

# The Scottish Historical Review

VOL. XI., No. 41

OCTOBER 1913

## Letters of the Papal Legate in Scotland, 1543

THE truce of Nice in 1538 closed the third war between Francis I. and Charles V. ; and Paul III., contemplating a Catholic league against Henry VIII., found it expedient to make David Beaton cardinal in order to secure the adhesion of Scotland. In the condition of German affairs, however, the Emperor feared to risk a conflict with England, and the failure of the league gave Henry an opportunity to deal with the King of Scots.

The past conduct of James V. lent some colour to the view that he might be induced to adopt his uncle's ecclesiastical policy. In 1531 he had approached Clement VII. with his plan for a College of Justice ; but the project, excellent in itself, was made the pretext for the sweeping demand that the churchmen should contribute £10,000 Scots annually to the crown. The Pope, in his anxiety to preserve the allegiance of Scotland, at first acquiesced : then the clergy, led by Archbishop James Beaton, entered a vehement protest : finally a compromise was reached by which the tax was restricted to a period of three years. James used the contributions of the reluctant churchmen to improve his palaces, and when he broached the subject of a new tax he did not find Paul III. so facile as Clement VII. had been. Prelates had feued church lands, had paid their contributions out of the considerations received, and had placed the responsibility for the business upon the Pope. Paul III. was disinclined to repeat the experiment, unless the money were to be spent on the defence of the church. It was politic enough to grant David Beaton the cardinal's hat ; but to make him legate *a latere*, as James vehemently desired,

would be to give the king's chief minister a dangerous power in relation to ecclesiastical property. It was not wonderful, therefore, that Henry VIII. hoped to find an apt pupil in his avaricious nephew, and suggested the bold course which he himself had followed. There was, at the least, a chance of creating strife between the king and the spiritual estate.

One factor in the situation, however, Henry left out of his account. James was perfectly conscious that he could not afford to alienate the churchmen, and that his financial schemes must not be too ambitious. The maladroit diplomacy of the English king in the end drove the unfortunate James to adopt the warlike attitude which it was the whole object of the ecclesiastical authorities to produce.

The situation, which was soon to end in the disaster of Solway Moss and the tragic death of the King of Scots, was in part created by the turn of European politics. Francis I. declared war upon Charles V. in 1542, and, while he would have preferred the active support of England, he was determined to procure, if possible, at least her neutrality. The Scots, on their part, looked with apprehension upon negotiations which might leave Henry VIII. free to mature his plans of conquest. Cardinal Beaton failed to obtain French aid in a Scottish war against England: he failed even to bring about an understanding between Francis and Henry which would secure his own country; and finally he was induced to believe that war was preferable to a peace which might be rudely broken when Henry saw his opportunity. James and his clergy would be united in a common cause: the Pope could not refuse to confirm ecclesiastical subsidies: the danger to an indispensable ally would force the hand of Francis: Protestant opinion might yield to the dictates of patriotism.

It was a significant fact that Paul III., aware of the hostilities with England, but ignorant of the king's death, granted James six-tenths of ecclesiastical fruits for two years, and appointed the Cardinal as collector. Francis, too, was angry with Henry, because he began to see that the English king intended to crush Scotland and then turn upon him. But his wrath was turned into consternation when he heard that Arran, as Governor, had thrown in his lot with the English faction, and that the Cardinal was a prisoner. Something must be done at once to restore the French party to power. To make matters worse, a fortnight after Beaton's arrest Henry entered into a treaty of alliance with the Emperor. In response to the French king's urgent appeal, Paul III. chose the

nephew of that Dominico Grimani who, as Cardinal of St. Mark, had been the protector of Scotland at the court of Rome in the first quarter of the century; and on March 25, 1543, he announced to the Scots that he was sending Marco Grimani, Patriarch of Aquileia, to collect the subsidy and dispense it for their defence and the liberation of Beaton. As a matter of fact the dexterous Cardinal was already in his own castle of St. Andrews, and all but free.

The tragedy of James V. was followed and relieved by comedy. Beaton, distrusting Arran, had tried to push him out of the governorship to which he was entitled. The Earl suspected that Guise was coming to control affairs; and there was Lennox, by birth the next claimant, in whom the Cardinal would find a willing ally. Consequently Arran decided to fortify himself by reinstating the Douglasses and receiving the lords captured at Solway Moss, who had cheerfully sworn to support Henry's schemes. The immediate result of the coalition was Beaton's arrest. Not that Arran had the least intention of presenting the dominion of Scotland to Henry VIII.: it was merely a race for power in which competitors were tempted to sail dangerously near the wind. But while Henry never quite succeeded in appreciating the manner in which the political game was played in Scotland, some of his servants were more experienced. Thus, while the Governor was writing to Lisle in an edifying strain and requesting a consignment of Bibles, Lisle had some men watching his correspondent's house for agents of the Cardinal. The arrest had been unpopular; and for Arran to deliver Beaton to Henry would have been to commit political suicide. The Parliament in March, which agreed to the project of an English marriage for the infant queen, left the Cardinal's case severely and significantly alone. Arran's conduct was determined by the danger from Lennox. Beaton could not be handed over to England: it might even be prudent to anticipate future combinations by conniving at his liberation.

The next stage was amazing enough. Beaton expressed readiness to serve Henry, and would agree to the projected marriage, always saving the independence of the realm. While the English solemnly discussed the phenomenon, obviously intended to postpone their warlike activities, Lennox appeared out of France, and the Cardinal's real policy was proved by an immediate coalition, while John Hamilton, Abbot of Paisley, set himself to remodel the views of his brother, the Governor. Henry's exorbitant demands served only to restore Beaton's influence, and the clergy, without

awaiting the Patriarch, voted a large subsidy for the defence of the church and the realm. Arran, who told Sadler that he would make short work with Grimani, and talked loudly of reformation, had just written to Paul III., committing Scotland to the protection of his Holiness. Yet the Governor was not seeking a reconciliation with the Cardinal, as he still deemed himself equal to the task of controlling the French faction. Beaton set about fortifying his castle: Lennox, who was in touch with him, saw to it that Dumbarton would not easily be taken, and dispatched a messenger to France for help.

Grimani meanwhile was in Paris. There he had an interview with an agent of Beaton, on the way to Rome, and an emissary of Lennox and the Queen Dowager. It was clear that the legate's presence in Scotland would be useless and even dangerous so long as Arran remained in power.

The Governor, according to the English agent Sadler, seemed now to 'wax cold' in his prosecution of Beaton and Lennox. He could not arrange any peace with Henry which would not endanger his own position, and if his rivals obtained assistance from France he might be in an exceedingly uncomfortable situation. Henry's purpose was to drive a hard bargain, or to profit by the civil war which would follow an agreement involving the abandonment of the French alliance. Yet, though Arran began to draw towards Beaton, he was not prepared for a *volte-face*. A treaty with Henry was arranged which included France, and postponed for years the sending of the little queen to England. Grasping the opportunity offered by even this modified agreement, Beaton summoned a council at St. Andrews, where the Governor was charged with misrule. The next step was to be the capture of Linlithgow and the seizure of the queen's person. Grimani, no doubt in response to an urgent message, rode post haste to Brest, but was disappointed to find that Henry and the Emperor had beset the channel so closely that he could not sail.

In Scotland the combatants faced one another but did not fight, Arran hoping that Beaton might become a party to the English treaty, Beaton waiting till Arran should be compelled to espouse the French cause. The Cardinal, who had to put off time in the expectation of French succour, succeeded in creating the pleasant impression that he would ratify the peace. Arran may or may not have been deceived. At all events he took no drastic action. Henry, on the other hand, was enraged; but in seizing certain Scottish ships he raised a storm of indignation and ruined the

prospects of his diplomacy. Before an English force could be even ordered the Governor had gone over to the Cardinal, and Mary was crowned at Stirling in the second week of September. Lennox, seeing his hopes crumble, left Stirling shortly after the coronation on the ground that his sister was ill. Fraternal affection was not, however, the only motive which determined his action.

Meanwhile Grimani seems to have lingered for two months at Brest. Though enjoying the dignity of legate he was in reality the tool of French policy, and his interest in the expedition perceptibly languished. More than a fortnight after the coronation at Stirling the ships at last set sail upon a voyage which the Patriarch describes with some gall. It was indeed irritating for a Venetian who in 1538 had been placed in charge of a fleet against the Turks to be carried at the arbitrary command of some unseamanlike French ambassadors; and he deserves all the credit which he claims for his patience. Fortunately for his self-respect the Frenchmen blundered in their own business of diplomacy, a point upon which Grimani did not fail to dwell.

James Stewart of Cardonald, who was sent to hasten the French succour and now returned with it, wrote to Beaton immediately on touching land that he had 'ane patriarche quhilk the pape has sent in Schotland, quhae sall do na thing bot as your lordship plessis command hyme.' But the Cardinal had not anticipated the arrival, or, more probably, could not venture into the west; and, as the voyagers could not be aware of the purpose which Lennox now conceived, that courteous and adroit nobleman took the opportunity to possess himself of the French money and lodge it safely in Dumbarton Castle. Angus, too, and certain of the 'English lords' were drawn to the scene with the intention of securing the adhesion of the serviceable Lennox and opening negotiations with Henry, after hearing the French envoys at Glasgow.

In his letter of October 15 Grimani gives an account of his adventurous journey to Stirling, where he found the Dowager and the Cardinal. Though Arran had joined Beaton, the English faction in the west was exceedingly strong, and the outlook was not promising. Writing from Stirling on October 24, the Patriarch thought that Scotland would go the way of England. The Queen and the Cardinal were financially exhausted, and, as regarded his own special function, the clergy were not receiving their fruits. While Beaton was using every expedient to increase

his following and secure support in the Parliament which was proclaimed for the first week in December, Grimani was lodged safely in St. Andrews, where, on November 27, he penned a depressing account of his position. His faculties had not been productive, as business had been done chiefly with Beaton's friends or poor persons, so that he was actually out of pocket to his scribe. It went without saying, of course, that in the condition of affairs the main object of his journey, the ecclesiastical tax, was out of the question. Accordingly he stated his intention of returning to France, and proposed to pass through England, preferring to trust Henry rather than the sea.

Leaving St. Andrews the Patriarch was in Edinburgh on November 30, in anticipation of the Parliament. When it met, he had an audience of the Scottish lords. A copy of the Latin speech which he had prepared for the occasion still exists. It was not, however, the somewhat heavy and occasionally inapposite eloquence of the legate so much as the diplomatic intrigues of the Cardinal that led to a decision for the French alliance.<sup>1</sup> The last of these letters from the Patriarch makes it clear that Beaton did not consider him of much importance, and yet treated him with every courtesy in order to secure for himself the coveted power *a latere*, which was the really vital point. Incidentally it appears that the French ambassadors, in their distrust of Arran, very nearly upset the concordat which the Cardinal had laboriously secured.

Shortly before Christmas Arran licensed a Scottish herald to procure from the English a safe-conduct for Grimani. His departure, however, was delayed. On February 29, 1543-4, he received an official letter of commendation to Paul III., in which praise was subordinated to an urgent request for legatine authority in Beaton's favour, a request which the Pope, now aware of the necessity, had already granted.

Henry was assailed by a fresh access of rage at the conduct of the Scots, and, while Hertford's invasion was soon to give his feelings a measure of relief, his hatred of Beaton was destined to become a permanent passion. Grimani obtained a safe-conduct, but in such terms that he preferred to hazard himself upon the water. It was perhaps intended, indeed, that he should go that way, since Paget wrote to Hertford on March 27, 'We have prepared as much as we can upon the sea to speak with my Lord

<sup>1</sup> The Patriarch in the speech mentions his relationship to the late Cardinal of St. Mark.

Patriarch.' The Venetian dispatched a letter of excuse to Henry, and tendered him some characteristically ponderous advice about making peace with France and reconciling the French King with the Emperor. 'Writing things so ill-grounded,' said the Imperial ambassador in England, 'only gives occasion to laugh at him.' As the Pope was urging the Venetians through Cardinal Grimani, Marco's brother, to join in defending Francis against Henry and Charles, the legate could hardly be secure on either element; but probably the main object of the English was to checkmate Beaton. They did succeed in intercepting the Cardinal's commission as legate, which they still retain.

Early in April the Patriarch took ship along with the Scottish ambassadors for the Continent, after writing an apology to the Dowager for the little he had been able to do for her. The voyagers escaped the English patrols and duly landed in France. It does not appear that Grimani thought fit to avail himself of a new passport granted on April 25, which permitted him under very precise restrictions to visit England by way of Calais. Some two months later we find him in Rome. Henry's agent at Venice reported to his master that Paul III. spoke openly of the cruel fashion in which the Scots had been treated, and turned to the Patriarch for his confirmation. Grimani 'spoke of those matters at length and much odiously.' The writer, with more obvious appreciation of Henry's character than of the real facts of the case, then proceeded to dwell upon the insolence of the Pope, who by sending the legate had been at the bottom of all the trouble. A few weeks later, probably at the beginning of August, the unfortunate Grimani, whose achievements were not in proportion to his labours, was dead.

There is one reference in these letters which, though it does not relate to the main purpose of Grimani's visit, involves a personality of some importance. 'The Reverend Master Robert, the Scottish Doctor,' can be none other than Robert Wauchope, often called 'the blind theologian' owing to his defective eyesight, one of the celebrated Scotsmen of his time. In July 1539 Cromer, Archbishop of Armagh, was suspended by the Pope from primatial jurisdiction as he had been compelled to submit to Henry VIII., and Wauchope was made administrator. The Scotsman strove, like his friend David Beaton, to identify the cause of national independence with the maintenance of the Roman Church. When the abbey of Dryburgh fell vacant Paul III. had justification in pressing Wauchope's claims against Thomas

Erskine, the nominee of James V. As a result Wauchope incurred the charge of 'impetration,' or soliciting benefices at Rome without royal license; and in December 1540, as 'parson of Pennycuik,' he was summoned before the Lords of Council to hear himself declared a rebel and an outlaw from Scotland. Paterson, who gives some account of the man in his *Family of Wauchope*, supposes him to have been the son of Archibald Wauchope of Niddrie-Merschell. He appears in fact to have been a son of that Gilbert Wauchope who died not long before Grimani's arrival.

[Authorities: *Henry VIII., Letters and Papers*, where other letters of the Patriarch are calendared; *State Papers (Venetian)*; *Diurnal of Occurrents*; *Correspondence of Mary of Guise* (MS. Register House); Raynaldus, *Annales Ecclesiastici*; Eubel, *Hierarchia Catholica*, vol. iii.; Brady, *Episcopal Succession*; *Oratio habita a R<sup>mo</sup> Patriarca Grimano legato apud Scotos*, copied by Dr. Maitland Thomson from Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele, Fondo Gesuitico 934, f. 155, and also extant in Arch. Secret. Vatic. xxxii, vol. 34, 'Bullae Diversae,' f. 151; *Archbishops of St. Andrews*, vols. iii. and iv.; *Rentale Sancti Andree* (Scot. Hist. Soc.).]

R. K. HANNAY.

#### INSTRUCTIONS

*Vat. MS. 7160 fol. 138. 6.*

April 1st (1543).

**F**IRST to travel with all speed to the Court of France and present to the Most Christian King his letter (breve) of introduction, and in virtue of these his credentials to set forth the cause for which our Lord, the Pope, sends him to Scotland, namely, to procure the liberation of the Most Reverend Cardinal of St. Andrews, if he be not already set free, and to help in maintaining and defending that kingdom in the Catholic faith and in its ancient liberty, etc., according to the wise suggestion and urgent solicitation of His Most Christian Majesty to the Pope. For which two purposes, seeing that His Holiness has conceded to him the six tenths, etc., as the King, in his lifetime had requested



him, so he will not fail in every other necessary assistance even to sending a certain force from the Apostolic See. In this is manifested the consideration in which the Holy Father holds that kingdom, the affection he bears to its Queen and to all the nobles and private persons appertaining thereto.

Item. To discuss with His Most Christian Majesty what seems to him the best way of reassuring and calming the minds of the nobles and of avoiding tumults and seditions, and, should His Majesty deem it expedient, to appoint, as soon as possible, a King to that realm, as has been suggested here to His Holiness. Enquiry should be made as to what His Majesty thinks good, and then every effort used to put his counsel into execution. Owing to his wisdom and his knowledge of that kingdom and the love he bears to it, he would not advise anything but what was useful and beneficial.

Item. To confer with His Majesty as to the time and manner of crossing over to Scotland in safety, without incurring danger from the English, and should this journey not seem to His Majesty either safe or necessary, you must not go further, but must remain in France, advising His Holiness of everything that takes place and await his reply; if, on the other hand, His Majesty encourages you to go forward and points out a safe course, you must, without further advice from here, continue your journey to Scotland, taking care to travel prudently both for your own sake and for that of your suite, and also with due regard to the dignity of the Apostolic See. But in any case, whether you decide to go or not to go, you must deliver up the letters that you carry for the French Court, and visit the Queen, Madame Marguerite, Madame d'Estampes, and the other lords and ladies of the Court, as you in your wisdom may judge proper, not forgetting the Cardinals of Tornon and Ferrara, and the Cardinal of Lorraine and Monsignor de Guise.

On your arrival in Scotland you must go directly to visit the Queen and those persons who are at the head of affairs in the kingdom, and blessing them in the name of His Holiness, give to each one his letter (breve) explaining the reason of your coming, as has been said above. And should the Cardinal of St. Andrews be already set at liberty, as is to be desired and hoped for, you must visit him, give him his letter, and inform him fully of your mission, and do nothing whatever without his advice and opinion, for he is experienced, very skilful, and of a good understanding. That which you resolve upon with him for the benefit of the

realm, His Holiness will consider decided. And should he be not yet set free—which God forbid—you must with the Queen and the other great personages of the land, forward his liberation by every effort in your power, His Holiness having nothing more at heart than this.

Item. To tell them of the authority you have to make the clergy of the realm pay the six tithes, according as the King, of glorious memory, had requested of His Holiness, and persuading the clergy to pay willingly, you must arrange, with the advice of the Queen and the lords deputed to the government of the country, that there should be appointed one or more treasurers of the tithes, persons of good standing and honest reputation, into whose hands the money must come and be afterwards spent as shall seem good to the Queen and to those who have charge of the kingdom. Your own dwelling-place shall be at Court, or wherever shall seem best and most expedient to you and to the above-named lords and to the Cardinal, if he be free.

The formalities must be carried out gravely and courteously, and without the least ostentation.

The powers with which you are invested must be employed in the service of the Lord our God, and for the edification and advantage of that kingdom, and in this you must exercise great care as regards your ministers, after the example of the Very Reverend the Cardinal Pole and of others who in past years have had embassies in those parts, etc.

Letters must be directed to the French Nuncio, to whom orders are given that he take means to forward them safely and quickly.

Should an opportunity arise of opening up favourable intercourse with England, it is left to your discretion to do so, with this warning however not to undertake anything that could be prejudicial to or that could bring disgrace upon the Christian Republic and the Apostolic See.

The duration of your stay in that country shall be long or short according to circumstances, and, if time will permit, you must inform His Holiness of your opinion and await the reply; and, if for any reason this is not possible, you must act on your own responsibility in this matter as well as in those spoken of above. Should it seem to you right to modify these instructions you are authorized to do so, especially if acting with the advice of the Cardinal of St. Andrews, if he be free, etc.

And should the state of affairs be such that His Most Christian

Majesty and those who govern the kingdom of Scotland desire to have assistance for the purpose of molesting England, there are in the latter country certain personages belonging to Scotland who, for the service of God, for the welfare of those islands and for the advantage to the Scots will expose their persons to every danger, and perhaps not without great results; which fact, according to the circumstances and the state of feeling you may find, you may notify first to His Most Christian Majesty, and afterwards in Scotland, or refrain from doing so, as shall seem to you best, etc.

Contemporary copy.

LETTER I.

Very Reverend and Illustrious, my Most Honoured Lord,

I have written many times to your Lordship since my arrival in France, the first letter was by a Venetian courier, the second by the Count of Mirandola, in which I gave an account of the audience I had with the King. I have since written several times by way of Lyons to relate what happened from day to day, and I think that all the letters must have reached their destination. I wrote recently on the eighteenth to report the news from Scotland, and now little is left for me to add, except that the King has letters from the Queen of Scotland, saying that the affairs of that kingdom are going on well, that she rules and is obeyed as Queen, and that she is sending one of her gentlemen to France to give to His Most Christian Majesty minute particulars of all that takes place in Scotland. The Cardinal of Tornon and the Cardinal of Ferrara have informed me, through my secretary, of all that I have recounted above. They say also that so soon as this Scottish gentleman arrives, the Most Christian King will decide about my movements, and that he will desire me to cross over to Scotland. I shall not fail to obey His Majesty, having been so commanded by His Holiness, and all the more willingly should I go could I feel sure of being able to serve the Holy Father as I desire, if only in allowing myself to be seen on occasions of ceremony and in granting favours and dispensations—to which I am wholly averse—but I shall go forward in any case with a good heart.

Monsignor Dandino arrived here on the 22nd, well and in good spirits. The day before, while with the Cardinal of Tornon, I heard that he was expected from hour to hour, Monsr. of Rhodes having written to the Cardinal to this effect. I have seen

him, and with the very greatest pleasure. And although he has not brought me letters, I feel happy to hear the good news he has given me of the health of His Holiness and of your Eminence.

The King came here for the festival of Corpus Christi ; he left this evening to sleep at Honè, three leagues hence ; it is said that he goes on to Villa Cottrè, but his further movements are not spoken of. I, for my part, believe that he will stay in this neighbourhood in order to see what the Emperor means to do, because if the King were to pass into Germany he thinks perhaps that it might give trouble on account of Flanders. These two princes seem to think of nothing else than of giving offence to each other without considering the action of the Turk or securing themselves against so powerful an enemy. If they will not move from this their attitude, they will repent too late, when there is no remedy. If I had had an opportunity, I should have unfolded my mind to His Majesty, but when I start for Scotland, if not before, I will say to him all that occurs to me, although I know my words will not bear much fruit. I know that the Holy Father will never be weary of continuing the friendly offices he has always exercised, and perhaps both the sovereigns reflecting upon the paternal exhortations of His Holiness, the ruin of Christendom, the distress of the nations and the common aspiration, may listen to the counsels of His Holiness, whom God preserve for many years for the sake of the public weal.

As regards news, I will leave that in the care of Monsr. Dandino. In conclusion, I humbly commend myself to the kind favour of your Eminence.

Your most humble servant,

MARCO GRIMANI, Patriarch.

From Paris on May 25th, 1543.

*Addressed—*

To the Most Reverend, Illustrious and Honourable, the LORD  
CARDINAL FARNESE.

*State Archives in Naples, Farnesian Correspondence, Bundle 709.*

## LETTER II.

Very Reverend and Illustrious, my Most Honoured Lord,

In my last letters, dated the 25th of July, I wrote that I was to start from Paris, and from these your Eminence will know of my arrival here to-day at Brest. I have journeyed with the greatest possible speed, expecting to find the ships here; they, however, have not appeared, and have not even been heard of, and it seems that everyone believes they are in no haste to come, perhaps dreading the Spanish, Flemish and English, who have a great number of armed vessels in these parts, and moreover do some damage. The other day they landed at Belle Ile, a little island near Vannes, and set fire to a good part of it. This island, as far as I understand, is feudatory to His Holiness and the Apostolic See, as are many others under the dominion of the King of England. These shores of Brittany, I hear, are well guarded and furnished with plenty of soldiers, so much so that they do not fear a sudden attack, but, should need arise, they would defend themselves valiantly, especially as Monsignor d'Estampes, governor-general of this province, is at no great distance with a large number of troops at command, to lend assistance if required. But returning to our chief point, I may add that I will await here the arrival of the ships, and so soon as they are come, no time will be lost, but with the first favourable wind we shall set sail for Scotland, and may it please God to conduct us thither in safety!

Nothing else remains to be said except to request your Eminence to be pleased to order the payment to Bandini of the 600 scudi which I had from M. Roberto di Rossi, and to Monsignor of Rhodes the last 1600 which I received by order of the Cardinal of Tornon, without which I could not have left Paris, and not having more to add I humbly subscribe myself,

Your most humble servant,

MARCO GRIMANI, Patriarch.

From Brest on the 12th of August, 1543.

*Addressed—*

To the Most Reverend, Illustrious and Honourable, the LORD  
CARDINAL FARNESE.

