THE FRANCISCAN OBSERVANTS IN ENGLAND 1482-1559

by Keith Duncan Brown, Corpus Christi College.

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Modern History of the University of Oxford, Trinity term 1986.

ABSTRACT

Chapter 1. The early development of the northern European Observant movement and the apparent lack of demand for Franciscan reform in England. The English Observant foundations as products of the interest of the monarchy based upon European court fashion allied to their own dynastic purposes.

Chapter 2. The standards of Apostolic Poverty which the northern Observants professed and the extent to which the English friars lived up to them. Numbers of friars and patterns of recruitment. The extent of royal patronage and its reflection in the court. The friars' intellectual temper.

Chapter 3. Suspicions of Lutheranism at Greenwich and Cardinal Wolsey's attempts to visit and reform the Greenwich friary in 1524-5. The flight of William Roy and Jerome Barlow to the Continent. Wolsey's employment of another Greenwich friar, John West to track down English protestants on the Continent and the danger of divided loyalties inherent in external patronage of individual friars.

Chapter 4. Friar William Peto's sermon before Henry VIII (Easter 1532) and the friars' opposition to Henry VIII's divorce and the break with Rome. Thomas Cromwell's attempts, with the aid of a disaffected faction among the friars led by John Lawrence, to control their public opposition and his ultimate failure. The suppression of the friaries as the consequence of the friars' refusal to accept the Royal Supremacy over the English Church.

Chapter 5. The aftermath of the suppression. The friars were not so brutally treated as Franciscan tradition has alleged and they continued to cause trouble. Their rôle in the `Pilgrimage of Grace'. The case of friar John Forest and the compilation of a list of former Observants. The refoundation of the convents at Greenwich and Southampton under Queen Mary.

An index of biographical data is appended.

BODLEIAN LIBRARY OXFORD
DEPOSITED
THESIS
16 VII 87

THE FRANCICAN OBSERVANTS IN ENGLAND 1482-1559

by Keith Brown, Corpus Christi College.

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Modern History of the University of Oxford, Trinity Term 1986.

ABSTRACT

The broad outline of the story of the Franciscan Observants in England is fairly familiar. Introduced into the country by King Edward IV in 1482 and settled adjacent to the royal palace at Greenwich, their settlement was refounded and ultimately multiplied up to a total of six houses through the conspicuous favour shown by Henry VII. At first his favour was continued in full measure by his son. But after a sojourn of barely half a century the friars were swept away in the holocaust of Henry VIII and Thomas Cromwell's reformation of the English church in the 1530s, as a result of their support for Katherine of Aragon and the Roman primacy.

This received picture has been put together from several sources. A number of the important foundation documents survive in England and have been published. Henry VII's refoundation charter for Greenwich was printed in the Archaeological Journal in 1866: while the doyen of English Franciscan historians, A. G. Little, published two papers on the foundations which he had delivered to the British Academy in 1923 and 1941, based upon a contemporary notarial account of Edward IV's original Greenwich foundation (which includes the text of the bull authorising the foundation) and upon a bull enabling the transfer of a number of unreformed friaries to the reform in 1497. In addition, a considerable amount of material relating (if sometimes tangentially) to the Observants, chiefly from the reign of Henry VIII, survives among the State Papers and other manuscript materials in the Public Record

Office and British Library. Much of this relates to the Observants' opposition to Cardinal Wolsey in the 1520s and, especially, to Thomas Cromwell in the 1530s, and as a result has achieved publication in various editions as well as being calendared in the Calendar of Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII and elsewhere.

A good deal of use has been made of this material. Little, Alan R. Martin and Charles Cotton have produced historical and topographical accounts of the friaries of Greenwich and Canterbury, while Dom David Knowles provided a typically sensitive account of the English Observance and its downfall in the third volume of The Religious Orders in England. And of course the story of the friars' opposition to Wolsey and Cromwell plays a peripheral rôle in a number of accounts concerned with the wider field of the political and religious events of those years.

All of this work is valuable so far as it goes. But it does not have very much to say about the root causes which lie behind the bare events. It has not, on the whole, delved very far into the dating and other problems inherent in the State Papers material extracted anything like all the riches undoubtedly present in them and in other documentary sources, such as Henry VII's Chamber accounts, which in this connection have hardly been used at all. Furthermore, in the particular case of the aftermath of the suppression of the province in 1534, a good deal of credence has been given to material of Franciscan origin which is essentially martyrological in nature and which for the most part will not stand critical scrutiny. Much remains to be done.

The present work is based upon the premise that the Franciscan Observants are important in the English context. Their significance is

not just in terms of their opposition to the Cromwellian Reformation. They represent, in effect, an experiment: one of the very few examples of reformed religion, and the only representative of contemporary reform movements among the Mendicant Orders, to acquire a foothold in pre-Reformation England. Here they have something to tell us about the attitudes of contemporary Englishmen and women at all levels of society towards the religious institutions which surrounded them.

Furthermore, sufficient material is available - in spite of a complete lack of record materials originating from within the English friaries themselves and an English Franciscan tradition much of which is of dubious historical value - to attempt some kind of thoroughgoing assessment of the nature of the English Observants and of their rôle in society at large which goes beyond anything attempted before. The sources available to undertake the task consist, on the one hand, of materials from within the Order - the chronicle of the fifteenth-century German Observant Nicholas Glassberger, the Annales minorum of the seventeenth century Irish Conventual Luke Wadding (as revised in the eighteenth and twentieth centuries) and the volumes of the Bullarium Franciscanum, together with the central legislation of the ultramontane Observants, the Abbrevatio Statutorum of 1451. On the other hand there is material of English origin. The odd piece of contemporary literature which sheds some incidental light upon the Observants' practices; by far the most significant of which is the Beryeng of the Masse, penned by two apostate Observants in 1527. And of course there are the English episcopal registers and the public records material already referred-to.

The present work can be broadly divided into three sections. The first, consisting of the first two chapters, explores the origins of

the reform on the Continent, the circumstances of its introduction into England and its essential character, in terms of the fulfilment of its own ideals, in terms of the kind of recruits which it attracted and in terms of the kinds of patronage which it acquired. In the light of this assessment the second section, consisting of the third and fourth chapters, attempts to provide as comprehensive a picture as possible of the events of the 1520s and 1530s. The final section, consisting of the fifth chapter, explores the aftermath of the suppression of the friaries in August 1534 and concludes with an account of the brief re-establishment of the Observance in England in Mary's reign.

The Observant reform as it appeared in England could trace its antecedents back to the early Observants of the northern French provinces who had obtained a measure of independence from the ministers of the Order from the Council of Constance in 1415. The movement's subsequent history was one of constant striving to maintain that independence, as the only guarantee that its standards could be maintained, in the face of hostility from the ministers, by recourse to patrons outside the Order and ultimately to the maintenance of papal privilege.

Although originally introduced into England by Edward IV, the Observance's flowering in England can be dated from Henry VII's re-foundation of the struggling Greenwich convent in 1485. The refound-ation was essentially a product of the new king's desire to publicly express a concern for religious propriety as part and parcel of his campaign to establish his own legitimacy. The subsequent transfer to the Observants of the unreformed Franciscan convents at Canterbury, Newcastle and Southampton in 1499 and the foundation of the house at Richmond shortly after the turn of the sixteenth century can be asso-

ciated with the preparations for the marriage of Prince Arthur to Katherine of Aragon. Hence three characteristics which emerge in the events of the 1520s and '30s - the friars' concern to maintain their independence from external jurisdictions, their ultimately unbreakable attachment to the papacy, and their alignment with the faction surrounding Katherine of Aragon - have their roots in the English Observants' very origins.

The friars were always closely aligned with the court; but despite - or perhaps because of - this they managed remarkably well to maintain the rigour of their professed standards of poverty. They always relied exclusively upon alms - to the extent of refusing to store or prepare foodstuffs - and appear to have refused a legacy from Henry VII which would have provided them with a cushion against disaster. They also suffered some qualms of conscience over the magnificence of some of the buildings and vestments which the king had given them, to the extent of twice seeking reassurance from the papacy that they might use them in good conscience, even though they did not add to the friars' bodily comforts. They did not handle money or do manual labour, and relied upon sympathetic laymen and women - `familiares' to act as proctors and carry out domestic tasks.

Never a large body - it probably never totalled much more than 150 friars, distributed in a maximum of six convents - the English Observance was initially composed entirely of Low-Countries friars. Scots make an early appearance; but by the end it was predominantly English in composition. It apparently recruited substantial numbers from London and from court circles, and also attracted a number of men with university backgrounds. This latter characteristic, and the friars' association with the court, contributed to an intellectual

atmosphere with Erasmian overtones, which goes some way towards explaining an outbreak of `Lutheranism´ at Greenwich in the early 1520s.

Cardinal Wolsey´s attempt to visit and reform the Greenwich friary in 1524-5 was partly occasioned by suspicions of Lutheranism and was vigorously opposed as an infringement of the friars´ cherished independence. But it was followed by the flight to the Continent of two Lutheran apostates. Wolsey´s employment of another Greenwich friar to track them down on his behalf was again opposed by the leadership as an infringement of the Order´s right to deal with its own; this demonstrates an awareness of the dangers posed by the divided loyalties of individuals with outside patrons, dangers which were to be revealed in the early 1530s when two disaffected friars with former patronal connections with Wolsey regularly betrayed the Order´s secrets to Thomas Cromwell.

The Observants´ support for Katherine of Aragon in Henry VIII´s divorce proceedings began long before 1532, but came to a head with the well-known sermon of the provincial minister, William Peto, before the king at Easter 1532, which belongs in the context of the contemporary Parliamentary campaign against the first stages of Cromwell´s legislative programme. Subsequently, with Peto and the warden of Greenwich, Henry Elston, first imprisoned and then exiled at Antwerp, the king and Cromwell attempted to bring the friars under control by ensuring the election of a subservient individual as minister. No election was made at the 1532 provincial chapter, but early in 1533 a French friar, Francis Faber, was imported for the purpose. Initially compliant, over a period of months Faber came to realise the impossibility of reconciling his profession with the king´s demands; and he vanished from the scene early in 1534. By now the

friars at some of the provincial friaries, at least, were openly preaching against the government. But although most, when the time came, swore to uphold the Boleyn succession, they refused to swear allegiance to the Royal Supremacy and their opposition was cut short by the forcible suppression of the friaries in August 1534.

However the friars did not now face the kind of brutal end alleged in Franciscan martyrological tradition. Imprisoned in Conventual friaries around the country, virtually all now swore the oath required of them and were freed to be placed under Conventual superiors. But their opposition to religious change continued, and they and their views enjoyed some popularity in the country. The Newcastle friary was briefly restored during the `Pilgrimage of Grace´ and in 1538 friar John Forest was executed as a relapsed heretic after being caught upholding the Pope´s authority in the confessional. And a number of other former Observants came to Cromwell´s attention during these years.

The Greenwich and Southampton friaries were briefly refounded during the reign of Philip and Mary, and a number of Henrician friars returned to their old haunts. But the friaries appear to have been sustained chiefly by the devotion of the queen, and to have attracted little popular support. And in any case, the end of the reign ensured their rapid demise.

THE FRANCISCAN OBSERVANTS IN ENGLAND 1482-1559.

by

Keith Brown

(Corpus Christi College).

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Modern History of the University of Oxford,

Trinity Term 1986.

Acknowledgements.

I would not wish to claim that what follows represents the last word on its subject; and I alone must accept responsibility for its deficiencies. But insofar as it possesses any merit, this is in large measure due to the willing assistance which I have received from others at all stages of its compilation. Like countless researchers before me, I have been admirably served by the staffs of the various libraries and archive repositories which I have visited. I have benefitted, too, from the willingness of workers in related fields to share with me something of the results of their work; and a number of their names will be found in the footnotes. Peter Scott and Andrew Smith have at various times gone to some lengths to help to overcome my limitations as a Latinist, while more recently Richard and Gill Hoyle have frequently opened their home to me on the occasions of my visits to Oxford. Frances White has provided invaluable - and frequently nocturnal - help with the mechanical aspects of preparing the results of my work for submission.

I have left my most important debt of gratitude until last. I consider myself to have been extremely fortunate to have been supervised while researching and writing this thesis by C. S. L. Davies. Cliff first steered me from a rather nebulous interest in popular religion into the more concrete world of friars and since then has brought to the task both a steady stream of stimulating suggestions and a fund of patience on which I fear that at times I have become heavily overdrawn.

Thank you all.

Contents.

Chapter 1: Origins.

(i) The Early Franciscan Disputes Over Poverty page 1

(ii) The Early Years of the Northern Observance 5

(iii) A Century of Conflict (1415-1517) 10

(iv) The English Background 19

(v) The Foundation at Greenwich 24

(vi) Canterbury, Newcastle and Southampton 32

(vii) Richmond 37

(viii) Newark 41.

Chapter 2: The Character of the Province.

(i) Introduction: The Observant Outlook page 43

(ii) The Practice of Poverty 49

(iii) The Apostolate 61

(iv) Offices, Chapters and the Enforcement of Discipline 63

(v) Population and Recruitment 69

(vi) The Friars and the Court 76

(vii) Learning and the Intellectual Climate 88.

Chapter 3: The Conflict of Loyalties (1): Cardinal Wolsey (1524-1529).

(i) Wolsey's Visitation of Greenwich page 103

(ii) William Roy and Jerome Barlow 111

(iii) Friar John West 122

(iv) Conclusion 130.

Chapter 4: The Conflict of Loyalties (2): The Break with Rome (March 1532-August 1534).

(i) Introduction page 135

(ii) Friars Peto, Elston and the Opposition to Henry VIII 136

(iii) Friar John Lawrence and the Opposition Within the Friaries 147

(iv) Friar Richard Lyst, Father Forest and the Death of Brother Raynscroft 158

(v) The 'Nun of Kent' and the Minister's Change of Mind 169

(vi) Opposition in the Country: Some Observant Preachers 179

(vii) The Final Phase 189.

Chapter 5: The Suppression of the Province and its Aftermath (1534-1559).

(i) Thomas Bourchier and the Franciscan Martyrological Tradition page 195

(ii) Conflict in the Friaries: Friar Arthur 202

(iii) The Friars and the 'Pilgrimage of Grace' 205

(iv) The Case of Friar Forest 211

(v) Cromwell's List of Former Observant Friars 217

(vi) The Marian Refoundations: Greenwich 222

(vii) The Marian Refoundations: Southampton 232

(viii) Father Peto and the English Legacy 233

(ix) The Accession of Elizabeth: Suppression and Exile 237.

Conclusion page 239.

Appendix 1: Index of Biographical Data page 242

Appendix 2: List of Superiors page 294

Appendix 3: James Beck's List of Friars Attending the Provincial Chapter at Richmond, September 1532 page 297

Appendix 4: Cromwell's List of Former Observant Friars (c. May 1538) page 299.

Bibliography

ERRATA.

Abbreviations and Conventions.

Add:

'Abbreviatio'	'Abbreviatio Statutorum tam papalium quam generalium edita apud Barchinonam...[1451]', ed. M. Bihl in AFH vol.xxxviii (1945).
	(References are to chapter and paragraph numbers, unless otherwise stated).
'Beryeng'	'The Beryeng of the Masse', ed. E. Arber as Rede Me and Be Nott Wrothe..., London, 1871.

Year-dating is given throughout according to the historical year, commencing on 1 January.

Abbreviations and Conventions.

(i) The following abbreviations are used in the footnotes and in appendix 1:

AFH	Archivum Franciscanum Historicum
BL	British Library
Bourchier	Thomas Bourchier, Historia ecclesiastica de martyrio fratrum Ordinis Divi Francisci, dictorvm de Observantia (Ingolstadt, 1583).
BRUC	A. B. Emden, A Biographical Register of the University of Cambridge to 1500 (Cambridge, 1963).
BRUO	A. B. Emden, A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D.1500 (3 vols., Oxford, 1957-63).
BRUO iv	A. B. Emden, A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford A.D.1501-1540 (Oxford, 1974).
Cotton	C. Cotton, The Grey Friars of Canterbury (repr. Ridgewood, N. J., 1965).
CSP Spanish	Calendar of State Papers, Spanish (London, 1862-).
CSP Venetian	Calendar of State Papers, Venetian (London, 1864-).
Davenport	Christopher Davenport, `Fragmenta, seu Historia minor Almae Provinciae Angliae ff. minorum' in his Manuale Missionariorum (2nd edition, Douai, 1661).
DNB	Dictionary of National Biography.
Ellis	H. Ellis (ed.), Original Letters Illustrative of English History (3 series in 11 vols., London, 1824-46).
FOR	Faculty Office Registers (ed. D. S. Chambers, London, 1966).
Glassberger	Chronica Fratris Nicolai Glassberger Ordinis Minorum Observantium (Analecta Franciscana vol.ii, Quaracchi, 1887).

`Grey Friar´s Chronicle´	`Chronicon...ex registro fratrum minorum Londiniae´ in Monumenta Franciscana vol.ii (Rolls Series vol.v, London, 1882).
Hall´s Chronicle	Hall´s Chronicle, ed. H. Ellis, London, 1809; repr. New York, 1965.
Hume	`English Books Printed Abroad, 1525-35: an Annotated Bibliography´ in More, Complete Works viii(ii), appendix B.
`Introduction´ (1)	A. G. Little, `Introduction of the Observant Friars into England´ in Proceedings of the British Academy vol.x (1921-3).
`Introduction´ (2)	A. G. Little, `Introduction of the Observant Friars into England: a Bull of Alexander VI´ in Proceedings of the British Academy vol.xxvii (1941).
Lisle Letters	The Lisle Letters, ed. M. St Clare Byrne, Chicago, 1981.
Little, Papers	A. G. Little, Franciscan Papers, Lists and Documents (Manchester, 1943).
LP	Calendar of Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII (London, 1862-1932).
Martin, `Greenwich´	A. R. Martin, `The Grey Friars of Greenwich´ in Archaeological Journal vol.lxxx (1923).
Mason	Richard Mason (Angelus a S. Francisco) Certamen seraphicum provinciae Angliae (Quaracchi, 1885 edition).
Merriman	R. B. Merriman, Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell, vol.ii (letters), Oxford, 1902.
NSTC	A Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640 (2nd edition, vol.ii (I-Z), London, 1976).
More, Complete Works	The Yale Edition of the Complete Works of St. Thomas More (New Haven, Connecticut, 1963-).

Parkinson	Anthony Parkinson, Collectanea Anglo-Minoritica (London, 1726).
PRO	Public Record Office.
Reg FitzJames, London	The MS London register of Bishop Richard FitzJames (1509-22), Guildhall Library, London MS 9531/9.
Reg. Foxe, Durham	The register of Richard Foxe, lord bishop of Durham, 1494-1501, ed. M. P. Howden, Surtees Society vol.cxlvii, 1932.
Reg. Fox, Winchester	The MS Winchester register of Bishop Richard Fox (5 vols., 1501-28), Hampshire Record Office, Winchester, MSS A1/17-21.
Regg. Gardiner &c., Winchester	Registra Stephani Gardiner et Johannis Poynet, episcoporum Wintonensium, ed. H. E. Malden and H. Chitty, Canterbury and York Society vol.xxxvii, 1930.
Regg. Hille &c., London	The MS London registers of Bishops Richard Hille, Thomas Savage, William Barons and Richard FitzJames (1489-1509), Guildhall Library, London MS 9531/8.
Regg. Longland &c., Lincoln (institutions)	The MS Lincoln registers of Bishops John Longland and Henry Holbeach, (1521-51), Lincolnshire Archives Office Episcopal Register XXVII.
Regg. Longland &c., Lincoln (ordinations)	ibid., vol. i, Lincolnshire Archives Office Episcopal Register XXVI.
Regg. Savage &c., Rochester	The MS Rochester registers of Bishops Thomas Savage, Richard FitzJames, John Fisher, John Hilsey and Nicholas Heath (1493-1554), Kent Archives Office, Maidstone, MS DRc/R7.
Reg. Savage, York	The MS York register of Archbishop Thomas Savage (1501-7), Borthwick Institute, York, Reg.25.
Reg. sede vacante, York	The MS register of the see of York sede vacante, Borthwick Institute, York, Reg.5A.
Reg. Stokesley, London	The MS London register of Bishop John Stokesley (1531-9), Guildhall Library, London, MS 9531/11.

Reg. Tunstall, Durham	The Register of Cuthbert Tunstall, bishop of Durham, 1530-59..., ed. G. Hinde, Surtees Society vol.clxi, 1952.
Reg. Tunstall, London	The MS London register of Bishop Cuthbert Tunstall (1522-30), Guildhall Library, London, MS 9531/10.
Reg. Warham, Canterbury	The MS Canterbury register of Archbishop William Warham (2 vols., 1503-32), Lambeth Palace Library, London.
Reg Warham, Canterbury (sv)	ibid., sections dealing with business in the see of London, sede vacante.
Reg. Wolsey, Winchester	Registrum Thomae Wolsey, cardinalis ecclesie Wintoniensis administratoris, ed. F. T. Madge and H. Chitty, Canterbury and York Society vol.xxxii, 1926.
Regg. Wolsey &c., Lincoln	The MS Lincoln registers of Bishops Thomas Wolsey and William Atwater (1514-21), Lincolnshire Archives Office, Lincoln, Episcopal Register XXV.
Reg. Whyte, Winchester	Registrum Johannis Whyte, episcopi Wintonensis A.D. MDLVI-MDLIX, Canterbury and York Society vol.xvi, 1914.
RO	Dom David Knowles, The Religious Orders in England, vol.iii, Cambridge, 1959.
Rogers	The Letters of Sir John Hackett 1526-1534, ed. E. F. Rogers, Morgantown, W. Virginia, 1971.
Rymer	T. Rymer (ed.), Foedera, Conventiones, Literae, etc., London, 1704-15.
SP	State Papers, Henry VIII, London, 1830-52.
STC	A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640, ed. A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave, London, 1926.
Stow	John Stow, The Annales, or Generall Chronicle of England, ed. E. Howes, London, 1615.
Testamenta Eboracensia	Testamenta Eboracensia vols.v and vi, ed. J. Raine and J. W. Clay (Surtees Society vols.lxxix, cvi), 1884,1902.

Testamenta Vetusta	Testamenta Vetusta, ed. N. H. Nicolas, 2 vols., London, 1823.
Wadding	Luke Wadding, Annales minorum (page references given are to the 2nd edition, Rome 1732-, which are reproduced in the Quaracchi edition of 1931-4).
Wriothesley	Charles Wriothesley, A Chronicle of England During the Reigns of the Tudors, ed. W. O. Hamilton, Camden Society new series vols.xi,xx, 1875.

References to Public Record Office Calendars, Hume, Lisle Letters, Merriman, NSTC Rogers, and STC are, unless otherwise indicated, to numbered entries. References to BRUC, BRUO, BRUO iv and DNB are to the appropriate alphabetical entry. All other references are to page numbers.

(ii) Conventions:

Quotations from original sources are given in the original spelling. Expansions of standard contractions and conjectural reconstructions are contained within square brackets. Punctuation has been modernised.

In almost all cases I have referred to the originals of calendared and printed documents; but in all cases the first reference cited is the one used.

It is impossible to adopt an altogether consistent policy for the spelling of surnames; but in general, where a name clearly derives from a particular place, I have adopted the modern spelling of the placename.

Where no detailed references are given in the footnotes for information relating to individual friars, reference should be made to the appropriate alphabetical entry in appendix 1.

Chapter 1: Origins.

(i) The Early Franciscan Disputes Over Poverty.

The Franciscan Regular Observance represented a conscientious response, in the circumstances of its time, to the dilemma posed to the followers of St. Francis in every age: how is the intensely personal vision of the Order's charismatic founder to be reconciled with the everyday realities of a large institutional Order with a vital apostolic rôle to play in the world at large? The Observance originated in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries in a variety of reactions against a widespread disregard within the Order of the standards of poverty which they had vowed to observe, prompted by the demands of the academic, preaching and pastoral mission and encouraged by papal dispensation, which nevertheless extended well beyond the bounds of propriety. The reform which was introduced into England towards the end of the fifteenth century was in the first place a product of these developments, and so ultimately of the debates over poverty which had marked the Order from its earliest days.[1]

The term `Franciscan Poverty' connotes rather more than the simple rejection of material wealth. St. Francis' conception had been radical in its simplicity: he had believed Christ and the Apostles to have been absolutely poor, in that they had completely renounced all spiritual and material reserves and relied entirely upon God's will and provid-

---

1. The following introductory sections are based, except where stated, on the standard modern accounts: in particular H. Holzapfel, Handbuch der Geschichte des Franziskanerordens (Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1909) and J. R. H. Moorman, A History of the Franciscan Order from its Origins to the Year 1517 (Oxford, 1968). Bulls cited are generally to be found in the Bullarium Franciscanum and Wadding. For the history of the early Franciscan debates on poverty, see especially M. D. Lambert, Franciscan Poverty (London, 1961); also G. Leff, Heresy in the Later Middle Ages (Manchester, 1968), i.83ff.

ence. Hence the actual renunciation of material goods, the rejection of money and the practice of begging one's food from day to day were but the outward manifestations of an inward, spiritual state; and in principle would devolve naturally from it. For this reason Francis had not bothered overmuch with laying down precise rules of conduct. But greater precision in this area was vital to an Order which had rapidly acquired buildings and books, the trappings of the academic, preaching and pastoral mission to which his followers, with the encouragement of the Church hierarchy, had soon devoted themselves.

Francis' friend and protector Cardinal Ugolino had, soon after the Saint's death, established a basic principle when as Pope Gregory IX he had issued the bull Quo elongati in 1230. He had distinguished between the ownership of goods and their use, and held that in the material sense Franciscan poverty consisted essentially in the Order's renunciation of ownership. This dominion had been, except where explicitly reserved to the donor, appropriated by the papacy by the terms of Innocent IV's Ordinem vestrum of 1245: and the principle - as articulated by the Order's `second-founder' St. Bonaventure in his Apologia pauperum of 1269 - had been reflected in Pope Nicholas III's definitive Declaration upon the Rule, Exiit qui seminat (1279), which had been taken into Canon Law and broadly accepted by all sides within the Order.

Nevertheless, the years after Bonaventure and Exiit had witnessed a continuing decline in the general level of observance within the Order. In one respect, the Bonaventuran settlement had shown up the crucial weakness of the legalistic approach. If the be-all and end-all of Franciscan poverty was to be the papal ownership of all the goods used by the Franciscans, it could be argued by a reductio ad absurdum that

there need be no limits placed upon the extent of, or the use made of those goods. This had left the Order open to the temptation to acquire substantial buildings and large libraries and to embark upon a more settled, secure existence in which the renunciation which was the essence of Francis' vision had no place. It was this question of renunciation, in particular of the extent to which the friars should be permitted to make use of material goods, which had lain at the root of the disputes between the `Spirituals' and the `Community' which marked the history of the Order during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries.

St. Bonaventure himself cannot be blamed for this state of affairs. He had been a product of the Franciscan school at Paris and as such a moderate member of the Community. He had accepted, by and large, the urban apostolic rôle into which the Order had been drawn and he had been prepared to allow some mitigation of the dictates of poverty in the interests of study. But his writings are imbued with the spirit of St. Francis and his Gospel examples and, while expressing the friars' legal obligation only to renounce dominion, he had lain upon them the clear moral obligation to avoid all but the barest use necessary to sustain life: the <u>simplex usus</u>. However, his stricture carried little force, and was increasingly honoured more in the breach than in the observance by many among the Community.

In the face of this relaxation the Spiritual party, after its mentor Petrus Johannis Olivi, had espoused the doctrine of the <u>usus pauper</u>; a term identified with a programme of rigid obligations to observe specific forms of renunciation based upon a rather literalistic reading of the Rule. The dispute between the two sides had thrown up an examin-

ation of the poverty question in the Council of Vienne, issuing in a further papal Declaration, Clement V's Exivi de paradiso of May 1312. which had sought to delineate the friars' obligation to observe the precepts of the Rule, but which had left a great deal up to the discretion of superiors. The conflict had developed into a confrontation between an increasingly separatist body of Spirituals who ultimately placed their obligation to the dictates of poverty before their concern for the unity of the Order, and the ministers of the Community, who fell back increasingly upon the friar's obligation to obedience; to the extent, henceforward, of tending to regard any observant tendency within the Order as potentially schismatic. It had been ended only by the condemnation of the Spiritual position by Pope John XXII in Quorumdam exigit (1317).

After this, while there were many among the friars who saw the need for reform, with the priority given to the vow of obedience the balance lay in favour of relaxation. The dictates of poverty had been forced to take a back seat. In particular, the friars increasingly collected and handled money on their own account, abandoning the use of proctors, and many friaries, particularly in some of the French and Italian provinces, had become magnificent affairs, sustained by substantial regular incomes based upon rents.

In these circumstances it is hardly surprising that attempts should still have been made by a number of small groups to find some way of observing the Rule more closely, while at the same time avoiding the heretical and schismatic associations of the Spirituals and their outlawed successors the fraticelli. It was from a number of these groups that the Regular Observance was to develop.

(ii) The Early Years of the Northern Observance.

To the extent that they represented a reaction against prevailing laxity, and to some extent in terms of their inspiration, the various groups which were eventually to constitute the Observance can be regarded as the heirs of the Spirituals. But they were born in differing circumstances and developed distinctive individual characteristics.[2] The Italian reform associated with Paoluccio dei Trinci, with which the Observant movement is classically held to have begun, espoused a strict observance based upon the Rule and St. Francis' Testament, within an eremitic context based upon the hermitages of the old Franciscan heartland of Umbria; and it could boast a close, probably a personal connection with a line of continuity stretching back via Angelo Clareno and the Spirituals to the Saint's Companions. On the other hand in the Northern French provinces,[3] while it began in seclusion, reform developed mainly within the Order's established urban apostolic context, and espoused a moderate level of observance based essentially upon the Bonaventuran settlement: that is, upon the Rule as interpreted by the Declarations Exiit and Exivi and upon the Statutes of the Order, ultimately represented by the Farinerian Constitutions of 1354. It was this level of observance which was ultimately to be the hallmark of the movement as a whole: but the Observance always remained divided into

---

2. This point is largely glossed over by Moorman, op. cit., pp.369ff. For this section, see his account; also Holzapfel, op. cit., pp.91ff; but especially D. Nimmo, 'The Franciscan Regular Observance 1368-1447 and the Divisions of the Order 1294-1528' (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1974), which gives much the best and most comprehensive account of events up to the issue of Ut sacra (see in particular pp.547ff, 651ff).

3. The term is used here primarily in its geographical, rather than its political, sense.

cismontane and ultramontane families; a division which in some measure survived even the reorganisation of the Order by Pope Leo X in 1517.

The northern French movement apparently originated with the reform of the friary of Mirebeau, in the province of Touraine, shortly before 1390.[4] From here it spread, via the convent at St. Omer, reformed in 1408, to the province of Cologne, with the reform of the convent at Gouda in 1439.[5] It was from this province in turn that it was to spread first, around mid century, into Scotland and then, some three decades later, into England.

The northern reformers inherited in full measure the legacy of the Order's earlier disputes. Their fundamental problem lay in the fact that, while there was a widespread desire among its more conscientious members for a measure of reform, it was in practice virtually impossible to bring this about without creating enclaves of reform which immediately risked attracting the traditional hostility of the Order's superiors. Here they fared less well than their Italian counterparts, who for some time, although they adopted a stricter standard of observance, managed to co-exist with their laxer brethren chiefly because they were able, with their superiors' permission, to isolate themselves in the old Umbrian hermitages. Here their particular brand of piety was seen as at once a potential source of spiritual regeneration for the

---

4. Nimmo, loc. cit, gives a more comprehensive account of the early development of the Northern French reform than does F. Gratien, `Les Débuts de la Réforme des Cordeliers en France et Guillaume Josseaume (1390-1416)', La France Franciscaine vol.xxxi (1941), pp.415ff.

5. There had been an earlier - apparently unsuccessful - mission in 1418. For the origins of the reform in the Low Countries see P. Schlager, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kölnischen Franziskaner-Ordenzprovinz im Mittelalter (Cologne, 1905), pp.97ff.

Order and one clearly set apart as requiring a special vocation to which few could aspire and so not posing a threat to the life of the majority. As a result, at first they maintained a tradition of co-operation with the superiors of the Order, who soon granted them a measure of independence subject to their provincial ministers.

On the other hand the northern reform espoused no more than the Order as a whole was bound in law and conscience to observe: and worse, once it had begun to expand it did so in daily view of its unreformed counterparts and their benefactors. As such it represented a standing rebuke to the way of life of the majority: and so it developed with the support of patrons outside the Order in the teeth of opposition from the ministers. As a result, the ministers' traditional worries became self-fulfilling: for in order to survive the reform was forced to acquire and defend a degree of jurisdictional independence which was ultimately to split the Order in two.

The reform's early expansion was chiefly a product of the Papal Schism; brought about through the active interest of the Avignonese pope Benedict XIII at the prompting of lay patrons frequently scandalised by both the disregard of standards of poverty and the accompanying moral laxity which characterised their local friaries. In 1404 Benedict is found authorising the foundation of a new convent at Bressuire, in the province of Touraine, and from 1406 a series of bulls emanated from his chancery authorising the establishment of new houses and the reformation of old. Not all of the schemes which he authorised came to anything; but by 1410 or so at least ten houses in the provinces of France (`Francia'), Burgundy and Touraine had adopted the reform and a clear Observant identity was beginning to develop.

But the reformers faced a concerted policy of harrassment on the part of the ministers. Reformed friars were transferred away to unreformed convents and unreformed friars infiltrated into reformed convents, their pastoral work was obstructed and they were forbidden to accept recruits. A particular quarrel developed over the ministers' demands for money payments from the reformed friars to cover their visitation expenses - a demand which struck at one of the Observants' most vital principles.

Like the Spirituals before them, the friars appealed to the minister-general for relief; and he in turn referred them to the pope. The sympathetic Benedict responded in April 1407 with a bull, addressed to the friars of Bressuire, Mirebeau and a number of other reformed friaries in the three provinces, conferring upon them a number of privileges. Most crucially, they were to be freed from the jurisdiction of all superiors below the minister-general, and were instead to elect from among themselves a vicar for each province, to act as the minister-general's commissary. A second bull, issued in May 1408, established a vicariate-general over all the reformed friars of the three provinces. There was a good deal of apprehension over the radical nature of these provisions: not only from the minister-general, who was charged with putting them into effect; but also from some among the reformers themselves. One immediate result was the secession from the Observance of Henry de Beaume, who was to become confessor to St. Colette and chief mentor to the Colettan reform; a movement which although closely aligned in spiritual terms with the Observance was until 1517 to remain within the ministerial fold and to share something of the ministers' hostility towards the Observants of the vicariates.

As a product of the Schism, the new dispensation faced its first major challenge with the withdrawal of France from the Avignon obedience in October 1408. For a time the unreformed friars succeeded in depriving the Observants of much of their outside support by ingenuously linking the issue of the Papal Schism with that of the emerging schism - as they saw it - within the Order. In particular, they obtained a decree from Charles VI of France cancelling the Observants' privileges and ordering their dispersal as schismatic; a decree reversed only after concerted lobbying on the part of the friars' remaining supporters and with the strict proviso that the friars should explicitly renounce their allegiance to Benedict XIII and his minister-general, John Bardolini. Soon afterwards a new threat appeared from the direction of the Council of Pisa, which with one hand gave its approval to the friars' independence and with the other threatened to take it away by electing to the papacy a former minister-general of the Order. Rather predictably, right at the start of his reign Alexander V issued Ordinem fratrum minorum, in which he ordered the reform's suppression.

The Observants' appeal against his command brought forth a series of judicial investigations which ultimately resulted, long after Alexander's death, in the confirmation of Ordinem in July 1414. But even before this, the years of indecision had given more freedom to the Observants' persecutors. A virtual state of undeclared war existed, punctuated by appeals and counter-appeals to any and all possible sources of support, including the University of Paris, from whom the Observants obtained an affidavit in their support in 1410. Ultimately, concerted attempts were made to disperse the reformers, in at least one case - that of St. Jean d'Angély in the province of Touraine - by the use of armed force.

Nevertheless, the reformers managed to retain sufficient cohesion to issue an appeal to the Council of Constance in June 1415.[6] Their petition, or Quaerimoniae - a catalogue of complaints against the unreformed friars together with specific proposals for ensuring the integrity of the reform under its own superiors - thrived in a climate generally favourable to reform and gained the immediate support of the Emperor Sigismund. And in reply, on 23 September 1415 the Council issued Supplicationibus personarum, which granted the friars' requests in almost every particular, in effect restoring a tidied-up version of the provisions of Benedict XIII. The French Observants were now to elect both provincial vicars and a vicar-general, who were to act as commissaries of the corresponding ministers and whose elections were normally to be confirmed by those ministers within three days. In practice, though, the ministers were deprived of even this power of veto; for in cases of difficulty the election of a provincial vicar might be confirmed by the vicar-general, while that of a vicar-general might be considered confirmed automatically by authority of the Council. The ministers were in fact left with only a nominal power of personal visitation.

(iii) A Century of Conflict (1415-1517).

The Constance decree was the definitive statement of the right of the Observance to exist as a distinct jurisdictional entity. In spite of repeated attempts to emasculate it, it was confirmed by Pope Martin V in 1420 and by the Council of Basel in 1435, and ultimately stood the

---

6. For this appeal see also D. Nimmo, 'Reform at the Council of Constance: the Franciscan Case', in D. Baker (ed.), Renaissance and Renewal in Christian History (Studies in Church History vol.xiv, 1977), pp.159ff.

test of time. But it was a measure which the unreformed friars - or Conventuals, as they had come to be known - could not accept: and while the Observants rapidly gained in strength and influence to the point where they could effectively see off any threat to their independent existence, the century after Constance was marked by continual conflict between the parties and the reformers could never afford to drop their guard. The Conventuals, concerned above all for the unity of the Order and viewing the Observants' vicars and distinctive habit as schismatic, demanded that they should give them up and submit to the ministers: while the Observants demanded as a quid pro quo that the Conventuals should reform themselves. A number of attempts were made during the course of the century to reach some kind of compromise which would preserve the unity of the Order; but all ultimately failed. The Conventuals proved incapable of reforming themselves: successive sets of reforming statutes become ever blander, wordier, more frantic in tone; and the friars refused to negotiate with the Observants on anything like equal terms, falling back upon a parroted demand for their unconditional surrender. For their part, the Observants soon lost faith in the Conventuals' ability to deliver any meaningful concessions and on the whole refused to co-operate with any initiatives which were made, seeing them simply as ruses designed to induce them into giving up the independence which they knew from bitter experience to be the only guarantee that their standards could be maintained. As a result, as the movement grew through the century in numbers and stature its independence was consolidated rather than diminished and the split widened rather than narrowed.

In the early years one initiative did come somewhere near to succeeding.[7] In 1430 Pope Martin V called together a capitulum generalissimum of the whole Order at Assisi, at which friars of both parties enthusiastically adopted reform proposals put forward by the leading Italian Observant John Capistrano which became known as the Constitutiones Martinianae. These enjoined, among other things, a return to a uniform habit, the rejection of fixed incomes and the handling of money, and a return to the use of lay proctors. But although the Conventual superiors' acceptance of these reforms was enough to persuade the French Observants briefly to renounce their independence, the euphoria of the chapter was short-lived. Only six weeks after its end the minister-general, William of Casale, obtained from the pope a release from the oaths which he had sworn to observe the new dispensation; and he went on to obtain the bull Ad statum, which effectively undid the chapter's work by allowing the Conventual friars to possess buildings, lands, fixed revenues and personal property through the agency of the papal proctors and in so doing sanctioned, in effect, two quite distinct levels of observance within the Order. Although Martin V's successor Eugenius IV attempted immediately upon his accession to annul his predecessor's mitigations and to revoke Casale's dispensations, he failed and was forced to restore Ad statum in 1432. From this point on the Conventual wing of the Order was for the most part effectively possessionate. Thus betrayed, there could now be no question of the Observants relinquishing the vicariate. Eugenius did

---

7. For developments from Constance to the issue of Ut sacra (1446) see Moorman, op. cit., pp.441ff; Holzapfel, op. cit., pp.106ff, Nimmo, thesis, pp.850ff.

make one further attempt to re-unite the Order after Casale's death in February 1442, when he tried to have the popular Italian Observant Albert of Sarteano elected minister-general at the 1443 general chapter: but the scheme finally floundered upon the outright refusal of the Conventuals, in chapter, to elect the pope's nominee. Eugenius, defeated, set about preparing the Order for division by establishing a comprehensive network of vicariates. A papal commission of enquiry set up following the 1443 débacle produced a temporary arrangement, rendered permanent by Ut sacra (11 January 1446). The Observants were now to hold triennial general chapters of their own for the cismontane and ultramontane families, at which each was to elect its own vicar-general. These were still to be subject to ministerial confirmation of their election but again, provision was made, failing this, for automatic confirmation by apostolic authority; and again, the minister-general was to retain virtually no real authority over them. Although the Order was still nominally one, the Observants now lost no time in establishing their own comprehensive legislative and administrative structure. The ultramontane friars adopted their own general statutes - the so-called 'Abbreviatio statutorum' - in chapter at Barcelona in 1451.

Ut sacra was not, however, to be the definitive solution to the problem.[8] The Conventuals would not accept the division of the Order into observant and relaxed branches and a number of small groups of reformed friars whom Eugenius had placed under the vicariates were returned to the ministerial jurisdiction immediately after the election of his successor, Nicholas V, in 1447. Sporadic attempts continued to

---

8. For events during the remainder of the fifteenth century see Moorman, op. cit., pp.479ff; Holzapfel, op. cit., pp.126ff.

be made to reunite the Order. In 1456 Pope Calixtus III, with some help from the Italian Observant James of the March, made a short-lived attempt in Illius cuius to reform the system of vicariates so as to make the minister-general's authority somewhat less nominal. And another Franciscan pope, Sixtus IV, planned to re-unify the Order on the basis of his rather bland Statuta Sixtina of 1471: the prospect of which drew down upon his head an orchestrated deluge of protest letters from kings and princes throughout Europe, including Edward IV of England.

The last serious attempts to enforce a re-unification of the two parties were made in the early years of the sixteenth century by two men: Giles Delfini, minister-general 1500-6 and his protegé, the Colettan Boniface of Ceva.[9] At the Conventual general chapter of 1500 Giles and his colleagues formulated yet another, even milder set of reforming statutes which, published with the approval of Pope Alexander VI, became known as the Alexandrina. Delfini used these statutes as the basis of a personal campaign of visitation and reform of houses throughout Europe, in a final attempt to secure the re-unification of a moderately reformed Order under the ministers. In general he gained the confidence of neither side and ultimately he achieved little success. But in the province of France, in conjunction with Boniface of Ceva (provincial minister from 1502), he succeeded in introducing a degree of reform into the notorious Great Convent of Paris and a number of

---

9. For what follows, see Moorman, op. cit., pp.569ff, Holzapfel, op. cit., pp.142ff and especially A. Renaudet, Préréforme et Humanisme à Paris (Paris, 1916), pp.556-8, 570-2; F. Delorme (ed.), `Documents pour l'histoire du Bienheureux Gabriel-Maria', in La France Franciscaine vol. xi (1928), p.113ff, 231ff, 457ff; H. Lippens, `Jean Glapion, Défenseur de la Réforme de l'Observance', AFH vol.xliv (1941), pp.45ff.

other houses; on the basis of which he was able to sell his brand of reform to the Parlement of Paris and King Louis XII (who was persuaded to write to Henry VII of England in their support), and to the papal legate Georges d´Amboise.

His activities alarmed the Observants of both families, who again contrived to direct a volley of protest letters at the Vatican from an impressive list of supporters, including Henry VII. A new pope - Julius II, a former cardinal-protector of the Order - responded first by issuing a confirmation of the Observants´ privileges and then by taking a hand himself in the business of reform, summoning another capitulum generalissimum to meet at Rome in 1506. This chapter once again failed to reconcile the parties; but it did have two significant consequences. On the one hand Julius, seeing the ultimate futility of attempts to re-unify the Order, set out to prepare it for division by the issue of Cum multae ex graves (16 June 1506), which ordered the subsumation of the various smaller groups of reformati within one or other of the major parties and at the same time prohibited any further attempts to transfer houses from the Conventuals to the Observants. On the other the Conventual representatives set up a commission under Boniface of Ceva, charged with once again reforming the statutes. But although he was an active reformer, Boniface was increasingly being guided by a fanatical hatred of the Observants. And although his statutes were aimed on the surface at reforming the Conventuals sufficiently at least to permit re-unification with those groups of reformati who still accepted the jurisdiction of the ministers, underlying them was a desire to marginalise the Observants with the ultimate aim of securing their suppression as schismatic. As such they were simply an anachronistic manifestation of the traditional, bankrupt Conventual position and had nothing

constructive to offer in the circumstances of their time. They were promulgated by authority of the minister-general in July 1508 and subsequently confirmed by the cardinal-protector: but although they came to be known as the Statuta Juliana the pope himself seems to have had nothing to do with them; and in any case in November 1510 he revoked them and restored the Alexandrina.

At the same time Boniface carried on alone with Delfini's attempt to re-unify the Order in France. In 1510 he was absolved from his provincial ministry and appointed commissary of the minister-general with wider powers: and he used a command of secular diplomacy, acquired during his earlier career as a soldier and courtier, to advantage. The attitude which underlay the Juliana was carried into a renewed, and increasingly fanatical, campaign against the Observants, first in the Parlement of Paris and later in the University: which developed from a dispute over the possession of various reformed friaries in the aftermath of Cum multae into a contest over the validity of the Constance decree and the relative faithfulness of the Observant and Conventual ways of life to the Rule and early Franciscan practice.

The unedifying disputes between Boniface of Ceva and his Observant opponents were merely the culmination of a long tradition: but they pointed up the ultimate impossibility of co-existence of the two parties within the same Order. Even when, over the years, completely new houses had been founded for the Observants they had often been established in, or adjacent to, the same towns as existing Conventual houses. So Observants and Conventuals had frequently been found vying with each other for the alms of the faithful and conducting their internecine disputes in public. As early as 1429 Martin V had found it neces-

sary to try to contain the situation by ruling that no new house should be founded within five leagues of an existing convent.

More scandal had resulted when patrons had tried, not always with the best of intentions,[10] to eject Conventuals from an existing house and replace them with Observants. Such transfers could be protracted affairs, marked by appeal and counter-appeal to Rome. Not all had been as long-drawn-out as that of Namur, which had dragged on over nine years from 1482; but a recent chronicler of these events has aptly called the case `symbolae ad historiam generalem Observantiae ultramontanae'.[11] Julius II had not been the first pope to try to contain the situation. Pius II's Inter assiduas curas, issued in January 1464, had presaged a series of bulls which forbade the forcible transfer of houses from one party to the other. But the frequency with which the prohibition had been repeated, the extent to which founders had been dispensed from it (including Henry VII of England in 1497) and the subsequent history of the Order demonstrate that it was largely ignored.

By this time the numbers of Observants in Europe as a whole had grown at least to the point of broad equality with the Conventuals (though in the ultramontane provinces, with the notable exception of England, they were in a majority) and the strength of their support had grown to the point where reform à la Boniface of Ceva - that is, by the

---

10. E.g. the case of Freiburg am Main, where there was a suspicion that the transfer was prompted by the desire of one of the city magistrates to acquire a forest which the friary had formerly held (Glassberger, p.555).

11. This is the subtitle given by H Lippens to his `De translatione conventus Namurcensis a Conventualibus ad Observantes (1482-1491)', AFH vol.xxxviii (1945), pp.198ff.

effective suppression of the Observance - had long ceased to be a realistic option. At the same time the Conventuals showed no sign of being prepared to put up meaningful answers to the very real questions with which the Observants faced them. The parties were de facto irreconcileable, and the problem was clearly not going to go away. The continuing stalemate and public disputes between the parties - especially between Boniface of Ceva and his opponents - were causing grave scandal and greatly impairing the moral stature of the Order: quite apart from the consequent floods of protest to Rome.

Not before time, the definitive solution to the problem was found during the pontificate of Leo X.[12] In the summer of 1516 he set up a commission of four cardinals and four friars to consider the problem and recommend a solution. Its first outcome was the calling of yet another capitulum generalissimum to meet at Rome at Pentecost 1517.

When the chapter began on 29 May it quickly became apparent that the friars themselves were not going to change their ways and that a solution would have to be imposed upon them: at which point Leo issued Ite vos in vineam meam (the so-called `bulla unionis´), which embodied the commission´s recommendations and which was read to the assembled friars the next day. The Observants of the vicariates were to absorb all the other groups of reformati, including the Colettans and others who hitherto had remained subject to the ministers, and were henceforward to be known as the true Order of Friars Minor. Both the ministers and all other officers were to be elected from this group: in effect the Observant vicars were to take the titles and rôles of the corresponding

---

12. For this, see Moorman, op. cit., pp.582ff, Holzapfel, op. cit., pp.153ff.

Conventual ministers, and the vow of obedience was henceforward to apply to them. The Conventuals, having failed to be shocked by this move into reforming themselves, and refusing to accept the jurisdiction of the Observant superiors, were reconstituted by Omnipotens Deus (12 June 1517) into a separate Order with its own superiors who, following Dominican practice, were to be known as `masters´ and who were required to seek confirmation of their election from the corresponding Observant minister. Largely through their own intransigence, the schism which the Conventuals had feared had come to pass.

(iv) The English Background.

Among their other gains the Observants obtained footholds in both Scotland and Ireland soon after the middle of the fifteenth century. After an early, abortive invitation by James I in 1436 they seem to have become established at Edinburgh in 1457; and the first Irish foundation seems to have been made around 1460, following a papal licence to found two houses granted in 1449.[13] The same period saw a fleeting attempt to introduce them into England. Probably during 1454 King Henry VI wrote to Margrave Charles I of Baden (whose family were active patrons of the reform) asking him to use his influence to persuade the Observant John Capistrano to come to England to assist in the establishment of some Observant houses. But the timing was inauspicious. Capistrano was preoccupied with plans for the recovery of Constantinople from the Turks and, writing from the Imperial Diet at

---

13. W. Moir Bryce, The Scottish Grey Friars (Edinburgh, 1909), i.51; J. Durkan, `The Observant Franciscan Province in Scotland´, Innes Review, vol.xxxv part 2 (1984), p.52; A. G. Little and E. B. FitzMaurice, Materials for the History of the Franciscan Province in Ireland, A. D. 1240-1450 (Manchester, 1920, reprinted Farnborough, Hants., 1966), p.203.

Frankfurt on 24 October 1454, he excused himself from coming on the ground of his impending departure for Hungary.[14] We can safely ascribe this initiative - probably in fact taken by Queen Margaret of Anjou - to an attempt to procure Henry's recovery from the madness which then afflicted him. Notwithstanding Capistrano's suggestion of the provincial vicar of France as a substitute, his absence and the king's recovery at Christmas 1454, together with the outbreak of civil war in England which shortly followed, seem to have inhibited further progress.

Furthermore, notwithstanding the attempts of some later Observant writers to demonstrate that the Observance was established in England during the 1460s,[15] it is clear that no actual progress was made before 1480. Its subsequent spread, too, was severely limited: untypically, in England the Observants always remained very much a minority of the total Franciscan presence. In contrast with the Continental experience, there was clearly no very great demand - either from within the Order or from without - for Franciscan reform which might have given the Observants their opportunity.

To some extent this lack of demand can be accounted for in terms of the general lack of receptivity to new religious movements from abroad which characterised fifteenth-century Englishmen, who tended to prefer home-grown forms of devotion based largely within the parish church. But since the Observant movement was as much as anything a response to perceived Conventual laxity, in part at least the reasons for its

---

14. Wadding, xii.210: paraphrased in `Introduction' (1), p.455.

15. `Introduction' (1), pp.456-8.

failure to spread must be sought in the nature of the medieval English Conventual Franciscan province.[16]

The English Franciscans were admittedly cast firmly in the Conventual mould. The province had long given precedence to the needs of the apostolate and had developed a strong scholarly base. And the friars shared many of the characteristic relaxations of their Continental counterparts; relaxations in large part made necessary by an ample - in many areas an over abundant supply of friaries and a system of economic support based upon the quest - the daily begging round - which at no time since the province's earliest years had been adequate to supply the demands made upon it.

Notwithstanding a long-term - though indeterminate - decline in numbers, and the friars' full participation in the burgeoning mass-trade, signs of increasing economic difficulty are plain from as early as the middle of the fourteenth century. And as a result of these pressures the Franciscans had been forced to resort increasingly to a number of dubious economic expedients including the acceptance of money and various forms of perpetual alms. By the fifteenth century they were letting rooms in their friaries to laymen and in their last years some houses were forced to resort to leasing out lands attached to the friary.

Economic decline led to a decline in standards of communal provision and discipline. The friary, long jealous of its `limitations', became increasingly reluctant to accommodate `foreign' friars: the warden's

---

16. The following summary is chiefly based upon A. G. Little's standard account of the medieval English Conventual province, Studies in English Franciscan History (Manchester, 1917), especially chapters 1-2; usefully supplemented for the period after the Black Death by M. W. Sheehan, `Franciscan Poverty in England 1348-1538' (D. Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 1974).

prerogative widened and terms of office in practice became greatly extended. At the same time the inadequacy of the communal income from the quest threw individual friars upon their own resources. They were largely left to fend for themselves by developing a network of personal `friends´ or benefactors; exacerbating the tendency - complained of by Wyclif - towards marked differences in individual standards of living.

Communal discipline accordingly deteriorated, abetted by the Papal Schism and an associated stream of appointments as honorary papal chaplains and dispensations to hold benefices issuing from the papal chancery. And the seal was set upon decline by the defeat of the reforming ministers John Zouche and Roger Downe early in the fifteenth century. It was at about this time that the English friars began to abandon their coarse grey habits for the more familiar - and expensive - brown: and by this time they were routinely wearing shoes. And there are numerous examples of individual friars receiving bequests, handling money and doing away with the use of proctors.

Nevertheless the English friars were very far from being altogether corrupt. This catalogue of relaxations should not blind us to the extent to which they had managed to hold on to much of their distinctive identity. They shared the Conventuals´ pride in their Order as the best in Christendom, a view bolstered by the appearance in the 1390s of Bartholomew of Pisa´s Liber Conformitatum. Furthermore, their province could look back upon a particularly glorious past. In its earliest days the generals John of Parma and Albert of Pisa had praised it as having followed the highest standards of poverty in the whole Order: and from its network of conventual and custodial schools and from its studia generale at Oxford and Cambridge had come forth more eminent scholars than from all the other provinces combined.

Something of these traditions remained with the province to the last. Its schools seem to have retained sufficient international repute to have attracted a significant number of Continental friars, chiefly of Germanic origin, in the fifteenth century. In the area of poverty, something of a tradition of moderation had prevailed, and to the end attempts seem to have been made to keep the worst abuses under control. There is no evidence either that the English friars' architecture was either over-extensive or over-elaborate or that their landholdings were at all excessive. And - crucially - they never to any appreciable extent fell victim to the Continental vice of obtaining income from the extensive commercial leasing of land: the single vice, above all, against which the Observance represented a reaction.

For these reasons it need not surprise us that to the end, something should have remained of the esprit de corps of the best province of the best Order in Christendom; and that there is very little sign of any desire for reform on the part of the friars themselves. But more important was the view of the friars held by the population at large who were their patrons. And it is clear that, notwithstanding the satirical literature directed against them, they always retained a good measure of public esteem. If the people were not over-generous to the limiter, they nevertheless continued to value the friars' services as preachers, confessors and intercessors. Friaries remained popular places of burial and the friars in general, and the Franciscans in particular, remained the most frequent religious beneficiaries of laymens' wills. And as the example of Dr. John Brackley of Norwich, who comes to life in the Paston Letters, demonstrates, a capable, educated, friar could make himself very useful in the service of

a powerful patron. In other words, there was no widespread lay desire for Franciscan reform in fifteenth-century England because the existing friars, whatever their deficiencies, had succeeded in making themselves useful to the community - and particularly to those sections of the community which mattered - without their lapses of observance causing the kind of scandal visible on the Continent.

So to explain why the reform made its breakthrough in England, and how it was able to flourish to the extent to which it did, we need to look elsewhere. Specifically, we need to look to royal initiative taken under Continental influences: first by Edward IV and later, more importantly, by Henry VII.

(v) The Foundation at Greenwich.

The inspiration behind the original foundation at Greenwich can safely be traced to Edward IV's contacts with the court of Burgundy, and in particular with his sister Margaret of York, who had married Duke Charles the Bold in 1468.[17] Edward's exposure to Burgundian idioms, brought about by his sister's marriage and by the ascendancy of the Woodville faction at the English court, had been reinforced by his own exile at Bruges during Henry VI's brief re-adeption during the winter of 1470-1. Upon his return, he had copied the private oratory of his host, the bibliophile Louis de Gruuthuse, and attempted to emulate his collection of Flemish illuminated manuscripts; and he had set about

---

17. Much of the story of the foundation of the convent at Greenwich by Edward IV in 1482, of its refoundation by Henry VII in 1485 and of the transfer to the reform of three Conventual houses by Henry VII has been told, and the key documents printed, in two papers delivered to the British Academy by A. G. Little in 1923 and 1941 (cited here as `Introduction' (1) and (2) respectively). Much of the following is based upon, and the relevant documents cited from, Little's work.

reforming the Royal Household upon Burgundian lines; a process involving the compilation of the `Black Book´ and culminating in the Household Ordinance of 1478.[18]

Yet the scope of his interest in Burgundian court culture had its limits. Edward was no learned sophisticate and seems to have been doing no more than follow the dictates of fashion in order to project an image of `royal magnificence´ to enhance his political position. Neither, in general, was he notable as an enthusiast for religious causes; and when in 1472 he was moved to respond to Mark of Bologna´s appeal for support by threatening to expel all the Conventual friars from his realm should the Observants be harmed[19] he was probably not acting alone. Christopher Davenport links `a certain lady´ with Edward in this enterprise: and this may well be the first sign of Margaret´s influence upon her brother in this area, an influence which was to be decisive in the foundation of Greenwich.[20]

Margaret had taken up the Burgundian enthusiasm for the Observance established by her father-in-law Duke Philip the Good, who had had a hand in the reform of the convent at Malines.[21] In 1482, with her

---

18. C. Ross, Edward IV (London, 1974), pp.264ff; C. A. J. Armstrong, `L´Echange Culturel entre les cours d´Angleterre et de Bourgogne à l´époque de Charles le Téméraire´, in England, France and Burgundy in the Fifteenth Century (London, 1983), pp.410-1; G. Kipling, `John Skelton and Burgundian Letters´, in J. van Dorsten (ed.), Ten Studies in Anglo-Dutch Relations (Leiden, 1974), p.27.

19. Wadding, xiv.2; cf. Glassberger, pp.455, 463, where the event is dated 1477 and Davenport, pp.135-6, where it is dated 1469.

20. This seems a more likely explanation of the presence of the `lady´ than Little´s suggestion that Davenport is referring to Henry VII´s protest against Julius II´s unification proposals (`Introduction´ (1), pp.457-8).

21. L. Ceyssens, `Les Ducs de Bourgogne et l´Introduction de l´Observance a Malines (1447-1469)´, AFH vol.xxx (1937), pp.391ff. Margaret was to be buried in this convent in 1503.

step-son-in-law Maximilian of Austria - another notable patron of the friars - she was to become involved in the long and unedifying saga of the transfer to the Observants of the convent of Namur.[22] After her husband's death at the battle of Nancy in 1477 she entered the political arena on behalf of her stepdaughter Mary, securing for her both her subjects' loyalty and the hand of Maximilian: and it was to negotiate on their behalf for English aid against France that she came to England in the late summer of 1480. She evidently used the occasion to proselytise on the Observants' behalf among the English nobility, for one outcome of the visit was a papal bull dated 24 September 1481 authorising the establishment of three houses in the kingdom.[23] No action appears to have resulted from this, probably because with Margaret's departure from England the driving force was gone.

During her stay, Margaret had spent some time at the palace of Greenwich: and it is probably more than coincidence that it was here, two years later, that the first foundation was actually made. Edward's limited incursions into the field of religious patronage were habitually governed by utilitarian considerations. Most were associated with various foundations attached to royal residences, which could be of immediate use to the royal family: in particular with the palaces of the Thames valley which were his first love, and where the court spent much of its time after 1473. Most notable of all was the interest which he lavished upon the College of St. George at Windsor and its associated Order of the Garter.[24] But although Edward enlarged the palace

---

22. Lippens, 'De translatione conventu Namurcensis'.

23. Wadding, xiv.274; Bullarium Franciscanum, nova series, (Quaracchi/Rome, 1929-), iii.1477.

24. Ross, op. cit., pp.273-6.

of Greenwich, before 1482 it possessed no associated religious foundation. So, to conjecture, in Edward's eyes a case could be made out for establishing here a house of exemplary religious - of whose virtues he was already aware; and it is not hard to see Margaret's rôle in putting the case to him.

At this point, informed guesswork meets concrete evidence. For the events which followed we are indebted to two parallel contemporary sources; an account contained in a notarial instrument and an open letter issued by the bishop of Rochester, Edmund Audley, setting out the circumstances of the foundation of the Greenwich house, and issued at the request of the friars themselves.[25]

The notarial instrument contains the text of the bull authorising the foundation: from which we learn that at some point, presumably during the latter part of 1480, Edward had summoned to England the vicar-general of the ultramontane Observants, William Bertho,[26] and had offered him a site upon which to establish a convent. Bertho had declined to act without apostolic licence; wherupon Edward had petitioned the pope for his authority. Sixtus IV's positive response was enshrined in the bull, issued on 4 January 1481,[27] authorising a single foundation at Greenwich or elsewhere in the kingdom. At the same time Sixtus wrote, copying the king's bull, to the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishops of Lincoln and Rochester, instructing them to act as

---

25. Both survive as copied into the letterbook of the notary Nicholas Collys, now Corpus Christi College, Cambridge MS 170. The former is printed in full by Little (`Introduction' (1), pp.466ff) with notes given of differences of detail in the latter.

26. Elected May 1478, died February 1481 (Glassberger, pp.464,476-7).

27. Bullarium Franciscanum, nova series, iii.696-8; Wadding, xiv.264; Calendar of Papal Registers, Papal Letters vol.xiii (London, 1955), p.737.

protectors to the friars and to ensure their peaceful possession of the house.

Upon receipt of the bull Edward sent again to the vicar-general - by now John Philippi[28] - inviting him to dispatch friars to England. And so it was that on the feast of the visitation of the Virgin, 2 July 1482 the friars, probably numbering twelve and led by the vicar-general's commissary Bernard of Lochen, were placed in possession of the site at Greenwich by James Goldwell, bishop of Norwich, representing the king, and the first stone of the new convent was laid.

The friary was established immediately to the east of the palace complex, upon a site made up of a flat walled piece of ground upon which ball-games had formerly been played, together with an adjacent plot and various old houses purchased by the king for the purpose, extending south-south-eastwards from the river frontage and, according to a modern estimate, encompassing an area of some 66 by 346.5 yards.[29]

But in spite of the `peculiar affection´ (`singularem deuocionis´) which he affected for them,[30] here the matter rested. His protegés´ confident hope - which they recalled to Henry VII in 1485 - that they

---

28. A former provincial vicar of Burgundy, elected for a third term as vicar-general in June 1481 (Glassberger, p.478).

29. `Introduction´ (1), pp.460-1. For the architecture and topography of the site see Martin, `Greenwich´, pp.93ff; also his Franciscan Architecture in England (Manchester, 1937, repr. Farnborough, Hants., 1966), pp.234ff. Both reproduce two drawings made of the palace in 1558 by Antony van den Wyngaerde, showing the friary buildings from the park and from the river. These drawings are also reproduced, and a plan showing the friary church in relation to contemporary and later buildings on the palace site given in H. M. Colvin et al. (eds.), The History of the King's Works vol.iv (London, 1982), plates 4-5 and p.98, fig. 8.

30. `Introduction´ (1), p.467.

would soon be granted more than their initial parcel of land[31] proved unfounded. While the terms of the foundation bull suggest that the pope had assumed that Edward intended to build a convent, he seems to have made no further contribution to their development in the short time which remained before his early death in April 1483; and no last will, in which we might have hoped to find some tangible measure of his favour for the friars, survived the political machinations of the years immediately after his death.

The friars fared no better during the succeeding reigns. The child-king Edward V, on the throne for less than three months, was in no position to assist and Richard III, with his Northern predilections, showed no sign of any interest. So in its earliest years, the Greenwich convent's material progress was very limited. The best which the friars could do, as they later recounted to Henry VII, was to begin, `with their own labour, expense and sweat' to build what they described as `poor little dwellings' (`paupercula domunculas') on their site, assisted by the devotion of some among the faithful. Not having the means to begin constructing their own chapel, they began, according to the antiquary John Rows, by using an existing chantry chapel nearby, dedicated to the Holy Cross.[32]

But the friars' fortunes underwent a remarkable change upon the accession of Henry VII in 1485. In the first months of his reign the

---

31. In their petition to the new king whose content is recounted in his charter of foundation for the convent.

32. John Rows, Historia Regum Angliae (Oxford, 1716), p.211. William Lambarde, A Perambulation of Kent (London, 1826), p.389, suggests that they obtained this chapel through the agency of Sir William Corbrige. For speculation on its history and site see Martin, `Greenwich', pp.79ff.

friars petitioned the new king for his favour, acquainting him with the circumstances of the foundation and its subsequent lack of progress. For his part, Henry responded by issuing, on 14 December 1485, a new charter of foundation for the convent;[33] a document remarkable for its attestation by a collection of most of the major figures of the Court and Household, headed by the archbishops of Canterbury and York.

This document, and the importance which Henry publicly attached to it, require some explanation. On a personal level, at least before the last few years of his reign, he, like Edward, could hardly be described as a religious enthusiast. In any case, he need hardly have gone to such lengths to express a purely personal devotion. Rather, he was the supreme statecraftsman: and there is no reason to disagree with Professor Knowles' conclusion that his religious policy grew from roots planted firmly in the earth.[34]

Again, rather like Edward's, the policy which he adopted in establishing his authority in the years after 1485 clearly owed much to what he had observed during his years of exile at the courts of Brittany and France. From here came his use of a semi-legendary historical justification of his leadership - his emphasis on his Celtic origins - and his concern for papal approbation. Part and parcel of his scheme of things was a claim to moral leadership, as a reformer of Englishmen's political conduct; a bringer of unity to a nation riven by faction. And

---

33. Ed. J. Burtt in Archaeological Journal vol.xxiii (1866), pp.57-9, and calendared in W. A. Campbell (ed.), Materials Illustrative of the Reign of Henry VII vol.i (Rolls Series vol.cliii, London, 1873), pp.216-7, and Calendar of Charter Rolls 1427-1516 (London, 1927), p.266.

34. RO iii.3. On Henry's religious outlook see especially A. Goodman, 'Henry VII and Christian Renewal', in K. Robbins (ed.), Religion and Humanism (Studies in Church History vol.17, Oxford, 1981), pp.115ff.

this moral leadership had a religious dimension, in his approval of pious causes. Hence his encouragement of the cult of Henry VI, his professed enthusiasm for the crusade and his interest in religious reform as an expression of a concern for propriety.

In this respect the Observants had an obvious relevance. In France and Brittany they were highly fashionable in court circles: and late fifteenth-century Brittany was the home of the celebrated Observant preacher Olivier Maillard. Although it is next to impossible to find out very much about what Henry was doing during his period of exile, the fact that the accounts of the king's Chamber reveal a steady stream of French and Breton friars - including Maillard - visiting his court in later years does suggest that they had made some impression upon him then.

So it looks as if - no doubt prompted by their Breton confrères - the Greenwich friars had chosen their moment well. In seizing the opportunity which they offered him of publicly throwing his weight behind the Observant reform, essentially the new king was making a personal statement of his commitment to a model of kingship. And at first his support was more symbolic than substantial. Like Edward before him, he did nothing to follow up his initial gesture. His support for the Observants did not distract him from doing his kingly duty as a patron of more established English religious communities - including the Franciscan Conventuals.[35] And, although virtually all the evidence has disappeared, like his predecessor he does not seem at

---

35. He renewed the habitual annual grants to the Oxford and Cambridge houses (CPR 1485-94, p.94) and established a chantry at his father's tomb in the Carmarthen house (ibid., p.365); and he was not above preferring the odd foreign friar to benefices (ibid., 1494-1509, pp.270, 338, 349, 369).

first to have contributed towards the construction of the Greenwich friary. The friars still made only slow material progress. Their church does not seem to have been completed before the early 1490s; and their cemetery and cloister were not ready for consecration until the early months of 1494.[36] As late as 1509 the king found it necessary to make provision in his will for the construction of a brick wall to enclose the friars' garden and orchard.[37] The refoundation of Greenwich may be said to mark the first phase of a revival of the Observants' fortunes in England. But in practical terms, as far as the friars were concerned it constituted little more than a holding operation. In 1485 the second - and by far the most spectacular - phase was still more than a decade away.

