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Abstract

This thesis examines the royal college of St George, Windsor Castle, in the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries. The thesis considers specific groups of individuals within the college, including canons, vicars, clerks and poor knights that resided within, and assesses how these groups interacted with one another. This discussion includes problems of individual wages, the college’s collective income, personal interactions and liturgical change. The thesis provides a community study of the college, and questions the extent to which St George’s was a coherent community. It argues that the college was a distinctive institution, which was able to adapt as fashions changed, but which was not perfect. The thesis makes use of the college’s extensive medieval archive at Windsor, supported by manuscripts from The National Archives and other repositories, and fills a substantial gap in the historiography of the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century college.

After setting out the college’s fourteenth-century foundations and historiography, five chapters consider different groups within the community. Chapters 1 and 2 investigate the secular canons who ran the college under the supervision of the dean or warden. The chapters first assess the composition of this group and then use a series of case studies to examine how the canons dealt with problems throughout the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries. Chapter 3 considers the college’s vicars, lay clerks and choristers and the ways in which their roles changed during the fifteenth century. Chapter 4 discusses a charitable element of the college’s constitution, the poor knights (a group of royal pensioners unique to St George’s and not found in other collegiate foundations), and assesses the burden these individuals placed on strained finances. The final chapter examines commemoration within the college, who was commemorated and how. Overall, the thesis sheds new light on an important and peculiar late-medieval collegiate institution.
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Figure 1: The Lower Ward, Windsor Castle, c.1530 (after Tim Tatton-Brown)¹

¹ Tim Tatton-Brown, ‘New Chapel’, p.72.
This thesis is, first and foremost, a study of a community: the royal college of St George in Windsor Castle. Within the college, however, there existed a number of smaller groups, each with its own identity and set of concerns. This makeup raises a number of questions. Was this a coherent community, which acted as a homogenous whole, or was it fragmented? How did unity - or discord - affect the college’s fortunes through the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries? How did different sub-groups in St George’s interact with each other, and within their own sub-communities? The thesis examines each group within the college individually. It will then consider how these groups interacted on a religious and on a domestic level within the enclosed area of Windsor Castle. In doing so, it will identify the ways in which St George’s College was a distinctive institution. Furthermore it will discuss how the college’s composition and day-to-day administration contributed to this distinctiveness.

In the history of St George’s, the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries are of particular interest on account of Edward IV’s re-endowment of the college and the building of a grand new St George’s chapel from 1475. Such large-scale building works, and the expansion of the college’s chapel, had both positive and negative impacts on the community. Disruption, combined with the threat of dynastic upheaval, and a period of prolonged economic crisis identified by A. K. B. Evans (née Roberts) some years ago, provide the backdrop for this narrative.\(^1\) The college of St George’s, Windsor, was founded on 6 August 1348 by letters patent of Edward III. From the start, its two main functions were clear: to glorify God and to serve the king. The secular college was to be attached to Edward’s new chivalric order, the Order of the Garter, a connection which continues to the present day. In order to understand the new college and its later history, it is important to appreciate the context in which such a foundation was conceived and brought into being.

---

\(^1\) Evans ‘Years of Arrears’.
Windsor Castle and the Round Table

Windsor Castle, the setting in which St George’s was to be located, was founded by William the Conqueror in the decade following his conquest of England. The castle, situated on a natural chalk bluff overlooking the River Thames, was in a strong location. The site was a perfect natural defence and proximity to the Thames allowed for goods, men, and building materials, amongst other things, to be easily transported between London and Windsor. London itself was a mere day’s ride to the east and Windsor Forest, a longstanding royal hunting ground, was on the castle’s doorstep. Under Henry I the castle became a royal residence, and it retains this status to the present day, with successive monarchs adapting the royal lodgings and other buildings in a piecemeal fashion to suit their own needs. Over time, three areas, or wards, of the castle became distinct. The upper ward was located in the east of the castle grounds, while the lower ward was found in the west. The two main wards were separated by a third, smaller, ward known as the middle ward, which contained the castle’s keep. As a result of this separation, both the upper and lower wards were individual self-contained spaces within the confines of the castle walls.

Of the various monarchical building initiatives, of particular note are those of Henry III, in 1240, who ordered the building of new royal lodgings in both the upper and lower wards. These were to be accompanied by a new chapel in the lower ward, some seventy feet long and twenty-eight feet wide. This chapel, dedicated to St Edward, would, in 1348, become the Chapel of St George, but even from its completion in 1248-9, it was regarded as the most important chapel in the castle. Edward III, on his accession, inherited a castle which, while grand, lacked coherence, built up by his predecessors in a haphazard manner. Furthermore, few repairs had been made in over fifty years, forcing Edward to commission a survey of the castle in the first months of

---


3 Ibid., pp. 19-27.

4 Ibid., pp. 25-6.

5 Ibid. This was in comparison to the smaller household chapel which was located in the castle’s Upper Ward.
his reign, in order to establish its condition.\textsuperscript{6} The scene was set for a complete redesign of the castle, both for Edward to promote his own majesty but also for practical purposes, and one which would provide the setting for the foundation of St George’s chapel and college.

Reorganisation of the castle allowed Edward to express the chivalric ideals of contemporary culture in his new building works. It was a culture that was of particular interest to Edward III, both personally and politically. Edward II’s rule had left the English Crown politically vulnerable and there was a recognised need to keep the nobility on the king’s side, and - more importantly - busy. Soldiers existed to fight, and through chivalric play-acting such as tournaments, Edward sought to keep his nobles both loyal and entertained. It was in this context that he devised the Order of the Round Table, precursor to the later and more familiar Order of the Garter. The idea of the Round Table had its roots in the legends of King Arthur and his knights, and its foundation was announced by Edward at a tournament in January 1344, as recorded by Thomas Walsingham:

\begin{quote}
In the year of grace 1344 ... King Edward summoned many workers to Windsor Castle and began to build a house which was called ‘The Round Table’. Its size from the centre to the circumference, the radius, was 100 feet, and its diameter was therefore two hundred feet'.\textsuperscript{7}
\end{quote}

Building works for this grand project were begun within a month of Edward’s announcement, and the workmen were initially provided with a weekly budget of £100.\textsuperscript{8} However, this sum soon fell to a mere £9 a week, because ‘of news which the King received from France’, and by November work on the building ceased altogether.\textsuperscript{9}

\textsuperscript{6} Ibid., p. 27; Hope, \textit{Windsor Castle}, i, pp. 107-9.
\textsuperscript{8} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{9} Ibid.; Julian Munby, ‘The Round Table Building: The Windsor Building Accounts’ in Edward III’s \textit{Round Table at Windsor}, pp. 44-52.
It is uncertain how complete the project was by this point, although it has been argued that the Round Table building may have been useable in part, albeit as a rough shell.\(^{10}\)

War with France, and the consequent financial constraints caused Edward’s chivalric project to be abandoned, and building works did not recommence on his victorious return from France in 1347. The reasons behind the king’s change in heart are uncertain. Perhaps victories in France and Scotland, which had resulted in the capture of both the French and Scottish kings, caused Edward to think more long-term, in the light of the financial rewards and ransoms these victories provided. Perhaps Edward wished to reward his commanders on these campaigns with a more exclusive chivalric order, or maybe he had simply gone off the idea of the Round Table. Interestingly, a rival Round Table project had also been put into action in France by Philip of Valois in order to attract the knights of Germany and Italy to his court, rather than Edward’s, possibly causing the English king to change the nature of his chivalric order.\(^{11}\)

**The Order of the Garter**

While Edward’s reasons for change are uncertain, on his return to England, his focus quickly moved from the Round Table to a new order: the Order of the Garter. A precise foundation date for the Order of the Garter has been the source of much speculation. Juliet Vale provides a *terminus ante quem* of 2 September 1349, but also postulates that the Order may have been formally instituted with a list of members by 18 December 1348.\(^{12}\) Mark Ormrod has further expanded on this to argue that while the pre-history of the Garter is uncertain and speculative, the co-foundation of the Order of the Garter and St George’s Chapel was essentially a product of Edward’s thinking and planning during the first half of 1348.\(^{13}\) The origins of the Order, however, predate its formal institution, possibly having been conceived in the aftermath of Edward’s

---

\(^{10}\) Ibid., pp. 51-2.


great victory against the French at Crécy two years earlier.¹⁴ Victory at Crécy marked a
turning point in Edward’s plans. While the Round Table was intended as a means of
gathering the wider nobility through endeavours such as tournaments, the Order of
the Garter was instead a reward of the close friends and associates who had fought
with him at Crécy. It was thus an exclusive community from the start.

Rather than being divisive, as Edward II had been in rewarding his favourites, the Order
was a public reward for loyalty and military service, and quickly expanded to include
nobles other than those present at Crécy, while retaining its exclusive status. The two-
year delay between the battle and the order’s foundation was perhaps inevitable,
given the preparations required to initiate such a foundation. This delay contrasted
sharply with the speed with which Edward had begun his Round Table project,
manifesting that it had been more carefully considered, in order to ensure the
Order’s future.