*State Archives in Naples, Farnesian Correspondence, Bundle 709.*

## LETTER III.

Very Reverend and Illustrious, my Most Honoured Lord,

We departed from Brest on the 27th of September, and on that same day I wrote to your Eminence of all that happened to me. The following morning I wrote briefly from Crodon, that by the help of God we had set sail for Scotland in the service of His Most Christian Majesty. I shall now relate what followed. We sailed with a very good wind for three successive days, so that we proceeded well upon our journey and already we had left England and a good part of Ireland behind. In obedience to the King we started, resolved to leave all the islands on our right and keep well out to sea, sailing to windward, in order to avoid danger from the English fleet. But the wind having changed we were obliged to run nearer to the Irish coast, and on the fifth day we came in sight of the island. We found ourselves about fifty leagues more to leeward than we had intended; and being in a place where it did not seem possible for the ships to double the Irish headland on account of the wind, which every hour increased and became more and more contrary to us, and fearing to be seen by the Irish and English fishermen, for we were not far distant from either of the islands, in a place called St. George's Channel, finding ourselves in such straits, it was determined to pass between England and Ireland, because the wind, which was contrary to us for the navigation of the ship outside, happened to be most favourable for the passage within, and so it was done. And by the grace of God this choice made by necessity turned out to be good, for on the night of St. Francis' feast, about midnight, we entered a port in Scotland, two leagues from Dumbarton. This caused me infinite joy, for many reasons which I will not enlarge upon now, so as not to tire you, reserving them rather for a personal interview when, with the help of God, I shall have returned. On the 5th, then, I disembarked, and came here to Dumbarton, where I am adapting myself to the customs of the country. Before I left the ship I wrote to the Queen, the Cardinal, the Regent, and the Earl of Lennox, and sent the letters expressly by a Scot, my servant. These letters contained only the news of my arrival here in their service, and a request for their commands in regard to my future duties, all which I would fulfil. The King's ambassadors also sent letters by means of my servant

to the same effect. The replies will not be long delayed, and I shall act according to their tenor, and will inform your Eminence of the result.

The Queen, who is at Stirling, had instant notice of the arrival of the ships here, but not having other particulars, she sent one of her messengers to obtain full information. Having afterwards received my letter, she replied to me, and has this morning sent two of her gentlemen to express her pleasure at my arrival and her desire to see me. And on the return of the said gentlemen to the Queen, I asked them to make known to her, both by word of mouth and by my letters, that I shall always serve her readily, this being the will of our Lord the Pope and of His Most Christian Majesty, and in whatever way I can exert myself for the preservation of this poor realm, I shall not fail to do so with all my heart. I use the word poor, because the kingdom is so divided and in such confusion that if God does not stretch forth His hand, and inspire these lords to unite together, manifest ruin, both public and private, lies before it. I have heard different accounts of the troubles of this country, but I think it better to abstain from writing any details until I have spoken with the Queen, the Cardinal, and the Regent, that I may be able to give some accurate description.

The Earl of Lennox came here two days ago: he has had a long interview with the ambassadors and with me, and from what he said, he would seem to wish to live and die in the service of the Most Christian King. He also declared that he has drawn over to the cause of His Most Christian Majesty some of these Scottish nobles who, left to themselves, were inclined to favour the King of England, and that they all agree in wishing to remove the government from the Regent, and that to-morrow he will depart for Lilburg<sup>1</sup> (Edinburgh), where, he says, the greater part of the Scottish lords are assembled, for the purpose of renewing the alliance and confederation between His Most Christian Majesty and this kingdom. I did not fail, such being the obligation laid upon me in the name of our Lord the Pope, to influence the Earl in favour of universal peace, pointing out to him how great would be the benefit resulting therefrom to this realm, and that I did not see much difficulty in the matter, provided he desired it, and especially after what he himself had said to me earlier, that the

<sup>1</sup> 'In the sixteenth century, or more precisely in the latter half of that century, Lislebourg was a French name for Edinburgh.'—T. G. Law in *Scottish Historical Review*, i. p. 19.

Governor is on good terms with the Queen and the Cardinal, and that, to say nothing of the peace conducing to the honour and advantage of His Most Christian Majesty, the Earl himself would establish in his own house the honourable rank that God had given him, and could enjoy it without disturbance—and other words to the same effect. The Earl, who is handsome and pleasing in aspect, has also impressed me as being gracious in disposition, for he replied that as for himself, he will not fail to do all in his power to live in peace. May God inspire his heart so to do! As for the rest, I will supplement this by other letters, if the ship which is ready to depart for Brittany be delayed.

To your Most Reverend Lordship I constantly commend myself.  
Given at Dumbarton on the 9th of Oct. 1543.

Since the above was written I have learned that these lords, the ambassadors, have placed the money in Dumbarton Castle under the control of the Earl of Lennox, and this against the command and commission of the Queen. May God grant the issues to be good, for it is understood that the Earl is not in harmony with the Queen or Cardinal, still less so with the Governor; to me this seems too hasty a decision. All will turn out favourably here if only it result in the advantage and honour of His Most Christian Majesty. In whose service I will always labour heartily, especially as in this I further the supreme desire of His Holiness.

Your most humble servant,

MARCO GRIMANI, Patriarch Legate.

*On the back—*  
To the Most Reverend, Illustrious and Honourable, the LORD  
CARDINAL FARNESE.

*State Archives of Naples, Farnesian Papers, Bundle 709.  
Duplicate.*



## LETTER IV.

Very Reverend and Illustrious, my Most Honoured Lord.

I wrote to your Eminence from Dumbarton on the 9th of all that took place from the time of my departure from Brittany until my arrival in Scotland, and though the letters may have miscarried, you will be able to understand the whole situation by means of the duplicate copy here annexed, for at that time I was so placed that for many reasons it appeared to me imprudent to write fully, therefore fearing lest the letters might be intercepted I passed lightly over details. But now that I am at Stirling with the Queen and the Cardinal, I desire to write freely and fully so that your Eminence may know what is going on here. Our Lord the Pope despatched me from Bologna, as your Eminence knows, with the express commission that I should make haste to proceed to the Most Christian King in France, and to fulfil all the commands of His Majesty regarding Scottish affairs, and this I did. And finally, as I was about to leave France, I had an audience with His Most Christian Majesty in order to receive his commands concerning all I had to do in his service. I learned from him that he had given orders to his ambassadors that they should communicate to me all that happened daily, and that they should not do anything without my knowledge, advice, and express desire. With this I departed from France, and although on board ship the ambassadors always took upon themselves to govern and to decide in their own fashion as to the navigation of the ship, and although I knew my safety was concerned, they not having had any experience of the sea, still I bore it all patiently. But having at length arrived here in Scotland, they ought not to have left the ship nor removed the money until they had first heard from the Queen and the Cardinal, and though they knew very well the present state of affairs in this kingdom, nevertheless it seemed good to them to land and to take the money with them to Dumbarton. To this place the Earl of Lennox afterwards came, and secretly intriguing with the ambassadors, he easily persuaded them to place the money in the fortress. I was informed of this proceeding by others, and although it appeared to me too hasty a resolution in a matter of such importance, still being ignorant of the commands they might have received from the Most Christian King, I let it pass. But I afterwards learned from one of the Queen's gentlemen, whom she sent expressly to

inform the ambassadors and me, that the Earl of Lennox was not on friendly terms with her nor with the Cardinal, and that he did not act straightforwardly, seeing that he was conducting an intrigue for the purpose of taking in marriage a daughter of the Earl of Angus, brother-in-law of the King of England; that he was in communication with all those who supported the English cause, and that therefore the ambassadors ought not to give up the money to him or to any other; so it seemed to me right to open up the matter with Monsignor dell' Abroza, one of the ambassadors, and persuade him to pause and give more mature consideration before making this decision. And not satisfied with this, I desired also that the treasurer himself and a Captain, Michele by name (who has been sent here by the Most Christian King to take back to France the ships in which we had crossed over), they also being displeased with such a resolution, should undertake this same duty of remonstrating with the ambassadors. The ambassadors, however, notwithstanding all these memorials and commands from the Queen, have deposited the money in Dumbarton Castle, under the charge of the above-named Earl, and have been satisfied with a quittance and receipt from him. What will now follow, God knows, but it is the general opinion that these ambassadors will not easily recover this money. Both the Queen and the Cardinal think evil will come of it, and they have declared to me, with great agitation, that they heartily wish the said money had been sunk in the sea, rather than what has been recounted above should have happened.

The money being placed in the fortress of Dumbarton, as I have said, I parted from the ambassadors on the 11th, and went to Glasgow, waiting till the Earl of Lennox should come with the Earl of Argyle to the said place for some good purpose, as he had promised. And while waiting in this expectation I was told that the Earl of Angus, before named, with many other lords, was to arrive in Glasgow, and already some of his followers were beginning to appear, when on the 13th a gentleman was sent to me from the Queen, and a little later another from the Cardinal, with letters of introduction. These gentlemen gave me to understand that the aforesaid Earl of Angus, and those other nobles who were to arrive on the following morning, were all of the English party, and therefore they begged and commanded me to depart from Glasgow as quickly and secretly as possible, and to go to Stirling, otherwise I should be taken prisoner by these lords and sent to England, from whose borders we were not far distant. Your

Eminence can imagine my state of mind; not losing courage, however, I allowed myself to be guided by the said gentlemen, and on the following morning, three hours before daylight, disguised and with one servant only, I set out for Stirling, where, by the grace of God, I arrived in safety; and although the Queen and the Cardinal had been informed that I came disguised and without a following, nevertheless they desired to see me on the very same evening. Early<sup>1</sup> in the evening, then, I betook myself to the castle of Stirling, where were the Queen and the Cardinal with a numerous guard. On being presented to Her Majesty I kissed her hand and paid my respects in the name of our Lord the Pope, and, in order not to revive her sorrow and distress, I briefly offered condolences on the part of His Holiness on account of the death of the King, her husband, of happy memory. Then I assured her of the good-will which the Holy Father bears her, and that for her preservation and that of the whole kingdom he was ever ready to lend her assistance, that he had sent me here on purpose to serve her in every way that was possible, and that I had willingly undertaken this mission in order to do her service, with other words suitable to the occasion. The Queen welcomed me graciously, was pleased to see me, and lamented that I should have come in these troublous times, because she could not extend to me the warm reception that she would have desired in honour of His Holiness; being situated as she was in that castle, with the infant queen, her daughter, and the Cardinal, the kingdom not only divided between her and some of the nobles, but also divided on account of the Lutherans, whose errors had become disseminated throughout almost the whole country since the death of the King, her husband, and the confinement of the Most Reverend Cardinal. In addition to all this, she declared that the King of England, by means of some Scottish nobles, did not cease to harass her more than her strength could bear. And that, had it not been for the Cardinal, who liberated her a few months before, she and her daughter would ere now have been in the hands of the King of England, with the certain loss of the kingdom. Being reduced to such extremities she knew no other course to take in regard to her affairs than to commend herself to God, to His Holiness the Pope, and to the Most Christian King. I strove to console her the best way I could, exhorting her to

<sup>1</sup> 'At one hour of the night' literally. In Italy the night begins at the hour when the Ave Maria is rung, *i.e.* a variable hour according to season (from 5 p.m. in winter to 8 p.m. in summer).

bear this adversity with good courage, because God by this means ordained that her virtue and prudence should be manifested, and I reminded her that she ought to hope that the affairs of this realm shall, by the help of God, have a more favourable issue than events seem to portend. Nor was it very difficult to reassure her, as she is intelligent and of a cheerful disposition, and it seemed that she felt calmed, looking upon my coming here in the name of His Holiness as of good augury. Our conversation lasted for more than an hour, I then took leave of Her Majesty, and the Cardinal taking me by the hand led me into another room, where I repeated to His Eminence all that I had said to the Queen, stating that our Lord the Pope had sent me here to promote the welfare of the realm, especially with a view to the liberation of his person, amplifying the discourse in general terms, according as it seemed to me suitable. The Cardinal, after having expressed his gratitude to the Holy Father, briefly recounted to me his labours and anxieties, as well as all that he had suffered in the past and all that he feared in the future, on account of the dissensions that were fostered among the Scottish nobles; he complained to me of his many adversities and of the enormous expense he had been called upon to bear, affirming that since the death of the King he found that he had spent 30,000 *scudi*,<sup>1</sup> besides all his own income, and that he would pay 20,000 more to find himself with me in France. He warned me not to trust the people here, neither in small matters nor in great, and said that he himself knew not against whom to guard. Finally, as the hour was late, I left His Eminence with orders to return and to present the letters (*brevi*) in public so soon as my retinue had arrived. All that follows I will narrate in a future letter.

To your Most Reverend Lordship I commend myself.

Your most humble servant,

M., Patriarch of Aquilea.

From Stirling on the 15th of October, 1543.

*On the back—*

To the Most Reverend, Illustrious and Honourable, the LORD  
CARDINAL FARNESE.

*State Archives in Naples, Farnesian Papers, Bundle 709.*

<sup>1</sup> *Scudo* is equal to  $5\frac{3}{8}$  lire, or about four shillings and sixpence in modern money.

## LETTER V.

Very Reverend and Illustrious, my Most Honoured Lord,

As I wrote to your Eminence on the 27th, I left St. Andrews, having been made much of and honoured by all from the first day to the last. And the Bishop of Whithorn and another brother of the Reverend Cardinal, who have kept me company all along, still desired to escort me after I set out from Stirling, both for the sake of doing me honour and of ensuring my safety, and all by order of the Cardinal, who certainly never fails to treat me in the kindest possible way.

On my arrival here in Edinburgh, I learned that on Monday last an immense number of New Testaments and books calculated to promote heresy were burned in the public square, and the men of Leith (either from fear lest something should happen, similar to what befell the inhabitants of Dundee, or perhaps through Divine inspiration) have indeed made great changes, so that it is to be hoped that they may be led into the right path. And as I passed yesterday by the said town of Leith I was very well received—a month ago this probably would not have been the case. May it please God to enlighten their minds and to confirm them more and more in all good!

The Queen has written to me to-day to tell me that she will be here on Sunday without fail with the Governor and the Cardinal, and she has sent me the enclosed, addressed to His Holiness, begging me to put it into my packet and thus immensely oblige her. The fact that she does not write to me of anything else makes me think that the messenger she now sends to France shall no longer have to proceed to Rome, as she informed me was her wish.

If this vessel, which is now ready to cross over to France, should be delayed, I will relate all that takes place in the meeting and despatch the letters as I now do by express messenger to Dundee, where the ship is lying. And to your Most Reverend Lordship I humbly commend myself.

Your most humble servant,

M., Patriarch Legate.

From Edinburgh on the last day of November, 1543.

*State Archives in Naples, Farnesian Correspondence, Bundle 709.*

## LETTER VI.

Very Reverend and Illustrious, my Most Honoured Lord,

The weather has been so threatening for many days that it has not been possible for the ship (by which my servant and the messenger from the Queen and the Cardinal are to cross over to France) to leave the port, and for this reason it has seemed good to me to write to your Eminence of what has taken place since my last letters of the 27th and 30th November.

The Queen, the Governor, and the Cardinal, all together, and then each one separately, have besought me again to beg in their name our Lord the Pope to come to their aid, as their trust in His Holiness leads them to expect, so that they may be enabled to preserve this kingdom in its allegiance to the Apostolic See. I told them that I had already executed this mission, and that I would not fail to repeat it again, and so in order not to come short I beg your Most Reverend Lordship to be sure to use your strongest influence with His Holiness, for truly their need is great.

The Cardinal has communicated to me one of his desires, appearing to be moved therein rather for the service of our Lord the Pope and the Apostolic See and for the welfare of the kingdom than for his private advantage; and this desire is that His Holiness would graciously bestow upon him the legation to this realm, which office he would fulfil as faithfully and with as much regard to the honour and satisfaction of the Holy Father and of the kingdom as any other devoted servant and follower of His Holiness could do—for such is the reputation of the Cardinal—and he urgently requested me to write to your Eminence on the subject. The Governor also has spoken of the matter to me, evincing his desire that the Holy Father should grant this honour to the Cardinal for the sake of maintaining this kingdom more securely in its devotion to the Apostolic See. Your Eminence knows something of the merits of the Cardinal, and I pray you to use such influence with the Holy Father as you in your wisdom may think proper.

I have not failed on every forthcoming opportunity to serve the Most Christian King, and besides those offices which I have performed in private, I also made public demonstration of my duty yesterday in the audience I had with this Parliament or meeting where were assembled many prelates and other lords with

the Governor and Cardinal. I spoke frankly, exhorting them to peace and harmony among themselves, and to the confirmation of the alliance with France. Not fully satisfied with this, however, knowing that all could not thoroughly understand me, I presented two documents, alike in substance, but the one written in Latin, the other in the Scottish language, in which I amply made known my good feeling towards this country, as your Eminence will see by means of the copy here enclosed. The Scottish version was read aloud, so that all could understand, and I believe that everyone was well pleased with it, and to-day some of these nobles came to my house to thank me for the gracious counsels and words of friendship that I offered to them yesterday in speech and by letter.

As regards the alliance with France, I hope that all will turn out favourably, because these nobles really seem to be fairly well disposed, thus may it please God to bring about peace among them! And may God pardon the French ambassadors who have endeavoured to disturb it and continue to do so to the extent of their power, taking every pains to create discord between the Queen, the Cardinal, and the Regent! In order the better to understand me your Eminence must know that the ambassadors have counselled the Queen to use every effort to secure the government to herself alone, and to seek to dismiss the Regent, promising, should the attempt be successful, to give assistance and protection in the name of their King. Naturally everyone has the desire to rule, and it appears that the Queen has given ear to the words of the ambassadors, who afterwards conferred with the Cardinal and exhorted him also to abandon the Regent and to give all his support to the Queen. The Cardinal, in reply, explained to them that this kingdom, on the death of its King, has always been ruled by a Regent, and to make a new law now would be too serious a matter, especially in these so pernicious times, and that disorders might ensue such as would lead to the ruin of the country. The ambassadors transmitted the reply of the Cardinal to the Queen, representing it in such a manner that the Queen complained to His Eminence, who, not a little roused by their action, went so far as to desire that the ambassadors should repeat in his presence and in that of the Queen all that had passed between them. But Her Majesty did not consent, not wishing to add fuel to the fire. The Cardinal has related to me the above account, complaining bitterly of the ambassadors, and I believe that this may be one of his reasons for now sending

his agent to France. I think the ambassadors entered into this intrigue for the sake of exalting the Earl of Lennox, but I, for my part, believe that their design will not be successful, and God grant that these negotiations may bring about a good result!

Yesterday at the meeting of Parliament I asked leave to depart, and I believe that all with the exception of three personages greatly regret my departure, and truly they appear to be sorry, nevertheless I shall avail myself of the first opportunity that occurs for my journey to France, and I shall endeavour to travel by that route that God will open up to me, reserving to the very last, as desperate, the way through England. I well know what must be the danger in putting out to sea at this season or in passing through England, yet I esteem my departure less of an evil than that of remaining here. Your Eminence can imagine to what straits I am reduced! When, by the help of God, I shall have returned to you, I will tell you everything; this for obvious reasons is not possible now.

The other evening there came to me the brothers and many relatives of the Rev. Master Robert, the Scottish Doctor. They had received letters from him directing them to place themselves at my disposal for any service or favour, and truly I ought to be extremely obliged for this his great friendliness. In conversation with them I learned that hardly a year had passed since the death of the father of this Master Robert, and that before his death he had seen a hundred descendants, his own and those of his children. For this alone, in my opinion, he has been most happy, and especially as this family is really honourable, and has been provided, according to the manners of the country, with ample means. I have never before heard in our times of such a family, and since it is a rare example I wished to record it to your Eminence, I know full well that if there were found in one of our Italian cities such a family as this, making so powerful a group, it would be regarded with suspicion.

Having nothing further to communicate to your Eminence I humbly commend myself.

As to the matters discussed in the meeting, no decision has been arrived at up to this date; many of these lords have not appeared. In every way in which it is possible I will most heartily exert myself to bring about peace among them.

Since writing the above, the Governor has sent me, by his secretary, some letters directed to His Holiness and to your Most Reverend Lordship, together with a memorial praying me



also to write with them to your Eminence ; I send the memorial itself so that you may see everything, and to your kind favour I recommend myself.

Your most humble servant,

M., Patriarch Legate.

From Edinburgh on the 11th of November,<sup>1</sup> 1543.

*On the back—*

To the Most Reverend, Illustrious and Honourable, the LORD  
CARDINAL FARNESE.

*State Archives in Naples, Farnesian Papers, Bundle 709.*

*The Editor of the Scottish Historical Review was indebted to the Rev. Father Pollen, S.J., for the letters which are printed above, and he has also to thank him for the following note. The translation of the letters, which were in Italian, is by Miss Louisa S. MacLehose.*

The *Carte Farnesiane* in the Archivio di Stato in Naples came there (if I mistake not) in consequence of the 'War of Succession,' about 1736 ; when the Duchy of Parma, the seat of the Farnese family, was ceded to Austria ; and the representative of that family (who was afterwards Charles III. of Spain) succeeded to the throne of Naples. The papers were packed in sacks, or tied up in large fascios, and slung over the backs of mules. Thus carried across Italy they were deposited in their new home, and in these same huge bundles they still remain, perhaps the largest unsorted archive in Europe, which is also of European interest.

But these Grimani papers were not originally sent (as their addresses show) to Parma, but to Rome, at a time when a Farnese

<sup>1</sup> The correct date of this letter is the 11th of *December*, as is shown by the first paragraph, and the fact that Grimani had audience of the Council on the 10th of December (*Henry VIII., Letters, etc.*, xviii. 2, 482).

pope, Paul III., sat on the throne, and had, as his Cardinal Secretary of State, a young nephew, Alexander Farnese, who lived to be Dean of the Sacred College. His correspondence (as was usual in those unofficial days) became deposited partly at the Vatican, partly at the Palazzo Farnese, and this latter portion was after his death, or after that of his nephew, Cardinal Edward Farnese, taken to Parma, whence, as we have seen, it was carried later to Naples. But such summary transportations are seldom very carefully done, and in this case a great deal of correspondence remains at Parma, where it is now in very good order.

This will suffice to show how the Grimani papers, now published, came to Naples, and have long lain there unknown. My bad memory unfortunately prevents my recollecting how attention was first attracted to them. I had a casual look at fascio No. 709, when I was at Naples in 1890, but did not note these documents, though I did others relating to Scotland. Probably some friend told me or Mr. Andrew Lang about them, and I got them copied for him, as he was then at work on that period of his *History of Scotland*, or thought they might have served him for some other publication, and I added a couple of papers from the Vatican Archives. I do not think that either he or I adverted to the publication then in progress of the other Grimani dispatches in the great series of *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII.*, and this may perhaps account for his not having seen his way to reconstruct from them the history of the legation, as Mr. Hannay has now so skilfully done.

It will be seen that while the Vatican collection has only two letters from Scotland, the *Carte Farnesiane* have yielded four, and they of greater importance. Even so, as we look to the references given in the correspondence to letters sent previously, we notice that many are still not forthcoming. One of the R.O. papers is an original, evidently intercepted by Henry's spies.

J. H. POLLEN, S.J.

## The Last Days, Death, and Funeral of Patrick, First Earl of Marchmont, Ex-Chancellor of Scotland

ON an August day in 1724, in his house at Berwick-on-Tweed, Sir Patrick Hume, Earl of Marchmont and Ex-Lord Chancellor of Scotland, lay a-dying. In these last hours of his life he could look back on a strenuous, and on the whole a successful, if not a brilliant career. The son of another Sir Patrick of Polwarth, he had been carefully brought up by his mother, a daughter of Sir Alexander Hamilton of Innerwick, and she had early imbued him with that attachment to Presbyterian principles which formed a distinguished feature in his life. Born in 1641, he was Member of Parliament for Berwickshire by the time he was twenty-four. A steadfast opponent of Lauderdale and his schemes, he found himself, before he had been ten years in Parliament, declared to be 'a factious person, having done what may usher in confusion and therefore incapable of all public trust.' For refusing to pay contributions for the purpose of placing garrisons in the private houses of his county he was committed to prison, and was confined in the Castles of Edinburgh, Dumbarton, and Stirling for seven months. Released in 1676 he contemplated emigration to Carolina; falling under the suspicion, however, of being concerned in the Rye House Plot, he was obliged to seek concealment from his enemies.

His adventures at this period of his life form a well-known story in Scottish History. How he lay hidden among the tombs of his ancestors in the vault of Polwarth Church, where he was surreptitiously fed by the hands of his daughter Grisel, is a romantic episode which has been told by many pens. After enduring further discomfort by living in an excavation below the floor of his own house, he at last succeeded in escaping to London and thence to Holland, where his family joined him. After living some time at Utrecht he took part, in 1685, in the ill-fated

expedition of the Earl of Argyll in Scotland, which was intended to assist the rising in the South on behalf of the Duke of Monmouth. If we are to believe Macaulay, who, however, shows persistent animus against Sir Patrick, the failure of the attempt was largely due to Hume's dogmatic and wrong-headed advice.

He again succeeded in escaping to Utrecht, though he himself was forfeited and his estates confiscated. But at the Revolution his troubles in this respect were over. He and his eldest son accompanied the Prince of Orange to England. His forfeiture was rescinded, his estates restored, and he was admitted a member of the Privy Council. In 1690 he was raised to the peerage under the title of Lord Polwarth, and received from the King a yearly pension of £400. There is a very characteristic letter from him to his wife, published by the Historical MSS. Commissioners in their report on the Marchmont papers. He was always, like most Scottish lairds, miserably hard up for money, and notwithstanding his pension of £400 a year it required much consideration as to how he was to keep up the dignity of his position on the income he had.

One suggestion he makes to his wife is that they should endeavour to arrange a good match for their eldest son, who seems to have been a young man of excellent disposition, whose early death was one of the greatest trials his father had to endure. Lord Polwarth's desires soared high, and his suggestions as to the sort of wife he would desire for his soldier son did not err on the side of modesty: he says 'you know matches of great means are not to be got [in Scotland] and if I can get here [London] a person of honourable birth, of sober breeding, of our own principle of religion, handsome and lovely, such as a young man may like for a bed-fellow, with £10,000 or £8,000 sterling pension, we need the less care for what disappointment the change of Court humour can give us, and to speak as it is, such a match cannot miss to strengthen our Court interest and make what we expect that way the more secure.'