(vi) Canterbury, Newcastle and Southampton.

This second phase commenced in the closing years of the century with the transfer to the Observants of three Conventual houses - at Canterbury, Newcastle upon Tyne and Southampton.[38] The story effectively begins with the issue of a bull by Pope Alexander VI on 14 April 1498,

---

36. Richard Tylle of Sellinge, Kent, bequeathed 100s. towards their building works in December 1485 (Martin, `Greenwich´, p.113; Testamenta Vetusta, p.384). The church may have been unfinished in September 1493, when Eliott Alfons, a citizen and vintner of London, left the friars 10s. `wheyr they wil haue it, in vitaill or to the bilding of the church at ther pleasure´ (PRO Prob.11/10 ff.214v-5r; Martin, loc. cit.); although in old age bishop Richard Fox recalled having baptised the future Henry VIII there in the Summer of 1491 (PRO SP1/54 f.356v (=LP iv(iii).5791 (p.2588)). The bishop of Rochester granted permission for the consecration of the cemetery and cloister on 8 April 1494 (Regg. Savage &c., Rochester f.16v).

37. T. Astle (ed.), The Will of King Henry VII (London, 1775), p.30.

38. For the earlier history and topography of the Canterbury friary see Cotton, Chapters 1-4; for Newcastle, J. Brand, A History of Newcastle-upon-Tyne (London, 1789), i.332ff; for Southampton, J. S. Davies, A History of Southampton (Southampton and London, 1883), pp. 442ff.

in response to a request which the king had made;[39] and it gives his reasons for making the request. Henry has alleged that of 57 Franciscan houses in England only that at Greenwich maintains the Regular Observance: in the others live Conventual friars, some of whom lead a reprobate life. Furthermore the number of Conventual friars has been reduced to the extent that the 57 houses of the kingdom are now inhabited by fewer friars than used to populate 25 houses. The Greenwich house now being full, the king asks that five Conventual houses, where the friars lead a life alien to the rule of religion (`vitam a religionis norma alienam´), be transferred to the reform.

Superficially, Henry´s reasoning is based upon a characteristic concern for seemliness; his very desire to reform, rather than found anew, is a projection of the image which he sought for himself. Yet much of what he claims does not altogether ring true. Leaving aside the question of the friars´ numbers (which at this distance are virtually impossible to assess accurately) it is for one thing by no means clear just where in England Henry was going to find five especially reprobate convents: there is certainly no evidence on which to level such an accusation against the three which were eventually chosen. And the perfectly reasonable statement that the Greenwich house was full is not in itself an argument for such a substantial expansion as was proposed. The king´s claims are clearly rhetorical: and this together with the fact that his petition marks in practice a major change of Henry´s policy towards the Observants leads again to a search for an external explanation for his action, grounded in his political policy.

---

39. Entered in Cardinal Morton´s Canterbury register, ff.206r-v; citations here are from the edition in `Introduction´ (2), pp.162ff.

Although once again the evidence is somewhat circumstantial, such an explanation is not difficult to find. The king's petition can quite reasonably be connected with the conclusion of the Aragon marriage treaty at the end of 1496. Henry cannot have been unaware of the contemporary religious renaissance in the Spanish kingdoms; or of the dominant rôle played in it by the Observant Fray Francisco Ximenes de Cisneros, archbishop of Toledo, who was Queen Isabella's confessor and who, with the support of the Catholic Monarchs, was undertaking a thoroughgoing programme of religious reform including - particularly in Castile - the wholesale expulsion of Conventual friars from their convents and their replacement by Observants.[40] He probably knew, too, that Katherine of Aragon fully shared her mother's attachment to the friars.

Such a programme must have appealed to Henry's characteristic concerns: and, since the marriage treaty was to mark his arrival among the top echelon of Europe's ruling families, he probably felt obliged to follow their lead. In this respect, if he could not countenance a reform of Cisnerian proportions, there was one thing he could do. The single small community at Greenwich was not sufficient to constitute a fully-fledged vicariate and had so far remained subject to control by foreign superiors. In the circumstances the king may have felt that this represented a slur upon his reforming zeal which must be removed, and his immediate aim may have been to increase the Observant presence in England to the level necessary to enable it to acquire jurisdictional autonomy: which was in fact to be achieved, as the plan was coming to

---

40. Moorman, History of the Franciscan Order, pp.495-6,538; Holzapfel, Handbuch der Geschichte des Franziskanerordens, pp.145-6.

fruition, at the ultramontane general chapter of 1499.41

Alexander VI's bull was addressed not to the king in person but to the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishops of Durham and Ely. In it he instructs them, or their representatives, to go with two or three Observants to visit in person five houses of Conventuals where the inmates are alleged to lead a reprobate life, to determine the truth of the allegations and, unless they should be prepared to submit to Observant rule, to transfer them elsewhere and to make over their houses, with all their possessions, to the Observants, calling in the aid of the secular arm if necessary. In the event, however, only three houses were transferred; and the circumstances of the transfer are rather obscure. In the year 1498, records the 'Grey Friar's Chronicle of London',42

> 'In August was the ii^{de} prouincialle chapter of the Freer Minores in London. And there beganne the Observanttes, and came with the kynges letters and commandment for sertayne placis, and so beganne with Newcastelle, Canterbery and Sowthhamton'.

There is no indication here that the proposed episcopal visitation had been carried out; nor anything to suggest why these three houses were chosen. But Dr. Little was probably close enough to the truth in suggesting that the Greenwich friars - at this stage still nearly all foreigners - would be keen to acquire houses within easy reach of the

---

41. The 1484 ultramontane general chapter at Bruges had incorporated the English friars into the family, but pending a growth in numbers they were to continue to be governed by a commissary appointed by the vicar-general. According to Wadding, the Toulouse chapter of 1487 had placed the friars under the immediate jurisdiction of the provincial vicar of Cologne and accorded them the right to send a single discreet to the general chapter (Glassberger, pp.489, 521; Wadding, xvi.382, 422 (where what are presumably the events of 1499 are placed in 1490)).

42. 'Grey Friar's Chronicle', p.182.

Continent (and, one might add, of Scotland).[43] The chronicle rather suggests that the Conventual chapter - evidently the second of that year and presumably called to deal with this specific matter - was presented with a fait accompli. One imponderable in all this is the rôle of the Breton Observant Olivier Maillard, who was in England in the early months of 1498. The source of this information, the Spanish ambassador Don Pedro de Ayala, reported late in July that Maillard had by then left England, but was expected to return soon.[44] Could it have been he who descended upon the chapter bearing the king's instructions?

In any event, the transfers clearly did not take place immediately. At Canterbury the aged Franciscan bishop Richard Martyn is found making his will on 9 November 1498, still installed in his private rooms in the friary and oblivious of the blowing of the wind of change.[45] The last recorded ordination of a Southampton Conventual occurs in December: and according to a loose translation made by the eighteenth-century antiquarian Dr. John Speed of extracts from a lost register of this house, the transfer took place here on the feast of St. Anne, 26 July 1499.[46] It had certainly taken place by the time the king paid a bill for works here and at Greenwich in March 1500.[47]

---

43. 'Introduction' (2), p.158.

44. CSP Spanish 1485-1509, no.210. Maillard was probably the un-named Breton friar to whom the king gave the extraordinary sum of £20 in alms in April 1498 (PRO E101/414/16 f.24r).

45. Cotton, pp.96-9: there is an addendum dated 14 November.

46. Reg. Langton, Winchester, f.33r; Davies, op. cit., p.447.

47. PRO E101/415/3 f.15r.

Obviously there was, as Dr. Little suggested, a `hitch in the proceedings´.[48] The Conventuals would not have enthused over the idea of having their convents snatched from them by their opponents and they probably made some attempt to appeal against the move on the basis of the prohibitory legislation already referred to. This would explain the drawing-up for the king´s benefit of the notarial copy of Alexander VI´s bull, made in circumstances of great solemnity by his Latin secretary, Peter Carmeliano, on 15 November 1498, from which its existence is known. The original bull had not been addressed to Henry in person and he presumably felt it necessary to have a proper copy of his exemption from the papal prohibitions.

(vii) Richmond.

Following on closely from the transfer episode came Henry VII´s single most impressive gesture of support for the Observants: when the king not only founded a convent for them adjacent to his new palace at Richmond, but built and equipped it in a manner sufficiently grand to cause the friars some embarrassment.[49] On the face of it Henry could offer no utilitarian justification for this foundation, from the point of view of either his or the Observants´ needs. In fact its location brought it, in a sense, into competition with Henry V´s Carthusian foundation at Sheen, another house of observant religious to which the first Tudor continued to show favour. In fact, in the light of what has already been said about Henry´s motivation, an explanation lies in the aspirations which the new palace represented.

---

48. `Introduction´ (2), p.157.

49. The foundation was probably largely responsible for the sequence of events leading up to the issue of the bull Merentur vestrae in January 1514 (below, pp.51-2).

The palace of Richmond, created out of the fire-damaged palace of Sheen during the years 1498-1501, came to be known as the `Rich Mount of England´. Built at great expense, largely in red brick, in the image of a Burgundian château,[50] it represented both a model of the king´s continental notions of kingship expressed in the projection of magnificent liberality, and a monument to the Spanish marriage which both established the arrival of the dynasty among the great ruling houses of Europe and promised its perpetuation. The friary was clearly intimately connected with the palace development. It was built, like the palace, largely of brick, by many of the same craftsmen. In all probability it was physically connected to the palace: a well-known drawing of the latter made by Anthony van den Wyngaerde in 1562 shows a half-ruined building immediately to the south which is probably the friars´ church.[51] This building adjoins a raised, enclosed gallery which surrounds the palace gardens and which is linked to a transeptal projection which probably represents a small oratory in which the king and his family could discreetly hear the friars´ services. All of this suggests that the Observant house was the counterpart, in the religious sphere, of the sentiments which the palace itself expressed.

No papal correspondence concerning the foundation has come to light: but it can probably be connected with the presence at court of a number of French and Breton friars including Maillard - at the time serving

---

50. G. Kipling, The Triumph of Honour, (Leiden, 1977), pp.3-6.

51. Reproduced as plate 10 accompanying H. M. Colvin´s account of the friary in his essay on `Henry VII´s Works of Piety´, in H. M. Colvin et al. (eds.), The History of the King´s Works, iii(i) (London, 1975), pp.195-6. The following account of the construction of the friary largely parallels Colvin´s, but is based upon original sources and differs from it in some significant aspects.

his second term as ultramontane vicar-general - in the years 1500-1.[52]

The extent of the friary's development has been obscured by subsequent building. Although it was evidently contiguous with the site of the palace and was probably for the most part built upon the king's land, he is found paying £10 for more land at Richmond, probably to extend the friary site, in May 1502.[53] By December 1501, with the appearance of a payment for 32 loads of Reigate stone for the friary, building work was clearly under way.[54] The work was carried out under the terms of a joint indenture by three master-craftsmen: Henry Redman, a mason, Robert Nevill, a bricklayer and Thomas Bynks, master of the London carpenters' company. Payments in respect of this indenture occur at intervals between May 1502 and April 1506,[55] although the bulk of the work would appear to have been completed by May 1504. By the time of the final payment Bynks's name no longer appears: his poor workmanship on other royal contracts had led to his dismissal; and his shortcomings probably occasioned the repairs which were carried out at the friary by the Clerk of the King's Works, Henry Smyth, over a period of a year from the summer of 1507 at a total cost exceeding £200.[56] Others were involved in the decoration and furnishing of the house. The church must have been nearing completion by December 1503, when one Thomas

---

52. PRO E101/415/3 ff.19r,39v,42r,55v.

53. Ibid., f.95v.

54. Ibid., f.76r. The king also paid for 12,000 bricks for the friary in May 1504 (BL MS Add. 59899 f.54v).

55. PRO E101/415/3 ff.94v,101r; BL MS Add. 59899 ff.1r,13v,35v,39r; PRO E36/214 f.27r.

56. PRO E36/214 ff.85v,92v,104r,116v,119v,128r,137r. For Bynks's downfall see D. R. Ransome, 'The Administration of the Works' in Colvin et al., op. cit., p.29.

Kenedy was paid for painting its `roffe´ (ie. its ceiling).[57] The decoration of the house was in the hands of Master John Oxenbridge, a royal clerk, who received payments totalling over £200 in the years 1504-5 for `certain ornaments´, `adournaments´, `garnishing´ and `certen stuf´ for the friary.[58] In March 1507 one Angell Dunn received £44.12s.1 1/2d. `vpon his bill for diu[er]se tables´ (ie. tableaux) for the friary church.[59] And in addition to his repair work, Henry Smyth carried out `cilynge´ (ie. plastering) work during the latter part of 1508 and 1509.[60] All told, including the cost of Smyth´s repairs the building, decoration and furnishing of the friary cost the king well over £1600.

To this should be added the sum of over £190 which the king spent on furnishing its library with books, most of which passed through the hands of Herman Rinck, a native of Cologne and a Knight of the Empire who was for long to be a faithful servant of the kings of England. He received £40 in March and £76.13s.4d. in May 1504 for the purpose, and another £28.11s.8d. `ou[er] & besyd[es]´ these previous payments in July 1507, totalling £145.5s. In addition £46.10s. was paid for books for the friary to one Henry Jacobe in June 1505.[61]

---

57. BL MS Add. 59899 f.41v.

58. Ibid., ff.62v,63r,71v; MS Add. 21480 f.24r.

59. PRO E36/214 f.69v.

60. Ibid. ff.147r,150v,162v.

61. BL MS Add. 59899 ff.49r,55v,89r; MS Add.21480 f.16v; PRO E36/214 f.85v.

(viii) Newark.

If the friars had indeed owed their turn-of-the-century expansion chiefly to Henry VII´s dynastic aspirations, it is hardly surprising that, with the death of Prince Arthur and the collapse of his hopes in that direction, that expansion was halted. Although the king fulfilled his commitment to the Richmond foundation and continued - as the next chapter will demonstrate - to favour the Observants above all other religious, only one more foundation was made, at Newark (Nottinghamshire) in the last years of the reign; and this in rather different circumstances. Probably it was motivated by a rather more immediate concern on Henry´s part for the health of his own soul - he was by now a sick man - and in this respect parallels the extensive ordering of masses which he was undertaking at about the same time.[62] Its location can probably be accounted for by the involvement of a group of men, formerly numbered among Lord Hastings´ indentured retainers, who represented Henry´s most consistent and important political support after the fall of the Stanleys in 1495 and who dominated the Midland shires.[63]

Once again the diplomatic background to the foundation is, at the moment, quite obscure; although a letter dispatched from the court to John Smyth, the vicar of Newark, in January 1507 may conceivably have had something to do with it.[64] The actual foundation can be placed in

---

62. Below, p.79.

63. This suggestion is due to Mr. A. W. Cameron (private communication, 1984); and see his `Meering and the Meryng Family´, Transactions of the Thoroton Society of Nottinghamshire vol. lxxvii (1973), p.46, and `Sir Henry Willoughby of Wollaton´, ibid., vol.lxxiv (1970), pp.16-17.

64. PRO E36/214 f.64r.

April 1508: on 4 April the Treasurer of the Chamber recorded the king's gift of £100 towards the building of the new house, while on 28 April a licence to alienate in Mortmain - citing the king and others (un-named) as founders - was granted in respect of the site.[65] The house was built upon the site of the ruined chapel of St. Saviour, adjacent to the town of Newark, together with various contiguous parcels of land belonging to St. Leonard's hospital, York, Henry, Lord le Scrope, the bishop of Lincoln and others. The site - still known as the Friary - lies to the north-east of the town centre. Of the buildings, nothing is known: but in the three decades or so of the friary's existence, no very extensive development is likely to have taken place.[66]

After this, no more foundations were made. There is a hint - no more - of an attempt to establish a friary at the church of St. John, Wakefield in 1527, but this certainly never came to anything.[67] The province had owed its expansion - possibly even its survival - overwhelmingly to its ability to serve Henry VII's political and dynastic purposes. And as the following chapters will show, its fortunes continued to be inextricably tied to the interests of the monarchy and its supporters.

---

65. PRO E36/214 f.124v; C66/605 m.12 (=CPR 1494-1509, pp.567-8).

66. For what little is known of the friary see M. W. Barley, 'Newark in the Sixteenth Century', Transactions of the Thoroton Society of Nottinghamshire vol.liii (1949), p.17.

67. Thomas Ryther, esquire, bequeathed £20 to the putative foundation in July 1527, but cautiously made alternative arrangements in case it should not go ahead (Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, York, Probate Reg. 9 ff.405r-6v (=Testamenta Eboracensia, v.229)).

Chapter 2: The Character of the Province.

(i) Introduction: The Observant Outlook.

The northern Observance was not, it will be recalled, by design a radical movement, except insofar as a contrast might be drawn between it and its Conventual counterpart. The whole thrust of its appeal to its patrons and protectors lay in its claim to embody the authentic succession to the Order of St. Francis' time, as defined by St. Bonaventure and the papal Declarations; and its own guiding statutes, the 'Abbreviatio statutorum' promulgated by the Barcelona chapter of 1451, followed firmly in the traditions established by earlier legislation. Hence the distinctiveness of the Observants' practice of Franciscan poverty lay not so much in the particular requirements imposed upon them as in the way in which they interpreted requirements common to all. And at the root of their interpretation was a reform of the spirit, deriving from a desire to uncover the mind of the founder himself, a desire which led to the conscientious study of a variety of inspirational texts: none the Observants' exclusive birthright, but which in terms of their influence on outward practice they made substantially their own.[1]

On the one hand they studied both the Rules - the longer version of 1221 as well as the Bullata of 1223 - and St. Francis' Testament -which the friars had not been bound to observe since 1230 but which was generally recognised within the Order as being of lasting spiritual value. On the other they knew a variety of 'legenda': stories of an exemplary nature about the saint and his early companions. Among them

---

1. This section is substantially based upon D. Nimmo, 'The Franciscan Regular Observance 1368-1447 and the Divisions of the Order 1294-1528' (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1974), pp.689ff, 858-9.

was St. Bonaventure's official life of the Saint, the Legenda maior. But they knew, too, the collections termed the `Leo-sources', which in their surviving forms owe their existence to the need of an earlier generation of would-be reformers - the Spirituals of the early fourteenth century - to justify their case, and which consequently contain more than a hint of polemical hindsight, but which have their distant origins in the written or oral recollections of brother Leo and the other Companions of St. Francis. From the early fourteenth century onwards these materials had been disseminated in the north in the form of a manuscript compilation of three works: the Speculum Perfectionis (an anonymous collection of the sayings of St. Francis and stories about him grouped under the virtues which they illustrated); the enigmatic Legend of the Three Companions (allegedly representing the recollections of the Companions Leo, Rufino and Angelo as written down in response to a request from the general chapter of Perugia (1246)), and the Actus Beati Francisci et Sociorum eius (the latin original of the better-known Fioretti, compiled from an oral tradition supposedly originating with Leo). Along with these went various more specifically devotional and mystical works emanating from the Spiritual camp; in particular the Arbor vitae crucifixae Jesus of Ubertino of Casale.

None of this is to say either that in political, rather than in spiritual terms, the Observants of the fifteenth century were followers of the Sprituals of the fourteenth; or that they enjoyed a monopoly of the Spirituals' spiritual and devotional legacy. But there is a good deal of evidence to show that an acquaintance with these works permeated the thinking of the northern Observants, as it did that of their spiritual (though not their jurisdictional) counterparts the Colettans. In particular the `Quaerimoniae' which they presented in

support of their case to the Council of Constance in 1415 are substantially a repetition (modified so as to espouse the moderate, rather than the literal Observance) of Ubertino's Sanctitas vestra: essentially an exposition of the Spiritual case for a literal observance based upon the Testament and the Leo-sources.[2] Later in the century, in the context of a lament against a perceived lack of spirituality among the reformed friars, the celebrated Low-Countries Observant preacher Jean Brugman, in his Speculum Imperfectionis (the title itself is suggestive) recommends as suitable reading for novices, in addition to `legenda sancti patri' (presumably Bonaventure's Legenda maior), the Actus, Speculum, and Ubertino's Arbor vitae.[3] And later still the Ultramontane friars are found taking a distinctly neo-Spiritual line on the subject of evangelical poverty in a discussion of the matter held at the Bruges general chapter of 1484.[4]

These literary influences supported a régime of life whose tenor was quite different from that of the friars' Conventual counterparts. In particular, the Observants took care to maintain the delicate balance between the devotional and the active elements of the friar's vocation. The first was reflected in part in a concern for the reverent, joyful and punctilious performance of liturgical obligations; in part in an emphasis upon bodily mortification; but most importantly in a charac-

---

2. L. Oliger, `De relatione inter Observantium quaerimoniae Constantienses (1415) et Ubertini Casalensis quoddam scriptum', AFH vol. ix (1916), pp.3ff.

3. H. Goyens (ed.), `Speculum Imperfectionis Fratrum Minorum compactum per venerabilem et religiosum P. F. Iohannem Brugman, OFM', ibid. vol. ii (1909), pp.613ff. Sections of this work are translated in G. G. Coulton, Five Centuries of Religion vol. iv (Cambridge, 1950), pp.440ff.

4. C. Schmitt, `La pauvreté évangélique discutée au Chapitre Observant de Bruges (1484)', AFH vol. lvi (1963), pp.332ff.

teristic emphasis upon the importance of private prayer and meditation. In this respect the Observants made one significant departure from the pattern of earlier legislation: the 'Abbreviatio' are the first Franciscan statutes to legislate for the setting-aside of time for private prayer. And this remained a major concern of superiors and chapters in succeeding years.[5]

Broadly speaking, the aim of the life of prayer was to enable the individual to follow in the footsteps of St. Francis in modelling his life more closely on the Christ-like ideal, in emptying himself of all reserves and placing himself, in both the spiritual and material senses, entirely in the hands of his Creator. Something of what this meant to the early friars in terms of actual practice is revealed in the University of Paris's affidavit of 1410, which may be taken as a model of the early Observance's specific concerns.[6] Here are particular emphases upon moral propriety - `good conversation' and keeping at a distance from the polluting effects of women; upon the wearing of a modestly, rather than an ostentatiously poor habit; upon the refusal to own anything individually or in common, or to accept any form of fixed income; but instead to be content with poor use, to store no provisions and to beg victuals daily, to refuse to handle money either personally or through an interposed person, and to maintain the common life. In general the friars conscientiously attempted to follow the dictates of the Declarations Exiit and Exivi, whose provisions on the subject of poverty were, after 1451, to be read aloud in the convent four times a

---

5. 'Abbreviatio', c.ii, `De divino officio, oratione et silentio'; I. Brady, `The History of Mental Prayer in the Order of Friars Minor', Franciscan Studies vol. xi (1951), especially pp.328ff.

6. Ed. L. Oliger in AFH vol. ix (1916), pp.38-41.

year.[7]

The second element was reflected in an energetic apostolic ministry of a comparatively rough-and-ready kind, characteristically based upon zeal rather than intellect, with a preference for preaching by example. And here in two specific areas the Observants allowed their Spiritual inspiration to lead them beyond the limits of the obligations expressed in the Declarations and Constitutions: for they came close to abrogating the settlement reached by Super Cathedram (1300) in refusing to hear laymens' confessions or to bury them in their churches without the express consent of the incumbent of the parish, and in their refusal to preach publicly in any diocese without the express consent of the bishop; and they renounced all formal degrees, on the ground that knowledge was more important than its pompous badges.[8]

But if an institutionalised dependency and meekness of spirit was a hallmark of the Observance, it was tempered by an element of militancy where the maintenance of its régime was concerned. This was not only reflected in the eternal vigilance necessary to preserve its independence from those who sought to destroy it. It comes across too in the manner in which it operated its systems of authority and discipline.

The Franciscan Order differs from the monastic in that it is more of a community of equals: and ultimately responsibility for the maintenance of standards of observance rests with the individual. The term `office' is used broadly in the sense of `function'. Hence it includes

---

7. `Abbreviatio', iii.12. The Declarations were to be read in their entirety at least twice annually, and the Barcelona statutes themselves at least three times a year (ibid., vi.34).

8. Nimmo, `Franciscan Regular Observance', pp.727-8.

preachers, confessors and lectors as well as `prelates´ - wardens or guardians (alternative renderings of the latin `guardianus´) and ministers.[9] In these last cases the terminology itself is suggestive: those placed over others exercise stewardship rather than power. They are elected for strictly limited terms and regularly held to account for their performance and subjected to confirmation in, or removal from, office. But at the same time, they can command absolute obedience (except where conscience dictates otherwise), and the individual is subjected to considerable peer-pressure to conform, expressed in a rigorous, all-pervasive system of discipline.

Where the individual´s salvation was concerned, it was characteristic of the reform as of the age that liberalism was not regarded as a virtue: and the movement´s characteristic introspection and continual self-examination, its historic belief, born of hard experience, that it had a special mission as the guarantor of proper Franciscan observance, meant that where discipline was concerned it did not mince matters. As elsewhere, much of what the Barcelona statutes have to say on the subject of discipline is derived from earlier constitutions: but in practice the reform gave the old injunctions a new rigour. Outside the bounds of private prayer and meditation, very little privacy was allowed. Regular confession was a ruthless process of self-examination: no-one could go out without a companion and informing on one another´s faults was a way of life. No appeal was allowed outside the Order, and its affairs were to be kept secret from outsiders. Punishments for transgression ranged from a bread-and-water diet to imprisonment.[10]

---

9. Cf. `Abbreviatio´, ii.33.

10. Ibid. c.vi, `De correctione deliquentium´.

(ii) The Practice of Poverty.

Such was the tradition to which the English Observants were heirs. But they were subject to a number of particular pressures which combined to ensure that they maintained high standards of observance. On the one hand, the friars were under an obligation to the king as their founder and chief patron to act as models of religious propriety; and at the same time they were - uniquely - juxtaposed against a much larger body of Conventual friars who themselves maintained unusually high standards. On the other hand, they were always in close touch with their brethren on the Continent. The reform began as an outgrowth of the reform in the province of Cologne and always remained in part populated by foreign friars. And even after they had achieved jurisdictional autonomy in 1499, they were subject to periodic visitation by the vicar-general or his appointed commissaries which served to keep them in touch with the reform's mainstream. As vicar-general, Olivier Maillard was in England in the Summer of 1498, again around Christmas 1500 and probably in the Summer of 1501.[11] In 1513-14 Simon of Prussia, warden of the convent of Gröningen, was active as commissary in England and Scotland.[12] Father Gabriel-Maria (Gilbert Nicolai) was appointed visitor of the provinces of England, Scotland and Ireland in July 1521.[13] And it is significant here that in the confusion which followed

---

11. CSP Spanish 1485-1509, no.210; Chamber Accounts, Henry VII, PRO E101/414/16 f.24r, E101/415/3 ff.39v,42r,55v.

12. A safe-conduct for him, as visitor of the province of Scotland, and his companion, was issued at Calais on 11 July 1513 (PRO SP1/230 f.18 (=LP i(ii).2090)). On 25 January 1514 he was at Southampton where, describing himself as commissary for England and Scotland, he issued a letter of fraternity to Nicholas West, Dean of Windsor (BL MS Cotton Vitellius B.ii ff.68-9 (=LP i(ii).2599)).

13. F. Delorme (ed.), `Documents pour l'histoire du Bienheureux Gabriel-Maria', La France Franciscaine vol. xi (1928), p.470.

the imprisonment of provincial minister Peto in 1532, the friars' and the king's reaction should have been to request the minister-general to dispatch foreign commissaries - sucessively Jean de la Haye, warden of the convent of Ghent, and Francis Faber of Lorraine - to try to bring the crisis under control.[14]

Inevitably, with the complete loss of the English friars' internal records many aspects of their lives and concerns are completely hidden from view. Even if we had them, it is doubtful that it would be possible to go into any great detail about the private devotional lives which underpinned their more public activities. But it is possible to see something of their practices through the eyes - and the records - of some of their contemporaries. And the record which remains suggests that the friars for the most part both maintained the full rigour of their calling and actively strove in conscience to prevent relaxation.

It is perhaps little more than stating the obvious to say that in the matter of poverty the English Observant <u>régime</u> was buttressed by the twin pillars of absolute rejection of ownership and genuine moderation in use. The <u>Beryeng of the masse</u> makes it clear that the English friars strictly observed the principle of papal ownership:[15]

> `They have scant as moche as a lousse;
> Nether clothes, churche, nor housse,
> But the Pope thereof is owner'.

Though in fact it may be that the King himself retained ownership of the friaries at Greenwich and Richmond, as he was entitled to do.

---

14. Below, pp.152ff.

15. `Beryeng,' p.87.

Franciscan legislation had long decreed moderation in the scale of conventual buildings and the number and quality of chalices and vestments, and exhibited stringent prohibitions against superfluity and excessive value in the shape of magnificent convents, rich vestments and church ornaments.[16] In England nearly all traces of these have long since disappeared, although Antony van den Wyngaerde's portrayals of the friary buildings at Greenwich and Richmond,[17] as well as the moderation which had always governed the Conventuals' building here, suggest that insofar as they were able the English Observants never allowed the dictates of moderation to be exceeded in this area. Nevertheless their close association with the monarchy did lead to a degree of heartsearching. The Observance in general had long been concerned - with good reason - over the paradox that the very standards of poverty which it espoused tended to attract to it lavish donations which themselves threatened those standards, but which it was unable to refuse. And this was obviously going to be an issue in some areas of Henry VII's patronage: chiefly over the manner of the foundation of the convent at Richmond. At some point the friars prevailed upon Katherine of Aragon to obtain on their behalf from Pope Julius II a re-iteration of the Declarations on the subject of poverty and a reassurance that such gifts as magnificent convents, vestments and church ornaments could be enjoyed insofar as they were given for the honour of God and did not add to the friars' bodily comforts. But the question was one

---

16. Cf. 'Abbreviatio', iii.18.

17. Reproduced in Martin, 'Greenwich', facing pp.81,85; in his Franciscan Architecture in England (Manchester, 1937, reprinted Farnborough, Hants., 1966), plates 25-6, and in H. M. Colvin et al. (eds.), The History of the King's Works, iii(i) (London, 1975), plate 10A and iv (London, 1982), plates 4-5.

which continued to trouble the friars and in response to a further appeal from England for direction in the matter Leo X repeated his predecessor's prescription on 3 January 1514.[18]

We are on somewhat firmer ground in the area of individual poverty. Here one of the more obvious symbols was the habit, over which there had been much dispute over the years, since the Rule had simply employed the term `vilitas' and had not specified its precise form. The statutes had traditionally tried to lay down the law in this area by insisting upon a combination of uniformity and moderation based upon a grey habit of strictly limited dimensions: and the `Abbreviatio's' prescriptions on the subject of clothing were in fact lifted lock, stock and barrel from the Farinerian constitutions of 1354.[19]

The English Observants, like their brethren elsewhere, obeyed these prescriptions. A single effigy survives of an English Observant friar in a grey habit;[20] while in 1531 Sir John Rudstone, an alderman and former Lord Mayor of London is found bequeathing a `long wollen gray clothe of the price of v marces for every clothe' to each of the six houses for making habits.[21] On the other hand, among the Conventuals in general the restrictions had long proved impossible to enforce; and although among the English friars the grey habit seems to have survived quite late,[22] at the start of the sixteenth century an illuminating

---

18. In Merentur vestrae (Wadding, xv.663-4).

19. `Abbreviatio', iii.1-9.

20. A. G. Little (ed.), Franciscan History and Legend in English Medieval Art (Manchester, 1937; reprinted Farnborough, Hants., 1966), p.114.

21. J. W. Clay (ed.), North Country Wills...1383-1558 (Surtees Society vol. cxvi, 1908), pp.126-7.

22. Little, Studies, pp.57ff.

perspective upon the contrast between the two parties - and upon the nature of relations between them - is given by the London chronicles. In 1502 - according to one account on St. George's day - the Greenwich Observants, represented by a `Scottysh doctor' who is probably to be identified with Father Donald Gilbert, and with the `especyall ffavour and assystance' of Bishop Fox of Winchester, prevailed upon the Conventual friars to put off their former habits of `ffyne russet & off the brunnest colours', costing up to 8s. a yard in favour of grey Kennet russet `as the shepe beryth it' at 2s. a yard, `albeit that grete labour was made to the contrary and many & sundry meanys by soom sowgth'.[23] This measure of reform was probably only ever enforced upon the London friars; and not surprisingly it did not last. By late 1534, following the suppression of the Observant régime in England, one of them could refer to his brethren's capitulation to Conventual rule in terms of their having `chayngede somwhat of ther garment'.[24]

While as late as 1354 the statutes had regarded going barefoot as the norm, the English friars had been going shod at least since the author of Pierce the Ploughman's Crede had complained at the end of the fourteenth century of their `bucled schon for bleynynge of her heles' and `hosen in harde weder y-hamled by [th]e ancle'.[25] In the sixteenth century the Observants were distinguished by the wearing of `cutt shues without eny hose', whose nature is revealed by Roy and Barlow's charac-

---

23. `Grey Friar's Chronicle', p.184; A. H. Thomas and I. D. Thornley (eds.), The Great Chronicle of London (London, 1938), p. 319; C. L. Kingsford (ed.), Chronicles of London (London, 1905), pp.255-6.

24. Francis Lybert to James Beck (13 October [1534]), PRO SP1/86 f.91 (=LP vii.1307, where `garment' is rendered `government').

25. W. W. Skeat (ed.), Pierce the Ploughman's Crede (Early English Text Society, original series vol. xxx, 1867), p.12.

ters in the course of a typical exchange.[26] In fact it may be that socks were worn in cold weather - a not unreasonable mitigation, one might think - since one father Abraham is found with a new pair in his possession in 1534.[27]

His habit apart, in general the friar forswore all personal property. Like all other late medieval Franciscan legislation, the Barcelona statutes decree penalties for the friar who holds or disburses money and for the proprietarius who attempts to appropriate and hold books or other property on his own account outside the friary.[28] And with one single exception - that of friar John West, whom we shall meet in the next chapter, and who might be said to prove the general rule - there is no indication that any of the friars held substantial personal property. This is not to say that they did not retain artefacts for their personal use. It had long been the practice to permit the friars some few books and personal effects, supplied as gifts by relatives or benefactors. But upon his death the individual friar's books and other personal effects were to be surrendered to the community.[29] The only list of such personal possessions which we have, of the goods left behind in London by the intransigent friars Francis Lybert and father Abraham before their banishment to imprisonment at Stamford in the Autumn of 1534, is pretty meagre. The former could lay claim only to a handkerchief, penner and inkhorn, a few knives, a firebox and two books, a psalter and Johann Eck's Enchiridion: the latter - in addition

---

26. 'Beryeng', pp.81-2.

27. Lybert to Beck (13 October [1534]).

28. 'Abbreviatio', iii.13-15; vi.24.

29. A friar's books were to remain after his death in the friary in which he had last lived (ibid., iii.21).

to his new pair of socks - a little mantle with a bottle wrapped in it, a roll of wax and a psalter.[30]

It is also clear that the friars were sustained exclusively by alms. Henry VII states unequivocally in his will of 1509[31] that

> `the said freres Observaunts have no possessions, nor other goods moveables nor immoveables, wherewith to sustaigne and mayntaigne, neither their lives with mete, drinke and clothing, nor for the renewing of their books, chalices, vestiments and other ornaments necessarie and convenient for the service of God, nor for reparacions of their churches and houses, but oonly of the almous, devocion and charitie of [christ]en people´.

The demands which they had to supply were minimal enough. Roy and Barlow´s Watkin says that `They flye diligently all excesse / Livynge in poverte and scasnes / With smale dryncke and browne breade´.[32] But even so the friars took care to see that their dependence upon others was of an immediate, day-to-day nature by refusing to store, and even to prepare, their own foodstuffs. Admittedly, in the English case the first can only be inferred: but the Observants had traditionally deprecated the use of storehouses,[33] and contemporary Scottish practice appears to have been to refuse to store foodstuffs;[34] and it is unlikely that the English friars would have been an exception to the general rule. And Watkin categorically points out that `they nether

---

30. Lybert to Beck (13 October [1534]). Father Abraham is probably to be identified with Abraham Wharton.

31. T. Astle (ed.), The Will of King Henry VII (London, 1775), pp.30-1.

32. 'Beryeng', p.79.

33. E.g. the complaint of the ultramontane general chapter at Amberg (1486) that the Conventuals were storing too much grain and wine (Glassberger, p.495).

34. W. Moir Bryce, The Scottish Grey Friars (Edinburgh, 1909), p.132.

bake nor brewe´.[35]

In fact, unlike the early reformers, there is no indication that the English friars performed manual work of any kind. Instead, they employed laymen to undertake domestic tasks.[36] In answer to Watkin´s question `Howe have they their meat rost or bake?´, his foil Jeffray replies that `Wother men for theym the payne take, Whom spretuall fathers they call´.[37] These men were generally not paid servants: here the layman who was paid by the king to maintain the friary garden at Greenwich between April 1506 and January 1509[38] is probably exceptional. They were in fact the latter-day equivalents of the nuntius and amicus spiritualis of early Franciscan practice:[39] and as such they were employed in a variety of supportive tasks, not the least of which was the disbursal of money for the friars´ benefit on behalf of donors.

Of course it was one of the Observants´ cardinal principles that they would `not for all Englonde / Handill money with their bare honde´:[40] and the contrast with the Conventuals in this respect is nicely illustrated by the situation uncovered by the warden of the London Greyfriars early in 1538, in which a number of Conventual friars are

---

35. `Beryeng´, p.79.

36. The northern Observants had employed lay assistants (`familiares´) at least since Brugman´s time (Goyens (ed.), `Speculum Imperfectionis´, p.615 (=Coulton, Five Centuries, iv.440))

37. `Beryeng´, pp.79-80. He also refers to spiritual mothers, sisters, brothers and daughters.

38. Chamber accounts, PRO E36/214 ff.26v,44v,62r,126v,156v.

39. For something of the complex early history of the lay proctor in Franciscan practice, see M. D. Lambert, Franciscan Poverty (London, 1961), pp.84ff.

40. `Beryeng´, p.86.

found holding for his use monies given by the Observant friar Forest's penitents.[41] And they clearly preferred to receive alms in kind. The author of God spede the plough speaks of `The poore Obs[er]uantes that ben so holy / They must among[is] vs haue corne or mete'; and deliberately or not, he contrasts them with the Conventuals, whom he pointedly portrays begging money.[42] Testators, too, frequently differentiate the Observants from the other Orders of friars by leaving them small gifts in kind rather than money.

Nevertheless the friars were permitted to make use of money gifts for necessary purposes - for food, clothing, the maintenance of divine service - through an intermediary. And in this respect, probably for purely practical reasons, the English friars seem to have lost something of the rigour of the earliest reformers. Jeffray implies that the effect of this relaxation was to nullify the effects of their voluntary poverty:[43]

> `They have also withouten lesynge,
> Money in wother mens' kepynge,
> Redy at their commaundement.
> Which by the wryttynge of a bill,
> In whattsoever vses they will,
> Dayly is bestowed and spent'.

But this misrepresents the true situation. Take, for example, a receipt issued in January 1522 by Father John Scryvener, warden of the Southampton convent, for a sum of money given by Lord Darcy, which states specifically that the sum had been paid `vnto suche p[er]sons as the

---

41. [Thomas Chapman] to Thomas Cromwell (undated), PRO SP1/131 f.256 (=LP xiii(i).880).

42. Skeat (ed.), Pierce the Ploughman's Crede, p.71.

43. `Beryeng', p.87.

said frer[es] were in dett, & dyd assygne to be delyuered vnto´ by Darcy´s proctor.[44] And it is significant that when Henry VII tried, with the best of intentions, to bequeath large sums of money to be held in trust for the six friaries to provide for their daily upkeep, they seem to have refused to accept the gift.[45] Neither on the odd occasions where individuals appear to have given alms systematically to the friars - Darcy seems to have given by the year or half-year and in 1502 Elizabeth of York gave what appears to have been a barrel of beer a week for a year to the Greenwich friars[46] - is there any suggestion that these came close to constituting perpetual alms.

The proctors whom the friars employed for these purposes technically always acted as the agent of the donor; and sometimes they were individuals nominated by him. For example, in the first known will to contain a bequest to the Canterbury Observants, one Henry Ramsey, requesting burial in the friars´ church, left the sum of 20s. in the care of the rector of the parish of St. Andrew for their use.[47] Henry VII used various household servants as his intermediaries in his dealings with the friars, and in his will he directed the sums of money which he earmarked for their relief into the care of various ecclesiastical individuals and corporations.[48] Lord Darcy´s gift was disbursed on the friars´ behalf by the king´s solicitor-general Richard Lyster, a man

---

44. Scryvener to Darcy, PRO SP1/23 f.273 (=LP iii(ii).1975): dated 20 January 1522 but stated to relate to alms for the year 1521.

45. Below, p.80.

46. N. H. Nicolas (ed.), Privy Purse Expences of Elizabeth of York (London, 1830), p.56.

47. Cotton, p.99.

48. The names of Angell Dunn, Richard Weston and John Whiting appear repeatedly in this connection in the Chamber Accounts. For Henry VII´s bequest see Astle (ed.), Will of Henry VII, pp.31-2.

who is found organising numerous other financial transactions on Darcy's behalf at around the same time.[49]

On the other hand, frequently sums would be paid to men nominated by the friars themselves: and no doubt these were the same men who undertook their various domestic tasks. Negotiating the performance of masses by the friars of Newark and Newcastle (again, probably in January 1522), Lord Darcy offers to send the sum of five marks `to such p[ro]ctt[e]r[es] as ye naym vnto me' as soon as he had been certified that the masses had been said.[50]

A few of these men can be identified. One may have been a Southampton man, Nicholas Waring, `proctor in this partie for the said frers', who was appointed collector of tunnage and poundage in the port of London at around the same time as another of Henry VII's bequests, of 500 marks to be devoted to the repair of five of the Observants' houses, was marked-down for payment to him in June 1509.[51] In the event, however, the money seems to have been delivered to a physician, Philippe du Karugys, of whom nothing further is known.[52] In 1529 one

---

49. Scryvener to Darcy (20 January 1522).

50. Darcy to [the warden of Newark or Newcastle], PRO SP1/122 f.32 (=LP xii(ii).186(22)): undated.

51. Warrant under sign manual to John Heron (6 June [1509]), PRO SP1/1 f.32 (=LP i(i).58); Pardon Roll 1 Henry VIII (10 June [1509]), Grant of the collectorship (13 June [1509]), LP i(i).438(1) (pp.206,208), grant 94(73).

52. Warrant under sign manual to John Heron (21 July [1509]), PRO SP1/1 f.66 (=LP i(i).115). The earlier of the two warrants is stated to have been issued `at the sp[ec]iall desire of certain of th'executours' and is subscribed by Margaret countess of Richmond, Thomas earl of Surrey, Bishop Fox of Winchester, Sir Thomas Lovell and Lord Herbert. This later warrant is not subscribed. The payment to Waring is recorded in the Chamber accounts as having been paid over on 1 July: but a second entry, dated only `mense July' but which must presumably be placed after 21st, records the same amount as having been paid by warrant to du Karugys (PRO E36/214 ff.167v, 169r).

John Stanleye is referred to as `sometyme the ffamylyare off ower covent at Ryschemownd´,[53] which may mean that he had fulfilled this rôle. But by far the best documented example is that of James Beck, who comes to life as a result of his second, less public rôle as an informer on the friars to Cromwell in 1532.[54]

Beck was a citizen and fishmonger of London whose house and shop were situated `at the sygne of the Crosse Keys, the next howse vnto Saynt Magnus´ church in goyng downe toward Belyngsgate´. Here he maintained a `freers´ chamber´ which was used as a base by the friars when in London. He seems to have acted as a regular channel of communication between the friars and the court. We shall see him carrying the king´s alms to the provincial chapters at Richmond in September 1532 and at Greenwich in the following year; and he was presumably responsible for disbursing these monies at the friars´ direction. He had certainly done them many kindnesses, for which Brother Lybert felt constrained to thank him.[55]

---

53. John West and John Lawrence to Cardinal Wolsey (12 June [1529]), PRO SP1/54 f.97 (=LP iv.5667).

54. For this see below, pp.152ff.

55. For his identity and the `freers´ chamber´ see Beck´s will, PRO Prob. 11/33 ff.167v-8r; Lybert to Beck (13 October [1534]); Henry Elston to Thomas Sydenham ([26 June 1533]), PRO SP1/77 f.93 (=LP vi.705).

(iii) The Apostolate.

The attitudes of meekness and dependence which characterised the English Observants' outlook upon the world in general were reflected in the way in which they maintained their apostolic calling. There is ample indication that they played a full part in the preaching and pastoral mission. The Beryeng of the masse suggests that they were much favoured as confessors by noble ladies; and friar Forest is discovered routinely hearing laymens' confessions in the London Greyfriars in 1538.[56] They preached both in an official capacity - later we shall see Observants acting as lenten preachers at court and in Calais and as regular preachers at St. Paul's Cross[57] - and in town and country, extempore. God spede the Plough speaks of the Observants `Preching dayly Sermondys inogh / With good Examples full graciously' in the typical mendicant manner;[58] and there are several scattered traces of the everyday round of popular preaching. Canterbury friars are found preaching at New Romney, Kent in 1505-6; others at Kingston-upon-Thames and making a preaching tour of South Hampshire in the early 1530s.[59] And in these last troubled years friars are found making considerable trouble for Thomas Cromwell's government by preaching

---

56. `Beryeng', p.83; below, pp.214-5.

57. For Lenten preachers at court see below, p.98; for Bernardine Covert and Thomas Roche at Calais, see below, pp.186ff; for Donald Gilbert and John Forest at St. Paul's Cross, see below, pp.98,160-1.

58. Skeat (ed.), Pierce the Ploughman's Crede, p.71.

59. `MSS of the Corporation of New Romney', calendared in the appendix to the Fifth Report of the Royal Commission on Historical MSS (London, 1876), p.552; for John Lawrence at Kingston in April-May 1532 see below, p.150; for Gabriel Pecock at Winchester and on tour in Hampshire, March-April 1534, see below, pp.184-6.

against its doctrinal innovations and in favour of the Papal Supremacy, either on their own account or at the invitation of conservative incumbents.[60]

Some of the content of some of these last sermons was reported to the government in substantial detail, and they will be dealt with in their place. But they are to a degree exceptional and in general there is not a great deal to say about the content of the friars' popular sermons. In the 1520s Roy and Barlow make one pregnant, if rather jaundiced point in referring to their manner of `uphold[ing] the popis rule both nyght and daye' in gratitude for the `Many bulles and previleges / With wretched confirmacions' which he has granted to them.[61] One element which might be expected to appear more than it does is the promotion of the cult of the Holy Name of Jesus with which the Observance elsewhere is particularly associated. In England, as a liturgical devotion it had an independent history going back to the early fourteenth century and had numbered Richard Rolle among its devotees: but it had expressed emphases quite different from those associated with Bernardino of Siena and John Capistrano. Its spread - in an England largely unreceptive to such things - seems to belong mainly to the last decade of the fifteenth century and to have been chiefly associated with the Lady Margaret Beaufort:[62] and the Observants may have had a hand here. But apart from this the only thing to connect them with the

---

60. For some particularly outrageous examples see below, pp.181ff. Although less overtly seditious, Pecock's sermon at Winchester fits into this category.

61. 'Beryeng', p.88.

62. R. W. Pfaff, New Liturgical Feasts in Later Medieval England (Oxford, 1970), pp.62ff.

cult at all is the practice - pretty well universal among the friars themselves and widespread among their supporters - of heading their letters with the name `Jh[esu]s´. Otherwise, almost nothing remains. The English friars had, as far as one can see, no popular preacher of the calibre of a Bernardino of Siena or an Olivier Maillard: certainly none whose sermons achieved transcription and publication.63

Neither is it clear precisely to what extent they followed their forebears in refusing, out of humility, to exercise their rights under Super cathedram: though a mandate issued by Bishop Fox of Winchester to the parish clergy of his diocese in September 1511, charging them with the duty of ensuring ready access for Observant preachers to their churches and parishes, might suggest that the friars habitually deferred to their wishes.64

(iv) Offices, Chapters and the Enforcement of Discipline.

Another indicator of the Observants´ spiritual vitality lies in the way in which, in apparent contrast to the Conventuals, they made the system of chapters and offices work. The English friars had presumably begun holding an annual vicarial chapter as such with the establishment of the vicariate and their expansion beyond a single convent in 1499. By the early 1530s they were holding their annual chapter during the week prior to Michaelmas. Its location was subject to a measure of rotation - it was held at Richmond in 1532 and at Greenwich in 1533 - and the king provided an annual alms of £6.13s.4d. for its expenses.65

---

63. I exclude from consideration here Stephen Barons´ series of purely academic sermons, given before the University of Cambridge.

64. Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol. iii f.51v.

65. Below, pp.154n.,176n.

The provincial vicar - minister after 1517 - was to be elected from the body of the chapter by a simple majority. He was limited to a maximum of a single three-year term, subject to annual confirmation in office by the chapter:[66] and again the record, such as it is, suggests that these provisions were observed in England.[67] Here too we might note the contrast with the Conventuals: for after the Conventual ministers were succeded by the Observant superiors in 1517 and the requirement for confirmation in office was reversed it was apparently some fourteen years before the matter became an issue in England. When in 1531 the Conventuals finally found it necessary to elect a new minister - they refused to adopt the hated title `master´ - and the Observant minister insisted upon exercising his right of confirmation, they protested bitterly that the heirs to such a proud tradition should be made subservient to such a small body.[68]

Each convent was in the charge of a warden, who was responsible for the discipline of the house and for supervising the system of communal provision. The warden was to be seen as a `father´ to the friars of his convent, a metaphor reflected in the stress placed by the Barcelona statutes on his rôle in ensuring that all are properly cared-for out of the communal income of the house and that proper provision is made for the care of the sick, and in their stipulation that a warden may not provide for his own food and clothing until provision had been made for

---

66. 'Abbreviatio', vii.12-13.

67. cf. below, appendix 2.

68. G. Abate (ed.), `Lettera del P. Tommaso Cudvero [i.e. Cudnor] Vicario della Provincia Minoritica d´Inghilterra al Rev.mo Padre Ministro Generale dell´Ordine´ [5 June 1531], Miscellanea Francescana vol.xxix (Rome, 1929), pp.113-4. I am grateful to Dr. M. W. Sheehan for bringing this important letter to my attention.

all the friars in the community.[69] He was to be elected annually, on a day specified by the provincial vicar (or minister), to hold office for a term of a single year.[70] English practice was to elect officers for a convent from from among the whole membership of the vicariate (or province) and, again, the record suggests that the principle of annual rotation was adhered to, even if - understandably in such a small body - the same few individuals do crop up repeatedly. Here, so far as one can see, the record was held by Gabriel Pecock, who seems to have succeeded to the wardenships of Newark, Canterbury and Southampton in successive years in the early 1530s.

The warden was assisted by a vice-warden or vicar. Although, as Henry VIII was reminded in September 1532, this office was `ne de la Reigle ne des statuts´,[71] it was of long standing. Jean Brugman had regarded it as the office upon which, in large measure, the discipline of the convent depended.[72] Presumably it was subject to annual election in the same way as was the wardenship.

The body of the convent also elected a number of `seniors´ or `discreets´. In 1534 Richmond had four.[73] They were to be elected annually, and were required to be in priest´s orders and of long standing in the Order. They were to consult with the warden and vicar, prelates and

---

69. `Abbreviatio´, iv.11,13. English usage, particularly in wills, frequently refers to the `father of the house´.

70. Ibid., vii.1-2,4-7.

71. Jean de la Haye to Henry VIII ([29 September 1532]), PRO SP1/71 f.67 (=LP v.1358).

72. Goyens, (ed.), `Speculum Imperfectionis´, pp.622-3 (=Coulton, Five Centuries, iv.443).

73. Rowland Lee and Thomas Bedyll to Cromwell (15 June [1534]), BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.49r (=LP vii.841).

visitors of the Order on matters concerned with the promotion of friars to offices, the correction of delinquents and other `gravibus negotiis´; and they were to represent the convent at the annual provincial chapter at which, in every third year, one would be elected from among them to act with the provincial vicar at the general chapter.[74]

The warden, vicar and discreets together directed the affairs of the convent and, by delegation, the vicariate and province. Corporately - and rather confusingly in relation to the later usage of the term to denote priesthood - they were known as the `fathers´ of the house and of the province, though Henry VII refers to the `fader and the rulers´ of the Greenwich house in his will in 1509.[75]

Where the workings of the system of discipline are concerned, there is very little to go on. By its very nature the process was secretive, and traces only appear where disgruntled individuals revealed something of its workings to outsiders in an attempt to discredit the system. From their unique perspective Roy and Barlow describe its workings[76] in terms which suggest a distinct lack of charity:

> `With grevous malice and rancour,
> One agaynst another dothe murmour,
> Full of craft and inconstancy.
> They have nether drede nor shame,
> Their faultles brethren to defame,
> Havynge none occasion why.
> Yonge men agaynst their superiors,
> And prelates agaynst their inferiours,
> One at another hath envy.
> In chapters and visitacions,
> They vse wrong accusations;
> With many slanderous iniuries
> They execute sharpe correccions,
> To ponysshe the transgressions
> Of their fantastycke ceremonyes´.

---

74. `Abbreviatio´, viii.6.

75. Astle (ed.), Will of Henry VII, p.30.

76. `Beryeng´, p.90.

They were not the only ones who thought the discipline misapplied. In February 1533 friar Richard Lyst complained to Thomas Cromwell of the death of one of his brethren in prison at Greenwich,[77] lamenting `the offens agaynst God, owre neybowr or brother, that men shuld be so punyshid and yntretyd amonge us, and for so light a cause to be put yn jebordy both of sowle and body´. Lyst does not reveal the exact nature of this `light cause´, but this had not been the only death in custody among the friars. On another occasion he refers to another death at Richmond sixteen years before this.[78] There had also been a number of cases of apostasy. Nineteen brothers had abandoned Greenwich rather than submit to visitation by Cardinal Wolsey in 1525.[79] And Lyst complained[80] that within the previous nine months five brothers - three from Greenwich and two from Richmond - had gone `over the watter owt of owre relygyon´ and had obtained dispensations from their habits. `I thynke´, he writes, `yf thay had byn well yntreted of owre fathers they wold not have takyn that way´. These particular apostasies probably had specific causes, which will be referred to in their places. But they, and certain other events of the 1530s which will be referred to later, serve to demonstrate that the system relied crucially upon the charity of those involved; which - such is human frailty - was sometimes lacking.

Nevertheless, in spite of these lapses the system clearly worked, at least insofar as the province seems on the whole to have maintained its

---

77. Lyst to Cromwell (4 February [1533]), BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.35 (=LP vi.116).

78. The same to the same (18 February [1533]), ibid., ff.33-4 (=LP vi.168).

79. 'Grey Friar's Chronicle', p.190.

80. Lyst to Cromwell (18 February [1533]).

standards remarkably well. In the first place, while it is quite impossible to make any kind of precise quantitative assessment of the friars' income in relation to their needs, they clearly succeeded in large measure in remaining poor; to the extent that, as Henry VII put it in his will in 1509,[81]

> `though the same frers be sometymes and for the more partie sufficiently after their necessite succoured, releved and purveid; yet know we experimently by the secrete conversacion that we have had with the said freres, that had ne been other privie souccours and releves diverse tymes made to theim in their extreme neds, thei had diverse and many tymes be in manifest perill of ruyne and daungier of perdicion for lack of fode'.

In the second place, the English friars clearly enjoyed a high popular reputation for the standard of their life. Roy and Barlow are forced to acknowledge that `the worlde doth theym preferre / For their wholy conversacion'; and they make it clear that this view extended from the court to the poorest in society,[82] thereby rather making a mockery of their detailed accusations of hypocrisy. There is some confirmation of this in the extent to which testators preferred the Observants to the other Orders of friars;[83] and the quality of their life was such that contemporaries routinely associated them with those contemporary paragons of observant religion the Carthusians and the Bridgettines of Syon,[84] with whom, as the next section of this chapter will suggest, they also shared certain characteristics in the area of recruitment.

---

81. Astle (ed.), op. cit., p.31.

82. 'Beryeng', pp.75,80-1,88.

83. J. A. F. Thomson, `Piety and Charity in Later Medieval London', Journal of Ecclesiastical History vol. xvi (1965), pp.189-90.

84. See the Benedictines' complaint to Cardinal Wolsey against his attempts to reform them, and the comparison of the three Orders made by

(v) Population and Recruitment.

As an outgrowth of the province of Cologne, at its inception the embryo vicariate was composed entirely of Low-Countries friars; and for the first few decades of its existence it remained essentially a foreign community. In its early years it imported a few friars from the earlier-established province of Scotland: one, Donald Gilbert, was warden of Greenwich in 1494 and another, Lawrence Scot, served a term as provincial vicar shortly after the turn of the sixteenth century. The first Englishman to join the Order in England[85] was Thomas Cotton, a Bachelor of Theology and formerly a fellow of King's College, Cambridge, who must have done so at some time between his last appearance in the Cambridge records in 1485-6 and the appearance in the London episcopal registers of other friars with apparently English names in 1493-4.[86] In its later years the province was predominantly English in composition, although Scottish, Low-Countries and the odd French names continue to appear to the end.[87]

Henry VII's foundation charter for Greenwich specifies that the convent is to consist of a warden and twelve friars at least; and this was probably the number of friars who had crossed to England in

---

Reginald Pole in his Pro ecclesiae unitate defensione, cited in RO, iii.159 & n.6. Pole made the same comparison in a speech to the citizens of London in defence of the religious houses in 1557 (J. Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials (Oxford, 1822), iii(ii).496).

85. But see `Introduction' (1), pp.465-6 for a Somerset man who entered the convent of St. Catherine at Galatina c.1493.

86. William Elliot first appears in June 1493; Raphael (Thomas) Garnett, Henry York and Richard Morecrofte in May 1494 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.28r,30r).

87. eg. Francis Dundye, Andrew Donall, Judocus Amsterdam. There was an un-named Scottish friar at Newark in 1534 (information against the Vicar of Newark, PRO SP1/88 ff.235-6 (= LP vii.261)).

1482.[88] The growth of their numbers from this point onwards is difficult to chart with any accuracy. The episcopal ordination lists demonstrate that in the early days a fair number of young lay friars was sent to England from the Low Countries; but the list is probably incomplete and in any case it is impossible to say how many older priest-friars accompanied them. The precise meaning of the king's statement in 1497 that the Greenwich house was then full is unclear.[89] Some young friars were sent to populate the newly-transferred convents of Canterbury, Newcastle and Southampton;[90] and with the additions of these and the new foundation at Richmond, the London ordination lists reveal a substantial rise in the number of recruits, both English and foreign, in the first years of the sixteenth century. Seven new names appear in the London registers in 1500, and eleven on 27 March 1501 alone.[91] In subsequent years the London and Winchester registers in particular continue to record a handful of new names each year, though there is a marked decline in the recorded numbers of ordinations after the mid-1520s.

However it is possible to arrive at a reasonable estimate of the ultimate size of the province by other means. In the first place one can estimate the probable maximum capacities of the various houses. We know that ultimately the Greenwich friary was large enough to enable Queen Mary to re-instal 25 friars in it in 1555 and shortly afterwards

---

88. Ed. J. Burtt in Archaeological Journal vol. xxiii (1866), p.58.

89. `Introduction' (1), p.463. The number of ordinations recorded in the surviving registers of the period equals the number of deaths returned in the general chapters, as recorded by Glassberger's chronicle.

90. cf. Reg. Foxe, Durham, p.151.

91. Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.67r-v.

to increase that number.[92] Given the circumstances of its foundation, it is reasonable to suppose that the Richmond house was as large. And the three houses taken over from the Conventuals were not dissimilar in capacity: both Newcastle and Canterbury had housed at least 30 friars in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries; though Southampton, on a very restricted site, may have housed fewer.[93] The house at Newark, barely begun at the time of Henry VII's death and with a life of less than three decades from its foundation to the suppression of the English Observance in 1534, probably remained comparatively small. Together, the putative capacities of the six houses might total somewhere in the region of 150-170 friars: a figure which receives some confirmation from a survey of friars extant at the time of the province's demise in 1534, which the present author has compiled chiefly from materials in the State Papers and which is given below as appendix 6. Although inevitably less than complete, this too gives a total of somewhere over 150 friars.

Probably a large majority of these men were priests. Although the ultramontane friars recognised the value of men whose vocation was to the lay-brotherhood - and allowed them a remarkably full share in the life of the friary[94] - lay-brothers were primarily a feature of the

---

92. Giovanni Michiel to the Doge and Senate (4 November 1555), CSP Venetian 1555-6, no.269.

93. D. Knowles and R. N. Hadcock (eds.), Medieval Religious Houses, England and Wales (2nd edition, London, 1972), p.226; Cotton, pp.31-2. The minister's accounts compiled after the dissolution record the area of the Southampton house as 1 acre and a `washing yard' (`Introduction' (1),p.464).

94. They had, for example, a voice in the election of discreets, though not of the warden of a house ('Abbreviatio', vii.2, viii.6), and Richard Lyst regularly accompanied friar Forest on preaching trips to St. Paul's Cross (Lyst to Thomas Cromwell (7 November [1532]), BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv. f.32 (= LP v.1525)).

eremetic strain within the Order and as such more characteristic of the cismontane family. While a number do appear in the 1530s sources, it is clear that in general they are young friars not yet ready to proceed to orders. And in fact the only older lay-brother of whom we know is Richard Lyst, who remained as such only because he was ineligible for the priesthood due to his having been party to a contract of marriage, and, as soon as the impediment was removed by the death of the lady concerned, expressed his intention of taking orders.

The Order's recruitment of Englishmen was probably substantially based upon the local areas of the individual friaries, although this is hard to pin down. With the odd early exception the English friars did not follow the custom of their Low-Countries brethren in adopting the common religious practice of taking as a surname the name of their place of origin. Instead they retained their family surnames: and by this time an English surname of geographical origin is far from being a guarantee of a particular place of birth. So although there are some names which suggest local origins - for example Sydenham and Crayford (Craforthe) in the case of Greenwich, Elston and Creswell in the case of Newark - their appearance does not in itself prove the proposition. We are, though, on rather firmer ground in the particular case of London, adjacent to both Greenwich and Richmond. A number of friars who will play substantial rôles in the story of the province's last years - William Roy, John West, John Lawrence, Richard Lyst, Francis Lybert - can be identified as Londoners, frequently from mercantile or craft backgrounds.

However, here as elsewhere the issue is complicated by the friars' close connection with the court. West's stepfather, a former Lord Mayor of London, was at the same time a prominent member of the Goldsmith's

Company who had carried out many royal commissions in his time. Lyst was a former `s[er]vant´ of (by which he evidently means a supplier to) Cardinal Wolsey. John Flegh may have belonged to the family of John Fligh, a yeoman of the wardrobe under Henry VII, as well as apparently being connected with a senior member of the Merchant Adventurers´ Company. Nottinghamshire gave the Order both a Meering and a Pierrepont (Perpoynt); but both families were active in court circles in the last years of Henry VII´s reign, and indeed both were probably involved with the foundation of the Newark convent.

These last were not unique. Given the court connection, it is hardly surprising that the Order attracted into its ranks a number of men who might be described as `of good family´. One was Raphael (Reginald) Sandys - described as `nobilis vir´, but whose precise origins are unknown - who was ordained as a Greenwich friar in 1521-2. He evidently did not find the life of a friar to his liking, for he was dispensed from his habit in 1528 and is subsequently found as incumbent of parishes in Wiltshire and Berkshire. In general, though, even where there are strong grounds for suspecting a particular family connection, the link is impossible to prove: it is commonly the case that, even where the family itself has been well documented, its celibate religious members, being of no genealogical significance, have escaped notice. A case in point is Bernardine (Roger) Covert, whom strong circumstantial evidence points to as a member of the West Sussex family of that name, but who quite escaped the attention of the family´s historians. Covert, incidentally, illustrates a further pitfall for the unwary in the English friars´ sporadic adoption of names in religion in place of their baptismal forenames. But he is an exception to the general rule. For the most part we are left with no more than a collection of tantal-

ising possibilities. One provincial vicar, Stephen Barons, may have been related to a bishop of London; while another, Francis Frowick, was probably related to the precocious Sir Thomas, erstwhile chief justice of the Common Pleas. And while it would be unwise to press the point too far, the number of similarities between other friars' surnames and those of members of court, craft and legal circles - among them Curzon, Forest and Kebyll - is probably more than coincidental.

Probably many of the friars were recruited as youths, though the statutes clearly laid down that none was to be taken in under the age of sixteen.[95] But it is a measure of the Observants' general reputation that they also recruited a significant number of late vocations. A rough guide to the extent of this practice can probably be obtained from a survey of the speed with which recruits were passed through the degrees of ordination:[96] and a number of individual cases stand out. The lay-brother Richard Lyst had been a grocer and apothecary in Cheapside. Others came from the ranks of the secular clergy. Francis Lybert apparently entered the Order while already in major orders. Alexander Holden MA, rector of St. John Baptist, Southampton, joined the friars in 1529; and Thomas Courteney, Bachelor of Canon Law and formerly chaplain, later fellow, of Winchester College, in 1533.

Holden and Courtenay point to an important characteristic of this particular tendency. In common with the contemporary Carthusians and Bridgettines, the Observants held a special attraction for University graduates, many of whom had distinguished academic careers behind them

---

95. 'Abbreviatio', i.1.

96. The assumption here is that a roughly annual rate of ordination implies that the candidate was of the minimum canonical ages necessary to proceed to each degree of ordination.

and who by virtue of their background are unusually well documented. In this respect Thomas Cotton established a trend. As well as Cotton, Cambridge gave the Order John Ryckes, Bachelor of Theology, sometime fellow of Corpus Christi College and twice University preacher. Oxford produced Thomas Person, formerly fellow of Merton, and Richard Risby, son of a tenant of Winchester College who had benefitted from the connection to become first scholar of Winchester and then successively scholar and fellow of New College. William Peto, a member of a prominent Warwickshire family and related to the Throckmortons, who was to be the last English-born provincial before the cataclysm of 1534, joined the Order after a distinguished career in both Universities: at Cambridge he had been fellow of Queens' College, lecturer in mathematics and University preacher. Others probably had University backgrounds of which no detailed record remains. Stephen Barons, provincial vicar at the time of Henry VII's death and confessor to Henry VIII at the start of his reign, gave a series of fifteen scholarly sermons at Cambridge which bear the imprint of a University man. Henry Elston may at one time have been a fellow of Peterhouse; while others like Gabriel (William) Pecock and Thomas Roche can be tentatively identified with individuals who appear in the Universities' records; and others still, like Francis Frowick and John Forest, have still more murky backgrounds reflected only in references to them by titles such as `Dominus', `Magister' and `Doctor'.

(vi) The friars and the Court.

It is impossible to say very much about patronage of the friars among the population in general, other than that for the most part the evidence supplied by wills suggests a popularity that was overwhelmingly local to the immediate areas of the friaries and which tended to issue in bequests of a conventional nature.

But there is plenty of evidence when it comes to relations between the friars and the court. In view of what has already been said about the circumstances of the vicariate's origins as an element in the establishment of the Tudor <u>régime</u> and a manifestation of religious patronage as an aspect of statecraft, it is hardly surprising that both Henry VII and his son maintained a policy of strong support for the friars - a policy amply, though no doubt far from comprehensively, documented in the surviving sources - and that their interest was reflected in court circles generally.

