The College and Canons of St Stephen's, Westminster, 1348 - 1548

Volume I of II

Elizabeth Biggs

PhD

University of York

History

October 2016

Abstract

This thesis is concerned with the college founded by Edward III in his principal palace of Westminster in 1348 and dissolved by Edward VI in 1548 in order to examine issues of royal patronage, the relationships of the Church to the Crown, and institutional networks across the later Middle Ages. As no internal archive survives from St Stephen's College, this thesis depends on comparison with and reconstruction from royal records and the archives of other institutions, including those of its sister college, St George's, Windsor. In so doing, it has two main aims: to place St Stephen's College back into its place at the heart of Westminster's political, religious and administrative life; and to develop a method for institutional history that is concerned more with connections than solely with the internal workings of a single institution.

As there has been no full scholarly study of St Stephen's College, this thesis provides a complete institutional history of the college from foundation to dissolution before turning to thematic consideration of its place in royal administration, music and worship, and the manor of Westminster. The circumstances and processes surrounding its foundation are compared with other such colleges to understand the multiple agencies that formed St Stephen's, including that of the canons themselves. Kings and their relatives used St Stephen's for their private worship and as a site of visible royal piety. It was the principal chapel of the palace that no king could ignore because of the presence of royal administration and consequently the presence of the public. The college was turned to new uses in the Reformation, when its canons were called upon to shape the theology of the new Church of England. Like all such institutions, St Stephen's adapted to the needs of each generation, but it did so extraordinarily successfully.

Table of Contents

Author's Declaration

This thesis is entirely my own work and includes nothing produced in collaboration, with the sole exception of the transcriptions provided to me by Maureen Jurkowski and Simon Neal. Maureen's transcriptions of the building accounts were produced for the Leverhulme Trust-funded project *The Building Accounts for St Stephen's Chapel, Palace of Westminster, 1292-1366* at the University of York. The aim of this project is a complete edition of the chapel's surviving building accounts edited by Tim Ayers, which is now forthcoming. Simon's transcriptions of documents relating to St Stephen's Chapel were produced for publication as part of the AHRC-funded project *St Stephen's Chapel, Westminster: Visual and Political Culture, 1292- 1941*, also based at the University of York, to which I am affiliated. The material they transcribed is referenced and acknowledged in the footnotes. Where necessary, I have translated the material myself and have checked ambiguities against the original documents. All interpretations in this thesis remain my own.

This work has not previously been presented for an award at this, or any other, university. All sources are acknowledged as references.

Introduction

'The palace chapel which is the most beautiful, most rich and most noble…'

Thus Jean Froissart described the chapel in which Richard II heard mass and then received the homage of his nobles on the eve of the Merciless Parliament in 1388, a parliament which was to destroy most of his favourites and reward his enemies.[1] The chapel Froissart was describing was the two-storey chapel of St Stephen and St Mary within the Palace of Westminster, begun under Edward I as the main chapel of the palace and only completed under his grandson, Edward III in 1363.[2] On 6 August 1348 Edward III founded 'to the honour of God, the Virgin Mary and St Stephen the Protomartyr' a college to serve that still-unfinished chapel in perpetuity, to add to the store of prayers offered in England and to pray for the royal dead.[3] St Stephen's College, unlike many other colleges, had no formal educational or charitable functions written into its foundation documents. Instead, its wider significance came from its position within the Palace of Westminster and as the home of well-connected royal servants as canons. It was to remain a royally-favoured institution through to the Reformation, when Henry VIII changed his Westminster royal residence to Whitehall after 1529, and Edward VI finally dissolved St Stephen's College in 1548. Its lands and valuables were either acquired by members of the Edwardian establishment or taken into the Court of Augmentations.[4] Its books and papers were mostly destroyed or dispersed at the same time. The chapel, used from c. 1550 as the permanent meeting place of the House of Commons, stood until 1834 when the devastating fire that destroyed most of the medieval palace laid bare the medieval fabric of St Stephen's to a fascinated public and antiquarians.[5] The college's cloisters were the only survival, along with Westminster Hall and the Jewel Tower, of the palace that Edward III had known. In Charles Barry's new palace, begun in 1840, the chapel was re-imagined as the public entrance way to

---

[1] 'la chappelle du palays qui est moult belle, moult riche et moult noble,' Besançon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 865, f. 363v; Froissart*, Chronicles*, ii, pp. 498-9.

[2] The building programme is the subject of James Hillson, 'St Stephen's Chapel, Westminster: Architecture, Decoration and Politics in the Reigns of Henry III and the three Edwards (1227-1363)', (PhD thesis, University of York, 2015); for earlier discussions of the building sequence see Maurice Hastings, *St Stephen's Chapel and its Place in the Development of Perpendicular Style in England,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955); an edition of the building accounts edited by Professor Tim Ayers is also forthcoming.

[3] *CPR 1348-50*, p. 147; also printed in William Dugdale et al., *Monasticon Anglicanum: a History of the Abbies and other Monasteries, Hospitals, Frieries, and Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, with their Dependencies, in England and Wales,* 6 vols. (London: Longman, 1818-30), vi, p. 1350; in working with letters patent I have cited the calendar and then if there are details in the original not mentioned in the calendar or that I have transcribed I have also cited the original roll.

[4] For example, a pensions list compiled by the Court of Augmentations that in part deals with St Stephen's College, BL Additional MS 8102.

[5] Alteration works in the early nineteenth century had produced antiquarian work, John Thomas Smith, *Antiquities of Westminster; the Old Palace; St. Stephen's Chapel (Now the House of Commons), Etc,* (London: John Thomas Smith, 1807); but it was the fire of 1834 that spurred the two extensive treatments of the chapel, first Edward Brayley and John Britton, *The History of the Ancient Palace and Late Houses of Parliament at Westminster,* (London: John Weale, 1835); and then Frederick Mackenzie, *The Architectural Antiquities of St Stephen's Chapel, late the House of Commons,* (London: John Weale, 1844).

Parliament in St Stephen's Hall and more recently the cloisters have been made into an office area. Thus, although the college's physical structures have largely been destroyed, they were well documented in the nineteenth century as being of historical interest.

This aims of this thesis are two-fold. Firstly, it follows standard institutional histories in providing a detailed history of the college of St Stephen's, Westminster and its canons through the two centuries of its existence, which has not before been attempted. Secondly, it intends to integrate the picture of the life of St Stephen's with the prevailing trends of English political and religious life, and in so doing, make a case for a more expansive institutional history, which is concerned with the connections between institutions, as well as between individuals and their institutions. The college and its personnel provide excellent case studies for issues of changing royal administration, changing attitudes to religious patronage, and ecclesiastical careers at the upper level of the Church, as well as interesting insights into specific issues of particular reigns. In this regard, the dean and canons of St Stephen's, living in the heart of government within the Palace of Westminster, had access to and were involved in the many changes across this period, politically, administratively and religiously. They did not live a monastic life behind closed doors and high walls; instead they combined service to God with active lives in royal service and a collegiality within the ranks of the court. Most of them also held other preferments, and so were part of wider communities of the Church.[6] The lesser clergy and other staff of the college also were part of the wider court and the manor of Westminster. The college, then, must be understood both for its intrinsic interest as a recipient of royal patronage, and for the light it can shed on the workings and development of the late medieval collegiate form. It was also a place where many different aspects of political and administrative life interacted. The life of St Stephen's shows the continuing vitality of royal ecclesiastical service even as the scope of that service narrowed and the numbers of men pursuing that life diminished. The importance of St Stephen's in the life of the church, as a significant musical centre and as one of many churches which strengthened the provision of divine service, was real. The chapel at the heart of the college, was fundamental to its purpose and its activities, but it was used by others as well, so the history of the chapel's usage from 1348 must be concerned with the college's relationship with the court that surrounded it, and the royal dynasties that created and sustained it. At either end of the period under discussion in this thesis, the college was part of two particular changes in royal and state display. At its founding in 1348, the college was a deliberate and visible part of Edward III's political and dynastic ideology, and at its dissolution two centuries later, it was swept up in another Edward's changes, this time in religion, as Edward VI and his advisers sought to create a Protestant kingship and a Protestant country.

---

[6] For full biographies see Appendix Three.

Despite its importance, St Stephen's exists on the edges of modern scholarship. St Stephen's has functioned as a useful exemplar, but has neither been studied in its own right nor as a complete institution. Art historians such as Maurice Hastings have examined the chapel as an example of influential ecclesiastical architecture, and historians interested in the late medieval Church tend to mention it in passing, or use an aspect of its existence as an example of larger phenomena.[7] Biographies of those who worked at the college treat it as one of many preferments held, rather than as often the working base of their lives in royal or ecclesiastical administration at Westminster.[8] This historical ambivalence is largely because of the problems of categorizing the college across academic disciplines, and the lack of internal sources about the operation of the college, which does not make it amenable to how historians have conventionally approached the institutions of the church, whether monastic or secular. St Stephen's dissolution in 1548 swept away almost all traces of its own records. The site was granted out to royal favourites in 1550 and 1553, the endowment lands were widely dispersed, and the chapel itself was decommissioned and turned into the House of Commons.[9] In the midst of such upheaval, the collegiate archives and library were lost. Thus, this thesis has had to look to other sources and methodologies to recreate the history and workings of the college. The surviving evidence for St Stephen's is largely royal grants and legal records kept by the king's courts. Other sources of information are the records of the monks of Westminster Abbey, particularly for a dispute between the college and the abbey over jurisdiction.[10] The college's obit book also survives, as do canons' wills from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.[11] This skewed

---

[7] On the architectural side, particularly see Hastings, *St Stephen's Chapel*; Christopher Wilson, 'The Origins of the Perpendicular Style and its Development to Circa 1360,' (PhD thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art, 1979); as well as Hillson, 'St Stephen's Chapel, Westminster'.

For examples of historians briefly mentioning St Stephen's, see in particular the debates over the Crowland Chronicle's second continuator. Everyone agrees that it is a Westminster perspective but who wrote it is hotly contested. Three of the proposed authors are canons or former canons of the college in 1485, John Russell, John Gunthorpe and Henry Sharp, then the dean. The most recent is Michael Hicks, 'Crowland's World: A Westminster View of the Yorkist Age,' *History* 90 (2005), pp. 172-90, with a useful summary of past writings on p. 172.

The two exceptions are isolated studies of aspects of St Stephen's existence, on Edward III's final bequest to the college, Chris Given-Wilson, 'Richard II and his Grandfather's Will,' *EHR* 93 (1978), pp. 320-37; and on the fourteenth-century dispute with Westminster Abbey, Ralf Lützelschwab, "Verletze Eitelkeiten? Westminster Abbey und St Stephen's, Westminster- Mönche und Kanoniker im Konflikt' in *Pluralität- Konkurrenz- Konflikt: Religiöse Spannungen im städtischen Raum der Vormoderne,* ed. Jörg Oberste, (Regensburg: Schell & Steiner, 2013), pp. 81-100.

[8] These include Andrew Chibi's collective biography of Henry VIII's bishops, *Henry VIII's Bishops: Diplomats, Administrators, Scholars and Shepherds,* (Cambridge: James Clark, 2003) as well as the earlier Lacey Baldwin Smith, *Tudor Prelates and Politics 1536-58,* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953). In the fifteenth century, John Gunthorpe has received some attention, most notably in A. Compton Reeves, 'John Gunthorpe: Keeper of Richard III's Privy Seal, Dean of Wells Cathedral', *Viator* 39 (2008), pp. 307-44; St Stephen's is incidental to the story of John Buckingham in Alison K. McHardy, 'The Early Ecclesiastical Career of John Buckingham,' *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 8 (1975), pp. 3-12.

[9] Winnifred Jay, 'The House of Commons and St. Stephen's Chapel,' *EHR* 36 (1921), pp. 225-8.

[10] Westminster Abbey Muniments has a variety of material, including letters from St Stephen's, petitions to the papacy concerning the case, and the documents produced by the abbey in the dispute.

[11] Wills are found in the PROB series in the National Archives, with some isolated ones in other jurisdictions, including one in the BL Harley Charters. The obit book is now the first part of BL Cotton MS Faustina B VIII, having been later bound with other ecclesiastical material.

survival of certain types of documentation inevitably creates imbalances in what it is possible to reconstruct. Fortunately, there are several other comparable colleges from the same period which can be shown to have influenced or been influenced by St Stephen's or its canons.

It is the consistent presence at St Stephen's of royal support long after its foundation that distinguishes it from the other colleges, which have started to receive attention once again both as their own institutions and as a type of foundation.[12] Royal support to the college seems in part to have been the result of simple proximity, and to the college's role in visualising and carrying out kingship and governance. St Stephen's offers an alternative, a chance to examine royal piety comparatively across ten English kings in two centuries and thus to begin to tease out the ways in which different kings responded differently to the apparatus of sacral monarchy available to them and expected of them in a single space.[13] Monarchy was performed at St Stephen's, where a small crowd in the nave could just barely see the king seated in relation to the murals staking out Edward III's personal sense of a relationship with the saints, and still more could see him enter or leave the chapel on feast days in procession as an embodiment of quasi-sacral power.[14] Even when the ruling king was absent, in the liturgy of St Stephen's he was present in the daily round of prayer and in the music sung in the chapel.[15] Every visitor, from Froissart to the sixteenth-century knights who heard

---

[12] The fundamental basis of all collegiate history remains Alexander Hamilton Thompson, 'Notes on Colleges of Secular Canons in England,' *Archaeological Journal* 74 (1917), pp. 139-99; recent attention on medieval colleges has particularly focussed on St George's College, Windsor on account of the survival of its records; in *St George's Chapel, Windsor in the Later Middle Ages*, eds. Colin Richmond & Eileen Scarff, (Windsor: for the Dean and Canons, 2001); and *St George's Chapel, Windsor in the Fourteenth Century,* ed. Nigel Saul, (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2005); these then spurred a conference and an edited volume on colleges more generally, *The Late Medieval English College and its Contexts,* eds. Clive Burgess & Martin Heale, (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2008); the earlier royal colleges are the subject of Jeffrey H. Denton, *English Royal Free Chapels 1100-1300: A Constitutional Study,* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1970) and more recently Charles Fonge, 'Patrimony and Patriarchy: Investing in the Medieval College,' in *The Foundations of medieval English Ecclesiastical History: studies presented to David Smith,* eds. Philippa H. Hoskin et al., (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2005), pp. 77-93.

Isolated studies of individual colleges and aspects of them have also started to appear outside of the essay collections listed above, including Alexandra Buckle on the Beauchamp Chantry chapel, 'Fit for a king: music and iconography in Richard Beauchamp's chantry chapel,' *Early Music* 38:1 (2010) pp. 3-20; Magnus Williamson on Eton, 'The Eton Choirbook: Its Institutional and Historical Background,' (DPhil thesis, Oxford, 1997); and Charles Fonge's introduction to his edition of St Mary, Warwick's cartulary, *The Cartulary of St. Mary's Collegiate Church, Warwick* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2004).

All of the colleges used in this study also have brief entries in the relevant *Victoria County History* volumes.

[13] There are few comparative studies of royal piety in the later middle ages, on the ways in which Richard II constructed saintliness for Edward II, Chris Given-Wilson, 'Richard II, Edward II and the Lancastrian Inheritance,' *EHR* 109 (1994), pp. 553-571; on the three Edwards' use of religion to project images of piety, W. Mark Ormrod, 'The English Monarchy and the Promotion of Religion in the Fourteenth Century' in *Religion und Politik im Mittelalter: Deutschland und England im Vergleich,* eds. Ludger Körntgen & Dominik Waßenhoven, (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013), pp. 205-18; on the limited theme of patronage, Joel T. Rosenthal, 'Kings, Continuity and Ecclesiastical Benefaction in Fifteenth Century England,' in *People, Politics and Community in the Later Middle Ages,* eds. Joel T. Rosenthal and Colin Richmond, (Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1987), pp. 161-75; for a later period remembering the three Edwards, Charles Farris, 'The New Edwardians? Royal Piety in the Yorkist Age,' in *The Yorkist Age: Proceedings of the 2011 Harlaxton Symposium,* eds. Hannes Kleineke & Christian Steer, (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2013), pp. 44-63.

[14] *Liber Regie Capelle,* ed. Walter Ullmann, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), pp. 56-7.

[15] This is implied by the foundation letter patent, where the college was to pray in perpetuity for Edward III, his progenitors and his successors, *CPR 1348-50*, p. 147.

mass in the chapel while at Westminster for law cases, would have been aware of the royal splendour and patronage shown in the heraldic decoration, the richness of the liturgical furnishings and the lavishness of the mass. The college was an expression of royal dynastic piety, and one that kings were careful to make their own, as well as to respond to the works of their predecessors. In addition, the canons of St Stephen's working within the king's government, in Chancery, the Exchequer and in the royal household, were part of the delegated royal government that carried out the king's will. As the men appointed to canonries were consistently royal servants, despite the increase in laymen in royal government, St Stephen's brings together both the religious and the practical sides of medieval kingship.[16] It is the consistent interrelationship between prayers for the king, as at any royal free chapel, and the particularly heavy involvement in government that make St Stephen's unusually interesting.

Beyond the king, St Stephen's also allows us to look at the Palace of Westminster within its wider contexts. Medieval and early modern Westminster is challenging because it does not fit easily into the mould of urban history, and then the records are themselves problematically divided.[17] Westminster was never fully a city in this period, as London was, remaining a manor under the control of Westminster Abbey, but still an urban centre in its own right. For urban historians, it straddles two classifications that should be distinct. They have been very interested in understanding how manorial forms could be made to work in an urban context without an urban corporation, and in the interplay between the abbey and the Crown for influence and control. Yet Westminster is still more than an exercise in urban government; as the home of the principal palace of the kings of England and as the administrative centre for the kingdom from the later middle ages onwards, it was one of the homes of the court and of parliament, both institutions that have received much attention. 'Court' is something of a loaded term before the early modern period due to its associations with the settled courts such as Versailles of the late sixteenth century and debates over whether the fifteenth century saw a new type of magnificent court.[18] The consensus has settled around the court as the public

---

[16] They thus feed into debates about the changing nature of clerical involvement in government, which is the theme of Chapter Five below, pp. 142-5; R.L. Storey, 'Gentlemen-bureaucrats,' in *Profession, Vocation and Culture in Later Medieval England: Essays dedicated to the Memory of A. R. Myers,* ed. C.H. Clough, (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1982), pp. 90-130; Charles W. Smith, 'Some Trends in the English Royal Chancery 1377-1483,' *Medieval Prosopography* 6 (1985), pp. 69-94; Christine Carpenter, 'Henry VI and the Deskilling of the Royal Bureaucracy,' in *The Fifteenth Century IX: English and Continental Perspectives,* ed. Linda Clark, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2010), pp. 1-37; for a view of careerism as a positive public force, see Michael Bennett, 'Careerism in Late Medieval England,' in *People, Politics and Community in the Later Middle Ages,* eds. Joel T. Rosenthal & Colin Richmond, (Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1987), pp. 19-39.
[17] Gervase Rosser, *Medieval Westminster 1200-1540,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989) and Julia F. Merritt, *The Social World of early modern Westminster: Abbey, Court, and Community 1525-1640,* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005).
[18] Malcolm Vale, *The Princely Court: Medieval Courts and Culture in North-West Europe, 1270-1380,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. 16-17.

political face of the household, which incorporated both personal and public aspects of the king.[19] Yet there have been few attempts to situate the medieval itinerant royal household and its hangers-on within their changing spatial contexts and to understand the interplay between the permanent, semi-permanent and fully temporary elements within Westminster.[20] At any given moment, Westminster played host to the king's administrative staff of the offices of state, and to those seeking justice in the law courts, a writ or other documentation in Chancery, or making payments or being paid at the Exchequer, all court functions. Regularly, these visitors would be augmented by the presence of the king and his household, men coming to court specifically as well as those there for parliament when it was in session. Added to this constant bustle and movement of people were the visitors to the shrine of Edward the Confessor in Westminster Abbey or to the abbey's fairs, and thus not part of the world of the court. Yet for historians the king's court rarely sits against this backdrop, but instead is its own itinerant world, separate from the palace environments in which it found itself.[21]

The study of St Stephen's allows us to combine and extend the two approaches which have begun to point to the need to integrate the court with its surroundings, particularly when at Westminster, and with its multiplicity of functions. Firstly, the work of architectural historians starting from Howard Colvin in the 1960s has begun to provide the material for understanding the physical spaces of particular palaces, which enables work to be done on the access routes and possibilities for visitors and members of the household alike.[22] Simon Thurley's work on the Tudor royal palaces as well as Whitehall hinted at, but then did not develop, the varying design priorities at different palaces that dramatically shaped the court's experiences there, from camping in tents at Eltham because it was a hunting lodge to the processional possibilities of Henry VIII's Whitehall and Hampton Court in the mid-sixteenth century.[23] Of particular importance for St Stephen's are the varying arrangements and layouts of royal palace chapels, which meant that the court's experience of the working liturgy would vary from place to place. On the side of personnel, Fiona Kisby has shown that the musicians of the

---

[19] John Watts, *Henry VI and the Politics of Kingship*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 86-8.
[20] Julia Merritt has looked at the interaction of the court with local society in 'The Cecils and Westminster 1558-1612,' in *Patronage, Culture and Power: The Early Cecils,* ed. Pauline Croft, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002), pp. 231-48; and on how the palace was accessed by women, Amanda Richardson, 'Gender and Space in English Royal Palaces c. 1160-c. 1547: A Study in Access Analysis and Imagery', *Medieval Archaeology* 47 (2003), pp. 131-65.
[21] Studies of the king's household and the surrounding court include Chris Given-Wilson, *The Royal Household and the King's Affinity;* Ralph A. Griffiths, 'The King's Court during the Wars of the Roses: Continuities in an Age of Discontinuities,' in *Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility: the Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age*, edited by Ronald G. Asch and Adolf M. Birke, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. 41-68; particularly controversially as it sees the court as emerging in the Yorkist period, D.A.L. Morgan, 'The House of Policy: The Political Role of the late Plantagenet Household, 1422-1485,' in *The English Court from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, ed. David Starkey, (London: Longmans, 1987), pp. 25-70.
[22] *HKW*, i, pp. 491-552; Richardson, 'Gender and Space in English Royal Palaces,' pp. 131-65.
[23] In Simon Thurley, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England: Architecture and Court Life, 1460-1547*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993) and idem, *Whitehall Palace: An Architectural History of the Royal Apartments, 1240-1698,* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999).

Chapel Royal under Henry VII and Henry VIII were strongly integrated into the musical world of London and of Westminster, particularly in the guild of St Nicholas, at least in part because of the routine nature of their presence at Westminster.[24] She also demonstrated the importance of the Chapel Royal to royal projections of kingship and power, although did not discuss the varying possibilities of the chapels they used.[25] As a space that was well known to visitors and the household alike, St Stephen's provides a place within the Palace of Westminster that allows analysis of how the king and his household as well as visitors to the palace and the local community actively used the chapel, and thus gives a sense of how they interacted with the palace as a whole. It provides a stable institution with a defined community through which to examine the interactions of the itinerant court, the administrative offices and the population of Westminster, across a broad time frame.

Any royal free chapel had to negotiate its relationship with the church and with the local diocesan, despite its status as exempt from ordinary ecclesiastical jurisdiction.[26] As a college whose canons were largely royal administrators of the Exchequer, Chancery and the household, and a significant number of whom went on to bishoprics, St Stephen's provides a vantage point onto ongoing debates over the changing relationship between the English Church and the king in the later middle ages and particularly in the Reformation. Again, historians have tended to look at individual cases, such as bishops' involvement in the conciliar governments of the 1380s, or responses to the Great Schism, rather than the full range of collaboration.[27] Royal powers of patronage have rightly been acknowledged as important, with the reassertion of the king's rights to vacant bishoprics and abbeys, as well as the scope of the church courts.[28] The tension between the king's courts and the church courts drove much of a long dispute between St Stephen's and Westminster Abbey, although it is notable that the English church courts backed down immediately when faced with royal displeasure. However, there was another side to interactions between the Church and the king. Recent work on clerical taxation and clerical involvement in Parliament has highlighted a long tradition of co-operation and collaboration, implicit in earlier work on the statesmen-bishops of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.[29] Bishops are often seen as unusual and separate from the lower clergy they led,

---

[24] Fiona Kisby, 'The Royal Household Chapel in early Tudor London, 1485-1547', (PhD thesis, University of London, 1996), ch. 6 and 7.
[25] Kisby, 'Where the King Goeth a Procession: Chapel Ceremonies and Services, the Ritual Year, and Religious Reforms at the Early Tudor Court, 1485-1547,' *Journal of British Studies* 40 (2001), pp. 44-75.
[26] The standard study on the processes by which royal colleges before St Stephen's became peculiars, exempt from diocesan control is Denton, *English Royal Free Chapels 1100-1300*.
[27] For example, J.H. Dahmus, 'Richard II and the Church,' *Catholic Historical Review* 39 (1954), pp. 408-433 and Richard G. Davies, 'Richard II and the Church in the Years of "Tyranny,"' *Journal of Medieval History* 1 (1975), pp.329-62 and Davies, 'The Episcopate and the Political Crisis in England of 1386-88,' *Speculum* 51 (1976), pp. 659-93.
[28] On boundaries between courts, Richard H. Helmholz, *Roman Canon Law in Reformation England,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 21-5.
[29] Maureen Jurkowski, 'The History of Clerical Taxation in England and Wales: the Findings of the E 179 Project,' *JEH* 67 (2016), pp. 53 - 81; Alison K. McHardy, 'Henry IV: The Clergy in Parliament' in *The reign of Henry IV:*

rather than as simply the most visible expression of a Church which co-operated with the king throughout the later Middle Ages and then carried out reform in the 1530s and 1540s.[30] Canons epitomised the continuing relationship of the church with the Crown, whether working in Chancery, the law courts, or as the king's secretary, his almoner or his chaplains. At the same time, a canon might also be an archdeacon, or a diocesan official for the bishop who had brought them into royal and ecclesiastical service.[31] On an institutional level, St Stephen's was used as the venue for church ceremonies, such as the consecration of bishops, as well as royal events such as crown-wearings or state trials. Its ordinary liturgy proclaimed royal piety within a church context, thus linking the Church, governance, and a visual expression of kingship in the liturgy.

Ultimately, St Stephen's College, Westminster allows and indeed demands a different type of institutional history for cathedral chapters and colleges. It is not enough to look solely at institutions in isolation, concerned with their formal structures. Instead, they need to be seen as being created and re-created by successive generations to suit the changing needs and desires of their occupants as those working on earlier monasteries have already begun to do.[32] While St Stephen's in 1530 shared many similarities with the St Stephen's Edward III had left on his death in 1377, they were not the same, simply by virtue of the interests and careers of their canons, independent of changes in musical, religious and administrative practice. Historians have been reluctant to think in terms of interconnected institutions in this time period.[33] Even when they do look at colleges as a type, they do not think in terms of the cross-connections and shared experiences that might join a St Stephen's with Westminster Abbey, with St Margaret's, Westminster, with the educational colleges of Oxford and Cambridge and with secular institutions such as the law courts or the king's household.[34] It was rare for one individual canon to spend his whole life at one college, or even in one career, so the

---

rebellion and survival, 1403-1413, eds. Gwilym Dodd & Douglas Biggs, (York: York Medieval Press, 2008), pp. 136-61.

[30] Peter Heath discusses the studies of bishops as churchmen and royal administrators, but sees the church as bipolar, with bishops and clergy as separate categories, Heath, 'Between Reform and Reformation: The English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries,' *JEH* 41 (1990), pp. 650-4.

[31] A useful early example is Bernard Brocas, who was William Edington's clerk in Winchester diocese, but was also a royal clerk in Gascony, see below, p. 32 n. 58, and p. 262.

[32] Monastic examples include Emilia Jamroziak, *Rievaulx Abbey and its Social Context, 1132-1300: Memory, Locality, Networks,* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005) and Katharine Sykes, *Inventing Sempringham: Gilbert of Sempringham and the Origins of the Master,* (Münster: LIT Verlag, 2011).

[33] For example, the essays in *The Late Medieval College* deal either with the abstract purposes of colleges or with specific examples of college life, such as David Skinner's essay on Fotheringhay College, Skinner, 'Music and the Reformation in the Collegiate Church of St Mary and All Saints, Fotheringhay,' pp. 253-74; see also the constitutional studies of Kathleen Edwards, *The English Secular Cathedrals in the Middle Ages: A Constitutional Study.* 2nd ed. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967) and David N. Lepine, *A Brotherhood of Canons Serving God: English Secular Cathedrals in the Later Middle Ages,* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1995).

[34] However, Heath notes a trend toward putting cathedrals into their diocesan contexts, 'Between Reform and Reformation,' p. 655; such as Barrie Dobson, 'Cathedral Chapters and Cathedral Cities: York, Durham and Carlisle in the fifteenth century,' *Northern History* 19 (1981), pp. 15-44; and for an example of a college in its political context, Kate Selway, 'The Role of Eton College and King's College, Cambridge in the Polity of the Lancastrian Monarchy,' (DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1993).

connections made could be far-reaching, both for the individuals and for the institutions concerned.[35] To make sense of what St Stephen's meant to its changing contemporary audiences and connections, we need to think in terms of the movement of individuals, of the contingent links made by individuals throughout their careers, as well as the formal typological links of shared purpose or shared forms. The types of materials that survive for St Stephen's in particular allow and indeed encourage this type of work, by suggesting the broader connections and cultural worlds in which its canons and vicars lived.

Sources and Comparisons

Conventionally, an institutional history would depend upon some sort of institutional archive or grouping of relevant documents within a larger archive, supplemented by documents that had been separated accidentally or purposefully from the main group but had once belonged to the institutional archive.[36] The archive's own interests or purpose determines the history that is written and rarely is it necessary to consider outside relationships, other than in passing.[37] As no internal archive of any type has survived from St Stephen's College, this type of institutional history has not been possible. Instead, I have constructed a different methodology, which offers its own challenges and limitations, to work with the types of material that survives about St Stephen's. As a royal college, St Stephen's consistently appeared in a variety of royal records from 1348 to the late sixteenth century. Those records are the primary materials on which this thesis has been based. In addition, St Stephen's had links with other colleges, religious houses and lay institutions, and the records of those groups have been used to look at St Stephen's as well, particularly those of Westminster Abbey. This outside-in perspective forces us to consider the college continuously as an institution that was part of larger networks and of the Palace of Westminster rather than as a fully discrete unit outside diocesan and royal control. It also allows us to think of St Stephen's as an ever-evolving institution, where the parameters created by the founder and the first generation of canons in the statutes were not set in stone, but rather were developed to meet the needs of each successive generation within and without the college. Beyond the documents that are directly related to St Stephen's or to its canons, I have also used a comparative approach to examine the range of possibilities collegiate institutions had in their decision-making and, where possible, to examine the importance and typicality of St Stephen's. The colleges I have chosen to use for comparative

---

[35] See McHardy's comments on the benefit Buckingham received from St Stephen's, in 'Buckingham's Early Ecclesiastical Career', p. 4; and *Cartulary of St Mary's Warwick,* pp. l-li.

[36] Thus for examples relevant to St Stephen's College's own networks, A.K.B Roberts, *St George's Chapel, Windsor 1348-1416: A Study in Early Collegiate Administration,* (Windsor: for the Dean and Canons, 1948); Alexander Hamilton Thompson, *The History of the Hospital and the New College of the Annunciation of St. Mary in the Newarke, Leicester,* (Leicester: Leicester Archaeological Society, 1937); and Magnus Williamson's DPhil thesis on the Eton Choirbook was based on Eton's own records, 'The Eton Choirbook'.

[37] For the intellectual implications of this, see Elizabeth Yale, 'The History of Archives: The State of the Discipline', *Book History* 18.1 (2015), pp. 332-359.

purposes will be further discussed below, but they have been selected for two purposes. European palace chapels were often collegiate, for reasons I will explore in Chapter One, and so they provide a first context for St Stephen's and how it fitted into the palace of Westminster and royal uses of palatine spaces.[38] Secondly, there was a network of colleges in England, which were founded by royal or noble laymen to pray for the souls of the dead, as St Stephen's was, and which often drew upon the same pools of priests, singers and clerks as St Stephen's. In addition, the later examples of these lay colleges often drew explicitly on contemporary practice at St Stephen's itself, which means that they can sometimes provide direct guidance as to what happened at Westminster. I have largely excluded the smaller chantry colleges and chantries simply because they commanded so much less wealth and resources than St Stephen's as to make them of an entirely different order in practical terms.

The royal documentation now largely in The National Archives or scattered to other repositories shows us the many ways in which the college interacted with the Crown, and of the range of engagement that was possible for a favoured institution. The single most crucial source for any history of St Stephen's is the royal patent rolls maintained throughout the college's existence by the Chancery. The letters patent granted to the college provide us with a narrative of the foundation of the college, with the names of most of its canons throughout the later Middle Ages, and with evidence of continuing royal grants of lands, money and privileges to the college and to its staff.[39] Smaller amounts of similar material were issued as letters close or as charters and so appear in the calendars of those series.[40] As enrolled copies of documentation issued to the dean and canons themselves, the Chancery rolls provide a basis for understanding what would have been in the college's own archives. These types of documents for the range of preferments held by canons are also the basis for the prosopographical biographies in the appendices. The issue rolls, the records of money paid out by the Exchequer on a daily and yearly basis, show the continuing financial support in cash by the kings of England well into the fifteenth century.[41] Records of the royal household permit us to see the king and his court in the surroundings of St Stephen's Chapel on feast days or on other extra-ordinary occasions.[42] Other royal records, however, allow a more contested view such as the petitions to the king and to Parliament in which the dean and canons sought to defend or

---

[38] Below, pp. 29-30.
[39] C 66 series, calendared until 1585 as *Calendar of Patent Rolls,* (London: HMSO, 1891-1986).
[40] *Calendar of the Charter Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office, Vol. 5: 15 Edward III - 5 Henry V, A.D. 1341-1417* (London: HMSO, 1916) and *Calendar of the Close Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office* (London: HMSO, 1893-1949).
[41] E 403 series through to 1461.
[42] Some accounts, such as those of Margaret of Anjou, and Elizabeth of York have been published, 'The Household of Margaret of Anjou 1452-53 II,' ed. Alec R. Myers, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 40 (1957), pp. 391-431 and *Privy Purse Expenses of Elizabeth of York etc.,* ed. N. H. Nicolas, (London: William Pickering, 1830). Other accounts are now in E 361, which are the enrolled versions of the particulars in the E 101 miscellaneous category.

extend their rights, their lands or their revenues.[43] Building accounts suggest heavy involvement by both the king and the college in creating the physical spaces enjoyed by the college.[44] Occasionally royal records allow us to look at the internal workings of the college, particularly in times of dispute, when the college appeared in the king's courts to defend itself or to challenge others in regard to its rights. Royal protection could play a role in whether or not the litigation went smoothly, and thus hint at the continuing relationships between the then-king and the college. Finally, royal documentation allows for discussion of the process of Reformation and the ways in which the machinery of government eventually absorbed the lands and revenues of St Stephen's after 1548.

The danger with seeing St Stephen's solely in relation to the king is that such an approach over-emphasises the on-going relationship with the Crown over other relationships that could be just as important, with the lay communities of Westminster and beyond, with the ecclesiastical hierarchy of England and Wales, and with the wider Church. After all, Richard II could support the college in its dispute with Westminster Abbey, but he could not alter the papacy's judgment of the case. Similarly, while the endowment of St Stephen's was first established by Edward III, it was augmented by the devoted gifts of laymen and laywomen over the next two centuries. Laypeople, both local to Westminster and from further afield, also attended services or left money to the college in their wills. Some of their commitment to the college can be found in royal records, but much of this material comes from archives kept by other institutions. Wills proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury as well as the local courts in Westminster and others across the country point to lay commitment to St Stephen's after death. The parish records of St Margaret's, Westminster that are now in the City of Westminster Archive reveal the cooperation between the parish and the college in the sixteenth century, from when records survive. The records of Westminster Abbey are crucial for understanding the dynamics within the manor of Westminster where both royally favoured institutions held lands and claimed ecclesiastical privileges across two hundred years. Records now at Brasenose College, Oxford show how a set of St Stephen's lands were plundered by the former dean, William Smith, to form the original endowment of this college, again showing the interaction between personal commitments and institutional needs.[45] The archives of St George's College, Windsor do not often deal directly with St Stephen's, yet still preserve evidence for cooperation between the two institutions in maintaining their obligations as well as considerable overlap in canons. Episcopal registers often contain incidental information about events at St Stephen's, individuals connected with the college or about the college's estate management.[46] Thus, where

---

[43] Now preserved in SC 8 (Ancient Petitions) series. This is an artificial class of document brought together from various departments in the nineteenth century.
[44] E 101 series.
[45] Oxford, Brasenose College Archives, Cold Norton Charters 37-41.
[46] I have mostly used the edited registers published by the Canterbury and York Society and local record societies,

possible, I have tried to move beyond the picture provided by the royal sources to look at St Stephen's in a context of all the other connections that kept it running or that revealed tensions between institutions and individuals. The problem with non-royal sources is that they tend not to cover the entire two hundred years discussed by this thesis, but deal with particular problems at particular moments and are generally much fuller for the sixteenth century. This material emphasises the process of continual change and adaptation that any college faced, as well as the ability of individuals to change the web of interconnections at any particular point.

The final group of sources I have used is material that directly or indirectly can be traced back to St Stephen's itself, created by or for the college rather than any other institution, and reflecting the institutional priorities of the dean and canons. This is the rarest type of source, and tends to survive for particular reasons, usually thanks to the interest of early antiquarians, and thus ended up in the British Library, particularly in the Cotton and Harley collections. Unlike most collegiate archives surviving today, these chance survivals tend not to be financial or legal documents, which would have been the types of material preserved by the college for its own use. Instead, the British Library holds a set of part-books of Lady Masses written in the mid sixteenth century for the college by Nicholas Ludford. It also owns the daily registers of canons attending high mass for 1485 to 1486 and a few manorial documents relating to the college's manors in Kent.[47] Elsewhere, Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge holds a choirbook probably written in the sixteenth century for St Stephen's and the New York Public Library has a missal possibly used in the chapel from the fifteenth to sixteenth centuries.[48] Nineteenth-century antiquarians, both before and after the 1834 fire, recorded the material remains of St Stephen's: the murals and decoration of the chapel, the surviving architecture and the evidence for how it related spatially to the now lost privy palace.[49] In addition, archaeological works, both during the building works in the 1850s to create the current St Mary Undercroft and in the 1990s underneath the chapel's foundations, have revealed information about the medieval chapel and its usage upon which I have been able to draw.[50] These particular survivals and finds have shaped where I have been able to take the college's own perspective, in commemoration, music, and liturgy, and in thinking about the material and spatial presence of St

---

and have not made a fully comprehensive search through all surviving registers. A full search would have been unfeasible within the timeframe and scope of this thesis.

[47] Respectively BL Royal MS Appendix 45-8, BL Harley MS 45 A 38-49 and BL Additional MS 28530 f. 17- 21.

[48] Now Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College MS 667/760; New York, New York Public Library MS MA 63.

[49] Mackenzie, *Architectural Antiquities*; Brayley and Britton, *Ancient Palace*; before 1834, John Topham, J. T. Smith and John Carter were the main antiquarians and draughtsmen recording the chapel before and during the 1790-1805 period of substantial alterations in John Topham (incorporating the drawings of John Carter), *Some Account of the Collegiate Chapel of St Stephen, Westminster,* (London: Society of Antiquaries, 1795-1807); Smith, *Antiquities of Westminster.*

[50] James Prior et al, 'Report of the Committee appointed by the Council of the Society of Antiquaries to investigate the circumstances attending the recent Discovery of a Body in St. Stephen's Chapel, Westminster,' *Archaeologia* 34 (1852), pp. 406 – 30; For the excavations underneath St Mary Undercroft in 1992, 1993 and 1994, London, Museum

Stephen's in Westminster. Oddly enough, these are subjects that rarely have good surviving evidence for pre-Reformation England, which survived because St Stephen's collections were lavish and valuable enough to become collectible and the site remained important enough for antiquarians to record.

In order to make sense of this large and disparate group of sources across many archives, I have turned to comparative work to set St Stephen's into its national and international contexts. At times this allows me to discuss possibilities for which there is no direct evidence of practice at St Stephen's. I chose the comparison colleges for a variety of reasons, including the surviving evidence about each institution. The two international palatine foundations of St Mary's at Aachen and the Sainte Chapelle on the Île de la Cité in Paris predate St Stephen's and so must be considered as possible exemplars for Edward III's foundation. Aachen is the older of the two foundations, dating back to Charlemagne in the ninth century, and gradually extended by successive Holy Roman emperors, with a major campaign in the 1350s by Charles IV even as he moved the political centre of the empire eastwards to Bohemia.[51] Similarly to St Stephen's and the Sainte Chapelle, the church at Aachen functioned both as a liturgical community and as a palace chapel when the monarch was in residence.[52] St Stephen's has frequently been compared architecturally to Louis IX's foundation of the Sainte Chapelle in 1248, but the more apt comparison is in its functions as simultaneously a royal chapel, a college and a cult centre.[53] While little is known about the prosopography of both colleges, there has been considerable scholarship on their roles within their palace complexes and on the complexities of creating precincts within existing royal residences.[54] St Stephen's implicitly responded to the organisation of the Sainte Chapelle, both architecturally and institutionally as well in how it was integrated into the ceremonial and administrative functions of the palace that surrounded it. In addition, Aachen and the Sainte Chapelle provide suggestions for how ecclesiastical foundations, royal power and display, and administrative functions interacted and were intended to function in the major palaces of their respective kingdoms in the 1340s.

---

of London Archaeology Service Report PWC92.

[51] Zoë Opačić and Paul Crossley, 'Prague as a New Capital' in *Prague, the Crown of Bohemia. Art and Culture under the Last Luxembourgs 1347-1437*, eds. Jiří Fajt and Barbara Drake Boehm, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005), pp. 59-73.

[52] Eric Rice, *Music and Ritual at Charlemagne's Marienkirche in Aachen,* (Berlin: Merseburger, 2009).

[53] See Claudine Billot, 'Le Fondation de Saint Louis: le collège des chanoines de la Sainte-Chapelle 1248-1555,' in *Le Trésor de la Sainte-Chapelle,* eds. J. Durand & M-P Laffitte, (Paris: Réunion des musées nationaux, 2001), pp. 98-106; for the Sainte Chapelle as a place of pilgrimage, see Meredith Cohen, *The Sainte-Chapelle and the Construction of Sacral Monarchy: Royal Architecture in Thirteenth Century Paris,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), ch. 4.

[54] Billot, 'L'insertion d'un quartier canonical dans un palais royal: problèmes de cohabitation. L'exemple de la Sainte-Chapelle de Paris', in *Palais Royaux et Princiers au Moyen Age,* ed. A Renoux, (Le Mans: Université du Maine, 1996), pp. 111-16; Alyce A. Jordan, *Visualising Kingship in the Windows of the Sainte-Chapelle,* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002); much of the work on Aachen has focused on the music, Michael McGrade, 'Affirmations of Royalty: Liturgical Music in the Collegiate Church of St Mary in Aachen, 1050-1350,' (PhD thesis, University of Chicago, 1998); Rice, *Music at Aachen.*

The most extended comparison in this thesis is with St George's College in the Lower Ward of Windsor Castle, the sister college of St Stephen's, of equal status in the minds of contemporaries because of their theoretically simultaneous foundation.[55] St George's survival through the Reformation kept its archives largely intact. It has also been well studied as the home of the Order of the Garter as well as an important college in its own right.[56] Recently, conference proceedings concerning St George's in the later Middle Ages have pointed to the interdisciplinary possibilities of studying colleges.[57] St George's provides comparative material in nearly all the aspects of St Stephen's I will discuss, because the kings of England consistently saw the two colleges as twin foundations, linked by shared history and staffing and in their status as royal free chapels bound by very similar foundational statutes. By far the largest group of canons of St Stephen's who held other collegiate prebends were those who also held St George's prebends, as a sign of royal favour and patronage.[58] Interestingly, the perception of the two colleges as twin did not however result in equal treatment, nor was it reflected in their functions within their respective palaces. St Stephen's was the largest chapel within the Westminster Palace complex, but it was not the dominant ecclesiastical institution in the area because of Westminster Abbey. St George's, however, was one of two major chapels within Windsor Castle, but had no other local college until the fifteenth century when Eton College was founded across the river Thames. St George's was also shaped by comparative lack of royal interest at Windsor for most of the fifteenth century, when St Stephen's and Westminster continued to be favoured.[59] The Order of the Garter generally brought the king to Windsor once a year in April, and the significance of the Garter was more in its political role than in its St George's Day gathering for most of its medieval existence. In both their similarities and differences, comparing St Stephen's and St George's allows us to see a range of possibilities of interaction of the institutions, their members and their royal patrons.

St George's and St Stephen's were not isolated examples within royal and court circles. Earlier small, often pre-Conquest royal free chapels such as those at Hastings or St Martin le Grand in London had

---

[55] St George's foundation patent of the same nominal date is on C 66/ 225 m. 6 as opposed to St Stephen's which is on m. 3; *CPR 1348-50*, p. 144.

[56] Roberts, *St George's*; and more recently Euan Roger, 'St George's College, Windsor Castle, in the Late-Fifteenth and Early-Sixteenth Centuries,' (PhD thesis, University of London, 2015); for the origins of the order of the Garter, the most recent work is Richard Barber, *Edward III and the Triumph of England,* (London: Allen Lane, 2013).

[57] *St George's Chapel, Windsor, in the Late Middle Ages,* eds. Colin Richmond & Eileen Scarff, (Windsor: for the Dean and Canons of St George's, 2001); and *St George's Chapel, Windsor in the Fourteenth Century*, ed. Nigel Saul, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005).

[58] S.L. Ollard, *Fasti Wyndsorienses: the Deans and Canons of Windsor,* (Windsor: for the dean and canons, 1950); also see Table 2.

[59] A.K.B. Evans, 'The Years of Arrears: Financial Problems of the College of St George in the Fifteenth Century,' in *St George's Chapel, Windsor in the Late Middle Ages*, pp. 93-106.

survived without much royal attention.[60] They were followed after 1348 by a small group of royal or noble college foundations, although the Beauchamp family's foundation of St Mary's, Warwick had twelfth-century roots.[61] While there were many more smaller colleges founded in England both before and after St Stephen's, I have chosen to draw out material from those colleges which were larger and better-endowed, simply because that allows a better comparison with practices at Westminster, in terms of their ability to manage their lands, direct their liturgy, and maintain their staffing over time. Using colleges with larger staffs and more money also allows for a slightly artificial separation between the colleges discussed in this thesis and perpetual chantries, with which they shared many functions, including that of praying for the dead.[62] The comparable colleges were all completely responsible for their churches rather than sharing the physical building with another institution, whether parochial or guild-related. In addition, the colleges I have used had either enduring or contingent links with St Stephen's, through their staff, their founders or their functions within their locality. I have rarely included the university colleges, simply because they were not organised around the liturgy, but around the community of scholars, ensuring that their structures and aims were very different. In addition to St Mary's, Warwick, the major noble foundations, often near the family's principal residence, were Tattershall, founded in 1439 by Ralph, lord Cromwell, which drew on St Stephen's statutes for inspiration and St Mary's in the Newarke, re-founded in 1353 as a college, by Henry, duke of Lancaster.[63] The Newarke was to become the family mausoleum of the Lancastrian dynasty, and through John of Gaunt passed into the royal family on Henry IV's usurpation of 1399, at which point its connection with men who would go on to St Stephen's began. Similarly, the Yorkist family mausoleum and college at Fotheringhay in Northamptonshire, which had been founded in 1411 on the wishes of Edward, duke of York, passed into royal hands after Edward IV's usurpation of 1461 and then received royal patronage.[64] Finally, Eton College has been used as a comparison as a royal foundation of the 1440s, in which Henry VI explicitly drew on St Stephen's to staff his new college and in design decisions.[65]

The structure of what follows is a response to the material available and to my general concern with considering colleges such as St Stephen's as sitting at the heart of their networks, some connections

---

[60] Denton, *Royal Free Chapels*, p. 35.

[61] *Cartulary of St Mary's Warwick,* p. vii and xxxii.

[62] The classic work on chantries is still Katharine Wood-Legh, *Perpetual Chantries in Britain*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961); for an example of chantries as part of their local communities, see Miri Rubin, *Charity and Community in Medieval Cambridge*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), particularly ch. 6.

[63] Williamson, 'The Eton Choirbook', p. 90 citing KCRO, MS U1475 Q/20, and see 'Colleges: Tattershall,' in *The Victoria County History of the County of Lincoln,* ed. William Page, (London, James Street, 1906), p. 237; for St Mary's in the Newarke, see Thompson, *St Mary in the Newarke, Leicester.*

[64] 'Colleges: Fotheringhay,' in *The Victoria County History of the County of Northampton: Volume Two,* eds. R. M. Serjeantson & W. Ryland D. Adkins, (London: James Street, 1906), pp. 170-177.

[65] Henry VI's Devise for Eton is printed in Robert Willis and John W. Clark, *The Architectural History of the University of Cambridge,* I (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1886) p. 354; for the staffing, see below, p. 218.

of which were permanent and others made and remade to suit the current needs of both parties. The first four chapters focus on the institutional history of St Stephen's and provide a near chronological narrative of the development and maintenance of the college in relation to other colleges, while also considering questions of royal piety and sacral kingship in relation to ongoing development and redevelopment of St Stephen's within the Palace of Westminster. This section ends by considering the political breakup of the college's lands under the Second Chantries Act of 1547 and the priorities of the Edwardian regime. The second half of the thesis considers particular themes that examine St Stephen's in relation to its surroundings and allow arguments to be made for its significance beyond the royal family. Chapter Five looks at the careers of its canons in terms of ongoing changes in royal administration and careers in the church, and provides the basis for understanding the contingent links between St Stephen's and other institutions where these pluralists held preferments. St Stephen's role as a church open to a multiplicity of audiences, including as one of the homes of the Chapel Royal, forms the heart of Chapter Six, which also considers the surviving evidence for the liturgy and music of the college. Chapter Seven moves outwards toward the lay and ecclesiastical worlds of the manor of Westminster itself, to consider how St Stephen's created its own niche within the influence of Westminster Abbey during and after a long running dispute in the late fourteenth century. The final chapter returns to questions about audience and influence of St Stephen's, to look at its relationships with laymen and women, both as a landowner and as a presence within Westminster, but also as a place of pilgrimage until the 1540s. St Stephen's was never a closed-off space, accessible to only a few. Rather it was an intensely well connected ecclesiastical institution, which served the most important palatine chapel in England. Edward III's foundation brought a full daily round of Catholic liturgy to the Palace of Westminster. It was another Edward's changed view of religious ideals that swept it away.

Section One: The Institutional History of St Stephen's College, Westminster, 1348-1548

Chapter One: The Foundation of St Stephen's College, 1348-1377

St Stephen's College was part of Edward III's grandest project, the creation of a twin set of foundations, one tied to his new Order of Chivalry at Windsor Castle and the other at the heart of royal government in Westminster. It was also to take the rest of Edward's life to complete after it was officially begun on 6 August 1348. In the historiography on colleges more generally, most attention has focussed on the process by which particular colleges went from idea to functioning reality with a certain constitutional structure as provided by the foundation statutes. Colleges have also been seen largely in relation to their major founders or patrons and their interests. This chapter looks at St Stephen's in those terms as Edward III's foundation, but also moves beyond that paradigm to look at how the thirty-year process of foundation was the collaborative work of the king, his ministers and the canons themselves. In addition, it was a reinvigoration of an older type of foundation, the royal free chapels, and was related to two other categories of ecclesiastical institutions, the secular cathedral chapters and perpetual chantries, on which Edward III could draw. The success of St Stephen's foundation also needs to be measured against other royal foundations, both secular and monastic, rather than seen solely as a constitutional effort. There were delays and difficulties in establishing the college. The dean and college had to petition in 1356 for the site allocated to the college to be formally granted and back-dated.[1] The chapel was not fully complete and possibly not particularly usable until 1366.[2] Yet St Stephen's was consistently staffed at the level laid out in 1348, with a dean, twelve canons, thirteen vicars, four clerks and around six choristers, whereas other institutions, such as Vale Royal and King's Langley, found themselves unable to afford the numbers of religious that had been first mooted. The endowment of St George's, Windsor was never fully completed as first envisaged in 1348 and the friars at King's Langley and the Cistercians at St Mary Graces were to wait until after 1377 for their full endowment.[3] Earlier royal foundations such as Vale Royal Abbey were still limping in the 1340s, in Vale Royal's case, despite a foundation date in the 1320s and intervention by the Black Prince.[4] By these measures, St Stephen's near-

---

[1] SC 8/247/12304.

[2] The final building accounts for the chapel are E 101/472/14 in 1365/6 where the only work specifically on the chapel seems to be minor jobs around the windows.

[3] For the discussion of how St Stephen's compares financially with other institutions, see Chapter Two, pp. 50-1; A. K.B. Evans, 'The Years of Arrears: Financial Problems of the College of St George in the Fifteenth Century,' in *St George's Chapel, Windsor in the Late Middle Ages*, eds. Colin Richmond & Eileen Scarff, (Windsor, for the Dean and Canons, 2001) p. 93; 'Friaries: King's Langley Priory,' in *The Victoria County History of the County of Hertford: Volume Four,* ed. William Page, (London: Constable and Company, 1914), pp. 446-45; and Ian Grainger & Christopher Phillpotts, *The Cistercian Abbey of St Mary Graces, East Smithfield, London*, (London, Museum of London Publications, 2011), p. 90.

[4] 'Houses of Cistercian monks: The abbey of Vale Royal,' in *The Victoria County History of the County of Chester: Volume Three,* eds. C.R. Elrington & B.E. Harris, (London: Institute of Historical Research, 1980), pp. 156-165.

completion by Edward III's death looks exceptional and indicative of the value placed on it by both the canons themselves and by Edward and his ministers.

Collegiate Contexts

St Stephen's was a new example of an older type, and one that was not particularly fashionable in 1348. In addition to the universities, where in 1337 Edward III had endowed King's Hall, Cambridge as a place of training for priests connected to the royal household, there were two different collegiate forms in England as well as important royal palatine chapels that he could point to as exemplars.[5] He already had access to the patronage privileges of the royal free chapels, a group of old, indeed often pre-Conquest, collegiate institutions with prebends that were largely held by absentee clerks as reward for royal service.[6] A very few similar colleges founded by laymen in the twelfth century or before had also survived. Most of the remaining collegiate institutions were closely related to the episcopate.[7] The nine secular cathedrals of England and Wales were run on a collegiate model.[8] Formerly, bishops had been able to use the secular cathedral chapters as extensions of their own household, and as a source of patronage. As the cathedrals became formally separated from their households, bishops found it expedient to found colleges that could be staffed by their clerks and so provide patronage, increase the level of prayer in the country, and offer support against their cathedral chapter in disputes.[9] Overseas, there were two important royal colleges in the palaces at Paris and Aachen that combined visible royal piety and patronage with institutional stability. Colleges thus had largely retreated in the face of the twelfth-century Gregorian reforms, which privileged the great monastic orders as sensible investments in religion.[10] Colleges looked outdated and ineffective, particularly since many of the older colleges, such as St Mary's Warwick had decreased in size and ambition over the years. In the mid-fourteenth century this attitude changed and St Stephen's and St George's were to be forerunners of a new interest in colleges and chantry provisions after the Black Death.

Most of the colleges extant in 1348 served primarily the living rather than the dead. Intense interest

---

[5] A. B. Cobban, *The King's Hall within the University of Cambridge in the Later Middle Ages,* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1969), pp. 15 and 19.

[6] W.R. Jones, 'Patronage and Administration: The King's Free Chapels in Medieval England,' *Journal of British Studies* 9 (1969), p. 15.

[7] This type of foundation was the subject of Charles Fonge, 'Patriarchy and Patronage: Investing in the Medieval College' in *The Foundations of Medieval English Ecclesiastical History: Studies presented to David Smith*, eds. Philippa M. Hoskin et al, (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2005), pp. 77-93.

[8] All of the secular cathedrals have extensive historiographies of their own; in particular, Kathleen Edwards, *The English Secular Cathedrals in the Middle Ages: A Constitutional Study,* 2nd ed. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967); and more recently David Lepine, *A Brotherhood of Canons Serving God: English Secular Cathedrals in the Later Middle Ages,* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1995).

[9] Fonge, 'Patriarchy and Patronage', p. 78.

[10] Clive Burgess, 'An Institution for All Seasons,' in *The Late Medieval English College and its Context,* eds. Clive Burgess & Martin Heale, (York, York Medieval Press, 2008), p. 20.

in colleges and chantries as providing spiritual services for those in purgatory would come later. Colleges were important for the patronage they allowed the king, bishops and a few noblemen to exercise towards their servants. The resident canons in cathedrals by this period tended not to be provided by the pope or the king.[11] The absentee canons could also expect prebends in the royal free chapels held in absentia, or other absentee benefices with a resident vicar as rewards for their royal or papal service. St Mary's, Warwick was one of the few such noble foundations, primarily for intercession for the earls of Warwick.[12] It also provided preferment for the clerks who served the Beauchamp family.[13] Bishops used their colleges as enticement for their clerks as set against increasingly independent and confident cathedral chapters with which bishops were often feuding.[14] As well as their role in providing patronage opportunities, colleges before 1350 also contributed to the store of liturgy celebrated in England; and some such as St Mary's Warwick or St Mary and Holy Angels in York also contributed to the life of a parish or a cathedral.[15] Hospitals, such as the one attached to St Mary's, Warwick, combined care for the sick and the poor with prayers for the founders.[16] They usually had a small staff, sometimes only a master, but they generally had a collegiate structure when larger than a single priest. The Oxford and Cambridge colleges combined education for the living with prayers both for the living and the dead.[17] In this sense, St George's, Windsor, with its charitable side in the original provision for twenty four poor knights, looks much more traditional than St Stephen's, which had no charitable or educational role in the fourteenth century.[18]

After 1348, colleges rose in importance. Two structural factors meant that monasteries and mendicant orders no longer looked as attractive as colleges in the later fourteenth century. Religion became nationalised to a degree, and so could be well served by colleges with their particular attachments to places and families. In addition the flexibility of creating collegiate statutes as

---

[11] Lepine, *Brotherhood of Canons*, p. 19.
[12] *The Cartulary of St Mary's Collegiate Church, Warwick*, ed. Charles Fonge, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004) p. xxxii.
[13] Ibid, p. xx.
[14] Fonge, 'Patriarchy and Patrimony,' p. 85.
[15] *Cartulary of St Mary's Warwick,* pp. 148-9 is the statute's discussion of the parochial responsibilities of St Mary's; the phenomenon of parish churches being made collegiate is covered in Burgess, 'Institution for All Seasons', pp. 14-15; Eleanor M. Warren, 'Community and Identity in the Shadow of York Minster: The Medieval Chapel of St Mary and the Holy Angels,' (PhD thesis, University of Leeds, 2013), chapter 4 deals with the interrelationship of the canons there to the Minster.
[16] The category is examined by Pat H. Cullum, 'Medieval Colleges and Charity' in *Late Medieval English Colleges*, p. 141.
[17] The most famous example of the intercessory functions of an Oxford college is All Souls, founded to pray for the dead of the Hundred Years' War, Jeremy Catto, 'The World of Henry Chichele and the Foundation of All Souls,' in Catto et al, *Unarmed Soldiery: Studies in the Early History of All Souls College Oxford,* (Oxford: All Souls College, 1996), p. 7.
[18] A.K.B Roberts, *St George's Chapel, Windsor 1348-1416: A Study in Early Collegiate Administration,* (Windsor: for the Dean and Canons, 1948)*,* p. 11.

opposed to the international orders with their set Rule appealed to founders.[19] Monastic orders struggled with the attacks on the alien priories from the thirteenth century, as they came to be seen as inimical to English interests.[20] Perhaps more importantly, the Black Death meant that there was a rise in emphasis on commemoration and the foundation of chantries. Concern for the dead understandably became immediately more important after one third of the population died. Monasteries had commemorated the dead previously, but not as intensively as the daily masses that chantries could offer. Chantries could either be temporary, lasting for a number of years, or permanent. Permanent chantries varied from single priests through to full chantry colleges served by multiple priests and support staff.[21] Colleges thus became vehicles for expensive and well-endowed chantries, usually founded by noblemen. Obvious examples are Fotheringhay, founded by the duke of York in 1411, and Tattershall, founded by Ralph, lord Cromwell in 1439. Smaller chantry colleges made a spectrum between these large, similar to St Stephen's in staffing and endowment, colleges and the small permanent or temporary chantries in urban parishes that supplemented the provision of priests in the parish church, which had already become a feature of English religion. The popularity of the new type of foundation can be seen in the numbers; over seventy chantry colleges were founded from 1350 to the Reformation, not including many more parish church chantries.[22]

Royal Palace Chapels and Royal Piety

Palace chapels in England provided spaces for communal worship and for display by the royal household. They existed in every royal manor, palace and castle to serve the needs of itinerant kingship and stood outside the parochial system as did most other chapels.[23] They would have been the setting for some displays of royal piety, such as the distribution of alms, the washing of feet on Maundy Thursday or crown wearing. In the reign of Henry III St Stephen's had also been the site of a formal handing over of money to the king, probably because it was very close to the Receipt of the Exchequer where the coin would need to be deposited after the ceremony. In his son's reign it was used for the receipt of some taxation.[24] Edward I decided to tear down and rebuild the chapel from the ground up. On account of the new St Stephen's unfinished state until the 1350s, a temporary chapel called St Stephen's by the Receipt effectively functioned as the main palace chapel at this

---

[19] Burgess, 'Institution for All Seasons', p. 17.
[20] Benjamin Thompson, 'Habendum et Tenendum: Lay and Ecclesiastical Attitudes to the Property of the Church,' in *Religious Belief and Ecclesiastical Careers in Late Medieval England,* ed. Christopher Harper- Bill (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1991) p. 224.
[21] The best study of this class of foundations remains Katharine Wood-Legh, *Perpetual Chantries in Britain,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965).
[22] Christopher Harper-Bill, 'The English Church and English Religion after the Black Death,' in *The Black Death in England, 1348-1500,* ed. W. Mark Ormrod & Philip Lindley, (Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1996), p. 104.
[23] Nicholas Orme, 'Church and Chapel in Medieval England,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Sixth Series, 6 (1996), p. 76.
[24] For Henry III, *CLR 1240-45*, p. 25; for Edward I, *HKW*, ii*, pp. 106 and 513; for both references I'm indebted to James Hillson.

point, and was staffed in similar ways, but in higher numbers, to the other royal chapels elsewhere.[25] This level of staffing may in part be an expression of Henry III's fondness for Westminster, or simply the more consistent use the chapel received because of the permanent presence of the various administrative offices.

The new St Stephen's from the very start was a dramatic piece of architecture, fronting both the river and the Great Hall, and so forming a very visible expression of royal piety within a very public royal palace complex. In addition, St Stephen's chapel marked a liminal point within the palace.[26] To the south lay the private palace, with the royal chambers, private chapels and the rest of the residential quarters. To the north, and west, lay the administrative, permanently occupied palace. This setting made it even more visible to a general audience than the other, smaller, private royal chapels. Edward III's palace chapels were staffed by several permanent chaplains, associated with the household, not with any of the administrative departments, as his predecessors' had been. They were paid by the king and were his personal rather than administrative employees, and rarely are identified by name.[27] These permanent chaplains would then be supplemented when the king was present by the chaplains who were always with the king, and the chapel goods that travelled with them.[28] The long stages of St Stephen's construction and its previous history meant that Edward III could refer to finishing the chapel as an act of dynastic piety ('p[er] p[ro]genitores n[ost]ros nobilit[er] inchoatam, n[ost]ris sumptib[us] regiis fecim[us] consummari'), in that he had completed what his ancestors had begun, a theme that will be developed further below.[29]

Other royal displays of piety were focussed outwards, on monastic and mendicant orders. These gifts could range from land to church ornaments or simply money. Some of these gifts were conventional and expected; others were expressions of personal royal interest or obligations handed down from a previous generation. Henry III's devotion to Edward the Confessor and to his shrine at Westminster Abbey was both an expression of a personal interest, but also stood in a tradition of royal support for favoured monastic houses. Both Edward III's immediate predecessors were also patrons of specific monastic houses; Edward I's only foundation was that of the Cistercian abbey at Vale Royal,

---

[25] Henry III's lavish staffing of St Stephen's can be seen by comparison to his son, *Issues of the Exchequer,* p. 34 tells us that there were four chaplains at St Stephen's in 1256/7 each paid 25s, whereas on p. 82 in 1272/3 Edward I was only paying for a more normal two chaplains at St Stephen's; only Winchester and St Stephen's had four permanent chaplains, Ian Bent, 'The English Chapel Royal before 1300,' *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association* 90 (1963-4), p. 80.

[26] See Map 2, p. 234.

[27] For Henry III's reign, one Simon was a chaplain of St Stephen's in 1241 when he was paid the seemingly standard 25s wage, *Issues of the Exchequer,* p. 13.

[28] Bent, 'Chapel Royal before 1300,' p. 90.

[29] C 66/ 225 m. 3; calendared in *CPR 1348-50*, p. 147; discussed in Paul Binski, *Westminster and the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power 1200-1400,* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), p. 182. When quoting from manuscripts I have indicated where I have expanded abbreviations. When I have quoted from an edition I

and Edward II's great project was the Friars Minor at King's Langley.[30] Edward III in the 1350s was supporting these houses in the on-going attempt to create stable and secure foundations, and others, both traditional royal beneficiaries and his own foundations, particularly the Cistercian house of St Mary Graces in London.[31] Westminster Abbey continued to receive significant royal attention, because of its status and its ability to project royal power as the site of coronations and royal funerals. This tradition of practical and financial support for monasteries was then extended to St Stephen's. As is discussed in Chapter Two below, it looks like Edward III was choosing to endow his new college on monastic lines.[32] In part this decision was practical; a college needed the type of monetary underpinning that a monastery also required because of their similar corporate natures. Edward II, however, had attempted a foundation at Windsor in the 1310s where the wages were supposed to be paid by the king directly, as to his chaplains.[33] Edward III thus had had other options, but chose to create a stable, independent pair of institutions with financial security, as he did for his monastic foundations.

Edward III and those around him were also aware of the new connections being forged between secular knighthood and the Church through the use of colleges. The new chivalric orders that were being attempted in this period, of which the Garter was to be the first that lasted, were all associated with particular chapels. The association between the universal Church and knighthood was of course not new. In an earlier period, the great military monks of the Knights Templar, the Knights Hospitallar and other such orders had been directed at international Crusading objectives. With their relative decline or destruction in the fourteenth century, and a desire to create national knighthoods as a way to reward and celebrate those around the king, the new orders were founded.[34] The knights of the new chivalric orders were not themselves in holy orders, so they were supported with the prayers of the associated chapels. At Windsor, St George's was to link Arthurian imagery, Edward III's fondness for the castle where he was born, and knighthood with a lavish collegiate foundation.[35] St Stephen's of course was not directly associated with the Garter and never seems to have hosted

have followed the text given, which often has been silently expanded.

[30] Jeffrey H. Denton, 'From the Foundation of Vale Royal Abbey to the Statute of Carlisle: Edward I and Ecclesiastical Patronage,' in *Thirteenth Century England IV,* eds. Peter R. Coss & S.D. Lloyd, (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1992) p. 124; 'King's Langley priory,' pp. 446-45.

[31] W. Mark Ormrod, 'The English Monarchy and the Promotion of Religion in the Fourteenth Century,' in *Religion und Politik in Mittelalter: Deutchland und England im Vergleich*, eds. Ludger Körntgen & Dominik Waßenhoven, (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013), p. 210; an example of Edward's financial support for a wide range of monastic houses, in the issue roll for Easter term 1354 payments are made to King's Langley, the friars minor of Canterbury, the friars minor of Oxford, Saint Mary Graces, the Abbot of Pipewell, Holy Trinity Norwich, the rector and chaplains of the Tower of London and St George's College, E 403/ 376.

[32] Below, p. 57.

[33] It did, however, fail because of fourteen years of arrears of wages, Roberts, *St George's,* p. 5.

[34] D'Arcy D. J. Boulton, *The Knights of the Crown: The Monarchical Orders of Knighthood in Later Medieval Europe 1325-1520,* 2nd ed. (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2000), pp. 16-17.

[35] Euan Roger, 'St George's College, Windsor Castle, in the Late-Fifteenth and Early-Sixteenth Centuries,' (PhD

Garter celebrations, other than possibly in 1488 when Henry VII held a Garter celebration at Westminster.[36] Colleges had been associated with a knightly order before and this was to become the standard format. In France, in 1344 John, duke of Normandy, soon to be king of France, had indicated his desire to found a knightly devotional confraternity linked to a college remarkably like what St George's, and by extension, St Stephen's were to look like. It was to have an apostolic form, with twelve canons and twelve supporting priests.[37] The English examples added a dean to this format, as well as some extra supporting staff in the form of clerks and choristers, perhaps drawn from the royal chapel organizations discussed below. Like St George's later, the chapel of St Mary for John's Order of the Star also provided charitable support for resident knights.[38] St Stephen's association with all of these chivalric chapels was of course tangential, but John of Normandy's foundation provides another example of a college that Edward III might have known about when he decided on a new purpose for the almost finished chapel at the heart of his palace of Westminster.

In addition to the new chivalric institutions, Edward had two other earlier royal exemplars, the Sainte Chapelle in Paris and St Mary's, Aachen, with which to compete or on which to draw when he founded two new palace colleges. Both were in palatial contexts and were associated with explicitly sacral rulers. The Sainte Chapelle had been the work of the royal saint Louis IX, reflecting his devotion to the Virgin, as well as his hobby of collecting important Passion relics, including the Crown of Thorns. The Sainte Chapelle in the century since its founding had been re-founded and its staffing extended by various French kings.[39] The latest such extension was in 1318, when it was given its final form, almost exactly parallel to St Stephen's, twelve canons headed by a dean, there called the *trésorier*, and with a total staff of forty three including choristers.[40] In the 1350s and 1360s Charles IV was to do similar work at Aachen, extending and re-codifying the college there.[41] That college had been founded by Charlemagne and remained the locus of imperial authority as the place where the Emperor was crowned. Aachen, however, was being eclipsed in administrative terms by Prague, where Charles IV was to spend most of his time and where he helped build a monastery and the cathedral.[42] In this sense, we almost have a parallel with St George's and St Stephen's, the new foundations associated with a newly important royal site, Prague, and another important institution

thesis, University of London, 2015), pp. 15-17.
[36] Leland, *Collectanea,* iv, p. 248.
[37] Boulton, *Knights of the Crown*, pp. 174-5.
[38] Ibid, pp. 175-6.
[39] Sauveur-Jérome Morand, *Constitutions des Trésorier, Chanoines et Collège de la Sainte- Chapelle Royale du Palais,* (Paris: Clousier, 1779), pp. 5-10.
[40] Claudine Billot, 'Le Fondation de Saint Louis: le collège des chanoines de la Sainte-Chapelle 1248-1555', in *Le Trésor de la Sainte-Chapelle*, eds. J. Durand & M-P Laffitte, (Paris: Reunion des musées, 2001), p. 102.
[41] Eric Rice, *Music and Ritual at Charlemagne's Marienkirche in Aachen,* (Berlin: Merseburger, 2009), p. 67.
[42] For Charles IV's interest in Prague and his works there, see Zoe Opačić and Paul Crossley, 'Prague as a New Capital' in *Prague, the Crown of Bohemia. Art and Culture under the Last Luxembourgs 1347-1437*, eds. Jiri Fajt and Barbara Drake Boehm, (New Haven and London, 2005), pp. 59-73.

at the established heart of government, Aachen.[43] The level of worship offered by these royal colleges was only possible with considerable investment and allowed for near continual celebration of the mass. This type of collegiate form was intensely practical, as it was essentially the only way to put a monastery in a royal palace and so show off royal piety within the very heart of royal life, as Aachen had been under Charlemagne and the Sainte Chapelle continued to be under successive French kings.

For the rest of Edward's life, St Stephen's continued to develop in relation to royal interests and changing royal priorities. Just as the college had in part been prompted by Edward's interests in chivalric orders, as well as his awareness of what other European monarchs had done with their important palace chapels, in 1355 war may have driven another round of royal work. In the autumn of 1355, Edward and his household were preparing for another campaign in France.[44] As part of those preparations, there seems to have been an effort to finish the structural foundation of St Stephen's. In October the cloisters were begun, and the statutes were finally completed and sealed in December. This point may also mark when the college first moved to its permanent quarters within the Palace of Westminster, since this was when they probably first received their palace site.[45] In a sense this burst of activity was a testamentary effort, aimed at completing a work that would aid Edward's soul if he died on campaign.[46] It was an appropriate gesture, since the Order of the Garter, and thus by extension, St Stephen's and St George's Colleges were founded in part as thanksgiving for victory at Crecy, it was complete institutionally in terms of personnel and statutes in time to offer support and then thanksgiving for the English victory at Poitiers in 1356.[47] In any case, Edward's personal gifts to the college and his concern for its welfare would continue until his death, in the form of lands, books, vestments and privileges.[48]

William Edington's Role at St Stephen's

William Edington, bishop of Winchester and treasurer and then chancellor of England, was heavily involved in the process of setting up St Stephen's even if his role now seems rather obscure. He was also involved in the founding of St George's, where he intended an obit to be kept, and with the

---

[43] Edward III's letter patent founding St George's referred to his baptism at Windsor, *CPR 1348-50*, p. 144; the order of the Garter made Windsor important in a way that it had not been before, similar to how Charles IV made Prague the major imperial centre during his reign.

[44] This campaign was to turn into the Black Prince's campaign of 1356 that ended in victory at Poitiers, W. Mark Ormrod, *Edward III,* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), p. 343.

[45] The statutes were sealed on 8 December, WAM 18431; the site was officially granted by a charter enrolled in January 1356, but back-dated to January 1355, *CChR 1349-1417*, pp. 133-4.

[46] Graham St John, 'Dying Beyond the Sea: Testamentary Preparation for Campaigning During the Hundred Years' War' in *Fourteenth Century England VII*, ed. W. Mark Ormrod, (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2012), p. 180.

[47] Discussed in Ormrod, *Edward III*, p. 303.

[48] Two specific examples, gifts of a missal and antiphon in 1362, are given in *Issues of the Exchequer*, p. 77; the grants of land are dealt with in Chapter Two, but they were to the value of c. £350 when Edward III died in 1377, pp. 53-

Order of the Garter as prelate.[49] In that way, he was the primary link in these early years between the two institutions. Edington's involvement was both personal and in an official capacity. On a personal level, he shaped the college's character and staffing through its statutes and guiding principles. On the institutional level, as chancellor of England from 1356 to 1363, he was the holder of the office that was responsible for overseeing the college once it had been removed from the normal jurisdiction of the church hierarchy. It is not known whether after 1355 he was called upon to visit the college, as the only visitation record is from 1377, but it was his responsibility, however laxly carried out.[50] Despite his long involvement with the college, he was not commemorated as founder since that distinction belonged to Edward III but his obit was kept at the college, as was due to the writer of the statutes, on 6 September annually.[51] His own register as bishop of Winchester gives little indication of his role at St Stephen's because of the college's extra-jurisdictional character to his diocese. Much of what follows is based upon scattered references and the prosopography of the early canons.

Edington was almost certainly involved at St Stephen's from the very start of Edward III's planning of the college. Two of the first three canons and the first dean, Thomas Crosse, were connected to Edington through shared work at the Exchequer, or through his diocese.[52] Exceptionally, during the deanery of Michael Northburgh from c. 1350 to 1355, Edington seems to have been acting as patron and providing canons. This involvement may have been because Northburgh was an absentee dean, being mostly occupied on the king's business overseas, or because the king's interest seems to have faltered slightly in these years.[53] Two canons are directly attested as having been provided canonries by Edington, and there is some suggestion that the Treasurer *ex officio* was intended to have the right to present to one of the prebends.[54] If so, this arrangement seems to have died with Edington, and shows how at St Stephen's the offices occupied by Edington and the man himself seem to have been blurred into indistinction. It may also be evidence for Edington's own personal interest in a foundation which offered the chance for the creation of a new hub for the Exchequer, to match the role played by St Martin le Grand for the Wardrobe and the Chancery houses for Chancery clerks.[55]

4.

[49] Roberts, *St George's,* p. 149.

[50] The only known visitation is that of Bishop Adam Houghton in 1377, the inspeximus is *CPR 1377-1381*, p. 57.

[51] He is remembered as the creator of the statutes, BL Cotton MS Faustina B VIII, f. 52.

[52] The exception is John Maidenstan, who was the rector of a parish appropriated for the college.

[53] Northburgh was absent on diplomatic missions in this period, c.f. Roy M. Haines, 'Northburgh, Michael (*c.*1300–1361)', *ODNB.*

[54] It is worth noting that this is just about the time when Edington left the Exchequer for Chancery and his successor may have worried about whether the right went with Edington personally or with the office. On 3 August 1356 there was a confirmation that the treasurer is to collate to the prebend lately vacated by Thomas Stapleford, *CPR 1354-56,* p. 487.

[55] Ormrod, 'Accountability and Collegiality: The English Royal Secretariat in the mid-Fourteenth Century,' in *Ecrit et Pouvoir dans les Chancelleries Médiévales: Espace Français, Espace Anglais,* eds. Kouky Fianu & DeLloyd J. Guth, (Louvain-La-Neuve: Fédération internationale des instituts d'études médiévales 1997), p. 79.

Several of the early clerks were joined with Edington in his attempts in the 1350s to make the Exchequer the dominant financial organ of government.[56] The other area Edington was involved in was the ongoing building and maintenance work at Westminster, which provided many early canons.[57] In addition to these connections, he had Bernard Brocas, who was of a prominent family and had served Edington in diocesan matters, as well as the King in Aquitaine made a canon in 1350.[58] All of these connections made St Stephen's in the 1350s and 1360s a place where most of the canons were Edington's friends and supporters.