As a matter of fact, young Lord Polwarth, as he afterwards became on his father's accession to a higher title, did not marry an English heiress, but a pretty and delicate Irish girl, a distant connection of his own. In four years she died of consumption, and though he married again 'Bonnie Jean of the Hirsell,' a daughter of the Earl of Home, he himself died a victim to the same fell disease in 1709.

But to return to Lord Polwarth's letter. He thinks that in

London they will require a chariot and four horses, a coachman and two footmen in livery, 'besides Andrew to attend our chambers.' Expenses of living were not so great then as now, for he says 'we can have our dyet in pension, lodging, horse meat and stabling within £5 by the week.' He inculcates in his wife the necessity of keeping up her proper position: 'you and your daughters take your place frankly before the ladies of Baronets, Lords of Session, and all inferior gentlemen. We are but a little step forward of our rank from what we were before, and so much the better, yet our place is not doubtful as before, and there is an ease in that.' His place was to be even less doubtful soon; honours were showered on him as he was evidently considered a safe, sensible, and influential supporter of the Government. In 1692 he was appointed Sheriff of Berwick and in 1693 one of the Extraordinary Lords of Session. The next year saw him Bailiff of Lauderdale, and in 1696 he was made Chancellor of Scotland. Another step in the peerage was accorded him in 1697 when he was created Earl of Marchmont, Viscount Blasonberrie, Lord Polwarth of Polwarth, Red Braes, and Greenlaw. He would have preferred the title of March to that of Marchmont, but refrained from asking it thinking it had been reserved by the king as a royal title.

From this period to the date of the union he was at the zenith of his career. He was Commissioner to the Parliament of Scotland in 1698, and filled the similar post to the General Assembly of the Church in 1702. The King, however, died while the Assembly was sitting, and the new commission from Queen Anne did not arrive till after it had been dissolved. Lord Marchmont did not apparently retain the confidence of the new Queen in so great a measure as he did in the case of King William, as in 1702 he was superseded in the office of Chancellor. In 1703 he succeeded in getting an Act passed for providing for the security of the Presbyterian Government, but an attempt to introduce a measure settling the succession of the Crown on the House of Hanover was received with violent opposition. He then set himself to work in the interests of the Union, and was one of the leaders of the 'Squadron Volante' which exercised so much influence on the result. He has been accused of taking English gold as a reward for his services in promoting the Union, but it has been pointed out that the sum he received, little over eleven hundred pounds, was more likely the arrears owed him by Government for his salary as Chancellor, and his pension of £400 a year which had

been bestowed on him by King William. After the Union his influence steadily declined. He twice failed to secure election as a representative peer, and in 1710 he was deprived of his office of Sheriff of Berwickshire, but this was restored to him on the accession of King George I., who also appointed him a Commissioner of Police.

He lived ten years after this, but at the age of 83 the old man, as we have said, lay dying at Berwick, to which he had been removed some years previously from his seat of Redbraes. Even in his last days his habitual cheerfulness did not forsake him. As Lord Binning, who had married his granddaughter Rachel Baillie, was sitting at his bedside not many hours before the end, he saw him smiling, and said to him, 'My Lord, what are you laughing at?' and he answered, 'I am diverted to think what a disappointment the worms will meet when they come to me, expecting a good meal, and finding nothing but bones.'

There are some letters and documents by his secretary Patrick Dickson, describing his last days, death, and funeral, which are in H.M. Register House, and which throw an interesting light on the occurrences of that time. Writing from Berwick on 26th July, 1724, to Alexander, the Earl's third son, then Lord Polwarth, having succeeded his eldest brother in that courtesy title, the second son Robert having also predeceased his father, he says:—

MY LORD,

Your Lordship will have mine of Friday the 17th. That night my Lord rested pretty well, and was calm all Saturday till the afternoon that the feverish fit came on. Being uneasie all that night, Lady Julian<sup>1</sup> called Dr. Coupar on the Sunday morning, he having come home late the night before. When he came about ten, had seen my Lord and been informed what Dr. Abernethy had prescribed, he approved of all. He added some things and further ordered an astringent glister. All the Sunday pretty easie, a little feverish in the night, but calm all the Monday, the looseness still continuing and frequent. On Monday night the fever was very high, even to raving, and could get no sleep. When Dr. Coupar came on Tuesday morning, he thought it proper my Lord should take the cortex, which is the Jesuits' Bark. This was what Dr. Abernethy had ordered in case the other remedies failed. This was used according to direction, Tuesday, Wednesday, and part of Thursday, without any of the least promised effects from it. Both the looseness and feverish fits

<sup>1</sup> His daughter, born 16th August, 1673, married in 1698 to Charles Bellingham, a man of neither fortune nor position, with whom she eloped.

still continued, the last not so violent as the strength of his body failed. Yesterday they were all given over, and only such diet as he can take given him. He is brought very low, and no wonder; yet still very sensible, sleeps much when calm, but gets bad rest under the fitt; never calls for anything but takes pleasantly what's given him; complaining little of pain, though we are sensible he is sometimes grip'd. If asked how he does, his answer is, 'very well, or pretty well.' He rested badly last night, a little easier this day, but as yet no stop can be put to the looseness.

I would have writ sooner since my last, but that I knew Lord Binning wrote on 19th, Lady Julian on 22nd, and Lord Kimmerghame<sup>1</sup> on 29th. His Lordship came here the third night.

Your Lordship will be easily persuaded that in this condition my Lord cannot last long without the assistance of the Great Physician.

When he shall be called to that happiest state, he leaves not behind him a man of more charitable thought towards all mortal, one of a more equal temper, nor one more inclined to help the helpless and needy than his Lordship was.

I send on this same paper the copy of a writing leaving the names blank, lest by any accident it should fall in the hands of any other person. But your Lordship will easily guess whose it is. I believe none has seen it since the writing, the person keeping it by himselfe, till a little after they came here, when they were pleased to commit it to my care and keeping, and bid me be sure to deliver it to the person he intended it for.

I am afraid directions from your Lordship upon it will come too late. But I intend, when necessary, to show it to Lord Kimmerghame, who will certainly follow the orders it contains, they being very clear and distinct.

Upon the event of what is feared your Lordship knows the office of High Sheriff or Sheriff Principal falls. If it is not already done it's good notice be taken of it in time. There will likeways be a vacancy in the Commission of Police. Now in these days the smallest offices are competed for.

I humbly beg your Lordship will not take in ill part the freedom of anything I use. The worthy master I have had the honour so long to serve having so accustomed me to it, that I cannot yet get off from it. But upon the least intimation that it is not so agreeable to your Lordship, I'll endeavour to forbear.

The only satisfaction that those about my Lord can have is that nothing of the least moment can be charged as the cause of his present sickness, and all care and pains taken that can any manner of way be thought to contribute to his ease either by night or day.

Your Lordship's other friends in this country are well. I heard of the young ladies at Edinburgh yester night. They are all well; Lady Julian

<sup>1</sup> The Earl's fourth son Andrew, born 19th July, 1676, advocate 29th July, 1696, appointed a Lord of Session as Lord Kimmerghame 25th November, 1714, died 16th March, 1730.

keeps her health, but is sore fatigued and stirrs little out of the rounge night or day.

I am,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's most obedient  
humble servant,

PATRICK DICKSON.

This very well expressed letter is extremely deferential to the rising sun. Though Mr. Dickson must have known Lord Polwarth from boyhood, he probably thought it prudent to apologise for his comparatively familiar style in writing to him and to promise to 'forbear' it if found 'disagreeable'. It is, however, somewhat curious to find him sending a copy of the Earl's will to his son before the death of the testator. It can hardly be because he thought it might facilitate the necessary arrangements being made, as he says himself that he is afraid any directions would come too late. Lord Polwarth was at this time out of the country altogether, as he had been nominated First Ambassador on the part of England to the Congress then being held at Cambrai, from which place he did not return till 1725.

The will itself, which occupies a page and a half of closely written foolscap, is strangely autobiographical: the Earl goes over the principal events of his life, and very little of it is taken up with the arrangement of his affairs. In fact he leaves everything to his son and gives no directions as to provisions for his daughters or other children. Perhaps he had made arrangements for these previously, but his affairs all his life had never been in a very prosperous condition, and he may not have had much to leave.

The next letter from Patrick Dickson to Lord Polwarth is dated, 2nd August, 1724, and gives him an account of his father's death.

MY LORD,

Considering what I wrote in my three former, the subject of this will be no surprise to your Lordship.

About one o'clock this morning a visible change happened on my Lord. After that he sensibly weakened every hour. About eight Mr. Somervel the minister was called. My Lord knew him, and with the little strength he had, offered his hand to him. Lady Julian asked if he should pray. His Lordship said 'Yes'; after prayer, being asked if he heard, he distinctly answered 'Very well.' About 12 Mr. Somervel called in, when



he was thought to be just wearing off. He prayed again, and in the time my Lord lifts up his eyes which had been shut all the day before, a good space. Then I, perceiving his strength failing, I gave Mr. Somervel a signe, and he concluded. Then he shut his eyes, and in three minutes afterwards it pleased the Lord to take him, his aged and faithful servant, to his eternal bless. He had his judgment sound to the last free of struggle or pain, but as it were slept away out of this into a life of ever blessed happiness.

Thus died the good and great Earl of Marchmont in the 84th year of his age, your Lordship's father, my worthy master, whom I have had the honour to serve these 26 years, a long but honourable and pleasant servitude.

My Lord Kimmerghame and Mr. Jo. Dickson are here. They intend to follow the method prescribed in the paper I sent your Lordship with respect to the burial. Seeing Lord Kimmerghame writes by this same post, I only add that

I am,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's most obedient  
humble servant,

PATRICK DICKSON.

*P.S.* I have presumed to make use of my Lord's seal only that the letter may be had the greater regard to in the offices.

The excellent and devoted Mr. Patrick Dickson having thus given an account of the demise of the ex-Chancellor to his eldest surviving son, a more serious duty now devolved on him, that of making arrangements for, and carrying out, the funeral. No function was regarded as of more importance in a Scottish house of whatever rank the inmates might be, and sums quite disproportionate to the income of the relatives were often spent on the ceremony. The funeral of one of the Earl's predecessors in the Chancellorship, the Duke of Rothes, had cost his son-in-law the Earl of Haddington upwards of £68,000 Scots, and its extravagance embarrassed the family for years. In the case of Lord Marchmont careful and prudent instructions had been left as to the burial. He directed that his body should be interred 'in the burial place belonging to my family in the Canongate Churchyard, close by the grave of my dear wife, upon the north side, and that without any pomp or vain show, having my body conveyed to the grave by my neighbouring relations and particular friends.'

On the 12th August, Patrick Dickson writes to the new Earl

a faithful account of how the funeral had been carried out pursuant to these directions. He says :—

As mine of the 2nd current would give your Lordship an account of the good Earl of Marchmont's death, I now presume to lay before you, as distinctly as I can, the way and manner of his Lordship's burial, which I am hopeful your Lordship will think was very decent, and without taking the words in too strict a sense, as close to the order left for that purpose in the paper I sent your Lordship a copy of, as could be.

On Sunday night the 2nd an express was sent to Edinburgh to make ready two escutcheons, one for this place, the other for the place of burial. The 16 branches were sent in for that purpose, of which I send your Lordship a copy.<sup>1</sup> Directions were also given to make the burial place in order and where to break the ground. Letters were at the same time sent to Sir James Hall,<sup>2</sup> Lord Binning,<sup>3</sup> Lord Torphichen,<sup>4</sup> and the Earl of Haddington<sup>5</sup> to come here to assist with their advice.

On Monday the necessary mournings were taken off, and a list of the number of friends condescended on to be invited was made, and the letters were written and despatched, of which list and letters I also send a copy.<sup>6</sup>

In the evening Mr. John Dickson and I went out to Redbraes, to cause take up, of the grass, four of your Lordship's fine mares, which, with two of my Lord Kimmerghame's for the wheel, made a very handsome sett for the hearse, my Lord's own horses being very low of body. A very good

<sup>1</sup> The sixteen branches were the eight immediate ancestors on both sides of the house, whose arms on small shields were arranged round the arms of the deceased on the escutcheon or hatchment. They were as follows :—(1) father, (2) father's mother, (3) father's father's mother, (4) father's mother's mother, (5) father's father's father's mother, (6) father's father's mother's mother, (7) father's mother's father's mother, (8) father's mother's mother's mother: (9) mother, (10) mother's mother, (11) mother's father's mother, (12) mother's mother's mother, (13) mother's father's father's mother, (14) mother's father's mother's mother, (15) mother's mother's father's mother, (16) mother's mother's mother's mother.

<sup>2</sup> Sir James Hall of Dunglass, Bart., married in 1698 Anne, fourth daughter of Lord Marchmont.

<sup>3</sup> Lord Binning was the eldest son of Thomas, sixth Lord Haddington, and had married about 1720 Rachel, daughter of George Baillie of Jerviswood and Grisel Hume, Lord Marchmont's eldest daughter.

<sup>4</sup> James, seventh Lord Torphichen, married in 1703 Jean, youngest daughter of the Earl.

<sup>5</sup> Thomas, sixth Earl of Haddington, father of Lord Binning.

<sup>6</sup> The letter ran as follows :—Sir, my father the Earl of Marchmont dyed on the 2nd current. By my Lord's directions I am to trouble none to be at his burial except his own relations, whereof you are one. Therefore I beg you'll honour us with your company at this place on Friday next, by eight o'clock in the morning, to convey his Lordship's body from this to his burial place in the Canongate Churchyard, which will very much oblige, Sir, your most humble servant, And. Hume. Berwick, 3d August, 1724.

Only thirty-seven persons altogether were invited to the funeral, of whom all were present but three.

hearse was got at Duns, and the mort-cloth and pall-cloth of the family, which we got at Redbraes, were made use of.

On Tuesday afternoon my Lord's body was put in a cere-cloth, being decently handled, none of his body clothes removed, nor his body in any manner of way exposed, and then drest as is the custom of the place.

The coffin was of wainscot handsome and plain, lined within with fine flannel ruffled on each side so as to meet the ruffling down the breast of the corps.

On Thursday my Lord's body was put on the coffin by Lord Kimmerghame, Lord Torphichen, Sir James Hall, Lord Binning, Sir Richard Newton, Earl of Haddington, Mr. George Ker, Captain Turnbull, and Mr. John Dickson. And then after lying a little, very gently made fast with shavings and bran that it might meet with the less jolting in the journey. Then locked up in the rounge.

Supper was provided at a public inn for such of the friends as came in that night which I think were about 24.

The hearse and pall came in about 3 o'clock, Adam Marshal drove, and your Lordship's servant, Samuel, rode postilion for taking care of the horses.

The Mayor, Justices, and Bailies, with about 60 of the principal burghesses and the officers of the garrison were invited to convey the corps such a distance out of town as they thought fitt.

On Friday morning the escutcheon was put over the gate head of my Lord's house here, the dining rounge hung, and the chairs all covered with black. On a tea-table tea, coffee, and chocolate sett in one end; on another table, claret, sherry, canary, plumcake and bisket in the other end of the rounge, for breakfast to such of the company as pleased to come in. And about nyne in the morning all were ready, going off thus.

Immediately before the hearse I, riding by myself, before me the Earl of Marchmont's 2 servants, before them Lord Kimmerghame's 2 servants, and before them Lord Torphichen's and Sir James Hall's 2 servants, these being the chief mourners.

Behind the hearse a mourning coach, behind that Lord Kimmerghame's, and behind that the Earl of Haddington's. The other friends, gentlemen of the neighbourhood, and garrison riding on horseback.

The hearse then moved slowly till quite free of the town, I, and the 6 before me, riding 2 and 2, uncovered.

When wee came to Aytoun we uncovered again till fully past the town, where a little halt was made till Lord Kimmerghame and the company returned thanks to those from Berwick.

From that to Coberspath, where a cold entertainment was ready for the company, stayed about an hour and a halfe and then on to Haddington.

When wee came nigh the town wee before the hearse rode uncovered, till wee came to the churchyearde, then lighted and walked in the same order before the body into the church, where in a free part in the middle the corps was set on two stools, the seats and pews about being all covered with black and a good number of great candles conveniently placed, and at night the doors were shut in.

My Lord Kimmerghame and his company then went to his Lordship's lodgings, where was a verry neat supper ready, beds provided and the horses taken care of.

We may interrupt Mr. Dickson's narrative at this point to remark on the 'very neat supper' provided by Lord Kimmerghame, as the bill for the same is yet extant. If it was confined to those invited to the funeral the company would only number thirty-four, but it is possible that the Provost and municipal dignitaries of Haddington were invited with perhaps some neighbouring lairds. At all events the supper kept up the credit of the proverbial hospitality shown at a Scottish funeral. Besides soup and fish and some other unconsidered trifles, there was beef and mutton, roast and boiled, roast lamb, two large turkeys, four 'goss's' (geese), a dozen of ducks, and the same number of capons, eighteen hens, besides an indefinite number of chickens and rabbits, two large pigeon pies, two dishes of 'minsh pays' (mince pies), two dishes of tarts, hams and 'tungs' (number unspecified), apricots, peaches, apples, pears, and cheese. To wash all this down required a fair amount of liquor, but it cannot be said that according to the standard of the period it is excessive. There was consumed, or at least paid for, three dozen of claret, two bottles sherry, five dozen of ale, one bottle and half a mutchkin of brandy, and a bottle of cinnamon water. Some tea and sugar are also included in the bill. Including a tip of a guinea for the cooks, the bill for the eatables came to £16 4s., and for the wine £4 7s. 4d. Eighteen horses got put up for the night at a cost of £1 6s. 4d., which included four pecks of corn more than the ordinary allowance, so that even the horses benefited by the general good cheer.

But we must resume Mr. Dickson's story which he tells in such detail :—

On Saturday morning the painters put on the mortcloth along the coffin, the 16 branches in small escutcheons eight a side as the copy sent, with a helmet and Earl's coronet on the top near the head of the coffin, with green and orange ribbons and a love crape hanging over.<sup>1</sup>

About eleven the Provost and bailies waited on my Lord Kimmerghame and the company, and on foot walked from his Lordship's lodgings, the magistrates first, the six and I uncovered, and then his Lordship and the

<sup>1</sup> Contrary to the usual custom, there do not appear to have been any Heralds at Lord Marchmont's funeral. It is possible that the Earl's liveries may have been orange and green, but these were not his proper heraldic liveries.

company, to the church, when the body was brought out by the friends and put in the hearse; all mounting horse I and the other six rode uncovered before the hearse till quite free of the town, the bells tolling all the while.

A little past Tranent the Master of Annandale, the Earl of Hopetoun, and Lord Newhall met the company, when the chief mourners halted a little and came out to receive them.

Then stepping very slowly went on to Edinburgh. So soon as wee entered the Nethergate the six and I rode uncovered up the Canongate till we came to the Churchyard. Then all lighted; the corps taken out of the hearse and carried by the nearest relations, Lord Kimmerghame at the head. I walked immediately before the body and the six by twos before me, walking very slowly, straight north till wee came before the door of the burial place, then turned east. When near the door the six stood 3 on each side, and I walked on close before the corps into the burial place to the east end of the grave, as many of the relations as could get rouse taking hold of the ropes, and with all tenderness let his Lordship's body down into the grave, being the very spot he himself by his papers had ordered. This was about half an hour after three in the afternoon.

When all needful was done then Lord Kimmerghame invited the company to his own house when a very good intertainment was provided for them.

In this decent yet not gawdie manner was the body of this good man brought to the grave on the 8th of August, 1729, in the 84th year of his age since 13th January last.

Your Lordship's four mares were kept in town till Monday, then sent out and not one farthing the worse. I am persuaded your Lordship will not take it ill, them being thus made use of. But rather so than have borrowed on such an occasion.

Yesterday I left the three young ladys<sup>1</sup> well at Edinburgh. Lady Julian is much affected with my Lord's death.

So soon as I have done some things here I intend to go to the country and assist Mr. Hume all I can till I shall receive your Lordship's further directions, as being

My Lord,

Your Lordship's most obedient  
humble servant,

PATRICK DICKSON.

So ended the career of a man who served his country faithfully according to his lights. His character was not a complex one. From early training and conviction a strong and devoted Presbyterian his common sense saved him from being a fanatic. He was emphatically a good and righteous man, though we may not

<sup>1</sup> If Mr. Dickson refers to the Chancellor's three surviving daughters they were no longer very young, as the youngest was born in 1683.

from our point of view agree with everything he did. It cannot be forgotten, for instance, that it was his casting vote that sent to execution the unhappy boy Thomas Aikenhead, without giving him even the respite of a few days 'to make his peace with the God whom he had offended.' But to call him a 'noisy republican,' as Macaulay does, is absurd. He was probably not a very popular man in public life: he may have been somewhat pragmatical and disputatious, and his foibles are well hit off by a contemporary annalist, who says he was 'a fine gentleman of clear parts but always a lover of set speeches.' His family life was singularly happy, though not without many trials, and he seems to have been a devoted husband and father. It is interesting to note that the daughter whose conduct must have grieved him most, as she made a runaway and most unfortunate marriage, was the one who watched over his declining days, and whom his death distressed acutely. That he inspired affection and even devotion in those who were in his employment is amply evidenced by the letters of Patrick Dickson quoted above.

JAMES BALFOUR PAUL.

## Medieval Education at Carlisle

**I**N many respects the geographical area now covered by the diocese of Carlisle offers more problems on institutional origins than any other area of equal extent in England. Its position, political and geographical, may be described as unique. The district or land of Carlisle, which embraced the ancient diocese, was the last addition to complete the English kingdom. The conquest of England was well advanced before Carlisle came under the influence of Norman ideas. The traditions of its former independence were alive for many years after its subjugation by the Red King, and its recovery from the immediate sovereignty of Scotland predisposed the inhabitants to favour the northern kingdom when international interests were in conflict. Henry I. governed his new province at the outset by means of a resident lieutenant who had all the appearance of a palatinate jurisdiction.

At a later period the district reverted to Scotland, when King David, in order to obliterate the ascendancy of English traditions, took up his residence in Carlisle, and ruled the district for nearly twenty years with the enlightened wisdom for which his reign on both sides of the Border is so justly famous. It was not till Carlisle was recovered from his grandson, Malcolm the Maiden, that the province can be said to have been incorporated as an integral portion of the English realm. The Scottish sympathies of the inhabitants, always a mixed race, continued a menace in English politics till the outbreak of the War of Independence, when Carlisle became a buffer state between the hostile kingdoms, and was reduced to a condition of destitution and savagery by centuries of continued warfare.

The political history of the district was not less unfortunate than its geographical position: perhaps its political troubles were the natural outcome of its territorial isolation. Nature seemed to have made it a battleground for the two kingdoms. On the east the Penine range shut it out from the old kingdom of Northumbria, and though it often acknowledged the sway of the Northumbrian

sovereigns, its leanings to independence are rarely absent. The approach from the south was intercepted by the sands and fords of Morecambe and Duddon. On the north it lay against Scotland with no ascertainable mark of delimitation, and on the west it was bounded by the estuary of the Solway and by the Irish Sea. The natural barriers contributed as much to its isolation as the political.

The land of Carlisle was regarded as a place to be avoided for many centuries by the outside world. We have two notable instances of the aversion in which the district was held so late as 1262. A justice itinerant petitioned the Chancellor of England to excuse him going on circuit in the parts of Cumberland, as well on account of the distance of the place as on account of the climate, which would ruin his health<sup>1</sup> (*propter distemperantiam aeris meae complexioni valde discordantem*). In the same year Archbishop Godfrey de Ludham of York provided a hostel in Coupland, a wide district in the south-western portion of Cumberland at that time within the jurisdiction of the arch-diocese, for the accommodation of the Archdeacon of Richmond and his officials when they were compelled to go there on ecclesiastical business, despite the sandy fords and floods and countless tempests of that region.<sup>2</sup> Nearly a century earlier a sane chronicler had little to say of Carlisle except that it suffered from obscurity, and that its forests and mountains were infested with goblins and other terrible monsters.<sup>3</sup> With a reputation of this kind, it is little wonder that the diocese, into which the district had been formed in 1133, had lain derelict and bereft of episcopal supervision for the latter half of the twelfth century.

Carlisle, however, was not so black as it was painted. Beneath its rugged exterior a nearer view of the internal conditions of life reveals a more pleasant picture. From the very dawn of documentary history we come in contact with institutional germs which gradually emerge into the clearer light of natural growth. Of all the institutions, early provision for education is the most obscure. The very isolation of the district made local provision inevitable: the place was far distant from the historic seats of English learning, and the Ishmaelish idiosyncrasies of the inhabitants threw them on their own resources. Back in the early story of the city, as the seventh century was drawing to a close, a school was founded in

<sup>1</sup> *Royal and Historical Letters* (R.S.), ii. 222.

<sup>2</sup> Dugdale, *Monasticon*, v. 341.

<sup>3</sup> Gervase of Tilbury, *Otia Imperialia*, cap. lxix.-lxxi.