From an early date the friars can be found playing a rôle in the public piety of the early Tudor court. At the age of 79, Bishop Fox of Winchester recalled having baptised the future Henry VIII in the friary church at Greenwich in 1491;[97] and Henry's short-lived younger brother Edward, Duke of Somerset, was christened there on 24 February 1499.[98] As well as his other gestures to the Aragon marriage, Henry VII retained an Observant as his confessor during the first years of the sixteenth century. And ironically it was this un-named friar who in

---

97. Recorded in the proceedings of the legatine court, 1529, PRO SP1/54 f.356v (=<u>LP</u> iv(iii).5791 (p.2588).

98. Stow, p.475.

1502 was charged with breaking the news of Prince Arthur's death to the King, the event which shattered the dynastic hopes of which the friars' turn-of-the-century expansion was a reflection.[99]

The dynastic element was reflected in the East window which the king provided at about the same time for the friars' church at Greenwich,[100] in which he was to be depicted twice, once with his queen, amid a plethora of ancient sainted royalty of more-or-less dubious authenticity. Less ostentatiously, the accounts of the king's Chamber reveal him, from the mid-1490s on, making major contributions both to the fabric of the friaries[101] and in alms for the sustenance of their inmates.[102] At this distance the precise purposes of many of the payments recorded are impossible to unravel; but a measure of their closeness to the crown can be found in the fact that in these accounts the Greenwich Observants are frequently referred to simply as `the friars'.

---

99. S. B. Chrimes, Henry VII (London, 1972), pp.302-3. A series of monthly payments to one John Whiting for boarding first two, then one Observant friar from July 1501 until June 1502 may relate to the confessor and his companion (PRO E101/415/3 ff.62v-99v).

100. Printed in H. H. Drake (ed.), Hasted's History of Kent vol.i (London, 1886), pp.86-7 n.2. The window was to include the king's daughter Margaret, but no trace is to be seen of either of his sons or of Katherine of Aragon, which probably dates the instruction to between the death of Arthur in March 1502 and the death of Elizabeth of York in February 1503.

101. The king paid £40 for the Greenwich and Southampton houses - probably for building work - in March 1500; £13.6s.8d. in May 1502 and £44.12s.1 1/2d. for `diu[er]se tables' for the friars' church at Richmond in March 1507 (PRO E101/415/3 ff.15r, 95v; E36/214 f.69v).

102. 40s. went to the proctor of the Greenwich friars in May 1497; £4.6s.8d. to the same house and 6s.8d. simply to `the friars' in December 1500; 66s.8d. to the Canterbury house in March 1501; 13s.4d. for cheese for the friars in June 1501 and 40s. for the Greenwich friars in October 1507 (PRO E101/414/6 f.70v; E101/415/3 ff.37v, 41v, 44v, 55v; E36/214 f.51v).

Henry carried his support over into the international arena, where he became a reliable and outspoken protagonist of the Observants' cause in the course of their disputes with the Conventuals. As has been mentioned in the previous chapter, he was one of those who wrote to Rome following the vicar-generals' appeals for support against the activities of Giles Delfini and Boniface of Ceva in 1504. Here the chronicler Glassberger marks him out from a long list of supporters by repeating his claim that rather than lose the five reformed convents in his kingdom he would expel from his realm all the Conventual friars from 50 convents,[103] a statement which squares with the similarly extravagant language of his letter to Alexander VI in 1497.[104] Later in that year, on 5 December, he directed another letter to Louis XII of France,[105] from which it appears that Delfini had managed to gain Louis' support for his reforming measures and had persuaded Louis to write to Henry soliciting his support for the minister and asking him to write to Rome to back-up his efforts. Henry's answer is forthright. He is adamant that the Observants set the standard by which all others are to be judged. He will be happy if the Conventual friaries are reformed so as to match their standards, but not otherwise. He will continue to support the Observants and he begs Louis to do the same. Not unreasonably, the modern editor of this letter has said of it that `elle restera un des plus beaux monuments à la gloire de l'Observance'.

---

103. Glassberger, p.542; cf. the more restrained tones of the contemporary letter of James IV of Scotland, printed in Bryce, Scottish Grey Friars, ii.267-8 (English translation ibid., i.91-3).

104. `Introduction' (2), p.163.

105. F. Delorme (ed.), `Documents pour l'histoire du Bienheureux Gabriel-Maria,' La France Franciscaine vol.xi (1928), pp.245-6.

Later, he was obviously moved to complain to the pope against Boniface of Ceva's activities, for in February 1509 Julius II wrote to reassure him that he had no intention of either revoking or diluting any of the provisions of Cum multae.[106]

Given the particular nature of Henry VII's religious temper, it is more than usually difficult to unravel the public and the private elements of his devotions. For unequivocal signs of the latter we have to wait for the last years of the king's life when, a sick man, he began to ponder his approaching death. During these years he began commissioning large numbers of masses from the friars for his own benefit: 1000 in April 1507 and 2000 each in March 1508 and March 1509.[107] And the will which he made in April 1509 contains his final, and perhaps his most revealing acts of generosity towards them.[108] Here again, expressing his `speciall confidence and trust' in the friars' `devoute praiers', he ordains masses to be said by them: five hundred each by the friars of Richmond and Greenwich, three hundred each by the friars of the other four houses. He appoints their provincial, Stephen Barons, one of a number of commissioners deputed to deal with claims against his executors for the rectifying of injustices; and he goes on to bequeath the sum of £200, to be bestowed by his executors on behalf

---

106. H. Lippens, `Jean Glapion, defenseur de la Réforme de l'Observance', AFH vol.xliv (1951), p.48.

107. The king paid £16.13s.4d. for masses said and sung in July 1507; the payments in respect of masses in April 1507, March 1508 and March 1509 were made at the rate of £25 per thousand. He also paid 10s. for a trental performed by the Richmond friars for the soul of Lady Bray in January 1508 and a similar sum, probably for the same purpose to the Greenwich friars a year later (Chamber accounts, PRO E36/214 ff.73r, 87r, 114v,122v,156v, 163r).

108. Astle (ed.), Will of Henry VII, pp.29ff.

of the Greenwich friars on the enclosure of their garden and orchard with a brick wall,

> `or about other things as by the fader and the rulers of the said house shall be thought most consonant to the laude of God, helth of our soule, and the weale of the said house and freres´

together with a similar sum to Richmond and 100 marks each to the houses of Canterbury, Newcastle and Southampton. His fears for the adequacy of their means of sustenance moved him to leave still more substantial sums in trust for the needs of the various houses: each was to be allocated £200 except Richmond, which was to receive 500 marks.

The scale of these bequests supplies impressive testimony to Henry´s regard for the Observants: they were by far the most favoured religious beneficiaries of his will. But at the same time, gifts of this size - particularly those intended for their day-to-day support - must have been something of an embarrassment to the friars themselves; and it may well have been at their request that his wishes were not in fact carried out in their entirety. The former bequest was reduced to the sum of 500 marks, to be spread among the five friaries; and there is no sign that the latter amounts were paid at all.[109]

Henry VIII´s first gestures of support for the friars might perhaps be put down to filial piety. It was probably at his dying father´s wish that he employed Barons as his confessor at the start of the reign - a responsibility which in part the friar discharged by compiling a treatise on kingship for the young king´s benefit - and he commissioned from the friars anniversary masses for the benefit of his father´s

---

109. Warrants under sign manual (6 June and 21 July [1509]), PRO SP1/1 ff.32,66 (=LP i(i).58,115): for these payments, see above, p.59.

soul.[110] But throughout the earlier part of the reign he fully maintained the traditions which his father had established. Under the new king the Observants and the Greenwich and Richmond friaries retained their court rôle. Again, both churches were used for royal christenings. The short-lived Prince Henry was christened in the friary church at Richmond in January 1511 and both the Princesses Mary and Elizabeth were christened in the church at Greenwich, in February 1516 and September 1533 respectively.[111] And it is likely that both king and queen frequently attended services and sermons in the friars' churches. The probable existence of a royal oratory at Richmond has already been mentioned;[112] while it was a sermon given in front of the king by the provincial minister, William Peto, in 1532 which was the first public indication of the opposition to the king's divorce proposal which was ultimately to lead to the province's suppression.

The king continued to make contributions towards the upkeep and improvement of the friars' houses - possibly including the rather ironic donation of a lantern and pulpit for the Greenwich church in

---

110. For two masses daily from Easter 1509 to Easter 1510 each house received £13.6s.8d. In addition Greenwich received £8.6s.8d. for 500 masses, probably on the anniversary of Henry VII's death (Chamber accounts, BL MS Add. 21481 f.28r/PRO E36/215 f.55r (=LP ii(ii), p.1445)).

111. For prince Henry, BL MS Add. 6113 ff.79v-80r (=LP i.670); for Mary, BL MS Harley 3504 ff.226-7 (=LP ii(i).1573); for Elizabeth, Hall's Chronicle, pp.805-6 and the various accounts calendared in LP vi.1111.

112. Above, p.38.

1531[113] - and towards the maintenance of their services:[114] and in the early 1530s he was making what looks like a regular annual payment prior to Michaelmas of £6.13s.4d. in alms for the holding of the provincial chapter.[115] He also continued to give aid to the friars' overseas brethren: both material - towards the building of a friary church in Brittany, to the friars maintaining the Holy Sepulchre in Palestine and to the relief of famine-ridden Irish friaries[116] - and diplomatic. In April 1511 he is found complaining to Louis XII about Boniface of Ceva's activities and once again soliciting his support for the Observants.[117] His letter to Leo X of March 1514, whose effusive praise of the friars' merits has frequently been quoted as an example of his

---

113. He paid £46.14s. 5d. for works at the Richmond friary in July 1511 and other sums for repairs to and the `ceiling' of the friars' wharf at Greenwich in May 1514 and March 1519 (Chamber accounts, BL MS Add.21481 ff. 64r, 155r/ PRO E36/ 215 ff. 127r, 155r; PRO E36/ 216 f. 77r (=LP ii(ii), pp.1451, 1464; iii(ii), p.1535). For the lantern and pulpit, A. G. l'Estrange, The Palace and the Hospital (London, 1880), i.242 (although the author cites no source for this).

114. He gave 100 pounds of wax to the Greenwich friars in July 1511 and December 1512 at a cost of 58s. and 48s. respectively (Chamber accounts, BL MS Add. 21481 ff.64r,109r/PRO E36/215 ff.127r,217r (=LP ii(ii), pp.1451,1458)).

115. Warrant under sign manual (26 September [1532]), PRO E101/421/5 no.16 (=LP v.1346): referred to (as dated 16 September) in a list of warrants in the possession of Cromwell's servant John Williamson (PRO E36/141 p.44 (=LP v.1258 (p.558))). The warrant in respect of the 1533 chapter at Greenwich is referred to in a list of warrants in Cromwell's hand, dated August 1533 by LP (PRO SP1/78 f.244r (=LP vi.1057)).

116. In October 1515 he paid £6.13s.4d. to two Breton Observants for the building of their church; in November 1516, according to Anthony Parkinson, he granted an annual pension of 1000 crowns to the friars maintaining the Holy sepulchre; and in March 1531 he licensed the friars of two Irish houses to import beans and malt from England in order to relieve famine (Chamber accounts, BL MS Add. 21481 f.202r/PRO E36/215 f.405r (=LP ii(ii), p.1469); Parkinson, p.218; LP v.166(34)).

117. PRO Paris transcripts, PRO 31/3/1 no.15 (=LP i(i).740): 13 April 1511.

devotion to them, is in fact an appeal for the Pope's support for a number of convents in the province of Cologne against Conventual harassment, a cause in which he also briefed his ambassador in Rome, the Bishop of Worcester, Silvestro de'Gigli.[118] These letters represent by no means all of those which Henry and his queen sent in support of the friars. In the 1514 letter the king refers to the number of previous occasions on which he has signified to the Pope his regard for them; and both he and the queen sent letters to Rome in support of the Observants at the time of the capitulum generalissimum of 1517.[119]

In its turn the monarchy found the friars useful agents in its own causes. In October 1513 the provincial vicar, Bonaventure Langley, travelled to Scotland, ostensibly carrying a message of condolence from Katherine of Aragon to Queen Margaret following James IV's death at Flodden. But since he was expected to bring back intelligence concerning the political alignment of Margaret and the Scottish Council, it seems that there was more to it than that.[120] At the start of 1515 Langley travelled to France with another friar, Francis Frowick (who was to succeed him as provincial) to try to dissuade Louis XII's widow, Henry VIII's sister Mary, from marrying Charles Brandon, Duke of Suf-

---

118. BL MS Add. 15387 f.17 (=Ellis (3rd series) i.165-8; LP i(ii).2715): 12 March [1514]. There is an edition of the Vatican copy, by P. J. Meseguer Fernandez, in AFH vol.xliv (1951), pp.476-80.

119. Sil[vestro de'Gigli] to Henry VIII (Rome, 17 June 1517), PRO SP1/15 ff.178-9 (=LP ii(ii).3374).

120. Langley probably carried letters from Katherine dated 18 October, which Margaret received on 6 November. He was on his way to Scotland via Carlisle by 24 October and had seen Margaret by 11 November, when she wrote to Katherine thanking her for her message (Margaret to Katherine of Aragon (Perth, 11 November [1513]), PRO SP49/1 f.19 (=LP i(ii).2440); Thomas [Ruthal, bishop of] Durham to [Wolsey] (24 October [1513]), BL MS Cotton Caligula B.vi ff.45-6 (=LP i(ii).2394); the same to Henry VIII (1 November [1513]), BL MS Cotton Caligula B.ii f.300 (=LP i(ii).2423)).

folk. Their mission was not well received - Brandon complained in a histrionic outburst that Langley had claimed that he and Wolsey meddled with the Devil - and to Henry's displeasure the marriage went ahead.[121]

It is only to be expected that the exceptional favour shown to the friars by the first two Tudors should have been reflected more generally in court circles. Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk, was a friend of friar Forest whose friendship seems to have lasted - despite the conflict of loyalties involved once the Observants had been redefined as the ing's enemies - until the friar's execution in 1538.[122] His sister Muriel, wife of Sir Thomas Knevet, was buried in the Greenwich friary church in December 1512.[123] The Lisles were regarded as founders of the Canterbury house;[124] and both Henry VIII's attorney-general Sir Christopher Hales and his cousin John, second baron of the Exchequer - members of a prominent Kentish family - appear as supporters of the Observants at Canterbury in their quarrel with the Conventual warden imposed upon the convent in 1534-5.[125] The most conspicuous individual example is that of Thomas, Lord Darcy. His papers - which fortuitously fell into the hands of the crown after his conviction for treason in

---

121. Suffolk to Henry VIII ([c. January 1515]), BL MS Cotton Caligula D.vi f.184v (=LP ii(i).80 (p.26)); the same to [Wolsey] ([?8 February 1515]), ibid. f.191 (=LP ii(i).138).

122. cf. Richard Lyst to Thomas Cromwell (4 February [1533]), BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.35 (=LP vi.116) and M. A. S. Hume (trs.), A Chronicle of King Henry the Eighth, in Spanish (London, 1889), pp.80-1.

123. Martin, `Greenwich', p.100.

124. Bernardine Covert to Lady Lisle (13 June 1534), PRO SP3/10 f.76 (=LP vii.837).

125. Friar Thomas Arthur to one Prows (8 November [1535]), PRO SP1/99 ff.11-12 (=LP ix.789(1)).

1537 - suggest a pattern of what look like regular payments of alms extending over a number of years;[126] and he also favoured the friars when commissioning masses.[127] His second wife Edith was buried at the Greenwich friary in August 1529 and before his own execution in June 1537 he requested that he should be buried with her: but his plea was rejected, and in the event he was buried at St. Botolph's, Aldgate.[128]

Apart from these individual examples, a broader picture of the range of the Observants' court contacts is supplied by a list of names of those to whom the warden of Richmond, Hugh Rich, was alleged to have revealed the treasonous prophecy of the `Nun of Kent' in 1533: a list which includes the names of the countess of Salisbury, Lord and Lady Hussey, the Marquess of Exeter, Lady Derby, Lady Bellingham, Sir Thomas Arundel, Sir George Carew and others.[129] And the Beryeng of the masse underlines the friars' attractions to `ladys and gentill wemen'.[130]

---

126. At Michaelmas 1520 Darcy made payments to Greenwich, Richmond, Southampton and Newark for a `half year' totalling £6.13s.4d.; in January 1522 John Scryvener, warden of Southampton, issued a receipt to him for a grant of £3.6s.8d. `by the wey of almes for the yere of o[u]r Lord 1521'; and in September 1526 payments to Richmond, Greenwich, Southampton and Canterbury of 5 marks each are recorded (PRO SP1/22 f.23v (=LP iii(i).1261); SP1/23 f.273 (=LP iii(ii).1975); SP1/39 f.189 (=LP iv(ii).2527)).

127. Probably at the start of 1522 he wrote to an unidentified warden - probably of Newark or Newcastle - concerning masses which he was sworn to have said for his deceased fellow-knights of the Garter (PRO SP1/122 f.32 (=LP xii(ii).186(22))). 66s.8d. in fees paid to the Newark friary - of an `extraordinary' nature - in September 1526 probably also relate to masses (SP1/39 f.188 (=LP iv(ii).2527)).

128. G. E. C[okayne], The Complete Peerage (ed. V. Gibbs et al., London, 1910-59), iv.74; PRO SP1/121 f.1 (=LP xii(ii).1).

129. PRO SP1/80 ff.126,130-1r,134 (=LP vi.1468(1-3)).

130. `Beryeng', p.84.

Of course the attentions of king and court laid the friars open to the temptation to acquire something of a taste for the good life, to which the authors of the Beryeng of the Masse would have us believe they succumbed wholeheartedly. Roy and Barlow accuse the friars of roistering with wealthy patrons in the guest-chamber and of being partial to `daynties / Sent from dyvers lordes and ladyes / Their wholy suffrages to procure'. They claim that when on the road friars will take care to seek out `gentilmens' habitacions' where they can be sure of being splendidly treated. They accuse them of fawning over benefactors - especially women - and of taking care never to criticise their moral failings.[131] But these accusations should serve more as an illustration of the dangers of abuse rather than of common practice. There are in fact no real grounds for believing that the friars allowed themselves to be led by willing patrons into a luxurious lifestyle: in the circumstances they can only be admired for their ability so successfully to remain poor in the midst of riches.

But one specific criticism deserves more attention. Roy and Barlow accuse the friars[132] of having fallen foul of the vice of individual patronage:

> `In eny covent where they be,
> Very feawe of theym thou shalt se,
> But have a frende temporally.
> To whom for every tryfill vayne,
> That commeth once into their brayne,
> Yf by wrytynge they signify,
> Though it cost a noble or twayne,
> By and by they shall it attayne,
> Not foarsyng what is layde oute'.

---

131. Ibid., pp.79, 82-4.

132. Ibid., p.87.

If there is any truth in this, then it laid open the prospect of competition among the friars for patronage and status. Roy and Barlow are, of course, anxious to confirm this suspicion:[133]

> `With all diligence they laboure
> To obtayne noblemens´ favoure
> And to be ladys´ confessours.
> In soche matters dayly they boste
> Who with grett estates maye do moste,
> Reckenynge theymselve wyse seniours´.

And if their description of the cut-throat nature of elections to office[134] bears little relation to reality, there is at least some suggestion of a consciousness of status among the friars in the tendency of individuals to enumerate their offices and status when writing to patrons.

And in fact there are in the 1520s and 1530s a few cases of individual patronal relationships. On occasion these could arise from a friar´s previous career: Richard Lyst had been a grocer and apothecary and a servant to Cardinal Wolsey, a connection which in due course was inherited at a fortuitous moment by Wolsey´s successor, Thomas Cromwell. Sometimes the assistance of a patron was necessary to enable a friar to discharge family commitments. Lyst relied on the help of Anne Boleyn to keep his poor mother; John Lawrence had a poor brother in London, for whom he solicited Cromwell´s aid to help him in his occupation. At the other end of the scale Wolsey´s factotum John West is found soliciting the Cardinal´s aid in a testamentary dispute, the details of which reveal him inheriting, buying and selling property in

---

133. Ibid., p.83.

134. Ibid., pp.89-90.

a manner most unexpected of an Observant Franciscan.[135]

We have no way of knowing how widespread this phenomenon was: West in particular is no doubt quite an exceptional case. But it does not take a moment's reflection on the names of these patrons and the relations which they enjoyed with the friars to see that these attachments represented a dangerous division of loyalties and a threat to communal discipline.

(vi) Learning and the Intellectual Climate.

One of the more enduring fallacies concerning the English Observants has been an implicit assumption of their willing co-existence with their Conventual counterparts: and nowhere has this been more so than in the area of the friars' academic activity. The general assumption may have been born of no more than an absence of much evidence of the kind of conflict seen on the Continent. And insofar as this was in fact the case, no doubt it can be accounted for by the strength of the royal support given to the Observant minority, although, as we have seen, signs of conflict between the parties are not altogether lacking. In the particular area of education and learning, the fallacy seems to have been based upon no more than Anthony Wood's naïve assumption that friar Forest, whom contemporaries knew as `doctor', had studied at the Oxford Greyfriars:[136] while in his early work on the Oxford friars A. G. Little claimed that the Observants were largely uninterested in study and used the appearance of a few former Observants there at the time of the dissolution in 1538 to suggest that what students they did

---

135. West to Wolsey (8 February 1529 [sic]), PRO SP1/52 ff.229-30 (=LP iv.5275).

136. cit. BRUO iv.

produce were sent to the Oxford house.[137]

It is true that, historically, the Observants' attitude towards academic study had always been somewhat ambiguous. In response to the charge which the Conventuals had laid against them at the Council of Basel in 1435, that they had no masters of theology and were unwilling to study, they had retorted that the Conventuals had excluded them from the studia.[138] But it is true - as they admitted - that they were not keen on establishing too close an aquaintance with the Universities. For one thing, it will be remembered that the early French Observants had rejected formal degrees as a form of vanity. For another: to generalise, not only were the Franciscan schools in the Universities, to an extent like the Universities themselves, becoming torpid, complacent and outdated in their thinking, but the relaxation of observance deemed necessary to support the advancement of learning had turned, in many of the University houses, into flagrant abuse. Olivier Maillard was scathing in his condemnation of places like the Great Convent of Paris at the end of the fifteenth century;[139] and in fact, when seen in this light, the state of affairs which Dr. Little uncovered at Oxford early in the sixteenth century supplies sufficient reason for disbelieving the assertion that the Observants ever studied with their Conventual counterparts here.[140]

On the other hand, while they were concerned lest an over-emphasis upon academic activity should interfere with their devotional life, the

---

137. A. G. Little, The Grey Friars in Oxford (Oxford Historical Society vol. xx, 1892), p.88.

138. Glassberger, p.297.

139. A. Renaudet, Préréforme et Humanisme à Paris (Paris, 1916), p.245.

140. Little, op. cit., especially chapter 7.

Observants recognised the value of learning to the preaching mission and by no means neglected the intellect in the interests of asceticism. And so in order to meet their needs they developed their own educational institutions within their own convents. The Ultramontane general chapter at St. Omer in 1447 had decreed that a school should be established in every province;[141] and every convent was expected to appoint a lector.[142] So the English friars can be assumed to have developed their own schools, although evidence of their existence is virtually impossible to come by.

It is clear enough that the houses possessed libraries. The Barcelona statutes prescribe the drawing up of an annual register of books,[143] and Henry VII's substantial expenditure upon books for the new Richmond house has already been mentioned.[144] In 1532 we hear of a confrontation between a Greenwich friar and one of the king's chaplains taking place `yn owre howse, yn owre lybyrary'.[145] The former Conventual houses at Canterbury, Newcastle and Southampton, of course, already possessed libraries at the time of the Observant takeover in 1499.

We know very little of the contents of these libraries. As with other mendicant and monastic libraries, their contents were dissipated after the dissolutions of 1538-9, and no catalogues survive. All that remains of the Greenwich library are a single fifteenth-century manu-

---

141. J. R. H. Moorman, A History of the Franciscan Order from its Origins to the Year 1517 (Oxford, 1968), p.507.

142. cf. 'Abbreviatio', vi.33.

143. Ibid., iii.22.

144. Above, p.40.

145. Richard Lyst to Thomas Cromwell (18 February [1533]), BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv ff.33-4 (=LP vi.168).

script of the writings of St. Bonaventure and two printed books: a volume of Sermones discipuli de Tempore et de Sanctis una cum promptuario exemplorum, printed at Strassburg in 1495 and given to the convent by one John Tyndale on the day of his son William's profession in 1508, and a volume of the works of St. Bernard, printed at Paris in 1494.[146] The Bonaventure volume may have come from Southampton, whose library also at some time included a thirteenth-century manuscript of the works of Pecham.[147] We know of a few additions to this library under the Observant régime. In December 1527 Thomas Walsche, a fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, bequeathed to the house a copy of Erasmus' 1516 Greek New Testament with his Paraphrases `in quatuor Euangelia et Epistolas Pauli distinctis voluminibus', together with a biblical concordance and copies of the Chronicon and Praeparationes Euangelia of Eusebius.[148] A number of manuscripts survive from an earlier era at Canterbury,[149] but no other titles are known. The libraries presumably survived the suppression of 1534 - the Southampton library was extant in 1538, `locked with ij lockeys and many bokes in yt chaneyd'[150] - but all except, perhaps, Greenwich and Richmond were no doubt rapidly dissipated in the orgy of destruction which followed the dissolution of 1538-9.

---

146. N. R. Ker, Medieval Libraries of Great Britain (London, 1964), pp.93, 266; Martin, `Greenwich', p.106 n.3.

147. Ker, loc. cit.

148. Corpus Christi College, Oxford, `Liber admissionum', f.11r.

149. Ker, op. cit., p.48.

150. J. S. Davies, `Dissolution of the Friary at Southampton', Proceedings and Papers of the Hampshire Field Club vol.1 part 4 (1890), p.22.

To an extent, the products of this system were cast in the traditional mendicant mould. It produced figures like the subservient John Lawrence, the devious Hugh Payne, the stubborn Anthony Browne. It gave birth to the odd literary oeuvre of an unexceptionable character: one friar Gararde, described as an Observant but about whom nothing else is known, was responsible for The Interpretation and Sygnyfycacyon of the Masse, 'a patently orthodox work on doctrine', printed in London in October 1532.[151] But there is one vitally important characteristic of the Observants' intellectual temper which owes more to the earlier university careers of a number of its members and to its links with the court than it does to the reform's own institutions. For a clear connection can be traced between the friars and the group of Erasmian humanist patrons grouped around the ladies of the early Tudor court.[152]

It is tempting here to try to associate Henry VII's mother the Lady Margaret Beaufort with the friars, though it is difficult to pin down signs of any special favour on her part. Her apparent association with the spreading of the cult of the Holy Name of Jesus in the 1490s may supply a circumstantial link.[153] Otherwise all there are to go on are a bequest to the Greenwich friars of £3.6s.8d. in her will in 1509 - one of the larger, but by no means her largest bequest to fashionable observant religious houses - and the inclusion in her executors' accounts of two payments of £4 for wine for the same house.[154] In any

---

151. Printed by R. Wyer, London 14 October 1532 (STC 11549; J. Ames, W. Herbert and T. F. Dibdin, Typographical Antiquities of Great Britain (London, 1810-19), iii.176; J. McConica, English Humanists and Reformation Politics (Oxford, 1965), p.129.

152. For the background to this see McConica, op. cit., chapter 3.

153. Above, pp.62-3.

154. C. H. Cooper, Memoir of Margaret, Countess of Richmond and Derby (Cambridge, 1874), pp.132,190,199.

case, far more significant in this connection is the figure of Katherine of Aragon.

Katherine had grown up in an atmosphere in which patronage of the Observants was an important feature of royal life. The Spanish Court which she had known was that of the Observant Cardinal Ximenez: confessor to her mother, humanist religious reformer and founder of the University of Alcalá. It was an atmosphere in which Erasmianism, courtly feminine devotion and the more austere religious Orders came to be closely linked; and this had been reflected in her own education.155 On the one hand it forms the background to her rôle, after her marriage to Henry VIII in 1509, at the centre of a circle of humanist patronage in the English court. On the other it gave birth to a close association with the English Observants, an association which began even before her arrival in England, when the prospect of her arrival gave the friars the new significance in Henry VII's eyes which was responsible for their turn-of-the-century expansion, and was to end in the 1530s with their suppression, the culmination of a process which began with their defence of Henry VIII's queen against the king's attempt to divorce her.

Later Franciscan tradition had it that, as queen, Katherine had belonged to the Franciscan Third Order and had regularly risen at midnight to hear the divine office in the friars' church at Greenwich. But there is no contemporary confirmation of any of this; and such stories must probably be put down to pious hindsight, reflecting the events of the 1530s.156 Katherine's patronal interests were wide-

---

155. McConica, op. cit., p.35; G. Mattingly, Catherine of Aragon (London, 1942), pp.17ff.

156. Davenport, p.156.

ranging and included those other austere, court-centred Orders, the Carthusians and, especially, the Bridgettines of Syon: and there is no evidential foundation for a measure of her relative affections on the basis of her almsgiving. Nevertheless there was clearly a particularly close association between her and the Observants, which can in part, no doubt, be attributed to what might be called sentimental associations: for in the midst of one of the darkest periods of her life and into the early years of Henry VIII's reign they provided her with certainly one, and possibly two Spanish confessors; the first of whom, from 1507 to 1515, was fray Diego Fernandez.[157]

Fernandez has, to say the least, had a bad press. The curious story of the strange thrall in which he held Katherine, of his conduct - unbecoming either of the queen's confessor or of her chancellor, which rôle he also fulfilled - and of his involvement in the conflicts which developed between her, various members of her Spanish entourage and her father's ambassadors, reached King Ferdinand and has reached us chiefly from the pens of hostile ambassadors. Particularly in the case of the first, the pompous Gutierre Gomez de Fuensalida, this hatred sprang in part from resentment at the influence which a man of low birth was able to exert over the queen: but one is inclined to suspect that Fernandez was to some extent made a scapegoat for the ambassadors' inability to manipulate the increasingly independent Katherine into acting wholly in the Spanish interest.

Nevertheless the man clearly exhibited a degree of moral depravity, and it is difficult to see what Katherine saw in him. It is unlikely to

---

157. For this story see Mattingley, op. cit., pp.88-90,110,125,128 and J. E. Paul, Katherine of Aragon and her Friends (London, 1966), pp.27-30.

have been a sympathetic intellect. Perhaps the answer lies simply in terms of his having been the right man at the right time. Alone, a virtual prisoner in a strange country, in the latter years of Henry VII´s reign Katherine more than ever sought solace in the practice of religion. And to this extent her apparent - and quite uncharacteristic - willingness to be manipulated by her confessor sprang from the same source as the excessive religious observances which her husband-to-be feared were injuring her health.[158] Probably Fernandez appeared to fill a void, to give her the sense of direction that she craved, and was rewarded with a gratitude which was prepared to overlook his failings.

To the last, Katherine vigorously defended him against his accusers. Ultimately, though, even she could not prevent Fernandez´ downfall. He was returned to Spain in 1515 under suspicion of having committed fornication; and despite Katherine´s pleas to her father he ended his life incarcerated in a Spanish convent at Ferdinand´s command.

Fernandez may in the first instance have been replaced by Alfonso de Villa Sancta. He is a more shadowy figure, although he was known to Sir Thomas More, who later recalled in print his peculiar views on the nature of devils; and More´s secretary John Harris later recalled that his master had once witnessed a disputation between Villa Sancta and a heretic.[159] Villa Sancta remained at Greenwich into the early 1520s, and he wrote there a number of tracts against Luther and his allies, of which two - dedicated to Katherine - survive. But if he was ever Katherine´s confessor, he did not remain so for long; for soon that rôle was

---

158. J. J. Scarisbrick, Henry VIII (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1971), p.25.

159. 'The apologye of syr Thomas More, knyght', chapter 9 in More, Complete Works vol.ix, p.40; ibid., p 328.

being undertaken by the Dominican Jorge de Athequa, who was promoted to the bishopric of Llandaff early in 1517 and who was to remain with her to the end.

Otherwise, signs of her closeness to the friars have to be sought in the context of the final phase of her life in England, in contacts between the friars, the queen and the Imperial ambassador Chapuys, and in the friars' frequent visits to her household at Buckden in the early 1530s.[160] She received the suffrages of the Order from the minister-general, Paul of Parma in the black days of January 1534;[161] and, curiously, at the end she willed - in 1536, well after the suppression of the province - that she should be buried in one of their houses.[162]

At the same time, there are numerous indicators of the friars' connection with the court humanist circle grouped around the queen. There are some visible patronal links with members of the circle: Dr. Nicholas West, dean of Windsor and subsequently bishop of Ely, was admitted by the vicar-general's commissary Simon of Prussia to the suffrages of the Order, in return for unspecified services rendered to the friars, in January 1514.[163] Richard Fox, as bishop of Durham, had in 1499 sponsored Wynkyn de Worde's edition of the Scottish Observant William Touris' devotional poem The contemplacioun of Synnaris.[164] His

---

160. Below, pp.137,147-8. Among a list of letters and presents sent to the princess dowager is mentioned a letter from Mary of 15 March [1532] sent `p[er] M[ar]gery to the fryers at Richemount' (PRO SP1/80 f.202 (=LP vi.1522)).

161. The letter of fraternity is PRO SP1/74 f.56 (=LP vi.54(1)).

162. BL MSS Cotton Otho C.x f.219, Titus C.vii f.44.

163. BL MS Cotton Vitellius B.ii ff.68-9 (=LP i(ii).2599)). For West's connection with the More circle see McConica, op. cit., pp.52-3,58-9.

164. STC 5643. For this edition see J. A. W. Bennett (ed.), Devotional Pieces in Verse and Prose (Scottish Text Society, 3rd series vol.xxiii (1949)), pp.xxv ff.

co-operation with the Scottish warden of Greenwich, Donald Gilbert, in 1502 in persuading the Conventual friars of London to adopt a more austere habit, and his concern to facilitate the friars' preaching in his diocese in 1511, have already been noted.

Other references are of a more circumstantial nature. Sir Thomas More had been an admirer of the friars in his youth; he had revered one saintly provincial, Donald Gilbert, and according to his Elizabethan biographer Thomas Stapleton had entertained an early vocation to the Order.[165] In later years he was to demonstrate, in embarrassing circumstances, his continuing familiarity with at least some of the friars in the aftermath of the `Nun of Kent' affair.[166] John Colet is found dining in the Greenwich friary in 1513 and afterwards spending an hour and a half in the friary garden discussing with the king a recent Good Friday sermon in which he had touched upon the rôle of the christian in warfare.[167] And in this respect the events of the early 1530s, when the friars played a major rôle in the opposition party which gathered around the queen, aiding More in co-ordinating the parliamentary opposition and organising the publication abroad of Bishop Fisher's works against the king's divorce proposal, may - notwithstanding that the divorce crisis threw together some unlikely bedfellows - be regarded as simply the culmination of a long-standing association.

Furthermore there is a good deal to suggest that, in the Greenwich and Richmond convents at least, much of the intellectual atmosphere was

---

165. Thomas Stapleton, The Life and Illustrious Martyrdom of Sir Thomas More (translated by P. E. Hallet, London, 1928), pp.9-10.

166. More to Thomas Cromwell ([c.March 1534]), BL MS Arundel 152 ff.296-7 (=LP vii.287).

167. J. H. Lupton, A Life of John Colet (London, 1909), pp.189-91.

very much more akin to contemporary court fashion than to the traditional fraternal scholarship of the University Schools.[168] At least, some of the province's most prominent figures achieved contemporary recognition from humanist scholars outside the Order.

The Scot Donald Gilbert, warden of Greenwich in 1494 and co-worker with Bishop Fox in the attempt to change the London Greyfriars' habits in 1502, was probably the `Scotus quidam doctor theologus' who expounded the Pauline epistles at St. Paul's in January 1508 at the behest of Dean Colet, and the saintly `good Scottysshe freer Father Donolde' whom Sir Thomas More heard in his youth at St. Paul's Cross. Two provincials appear among the ranks of the king's Lenten preachers. One, probably the diplomat Langley, is recorded as having been awarded 20s. for a sermon in Lent 1513: he may also have been the `M[aster] Langelye' who pleased the king with a Friday sermon during Lent 1518. John Longland spoke of his successor, Francis Frowick, in the same breath as John Colet as a notable Lenten preacher before the king. Frowick attended the capitulum generalissimum at Rome at Pentecost 1517, where he aroused the admiration of Silvestro de'Gigli; and during his return journey to England in June he called on Erasmus at Louvain and gave him news of new Greek texts from the Rome presses, a visit which earned him Erasmus' epithet `optimus ille Frowicus'.

The last English-born provincial, William Peto, gives away something of his outlook in a conversation with the agent of the Antwerp Merchant Adventurers, John Hutton, in 1538. Peto had been in the thick of the `Aragonese' opposition group centred around the queen, More, Fisher and

---

168 Cf. some similar examples among the friars' continental contemporaries; e.g. Amandus of Zierikzee, Edmond of St. Omer, Jan Bihl of Louvain, noticed in vol. i of P. G. Bietenholz and T. B. Deutscher (eds.), Contemporaries of Erasmus (Toronto, 1985).

the Imperial ambassador Chapuys, in the early 1530s, and was now soon to join the retinue of Cardinal Reginald Pole. Hutton reported that although he stuck firmly to the Papal Supremacy, he was `very ernist agaynst the abussis of all religios men...The suppresscion of th´abbeis he makithe very light; but he thynkith the[y] myght be put to bett[er] use´: a remarkably advanced attitude, one might think, for a friar.[169]

Finally, one particular individual is worth looking at in more detail, although he has received some recent attention; not just because he illustrates the tendencies already described but also because he will stand as a type of the kind of person for whom the Order might have had a particular attraction. In the early 1520s John Ryckes, a former fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, composed - originally in Latin - the work which survives in its English version as the Ymage of Loue.[170] The work probably owes its origin to an association with the Bridgettine nuns of Syon, close to the convent at Richmond; since it purports to have been produced for a group of `spirituall persones´ and `good ladyes´, and the Bridgettines certainly ordered sixty copies - equivalent to one for each of the nuns - of Wynkyn de Worde´s first printed edition of October 1525.

This first edition got de Worde and its translator, John Gough, into trouble with the ecclesiastical authorities;[171] and thanks mainly to John Bale, Ryckes subsequently acquired something of a reputation as a

---

169. Hutton to Cromwell (20 January [1538]), PRO SP1/128 ff.134-5 (=LP xiii(i).115).

170. The following is based upon E. Ruth Harvey, `The Image of Love´, in More, Complete Works vi(ii), pp.727ff.

171. This edition (NSTC 21471.5) fortuitously did not name Ryckes; but Gough published a second edition, this time naming the author, under his royal patent in the early ´thirties (ibid., 21472).

protestant. Bale probably based his supposition on Ryckes' English translation of Otto of Brunfels' Prognostication - a revision of the Church calendar substituting Bible stories for the lives of saints - which was published in London in 1536, dedicated to Thomas Cromwell; but he could not resist adding the spurious attribution of a work Contra papistarum blasphemias to help matters along.[172]

In fact, on the strength of his surviving works Ryckes cannot be described as a protestant. True, he appears as a champion of the practice of the primitive Church as revealed in Scripture and the writings of the Fathers; and he laments the all-too-frequent latter-day replacement of internal `charity' by outward ritual and splendour. The `holy doctour' in the Ymage laments `than were treen chalyces & golden preestes: now be golden chalyces & treen preestes or rather erthen preestes'. And, the author realises, splendid outward religious observances sometimes `letteth or hyndereth charyte & contemplacyon sterynge the mynde to elacion and vaynglory'. All this is far from the idea of charity as interpreted by St. Paul or the great monastic founders. The Christian was to give away surpluses in alms, not to aquire ostentatious wealth, for whatever purpose. With the help of Scripture, his author eventually concludes that the true image of christian love is to be found in the reflection of God in a virtuous and purified soul.

This emphasis on the internal rather than the external; the condemnation - however moderately expressed - of the degradations wrought by the wealth and splendour of the contemporary Church; the reliance on ancient precedent rather than on obedience to modern authority: all

---

172. STC 3943; Ames et al. (eds.), Typographical Antiquities, iii.393; J. Bale, Scriptorum illustrium maioris Brytannie Catalogus (Basel, 1557-9), ii.102-3.

these give Ryckes enough in common with the complaints of Lollard and Lutheran to sound a warning to the defenders of Catholic doctrine in the England of the 1520s. Yet he was ready to employ Aquinas and the Decretum and, significantly, even in the 1530s he retained the major feasts of the Virgin in his revision of the Church calendar. Despite his criticisms of its latter-day practice, he made it clear in the Ymage that `we may not leue of the honourable and deuoute customes and holy ordynaunces of the Chyrche;' and More, while he had reservations about Ryckes' views on the veneration of images, saw him as over-enthusiastic rather than heretical.[173]

Ryckes's work reveals the sort of mind which, in its emphasis on internal devotion and its dislike of ecclesiastical wealth, could lead him to find his vocation among the Observants, but whose allowance of a reduced rôle for ecclesiastical authority, while not drawing him into Lutheranism, could allow him to conform in the 1530s. It is this man, rather than Bale's rabid protestant, who is the true John Ryckes: and he is unlikely to have been the only man of this temper who found himself attracted into the Order. For up to a point this cast of mind fitted very well the characteristic Observant piety, both in terms of the radical critique of the secular clergy which had always been inherent in the mendicant outlook and in the emphasis upon the inner religious life of the individual, upon teaching by example and - a view which Erasmus shared with St. Francis - upon the Christian life as an attempt to imitate the life of Christ.

But this outlook had a sting in its tail. It tended to devalue the vocation to the regular religious life, seeing it as one among many

---

173. `A Dialogue Concerning Heresies', Book 1 chapter 2, in More, Complete Works, vi(i).40ff.

rather than necessarily the highest of all. In its desire for the laïcisation of religion it dealt a blow against the whole concept of ecclesiastical authority and the clerical élite, with its paraphernalia of ceremony and its proprietorial attitude towards Scripture. In its criticism of the contemporary papacy, it denigrated the institution which was the friars' constitutional bedrock. And in its dislike of metaphysical speculation and its tendency towards doctrinal neutrality it was to leave the friars exposed once the Catholic consensus was broken.

None of this mattered a great deal before the 1520s. But then two things happened which effectively destroyed that consensus. First, the Catholic world began to sit up and take notice of the writings of a German Austin friar named Martin Luther. It is a commonplace that, initially at least, little seemed to separate Erasmus and Luther, and that the short path from orthodox Erasmianism to heretical Lutheranism was one trodden by many contemporary Englishmen: and for this reason it need not surprise us that the Order which was in the succeeding decade to prove itself for the most part a steadfast defender of Catholic orthodoxy, in the 1520s should have seen an outbreak of Lutheranism. Secondly, during the course of the 1520s Henry VIII developed a determination to divorce his wife, and in the process instituted a train of events which was to lead to the separation of the Church of England from Rome. Under these circumstances, like everyone else the friars had to make up their minds whose side they were on; and enough has already been said to show that there was plenty in the Order's background to provide an explanation in general terms for the ways in which, on the whole, it reacted, as well as for the disputes which the issue engendered within it. It is to these events of the province's final decade that we must now turn.

Chapter 3.

The Conflict of Loyalties (1): Cardinal Wolsey (1524-1529).

(i) Wolsey's Visitation of Greenwich.

There was plenty in Thomas Wolsey to touch off in the Observants all the traditional mendicant hostility towards the secular clergy. As a clergyman, notoriously evil-living and displaying conspicuous wealth, he represented the living embodiment of all that was most corrupt in the contemporary Church. As a statesman, low-born yet imperious, he offended against the mores of the Observants' patrons among the membership of the political nation, and ultimately dared, so it was commonly thought, even to interfere between the king and the wife who was one of the friars' closest friends.

A more immediate problem lay in his systematic attempts to eliminate all exemptions from his own ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Under the pope, jurisdiction over the exempt Orders belonged only to a duly empowered legatus a latere: and as such, Wolsey was granted powers of visitation and correction over all Orders of regular clergy, exempt or not, first jointly with his fellow-legate Campeggio in August 1518 and then on his own account in June 1519; powers which were regularly extended and ultimately, in 1524, granted for life.[1] Whatever his motivation - whether a disinterested concern for the reform of religious morals or simply a means of self-aggrandisement - when he came to try to establish his jurisdiction over the Observants he was bound to strike a raw nerve.

---

1. Accounts in A. F. Pollard, Wolsey (London, 1929) pp.165f; RO iii.158ff (neither reflects the specific relevance of the bull of 21 (not 24) August 1524 to the Observants).

In fact Wolsey's attempt to visit the Observants, when it came, was clearly not altogether a mindless excercise of arbitrary power; for by the summer of 1524, when his thoughts turned towards the reform of the friars, he had become aware of an outbreak of dangerous theological radicalism with Lutheran overtones among the Greenwich community.[2] But, even so, the friars reacted as might be expected in the light of their history; and they deployed their considerable lobbying-power in Rome in an attempt to exclude themselves from Wolsey's unwanted attentions.

First, they prevailed upon Pope Clement VII and Cardinal Ara Coeli - Christopher of Forlì, who had been the first Observant minister-general - to write to Wolsey early in July and attempt to dissuade him from attempting to visit and correct them.[3] Clement, caught between two powerful and opposing forces, at once ostensibly encouraged Wolsey in his purpose and urged him in his wisdom to tread very carefully and not to do anything which, while it might do some good in England, might cause trouble elsewhere. The friars, he wrote, would accept Wolsey's visitation, but feared the establishment of a precedent which would be seized upon in other provinces to the detriment of their independence. Their reputation throughout the world was worth a great deal to Rome in the present troubled times: so Clement exhorted Wolsey to think of the good of Christendom and to deal with them gently and tactfully. Ara Coeli wrote very much in the same vein, asking Wolsey to desist from

---

2. [Clement VII] to Wolsey (Rome, [21 August 1524]), printed as no. xxxvii of `Jacobi Sadoleti Epistolae Pontificum Romanorum Nomine Scriptae' in P. Lazeri (ed.), Miscellaneorum ex MSS. Libri Bibliothequae Colegii Romani Societatis Jesu vol. i (Rome, 1754) pp.439-40 (=LP iii(i).569, where misdated 1519 and attributed to Leo X).

3. Clement VII to Wolsey (Rome, 7 July 1524), PRO SP1/31 ff.190-1 (=LP iv.477); Christopher [of Forli] Cardinal Ara Coeli to Wolsey (Rome, [7 July] 1524), BL MS Cotton Vitellius B.vi f.114 (=LP iv.478).

his purpose and assuring him that, while the friars did not object to the cardinal's visitation as such, they feared that the precedent thus established might lead to problems under his successor.

At the same time the friars also tried to prevent the visitation by means of a legal injunction in the Curia. The bull of amplification of Wolsey's legacy which Clement finally granted, after much persuasion, on 21 August[4] does not specifically name the Observants; but from the terms which it employs it is obvious that it was designed specifically to override their objections and to allow the visitation to take place. In spite, it states, of the fact that Wolsey's powers were intended to override all exemptions, some exempt religious had attempted to prevent his visitation by obtaining a prohibition in the Curia or elsewhere: firstly on the grounds that they were not required to submit to such a visitation from any legate whose powers were not specifically mentioned in their Rule (`ordo') or privileges; and secondly because they interpreted their obligation to obey their minister-general to mean that without his consent, they might not offer obedience to, or in any way submit to the jurisdiction of, anyone else without offending against the Rule of St. Francis. The bull therefore specifically removes all such impediments to Wolsey's plenitude of power.

The timorous Clement accompanied the bull with a covering letter commending the friars to Wolsey's favour and assuring him that they

---

4. Clement VII to Wolsey (Rome, 21 August 1524), printed in Rymer, xiv.18-20. It was dispatched from Rome, with another bull relating to Wolsey's plan for the suppression of certain smaller monasteries, by John Clerk on 22 August (Clerk to Wolsey (Rome, 31 August [1524]), BL MS Cotton Vitellius B.vi ff.202-3 (=LP iv.610)).

were very ready to submit to his visitation.[5] He is sure, he writes, that the friars' fears will not be justified by their experience; nevertheless he urges Wolsey again to act so as to give no cause for complaint. At the same time he persuaded the English ambassador at the Curia, John Clerk, bishop of Bath and Wells, to write in a rather different vein, exhorting Wolsey `for Godd[es] saake to vse mercye w[ith] thois friars, sayen[ge] that they be as desperatt best[es] past shame, that can lee[se] nothyng by clamors'.[6] Wolsey replied, thanking the pope for the bull on 21 October,[7] assuring him that he would use his legatine authority with such moderation and discretion that no complaint would reach Clement's ears.

But the battle was not yet over. Although now prevented from denying the cardinal's jurisdiction over them, the friars' influence at Rome was such that within two days of the bull's issue they had obtained and exhibited a two years' exemption from its effects. Girolamo Ghinucci, auditor of the Apostolic Chamber, bishop of Worcester and Wolsey's agent in Rome, professed embarrassment at this turn of events, excusing himself by saying that he could not possibly keep a close eye on everything that went on in his office, and promising Wolsey that he would try to have the exemption cancelled.[8] And Wolsey himself appealed

---

5. [Clement VII] to Wolsey ([21 August 1524]).

6. Clerk to Wolsey (31 August [1524]).

7. His letter is printed in A. Theiner (ed.), Vetera Monumenta Hibernorum et Scotorum Historiam Illustrantia (Rome, 1864) pp.544-5 (=LP iv.759: an extremely cursory summary). Wolsey also thanks Clement for the bull relating to the monasteries.

8. Ghinucci to Wolsey (23 August 1524), BL MS Cotton Vitellius B.vi f.191 (=LP iv.587).

to the ope against it without, it seems, any immediate effect.[9]

By this time the cardinal was losing his patience with the friars. For once, he now seems to have cast aside his usual scrupulous concern for legal niceties: the urgency of the matter persuaded him to brazen the matter out. Accordingly, he set in train preparations for a visitation of the convent at Greenwich.

The outcome of these preparations is well known.[10] By the time Wolsey's representatives Dr. Henry Standish, bishop of St. Asaph, Dr. John Allen, Wolsey's commissary-general, and their subordinates arrived at Greenwich on 16 January 1525, nineteen friars had absconded from the convent. The visitors withdrew and appointed another day for the visitation. By their action the absconders had laid themselves open to the charge of apostasy. As apostates, according to the Statutes of the Order they had automatically rendered themselves excommunicate; and on the following Sunday father John Forest publicly proclaimed their excommunication at St. Paul's Cross.[11] By the time Standish and Allen re-appeared some days later, some had returned. These, significantly, were consigned not to the Order's own prisons, but to the porter's ward at York Place; and one particularly recalcitrant individual, John Raynscroft, was sent to prison at the London Greyfriars before submitting to the cardinal and being allowed to return to Greenwich.[12]

---

9. The same to the same (7 November [1525]), BL MS Cotton Vitellius B.vii f.202 (=LP iv.1750).

10. Accounts in 'Grey Friar's Chronicle,' p.190 and Hall's Chronicle, p.691.

11. Following the procedure laid down in the Statutes ('Abbreviatio', vi.37-8,41).

12. Pace the 'Grey Friar's Chronicle,' Raynscroft was not a lay-brother: see below, appendix 1.

Only the dramatic reaction to it justified this visitation's appearance in the contemporary London chronicles and we do not know whether Wolsey visited any of the other Observant houses at this time. Probably not, for the issue was still simmering in the ummer of 1525; and by now protests against his activities were being heard from the Dominicans as well as the Observants. Writing from Rome on 28 July,[13] Clerk reported that the Black Friars had in the end been content to submit to the cardinal's jurisdiction. But the Observants were a different matter: Clerk related the details of an interview in which a harrassed Pope Clement had begged him to exhort Wolsey in his name

> `to dea[l] moderatly and to meadill with theym as litle [as] may be. For they be clamoros peopul; importe[nate], bold and past shame; and bycause they hav[e] nothing to lese and have great assistence her[e in the] couurte, and credite every wher ell[es] amongste t[he] lay people'.

The pope's problems had been exacerbated by the presence in Rome of an Observant chapter. He had managed to put the matter off pending the arrival of the minister-general, and would perhaps write a letter to Wolsey urging moderation: but he did not wish this to be interpreted as being prejudicial to his legacy. Clerk had tried to play down the seriousness of the problem, claiming

> `that ther wa[s] ne lucre, ne glorye, ne envye that cowde move your Grace to do anything against theym. For they war poor, evyll and few, and of litle estimacion in comparison of other religious in Englond':

and in order to calm the pope down, he had told him that Wolsey was letting the matter rest for the moment.

---

13. BL MS Cotton Vitellius B.vii ff.176-7 (=LP iv.1521).

The friars' exemption was eventually removed in November 1525:[14] but at this point the record of Wolsey's attempts to visit and reform the friars peters out. What is most revealing about what is recorded is not so much the way in which the friars fought tooth and nail to preserve their jurisdictional independence - we might have expected nothing less - as the way in which, once that battle was lost, the visitation split the convent down the middle.

Wolsey's action had suceeded for the first time in bringing to a head the potential which lay inherent in the English friars' situation for a conflict between two fundamental loyalties: to their exemption from outside ecclesiastical jurisdictions short of Rome, and to the king who was their founder, patron and protector. In the end the leadership evidently saw no alternative to compromise and submission. But their decision was sufficiently contentious to cause a partial breakdown of conventual discipline. A substantial party - which may even have represented a majority of the community - felt itself driven to the lengths of abandoning its obedience and thereby lapsing into apostasy and automatic excommunication.

In part, this reaction could be explained simply enough. Technically, in carrying out the visitation when he did, Wolsey had been acting illegally. And the irony of a visitation of such an Order by a figure of such notoriety cannot have been lost upon the friars. Of the visitors, Allen shared in the general opprobrium heaped upon his master. But Wolsey's most monumental act of tactlessness was his appointment of Standish, who of all his contemporaries was surely the epitome of the

---

14. Ghinucci to Wolsey (7 November [1525]); Clerk to Wolsey (Bologna, 21 November [1525]), PRO SP1/36 f.168v (=LP iv.1777).

Conventual Franciscan: emphatically not one whom the Observants could regard as fit to assess their observance of the Rule. It is also true that in at least one respect the friars' earlier fears had been well founded. For one precedent was set in Wolsey's use of a Conventual prison for the punishment of a recalcitrant Observant, a practice which was to be repeated and extended by Wolsey's protégé Thomas Cromwell in the different circumstances of the 1530s.

For these reasons it is tempting to regard this mass apostasy simply as a protest against the subjection of the Order to an outside jurisdiction whose values were quite different from the friars' own, and against the leadership's ultimate failure to resist, and as such quite independent of any consideration of theological orthodoxy. But there must have been more to it than this. The abandonment of their obedience was a step which the apostates could not have taken lightly: and the 'Grey Friar's Chronicle's' implication that only some of them returned is suggestive. One is led to suspect - as subsequent events in fact demonstrate - that there was some substance in Wolsey's suspicions of Lutheranism within the convent.

It is not altogether surprising, though on the face of it paradoxical, that in an Order which in the succeeding decade was to stand firmly and conspicuously for Roman Catholic orthodoxy, the 1520s should have been marked by the appearance of heterodox tendencies among certain of its members. It is easy enough to see where such opinions could have been picked up: the friars of Greenwich needed no White Horse tavern when they moved in the midst of the London mercantile community. And such ideas would sit well with the idealistic, humanistic outlook which it has already been suggested was characteristic of the friary.

It is after all a truism of the age that, up to a point, comparatively little separated Erasmus and Luther.

It is not, however, at all clear how deeply specifically Lutheran thinking had penetrated. The papal correspondence on the matter speaks of `turbatores aut speculatores ratione improba´ among the friars as much as of Lutheranism per se;[15] and elsewhere for the most part the term is used by hostile witnesses who might have been prone to confuse Lutheranism with simple opposition to the cardinal. All of this suggests a slightly more subtle interpretation of events. It could be argued that in some men a more-or-less vulgar Lutheranism, picked up in London, was turned by the circumstances of the visitation and the superiors´ ultimate failure to resist into a vehicle for the expression of a loss of confidence in the Observants´ realisation of their ideals and, by extension, of the possibility of doing so within the existing Catholic régime. This suggestion is to some extent borne out by what we know of the two individuals who found themselves impelled to flee Greenwich to join the community of English protestant exiles on the Continent.

(ii) William Roy and Jerome Barlow.

So far William Roy and Jerome Barlow have attracted notice in the main as minor stars in the firmament of early English protestant writing. Comparatively little attention has so far been paid to the significance of their Observant background: so in view of what has just been said it is worth attempting some re-assessment of them in this light.

---

15. [Clement VII] to Wolsey ([21 August 1524]).

Roy was born of Jewish stock, and may have been the son of a native of Brabant who was granted letters of denization in London in February 1512. He may have grown up in Calais, to whose inhabitants he was to address the prologue to his Brefe Dialoge in 1527. But in later years the family probably lived in Westminster, where he was to visit his mother in 1528. He seems to have been a small man, since on one occasion he is described as `pety Guele[m] Roye´. He first appears as a Greenwich friar at the time of his ordination to the degree of acolyte in December 1516.

In view of what has been suggested about the intellectual climate at Greenwich during these years, this fact alone is quite enough to disprove the highly improbable, but remarkably tenacious surmise of J. Rendel Harris, who attempted a century ago to attribute to Roy the writing of the Montford Codex of the Greek New Testament, to assist Henry Standish in his conflict with Erasmus over the latter´s edition of 1516.[16] At the other extreme, anxious to counter exaggerated claims of Roy´s brilliance, E. G. Rupp, writing in the 1940s, perhaps swallowed a little too much of Tyndale´s view of Roy, seeing him simply as a garrulous charlatan and tending to minimise his contribution to the early protestant corpus.[17] More recent opinion has tended to favour a view which lies somewhere between the two extremes. Probably Wilhelm

---

16. J. Rendel Harris, The Origin of the Leicester Codex of the New Testament (London, 1887), pp.47-9. Harris´s conjecture rested upon a single inscription recording that the earliest known owner of his codex was a `frater froy´; combined, one supposes, with a misunderstanding of the nature of Roy´s contribution to Tyndale´s New Testament and a failure to distinguish between Observant and Conventual Franciscans which enabled him to suppose that Roy might have studied at Cambridge in the traditional mendicant fashion.

17. E. G. Rupp, Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition (Cambridge, 1949), pp.52ff.

Clebsch, among latter-day writers, has most aptly classified Roy among early protestant writers as one of a number of apprentices who never became journeymen.[18]

His reputed brilliance probably owes much to the garrulity and boastfulness which Tyndale attributes to him. He was certainly no genius; and there is no sign of his ever having attended either of the English Universities. Admittedly, he did possess an ability to speak many languages: understandably enough if he was of foreign origin and had spent his formative years in the cosmopolitan atmospheres of Calais and London. And he would certainly have had the opportunity of picking up some Greek, if not Hebrew, as well as Latin at Greenwich: if so he would be by no means the only young graecist of the period to find himself attracted to Lutheranism.

Nevertheless it has to be said that such capabilities find little expression in his literary work. Nowhere does either he or Tyndale suggest that his contribution to the English New Testament was anything more than that of Tyndale's _amanuensis_. His only acknowledged work is the _Brefe Dialoge Bitwene a Christen Father and His Stobborne Sonne_, a loose translation from Latin or German (it is not clear which) of a work by Wilhelm Koepfel (Capito), published in 1527.[19] But Sir Thomas More, supported more recently by Wilhelm Clebsch, thought him responsible for an anonymous translation of Luther's exposition of the seventh chapter of _1 Corinthians_ which appeared, bound together with a

---

18. W. A. Clebsch, _England's Earliest Protestants, 1520-1535_ (New Haven, Conn., 1964), p.229.

19. _NSTC_ 24223.3; Hume 4: ed. A. Wolf as _William Roye's Dialogue Between a Christian Father and his Stubborn Son_ (Vienna, 1874).

translation of Erasmus' Paraclesis, in 1529.[20] The translator of the former work appears at one point to associate himself with Tyndale in the context of the English Bible, and the attribution is reasonable on stylistic grounds. This man could certainly run to fragmentary literal translation from the Greek and Latin for comparison with Tyndale's English text, in order to counter accusations that the protestants differed amongst themselves. But although in the preface to the Brefe Dialoge Roy promises translations of certain books of the Old Testament, these almost certainly, as Tyndale predicted, never appeared.[21]

If Roy's linguistic abilities do not exactly shine through his works, neither does he reveal himself as an outstanding theologian. His dialogue[22] is an unsophisticated, colloquial work intended for popular reading. It is of some theological interest in that it represents the first systematic exposition of reformed doctrine in English and the first evidence of a swing among the English reformers from Luther towards the Zwinglian doctrines of Zurich. But it does not show Roy to have possessed much in the way of theological discrimination. In fact, if he was the translator of Luther's sermon and the Paraclesis, he might more reasonably be accused of eclecticism. Roy's literary rôle

---

20. STC 10493, Hume 10; More, `Confutacyon of Tyndale's Answere' (1532), preface, in Complete Works viii(i), p.8; W. A. Clebsch, `The Earliest Translations of Luther into English', Harvard Theological Review vol. lvi (1963), pp.77ff.

21. Wolf (ed.), op. cit., p.33; Tyndale, The Parable of the Wycked Mammon, (`Marburg, Hans Luft' (ie. Antwerp, Jan Hoogstraten), 8 May 1528 (STC 24454, Hume 6)), prologue, sigs. A.ii.r-v.

22. For what follows see A. Hume, `William Roye's `Brefe Dialoge' (1527): An English Version of a Strassburg Catechism', Harvard Theological Review vol.lx (1967) pp.307ff; L. A. Schuster, `Thomas More's Polemical Career, 1523-1533,' in More, Complete Works viii(iii), pp.1171-3.

was that of the popular propagandist rather than that of the scholar. His most prominent literary characteristic - perhaps most cogently expressed in the substantial contribution which he made to Barlow's 'Beryeng of the Masse'- is a venomous hatred of the English clergy in general, and of Wolsey in particular.

This attitude clearly owed a great deal to Roy's association with Tyndale. Like him, he took some pride in the achievement represented by the English New Testament; and he too seems to have been stung to the quick by the reception which officialdom accorded the work in England, some elements of which bit deeply into his psyche. As he put it in the introduction to the Brefe Dialoge,[23]

> 'Ye and where as they hade no thynge wheron to grounde theymselves agaynst vs, they were nott aschamed faulcely to diffame theym, whiche longe before that tyme were deed and rotten, as my father. Thynkinge that defamynge of hym, they shulde qwenche and dercken the cleare and evident light of God. Whyche they hate worsse then other toade or addre, as a thynge agaynst their bellies moste noyous and contrary, saynge "his father wolde eate noo porke; what frute can soche a tre brynge forthe?"'

His injury, in other words, was compounded by the critics' sneers against his own Jewish background.

Nevertheless, the prominence afforded the Observants in the Beryeng suggests that we should not underestimate the significance of Roy's earlier experiences among the friars. Although the evidence is circumstantial, he was probably one of those who disappeared from Greenwich after Wolsey's visitation. He was still a young man: on the basis of his ordination records it would be reasonable to suppose that he was

---

23. Wolf (ed.), op. cit., pp.34-5.

aged no more than thirty in 1525. And with his background, he would have been particularly well-placed to pick up Lutheran ideas among the London merchant community; although the suggestion, on the basis of the government´s later charges, that his flight was financed by Alderman Humphrey Monmouth is probably no more than a reflection of his association with Tyndale.[24] In his case, at least, Wolsey´s visitation could quite easily have had a catalytic effect upon his thinking.

If Roy was one of those who fled in January 1525, his movements over the next few months are obscure. We know that he matriculated at Wittenberg on 10 June: and it was possibly here that he encountered William Tyndale.[25] At any rate, by the time the two met, Roy was penniless; and Tyndale took him on to act as his _amanuensis_ in the publication of his English New Testament. But, not altogether untypically, he soon developed a hearty dislike for his new assistant. In the prologue to his _Parable of the Wycked Mammon_, published in May 1528,[26] he describes Roy as

> `a man somewhat craftye when he cometh vnto new aquayntaunce & before he be thorow knowen...As longe as he had no money, somwhat I could ruele him: but as sone as he had goten him money, he became lyke hym selfe agayne. Neuerthelesse I suffered all thinges tyll yt was ended whyche I coulde not doo alone wythout one both to wryte and to helpe me to compare [the] textes to gether. When that was ended I toke my leue & bade him farewel for oure two lyues, and as men saye a daye longer.´

---

24. `Articles mynystred against Homfreye Munmouthe´ [1528], printed in J. Strype, _Ecclesiastical Memorials_ (Oxford, 1822), i.488-91 (articles iii,iv,vii) (=_LP_ iv.4260).

25. J. F. Mozley, _William Tyndale_ (London, 1937) pp.16-17,52-3,56. Alternatively, they might have met later at Cologne.

26. _Mammon_, prologue sigs. A.ii.r-v.

But before that happy time arrived, both men had been forced to make a rapid exit from Cologne, where the work was being printed. According to his own account, given some years later in a controversial pamphlet,[27] Johann Dobneck (Cochlaeus) heard rumours circulating among the Cologne printers of a plot to turn England Lutheran, and of the presence in the city of two mysterious Englishmen, skilled in languages. By plying a group of printers with wine at his lodging, he learned of the printing of 3,000 copies of the New Testament and of plans to have them distributed in England by the merchants who were financing the operation. He alerted Herman Rinck, a member of a prominent patrician family in the city, who secured a prohibition against the work from the city magistrates. Printing was hastily interrupted and Tyndale and Roy fled with the printed sheets upriver to Worms, where printing of a new octavo edition was completed by March 1526.[28]

Tyndale says that after their acrimonious parting, Roy

> `went and gate him new frendes, which thinge to doo he passeth all that euer I yet knewe. And there when he had stored hym of money he gote him to Argentine [Strassburg], where he professeth wonderfull faculties & maketh bost of no small thinges´.

Wolsey´s activities probably also had a good deal to do with the apostasy of Roy´s fellow Greenwich friar Jerome Barlow, who joined him around May 1527; however, Barlow´s background is obscure and he cannot

---

27. `De Actis et Scriptis Martini Lutheri´ (1549); passage printed, with parallel English translation, in E. Arber (ed.), The First Printed English New Testament (London, 1871), pp.23-4.

28. STC 2824, Hume 2. The Cologne fragment of 80 quarto pages (probably comprising the Gospels of Matthew and Mark) was issued separately (STC 2823, Hume 1).

be identified as one of the apostates of 1525. He is no longer confused with the Austin anon-turned-bishop William Barlow; but they may just possibly have been related. Another member of the bishop's clan is known to have had the same red hair which was apparently Friar Jerome's chief identifying characteristic.[29]

To judge from his literary output, Barlow seems to have been a less fully-committed protestant than his fellow. His best-known work is the bitterly satirical `Beryeng of the Masse' of 1527.[30] Barlow's contemporaries attributed this work to him;[31] and no doubt the actual work of composition was his. But it was clearly to some extent a collaborative effort, since it evinces knowledge of recent events on both sides of the English Channel; and the vehemence of its tone is more characteristic of Roy, yet contrasts markedly with the more muted criticisms of Barlow's only other surviving work, the Proper Dyaloge Betwene a Gentillman and a Husbandman of 1530.[32] The `Beryeng' is chiefly concerned

---

29. This was William's brother John Barlow, sometime fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and ultimately dean of Worcester (Rupp, English Protestant Tradition, pp.63-5).

30. STC 21427, Hume 5: ed. E. Arber as Rede me and be nott wrothe, For I saye no thinge but trothe (London, 1871); Schuster, `More's Polemical Career', pp.1175-8. The work may have been inspired by the reputation of, if not by actual aquaintance with Niclaus Manuel's Krankheit der Messe, published at the start of 1528 (C. H. Herford, Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century (Cambridge, 1886) pp.33ff).

31. Cf. More, `A Dialogue Concerning Heresies', Book 3 chapter 9 in Complete Works vi(i), pp.291-2; he repeats Tyndale's account of Barlow but mistakenly applies to him Tyndale's comment about Roy's propensity to promise more than he could deliver.