The role played by Edington at St Stephen's was exceptional, and there are no real parallels elsewhere. His authority for his actions was drawn from several sources. As treasurer until 1356, Edington had been authorising the payments to finish the chapel, and would have had to be consulted on the practicalities of financing the new college. As a close associate of Edward III's he would probably also have been consulted informally after he moved to Chancery as Lord Chancellor. In the 1350s he took responsibility for overseeing the building and was also one of the members of the king's council that ordered the choir stalls to be replaced in 1352.[59] As chancellor from 1356 he was responsible for the college's general welfare and the maintenance of standards.[60] On the ecclesiastical side, he was ordered by the pope to oversee the statutes and indulgences, which shows deliberation since the usual authority for such matters would have been either the bishop of London or the abbot of Westminster.[61] Even at St George's, where Edington was also involved with the statutes and papal approval process, he did not seem to have the same influence as he did at St

---

[56] The men involved were William Cusance, canon from the 1350s to his death in 1361, John Buckingham, canon from 1348 to his promotion to a bishopric in 1363, and William Rothwell, canon from 1350 probably until 1356, Ormrod, 'The Protecolla Rolls and English Government Finance, 1353-1364,' *EHR* 102 (1987), pp. 625-6.

[57] Edington can be seen involved with St Stephen's specifically in 1352 with the choir stalls, see paragraph below; John Box is ordered to appear before him in connection with the works at Westminster, *CCR 1349-54* p. 226; canons who were clerk or controller of works at Westminster included Adam Chesterfield, William Cusance, William Hannay, William Lambhith, William Rothwell, and Martin Ixnyng.

[58] There are two Bernard Brocases in Edington's register, who seem to have been related. The secular one appears offering local patronage within Wiltshire. The clerk Bernard Brocas appears in Edington's register in several capacities suggesting their close alliance. First he appears serving the bishop, being appointed to inquire into the validity of presentations in 1350, Reg. Edington, i, p. 116; four years earlier, his royal career had intersected with his Winchester one when his Wiltshire goods were distrained on account of his failure to hand in his counter-rolls from Gascony, ibid, ii, p. 79; this absence was so marked in that year that he was listed as an alien holding a Winchester benefice, that of St Nicholas Guildford, despite being from a Wiltshire family, ibid, ii, p. 82; the pattern of not producing royal records and the bishop having to raise money for his fines continued, in 1366 Edington sought to protect himself from having to pay the fines for Brocas identified as 'his clerk', ibid, ii, pp. 102-3; all of this nicely illustrates his career as mingling service to the bishop and to the king, but at the same time his conduct on the king's service could affect the bishop financially.

[59] The documentation for the stalls is E 101/471/5 m. 3; and for a full discussion of Edington's role in completing the buildings of St Stephen's, see James Hillson, 'St Stephen's Chapel, Westminster: Architecture, Decoration and Politics in the Reigns of Henry III and the three Edwards (1227-1363)', (PhD thesis, University of York, 2015), pp. 209-10.

[60] The definite evidence of the statutes does not survive; however, in 1377, the Chancellor, Adam Houghton, bishop of St David's carried out a visitation *ex officio*, *CPR 1377-81*, p. 57.

[61] *Cal. Pap. Petitions*, pp. 176-197.

Stephen's despite also leaving an obit there.[62] At St George's as prelate of the Order of the Garter he had a greater institutional connection to the new foundation rather than the problematic blurring of where his authority lay at St Stephen's. Often when a new college was founded, the diocesan's approval was sought rather than at St Stephen's and St George's where Edward III and Edington worked outside the usual hierarchies.[63] Rarely did any bishop then become involved in the practical setting up of the institution. St Stephen's was a royal peculiar at this point, like many of the other royal free chapels, and so one would expect even less involvement from any bishop, let alone a non-diocesan bishop. At St Stephen's Edington's triple roles of treasurer, chancellor, and prelate tasked by the pope with overseeing the new college, and the authorities each had on the new college in the king's free chapel interacted to give Edington extraordinary influence.

The Process of Foundation

The letter patent of 6 August 1348 was the beginning of the formal and legal process of founding St Stephen's rather than a culmination of it. In July 1348 John Maidenstan had been paid for his work in appropriating his church of Dewsbury Minster for the August grant to the college, suggesting that August marked a formal acknowledgment of work already begun.[64] 6 August was an artificial date, one that brought together the two new foundations at Windsor and Westminster as equally important and valued foundations. Both foundation patents are found among material from late August into early September on the patent rolls, which suggests a back-dating of perhaps less than a month. The king was at Westminster in early September for the funeral of his son, William of Windsor, so this was probably the point at which the college was authorised.[65] There is no firm reason why the date of 6 August was chosen but there are several possible contexts; perhaps because it was not directly linked to any of the dedicatees of the two chapels, but was surrounded the feast-days of two later St Stephens on 2 and 16 August. 15 August was also one of the feast days of the Virgin. By this reckoning, the college was being positioned among, but not tied to significant festivals. The date may also relate to the deaths of Princess Joan in Bordeaux in July 1348 and William of Windsor in late August of the same year, but that is never discussed in relation to these institutions, and their obits seems not to have been kept at either college.[66] A practical consideration

---

[62] Roberts, *St George's*, p. 7.

[63] He also makes the point that bishops' registers provide much of our information about colleges, so it may be skewed; it, however, would require extra effort for a founder to set up an arrangement that did not involve the local bishop, Alexander Hamilton Thompson, 'Notes on Colleges of Secular Canons in England,' *Archaeological Journal* 74 (1917), p. 156.

[64] 14 July 1348, E 403/ 343, m. 23.

[65] Ormrod, *Edward III,* p. 306; the patent for St Stephen's was directly authorised by the king and dated at Westminster, rather than through a privy seal warrant, which means that it must date from a period when the king was present in Westminster, *CPR 1348-50*, p. 147; the material surrounding it on the patent rolls is also from this early September/ late August context, supporting the suggestion that Chancery became aware of the grant c. 5 September, in contrast, St George's was authorised on 6 August via the privy seal, *CPR 1348-50,* p. 144.

[66] For Joan's death, see Ormrod, 'The Royal Nursery: A Household for the Younger Children of Edward III,' *EHR*

in dating the foundation patent might have been the completion of structural work on St Stephen's chapel in the week of 4 August.[67] It is equally hard to pin down an appropriate end point for the foundational period of the college, since different parts of it were complete at different points, but in 1366 the chapel was finally complete, the college had its statutes and was fully staffed, and the income was at the level first envisaged by Edward III. The full endowment would take longer but the college can be said to be fully operational in its intended home at this point.

The Black Death interrupted and complicated the foundation of the college rather than acting as a spur to action. In the face of the threat, colleges lagged. Edward III retreated into traditional religion in response to the plague, choosing in 1350 to create the Cistercian abbey of St Mary Graces at the site of one of the plague pits as well as in the previous year augmenting the friars minor at King's Langley with a sister convent at Dartford.[68] Despite the suggestion of Sloane, St Stephen's was not a response to the approaching epidemic, as it had been begun well before it was seen as a true threat.[69] Ormrod has suggested that it would take until December for Edward III to be fully aware of the danger.[70] In addition, it did not reach London until October or November of 1348, when the college was already a reality, if not yet a complete institution.[71] In the summer, while the West Country was beginning to suffer from the plague, central government in London continued as normal. As mentioned above, work on the college had seemingly been underway for some time, to the point where John Maidenstan could be paid for the appropriation of his rectory in preparation for its grant to the college in late July. The area in which the Black Death complicated matters for the new St Stephen's college was operational. Deaths among the masons, the canons and other staff meant that replacements were needed and that the rate of work on the chapel itself slowed from late 1348 into 1349.[72] The first dean, Thomas Crosse, is known to have died during the epidemic and one of the first three canons, John Maidenstan, probably also died between 1348 and 1350. The other two original canons, John Buckingham and John Chesterfield, survived. In the confusion, it is not known when Michael Northburgh, the second dean, was appointed, as the letter patent was not enrolled or perhaps was never issued.[73]

---

120 (2005) pp. 412-3; a gift of some of Joan's goods was made by the king to the college in E 403/344 m. 21.

[67] Work, including roofing, was being done on the Galilee and the account runs to October 1348 but no further payments of wages are made after this time, E 101/ 370/ 18, m. 12.

[68] Grainger and Phillpotts, *St Mary Graces*, p. 75.

[69] Barney Sloane, *The Black Death in London,* (Stroud: History, 2011), p. 11.

[70] Ormrod, 'The English Government and the Black Death of 1348-9,' in *England in the Fourteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1985 Harlaxton Symposium,* ed. W. Mark Ormrod, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1986), p. 175.

[71] There is disagreement about when it arrived in London, Ziegler thought November, with possible cases in October as well, Philip Ziegler, *The Black Death,* (London: Collins, 1969), p. 156; Shrewsbury thought the plague only really reached London in January 1348, J.F.D. Shrewsbury, *A History of the Bubonic Plague in the British Isles,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), p. 38.

[72] For the period 1346-51, E 372/197 rots. 47-47d.

Work then proceeded rather intermittently, as royal interest levels and available resources varied. Much of the work had been completed by 1356, so it is hard to imagine that from this point on the college was not making use of one of the other chapels in the palace or near it for the round of daily liturgy, even if St Stephen's chapel itself had not yet been finished. Much depended on the dean; little progress seems to have been made under Michael Northburgh, but once Thomas Keynes became dean in October 1355 the cloisters and the grant of the college site were expedited. The statutes seem to have been started under Thomas Crosse, but were finally completed in December 1355 by Keynes.[74] In the years between, Edington may have kept the process of foundation at least partially in mind, even as Edward III moved on to his later foundations at Dartford and St Mary Graces as well as the still on-going works to make St George's the home of both the college and the Order of the Garter. That is not to say that the college was ever in any danger of being incomplete on the level of Vale Royal Abbey, simply that a combination of an absentee dean and many demands on royal interest and time combined to make St Stephen's a lower priority for a few years. An indication of the disorganisation that followed the death of Thomas Crosse by 1350 was the failure to complete the necessary papal approvals until 1355. The mandate in 1355 tactfully mentioned the death of Clement IV, but in reality, it was the college's and the king's failure to ensure that the necessary permissions had been granted.[75] The final approval came at the start of the same revitalisation of the college that finished the statutes, fully staffed the college and completed the endowment. It may have been related to Edward's imminent departure for France, but it also coincided with the advancement of Northburgh to the bishopric of London, which opened up the deanery to Keynes.

The site of St Stephen's within the palace also suggests faltering royal interest in the 1350s until the pre-Poitiers campaign. In 1356, the dean and canons had to petition to have their precinct and rights within the Palace of Westminster clarified.[76] The charter confirming the college's rights was then back-dated to January 1355, which suggests that it had been in unofficial occupation of the area since then.[77] The start of works in the autumn of 1355 on the cloister on the same site as the present one probably marks the *terminus ante quem* for the college's acquisition of the land.[78] The original letter patent had said nothing about such practical matters as housing, a cloister, or any of the appurtenances which were needed for a functioning college. Just as at the Sainte Chapelle, St Stephen's site needed to be fitted in among other buildings and uses.[79] The college was ultimately

---

[73] His deanery of Westminster is mentioned in *Cal. Pap. Letters 1342-1362*, p. 398.
[74] WAM 18431 mentions Thomas Crosse as dean but was signed in 1355, in the deanship of Thomas Keynes.
[75] *Cal. Pap. Petitions*, p. 288.
[76] SC 8/247/12304.
[77] *CChR 1349-1417*, pp. 133-4.
[78] My thanks to James Hillson for this suggestion. Work on a cloister began in October 1355, E 101/471/16 m. 2.
[79] Billot, 'L'insertion d'un quartier canonical dans un palais royal: problèmes de cohabitation. L'exemple de la Sainte-Chapelle de Paris', in *Palais Royaux et Princiers au Moyen Age,* ed. A Renoux, (Le Mans: Université du Maine, 1996), pp. 112-3.

given the site north of the chapel itself and east of Westminster Hall, and the house of the former earl of Kent, Edmund of Woodstock, just north of Palace Yard. The site bounded by the chapel, the Receipt of the Exchequer, Westminster Hall and the river in 1348 was largely a building site, probably housing the various workshops and houses used by the masons and other workmen of the chapel.[80] Also in the vicinity, if hard to place exactly, was St Stephen's by the Receipt, the temporary chapel that fades away from the records after the 1330s. It is entirely possible that the college started its working life in St Stephen's by the Receipt, or possibly in the chapel in the earl of Kent's *hospicia.* Perhaps, as the masons completed their works by 1363 on the cloisters and the chapel, the college gradually moved from temporary housing, probably including the chaplain's houses referenced in the 1330s in the building accounts, and took over the various houses of the masons and chaplains in the cloister area.[81] There was also some new construction work here, such as in 1357 when the dean's house was being built.[82] If it was like St George's at this point, the dean and each canon shared his house with his vicar. In the 1390s the canons moved northwards to houses on the site of the earl of Kent's *hospicia,* which became known as Canon Row and left the vicars in newly built houses along the Thames shore by the also rebuilt cloisters.[83]

The chapel marked a meeting place between royal interests and the needs and wishes of the new college. In 1350, the chapel's structure was fundamentally complete but undecorated.[84] The work thus for the next fifteen years was largely decorative in focus. The college's needs, however, meant that alterations to the not-quite finished chapel were needed. When it had been designed as a palace chapel, its needs in terms of layout were quite different from those of a college celebrating the full round of liturgy in the same manner as a cathedral. This change in function meant significant structural alterations to the upper chapel, to insert the required choir stalls and a pulpitum to divide the nave from the choir, in order to comply with the Use of Sarum, the most common liturgical rule in late-medieval England.[85] There are no records of consecration, so it is not known when the college was first able to celebrate mass there rather than in their temporary home. It might have been

---

[80] The workshops and masons' houses were first constructed in the 1290s, E 101/468/6; my thanks to James Hillson for the reference; for the repair of the working areas in 1339-42, Hillson, 'St Stephen's Chapel,' p. 164.
[81] Repairs to the houses of the king's chaplains occur in E 101/469/19 (1334-5), E 101/470/5 (1338-9) and E 101/470/7 (1339-40); my thanks to Maureen Jurkowski for the references; the land was for the cloister and 'maisons busoigenables et necessa[i]r[e]s,' SC 8/ 247/ 12304.
[82] E 101/472/4.
[83] For a list of the houses of the canons on the site of the house of the earl of Kent along the Thames bank in 1394, BL Cotton MS Faustina A III ff. 296v- 298r; for the former site of the housing on the palace site, as well as the move northwards, ibid, f. 295r; for St George's equivalents, Tim Tatton-Brown, 'The Constructional Sequence and Topography of the Chapel and College Buildings' in *St George's Chapel, Windsor in the Late Middle Ages,* eds. Colin Richmond & Eileen Scarff, (Windsor: for the dean and chapter, 2001), p. 28.
[84] On 18 March 1350 Hugh of St Albans was authorised to impress painters, *CPR 1348-50*, p. 481.
[85] See Maurice Hastings, *St Stephen's Chapel and its Place in the Development of Perpendicular Style in England,* (Cambridge, CUP, 1955), p. 52; on the mutability of the various Uses, Matthew Cheung Salisbury, 'Rethinking the uses of Sarum and York: a historiographical essay,' in *Understanding Medieval Liturgy: Essays in Interpretation*, eds. Helen Gittos and

as early as 1352 when a marriage was held in 'the king's chapel at Westminster', but equally could have been as late as the 1360s, if Knighton referred instead to St Stephen's by the Receipt or St John the Evangelist.[86] It is also possible that the college started using the lower chapel of St Mary beneath the Vaults while work continued in the upper chapel, before moving upstairs. The structural changes may have been informed by members of the college, either as clerks of the works, or in requesting particular features. The clearest case of intervention is over the choir stalls. The stalls were begun, and then in 1352 Edington and others of the king's council sold them to the nuns of Barking and brought in a new master-carpenter, Edmund of St Andrew, to make new and apparently more acceptable stalls.[87] In addition to this apparent disagreement between the college and the royal council over the decoration of the stalls, because the stalls were structurally sound enough to be reused at Barking, Binski has seen the decoration as collegiate, visible most clearly from, and orientated towards the choir stalls.[88] That decorative scheme, however, was focussed on depictions on the east wall of Edward III and his family, a dynastic portrait that linked St Stephen's visually to Edward's self-presentation.[89]

Turning from the buildings to the institution itself, the college's staff was largely complete by 1352, and in 1356 six new canons joined St Stephen's. Interestingly, staffing is the one area where it is hard to see direct royal influence. Almost all the canons were relatively senior clerks, but it is difficult to see their status as a personal sign of royal favour. No doubt Edward wanted to use the college to provide rewards for those priests who had served him well, but the little evidence we have suggests that beyond that principle it was others who chose the canons. The first three canons and the dean were appointed two weeks after the college was nominally founded.[90] Thomas Crosse and John Maidenstan were probably dead within the year. Two people a year were appointed to prebends in 1349 and 1350 as the Black Death continued to take a heavy toll on England's population, but in 1351 and 1352 enough canons were appointed that the college may have been fully staffed at this

Sarah Hamilton, (Aldershot, Ashgate, 2015), pp. 103-22, particularly p. 108 and 122.
[86] The Latin is 'in capella regis apud Westmonasterium' which is the general form often used in the building accounts for St Stephen's, *Knighton's Chronicle 1337-1396*, ed. and trans. G.H. Martin, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), pp. 112-13.
[87] The profits from the sale of the 'reredos' of the choir stalls to the nuns of Barking were recorded as were payments 'ad nunciand[um] [et] demonstrand[um] eid[em] Thes[aurio] [et] al[iis] de concilio Regis modu[m] [et] formam p[re]d[ic]tor[um] stallor[um]' before they were sold. It is worth noting that only after this point was Edmund of St Andrew, a Gilbertine canon, brought in to build the 'clausura' at St Stephen's, E 101/471/5 mm. 1 and 3.
[88] Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets*, pp. 184-5.
[89] Emily Howe, 'Divine Kingship and Dynastic Display: the Altar Wall Murals of St Stephen's Chapel, Westminster', *Antiquaries Journal* 81 (2001), pp. 259-304.
[90] On 20 August 1348, Thomas Crosse, John Maidenstan, John Buckingham and John Chesterfield made up the first appointees to the college; Maidenstan and Crosse disappear quickly from the records, so I have assumed that they were victims of the Black Death, *CPR 1348-50*, pp. 146-7.

point.[91] There was then a break with no new canons officially appointed until 1355 when after a new dean, Thomas Keynes, took office, when two new canons joined the college immediately and another six followed the following year.[92] Unofficially, between two and six canons were probably given prebends by William Edington's patronage and were not confirmed through the patent rolls.[93] Even after Keynes oversaw the completion of the staffing, Edington's men continued to dominate the college.[94] Staffing a royal college with royal clerks was probably an area where subordinates such as Keynes or Edington himself could exert their influence. The other ranks within the college are even more obscure. My suspicion is that the vicars were drawn in part from the chaplains who had served St Stephen's by the Receipt as that would parallel what happened elsewhere, and so would have been part of the college from the early 1350s at the latest.[95] The clerks and choristers of this date have left no trace, but again would probably have been recruited when the college was actually operational in its temporary home, if not yet in St Stephen's Chapel itself.

The statutes of St Stephen's represented an important institutional step for the college. The ability to write statutes depended on the acceptance of the new college by the religious authorities. First, Pope Clement VI gave consent for St Stephen's in 1349 as did his successor, Innocent VI in 1355, directing Edington to oversee the statutes.[96] In 1350, Clement had given authorisation for statutes at St George's. Those statutes were complete in 1352, when they were authorised by Edington, the king, the bishop of Salisbury and the dean of St George's.[97] The longer process at St Stephen's took until late 1355 and required further papal authorisation as something seems to have gone astray.[98]

---

[91] The four appointed in 1349-50 were William Shrewsbury, Walter Weston, Bernard Brocas and William Rothwell in that order, *CPR 1348-50,* pp. 280, 446, 563, 570; then in 1351 Henry Greystock, Roger Chesterfield, Ralph Brantingham and Martin Ixnyng were granted prebends, *CPR 1350-4,* pp.54-5 and 60; in 1352 only William Lambhith was given a prebend, significantly the twelfth and final prebend suggesting that the college was fully staffed at this point*, CPR 1350-4,* p. 200.

[92] 1355 saw the arrival on 26 November 1355 of Keynes as dean, *CPR 1354-56*, pp. 321-2; on 3 December 1355 collations of prebends to John Buckingham and Roger Chesterfield, *CPR 1354-56, p. 322*; and then in June/July 1356 the return of John Chesterfield and the arrival of William Huntlow, *CPR 1354-56*, p. 408; and the grants to William Tiddeswell, William Rothwell, William Walcote, and James Beauford, *CPR 1354-56*, p. 417.

[93] Five canons to 1366 were only attested when they left the college. One of those, Thomas Stapleford in 1362 was explicitly provided to a prebend by Edington. Some of the remaining four all had close links to Edington. John Blebury was to be one of the executors of Edington's will. William Cusance and John Leche were senior Exchequer officials who worked closely with Edington. Only Hugh Hermit seems to have had no obvious connection to Edington, but equally seems not to have been in royal service. Ralph Brantingham in 1351 was granted his prebend by patent, but was said to be Edington's appointee.

[94] See above on Edington's role in the college's founding, pp. 30-3.

[95] The payments from the fee-farms of Essex and London that went to worship in St Stephen's, probably St Stephen's by the Receipt, were taken over by the college, E 372/214; at St George's chaplains were absorbed into the new college, Roberts, *St George's*, p. 6

[96] *Cal. Pap. Petitions*, pp. 176-197.

[97] Windsor, St George's College Archives XI D 20.

[98] It is not clear which mandates of the seven granted in 1349 had not been completed and were thus reissued in June 1355, but it is likely that one of those mandates was the one relating to the statutes, and that as negotiations finished over the relationship to Westminster Abbey, it was realised that the papal approvals were incomplete. This was before Keynes officially had the deanery, but it is probably that it was part of a longer process since Michael Northburgh's elevation to bishop of London would have been known for some time before, *Cal. Pap. Petitions*, p.

Work may have begun immediately in 1349 and then slowed after the death of Thomas Crosse, as he is named in the Westminster Abbey excerpt of the statutes as dean. Slow progress was also caused by the need to work out the rights of St Stephen's vis-à-vis Westminster Abbey, and the parish church of St Margaret's. As the abbey had sole jurisdiction in its parish, when the statutes were finally completed in December 1355, just a month after Keynes received the deanery, they were sealed by the abbot as well as Edington, the king and the college itself.[99] The negotiations seem to have left all parochial powers such as tithes, probate of wills and usual offerings in the hands of St Margaret's, as the college was to lose the court case at the end of the century about whether it could exercise jurisdiction within the palace precinct.[100] The fragment of the statutes that survives, copied to be used in that court case, deals with the college's rights to keep the collections made at services when the king was present, and the abbot's authority to install any new dean or canons. As discussed below, the statutes would have dealt with a wide range of issues and potential concerns. Although amended slightly in 1479, they seem to not have been superseded, as in the sixteenth century, the Edington statutes were still in force, and referred to in a Chancery suit.[101]

The Statutes

Since only a very small fragment of the college's statutes survives, copied to make the case for the abbey's jurisdiction and rights over the college in 1394, this section looks at a variety of other statutes and chapter acts from contemporary or near contemporary colleges to consider what might have been dealt with in the statutes. The best comparison for St Stephen's is of course St George's, because they were both approved and possibly written by the same person, William Edington.[102] The flexibility of colleges, which allowed them to be shaped to the desires of the founder, also meant that statutes did not necessarily follow any standard form. Unlike monastic orders where a Rule was set centrally and then obeyed locally, college statutes did not have to include any particular regulations; although where statutes were sketchy monastic norms might well have been followed.[103] They were very much a negotiation between various interested parties for the purpose of accountability.[104] At the time of foundation those would have been the founder themselves or their agents, the new

---

288

[99] WAM 18431.

[100] The agreement ending the case has several copies, of which one is WAM 18468; it was acknowledged in *CPR 1391-96*, p.553.

[101] *Cal. Pap. Letters 1471-1484,* pp. 678-9; there was a case concerning dilapidations to a prebend at St Stephen's in the 1520s, C 1/ 466/8.

[102] Roberts, *St George's,* p. 7; both WAM 18431 and St George's, Windsor, XI D 20 contain clauses stating that they were approved by Edington among others.

[103] The most likely rule to be observed or looked to for guidance would be that of the Augustinian Canons. For an example of a college seamlessly transformed into an Augustinian house in 1359/60, Thompson, 'Notes on Secular Colleges,' p. 144.

[104] On the role of college statutes more generally as a tool of enforcement and guidance although he sees them as created by founders rather than through negotiation, see John Sabapathy, *Officers and Accountability in Medieval England, 1170-1300*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 192-5.

college's staff if they had been appointed as most had been, the local bishop and potentially any other institution that was absorbed into the new foundation. At St Stephen's the situation was slightly more complex because of multiple jurisdictional issues. The relevant parties were the king or his agents as founder, the dean, Edington as a bishop appointed by the king and the pope to deal with the new college, and Westminster Abbey as holding in a sense diocesan rights over the parish.[105] Since no other institution was being absorbed into the college, and there was no cure of souls attached to it, the parish as parish and another collegiate or chantry establishment did not have to be considered. Because of the negotiated nature of statutes, they often included only what the parties thought was important, and were then often renegotiated and changed based on visitations, perceived failings and situations arising that were felt to require amendments. By 1479 problems at St Stephen's with retaining vicars meant that the statutes were changed to allow them to hold other benefices as well and the residence rules for canons were loosened.[106] While this is the only known alteration in the statutes, it would be a mistake to see the college as forever adhering only to the statutes that we know about, and not changing in response to changing priorities and ideals.

The statutes that Edward III and the college had available to them as models were diverse. The ones that came after St Stephen's were more codified and formal. Some institutions had full formal statutes from the beginning, modified as necessary, such as some Oxford and Cambridge colleges. Merton College led the way here, with its series of 1264 to 1274 statutes dealing with the common life of the institution.[107] Others had layers of ordinances that addressed the various issues identified over time. For example at Exeter Cathedral, almost certainly a model for St Stephen's because of its unusual use of a common fund to even out the value of prebends, the statute book compiled in the late fifteenth century contains provisions from the eleventh century that were still in force, and that had been added to over the years by the various bishops.[108] The small bishop's college of St Mary and Holy Angels in York relied on its twelfth-century foundation charters to act as statutes rather than having statutes per se.[109] St Mary's in the Newarke, founded in 1331, only gained full statutes in 1355-6, and used its foundation charter until that point. There would be another round of statutes after a visitation in 1441 to correct the problems found by the bishop.[110] In 1367 St Mary's, Warwick was granted statutes that only dealt with the pressing issues facing the college at that point such as

[105] See WAM 18431.

[106] *Cal. Pap. Letters 1471-1484,* pp. 678-9.

[107] 'Merton College' in *The Victoria County History of the County of Oxford. Volume Three: The University of Oxford*, eds. H. E. Salter and Mary D. Lobel, (London: Institute of Historical Research, 1954), pp. 95-106.

[108] The Exeter Cartulary from the late fifteenth century contains material from the twelfth century that was still in force, BL Harley MS 1027.

[109] See Warren, 'St Mary and Holy Angels', p. 7.

[110] Thompson, *The History of the Hospital and the New College of the Annunciation of St. Mary in the Newarke, Leicester*, (Leicester: Leicester Archaeological Society, 1937), pp. 41-81 for the first statutes, and pp. 112-16 for the results of the visitation.

the loss of lands despite a twelfth-century foundation date.[111] It looks like a remnant of older approaches to statutes - rather than being comprehensive they were concerned with particular pressing matters. These two colleges were both considerably older than St Stephen's, yet in both cases, only in the wake of the example set by St Stephen's and St George's did they fully codify their practices and customs. Royal free chapels such as St Martin le Grand also tended to have only later statutes and presumably earlier relied on customary practice and hazy tradition.[112] Just before the foundation of St Stephen's in 1342 Rushworth College in Norfolk was founded with full and extremely idiosyncratic statutes.[113] Later colleges, such as Fotheringhay, had well-codified statutes from the very start, possibly because collegiate forms were becoming more standardised and founders recognised statutes' value for expressing their wishes for their new institution.[114]

Bishops' preferences, including those of Edington, probably played a role in determining what was and was not included in statutes. At Exeter, where the bishop had the role of founder and patron and so did not need to consult widely, bishops often promulgated new statutes, adding to and adapting the current statutes to reflect their particular concerns about the behaviour of the dean and chapter with whom they were often in conflict.[115] At St Mary's in the Newarke in the 1350s we have a rare example of work in progress on statutes because the copy that the founder seems to have submitted to the diocesan, Bishop Gynewell of Lincoln, the copy actually enacted, and a contemporary codicil were all entered into the relevant register.[116] The differences between the two copies reflect the bishop's concern with balancing the finances of the college with its spiritual provisions by cutting its expenditure.[117] Unlike at St George's, the Warwick statutes did not cover matters other than need for residency and the new requirement of a common fund rather than individual prebends drawing on individual landed estates. The level of detail in the statutes of St George's from 1352 was unusual therefore, and may reflect Edington's own desire to establish firm rules and regulations for this new and prestigious institution, as suggested by the provision that the new college should look to the cathedral chapters for their guidance.[118] Edington was the only bishop to specify how the college was to manage its money down to the level of reserves that were

---

[111] *Cartulary of St Mary's Warwick,* pp. 143-55; the circumstances of these statutes are discussed in his introduction, pp. xlviii- liii.

[112] 'Colleges: St Martin le Grand,' in *The Victoria County History of the Counties of England: London,* ed. William Page, (London: Constable and Company, 1909), pp. 555-566.

[113] E.K. Bennet, 'Notes on the Original Statutes of the College of St John the Evangelist of Rushworth, Norfolk, founded by Edmund Gonville, AD 1342,' *Norfolk Archaeology* 10 (1888), pp. 51-56.

[114] Alexander Hamilton Thompson published the statutes of Fotheringhay from its foundation c. 1415 in idem, 'The Statutes of the College of St. Mary and All Saints, Fotheringhay', *Archaeological Journal* 75 (1918), pp. 241-309.

[115] Lepine, *Brotherhood of Canons*, p. 1.

[116] Thompson, *St Mary's in the Newarke*, p. 41.

[117] Thompson, *St Mary's in the Newarke*, e.g. lowering of wages on p. 44; the change in the examination of vicars before they were instituted on p. 51.

[118] St George's, Windsor, XI. D. 20; as transcribed in 'Statutes of St George's,' p. 3.

to be kept in the common fund before any distribution of profits to the canons.[119] On account of Edington's involvement with St Stephen's as well, it is highly likely that the statutes of St Stephen's were equally detailed and reflected his own concerns about the proper running of a collegiate institution. A small hint that this was the case was the inclusion of an agreement as to how offerings should be handled when the king was present. As this was to the detriment of Westminster Abbey's revenues, it made it into the 'clausule' copied in 1394.[120]

Local factors also shaped collegiate statutes; the high likelihood that St George's canons would be working for the king and so would tend to be absentee meant that the statutes there precisely dealt with permissible absence and with how to handle the workload of the chapter when there were significant absences.[121] Whether that was a concern at St Stephen's, where most of the canons would be residential because of their work in Westminster or London is hard to say. Specifying residence requirements and allowable absences probably cut down on disputes about fairness and parity among canons.[122] On the other hand, in the statutes at St George's the dean was enjoined to keep residence more closely than the rest of the chapter, as was also done at St Mary's, Warwick and Exeter, but at St Stephen's the second dean was largely absentee in the early 1350s, before the statutes were finalised.[123] The experience of those years when work on St Stephen's stalled slightly might have encouraged similar strict provisions about absences in the St Stephen's statutes. The relationship of the chapel to the king might also be another case of particular concern created by the circumstances of a new palace chapel college. The statutes of St George's did not mention particular things to be done when the king was present, but did mention royal privileges such as the baptism of the king's children.[124] The clause mentioned above about the treatment of offerings when the king was present hints that St Stephen's dual role as king's chapel and as collegiate church might have been dealt with explicitly in the now-lost statutes.[125] Another instance where specific local provisions were made was at St Mary's in the Newarke where only the obit of the founder and his wife were to be celebrated by the college. None of the priests or vicars were to be allowed to accept money for other anniversary masses, but chantries were to be allowed on a case by case basis.[126]

The most basic duty of statutes was to set out the form of the college, and the rights of presentation and patronage to it. All these early statutes deal with such matters because these lay at the heart of

---

[119] Ibid, p. 9.
[120] WAM 18431 dorse annotation.
[121] There was to be a ten-day delay to allow canons to return to vote, 'Statutes of St George's,' pp. 16-17.
[122] Originally up to sixty days of absence annually were permitted, *Cal. Pap. Letters 1471-1484,* pp. 678-9.
[123] Michael Northburgh was usually to be found on the king's business overseas in the years that he was dean.
[124] St Stephen's had a similar privilege to baptize and to bury the king's children in *Cal. Pap. Petitions*, pp. 361-375.
[125] See below on St Stephen's and the Chapel Royal, pp. 174-81.
[126] Thompson, *St Mary's in the Newarke*, p. 57.

what could be disputed. Presentation and thus the ability to exercise patronage to one's own clerks was an important motive for foundations, and this was the set of clauses which guaranteed those rights. Bishops such as Edington himself wanted to have an alternate source of patronage for their own household as the cathedral chapters became more distinct from their influence.[127] An earlier example of this was St Mary's and Holy Angels in York, founded in the twelfth century to give the Archbishop potential rewards and leverage against the cathedral chapter.[128] Even the fragmentary statutes of St Mary's Warwick dealt with the rights of the earls of Warwick to present canons and the dean.[129] At Leicester, great care was taken to ensure that there would not be disputes over the presentation of canons if the earldom should be divided in the future as it was to be in 1361.[130] There, interestingly and fairly unusually, the dean was elected from among the canons, not chosen directly by the patron.[131] The statutes of St George's did not deviate from the pattern of founder presentation in any way. The king was to have the right to present both the dean and the canons.[132] Judging from the patent roll records of royal presentations to St Stephen's, similar language would have been used in its statutes. The one unclear detail about the language regarding presentation to canonries at St Stephen's is whether the right confirmed in 1356 to the Treasurer of the Exchequer to present to one of the prebends was written into the statutes from the previous year.[133] The need for clarification after Edington left the Exchequer for Chancery would suggest that this was not mentioned in the statutes, but it seems unlikely that Edington, so particular at St George's, would be so careless in the St Stephen's equivalent unless it was his personal privilege to present to a prebend, and his successor at the Exchequer simply wanted to turn it into an institutional privilege.

Late-medieval collegiate statutes also tended to deal with the financial practicalities of the new or re-founded institution. That the statutes at St Mary's Warwick were primarily concerned with the lost churches of the endowment reflected the fundamental importance of the endowment to any college.[134] Elsewhere, a description of the endowment was uncommon; St George's and thus presumably St Stephen's statutes lacked such clauses.[135] The level of the endowment could affect the statutes, such as when the bishop of Lincoln raised the wages of the dean, canons, vicars and choristers at Leicester after an increase in the resources available.[136] At Warwick too the wages of

---

[127] For earlier examples, Fonge, 'Patriarchy and Patrimony,' pp. 77-93.
[128] Warren, 'St Mary and Holy Angels', p. 20.
[129] *St Mary's, Warwick,* pp. 150-1.
[130] Thompson, *St Mary's in the Newarke*, pp. 48-9; for the arrival of John of Gaunt as patron on his marriage to Blanche of Lancaster, ibid, pp. 39-40.
[131] Thompson, *St Mary's in the Newarke,* p. 48.
[132] 'Statutes of St George's,' p. 7.
[133] *CPR 1354-58,* p. 430.
[134] *St Mary's, Warwick*, pp. 143-49.
[135] Rather, the endowment was a matter for the foundation letters patent, *CPR 1348-50*, p. 147.
[136] Commented on by Thompson, *St Mary's in the Newarke,* p. 44.

each member of the college and the payment schedule was laid out.[137] St George's fussy financial provisions for the common fund and loans were already mentioned, but it also had the usual elements of wages and staffing clauses.[138] The wages of the dean and canons were specified as were the stipends of the various supporting clergy and staff. As was common, the choristers' wages were handled by one of the vicars or canons acting as master of choristers.[139] What was unusual in the wage specification of St George's was the daily residence payments of 1s at mass, which copied the practice at Exeter Cathedral.[140] This practice seems to have been taken from the already known practice of obit payments and to be directed at maintaining a full round of liturgy. Elsewhere, including the great cathedrals and the royal free chapels, non-residence and consequently heavy burdens of administration falling on the few resident canons were known to be significant problems.[141] This innovation addressed those problems by providing incentive to reside since the base salary for a canon at 40s annually was markedly lower than elsewhere.[142] Because of the description of St Stephen's as having residence payments and the consistency of the wages through to the sixteenth century where the final valuation of the college in 1548 gives the same basic wage rate as seen in the statutes of St George's, it is safe to assume that St Stephen's had very similar provisions to St George's when it came to wages, staffing and the maintenance of the endowment.[143]

As well as the financial rewards of service to a college, the statutes also had to deal with the obligations and expectations of the college towards its members. Founders often included clauses about proper behaviour of vicars, clerks and choristers, appropriate sanctions for misbehaviour, the dress of all members of the college, and their terms of office.[144] Vicars usually served at pleasure, choristers until their voices broke and clerks until they advanced further into Holy Orders.[145] Where colleges often differed, however, was in how they handled the major offices. In a cathedral chapter there were usually four major officers, appointed directly to that role when they were given the prebend.[146] In all the colleges surveyed here, the numbers of officers was not stable, and they were elected from among the canons to serve for a specified period of time. Their roles were usually

---

[137] *St Mary's, Warwick*, pp. 149-
[138] 'Statutes of St George's,' pp. 8-9 on how to appoint clerks, vicars and choristers; ibid. p. 5 for the payment schedules for the dean and canons.
[139] 'Statutes of St George's,' p. 6; elsewhere this role was filled by the sacrist, for example, Thompson, *St Mary's in the Newarke*, p. 52.
[140] 'Statutes of St George's,' p. 5; Edwards, *Secular Cathedrals*, pp. 43-44.
[141] Lepine, *Brotherhood of Canons*, p. 3.
[142] 10 marks at the lowest at St Mary's in the Newarke, Thompson, *St Mary's in the Newarke,* p. 44.
[143] Wages in 1548 for each canon was 40s, £18 5s from 12d daily residence payments with obits adding another 70s 4d in SC 12/6/ 62. The numbers given in the Chantry Certificate for the wages of the dean and canons of St Stephen's, not including the variable obit payments, are identical to those set out by statute for St George's in 1348, 'Statutes of St George's,' p. 5.
[144] 'Statutes of St George's,' p. 12; Hamilton Thompson, *St Mary's in the Newarke*, pp. 51-2 and p. 61 'how the canons shall not be haunters of taverns'.
[145] 'Statutes of St George's,' p. 9; Hamilton Thompson, *St Mary's in the Newarke*, p. 53.

defined in the statutes according to the perceived needs of the institution. A shift in practice might be seen at St Mary's Warwick where in the 1367 statutes only the treasurer's role was specified. That this office was described in such detail suggests that there had been problems with the customary understanding of the role.[147] This impression is reinforced by the change to a common fund to alleviate financial problems.[148] At St Stephen's, the fairly typical steward, treasurer, and precentor are attested later, which means that they were following cathedral chapter practice.[149] The length of time served in each office is unclear, since some may have held the office for longer than a year, but conventional practice in colleges was for annual terms with the possibility of renewal, as at St George's.[150] Smaller colleges such as St Mary and Holy Angels in York might only have a sacrist or *custos* who seemed to function as a dean and as a treasurer.[151] Usually these officials also were given an extra allowance by virtue of their office, and this was laid down in statutory form.[152] At St Stephen's in the sixteenth century, the officials were receiving extra payments, so it can be assumed that this was also in the original statutes even if the amount was likely to have been altered over the years.[153]

Despite the general adoption of the Use of Sarum to guide liturgical practice in this period, colleges often shaped the liturgy to meet specific desires of founders or perhaps the college itself. These expectations usually included provision for prayers for the founder and possibly their families. At Leicester, the form of prayers for the founder was specified as were particular practices during masses, and a collect for the king.[154] At Warwick, these practices were not specified, perhaps since the college already had its own set of customary practices in 1364. The only instance that needed clarification there were the altars of the saints for which each prebend was named and the private masses to be said at each altar.[155] In this case, the saints' altars corresponded to parish churches alienated by the statutes to the college and which had consequently lost their parochial status. By making them part of the specified liturgy, in a sense the worship of these churches continued. St George's had long and detailed liturgical provisions, not least because as a new college it would have no pre-existing customs that could go unrecorded. It also had directions for a collect for Edward III,

---

[146] Lepine, *Brotherhood of Canons*, p. 2.

[147] Fonge, *St Mary's, Warwick*, pp. 152-153.

[148] The treasurer's duties are changed by this provision as he will henceforth have to administer the common fund, ibid, p. 150.

[149] All are attested at various points in financial documents; the treasurer occurs in the obit book, BL Cotton MS Faustina B VIII, in all the indentures; the steward occurs in the pipe rolls, E 372/ 240 rot. 10; a 1493 court document discusses payments to the precentor or sacristan, C 146/6940.

[150] Roberts, *St George's,* p. 50.

[151] Warren, 'St Mary and Holy Angels', pp. 52-3.

[152] Roberts, *St George's*, p. 51.

[153] They were given extra wages, and access to expense payments, SC 12/6/62.

[154] Thompson, *St Mary in the Newarke*, pp. 54-57.

[155] Fonge, *St Mary's Warwick,* p. 151.

and for the king 'that now is'.[156] As was usual, the responsibility of the dean and canons in celebrating the various offices were specified and that all services were to be sung.[157] Each canon was to take turns at celebrate mass on the high festivals, and each vicar was to celebrate mass daily.[158] Unusually, the presence of a higher prelate was anticipated, connected to the annual Garter celebrations, and so the dean's position in relation to that visiting bishop or dignitary was spelled out.[159] Devotion to the Virgin and concern for the dead prompted the inclusion of the Lady Mass and the Mass for the Dead in the daily round at St George's.[160] This type of provision must also have been the case at St Stephen's, where in addition the relation of the upper chapel of St Stephen to the lower one of St Mary would have had to be laid down. The special masses for the dead and the Virgin, for example, might well have been held in the lower chapel, both on account of the dedication and the lower chapel's later use as a mausoleum for members of the college.[161]

An important part of any statutes legally was the relationship of the college to its obligations to others. Particularly important legally was the college's relationship with parochial duties, if there were any, and to any other charitable purpose. Most of these involved the dean's obligation to ensure that all functioned smoothly. These were the types of provisions which would be immensely important in any lawsuit as St Stephen's was to find to its cost in the 1370s through to 1394, when its relationship to St Margaret's and to Westminster Abbey was under litigation. At Warwick, the responsibility of the dean to act as rector of the appropriated churches so that the parish duties would be carried out was mentioned in the statutes.[162] Parochial provisions were important, and the financial desires of colleges were not allowed to supersede them. At St Stephen's when churches were appropriated, it was obligated to provide and pay for a resident vicar.[163] Where there were alms houses such as at Leicester, their smooth running, as well as the college's responsibilities for their maintenance were included in the college's statutes.[164] At St George's the regulations for the poor knights were consequently included, specifying such matters as their maximum prescribed income, their daily payments and so forth.[165] St Stephen's did not have charitable or parochial responsibilities, but it was to try to claim jurisdiction over the Palace of Westminster in 1377. The statutes were evidently unclear on this matter and so the case was to drag on through the Curia until 1394 when the matter

---

[156] *Statutes of St George's*, p. 13.
[157] Ibid, p. 10.
[158] Ibid, pp. 10-11.
[159] Ibid, p. 11.
[160] Ibid, p. 1.
[161] See Table 10 for all known burial requests; fifteenth-century canons' wills express desires to be buried in the lower chapel, for example, William Chauntre, PROB 11/7/ 276; also Robert Foulmer, PROB 11//2A/16.
[162] *St Mary's, Warwick*, pp. 148-9.
[163] For example, a later appropriation of an advowson that of Bledlow, is conditional on appointment of a vicar, *CPR 1408-1413,* p. 465.
[164] Thompson, *St Mary's in the Newarke,* pp. 45-47.
[165] 'Statutes of St George's,' p. 6.

was clarified.[166] The fragment of statutes that survives said nothing about any parochial responsibilities at St Stephen's, which suggests that either they were absent entirely — or less likely, given that statutes of St George's have no such clause — that there was a clause giving the college parochial responsibilities for its own staff that the monks of Westminster wanted to ignore.[167]

In all of this, we get a picture of statutes as highly variable, highly responsive documents, which could fulfil a variety of functions. They were also living documents, supplemented and extended by custom, or perhaps even superseded by tradition or revised such as at St Stephen's in 1479. Visitation reports, such as the one in 1377 for St Stephen's, or in 1441 for St Mary's, Warwick usually had ordinances that were to be read alongside the existing statutes. At Exeter, various bishops extended and altered their statutes to provide updated guidance for the collegiate chapter. St Stephen's, like St George's, was given detailed statutes at a time when statutes were not as necessary as they were to become. Earlier colleges had relied on foundation charters, custom and memory to govern their actions. In the 1350s just as colleges were becoming more popular, founders, including Edward III, realised that through statutes they could manage and direct the life of the institutions they founded in a way that was not possible with monastic foundations. The assumptions that colleges knew their duties and obligations in everything from their wages to their celebration of the liturgy or to their schedule of general chapters were fading away in favour of specific and minute detailing. In part this shift may be driven by a shift to lay creation of colleges, where lay founders saw in colleges a way to shape religious practices to suit themselves, but also a growing concern to specify what good religious practice looked like. For older institutions, such as the royal free chapels or the bishops' colleges, that could be done in the mid fourteenth century through visitation ordinances, chapter acts or new sometimes partial statutes. For new colleges such as St Stephen's the papally-commanded statutes provided a vehicle to set out those expectations and provide a yardstick against which to judge the college's performance.

Conclusions

The foundation of the college of St Stephen marked a turning point in royal piety. From 1348 onward two of the most important royal palaces contained institutions that constantly provided prayer and liturgy, rather than serving solely as sites for itinerant royal services by the still-peripatetic Chapel Royal. St Stephen's visibility within Westminster meant that it could function as a constant reminder of the dynastic piety of Edward III, both looking back to the ancestors who had begun the work on the chapel but also forward in the persons of his children as displayed on the altar mural. Like the foundation of a monastery, St Stephen's was an act of visible and enduring religious

---

[166] *CPR 1392-96*, p. 553.
[167] WAM 18431.

patronage, where Edward's generosity would be remembered throughout the college's existence. St Stephen's, however, was more than just a royal site of display; it functioned as part of a palace that increasingly was dominated by royal administration. As such, it was to provide a home and rewards for many who worked in Westminster's offices. The administrative side of Westminster was the one that most concerned Edington, and which he was able to turn to the use of his financial reforms. Edington's involvement provided a clear purpose for the college within the Westminster world, tying it to the Exchequer in particular and offering something greater than the sum of its parts. The early canons from 1348 played an important role in defining and articulating St Stephen's purpose and ensuring that the work was carried out. The critical year in the foundation of St Stephen's was 1355, when the college was firmly set on its feet as an institution with a formal existence and officially a site of its own. To get so far had been the work of many to insert an ecclesiastical institution into a palace where many other needs competed and jurisdiction was held by another foundation jealous of its rights. The endowment, the subject of the next chapter, was similarly to be the work of many agencies over the lifetime of the college to carry out the work assigned to it in 1348 and confirmed in the statutes of 1355.

Chapter Two: The Endowment of St Stephen's College, 1348-1548

The endowment and land management of St Stephen's was a collaborative and changing venture throughout its existence. Without the ongoing support of small donors, magnates and the royal family, as well as the commitment of its canons, St Stephen's would not have survived the fifteenth century as successfully as it did. It was also distinctively different from most of its contemporary colleges and cathedral chapters, in the type and success of its lands and other revenues.[1] While most scholarship has looked at the foundation of institutions' endowments, it has been harder to see how those endowments were developed, managed and encroached upon.[2] In addition, since that work largely remains to be done, it has been difficult to see how entire groups or classes of ecclesiastical institutions fared, and what that says about the larger trends in support for the church in the centuries before the Reformation. Much of the work on the value of religious institutions to the laity of late medieval England has looked at the chantries within parochial needs and priorities.[3] Yet colleges such as St Stephen's did not just respond to their royal patrons, but also to a wider audience, who also supported them financially and practically, a theme that will be fully developed in Chapter Eight.[4] Thus, the college's endowments and its changing priorities and lands need to be seen in a wider comparative context to understand how and why it gathered and maintained the support that it did as well as pointing towards the wider religious and economic climate at the time. In addition, by looking at what can be gleaned from the surviving evidence on how the dean and canons managed their lands, it is possible to understand the college's own priorities and their ability to shape its revenues to its own needs. On the eve of the Reformation St Stephen's was

---

[1] For a full listing of the lands and advowsons held by St Stephen's, see Table 1.

[2] At St George's, Windsor, A.K.B. Roberts, *St George's Chapel Windsor 1348-1415: A study in Early Collegiate Administration*, (Windsor: for the Dean and Canons, 1948) looked at the foundational management of the endowment, but was not really interested in how it then developed further, although she did then write A.K.B. Evans, 'The Years of Arrears: Financial Problems of the College of St George in the Fifteenth Century' in *St George's Chapel, Windsor in the Late Middle Ages*, eds. Colin Richmond & Eileen Scarff, (Windsor: the dean and canons, 2001), pp. 93-106.

For Westminster Abbey, Barbara Harvey, *The Obedientiaries of Westminster Abbey and their Financial Records c.1275-1540*. (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002) and idem, *Westminster Abbey and its Estates in the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977). Both Evans and Harvey were able to think about development through time because of the unusual survival of both these institution's archives through the Reformation and through to the present day at the institutions themselves.

Elsewhere, there is rarely enough material to make it worth trying to do more than summarise the known values of the lands, especially since the Crown did not know the value of the church's lands until 1535, *Valor Ecclesiasticus temp. Henr. VIII: Auctoritate regia institutus*, eds. John Caley & Joseph Hunter, 6 vols. (London: Great Britain Record Commission, 1810-34), i, pp. 428-30.

[3] Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400–1580,* (New Haven: Yale, 1992) is particularly concerned with the parochial experience; chantries focussed community sentiment, Miri Rubin, *Charity and Community in Medieval Cambridge,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Clive Burgess, 'Strategies for Eternity: Perpetual Chantry Foundation in Late Medieval Bristol' in, *Religious Belief and Ecclesiastical Careers in Late Medieval England,* ed. Christopher Harper-Bill, (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1991), pp. 1-32 and idem, 'For the Increase of Divine Service: Chantries in the Parish in Late Medieval Bristol', *JEH* 36 (1985), pp. 48-65.

[4] Summarised below, p. 195.

vibrant, vital and intensely well-resourced thanks to the combined efforts of many individuals over the previous two centuries.

Many other large colleges managed with much less than St Stephen's had. Edward III envisaged a foundation with an income of £500 yearly and by the time it was dissolved, the value of its lands was calculated at £995 19s 10½d or £1080 19s 1 ¾ d annually.[5] Other royal colleges with comparable levels of staffing such as St Martin le Grand in London did not approach St Stephen's income, earning only c. £300 at the start of the thirteenth century and c. £540 in 1535, which is a reminder that collegiate foundations did not have to be expensive.[6] Fotheringhay's endowment was extremely uncertain in its early years but in 1548 was worth £536 19s 7½d annually.[7] A hybrid example which had a high income for a time under royal patronage, St Mary's in the Newarke had at £302 6s 8d in 1355 on the grant of Henry, duke of Lancaster, but was lavishly extended by his son-in-law, John of Gaunt, to £1000 yearly in 1357.[8] At its dissolution under the first chantries act in 1545 it had £850 p.a.[9] Interestingly, the income for the monastic and mendicant foundations sponsored by Edward III at the same time as his foundation of St Stephen's tended to be lower at their dissolution than they had been in the fourteenth century.[10] The Dominican house at King's Langley lost significant income and was only worth £130 16s. 8d in 1535, whereas its original endowment was £150 in 1311, increased to 200 marks in 1346.[11] Edward III thought that the friars at King's Langley needed £500 annually in his will in 1377, yet by the dissolution of the house in 1539 the annual income of the house had fallen further still from the 1535 value to £100.[12] The same picture can be seen at St Mary Graces where the high early income was not sustained.[13] A similar collapse can be seen at Vale Royal Abbey, the favoured foundation of Edward I,

---

[5] For the envisaged endowment, *CPR 1348-50*, p. 147; the value of the college in 1548 was £995 19s 10 ½ d, SC 12/6/62; but in the other 1548 valuation it was £1080 19s 1 ¾ d, *London and Middlesex Chantry Certificate 1548*, ed. C. Kitching, London Record Society 16 (Woodbridge, 1980), p. 80.

[6] 'Colleges: St Martin le Grand,' in *The Victoria County History of the Counties of England: London*, ed. William Page, (London: Constable and Company, 1909), p. 556; the numbers given for the dissolution value are problematic, because the college had been absorbed into Westminster Abbey in 1504; St George's was supposed to have £1000 yearly, Edward III cut that to £655 by the end of his life according to Evans, 'The Years of Arrears', p. 93; in 1483 its income was £1091 2s 8 ½d, ibid., p. 104.

[7] 'Colleges: Fotheringhay', in *The Victoria County History of the County of Northampton: Volume 2,* eds. R.M. Serjeantson & W.R.D. Adkins, (London: James Street, 1906), pp. 170-177.

[8] Alexander Hamilton Thompson, *The History of the Hospital and the New College of St Mary in the Newarke, Leicester*, (Leicester: Leicester Archaeological Society, 1937), pp. 30-1.

[9] Ibid. p. 206.

[10] The final income of the abbey was £603, which made it the third-wealthiest Cistercian abbey in England, Ian Grainger & Christopher Phillpotts, *The Cistercian Abbey of St Mary Graces, East Smithfield, London*, (London: Museum of London Publications, 2011), p. 90.

[11] 'Friaries: King's Langley priory,' in *The Victoria County History of the County of Hertford: Volume Four*, ed. William Page, (London: Constable and Company, 1914), pp. 446-45.

[12] Chris Given-Wilson, 'Richard II and his Grandfather's Will,' *EHR* 93 (1978), p. 327; 'King's Langley', p. 450.

[13] The value of St Mary Graces was intended to be 1000 marks (£666 13s 4d) but had fallen to £603 in 1535, Grainger &

even after its problematic beginnings.[14]

While the raw numbers hide yearly variation, problems collecting revenues and varying institutional needs, and thus are simply a crude comparative measure, the general trend among cathedrals is worth exploring. St Stephen's never reached the income of the secular cathedrals, which in 1535 tended to have revenues of £2,000 to £2,500 each year, and the wealthiest, Lincoln had at least £3,426 annually.[15] Lincoln's revenues in the mid-fourteenth century are unknown, but in the 1291 *Taxatio* it had had an income of £1,398 3s, which suggests that by the sixteenth century, the chapter was been able to maintain high levels of support from donors and from canons.[16] In contrast, the monastic cathedrals had lost revenues in the fourteenth century and their average income was much lower than their secular counterparts, with a range of c. £400 to £2,500 annual income by the sixteenth century.[17] Durham's income went from c. £4,500 annually in 1308, to £1,575 in 1535.[18] The decline of monastic revenues was of course partially political on account of the appropriation by the Crown of the alien priories in the fifteenth century and ongoing taxation demands.[19] However, it also seems as if the colleges, including the cathedrals, were better placed to develop their existing lands and better able to attract continuing grants of land from local donors and the Crown.[20]

Edward III's Endowment

Edward III took twelve years to establish fully the endowment of his new college at Westminster. It was very much his efforts which saw the college receive a stable base income remarkably fast compared to some monasteries. By 1360 his intentions for the college were clear.[21] The early endowment of St Stephen's, with one exception, came from royal grants. In contrast, Edward III leant on Garter knights

---

Phillpotts, *St Mary Graces*, p. 87 and 90.

[14] Jeffrey Denton, 'From the Foundation of Vale Royal Abbey to the Statute of Carlisle: Edward I and Ecclesiastical Patronage in *Thirteenth Century England IV*, eds. Peter R. Coss & S.D. Lloyd, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992), p. 135.

[15] Stanford E. Lehmberg, *The Reformation of Cathedrals: Cathedrals in English Society, 1485 -1603*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), p. 26.

[16] 'Lincoln cathedral,' in *The Victoria County History of the County of Lincoln*, ed. William Page, (London: James Street, 1906), pp. 80-96.

[17] Lehmberg, *Reformation of Cathedrals,* p. 46.

[18] Ibid, pp. 46-7.

[19] Benjamin Thompson, 'Habendum et Tenendum: Lay and Ecclesiastical Attitudes to the Property of the Church,' in *Religious Belief and Ecclesiastical Careers in Late Medieval England*, ed. Christopher. Harper-Bill, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1991), p. 224.

[20] For example, see Emilia Jamroziak's comments on Rievaulx Abbey after 1300 as 'stable and even prosperous' but under heavy pressure from royal taxation and Scots raiding and thus distinctively different from its expansionist pre-1300 phase, *Rievaulx Abbey and its Social Context, 1132-1300,* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), p. 4; and Lehmberg, *Reformation of Cathedrals*, pp. 45-6.

[21] *CPR 1358-61,* pp. 441-2.

and family members to help endow St George's.[22] In these first years, Edward's gifts to the college were of church advowsons, centred around Wakefield, funds from the fee-farms of Essex and London, and London property. Because these revenues did not total the £500 annually that Edward had envisaged for the college's income, the college was also supposed to be drawing on the Exchequer as well as the fee-farm of York to make up the difference. Instead, it appears that St Stephen's did not claim the Exchequer income as it does not appear on the Issue Rolls until 1361.[23] After 1360, the king added little, except to replace lands which were in dispute and thus lost to the college. Under the terms of his will in 1377, the college's incomplete endowment was to be finally completed with manorial lands of the Leybourne inheritance.

Two aspects of St Stephen's early endowment by Edward stand out as unusual. First, the college was granted unusually dispersed lands, and second it was not granted primarily manorial land. The other major Edwardian grants or new foundations tended to be given temporal lands close to their own site. Thus, most of St Mary Graces' endowment was clustered around London.[24] This same pattern can be seen at St Mary's, Warwick, where most of the lands were carefully chosen to be reasonably close to the college itself.[25] This concern has also been seen at Tattershall much later.[26] St George's also received a variety of lands as well as advowsons, but they too were largely in the Midlands.[27] In contrast, St Stephen's received London *hospicia* and Yorkshire advowsons from the king. Four of the five Yorkshire churches were clustered in the West Riding, around Wakefield, and came from the estates of the alien priory of Lewes.[28] The Cambridgeshire advowsons of the same priory went to St George's.[29] Dewsbury Minster and All Hallows, Kirkburton had returned to the Crown from the Despensers when they were attainted, and St Helen's, Sandal Magna had been a negotiating tool in the talks which were to lead to the priory of Lewes being naturalised in 1351.[30] The final church advowson, that of St John the Baptist, Penistone, seems to have been intended to complete the college's control of the local churches, even though it was not an alien priory possession.[31] Holy Trinity, Bledlow in Buckinghamshire, of which the

---

[22] Early knights of the Garter gave advowsons to St George's, Windsor, Roberts, *St George's,* p. 14.

[23] St Stephen's first appears receiving money from the Exchequer in 1361, E 403/ 408 m. 26.

[24] Grainger & Phillpotts, *St Mary Graces*, p. 89.

[25] *The Cartulary of St Mary's Collegiate Church, Warwick*, ed. Charles Fonge, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004), pp. lxxvii-viii.

[26] 'Colleges: Tattershall,' in *The Victoria County History of the County of Lincoln,* ed. William Page, (London: James Street, 1906), p. 237.

[27] The closeness of Windsor to Wraysbury was a factor in its alienation to St George's, Roberts, *St George's,* p. 15; for the other manorial lands near Windsor and Deddington in Oxfordshire, ibid. pp. 27-30

[28] St Helen's, Sandal Magna; All Hallows, Wakefield; Dewsbury Minster; St John the Baptist, Kirkburton; the churches of the alien priory of Lewes were being used by both St Stephen's and St George's. *CPR 1350-1354*, p. 380**.**

[29] Roberts, *St George's,* pp. 18-19.

[30] *CCR 1349-54*, p. 242; the feoffment to the Despensers is in *CCR 1323-27*, p. 497.

[31] The advowson and some manorial land were officially gifts from Ellis de Burton and John de Dronsfeld. *CPR 1358-*

college was to have uncertain possession until 1413, was also an alien possession, belonging to the abbey of Grestein, and had been taken into the king's hands because of the war in France.[32] Bledlow's income of £40 yearly was paid to the college, but it was not formally theirs until 1413 and was instead accounted for at the Exchequer.[33] The only manorial land was a small plot in St Albans, granted by the king in 1351 but seemingly sold or lost before 1360.[34]

The royal administration that employed so many canons was also brought in to support St Stephen's through rents from London property. The first such grant in 1348, alongside the Yorkshire churches, was of the house in Lombard Street which was then the home of the Great Wardrobe. It was in bad condition, but until 1361, when the de la Poles won a long-running dispute to obtain it, it was to provide £5 in rent annually to the college. In addition, they were not responsible for the repairs that occupied large sections of the wardrobe accounts.[35] The new home of the wardrobe never had any connection to St Stephen's. Instead, the canons were compensated with £20 rent from an equivalent house, La Réole, which had been used by the queen's wardrobe, after the death of Queen Philippa in 1369.[36] This property, however, was alienated by 1440 when it was owned by Margaret Holland and valued at only 40s.[37] The final government-related London property the college owned was an inn called Serne's Tower, which had previously been the home of the Exchange.[38] The college also received rents and profits from six houses of the Wool Staple in Westminster, as well as the site of the former inn of the earl of Kent to the north of the collegiate site, which gave it significant Westminster rents by the sixteenth century as well as providing lodgings for the canons themselves from the late fourteenth century.[39]

While the property did not yet total £500, the canons seem to have been oddly slow to claim the difference from the Exchequer and to fully assert their rights to particular payments. At some point after 1348, the college took over earlier regular payments from the fee-farms of London and Essex which had

---

1361, p. 23.

[32] Discussed in, 'The parishes of Risborough Hundred: Bledlow', *The Victoria County History of the County of Buckingham: Volume 2*, ed. William Page, (London: Constable and Company, 1908), pp. 247-253; *CPR 1361-64*, p. 84.

[33] From 15 December 1372 the college's payment from the Exchequer was reduced by the value of Le Réole at £20 annually and that of Bledlow, at £40 annually, since La Réole had been given to them in 1369, and the college acknowledged that it was receiving £40 from Roger Outy, rector of Bledlow, E 403/ 444 m. 19.

[34] The college enfeoffed Richard Eccleshall of the St Albans lands on 24 April 1354, *CPR 1354-58,* p. 49; the land was then not included in the 1360 summary of the lands owned by St Stephen's College, *CPR 1358-60,* pp. 441-2.

[35] T.F. Tout, *Chapters in Medieval Administrative History*, 6 vols. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1929), iv, pp. 404-5.

[36] On 10 October 1369, *CPR 1367-70,* p. 311.

[37] C.L. Kingsford, 'Historical Notes on Medieval London Houses,' *London Topographical Record* 12 (1920), p. 11.

[38] *CPR 1358-61,* p. 568.

[39] *CChR 1349-1417*, pp. 133-4; for the back history of this grant, see Chapter One, pp. 35-6.

been granted to the earlier chaplains at St Stephen's.[40] The £35 14s 7d that the college was given from the fee-farm of York had to be yearly renewed until the king should grant it lands to that value, because of the heavy claims on that particular source.[41] In actuality, the Crown never stopped authorising these payments through Chancery writs.[42] Occasionally the money was interrupted, for example in 1355/6, and the arrears seem not to have been paid. St Stephen's took until after the letter patent confirming and extending its income by £5 annually to start drawing money from the Exchequer.[43] St George's had been claiming £100 annually from 1354, with an arrears payment which suggested that the statutes of 1352 were seen as the starting point for payments.[44] The certain rents for St Stephen's in 1360 came to £222, including the houses in London and the churches in Yorkshire as well as the grants from the fee-farms of Essex and London. The uncertain rents were the fee-farm of York as well as profits from the Wool Staple in London, and then the total was supposed to be brought up to the required £505 by the Exchequer.[45] Thus by Edward III's death in 1377, the endowment probably stood at around £350 of rents if the canons had managed to use the licence given in 1369 to acquire lands to the value of 100 marks.[46] Adding in the value of the fee-farms at just over £102 meant that in 1377 the college had a more-or-less guaranteed income of £450 and was receiving in addition £124 14s 7d from the Exchequer.[47] Edward III's commitment to the college had ensured that it was amply endowed to fulfil his intentions for it, and the final gift in his will completed the lands of St Stephen's.

Conflict with Richard II

Richard II's relationship with the college's endowment was uneasy. His councillors were to spend years challenging Edward III's final provisions for his ecclesiastical foundations, but then Richard himself was to grant lands to the college towards the end of his reign.[48] Edward III's bequests to his favourite

---

[40] The grant of monies from Essex and the City of London's fee farms were made in 6 Edward III for worship in St Stephen's according to the pipe rolls, such as E 372/214.

[41] The scholarship on this focuses on the fifteenth century when there were negotiations over the claims made by, among others, St Stephen's College; Lorraine C. Attreed, 'The King's Interest: York's Fee Farm and the Central Government,' *Northern History* 17 (1981) p. 27 and pp. 40-2.

[42] The writs are found in E 159, for example, E 159/227 b.d. r. 8; pipe roll entries in E 372 reference these authorisations. such as E 372/214; occasionally, such as in 1377, the college had to petition for the writ itself, SC 8/170/8490.

[43] The first such payment was on 14 June 1361 when the college was paid £184 14s 7d, the full amount payable, E 403/408 m. 26.

[44] The payments to St George's started in E 403/374 m. 8; the date of St Stephen's statutes was 8 December 1355, which seems to have no bearing on the college's financial situation, WAM 18431.

[45] *CPR 1358-60,* pp. 441-2.

[46] *CPR 1367-70,* p. 311.

[47] Given Wilson, 'Richard II', p. 326; he gives the Exchequer annuity in 1377 as £164 14s 7d, but in actual fact, the college was receiving £124 14s 7d annually because of the complications around the advowson of Bledlow, discussed above, pp. 52-3.

[48] It was not directly financial, since Richard rebuilt the college's site and created the sub-college of vicars, see Chapter

ecclesiastical institutions in his will encompassed all the land he had acquired that had not yet been granted out, but in particular the Leybourne inheritance, largely in Kent. This vast set of estates was to have substantially augmented the endowments of the friars at King's Langley, the abbey of St Mary Graces and St Stephen's itself at the feoffees' discretion. St George's endowment was felt to be complete even though it had not been endowed to the level first envisaged.[49] Richard II's minority council and then the king himself were concerned with the alienation of so much land and so sought any loophole possible to reclaim all of it for the Crown. Until 1382, the dispute was over the entirety of the lands entrusted to the feoffees for the execution of the will, but after 1382, the case narrowed to just the Kentish lands which had belonged to Juliana Leybourne with the rest returned to the crown estates. When in 1382 the revenues from the lands were temporarily given to the institutions for forty years, St Stephen's received the manors of Ashford, Barton Buckwell, Eastling, Mere, Langley by Leeds, Elham and Colbridge, as well as meadowland in Eynsford. They were also to receive the revenues of Winchfield after the death of its current occupant. This settlement was to cost the college £240 over three years. The value of these lands should have been around £197 5s 16d, which would have taken the college's income to approximately £650 annually, well above that envisaged by Edward III in 1348.[50] However, in 1396 the college still lacked Winchfield and the rest of the lands were valued at £111 annually with the exchequer was still making up the difference of £53 14s 7d to £500.[51] In addition to the actual lower returns on the land, the dispute became more complicated in 1383 when Richard granted all the Leybourne lands to Simon Burley as his comital estate. The legal dispute was then to continue until 1389 when the case was settled and the lands handed over permanently, but the final seisin of lands only took place in 1399.

Given-Wilson suggests that the college enjoyed full uncontested possession of the manors in the 1390s, but the evidence suggests otherwise. The college was still dealing with uncertainty in its land holdings through this decade. Much of the patent roll evidence notes that the grants are conditional on the success of the college in asserting its rights. The cost of gaining the stock from the manor of Eastling in 1390 was probably higher than the potential gains to the college of possession of the manor, which it was not to keep.[52] This situation may have prompted the alienation to the college in 1392 of various

---

Three, pp. 74, 95.

[49] From 1363 the college received no money from the Exchequer, there is no sign that any attempt was made to bring the income up to £1000, Roberts, *St George's*, pp. 43-44.

[50] Given-Wilson, 'Richard II', p. 326 gives the values of the lands as they had been valued in 1369/70 in SC 6/898/27.

[51] Entry dated 15 December 1396, E 403/554 m. 15.

[52] *CPR 1389-92*, pp. 240 and 313.

messuages in the City of London by the canons themselves at the cost of 80 marks in the hanaper.[53] These lands, ideal for leasing out in the commercial areas of the city, were much less uncertain than the Kentish lands in the midst of legal proceedings. The canons were probably trying to mitigate the costs of the lawsuits, which were a possibility until 1399 despite a legal victory for the feoffees of the land and St Stephen's, St Mary Graces and King's Langley in 1389.[54] The larger problem, however, was the uncertainty of the college's rental income. In 1392 a tenant in Kent, Richard Sherman of Elham, was pardoned of a debt of 20 marks, presumably for arrears of rent.[55] Elham was one of the manors in dispute and so it is not surprising that the college would struggle to claim its money when Simon Burley was also seeking payment from the same tenants. In addition, tenants elsewhere appear to have felt that the college's legal difficulties made it permissible to default on their debts. Others who defaulted included tenants in London, as well as the vicar of the church of Wakefield, possibly in a dispute over tithes.[56] The courts seem to have, at least in part, supported them. This string of pardons for non-appearance concerning debts in the 1390s suggests that the college was struggling to claim all that it was owed and that the judicial system was not necessarily working in its favour. From 1399, Henry IV tied up the remaining loose ends; in 1401 he confirmed Richard II's gifts, and in 1402 he protected the lands of the three institutions from the reversion of Burley's attainder.[57] After this, the college could finally be reassured that the lands granted to it in 1377 were firmly in its possession.

Alien Priory Lands

St Stephen's endowment also reflected changing priorities in what was valued in the English church. Even before the Reformation, dissolving, re-founding and adapting monastic houses was common, and St Stephen's could be one of the beneficiaries. The group of houses known as the alien priories largely funded the growth of English colleges in the latter half of the fourteenth century, including St Stephen's. They were houses founded as daughter and dependent monasteries of the large French monastic orders, such as those of Cluny or Cîteaux. Alien priories were usually felt to be problematic in a religious landscape which was becoming more tightly identified with an English nationalism in which the prayers of the faithful, and particularly of specialised, trained liturgists, were felt to speed the English aims in France.[58] By the fourteenth century, English suspicion of any institution or person who owed allegiance

---

[53] *CPR 1391-96,* p. 163.
[54] Given-Wilson, 'Richard II', pp. 325, 331.
[55] *CPR 1391-96*, p. 255.
[56] Robert Fynet was pardoned of 30 marks in 1393, *CPR 1391-96*, p. 258; Nicholas Stratton of London had his outlawry reversed, *CPR 1396-99*, p. 22; and Stratton was pardoned for £10 debt, ibid, p. 126; John Bolteby, vicar of Wakefield was pardoned for a debt of £32 to the college, ibid, p. 392.
[57] *CPR 1401-1405,* pp. 122 and 266-7.
[58] Clive Burgess, 'St George's College, Windsor: Context and Consequence,' in *St George's Chapel, Windsor in the Fourteenth*

to anyone other than the English king meant that these houses, often richly endowed, were seen as a potential revenue source.[59] All alien lands were confiscated at various points during the Hundred Years' War, and finally were appropriated to the Crown completely in 1414. Some houses, such as the Cluniac house of Lewes, were to be able to obtain naturalisation from the Crown and so were removed from the category of alien.[60] At times political considerations and the intervention of a powerful sponsor could make the difference between whether a house was considered alien or not.[61] As well as providing an easy way for the king to augment his income when searching for revenues to finance war, they provided a cheap way to exercise religious patronage. Lands and monies extracted from the alien priories were used to reward royal servants, but also to pay for new royal religious patronage.[62] Laymen and women also involved themselves by dissolving alien priories in order to turn their revenues to new religious purposes, particularly colleges, or intervening to naturalise a local house, often for family reasons, thus showing the variety of responses possible to the problem.[63]

St Stephen's, as a fairly early example of the new type of colleges of the fourteenth century, initially had an endowment which looked more like a conventional endowment for a new foundation, with both spiritual and temporal income from manors which belonged at that time to the king, even if some of those revenues came originally from the priory of Lewes. The lands of alien priories were not yet being granted out as a policy. The churches from Edward III's grant could have been given to laymen, as happened with St John's, Penistone, and the two held by the Despensers. When the alien priories became fully available after the confiscation of 1414, St Stephen's started to benefit, as did other similar colleges.[64] The alien priory land was not needed to make up the endowment, which had already been completed, but to compensate for the fifteenth century's problematic rental economy or to pay for royal obits. In 1437 the college pled financial difficulties and was rewarded with the lands of the alien priory of Frampton in Dorset which were valued at £166 13s 4d yearly.[65] In return St Stephen's was expected to keep the obits of Henry VI and his predecessors. Interestingly, St George's had to wait until the 1470s for their equivalent royal bailout despite a worse financial situation.[66] Similarly thirty years later, Edward

---

Century, ed. Nigel Saul, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005), pp. 65-8.

[59] Thompson, 'Habendum et Tenendum,' p. 224.

[60] Thompson, 'The Laity, the Alien Priories and the Redistribution of Ecclesiastical Property,' in *England in the Fifteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1992 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Nigel Rogers, (Stamford, Lincs.: Paul Watkins, 1994), p. 30.

[61] Ibid.

[62] On Henry IV's concern in 1399 that the alien priories return to religious use, ibid. p. 19.

[63] On the case study of the re-foundation of Stoke-by-Clare under the patronage of the Mortimer family, ibid. pp. 31-32.

[64] Kate Selway, 'The Role of Eton College and King's College, Cambridge in the Polity of the Lancastrian Monarchy,' (DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1993), pp. 3-4 and p. 16.

[65] *CPR 1436-41,* p. 125.

[66] Evans, 'The Years of Arrears,' p. 104.

IV's grant of the lordship of the alien priory of Welles to St Stephen's was intended to pay for obits as well as acting as a mark of royal favour. A part of that gift, the manor of Queen's Court in Kent, which was finally granted in 1488, was worth £26 annually.[67] Edward IV's grants to St Stephen's paralleled his building works at Windsor for St George's in that they were both intended to leave his mark on the royal colleges and so to aid his soul in purgatory. I1507 no reason was given for the grant of the entire estates of the priory of Cold Norton, which the college was to sell after three years.[68] Cold Norton was not an alien priory, but had been surrendered to the Crown on the death of the last prior and so its resources were available for use in the same manner as an alien priory.[69] The grant to St Stephen's was probably related to the setting up of an obit for Henry VII and Elizabeth of York. Royal obits thus were endowed with appropriate religious lands on a lavish scale.

Support from Smaller Donors

From its inception, St Stephen's was envisaged as open to the public and thus had much in common with chantries found in parish churches and other forms of communal religious and social expression. This decision affected the college's resources; it was not a closed off institution. St Stephen's was in part a place of pilgrimage to the image of Our Lady of the Pew.[70] As a result, the college's finances were increased by offerings made there, and by the larger gifts that Marian piety prompted. In addition, it offered chantry functions, similar to a parish church, but with greater staff and liturgical resources. There was no ban on adding to the college's chantry functions, which allowed other individuals to adapt the college's commemorations for themselves. Thus, Edward III envisaged St Stephen's as an institution that would look outwards and be amenable to further development by his successors. As a college founded to pray for the royal dead, St Stephen's found itself praying for a wide variety of benefactors either permanently or temporarily, from bishops, canons and their families to much humbler individuals and those who simply gave lights to the high altar. Rather than found a large, expensive, permanent institution, donors came to prefer supporting existing and stable institutions to ensure the long continuity of their gifts' intercessory powers, whether that was in their parish church or a college such as St Stephen's. These added to the college's resources and obligations either temporarily or permanently. Layfolk could also aid the chapel in ways that did not add to its lands, but showed their commitment to the college, which is the subject of Chapter Eight, in the full context of support, both financial and

---

[67] For Queencourt, *CPR 1485-94*, p. 23; for the March 1463 grant of Welles on condition that the college pray for Edward IV and Elizabeth Woodville, *CPR 1467-77*, p. 163.
[68] *CPR 1494-1509*, p. 544.
[69] 'Houses of Augustinian canons: The priory of Cold Norton,' in *The Victoria County History of the County of Oxford: Volume 2*, ed. William Page, (London: Constable and Company, 1907), pp. 95-97.
[70] The cult of St Mary le Pew is first securely attested in 1356, SC 8/247/12304.

otherwise.[71] This section looks at the landed and monetary support the college received, both from within the college and from the wider lay communities that surrounded it.