Carlisle by St. Cuthbert,<sup>1</sup> when ecclesiastical institutions were pursuing a normal course in the land. For some years the school of Carlisle shines as a twinkling light in the surrounding darkness. The Danes came, and again, for two centuries or more, all is gloom. It is probable that the renewal or re-establishment of St. Cuthbert's school was coeval with the foundation of the bishopric of Carlisle. Alberic, the papal legate, had visited the city and held a council of Scottish bishops<sup>2</sup> there in 1138. In the same year, as the mouthpiece of the English episcopate, he issued constitutions<sup>3</sup> for the guidance of the church, in which the regulation of schools formed a part.

Ecclesiastical legislation touching schools at this early period is not without instruction when we know that the school of Carlisle was a prominent agency of diocesan action with an independent endowment of its own in 1186. The papal legislation of the Third Lateran Council (1179), which is supposed to have originated most of our cathedral schools, can scarcely have caused the foundation of that at Carlisle. It is unlikely that such an effect could have been produced in a place like Carlisle in so short a period as seven years; the more probable explanation is that the papal legislation was the recognition and sanction of a law already in existence. Be that as it may, when the curtain is withdrawn from diocesan movement in 1186-8, the school of Carlisle appears a normal institution under diocesan control and pensionary to the work of the diocese to the extent of one mark a year.<sup>4</sup> The earliest schoolmaster, whose name has been ascertained, was one of the canons of Carlisle.<sup>5</sup> No other educational institution, apart from the schools supposed to be attached to monastic foundations, comes into view in the twelfth century.<sup>6</sup>

The revival of letters in the following century had an immediate influence on the distribution of schools in the towns and villages of the north-western counties. Roger Bacon, who wrote

<sup>1</sup> Symeon of Durham, *Historia de Cuthberto* (Surtees Soc.), i. 141.

<sup>2</sup> Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 31.

<sup>3</sup> Spelman, *Concilia*, ii. 41.

<sup>4</sup> *Pipe Roll of Cumberland*, 34 Hen. II.

<sup>5</sup> *Whitby Chartulary* (Surtees Soc.), i. 289.

<sup>6</sup> Schools must have been in existence in the important centres of the district in the twelfth century. Reginald of Durham (Surtees Soc. i. 149), writing about 1170, tells the story of a boy who got a good thrashing from his master in a village school in Northumberland. The school was held in the parish church according to a custom, he said, well known and widely observed at that time.

towards the close of the reign of Henry III., stated that never had there been so great an appearance of learning and so general an application to study in so many different faculties as in his time when schools were erected in every city, town, burgh, and castle throughout the land.<sup>1</sup> There is independent testimony that Bacon's statement was true of Carlisle. In the diocesan legislation of 1259, the date of which the *doctor mirabilis* was speaking, special injunctions were given to parish priests near to the schools in the cities and castles of the diocese touching their ministrations to the scholars.<sup>2</sup> But actual knowledge of these institutions, with the exception of that at Carlisle, is disappointingly obscure at this period. There is, however, little doubt that schools existed in such centres of population as Penrith, Cockermouth, Appleby, and Kendal, where we find grammar schools in full operation in the fourteenth century.<sup>3</sup>

The school of Carlisle, which was an appendage of the cathedral, was under the special tuition and patronage of the Bishop and his officers. From time to time efforts were made to extend its usefulness as the chief educational institution of the diocese. In 1285 Bishop Ireton charged the revenues of the church of his episcopal manor of Dalston with the maintenance of twelve poor scholars in the school of Carlisle, four of whom were obliged to attend the church of Dalston from which they received their bursaries. That the parishioners might not suffer by the partial withdrawal of their revenues, it was arranged that the provision of an assistant priest to minister in that church should be the first charge on the scholars' portion.<sup>4</sup> Though this diversion of the endowments to strictly educational purposes was after a few years annulled by the intervention of the Crown on the allegation that the Bishop had acted without royal sanction,<sup>5</sup> it furnishes clear evidence of the movement of ecclesiastical opinion in the supreme matter of popular education.

<sup>1</sup> *Opus Maius*, pref., quoted by N. Carlisle, *Endowed Grammar Schools*, i. p. xxi.

<sup>2</sup> Statuta Karleolensia, MS. No. 18.

<sup>3</sup> In Westmorland alone the schoolmasters of Appleby, Kendal, and Brough under Stainmore were pensioned in 1553 when the revenues of their schools were seized by the Crown, the schools having been connected with chantries (*Q.R. Miscell.*, 835-59). Early in the fourteenth century, Master Peter de Holdernes, 'rector scholarum de Cokermue,' witnessed a deed now at Hesleyside.

<sup>4</sup> See my text of the document from the Register of Archbishop John le Romeyn of York, MS. ff. 131-2, printed in this *Review*, v. 297-303.

<sup>5</sup> *Close Roll*, 20 Edw. I., m. 6d.

It may be taken that all the medieval schools of which we find mention in the district of Carlisle were at one time or another designated Grammar-schools or Bishop-schools. These names were indiscriminately applied to the same school. Grammar school was the title of the institution at Carlisle, though some of the Bishops preferred to speak of it as our school of Carlisle.<sup>1</sup> The schoolmaster there was not necessarily a priest: as a rule he was in sacred orders, but sometimes he was not. For example, in 1363 Bishop Welton gave his licence to Master John de Burdon, clerk, with whose ability, knowledge, and zeal he was acquainted, to hold the grammar school within the city of Carlisle, and to teach boys, adults, and others willing to be taught, in the knowledge of grammar, and in other matters in which he was fitted to instruct them.<sup>2</sup> Before his decease nine years later, the schoolmaster made provision for Christiane his wife, and bequeathed all his books to a friend. The will was made in the schoolhouse<sup>3</sup> (*in hospicio scholarum*), which shows that a master's residence was part of the school buildings.

But the attention of the Bishops of Carlisle was not wholly confined to the care of the school attached to the seat of their jurisdiction. There was a school in Penrith at an early date, the origin of which is not known, but from various circumstances it may be concluded that it was of episcopal foundation. So early as 1340 the institution was in full development when the Bishop gave his licence to John de Eskheved to act as schoolmaster there.<sup>4</sup> The school of Penrith may be taken as representative of similar institutions in the towns and castles of the diocese. In 1361 the Bishop stated that it would be for the commonweal if more schools were founded and maintained in different places for the instruction of the young, and for that reason he licensed Robert of Brougham, chaplain, of whose erudition he was fully informed, to hold a school in the town of Penrith and to instruct boys and youths *super psalteriis, donato et cantu* with his customary

<sup>1</sup> In 1333 Bishop Kirkby licensed Master William of Salkeld, clerk, to be 'magister scholarum nostrarum Karleolensium . . . pro beneplacito nostro' (*Carl. Epis. Reg.*, Kirkby, MS. f. 278).

<sup>2</sup> *Carl. Epis. Reg.*, Welton, MS. f. 103.

<sup>3</sup> *Testamenta Karleolensia* (ed. R. S. Ferguson), p. 101. Master Nicholas de Surreton, *rector scholarum Karlioli*, was admitted to the several grades of holy orders in 1316-9 (*Carl. Epis. Reg.*, Halton, MS. ff. 193-4, 218). He was, therefore, a layman when appointed.

<sup>4</sup> *Carl. Epis. Reg.*, Kirkby, MS. f. 416.

zeal. The appointment was during pleasure, and all rivals in the same town were inhibited.<sup>1</sup>

The school curriculum at Penrith, as laid down in the master's appointment, deserves attention. What precise meanings may be attached to the words in the licence, *psalteria*, *donatus*, and *cantus*? No dogmatic opinion is offered on the signification of *super psalteriis*: the substantive is in the plural, which adds to the difficulty. Having regard to the examples quoted in the Oxford Dictionary, can the phrase be interpreted as instruction in instrumental music? The *psaltery* of the Authorised Version: the *psalterium* of the Vulgate: the *sautrye* of Chaucer: *psalterium* as the equivalent of *organum* in the *Catholicon Anglicum* of 1483: all point, since the word is in the plural number, to musical instruments of some sort. The phrase *super donato* admits of easy explanation as the equivalent of grammar, a wide term in the fourteenth century representative of all the rudiments of learning in any art or faculty. Donat or Donet was spoken of in the medieval period for grammar as Cocker was the equivalent of arithmetic at a later date, the system taking its name from Aelius Donatus, the inventor, a grammarian of the fourth century. Readers of Chaucer and Piers the Plowman will be familiar with the usage. The last department in the curriculum at Penrith was singing, a very necessary accomplishment in a considerable town. Song and grammar were often incorporated in the same school, like that of Bishop Langley's (1406-1437) foundation at Durham.<sup>2</sup> All the popular schools of the diocese of Carlisle were fashioned on a similar system to give a simple form of education suitable to the requirements of the age. The aim of the medieval system was not so much to make good scholars as good Englishmen.

In the matter of higher education, despite the drawbacks attending its geographical isolation, Carlisle does not appear to have suffered more during the period under review than at more recent dates. So early as the thirteenth century, when Oxford and Cambridge stand out without rivals as the two great Universities of England, it was to Oxford that the young men of Cumberland and Westmorland resorted for study. Cambridge seems to have played an insignificant part<sup>3</sup> in the higher educa-

<sup>1</sup> *Carl. Epis. Reg.*, Welton, MS. f. 81.

<sup>2</sup> Leland, *Itinerary* (ed. Toulmin Smith), v. 127.

<sup>3</sup> In 1307 Bishop Halton gave licence to the incumbent of Addingham 'quod possit stare in studio apud Oxoniam et Cantebriam' for two years, but very few references to Cambridge have been found (*Carl. Epis. Reg.*, Halton, MS. ff. 106-107).

tion of the north-western counties before the period of the Renaissance. It is natural that most of our evidences at this early date should be concerned with the training of the clergy. Education from its lowest to its highest grade was originally one of the chief concerns of the English Church. Universities for a long period in their history were meant for the education of the clergy: their system of study was theological and their supervision was episcopal. When Bishop Walter resigned Carlisle in 1246 it was to Oxford<sup>1</sup> he retired, where he became the benefactor of the Dominicans. The philologists, by the dissection of his surname of Mauclerc, have jumped to the conclusion that he was a prelate of little learning, a charge which might perhaps have been true of one of his remote ancestors or the patriarch of his family. At all events it was to Oxford he repaired on his retirement to settle amongst the Dominicans, though he was instrumental in introducing communities of Dominicans and Franciscans into his cathedral city while he ruled the see.<sup>2</sup>

It is pathetic to read Bishop Halton's expressions of veneration for the *alma mater* that first directed his studies. In taking the University of Oxford under his protection in 1295, he recalls the time when he was a student in its schools—when he sucked the teats of its ennobling learning from the very rudiments of knowledge (*a primis cunabulis scholasticis nostris*) till he was called in the Providence of God to a higher charge.<sup>3</sup> In the following year he described Oxford as the nursing mother of English learning (*mater et nutrix studii Anglicani*), and protested to Boniface VIII. that there would be ructions in England unless Oxford received the papal privilege of the University of Paris in having its degrees recognised throughout Europe. Why should not Oxford stand on a level with Paris? As a prolific offspring, he argued, was the joy of a mother, and when her sons were a credit to her, the joy was increased: so it was with the inexhaustible fertility of the University of Oxford, which never ceased to bring forth sons that proved a blessing to the Lord's heritage.<sup>4</sup> Bishop Halton was a canon of Carlisle before his

<sup>1</sup> M. Paris, *Chron. Majora* (R.S.), iv. 564.

<sup>2</sup> *Chronicon de Lanercost* (Bann. Club), p. 42.

<sup>3</sup> *Carl. Epis. Reg.*, Halton, MS. f. 17. Oxford and Cambridge absorbed all the education of the country in the thirteenth century except the very rudiments: they were grammar schools, public schools, and universities all rolled into one (Lightfoot, *Hist. Essays*, p. 158).

<sup>4</sup> *Letters from the Northern Registers* (R.S.), pp. 122-3.

election to the bishopric, and in all probability a north-country-man<sup>1</sup> by birth.

The parochial clergy, who had the advantage of an University education, were chiefly Oxford men. It is a mistake to suppose that the bulk of the Carlisle clergy during the medieval period were the product of local schools. Diocesan registrars were not over-zealous in these days to append academic initials when recording the names of those admitted to sacred orders or of incumbents instituted to benefices. No doubt clerical education was always a grave concern to the rulers of the northern diocese. It would have been little short of miraculous had it been otherwise. The distance of Carlisle from Oxford and Cambridge: the poverty of the diocese: the wastes and ravages of warfare with little interruption for three centuries: settled institutions and normal life always in jeopardy: all combined to raise barriers against higher education on a large scale. We see evidence of the conditions of the district in 1340-42 when Robert of Eglesfeld, a Westmorland incumbent, founded Queen's College, Oxford, with the design of giving special facilities for education to the youth of Cumberland and Westmorland. These counties, he said, were almost desert places, and the inhabitants suffered from an unusual want of learning (*literature insolitam raritatem*). The activity of military operations on the Border under the personal direction of Edward III. made Eglesfeld's picture of diocesan life in Carlisle a true description of what was taking place.

Despite the local difficulties occasioned by the hostility of Scotland, it is probable that the education of the clergy of the fourteenth century was equal to that of their immediate predecessors, and certainly not inferior to their education in the period between the Reformation and the Restoration. The standard laid down by the Bishop of Carlisle and his clergy in the diocesan synod of 1259 as the minimum equipment for a parochial incumbent cannot be said to have erred on the side of severity, as such matters are regarded at the present time. The Bishop, of course, controlled the standard for admission to sacred orders with the sanction of the Pan-Anglican Synod of London in 1237, which declared that want of learning was a fatal disability. John of Ayton, the fourteenth century glossarist, in his notes on this constitution, stated

<sup>1</sup> At this date Oxford had a large claim on the North of England. Archbishop Melton of York (1317-40), in the early years of his primacy, granted to the University a halfpenny in each mark from the benefices of the archdiocese (*Ibid.*, pp. 346-9).

that ignorance in the priesthood was a mortal sin and the mother of all errors.<sup>1</sup> The canon law of the English Church was reinforced by the local law of the diocese. Archbishop Sterne, writing in 1664 to his successor at Carlisle, warned him that it was easier for him to exclude undesirable men from holy orders than it was to exclude them from benefices when once they were ordained.<sup>2</sup> Herein, it may be noted, the medieval Bishops occupied a more advantageous position than their modern successors in the control of the clergy. By the law of the diocese the Bishop of Carlisle had power to test the knowledge of a parochial incumbent both before and after admission to a cure. The lay patron was not so supreme in the medieval period as he is to-day in the exercise of ecclesiastical patronage.

As the legislation of the diocese of Carlisle on the minimum standard of clerical education is in many ways of considerable interest, the whole statute may be given in rough translation :

Of inquisition made of the learning of ecclesiastical persons.

Because many ignorant and illiterate pastors seize upon office to the peril of souls and the loss of their own salvation, we order that careful inquiry be made as well by the Archdeacon as by our Official what rectors or vicars suffer a great want of learning, and that report be made to us, and that examination be often made by the same of the knowledge of parish priests ; and whether they know the Decalogue, that is, the Ten Precepts of the Law of Moses, and that they preach and explain them to the people entrusted to them ; and whether they know how to repeat the Seven Deadly Sins and to preach them to be avoided by the people : and whether they know simply the Seven Sacraments : and whether they have at least a simple understanding of the Faith according to what is contained in the Psalm, *Quicumque Vult*, and in the larger Creed, and know how to instruct the people entrusted to them in these things.<sup>3</sup>

It should be remembered that this was the spontaneous law of the diocese enacted nearly half a century before the rupture with Scotland and the calamities that came in its train. It is an expression of the wishes of the general body of the parochial clergy of Cumberland and Westmorland when the diocese was in a state of peace and safety. Taking this standard as a whole and all that it comprises, one may well say, without posing as a *laudator temporis acti*, that a parish priest in what Dean Stanley once called 'the wilds of Cumberland' could not be justly described

<sup>1</sup> Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, ii. 16-17.

<sup>2</sup> Holograph letter in the Diocesan Registry of Carlisle.

<sup>3</sup> Statuta Karleolensia, MS. No. 26.

as ignorant of theology. A knowledge of the Psalm, known as the *Quicumque Vult*, now called the Athenasian Creed, taken by itself, without mentioning the Nicene Creed, the Ten Commandments, the Seven Sacraments and the Seven Deadly Sins, adumbrates an acquaintance with historical divinity not unworthy of comparison with the minimum theological attainments of other periods of our ecclesiastical history.

The striking feature of the diocesan regulation is not so much the amount of theological knowledge required in a parochial incumbent as his ability to communicate that knowledge to the people under his charge. The clergy themselves invested the Bishop with power to control their ministerial efficiency, as they threw upon him the responsibility of regulating the private purity and public propriety of their lives. The Archdeacon of Carlisle was obliged, in his periodical visitations, to do a great deal more than test their theological knowledge and pulpit aptitudes. It was also his business to report to his diocesan on the incumbent's mode of administering the Sacraments, and of conducting the various diurnal and nocturnal services. Special tests were to be applied by the archdeacon to the incumbent's methods in order to ensure solemn and impressive devotions for the faithful. Clear and distinct reading was regarded as a requisite of great importance: the incumbent must not drawl or gallop through his offices, telescoping successive words or omitting final syllables.<sup>1</sup> The glory of God and the edification of the people were to be the first consideration. To these tests the general body of the Carlisle diocesan clergy gave a willing consent. Periodical visitations on the lines established in 1259 would add a new interest to modern parochial life, and perhaps raise a ripple of excitement on its placid surface.

There is no reference in the Carlisle ecclesiastical statutes to the academic training of the clergy. The religious knowledge there indicated might well have been acquired in any of the local schools. The cathedral school, any of the monastic schools, or the schools of the four Orders of Friars which had habitations in the diocese, were capable of preparing candidates for sacred orders or benefices under these conditions. The ordination lists and the records of institutions give us little encouragement to assume higher education on an extensive scale. Exceptions, of course, there are, but they are of such rare occurrence that they serve only to prove the rule. The Bishops, however, with the sanction of canon law, had a scheme whereby they improved the education of the clergy by

<sup>1</sup> Statuta Karleolensia, MS. No. 37.



giving them the advantage of study at some University. One of the most frequent of the acts of the medieval Bishops of Carlisle was the *licencia studendi* granted to an incumbent soon after his institution to a benefice. The period for which absence was allowed for this purpose varied from one to seven years. The Bishop did not specify the particular University to which the applicant was to go: but it must be to a place *ubi vigere dinoscitur studium generale*,<sup>1</sup> that is, to a recognised University. Licences of this nature were always attended with the stipulation that the cure of souls, thereby temporarily deserted by the lawful pastor, should be properly served by a sufficient chaplain, and the dues of the benefice adequately discharged. It is noticeable that many of these licences were granted to the incumbents of benefices in lay patronage. The Bishops defended this singular procedure on the ground that the parishioners were the ultimate gainers: an educated pastor was a blessing to his flock, and there was no reason why a rich parish should not contribute to such an object. Notices of clergymen holding academic degrees are met with from time to time in the ecclesiastical records of Carlisle, masters in the faculty of arts, bachelors of theology, professors of the sacred page, professors of sacred theology, professors of canon and of civil law, doctors of decrees, and so on: towards the close of the medieval period the occurrence is more frequent. Sometimes the Carlisle clergy numbered amongst them an incumbent who graduated at the famous University of Paris.<sup>2</sup>

There is another feature to be taken into account in estimating the educational attainments of the clergy of Carlisle. A large proportion of the churches were appropriated to monastic institutions, two of which, the Augustinian priories of Carlisle and Lanercost,<sup>3</sup> served their appropriate parishes by members of their own communities. For this reason more than a third of the parishes of the diocese were in the pastoral charge of canons. Whether these canons had imbibed the rudiments of learning as youths in a *studium generale* or in the lecture rooms of their priories during noviciate, everything that is known of them betokens a liberal

<sup>1</sup> *Carl. Epis. Reg.*, Welton, MS. f. 15.

<sup>2</sup> *Carl. Epis. Reg.*, Halton, MS. f. 124. In some of the licences to study, liberty is given to go beyond the seas for that purpose. The common phrase is *citra mare vel ultra*.

<sup>3</sup> Other Austin priories outside the diocese, like Hexham, Wartre, and Conishead, had appropriate churches in Cumberland and Westmorland, which were served by their canons in the same way.

education. The Cistercians, the most influential of the religious orders in Cumberland, were obliged to maintain students at Oxford according to the number of monks in each community and the amount of their revenues. St. Bernard's College there, now represented by St. John's, was the Cistercian College, to which the English, Scottish, Welsh, and Irish students of the order were required to go at the expense of their respective monasteries.<sup>1</sup> Their course of study embraced theology, the decretals, and laws.

It is somewhat curious that Carlisle produced so few scholars whose fame outlived their own generation. The diocese may be described as the silent daughter of the English Church during the period under review. Leland,<sup>2</sup> who had unrivalled opportunities for collecting information while he perambulated the country in 1535-43, has mentioned only one Cumberland author in his great commentary, Roger Whelpdale, the *philosophiae alumnus*, sometime provost of Queen's College, Oxford, and afterwards Bishop of Carlisle (1420-1423). Little reliance can be placed on Fuller's list,<sup>3</sup> given a century later. Fuller distributed his writers, as if with a pepper-pot, in the various counties with little ascertainable connection, except what might be gleaned from the jingle of the territorial surname. The claims of more modern writers, mentioned by him, rest on a more satisfactory basis.

The paucity of literary or philosophical writers may perhaps be explained by the political unsettlement of the district. Border life in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries had a tendency to breed men of action, not men of letters: it needed the service of the sword more than of the pen. To one department of study at least the international troubles were a fatal hindrance. The study of history depends on the accessibility of original sources, and if the sources are destroyed the study must cease. Before the outbreak of the war with Scotland in 1296, the canons of Carlisle were without doubt proficient in historical knowledge, but at a later period, when they attempted excursions into this department of

<sup>1</sup>There is an early copy of the *Privilegium* of Benedict XII. (1334-42), in the Diocesan Registry of Carlisle, by which these matters were regulated. In setting out the Universities to which the several nations had to resort, we have in the text, 'et Exoniam Anglici, Scoti, Wallenses et Hibernici destinentur.' The scribal error, *Exoniam* for *Oxoniam*, is frequent in the texts of this important papal bull. The University of Paris, the 'principium et fons omnium studiorum,' held the hegemonic place among the universities of Europe, and its doors were open to all nations.

<sup>2</sup>*De Scriptoribus Britannicis* (1709), ii. 406.

<sup>3</sup>*The Worthies of England* (1684), pp. 136-7.

study, they prove themselves to be unsafe guides. The cause may be put down to the destruction of their records in the great fire of Carlisle in 1292, and the subsequent raids and captures of the city. The reader of the *Cronica de Karleolo*,<sup>1</sup> a historical document drawn up by the canons in 1291 at the request of Edward I., cannot fail to be impressed with their extensive acquaintance with historical sources. The actual author of the document, as it may be allowable to hold, was Alan of Frizington, a canon of the house and precentor of the church, who compiled the statement, under the supervision of the community, after diligent scrutiny of the chronicles, memoranda, and other writings in their possession. The student at his leisure can unravel the sources of this compilation and trace the origin of almost every statement in it. In this way he can get a glimpse into the scriptorium of the priory of Carlisle and the historical manuscripts it contained before the great destruction of 1292.

There can be no question that the compiler made use, amongst others, of the chronicles of Roger de Hoveden, Henry of Huntingdon, William of Malmesbury, John of Hexham, Benedictus Abbas, Ralph de Diceto, Matthew Paris, and the *Chronicle of Melrose*. No contribution has been taken from the legendary chronicles, Carlisle thus differing from many of the other religious houses who made reports at the same time. The precentor of Carlisle knew what trustworthy sources to consult on the question submitted by royal command, and his report is in consequence a model of historical accuracy. It should be added that Alan of Frizington afterwards forsook his learned leisure in the priory and was successively incumbent of Castlesowerby<sup>2</sup> and Camerton, two parochial churches appropriate to the cathedral. The last we hear of him occurs in 1323, when he is described as a canon of St. Mary's, Carlisle, and parson of Camerton.<sup>3</sup>

About half a century after the date of the *Cronica de Karleolo*, the canons had occasion to draw up another historical statement under less exalted patronage and upon a less difficult theme. Their neighbours, the canons of Conishead, wished to know the history of the advowson of the church of Orton in Westmorland, which belonged to their house, and was within the jurisdiction of

<sup>1</sup> Printed by Palgrave, *Documents and Records* (Rec. Com.), pp. 68-76. The purport of the document is well known for its judicious account of the ancient political relations between England and Scotland.

<sup>2</sup> *Carl. Epis. Reg.*, Halton, MS. ff. 124, 158.