32. The work is prefaced with an `ABC to the Spiritualtie'. It went through two editions in 1530: the second, carrying the `Marburg' colophon, was bound with another Lollard work in favour of vernacular Scriptures (NSTC 1462.3,6813; Hume 15,17: see Schuster, op. cit., pp.1223-4 and Rupp, op. cit., p.59).

with attacking the English clergy, and has no real theological message beyond expressing a preference for Scripture over ceremony; while the Proper Dyaloge is in effect merely a new framework for an old Lollard tract attacking Church temporalities. Barlow's other works, published and unpublished, of which only titles or brief descriptions are known, apparently went no further than extolling the virtues of Scripture, and criticising the clergy and the abuses surrounding the shrine of St. Thomas Becket.[33] His criticism, in short, is not primarily theological. It is an expression of disillusionment with the way things were in the contemporary English Church. He clearly saw Wolsey as the key to the problem;[34] and it is remarkable that after the cardinal's fall he submitted to the king in terms which place him firmly among those who saw that event as heralding a new dawn, and Henry VIII as the potential saviour of the English Church.[35]

Tyndale records[36] how, having abandoned Greenwich and crossed to the Continent, in about May 1527 Barlow passed through Worms on his way to Strassburg,

> `sayenge that he entended to be Christe's disciple another whyle and to kepe (as nye as God wolde gyue him grace) the profession of his bapti[s]m; and to gett his lyuing with his handes, and to lyue no lenger ydely and of the swete & laboure of those captyues whiche they had taught not to byleue in Chryst, but in cutt showes and russet coetes'.

---

33. [Barlow] to Henry VIII (undated), BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.146 (= Wright, pp.6-7): a transcript erroneously attributed to `William Barlo'.

34. Beryeng, pp.49,51-3.

35. [Barlow] to Henry VIII (undated), above, note 33.

36. Mammon, prologue sig. A.ii.v.

Tyndale may of course be seeking to paint Barlow in the best possible light in order to blacken Roy. But his picture of simple idealism is quite compatible with what we know of Barlow from his later career. He too fits the picture: for him, Lutheranism, so far as it went, was an expression of disaffection with the Observants' realisation of a yearning for primitive simplicity.

It is possible that Barlow was on his way to Strassburg with the specific intention of making a rendezvous with Roy. It is also possible - though in view of their later troubles perhaps rather doubtful - that he had been sent with money by Monmouth.[37] Tyndale warned him about Roy's `boldnesse',

> `and exhorted hym to bewarre of hym & to walke quyetly and with all pacience and longe sofferinge accordinge as we haue Chryste & his apostles for an ensample; which thinge he also promysed me'.

But his warning was to no avail. For when Barlow reached Strassburg, Roy

> `gate him to hym & set him a werke to make rymes; whyle he hymselfe translated a dialoge out of Laten into Englysh, in whose prologe he promyseth moare a greate deal than I fere me he wyll euer paye'.

The appearance of these works, the Brefe Dialoge and the`Beryeng', drew a sharp response from Tyndale. In his prologue to the former Roy had embarrassed Tyndale by publicly identifying him as the translator of the English New Testament, and himself as his `healpe felowe, and parte

---

37. Monmouth was accused in 1528 of having been `privy and of counsel, of certain detestable books late printed beyond the sea, in English, against the Sacrament, and all other observances of holy Church, and chiefly against the blessed Sacrament of the Autar, and the observance of the holy Masse' (Strype (ed.), Ecclesiastical Memorials, i.488-91 (article xi)).

taker of his laboures´. And thanks to this identification the`Beryeng´- a scurrilous work which Tyndale considered unworthy of the cause for which he was fighting - could, because of Roy´s association with both it and the New Testament, be used as ammunition against Tyndale by his enemies in England. He attempted to head off this threat by devoting a good part of the Mammon prologue[38] to a condemnation of Roy and Barlow´s methods and an attempt to distance himself from them:

> `Paul sayth (the seconde pystel to Thimothe the seconde chapiter), "The seruant of the Lord must not stryue, but be peceable vnto all men and ready to teach, & one that can suffer the euyll with mekeness, and that can enfourme them that resyste, if God at any tyme wyll gyue them repentaunce for to know the throuth". It becometh not then the Lorde´s seruante to vse raylynge rymes, but God´s wordes; which is the right wepon to slaye synne, vice & all iniquite...Let it not offende the[e that] some walke inordinatly. Let not the wickednes of Judas cause the[e] to despice the doctrine of his felows. No man ought to thynke that Steuen was a fals preacher because that Nycolas whiche was chosen felowe with hi[m] (Act.vi) to mynistre vnto [the] widowes fel after i[n] to great heresyes, as hystories make mencion. Good and euell goo alwayes togeder: one can not be knowen without the other´.

In the event, though, Roy and Barlow´s works made only the slightest impact upon the English consciousness. For at this point Wolsey carried the campaign to stem the tide of printed protestant books entering England to the Continent, aiming to strike at the root of the problem by acting against their printers, distributors and above all their creators. To do this, the cardinal harnessed the energies of the king´s solicitor and ambassador at the Court of Malines, Sir John Hackett, and of Herman Rinck in Cologne. And to act as his intermediary he chose one of Roy and Barlow´s confrères from Greenwich.

---

38. Mammon, sigs. A.ii.v-A.iii.r.

(iii) Friar John West.

John West is remarkable among the English Observants in that his parentage can be reliably established. He himself tells us that he was the son by a previous marriage of Lady Elizabeth Exmew and the stepson of Sir Thomas Exmew, citizen, goldsmith and sometime Lord Mayor of London; and it is possible that through this connection he was related to the Carthusian martyr William Exmew.

We have no way of knowing when West had entered the Order, but around 1528 he describes himself as `precher & confesser´,[39] so by now he was clearly of some standing within it. At the same time he was a long-standing client of Wolsey:[40] and as such he was to demonstrate the dangers inherent in the appearance of a second centre of loyalty to rival the Order´s own disciplinary structure. On one level, he was able successfully to disregard the Order´s practice in the maintenance of individual poverty. In a revealing letter to Wolsey, appealing for aid in a dispute over his stepfather´s will in February 1529,[41] he reveals himself as the inheritor from his mother of lands at Hackney, which he had proceeded to sell to his sister and her husband, and as the inheritor and possessor on his own account of various items in gold and amounts in cash. In short, by his own admission, West stands condemned as a <u>proprietarius</u>. On another level, his pursuit of the cardinal´s

---

39. West to [Brian Tuke] (Greenwich, 17 December 1528), BL MS Cotton Vitellius B.x f.188 (=Rogers 94, <u>LP</u> iv.5043).

40. Herman Rinck found him `tum fidelem tum diligentem vestrae gratiae...et cui saepe inserviiset, et adhuc procul dubio inserviet´ (Rinck to Wolsey (4 October 1528), BL MS Cotton Vitellius B.xxi f.49r (=<u>LP</u> iv.4810)).

41. West to Wolsey (Greenwich, 8 February 1529 [<u>sic</u>]), PRO SP1/52 ff.229-30 (=<u>LP</u> iv.5275: this material is not reproduced in Rogers 107).

business successfully defied the efforts of his superiors to subject him to the discipline of the Order.

Initially Wolsey's main targets were the perpetrators of the English New Testament, identified as Tyndale and Roy. But the commission - under the Great Seal[42] - which he gave to West was to involve him more generally in seeking out and securing the apprehension of various other English fugitives, prominent among whom was an English merchant at Antwerp, Richard Harman, who had been identified as a key link in the chain along which Tyndale's Scriptures were conveyed to England.[43]

On 18 June 1528 Wolsey had instructed Hackett to procure the extradition as heretics of Tyndale, Roy and Harman. Only the last could be found, and on 12 July Hackett had him arrested, together with his wife and a fugitive English priest, Richard Akerston.[44] But the regent of the Netherlands, Margaret of Austria-Savoy, and the Council of Brabant made difficulties. Harman had for many years held burgess rights at Antwerp, and his fellow citizens agitated to have him tried under Imperial law on the grounds that he was sworn to the Emperor. Even though Henry VIII, on Hackett's advice, formally demanded his extradition as a traitor to him under the terms of a treaty of 1505, the

---

42. West to [Tuke] (17 December 1528).

43. The campaign against Harman can be traced in Rogers 67ff. and in the pages of LP vol.iv and will not be detailed here except insofar as it bears upon West's activities, or where in odd cases my interpretation of the evidence differs from Miss Rogers'.

44. Wolsey's instructions to Hackett are lost, and Miss Rogers seems to have assumed (p.155 n.7) that the three individuals named therein were Harman, his wife and Akerston. But Hackett makes clear (Rogers 68 (=LP iv.4511)) that the latter two were arrested on the initiative of the margrave of Antwerp; and in the light of West's later activities it is much more likely that Wolsey was after Tyndale and Roy, by now known in England as collaborators on the New Testament edition.

regent and Council insisted that Hackett should first supply detailed evidence to substantiate the charges against Harman. To the ambassador's increasing frustration, this Wolsey proved quite unable to do; and in fact he seems to have remitted the matter entirely into the hands of friar West.

West left the cardinal at Hampton Court on or shortly after 5 August[45] and, probably accompanied by friar John Flegh (whose particular usefulness seems to have stemmed from a relationship with a senior member of the Merchant Adventurers' company), he crossed to Antwerp, where he based himself in the Observant house while he set about searching for evidence in the town. With the governor of the Merchant Adventurers, Sir John Style, he searched Harman's house, where in spite of much refractory verbiage and some outright obstruction they succeeded in obtaining a sight of four incriminating letters. He also heard from a bookbinder named Francis Brynkman that `[this] boke [that] was lest made ageynst the kyng[es] Hyenesse & my Lord Cardynall[e]' (ie. the Beryeng) had been produced by Roy, Barlow and (ironically) Tyndale, and that Johann Schott of Strassburg had printed it. `Yett another holle pyppe off them' lay at Frankfurt. Brynkman had offered to buy them up: he could then send Tyndale, Roy and Barlow to Cologne to collect the purchase money, where West proposed to capture them with Rynck's assistance.[46]

---

45. He carried letters to Herman Rinck dated 5 August, and probably also those to Hackett, dated 4 and 5 August, to which the latter replied on the 20th (Rinck to Wolsey (4 October 1528), BL MS Cotton Galba B.xxi ff.49-50 (=LP iv.4810); Rogers 77 (=LP iv.4657).

46. West to Hackett, Style to Hackett (Antwerp, 2 September 1528), PRO SP1/50 ff.75-6,77-8 (=Rogers 78-9, LP iv.4693-4). The letters for Wolsey do not survive, but Hackett sent on those addressed to him with his letter of 10 September.

On 10 September West joined Hackett at Malines. But he did not stay long. After dinner the following evening he left for Cologne, with Brother Flegh and a `si[n]guler good trywma[n]´ to act as a guide, and financed (at Wolsey´s command) by Hackett, intending there to relinquish his habit.[47]

At Cologne, on 21 September, West made contact with Herman Rinck, to discover that the latter had - as he later informed Wolsey - carried out a coup which had succeeded in removing Roy and Barlow´s works virtually completely from the market.[48] It appears that the renegades, no doubt employing Roy´s legendary garrulity, had commissioned the printing of their two books without having the wherewithal to pay the printer. They had ordered 1000 copies of each from Schott, and a plot had been hatched to conceal them in paper covers, pack them in bundles covered with linen and convey them to England and Scotland to be sold as blank paper. But when no money was forthcoming they had been pledged as security to Jewish bankers at Frankfurt.

Rinck had heard of this, he says, three weeks before West´s arrival, and had made for the Frankfurt mart in order to capture them. Schott, in an attempt to recoup his costs, had been prepared to sell the books to the highest bidder. But Rinck had succeeded in bribing various of

---

47. Hackett to [Wolsey] (Malines, [10],12 September 1528), BL MS Cotton Galba B.ix ff.199-201,205-6 (=Rogers 80-1, LP iv.4714,4725). West had already received 20 florins from Style (Style to Hackett (2 September 1528)).

48. Rinck to Wolsey (4 October 1528). This letter is printed, with parallel English translation, in Arber (ed.), First Printed English New Testament, pp.32-6. It was conveyed to Wolsey by Rinck´s son (another Herman) and his servant John Gelger. On their way they met Hackett at Malines on 7 October (Rogers 88, LP iv.4827).

the city authorities into allowing him to redeem them on his own account at a cost, it later transpired, of £73.4s.[49] Armed with an Imperial mandate, he had cornered Schott at the mart and forced him to confess on oath before the city authorities to having printed the books; and he had procured from the authorities a prohibition, reinforced by oaths, against the printing of any more copies, and forced Schott to swear to deliver his original written copy to him. With the exception of two copies which he had passed on to friar West, the books were now lodged at his house in Cologne to await developments.

But as far as the authors - whom he mistakenly identifies as Roy and Tyndale - were concerned, Rinck could offer little comfort. Neither had been seen in Frankfurt since Easter and Schott had claimed to have lost touch with them. Nevertheless, he promised to do all he could to find out where they were and to arrest them. And he offered to go to the Emperor if necessary in order to secure the fugitives' extradition. In fact, by this time Tyndale had long since gone to ground in Antwerp, where Mammon had been published in May and where at some point he was joined by Barlow; and Roy had probably returned to England to visit his mother at Westminster.

Having failed to locate his quarry at Cologne, West returned to Antwerp, whence he departed for England on or shortly after 7 October.[50] By this time, despite Hackett's having repeatedly - though with ever-increasing difficulty - managed to put off the conclusion of

---

49. West to Wolsey [?6 Febuary 1528], BL MS Cotton Appendix 1 f.38r (=Rogers 109, LP iv.5402; the latter gives the erroneous figure of £63.4s.).

50. West to [Wolsey] (Antwerp, 7 October 1528), PRO SP1/50 ff.193-4 (=Rogers 87, LP iv.4826).

Harman´s case in the hope that Wolsey would be able to come up with the necessary evidence, he had ultimately been unable to prevent his release from prison on surety. It was evidently felt that a personal briefing might do something to awaken the cardinal to the urgency of the situation: so on his return West wrote to Wolsey requesting an interview, stressing that unless he could produce `some other p[ar]ticulare declarations off treason then ther ys leyd ageynst hym as yett´, Harman was likely to be set free `ffor alltogyder´ within the next three weeks.[51] West knew by now that Roy had been back in England with his mother and where Tyndale, Barlow and others were (i.e. in Antwerp), and `after what man[ner] and weys they must be taken and w[ith] whome or ell[es] they wyll nott be taken nor yett had´.

But his personal briefing did nothing immediately to end Wolsey´s procrastination. On 21 November he complained to the ambassador from Greenwich that he had still got nothing from the cardinal, who had excused himself by alleging pressure of other business.[52] By this time West had problems of his own to contend with. He had been attempting to carry out his own investigations, into (among other things) where Roy had been when he had visited his mother at Westminster -

---

51. PRO SP1/53 ff.201-2 (=Rogers 115, LP iv.5462). In the course of his correspondence Hackett mentions having obtained a total of four extensions of time in the Harman case. The first ended on 22 September, the third on 4 December and the last on the last Friday of February. Pace both Rogers and LP this undated letter clearly represents West´s first communication with the cardinal on his return to England and the impending release to which he refers must be identified with the end of the second period of grace (which may be presumed to have fallen at the end of October) rather than, as they seem to have assumed, with his final acquittal.

52. This letter is lost, but this much of its content can be gleaned from Hackett´s reply of [31] December (BL MS Cotton Galba B.ix ff.155-6 (=Rogers 95, LP iv.5078)).

Hackett had again asked that he should be dispensed from his habit for the purpose - but was being prevented by his superiors, who had taken exception to his activities. He complained to Brian Tuke, treasurer of the Chamber (and hence Hackett's financial contact in London)[53] that he could `s[et] abowt none off my bessynes but they wyll knowe yt'. Furthermore, the provincial minister and William Robinson, the warden of Greenwich, had been to Wolsey to demand the revocation of West's commission. They had taken from him the companion (possibly Flegh) whom he had brought with him from the Low Countries, and had sent him away in a ship alone, without a companion. So he now proposed to take back with him one Brother Cornelius Hewtssam, a Dutchman whose poor English would enable him to act more discreetly. Since the friars would not obey the king's `brodssell' he begged Tuke to obtain from Wolsey either a dispensation or, failing that, `a [letter] off an obedyencce vnder my Lord['s] brodssealle', which Tuke should see was delivered personally to him at Greenwich. He even offered to reimburse Tuke its cost, `ffor I ame so dessolatte [that] w[ith]owt yowr helpe [that] I myght come to the speche off my Lord['s] Gracce, they wyll put me in pryssone'.

West evidently survived this particular crisis, in circumstances which are unclear. Hackett, meanwhile, had managed to secure yet another delay in the hearing of Harman's case - to expire on the last day of February - but was complaining that he had now heard nothing from Wolsey for four months or more.[54] `I maruail', he wrote to West, `that you haue nott schowyth vnto hys G[race] the inportance of this bys-

---

53. West to [Tuke] (Greenwich, 17 December 1528), BL MS Cotton Vitellius B.x f.188 (=Rogers 94, LP iv.5043).

54. Hackett to West ([31] December 1528).

senes´. He seems to have heard nothing further by 20 January 1529, when he badgered Tuke to send West to him `w[ith] good instruxion´.[55] By the beginning of February West too was becoming visibly agitated. He warned the cardinal of Harman´s impending aquittal, and of the imminence of the opening of the Frankfurt bookmart; he asked him to prepare a comprehensive selection of `p[ro]cess[es] off letters w[ith] other artty-kyll[es]´ intended to tighten-up measures against refugee English heretics, which he would need upon his return to the Continent; and he again asked for a dispensation from his habit in order that he and Rinck´s servant John Gelger might `go togyther pryue[ly]´.[56] A few days later, on 8 February, he wrote again from Greenwich, expressing a suitably heightened sense of urgency.[57] He appealed to be dispatched, reminding Wolsey that come a fortnight from the next Friday, if nothing was done, Harman would be `delyueryd conwytte´ and Hackett would find himself in court, required to compensate Harman for the sum - exceeding 2,000 florins[58] - which the latter claimed he had lost over the period of his imprisonment; `ffor the whyche, yff R. Harman opteyne, yt schalbe a schrewyd auctore ffor the other rebellyous and Lutheryans in that contre´.

In spite of the urgency of his appeals, there is in fact no firm indication that West ever returned to the Continent in connection with

---

55. BL MS Cotton Galba B.ix ff.160-2 (=Rogers 103, LP iv.5192).

56. West to Wolsey ([?Greenwich, 6 February 1529]), BL MS Cotton Appendix 1 ff.38-9 (=Rogers 109, LP iv.5402).

57. PRO SP1/52 ff.229-30 (=Rogers 107, LP iv.5275).

58. Hackett to West ([31] December 1528).

his business there. Hackett, at Brussels, had received no news of his coming by 14 February.[59] But he may have been the courier of the King's and Wolsey's letters to the Regent and Council concerning one William Clay, a fugitive London mercer - among those which he had earlier requested - which were among those, dated 20 March, which Hackett received on the 29th.[60] By this time, so far as Harman was concerned, all was lost. At the end of February, for lack of evidence, he had been aquitted of all the charges against him: the tables had been turned, and Hackett had been faced with defending himself against a damages suit.

(iv) Conclusion.

West never did catch up with Roy or Barlow, although he ran them close. Their movements during the early part of 1529 are a mystery; though it is probable that, in Tyndale's absence in Hamburg, both were hiding out in Antwerp. The translations of Luther's sermon on 1 Corinthians 7 and Erasmus' Paraclesis appeared there in June 1529. But by this time both Roy and Barlow were back in England, where we find them being pursued across East Anglia by West and another Greenwich friar, John Lawrence. The pursuers reported their progress to Wolsey from the abbey of St. Benet, Holme on 12 June.[61]

Acting on information received from one John Stanleye, `sometyme the ffamylyare off ower covent at Ryschemownd', the pair had been sent by Wolsey to entrap Roy at Yarmouth. He had eluded their search in the

---

59. Hackett to Tuke, PRO SP1/53 ff.6-7 (=Rogers 108, LP iv.5292).

60. Hackett to Wolsey (13 April 1529), BL MS Cotton Galba B.ix ff.165-70 (=Rogers 111, LP iv.5461).

61. PRO SP1/54 f.97 (=LP iv.5667).

Greyfriars and the town; but they had come across a local schoolmaster who claimed to have drunk with him between Yarmouth and Lowestoft during Whitsun week. In substantiating his claim the schoolmaster

> `schewyd to vs all [the] ffetures and ffacyon off hys parssone; also the prevy & secrett mark[es] off hys fface; also the manere off hys spekyng, and how he dothe speke all man-[ner] off langayche, w[ith] the manere off hys apparell. And he descrybythe hym so yn euery proparte, that by all apperance [it] schuld be he´.

He had reported that the man had claimed to have come from over sea and to be heading for the North.

Despairing of catching up with Roy, the pair had left Yarmouth for Norwich. But at Langley Abbey they had met a young Lincolnshire man who two days before had encountered him and another, red-headed man, - whom they thought was probably Barlow - at Attleborough on the road to Lynn. On seeing him, Roy had `declynyd owt off the hye weye and hyd hys ffacce, by cawsse he wold nott be seen nore knowen´. But the other had stopped to ask him the way to Lynn, and on receiving this information, the pair had moved off down the road at great speed.

Realising that they themselves could not hope to catch the fugitives, West and Lawrence had resorted to the abbot of St. Benet´s who, immediately upon hearing that they were on the cardinal´s business, had sent servants on horseback to Lynn and Walsingham. The former had returned with the news that the fugitives had taken ship for Newcastle. Their pursuers prepared to follow them, and asked Wolsey for another letter in case they had to go beyond Newcastle; for they feared that Roy might be heading for Scotland.

The fugitives evidently made good their escape; and at this point Roy disappears from sight. We must leave the last word on him to Sir

Thomas More, who recounted in 1532 that since abandoning his Order Roy had

> `sought many a false vnlyefull way to lyue by; wherin he made so many chaunges that, as [Richard] Bayfield another heretyque & late burned in Smythfeld tolde vnto me, he made a mete ende at last and was burned in Portyngale´.

A marginal annotation of the copy in Bishop Tunstall´s London register of his October 1526 prohibition of Tyndale´s New Testament, picked up by John Fox, suggests 1531 as the date of his burning.[62]

Barlow made a less unpleasant end. He had apparently returned to Antwerp by early in 1530, when his Proper Dyaloge appeared from Hoogstraten´s press. Subsequently he returned to England to make his peace with the king,[63] putting his faith in Henry´s

> `so excellent learnynge and synguler jugement of the trothe, which endevored not onely to chace away and extyrpe all heresyes, but also to se a reformacyone of slawnderous lyvynge, for the restraynte of vyce in all estates, to the furtheraunce of vertue and avauncement of Gode´s Worde; also considerynge the pyteous favour voyde of rygour, and mercye abhorrynge cruelte, which your Hygnes hath used towarde other of your subgettes fallen into soche lyke heresyes, as have submytted theym selves humbly unto your Grace´.

At this point Barlow, too, disappears from the pages of history.

West ultimately found the pressure of competing jurisdictions intolerable. After June 1529 he too disappears from sight, having probably

---

62. More, `Confutacyon of Tyndale´s Answere´ (1532), preface, in Complete Works viii(i), p.8; John Foxe, Acts and Monuments (ed. J. Pratt, London, [1887]), iv.696,753. The Parma general chapter of 1529 had decreed measures to deal with Lutheran apostates, including a provision for handing over responsibility for those who could not be secured by the prelates of the Order to the secular arm (Glassberger, p.563).

63. [Barlow] to Henry VIII BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.146 (=Wright, pp.6-7).

achieved the dispensation which he sought. He is an example of the kind of virtually independent operator common enough among the Conventual friars in England, but otherwise unheard-of among the Observants. And as such his activities were of great concern to his superiors, who after his return to England in October 1528 had tried to put a stop to them. It is worth returning for a moment to the letter in which West describes his tribulations at that point.[64] In it he offers a remarkable explanation of their hostility to him in terms of their support for the heretics:

> `they haue grett indignation at me bycawsse I haue sped so well, and bycawsse ther ys moo off them gylty in the matters off Lutheryans...I ame wery off my lyffe amonge them, and all bycawsse I see them that [they] be wyllyng to mayntteyne thes rebellyo[us] heretyk[es] in ther myscheffe; and they praye to God [that] they moutte neu[er] be taken...they cannott speke amonge them a good word off my Lord[es] Gracce and the Kyng-[es]. And bycawsse I do repr[ove] them off ther yll seyng[es] they go abowt all [that] they can to put me t[o] trobyll & vexations and desolations´.

Making due allowance for an element of exaggeration, there is an important point here. In claiming, in effect, that the friars´ opposition to Wolsey (and by implication to the king) overrode even their concern for doctrinal orthodoxy, West is actually underlining the extent of their desire to maintain their jurisdictional independence. The Greenwich superiors were not expressing their approval of heresy. Rather they were saying that the disciplining of Roy and Barlow, professed friars, belonged to them, and not to Wolsey or anyone else.

If the cardinal really had the interests of good Franciscan observance at heart in his dealings with the Observants, his actions

---

64. West to [Tuke] (17 December 1528).

were utterly misconceived. Throughout this whole business it was the Greenwich superiors who had a better grasp of the realities of the situation, in appreciating that so far as the friars were concerned it was the question of jurisdiction, rather than that of doctrinal orthodoxy, which was of crucial importance. The latter could be kept under control and dealt with through the existing disciplinary structure. But not the least consequence of Wolsey's interference was that his visitation threw a proportion of the Lutheran element out of control and so made the situation worse rather than better. And it had another, more insidious consequence. Once the integrity of the structure was damaged, once another source of jurisdiction and patronage was introduced into it, the whole edifice of Franciscan observance was infected with a cancer which was to prove impossible to eradicate. The disease did not appear only in the person of one man, friar West; nor did it disappear with the death of the Cardinal of York. As we shall see in the next chapter, Wolsey left behind him a legacy of divided loyalties which was to compromise the friars when, in the 1530s, they came into conflict in quite different circumstances with his successor, Thomas Cromwell.

Chapter 4.

The Conflict of Loyalties (2): The Break with Rome (March 1532-August 1534).

(i) Introduction.

Because of their special importance, both symbolic (as the supreme public embodiment of early Tudor dynastic piety) and practical (in their importance as preachers and confessors whose reputation and influence was widespread and reached deep into the heart of the political nation), and because of their international character, securing the Observants' acquiescence in the religious changes of the early 1530s was necessarily a priority for Thomas Cromwell's government. Converted to his cause, they could be the king's priceless allies: unconverted, they could be among his most effective opponents, the consequences of whose opposition could be to aid sedition at home and action by hostile foreign powers, and ultimately to contribute to the downfall of the still insecure dynasty.

But Henry VIII's determination to secure a divorce from Katherine of Aragon, and the historic changes of policy which resulted, fundamentally divided the friars' historical loyalties to the King on the one hand, the queen and the Pope on the other. In this, their dilemma was more acute than that of all other Englishmen, who in these years were forced to make the choice; for while the friars were no less the king's subjects, their constitutional dependence upon the papacy was such that they could not abandon it and retain their organisational integrity.

At first, during the debate over the king's proposed divorce, the two loyalties did not appear to be necessarily mutually exclusive, and there was some room for debate and attempts at compromise. And while at first the majority of the Greenwich friars supported the queen, there

was a small party - based largely upon individual patronal links - which took the part of the king and the Boleyn marriage. For a time, Cromwell was able to use this party in an attempt to exert some kind of control over the friars; and circumstances conspired to mute somewhat their public opposition to his policy. But as that policy moved towards the formal renunciation of the Roman primacy, the friars' opinions hardened and their opposition found its way, in varying degrees, into the public domain. They ultimately realised that they would not be allowed to serve two masters: in the end they took their stand on the issue of the Royal Supremacy, and faced the consequences.

(ii) Friars William Peto, Henry Elston and the Opposition to Henry VIII.

Open opposition from among the friars' ranks at first took the form of isolated acts by individuals, moves in the wider game being played out inside and outside Parliament between the summer of 1530 and early 1532. By the summer of 1530 it had become clear that political events in Italy - in particular, the domination which Katherine of Aragon's uncle, the Emperor Charles V, exercised over Pope Clement VII - meant that the king could not hope to obtain satisfaction over the divorce issue. In England, the diplomatic impasse issued in a battle for control of policy between a radical group centred on Thomas Cromwell and the collection of caesaro-papist proof-texts known as 'Collectanea satis copiosa', and a theologically conservative, largely humanist 'Aragonese' group, including Bishop Fisher of Rochester and the Lord Chancellor, Sir Thomas More and grouped around the queen and the Imper-

ial ambassador Eustace Chapuys.[1]

It was natural enough, in view of their long-standing and close association, that the friars should be sympathetic to the queen's cause and make use of their local and international connections to lobby on her behalf. As early as January 1528 it had been reported from Italy that their general had asked Cardinal Campeggio to write to the pope seeking a prohibition against a trial of the divorce question in England.[2] But by the beginning of 1532 some of the friars who were closest to the centre of events were beginning to see that the king's desire for a divorce was such that in the absence of a satisfactory verdict from the Vatican he was allowing himself to be drawn into taking punitive measures against Rome which might ultimately amount to schism.

By the early spring of 1532 the English Observants' provincial minister, William Peto, and Henry Elston, the warden of Greenwich, were clearly playing an active, though covert rôle in the Aragonese opposition. They were in contact with Chapuys, and the ambassador implies that they were already (as they certainly were later) using their international connections to smuggle out anti-divorce propaganda for publication abroad.[3] And a little later Peto is found, in conjunction with More, attempting to fortify the Parliamentary opposition.

---

1. This interpretation of events originated in an article by G. R. Elton, `Sir Thomas More and the Opposition to Henry VIII', first published in Moreana (1967) but latterly most accessible in his Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government vol.1 (Cambridge, 1974), pp.155ff. What follows is chiefly based upon the development of this interpretation by J. A. Guy, The Public Career of Sir Thomas More (Brighton, 1980), pp.128ff.

2. [Copy of] Gregory Casale to Wolsey (Orvieto, 13 January [1528]), BL MS Cotton Vitellius B.x f.39r (=LP iv.3802).

3. Chapuys to Charles V (16 April [15]32), CSP Spanish 1531-3, no.934 (=LP v.941).

By now the radical party was making the running inside and outside Parliament. At the end of March 1531 Parliament had been presented with an edition by the king's printer Thomas Berthelet of the opinions in favour of the divorce which Thomas Cranmer and others had gathered from the European universities, together with an abridgement of `Collectanea satis copiosa'. In November Berthelet had published Cranmer's English translation of the work to make it available to a wider audience. The January-May Parliamentary session was the first in which it is possible to see Cromwell's guiding hand at work. The Commons' `Supplication against the Ordinaries' had been conveyed to the king on 18 March, while, notwithstanding strenuous opposition from Aragonese sympathisers, the Annates bill had passed both houses - albeit in a conditional form - by early in Easter week.

So the sermon which Peto gave before the king in the friars' church at Greenwich a few days later on Easter Sunday, 29 March, looks very much like a timely shot in the Aragonese campaign: an attempt to thwart the tendencies of Cromwellian policy by bringing pressure from a particularly influential source to bear upon the king's instinctively Catholic conscience; to warn him to be on his guard against the perils of false advice, to appreciate the consequences of following the course down which he was allowing himself to be led and to draw back while there was still time.

Peto chose an appropriate text; the story of King Ahab and the prophet Micaiah (1 Kings 22). According to Chapuys,[4] he alluded,

---

4. Ibid. Chapuys seems to have obtained his information at second hand; but while the odd detail is clearly incorrect, in general, and in particular in his chronology, he seems reasonably accurate. There is a second contemporary account, dated 13 April, from the pen of the Venetian ambassador (CSP Venetian 1527-33, no.860), but this appears to be based entirely upon hearsay and is rather less useful.

`though in general terms, to the fact that the excessive affection of princes and false counsellors often precluded the knowledge of the truth´. With the benefit of more than 20 years´ hindsight the Marian archdeacon of Canterbury, Nicholas Harpsfield, has him behaving rather less cautiously, explicitly picturing himself as Micaiah and those who preached in favour of the divorce as the multitude of false prophets who sent Ahab to attack Ramon-Gilead and so brought about his doom, and directly attacking the divorce in his sermon.[5] But there would be no need; nor, perhaps, would prudence allow Peto to go quite this far. The allusion would be obvious enough. Should Henry go ahead with the divorce, the dogs would lick his blood as they had Ahab´s. The point could be pressed home later, as king and preacher talked in the friary garden.

As they talked, Peto did refer directly to the divorce issue. Soon afterwards he recalled the conversation to his kinsman Sir George Throckmorton, who wrote down his recollections of their meeting for the king´s benefit some years later:[6]

> `he sewryd me [that] he dyd tell you [that] yn hys consyen-[es] ye kowde neyuer haue other wyfe wyl [the] Prynses Dowe-ger dyd lyfe, w[ith]owthe ye cowde proue a carnal knowlege betwyxte Prynse Harter & her: wyche he seyd yn hy[es] consy-

---

5. Nicholas Harpsfield, A Treatise on the Pretended Divorce Between Henry VIII and Katharine of Aragon (ed. N. Pocock, Camden Society new series vol.xii, 1878) pp.202-5. Although tendentious and chronologically unreliable, this account deserves some credence since its author claims to have obtained the details from the mouth of friar Elston. It was substantially followed by John Stow (Stow, p.561).

6. Throckmorton´s confession to Henry VIII ([October 1537]), PRO SP1/125 ff.247ff (printed in Guy, op. cit., appendix B, =LP xii(ii).952(1)). The passage quoted occurs on f.249v.

en[es] cowde neyuer be well profyd, ffor he seyd seche solde beste know yt of any lyfy[n]g creyture & [that] seche had reyceyd [the] sacreme[n]t to [the] contrarye. And seche bey-[n]g sow vertu[es] a womane there owthe to be moure creyd-a[n]ce gyffe[n] to her then to al [the] other profy[es]. & as to al [the] other profy[es], he seyd were but apon preysu[m]-cy[es] saufe [the] seyng of Prynce Harter [that] he had byn yn [the] mydyl of Spayne; wyche he soppousyd was bot a lyte worde spowke of hym. & ferder seyd [that] he dyd sewre yo[u]r Grase [that] ye cowde neyfer mary Quene Ane, ffor [that] yt was seyd ye had meydyld w[ith] [the] moder & [the] dowter´.

Chapuys had heard that Peto had warned the king that he stood to lose his kingdom if the Boleyn marriage went ahead, as `all his subjects, high and low, were opposed to it´. Henry could not persuade Peto to change his mind, but did not at this stage take any action against him and, indeed, gave him the permission which he asked to leave the country to attend the Pentecost general chapter at Toulouse.[7]

Peto then took himself elsewhere; probably to Canterbury.[8] And the king proceeded to use his absence to arrange that on the next Sunday his chaplain Dr. Richard Curwen should preach in the friars´ church to contradict Peto; even though in order to do so he had to disregard both the practice of the Order and the wishes of the warden, Elston.[9] In the course of what Harpsfield, no doubt with a touch of rhetorical exagge-ration, pictures as an arrogant, mocking sermon, he expressed regret that the provincial was not there to defend himself. This provided the cue for Elston, already angered by the infringement of the friars´

---

7. Chapuys to Charles V (16 April [15]32). Chapuys´ implication that Peto immediately left the country is belied by the speed of his return after the events of the following Sunday. For the Pentecost chapter at Toulouse, Wadding, xvi.308,310.

8. Harpsfield, followed by Christopher Davenport (Davenport, pp.190-1), says that he went to a provincial chapter at Canterbury.

9. Chapuys to Charles V (16 April [15]32).

privileges which the sermon represented, to interrupt him (according to Harpsfield from the roodloft) with an offer to respond in Peto's place. He was calmed down for the moment, but returned to the fray when at the end of his sermon Curwen asserted - quite untruthfully - that `all the universities and doctors' had declared for the legality of the divorce. According to Chapuys, Elston responded by condemning the whole sermon as `a fabrication and a lie'.

This time the king acted. As soon as he heard of the incident, Peto returned home to receive a letter, signed at Henry's command by the bishops, demanding that he should deprive Elston of office and have him punished for his temerity. This he refused to do: and so on or shortly after 13 April the king ordered that they should both be imprisoned.[10] Pending a change of attitude on their part, they were committed to the custody of Bishop Henry Standish and lodged in the porter's ward at Lambeth Palace.[11]

In the end, Peto's gesture proved to have been counter-productive. While he had obviously shaken the king's conscience, at the same time he had helped to make Henry aware of the strength of the Aragonese lobby's opposition to the divorce. The opposition's miscalculation was that the king was simply ill-advised, and was still accessible via reasonable argument. But by now, convinced in his own mind of the

---

10. Ibid. The bishops' letter cannot have been procured before the re-assembly of Parliament after the Easter recess on 10 April. The Venetian ambassador, writing on 13 April, reports that `today it is reported that he [Elston] has been sent to the Tower'; while Chapuys dates the pair's arrest to the day before he wrote.

11. For the place of imprisonment (`a toure yn Lambyth oufer [the] gayte'), see Throckmorton's confession, f.249v. For Standish as custodian, see S. E. Lehmberg, The Reformation Parliament, 1529-1536 (Cambridge, 1970) p.146n, citing Christ Church, Oxford, MS 306 f.46.

rightness of his own case, he was determined only upon obtaining his divorce by whatever means were necessary. While part of him saw Peto's point, another - and by now dominant - part of him saw this opposition as a betrayal. In the end, the sermon served to harden the king's heart. The final straw was Bishop Gardiner's uncompromising and grossly miscalculated reply to the Supplication against the Ordinaries later in the month. Henry was pushed firmly into the radical camp. The sequels were the submission of the clergy, More's resignation from the chancellorship and the removal of the Aragonese group from influence at court and in Parliament.

No doubt the Conventual Standish had been chosen for the job of jailer with a due sense of irony and intent to humiliate: he had after all been Wolsey's agent in his 1525 visitation. But in the changed circumstances of 1532 he was a short-sighted choice. The usual rules of the game no longer applied: jailer and prisoners were united by sympathy for Katherine's cause. So he proved a light-handed custodian. With his connivance the pair were able to receive visits from their brethren and to continue to communicate with Chapuys and the queen.[12] At some point Peto was visited in jail by his kinsman Sir George Throckmorton, and reinforced the latter's resolve to continue his opposition to Cromwell's programme in the Commons.[13]

---

12. Chapuys to Charles V (2 May [15]32), CSP Spanish 1531-3, no.948 (=LP v.989). For visits by William Curzon, the vicar of the Greenwich convent, John Lawrence to [Cromwell] [April-May 1532], BL MS Lansdowne 116 f.53 (=LP v.1142).

13. Throckmorton's confession, ff.249v-50r. Throckmorton, writing in 1537, places the meeting shortly before the beginning of the Parliamentary session on 10 April; but this chronology is incompatible with the contemporary ambassadorial accounts.

According to the vicar of the Greenwich convent, William Curzon, Elston at least subsequently appeared `dyu[er]s tymes byfore the bysshoopes & ones byfore the Cynocacion´.[14] The latter reference is probably to Peto and Elston´s appearance on 19 April, when they fruitlessly complained against Curwen for having preached in the convent without permission.[15] On 2 May Chapuys reported that the king had sent to Rome for a commission for Dr. George Browne, provincial of the Austin friars, to try them. At their and the queen´s request he had asked the emperor to have his ambassador in Rome stop the commission; and he had also asked the papal nuncio in England to write in their support. These moves seem to have been successful: at any rate we hear no more of the intended prosecution.

At some time between mid-April and mid-May, Cromwell was warned that Peto and Elston were receiving regular visits from Curzon:[16] so he had them separated and removed elsewhere. By 22 May Elston was in the care of the Conventual Franciscans of Bedford, and Curzon found it necessary to write to a local knight and patron of the Observants, Sir John Dyve, in an attempt to discover the circumstances of his imprisonment, and whether he was being allowed to communicate with outsiders.[17] Peto´s whereabouts at this time are unknown. Both friars were still in custody at the end of September, when the commissary who had by then been sent by the minister-general to sort out the province´s affairs petitioned

---

14. William Curzon to Sir John Dyve ([22 May 1532]), PRO SP1/66 f.31 (=LP v.266/1043).

15. Lehmberg, loc. cit.

16. Lawrence to [Cromwell] [April-May 1532].

17. Curzon to Dyve [22 May 1532].

the king to return them to their community.[18] But in the event both left the country, in circumstances which are unclear.

Peto was at Pontoise, near Paris, conferring with the minister-general, at the start of 1533:[19] but by the end of June both he and Elston had settled in the convent at Antwerp, where they engaged in preparing and publishing controversial works against the Boleyn marriage. Informing Cromwell of their presence, John Coke, chaplain to the English Merchant Adventurers in the town, enclosed three letters from the friars which he had intercepted.[20] Coke's warning prompted Cromwell to enquire further into their activities. He began by commissioning a report from William Lok, a London mercer who travelled to Antwerp in July. On his arrival, Lok went straight to Coke; and their reports and others from Cromwell's friend Stephen Vaughan, the king's factor in Antwerp, shed considerable light on the friars' activities.[21]

Peto, wrote Coke, was supported by `certeyn Espanyard[es]...by meanes wherof he is well entertayned in the Grayfriers here, and hath

---

18. Jean de la Haye to Henry VIII ([29 September 1532]), PRO SP1/71 f.67 (=LP v.1358).

19. Peto's name appears in the register of the convent on 10 January (DNB), and the minister-general wrote to Henry VIII from here on 13 January (BL MS Cotton Caligula E.ii f.187 (=LP v.715/vi.36)).

20. PRO SP1/77 f.107 (=LP vi.726). One of these letters was probably that written on 26 June by Elston to his successor at Greenwich, Thomas Sydenham, asking the latter to write to the warden at Antwerp asking that he should provide for Elston out of the common income of the house (ibid., f.93 (=LP vi.705)).

21. Lok to Cromwell, Coke to Cromwell (Antwerp, 26 July 1533, [1533]), PRO SP1/78 ff.37-8,39 (=LP vi.899-900); Vaughan to Cromwell (Calais, 30 July [1533]), ibid. ff.57-8 (=LP vi.917); the same to the same (Antwerp, 3 August [1533]), ibid. ff.84-5 (=SP vii, pp.489-90; LP vi.934); the same to the same (Antwerp, 21 October [1533]), ibid. SP1/80 ff.5-6 (=SP vii, pp.517-8; LP vi.1324).

appoynted vnto hym the fairest lodgyng in all the howse, lackyng therto no bok[es]´. He was receiving money from England, at least some of which was coming from a black-bearded London merchant who, Coke later told Vaughan, had tried to persuade him to carry £10 to Antwerp for the friar. And he was liberally supplied with gifts in kind. `He is not able´ wrote Vaughan in October `to were the clokys and kukullys [ie. cowls] that be sent hym owt of Englond, they be so many.´

The pair were in regular touch with England via a constant traffic of friars passing in both directions across the Channel. Lok reported that, ten days before he wrote, an English friar had left Antwerp for England carrying `a c[er]tyn wrytynn´, which he could not identify. Already before this two other friars (Hugh Payne and one brother Cornelius) had crossed over to England to search out texts for Peto, and had visited Katherine of Aragon at Buckden:[22] and on 3 August Vaughan warned Cromwell that two more friars had lately gone over to England. He remarked that a friar came to Peto from England every week and warned Cromwell to beware of friars leaving the country in lay attire.

By this means Peto and Elston kept in touch with leading opposition figures in England. `Maister More´ reported Vaughan on 3 August `hathe sent often tymes and lately book[es] vnto Peto in Andwerp, as his book of the confutac[i]on of Tyndale, and ffrythe his opynyon of the Sacrament, w[ith] dyuers other book[es]´. More importantly, the friars were engaged in having printed and distributed a Latin tract against the king´s `Great Matter´ in answer to A Glasse of the Truthe, a popular

---

22. [Cromwell to Henry VIII] ([pre-23 July 1533]), PRO SP1/80 ff.51-2 (=Merriman 65, LP vi.1369; in both cases erroneously placed at the end of October); the same to the same (London, 23 July [1533]), ibid. SP1/78 ff.26-7 (=Merriman 52, LP vi.887); Vaughan to Cromwell (3 August).

presentation of the government's arguments for the king's unmarried state and for England's independence from foreign jurisdictions, which had appeared from Berthelet's press in September 1532.[23] Coke claimed on 26 July that the book was not yet finished, but that he had been promised a sight of it when it was; while Vaughan, writing from Calais on 30 July, had heard that the book was already abroad. By 3 August he had discovered that it had been drawn up by Bishop Fisher and edited in England by two Spanish laymen. Peto and `one fryer Elston of Cantorbury' were, he reported, `the only men that haue and do take vpon them to be conveyers of the same book[es] into Englond, and conveyers of all other thing[es] onto and out of Englond'.

Eighty copies of the book had been sent to England; but `here they haue determyned to put none abrode till they maye here how those be bestowed there'. In fact, the delay was probably due to the difficulty which the friars experienced in obtaining official authority to publish the book in the Low Countries, since Vaughan also mentions that Peto was continually `runnyng to and from the courte here', and a little before this Lord Lisle had remarked of the book that the friars `as yet cannot get lyssens to have hit owght cu[m] p[ri]uylegeo'.[24]

---

23. A copy of this short work, purportedly published at Luneburg, survives in the British Library (although I have been unable to locate it). It includes material extracted from the Spanish royal archives and seeks to prove that Katherine's marriage to Arthur had not been consummated and that, even if it had been, Henry VIII's papal dispensation was valid. It describes itself as a `Parasceue' - an introduction to a longer work called `Anticatoptron', enlarging upon the same themes, which is no doubt to be identified with the second work mentioned by Cromwell's correspondents (N. Pocock (ed.), Records of the Reformation (Oxford, 1870), ii.422ff; LP vi.901).

24. Appended to a fragment of intelligence in the hand of Sir John Hackett ([post-3 July 1533]), BL MS Cotton Galba B.x f.41 (=Lisle Letters i.appendix 1(a); LP vi.902).

Nevertheless Vaughan managed to get hold of a copy, which he forwarded to Cromwell: he also discovered that `another booke muche greater then this...is a pryntyng in Andwerp, agenst the kyng[es] Greate Matter, and made by them that made th´other, as it is supposed´. He later heard that they had taken this new book to Tyndale, and had asked him to correct it; but Tyndale had refused, saying that `he wolde no farther medle in his prynce´s mater, ne wolde move his people agenst hym, sithe it was done´.

Vaughan was lavish in his condemnation of Peto, calling him

> `an ipocrite knave, as the more p[ar]te of his brethern be; a wolff, a tyger cladd in a shepe´s skyn. It is a p[er]ilous knave, a reyser of sedyc[i]on, an euyll reporter of t[he] kyng[e´s] Hieghnes, a prophesyar of myschief, a felow that I wo[ld] wysshe to be in the kyng[e´s] hand[es] and to be shamefully punysshed´.

He promised that he would inform the king of Peto´s every move, and that he would try to arrange his capture. This last he failed to do: and both Peto and Elston remained at large. But at this point we must leave them, having run ahead of ourselves just enough to fill in the background to contemporary events in England.

(iii) Friar John Lawrence and the Opposition Within the Friaries.

At first, Cromwell´s intelligence suggested that Peto and Elston might be part of a relatively small minority of militant dissidents. After their arrest he carried out some investigations of his own into the state of opinion within the Greenwich friary, in the course of which he interviewed Curzon, who seems to have satisfied him about his own views. But it soon became clear not only that Curzon and other leading friars fully supported Peto and Elston and were in constant

touch with them, but that the friars were in constant touch with the queen.[25] Even so, Cromwell still saw the situation as controllable, so long as he could ensure that Aragonese sympathisers were removed from office and the province placed in reliable hands in order effectively to isolate it from Antwerp and from the queen.

Cromwell was able to take this view, and at first to achieve a measure of success in his efforts, largely through the existence of a dissident minority among the Greenwich friars which was prepared actively to support the king. Insofar as it can be pinned down, this group seems to have grown out of individual patronal connections: both of its most prominent figures had at one time been clients of Wolsey, and one now relied upon the charity of Anne Boleyn. These men suffered from the attempts of the leadership to re-assert communal discipline, which they saw as persecution by a minority unmindful of its duty to the king. The years 1532 and early 1533 saw a number of apostasies - and one death in prison - at Greenwich and Richmond which can probably be attributed to this process.[26] And under this pressure two friars in particular came out into the open to seek Cromwell's and the king's protection against their brethren by providing information against them: information which Cromwell was able to put to good use.

---

25. Some years later a former servant of Katherine of Aragon, identified by LP as Anthony Roke, gave the government a number of names of friars, including Peto, Curzon, William Robinson and John Forest, who had visited Katherine's household `at dyu[er]s feest[es] and at sondry plac[es] many tymes to confesse the ladyes and gentilwomen: and sometyme they said it was their wey frome oone of their houses to another' (PRO SP1/142 f.201v (=LP xiv(i).190)).

26. Richard Lyst to Cromwell (18 February [1533]), BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv ff.33-4 (=Ellis (3rd series) ii.257ff; LP vi.168).

The more important of the two was John Lawrence, whom we have already encountered as the companion of Wolsey's agent friar John West in the summer of 1529. By now Lawrence was quite a senior figure among the Greenwich friars: in contemporary correspondence he is repeatedly described as `father', and he probably held the office of discreet in the community. He was certainly a regular public preacher. Nevertheless, in his surviving letters Lawrence comes across as a rather pathetic figure. Obsequious in the extreme, he is forever pleading urgently for personal interviews with the king and Cromwell and asking for a royal commission to preach the king's cause to protect him from his brethren; this he never got, probably because it would effectively have destroyed his value as an informant. He made free with policy advice, most of which turned out in the end to have been misconceived, to the extent that on at least one occasion he fell altogether out of Cromwell's favour, finding himself and his messengers refused admission to Cromwell's house, and subsequently feeling compelled to submit an apology for his behaviour.[27] Nevertheless Cromwell found his information useful and acted upon it.

Lawrence's troubles came to a head over his public preaching in favour of the king. In what is probably the earliest of his surviving letters to Cromwell, written from Richmond in April or early May 1532,[28] he begs to be allowed to do the king service and bemoans his plight:

---

27. PRO SP1/73 f.118 (=LP v.1739): probably written in London during Lawrence's exile from Greenwich in late 1533 or early 1534.

28. Ibid., SP1/70 f.161 (=LP v.1143).

> `Sere, I am note abylle to abyde [the] ylle wylle [that] owre fathar[es] hathe co[n]sauyd aganste me becaws [that] I do fauore [the] kyng[es] party. For they do ynvente & ynmagene all [the] mense & wayse possybylle to pute me to co[n]fusyone; & I can speke nothynge yn no awdyens wher as I do pretche whytche schollde ynduce [the] pe[p]yll to deve reverence & obed[i]ence to ther suverane byt [the] frers do say [that] I dowe pretche [the] kyng[es] mattare´.

The immediate cause of his discomfiture was an incident which had occurred on the previous day. He had been preaching at Kingston-upon-Thames. He had spoken , he claims, `byte a fev words ynducynge & p[er]swadynge [the] pepyll to haue thar prynce yn reuerence by autoryte of Scryptur & exampyll[es]´; but no sooner had he set foot inside the convent than various of the fathers of the house had descended upon him

> `w[ith] oppyn mowthe, saynge [that] I hade prechyd [the] kyng[es] mattare & [that] all owre relygyone schollde be slawndarde therby; allso [that] all they whytche haue bene owre benefactor[es] & luvar[es] yn tyme paste wollde by [the] resone of my prechynge w[ith]drawe frome owre relygyone bothe there benefyts & deuocyone´.

The friars had reported his preaching to the queen and to `ma[n]ny othare nobyle parsons...wherfore I ame hade yn hatrede to alle theme whytche dothe fauore [the] qwen's cawse´.

Soon afterwards he returned to Greenwich, where, as he told Cromwell, he learned that on the previous Sunday father John Robinson, the vicar of the Richmond convent, had offered to dispute with an abbot who had that day preached in the king´s part at St. Paul´s Cross;[29]

> `wher apon ys rysyn a co[m]myn brvte [that the] frers of Grenwytch, yf they myhte be suffarde to tell [the] trothe, wollde pute to sylence all theyme whytche hath or schalle pretch yn owre sufferande [the] kyn's caws & allso proue all thyng[es] fals [that] they haue pretchyde´.

---

29. BL MS Lansdowne 116 f.53 (=LP v.1142): dated by a reference to `owre fathars at Lambethe´ to 13/15 April-22 May 1532.

Robinson now proposed to preach on the divorce on the following Sunday, a time chosen so as to ensure him `[the] moste soleme awdyence´, and `os mytche os yn hym ys bothe w[ith] hys wyte & lernynge to iustyfy [the] quen´s parte´. Lawrence advises Cromwell to find some way of preventing his sermon, otherwise `error posterior erit priore peior´.

Robinson was not alone in his feelings. Curzon, the vicar of Greenwich, was not what he had made himself out to be when he had spoken with Cromwell. He had been with Robinson at St. Paul´s Cross, and had been the first to bring the news of the events there back to Greenwich. He was most of the time either with Peto and Elston at Lambeth, or else `abrode amonkste secular[es]´: furthermore,

> `by hys desaytfull flattrynge he dothe mytch harme bothe amonkste owr brethryne & allso amonkste secular[es]. He dothe aprove yt to be well done [that] owr wardeyn dyd reproue [the] pretcher [Curwen] yn [the] pulpete w[ith]yn owr covent[e], bothe os consarnyge [the] tyme & allso [the] ma[n]nar of hys spekynge; yn so mytche [that] he hathe mayd reporte to sartayn brethryne of [the] covente of Rytchmonte [that] yt was not owr wardeyne whytche dyd speke, byt yt was [the] Holy Goste [that] dyde speke yn hyme...He allso mad[e] reporte [that] owre for[sa]yd fathars [Peto and Elston] schollde schortly prevale aganste yowr Lordschyppe & allso aganste all theme whytche dothe fav[o]re owr sufferand´s cawse´.

Lawrence, it turns out, had an immediate ulterior motive in highlighting his vicar´s `crafte & dyssymulasyone´; for Curzon had spoken ill of him before the king and Cromwell, and had threatened him with the king´s displeasure. But his warning was a salutary signal to Cromwell that opposition among the friars was more widespread than he had at first thought. His immediate response seems to have been to have put a stop to Robinson´s sermon and to have Peto and Elston removed from Lambeth. But the friars clearly needed to be closely watched. And for the immediate future his priority had to be to ensure that the unrepen-

tant Peto and Elston and their supporters, in particular Curzon and Robinson, should be removed from positions of influence.

For this reason a great deal of importance attached to the forthcoming Michaelmas provincial chapter, at which the province's superiors would be subject to formal re-election. With the province in disarray following Peto's arrest, the minister-general was applied-to to dispatch a commissary to oversee the proceedings. Father Jean de la Haye, warden of the convent of Ghent,[30] duly arrived in England, to be briefed by the king to ensure the deposition from office of the four offenders. And the idea was canvassed that, if no English friar could be found who would satisfy both parties, the king should ask the minister-general to send a foreigner to take Peto's place.

At this point Cromwell recruited another informant: the layman who more than any other was privy to the Observants' affairs, James Beck, the London fishmonger who acted as the friars' amicus spiritualis.[31] He immediately demonstrated his usefulness by supplying an advance assessment of the state of the parties within the Order in the form of a list of names of the superiors and discreets delegated to attend the chapter. This list[32] - which is reproduced below as appendix 3 - can be divided into three parts. The first lists the names of the provincial minister and the wardens of the six convents: the second - which

---

30. For his identity, de la Haye to Henry VIII [29 September 1532], PRO SP1/71 f.67 (=LP v.1358). He was warden of Ghent in December 1532 (Mary of Hungary to the commissary-general of the Observants in the province of France (19 December 1532), BL MS Cotton Vespasian F.iii f.164 (=LP v.1676, where misdated 29 December).

31. Above, p.60.

32. PRO SP1/71 f.33v (=LP v.1312(ii)): a copy in Cromwell's hand on the reverse of a sheet carrying the deposition of one Robert Hales alias a Meredithe, given on 13 September.

contains the names of fathers Robinson and Curzon - apparently lists those discreets whom Beck considered likely to support Peto and Elston; and the final part lists those whom he thought likely to vote `contra Petow´. Naturally this latter list contains Lawrence´s name. More surprisingly, in view of subsequent events, it includes the name of John Forest.

In the light of his later significance as a martyr - he was beatified in 1886 - numerous guesses have been made about Forest´s origins; but in fact virtually nothing reliable is known of his early biography, and by now he was an old man. His earliest appearance in the surviving contemporary sources is on the occasion of his sermon at St. Paul´s Cross anathematising the apostates of 1525.[33] A little after this, in February 1526, he first appears as `doctor´ in the London episcopal registers; and the appellation is also applied to him in the chronicles, though no trace can be found of him in the extant records of the English Universities.[34] His appearance in Beck´s list probably marks him out as a discreet of Greenwich; but this is the only office with which he can be connected with anything like certainty. Neither is there any good reason to accept the oft-repeated assertion that he was Katherine of Aragon´s confessor.[35] At this distance our picture of Forest is coloured by being viewed chiefly through his enemies´ eyes: but through the distortion he appears as an elder-statesman figure; an

---

33. Above, p.107.

34. Anthony Wood´s suggestion that he studied at the Conventual house at Oxford appears to be no more than a surmise based upon a failure to differentiate between Conventual and Observant friars (Athenae Oxonienses (London, 1813), i.107).

35. This appears to be based upon Thomas Bourchier´s claims (Bourchier, p.25v); cf. above, pp.94-6.

influential, and as Beck saw him an essentially moderate voice whose influence was to be enhanced with the province under the control of foreigners, as it was to be from now on. But as events were to show, his moderation did not extend to placing the interests of the king above those of the Order.

Beck travelled to Richmond with the king's alms for the chapter; and from here, on Friday 27 September, he reported back to Cromwell.[36] By this time de la Haye had arrived in England, and Forest was acting as his guide. On Tuesday (24 September), reported Beck, both had been with the king, who `toke & retaynyd [the] genarale comesarey w[ith] good wordes', and expressed the wish that they should join him again on the next Sunday. On the Wednesday, the two friars went from Richmond to Greenwich, where the commissary was to sit in visitation in order to ascertain the friars' opinions; `& hewere man[e] to be sole examynyd be hym[e] sleff [sic] & hys name takyn[e]'. Afterwards they were to return to Richmond to obtain opinions there. But in the meantime, with Forest and the commissary away at Greenwich, Beck feared what might occur at the chapter in their absence. With their moderating influence gone, he feared that the running would be made by the `hedest & steff sortte' and that, unless the king should impose a superior upon them, the chapter would confirm Peto in office. However, Henry could count upon `good scheyer' from those `[that] I toke yowe [the] names off' (ie. those whom he had listed as `contra Petow'); and he added that these friars would be content if Henry should nominate a foreigner as minister, so long as he was an Observant.

---

36. A royal warrant was issued to Cromwell for the delivery of the king's alms of £6.13s.4d. to the chapter on 26 September [1532] (PRO E101/421/5 no.16 (=LP v.1346)); Beck to Cromwell (Friday [27 September 1532]), ibid., SP1/71 ff.34-5 (=LP v.1313).

We are left to infer what actually went on at the chapter. We must suppose that Forest and the commissary returned to Richmond in time to prevent Beck's worst fears from being realised, for Peto was not confirmed in office. But neither was anyone elected in his place. And de la Haye certainly disappointed the king in one respect, for afterwards he received a royal rebuke for having failed to deprive Robinson and Curzon of all office. The commissary excused himself by pointing out[37] that `vicaires des conuents ne sont offices, ne de la Reigle, ne des statuts': otherwise, he claimed (not altogether convincingly), he would have been willing to do it.

To some extent, this state of affairs was Forest's doing. Lawrence later reported of him[38] that

> `he doth gretly reiose [that] he dyd put [the] kyng[es] Grace besyds hys purpose at owre laste chapture; & he doth boste hym selfe ther ofe oppynly, addynge therto [that] yf he had not bene, [the] kynge wollde haue dystroyde all owr relygyone'.

Ultimately, however, it was decided that a foreigner should be appointed minister and, at Lawrence's recommendation (or so he thought), the choice fell upon de la Haye. But he had left England after the chapter, leaving the warden of Canterbury to act as his deputy. So Lawrence was dispatched to Paris with the king's letters to the minister-general, Paul Pisotti of Parma, asking that de la Haye should both be re-appointed commissary-general and be appointed provincial minister for the English province. The mission almost came

---

37. de la Haye to Henry VIII ([29 September 1532]).

38. Lawrence to [Cromwell] (30 November [1532]), BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.164 (=LP v.1591).

to grief when it had got no further than the French coast, since Lawrence succeeded in injuring his leg and it turned out that neither he nor his companion knew anything of either the French language or geography.[39] But they had reached Paris by 26 October, when the minister-general replied to the king's request. He duly re-appointed de la Haye his commissary-general in England, but regretted that he could not appoint him provincial minister as this was a matter for election by the province. Lawrence and his companion immediately returned with his reply to England.[40]

Before long, Lawrence had begun to entertain doubts about the wisdom of his advice. On 30 November[41] he apologetically announced to Cromwell from Richmond that since his return to England he had received `sytch ynformacyone of dyuars os towchynge owr fathar co[m]messary...[that] I do gretly dowte not only of hys fydelyty towards owre most gracyus suverane, byt allso yn party os co[n]sarnynge hys returnynge'. Furthermore if de la Haye did return it would, he thought, be necessary to warn him to beware of father Forest, `whyctche dothe boste hymselfe, saynge [that] he may & wyll reull [the] sayd co[m]messary at hys plesure'.

A little later,[42] Lawrence heard that the commissary had sent letters to the king, to his acting deputy the warden of Canterbury (`a

---

39. The same to the same (Boulogne; undated), PRO SP1/71 f.197 (=LP v.1497).

40. Paul of Parma to [Henry VIII] (Paris, [26 October] 1532), BL MS Cotton Vitellius B.xiii f.221 (=LP v.1471); Lawrence to Cromwell ([post-30 November 1532]), BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.12 (=LP v. 1371).

41. Lawrence to [Cromwell] (30 November [1532]).

42. The same to the same ([post-30 November 1532]).

mane of Fathare Forrest´s promotynge, hy fawtor to [the] qwene & iusty-fyar of her caws´) and to Forest. Lawrence did not know precisely what they contained, but had learned from one of the discreets that de la Haye had advised the friars to leave the province as it was, since it would represent a `grete reprofe´ if a stranger should be placed at its head. Lawrence warned that the friars intended either that day or the next to `make sevte´ to this effect to the king, and advised Cromwell to prevent the audience, since anything that the king told them would be reported to the queen.

In fact Lawrence was right about de la Haye´s not returning, although, in the event, for the wrong reasons. For when they heard of the plan, Mary of Hungary, regent of the Netherlands, and the Great Council of Brabant objected on the grounds that his presence, and in particular his preaching in the Low Countries, were too valuable to lose. Father Paul, feeling himself compelled to accede to their objection, sent his apologies to Henry VIII and proposed instead to send a suitable friar of Lorraine (`Lotoringia´), a member of the province of Paris.[43] This was Francis Faber, who had arrived in England and been duly `chosen & assygnyd´ provincial minister by early April 1533.[44]

---

43. Mary of Hungary to the Observant commissary-general in the province of France (19 December 1532); Paul of Parma to Henry VIII (Pontoise, [13 January 1533]), BL MS Cotton Caligula E.ii f.187 (=LP v.715/vi.36: but not in favour of de la Haye). The province of Paris (`Francia Parisiensis´) was the post-1517 Observant equivalent of the old province of France.

44. Little, Papers, p.207; Richard Lyst to Cromwell ([12 April 1533]), BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.30 (=Ellis (3rd series) ii.265ff, LP vi.334).

(iv) Friar Richard Lyst, Father Forest and the Death of Brother Raynscroft.

His return to England placed Lawrence in an awkward position. Increasingly aware that his championship of de la Haye had been misconceived, and fearing that as a result Cromwell's favour was likely to be withdrawn, he was also conscious that Forest and his party were working up opinion against him within the Greenwich friary. He complained to Cromwell that although he had brought a number of the Greenwich friars round to the king's cause, Forest had `so dysswadyd theme to co[n]trary [that] for fere & throw hys flattrynge they ar nowe for [the] moste parte of a co[n]trayry opynyone'.[45] For the time being, he gained some breathing-space by going to Richmond.[46] But this was still too close to the centre of things for the leadership's liking; and now moves were afoot to have him removed to another convent further away, where he would be less troublesome.

Some months earlier,[47] Lawrence had recommended to Cromwell a Greenwich lay-brother, Richard Lyst, as one `whytch to hys lytyll poware dothe faythfully favowre owre sufferande & allso hys cawse, whytch ys allso dysyrus of yowre prosperyte'. It was probably not entirely coincidental that this same friar Lyst now dispatched a letter to Cromwell at Calais, warning him of the threat to Lawrence and giving a glowing endorsement of `the goode qualytees and grace' that he possessed `both yn hys learnynge, prechynge and pollytyke wytte' and stres-

---

45. Lawrence to Cromwell (30 November [1532]).

46. Ibid.; the same to the same [post-30 November]. And see also Roger Hurlton to Lawrence (Greenwich, [c.30 November 1532]), BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.165 (not in LP): a generalised letter of complaint against Forest which adds nothing material to our knowledge.

47. Lawrence to Cromwell [13/15 April-22 May 1532].

sing his usefulness as a preacher in the king´s cause.[48]

Lyst too had once - in secular life - been a `s[er]vant´ of Cardinal Wolsey, though lately he had become a client of Anne Boleyn, `vnto whom I am moche bownde vnto, and also a poore mother of myne, by the reson of hyr charytabyll benyfytes´;[49] and he had friends in reformist circles at court in John Cole, subdean of the Chapel Royal at Greenwich and Dr. Thomas Goodrich, a canon of St. Stephen´s Westminster and one of the king´s chaplains.[50] His association with the Boleyn party made him, as he claimed to Anne,[51] a vigorous protagonist in her cause within the friary:

> `by the reason [that] I haue som learnynge and yntelligens I haue oftontymes spokon and answeryd yn the kyngis cawse and yowrs; and by the reason there of I haue suffryd oftontymes rebewkys and som trowbyll...oftontymes yn derysyon I haue byn callyd yowre chaplayne´.

A frightened and disaffected man, he too sought by passing information to acquire protection from his enemies within the friary. Chief among these was Forest, whom he saw as a hypocrite who had escaped punishment for various (unspecified) misdeeds while lavishing it upon others, and whom he denounced in terms which emphasised his disloyalty to, and the dishonour done by himself and his associates to, the king and Cromwell.

---

48. Lyst to Cromwell, (Greenwich, 7 November [1532]), BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv. f.32 (=Ellis (3rd series) ii.249ff., LP v.1525).

49. Lyst to Cromwell (7 November [1532]).

50. The same to Anne Boleyn (Greenwich, 4 February [1533]), BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.31 (=Ellis (3rd series) ii.245ff; LP vi.115).

51. Ibid.

Introducing himself to Cromwell on 7 November, Lyst warns him that Forest, `whiche doth nother love nor favor yow´, has attempted to deprive Lawrence of the favour both of the king and of the friars, and to have him sent away from Greenwich, because he knew that Lawrence was `provyded´ (ie. that he was a client of Cromwell) and would preach `the kyngis mater´ on demand; `and so the very trewth ys that father Forest wyll not preche the kyngis mater hymselffe to his honowre nor yet suffer [F]ather Larans by hys wyll soo to do´. If Cromwell should hear that Lawrence has been ordered to remove himself from Greenwich, he should move the king to countermand the order, `for that shall be to the kyngis honowre and to the co[m]forde of vs that doth favor the kyngis Grace and cawse´.

Unhelpfully, Lyst had written in more detail `as towchinge the onfaythfulnes, yndyscressyon and faynyd favor as consernynge agaynst the kyngis Grace of father Forest´ to Anne Boleyn, in a letter which is now lost. But he adds to his accusations for Cromwell´s benefit:

> `I haue harde father fforest dyvers tymes report that yow dare not dysplese hym for feare lest he shulde barke agaynst yow and yowre dedys yn hys precheynge. And also he hath sayede many tymes that he wolde never take the kyngis part nor favor hys cawse: the more shame and confusyon to hym, for I haue hard the kyngis Grace say my selfe that he promessyd hym both to favor hys cawse & to preche there yn´.

In any case, Lyst thought little of Forest´s preaching ability. He gives a sneering account of a recent sermon which he had heard at St. Paul´s Cross, in which Forest had `ondyscretly...vsyd hym selfe more lyker [sic] barkynge and raylynge than p[r]echinge, spekynge and raylynge over large of the decaye of this realme and of polynge downe of churches´ and declaiming upon current issues which he did not fully understand. Many times, he says, he has accompanied Forest to St.