The chantries, of which St Stephen's in 1548 had three, were the largest change to the college's structure and lands, as these brought in extra chaplains whose wages the college paid. Chantries tended to be the preserve of the wealthy, since they required enough resources to pay a priest's or priests' wages reliably in perpetuity. Bourgeois chantries, which were often time-limited to five or ten years, seem to have been set up rarely at St Stephen's although it is possible that more existed than were recorded.[72] The chantries known at St Stephen's, those that persisted until their dissolution in 1548, were not routinely recorded in the obit book and cash payments to hire chaplains for a temporary chantry would have been a matter for internal accounting rather than a concern of royal administration. Temporary chantries were often a way of adding to the provision for the cure of souls in a parish setting. A donor would in essence be working with others to pool together enough resources to continue to pay for another priest for the parish.[73] As St Stephen's had minimal cure for souls, the major concern of donors was not for the surrounding community, but for getting access to the college's intercessory powers to aid them in purgatory. Thus a perpetual institution, whether of a chantry or of an obit, would in a sense be the better spiritual investment. One of the few temporary chantries to leave a documentary trace was the request in 1485 by William Chauntre, formerly a canon of the college for a chantry for three years, and then a perpetual obit for himself, his parents and Lord Hastings, his patron.[74] The largest permanent chantry at St Stephen's was that of Bishop William Lyndwood, which brought two chaplains to the college, who in 1548 were each receiving wages of £7 8s 8d. This chantry carried an endowment of 24 marks and was based in the lower chapel of St Mary beneath the Vaults, where Lyndwood himself was buried or possibly in a dedicated chantry chapel.[75] Another chantry priest, that of Master Chatton, was also listed as a clerk, as he was both supporting the chantry and acting as one of the four clerks provided for in the foundation statutes.[76] The chantries thus, stood slightly apart from the college with their own round of masses and priorities, but could very much support the life of the college by helping to provide for staffing.

Obits could come with nearby land, with money or occasionally the college agreed to observe an obit

---

[71] Particularly below, pp. 204-6.
[72] Burgess, 'Strategies for Eternity,' pp. 2-3.
[73] Ibid. pp. 3 and 6.
[74] PROB 11/7/276; all known chantries are tabulated in Table 9.
[75] The indenture between Lyndwood and the college setting up both the chantry and an obit was copied into BL Cotton Faustina B VIII, ff. 33r-34r.
[76] SC 12/6 /62; if it's a misspelling of Canon Richard Hatton, then his obit was kept on 22 May and his 1509 will asked for two chaplains to say masses for him for three years and an obit to be kept thereafter, PROB 11/16/504.

without any attached endowment. The properties given as part of setting up these annual masses tended to be worth about 40s yearly. The least valuable property was a Westminster messuage worth 20s a year, but the canons did not have to pay for the expensive legal formalities to appropriate it. This early gift for the obit of Robert Elmham would barely have covered the cost of the specified payments to each member of the college, which if every member of the college in Edward III's reign was present would have come to 22s 2d.[77] The college either assumed that not everyone would be present and any surplus could be put into the common fund, or that if necessary money could be drawn from the common fund to make up the difference. Most properties, however, amply supported the obit payments laid down by the donors; indeed one property, in the parish of St Anthony's, Cordwainer Street in the city of London supported four obits, including that of the magnate Ralph, lord Cromwell. It was valued at 10 marks annually, more than enough to support the payments of c. 120s annually that the four obits would have required.[78] Henry Merston, a canon of the college, gave £40 for the tenement's repair as part of the agreement which added his obit to the property's obligations.[79] The land in Lambeth is particularly interesting, as it was the gift of a local widow, Margaret Swift, whose connection to the college is otherwise obscure.[80] At other times, the deceased simply gave money to be used to buy land to support their obit, probably because licences to alienate in mortmain were expensive, or they had ready cash to leave, but no suitable property in the near vicinity to the college. Examples of cash values left to the college were in the region of £100, but sometimes donors were more uncertain.[81] The residue of the estate of William Sleaford after funeral and building expenses was to come to the college for an obit. Sleaford's executors finally handed over £50 for an obit; definitely on the lower side of these cash payments, but probably sufficient, given that his obit was established and recorded.[82]

Land Management

The land management of the college, which would have varied according to its needs and interests, was certainly not uniform even in the sixteenth century, when the overall picture is clearest. The first few

---

[77] Calculation as follows: dean and twelve canons each to have 1s, so 13s total; each vicar 6d, so 6 1/2s total; four clerks at 4d each, so 16d total for them; 6 choristers at 2d each are 1s, and then the verger had 4d, Cotton Faustina B VIII, f. 16r.

[78] It supported the obits of Thomas Orgrave from 1425, Thomas, Lord Hungerford from 1428, Henry Merston from 1427, and Ralph, Lord Cromwell from 1437, for the valuation, ibid. f. 8v.

[79] Ibid, f. 18v.

[80] Ibid, f. 34v–36r.

[81] John Gunthorpe in 1498 left 100 marks, *Somerset Medieval Wills (1383–1500),* ed. F. W. Weaver, (London: Somerset Record Society, 1901), p. 360; Adam Chesterfield gave £20, Cotton Faustina B VIII, f. 9v; Nicholas Slake left £110 for his obit in 1418; ibid, f. 13r; Robert Kirkham left 100 marks for an obit in 1471, ibid, f. 36r; others on the obit list such as Thomas Rous or Anthony, lord Rivers whose indentures with the college were not preserved probably also left cash rather than land.

[82] The indenture was made in 1399; Sleaford had died in 1396, Cotton Faustina B VIII, f. 19v.

generations seem to have been rocky, given that in 1377 Bishop Adam Houghton censured the college for poor record keeping and bad financial management.[83] In addition, as mentioned above, the college seemed to be unaware of its financial rights at the Exchequer in the 1350s, perhaps because it was not yet fully functioning in its permanent home. After this time, however, the college seems to have become a tenacious defender of its rights, judging from the ways in which it opposed Richard II and the fifteenth-century lawsuits over rents. To add to the complexity of this issue, between 1396 and 1479 the college was in essence two entities. There is very little evidence for how the college of canons and the sub-college for the vicars and chaplains were financially related, but the sub-college held its own lands and revenues until they were absorbed back into the college when the sub-college was dissolved by Edward IV.[84] The management of those lands would presumably have fallen to the *custos* of the sub-college. Land management in the sixteenth century was subject to the political and religious changes of the day, complicating management of the endowment and prompting new responses to the situation.

In addition to being given lands for particular purposes, often commemorative, St Stephen's actively acquired suitable lands, usually conforming to the more usual pattern of being close to London and Westminster, often for particular purposes. In 1382 several canons used land they had purchased to alleviate the pain caused by the loss of the lands granted by Edward III's will. In 1449 a Ricardian grant to acquire land to the value of 100 marks was confirmed, and in 1457 the college was pardoned for buying land without a licence.[85] These hints suggest that, unlike St George's, the college in the mid-fifteenth century was able to invest cash gifts or income in land and so overcome problems of generally falling rents. These acquisitions were probably in London and Westminster as those areas provided high incomes that were not broken down further in the sixteenth century valuations.[86] St Stephen's also had a history of acquiring urban properties to support obits, and much of the cash being used to build up urban holdings would probably have come from obit agreements, as the college was unlikely to be carrying a surplus of ready cash when it was also struggling with rent arrears. The last grant of a licence to acquire lands was in 1542, possibly related to the foundation of almsrooms by 1547 as there was no

---

[83] The visitation in 1377 censured the recordkeeping and cited the need for a cartulary and an obit-book, C 66/ 298 m. 34; *CPR 1377-81*, p. 57; the creation of the surviving obit book was probably the cause of a lawsuit in the early 1450s, recorded in C 1/17/399; thanks to Maureen Jurkowski for the reference and transcription.

[84] There are two references to the college of vicars in relation to lands after its foundation in 1396 when it was given land along the Thames in *CPR 1392-1396,* p. 669; the first is from 1418 where Nicholas Slake wanted all residue of the income from his endowment to go to the vicars, clerks and choristers in Cotton MS Faustina B VIII, f. 12v; the second is in 1469 when the college alienated a property called 'Le Newe Rente' in Westminster to the vicars' college, *CPR 1467-77*, pp. 150-1.

[85] *CPR 1452-61,* p. 417.

[86] There was a separate inventory listing the London and Westminster properties, which has not survived, SC 12/ 6/ 62.

major acquisition for the college after 1530 and the last known obit agreement was in 1510.[87] The estates can be identified as having been bought by the college as a corporate entity are all from the late fifteenth or early sixteenth centuries, when it bought farms and land in Iwade, Wychling, Codyng, Halstow and Bledlow, Buckinghamshire, to extend its existing holdings in these areas.[88] The almsrooms in 1548 had £64 p.a. provided by rents in Staines, Surrey and the manors of Hall Place and High Graveney, Sussex, and Seche in Norfolk.[89] This new endowment paid for wages and livery for the seven men and one woman who lived there, as well as a gatekeeper and the annuity of Master Reper, the gatekeeper. It is entirely probable that the college had bought and subsequently sold other lands, which are invisible in the records, given that only summaries of the lands currently held in 1360, 1535 and 1548 exist. For example of a sale not known from the royal records, in 1510 St Stephen's sold the estates of Cold Norton Priory to Brasenose College, Oxford for 1,150 marks in cash, probably at the instigation of the former dean, William Smith, founder of Brasenose.[90]

The interplay between the college's early carelessness, its later care and the collaborative approach to the endowment can be seen in the history of its exemption from clerical taxation and exemptions from local tolls and dues. This status was granted by letters patent twice, once in 1351 and then again in 1352. It then, however was disputed, since the 1356 petition to the king also mentioned exemption from taxation as something that the college was seeking.[91] The pipe rolls also suggest that the scope and nature of this exemption was under negotiation in Edward III's reign, since the college was evidently refusing to pay the tenths of some of the Yorkshire churches, which appeared as unpaid debts on the sheriff's accounts.[92] A petition to Richard II followed in 1381, at a time when a clerical subsidy had been voted and the vicars were taxed.[93] In each case, the college was granted exemption from ecclesiastical taxation, but the college had to defend this right again later. In 1465 Edward IV confirmed their privileges, presumably at the college's request, as the exemption from taxation had not been used.[94] Yet St

---

[87] *L & P Henry VIII 1542*, no. 71 (35); Cotton MS Faustina B VIII, f. 51; having said that there are no known obits after 1510, Henry VIII's obit was paid for by the Court of Augmentations in SC/ 6/12/62 in 1548.

[88] These lands are identified as having been bought by the college. Iwade was purchased in 20 Henry VII (1505), Wyching in 9 Henry VIII (1518), Codyng in 2 Richard III (1484), Halstowe in 10 Henry VIII (1519), and the lands 'late of Hitchcockes' in 22 Henry VIII (1530), SC 12/6 /62.

[89] *Chantry Certificate*, pp. 79-80.

[90] Oxford, Brasenose College Archives, Cold Norton Charters 38.

[91] SC 8/274/12304.

[92] E 372/216; this was also at stake in 1395 when the college was charged £8 15 s 4d for the Yorkshire churches, E 179/67/22 m. 27.

[93] SC 8/174/8679; E 179/ 44/ 347.

[94] The college was taxed in 1450, E 179/52/207; then in 1465 the re-grant of exemption from taxation by Edward IV is *CPR 1461-67*, p. 455; this grant is then referred to in all subsequent writs of supersedeas that survived, for example a Henry VII writ of supersedeas from 1494 exempting the college from taxation in Dorset, E 179/ 363/ 301; or also from Dorset in Richard III's reign, E 179/ 363/ 290.

Stephen's only appears once in the fine rolls for unpaid taxation, in 1437 for the rectory of Frampton, which they were then in the process of appropriating.[95] In 1406, the vicars choral were taxed as unbeneficed clergy, rather than benefiting from the college's immunity as they were to do in most other grants of taxation.[96] In the late fifteenth century, however, the college received exemption from local tolls in York as a consequence of their royal privileges. In September 1483 both John Crosier and Richard Robert showed that since they held land of the dean and college that they should be free of local taxation in the form of tolls.[97] The survival of the York city government records for this period allows this observation of collegiate privileges in practice, and reminds us of that St Stephen's would have thus offered its tenants potentially useful economic advantages, even if it did not seem to have been not aggressively defending its own tax-exempt status between 1380 and 1465.

The variety and the dispersal of St Stephen's lands and rights meant that it practiced both direct and indirect management of its estates. In its oversight and responsibility, however, the college looks conventional and similar to other colleges. The internal accounting system may well have been like that of St George's, where resident canons took turns as treasurer, steward and precentor of the college.[98] A similar system was followed at St Mary's, Warwick and other institutions. The office of treasurer as chief financial officer is attested in the various surviving agreements for obits.[99] In the pipe rolls, a steward occurred in 1390.[100] Occasionally the two roles may have been conflated; William Beverley mislaid £84 4s as either steward or treasurer and his executors were sued by the dean and canons for its recovery.[101] The accounting system persisted through to 1548, when both the treasurer and steward received extra wages and expenses, but there was no reference to the precentor.[102] The precentor is harder to track, as he would be involved mainly with chapel expenses and account to the treasurer, rather than do anything that the Exchequer or the Crown would be interested in; therefore there are few references to him.[103] The usual division of labour would be the treasurer as primary financial officer, with the steward as

---

[95] *CFR 1430-37*, pp. 325 and 335.

[96] For the vicars choral being taxed, E 179/42/49; my thanks to Maureen Jurkowski for the reference.

[97] *The York House Books 1461- 1490,* ed. Lorraine. C. Attreed, 2 vols. (Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1991) ii, pp. 726-8.

[98] Evans, 'Years of Arrears', p. 50

[99] In every surviving indenture, the treasurer is responsible for paying out the requisite sums to the members of the college, and for responsibly using any residue as directed by the giver of the obit; Cotton MS Faustina B VIII ff. 8-53.

[100] William Hannay as steward received £17 17s 3d of the £35 14s 7d that the college was supposed to receive from the fee-farm of York, E 372/ 240 rot. 10.

[101] Beverley died in 1395 and the case was heard in 1398, CP 40/550, rot. 302; my thanks to Dr Hannes Kleineke for the reference.

[102] The treasurer's wage for his position was 100s, and the steward received £7 10s, not including travel expenses of £8 15s 8d, SC 12/6 / 62.

[103] For the precentor's role at St George's, Roberts, *St George's,* p. 80; A 1493 court case discusses payments to the precentor or the sacristan, C 146/6940.

responsible for receiving income and organising leases. This would explain why the steward occurs only in documents dealing with the receipt of revenues by the college. Whether the steward's position was continuously filled or regularly rotated may be open to question, as the dean in some years received the money from York's fee-farm and Robert Congham, probably as steward, received the Exchequer receipts for several years in the late 1360s.[104] The principle was one of collective financial management, where no one individual was responsible over the long term for the financial health of the college. The work of the officials would then be checked by the auditors, two canons and the dean, who approved all expenditure.[105]

While the internal management looked conventional, it overlaid a variety of approaches in the various lands and revenues that the college had. Some of this was of course conditioned by the type of revenues the college had from the start. It would be hard to have an active interest in the management of the London governmental rents, for example, not least because the Crown was paying for upkeep.[106] The general principle from the start seems to have been to farm or lease out lands in return for a steady income, because of the distances involved, unlike at St George's where leases longer than five years were forbidden by the statutes.[107] In Yorkshire, with its advowsons, a receiver collected the money due to the college and brought it to London, but in Kent or elsewhere with manorial rights such as at Frampton in Dorset, the college employed bailiffs and stewards to look after its rights and deal with leases, repairs and so forth.[108] The steward would then be responsible for checking up on their work, and so would draw travel expenses. Further afield, farming out lands seems to have been the custom from the very beginning, because of the practical difficulties of trying to oversee collegiate rights in Yorkshire from London. While there is no direct evidence for this system, the remarkably stable value of the Yorkshire churches throughout their association with St Stephen's suggests that the college was leasing out the collection of tithes and other rights in return for steady income right from the start, and thus giving up the chance for more substantial profits to the lessee.[109] At St George's, moreover, the chapter had from

---

[104] Robert Congham received money from York's fee farm from 1365 to 1370, E 372/211-15; the dean received the money from 1371 to 1374, E 372/217-19; some years who was given the money was not recorded, so this is an unreliable method of identifying the steward, but I would expect that the steward should normally be the one dealing with both the fee-farms and the Exchequer annuities.

[105] The dean, John Chambre and the two canons auditor authorised valuations, SC 12/6 /62.

[106] Canons involved in the Wardrobe in Edward III's reign included William Cusance, William Beverley, John Buckingham, William Mulsho, James Beauford. Richard Ravenser was Queen Philippa's receiver in the 1350s and 1360s.

[107] For example, in 1548 Winchfield in Dorset had an eighty-year lease from 21 Edward IV, SC 12/6 /62; at St George's, 'Statutes of St George's,' p. 17.

[108] Their wages appear in SC 12/6 /62; the customary of the manors of Ashford and Elmham as agreed in 1516 survives in a later copy in BL Additional MS 28530, ff. 17-21.

[109] For example, Dewsbury Minster in 1348 was worth 100 marks, or £66 6s 8d annually, the same value as in 1360. In 1548 its farmed value was £50 annually, SC 12/6 /62.

the start leased out their most distant property, Deddington Castle in Oxfordshire, which was considerably closer to Windsor than the Wakefield-area churches were to Westminster.[110] The unusualness of these types of lease rather than direct management at this point is suggested by the care that the college took to have an early lease of London property authenticated by royal authority on the patent roll. This serves as an example of the type of lease that would have been then in use, a life-long interest in the house, which reverted to the dean and college two years after Giles Holbech, then sheriff of London, died.[111] Leases had been found to be more practical and easier to manage than trying to directly run a dispersed estate when the canons were all busy men with other tasks.

When the leases were too complicated or too distant to be managed directly, the college appointed receivers and bailiffs. As most of the evidence for their activities comes from the three sixteenth-century valuations, their earlier activities can only be surmised, and were necessarily partially political. A Westminster man, John Henbury, was bailiff for the college's Lambeth lands in the 1520s, and ended up in debt to the college, probably for rent arrears.[112] The bailiffs in Kent dealt with both manorial rights and complex tenures.[113] In Kent in the sixteenth century, bailiffs also dealt with the newly granted fairs, which usually were highly profitable for manorial lords, at Elham and Ashford. Frampton in Dorset also had a fair.[114] In this way, the college in the sixteenth century aggressively sought stronger exploitation of its rights on its land, at a time when it was also expanding its landed endowment by purchases in the same area.[115] For example, in Ashford, in addition to the leases of the demesne lands worth £22 5s 8d in 1548, the college received various other sets of fees including 20s for the farm of 'stalls of fish' for a total of £57 16s 7 3/4d.[116] This type of income outweighed by far the standard leases, and showed the college and its servants carefully tracking and exploiting their rights. The material for Ashford is unusually detailed, but it would have been a similar story elsewhere in Kent and at Frampton in Dorset. The Reformation also had an effect on the choice of Yorkshire receivers. In the 1548 Valor the receiver of the Yorkshire churches was Sir Arthur Darcy; the receiver in the chantry certificate was Sir John Constable. Both were from Yorkshire, so were partially chosen for their closeness to the relevant estates.

---

[110] Roberts, *St George's*, pp. 17-18.
[111] *CPR 1358-1361* p. 568.
[112] The case is not dated, but is addressed to Thomas Wolsey as Lord Chancellor and Cardinal Legate, C 1/517/57.
[113] One example of the complexity of tenure in Kent is a dispute over the college's possessions in Ashford in relation to those of the prior and convent of Christ Church Canterbury in 1522-28. One of the questions was about the jurisdiction of the college's court in Ashford, London, Lambeth Palace Library MS CM XVI/ 2-6.
[114] *L & P Henry VIII 1533*, no. 300 (1).
[115] Iwade and Halstowe were very close to the existing holding of Mere, part of Edward III's bequest, Wichling was south of that group, and north of Langley by Leeds and Colbridge. Codyng was unusually isolated, lying on the southern Kent coast.
[116] SC 12/6 /62.

Constable was possibly Catholic and certainly out of favour at the court of Protector Somerset, while Darcy was in November 1551 to be made Lieutenant of the Tower of London.[117] In 1548 his older brother George Darcy had been re-granted their father's barony, lost through attainder as a result of the Pilgrimage of Grace.[118] This may be a small hint that the college was responding by disassociating itself from a known Catholic, and paying wages of 100s to Darcy, who seems to have been in greater royal favour.

Wider political and economic conditions had particular impact on revenue, mitigated either by new gifts of land by the king or by acquiring new lands. In the fifteenth century, like other religious institutions, the college seems to have struggled with rent arrears and collecting what it was owed. Unlike in the fourteenth century, when arrears were probably tied to the legal difficulties the college faced over their Kent estates, in the fifteenth century the arrears were part of more general economic problems.[119] However, it was in better shape than St George's, where significant problems emerged as the value of its lands decreased.[120] The only sign of this occurring at St Stephen's is incidental. In 1398 Richard II issued letters patent saying that the foundation has been completed and that the income was £510.[121] The problem with this patent is that the value of the lands the college held at Edward III's death should have been slightly more than this amount.[122] This discrepancy suggests that the income received from the various lands had significantly decreased in those twenty years. In addition, the numbers in the debt cases from the 1450s to the end of the century were considerably larger than previously, which suggests that the college was struggling in a period of economic and political instability to collect what it was owed.[123] In 1451 a tenant of Fenstaunton, one of the churches only appropriated in 1413, owed £80 to

---

[117] C.J. Black, 'Sir John Constable (by 1491-1554/56), of Kinoulton, Notts.' in *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1509-1558*, ed. S.T. Bindoff, (London, 1982); BL Harley MS 284 f. 94 for Arthur Darcy's appointment as lieutenant of the Tower of London in 1551.

[118] R. W. Hoyle, 'Darcy, Thomas, Baron Darcy of Darcy (*b.* in or before 1467, *d.* 1537)', *ODNB.*

[119] John Hatcher, 'The Great Slump of the Mid-Fifteenth Century' in *Progress and Problems in Medieval England,* eds. Richard H. Britnell & John Hatcher, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) pp. 247 and 253 on the impact on rents and p. 242 on the wool trade.

[120] On loss of income from Cambridgeshire and Scottish advowsons, see Evans*,* 'Years of Arrears', p. 19.

[121] *CPR 1396-99*, p. 316; also published in William Dugdale et al., *Monasticon Anglicanum: a History of the Abbies and other Monasteries, Hospitals, Frieries, and Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, with their Dependencies, in England and Wales,* 6 vols. (London: Longman, 1818-30), vi, pp. 1352-3.

[122] The value of the college's lands at the end of Richard II's reign should have been the c. £450 at the end of Edward III's reign plus £200 for the Kentish lands, to give a conservative total of £650. This does not include lands from obit agreements, Winchfield, the houses of the Wool Staple or any Exchequer payments. However, the issue roll for 19 Richard II says that in the 1390s the value of the Kentish lands was £111, E 403/554 m. 15; in short, there must have been a serious fall in the values of rents, and substantial arrears. Unfortunately the patent only details the Kentish lands, not the rest of the college's possessions, as published in *Monasticon,* vi, pp. 1352-3.

[123] These cases must represent arrears built up over a long time, *CPR 1476- 1485*, p. 291 re. debt of 253l 6s 8d; *CPR 1467-1477,* p. 79 concerned £40; ibid, p. 147 concerned £34.

the college.[124] The houses of the Wool Staple in London seem to have been particularly unstable and at least once the college was actually given wool instead of cash as payment in kind.[125] Arrears there also had a tendency to build up. [126] In the 1370s the wool houses were expected to produce £66 6s 8d annually, but in 1436 the college complained that it was only receiving 20s from the Wool Staple.[127] In the sixteenth century, the college was twice granted licence to make large-scale repairs at its own cost, suggesting that the houses had again been allowed to decline in value.[128] The increase in the college's financial resources in the sixteenth century came from the renewed profitability of its existing lands and new acquisitions.

The college was in extremely good shape financially in the sixteenth century. The 1535 Valor shows that the college had a particularly large nominal surplus annually of roughly 40% of its income.[129] In all of the sixteenth-century documents, the college on paper received surplus income annually, and that money would have then been kept against need with a dividend of profits to the canons.[130] The college's use of that money did not concern the Crown; the Crown wanted to know the excess that was available for taxation. The lack of rent arrears cases appearing in the patent rolls at this time suggests as well that the college was not facing arrears that would offset the projected surplus. Only the 1548 *Valor*, however, noted occasionally where properties were empty, so it is possible that the college was not receiving the full value of its lands each year as the surviving valuations tracked the nominal farmed value of the land the college owned rather than the income the land was producing. This possibility might then explain why in 1548 the college was valued both at £1080 19s 1 3/4d and £995 19s 10 1/2d. The first number probably reflected the value of all the lands when they were fully leased out, and the second the actual income of the college for the year just past. The first number would be the taxation value that would aim to cover all the value of the lands, whereas the second gives the income that Edward VI could expect

---

[124] *CPR 1447-52,* p. 483.
[125] E 403/ 447 m. 20.
[126] Evidence of this can be seen in the arrears of c. £50 in E 403/ 447 m. 20, and E 403/ 452 m. 26; the college handed back the Wool Staple houses by 1437 when they were granted out again, *CPR 1436-1441*, p. 123; however, in 1443 the houses of the Staple were returned to the college as part of an obit agreement, *CPR 1441-1446*, p. 143; they were a major reason for the grant of the priory of Frampton in Dorset, see above on alien priories, pp. 56-8.
[127] *CPR 1436-41,* p. 125.
[128] There is no indication of their value at this time; and the houses of the Wool Staple are not singled out in any of the sixteenth century valuations of the college's possessions. Repairs were granted in 1521, *L & P Henry VIII 1519-21,* no. 1163; and again in 1529, *L & P Henry VIII 1529-30*, no. 5663.
[129] The *Valor* has a clear remainder of £458 4s 10 ½ d, out of an income of £1085 10s ¼ d. The deductions allowed, however, were mostly for wages and no other expenses, *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, i, pp. 428-9; the two 1548 valuations had a wider variety of allowed deductions which makes straight comparisons tricky.
[130] In theory the canons were sharing out profits of about £15 each or a total of £180. This still allowed some money to be kept for extraordinary expenses. This is based on the difference between the chantry certificate and the Valor. In the chantry certificate, the canons wages were each £37 15s 4d, *Chantry Certificate*, p. 79; the other 1548 valuation had wages

immediately from the lands he had just acquired. The very slight differences in deductions taken, £798 0s 2 3/4d compared to £791 10s 17 1/4d, reflected the differences between actual expenses of a given year and the expected values. If true, these figures imply that the chantry commissioners were given the recent set of documents relating to the year which ended in 1547 when they asked for the information early in 1548, and that the college's ideal material had been handed over to the Crown slightly earlier.[131]

In addition to income, St Stephen's also had obligations to other individuals and institutions, which add to the picture already developed of its associations with other houses such as the brief connection to Brasenose College, and the local men who administered its estates, whether in Lambeth or in Yorkshire, and their tenants. Not all of those connections' meanings can be reconstructed, but it is worth noting that the financial obligations might or might not go alongside other points of contact, particularly with other ecclesiastical institutions. Most of the evidence for the connections created by financial obligations comes from the sixteenth century, such as the rent owed yearly to Thomas, lord Berkeley for Buckinghamshire lands.[132] This type of small 'rent resolute' seems to have acted as a reminder of the former history of the land, with former owners keeping a nominal interest, even as the land changed hands. There were also institutional connections. From the fourteenth century St Stephen's was theoretically responsible for a five mark pension to Westminster Abbey, which was rarely if ever paid.[133] The connection to Westminster Abbey was a complicated one, and one of its most visible effects was in the unenforced pension requirement, because the college could flout what it saw as unimportant. Henry VII then built on that existing connection when he bound together St Martin le Grand, St Stephen's and other houses to pay for his new Lady Chapel at Westminster, and to pay pensions towards the services there.[134] Here, a major donor was partially appropriating income to his particular project from other institutions, while also getting them to pray for him themselves. Similarly, Henry VI had given a small rent to Eton College that came from the rights of St Stephen's to the rectory of Bledlow, which probably

of £23 15s 4d for each canon, SC 12/6 /62.

[131] The chantry certificate's description of the college as the 'late' college, as well as its identification of only eleven canons rather than the twelve of SC 12/6 /62 suggests that it was made after SC 12/6 /62, but they were certainly made within a few months of each other at most, *Chantry Certificate*, p. 79; SC 12/6 /62.

[132] SC 12/ 6/ 62; Fenstaunton is a good example because the manor belonged first to the Mowbray family, earls of Nottingham and then dukes of Norfolk, of whom Thomas Mowbray gave the church to St Stephen's in 1394. The manor passed to the Berkeley family by 1504; 'Parishes: Fen Stanton', in *The Victoria County History of the County of Huntingdon: Volume Two,* eds. William Page, Granville Proby & S. Inskip Ladds, (London: St Catherine's Press, 1932), pp. 280-28.

[133] The payment was created in 1394 when agreement in a long-running dispute was finally reached, Cotton MS Faustina A III, f. 310r; and for the lack of payment, the abbey's receivers' accounts for 1520-30, in which f. 32v with a heading 'Collegium St Steph[an]i' is always blank, WAM 33270-79.

[134] The elaborate system of indentures is discussed in Margaret Condon, 'God Save the King! Piety, Propaganda, and the Perpetual Memorial', in *Westminster Abbey: The Lady Chapel of Henry VII*, ed. Tim Tatton-Brown and Richard Mortimer, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), pp. 59-97.

reflected an earlier obligation to the Crown for the land, but which was then turned into 7s of income for Eton.[135] The dissolution of the monasteries after 1536 did not affect the college's financial obligations but merely changed the payees. The 66s 8d paid to Castleacre Priory for Gayton Manor in 1535 was converted to a payment to the king of the same amount in the same way that the pension to Westminster Abbey became a pension for the dean and chapter of Westminster.[136]

Conclusions

St Stephen's endowment was never static. It changed and adapted to suit new needs, new perceptions of religious benefits, and political and economic change. It was also never solely the work of one donor or the college alone, but was instead a collaborative endeavour throughout the college's existence. Kings, laymen, canons, and others might grant lands and privileges, but those then had to be accepted and maintained by the college, such as in 1413 when the then dean, Nicholas Slake, finally succeeded in fully appropriating churches that had been granted by Edward III almost fifty years earlier.[137] Endowments could easily decay, so it was to St Stephen's great good fortune that its canons were committed to its maintenance, that the kings of England were committed to its continuance and that it was able to attract support throughout the difficult years in the fifteenth century, before emerging to economic vitality on the eve of the Reformation in the sixteenth century. As the larger economy and religious politics changed, St Stephen's was lucky enough and shrewd enough to change with them. Without knowing the minutiae of the college's balance sheets and without insight into the yearly expenditure, it is hard to track specific decisions, policies or whether income and expenditure balanced in any given year, but the overall picture is clear. The experience of other colleges shows that its vitality was not a foregone conclusion, but one that had been worked at by many individuals. Between the early foundational documents and the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* was not a smooth story of acquisitions or losses, but one of changing responses to economic and political circumstances, and of sustained commitment to St Stephen's offerings of prayer. Many other colleges were not as spectacularly successful, although they too probably had more complicated histories than the two sets of numbers suggest, with the endowment in a sense acting as a proxy for the commitment of the institution and its patrons, both large and small, to its continued existence and success.

---

[135] SC 12/ 6/62.
[136] Quitrent to the king of £3 6s 8d, *Chantry Certificate*, p. 77; for the dean and chapter, ibid, p. 78.
[137] *CPR 1409-13*, pp. 465-6.

Chapter Three: Continuing Royal Patronage at St Stephen's College, 1377-1527

St Stephen's relationships with every English king from Richard II to Henry VIII were conditioned by its location and function within the Palace of Westminster as the king's main chapel there. The patronage at St Stephen's suggests possibilities for a more nuanced and collaborative understanding of ecclesiastical foundations and the maintenance of institutions by lay patrons. Individual institutions associated with or founded by particular monarchs have been well studied, and there are ample studies of the patronage of individual kings as a whole, but St Stephen's appears rather different from the usual patterns of support given its ongoing and collaborative relationship with successive kings.[1] The 1512-13 fire in the palace, which has been seen as ending Westminster's role as a royal residence, did not end St Stephen's associations with the king, but instead may have spurred further works.[2] In addition, precisely because it was within the palace, the chapel remained a canvas for royal self-representation, alongside Westminster Abbey.[3] In order to assess St Stephen's place within English kingship and the various agencies at work in creating St Stephen's as a royally supported institution, this chapter looks at three elements of royal

---

[1] Studies of specific kings at specific institutions include Kate Selway, 'The Role of Eton College and King's College, Cambridge in the Polity of the Lancastrian Monarchy,' (DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1993); on St Mary Graces and its relationships with Edward III and then Richard II, Ian Grainger and Christopher Phillpotts, *The Cistercian Abbey of St Mary Graces, East Smithfield, London* (London: Museum of London, 2011); Paul Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power 1200-1400,* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995); and for the later period, Thomas Cocke, 'Henry VII Chapel: The Royal Connection,' in *Westminster Abbey: The Lady Chapel of Henry VII*, eds. Tim Tatton-Brown & Richard Mortimer (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2003), pp. 315-25; Margaret Beaufort's involvement at Tattershall is discussed in Michael K. Jones & Malcolm G. Underwood, *The King's Mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 131-2; for the pattern of indifference to St George's before Edward IV, see A. K. B. Evans, 'The Years of Arrears: Financial Problems of the College of St George in the Fifteenth Century,' in *St George's Chapel, Windsor in the Late Middle Ages*, eds. Colin Richmond & Eileen Scarff, (Windsor: for the Dean and Chapter, 2001), pp. 93-105.

For overarching studies of particular monarchs and the Church, often with comments on their personal sense of piety, see for example, Christopher Phillpotts, 'Richard II and the Monasteries of London' in *Fourteenth Century England VII,* ed. W. Mark Ormrod, (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2012), pp. 197-224; Richard G. Davies, 'Richard II and the Church in the Years of Tyranny,' *Journal of Medieval History* 1 (1975), pp. 329–362; and Alison K. McHardy, 'Religion, Court Culture and Propaganda: The Chapel Royal in the Reign of Henry V,' in *Henry V: New Interpretations,* ed. Gwilym Dodd, (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2013), pp. 131-56.

For more comparative approaches see: on the three Edwards' use of religion to project images of piety, W. Mark Ormrod, 'The English Monarchy and the Promotion of Religion in the Fourteenth Century' in *Religion und Politik im Mittelalter: Deutschland und England im Vergleich,* eds. Ludger Körntgen & Dominik Waßenhoven, (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013), pp. 205-18; on the limited theme of patronage, Joel T. Rosenthal, 'Kings, Continuity and Ecclesiastical Benefaction in Fifteenth Century England,' in *People, Politics and Community in the Later Middle Ages,* eds. Joel T. Rosenthal and Colin Richmond, (Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1987), pp. 161-75; for a later period remembering the three Edwards, Charles Farris, 'The New Edwardians? Royal Piety in the Yorkist Age,' in *The Yorkist Age: Proceedings of the 2011 Harlaxton Symposium,* eds. Hannes Kleineke & Christian Steer, (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2013), pp. 44-63.

[2] David Starkey, 'Court, Council, and Nobility in Tudor England,' in *Princes, Patronage and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age, c. 1450-1650*, eds. Ronald G. Asch and Adolf M. Birke, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 180.

[3] The concentration of administrative and judicial functions at Westminster helped to transform Westminster Abbey into a political cult centre because it was so near the stable centre of power, Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets,* pp. 4-6.

interaction with the chapel and the college. This chapter first surveys the known building campaigns to construct a model of the ways in which kings chose to visibly and permanently associate themselves with the college and how they did it. Second, it turns to the smaller gifts, and evidence for the use of St Stephen's by kings for worship, to see how it had become customary and routine to support the college. As part of understanding the agencies at work, this chapter finally examines the roles offered to the king's female relatives in the chapel, and whether they were, as Laynesmith has suggested, simply acting as proxies for the king and his kingship or whether they were making independent pious choices to support and care for the college.[4] In all of these aspects there are substantial questions of agency at work in this chapter, as the college was not simply a passive recipient of royal largess, but rather was capable of requesting, as the dean and canons did many times, royal support or acquiescence to their own plans.[5] Their efforts were also complicated by the king's plans for the surrounding palace more generally.

St Stephen's and its continental equivalents, the Sainte Chapelle and Aachen, are usually analysed in terms of its connection to royal visual magnificence, and the imagery on their walls as set by their founders, rather than as a collaborative, developing and changing set of institutions in which kingship could be articulated and associated with the Roman Church. Since the discussions of sacral kingship by Kantorowicz, the images and liturgy at these colleges have been analysed in terms of kings having a special relationship with God through consecration.[6] Rice has seen in the liturgy of Aachen the use of Charlemagne as comparison with the current Holy Roman Emperor.[7] At the Sainte Chapelle, it took on a further dimension, of the founder as both saint and king commemorated by later generations, an ambiguity gestured to by Cohen.[8] Jordan has seen the culmination of a French programme of sacral and biblical kingship in the windows of the Sainte Chapelle a century before the college of St Stephen was founded, a programme of which the English kings would have been aware.[9] The imagery on the walls of St Stephen's also spoke of the same types of dynastic and genealogical concerns as the windows of the Sainte Chapelle. The choices made to show Edward III, Philippa and their children meant that the

---

[4] Joanna Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship 1445-1503,* (Oxford: OUP, 2004), p. 26; also see her discussion of piety and queens' involvement with college foundations and support, ibid, pp. 252-8.

[5] Petitions coved a range of issues from requests for land to be granted to the college to freedoms from clerical taxation, SC 8/174/ 8679, SC 8/170/ 8490, SC 8/ 247/12304, SC 8/150/ 7498 A-B; there are also individual requests relating to St Stephen's such as John Henley's petition concerning land he intended to grant to the college c. 1391 but was frustrated by Westminster Abbey, SC 8/116/5760; my thanks to Simon Neal for his transcriptions of these documents.

[6] Ernest Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology,* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957).

[7] Eric Rice, *Music and Ritual at Charlemagne's Marienkirche in Aachen,* (Berlin: Merseburger, 2009), p. 68.

[8] Meredith Cohen, *The Sainte Chapelle and the Construction of Sacral Monarchy: Royal Architecture in Thirteenth Century Paris,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), p. 168; she also gestures towards the importance of the institution, but never fully explores the interactions between liturgy, the king and the college, ibid, p. 152.

[9] Alyce A. Jordan, *Visualising Kingship in the Windows of the Sainte-Chapelle of Paris* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002) pp. 26-28.

imagery of the chapel continued to have relevance through to the Tudor period.[10] Both the Lancastrian and Yorkist kings looked back, as it happened, to Edward III for their claims on the English throne, through his sons, arrayed in armour behind their father. The accident of history, as well as Edward's concern for both his lineage through the Black Prince and the display of his successful family meant that the murals continued to have dynastic meaning through to the end of the college's existence. The murals also created a direct relationship between the king and the communion of saints through St George's intervention on the same plane of existence as Edward III, leading him towards the altar and the Virgin.[11] This personal piety, commemorated on the walls of the chapel, also continued to have meaning for Edward's successors. Richard II's personal religious devotions to the saints, to the Virgin Mary in particular, shaped much of his royal self-presentation, including in the most famous image of him in the Wilton Diptych, which mirrors the concerns showed in the altar murals for the personal relationship of the king, and through him the kingdom, to the saints, and particularly the Virgin.[12] Later kings also followed this lead. Henry VI's devotion to Edward the Confessor and his sense of publically dynastic religion created the new collegiate foundations of Eton and King's College Cambridge in part on the model of St Stephen's.[13] This chapter ends when the ideas of the communion of saints and the importance of a Catholic royal piety were being questioned in the late 1520s on the eve of the English Reformation.

Building Campaigns

The most visible and expensive way for the king to assert his involvement with the college conventionally identified as his college in his palace of Westminster was to be involved with building works there. Both major and minor alterations and repairs are known to have been carried out on the buildings and grounds of the college throughout its existence. Some of these were responses to structural changes to the college, others to the changing needs of the royal palace and still more to dilapidation and the needs of the college's staff. The first major project that we know of comes in the 1380s and the last in the 1520s at the latest, so nearly spanning the full range of dates in which the college was active. In all the building campaigns, there was interplay between the royal will, royal images of generous kingship and

---

[10] The fragments of wall paintings from St Stephen's that survive are in the British Museum, 1814,0312.2. The latest discussion of the altar-wall paintings is Emily Howe, 'Divine Kingship and Dynastic Display: The Altar Wall Murals of St Stephen's Chapel, Westminster,' *Antiquaries Journal* 81(2001), pp. 259-304; also James Hillson, 'St Stephen's Chapel, Westminster: Architecture, Decoration and Politics in the Reigns of Henry III and the three Edwards (1227-1363),' (PhD thesis, University of York, 2015), pp. 198-202.

[11] Howe, 'Altar Wall Murals', p. 259.

[12] Nigel Saul, *Richard II,* (New Haven: Yale, 1997), pp. 304-5.

[13] Selway, 'Eton and King's College,' p. 3; Maurice Hastings, *St Stephen's Chapel and its Place in the Development of Perpendicular Style in England,* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1955), p. 103.

patronage, the needs and desires of the dean and canons, and finally the wider surrounding context of Westminster Palace. This probably helps to account for the continuing royal interest in and concern for the college. It was never an institution separate from the king, because of its position within Westminster. This section of the chapter sets out the site of the college within the palace and then discusses the various ways in which English kings involved themselves with building and rebuilding St Stephen's as both an act of conspicuous piety and as part of royal ceremonial. The chapel never served just the college itself. There were strong links with the Chapel Royal, the itinerant chapel that accompanied the king, and evidence of individuals worshiping in the chapel before Parliaments, or generally when within Westminster. The accessibility to both the royal family and to outside individuals of the court or even casual visitors made the chapel and the college that served the chapel an important tool for projecting an image of royal power and majesty.[14] This section sets out a model of how the king could visually and in terms of his architecture display his piety and interest in St Stephen's. However, at all times, it was in partnership with the college. Canons of the college were involved in the campaigns to finish the buildings in the 1350s.[15] Later building work was sometimes done on the initiative of or paid for by the college's then canons, but royal approval and involvement were always necessary, precisely because of the royal palatial context.

First, it is necessary to establish the parameters of the college's physical site and the points at which there is evidence for that site, whether in the surviving fabric or from documentary sources. The boundaries of the residential site, as opposed to the land leased out in Westminster, changed little. The college controlled the Thames riverfront, originally from the chapel itself north to the Receipt of the Exchequer and then on the other side of Bridge Street, from the Clock Tower north towards what would later become Whitehall. In 1396, Richard II extended this southward, from the chapel to the Marcolf Chamber underneath the Painted Chamber.[16] This land always seems to have been a garden, although it also contained at least one house in the fifteenth century, which did not belong to the college.[17] No further additions of land were made, but re-organisations of the space seem to have occurred. In 1355 the canons and probably the vicars were living in houses along the riverfront between the chapel and the

[14] It is generally asserted that the upper chapel was reserved for the College and the Royal family. Chapter Six will deal with this issue, as the evidence is considerably more complex, and suggests that there was access for pilgrims to the upper chapel, pp. 173-4.

[15] Canons who were clerk or controller of works at Westminster included Adam Chesterfield, William Cusance, William Hannay, William Lambhith, William Rothwell, and Martin Ixnyng, see their biographies in the appendices and discussion below, pp. 144-5.

[16] *CPR 1392-96*, p. 669.

[17] Ibid; C.L. Kingsford, 'Our Lady of the Pew. The King's Oratory or Closet in the Palace of Westminster,' *Archaeologia*, 68 (1917), p. 3.

Receipt of the Exchequer, and the cloister was probably in the same position that it occupies today, to the north of the chapel.[18] The next point at which we have substantial information about the college's physical layout and appearance is in 1394, when the site is described in an agreement made with Westminster Abbey concerning the jurisdiction of the dean.[19] In this indenture, the canons' houses had been moved northward to what would become known as Canon Row, and their original houses along the river frontage rebuilt, along with the cloister, for the vicars.[20] In addition to the long series of royal involvements with the fabric of the college creating relevant records, we also have curious lacunae, particularly towards the end of the college's existence. There are no records of the building of the current sixteenth-century cloister, so all speculation about its dating come from stylistic and heraldic evidence, rather than any building accounts or indentures.[21] Beyond the cloister, the creation of the final collegiate complex is complicated to reconstruct, since grants and re-grants of the site allowed the chance for unrecorded alterations to the various buildings.[22] In addition, all of the extant drawings of the palace from the river are from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, after a century of alterations to suit various post-collegiate occupants of the riverside frontage. White it is entirely possible that some of the buildings in the Wyngaerde and Hollar engravings were originally those of the college, it is impossible to be certain. In addition, because of the loss of the valuation and rental of the college's Westminster holdings referred to in the Chantry Certificate, we have no secure way of understanding the college's site on the eve of dissolution.[23] All we know comes from later references as the lands and site were granted out piecemeal to royal favourites, and after 1572 on the death of the last private grantee, the Exchequer expanded into the buildings formerly of St Stephen's.[24]

The king most visibly involved in rebuilding parts of St Stephen's was Richard II, who added the porch to the chapel and then paid for the building of the vicars' houses and the new cloisters. Between 1384 and 1396 successive clerks of the royal works at Westminster accounted for the various aspects of rebuilding the college, including three canons of the college, William Hannay, William Dionys and John Godmanston, as part of their wider duties for the Works in the Palace of Westminster and the Tower of

---

[18] The canons seem to be living in the earlier houses in the area of the cloister in 1355 when the land for the cloister and 'maisons busoigenables et necessa[i]r[e]s' was requested, SC 8/ 247/12304; repairs to the houses of the king's chaplains occur in E 101/469/19 (1334-5), E 101/470/5 (1338-9) and E 101/470/7 (1339-40); my thanks to Dr Maureen Jurkowski for these references; the dean's house was being built in 1356, in E 101/472/4.

[19] The agreement exists in BL Cotton MS Faustina A III, ff. 293r- 314r; as well as in copies in the Patent Rolls, C 66/341 mm. 26-24, calendared in *CPR 1391-96*, p. 553; and in the abbey records, WAM Muniment Book 12 ff. 74r-84v.

[20] The new locations of the canons' houses are given in Cotton MS Faustina A III ff. 296r-298r.

[21] See below on why the cloisters are undocumented beyond Stow's late sixteenth century comments, pp. 78-9.

[22] See Chapter Four for details, pp. 128-9.

[23] Mentioned in *Chantry Certificate,* p. 80.

[24] As can be seen in Howard Colvin, 'Views of the Old Palace of Westminster', *Architectural History* 9 (1966), pp. 130-1.

London.[25] Once again, canons of the college can be seen to be heavily involved with a royal building project that combined their two loyalties to king and college. However, there is no suggestion that the college or its dean, William Sleaford, were given a formal role in the project. The additions and rebuilding at St Stephen's also were part of larger plans covering the two major London-area royal houses. Concurrently with the works on the college, there were ongoing works on the Great Hall from 1393 and the Privy Palace from 1386, which suggests that Richard II saw his work on the college as a part of his larger interests in updating and improving the palace as a whole.[26] All three sets of works were accounted for together within the existing framework of clerks of works for individual palaces rather than forming a separate project funded and accounted for separately, as the chapel itself had been in the reigns of the first two Edwards.[27] In accounting and in design, Richard was setting in motion a plan to refurbish and renew the entire palace, and as part of that he added to the visual magnificence of the college. Much has been written about the technical demands of the creation of the new roof of Westminster Hall, but little attention has been paid in how it fit into Richard II's wider architectural program, including his work at St Stephen's, which was slightly earlier in date.[28] The current St Stephen's cloister is integrated with the existing architecture of the Edward III belfry, which means that it is not quite parallel to the Hall and slightly off the right angle to the chapel itself, and there is every reason to suppose, as Colvin did, that in this it is following the foundations of Richard II's cloister.[29] This orientation is especially interesting since the Ricardian cloister was also structurally integrated with the Hall. The buttressing added to the Hall to support the new roof swept over the cloister and was integrated with it, both tying them together visually when viewed from the cloister itself and suggesting that the design process for both aspects would have had at the least to be coordinated when in 1393 the rebuilding of the Hall was begun.[30] In building the new structures for the college, Richard was both signalling his personal support for the institution, then mired in a long-running dispute with Westminster Abbey, and linking it even more firmly into his palace visually. The porch added to the west end of the chapel served as a liminal space, an entranceway that connected to the Hall itself, as well as to the more public parts of the privy palace such as the lesser hall, just as the alura of the 1340s connected the chapel

---

[25] E 101/ 473/ 5-6, 11-12.

[26] *HKW*, i, p. 533.

[27] For example, see the difference between E 101/ 470/2 from 1337 and E 101/ 473/ 5 from 1388-9; the first is only St Stephen's, and the second is for the entire palace.

[28] As examples see Gene Waddell, 'The Design of the Westminster Hall Roof,' *Architectural History* 42 (1999), pp. 47-67; L.T. Courtenay, 'The Westminster Hall Roof and its 14th-century Sources,' *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 43 (1984), pp. 295-309; and E. Toby Morris et al, 'Report on the Finite Element Analysis to Historic Structures: Westminster Hall, London,' *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 54 (1995), pp. 336-347.

[29] *HKW,* i. p. 527.

[30] Ibid, pp. 527-33.

to the Painted Chamber and the king's personal quarters.[31] Richard II was asserting his own influence on a space and institution strongly associated with his grandfather, not least in the imagery of the chapel itself, while also affirming its royal status as part of, not separate from, the palace as a whole.

From 1396 to the 1510s all known royal involvement in building works at the college are very small indeed. Routine ongoing repairs were the responsibility of the college and needed no royal intervention. The college was seen as sufficiently taken care of, and fully endowed. At St Stephen's, the main chapel was never altered as far as we know, but the belfry and the chapel of St Mary le Pew, just to the south of the main chapel, both required work in the mid fifteenth century. Henry VI in 1453 granted the clock tower in New Palace Yard to the college, had the bells purchased by Edward III hung, and then handed it over to the college as their responsibility.[32] His concern for his ancestors, particularly Edward III, and the needs of his chapel were being considered rather than any particular devotion to the institution. St Stephen's though served as a model for Eton and for King's College, Cambridge alongside the Wykehamite colleges of Winchester and New College, Oxford. Henry saw no pressing building needs at St Stephen's, other than the belfry, but rather a complete and useful model for his own foundations elsewhere.[33] Interestingly, the few sources that we have for the cloister belfry and St Mary le Pew suggest that they were rebuilt largely by noblemen and bishops, although Henry VI may have contributed some money to the project.[34] In 1446, William Lyndwood had left six hundred marks for the completion of the cloister and bell-tower, suggesting that the Ricardian works had not been quite completed or that he wanted additions made.[35] This bequest may explain why there is a reference in 1548 to Lyndwood's chapel, which might tentatively be identified with one of the two in the current cloister on the western walkway.[36] The other donors who made possible the rebuilding of the Pew chapel after a fire in 1452 are scarcely documented.[37] Neither Henry VI despite his devotion to the Virgin, nor Edward IV seem to have been involved in any overt way, although that may simply reflect the loss of the relevant documentation. The work was probably finished by 1471, when Thomas Powtrell was thanked by the

---

[31] The accounts for works in 1395-6 on a porch and other works at St Stephen's are in BL Additional Ch 27018.

[32] *CPR 1452-61*, p. 113.

[33] Hastings, *St Stephen's*, pp. 72 and 103.

[34] Kingsford, 'St Mary le Pew', p. 12.

[35] John Prior et al, 'Report of the Committee appointed by the Council of the Society of Antiquaries to investigate the circumstances attending the recent Discovery of a body in St Stephen's Chapel, Westminster,' *Archaeologia* 34 (1851-2), p. 415; for Lyndwood's will, see ibid, pp. 418-20.

[36] The 1548 inventory lists 'iij chalices in the pue and one in the chapell of lynwood', 'Inventory of St Stephen's Chapel, Westminster,' eds. J.R.D. Tyssen & M.E.C. Walcott, *Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society* IV (1871), p. 373.

[37] Kingsford, 'St Mary le Pew', pp. 10-11.

college for his munificence towards St Mary le Pew.[38] Stow claimed that the rebuilding was the work of Anthony, lord Rivers.[39] Rivers certainly took an interest in the college as he obtained a major indulgence for it, which may be connected to the rebuilding.[40]

Our knowledge of the Tudor interests in building continues to suggest a desire to leave their mark on Westminster. Despite Henry VII's interests in Westminster, as seen in his building programme at the Abbey and his creation of the lavish new Lady Chapel in the newest style there, St Stephen's was not included in this royal architectural patronage, nor apparently was much work carried out on the palace more generally. Henry VII was also engaged in finishing Edward IV's lavish works at Windsor, and his palace-building focussed on Richmond. There, however, he commissioned a portrait of his family and St George, possibly for the chapel's altar, which mirrored that of Edward III's family on the walls of St Stephen's.[41] The one known set of expenditure on the college's buildings by the Crown under Henry VII was temporary works to houses in Canon Row to make them suitable for entertaining visiting Spanish lords in 1501, rather than anything long-lasting for the benefit of the college itself.[42] These temporary works point to the continuing importance of St Stephen's within the palace and within royal ceremonial. However, the college had to wait for his son's reign for its final and most permanent architectural alterations.

Henry VIII is usually discussed at Westminster in the context of his creation of Whitehall and St James, rather than in the old palace.[43] The evidence is unusually problematic and clouded by generations of assumptions by antiquarians and scholars. This section reassesses the known evidence and the context of the palace to suggest one possible new reading for St Stephen's as a site of royal building in the sixteenth century. The current St Stephen's cloister as it survives today within the modern palace is clearly a sixteenth century building with its fan vaulting, comparable to the nave of King's College Chapel in Cambridge, St George's, Windsor, and to the Henry VII and Islip Chapels within Westminster Abbey. All four of those works are known to be the work of William Vertue and Henry Redman and to have

---

[38] Cotton MS Faustina B VIII, f. 39r.
[39] John Stow, 'The Citie of Westminster', in *A Survey of London. Reprinted From the Text of 1603*, ed. C. L. Kingsford (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1908), pp. 97-124 accessed through http://www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/survey-of-london-stow/1603/pp97-124 [accessed 31 May 2015].
[40] *Cal. Pap. Letters 1471-84*, p. 498.
[41] The image 'The Family of Henry VII with St George and the Dragon' is now in the Royal Collection, OM 19.
[42] BL Royal MS 14 B XXXIX, f. 5.
[43] For example, the comments of Gervase Rosser, *Medieval Westminster 1200-1540,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989)*,* p. 41.

been underway in the 1510s and early 1520s.[44] On stylistic grounds, therefore, St Stephen's cloister has been identified as the work of the same masons and their craftsmen. On a series of misidentifications and elliptic statements, the cloister has been identified as the work of 1526-29, but I would suggest that it is earlier in date.[45] The first serious problem comes from the mistaken confluence of two separate statements. First, that John Chambre was only dean from 1526, when in fact the letter patent appointing him dean in 1514 survives.[46] This is a failure by Emden and those who followed him, thanks to a persistent myth that the 'dean of the king's chapel' meant the dean of St Stephen's rather than that of the Chapel Royal and thus that from 1514 to 1526 the dean at St Stephen's was Richard Sampson.[47] While there had been considerable overlap in the two roles, this was not the case from 1514 onwards as Chambre was never associated with the Chapel Royal.[48] Because of Stow's statement that John Chambre built the St Stephen's cloister at a charge of 11,000 marks, 1526 has been held as the starting point for works.[49] On entirely other grounds, the completion date has been set as no later than 1529, that the heraldry of the roof bosses includes the arms of Castile and the pomegranate of Catherine of Aragon. After 1529, the assumption is that Catherine's arms would be so out of favour that they would not have been included.[50]

Stow needs to be taken seriously as a near-contemporary with access to good information, but in this case seeing the cloister as solely the generous gift of the dean neither fits with St Stephen's larger place within the palace, nor with the uses made of it by Henry VIII later. The college could not rip down and rebuild its Ricardian cloister without negotiation with the king and those responsible for the wider palace. The old cloister was structurally integrated into Westminster Hall and the site was at the heart of the palace. In addition in the 1520s the college needed royal approval to rebuild the Wool Staple houses it also owned in the palace precinct and approval in 1547 for new almshouses.[51] Such approval does not survive for the St Stephen's cloisters, suggesting that it was in part a royal project, where no approval through enrolled letters patent was needed. At a bare minimum, the cloister was a collaborative project

---

[44] John Goodall, 'The Jesus Chapel or Islip's Chantry at Westminster Abbey,' *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 164 (2011), p. 272; all the other examples given were also the work of William Vertue and/or Henry Redman, for their careers see John Harvey, *English Medieval Architects: A Biographical Dictionary down to 1550,* Rev. ed. (Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1987), pp. 307-9 and pp. 246-48.
[45] *Royal Commission on Historical Monuments: An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in London,* (London: HMSO, 1925), p. 123.
[46] John Chambre was appointed to the deanery on 22 November 1514, *L & P Henry VIII 1513-14*, no. 3499 (54).
[47] *RCHM London*, p. 123.
[48] See Chapter Six for a full discussion of the issue, pp. 174-81.
[49] Stow, 'The Citie of Westminster', pp. 97-124.
[50] *RCHM London*, p. 123.
[51] Licences were granted in 1521 for the wool staple houses, *L & P Henry VIII 1519-21*, no. 1163; the almshouses were licenced in SP 46/128 f. 208.

between the king and the dean, where the dean and college put up some of the money, and Stow knew only about that side of it. This collaborative reading of the enterprise is strengthened both visually and in the documentation. Visually, the surviving roof-bosses from the lower cloister have three main themes, royal heraldry, the college's patron saints and history, and the Order of the Garter. The strong royal presence in the bosses of both Henry himself, and of Catherine of Aragon, in part highlights St Stephen's as a royally favoured college, while also pointing to potential patronage of the project. The one non-royal personal boss, which one would expect to deal with the patron of the project, is of Thomas Wolsey as cardinal-archbishop of York. In addition to his own lavish building, Wolsey oversaw the early Henrician building program elsewhere, including the completion of King's College and St George's, Windsor, working with the same masons, William Vertue and Henry Redeman, as are thought to have worked on St Stephen's.[52] Wolsey's own project of Cardinal College, later Christ Church Oxford, built by the same group of masons, and similarly had a free standing cloister, although not double storey as at Westminster.[53] Wolsey was dean of St Stephen's from 1512 to 1514, and attempted to remain dean in 1514 when bishop of Lincoln, but had to give it up when made archbishop of York later that year.[54] The cloister boss means that the possible earliest date for the cloister's completion is 1515, when Wolsey was made cardinal. Given the presence of Thomas Larke as a canon from 1511, who worked with Wolsey on Cambridge and Windsor, it seems like a project of the 1510s, perhaps begun with royal support and enthusiasm just before Wolsey's elevation to bishop, and finished under the supervision of his successor as dean, Chambre.[55]

The iconographic programme highlights the interplay between the college and its long royal history. First, there were bosses relating to the religious dedications of the College, with bosses displaying Christ, the IHS monogram, St Stephen, and the Virgin, as well as interestingly, given the secondary dedication mentioned in 1396 to Edward the Confessor, elements of the Confessor's arms. These clustered in the western corridor of the cloister, centred on the entrance to the lower chantry chapel. Second, there are potential links with St George's and the Order of the Garter, as several bosses include coats of arms inside the Garter, one of three sickles, related to the Hungerford family, and one, probably referring to Edward III as founder, has the ancient arms of England inside the Garter.[56] Beyond this one example,

---

[52] Simon Thurley, 'The Domestic Building Works of Cardinal Wolsey,' in *Cardinal Wolsey: Church, State and Art,* edited by Steven J. Gunn & Phillip G. Lindley, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 80; note as well that Wolsey, through Thomas Cromwell, was building his own colleges at Ipswich and Oxford.
[53] John Newman, 'Cardinal Wolsey's Collegiate Foundations,' in *Cardinal Wolsey,* p. 111.
[54] *L & P Henry VIII 1513-14,* no. 2629 (8) and no. 3499 (40).
[55] Larke's work is discussed in *HKW,* iii. p. 189; for Bridewell see ibid, p. 15; he was appointed canon in 1511, *L & P Henry VIII 1509-1513,* no. 960 (50).
[56] The badge in the Garter surround was identified in an 1836 heraldic list as belonging to Walter, lord Hungerford (d.

there are many other examples of royal heraldry, from examples of the arms of England- ancient, to the version used by Henry VII and then Henry VIII until the middle of his reign. The switch from the older version with a field of fleur de lys to the modern version with only three happened early in the fifteenth century, so the older versions might well be harking back to the iconography and heraldry of the Ricardian cloister it was replacing.[57] The omnipresent Tudor rose, however, was a firm reminder of the current generation and the royal context of the cloister. Also included in this royal heraldry were the arms of Castile, probably an allusion to Catherine of Aragon, as her pomegranate was included in a supporting boss, and the presence of roses and pomegranates on the field of the boss itself. The use of Catherine of Aragon's heraldry suggests that the heraldry was completed before 1527, and the start of the divorce case.[58] The roof bosses of St Stephen's would be harder to replace than the living queen however, and Catherine of Aragon's symbols remained.

The new cloisters were very much part of the Palace of Westminster, and shows that Westminster would not be forgotten after the fire of the winter of 1512/13, which it has been argued ended the palace's use as a royal residence and changed Henry VIII's relationship with his administration.[59] Starkey's argument, and that of all who have followed him, rests on assumptions about where Henry VIII spent his time before 1512 and the nature of the palace of Westminster. Even before the fire, Henry had spent very little sustained time in Westminster, and thus the fire could not radically change the nature of his kingship. While there is as yet no full itinerary for his reign, his book of payments gives some clues. In the first six years of Henry's reign, he stayed at Westminster for a month twice, first in January to February 1510 and then in February to March 1512.[60] Otherwise there were a few mass-offerings and payments that suggest the king had resided at most for a couple of days at the palace, in July 1509, May 1510, February 1511, June 1514 and February 1515.[61] However, Westminster was the venue for particularly spectacular royal events. In May 1510, Henry and Catherine of Aragon were present for tilts

---

1541) based on the cloister itself and this has then been repeated since, *Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica,* (Westminster: John Nichol, 1836), p. 71; unfortunately, the Tudor Lord Hungerford was never a Garter knight, so if it is a Hungerford badge, it must refer to the Lord Hungerford of Hungerford active in the 1420s. The badge also appears in the Hungerford Chapel at Salisbury Cathedral, which suggests the identification is of the correct family but the wrong individual. It then raises questions about why his badge is present when he was long dead in the 1510s and the earlier cloister had been largely completed before his gift of houses to the college in 1428.

[57] *Boutell's Heraldry*, rev. J.P. Brooke-Little, (London: Warne, 1983), p. 208.

[58] Geoffrey de C. Parmiter, *The King's Great Matter: A Study of Anglo-Papal Relations 1527-1534,* (London: Longmans, 1967), p. 11.

[59] Starkey, 'Court and Council,' p. 180; for Henry VIII staying at Bridewell rather than Westminster in 1519, Neil Samman, 'The Progresses of Henry VIII,' in *The Reign of Henry VIII: Politics, Policy and Piety*, ed. Diarmaid MacCulloch, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1995), p. 70.

[60] *L & P Henry VIII 1517-18*, no. (1.10) at p. 1444 and no. (3.9) at p. 1454.

[61] *L & P Henry VIII 1517-18*, no. (1.3) at p. 1442, no. (2) at p. 1446, no. (2.8-2.9) at p. 1449, no. (6.1) at p. 1464 and no. (6.9) at p. 1466.

at Westminster with an expensive masque and revel. The following February saw further jousting with corresponding high expenditure. On 30 March 1512, the king knighted Sir Henry Guilford and Sir Charles Brandon at Westminster, in a repeat of their earlier dubbing the previous year by the king of Aragon at Calais.[62] The palace was clearly used for big set-piece events where the king and queen wanted to be particularly visible and impressive. In June 1513 after the fire, John Taylor when writing about Henry VIII's entrance to Lille could still reference Westminster, saying that the king entered the city 'with as much pomp as ever he did at Westminster, with his crown on'.[63] In December 1515, William Warham, archbishop of Canterbury returned the great seal to Henry VIII in a small room at Westminster, near the Lesser Hall.[64] Even before the fire, the primary consistent usage of the palace had been in administration, the law courts and offices of state. Those functions remained at Westminster after the fire and were added to under Henry VIII in the 1530s, with the new courts of First Fruits and Tenths and then Augmentations.[65] In addition, the 1514-15 parliament was begun at Blackfriars, but after four days moved to Westminster.[66] Other than the Reformation Parliament of 1529-36, Parliament remained at Westminster. Seeing Westminster as abandoned after 1513 is to neglect its continuing vital importance as the heart of royal government, and the palace that individual subjects were most likely to see, when they sought governance. It also neglects the palace's role in coronations, and other spectacular set-piece events.

Royal government and royal events happened in the area around St Stephen's, centred on Westminster Hall, not necessarily in the privy palace. Rebuilding the cloisters of St Stephen's helped to keep the entire area usable and accessible for such events, despite the general usage of cloisters as private religious processional spaces. The Ricardian cloisters had been single storey, judging from the surviving evidence of the Ricardian buttressing and its awkward interplay with the upper level of the cloisters in a nineteenth century painting.[67] The new sixteenth-century cloisters were double storey, accessible from the porch of the chapel on both levels. In the short term, the new upper level might have allowed for easier access to Star Chamber, which seems to have been in the range just north of the cloister and the vicars' hall and also made some ceremonial accesses more visually splendid. Before the new cloisters were built, in 1489 when he was made Prince of Wales, Prince Arthur was … 'princeley conveid through Seint Stephens

---

[62] *L & P Henry VIII 1513-14*, no. 26.
[63] *L & P Henry VIII 1513-14*, no. 2391 at p. 1060.
[64] *L & P Henry VIII 1515-16*, no. 1335; note that the Parliament of 1515 was then meeting at Westminster.
[65] Walter C Richardson, *History of the Court of Augmentations 1536-1554,* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1961), pp. 46-7.
[66] *L & P Henry VIII 1513-14*, no. 2590.
[67] Robert William Billings, 'St. Stephen's Chapel: View from Speaker's Gallery after the Fire 1834,' Parliamentary Art Collection, WOA 1665.

Chapell to the nether End of the Steirs, toward the Vicars Logyng, wher he took his Hors'.[68] The stairs are the King's Stairs, the watergate of the palace just north of the vicars' houses, which means that Arthur and his escort were moving through the cloisters towards the water gate. Six years later in 1494, the future Henry VIII went through the cloisters to Westminster Hall and then Star Chamber.[69] In 1533, however, Henry had a gallery cut through from the upper level of the cloister to Westminster Hall in the western range, and watched Anne Boleyn's coronation feast from there.[70] At that point, he also decorated the cloisters lavishly, underscoring the point that these were not just institutional cloisters, but rather a visible and important part of the palace, and one in which the king could and did take an interest.[71] The cloister, then sits in royal and institutional contexts, as well as in memory of the Ricardian works, and the extravagant display of royal piety and power.

One further mystery of the cloister remains to be discussed. In the cloister, as it currently exists, is a pair of small rooms opening off the western walkways whose purpose has always been rather uncertain. They were repaired and rebuilt several times before the 1960s, so other than their footprint on the cloister courtyard, there is no original evidence for their original purpose. In the nineteenth century Mackenzie suggested that they were the chapter house of the college.[72] The chapter house in 1394 had been beneath the chapel of St Mary Le Pew on the south side of the chapel itself although it was supposed to move to the cloister area.[73] In any case, while it is an attractive suggestion that one of the surviving rooms off the cloister was a chapter house, not least that it would mean that the room where Archbishop Cranmer took his disingenuous oath to the papacy in 1533 before his consecration at St Stephen's would survive, the current space is quite small for that purpose.[74] We managed to fit twenty four people inside the lower of the two rooms, so it would potentially be usable as a chapter house. The designation on a 1593 plan of the cloisters, now in the Cecil papers, of the two spaces as chapels seems more logical and likely to have been carried over from the college's usage.[75] It seems probable that these were chantry chapels used

---

[68] Leland, *Collectanea,* iv, p. 252.

[69] Kingsford, 'St Mary le Pew', pp. 3-4.

[70] *Hall's Chronicle, Containing the History of England During the Reign of Henry IV and the Succeeding Monarchs to the End of the Reign of Henry VIII,* ed. Henry Ellis, (London: J. Johnson et al, 1809), pp. 804-5; payments for the work are in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson D 775, f. 175r.

[71] Rawlinson D 775, ff. 190r and 192v.

[72] Frederick Mackenzie, *Architectural Antiquities of the Collegiate Chapel of St. Stephen, Westminster, the late House of Commons,* (London: Society of Antiquaries, 1844), pp. 4-5.

[73] For the 1394 description in which the chapter house is described thus: 'p[ar]va capella [con]tigua d[ic]te capelle s[anc]ti Steph[an]i ex p[ar]te aust[ra]li vocata nu[n]c dom[us] cap[itu]li [et] capella de la Pewe', and that the cloisters and chapter house were to be 'de novo co[n]strue[n]da', suggesting that the chapter house was part of that complex at the time but that there were plans to move it to the cloisters, BL Cotton MS Faustina A III f. 294r-v.

[74] Reg. Cranmer, ff. 4r-6v.

[75] Hatfield, Hatfield House, Cecil Papers 24/ 61 (112) and 24/62 (113).

as additional spaces for the celebration of the many obits endowed at the college, and that one of them may be Lyndwood's chapel, copied over from the previous single-storey cloister.[76] If they were used as chapels, then we can see the needs of the college to commemorate their benefactors in dialogue with the royal patronage and wishes in the support for the college's purpose shown in the design of the new space. In 1593 they were clearly being used as chapels, as all the other spaces are labelled with their late sixteenth century usage within the palace, down to the sub-division of the cloister walkways into office spaces. Elizabeth's government were now using the former St Stephen's site as a source of patronage as well as workspace for lay Exchequer personnel.[77] It may be that the functions St Stephen's had played in providing a space for worship by those working in the various administrative offices had been taken over by its smaller chantry chapels in the cloister.

The two major sets of works, separated by over a century, were both royal building projects, designed to show off the magnificence and the piety of the English kings within their most important royal palace. In both sets of works on the cloisters, the palace around it was changing significantly. In Richard II's time, the whole palace was being renovated and refurbished as a glittering setting for a monarch who valued pomp, ceremony and magnificence. The cloisters, vicars' houses and the kitchen and hall complex would have functioned as very real reminders that the college was a royal one, which belonged as much to the king as it had to his grandfather. In Henry VIII's reign it is more surprising that he would undertake such lavish works in a palatial context which was in the process of being abandoned in favour of other London palaces such as Eltham or Bridewell, and the suburban palaces at Richmond and Greenwich, and above all, Whitehall. Part of the reasoning is likely to have been that St Stephen's would continue to be important for major royal ceremonial such as funerals, coronations and marriages and remained relevant to the administrative offices surrounding it. Major royal ceremonial would require the same sort of magnificence that Richard had required, updated for a Renaissance prince. It is striking then, that these were not just building works of royal piety, but also of princely magnificence. It is also instructive that the chapel was considered to need no major alteration and to function as a lavish setting for ceremonial without such alterations, but that the cloisters proved to offer a way for these kings to display their wealth, power and piety in what was considered a quasi-public space. In the next section, we turn to the kings of England as pious individuals who made gifts to the college, worshiped there and saw the institution rather than the setting as important. The question becomes whether the patterns of interest

---

[76] Prior, 'Report', p. 419.
[77] The cloisters returned to the Crown on Edward, lord Hastings' death in 1572, cf. BL Lansdowne MS 171, no. 169, f. 359; the cloisters, subdivided into the housing cum offices seen on the Cecil Paper plans, were then granted to the tellers of the Exchequer, Cecil Papers, 24/ 61 (112) and 24/ 62 (113).

which sponsored building works continued to also make the kings of England benefactors of the college.

Royal Grants, Gifts and Presence in the Chapel

St Stephen's was both an institution slightly apart from the rest of the palace, as it had a legal and practical existence separate from the court, but also very much entwined within it. When the itinerant English kings were at Westminster, St Stephen's became the temporary home of the Chapel Royal, and was the setting for the daily services that the king and the court could choose to attend. While the interrelationship between the college and the Chapel Royal is the subject of Chapter Six, this section starts to lay out a theme that will be picked up again there, of both the routine and unusual presence of the king in St Stephen's chapel, the gifts and offerings that went with the royal presence, and thus the king's relationship with the institution of the college independent of his personal relationships with the royal servants who staffed it as canons.[78] It looks at them in the context of the expensive, lavish building plans discussed above in order to see if concern for the fabric of the college tallies with presence and piety within it. Some of this correlation is expected and the conventional expressions of piety by kings such as attendance at mass, gifts to various monasteries and convents, pilgrimages to major shrines such as those at Walsingham and Canterbury, and usually a careful consideration of the shrine of Edward the Confessor across the road in the abbey. St Stephen very quickly was added to that traditional round of visible royal piety in front of ambassadors, the court and the canons themselves. In addition, and more unusually, it became a place of commemoration for the English Crown, as obits for each king were added to its remembrances, creating a yearly pattern of legitimacy and prayers surrounding the living king. From Richard II's reign onward the chapel and the college were consistently used by the English kings when at Westminster. Only on Henry VIII's acquisition of Whitehall in 1529 was there a comparable royal chapel in Westminster. This sense of ownership and patronage extended to the legal defence of the college in the two decades of conflict with the abbey in the late fourteenth century. However, royal munificence did not extend to disputes over royal lands, as discussed in the previous chapter, when Richard II and his council attempted to reclaim lands granted in Edward III's will and Richard then granted out the disputed lands to his favourite, Simon Burley, a reminder that royal favour had limits, even in a most favoured chapel.

St Stephen's dual role within the Palace of Westminster as institutional chapel, and also as the king's 'chief chapel within his palace' is nearly unparalleled.[79] The liturgical implications of the lack of another

---

[78] Below, pp. 174-81.
[79] This description comes from the 1520s in C 1/442/8; my thanks to Simon Neal for the reference.

chapel for the use of the king and his household will be further explored in Chapter Six. In terms of royal patronage, the consistent use of the chapel for royal ceremonial and liturgy meant that the clergy of St Stephen's had greater access to the king and thus patronage was consistent rather than sporadic.[80] Most religious patronage given to institutions was to start or complete projects, so Henry V supported the Charterhouse and Syon Abbey, and Henry VI created new foundations at Eton and Cambridge, rather than adding to existing houses with complete endowments and buildings.[81] At St Mary's, Warwick the college had been moved from the castle to the parish church, which gave it some distance from the Beauchamp earls, while also serving as a reminder of their lavish gifts to the Church.[82] Similarly, at Windsor, the king's personal chapel was in the Upper Ward, whereas St George's dominated the Lower Ward, and thus was physically and institutionally separate from the king as St Stephen's never was. At St George's, there is the additional complication of the Order of the Garter creating a very different type of association with the monarch. Devotion to St George, military remembrance of past victories and the prestige created by Edward III for the Order meant that St George's seems to have been much more tied to interest in the saint specifically and to the Arthurian interests of particular monarchs.[83] Little was done at St George's, either financially or to the fabric before the reign of Edward IV, whose interest in the military exploits of Edward III and the Garter led him to lavishly rebuild the choir and re-endow the college, which was struggling financially at this point.[84] St Stephen's received less spectacular but more sustained patronage. It probably reflected the visibility of the chapel within the palace, its tight association with monarchy and the nature of Westminster as the busiest and most visible royal residence.

In addition to the public and ceremonial side of royal piety, St Stephen's may also have been used for a more private side of royal devotion. According to the 1394 agreement brokered with Westminster Abbey, St Stephen's College had jurisdiction over three chapel spaces at that time, the main two-storey chapel of St Stephen with St Mary Undercroft, and the oratory of St Mary le Pew with its jewelled image of the Virgin.[85] St Stephen's Chapel and St Mary Undercroft were larger, more public venues for mass, the daily offices, and commemorative masses, which will be further discussed below.[86] Private prayer and devotion seem to have been the province of St Mary le Pew, according to the evidence gathered by

---

[80] Below, pp. 174-81.
[81] The public character of the Lancastrian kings' foundations under the Yorkist kings is discussed in Selway, 'Eton College and King's College,' p. 27.
[82] *The Cartulary of St Mary's Collegiate Church, Warwick,* ed. Charles Fonge, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004), pp. vii.
[83] Edward IV's interest in Arthur contributed to his decisions to rebuild St George's and to buy lavish furnishings and vestments for the chapel, see Charles Ross, *Edward IV,* 2nd ed. (London: Meuthen, 1984), p. 274.
[84] Evans, 'The Years of Arrears,' p. 104; also see discussion in Chapter Two about the comparative endowments between the two chapels, pp. 57, 61.
[85] Cotton MS Faustina A III, f. 294r.