<sup>3</sup> *Cal. of Patent Rolls*, 1321-4, pp. 285-6.

the Bishop of Carlisle and his diocesan chapter. The chronicles and ancient books of Carlisle were again diligently examined, and the result of the investigation communicated to the Lancashire canons under capitular seal.<sup>1</sup> The contents of this document, dated 17th September, 1343, disclose a strange absence of the use of historical evidence. The canons of Carlisle were incapable of tracing the chronological succession of the Bishops of their own diocese! It would seem that they had access to only two pieces of evidence, a copy of the chronicle of Matthew Paris and the record of the charter of Bartholomew, a former prior of their house, who confirmed Bishop Hugh's grant<sup>2</sup> of the church of Orton to the priory of Conishead. In every instance, when they wandered beyond these two authorities, their historical guesses were invariably wrong. Fifty years of quiet life could not have changed the traditions of the priory to such a deplorable extent. Through many different avenues the same tale comes that the destruction of the cathedral by fire in 1292, and the international troubles that followed so soon after, completely changed the whole thought and life of the Border counties. It is not without significance that the extant episcopal registers begin in 1292, the year in which the city was laid in ashes.

One literary work of permanent interest at least was produced in Cumberland, though the name of the author is unknown. The *Chronicle of Lanercost* is acknowledged to be of value as a historical record of public affairs on both sides of the Border during the reigns of Edward I., Edward II., and Edward III., up to its close in 1346. The earlier portions were compiled from different sources after the manner of such records, but when the chronicler reaches contemporary history, his views of passing events become of great interest. The work affords ample proof of high educational training.<sup>3</sup> Though the chronicle took its final shape in the story-telling age, and gives many indications that the redactor was not uninfluenced by the historical temper that prevailed, the whole compilation is a monument of considerable learning, and entitles Lanercost to rank with Hexham, Durham, and Melrose as a centre of historical study. Interpreted by the testimony of this record,

<sup>1</sup> Duchy of Lancaster Charter, Box A, No. 416, printed in the *Register of Wetherhal* (ed. J. E. Prescott), pp. 417-8.

<sup>2</sup> Bishop Hugh's charter is still extant, the first witness of which is Prior Bartholomew (D. of L. Charter, Box A, No. 412).

<sup>3</sup> See my article in this *Review*, x. 138-155, on the 'Authorship of the Chronicle of Lanercost.'

the educational possibilities of the district in which it was produced appear in a new light.

In forming an estimate of the educational attainments of the north-western counties during the medieval period, allowance must be made for the destruction or loss of our local literary sources. The burning of Carlisle at the close of the thirteenth century was perhaps in this respect the worst calamity. Frequent captures of Rose Castle, the residence of the Bishops, were equally unfortunate. The Scots in their periodic incursions carried off manuscripts<sup>1</sup> as well as cattle. The great pillage of the religious houses in the sixteenth century and the Civil War in the seventeenth completed the catastrophe. The marvel is that so much local manuscript material, poor as it is, has survived.

There are no evidences at present known for a history of the school of Carlisle previous to the sixteenth century, except a few scattered references like those above indicated. Notwithstanding this absence of material, we know that it was a vital institution of the diocese in the previous centuries. The same view may be taken of the other educational centres in the district, and if so, it cannot be said that the opportunities of the people were neglected. The attainments of the clergy, too, could not have been far behind those of their brethren in more peaceful places, and though they have left no theological treatises behind them, it does not follow that none were written. The wisdom of the Bishops in charging the parishes with the higher intellectual training of so many of the incumbents could not help but raise the educational tone of their afflicted diocese. Piers the Plowman's picture of the priest who knew rhymes about Robin Hood better than his prayers, and could find a hare in a field more readily than he could read the lives of the saints, does not apply to the clergy of Carlisle.

JAMES WILSON.

<sup>1</sup> Fordun, *Scotichronicon* (ed. Goodall), ii. 402-403.

### ‘The Savage Man’

THIS caricature refers to the celebrated quarrel between David Hume and Rousseau, which is related at length in the former's pamphlet entitled *A concise and genuine Account of the Dispute between Mr. Hume and Mr. Rousseau*, which was published by Hume in 1766.

In the centre is Jean Jacques Rousseau, in the garb of a ‘Salvage Man’ in heraldry. On the left is David Hume humbly offering him a fish for dinner, and deprecating his anger. On the other side of Rousseau is Voltaire, holding in his hand a cane with a fox's head. The figure encouraging Voltaire to ‘wip’ Rousseau is ‘Peter the Wild Boy,’ a freak who was being exhibited in England during the winter of 1766-7. A more detailed explanation of the caricature (which was published in January, 1767) may be found in the *British Museum Catalogue of Satirical Prints*, Volume IV., Number 4158.

C. H. FIRTH.

THE SAVAGE MAN.



As to David cannot be brought  
if he be not the best of Men, must  
the best of men be

Mr. G. says

Why what my dear Sir, how  
your Sir! O my dear Sir,

For my friends say  
Loren

It is my friends Humour

the equality of

all my letters  
I have  
I have  
I have

## The Lollard Knights

IN speaking of Wycliffe and his early followers, certain contemporary chroniclers lay much stress on the support bestowed on the Lollard movement by representatives of the nobility and gentry, some of whom are singled out by name. The fullest particulars are given by the continuator of Knighton's chronicle, a canon of St. Mary's Abbey, Leicester, who under date of 1382 inserts a long and heated account of the teachings and doings of Wycliffe and his poor priests. He says that among the upholders of the heretics were to be found dukes and earls, but especially conspicuous were the knights Thomas Latimer, John Trussell, Lewis Clifford, John Peche, Richard Stury, and Reginald Hilton. These men, having a zeal for God but not according to knowledge, became the subjects and servants of the Lollard preachers. Whenever a poor priest visited one of their estates, the knight would force the people of the neighbourhood to come and hear him, sometimes in the parish church itself, and during the discourse would stand by armed to secure the preacher from molestation or criticism.<sup>1</sup>

The St. Albans chronicles are less picturesque but equally liberal with names. Under the year 1387, they describe an attack made by Peter Pateshull, a renegade Austin friar, on the morals of his order. His accusations are said to have given much satisfaction to the 'hooded knights,' so-called from their refusal to uncover in the presence of the Host. Among these men, who were also eager supporters of the Wycliffites, the most notable were William Neville, Lewis Clifford, John Clanvowe, Richard Stury, Thomas Latimer, and John Montagu. The worst of all was Montagu, who had removed the images from his chapel at Shenley in Hertfordshire. Here he harboured Lollard preachers, among them the famous Nicholas Hereford.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Chron. Henr. Knighton* (R.S.), ii. 181. For convenience' sake, I shall refer to the continuator as 'Knighton.'

<sup>2</sup> *Chron. Angliae, 1328-1388* (R.S.), 377; Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.* (R.S.), ii. 159. Walsingham gives a few more details, but at this point his chronicle is a mere



A few years later some of these knights appear again in connection with one of the best-known episodes in the history of Lollardy. In January, 1395, the Lollards, taking advantage of the king's absence in Ireland, nailed to the doors of St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey twelve propositions enunciating some of the chief points of their teaching. These articles attacked the doctrines and institutions which commonly excited Lollard scorn; but an unusual feature was the condemnation of all war as sinful, and of certain trades, such as the armourer's and the goldsmith's, as unnecessary. These views, we are told, were held and defended by Clifford, Stury, Latimer, Montagu, and other important men, some of whom, headed by Stury and Latimer, went so far as to advocate them before the Parliament then sitting at Westminster. The bishops in great alarm sent to tell the king of the dangers by which the church was beset. Richard hurried back, threatened the Lollard leaders with death, and made Stury swear that he would hold no heretical opinions in future. After this the Lollards kept quiet for some time.<sup>1</sup>

No further mention of Stury or Latimer occurs in the chronicles. But in writing of the death in 1400 of John Montagu, then Earl of Salisbury, at the hands of the men of Cirencester, the St. Albans writers describe him as a life-long supporter of the Lollards, a despiser of images and a mocker at the sacraments, and add that he died without confession.<sup>2</sup> Two years later, according to the same authorities, Lewis Clifford abjured Lollardy, having at last understood the full import of its doctrines, which up to now the members of the sect had cloaked in ambiguous language. He gave the primate a list of some of their tenets, with the names of the Lollard leaders. The opinions attributed to them are very radical and expressed in violent language. The sacraments are described as 'dead signs,' that of the altar in particular as a 'pinnacle of Antichrist,' and the church is styled 'the synagogue of Satan.' The mere consent of two parties is affirmed to constitute a valid marriage; the doctrine of original sin is denied; and revision of the other, which indeed he probably compiled himself. (See Sir E. Maunde Thompson's introduction to the *Chronicon Angliæ*.) Capgrave's story (*Chronicle* (R.S.), 244) of Montagu's desecration of the Host is manifestly due to careless use of Walsingham, who tells the tale about a different person (*Chron Angl.* 377).

<sup>1</sup> *Annales Ricardi II.* (R.S.), 173 ff.; Wals. *op. cit.* 216. After 1392 the *Historia Anglicana* is seldom more than a condensation of the *Annales*. In this case, their accounts are in all essentials the same.

<sup>2</sup> *Annales Henrici IV.*, 326; Wals., *op. cit.*, ii. 244.

it is declared that no day should be regarded as more sacred than another.<sup>1</sup>

Meanwhile another knight had attracted attention by reason of his attitude towards the church. This was Sir John Cheyne, who was Speaker at the Parliament of 1399. The *Annales Henrici Quarti*<sup>2</sup> state that in the Convocation which met simultaneously, Archbishop Arundel warned the clergy against certain of the knights in Parliament. Among these Cheyne, he said, was conspicuous for his hostility to the church, and they would be well advised to give such enemies no grounds for criticism.

Five years later, at the so-called Unlearned Parliament of Coventry, some of the knights proposed that, in view of Henry IV.'s lack of funds, the temporalities of the church should be seized for a year into the king's hand.<sup>3</sup> According to Walsingham, Cheyne, who was again Speaker, made himself prominent in support of the suggestion, and poured scorn on the primate's plea that apart from the taxes paid by the clergy, the prayers of the church were a source of strength to the state. Henry, however, supported the archbishop, and the knights were defeated.<sup>4</sup>

The statements just summarised have been generally accepted by modern historians, and all the knights mentioned have been regarded as whole-hearted Lollards anxious for a reform of the church in organisation, practice, and doctrine.<sup>5</sup> Even Cheyne is often included, though he is nowhere accused by the chroniclers of anything more than anti-clericalism. But though at first sight the evidence seems good, it does not carry us far. Some of it, even if true, is of little moment, and nearly all the information furnished is vague, and expressed in violent if not hysterical language. The hope of shedding clearer light on the real attitude of the knights accused by Knighton and Walsingham has led me to investigate their careers. The results may best be presented

<sup>1</sup> *Ann. Hen. IV.*, 347; *Wals.*, *op. cit.*, ii. 252.

<sup>2</sup> P. 290.

<sup>3</sup> *Ann. Hen. IV.*, 391 f.

<sup>4</sup> *Wals.*, *op. cit.*, ii. 264 f.

<sup>5</sup> See, for example, Mr. G. M. Trevelyan's *England in the Age of Wycliffe*, Dr. J. H. Wylie's *History of England under Henry the Fourth*, iii. 296 f.; and especially Dr. Gairdner's *Lollardy and the Reformation*, i. 40 f. Dr. Gairdner writes: 'A considerable body of influential knights took up the cause of the Wycliffite clergy in a way that showed that they believed in their principles most sincerely.' He mentions as such all the knights referred to by Knighton and Walsingham, with the exception of Cheyne.

in a series of short biographies, and for the sake of clearness I shall adopt an order different from that in which the names are given by either of the chroniclers.

Lewis Clifford, third son of Robert, third Lord Clifford, was born before 1336.<sup>1</sup> He early entered upon a military career, though it is difficult to accept Froissart's statement that he served in Brittany in 1342.<sup>2</sup> There is, however, no reason to doubt the same authority when he asserts that in 1351 Clifford was in the garrison of Calais, and was taken prisoner in the famous fight near Ardres on the Whit Monday of that year. He was soon ransomed,<sup>3</sup> but nothing more is heard of him for a number of years. Probably he was still engaged in military service, for he seems to have accompanied the Spanish expedition of 1367,<sup>4</sup> and six years later he took part in John of Gaunt's futile march through France.<sup>5</sup>

Except in this year, however, he was more closely connected with the Black Prince than with his younger brother, receiving in fact a substantial annual salary from his revenues.<sup>6</sup> He remained in the prince's favour till his death, and afterwards retained the confidence of his widow and the young Richard. In 1377 the princess employed him as mediator between John of Gaunt and the Londoners when the duke's support of Wycliffe had stirred the city to violence against him, and in the following year, when the reformer was brought before Archbishop Sudbury at Lambeth, Clifford was sent with a message forbidding extreme measures.<sup>7</sup> About the same time Joan gave Clifford the custody of Cardigan castle, with a stipend of £100 a year, and the king subsequently confirmed him in this office for life.<sup>8</sup>

Clifford's importance increased rapidly during the first years of the new reign. In 1377 he became a Knight of the Garter, succeeding to the stall left vacant when Enguerraud de Coucy renounced his allegiance to England.<sup>9</sup> In the summer of 1378

<sup>1</sup> G. E. C., *Complete Peerage*, ii. 290; *Scrope and Grosvenor Controversy*, ed. Nicolas, i. 179.

<sup>2</sup> Froissart (ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove), iv. 143.

<sup>3</sup> Froissart, v. 302, 303.

<sup>4</sup> *Scrope and Grosvenor Controversy*, loc. cit.

<sup>5</sup> Froissart, viii. 280, 284; cf. *John of Gaunt's Register* (ed. S. Armitage-Smith), i. 125, ii. 192, 224.

<sup>6</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., i. 156, 158; cf. Nicolas, *Testamenta Vetusta*, 13.

<sup>7</sup> *Chron. Angliae*, 126, 183.

<sup>8</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., ii. 185.

<sup>9</sup> Beltz, *Order of the Garter*, 27.

he served as joint-commander of fifty men-at-arms and fifty archers in a disastrous naval expedition to Brittany under John of Gaunt.<sup>1</sup> It is remarkable that, despite his connection with the Black Prince's party, Clifford won the regard of the duke, who about this time made him one of his executors.<sup>2</sup> For the next few years Clifford seems to have remained in England,<sup>3</sup> and it is to this period that Knighton's chronicle refers his activities in support of the Lollard preachers. A document of 1381 styles him 'king's knight,'<sup>4</sup> but though he was thus retained in Richard's immediate service, it is likely that he was as a rule in attendance on the king's mother, for in 1385, when all of gentle blood were enjoined to prepare for the Scottish expedition, Clifford received a special mandate to stay with the princess.<sup>5</sup> Joan, however, died a month or two later, after appointing Sir Lewis as one of her executors.<sup>6</sup>

During the troubles that began with the parliament of 1386, Clifford is almost entirely lost to view. In October, 1386, he gave evidence in the great Scrope and Grosvenor case;<sup>7</sup> Walsingham says that he supported Pateshull in 1387; and he was in England in May, 1388;<sup>8</sup> otherwise he remains in obscurity till Richard's resumption of power in 1389. Then, however, Clifford was made a member of the Privy Council,<sup>9</sup> and came to the front as a diplomatist. In May, 1390, his name appears among the numerous and imposing signatures at the foot of a strong remonstrance to the pope against provisions and reservations.<sup>10</sup> He was one of the ambassadors whose arrival at Paris in February, 1391, caused Charles VI. to abandon his projected expedition against Boniface IX.<sup>11</sup> Clifford, it is clear, was at this time held in general respect: he was a knight of the king's chamber;<sup>12</sup> great nobles

<sup>1</sup> *Enrolled Accounts*, F., 5 Ric. II., i.

<sup>2</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., i. 262.

<sup>3</sup> *Rot. Franc.*, 3 Ric. II., m. 8, 4 Ric. II., m. 7, 5 Ric. II., m. 2, 6 Ric. II., m. 30.

<sup>4</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., ii. 33.

<sup>5</sup> *Foedera*, vii. 474. Except when the contrary is indicated, references are made to the original edition of the *Foedera*.

<sup>6</sup> *Test. Vetust.*, 14.

<sup>7</sup> *Scrope and Grosvenor Controversy*, i. 179, 183.

<sup>8</sup> *Rot. Franc.*, 11 Ric. II., m. 4.

<sup>9</sup> *Proceedings of the Privy Council*, i. *passim*; *Enrolled Accts.* F., 13 Ric. II., B.

<sup>10</sup> *Foed.*, vii. 672.

<sup>11</sup> Froiss. (ed. cit.), xiv. 284, 288; *Contin. Polychronici* (R.S.), ix. 247; *Rot. Franc.*, 15 Ric. II., m. 14; *Enrolled Accts.* F., 16 Ric. II., B.

<sup>12</sup> Froiss. xiv. 289.

like the Earls of Derby and of Rutland chose him as one of their attorneys while they were abroad;<sup>1</sup> and the Duchess of York, who died in 1392, made him one of her executors.<sup>2</sup> The other was Sir Richard Stury: and the will sheds a most interesting and astonishing light on the religious views, or at all events the religious reputation, of the two men. On the day of the duchess's death 'a hundred trentals and two hundred sauters' were to be said for her soul, and for four years masses in her behalf were to be sung. If Knighton and Walsingham are to be believed, the duchess entrusted the execution of these pious wishes to two notorious heretics, who would regard the purchase of prayers for the dead with peculiar aversion and to whom the mass was idolatry. The bearing of the will on the case of Stury will be considered later; but in regard to Clifford it seems to me to prove that among those who knew him best he had up to this time no reputation for heresy. It is incredible that the duchess, with her soul's peace at stake and with scores of competent and orthodox knights and clerks at hand, should select anyone under the least suspicion of Lollardy. The confidence shown in Sir Lewis by Richard's mother tends to confirm the conclusion just drawn: for notwithstanding her support of Wycliffe in 1378 she was a devoted daughter of the church, and it is significant that she was buried in a church of the Franciscans, the bitterest enemies of Lollardy.<sup>3</sup>

During the three years following the death of the Duchess of York, Clifford was given almost continuous employment. He served on numerous commissions, mainly judicial, and in 1393 was sent with Lancaster, Gloucester, and other magnates to treat for peace with France.<sup>4</sup> At the beginning of 1395 came the publication of the Lollard articles at St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey, and, as we have seen, Clifford was believed at St. Albans to have given them his support. What shape his sympathy took is not stated; he seems to have had no share in the alleged presentation of the articles to Parliament; and there is grave doubt whether his name ought to be mentioned at all. For in a document of 1396 Clifford appears as a member of the

<sup>1</sup> *Rot. Franc.*, 15 Ric. II., m. 5, 16 Ric. II., m. 14.

<sup>2</sup> *Test. Vetust.*, 134 f.

<sup>3</sup> *Wals.*, *op. cit.*, ii. 130.

<sup>4</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., v. 17, 68, 76, 166, 290, 318, 388; *Contin. Polychron.*, ix. 280; *Foed.*, vii. 738; *Enrolled Accts. F.*, 16 Ric. II., B.

Order or the Passion,<sup>1</sup> a military society founded by the visionary Philip de Mezières to resist the advance of the Turks and to prepare and lead a great crusade for the recovery of the holy places. Now not only were crusades condemned by Wycliffe,<sup>2</sup> but the Lollard conclusions of 1395 denounced 'manslaute be batayle . . . for temporal cause or spiritual' as 'expres contrarious to the newe testament,' and had specially singled out for reprobation 'Knythis that rennen to hethnesse to geten hem a name in sleinge of men.'<sup>3</sup> A few months after these views were published—perhaps indeed at that very time—Clifford belonged to an Order which existed expressly for the slaying of heathen. The conclusions, too, proposed that goldsmiths and armourers and 'all manere craftis nout nedeful to man . . . schulde ben destroyd for the ences of vertu'<sup>4</sup>—a strange suggestion to meet with the approval of a Knight of the Garter, who had for long spent much of his time at Court and continued to do so afterwards.

That Clifford sincerely maintained such opinions is impossible. That he even pretended to do so is most unlikely: his hypocrisy would have been patent to all. Lollardy would, at any rate, derive no real strength from such support.

Though the St. Albans writers say that the king threatened Sir Lewis and his associates with death for their support of heresy, the incident made no difference to Clifford's position and manner of life. He continued to do much work on commissions,<sup>5</sup> took part in the negotiations which led to Richard's marriage with Isabella of France,<sup>6</sup> and in 1398 was still a king's knight.<sup>7</sup> There is, however, no indication of the attitude he assumed during Richard's brief tyranny: and after the accession of Henry IV. no further use of his services seems to have been made.

There are few notices of Clifford after 1399; and the only one of particular interest is the passage, already mentioned, which tells of his repudiation of Lollardy.

<sup>1</sup> *Les Archives de l'Orient Latin*, i. 363. For further information concerning the Order, see Delaville le Roulx, *La France en Orient au xiv<sup>e</sup> siècle*, i. 204 f. It is not clear when Clifford joined the Order; we only know that it was between 1385 and 1396.

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g. *Polemical Works of John Wycliffe* (Wycliffe Society), 270 f.; *Select English Works of Wycliffe* (ed. Arnold), i. 367, iii. 136 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *English Historical Review*, vol. xxii. 302.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 304.

<sup>5</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., v. 689, vi. 357.

<sup>6</sup> Froissart, xv. 164, 194.

<sup>7</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., vi. 357.

Now there is nothing *a priori* astonishing in a recantation of Lollard views in the year 1402. The new dynasty was determined to uphold the church. The Statute *de Heretico comburendo* had been passed the year before. The Wycliffites were on the decline. But the account of Clifford's abjuration is not quite convincing. He is said to have pleaded that he had previously not understood the meaning of the chief Lollard doctrines. This excuse may of course have been a lie, but if true, it indicates that Clifford had not been intimate with the Lollards for as long as the St. Albans writers make out, for the early members of the sect put their views plainly and bluntly, and the articles of 1395 were nothing if not explicit. Furthermore, some of the views which he is said to have ascribed to the Lollards were held by only a few extreme fanatics; and though Clifford, with a convert's zeal, may have picked out the very worst of the tenets of his former associates, another explanation would be that his knowledge of Lollardy was really slight. In view of the will of the Duchess of York and his connection with the Order of the Passion, it would moreover seem that his adoption of Lollard beliefs must have occurred, if at all, after 1396. It is surely improbable that an elderly man, who had evidently remained orthodox in the hopeful days of Lollardy, should change his faith when the fortunes of the sect were declining, and the influence of the State was being strongly used against it.<sup>1</sup> Clifford, however, evidently had a bad name in certain quarters, and a desire to clear himself and perhaps to win favour in the eyes of the influential Archbishop Arundel, may have led him to come forward with information against the Lollards—an act which the St. Albans monks would naturally construe as an abjuration.

Whatever may have been the real character of Clifford's recantation, it did him little good in this world. In 1404 Princes Risboro' and Mere, two manors given him for life by Richard, were seized by the Prince of Wales, on the ground that they formed part of the duchy of Cornwall.<sup>2</sup> The loss must have

<sup>1</sup> Though the *Statutum de heretico* was not passed till 1401, the government had, from 1382 onwards, taken administrative action against the Lollards. Bishops and special commissions were repeatedly empowered to seize them or their writings (*Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II. *passim*). It should be noted that there is not a particle of respectable evidence against the orthodoxy of Richard II. When his attitude towards heresy is alluded to by the chroniclers, it is always in terms of praise.

<sup>2</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Henry IV., ii. 399, 402.

been a severe one, for Sir Lewis was not wealthy.<sup>1</sup> But before the end of the year he was dead.<sup>2</sup>

Clifford's will is couched in extremely contrite terms. His expressions of self-contempt are remarkably strong, and only paralleled in the wills of Sir Thomas Latimer and Sir John Cheyne, both of whom were likewise said to be hostile to the church.<sup>3</sup> The significance of the resemblance is indeed somewhat diminished by the fact that Clifford was one of Latimer's executors and Cheyne one of Clifford's;<sup>4</sup> but they would hardly have used this remorseful language unless they had some special load on their souls. What, then, was this heinous sin? In Clifford's case there seems reason to reject the usual explanation that it was heresy. What he really had done, and how two independent chroniclers both set him down as a Lollard, may be more adequately discussed when the other knights have been considered.

<sup>1</sup> At the height of his fortunes (1391 or thereabouts) Clifford held, besides Princes Risboro' and Mere (*Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., i. 156, iii. 53), the custody of Cardigan for life (*Ibid.*, ii. 185), the lordship of Ewyas Harald (*Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., iii. 310), and the temporalities in England of the Abbey of Préaux (*Ibid.*, iv. 306, 355). He drew 25 marks as rent for a third of the manor of Hickling, £10 *per annum* from the duchy of Cornwall, and £100 from the lordship of Cardigan (*Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., ii. 477, i. 157, ii. 185). He received 10s. for every day when he attended the Council (*Enrolled Accounts*, F., 13 Ric. II., B.), had £6 13s. 4d. and two suits of robes a year as a knight of the chamber (*Exchequer Accts.*, K.R. Wardrobe, 402/5 *et passim*). As a king's knight he would, when not employed on any special errand, have his board and lodging at court or one of the royal palaces or castles. (*Exch. Accts.*, K.R. Wardrobe, 393/15, 394/16, pp. 9, 10, 401/6), and he might count on occasional presents from the king. But by 1404 he had disposed of Ewyas Harald (*Cal. Pat.*, Hen. IV., i. 204) and transferred his rights over the property of Préaux (*Ibid.*, ii. 263). He was no longer a king's knight or a councillor, so the loss of the two manors in this year must have been very serious.

<sup>2</sup> His will was proved on December 5, 1404 (*Test. Vetust.*, 164 f.).

