. *Annals of Cambridge*. Cambridge, 1842-53. 5 vols.
- Corpus documentorum inquisitionis pravitatis neerlandicae*. Edited by Paul Fredericq. Ghent, 1900. 5 vols.
- Corpus Reformatorum*. Edited by Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider. Halle, 1834-7. Vols. 2 and 3.
- Cotton, Henry. *Fasti Ecclesiae Hibernicae*. Dublin, 1850. 3 vols.
- The Crowland Chronicle Continuations, 1459-1486*. Edited by N. Pronay and J. Cox. London, 1986.
- Dialogus inter Militem et Clericum, Richard FitzRalph's Sermon 'Defensio Curatorum' and Methodius, 'Pe Bygynnyng of þe World and þe Ende of Worldes.'* Edited and translated by John Trevisa. Early English Text Society, 167. London, 1925.
- Dugdale, William. *Monasticon Anglicanum or the history of abbies, and other monasteries, hospitals, cathedral and collegiate churches in England and Wales. ... Collected and published in Latin by Sir W. D. and now epitomised in English*. Edited by B. Bandinel, J. Caley, R. Dodsworth, H. Ellis. London, 1817-30. 6 vols. in 8 pts.
- . *The Antiquities of Warwickshire*. Didsbury, 1973..
- The Early South-English Legendary*. Edited by Carl Horstmann. Early English Text Society, 87. London, 1887.
- Ely Diocesan Remembrancer* 49. Cambridge, 1910.
- Emden, A.B. *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to AD 1500*. Oxford, 1959. 3 vols.
- . *A Biographical Register of the University of Cambridge up to 1500*. Cambridge, 1963.
- Empoli, Lorenzo. *Bullarium Ordinis Eremitarum Sancti Augustini*. Rome, 1628.
- The English Works of Wyclif Hitherto Unprinted*. Edited by F.D. Matthew. Early English Text Society, 74. London, 1880.
- Epistolae Academicæ Oxoniæ*. Edited by Henry Anstey. Oxford Historical Society, n.s. 26. Oxford, 1898. 2 vols.
- Erasmus. *Selections from Erasmus, principally from his Epistles*. Edited by P.S. Allen. Oxford, 1908.
- . *The Correspondence of Erasmus*. Edited by R.A.B. Mynors et al. Toronto, 1974.
- Eulogium Historiarum*. Edited by Frank Scott Haydon. Rolls Series, 9. London, 1853-63. 3 vols.
- Faculty Office Registers 1534-1549*. Edited by D.S. Chambers. Oxford, 1966.

- Gandolfo, Dominico. *Dissertatio Historica de Ducentis Celeberrimis Augustinianis Scriptoribus*. Rome, 1704.
- Gilte Legende*. Edited by Richard Hamer and Vida Russell. Early English Text Society, 327, 328, 339. Oxford, 2006. 3 vols.
- Gower, John. *Mirour de l'omme*. Edited by William Burton Wilson. East Lansing, 1992.
- Grace Book B*. Edited by Mary Bateson. Cambridge Antiquarian Society. Cambridge, 1903-5.
- Grace Book G*. Edited by William Searle. Cambridge Antiquarian Society. Cambridge, 1903-5.
- The Great Chronicle of London*. Edited by A.H. Thomas and I.D. Thornley. London, 1938.
- "Gregory's Chronicle: 1461-1469." In *The Historical Collections of A Citizen of London in the Fifteenth Century*. Edited by James Gairdner. 210-39. Camden Society, n.s. 17. London, 1876.
- Guillemi de Villana Cremonensis. *Guillemi De Villana Cremonensis O.S.A. Tractatus Cuius Titulus Reprobatio Errorum*. Edited by Darach Mac Fhionnbhairr. Rome, 1977.
- Halle, Edward. *The Union of the Noble Families of Lancaster and York (1550)*. Menston, 1970.
- Henricus de Frimaria. "Tractatus de origine et progressu Ordinis Fratrum Heremitarum Sancti Augustini." Edited by Rudolph Arbesmann. *Augustiniana*, 6 (1956): 90-145.
- Heresy Trials in the Diocese of Norwich, 1428-31, from Westminster Diocesan Archives MS B.2*. Edited by Norman Tanner. Camden Society, fourth series, 20. London, 1977.
- Hierarchia Catholica Medii Aevi*. Edited by Konrad Eubel. Regensburg, 1898. 9 vols.
- Höhn, Anton. *Chronologia Provinciae Rheno-Suevicæ Ordinis F.F. Eremitarum S.P. Augustini*. Würzburg, 1744.
- Holinshed, Raphael. *Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland*. London, 1807-08. 6 vols.
- "Irish material in the Augustian Archives, Rome, 1354-1624." Edited by A. de Meijer and F.X. Martin. *Archivium Hibernicum*, 19 (1956): 61-134.
- Jacobus de Voragine. *The Golden Legend: Reading on the Saints*. Translated by William Granger Ryan and Eamon Duffy. Princeton, 2012.
- James of Viterbo. *De Regime Christiano: A Critical Edition and Translation*. Translated by R.W. Dyson. Leiden, 2009.
- John of Amersham. *Annales Monasterii S. Albani*. Edited by Henry Riley. Roll Series, 28. London, 1870-71. 2 vols.
- Jordan of Quedlinburg. *Jordani de Saxonia ordinis Eremitarum Sancti Augustini Liber Vitasfratrum*. Edited by Rudolph Arbesmann and Winfridus Hümpfner. Cassiciacum, 1. New York, 1943. 2 vols.

- Kent Chancies*. A. Hussey. Kent Archaeological Society Record Branch, 12. Ashford, 1936. 3 vols.
- Ker, Neil Ripley. *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: a list of surviving books*. 2nd edition. Offices of the Royal Historical Society, Guides and Handbooks, 3. London, 1964.
- Lambarde, William. *Dictionarium Angliae Topographicum et Historicum*. London, 1730.
- Leland, John. *Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britannicis*. Edited by A. Hall. Oxford, 1709. 2 vols.
- Letters and papers illustrative of the wars of the English in France during the reign of Henry the Sixth, King of England*. Edited by Joseph Stevenson. Rolls Series, 22. London, 1864. 2 vols.
- Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII: preserved in the Public Record Office, the British Museum, and elsewhere*. Edited by J.S. Brewer and R.H. Brodie. London, 1862-1932. 28 vols.
- “Letters of Prince and King.” In H. Owen and J. Blakeway, *A History of Shrewsbury*. London, 1825. 2:457-466.
- Lincoln Wills Registered in the District Probate Registry at Lincoln*. Edited by C.W. Foster. Lincoln Record Society, 5, 10, 24. Lincoln, 1914. 3 vols.
- The Logge Register of Prerogative Court of Canterbury Wills 1479-1486*. Edited by Lesley Boatwright, et al. Richard III Society. Knaphill, 2008. 2 vols.
- Luther, Martin. “Vorrede Luthers zu Robert Barnes Bekenntnis des Glaubens.” In *Weimarer Ausgabe*, 51: 449-451.
- . “Von Bruder Henrico in Ditmar verbrannt samt dem sehten Psalmen ausgelegt.” *Weimarer Ausgabe*, 18: 224-240.
- Madox, Thomas. *Formulare Anglicanum*. London, 1702.
- “The Manuscripts of Shrewsbury and Coventry Corporations, the Earl of Radnor, Sir Walter Corbet, Bart., and Others (15th Reprint, appendix x).” *Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts*, 47 (1897).
- Matricule de l’Université de Louvain*. Edited by Edmond Reusens et al. Brussels, 1903. 10 vols.
- Monumenta Franciscana*. Edited by J.S. Brewer and Richard Howlett. Rolls Series 4:1. London, 1858-1882. 2 vols.
- More, Thomas. *History of King Richard III*. Edited by R. S. Sylvester. Yale Edition of the Complete Works of St. Thomas More, 2. New Haven, 1963.
- Munimenta Academica, or, documents illustrative of the academical life and studies at Oxford*. Edited by Henry Anstey. Rolls Series, 50. London, 1868. 2 vols.
- Netter, Thomas. *Fasciculi Zizaniorum magistri Johannis Wyclif cum tritico*. Edited by Walter Waddington Shirley. Rolls Series, 5. London, 1858.