Kingsford.[87] Its position between the main chapel to the north and the privy palace to the south meant that it was closer to the royal apartments and a smaller space, although on All Soul's Day in 1519 54 priests were paid for saying masses in front of its altar.[88] Its location on the river frontage of the palace is clear from a Henry VI grant, and from the 1494 route from the Painted Chamber through St Mary le Pew to St Stephen's and then the Great Hall used by the future Henry VIII when he was made Knight of the Bath.[89] Any discussion of St Mary le Pew is complicated by Westlake's problematic identification of another chapel of St Mary le Pew in Westminster Abbey.[90] All of the evidence below could relate to an abbey chapel or to the palace chapel, as contemporaries tended not to distinguish between the two.[91] Froissart wrote of how Richard II went to pray in front of a famous image of the Virgin in the abbey before meeting the rebels at Smithfield in 1381, which probably refers to St Mary le Pew in the palace.[92] Richard may also have used the palace oratory for a private meeting in 1397 with a French chronicler, Pierre Salmon.[93] So too, Henry V may have prayed in St Mary le Pew after his father's death in the Jerusalem Chamber of the abbey before taking up royal responsibility.[94] These are of course incidental mentions of personal devotion; rare, but perhaps telling of the role played by this part of the collegiate site in royal devotions. It is also telling that St Mary le Pew receives the most identifiable small gifts and offerings of all of the chapel spaces the college had at its disposal. Richard III's use of the chapel may be suggested by his grant in 1484 of an annuity of six marks to the keeper of the chapel in the palace.[95] Henry VIII's offerings at St Mary le Pew continued even after he was based at Whitehall, when in 1539 he made payments to priests at St Mary le Pew, Eton and Windsor.[96]

---

[86] Below, pp. 165-74.
[87] Kingsford, 'St Mary le Pew,' pp. 1-20.
[88] In the King's Book of Payments, calendared in *L & P Henry VIII 1521-23*, no. 3695.1 at p. 1538.
[89] These grants discussed in Kingsford, 'St Mary le Pew,' pp. 3-4.
[90] H.F. Westlake, *Westminster Abbey: The Church, Convent, Cathedral and College of St Peter, Westminster*, 2 vols. (London: Philip Allan, 1923), ii, pp. 351-3.
[91] Westlake references only the sacrist's rolls and a later bequest involving the Scala Coeli indulgence, which St Stephen's is known to have and the abbey is not until c. 1504, (cf. Nigel Morgan, 'The Scala Coeli Indulgence and the Royal Chapels' in *The Reign of Henry VII*, ed. Benjamin Thompson, (Woodbridge: Shaun Tyas, 1995), p. 94, however he thinks that the Scala Coeli altar at St Mary le Pew was then supressed) so there may be misidentification going on here, ibid, pp. 351-2; for Scala Coeli at St Stephen's see *Cal. Pap. Petitions*, pp. 495-507; in addition an indenture made between Richard Grene and the college during the deanery of Henry Sharp (1480-90) and copied into the college obit book, clearly describes St Mary le Pew in the Palace of Westminster when asking for masses relating to the Scala Coeli indulgence, Cotton Faustina B VIII, ff. 43v-44r.
[92] "In this church [the abbey] there is a statue of our lady in a small chapel that has many virtues and performs great miracles, in which the Kings of England have much faith. The king, having paid his devotions and made his offerings to this shrine, mounted his horse," Froissart, *Chronicles*, ii, p. 474; the problem with accepting Froissart's identification of this chapel as being in the abbey is that there is not known to have been a cult image in the abbey's St Mary le Pew before 1377, whereas the image in the Palace's St Mary le Pew is referenced in 1355 in SC 8/ 247/12304.
[93] Kingsford, 'St Mary le Pew', p. 8.
[94] *Vita Henrici Quinti* quoted in Kingsford, 'St Mary le Pew', p. 9.
[95] Kingsford, 'St Mary le Pew', p. 15.
[96] *L & P Henry VIII 1539 Part 2*, no. 781 at p. 306.

The most ceremonial presence of the king and the slightly better attested royal patronage of the chapel were the mass and the king's presence at feast days. The statutes anticipated, as discussed in Chapter One, that the king would be present regularly in the chapel and that the college would have some responsibility for royal services.[97] Unfortunately, evidence for the fulfilment of this part of the statutes is patchy. First, the royal itineraries tend to be unclear, making it hard to locate the monarch securely at Westminster. Second, comments tended to be made by chroniclers and contemporaries only when something unusual happened or bishops, rather than the dean of the chapel, were involved. Kings seem to be often at Westminster sporadically throughout the year, not least when Parliament was sitting. As an example, Richard II, 'with the crown on his head', heard mass said by the archbishop of Canterbury, William Courtenay, 'in the chapel of the palace, which is very handsome and richly decorated' and then received homage on the eve of the Merciless Parliament of 1388.[98] Here the chapel was the usual setting for mass, but the usual reason for comment was that the ceremony of crown-wearing was allied to the holding of a Parliament and that the king was using the chapel as a setting to assert his authority before what was to become a disastrous Parliament for his supporters. Beyond Parliament, Christmas and St Stephen's feast day on 26 December were also important for the college. Under Richard II, Christmas was also usually at Westminster until 1397, which was probably a fairly set pattern for most of his successors as well.[99] Exchequer payments are known for both Richard II and Henry VIII to the boy bishop of St Nicholas at Christmas at St Stephen's, for example.[100] These payments may well track the relevant king's personal presence in the chapel for the festivities, even after Henry VIII abandoned the Palace of Westminster as a personal residence.

Later in the college's history, according to the *Liber Regie Capelle*, there were three daily services by the Chapel Royal in Henry VI's reign, matins, a mass and then a mass of the Virgin immediately afterward.[101] As part of this there was a procession with music and collects. The details for the procession back reference the king's oratory, which is likely to have been St Mary le Pew when at Westminster.[102] For these purposes though, assuming that the pattern was that followed when the court was at Westminster, Henry VI preferred to hear mass privately, but attended the chapel services only on feast days.[103] In this

---

[97] WAM 18431.

[98] Froissart, *Chronicles*, iii, pp. 498-9.

[99] Saul, *Richard II,* p. 337.

[100] For Richard II, *Issues of the Exchequer*, p. 222; for Henry VIII in 1526, *L & P Henry VIII 1524-26,* no. 1939.1 at p. 869; the last such payment known is in 1531, BL Additional MS 33378, f. 29.

[101] *Liber Regie Capelle*, ed. Walter Ullman, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), p. 50.

[102] Ibid, p. 65.

[103] Ibid. p. 59.

he may have been following his father's example. The one incidental mention of Henry V's presence in St Stephen's Chapel is from the Feast of the Purification of the Virgin on 2 February 1415.[104] This must have been an extraordinary occasion because Archbishop Chichele officiated, supported by Bishop Lyndwood and the Bishop of Carlisle and the offerings came to one hundred pounds of wax, four pounds and twenty pence of gold, and twenty shillings and a penny in silver. The *Liber Regie Capelle* thought that the king should offer 7d on feast days, which this mass far exceeded, even assuming that most of the court had also given offerings. The college was the setting, and probably was involved in the service supporting the archbishop and bishops. The king's presence on Candlemas was routine in a sense: it was a feast day, he was at Westminster and St Stephen's was his chapel so he was present at mass. Many other occasions when the Lancastrian monarchs were present in St Stephen's for feast day masses must have passed without comment because of the smooth way the chapel and college were integrated into the routine of the Chapel Royal.

The extraordinary royal ceremonial in the chapel was deliberate, and often on account of the king's presence in the palace when the need for such services arose. Westminster Abbey tended to want to hold such services as it was jealous of its privileges, including baptism, marriages and burials, so any such event in St Stephen's was a sign of deliberate royal choice to favour the college. It is likely that the college took some part in coronations, although this is nowhere explicit, not least because the coronation ceremony was written to be as general as possible to allow flexibility and the college's staff were likely already to have been drafted into the Chapel Royal's staff for the purposes of the coronation.[105] Edward IV's reign was very rich in records of this type of ceremonial, either because he spent a great deal of time in Westminster, or because he chose to value the college highly as a venue for such events. In 1483 his younger son, Richard, duke of York, married Anne Mowbray in the chapel.[106] It was an odd choice for a marriage venue, although perhaps quieter than the abbey would be and thus more suitable for the scale of the wedding, given that Richard was just four years old. In the same year, Edward IV died at Westminster unexpectedly. As he had asked to be buried at Windsor, among the Arthurian associations of St George's, his body lay in state in Westminster for several days as his funeral procession was prepared.[107] During that time, he lay in front of the high altar of St Stephen's, awaiting the journey between his namesake's two foundations. Richard II's choice to use the chapel as a backdrop for his own sense of his majesty fit in well with his building campaigns to make the palace as a whole more splendid.

---

[104] Reg. Chichele, iv, pp. 111-12.
[105] See Chapter Six, pp. 174-81.
[106] Rosemary Horrox, 'Richard, duke of York and duke of Norfolk (1473–1483)', *ODNB*.
[107] *Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Reigns of Richard III and Henry VII,* ed. James Gairdner, 2 vols. (London: Longman,

Edward IV's presences are rather more unexpected, since his great concern was with St George's, and he was not thought of as particularly interested in Westminster.

Of the aspects of royal favour discussed above, most were very much related to the chapel as a space rather than to the college as an institution, although the two were of course intertwined. The clearest demonstration of continuing royal interest in the institution were the various endowments made, often in connections with obits, as discussed in the previous chapter. Beyond the landed endowments, which St Stephen's was fortunate enough to be able to able to attract from successive kings, there was also legal support offered to the college. The first and perhaps the largest instance of this, was Richard II's support against the abbey in the long-running dispute over jurisdiction, which is the focus of Chapter Seven.[108] Richard supported the college against the abbey, despite his later devotion to the shrine of Edward the Confessor, and his patronage was critical to the eventual settlement in 1394, which was more favourable to the college than otherwise it would have been.[109] The king's ambassadors to Rome were involved in the 1380s and hearings were held in front of the king himself as well as the Archbishop of Canterbury as an agreement drew closer.[110] Through all of this, his support allowed the dean and canons to continue fighting the judgment and their subsequent excommunication. Later, his influence made a settlement favourable to the college possible. And yet at the same time, Richard was ruthlessly favouring Simon Burley with lands that had been granted to the college by Edward III. The college, along with the other institutions involved, St Mary Graces and the friars at King's Langley, were petitioning for their legal rights, and the king did little.[111] The rights of the college as an ecclesiastical institution under his patronage were important to Richard, but the college's claims to royal lands that his favourite wanted to build up a comital estate were not.[112]

Royal patronage in gifts and presence was often not about the king's personal wishes and benefactions, but rather about a setting for the round of masses and other opportunities for the king to show off his good relationship with the Church. Richard II had the most complex relationship with the college of any monarch. The college benefited from his building works, his interest in the institution's structure and his

---

1861-3), i, p. 4, drawing on a Herald's account, College of Arms, MS I.7 f. 7.

[108] Below, pp. 191-3.

[109] A Westminster Abbey cartulary index lists the various documents, including that in 1378 the case had been decided for the abbey, and the college excommunicated; WAM Muniment Book 12 f. 31r.

[110] For the hearings in front of the archbishop, WAM 18437; for the king's ambassadors' involvement in Rome on the college's side, WAM 9256 D.

[111] The petition of the dean and canons to Parliament in 1388 is SC 8/199/9921.

[112] For Burley's acquisition of the Kentish lands in question, Chris Given-Wilson, 'Richard II and His Grandfather's Will,' *EHR* 93 (1978), pp. 327-9; also discussed in Chapter Two, pp. 55-6.

use of the college space for his own personal devotions. However, in many ways he was completing the college to the standard of independence required. Royal patronage was less overt and institutional once the needs of the college had been met; their site and housing secured, the abbey's jurisdiction clarified and the endowment negotiated. The college's consistent relationship with the English kings was about the preferment its prebends offered, the stage it offered for dynastic imagery and for the round of usual and extraordinary piety of the Church year as carried out in the king's chapels. The building works marked out particularly involved kings, but this might not be carried through into sustained patronage. Henry VI is particularly important here, since he gave alien priory lands and oversaw the completion of the belfry for the college, but does not seem to have made smaller gifts. It is even hard to place him in the chapel for services, other than to assume that because the pattern of the Chapel Royal is known, the pattern at St Stephen's when the king was in residence is known. Henry VIII's Westminster is the hardest to reconstruct, both in terms of his presence in the palace and consequently at mass and also in terms of his interest in the chapel. That he made the customary payments at Christmas, and continued a long royal tradition of devotion to St Mary le Pew, which had included his mother, suggests that Henry VIII was still concerned with the college as an institution worthy of his support even after he stopped using the Old Palace of Westminster, moved restlessly around London and then settled at Whitehall.[113]

Royal Women

Much of what was done at St Stephen's was done in the names of the kings of England, not in those of their wives, mothers, sisters and daughters. However, royal women had ecclesiastical staffs of their own: almoners and confessors as well as chaplains. Queens attended public worship and offered patronage to colleges and monasteries in their own right, such as the series of queens who were involved at Greyfriars London in the fourteenth century.[114] They too spent significant periods of time each year in the palace at Westminster or near to it. At times they could receive delegated authority from the king to act for him, as well as acting on their own behalf. The upper chapel contained the visual representation of the importance of royal women. Philippa of Hainault was shown on the chapel altar murals, and the sense of dynastic kingship evoked there drew just as much on the marriage alliances her daughters were expected to make as the military victories of her sons in France. Philippa's own example of motherhood, her happy marriage and many healthy children, in many ways was the model for future queens. Philippa had succeeded in producing dynastic stability for Edward III; her intercessions for justice and her religious

---

[113] Samman, 'Progresses of Henry VIII', p. 70.
[114] Laura Slater, 'Defining Queenship at Greyfriars London, c. 1300-58,' *Gender & History* 27:1 (April 2015), p. 55.

patronage were favourably commented on by contemporaries.[115] In addition, the Marian imagery of the chapel, particularly in the lower chapel and in that of St Mary Le Pew, was a strong link to ideals of female roles of intercession, piety and motherhood as exemplified by the Virgin. The evidence for interaction between the many royal women and St Stephen's is inevitably patchy, since many household and financial records for the queens of England do not survive. Just as with the kings, however, we can see the same range of interactions with the college. At various points, queens or royal female relatives appointed canons, both directly and indirectly, gave offerings after attending mass in the chapel, may have been involved with building campaigns, and offered their support to the college through gifts. They also were commemorated in the college after their deaths, suggesting that the chapel and college had meaning for them, or were associated with them or their roles by those who made such arrangements.

The most long-lasting effect on the college made by royal women was in staffing, both directly and indirectly. This influence largely happened after 1450, as the numbers of priests in royal service more generally declined. As will be discussed in Chapter Five, the canons had previously been largely drawn from the Exchequer and Chancery, areas where queens were less likely to have influence.[116] After 1400, the household and the personal priests of the king started to become more prominent, but it took longer for the queen's household to be represented in the stalls. Katherine of Valois from 1420 was involved in the earlier careers of men who much later became canons, without appearing to have any direct influence on their appointment to St Stephen's itself.[117] Rather, she exercised her patronage at the Lancastrian mausoleum of St Mary in the Newarke, removed from London and of less political significance than the St Stephen's prebends. Margaret of Anjou's household equally left no real mark on the college. It was the Yorkist and then Tudor women who shaped the college most dramatically. Elizabeth Woodville's direct influence brought Edmund Chaderton, her chancellor, and an otherwise unknown figure, George Daune, to prebends.[118] In the 1470s Elizabeth Woodville was twice granted the right to present to the next vacant canonry, which was particularly unusual because she did so alone.[119] Her daughter, Elizabeth of York, her mother-in-law Cicely, and Margaret Beaufort all were named in groups of councillors who were given the right to present in the 1480s and 1490s.[120] How much influence they had within these

---

[115] Juliet Vale, 'Philippa (1310x15?–1369),' *ODNB*, quotes Walsingham's approving comment on Philippa as 'a most noble woman'.

[116] See Table 5; also below, pp. 143-4.

[117] They were John Everdon, Thomas Suthwell, and William Walesby; for details of Katherine of Valois at St Mary in the Newarke, see McHardy, 'Patronage in Late Medieval Colleges' in *The Late Medieval English College and its Context,* eds. Clive Burgess & Martin Heale, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008), pp. 102 and 106.

[118] Daune had to be confirmed on 12 November 1475, *CPR 1467-77*, p. 547.

[119] Her two presentations were 1 October 1472 in *CPR 1467-77*, p. 360; and 23 November 1476 in ibid, p. 604.

[120] For example, on 22 April 1478 a grant was made to the king's mother Cecily, his daughter Elizabeth, Richard, duke of

groups is unclear. However, in the 1490s and 1500s humanists patronised by Margaret Beaufort, such as Hugh Oldham and Christopher Urswick shaped the intellectual climate of the college, and may have been appointed as a result of those grants or as a result of Lady Margaret's closeness to her son, and thus reflecting her wider intellectual interests.[121] Indirect rather than direct patronage, through the use of intercession, can be inferred from the households of Catherine of Aragon and Mary, queen of France and then duchess of Suffolk. Catherine of Aragon offered literary and religious patronage to humanists, one of whom, Thomas Linacre, became a canon in 1517.[122] In a surviving letter that might well look like the types of letter written by other royal women earlier seeking preferment for their servants in 1515, Mary, queen of France wrote to Wolsey asking for a prebend for her almoner, James Denton.[123] Looking forward beyond the scope of this chapter to the next, Anne Boleyn's religious sympathies and patronage were to be reflected at St Stephen's, through the appointment of lawyers and theologians supportive of her marriage.[124]

Just as with their male relatives, royal women worshipped in St Stephen's precinct as can be seen from their mass-offerings and other circumstantial evidence. Queens would have been present for at least some of the unusual services held in the chapel, as Elizabeth Woodville and her daughters were for the marriage of Richard of York. Elizabeth of York returned in 1486 for her coronation, when she and Henry VII heard mass the morning after in St Stephen's.[125] David Skinner offers the intriguing suggestion that the motet *Salve Regina, pudica mater* in the Caius choirbook, probably written for the college's use, might reflect Catherine of Aragon's desire for a child, and so might be evidence for an adaptation of the music and liturgy of the chapel to suit her interests and tastes.[126] For more ordinary

---

Gloucester and William, lord Hastings of presentation to the next vacant prebend, *CPR 1476-85*, p. 143; for Margaret Beaufort, see for example, the 21 December 1487 grant to Margaret, countess of Richmond, Elizabeth, the king's consort, John, archbishop of Canterbury, Richard, bishop of Exeter and Reynold Bray, knight, of next collation to the deanery, *CPR 1485-94* p. 206.

[121] Oldham was not appointed directly via letters patent, so was probably appointed by one of the indirect grants; Urswick was the first man appointed to the college by the newly victorious Henry VII on 21 September 1485, *CPR 1485-94,* p. 24; for their connections to Beaufort, see *BRUC,* pp. 433-4 for Oldham, and pp. 605-6 for Urswick; Hugh Ashton, possibly John Chambre, James Denton, Hugh Oldham, and James Whitsons were all canons of St Stephen's and known to have been of Beaufort's household; note that Urswick was not of this group, although he and Thomas Linacre are known to have been patronised by Beaufort; also it is worth noting that none of these canons came through her chapel, all were scholars or lawyers, those who were purely chaplains tended to end up at Tattershall College, Jones & Underwood, *The King's Mother,* pp. 268-87.

[122] *L & P Henry VIII 1517-18*, no. 3624.

[123] *L & P Henry VIII 1515-16*, no. 172.

[124] For example, her almoners, John Skip who resigned his canonry in 1539, and Nicholas Shaxton, who was granted a prebend in 1534, both seemed to have owed their prebends to Anne, see Chapter Four, pp. 104-5.

[125] *Privy Purse Expenses of Elizabeth of York etc.,* ed. N. H. Nicolas, (London: William Pickering, 1830), p. lxxv.

[126] David Skinner, 'Nicholas Ludford (c. 1490-1557): A Biography and Critical Edition of the Antiphons, with a Study of the Collegiate Chapel of the Holy Trinity, Arundel, under the Mastership of Edward Higgons, and a History of the Caius and Lambeth Choirbooks,' (DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1996), p. 46.

events, William Say offered the comment in his *Liber Regie Capelle* of 1450 that the then-queen, Margaret of Anjou, was generally present at the procession and mass daily.[127] While it is rare for household accounts to survive with enough detail to be able to pinpoint the queen's presence in the chapel, the Privy Purse expenses for Elizabeth of York provide a glimpse of her relationship with the college and chapel. Her Privy Purse accounts survived for only 1502 to 1503, as Elizabeth of York's death in March 1503 meant that they were needed to wind up her finances. She never directly referred to the college, although she did note payments for mass at St George's College, Windsor. Rather, when she is in Westminster, payments are made for five shilling mass-offerings on feast days, and since the abbey is not directly mentioned, it is almost certain that the accounts refer to the principal chapel of the palace itself, St Stephen's.[128] This assumption that the chapel was a royal space, and that the payments were often made to the dean or sub-dean of the Chapel-Royal, suggests that the strong link in personnel seen between the College and the Chapel Royal, discussed further in Chapter Six, manifested itself also in a blurring of the boundaries between separate college and royal chapel in the minds of the queen and her financial staff.[129] Also, interesting is that the offerings are generally only on feast days, suggesting that Elizabeth of York did not attend mass in St Stephen's daily when at Westminster, and that her presence in the chapel was not one of private devotion, but rather of visible and public display of royal piety in front of the Court, on a par with that of her husband.

Queenship was also played out in royal chapels, particularly in the ceremonies surrounding childbirth, and then the celebrations for a healthy child. How the canons of St Stephen's and other staff were integrated into the ceremonial overseen by the Chapel Royal is unknown. The *Liber Regie Capelle* had to be non-specific to be useful in all circumstances the Chapel Royal might find themselves carrying out their duties.[130] The instructions for the churching of the queen after childbirth involved a procession in which anthems, but not a route, were specified to allow use of these instructions at any royal palace chapel, which at Westminster would be St Stephen's.[131] One of the slightly better documented instances of the services surrounding childbirth, from the withdrawal from court life before the birth to the churching of the queen and the child's christening, comes from ordinances drawn up by Margaret Beaufort. They probably relate to the birth and christening of Margaret, later queen of Scotland, at

---

[127] 'Presente aliquando rege in processione, et raro deficiente Regina', *Liber Regie Capelle*, p. 59.
[128] Elizabeth of York gave an offering to the dean of the king's chapel, and 5s at mass at St George's in July 1502, and at Westminster for St Simon and St Jude's feast days, and the feast of All Saints, in October and November 1502, *Privy Purse Expenses,* pp. 31 and 53-4.
[129] Below, pp. 174-81.
[130] *Liber Regie Capelle*, p. 55.
[131] Ibid, p. 73.

Westminster in 1489, rather than to Prince Arthur's birth two years earlier at Winchester. While the orders, based on the proscriptions of the *Liber*, refer to Westminster, it is not clear whether they relate to St Stephen's or to St Margaret's, Westminster and both have been claimed.[132] Yet, the reference to the Parliament Chamber, probably the Lesser Hall, as the location for the feast after the christening suggests that St Stephen's was intended.[133] The chapel was to be carpeted and hung with arras, including the porch, which might be difficult at St Stephen's but not impossible. The Abbot of Westminster was to bless a silver font brought from Canterbury, or another font 'as shall please the king', if her son did not approve. Earlier queens would have experienced similar occasions at St Stephen's. These ceremonies brought queenship into the heart of St Stephen's, as they focussed on the most essential function of a queen, that of mother to heirs.

Other than Philippa of Hainault there is no evidence that queens of England were benefactors on a lavish scale of the college and even for Philippa the evidence is much later in date.[134] For Anne of Bohemia a single warrant for payment to the dean and college of St Stephen's survives, related to her obligation to pay £20 to the college for the use of the college's house of La Réole for her Wardrobe.[135] Their piety tended towards the monastic orders, and often towards convents rather than collegiate churches. For example, what is known of Catherine of Aragon's religious patronage suggests that she inclined towards the Observant Franciscans rather than any particular house.[136] These types of interests and devotional impulses were not easily fulfilled by St Stephen's. Rather, it was Marian devotion that the college could offer the queens of England. Margaret of Anjou gave a new stained glass window to the rebuilding of St Mary le Pew, showing herself kneeling with Henry VI in front of the Virgin and including arms of St George and St Edward the Confessor.[137] Margaret Beaufort intended to found a chantry at St Mary le Pew in 1494.[138] Elizabeth of York's account book gives us interesting information about her concern for the image of the Virgin in the Pew chapel. She sent offerings to many of the Marian shrines in southern England after Easter 1502, including to our Lady of the Pew, as well as the major Marian sites such as Walsingham. Consistently when she was in Westminster there were small

---

[132] Leland, *Collectanea*, iv, pp. 179-84.
[133] Ibid, pp. 182-3.
[134] The first edition of Fabyan's chronicle was 1516, and it is not clear where he drew this information from, Robert Fabyan, *New Chronicles of England and France,* (London: Henry Ellis, 1802), p. 480.
[135] In 1384-5, E 101/510/29.
[136] C. S. L. Davies and John Edwards, 'Katherine (1485–1536),' *ODNB*.
[137], 'The Household of Margaret of Anjou 1452-53 II', ed. Alec R. Myers, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 40 (1957), p. 423.
[138] Morgan, 'Scala Coeli,' pp. 89-91; this chantry seems never to have been fully carried out, as it is not in the college obit book.

offerings at St Mary le Pew.[139] In addition, queens were included after death in the commemorative functions of the college, just as their husbands were. There is evidence for obits for Philippa of Hainault, Anne of Bohemia, Katherine of Valois and Elizabeth of York.[140] In all cases, it seems as if the involvement is about the dynasty and the queen's contribution to the monarchy. The exceptions, Joan of Navarre, Margaret of Anjou and Elizabeth Woodville, had no son on the throne to add them to the college's remembrances permanently on their deaths.

Similar to their husbands, women's chantry impulses may have shaped the college's site. Royal women's roles in the building campaigns that shaped the college are very hard to find. Anne of Bohemia inspired the last major extension of the college's Westminster site in 1396 when Richard II created the sub-college of vicars to act as a large chantry foundation in addition to their general duties. The vicars were to keep Anne's anniversary in perpetuity and in return were given rights and lands of their own.[141] This obit may be related to St Stephen's existing obits for Philippa of Hainault and Isabella of France, dedicated in St Mary le Pew in 1369.[142] It might have reflected a personal interest in the college itself on Anne's part and carried out by her husband. However, there is no indication that Anne took an interest in the building works from 1384 to 1394 that had created the houses and offices necessary for the sub-college that was intended to pray for her to the end of the college's existence. The interplay of dynastic sympathies between Margaret of Anjou's window in St Mary le Pew, installed in 1452 just before the fire of that year, and Elizabeth Woodville's lack of known support for the rebuilding efforts there in the 1460s, despite the involvement of her brother, Lord Rivers, cannot be known, but both women would have known and used the chapel.[143] The heraldry of Catherine of Aragon is reflected in the cloister iconography, as discussed above, but again it is hard to see if it is a reflection of her own interest and involvement or simply another reflection of the dynastic decoration everywhere else in the chapel.

Royal women's relationships with St Stephen's mirrored those of their male relatives. The earlier royal women, Philippa of Hainault and Anne of Bohemia, were apparently part of the same building campaigns that their husbands were undertaking to complete St Stephen's, whether on their own initiative or simply because it was an institution in need of intercession and support at that time. Later

---

[139] For the set of Marian offerings in March 1502, *Privy Purse Expenses,* pp. 2-3; offerings to St Mary le Pew alone in June 1502, ibid, pp. 22-3; and on departing for the Tower of London on 13 December 1502, ibid, p. 78.
[140] Cotton MS Faustina B VIII f. 5v for Philippa of Hainault, f. 2r for Katherine of Valois, and f. 4r for Elizabeth of York; for Anne of Bohemia, see *CPR 1392-1396*, p. 669.
[141] *CPR 1392-1396*, p. 669.
[142] Kingsford, 'St Mary le Pew,' pp. 7-8.
[143] See above, p. 77.

queens are never mentioned in connection with the fabric, but increasingly are able to access the patronage benefits of the college for their own servants and connections, and consistently are present when at Westminster in the chapel either alongside their male relatives or instead of them. Indeed, Margaret of Anjou may have spent more time in the chapel than her famously pious husband, because his piety tended to the personal rather than the ostentatious. Even the snippets of evidence for a concern with the Marian devotion in St Mary le Pew, while it is analogous to the similar expressions of devotion by Richard II and possibly by other monarchs, suggest that the college had much to offer in this aspect of religious life, traditionally associated with women. Once again, St Stephen's appears to be the comfortable, useful recipient of customary interest, and a useful and valued backdrop against which the imagery and power of queenship could be played out.

Conclusions

Pulling together trends in the ways in which St Stephen's was used by very different kings across a century and a half of royal change risks over-generalisation. The college's relationship with the king was also conditioned by the personnel of the college, who are discussed further in Chapter Five, and who had differing levels of access to the monarch and different ideas about what was needed for the college.[144] Much also depended on the endowment, as was the subject of the previous chapter, since royal religious patronage did tend to focus on houses that needed support, or on a desire to rebuild and thus show off royal munificence. St Stephen's received most from Richard II, and then again in the earlier years of Henry VIII because in the intervening period it was largely self-sufficient. Where the Lancastrian and Yorkist kings added to the college it was to include themselves in a display of dynastic piety through obits, and to be seen as Christian kings when at the Palace of Westminster through their presence at mass on feast-days and in the life of the Chapel Royal and the college. Yet they too felt it was important to associate themselves with the imagery of Edward III as a successful military king and to make the chapel their own in front of the administration and household, as well as their magnates. This then raises questions of the audience in front of which the monarch and his family were seen to act in the chapel and in relation to the college. The level of indulgences granted to the college in the 1350s and then the few references to masses and other uses suggests that this audience was wide. It was assumed that pilgrims would come, including to see the image of the Virgin in the Pew chapel.[145] The main chapel was felt to be a fit judicial and conciliar space in the 1450s, as will be discussed in Chapter Eight.[146] London merchants knew the college and chapel well enough to feel that they wanted in a small way to be

---

[144] Below, pp. 151-3.
[145] Indulgences were granted or confirmed in 1349, 1354, 1361 and 1476, see below, p. 173.

remembered there and to have themselves added to the prayers for the kings and queens, past and to come. Bishops and archbishops were consecrated at the chapel, which raises questions about the way in which St Stephen's fit into relationships between the Church and the king. From 1527, those relationships were to be tested as never before, as the canons were asked to choose between Henry and Rome, and then to support the theological efforts that would in 1548 make the college itself redundant.

---

[146] Including Eleanor Cobham's trial, but there are also letters from the council at St Stephen's, below, pp. 210-12.

Chapter Four: From Reformation to Dissolution, 1527-1548

This chapter marks the end of the institutional history of St Stephen's College, which occurred in a turbulent and transformative period in English political and ecclesiastical history. Indeed, rarely were those two aspects of life as tightly connected as during the Henrician Reformation from 1533 to 1547 and then in the reigns of his children through to 1603. As the Reformation splintered the Roman Church of the Latin Rite, in England personal religious beliefs became a political signal as Henry VIII broke with Rome but not with many liturgical or theological tenets of the Roman Church. Evangelicals, moderates, and Catholics alike trod carefully in those years as the political theology became fraught. Because of the intense interest in the Reformation and its afterlives among historians and the methods by which these debates have been carried out, this chapter breaks from the late medieval contexts of ecclesiastical institutions and royal patronage to consider St Stephen's College in the light of a very different set of historiographies. The relevant debates among Reformation scholars have tended to work in three very different spheres that interlock. First, there have been debates about the theology of the nascent Church of England and the processes by which Henry VIII and those around him created a church separate from Rome, but also separate from the Lutheran churches of Germany.[1] Second, there has been scholarly disagreement over the take-up of that central Reformation in the localities of early Modern England and particularly over the vibrancy or otherwise of late medieval lay Catholicism in the light of resistance to the Marian Counter-Reformation of the 1550s.[2] Third, and importantly for St Stephen's in particular, there have been debates over the political contexts and culture of early modern England and the ways in which the royal will was disseminated.[3] St Stephen's brings together all of these elements in the historiography.

---

[1] Alec Ryrie, *The Gospel and Henry VIII: Evangelicals in the Early English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Bernard controversially sees Henry himself as the most important driver of religious and political policy during his reign, George Bernard, *The King's Reformation: Henry VIII and the Remaking of the English Church,* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005); for the ecclesiastical side of policy, Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life,* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996); there are also numerous studies of individual episodes, such as the Six Articles, which has been particularly controversial.

[2] Within this concern there have been several approaches to the question such as Ethan H. Shagan, *Popular Politics and the English Reformation*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); on the vibrancy of the late medieval church, Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, c. 1400-c. 1580,* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992); Duffy was responding to a narrative of the English Church in 1530 as ready to collapse, such as Geoffrey Elton's comments in his *Reform and Reformation: England 1509-1558,* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977) p. 9; on the material changes and decisions of parishes, Robert Whiting, *The Reformation of the English Parish Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge, University Press, 2010); there have also been local studies such as Susan Brigden, *London and the Reformation,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).

[3] John Guy sets out his position for Henry as manipulated and guided by those around him, which remains the dominant view in Guy, *Tudor England,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 83; Scarisbrick argued for a stronger role for the king, J.J. Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII,* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969); a view later taken up by Bernard, *King's Reformation.*

It was a royal college that played a significant part in creating and disseminating Henry VIII's official theology, but was itself riven by divisions, which can only be tentatively reconstructed, which point to the complexities for contemporaries in trying to keep abreast of religious developments. Finally, first in its role in Henry VIII's Great Matter of his divorce from Catherine of Aragon and in its dissolution in the first year of Edward VI, the workings and machinations of political action determined how and why it and its endowments were torn apart and dispersed.

Before turning to the story of St Stephen's in those twenty-one years, it is worth pausing to consider the source base for this chapter and how that conditions what can be written about the canons' and other staff's experiences of the Reformation. Just as in the other institutional history chapters in this section, the main evidence base has been royal documentation surviving in The National Archives, which shows the college from the perspective of government and the court. In addition to Chancery and Exchequer material, this chapter also draws on records from the new courts of Augmentations and First Fruits and Tenths, which in many ways duplicated medieval efforts to tally and manage royal landed property. The difference in this chapter, however, is how the scholarship has worked with that collected material. Ever since the sustained efforts of the Victorian calendarists in producing the means by which all subsequent scholarship has approached the material, there has been a divergence between medievalists and early modernists. Medievalists are used to working with the separate sets of calendars for the Patent Rolls, the Close Rolls and the Charter Rolls as well as the various catalogues of other series created by the Victorians when the records were brought together as the Public Record Office in the 1860s. Early modernists, by contrast, deal with these very separate sources as a unified whole along with select material in private collections through the Letters and Papers series for Henry VIII and the State Papers Foreign and Domestic for subsequent monarchs.[4] This may seem a minor point, but it has conditioned all recent scholarship.[5] Superficially, early modern government looks very different based on a survey of the State Papers; it looks much more responsive in that correspondence and unofficial contacts sit alongside the paper or parchment official output of government. Grants are grouped by month, and not in the order they were enrolled

---

[4] C. S. Knighton, 'The Calendars and their Editors, 1856-2006,' in *State Papers Online,* ed. Stephen Alford, (GaleCengage Database, 2006).

[5] This assumption that the State Papers are comprehensive is best seen in Alford's comment: 'here is Tudor government stripped bare, exposed in all its fabulous richness and subtlety,' Stephen Alford, 'Introduction' in *State Papers Online*; there is still material outside the calendars, and the illusion of completeness can be misleading; John Watts, however considers the State Papers to reflect greater reliance on paper-based governance, Watts, "New Men,' 'New Learning', and 'New Monarchy': Personnel and Policy in Royal Government, 1461-1529,' in *Political society in later medieval England: a festschrift for Christine Carpenter*, eds. Benjamin Thompson & John Watts, (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2015), p. 221.

in Chancery.[6] In contrast, medievalists work with an awareness of the forms in which documents were produced by the Chancery based on a longer process of drafts and of letters which often do survive, but are calendared or catalogued elsewhere.[7] Those series of enrollments continue into the early modern period, but they lose their distinctive identity for scholars because they appear alongside so much other material. While this is not the only reason why early modernists' conceptions of the court and of the state have been so different from those working on earlier versions of the same phenomena, it helps to explain why this chapter on St Stephen's has had to take a different route through the same types of material as existed for the fifteenth century.

St Stephen's College in the Reformation

St Stephen's, Westminster forms a significant vantage point for the course of the English Reformation. It was not a parish church in the localities; it was a privileged royal chapel at the heart of Henrician administration and the court.[8] Most of the scholarship is concerned with the court, following the descriptions in the primary sources, as the place where the central Reformation was created. Yet few scholars have thought about where those debates were happening and how the changing uses of the Palace of Westminster and the London-area palaces more generally intersected with the progress of the Reformation.[9] The court tends to be seen as a disembodied grouping distant from the parishes which felt the sting of reform.[10] David Starkey has identified as a problem for Henry VIII that there was an increasing distinction between the world of administration within the palace of Westminster and the king's court and household, which after the winter of 1512/3, was largely based elsewhere until the 1530s remodelling of York Place into Whitehall as part of his argument for why Wolsey dominated the early years of Henrician administration.[11] However, the

---

[6] Amanda Bevan, 'State Papers of Henry VIII: the archives and the documents,' in *State Papers Online,* particularly her comment about the ways in which the state papers were assembled from earlier classifications.

[7] For example, in SC 1, which is also an artificial category created by the Victorians, but contains ancient correspondence, or in SC 8, which is ancient petitions to a variety of officials, including the king himself, the Lord Chancellor, and Parliament, that does some of the same work as the State Papers. In addition, collections such as the Lisle Letters now in State Papers are in part paralleled by earlier letter collections of well-connected but non-aristocratic families such as the Pastons.

[8] The college's staff were given the privilege of maintaining their pluralism and their title as 'king's chaplains', thus associating them directly with the king, *L & P Henry VIII 1537 Part 2,* no. 1150 (35).

[9] Samman gestures at the possibilities of studying the locations of the court, but the rest of his thesis is concerned with the slightly artificial definition of progresses as opposed to the usual itineration of the king and his court, Neil Samman, 'The Henrician Court during Cardinal Wolsey's Ascendancy, c.1514-29,' (PhD thesis, University of Wales, 1988), pp. 7-8.

[10] Even Julia Merritt's book on early modern Westminster deals largely with the parishes of St Margaret's and St Martin in the Fields rather than considering how those parishes interacted with the court at Whitehall, Julia Merritt, *The Social World of Early Modern Westminster: Abbey, Court and Community 1525-1640,* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), p. 10.

[11] David Starkey, 'Court, Council and Nobility in Tudor England', in eds. Ronald G. Asch & Adolf M. Birke, *Princes,*

court did not move far, and could still be quickly reached by water, whether it was at Bridewell, Greenwich or Richmond. Additionally, in 1536 by an act of Parliament, Westminster and Whitehall palaces were effectively joined together in administrative terms, which marked a return to the close physical association between administration and the court when the king was present. Simon Thurley has also written on Henry VIII's changing architectural tastes, but has not pushed this line of inquiry further to consider how localising the court in the palaces it used might help us understand the Reformation and those at its heart.[12] Because of its position within the palace used for administration, and its accessibility for public audiences, it was no accident that St Stephen's was the institution used to reward theologians in Henry VIII's favour and that its canons were influential in creating the new doctrines of the Henrician church, which was neither Catholic nor fully evangelical in the mould of Luther or the continental reformers.

St Stephen's had two major benefits for Henry VIII and for his theologians. First, most pragmatically, St Stephen's offered wages and housing near the court, wherever it happened to be, whether the London-area palaces, Whitehall or along the river at Greenwich or later Hampton Court. Canons could attend services at St Stephen's and still easily be with the court when required. Second, Henry VIII may also have found the college's jurisdictional independence helpful; the dean could act without the approbation of the local bishop, Cuthbert Tunstall of London until 1530 and then his successor John Stokesley until 1539.[13] From 1540 through to 1550 the archdeaconry of Westminster, which included St Stephen's and the surrounding area, was made into a bishopric in its own right, that of Westminster with Thomas Thirlby as bishop.[14] On account of this jurisdictional independence, in 1533 Thomas Cranmer could be consecrated as archbishop of Canterbury at St Stephen's in a very visible show of royal support and defiance of the pope.[15] The consecration at St Stephen's was a deliberate choice; there was nowhere more suitable than a royal free chapel within Westminster Palace for such a ceremony as royal authority replaced papal authority. While we have ambiguous evidence of how services at St Stephen's changed during the Reformation, we do know that St Stephen's, along with the Chapel Royal, with which it was closely associated, could have

Patronage, and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age, c. 1450-1650, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 180.

[12] Simon Thurley, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England: A Social and Architectural History,* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), pp. 136-40.

[13] The privilege of St Stephen's as exempt from London was confirmed by Edward IV, and recopied in the sixteenth century in BL Lansdowne MS 410, ff. 1-26v.

[14] Merritt, *Early Modern Westminster*, p. 27.

[15] He took his oath to the papacy in St Stephen's Chapter House and then was consecrated by John Longland in the chapel, Reg. Cranmer, ff. 1-3.

served as a testing ground for religious and liturgical innovations.[16] As a royal palatine chapel accessible to the general public thronging the law courts or Parliament, St Stephen's services would have sent strong signals about religious policy, second only to those of the Chapel Royal and thus repay careful scrutiny. As an institution that survived the first rounds of dissolutions under Henry VIII to be dissolved under Edward VI, it also allows for comparisons between the reforming policies of both monarchs, and the developing changes in the purposes of colleges, charities and the Church more widely.

St Stephen's College had a longer history of interest in reform within the Catholic Church, in ways that look very familiar to scholars of humanist thought.[17] The humanism of the canons of St Stephen's before the reformation came from their university educations, time spent abroad, and their interest in the Classics, and was not yet anything other than an orthodox intellectual interest. The circles of humanist scholars drew from the universities and from circles around influential, and often royal, patrons.[18] In Henry VII's reign, probably under the patronage of Margaret Beaufort, canons included prominent humanists such as John Gunthorpe, Christopher Urswick, Pietro Carmeliano and Andreas Ammonias.[19] These men were both royal servants, serving as secretaries and almoners to Henry VII and then Henry VIII, and men of letters, involved with the scholarly efforts of the day. This trend of appointing distinguished scholars and courtiers to St Stephen's, which kept them close to the court and, as a royal college, gave them a marker of royal favour, seems to have been continued under Henry VIII, although on a smaller scale, with the appointments of Thomas Linacre in 1517, and later that year, John Longland.[20] Linacre has often been discussed as a doctor and cleric, but he was appointed to St Stephen's for his royal educational service, and possibly for his

---

[16] Marsh notes that although the Chapel Royal has been seen as setting the ritual trends for the kingdom as a whole, this is now felt to be incorrect, Dana T. Marsh, 'Sacred Polyphony 'not Understandid': Medieval Exegesis, Ritual Tradition and Henry VIII's Reformation,' *Early Music History* 29 (2010), pp. 39-40; rather than formally setting the agenda, I would like to suggest that the Chapel Royal offered a display of ritual practice that was associated with the king and thus could be looked to by contemporaries, as suggested in the comments by Thomas Cranmer in a letter to Cromwell in 1537, 'But, my lord, if in the Court you do keep such holydays and fasting days as be abrogated, when shall we persuade the people to cease from keeping of them; for the King's own house shall be an example unto all the realm to break his own ordinances,' *L & P Henry VIII 1537 Part 2*, no. 592.

[17] Lucy C.E. Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism in the Reformation,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 37-8.

[18] James K. McConica, *English Humanists and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), p. 6 on royal patronage, p. 53 on the convergence at Doctors' Commons of the court, the universities and the City of London; see also Arthur J. Slavin, 'Humanists and Government in Early Tudor England,' *Viator* 1 (1970), p. 311.

[19] Chapter Three, pp. 91-2.

[20] Linacre was appointed to replace Ammonias, *L & P Henry VIII 1517-18,* no. 3624; John Longland, later bishop of Lincoln was appointed in in *L & P Henry VIII 1517-18*, no. 3809; for his career see Margaret Bowker, 'Longland, John (1473–1547)', *ODNB*.

connection with Wolsey.[21] During his ascendancy, Thomas Wolsey was a strong influence on the college, appointing men such as Richard Wolman, Thomas Larke and Hugh Ashton, who had also been of Margaret Beaufort's household, showing a continuity of interests from the fifteenth to the sixteenth centuries.[22] What is interesting though, in light of historiographical interest in Henry VIII's Erasmian sympathy for reformed Catholic learning in the 1510s and 1520s is that it was rarely played out at St Stephen's, perhaps because his humanist patronage tended to go to members of the laity rather than those who were priests.[23] He rarely appointed to the canonries himself, preferring to grant out the right to present to members of the college or of his court.[24] Those known to have been appointed directly by the king are men such as John Taylor, an administrator in Chancery rather than a scholar, as a traditional reward for royal service.[25] Robert Toney, who worked in Chancery but was a friend of Erasmus', bridged the divide.[26] The known canons on the eve of the Reformation were administrators, or those appointed by others, often educated in the humanist colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, and who were to prove cautiously sympathetic to Henry VIII's efforts at reform in the Church.

Given the lack of Henrician patronage of humanism in the early part of his reign, it is perhaps not surprising that St Stephen's and the other royal free colleges seem rather removed from the efforts to gather support and evidence for the king's divorce case in the 1520s. When Stephen Gardiner was writing his lists of who to examine to see if he could produce convincing learned opinion for a repudiation of Catherine of Aragon, he looked to the universities and the canon lawyers, not to the humanist priests of a slightly older generation at places like St Stephen's or St George's, Windsor.[27] As most of the theologian canons at St Stephen's were of a slightly older generation, such as

---

[21] Vivian Nutton, 'Linacre, Thomas (c.1460–1524)', *ODNB*.
[22] Wolsey's influence at St Stephen's can be seen in the letter from Mary, queen of France complaining to Henry VIII that Wolsey has appointed Richard Sampson to a canonry, *L & P Henry VIII 1515-16*, no. 172; Lewycky lists seven men who would go on to canonries at St Stephen's, Hugh Ashton, William Knight, Thomas Linacre, Richard Rawlins, Richard Sampson, Richard Wade and Richard Wolman, Nadine Lewycky, 'Serving God and King: Cardinal Thomas Wolsey's patronage networks and early Tudor government, 1514-1529, with special reference to the Archdiocese of York,' (PhD thesis, University of York, 2008), appendix 5, pp. 313-57.
[23] On the lack of direct Henrician patronage, McConica, *English Humanists*, p. 58; Bernard, *King's Reformation*, pp. 236-7.
[24] Examples include the grants for Thomas, marquis of Dorset and John Branche, *L & P Henry VIII 1515-16*, no. 4, for the archbishop of Canterbury and Cuthbert Tunstall, ibid, no 310; and for the archbishop of York, the abbot of Westminster, Sir William Compton and John Chambre, ibid, no. 315.
[25] John Taylor, the Master of the Rolls was appointed to St Stephen's on 16 March 1518, *L & P Henry VIII 1517-18*, no. 4012.
[26] Toney was appointed canon in 1523 as clerk of the Hanaper of Chancery, *L & P Henry VIII 1521-23*, no. 2987; he was a papal prothonotary and a friend of Erasmus, *L & P Henry VIII 1519-21*, no. 968.
[27] For example, Gardiner's list of possible supporters does not contain any names of then-current canons of St Stephen's, *L & P Henry VIII 1531-32,* no. 6 (18).

Ammonias and Carmeliano who had been appointed for their work in the 1490s and 1510s, they were probably felt to be unlikely to support the king. They were not to support Catherine of Aragon in the divorce case, the only possible exception being William Benet.[28] The slightly younger generation, men such as Taylor or Richard Rawlins, were scholars in the sense that they had been educated in the universities, but their post-graduate education was in civil and canon law, not in the interpretation of theology.[29] Henry and his team were trying to show that Leviticus rather than Deuteronomy held true for his situation, that he was cursed by lack of heirs on account of his marriage to his brother's widow. He needed theologians, rather than lawyers, even canon lawyers, for that effort. Instead, then-canons such as Richard Sampson were better used as diplomats, seeking to turn the theologians' efforts into diplomatic reality, through their contacts with France and the Holy Roman Empire.[30] Others, such as William Knight who were also to be canons in 1530s, were also used in this effort; Knight spent most of the late 1520s in Rome trying to win papal support for the divorce case.[31] The events of the 1520s did, however, reinvigorate the pool of candidates for canonries at these types of royal foundations, by bringing to royal attention young scholarly priests whose efforts could be rewarded with prebends in the new regime after 1529.

For the rest of Henry's reign, St Stephen's was a place in which royal chaplains and theologians were given prebends, and the use of grants of collation dropped away, showing that once again, St Stephen's prebends were an important royal resource. One wonders how much sympathy the older generation of administrator canons such as Edward Higgons or Robert Toney had with the new men as theologians and canon lawyers were needed to create and defend the king's religious policy. On Gardiner's list of 1531 concerning those who should be asked to offer opinions on the king's divorce, two men who would later be canons are listed, Thomas Canner and Richard Coren.[32] The first sign of a shift in royal priorities with regard to St Stephen's prebends came in 1530, when John Stokesley resigned his prebend for the bishopric of London and was replaced by one of Henry VIII's more important theologians, Edward Lee, later archbishop of York.[33] Although he was later to be seen very much as a conservative, in 1530 he was an active reformer within the boundaries of the

---

[28] None of the canons other than possibly Dr Benet [if William Benet] are listed in Maria Dowling, 'Humanist Support for Katherine of Aragon,' *Bulletin of the Institute for Historical Research* 57 (1984), p. 46-55; for William Bennet's support for Catherine, see, Donald F. Logan, 'Benet, William (*d.* 1533),' *ODNB*; and for Catherine's humanist circle before 1527, McConica, *English Humanists,* p. 54.

[29] See appendices for details.

[30] Andrew A. Chibi, 'Sampson, Richard (*d.* 1554)', *ODNB.*

[31] William Knight's career is summarised in Richard Clark, 'Knight, William (1475/6–1547)', *ODNB;* vast numbers of his often-frustrated letters back to Wolsey and Henry VIII survive in the State Papers.

[32] *L & P Henry VIII 1531-32*, no. 6 (18).

Church. Lee was followed in the next four years by John Brereton, again one of the theologians who were working on the divorce in 1531 and in 1534 by Nicholas Shaxton, at the time a leading evangelical although he was to become very conservative from 1546.[34] At some point around that time, possibly in 1532, Thomas Goodrich was made a canon, again an evangelical at the time who later became a bishop.[35] For the rest of the 1530s and the 1540s, St Stephen's had a mix of canons; some who were only briefly at the college on their career progression to the episcopate, such as George Day, or John Skip, and some who were to stay to their deaths.[36] Men such as Alan Cook, Thomas Robertson, Richard Coren, and John Donne were royal chaplains but like Roger Ascham, seem to have wanted to stay away from the political complexities of a bishopric, while still being involved in the creation and maintenance of theology.[37]

St Stephen's role in the creation of official theology before 1547 requires looking at the level beneath the bishops or at the bishops before they became part of the episcopate. The role of Henrician bishops in creating religious policy has been contentious among historians, but equally it has been studied, by Baldwin Smith and Chibi and disputed by Bernard.[38] Chibi in particular divided the bishops into overly schematic theological camps, which obscures the multiplicities of possible opinions here.[39] More broadly, the divisions between evangelical and conservative have been drawn too strongly for the complexities of their collective thought and the multiple possibilities for disagreement and compromise.[40] Ryrie's evangelicals are the outspoken, influential men and women who can be seen as outside the mainstream. Yet, after 1533, all the bishops had accepted royal supremacy, anti-papal sentiment and the need for reform. What that reform should look like was another matter, as was how it played into other practical or political concerns both at the episcopal and at the lower level. The canons at St Stephen's were rarely evangelical, and firmly within the mainstream, but they were committed to some form of reform and experimentation within the

---

[33] *L & P Henry VIII 1529-30*, no. 6506.
[34] For Brereton see *BRUO 1540,* pp. 67-8; and for Shaxton see Susan Wabuda, 'Shaxton, Nicholas (*c*.1485–1556)', *ODNB.*
[35] Goodrich is only known when he left St Stephen's for the bishopric of Ely and was replaced by Shaxton, *L & P Henry VIII 1534*, no. 589 (8).
[36] For the bishops, see Table 5.
[37] For Ascham's reluctance to take a position at court, see McConica*, English Humanists*, p. 208-9.
[38] Lacey Baldwin Smith, *Tudor Prelates and Politics 1536-1563,* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953); Andrew A. Chibi, *Henry VIII's Bishops: Diplomats, Administrators, Scholars and Shepherds*, (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2003); for Bernard's views on the bishops, see *King's Reformation*, pp. 477-9.
[39] Commented on by Peter Marshall, 'Review of *Henry VIII's Bishops: Diplomats, Administrators, Scholars and Shepherds'*, (review no. 399) at http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/review/399 [accessed 5 May 2016].
[40] The boundary between Catholic and Protestant was more fluid than often thought, Ryrie, *Gospel and Henry VIII*, p. 3; evangelicals were a small, but important minority, ibid, pp. 6-7.

church, so Catholic does not quite describe them either. For example, in 1536, three canons were implicated in a plot to favour Princess Mary at a time when Henry VIII had no obvious heir given that he had repudiated both his first and second marriages.[41] They were supposed to have discussed the matter in their houses in Canon Row. Richard Wolman had been one of Wolsey's men, involved in the king's divorce, but not an ardent reformer by any means.[42] He and William Knight, Henry's secretary in the 1520s, were old friends, probably through their shared experiences as diplomats.[43] The third canon, John Bell, was also of that group of those who accepted the king's will but were cautious reformers; he had worked for Wolsey in the 1520s, and had canvassed Oxford concerning the king's divorce.[44] Bell and Wolman had both taken part in the May 1527 divorce court organised by Wolsey, hardly a sign that they would later be partial to Mary.[45] Nothing came of the supposed plot of 1536, and indeed Bell and Knight were both later bishops. Their religious sympathies are not easy to discern. In addition to work on the divorce, Bell was involved with the Bishop's Book of 1537 in some capacity, as his name appears on the commission list.[46] Wolman also signed the letter from Convocation in 1537 asking for the Bishop's Book to be accepted by the king, shortly before his death.[47] They were very well educated men, whose theological knowledge and opinions were at the service of the king and of Cranmer.

Where the theology and the personalities become particularly interesting is in the careers of the men who never were bishops, because they were often the ones doing the behind-the-scenes work and whose opinions and thoughts fed into the complexities of theology at the higher level. They were the ones arguing in Convocation, preaching at court, and otherwise doing the intellectual work that would be refined into policy. Teams of priests worked on every theological statement of Henry's reign, and part of the authority of those statements was that they supposedly came from the English Church as a whole, with royal assent as its Supreme Head. Certainly, the politics of choosing those

---

[41] *L & P Henry VIII Vol 10: 1536*, no. 1134 (4); this seems to have triggered Wriothesley's request to Cromwell that 'fat priests' like Bell, Knight and Wolman should have to pay money towards the levies, SP 1/109 f. 26, calendared as *L & P Henry VIII Vol 11: 1536*, no. 834.

[42] Wolman was Wolsey's proctor, F.D. Logan, 'Doctors' Commons in the early sixteenth century: a society of many talents,' *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 61 (1988), p. 161; he was the prolocutor for Convocation in 1529, *L & P Henry VIII 1529-30*, no. 6047; he consistently identified as king's chaplain and for a summary of his career, see Brett Usher, 'Wolman, Richard (*d*. 1537)', *ODNB*.

[43] Knight paid for an obit for Wolman, and served as his executor, PROB 11/27/113.

[44] Susan Wabuda, 'Bell, John (*d*. 1556)', *ODNB*.

[45] Geoffrey de C. Parmiter, *The King's Great Matter: A Study of Anglo-Papal Relations 1527-1534,* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1967), pp. 12-13.

[46] Both Bell and Wolman answered the questions concerning confirmation that went into the Bishops' Book, BL Cotton MS Cleopatra E V f. 75; for the commission see Wabuda, 'John Bell'.

[47] *L & P Henry VIII 1537 Part 2*, no. 402.

who served on such commissions could be intense, given the competing broad-brush parties with their different interests. Still, the king's chaplains included a range of opinions, united only by the not particularly contentious belief in the Church of England and the royal supremacy. Beyond that, a commitment to creating a better church was all that the king seems to have required. How that was to be achieved was open to debate. Thus at the dissolution of the college in 1548, Richard Cox, Thomas Robertson, John Donne, and Thomas Slater were all among the canons, and provide a sampling of the range of variation within Henrician religious policy, particularly at the end of Henry's reign.[48] Cox was Edward VI's tutor, chosen for his erudition and his commitment to reform, and was close to the evangelical grouping at court, including Anthony Denny.[49] Dean of Westminster under Edward VI, he fled under Mary and returned under Elizabeth. Thomas Robertson was much further to the conservative side as he both worked on the Bishop's Book and later was a highly trusted dean of Durham under Mary.[50] John Donne and Thomas Slater provide a particularly interesting pairing, since twenty years earlier in 1528, they had been on opposing sides at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Donne, later sub-dean of the Chapel Royal and recipient of various preferments, was among those calling for radical reform whereas Slater was of the Catholic party then and only ever held a prebend at St Stephen's.[51] Yet both men contributed to the creation of religious policy and both were king's chaplains.

Definitional ambiguity was the defining characteristic of the canons at this point, and reflected their diversity of opinions and Henry VIII's personal commitment to debate within the church. It is impossible to tie canons' opinions and their appointments to political factions at court in the 1540s. Instead, canons of St Stephen's worked on all of the major religious policy statements of the reign, from the early efforts in the late 1520s and early 1530s to define the theological basis of the divorce case, through to the late statements on faith. They also took part in the diplomacy and commissions, which bolstered and supported the theological work of Cranmer and the rest of the episcopate as well as those scholars who were asked for their opinions. For the earlier part of Henry's reformation, Richard Coren, or Curwen, shows the range of work, the ambivalent personal beliefs and the sheer level of demands that these king's chaplains faced. In 1532, he preached a sermon in reaction to the anti-divorce sermon of William Peto at Greenwich, at the king's command.[52] Four years later, he

---

[48] They are all listed in the *Chantry Certificate*, p. 80.
[49] Felicity Heal, 'Cox, Richard (*c.*1500–1581)', *ODNB.*
[50] H. L. Parish, 'Robertson, Thomas (*fl. c.*1520–1561)', *ODNB.*
[51] For Donne, see *BRUO 1540,* p. 172; and for Slater see ibid, p. 519.
[52] For a discussion of Peto's sermon see Parmiter, *The King's Great Matter*, pp. 198-9; for Coren's sermon see Chapuys' comments as summarised in *L & P Henry VIII 1531-32*, no. 941.

denied papal authority in 1536 as the break from Rome became permanent.[53] In 1537, he was among the commission sent north with the duke of Norfolk to deal with the Pilgrimage of Grace, and wrote back to Cromwell about the difficulties they encountered[54]. Coren answered the questions put to the bishops in 1539, and his responses thus contributed to the King's Book of 1540.[55] Three years later in 1542, he was among those who were working on a new Bible in English as part of Convocation.[56] Yet when he died in the summer of 1542, his will looked extraordinarily traditional with its requests to the saints to intercede for him. He wanted to be buried at St Stephen's with the full funeral mass and with a temporary chantry.[57] While those were not yet banned, they were not the choices of a strongly evangelical reformer. Coren was not alone in his dedicated and varied service to the English Church. John Crayford, a canon from 1541 to 1544, also had a range of roles. He first occurs identified as the king's confessor in 1527, when he is given a benefice in Calais by Wolsey.[58] From 1534 to 1537 he appears at Cambridge as the Master of Clare Hall and the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, where Nicholas Latimer was only slightly sceptical of his reforming credentials, which probably means he was more to the reformed side than Coren or Robertson.[59] In 1537 he was probably among the preachers at Paul's Cross.[60] He then left Cambridge to help survey the monasteries, where he wrote to Wriothesley about Titchfield Abbey and Hyde Abbey.[61] After this, his active work other than meeting Anne of Cleves at Dover in 1540 seems to disappear from the records, but he gathers up various prebends, including Winchester and Durham as well as maintaining residence at St Paul's.[62]

As a final example of the ways in which St Stephen's contributed to the Reformation, and the variety of approaches to it that can be found in its canons' careers, John Rudd had a turbulent and sporadic professional life before coming to St Stephen's late, by 1546. He first appears in the State Papers as a 'professor artium' at King's College, Cambridge in 1522.[63] He next appears for preaching sedition in

---

[53] *L & P Henry VIII Vol 11: 1536*, nos. 120 (10) and 124 (5).
[54] *L & P Henry VIII 1537 Part 1*, no. 615; and *L & P Henry VIII 1537 Part 2*, no. 219, which is Coren's letter to Cromwell concerning Robert Aske's execution.
[55] *L & P Henry VIII 1539 Part 1*, no. 1063 (4).
[56] *L & P Henry VIII 1542*, no. 176.
[57] PROB 11/27/113.
[58] *L & P Henry VIII 1526-28*, no. 3304.
[59] *L & P Henry VIII 1537 Part 2*, no. 258.
[60] Cranmer told Thirlby that he has lost Crayford's bill for preaching at Paul's Cross, *L & P Henry VIII 1534*, no. 703.
[61] *L & P Henry VIII 1539 Part 1,* no. 862.
[62] For Dover, *L & P Henry VIII 1539 Part 2*, no. 573 (3); Cromwell notes in 1534 and 1540 that he should ensure Crayford has preferment, *L & P Henry VIII 1534*, no. 257, and *L & P Henry VIII 1540*, no 322; in 1544 he is listed as a residentiary at St Paul's, *L & P Henry VIII 1544 Part 2*, no. 328 (9).
[63] *L & P Henry VIII Addenda* Vol. I Part I, no. 357 at p. 107.

1534. At Paul's Cross he defended those 'imposters' who had been condemned, saying that the trial had been a farce and the evidence false. For this, he had been imprisoned and wrote to Roland Lee, then bishop-elect of Coventry and Lichfield, asking for his help in being released. As a gift to persuade Lee that he was the sort of person Lee should help, he included a map he had drawn of the Holy Land based on Strabo and the church fathers, and claiming that he has some fame in the drawing of maps.[64] It was an odd gift to send Lee, who is not known to have otherwise been interested in that sort of humanist reconciliation of classical and patristic sources.[65] After this rocky start, Rudd also signed the letter from Convocation in 1540 concerning the annulment of Henry's marriage to Anne of Cleves, along with most of his future colleagues at St Stephen's.[66] Perhaps his work in that Convocation is what brought him to favourable royal attention. In 1545 to 1546 he appears as clerk of the king's closet, the chaplain who oversaw all the practical needs of Henry's personal chapel.[67] Thus, again, there is no real doctrinal clarity in his career. At Cambridge he appears possibly evangelical, if the reference to 'imposters' is about those imprisoned for heresy in 1534, yet by 1546 he is paying for the repairs of mass books and the laundering of altar linens. In many ways doctrinal clarity and clearly defined confessional positions were not what the most influential churchmen in England were looking for; rather they wanted a variety of beliefs within a set of boundaries that were themselves flexible, neither too evangelical nor too Popish at any given moment, according to the situation and the debates within the Church. Perhaps the best definition of what was required is William Paget writing to Stephen Gardiner in 1547, 'I will not allow private concerns to hinder the public cause and have always dealt in public affairs according to my conscience.'[68]

In addition, St Stephen's College needs to be set against the backdrop of the working out of theology in the period, especially the tensions between efforts to reform in line with scripture and the desire to maintain an authoritative structure for the Church of England. In particular, modern scholars have struggled with Henry VIII's attitude towards colleges during the Reformation.[69] In part this comes

---

[64] *L & P Henry VIII 1534,* no. 303.

[65] For Roland Lee's career and beliefs see Michael A. Jones, 'Lee, Rowland (*c.*1487–1543)', *ODNB.*

[66] John Taylor, John Chambre, John Crayford, Richard Rawson, Richard Coren, William Knight, Thomas Robertson, Thomas Thirlby, Richard Wade and Richard Cox were among the signatories, *L & P Henry VIII 1540,* no. 861.

[67] *L & P Henry VIII 1545 Part 1*, no. 418.

[68] *Cal. State Papers Edward VI*, no. 24.

[69] For contrasting views see Richard Rex & C.D.C. Armstrong, 'Henry VIII's Ecclesiastical and Collegiate Foundations,' *Historical Research* 75 (2002), pp. 390- 407, which sees Henry as an active benefactor to abbeys and particularly colleges which were fundamentally Catholic, as opposed to Alan Kreider, *English Chantries: The Road to Dissolution,* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979), p. 37 on the possibilities for colleges within a

from historiographical definitional over-precision, as Henry was associated with three new chantry colleges, Brecon, Burton on Trent, and Thornton, in the 1540s and founded the new cathedrals of 1540, which were collegiate in form, but these have not been seen as equivalent.[70] Historians have noted that, in contrast to his father, he never directly built any ecclesiastical institutions, only finished projects begun by others, such as Cardinal College becoming Christ Church in the 1530s.[71] Yet all three types of foundation were colleges to contemporaries. Colleges were useful in the thinking of many strands of reforming thought. For those interested in maintaining the episcopal structures of the church, they could run cathedrals, and indeed colleges took over the old monastic cathedrals and staffed the new diocesan ones of 1540.[72] They provided a potential means of organising education, so the reformers interested in Lutheran ideas of *sola scriptura* and godly learning could support their expansion, particularly in Oxford and Cambridge, and as schools elsewhere.[73] Finally, they often added to the pastoral and social care available, which had been a concern before the Reformation and continued to be a concern.[74] It was only from the mid to late 1530s that distinctions between cathedrals, chantries and educational colleges began to be drawn, as reformers sought to destroy the doctrine of Purgatory and any suggestion that prayers for the dead were efficacious.[75] At the same time, educational colleges at the universities were the places where theology was taught, and since most of those involved in the debate had doctorates from one of the universities, they were understandably reluctant to see those colleges disappear. Thus the 1545 Chantries Act was a problematic piece of legislation, which allowed the surrender into the king's hands of chantries and colleges, but did not require it.[76] Only a few of the major colleges succumbed at this point; mostly the 1545 surrenders were of decayed chantries that had lands that could be expropriated without a fuss and without threatening education or social provision.[77]

The one known institutional response to the Reformation at St Stephen's comes from this changing,

---

reformed church.

[70] Rex & Armstrong, 'Henry VIII's Foundations,' p. 400.

[71] Bernard, *King's Reformation*, p. 235; however, this is a problematic statement given that he did finish what had been started, other monarchs simply let projects decay, and his possible involvement in the St Stephen's cloisters, see Chapter Three, pp. 78-81.

[72] Henry ordered four more cathedral and collegial churches, Bernard, *King's Reformation*, pp. 457-8.

[73] Ryrie, *Gospel and Henry VIII*, p. 159; on Richard Cox's vigorous protests against dissolving colleges, McConica, *English Humanists*, p. 216.

[74] Duffy, *Stripping the Altars*, pp. 454-5.

[75] Peter Marshall, *Beliefs and the Dead in Reformation England*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 76-7 on the attack on Purgatory in 1537, although radicals had been pushing for it since 1531, p. 52.

[76] The Act is 37 Hen. VIII, c.4, published in *Statutes of the Realm,* 11 vols. (London: Dawsons of Pall Mall for the Record Commission, 1810-28), iv, pp. 989-93; alleges misuse of chantries by laymen as the reason for the statute, ibid, p. 989; for the campaigns to save the universities from it see Ryrie, *Gospel and Henry VIII*, pp. 164-5.

[77] Kreider, *Chantries*, p. 154.

but not yet changed context for colleges within the English church. Before 1547, and probably starting as early as 1542 when a licence to acquire lands in mortmain was granted, John Chambre as dean set about creating a set of almsrooms within the college.[78] He, and probably the college as an institution, bought up lands in Middlesex and Surrey to endow and support the almsrooms and their keeper, keeping the lands close to the institution and thus easier to manage than the college's own dispersed estates.[79] He may have had two overlapping motives for this new development. First that the dissolution of Westminster Abbey in 1539 had thrown the social provisions for the parish of St Margaret's into disarray.[80] The abbey's alms provision and its role as the landlord for much of the manor meant that its fall and the consequent confusion as it was reconstituted as a diocesan cathedral caused hardship and lack of charity in Westminster. While the new almsrooms with their eight inhabitants in St Stephen's Alley, to the north of Canon Row, could not match the earlier provision, it was at least an attempt to alleviate a pressing problem. The other side of the new foundation may have been to try to put St Stephen's on the right side of the growing definitional gap between colleges as chantries, with doctrinally-dubious prayers for the dead, and colleges as providing a home for godly, educated priests and doing good works in their vicinity. However motivated, the alms rooms seem to have survived the college for another two hundred years and gradually faded away. The buildings were in decay by 1651 when a commission noted that since the execution of Charles I there had been no maintenance.[81] Until the reign of Anne, there are occasional grants by monarchs by letters patent to their elderly servants of a room at St Stephen's for long service.[82]

Historians have ignored how the Reformation affected the religious life of the royal household, in terms of how services were conducted, and what observers saw. There is, however, an older scholarship in musicology which saw the Chapel Royal as the proxy for the liturgical music of the English Reformation and a scholarship on individuals' religious choices.[83] While Fiona Kisby has made a strong case for the importance of the Chapel Royal in displaying and disseminating the

---

[78] *L & P Henry VIII 1542*, no. 71 (35); and SP 46/128 f. 208 from 1547.
[79] The lands bought for the almshouses and the names of the almsmen are listed in *Chantry Certificate*, p. 79.
[80] Gervase Rosser, *Medieval Westminster 1200-1540*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), pp. 298-300 on Westminster Abbey's charitable efforts; pp. 309-10 on the end of St James' Hospital; and pp. 310-21 on local support for the guild charity of St Mary Rounceval.
[81] E 367/ 2042.
[82] There is a 1708 petition concerning their allowances in PC 1/2/79.
[83] Marsh, 'Sacred Polyphony' p. 38; Fiona Kisby, '"When the King Goeth a Procession": Chapel Ceremonies and Services, the Ritual Year, and Religious Reforms at the Early Tudor Court, 1485-1547,' *Journal of British Studies* 40 (2001), p. 45; see also the now outdated Elizabeth A. Culling, 'The Impact of the Reformation on the Royal Household to 1553,' (PhD thesis, University of Durham, 1986).

images of monarchy in this period, this can be extended into looking at the liturgy itself, rather than just the musical personnel.[84] The Henrician Reformation's impact on the parishes of England has been well studied, not least because it is to the parishes that historians have looked for answers about the take-up of the ideas being formulated in the centre by Henry VIII and his ministers.[85] The Reformation at Westminster in particular deserves careful attention because it allows us to see the interplay of the royal will, the religious beliefs of his servants and the politics of the day. On a daily basis the services offered by the Chapel Royal and by the two royal colleges would have sent strong signals about what a reformed Church as sanctioned by the king might look like. How the Chapel Royal conducted its services during this period, however, has not yet been studied, so St Stephen's is in part a proxy here for the larger chapel. Studies of Henry's personal religious practices naturally focus on his closet, where his preferences were supreme, whereas the Chapel Royal was a much more public venue.[86] Despite Bernard's insistence that Henry VIII's religious policy was consistent throughout the 1530s and 1540s, it cannot have felt that way to contemporaries, who saw the rise and fall of ministers, and the changing orders for how to conduct services and what godly education should look like. They would have looked to various sources to understand what was required at that time, their diocesan bishops, the orders of visitations, and perhaps reports of the sermons preached at Court and the details of royal services if they happened to be able to witness the spectacle. For general audiences who were not the court, St Stephen's services would be a particularly important venue for displaying policy in action, as the chapel at Westminster that was accessible to those visiting the king's administration and the law courts, as opposed to the itinerant Chapel Royal, or the intermittently used chapel at Whitehall.

St Stephen's had a potentially quite fraught relationship with the changing directives of the Church of England given the hints that have survived of their adaptation to the Reformation. This pattern also seems to have been played out at St Stephen's sister institutions; the little evidence that survives suggests that St George's and the Chapel Royal were also conservative in their liturgical changes.[87] Unlike many parish churches, St Stephen's existed under royal scrutiny. From 1537 its canons and vicars were explicitly identified as 'king's chaplains' and allowed to remain pluralists and resident at

---

[84] Kisby, 'Where the King Goeth', p. 45.
[85] Duffy looked at East Anglia, Brigden at London's parish records, Whiting at the South West, Bowker at the diocese of Lincoln to 1520, to name just a few examples.
[86] Bernard focusses on his theology rather than on the settings he chose for religious services, which in a section on Henry VIII's religion seems surprising, Bernard, *King's Reformation*, pp. 228-240; see also on the importance of Richard Sampson, Marsh, 'Sacred Polyphony', pp. 33-77.
[87] For the Chapel Royal, see Kisby, 'Where the King Goeth', pp. 66-67; and for St George's, Windsor, I am grateful to Euan Roger for discussing his ongoing work on this topic with me.

the college rather than their rectories or vicarages.[88] Its canons were consistently among those canvassed for their opinions on the theological questions of the 1530s and early 1540s, which would suggest that the college should be a model example of correct Henrician practice. Yet it took until 1545 and a direct order from the king's council for the cult image of our Lady of Pity to be removed from St Mary le Pew despite the earlier orders to remove images that received veneration from churches.[89] Indeed, the Ten Articles of 1536 should have ended most of the cult at Westminster given the presence of the Scala Coeli indulgence, specifically mentioned in the articles as an abuse.[90] The delay may have reflected the influence of the dean, John Chambre, who seems to have been firmly catholic in his tastes, given his 1549 will referencing the saints and the intercession of Heaven.[91] For four years St Stephen's maintained a Marian cult in the heart of Westminster, apparently without comment from the diocesan, Thomas Thirlby, and from the king. Thirlby was known as more conservative than some and was a former canon himself, but it is surprising that he would tolerate such disobedience.[92] Whether the college disposed of its other relics in 1541 or maintained them until 1545 or later is unknown, because they are absent from the 1547 and 1548 valuations.[93] If the missal now in the New York Public Library that has been identified as belonging to the college was indeed used at St Stephen's, its entry for St Thomas of Canterbury's mass also shows ambivalence towards the destruction of the old religion. It is carefully scored through neatly with either a single line or wide cross-hatching, thus obeying the order to remove such masses with the abolition of Becket's cult, but allowing it to remain legible and thus usable if ever required.[94] While it is uncertain that the missal was used at the college, as it belonged to John Chambre at some point, it is none the less suggestive.

St Stephen's lavish setting for the daily offices and mass seems to have been largely unchanged. Much of the college's furnishings other than relics would have been unscathed by the Henrician reformation, including the impressive and expensive vestment and plate collection given by canons and kings over the centuries, which were still in use because they had not yet been abolished.[95] Interestingly, there was no attempt, either earlier or particularly in 1547, to cover over the images on

---

[88] *L & P Henry VIII 1537 Part 2*, no. 1150 (35).
[89] *L & P Henry VIII 1545 Part 2*, no. 645; the orders to remove all cult images were part of the Injunctions of 1536.
[90] Duffy, *Stripping the Altars,* p. 393.
[91] PROB 11/32/ 503.
[92] For Thirlby's career, see C. S. Knighton, 'Thirlby, Thomas (*c.*1500–1570)', *ODNB.*
[93] SC 12/ 6/ 62 and *Chantry Certificate*, pp. 79-81.
[94] New York, New York Public Library MS MA 63, ff. 23r-v.
[95] The college's 1548 Inventory, E 117/11/49; it is also printed in 'Inventory of St Stephen's Chapel, Westminster,' eds. J.R.D. Tyssen and M.E.C. Walcott, *The Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society* iv (London,

the walls of St Stephen's. Iconoclasm in London in 1547 did not reach within the palace.[96] The surviving painted fragments in the British Museum show no signs of having been whitewashed.[97] Thus the visual surroundings of the mass until 1548 would have been the Catholic royal imagery known by Edward III, with its saints and Old Testament stories. This situation of course was not yet exceptional. Rather than the physical surroundings, Henry VIII's reformation focussed on the service books and the surrounding educational material such as the Primer, the King's Book, the Bible in English and the use of sermons. The aural experience rather than the visual setting was the main target for reformers before 1547. While it may simply reflect the value of the older books as gilded, precious objects, it is notable that in the listing of books belonging to St Stephen's in the 1548 inventory of items taken by the Court of Augmentations, there is no Bible, either in English or in Latin, and no sign of the theological statements of the 1540s.[98] The 1547 injunctions to shorten the service in order to accommodate more Bible readings may well have been followed at St Stephen's but the books are not in the inventory.[99] Instead, the antiphonals, missals, graduals and choirbooks were still in use, given that they are listed as being in the choir itself, which may suggest the maintenance of a more Catholic service. The need to educate parishioners in English of course had no effect on St Stephen's as it lacked a formal parish, so the elements of reform in pastoral care were less important. It is striking, however, that at a very visible, very public chapel, there were no signs of the liturgical effects of the past fifteen years.