<sup>3</sup> He styles himself 'false and traitor to my Lord God . . . and unworthy to be called a Christian man.' His body is referred to as 'stinking carrion.' He is to be buried without any pomp, and no stone is to mark his grave. Latimer's will is rather less violent in tone. (*Test. Vetust.*, 158 f.) Much of Cheyne's is identical with that of Clifford, and obviously copied from it. (*Reg. Arundel*, ii. 203 b.) Expressions of self-contempt, though of less violence than those used by Clifford, are to be found in wills of persons under no suspicion of heresy. Thus Sir Brian de Stapleton, who died in 1394, speaks of both his soul and his body as 'caitiff'; Edward Duke of York, slain at Agincourt, calls himself 'of all sinners the most wicked'; and Joan, Lady Abergavenny, whose death occurred in 1434, talks of her 'simple and wretched body.' (*Test. Eboracensia*, [Surtees Society], i. 198; *Test. Vetust.*, 113, 225.)

<sup>4</sup> *Test. Vetust.*, 159, 165.



Richard Stury, whom it is convenient to deal with next, was probably the son of Sir William Stury, a landowner of Shropshire,<sup>1</sup> who was marshal of the household from 1338 to 1340,<sup>2</sup> rendered diplomatic and military service in the early days of the Hundred Years' War,<sup>3</sup> became seneschal of Calais in 1347,<sup>4</sup> and apparently ended his life as governor of the Channel Islands.<sup>5</sup> The first trustworthy notice of Richard appears to date from 1347, when he is mentioned as having served at sea.<sup>6</sup> Two years later he is referred to as having seen further service, and as an esquire of the king's household.<sup>7</sup>

In 1353 his name appears at the head of a list of king's esquires, and about the same time he was granted a pension of ten marks a year.<sup>8</sup> The winter of 1359-60 saw him in France with a retinue of one archer, and during the ensuing campaign he was taken prisoner, the king granting £50 towards his ransom.<sup>9</sup> At the close of 1360 he was an esquire of the king's chamber :<sup>10</sup> three years later he was still attached to the court, though in what capacity does not appear;<sup>11</sup> but his hitherto slow advance was accelerated in 1365, when he became trier of weights and measures and escheator of Ireland.<sup>12</sup> He was knighted by 1368, in which year he was despatched to Flanders on diplomatic busi-

<sup>1</sup> *Cal. Claus.*, Edw. III., iii. 496. He is probably to be identified with the William Stury who was an esquire of Roger Mortimer's in the days of Edward II. (*Parly. Writs*, pt. ii. 244 f.). Kervyn de Lettenhove (*Œuvres de Froissart*, 1a. 421, xv. 387) says that Richard's father was a London merchant, but he cites no evidence in support of this assertion, and I have been unable to find any.

<sup>2</sup> *Exch. Accts.*, K.R. Wardrobe, 388/9, pp. 5a, 6a, 12a.

<sup>3</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Edw. III., iv. 387; *Cal. Claus.*, Edw. III., v. 525, vi. 279; *Foed.*, v. 458; *Exch. Accts.*, K.R. Wardrobe, 390/12, pp. 18, 41.

<sup>4</sup> *Foed.* (ed. 1830), iii. pt. i. 145.

<sup>5</sup> *Foed.* (ed. 1830), iii. pt. i. 275, v. 823. William Stury died before April 12, 1357 (*Cal. Pat.*, Edw. III., x. 525).

<sup>6</sup> *Exch. Accts.*, K.R. Wardrobe, 391/9, p. 14. Froissart (iii. 206, v. 193) says that Stury fought at Sluys, and, as a king's knight, played a conspicuous part at the siege of Calais. Stury was not knighted till years afterwards, and the chronicler is apparently confusing him with his father.

<sup>7</sup> *Exch. Accts.*, K.R. Wardrobe, 390/12, pp. 51, 56, 58.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 392/12; *Cal. Pat.*, Edw. III., ix. 532.

<sup>9</sup> *Exch. Accts.*, K.R. Wardrobe, 393/11, pp. 69, 102b.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 393/15.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.* 394/16; cf. Froissart, vi. 384.

<sup>12</sup> *Cal. Claus.*, Edw. III., xii. 146, 150.

ness.<sup>1</sup> His visit to the Netherlands was repeated several times during the next few years.<sup>2</sup> In 1369 Stury was serving under John of Gaunt in the north of France, and from that year till 1377 he was captain of Hammes castle in Picardy; but both here and in Ireland he evidently performed his duties by deputy.<sup>3</sup> Stury was now an important man. In 1370 he was chosen to accompany Charles the Bad, King of Navarre, on his return to his dominions.<sup>4</sup> Next year he formed part of an embassy to Brittany. On the way the ambassadors and their escort fell in with a Flemish squadron off the Breton coast; in the fierce fight which followed the English were victorious, and Stury attracted notice by his bravery.<sup>5</sup> At this time he was a knight of the chamber, a position which he apparently retained for some years.<sup>6</sup> He would thus be brought into personal touch with the king, and it is clear from subsequent events that he acquired considerable influence at court. He was a member of the clique led by John of Gaunt, which for some time controlled the administration, and were notorious for their corruption and hostility to the clergy. Sir Richard was on terms of particular enmity with the Black Prince, who refused to be reconciled even when Stury visited him on his death-bed.<sup>7</sup> Stury was at the moment acting as an agent in the negotiations between the king and the Good Parliament, and being convicted of making false and malicious reports regarding the intentions of the Commons, he was banished from court by Edward.<sup>8</sup> The influence of John of Gaunt and Alice Perrers soon, however, restored him to favour; and the autumn of 1376 saw his material resources increased by several royal grants.<sup>9</sup> Early in 1377 he was sent to France on political

<sup>1</sup> *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 42 Edw. III., E. Contradicting the statement cited above, Froissart (vi. 267) says that Stury was knighted by the king before the gates of Paris in April, 1360; but the wardrobe accounts and close rolls make it clear that this statement also is false. He may have been, as Froissart says, a knight in 1363, but in official documents the title is first applied to him in 1368.

<sup>2</sup> *Enrolled Accts.* F., 42 Edw. III., D.C., 44 Edw. III., C.

<sup>3</sup> Frois., vii. 423; *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 43 Edw. III., C.; *Cal. Claus.*, Edw. III., xiii. 512; *Rot. Franc.*, Ric. II., p. 1, m. 20.

<sup>4</sup> *Foed.*, vi. 661.

<sup>5</sup> Froiss., viii. 93 f.

<sup>6</sup> *Exch. Accts.*, K.R. Wardrobe, 397/5, 398/9.

<sup>7</sup> *Chron. Angliæ* (1328-88), 89.

<sup>8</sup> *Chron. Ang.*, 87. The passage is very bitter in tone and should be received with caution.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 87, 105; *Cal Pat.*, Ric. II., i. 80, 121, 314, 337.

business, and was thus out of the way at the time of Wycliffe's trial at St. Paul's and the consequent rising of the Londoners against his patron.<sup>1</sup> On the death of Edward III. and the temporary loss of the duke's influence, Stury found himself in difficulties. At the Parliament which met in the autumn of 1377 he gave evidence, presumably under compulsion, against his former benefactress Alice Perrers;<sup>2</sup> and soon afterwards he was deprived of the custody of the castles of Hammes and Bamborough.<sup>3</sup> But when, early in 1378, John of Gaunt recovered some of his power, Stury at once benefited by the change. He was put on the list of king's knights.<sup>4</sup> Edward III.'s grant of the manor of Bolsover, made in 1376, was confirmed, and as joint-commander of sixty men-at-arms and sixty archers he took part in Lancaster's expedition to Brittany.<sup>5</sup> In 1379, besides being granted an annuity of £100 as compensation for the loss of Bamborough, he was appointed keeper of Carisbrooke Castle, a position which he held for a year.<sup>6</sup> In 1381 Stury was a knight of the chamber, but luckily perhaps for himself he was in France treating for peace at the time of the Peasants' Revolt.<sup>7</sup> After another visit to France in the following winter,<sup>8</sup> Stury drops out of sight for some time. It is under 1382 that Knighton speaks of the support he gave to the Lollard preachers, and it must be remembered that Stury held the manor of Barnwell in Northamptonshire, not far from Leicester.<sup>9</sup> The general hatred of John of Gaunt which the revolt of 1381 had revealed may have led Stury to withdraw from politics for a while and sever his connection with the duke. At all events, when he reappears, it is as an associate of Clifford in the service of the Princess of Wales. In 1384 Joan made him keeper of the castle and lordship of Aberystwith, with a salary of 100 marks;<sup>10</sup> and next year Sir Richard was one of the knights

<sup>1</sup> *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 50 Edw. III., E. Stury left London on Feb. 13 and returned on Mar. 25; Chaucer was one of his colleagues (Froiss., viii. 383).

<sup>2</sup> *Rot. Parl.*, iii. 14a.

<sup>3</sup> *Rot. Franc.*, 1 Ric. II., p. 1, m. 20; *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., i. 80. Bamborough had been given him in October, 1376.

<sup>4</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., i. 121, 337.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 121; *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 2 Ric. II., A.

<sup>6</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., i. 337; *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 3 Ric. II., H.

<sup>7</sup> *Foed.*, vii. 308 f.; *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 4 Ric. II., L.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, B.

<sup>9</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., i. 314, ii. 160.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, ii. 453, v. 670.

who remained with the princess during the expedition to Scotland.<sup>1</sup> He was an executor of her will, and took a prominent part in administering her estate and providing for the repose of her soul.<sup>2</sup> The death of the princess set him free to serve her son; he again became a knight of the chamber;<sup>3</sup> and in the winter of 1385 and spring of 1386 he was engaged in negotiations on the Scottish border.<sup>4</sup>

According to Walsingham, Stury was hand-in-glove with Aubrey de Vere, Michael de la Pole, Simon Burley, and other favourites of Richard, and united with them in poisoning the king's mind against the Earls of Arundel and Nottingham, and thereby precipitating the crisis of 1387.<sup>5</sup> During that year Stury seems to have stood by the king, for in May he was appointed justice of Cardigan, and, according to Froissart, used his influence strongly to induce Richard to return to London in the autumn.<sup>6</sup> About the same time occurred the attacks of Pateshull on the Friars; but Stury must have been too much preoccupied with politics to lend much aid to the assault.

It is significant that Stury's name is not found in a single document dating from 1388, when Richard's influence was altogether eclipsed, and equally significant that when the king resumed the reins of government, Stury once more became a knight of the chamber,<sup>7</sup> was made member of the royal council,<sup>8</sup> and was given frequent employment on diplomatic, judicial, and administrative commissions. Thus in 1389 and 1390 he was sent to negotiate with France, and to inspect the condition of Calais and the neighbourhood; <sup>9</sup> in 1394 he was associated with Lancaster, York, and others on a most imposing embassy to treat for peace with the French,<sup>10</sup> and as soon as he returned, was despatched to the Border

<sup>1</sup> *Foed.*, vii. 474.

<sup>2</sup> *Test. Vetust.*, 14; *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., iii. 65.

<sup>3</sup> *Rot. Scot.*, ii. 75.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 75, 82; *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 8 Ric. II., B.

<sup>5</sup> *Wals.*, *Hist. Ang.*, ii. 156. The passage is hysterically violent, but the main facts recorded are credible enough.

<sup>6</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., iii. 307; *Frois.*, xii. 291. Froissart's account of the events in England at this time is hopelessly confused, and the details cannot be trusted. Stury's presence with the king, however, is intrinsically probable.

<sup>7</sup> *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 12 Ric. II., B.

<sup>8</sup> *Proceedings of Privy Council*, . 6 *et passim*.

<sup>9</sup> *Rot. Franc.*, 13 Ric. II., mm. 3, 6; *Foed.*, vii. 667 f.

<sup>10</sup> *Rot. Franc.*, 17 Ric. II., m. 8; *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 16 Ric. II., E.

on business connected with a truce recently arranged and a prospective marriage alliance with Scotland.<sup>1</sup> When not abroad, Stury was kept busy at home by attendance at the council and by judicial and administrative business.<sup>2</sup> In 1390 he signed the protest against papal provisions ;<sup>3</sup> and in 1392, as we have seen, he assisted in carrying out the pious wishes of the Duchess of York.

Everything that has been said regarding Clifford's share in the matter will apply with equal force to Stury. In the latter's case, indeed, the prominent part he took in arranging for masses after the death of the Princess of Wales gives additional strength to the conclusion that up to 1392 Sir Richard was under no suspicion of heresy at court.<sup>4</sup>

We are now brought to Stury's alleged advocacy of the Lollard conclusions of 1395. The charge against him is more explicit than that against Clifford. Stury was a leader of those who laid the propositions before Parliament. He is also said to have drawn on his head the special wrath of the king ; in fact, the impression left is that he was the ringleader throughout.

The account of the St. Albans writers cannot be disproved. But it lies under much suspicion. In the first place, it entirely lacks confirmation from any contemporary chronicle or record. The silence of the rolls of Parliament may be ascribed to Richard's desire to remove from the State records all trace of an unpleasant episode ; but it is remarkable that in the letter from the council asking the king to return, nothing is said or even hinted regarding the Lollards : the only reason given is the dangerous activity of the Scots.<sup>5</sup> Neither Stury nor any of the others mentioned was a member of this Parliament ; Richard, notwithstanding Walsingham's assertion, was in no hurry to come back ;<sup>6</sup> and whatever

<sup>1</sup> *Foed.*, vii. 785, 787 ; *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 17 Ric. II., A.

<sup>2</sup> *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 13 Ric. II., B. ; 15 Ric. II., B. ; *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., v. 37 *et passim*.

<sup>3</sup> *Foed.*, vii. 672 f.

<sup>4</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., iii. 65. Though Sir Lewis Clifford, Sir John Clanvowe, and Sir William Neville were also nominated executors by the princess, they seem to have been less active than Stury.

<sup>5</sup> *Proceedings of the Privy Council*, i. 59.

<sup>6</sup> As early as February 10 orders were issued for the levy of ships to convey the messengers despatched to Ireland (*Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., v. 587 ; *cf. Ann. Ric. II.*, 173) ; but the ships for Richard's journey home were not required to be at Waterford till April 30 ; *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., v. 590 ; and the king did not reach Westminster before May 10 (*Ibid.* 565, 567, 572).

threats he may have uttered, Stury retained his position at court, his services were still made use of, he continued to attend the meetings of the council, and two months after Richard's return, was evidently on terms of remarkable intimacy with the king.<sup>1</sup>

And even if Stury lent his countenance to the Lollard articles, he cannot have sincerely believed them. At the time when, according to the St. Albans chronicles, he was denouncing the mass and special prayers for the dead, he was still paying for masses on behalf of the late Duchess of York: and condemnation of armourers and goldsmiths comes strangely from a soldier and courtier who, probably at that very time, was helping to determine an appeal in a cause of arms from the Constable's court.<sup>2</sup> It is hard to see what Stury could hope to gain by pretending to support such conclusions when his insincerity would be manifest to all who knew him. In fact, the above considerations, when taken together, make it difficult to believe that Stury's name ought to have been mentioned at all in this connection.

Unfortunately, Stury had little chance of giving further evidence of his religious beliefs. He was with the king at Eltham in July, and there he met Froissart, whom he had not seen for over twenty-four years, and walking with him in the vine-covered alleys of the palace garden, he recounted what had passed at the morning's meeting of the council, and expressed his opinion of the political situation. A day or two later he obtained for Froissart an opportunity of giving Richard the book which he had brought as a present.<sup>3</sup> But this is the last we hear of him, for on September 12 of the same year he died.<sup>4</sup>

A survey of Stury's career does not leave a pleasant impression. His association with John of Gaunt's gang of political jobbers, his friendship with Alice Perrers, the unconquerable aversion felt towards him by the Black Prince, his transference of allegiance to the Prince's widow just when the duke's star seemed on the decline, his reputation as a maker of mischief between kings and their advisers—all go to make up a picture of an unscrupulous, self-seeking, and time-serving adventurer. It is true that most of our information about Stury's character comes from the St. Albans writers, whose judgments are generally one-sided and prejudiced

<sup>1</sup> Froiss., xv. 157; *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., v. 570, 576. Froissart's evidence in this case is that of an eye-witness.

<sup>2</sup> *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xxii. 299, 304; *Test. Vetust.*, 135; *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., v. 531.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, xv. 157 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Inq. post mort.*, Ric. II., File 89.

against any one connected with John of Gaunt; and it must not be forgotten that Froissart speaks in high terms of his friend. But, though the invective of the chronicles should not be treated too seriously, the evidence of official records rather confirms than contradicts the main facts they report; and Froissart's eulogy is discounted by the fact that he never saw Stury from 1371 to 1395, and that he was apt to take a restricted view of the moral character of his friends. Sir Richard had his good points. He was a brave soldier. He must, too, have been a man of energy and ability; for with no material resources at his back,<sup>1</sup> he rose from a humble position<sup>2</sup> to one of much dignity and considerable wealth.<sup>3</sup> His possessions at his death included a MS. of the *Roman de la Rose*,<sup>4</sup> and this, added to his friendship with Froissart, and his acquaintanceship with Chaucer, suggests that he had literary interests. But, whatever his virtues, he was not a man likely to hazard his prosperity by throwing in his lot with a sect of unpopular heretics.

Concerning Thomas Latimer much less can be ascertained. He was a distant relative of the Lord Latimer impeached by the Good Parliament, and was born in 1341.<sup>5</sup> Though only the third son of his father, he possessed, partly through the death of his brothers without heirs and partly in right of his wife, considerable landed property, mainly in Leicestershire and Northants.<sup>6</sup> His chief seat was at Braybrooke in the latter county. As a young

<sup>1</sup> I have not been able to find anything inherited by Stury from his father, who in any case was not a rich man.

<sup>2</sup> As an esquire of the household, Stury would be allowed 40s. a year for two sets of robes. Otherwise he would receive no regular stipend, except by special favour of the king. (*Exch. Accts.*, K.R. Wardrobe, 392/12, 393/11.)

<sup>3</sup> In the record of the inquisition into his possessions taken after his death, only Bolsover is mentioned (*Inq. post mort.*, Ric. II., File 89). But in 1385 he held the manor of Barnwell, Northants, in tail male, and there is no evidence that it had changed hands (*Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., ii. 532, cf. i. 314, ii. 160). He also drew £100 per annum from the lordship of Oakham, 50 marks from the lordship of Aberystwith, and 50 more from the revenues of Carmarthen (*Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., i. 337, 453). He was in joint-ownership of the manors of Risinglass, Suffolk, and Hickling, Norfolk, though his share cannot have yielded much (*Cal. Claus.*, Edw. III., xiii. 340). In addition, of course, he would receive a regular salary as councillor and knight of the chamber. He seems to have died without issue. His widow was Alice, daughter of Sir John Blount and Elizabeth Furneaux, whom he apparently married early in 1385. (*Miscellanea Genealogica et Heraldica*, 3rd series, iii. 273; *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., ii. 532.)

<sup>4</sup> *Catalogue of MSS. Bibl. Reg.*, p. 297.

<sup>5</sup> G. E. C., *Complete Peerage*, v. 21.

<sup>6</sup> *Inq. post mort.*, Henry IV., File 24.

man he saw much military service in France: in 1366 he was serving under the Black Prince, whom he followed to Spain in the next year;<sup>1</sup> in 1369 he fought under the same commander in Aquitaine, and four years later he appears in the retinue of John of Gaunt.<sup>2</sup> For some time afterwards, however, nothing is heard of him.<sup>3</sup> As a wealthy landowner, he was not dependent, like Clifford and Stury, on the favour of noble patrons; and for several years he seems to have lived on his estates. He was perhaps connected with John of Gaunt's party, in which his kinsman, Lord Latimer, was one of the leading figures, for at the Parliament of January, 1377, which had been packed in the interests of the duke, Sir Thomas was one of the members for Northamptonshire.<sup>4</sup> In 1378 he probably accompanied the expedition to Brittany,<sup>5</sup> and in the autumn he again represented Northants at the Parliament of Gloucester, where he would hear Wycliffe read a discourse on the abuse of the right of sanctuary.<sup>6</sup> For the next few years Latimer is prominent as a justice of the peace and a member of judicial and administrative commissions in his county;<sup>7</sup> it is of course to this period that Knighton refers his support of the Lollards. Later he perhaps entered the service of the Princess of Wales; for in 1385 he was in attendance on her during Richard's invasion of Scotland.<sup>8</sup> He is, as we have seen, mentioned in 1387 by Walsingham in connection with Pateshull, and in the same year he was summoned to appear before the council with certain heretical books and pamphlets that were reported to be in his possession.<sup>9</sup> This is the only instance where one of the knights under discussion is connected with Lollardy in an official document, and it is the more regrettable that it tells us so little. Nothing is known of the issue of Latimer's examination; we cannot even be sure whether the books belonged to him, or had been seized by him from Lollards in his neighbourhood.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dugdale, *Baronage*, ii. 33.

<sup>2</sup> *Foed.* (ed. 1830), iii. pt. 2, 857; *John of Gaunt's Register*, i. 33.

<sup>3</sup> *Cal. Claus.*, Edward III., xii. 472.

<sup>4</sup> *Returns of M.P.'s*, i. 196.

<sup>5</sup> *Rot. Franc.*, 1 Ric. II., p. 2, m. 19.

<sup>6</sup> *Returns of M.P.'s*, i. 200.

<sup>7</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., ii. *passim*.

<sup>8</sup> *Foed.*, vii. 474.

<sup>9</sup> *Pell Issue Roll*, Easter, 11 Ric. II., m. 4.

<sup>10</sup> The entry records the payment of a messenger sent with a writ 'directo Thome Latymere militi de veniendo Londinium coram consilio regis cum certis libris et quaternis in custodia sua existentibus de erronia et perversa doctrina fidei catholice ut dicitur.'



The former alternative seems the more natural,<sup>1</sup> and perhaps it was the unfavourable result of the council's enquiries that accounts for Latimer's almost complete disappearance from public life after this time.

The St. Albans writers bring Latimer out of his obscurity at the beginning of 1395, and associate him with Stury in laying the Lollard articles before Parliament. The episode of 1387 goes to strengthen the case against him; in fact, if any of the knights mentioned in this connection was guilty of heresy, Latimer was the man. But he had no seat in the Parliament, and was not, like Clifford, Stury, and Montagu, attached to the court. If he really did present the conclusions to Parliament, he must have made a winter journey to London specially for the purpose. In that case, however, one would expect his enthusiasm to have marked him out as the Lollard leader, whereas the chronicler makes Stury the chief offender. And if Latimer was ready to run such risks in the interests of heresy, it is surprising that we hear so little of his activity in the cause. Such considerations, however, while justifying an attitude of caution, are not decisive enough to discredit the St. Albans writers altogether.

Latimer died at Braybrooke on September 14, 1401. His will, dated the day before, is very contrite in tone. He calls himself a 'false knight to God,' declares himself unworthy to lie in the church, and desires to be buried in the furthest corner of the churchyard. His 'wretched soul' he commends to God, trusting in the prayers of the Virgin and the saints. Sir Lewis Clifford was named as an overseer of the will.<sup>2</sup>

The accusations of Lollardy against Latimer, it will be seen, are on a firmer footing than those against Clifford and Stury. He cannot be proved guilty of anything inconsistent with a sincere adherence to Wycliffe's teaching, and a State record in addition to his will supports the charges of the chronicles. It is quite possible that we have in him a genuine supporter of the Lollard attempt at

<sup>1</sup>The wording of the Issue Roll tends to support this view (*cf. Rot. Pat.*, 11 Ric. II., p. 2, m. 26 d). Latimer, moreover, was not on the commission of the peace at this time, nor does his name appear in any of the special commissions appointed to seize Lollards and their books (*cf. Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., iii. 427 *et passim*). Any measures taken by him against Lollardy would therefore be due to private enterprise.

<sup>2</sup>*Inq. post mort.*, Henry IV., File 24; *Testamenta Vetusta*, 158 f. Latimer died without issue, and his younger brother Edward succeeded to his lands. (*G. E. C.*, v. 21 f.)

religious reform, though we cannot be sure that his conversion to orthodoxy did not occur some years before his death.

The career of John Montagu, after 1397 Earl of Salisbury, has been treated at length in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, and little need be added to what is said there. The accusations of Lollardy against Montagu are all from the St. Albans writers, and appear under the dates 1387, 1395, and 1400. There seems no reason to doubt Walsingham's story of the removal of the images from the chapel at Shenley, which is only a few miles from St. Albans, and the presence of Hereford would show that Montagu's support of the Wycliffites continued till at least 1386.<sup>1</sup> But his views must have changed in 1391, for in that year he set out for Prussia, where he fought in a crusade against the Lithuanians.<sup>2</sup> It is impossible to reconcile this act with an acceptance of Wycliffe's teaching, for as a cultured man and a soldier Montagu must have been aware of the Lollard views on crusades. Perhaps his succession in 1390 to his father's property had rendered him more content with the established order, and the conversion of Hereford about this time doubtless had its effect on his patron.<sup>3</sup>

In 1395 Montagu was a member of the House of Peers,<sup>4</sup> and thus the only one of the so-called leaders of the Lollards with a seat in Parliament. It is therefore strange that the chroniclers do not ascribe to him a more prominent part in supporting the Lollard conclusions. The fact that he signed the letter asking the king to return is of little moment: as a member of the council he could hardly refuse to do so.<sup>5</sup> But his crusading expedition renders it most unlikely that he should have subscribed to the Lollard articles, with their strong condemnation of such enterprises. Of course it is conceivable that between 1392 and 1395 Montagu relapsed into heresy. In that case, however, he was once more re-converted by 1399, for in that year Pope Boniface IX. granted him indulgence to possess a portable altar and to choose his own confessor.<sup>6</sup> It does not appear whether Montagu made any use of

<sup>1</sup> See *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s.v. Nicholas of Hereford. Hereford cannot have reached England from Italy till late in 1385.