The Order of the Garter was in some respects a fresh incarnation of Edward’s original
Round Table project, but one key difference remained between the two, the
association with an ecclesiastical body. The Round Table was a purely chivalric
foundation, with no spiritual dimension. It is uncertain whether Edward intended to
found a religious institution, such as St George’s, to partner the Round Table, had the
project been completed, but its location suggests otherwise: the structure was
positioned in the south-east corner of the upper ward, forming a curve against the
castle walls.¹⁵ By contrast, the new St George’s Chapel, spiritual home for both the
college of St George and the Order of the Garter was situated in almost the exact
opposite end of the castle, in Henry III’s chapel dedicated to Edward the Confessor,

¹⁴ Vale, Edward III and Chivalry, pp. 76-91. This may explain, amongst other details, the oddity of the
Order’s motto being French, in a time when many other known mottoes were appearing in the English
vernacular. D’Arcy Boulton and Hugh Collins have further built on Vale’s argument, citing a possible
connection with the Castillian Order of the Band, or proposals developed in 1344 by Jean, Duke of
Normandy: Boulton, Knights of the Crown, pp. 109, 113-4, 158; Hugh Collins, Order of the Garter
¹⁵ Munby, Barber and Brown, Edward III’s Round Table at Windsor, Plates X, XIV, XV, pp. 156-77 for the
full archaeological report.
within the lower ward of the Castle, close to the royal almonry, stables and various service buildings.\textsuperscript{16}

This change of location, indicative of Edward III’s systematic rebuilding and reorganisation of Windsor Castle, brought about the separation of ecclesiastical and royal communities within the castle’s walls, as has been shown in detail by Christopher Wilson.\textsuperscript{17} The upper ward was remodelled to facilitate courtly ceremony, rationalising in one set of building works what had evolved piecemeal at Westminster Palace. The lower ward, however, was turned over to the king’s new college and order, to form an ecclesiastical centre and community in the castle.\textsuperscript{18} Moving the Order of the Garter from the upper ward to the lower ward, demonstrates a fundamental change in Edward III’s plans. As A. K. B. Roberts has argued:

‘The new foundation was to combine both piety and chivalry [my italics]. To this end, the chapel in Windsor Castle was rededicated and its staff considerably augmented; it was made an integral part of the Order of the Garter, and liberally endowed’.\textsuperscript{19}

Such a provision firmly linked the Order of the Garter with the new chapel and college of St George, providing both a ceremonial but also a spiritual setting for the order. It also emphasized and strengthened the status of the lower ward as the pre-eminent religious centre within the castle. In order to combine both piety and chivalry, Henry III’s chapel and staff required substantial expansion, in order to provide a powerful religious community befitting the grand new order.

\textbf{The Foundation of St George’s College}

The chapel of St Edward in the lower ward was rededicated in August 1348 to ‘the honour of God, the Virgin Mary and Saints George the Martyr and Edward the

\textsuperscript{16} Tim Tatton-Brown, ‘Windsor Castle before 1344’, pp. 22-3.
\textsuperscript{18} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 15-6.
\textsuperscript{19} Roberts, \textit{St George’s, 1348-1416}, p. 1.
Confessor’.\textsuperscript{20} Roberts notes that of these, it was St George who took the foremost position from the outset, as the chapter seal, produced at roughly the same time as the foundation depicts him in the chief place.\textsuperscript{21} This was confirmed in letters patent of the next year, which refer to the ‘chapel of St George, Windsor’, and of 1351, which referred to the chapel ‘erected by the king in the castle of Windsor in honour of the blessed George, the most invincible athlete of Christ, whose name and protection the English race invoke as that of their peculiar patron’.\textsuperscript{22} This style persisted through the majority of contemporary references to the chapel and college, although there was occasional reference to the joint dedication to the Virgin Mary.\textsuperscript{23}

Interestingly, the college of St George as founded in 1348, may have had its roots in an earlier collegiate institution on its doorstep. In 1313, Edward III’s father, Edward II, had founded a college dedicated to the Virgin Mary in the king’s manor within Windsor Park, with a dean, twelve chaplains and four clerks.\textsuperscript{24} This collegiate chapel ended up being a major financial drain on Crown finances and was eventually disbanded, with four of the chaplains and clerks moving into the castle proper, one of whom became one of the first canons of the 1348 foundation.\textsuperscript{25} It is perhaps not inconceivable that this institution, while not financially viable, may have influenced Edward in his foundation of St George’s within the bounds of the castle, although located in the lower ward, close to the king and his court, and in view of its connections with the Order of the Garter, the new college could claim significantly more prestige than Edward II’s foundation.

The college’s foundation on 6 August, 1348, made provision for a warden and fifteen canons, in addition to the eight chaplains already present at the chapel, and a number

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{20} CPR, 1348-50, p. 144.
\item \textsuperscript{21} Roberts, St George’s, 1348-1416, p. 2; Sir Nicholas Harris Nicolas, History of the Orders of Knighthood of the British Empire (London, 1842), p. 15, n. 3. The dedication to St George also precedes that of Edward the Confessor, to whom the chapel was previously dedicated: Sir Nicholas Harris Nicolas, ‘Observations of the Institution of the Order of the Garter’, Archaeologia, 31 (1846), p. 126. Eventually, St Edward’s name came to be used so rarely in connection with the chapel as to be often forgotten.
\item \textsuperscript{22} CPR, 1348-50, p. 372; CPR, 1350-4, p. 127.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Roberts, St George’s, 1348-1416, p. 2.
\item \textsuperscript{24} Ibid., p. 5.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Ibid., pp. 5-6; CPR, 1330-4, p. 80; CCR, 1330-33, p. 210. The canon in question was John of Melton, who became chief chaplain at the castle on his move, replacing Robert Shutlington.
\end{itemize}
of unnamed ministers to serve there under the warden. Crucially, the foundation also included a body of twenty-four poor knights who were to be maintained from the college’s resources.\(^{26}\) The college was initially endowed with the incomes of the churches of Wraysbury (including the chapel of Langley Marish, Buckinghamshire), South Tawton, Devon, and Uttoxeter, Staffordshire, with other grants providing the overall sum of £1000 annually.\(^{27}\) The presentation to Wraysbury was at first made by the college’s officials, but from 1361 was farmed out for £24 (on average) annually, while the chapel at Langley was worth between £26 13s. 4d. and £33 6s. 8d., plus an annual rent of 9s.\(^{28}\) South Tawton was farmed at £24, except for a period between 1386 and 1406 when this sum dropped to £20.\(^{29}\) Uttoxeter was richer and its value at farm increased from £43 6s. to a maximum of £50, before dropping to between £35 and £40 annually.\(^{30}\) Further church estates were granted as endowments to the college in the years after its foundation: Deddington and Datchet in 1350, Iver, Ryston, Whaddon and Caxton in 1351, and Simonburn and Saltash in a separate endowment of 1351.\(^{31}\) Two manorial grants, at Iver and of lands in Bray, were further granted in 1352 and one-third of the estate of Deddington Castle, Oxfordshire, was acquired by the college by purchase in 1386. Other grants from individuals were added throughout the fourteenth and early-fifteenth centuries.\(^{32}\)

The foundation received papal sanction on 30 November 1350 while, on 12 February 1351, a further bull granted the college exemption from ordinary jurisdiction.\(^{33}\) Windsor lay within the diocese of Salisbury, and it is uncertain why the Bishop of Winchester, William Edington, was chosen to settle the statutes and ordinances. Martin Biddle has argued that this was a deliberate choice by the king, and that Edington may have also been prelate of the Order of the Garter from the outset, as

\(^{26}\) *CPR, 1348-50*, p. 144.

\(^{27}\) *Ibid.; Roberts, St George’s, 1348-1416*, p. 14-15. Of these, only Wraysbury was in the King’s possession to give, as South Tawton belonged to Thomas Beauchamp, earl of Warwick, and Uttoxeter to Henry, earl of Lancaster.


\(^{29}\) *Ibid.*

\(^{30}\) *Ibid.*


later bishops of Winchester were to be.\textsuperscript{34} The college’s statutes and ordinances were finally completed on 30 November 1352, although none of the statutes survive in their original forms.\textsuperscript{35} In the four years between Edward’s grant and the completion of the college’s statutes the structure of the new foundation was altered slightly: there were now to be twenty-six, rather than twenty-four priests and poor knights alike.\textsuperscript{36} Of the clerical members of the college, there was to be one warden, twelve secular canons, thirteen priest-vicars and four clerks to aid them.\textsuperscript{37} This number of twenty-six ecclesiastics, and twenty-six poor knights, was intended to match the number of Knights of the Garter, and provide balance with the Order of the Garter. Furthermore, each of the original knights had the right to present one of the first canons or vicars of the college and one poor knight to pray in his stead daily in the chapel, with all subsequent presentations reserved to the sovereign.\textsuperscript{38}

**Collegiate Institutions**

The college of St George’s, Windsor was, by no means, a unique institution in England, and is directly comparable to several other cathedral and collegiate foundations, both pre- and post-Conquest. In particular, the college’s status as a royal free chapel allows for a direct comparison with other royal free chapels such as those identified by Hamilton Thompson and further subdivided according to the way in which the chapel’s

\textsuperscript{34} Martin Biddle, ‘Why is the Bishop of Winchester Prelate of the Order?’, in *St George’s Chapel, Windsor: History and Heritage*, ed. by N. Saul and T. Tatton-Brown (Stanbridge, 2010), pp. 52-5. Biddle further postulates that this may have represented a connection between the new foundations at Windsor and King Arthur, so often associated with Winchester, in an attempt to validate the status of Windsor as the new seat of chivalry. D’Arcy Boulton also put forward a similar argument regarding a connection with King Arthur: Boulton, *Knights of the Crown*, p. 148.