Where the changes of the 1538 and then 1547 injunctions would have cut deep would not have been in the normal masses, but in the college's abilities to maintain their chantry provisions as they had promised generations of donors. Here again, the evidence is equivocal, and points neither to an aggressively reforming dean and chapter nor to one that was unyieldingly wedded to the old forms of religion. Work on the parish churches has seen a variety of responses to the chipping away at the visible expressions of belief in Purgatory, but at St Stephen's and other similar colleges, the round of obits and lights and chantry provision were even more central to their purpose.[100] The lay gifts of altar lights, found in wills right up to 1538, would have added candles to the high altar in memory of the dead to aid them in Purgatory. Those would have had to be moved in 1538, probably to the rood

---

1852), pp 366-372.
[96] Duffy, *Stripping the Altars*, pp. 453-4.
[97] London, British Museum 1814,0312.2, 1883,0310.1.
[98] E 117/11/49.
[99] On the 1547 changes, Duffy, *Stripping the Altars*, p. 450; E 117/11/49.
[100] For Marshall, treatment of the dead was the divisive issue of the Reformation, Marshall, *Beliefs and the Dead*, p. 47.

loft, and finally were fully abolished in 1547's injunctions.[101] They certainly are not in the inventory, suggesting that they had been taken away. Removing the lights on the altar would have been one visible sign of changing authorised beliefs. Yet despite the Henrician regime's scepticism over Purgatory, the inventory of 1548 at St Stephen's shows that the college continued to celebrate obits and chantry masses right up until its destruction. Canons were paid for their presence at obits and the four chantry priests whose jobs had been created by the three major chantries of the fifteenth century were still employed in 1548.[102] At the same time the same concern over religious change seen in the parishes can also been seen at St Stephen's. The last obit listed in the college's obit book was entered in 1510, for Archbishop Warham, who died in 1533.[103] John Chambre's 1538 request for an obit at St George's, Windsor, where he was also a canon, which was probably paralleled at St Stephen's, is the last known for a canon, although he ultimately outlived obits and chantries.[104] Henry VIII's obit, paid for by the Court of Augmentations, would only have received his month's mind and the first yearly service, before it too was gone.[105]

The Edwardian State and the Dissolution of St Stephen's

In January 1547 when Henry VIII died at Whitehall and the nine-year old Edward VI was proclaimed king, it would have been hard for observers to believe that the wealthy, well-connected St Stephen's College would be gone within approximately a year. It is easy to divide the first phase of the English Reformation into two unequal halves, seeing Henry VIII's reformation as conservative and fundamentally Catholic in its approaches to religion and then a dramatic shift under Edward VI and his evangelical inner circle towards a more aggressively Protestant religion. Certainly the most dramatic reforms came in Edward's reign as Archbishop Cranmer rewrote the daily offices into the three-fold structure of Morning Prayer, Communion and Evening Prayer in the 1549 Book of Common Prayer, altars were abolished, and images fully removed. Yet the evangelical grouping had already been present and influential at court under Henry VIII, as Ryrie has shown.[106] Equally, religious reform under Edward VI was not immediate, nor was it always fully evangelical in its aims. As discussed above, Henry VIII's reformation mixed politics, the desire for lands and revenues, as well as a concern for theology into a complex mix of religious and political influences that contemporaries, let alone historians, struggled to make sense of. Despite being chantry colleges,

---

[101] Discussed in Duffy, *Stripping the Altars*, p. 407.
[102] List of wage obligations in SC 12/6/62.
[103] BL Cotton MS Faustina B VIII, ff. 50v-51v and f. 53r.
[104] The indenture was made in February 1538, Windsor, St George's College Archives XV 58 C 28.
[105] SC 12/6 /62.
[106] Ryrie, *Gospel and Henry VIII*, p. 194.

predicated on the assumption of Purgatory abolished under Henry VIII, St Stephen's and St George's were not immediately white elephants under Edward VI. St George's, indeed, was to survive nearly unscathed. St Stephen's continued to play an important function in the reformation at Westminster throughout 1547 and perhaps into the early months of 1548. When it did fall, before March 1548, it was the victim of two intertwined changes, first in the definition of what a college's purpose should be and second of changing usages of the Palace of Westminster itself such that a chapel at the heart of the palace was no longer necessary. Its dissolution was aided by the rich rewards it offered to those closely-connected courtiers and administrators who already had and were developing interests in the manor of Westminster. The conciliar politics of Edward VI's reign helped to doom St Stephen's, but also point towards the continuing importance of the area to governance and kingship.

From January 1547 through to March 1548, very little evidence for St Stephen's survives, but what does survive points towards its continuing importance within its diocese. Indeed, there is nothing to suggest that it was being considered for suppression: no petitions from the dean and college asking for mercy, no petitions such as those organised to save the Oxford and Cambridge colleges, no discussion minuted in the Privy Council act books. Rather, St Stephen's was still valued as an agent of the Reformation and as the house of some of the king's chaplains. Its landed privileges were confirmed.[107] In September 1547 the royal visitation of all dioceses sent particular instructions to Bishop Thirlby of Westminster both personally and for his diocese, to ensure that he was complying with the religious policy of the day. The commissioners ordered that all priests of his diocese were to attend the weekly sermon and any divinity lectures at St Stephen's if they were not otherwise preaching.[108] This order reflected an increasing emphasis on scripture and correct belief rather than good deeds or practice in the English Church, but also shows trust that the college would lead by example and deliver good orthodox teaching to their fellow clergy of Westminster. St Stephen's was an obvious place for a divinity lecture, given that its canons were trained theologians close to the heart of policy-making of the previous reign. It may be that the weekly lecture and sermon go back before September 1547 and reflect Henrician concerns to disseminate the theology created by the various processes of Cranmer and Convocation to a wider audience. If so, it shows that despite the ambiguity of the college's liturgical response to the reformation, St Stephen's was an active tool in

---

[107] The 10 August 1547 patent confirmed the liberties of the college, *CPR 1547-48*, p. 231.
[108] *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation: Vol. 2 1536-1558,* eds. W.H. Frere and W. McClure Kennedy, (London: Longmans, 1910), pp. 131-4; the general injunctions would also have applied to St Stephen's, including the provisions about the need to have Bibles in the choir and to found a grammar school, although St

disseminating policy, because, as discussed above, it was in many ways a quasi-public space. Alternatively, it may be an innovation in response to the visitation of 1547 showing up problems in theological learning in the diocese.[109] Thirlby's conduct does not seem to have pleased Somerset's commissioners because he was seen as too conservative, and the injunction may be an attempt to speed the pace of reform by disseminating the newest theology to the diocesan clergy without going through their bishop.

Unfortunately, there is no evidence indicating that the canons of St Stephen's knew in advance of the second chantries act of Christmas Eve 1547 that they were to be one of its targets, but they would have known soon after that they were not to be exempted and indeed were to function as a test case for the commissioners of the act. The second chantries act was perhaps the single most important piece of legislation in the English Reformation because of its impact on the entirety of religious practice in England and Wales. It swept away all the elements of pre-Reformation religion that lay men and women had been most attached to, and laid the groundwork for the later Edwardian reforms, by abolishing not only chantries, which laypeople had maintained for their ancestors, but also the smaller remembrances of lights and lamps on altars and the guilds and fraternities, those social organisations that bound together the parish and the church.[110] The dissolution of the monasteries was traumatic and important, but did not strike directly at every single parish church in the country as this act did. A sense of its unpopularity can be gleaned from the numerous petitions for exemption that survive, the sheer range of lands and goods which were concealed from the commissioners, and the numbers of chantries and guilds that attempted to continue in defiance of the law.[111] The first chantries act had only allowed surrender, the second compelled surrender of all lands, goods and rents that pertained to any chantry. Gathering all of the wealth and making sense of it would take time, so one of the provisions of the act was that the commissioners appointed by the Court of Augmentations were to survey the lands and goods in teams, usually by county, from January to Easter 1548, and then all such goods were to be surrendered at Easter. In the London and Middlesex Chantry certificate of what was surrendered, St Stephen's is the only institution to be called 'the late college', probably because it had been used as a test case, on account of the complexity and wealth of its holdings, with an income of c. £1085 annually and valuable plate, jewels

Stephen's seems to have done neither, ibid, pp. 135-39.
[109] Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation*, (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), p. 83-4.
[110] Duffy, *Stripping the Altars*, pp. 454-5.
[111] Shagan, *Popular Politics*, p. 254.

and vestments.[112]

What then had changed between the approving messages towards St Stephen's of 1547 and the early surrender of 1548? In part, Edward VI's government were continuing and developing the political theology begun under Henry VIII in which the old doctrines of salvation by good works no longer applied in a straightforward way. The colleges that survived the second chantries act were those who offered more than the power of their prayers to the common weal and to the king. The university colleges at Oxford and Cambridge defended themselves on the basis of their learning, the education they offered their students and the theology that they could offer the king. Elsewhere, the medieval educational colleges such as Eton and Winchester again survived because they could point to their ability to offer godly education in their communities. They were to lose their chantry functions, and their collegiate priests, but their educational missions were enhanced. Similarly, the stated aim of the second chantries act that the money raised by the suppression of the chantries would go to improve education led to the foundation of some grammar schools and some chantry priests were retained where they were needed to ensure that their parish had suitable provision for the cure of souls. The cathedrals lost the chantries founded in them over the centuries, but retained their canons to support the diocesan bishops. Even those chantry colleges, such as Manchester and St George's that survived, saw their purposes changed from their founders' intentions in their statutes. Manchester entered a twilight existence, primarily as a school rather than as a chantry, while St George's survived because it was the home of the Order of the Garter and the associated poor knights.[113] Retaining St George's College to look after the Garter allowed the order to paradoxically maintain its role as a religious fraternity. Edward VI's changes to the statutes of the order emphasise the importance of the Garter as an elite body devoted to correct religious practices and godly rule. That it was supported by the single chantry organisation still officially in existence was not mentioned.

The other side of St Stephen's dissolution was local to the circumstances of Westminster in the mid sixteenth century. St Stephen's might equally have been given an educational or charitable role in Westminster in 1548 if Protector Somerset had so been inclined, rather than plundering it for its wealth and valuable property. It already had some provision for almshouses as founded by John Chambre, perhaps for exactly this purpose, as discussed above. The almshouses in St Stephen's Alley

---

[112] *Chantry Certificate*, p. 79.

[113] 'Colleges: Manchester', in *The Victoria County History of the County of Lancaster: Volume Two*, eds. William Farrer & J. Brownbill, (London: Constable and Company, 1908), p. 167; St George's received new injunctions to supersede the statutes in 1550, *Visitation Articles and Injunctions*, pp. 254-61; with particular concern for preaching, ibid, pp. 260-1.

were to survive in some form until the early eighteenth century; the college could have been left in place alongside them and further educational provision added, beyond any quasi-official school for the choristers that might already have existed.[114] There were, however, two reasons why that might not have been acceptable. First, Westminster Abbey, then the cathedral for the diocese of Westminster, was soon to become simply a collegiate church when in 1550 the diocese was merged back into the diocese of London, in part to side-line Bishop Thirlby in favour of Nicholas Ridley of London. The abbey already had almshouses and a school, which was officially to be re-founded by Elizabeth I in 1560, and as the coronation church, had to be maintained as a cathedral, or as near to one as possible. While there were to be serious issues with social provision in Westminster over the remainder of the century, the apparent need in 1548 was not so great that the commissioners would have recommended the survival of St Stephen's in addition to the cathedral and its provisions. Elsewhere in the country, chapels of ease were being demolished even when they were essential to parochial provision. In Westminster, with three parishes in close proximity, there was no need for further churches at that time. Thus there was no argument for keeping St Stephen's in preference to Westminster Abbey, especially with the changes of the previous forty years at the palace of Westminster.

The second reason for the dissolution was the changing status of the palace around the college. For almost all of its existence St Stephen's sat at the heart of the Palace of Westminster as kings and their servants, the court and the royal administration came and went. When in the winter of 1512/13, a fire destroyed at least some of Westminster's privy palace apartments, the functions of the palace changed, in ways that damaged St Stephen's College.[115] The change was not immediate, as Henry VIII still used the palace at times as a residence, but by 1548, it was as the current building is today, largely a ceremonial and administrative centre close to the main royal residences. Edward VI came there for his coronation banquet and the law courts, Chancery and the Exchequer continued to occupy their quarters largely unaffected. St Stephen's, with its secondary function as the palace chapel, was superseded by the palace chapels of the houses regularly in use, particularly Whitehall just to the north. Whitehall seems to have become the 'king's chapel at Westminster', the centre of

---

[114] A school is known in 1452, when a careless schoolboy started a fire but that may have been an ad hoc arrangement rather than a permanent school, C.L. Kingsford, *English Historical Literature of the Fifteenth Century*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), pp. 372-3.

[115] It has been asserted that Henry abandoned Westminster after 1512/3, see Neil Samman, 'The Progresses of Henry VIII,' in *The Reign of Henry VIII: Politics, Policy and Piety,* ed. Diarmaid MacCulloch, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1995), p. 70; the problem with this is that there seems to have been no disruption in the other functions of the Palace of Westminster, so the fire cannot have been as extensive as assumed.

religious and political intrigue.[116] Similarly, St Stephen's was not the parish church for the area, that was St Margaret's across Palace Yard, and thus it was not essential to parochial provision. It was not one of the palace chapels that Edward VI would have known particularly well, nor was it the centre of court worship by the time he came to the throne. Its lavish decoration, wealth and visibility, which had helped it in the Henrician reformation, may now have been liabilities in the more subdued, Biblical reformation of Somerset and the rest of the council. As they were concerned to display their new and unfamiliar version of religious services, with an emphasis on iconoclasm and the power of scripture, St Stephen's would have been an uneasy venue for such services, if certainly a possible one, given its usage in 1547. In addition, the additional pressure on space within the Palace of Westminster because of the creation of new law courts under Henry VIII, those of First Fruits and Tenths, and Augmentations, would have created temptation to reclaim St Stephen's valuable waterfront property within the palace, either for offices or for crown favourites, as indeed was to happen in the 1550s and beyond.[117]

The House of Commons, the longest occupants of the chapel, came to St Stephen's with a whimper rather than a bang; as it moved over from Westminster Abbey at some point before 1550. The first reference is from 1550, when a letter patent says that Edward VI 'took and assigned for the house of Parliament and for holding our Parliaments there' the upper chapel.[118] The grant referenced does not survive, so we do not know when precisely Edward VI and his council chose to install the House of Commons in the chapel, nor do we know what was done for the arrival of MPs. Even which sessions of Parliament were held in St Stephen's in the Parliament of 1549 is unknown. The only evidence for money spent on adapting the chapel comes from a summary account by the clerk of the works, Laurence Bradshaw, in 1559, looking back on work done during 1552-3.[119] He described the purchase of materials, the wages of carpenters, bricklayers, glaziers and other labourers, and the costs of building and repairing record storage areas in the Parliament House at a total cost of £34 19s 6d. Despite this lack of detail, the circumstances of MPs' arrival are fairly clear. Westminster Abbey had always found the Commons to be difficult house-guests, and numerous petitions survive asking for

---

[116] When in 1533 a correspondent wrote to Lord Lisle that a marriage had taken place in the king's chapel at Westminster, it probably meant Whitehall but could still have been St Stephen's at this point before the 1536 act joining the two palaces, *L & P Henry VIII 1533,* no. 728.

[117] Walter C. Richardson, *History of the Court of Augmentations 1536-1554,* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1961), p. 2 and pp. 10-11.

[118] 'p[ro] domo parliamenti [et] ac p[ro] domo parliamenti n[ost]ris ibidem tened[is]' C 66/ 834 m. 22; *CPR 1550-53*, pp. 12-13; my thanks to Simon Neal.

[119] E 351/ 3326 mm. 7-8; my thanks to Simon Neal.

restitution after MPs had destroyed furniture or rooms.[120] The bishop of Westminster, Thomas Thirlby or his successor, the dean of St Peter's, would have been pleased to regain their Chapter House. In addition, the House of Lords by this point were fairly consistently meeting in the Lesser Hall, just across a courtyard from St Stephen's, and formal joint meetings were possibly in Westminster Hall, again just across another courtyard.[121] Thus when the chapel was made vacant and deconsecrated, it was a geographically convenient venue for the Commons if also very cramped. It gave them for the very first time, their own space and their own permanent headquarters. The Lords had in essence gained that privilege after 1513 when the residential functions of the palace ceased and the other demands on the Lesser Hall decreased. Thus after about 1550, both houses of Parliament were permanently placed in proximity, and acknowledged as an important part of royal administration, on account of their proximity to the rest of the offices of state.

Despite the apparent abandonment of the old palace, courtiers and administrators were eager to obtain housing there, which serves a reminder that Westminster remained the centre of royal administration and government. Use of St Stephen's as a base was not new. The canons had acted similarly when they served as Parliamentary proctors or in the offices of state, as had those who rented houses from them in Canon Row, such as the Lord Treasurer in 1534 (glossed by St Clair Byrne as William Fitzwilliam, the treasurer of the household, rather than Thomas Howard, the Lord High Treasurer).[122] The dissolution of St Stephen's lands fed into the political circumstances of Edwardian government, and concentrated rewards in the hands of those favoured by first Somerset and then Northumberland after 1551. Westminster houses seem to have been still sought-after. Two names stand out. Protector Somerset himself plundered the best vestments and place for Somerset House, but did not acquire the lands.[123] Sir Anthony Denny as keeper of the old Palace seems to have served as broker for sales and leases to the inter-connected group that snapped up the Canon Row properties. Some were granted to minor officials, such as Richard Audley, who had a small connection with the Court of Augmentations.[124] Sir Michael Stanhope, Protector Somerset's brother

---

[120] Alastair Hawkyard, 'From Painted Chamber to St Stephen's Chapel: The Meeting Places of the House of Commons at Westminster until 1603,' *Parliamentary History* 21 (2003), pp. 65-66; for destruction of abbey property, ibid, p. 71.

[121] For example, the 1552 grant to Sir John Gates, which references the Lords' Parliament House in the Painted Chamber, DL 10/404; my thanks to Simon Neal for his transcription of this grant.

[122] *The Lisle Letters,* ed. Muriel St. Clare Byrne, 6 vols. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), ii, p. 54.

[123] For the costly valuables that Somerset had acquired from St Stephen's, when in 1549 they were reclaimed by Augmentations, Sir Ralph Vane and Sir John Thynne had also profited from the liturgical richness of the college, *Cal. State Papers Edward VI,* no. 424.

[124] *CPR 1548-49*, p. 77; Richardson, *Augmentations*, p. 136 n. 72.

in law, received multiple houses in Canon Row in 1548.[125] William Cecil, then secretary to Protector Somerset, was offered the chance to buy two properties for £400, and seems to have done so.[126] It was the start of a long and profitable association between the Cecils and Westminster.[127] Sir Walter Mildmay, an auditor of the Court of Augmentations, also seems to have acquired a house in Canon Row.[128] Mildmay's wife was Denny's niece and Denny had himself risen through the Court of Augmentations to the Privy Council. However, the lavish rewards also went with considerable political peril. Sir Ralph Fane, a prominent supporter of Protector Somerset, was granted the college precinct save only the upper chapel in 1550, but lost it in 1552 when he was executed for conspiring against Northumberland.[129] Sir John Gates, who was the second man to hold the college precinct from the Crown, was also connected through family ties to this group as Denny's brother-in-law and thus had access to the spoils.[130]

St Stephen's properties show the landed rather than the spiritual priorities of the Edwardian gentry and nobility. The valuable London and Westminster lands were quickly snapped up either to create Westminster residences or to rent out. The other lands and benefices owned by the college across England were not as attractive to Denny and his circle as they were scattered and, in most cases, individually quite small. The bulk of the lands were in the Home Counties, but they were not easily grouped together. St Stephen's had spent about 73s yearly defending and maintaining its title in the year before its dissolution.[131] There was no prospect of creating a power base out of St Stephen's estates, so they were not granted out as an entirety as had happened to some of the monastic lands. Rather, what happened to the rest of the estates shows the range of possibilities open to the Augmentations office and the wide range of individuals who profited from the dissolution of the chantries. From August 1548, lands formerly of St Stephen's were granted out in small chunks to a wide range of individuals, from Lord Clinton and Say who gathered up in the early 1550s the

---

[125] C 66/811 mm. 34- 37; *CPR 1547-48*, pp. 391-2 (note that the calendar only references one of the houses in Canon Row, that of Richard Cox, and omits those of Edward Rogers and John Chambre); for Stanhope more generally see Keith Dockray, 'Stanhope, Sir Michael (b. before 1508, d. 1552)', *ODNB*.
[126] *Cal. State Papers Edward VI,* no. 471.
[127] Julia F. Merritt, 'The Cecils and Westminster 1558-1612,' in *Patronage, Culture and Power: The Early Cecils,* ed. Pauline Croft, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002), p. 232.
[128] For Walter Mildmay's career see L. L. Ford, 'Mildmay, Sir Walter (1520/21–1589)', *ODNB*; for his marriage to Denny's niece see Stanford E. Lehmberg, *Sir Walter Mildmay and Tudor Government*, (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1964), p. 17.
[129] *CPR 1550-53*, pp. 12-13; for Fane's career and connections see J. Andreas Löwe, 'Fane, Sir Ralph (*b.* before 1510, *d.* 1552)', *ODNB*.
[130] The grant of the college precinct was *CPR 1540-53*, p. 325; for Gates' career and connections see Narasingha P. Sil, 'Gates, Sir John (1504–1553)', *ODNB*.
[131] Under costs for lawyers, SC 12/6/62.

college's lands in Dorset, including the manor of Winterbourne Cane, and Elham in Kent, to John Cheke, the king's tutor, and then to many more minor individuals such as John Hulson or Thomas Babington.[132] Other lands were sold through the Court of Augmentations, and others still were leased out, either for twenty one years or the owner's lifetime. The larger manors such as Welhall or Colbridge as well as the London commercial property were the first to be disposed of, as clearly profitable.[133] There is no evidence at all that any of the lands of St Stephen's were turned to charitable purposes as had been promised in the second chantries act and no schools were founded using the endowment. The tangle of grants led to later problems and uncertainties under Elizabeth and then James I. There are cancelled grants, when lands were found to have been double-granted, and inquiries, including efforts by Julius Caesar.[134]

The break with the past was perhaps nowhere clearer than in the Marian restoration of 1553 to 1558. While Mary was interested in restoring the monasteries, or at least some of them, as a visible sign of the restoration of the old religion, the chantries and the colleges were too contested, too ambiguous for her to attempt a whole-sale restoration. The surviving colleges were returned to Catholic doctrine, even if their chantries were not restored. Only the twilight existence of Manchester College could be brought back officially, if not in quite the same form, because it still had lands and support.[135] In addition, the financial costs of attempting to turn back the clock for the monasteries was already too high for more than a few, symbolic re-foundations, such as Westminster Abbey and the shrine at Walsingham. The wealth of the chantries had in part gone to pay for French and Scottish wars; the monasteries' wealth was already gone by 1547, let alone 1553. The Marian Catholic England could not replicate the Catholic England of 1530 in the rich variety of institutions in the church, the shared religious landscape and the lay devotion that had sustained colleges and monasteries.[136] Instead, Mary and Cardinal Pole faced a divided and divisive country, where ambivalence and fear went alongside religious fervour and persecution.[137] St Stephen's precinct and the lower chapel were confiscated from Sir John Gates on his attainder for supporting Lady Jane

---

[132] Lord Clinton and Say's grants are in *CPR 1550-53*, pp. 190, 206; those to John Cheke, *CPR 1547-48*, pp. 284-5; and to John Hulson and Thomas Babington, *CPR 1549-51*, pp. 128-9.

[133] Welhall was granted out in August 1548 in *CPR 1547-8*, pp. 397-8; the grant of the George Inn Lombard Street was in September 1548, *CPR 1548-49*, pp. 62-3.

[134] For example, Lord Chancellor Ellesmere ended up with the documentation for the grant of the rectory of Sandal Magna in the 1580s, probably because it was contested later, San Marino, Huntington Library, Ellesmere MS EL 1994; also see Sir Julius Caesar's attempt to catalogue some of the St Stephen's lands in BL Lansdowne MS 171, no. 169, f. 359.

[135] 'Colleges: Manchester', p. 167; Lucy Wooding has a new history of Manchester College to 1560 forthcoming.

[136] For the narrower devotional range of Marian Catholicism as a reflection of the economic situation in the parish, see Duffy, *Stripping the Altars*, p. 563.

Grey, and granted out again to Sir Edward Hastings, who had been one of those who were quick to support Mary's accession.[138] Just as her brother's regime had, Mary used the valuable Westminster property to bolster her political support, with grants to Sir Robert Rochester, her comptroller of the household, in 1555 and Sir John Perrott in 1556.[139] In addition, Sir Edward Hastings, her master of horse and then Lord Chamberlain, who Reginald Pole called 'my good cousin', was given the college precinct, and held it until his death in 1572.[140] Of the then- surviving canons of St Stephen's, Thomas Robertson and Richard Cox have been mentioned above, the others, William Ibrie, John Vaughan, Robert Brock and Thomas Day also had to choose how to reconcile their theology and their monarch, and their answers have not survived.[141]

Conclusions

St Stephen's during the Reformation and after shows the complexities of reform, both for its canons as royal servants and for policy. At no time during the early Reformation in England, other than perhaps under Edward VI, was state policy clear and unambiguous with regard to religion. Instead, it was created out of a mix of circumstances, trends and debate directed by the king, but not always fully responsive to his personal wishes. Rather than seeing a reformation that was solely the work of Henry VIII or of factions at court during this period and imposed on the English church and people by a minority, we should rather see a broader base of reform, drawing on earlier calls for change, and on debates within the elite of the church. The elite of the church were not just the well-studied bishops but those men such as the canons of St Stephen's who were involved in Convocation, in discussions at court and above all were called king's chaplains. We should also emphasise the levels of confusion, even for those such as the canons, privileged and centrally placed, given that they too seem to have been uncertain about the new parameters of the faith, even as they were involved in the debates and manoeuvring that led to the theological statements of Henry's reign. While late medieval Catholicism was a vibrant and living religion, it was also changing and developing in ways that might well have paralleled what Henry VIII's church did independently. We also need to bring the material about the experience of the mass and how it changed into dialogue with changing theology, because

---

[137] McConica, *English Humanists*, p. 235.
[138] The grant is copied in BL Lansdowne MS 447, f. 359v.
[139] There were six grants of the lands and rights of St Stephen's in the Patent Rolls during Mary's reign, including grants to Sir Richard Rochester in 1555 in *CPR 1554-55*, p. 220; for his career see, Jonathan Hughes, 'Rochester, Sir Robert (*c.*1500–1557)', *ODNB*; and in 1556 to Sir John Perrott in *CPR 1555-57*, p. 274; Perrott's career is particularly interesting since he was a Protestant who had supported Northumberland, but received significant patronage from Mary, Roger Turvey, 'Perrot, Sir John (1528–1592)', *ODNB*.
[140] As attested in BL Lansdowne 171, ff. 359-359v from 1600; this copied the 1578 reversal of the property back to the Crown and its re-grant to the Exchequer.

while theology was important, far more people experienced religious services than necessarily understood them. St Stephen's disappeared just as the confused, open to interpretation and thus hard to fight against Reformation became a fully iconoclastic and much clearer Reformation under Cranmer in Edward VI's reign. What happened to St Stephen's in 1548 and then to its lands in the 1550s through to 1600 shows the intersection of genuinely held religious belief, deep practicality and avarice among the Edwardian government, the limitations of the Marian restoration, and the ways in which the Elizabethan administration dealt with the landed complexities they inherited in 1558. The Edwardian dissolution of the chantries and St Stephen's was in part a reaction to the Scottish and French Wars emptying the treasury, but it was also a reflection of their repudiation of the benefits those chantries offered and of the doctrine of Purgatory. St Stephen's, active right up until January 1548, was now irrelevant and thus reasonably could be plundered to create the new Westminster of courtiers and administrators in Canon Row, in the palace and in the parish of St Margaret's.

---

[141]The pension list from 1554, BL Additional MS 8102.

Section Two: The Royal and Ecclesiastical Service of St Stephen's College, Westminster

Chapter Five: Royal Service and the Canons of St Stephen's, 1348-1548

Institutions are hollow shells without the individuals who inhabit them. St Stephen's depended on its people, from the dean and canons to the clerks and choristers who often left no trace at all on the surviving records. For most of the deans and canons, insofar as they can be traced, their time at St Stephen's was part of larger careers in the service of the king. The canons were by definition elite priests. As such, they have rather fallen between the gaps in the historiography, as Peter Heath identified. They were neither parochial clergy nor bishops, although they often started out as parish priests and might finish their careers as bishops.[1] The parish clergy have been intensively studied for their contribution to the English church on the eve of the Reformation and their contribution to the spiritual life of the laity in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.[2] Interest in the cathedral chapters, to which the canons of St Stephen's often also belonged, has focussed on origins and education of their clergy.[3] Individual, particularly distinguished royal administrators have been studied in isolation and with little attention to the interplay between ecclesiastical and administrative service.[4] The other side of the canons' lives, royal service and government, has a complex historiography of its own. Apparent changes in fifteenth century governance feed into larger debates about the effectiveness of royal government around the Wars of the Roses. The decline of administration was a theme first developed by R.L. Storey, and then has been picked up by, among others, Christine Carpenter.[5] Bureaucratic transformation and revival has been

---

[1] Peter Heath, 'Between Reform and Reformation: The English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries,' *JEH* 41 (1990), pp. 650-4.

[2] Studies include Margaret Bowker, *The Secular Clergy in the Diocese of Lincoln 1495-1520,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968); Tim Cooper, *The Last Generation of English Catholic Clergy: Parish Priests in the Diocese of Coventry and Lichfield in the Early Sixteenth Century,* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1999); Peter Heath, *The English Parish Clergy on the Eve of the Reformation*, (London: Routledge, 1969); and comments in Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400-1580,* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), introduction.

[3] For example, David N. Lepine, 'The Origins and Careers of the Canons of Exeter Cathedral, 1300-1455,' in *Religious Belief and Ecclesiastical Careers in Late Medieval England: Proceedings of the Conference held at Strawberry Hill Easter 1989,* ed. Christopher Harper-Bill, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1991), pp. 87-120.

[4] In the fifteenth century where St Stephen's is not discussed, A. Compton Reeves, 'John Gunthorpe: Keeper of Richard III's Privy Seal, Dean of Wells Cathedral,' *Viator* 39 (2008), pp. 307-44; for the fourteenth century, St Stephen's is incidental to the story of John Buckingham in Alison K. McHardy, 'The Early Ecclesiastical Career of John Buckingham' *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 8 (1975) pp. 3-12.

[5] See Robin L. Storey, 'Gentlemen-bureaucrats' in *Profession, Vocation and Culture in Later Medieval England: Essays dedicated to the Memory of A. R. Myers,* ed. C.H. Clough (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1982), pp. 90-130; Charles W. Smith, 'Some Trends in the English Royal Chancery 1377-1483.' *Medieval Prosopography* 6 (1985), pp. 69-94; Christine Carpenter, 'Henry VI and the Deskilling of the Royal Bureaucracy,' in *The Fifteenth Century IX: English and Continental Perspectives*, ed. Linda Clark, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2010), pp. 1-37; for a view of careerism as a positive public force, see Michael Bennett, 'Careerism in Late Medieval England' in *People, Politics and Community in the Later Middle Ages,* eds. Joel T.

heavily contested.[6] Instead of these historians' focus on what happened to specific offices within particular departments, customarily Chancery and the Exchequer, this chapter looks at an influential grouping of individuals, the canons of St Stephen's, who in the period in question were exactly the types of royal administrator that Storey and Carpenter identified as withdrawing from these offices. Changes in how historians have studied and conceptualised government and politics; and particularly the shift away from bastard feudalism towards a language of lordship, service and private interests has also shifted how we understand the working lives of medieval administrators.[7] By using St Stephen's to create a manageable sample of men who served the king in a variety of ways, we can examine the value and variety in royal service over the later medieval period. This chapter, the first in a pair on the intersection between church and state at St Stephen's, looks at the collective biographies of the 268 canons known to have held prebends at St Stephen's in order to examine their and the college's place within both royal administration and the Church.

This chapter is concerned with those canons whose careers can be traced within royal service. Yet known royal servants were not the only members of the college. I have been unable to trace governmental experience for eighty out of 268 known canons. Although the term 'king's clerk' is ambiguous and the range of work a king's clerk might do unclear, I have included as royal servants the twenty-five men known as 'king's clerk' in this count alongside those whose precise roles are known. A wider search for evidence beyond the obvious offices might have reduced the number of canons not in royal service still further. Those who did not serve in the great offices of state are more likely to be included among those whose royal service is unknown. For example, George Daune probably was a servant of Elizabeth Woodville, who presented him to his prebend at St Stephen's.[8] Yet he is one of the eighty for the purpose of this count, since he cannot be securely identified in the known records. Some of the other seventy nine men so identified came to the college through exchanging their cathedral prebend for a St Stephen's prebend, such as the early example in 1363 when Hugh Hermit exchanged

---

Rosenthal & Colin Richmond, (Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1987), pp. 19-39.

[6] Elton argued for the mid-sixteenth century, Geoffrey R. Elton, *The Tudor Revolution in Government: Administrative Changes in the Reign of Henry VIII*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), pp. 3-4; more recently, Morgan saw revival under Edward IV, D.A.L. Morgan, 'The House of Policy: The Political Role of the late Plantagenet Household, 1422-1485,' in *The English Court from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, ed. David Starkey, (London: Longmans, 1987), pp. 25-70.

[7] On the multiplicity of ties that made up late medieval service, Rosemary Horrox, *Richard III: A Study of Service* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 21; for examples of such ties, Charles W. Smith, 'A Conflict of Interest? Chancery Clerks in Private Service,' in *People, Politics and Community*, p. 176-91; and David Grummitt, 'Public Service, Private Interest and Patronage in the Fifteenth-Century Exchequer,' in *Fifteenth Century III: Authority and Subversion,* ed. Linda Clark, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), pp. 156-7.

[8] *CPR 1467-77*, p. 547.

the precentorship at Hereford for the prebend held by William Outy at St Stephen's.[9] Hermit is not otherwise known in royal service. In the fifteenth century, John Gourll, who was to stay at the college for over twenty years, exchanged a cathedral prebend for one at Westminster.[10] Other men arrived through their families' royal service such as Christopher Litton in 1494, who was the younger brother of Sir Richard Litton, under-treasurer of the Exchequer and keeper of the Great Wardrobe.[11] In the sixteenth century, Cardinal Wolsey, himself a former canon, used his influence to obtain a prebend for his son, Thomas Winter.[12] Particularly in the fifteenth century, when canons were often appointed by groups of nobles, clergy and other council members, canons might have served in bishops' or nobles' households rather than in that of the king. For example, John Arundel in the fifteenth century had been physician to the earl of Warwick before he came to royal service and then to St Stephen's.[13] These examples serve as a reminder that while royal service and government shaped most of the canons' lives, there were also other less well documented routes into the college.

Prebends of St Stephen's within Royally-Sponsored Ecclesiastical Careers
David Skinner commented that Edward Higgons' canonry, granted in 1518, was something of a 'golden handshake' for this lawyer on the brink of retirement from Westminster to his Sussex family interests.[14] This section places the grant of a canonry at St Stephen's into the context of ecclesiastical career trajectories that shifted over time. Prebends at collegiate institutions were generally valued because they could be held in plurality with dispensation from the papal curia. They generally were sinecures in the original meaning of the term– offices that did not carry the expectation of responsibility for a parish and parishioners. Almost all of the canons were pluralists during their time at the college, often combining their prebends at St Stephen's with others in cathedrals, and with a rectory or rectories.[15] Some also sought dispensation to have multiple livings with cure of souls, and so might have several rectories or one of the few collegiate prebends that carried parochial responsibilities with it.[16] In this way, priests could supplement their income, without turning their attention from their careers elsewhere in royal service. Exeter Cathedral was an exception, committed to a higher proportion of residency than

---

[9] *CPR 1361-64*, p. 349.
[10] *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1300-1541: Volume 1, Lincoln Diocese,* ed. H. P. F. King, (London: Institute of Historical Research, 1962), pp. 122-4; he was still at the college in 1485, BL Harley Ch. 45 A 38.
[11] *CPR 1485-94*, p. 479; for Litton more generally see Steven J. Gunn, "The Structures of Politics in Early Tudor England,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 5 (1995), p. 78.
[12] *L & P Henry VIII 1529-30,* no. 6803 (19).
[13] *BRUO*, p. 50.
[14] David Skinner, 'Discovering the Provenance of the Caius and Lambeth Choirbooks,' *Early Music* 25 (1997), p. 249.
[15] See appendices for details.
[16] For example, Richard Shaw was pardoned for improper use of papal dispensation for pluralism in 1392, *Cal. Pap. Letters 1362-1404*, pp. 423-7; more conventionally, in 1457 Robert Kirkenham was licenced for three incompatible

elsewhere, because of its isolation and the existence of a common fund with residence payments.[17] St Stephen's and St George's copied Exeter and attempted to have the main value of the prebend come from residency payments. St George's struggled with this requirement, and in the fifteenth century had many years with only around four resident canons present at any given time. In contrast, although the value of a Westminster prebend was not in its yearly pay but in the residence payments, the house in Canon Row and proximity to royal administration made St Stephen's attractive.[18] This situation had implications for the way canons used it within their careers; often it functioned as a shorter association while working in Westminster or as a home base when involved in diplomacy overseas.

Canons came to St Stephen's and to royal service through a variety of routes. As might be expected from earlier studies of the changes in priests' education in general in this period, canons of St Stephen's became gradually more likely to have gone to the universities and increasingly more likely to have taken higher degrees.[19] In the mid fifteenth century, it is possible to track many canons from the royal or administrator-founded colleges of Eton and Winchester through to their partner university colleges of King's, Cambridge and New College, Oxford and then directly into royal service.[20] The earlier King's Hall, founded as the college for priests in royal service, also appears in the educational backgrounds of many canons suggesting its potential role in bringing men to royal attention.[21] In the mid-fourteenth century, however, it was a rare canon who can be found in the university records, and only usually holding the MA.[22] More commonly, they seem to have been ordained young alongside their other tasks, and the road to their preferments came through family connections in the major offices of state. For example, at St Stephen's, the Ravenser, Chesterfield, Sleaford and Clifford families all provided at least two canons and often exchanged prebends between family members.[23] These families had longer histories of dominating the royal administrative departments, and their familial patronage to nephews, brothers and cousins was an accepted route into Chancery and the Exchequer.[24] Others used local

benefices, *Cal. Pap. Letters 1455-64*, pp. 140-52.

[17] Lepine, 'The Origins and Careers of the Canons of Exeter Cathedral,' pp. 87 and 92.

[18] The base salary was only 40s a year, see above, p. 44.

[19] See Table 3.

[20] Examples include: William Say who went from Winchester to New College, *BRUO,* pp. 1649-50; William Westbury, also Winchester to New, *BRUO*, pp. 2020-21; Thomas Barrow who went from Eton College to King's College, *BRUC*, pp. 40-1.

[21] A.B. Cobban, *The King's Hall Within the University of Cambridge in the Later Middle Ages,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969) pp. 20-21; for canons educated there see biographies in appendices, pp. 256-7, 267, 273, 277-8, 294-5, 300-1, 301, and 324-5.

[22] For example, of the first twelve canons only Thomas Crosse and Walter Weston are in Emden, *BRUO,* p. 518 for Crosse, and pp. 2025-6 for Weston.

[23] For example, in 1366 there was an exchange of prebends between John Ravenser and Richard Ravenser, *CPR 1364-67,* p. 244.

[24] Bennett, 'Careerism', p. 28.

connections to enter these government offices, such as those who came to the notice of important bishops such as William Edington through local networks of service. For example, many of the Exchequer clerks during Edington's time as treasurer seem to have been associated with him in royal service.[25] In the fifteenth century, there are fewer cases of individuals gaining canonries through obvious connections. One example is the prebend exchange between Thomas and Edmund Bonyfaunt in 1469.[26] The family networks faltered, and more formal recruitment of the specialised skills provided by the universities took their place. There were two facets to this change. Higher degrees fitted men for royal diplomatic service, work in the canon and civil law courts and potentially for medical or theological service to the king.[27] In addition, campaigns by bishops for the better education of the clergy in the fifteenth century meant that the universities were expanding to meet the demand for education.[28] Colleges were being founded by those concerned to improve the learning of the clergy, such as William Smith, dean in the 1510s, who was actively involved in the foundation of Brasenose College, Oxford.[29] Henry VIII's reign, as discussed in the previous chapter, brought a particularly strong emphasis on rewarding those whose university educations had prepared them for the type of legal and reforming work that Henry needed.[30]

One of the first steps for an ambitious young priest or would-be priest, since rectories were often given before their incumbents were fully ordained into higher orders, was to obtain a rectory.[31] These appointments depended on a degree of luck and connections, since there were far more men desiring rectories than there were rectories for them throughout the later middle ages.[32] That the college's canons generally started out with a rectory and that they do not seem to have had an intervening period of joblessness or acting as a vicar for other rectors suggests that from the very start of their careers they were marked out as high-flyers. Later, as the universities took over important functions of patronage, we see canons of St Stephen's start their careers at rectories in the patronage of their Oxford or Cambridge

---

[25] W. Mark Ormrod, 'The Protecolla Rolls and English Government Finance, 1353-1364,' *EHR* 102 (1987), p. 626; also discussed in Chapter One, pp. 31-2.
[26] *CPR 1467-77*, p. 180.
[27] Jeremy Catto, 'Master, Patrons, and the Careers of Graduates in Fifteenth-Century England,' in *The Fifteenth Century I: Concepts and Patterns of Service in the Later Middle Ages*, eds. Anne Curry & Elizabeth Matthew, (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2000), p. 54.
[28] Cooper, *Last Generation,* pp. 12-13.
[29] Margaret Bowker, 'Smith, William (*d.* 1514),' *ODNB*.
[30] See Chapter Four for discussion of Henry's appointments to St Stephen's prebends, pp. 103-5.
[31] Virginia Davis, 'Preparation for Service in the late medieval English Church,' in *Fifteenth Century England I: Concepts and Patterns of Service in the Fifteenth Century*, eds. Anne Curry & Elizabeth Matthew, (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2000), p. 39.
[32] Cooper, *Last Generation*, p. 39.

colleges.[33] Merton College, Oxford, for example, often used its appropriated churches to support its graduates. Canons who had this type of patronage included John Arundel, whose first rectory was in Merton's gift.[34] These rectories were not permanent, quite often they would be swapped for more lucrative or convenient rectories or prebends elsewhere, and the priests who had the access to these types of patronage and networks rarely lived in their nominal parishes. Instead, they hired out the actual parochial work to vicars in return for usually a fairly small stipend.[35] These vicars approximated the vicars at St Stephen's itself, hired by the canon or rector to take part in the work of running the church but in part excluded from the rewards of the clerical patronage system.[36] St Stephen's itself as a corporate entity provided vicars to the churches appropriated to it, such as Dewsbury and Wakefield in Yorkshire and then the priory churches of the alien priory acquisitions of the fifteenth century. One of the last canons of the college, John Herbert, was also vicar of the college's church of Penistone in Yorkshire.[37] This is an extremely odd, but not unique, example of a canon simultaneously acting as a vicar. It is an open question as to whether he had another vicar to do the actual work of the parish, but it serves as a reminder that the both the college and its constituent canons acted within the wider parish system and had responsibilities to dioceses.

Until the sixteenth century, most canons held cathedral prebends before they joined St Stephen's and while they were canons. Cathedral prebends could vary enormously in value and we can see canons swapping their prebends for others to try to obtain the best rewards, both within the cathedral itself and outside it.[38] Cathedral prebends were often a mark of royal favour to king's clerks as the king often had the right to present to prebends.[39] The king also could influence the appointment of the cathedral deans, although he did not always do so.[40] There seem to have been strong trends in which sees were considered most desirable, with considerable numbers of canons of St Stephen's also holding Lincoln prebends, and not many at Hereford, for example.[41] York was also a popular diocese, particularly since some of its prebends were spectacularly lucrative and consequently often contested.[42] Exeter was

---

[33] Bowker, *Secular Clergy in Lincoln*, p. 76.
[34] *BRUO*, p. 49-50.
[35] Bowker, *Secular Clergy in Lincoln*, pp. 103-5.
[36] Davis, 'Preparation for Service', pp. 49-50.
[37] *BRUO 1540,* p. 282.
[38] See biographical data in appendices; for example, Nicholas Dixon in the early fifteenth century at Lincoln Cathedral, p. 272; also Edward Finch in the sixteenth century at Salisbury Cathedral, pp. 275-6.
[39] David N. Lepine, *A Brotherhood of Canons Serving God: English Secular Cathedrals in the Later Middle Ages*, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1995), p. 19.
[40] A. Compton Reeves, 'Cathedral Deans of the Yorkist Age,' *The Ricardian* 18 (2008), pp. 83-91.
[41] See Table 4.
[42] Kathleen Edwards, *The English Secular Cathedrals in the Middle Ages: A Constitutional Study*, 2nd ed. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967), p. 39.

unusual in that the bishops tended to be able to present to the canonries, and tended to reward local men who would maintain their residences there.[43]. It is highly likely that unless they held one of the offices of the cathedral, such as precentor, the canons of St Stephen's were non-resident at the cathedrals at least at the time when they held both, as the rewards for residency at cathedrals were much less than in Westminster.[44] This question will be addressed further below in the section on collegiality, but there is little evidence of non-residence at St Stephen's, not least because unlike other prebends available to royal administrators, residence there was compatible with, and indeed helpful to, work in the major financial and administrative offices at Westminster. St Stephen's may also have helped individual canons gain better access to valuable cathedral canonries, as occasionally canons of St Stephen's followed another canon to a particular prebend, such as when in 1438 William Aiscough resigned from Sutton cum Buckingham in Lincoln Cathedral, and Nicholas Dixon was appointed in his stead.[45] At that time both men were canons at Westminster, and Aiscough might well have suggested his brother canon as his successor, without it being a formal prebend exchange.

Other collegiate prebends were valued for the same reasons that cathedral canonries were, that they often were without care of souls so could be held as pluralists. They too could range from small local institutions that may provide clues to early local patronage networks before they came to royal attention, to large and important colleges that a canon of St Stephen's could have entrance to. Access to some noble patronage can be inferred from the six canons who also held prebends at St Mary's Warwick, the college where the earls of Warwick had the right of presentation.[46] In addition, there was significant overlap at St Mary's in the Newarke, the Lancastrian family college and mausoleum, particularly after the Lancastrian dynasty became kings of England, and patronage passed to Katherine of Valois, as can be seen in Table 2. St Mary's Warwick interestingly fades out as a source of prebends for those who held St Stephen's prebends in the middle of the fifteenth century, perhaps as a result of the shifting influence of the earls as much as a reflection on the decreasing pressure on royal presentations.[47] However, these other colleges were like St Stephen's in that they usually had privileges for residence, so it was unusual for an individual to hold these at the same time as they were a canon of St Stephen's. Using St George's as an example, because it also had royal patronage and royal presentations, we can track the overlap

---

[43] Lepine, 'Origins and Careers of Exeter Canons,' p. 93.
[44] For a summary of general levels of non-residence see Edwards, *Secular Cathedrals,* pp. 82-3.
[45] *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1300-1541: volume 1: Lincoln diocese*, ed. H.P.F King, (London: Institute of Historical Research, 1962), pp. 113-114.
[46] *The Cartulary of St Mary's Collegiate Church, Warwick*, ed. Charles Fonge, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004) pp. 397-402.
[47] For a suggestion that noble patronage of priests significantly decreased in this period, Catto, 'Masters, Patrons and Careers,' p. 58.

between prebends. In general, it was rare for someone to have held prebends at both colleges until the fifteenth century, probably because there were more priests in royal service in the fourteenth century and so higher demand for prebends.[48] The first was William Mulsho, chamberlain of the Exchequer in the 1360s who has also served as clerk of the Wardrobe and clerk of the King's Works both at Windsor and Westminster. He held his canonry at St George's from at least 1361 while clerk of the works at the castle to 1368, and at St Stephen's from 1365 also to 1368. It may be that this was to facilitate his work in the king's ongoing attempts to build and repair the chapels at both palaces. In 1368 he may have retired from active service as he gave up his prebend at the small college of Hastings as well, only to return briefly to royal service in 1375-6 as Keeper of the Wardrobe.[49] The next canon of St Stephen's also to hold a stall at Windsor was Richard Shawe who exchanged his prebend at St Stephen's for that at St George's rather than holding them simultaneously.[50] In the sixteenth century it became more common, but still not the norm, when John Chambre, John Veysey, and John Longland among others had prebends at both colleges sequentially or more rarely, simultaneously.[51]

All of these types of preferments were indicative of very lucrative careers where the canons of St Stephen's were able to make use of local, episcopal, noble and royal networks of influence and connections to obtain valuable benefices and rewards for themselves. As pluralists, the canons enriched themselves through multiple simultaneous benefices and were often non-resident in their parish churches. Such pluralism does not seem to have been an important theme in calls for reform in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, although it forms a persistent theme in the historiography.[52] Absentee clergy were deplored, but as long as a vicar was appointed to maintain services, parishioners seem to have been content.[53] The Church hierarchy sought to stop the rampant pluralism and absenteeism of men such as William Wykeham in the fourteenth century through papal or episcopal licensing of those

---

[48] In the first 50 years of St Stephen's only seven canons also had prebends at some point at St George's, whereas in the whole of the fifteenth century there were seventeen canons with prebends at both colleges. This is not taking into account that the lists of canons are not complete in the fifteenth century, so there may be more that are unknown, see Table 2.

[49] S.L. Ollard, *Fasti Wyndesorienses: The Deans and Canons of Windsor* (Windsor: for the Dean and Canons of St George's Chapel, 1950), p. 115.

[50] Ibid, p. 98; the exchange is in *CPR 1364-67*, p. 206.

[51] Ollard listed some of the men who held canonries at both colleges, Ollard, *Fasti Wyndsorienses*, p. 164; see Table 2 for the full list.

[52] Studies of parish clergy tend to include a section on non-residence and its implications for the parishes under study and by extension the pluralism that encouraged non-residence, Bowker, *Secular Clergy in Lincoln*, pp. 85-109; Heath, *Parish Clergy*, pp. 49-70; Cooper, *Last Generation*, pp. 37- 38; The major study of pluralism remains Alexander Hamilton Thompson, 'Pluralism in the Medieval Church; with notes on Pluralists in the diocese of Lincoln, 1366,' *Associated Archaeological Societies' Reports* 33 (1915), pp. 35-73.

[53] Complaints about failures of clergy and their non-residence discussed in Robert N. Swanson, 'Problems of the Priesthood in Pre-Reformation England,' *EHR* 105 (1990), p. 848.

who wished to hold multiple benefices with pastoral responsibilities or be absent from their parishes.[54] In the 1366 pluralist returns for the province of Canterbury, the then-canon William Wenlock held one parish church and four sinecures, including a St Paul's prebend.[55] It is worth noting that Wenlock, like the other canons of St Stephen's whose rectories are known, tended to hold multiple cathedral prebends or other sinecures rather than multiple parish churches. In this, they were following the accepted pattern. In 1529, when Henry VIII used pluralism as a means of attacking the Church as a whole, the bishops negotiated a compromise allowing loopholes for sinecure pluralism.[56] Anti-clericalism thus needs to be divorced from pluralism. The concern over pluralism was tied to concerns over proper parochial provision and as long as the pluralist clergy ensured that their parishes were not neglected they were free to amass other benefices with dispensation.

Where canons were not so successful was in obtaining bishoprics, as shown in Table 5. Proportionally few canons went on to bishoprics, just as at St George's, mostly from the late 15th century, and particularly under Henry VIII.[57] St Stephen's had more bishops come from its ranks than St George's did, probably because of its continuing higher proportion of royal servants in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, but they tended to be only briefly canons. A canonry at St Stephen's was a brief honour for William Wykeham on his way to the bishopric of Winchester and the heights of influence he obtained in the last years of Edward III's reign.[58] Richard II's appointments to the college and then to the episcopate, Richard Clifford and Richard Medford, reached the episcopate on account of their political connections.[59] Medford may never have taken up his prebend, as it was given to him in 1386 just before he was first named to Bath and Wells. His election was overturned but he finally became bishop of Chichester in 1388.[60] For those who became bishops in the fifteenth century, they too received prebends just a few years before their elevation, suggesting that the canonry was a reward for the same type of work that would take them to the episcopal bench. William Aiscough was made canon in 1436, and in 1438 was consecrated bishop of Salisbury and resigned the prebend. His career was very much in the personal service of Henry VI, whose marriage he celebrated and on whose council he served until he was

---

[54] Pluralism is discussed in Heath, *Parish Clergy*, p. 50; absenteeism in Bowker, *Secular Clergy in Lincoln*, pp. 93-5.
[55] Reg. Langham, p. 34.
[56] Ethan H. Shagan, *Popular Politics and the English Reformation*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 140-1.
[57] Bishops at St George's are listed by Ollard, *Fasti Wyndsorienses*, pp. 7-9; for those at St Stephen's, see Table 5.
[58] *CPR 1361-64,* p. 345; and was appointed bishop in 1366, P. Partner, 'Wykeham, William (*c*.1324–1404)', *ODNB*.
[59] Richard G. Davies, 'Clifford, Richard (*d.* 1421)', *ODNB;* and for his appointments to St Stephen's prebends, *CPR 1381-85*, p. 219 and *CPR 1396-99*, p. 61; B. Golding, 'Medford, Richard (*d.* 1407)', *ODNB*; and for his appointment to St Stephen's on exchange with Clifford, see *CPR 1385-89*, p. 215.
[60] Golding, 'Medford'.

murdered in 1450.[61] John Arundel stayed at the college for longer, 1452 to 1459, when he became bishop of Chichester for similar reasons of personal service as chaplain and physician to Henry VI.[62] The longest serving future bishop was John Buckingham, whose entrance to royal service from that of the earl of Warwick in 1347 was rewarded with one of the first St Stephen's prebends in August 1348. He was to stay at the college for the next fifteen years as he rose through the ranks of the Exchequer and then was consecrated to Lincoln in 1363.[63] Unusually for this pattern of rare bishoprics, and usually as a final honour before the episcopate, in Henry VIII's reign, St Stephen's, unlike St George's, became the home of many of the canon and civil lawyers who were to be promoted quickly to the episcopate to drive through Henry VIII's reformation.[64]

A prebend at St Stephen's seems to have largely come towards the end of most careers, or as the final step for those few who went on to direct the English church for the king. Edward Higgons was certainly not unusual in having a canonry as a reward at the end of a long and valued period of work for the royal court. The numbers of canons who died in office bears this out, from the early years when the elderly William Cusance was given a prebend after half a century of work in the Exchequer and died in post in 1360, through to John Chambre, last dean of the college who was already in his fifties when he became a canon in 1512, became dean in 1515 and survived the college's dissolution by only a year.[65] Canons often died in post, whether they had held it for a short time or for over a decade. For example, Hugh Ashton was a canon from 1509 to his death in 1523.[66] However, we also have some canons who stayed for decades as they moved their way up through royal administration. John Blockeley joined the college in 1361 and stayed for over twenty years.[67] William Wenlock was similarly long-lasting; at the college from 1365 until 1390.[68] For them, St Stephen's was an early reward that allowed them the privileges of a prebend and free housing close to their work. Later canons such as Gerald Hesyll were at the college for nineteen years or longer in the fifteenth century.[69] Others, particularly in the early years of the college,

---

[61] *BRUC*, p. 28.
[62] *BRUO*, p. 49-50.
[63] McHardy, 'The Early Ecclesiastical Career of John Buckingham,' pp. 3-4.
[64] The best discussion of Henry VIII's bishops is Lacey Baldwin Smith, *Tudor Prelates and Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953); but more recently Chibi has attempted to summarise their careers, Andrew A. Chibi, *Henry VIII's Bishops: Diplomats, Administrators, Scholars and Shepherds* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2003); see also Table 5.
[65] For William Cusance's career, see W. Mark Ormrod, 'Cusance, William (*d.* 1360)', *ODNB;* he is one of the few canons not to be appointed by letter patent in the 1350s, but is attested as having died a canon in *CPR 1361-1364*, p. 53; John Chambre was appointed canon in the patent rolls, *L & P Henry VIII 1513-14*, 3499 (40); Chambre's 1549 will is PROB 11/32.
[66] *BRUC*, p. 18-19.
[67] Blockley was appointed in *CPR 1361-64,* p. 85; and vacated in *CPR 1381-1385,* p. 193.
[68] Wenlock was appointed in *CPR 1364- 67,* p. 101; and vacated in *CPR 1391-96,* p. 58.
[69] Hesyll was appointed in *CPR 1429-36,* p. 268; and had died by *CPR 1452-61,* p. 527.

seem to have used it as a staging post for attempting to get the best combination of preferments to maximise their income. For example, John Hermesthorp, who was a canon from 1363 to an unknown point, seems to have swapped in and out of three prebends at St Stephen's relatively early in his career as he was then Chamberlain of the Exchequer from 1376 until 1396.[70] Others stayed for much shorter periods; of the other canons appointed in 1363, William Outy was granted his prebend on 30 May and gave it up on 8 June, and similarly John Sleaford exchanged his prebend at St Stephen's within six months of obtaining it.[71] Outy and Sleaford were both comparatively young men, both of whom were to continue to be in royal service until well into the reign of Richard II.[72] This suggests both the value and the flexibility of St Stephen's to royal servants within their individual careers.

Collegiality

It has been easier to consider what role St Stephen's played in an individual's career and how it fitted into larger patterns of how individuals came to, and left the college than to understand the relationships between canons while they were at St Stephen's. At times, family members and those who all served in particular offices dominated the college and at these moments it is easy to assume that working or familial relationships coloured their experiences in the college. William Edington was probably seeking from the start to make St Stephen's into a base for Exchequer clerks to promote collegiality, rather as St Martin le Grand had become a household base by the mid fourteenth century.[73] However, this type of external impetus for collegiality seems rather to have faded by the 1380s when Edward and Edington were no longer alive to direct this effort. Instead, while most canons seem to have been in some sort of royal service, there no longer seems to be such ready-made external foci for the canons' interests. These broad trends are the focus of the section below on the groupings of royal service within the college; this section will focus on the few places where there is enough evidence for canons' friendships with, and personal associations with, each other and their commitment to and valuing of the college beyond simply another benefice that was advantageous to them. With the growth of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury as the place where most wills from London and its surrounding areas were proved in the fifteenth century, enough wills of canons and former canons at their deaths have survived from the mid-

---

[70] John Hermesthorp occurs as Warwick chamberlain from 1376-96 in J.C. Sainty, *Officers of the Exchequer*, List and Index Society Special Series 18 (1983), p. 15; at St Stephen's, the *CPR* references for his exchanges in and out in 1363 are *CPR 1361-64,* p. 307 (his arrival), p. 323 (exchange) and p. 335 (return to college); and then in 1365, *CPR 1364-67,* p. 57 (second exchange out) and p. 346 (return to college where he was to stay to an unknown date).
[71] *CPR 1361-64,* p. 349 for the grant of the prebend and p. 345 for the exchange.
[72] *CPR 1361-64,* pp. 354 and 431.
[73] W. Mark Ormrod, 'Accountability and Collegiality: The English Royal Secretariat in the mid-Fourteenth Century,' in *Ecrit et Pouvoir dans les Chancelleries Médiévales: Espace Français, Espace Anglais,* eds. Kouky Fianu & DeLloyd J. Guth, (Louvain-La-Neuve: Fédération internationale des instituts d'études médiévales, 1997), p. 79.

fifteenth century onwards to study how they viewed the college. For slightly earlier material, the obit book offers hints at the value canons from the late fourteenth century through to the dissolution placed on the access to prayers that St Stephen's offered them.[74] Finally, the rare survival of the treasurer's accounts for 1485-6 giving details of residence in the six months that they cover offers another way into the question of canons' collegiality.[75] For the vicars and the other members of the lesser clergy at the college, there is sadly much less evidence, and much of that is from the surviving taxation records.[76] All of this evidence suggests that St Stephen's did provide a focus for the loyalties of its staff, and that they appreciated and valued what it had to offer.

For the period 1348 to about 1415 it is almost impossible to understand whether the college was a community rather than simply a corporate entity to which the canons happened to belong for the length, long or short, of their tenure. For this time, no internal records of the college survive and the obit book had not yet been created. No records of residence survive, or even any sense of the quotidian staffing of the chapel. When the obit book was written in the 1430s, it included only a few canons from the previous period, and may have omitted more because of funds running out, or simple administrative loss of documents.[77] On account of this small sample size, we cannot attempt to infer their opinions on the college that they were part of, other than to say they valued the prayers for their souls that the college offered to them. Nothing of the networks of friendships and acquaintances within the college left a trace on the documentary record, although perhaps that there were external connections between canons, whether of family as discussed above, or in common work as the section below will discuss, suggests that there would have been collegiality among the canons in this period. The canons appeared to have acted together, for example in matters such as obtaining the grant of the precinct in 1356, and pursuing the college's claims against Richard II for the Leybourne lands while mitigating the case's financial impact.[78] However, this evidence says little about the relationships other than that they at least were functional enough to make concerted action possible, even when in 1377 the college was visited by the Chancellor, who had sharp comments for the dean.[79] At this point, it seems clear enough that collegiality between the dean, William Sleaford, and his canons, might well have been strained. We can say some things about

---

[74] The obit book is BL Cotton MS Faustina B VIII.

[75] BL Harley Ch. 45 A 38-49.

[76] Vicars are listed in 1380 for the poll tax, E 179/ 44/ 347 m. 6; for the 1406 tax on unbeneficed clergy, E 179/42/49; in 1546 for the 'free and voluntary contribution', E 179/ 141/ 160 m. 21; and then in 1548, *Chantry Certificate*, 80; for a full listing of all known vicars and clerks see Table 7.

[77] The obit book was written c. 1430 as seen in this case over whether it had been finished or not, C 1/17/399; my thanks to Maureen Jurkowski for bringing this case to my attention.

[78] For the petition in 1356, SC 8/274/12304; for the response to the dispute with Richard II, see above, pp. 54-6.

[79] The concerns include problems with records, lack of vicars and financial mismanagement by the dean, *CPR 1377-81*,

the internal structure, including that the vicars, choristers and clerks formed their own sub-college from 1396 and so had their own separate identity in this period, but whether there was a great gulf between the canons and the rest of the college is unknowable, as are the internal friendships and connections of the vicars and clerks themselves.[80] They were appointed by the dean and canons collectively, but through what networks is unclear and their length of tenure at the college is equally unknown.[81]

For the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, evidence from wills coupled with the obit book's register make the picture much clearer for the canons, if not much clearer for the vicars. There were no bequests in the surviving group of PCC wills to vicars, which suggests that there was something of a social gulf between the two groups. Nicholas Ludford, the sixteenth century organist and verger, left nothing to any of the surviving members of the college in 1553. Instead his few bequests were to his family and to other parishioners of St Margaret's, Westminster.[82] An earlier chantry priest who Ludford would have known, John Langisloo in 1535 left bequests to some of the vicars and the clerks, but not to any of the canons.[83] Similarly, canons made bequests to other canons on occasion, and acted as executors for each other, suggesting friendships were formed within the college if not between different groupings within the college.[84] In addition, canons self-identified as canons in their wills, not exclusively, but certainly enough to be suggestive that they saw the college as an important affiliation. Burials and requests for burials, even if not carried out, also indicate that the college had value for the self-image and presentation of the canons as a group. Canons often requested burials in particular places and even next to individuals. For example, in 1524 Thomas Reynes asked to be buried by his friend William Underhill, who was also a canon, in the north cloisters.[85] Other signs of friendship include canons acting as executors for other canons, such as when in 1497 John Broun named Henry Aynesworth as his executor.[86] In addition to burials, we can also see canons showing their appreciation of the college through the endowment of obits, lights and through leaving their books to the college, sometimes at the same time as requesting

---

p. 57.

[80] The creation of a sub college is *CPR 1391-96*, p. 669.

[81] See discussion in Chapter Six, pp. 161-4.

[82] For the transcription of Ludford's will, David Skinner & Nicholas Caldwell, "'At the Mynde of Nicholas Ludford,": New Light on Ludford from the Churchwarden's Accounts of St Margaret's, Westminster,' *Early Music* 22 (1995), p. 409.

[83] London, Westminster City Archives, PCW Bracy, ff. 52v-53; cited in Skinner, 'At the Mynde of Nicholas Ludford,' p. 396.

[84] John Gunthorpe in his 1498 will named Richard Hatton as one of his executors, printed in *Somerset Medieval Wills (1383–1500),* ed. F. W. Weaver, (London: Somerset Record Society, 1901), p. 361; Hatton in turn in 1509 called Gunthorpe his benefactor and endowed masses at St Stephen's for himself and Gunthorpe, PROB 11/16/504; Richard Wolman left vestments to the college as well as gifts to fellow canons, Dr [William?] Benet and Dr William Knight, who was also to be his executor, PROB 11/27/113.

[85] PROB 11/ 21/278.

[86] PROB 11/11/350.

burials.[87] One obit request recorded in the obit books showed a strong attachment to the particular prebend held by the canon in life, as the anniversary mass was to be said by the current holder of the prebend in perpetuity.[88] Some specified that any residue after their obit was paid for was to go to the common fund of the college, for the welfare of all.[89] At other times, canons banded together to obtain property for obits, whether by buying the tenements collectively or by obtaining the licences to alienate in mortmain. Groups of obits were attached to particular houses, perhaps indicating a collective action to look after each other even in Purgatory.[90]

This view of the canons as broadly invested in the health of the college and acting in concert with others during their time there is supported by the case study in residence offered by the chance survival of the residence records for six months in 1485 to 1486. Residence was demanded by the statutes, and referenced in royal grants, such as that of Henry VI, but that was completely normal for a late medieval college.[91] What was, however, rare was for resident canons to be the most common form of canon. At the cathedrals, in contested elections we can see canons becoming resident specifically to vote, and generally any chapter was made up of a core of residents with specific arrangements for non-residents.[92] For example, also many canons of St Paul's, even those living and working in London, were non-resident simply because of the burden of entertaining that fell on resident canons.[93] At St George's, many canons were generally non-resident in the fifteenth century, and there was provision in the statutes for business to be delayed if most of the chapter were absent, and thus non-resident temporarily.[94] St Stephen's then looks very unusual in that in June 1485 eight canons and the dean were there every day or only missed at most two days. Of the remaining four, only one, William Beverley, was completely absent for the whole month; Thomas Barowe missed four days, probably on college business and perhaps as steward, and thus was paid his quotidian fully; Edmund Chaderton was absent completely for four days, but possibly on college business for six further days; Edward Lee was away for three days.[95] This was an extraordinary attendance record, and it was repeated in broadly similar lines for the other four months of that year,

---

[87] For example, in 1381 Adam Chesterfield left a missal for the morrow mass in the lower chapel, and an ordinal and a gradual for St Mary le Pew, BL Cotton MS Faustina B III f. 10r.

[88] Ibid, f. 24v.

[89] Most say this, for example, ibid, Henry Merston on f. 18r, Robert Fulmer on f. 23v and John Preston on f. 25v.

[90] Ibid, f. 18r where Henry Merston is adding himself to the house in Cordwainer Street in London that had been given by Richard Shawe and William Beverley.

[91] *CPR 1446-1452,* p. 66.

[92] Edwards, *English Secular Cathedrals*, p. 35.

[93] Ibid, pp. 61-3; although this was reduced in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

[94] Windsor, St George's College Archives, XI D 20.

[95] BL Harley Ch. 45 A 44.

May, July, August and September, for which records survived.[96] The vast majority of the canons were in residence and appearing at high mass in this period. The financial accounts for January to March 1486 similarly show most of the canons receiving the full £4 10s that indicates full residence during the quarter in question.[97] Assuming that this is not an anomalous year when most of the canons were keeping residence due to the extraordinary events around the battle of Bosworth, it is an remarkable sign of the corporate identity of the college. The canons were invested enough in the college to attend the daily high mass and to receive their shilling for so doing. This attitude was of course helped by the way that St Stephen's fitted smoothly into the working life of Westminster to which so many of these men belonged. Even at its sister college at Windsor it was not possible to find this level of attendance and residence at this time.[98]

Royal Administration

The collegiality of the college came in part from its convenience for royal service at Westminster or with the itinerant court. This section describes and assesses the changes in the types of work canons of St Stephen's did in the administrative and judicial offices which drew their authority from the king, but were increasingly separate from the itinerant court and firmly based at Westminster. The next section suggests that as the canons worked less and less in the administrative and judicial aspects of royal government, they increasingly were drawn from the king's household, widely defined as the offices described and delineated in the Black Book of the Household and other prescriptive texts including the *Liber Regis Capelle*. These were not exclusive groups; men could move from one to another as the needs of the king demanded. They could also move to and from the service of other great noble households and hold positions in more than one simultaneously. The networks and trends thus are fuzzy rather than precise, reflecting the multiplicity of tasks that could be defined by the term 'service' in the late Middle Ages. Broadly speaking, St Stephen's was always a home for canons who worked for the king in some capacity, but what they were doing was changing over time. In the fourteenth century, and in the reign of Henry IV canons were often named in the patent appointing them to the college as simply 'king's clerk'. This designation emphasised that they might be based in a particular department of the household or the administrative offices, but fundamentally they were there to do whatever tasks might be asked of them, and would move from department to department if needed or if they felt it was useful to their careers.

---

[96] BL Harley Ch. 45 A 39-41 and 45.
[97] BL Harley Ch. 45 A 42.
[98] Nigel Saul estimated attendance at 66%, Nigel Saul, 'Servants of God and Crown: the Canons of St George's Chapel, 1348-1420,' in *St George's Chapel, Windsor in the Fourteenth Century*, ed. Nigel Saul, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005), p. 106; however, Euan Roger has shown the averages were much lower in the later fifteenth century, Euan Roger, 'St George's Chapel in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries,' (PhD thesis, Royal Holloway, University of London, 2015), p. 260.

By the end of the fifteenth century men presented to prebends are identified by the specialised work that they did such as acting as secretaries or almoners, a sign that the priests eligible for prebends at St Stephen's were doing narrower tasks within the wider household and had withdrawn from the administrative offices. However, the range of work open to priests and done by the canons of St Stephen's within the broad area of royal service remained vast. Royal service also could be indirect, as from the mid-fifteenth century the king was often granting out the right to present to the prebends of both St Stephen's and St George's to members of his council and to his family.[99] They then were able to use canonries at St Stephen's to reward their own servants, and conversely, ambitious priests could use those networks of patronage to access the privileges of the king's colleges.

St Stephen's very much reflected its surroundings within the palace of Westminster. Unlike the Sainte Chapelle in Paris, it had significant levels of administrative staff in its ranks, even in the sixteenth century. This reflected the structure of the royal presence in Westminster, with a strong core of administrative and judicial staff permanently based in and around the palace or in the various London offices in the Exchequer, Chancery, the various law courts and then the Great Wardrobe and Wardrobe in London itself. This staff found homes at St Stephen's, St Martin le Grand and in the various Inns of Chancery as external institutions that nevertheless were related to the court. The Inns of Chancery were new when St Stephen's itself was founded, but St Martin le Grand had already gradually joined the ranks of institutions to which the king had the right to present, and that became a royal interest.[100] Gradually then, the canons of St Stephen's would have had access to the growing legal communities of London through common interests in the Inns. By the fifteenth century the church courts and their professional base at Doctors' Commons were also nearby.[101] Doctors' Commons provided a meeting place for advocates of the Court of Arches beyond just those in the king's direct service and provided another network that fifteenth and sixteenth century canons used.[102] All of these connections were then supplemented by those men who worked for the king's household, either the very public side of royal display and ceremonial that the Chapel Royal and the almoner among others served or in the private world of the king's secretaries, tutors and privy chaplains. At the Sainte Chapelle by contrast, the major presence in its choir stalls were members of the king's private household, including traditionally the royal

---

[99] These groups first occur in 1457 and are used intermittently after, *CPR 1452-61,* p. 352; Cooper, *Last Generation*, pp. 45-7.

[100] 'Colleges: St Martin le Grand,' in *The Victoria County History of the Counties of England: London*, ed. William Page, (London: Constable and Company, 1909), pp. 555-566.

[101] On the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century foundation of Doctors' Commons, George D. Squibb, *Doctors' Commons: A History of the College of Advocates and Doctors of Law,* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), pp. 3-5.

[102] Canons involved with Doctors Commons included Richard Rawson, John Taylor, John Veysey, John Vaughan and Hugh Oldham, Squibb, *Doctors' Commons*, pp. 122, 124- 5 and 128.

almoner, because of the less extensive settlement of administration in Paris. The presence of the Sorbonne in Paris also meant that the Sainte Chapelle was often filled with members of the university in a way that neither Oxford nor Cambridge were to do at St Stephen's.[103] Canons had moved away from their university careers by the time that they reached their prebends at Westminster, with a few exceptions such as John Chambre, who combined the deanery with the wardenship of Merton College, Oxford.[104]

St Stephen's also allows us to examine the issue of the laicisation of the king's clerks through the lens of a group of priests known to be involved with royal service over the period when administration is thought to have been radically changed. When discussing this issue, historians have focussed on the shift from priests to laymen in the administrative offices of Exchequer and Chancery.[105] The picture they have painted is of an early fifteenth-century shift away from priests in the Exchequer, and a slightly later one in Chancery.[106] In part, the story has been of clerks choosing not to enter into holy orders and instead to amass secular lands and found gentry dynasties. The other part of the argument has been that tenures in particular offices grew shorter, as men were 'parachuted in' rather than working their way up. The implications of this argument have been far-reaching, as secularisation is thought to have led to a decline in skills and then to administrative collapse by the mid fifteenth century in the Wars of the Roses.[107] The first problem with this thesis is that the focus on the great offices of state ignores those men who held the amorphous title of 'king's clerk' and were probably carrying out a range of tasks in a variety of offices. It also elides the ability seen in the supposed heyday of royal administration under Edward III for clerks such as Roger Chesterfield to move between Exchequer and Chancery in 1360.[108] At the other end of the period, priests in the 'new monarchy' have rather been ignored as royal servants, as they are assumed to be atypically influential rather than examples of continuing royal administrative service by priests under the rank of bishop.[109]

---

[103] Claudine Billot, 'La Foundation de Saint Louis: le Collège des Chanoines de la Sainte-Chapelle (1248-1555),' in *Le Trésor de la Sainte-Chapelle*, eds. J. Durand & M-P Laffitte, (Paris: Réunion des musées nationaux, 2001), p. 104.

[104] Norman Moore, 'Chambre, John (1470–1549)', rev. Sarah Bakewell, *ODNB*.

[105] Storey, 'Gentlemen-bureaucrats,' pp. 90-130; Smith, 'Some Trends in Chancery,' pp. 69-94; Carpenter, 'Deskilling,' pp. 1-37; in contrast, Bennett, 'Careerism,' pp. 19-39.

[106] Storey, 'Gentleman-bureaucrats', pp. 100-2.

[107] Carpenter, 'Deskilling,' pp. 22-3.

[108] Bertie Wilkinson, *The Chancery under Edward III*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1929), p. 167.

[109] For example, the clerks listed in the appendices to John Watts, "New Men,' 'New Learning', and 'New Monarchy': Personnel and Policy in Royal Government, 1461-1529,' in *Political Society in later medieval England: a festschrift for Christine Carpenter*, edited by Benjamin Thompson and John Watts, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2015), pp. 223-8; also note comments on the continued presence of humanist-trained priests in royal service after 1534, Arthur J. Slavin, 'Humanists and Government in Early Tudor England,' *Viator* 1 (1970), p. 324.

The picture of laicisation at St Stephen's is rather different from the conventional narrative, in part because the canons can be tracked as working across a range of institutions within royal administration. Table 6 summarises the numbers of men known to have worked in the various offices, although for reasons of space it excludes the Privy Seal office, which by the mid-fourteenth century was separate from Chancery. The nine canons at St Stephen's who are known to have been keeper of the privy seal or to have worked in the privy seal office from the 1360s to the 1480s often went on to bishoprics.[110] The pattern revealed in Table 6 is of consistent engagement with administrative service throughout the college's existence, even though the offices varied over time. The Exchequer employed at least one canon at a time consistently through to the 1450s. The last of the canons to be Chancellor of the Exchequer was John Legbourne, who was appointed in 1403 and remained in post for a decade to 1413.[111] Nicholas Dixon started as clerk of the Pipe in 1413 and on his death in 1448 had been a baron of the Exchequer for twenty five years.[112] His colleague William Fallan had a similarly long career in the Exchequer, as king's clerk by 1421, baron of the Exchequer from May 1436 to after 1450 and possibly to his death in 1460.[113] Both men were pluralists within the Church and had clearly managed to exploit the ecclesiastical rewards that their lay colleagues were struggling to obtain at this point. It is also worth stressing the length and stability of their careers, hardly a sign of administrative collapse. Dixon is not known to have been a graduate, but Fallan went to university in the middle of his administrative career. After Fallan and Dixon, there were no further Exchequer clerks at St Stephen's, probably because at this point, there were no more priests left in the Exchequer. Edmund Chaderton in the 1480s, however, was carrying out similar work to that of Exchequer clerks as treasurer of the Chamber, after his time in Chancery as keeper of the Hanaper.[114]

Chancery looks rather different. It was a much more consistent presence within the stalls because of its proximity to Westminster Hall.[115] In October 1445 Robert Mouter was explicitly appointed to the next vacant canonry because he was keeper of the Hanaper and needed the college's housing.[116] While St Stephen's did not start off as a base for Chancery, a few Chancery clerks in Edward III's reign did reap the rewards at St Stephen's, such as Richard Ravenser, who was Queen Philippa's attorney and then

---

[110] They were Henry Aynesworth, John Buckingham, Richard Clifford, Peter Courtenay, John Gunthorpe, Michael Northburgh, John Russell, Robert Stillington, and William Wykeham.

[111] Sainty, *Officers of the Exchequer*, p. 9.

[112] Ibid, p. 63.

[113] *BRUC*, p. 220.

[114] *The Household of Edward IV: The Black Book and the Ordinance of 1478,* ed. Alec R. Myers, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959), p. 291.

[115] T. S. Haskett, 'The Medieval English Court of Chancery,' *Law and History Review* 14 (1996), pp. 245-313.

[116] *CPR 1441-46,* p. 413.

treasurer, keeper of the Hanaper, and Chancery clerk until his death.[117] From the appointment of Ravenser in 1357 through to the 1530s, there was always a Chancery clerk who was a canon of St Stephen's, when John Taylor was master of the rolls until just before his death in 1534.[118] Even in the late fifteenth century Chancery masters served for a variety of terms, from relatively short stints to a decade or more. John Alcock worked in Chancery for just two years from 1471 to 1473 as keeper of the rolls and then as keeper of the Great Seal.[119] John Davyson stayed in Chancery for eleven years from 1462 to 1473.[120] Thomas Barowe survived the upheaval of 1485 by being competent in Chancery, where he was appointed by Richard III, but was then seemingly kept on by Henry VII until his death in 1499.[121] His contemporary, John Broun, was also a master in Chancery across the divide of 1485, and probably worked in Chancery from 1482 to his death in 1497.[122] This evidence suggests more continuity and less administrative breakdown across the fifteenth century. In addition, we continue to see priests making careers for themselves in royal service alongside laymen rather than supplanted by them. The flexibility of Ravenser's career would have been familiar to his fifteenth and sixteenth century successors in a very different environment.