<sup>2</sup> *Rot. Franc.*, 5 Ric. II., m. 12.

<sup>3</sup> Hereford must have abjured Lollardy some time before December 12, 1391 (*Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., v. 8), possibly by June 20, 1390 (*Ibid.*, iv. 261), though the Nicholas Hereford referred to under that date may not have been the preacher.

<sup>4</sup> After the death of his father in 1390 he sat as Baron Montagu till he succeeded to his uncle's earldom (*G. E. C.*, v. 339).

<sup>5</sup> *Proc. Priv. Council*, i. 59.

<sup>6</sup> *Cal. Papal Registers*, iv. 216, 220.

these privileges, but no motive could account for the bestowal of these favours on a notable heretic who held that the mass 'inducith alle men but a fewe to ydolatrie,' and that auricular confession led to unmentionable sin.<sup>1</sup> Montagu's orthodoxy in 1399 makes it hard to believe that he was a Lollard in 1395.

Just a year after the Pope's grant, Montagu perished at Cirencester during the collapse of a conspiracy against Henry IV. Considering the circumstances of his death, it is of no great moment if he died without confession. That such was the case, moreover, is not certain: the chronicler himself is doubtful about it.<sup>2</sup> In any event his statement that the earl was a life-long heretic and patron of heretics is, as we have seen, an exaggeration.

Intellectually Montagu was evidently a man of great culture and refinement, but his moral character was less attractive. He was one of Richard's chief advisers and abettors during his tyranny; and the lack of scruple which marked his public career<sup>3</sup> seems to have appeared also in his private dealings.<sup>4</sup> Apart from the references to his support of Lollardy, no one would suspect him of deep interest in religion. In regard to his beliefs the conclusion to be drawn is, I think, that while up to 1390 or thereabouts he defended and maintained Wycliffite preachers in open defiance of ecclesiastical authority, after that date he was obedient to the laws of the church. A genuine Lollard in his later days he certainly was not.

The four knights hitherto dealt with fall into a group apart from the rest. The accusations of heresy are much better supported in their cases than in those of the others. Yet there seems good reason to believe that Clifford and Stury were never real Lollards at all, and that Montagu abandoned the cause some ten years before his death. It is possible to speak still more confidently in regard to the remaining knights, for not only are the charges against them weaker, but there is often stronger evidence on the other side.

<sup>1</sup> *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xxii. 297, 301.

<sup>2</sup> *Ann. Henry IV.*, 324 f.; *Wals.*, *op. cit.*, ii. 244. The former says (p. 326): 'Comes Sarum, qui Lollardorum fautor fuerat in tota vita, et imaginum vilipensor, sacramentorumque derisor, sine sacramento confessionis, si verum est quod vulgo dicitur, miserabiliter vitam finivit.'

<sup>3</sup> For instance, after consenting to act as one of the attorneys of the banished Hereford, he agreed to the revocation of his own powers (*Foed.*, viii. 49; *Rot. Parl.*, iv. 372). His friends considered him capable of shameless treachery. (*Rot. Parl.*, iv. 360.)

<sup>4</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Henry IV., i. 124, ii. 82.

The cases of Sir John Clanvowe and Sir William Neville naturally fall together. The former belonged to a Herefordshire family, which held Cusop Castle near Hay.<sup>1</sup> As a witness in the Scrope and Grosvenor suit he is reported to have stated that he was born in 1351;<sup>2</sup> but there are strong grounds for doubting the correctness of this date. At all events a John Clanvowe appears as an esquire of the royal household in 1349, when he had already seen military service;<sup>3</sup> and though this may perhaps have been the reputed Lollard's father, one can hardly refuse to identify the John Clanvowe who in 1362 owed money to the king, or the knight of that name who in 1364 served in Brittany, with the witness in the Scrope and Grosvenor case.<sup>4</sup>

In 1369 Clanvowe fought in France under Chandos, and took part in the fight at which that hero was slain.<sup>5</sup> Next year he served under Knollys,<sup>6</sup> and in 1374 was at sea in command of a hundred men.<sup>7</sup> It is likely that he was connected with the party of John of Gaunt, for at the Good Parliament he was one of those who stood bail for Lord Latimer.<sup>8</sup> In 1378 he served under the duke, sharing with Neville, Stury, and Sir Philip de la Vache, in the command of 120 men.<sup>9</sup> He soon began to command the steady favour of the king. He was retained in the royal service, and in 1381 was made steward of the lordship and constable of the castle of Haverfordwest. Four

<sup>1</sup> C. J. Robinson, *Castles of Herefordshire*, 41.

<sup>2</sup> *S. and G. Controversy*, i. 184, 437.

<sup>3</sup> *Exchequer Accts.*, K.R. Wardrobe, 391/9.

<sup>4</sup> Robinson (*loc. cit.*) says that John was the son of Philip Clanvowe, who played some part in the troubles of the reign of Edward II. (*Parl. Writs*, pt. ii. 68, 166). He gives no evidence in support of this statement, and it is perhaps more likely that the esquire of the household was Philip's son and the so-called Lollard's father. A John Clanvowe died in 1361, leaving an heir under age (*Cal. Pat.*, Edw. III., xii. 123; *cf. Cal. Claus.*, Edw. III., xi. 158). By August, 1362, he had apparently attained his majority (*Cal. Claus.*, Edw. III., xi. 421). If this was the John Clanvowe under discussion, the year of his birth would be 1341, and a small error, whether in hearing or reading his evidence, would explain the mistake in the Scrope and Grosvenor roll. No other John Clanvowe, certainly no other knight of the name, appears in contemporary records.

For Clanvowe's service in 1364, see *Foed.* (ed. 1830), iii. pt. 2, 725.

<sup>5</sup> Froissart, vii. 447, 449, 456, 458.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 897f.

<sup>7</sup> *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 49 Edw. III., F.

<sup>8</sup> *Rot. Parl.*, ii. 326f. In 1373 Clanvowe's name appears in a list of those receiving presents from the duke. Among the others are several of Lancaster's relatives and Lord Latimer (*John of Gaunt's Register*, ii. 192).

<sup>9</sup> *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 2 Ric. II., A.

years later he was granted full possession of these for life.<sup>1</sup> In 1382, when he was a knight of the chamber, he was appointed keeper of the forest of Snowdon.<sup>2</sup> About this time he fell seriously ill, and the court surgeon who cured him received a special mark of gratitude from the king.<sup>3</sup> Between 1381 and 1386 he served on several commissions, mostly concerned with the maintenance of order in Wales and the March; in 1384 and the two succeeding years he again appears as knight of the chamber; and in 1385 he was named an executor of the will of the Princess of Wales.<sup>4</sup> In the year last mentioned he was appointed to treat with the French, though it is doubtful whether he ever went, and later he took part in the invasion of Scotland.<sup>5</sup> During the next winter he was sent to Calais to negotiate for peace and inspect the defences of the English strongholds in the district;<sup>6</sup> on his return he was put on the commissions which arranged treaties with Portugal and with John of Gaunt, who was preparing to set out for Spain;<sup>7</sup> he then went back to Calais, where, in command of eleven men, he did garrison duty;<sup>8</sup> and in the autumn he and Neville were despatched to Essex and Suffolk to take measures against a threatened invasion.<sup>9</sup> Clanvowe's remarkable activity at this time is a striking indication of the confidence felt towards him by the king, who was no doubt influenced in Sir John's favour by the latter's friend, Sir Simon Burley.<sup>10</sup> It is noteworthy that for more than two years after September, 1386, Clanvowe's name is almost entirely absent from State records. In 1387 he is mentioned as a supporter of Pateshull, and during the crisis of that year he probably stood by the king, for on November 23, immediately after the Lords Appellant had brought their charges against Richard's chief counsellors, he was at court.<sup>11</sup> Having escaped the vengeance of the Merciless Parliament, he resumed his diplomatic activity in the autumn of 1388, when he was given the familiar task of

<sup>1</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., i. 627, iii. 14.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, ii. 104.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, ii. 214.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, ii. 17, 138, 575, iii. 214; *Exch. Accts.*, K.R. Wardrobe, 401/2; *Test Vetust.*, 14.

<sup>5</sup> *Foed.*, vii. 466; *cf. Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., 575; *Proceedings of Privy Coun.*, i. 8; *S. and G. Controversy*, ii. 437; *Rot. Scot.*, ii. 75.

<sup>6</sup> *Foed.*, vii. 492; *Rot. Franc.*, 9 Ric. II., m. 10; *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 8 Ric. II., C.

<sup>7</sup> *Foed.*, vii. 514, 520.

<sup>8</sup> *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 9 Ric. II., B.

<sup>9</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., iii. 214.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, iv. 361; *Rot. Franc.*, 1 Ric. II., p. 2, m. 17.

<sup>11</sup> *Exch. Accts.*, K.R. Wardrobe, 401/19.

treating for peace with the French. The consequent negotiations were long and intricate, and it was not till the summer of 1389 that they ended with the conclusion of a three years' peace.<sup>1</sup> By this time Richard was once more his own master. Clanvowe again appears as a knight of the chamber, was put on the council, and soon afterwards was sent to Calais to negotiate with the Flemings.<sup>2</sup> In February, 1390, he was on a commission of enquiry in the Welsh march,<sup>3</sup> but in the early spring he again crossed the channel. He and Sir William Neville had obtained the king's leave to take part in the crusade which Louis of Bourbon was about to lead against the Moors of Tunis, and with Thomas Lord Clifford and some hundred and twenty fellow Englishmen, they joined the expedition when it was on the point of sailing. The two friends were apparently present at the futile operations before El Mahadia, where the English fought well, and, it seems, subsequently returned to Genoa with the majority of the survivors.<sup>4</sup> If Froissart is to be believed, Clanvowe arrived at Paris in February, 1391, and a little later appeared at Tours, charged by Richard with important political business.<sup>5</sup> Froissart adds that Clanvowe afterwards returned to London, but his stay in England cannot have been long, for he and Neville soon made their way to the Eastern Empire, whether to fight the Turks or with a view to a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, does not appear. There, in a village near Constantinople, Clanvowe died on October 17, 1391, to be followed after two days by Neville, who in his grief refused to take food.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Foed.*, vii. 610 ff., 616 ff., 622; *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 11 Ric. II., K.; Froiss., xiii. 318. Clanvowe was sent to the King of France to witness his oath to the truce (*Ibid.*, xiii. 353).

<sup>2</sup> *Exch. Accts.*, K.R. Wardrobe, 402/5; *Rot. Franc.*, 12 Ric. II., m. 3; *Foed.*, vii. 648, 654; *Proc. Privy Council*, i. 6. 14 c; *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 12 Ric. II., C.

<sup>3</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., iv. 217.

<sup>4</sup> Cabaret, *La Chronique du bon duc Loys de Bourbon*, 222 f.; *Contin. Polychronici* (R.S.), ix. 235; *Rot. Franc.*, 13 Ric. II., mm. 8, 11.

<sup>5</sup> Froiss., xiv. 288, 355.

<sup>6</sup> *Contin. Polychron.*, 261. The same authority mentions that in the summer Thomas Lord Clifford had died 'in a certain island' on his way to Jerusalem. As Clifford had been to Tunis, it is perhaps likely that Clanvowe and Neville were on pilgrimage also. The monk of Evesham (*Vita Ric. II.*, 123) mentions their deaths, but says they occurred in Barbary in 1392. Clanvowe's prosperity depended almost entirely on the goodwill of the king. He probably owned a little property in the Welsh march (*Cal. Claus.*, Ed. III., xi. 158; *Cal. Pat.*, Ed. III., xii. 123), but otherwise he seems to have possessed nothing save his life-interest in Haverfordwest, the keepership of the forest of Snowdon, and his wages and perquisites as councillor and knight of the chamber.

Clanvowe's faithful friend was the younger son of Ralph, second Lord Neville of Raby.<sup>1</sup> In the Scrope and Grosvenor case he gave 1350 as the year of his birth;<sup>2</sup> but his career makes it probable that, like Clanvowe, he was older than he said. According to himself, he was 'armed' in 1363, but nothing is heard of his achievements till 1370, when, serving as a knight in the raid of Sir Robert Knollys, he distinguished himself in a reconnaissance before Arras, and was taken prisoner at Pontvallain.<sup>3</sup> Neville's rise was remarkably rapid, for in 1372 he was made admiral of the north, and sailed with two hundred men in his personal retinue.<sup>4</sup> In the following year he was one of the commanders in a successful action at St. Malo, which resulted in the destruction of seven Spanish ships, and enabled the English to throw reinforcements and food into Brest.<sup>5</sup> He retained his position as admiral till 1376.<sup>6</sup> It is natural to infer from this that he was in sympathy with Lancaster's party, and the suspicion is confirmed by the fact that Neville stood bail for Lord Latimer during the Good Parliament.<sup>7</sup> At this time he evidently lost his command; but during

<sup>1</sup> *Scrope and Grosvenor Controversy*, ii. 442; *Durham Wills and Inventories* (Surtees Society Publications, vol. ii.), 38 f.

<sup>2</sup> *S. and G. Controversy*, i. 187. A William Neville was owed military wages in 1347, but I assume him to have been another of the name (*Exch. Accounts*, K.R. Wardrobe, 391/9, p. 15). The ramifications of the Neville family were so numerous and intricate that the greatest caution is necessary in tracing the career of any of its members. There was another Sir William Neville alive in the second half of the fourteenth century. He had estates in North Yorkshire, and is sometimes distinguished as 'of Pickhill,' or 'of Fencotes.' Most unfortunately he also held the manor of Rolleston in Nottinghamshire, and was thus brought into connection with the very county with which the reputed Lollard was specially associated (*Genealogist*, xxvii. 6; *S. and G. Controversy*, i. 154, ii. 442; *Foed.* (ed. 1830), iii. p. 2. 871; *Rot. Claus.*, 1 Ric. II., m. 42d; *Rot. Franc.*, 1 Ric. II., p. 2, mm. 12, 17; *Rot. Scot.*, ii. 68; *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., iv. 271, v. 591; *Foed.*, viii. 414). In some cases where the name occurs it is impossible to be sure which of the two knights is meant.

<sup>3</sup> *Foed.* (ed. 1830), iii. pt. 2, 897 f.; Froiss., viii. 19, 52, 53. The same authority (p. 32) says that Neville was at the siege of Limoges, but this is unlikely.

<sup>4</sup> *Foed.* (ed. 1830), iii. pt. 2, 937; *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 46 Edw. III., B. During part of his voyage Neville drew banneret's pay, though he was never more than a knight bachelor.

<sup>5</sup> Froiss., viii. 245, 247, 252, 258, 260.

<sup>6</sup> *Foed.* (ed. 1830), iii. p. 2, 1006, 1046, 1054; *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 49 Edw. III., A.

<sup>7</sup> *Rot. Parl.*, ii. 326 f. Cf. also Lancaster's gift to him in 1372 (*John of Gaunt's Register*, i. 54).

Lancaster's ascendancy in the last months of his father's reign, Neville was granted an annual pension of 100 marks.<sup>1</sup>

In 1378 Neville, as was mentioned above, shared the command of a contingent in Lancaster's fleet, and perhaps sat as member for Nottinghamshire at the Parliament of Gloucester.<sup>2</sup> The next year saw him on the list of king's knights,<sup>3</sup> and the influence which he had lost after 1376 was now regained. He was a knight of the chamber in 1381, and in that year was appointed keeper of Sherwood Forest and constable of Nottingham Castle for life, as well as keeper and justice of the forests beyond Trent.<sup>4</sup> Two years later he was employed in negotiations with France.<sup>5</sup> In 1384 he was still a knight of the chamber; and during that year and the two next spent much time on the Scottish border, whether treating with the Scots, inspecting the English defences, or helping to garrison Carlisle.<sup>6</sup> Mention has already been made of his appointment with Clanvowe to take measures for the protection of the east coast against the threatened invasion of 1386. Otherwise little is heard of Neville about this time. In January, 1387, he exchanged the office of keeper of the forests beyond Trent with Sir Thomas Clifford for several manors in Cornwall and Devon,<sup>7</sup> but apparently retained the custody of Sherwood.<sup>8</sup> He was evidently on the king's side in the crisis of this year: Archbishop Neville of York, one of Richard's counsellors accused by the Lords Appellant, was his brother, and he himself was at court on November 23.<sup>9</sup> Next year he seems to have been sent abroad, though on what errand does not appear;<sup>10</sup> in 1389 he was again a knight of the chamber, and was made a member of the council.<sup>11</sup> Early in 1390 he was at Calais on a commission of

<sup>1</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., i. 277.

<sup>2</sup> *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 2 Ric. II., A.; *Returns of Members of Parliament*, 200. The M.P. may have been the other Sir William.

<sup>3</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., i. 334.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, ii. 54, 60; *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 5 Ric. II., F. <sup>5</sup> *Foed.*, vii. 305.

<sup>6</sup> *Exch. Accts.*, K.R. Wardrobe, 401/2; *Rot. Scot.*, ii. 69, 70, 75, 82; Froiss., x. 394.

<sup>7</sup> Calistoke, Tremarton, and Ashborough, Cornwall, and Winkleigh, Devon (*Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., iii. 267).

<sup>8</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., v. 449.

<sup>9</sup> *Exch. Accts.*, K.R. Wardrobe, 401/19; *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., iii. 431.

<sup>10</sup> *Rot. Franc.*, 11 Ric. II., m. 8.

<sup>11</sup> *Exch. Accts.*, K.R. Wardrobe, 402/5; *Proc. Priv. Council*, i. 6, 11, 12d, 14c, 17; *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., iv. 214.



enquiry into the misdeeds of the governor of Guisnes,<sup>1</sup> and soon afterwards, as we have seen, set out for Africa with the Duke of Bourbon. From that time his fortunes were doubtless much the same as Clanvowe's.<sup>2</sup>

Walsingham's account of the doings of Pateshull in 1387 is the only place where either Clanvowe or Neville is accused of favouring heresy. On the other hand, we know that a year or two later they went on crusade, and that they died while probably on pilgrimage. In the eyes of a Lollard a pilgrimage, while less criminal than a crusade, was equally foolish.<sup>3</sup> It is thus evident that, even if we are to believe Walsingham, their views must have changed in a very short time. But quite as significant as their presence on a crusade or the circumstances of their deaths is the way in which they are spoken of by the chronicler who records their fate. He was a Westminster monk,<sup>4</sup> well informed regarding the court, and, for one of his class, a careful and accurate historian. He has plenty to say about Lollardy, of which he was a bitter foe. But though Clanvowe and Neville were well known at Westminster, he has nothing but praise for their characters and attainments.<sup>5</sup> Evidently no rumour of their heterodoxy had reached his ears. In face of his very emphatic testimony, Walsingham's rather indefinite evidence must give way; and while it is possible that the two knights had befriended an occasional Lollard preacher in the early days of the sect, we cannot believe that they ever accepted Wycliffe's doctrines themselves, or were conspicuous in defence of those who did.

Though much is known about the career of Sir John Cheyne, his origin is quite uncertain. There were Cheynes in Bucks, Kent, and Cambridgeshire; but the only county specially associated with the alleged Lollard was Gloucestershire, and this connection can be traced entirely to acquisitions made by Sir

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> At his death he seems to have possessed no resources except what he derived from the pension, estates, and appointments already mentioned.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, *Wycliffe's Sermons* (Wycliffe Society), ii. 341; *English Works of Wycliffe* (Early English Text Society), 7, 102 f., 343; *ante*, xxii. 300.

<sup>4</sup> See Dr. J. Armitage Robinson's paper, *An Unrecognized Westminster Chronicler* (London, 1907).

<sup>5</sup> 'Johannes Clanvowe, miles egregius.' 'Erant isti milites inter Anglicos famosi viri, nobiles, et strenui, ac etiam de genere claro producti' (*Contin. Polychron.*, ix. 261).

John himself.<sup>1</sup> Regarding Cheyne's early days an interesting question arises. In recounting his doings at the Parliament of Coventry in 1404, Walsingham mentions a report that he had formerly been in deacon's orders, which he had irregularly renounced.<sup>2</sup> Now a John Cheyne appears from 1372 to 1383 as a clerk in the service of John of Gaunt. He was successively treasurer of the duchess and of the duke's household, and receiver for the honour of Tutbury and the duke's lands in Derbyshire. In 1373 and 1374 he is referred to as parson of Hanbury-in-Needwood.<sup>3</sup> Was this Cheyne the same man as the knight afterwards under suspicion for his religious views? John of Gaunt's official is never styled knight, but when any designation is given, always 'clerk';<sup>4</sup> and the John Cheyne under consideration was married before the death of Edward III, and a knight in 1378, some years before John Cheyne, clerk, left the duke's service.<sup>5</sup> From this it would seem that we have to do with two different persons. On the other hand, among Cheyne's bequests appear a set of priest's vestments and a psalter 'glossed' by Richard 'the Hermit.'<sup>6</sup> Cheyne, moreover, was several times chosen to go on difficult and delicate business to the papal curia,<sup>7</sup> and this suggests that he had a knowledge of Latin and some acquaintance with the canon law. There may then be something after all in the rumour preserved in Walsingham. And seeing that on the accession of the house of Lancaster, Sir John at once leaped into unprecedented prominence and received many marks of royal favour, he may even prove to be the former clerk in the service of the duchy.<sup>8</sup> In that case, it would have to be

<sup>1</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., ii. 312, Henry IV., i. 205, 431, 559; *Cal. Papal Registers*, iv. 328; *Returns of M.P.'s*, i. 237, 244, 247, 258.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. Ang.*, ii. 265-6.

<sup>3</sup> *John of Gaunt's Register*, i. 127, 151, ii. 17, 118, 236, 297 *et passim*; *Duchy of Lancaster Records, Miscellaneous Books*, xiv. 14, 18, 18b, 34b, *et passim*; *cf. John of Gaunt's Register*, i. xiii. There was a John Cheyne, clerk, who in 1362 and 1363 was granted a pension at the wish of the king (*Cal. Pat.*, Edw. III., xii. 388, 554); but there is no reason for identifying him with the object of this inquiry.

<sup>4</sup> He is still referred to as such in Dec. 1380 (*Duc. Lanc. Records, Misc. Books*, xiv. 105b).

<sup>5</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., i. 132.

<sup>6</sup> *Reg. Arundel*, ii. 203b; *Reg. Chichele*, i. 279b. The vestments include a chasuble, and two tunicles, albs, amices, fanons, and stoles.

<sup>7</sup> *Vide infra*.

<sup>8</sup> *Rot. Parl.*, iii. 424; *Cal. Pat.*, Henry IV., i. 205, 431; *Proceedings of Priv. Coun.*, i. 122, 127; *Wals.*, ii. 242. It may be noted that in 1372 John Cheyne

assumed that after 1376 Cheyne's duties in Derbyshire were often performed by deputy, and that when he is subsequently termed 'clerk,' it was because his post was naturally a clerical one. There is, however, not enough evidence to justify a definite conclusion on this point.

Apart from the references to John of Gaunt's clerk, our earliest mention of Cheyne concerns his marriage, before the death of Edward III., to Margaret, widow of Roger Tiptoft. Roger was a tenant-in-chief, and for marrying Margaret without the King's leave, Cheyne incurred a fine of £100, half of which was however remitted in 1378 by Richard II.<sup>1</sup> This act of grace may be connected with Lancaster's return to influence about the same time, and with the service rendered by Cheyne immediately afterwards in the Duke's expedition to Brittany, during which he was one of the knights in the retinue of Sir William Beauchamp and Sir Lewis Clifford.<sup>2</sup> Two years later he was sent to Brittany on important diplomatic business, and in the autumn of the following year he was again abroad, though where does not appear. In May, 1383, a few weeks after the last reference to John Cheyne in the Duchy of Lancaster records,<sup>3</sup> he is mentioned as 'retained' by the king, and was given custody for life of the temporalities of the alien 'priory' of Beckford in Gloucestershire.<sup>4</sup> Next year he was made keeper of Merk Castle, a post which he held till October, 1387.<sup>5</sup> In the same year he apparently concluded with the Norman abbey of Bec an agreement whereby the temporalities of the house in Gloucestershire should become his for life.<sup>6</sup>

the clerk had acted as receiver for the young Henry Bolingbroke (*John of Gaunt's Register*, i. 127).

<sup>1</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., i. 132.

<sup>2</sup> *Rot. Franc.*, 1 Ric. II., pt. 2, m. 17; cf. *Enrolled Accts.* (K.R.), F., 3 Ric. II., C.

<sup>3</sup> On April 7 he was still receiver of Tutbury (*Duc. Lanc. Records, Misc. Books*, xiv. 70).