\textsuperscript{35} Roberts, *St George’s, 1348-1416*, p. 7. A roll with a copy of these statutes survives from the early-fifteenth or late-fourteenth century in the college’s archives, along with a complete copy in the fifteenth-century Arundel White Book in the same archive, although this differs in some aspects from the earlier copy: SGC, XI.D.20; IV.B.1, ff. 74-84. Outside of St George’s, two copies survive in the British Library, in BL, Harleian MS 564 and Add. MS 4845.

\textsuperscript{36} Roberts, *St George’s, 1348-1416*, p. 7.

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid. During the early years of the college, the title of the warden was the subject of some debate, with both the terms custos and decanus used interchangeably. The matter was settled during the wardenship of John Arundel in 1429. Arundel petitioned parliament for legal recognition of both titles, as his predecessor had been appointed as dean despite the statutes styling the position warden: *PROME*, iv, pp. 346-7; *CPR*, 1422-1429, pp. 527-8; *CPR*, 1429-36, p. 45.

\textsuperscript{38} Roberts, *St George’s, 1348-1416*, p. 12.
chapter was elected. 39 Thus, St Mary’s at Shrewsbury, St Edith’s at Tamworth, St Michael’s at Penkridge and St Peter’s at Wolverhampton were composed of a dean, appointed by the Crown, and a body of canons, appointed by the dean.40 All Saints’ at Derby, St Martin’s-le-Grand in London, Wimborne Minster in Dorset, St Buryan’s in Cornwall and St Mary Magdalene’s at Bridgnorth had both their deaneries and canonries as Crown preferments, although nominations to canonries were generally controlled by the dean.41 Crucially, these free chapels generally had early foundation dates in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, predating Edward III’s foundation at Windsor by some years. St Mary’s at Warwick and St Mary’s in the Castle at Leicester were both founded by earls in the century after the Conquest and thus remained outside royal jurisdiction, but maintained a similar structure to that of the royal free chapels.42

St George’s was not the only royal college established in 1348. St Stephen’s college at Westminster - often called a twin institution to St George’s - was founded at the same time, and closely resembled its counterpart in Windsor.43 Edward III’s institutions of St George’s and St Stephen’s were established after a considerable hiatus in the making of royal foundations. They were made up with a dean and twelve canons, whose benefices were royal donatives.44 In this time, however, the form and function of such institutions had changed. According to Hamilton Thompson, the English collegiate institutions of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were generally characterised by a foundation upon a cathedral pattern. Each ‘separate prebend [was] held by its occupant as a freehold benefice, and conditions of residence which, if they were nominally obligatory, did not in practice preclude the tenure of other benefices by

40 *Ibid.*, p. 81. Penkridge would, in 1226, be granted to the archbishop of Dublin and his successors, provided they were not Irishmen: *ibid.*, pp. 82-3; CPR, 1225-32, p. 97.
41 Hamilton Thompson, *The English Clergy and their organization in the later Middle Ages*, pp. 81-3. All Saints was later granted to the dean and chapter of Lincoln in 1279: CPR, 1272-81, p. 313.
43 No comprehensive study of the medieval college of St Stephen has been published to date, although current research by Elizabeth Biggs will, it is hoped, fill this gap.
canons’. Windsor, while similar to the aforementioned colleges in its royal status, and in the influence of the Crown on nominations and appointments, was certainly distinctive in the structure of its prebendary system. This fact was curiously overlooked by Hamilton Thompson in his otherwise meticulous work. Indeed, St George’s and St Stephen’s in particular, could be seen to be an attempt to copy Louis IX’s foundation, la Sainte-Chapelle, both in the number of priests, and even in their position on the main river of the capital city.

At St George’s, all twelve canonries were equal in value, deriving from a common fund rather than from individual benefices. Annual stipends were equal, thus no stall in particular was more desirable than others. Furthermore, the stipend formed only part of a canon’s income, which was supplemented by daily payments for attendance in chapel. This structure sharpened the distinction between residentiaries and non-residents, as it provided a greater degree of central control over each canon’s annual income, and accommodated both groups. In terms of function, St George’s was essentially a half-way house between the old prebendal institutions, where prebendaries were often absent, and the newer developing chantry colleges, where chaplains were obliged to be present. The system which Hamilton Thompson has described as ‘the old system of equal prebends’, was not unique to Windsor, and also operated at Exeter cathedral, and at ‘the two colleges of Shrewsbury, the royal free chapel of St Mary, and the bishop of Lichfield’s church of St Chad’. The question of residency will be discussed in detail in the following, but it is important to note the peculiarities in the college’s structure. This structure can perhaps be explained by the limited number of grants given to the college upon its foundation: grants which were sizeable in substance, but limited in number, and could thus not be assigned to a single beneficiary in their entirety. As Hamilton Thompson notes, the use of a common fund ‘resembled those rectories divided into moieties, common all over England, which

45 Ibid., pp. 84-5.
46 While the college’s statutes refer specifically to prebends, this thesis will instead use the words canonry and canonries to describe the canons’ incomes. This is in order to differentiate between early prebendal institutions, with fixed lands providing an income for each canon, rather than the common fund used at Windsor: Statutes and Injunctions, p. 5.
47 Hamilton Thompson, The English Clergy and their organization in the later Middle Ages, pp. 86-7.
were due to the existence of two patrons or the division of the heritage of a single patron’.\textsuperscript{48} In the case of St George’s, the latter was clearly an important factor in the need for a common fund, thus avoiding any need to subdivide the substantial grants with which the college had been endowed.

**Statutes**

The college’s original statutes, granted in 1352, unfortunately do not survive. The edition used below is from the College’s archives, edited by Canon Dalton and currently archived as an unpublished galley proof.\textsuperscript{49} The statutes provide great detail about the day-to-day running of the chapel and college, and will be used frequently throughout this thesis when discussing each group of the community. However, it is useful briefly to consider some of the more important and overriding statutes which affected the whole community. First of these is the provision of obedientiaries to run the college’s administration. Below the dean, the three principal offices were those of treasurer, steward and precentor, each elected annually by the chapter.

**Steward and Treasurer**

The two obedientiaries responsible for the financial affairs of the community were the steward and the treasurer. The individuals elected to these offices annually at Michaelmas were to be those

‘whom they [the canons] shall think most prudent and faithful, and in whom the Warden and the rest of the Canons then present, or the greater or more discreet part of the same in comparison of the minority, shall agree together on’.\textsuperscript{50}

The steward was to deal with the college’s various properties and tenants, ‘especially those that lie without the precincts’, instructing them both in ‘direction and government’, in order to retrieve money owed in rent, and pass this sum on to the treasurer. In turn, the treasurer was obliged to distribute this money amongst the

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[48]{Ibid., p. 86.}
\footnotetext[49]{Statutes and Injunctions.}
\footnotetext[50]{Ibid., p. 14.}
\end{footnotes}
community in accordance with the portions allocated by statute, ‘without friendship, hatred or favour’. 51 The treasurer was also required to protect and keep the ornaments not assigned to the precentor including jewels and the ‘residue of the treasure of the same Chapel’. 52

Their respective rolls of account reveal that both the treasurer and steward dealt with considerably more than what was provided for in college statute, using their budgets to provide for repairs at St George’s and in the college’s other properties, travelling expenses and other miscellaneous gifts and costs. They received a stipend of 100s. per annum, or a proportion of this sum, if they completed only part of the year. Tenure of one of these offices held its risks. According to statute, if the steward or treasurer was remiss in making payments to each relevant individual, then he was to be considered ‘shut out’ from his cotidian allowance. If no satisfaction had been reached within eight days, his cotidians were to be distributed to those canons residing, until their arrears had been paid. 53 Thus, in times of financial uncertainty the steward and treasurer were at risk of losing out, if they were unable to fully account for their actions. The visitation of the college’s properties was not, however, exclusively the treasurer’s and steward’s responsibility, as each year all the ecclesiastical benefices and manors of the college were to be visited by two resident canons who were to report back in chapter. 54 These individuals were to be chosen by the dean and canons, presumably in chapter, and thus the election was decided by those resident. Furthermore, if those chosen decided not to go, they were fined, and the canons were to receive expenses for only one day consisting of hay and oats for their horses, and fuel and straw. 55 As the main financial officers for the college, the treasurer and steward also held keys for the college’s common chest which contained the common seal and charters, a privilege which they shared with the dean, but not with the precentor. 56