Administration also encompassed several other areas where Chancery and Exchequer clerks could be seconded as needed, including the clerks of the Parliaments, who were often canons of St Stephen's, including John Gunthorpe in the early 1480s.[123] Others clerks involved with Parliament, as receivers of petitions or as ecclesiastical proctors, included Adam Chesterfield, Robert Manfield, and Richard Ravenser.[124] Building works were constant as an object of the king's expenditure, but were intermittent in terms of having any institutional continuity.[125] As a consequence, it was work that was largely ad hoc, drawing on the general pool of Exchequer clerks. Some such as William Mulsho, or William Wykeham in the 1350s and 1360s would find it occupying much of their time and energy; others such as Martin

---

[117] Alison K. McHardy, 'Ravenser, Richard (d. 1386),' *ODNB*.
[118] P. R. N. Carter, 'Taylor, John (d. 1534),' *ODNB*.
[119] R. J. Schoeck, 'Alcock, John (1430–1500),' *ODNB*.
[120] Smith, 'Some Trends in Chancery,' p. 80.
[121] Jonathan Hughes, 'Barowe, Thomas (d. 1499),' *ODNB*.
[122] Smith, 'Some Trends in Chancery,' p. 80.
[123] Reeves, 'John Gunthorpe,' p. 320.
[124] The data will be much fuller once Alison K. McHardy and Phil Bradford's calendar of the SC 10 material is published by the Canterbury and York Society. For Chesterfield and Manfield I am grateful to them for the following references. Chesterfield occurs in 1376 in SC 10/31/1524, in 1377 in SC 10/31/1542, in 1379 in SC 10/33/1601, in 1380 in SC 10/33/1624 and in 1381 in SC 10/34/1673; Robert Manfield occurs in 1382 in SC 10/ 34/1690, in 1384 in SC 10/35/1740, in 1386 in SC 10/36/1775 and 1388 in SC 10/37/ 1810; Ravenser occurs as receiver of petitions in the parliaments between 1371, W. Mark Ormrod (ed.), 'Edward III: Parliament of February 1371, Text and Translation', in *PROME,* and 1379, Geoffrey Martin (ed.), 'Richard II: Parliament of February 1379, Text and Translation', in *PROME.*
[125] *HKW*, i, pp. 172-3.

Ixnyng and Adam Chesterfield made it a smaller part of their careers.[126] Adam Chesterfield was as clerk of the works in Westminster on secondment from the Exchequer in the 1390s.[127] As discussed above in Chapter One, a significant number of early canons had worked on St Stephen's itself while it was being built as clerk of the works.[128] The connection of St Stephen's to building works largely faded after Richard II's reign when both John Godmanston and William Hanney were clerk of the works and canon of St Stephen's at the same time.[129] However, a later canon, William Walesby, was involved in mid-Lancastrian efforts to maintain Calais, in 1442, when he was one of a commission sent to investigate where the money intended for the garrison had gone.[130] The men who at the same time were overseeing Henry VI's works at Eton and King's College were laymen, a sign of the ways in which priests had retreated from royal service in favour of specialist laymen.[131] Thomas Canner returned to an older pattern of Exchequer and works service when he was the surveyor of works on the Isle of Wight and then at Whitehall while also holding a prebend in the sixteenth century.[132]

The area of administration that became more prominent over time was service on the king's council. The council's role as an advisory body which came to take on governing functions meant that it generally had a range of opinions and experiences on it at any given time. Usually the ecclesiastical hierarchy was represented by several bishops, senior clerics in royal service through their roles in the offices of state, and perhaps some specialists in civil law, if that was valued. Canons who can be identified in the fifteenth century as king's councillors included Robert Stillington and Richard Martyn.[133] Fifteenth-century canons such as Henry Sever and William Aiscough also served in this capacity while at St Stephen's. We can be most detailed, however, with St Stephen's role on the council for the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, thanks to the survival of late sixteenth-century copies of the council registers for Henry VII and Henry VIII in the Ellesmere manuscripts.[134] These copies are selective in order to show the range of judicial activities that the Elizabethan and then Jacobean lawyers expected the council to carry out, but critically, they copied in the attendance lists for the cases they chose.[135] There does not seem to be much specialisation going on, in that ecclesiastics are not noticeably more present

---

[126] Ibid, pp. 166-7.
[127] Adam Chesterfield occurs as clerk of the works at Westminster in 1355-7, E 101/471/4, 14-16.
[128] Above, p. 32, n. 57.
[129] Godmanston occurs in 1395-6, BL Add. MS Ch 27018; Hannay is discussed in *HKW,* i, p. 173.
[130] *HKW,* i, p. 431.
[131] Ibid, ii, pp. 272 and 279.
[132] *L & P Henry VIII 1539 Part 1,* no. 899; and *L & P Henry VIII 1546 Part 1,* no. 1165 (34).
[133] For Stillington see *BRUO*, pp. 1777-9; and for Martyn, see *BRUO*, pp. 1236-7.
[134] San Marino CA, the Huntington Library, Ellesmere MS 2652-5 and 2768.
[135] Discussed in William H. Dunham, 'The Ellesmere Extracts from the 'Acta Consilii' of King Henry VIII,' *EHR* 58 (1943), pp. 308-10.

for ecclesiastical issues, although for major cases, most of the council would attend. Particularly interesting for the purposes of this chapter, however, are those ecclesiastics who are present *ex officio* at some cases. Most priests below the rank of bishop are identified by name or by their title, such as the king's secretary or archdeacon of Lincoln, rather than *ex officio*.[136] There are four usual exceptions to this rule, the deans of the chapel [the Chapel Royal], St Stephen's, and St George's, and then the Prior of the Knights of St John of Jerusalem in Henry VIII's reign.[137] This record may suggest that the dean of the Chapel Royal and the deans of the two major royal colleges sat on the council by virtue of their office, and thus ranked with the bishops in the expectation that they would offer advice and support to the king. That the deans were also royal servants who might have been called upon for the council earlier in their careers because of their experience in law and administration might also have played a role.

Administrative service under the late-medieval kings was not exclusive even in the fourteenth century; canons could and did make use of multiple routes of preferment in their careers.[138] The dilution of royal service as lay administrators looked elsewhere for advancement makes no sense for the canons of St Stephen's, who were reasonably typical of king's clerks. Priests too could serve multiple masters, and indeed always were answerable to the ecclesiastical hierarchy for their parishes and prebends, especially if they were also diocesan officials. William Edington provides a good if unusually powerful example here. His diocesan officials and close supporters had both royal and diocesan careers and seem to have seen no contradiction in this divided service. For example, John Blebury, not the Chancery clerk active in Edward II's reign, but perhaps a younger relative, was ordained by Edington in 1349, acted on commissions, inquiries, and as a witness to important business throughout the diocese of Winchester. He was also one of the bishop's executors in 1366.[139] In addition, he was the recipient of important royal patronage, including grants of collegiate prebends, and was described as a 'king's clerk' in 1361.[140] It is not clear what service he was providing to the king, although it does not seem to have been in Chancery or the Exchequer, so he was probably working in the household. The other important official of Winchester at the same time with a better-attested royal career was Bernard Brocas. Brocas was part of an important Wiltshire gentry family, unusually for this time he had his MA, possibly from Oxford, and he too had a dual career working for the king and for Edington, in the diocese and overseas as controller

---

[136] The archdeacon occurs in Ellesmere MS 2655 f. 1v; and the king's secretary (possibly Oliver King or John Ruthall) occurs in Ellesmere MS 2655, f. 4r.
[137] For example, Ellesmere MS 2768, f. 5r.
[138] Carpenter, 'Deskilling', pp. 10-11.
[139] For Edington's will and Blebury's description as a diocesan official, Reg. Edington, i p. viii; for his ordination, ibid, ii, p. 146.
[140] Blebury was called 'king's clerk' when he was presented to a prebend at Landewy Brevy, *CPR 1361-64,* p. 89.

of Gascony.[141] His dual connections were acknowledged by both sides.[142] Other early canons who had two or more patrons included the three canons who were the Beauchamp Chamberlains of the Exchequer, appointed by the earls of Warwick in the fourteenth century, John Buckingham, William Rothwell and John Hermesthorp.[143] William Denby, canon from 1372, also mostly drew his patronage from non-royal sources, even this early, as the receiver-general of the bishop of Durham in the 1380s.[144] The various bishops who came from St Stephen's most obviously had to balance temporal and ecclesiastical obligations, in that they were answerable to the primates and to the pope as well as to the king who usually had appointed them. They usually had royal experience, but were not solely royal servants. A good example, John Carpenter, canon of St Stephen's in the mid-fifteenth century and then bishop of Worcester from 1444, was admired for his pastoral work rather than simply as the king's man.[145]

Diplomacy was an important area of royal service to which canons contributed. Canon and civil law training, or simply being an experienced priest with the Latin skills needed by overseas diplomacy was useful to the king in many different settings. In addition, a significant number of canons had been educated on the continent, and so had the skills and connections that the king valued. Bologna for civil law and Padua for canon law, for example, provided valued experience.[146] Diplomacy became more important in the later years, but even in the early years of the college, a few men such as Michael Northburgh and William Cusance spent much of their time overseas working on trade agreements, treaties and other general negotiations.[147] It is almost possible to trace the shifting priorities of the English government by where canons were sent. Henry Aynesworth, Edmund Martyn and Richard Hatton were all engaged in diplomatic missions in the last decade of the fifteenth century. Martyn's career seems to have been mostly financially based, so his overseas experience was in negotiations with the Hanse in 1491.[148] Aynesworth and Hatton were both ambassadors to the Spanish court in the late

---

[141] Brocas was called 'Master' when in 1350 he was appointed to a prebend at St Stephen's, *CPR 1348-50,* p. 563; for details of his service to Edward III and to Edington, see Chapter One, p. 32 n. 58.

[142] The king knew enough of his work for Edington to send a message to Edington's officials in 1366 identifying Brocas as Edington's clerk while also distraining his goods for failure to hand in his rolls for Gascony, Reg. Edington, ii, pp. 102-3.

[143] Sainty, *Officers of the Exchequer*, p. 15; Buckingham was canon from 1348, Rothwell from 1350 and Hermesthorp from 1363, although all seem to have left and returned at least once.

[144] *BRUO*, p. 568.

[145] Roy M. Haines, 'Aspects of the Episcopate of John Carpenter, Bishop of Worcester 1444–1476,' *JEH* 19 (1968), p. 11.

[146] Henry Aynesworth studied at Bologna, *BRUO* p. 84; for Padua, see Henry Sharp, *BRUO* pp. 1678-80, and Peter Courtenay, *BRUO* pp. 499-500.

[147] Roy M. Haines, 'Northburgh, Michael (c.1300–1361)', *ODNB,* and Ormrod, 'Cusance'.

[148] *BRUO*, p. 1233-5.

1480s when negotiations for the marriage of Prince Arthur to Catherine of Aragon began, as was Christopher Urswick in the 1490s. [149] In the 1470s Peter Courtenay and John Alcock, both future bishops, had been treating with the Scots whereas in the early fifteenth century the great conciliar movement had occupied Richard Dereham at Constance and Pisa.[150] The proportion of diplomats to administrators had certainly changed through the years as well as the specific diplomatic needs of the day. Northburgh and Cusance had been the exception in the fourteenth century, whereas by the mid to late fifteenth century diplomatic service was more common among the canons. William Benet, if he is the Dr Benet referred to in a will, was Wolsey's servant, and his main royal service was a long series of embassies until his death in 1534.[151] Resident ambassadors overseas, such as Richard Sampson from 1515 at the imperial court, were also canons, although they may never have formally taken up their prebends.[152] Several canons were active as English representatives at the Curia, such as in the later fifteenth century, Henry Sharp, Christopher Urswick and Peter Courtenay.[153] These men, like Sampson, tended not to be canons when they were overseas for long periods, but instead the prebend was their reward for their diplomatic efforts.

Identifying the routes to a canonry in the mid-fifteenth century onwards becomes much harder because the king began to grant out the right to present to the next vacant canonry to individuals and groups of his councillors and family. These royal grants might suggest that the king himself had fewer administrative servants who could see a prebend as their reward for service. However, those appointed through this route seem to have equally royal careers as opposed to those directly appointed through letters patent. Rather, the groups given the right to present seem to have been acting on delegated royal authority and rewarding those who had had careers in the king's service. Often the groups included the dean of St Stephen's or another canon of the college, perhaps as a way of ensuring that the choice fell on someone acceptable to the college.[154] For example, Elizabeth Woodville's choice of George Daune as canon was confirmed by patent and so is a rare example of when we can match the canon to the preceding grant of the right to present.[155] Daune seems not to have been a king's clerk, and is only

[149] For Aynesworth, *BRUO,* p. 84; Hatton, *BRUC*, p. 293; Urswick, *BRUC*, p. 605-6.
[150] For Courtenay, *BRUO,* pp. 499-500; Alcock, *BRUC*, pp. 5-6; Dereham, *BRUC,* p. 184-5.
[151] F. Donald Logan, 'Benet, William (*d.* 1533)', *ODNB.*
[152] Sampson is only attested in 1515 has having been given a canonry by Wolsey in a complaint from Mary Tudor, Queen of France that she had wanted the prebend for her almoner, James Denton, *L & P Henry VIII 1515-16*, no. 172; for Sampson's career more generally see A.A. Chibi, 'Sampson, Richard (*d.* 1554)', *ODNB.*
[153] Henry Sharp, *BRUO*, pp. 1678-80; Christopher Urswick, *BRUC*, p. 605-6; and Peter Courtenay, *BRUO*, pp. 499-500.
[154] For example, on 16 February 1483 Edward IV granted the right to present to Thomas, archbishop of York, John, bishop of Lincoln, William, lord Hastings, Thomas Montgomery, knight, Thomas Danet, clerk, and Robert Langton, of whom Danet was a canon, *CPR 1476-85,* p. 342.
[155] Her 1 October 1472 grant was *CPR 1467-77*, p. 360; ibid, p. 547 on 12 November 1475 is the confirmation.

referred to as a 'chaplain', which may explain why he had to be confirmed by the king, as an apparently unsuitable choice for his lack of royal service. In any case he very quickly exchanged his prebend for one at Chichester.[156] Of the four canons who can be definitively linked to Margaret Beaufort, who was granted two presentations in groups including her daughter-in-law, two – Christopher Urswick in 1483 and Hugh Ashton in 1509 – were appointed by letters patent as normal and two – James Whitstons and Hugh Oldham – occur as canons only after their appointments.[157] It is thus tempting to see Whitstons and Oldham as being appointed by those groups including Margaret Beaufort in 1487 and 1489.[158] All are equally royal clerks and all served Beaufort, her son and her grandsons at various points, which suggests once again that royal service was flexible and that even when royal presentations though letters patent were not used, the men appointed were usually those who combined royal and high noble service. The results of other grants to groups of the right to present cannot be tracked as easily, but the known canons of St Stephen's for this period, with the rare exception of Daune, can be localised to their royal administrative or diplomatic service, and often also to the household, to which we now turn.

Canons in the King's Household

The household was a rather amorphous set of offices and entities that had gradually grown up to look after the king and his court's needs. It included semi-separate offices such as the Wardrobe and the Great Wardrobe, as well as the itinerant departments such as the Chapel Royal and the Chamber. In addition, it covers the personal servants of the king such as his chaplains and his physicians. Canons of St Stephen's belonged to all of these different groupings at different points. Using the prescriptive texts about the smooth ordering of the late medieval royal household as a basis for discussion of the tasks asked of those who belonged to St Stephen's, we can begin to tease out how the household employed those of St Stephen's. The first text, from the 1440s, discusses only the role of the Chapel Royal, the *Liber Regie Capelle,* written by William Say, canon of St Stephen's and also dean of the Chapel Royal, but as part of that sets out the fundamental pattern of royal religious provision, including aspects that would affect the college if the king was at Westminster. The household ordinances of 1478, designed to limit the king's expenses while still providing appropriate levels of magnificence and display, divided the household into two parts. Canons of St Stephen's in the later fifteenth century could be found in both

---

[156] The exchange is in *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1300-1541: volume 7: Chichester diocese*, ed. Joyce M. Horn, (London: Institute of Historical Research, 1964), p. 44 where Daune was to remain a canon until his death in 1502.
[157] Christopher Urswick *BRUC*, p. 605-6; he was appointed to a prebend in *CPR 1485-94,* p. 24; for Hugh Ashton, *BRUC,* pp. 18-19; and is appointed to a prebend in *L & P Henry VIII 1509-13*, no. 54 (84); for Hugh Oldham, *BRUC,* pp. 433-4; James Whitstons is referred to as 'President of the council of Margaret the king's mother' in *L & P Henry VIII 1509-13*, no. 438 at p. 220.
[158] The grants are in *CPR 1485-94*, p. 206 for 1487 and p. 292 for 1489.

the *domus magnificie* and the *domus providencie*. Those canons that were part of the *domus magnificie* worked on the outward display that made the king's court impressive and lavish, whereas those of the *domus providencie* carried out more practical tasks.[159] For example, the Chapel Royal was part of the *domus magnificie*, but the treasurer of the household and later that of the chamber were of the *domus providencie*.

The generalist and financial areas of household work became largely devoid of canons by the mid fifteenth century despite a few notable exceptions. The king's household had its own financial officers to oversee expenditure. Experimentation was very possible in these offices since the king and the Exchequer were often in dispute over who controlled revenues. In the 1340s William Edington had brought the household expenditure under Exchequer oversight, using men who later became canons at St Stephen's as his officers in the household, in addition to their work in the Exchequer. Similarly, he brought the Wardrobe and the Great Wardrobe under Exchequer supervision, as these officers had also been used as ad-hoc household treasurers by Edward III.[160] By the time of the Black Book and the various late-fifteenth century ordinances, the treasurer of the household had become the most important financial officer, a position usually held by a layman rather than one of the remaining clerks of Chancery or Exchequer. Interestingly, despite the pattern of withdrawal of priests from unspecialised royal service, in the reign of Edward IV a canon of St Stephen's, Edmund Chaderton, was treasurer of the chamber, a post that was usually held by a layman, in addition to his work on the administrative side mentioned above.[161] Similarly, Hugh Ashton was controller of Margaret Beaufort's quasi-royal household.[162] These men, however were unusual and stand as examples more of the flexibility of clerical service even this late in the fifteenth century and into the sixteenth than as examples of a general trend of continuing priestly service in largely non-clerical roles.

Priests and canons of St Stephen's remained in specialised roles within the household. The training in theology, law and rhetoric that many of them by the mid-fifteenth century had received made them suitable for posts as secretaries and tutors. St Stephen's provided a convenient reward for these more personal and multi-talented servants, who often served on the king's council, and were also diplomats in addition to being personally close to the monarch. The earliest example is Richard Medford, one of Richard II's favourites, and also his secretary.[163] Later secretaries can also be identified as having

---

[159] *Black Book of the Household,* p. 15.
[160] Ormrod, 'The Protecolla Rolls and English Government Finance, 1353-1364,' *EHR* 102 (1987), pp. 625-6; for Edington at St Stephen's, see pp. 26-8.
[161] *Black Book of the Household*, p. 291.
[162] *BRUC,* pp. 18-19.
[163] *BRUC,* pp. 398-99.

humanist interests. Having a prominent intellectual teaching the king's sons and as his French or Italian secretary, responsible for high-level correspondence with other royal courts was very much part of the royal display of patronage and learning.[164] For St Stephen's as an institution, it meant access to a community of university learning and international humanist links. Henry VI's son Edward, prince of Wales, was taught by two canons of St Stephen's, Richard Martyn and John Alcock, both of whom also held administrative posts in Chancery, which underscores the flexibility of royal service.[165] Humanism continued to play a role when in 1517 Thomas Linacre was rewarded with a prebend for his work as tutor to Prince Arthur and then briefly Princess Mary.[166] The final royal tutor to hold a prebend was Richard Cox, Edward VI's tutor from 1541.[167] In addition, during Edward IV's and Henry VII's reigns we find men such as John Gunthorpe, Christopher Urswick, Oliver King, Pietro Carmeliano and Andreas Ammonias as canons of St Stephen's who were also important intellectual figures while working as secretaries in the household.[168] Ammonias' letters suggest that he was writing important letters regularly, often those which would be sent with diplomatic missions.[169] They contributed to the display of humanist ideals, the international diplomacy of Latin Christendom and to the sense of England as an important part of wider humanist thought. Erasmus never stayed at St Stephen's, but he was friends with Ammonias and Urswick and corresponded with Linacre and Thomas Larke as well, showing canons' engagement with Europe-wide intellectual culture.[170] All of these men combined royal service with papal patronage and with their own intellectual networks both within and without the court.

The other specialised role within the household that was not specifically ecclesiastical and which was fulfilled by canons of St Stephen's was that of physician. Physicians were not necessarily priests, as it was perfectly possible for a man to take higher degrees without entering into major orders, but the priesthood offered other opportunities of patronage, so some did choose to be ordained. Of the multiple doctors in attendance on the king at any time, only four in the century between 1448 and 1548 are known to have also been canons of St Stephen's. They were John Arundel, physician to Henry, earl of Warwick and then to Henry VI, who was an important and influential Lancastrian figure, and John

---

[164] Joel T. Rosenthal, 'Kings, Continuity and Ecclesiastical Benefaction,' in *People, Politics and Community,* p. 167.

[165] John Alcock, *BRUC*, pp. 5-6; and Richard Martin, *BRUC,* p. 394.

[166] Vivian Nutton, 'Linacre, Thomas (c. 1460-1524)', *ODNB*.

[167] *L & P Henry VIII 1540-41*, no. 305 (49).

[168] Compton Reeves, 'John Gunthorpe', pp. 307-44; J. B. Trapp, 'Urswick, Christopher (1448?–1522)', *ODNB*; S. J. Gunn, 'King, Oliver (d. 1503)', *ODNB*; J. B. Trapp, 'Carmeliano, Pietro (c.1451–1527)', *ODNB*, and idem, 'Ammonius, Andreas [Andrea della Rena] (bap. 1476, d. 1517)', *ODNB*.

[169] For example, on 11 April 1515 he wrote to Wolsey concerning intelligence in cipher relating to Papal diplomacy, *L & P Henry VIII 1515-16,* no. 312; on 19 August 1515, Ammonias wrote to Wolsey concerning the briefs sent with Richard Sampson to Flanders, ibid, no. 823.

[170] Carmeliano was appointed in 1493 in *CPR 1485-94*, p. 412; Urswick had been appointed in 1485 in *CPR 1485-94*, p.

Chambre, last dean of the college and physician to both Henry VII and Henry VIII, whom he out-lived by a year.[171] In between these two men, Stephen Berworth was the doctor for the young Prince Arthur in 1488.[172] Thomas Linacre was also a royal physician in the 1510s, in addition to his role as tutor, mentioned above. This role offered significant influence and proximity to the king, but also went alongside other career options: Arundel was a bishop, on the king's council and involved in negotiation with the Scots, as discussed above. Chambre's other activities were focussed on Oxford where he was dean of Merton to 1544, and with the emerging College of Surgeons in London, rather than on more diverse royal service abroad. This variety serves to illustrate the personal choices available to individuals both in how they pursued their qualifications, and in how they then combined it with other tasks and networks to create the types of service that they were interested in. Arundel's role on the council, his political interests and his involvement with diplomacy pushed his career in very different directions to that of Chambre, who is a rather shadowy figure in comparison, because he was not as involved in activities that have left significant records. Where their experiences were similar was in the rewards available to a favoured personal servant of the king of the day, the prebends and ecclesiastical preferment that was in the king's gift, and the ability to offer access to others.

Equally significant in terms of potential personal access to the king were his personal priests, as opposed to the Chapel Royal, although there was significant overlap. The three main roles in this category of royal household service were the confessor, the almoner and the chaplains. Of these, the almoner had the largest structural role in the household on account of his responsibility for the discarded food to be offered to the poor and the very visible provision of charity.[173] At St Stephen's, from the reign of Henry VI, with its strong emphasis on the image of a saintly king, we start to see almoners being given prebends. The first of these is John Delabere in 1441 followed by Henry Sever in 1444, and Alexander Lee and John Gunthorpe in the 1470s before the most well-known almoner of all, Thomas Wolsey.[174] Generally they are also described as 'king's chaplain', a shift that prioritises their religious functions rather than as general clerks. Gunthorpe's career has threaded through several sections of this chapter, as a diplomat, secretary and then as bishop, which once again reinforces that each type of task and position discussed could and did go alongside other tasks and interests that often went far beyond royal service. Lee too saw diplomatic service, including a fairly financially significant mission to the Hanse in 1474, the

---

24 and Ammonias was appointed in 1512 in *L & P Henry VIII 1509-13,* no. 1083 (1).
[171] For Arundel, *BRUO,* pp. 49-50; for Chambre, see Moore, 'Chambre, John'.
[172] *BRUO,* p. 125.
[173] R.A. Houston, 'What did the Royal Almoner do in Britain and Ireland, c.1450–1700?' *EHR* 125 (2010), p. 286.
[174] Delabere was called almoner, *CPR 1441-46*, p. 3; for Sever see *BRUO*, p. 1672-3; for Leigh see *BRUC*, p. 360; and Gunthorpe was also called almoner, *CPR 1467-77*, p. 306.

same year he became almoner. Two years later, his reward was a prebend at St Stephen's.[175] The king's confessors were extraordinarily influential, and often became bishops. Unusually, William Aiscough in Henry VI's reign was a bishop before he became the confessor, and so he had already resigned his prebend at St Stephen's.[176] The personal reliance on the confessor by the king could be immense. Aiscough celebrated Henry's marriage to Margaret of Anjou and died in his cause in 1450. He was a councillor and had immense political involvement. In a later generation, John Longland was both confessor and almoner to Henry VIII, before obtaining the bishopric of Lincoln.[177] John Stokesley was confessor to Henry VIII alongside the now-familiar pattern of secretarial, diplomatic and administrative work, in his case as trier of petitions in the 1520s.[178] The chaplains' roles were diffuse, easily changed and adapted, but related to the private religious devotions of the king rather than the public round of services provided by the Chapel Royal.

The Chapel Royal was easily confused with St Stephen's both by contemporaries and by those antiquarians who sought to codify and delineate the staffing of both institutions. The itinerant Chapel Royal used St Stephen's when it was Westminster and shared staff with it, but was itself entirely separate liturgically. The interrelationship of the institutions is the subject of the next chapter, but here I am concerned with their overlapping personnel. The dean of the king's chapel, i.e. the dean of the Chapel Royal, was responsible for the daily maintenance of a round of prayers wherever the king happened to be, supported by his own singing staff over whom he had complete control. Members of the Chapel Royal who were also canons included the three canons named in the c. 1358 motet *Sub Arturo*, John Corby, William Excestre and William Tiddeswell.[179] They all seem to have been singers and composers, but who contributed to two different sets of liturgy: that of the college as well as the Chapel Royal. From the fifteenth century, the Chapel became more institutionalised, with its own dean and ordinances rather than being part of the undifferentiated household. Nicholas Sturgeon may have been part of this shift, as he was sub-dean from 1428, a role that is not listed in the *Liber Regie Capelle* of 1449 by William Say, which was probably based on older practices.[180] Say and both his predecessor as dean, William Hill, and his successor Thomas Bonyfaunt, were all canons of St Stephen's.[181] It could also be a reward for a favourite, as William Beverley was deposed from both the deanery of the Chapel Royal and his St

[175] For Lee's career see biography in appendices, pp. 295-6; *CPR 1467-77*, p. 288.
[176] *BRUC,* p. 28.
[177] Margaret Bowker, 'Longland, John (1473–1547)', *ODNB*.
[178] A.A. Chibi, 'Stokesley, John (1475–1539)', *ODNB*.
[179] Brian Trowell, 'A Fourteenth Century Motet and its Composer,' *Acta Musicologica* 29 (1957); pp. 69-73.
[180] *BRUO,* p. 1810; *Liber Regie Capelle*, ed. Walter Ullmann, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959).
[181] For Hill, see *BRUO,* p. 936; for Say see *BRUO*, pp. 1649-50; and for Bonyfaunt, see *BRUO*, pp. 217-8.

Stephen's prebend on the ascension of Henry VII in 1485 for his Ricardian partisanship.[182] At the Henrician court, Wolsey seems to have controlled the appointment of the dean of the Chapel Royal, so John Vesey, Thomas Thirlby and Richard Sampson probably owed their appointments to both the deanery and the college to his patronage.[183] Veysey combined this role with membership of the council of the Marches, as Sampson did with the vicarship of Tournai, and Thirlby did with diplomacy.[184]

Whether serving in the household or in the offices of state, canons were vulnerable to some degree of political change and instability. At the start of a new regime or a new reign, the patent rolls contain multiple confirmations of canons' positions at St Stephen's.[185] While not all felt the need to obtain such confirmation, canons were often anxious to guarantee their hold on prebends dependent on royal favour, which is an indication of how precarious they felt their positions were. Careers that seemed promising under one king might be curtailed under the next, particularly in the regime changes of the fifteenth century. Personal royal favour made the careers of Nicholas Slake and Richard Maudeleyn under Richard II, and brought both men to St Stephen's.[186] Maudeleyn was executed by the Lancastrian regime in 1400 and Slake's career was never to recover to its Ricardian heights.[187] Although he retained his deanery of St Stephen's, he was to have great difficulty retaining his deanery of Wells Cathedral, and was never to obtain the bishopric that probably looked inevitable before 1396.[188] Lancastrian adherents were only brought in slowly, as men appointed by Richard died or resigned. During the turbulent years of the 1440s and 1450s, Henry VI was granting royal councillors the right to appoint, which may have buffered St Stephen's slightly from political misfortune by distancing the canons slightly from personal royal patronage. However, Ralph Makerell, chancellor to Margaret of Anjou, who followed Henry VI into exile in 1463, may have acted as a go-between and was given a general pardon by Edward IV in 1469. His reward was a prebend in St Stephen's in the readeption of 1470-1, followed by deprivation and attainder when Edward IV returned in April 1471.[189] The rest of his life was a quiet one until his death in

---

[182] *CPR 1485-94*, p. 24.

[183] Fiona Kisby, 'Office and Office-Holding at the English Court: A Study of the Chapel Royal 1485-1547,' *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle* 32 (1999), p. 15.

[184] For Veysey, see Nicholas Orme, 'Veysey, John (*c.*1464–1554)', *ODNB*; and for Thomas Thirlby, see Timothy F. Shirley, *Thomas Thirlby: Tudor Bishop,* (London: SPCK, 1964).

[185] When in 1388 the estate of Nicholas Salisbury was confirmed by Richard II, he was parson of Merlawe, and prebendary both of St Stephen's and of Warham in Hereford Cathedral, *CPR 1385-89,* p. 461; at the start of Henry IV's reign, four canons' estates were ratified in the patent rolls, *CPR 1399-1401*, pp. 26, 137 and 363.

[186] For Maudeleyn's resignation, *CPR 1396-99*, p. 277; for the grant of the deanery to Slake, *CPR 1392-96*, p. 684; see also their biographies in the appendices, pp. 300-1 and p. 316-17.

[187] *BRUC*, p. 396.

[188] The case about the deanery of Wells dates from 1402, KB 9/187/43; my thanks to Chris Given-Wilson for bringing this case to my attention.

[189] *CPR 1467-77*, p. 235; the prebend was re-granted to Thomas Couton, *CPR 1467-77*, p. 258; for Makerell's career, Margaret L. Kekewich, 'The Mysterious Doctor Makerell: his general pardon of 27 November 1469,' in *Much Heaving and*

1477. At the end of the Wars of the Roses, William Beverley, the close associate of Richard III, was to lose his prebend at St Stephen's as well as the deanery of St George's as a usurper in 1485 on Henry VII's victory at Bosworth.[190] Beverley retained his northern prebends at York and Beverley, perhaps because they were seen as safely distant from royal politics. No other canon of St Stephen's was deprived in 1485, suggesting either quick compliance with Henry VII or that Henry VII needed the college's expertise in royal service too much to thoroughly clear it out. Instead, he appointed Christopher Urswick, who had been with him at Bosworth, to replace Beverley and then gradually used the right to collate to a vacant prebend as a political tool.[191]

Conclusions

St Stephen's was valuable as a source of rewards for priests in the king's service. Those who cannot be identified as royal servants joined a college that was focussed around the needs of administration at Westminster or the itinerant court. Some were to stay and use that to their advantage. Others left quickly for other benefices. Priests in royal service were as valuable to Henry VIII as they had been to Edward III, even as the tasks they carried out and the offices they worked in had changed. Laicisation was not the whole story. The range of value to the king provided by canons naturally varied from those such as confessors, who served the king in a particularly personal form, to those such as Exchequer clerks, whose service was naturally much more remote from the king's person. However, careers did not only depend on the king. Patronage from nobles and bishops could bring men into royal service or to St Stephen's, but also the connections made at institutions such as St Stephen's or the cathedral chapters as well as in the offices of state could lead to career opportunities for canons. The recruitment of and work done by royal servants was changing over the period, particularly in response to educational trends and concerns within the Church, rather than a fundamental change in the nature of royal administration in the fifteenth century. We need to situate priests' careers in royal service within their multiple contexts, not only in particular offices, but in the networks of friendships, shared work, and benefices that shaped careers. St Stephen's was in turn valued by its canons, who found residence appealing for its proximity to their administrative work as well as a source of friendships and career advancement, to judge from their wills and presence in Westminster during a particularly fraught year. The king's lordship was never the sole influence on the service he received and the other connections of the canons could be particularly influential. By looking at canons' careers across the sheer range of tasks within royal administration, the

---

Shoving: Late Medieval Gentry and their Concerns: Essays for Colin Richmond, eds. Margaret Aston & Rosemary Horrox, (Lavenham, Sussex: Lavenham Press, 2005), pp. 45-9.
[190] *CPR 1476-85*, p. 373; *CPR 1485-94*, p. 24.

household and in more amorphous forms as 'king's clerks', we can move away from understanding royal administration within the limits of the great offices of state towards understanding it as flexible, responsive to particular needs and as much driven by the individuals in royal service as by their master.

---

[191] For example, *CPR 1485-94,* pp. 65 and 66, which are grants to Elizabeth of York and John Morton, bishop of Ely, and John Weston, prior of St John of Jerusalem and others, respectively.

Chapter Six: Music and Worship at St Stephen's College

Oddly enough, the heart of the medieval St Stephen's College has received the least scholarly attention and has the least surviving documentation, as its workings were primarily of interest to the college itself. The liturgy and the individuals who carried it out were central to Edward III's foundation and then to the dissolution of St Stephen's two hundred years later, as Edward VI's Church saw no need for non-educational and non-charitable foundations. Edward III's concern for prayer was fundamental to his new college. The careers of the canons were often separated from their status as priests, but they too were expected to play a part in the working life of the college. It is easy to examine their worldly careers in royal administration because they are the best documented parts of their lives and of the college as a whole. Yet of the thirty eight persons listed as belonging to St Stephen's in 1394, the dean and canons were the minority.[1] The bulk of the college was always the liturgical staff, the vicars, clerks, and choristers, supported by chantry priests and the verger, later the organist-verger. While historians and art-historians have been concerned with the space and the staffing of colleges as well as their audiences, musicologists have studied the music and musical personnel of these large institutions.[2]

---

[1] BL Cotton MS Faustina A III, f. 295r.

[2] The principal guide to music and liturgy, which deals with the general demands of liturgy on church and chapel spaces is John Harper, *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy from the Tenth to the Eighteenth Century,* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991); on the musical repertory of Aachen, Eric Rice, *Music and Ritual at Charlemagne's Marienkirche in Aachen,* (Kassel: Merseburger, 2009) particularly Chapter Two; also on Aachen, but earlier, Michael McGrade, 'Affirmations of Royalty: Liturgical Music in the Collegiate Church of St Mary in Aachen, 1050-1350,' (PhD thesis, University of Chicago, 1998); while there is nothing directly comparable for any English collegiate churches, let alone St Stephen's sister college of St George's, Windsor, Williamson discusses some of the liturgical context for the fifteenth century Eton choirbook, although his main focus is on the personnel and musical capabilities of the college Magnus Williamson, 'The Eton Choirbook: Its Institutional and Historical Background,' (DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1997); Buckle discusses the integration of music into the decorative scheme in a chantry chapel within the larger collegiate foundation of St Mary's, Warwick, Alexandra Buckle, '"Fit for a king": music and iconography in Richard Beauchamp's chantry chapel,' *Early Music* 38 (2010) pp. 3-15; much of the work on the shaping of the liturgy at specific colleges has been confined within studies of individual statutes, such as on the 1441 visitation statutes and their proscriptions for the liturgy at St Mary's, Warwick, *The Cartulary of St Mary's Warwick*, ed. Charles Fonge, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004) pp. lxv-vi; and in Magnus Williamson, 'The Will of John Boraston: Musicians within Collegiate and Parochial Communities' in *The Late Medieval English College and its Context*, ed. Clive Burgess and Martin Heale, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008), p. 190; see also the discussion of how liturgy and architecture interacted at Wells Cathedral and the abbey of St Bénigne, Carolyn Marino Malone, 'Architecture as Evidence for Liturgical Performance,' in *Understanding Medieval Liturgy: Essays in Interpretation*, eds. Helen Gittos and Sarah Hamilton, (Aldershot, Ashgate, 2015), pp. 207-37.

      For music and musicians associated with large, collegiate institutions see: Fiona Kisby's work is generally on the music and musicians of Tudor Westminster, with implications for liturgy, particularly '"Where the King Goeth a procession" Chapel Ceremonies and Services, the Ritual Year, and Religious Reforms at the Early Tudor Court, 1485-1547,' *Journal of British Studies* 40 (2001), pp. 44-75; on the related pair of early Tudor polyphonic choirbooks and the patron, Canon Edward Higgons of St Stephen's, who had them made, David Skinner, 'Discovering the Provenance of the Lambeth and Caius Choirbooks,' *Early Music* 25 (1997), pp. 245-68; earlier studies of music associated with the Chapel Royal and with St Stephen's in particular include Trowell on a motet associated with St George's, Windsor and the Order of the Garter, Brian Trowell, 'A Fourteenth-Century Ceremonial Motet and Its Composer' *Acta Musicologica*, 29 (1957), pp. 65-75; Frank Harrison, 'Polyphonic Music for a Chapel of Edward III,' *Music & Letters*, 59 (1978), pp. 420-428.

This chapter brings together all three elements to assess how they affected the liturgy, whose historiography has often been divorced from the spaces in which it was carried out, and the accommodations consequently needed.[3] The liturgy at St Stephen's was complicated by its audiences and its use by multiple constituencies. Rigid focus on St Stephen's as a sharply defined institution, removed from diocesan structures by statute, and constituting a clear group of individuals, misses the ways in which the networks of clergy and the convenience and the needs of the palace around them made St Stephen's a much more flexible foundation. Its relationships with the kings of England have already been examined; this chapter widens the discussion to the royal household and particularly to the ways in which St Stephen's and the Chapel Royal overlapped, merged and co-operated when they were at Westminster. In addition, it begins to consider the audiences who were present in St Stephen's for services and who knew its personnel and availed themselves of the spiritual help the college could provide. Because of the miscellany of surviving evidence from and about St Stephen's as a liturgical space, it is possible to gather the scattered and fragmentary evidence to begin to assemble a picture of the daily and yearly round of St Stephen's religious life in terms of audience, music, staffing and purpose. The themes of audience and the external relationships of the college will then be picked up in the final pair of chapters, on lay and ecclesiastical connections.

Individuals and the Ecclesiastical life of the Chapel

Liturgical observances were at the heart of Edward III's foundation. St Stephen's was to pray for his soul and for all the dead as well as adding to the power of prayer within England.[4] The much-discussed buildings and the music of the college were subordinate to the needs of the liturgy, to be used by the canons, and particularly, the vicars and other personnel in the course of their duties in the choir.[5] Once the college had been fully established, the most problematic task of the dean and canons was to ensure that the college maintained its full level of personnel from fellow canons through to choristers and verger. The success of St Stephen's as a working chapel depended on its ability to attract and retain the staff it needed to run the round of offices and then extraordinary services, such as chantry obits. While it is near-impossible to reconstruct the daily workings of the chapel because of the lack of institutional sources such as treasurer's accounts or the weekly rotas of services created by the hebdomadary canon,

---

[3] An exception is Helen Gittos, *Liturgy, Architecture, and Sacred Places in Anglo-Saxon England,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

[4] *CPR 1348-50*, p. 147.

[5] On the music, see Skinner and Nicholas Caldwell, "'At the Mynde of Nicholas Ludford,'": New Light on Ludford from the Churchwarden's Accounts of St Margaret's, Westminster,' *Early Music* 22 (1995), pp. 393-415; and Skinner, 'Caius and Lambeth choirbooks,' pp. 245-66.

this section looks at what can be known about those in major and minor orders who took part in services in the chapel and their commitment to the college they served, if only for a time. The vicars choral and the clerks are usually only recorded as sporadic names because they tended to be much less well educated than the canons and to stay for shorter periods of time, making it less likely that they would be recorded as a vicar or clerk of St Stephen's. Direct comparison with St George's, Windsor also suggests that vicars and clerks rarely saw these colleges as long-term employers, but that a few stayed for a very long time.[6] The choristers and clerks are even less likely to appear in any accounts, thus any sense of their careers, or even where the choristers went when they left the college, is impossible.

The canons of St Stephen's were more involved generally in the college's life than their contemporaries were at other sinecures or than they themselves were in their other benefices. If we assume that the roughly 75% attendance figure suggested by the surviving attendance register was at least reasonably indicative of the general levels of attendance in the chapel by the canons, given that in the same years, St George's was struggling badly to maintain even minimal levels of staffing, then most canons must have been involved with the music and liturgy on a regular basis.[7] Canons would have taken turns saying mass at the high altar, but would also have been expected to take part in the liturgy from the choir for at least the high mass daily.[8] As priests, they would have had to celebrate mass daily, perhaps at the two altars in the nave of the upper chapel, or at the unknown number of altars in the lower chapel. If the hebdomadary canon, the canon responsible that week for all services, then he would have to be present at all the college's services that week, and be responsible for seeing that all those services were adequately staffed.[9] The canons' general rather than minimal presence meant that instead of replacing them, the vicars of the college were there to augment the life of the community, unlike at other colleges and cathedral churches.[10] The canons' presence also had larger implications for the religious life of St Stephen's. It has generally been assumed among musicologists that the clerks and choristers bore the heaviest demands of the polyphonic liturgical developments of the fifteenth century, given the general absenteeism rate among cathedral canons.[11] At St Stephen's though, the sustained presence of canons because of their work in the administration based at Westminster meant that they might be more

---

[6] Roger Bowers, 'The Music and Musical Establishment of St George's Chapel, Windsor in the Fifteenth Century,' in *St George's Chapel, Windsor, in the Late Middle Ages,* eds. Colin Richmond & Eileen Scarff, (Windsor: Dean and Canons of St George's, 2001), pp. 186 on the vicars, and 188 on the clerks.
[7] A comparison of Windsor, St George's College Archives, V B 2, which covers 1468-79, and BL Harley Ch. 45 A 38-45, covering six months from 1485-6 suggests that St Stephen's was a more attractive place to maintain residence.
[8] St George's, XI D 20 as transcribed in 'Statutes of St George's,' p. 11.
[9] As was the custom in the secular cathedrals, Kathleen Edwards, *The English Secular Cathedrals in the Middle Ages: A Constitutional Study,* (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1947), p. 58.
[10] Ibid, pp. 256-7.

involved in the musical life of the college.[12] In addition, the composers known to have been at St Stephen's were largely among the canons, suggesting that music might also have been as much the responsibility of the canons as of the other members of the college, or that at least some of the musical developments might have come from them as much as from their subordinates.[13] Added to this generally active involvement by canons in services, some canons gave vestments, lights or altar vessels to the college.[14]

The college's vicars had their own corporate body defined by letters patent for over eighty years, from 1396 until 1479. Unfortunately, even less documentation survives for this sub-college than for the main college as a whole, as its existence was dependent on the dean and canons. Their purpose as a chantry for Anne of Bohemia is clear, but how this duty fit with the larger liturgical life of St Stephen's is unclear.[15] The vicars' college paralleled similar developments at the cathedrals at the same date, and the hall built for them by Richard II allowed them to have a communal life separate from, if closely connected with, the canons they served.[16] Since the vicars were appointed internally by the dean and canons in chapter it is hard to find records listing them, and even harder to have any sense of how their daily routines interacted with those of the canons, other than that they were expected to be at every service, while the canons would only be present reliably at high mass.[17] There are only hints of the particular responsibilities of the vicars, such as when in 1485 the precentor, 'Roly', perhaps John Roly of Westminster, was presumably a vicar, rather than a canon.[18] Vicars were also the gospel readers across the college's existence, occurring in the fourteenth and the sixteenth centuries.[19] In the late fourteenth century, just after the agreement with Westminster Abbey in 1394 concerning jurisdiction, there are letters from the then dean informing the abbot of new vicars, which show that for the years 1396-99 over half the vicars had been replaced, and since few of the names repeat, it is likely that there were still

---

[11] For example, Skinner, 'At the Mynde of Ludford', p. 396.

[12] Most canons worked in the various departments based in Westminster and the rest had appointments in the royal household, see Chapter Five, pp. 128 and 140-55.

[13] For example, Nicholas Sturgeon and Thomas Danet in the fifteenth century, and William Excestre in the fourteenth century were all canons. John Bedyngham and Nicholas Ludford were both vergers and none of the vicars are known to have been composers. For full details see appendices.

[14] For example, in the inventory of 1548 'Master Dean [John Chambre?] is listed as having given a red cope and Master Peter Carmelian is noted as having giving a set of red altar hangings, E 117/ 11/49 f. 1r; Doctor Wolman and Master Algar gave copes, E 117/11/49 f. 2; John Ware in 1411 left a light for St Mary le Pew, Cotton Faustina B VIII, f. 20v.

[15] *CPR 1392-96,* p. 669; also above, p. 95.

[16] Referenced in *CPR 1392-96,* p. 669; for such colleges at the cathedrals, where they were maintained until the sixteenth century, see Edwards, *English Secular Cathedrals*, pp. 276-85.

[17] Assuming that St Stephen's was like St George's in this respect given the attendance registers, St George's, V B1 and V B 2.

[18] For example, BL Harley Ch. 45 A 38.

[19] John Norton was the new vicar and gospel reader in 1396, WAM 18492.

more replacements where the notification has been lost.[20] Unlike the canons, there often seems to have been gaps in the numbers of vicars choral, perhaps because the positions were not particularly desirable and money could be saved by having one or two fewer than the statutory thirteen vicars. In all the tax records, where all the vicars then at the college are named, there are always eleven or twelve names listed.[21] At St George's, when the full attendance registers survived, it was only when they were short three or more vicars that the canons replaced one in the fifteenth century.[22] The tax records also show high turn-over between 1546 and 1548, given that the list of vicars paying the free and voluntary contribution in 1546 has four or possibly five names that repeat in the Chantry Certificate two years later, a turn-over of around two-thirds.[23] While St Stephen's never struggled in the same way as St George's with their finances, it is clear that maintaining the numbers of vicars and clerks required constant recruitment.

St Stephen's vicars had very different careers and skills to those of the canons. None of the names of vicars choral that survive appears in Emden's *Biographical Registers* other than John Bristow. The vicars then, were drawn from a very different group of priests than the canons, and given the expectation that they be present constantly at the offices of the day, would have been unable to combine this job with any other benefice. As at St George's and reaffirmed at St Stephen's in the fifteenth century, their two primary qualifications were to have a good singing voice and to be in full priest's orders.[24] While there is no particular way to understand how good potential vicars' voices were, or even whether the dean and chapter considered it an important qualification in practice, the evidence for the priesthood is more equivocal. The letters from the dean to the abbot of Westminster, which were supposed to be sent every time a new canon, vicar, clerk or chorister was admitted to the college, are now very patchy, surviving in two general clusters, one from the deanery of Nicholas Slake from 1396 to 1407, but are not complete for this period, and a smaller cluster from the early years of the sixteenth century, with a few chance survivors from the fifteenth century.[25] Under Slake, most of the vicars are listed in these documents as 'presbyter', suggesting that at this point, finding ordained men to fill the vicars' stalls was not a problem.[26] William Scot, described as a vicar of St Stephen's, was dispensed retrospectively for

---

[20] WAM 18492-95.
[21] For example, E 179/42/49 from 1406 and E 179/ 141/ 160 m. 22 from 1546.
[22] For example, in May- June 1471 when only after the death of a vicar, Andrew Wynd, was one of the two already existing vacancies filled, St George's College, V B 2 f. 12v- 13r.
[23] The vicars in both the 1546 and 1548 lists are bolded in Table 7.
[24] 'Statutes of St George's,' p. 10; *Cal. Pap. Letters 1471-1484,* pp. 678-9.
[25] WAM 18486-87 and 18492-95 from Slake's deanery; and WAM 18510-11 from John Foster's deanery.
[26] For example, WAM 18486.

illegitimacy in 1393 and for having thus obtained his ordination under false pretences.[27] How vicars' status developed in the fifteenth century is not clear, although the 1479 papal letter suggests that singers preferred to remain outside holy orders and so the college might have turned to lay conductors instead.[28] The ordination lists of London may help fill in some of the gaps here. Two men in 1397 and 1413 were ordained in London to the title of their vicarages in St Stephen's Chapel, suggesting that the chapter was willing to give a probationary period of a year, as at cathedrals, for the vicars to move through the major orders. William Laurence only needed the priesthood, in March 1413, whereas earlier William Sykelaby had needed all three major orders in less than a year.[29] Until that time, they would have served at the altar, but not celebrated mass themselves, which could be just as useful given that the use of Sarum asked for the celebrating priest to be attended by a deacon and a sub-deacon through most services.[30] These two examples suggest that the other thirty six surviving examples of men ordained to the title of St Stephen's or to that of the dean specifically in London were probably also vicars of the college, again using their position to obtain the necessary ordination.

Unusually for an institution in Westminster, where we might assume that the vicars were mostly drawn from the large local clerical populace, both the installation letters and the ordination records suggest that vicars came drawn from across the country as well as from the immediate vicinity of the college.[31] Slake in one case identified the dioceses from which his three new vicars were drawn, Lincoln, Coventry and Lichfield, and York.[32] At the time, the college had property in Buckinghamshire and Yorkshire, so it may reflect patterns of recruitment from lands owned by St Stephen's as well as the popularity of London and its suburbs for priests seeking work in the many parish churches, guilds, chantries and colleges in the area.[33] St Stephen's was probably able to be selective about its vicars in either case, either by specifically recruiting them from those who were already known to the college's officers through their interactions in the manors and benefices the college controlled and which the officers visited regularly, or by choosing from among a large pool of individuals drawn to London by the potential jobs there. It is unlikely to reflect an aberration of normal recruitment from London, although it is not clear why only in this case

---

[27] *Cal. Pap. Letters 1362-1404,* p. 446.
[28] *Cal. Pap. Letters 1471-1484,* p. 679.
[29] References to ordinations in London taken from Virginia Davis, *Clergy in London in the late Middle Ages: a register of clergy ordained in the diocese of London, based on episcopal ordination lists, 1361-1539*, (London: Centre for Metropolitan History, Institute of Historical Research, 2001); Reg. Clifford f. 63v for Laurence and Reg. Braybrooke f. 47r for Sylkelaby.
[30] Harper, *Forms of Liturgy*, p. 121.
[31] Clerics were taken in by the hospital of St Mary Rounceval in Westminster, discussed in Robert N. Swanson, *Church and Society in Late Medieval England,* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989), p. 63.
[32] WAM 18486.
[33] They are known to have had the advowson of three Yorkshire churches and Holy Trinity, Bledlow in Bucks, part of Lincoln's diocese at this point; for further details, see Table 1.

did Slake identify the new vicars by diocese, as the ordination records have a similarly wide range of home-dioceses and residences listed for the men ordained to St Stephen's title. Only a few were originally from a City of London parish or from elsewhere in the diocese. Most men had come from quite a distance. Richard Bechamp in 1412 was identified as from Exeter, not a diocese in which St Stephen's had land, and one that tended to keep its priests locally rather than sending them elsewhere.[34] John Carlebury came from the diocese of Durham, and Adam Norwich from Causton in Norfolk.[35] William Sylkelaby, identified as from Lincoln, specifically from Kirkby Bellars, was one of the two men ordained to their stalls in the chapel.[36] The other, William Laurence was a local man, from the diocese of London, although his parish is not given.[37]

Edward III's inclusion of lay clerks and choristers in his foundation of 1348 already suggests a premium on the sung rather than chanted liturgy, as the clerks were very much intended to be musical specialists.[38] In 1548 the college had exactly the statutory number of clerks and seven rather than six choristers, as well as the additional four chantry priests.[39] It is tempting therefore to see St Stephen's as maintaining throughout its existence a stable musical establishment of four lay clerks and six or seven choristers. Stability, however, seems implausible. At its height, St George's, Windsor is known to have had thirteen singing men and thirteen choristers after the re-foundation by Edward IV, and the growing elaboration of liturgy in the fifteenth century makes it unlikely that St Stephen's would have been content with its smaller fourteenth-century establishment.[40] That the college was exempted from impressment by other institutions, and had leave to impress on its own behalf, also suggests that its musical capabilities were important enough to the king and to the college that they are likely to have expanded in the fifteenth century before contracting at the Reformation, not least when the role of keeper of St Mary le Pew vanished in 1545 on the removal of the cult image there.[41] Music was certainly important enough that St Stephen's stretched the role of verger, known in 1394, to include that of organist from the mid fifteenth century when it was held by the composer John Bedyngham.[42] The employment certificate of the last

---

[34] Reg. Clifford, f. 58v for his ordination as a deacon, and f. 59r for ordination to the priesthood.

[35] Davis, *Clergy in London;* John Carlebury is listed for ordination to subdeacon in Febuary 1372 in Reg. Sudbury, p. 110; for ordination to deacon in May 1372, ibid, p. 114; and for ordination to priest in September 1372, ibid, p. 115, all to St Stephen's title; Adam Norwich was ordained as a deacon in April 1408, Reg. Clifford, f. 38v; and as a priest in June 1408, Reg. Clifford, f. 38v, both to St Stephen's title.

[36] Reg. Braybrooke, f.47 r.

[37] Reg. Clifford, f. 63v.

[38] *CPR 1348-50*, p. 147.

[39] *Chantry Certificate*, p. 79 for their wages and p. 80 for the list of names.

[40] Bowers, 'Music and Musical Establishment,' p. 200.

[41] The role of keeper is not listed in the chantry certificate wage lists, *Chantry Certificate,* p. 79; the removal of the image of St Mary from the Pew Chapel is 1545, *L & P Henry VIII 1545 Part 2*, no. 645.

[42] Brian Trowell, 'Bedyngham, John (*d.* 1459/60)', *ODNB.*

holder of the post, Nicholas Ludford, makes it clear that the role was composite, serving both liturgical and musical needs, like some parish clerks.[43] Unfortunately, names of the singing men survive so rarely that it is impossible to reconstruct any sense of their careers and their movements, let alone their specific duties within the college. Like the vicars, they were probably drawn from a variety of places, including nearby Westminster Abbey. John Langisloo, a former chantry chaplain, seems to have been a local man and very much part of the Westminster musical world, leaving gifts to townsfolk as well as the college's clerks and vicars.[44] The choristers are even more shadowy than the clerks they worked with. Only a few names of choristers from St Stephen's survive from the very end of the college's existence, thus there is no way to begin to speculate about their origins.[45] After the dissolution in the 1550s, Ludford and William Pampion, one of the singing men in 1548, were still living in houses formerly owned by the college, suggesting that the clerks, choristers and verger lived in the vicinity of Canon Row rather than with the vicars within the palace precinct due to the limited space available.[46]

This section has focussed on the available evidence for the supporting cast of staff from St Stephen's College, those whose careers were firmly within the Church and for whom very little evidence survives. In part, this section is intended to flag up their existence and their centrality to the fundamental role of the college, the maintenance of the liturgy, rather than to understand their working lives. It is also to emphasise the variety of these individuals whose names have survived, and to begin to point to the diversity of the connections St Stephen's had with the communities surrounding it, including the town of Westminster. There are few conclusions that can be drawn about the individual experiences of individuals who worked at St Stephen's from the sporadic identification of vicars, clerks and vergers. We cannot even be sure how many of them there were at any given point, other than in 1548's pensioning off records. The theme, however, of their combined and collective service to the college was the maintenance of the *opus dei* and the regular round of prayers and services for the founder, his family, the kingdom and Christendom. Their essential roles left no space for parallel careers in royal service and thus had much more in common with the full-time clergy of London's parish churches and with the chantry priests at cathedrals. That is not to say that they were completely divorced from the political life of the court when it was at Westminster. There is one known payment from Henry VIII's close friend, the duke of Buckingham, for drinking with the vicars of St Stephen's.[47] Similarly, even as the focus of the

---

[43] E 40/13426; printed in full in Skinner, 'At the Mynde of Nicholas Ludford', p. 408.
[44] Gervase Rosser, *Medieval Westminster 1200-1540*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), p. 210; London, Westminster City Archives, PCW Bracy, ff. 52v-53.
[45] BL Additional MS 81102, m. 7.
[46] Skinner, 'At the Mynde of Nicholas Ludford,' p. 403.
[47] *L & P Henry VIII 1519-21*, no. 1285 at p. 497.

canons' lives were their separate careers in which St Stephen's was one among many benefices, canons took part in, supported and seemingly valued the liturgical life of which they were part. Their commitment was of course easier at St Stephen's than at St George's, for example, but the college was able to enjoy the benefits for its liturgical life.

Liturgy and the Divine Office

To understand the daily, weekly and yearly round of liturgical practice at St Stephen's we would need to fully reconstruct the spaces available to the canons of St Stephen's and to have a surviving customary or processional from the college. How the canons adapted the Use of Sarum and the orders for using that particular cathedral into the spaces they had available was a matter of individual taste within spatial constraints of buildings that were not originally designed to be used by a college of canons. In addition, changing fashions and staffing could affect the decisions of how to stage the mass and the round of Offices. This section offers a discussion of the material that is known about the liturgical life of St Stephen's when the king was absent and thus the college alone had jurisdiction. The life of the chapel when the royal household along with the Chapel Royal were present is the subject of the next section, when the problems of integrating two very different ecclesiastical institutions are explored. When the royal household were not at Westminster, the staff of St Stephen's was solely responsible for maintaining worship and music in the three chapels that made up St Stephen's College, observing the many obits and chantries set up in the college and managing the cult of the Virgin housed in the oratory of St Mary le Pew.[48] Even when the college was alone at St Stephen's, its liturgical practices were not private. As will be discussed further in Chapter Eight, both those working within the palace of Westminster and those visiting for business with the courts or with the various offices housed in the palace, attended mass in the chapel if they so desired.[49] Others came to visit the miracle-working image of the Virgin or to take advantage of the indulgences offered for visits to the chapel on specified feast days. While St Stephen's had no parochial responsibilities and thus no immediate constituency of laymen and women to support its worship, it did frequently have an audience. That audience would have heard, and seen glimpses of, the lavishly complex liturgy carried out by St Stephen's from their positions behind the choir screens in the naves of either St Stephen's Chapel or St Mary beneath the Vaults. As the Use of Sarum was the most common usage in England, the Latin of the mass would have sounded very familiar, unless they

---

[48] The cult image is first referenced securely in 1355 when the dean and canons petitioned for public access to the chapel housing it in SC 8/247/12304.

[49] For example, we know that in 1382 William Ufford, duke of Suffolk died coming out of mass at St Stephen's on his way to a session of the Lords, *Westminster Chronicle*, pp. 22-3; at the other end of the period, John Selake heard mass in the chapel when he was visiting Westminster for a law case, C 1/442/7 and C 1/442/8; both examples are fully discussed in Chapter Eight, pp. 215, 217.

came from the few areas that used slightly different rites, such as that of York.[50] However, the extraordinary polyphony and the shaping of the liturgy towards the glorification of the monarch and the remembrance of the dead would have stood out as different from the norm of liturgical life.[51] This section aims to provide a sense of both the distinctive and the unusual aspects of services at the college as well as the underlying pattern of worship familiar to the late medieval visitor but hazy to the modern eye.

The two institutions closest to St Stephen's in terms of their function as palace chapels that carried out a separate liturgy as well as having a role in royal ceremonial were also shrines in a way that St Stephen's never was. Aachen's veneration of Charlemagne, its illustrious founder, and the shaping of its liturgy in the 1350s to parallel the Sainte Chapelle is documented in the many surviving liturgical and musical books from the chapter there.[52] At the same time as Edward III was considering how best to turn St Stephen's into a concrete organisation, Charles IV of the Holy Roman Empire was beginning to rebuild Aachen's choir and adapting its liturgy to suit his own interests. Specific music and particular feasts as well as the association with Charlemagne and its continued status as the coronation church helped to maintain Aachen's relevance within the Holy Roman Empire even after the palace was largely abandoned when Charles moved his court to Prague.[53] While the liturgical books of the Sainte Chapelle have largely been lost, the most important feast celebrated there spread throughout the western Church and so is well known, that of the Crown of Thorns, the passion-relic translated to Paris by Louis IX in the 1240s.[54] Louis' own shrine then added to the particular and royally-created ritual life at the chapel. St Stephen's never served as a cult centre for royal saints in the ways that its international peers did, as Westminster Abbey fulfilled that role, and none of its liturgical practices are known to have spread and thus preserved. The loss of any service books specific to the college's own practices means that it is very hard to assess how English royal ideology was tied into the life of the chapel. The statutes at St George's provide clues to the ways in which Edward III was thinking of liturgical shaping, as does the material culture of St Stephen's itself. It may be that St Stephen's liturgy was as royally particular and distinctive as the Sainte Chapelle, which Edward III knew, or Aachen, but that the evidence does not survive. What follows is thus an inevitably partial reconstruction.

---

[50] Harper, *Forms of Liturgy,* pp. 202-3.
[51] The Office of the Dead is mentioned as a daily occurrence at St George's, Windsor, 'Statutes of St George's,' p. 11; Harper notes that it was frequently a daily votive office in chantries, not in colleges, but otherwise was only used at funerals, Harper, *Forms of the Liturgy*, p. 105.
[52] On earlier use of the liturgy around Charlemagne, Rice, *Music at Aachen*, pp. 38-9.
[53] On Charles IV's continued devotion to Aachen, even as he was moving practical administration eastwards, ibid, pp. 69-70.
[54] Meredith Cohen, 'An Indulgence for the Visitor: The Public of the Sainte-Chapelle of Paris,' *Speculum* 83 (2008), p. 869.

The fundamental problem of trying to understand St Stephen's liturgical practice is the complexity of the chapels involved and the points of connection. The double chapel structure, often assumed to have been constructed to allow the king and his household to hear mass at the same time in acoustically separate spaces, means that the college of St Stephen had to create for themselves a plan for how to use both the upper chapel of St Stephen and the lower of St Mary beneath the Vaults. The little surviving evidence, mostly late fifteenth- and sixteenth- century, is that the lower chapel had a font, and it was also where burials took place, indicating that it might be used for both for royal baptisms and perhaps for the daily Office of the Dead.[55] St Mary beneath the Vaults may not even have had choir stalls, making it a tricky place to stage any services that required the entire community.[56] It may have been where obits were observed, given the presence of burials in the chapel floor.[57] When there are external references to mass in the chapel, it is always St Stephen's that is specified, suggesting that both the royal household and external visitors heard mass in the upper chapel, and that this was always the primary chapel for services.[58] This conclusion, however, must be tentative given that the entire building could be called St Stephen's and that these references never give details that would enable the definitive identification of either the upper or lower chapel. In addition to questions of the normal round of daily services there are also questions about processional routes and points of connection within the building. It is not clear from the surviving descriptions of the building whether there were more connecting stairs than those in the west end's porch and thus whether the processions that had to take in all of the chapels and altars within the chapels had to bottleneck at the west end to move between the storeys and then the cloister, which may also have included chantry chapels as well.[59] Other places which might reasonably have been connected by staircases and galleries to the main chapel of St Stephen and then available for processional or general use would be St Mary le Pew, with the fourteenth-century chapel cum chapter house beneath,

---

[55] The presence of the font is mentioned in an indenture from 1520 where payment was to be made 'over the font in the lower chapel', E 40/ 3184; it is also mentioned in the will of William Chauntre from 1484 who asked to be buried in the lower chapel between the font and the west door, PROB 11/ 7/ 276; burials may also explain why in 1548, the inventory has candlesticks for the hearse kept in the lower chapel, E 117/11/49 f. 5; for a full list of those canons and others known to have asked for burial in the lower chapel, see Table 10.

[56] There is ambiguity about stalls; Canon Adam Chesterfield's obit makes reference to a small chapel lying opposite the vicars' stalls (coram extremo stallo vicanor[um] versus sum[m]u[m] altare ex parte australi). The previous line refers to the lower chapel, but I think it is more likely that here Chesterfield or his executors are referring to St Mary le Pew, which was on the same level as St Stephen's chapel, rather than to the chapel that served as a chapter house in the fourteenth century, Cotton MS Faustina B VIII f. 10v.

[57] Tabulated in Table 10.

[58] Discussed further in Chapter Eight, pp. 216-17.

[59] In the surviving sixteenth-century cloister there are a pair of rooms, which seem to have been chantry chapels. Whether they were copied over from the earlier fourteenth century cloister on the same site is unclear. For a full discussion of their use and purpose, see Chapter Three, pp. 82-3.

or on the other side of the east end, the double vestries.[60] If there were stairs in the east end, it would have simplified the fourteenth-century processional route from chapel to chapter that was the weekly duty at St George's, Windsor, and thus probably at St Stephen's too.[61] Once the new chapter house had been built under Richard II, then it would be a procession out through the cloister, however accessed at that point, and into the chapter house to the north of the chapel to finish Prime.[62]

Edward III's foundation statutes of 1355 would have shaped the liturgy at St Stephen's in ways that added intercession for himself and his family as well as proclaiming his personal devotions to the Virgin Mary and the saints. As discussed in Chapter One, the statutes were his opportunity to shape the Sarum rite into something that reflected his own concerns, and those of his treasurer, William Edington.[63] At St George's, the principal deviations and additions to the basic liturgy were concerned with the college's function as a chantry and with Edward's own devotion to the Virgin. Thus there was to be a daily Lady Mass and a daily Office of the Dead, and obits for Edward III, Philippa of Hainault and the Black Prince were to be kept yearly after their deaths.[64] A final concern was the kingdom, and so the college was to say the collect *Salus Populi* and prayers for the then king daily. It is then highly likely that this was replicated at St Stephen's, if not extended as St Stephen's foundation letter patent says that the college is to pray for the king and his ancestors as well as the future of his dynasty.[65] Thus the college would have had to integrate two full extra services into their daily round from Matins to Compline along with adding several prayers for the monarchy. The requirement that vicars celebrate mass daily themselves at St George's would have been eased at St Stephen's by the minimum of five altars available across three chapels, with the possibility of a fourth altar beneath St Mary le Pew and extra altars in St Mary beneath the Vaults.[66] While Edward III did not shape the liturgy as dramatically as Louis IX had in Paris with the introduction of a new feast in the Sainte Chapelle, that of the Crown of Thorns, he was adding to the college's piety his concern for his dynastic success and his own salvation.[67] How far these wishes were then observed is unclear, although in 1377 Adam Houghton had no concerns with the actual practice of the liturgy, but with the obits of past canons which suggests that at least for the rest of Edward's life, his

---

[60] The lower vestry is referenced in *CCR 1454-61,* p. 49; and the upper vestry in William Lyndwood's will, where a copy of his *Provinciales* was to be chained there, Prior et al, 'Report of the Committee appointed by the Council of the Society of Antiquaries to investigate the circumstances attending the recent Discovery of a Body in St. Stephen's Chapel, Westminster', *Archaeologia* 34 (1852), p. 419.

[61] 'Statutes of St George's,' p. 11.

[62] The agreement of 1394 references the new chapter house, C 66/341 m. 26; *CPR 1391-96*, p. 553.

[63] Above, pp. 45-6.

[64] 'Statutes of St George's,' p. 11.

[65] Ibid, p. 12; and for the language about St Stephen's see *CPR 1348-50*, p. 147.

[66] 'Statutes of St George's', p. 10.

[67] Cohen, 'An Indulgence for the Visitor,' p. 846.

desires for the *opus dei* were upheld.[68] The faithful continuation of service may be why no further visitations seem to have been required.

In addition to the main demands of the Sarum rite on the college's staff, there was also the needs of the semi-separate oratory of St Mary le Pew, which had its own keeper and seems to have been viewed as liturgically distinct.[69] This oratory, just to the south of the high altar and between the buttresses of the main chapel, housed a significant cult image of the Virgin Mary. While Kingsford has summarised the known evidence for this chapel, he did not examine how it fit into the life of the two main collegiate chapels, or where the image came from. The keeper of the Pew seems to have generally been a clerk or vicar of the college, and the incumbent was included as part of the dean's jurisdiction in the 1394 settlement with Westminster Abbey in addition to the other classes of college staff.[70] His task seems to have been the maintenance of the image and the chapel, as well as maintaining a separate round of services there. In 1548, after the 1545 removal of the image of the Virgin as idolatrous, there were still fifteen sets of vestments for the use of the Pew Chapel, including four sets of cloth of gold vestments with matching altar hangings.[71] It is worth noting that these were only for one priest, as there are no vestments for deacons or for children. In addition, St Mary le Pew had its own sets of mass books and altar vessels.[72] From the available evidence, mostly of wills, St Mary le Pew seems to have been used primarily for obits and possibly for chantries, particularly after 1476 when Anthony, lord Rivers obtained the Scala Coeli indulgence for this chapel.[73] This indulgence was a plenary one for the dead, coupled with fifteen years' remission of sins for the living who visited the oratory. The chapel might also have been used for educating the choristers as well as local boys as it was a child's carelessness with candles that caused the chapel to burn in 1452.[74] The image may well have come from the Chapel Royal collection, as it was described by Froissart as an object 'in which the kings of England have great trust' in reference to the events of 1381.[75] There is no such image in the 1332-3 inventory of the king's relics, so either it was one particularly valued by Edward III and so with him at that point rather than in the storehouses, or it was the image listed as being in St Stephen's by the Receipt in 1308, although that image was listed as an

---

[68] C 66/298 m. 34; *CPR 1377- 81*, p. 57.

[69] Most of the evidence for St Mary le Pew is gathered in C.L. Kingsford, 'Our Lady of the Pew. The King's Oratory or Closet in the Palace of Westminster,' *Archaeologia* 68 (1917), pp. 1-20.

[70] C 66/ 341 m. 24; *CPR 1391-96*, p. 553.

[71] All the items identified as for use in the Pew chapel are listed in E 117/11/49 f. 9.

[72] 'iiij Masse bokes and iij deskes' valued at 4s 4d as well as 'iij chalesis w[i]t[h] patens gylt' although this last entry has been struck through for reasons that are unclear, ibid.

[73] *Cal. Pap. Letters 1471-84,* p. 498; see also Nigel Morgan, 'The Scala Coeli Indulgence and the Royal Chapels,' in *The Reign of Henry VII*, edited by Benjamin Thompson, (Woodbridge: Shaun Tyas, 1995), pp. 82-103.

[74] Kingsford, 'Our Lady of the Pew', pp. 10-11.

[75] Froissart, *Chronicles*, ii, p. 474.

'iconia' rather than an 'ymaige'.[76]

The surviving material culture of St Stephen's helps to shed light on how the chapels were used in practice. The basis for any reconstruction of St Stephen's liturgical practices as a college remains the New Customary of Salisbury, the basis for the Use of Sarum, which is known to have been the Use celebrated at St Stephen's.[77] The college, however, would have adapted it to suit the demands of their own space and liturgical needs.[78] The foundation statutes for St George's, Windsor state that the college there was to adopt the Sarum usage as far as was practicable in their own spaces as at a cathedral.[79] The few hints that survive of how St Stephen's interpreted this mandate suggest that they were able to match or even surpass the grandeur of a secular cathedral in their celebration of the ritual year. In the late fourteenth century the early morning mass, the morrow mass, was said in the lower chapel.[80] The inventory of 1548, after the first depredations of the Reformation, still lists an extraordinary array of liturgical objects available to the college and hints at the various uses of the chapels. The college had lost all relics, including the small relic of St George's bone in a wooden casket given by a former canon, but retained its sets of vestments, its silver and gold altar vessels, the lavish Latin missals and antiphoners and the books of polyphonic music.[81] In the lower chapel, which had four sets of older vestments and a hearse as well as a pair of organs and copper candlesticks, the furnishings seem to have been much less lavish, which suggests it would generally have only one priest celebrating services there.[82] In the upper chapel, by contrast, is where the valuable objects were found, including multiple crosses set with jewels, patronal statues of St Stephen and St Barbara made of silver gilt set with jewels, and sets of vestments for the entire community down to the choristers' green satin albs.[83] The specification of the vestments in sets, usually containing expensive sets of copes and albs for the celebrating priest, his deacon and sub-deacon shows that St Stephen's, as one would expect, carried out the full supporting ritual of the priest supported by two others that Sarum ordained and that most churches were unable to carry out.[84] The

---

[76] E 101/468/21 f. 106r; my thanks to James Hillson for the reference and for discussing with me the implications of the word iconia in this context.

[77] It was the general use of the king's chapel, *Liber Regie Capelle*, ed. Walter Ullman, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), p. 58; more importantly it was the use of St George's, Windsor, 'Statutes of St George's,' p. 10.

[78] For extended discussion of how liturgy and space were adapted to particular churches, see Gittos, *Liturgy, Architecture and Sacred Spaces*; Malone, 'Architecture as Evidence,' pp. 207-37.

[79] 'Statutes of St George's,' p. 10.

[80] Adam Chesterfield's will gave a missal for use in the morrow mass in the lower chapel, Cotton Faustina B VIII f. 10r.

[81] for the bone, PROB 11/ 3/ 361; E 117/11/49.

[82] Ibid. f. 5.

[83] Ibid. f. 6 for the jewels and plate, and ff. 1-3 for the vestments, the choristers' albs are on f. 3.

[84] For example, the inventory lists 'It[e]m iij Garmentes w[i]t[h] albes / vestiment deacon and subdeacon of cloth of gold w[i]t[h] whit velvit fygury. It[e]m ij Copis of Clothe of gold Raysid w[i]t[h] whit velvit fygury' as a set, ibid, f. 2.

glittering richness of the upper chapel's furnishings also points to a tentative conclusion that the upper chapel was the college's primary chapel, containing at that point its books and wealth. If this marked a shift from earlier practices, then the evidence for that shift simply does not survive.

Among the items listed in that final inventory of the college, perhaps the most frustrating are the three 'grete books of pricksong'.[85] These large-scale books volumes of polyphonic music from which the college's polyphonic repertory could be drawn imply that there was at least one choir lectern, and their contents would provide an invaluable guide to the musical possibilities at St Stephen's. While there is good reason to assume that what is now known as the Gonville and Caius Choirbook was one of these three books, where the others went and what they contained has been lost. The Caius Choirbook has an *ex dono* inscription from Edward Higgons, 'canon of this church', and contains a set of polyphonic masses and Magnificats by St Stephen's own organist-verger as well as composers employed by the Chapel Royal.[86] In this, it seems to be both a beautiful and a practical book, containing a well ordered selection of useful liturgical music. Particularly noteworthy in the choir book is an elaborate mass for the feast of St Stephen, one of the principal feast days of the college and probably the dedication day as well.[87] A set of 1520s part books survive in the British Library Royal collection that have daily polyphonic Lady masses by Nicholas Ludford and may once have belonged to the college, although they were in the king's library at Whitehall by 1542.[88] They show the polyphonic Lady Mass as something that was part of the college's usual round, as well as the skill needed to improvise the missing part of the organ in the masses. Ludford himself as organist would have been responsible for the improvisation required, giving a sense of his regular and sustained participation in the daily round. These sixteenth-century books represent the end of St Stephen's musical traditions, which had begun two hundred years earlier and highlight the commitment to a complex sung liturgy and to the devotion to the Virgin Mary.

The early sixteenth-century repertoire was probably a continuation of earlier traditions of elaborately sung services. From the beginning, Edward III had wanted the college's liturgy to be 'cum nota', with song, although how that was precisely carried out at that point is unknown.[89] In the visitation of 1377 by Adam Houghton, bishop of St David's, there was concern for the correct singing of the liturgy by the

---

[85] Ibid, f. 5.; pricksong was the general term for written-down music or polyphony as opposed to plainchant.
[86] Skinner, 'Caius and Lambeth Choirbooks', p. 246.
[87] Skinner, 'Nicholas Ludford (c. 1490-1557): A Biography and Critical Edition of the Antiphons, with a Study of the Collegiate Chapel of the Holy Trinity, Arundel, under the Mastership of Edward Higgons, and a History of the Caius and Lambeth Choirbooks' (DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1996), p. 45.
[88] BL Royal MS Appendix 45-48.
[89] *CPR 1348-50*, p. 147.

vicars although no indication of any particular musical developments at this point.[90] His injunction may be a sign that the college was failing to live up to a particularly elaborate round of liturgy, beyond their ability to sustain, or it may simply reflect sloppiness on the part of the college's officers more generally, which Houghton also censured. Between 1377 and the 1520s, only the knowledge that composers such as Nicholas Sturgeon and John Bedyngham were members of the college and that the college was protected from having its singers impressed provides any evidence that St Stephen's remained an important musical centre.[91] A beautiful fifteenth-century noted missal, which may have belonged to the college, offers some equivocal evidence. This missal's connection with St Stephen's is that it has a sixteenth-century *ex dono* inscription: 'Chamber, decani Sancti Stephani', which has been assumed to mean that it belonged to St Stephen's but was given away in 1549 by John Chambre after the college's dissolution, although there is no direct evidence.[92] I have found no signs of customisation for the needs of St Stephen's as opposed to the general dictates of the Sarum rite, so the applicability may simply be pure chance, or a sign that St Stephen's stood firmly within the standard musical and liturgical traditions of wealthy fifteenth-century institutions.

Beyond its own settled round of liturgy, St Stephen's also played a role within the life of the larger Church independent of its role for the Chapel Royal. Bishops and archbishops were able to celebrate services within the chapel, often precisely because St Stephen's stood outside the diocesan structures and perhaps conveyed royal approval of any such action, because of the need for royal sanction for such services. Perhaps the most politically motivated of these services was Archbishop Cranmer's choice to consecrate new bishops in 1535 in St Stephen's Chapel, without the permission or authority of the Pope.[93] In this, Cranmer was flaunting his independence from Rome and the new apostolic authority of Henry VIII as head of the English Church in a chapel which had long been separate from the diocese of London surrounding it, and under royal authority. In an earlier era, bishops such as William Lyndwood, bishop of St David's, who worked in the royal administration, were consecrated there, probably in part because it was convenient both for the Archbishop of Canterbury and his new subordinate.[94] Similarly,

---

[90] *CPR 1377-81*, p. 57.