Paul´s Cross, only to find himself sitting under the pulpit `wyth a payre of redde earys, becawse I haue harde hym soo ofton breke aster Precyen´s [the grammarian Priscian´s] hede´. He recommends that the chancellor of London should be instructed not to assign him to preach at St. Paul´s Cross: `yn my jodgement hyt ys more convenyent for hym to syt at home w[ith] hys bedys than to goo forth and preche´.

As a result of Lyst´s denunciations - and not least because he had accused Forest of repeatedly criticising Cromwell - the latter seems on at least one occasion to have subjected Forest to a dressing-down.[52] If he did, it proved quite ineffective. But for the moment Forest retained the king´s favour. Writing to Cromwell on 4 February 1533,[53] Lyst retails the gist of Forest´s report to the brethren of Greenwich of an audience with the king on the previous Monday. Forest had spoken with the king for over half an hour `and was well reteynyd of his Grace, and...the kyngis Grace dyd sende hym a grete pece of beffe from his owne tabull.´ He had spoken with the Duke of Norfolk, who `toke hym in his armys and bade hym wellcom´. Lyst understood - incorrectly - that Forest had advised the king to send for Father de la Haye. Forest had been asked to return on the following Saturday `for to reseve wryttynge from the kyngis Grace for the forsayed Father Hey´. Lyst disapproved of this idea,

---

52. Lyst later refers to `the fyrst tyme that yow rebewkyd father fforest for suche wordys that he yndyscretly reported by yow´ and to `suche thyngys that yow spake to hym before my Lorde of Norfoke´ (the same to Cromwell (Greenwich, 18 February [1533]), BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv ff.33-4 (=Ellis (3rd series) ii.257ff; LP vi.168).

53. The same to Cromwell ([Greenwich], 4 February [1533]), ibid. f.35 (=Ellis (3rd series) ii.253ff, LP vi.116).

> `for he was rewlyd a grete part by father Forest when he was here last; and so he dyd lytyll good here amonge vs, nother too the kyngis honowre nor yet proffet to owre relygion, and as farre as I can p[er]seve he ys all on the quyne´s part and agaynst the kyngis cawse´.

He suggests that he and another dissident, father Roger Hurlton should be allowed to speak to the king before Forest returns to him, to appraise him of the facts.

At this point Cromwell seems to have judged that the time was ripe to put the king fully in the picture about what was going on at Greenwich. For when Forest next came to the Court he found that the atmosphere had changed. According to Lyst, writing to Cromwell on 18 February, `his Grace layed serten thyng[es] agaynst hym; & wyth hym hys Grace was not content´. When Forest returned to Greenwich he gave the king´s accusations in writing to the warden, Thomas Sydenham, and had him declare them before the whole convent. However, the accusations as given were directed not against Forest specifically, but against the friars as a whole, `whiche for the moost part[e] hath not offendyd yn no suche thyngis that father Forest cawsyd to be rehersed amonge vs ooponly´. The same was true of the account which Forest himself then gave of a brush with Cromwell before the Duke of Norfolk. Lyst saw this as another example of Forest´s duplicity, for `that ys hys old man-[ner]: to put all blame from hym and yet he ys moost fawty hym selfe´. But by now Cromwell must have been quite aware that opposition to royal policy was endemic within the Order and it seems likely that Forest was giving the friars a more-or-less accurate account of the accusations which the king and Cromwell had actually brought to his attention.

Now, Lyst told Cromwell, Forest was `sore offendyd and set agaynst yow, becawse yow haue byn playne w[ith] hyme and shewyd hym the

trewth'. More dangerously, Forest now proposed to lobby the king to obtain all the letters which Lyst and others had written to Cromwell against him, in order to have them punished for revealing the secrets of the Order to outsiders.

He had more to say, too, on Forest's party. A young preacher of Greenwich, Thomas Person, whom Forest had recently introduced to the king and commended to him for his learning, was staunchly opposed to the king's cause; and in fact when the Court had been last at Greenwich had cornered the unfortunate Doctor Curwen in the conventual library and `reprovyd and rebewkyd' him for preaching in the king's favour against the queen.

But if the Greenwich friars were for the most part staunchly opposed to the prevailing policy, at least in the early months of 1533 the government had one lucky break which meant that the friars' public opposition remained somewhat muted. The circumstance arose out of an incident in which Brother John Raynscroft had died in prison at Greenwich in doubtful circumstances. The friars seem to have tried to cover up his death, but Lyst leaked news of it to the king, Cromwell, Anne Boleyn and her father the Earl of Wiltshire.[54]

In his surviving letters Lyst is reticent about the details: but whatever had been Raynscroft's transgression, Lyst considered the punishment too severe to fit the crime. And he was disturbed that no-one seemed to have taken much notice of his initial warnings: as he complained to Cromwell on 4 February,

---

54. Ibid.; Lyst to Anne Boleyn (4 February [1533]).

`I do gretly mervell that as yet the forsayed mater is so sup[er]fyssyally and sklendyrly lokyd vppon: fyrst consydyrynge the offens agaynst God, owre neybowre or brother that men shulde be so punyshid and yntretyd amonge vs and for so lyght a cawse to be put yn jebordy both of sowle and body; secondaryly consydyrynge the offens and dyshonowre don agaynst the kyngis Grace owre soverand and my lady Marcus of Penbroke [Anne Boleyn], and [that] of sume of owre famyly and company as father Peyto, father Elston and father Forest & other´.

Had the king followed his advice,

> `that forsayed mater shulde haue byn more substansyally handyllyd, both to the kyngis honowre and avoydyng of all suche crewelte and onmercyfulnes yn tyme too com. For the forsayede mater ys very pyttyows, and susspissyows also, consydyrynge both the susspecte prosses after the deede was don and the maner of the deede don hit selffe´.

He saw treatment of this kind as symptomatic of the tyranny exercised by Forest and his friends. Referring on 18 February to a number of recent apostasies from Greenwich and Richmond, he comments, `I thynke yf thay had byn well yntreted of owre fathers, they wold not haue takyn that way´. But he had an answer to the problem. Earlier, on 4 February, he had recommended to both Anne Boleyn and Cromwell a proposal of which he had heard more than a year previously: that the Greenwich convent should be turned into a college and the friars transferred to the dissolved monastery of Christ Church, Aldgate, in London; considering that `if there had been a place of our religion in London, many inconveniences that have chanced by our brethren against the observance of our Rule would have been avoided, and should be in future´.

Nevertheless, Lyst did realise that the incident was fortuitous for the government. As he claimed to Cromwell on 18 February, if the matter had not reached the king´s ears, a number of the Order´s preachers

would in the approaching Lent have come out publicly in favour of the queen and against the king; `but thys...preve chans...ys a grete staye and a stoppynge morsell for father Forest yn specyall & vs all yn generall´. Now none of the friars dared say or do anything which might offend the king, Cromwell or any of their adherents; and they feared that the king might `make a grete mater´ over the affair, particularly since he was aware of a similar incident which had occurred at Richmond some sixteen years before.

This `preve chans´ had, though, had a profoundly disturbing effect upon Lyst himself: he was losing a good deal of sleep over it and feared that it would make him ill. In part this can be accounted for as a very real fear that something similar might happen to him should he fall into the clutches of Forest and his friends. He had good cause to be worried; for Forest blamed him for government´s change of attitude. After Cromwell had first rebuked Forest `he wold never speke vnto me sens that tyme, nor yet shew noo tokons owteward that he ys yn charte w[ith] me´. Worse, he had complained behind Lyst´s back that Lyst had accused the brethren of murder to the king and Cromwell, and had `sklandyryd and defamyd the relygyon´, and had promised that exemplary punishment would be meted out to him. All of this had set the brothers at both Greenwich and Richmond against Lyst.

Furthermore Forest and Sydenham, the warden, had been trying to have Lyst removed from Greenwich and sent to Southampton, where he could cause less trouble. So far he had managed to forestall this, feeling that, at Greenwich, he was at least in a position to appeal for help to `som frynd[es] & accoyntans that I haue´ if he should in future be put to any `trowbull or pu[n]nyshement´ as a result of Forest´s endeavours: whereas if he was sent away, `I ame yn a dowte howe I shuld be ordyred,

becawse F[ather] Forest hath put me yn suche a grete infamy and noote amonge the fryres and set the relygyon agaynst me'.

Nevertheless he remained defiant. His next step was to be the delivery of a personal reprimand to Forest, and, since that worthy refused to speak to him, he would do it by means of `a longe pystyll',

> `where yn shall be contaynyd suche fawtys and transgressyons that he hath co[m]mytted amonge vs, of the whiche for my tyme I haue experyens & trewe knowlege of. And becawse he was never pu[n]nyshed for suche fawt[es] and transgressyons that he hath don, nor yn no wyse wold not be, but ever he hath avoyded correccyon and pu[n]nyshement by won means or other; therefore yet I shall put them yn hys remembyrans, that nowe thys holy tyme of Lent he maye be sory for them & make som amend[es] vnto God & to the relygyon whom he hath offendyd. Also yn my forsayed pystyll shall be contaynyd the very trew wordys and forme how onfaythfully & ondyscretly he hath vsyd hym selfe agaynst the kyngys Grace and yowre Mastershippe, as I haue trewe experyens of, for my parte & also to brynge suffyssyent recorde for ferther proffe yf neede requyre'.

Predictably, Forest took no notice of this righteous rebuke. Lyst reported on 12 April[55] that

> `trewly he hath not regarded my forsade wrytynge or pystyll, nor yet payne that I haue taken after the forme of the Gospell, but after his maner dysdaynyth both me and my wrytynge also: & therefore I haue & also wyll take a furthur prosces wyth hym after the Gospell: becawse father Forest hath byn extrem yn sekynge grete pu[n]nyshement of other men for smale fawtys & ynperfeccyons, there for I thowght hit was nessessary to wryte vnto hym & to put hym yn reme[m]byrans of greter fawtys & ynperfeccyons that he hath co[m]mytted & don hym selfe'.

With this letter Lyst sent a copy of his `pystyll' to Cromwell - it does not survive - for use in case Forest should commit any mischief in the future. There was a glimmer of hope that things might improve, for now the new minister, Faber, had arrived in England. `I trust', Lyst

---

55. Lyst to Cromwell (Greenwich, [12 April 1533]), BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.30 (=Ellis (3rd series) ii.265ff, LP vi.334).

writes, `he shall doo muche goode amonge vs, yf he wyll be yndyfferent secu[n]du[m] viritate, as I trust he wyll, & helpe to refurme father Forest specyally and also som other thyngis nessessary to be refurmyd amonge vs´. However he recommends that Cromwell and the king should speak with Faber `to ynforme hym vnder what maner he shude vse hym selfe amonge vs as consernynge the kyngis Gracis onowre´. Further, if it is Cromwell´s pleasure `to helpe to reforme´ Forest, he recommends that he should have him removed from Greenwich and sent either to Newark or to Newcastle. If this were to be done, `I thynke yow shulde do a merytoryes deede & haue grete rewarde of Goode therefore & many thankys and prayers of many yn owre re[ly]gyon´.

In his initial ignorance of the English situation Faber was anxious to please the king and for a few months his compliance was to seem a vindication of the government´s policy. Cromwell concurred with Lyst´s last suggestion and sent Faber his `pystyll´: as a result of which it was `both redde & expownyd before owre newe mynyster & all the fathers yn owre howse & layed to father Forestys charge; & many other thyng[es] also´; with the consequence that Forest was deposed from office and dispatched from Greenwich to one of the northern convents. `For all hys grete crakys´, writes Lyst with an almost audible sigh of relief, `he ys nowe farre inowghe from vs´.[56]

But Forest´s removal did nothing to improve Lyst´s sleep. In fact his `trowbyll´, which had begun with Raynscroft´s death, seemed to be worsening rather than improving, so that by now `contynnewaly iij or iiij nyghtys every weke I am so fearfully trowbyllyd dyvers man[ner] of

---

56. Lyst to Cromwell (Greenwich, 20 May [1533]), PRO SP1/76 f.85 (=Ellis (3rd series) ii.267ff, LP vi.512).

wyse, so that yn man[ner] I can not haue no naturall rest'. And by now he had come to think that his only remedy lay in departing from the Order. He sent Cromwell and Anne Boleyn gifts of `glassys wyth watyrs' which he had made, excercising his old trade, as an inducement to them to be his friends in time to come.

This was the end of Lyst's career among the friars. He abandoned the Order during the last week of May 1533 and went as a student to Clare Hall, Cambridge. Early in the Autumn he took his first orders at St. Audrey's, Ely, and he proposed now `to prosede furthur and to be a secular pryst, and to serve God I trust better and wyth more quyetnes than I haue done or myght be suffryd yn tyme past amonge the freres'.[57]

At some time before Christmas he came to London on business of his own, and it was probably then that he solicited a letter from Cromwell to the Master of Clare, Dr. John Crayford, recommending him for a fellowship. In his last extant letter to Cromwell, written on 8 March 1534, he returns to the matter. Two fellowships were now vacant, and Crayford was in London, `a sewter to yowr Mastershippe'. Lyst asks that he may be reminded of Cromwell's request.[58]

Lyst may well never have got his fellowship. At any rate, no trace of his name survives among the college's records. But if not, he did at least receive some compensation. For in February 1536, having attained the priesthood, he was instituted into the vicarage of St. Dunstan-in-the-West, Fleet Street, London. Here he seems to have achieved his ambition of a quieter life, for he stayed for twenty years.

---

57. Lyst to Cromwell (12 October [1533]), ibid., SP1/79 f.186 (=LP vi.1264).

58. The same to the same (8 March [1534]), ibid., SP1/82 f.269 (=LP vii.302). Lyst also asks Cromwell's help in recovering a debt.

(v) The `Nun of Kent´ and the Minister´s Change of Mind.

With the province now apparently in reliable hands, and subdued by the scandal of Raynscroft´s death, in the early months of 1533 Cromwell had some cause for optimism. But his problems were by no means over. In the course of the summer of 1533 two new shadows were cast over the scene. The first was the disturbing demonstration of the Observants´ subversive potential given by the involvement of certain of the friars in the affair of Elizabeth Barton, the so-called `Nun of Kent´.[59]

Whatever may have been her own motivation, this ecstatic visionary´s prophecies against the king´s remarriage inevitably made her a potential focus of opposition to government policy. Like many others, no doubt, the Observants took up her cause because she told them what they wanted to hear. Their rôle - as the sermon preached on the occasion of the public condemnation of the Nun and her chief accomplices makes clear[60] - lay chiefly in disseminating her prophecies among the laity. Their peculiar danger - as the government´s enquiries were to make clear - lay in their ready access to members of the political nation. And to that extent, if in fact the Nun´s prophecies came anywhere near to engendering a coup d´état - as has been suggested - , it was largely the Observants´ doing. The seriousness with which the government viewed their contribution is reflected in the fact that two prominent friars, Richard Risby and Hugh Rich, were attainted and executed with her.

---

59. For the background to this episode see Alan Neame, The Holy Maid of Kent (London, 1971).

60. Ed. L. E. Whatmore, `The Sermon Against the Holy Maid of Kent and her Adherents´, English Historical Review vol. lviii (1943) p.467 (=LP vii.72(iii)).

The friars' connection with Elizabeth Barton was of long standing. Her home territory in Kent lay within the ambit of the Canterbury friary; and she would have become acquainted with the friars early in her career. Two of them, Lewis Wilkinson and an unnamed confrère, had sat as assessors on the archepiscopal commission which investigated her visions in 1526;[61] and Risby, the warden of Canterbury in 1533, had long been one of her chief adherents.

By all accounts intensely pious to the point of naïveté, Risby was, it was later claimed, one of a number of priests prepared to preach the Nun's treasonous revelations who in preparation `gaue themselues to greate fasting, watch [ie. vigils], long prayers, wering of shurtes of here and greate chaynes of yron aboute their myddell[es]', so as, it was said, to gain a greater reputation for holiness. After his arrest his `redynes and promptnes to confesse the truethe at his first examyn-ac[i]on' led his captors to think his lapse due more to `ouersight' and `light credence' than to malice: not that this availed him anything in the end.[62] He had introduced the Nun to Thomas Goldwell, prior of Christ Church, Canterbury, in 1531, and a year later had tried unsuccessfully to interest Sir Thomas More in her political revelations.[63]

But the credulous Risby was a small fish compared with his fellow adherent Rich, the warden of Richmond. Where Risby resorted to hair-shirts and chains, Rich resorted to necromancy; and he proved harder to

---

61. W. Lambard, A Perambulation of Kent (Chatham, 1826), p.173.

62. Draft of charges against the Nun and her adherents (c. January-February 1534), PRO SP1/82 ff.86r-v (=LP vii.72(i)).

63. Goldwell to [Cromwell] ([Canterbury, c. November 1533]), BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.91 (=Wright, pp.19ff., LP vi.1470); [More] to Cromwell ([c. March 1534]), ibid., MS Arundel 152 ff.296r-v (=LP vii.287).

catch and a good deal more slippery under interrogation. His captors complained that under interrogation he had `handled himselfe very dobly, wherin hathe apperid his greate crafte, sotilty and ipocrasy, farr vnlike vnto suche vertues plainely and simpliciter as a man wold thinke to be in p[er]sonnes of his coote and religion´.[64] In the end, in order to get anything out of him they had to resort to the use of an agent provocateur. They placed Rich in a cell in the Tower with one Johann Wolff, a convicted murderer, to whom he recounted with enthusiasm and at exasperating length the story of the Nun´s miracles and prophecies, which Wolff wrote down for Cromwell´s benefit in the margin of his psalter.[65]

In terms of the range of his contacts, Rich was in a different league from the rest of the Nun´s principal supporters. He was eventually accused not only of having told the friars of Richmond, as well as sundry other religious, secular clergy and members of the London merchant community, of her political prophecy. He was also alleged to have conveyed it to Katherine of Aragon - who sensibly refused to have anything to do with the Nun - and to the Princess Mary. On three occasions between the beginning of Lent and November 1533 he had attempted unsuccessfully to remedy Risby´s earlier failure to bring More over to her cause; twice in conversation at More´s Chelsea home and once in the friars´ garden at Richmond. Other names on the list include those of Margaret Pole, countess of Salisbury; the Princess Mary´s chamberlain, Lord Hussey and his wife; the Marquess of Exeter; the

---

64. Draft of charges, f.86v.

65. Wolff´s - anonymous - information is BL MS Cotton Cleopatra F.iv. ff.87-90 (= Wright, pp.14ff., Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials (Oxford, 1822) i(i).271ff., LP vi.1466). The identification of its author was made by the Rev. Whatmore.

Countess of Derby; Lady Bellingham; Sir Thomas Arundel; Sir George Carew; Lady Kingston, the wife of the Constable of the Tower and Captain of the Guard, and others: certainly names to conjure with when thinking in terms of a potential coup d'état.[66]

Lawrence, too, comes into the story. We next catch him in London on 4 April 1533, complaining to Cromwell that he had waited at his house for three days in the vain hope of obtaining an interview, and would have waited longer had he not been `co[n]straynyd by obedyens'.[67] In fact he probably saw Cromwell fairly soon afterwards, for shortly after this he went to Canterbury to gather intelligence on his behalf. At some time before the end of May he spoke there with Elizabeth Barton, and she, no doubt thinking Lawrence as sympathetic as his confrères, repeated her treasonous prophecy to him.[68] He heard the same from the mouth of the priest Henry Gold, and more incriminating matter from Gold's sister-in-law, Mrs. Thomas Gold, from Rich, and doubtless from others.[69] By the middle of July, he had returned to London; and Cromwell reported that since his return he had heard further news about the Nun which he was only prepared to repeat to the king.[70]

---

66. Draft of charges, f.86r; Drafts of a list of those whom Rich and others had told of the Nun's prophecy concerning the king and his reign, PRO SP1/80 ff.126,130-1r,134 (=LP vi.1468(1-3)); More to Cromwell ([c. March 1534]), ff.296v-7r.

67. PRO SP1/75 f.79 (=LP vi.309).

68. List of Rich's contacts, as above, n.66; [Deposition of Lawrence] (undated), PRO SP1/80 f.138 (=LP vi.1468(5)). Lawrence is not identified by name in this deposition, but the handwriting and style are clearly his.

69. List of Gold's contacts (as Rich's); [deposition of Lawrence].

70. Draft `minute' of [Cromwell to Henry VIII], ([London, pre-23 July 1533]), PRO SP1/80 ff.51-2 (=Merriman 65, LP vi.1369: Neame, Holy Maid, p.253 follows Merriman in erroneously placing this document at the end of October).

By now, too, Cromwell was beginning to become aware of the extent of Peto and Elston's activities in Antwerp and of the contacts which existed between them, the friars in England and Katherine of Aragon. Already at the time of the 1532 chapter Beck had reported to him a rumour that the friars might be responsible for the importation into England of the papal sentence of excommunication against the king.[71] Now he had heard from Lawrence that two foreign Observants had recently entered the country,

> `which ij ffreers haue exploryd here ffor all suche bok[es], centencys and determynacyons as hathe passyd touching yo[ur] Hygnes' matrymonye, which they intend w[ith] other pryvey practysys to convey w[ith] them to ffreer Petow who, as I am credyblye infformyd, sent them into this yo[ur] Realme. [crossed out: I trust to get ow[t] the roote of hys practyse.] The sayd ij ffreers, as I ame acertaynyd, haue browght w[ith] them pry[ve]y l[ette]res to dyuers and bene now gone to the... Dowager'.

In fact the individuals concerned were not both strangers. One was Hugh Payne, a Newark friar who was to prove a recurring headache for Cromwell over the next few years. He and his companion, one Brother Cornelius, called at Greenwich before making for Buckden; and it was probably then that Lawrence alerted both Cromwell and Faber to their intentions. The minister, still anxious to please, summoned them to him at Richmond. But they seem to have ignored him; and for the moment, their continued freedom suited Cromwell. He advised the king that

> `in my poore oppynyon it shal be right well done that thaye might be sent ffor by sum trustye p[er]son: howbeit were best that theye ffyrste sholde be sufferyd to speke w[ith] [the Prynces Dowager] and suche other of hers as woolde p[er]aduenture delyu[er] to them any thing wherbye theyr ffurther

---

71. Beck to Cromwell ([27 September 1532]), PRO SP1/71 ff.34-5 (=LP v.1313).

> practysys myght be p[er]sayuyd, and so thayr cankryd intentt-[es] myght be therbye dyscyfferyd. I am also infformyd that there ys a m[er]chant of London whiche dothe practyse w[ith] them in thes p[re]myss[es]...yf it be trew he ys worthye to suffer to make other beware in tyme; he ys of good substaunce´.

He promptly had the friars followed, and on 23 July he could report progress.[72] Having visited Katherine, the pair,

> `being subtillie conueyed from thens were first espied at Ware by suche espialles as I leyed for that purpose, and hauyng good awayte leyed vppon them were from thens dogged to London and there (notw[ith]stonding many wyles and cauteles by them invented to escape) were taken and deteyned till my cu[m]myng home´.

He had interrogated them and at first uncovered nothing of importance; but subsequently he found one of the pair, Payne, to be a `veray sedycious person´, and committed both to prison to await the king´s pleasure. Immediately afterwards he had been visited by Sydenham, the warden of Greenwich, who `made grete intercession´ to have the friars delivered to him for punishment, telling him that Faber had commanded them by virtue of obedience to come to him at Richmond to receive correction. Cromwell was impressed:

> `It semeth assuredlie that the saide mynyster is a right honest and discrete person and ffayne wolde haue prevented and taken the saide ffreers, if he had coulde by any meanes´.

For the moment, this view was quite justified. Indeed, Faber´s anxiety to appease the king extended to the length of his being prepared to consign Payne and his companion to a house of Conventual friars as a

---

72. Cromwell to Henry VIII (London, 23 July [1533]), PRO SP1/78 ff.26-7 (=Merriman 52, LP vi.887).

form of punishment.[73] But for the moment, Cromwell merely asked the king's pleasure regarding what was to be done with the miscreants, adding ominously that

> `it is vndoubted that they haue intended and wolde confesse sum grete matier if they might be examyned as they ought to be, that is to sey by paynes: for I perceyue the saide Hugh Payne to be a subtile ffelowe and moche gyuen to sedycyon'.

On this last point, as subsequent events were to show, he was not mistaken. Nevertheless the compliant Faber seems to have saved the two from Cromwell's clutches this time. But at the same time he took measures to curtail the activities of Peto, Elston and their associates. According to Lawrence, writing to the king from Richmond on 29 August,[74] Faber had sent `lettar[es]...to owre mynystar-gene[ral] co[n]-sarny[n]ge [the] restreynte & correccyone of [the] forsayde Peytoo and Ellstone'; to which he had evidently had a reply which went some way towards satisfying the government's aspirations, although there is nothing to tell us what its practical significance was.

The minister's actions had done nothing to improve Lawrence's popularity among his brethren. He complains that he has been `pute yn grete defawte' by the friars both for the `taychynge' of Payne and Brother Cornelius, and also over Faber's letter to the minister-general;

> `for sartayne of theme hathe sayde to my [?face] w[ith] word[es] of co[n]tempte & hy prouocasyone, saynge thate yf yt had note bene thorow my yntysynge owr forsayde mynystare wollde neuare haue wryttyne so extreymly to ther co[n]fusyone. So thus to co[n]clude, who so euer hathe thank[es], [the] blayme ys layde holly to me'.

---

73. Peto to Payne (Antwerp, [15 July 1533]), BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.11 (=LP vi.836). Peto states that he does not know by what authority the minister proposes to do this.

74. PRO SP1/70 f.247 (=LP v.1259).

In a covering letter which he sent at the same time to Cromwell,[75] he goes further: `I haue borne so mytche´, he writes, `[that] I a[m] note abyll to bere no more standynge as I doo.´

Lawrence´s chief purpose in writing to the king was to tell what he knew of `owre acts passyde or to be passyde´ at the forthcoming Michaelmas provincial chapter at Greenwich:[76] and he makes it clear that by now Faber was becoming more aware of the difficulty of reconciling his duty to the king with that to the friars´ profession. `I besytch Jhesu´, writes Lawrence, `[that] owr fathare mynystare do note leyne to mytche to [the] cowncelle of su[m] of owre fathar[es]; for yf he doo not only he byt allso yowre Grace schalle be defa[my]de thorowe there crafty yllusyone´. To Cromwell he expresses the hope `[that] owre fathare mynystare may co[n]clu[de] all thyng[es] to [the] kyng[es] honore. I doo mytche fere hys ynco[n]stante mynde´.

In particular it appears that Faber now wished to appoint father Robinson, who had earned the king´s displeasure in the previous year, to some office. Already, Lawrence told the king, in spite of his own efforts and Henry´s displeasure, Robinson had been elected by the majority of the brethren to act as discreet for the Richmond convent at the forthcoming chapter. Lawrence had tried to persuade him not to accept the office, and to acknowledge his offences and submit himself to the king´s mercy; but he had received short shrift. Robinson had bluntly refused to acknowledge any fault, `for I dyd nevar pretche nor speke nothy[n]ge byt I wyll aproue yt & allso defend yt to [the] fyre´:

---

75. Ibid., f.200 (=LP v.1208).

76. At about this time Beck was paid £6.13s.4d. for `th´coste off the ffreers Obs[eruan]tes in o[u]r tow[n]e [of] Grenewyche´ (ibid., SP1/78 f.244r (=LP vi.1057): an entry in a list of warrants in Cromwell´s hand).

and he desired that Lawrence should not try to persuade the king to promote him, saying that he would never accept office at the king's `asynge [sic] or poyntmente'. `Wherfore', comments Lawrence, `aftar my sentymente he dothe lake a grete dele of [that] treve meknes yn hys harte whytch he dothe pretende yn hys exteryall behauyowr'.

In addition, father Curzon had been elected discreet for the South-ampton convent: another example, Lawrence thought, of the friars' lack of due regard for the king's wishes. Curzon was making strenuous efforts to be allowed to remain at Greenwich for the next year, alleging - or so Lawrence thought, feigning - sickness. He warned Cromwell to ensure that Curzon was not allowed to remain at either Greenwich or Richmond, `for yf he doo trevly he wyll schortly doo mytche dyshonore bothe to [the] kyng[es] Grace & allso to yowe'.

The minister's changing mind did not prevent the king from employing the friars' church at Greenwich for the christening of the Princess Elizabeth on 10 September,[77] though what many of the friars thought of this may be imagined. But Lawrence's warning had been timely. By October, Faber's metamorphosis was complete. He was now clearly taking the part of the king's opponents among the friars, and he was becoming very tired of Lawrence's continual exhortation. Lawrence was removed from office and forbidden on pain of imprisonment to write to the king or to Cromwell. But he did succeed in getting messages to both, warning that a change had come over Faber since the chapter, and that he was not the man the king and Cromwell had taken him to be. He complained to Henry that the minister had taken a great dislike to him; and

---

77. Accounts in Hall's Chronicle, pp. 805-6; A. H. Thomas and I. D. Thornley (ed.), The Great Chronicle of London (London, 1938), p.289 and summarised in LP vi.1111.

`as Gode ys my iuge I do knowe no caws why excepte yt be thys. I dyd wryte to hyme to [the] chaptore, desyrynge hyme to be faythfulle to yowre Grace acordynge to [the] co[n]fydence whytche yowre Grace hath yn hyme. I haue gyuyne exortacyone to [the] same by mowthe: to [the] whytche he hathe mayde answere saynge "wylte thowe supplante me vndare [the] kyng[es] feyte? I wyll note abay to [the] kynge; I wyll abay to [the] relygyone"; & sence thate tyme he wollde nevare speke to me merrely, byte he hathe pykte quarrel[es] to me dayly´.

Further, as he told Cromwell,

> `he hathe sartyffyde sartayne ofe owre fathars whytch ar note luvar[es] to [the] kyng[es] Hynes thate I ame to hyme very molestyus; & [that] I wollde subdev hyme vndare the kyng[es] feyte & make hyme obedyente to hys Grace yn all thyng[es], whytch thynge he dothe say that he wyll nevar be...he ys very famylyare & amyabylle to sytche fathars as dothe note ffauore [the] kynge & very strawnge & vngentylle yn hys behauyowre to sytche as dothe fauor hys Grace & hys iuste caws´.

Faber, he claimed, had resolved on the advice of those fathers opposed to the king to find some pretext or other upon which to obtain Henry´s permission to have Lawrence punished, whereupon they intended instead to imprison him for having revealed the secrets of the religion to outsiders; `whytche doone they wyll delvde hys Grace at there pleysure´.[78]

Cromwell noted Lawrence´s warning; but with the minister now aroused against him, his usefulness was largely at an end and his position among the friars had become intolerable. At this point Lawrence exclaustrated himself. For the moment he appears to have lived in London; and from there he wrote to enquire what Cromwell wished to do with him. If he wished him to return to the friars, he asked that he should be placed in the office of either of the `ij ffathars whytche ar nowe yn hollde´

---

78. To Cromwell, PRO SP1/70 f.248 (=LP v.1260); to Henry VIII, ibid., SP1/73 f.117 (=LP v.1738).

(Rich and Risby); `whytch thynge I do note desyre for onny affecsyone [that] I haue to onny p[ro]mocyone w[ith] yn owre relygyone, byt only ffor [the] kyng[es] honore & yowrs & for [the] sauegarde of my parsone´. For he would not believe any promises which Faber might give to treat him well, `yf he dyde speke to me os fare os dyd Judas to Cryste whyen he dyd betray hyme´; since he had discerned in him `very lytylle stabylyte & mytch les fydelyte´ both towards himself and the king.[79]

His audacity was not rewarded. Instead, Cromwell proposed to obtain for him a dispensation from his habit and, perhaps, a benefice. Lawrence responded fulsomely:[80] but he had yet a while to wait for his release. After the suppression of the Observant province in August 1534 he is found living uneasily with a number of his brethren in the London Greyfriars and begging Cromwell to fulfil his earlier promise.[81] His dispensation was finally registered by the Faculty Office in October 1535, at which point he disappears into obscurity.

(vi) Opposition in the Country: some Observant Preachers.

By the end of 1533 the mood in the friaries was decisively hardening. With the leadership now unequivocally opposed to the king and Cromwell, some kind of confrontation had become inevitable. By 21 December, relations between the king and the Greenwich friars had sunk so low that they thought it prudent to present Henry with a letter of submission, begging his pardon for any offence which they might have committed and protesting their desire to live peacefully under him and obey him in all things consistent with their Rule. Cromwell clearly had

---

79. Ibid., SP1/86 f.151 (=LP vii.139): undated.

80. Ibid., SP1/72 f.1 (=LP v.1500): undated.

81. Ibid., SP1/83 f.195 (=LP vii.580): undated.

a hand in the matter somewhere, but the document itself is something of a mystery. Although it professes to be signed by the minister, warden and all the friars of Greenwich, and at one point Cromwell reminded himself to have it signed; it survives, unsigned, among his papers. Perhaps he thought better of the idea, realising that the document's qualification, pointing as it did to the nub of the problem, ensured that it could in practice solve nothing.[82]

For Faber, the end of the road came in April 1534. His credibility with the government gone, he was allowed to depart to visit the houses of the Order in Ireland, promising Chapuys (so the latter alleged) that he would do all in his power to uphold the power of the pope there.[83] He is not heard of again, and in all probability he never returned. For the rest, the increasing tempo of religious reform, culminating in the formal renunciation of the Papal Supremacy in March 1534, placed the friars and the government on a collision course.

The government had by now become alive to the necessity of ensuring conformity among preachers. In December 1533 the Council had turned its attention to organising the control of preaching in order to ensure that the pope was publicly put - and kept - in his place. Memoranda on the matter[84] make provision `that a specyall practise be made, and a streight co[m]maundement yoven' to the four Orders of friars; and in particular they resolve

---

82. PRO SP1/81 f.12 (=LP vi.1549); Cromwell's `remembranc[es]', BL MS Cotton Titus B.i f.463r (=LP vii.108).

83. Chapuys to Charles V (7 July 1534), CSP Spanish 1534-5, no.70 (=LP vii.957). Cromwell noted `the ffreers of Grenewiche to haue licence to go into Irelonde' (`remembranc[es]', f.462r).

84. BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.vi f.326r (=SP vol.i, p. 411, LP vi.1487(1)).

> `to practise w[ith] all the ffreers Obser[uaun]t[es] of this realme, and to co[m]maunde them to preche in lyke wise; or elles that they may be stayed, and not suffered to preche in no place of the realme´.

And by Lent 1534 Archbishop Cranmer, in consultation with his senior bishops, had issued a general inhibition against preachers in his province, requiring that individuals should apply to him for licences and laying down requirements for preaching in favour of the Boleyn marriage and against the Pope.[85] It is against this background that we now begin to find traces of troublesome public preaching by Observants in the early months of 1534.

The Newark friary seems to have been something of a hotbed of conservative resistance. At one point Sir John Markham, returning home, heard reports that an Observant friar had preached certain sermons in Newark parish church `whos word[es] men muche notyd to be sumwhat sedycyus & slaunderus´.[86] He went to the friary, where in front of the warden and another friar he confronted the miscreant with his alleged words and demanded to know whether or not they were an accurate representation of what he had said. The friar readily agreed that they were for the most part his words, affirming that he would `stand & abyd by [the] sam to [the] exstremety´. Markham sent a note of the friar´s words to Cromwell (it has since been lost) commenting,

> `S[er], what hurt or enconvenyenc[e] may enseu yff thes men shuld be thus sufferyd to pretche & to move & styr men in comunycac[y]ons & in theyr confessyons (consyderyng [the] credyt they be in emongest [the] peopll) I remytte to your Mastershype´s dyscrec[y]on´.

---

85. J. E. Cox (ed.), Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer (Parker Society, 1846), pp.283-4, 460-2 (=LP vii.463-4).

86. Markham to Cromwell, PRO SP1/81 f.126 (=LP vi.1664): undated.

Markham does not identify this particular friar. But he was evidently not the only troublemaker among the Newark community. Sometime after 25 March Cromwell received an anonymous letter of accusation against the vicar of the parish, Henry Litherland, and an un-named Scottish friar, from which it appears that Litherland was acting in concert with the friars in an attempt to suppress reformist tendencies among the laity.[87] Cromwell's informant alleged that Litherland had told the friars `that they may speke agaynst theis bookes cum previlegio for you haue nothyng to losse, but I may not speake so playne for bycause I haue sumwhat to losse'. He had charged his parishioners that they should not read any such book without consulting himself or the friars. Furthermore,

> `A Schottesh ffrere said on our Ladie Daye at afternone in Newark cherche that suche book[es] as were made cum previlegio, that they were heresyes. And if the kyng and his councell and my Lorde of Canterbury doo that which is aggreed by P[ar]liamente and contrarie to the holie ꝑope of Rome and the holl Churche ther, yt is heryssyes. But I dare well say that the kyng[es] G[ra]ce neu[er] knew of no suche bookes; and I truste to se that suche traytours as haue made theym, that thair heed[es] shall haue knock[es]. My brethren, if their come an angell from heven and will shewe you another way to lyve than that your fathers hath lyved afore you, beleve hym nott. Ther was as wise men before this daye as ther is noweadays and wyser. Leve thes heretyques opinions and kepe you owte of suche mens company; for if they be treu holly Saincte Fraunces is a devill in hell w[ith] many other sainct[es]'.

A little later in the year two other Newark friars, Hugh Payne and one Brother Thomas Hayfild, caused some upset on a preaching tour in the West Country.[88] On 9 June the pair were examined concerning their `roylyng' by the mayor of Bristol, `but awnsweryd soe for themselvys

---

87. Ibid., SP1/82 ff.235-6 (=LP vii.261).

88. John Hilsey to Cromwell (Cardiff, 3 July 1534), ibid., SP1/85 f.26 (=LP vii.939).

there that thay ware supposyd to be holy men': even so, they left the town immediately they were released. The next day the Dominican provincial, Doctor John Hilsey, appeared in Bristol on the government's business and, hearing of their activities, set off in pursuit. He chased them through Somerset, Devon and Cornwall, and succeeded in running them so close that they were forced to abandon their habits and take to lay attire. They crossed into Wales and were eventually apprehended at Cardiff on 30 June by the bailiff, Thomas Lichefeld, while bargaining with the master of a Breton ship to carry them to Brittany. They confessed to Lichefeld that the king had sent a commission to the sheritts of Somerset and Devonshire to capture them, and in the circumstances he personally escorted them to Westminster.[89] The next day Hilsey arrived in Cardiff. Of Payne and Hayfild he reported that

> `yn all places wher they come they p[er]swade the peple to holde off [the] byshoppe off Rome, callynge hyme Pope & sayynge that they wyll dye y[n] hys cause & never forsake hy[m] whyle they leve. They royle att [the] book[es] sett forthe cu[m] priuelegio, callynge them he[re]sys & he[re]tyck[es] [that] sett them forthe & they [that] study yn them. Yff co[m]munycac[y]on be off [the] qwynys Grace [the] pry[n]ces' Grace or off [the] kyng[es] maryage most g[ra]-cyows, they report [the] wurst [that] they ca[n] & dare: as by [the] record[es] off a hu[n]drethe y[n] Cardyff hytt ys to be tryyd [that], when hytt was askyd off them whey[ther] they war att [the] crystenynge off [the] pry[n]ces' Grace & whey-[ther] she was crystenyd yn colde water or els yn whott, they answeryd [that] she was crystenyd yn whot water but hytt was nott whot inowghe (seythe they). Off M[aster] Latym[er] & all hys fauorars they seythe they be he[re]tyck[es] [and that] they wolle p[ro]ve'.

The friars' bravado did not long survive imprisonment. Not long afterwards they wrote a grovelling - and hardly convincing - letter of

---

89. Lichefeld to the Earl of Worcester (Westminster), ibid., f.93 (=LP vii.1020).

appeal to the king, in which they submitted themselves to his mercy `being yn greate payns and syknes´, begging him not to believe all that he had heard of them and denying any intention of speaking against the Boleyn marriage or of upholding the authority of the Pope.[90] Not, evidently, of the stuff of which martyrs are made, the pair seem to have been let off this time; but Cromwell had not heard the last of Payne.

By contrast, at this time the Southampton friary enjoyed an excellent local reputation, much of the credit for which belonged to the warden, Gabriel Pecock. Although in an earlier capacity as warden of Canterbury Pecock had opposed Peto´s activities, he was certainly no supporter of religious change, nor was he afraid of making his opposition public. But, according to an anonymous report of a sermon which he gave at the abjuration of a heretic in Winchester on Passion Sunday, 22 March 1534, his tones were rather more measured than those of some of his contemporaries.[91]

After reciting various heresies, Pecock charged the people to forswear them and `strongely to stonde in their faith´: but in doing so he was careful to enjoin his listeners to remain humbly obedient to their prince, `and not stoburnely to resiste´. He illustrated his point by reference to the story of St. Maurice, who, although a powerful military commander who could perfectly well have resisted by force of arms, chose instead to throw down his weapons and submit to his prince´s wrath when ordered on pain of death to commit some act which was contrary to the law and would involve his offending God. And when he had finished, Pecock carefully re-iterated his message, since, as he

---

90. Ibid., SP1/88 f.97 (=LP vii.1652): undated.

91. Ibid., SP2/P ff.158-9 (=LP vii.449).

put it, `here be many herers, and thei be not all of one capaccyte; some ther be that vnderstonde me, and some p[er]aduenture that vnderstonde me not, but otherwise do take me & shall reaporte me than I do speake or myende´.

He moved on to lament `the dyu[er]site of preachyng[es] that is vsed nowe dayes, and the contradictions of clerk[es] and lerned men´. He had heard, he said, that various preachers were regularly putting it about that St. Peter had been invested by God with no more authority than had been the other Apostles, that the pope possessed no more authority, power or jurisdiction outside Rome than did any other bishop outside his own diocese, nor a bishop any more than a `symple curate´. These, he said, were `grevouse errours´: nevertheless, since he was informed that these preachers brought books into the pulpit with which to back up their claims, he would bring out his own in order to disprove them. He took out his book and laid it upon the pulpit, `and redde theryn five or sixe plac[es] approvynge primatum Petri, and Englisshed the same´. He then laid down his book, `p[ro]cedynge in other matters; reprehendynge vice, as the co[m]men fasshon of preachers is´.

More cautious and subtle than Payne and Hayfild´s approach, Pecock´s preaching nevertheless demanded further investigation. Cromwell dispatched letters by the king´s messenger to the mayor of Southampton, John Perchard, and to his friend Henry Huttoft, a prominent burgess and wine-merchant of the town, requiring them to apprehend Pecock and send him up to London. The pair went to the convent on the morning of Wednesday 8 April to find that their quarry was out preaching. So the mayor organised a search. When found and told of Cromwell´s summons, Pecock immediately returned to his convent, arriving there on the Saturday night and departing thence for London the next morning, accom-

panied by glowing testimonials. Huttoft asked Cromwell's favour for him, for `syns his cu[m]myng hether the man hath bene of a very good behavyo[ur] & also kepythe his covent in a right good order'. The mayor reported that `yn hym I founde no obstinace'.92

Pecock was still absent from Southampton at the beginning of May;93 but he was back by 16 July when, writing to Cromwell on another matter,94 he praised his `noble and rare (among such of yo[ur] auctoritie) v[er]tue of facilitie and redynes to here all man[ner] of mens reasonable matters w[ith] a most naturall and gentyll ent[er]teynment, as I my self so vyle a p[er]son of late had c[er]tayne exp[er]ience of'.

No doubt the Canterbury house was moved to discretion by the still-green memory of the outcome of the `Nun of Kent' affair, and the scandal caused by a sermon given by friar Henry Bocher at Rye in the previous year was not, so far as we know, repeated.95 Richard Risby had been succeeded as warden here by the eminently conformable Bernardine Covert, who comes to life for a brief period via the Lisle correspondence.

Covert - a scion of a prominent West Sussex family who numbered clock-mending among his accomplishments - was well known to the Lisles, who were founders of the convent and who valued his preaching ability. With a companion, Thomas Roche, he was a regular preacher at Calais; and the pair were granted a royal letter of credence - addressed to all

---

92. Perchard to Cromwell, Huttoft to Cromwell [8 & 12 April 1534], ibid., SP1/83 ff.78-9, 89-90 (=LP vii.448,450,472-3).

93. J. A. Muller (ed.), The Letters of Stephen Gardiner (Cambridge, 1933), pp.56-7 (=LP vii.610).

94. PRO SP1/85 ff.63-4 (=LP vii.982).

95. Below, p.204.

the king's subjects, but especially to the Council of Calais - enabling them to travel there to preach, `as they have sundry tymes doone heretofore', on 24 January 1534.[96]

The letter is remarkable in that it shows that, even at this late stage, the king's wrath was directed only against certain friars. The Order as a whole was not, as yet, in danger. Nevertheless, although it is not entirely explicit it makes it reasonably clear that Covert and Roche had fallen foul of a general air of opprobrium following the outcome of the `Nun of Kent' affair:

> `nowe lately ther hathe been certeyn freres of the Ordre of Obs[er]u[a]nt[es] whiche w[ith]in this o[ur] realme have been detected of certain crimes, by reason wherof other honest [?discreet] and vertuous breder of that Order by som p[er]sons of light iudgement myght p[er]cace be the worse taken and lesse credence given vnto them in the declaring of the worde of God or other vertuous ensamples'.

Covert and Roche, it states, `be men of godly behav[i]o[ur], good name [and] fame, and in no wyse suspected of the said crime'; and it enjoins its readers to accept and give assistance to them `as heretofore ye have doon'.

But shortly after this Covert fell foul of Cranmer's measures; and when Lord Lisle wished him to return to Calais to preach during Lent he had to send John Worth, a gentleman in his service, with a letter to the archbishop requesting a special licence. Worth received a fair reply,[97] but not, it seems, one which gave Lisle all that he wanted. For immediately afterwards he charged Sir Thomas Palmer with the task of seeing Cranmer on the same matter, apparently with the intention of

---

96. PRO E135/2 no.13 (not in LP).

97. Worth to Lord Lisle (London, 21 March [1534]), ibid., SP3/6 f.67 (=Lisle Letters, ii.148, LP vii.350).

getting Covert a permanent licence. He too apparently received a favourable reply.[98]

Yet father Covert continued to experience problems. We hear of a number of enemies - although he himself professed, charitably, to regard this as an exaggeration - and it can be inferred from his letters to Lady Lisle written at Canterbury on 1 and 13 June[99] that someone had reported some suspicious element in his preaching to the authorities. Again, Lord Lisle had entrusted a servant with the task - among others - of attempting to sort the matter out with Cranmer; and later, on his way back from London to Calais, this man had called on Covert at Canterbury to hear, as the latter put it on 1 June, that

> `lawde be hyt vnto God, I haue made a quyett end w[ith] my Lorde of Cawnterbery, and had of hym very gracyvs & good wordes. Also myne accuser ys dep[ar]ted thys worlde, on whoys sowle Jh[es]u have mercy´.

In his second letter he gently scorns Lady Lisle's suggestion that he has many enemies:

> `Hyt ys comynly seyn that men takyth passage at Dover in a herde wynde, and yet hyt happynythe that they aryve in to Calyce w[ith] a fore wynde (truyth wylbe knowen). Wattr & wynd bryngyth me[n] to Calyce; so hyt ys [that] inaffectyon & lyzght tonges bryngyth me[n] to care´.

Nevertheless, while not actually forbidden to do so, he had not preached since his last return from Calais; and he thought the time inauspicious for another visit.

---

98. Palmer to Lord Lisle (London, [28 March], 18 April [1534]), ibid., SP3/13 f.42, SP3/6 f.81 (=Lisle Letters, ii.151,170, LP vii.385,510).

99. Ibid., SP3/10 ff.75-6 (=Lisle Letters, ii.204,213, LP vii.765,837).

The well-connected Covert was certainly no aspiring martyr in the cause of Rome. We do not know whether in fact he resumed his Calais preaching tours, but, in any case, after the suppression of the Observant province which was shortly to follow, he quickly acquired a dispensation from his habit and embarked upon the career of a secular pluralist.

(vii) The Final Phase.

While they presented Cromwell with a potentially serious problem of enforcement, these examples of suspicious preaching were comparatively isolated, and at the time such incidents were no means confined to the Observants. They were not the final straw. The issue which finally brought about the friars' downfall was that of the two oaths which the government now required them to swear, signifying allegiance to the Boleyn succession and the Royal Supremacy.

By early May 1534, measures were in hand to require of every adult male the swearing of the first, upholding the succession rights of the heirs of the Boleyn marriage, as prescribed in the Succession Act passed in the Spring Parliamentary session of 1534: and the signs are that in this, despite misgivings, most of the Observants were ultimately prepared to acquiesce.

On 7 May we find Rowland Lee, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, and Thomas Bedyll, archdeacon of London and clerk to the Privy Council, at Syon, attempting to swear the inmates of the religious houses of the vicinity. The Carthusians of Sheen, they reported to Cromwell,[100] had already proved conformable; and the nuns and brothers of Syon showed

---

100. PRO SP1/83 ff.255-6 (=LP vii.622).

signs of a similar inclination. They had had the help of the prior and procurator of Sheen in their attempts to move the Richmond Observants,

> `w[ith] which frires by mediacion[e] of thair rulers we haue had diu[er]se co[n]terenc[es]; and haue al this tyme been in dispaire of thair reco[n]ciliation tyl this mornyng, in which we haue p[er]ceyued now som[e] hop[e] that w[ith]in a co[m]-munication or two we shal reduce tham[e] to good co[n]for-mite´.

We know, too, that most of the Canterbury friars conformed. Early in June, Cromwell heard from one John Antony, a lay servant of Christ Church priory,[101] that

> `the moest part or all Kent have taken ther oth acordyng to the kyng[e´s] co[m]myssyon, savyng that whe have ij Obs-[er]vantt[es] fryers w[ith] vs at Cant[er]bury that wold not suere nor take the sayed oyth as the rest of there company dyd. Ther namys be father Mychelson & father Gam´.

There is no sign of trouble at Southampton, where in Pecock´s absence his vicar attended a gathering organised by Bishop Gardiner in the Great Hall at Winchester on 4 May and there `very obediently´ swore the oath and gave the names of all his friars for the commissioners´ benefit.[102]

With these exceptions, the conclusion that the friars conformed must rest upon the apparent absence of any punitive action against them. Nevertheless, if the friars had been able on this occasion to reconcile their consciences and their pragmatic instincts sufficiently to enable the majority of them to swear, their respite was to be very brief. For the government had already decided upon further measures to ensure the

---

101. Ibid., SP1/88 f.168 (=LP vii (appendix).27): [7 June 1534].

102. Muller (ed.), Letters of Stephen Gardiner, pp.56-7.

conformity of the clergy not only to the Boleyn succession but also to the Royal Supremacy.

Again the friars, and the Observants in particular, found themselves specially targeted. On 13 April a royal commission was addressed to Doctors John Hilsey and George Browne, by now provincials respectively of the Dominicans and the Austin friars, to carry out a visitation of all houses of friars in the kingdom and to secure the inmates' adherence to a comprehensive set of articles.[103] These included a repetition of the earlier succession oath, a specific admission of the validity of the Boleyn marriage, acceptance of the king as Supreme Head of the Church in England, and a denial that the pope had any more authority than any bishop outside his own diocese. They were to agree never to refer to the pope as such and in their sermons were to declare his power to be a usurpation. Two special provisions were included to settle the matter of the Observants' loyalties once and for all: they were to make a new profession to observe the Rule in obedience to the king rather than to the bishop of Rome; and they were to accept Browne as their minister-general. But an oath containing such provisions outstripped the Observants' capacity for compromise.

Lee and Bedyll once again found themselves with the task of dealing with the Observants.[104] Early in the evening of Saturday 13 June they were visited by Browne with instructions from Cromwell. They left immediately for Richmond, where the next morning they had words with

---

103. LP vii.587(18); articles printed by H. de Vocht, Acta Thomae Mori (Louvain, 1947), pp.208-9 (=LP vii.590, which does not mention the special provisions relating to the Observants).

104. Lee and Bedyll to Cromwell (15 June [1534]), BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv ff.49-50 (=Wright, pp.41ff., LP vii.841).

the warden and `oon of the seniors named Sebastian´, and afterwards spoke to the assembled convent `and moued them by all the meanes and policies that we coulde devise to consent to the articles delyu[er]ed vnto vs by [Browne] and requyred the confirmation of them by their convent seale´. The community refused to co-operate, although they did agree to place the matter in the hands of their four discreets, who were engaged to appear, with the seal and empowered to assent or dissent on behalf of all, at Greenwich on the following Monday morning.

The visitors then went to Greenwich and attempted to repeat their ploy, trying to persuade the friars there `lakewise to putt the hole mattier in the hand[es] of their seniors or discrett[es], to th´entent to avoide superfluouse woord[es] and idle reasonyng; and specially to th´entent that if the discrett[es] shulde refuse to consent, it were better after our mynd[es] to strayne a ffewe then a multytude´. But here they had no luck. The Greenwich friars `stiffely affyrmed that, wher the mattier concerned perticulerly euery oone of their soules, they wolde aunswere perticulerly euery man ffor hymself´.

After much argument the commissioners found, demanding the friars´ `ffinall and determynatt aunswer´, that every one opposed the articles, but especially that stating that the pope possessed no more authority or jurisdiction than had any bishop, in England or elsewhere, in his own diocese. To this proposition they opposed the chapter of the Rule enjoining ministers-general to seek from the pope the appointment of a cardinal-protector of the Order.

To this Lee and Bedyll made three replies. First, they claimed that St. Francis dwelt in Italy and owed obedience to the bishop of Rome as English monks owed obedience to the archbishop of Canterbury, and that this part of the Rule was not intended to apply to friars in England.

Next they claimed that the words in question had been forged by some ambitious friar. Finally, they said that the friars were the king's subjects and by the law of God owed him their entire obedience. Of these, only the last probably stood any chance of carrying much weight: but even this argument, effective as it had been with many conscientious Englishmen - and the commissioners recited a list of prominent English ecclesiastics who had subscribed the repudiation of the Papal Supremacy - was bound to be of little consequence for the Observants. To them, the arguments could be seen only as sops to the conscience: as mere excuses for submission to coercion which would, as the friars understood, undermine both the authority structure and the very legitimacy of the Order. `All this notwithstonding', the commissioners were forced to admit, `their conclusion was [that] they had professed Saincte ffrauncis' religion, and in the obs[er]uannce therof they wolde lyve and dye'.

The friars' flat refusal to co-operate swiftly brought down the government's wrath upon them. On Friday 19 June Lord Lisle's servant Leonard Smyth reported from London[105] that `ij cartes full of ffryers, I herd sey, came vnto the Tower w[ithin] ij dayes before this date, and more co[min]g aft[er], as o[ur] Lord God knowith'.

The other friaries seem to have been left in peace for the moment, although in July Browne and Hilsey's commission did give rise to a curious incident at Southampton, in which an unidentified individual in the garb of a black friar attempted, on apparently forged royal authority, to carry out a visitation of the convent.[106] We do not know what

---

105. PRO SP3/7 f.124 (=Lisle Letters, ii.215, LP vii.856).

106. Pecock to Cromwell (16 July [1534]).

happened when the Southampton friars were in due course faced with a genuine visitation, or what happened at Canterbury, Newark or Newcastle. But from the government's reaction we can safely assume that Browne and Hilsey (or their representatives) were met with a resistance sufficiently solid to leave Cromwell with no realistic hope of securing the compliance of even a rump province. As the Greenwich friars had made clear to Lee and Bedyll, the root cause was their constitutional attachment to Rome which ultimately they alone of the English friars were unprepared to compromise.

The immediate result of their stand was the suppression of the Observant province. On 11 August Chapuys reported to Charles V that of five (sic) houses of Observants, three had already been emptied of friars, `owing to their respective congregations having refused to swear to the statute against the pope'. Those in the remaining two houses were also expecting to be expelled.[107] The chronicler Wriothesley later noted 11 August as the date on which the friars of Richmond and Greenwich were expelled `and all other places of the same order in Englande were allso putt downe by the kinges commaundement'.[108]

---

107. CSP Spanish 1534-5, no.84 (=LP vii.1057, which reads seven and five houses respectively).

108. Wriothesley, i.25.

Chapter 5. The Suppression of the Province and its Aftermath (1534-1559).

(i) Thomas Bourchier and the Franciscan Martyrological Tradition.

With the suppression of the Observant province, in the minds of English Catholics the friars acquired a new rôle: that of the victims of impious oppression and of martyrs for the Roman cause. As such they took their place in what might usefully be called a mythology; and in this context a traditional version of events developed; based in part, no doubt, upon genuine recollection, but in large measure upon the product of one fertile imagination.

Briefly stated, the traditional story has most of the friars dispersed from their friaries in pairs into a harsh régime of imprisonment in various far-flung places, from the effects of which many of them died; while a smaller number courageously defended Rome against Henry VIII's assaults and suffered terrible privations and martyrdom as a result. It is essentially a story of the revenge wreaked by a depraved, vindictive king against those whom he saw as his betrayers.

The earliest extant version of this tradition is that of the late sixteenth-century English Observant Thomas Bourchier, whose Historia Ecclesiastica de Martyrio Fratrvm Ordinis Minorum Divi Francisci, de Observantia Nuncupatorum was published in Paris in 1582 and at Ingolstadt in the following year. Notwithstanding his numerous obvious chronological and other inaccuracies and borrowings from other contexts, Bourchier has been accepted as substantially reliable not only by modern Catholic writers such as the martyrologists Morris and Pollen, and Professor Knowles;[1] but by non-Catholic scholars

---

1. The former in their account of Forest in Dom Bede Camm (ed.), Lives of the English Martyrs (London, 1904), pp.274ff,468ff; the latter in RO iii.210-1.

of the stature of A. G. Little and J. R. H. Moorman.[2]

But it is a mistake to make too much of Bourchier's account of events. He was an exile with no personal experience of the English province (he was probably not, as is frequently stated, an inmate of Marian Greenwich[3]); and he was writing nearly half a century after those events had taken place. He has no regard for the complexities of the ecclesio-political picture of the England of the early 1530s. His reproduction is strictly monochrome: to him Henry VIII was no more than a monster of depravity who sought ruthlessly to overthrow the Church because it stood in the way of his attempts to gratify his lust, and who out of vindictiveness cruelly destroyed any individual who dared to point out to him the error of his ways.

His chronology is clearly inaccurate: he seems to have conflated the events of 1534 with the prosecution of Forest in 1538 and to have turned the whole into a single, generalised persecution which for some reason he places in 1537. Furthermore the only recognisable names in his version of events are those of fathers Rich, Risby and Forest. Yet his accounts even of their sufferings and deaths owe little to verifiable reality. Rich and Risby are portrayed as going heroically to their deaths purely as a result of their denial of the Royal Supremacy: in describing their deaths Bourchier appears to have borrowed from accounts of the 1535 executions of Richard Reynolds of Syon and a number

---

2. The former in his account of the Greenwich friary in The Victoria History of the County of Kent vol.ii (ed. W. Page, London, 1926), p.197; the latter in his commemorative volume The Franciscans in England (Oxford, 1974), p.93.

3. According to the printer of the 1583 Ingolstadt edition of his martyrology he was one of a number of Englishmen who entered the Order on the Continent in 1566 (Bourchier, sig. A.4.v.).

of London Carthusians, and nothing is said of the `Nun of Kent´.[4] Bourchier´s treatment of Forest will be dealt with later. His other `martyrs´, Anthony Brorbe, Thomas Cortt and Thomas Belchiam, and his named `exiles´, Thomas Pakinton, Bonaventure Roo, John Tuhit and Richard Carter, defy all attempts to link them with known individuals.[5]

But of course, as his title makes clear, Bourchier was not trying to write any kind of objective history in the modern sense. He was writing hagiography, not history. His aim was to edify, not to inform. So where he did not know what had happened (and even, perhaps, where he did) he made events fit into a conventional pattern. To say so is not to blame him for doing what he did: it is simply to say that his work needs to be recognised for what it is, and treated accordingly.

Those latter-day writers who have taken Bourchier´s account to be basically authentic have by and large done so for two reasons. First, they have seen him as reflecting Franciscan tradition rather than, as seems much more likely, originating it. Second, despite his obvious inaccuracies he does give some details which can be backed-up from contemporary documentary sources. He tells of friars being sent two by two into captivity around the country and of friars going into exile in Scotland and the Low Countries, all of which receives independent confirmation. And his figure of 32 friars who died in captivity is remarkably close to a number of deaths obtained from a nearly-contemp-

---

4. Bourchier, pp.12v-15r. cf. A. Neame, The Holy Maid of Kent (London, 1971), pp.366-9: another author who recognises the difficulties yet persists in regarding Bourchier as essentially authentic.

5. Bourchier, pp.15v ff, 23r-v. I can offer no explanation for Bourchier´s story of the Earl of Southampton´s intercession with Henry VIII for the release of eight imprisoned friars (pp.22v-3r), unless it be a garbled recollection of the Duke of Feria´s intercession for on behalf of the Marian friars and nuns in 1559 (for which see below, p.238).

orary government source to which we shall come in a moment.[6]

In the immediate aftermath of the suppression of the friaries, Eustace Chapuys reported to the Emperor on 29 August 1534 that all the Observants of the kingdom had been ejected from their houses and distributed among others `where they are locked up in chains and worse treated than they could be in prison´.[7] And on the face of it his story is corroborated by a letter which fell into Thomas Cromwell´s hands a little over two months later. The writer was Brother Francis Lybert, lately of Greenwich, but at the date of writing, 25 October, with a companion, one Father Abraham (probably Abraham Wharton), at the Conventual house at Stamford `enclosed...in a pore logynge, accordyng to the kyng[es] commaundement´.[8]

These two letters would appear to vindicate at least one key element in Bourchier´s tale; and there is one more document which tends to lend him credence. This is an undated list of English Observant friars, prepared at some time after the suppression, which survives in the Public Record Office and of which a full transcript is given below as appendix 4. It gives the names of 44 friars `permanantium in regno´ (mostly in locations which clearly represent Conventual Franciscan convents), 31 `defunctorum´ (compared with Bourchier´s figure of 32), 36 `exemptorum´ (ie. dispensed from their habits) and 30 `qui fugam pecierunt´ (either to Scotland or the Continent). If this list can be dated, as Professor Knowles and others have assumed, to a point compar-

---

6. Ibid., pp.23r-v.

7. LP vii.1095.

8. Lybert to James Beck, PRO SP1/86 f.91 (=LP vii.1307).

atively soon after the suppression, then it does seem to be a powerful confirmation of the tenor of Bourchier's account.

Nevertheless, the contemporary material does leave us some difficulties to resolve. We need not take Chapuys too seriously when he refers to the ferocity of the friars' imprisonment; he was a little prone to rhetorical exaggeration in such matters. There are signs, too, that not all the friars were dispersed. Lybert asks for news of his brethren at London and Greenwich in terms which suggest a degree of concentration. A glance at appendix 4, below, will demonstrate that there was still a large number of former Observants at the London house in 1538, while as we shall shortly see there was a sizeable number - sufficient to make the warden's life intolerable - at Canterbury in 1535. Perhaps those who were dispersed were those whom the authorities saw as the most potentially troublesome (there is a near-parallel in the earlier dispersal of some troublesome London Carthusians). After all, Canterbury had been fairly compliant earlier in the year; while Lybert - with his Enchiridion Eckii - and his companion never seem to have become reconciled to the new order of things; the one still imprisoned three-and-a-half years later, the other apparently fled to Scotland. Lybert's reference to `our fathers' at Greenwich suggests, too, that the powers that were had, not unreasonably, kept the friars' leaders near at hand.

The greatest difficulty, however, lies in the interpretation of the list of friars. Its use to back-up Bourchier hinges upon its being dated to comparatively soon after the suppression - say the end of 1534 or early in 1535. This list will be more fully dealt with in its proper context later; but here it can be said that it clearly belongs to the aftermath of the arrest of Friar Forest, say March or April 1538. This

being the case, the effects of the government's vindictiveness appear markedly reduced.

But vindictiveness, in fact, was not the aim of the exercise. The government's true intention is given away by Lybert when he writes of the fathers of his Order at London and Greenwich. He has heard that they `be all sworne, & that they haue chayngede somwhat of ther garment';[9] and as a result they `go at lyberte'. In other words, the purpose of the redistribution and imprisonment of the Observants was to coerce them in isolation into swearing the Supremacy oath which collectively they had refused; and in addition, since the government had altogether lost faith in the province's corporate ability to conform, into renouncing their former allegiance and habit and submitting themselves to the more compliant Conventual superiors.

This was hardly the martyrdom which Bourchier relished. Yet the truth is that nearly all the friars submitted, at least on the surface. Friar William Robinson, in a deposition made before the King's Council in the North at York in July 1538, states that four years before all the brethren of his Order had promised `to obs[er]we and kepe trew alligiance onto the kynges Hygthnesse'.[10] Even friar Forest succumbed: at the time of his trial for heresy in 1538 it was alleged that he had confessed to having sworn - doubtless like many of his brethren - `by an othe geuen by his outwarde man but not in th'inwarde man'.[11]

---

9. LP erroneously renders this last word `government'.

10. PRO SP1/141 f.244 (=LP xiii(ii) appendix, no.28)

11. `Excerpte out of the confessions of friar fforest', PRO SP1/132 ff.155-6 (=LP xiii(i).1043(1)).

The ultimate penalty paid by the Observants for their intransigence was for the most part not the pain of martyrdom, but the humiliation of being forced to deny many of their most cherished tenets, to see the destruction of the institution which alone safeguarded the integrity of their profession and to be subjected to the oversight of superiors representing a branch of the Franciscan tradition which they could only regard as inferior to their own. But if this seemed to the friars like the vindictiveness of their former champion, it was in the main only a means to the end of ensuring their ultimate compliance with the government's religious changes.

To complete the humiliation, three of the former Observant convents, at Greenwich, Canterbury and Newcastle, were made over to the Conventuals:[12] those of Newark, Richmond and Southampton - no doubt due to the influence of the ubiquitous Dr. George Browne - went to the Austin friars.[13] The former Observant friars were left to work out their vocations in new and hostile surroundings. Nevertheless the contemporary sources are clear that they maintained many of their distinctive practices, if not their distinctive habits: and that neither the level of lay support which they enjoyed nor their opposition to contemporary

---

12. On 27 March 1537 the king granted an annuity of £100, payable in quarterly instalments, to the grey friars who had taken over from the Observants at Greenwich (LP xii(i).795(44)). Payments at Lady Day, Midsummer and Michaelmas 1538 are recorded in the Chamber accounts (BL MS Arundel 97 ff.10v, 25r, 37v); the first (only) is calendared in LP xiii(ii).1280 (p.528)). For Canterbury see below, section (ii); for Newcastle, DKPR 8th Report appendix 2, p.32 (=Rymer, xiv.624, LP xiv(i).40)).

13. For the seal of the Austin foundation at Richmond see A. G. Little (ed.), Franciscan History and Legend in English Medieval Art (Manchester, 1937; repr. Farnborough, Hants., 1966), p.97; for Newark and Southampton, below, appendix 1 (Bonaventure Jonson) and J. S. Davies, `Dissolution of the Friary at Southampton', Proceedings and Papers of the Hampshire Field Club vol.i part 4 (1890), pp.17ff.

religious change had been wholly eliminated. Over the next few years all of these were to resurface sporadically in a variety of - to the government - potentially dangerous ways. The dust thrown up by the Observants' opposition to the Henrician religious settlement was to be a long time settling.

(ii) Conflict in the Friaries: Friar Arthur.

In the first place, in view of the previous state of relations between the two branches of the Franciscan Order, the new situation was bound to result in the generation of tensions between parties within the convents in which they now found themselves, exacerbating the breakdown in conventual discipline which seems to have been a general characteristic of the friaries in their twilight years.

The London convent continued to house a number of former Observants until its own dissolution: sufficient to make the obsequious friar John Lawrence's position untenable, particularly since he insisted upon going out and preaching to the world the justice, and even the mercifulness of the manner in which they had been treated.[14] But the most vivid, if rather confused, illustration of this lies in a pair of extant letters which reveal a situation of near-anarchy within the Canterbury convent in 1535 in which, with powerful outside support, the former Observant inmates were able to prevail in a battle of wills with their new Conventual warden, John Arthur.[15]

---

14. Lawrence to Cromwell (undated), PRO SP1/83 f.195 (=LP vii.580).

15. The following account is derived from very poor copies of two letters written by friar John Arthur from Dieppe on 8 November [1535], to a servant of Cromwell named Prows and to Dr. George Browne (PRO SP1/99 ff.11-12 (=LP ix.789(i)): the name of the first addressee is found in the second letter.