<sup>4</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., ii. 312. Beckford is commonly styled a 'priory' in the records. Really it was the manor of Beckford that Cheyne administered. The manor was a cell of the priory of St. Barbe-en-Auge, which used to send two monks as overseers of the property. There was no conventual establishment; even the parish church did not belong to the cell. Later, Cheyne came to an agreement with the mother house which secured both himself, his wife, and his son John in the custody of the property for their lives (*Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., iv. 118, v. 632; *Cal. Pap. Reg.*, iv. 328; *Monasticon* (ed. 1846), vii. 1048).

<sup>5</sup> *Rot. Franc.*, 8 Ric. II., m. 22, 11 Ric. II., m. 15.

<sup>6</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., iii. 130, Hen. IV., i. 130.

Otherwise very little is heard of him at this time, and there is no indication of the side he took in the struggle between Richard and the Lords Appellant. Sir John sat as knight for Gloucestershire in the Parliament of 1390, which passed a revised version of the statute of Provisors.<sup>1</sup> Soon afterwards he went on the first of his visits to Rome, being commissioned to lay before Boniface IX. letters concerning the new statute, including no doubt the protest against provisions and reservations which was at this time signed by the leading magnates. While at Rome he obtained papal confirmation of the arrangement he had made regarding Beckford with the priory of St. Barbe.<sup>2</sup>

In 1393 and 1394 he again sat in Parliament for Gloucestershire,<sup>3</sup> and in the autumn of the latter year accompanied Richard on his expedition to Ireland, where after the king's return he remained in the retinue of the Earl of March.<sup>4</sup> For some years Cheyne's attention had been largely devoted to his duties as deputy of the Duke of Gloucester in the constable's court, and appeals against his decisions were frequent. On his return from Ireland in 1396 he resumed this position.<sup>5</sup> In May, 1397, he went back to Ireland, where he again served under the Earl of March.<sup>6</sup> An unsupported but respectable authority says that Cheyne was arrested in the summer of this year at the same time as Gloucester and Arundel;<sup>7</sup> and according to a St. Albans writer Sir John afterwards referred in Parliament to an imprisonment which he had undergone 'by the procurement of his enemies.'<sup>8</sup> Possibly the arrest was merely a precautionary measure in view of Cheyne's official connection with Gloucester. At all events, no judicial proceedings seem to have been taken against him; in March, 1398, he was at liberty, and the following June saw him employed on a Gloucestershire commission.<sup>9</sup>

That Cheyne, however, was opposed to Richard's tyrannical rule is suggested by his return for Gloucestershire to the Parliament of September, 1399.<sup>10</sup> He was chosen Speaker, but next day resigned the position on the ground of ill-health, the result of his imprisonment.<sup>11</sup> In the meanwhile, however, Archbishop Arundel

<sup>1</sup> *Return of M.P.'s*, i. 237.

<sup>2</sup> *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 13 Ric. II., A; *Cal. Pap. Reg.*, iv. 328.

<sup>3</sup> *Returns of M.P.'s*, i. 244, 247.

<sup>4</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., v. 472, 562, 638.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, v., vi. *passim*.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, vi. 146.

<sup>7</sup> *Chronicle of London* (ed. Nicolas), 81.

<sup>8</sup> *Ann. Hen. IV.*, 302.

<sup>9</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., vi. 318, 371.

<sup>10</sup> *Returns of M.P.'s*, i. 258.

<sup>11</sup> *Rot. Parl.*, iii. 424; *Adam of Usk*, 36; *Ann. Hen. IV.*, 302.

had found time to warn convocation against Cheyne as a conspicuous enemy of the church. By modern writers this has often been regarded as equivalent to a charge of Lollardy; but the chronicler alludes to nothing more than a strong anti-clerical attitude, which would be quite compatible with doctrinal orthodoxy. That Cheyne had ever been regarded as favourable to heresy is indeed most improbable in view of the silence of Knighton and Walsingham on the matter and of Cheyne's mission to Rome and dealings with the pope; that he was reputed a Lollard in 1399 is incredible if it be true, as Walsingham's chronicle states, that Cheyne was picked out by the new king as one of the envoys who in the autumn of the year were commissioned to explain Henry's claim to Boniface IX.<sup>1</sup>

The rest of his life Cheyne spent in prosperity and honour. To his former possessions he soon added certain estates and revenues of the abbey of St. Mary, Cormeilles.<sup>2</sup> He became a member of the Council, and his services were often used on commissions at home,<sup>3</sup> but it was as a diplomatist that he achieved most fame. During 1404 he was employed in a series of prolonged negotiations with France.<sup>4</sup> In the autumn of that year was the 'Unlearned' Parliament of Coventry, at which, as we have seen, Cheyne is reported to have led the knights in a demand for the confiscation of the temporalities of the church. But not only was Cheyne not Speaker, as Walsingham terms him,<sup>5</sup> he was not even a member of this Parliament. It is indeed true that Sir

<sup>1</sup> Wals., *Hist. Ang.*, ii. 242. Walsingham is the only authority for the mission of Cheyne at this time; but Sir John's selection is intrinsically likely.

<sup>2</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Henry IV., i. 205, 431. He was granted the manors of Kingston and Newent, and half the emoluments of the rectories of Newent, Beckford, and Dymock, which belonged to Newent priory. The rent due for Newent was soon afterwards remitted (*Ibid.* ii. 183), and from the revenues of the churches Cheyne received a grant which must have exceeded the rent which he paid the crown for them. On December 1, 1399, the rent due to the king from the temporalities of Bec was granted to Cheyne's son John for life (*Ibid.* i. 130).

<sup>3</sup> *Proc. Privy Council*, i. 122, 127, 146, 191, 222, 295; *Rot. Parl.*, iii. 530, 572; *Cal. Pat.*, Hen. IV., ii. 183 *et passim*.

<sup>4</sup> *Royal and Historical Letters of the Time of Henry IV.* (R.S.), 224, 279, 306; *Foed.*, viii. 378; *Proc. Priv. Council.*, i. 241, 267; *Enrolled Acts.*, F., 5 Hen. IV., A.

<sup>5</sup> It is just possible that Walsingham may be using 'prolocutor' in the general sense of 'spokesman,' but in the context it is most natural to interpret it as 'speaker.' The same writer does not distinguish clearly between the king's knights and the knights of the shires. But the impression left is that Cheyne supported the proposal for confiscation in Parliament, and as Speaker.

John, attached to the court as he was, may have played some part in discussions outside Parliament. The best St. Albans chronicle of this time, however, omits all reference to Cheyne, and as Walsingham ignores him when describing the Parliament of 1399, it looks as if the latter writer, using his authorities carelessly, had confused the two occasions. In any case, however, he says nothing about positive Lollardy. Henry's knights had a bad reputation at St. Albans for their irreverence towards sacred things, and if Cheyne had been conspicuous for heretical leanings, it would no doubt have been noticed.<sup>1</sup>

Soon after the Parliament of Coventry came the death of Sir Lewis Clifford, and Cheyne, who had long known him, was named as a supervisor of his will, and was bequeathed some of his goods.<sup>2</sup> In 1406 Cheyne visited Italy for the third time and on the most important business that had yet been committed to him. He was sent to placate papal wrath at the execution of Archbishop Scrope, and also to exert the influence of England for the termination of the great schism. His companion on this errand was Henry Chichele, afterwards Primate. They left England in the autumn, apparently conducted some business in France on the way, visited the anti-pope, Benedict XIII., at Marseilles, spent about a year in Italy, and returned in August, 1408.<sup>3</sup> They were thought to agree with the pope as against the cardinals in regard to the best way of ending the schism; but on their return to England they gave the king unexpected advice which was instrumental in gaining his support for the Council of Pisa in the following year.<sup>4</sup>

In 1410 and 1411 Cheyne took part in a series of negotiations with the French.<sup>5</sup> Next year he added to his lands the manor and hundred of Berton, Gloucestershire.<sup>6</sup> He died before April 28,

<sup>1</sup> *Ann. Hen. IV.*, 395.

<sup>2</sup> *Test. Vetust.*, 164 f.; *Rot. Franc.*, 1 Ric. II., pt. 2, m. 17, 3 Ric. II., m. 8, 13 Ric. II., m. 12; *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 5 Ric. II., I. Cheyne may indeed have been distantly related to Clifford. A clerk called Roger Clifford is referred to in Cheyne's will as his cousin, and in 1391 a clerk of that name acted with Sir Lewis as attorney for the latter's nephew, Thomas, Lord Clifford (*Reg. Arundel*, ii. 203b; *Rot. Franc.*, 14 Ric. II., m. 6).

<sup>3</sup> *Foed.*, viii. 446, 452, 479; *Enrolled Accts.*, F., 9 Hen. IV., C.; Muratori: *Scriptores rerum Italicarum*, iii. pt. 2, 800; MS. Cotton, *Cleop. E II.*, 249 f.; N. Valois: *La France et le grande schisme d'Occident* (Paris, 1896-1902), iii. 569 n.

<sup>4</sup> *Libri viii. epistolarum Leonardi Arretini*, i. 72.

<sup>5</sup> *Foed.*, viii. 636, 694 f

<sup>6</sup> *Cat. Pat.*, Hen. IV., iv. 451.

1414.<sup>1</sup> His will was dated Nov. 1, 1413.<sup>2</sup> He describes himself as 'stinking carrion' shall be buried at the east end of the chapel which he had built in the churchyard of Beckford. There follow various pious bequests, mostly to secure the repose of his soul,<sup>3</sup> and apparently in a codicil, he establishes a fund of forty pounds from which the tenants of Beckford are to be allowed to borrow sums not exceeding forty shillings.<sup>4</sup> Cheyne left two sons. The younger, Edward, died in 1415, leaving three sons, two of them small boys. The tone of his will is repentant, and very like that of his father's.<sup>5</sup> The other son, John, who had been with his father to Rome, and was an esquire of Henry IV., died intestate in 1420, leaving a daughter, Anne, aged twelve years.<sup>6</sup>

Cheyne is nowhere charged with holding Lollard views, and there is no good reason to suppose that he did. The tone of his will may be thought to point in that direction. But as there are strong indications that Cheyne was reputed orthodox in 1390, 1399, 1406, and for some time before his death,<sup>7</sup> it is hard to find a period to which a belief in Lollard doctrines can be referred. After all, if Sir John had been a conspicuous enemy of the clergy, and if, as there is reason to suspect, he had been in orders and unfrocked himself, he had, from the medieval standpoint, ample cause for remorse.

There remain the three knights mentioned by Knighton only. Apart from his reference there is nothing to connect them with Lollardy. John Trussell belonged to the junior branch of a family which held extensive property in the Midlands; and he himself owned estates in Warwickshire, Northants, and Leicestershire. He was commissioner of array for Northants in 1385 and 1392, and was doubtless well known in the neighbourhood of Leicester. When Knighton wrote he must have been a young man, as he did not die till 1439.<sup>8</sup> The absence of any further

<sup>1</sup> *Reg. Arundel*, ii. 203b.

<sup>2</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Hen. IV., iv. 451.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Reg. Chichele*, ii. 306a.

<sup>5</sup> *Reg. Arundel*, *loc. cit.*, *Chichele*, 278a, b.

<sup>6</sup> *Wals.*, *Hist. Ang.*, ii. 242; *Cal. Pat.*, Hen. IV., iv. 148; *Inq. post. mort.*, 8 Hen. V., No. 113; *Reg. Chich.*, ii. 285b.

<sup>7</sup> His having built a chapel at Beckford is conclusive as to this.

<sup>8</sup> *Dugdale*, *History of Warwicksh.*, ii. 715, 718, 941, 958; *Bridges*, *Hist. of Northants*, ii. 263, 507; *Baker*, *Hist. of Northampton*, i. 153, 154, ii. 275; *Nichols*, *History and Antiquities of Leicestershire*, ii. 511, 523, iv. 143, 327; *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., ii. 590, v. 90. The chief seat of the branch of the family to which Sir John

allusion to his support of heresy makes it probable that he soon changed his attitude.

Sir John Peche was born about 1361. Succeeding to his father's estates at the age of fifteen, he was at the time to which Knighton refers, lord of several manors, mostly in Warwickshire. It is interesting to note that Hampton-in-Arden, where Peche seems usually to have resided, is close to Solihull, which Trussell for some time held in right of his wife. Whatever support Peche may have given to Lollardy was shortlived, for he died on May 1, 1386.<sup>1</sup>

Of a knight called Reginald Hilton I have been unable to find any further trace. One might suspect Knighton of a mistake over the Christian name of Sir Robert de Hilton, who often appears in contemporary records, were it not that he lived in Yorkshire,<sup>2</sup> which seems never to have become infected with Lollardy. It might also be thought that the chronicler, who puts Hilton at the end of his list, had forgotten that he was speaking of knights, and meant a certain Reginald Hilton, king's clerk, who was controller of the royal household from 1377 to 1381.<sup>3</sup> Some colour would be lent to this supposition by the fact that in 1389 Reginald Hilton, presumably the same man, became a canon of St. Mary's collegiate church, Leicester.<sup>4</sup> But it is impossible to conceive why such a distinguished pluralist<sup>5</sup> as Hilton should have supported Lollardy, even in its earliest phase. In fact, if Knighton's mention of Sir Reginald is worth anything, he must have been an altogether obscure man.

Wycliffe  
was a notable  
pluralist  
until his  
death

After this examination of the separate careers of the knights the conclusions reached may be briefly summarised. Clanvowe, Neville, and Cheyne may be pronounced not guilty of the

Trussell belonged was at Floore, near Northampton, but it seems not to have come into his personal possession till 1404 (Baker, *op. cit.*, i. 154). Dugdale (*op. cit.*, ii. 718) says that he died before 1383, but this is a palpable error.

<sup>1</sup> Dugdale, *Hist. of Warwicksh.*, ii. 955; *Placita in Cancellaria*, File 14, No. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., *passim*; *P.R.O. Lists and Indexes*, ix. 162.

<sup>3</sup> *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xxiv. 504.

<sup>4</sup> *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., iv. 157, 163. Knighton's account of the Lollards was evidently written considerably later than 1389. Cf. ii. 173 (nam Clemens papa schismaticus illis diebus adhuc florebat), 178 (nam Franci eidem Clementi adhaerebant), 188 (et nisi deus abreviasset dies asperitatis illorum, etc., which seems an allusion to Archbishop Courtenay's visit to Leicester in 1389, p. 311 ff.). Other indications point to the same conclusion.

<sup>5</sup> For Hilton's preferments, see *Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., i. 160, 168, 442, 502, 602, ii. 96, iii. 159.



reproach of heresy. The case against Clifford and Stury is stronger; but their belief in Wycliffe, if it existed at all, must have been partial and shortlived. Peche died in 1386, and Montagu's heretical days appear to have ended by 1390. As Trussell escaped the censure of Walsingham, it is likely that he soon abandoned the attitude ascribed to him by Knighton. Of Hilton nothing is known. Latimer, in fact, is the only one from whom Lollardy can have derived continued or substantial support, and even he made an orthodox end.

It may be thought that insufficient justice has been done to the chroniclers. They seem to be supported by the wills of Latimer, Clifford, and Cheyne—so strikingly similar in their expressions of remorse. Stury, Latimer, Trussell, and Peche had estates at no great distance from Leicester. Montagu's manor of Shenley is only six or seven miles from St. Albans. Moreover, Knighton and Walsingham are quite independent of each other, yet both bring the same charge against Stury, Clifford, and Latimer. And in one respect their evidence finds strong corroboration in the records. Certain men are accused of Lollardy, and assuming that the charges are true, we should naturally infer that they were in close touch and on friendly terms with one another. Regarding Trussell, Peche, and Hilton there is no evidence on this point beyond the fact, already mentioned, that the first two held contiguous estates in Warwickshire. But official records at once make it clear that all the rest knew one another well. Numerous illustrations of this have already been adduced, and they are only a few out of the many that might be cited. In fact, when the name of one of the knights occurs, the odds are that at least one other will be mentioned in the same document. Sometimes four, frequently three of them appear together, and almost any two may be found in combination.<sup>1</sup> It is specially remarkable that Cheyne, whom the chroniclers never bring into explicit connection with the rest, proves to have been most familiar with them. Of course the connection of most of the knights with the court is amply sufficient to account for their mutual acquaintance: the striking point is that the chroniclers, with several score of king's knights to choose from, should pick out as fellow-heretics some half-dozen who as a fact were particularly intimate.

It is evident that Knighton and Walsingham were not merely

<sup>1</sup> I have not met with a case where either Latimer or Montagu is associated with Clanvowe or Neville; but they had so many common friends that their acquaintanceship is certain.

repeating charges against men of whom they otherwise knew nothing. Their accusations can hardly be groundless. Nevertheless, in face of the considerations discussed above, it is impossible to believe that more than one or two of the knights honestly accepted Wycliffite doctrines for any length of time. Is there any explanation that will cover all the facts ?

A previous attitude of violent and unscrupulous hostility to the clergy is, I think, sufficient to account for the remorseful wills. Anti-clericalism, sometimes amounting to religious scepticism, was rife ; and apart from the accusations of the chroniclers, one would naturally expect our knights to share this attitude. Most of them had been in the French wars, and were doubtless accustomed to think of the pope as the ally of their enemies. Several had belonged to the party of John of Gaunt at the time when his feud with the clergy was at its height. Clifford had been in the service of the Princess of Wales, who was evidently sympathetic with the earlier phases of Wycliffe's teaching. If Cheyne was a renegade priest, he was likely to be particularly bitter against his former comrades. Moreover, the material resources of most of the knights were precarious. Latimer, indeed, was well off : so, after 1390, was Montagu. But Clifford, Stury, Clanvowe, Neville, and Cheyne were almost entirely dependent on the goodwill of the king. A political crisis might spell ruin. Stury was hard hit by the death of Edward III. ; and, as we have seen, the revolution of 1399 completely changed the prospects of Clifford, who died a comparatively poor man. Men in this position were naturally eager to establish their fortunes on a firmer basis, and the temporalities of the clergy must have seemed a promising source of plunder. It is significant that some of them jumped at the opening afforded by the ambiguous position of the alien priories.<sup>1</sup> To such men, the Lollard denunciations of clerical wealth must have seemed providential, and it is no wonder if they went to considerable lengths in their support of the sect.

Anti-clerical zeal will also go far to explain the charges brought against the knights by the chroniclers. Knighton does not state to what period his account of the knights refers ; but his mention of dukes and earls who supported Lollardy and the point at which he inserts the passage render it almost certain that he had the

<sup>1</sup> Clifford, Cheyne (*vide supra*), and Clanvowe. In 1386 the last-named was given leave to treat with the abbot of Bec for the transfer of some of the abbey lands in Gloucestershire, but the negotiations apparently came to nothing (*Cal. Pat.*, Ric. II., iii. 130).

year 1382 specially in mind.<sup>1</sup> Now Knighton's treatment of Lollardy is highly coloured and demonstrably exaggerated; but even if his accusations against the knights are altogether true, they need not imply very much. For up to the summer of the year in question, active support of the Wycliffites was by no means incompatible with orthodoxy. Wycliffe's denial of transubstantiation had been made public only a year before and cannot have been generally understood; his doctrines had never been authoritatively condemned till the Blackfriars Council in the May of this year; Oxford University was still hotly on his side; and in July it was possible for John of Gaunt, whose professed creed was unassailably orthodox, to save a very outspoken Lollard from the stake.<sup>2</sup> A knight might champion a poor priest without any intention of supporting unsound dogma.

This explanation will not apply to the notices of the knights in the St. Albans chronicles, which refer to a time when the Lollards were notoriously heretics. But after all, this group of authorities gives little specific information. We read of Montagu's doings at Shenley, and that Stury and Latimer laid before Parliament the articles of 1395. Otherwise, we are simply told that these and one or two more were disrespectful to the host, that they were pleased with Pateshull's attack on the friars, that they aided and abetted the Lollards generally, that Montagu was said to have died without confession, and that Clifford changed his views before his death. Now the St. Albans writers, apart from criticisms made above, are admittedly inaccurate and unscrupulous. Walsingham, in particular, hated John of Gaunt, with whom several of the knights had been connected. And nice discrimination between various degrees of free-thought was not to be expected of a fourteenth century monk who lived in a country which had been wonderfully free from heterodoxy. If a protest against profane speech was enough to make even Chaucer's host 'smell a Loller in the wind,'<sup>3</sup> it is not astonishing that the knights stank in the nostrils of the St. Albans monks. They were friends of the duke; they hated the clergy; they had supported the poor priests; one or two of them did so still; and the others rather welcomed Lollard attacks on the church. What more was needed to brand them as Wycliffites? The chroniclers may have been quite honest

<sup>1</sup> A later allusion by Knighton shows that he was trying to maintain a chronological sequence in his description of the Lollards (ii. 313).

<sup>2</sup> Knighton, ii. 193, 197.

<sup>3</sup> *Canterbury Tales* (ed. Pollard), i. 247.

in their charges. But, except perhaps in the case of Latimer, they were mistaken in ascribing to the knights any persistent desire for a reform of the church in practice, organisation, and doctrine on the lines advocated by the Lollards.

As for the dukes and earls mentioned by Knighton as friends of the Lollard preachers, there is nothing to show whom he meant. One duke, John of Gaunt, gave the sect some shortlived encouragement, and late in life John Montagu became Earl of Salisbury. But even with the help of these, Knighton's plurals remain unsupported.

With respect to the gentry in general, we have no reason to suspect them of sympathy with the Lollard cause. It is indeed certain that much jealous dislike of the clergy and much irreverence and indifference towards religion could be found among them. But there was little desire to substitute a new faith for the old. It must have been seldom that one met with such men as the Wiltshire knight who ate the host with his oysters,<sup>1</sup> or Thomas Comperworth, an esquire of Oxfordshire, who is said to have been a Lollard preacher and a thorn in the flesh of the abbot of Oseney.<sup>2</sup> And though the House of Commons sometimes showed itself impatient of the power and wealth of the church, there is no trustworthy evidence of any disposition to criticise its doctrines.<sup>3</sup> It is significant that, in his later years, Wycliffe apparently lost all faith in the nobility and gentry.<sup>4</sup> Sir John Oldcastle, it is true,

<sup>1</sup> Wals., *ubi supra*.

<sup>2</sup> *Mon. Evesham*, 67; *Contin. Polychr.*, ix. 174. It is characteristic that when Comperworth was brought up for trial he speedily recanted.

<sup>3</sup> According to common belief at St. Albans, the Commons proposed to lay violent hands on the church's temporalities in 1385 (Wals., *op. cit.*, ii. 139), 1404 (*Ibid.*, ii. 264; *Ann. Hen. IV.*, 391 f.), and 1410 (Wals., ii. 283). Regarding the first of these occasions, there is nothing in the rolls to support Walsingham: on the other hand, they contain a petition which shows that the Lower House was orthodox (*Rot. Parl.*, iii. 213). There is likewise nothing in official records to lend colour to the charge of anti-clericalism against the Unlearned Parliament. For a discussion of the Parliament of 1410, see my article on Sir John Oldcastle (*Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xx. 439 f.). In any case, predatory intentions towards the estates of the clergy were not incompatible with doctrinal orthodoxy. As for the Lollard articles of 1395, it is nowhere claimed that they aroused much sympathy, in Parliament or elsewhere.

<sup>4</sup> *Cum ergo seculares domini non sine causa a deo habeant potestatem ad coerendum rebelles fidei, saltem non ipsos contra fidem ecclesie defendentes, tales domini . . . debent ex suo officio pro ista declaratione fidei laborare. Sed heu! amor Christi et fidei sue ab istis contempnitur, et plus quam Christus illud quod retardat ab isto officio infideliter preamatur* (*De Detectione Perfidiarum Antichristi: Wycliffe's Polemical Works*, i. 382). Though Dr. Buddensieg, the editor, hesitates

must have been a genuine Lollard. His case, however, goes far to prove that he was unique. If the clergy were bold enough to attack a personal friend of the reigning monarch, they would surely not have suffered the escape of less formidable offenders. But previous to Oldcastle's rebellion, no one of gentle blood was even put on his trial for heresy. Apart from the leader, moreover, only two men of good birth are known to have been concerned in the rising of 1414, and that these were Lollards is by no means certain.<sup>1</sup>

It appears therefore that Lollardy made little appeal to the upper classes. Though its critical and destructive side no doubt met with much approval, its attempts at religious reconstruction were faced with hostility or, at best, indifference. The nobility and gentry had little to do with such success as it attained. That success, too, as it seems to me, has generally been over-estimated. It is the lack, not the abundance, of our information that is significant. In the fourteenth century, the least sign of opposition to the accepted faith was enough to scandalise the conservatives, proud as they were of England's former freedom from heresy; and like all upholders of orthodoxy, the chroniclers were apt to confound the merely sceptical and indifferent with the would-be reformer. Yet except among the St. Albans writers, notices of Lollardy after the death of Wycliffe are scattered and meagre. Sixteenth century Protestantism invested the Lollards with a posthumous renown, but there can be little doubt that, when their first energy had spent itself, they speedily became an obscure sect, destitute of living leaders, and vaguely re-echoing the teachings of a deceased founder whom they only half understood.

W. T. WAUGH.

as to the date of the tract, he is inclined to ascribe it to the early summer of 1382, just the time to which Knighton specially refers the activities of the knights. There is a somewhat similar passage in the tract *De citationibus frivolis* (*Polemical Works*, ii. 553).

<sup>1</sup> *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xx. 641 f.