[91] In December 1528 St Stephen's College was one of five royal chapels protected from impressment by King's College, Cambridge, *L & P Henry VIII 1526-28*, no. 5083 (12).

[92] New York, New York Public Library MS MA 63, f. 7v; the identification is made in *The Libraries of Collegiate Churches,* ed. James M. Willoughby, 2 vols. (London: British Library, 2013), ii, 592; a psalter, now Cambridge, St John's College, MS D 30 also has an identical *ex dono*, but has never been connected to St Stephen's College, Neil R. Ker, *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries*, 5 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), ii, p. 250.

[93] Nicholas Shaxton and possibly Hugh Latimer were consecrated in April 1535 at St Stephen's, John Strype, *Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Cranmer*, new ed. 3 vols. (Oxford: at the University Press, 1840), i, p. 53.

[94] When he was consecrated as bishop of St David's in August 1442, he was also the Lord Privy Seal and a senior diplomat. The then archbishop of Canterbury was Henry Chichele, then in ill-health. That he was consecrated at St

archbishops found St Stephen's a convenient place to receive the pallium, such as Simon Langham, and Cranmer himself, before their consecration in their cathedral churches.[95] Again, St Stephen's status as a royal chapel may have been driving this usage, as it was close to their working lives as royal councillors and administrators. Interestingly, despite the college's hard-fought and cherished independence from diocesan structures and from Westminster Abbey, on 4 April 1416 the bishop of Bangor, who has no known affiliation with St Stephen's College, ordained just four people in the chapel; two of them, Robert Felton and William Bontemps, were in the 1420s to become canons.[96] Both men were Chancery administrators, so this may reflect St Stephen's continuing role as the chapel for the administrative offices in Westminster. All of these usages by bishops point towards a continuing interrelationship between the English Church, his higher clergy and the king's administration, both in terms of their royal service, but also in their ability to use the royal chapel for convenience or to make a political point. These are just the surviving examples, found by chance in bishops' registers, and it is highly likely that St Stephen's was a more heavily used chapel than even these examples suggest, across the two centuries that the college was active.

We are, however, on surer ground when discussing who witnessed and knew the college's liturgical offerings and whether the liturgy was intended for a wider audience than simply those within the palace. From 1348, it is clear that, just as at the Sainte Chapelle, the English kings were using St Stephen's to advertise a quasi-monastic or cathedral piety within their palace.[97] The decision to install the image of the Virgin and to seek indulgences, not to support the building work but to bring visitors into the chapel, as Froissart described it, 'the most beautiful, the most rich and most noble' palace chapel.[98] Indulgences for feast days also had the additional benefit of granting remission of sins for the royal household and the king if they happened to be at Westminster on the relevant dates.[99] The Virgin cult was evidently the main attraction for the public, as shown by the granting of public access to the cult image through Westminster Hall. A petition from the dean and canons from 1356 survives in which they ask for access for pilgrims coming to see the Virgin's image.[100] That they were then granted the right to have access through Westminster Hall for those pilgrims in a charter backdated to 1355, is a hint that the indulgences

Stephen's, 'ubi munus consecracionis accepi [sic]', is mentioned in his will, Prior et al, 'Report on Lyndwood', p. 418.
[95] For Langham, see Reg. Langham, pp. 112-13 and for Cranmer see Reg. Cranmer, f. 1.
[96] Reg. Nichols, p. 103; for Felton and Bontemps, see appendices, pp. 275 and 254.
[97] On the public royal display at the Sainte Chapelle, Cohen, 'An Indulgence for the Visitor', pp. 864-5.
[98] Froissart, *Chronicles*, iii, pp. 498-9.
[99] Indulgences were granted or confirmed in 1349 (*Cal. Pap. Petitions*, p. 188), 1354 (*Cal. Pap. Letters 1342-62*, p. 538), and 1361 (*Cal. Pap. Petitions*, p. 372); the final known indulgence, that of Scala Coeli dates from 1476, *Cal. Pap. Letters 1471-1484*, p. 498.
[100] SC 8/247/12304.

were already being taken up by those not already associated with the Palace of Westminster and the king's own household.[101] Similarly, the record of a theft of 500 marks worth of offerings from St Mary le Pew in 1392 is also a sign that the cult had found popularity.[102] Gifts in wills from individuals far from Westminster in the sixteenth century along with evidence for causal visitors attending mass suggest that services in St Stephen's were not for a narrowly restricted audience, despite the competing presences of St Margaret's, Westminster and Westminster Abbey.[103] In addition to the visitors to its services, the audience for the liturgical life of the college was increased by the presence throughout the year of the Chapel Royal.

The Chapel Royal

There has been little work done on the medieval Chapel Royal, the department of the royal household responsible for providing the public round of worship for the English kings at whatever palace he happened to find himself. The work that has been done has not considered where the Chapel Royal carried out their duties, nor has it considered the material culture of the Chapel.[104] None of the available chapels in the royal palaces and manor houses were identical and access to each was different, not least in the presence or absence of distinct royal pews.[105] In addition, the Chapel Royal's storehouses and its collections of relics, vestments, plate and instruments were large, and could be drawn on to provide different furnishings and objects for veneration.[106] How and why they were moved from chapel to chapel as the king and his household moved around the Thames Valley and beyond has not yet been studied. Instead much of the focus has been musicological, interested in the musical establishment maintained by the king and its repertoire rather than how it was adapted to the multiplicity of spaces and layouts used. This section does not attempt a wide study of the practices of the Chapel Royal in general, although it provides material that may point towards possibilities for such a study, but instead in

---

[101] *CChR, 1341-1419,* p. 133-4; see also Maps 2-4, pp. 234-6.

[102] *CPR 1392-96,* p. 244.

[103] Discussed below in Chapter Eight, pp. 196-208.

[104] The most extensive study is that of Kisby, 'Chapel Royal', which covers only 1485-1547; for an earlier period, Bent covers the king's use of musicians rather than the spaces in which they worked, Ian Bent, 'The Chapel Royal before 1300,' *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association*, 90 (1963 - 1964), pp. 77-95; on the personnel of the Chapel Royal more generally, David Baldwin, *The Chapel Royal Ancient and Modern,* (London: Duckworth, 1990); Wathey notes the need to see musicians as part of a 'sea of relationships', but then goes on to deal only with the musicians rather than with the totality of the Chapel Royal, and pp. 26-7 notes the need for further work on the material culture of chapels, Andrew Wathey, 'The English Chapel Royal: Models and Perspectives,' in *The Royal Chapel in the Time of the Habsburgs: Music and Ceremonial in the Early Modern European Court*, ed. Tess Knighton, Juan José Carreras and Bernardo García García and trans. Yolanda Acker, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005), p. 25.

[105] On the type of medieval chapel Henry VIII inherited and that he came to build, Simon Thurley, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England: Architecture and Court Life 1460-1547* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), pp.195-7; Thurley sees one master-plan, but the evidence he is presenting actually suggests a variety of spaces and plans.

[106] One well known inventory of Chapel Royal artefacts from 1332-3 is E 101/ 386/3 1-3.

concerned with how the Chapel Royal used the spaces and personnel available to it when at Westminster. The Palace of Westminster was the king's principal palace, and St Stephen's was the only chapel within the palace complex large enough to be used by the Chapel Royal for their household services.[107] Their use of St Stephen's meant that co-operation and collaboration between the two institutions was essential for both, to ensure the smooth running of both sets of services when the royal household was in residence. The resulting overlap between St Stephen's own personnel and that of the Chapel Royal also necessitates a re-examination of the known music of the chapel, its audiences and its meanings.

Part of the problem when dealing with the Chapel Royal is dealing with definitions and terminology. The standard institutional account of the Chapel Royal and its personnel depends on the descriptions given in two fifteenth-century sets of ordinances. The more detailed instructions are in the *Liber Regie Capelle* of 1450, which focusses directly on the Chapel Royal and its internal structures.[108] For how the chapel then interacted with the wider household and the other chaplains and priests in the household, historians and musicologists have then turned to the Black Book of the Household's comments from the 1470s.[109] Yet those texts give greater clarity to the Chapel Royal than is perhaps warranted. There is no doubt that the structures of the chapel existed, and that to belong to the Chapel Royal was a particular dignity within the royal household. Branner cautioned against associating the French Chapel Royal solely with the Sainte Chapelle for this reason.[110] However, going back to the Latin terminology of grants and other references, the situation becomes murkier. The Latin term 'capella regis' was used for two categories of individuals and buildings. Its first and most straightforward use is in describing the chapel buildings within royal palaces or otherwise tied to the king such as the royal free chapels. In this, St Stephen's Chapel was emphatically a 'capella regis'. The alternative meaning of the term was what is now known as the Chapel Royal, the collection of singers, priests and choirboys who carried out the daily round of liturgy for the king and his court. Yet the individual priests were 'king's chaplains', a term that has wider meanings than simply those who were formally paid as part of the Chapel.[111] Canons of St Stephen's were usually 'king's chaplains' or 'king's clerks', a privileged title that was finally confirmed by Henry

---

[107] It was also the one best placed for the public display aspect of the Chapel Royal's duties, as it sat between the Great Hall and the Privy Palace, see Maps 2-4, pp. 234-6.

[108] *Liber Regie Capelle*, introduction.

[109] *The Household of Edward IV: The Black Book of the Household and the Ordinance of 1478*, ed. Alec R. Myers, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959), pp. 133-7.

[110] Robert Branner, 'The Sainte Chapelle and the Capella Regis in the Thirteenth Century, *Gesta* 10:1 (1971), p. 19.

[111] The Black Book separates its discussion of 'capellanis regis', the king's personal chaplains as opposed to the Chapel Royal, *Black Book of the Household*, p. 111 and pp. 133- 37; while the Black Book seems to suggest that the capellanis regis were only those on personal attendance on the king at any moment, the term also had an honorific usage.

VIII in 1537.[112] That did not mean that they were necessarily formally part of the Chapel Royal, but that they were associated with the king and in his service. It also suggests that the definitional boundaries have been drawn too tightly, and that we should see the Chapel Royal as part of a broader group of priests in royal service who could be called upon when needed, whether from St Stephen's or elsewhere.

All the surviving evidence points through absence of other evidence to St Stephen's as the home of the Chapel Royal when it was based at Westminster. St Stephen's had been the principal chapel of the palace before its rebuilding under the three Edwards and had had a large number of chaplains under Henry III.[113] No other chapel stood in the area that was most accessible to visitors and the household alike, near the Great Hall. All the other known chapels in the palace complex are small oratories for private use by the monarch, his family or the college itself, or as St Mary le Pew, a small cult centre built into the walls of St Stephen's.[114] The only possible exception is the shadowy church of St John the Evangelist, which disappears from the documentary record after Richard II's reign.[115] In addition to the lack of known alternatives, St Stephen's rarely appears separately from the Chapel Royal in the surviving sixteenth-century accounts, unlike St George's, Windsor. As discussed in the section on royal female patronage, Elizabeth of York did not distinguish between St Stephen's and the household chapel when she was at Westminster in the way that she distinguished between St George's College and the king's chapel there.[116] Similarly, in the account of Henry VII's celebration of St George's Day, the royal chapel in the Upper Ward is the venue for the first set of services and St George's Chapel for the second.[117] In accounts of events at Westminster, there is never such as distinction, and St Stephen's is treated as the royal chapel, including in chronicle texts. The *Brut* called St Stephen's the 'king's chief chapel' and Froissart described it as the 'most noble' palace chapel.[118] Instead the college disappears in favour of the Chapel Royal in such accounts. This fits with the pattern described in the *Liber Regie Capelle*, the guide to the basic workings of the fifteenth-century Chapel Royal, that on feast days the monarch attended

---

[112] *L & P Henry VIII 1537 Part 2*, no. 1150 (35).

[113] C 62/24 m. 15 from 1247 has the largest number of chaplains at Henry III's St Stephen's, by 1260 it had dropped to six chaplains; for a tabulation of the data see James Hillson, 'St Stephen's Chapel, Westminster: Architecture, Decoration and Politics in the Reigns of Henry III and the three Edwards (1227-1363),' (PhD thesis, University of York, 2015), p. 48.

[114] *HKW*, plan of the medieval palace of Westminster shows the queen's chapel and the oratory of St Lawrence as well as a private king's chapel in the privy palace and then St Stephen's and St Mary le Pew. Somewhere in the site would have been St John the Evangelist and before 1355, St Stephen's by the Receipt; see also Map 1, p. 233.

[115] The last reference that I am aware of to it is in the 1394 agreement, where it was excluded from the college's jurisdiction, C 66/341 m. 24; *CPR 1391-96*, p. 553.

[116] For the distinguishing of St George's from the king's chapel at Windsor Castle, see *Privy Purse Expenses,* p. 31.

[117] Leland, *Collectanea*, iv, p. 238.

[118] *The Brut or the Chronicle of England*, ed. Frederick W.D. Brie. 2 volumes. Early English Text Society, 131 and 136, (London: Early English Text Society, 1906-8), i, p. 478; Froissart, *Chronicles*, iii, pp. 498-9.

services in the public chapel, but otherwise heard mass said by his private chaplains.[119] Earlier, from the beginning of the college, it had been assumed that the king would regularly be at mass in St Stephen's, suggesting that from the mid-fourteenth century, St Stephen's was envisaged as the household chapel for Westminster.[120] Finally, St Stephen's was used as the venue for royal events such as the wedding of Richard, duke of York, as well as the mass the morning after his sister, Elizabeth of York's, coronation in 1486.[121] These were the type of events for which the Chapel Royal was usually responsible. Therefore, it seems reasonably safe to suggest that St Stephen's Chapel was the Chapel Royal's chapel when at Westminster. The implications are then three-fold.

First, St Stephen's was the only one of the chapels used by the Chapel Royal regularly that had its own full staff. All the rest of the king's palace chapels had a small permanent staff of a few chaplains, nothing near the heft of St Stephen's. The other chapels did not maintain a full round of divine office from Matins through to Compline and their chaplains could be easily absorbed into the Chapel Royal while the household was there. In addition, Westminster was possibly the most heavily used palace of all the royal houses, given the frequent royal presence as well as the sustained presence of the courts and administration.[122] At St Stephen's, by contrast, the college's own liturgical life had to continue. Not only did they have their own round of liturgy, also based on the Sarum Rite but with its own additions, they also had chantry and obit provisions to maintain. The college and the Chapel Royal would have had to negotiate some sort of settlement as to how to run both sets of services concurrently. The Chapel Royal needed space and time for the ordinary round prescribed by the Sarum rite with three added nightly memorials, a daily Office of the Virgin and a daily procession.[123] St Stephen's needed the seven offices of the Sarum rite, including High Mass, a Lady Mass and an Office of the Dead daily before taking into account any special provisions for anniversaries or feast days. While these are similar, they do not perfectly correspond. One possible solution would be that on such days, St Stephen's College would celebrate the conflicting services in St Mary beneath the Vaults, leaving the upper chapel to the royal household, given that accounts tend to state that the king was at mass in St Stephen's with no mention of the lower chapel. Another would be that the college was absorbed into the Chapel Royal for those particular services, giving a total musical strength of up to about sixty individuals, assuming that the

---

[119] *Liber Regie Capelle*, p. 64.
[120] The fragment of statutes that survives deals with how to allocate offerings between the college and the abbey when the king was present, WAM 18431.
[121] For Elizabeth of York's coronation, Leland, *Collectanea*, iv, p. 228.
[122] In Henry VII's reign, the two preferred palaces were Richmond and Westminster, a pattern which also held true for Richard II, Kisby, 'Chapel Royal,' p. 320; the king's presence in Westminster was also discussed above in Chapter Three, pp. 84-90.
[123] *Liber Regie Capelle*, pp. 56-7.

Chapel Royal was at full strength and not operating on a rota system.[124] The second option would have the benefit of adding to the musical capabilities and impressiveness of the Chapel Royal at Westminster without having to maintain extra members of the royal household. Possible supporting evidence for this hypothesis is that on the surface St Stephen's never appears to have taken part in the state occasions such as coronations and royal funerals. Instead, the Chapel Royal took part in these occasions alongside Westminster Abbey's monks.[125] Even when the deans of St George's and cathedral churches were named as part of the procession on these occasions, St Stephen's dean is never listed as a dignitary, perhaps because he was among those supplementing the Chapel Royal and so subsumed in it.[126]

This brings us to the second implication of St Stephen's secondary usage as the Chapel Royal when at Westminster, that of the personnel available to both institutions and to the musical potentials of that staffing. That, as discussed in the previous chapter, the dean of the Chapel Royal was also generally a canon or the dean of St Stephen's in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, would have allowed for smoother co-operation between the two institutions, and may have been policy rather than a convenient accident. William Say, Thomas Bonyfaunt and William Hill formed a mid-fifteenth century chain of deans who also had stalls in St Stephen's.[127] Five or perhaps six of the ten Tudor deans of the Chapel Royal held stalls in St Stephen's.[128] When parts of the privy palace burned down in the fire of 1512/13, the Chapel Royal no longer came with the royal household to the old Palace of Westminster. Instead, they were established at the two new palaces in the area, St James' and most importantly, Whitehall.[129] Whitehall then became the ceremonial centre of the Chapel's operations. As the Chapel Royal is equally badly documented as a household department, with few surviving internal records, it is even harder to see how the singing men of St Stephen's interacted with those of the Chapel Royal.[130] For the sixteenth century, when documentation is slightly better, in Fiona Kisby's study of the early Tudor Chapel Royal, there are only a few known singers, John Fuller and Henry Meddows, who moved between the two institutions.[131] The comparative lack of overlap is unsurprising as the requirements of both institutions

---

[124] Ibid, p. 58.

[125] Ibid, p. 77; St Stephen's is also not listed in the funeral expenses of Henry VII at Westminster Abbey, although some individual members of the college, such as Thomas Wolsey and Richard Hatton are listed as chaplains, San Marino CA, Huntington Library, Huntington MS 745, pp. 79 and 86.

[126] For example, at the coronation of Elizabeth of York in 1486, Leland, *Collectanea*, iv, p. 223; and the previous year for the funeral of Henry VII at St Pauls and then Westminster Abbey, ibid, p. 305.

[127] See their biographical details in the appendices.

[128] Kisby, 'Chapel Royal', pp. 460-64; of the ten names she gives as deans from 1485 to 1547, William Atwater, John Veysey, John Clerk and Thomas Thirlby were all attested as canons of St Stephen's. There is some doubt over whether Richard Sampson ever held a stall, although he was referred to as a canon, *L & P Henry VIII 1515-16*, no. 172.

[129] Thurley, *Tudor Royal Palaces*, pp. 51-56.

[130] Kisby, 'Chapel Royal,' p. 70.

[131] As compared to the lists in E 179 and in the Chantry Certificate, Kisby, 'Chapel Royal,' pp. 477-98; contra Kisby,

for their staff would have precluded holding the positions in plurality, but it is surprising that only two of the known singers moved from one to the other. It may simply be that there is too small a surviving sample of names, and that by chance, only those who were not at both institutions have been recorded. It may also reflect the similarities between the two institutions, so there was not much point in moving between the institutions, whereas there were inducements to move elsewhere, such as higher pay and greater stability.

Third, if we assume, as I think we must, that there was significant overlap and co-operation between the staff of the Chapel Royal and that of St Stephen's within the Palace of Westminster, it opens up questions of musical repertoire. St Stephen's College was certainly not lacking in musical ability and expertise in its daily round of services, as discussed above. Neither was the Chapel Royal; prominent composers known to have been employed by the sixteenth-century Chapel Royal included Robert Fairfax, Gilbert Banaster and William Cornish.[132] Fairfax's and Cornish's work appears in the Caius Choirbook, suggesting that repertoire was shared between the two institutions at this point, even as day to day collaboration would have lessened after the abandonment of Westminster as a royal residence in the previous decade.[133] Similarly, at the start of the college's existence, the motet *Sub Arturo,* often thought to have been written for the Chapel Royal on St George's Day in the 1360s references two or possibly three musicians, John Corby and William Tiddeswell, and possibly William Excestre, who were also canons of St Stephen's, again suggesting a shared musical staffing and repertoire and that we should not see music as belonging to one or the other, but probably shared.[134] In the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century, two settings of *O Maria et Elizabeth*, a motet based on a votive antiphon to the Virgin and to her cousin, were produced for the royal chapel. The new feast of the Visitation of the Virgin would have had resonance for St Stephen's, as the feast emphasised the unexpected pregnancies of the Virgin and St Elizabeth, and the cult of Our Lady of the Pew seems to have in part been a maternal cult.[135] One, by Banaster, has been studied for its potential as a 'piece of royal image-making' of the late fifteenth century as it survives in the Eton Choirbook.[136] The text set by Banaster, is a prayer for dynastic stability in the face of dynastic change under either Edward IV or more probably, Henry VII.[137] If it was

---

Skinner identified Ludford as a former member of the Chapel Royal, Skinner, 'Nicholas Ludford', p. 21.

[132] Kisby, 'Chapel Royal,' p. 186.

[133] Skinner, 'At the Mynde of Nicholas Ludford,' p. 397.

[134] Trowell, 'A Fourteenth-Century Ceremonial Motet and Its Composer,' p. 66-7.

[135] Payments were made to a number of Marian shrines including those at Walsingham and Willesden in addition to St Mary le Pew, *Privy Purse Expenses*, pp. 3-4; for the feast see Magnus Williamson, 'Royal Image-Making and Textual Interplay in Gilbert Banaster's 'O Maria et Elizabeth',' *Early Music History* 19 (2000), p. 238.

[136] The text is given in Williamson, 'O Maria et Elizabeth,' pp. 244-5.

[137] Ibid, p. 267.

produced for performance at Westminster, it is tempting to speculate about the interplay between the music's plea for stability in a changing world and the imagery of Edward III's dynastic successes on the walls of the chapel. A later setting by Fairfax of a text with the same title is recorded only through a payment record by Elizabeth of York in 1502, suggesting royal intervention in the music of the Chapel Royal, and by extension, since the payment was made when the Queen was at Westminster, St Stephen's as well, as a potential recipient of such a piece.[138]

The presence of the royal household and the Chapel Royal at Westminster would have brought larger audiences and perhaps a more complicated liturgy to St Stephen's as its staff worked alongside those of the Chapel to ensure that all services necessary were sung. It meant greater offerings at mass for the common fund and perhaps involvement in the very public display of royal munificence and power in the ordinary and extraordinary services carried out by the Chapel Royal.[139] For the Chapel Royal , however, it must have involved considerable deviation from what has been regarded their norm, in order to make their general movement through a chapel space fit with what was available to them in St Stephen's. By the sixteenth century, almost if not all royal palaces had chapels with separate and distinct royal pews or holy day closets such as the ones that survive at Hampton Court.[140] The standard layout most musicologists have assumed for a royal household chapel is similar to the ones there, where the king and queen were separated from the *opus dei,* and above it at the back, but could come down via convenient stairs to join the service at specific moments, such as receiving communion.[141] At St Stephen's the royal pews seem to have been within the choir, but on the same level as everyone else, removing an opportunity for lavishly symbolic movement visible to the lay audience in the nave.[142] The Tudor chapels tended also to be designed for visible processions through the galleries of the palace back to the monarchs' quarters, which left from the western end of the chapel.[143] At St Stephen's and Westminster more generally, this seems not to have been the case. The alura at St Stephen's from the eastern end of the chapel through St Mary le Pew and then on to the Painted Chamber would have been a potential procession route as would a route through the porch at the western end into the area between the

---

[138] *Privy Purse Expenses*, p. 2.
[139] An exceptional example is provided in Reg. Chichele, iv. pp. 111-12.
[140] Thurley assumes that holy day closets were a consistent feature, Thurley, *Tudor Royal Palaces*, p. 199.
[141] Thurley also notes that Henry VIII was introducing those stairs into his palaces at Greenwich and Eltham when he rebuilt their chapels, ibid, p. 196; Kisby, 'Chapel Royal,' p. 37.
[142] There is no evidence surviving from St Stephen's to indicate where the royal pews were within the upper chapel, suggesting that they were probably integrated into the eastern end of the stalls.
[143] On the role of the procession Thurley, *Tudor Royal Palaces*, pp. 198-9; the plans (un-paginated) at the back of the book, show galleries leading to the chapel at Greenwich (Plan 4), Hampton Court (Plans 7 and 8), Richmond (Plan 11), Whitehall (Plan 13), and Windsor Castle Upper Ward (Plan 14); these are a mix of palaces built or renovated by Henry VIII and those where the layout was inherited from either Edward IV or Henry VII.

Greater and Lesser Halls and then perhaps through the Lesser Hall to the Privy Palace.[144] The route would either pass through a fairly narrow, fairly private gallery straight into the more private areas of the palace, without the usual opportunities for petitions by spectators or for royal broadcasting of their visibility, or would have to move into an extremely public area, choked with individuals going to the law courts or to the Lords, if Parliament was in session.

Conclusions: Church and State at St Stephen's

Any church in the province of Canterbury was likely to have multiple audiences who took part in the devotional life of the church, from priests and parishioners, to the patron of the living and the diocesan officials who might visit or use the church for their own needs. Despite its exemption from diocesan control and its lack of a parish, St Stephen's seems to have been a much-used, much appreciated space. At St Stephen's the prevailing assumption that it was a pair of chapels solely for the use of the king, the college and the royal household is wrong. St Stephen's and its multiple subsidiary chapels had multiple audiences, including those pilgrims who came to view the image of Our Lady of the Pew until 1545, who were drawn from the court, those visiting Westminster and other chance passers-by. The liturgy they heard or glimpsed through the pulpitum was a lavish and glittering round of services, designed to impress even when the king was not in residence. His munificence and piety were on display even in his absence in the most publically accessible of his palaces, on account of the usual presence of the courts and the administrative offices. When the king and the Chapel Royal were present and supplementing the college, then the visual and aural splendour would have been overwhelming. The audiences' appreciation for St Stephen's is the subject of chapter eight, on the patronage by those other than the king, but this chapter has brought out the sheer variety of liturgical and ecclesiastical uses to which a royal household chapel could be put. It also shows that even a chapel outside the parish system was not a strictly private, controlled space, a theme that is picked up in the final chapter. It has also highlighted the blurriness in the later middle ages of the line between church and state. St Stephen's could be used as much by the king whose chapel it was, as by the senior bishops for consecrations and ordinations and the rites of the church. That those bishops were also often themselves royal administrators working alongside the canons of St Stephen's in the royal administration also points to the continued interrelationship of the English church to the country's governance.

---

[144] The route through the alura was certainly the processional route used when Prince Arthur was made Prince of Wales in 1487 and the future Henry VIII was made a knight of the Bath in 1494; see also Maps 2-4, pp. 234-6.

Section Three: Beyond the Walls of St Stephen's, Westminster

Chapter Seven: The Dispute with Westminster Abbey

Court records of disputes over revenues, jurisdictions and rights tend to provide the best evidence for relationships between ecclesiastical institutions in the later middle ages. They show us ecclesiastical institutions in their actuality rather than in the proscriptive aspirations of their foundation statutes. The records, however, also condition how we understand the relationships as consistently adversarial and competitive rather than seeing such court cases as interruptions to otherwise relatively harmonious relationships.[1] After all, when the relationship was working there was no need for the courts to become involved. Much of the work on the ecclesiastical courts in England has been done with a view to understanding how laymen and women were affected by the canon law and how the canon law interacted with the secular law courts of King's Bench and Common Pleas.[2] There has also been work on the relationships between the various strands of canon law and the peculiarity of English courts.[3] Most recently, Benjamin Thompson has noted the ways in which ecclesiastical institutions could use both the church and royal courts strategically, a theme that will run through this chapter.[4] This chapter examines the dispute over jurisdiction and revenues between St Stephen's College and Westminster Abbey between 1370 and 1394 for what it says about the rights of each institution, the legal possibilities open to each side and the wider political and ecclesiastical contexts in which this case occurred. It

---

[1] Much of the scholarship has focussed on one dispute only such as Ralf Lützelschwab, 'Verletze Eitelkeiten? Westminster Abbey und St Stephen's, Westminster- Mönche und Kanoniker im Konflikt,' in *Pluralität- Konkurrenz-Konflikt: Religiöse Spannungen im städtischen Raum der Vormoderne,* ed. Jörg Oberste, (Regensburg: Schell & Steiner, 2013), pp. 85-101; or David K. Maxfield, 'A Fifteenth-Century Lawsuit: The Case of St Anthony's Hospital,' *JEH* 44 (1993), pp. 199- 223; the one major study of the free chapels as a group which developed their own jurisdiction ends in 1300, Jeffery H. Denton's *English Royal Free Chapels 1100-1300: A Constitutional Study,* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1970); earlier Thompson pointed to the constitutional similarities of secular colleges rather than to their ongoing links with each other, Alexander Hamilton Thompson, 'Notes on Colleges of Secular Canons in England,' *Archaeological Journal* 74 (1917), pp. 139-99.

[2] For the expected workings of the canon law courts in Rome and England see James Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law,* (London: Longman, 1995); for the effect on laymen and women as well as the overlaps in jurisdiction with the royal courts, see particularly Richard H. Helmholz, *The Oxford History of the laws of England: vol 1: The Canon Law and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction from 597 to the 1640s,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); David M. Owen, 'Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction in England 1300-1550: The Records and their Interpretation,' in *The Materials, Sources and Methods of Ecclesiastical History*, ed. Derek Baker, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1975), pp. 199-221.

[3] Jane E. Sayers, *Papal Judges Delegate in the Province of Canterbury 1198-1254: A Study in Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Administration,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971); Patrick N.R. Zutshi, 'Proctors acting for English Petitioners in the Chancery of the Avignon Popes 1305-1378,' *JEH* 35 (1984) pp 15-29; Barbara Bombi, 'The Role of Judges Delegate in England. The Dispute between the Archbishops of Canterbury [and] St Augustine's Abbey,' in *Legati e delegati papali: Profili, ambiti d'azione e tipologie di intervento nei secoli XII-XIII,'* eds. Maria Pia Alberzoni and Claudia Zey, (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 2012), pp. 221-60.

provides for the first time, a full narrative of a dispute that has been largely referred to in passing as an important but complex case, with the exception of the limited summary in the Victoria County History and the one extended treatment of the case by Ralf Lützelschwab, which saw the case solely as a squabble over financial privilege and access to the king within Westminster.[5] The two sides jockeyed for position and advantage in the courts of England and Rome, but equally dealt with the vagaries of diplomacy, schism, and the Hundred Years War. While this chapter necessarily focusses on a period of heightened tensions and acrimony, in which the Westminster Abbey chronicler could write scathingly about St Stephen's, it was also a step towards clarifying both side's rights and obligations within Westminster and thus laying the foundations for the continued co-operation discussed in the next chapter.

The workings of the dispute are summarised in Table 11 along with the political contexts that shaped the possibilities of action for both sides. The case began officially in 1375 in front of a papal judge-delegate at St Frideswide's in Oxford. The court's concern was the wills proved by the dean of St Stephen's since 1370 in violation of the abbey's right to prove all wills from within the parish in its archdeaconry court of Westminster. The case was soon widened to include issues of whether St Stephen's owed tithe payments to the abbey and whether the dean had his own exempt deanery within the palace of Westminster. After the judge-delegate hearing was stopped by a royal writ of *prohibitio* the abbey's proctors took the case directly to the Roman Curia. The dean and canons of St Stephen's disputed the right of the abbey to go directly to Rome, asserting that the case needed to be heard in the English court of Chancery first, which the abbey's proctors vigorously denied. Elements of the dispute were thus heard in three different jurisdictions, the papal judge-delegate system, the Curia in Rome, and the English Chancery, depending on the international and national political situations. In addition, there were conciliar hearings in 1380 associated with Parliament. The effects of the litigation were potentially serious. St Stephen's was excommunicated in 1378 and the fruits of the college sequestrated the following year, although it is not clear if the penalties were ever enforced for their unwillingness to engage with the papal courts.[6] In retaliation, in 1381-2 the abbey's lands were sequestrated by Richard II for breach of *praemunire* and for ignoring writs of *prohibitio*.[7] The case falls relatively neatly into three

---

[4] Benjamin Thompson, 'Locality and Ecclesiastical Polity: The Late Medieval Church between Duality and Integration,' in *Political Society in Later Medieval England: a Festschrift for Christine Carpenter*, ed. Benjamin Thompson and John Watts (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2015), pp. 137-9.
[5] 'Colleges: Royal Free Chapel of St Stephen, Westminster', in *The Victoria County History of the Counties of England: London,* ed. William Page, (London: Constable and Company, 1909), pp. 566-571; Lützelschwab, 'Verletze Eitelkeiten?' pp. 85-101, particularly p. 85.
[6] WAM Muniment Book 12 f. 46r-v.
[7] *CPR 1381-1385*, p. 437.

phases, a first phase of intense litigation to 1382 when negotiations for a settlement were begun. The failure of the negotiations by 1386 started a second phase of litigation that year. Finally, negotiations from 1392 to 1394 ended in a successful settlement sealed in 1394.

Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Dispute

Our understanding of this case is conditioned by the documents that have survived. The first and most important caveat about the source material is that it is only from Westminster Abbey, not from St Stephen's College or any other party to the case.[8] While the abbey's strong tradition of record keeping meant that there are many working documents from their litigation and the lines of argument that they put forward can be traced in development, it does mean that many other aspects of the case can only be seen through the traces left in the abbey's documents. For example, while the material relating to the cases in the Roman Curia is reasonably full, there were two other sets of proceedings which are barely acknowledged in the abbey muniments; a set of hearings in front of the king's council that was partially a re-delegation of papal authority to the archbishop of Canterbury, and hearings in the court of Chancery which the abbey never acknowledged as valid and so are only hinted at.[9] If we had the equivalent set of papers surviving from the college's archives, we would almost certainly have a very different view of the dispute as the college would have prioritised the Chancery case's findings and would have felt the hearings in front of Simon Sudbury, archbishop of Canterbury and chancellor, to be important, because of their repeated assertions as reported in the abbey's documents, that they should only be sued in Chancery.[10] Just as the abbey did not acknowledge the legitimacy of the royal courts in this matter, St Stephen's did not acknowledge the legitimacy of the papal court in the first instance. Any discussion of the dispute must thus inevitably deal at greater length with the processes and decisions of the Roman Curia, but we should keep in mind that there were parallel hearings in the secular English courts, which have not survived, and which might have given a very different perspective on the matters in question.

The situation in 1375, when the case was officially begun, was one of ambiguity concerning the college's

---

[8] While the Westminster Abbey Muniments do contain some documents produced by St Stephen's during the course of the dispute, they are only formal replies probably read out in court and only when they were germane to the line of argument pursued by the abbey. This means that the narrative provided is overwhelmingly that of the support for the abbey's case rather than any possible counter-arguments, summarised in Table 11.

[9] For the 1380 hearing in the Redechamber in the Palace of Westminster, WAM, Westminster Domesday, f. 72v; the Chancery suit is referenced in Richard II's pardon to Westminster Abbey and the restoration of their temporalities in 1384, *CPR 1381-1385*, p. 437; the original of this document, which still has its original royal seal including the threading is WAM 18449, there is also a brief mention that their indemnity had been confirmed in a hearing in front of Chancellor Richard Scrope and which thus falls between 1378 and 1382, WAM 18461; the abbey side in a hearing before William Scrope in 1382 may also relate to this case, although William Scrope was simply one of the king's favourites at this time, WAM 18444-5.

privileges. Before 1348 there was no particular problem with the chapel of St Stephen's or its temporary replacement, St Stephen's by the Receipt, as ecclesiastical spaces in relation to Westminster Abbey and the parish church of St Margaret's. They simply were private palace chapels with no particular parochial functions that could threaten the parish church and were used by the king and his household when they were at Westminster. After 1348, however, the new institution's position had to be clarified given that royal free chapels and their collegiate staffs had certain rights independent of the parish in which they sat.[11] Those included the right to hold their own ecclesiastical courts, to prove wills and to collect tithes. Any disputes were handled at the diocesan level or in the king's court of Chancery. St George's, Windsor, for example, only had to deal with the ordinary jurisdiction of the bishop of Salisbury, whenever their exemptions were under question as happened in the sixteenth century.[12] At St Stephen's, although some of the jurisdictional issues were doubtless worked out with the abbey prior to the sealing of the statutes in 1355, enough was left unclear that litigation was required. St Stephen's had customary privileges as a royal free chapel, which were confirmed by papal bulls of 1349, of exemption from diocesan control which specifically mentioned both exemption from the archdeaconry and that the dean was to have cure of souls.[13] Which souls, however, were not made clear. For the dean of St Stephen's, the obvious interpretation would have been that his jurisdiction covered the palace of Westminster and its inhabitants, both permanent and temporary. In the 1370s, William Sleaford proved wills of palace inhabitants in line with this interpretation of the college's privileges and thus sparked litigation.[14]

The college's situation after 1394 looked very different. The agreement in 1394 that ended the case allowed the college to function as a free chapel exempt from all abbey jurisdiction but only in regard to its own personnel and buildings and for a yearly pension of five marks.[15] The palace of Westminster returned to the control of the abbot of Westminster Abbey and its residents were once again parishioners of St Margaret's Church. The dean no longer could prove wills or exercise any powers over a wider constituency than the thirty eight persons who made up the college and their servants, or over

---

[10] For example, WAM 18465 and 18461.

[11] Denton, *Royal Free Chapels*, p. 1 on the claims and p. 102 on the thirteenth century victories in obtaining exemptions.

[12] Windsor, St George's College Archives XV 58 5.

[13] *Cal. Pap. Petitions*, p. 187; it is worth noting here that peculiars' boundaries could be very uncertain indeed, see Owen, 'Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction', p. 204.

[14] An undated document that may date from before 1377 says that Sleaford had proved the wills of Ussheborne and Sutton, and that he was to prove the will of John Thornington, WAM 18462; a list of defects that the abbey needed to repair in its case, probably from the second round of litigation in the 1380s says that he had proved all three wills and that the abbey had stopped him from proving the will of Thomas Pyk, WAM 18453; Sleaford was described as 'wilfully usurping' the jurisdiction of the abbey (translation mine), WAM Muniment Book 12 f. 33v.

[15] C 66/ 341 mm. 26-24; my thanks to Maureen Jurkowski for her transcription of this agreement, which I then checked against the abbey's copy in BL Cotton MS Faustina A III, ff. 293r- 314r; the calendar is *CPR 1391-96*, p. 553.

any buildings beyond those listed carefully in the agreement.[16] Within the college he might still exercise those rights that pertained to the other royal free chapels in England. The fundamental principle was that the college's thirty-eight staff were parishioners of St Margaret's but were exempt from most parochial duties, including the obligation to pay tithes. In return, the yearly five mark pension compensated the abbey for the loss of hypothetical tithe revenues from offerings by members of the public or the court in St Stephen's Chapel or St Mary le Pew.[17] Each canon and vicar had to swear an oath to uphold the agreement and to not seek to undermine the abbey's rights within the manor.[18] The complexity of the situation within the palace was also acknowledged. There were concessions to royal usage of the chapels controlled by St Stephen's, such as the permission to have a font for the baptism of royal and noble children.[19] Funerals of the members of the college were permitted, but any other funerals or marriages required the permission of the abbot and chapter of Westminster Abbey.[20] The implication was that St Stephen's was to be allowed to function as an institution but that it was not to be allowed to rival St Margaret's or to build up a royally-sponsored exempt jurisdiction that encompassed the palace.

One of the many reasons that the dispute was so protracted was that there was a fundamental clash of incompatible privileges between the two institutions such that even choosing a court competent to hear the case was a matter of contention. Westminster Abbey's privileges were older, dating back to the 1220s, and more comprehensive. Its advocates based their arguments, as Lützelschwab identified, on the papal grant of exemption from the usual church hierarchies in the 1220s and the consequent status as an exempt deanery within the diocese of London.[21] Langton's privilege for the abbey meant that it stood outside the customary English church courts, and instead answered only to the papacy and the papal courts. In addition, the abbey acquired control of the archdeaconry of Westminster, the administrative division of the diocese of London which was roughly coterminous with the manor of Westminster, and thus had its own exclusive spiritual jurisdiction in the area, including over wills.[22] Finally, and perhaps most pertinently for the dispute, the abbey controlled the parish church of St Margaret's. Hence the larger principle of the dispute, that St Stephen's owed the abbey shares in any revenues that they received from quasi-parochial activity, including tithes.[23] The competing claim was that the Palace of Westminster was itself exempt, and thus the palace fell under the jurisdiction not of the diocesan, but of the dean of

---

[16] Cotton Faustina A III, f. 294v-295r.
[17] Ibid, f. 310r.
[18] Carefully recorded in WAM Muniment Book 12, ff. 86r-87v.
[19] C 66/ 341 m. 24 for the font, and m. 25 for the principle of being parishioners of St Margaret's; *CPR 1391-96*, p. 553.
[20] Cotton Faustina A III, f. 306 r.
[21] Lützelschwab, 'Verletze Eitelkeiten,' pp. 85-6.
[22] For example, Brother Peter Combe of Westminster Abbey occurs as archdeacon in 1386 in WAM 18447.
[23] WAM 18457.

St Stephen's.[24] The free chapels also had the right to only be sued in Chancery, a privilege that St Stephen's was consistently to claim throughout the dispute. The college must have assumed that the existence of the old St Stephen's as a royal chapel before 1348 gave them the rights and privileges held by royal free collegiate chapels from the pre-Conquest period, which generally included a jurisdiction beyond just that of the college's own members and their servants to include a parish, or even a deanery.[25] The papal grant of 1349 supported this assumption.[26] In essence, the papacy had double-granted privileges in Westminster to two powerful and royally-supported institutions. The dispute was to disentangle the rights, obligations and privileges of each institution, and part of that was over which courts had jurisdiction over them both in the first instance.

This dispute has important papal and international contexts, both practically and diplomatically. From 1370 to 1376, while Sleaford proved wills at Westminster, Pope Gregory XI was trying to move the papal court from Avignon to Rome, with consequent delays for any judicial activity, as documents and officials moved between the cities.[27] Although the abbey was already exploring the basis of their case in 1375, when John Bokenhull, the abbey's proctor in Rome, wrote to Simon Langham, the former abbot, about the case, it was only formally begun in late 1375 as the papal court started its slow move back to Rome.[28] The need to obtain bulls may have delayed the first hearing of the case, when judges-delegate chosen by the abbey and approved by the pope met at St Frideswide's in Oxford in 1376.[29] It was however to particularly affect the appeals to Rome from 1377 on, when William Colchester, who became abbot of Westminster in 1386, was to spend two years traveling between Rome and Avignon trying to corral the necessary parts of the papal bureaucracy to produce the documents needed to advance the case.[30] The process of the slow move was then further complicated by the start of the Great Schism in 1378. England's adherence to the Roman Pope Urban VI was not seriously in question, but it was a useful bargaining tool. In 1382 when Urban agreed to arbitration not by papal delegates, but rather by the archbishop of Canterbury and other English bishops and members of the royal council, he did so in

---

[24] WAM 18465.

[25] William Sleaford explicitly positioned St Stephen's among this group of institutions when he described St Stephen's as 'sicut alie Capelle regie p[er] regn[u]m Angl' quality[er]cu[m]q[ue] constitue,' WAM 18465. Cf. Denton says that St Stephen's was not an exempt deanery, Denton, *Royal Free Chapels*, p. 116.

[26] *Cal. Pap. Petitions*, p. 187; it is worth noting here that peculiars' boundaries could be very uncertain indeed, see Owen, 'Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction', p. 204.

[27] For the context of this for the English expatriate community, including proctors working for the abbey, see Margaret Harvey, *The English in Rome 1362-1420: Portrait of an Expatriate Community,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 31-33.

[28] J.A. Robinson, 'Simon Langham,' *Church Quarterly Review* 66 (1908); p. 358; the case was begun in WAM 18478 A.

[29] The events at St Frideswide's are discussed in WAM Muniment Book 12 f. 33r-34r.

[30] The expenses from 10 July 1377 to November 1379 are WAM 9256 A-E.

a climate of tense negotiations with the English Crown.[31] Richard II had sent ambassadors to represent the college in Rome in 1380, and the ambassadors in Rome negotiating with the papal court over a range of issues in early 1382 included the matter of St Stephen's in their presentations.[32] The matter of the college's jurisdiction was considered to be part of the English relationship with the papacy, a sign of its importance to the king.

National politics also played a role in the timings of aspects of the case, and the abbey was particularly alert to the possibilities of politics. It was fortunate for the abbey's litigation that Edward III died on 21 June 1377 and was succeeded by the minor Richard II. Edward III's writ of *prohibitio* of 1376 had ended the first hearing of the case before Thomas Chandos and John Colton as judges-delegate in Oxford, well away from the bishopric of London and any competing jurisdiction there.[33] This writ, however, does not seem to have deterred Nicholas Littlyngton, the then abbot of Westminster. He almost certainly immediately started the long task of obtaining writs and citations to restart the case, as he seems to have regarded the royal prohibition as an inconvenient roadblock rather than a reason to suspend the case completely in the ecclesiastical courts.[34] Most other religious would have accepted defeat at this point, but Littlyngton was himself a royal servant, and seems to have been willing to gamble with royal favour.[35] It would take until November 1377 for the abbey to obtain new documents in the Roman Curia and cite Sleaford and the college to appear in Rome before papal auditors.[36] This went unopposed by the new English minority council, until the receipt of the new citation prompted two new writs of *prohibitio*. The first of these, issued on 8 December 1377, was a general prohibition against suing the college anywhere other than in Chancery.[37] A second more specific writ of *prohibitio* by Richard II withdrawn on 30 March 1383 is alluded to in the abbey muniments.[38] The abbey then chose deliberately in 1386 to renew the case at a point when Richard II looked politically vulnerable at home and abroad. The documentation of the second sentence against St Stephen's was issued in June and August 1386 as

---

[31] For example, for two separate responses to matters of disagreement by Richard's ambassadors to Urban VI in early 1382, see Édouard Perroy, *L'Angleterre et le Grand Schisme d'Occident: Etude sur la Politique Religiouse de l'Angleterre sous Richard II, 1378-1399,* (Paris: J. Monnier, 1933), pp. 397-404.

[32] Ibid, pp. 400 and 403-4 where article 9 in both responses in BL Cotton MS Cleopatra E II concerns St Stephen's and its rights; the ambassadors sent to Rome to represent the College occur in several documents, including WAM 18478B.

[33] Several copies of the documents produced by these judges-delegate survive, the most formal is the notarised copy that is WAM 18439; for the writs of prohibitio see WAM Muniment Book 12, ff. 34v -35r; for the court's immediate cessation of proceedings when Edward III's writ was produced, Muniment Book 12, f. 35 r.

[34] He immediately petitioned the king for redress from the writ of *prohibitio* in WAM 18475; the documents from the Papal Curia starting the case in Rome start being issued 6 November 1377, WAM Muniment Book, f. 37v.

[35] For Littlyngton's career see further, Pearce, *Monks of Westminster*, pp. 84-6.

[36] WAM Muniment Book 12 f. 37.

[37] *CPR 1381-85,* p. 437.

[38] WAM Muniment Book 12, f. 65r.

the crisis deepened, but would have had to be started earlier against the context of Richard's expedition to the north of England and the threat of French invasion.[39] Both events would make it unlikely that the king or the college could contest the petition in the papal courts, or alter the grounds on which the final set of hearings would be conducted. The success or failure of the case for each side depended on the terms of engagement and the court.

The final end of the case reflected weariness on both sides. Matters began to shift in May 1390, when one canon, Ralph Kesteven, asked for papal absolution from the college's excommunication because of age and infirmities.[40] It seems that at the same time the abbey adopted a more conciliatory approach. The 1382 negotiations had made few concessions to St Stephen's, asserting that all jurisdiction belonged to the abbey, and that it had financial rights to all tithes, offerings and mortuary payments, and in addition St Stephen's would have to pay a high yearly pension of £5.[41] Understandably, the college resisted and continued to seek full cure of souls within the Palace of Westminster.[42] In 1392, negotiations seem to have begun before any general requests were sent to the pope, by now the third pope involved with this case, Boniface IX. In 1392 Brothers John Burghwell and William Sudbury were paid expenses by the abbey treasurer for travelling to Windsor for a week of negotiations with St Stephen's.[43] No record of the contents or outcome of these negotiations, presumably at the behest of Richard II, survived. Only in the following year, in July 1393, did Boniface IX write to the bishop of Salisbury, at this point John Waltham, to absolve Sleaford and the chapter of St Stephen's on account of their 'ignorance of the law' which had let them to defy papal excommunication. The letter noted also that the college was 'now ready to submit and to make satisfaction to the abbot and convent'.[44] The papal letter was probably not the final step in the negotiations between St Stephen's and Westminster Abbey as the final concordance between the two houses was only sealed in August 1394, but clearly came at a turning point in the negotiations when both sides felt as if a full and final settlement was finally possible.[45] The letter also reflects either St Stephen's awareness that Waltham had authority over them, as he was then Lord

---

[39] Muniment Book 12 f. 31v; for the crisis of 1386-8 see Richard G. Davies, 'The Episcopate and the Political Crisis in England of 1386-88,' *Speculum* 51 (1976), pp. 659-93.

[40] *Cal. Pap. Letters 1398-1404,* pp. 328-9.

[41] WAM 18435 is a collection of various drafts and miscellaneous documents from this period of negotiation; for example, it has a draft that gives the abbey full jurisdiction over the Palace, all oblations are to be given to the abbey, and that the statutes of the college are to be revised, ibid, f. 5r; a pension of 100 s yearly, rather than the 30s that would finally be agreed is mentioned, ibid, f. 11r; see also Table 11.

[42] St Stephen's counter-proposals partially survive, including a proposal that the palace's tithes should go to the college rather than the abbey, WAM 18435 ff. 14 r-v.

[43] *Monks of Westminster*, p. 113; at the time Sudbury was senior enough that the following year he was appointed the abbey's treasurer.

[44] *Cal. Pap. Letters 1398-1404*, pp. 462-3.

[45] C 66/ 341 m. 26; *CPR 1391-96*, p. 553.

Treasurer, or papal acceptance of St Stephen's status as exempt, given that even three years earlier, the mandate to absolve Kesteven went to the diocesan ordinary, Robert Braybrooke, as bishop of London.[46] The final settlement gave St Stephen's an exempt existence within the deanery, but without wider jurisdiction than the college itself and the rights to some, but not all, gifts and offerings made within the college's own chapels. No further mention of the abbey's costs was made, and the yearly pension payable was substantially decreased.[47] William Sleaford and his fellow canons could be pleased that they had held out for a reasonable, if imperfect, settlement.

The mismatch that emerges most clearly from the contexts of the papal court is that St Stephen's simply did not have the resources at the Curia that the abbey could command. Westminster Abbey seems to have regularly kept proctors to watch over their interests in the Avignon and then Roman courts, and many of their senior monks spent time at the papal court.[48] Thus, the abbey was comfortable with the procedures and with the personnel of the Curia. Simon Langham, cardinal-archbishop of Canterbury to 1376 and former abbot of Westminster who died at Avignon in 1376, was just the latest example of monks of Westminster who knew the papal court well and who pursued the abbey's interests there, whether at Rome or Avignon.[49] This familiarity, for example, is seen in a draft of a letter to a cardinal or a bishop asking for his support in the dispute that happens to survive in the abbey muniments.[50] At every point when the case was heard in Rome, the abbey were firmly in control of events, at times so much so that they were reprimanded for not giving St Stephen's the information the college needed to begin to be able to prepare answers to the citations.[51] Critically, the abbey's long-standing proctors were able to shape the case, to protest any documentation that potentially harmed the abbey's privileges and respond quickly as matters developed. In contrast, St Stephen's only engaged a Roman proctor in December 1381, and there is no suggestion that anyone from the college, let alone someone as important and high-flying as Brother William Colchester, was ever sent out to oversee the college's responses in the Curia.[52] Rather, William Sleaford had to answer in writing with imperfect information and to rely on two

---

[46] *Cal. Pap. Letters 1398-1404,* pp. 328-9.

[47] The annual pension of 5 marks (a reduction from £5) is in C 66/ 341 m 24; *CPR 1391-96*, p. 553.

[48] William Colchester, Nicholas Littlyngton, William Sudbury and John Burghwell all spent time at the Curia connected with this case.

[49] For Langham's career at Avignon see W. J. Dohar, 'Langham, Simon (*d.* 1376)', *ODNB.*

[50] The draft is probably from 1382-4 as it mentions that abbey temporalities had been seized, WAM 18473.

[51] The abbey had not caused the documents to be passed to the college, and in addition they had not been displayed in a public enough place, WAM Muniment Book 12 f. 56v; in the index of the documents it was noted that the first citation to Sleaford to appear in the case had been publicised at Rome and at Bruges, ibid, f. 31r; the implication is that it was deliberately not publicised in a way that was likely to reach St Stephen's.

[52] The proctor was Dionysus Topham, WAM 18435 f. 22 r; for Colchester's career, including that he was abbot of Westminster from 1386 to 1420 and that he was a royal ambassador on other business in 1391, see Pearce, *Monks of Westminster*, pp. 103-4; others involved as abbey proctors in the case were Peter Combe, John Borewell and John

sets of royal ambassadors for help and advocacy.[53] He forced the refinement of the abbey's case, but never really shifted the terms of engagement.[54] Part of this imbalance reflected Westminster Abbey's proud connection with the papacy, given its privileges meant that much ordinary business that would usually have been dealt with at a lower level of the court hierarchy was dealt with in Rome or by papal judge-delegates in England. It also reflected a pragmatic choice, given that the English courts would refuse to proceed once the college introduced the writ of *prohibitio*, and the papacy clearly did not acknowledge *prohibitio* as having any meaning in the Roman law, the Roman courts were the only place where the abbey could feel confident in the success of their case, to the point of having Peter Combe, monk and archdeacon of Westminster acting as executor in the case for the bishop actually supposed to hear the matter.[55]

In contrast, St Stephen's exploited its closeness to the king and its status as the king's household chapel when he was at Westminster to put forward its side of the case. The Westminster Chronicler is bitter in his condemnation of their greed and that 'they were watchfully and ruthlessly setting the king, the duke of Gloucester, Thomas [Arundel], archbishop of York and chancellor of England, and other noblemen against the monks'.[56] While only one of the college's petitions to Richard II and his council have survived, the resulting letters to Westminster Abbey have, and so the outlines of their competing narrative to the king can be traced.[57] Richard II wrote in March 1382 to Westminster Abbey holding them in contempt of royal authority as the college was only under the jurisdiction of the Lord Chancellor, and the case should have been begun there, and Rome should not have been used as the court of first instance.[58] This line of royal thinking had serious implications for St Stephen's ability to survive the papal penalties and obtain the favourable settlement of 1394. The college was able to have the abbey's lands taken into the king's hands from 17 April 1383 to 29 June 1384, according to the Westminster Chronicler.[59] At this time, the case was almost certainly contributing to the perception that royal authority was being undermined by appeals to Rome that led to the 1392 Statute of Praemunire.[60]

Lakenheth in WAM 18441.

[53] The two written responses that survive from Sleaford are WAM 18446 from March 1383 and probably from slightly earlier, his proposed agreement in WAM 18461; the abbey's case had not been contested in 1377 and thus won by default, WAM Muniment Book 12 f. 43v.

[54] For example, the written answers to the case in March 1383 are about details, such as whether the college's servants count as exempt and which costs they should pay, rather than about the principles of jurisdiction, WAM 18446.

[55] Combe acted as sub-executor for the bishop of Penna, WAM 18435 f. 1r.

[56] *Westminster Chronicle,* pp. 380-1; note that Thomas Arundel was only archbishop of York from 1388.

[57] The surviving letter bases St Stephen's defence on the privileges of the palace which are older than those of the abbey, the terms of the 1355 statutes, and its status as a royal free chapel, WAM 18465.

[58] WAM Muniment Book 12 f. 65r.

[59] *Westminster Chronicle,* pp. 38-9.

[60] Helmholz suggests that it was precisely this sort of failure in the writs of *prohibitio* that led to the two *praemunire* statutes

The college was able to financially hurt Westminster Abbey, while at the same time completely ignoring the equivalent papal penalties levied on them from 1377. St Stephen's seems to have seen the excommunication as a temporary irritation rather than anything else. It certainly did not induce them to accept the offered judgements to 1382, which asserted the abbey's jurisdiction and financial rights with very few concessions. Rather, St Stephen's was still insisting in 1383 that they be given jurisdiction over the entire palace.[61] Throughout this period, Richard II and his councillors appointed new canons to fill vacancies, and the chapel continued to be used for services, such as the 1388 service before the Merciless Parliament.[62] Royal authority was much closer and more immediate than that of the papacy, and St Stephen's claim on the king as patron allowed them to continue despite papal disapproval.

Royal favour and support was to be the key determining factor in the outcome of the case; it conditioned whether Westminster Abbey would be able to enforce their papal judgments or whether St Stephen's would be able to successfully resist capitulating. Both sides knew that they needed Richard II's favour and used strikingly similar language to court that favour with very different results. St Stephen's was able to build a language of royal patronage, of quiet exercise of their ancient rights within the king's palace that had been infringed by forces outside the palace walls in order to gain royal support successfully.[63] John Schepey, Michael de la Pole and John Burley were sent to Rome in 1381 to plead for the college, although they were identified as royal ambassadors and seem to have had no other links to St Stephen's.[64] Michael de la Pole and John Burley were both members of Richard II's household; Burley was a Garter Knight and de la Pole had been Richard's ambassador to the Holy Roman Empire the previous year and was to be seen as controversially close to Richard in the Wonderful Parliament of 1385.[65] John Shepey was dean of Lincoln, and also had extensive diplomatic experience, including to Avignon in 1373.[66] Even as St Stephen's was referred to by Richard's ambassadors to the Papal Curia as the chapel of 'the principal palace of the kingdom', the abbey too was using the language of royal dignity and the coronation to appeal to Richard.[67] It was a measure of how important royal favour was to the successful enforcement of the papal sentences, or to any favourable sentences for the monks. The abbey

---

of 1353 and 1392, Helmholz, *Canon Law and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction*, pp. 177-8.

[61] See particularly their counterproposal to the abbey's suggested settlement, WAM 18461.

[62] Froissart, *Chronicles,* iii, pp. 498-9; and discussed above in Chapter Three, p. 87; new canons were appointed in 1379, 1380, 1381, 1382, 1386, 1389, 1390, 1391, and 1392.

[63] For example, the justifications of St Stephen's seem to have been highly successful in persuading the king, WAM 18465.

[64] They occur first acting for the college in 1381, WAM 18457.

[65] For Burley, cf. 'BURLEY, John I (d. 1415/16), of Broncroft in Corvedale, Salop' in *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1386-1421*, eds. J.S. Roskell, Linda Clark and Carole Rawcliffe, (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1993); and for de la Pole see Anthony Tuck, 'Pole, Michael de la, first earl of Suffolk (*c*.1330–1389)', *ODNB.*

[66] For Shepey's career, see F. Donald Logan, 'Shepey, John (*d.* 1412)', *ODNB.*

wrote in an undated letter that it was the coronation church, the church of Edward the Confessor and so should have access to his mercy and favour in this matter.[68] Favour was forthcoming through Richard's building works at the abbey and his concern for Edward the Confessor's cult.[69] But this was not the case in relation to St Stephen's. Richard's consistent help and support in the case went to the college, and he never offered any help to the abbey in enforcing the papal citations and excommunication.[70] It was only absolved from excommunication at the very end of the case.[71] In contrast, when the abbey's temporalities were seized in 1381, the abbey immediately had to respond, and as the Westminster chronicler put it, 'the proceedings for their recovery were costly enough'.[72]

Conclusions

The case was an important one for both parties in order to clarify their rights and places within the ecclesiastical framework, but it was not the only thing occupying both houses. Patronage did not hinge on the latest twists and turns in the case; papal grants were still made to St Stephen's staff, such as the grant to William Scot that he might hold benefices despite being the illegitimate son of a priest in 1392, while Richard II was generous to Westminster Abbey in the 1380s and 1390s.[73] St Stephen's continued to celebrate divine service for the king's household and for its own members, while the abbey continued to be used as a source of diplomatic experience for royal embassies.[74] William Sleaford was in good enough standing with the abbey to ask to be buried there in 1396.[75] It also says much about the options open to ecclesiastical litigants both in the royal and papal courts, given the abbey's decisions to focus their efforts on first obtaining and then enforcing the papal judgments. Particularly interesting is the way that the writ of prohibition did not fully stop litigation but rather re-routed it from a case delegated to the abbey's appointees in England to a case heard by members of the Papal court, who might then be persuaded to delegate authority further to a monk of Westminster. The general view has been that *prohibitio* and *praemunire* charges carried real weight, but here they are seen to be ineffective.[76] When dealing with a wealthy house with strong links to the papacy such that it could go directly to the highest

---

[67] For the full Latin text, Perroy, *L'Angleterre et le Grand Schisme*, p. 403.

[68] WAM 18437.

[69] For example, Paul Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power, 1200-1400,* (New Haven: Yale, 1996).

[70] There are for example, no known orders to the sheriffs of Middlesex to enforce the excommunication or to sequester the college's goods.

[71] The absolution was copied into WAM Muniment Book 12 f. 85 v.

[72] *Westminster Chronicle,* p. 381.

[73] *Cal. Pap. Letters 1398-1404*, p. 446.

[74] For example, William Colchester in 1391, cf. *Monks of Westminster*, p. 104.

[75] Barbara Harvey, *Westminster Abbey and its Estates in the Middle Ages,* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), p. 379.

[76] For *prohibitio,* Helmholz, 'Writs of Citation and Ecclesiastical Sanctions in English Courts Christian,' *Minnesota Law*

court in Christendom, *prohibitio* and *praemunire* charges were blunt instruments. Once the case was being heard within the papal courts, it was difficult for the king and his ambassadors to intervene effectively unless using punishments in England to attempt to force compliance. However, this case also highlighted the extreme limitations of the papal system in enforcing its decisions without royal co-operation, which in this case was not forthcoming.[77] Once the agreement was finally reached, it was to be upheld faithfully by both parties, and the pension was certainly being paid in 1548, whatever irregularities lay between 1394 and 1548.[78]

Review 60 (1975), p. 1019; for *praemunire* see idem, *Canon Law and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction*, pp. 177-80.
[77] On wider question of enforcement, Helmholz, 'Writs of Citation,' p. 1031.
[78] WAM 18513.

Chapter Eight: St Stephen's College and the Wider World

This final chapter examines St Stephen's as an institution that had much wider connections and audiences than simply successive English kings and at the same time had a local existence in Westminster. St Stephen's has long been seen as largely separate from its urban and palatial contexts, yet its connections brought important resources to the college and provided it with wider significance beyond the palace. Despite its lack of the types of provision that historians have seen as important for lay communities, such as guilds, hospitals or almshouses, it was not closed away and separate from the institutions and individuals who surrounded it.[1] In addition, St Stephen's lacked the lay fraternity of the Garter, which gave St George's, Windsor its aristocratic patronage, and instead gathered support through pilgrimage and its position as the chief chapel in Westminster. Perhaps the largest grouping of individuals who came and went through the chapel were the members of the king's household when the king was at Westminster, where they joined the administrative staffs of the offices of state, the Chancery and Exchequer, that were permanently based there. Westminster has been well studied in terms of its urban functions, yet the role of the palace and of the king's administration in the town has largely been overlooked, as has the irregular presence of Parliament in Westminster Abbey and the palace.[2] Finally, and perhaps most interestingly, the governing figures of the Church were largely based near Westminster, with bishops' palaces and residences along the Strand, in London, and at Lambeth, as well as the Court of Arches in the City of London. St Stephen's then was convenient for the Church as well as the king and his administration. The college's relationships with its multiple audiences suggest ways to integrate these aspects of the town into a more complex picture of a busy, urban community with fluid boundaries and multiple overlapping allegiances, to the king and his palace, to the abbey as the major religious institution and landowner, and to St Stephen's within the palace.

---

[1] On guilds and hospitals, Miri Rubin, *Charity and Community in Medieval Cambridge*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Clive Burgess, 'Time and Place: The Late Medieval English Parish in Perspective,' in *The Parish Church in Medieval England,* ed. Clive Burgess & Eamon Duffy, (Donnington: Shaun Tyas, 2006), pp. 1-28.

[2] Both Rosser and Harvey look at the town through the lens of the abbey as primary landowner, Gervase Rosser, *Medieval Westminster,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989) and Barbara Harvey, *Westminster Abbey and its Estates in the Middle Ages,* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977); Merritt picks up the story when the abbey was re-founded as a college, Julia F. Merritt, *The Social World of Early Modern Westminster: Abbey, Court and Community 1525-1640* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005) and idem, 'The Cecils and Westminster 1558-1612,' in *Patronage, Culture and Power: The Early Cecils,* ed. Pauline Croft, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002), pp. 231-248; other work such as the various articles of Fiona Kisby, and the work of David Skinner has focussed on the musicians of the town, particularly Nicholas Ludford; Colvin covers much of the development of Westminster as a palace, *HKW,* i; and for the later period, Simon Thurley has written on Whitehall Palace's development in the mid-sixteenth century, *Whitehall Palace: An Architectural History of the Royal Apartments, 1240-1698,* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999); for Parliament see Alastair Hawkyard, 'From Painted Chamber to St Stephen's Chapel: The Meeting Places of the House of Commons to 1603,' *Parliamentary History* 21 (2003), pp. 62–84.

There are a number of historiographies that deal with Westminster as a place and an idea for the medieval and early modern periods because the area combined so many divergent and unstable functions, as well as being closely related to the City of London downriver. The work that has been directly done on Westminster has analysed the vill in terms of its oddly both rural and urban nature, of a manor of Westminster Abbey without its own autonomous town structures and as a lay community under the shadow of the abbey walls.[3] The other historiographies that are related to Westminster are those of the court, itinerant but often present at the palace throughout this period, and of royal administration and the law courts, which were based in the area even after the palace ceased to be a royal residence.[4] Finally, Parliament was customarily based in the area, with the House of Lords meeting in the palace itself and the Commons in the Chapter House of Westminster Abbey, unless circumstances demanded that Parliament be called elsewhere.[5] St Stephen's interacted with all these elements, whether directly, through its canons' work or as a venue for court events, or indirectly, through the incidental presence of those who came to experience the king's government and who later remembered it. St Stephen's also may have drawn visitors to the area, through the presence of the Scala Coeli indulgence from the late fifteenth century and the miracle-working image of the Virgin Mary in the oratory chapel of St Mary le Pew.[6] All of these connections help both to place St Stephen's at the heart of Westminster, and to assess more broadly the urban communities that surrounded the college.

St Stephen's and the Parish of St Margaret's Westminster

There is no question that the dominant institutional force in the manor of Westminster was the abbey. Its control came from owning the parish of St Margaret's as well as from its status as the largest landowner and as lord of the manor. Equally, the kings of England could and did exert influence on the

---

[3] Rosser, *Medieval Westminster*, pp. 1-3.

[4] Chris Given-Wilson, *The Royal Household and the King's Affinity: Service, Politics and Finance in England 1360-1413* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986) p. 2 where the *familia regis* and the court are roughly equated. More recent work on the medieval court comes from Ralph A. Griffiths, 'The King's Court during the Wars of the Roses: Continuities in an Age of Discontinuities,' in *Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age*, eds. Ronald G Asch and Adolf M. Birke, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991): 41-68. More generally, Malcolm Vale, *The Princely Court: Medieval Courts and Culture in Northwest Europe 1270-1380,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 16-7 on the itinerant court and household of this period. The court is a major theme for early modern historians; see particularly David Starkey et al, *The English Court from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, (London: Longman, 1987).

The major study of the administration based at Westminster remains T.F. Tout, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England*, 6 Vols. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1920-1933); studies of aspects of administration include Charles W. Smith 'Some Trends in the English Royal Chancery 1377-1483,' *Medieval Prosopography* 6 (1985), pp. 69-94; and Christine Carpenter, 'Henry VI and the Deskilling of the Royal Bureaucracy,' in *The Fifteenth Century IX: English and Continental Perspectives*, ed. Linda Clark, (Woodbridge, Boydell, 2010), pp. 1-37.

[5] Hawkyard, 'From Painted Chamber to St Stephen's,' pp. 62-3.

[6] C.L. Kingsford, 'Our Lady of the Pew. The King's Oratory or Closet in the Palace of Westminster,' *Archaeologia*, 68 (1917), p. 6.

vill, through their courts and administration, patronage and the sheer consumption of goods and services that the palace demanded year around. However, the itinerant court meant that direct personal royal influence was patchy. The administrative hubs and courts meant that the palace became much quieter when the law courts were not in session. This section looks at the ways in which St Stephen's, as an independent, but also royal, institution fitted into the life of the manor, in spiritual, liturgical and practical terms. Despite tensions, the college collaborated extensively with the abbey, and co-existed with it within the parish. The other ecclesiastical institutions, all hospitals, within the parish also had ties with St Stephen's. The chapel at times provided the music for the parochial celebrations of St Margaret's, Westminster, along with other important choirs from the vicinity. While the college's charitable efforts seem to have been less than those of the better-documented abbey almonry, it also offered some alms and help to those living in the surrounding town, particularly in the sixteenth century. In addition, the college was a landowner and involved, therefore, directly in the commercial and residential business of the townspeople. The town was not simply just something with which they had to engage because it too was part of the urban fabric. Almost all the evidence for St Stephen's interactions with the town comes from the sixteenth century when the parish accounts, wills and most crucially, rental lists for King Street and perhaps the entire manor survive. With this evidence it is possible to identify some aspects of the college's Westminster landholdings and its relationships with their neighbours and their tenants.

St Stephen's was tied into the manor of Westminster as a landowner. Around seventy-two households seem to have interacted with the college as their landlord at any one time, even if a few properties were standing empty. In 1548 the Westminster lands were worth £142 4s 8d annually, about 15% of the total income. This was considerably more than the London rents, which brought in £75 11s 8d each year before expenses.[7] For comparative purposes, the various offices of the abbey took in £271 per year between 1500 and 1530, so while St Stephen's could not compare with the its landholdings, it was still a significant landlord for the area, second only to the abbey itself.[8] Much of this land came from the Crown, in the grant of Edward III in 1356 of the site of the *hospicia* of the earl of Kent and then of the houses of the Wool Staple. Successive canons had left Westminster lands for their obits, such as the messuage worth 40s annually given for John Breche's obit in 1432.[9] In addition, the college probably invested the cash gifts from other obits and general oblations into Westminster tenements when possible. Not surprisingly, the college's landed property seem to have been concentrated around the southern end of King Street, and particularly around St Stephen's Alley and the site of the former

---

[7] SC 12/6/62.
[8] Rosser, *Medieval Westminster*, pp. 342-4.

hospicia, with another cluster across the road around Chequer Alley, which probably had been created by the college's own purchases.[10] In addition, in 1513, the abbey seems to have compiled a list, now badly damaged by damp, of all the properties in the manor. Although this does not identify the properties by street, it does seem to group them by location, as those beyond the bars are identified as are those in St Stephen's Alley. The properties identified as belonging to the college are mostly grouped together, with comments about the few without tenants, which confirms that the college's landholdings in Westminster were largely south of the bars and focussed around St Stephen's Alley and the college's own buildings.[11] St Stephen's also owned some tenements, such as stables, within the palace itself, which are not listed in the rentals, perhaps because they did not come under the secular jurisdiction of the abbey.[12]

St Stephen's was also part of the urban community through interactions with its tenants and other townsfolk. By the sixteenth century the college had a secular liberty of its own with significant judicial privileges, although this seems to have been built up by encroachment, rather than through any formal grant.[13] The college's own buildings and the housing occupied by the canons lay on Canon Row, cheek by jowl with properties leased out on St Stephen's Alley and King Street, as well as at the southern end with the Wool Staple and the various buildings of New Palace Yard.[14] St Stephen's tenants seem largely typical of those of the abbey as discussed by Rosser, with skilled urban professions such as masons, smiths and barbers.[15] The masons might well have earned their living on the ongoing works at the abbey and later Whitehall. Other tenants, such as the chandler John Attwell, or John Henbury, the college's bailiff for a time, held lands both of the college and the abbey.[16] There were also unnamed female tenants, for example, a widow and a flaxwife.[17] In the 1513 list four women are identified as 'of the college', Joan Ferrers, Agneta Hays, Elizabeth Mashfield and Elizabeth Quirk.[18] While it is not possible to identify whether any of these women was the flaxwife or widow of the c. 1508 rental, they were acting

---

[9] *CChR 1341-1417,* p. 133-4; for John Breche's obit, Cotton Faustina B VIII f. 15r.

[10] WAM 18599 f. 3.

[11] WAM 33308.

[12] The summary of 1360 included a chamber within the gate onto New Palace Yard, stables and the tenements within the Palace that used to belong to Roger de Heydon, the king's physician, as well as the house of the earl of Kent, *CChR 1341-1417,* pp. 133-4; none of these appear in the abbey muniments' lists.
The most recent attempt to clarify the topography is John Crook, 'An Introduction to the Topography of the Medieval Palace of Westminster,' in *Westminster II: The Art, Architecture and Archaeology of the Royal Palace*, eds. Warwick Rodwell & Tim Tatton-Brown, (Leeds: the British Archaeological Association, 2016), pp. 1-21.

[13] KB 9/537 and KB 9/ 554; my thanks to Simon Neal for drawing these to my attention.

[14] For discussion of the canons' and vicars' housing see Chapter One, p. 36.

[15] Rosser *Medieval Westminster*, p. 120.

[16] Ibid*,* pp. 368-9 for Attwell; and C 1/517/57 for John Henbury; my thanks to Simon Neal for the reference and transcription of this case.

[17] WAM 18599.

[18] WAM 33308.

as the heads of their households and interacting as tenants with the college's officers. The college also owned an interest in 'le Holewetauerne', a tavern to the south of the palace, granted to it by Robert Elmham for his obit in 1373.[19] Thus, like the abbey, St Stephen's directly benefited from the commercial activity of the multiplicity of taverns and inns in Westminster. The inn also fulfilled local functions. For example in 1525, the coroner of the college's liberty, Thomas Roberts, held an inquest there into the murder of Lawrence Tappe, who died at Westminster although he had been stabbed in Southwark.[20] It may be that Tappe had sought shelter at St Stephen's and thus the inquest fell within the college's jurisdiction, or it may simply have been that this was the most convenient location for this particular inquest. The jury assembled were local Westminster men rather than the college's own servants, such as the warden of St Cornelius' Guild, William Combe.[21]

In addition to leasing tenements to local residents, the college employed laymen, who were integrated into the life of St Margaret's parish and at times offered services to the local population. Some of the staff leased houses from the college in the town, making them neighbours within the community. For example, the composer Nicholas Ludford and some of the singingmen of the college are known to have occupied houses owned by the college in Longwolstable Street, probably through most of the 1530s and 1540s.[22] Ludford himself was churchwarden; John Coke, the sexton of the chapel in the 1520s, was also a tailor and appears in the churchwardens' accounts, suggesting that the college was drawing easily on pools of semi-casual labour for the intermittent need for a sexton, given that the chapel saw few burials.[23] Philip Lentall, who made up rentals for the college in the 1540s, was a churchwarden of St Margaret's 1528-30, and cousin to Henry Lentall, the valet of the abbey.[24] After 1547, the almshouses endowed by John Chambre provided employment in Westminster for Robert Derker as gatekeeper, but also houses, livery and a small pension for eight bedesmen, probably originally tenants or neighbours of the college although John Massy also seems also to have been part of the royal household.[25] One of the almspeople, Margaret Chaderton, had held lands earlier that were in dispute with John Chambre.[26]

---

[19] BL Harley Ch. 46 E 26.
[20] KB 9/497; my thanks to Simon Neal for the reference.
[21] Rosser, *Medieval Westminster*, p. 374.
[22] David Skinner & Nicholas Caldwell, '"At the Mynde of Nicholas Ludford,": New Light on Ludford from the Churchwarden's Accounts of St Margaret's, Westminster,' *Early Music* 22 (1995), pp. 400 and 403.
[23] Fiona Kisby, 'Music and Musicians of early Tudor Westminster,' *Early Music* 23 (1995) p. 231.
[24] Rosser, *Medieval Westminster,* pp. 386-7.
[25] For Massy's wages at Christmas 1545, *L & P Henry VIII 1545 Part 2*, no. 1035 at p. 517; for the names of the beadsmen, *Chantry Certificate,* p. 79.
[26] For example, see the case in the 1530s between an Edmund Chaderton and John Chambre over evidences for lands originally belonging to Margaret Chaderton, which had come into Chambre's hands. It is also possible that Margaret was related to Edmund Chaderton, canon of St Stephen's, who died in 1499, C 1/967/8; my thanks to Simon Neal for his transcription of this case.