- Nigel de Longchamps. *Speculum Stultorum*. Edited by J.H. Mozley and R.R. Raynis. Berkeley, 1960.
- Norwich Consistory Court Depositions, 1499-1512 and 1518-1530. Edited by E.D. Stone and B. Cozens-Hardy. Norfolk Record Society, 10. London, 1938.
- Pamphilus, Joseph. *Chronica Ordinis Fratrum Eremitarum Sancti Augustini*. Rome, 1581.
- Parker, Douglas H. *A Critical Edition of Robert Barnes' A Supplication Unto the Most Gracious*. Toronto, 2008.
- The Paston Letters, 1422-1509 A.D.* Edited by James Gairdner. 3 vols. London, 1872-75.
- Peacock, E. "Extracts from the Lincoln Episcopal Visitations in the 15th, 16th and 17th Centuries." *Archaeologia*, 48 (1884): 249-269.
- Pecock, Reginald. *Repressor of Over Much Blaming of the Clergy*. Edited by Churchill Babington. Rolls Series, 19. London, 1860.
- Petrarca, Francesco. *Petrarch's Secretum with introduction, notes and critical anthology*. Edited by Davy Carozza and H. James Shey. New York, 1989.
- Philip of Harvengt. "Vita Sancti Augustini." *Patrologia Latina*, 203: 1205-1234.
- Pierce the Ploughman's Crede*. Edited by Walter Skeat. Early English Text Society, 30. Oxford, 1906.
- Possidius. "Vita Sancti Augustini Scripta a Possidio Episcopo." *Patrologia Latina*, 32: 33-66.
- Las Primitivas Constituciones de los Agustinos (Ratisbonenses del año 1290)*. Edited by I. Arámburu Cendoya. Valladolid, 1966.
- Pseudo-Augustine. "Sermones ad Fratres in Eremo." *Patrologia Latina*, 40: 1235-1358.
- Purvis, J.S. "Monastic Chancery Proceedings." *Yorkshire Archaeological Society Records Series*, 88 (1934): 1-183.
- Redstone, V.B. "Extracts from Wills and Other Material Showing the History of Suffolk Churches, Chantries, and Guilds, Being an Appendix to the Article Published in the Proceedings, Vol. XII." *Suffolk Institute for Archeology and Natural History*, 23 (1937/8): 50-78.
- The Register of Henry Chichele, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1414-1443*. Edited by E.F. Jacob. Canterbury and York Society, 42, 45-47. Oxford, 1937-1947. 4 vols.
- The Register of Thomas Bekyngton, Bishop of Bath and Wells 1443-1465*. Edited by Henry Churchill et al. Somerset Record Society, 49-50. Oxford, 1934-35. 2 vols.
- The Register of John Catterick Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield 1415-1419*. Edited by R.N. Swanson. Canterbury and York Society 77. Woodbridge, 1990.
- The Register of Richard Fleming, Bishop of Lincoln, 1420-1431*. Edited by N.H. Bennet. Canterbury and York Society 73, 99. Oxford, 1984. 2 vols.

- The Register of William Bothe, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield 1447-1452.* Edited by John Condliffe Bates. Canterbury and York Society 98. Woodbridge, 2008.
- Remains of Myles Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter.* Edited by George Pearson. Parker Society. Cambridge, 1846.
- Report on the manuscripts of Lord de L'Isle and Dudley preserved at Penshurst Place.* Edited by Charles Kingsford. Historical Manuscript Commission, 77. London, 1925-66. 6 vols.
- Rotuli Normanniae in Turri Londinensi asservati: Johanne et Henrico Quinto Angliae Regibus.* Edited by Thomas Duffus Hardy. London, 1835.
- Salter, H.E. *The Boarstall Cartulary.* Oxford Historical Society, 88. Oxford, 1930.
- Select English Works of John Wyclif.* Edited by T. Arnold. Oxford, 1869-1871. 3 vols.
- Sermons of Hugh Latimer.* Edited by G.E. Corrie. Folger Documents of Tudor and Stuart Civilization. Cambridge, 1844.
- Shakespeare, William. *Richard III.* Edited by Rafael Burton and Harold Bloom. New Haven, 2008.
- Sharpe, Reginald R. *Calendar of Wills proved and Enrolled in the Court of Husting, London, A.D. 1258-1688: preserved among the archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall.* London, 1889-90. 2 vols.
- Some Oxfordshire Wills Proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, 1393-1510.* Edited by J.R.H. Weaver and A. Beardwood. Oxfordshire Record Society, 39. Oxford, 1958.
- Somerset Medieval Wills.* Edited by F.W. Weaver. Somerset Record Society, 16, 19, 21. London, 1901-5. 3 vols.
- The Stacions of Rome and the Pilgrims Sea-Voyage.* Edited by F.J. Furnivall. London, 1867.
- Stow, John. *Survey of London.* Edited by Henry B. Wheatley. London, 1956.
- . *The Annales, or a Generall Chronicle, of England, begun first by maister Iohn Stow.* London, 1615.
- Strype, John. *Ecclesiastical Memorials, relating chiefly to religion, and the reformation of it, and the emergencies of the Church of England, under Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Queen Mary the first.* London, 1721. 3 vols.
- . *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker, the first Archbishop of Canterbury in the reign of Queen Elizabeth.* Oxford, 1821. 3 vols.
- Tanner, Thomas. *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica qui in Anglia, Scotia et Hiberia ad saeculi XVII initium floruerunt...* London, 1748.
- Testamenta Cantiana: a series of extracts from fifteenth and sixteenth century wills relating to church building and topography.* Edited by Leland L. Duncan and Arthur Hussey. London, 1906-7. 2 vols.
- Testamenta Eboracensia, or, Wills registered at York: illustrative of the history, manners, language, statistics, etc. of the province of York, from the year MCCC downwards.*

Edited by James Raine and John William Clay. *Surtees Society* 4, 30, 45, 53, 79, 106. London, 1836-1902. 6 vols.

Testamenta Vetusta: illustrations from wills, of manners, customs, etc., from the reign of Henry the Second to Queen Elizabeth. Edited by Nicholas H. Nicolas. London, 1826. 2 vols.

Torelli, Luigi. *Secoli Agostiniani.* Bologna, 1675. 8 vols.

Transcripts of Sussex Wills. Edited by R. Garraway Rice and W.H. Godfrey. Somerset Record Society, 41-43 and 45. Lewes, 1937-41.

Vergil, Polydore. *The Anglica Historia of Polydore Vergil, A.D. 1485-1537.* Edited and translated by Denys Hay. Camden Society, third series, 74. London, 1950.

Walsingham, Thomas. *The St Albans Chronicle: The Chronica Maiora of Thomas Walsingham.* Edited and translated by John Taylor et al. Oxford, 2011.

———. *Historia Anglicana.* Edited by Henry Thomas Riley. Rolls Series, 28:1. London, 1863-64. 2 vols.

Ware, R. *The Reformation of the Church of Ireland, in the life and death of George Browne.* Dublin, 1681.

Watson, Andrew. *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: a list of surviving books; supplement to the second edition.* Offices of the Royal Historical Society, Guides and Handbooks, 15. London, 1987.

Weever, John. *Antient Funeral Monuments, of Great Britain, Ireland, and the Islands Adjacent.* London, 1767.

William of St Amour. *De Periculis Novissimorum Temporum.* Edited by Guy Geltner. Dallas Medieval Texts and Translations, 8. Leuven, 2008.

Wills of the Archdeaconry of Sudbury, 1439-1474, Wills from the Register 'Baldwyne.' Edited by Peter Northeast. Suffolk Records Society, 44. Woodbridge, 2010. 2 vols.

Wood, Anthony. *Fasti Oxonienses.* Edited by John Gutch. Oxford, 1790.

———. *Survey of the Antiquities of the City of Oxford in 1661-66.* Edited by Andrew Clark. Oxford Historical Society, 15, 17, 37. Oxford, 1889. 3 vols.

Worcester, William. *William Worcestre's Itineraries.* Edited by John Harvey. Oxford, 1969.

York Civic Records. Edited by Angelo Raine and Deborah Sutton. Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 98, 103, 106, 108, 110, 112, 115, 119, 138. Wakefield, 1939-78. 9 vols.

Secondary Sources

Akai, Yuichi. *A Mendicant Sermon Collection from Composition to Reception: The Novum Opus Dominicale of John Waldeby, OESA.* Turnhout, 2015.

Anderson, Charles. "The Person and Position of Dr. Robert Barnes, 1495-1540: A Study in the Relationship between the English and German Reformations." Th.D. diss., Union Theological Seminary, 1962.

- Andrews, Frances. *The Other Friars: The Carmelite, Augustinian, Sack and Pied Friars in the Middle Ages*. Woodbridge, 2006.
- Arbesmann, Rudolph. "The Question of the *Regula Sancti Augustini*." *Augustinian Studies*, 1 (1970): 237-261.
- . "The *Vita Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi* in Cod. Laurent. Plut. 90 Sup. 48." *Traditio*, 18 (1962): 319-55.
- . "Jordanus of Saxony's *Vita S. Augustini*: The Source for John Capgrave's *Life of St. Augustine*." *Traditio*, 1 (1943): 341-355.
- Ashton, Gail. *The Generation of Identity in Late Medieval Hagiography*. London, 2000.
- Aston, Margaret. *Lollards and Reformers: Images and Literacy in Late Medieval Religion*. London, 1984.
- Babington, Churchill. "Introduction." In Pecock, Reginald. *The Repressor of Overmuch Blaming of the Clergy*. Edited by Churchill Babington. 1:i-lxxxvi. London, 1860.
- Bale, Anthony. *St Edmund, King and Martyr: Changing Images of a Medieval Saint*. Woodbridge, 2009.
- Ball, R.M. "The Opponents of Bishop Pecok." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 48:2 (1997): 230-262.
- Barrett, C.R.B. *Essex: Highways, Byways and Waterways*. London, 1893.
- Beaumont, William. *History of Warrington Friary*. Manchester, 1872.
- Bedouelle, Guy. "The Consultations of the Universities and Scholars Concerning the Great Matter of King Henry VIII." In *The Bible in the Sixteenth Century*. Edited by David Steinmetz. 21-36. Durham, 1990.
- Bennet, R.F. *The Early Dominicans*. Cambridge, 1937.
- Benso, Silvia. "Monica's Grin of Tension." *Contemporary Philosophy*, 15 (1993): 5-10.
- Bernhau, Anke. "A Christian *Corpus*: Virginity, Violence, and Knowledge in the Life of Saint Katharine of Alexandria." In *Saint Katharine of Alexandria: Texts and Contexts in Western Medieval Europe*. Edited by Jacqueline Jenkins and Katharine Lewis. 109-130. Turnhout, 2003.
- Blomefield, Francis. *An Essay Towards a Topographical History of the County of Norfolk*. Edited by Charles Parkin et al. London, 1808. 11 vols.
- Boehmer, Julius. "De Beschaffenheit der Quellenschriften zu Heinrich Voes und Johann van den Esschen." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 28 (1931): 112-133.
- Bonner, Gerald. *The Monastic Rules of Saint Augustine*. New York, 2004.