It is impossible to unravel fully the story of Arthur's undoing at Canterbury: we have only his version of it, written in desperation in his own defence, and he is certainly not telling the whole truth. Nevertheless, imposed - as a Conventual - upon a community containing a significantly large and truculent Observant complement, with sufficient powerful lay support to enable it to prevail against his authority, and in the face of opposition from his own minister, it is clear that he faced an impossible situation. But it does not take too much reading between the lines to appreciate that Arthur's character was his own worst enemy.

Arthur was a West-Countryman, an Oxford Bachelor of Theology with a background of accusations against him - albeit unproven - of dubious morality,[16] who seems to have been adept at acquiring enemies and to have made a practice of using an obsequious outward conformity to the religious changes of the 1530s as a means of avoiding the discipline imposed by his Order. For this reason he had fallen out with the Conventual provincial, Dr. William Call.

No doubt it was his supposed political reliability rather than his probity which had moved the king, through the agency of Doctor George Browne, to install him as warden at Canterbury after the suppression of the Observant <u>régime</u>. Not surprisingly the move was made, as he confessed, `moche agay[nst] [the]harte of my p[rov]inciall'. But Arthur's compliance with the imposition of the Royal Supremacy did not extend to support for the theological innovations which accompanied the Henrician Reformation. In March 1535 he was reported to Thomas Cromwell for an outburst of doctrinal conservatism - exaggerated in tone but by no

---

16. A. G. Little, <u>The Grey Friars in Oxford</u> (Oxford Historical Society vol. xx, 1891), pp.95-6,284-5.

means untypical of its time - in a sermon which he had given in the parish church of Herne, Kent, on Passion Sunday (14 March). According to Cromwell's anonymous informant, he railed against `thes new bokes & thes new prech[ers]' for denying the efficacy of fasting, prayers for the dead and pilgrimages, and neglected to pray for the king as head of the Church.[17]

In his management of his friary, he claimed to have

> `kepte [the] Obs[er]ua[nt]s somwhat strayt & restraynyd the[m] fr[m] some libertes [that] they lobyd to haue, because thei rebellyd soo moche a gayn[st] owre p[ri]nce & helde soo stefly w[ith] [the] byshope of Rome & dyd dayly rep[ro]ue [th]em for it; for I had manny of the[m] w[ith] me'.

His attentions were particularly directed towards one former Observant, Henry Bocher. Arthur claims that almost two years previously Bocher had preached a seditious sermon at Rye, `wher if he had not craftely a co[n]vayd hy[m]selfe awaye owte of Ryee [the] men of Ryee had put hy[m] by [the] helys because he spake soo owteragely agayn[st] [the] trewth, ye & agayn[st] [the] kyng[es] stattuttes'.

Now Arthur has a whole catalogue of complaints to make against Bocher's more recent conduct, ranging from accusations that he had refused to preach the king's title as Supreme Head in public and had terrorised a `Doche' friar, whom Arthur had employed to blot out the pope's name from the service books, into fleeing the country with a companion, to accusations of theft and intent to ravish an `honest wyffe' of the town. He claims that, in order to avoid due punishment for his various misdemeanours, Bocher had written to the king's Attorney-General, Christopher Hales, or to his cousin John, second

---

17. PRO SP1/91 f.176 (=LP viii.480): undated.

baron of the Exchequer (both powerful local supporters of Observants), accusing Arthur of having said `serten wordd[es] to hy[m] p[ri]uile i[n] a garden agayn[st] [the] kyng[es] honor & hys laves´. The Attorney-General had promptly had Arthur imprisoned; and as soon as Call had heard of the affair he had come to Canterbury to depose him in the king´s name. Arthur claims that Call had conspired with the Observants against him, and that together they used his imprisonment to wreak their revenge upon him, starving him and boasting that he would rot in prison: which he had believed, `because [the] kyng[es] attorne & Barne Hale favor[es] [the] Obs[er]ua[nt]s soo moch´. Finally, he had managed to escape to Dieppe, whence he directed his appeals for help.

(iii) The Friars and the `Pilgrimage of Grace´.

The internecine warfare at Canterbury, though, was relatively localised and on the whole probably more unedifying than dangerous. Another, more pointed example of the real problems which the friars, together with their lay supporters, could continue to pose to the government lies in the rôle which they played in the disturbances which rocked the North during the latter part of 1536 and early 1537.[18]

One friar in particular played a leading role in one episode of the insurgence. By the summer of 1535 Donaventure Jonson (whose baptismal name was Thomas) was residing at the Conventual house at Beverley. Here he made the aquaintance of the sickly Christopher Stapleton, head of the Stapleton family of Wighill, near Tadcaster, who was boarding in the convent with his wife for the sake of his health; and later he

---

18. For the background to what follows, see M. H. & R. Dodds, The Pilgrimage of Grace, 1536-7 and the Exeter Conspiracy, 1538 (2 vols., Cambridge, 1915; repr. London, 1971), especially chapters vii,xiv,xv.

visited the couple at their home at Wighill.[19]

Stapleton returned to Beverley for the summer of 1536, accompanied by his brother William, a lawyer of Gray's Inn and a friend of Robert Aske. Following the rising at Beverley on 9 October 1536, Jonson, who was sworn to the rebel cause, was responsible for saving the Staple-tons, who had taken refuge in the convent, from being burned along with it. He was apparently responsible for the commons' acceptance of William Stapleton as their captain, and subsequently rode in harness with the rebels as far as Doncaster, where he left them, saying that he was going to the convent at Newcastle.[20]

An un-named Observant was present at the convocation of rebel clergy held at Pontefract priory early in December.[21] Significantly, the sixth of the articles drawn up by this assembly, for presentation to the duke of Norfolk at the meeting at Doncaster which immediately followed it, called for the restoration of the Observants to their former houses;[22] and it is apparent from subsequent events that this request represented not so much special pleading as the Observants' continuing share in the popular esteem in which the religious in general were held in the North.

---

19. For this episode see the confession of William Stapleton, PRO E36/118 f.74 (ed. J. C. Cox, `William Stapleton and the Pilgrimage of Grace', in Transactions of the East Riding Antiquarian Society vol.x (1902), pp.85-6; =LP xii(i).392(2)).

20. Jonson ultimately took the habit of an Austin friar and returned to live in the convent at Newark. For his downfall in 1538, see below, p.220.

21. The deposition of John Dakyn, rector of Kirkby Ravensworth, refers to an unnamed friar of unspecified Order: that of the Dominican Dr. John Pykeryng calls him an Observant (PRO SP1/117 ff.201r,279r (LP xii(i).786(ii.1),1021(1)).

22. PRO SP1/112 ff.143r,149r (=LP xi.1246(i&iii).

No directions from the king to Norfolk concerning the line which he was to take on this question have survived. Neither is there any hint of any private accommodation which might have been reached between the rebels and Norfolk. Clearly the compromise apparently reached over the recently-suppressed lesser monasteries - provisional restoration of the monks pending a reconsideration of the matter by Parliament - was not valid in this case, since the Observants had not been suppressed by Act of Parliament. Even though, as a religious conservative and a former patron of the Observants,[23] he would not have been altogether unsympathetic towards their case, Norfolk must have known that the king would not consent to such a restoration and that advocacy of their cause at court could lead only to doubts being raised about his own loyalty. Nevertheless, he does seem somehow to have left a mood of some optimism about the matter behind him in the North.

There are signs that pressure for the restoration of the Newcastle Observants had begun as early as October (it was probably in this connection that Friar Jonson rode North from Doncaster and at around this time that a group of English friars, hearing of the insurrection, returned from exile in Scotland). It seems most likely that it was immediately after the end of the Doncaster meeting on 8 December that Sir Thomas Hilton, sheriff of Durham and one of the leading rebel representatives at Doncaster, rode north to Newcastle and, with the aid of a number of supporters, secured the restoration of the Observants to their house.

The mayor of Newcastle, Richard Brandlyng, wrote immediately to Norfolk to tell him what had happened. He claimed afterwards to William

---

23. See above, p.84.

Blithman (one of Cromwell's commissioners for the suppression of the lesser monasteries under the 1536 Act) that the deed had been done against his will, and that he had allowed it only because of the extent of the support which the friars enjoyed:[24]

> `we must other suffer theme to entre into ther hous or elles we must haue put all on jeperdy; for S[er] Thomas Hilton and other wiche wold haue qwerelit w[ith] vs was ther spekers for, and as ye knowe they war favour[ed] by my cosyng And-[er]son and other...yt was thought therby we shuld kep vs all togethers and kep o[ur] towne w[ith]out stryff vnto suche tyme that the kyng[es] Grace[´s] ples[er] haue ben knowne· and as ye know a gret part off the stay off thys contre hang[es] vp[o]n thys town´.

The friars probably included virtually all of those who had earlier fled to Scotland: probably friars from the Northern convents who had been able to escape the government's clutches in August 1534 and so had avoided swearing the king's oaths. There had certainly been English friars in Scotland soon after the suppression: on 14 January 1535 Chapuys had reported to Charles V that the duke of Norfolk's brother, Lord William Howard, then about to leave on an embassy to the king of Scotland, was instructed to request the return of certain English Observants `who go about preaching there that this king is schismatic'.[25] But probably not all were returned exiles. Richard Wallwoode had been dispensed from his habit in April 1536, but is found in Scotland early in 1538, which rather suggests that he had joined the Newcastle friars and been expelled along with them.

In due course the friars' activities also came to the notice of the king, in part <u>via</u> a `declaration' of the bishop of Durham which can

---

24. Postscript to Brandlyng to Blithman ([26 December 1536]), PRO SP1/113 f.34 (=<u>LP</u> xi.1372).

25. <u>LP</u> viii.48.

probably be identified with a lost `scedule´ sent on by Norfolk from Lincoln in February, giving an assessment of the state of the North.[26] Norfolk considered Tunstall´s scenario to be unduly alarmist; but we can guess that it revealed the newly re-installed Observants to be actively destabilising the area by preaching against the Royal Supremacy and fuelling rumour concerning the king´s plans for the depredation of the English Church. For from it - and his other information - Henry concluded that the Observants were `disciples of the bishop of Rome and sowers of sedicion among[st] the people;´ and in mid-March 1537 he instructed Norfolk[27] that he should

> `make due serche in all p[ar]tes where yo[u] shall demore or travayl for all the freres of that faction; and that yo[u] shall from tyme to tyme apprehende them and cause them to be remytted to other places of ffreres to abide their as captyves w[ith]out libertie to speake w[ith] any man tyl we shall further determyn o[ur] pleasure vppon them´.

The instruction probably arrived too late. For Norfolk had appeared in Newcastle at the end of February; and we can safely assume that one of his first tasks there had been the friars´ removal. He had duly expelled them from the convent and sent them back to Scotland, ordering them not to return again to England[28] - probably relieved, for the sake both of his own sympathies and of public order, not to have been compelled to deal too harshly with them.

---

26. Norfolk to Henry VIII (Lincoln, 30 January [1537]), PRO SP1/115 ff.132-3 (=LP xii(i).292).

27. PRO SP1/117 ff.17-20 (=LP xii(i).666): a corrected draft out-letter in Wriothesley´s hand, endorsed as sent 17 March [1537].

28. Cuthbert Tunstall and the Council in the North to Henry VIII (13 November [1537]), PRO SP1/126 ff.148-9 (=LP xii(ii).1076).

The friars were evidently back in Scotland by 23 April, when Henry Ray, Berwick Pursuivant, was questioned on the matter in Edinburgh by members of the Scottish Council.[29] And there was a sequel to Norfolk's action later in 1537. In November two lay-brothers, Henry Bukkery and Thomas Danyell, returned again to England and soon found themselves imprisoned by Robert Bowes at Barnard Castle. Interrogated there, they had confessed, as Bishop Tunstall and the Council in the North reported to the king on 13 November,[30] that they had returned only because of the `veray mysery and great penury' which they had suffered in Scotland. Examined before the Council in York, they had expressed their willingness to abandon their allegiance to Rome and to `submytt them holly' to the king. In an accompanying letter Tunstall recommended to Cromwell[31] that they should be shown mercy, both because of their penitence and because if they were to be well received their companions might follow them.

It would be pleasant to think that at this stage the king found it within himself to treat the two leniently. A Thomas Danyell is recorded in the following year as having died _in patria_: but it is not certain that the two were the same; our friar might rather be identified with the lay-brother Richard Danyell recorded at the same time as _ad mundum reuersus_. Of his companion we know nothing more. As for Tunstall's aspiration, there are some signs that exiled friars may soon have begun to trickle back surreptitiously from Scotland into England. A Peter of

---

29. `The saing of me Henry Ray P[er]sevaunt of Berwicke, at my retourne last from Scotland', BL MS Cotton Caligula B.i. ff.343-4 (=_LP_ xii(i). 1094).

30. Tunstall and the Council to Henry VIII (13 November [1537]).

31. PRO SP1/126 ff.150-1 (=_LP_ xii(ii).1077).

Mainz was at the house of Llanfaes (Anglesey) at its dissolution in August 1538 and a John Jobbe was to be found at the Scarborough convent at the time of its dissolution early in 1539. And of the 21 friars apparently in Scotland early in 1538 only four - William Bartram, William Symson, Thomas Cony and John Lambert - feature in an extant list of `the namys of certain Englishemen rebel[les] reset within Scoteland', probably compiled in January 1540.[32]

(iv) The Case of Friar Forest.

It was not just in the North that former Observants continued to provide headaches for Cromwell's government. Early in 1538 his attention was drawn to a problem rather closer to home, which centred upon another of his old adversaries, father John Forest.

Forest, an individual whose historical existence is well attested and whose memory is unsullied by association with treasonous activities, has naturally taken a prominent place in the Franciscan martyrological tradition. Even the most comprehensive modern treatment of the story of Forest's downfall, that of Morris and Pollen,[33] is avowedly martyrological and, notwithstanding a number of critical reservations, persists in giving Thomas Bourchier's testimony rather too much credence. So, while eschewing the hagiographer's interest in the martyr's sufferings and the manner of his death, it is worth giving a new account of the circumstances of the case in the context of Cromwell's attempts to enforce religious change.

---

32. BL MS Royal 7C.xvi f.142 (=LP xv.96): it was enclosed with a letter from the Captain of Berwick to the Lord Privy Seal dated 22 January 1540.

33. In Camm (ed.), Lives of the English Martyrs, pp.274ff (and see also 468ff); substantially followed by Professor Knowles (RO iii.210-1).

Bourchier, writing over 40 years after the event, does seem to have had access to some genuine details of the story. He refers to Forest's incrimination on the basis of words spoken in the confessional, and to his imprisonment in Newgate; and he seems to have had access to a report of Forest's defiant words on the scaffold. But around these landmarks of detail he weaves a story of his own which contains little reference to reality.[34] For the real-life Forest was not quite the fearless martyr whom he required. He was a fallible human being who had shown signs of weakness: under duress he had sworn the king's oaths in 1534; his later opposition was covert rather than overt; and at his trial he was brought to the point of abjuration. So in order to place the story within his pattern of steadfast victims of the vindictiveness of a degenerate king, Bourchier was forced to invent.

Bourchier ascribes Forest's arrest to the king's placing of an agent provocateur in the confessional, having heard rumours of Forest's having written and prepared to publish a book against the Royal Supremacy. He gives this work a rather pedestrian title, de auctoritate Ecclesiae et Pontificis Maximi, and also adds an incipit - `Nemo sibi sumat honorem nisi fuerit vocatus a Deo tanquam Aaron (Hebr. 5)' - and describes an argument based upon it. If there ever was such a book, no trace now remains of it. But in any case it is of no more than passing interest, since it was quite clearly not an issue in the government's prosecution of Forest. Nowhere is it mentioned in the contemporary papers relating to the case against him.

Bourchier knew that Forest had been imprisoned in Newgate and, basing himself upon the claim that he had been confessor to Katherine

---

34. Bourchier, pp.25v ff.

of Aragon, goes on to print a series of letters of mutual encouragement which allegedly passed between the imprisoned (and apparently at one point condemned) Forest, Katherine of Aragon, her lady-in-waiting Elizabeth Hammon and her imprisoned chaplain Dr. Thomas Abel.[35] If these letters are at all genuine, Forest must have been imprisoned at some point prior to Katherine's death in 1536, hence the establishment of a tradition of Forest's early imprisonment and condemnation which has been perpetuated by Morris and Pollen, Knowles and others.[36]

But quite apart from the chronological problem, it is of course most unusual (as indeed Morris and Pollen point out) for both sides of anything like a complete sequence of personal correspondence of this nature to survive intact. And in any case, for the most part the letters lack verifiable substance. In the main, they consist of pious platitudes and Biblical allusions, although at one point Bourchier includes some material which reads remarkably like Forest's last defiant speech at Smithfield in 1538, as reported by the chronicler Wriothesley.[37] The letters are evidently no more than pious exemplars, the inventions of Bourchier's fertile imagination.

There is in fact no reliable evidence to suggest that Forest suffered imprisonment to any greater extent than his <u>confrères</u> before 1538. Admittedly we know nearly nothing about his career in the years between his exile to one of the northern convents in 1533 and his reappearance at the Conventual house in London in early 1538: but nothing remains to suggest that his career was any different from theirs.

---

35. They are translated by Morris and Pollen (Camm (ed.), <u>op. cit.</u>, pp.283ff,468ff) and calendared in <u>LP</u> vii.129-34.

36. Camm (ed.), <u>op. cit.</u>, pp.282-3; <u>RO</u> iii.370&n.

37. Cf. Wriothesley, i.79-80.

Certainly he had sworn the king's oath, albeit, as he claimed later, with a mental reservation.

When he does reappear in the historical record, early in 1538, he is resident at the London Greyfriars and acting as confessor to, and orator on behalf of, men of a conservative religious disposition. And it was the potentially seditious nature of these essentially covert activities which concerned Cromwell. Somehow Forest's activities came to the notice of the government. The story of a malevolent informer - a persistent one with some basis in the documentary sources - is plausible enough. Given the knowledge of the lay circles in which Forest moved, the dangers of the situation were obvious: the government was compelled to take notice.

First, Cromwell had to find out who had been seeing the friar, and he called in the warden of the London Conventuals, Thomas Chapman, and required him to supply the information. Chapman, it seems, took his time. But eventually he learned that two of his friars were holding and disbursing money on Forest's behalf, given by his clients, who included Dr. Richard Wulman, dean of Wells, and Lord Mordaunt.[38] At some point Forest was pulled in and questioned. He too gave the government a list of names, which again included that of Lord Mordaunt.

Mordaunt, too, was examined, and produced a long (and excruciatingly badly-written) deposition[39] in which, while admitting that he had once made his confession to Forest (on about 23 February 1538) and had in recompense supplied him with 3s. 4d. worth of coal, he strongly denied having had with him any discussion of the pope or of the Royal

---

38. [Chapman] to Cromwell, PRO SP1/131 f.256 (=LP xiii(i).880): undated.

39. BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv. f.161 (=LP xiii(i).1043(2)): undated.

Supremacy. We may however be justified in thinking, as the government appears to have done, that Mordaunt was not quite telling the whole truth. He claimed that he had employed Forest on this one occasion because his regular confessor, a friar Robyns, had left the London convent. This friar Robyns can possibly be identified with another former Observant; if so, we have grounds for suspecting that Lord Mordaunt had made a deliberate practice of seeking Observant confessors who shared his own conservative religious views. And he probably was not the only one.

Expressing conservative religious views in the confessional was clearly what Forest had been doing. He himself confessed under questioning[40] that he had claimed to one penitent that he had `denyed the busshop of Rome by an othe geuen by his outwarde man but not in th´inwarde man´, that he had refused absolution to another who had shown signs of Lutheranism, and that he `vsed and practized to move men in confession to holde and sticke to th´olde fasshion of bilave that was vsed in the realme of long tyme past´.

Other questions elicited more details of his own beliefs. He professed belief in the Church of Rome as the true Church, and associated Bishop Fisher and other recent martyrs with St. Thomas Becket as upholders of the rights of the Church; but expressed a dilemma - which must have been common among his brethren - over his twin obediences, `firste to the king[es] Highnes by the lawe of God and the seconde to the busshop of Rome by his Rule and p[ro]fession´.

---

40. `Excerpte out of the confessions of frier fforest´, PRO SP1/132 ff.155-6 (=LP xiii(i).1043(i)): undated.

But this was not quite what the government needed in order to press charges. `Articles´ were framed,[41] under which Forest was to be tried - uniquely and ironically - on a charge of heresy. Our source for these articles as finally framed and publicly proclaimed at the scene of Forest´s execution is the chronicler Wriothesley:[42]

> `First, that the Holie Catholike Church was the Church of Rome, and that wee ought to beleeve out of the same. Second, that wee should beleeve on the pope´s pardon for remission of our sinnes. Thirdlie, that wee ought to beleeve and doe as our fathers have done aforetyme fowertene yeares past. Fourthlie, that a priest maie turne and change the paines of Hell of a sinner, trulie penitent, contrite of his sinns, by certaine pennance enjoyned him in the paines of Purgatorie´.

The remainder of the story is fairly familiar, and there is little point in repeating it in any detail here.[43] Forest first abjured his opinions, then changed his mind and refused to repeat his abjuration, or to undergo public penance, and as a result was burnt to death as relapsed. It is hardly worth speculating on the thought-processes which brought about his change of mind, but it may well be significant that, even now, Forest had some influential friends. For Hugh Latimer found it necessary, in communicating with Cromwell on 18 May about the arrangements for the friar´s execution, to complain about what he saw as the

---

41. Cranmer to Cromwell (6 April [1538]), PRO SP1/131 ff.32-3 (=Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer (ed. J. E. Cox, Parker Society, 1846), appendix no.221; LP xiii(i).687).

42. Wriothesley, i.79.

43. The story is told by Wriothesley, i.78-81, substantially repeated by Stow, p.574. The occasion of his execution is described, apparently on the basis of an eyewitness account, by the anonymous author of A Chronicle of the Reign of Henry VIII, in Spanish (trs. M. A. S. Hume, London, 1889), pp.77ff.

excessively comfortable circumstances of his imprisonment.[44] And an anonymous Spanish chronicler notes - with an appropriate sense of wonderment at the flouting of social convention involved - how at the scene of his execution (which was set up as a public spectacle as part of Cromwell's current campaign against religious images) the duke of Norfolk, no less, attempted to speak with the condemned.[45]

(v) Cromwell's List of Former Observant Friars.

The implication of all the cases which we have considered so far was that even in 1538 the Observant friars still enjoyed a good deal of lay support and that they were still capable of posing a substantial threat to the establishment of the new ecclesiastical order. But these, although the most dangerous, were by no means the only cases which Cromwell was able to ponder. By early 1538 a number of individual friars were apparently in some form of individual custody.[46] The reasons for some of these can be guessed at. The tone of Francis Lybert's letter[47] rather suggests that he may have remained recalcitrant; hence, no doubt, his detention with Dr. John Crayford, a client of Cromwell, master of Clare Hall, Cambridge, and sometime vice-chancellor of the University. John Barton and William Crayford, who appear 'at the pleasure' of the archbishop of Canterbury, may (notwithstanding the lapse of some months) be identifiable with the un-named

---

44. PRO SP1/132 f.134 (=Sermons and Remains of Hugh Latimer (ed. G. E. Corrie, Parker Society, 1845) pp.391-2; Ellis (3rd series), ii.202; LP xiii(i).1024).

45. Chronicle of the Reign of Henry VIII, pp.80-1.

46. See below, appendix 4.

47. To James Beck (25 October [1534]), PRO SP1/86 f/91 (=LP vii.1307).

pair whom Cromwell sent down for questioning and of whom Cranmer reported back on 10 October 1538 that they had `co[n]fessed that which I suppose is hye treason´.[48] Thomas Robinson, in custody with the castellan of Cardiff, is probably the same as the John Robynson who had previously written to Cromwell from the friary there begging for a dispensation from his habit; though the reasons for his apparent imprisonment are obscure, as are the reasons for the placing of the former warden of Greenwich, Thomas Sydenham, in Kent with Sir William Hawt and for Elyas Mody´s stay with the abbot of Faversham.

Mody, in fact, had by this time already been dispensed from his habit, which is an indication that even out of their religious environment the friars´ views would not necessarily be changed, nor would they necessarily be any less troublesome. Cromwell´s old bête noir Hugh Payne had met his end at the start of the previous year. After his dispensation he had obtained employment as a curate in Archbishop Cranmer´s peculiar at Hadleigh, Suffolk; and he had repeatedly fallen foul of the archbishop over the `erronious and seditious´ sermons which he had preached there and in the Canterbury peculiars in London. Eventually declared excommunicate, he had fled beyond Cranmer´s reach to continue his subversive activities as `a parish preist and a preacher´ at Stoke Nayland, Suffolk. Once again he came to Cromwell´s notice, and ultimately he found himself in the Marshalsea. From here he is found appealing to the duke of Norfolk to intercede with Cromwell to expedite his trial. But this time no amount of grovelling was going to save him. It looks as if Cromwell had finally tired of his antics and

---

48. PRO SP1/137 ff.153-4 (= Miscellaneous Writings and Letters, appendix, no.245; LP xiii(ii).576).

had simply dumped him in prison to rot; at any rate, he had died in prison by early February 1537.[49]

No doubt by the early months of 1538 these incidents had accumulated in Cromwell's mind. But circumstantially at least it seems highly probable that it was the shock of discovering Forest's activities which set him to finding out just what had happened to the former Observants during the past three-and-a-half years, and which resulted in the compilation of the list of friars which survives among his papers and is reproduced below as appendix 4.

The list - a Latin fair-copy - is clearly of ecclesiastical origin. It can be dated roughly by comparing its data on dispensations with those contained in the first register of the archbishop of Canterbury's Faculty Office;[50] though its compilers clearly did not use the register as a source, since they omitted six names of dispensed Observants which appear in it and included eighteen which do not. More precisely, it cannot, presumably, post-date Forest's execution on 22 May 1538, since he is described as being in prison in London; and neither can it substantially predate Anthony Browne's dispensation to become a hermit, which was registered by the Faculty Office on 30 May. It contains a number of obvious transcription errors in its rendering of names (eg. `Dehohe' for `Delphe' [ie. Delft]). And the frequency with which identical or very similar names are repeated, allied to differing, though not necessarily incompatible data (the name `Thomas Packe' occurs three times) leads one to suspect that the information which it

---

49. Cranmer to Cromwell (28 January and 7 February [1537]), PRO SP1/115 f.89, SP1/143 ff.30-1 (= Miscellaneous Writings and Letters, pp.333, 361, LP xii(i).256(1), xiv(i).244); Payne to Norfolk, PRO SP1/115 f.91 (=LP xii(i).257): undated.

50. Printed in FOR.

contains was obtained over a period from several different sources which relied in part upon hearsay. The locations mentioned correspond in general with the locations of Conventual Franciscan houses; and it seems most likely that the list represents the collected replies to a questionnaire sent around the friaries at Cromwell's request by the compliant provincial Dr. Call.

The compilation of the list was not, of course, the end of the story, although it does seem to have brought about Bonaventure Jonson's end.[51] In the summer of 1538 a former Greenwich friar, Anthony Browne, latterly dispensed to become a hermit, was convicted of verbal treason at Norwich. Taken to the Duke of Norfolk at Kenninghall for further examination, he was brought to the point of accepting that the pope need not be head of the Church, but could not be made to swallow the Royal Supremacy: and the law was presumably allowed to take its course.[52] A little later in the same year it appeared that a former Observant had been present in the retinue of the Countess of Salisbury.[53] And as late as 1543 Francis Dundy, now parochial chaplain of Milton, near Canterbury, was under suspicion of heresy.[54] But by now the worst was over.

---

51. He occurs in the list as an Austin friar; and it can hardly be co-incidental that in July 1538 the Chamber paid one Richard Lucas the sum of 40s. `in recompence of his chargis & labors taken in bringinge one Bonaventure a ffryor of Newerke' (BL MS Arundel 97 f.28v (=LP xiii(ii).1280 (p.533))).

52. Duke of Norfolk and Sir Roger Townsend to Cromwell (4 August 1538), BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv ff.122-3 (=Ellis (1st series), ii.85ff, LP xiii(ii).34).

53. Information against the Countess by Gervase Tyndall alias Clifton ([c. November 1538]), BL MS Cotton Appendix 1 f.84r (=LP xiii(ii).817 (p.325)).

54. `Cranmer and the Heretics of Kent', LP xviii(ii).546 (p.294).

Though some of them were serious enough, the spasms of continued resistance which came to Cromwell's attention should not deflect us from the fact that ultimately most of the friars more-or-less gracefully conformed, at least outwardly, to the new order of things. The death-throes of the Observance in England were not as Thomas Bourchier painted them. They were a good deal longer-drawn-and, on the whole, less violent. It was the friars' spirits, rather than their bodies, which were ultimately crushed.

But we cannot conclude this part of our story without referring to one final, bizarre incident. As late as the early summer of 1538, after all the problems which the friars had caused, and at a time when Cromwell was in the thick of his negotiations for the Cleves marriage which was to draw England, for the time being, closer to the Lutheran camp, and which was shortly to see the suppression of all the houses of religion in England, William Robinson, who had been such a thorn in the government's side in 1532-3, wrote a memorandum for Robert Holgate, master of the Order of Sempringham (because, as he said, he was aware that Holgate was high in the king's favour) canvassing a re-establishment of the Observance in England.

Robinson was right enough about one thing. Holgate was a favoured man. In fact, in late June he was appointed Lord President of the King's Council in the North and Robinson soon found himself in custody and under examination by the Council at York.[55] He claimed that any re-establishment would be according to the laws of the kingdom. But can he really have been serious about re-establishing the Observance in isol-

---

55. Robinson's deposition is PRO SP1/141 f.243 (=LP xiii(ii), appendix, no.28). It was dispatched from York to Holgate, at Cawood on 4 July 1538 (see LP.xiii(i).1326,1328).

ation from Rome? At any rate, there was now no prospect of his request being acted upon. We do not know what subsequently became of Robinson; but his request was more scatter-brained than dangerous and it is unlikely that he was punished very severely. As far as the Observants were concerned, his appeal for the king's favour was a last harking-back to an age which was past. He had been overtaken by events. Already by this time the former Dominican Richard Ingworth, now suffragan bishop of Dover, had begun the tour of the English friaries which was to result in their dissolution: for the time being, the day of the friars in England was done.

(vi) The Marian Refoundations: Greenwich.

For a number of reasons, the accession of Katherine of Aragon's daughter to the throne in 1553 immediately raised the possibility of some restoration of the Observance in England. The general question of the restitution of the erstwhile possessions of the religious to religious uses (if not necessarily to their former owners) was one which weighed particularly heavily both with Mary and her Cardinal Legate, Reginald Pole. But their conscientious instincts led them well beyond the bounds of practical politics. As the Emperor Charles V and his son, Mary's new husband Philip, realised, widespread restitution was a practical impossibility.[56]

Nevertheless, in spite of the more general problems, there were a number of reasons why a restoration of the Observants should have been a particular priority. In part these were purely practical. As theologians and active preachers, the friars had an obvious rôle to

---

56. For the political background to what follows, see especially D. M. Loades, The Reign of Mary Tudor (London 1979), chapters 4-5: also RO iii.421-3.

play in leading England back to Catholic orthodoxy: a point which would not be lost on Pole, who had received a good deal of support from Observants in exile. And although most of the erstwhile religious houses had by this time passed from the Crown into lay ownership, and many had been quickly demolished or diverted to other uses, the Observant friaries of Greenwich and Richmond remained in the queen's hands to dispose of as she would.

Furthermore, there remained a significant body of Observant friars, led by Fathers Peto and Elston, who had neither fallen into schism by swearing King Henry's oaths of Succession and Supremacy, nor, in effect, apostasised by seeking dispensations from their habits from the Henrician ecclesiastical administration, but had instead preferred the alternative of voluntary exile. Cromwell's 1538 list includes the names of some fifteen friars of the erstwhile English province reputed to be in exile on the Continent; to which should be added those of Peto, Elston and at least one other, John Flegh. These men had remained free to play a full part in the affairs of the Order and, notwithstanding the inevitability of deaths in the interim, provided a degree of personal, if not institutional, continuity with the old days.

This very continuity appealed to Queen Mary's profoundest personal loyalty. The new queen had herself been baptised in the friars' church at Greenwich and she had had regular and close contacts with them throughout her childhood and early youth. The friars had been, for the most part, her mother's and her constant supporters to the end. And during the years of schism and heresy she had apparently kept up a regular correspondence with Peto in Rome.[57] Mary was to repay their

---

57. Bernardo Navagero, Venetian ambassador at Rome, to the Doge and Senate (18 June 1557), CSP Venetian 1556-7, no.938.

loyalty handsomely. Not only were the Observants the earliest religious to be re-established; they were to be the only ones to re-establish more than a single house. And the extent of the queen's personal devotion is revealed both in the money which she was to lavish upon the refounded houses and in the ceremonial and devotional use which she was to make of the Greenwich friary.

Nevertheless, any refoundation would in practice have to await the formal reconciliation of England to Rome, which, for political reasons, was to be somewhat delayed. The Emperor Charles V's ascendancy over Mary *via* his ambassador Simon Renard, his prosecution - against Pole's opposition - of the queen's marriage to his son Philip, and his intention of projecting England's return to the Catholic fold as a Hapsburg achievment, ensured that, pending Philip's arrival in England, Pole, who had left Rome in September 1553, was left kicking his heels, first in a monastery at Dillingen, Bavaria, and then at Brussels, until November 1554.

Father Peto had by this time been serving for some years in Pole's retinue. After attempting to act as a mediator in the cardinal's fruitless attempts to contrive a reconciliation with Henry VIII during the abortive mission to the North in 1537, he had left the Low Countries for Italy in the early months of 1538. Since at least 1544 he had been living at the English hospice of St. Thomas the Martyr in Rome, of which Pole had been appointed warden in 1538 and which was home to many of his followers during these years. Peto had been attainted along with Pole and others by the Parliament of April-June 1539, and had been provided to the see of Salisbury *in absentia* by Pope Paul III in March 1543.

Now he returned north with Pole's party. He left the English hospice at Rome on 19 September 1553;[58] and in February 1554 he is found writing to Mary - no doubt at Pole's prompting - advising her strongly not to marry, offering Biblical justifications and the practical grounds that she would be likely to fall under her husband's domination, while at her age childbearing would be likely to endanger her life.[59]

In spite of his and Pole's advice, the marriage duly took place at the end of July 1554; and in fact it is to Philip that we must attribute the first practical moves towards the restoration of the friaries in England. He brought with him in his train a number of Spanish Dominicans and Franciscans, the latter including the Observant Alonso a Castro, bishop of Cuenca, who was to head his chapel establishment in England. And according to the Venetian ambassador with Charles V, it was to the new king that a number of exiled English friars now wrote to ask advice about the possibility of their returning to England, receiving in return affirmation that they might return `at their pleasure'.[60]

They seem to have acted very rapidly on this advice, for Renard and his colleagues reported to the Emperor as early as 8 August[61] that `It is already being said that...the king has brought over Franciscans and

---

58. `The English Hospice at Rome', ed. the students of the English School at Rome as The Venerabile vol.xxi (Exeter, 1962), p.209.

59. Simon Renard to Charles V (20 February 1554), CSP Spanish 1554, pp.122-3. Renard states that the letter was written three days before his.

60. CSP Venetian 1534-54, no.936: 19 August 1554.

61. CSP Spanish 1554-8, no.26.

other monks to make a beginning'. These former probably included a number of English Observants, including Elston, who had remained at Antwerp, among his other activities organising communications, largely on Pole's behalf, between England, Scotland and Italy. During the years since the 1530s Elston had enjoyed an auspicious career in the Lower German province,[62] serving as warden of Antwerp in 1545 and as provincial minister in 1549, as well as serving two terms as visitor of the province. And now he was destined to become the first warden of the refounded Greenwich convent.

As well as Elston and his fellows, the number probably included a number of exiled English Dominicans including William Peryn, shortly to become prior of the Marian Dominican foundation at St. Bartholomew's Smithfield, London. Both Franciscans and Dominicans were certainly back in England by mid-March 1555, when the Venetian ambassador in London, Giovanni Michiel, reported[63] that the queen had

> 'sent for many English friars of the orders of St. Dominick and St. Francis, who to escape the past persecutions, withdrew beyond the sea, and lived in poverty in Flanders, in order to give them monasteries and means of subsistence; and they, showing themselves in public everywhere, are tolerably well received and kindly treated'.

By now, a refoundation could be actively contemplated. Pole had arrived in London, his Henrician attainder reversed, on 24 November 1554, and had pronounced solemn absolution upon the kingdom on 30 November. On 13 March 1555 Renard reported to Charles V that both the Greenwich and Richmond friaries were being repaired in order to receive

---

62. The Lower German province was the product of a division in 1529 of the old Observant vicariate/province of Cologne.

63. CSP Venetian 1555-6, no.32: 19 March 1555.

inmates by Easter.[64] This is the only reference to any attempt to re-establish the Richmond friary, which was obviously soon abandoned if in fact it was ever made. But the friars were formally admitted to possession of the Greenwich house on Palm Sunday, 7 April 1555 by Maurice Griffin, bishop of Rochester.[65]

The friary was, in effect, a new foundation. Although Griffin's formal admission of the friars predated the bull Praeclara, it had been preceded by Pole's earlier renunciation of the Church's claim to secularised religious property and the statute which had preceded it. In practice, the ceremony signified Mary's acceptance that the friary had reverted to being Crown property and in effect it was a rerun of that of July 1482.

For the same reason the old English province could now be considered extinct. In any case it had presumably ceased to exist when most of its members swore to accept Conventual rule and their convents were taken over by others. The constitutional status of the refoundation within the Order is not clear. The friars were too few in number to constitute a full province: but although the reference in a seventeenth-century source to a Marian custos of Greenwich is probably anachronistic,[66] the friars may have been reconstituted as a custody of the province of Lower Germany.

---

64. CSP Spanish 1554-8, no.158.

65. Wriothesley, ii.128; Grey Friar's Chronicle, p.257. For the seal of the warden of the refounded house see A. G. Little (ed.), Franciscan History and Legend in English Medieval Art (Manchester, 1937; repr. Farnborough, Hants., 1966), p.92 and Archaeological Journal vol.xxiii, pp.56-7 (where it is improbably assigned to the reign of Henry VII).

66. One Stephen Fox is so described by Mason, p.12; followed by Parkinson, p.257.

At first the foundation consisted of 25 friars, but by November 1555 the queen had enlarged it.[67] The nucleus consisted of the survivors of the English exiles, including Peto and Elston; but these constituted only a small minority of the total.[68] Numbers were made up by strangers - Spaniards and probably Low-Countries friars[69] - and, as time went on, by a number of new English recruits. Among these was one Richard Bristan, a divine whom Nicholas Sander had known at Oxford and whom the latter claimed had suffered long imprisonment for his opposition to the Royal Supremacy. He, however, died soon after entering the Order. Another was George Denis, a member of a substantial Devon family who had been standard-bearer to Henry VIII at the siege of Boulogne in 1544. He joined the Greenwich friars in 1558 and went with them into exile, dying at Liège in 1584.

The refoundation's importance in the queen's eyes can be gauged from the fact that - according to the accounts of her surveyor of works and buildings - during the first three years of her reign she spent as much as £1551.8s.6d. on the refurbishment of the house.[70] And like her father and grandfather before her, Mary made grants to the friars in order to supply their material wants, although these grants were no doubt rather more numerous than the few which are known to us. On 1 February 1558 she granted them by signet warrant an acre of wood `in

---

67. Michiel to the Doge and Senate (4 November 1555), CSP Venetian 1555-6, no.269; Wriothesley, loc. cit.

68. Paolo Tiepolo, Venetian ambassador with King Philip, to the Doge and Senate (16 June 1559), CSP Venetian 1558-80, no.81.

69. Wriothesley, loc. cit.; Davenport, p.200, mentions Alonso a Castro and one friar Pymander.

70. PRO E351/3326 m.8d.

our wood called Westwood in the parrishe of Lewesh[am]' for fuel.[71] And in the will which she made on 30 March 1558 she bequeathed them the sum of £500 - a sum larger by a considerable margin than any of her other religious bequests - which provides a final unequivocal statement of her affection.[72]

Once again the Greenwich friary became the setting for occasions of state. It was in the friars' church that the newly-priested Reginald Pole celebrated his first mass on the evening of 21 March 1556, the day of Cranmer's burning in Oxford.[73] On the following day, Passion Sunday, Pole was consecrated archbishop of Canterbury in the church by Nicholas Heath, archbishop of York, in the presence of the queen, several bishops and various other notables.[74] And a servant of Pole's gives an account of various ceremonies performed by the queen in the friars' church that Easter.[75]

Like her mother before her, Mary also came to use the friary for her own personal devotions. Early in November 1555 the Venetian ambassador Michiel, reporting the expected dissolution of Parliament, added that owing to her husband's absence (he had left England at the end of August at the end of the queen's illusory pregnancy) the queen was `most impatient to return and enjoy her monastery, at Greenwich, in

---

71. The warrant is BL MS Cotton Titus B.ii f.106.

72. BL MS Harley 6949 f.31r; a transcript.

73. Stow, p.628; Parkinson, p.250.

74. J. Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials (Oxford, 1822), iii(i).473 states that Heath was attended by seven bishops. The Diary of Henry Machyn, (ed. J. G. Nicholls, Camden Society original series vol.xlii, 1848), p.102, refers to `x byshopes mytyred'.

75. Marco Antonio Faitta to Dr. Ippolito Chizzola (3 May 1556), CSP Venetian 1555-6, no.473.

which she delights marvellously, and has great and especial care of it'. He noted that she had left for Greenwich by 9 December.[76] The diarist Henry Machyn records an occasion in August 1555 when Mary and Philip travelled by barge to Greenwich, `and up to the frers and ther thare Graces mad ther praers and at her Grace['s] landyng received ix. or x. suplycasyon; and so bake agayn to the cort with a c. torchys bornyng'.[77] Somewhat later, in March 1558, Pole wrote to Philip at the end of another Parliament[78] that

> `although from the nature of the times there can be no lack of causes for vexation, the queen will be enabled nevertheless, with greater mental quiet, to enjoy the residence and monastery of Greenwich, with the hope that before her departure thence she will be comforted by the so earnestly desired presence of the king, for the attainment of which grace she will be assisted by the prayers of those good fathers'.

In contrast to the queen's devotion, we search in vain for any real sign of popular affection towards the Greenwich friars in London, which had been in the previous reign the heartland of English Protestantism. The only wills including bequests to the friars known to the present author originate in court circles.[79] And there is some evidence of open hostility. At the end of July 1555 Elston, the warden, had cause to complain to the queen and to the Lord Treasurer, the marquis of Winches-

---

76. CSP Venetian 1555-6, nos.269,307: 4 November and 9 December 1555.

77. Diary of Henry Machyn, p.93.

78. CSP Venetian 1557-8, no.1189: 9 March 1558.

79. Apart from the queen's, the only wills including bequests to the house known to me are those of Edward Lord Hastings and Sir Thomas Hastings, who left sums of £20 and 40s. in May 1556 and March 1558 respectively; and of James Griffin, bishop of Rochester, who left £5 in October 1558 (Testamenta Vetusta, pp.740,751; Martin, 'Greenwich', pp.113-4).

ter, that `he and Father Peito were beaten with stones which were flong at them by diverse lewde personnes as they passed from London to Greenwich on Sondaye last'. The Treasurer was ordered to make diligent enquiries into the affair, to have the Lord Mayor proclaim a reward to be paid to anyone who would reveal the names of those responsible and to speak to the lieutenant of the Tower and the bailiff of St. Katherine's `to marke from hensfourth who shal dysordre themselffes unto them, and to apprehend them and committ them to warde'.[80]

At the same time the Treasurer was ordered to speak to the Lord Mayor `for the spedy punyshment of the late disordre at the Graye Freeres in London': which suggests that the stone-throwing might have been connected with Peto's contribution to the contemporary debate over the future of the former Greyfriars. It was probably at around this time that a royal commission had sat to determine the future of Christ's Hospital, founded in the former Greyfriars' premises in 1552 by the City of London to care for the city's orphans. According to a later account,[81] a group of five or six of the friary's former inmates had lobbied to have the friary restored to its former use, and their cause had been taken up by Peto and the Dominican prior, Peryn. The commissioners had brought in one friar John, a Spaniard (probably the Dominican Juan de Vilagarcia) and one Alfonso, the king's confessor (probably Alonso a Castro) to examine the foundation, expecting that they would support the project to restore the friars. Instead of this, both had expressed their approval of the orphanage's work. Friar John in particular,

---

80. J. R. Dasent (ed.), Acts of the Privy Council vol.v, 1555-6 (London, 1892), p.169.

81. S. V. Morgan (ed.), John Howes' MS, 1582 (London, 1904), pp.65ff.

> `being there at dinner tyme & seing the poore children sett at the tables in the halle & seing them served in w[ith] meate, he was so wrapped in admyrasc[i]on that sodenly he burst oute into teares & saide in Lattin to the company that he had rather be a scullion in theire kytchin than stewarde to the kinge´.

Which outburst `did so appalle ffryer Perin & ffryer Peto that they never durste open theire mouthes againste that house´.

(vii) The Marian Refoundations: Southampton.

The Greenwich and Smithfield friaries were not intended to be the only houses of their kind. Apart from the attempt to restore the London Greyfriars, there seem to have been proposals to restore houses of friars in Oxford and Cambridge.[82] But in the event the only other successful refoundation was that of the Observants of Southampton. The prime mover here was ostensibly William Herbert, earl of Pembroke, the Crown´s lessee of the friary premises. But since he has left behind him a reputation as a protestant sympathiser, presumably his gesture was a political one and here, too, the prime movers were the king and queen.[83]

There was at least one Franciscan in the town as early as September 1556, when Pole jubilantly recounted to Michiel how this single friar had recently secured the repentance of 24 condemned pirates, to the great edification of the whole of Hampshire.[84] And the refoundation had almost certainly taken place by 25 January 1557 when Thomas Bowes, a London merchant who had a lease of the friary from Pembroke, was gran-

---

82. Loades, Reign of Mary Tudor, pp.454-5.

83. The foundation may have had something to do with Pembroke´s appointment as governor of Calais in November 1556.

84. Michiel to the Doge and Senate (15 September 1556), CSP Venetian 1555-6, no.615.

ted a licence to export 40,000 woollen kerseys from London and Southampton in compensation for having, at the request of the king and queen, surrendered his lease to enable Pembroke to carry out his intention of restoring the friary to its former role.[85]

The house was presumably populated by migrant friars from Greenwich, though it seems to have acquired at least one addition on its own account. For by early February 1557, Francis Bucknall, formerly of Greenwich but latterly vicar of Sopley, Hampshire, had vacated his benefice in order to re-enter religion; and it seems most likely that he would have gone to join the new Hampshire community at its inception.

Unlike Greenwich, the house does feature in some extant local wills. At some time in 1558 one Jane Rygges willed that she should be buried in their church; and in October of that year a local physician, Charles Harrison, left his books to the friars of the house `to inform them of philosophy, divinity and history, and to be preserved in their library for ever'.[86] Mary herself willed the sum of £200 to the friars in March 1558.[87]

(viii) Father Peto and the English Legacy.

With the new reign, the possibility of Peto's accession to the bishopric of Salisbury had become actual rather than theoretical. But by now he was feeling the effects of his advanced age (he would now have been almost eighty); and by November 1555 he had formally resigned

---

85. CPR 1555-7, pp.360-1.

86. C. Platt., Medieval Southampton (London 1973), p.212, citing MS wills at the Hampshire Record Office, Winchester.

87. BL MS Harley 6949 f.69r.

the see.[88] After the accession to the papacy in May 1555 of his friend Cardinal Caraffa (with whom he had collaborated in Rome during the latter's period of office as head of the Inquisition), Peto's name was one of six proposed by the new Pope Paul IV for elevation to the Cardinalate.[89] In the event, no more was heard of this proposal for the moment, and he was allowed to retire to Greenwich. He did not act as the queen's confessor, as many, including the new pope, seem to have thought.[90]

His last moment of notoriety saw him an unwitting tool of papal policy. Paul IV's election had heralded a difficult period for the English government and Church.[91] His Neapolitan dislike of the Hapsburgs was to lead in September 1556 to a war which in the course of time ranged a Franco-Papal alliance against the Imperial camp, with which England was inevitably aligned. Pole became involved as - or so the pope was inclined to think - a Hapsburg agent; and the cardinal's early attempts at peacemaking rekindled the suspicions of his justification theology which the future pope had earlier entertained at the Council of Trent, with the result that Paul determined to have him and his friends investigated by the Inquisition.

Pope Paul had already hinted that he wished Pole to return to Rome. Now, in Consistory on 9 April 1557, he announced his decision to

---

88. Michiel to the Doge and Senate (4 November 1555), CSP Venetian 1555-6, no.269.

89. Ibid.; Bernardo Navagero to the Doge and Senate (Rome, 12 July 1557), ibid., 1556-7, no.959.

90. Navagero to the Doge and Senate (18 June 1557), ibid., 1556-7, no.937.

91. For the background to the following see D. Fenlon, Heresy and Obedience in Tridentine Italy: Cardinal Pole and the Counter-Reformation (Cambridge, 1972).

recall all his legates and nuncios in Philip's dominions. He specifically mentioned Pole and it soon became known in England that he proposed not only to revoke his legacy a latere but to deprive the see of Canterbury of its legatine status, a move which would seriously hamper effective government of the English Church. Philip's fortuitous presence in England facilitated concerted opposition to the plan from both himself and the queen and from Pole, despite the latter's habitual deference to the Holy See. Their protests bore some fruit when on 14 May the Pope announced that for the present Pole would be allowed to remain in England, retaining the status of legatus natus which automatically accompanied the archbishopric. Nevertheless on 14 June the Pope suddenly announced in Consistory that he intended after all to summon him to Rome. He gave no reason for his decision, but one ominous portent had been the arrest of the cardinal protector of England and Pole's close friend, Morone, on 31 May. It was becoming only too clear what Pole's fate would be should he return to Italy.

At the same time, to the surprise of everyone in Rome, Paul IV announced the revival of his earlier plan to elevate Peto to the cardinalate; and furthermore proposed to invest him with Pole's legacy. This move infuriated the English ambassador at the Curia, Sir Edward Carne, who, according to the Venetian ambassador in Rome, replied to a message of congratulation from the Pope's nephew, Cardinal Carlo Caraffa, that the elevation provided not the slightest excuse for rejoicing, since they had made a blockhead cardinal and legate. The next day, in audience with the Pope himself, he was slightly more diplomatic. He, and he supposed the kingdom, were not averse to having another of their compatriots elevated to the Sacred College. But the legacy was another matter. Pointing out Peto's infirmity - he called

him `an old dotard, who could not bear any fatigue, but [could] merely remain in his cell reciting orisons´ - and the closeness of the relationship between the queen and Pole, he added that it was not in the English nature to afford respect to one who possessed neither wealth, nobility, armed strength nor affinity to the monarch. In conclusion he told the pope that he would have to send the hat and Pole´s letter of recall by a messenger of his own, for he himself did not dare to convey such news to the queen.[92]

In the event, a gentleman in the service of the cardinal of Pisa was employed as courier; but he never reached England, as the queen prevented him from crossing the Channel.[93] At first Pole laboured to persuade her and the Council to relent: but when the news reached him that his commission had been revoked he gave up his efforts, declining to exercise it any further but excusing himself for not obeying the pope´s summons by pointing out that the letter had not reached him.[94] Upon hearing of his promotion Peto wrote to the pope declining both cardinalate and legacy on the grounds of his age and infirmity. The messenger who carried his letter to Rome also conveyed another from the queen, requesting again that Pole´s legacy should be restored to him.[95] The pope, however, responded with prevarication;[96] and although the conduct of English business in the Curia was now virtually impossible, the

---

92. Navagero to the Doge and Senate (18 June 1557).

93. The same to the same (3 July 1557), CSP Venetian 1556-7, no.955.

94. The same to the same (7 September 1557), ibid., no.1024; `Advices from Rome´, CSP Spanish 1554-8, no.315.

95. Navagero to the Doge and Senate (5 August 1557), CSP Venetian 1556-7, no.981 (pp.1240-1).

96. The same to the same (7 August 1557), ibid., no.983.

matter was not resolved until the deaths of Pole and the queen and the accession of Elizabeth rendered the matter academic. In any case, as far as Peto was concerned this was the end of the affair; for he died at Greenwich in April 1558.

(ix) The Accession of Elizabeth: Suppression and Exile.

With the deaths of Mary and Pole on 17 November 1558 the end of the road for the English religious could not be far off. The start of the new reign brought into the open the feelings already revealed in the stone-throwing incident of 1555 and the extent to which the friars in particular - a predominantly foreign presence closely associated with Mary, Philip and Pole and thus, in the popular mind, with all the misfortunes brought with the reign - had failed, at least in London, to win the support of the people at large. Early in January 1559 a scandalised Mantuan servant of Sir Thomas Tresham wrote home of a `masquerade of friars' in the streets of the city. And no doubt friars featured prominentiy in the plays put on by `frivolous and foolish people' in certain London taverns `in derision of the Catholic faith, of the Church, of the clergy and of the religion' which the same witness reported a little later.[97]

The friars nevertheless managed to remain <u>in situ</u> for almost another eight months. But following the passing, by the first Parliament of the new reign, of Acts of Uniformity and Supremacy, together with another suppressing the religious houses, their fate was sealed. None of the Observants, so far as we know, swore the new oath required of them.

---

97. Il Schifanoya to the castellan of Mantua and Ottavio Vivaldino (London, 23 January and 6 February 1559), <u>CSP Venetian</u> 1558-1580, nos.10, 18.

Instead, taking advantage of the permission obtained by the Spanish ambassador Feria for friars and nuns to leave the country,[98] they probably awaited only the arrival of the commissioners deputed to carry out the suppressions before leaving for the Continent. According to Machyn, the Greenwich friars departed on 12 July 1559[99] - presumably those of Southampton went at about the same time - and they travelled by sea to Antwerp.[100]

So ended, for the second time, the Observant presence in England. For the present there was to be no attempt to perpetuate an English community as such in exile. The friars were dispersed amongst their continental brethren in the province of Lower Germany.[101] Father Elston would by now probably have been aged about seventy; but Davenport hints that he survived to see exile for a second time. The Order continued to attract a few English recruits, including the martyrologist Thomas Bourchier. But it did not take part to any extent in the English Mission before the foundation of the English convent at Douai in 1618. For the present, for the most part, the Observant Franciscans were erased from the English consciousness.

---

98. Paolo Tiepolo to the Doge and Senate (Brussels, 16 June 1559), ibid., no.81. There was some doubt over whether the provision would apply to all friars and nuns or only to those who had been in religion in the reign of Henry VIII.

99. Diary of Henry Machyn, p.204 (entry dated 12 June, but placed between others dated 11 and 13 July); Wriothesley, ii.145-6.

100. J. H. Pollen (ed.), `Dr. Nicholas Sander's Report to Cardinal Moroni on the Change of Religion in 1558-9' [1561] in Miscellanea I (publications of the Catholic Record Society vol.i, 1905), pp.19,43.

101. Davenport, pp.200ff. The story of Stephen Fox, the custos of Greenwich who accompanied a group of English Poor Clares to Lisbon, is problematical since the Lisbon house, built by Philip II, was in fact a house of English Bridgettines. (Mason, p.12; Parkinson, p.257.)

Conclusion.

Looking back, the story of the Observant friars in England presents a picture of both success and failure. To take first their standing within the narrower context of the religious life: while they were bound, because of their special relationship with the Tudor dynasty, to shine as beacons of religious propriety in a decayed and decaying world, nevertheless it is remarkable how, with the odd exception, the friars demonstrated lively consciences and made strenuous attempts to maintain the observance of their profession in the fullness of its rigour. In part, no doubt, this was because the reform was historically committed to a vision of itself as the maintainer of the authentic tradition of what all parties within it believed was the most perfect of all the Orders. In part, also, it was because the Observance remained a small, close-knit community, whose reputation was in a sense self-perpetuating because it encouraged professions among mature, intelligent men with highly-developed religious consciences - men who would nowadays be termed idealists.

Even so, the lengths to which the friars were prepared to go to maintain a state of indigence - their refusal to store or prepare foodstuffs, their refusal to accept Henry VII's bequest which might have afforded them a cushion against disaster - and their concern to obtain papal sanction to make use of lavish buildings and vestments, even when they did not contribute to the friars' own material comfort, are impressive, as is the way in which they made their governmental and administrative machine work. While some aspects of the <u>régime</u> might seem as distasteful to the modern liberal mind, though for different reasons, as they did to friar Lyst, it must be remembered that it was ultimately a system founded upon the consent of individual consciences:

and clearly it did succeed to a large extent in preserving the vitality of the movement.

This vitality, and its basis, do not explain only the friars' reactions to Cardinal Wolsey's attempts to visit and reform them in the 1520s, and their opposition to moves against the Roman Primacy in the 1530s. They also serve to explain much of what has been shown to have been going on in the friaries in the 1530s. Friar Forest's activities, the friars' refusal, beyond a certain point, to allow the king to influence elections to office, minister Faber's change of mind. these are not merely, as friars Lawrence, Lyst and their friends would have us believe, the products of wilful disloyalty to the king who was the friars' founder. The friars were simply basing their judgements upon the dictates of their religious profession and upon their responsibility to the community, as they had always done. And when the ultimate test came in 1534, it is an indication of the strength of the régime that, with very few exceptions, the friars defied the king: for here again it was ultimately individual conscience which dictated the outcome.

But it is otherwise in the wider context. It would be pleasant, perhaps, to be able to think that the Observance represented some kind of late medieval religious revolution in England which was tragically nipped in the bud by the cataclysm of the 1530s. But this is clearly not the case. While one of the chief limitations of this study has been - inevitably, due to the nature of the sources - that its coverage of lay patronage of the friars has been heavily biased in favour of the court, nevertheless it is clear that in England at large the Observants' impact was limited. It could hardly be otherwise for such a small group, so sparsely distributed in the landscape. Within the

immediate areas of the friaries there is some sign that testators valued the Observants' prayers more highly than those of other friars, but this is all. The friars owed their introduction and spread overwhelmingly to the interest of the monarchy. There was no corresponding wave of foundations by others, and the Observant friars never really broke free, in the popular mind, from the traditional mendicant mould. Their experience tends to confirm the view that late medieval Englishmen and women were more interested in other ways of expressing their piety than in the patronage of religious Orders, however reformed. In this light, the Franciscan Observants represent little more than a footnote to the history of the late-medieval English religious outlook.

Appendix 1:

Index of Biographical Data.

The following index is intended to present only authentic data on individuals who can reasonably be supposed to have belonged to the English branch of the Observance. It does not attempt to refute the unsubstantiated conjecture which has been put forward in the past in relation to some individuals, notably John Forest. Neither does it include various names given by Bourchier, Mason and others whose existence, or whose Observant status, must be held to be doubtful.

For the sake of brevity, source references are given as concisely as possible and multiple editions of various documents are not generally indicated here.

In cases where data given in the index are significantly enlarged upon in the text, references to the appropriate page numbers are given in square brackets at the foot of an entry.

=A=

of AACHEN, Hubert (*Robert)

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 27 March, deacon 10 April 1501, *priest 2 March 1504 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.67v,87v).

Abraham

-see WHARTON.

ACRYTH, Thomas

-Richmond convent, ordained priest 4 March 1531 (Reg. Stokesley, London, f.128r).

ADAM, Thomas

-Fled to the Continent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

AGARGELYNYE, William

-Greenwich convent, ordained priest 2 March 1504 (Regg. Hille &c., London, f.87v).

AMNE, ?John

-?Greenwich convent; left with some possessions by fr. Francis Lybert (q.v.) before October 1534 (PRO SP1/86 f.91 (=LP vii.1307)).
-?Canterbury convent; possibly identifiable with John Amney, priest, licensed, with a Carmelite of Calais, to collect money for this convent, post-August 1534 (Ibid., SP1/88 f.53 (=LP vii.1620).
-London convent at dissolution, signed the deed of surrender 12 November 1538 (DKPR 8th Report, Appendix 2 p.28 (=Rymer, xiv.609)).

of AMSTERDAM, Judocus

-Died at Canterbury convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

ANTELERNES, Raphael

-Greenwich convent, ordained acolyte 1 June, subdeacon 21 September 1493 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.28r,28v).
-Died at Reading convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

AQUIS, Hubert

-see AACHEN.

ART, Thomas

-see ARTHURE.

ARTHURE, Thomas

-Greenwich convent., ordained acolyte 3 April 1500 (Regg. Hille &c., London, f.62v).
-Newcastle convent., ordained subdeacon 27 March, deacon 10 April, priest 5 June 1501 (Reg. Foxe, Durham, p.152; Reg. sede vacante, York, f.532v; Reg. Savage, York, f.109r).
-Died at London convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

ATTPURBURE, William

-Dispensed by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

AWSTEN, Robert

-Greenwich convent., ordained subdeacon 9 April 1519.
-Richmond convent, ordained deacon 3 March, priest 22 December 1520 (Reg. FitzJames, London, ff.188v,190r,192r).

=B=

BAKER, John

-Probably identifiable with Father Baker, warden of Newcastle convent in September 1532 (below, appendix 3).
-Richmond (Yorks) convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4). Still there at dissolution, signed the deed of surrender 19 January 1539 (DKPR 8th Report, Appendix 2 p.38 (=Rymer, xiv.623)).

BAKER, Robert

-Newcastle convent., ordained deacon 7 June, priest 20 December 1533 (Reg. Tunstall, Durham, pp.47,54).
-Died at Doncaster convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

BARKER, John

-see BAKER.

BARKHAM, Theodoric

-?Southampton convent., ordained exorcist, acolyte 22 September 1509 (Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.ii f.24v)
-Greenwich convent., ordained subdeacon 25 May 1510 (Reg. Fitz-James, London, f.170v).
-Southampton convent., ordained deacon 23 September 1510, priest 14 June 1511 (Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.ii ff.25r,26r).
-Died at Greenwich convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

BARLOW, Jerome

-Had red hair.
-Greenwich convent.
-Fled to Strassburg, early 1527; on his way encountered William Tyndale at Worms (Tyndale, Parable of the Wycked Mammon (STC

24454, Hume 6), prologue, sigs. A.ii. r-v).
-Author of (1) (with William Roy (q.v.)) The Beryeng of the Masse (1527: STC 21427, Hume 5): (2) A Proper Dyaloge Betwene a Gentillman and a Husbandman (2 editions, 1530: NSTC 1462.3,6813, Hume 15,17); and other works published and unpublished, now lost.
-Returned briefly to England with Roy in the summer of 1529 (PRO SP1/54 f.97 (=LP iv.5667)).
-Subsequently submitted to Henry VIII (BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.146 (=Wright, pp.6-7)).

[and see above, pp.117ff].

BARONS, Stephen

-Possibly related to William Barons, sometime master of the Rolls and bishop of London (1504-5).
-Provincial vicar of England in April 1508 (CPR 1494-1509, p.568); still early in the reign of Henry VIII (BL MS Royal 12A.xvi f.2r).
-Probably the provincial appointed an arbitrator of claims for the rectification of injustices in the will of Henry VII, April 1509 (T. Astle (ed.), The Will of Henry VII (London, 1775), p.12).
-Confessor to the young Henry VIII: presented to the king a Tractatulus de Regimi[n]le seu caritate principum (BL MS Royal 12A.xvi) and gave a series of 15 academic sermons before the University of Cambridge. The treatise and the sermons were printed in undated combined editions by Wynkyn de Worde and in Paris (J. Ames, W. Herbert and T. F. Dibdin (eds.), Typographical Antiquities of Great Britain (London, 1810-19), ii.343-4; J. W. Blench, Preaching in England (Oxford, 1964), p.356).

BARTONE, John

-Richmond convent by September 1527, when he presented a friar of the convent for ordination (Reg. Tunstall, London, f.160r).
-With friar William Craforthe (q.v.), detained in Kent by the archbishop of Canterbury by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4). They were possibly the pair whom Cranmer reported in October 1538 to have made a confession of treason (PRO SP1/137 f.153 (=LP xiii(ii).576)).

BARTRAM, William

-Fled to Scotland by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4); probably identifiable with friar Barton, Observant, listed among English rebels there in January 1540 (BL MS Royal 7C.xvi f.142 (=LP xv.96)).

-One of the two above is probably to be identified with friar Barton, Newark convent in c. July 1528 (C. W. Foster (ed)., Lincoln Wills vol.ii (Lincoln Record Society vol.x, 1918), p.89).

BEGONE, Sebastian

-see HYGON.

BELLYNG, Leonard

-Southampton convent, ordained subdeacon 24 March 1520 (Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.iv f.70r).
-Probably identifiable with Leonard Benett, Richmond convent, ordained deacon 16 March 1521 (Reg. FitzJames, London, f.193r).
-Newark convent, ordained priest 28 February 1523 (Regg. Longland &c., Lincoln (ordinations), f.6r).

BENDISSHE, Leonard

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 19 December 1495, deacon 24 September 1496, priest 24 May 1499 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.33r,34v,61r).

BENETT, Leonard

-see BELLYNG.

BERGES, Francis

-Greenwich convent, ordained acolyte 22 March 1505, deacon 6 June 1506, priest 18 December 1507 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.90v,94v; Regg. Savage &c., Rochester, f.48r).

BEYNSTON, John

-Dispensed, if given his superior's consent, 20 December 1536: fee £4 (FOR, p.82).

BILTONE, John

-Died 'in patria' by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

BLACKBURN, Bernardine

-York convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).
-Cardiff convent at dissolution; dispensed 20 November 1538 (FOR, p.166, where the convent is incorrectly given as 'Cardigan').

BOCHER, Henry

-Greenwich convent, ordained exorcist, acolyte 19 April, subdeacon 24 June 1522 (Reg. Warham, Canterbury (sv), ff.297v, 298v).
-Canterbury convent by c. late 1533.
-Came into conflict with the Conventual warden of Canterbury, Thomas Arthur in 1535; by whom he was accused of having preached an inflammatory sermon against contemporary religious innovations at Rye almost two years previously, together with numerous other misdemeanours (PRO SP1/99 ff.11-12 (=LP ix.789(1)).
-Dispensed by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

[and see above, pp.204-5].

of BOLSWARD, Anthony

-?Newcastle convent, ordained acolyte 18 September 1501 (Reg. Savage, York, f.109v).
-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 24 September, deacon 17 December 1502, priest 10 June 1503 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.83v,84r,86v).

BORODON, Robert

-Greenwich convent by June 1522, when he presented friars of the house for ordination (Reg. Warham, Canterbury (sv), f.298v).

of BORROM, Christian

-Greenwich convent, ordained priest 2 April 1491 (Regg. Hille &c., London, f.23r).

BOWSES, John

-?Greenwich convent, ordained deacon 6 June 1506 (Regg. Hille &c., London, f.94v).

BRADYE, William

-Latterly Greenwich convent.
-Dispensed 6 April 1536: no fee (FOR, p.56).

BRAUGHING, Thomas

-Greenwich convent, ordained acolyte 15 February, subdeacon 22 March 1505, deacon 28 March 1506, priest 26 February 1507 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.89v,90v,93r,96r).

BRNGYS, Cornelius

-see BRILL.

of BRILL, Cornelius

-Canterbury convent, ordained acolyte 3 April 1507, subdeacon 22 April 1508, deacon 7 April 1509 (Reg. Warham, Canterbury, ff.263r,263v,264r).
-Greenwich convent, ordained priest 19 February 1513 (Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.iii f.52v).

of BRILL, Cornelius

-Richmond convent, ordained subdeacon 18 September 1507 (Regg. Hille &c., London, f.97r).

-One of the last two is probably identifiable with the brother Cornelius apprehended with friar Hugh Payne (q.v.), having come from Antwerp and visited Katherine of Aragon at Buckden, in July

1533 (PRO SP1/80 f.51, SP1/78 f.26 (=LP vi.1369,887)).
-One of the last two had fled to the Continent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

BRITAN, Richard

-According to Nicholas Sander, of whom he was an Oxford contemporary, this man - a very competent divine at the age of 24 and well-known for the austerity of his life - entered the refounded Greenwich convent in Mary's reign after long imprisonment for his support of the Papal Supremacy, and died there soon afterwards (Davenport, pp.195-6; Parkinson, pp.249-50).