As well as providing employment, the college or some of its employees may at times have operated a school. When St Mary le Pew burned in 1452, it was because of carelessness with fire by schoolboys.[27] Since this is the only known reference to a school, it is hard to know how organised it was or indeed whose children it was educating. Given the seemingly ad hoc nature of the school and that it was run by a clerk of the college, who presumably lived in the town, it seems reasonable to suggest that it was educating the sons of the town as well as the choristers of the college itself. In this, it would have paralleled the small school within the abbey that was eventually to develop into the formal school re-founded by Elizabeth I.[28]

The vicars and clerks of the college are most clearly recorded in the early sixteenth century through their links to the commercial world of Westminster. Clerks and vicars were not appointed by the king, but rather by the college and seem to have been more transient than the canons.[29] They also seem to have lived in the town since there was no housing specifically set aside for them, and as discussed above, some of them appear renting houses from the college itself.[30] The best evidence comes from their Westminster activity, particularly their mobility and immersion in a musical world that took in the choirs at St Margaret's and in the abbey's Lady Chapel as well as St Stephen's. John Fuller in the 1520s moved from being a singingman in the Chapel Royal to St Stephen's, and at some point before 1535 Henry Meddows went from being a clerk at St Stephen's to being a chantry priest at St Margaret's, probably for better pay.[31] Nicholas Ludford's twenty years at the college followed an earlier composer-verger there, John Bedyngham.[32] There seems to have been a settled, well-connected community of musicians within Westminster, who moved easily between various employment opportunities including major noble households such as Margaret Beaufort's before 1509, or from 1515 onwards, that of Cardinal Wolsey at York Place.[33] Fiona Kisby's work on the overlapping, intertwined musical networks that stretched from the court to Westminster and beyond to London and the great noble households as well as the elite colleges of Eton, Fotheringhay and Tattershall, deals with St Stephen's only through the careers of the

---

[27] Kingsford, 'Our Lady of the Pew', pp. 10-11; the author of the account was John Pygott and the transcription of this episode is in Kingsford, *English Historical Literature of the Fifteenth Century*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), pp. 372-3.
[28] Rosser, *Medieval Westminster*, p. 207.
[29] Chapter Six, pp. 160-3.
[30] Above, p. 199.
[31] Kisby, 'Music of Tudor Westminster', pp. 226 and p. 236.
[32] Skinner & Caldwell, 'At the Mynde of Ludford', p. 395.
[33] Kisby, 'Office and Office Holding at the English Court: A Study of the Chapel Royal 1485-1547', *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle* 32 (1999) p. 14.

canons who moved easily between these worlds.[34] Perhaps because such employment was transient and because St Stephen's own records are lost, Kisby was unable to link the majority of St Stephen's vicars, clerks or singing men to these richly interconnected networks. St Stephen's choir sung in St Margaret's, collaborated with the abbey and was musically prestigious. Thus, it seems likely that the loss of the internal St Stephen's evidence makes it difficult to see more than isolated movements between ecclesiastical and musical institutions. In all likelihood, musical employment was a complicated, shifting pattern of temporary, ad-hoc jobs as and when singers were required. A pattern, moreover, which occurred against a background of a community that all knew each other and had worked with each other in various locations.

Not all the contacts, however, between St Stephen's and their tenants and neighbours were amicable. In the 1520s three cases were brought in Chancery in relation to St Stephen's and Westminster. First, the college suffered from the unpleasant effects of beer-brewing in their vicinity and complained to the king's courts that they were being made ill by the fumes and stench that Richard Taylor allowed to escape his workings in his tenement in the vicinity of Canon Row.[35] As the court record discussed discharge of brewing waste materials into the Thames, this house was probably at the northern end of Canon Row, and one of the properties leased out by the college. The college also alleged that the house was unrepaired and roofless, thus causing damage to the canons' own houses, and that his large dogs barked day and night. In turn, local residents complained about the college's failures to maintain the Clowson stream and its walls.[36] The Clowson by this point seems to have been ditched in, and generally unpleasant, but it ran through the college's main landholdings just to the north of the palace. The college and John Chambre as dean were taken to court by the local jury for failure to repair the sluice and gutters along King Street because when the Thames flooded, so too did King Street via this open drain.[37] The college's bailiff for Westminster, John Henbury, himself a powerful figure and keeper of the Red Lion tavern, complained in Chancery about the problems of collecting rents, having stood surety for £200 in rents, then ended up embroiled in disputes where even the amount still owed to the college was uncertain but seems to have been between £50 and £80.[38] The college had fired him as bailiff for not successfully collecting the money that it was owed. His local connection, John Pomfret, who had been

---

[34] Kisby, 'A Mirror of Monarchy: Music and Musicians in the Household Chapel of the Lady Margaret Beaufort, Mother of Henry VII,' *Early Music History* 16 (1997), p. 220 for Christopher Urswick.

[35] KB 9/ 497; my thanks to Simon Neal for bringing all these cases to my attention.

[36] KB 9/ 508.

[37] KB 9/501/1 and KB 9/508.

[38] The case is C 1/517/57; it gives his status as a tenant of Westminster Abbey as well as his tale of woe regarding St Stephen's College; see also Rosser, *Medieval Westminster,* pp. 127-8.

his surety for this amount had him thrown in prison for debt and added charges to those pursued by the college. All three of these cases show the potential problems of living in a crowded urban environment where tenants came and went, and where commercial activity lay side by side with large and affluent residences. It also shows St Stephen's as an institution concerned for its revenues, with responsibilities to the community at large and as a part of the bustling Westminster commercial world.

Some ties between Westminster Abbey and the college were purely financial and administrative, yet important in maintaining regular low-level contact between the two houses. St Stephen's paid a yearly pension to the monks after 1394 to recompense them for some of the fees that the chapel received that the abbey believed should have belonged to them.[39] The five mark pension was a token amount, but it represented an acknowledgement that St Stephen's existed within, not outside, St Margaret's parish. However sporadic the payments were, the abbey's officers also received parts of the offerings given at St Stephen's, unless the king was present in person in the chapel.[40] In the sixteenth century, the money was not being recorded in the abbey records, but after the dissolution of 1548, the dean of Westminster had to send many letters pleading for the money due to it from St Stephen's, as the Court of Augmentations was then responsible for the payments.[41] In addition, each new canon after 1395 was supposed to swear to uphold the agreement of jurisdiction and the abbey recorded that the canon had done so with care in its muniment book for the first fifteen years of the agreement.[42] After this point, the canons probably still did swear the oath agreeing to the 1394 agreement, but for whatever reason, it was not recorded systematically.[43] This reminder of the subordinate status of the college was in turn reflected in ceremonial action. As a symbol of the abbey's jurisdictional rights over the college, the abbot installed the dean of the college, which acted as a formal reminder of the lines of spiritual authority claimed by the abbey.[44] It would have been possible for the abbey to disrupt the smooth transition from dean to dean; yet it never seems to have impeded the orderly workings of St Stephen's through that power.

There is also evidence of larger collaboration between the institutions, usually when the college's personnel were drafted into royal celebrations at the abbey. It is noteworthy, however, that St Stephen's choir sung for both St Margaret's and for the guilds on different occasions.[45] Canons were also involved

---

[39] C 66/ 341 m. 24; *CPR 1391-96*, p. 553.
[40] WAM 18431.
[41] WAM 18513-14B and 18515-18.
[42] Until 1409, WAM Muniment Book 12 ff. 86r-87v.
[43] For the 1394 agreement see Chapter Seven, pp. 185-6.
[44] As agreed in 1394 in C 66/ 341 m. 24; *CPR 1391-96*, p. 553.
[45]' Kisby, 'Music of Tudor Westminster,' pp. 226 and 231.

with the other local ecclesiastical institutions. The hospitals of St James, St Katherine, and St Mary Rounceval also sat within the parish, and thus also had to interact with the abbey, at times contentiously.[46] Canons of St Stephen's (for example Thomas Orgrave at St Katherine's in the 1380s) were often absentee masters of these houses.[47] Most of the time, however, they too shared liturgical and spiritual life with both the abbey and with St Stephen's, the largest chantry organisation in the parish and the one most closely affiliated with the court.[48] Although the evidence base for the local ecclesiastical institutions other than the abbey is slight, we need to understand them as interacting, interrelated institutions. The only time that this type of co-operation with the abbey was explicitly mentioned is in the text reprinted from a Cotton manuscript by Leland concerning Henry VII's first progress in 1486. It says that the king was met at the water gate at Westminster by a combined procession of abbey monks and personnel of St Stephen's who then accompanied him and his entourage to the abbey for a service of thanksgiving.[49] While there are no explicit directions in the coronation ordo, the *Liber Regalis*, for incorporating St Stephen's as an institution into the coronation proceedings, the ordo does assume that any available musicians and singers would be used by the Chapel Royal to add to the abbey's own preparations as the coronation church.[50] Perhaps the closest collaboration came from 1540 onwards when Thomas Thirlby was made bishop of the new diocese of Westminster with the abbey as his cathedral and the archdeaconry became formalised as separate from London within the Church of England.[51] Thirlby was a former canon of St Stephen's, and he may have relied on St Stephen's to be sympathetic to his type of cautious magisterial reform. In 1547 royal visitation injunctions to his diocese ordered the local clergy to attend the sermon at St Stephen's on Sundays, tying St Stephen's directly into the dissemination of religious information in the manor.[52]

The various links between Westminster-area institutions were considerably strengthened in the sixteenth century when Henry VII reprised major building works in the abbey and drafted in surrounding institutions to help finance and oversee the work. First in 1503 the college of St Martin le Grand in the Strand was considerably reduced and its revenues allocated to Westminster Abbey for the building of Henry's Lady Chapel and then the maintenance of obits for Henry and his family. St Martin le Grand and St Stephen's had a history of overlapping staff, and both were bases for royal servants working in

---

[46] Rosser, *Medieval Westminster*, pp. 306-7.
[47] Ibid, p. 307.
[48] Kisby, 'Music of Tudor Westminster,' pp. 223-242.
[49] Leland, *Collectanea*, iv, p. 202.
[50] *Liber Regalis, seu, Ordo consecrandi regem solum. Ordo consecrandi reginam cum rege. Ordo consecrandi reginam solam. Rubrica de regis exequiis. E codice Westmonasteriensi editus*, ed. W.H. Bliss, (London: Roxburghe Club, 1870).
[51] For Thirlby see C. S. Knighton, 'Thirlby, Thomas (*c*.1500–1570),' *ODNB*.
[52] See Chapter Four, pp. 116-17.

London and Westminster. At the time of the dissolution of St Martin le Grand, none of the canons there appear to have also been canons at St Stephen's, so there were no direct repercussions for St Stephen's staff.[53] In addition, Henry VII created an elaborate system of indentures to ensure that the work was carried out as he wished. As part of a series of obligations, other institutions, including St Stephen's, were made responsible for monitoring the abbey's performance of the chantry and the administration of the almshouses of the new foundation, in a seven-part indenture.[54] If the City of London failed to ensure that the chantry was kept, St Stephen's would receive the fine and be responsible for the performance of the chantry; if St Stephen's failed, then St Paul's, London was next on a list that moved gradually further away from London and Westminster to Winchester Cathedral and then Canterbury Cathedral.[55] St Stephen's was an obvious choice because Thomas Hobbes, the then dean, was a royal councillor, and the college stood immediately next door.[56] The dean and canons could easily attend, as they would have to do, the annual celebration of Elizabeth of York's obit from 1504 and then Henry VII's after his death in 1509.[57] In addition, St Stephen's was one of the twenty ecclesiastical institutions, including St George's and other favoured royal ones such as St Mary Graces and the two universities of Oxford and Cambridge, where so-called foreign obits were created. These obits were overseen and paid for by the abbey as well as a yearly mass for Henry and Elizabeth at those institutions and the constant commemoration in the new Lady Chapel itself.[58] Thus, St Stephen's both made sure that the monks of Westminster upheld their obligations and contributed to those obligations through their own provision of prayer. Payments now went back and forth between the two houses as each made sure that the other was discharging their duties correctly.

St Stephen's also contributed to the religious and commemorative life of the parish of Westminster. The image of Our Lady of the Pew received lay donations and bequests as a pilgrimage site, particularly from 1476 to c. 1509 as the only English example of the Scala Coeli indulgence, which was attached to the chapel of St Mary le Pew in Westminster Palace.[59] Gifts to obtain the benefits of Scala Coeli were very common in the surviving wills of Westminster residents, and indeed elsewhere. Richard Hall in 1506 was clearly ensuring that all possibilities for salvation were explored when he asked for masses at all of the major churches within the parish in addition to burial at St Margaret's. Hall wanted masses said for him

---

[53] 'St Martin le Grand,' pp. 555-566.
[54] St Stephen's copy of this indenture is BL Additional MS 2112.
[55] Margaret Condon, 'God Save the King! Piety, Propaganda and the Perpetual Memorial,' in *Westminster Abbey: The Lady Chapel of Henry VII,* eds. Tim Tatton-Brown & Richard Mortimer, (Woodbridge Boydell & Brewer, 2003), p. 78.
[56] Ibid, p. 79.
[57] Ibid, p. 83.
[58] St Stephen's was to receive 100 s yearly for the obit, ibid, p. 81.
[59] *Cal. Pap. Letters 1471-84*, p. 498.

in St Mary le Pew at Scala Coeli Westminster Abbey, and St Mary Rounceval.[60] Robert Stowell, the chief of the abbey masons, had asked for a trental at Scala Coeli the year before.[61] Canons also took advantage of the Scala Coeli indulgence, including Richard Grene in 1480, making it perhaps the most popular service the college offered in these years.[62] Beyond Westminster, in 1494 a London widow, Pernell Rogers, left money for masses for her soul at Scala Coeli in Rome, or if it was to prove impossible, at St Mary le Pew.[63] After c. 1509, when the abbey obtained its own Scala Coeli indulgence thanks to Henry VII and his mother, laypeople seem to have largely abandoned St Stephen's although at times the evidence is ambiguous.[64] William More of London in 1520 describes the Scala Coeli altar as being in the 'Chapell of the Pewe before our Lady next St Edward chapel', which shows confusion between St Mary le Pew in the palace and the Lady Chapel in Westminster Abbey.[65] Consolidating prayers for one's soul in Purgatory in a place of high spiritual benefit might make more sense than spreading them out across Westminster although some doubt about the effectiveness of such indulgences persisted. The wealthiest individuals continued to ask for trentals at the original S. Maria Scala Coeli, probably seeing it as a more certain help than those offered by the imitators in Westminster. Despite asking for burial in the walls of the abbey, in 1511 the well-to-do brewer William Baynard also asked for a trental to be said in Rome.[66]

Wills from St Margaret's parish show the college was a valued part of the local community. Because of the nature of St Stephen's ecclesiastical status, as a free chapel within St Margaret's parish, it never received the types of gifts that St Margaret's itself did: money for the work of rebuilding in the 1510s and 1520s, tithe payments, burial payments and gifts to the guilds housed there. No wills from the parish registers record requests to be buried at St Stephen's, although both the abbey and St Mary Rounceval were mentioned as desirable burial places.[67] The only known burial not of a member of the college comes from 1473, when Walter Metyngham, citizen and freeman of London, requested burial in the lower chapel next to that of William Kirton, the former verger.[68] In 1510 William Cooper, a local priest, wanted a trental of masses said at St Mary le Pew, but also wanted £20 to be divided among the vicars.[69] A few townsfolk also left small items to the chapel in this period, such as the cloth of diaperwork left to

---

[60] London, Westminster City Archives, PCW Wyks, p. 68.
[61] Rosser, *Medieval Westminster*, p. 264; PCW Wyks p. 43.
[62] Cotton Faustina B VIII ff. 43-4.
[63] Kingsford, 'Our Lady of the Pew' p. 13.
[64] Nigel Morgan, 'The Scala Coeli Indulgence and the Royal Chapels,' in *The Reign of Henry VII,* ed. Benjamin Thompson, (Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1995)*,* pp. 93-101.
[65] PROB 11/ 20/118.
[66] PCW Wyks, p. 68.
[67] PCW Wyks, p. 46.
[68] *CCR 1467-76*, 358.
[69] PCW Wyks, pp. 117-8.

the vicars by Richard Wilson in 1506. Wilson also used canons John Sparrow and Edmund Carter as his executors.[70] Joanna Baker's will mentioned William Oldham, one of the college's chantry priests, as a friend and legatee.[71] Property could also be passed through this means; John Gybbys' 1517 will disposed of lands he held of the dean and college by inheritance from John Coke (perhaps the St Stephen's sexton of that name).[72] Edward Bowes, a local priest, in 1506 named the canon Richard Hatton his sole executor.[73] At times, influential court groupings appear as witnesses to wills, such as one including canons William Atwater and John Chambre who witnessed the will of Sir Hugh Denys, himself an important courtier under Henry VII and the treasurer of the Privy Chamber.[74] In the sixteenth century, Canon Richard Wolman's will left money to William Jennings, about to be churchwarden of St Margaret's and master of the Rounceval guild.[75] Canon Robert Bishop's executors in 1517 were Thomas Brightman, his wife Joanna and the college's sexton, John Coke.[76] Thomas Brightman held land in Endive Lane in 1520, and was one of those removed from their abbey tenements to allow for the expansion of York Place by Wolsey.[77] His lands thus lay just north of the college's own lands in Canon Row and St Stephen's Alley.

Canons and vicars in their turn also had local connections in their wills, including to Westminster Abbey. Henry Merston in the 1420s founded a chantry within the abbey as well as an obit at St Stephen's, where he was buried in 1443.[78] His will spoke both of his fellow canons and other benefices, but also of his 'fellow brother monks' in Westminster.[79] Other canons are known to have sought burial in Westminster Abbey: John Blockeley, Robert Elmham, Richard Chesterfield and Thomas Bonyfaunt.[80] Of these all but Bonyfaunt also endowed obits at St Stephen's.[81] The most extreme example of personal ties to both St Stephen's and the abbey was that of Master John Stokes, who entered the abbey as a novice in the early fifteenth century and left it in the financial year 1421/2 before returning in 1436/7. He was at the same time from 1441 a monk of the abbey, prothonotary of Chancery and a canon of St Stephen's to his death in 1450.[82] The political and personal complexities of canons' ties in Westminster can be seen in the 1494

---

[70] PCW Wyks pp. 58-9.
[71] PCW Wyks, p. 40.
[72] PCW Wyks, p. 258.
[73] PCW Wyks, p. 70.
[74] PCW Wyks p. 173.
[75] PROB 11/27/ 113; for Jennings see Rosser, *Medieval Westminster*, p. 383.
[76] referenced in C 1/466/8.
[77] The 1520 indenture recording payment to Brightman and his wife for their land there is given in E 40/1526.
[78] Rosser, *Medieval Westminster,* p. 89.
[79] PROB 11/3/122.
[80] Harvey, *Westminster Abbey,* pp. 378, 380 and 382.
[81] See Table 9.
[82] Pearce, *Monks of Westminster,* p. 133.

will of Thomas Barrow, which sums up the many ways in which he was involved with the wider parish. His will is unusually detailed to deal with his extensive family connections, his lands and multiple preferments, but in the final gift section his multiple connections to the diverse facets of Westminster are very clear.[83] There are gifts to his patron, Sir Robert Dymoke, and other courtiers such as Sir William Tunstall and Sir James Tyrell, the son of the attained Sir James Tyrell, all Yorkist sympathisers. [84] There was also a gift to the gentry lawyer and attorney general under Richard III, Morgan Kidwelly, a sign of connections to the administrative and court business of Westminster. Interestingly since Barrow was appointed to the college in 1483 by Richard III, his Ricardian connections continued to the end of his life although they did not affect his continuing royal service to Henry VII.[85] Although it has not been possible to track all of the individuals, and some at least were connected to his other property near his family in Wiltshire, Thomas Bough of Westminster can be certainly identified. Bough was a prominent Westminster citizen, as well as a royal officer as gentleman usher of the Exchequer and was involved with the Assumption guild as warden and then master.[86]

The depth of St Stephen's entanglement with the manor of Westminster and the problems that this could cause is best seen in the later years of Henry VIII, when in 1538 and then 1543 the king was attempting to curtail the liberty that the college enjoyed in Westminster, which gave it wide judicial rights in the vill over their own tenants.[87] These sixteenth-century claims seem to have been based on the rights granted by Edward III in relation to jurisdiction. The college developed the fourteenth-century immunities into a free-standing peculiar fully judicially separate from both the king's jurisdiction of the Marshalsea and the abbey's manorial jurisdiction.[88] While there is no surviving evidence for these rights actually being exercised, it is a reminder that in the sixteenth century at least, the college could influence the lives of the around seventy-two households, and the perhaps 270 people who lived in those households in extensive ways.[89] Beyond the tenants, the college offered spiritual services and music to

[83] PROB 11/11/672.
[84] For Robert Dymoke see Anthony J. Musson, 'Dymoke family (*per. c.*1340–*c.*1580)', *ODNB*; and for James Tyrell see Rosemary Horrox, 'Tyrell, Sir James (c.1455–1502)', *ODNB;* for Kidwelly, see Rosemary Horrox, *Richard III: A Life in Service* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 210; also note there had been a connection in Welsh affairs between Kidwelly and James Tyrell's father.
[85] *CPR 1476-85*, p. 366; Barrow was also chancellor to Richard III, see Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 139 for his move into Chancery in 1483 along with his prebend.
[86] Rosser, *Medieval Westminster*, p. 371.
[87] KB 9/ 537 and then KB 9/554; there is no record of the resolution of this case. My thanks to Simon Neal for his transcription of this case.
[88] Edward III's charter granted exemptions from taxation and some exemption from courts, particularly that they could not be sued in any other court than the Chancellors' own, they were also free from purveyance and forest law. This did not necessarily mean the right to land tenure in the way that it was being interpreted in the sixteenth century, *CChR 1341-1417,* pp. 133-4.
[89] WAM 33308.

the manor, was embroiled in the constant battles to maintain the urban fabric and the infrastructure of the area and employed locals in a surprising variety of roles. It is also worth remembering that canons of St Stephen's were also at times semi-absentee masters of the local hospitals, such as St Mary Rounceval and St James, responsible, if at times indifferently, for some of the charitable provision within the parish and thus in theory engaged with the needs of the urban community.[90] In all of these ways, the college looks rather like a smaller, more fragmented version of Westminster Abbey: an active, engaged and at times quarrelsome part of a crowded urban environment where religious and secular obligations overlapped. Rather than simply being part of a royal palace that was rather distant from the town as whole, St Stephen's by necessity and design was engaged with the urban fabric, and not just the court, to which we now turn.

St Stephen's and the Court

As the principal chapel for the entirety of the Palace of Westminster, St Stephen's was used by the court when the king's household was present and by those visiting the permanent parts of royal administration housed at Westminster. Thus, at St Stephen's it is possible to see the court at its fullest extent as the collection of governing institutions of England, including the king as well as the institutions and individuals that surrounded him. The identity of St Stephen's Chapel as a palace chapel was never wholly lost in its secondary identity as a collegiate chapel. Members of the household knew it as the place used for royal liturgical ceremonial such as crown-wearings, and also as the chapel they too worshiped at. In addition, St Stephen's was used as a venue by the king and his council in the fifteenth century, reinforcing St Stephen's institutional connections to the royal administration that surrounded it. Those connections extended beyond those discussed in Chapter Five, the individual associations of the canons to the household and administration that usually employed them, although those connections contributed to the importance of the college.[91] The court's presence at Westminster and the canons' connections within that court world brought benefactions to the chapel, although never quite on the scale that the Garter brought rewards to St George's. These benefactions and other incidental mentions of St Stephen's within the life of the king's household and court provide the best evidence for engagement with the college by these men and women beyond their shared spaces.[92] St Stephen's was never just a royal chapel, but rather one that sat within overlapping layers of engagement by nobles, members of the household, and those who were visiting the king's court or his law courts.

---

[90] Rosser, *Medieval Westminster*, pp. 306-7.
[91] Above, pp. 140-9.
[92] See Introduction, pp. 17-18.

St Stephen's can be associated with the same type of noble patronage as has been seen at its sister-college. From 1349, the Order of the Garter brought patronage and aristocratic support to St George's, Windsor, not least through the mandated alms both on St George's day and on the deaths of members. St George's College played an important role in the religious life of the nobles associated with it yearly through the Garter.[93] It was also imitated; founder knights were inspired by Windsor to found new chantries on similar lines.[94] Others have looked at the ways in which the Garter became the mark of political distinction for the nobility as well as a fighting force for the Hundred Years' War.[95] For the canons and knights at Windsor, displaying their association with and patronage of St George's marked them as part of the royal military elite. There was only one Garter celebration at Westminster and yet St Stephen's was also remembered by some members of the order in their religious lives.[96] St Stephen's was the chapel of their working lives as a part of the court at Westminster, as the usual venue for Parliaments and the chapel closest to the administrative offices and law courts. Thus, occasional references to court activity and the few obits documented in the college's surviving records probably conceal a great deal more activity at St Stephen's. Of the three known magnates who left significant gifts to the chapel for their obits or who sponsored considerable works there, two were knights of the Garter. Walter, lord Hungerford of Hungerford in the 1420s left London lands to the college for his obit.[97] Slightly later, Ralph, lord Cromwell, who used St Stephen's as a model for his collegiate foundation at Tattershall, also seems to have given generously at Westminster as the canons of St Stephen's themselves endowed an obit for him 'as if a founder' because of his gifts to them.[98] The form of those gifts is unfortunately unknown, but he may have been involved in their acquisition of new lands at this point.[99] The final fifteenth-century magnate benefactor was Anthony Woodville, lord Rivers. Rivers asked to be buried in St Mary le Pew, although that request was denied because of his execution at Pontefract, but he may have helped to rebuild that chapel after a devastating fire and obtained for the college the Scala Coeli indulgence, the earliest known such in England.[100] He too received an obit at the college.[101] Hungerford and Cromwell were both significant politicians, and also treasurers of England, thus based in

[93] Hugh E. I. Collins, *The Order of the Garter 1348-1461: Chivalry and Politics in Late Medieval England*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), pp. 25-6 on the statutes' requirement that the knights provide masses.

[94] Clive Burgess, 'An Institution for All Seasons: The Late Medieval English College' in *The Late Medieval English College and its Context,* eds. Clive Burgess & Martin Heale, (York: York Medieval Press, 2008), p. 21.

[95] Collins, *Order of the Garter,* p. 20; the idea of the Garter as a tournament company comes from Juliet Vale, *Edward III and Chivalry: Chivalric Society and Its Context, 1270-1350,* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1982).

[96] 'the king kept a chapter of the Order of the Garter at Westminster' in 1489, Leland, *Collectanea,* iv, p. 248.

[97] BL Cotton MS Faustina B VIII ff. 11-12r.

[98] Cotton Faustina B VIII f. 27r.

[99] See Chapter Two, p. 60.

[100] *Cal. Pap. Letters 1471-84,* p. 498; Chapter Three, p. 77.

Westminster. Rivers' major political role was as governor to the future Edward V, and it is unclear how he became involved at St Stephen's, other than perhaps Edward IV's personal interest in the sister chapel to St George's, and his use of St Stephen's for marriages and baptisms, as discussed in Chapter Three.[102]

St Stephen's was also accessible to members of the court as well as to the royal family as a space for dynastic and political action, in which members of the household might be actors as well as spectators. The chapel was not the largest venue, holding about eighty people in its nave, and possibly more in the lower chapel.[103] It was not solely reserved to the royal family, but indeed was used for a range of political functions, from displaying the king's approbation of events, to council meetings and judicial business. Chroniclers mentioned a few such examples, usually the most interesting and important. The earliest known such usage was in 1352 when the count of Zeeland married Maud of Lancaster in 'the king's chapel at Westminster,' possibly St Stephen's or St Stephen's by the Receipt, both of which were under the control of St Stephen's College.[104] This choice was both a statement of dynastic success for the Lancastrian family, and also an important diplomatic move since William of Zeeland was a potential ally in the English campaigns in northern France.[105] The chapel was also used for secular political events and meetings. In 1446 orders from Henry VI's council concerning a clerical tenth were issued from its meeting place in St Stephen's Chapel.[106] Why the council met in here specifically is not clear, unless it was meant to show the unity of Church and Crown at this point. Clerical taxation was under the control of the two convocations, of the two dioceses of Canterbury and York, and so theoretically solely a church matter, even if in practice it was driven by the king's demands. By using the chapel, the council, including several bishops, was asserting that their actions both came both officially from the king, and were sanctioned by the church hierarchy through their meeting place. This usage differed from that in 1441, when the bishops had met in the chapel as a demonstration of royal and episcopal unity in a deeply ambiguous trial.

The episode that most clearly shows St Stephen's as deeply intertwined with the court politics that surrounded it is the 1441 trial of Eleanor Cobham, duchess of Gloucester for treasonable necromancy.[107]

---

[101] BL Cotton MS Faustina B VIII f. 4v.

[102] Above, pp. 88-9.

[103] Leland, *Collectanea*, iv, pp. 228.

[104] *Knighton's Chronicle 1337-1396*, ed. and trans. G. H. Martin, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 112.

[105] W. Mark Ormrod, *Edward III,* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), pp. 438-9.

[106] Reg. Stafford and Kemp, ii, p. 168.

[107] Ralph A. Griffiths, 'The Trial of Eleanor Cobham,' in idem. *King and Country: England and Wales in the Fifteenth Century* (London: Hambleton Press, 1991), pp. 233-52; most of what follows is based on Griffith's account, as it is the best summary of the case in its political contexts, in addition Nolan and Carey deal with aspects of this case, its literary

The trial not only directly concerned the college, as one of the canons was accused of conspiring with the duchess to kill Henry VI, but also because the archbishop of Canterbury with other bishops and the Privy Council heard the case in the chapel itself.[108] The conventional reading of this episode is still that of the Tudor historians, who saw it as a woman behaving badly as well as a first political assault on Eleanor's husband, Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, who was Henry VI's nearest relative and putative heir.[109] Gloucester was disgraced in the following year, in part because of the scandal. Yet beyond the political and literary approaches to this under-studied witchcraft trial, there are interesting intersections between St Stephen's and the royal court, the legal world which could not easily deal with Eleanor's status as a peeress without strong family support of her own and the audiences of royal justice. From the indictments alone, the case was an extraordinary one. Eleanor's four associates were first accused of conspiring with her to kill the king through necromancy and black masses. These associates were Thomas Southwell, a physician and canon of St Stephen's, Roger Bolingbroke, a master of an Oxford college and a noted astrologer, John Home, canon of Hereford and St Asaph's, and Margery Jourdemayne, who is described as living near Westminster. Southwell, Bolingbroke and Home were all of the educated, pluralist clergy, closely associated with the court and taking part in the interest in astrology of the time. From the depositions and what they apparently admitted when questioned, Southwell and Bolingbroke seem to have cast a horoscope in 1440 that suggested Henry VI would be seriously ill in the winter of 1441. As rumours of this horoscope spread from the Gloucester household throughout the court, the king became alarmed and had other horoscopes cast saying that he would remain healthy. In a context where the king had no child of his own, that Gloucester's household was the source of such predictions looked threatening. While astrology was a popular predictive tool in the period, practiced by men such as those who were labelled as Eleanor's associates, it could also become a political tool, as in this instance.[110] It did not matter that Southwell was associated with the court, what mattered was that he was also Eleanor's physician and so had acted supposedly on her orders. Here the overlap in potential service to both the king and a great magnate on the part of a cleric ended in failure, disgrace and death in the Tower of London.

---

notoriety and its astrological context respectively, Maura B. Nolan, 'Necromancy, Treason, Semiosis, Spectacle: The Trial of Eleanor Cobham, Duchess of Gloucester,' *Proteus* 13:1 (1996), pp. 7-11; also Hilary M. Carey, *Courting Disaster: Astrology at the English Court and University in the Later Middle Ages,* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992), pp. 138-49; for a study of the other woman accused of witchcraft in this case, Margery Jourdemayne, see Jessica Freeman, 'Sorcery at court and manor: Margery Jourdemayne, the witch of Eye next Westminster,' *Journal of Medieval History* 30 (2004), pp. 343-357.
[108] The indictments for the case are all in the King's Bench records, KB 9 / 72/1–6, 9, 11, 14; the case was heard in front of the archbishop of Canterbury and other bishops in St Stephen's, *CPR 1436-1441,* p. 559; the Privy Council were heavily involved, Griffiths, 'Eleanor Cobham', p. 240.
[109] Nolan, 'Necromancy, Treason, Semiosis, Spectacle', p. 9.

St Stephen's role in the legal side of this case is illuminating of its place within the fundamental functions of the court and the court systems which had gradually become separated from the king's household. In the *Brut*'s account of the case, St Stephen's is 'called the "the Kynges chapell" and "the Kynges college"' and it is important, as Nolan noted, that St Stephen's royal associations are being drawn on here.[111] She also rightly brought out the legal ambiguities of Eleanor Cobham's status as a peeress. Yet the ambiguities of the case went, I think, deeper. Using St Stephen's as a venue for the most spectacular parts of the trial had two effects. First, it short-circuited confusion about who should hear the case by providing a venue where both bishops and lay privy councillors could be involved, and second it made the resolution of the case extremely visible to a more general audience, both from the court and beyond. The complexities of the case were formidable, since treason was under the purview of the council, heresy (as astrology could be classified) was the province of the church courts, and the jurisdiction responsible for noble women had not yet been clarified as it was to be in 1442 in response to this trial. Initial indictments of the four associates were produced by King's Bench, which provide most of the information about what was alleged to have happened. Once the four associates had been dealt with by the church courts, probably under the aegis of the bishop of London, Eleanor herself was summoned to appear before the archbishop of Canterbury and other bishops in St Stephen's Chapel on 24 or 25 July. The letter patent noting that the matter had been heard at St Stephen's carefully did not say in what capacity the bishops were acting, either as members of the council or as the highest church court in the country.[112] In either case, the co-operation between the church courts and the council continued. The judgement on Eleanor was finally given in the council, but the penalties were ecclesiastical penance rather than secular punishment.[113] St Stephen's fit well into this carefully ambiguous legal manoeuvring because it was removed from the usual jurisdictions as a royal chapel so suggested royal approval of a high profile trial, but one that was also heard in an ecclesiastical space. The bench of bishops sat as in a church court under the aegis of the king. Finally, St Stephen's was highly public without being uncontrollable, given its size. Holding the trial there kept it visible within Westminster, and may have contributed to the case's notoriety later by making it reasonably accessible to those in the area on other business.

St Stephen's and its canons were expected to be an integral part of the court when it was at Westminster until Whitehall became the royal residence in the town after 1529. The college also seems to have

---

[110] Carey, *Courting Disaster,* p. 138.
[111] Nolan, 'Necromancy, Treason, Semiosis, Spectacle', p. 8.
[112] *CPR 1436-1441,* p. 559.
[113] Griffiths, 'Eleanor Cobham', p. 250.

provided hospitality to the court at Westminster and to have functioned as a quasi-guesthouse when needed. Although most of the evidence for this practice is from the sixteenth century, it was referenced from the start by Edward III. He asked the pope to grant leave to increase the college's income in 1350 because of the high costs they incurred in entertaining courtiers.[114] While there is no particular corroborating evidence for entertainment, on account of the lack of the college's own financial records, similar collegiate institutions had similar burdens. A common reason for canons of St Paul's Cathedral to remain non-resident was the high entry costs for those in residence in feasting the leading citizens of the City of London.[115] Those who seem to have taken advantage of the traditions of hospitality at St Stephen's in the sixteenth century included Charles Brandon, duke of Suffolk, who recorded drinking with the vicars in his accounts and either Thomas Howard, duke of Norfolk or perhaps William Fitzwilliam.[116] In 1528 Sir George Hastings took advantage of the expertise of Dean John Chambre when he was injured at court and was recovering at Bridewell, just up the river.[117] These men were all at the centre of court life in the reign of Henry VIII, and all would have found Canon Row convenient both for the law courts in the Old Palace, and for being in attendance on the king at the New Palace of Whitehall after 1529. In 1533 Thomas Cranmer seems to have either leased or been lent a house in Canon Row while waiting for his official appointment as archbishop of Canterbury.[118] A more formal side of entertainment and lodging can be seen in the earlier usage of Canon Row to house ambassadors. In 1472, the duke of Burgundy's ambassador, Lord Gruthuse, was lodged by the king in the dean's lodging in Canon Row.[119] Later, in 1501 the Spanish Ambassadors who accompanied Catherine of Aragon when she formally entered England to marry Arthur, prince of Wales stayed in Canon Row.[120] On that occasion at least Henry VII's treasury paid the cost of their stay rather than demanding that the canons provide food and drink at their own cost.

From the middle of the fifteenth century to the dissolution, courtiers could also access some of the

---

[114] 'The dean and college, in order to avoid the indignation and keep the goodwill of the nobles, entertain daily in great numbers, at dinner and in other ways, those who come to the palace, and that their means are not sufficient to meet such expenses', *Cal. Pap. Petitions,* pp. 176-97.

[115] Kathleen Edwards, *The English Secular Cathedrals in the Middle Ages*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1949), pp. 61-3.

[116] SP 3/7 p. 21 is written by John Rookwood to Lord Lisle 'from the Lord Treasurer's House in Canon Row'; calendared in *L & P Henry VIII 1534*, no. 270; the house is perhaps that of the duke of Norfolk, then Lord Treasurer of England although St Clair Byrne thought it referred to William Fitzwilliam, the Treasurer of the Chamber in her notes, *The Lisle Letters,* ed. Muriel St. Clare Byrne, 6 vols. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), ii, p. 54.

[117] San Marino CA, Huntington Library, Hastings MS 5274, 28 November 1528, Sir George Hastings to Lady Hastings.

[118] Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), p. 84.

[119] Kingsford, *English Historical Literature*, p. 385; reprinting the record of Bluemantle Pursuivant from Cotton MS Julius C VI.

[120] BL Royal MS 14 B XXXIX f.5.

patronage benefits of St Stephen's that had previously been restricted to the king in theory, however much in practice the reigning monarch took advice from those around him. The access this gave to the royal women has been discussed above, but equally it could prove valuable for courtiers.[121] From December 1461 to his execution in June 1483 William, lord Hastings provides a case-study in the various forms that this patronage could take and the variety of individuals involved. In that time, Hastings was part of nine groups given the right to present to the next canonry, six of these between 1478 and 1483. The grants began just as Hastings himself was rapidly promoted by Edward IV, in December 1461, when Hastings and Roger Ree, the usher of the Chamber, were given the next presentation.[122] Ree occurs again in connection to Hastings, when in 1472 Hastings arranged the election of Ree as knight of the shire for Middlesex in the new Parliament.[123] Two others who appear with Hastings in grants of presentation to St Stephen's also occur in that election backing Ree, William Jardyn, a Westminster tailor and innkeeper, and Thomas Luyt, the undersheriff of the shire, who was also a mercer of the City of London.[124] Luyt and Jardyn seem therefore to have owed their position in the grants of presentation to their reliability and support for Hastings. These two represent Hastings' connections within Westminster, just as Ree represented his links with the household of Edward IV and his ability to bring his own men into royal service. Similarly to Ree, in 1468, before Hastings left for Calais, he and Sir John Parr, an esquire of the body who was also a northern client of Richard, duke of Gloucester, had the right to present.[125] Parr and Sir Thomas Montgomery, who appeared several times in connection with Hastings in these grants, were both on a tournament team with Hastings in 1467, one that Colin Richmond thought represented Edward IV's closest, most martial friends.[126] Hastings could also be asked to serve alongside the king's relatives, as in 1478 and then 1480, with Richard, duke of Gloucester.[127] In 1480 the third member of the group was John Morton, then bishop of Ely, more closely associated with Hastings than Gloucester. Other such senior churchmen included in 1474 the then bishop of Durham, Lawrence Booth, and the man who was to replace him that year, William Dudley, dean of the Chapel Royal, in 1472.[128] In 1482 and 1483 Hastings' close associate, Thomas Rotherham, archbishop of York recurs, suggesting that Hastings and his friends might have been working together to ensure their candidates'

---

[121] See Chapter Three, pp. 91-2.
[122] *CPR 1461-1467*, p. 78.
[123] Jessica Freeman, 'The Moneyers of the Tower of London and William Lord Hastings in 1472,' *The Ricardian* 16 (2006) p. 59.
[124] Ibid, p. 63; Luyt is associated with Hastings at St Stephen's in May 1474, *CPR 1467-1477*, p. 439 and Jardyn appears in October 1472 in *CPR 1467-1477*, p. 363.
[125] *CPR 1467-1477*, p. 106; for Parr's links to Richard III, see Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 38-9.
[126] A. Compton Reeves, 'The Foppish Eleven of 1483,' *Medieval Prosopography* 16:2 (Autumn 1995), pp. 120-1; for the Eltham tournament of 1467 see Colin Richmond, *The Paston Family in the Fifteenth Century: Endings,* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), p. 147.
[127] For 1478, *CPR 1476-1485*, p. 143; and for 1480, ibid, p. 237.

successes.[129] The college's own personnel also appeared alongside Hastings: Henry Sharp in 1479, just before his official appointment to the deanery in 1480, and in 1483, a large group was given the right to present, which included John Russell, bishop of Lincoln and a former canon, and also Thomas Danet, Edward IV's almoner and then a canon of St Stephen's, who appears to have been close to Hastings personally.[130]

Parliaments provide the best point of contact between St Stephen's and the lay world beyond Westminster, and show the range of connections possible between the individuals involved and institutions. Courtiers might maintain houses in Westminster because of the continual presence of administration and the frequent presence of the king and his household, but equally they might keep an eye on Westminster on account of the sporadic presence of the medieval parliaments in Westminster Abbey and in the public spaces of the palace itself. Parliaments brought large numbers of knights of the shire, burgesses and other worthies to the area, to see and be seen, to argue policy and then finally to take what they had seen back to their localities, to explain the taxes levied, to report on the king's majesty and to grumble about the affairs of the day. Parliaments occasionally also provide a lens through which St Stephen's can be glimpsed both as a place and as an institution made up of individuals. Canons served as ecclesiastical proctors and as receivers of petitions, dealing directly with those who had business with parliament.[131] Their housing in the area was rented out by men who were there for sessions, and the chapel seems to have been used by MPs and peers for their worship, at least some of the time. In this, it was an outgrowth of the usual administrative presence at Westminster, but far busier and far more time-limited. Still, it would have added variety and audiences to the usual round of St Stephen's staff.

The evidence for the chapel and college as playing a role around Parliament comes from across the college's existence. In 1382 William Ufford, duke of Suffolk died at the entrance door of the chapel as he came out of mass.[132] According to Walsingham, he was on his way into the House of Lords, then meeting in the Lesser Hall.[133] The Westminster Chronicler very much wanted to play up the suddenness and inevitability of death striking a good friend of the commons, and so emphasised that he had died

---

[128] For the 1474 grant involving Booth, *CPR 1467-77*, p. 439; and for the grant involving Dudley, ibid, p. 363.
[129] *CPR 1476-85*, pp. 301, 333 and 342.
[130] *CPR 1476-85*, pp. 174 and 342; Danet and another canon, Oliver King appear acting with Hastings in a lawsuit in 1482, CP 25/1/22/126 item 49.
[131] See the forthcoming volume on Parliamentary Proctors edited by Alison McHardy and Phil Bradford for full details; some details are given above, p. 144, n. 124.
[132] *Westminster Chronicle*, pp. 22-3.
[133] *The Chronica Maiora of Thomas Walsingham, 1376-1422*, eds. David Preest and James G. Clark (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2005), p. 579.

leaving a holy space, albeit one that was then in conflict with the writer's abbey. The other chroniclers were much more interested in parliament, and thus remind us that the vestibule of St Stephen's opened onto a liminal space where the entrances to the Great Hall, the Lesser Hall and the chapel met.[134] This confluence put St Stephen's at the heart of the political spaces of Westminster, given that there were usually sessions in the Great and Lesser Halls, as well as the Painted Chamber, which was connected to St Stephen's through the alura. In 1472, the Lord Gruthuse 'went into a chamber by o(ur) lady of pu [pew]' before a procession into the Parliament Chamber after which the bishop of Lincoln celebrated high mass, either in the abbey or possibly in St Stephen's.[135] Under the Lancastrians, Thomas Haseley, a knight and MP, who was also a Chancery clerk and a clerk of the commons, was both a colleague of the early fifteenth century canons in royal administration and apparently by the time of his death in 1443, a 'confrater' of the college, to which he left 100 marks.[136] While Haseley's profitable career in administration was probably the stronger impetus for his gift to St Stephen's, his parliamentary roles may have also helped to bring him into contact with the college. Thirty years later in January 1478, Lord Rivers wrote to Mr Molyneux, the chancellor of the young Richard, duke of York, anxiously about the parliament then approaching, and mentioned the possibility of renting a house in Canon Row for himself, 'thys parlyament time'.[137] Clearly, the canons of St Stephen's could do well out of parliamentarians when their demands for housing were added to the usual crowded presence of royal administration.

The court at Westminster was more than the court elsewhere. Other than when the law courts were in recess, St Stephen's was continually surrounded by the bustle and activity centred on Westminster Hall, and the Exchequer offices nearby. There is no suggestion that the upper chapel was reserved simply for the king and his family but open to visitors from the very start.[138] Even St Mary le Pew, the king's own closet by some accounts, was accessible to the general public, because it housed the image of the Our Lady of the Pew. It thus received bequests to the image and to its indulgence of Scala Coeli in the later fifteenth century.[139] In 1361 Edward III's petition for indulgences for the college implied that one of the concerns was to allow outsiders access to the chapel to take advantage of these chances for spiritual

---

[134] See Maps 2-4, pp. 234-6.
[135] Kingsford, *Historical Literature*, p. 383.
[136] Reg. Stafford and Kemp, ii, pp. 620-25.
[137] This letter is reprinted in James Gairdner, *History of the Life and Reign of Richard III to which is added the Story of Perkin Warbeck*, rev. ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1898), p. 341; Gairdner did not give the full manuscript reference, other than it came from a MS in the Public Record Office marked 'Augmentations No. 486', ibid, p. 338.
[138] *CChR 1341-1417*, p. 133 discusses the rights of pilgrims to come through Westminster Hall to the chapel.
[139] Kingsford, 'Our Lady of the Pew,' p. 8.

redemption.[140] Petitioners might well come to the chapel for services as might members of the royal household and administration. While there are few indications of who took advantage of the indulgences, the concern for access to the chapel through Westminster Hall, rather than from the privy palace suggests the chapel was supposed to be open to visitors as well as court residents. There are two sixteenth-century examples where public access to the chapels is implied. In 1520 a group of men not otherwise connected with the chapel in an indenture relating to Horspath in Oxfordshire said that the payment for lands would be made yearly on St Wulfstan's day (19 January) 'upon the font in the church under St. Stephen's chapel,' i.e. St Mary Undercroft.[141] In the 1510s or 1520s, the gentleman John Selake of Devon petitioned Wolsey as Chancellor for redress because Sir Giles Capel of Essex attacked him as he was coming out of the chapel to Westminster Hall.[142] John Selake was at Westminster to pursue law cases, went into St Stephen's to hear mass, was dragged out and brought to London to the Court of the Poultry in London, and was then imprisoned. Although Selake only identifies the chapel as 'St Stephen's', it is worth taking him at his word and seeing him as having been dragged out of mass in the nave of the upper chapel by Capel and his men.

St Stephen's and the Wider Church

The Church, even more so than the court, resists definition. It was a collection of individuals, offices, and institutions with overlapping interests, jurisdictions and purposes.[143] The definition of its membership was changing in this period, as benefit of clergy was litigated. Yet it also was a strictly defined system in theory if not always in practice. The secular side of the Church, of course, was defined by its territorial units of parishes grouped into deaneries and so on up to the bishoprics and provinces under the papacy. The mendicant and monastic elements worked across the territorial divisions but were still in theory subject to the higher levels of the national Church. Yet the exceptions were legion and these complicate the picture of a hierarchical, defined Church in England by granting authority to non-territorial control of churches, as in the bishops' peculiars, or to ecclesiastical jurisdiction under the auspices of the Crown, such as the chancellor's authority over the royal free chapels. In addition,

---

[140] For example, Innocent VI gave a seven-year indulgence to those who visit the chapel on the major feast days of Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, Corpus Christi, SS Peter and Paul and St Stephen, *Cal. Pap. Petitions,* pp. 361-75.

[141] E 40/ 3184; none of the men, Richard Rokeby, Thomas Hennage, Michael Hethe of Oxford, and John Pulker appear in any other connection in the surviving St Stephen's documentation. The location for payment was probably chosen for its proximity to the Exchequer, where a copy of the indenture seems to have been deposited.

[142] C 1/442/7 and C 1/442/8; if Sir Giles Capel was acting in his capacity as sheriff of Essex, then the case would be datable to 1529, but it may be much earlier.

[143] Described in Alexander Hamilton Thompson, *The English Clergy and their Organisation in the Later Middle Ages*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1947); the most recent review article on scholarship of the Church as a whole remains Peter

licensing of private chapels again complicated the picture of the spiritual provision of the Church, by moving it into the realm of the household. How all of these elements interacted, both within the hierarchy and across it, is far beyond the scope of this section. St Stephen's Chapel, like all other royal free chapels, is problematic. It stood, however, in an interesting place in relation to the wider Church, and thus permits us to examine some of the ways in which elements of the Church interacted and the variety of connections that were possible within it. The canons' place within the networks of elite priests that crossed institutions helped to shape the college's place within the English Church at large. The college's access to power was conditioned by its status as a royally-privileged institution near to the London homes and workplaces of the bishops, whether they were active in royal government or not. Indeed, the ambiguity of the college's position as the royal chapel at Westminster allowed it to have a wider range of uses than otherwise would have been possible, particularly when events or ceremonies concerned both the king and the Church.

The college's relationships with other ecclesiastical organisations went beyond both institutional and personal links in that occasionally there are hints that St Stephen's influenced practice at other houses or was itself influenced by what was done elsewhere. At Tattershall, the impetus to look to St Stephen's came from Ralph, lord Cromwell who in his foundation charter ordered his foundation's statutes to be based on best practices from the leading colleges of the day, including St Stephen's.[144] In this case, the connections came from a wealthy and important donor deciding that he liked the model St Stephen's offered, and not from any overlap in personnel. St Stephen's liturgical practice and its stalls were copied in some form by Eton by order of Henry VI. [145] He also moved a canon from St Stephen's to support his new foundation. Henry Sever, the first provost, moved from St Stephen's to Eton in October 1440.[146] William Westbury, the third provost and John Kette, one of the first fellows of Eton, were later in reverse moved to St Stephen's, suggesting that Eton had by 1447 become a means of promotion within the Lancastrian government.[147] A Particularly fortunate canon could also do what was usually reserved for founders or patrons. John Buckingham, canon of St Stephen's from 1348, seems to have shaped the statutes of St Mary's Warwick when it was re-founded in 1367 in ways that reflected his

Heath, 'Between Reform and Reformation: The English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries,' *JEH* 41 (1990), pp. 647-78.
[144] Magnus Williamson, "The Eton Choirbook: Its Institutional and Historical Background,' (DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1997), p. 90, citing KCRO, MS U1475 Q/20.
[145] Maurice Hastings, *St Stephen's Chapel and its Place in the Development of Perpendicular Style in England,* (Cambridge, CUP, 1955), p. 103.
[146] Wasey Sterry, *The Eton College Register, 1441-1698,* (Eton: Spottiswode & Ballantine, 1943), p. xxviii; for his appointment to St Stephen's see *CPR 1436-41*, p. 171 from June 1438.
[147] Sterry, *Eton College Register*, p. xxviii and p. xxviii.

experiences at Westminster, particularly in relation to residence payments and the common fund.[148] Musicologists have also suggested that the joint office of organist- verger might be a St Stephen's development that then spread elsewhere. If so, the post developed out of the constraints of the original foundation, which did not provide for an organist, but did for a verger.[149] It is worth pointing out that the post might well have spread to St Stephen's from elsewhere as the dean and canons looked for the most appropriate ways to fulfil their obligations to the liturgy. Certainly, given the range of places that canons of St Stephen's had held prebends, there would be no shortage of potential exemplars that the college too could draw on to keep abreast of liturgical trends.

St Stephen's College had links with other ecclesiastical institutions, both monastic and secular, usually over lands and finances, or over spiritual provisions such as chantries. There were probably many more links whose evidence has been lost, but the surviving documentation provides further hints of St Stephen's as in constant communication with other institutions and individuals. The most easily tracked connections are like those with Westminster Abbey, which were financial. For example, overlapping landownership produced complex financial interrelationships that required careful handling. such as the case in the 1520s in Kent where tenants were unclear as to whether they owed money to St Stephen's or to the prior of Christ Church, Canterbury. Both institutions had to become involved to disentangle the various rights at stake in the manor of Ashford.[150] Other lasting relationships were created by donors using institutions to monitor each other. St Stephen's was to be paid the fines set up by John Chambre if his obit at St George's, Windsor failed.[151] The principle was that the institution would last even when direct family lines had failed. Conversely, from 1412 the dean of St Stephen's was to appoint a priest for the chantry of John of Gaunt and Blanche of Lancaster in St Paul's Cathedral and to ensure that the detailed stipulations for prayers were upheld.[152] If the two chantry chaplains or their successors failed in their duties, then St Stephen's was to receive £10 of the chantry's revenues. If St Stephen's failed to present chaplains to vacancies, then the abbot of Westminster was to have the right to present. St Stephen's itself was monitored by other institutions. The abbot and prior of St Albans were to oversee the 1394 indenture with Westminster Abbey, giving them reasons to interact with St Stephen's if needed,

---

[148] Buckingham was canon at St Stephen's from 1348 and at St Mary's Warwick from a similar date to 1367, when the new statutes at Warwick were agreed, Charles Fonge, pers. comm.

[149] David Skinner & Nicholas Caldwell, "'At the Mynde of Nicholas Ludford,'': New Light on Ludford from the Churchwarden's Accounts of St Margaret's, Westminster,' *Early Music* 22 (1995), pp. 395, referencing the work of Roger Bowers.

[150] London, Lambeth Palace Library MSS, CM XVI/ 2 and CM XVI/ 4.

[151] Windsor, St George's College Archives XV 58 C 28.

[152] *CPR 1408-1413,* pp. 385-6.

although there is no sign that they were ever called on to mediate the agreement.[153] Other more contingent relationships depended on individual canons. For example in 1510 William Smith, then dean of St Stephen's, sold properties to Brasenose College, Oxford, as he was one of the founders of Brasenose and seems to have been using St Stephen's as an intermediary in his attempts to provide Brasenose with a stable endowment.[154] After this date, there is no indication whatsoever that Brasenose continued to have links with Westminster.

Temporary and contingent links within the Church might be formed by individual canons through their membership in other collegiate or cathedral chapters as well as in royal service. The intellectual and political possibilities for connections within this world have also been neglected. As discussed in Chapter Five, the small world of royal service and the benefits it opened up helped to promote unusually high levels of collegiality within St Stephen's, but it also helped to situate the college within wider networks within the Church.[155] Andreas Ammonias in the 1510s corresponded avidly with a range of people from Erasmus to Wolsey about administrative matters due to his job as the king's secretary, international and papal politics, as well as humanist translations and literary endeavours. From his house in the college's Westminster precinct, he acted as a clearing house for Wolsey, often passing on letters from bishops at the papal court such as Silvester, bishop of Rochester.[156] His correspondence with Erasmus covered literary commentary, discussion of possible patrons, events in Switzerland and Ammonias' attempts to obtain the post of papal tax collector in England.[157] But he also wrote to Erasmus describing fellow canon, Thomas Larke, as being 'omnipotent' with Wolsey as he passed on a gift from Larke and suggested that Erasmus should correspond with him.[158] Richard Nix, later bishop of Norwich is a good example of slightly earlier important ties where the cathedrals, St Stephen's and humanist interests came together. Nix was never a canon at St Stephen's. Rather his connections with the college came from his rather shadowy royal service, particularly in the 1490s on the king's council and as dean of the Chapel Royal, at St George's, Windsor, and through shared humanist interests.[159] Nix had been educated in Ferrara and Bologna in the 1480s, although he was to become highly conservative in the 1530s, and was

---

[153] C 66/341 m. 24; *CPR 1391-96*, p. 553.
[154] Oxford, Brasenose College Archives, Cold Norton Charters 38.
[155] Chapter Five, pp. 137-40.
[156] for example, *L & P Henry VIII 1513-14*, no. 3302; *L & P Henry VIII 1515-16*, no. 110.
[157] *L & P Henry VIII 1509-13*, no. 1188; *L & P Henry VIII 1513-14,* no. 2457; *L & P Henry VIII 1515-16*, nos. 311, 477 and 985.
[158] *L & P Henry VIII 1515-16*, no. 629.
[159] For royal service Nix was given the rectory of Chedzoy in Somerset in *CPR 1485-94,* p. 291; he appears in Ellesmere MS 2655 on the council, for example on f. 1r; see for St George's where he replaced the canon of St Stephen's, Christopher Urswick, who had been given the deanery at Windsor, see *CPR 1494-1509*, p. 125.

probably friendly with the humanist John Gunthorpe at Wells.[160] Nix also owned a range of books

including works by Cicero that he was given by a fellow canon at Wells.[161] In 1512, he was the executor

for Dean John Forster of St Stephen's, along with Canon William Atwater and John Heron, Henry VII's

treasurer.[162] This request probably reflected shared royal service, as their cathedral prebends did not

overlap because Forster had been at St Paul's rather than Wells.

Bishops' registers show the variety of ways in which canons and the college as a whole came into contact

with the wider church. The register of John Chedworth, bishop of Lincoln from 1452 to his death in

1471, provides a range of examples. St Stephen's College held the rights of advowson to parish churches

in Buckinghamshire, Dorset, Huntingdonshire and in Yorkshire as well as briefly in Oxfordshire.[163]

Necessarily, those rights demanded contact with the parishioners as well as the diocesan and the local

vicar appointed by the college. In the 1450s, the parishioners of Fenstaunton in Huntingdonshire

complained to the bishop over the low level of alms paid in the parish by St Stephen's.[164] These alms had

been set in 1394 when the college was granted the right to impropriate the church and was commanded

to ensure the continuance of proper parochial provision.[165] In 1437, St Stephen's had transferred lands in

the area to pay for repairs to the rectory and to give the vicar a more settled income, showing that at this

time at least it was concerned to maintain the parish.[166] The case Chedworth and his officials had to

decide may have been related to the presentation in 1454 of a new perpetual vicar at Fenstaunton, John

Hammond, by the dean, William Walesby.[167] By 1458, the case had been settled and the alms paid to

poor parishioners increased to 26s 8d a year in an agreement between the college's then dean, Robert

Kirkenham, and the parish.[168] While this case is unusual, it does highlight the ongoing contacts with

churches they controlled and the local patronage that it could provide in Fenstaunton and elsewhere.

Chedworth's register also contains information about the canons of the college as they moved into and

out of parish churches and Lincoln Cathedral prebends. Robert Wodemanston is only known as a canon

from this register, when he swapped his prebend at St Stephen's for the rectory of Surfleet with John

---

[160] A. Compton Reeves, 'John Gunthorpe: Keeper of Richard III's Privy Seal, Dean of Wells Cathedral.' *Viator* 39 (2008), p. 337; for Nix's later career see, Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors: Politics and Religion in an English County, 1500-1600*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), ch. 4.
[161] Norman P. Tanner, 'Nix, Richard (*c*.1447–1535),' *ODNB*.
[162] PROB 11/ 17/277.
[163] See Table 1.
[164] Reg. Chedworth, f. 30r-v.
[165] *CPR 1391-1396*, p. 518.
[166] *CPR 1436-1441*, p. 51.
[167] Reg. Chedworth, f. 299r.
[168] Reg. Chedworth, f. 30r.

Davyson.[169] John Derby brought with him a letter from the dean of St Stephen's in 1456 when he exchanged his prebend at Lincoln with John Kirkeby for one at St Stephen's.[170] Registers elsewhere contain similar information, tying the canons and the college into the routine business of the dioceses of England and Wales.

More significant contact between the ecclesiastical hierarchy and the college came from St Stephen's status as a royal peculiar from the very start of its existence. Edward III's provisions for his new college deliberately situated it with relation to his trusted episcopal councillors. The two critical offices for St Stephen's were to be the treasurer and the chancellor. The chancellor's role had no particular reference to St Stephen's location or staffing, only that Chancery was the only court presided over by a bishop that was not an official church court.[171] Thus St Stephen's joined the other free royal chapels in having the court of Chancery as the only court they in theory had to engage with.[172] All these chapels were able thus assert their royal links when dealing with what would usually be dealt with in the various ecclesiastical courts. When dealing with common law matters, the colleges did so in the royal courts. At St George's, Windsor the most important link after the Chancellor as visitor was to the bishopric of Winchester, because of the older associations of Winchester with King Arthur that Edward III wanted to co-opt for Windsor.[173] At St Stephen's, the second most important ecclesiastical connection was not strictly ecclesiastical, but administrative, and was based on St Stephen's proximity to the various offices of the Exchequer. The treasurer of England, who was in the early fourteenth century also almost invariably a bishop, had rights over the previous St Stephen's as seen when in 1356, the treasurer's right to appoint a chaplain in St Stephen's by the Receipt was transferred to the new St Stephen's Chapel.[174] That the then treasurer happened to be William Edington, bishop of Winchester and the most important servant of Edward III, made the setting up of the new institutional nexus at both colleges much easier.[175] Later, the connection between the college and the king's chief financial administrator became lost. Informal contact with bishops and with royal officials seems to have taken the place of the formal links envisaged

---

[169] Reg. Chedworth, f. 145v.
[170] Reg. Chedworth, f. 317r.
[171] For the workings of Chancery see T. S. Haskett, 'The Medieval English Court of Chancery', *Law and History Review* 14 (1996) pp. 245-313.
[172] W.R. Jones, 'Patronage and Administration: The King's Free Chapels in Medieval England,' *Journal of British Studies* (1969), pp. 5-6; and J. H. Denton, *English Royal Free Chapels 1100-1300: A Constitutional Study* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1970) pp. 14 and then 145; for William Sleaford explicitly positioning St Stephen's among this group of institutions when he described St Stephen's as 'sicut alie Capelle regie p(er) regn(u)m Angl' qualit(er)cu(m)q(ue) constitue' see WAM 18465.
[173] For the Arthurian connections see Martin Biddle, *King Arthur's round table: an Archaeological Investigation,* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2001) appendix on Winchester and the Order of the Garter.
[174] *CPR 1354-1358* p. 430.
[175] See Chapter One, pp. 31-2.

by Edward III and Edington.

The most visible contact between bishops, other churchmen in royal service and the canons of St Stephen's College came from shared royal service and particularly in relation to the king's council. The Ellesmere copies of council registers relating to Star Chamber from the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII show bishops regularly attending council sessions along with canons John Gunthorpe and Richard Hatton, and the deans of St Stephen's, St George's and the Chapel Royal at various points.[176] Councillors affected St Stephen's both liturgically and in terms of staffing through the connections made at the council. Archbishop Warham set up an obit at the college in 1510, long before his death in 1532, which almost certainly reflected his long association with canons through his roles on the council and in Chancery until the dominance of Thomas Wolsey.[177] Bishops and other councillors were also given the right to present to prebends, which gave them a direct stake in the college's staffing.[178] Wolsey, for example, was said to have appointed Richard Sampson as a canon in 1515.[179] At other times, bishops acted alongside canons to appoint new canons. In September 1476, John Russell, bishop of Rochester and former canon, Canon John Gunthorpe and Canon Richard Martyn were granted the presentation to a vacant prebend.[180]

The intersection between church and state, which conditioned the outcome of the Westminster Abbey dispute, also influenced St Stephen's usage within the church. While it was not a regularly used episcopal chapel, it still served a variety of purposes for bishops. As a royal free chapel within the principal royal palace, it was tightly associated with the king, and so it may have been chosen when royal approval was visibly being sought, or the king and the church wanted to be seen as acting in concert. Bishops were consecrated in St Stephen's, perhaps because it was a central location without inconveniently trespassing in another's diocese, and seems to have been particularly used for royal administrators' convenience. William Lyndwood remembered the college fondly in his will because of his consecration there in 1442, and another royal administrator, Archbishop Simon Langham, received the pallium in St Stephen's in 1366.[181] A late example of the same phenomenon comes from the 1478 consecration of Edward Story as

---

[176] On 23 November 1505 the register lists Mr Doctor Ruthall, the king's secretary (possibly Pietro Carmeliano, the king's Latin secretary), the dean of the Chapel Royal (Geoffrey Simeon), Mr West, Robert Litton, Mr Hobbys (dean of St Stephen's) and Mr Hatton (canon of St Stephen's), Ellesmere MS 2655, f. 5r.

[177] *L & P Henry VIII 1509-13*, no. 397.

[178] For a group including bishops presenting to a vacant prebend, see Chapter Five, p. 156, n. 191.

[179] Referenced in *L & P Henry VIII 1515-16*, no. 172.

[180] *CPR 1467-77*, p. 597.

[181] Lyndwood's will is printed in Reg. Stafford and Kemp, ii pp. 453-57, for Simon Langham see Reg. Langham, pp. 112-13.

bishop of Chichester. Story was a royal servant who was to continue to spend much of his time at court as Elizabeth Woodville's confessor. His consecration at St Stephen's reflected his personal ties to royal administration.[182] Bishops also used the chapel for their work, both secular and ecclesiastical. In the case of Eleanor Cobham and witchcraft, for example, a panel of bishops including the Archbishop of Canterbury, sat in St Stephen's to try her for necromancy and then on the secular side for treason.[183] On the spiritual side, Archbishop Chichele celebrated mass there in February 1415, assisted by Lyndwood among others, as had Archbishop William Courtenay in 1388.[184] These may just be the examples that were recorded, and there were probably many more occasions when the bishops were present in the chapel in connection with the Chapel Royal, as discussed in Chapter Six.[185] In addition, in an unusual ceremony in 1416 the bishop of Bangor ordained just four men in St Stephen's Chapel.[186] Of these, two, Robert Felton and William Bontemps, would become canons of St Stephen's in the 1420s suggesting that all four were clerks based in the palace and the ordination ceremony was connected with the administrative offices.[187] All of these interactions gave St Stephen's a role within the English church that was largely mediated through royal administration and the continued links between the church hierarchy, royal service and prebendaries at St Stephen's.

Conclusions

St Stephen's multiple audiences testify to the complexity of the institution and its surroundings. St Stephen's sat within the lay world of the manor as a landowner and neighbour and also offered spiritual services that could be taken up by its neighbours in its chantries and indulgences, just as any college in an urban location might. Yet also as a royal chapel and the chapel at the heart of the king's administration at Westminster, it was accessible to and used by those who were in the king's household and travelled with him, as well as courtiers and those seeking justice or documentation from the royal administration. In this it was by far more fortunate than many other institutions, not least St George's, which could not draw on the same combination of urban, court and royal patronage. Extraordinarily, this success occurred against a backdrop of local and national political crisis, particularly in the fifteenth century, as conciliar politics played out at Westminster. The canons were often involved, but St Stephen's itself had the good fortune to be popular not only with all the kings of England but also with those that surrounded it in the palace and in the vill. That is not to say that it in any way surpassed the abbey, which

---

[182] R. J. Schoeck, 'Story, Edward (*d.* 1503),' *ODNB.*
[183] *CPR 1436-41,* p. 559; also see above, pp. 210-12.
[184] Reg. Chichele, iv, pp. 111-12.
[185] Above, pp. 172-3.
[186] Reg. Nichols, p. 103.

had built up a dominant position in the town by c. 1300, but that St Stephen's offered a complement to the spiritual services of the abbey and St Margaret's. The college stood as an independent force in a web of connections that moved right through the social scale from the great magnates to the humblest town resident who wanted to associate themselves with the powers of St Mary le Pew or with Scala Coeli, and as such, provide a new lens into this interconnected world. St Stephen's was able to integrate itself into both the palace and the manor despite lacking most conventional attractions for the laity and being outside the parochial structures of late medieval England. Free chapels, colleges and other extra-parochial institutions more generally need to be taken seriously as part of wider networks and connections within their communities than has been done before. In addition, St Stephen's offers us an opportunity to build a more nuanced picture of the ongoing interrelationship of the Crown and the Church especially in relation to ecclesiastical personnel. The canons served alongside others in the cathedral chapters, and with bishops both in royal service but also in the Church from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries. By looking at the ways in which bishops were able to exploit the ambiguity of St Stephen's for their own work and to signal their closeness to the king they served, it is possible to track their ongoing interdependence on the Crown as well as other elements within the Church.

---

[187] For Felton see *CPR 1422-29,* p. 142 and for Bontemps, see *CPR 1416-22,* p. 277.

Conclusions

Writing about St Stephen's, Westminster has been a process of inclusion rather than exclusion; of a variety of themes relating to one institution bounded by dates, rather than a theme traced through time. In its extended discussion of one institution and its personnel over two centuries, this thesis has moved outwards in ever-expanding circles to look at the place of St Stephen's within its surroundings, both physical and in terms of connections. In so doing, it has turned two venerable forms of historical method, institutional history and prosopography, to new ends. Partially that has been because of the source base, to the materials that survive about St Stephen's and its people. But it also owes much to a dissatisfaction with traditional historical boundaries for colleges. St Stephen's cannot solely be defined by what lay within the college's walls, or with the aims laid down for it by its founder and early patrons. Rather it needs to be seen as a constantly shifting institution, where new individuals, new ideas, and new needs shaped the institution and its structures to their own requirements. The college of 1548 both fulfilled the commandments of 1348 and interpreted them differently in a radically changed religious and political environment. St Stephen's also needs to be seen as a place which was not the exclusive focus of attention for its own personnel and supporters. Its canons and other staff made it one part of their careers; its continued support from kings, nobles, bishops and laypeople went alongside patronage to other institutions. St Stephen's itself was connected, both to its sister college at Windsor, and also to abbeys, cathedrals, other colleges, guilds, and the universities. Thus, these conclusions fall into two parts. First, there is a discussion of how St Stephen's fitted into and was part of the political, religious and administrative landscape of late-medieval England, and the implications for our understanding of that landscape. Second, St Stephen's, Westminster has methodological implications for how we approach writing such histories, particularly in relation to archival materials.

St Stephen's College was a presence in Westminster for two hundred years as both it and the communities around it changed and grew. In part, it needs to be localised within the deeply unusual manor of Westminster, with urban functions but without an urban governance structure. It also needs to be placed within the court that in part made its home at Westminster. The college's networks, however, were not confined to Westminster alone, but rather extended throughout the English Church and society. These connections could be formal and institutionalised or informal and causal, through personal friendships and earlier careers. In this it was not unique, even as it was highly privileged by its position, its royal support and the connections of its canons. It thrived

financially and in terms of its ecclesiastical services because it could offer visible royal piety to the king, a base for royal servants, and a stable chapel for the Chapel Royal and the court when at Westminster. Its canons served alongside laymen as clerical proctors in parliaments. MPs knew it as a royal chapel long before it became their home after 1548. The chapel could also be used to signal royal assent to matters nominally within Church control or regular ecclesiastical functions such as the consecrations of bishops. Yet in a crowded ecclesiastical landscape, it could also draw on local support and devotion, sometimes in collaboration with St Margaret's, Westminster, Westminster Abbey or the guilds elsewhere in the manor. The major indulgence of Scala Coeli, the image of St Mary le Pew and the possibilities of plenary masses not only drew financial support, but also provided a way in which a palatine chapel could interact with its local communities and visitors. While this thesis has focussed on St Stephen's in particular, this approach could easily be extended to other colleges and cathedral chapters that were also located within both national and local networks. St George's, Windsor, for example, shared personnel with St Stephen's and was tied into similar networks of friendship, family and shared service of royal administration. But it was also further away from the heart of government, and so its networks might well have been closer to Eton College and the lay population of the Thames Valley. St Mary's in the Newarke needs to be placed back into its urban context in Leicester, not just in its links with the Lancastrian family and their retainers.

The canons of St Stephen's, as the best documented part of the college, need to be seen in a more rounded light. The study of exceptional individuals obscures more general experiences in royal service, and studying institutions alone hides the ways in which clerics were able to move fluidly between institutions and various forms of service. It is not enough to discuss such men solely in terms of their work at Westminster, and to discount their pluralism, their royal service, and their links to the episcopal hierarchy, their families and the universities. St Stephen's was often an important base for them, and a major part of their working lives, yet it could also be just one of many employments and concerns. By looking at collective biographies and charting change over time, we begin to see the range of possibilities in such careers and how those possibilities were mutating over the course of the later Middle Ages. We can also begin to see the choices they made about what they wanted from their service to the king and to the ecclesiastical hierarchy as well as their attempts to secure the best possible combination of benefices. Thus the prosopographical approach allows for a sense of typicality, while also opening up questions of individual agency because each canon can be seen both as an individual but also as part of larger systems. This thesis has attempted to put the canons back into the rich world of their connections, friendships and networks, but inevitably by

focussing on St Stephen's, it has still not created a full picture of that richness. Additional work on those priests in royal service who did not receive prebends at St Stephen's and whose careers intersected with canons of St Stephen's would further illuminate the workings of late medieval administration, and particularly the choices and governmental processes that turned the royal will and conciliar policy into action and bridged the divide between the king and his subjects.

Even as the individuals are not one-dimensional, so the institutions are themselves multi-faceted and not strictly defined. Constitutional studies, while valuable, give only a snapshot of a college. St Stephen's allows us to examine on-going and changing relationships between individuals as well as between collegiate institutions. In this, it also allows us to create a picture of a more complex development and maintenance of ecclesiastical institutions. First, in the foundation of St Stephen's Chapel as a college, we see the interplay between the wishes of Edward III, of William Edington, to whom the king delegated much of the practical work, and of the college itself in the form of its early canons and their work on the building campaigns. That interplay created the conditions that were written down in the statutes, which could then be interpreted and reinterpreted throughout the college's existence. Second, because St Stephen's often exists in the archival record precisely in those contexts where it was interacting with other churches, offices of state and individuals, this thesis has been able to examine the multiplicity of connections that defined it and gave it value, from its place within Westminster to the cathedrals with which it often shared staff, or with the institutions for which it guaranteed chantries and other rights. In addition, we can see how St Stephen's and the Chapel Royal were not only both semantically and liturgically intertwined, but also distinctively separate organisations (in spite of the historiographical confusion). Finally, St Stephen's was a royal college, founded and maintained at the kings' behest, and so it provides an excellent case study in comparative royal piety. The complexities of kings' relationships with St Stephen's allow us to see the limits of personal piety as well as the expected norms of kings' relationship with the Church. Queens too were able to use St Stephen's for both devotion and for patronage. In addition, because the canons of St Stephen's were royal servants, they provide excellent case studies in how royal patronage of priests was changing across this period.

On the broadest level, St Stephen's provides a case study in the relationship of the English church to the secular powers and to the king that challenges assumptions about the Reformation. The first aspect of this reappraisal is the sheer variety of the careers and choices of the canons, from individuals who worked for the king and the Church to co-ordinated, concerted action by both

officially. At St Stephen's we see the close interrelationship of royal and ecclesiastical service and the ways in which both could be blurred for particular purposes long before the Henrician Reformation made the church subordinate to the Crown and to Parliament rather than the papacy. Even in the fourteenth century, when Westminster Abbey and St Stephen's were litigating the limits of their jurisdictions, the lines between what came under royal jurisdiction and what was solely the church's responsibility was unclear and contested. Royal favour and patronage could be a stronger influence within the English church than anything coming from the papacy. Equally, St Stephen's provided a venue where the church's hierarchy and the king could visibly collaborate, without being solely in the territory of one or the other, such as during consecrations, or state events. At St Stephen's, priests in royal service easily moved between tasks for the ecclesiastical hierarchy as well as the king, and could be found representing other religious houses in parliament as well as acting as royal ambassadors abroad. Thus, rather than seeing the Church on the eve of the Reformation as largely separate from royal administration, day-to-day politics and the king, we should see the two as intertwined. Building from that observation, we see that the Reformation's intense politicisation of religion intensified, but did not create, the strong links below the rank of bishop between elite clergy and royal administration. Both the Church hierarchy and the king benefited from this arrangement, and tolerated its use, complaints against pluralism notwithstanding.

Turning to the methodological conclusions of this thesis, institutional history does not have to mean only a comprehensive but inward-looking study or a purely constitutional examination of one college. Rather this thesis shows that it can be a viable means of constructing a case study that looks at a range of issues and makes them manageable by its specificity. Only by using an institutional framework is it possible to examine a college such as St Stephen's, where in its everyday life ecclesiastical, royal and local considerations interacted to shape decision making and the experience of its staff from canons to choristers. Being concerned with a specific institution in its entirety allows us to locate it within its vicinity and the overlapping uses of space. This therefore presents a more complex picture of the institution, rather than separating off aspects of its existence according to modern disciplinary norms. Beyond St Stephen's though, this method also allows us to consider how the late medieval Church was more than its parts. It was the parishes and the dioceses, the parish clergy and the bishops, liturgy and lay devotion, intellectual and practical. It also allows us to see the English Church as one where institutions collaborated in ways that are easily overlooked, such as in guaranteeing agreements, joining forces within the parish and drawing on each other's expertise, personnel and lands. At the same time that it allows for depth and interaction, a collegiate

institutional history also allows for breadth and change over time. This thesis has discussed the changing patterns of priests in royal service, as well as the changing lay involvement with extra-parochial organisations. At St Stephen's, we are dealing with one elite aspect of the English Church, but one that was not just about rewards for royal service, or solely concerned with the liturgy. Other, less privileged institutions also were connected and changed over time. The question remains whether the records to show those changes have survived.

Ultimately, working on St Stephen's has pointed to further possibilities of deliberately writing collegiate history from a variety of perspectives by using multiple related archives and a comparative approach. It has also begun to emphasise the importance of interdisciplinary institutional history, concerned with the spaces, sounds and people of the institution in question. By being aware of the possibilities and limitations of multiple archives and understanding their contexts, we can artificially start to bring back together material that has been scattered or that would never have been collected together. By using diverse archives and extensive comparison, we see St Stephen's College in a variety of contexts, each of which is not enough alone to understand the institution. By working with the royal documentation, we see the college as favoured by the king, but also see it interacting with other institutions and individuals in Westminster. In the archives of St George's, Windsor, we see some canons' deep concern for one of their other prebends as well as the institutional connections between the two colleges. In Westminster Abbey's muniment room, St Stephen's is the adversary that turned into the cooperative neighbour. The material that survives in the British Library is material that was of interest to the seventeenth century antiquarians who knew St Stephen's as the home of the House of Commons. Still more is only hinted at. Had the St Stephen's archives survived, or been identifiable, this would be a very different analysis. While this thesis is grounded in what does survive, it works around what does not through comparison and an awareness of what is lost. In this it provides a method which may open up significant archival work for other colleges that lack easily-definable archives of their own. St Stephen's College, Westminster thus stands both as an important example in its own right, but also as an exemplar for the possibilities of further work on the collegiate institutions and personnel of the late medieval Church more generally.