- Botfield, B. "On the discovery of the Remains of the Priory of Austin Friars at Ludlow." *Archaeologia*, 39 (1863): 173-188.
- Bowery, Anne-Marie. "Monica: The Feminine Face of Christ." In *Feminist Interpretations of Augustine*. Edited by Judith Chelius Stark. 69-95. Pennsylvania, 2007.
- Bradshaw, Brendan. "George Browne, First Reformation Archbishop of Dublin, 1536-1554." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 21:4 (1970): 301-326.
- Brand, John. *The History and Antiquities of the Town and County of the Town of Newcastle upon Tyne*. London, 1789.
- Brigden, Susan. *London and the Reformation*. Oxford, 1989.
- . "Religion and Social Obligation in Early Sixteenth-Century London." *Past & Present*, 103:1 (1984): 67-112.
- Brook, Benjamin. *The Lives of the Puritans*. London, 1813. 3 vols.
- Brooke, Christopher. "Monk and Canon: Some Patterns in the Religious Life of the Twelfth Century." *Studies in Church History*, 22 (1985): 109-129.
- Broomfield, F. "Introduction." In Thomas de Chobham. *Summa Confessorum*. Edited by F. Broomfield. xxiv-lxix. Leuven, 1968.
- Brotto, G. and Zonta, G. *La Facoltà Teologica dell'Università di Padova*. Padua, 1922. 2 vols.
- Burrus, Virginia and Catherine Keller. "Confessing Monica." In *Feminist Interpretations of Augustine*. Edited by Judith Chelius Stark. 119-45. Pennsylvania, 2007.
- Bush, M.L. *The Pilgrimage of Grace: a study of the rebel armies of October 1536*. Manchester, 1996.
- Butler, Pierce. *Legenda aurea – Légende dorée – Golden legend: a study of Caxton's Golden legend with special reference to its relations to the earlier English prose translation*. Baltimore, 1899.
- Cameron, Euan. *The European Reformation*. Oxford, 1991.
- Campbell, H. "Franciscan Preaching in Thirteenth-Century England: Sources, Problems and Possibilities." In *The Friars in Medieval Britain*. Edited by Nicholas Rogers. 25-40. Donington, 2010.
- Cargill Thompson, W.D.J. "The Sixteenth Century Editions of *A Supplication unto King Henry VIII* by Robert Barnes D.D." *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, 3 (1960): 133-42.
- Carlson, D.R. "Royal tutors in the reign of Henry VII." *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 22 (1991): 253-80.
- . "The writings of Bernard André (c. 1450-1522)." *Renaissance Studies*, 12:2 (1998): 229-250.

- . “Politicizing Tudor Court Literature: Gaguin's Embassy and Henry VII's Humanists' Response.” *Studies in Philology*, 85:3 (1988): 279-304.
- Carpenter, Christine. “Religion.” In *Gentry Culture in Late Medieval England*. Edited by R. Radulescu and A. Truelove. 134-150. Manchester, 2005.
- . *The Wars of the Roses: Politics and Constitution in England, c. 1437-1509*. Cambridge, 1997.
- Castor, Helen. “Tuddenham, Sir Thomas (1401–1462), landowner.” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
- . *The King, the Crown, and the Duchy of Lancaster: Public Authority and Private Power, 1399-1461*. Oxford, 2000.
- Catto, Jeremy. “Penketh, Thomas (d. 1487) Augustinian friar and theologian.” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
- Cels, Marc. “Reconciling Mendicant and Secular Confessors in Late-Medieval England.” *Journal of Medieval History*, 38:2 (2012): 225-243.
- Clark, Elizabeth. “Holy Women, Holy Words: Early Christian Women, Social History, and the ‘Linguistic Turn.’” *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 6:3 (1998): 413-30.
- Clark, James. *A Monastic Renaissance at St Albans: Thomas Walsingham and His Circle, c.1350-1440*. Oxford, 2004.
- . *The Benedictines in the Middle Ages*. Woodbridge, 2011.
- Clark-Maxwell, W.G. “Some Letters of Confraternity.” *Archaeologia*, 75 (1926): 179-216.
- . “Some Further Letters of Fraternity.” *Archaeologia*, 79 (1929): 19-60.
- Clay, R.M. *The Hermits and Anchorites of England*. London, 1914.
- Cockerell, S.C. *The Gorleston Psalter, Described in Relation to Other East Anglian Books of the Period*. London, 1907.
- Colledge, Edmund. “The Capgrave Autographs” *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, 6 (1974): 137-48.
- . “John Capgrave's Literary Vocation.” *Analecta Augustiniana*, 40 (1977): 187-95.
- Coleman, Janet. *Medieval Readers and Writers, 1350-1400*. New York, 1981.
- Colson, J. “Alien Communities and Alien Fraternities.” *The London Journal*, 35 (2010): 111-143.
- Cooper, Helen. *The Canterbury Tales*. Oxford, 1996.
- Copsey, Richard. “Simon Stock and the Scapular Vision.” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 50:4 (1999): 652-683.

- . “Establishment, Identity and Papal Approval: The Carmelite Order’s Creation of its Legendary History.” In Copsey, Richard. *Carmel in Britain: Studies on the Early History of the Carmelite Order*. 3:1-16. Faversham, 2004.
- . “The English Carmelites at the Dissolution.” In Copsey, Richard. *Carmel in Britain: Studies on the Early History of the Carmelite Order*. 3:327-340. Faversham, 2004.
- Corbett, John. “William Langland – poet and hermit.” *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological Society*, 57 (1961): 224-30.
- Courtenay, William. *Schools and Scholars in Fourteenth Century England*. Princeton, 1987.
- Dale, Sharon. “A House Divided: San Pietro in Ciel d’Oro in Pavia and the Politics of Pope John XXII.” *Journal of Medieval History*, 27:1 (2001), 55-77.
- Dallmann, William. *Robert Barnes: English Lutheran Martyr*. Reprinted edition. St Louis, 1997.
- . *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.
- Davis, John. *Heresy and Reformation in the South-East of England 1520-1559*. London, 1983.
- De Decker, Alphonsus. *Les Augustins d’Anvers et la Réforme*. Antwerp, 1884.
- Delany, Sheila. *Impolitic Bodies: Poetry, Saints, and Society in Fifteenth-Century England. The Work of Osbern Bokenham*. Oxford, 1998.
- . “The Friar as Critic: Bokenham reads Chaucer.” In *Medievalitas: Reading the Middle Ages*. Edited by Piero Boitani and Anna Torti. 63-79. Cambridge, 1996.
- . “Bokenham’s Claudian as Yorkist Propaganda.” *Journal of Medieval History*, 22:1 (1996): 83-96.
- . “Matronage or Patronage? The Case of Osbern Bokenham’s Women Patrons.” *Florilegium* 16 (1999): 97-105.
- De Meijer, Alberic. “John Capgrave, O.E.S.A.” *Augustiniana*, 5 (1955): 400-40 and 7 (1957): 118-48, 532-41.
- Dereine, Charles. “Chanoines: Des Origines au XIII^e s.,” *Dictionnaire d’histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique*, 12 (1953): cols. 353-405.
- Desbonnets, T. “Recherches sur la Généalogie des Biographes primitives de Saint François.” *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, 60 (1967): 273-316.
- D’Evelyn Charlotte. “Saints’ Legends.” In *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1500*. Edited by John Edwin Wells et al. 2:410-57. New Haven, 1970.
- Dickinson, J.C. *The Origins of the Austin Canons and their Introduction into England*. London, 1950.

- Dipple, G. *Antifraternalism and Anticlericalism in the German Reformation: Johann Eberlin von Gunzburg and the Campaign against the Friars*. Aldershot, 1996.
- Duke, Alistair. "The Origins of Evangelical Dissent in the Low Countries." In Duke, Alistair. *Reformation and Revolt in the Low Countries*. London, 1990.
- . "The Netherlands." In *The Early Reformation in Europe*. Edited by Andrew Pettegree. 142-165. Cambridge, 1992.
- Eaves, Richard Glen. "The Reformation thought of Dr Robert Barnes, Lutheran chaplain and ambassador for Henry VIII." *Lutheran Quarterly*, 28 (1976): 156-65.
- Echard, Sian and Robert Rouse. *The Encyclopedia of Medieval Literature in Britain*. Oxford, 2017.
- Edwards, A.S.G. "The Middle English Translation of Claudian's *De consulatu Stilichonis*." In *Middle English Poetry: Texts and Traditions*. Edited by A.J. Minnis. 267-78. York, 2001.
- Edwards, R.D. *Church and State in Tudor Ireland*. London, 1935.
- Erickson, Carolly. "The Fourteenth Century Franciscans and Their Critics." *Franciscan Studies*, 35 (1975): 107-35; 36 (1976): 108-47.
- Esser, Kajetan. *Origins of the Franciscan Order*. Chicago, 1970.
- Ferrari, Leo. "Monica on the Wooden Ruler." *Augustinian Studies*, 6 (1975): 193-205.
- . "The Dreams of Monica in Augustine's *Confessions*." *Augustinian Studies*, 9 (1979): 3-17.
- Fisher, N.H. "The Contribution of Robert Barnes to the English Reformation." MA diss., University of Birmingham, 1950.
- Fletcher, Alan. *Preaching and Politics in Late-Medieval England*. Dublin, 1998.
- Flügel, E. "Eine Mittelenglische Claudianübersetzung (1445) Brit. Mus. Add. MS 11814: I. Text." *Anglia*, 28 (1905): 255-299.
- Foran, E. *The Augustinians from St. Augustine to the Union, 1256*. London, 1938.
- . "Robert Waldeby, OSA, Archbishop of Dublin 1390-95." *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, 17 (1921): 356-64.
- Formoy, Beryl. *The Dominican Order in England before the Reformation*. London, 1925.
- Forte, Stephen. *The Cardinal-Protector of the Dominican Order*. Rome, 1959.
- Fredeman, Jane. "The Life of John Capgrave, O.E.S.A. (1393-1464)." *Augustiniana*, 29 (1979): 197-237.
- . "Style and Characterization in John Capgrave's *Life of St. Katharine*." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 62 (1979-80): 346-87.