BROWNE, Anthony

-Richmond convent, ordained acolyte 23 September 1508 (Regg. Hille &c., London, f.99r).
-Canterbury convent, ordained subdeacon 7 April 1509 (Reg. Warham, Canterbury, f.264r).
-Dispensed to follow the life of a hermit of St. Paul, 30 May 1538: fee 40s (FOR, p.135; below, appendix 4).
-Convicted on a charge of verbal treason after upholding the Papal, and denying the Royal Supremacy, 1538. He subsequently retracted the first point under pressure, but maintained the second - being described by his interrogators as 'smallye lerned and as litle reasonable' - and was probably executed at Norwich, August 1538 (BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv ff.122-3 (=LP xiii(ii).34)).

BRUER, Robert

-Greenwich convent, ordained acolyte 23 December 1497, subdeacon 10 March, deacon 14 April, priest 21 September 1498 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.56v,57r,58r,58v).

BRYMSTONE, John

-An Austin friar by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

BUCKNALL, Francis

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 19 April, deacon 24 June 1522, priest 30 May 1523 (Reg. Warham, Canterbury (sv), ff.297v,298v; Reg. Tunstall, London, f.153v).
-Discreet, 'contra Petow' in September 1532 (below, appendix 3).
-Dispensed by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).
-'Magister' by March 1540.
-Vicar of Sopley, Hants, admitted 13 March 1540 (Regg. Gardiner &c., Winchester, p.121).
-Had re-entered religion, probably at the refounded Southampton convent, by 9 February 1557 (Reg. Whyte, Winchester, p.19).

BUKKERY, Henry

-Of Old Lynn, Norfolk.
-Lay-brother, not professed.
-Exiled to Scotland. Returned briefly with others to Newcastle convent during the 'Pilgrimage of Grace', late 1536, but banished back to Scotland by the duke of Norfolk. Subsequently returned again to England with friar Thomas Danyell (q.v.), imprisoned at Barnard Castle and interrogated by the Council in the North at York, November 1537 (PRO SP1/126 ff.148-9 (=LP xii(ii).1076)).

[and see above, p.210].

BULLYN, Michael (*Nicholas)

-Richmond convent, ordained *acolyte 22 September 1520, *subdeacon 16 March 1521, deacon 15 March, priest 24 June 1522 (Reg. Fitz-James, London, ff.191v,193r; Reg. Warham, Canterbury (sv), ff.296v,298v).
-*Dispensed by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

BURRELL, Christopher

-Greenwich convent, ordained deacon 18 September 1518 (Reg. Fitz-James, London, f.187r).
-Canterbury convent, mad by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

BURTON, Thomas

-Southampton convent, ordained subdeacon 27 February 1518 (Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.iv f.69v).

BURWELL, William

-Bedford convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

BUTLER, John (*Thomas)

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 9 April 1519 (Reg. FitzJames, London, f.188v).
-Richmond convent, ordained priest 15 March 1522 (Reg. Warham, Canterbury (sv), f.296v).
-Dispensed 20 November 1535: fee £8 (FOR p.36; *below, appendix 4).

BYLLYNGE, John

-Fled to Scotland by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

BYNKYS, Robert

-Died at OFM Reading convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

of CALAIS, Richard

-Greenwich convent., ordained subdeacon 19 March 1491, deacon 16 April 1492 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.33r,34v).

CAMPIS

-see KAMPEN.

CANEWE, Francis

-Dispensed by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

CARO, Francis

-see CARRE.

CARRE, Francis

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 20 December 1522, deacon 30 May 1523 (Reg. Tunstall, London, ff.152r,153v).
-Died 'in patria' by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).
-Probably identifiable with Francis Caro, died at Bristol convent by c. May 1538 (ibid.).

CARTELAGE, John

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 19 December 1495, deacon 24 September 1496, priest 23 December 1497 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.33r,34v,56v).

CARTHAGE, John

-see CARTELAGE.

CHADWORTH, Henry

-Provincial minister of England by 18 September 1518, when he presented friars of Greenwich convent for ordination 'sub sigillo suo' (Reg. FitzJames, London, f.187r).

CHAMB[ER]LEYN, William

-Richmond convent, ordained acolyte 23 September 1508.
-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 3 March, deacon 22 September 1509, priest 23 February 1510 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.99r,99v; Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.ii f.25r; Reg. FitzJames, London, f.169r).

CONY, Thomas

-Fled to Scotland by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4): listed among English rebels there in January 1540 (BL MS Royal 7C.xvi f.142 (=LP xv.96)).

COOKE, John

-Newcastle convent., ordained deacon 14 June 1511 (Reg. Bainbridge, York, f.114r).
-Dispensed 20 May 1538: no fee (FOR, p.133).

CORBETE, Robert

-Dispensed by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

CORKER, John

-Richmond convent., ordained exorcist, acolyte 7 March 1517, subdeacon 23 February 1521 (Reg. FitzJames, London, ff.184r,192v).
-Greenwich convent., ordained deacon 19 April, priest 24 June 1522 (Reg. Warham, Canterbury (sv), ff.298r,298v).

CORSON, William

-see CURZON.

COTON, Richard

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 19 December 1495, deacon 24 September, priest 17 December 1496 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.33r,34v,53r).

COTTON, Thomas

-Born c.1459, son of John Cotton of Hamstall Ridware, Staffordshire and his second wife Joan.
-Eton College; King's Scholar 1470-6.
-King's College, Cambridge; scholar 1476, fellow 1479-c.1485.
-Possibly Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, c.1484-6.
-B.Th.
-The first Englishman to join the Observants in England, c.1486-93 (cf. Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.28r,30r).
-Richmond convent in December 1514, still in December 1515, when he presented friars of the convent for ordination (Reg. FitzJames, London, ff.179v,181v).
-Died at Richmond (BRUC; A. G. Little (ed.), Franciscan History and Legend in English Medieval Art (Manchester, 1937, reprinted Farnborough, Hants., 1966), pp.114-5).

COURTENEY, Thomas

-Of Georgeham, Devon.
-Supplicated for B.Cn.L. at Oxford 13 October 1527.
-Winchester College, chaplain 1529-1531; fellow July 1531-

c.July 1533.
-Entered the Order 1533 (BRUO iv).
-Fled to Scotland by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

COVERT, Bernardine (*Roger)

-Probably a member of the West Sussex family of this name (although he does not appear in J. H. Cooper, 'The Coverts' part 2, Sussex Archaeological Collections vol.xlvii (1904), pp.116ff.).
-B.Th. by November 1536.
-Greenwich convent, *ordained exorcist, acolyte 20 December 1516 (Reg. FitzJames, London, f.183v).
-Discreet, 'contra Petow' in September 1532 (below, appendix 3).
-A visitor to Katherine of Aragon's household at Buckden (PRO SP1/142 f.201v (=LP xiv(i).190)).
-Canterbury convent, warden by June 1534 (PRO SP3/10 ff.75-6 (=Lisle Letters ii.204,213, LP vii.765,837). With all but two of his convent, swore the Oath of Succession by 7 June 1534 (PRO SP1/88 f.168 (=LP vii(appendix).27)).
-With friar Thomas Roche (q.v.) a regular preacher at Calais: as such given a royal letter of credence in the aftermath of the 'Nun of Kent' affair, January 1534 (PRO E135/2 no.13 (not in LP)).
-Fell foul of Archbishop Cranmer's measures for the licensing of preachers and of accusations apparently made against his preaching, early 1534. He was supported by the Lisles, who wished him to return to preach at Calais and made efforts to obtain the necessary authority (PRO SP3/6 ff.67,81, SP3/10 ff.75-6, SP3/13 f.42 (=Lisle Letters ii.148,151,170, 204,213, LP vii.350,385, 510,765,837)).
-*Dispensed 19 February 1535: fee £12. *Dispensed further for non-residence for two years 9 December 1535: fee 5s (FOR pp.21, 39).
-B.Th., vicar of Cowfold, West Sussex by November 1536, till death. Dispensed to hold an additional benefice 10 November 1536: fee £6. 10s (FOR p.80; G. Hennessy, Chichester Diocesan Clergy Lists (London, 1900), p.53).
-Vicar of St. Giles Cripplegate, London by 1539 (G. Hennessy, Novum Repertorium Parochiale Londinense (London, 1898), p.172).
-Died c.1551-2.

[and see above, pp.186ff].

CRAFORTHE, William

-With friar John Bartone (q.v.), detained in Kent by the archbishop of Canterbury by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4): they were possibly the pair whom Cranmer reported in October 1538 to have made a confession of treason (PRO SP1/137 f.153 (=LP xiii(ii).576)).

CRESWELL, Ralph

-Greenwich convent, ordained exorcist, acolyte 12 March, subdeacon 11 June 1530 (Reg. Tunstall, London, f.163v; Reg. Warham, Canterbury (sv), f.314r).
-Richmond convent, ordained deacon 4 March 1531 (Reg. Stokesley,

London, f.128r).
-Greenwich convent, ordained priest 25 May 1532 (Regg. Savage &c., Rochester, f.164r).
-Reading convent in c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).
-Oxford convent at dissolution (LP xiii(ii).235); dispensed 31 July 1538 (FOR, p.145).

CURZON, William

-Greenwich convent, ordained acolyte 19 February, subdeacon 12 March 1513.
-Richmond convent, ordained deacon 24 September 1513, priest 23 September 1514 (Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.iii f.52r; Reg. Fitz-James, London, ff.176r,177r,179v).
-Greenwich convent, vicar in April-May 1532: as such in communication with the imprisoned Fathers Peto and Elston (q.v.) and a supporter of Father William Robinson (q.v.) in his plan to preach publicly against the king (BL MS Lansdowne 116 f.53; PRO SP1/66 f.31 (=LP v.1142,266/1043)).
-In spite of the king's wishes, not deprived of all office by the minister-general's commissary at the Michaelmas provincial chapter, 1532 (PRO SP1/71 f.67 (=LP v.1358)).
-A visitor to Katherine of Aragon's household at Buckden (ibid., SP1/142 f.201v (=LP xiv (i).190)).
-Elected discreet for the Southampton convent to the provincial chapter, August 1533: but wished to be allowed to remain at Greenwich, alleging sickness (PRO SP1/70 f.247 (=LP v.1259)).
-Bedford convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

[and see above, p.151].

CUTHBERT, John

-Lay-brother.
-Dispensed by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

=D=

DANCE, James

-Richmond convent, ordained priest 23 December 1525 (Reg. Tunstall, London, f.157v).
-Fled to the Continent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

DANIELL, Richard

-See DANYELL, Thomas.

DANOLDE, Andrew

-see DONALL.

DANYELL, Thomas

-Of Devonshire.
-Lay-brother, professed at Canterbury convent.
-Exiled to Scotland after the suppression of 1534; briefly returned with others to Newcastle convent during the 'Pilgrimage of Grace', late 1536; but banished back to Scotland by the duke of Norfolk. Subsequently returned again to England with friar Henry Bukkery (q.v.), imprisoned at Barnard Castle and interrogated by the Council in the North at York, November 1537 (PRO SP1/126 ff.148-9 (=LP xii(ii).1076)).

[and see above, p.210].

-A man of this name was reported to have died 'in patria' by c. May 1538: but this friar is more probably to be identified with Richard Daniell, a lay-brother recorded at the same time as 'ad mundum reversus' (Below, appendix 4).

DAVENPORT, William

-Canterbury convent, ordained acolyte 22 December 1510, subdeacon 20 March 1511 (Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.ii f.27r).
-Greenwich convent, ordained deacon 5 April, priest 19 April 1511 (Reg. FitzJames, London, ff.171v,172r). Junior-master by December 1511, when he presented friars of the house for ordination (ibid., f.173r).

DEHOHE, Adrian

-see DELFT.

of DELFT, Adrian

-Southampton convent, lay-brother in 1533 when shown the revelations of Elizabeth Barton concerning the king and his reign by friar Richard Risby (q.v.) (PRO SP1/80 ff.126v,131r,134v (=LP vi.1468(1,2,3).
-Died 'in patria' by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

DENIS, George

-Of a substantial Devon family; standard-bearer to Henry VIII at the siege of Boulogne, 1544.
-Entered the refounded Greenwich convent 1558. Subsequently exiled first to Brabant, then to Liège.
-Priest and confessor.
-Died at Liège, 7 April 1584 (Davenport, p.203; H. Lippens (ed.), 'Necrologium Conventus Leodiensis' in Necrologia I (Analecta Franciscana vol.vi, 1917), p.332).

DENTE, Francis

-Dispensed by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

DERYKE

-'Father', discreet in September 1532 (below, appendix 3).

DEWO, Benedict

-Greenwich convent, ordained exorcist, acolyte 19 December 1517 (Reg. FitzJames, London, f.185v).
-Norwich convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

DOMET, Thomas

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 10 March 1498, deacon 27 March, priest 10 April 1501 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.57r,67r,68r).

DONALL, Andrew

-'Father', discreet in September 1532 (below, appendix 3).
-Died at Greenwich convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

DUNDY, Francis

-Dispensed 1 November 1535: no fee (FOR p.33; below, appendix 4).
-Chaplain to the parson of Milton, near Canterbury by 1543; with a number of others, under investigation by Cranmer on suspicion of heresy (LP xviii(ii).546(p.294)).

DYRYSON, Gerard

-Died 'in patria' by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

=E=

de EBORACO, Henry

-see YORK.

ELIOTT, William

-Greenwich convent, ordained acolyte 1 June, subdeacon 21 September 1493, deacon 24 May 1494, priest 2 April 1496 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.28r,28v,30r,34r).
-Possibly identifiable with William Ellell, died at Doncaster convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

ELKYN, Thomas

-Fled to Scotland by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

ELLELL, William

-See ELLOTT, William.

ELSTON, Henry

-Probably identifiable with Henry Elston (Olsten), fellow of Peterhouse, Cambridge, 1517, MA 1517-18 (J. and J. A. Venn, Alumni Cantabrigienses part 1 (Cambridge, 1922-7), iii.280).
-Richmond convent, ordained subdeacon 3 March, deacon 24 March, priest 22 December 1520 (Reg. FitzJames, London, ff.190r, 190v, 192r).
-Greenwich convent, warden in April 1532, when he publicly defended a sermon given by the provincial minister, William Peto (q.v.), against Henry VIII's proposed divorce, against a counter-attack by the king's chaplain Dr. Richard Curwen.
-Following Peto's refusal to deprive him of office, both were imprisoned c. mid-April at Lambeth palace (CSP Spanish 1531-3, no.934 (=LP v.941); cf. BL MS Lansdowne 116 f.53 (=LP v.1142); Nicholas Harpsfield, A Treatise on the Pretended divorce Between Henry VIII and Katherine of Aragon (ed. N. Pocock, Camden Society new series vol.xii, 1878), pp.202-5).
-Appeared 'dyu[er]s tymes byfore the byshoopes & ones byfore the Cynocacion': subsequently detained at Bedford convent by c. mid-May and still in detention at the end of September 1532 (PRO SP1/66 f.31, SP1/71 f.67 (=LP v.266/1043, 1358)).
-Antwerp convent, with Peto and other English friars by late June 1533 (PRO SP1/76 ff.93,107 (=LP vi.726,705). Engaged there in the conveyance of writings in both directions across the Channel: sent letters from Rome to the provincial minister in England, c. October 1533 (PRO SP1/78 ff.84-5, E36/143 p.29 (=LP vi.934,1370)).
-Alleged to be predicting a Spanish invasion of England, April 1534 (PRO SP1/83 f.72 (=LP vii.440)).
-Subsequently warden of the Antwerp convent in 1545, twice visitor of the province of Lower Germany and provincial minister in 1549 (PRO SP1/200 f.223 (=LP xx(i).696(2)); Davenport, pp.204-5).
-At Antwerp a 'redy doer of all [Cardinal] Poole's busynes' (PRO SP1/197 f.64 (=LP xx(i).48)) and engaged in forwarding letters between England, Scotland, Padua and Rome (PRO SP1/121 f.150, SP1/131 f.225, SP1/132 f.41r, SP1/242 f.96v, SP1/197 ff.53,64, SP1/200 f.223 (=LP xii(ii).127, xiii(i).851,935, Addenda i.1364, xx(i).40,48, xx(i).696(2)): also LP xvi.154-5).
-First warden of the refounded Greenwich convent, 1555 (J. R. Dasent (ed.), Acts of the Privy Council vol. v (London, 1892), p.169)
-Probably identifiable with either Henry Holsten or John Elston, named by Mason, p.15, as having died in exile temp. Elizabeth I.

[and see above, pp.140ff]

ELSTON, John

-Ware convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

ELWYN, Richard

-Discreet in September 1532 (below, appendix 3).
-Fled to the Continent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

ELY, William

-see LEE.

ELYSTON, Michael

-Southampton convent, ordained deacon 24 September 1524 (Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.v f.35r).

of EMDEN, Francis

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 27 March, deacon 5 June 1501, priest 2 March 1504 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.67v,77r,87v).

=F=

FABER, Francis

-Of Lorraine ('Lotoringia'); a member of the province of Paris ('Francia Parisiensis') (BL MS Cotton Caligula E.ii f.187 (=LP v.715/vi.36)).
-Dispatched to England as commissary by the minister-general, in place of father Jean de la Haye (q.v.): had arrived in England and been elected provincial minister by early April 1533 (BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.30 (=LP vi.334)).
-Issued a letter of fraternity to the monks of Durham, 1533 (Little, Papers, p.207).
-Initially adopted a conciliatory attitude towards the king: he concurred in the removal of father John Forest (q.v.) to one of the northern convents and his proposal to discipline friars Hugh Payne and Cornelius [of Brill] (q.v.) in July 1533 led Thomas Cromwell to think him a 'right honest and discrete person' (PRO SP1/76 f.85, SP1/78 f.26r (=LP vi.512,887)); and he sent letters to the minister-general concerning the 'restreynte & correccyone' of fathers Peto and Elston (q.v.) c. July-August 1533 (PRO SP1/70 f.247 (=LP v.1259)).
-Subsequently, according to father John Lawrence (q.v.) came round to the views of those friars opposed to the king (PRO SP1/70 ff.200,248, SP1/73 f.117 (=LP v.1208,1260,1738)).
-Left England to visit the houses of the Order in Ireland, April 1534 (CSP Spanish 1534-5, no.70 (=LP vii.957)).

[and see above, pp.166-7,174ff].

FEELD, ?William

-Greenwich convent, sometime porter and keeper of the infirmary.
-London convent by October 1534 (PRO SP1/86 f.91 (=LP vii.1307)).
-Probably identifiable with friar William Felde, London convent, dispensed first to hold a benefice without change of habit if permitted by his prior or provincial, 19 February 1535, then to hold a benefice, wearing his habit beneath that of a secular priest, 20 February 1535: fee £4 (FOR, pp.20,21,23).

FERNANDEZ, Diego

-Of Castile. Of humble birth, though he had apparently studied at Salamanca.
-Probably Greenwich convent: confessor to Katherine of Aragon by April 1507 (CSP Spanish 1485-1509, no.513): also served as her chancellor.
-Despite Katherine's high opinion of him, aroused the hostility of members of her Spanish entourage and with her father's ambassadors (G. Mattingly, Catherine of Aragon (London, 1942), pp.88-90,110,125,128; J. E. Paul, Catherine of Aragon and her Friends (London, 1966), pp.27-30).
-Returned to Spain in disgrace, accused of fornication, by October 1515: ended his life imprisoned in a Spanish convent at King Ferdinand's command (CSP Spanish 1509-1525, no.228; Duc de Berwick y de Alba (ed.). Correspondencia de Gutierre Gomez de Fuensalida (Madrid, 1507), p.lxxxii n.1).

FISHBOURNE, Bryan

-Died at Yarmouth convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

FIZMARK, John

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 23 December 1497, deacon 10 March, priest 14 April 1498 (Regg Hille &c., London, ff.56v,57r,58r).

FLEGH, John

-An Englishman: possibly related to John Fligh, yeoman of the Wardrobe (d.1502) and/or to Robert Flegge, governor of the Antwerp Merchant Adventurers in 1528 and subsequently deputy to Sir John Style (cf. PRO Prob.11/14 f.44v; O. de Smedt, De Engelse Natie te Antwerpen in de 16e Eeuw (Antwerp, 1950/4), ii.76-7,89-90).
-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 20 December 1511, deacon 18 December 1512, priest 23 December 1514 (Reg. Fitzjames, London, ff.173r,175v,179v).
-Companion to Friar John West (q.v.) in the latter's journey to the Continent, c.August-September 1528 (BL MS Cotton Galba B.ix f.205r (=LP iv.4725)). Possibly the fellow who was taken away from West upon his return to Greenwich, c. December 1528 and sent away alone in a ship (ibid., MS Cotton Vitellius B.x f.188 (=LP iv.5043)).
-Bergen op Zoom convent, with father William Peto (q.v.) in March 1536 (PRO SP1/102 ff.241-2 (=LP x.524)).

FOREST, John

-Probably born c.1470 (cf. M. A. S. Hume (trs.), A Chronicle of King Henry VIII in Spanish (London, 1889), p.78).
-'Doctor' by February 1526 (Reg. Tunstall, London, f.157v).
-Greenwich convent by January 1525, when he anathematised nineteen friars who had fled Cardinal Wolsey's visitation of the convent ('Grey Friar's Chronicle', p.190; Hall's Chronicle, p.691).

-Greenwich convent in 1532-3: discreet, 'contra Petow' in September 1532 (below, appendix 3). At this time a frequent preacher at St. Paul's Cross, where he employed inelegant latin (BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.32 (=LP v.1525)).
-A visitor to Katherine of Aragon's household at Buckden (PRO SP1/142 f.201v (=LP xiv(i).190)).
-Much favoured by the king and the duke of Norfolk (BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.35 (=LP VI.116)).
-A senior figure in the convent and province who initially exerted much influence over the minister-general's commissary Jean de la Haye (q.v.) and the replacement provincial minister Francis Faber (q.v.): the subject of complaints against his conduct - especially his alleged duplicity towards the king - by Father John Lawrence and Brothers Richard Lyst and Roger Hurlton (q.v.). Ultimately, as a result of specific charges laid against him by Lyst and others, was deposed from office by Faber and sent away to one of the Northern convents, May 1533 (BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv ff.164,32,35,33-4,30; PRO SP1/76 f.85 (=LP v.1591,1525, vi.116,168,334,512); BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.165 (not in LP)).
-London convent by early 1538. Imprisoned and convicted on a charge of heresy following accusations of upholding Roman doctrine in the confessional. Abjured, but refused penance and executed as relapsed at Smithfield, 22 May 1538 (PRO SP1/131 f.256, SP1/132 ff.155-6, BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.161, PRO SP1/131 f.32, SP1/132 f.134 (=LP xiii(i).880,1043(1-2),687,1024); Wriothesley, i.78-81; M. A. S. Hume (trs.), A Chronicle of the Reign of Henry VIII, in Spanish (London, 1889), pp.77ff.

[and see above, pp.153ff, 211ff].

FORGATE, Reginald (*Arnold)

-Richmond convent, ordained deacon 3 March 1520, priest 22 September 1522 (Reg. FitzJames, London, ff.190r,190v).
-*Fled to the Continent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

FREEMAN, Walter

-OFM Ware convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

FROWICK, Francis

-An Englishman: probably of a prominent London family and related to Sir Thomas, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas (d.1505) (cf. S. Thrupp, The Merchant Class of Medieval London (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1962), pp.342-4).
-Greenwich convent, ordained acolyte 15 February 1505, deacon 28 March 1506, priest 26 February 1507 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.89v,93r,96r); still in September 1512, probably still in March, still in September 1513, December 1514, December 1516, when he presented friars of this and other convents for ordination (Reg. FitzJames, London, ff.175r,176v,177r,177v,179v,183v; he is described variously on these occasions as 'Dominus' and 'Magister').
-A celebrated lenten preacher before the king, whom Bishop Long-

land compared with John Colet (J. H. Lupton, A Life of John Colet, D.D. (London, 1909), p.224n.).
-Accompanied friar Bonaventure Langley (q.v.) on a mission to the dowager Queen Mary of France, c. January 1515 (BL MS Cotton Caligula D.vi f.184v (=LP ii(i).80)).
-Provincial vicar of England in June 1517. As such he visited the capitulum generalissimum at Rome, where he aroused the admiration of Silvestro de'Gigli (PRO SP1/15 ff.174-5,178-9 (=LP ii(ii).3370,3374)). On his return he called on Erasmus at Louvain and gave him news of new Greek books from the Roman presses. His visit occasioned the Erasmian epithet 'optimus ille Frowicus' (P. S. and H. M. Allen (eds.), Opvs Epistolarvm Des. Erasmi Roterdami (Oxford, 1906-47), nos.642-3,649).
-Died by 1527 (Lupton, loc. cit.).

FULLMER, William

-Southampton convent, ordained subdeacon 27 February 1517 (Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.iv f.69v).
-Dispensed by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

=G=

GAM, Richard (*John)

-Greenwich convent, ordained acolyte 23 December 1497, subdeacon 10 March, deacon 21 September 1498, priest 24 May 1499 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.56v,57r,58v,61r).
-Probably identifiable with father Game, Canterbury convent in May-June 1534, when with father Mychelson (q.v.) he refused to swear the Oath of Succession (PRO SP1/88 f.168 (=LP vii (appendix).27)).
-*Probably identifiable with John Gam, London convent by c.May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

GARARDE (or ....., Gararde),

-Author of The Interpretation and Sygnyfycacyon of the Masse (October 1532) (STC 11549; J. Ames, W. Herbert and T. F. Dibdin, Typographical Antiquities of Great Britain (London, 1810-19), iii.176; J. McConica, English Humanists and Reformation Politics (Oxford, 1965), p.129).

GARNETT, Raphael (*Thomas)

-Greenwich convent, ordained *deacon 24 May 1494, priest 19 December 1495 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.30r,33r).

GEDGE, John

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 2 June 1515.
-Richmond convent, ordained deacon 7 March 1517 (Reg. FitzJames, London, ff.181r,184r).

of GENEMUIDEN, Bernardine

-Greenwich convent, ordained priest 21 September 1499 (Regg. Hille &c.,London, f.61v).

GIBSON, Donald

-see GILBERT.

GILBERT, Donald

-Greenwich convent, warden in April 1494 (Regg. Savage &c., Rochester, f.16v).
-Probably the 'Scottysh doctor' and friar of Greenwich who co-operated with Bishop Fox in persuading the Conventual Franciscans of London to change their habits, April 1502 ('Grey Friar's Chronicle', p.184; A. H. Thomas and I. D. Thornley (eds.), The Great Chronicle of London (London, 1938), p.319; C. L. Kingsford (ed.), Chronicles of London (London, 1905), pp.255-6).
-Probably the 'Scotus quidam doctor theologus' who expounded the Pauline Epistles at St. Paul's in January 1508 and the 'good Scottysshe freer father Donolde whome I reken surely for a saynt yf there be any yn heuen', whom Thomas More heard in his youth preaching at St. Paul's Cross against abuses attached to pilgrimages to Marian shrines (Bernard André, 'Annales Henrici VII', ed. J. Gairdner in Memorials of King Henry VII (Rolls Series vol.x, 1858), pp.105-6; 'A Dialogue Concerning Heresies' in More, Complete Works vol.vi(i), p.100; M. Sinclair, 'Saint Thomas More's "Good Scottish Frere"', Moreana vol.xiv (1977), pp.53-4).

GUMBRY, William

-Fled to Scotland by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

of GUTHORN, John

-Greenwich convent., ordained subdeacon 27 March, deacon 5 June 1501, priest 2 March 1504 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.67v,77r,87v); still in June 1515 when he presented friars of the convent for ordination (Reg. FitzJames, London, f.181r).

=H=

HADLEY, Richard

-Fled to the Continent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

HALTER, Henry

-Fled to the Continent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

HARE, Thomas

-Canterbury convent, ordained priest 6 June 1517 (Regg. Savage &c., Rochester, f.75r).

HARFORTH, Nicholas

-London convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

HASARDE, William

-Died at Dunwich convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

de la HAYE, Jean

-Ghent convent., warden in December 1532 and a celebrated preacher in the Low Countries (BL MS Cotton Vespasian F.iii f.164 (=LP v.1676)).
-In England as the minister-general's commissary by 24 September 1532, charged with supervising the election of a successor to father William Peto (q.v.) as provincial minister (PRO SP1/71 ff.34-5 (=LP v.1313)).
-Much influenced by father John Forest (q.v.) while in England (BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.35 (=LP vi.116)). Dissappointed Henry VIII by not depriving fathers William Robinson and William Curzon (q.v.) of all office (PRO SP1/71 f.67 (=LP v.1358)).
-Left England after the Michaelmas provincial chapter, 1532, leaving the warden of Canterbury [Gabriel Pecock (q.v.)] to act as his deputy but with no replacement for Peto having been elected. Subsequently advised against the election of a foreigner as this would constitute a 'grete reprofe' to the province (BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.12 (=LP v.1371)).
-At the king's request, re-appointed commissary by the minister-general, c.26 October 1532; but he had not returned to England when in January 1533 the appointment was rescinded at the urgent request of Mary of Hungary and the Great Council of Brabant (BL MS Cotton Vitellius B.xiii f.221, MS Cotton Caligula E.ii f.187 (=LP v.1471, v.715/vi.36)).

[and see above, pp.152ff].

HAYFILD, Thomas

-Greenwich convent., ordained priest 23 September 1525 (Reg. Tunstall, London, f.157r).
-Newark convent by June 1534. Following a tour of inflammatory preaching in the West Country captured, with friar Hugh Payne (q.v.), in lay attire at Cardiff, June 1534 and sent up to London (PRO SP1/85 ff.26,93 (=LP vii.939,1020)).
-Apparently released with Payne following a grovelling appeal to the king disclaiming any intention of speaking against the Boleyn marriage or upholding the authority of the pope (ibid., SP1/88 f.97 (=LP vii.1652)).
-Reading convent at dissolution, dispensed 30 September 1538 (FOR, p.150).

HELMSLEY, John

-Latterly Richmond convent.
-Scarborough convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).
-Dispensed 30 September 1539 (FOR, p.246).

HELTRYNE, Henry

-Died 'in patria' by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

of HERENTALS, Florencius

-Greenwich convent, ordained priest 21 September 1499 (Regg. Hille &c., London, f.61v).

HEWTSSAM, Cornelius

-Greenwich convent: a 'Dutchman', with little knowledge of English, whom friar John West (q.v.) intended to take with him as a companion on his second expedition to the Continent, December 1528, to enable him to act with greater secrecy (BL MS Cotton Vitellius B.x f.188 (=LP iv.5403)).

HILL, John

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 25 May 1521.
-Richmond convent, ordained deacon 19 April 1522, priest 19 September 1523 (Reg. FitzJames, London, f.193v; Reg. Warham, Canterbury (sv), f.298r; Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.iv f.32v).

HILL

-see also de MONTE.

HITCHIN, Robert

-Lincoln convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

HOLDEN, Alexander

-MA, rector of St. John Baptist, Southampton, admitted 6 September 1529 (Reg. Wolsey, Winchester, p.179).
-Vacated his benefice and entered the Order, probably at Southampton convent, by 7 June 1533 (Regg. Gardiner &c., Winchester, p.106).
-Dispensed by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

HOLSTEN, Henry

-see ELSTON.

HOODE, Anthony

-Lincoln convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

HORE, John

-Southampton convent., ordained subdeacon 26 March, deacon 24 September 1513 (Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.iii f.53r; Reg. FitzJames, London, f.177r).
-Ware convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

HUNTE, Robert

-Fled to the Continent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

HUNTER, Thomas

-Greenwich convent., ordained subdeacon 23 September 1525, deacon 22 September 1526, priest 6 April 1527 (Reg. Tunstall, London ff.157r,158v,159v).
-'Father', discreet in September 1532 (below, appendix 3).
-Fled to the Continent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

HURLTON, Roger

-Greenwich convent in November 1532 and February 1533: a priest and preacher.
-An opponent of father John Forest (q.v.) (BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.35 (=LP vi.116); ibid., f.165 (not in LP)).
-Scarborough convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

HYGON, Sebastian

-Greenwich convent by December 1518 when he presented friars of the convent for ordination (Reg. FitzJames, London, f.187v).
-Probably identifiable with *father Sebastian, discreet, 'contra Petow' in September 1532 (below, appendix 3).
-*A visitor to Katherine of Aragon's household at Buckden (PRO SP1/142 f.201v (=LP xiv(i).190)).
-*Richmond convent., discreet in June 1534 when he conferred with Bishop Rowland Lee and Thomas Bedyll over the convent's approach to the Oath of Supremacy (BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.49r (=Wright, p.42, LP vii.841)).
-Probably identifiable with Sebastian Begone, fled to the Continent by c. May 1534 (below, appendix 4).

HYLL, Alexander

-Died 'in patria' by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

=J=

JACSON, Peter

-Lay-brother, 'ad mundum reversus' by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 5).

JOBBE, John

-Fled to Scotland by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

-A friar of this name was at Scarborough convent at dissolution, dispensed as of this house 20 June 1539 (FOR, p.187).

JONES, David

-Latterly Greenwich convent.
-In Kent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).
-Dispensed 10 November 1538 (FOR, p.156).

JONSON, Bonaventure (Thomas)

-Probably at York convent following the suppression of August 1534: sent by the warden there to Beverley convent by Summer 1535.
-A friend of the Stapleton family and involved in the rising at Beverley, October 1536. Sworn to the rebels' cause and rode with them to Doncaster, then left to rejoin his brethren at Newcastle convent (PRO E36/118 f.74 (=LP xii(i).392(2))).
-An Austin friar by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4). Probably identifiable with 'one Bonaventure a ffryor of Newerke' who was removed to London c. July 1538 (BL MS Arundel 97 f.28v (=LP xiii(ii).1280 (p.533))).

JONSON, John

-Lay-brother, 'ad mundum reversus' by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

JUS, Thomas

-Greenwich convent, ordained deacon 2 March, priest 29 June 1504 (Reg. Warham, London, ff.87v,89r).

JUWODE, Robert

-Greenwich convent, ordained priest 20 December 1511 (Reg. Fitz-James, London, f.173r).

=K=

of KALKAR, John

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 5 June 1501, priest 2 March 1504 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.77r,87v). London).

of KAMPEN, Bernardine

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 5 June 1501 (Regg. Hille &c., London, f.77r).

of KAMPEN, Francis

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 27 March, deacon 10 April 1501 (Regg. Hille &c., London, f.67v).

of KAMPEN, Richard

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 27 March, deacon 10 April 1501, priest 21 May 1502 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.67v,83r).

KEBYLL, John

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 27 February, deacon 18 September 1518, priest 19 March 1519 (Reg. FitzJames, London, ff.186r,187r,188r).
-Canterbury convent in 1533 when shown the 'Nun of Kent's' prophecies concerning the king and his reign by father Richard Risby (q.v.) (PRO SP1/80 ff.127r,131r,134v (=LP vi.1468(1-3))).
-Gloucester convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4). Still there at dissolution, dispensed as of this house 10 September 1538 (FOR, p.162).
-Rector of St. Aldate, Gloucester by 1551, when at the time of the bishop's visitation he was absent at another benefice outside the diocese (J. Gairdner (ed.), 'Bishop Hooper's Visitation of Gloucester', EHR vol.xix (1904), p.101).

KELLAM, Thomas

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 7 May 1533 (Reg. Stokesley, London, f.129r).
-Died at London convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

KELLO, James

-Newcastle convent, ordained subdeacon 7 June , deacon 20 December 1533, priest 4 April 1534 (Reg. Tunstall, Durham, pp.47,54,57).
-London convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4); still there at dissolution, signed the deed of surrender 12 November 1538 (DKPR 8th Report, appendix ii p.28 (=Rymer, xiv.609)), dispensed 6 September [1539] (FOR, p.149).

KINGE, John

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 19 April, deacon 24 June 1522 (Reg. Warham, Canterbury (sv), ff.297v,298v).
-Died at London convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

KIRSWELL, Ralph

-see CRESWELL.

KNILL, Hugh

-Southampton convent, ordained subdeacon 24 September 1513 (Reg. FitzJames, London, f.177r).
-Newark convent, ordained deacon 15 April, priest 13 September 1514 (Regg. Wolsey &c., Lincoln, ff.9r,11r).

KNIVETON, Michael

-Southampton convent, ordained subdeacon 21 March 1523 (Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.v f.31v).
-Richmond convent, ordained priest 22 May 1529 (Reg. Stokesley, London, f.163r).
-Dispensed by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

KYXE, John

-Died at London convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

=L=

LAMBART, Robert

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 18 September 1512 (Reg. FitzJames, London, f.175r).
-Reading convent at dissolution, dispensed as of this house 30 September 1538 (FOR, p.150).

LAMBERT, John

-Fled to Scotland by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4): probably identifiable with friar Lambr'k, Observant, listed among English rebels in Scotland, January 1540 (BL MS Royal 7C.xvi.f.142 (=LP xv.96)).

LAMBTON, Robert

-Newcastle convent, ordained acolyte 21 May 1502 (Reg. Savage, York, f.112v).

LANGLEY, Bonaventure

-May have been confessor to the daughters of Henry VII (Little, Papers, p.207).
-Provincial vicar of England by October 1513, probably still in February 1515.
-Employed on diplomatic missions to Queen Margaret of Scotland, October 1513 and (with friar Francis Frowick (q.v.)) to the dowager Queen Mary of France, February 1515 (above, chapter 2).
-Probably the 'p[ro]vinciall of Grenewyche' who preached before the king at Greenwich, February 1513 (BL MS Add.21481 f.115v / PRO E36/215 f.115v (=LP ii(ii), p.1459)) and the 'Mr. Langleye' who pleased the king with a Friday sermon in March 1518 (PRO SP1/16 f.201r (=LP ii(ii).4045)).

-Richmond convent by March 1520 when he presented friars of the convent for ordination (Reg. FitzJames, London, f.190r).

LANGWITH, William

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 27 March, deacon 10 April 1501 (Regg. Hille &c., London, f.67v).

LANHAM, Robert

-Richmond convent, ordained exorcist, acolyte 19 December 1517 (Reg. FitzJames, London, f.185v).
-Southampton convent, ordained subdeacon 27 February 1518, priest 30 March 1520 (Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.iv ff.69v,71v).
-Latterly Richmond convent.
-Dispensed to wear his habit beneath that of a secular priest 20 November 1537: no fee (FOR, p.113; below, appendix 4).

LATOMER, Robert

-Dispensed by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

LAWRENCE, John

-alias Warde (FOR, p.34).
-Probably of London: had a 'powr brothar' and a 'powre systare' there whom he used in his communications with Thomas Cromwell (BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.164; PRO SP1/75 f.79, SP1/86 f.132A (=LP v.1591, vi.309, vii.1343)).
-Companion of friar John West (q.v.) in his pursuit of William Roy (q.v.) in Norfolk, June 1529 (PRO SP1/54 f.97 (=LP iv.5667)).
-Greenwich convent by April-May 1532: discreet, 'contra Petow' in September 1532 (below, appendix 3).
-Aroused the hostility of many of his brethren by his public preaching in favour of the king's divorce: as a result he was in communication with Cromwell by April-May 1532, lobbying for a royal commission to preach and informing against friars actively opposed to the king, particularly fathers William Robinson and William Curzon (q.v.) (PRO SP1/70 f.161; BL MS Lansdowne 116 f.53 (=LP v.1143,1142)).
-Following the Michaelmas provincial chapter, 1532, he recommended that father Jean de la Haye (q.v.) should be recalled to England to act as provincial minister. He travelled to Paris to obtain his commission from the minister-general, October 1532, but subsequently had cause to regret his recommendation ((PRO SP1/71 f.97; BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv ff.164,12 (=LP v.1497,1591,1371)).
-Travelled to Kent, c. April-May 1533 to gather information on Cromwell's behalf concerning the 'Nun of Kent' (PRO SP1/80 f.138 (=LP vi.1468(5))). After his return he reported the presence in England of friars Hugh Payne and Cornelius [of Brill] (q.v.) (ibid., f.51 (=LP vi.1369)), prompted the provincial minister, Francis Faber (q.v.) to write to the minister-general concerning the 'restraynte & correccyone' of fathers Peto and Elston (q.v.) and betrayed preparations for the 1533 provincial chapter. His activities, and his continual advocacy of the king's interests

with fathers Robinson, Faber and others ultimately led to his being deprived of office at the chapter and to a fear that the minister was seeking a pretext upon which to imprison him (PRO SP1/70 ff.247,200,248, SP1/73 f.117 (=LP 1259,1208,1260,1738)).
-Subsequently exclaustrated himself and requested that if Cromwell should wish him to return to the friars he should for his own protection be placed in the office of either of the imprisoned fathers Rich and Risby (q.v.) (PRO SP1/86 f.151 (=LP vii.139)).
-London convent following the suppression of the Observance in August 1534, when he aroused the hostility of other former Observants in the convent by publicly preaching the justice of the king's action in suppressing the province (PRO SP1/83 f.195 (=LP vii.580)).
-Dispensed 22 October 1535: no fee (FOR, p.34; below, appendix 4).

[and see above, pp.147ff,172ff]

LAYCUS, Anthony

-[Lay-brother], London convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

LAYCUS, James

-[Lay-brother], London convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

LEDYSHAM, Thomas

-Greenwich convent, novice-master by December 1522 when he presented friars of the convent for ordination (Reg. Tunstall, London, f.152r).

LEE, William

-Cardiff convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).
-Probably identifiable with William Ele, Carmarthen convent by c. May 1538 (ibid.).

LENES, Anthony

-see ANTELERNES, Raphael.

LEODIE, John

-see LIEGE.

LEONIS, Leo

-Vicar-general's commissary to the English province, probably from c.1484 in succession to Bernard of Lochen.
-Died in England by June 1487 (Glassberger, p.503).

LEWES, Hugh

-Greenwich convent., ordained subdeacon 2 June 1515.
-Richmond convent, ordained deacon 7 March 1517 (Reg. FitzJames, London, ff.181r,184r).

of LIEGE, John

-Greenwich convent., ordained priest 2 March 1504 (Regg. Hille &c., London, f.87v).

of LIERRE, Denis

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 19 March 1491 (Regg. Hille &c., London, f.22v).

of LIMBURG, Reynerus

-Greenwich convent, ordained priest 18 December 1506 (Regg. Hille &c., London, f.95r).

of LOCHEN, Bernard

-Kampen convent, warden in 1481; one of a number of friars sent to the province of Denmark (Glassberger, p.479).
-Sometime commissary to the province of Ireland.
-As vicar-general's commissary, led the first group of Observants to England to found Greenwich convent, July 1482 ('Introduction' (1), p.460).
-Died in Denmark by June 1484 (Glassberger, p.490).

LORDINGE, John

-Dispensed by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

LOWYR, Denis

-see LIERRE.

LUTTON, Edmund

-Greenwich convent, ordained acolyte 22 December 1509, subdeacon 23 February 1510 (Reg. FitzJames, London, ff.168v,169r).

LYBERT, Francis

-Of London; had a sister in Tower Street and a cousin 'at the Strande without [Tem]pell Bare' in October 1534.
-Probably identifiable with Francis Liberd, London diocese, ordained exorcist, acolyte 8 March 1516 (Reg. FitzJames, London, f.182r).
-Richmond convent., ordained subdeacon 23 February 1521 (ibid., f.192v).
-Greenwich convent., ordained deacon 19 April, priest 24 June 1522 (Reg. Warham, Canterbury (sv), ff.298r,298v).

-Following the suppression of the Observance in August 1534, detained with one Father Abraham [probably Wharton (q.v.)] at Stamford convent by October 1534 (PRO SP1/86 f.91 (=LP vii.1307)).
-Detained in Cambridge with Dr. John Crayford, c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

[and see above, pp.53-5,198ff].

LYE, John

-Bristol convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

LYST, Richard

-Of London: formerly a 's[er]vant' of Cardinal Wolsey and for 8 years a grocer and apothecary in Cheapside (PRO SP1/76 f.85 (=LP vi.512)).
-Greenwich convent by April-May 1532. A lay-brother, since he had previously been 'made shewre to a yonge woman yn the way of maredge': but she had died by February 1533 and he then proposed to proceed to orders.
-Claimed to possess 'som yntellygens and learnynge', for which reason he had often been assigned to accompany father John Forest (q.v.) on preaching expeditions to St. Paul's Cross.
-Latterly a client of Anne Boleyn, whose generosity enabled him to support his mother: as a result, he became a spokesman for her cause within the friary.
-Had friends among reformist circles at court including John Cole, subdean of the Greenwich chapel royal and Dr. Thomas Goodrich, one of the king's chaplains (BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv ff.31-2 (=LP vi.115, v.1525)).
-Recommended to Thomas Cromwell by father John Lawrence (q.v.) as one 'whytch to hys lytyll poware dothe faythfully favowre owre sufferande & allso hys cawse', April-May 1532 (BL MS Lansdowne 116 f.53 (=LP v.1142)).
-Wrote to Cromwell November 1532 warning of the threat to Lawrence from Forest and his supporters. Subsequently he wrote on a number of occasions to Cromwell and Anne Boleyn complaining against Forest and his friends and revealing the death in prison at Greenwich of friar John Rayncroft (q.v.). He survived attempts to discipline him and to have him removed to Southampton and his complaints were largely responsible for Forest's deposition from office (BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv ff.32,31,35,33-4,30; PRO SP1/76 f.85 (=LP v.1525, vi.115,116,168,334,512)).
-As a result of his sleeplessness following Raynscroft's death he left the Order in the week of Pentecost, 1533, became a student of Clare Hall, Cambridge and by October had taken his first Orders at St. Audrey's, Ely. He visited London before Christmas 1533 in order to retrieve some old debts; and asked Cromwell's help in this matter and towards obtaining a fellowship at Clare (PRO SP1/79 f.186, SP1/82 f.269 (=LP vi.1264, vii.302)).

-Probably did not attain a fellowship (he does not appear in W. J. Harrison, Notes on the Masters, Fellows &c. of Clare College, Cambridge (Cambridge, 1953)).
-Vicar of St. Dunstan-in-the-West Fleet Street, London: presented by the king's physician Dr. Thomas Wendy and instituted 5 February 1536; resigned by 11 May 1556 (G. Hennessy, Novum Repertorium Parochiale Londinense (London, 1898), p.138).

[and see above, pp.158ff].

=M=

MAGONCIE, Peter

-see MAINZ.

of MAINZ, Peter

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 18 September 1501, priest 21 December 1504 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.77v,89v).
-Fled to Scotland by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).
-Possibly identifiable with the friar of this name who signed the deed of surrender at Llanfaes convent (Anglesey) on 9 August 1538 (LP xiii(ii).138).

of MALINES, Arnold

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 19 September, deacon 20 December 1500, priest 27 March 1501 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.65r,66r,67v).

of MALINES, Bernard

-Greenwich convent, ordained priest 2 April 1491 (Regg. Hille &c., London, f.23r).

of MALINES, Francis

-Newcastle convent, ordained acolyte 27 March, subdeacon 5 June, deacon 18 September 1501, priest 1 June 1504 (Reg. Foxe, Durham, p.151; Reg. Savage, York, ff.108Bv,110r, 125r).

of MALINES, John

-Newcastle convent, ordained acolyte 27 March, subdeacon 10 April 1501 (Reg. Foxe, Durham, p.151; Reg. sede vacante, York, f.532v).

of MALINES, William

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 19 September 1500 (Regg. Hille &c., London, f.65r).
-?Newcastle convent, ordained deacon 18 September 1501 (Reg. Savage, York, f.110r).

MANSON, Jeremy

-Died at London convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

MARKANT, Richard

-Canterbury convent, ordained subdeacon 31 March 1514, deacon 2 June 1515 (Reg. FitzJames, London, ff.178v,181r).

MARTYNE, John

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 27 February 1518 (Reg. FitzJames, London, f.186r).
-Died at Newcastle convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

MARTYNE, Thomas

-Greenwich convent, ordained exorcist, acolyte 23 September 1525, subdeacon 24 February, deacon 22 September 1526, priest 6 April 1527 (Reg. Tunstall, London, ff.157r,157v,158v, 159v).
-Dispensed to wear his habit beneath that ot a secular priest, 7 March 1536: no fee (FOR, p.47; below, appendix 4).

MASSEY, Ralph

-Richmond convent, ordained exorcist, acolyte 22 September 1520, subdeacon 16 March 1521, deacon 15 March, priest 24 June 1522 (Reg. FitzJames, London, ff.191v,193r; Reg. Warham, Canterbury (sv), ff.296v,298v).
-Latterly Southampton convent.
-Discreet, 'contra Petow' in September 1532 (below, appendix 3).
-Dispensed 31 October 1536: no fee (FOR, p.78; below, appendix 4).

MEERING, Thomas

-Second son of Sir William Meryng of Meering, Notts.
-Probably entered the Order at Newark, of which convent his father probably had a hand in the foundation. (A. W. Cameron, 'A Nottinghamshire Quarrel in the Reign of Henry VII', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research vol.xlv (1972), pp.29-30).
-Left an annuity of 10 Marks in his father's will in 1537 (id., 'Meering and the Meryng Family', Transactions of the Thoroton Society of Nottinghamshire vol. lxxvii (1973), p.48).
-Possibly died 1576, without heirs (ibid. and private communication from the author, 1984).

MEPELL, Henry

-Southampton convent, ordained subdeacon 27 February 1518 (Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.iv f.69v).

MODY, Elyas

-Canterbury convent, dispensed 20 December 1535: fee £4 (FOR, p.38).
-In Kent with the abbot of Faversham by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

de MONTE, John

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 27 March 1501, deacon 19 February, priest 21 May 1502 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.67v,80r, 83r).

de MONTE, John

-Greenwich convent, ordained priest 19 February 1507 (Regg. Hille &c., London, f.95v).

-A man of this name was vicar of Greenwich convent in April 1522 when he presented friars of the convent for ordination (Reg. Warham, Canterbury (sv), ff.297v,298r).

MORCROFTE, Richard

-Greenwich convent, ordained priest 24 may 1494 (Regg. Hille &c., London, f.30r).

MORTIMER, John

-Newark convent, ordained acolyte 19 September 1517 (Regg. Wolsey &c., Lincoln, f.122v).
-Greenwich convent, ordained deacon 18 December 1518 (Reg. Fitz-James, London, f.187v).

MYCHELSON,

-Father.
-Canterbury convent by June 1534, when with father Richard Gam (q.v.) he refused to swear the Oath of Succession (PRO SP1/88 f.168 (=LP vii (Appendix). 27)).

MYLLYNGE, Thomas

-Lay-brother, 'ad mundum reversus' by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

MYRTHWAITE, William

-Newcastle convent, first tonsure 7 June, ordained acolyte 20 December 1533, deacon 4 April 1534 (Reg. Tunstall, Durham, pp.47,54,57).
-Babwell convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

=N=

de N...., William

-Provincial minister of England in May 1523 when he was elected diffinitor of the 'citramontane' friars in the combined general chapter at Burgos (Wadding, xvi.145; F. Delorme (ed.), 'Documents pour l'histoire du bienheureux Gabriel-Maria', AFH vol. xi (1928), p.470).

NELSON

-see ELSTON, Henry.

NESWICK, Robert

-'Father'; discreet in September 1532 (below, appendix 3).
-A visitor to Katherine of Aragon's household at Buckden (PRO SP1/142 f.201v (=LP xiv(i).190)). Went there with friar Hugh Rich (q.v.), 6 days before the latter's arrest c. early November 1533, to see a man dwelling six miles away 'that hath a prophesy' (BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.90r (=LP vi.1466 (p.586))).
-Ware convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

NORRYS, Hugh

-Stamford convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).
-London convent at dissolution, dispensed 6 September 1538 (FOR, p.149).

=O=

of OOTMARSUN, John

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 27 March, deacon 10 April, priest 5 June 1501 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.67v,77v).

ORPHEN, William

-Newcastle convent, ordained deacon 1 April 1525 (Reg. Wolsey, York, f.205v).
-Newark convent, ordained priest 13 September 1525 (Regg. Longland &c., Lincoln (ordinations), f.12v).
-Dispensed 13 July 1536: no fee (FOR, p.67).

of OSTEND, Arnold

-One of the group of friars sent with the vicar general's commissary Bernard of Lochen to England to found the Greenwich convent, July 1482 ('Introduction' (1), p.460).

of OSTEND, Vincent

-One of the group of friars sent with the vicar general's commissary Bernard of Lochen to England to found the Greenwich convent, July 1482.
-Acted as diffinitor in a number of provincial chapters of France and as discreet for the ultramontane general chapter at Florensac, May 1493.
-Liège convent (founded 1487), 'Primus fundator, guardianus huius loci'.
-Sometime vicar general's commissary in England, probably after Leo Leonis (q.v.) (d.1487).
-Died in the province of France, 'electus in vicarium provincialem', by May 1496. His obit was celebrated at Liège on 20 July (H. Lippens (ed.), 'Necrologium Conventus Leodiensis', in Necrologia I (Analecta Franciscana vol.vi, 1917), p.351; Glassberger, p.514).

=P=

PACKE, Thomas

-Friars of this name were variously reported to be at OFM Richmond (Yorks.) convent, to have been dispensed and to have fled to Scotland, c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

PALDEN, Robert

-Richmond convent, ordained acolyte 18 September 1507, subdeacon 23 September 1508.
-Canterbury convent, ordained priest 24 September 1513 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.97r,99r,177r).

PAYNE, Hugh

-Antwerp convent by c. July 1533 when he was sent to England by father William Peto (q.v.) with one Brother Cornelius [probably Brill (q.v.)] to search out texts concerning Henry VIII's divorce. Having visited Katherine of Aragon at Buckden, the pair were trailed to London by Cromwell's agents and arrested there. Payne was found by Cromwell upon interrogation to be a 'veray sedycious person': but the pair were probably saved by the intervention of the provincial minister (PRO SP1/80 f.51, SP1/78 f.26r (=LP vi.1369,887)).
-Newark convent by c. June 1534: having caused trouble with inflammatory preaching at Bristol and been pursued around the West Country, he was arrested with friar Thomas Hayfild (q.v.) in lay clothing at Cardiff, attempting to leave the country, June 1534 and sent up to London. Apparently the pair were released following a grovelling appeal to the king (PRO SP1/85 ff.26,93, SP1/88 f.97 (=LP vii.939,1020, 1652)).
-Dispensed by c. late 1536 when as curate of Hadleigh, Suffolk he appeared twice before archbishop Cranmer after persistently preaching 'erronious and seditious' sermons in the latter's peculiars there and in London. On the second occasion, after accepting

penance he absconded and found employment as a parish priest and preacher at Stoke Nayland, Suffolk. Refusing to obey a third summons he was declared excommunicate.
-Rector of Sutton Magna, Essex: instituted, despite a dispute over the right of patronage, 23 November 1536.
-Imprisoned in the Marshalsea and, despite an appeal to the duke of Norfolk, died there by 7 February 1537 (PRO SP1/115 ff.89,91, SP1/143 ff.30-1 (=LP xii(i).256(1),257, xiv(i).244); R. Newcourt, Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense vol. ii (London, 1710), p.567).

[and see above, pp.173-5,182-4].

-- PECOCK, Gabriel (*William)

-*Possibly identifiable with the man of this name who was Cardinal Morton Scholar at New Inn Hall, Oxford in 1508 and supplicated for the degree of Bachelor of Civil Law in December 1510 (BRUO iv).
-Richmond convent, *ordained subdeacon 23 September 1514, deacon 22 December 1515 (Reg. FitzJames, London, ff.179r, 181v).
-Newark convent, ordained priest 6 June 1517 (Reg. Wolsey, York, f.177v).
-Newark convent, warden c. 1531-2 (cf. Testamenta Eboracensia, vi.29-30).
-Canterbury convent, warden, 'contra Petow' in September 1532 (below, appendix 3). Probably the un-named warden of Canterbury whom the minister-general's commissary father Jean de la Haye (q.v.) appointed his deputy upon his departure from England following the Michaelmas provincial chapter, 1532, whom father John Lawrence (q.v.) describes as 'a mane of fathare Forrest's promotynge, hy fawtor to [the] qwene & iustyfyar of her caws' (BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.12 (=LP v.1371)).
-Southampton convent, warden in March and July 1534.
-Sent for and interrogated in London by Thomas Cromwell following a sermon which he gave at St. Swithun's, Winchester on Easter Sunday 1534 (PRO SP2/P ff.158-9, SP1/83 ff.78-9,89-90 (=LP vii.449,448,450,472-3)).
-Foiled an attempted false visitation of the convent, July 1534 (PRO SP1/85 ff.63-4 (=LP vii.982)).
-Lincoln convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4); still there at dissolution, *dispensed 10 October 1539 (FOR, p.195).
-Vicar of Goxhill, Lincs.; presented by Bishop Longland, admitted 12 December 1540; resigned by 22 December 1543 (Regg. Longland &c., Lincoln (institutions), ff.73r,81v).
-Unsuccessfully presented to the rectory of Sapperton, Lincs., February 1541 (C. W. Foster (ed.), 'Institutions to Benefices in the Diocese of Lincoln, 1540-1570: Calendar no.1' in Associated Architectural Societies' Reports vol.xxiv (1897-8), p.26).

[and see above, pp.184-6].

PENRITH, William

-Newcastle convent, ordained deacon 14 June 1511 (Reg. Bainbridge, York, f.114r).
-Greenwich convent, ordained priest 26 mar 1513 (Reg. FitzJames, London, f.176r).
-Richmond convent, junior-master in December 1521 and March 1522, vicar in December 1525 when he presented friars of the convent for ordination (Reg. FitzJames, London, f.194v, Reg. Warham, Canterbury (sv), f.296v; Reg. Tunstall, London, f.157v).
-Discreet, 'contra Petow' in September 1532 (below, appendix 3).
-Variously reported to be at OFM Richmond (Yorks) and York convents c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4); York convent at dissolution, 27 November 1538 (DKPR 8th Report, appendix ii p.51 (=Rymer, xiv.623)).

PERPOYNT, Thomas

-Richmond convent, ordained exorcist, acolyte 21 December 1521, subdeacon 19 April, deacon 24 June 1522 (Reg. FitzJames, London, f.194v; Reg. Warham, Canterbury (sv), ff.297v,298v).

PERSON, Thomas

-Of Oxfordshire.
-Merton college, Oxford; bachelor, elected March 1519; fellow, elected March 1520 (BRUO iv).
-Greenwich convent, ordained acolyte 19 April, subdeacon 24 June 1522 (Reg. Warham, Canterbury (sv) ff.297v,298v).
-Greenwich convent in February 1533, 'a yonge man a precher yn thys howse' and a protegé of father John Forest (q.v.), who 'co-[m]mended hym...hyly for hys learnynge' before the king. He reproved Dr. Hugh Curwen in the convent library for having preached in favour of the king's divorce (BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv ff.33-4 (=LP vi.168)).
-Lynn convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4); still there at dissolution, dispensed 10 November 1538 (DKPR 8th Report, appendix ii p.30; FOR, p.165).
-Possibly identifiable with the man of this name, rector of Knapwell, Ely diocese and chaplain to the bishop of Lincoln, who was dispensed to hold an additional benfice, 2 October 1539: fee £6. 10s. (FOR, p.197).

PETER, William

-Lay-brother, 'ad mundum reversus' by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).
-Probably identifiable with William Petitt, a lay-brother described as 'dispensed' c. May 1538 (ibid.).

PETITT, William

-see PETER.

PETO, William

-Born probably c.1475 (cf. CSP Spanish 1554-8, p.297).
-Worcester diocese, son of Edward Peyto of Chesterton, Warwickshire and related to the Throckmortons.
-B.A. Oxford by 1502; MA Cambridge 1504-5; MA Oxford June 1510.
-Queens' College, Cambridge, fellow 1507-11; lectured in mathematics 1507-8, University preacher 1510-11 (BRUO iv).
-Ordained deacon to the title of King's College, Cambridge 22 April 1508 (Regg. Hille &c., London, f.98v).
-Probably entered the Order c.1511.
-Richmond convent, vicar in December 1520, warden in April 1522 when he presented friars of the convent for ordination (Reg. Fitz-James, London, f.192r; Reg. Warham, Canterbury (sv), ff.297v,298r).
-Once confessed the young princess Mary (CSP Venetian 1556-7, p.239). Later a visitor to Katherine of Aragon's household at Buckden (PRO SP1/142 f.201v (=LP xiv(i).190)).
-Provincial minister in March 1532: deposed from office at the provincial chapter, Michaelmas 1532.
-Preached a sermon before the king in the Greenwich convent church, Easter Sunday 1532, against his proposed divorce from Katherine of Aragon. Defended in his absence a week later by the warden, father Henry Elston (q.v.). On his refusal to depose Elston from office both were imprisoned, initially at Lambeth Palace (CSP Spanish 1531-3 no.934 (=LP v.941); PRO SP1/125 f.249v (=LP xii(ii).952(1)); Nicholas Harpsfield, A Treatise on the Pretended Divorce Between Henry VIII and Katherine of Aragon (Camden Society new series vol.xii, 1878), pp.202-5).
-Still in custody at the end of September 1532 (PRO SP1/71 f.67 (=LP v.1358)); but subsequently travelled abroad. He was at Pontiose, near Paris, in January 1533 (DNB) and at Antwerp, with Elston and other English friars in July 1533. They were engaged there in the publication of a pair of works against the king's 'great matter', in reply to the official Glass of Truth, reputed to have been written by Bishop Fisher, and were in constant touch with England (PRO SP1/77 f.107, SP1/78 ff.37,39,57,84-5, SP1/80 ff.5-6,51 (=LP vi.726,899,900,917,934,1324,1369)).
-At Bergen-op-Zoom, with friar John Flegh (q.v.) in March 1536; and in December 1537 and January 1538 (PRO SP1/102 ff.241-2,1/127 f.107, 1/128 ff.134-5 (=LP x.524, xii(ii).1243, xiii(i).115)).
-Unwittingly provided a letter of introduction which enabled an English spy to gain access to Cardinal Reginald Pole's household at Liège, June 1537 (PRO SP1/121 ff.136-7 (=LP xii(ii).107)).
-At Liège on the business of his Order on 20 August 1537. Subsequently, in conjunction with his kinsman Michael Throckmorton he attempted to act as an intermediary between Pole and Thomas Cromwell (SP1/124 ff.80,167-8, 1/127 ff.7,107,174, 1/128 ff.134-5, 1/129 f.92 (=LP xii(ii).553,635,1172,1243,1303, xiii(i).115,326)).
-Travelled south in secular dress, April 1538. He was at Venice in August; at Padua - preparing to ride to Rome - in late October; at Venice mid-November and at Padua mid-December 1538, for the moment forbidden by the minister-general to go to Rome (PRO SP1/131 f.190, BL MS Cotton Nero B.vi ff.153-4, PRO SP1/242 f.96, BL MS Cotton Nero B.vi ff.55-6,128 (=LP xiii(i).827, xiii(ii).117, Add-

enda i.1364, xiii(ii).813,1034)).
-Attainted with Pole, Throckmorton and others 1539 (31 Henry VIII c.15, LP xiv(i).867) and provided to the bishopric of Salisbury, March 1543 (LP xviii(i).336).
-From at least early 1544 to September 1553 a resident of the English hospice of St. Thomas the Martyr, Rome ('The English Hospice at Rome', The Venerabile vol.xxi (Exeter, 1962), pp.209,269-70). During this period he was in regular communication with the head of the Inquisition, Cardinal Gian Pietro Caraffa and corresponded with the Princess Mary (CSP Venetian 1556-7, no.938).
-Travelled north with Pole's party following Mary's accession to the English throne, 1553-4: wrote to the new queen advising her strongly not to marry, c. 17 February 1554 (CSP Spanish 1554, pp.122-3).
-His attainder reversed, he returned to the refounded Greenwich convent, April 1555. In July he and the warden, Elston, were subjected to stone-throwing as they returned to the convent from London (J. R. Dasent (ed.), Acts of the Privy Council vol. v (London, 1892), p.169).
-Involved in an attempt to return the erstwhile London Greyfriars to its former use (S. V. Morgan (ed.), John Howes' MS, 1582 (London, 1904), pp.65ff.)
-Had already formally resigned the see of Salisbury but nevertheless was created cardinal and given Pole's legacy by Pope Paul IV, 14 June 1557: he declined both on the grounds of age and infirmity (CSP Venetian 1555-6, no.269, 1556-7, nos.937,981).
-Accused by Mary's ambassador Sir Edward Carne, December 1557, of having tried to interfere to expedite a long-running marriage-suit at the Curia in which one of the parties was a relative (PRO SP69/11 ff.114-5).
-Died April 1558.
-Editor of Richard Whitford's translation of Thomas a Kempis' 'Imitatio Christi', printed as The folowinge of Chryste... [with] the golden epystle of Saynt Barnarde, London, 1556 (NSTC 23966).

[and see above, pp.136ff, 222ff].

PLAKINODE, Gabriel

-Greenwich convent, ordained acolyte 1 June, subdeacon 21 September 1493 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.28r,28v).

POPE, Edward

-Southampton convent, ordained subdeacon 21 March, deacon 30 May, priest 19 September 1523 (Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.iv ff.31v,32r,32v).
-Died 'in patria' by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

PRESTON, Roger

-Greenwich convent, ordained exorcist, acolyte 19 December 1517, subdeacon 27 February 1518.
-Richmond convent, ordained priest 22 sept 1520 (Reg. FitzJames, London, ff.185v,186r,191v).

=Q=

QUEYNTANCE, Thomas

-'Father'; discreet, 'contra Petow' in September 1532 (below, appendix 3).
-Dispensed by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

=R=

RAYNSCROFT, William

-Greenwich convent, ordained exorcist, acolyte 25 May, subdeacon 22 December 1510, deacon 20 March, priest 5 April 1511 (Reg. FitzJames, London, ff.170v,172r; Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.ii ff.27r,27v).
-Imprisoned at London convent following Bishop Standish's visitation of Greenwich, January 1525; subsequently allowed to return to his convent ('Grey Friar's Chronicle', p.190).
-Died in prison at Greenwich, in mysterious circumstances, early in 1532 (BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv ff.31,35 (=LP vi.115-6)).

REYNOLD, Ralph

-Canterbury convent, ordained subdeacon 31 March 1514, deacon 2 June 1515.
-Greenwich convent, ordained priest 20 March 1518 (Reg. FitzJames, London, ff.178v,181r,186v).

RICARDI, Philip

-Richmond convent, ordained priest 18 March 1508 (Regg. Hille &c., London, f.97v).

RICH, Hugh

-Greenwich convent, ordained exorcist, acolyte 19 December 1517 (Reg. FitzJames, London, f.185v).
-Newark convent, ordained deacon 19 March, priest 28 April 1519 (Regg. Wolsey &c., Lincoln, ff.128r,129v).
-Richmond convent, warden in September 1532 (below, appendix 3) and in late 1533. A fashionable preacher and confessor in court circles.
-A visitor to Katherine of Aragon's household at Buckden (PRO SP1/142 f.201v (=LP xiv(i).190)).
-Probably encountered Elizabeth Barton, the 'Nun of Kent' in the course of one of her visits to Richmond, Sheen and Syon in 1531-2. He was himself the subject of one of her prophecies and was subsequently accused of having been one of the chief promotors - particularly in court circles - of her treasonous prophecy that the king would not reign for one month after marrying Anne Boleyn (BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv ff.87ff, PRO SP1/80 ff.126r-v, 130r-1r,134r-v (=LP vi.1466,1468(1-3)); BL MS Arundel 152 f.296v-7r (=LP vii.287)).

-Went to Buckden with father Robert Neswick (q.v.), six days before his arrest, to visit a man living two miles away 'that hath a prophesy' (BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.90r (=LP vi.1466 (p.586))).
-Probably arrested early November 1533 (PRO E36/143 p.29, SP1/80 f.101 (=LP vi.1370,1417)). He was in custody by 23 November, when he appeared with the Nun, father Richard Risby (q.v.) and her other chief adherents before Star Chamber (CSP Spanish 1531-3, no.1153; Hall's Chronicle, pp.806-7).
-Proved unco-operative under interrogation and at the time of the public penance of the Nun and her chief adherents at St. Paul's Cross, 23 November and at Canterbury, 7 December 1533 he had not revealed the names of those to whom he had communicated her treasonous prophecy. He was eventually induced to make a full and frank confession by the placing of an agent provocateur in his cell in the Tower (L. E. Whatmore, 'The Sermon Against the Holy Maid and her Adherents', EHR vol.lviii (1943), p.474 (=LP vii.72(iii)); CSP Spanish 1531-3, no.1154; PRO SP1/82 fff.86r-v, BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv ff.87-90 (=LP vii.72(i), vi.1466)).
-Attainted with the Nun, Risby and others (25 Henry VIII c.12 (=Statutes of the Realm vol.iii (London, 1817), p.449). Executed with them at Tyburn, 20 April 1534 and buried at the London Greyfriars (PRO SP3/5 f.95 (=LP vii.522); 'Grey Friar's Chronicle', p.197; Hall's Chronicle, pp.808ff).