51 Ibid.
52 Ibid.
54 Ibid., pp. 17-8.
55 Ibid., p. 18.
56 Ibid., p. 16.
Precentor

The precentor was also to be elected by the dean and canons annually to facilitate the daily running of the chapel and its liturgy. According to the college’s statutes, the precentor was to

‘regulate the singers in the said Chapel and those that are present in the same at divine service, in their chaunting and in the psalms: and to give notice by himself or some other who of them is to begin the antiphon, and what it is: and it shall not be permitted to any one when he hath notice given him of this to gainsay the same. He shall also order which of the Cantors on either side of the choir are to begin the Psalms’.\textsuperscript{57}

The precentor was first and foremost charged with organising the weekly liturgy, and was further responsible for producing a wax tablet or parchment every Sunday detailing the college’s rota for the following week with regard to masses, lessons, epistles, gospels and other such matters.\textsuperscript{58} He was also custodian of the chapel’s fittings and furnishings, namely ‘the books, the crosses, the chalices, the vestments, the ornaments, the candlesticks, the common property appointed for the common use of the same Chapel’, and other fixed items such as the college’s bells, which were to ring at appropriate times.\textsuperscript{59}

While few precentor’s rolls survive for the late-fifteenth century, the work of various precentors is in evidence in the attendance registers upon which part of this study relies. Part of the precentor’s job in organising the daily liturgy was to record any absence of members of the community so that the individuals in question could be brought to account in chapter ‘one by one in detail’, alongside ‘any other defects whatsoever if he [the precentor] shall have perceived any’.\textsuperscript{60} Such individuals could then excuse their absence, provided their reasons were deemed acceptable by the

\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., p. 13.
\textsuperscript{58} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., pp. 13-14.
\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., p. 13.
canons present, although in the case of the choristers this defence was to come from the vicar, who was their master and teacher.

The precentor held the crucial responsibility for the day-to-day running of the college of St George’s, regulating and enforcing the daily liturgy in order to ensure a high quality and consistent divine service. For his work, he was to be given the sum of 100s. per annum, or a smaller sum proportional to the duration of his service if he left early.61

**The Chapter**

On a daily basis, the entire foundation would retire after Matins to the chapter room, where they would finish Prime, according to the Sarum Use, after which the canons would be left alone to discuss any issues regarding the college.62 There was to be no ‘arguing, talking, noise or trifles’ once each service had begun, and disputes were frowned upon amongst the chapter.63 Quarrels were to be resolved by reconciliation within eight days, otherwise both parties were to be suspended from chapel and the guilty party or parties were to pay daily payment to the other for loss of earnings.64 Furthermore, ‘because defamers and grumblers, and sewers of discord amongst companions and brethren do damnably bring in division, provoke hatred and banish charity’, such individuals (if below the level of canon) were to be given three warnings before they were expelled.65 Finally, two general chapters were to take place annually, at All Souls (or on the next Sunday if All Souls did not fall on a Sunday), and ‘on the Monday after the Sunday on which the Introit Quasi modo geniti is sung’.66 At these general chapter meetings, two auditors would be appointed from within the chapter, who would check all the financial accounts and resolve any issues.

**Archive and Historiography**

62 ibid., p. 11.
63 ibid., pp. 10-11.
64 ibid., p. 15.
65 ibid.
66 ibid. This was the day after Low Sunday, eight days after Easter Sunday.
The core of the documentation for this study is found in the college's own archives, although the status of St George's as a royal free chapel meant that the college and its community often featured in central records of the Crown, now in the National Archives, and also in other local records. Apart from an excellent series of obedientiaries' accounts, the college's surviving records include a wide range of documents relating to chantry foundations, property grants and estate administration, and relations with the Crown and the papacy.

Central for the purposes of this thesis are the college's surviving obedientiary accounts, most notably those of the treasurers and stewards which survive for much of the late-fifteenth century. The treasurer's rolls contain entries relating to the internal workings of the college, including cotidian and stipend payments to all members of the community; anniversary records and payments; expenses for repairs within the college; and expenses of the treasurer and other canons travelling on college business. The accounts provide a comprehensive break-down of the collegiate community in each year that they survive for, and allow for a detailed community study during the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries. The steward's accounts are concerned primarily with the renting of the college's various properties and sources of income. They contain details of the various lands and tenements held by the college, including their annual income, amount owed and the holder of the property. The rolls also include repairs to these properties; expenses of the steward and others in travelling to hold court and other college business; and some expenses for items such as building materials within the college itself. As with the treasurer's rolls, the steward's accounts also provide some names for the college's obedientiaries. From both the treasurer's and steward's accounts, it has been possible to create a list of the college's obedientiaries for twenty-three years between Michaelmas 1467 and Michaelmas 1504. A unique survival among the college's records is a register recording the attendance of the members of the college in chapel for eleven years between June

---

67 The extant accounts from Michaelmas 1468 to Michaelmas 1504 have been tabulated in Appendix 1.
68 See Appendix 2.
1468 and July 1479. This register provides detailed records for daily attendance in chapel for the college community, and forms the core of this thesis.

In spite of its excellent archive, the scholarly study of the College of St George was slow to evolve. Most notable among the early historiography concerning the castle is William St John Hope’s three volume work, *Windsor Castle: An Architectural History*. St John Hope provides the only all-encompassing study of the castle’s history and architecture to date, drawing on a limited range of the college’s archival materials. The most important modern study of the medieval college of St George as a discreet institution is provided by A.K.B. Roberts’ *St George’s Chapel, Windsor Castle: 1348-1416*, a work which the present thesis seeks to expand into the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries. More recently, Evans (née Roberts) has also provided an important supplementary discussion of the college’s financial problems in the fifteenth century, a theme which recurs in the following. In her work, Evans was able to draw upon the earlier prosopographical work of minor canon and canon of Windsor - Edmund Fellowes and Sidney Ollard respectively - now in need of updating, but in their day pioneering in their use of the college archives. In recent years, four collections of essays, three of them arising from conferences, have done much to illuminate individual aspects of the college’s history. The focus of much of this work has been the first century of the college’s existence, with a particular emphasis on the fourteenth century. Evans, Nigel Saul and Clive Burgess have written about the college and canons of St George’s in the fourteenth century, and have discussed factors such as community, property litigation and the college’s foundation. Musicologists, like

---

69 SGC, V.B.II. A similar record survives for the fourteenth century, but covers less than a year: SGC, V.B.I.
70 Hope, *Windsor Castle*.
71 Roberts, *St George’s, 1348-1416*.
72 Evans, ‘Years of Arrears’.
73 Fellowes, *The Vicars or Minor Canons; idem, Organists and Masters of the Choristers of St George’s Chapel in Windsor Castle* (Windsor, 1939), *idem, Military Knights; Fasti Wyndesorienses*.
74 *St George’s Chapel, Windsor, in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. by C. Richmond and E. Scarff (Windsor, 2001); *Windsor: Medieval Archaeology, Art and Architecture of the Thames Valley*, ed. Laurence Keen and Eileen Scarff (Leeds, 2002); *St George’s Chapel, Windsor, in the Fourteenth Century*, ed. by N. Saul (Woodbridge, 2005); *St George’s Chapel, Windsor: History and Heritage*, ed. N. Saul and T. Tatton-Brown (Stanbridge, 2010).
75 Nigel Saul, ‘St George’s Chapel and the Foundation of the Order of the Garter’, in *St George’s Chapel, Windsor: History and Heritage*, pp. 45-51; Clive Burgess, ‘St George’s College, Windsor: Context and Consequence’, in *St George’s Chapel, Windsor, in the Fourteenth Century*, pp. 63-96; Nigel Saul,
Roger Bowers and Helen Jeffries, have been prominent in analysing the evolution of music and liturgy in the college, while the manuscripts and printed books in the college’s library have also attracted some attention.76

Necessary building and repair works in Windsor castle have over recent decades provided the opportunity for archaeological and architectural surveys, some of the findings of which have informed the writings of scholars like John Crook, Tim Tatton-Brown, Peter Kidson, and Jane Geddes.77 Archaeological evidence has also been of the first importance for the study of the St George’s site before 1348, for which archival material is more limited.78

The medieval collegiate church more generally has attracted scholarly study in its own right. Hamilton Thompson’s classic work on the English clergy has more recently been supplemented by a useful collection of essays dedicated to the medieval college, and the role which such institutions could play.79 There has in addition been a substantial amount of work, much of it prosopographical, on the late medieval secular clergy, not least that of David Lepine on secular canons throughout the kingdom.80

---


78 Steven Brindle, ‘The First St George’s Chapel’, in St George’s Chapel, Windsor: History and Heritage, pp. 36-44; David Carpenter and Julie Kantner, ‘King Henry III and Windsor Castle’, in St George’s Chapel, Windsor: History and Heritage, pp. 25-35; Munby, Barber and Brown, Edward III’s Round Table at Windsor.