- . “John Capgrave’s ‘Life of St. Augustine.’” *Augustiniana*, 28 (1978): 288-309.
- French, Katherine. *The People of the Parish: Community Life in a Late Medieval English Diocese*. Philadelphia, 2001.
- Fryde, E.B. et al., *Handbook of British Chronology*. 3rd edition. Cambridge, 1996.
- Furnivall, F.J. “Introduction.” In Capgrave, John. *The Life of Saint Katharine of Alexandria*. Edited by Carl Horstmann. v-xlvi. Early English Texts Society, 100. London, 1893.
- . “Introduction.” In Capgrave, John. *Johannis Capgrave Liber de illustribus Henricis*. Edited by F.C. Hingeston. xi-lvii. Rolls Series, 7. London, 1858.
- Gairdner, James. *Lollardy and the Reformation in England: An Historical Survey*. London, 1908. 4 vols.
- Galbraith, V.H. “Articles Laid Before the Parliament of 1371.” *English Historical Research*, 34:136 (1919): 579-82.
- Galpern, A. “The Legacy of the Late-Medieval Religion in Sixteenth-Century Champagne.” In *The Pursuit of Holiness in Late Medieval and Renaissance Religion*. Edited by C. Trinkaus and H.A. Oberman. 141-76. Leiden, 1974.
- Gayk, Shannon. “‘Ete this book’: Literary Consumption and Poetic Invention in John Capgrave’s *Life of St Katharine*.” In *Form and Reform: Reading Across the Fifteenth Century*. Edited by Shannon Gayk and Kathleen Tomy. 88-109. Columbus, 2011.
- . *Image, Text, and Religious Reform in Fifteenth Century England*. Cambridge, 2010.
- Geltner, G. *The Making of Medieval Antifraternalism: Polemic, Violence, Deviance & Remembrance*. Oxford, 2012.
- . “Mendicants as Victims: Scale, Scope and the Idiom of Violence.” *Journal of Medieval History*, 36 (2010): 126-141.
- Ghosh, Kantik. *The Wycliffite Heresy: Authority and the Interpretation of Texts*. Cambridge, 2001.
- Gilchrist, Roberta and Marilyn Oliva. *Religious Women in Medieval East Anglia: History and Archaeology, c. 1100-1540*. Norwich, 1993.
- Gill, Meredith. *Augustine in the Italian Renaissance: Art and Philosophy from Petrarch to Michelangelo*. New York, 2004.
- Given-Wilson, C. “Fitzalan, Richard (III), fourth earl of Arundel and ninth earl of Surrey (1346–1397), magnate.” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
- Görlach, Manfred. *Studies in Middle English Saints’ Legends*. Heidelberg, 1998.
- . *The South English Legendary, Gilte Legende and Golden Legend*. Braunschweig, 1972.
- Gottfried, Robert. *Bury St. Edmunds and the Urban Crisis: 1290–1519*. Princeton, 1982.

- Greatrex, Joan. *The English Benedictine Cathedral Priories: Rule and Practice, c. 1270-1420*. Oxford, 2011.
- Green, V.H.H. *Bishop Reginal Pecock*. Cambridge, 1945.
- Green, Richard Firth. "Textual Production and Textual Communities." In *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Literature, 1100-1500*. 25-36. Cambridge, 2009.
- Gregory, Brad. "Late medieval religiosity and the renaissance of Christian martyrdom in the Reformation era." In *Continuity and change: the harvest of late medieval and Reformation history*. Edited by Robert James Bast et al. 379-99. Leiden, 2000.
- . *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge, 1999.
- Grell, Peter. "Scandinavia." In *The Early Reformation in Europe*. Edited by Andrew Pettegree. 94-119. Cambridge, 1992.
- Gribbin, Joseph. *The Premonstratensian Order in Late Medieval England*. Woodbridge, 2001.
- Griffiths, Ralph. *The Reign of King Henry VI: The Exercise of Royal Authority, 1422-1461*. London, 1981.
- . "Richard, duke of York, and the crisis of Henry VI's household in 1450-1: some further evidence." *Journal of Medieval History*, 38:2 (2012): 244-256.
- Gumbley, Walter, OP. "In Public Life." In *The English Dominican Province (1221-1921)*. Edited by Felix Couturier, OP. 25-52. London, 1921.
- . "As Preachers." In *The English Dominican Province (1221-1921)*. Edited by Felix Couturier, OP. 141-164. London, 1921.
- Guppy, Henry. *Miles Coverdale and the English Bible, 1488-1568*. Manchester, 1935.
- Gutiérrez, David. *Die Augustiner im Spätmittelalter, 1357-1517*. Würzburg, 1981.
- . *The Augustinians in the Middle Ages 1256-1356*. Translated by Arthur Ennis. Villanova, 1984.
- . *Die Augustiner vom Beginn der Reformation bis zur katholischen Restauration, 1518-1648*. Rome, 1975.
- Gwynn, Aubrey. *The English Austin Friars in the Time of Wyclif*. London, 1940.
- . "Archbishop FitzRalph and the Friars." *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, 20:101 (1937): 50-67.
- Hackett, B. *William Flete, OSA, and Catherine of Siena*. Villanova, 1992.
- . "William Flete and the *De remediis contra temptationes*." In *Medieval Studies Presented to Aubrey Gwynn*. Edited by J.A. Watt et al. 330-48. Dublin, 1961.
- . "The Spiritual Life of the English Austin Friars in the Fourteenth Century." *Sanctus Augustinus vitae spiritualis magister*. 2:421-92. Rome, 1959.

- . “Geoffrey Hardeby's *Quaestio* on S. Augustine as founder of the order of the Friars Hermits.” *Traditio Augustiniana*. Edited by A. Zumkeller and A. Krümmel. 525-56. Würzburg, 1994.
- . *Blessed John Stone, Austin Friar Martyr*. London, 1963.
- Halliburton, R.J. “Review of *La Règle de saint Augustine* by Luc Verheijen.” *Journal of Theological Studies*, 19 (1968): 657-663.
- Harding, Vanessa. “Burial Choice and Burial Location in Later Medieval London.” In *Death in Towns: Urban Responses to the Dying and the Dead, 100-1600*. Edited by Steven Basset. 119-35. Leicester, 1992.
- . *The Dead and the Living in Paris and London, 1500-1670*. Cambridge, 2002.
- Haren, Michael. “Social Ideas in the Pastoral Literature of Fourteenth-Century England.” In *Religious Belief and Ecclesiastical Careers in Late-Medieval England*. Edited by Christopher Harper Bill. 43-58. Woodbridge, 1991.
- Harper-Bill, Christopher. “Introduction.” In *Medieval East Anglia*. Edited by Christopher Harper-Bill. 1-10. Woodbridge, 2005.
- . “Monastic Apostasy in Late-Medieval England.” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 32:1 (1981): 1-18.
- Harris, Barbara. *Edward Stafford: Third Duke of Buckingham, 1478-1521*. Stanford, 1986.
- Harriss, G.L. *Cardinal Beaufort: A Study of Lancastrian Ascendancy and Decline*. Oxford, 1988.
- . “Humphrey [Humphrey or Humphrey of Lancaster], duke of Gloucester [*called* Good Duke Humphrey] (1390-1447), prince, soldier, and literary patron.” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
- . “Richard [Richard of Conisbrough], earl of Cambridge (1385-1415), magnate.” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
- Harrod, H. *Report on the Deeds and Records of the Borough of King's Lynn*. King's Lynn, 1874.
- Harvey, Barbara. *Living and Dying in England, 1100-1540: The Monastic Experience*. Oxford, 1993.
- Harvey, I.M.W. *Jack Cade's Rebellion of 1450*. Oxford, 1991.
- Harvey, Margaret. “The Diffusion of the *Doctrinale* of Thomas Netter in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries.” In *Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages*. Edited by Lesley Smith and Benedicta Ward. 281-294. London, 1992.
- Hasler, Antony. *Court Poetry in Late Medieval England and Scotland: Allegories of Authority*. Cambridge, 2014.
- Hayden, J.M. “Religious Reform and Religious Orders in England, 1490-1540: The Case of the Crutched Friars.” *The Catholic Historical Review*, 86:3 (2000): 420-438.