[and see above, pp.169-72].

RICHARDSON, Bonaventure

-Sarum diocese.
-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 19 September, deacon 20 December 1500, priest 27 March 1501 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.65r,66r,67v).

RISBY, Richard

-Born 1490: of the parish of St Lawrence, Reading, Sarum diocese; the son of a tenant of Winchester college.
-Winchester College; scholar, admitted 1500 at age 10. New College, Oxford; scholar, admitted August 1506; fellow 1508, still in March, vacated on entering religion by May 1513.
-B.A. 1510 (BRUO iv).
-Ordained subdeacon 12 March, deacon 26 March 1513 (Reg. Fitz-James, London, ff.176r,176v).
-Richmond convent, ordained priest 23 December 1514 (ibid., f.179v); probably still there in March 1517, certainly in February, March 1521 when he presented friars of the convent for ordination (ibid., ff.184r,192v,193r).
-Greenwich convent, vicar in May 1521 when he presented friars of the convent for ordination (ibid., f.193v).
-Canterbury convent by late 1531-early 1532, when he introduced Elizabeth Barton, the 'Nun of Kent' to Thomas Goldwell, prior of Christ Church, Canterbury (BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.91 (=Wright, pp.19-21, LP vi.1470)). Warden of Canterbury by November 1533.

-Alleged to have been one of a number of priests who practiced extreme penances in reaction to the Nun's prophecies, and to have been one of the chief propagators of her treasonous prophecy that the king should not reign for a month after marrying Anne Boleyn. He attempted unsuccessfully to interest Sir Thomas More in her prophecy, Christmas 1532 (PRO SP1/80 ff.126v-7r,131r,134v, SP1/82 ff.86r-v, BL MS Arundel 152 f.296 (=LP vi.1468(1-3), vii.72(i),287)).
-Arrested c. early November 1533 and readily confessed his involvement: his captors thought him moved more by naïveté than malice (PRO E36/143 p.29, SP1/80 f.101, SP1/82 ff.86r-v (=LP vi.1370,1417, vii.72(i)). He appeared with the Nun, Father Hugh Rich (q.v.) and her other chief adherents before Star Chamber, 20 November and at the public penance of the Nun and her chief adherents at St. Paul's Cross, 23 November and at Canterbury, 7 December 1533 (CSP Spanish 1531-3, nos.1153-4; Hall's Chronicle, pp.806-7; L. E. Whatmore (ed.), 'The Sermon Against the Holy Maid of Kent and Her Adherents', EHR vol.lviii (1943), p.474 (=LP vii.72(iii))).
-Attainted with the Nun, Rich and others (25 Henry VIII c.12 (=Statutes of the Realm vol.iii (London, 1817), p.449)). Executed with them at Tyburn, 20 April 1534 and buried at the London Greyfriars (PRO SP3/5 f.95 (=LP vii.522); 'Grey Friar's Chronicle', p.197; Hall's Chronicle, pp.808ff).

[and see above, pp.169-70].

ROBINSON, John (*Thomas)

-Newark convent, ordained subdeacon 12 April 1533 (Regg. Longland &c., Lincoln (ordinations), f.33r).
-Wrote to Cromwell 28 September ?1535 requesting a dispensation because he was in a strange country where he was not known (PRO SP1/85 f.216 (=LP vii.1196).
-*In detention with the castellan of Cardiff c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

ROBINSON, William

-Richmond convent, warden in September 1514 when he presented friars of the convent for ordination (Reg. FitzJames, London, ff.179r,179v).
-Greenwich convent, warden in December 1528 (BL MS Cotton Vitellius B.x f.188 (=LP iv.5403).
-Richmond convent, vicar in September 1532 (below, appendix 3).
-Proposed to preach in refutation of a sermon made by an abbot at St. Paul's Cross in support of the king's divorce, April-May 1532 (BL MS Lansdowne 116 f.53 (=LP v.1142)).
-Despite the king's wish, was not deprived of all office by the minister-general's commissary, Jean de la Haye (q.v.) at the Michaelmas provincial chapter, 1532 (PRO SP1/71 f.67 (=LP v.1358)).
-Proposed for promotion to some office by the provincial minister, Francis Faber (q.v.), August 1533 (PRO SP1/70 f.200 (=LP v.1208)).
-A visitor to Katherine of Aragon's household at Buckden (PRO SP1/142 f.201v (=LP xiv(i).190)).

-London convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).
-Appeared before the Council in the North at York, July 1538, where he was required to explain a memorandum requesting the re-establishment of the Observance in England (PRO SP1/141 f.243 (=LP xiii(ii) (appendix).38)).

[and see above, pp.221-2].

ROBYNS, Thomas

-Canterbury convent, ordained acolyte 11 April 1506.
-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 6 June 1506.
-Canterbury convent, ordained deacon 3 April 1507 (Reg. Warham, Canterbury, ff.262v,263r; Regg. Hille &c., London, f.94r).
-Possibly identifiable with father Robyns, of London convent in early 1538 and regular confessor to Lord Mordaunt, who had left by 23 February (BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv f.161 (=LP xiii(i).1043(2))).

ROCHE, Thomas

-Possibly B.A. Oxford, November 1512 (BRUO iv).
-Canterbury convent by 1533 when he was shown the 'Nun of Kent's' revelations concerning the king and his reign by father Richard Risby (q.v.) (PRO SP1/80 ff.127r,131r,134v (=LP vi.1468(1-3))).
-Still there in January 1534.
-A regular companion of father Bernardine Covert (q.v.) on preaching tours to Calais. As such he was named in a royal letter of credence issued in January 1534 in the aftermath of the 'Nun of Kent' affair (PRO E135/2 no.13 (not in LP)).
-Still there on 1 June when father Covert conveyed his greetings to Lady Lisle (PRO SP3/10 f.75 (=Lisle Letters, ii.204, LP vii.765)).
-Dispensed 10 February 1536: no fee (FOR, p.144; below, appendix 5).
-Rector of Sutton Magna, Essex; presented by George Covert in succession to Hugh Payne (q.v.), 10 February 1538.
-Died by 8 May 1542 (R. Newcourt, Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense vol.ii (London, 1710), p.567).

ROY, William

-Probably born in Calais of Jewish stock: possibly the son of a native of Brabant who was granted letters of denization in London, February 1512 (cf. A. Wolf (ed.), William Roye's Dialogue (Vienna, 1874), p.xx; C. H. Williams, William Tyndale (London, 1969), p.17).
-Described as 'pety Guele[m] Roye' and appears to have had some distinctive facial features. He possessed an ability to speak 'all man[ner] off langayche' and is described by William Tyndale as 'somewhat craftye when he cometh vnto new aquayntaunce & before he be thorow knowen' and as one whose garrulity resulted in boasts which exceeded his capacities (PRO SP1/50 f.[75-6], SP1/54 f.97 (=LP iv.4693,5667); Tyndale, Parable of the Wycked Mammon (1528: STC 24454, Hume 6), sigs. A.ii.r-v)

-Greenwich convent, ordained exorcist, acolyte 20 December 1516, deacon 18 September 1518 (Reg. FitzJames, London, ff.184r,187r).
-Left England early 1525, probably following Wolsey's attempt to visit the Greenwich convent in January. He matriculated at Wittenberg on 10 June 1525 (P. Smith, 'Englishmen at Wittenberg in the Sixteenth Century', EHR vol.xxxvi (1921), p.422).
-Subsequently acted as amanuensis to William Tyndale in the publication of his English New Testament at Cologne and Worms; but they parted less than amicably after its completion. He moved to Strassburg, where in the summer of 1527 he was joined by Jerome Barlow (q.v.): they collaborated in the production of the Beryeng of the Masse (STC 21427, Hume 5) and he himself produced a Brefe Dialoge Bitwene a Christen Father and his Stobborne Sonne (NSTC 24223.3, Hume 4) (Tyndale, loc. cit.).
-At some time before mid-October 1528, returned to visit his mother in Westminster (cf. PRO SP1/53 ff.201-2, BL MS Cotton Vitellius B.x f.188 (=Rogers 115,94, LP iv.5462,5043)).
-In England again in June 1529, when he and Barlow were pursued around East Anglia by friars John West and John Lawrence (q.v.): they were last heard of taking ship for Newcastle (PRO SP1/54 f.97 (=LPiv.5667)).
-Subsequently reputed to have been burned as a heretic in Portugal (Sir Thomas More, 'Confutacyon of Tyndale's Answere' in Complete Works, viii(i).8; John Foxe, Acts and Monuments (ed. J. Pratt, London, [1887]), iv.693,753).
-Possibly translated into English Luther's sermon on 1 Corinthians 7 and Erasmus' Paraclesis (1529) (STC 10493, Hume 10).

[and see above, pp.111ff].

RUFFORD, Robert

-Greenwich convent, ordained acolyte 19 February, subdeacon 12 March, deacon 24 September 1513 (Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.iii f.52r; Reg. FitzJames, London, ff.176r,177r).
-Canterbury convent in 1533 when he was shown the 'Nun of Kent's' revelations concerning the king and his reign by father Richard Risby (q.v.) (PRO SP1/80 ff.127r,131r,134v (LP v.1468(1-3))).
-Bedford convent by c. May 1538; still there at dissolution, 3 October, dispensed 31 December 1538 (DKPR 8th Report, appendix ii p.9 (=Rymer, xiv.610); FOR, p.169; below, appendix 4).

RYCKES, John

-Cambridge university; questionist, January 1501, grace to incept in Arts granted April 1504, B.Th. 1516-7.
-Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; fellow, admitted 1503, vacated 1510. Named as executor in the will of Dr. Thomas Edyman, master of the college, 3 December 1515.
-University preacher 1511-2, 1515-6 (BRUC).
-Possibly Richmond convent in the early 1520's when he wrote the Latin work published in English translation as The Ymage of Loue (October 1525; NSTC 21471.5: second edition, c.1532-5, ibid., 21472).
-Newark convent, warden in September 1532 (below, appendix 3).

-Dispensed by c. 1536 when his English translation of Otto of Brunfels' Prognostication was published in London (STC 3943; J. Ames, W. Herbert & T. F. Dibdin (eds.), Typographical Antiquities of Great Britain (London, 1810-19), iii.176; John Bale, Scriptorum Illustriu[m] Maioris Brytannie Catalogus vol.ii (Basel, 1559), pp.102-3; E. Ruth Harvey, 'The Image of Love' in More, Complete Works vi(ii), pp.727ff).

[and see above, pp.99ff].

RYKETT, John

-Newark convent, ordained subdeacon 12 April 1533, priest 4 April 1534 (Regg. Longland &c., Lincoln (ordinations), ff.33r,39r).
-Fled to Scotland by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

=S=

SANDYS, Raphael (*Reginald)

-'Nobilis vir.'
-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 25 May 1521, deacon 19 April 1522 (Reg. FitzJames, London, f.193v; Reg. Warham, Canterbury (sv), f.298r).
-*Dispensed 10 December 1528.
-*Rector of Orcheston St. George, Wiltshire; admitted March 1531, vacated by August 1532. *Rector of Clewer, Berkshire; admitted August 1537, vacated by July 1542 (BRUO iv).

SARE, Thomas

-see SAYER.

SAWERE, John

-see SAYER, Thomas.

SAVLEY, Robert

-Richmond convent, ordained deacon 22 December 1510 (Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.ii f.27r).

SAYER, Thomas

-Dispensed, if given his superior's consent, 7 January 1536 (FOR, p.45; below, appendix 4).
-Probably identifiable with John Sawere, dispensed by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

SCOT, Laurence

-Provincial vicar of England for one term between 1499 and 1507.
-Died by 1 June 1508 (Glassberger, p.548).

SCRYVENER, John

-Greenwich convent., ordained subdeacon 19 December 1495, deacon 24 September, priest 17 December 1496 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.33r,34v,53r).
-Southampton convent., warden in January 1522 when he acknowledged receipt of £3 6s 8d granted to the convent by Lord Darcy (PRO SP1/23 f.273 (=LP iii.1975)); again in September 1532 (below, appendix 3).
-Died at Reading convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

SEBASTIAN (or ....., Sebastian),

-see HYGON, Sebastian.

SHORTE, Robert

-Fled to Scotland by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

SINGLETON John (*Henry)

-Southampton convent., *ordained acolyte 21 March 1523.
-Greenwich convent, ordained priest 23 September 1525 (Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.v f.31v; Reg. Tunstall, London, f.157v).
-*Reading convent at dissolution, dispensed 30 September 1538 (FOR, p.150).

SMALL, Thomas

-Greenwich convent., ordained subdeacon 11 June 1530 (Reg. Warham, Canterbury (sv), f.314r).
-Dispensed 13 July 1536: no fee (FOR, p.67).

SMYTHE, William

-Fled to Scotland by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

SONNING, John

-Richmond convent., ordained exorcist, acolyte 21 September 1527, subdeacon 28 March, deacon 18 December 1528, priest 22 May 1529 (Reg. Tunstall, London, ff.160r,160v,162r,163r).

SOTYLL, Henry

-Ware convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

of SOUTHAMPTON, Laurence

-Greenwich convent., ordained priest 2 March 1504 (Regg. Hille &c., London, f.87v).

SPENS, John

-Greenwich convent., ordained deacon 2 March, priest 29 June 1504 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.87v,89r).
-Died at London convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

STARECOTT, John

-Greenwich convent., ordained subdeacon 27 February, deacon 18 December 1518, priest 19 March 1519 (Reg. FitzJames, London, ff.186r,187v,188r).

STAVELEY, William

-Greenwich convent., ordained acolyte 23 September 1508, subdeacon 3 March, deacon 22 September 1509, priest 25 May 1510 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.99r,99v,170v; Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.iii f.25r).
-Bedford convent by c. May 1538; still at dissolution 28 October 1538. Northampton convent at dissolution, dispensed 2 January 1539 (below, appendix 4; DKPR 8th Report, appendix ii p.34; FOR, p.180).

STOTT, John

-Newcastle convent., ordained subdeacon 26 March, deacon 21 May, priest 24 September 1502 (Reg. Savage, York, ff.112r,112v,114v).

SYDENHAM, Thomas

-Greenwich convent., ordained acolyte 19 February, subdeacon 12 March, deacon 24 September 1513, priest 23 December 1514 (Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.iii f.52r; Reg. FitzJames, London, ff.176r, 177r,179v).
-'Father;' discreet, 'contra Petow' in September 1532 (below, appendix 3).
-Greenwich convent.: probably the warden who collaborated with father John Forest (q.v.) in an attempt to remove friar Richard Lyst (q.v.) to Southampton, February 1533; certainly warden in June and July 1533 (BL MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv ff.33-4; PRO SP1/77 f.93, SP1/78 f.26 (=LP vi.168,705,887)).
-In Kent, in the care of Sir William Hawte by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

SYMONDS, Cornelius

-Friars of this name are reported to have fled over sea and to have died 'in patria', c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

SYMSON, William

-Richmond convent., ordained deacon 25 May 1532 (Regg. Savage &c., Rochester, f.164r).
-Newcastle convent., ordained priest 7 June 1533 (Reg. Tunstall, Durham, p.48).
-Fled to Scotland by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4); appears in a

list of English rebels in Scotland, January 1540 (BL MS Royal 7C.xvi f.142 (=LP xv.96)).

=T=

THELWALL, Simon

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 23 December 1514 (Reg. FitzJames, London, f.179v).
-Newark convent, ordained deacon 7 April 1515 (Regg. Wolsey &c., Lincoln, f.113v).

de TYLA, Peter

-Greenwich convent, ordained subdeacon 20 December 1511.
-Richmond convent, ordained deacon 27 March, priest 5 June 1512 (Reg. FitzJames, London, ff.173r,174r,174v).

TYNDALE, William (*John)

-Professed 1508 at Greenwich. His father John gave the convent a volume of Sermones discipuli de Tempore et de Sanctis una cum promptuario exemplorum (1495) on the day of his profession (Martin, 'Greenwich', p.106 n.3).
-*Dispensed by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

TYNGYLL, Thomas

-Lay-brother.
-'Ad mundum reversus' by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).
-Probably identifiable with another of the same name, reported dispensed by c. May 1538 (ibid.).

=V=

de VILLA SANCTA, Alfonso

-A Spaniard, possibly briefly confessor to Queen Katherine of Aragon, c. 1515-17 following the departure of fray Diego Fernandez (q.v.).
-Greenwich convent, novice-master by May 1523 when he presented friars of the convent for ordination (Reg. Tunstall, London, f.153v).
-Had peculiar views on the nature of devils ('The Apologye of Syr Thomas More, Knyght', in More, Complete Works, ix.40,328).
-Author of a number of anti-protestant works including De libero arbitrio adversus Melanchtonum (November 1523) and Problema indulgentiarum, quo Lutheri errata dissoluuntur (February 1524), both dedicated to the queen (NSTC 24728-9; E. G. Rupp, 'The Battle of the Books: the Ferment of Ideas and the Beginning of the Reformation' in P. N. Brooks (ed.), Reformation Principle and Practice (London, 1980), p.13).

=W=

WAGAR, Ludovic

-According to FOR (p.48), an Observant friar of this name was dispensed to wear his habit below that of a secular priest on 24 March 1536: but a Conventual friar of this name, of the Oxford convent., was ordained subdeacon on 21 September 1521 (BRUO iv).

of WAREGEM, Cornelius

-One of the group of friars sent with the vicar general's commissary Bernard of Lochen to found Greenwich convent, July 1482 (Little, 'Introduction' (1), p.460).

of WAREGEM, Cornelius

-Greenwich convent., ordained subdeacon 27 March, deacon 10 April 1501, priest 21 May 1502 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.67v,83r).

of WAREGEM, John

-Greenwich convent., ordained subdeacon 18 September 1501, priest 2 March 1504 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.77v,87v).

WALKAR, Thomas

-Greenwich convent., ordained subdeacon 19 February, deacon 12 March, priest 21 May 1502 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.80r,81v, 83r).

WALLWOODE, Richard

-Newark convent., ordained acolyte 12 April 1533, deacon 4 April 1534 (Regg. Longland &c., Lincoln (ordinations), ff.33r,38v).
-Dispensed, with permission to be non-resident, 2 April 1536: fee £6 (FOR, p.49).
-Fled to Scotland by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

WEBSTER, George

-Fled to Scotland by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

WECHE, Frederick

-Greenwich convent., ordained subdeacon 27 March, deacon 10 April 1501, priest 21 May 1502 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.67v,83r).

WELLS, John

-Died at Ipswich convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

WEST, John

-Of London: stepson of Sir Thomas Exmew, a citizen, goldsmith and sometime Lord Mayor of London; son of Lady Elizabeth Exmew and brother of Katherine, wife of William Colswell (PRO SP1/52 ff.229-30 (=LP iv.5275)).
-Greenwich convent, preacher and confessor by December 1528 (BL MS Cotton Vitellius B.x f.188 (=LP iv.5043)).
-A client of Cardinal Wolsey: he was sent to Antwerp, probably with friar John Flegh (q.v.), c. 5 August 1527 to secure the capture and extradition of William Tyndale and William Roy (q.v.) and other English fugitives, particularly one Richard Harman (BL MS Cotton Vitellius B.xxi f.49r; PRO SP1/50 ff.75,77 (=LP iv.4810,4693-4)).
-At Malines 10-11 September, thence went with Flegh to Cologne, where the pair made contact with Herman Rinck and learned of the successful removal of Roy and Jerome Barlows' (q.v.) works from the market (BL MS Cotton Galba B.ix ff.199-201,205, Vitellius B.xxi ff.49-50 (=LP iv.4714,4725,4810)).
-Returned to Antwerp and departed for England c. 7 October 1527 (PRO SP1/50 ff.193-4 (=LP iv.4826)).
-After his return he repeatedly attempted, with little success, to persuade Wolsey to take some action to expedite the case against Harman and the capture of Tyndale, Roy, Barlow and others (PRO SP1/53 f.201; BL MS Cotton Galba B.ix ff.155-6,160-2, Cotton Appendix 1 ff.38-9, PRO SP1/52 f.229 (=LP iv.5462,5078,5192, 5402,5275)).
-Complained, December 1528 of attempts by his superiors to hinder his activities on Wolsey's behalf and appealed for a dispensation or a letter of obedience (BL MS Cotton Vitellius B.x f.188 (=LP iv.5043)).
-Appealed for Wolsey's help in a dispute over his stepfather's will, February 1529 (PRO SP1/52 ff.229-30 (=LP iv.5275)).
-With friar John Lawrence (q.v.), pursued Roy and Barlow through East Anglia, June 1529 (PRO SP1/54 f.97 (=LP iv.5667)).
-Probably dispensed from his habit soon afterwards.

[and see above, pp.122ff].

WEUER, Richard

-Greenwich convent, ordained priest 3 March 1509 (Regg. Hill &c., London, f.100r).

WHARTON, Abraham

-Probably Greenwich convent.
-Probably identifiable with father Abraham, companion of friar Francis Lybert (q.v.) in detention at Stamford convent, October 1534 (PRO SP1/86 f.91 (=LP vii.1307)).
-Fled to Scotland by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

of WIERS, Egidius

-Greenwich convent., ordained priest 3 April 1500 (Regg. Hille &c., London, f.63r).

WILD, Richard

-Greenwich convent., ordained subdeacon 24 September, deacon 17 December 1502, priest 29 June 1504 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.83v,84r,89r).

WILLIAMSON, James

-Died at Colchester convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

WILKINSON Lewis (*William)

-Possibly a Scot., although he is not to be confused with the later Scottish Observant of this name.
-Greenwich convent., ordained *subdeacon 6 March, deacon 27 March, priest 10 April 1501 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.66v,67r,68r).
-'Father,' Canterbury convent by 1526 when with an un-named brother of the convent he served on the archiepiscopal commission enquiring into the bona fides of the 'Nun of Kent' (above, chapter 4).
-Still there in 1533 when he was shown the 'Nun of Kent's' revelations concerning the king and his reign by father Richard Risby (PRO SP1/80 ff.127r,131r,134v (=LP vi.1468(1-3))).
-Died at Canterbury convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

WILKINSON, Philip

-Probably Greenwich convent; ordained deacon 6 June 1506 (Regg. Hille &c., London, f.94v).
-Fled to Scotland by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

WILLIAMSON, Lewis

-see WILKINSON.

WILLME, Hugh

-Greenwich convent., ordained acolyte 19 February 1513 (Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.iii f.52r).

WILLSON, William

-Canterbury convent., ordained subdeacon 7 April 1509, deacon 24 March 1510, priest 22 December 1510 (Reg. Warham, Canterbury, f.264r; Regg. Savage &c., Rochester; Reg. Fox, Winchester, vol.ii f.27r).

WOLLS, John

-Fled to the Continent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

a WOODE, Christopher

-Greenwich convent., ordained acolyte 20 December 1522, deacon 30 May 1523 (Reg. Tunstall, London, ff.152r,153v).

of WORMS, Nicholas

-Greenwich convent., ordained subdeacon 27 March 1501, deacon 19 February 1502, priest 2 March 1504 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.67v,80r,87v).

=X=

of XANTEN, Andreas

-Greenwich convent., ordained deacon 1 June 1493, priest 19 December 1495 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.28r,33r).

=Y=

YONGE, John

-Greenwich convent., ordained acolyte 25 May 1532 (Regg. Savage &c., Rochester, f.164r).
-Norwich convent by c. May 1538 (below, appendix 4).

of YORK, Henry

-Greenwich convent., ordained deacon 24 May 1494, priest 19 December 1495 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.30r,33r).

=Z=

ZANTIS

-see XANTEN.

ZETHAMTONIE

-see SOUTHAMPTON.

of ZUTPHEN, Andreas

-Greenwich convent, ordained deacon 3 April, priest 19 September 1500 (Regg. Hille &c., London, ff.63r,65v).

Appendix 2.

List of Superiors

The following list gives the names of those known to have held the offices of vicar-general's commissary, provincial vicar or minister and warden or vicar of a convent in the English vicariate/province, together with the dates at which they appear in the sources as holding office. References may be found in the appropriate entries in appendix 1, above.

Immediately after the foundation of Greenwich in 1482 the friars in England were governed by commissaries appointed by the ultramontane vicar-general. According to Wadding, after 1487 they came under the jurisdiction of the provincial vicar of Cologne (above, p.35). After the acquisition of three further convents in 1499, the friars elected their own provincial vicar (minister after 1517), to serve for a single three-year term (above, p.64).

Each house elected a warden and vicar to serve for a term of one year (above, pp.64-5)

1. Provincials.

(i) Commissaries of the Ultramontane Vicars-General (1482-7).

Bernard of Lochen	June 1482
Leo Leonis	before 1487
Vincent of Ostend	?

(ii) Vicars and Ministers Provincial (1499-1534).

Laurence Scot	before c.1507.
Stephen Barons	c.1507-9.
Bonaventure Langley	October 1513 and February 1515.
Francis Frowick	June 1517.
Henry Chadworth	September 1518.
William de N.	c. June 1523.
William Peto	March 1532.
Francis Faber	c. April 1533-February 1534.

2. Heads of Houses and Their Deputies.

(i) Greenwich (1482).

Wardens:

Donald Gilbert	April 1494.
William Robinson	Dec. 1528.
Henry Elston	March 1532.
Thomas Sydenham	June 1533.
Henry Elston	July 1555.

Vicars:

Richard Risby	May 1521.
John de Monte	April 1522.
William Curzon	May 1532.

(ii) Canterbury (1499).

Wardens:

Gabriel Pecock	September 1532.
Richard Risby	November 1533.
Bernardine Covert	June 1534.

(iii) Newcastle (1499).

Wardens:

John Baker	September 1532.

(iv) Southampton (1499).

Wardens:	
John Scryvener	January 1522 and September 1532.
Gabriel Pecock	March and July 1534.

(v) Richmond (1501).

Wardens:	
William Robinson	September 1514.
William Peto	April 1522.
Hugh Rich	September 1532 and November 1533.
Vicars:	
William Peto	December 1520.
William Penrith	December 1525.
William Robinson	December 1532.

(vi) Newark (1508).

Wardens:	
Gabriel Pecock	before September 1532.
John Ryckes	September 1532.

Appendix 3.

James Beck's List of Friars Attending the Provincial Chapter at Richmond, September 1532.

(The original of this list is PRO SP1/71 f.33v (=LP v.1312(ii)): for its provenance see above, pp.152-3. I have retained the original spelling of names.)

(i) [Minister and wardens].

Mynyster: ffather [William] Peytow

Warden of Grenwyche: ffreer Henrye Elston.

Warden of Rychmond: ffreer [Hugh] Ryche.

Warden of Canterburye: Gabryell Pekoke.

Warden of Newarke: ffather [John] Rykys.

Warden of Newcastell: ffather [John] Baker.

Warden of Sowth[a]mpton: ffather [John] Scryuener.

(ii) [Those whom Beck thought would support the re-election of William Peto as provincial minister].

ffather [Andrew] Donall.

ffather Deryke.

ffather [William] Corson, veker of Grenwyche.

ffather [Thomas] Honter.

ffather [William] Robynson [vicar of Richmond].

ffather Robert Neswyke.

ffather [Richard] Elwyn.

(iii) Co[n]tra peytow.

ffather [Gabriel] Pecoke.

ffather [John] fforest.

ffather [John] Lawrens.

ffathe[r] [Bernardine] Covert.

ffather [Thomas] Sydney [ie. Sydenham].

ffather [William] Penreth.

ffather Tho[ma]s Queynta[n]ce.

ffather [Ralph] Massey.

ffranc[es] Boknell.

ffather Sebastyon.

Appendix 4.

Thomas Cromwell's List of Former Observant Friars (c.May 1538).

(The original of this document is PRO E36/153 ff.1-2 (=LP vii.1607). For its provenance see above, pp.219-20. I have retained the original spellings of names.)

(i) Nomina fr[atrum] Obseru[a]ntiu[m] p[er]manentiu[m] in regno.

ffrater Will[el]m[us] Robynson est Londonijs.

ffr[ater] Joh[ann]es Game est ibidem

ffrater Jacobus Kello est ibidem.

ffrater Jacobus laycus est ibidem.

ffrater Antoni[us] laycus est ibidem.

ffrater Joh[ann]es Foreste est ibidem in carcere.

ffrater Joh[ann]es Bartone & ffr[ater] Will[el]m[us] Craforth su[n]t in Cancia ad volu[n]tate[m] ep[iscop]i Canturiensis.

ffrater Joh[ann]es Yonge est Norwyci.

ffrater Benedictus Dewo est ibidem.

ffrater Thomas Peresone est Lynnie.

ffrater Will[el]m[us] Morewhate est Babwellie.1.

ffrater Gabriell Pecocke est Lincolnie.

ffrater Antonius Hoode est ibidem.

ffrater Thomas Sydman est in Cancia cu[m] D[omi]no Will[el]mo Hawt, milite.

ffrater Will[el]m[us] Perith est Eboraci.2.

ffrater Robertus Hychon est Lyncolnie.

---

1. =Myrthwaite.

2. cf. William Penrith, Richmond (Yorks.) convent, below.

ffrater Bonauentura Jo[n]son est frater Augustinensis.

ffrater Robertus Neseweke est apud Ware.

ffrater Henricus Sotyll est ibidem.

ffrater Walterus ffreman est ibidem.

ffrater Joh[ann]es Elstonys est ibidem.

ffrater Joh[ann]es Hore est ibidem.

ffrater Joh[ann]es He[m]mysley est Scarburgie.

ffrater Joh[ann]es Bakare est Rychemu[n]die [Yorks.].

ffrater Will[el]m[us] Penrith est ibidem.[3]

ffrater Thomas Packe est ibidem.[4]

ffrater Will[el]m[us] Curson est Bedfordie.

ffrater Will[el]m[us] Stapeley est ibidem.

ffrater Dauid Jonys est i[n] Cancia.[5]

ffrater Will[el]m[us] Lee est Cardiuie.[6]

ffrater Joh[ann]es Kebyll est Gloucestrie.

ffrater Joh[ann]es Lye est Brystolys.

ffrater Elyas Mody est in Cancia cu[m] abbate de Feversame.

ffrater Franciscus Luberte est in Cancia cu[m] Magistro Crayforth.[7]

---

3. cf. William Perith, York convent, above.

4. cf. Thomas Packe, `exempt,´ below; also Thomas Packe, `fled to Scotland,´ below.

5. Either `in Kent´ (as LP) or a mistranscription of `Cambridge´ (cf. Francis Luberte, below). The former seems more likely since this friar was dispensed individually in November 1538 (above, appendix 1).

6. cf. William Ele, Carmarthen convent, below.

7. `Cancia´ here is probably a mistranscription. John Crayford was master of Clare Hall, Cambridge, 1530-9 and vice-chancellor of the University.

ffrater Robertus Rufforde est Bedfordie.

ffrater willm[us] Ele est Carmardinie.[8]

ffrater Barnardin[us] Blackborne est Eboraci.

ffrater Rogerus Harltone est Scarbugie.

ffrater Joh[ann]es Brymstone est frater Augustuensis.

ffrater Thomas Robynsone est Cardiuie cu[m] d[omi]no castelli ibide[m].

ffrater [Christ]ofer Burrell est Cantuarie & demens.

ffrater Will[el]m[us] Brwellus est Bedfordie.

ffrater Hugo Norrysse est Stamfordie.

ffrater Radulphus Creswell est Redingie.

(ii) No[m]i[n]a eoru[n]dem obs[er]uantiu[m] defu[n]ctoru[m].

ffrater Joh[ann]es Spens obijt Londonijs.

ffrater Thomas Artte obijt ibidem.[9]

ffrater Thomas Kellam obijt ibidem.

ffrater Jeronim[us] Manson obijt ibidem.

ffrater Joh[ann]es Kinge obijt ibidem.

ffrater Joh[ann]es Kyxe obijt ibidem.

ffrater Nicholaus Harfforthe obijt ibidem.

ffrater Judoc[us] Asterdam obijt Cantuarie.

ffrater Andreas Danolde obijt Grenewygye.

ffrater Joh[ann]es Scryvner obijt apud Redynge.

ffrater Antoni[us] Lenes obijt ibidem.[10]

---

8. cf. William Lee, Cardiff convent, above.

9. =Arthur.

10. Misreading of Raphael Antelernes.

ffrater Alexandere Hyll obijt in p[at]ria.

ffrater Theodoricus Barkham obijt apud Grenewygie.

ffrater Jacobus Wylyamson obijt Colcestrie.

ffrater Cornelius Symondys obijt in p[at]ria.

ffrater Edwardus Pope obijt ibidem.

ffrater Johannes Biltone obijt in p[at]ria.

ffrater Will[el]m[us] Ellell obijt Dancastie.

ffrater Gerardus Dyryson obijt in p[at]ria.

ffrater Joh[an]nes Martync obijt apud Newcastell.

ffrater Robertus Bynkys obijt apud Redynge.

ffrater ffranciscus Caro obijt apud Brystowe.[11]

ffrater Henricus Heltryne obijt in p[at]ria.

ffrater Adrianus Dehohe obijt in p[at]ria.[12]

ffrater Thomas Danyell obijt ibidem.

ffrater Franciscus Carre obijt ibidem.[13]

ffrater Ludowicus Wylkynson obijt Cantuarie.

ffrater Brianus ffysshborne obijt apud Yermothe.

ffrater Will[el]mus Hasarde obijt apud Dunwyche.

ffrater Joh[ann]es Well[es] obijt apud Yppyswych.[14]

ffrater Robertus Bakare obijt apud Dancaster.

Su[m]ma [?omnium] vij store j

---

11. cf. Francis Carre, died `in patria´, below.

12. Mistranscription of `Delphe´ (=Delft).

13. cf. Francis Caro, died at Bristol, above.

14. cf. Johannes Wells, `fugit transmare´, below.

(iii) No[m]i[n]a eorundem exemptorum.

ffrater Barnardinus Couertt exemptus.

ffrater Antonius Browne heremita.

ffrater Joh[ann]es Lawrence exemptus.

ffrater Robertus Lanham exemptus.

ffrater Thomas Tyngyll laicus ad mu[n]du[m] reu[er]sus.15

ffrater Thomas Martyne exemptus.

ffrater Alexander Holdene exemptus.

ffrater Joh[ann]es Lordinge exemptus.

ffrater Franciscus Dente exemptus.

ffrater Radulphus Massy exemptus.

ffrater Thomas Packe exemptus.16

ffrater Thomas Roche exemptus.

ffrater Thomas Quyntans exemptus.

ffrater Thomas Butlere exemptus.

ffrater Michaell Knyffton exemptus.

ffrater Will[el]m[us] Fullmer exemptus.

ffrater Franciscus Bucnall exemptus.

ffrater Will[el]m[us] Petitt laycus et exemptus.

ffrater Henricus Becher exemptus.

ffrater Will[el]m[us] Attpurbure exemptus.

ffrater Thomas Myllinge laicus ad mu[n]du[m] reu[er]sus.

ffrater Richardus Daniell laicus ad mu[n]du[m] reu[er]sus.

ffrater Franciscus Canewe exemptus.

---

15. cf. Thomas Tyngyll, `exemptus´, below.

16. cf. Thomas Packe, Richmond (Yorks.) convent, above; also Thomas Packe, `fugit in Scotiam´, below.

ffrater Robertus Latomer exemptus.

ffrater Thomas Tyngyll exemptus.[17]

ffrater Will[el]m[us] Peter laicus ad mu[n]du[m] reu[er]sus.

ffrater Petrus Jacson laicus ad mu[n]du[m] reu[er]sus.

ffrater Joh[ann]es Jonson laicus ad mu[n]du[m] reu[er]sus.

ffrater Joh[ann]es Tyndale exemptus.

ffrater Joh[ann]es Sawere exemptus.

ffrater Franciscus Dundye exemptus.

ffrater Robertus Corbete exemptus.

ffrater Thomas Sayer exemptus.

ffrater Joh[ann]es Cutberte laicus exemptus.

ffrater Hugo Payne exemptus.

ffrater Nycholaus Bullyn exemptus.

(iv) Nomina eoru[n]dem qui fugam pecieru[n]t.

ffrater Sebastianus Begone fugit transmare.[18]

ffrater Richardus Elvyn fugit transmare.

ffrater Robertus Shorte fugit in Scociam.

ffrater Joh[ann]es Jobbe fugit in Scociam.

ffrater Cornelius Simons fugit transmare.

ffrater Joh[ann]es Wells fugit transmare.[19]

ffrater Joh[ann]es Lambert fugit in Scociam.

ffrater Abraham Wharton fugit in Scociam.

---

17. cf. Thomas Tyngyll, `laicus ad mundum reversus,' above.

18. =Hygon.

19. cf. John Welles, died at Ipswich convent, above.

ffrater willm[us] Symson fugit in Scociam.

ffrater Robertus Hunte fugit transmare.

ffrater Philippus Wylkynson fugit in Scociam.

ffrater Thomas Adam fugit transmare.

ffrater Cornelius Brylys fugit transmare.

ffrater Richardus Hadley fugit transmare.

ffrater Will[el]m[us] Gumbry fugit in Scociam.

ffrater Will[el]m[us] Bartram fugit in Scociam.

ffrater Will[el]m[us] Smyth fugit in Scociam.

ffrater Thomas Cony fugit in Scociam.

ffrater Petrus de Magu[n]tia fugit in Scociam.

ffrater Thomas Hunter fugit transmare.

ffrater Thomas Packe fugit in Scociam.[20]

ffrater Henricus Halter fugit transmare.

ffrater Joh[ann]es Byllinge fugit in Scociam.

ffrater Joh[ann]es Rycket fugit in Scociam.

ffrater Richardus Wallwode fugit in Scociam.

ffrater Georgius Webstere fugit in Scociam.

ffrater Thomas Curtney fugit in Scociam.

ffrater Thomas Elkyn fugit in Scociam.

ffrater Arnoldus Forgate fugit transmare.

ffrater Jacobus Dansy fugit transmare.

---

20. cf. Thomas Packe, Richmond (Yorks.) convent, above; also Thomas Packe, `exempt,' above.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Primary Sources

(i) Manuscript sources.

Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, York

The MS registers of archbishops Thomas Savage (1501-7), Christopher Bainbridge (1508-14) and Thomas Wolsey (1514-30), Regs. 25-7, and the relevant volumes of the registers of the see of York *sede vacante*, Reg. 5A.

British Library, London

Various MSS from the Cotton, Harley and Royal collections, especially MS Cotton Galba B.ix (Correspondence relating to relations between England and the Netherlands, 1524-9) and MS Cotton Cleopatra E.iv (Correspondence relating to the suppression of the monasteries).

Guildhall Library, London

The MS London registers of bishops Richard Hille, Thomas Savage, William Barons and Richard FitzJames, with some material relating to the see of London *sede vacante* (1489-1509); Richard FitzJames (1509-22); Cuthbert Tunstall (1522-30), and John Stokesley (1531-9), MSS 9531/8-11.

Hampshire Record Office, Winchester

The MS Winchester register of bishop Richard Fox (5 vols., 1501-28), MSS A1/17-21.

Kent Archives Office, Maidstone

The MS Rochester registers of bishops Thomas Savage, Richard FitzJames, John Fisher, John Hilsey and Nicholas Heath, with some material relating to the see of Rochester *sede vacante* (1493-1554), MS DRc/R7.

Lambeth Palace Library, London

The MS Canterbury register of Archbishop William Warham (2 vols., 1503-32) (microfilm).

Lincolnshire Archives Office, Lincoln

The MS Lincoln registers of bishops Thomas Wolsey and William Atwater, with some *sede vacante* material (1514-21), John Longland and Henry Holbeach (2 vols., 1521-51), Episcopal Registers XXV-VII.

Public Record Office, London

Documents from the following classes:

E36	Exchequer, Treasury of the Receipt, miscellaneous books.
E101	Exchequer, King's Remembrancer, accounts, various.
E135	Exchequer, King's Remembrancer, ecclesiastical documents.
Prob.11	Registers of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury.
PRO 31/3	Paris transcripts.
SP1	State Papers, Henry VIII.
SP2	Ibid., folio volumes.
SP3	Lisle papers.
SP49	State papers, Scotland, Henry VIII.
SP69	State Papers, Philip and Mary.

(ii) Printed works.

ABATE, G. (ed.)

`Lettera del P. Tommaso Cudvero Vicario della Provincia Minoritica d'Inghilterra al Rev.mo Padre Ministro Generale dell'Ordine', Miscellanea Francescana vol.xxix (1929), pp.113-4.

ARBER, E. (ed.)

The First Printed English New Testament, London, 1871.

ASTLE, T. (ed.)

The Will of Henry VII, London, 1775.

BARLOW, Jerome

A Proper Dyaloge Betwene a Gentillman and a Husbandman, `Marburg' (ie. Antwerp), 1530.

BARLOW, Jerome and ROY, William

`The Beryeng of the Masse' (1528): ed. E. Arber as Rede Me and Be Nott Wrothe, For I Say No Thing but Trothe, Arber's English Reprints, London, 1871.

BIHL, M. (ed.)

`Statuta Provincialia Provinciae Coloniae O.F.M. Observ., Annorum 1474 et 1524,' in AFH vol.vii (1914) pp.710-38.

`Statuta Generalia Observantium Ultramontanorum An. 1451 Barcinonae Condita,' in AFH vol.xxxv (1945) pp.3-39,106-97.

BRUGMAN, Jean

'Speculum Imperfectionis Fratrum Minorum compactum per venerabilem et religiosum P. F. Iohannem Brugman, OFM', ed. H. Goyens, AFH vol. ii, (1909), pp.613ff.

BULLARIUM FRANCISCANUM

Vols.i-iv, ed. J. H. Sbaralea, Rome, 1759-68; vols.v-vii, ed. C. Eubel, Rome, 1898-1904; nova series vols.i-, ed. U. Hüntemann and J. M. Pou y Marti, Quaracchi/Rome, 1929-.

BURTT, J. and GRAVES, J. (eds.)

'Charter of Henry VII to the Franciscan Friars at Greenwich, and an Inedited Seal of the Warden,' in Archaeological Journal vol. xxiii (1866) pp.54-9.

BYRNE, M. St. Clare (ed.)

The Lisle Letters, 6 vols., Chicago, 1981.

CAMPBELL, W. A. (ed.)

Materials Illustrative of the Reign of Henry VII vol. i (Rolls Series vol.clii), London, 1873.

CHAMBERS, D. S. (ed.)

Faculty Office Registers 1534-1549, London, 1966.

CHITTY, H. (ed.)

Registrum Johannis Whyte, episcopi Wintonensis A.D. MDLVI-MDLIX, Canterbury and York Society vol.xvi, 1914.

CLAY, J. W. (ed.)

Testamenta Eboracensia vol.vi (Surtees Society vol.cvi), 1902.

North Country Wills...at Somerset House and Lambeth Palace, 1383-1558, Surtees Society vol.cxvi, 1908.

CRANMER, Thomas

Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, ed. J. E. Cox, Parker Society, 1846.

DASENT, J. R. (ed.)

Acts of the Privy Council vol.v (1555-6), London, 1892.

DELORME, F. (ed.)

`Documents pour l´histoire du Bienheureux Gabriel-Maria´, La France Franciscaine vols. ix-xi, 1926-8.

ELLIS, H. (ed.)

Original Letters Illustrative of English History, 3 series in 11 vols., London, 1824-46.

ERASMUS, Desiderius

Opvs Epistolarvm Des. Erasmi Roterodami vol.iii, ed. P. S. and H. M. Allen, Oxford, 1913.

FOSTER, C. W. (ed.)

Lincoln Wills vols. ii, iii (Lincoln Record Society vols. x, xxiv), Lincoln, 1918,1930.

FRANCIS, Saint, of Assisi

St. Francis of Assisi - Writings and Early Biographies (English Omnibus of the Sources for the Life of St. Francis), ed. M. A. Habig, Chicago, 1973.

FUENSALIDA, Gutierre Gomez de

Correspondencia de Gutierre Gomez de Fuensalida, ed. Duque de Berwick y de Alba, Madrid, 1907.

FURNIVALL, F. J. (ed.)

Political, Religious and Love Poems (EETS original series vol.xv), London, 1903.

GAIRDNER, J. (ed.)

`Bishop Hooper´s Visitation of Gloucester´, EHR vol. xix, 1904.

GARDINER, Stephen

The Letters of Stephen Gardiner, ed. J. A. Muller, Cambridge, 1933.

HACKETT, Sir John

The Letters of Sir John Hackett 1526-1534, ed. E. F. Rogers, Morgantown, W. Virginia, 1971.

HAREN, M. J. (ed.)

Calendar of Papal Registers Relating to Great Britain and Ireland, Papal Letters vol.xv (1484-92), Dublin, 1978.

HINDE, G. (ed.)

The register of Cuthbert Tunstall, bishop of Durham 1530-59, and James Pilkington, bishop of Durham, 1561-76, Surtees Society vol. clxi, 1952.

HISTORICAL MSS COMMISSION

`MSS of the corporation of New Romney', calendared in the appendix to the Fifth Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts (London, 1886).

HOWDEN, M. P. (ed.)

The register of Richard Foxe, lord bishop of Durham, 1494-1501, Surtees Society vol.cxlvii, 1932.

LATIMER, Hugh

Sermons and Remains of Hugh Latimer, ed. G. E. Corrie, Parker Society, 1845.

LAZERI, P. (ed.)

Miscellaneorum ex MSS Libri Bibliothequae Colegii Romani Societatis Jesu vol.i, Rome, 1754.

LIPPENS, H. (ed.)

`Necrologium Conventus Leodensis...(1487-1794)' in Necrologia I (Analecta Franciscana vol.vi), 1917, pp.307ff.

McGREGOR, M. (ed.)

Bedfordshire Wills Proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury 1348-1538, Bedfordshire Historical Record Society vol.lviii, 1979.

MADGE, F. T. and CHITTY, H. (eds.)

Registrum Thome Wolsey, cardinalis ecclesie Wintoniensis administratoris, Canterbury and York Society vol.xxxii, 1926.

MALDEN, H. E. and CHITTY, H. (eds.)

Registra Stephani Gardiner et Johannis Poynet, episcoporum Wintonensium, Canterbury and York Society vol.xxxvii, 1930.

MERRIMAN, R. B.

Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell vol.ii (letters), Oxford, 1902.

MESEGUER FERNANDEZ, P. J. (ed.)

`Carta de Enrique VIII a Leòn X en favor de los franciscanos observantes de la provincia de Colonia (12 de marzo de 1514),´ in AFH vol.xliv (1951) pp.476-80.

MORE, St. Thomas,

The Yale Edition of the Complete Works of St. Thomas More, New Haven, Connecticut, 1963- :

vol. vi, `A Dialogue Concerning Heresies,´ ed. T. Lawler, G. Marc´hadour and R. Marius, 1981.

vol. viii, `The Confutation of Tyndale´s Answer,´ ed. L. A. Schuster, R. C. Marius, J. P. Lusardi and R. J. Schoek, 1973.

vol. ix, `The Apologye of Syr Thomas More, Knyght´, ed. J. B. Trapp, 1979.

NICOLAS, N. H. (ed.)

Testamenta Vetusta, 2 vols., London, 1823.

Privy Purse Expences of Elizabeth of York, London, 1830.

NICHOLS, J. G. and BRUCE, J. (eds.)

Wills from Doctors´ Commons, Camden Society original series vol. lxxxiii, 1863.

POLLEN, J. H. (ed.)

`Dr. Nicholas Sander´s Report to Cardinal Moroni on the Change of Religion in 1558-9 [1561],´ in Miscellanea I (Publications of the Catholic Record Society vol.i), 1905, pp.1ff.

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE

The Eighth Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records, London, 1847.

Calendar of Charter Rolls vol.vi (1427-1516), London, 1927.

Calendar of Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, ed. J. S. Brewer, J. Gairdner and R. S. Brodie, 36 vols., London, 1862-1932; facsimile reprint with corrections, Vaduz, 1965.

Calendar of Papal Registers Relating to Great Britain and Ireland, Papal Letters vols.xiii parts i and ii (1471-84), and xiv (1484-92), ed. J. A. Twemlow, 1955/60.

Calendar of Patent Rolls

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE (continued)

Calendar of State Papers, Spanish, ed. G. A. Bergenroth, P. de Gayangos et al., 1862-.

Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, ed. Rawdon Brown, 1864-.

State Papers: King Henry the Eighth, 11 vols., London, 1830-52.

RAINE, J. (ed.)

Wills and Inventories...of the Northern Counties of England... vol.i (Surtees Society vol.ii), 1835.

Testamenta Eboracensia vol.v (Surtees Society vol.lxxix), 1884.

ROY, WILLIAM

William Rove's Dialogue between a Christian father and his stubborn son, ed. A. Wolf, Vienna, 1874.

RYMER, T. (ed.)

Foedera, Conventiones, Literae, etc., London, 1704-15.

SCHMITT, C. (ed.)

`La Pauvreté evangélique discutée au Chapitre Observant de Bruges (1484)', AFH vol.lvi (1963), pp.332ff.

SKEAT, W. W. (ed.)

Pierce the Ploughman's Crede, EETS original series vol. xxx, 1867.

STATUTES OF THE REALM

The Statutes of the Realm, vols. ii-iv, London, 1816-19.

STRYPE, J. (ed.)

Ecclesiastical Memorials, 3 vols. (in 6), Oxford, 1822.

THEINER, A. (ed.)

Vetera Monumenta Hibernorum et Scotorum Historiam Illustrantia, Rome, 1864.

TYNDALE, WILLIAM

The Parable of the Wycked Mammon, `Marburg' [ie. Antwerp], 1528.

WEAVER, F. W. (ed.)

Somerset Medieval Wills, 2nd. series (1501-30), Somerset Record Society vol.xix, 1903.

WHATMORE, L. E. (ed.)

`The Sermon Against the Holy Maid of Kent and her Adherents´, EHR vol. lviii (1943), pp.463ff.

WRIGHT, T. (ed.)

Three Chapters of Letters Relating to the Suppression of the Monasteries (Camden Society original series vol.xxvi), London, 1843.

2. Secondary Works.

AMES, J., HERBERT, W. and DIBDIN, T. F. (eds.),

Typographical Antiquities of Great Britain, 4 vols., London, 1810-19.

ANDRE, Bernard

`Annales Henrici VII´, ed. J. Gairdner in Memorials of King Henry VII, Rolls Series vol.vi, 1858, pp.77ff.

ARMSTRONG, C. A. J.

`L´échange culturel entre les cours d´Angleterre et de Bourgogne à l´époque de Charles le Téméraire´, in Cinq-centième Anniversaire de la Bataille de Nancy (1477), Nancy, 1979.

BALE, John

Scriptorum illustrium maioris Brytannie Catalogus, 2 vols., Basel, 1557/9.

BARLEY, M. W.

`Newark in the Sixteenth Century´, in Transactions of the Thoroton Society of Nottinghamshire vol.liii (1949), pp.15ff.

BASKERVILLE, G.

`Married clergy and pensioned religious in Norwich Diocese, 1555´, in EHR vol.xlviii (1933), pp.43ff,199ff.

BENNETT, J. A. W. (ed.)

Devotional Poems in Verse and Prose (Scottish Text Society, 3rd series vol. xxiii), 1949.

BIETENHOLZ, P. G. and DEUTSCHER, T. B. (eds.)

Contemporaries of Erasmus vols. i-ii, Toronto, 1985/6.

BIHL, M.

`De transitu conventus Pforzeimensis ad Observantes, an. 1443´, in AFH vol.xxxvi (1943), pp.120ff..

BLENCH, J.W.

Preaching in England, Oxford, 1964.

BOURCHIER, Thomas

Historia ecclesiastica de martyrio fratrum Ordinis Divi Francisci, dictorvm de Observantia.... Ingolstadt, 1583.

BRADY, Ignatius

`The History of Mental Prayer in the Order of Friars Minor´, Franciscan Studies vol.xi (1951), pp.317ff.

BRAND, John

The History and Antiquities of the Town and County of the Town of Newcastle Upon Tyne, 2 vols., London, 1789.

BROWN, Cornelius

A History of Newark-on-Trent, Newark, 1904/7.

BRYCE, W. Moir

The Scottish Grey Friars, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1909.

CAMERON, Alan W.

`Sir Henry Willoughby of Wollaton´, in Transactions of the Thoroton Society of Nottingham vol.lxxiv (1970), pp.10ff.

`A Nottinghamshire Quarrel in the Reign of Henry VII´, in Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research vol.xlv (1972), pp.27ff.

`Meering and the Meryng Family´, in Transactions of the Thoroton Society of Nottinghamshire vol.lxxvii (1973), pp.41ff.

CAMM, Dom Bede (ed.)

Lives of The English Martyrs, London, 1904.

CEYSSENS, L.

`Les Ducs de Bourgogne et l´Introduction de l´Observance a Malines (1447-1469)´, AFH vol.xxx (1937), pp.391-419.

CHRIMES, S. B.

Henry VII, London, 1972.

CLEBSCH, W. A.

'The Earliest Translations of Luther into English', Harvard Theological Review vol.lvi (1963), pp.75ff.

England's Earliest Protestants, 1520-1535, New Haven, Connecticut, 1964.

C[OKAYNE], G. E.

The Complete Peerage (new edition, ed. V. Gibbs et al.), 12 vols. in 13, London, 1910-59.

COLVIN, H. M., et al. (eds.)

The History of the King's Works; vol.iii part i, London, 1975, vol.iv, London, 1982.

COOPER, C.H.

Memoir of Margaret, Countess of Richmond and Derby, ed. J. B. Mayor, Cambridge, 1874.

COOPER, J. H.

'The Coverts,' Sussex Archaeological Collections vols.xlvi (1903), pp.170ff; xlvii (1904), pp.116ff; xlviii (1905), pp.1ff.

COTTON, Charles

The Grey Friars of Canterbury 1224 to 1538; Manchester, 1924, repr. Ridgewood, New Jersey, 1965.

COULTON, G.G.

Five Centuries of Religion vol.iv, Cambridge, 1950.

COX, J. C.

'William Stapleton and the Pilgrimage of Grace,' in Transactions of the East Riding Antiquarian Society vol.x (1903), pp.80ff.

DAVENPORT, Christopher (Franciscus a Sta. Clara).

'Fragmenta, seu historia minor almae provinciae Anglie ff. minorum', published as the first part of his Manuale Missionariorum, 2nd edition, Douai, 1661.

DAVIES, J. S.

A History of Southampton, Southampton and London, 1883.

DAVIES, J. S. (continued)

`Dissolution of the Friary at Southampton´, Hampshire Field Club Proceedings and Papers vol.i part iv (1890), pp.17ff.

DICTIONARY OF NATIONAL BIOGRAPHY

Dictionary of National Biography, ed. L. Stephen and S. Lee, 63 vols., London, 1885-1900.

DOCKERY, J. B.

Christopher Davenport, Friar and Diplomat, London, 1960.

DODDS, M. H. and R.

The Pilgrimage of Grace, 1536-7 and the Exeter Conspiracy, 1538; 2 vols., Cambridge, 1915, repr. London, 1971.

DURKAN, J.

`The Observant Franciscan Province in Scotland´, Innes Review, vol.xxxv part 2, 1984.

DURKAN, J. and KIRK, J.

The University of Glasgow 1451-1577, Glasgow, 1977.

ELTON, G. R.

`Sir Thomas More and the Opposition to Henry VIII´ (1967), repr. in Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government vol.i (Cambridge, 1974), pp.155ff.

Policy and Police, Cambridge, 1972.

Reform and Reformation, London, 1977.

EMDEN, A. B.

A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D.1500, 3 vols., Oxford, 1957-62.

A Biographical Register of the University of Cambridge to 1500, Cambridge, 1963.

A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford A.D.1501-1540, Oxford, 1974.

l´ESTRANGE, A. G.

The Palace and the Hospital; or, Chronicles of Greenwich, 2 vols., London, 1886.

FENLON, Dermot

Heresy and Obedience in Tridentine Italy: Cardinal Pole and the Counter Reformation, Cambridge, 1972.

FOSTER, C. W.

`Institutions to Benefices in the Diocese of Lincoln, 1540-1570: Calendar no.1', Associated Architectural Societies' Reports vol. xxiv (1897-8), pp.1ff,467ff.

FOXE, John

Acts and Monuments, 4th edition in 8 vols., ed. J. Pratt, London, [1887].

GILLOW, J.

A Literary and Biographical Dictionary of the English Catholics, 5 vols., London, 1885-1902.

GLASSBERGER, Nicholas

Chronica Fratris Nicolai Glassberger Ordinis Minorum Observantium, ed. the fathers of the College of St. Bonaventure (Analecta Franciscana vol.ii), Quaracchi, 1887.

GOODMAN, Anthony

`Henry VII and Christian Renewal', in K. Robbins (ed.), Religion and Humanism (Studies in Church History vol.xvii), Oxford, 1981, pp.115-25.

GRATIEN, P.

`Les débuts de la réforme des cordeliers en France et Guillaume Josseaume (1390-1436)', in Etudes Franciscaines vol.xxxi (1914), pp.415ff.

GREAT CHRONICLE OF LONDON

The Great Chronicle of London, ed. A. H. Thomas and I. D. Thornley, London, 1938.

GREY FRIAR'S CHRONICLE

`Chronicon ab anno 1189 ad 1556 ex registro fratrum minorum Londiniae,' ed. R. Howlett, in Monumenta Franciscana vol.ii (Rolls Series vol.v), London, 1882, pp.143ff.

GUY, J. A.

The Public Career of Sir Thomas More, Brighton, 1980.

HALL, Edward

Hall's Chronicle, ed. H. Ellis, London, 1809; repr. New York, 1965.

HARPSFIELD, Nicholas

A Treatise on the Pretended Divorce Between Henry VIII and Katharine of Aragon, ed. N. Pocock, Camden Society new series vol.xii, 1878.

HARRIS, J. R.

The Origin of the Leicester Codex of the New Testament, London, 1887.

HARRISON, W. J.

Notes on the Masters, Fellows &c. of Clare College, Cambridge, Cambridge, 1953.

HASTED, W.

Hasted's History of Kent: Part 1, The Hundred of Blackheath, ed. H. H. Drake, London, 1886.

HENNESSY, G.

Novum Repertorium Parochiale Londinense, London, 1898.

Chichester Diocesan Clergy Lists, London, 1900.

HERFORD, C. H.

Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century, Cambridge, 1886.

HODGETT, G. A. J.

`The Unpensioned ex-Religious in Tudor England,' in Journal of Ecclesiastical History vol.xiii (1962), pp.195ff.

HOLZAPFEL, H.

Handbuch der Geschichte des Franziskanerordens, Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1909.

HOWES, John

John Howes' MS. 1582, ed. S. V. Morgan; privately printed, London, 1904.

HUME, Anthea

`William Roye's `Brefe Dialoge' (1527): An English Version of a Strassburg Catechism', Harvard Theological Review vol.lx (1967), pp.307ff.

`English Books Printed Abroad, 1525-35: An Annotated Bibliography,' in More, Complete Works viii(ii), appendix B (1973).

HUME, M. A. S. (trs.)

A Chronicle of King Henry VIII, in Spanish, London, 1889.

KER, N. R.

Medieval Libraries of Great Britain, 2nd edition, London, 1964.

KINGSFORD, C.L.

The Grey Friars of London; Aberdeen, 1915, repr. Ridgewood, N. J., 1965.

`Additional Material for the History of the Greyfriars, London', in Collectanea Franciscana vol.ii; Manchester, 1922, repr. Farnborough, Hants., 1966), pp.61ff.

(ed.), Chronicles of London, London, 1905.

KIPLING, Gordon

`John Skelton and Burgundian letters' in J. van Dorsten (ed.), Ten Studies in Anglo-Dutch Relations (Leiden, 1974).

The Triumph of Honour: the Burgundian Origins of the Elizabethan Renaissance, Leiden, 1977.

KNOWLES, D.

The Religious Orders in England; vols.ii-iii, Cambridge, 1955/9.

KNOWLES, D. and HADCOCK, R. N.

Medieval Religious Houses, England and Wales; 2nd edn., London, 1972.

LAMBARD, W.

A Perambulation of Kent, Chatham, 1826.

LAMBERT, M. D.

Franciscan Poverty, London, 1961.

LEFF, G.

Heresy in the Later Middle Ages, 2 vols., Manchester, 1968.

LEHMBERG, S. E.

The Reformation Parliament, 1529-1536, Cambridge, 1970.

LIPPENS, H.

`De translatione conventus Namurcensis a Conventualibus ad Observantes (1482-1491)´, in AFH vol.xxxviii (1948), pp.198ff.

`Jean Glapion, défenseur de la Réforme de l´Observance, conseiller de l´empereur Charles-Quint´, in AFH vol.xliv (1951) pp.3ff, vol.

LITTLE, A. G.

The Grey Friars in Oxford (Oxford Historical Society vol.xx), Oxford, 1891.

Studies in English Franciscan History, Manchester, 1917.

`Introduction of the Observant Friars into England´, in Proceedings of the British Academy vol.x (1921-3), pp.455-71.

`The Franciscan Friars of Canterbury´ and `The Observant Friars of Greenwich´ in The Victoria History of the County of Kent vol.ii (ed. W. Page, London, 1926), pp.190ff.

(ed.) Franciscan History and Legend in English Medieval Art; Manchester, 1937, repr. Farnborough, Hants., 1966.

`Introduction of the Observant Friars into England: a Bull of Alexander VI,´ in Proceedings of the British Academy vol.xxvii (1941) pp.155-66.

Franciscan Papers, Lists and Documents, Manchester, 1943.

LITTLE, A. G. and FITZMAURICE, E. B.

Materials for the History of the Franciscan Province of Ireland A.D. 1240-1450; Manchester, 1920; repr. Farnborough, Hants., 1966.

LOADES, D. M.

The Reign of Mary Tudor, London, 1979.

LUPTON, J. H.

A Life of John Colet, D.D.; 2nd edn., London, 1909.

MANNING, O. and BRAY, W.

The History and Antiquities of the County of Surrey; 3 vols., London, 1804-14, repr. East Ardsley, Wakefield, Yorks., 1974.

MARTIN, Alan R.

`The Grey Friars of Greenwich´, Archaeological Journal vol.lxxx (1923), pp.81ff.

Franciscan Architecture in England; Manchester, 1937, repr. Farnborough, Hants., 1966.

MASON, Richard (Angelus a S. Francisco)

Certamen seraphicum provinciae Angliae, Douai, 1649; new edition by the fathers of the College of St. Bonaventure, Quaracchi, 1885.

MATTINGLEY, Garret

Catherine of Aragon, London, 1942.

McCONICA, J.

English Humanists and Reformation Politics, Oxford, 1965.

MOORMAN, J. R. H.

A History of the Franciscan Order from its Origins to the Year 1517, Oxford, 1968.

The Franciscans in England, Oxford, 1974.

MOZLEY, J. F.

William Tyndale, London, 1937.

NEAME, Alan

The Holy Maid of Kent: the Life of Elizabeth Barton, 1506-1534, London, 1971.

NEWCOURT, R.

Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense, 2 vols., London, 1708/10.

NIMMO, D.

`The Franciscan Regular Observance 1368-1447 and the Divisions of the Order 1294-1528´; unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1974.

NIMMO, D. (continued)

`Reform at the Council of Constance: the Franciscan Case´, in D. Baker (ed.), Renaissance and Renewal in Christian History (Studies in Church History vol.xiv), Oxford, 1977, pp.159ff.

NYHUS, Paul

`The Observant Reform Movement in Southern Germany´, in Franciscan Studies vol.xxxii (1972), pp.154ff.

OLIGER, L.

`De relatione inter Observantium quaerimoniae Constantienses (1415) et Ubertini Casalensis quoddam scriptum´ AFH vol.ix (1916), pp.3ff.

P[ARKINSON], A[nthony]

Collectanea Anglo-Minoritica, or, a Collection of the Antiquities of the English Franciscans, London, 1726.

PAUL, J. E.

Catherine of Aragon and Her Friends, London, 1966.

PFAFF, R. W.

New Liturgical Feasts in Later Medieval England, Oxford, 1970.

PLATT, C.

Medieval Southampton, London, 1973.

POCOCK, N. (ed.)

Records of the Reformation: the Divorce 1527-33, 2 vols., Oxford, 1870.

POLLARD, A. F.

Wolsey, London, 1929.

RENAUDET, A.

Préréforme et Humanisme a Paris, Paris, 1916.

ROSS, C.

Edward IV, London, 1974.

Richard III, London, 1981.

ROTH, F.

`Sources for a History of the English Austin Friars', reprinted from Augustiniana, Louvain, 1958-61.

ROWS, John

Historia Regum Angliae; ed. Thomas Hearne, Oxford, 1716.

RUPP, E. G.

Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition, Cambridge, 1949.

`The Battle of the Books: the Ferment of Ideas and the Beginning of the Reformation', in P. N. Brooks (ed.), Reformation Principle and Practice: Essays in Honour of A. G. Dickens (London, 1980), pp.3ff.

SCARISBRICK, J. J.

Henry VIII; 1968, repr. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1971.

SCHENK, W.

Reginald Pole: Cardinal of England, London, 1950.

SCHLAGER, P.

Beiträge zur Geschichte der kölnischen Franziskaner-Ordenzprovinz im Mittelalter, Cologne, 1905.

SCHOUTENS, S.

Geschiedenis van het Voormalig Minderbroedersklooster van Antwerpen (1446-1797), Antwerp, 1894.

SCHUSTER, L. A.

`Thomas More's Polemical Career, 1523-1533,' in More, Complete Works viii(iii), pp.1135ff (1981).

SCOFIELD, C. L.

The Life and Reign of King Edward the Fourth, 2 vols., London, 1923.

SHEEHAN, M. W.

`Franciscan Poverty in England, 1348-1538'; unpublished D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 1974.

SHORT TITLE CATALOGUE

A Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640, ed. A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave, London, 1926.

Ibid., 2nd edition, ed. W. A. Jackson, F. S. Ferguson and K. F. Panzer, vol.ii (I-Z), London, 1976.

SINCLAIR, M.

`Saint Thomas More's "Good Scottish Frere"', in Moreana vol.xiv (1977), pp.53-4.

SMEDT, O. de

De Engelse Natie te Antwerpen in de 16e Eeuw (1496-1582), 2 vols., Antwerp, 1950/4.

SMITH, P.

`Englishmen at Wittenberg in the Sixteenth Century', in EHR vol. xxxvi (1921), pp.422ff.

STAPLETON, Thomas

The Life and Illustrious Martyrdom of Sir Thomas More, trs. P. E. Hallet, London, 1928.

STOW, John

The Annales, or Generall Chronicle of England, ed. E. Howes, London, 1615.

THOMSON, J. A. F.

`Piety and Charity in Late Medieval London', in Journal of Ecclesiastical History vol.xvi (1965), pp.178ff.

THRUPP, S.

The Merchant Class of Medieval London, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1962.

VENERABILE, The

`The English College at Rome,' ed. the students of the English College of St. Thomas the Martyr, Rome, as The Venerabile vol.xxi, Exeter, 1962.

VENN, J. and J. A.

Alumni Cantabrigienses Part 1, 4 vols., Cambridge, 1922-7.

de VOCHT, H.

Acta Thomae Mori, Louvain, 1947.

WADDING, Luke

Annales Minorum; 2nd. edition, with additions by J. M. Fonseca, 19 vols., Rome, 1731ff, ed. in 25 vols. by the fathers of the College of St. Bonaventure, Quaracchi, 1931-4.

Scriptores Ordinis Minorum; ed. J. H. Sbaralea, Rome, 1806.

WHATMORE, L. E.

The Carthusians Under King Henry the Eighth (Analecta Cartusiana no.109), Salzburg, 1983.

WILLIAMS, C. H.

William Tyndale, London, 1969.

a WOOD, Anthony

Athenae Oxonienses; ed. Philip Bliss, 4 vols., London, 1813-20.

WRIOTHESLEY, Charles

A Chronicle of England During the Reigns of the Tudors; ed. W. O. Hamilton, 2 vols. (Camden Society new series vols.xi,xx), 1875.