79 The Late Medieval English College and its Context, ed. by C. Burgess and M. Heale (Woodbridge, 2008).

80 David Lepine, A Brotherhood of Canons Serving God: English Secular Cathedrals in the Later Middle Ages (Woodbridge, 1995); idem, “Loose Canons”: The Mobility of the Higher Clergy in the Later Middle Ages’, in Freedom of Movement in the Middle Ages, ed. by P. Horden (Donington, 2007), pp. 104-22; idem, “A Long Way from University”: Cathedral Canons and Learning at Hereford in the Fifteenth
Methodology

This thesis will discuss each of the sub-groups present at St George’s in turn. It will focus on the community and St George’s and, for reasons of brevity, will not consider in detail relations with the wider lay castle community, except where the community was directly impacted. Such interactions are the basis of future research in their own right, and it is impossible to accurately judge such relationships without first understanding the collegiate community at St George’s. The four groups considered in the following are the canons, vicars, lay clerks and poor knights. Each study will involve a degree of prosopographical analysis and will, where possible, look at factors such as individual’s career and education. The thesis makes extensive use of the college’s extant fifteenth-century attendance register, and detailed statistics are provided for each group. These in-depth studies of daily attendance for each group present new revelations about life in a collegiate institution, and how such a community functioned. Detailed lists of the college community are also provided for all the groups discussed. Chapters 1 and 2 analyse the most important group in the college: the dean and canons. Chapter 1 provides a focused study of the college’s composition during the eleven-year period covered by the attendance register, assessing what type of men took up positions at St George’s in the late-fifteenth century, and how sub-divisions and coterie networks within the chapter affected the college. Chapter 2 furthers this analysis, using three case studies of education, dynastic upheaval, and housing allocations to take discussion into the sixteenth-century. Chapter 3 provides an analysis of the vicars and lay clerks, how they fitted into the collegiate hierarchy, and how this structure changed with the spread of polyphony, and changing trends. Chapter 4 examines the role of the poor knights in the college, as a lay element in an inherently religious community, and assesses the effects of this dichotomy. Finally, 

Chapter 5 provides an assessment of community commemoration at St George’s: who was commemorated and how. This chapter brings together all of the groups previously examined, in order to assess how the community functioned as a whole in chapel. Important questions which the study will answer include: whether St George’s College, and the Lower Ward more generally, were ever a coherent community, or whether it was only ever partial and fractured; if the statutes put forward in 1352 specifically cater for the reality of an institution used in a peculiar way by a succession of English kings; and whether reality outstripped Edward III’s institution, causing it to change throughout the fifteenth century. The college of St George’s was, from its foundation, a peculiar ecclesiastical entity within England, and had grown to become a powerful institution by the fifteenth century, led by influential individuals amongst the chapter of the dean and canons. This thesis furthers the story and explores how the college adapted to the challenges of turbulent times.
Chapter 1 - Canons in the Cloister I: 1468-79

To understand the community of St George’s College, Windsor Castle, it is first necessary to examine the individual groups and hierarchies that comprised and governed this community. The first of these groups to be discussed is that of the dean and canons, the most important and powerful men within the college. At any one point, thirteen such men held prebends within the college - a dean and twelve canons - who between them formed the college’s chapter. The following will attempt to ascertain what type of men filled these positions, and the way in which they interacted with each other and with the wider world. To do so, this chapter will start by discussing the attendance and duration of service of the dean and canons, in order to determine how committed they were to their canonries, and to establish groups of canons within the college community. It will then move to a discussion of the canons’ education, in particular their connections with the Oxford colleges of All Souls and Merton. This will establish the type of men who held canonries at Windsor, and their backgrounds, and also demonstrate one coterie network present at St George’s. The study will then consider the constitution of the chapter, discussing the obedientiary positions within the college, the key duties performed by these men, and which canons took these jobs.

Having described the constitution and the characteristics of those canons holding canonries at St George’s, the chapter will then go on to discuss the two key groups present: those of the ‘Windsor-men’, with high attendance and commitment, and the absentees, those with low attendance but important men in their own right outside of Windsor. This analysis will be in part financial, examining how the college’s central fund was utilised by the canons. The chapter will discuss what each group contributed to the community of St George’s, and also identify problems that accompanied their presence. It will demonstrate that within sub-groups within the chapter created a balance between absentees and residents, which allowed the college to fulfil its two main functions of prayer and patronage. This balance helped the college to survive and even prosper through turbulent times, both financially and politically. The chapter will
conclude with two case studies discussing two very different crises that affected St George’s in the late-fifteenth century and how the chapter dealt with them. The two cases used are the Readeption of Henry VI, 1470-1, and the building of the grand new chapel within the Lower Ward from 1475. These will demonstrate how the college dealt firstly with a political crisis and the shifting power struggles of the War of the Roses, and secondly with the more domestic upheaval and challenge of living and working on a building site for a prolonged period of time. The focus of this study is to demonstrate how the chapter of St George’s in the late-fifteenth century was a balanced one of residents and absentees, who between them formed a mutually beneficial community. This balance provided all the canons with the means to prosper, with a resident pool from whom the college’s obedientiaries were drawn, supported by absentee canons with powerful socio-political connections and the ability to provide access to centres of power.

Evidence

This chapter will focus on an eleven year time-frame between June 1468 and July 1479. This period has been chosen because of the relatively high level of documentary survival. Most notably the attendance register for these years is extant, covering the months between June 1468 and July 1479 inclusive, and comprising sixty-seven pages, one of only two registers of the type to survive for this college before the Reformation.¹ For the purposes of the present study, this register is of considerable interest, as it contains not only attendance figures for the dean, canons, poor knights, vicars and clerks for an eleven year period, it also notes events such as individual deaths, installations and resignations. From the data drawn from the registers, it is possible to create a snapshot of the college over the course of a decade. The use of the registers permits a level of statistical analysis which enhances our understanding both of the office holders of the college in the second half of the fifteenth century and the role of the dean and canons within their community.

¹ SGC, V.B.II. The other surviving register, V.B.I, is for the fourteenth century, for the years 1384-6.
The college’s obedientiary accounts are of particular use when considering the canons of St George’s. Multiple treasurer’s rolls and steward’s rolls survive for the period, 1468-79, although no precentor’s rolls are extant for the years between 1458 and 1511.² The rolls vary in condition. Some are missing sections, while others are draft accounts, containing numerous corrections and additions.³ From the extant rolls, it is also possible to identify those canons holding obedientiary positions within St George’s. This includes the auditors of each account, who are often not named outside the rolls. Various bills and indentures also survive within St George’s archives from the fifteenth century. Most notable for the purposes of the current study are five indentures of money delivered to the college by the treasurer and canon, Thomas Passhe in 1479-80, and a bill of payments by the same Thomas as steward and David Hopton c.1474.⁴ Other bills and indentures survive for the periods shortly before and after the study period, which can help to shed light on the events of 1468-79.

Attendance

By college statute, the canons were required to attend once a day in choir, either at Matins or High Mass, or Vespers and Compline.⁵ A residency period of three weeks in which a canon was required to attend these three principal canonical services was also confirmed by a chapter act of 1430.⁶ The attendance registers record a canon’s attendance at chapel by a circle, and his absence by the lack of one, in order that the treasurer might accurately calculate cotidian payments for each individual.⁷ On occasion, the canon keeping the register would add a small dot immediately beneath

² Treasurers’ Rolls exist in SGC for the following years between 1468 and 1479: 1468-9 (XV.34.56), 1471-2 (XV.34.51), 1474-5 (XV.34.52), 1475-6 (XV.34.53), 1477-8 (XV.34.54) and 1478-9 (XV.34.55). Stewards’ Rolls exist in SGC for the following years: 1467-8 (XV.48.36-8), 1471 (XV.48.39), 1471-2 (XV.48.40), 1473-4 (XV.48.41), 1474-5 (XV.48.43) 1475-6 (XV.48.42), 1476-7 (XV.48.62), 1477-8 (XV.3.13), 1478-9 (XV.48.44) and 1479-80 (XV.48.45).
³ Draft versions of account rolls can also be distinguished by the material on which they were written, with paper being used as a draft material and the finalised account copied onto parchment.
⁴ SGC, XV.57.10; XV.57.12. Short calendar entries for these can be found in Dalton, Manuscripts, p. 130.
⁵ Roberts, St George’s, 1348-1416, p. 8; Statutes and Injunctions, p. 5.
⁷ This was in contrast to the college’s vicars and clerks whose attendance was recorded at each office. For the attendance of the vicars and clerks, see Chapter 3. As the canons were required to attend only once daily, it is impossible to tell which of the three main offices each canon attended.
the circle indicating an individual’s presence. These dots represent occasions when the
canon in question was not actually present in chapel, but away on approved college
business. This had been allowed by college statute, which stipulated that the canon in
question would receive his cotidians as normal, provided that the business they were
undertaking had been approved by the chapter.8 In the early days of the college’s
existence the canons abused this system to gain their daily stipend without spending
too much time in chapel itself. The injunctions issued by Adam Houghton, Chancellor
of England and Bishop of St David’s, in 1378 stated that the canons:

‘doe not celebrat in the said Chappell as the ought to doe, but they come for one
houre in the same, and having received the dayly stipend for that day depart
because concerning these matters nothing was established in the Statutes and
ordinances of old’.9

Houghton’s injunctions also give a possible indication as to the canons’ preferred use
of their time. One of the canons, Edmund Clove, ‘was antiently of evill Fame for
wenching, and is wanton and bucksome, and accompanies with Laicks in the time of
Masse, and of other hours scandalously’.10 Another canon, John Loring, ‘doth not
celebrate in the said Chappell as he ought, but is given to Hawking and Hunting and
hath soe been o old’.11 The issue was not isolated amongst the canons either, as ‘John
Breton, Knight aforesaid, too much given to his insolencies comes late and too
delicately to his Canonickal hours in the said Chappell; and when he kneels to pray in
the same, he presently falls asleep, soe that he scarcely awakes till the Sacrament of
the Altar’.12 Archbishop John Kemp’s injunctions of 1430 demonstrate that this
problem was ongoing, claiming that the canons only spent as much time in chapel as
was required to gain their cotidians, before leaving to pursue their own affairs.13

---

8 Statutes and Injunctions, p. 7.
9 Ibid., p. 22.
10 Ibid., pp. 21-2
11 Ibid., p. 22.
12 Ibid., p. 21.
13 SGC, XI.D.7
Unfortunately, the absence of later statutes and complete injunctions to the college makes it uncertain whether these issues were ever resolved.

**Table 1: List of Canons (including the Dean) present between June 1468 and July 1479**

The table below provides a list of all the deans and canons present in the eleven-year period covered by the register, including the years when they held their prebend and an average percentage value for their attendance at chapel in the period for which these records survive.14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dates at Windsor</th>
<th>Average Percentage Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Bowyer</td>
<td>30 April 1459 - 12 May 1471</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wygryme</td>
<td>7 June 1457 - 4 October 1468</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bury</td>
<td>10 November 1446 - 28 January 1472</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Towres</td>
<td>31 January 1472 - c. May 1485</td>
<td>99.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payn Burghill</td>
<td>c.1443 - 7 April 1474</td>
<td>97.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Passhe</td>
<td>11 December 1449 - c. November 1489</td>
<td>96.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Misterton</td>
<td>c.1452 - 4 December 1469</td>
<td>96.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hermer</td>
<td>18 December 1455 - 11 July 1473</td>
<td>95.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Faukes [Vaux]</td>
<td>c. Michaelmas 1461 - 5 February 1471</td>
<td>93.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(dean)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hore</td>
<td>c.1452 - 8 February 1474</td>
<td>93.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clement Smyth</td>
<td>c. April 1467 - 13 February 1471</td>
<td>85.68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 SGC, V.B.II; *Fasti Wyndesorienses*, pp. 30-5, 58, 66-7, 73-4, 83, 92, 99, 108-9, 115, 117, 127, 137, 145, 155; *BRUO*, pp. 75-6, 106-7, 137-8, 499-500, 540-1, 552, 599-600, 753, 783-6, 1228-9, 1420-1, 1432, 1675-6, 1714-15, 1941, 2108; *BRUC*, pp. 24, 262, 360, 646-7; TNA, C270/24/18; C270/24/22.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term Dates</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Cokkys</td>
<td>24 July 1478 - 20 December 1487</td>
<td>72.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hopton</td>
<td>20 August 1472 - c. December 1492</td>
<td>69.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Beauchamp</td>
<td>24 March 1477 - 18 October 1481</td>
<td>64.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(dean)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Seymour</td>
<td>15 November 1471 - c. January 1501</td>
<td>60.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin Hyde</td>
<td>19 March 1469 - 16 August 1472</td>
<td>57.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyson Geoffrey</td>
<td>23 August 1463 - 13 August 1474</td>
<td>56.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Vaughan</td>
<td>12 May 1471 - c. December 1499</td>
<td>52.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Wodmanston</td>
<td>26 October 1468 - 17 March 1469</td>
<td>47.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Coryngdon</td>
<td>27 July 1473 - 30 September 1476</td>
<td>42.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Downe</td>
<td>c. November 1465 - 17 November 1479</td>
<td>40.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Marshall</td>
<td>14 August 1474 - 22 July 1478</td>
<td>25.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Davyson (dean)</td>
<td>30 October 1471 - 30 November 1473</td>
<td>24.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Lee</td>
<td>6 November 1469 - c. October 1480</td>
<td>19.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Danett</td>
<td>1 October 1472 - 25 October 1481</td>
<td>19.71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the table above, the canons have been divided into three distinct groups: those whose average attendance was above 75%, those between 25% and 75% and those falling below 25%. This selection of quartile values is based on a potential maximum attendance of 100%. However, it must be remembered that by college statute, the dean was allowed a total of sixty days’ absence each year, fifteen in each term, and would therefore have required an average attendance of 83.56% to satisfy these conditions, attending chapel at least once a day.15 In the 1470s, the canons of the college petitioned for a similar allowance and in 1478 they were granted a total of fifty-six days’ absence per year, fourteen in each term.16 As a consequence of this ruling, for the years 1478 and 1479, a canon needed to reach an average attendance of 84.66% to fulfil their obligations.

---

15 Statutes and Injunctions, p. 7.
16 Roberts, St George’s, 1348-1416, p. 9.
The incremental difference between the average attendance percentages shown above also justifies the separation into three groups. Two large drops in average percentage values are noticeable in the data, demonstrating that within St George’s there was clearly a very diverse community of individuals. The first drop is of 13.15%, between Clement Smyth and William Cokkys, across the upper quartile line. The second significant drop is a slightly larger difference of 15.51%, between Thomas Downe and John Marshall. This drop takes place at the lower end of the median group, and is grounds for reclassifying Marshall to the lower quartile, despite his average of 25.16% being slightly over the line of 25%.

As with any statistical analysis, there is also the problem of sample size used: in this case the extant attendance material. The available data used to establish averages for each canon may vary. John Wygryme, for example, is seen to have an average attendance of 100%, but this figure is based on data for just four months and five days from the start date of the surviving register to his death.17 The year 1471 is also slightly problematic, as no fewer than three deans held office this year. This data will be examined in further detail, but it is important to bear these limitations of the records in mind.

Despite the problems inherent in undertaking statistical analysis based on limited surviving data, such a pursuit provides worthwhile insight. It is particularly useful when seeking to understand the community of the college of St George’s Chapel, and the various peer groups within this community. Making a tripartite division between the canons of St George’s allows us to make a clear distinction of those in the community who were present regularly, and those who were rarely there. Those in the middle group are more difficult to identify, as they seem to drift between high and low attendances, but the top and bottom groups are clear in their attendance, or lack of it. We will return to these groupings later in the study, as they will be analysed as distinct groups: ‘Windsor-men’ with high attendances, and absentees - both sinecurists and pluralists - with little attendance at Windsor.

17 SGC, V.B.II, ff. 1-3.
Duration of Service

Another useful indicator of the commitment of canons to the college, other than that of average attendance, is the length of time that they held a prebend. For the earlier period of 1360-1420, Nigel Saul has calculated that the average duration for which the canons of St George’s maintained their positions was twelve and a half years. Further analysis suggests that eight canons (12%) held them for less than a year; twenty-eight, or just under half, held them for between two and ten years; fourteen (21%) for eleven to twenty years; eleven (17%) for between twenty-one and thirty years; and a small group of five who were in post for over thirty years.18 A similar analysis for the fifteenth century shows a change in this pattern. Looking at the thirty-three canons present between 1468 and 1479, and employing the same categories used by Saul, the analysis is as follows. Four canons (12.12%) held their prebend for less than a year; ten (30.30%) for between two and ten years; thirteen (39.39%) for between eleven and twenty years; five (15.15%) for between twenty-one and thirty years; and only one canon (3.03%) held his prebend for more than thirty years.19

This statistical analysis demonstrates that there was little change in the number of canons keeping their canonries for less than one year, or in the group holding a canonry for between twenty-one and thirty years. The change instead occurred in the group who maintained their positions for between two and twenty years. In Saul’s study this number was heavily weighted towards the shorter end of the scale, with almost half under the ten year mark. The present fifteenth-century study however shows a more balanced spread over the period. As such, it is possible that more canons were committing themselves to the college for a longer duration than previously before, once the ‘birds of passage’ and other prominent pluralists are discounted. Such continuity brought a degree of stability to the college, both in terms of providing an experienced and committed group of potential obedientiaries who had made their home at Windsor; but also a collection of long-term sinecurists and pluralists who could facilitate access to the spaces and personnel of the royal

---

19 See Table 1.
household and parliament, in times of trouble for the college.\textsuperscript{20} Indeed, it is probable that it was this continuity and relative stability which provided the means for the college to escape the financial uncertainty of the late-fifteenth century relatively unscathed.\textsuperscript{21}

What kind of men was attracted to a canonry at Windsor? It is useful to consider the background of the late-medieval canons who were appointed to the college, and the networks in which these men moved. The fifteenth-century canons of St George’s were, in general, a highly educated and well-read group. Within the chapter, there were also cliques, who may have formed sub-groups within the community based on ‘old-tie’ collegiate connections from their university days.