- Hazlett, Ian. *The Reformation in Britain and Ireland: An Introduction*. London, 2003.
- Heal, Felicity. *Reformation in Britain and Ireland*. Oxford, 2003.
- Heale, Martin. *The Abbots and Priors of Late Medieval and Reformation England*. Oxford, 2016.
- . *Monasticism in Late Medieval England, c.1300-1535*. Manchester, 2009.
- Heffernan, Thomas. *Sacred Biography: Saints and Their Biographers in the Middle Ages*. New York, 1988.
- Henry, Joni. "Capgrave's Dedications: Reassessing an English Flunkey." *Studies in Philology*, 110:4 (2013): 731-61.
- Hicks, Michael. "The Rising Price of Piety in the Later Middle Ages." In *Monasteries and Society in the British Isles in the Later Middle Ages*. Edited by Janet Burton and Karen Stöber. 95-112. Woodbridge, 2008.
- . *The Wars of the Roses: 1455-1485*. New Haven, 2010.
- Hillen, H.J. *History of the Borough of King's Lynn*. Norwich, 1907.
- Hilton, Geoff. *John Strecche, Canon of Kenilworth: the life and times of a medieval historian*. Kenilworth, 2004.
- Hingeston, F.C. "Introduction." In Capgrave, John. *The Book of Illustrious Henries*. Edited and translated by F.C. Hingeston. Xiii-xxii. Rolls Series, 7a. London, 1858.
- . "Introduction." *The Chronicle of England*. Edited by F.C. Hingeston. xi-xviii. Rolls Series, 1. London, 1858.
- Hinnesbusch, William. *The History of the Dominican Order*. New York, 1973.
- . *The Early English Friars Preachers*. Vatican, 1951.
- Holder, Nicholas. *The Medieval Friaries of London: a topographic and archaeological history, before and after the Dissolution*. PhD diss., University of London, 2011.
- Holgate, Ian. "The Cult of Saint Monica in Quattrocento Italy: Her Place in Augustinian Iconography, Devotion, and Legend." *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 71 (2003): 181-206.
- . "Santa Monica, Venice, and the Vivarini." In *Art and the Augustinian Order in Early Renaissance Italy*. Edited by Louise Bourdua and Anne Dunlop. 163-182. London, 2007.
- Holmes, G.A. "Florentine Merchants in London: 1346-1436." *Economic History Review*, 13:2 (1960): 193-208.
- Horobin, Simon. "A Manuscript Found in the Library of Abbotsford House and the Lost Legendary of Osbern Bokenham." *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700*, 14 (2008): 132-164.

- . “Politics, Patronage, and Piety in the Work of Osbern Bokenham” *Speculum*, 82 (2007): 932-49.
- . “‘Speaking and Writing in Suffolk speech’: the language and dialect of Osbern Bokenham.” In *þe laurer of oure Englische Tonge*. Edited by Marcin Krygier and Liliana Sikorska. 9-19. Frankfurt, 2009.
- Horrox, Rosemary. “Tyrell family (*per.* c.1304–c.1510), gentry.” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
- Horstmann, Carl. “*Mappula Angliae*, von Osbern Bokenham.” *Englische Studien*, 10 (1887): 1-34.
- Houlbrooke, Ralph. “Refoundation and reformation, 1536-1628.” In *Norwich Cathedral: Church, City and Diocese, 1096-1996*. Edited by I. Atherton et al. 507-539. London, 1996.
- . *Death, Religion, and the Family in England, 1480-1750*. Oxford, 2004.
- Hoyle, R.W. *The Pilgrimage of Grace and the Politics of the 1530s*. Oxford, 2001.
- . “Thomas Lord Darcy and the Rothwell tenants, c.1526–1534.” *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, 63 (1991): 85–107.
- Hudson, Anne. *Lollards and Their Books*. London, 1985.
- Hughes, Jonathan. *Pastors and Visionaries: Religion and Secular Life in Late-Medieval Yorkshire*. Woodbridge, 1988.
- Hümpfner, Winfridus. “Introduction,” in *Jordani de Saxonia Liber Vitasfratrum*. Edited by Winfridus Hümpfner and Rudolph Arbesmann. i-xcii. New York: 1943.
- Irvine, James. *Handbook to Ludlow: Containing a Descriptive Account of Ludlow Church*. Ludlow, 1865.
- Jacob, E.F. “Reynold Pecock, Bishop of Chichester.” In E.F. Jacob, *Essays in Later Medieval History*. 1-34. Manchester, 1968.
- Jambeck, Karen. “Patterns of Women’s Literary Patronage: England, 1200 – ca. 1475.” In *The Cultural Patronage of Medieval Women*. Edited by June Hall McCash. 228-265. Athens, 1996.
- James, Sarah. “‘Doctryne and Studie’: Female Learning and Religious Debate in Capgrave’s *Life of St. Katharine*” *Leeds Studies in English*, 36 (2005): 275-302.
- Jarrett, Bede. *The English Dominicans*. London, 1921.
- . “Their Ascetical Training.” In *The English Dominican Province (1221-1921)*. Edited by Felix Couturier, OP. 113-140. London, 1921.
- Jefferies, Henry. “Nangle, Richard (d. 1541?), Church of Ireland bishop of Clonfert.” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
- Jenning, Margaret. “Introduction.” In Higden, Ranulph. *Ars Componendi Sermones*. Edited and translated by Margaret Jennings and Sally Wilson. 1-23. Leiden, 1991.

- Jeremy, S.M. "The English Prose Translation of the *Legenda Aurea*." *Modern Language Notes*, 59 (1944): 181-83.
- . "Caxton's Golden Legend and Varagine's *Legenda Aurea*." *Speculum*, 21 (1946): 212-221.
- . "Caxton's Golden Legend and De Vignay's *Légende Dorée*." *Medieval Studies*, 8 (1946): 259-61.
- . "Caxton and the Synfull Wretche." *Traditio*, 4 (1946): 423-428.
- Johnson, Ian. "Auctricitas? Holy Women and their Middle English Texts." In *Prophets Abroad: The Reception of Continental Holy Women in Late-Medieval England*. ed. Rosalynn Voaden (Cambridge, 1996): 177-97.
- Jones, Mike Rodman. *Radical Pastoral, 1381–1594: Appropriation and the Writing of Religious Controversy*. Surrey, 2011.
- Jørgensen, J. *Den hellige Frans af Assisi*. Koebenhavn og Kristiana, 1907.
- . *St Francis of Assisi*. Translated by T. O'Connor Sloane. 2nd edition. New York, 1913.
- Kirkpatrick, John. *History of the Religious Orders and Communities, and of the Hospitals and Castle, of Norwich*. Edited by Dawson Turner. Yarmouth, 1845.
- Knapp, Ethan. "Thomas Hoccleve." In *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Literature 1100–1500*. Edited by Larry Scanlon. 191-204. Cambridge, 2009.
- Knowles, David. *The Religious Orders in England*. Cambridge, 1948-59. 3 vols.
- Knowles, David and R. Neville Hadcock. *Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales*. London, 1953.
- Kurvinen, Auvo. "The Source of Capgrave's Life of St. Katharine of Alexandria." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 61 (1960): 268-324.
- . "Caxton's Golden Legend and the manuscripts of the Gilte Legende." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 60 (1959): 353-75.
- . *The Life of St Catherine of Alexandria in Middle English Prose*. DPhil diss., University of Oxford, 1959.
- Laferrière, Anik. "The Doubting Augustine: The Deletion of Monica from Fourteenth-Century *Vitae Augustini* in the Augustinian Order of Hermits." *Studies in Church History*, 52 (2016): 150-163.
- Lambert, Malcolm. *Franciscan Poverty: The Doctrine of the Absolute Poverty of Christ and the Apostles in the Franciscan Order 1210-1323*. New York, 1998.
- Lawless, George. *Augustine of Hippo and his Monastic Rule*. Oxford, 1991.
- Lawrence, C.H. *Friars: The Impact of the Mendicant Orders on Medieval Society*. London, 2013.

- Lawton, David. "Dullness and the Fifteenth Century." *English Literary History*, 54 (1987): 761-799.
- Leith Spencer, H. *English Preaching in the Late Middle Ages*. Oxford, 1993.
- Lerous, Neil. *Martin Luther as Comforter: Writings on Death*. Leiden, 2007.
- Levenson, Carl. "Distance and Presence in Augustine's Confessions." *Journal of Religion*, 65 (1985): 500-512.
- Lewis, Katharine. *The Cult of St. Katharine of Alexandria in Late Medieval England*. Woodbridge, 1999.
- . *Kingship and Masculinity in Late Medieval England*. London, 2013.
- Lindberg, Carter. *European Reformation*. Oxford, 1996.
- A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English*. Edited by A. McIntosh et al. Aberdeen, 1986.
- Little, A.G. and R.C. Easterling. *The Franciscans and Dominicans of Exeter*. Exeter, 1927.
- Little, A.G. *Studies in English Franciscan History*. Manchester, 1917.
- . *Introduction of the Observant Friars into England: a Bull of Alexander VI*. London, 1941.
- Loane, Marcus. *Pioneers of the Reformation in England*. London, 1964.
- Logan, F. Donald. *Runaway Religious in Medieval England, c.1240-1540*. Cambridge, 1996.
- Lovatt, Roger. "John Blacman: Biographer of Henry VI." In *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Richard William Southern*. Edited by R.H.C. Davis and J.M. Wallace-Hadrill. 415-444. Oxford, 1981.
- Lucas, Peter. "On the Date of John Capgrave's *Life of St Norbert*." *The Library*, 3 (1981): 328-30.
- . "John Capgrave, O.S.A. (1393-1464), Scribe and 'Publisher.'" *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, 5 (1969): 1-35.
- . *From Author to Audience: John Capgrave and Medieval Publication*. Dublin, 1997.
- . "A Fifteenth-Century Copyist under Authorial Scrutiny: An Incident from John Capgrave's Scriptorium." *Studies in Bibliography*, 34 (1981): 66-95.
- Lunt, William. *Financial Relations of the Papacy with England 1327-1534*. Cambridge, 1962.
- Lusardi, J.P. "The Career of Robert Barnes." In More, Thomas. *Complete Works of Thomas More*. Vol. 8:1365-1415. New Haven, 1963-1977.
- Luxford, Julian. *The Art and Architecture of English Benedictine Monasteries, 1300-1540: A Patronage History*. Woodbridge, 2005.
- Maas, Korey. *The Reformation and Robert Barnes: History, Theology and Polemic in Early Modern England*. Woodbridge, 2010.

- . “Revisiting Robert Barnes on the Eucharist.” *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, 72 (2008): 135-149.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *Thomas Cranmer: A Life*. New Haven, 1996.
- . “Foxes, Firebrands and Forgery: Robert Ware’s pollution of Reformation history.” *Historical Journal*, 54 (2011): 307-46.
- . *Suffolk and the Tudors: politics and religion in an English county, 1500-1600*. Oxford, 1987.
- Mackenzie, Eneas. *Historical Account of Newcastle-Upon-Tyne Including the Borough of Gateshead*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1827.
- Marshall, Peter. “Papist as Heretic: The Burning as Heretic, 1538.” *The Historical Journal*, 41:2 (1998): 351-374.
- Martin, F.X. “The Augustinian Observant Movement.” In *Reformbemühungen und Observanzbestrebungen im spätmittelalterlichen Ordenswesen*. Edited by Kaspar Elm. 325-45. Berlin, 1989.
- . “The Augustinian Order on the Eve of the Reformation.” *Miscellanea Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, 2 (1967): 71-104.
- . “The Irish Augustinian Reform Movement in the Fifteenth Century.” *Medieval Studies* (1961): 230-264.
- Martin, Thomas. *The History of the Town of Thetford*. London, 1779.
- McEntegart, Rory. *Henry VIII, the League of Schmalkalden, and the English Reformation*. Woodbridge, 2002.
- McFarlane, K.B. *The Nobility of Later Medieval England*. Oxford, 1973.
- . *Lancastrian Kings and Lollard Knights*. Oxford, 1972.
- . *England in the Fifteenth Century: Collected Essays*. Edited by G.L. Harriss. London, 1981.
- McGoldrick, James. *Luther’s English Connection*. Milwaukee, 1979.
- McGrath, Alister. *The Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation*. 2nd edition. Oxford, 2004.
- McGreal, Wilfrid, OCarm. *The History of the Friars Aylesford*. Aylesford, 1998.
- McKinley, R.A. *Norfolk and Suffolk Surnames in the Middle Ages*. London, 1975.
- Mélar, M. “Les débuts de la réforme à Anvers, 1518-1530.” PhD diss., Université de Liège, 1971-72.
- Mellor, Jean and Terry Pearce. *The Augustinian Friary in Leicester: Excavated 1973-1978*. Leicester, 1982.

- Methuen, Charlotte. *Luther and Calvin: Religious Revolutionaries*. Oxford, 2011.
- Middleton-Stewart, Judith. *Inward Purity and Outward Splendour: Death and Remembrance in the Deanery of Dunwich, Suffolk, 1370-1547*. Woodbridge, 2001.
- Mixson, James. "Introduction." In *A Companion to Observant Reform in the Late Middle Ages and Beyond*. Edited by James Mixson and Bert Roest. 1-22. Leiden, 2015.
- Moore, S. "Patrons of Letters in Norfolk and Suffolk II." *Proceedings of the Modern Languages Association*, 28:1 (1913): 79-105.
- Moorman, John. *A History of the Franciscan Order from its Origins to the Year 1517*. Oxford, 1968.
- . *The Sources for the Life of S. Francis of Assisi*. Manchester, 1940.
- More, Allison. "Dynamics of Regulation, Innovation, and Invention." In *A Companion to Observant Reform in the Late Middle Ages and Beyond*. Edited by James Mixson and Bert Roest. 85-110. Leiden, 2015.
- Morgan, Nigel. "The Scala Coeli Indulgence and the Royal Chapels." In *The Reign of Henry VII*. Edited by Benjamin Thompson. 82-103. Stamford, 1995.
- Morrin, Margaret. *John Waldeby O.S.A., c. 1315 – c.1372: English Augustinian Preacher and Writer*. Rome, 1975.
- Mozley, J.F. *Coverdale and his Bibles*. London, 1953.
- Muessig, Carolyn. "Catherine of Siena in Late Medieval Sermons." In *A Companion to Catherine of Siena*. Edited by Carolyn Muessig et al. 203-226. Leiden, 2012.
- Muller, James Arthur. *Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction*. London, 1926.
- Munro, J.J. "Introduction." In *John Capgrave's Lives of St Augustine and St Gilbert of Sempringham and a Sermon*. Edited by J.J. Munro. v-xxi. Early English Text Society, 140. London, 1910.
- Murray, James. *Enforcing the English Reformation in Ireland: Clerical Resistance and Political Conflict in the Diocese of Dublin, 1534-1590*. Cambridge, 2009.
- Neel, Carol. "Philip of Harvengt and Anselm of Havelberg: The Premonstratensian Vision of Time." *Church History*, 62:4 (1993): 483-493.
- Newhauser, Richard. "Religious Writing: Hagiography, Pastoralia, Devotional and Contemplative Works." In *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Literature, 1100-1500*. 37-56. Cambridge, 2009.
- Nichols, John Gough et al., *Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica*. London, 1833-43. 8 vols.
- Nichols, John. *The History and Antiquities of the County of Leicester*. London, 1815. 4 vols.
- Nimmo, Duncan. *Reform and Division in the Medieval Franciscan Order: From St Francis to the Foundation of the Capuchins*. Rome, 1987.

- Nolan, Maura. *John Lydgate and the Making of Public Culture*. Cambridge, 2005.
- Oberman, Heiko. "The Shape of Late Medieval Thought: The Birthpangs of the Modern Era." In *The Pursuit of Holiness in Late Medieval and Renaissance Religion*. Edited by Charles Trinkaus and Heiko Oberman. Leiden, 1974.
- . "Headwaters of the Reformation: Initia Lutheri–Initia Reformationis." In *Luther and the Dawn of the Modern Era*. Edited by Heiko Oberman. 40-88. Leiden, 1974.
- . "Tuus sum, salvum me fac: Augustinreveil zwischen Renaissance und Reformation." In *Scientia Augustiniana: Studien über Augustinus, den Augustinismus und den Augustinerorden*. Edited by C. P. Mayer and W. Eckermann. 3-25. Würzburg: 1975.
- . *Masters of the Reformation: The Emergence of a New Intellectual Climate in Europe*. Cambridge, 1981.
- . *Luther: Man between God and the Devil*. New Haven, 1989.
- . *Archbishop Thomas Bradwardine: A Fourteenth-Century Augustinian*. Utrecht, 1958.
- Owen, D.M. *The Making of King's Lynn: A Documentary Survey*. London, 1984.
- Owen, Hugh and John Brickdale Blakeway. *A History of Shrewsbury*. London, 1825. 2 vols.
- Owst, G.R. *Preaching in Medieval England: an introduction to sermon manuscripts of the period 1350-1450*. Cambridge, 1926.
- Ottley, Robert. *Studies in the Confessions of St Augustine*. London, 1919.
- Palliser, D.M. *Medieval York: 600-1540*. Oxford, 2014.
- Pantin, W.A. *The English Church in the Fourteenth Century*. 2nd edn. Toronto, 1981.
- Pardue, Brad. *Printing, Power, and Piety: Appeals to the Public during the Early Years of the English Reformation*. Brill, 2012.
- Parkin, Wilfred. *The Friars Preachers in Lancashire: 1260-1990*. London, 1991.
- Pearsall, Derek. "John Capgrave's Life of St. Katharine and Popular Romance Style." *Medievalia et Humanistica*, 6 (1975): 121-37.
- Perkins, Nicholas. *Hoccleve's Regiment of Princes: Counsel and Constraint*. Cambridge, 2001.
- Petrina, Alessandra. *Cultural Politics in Fifteenth-Century England: The Case of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester*. Leiden, 2004.
- Pinner, Rebecca. *The Cult of St Edmund in Medieval East Anglia*. Woodbridge, 2015.
- Plummer, Charles. "Introduction." In Fortescue, John, Sir. *The Governance of England*. Edited by Charles Plummer. 1-106. Oxford, 1885.
- Poland, E.B. *Friars in Sussex*. Hove, 1928.