**Education**

A cursory study of the canons of St George’s and their backgrounds points to a community of highly educated men, fairly typical by the fifteenth century. A. B. Emden’s biographical registers of Oxford and Cambridge contain details of the careers of just over half of the canons present between 1468 and 1479. Fifteen canons have not been traced at either university, but Emden’s works provide details for the other eighteen individuals.\textsuperscript{22} First and foremost there was a strong connection to Oxford University, and to All Souls and Merton Colleges in particular. Sixteen of the canons surveyed had studied at Oxford, of whom four were members of All Souls, and four of Merton.\textsuperscript{23} Cambridge alumni do not figure on the whole: of the five individuals

---

\textsuperscript{20} Physical access to both the royal household and parliament were essential in the process of petitioning in particular: Kleineke, ‘Lobbying and Access’, pp. 145-159.

\textsuperscript{21} Evans, ‘Years of Arrears’, pp. 93-106.


\textsuperscript{23} Edmund Audley, Richard Beauchamp, Peter Courtenay, Thomas Danett, John Davyson, William Dudley, John Dunmow, Leyson Geffrey, James Goldwell, John Marshall, Thomas Palett, Thomas Passhe, John Seymour, Clement Smyth, John Vaughan and John Wygryme. Danett, Marshall, Passhe and Wygryme were graduates of Merton College, while Dunmow, Goldwell, Palett and Seymour were graduates of All Souls.
recorded as studying there, three were graduates of Oxford, incorporated at Cambridge for higher degrees.24

Not all of the canons who were recorded as attending university read the same subjects. Of the thirty-three individuals in this study, twenty are confirmed as having a university degree, while thirteen are currently unaccounted for.25 Eight canons were graduates in Canon Law, three in theology, and one in Civil Law. Two individuals were graduates in both Canon and Civil Law, while the final six obtained an MA with no specialisation into law or theology.26 Among the graduates, it would thus appear that legal, rather than theological training was required to set oneself up for life within the higher echelons of the Church. At St George’s, lawyers accounted for a third of the canons in question. At least one of the canons present at Windsor in the period, Peter Courtenay, also studied abroad. Courtenay initially studied at Oxford but, despite holding a considerable selection of benefices, by 1457 he was studying law in Cologne, and by 1461 had moved to Padua where he was elected rector of the university, before returning to England and incorporating to study Canon Law at Oxford in 1478.27

The canons of St George’s often maintained their educational links in the years following their time at university. John Marshall, a canon of Windsor during the years 1474-8, and a future bishop of Llandaff, rented a scola geometrie in Schools Street, Oxford, during the years 1454-6, and a scola metaphisice rented jointly with one

24 Only Alexander Lee and Robert Wodmanston studied solely at Cambridge, although Audley, Danett and Goldwell studied at both Oxford and Cambridge.
26 Beauchamp, Coryngdon, Downe, Geoffrey, Hopton, Lee, Vaughan and Wodmanston studied for degrees in Canon Law; Audley, Danett and Marshall for degrees in Theology; Dunmow studied in Civil Law but may have moved to Canon Law by 1486: BRUO, p. 127. Courtenay and Goldwell studied both Canon and Civil Law, while Dudley, Palett, Passhe, Seymour, Smyth and Wygryme received only MA degrees.
27 Rosemary Horrox, ‘Courtenay, Peter (c.1432-1492)’, ODNB; BRUO, i, pp. 499-500; ‘English Students at Padua, pp. 101-117.
William Marrys from 1466-7. Marshall had previously served as bursar of Merton College, 1452-3, and went on to resume this position in the years 1456-7, having acted as master of Wyliot’s exhibition, 1456-7. He had also served as principal of Coleshill Hall, 1448-53, and was senior (northern) proctor of the University during his time on Schools Street, 1455-6. Marshall clearly had a strong association with his former college and university, which is further demonstrated in the bequests made to Merton College in his will. Alongside a gift of £20 and the use for the warden of his new silver cup parcel gilt, eight books are known to have come to Merton by this bequest.

The £20 given to Merton College was to be used towards the painting of the new stalls and pulpit in the college chapel, while a further 13s. 4d. was given to the church of St Peter-le-Bailey, Oxford, which belonged to Coleshill Hall. He also gave to Merton at this time a *parva Biblia pulcra cum interpretationibus* and *Concordanciae vocalis*, while a copy of Aquinas’ *super quartum librum Sententiarum* made its way to St George’s.

---

28 *BRUO*, pp. 1228-9. Schools Street was an Oxford street with a high number of university ‘schools’, rooms which could hold thirty or more students on average and which were used for teaching purposes: J. H. Harvey, ‘Architecture in Oxford, 1350-1500’ in *The History of the University of Oxford*, ed. by T. H. Aston, 8 vols. (Oxford, 1984-94), ii, p. 751.  
29 *Ibid.*; J. R. L. Highfield, ‘The Early Colleges’ in *The History of the University of Oxford*, i, pp. 249-50; J. M. Fletcher, ‘Developments in the Faculty of Arts, 1370-1420’ in *The History of the University of Oxford*, ii, p. 373. Wyliot’s exhibition was a provision for twelve young scholars to study at Merton College, set up in 1380 by John Wyliot. These boys were to be qualified in grammar when they were chosen and to spend five years on the arts course. Ideally the scholars were to be chosen from Wyliot’s kin, but otherwise were to come from Oxfordshire, Hertfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Huntingdonshire and the diocese of London, although the chancellor of Exeter cathedral could select two of his own choice. The students were required to obtain as soon as possible ‘texts of logic and tracts useful for logical exercises and the tracts De sphaera, Compotus and Algorismus’.

30 *BRUO*, pp. 1228-9. Coleshill Hall was one of the many academic halls which served as accommodation for students in fifteenth-century Oxford. For more on the halls, see Jeremy Catto, ‘Citizens, Scholars and Masters’ in *The History of the University of Oxford*, i, pp. 176-84; A. B. Cobban, ‘Colleges and Halls, 1380-1500’ in *The History of the University of Oxford*, ii, pp. 581-634.

31 TNA, PROB 11/10/533.  

33 TNA, PROB 11/10/533.  
Other canons of the period made bequests to Merton, both during their lives and in their wills. Thomas Passhe, an alumnus of Merton and canon at Windsor, 1449-89, in February 1486 gave a silver covered cup, and in August 1487 the sum of £5.\(^{35}\) In 1488, Passhe also gave five books to the college, of which two were the *Flores Barnardi* of William of Tournai, and a ‘liber particularis’.\(^{36}\) Another alumnus, John Wygryme gave his former college gifts at several instances throughout his life, including a *Processionale ad choram*, a chalice, a *Portiforium* (a breviary) in two volumes, and even a tenement and cottage in Shaftesbury, Dorset.\(^{37}\) The scientific nature of some of the texts given to Oxford is demonstrated by one canon in particular, Edmund Audley, a canon of St George’s from 1474 to 1480. Early in the sixteenth century, Audley gave a collection of manuscripts to Lincoln College which included a Greek manuscript of the gospels, *De situ orbis* by Strabo, the *Astronomia* of Julius Formicus Siculus and several printed historical and theological books.\(^{38}\) Audley, as bishop of Salisbury at the time of his death, also made a provision of £400, in 1518, to Lincoln College to support his obit after his death. Manuscript collections amongst the canons of Windsor were, however, by no means limited to theological and scientific texts, as demonstrated by the will of Baldwin Hyde, canon 1469-72. He mentioned a collection of legal documents, accrued during his time in Chancery, as clerk of the parliaments, 1470-1, and during his residence at Lincoln’s Inn in the last years of his life.\(^{39}\) William Morland, Master of the Rolls and short-lived Dean of St George’s in 1471, also owned a book of statutes and a register of briefs, listed in his will, alongside a curious book named simply ‘Henry Harpe’.\(^{40}\)

\(^{35}\) *BRUO*, p. 1432.

\(^{36}\) Ibid.

\(^{37}\) Ibid., p. 2108; TNA, PROB 11/5/84.

\(^{38}\) *BRUO*, pp. 75-6; TNA, PROB 11/21/484.