- Poskitt, Margaret. "Thomas Netter of Walden." In *Carmel in Britain: Essays on the Medieval English Carmelite Province*. Edited by Patrick Fitzgerald-Lombard, OCarm. 2:166-170. Rome, 1992.
- . "The English Carmelite Province, 15th century." In *Carmel in Britain: Essays on the medieval English Carmelite Province*. Edited by Patrick Fitzgerald-Lombard, OCarm. 1:149-154. Rome, 1992.
- Postles, David. "The Austin Canons in English Towns, c. 1100-1350" *Historical Research*, 66 (1993): 1-20.
- Power, Kim. *Veiled Desire: Augustine's Writing on Women*. London, 1995.
- Price, Paul. "I Want To Be Alone: The Single Woman in Fifteenth-Century Legends of St. Katharine of Alexandria." In *The Single Woman in Medieval and Early Modern England: Her Life and Representation*. Edited by Laurel Amtower and Dorothea Kehler. 21-30. Tempe, 2003.
- . "Trumping Chaucer: Osbern Bokenham's Katharine." *Chaucer Review*, 36:2 (2001): 158-183.
- Rader, Rosemary. *Breaking Boundaries: Male/Female Friendship in Early Christian Communities*. New York, 1983.
- Radford Ruether, Rosemary. "Augustine: Sexuality, Gender and Women." In *Feminist Interpretations of Augustine*. Edited by Judith Chelius Stark. 47-67. Pennsylvania, 2007.
- Raine, J. "Notices of Scoreby and the Family of Blake", *Yorkshire Archaeological and Topographical Journal*, 10 (1889): all pages.
- Rano, Balbino. "Las Dos Primeras Obras Conocidas sobre el Origen de la Orden Augustiniana." *Analacta Augustiniana*, 45 (1982): 331-376.
- Reames, Sherry. *The Legenda Aurea: a Reexamination of its Paradoxical History*. Madison, 1985.
- Redmonds, George. *Yorkshire West Riding*. Chichester, 1973.
- Redstone, L. "Suffolk Limiters." *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology*, 20:1 (1928): 36-42.
- Rex, Richard. *Henry VIII and the English Reformation*. London, 2006.
- . "The Friars in the English Reformation." In *The Beginnings of English Protestantism*. Edited by P. Marshall and A. Ryrie. 38-59. Cambridge, 2002.
- Richmond, C. "The English Gentry and Religion, c. 1500" in *Religious Belief and Ecclesiastical Careers in Late Medieval England*, ed. C. Harper-Bill (Woodbridge, 1991), 121-150;
- . "Religion and the Fifteenth Century English Gentleman." In *The Church, Politics and Patronage in the Fifteenth Century*. Edited by R.B. Dobson. 193-208. Gloucester, 1984.

- . “Religion.” In *Fifteenth Century Attitudes*. Edited by Rosemary Horrox. 183-201. Cambridge, 1994.
- Robinson, David. *The Geography of Augustinian Settlement in Medieval England and Wales*. Oxford, 1980.
- Robson, Michael. *The Franciscans in the Middle Ages*. Woodbridge, 2006.
- . “The Franciscan Custody of York in the Thirteenth Century.” In *The Friars in Medieval Britain*. Edited by Nicholas Rogers. 1-24. Donington, 2010.
- Roest, Bert. “Observant reform in religious orders.” In *The Cambridge History of Christianity: Christianity in Western Europe, c.1100-1500*. Edited by Miri Rubin and Walter Simons. 446-57. Cambridge, 2010.
- Röhrkasten, Jens. *The Mendicant Houses of Medieval London, 1221-1539*. Münster, 2004.
- . “Friars and the Laity in the Franciscan Custody of Cambridge.” In *The Friars in Medieval Britain*. Edited by Nicholas Rogers. 107-124. Donington, 2010.
- Ronan, M.V. *Reformation in Dublin, 1536-58*. London, 1926.
- Rosenthal, Joel. “Local Girls Do It Better: Women and Religion in Late Medieval East Anglia.” In *Traditions and Transformations in Late Medieval England*. Edited by Douglas Biggs et al. 1-20. Leiden, 2002.
- . *The Purchase of Paradise: Gift Giving and the Aristocracy*. London, 1972.
- . *Margaret Paston’s Piety*. New York, 2010.
- Ross, Charles. *Richard III*. London, 1981.
- Rosser, Gervase. *The Art of Solidarity in the Middle Ages: Guilds in England, 1250-1550*. Oxford, 2015.
- Roth, Francis. *The English Austin Friars: 1249-1538*. Cassiciacum, 6 and 7. Rome, 1966. 2 vols.
- Rowlands, Kenneth. *The Friars: A History of the British Medieval Friars*. Sussex, 1999.
- Rupp, E.G. *Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition*. Cambridge, 1966.
- Saak, Eric. *Creating Augustine: Interpreting Augustine and Augustinianism in the Later Middle Ages*. Oxford, 2012.
- . “Religio Augustini: Jordan of Quedlinburg and the Augustinian Tradition in Late Medieval Germany.” PhD diss., the University of Arizona, 1993.
- . “Quilibet Christianus: Saints in Society in the Sermons of Jordan of Quedlinburg, OESA.” In *Models of Holiness in Medieval Sermons*. Edited by Beverly Mayne Kienzle, et al. 317-338. Louvain-la-Neuve, 1996.

- . “The Reception of Augustine in the Later Middle Ages.” In *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*. Edited by Irena Backus. 1: 367-404. Leiden, 1997.
- . “The Creation of an Augustinian Identity in the Later Middle Ages.” *Augustiniana*, 49 (1999): 109-164, 251-286.
- . “Milleloquium Sancti Augustini.” In *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*. Edited by Allan D. Fitzgerald. Grand Rapids, 1999.
- . *High Way to Heaven: The Augustinian Platform Between Reform and Reformation, 1292-1524*. Leiden, 2002.
- . “Augustine in the Western Middle Ages to the Reformation.” In *Companion to Augustine*. Edited by Mark Vessey. 465-477. Oxford, 2012.
- . “‘Ex Vita Patrum Formatur Vita Fratrum’: The Appropriation of the Desert Fathers in the Augustinian Monasticism of the Later Middle Ages.” *Church History and Religious Culture*, 86:4 (2006): 191-228.
- Sabatier, Paul. *Vie de saint François d’Assise*. Paris, 1931.
- . “L’Originalité de Saint François d’Assise.” In *Franciscan Essays I*. Edited by Paul Sabatier et al. 1-17. Aberdeen, 1912.
- Sanderlin, George. “John Capgrave Speaks Up for the Hermits.” *Speculum*, 18 (1943): 358-62.
- Sandler, Lucy Freeman. *Illuminators and Patrons in Fourteenth-Century England: the Psalter and Hours of Humphrey de Bohun and the Manuscripts of the Bohun Family*. Toronto, 2014.
- Saul, Nigel. *English Church Monuments in the Middle Ages: History and Representation*. Oxford, 2009.
- Scase, Wendy. *Piers Plowman and the New Anticlericalism*. Cambridge, 1989.
- Serjeantson, Mary. “Introduction.” In *Legendys of Hooly Wummen, by Osbern Bokenham*. Edited by Mary Serjeantson. i-lxxx. Early English Text Society, 206. London, 1938.
- Serjeantson, R.M. and H.I. Longdon. “The Parish Churches and Religious Houses of Northamptonshire: Their Dedications, Altars, Images and Lights.” *Archaeological Journal*, 70 (1913): 217-456.
- Seward, Desmond. *Richard III: England’s Black Legend*. Revised edn. London, 1997.
- Seymour, M.C. *John Capgrave*. Brookfield, 1996.
- Shoemaker, Karl. *Sanctuary and Crime in the Middle Ages*. New York, 2011.
- Sikorska, Liliana. “Medieval Confession Manuals and their Literary (Re)Readings. The Case of John Capgrave’s *Life of St Augustine* and John Lydgate’s *The Pilgrimage of the Life of Man*.” In *Text and Language in medieval English prose*. Edited by Akio Oizumi et al. 237-54. Oxford, 2005.

- Simpson, James. *Reform and Cultural Revolution*. Oxford, 2002.
- . “Saving Satire after Arundel’s Constitutions: John Audelay’s ‘Marcol and Solomon.’” *Medieval Church Studies* 4 (2004): 387-404.
- . “Dysemol Daies and Fatal Houres’: Lydgate’s Destruction of Thebes and Chaucer’s Knight’s Tale.” In *The Long Fifteenth Century: Essays for Douglas Gray*. Edited by Helen Cooper and Sally Mapstone. 15-33. Oxford, 1997.
- . “John Lydgate.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Literature 1100–1500*. Edited by Larry Scanlon. 205-216. Cambridge, 2009.
- Skeeters, Martha. *Community and Clergy: Bristol and the Reformation, c. 1530-1570*. Oxford, 1993.
- Smetana, Cyril Lawrence. “Introduction.” In *Life of St Augustine by John Capgrave*. Edited by Cyril Lawrence Smetana. i-x. Studies and Texts (Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies), 138. Toronto, 2001.
- Smith, A.H. *The Place Names of the West Riding of Yorkshire*. 8 vols. Cambridge, 1961.
- Spark, Muriel. “St. Monica,” *Month*, 17 (1957): 309-320.
- Spencer, Alice. *Language, Lineage, and Location in the Works of Osbern Bokenham*. Newcastle upon Tyne, 2013.
- Stanbury, Sarah. “The Vivacity of Images: St. Katharine, Knighton’s Lollards, and the Breaking of Idols.” In *Images, Idolatry, and Iconoclasm in Late Medieval England*. Edited by Jeremy Dimmick et al. 131-50. Oxford, 2002.
- . “Knighton’s Lollards, Capgrave’s *Katharine*, and Walter Hilton’s ‘Merk Ymage.’” In *eadem, The Visual Object of Desire in Late Medieval England*. 33-75. Philadelphia, 2008.
- Steck, Francis Borgia. *Franciscans and the Protestant Revolution in England*. Chicago, 1920.
- Steer, Christian. “The Lorde Barons Slaine at Barnet Field,” *Ricardian*, 26 (2016): 87-98.
- . “Royal and Noble Commemoration in the Mendicant Houses of London, c. 1240-1540” in *Memory and Commemoration in Medieval England*. Edited by C. Barron and C. Burgess. 117-42. Donington, 2010.
- Storey, R.L. *The End of the House of Lancaster*. New York, 1967.
- Stouck, Mary-Ann. “Chaucer and Capgrave’s Life of St. Katharine.” *American Benedictine Review*, 33 (1982): 276-91.
- Straker, Scott Morgan. “Propaganda and Intentionality, and the Lancastrain Lydgate.” In *John Lydgate: Poetry, Culture and Lancastrian England*. Edited by Larry Scanlon and James Simpson. 98-128. Notre Dame, 2006.
- Strohm, Paul. *England’s Empty Throne: Usurpation and the Language of Legitimation, 1399-1422*. New Haven, 1996.

- . “Hoccleve, Lydgate, and the Lancastrian Court.” In *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature*. Edited by David Wallace. 640-646. Cambridge, 1999.
- Sunley, Harry and Norman Stevens. *Kenilworth, the story of the abbey*. Kenilworth, 1995.
- Swanson, R.N. “Letters of Confraternity and Indulgence in Late Medieval England.” *Archives London British Records Association*, 25 (2000): 40-57.
- . “Mendicants and Confraternity in Late-Medieval England.” In *The Religious Orders in Pre-Reformation England*. Edited by James Clark. 121-41. Woodbridge, 2002.
- . *Indulgences in Late Medieval England: Passports to Paradise?* Cambridge, 2007.
- . *Church and Society in Late Medieval England*. Oxford, 1989.
- Tanner, Norman. “The Cathedral and the City.” In *Norwich Cathedral: Church and Diocese, 1096-1996*. Edited by Ian Atherton et al. 255-313. London, 1996.
- . *The Church in Late Medieval Norwich, 1370-1532*. Toronto, 1984.
- . “Popular Religion in Norwich with Special Reference to the Evidence of Wills, 1370-1532.” D.Phil dissertation. University of Oxford, 1974.
- Taylor, Frank. *The Chronicle of John Strecche for the Reign of Henry V (1414-1422)*. Manchester, 1932.
- Taylor, James. *The Shadow of the White Rose: Edward Courtenay, Earl of Devon: 1526-1556*. New York, 2006.
- Taylor, Martin. *The Greyfriars, Canterbury: the First Franciscan House in England*. Canterbury, 2003.
- Thomson, J.A.F. “Piety and Charity in Late-Medieval London.” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 16:2 (1965): 178-95.
- Thornton, Gladys. *A History of Clare, Suffolk*. Cambridge, 1928.
- Tierney, Brian. *Origins of Papal Infallibility, 1150-1350: a study on the concepts of infallibility, sovereignty and tradition in the Middle Ages*. Leiden, 1972.
- Tjernagel, Neelak. “Robert Barnes and Wittenberg.” *Concordia Theological*, 9 (1957): 641-653.
- . *Lutheran Martyr*. Milwaukee, 1982.
- . *Henry VIII and the Lutherans: A study in the Anglo-Lutheran relations from 1521 to 1547*. St Louis, 1965.
- Trapp, Damasus A. “Hiltalinger's Augustinian Quotations.” *Augustiniana*, 4 (1954): 412-449.
- . “Augustinian Theology of the 14th century.” *Augustiniana*, 6 (1956): 146-274.
- Trueman, Carl. *Luther's Legacy: Salvation and English Reformers 1526-1556*. Oxford, 1994.

- Tuck, Anthony. "Edmund [Edmund of Langley], first duke of York (1341–1402), prince." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
- Turner Camp, Cynthia. "Osbern Bokenham and the House of York Revisited." *Viator*, 44:1 (2013): 327-352.
- Unwin, George. *The Guilds and Companies of London*. 2nd edition. London, 1938.
- Van Bavel, T. "Introduction." In *The Rule of Saint Augustine: Introduction and Commentary*. Edited by T. van Bavel and translated by Raymond Canning. 3-8. London, 1984.
- Van Engen, John H. *Rupert of Deutz*. Berkeley, 1983.
- Verheijen, Luc. *Règle de Saint Augustin*. Paris, 1967.
- . *Nouvelle Approche de la Règle de Saint Augustin*. Bégrolles-en-Mauges, 1980.
- Vessey, Mark. "The Demise of the Christian Writer and the Remaking of 'Late Antiquity': From H.-I. Marrou's Saint Augustine (1938) to Peter Brown's Holy Man (1983)." *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 6:3 (1998): 377-411.
- Viallet, Ludovic. *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.
- Vicaire, M.-H. *L'Imitation des Apôtres: Moines, Chanoines, Mendicants (IV-XIIIe siècles)*. Paris, 1963.
- Vickers, Kenneth Hotham. *England in the Later Middle Ages*. London, 1950.
- The Victoria History of the Counties of England*. Edited by W.H. Page et al. London and Oxford, 1900- .
- Vidler, Leopold Amon. *A New History of Rye*. Sussex, 1934.
- Viera, David. "Parallels in Fifteenth-Century Hagiography: John Capgrave's *Life of St. Katharine of Alexandria* and Vincent Ferrer's Catalan Sermon on Santa Caterina." *Augustiniana*, 51 (2001): 231-41.
- Wabuda, Susan. *Preaching During the English Reformation*. Cambridge, 2007.
- Walsh, Katharine. "Wie ein Bettelorden zu (s)einem Gründer kam. Fingierte Traditionen um die Entstehung der Augustiner-Eremiten." In *Fälschungen im Mittelalter*. 5:585-610. Hanover, 1988.
- . "The *De vita evangelica* of Geoffrey Hardeby OESA (c. 1320-c. 1385) a study in the mendicant controversies of the fourteenth century [part 1]." *Analecta Augustiniana*, 33 (1970): 151–261.
- . "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 [part 2]." *Analecta Augustiniana*, 34 (1971): 5–83.
- . *A Fourteenth-Century Scholar and Primate: Richard FitzRalph in Oxford, Avignon and Armagh*. Oxford, 1981.

- . “The Observance: Sources for a History of the Observant Reform Movement in the Order of Augustinian Friars in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.” *Rivista di storia della chiesa in Italia*, 31 (1977): 40-67.
- Watson, Nicholas. “Censorship and Cultural Change in Late-Medieval England: Vernacular Theology, the Oxford Translation Debate, and Arundel's Constitutions of 1409.” *Speculum*, 70:4 (1995): 822-864.
- Watt, Diane. “John Gower.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Literature, 1100-1500*. Edited by Larry Scanlon. 153-164. Cambridge, 2009.
- Watts, J. “*De Consulatu Stiliconis*: texts and politics in the reign of Henry VI.” *Journal of Medieval History*, 16 (1990): 251-266.
- . *Henry VI and the Politics of Kingship*. Cambridge, 1996.
- Webb, Diana. *Pilgrims and Pilgrimage in the Medieval West*. London, 2001.
- . “Eloquence and Education: A Humanist Approach to Hagiography.” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 31:1 (1980): 19-39.
- Wedgwood, Josiah. *History of Parliament: biographies of the members of the commons house, 1439-1509*. London, 1936.
- Welch, Charles. *Welch's History of the Pewterers' Company*. London, 1902.
- Wenzel, Siegfried. *Latin Sermons from Later Medieval England: Orthodox Preaching in the Age of Wyclif*. Cambridge, 2005.
- . *Verses in Sermons: Fasciculus Morum and its Middle English Poems*. Cambridge, 1978.
- Westlake, H.F. *The Parish Guilds of Medieval England*. London, 1919.
- Williams, Arnold. “Relations Between the Mendicant Friars and the Regular Clergy in England in the Later Fourteenth Century.” *Annuaire Mediaevale*, 1 (1960): 22-95.
- Winstead, Karen. *John Capgrave's Fifteenth Century*. Philadelphia, 2007.
- . “Piety, Politics, and Social Commitment in Capgrave's Life of St. Katherine.” *Medievalia et Humanistica*, 17 (1990): 59-80.
- . “Capgrave's Saint Katherine: The Perils of Gynecocracy.” *Viator*, 25 (1994): 361-376.
- . “John Capgrave and the Chaucer Tradition” *Chaucer Review*, 30 (1996): 389-400.
- . *Virgin Martyrs: Legends of Sainthood in Late Medieval England*. Ithaca, 1997.
- . “Osbern Bokenham's ‘Englische boke’: Reforming Holy Women.” In *Form and Reform: Reading across the Fifteenth Century*. Edited by Shannon Gayk and Kathleen Tomy. 67-87. Columbus, 2011.
- Wolffe, Bertram Percy. *Henry VI*. London, 1981.

Wyatt, Michael. *The Italian Encounter with Tudor England: A Cultural Politics of Translation*. Cambridge, 2005.

Ziolkowski, Eric. "St. Augustine: Aeneas' Antitype, Monica's Boy." *Literature and Theology*, 9:1 (1995): 1-23.

Online Databases

British History Online. [<http://www.british-history.ac.uk>].

Foxe, John. *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online (1583 edition)*. Sheffield, 2011. [<http://www.johnfoxe.org>].

Medieval Libraries of Great Britain. University of Oxford. [<http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk>]

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Oxford, 2004. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com>].

State Papers Online, 1509-1714. [<http://gale.cengage.co.uk/state-papers-online-15091714.aspx>].