\(^{40}\) TNA, PROB 11/9/113. This may be a scribal error when the entry was transcribed into the register and may therefore refer to the ecclesiastical lawyer Henry Sharpe, who studied in Italy and is often linked with the movement of printed books from the Continent to England: Elizabeth Armstrong, ‘English Purchases of Printed Books from the Continent 1465-1526’, *English Historical Review*, 94, 371 (1979), pp. 268-90; ‘English Students at Padua, 1460-75’, pp. 101-117; ‘English Students at Bologna’, pp. 270-87.
During his time at Oxford, it is likely that John Marshall may have come into contact with another future canon of Windsor, Thomas Palett, who held a canonry at St George’s from 1474 till his death in 1488. Palett appears to have followed a similar early career to Marshall, as he is recorded as jointly renting a *scola philosophie naturalis* on Schools Street between 1458-9.\(^{41}\) Palett’s will is not known to survive and so we do not know if he made any bequests to his college of All Souls on his death, although he was recorded as arts bursar for the years 1462-3 and 1466-7.\(^{42}\) Interestingly both Palett and Marshall are recorded as renting these schools in the year immediately following the dispensation of their MA qualifications, and for short periods only.\(^{43}\)

Another contemporary of Marshall and Palett at both Oxford and Windsor was John Seymour, canon of St George’s, 1471-1501, and Dean of Arts for All Souls College, 1455-6. Seymour served as both principal of Little University Hall from 1451- c.1465, and Junior Proctor of the University, 1453-4.\(^{44}\) As with Marshall, Seymour remembered his university days later in life. He bequeathed to All Souls amongst other things, a silk banner bearing the royal arms, three unspecified theological books, and £3 6s. 8d. for the glazing of a window there.\(^{45}\) Furthermore, Seymour provided exhibitions for four scholars to be maintained at Oxford for the duration of three years. The first of these was to be one William Marble, who joined with Seymour to give All Souls two copes of red silk and was to have 6s. 8d. a year; the second an unnamed scholar from St Anthony’s College, London, born in Northampton, who was to have 40s. a year; and the third and fourth from Cambridge, Robert Hobbet and John Baret to receive £4 a

\(^{41}\) BRUO, pp. 1420-1.  
\(^{42}\) Ibid.  
\(^{43}\) Ibid., pp. 1420-1, 1228-9. Marshall, who had his MA dispensed on 12 May 1453, is first recorded as renting a school in 1454 and again in 1466, both for one year only. Palett received his MA in 1457 and rented his property first in 1458, again only for the duration of one year.  
\(^{44}\) BRUO, pp. 1675-6.  
\(^{45}\) Ibid.; TNA, PROB 11/13/319. The gift of windows and glazing was a common way of demonstrating patronage, as it allowed for an individual’s coat of arms to be included in the design, as well as providing an extra element to the liturgy: See Euan Roger, ‘Blakberd’s Treasure: A study in fifteenth-century hospital administration at St Bartholomew’s Hospital, London’, in *The Fifteenth Century XIII* ed. Linda S. Clark (Woodbridge, 2014), pp. 81-108; Carole Rawcliffe, “‘A Word from our Sponsor’: Advertising the Patron in the Medieval Hospital”, in *The Impact of Hospitals, 300-2000*, ed. John Henderson, Peregrine Horden and Alessandro Pastore (Oxford, 2007), p. 168
Seymour requested burial in the chapel of St Saviour, St Mary and St George, recently built by Bishop Oliver King in St George’s Chapel, Windsor, but also made a sizeable bequest of £16 13s. 4d. for 1000 masses to be celebrated by priests, both regular and secular at Oxford and Cambridge.

The universities of Oxford and Cambridge were not the only educational institutions to receive patronage from the canons of St George’s. Seen from the canons’ houses at Windsor, the modern skyline is dominated by the chapel of Eton College, just across the River Thames. Eton was Henry VI’s creation, left uncompleted upon Edward IV’s seizure of the throne. The fellows of Eton had taken immediate action upon hearing of York’s victory at Mortimer’s Cross in 1461 to gain a written promise of protection as Edward marched towards London. By 1463, however, Edward had changed his mind regarding Eton’s future, and acted to annex the college to his own college of St George’s with a papal Bull of Union. It is uncertain quite how incorporated the two institutions became, although by 1465, St George’s had acquired the moveable goods of Eton at the very least. Edward’s plans soon changed again, in 1467 he began revoking the planned annexation, and returned to Eton a number of its previous holdings. The dean and canons of Windsor retained the moveable goods for only a few years. During Henry VI’s restoration between 1470 and 1471 they seem to have been ordered to return some goods to their original owners, as a yeoman of the Crown brought a privy seal to the college, ‘of the delivery of the goods of Eton’.

Personal connections, if not formal incorporation, were established between the two institutions during the 1460s, partially through the efforts of two of the canons of Windsor: Clement Smyth and Thomas Passhe. Smyth, a canon of St George’s, 1467-71, was a man much concerned with education and schooling. Educated at Winchester College and at New College, Oxford, he went on to serve as headmaster of Eton.

46 TNA, PROB 11/13/319.
47 Ibid.
49 Ibid., pp. 60-1.
50 Ibid., pp. 61-2.
51 Ibid., pp. 63-4.
52 SGC, XV.48.39. The Readeption of Henry VI is considered in further detail in the first case study.
College twice, during the 1450s and 60s, with a short interim spell as headmaster of Winchester College, during which time he was also bursar, precentor and fellow of Eton in various years. Clearly, Smyth had a strong personal connection with Eton and may have been a key figure in improving relations between the two neighbouring colleges. Appointed to St George’s in April 1467, it is uncertain whether Smyth’s installation at Windsor was intended to help the process of incorporation. Nevertheless, a note in the treasurer’s roll for the year 1468-9 records that a level of integration had taking place, as Thomas Passhe was paid £10 which he had loaned to St George’s ‘pro unione collegii de Eton’.

The community of St George’s also contained at this time a canon by the name of Payn Burghill, canon 1443-74. Burghill who had been rector of the parish church of Eton, prior to 1439, when he was induced to resign in order that Henry VI could gain the advowson and begin his project. Burghill was then promoted to a canonry at Windsor, possibly in order to appease the loss of the rectory, where he would remain until his death in 1474. Personal connections with Eton may have continued into the reign of Henry VII, as John Seymour bequeathed 26s. 8d. to the college on his death in 1502, alongside the aforementioned sums given to Oxford and Cambridge. While the two institutions never became formally incorporated as one, there were clearly some personal connections between them which continued despite the politics of the Readeption. Such relationships demonstrate that Oxford or Cambridge were not the only educational institutions where men could form coterie networks, but these could also continue in later life at places like Eton.

It is uncertain whether the mix of graduates and non-graduates, proved to be a divisive force amongst the community of St George’s or not. It is, however, a strong possibility that the presence of a range of individuals from the same (mainly Oxford) colleges, who generally maintained their connections after university, may have caused cliques

---

53 BRUO, pp. 1714-5.
54 SGC, XV.34.56.
55 George Lipscomb, The History and Antiquities of the County of Buckingham (London, 1847), iii, p. 195; History of Eton College, p. 4.
56 TNA, PROB 11/13/319.
to form based on mutual experiences. The Windsor chapter was clearly full of educated men, many of whom had backgrounds in law. The college’s chapter was not comprised entirely of liturgists and theologians, but practical and legally trained individuals. As a consequence, it was well placed to protect the interests of St George’s and to participate in both financial accounting and the political machinations of the court or parliament as required.

**Constitution**

The constitution underpinning St George’s, Windsor, as discussed in the introduction to this study, had a direct impact on the way in which the college was administered, and also in the type of men who were attracted to life in Windsor. The use of a common fund, rather than distinct prebends, to fund the canons’ wages provided opportunities for both absenteees and residents. Annual stipends were equal, thus no one prebend was more desirable than another. Stipends amounted to a small part of a canon’s earnings, however, and residency was required in order to supplement wages through the payment of cotidians. Further commitments, such as obedientiary positions and anniversary attendances brought additional financial reward, and the opportunity to advance one’s position within the college. This could provide a relatively lucrative annual salary for the committed resident canon. On the other hand, the lack of substantial punishment for non-attendance provided the opportunity for a canonry at St George’s to function as a sinecure, or as one in a series of prebendary positions for a serial pluralist. A canon could maintain his position with extremely low attendance, and still receive his annual stipend without substantial cotidian payments. If the individual in question held a position within the king’s household, or at another cathedral or major religious houses, extra earnings may not have been required. Instead the canon’s prestige as a member of one of Edward IV’s main royal free chapels still continued, unabated by attendance records. If residency was required or convenient, a canon could simply spend the relevant time at Windsor in order to qualify for his cotidians without penalty. Within the chapter of St George’s two distinct sub-groups are immediately visible, both in terms of attendance and commitment to the college: resident ‘Windsor-men’ and absenteees, generally pluralists or sinecurists.
This chapter will discuss the former group first, through an analysis of the college’s obedientiaries, in order to demonstrate their commitment to both the college, and the ways in which they were able to earn money and control important decisions within the chapter.

The duties of the main obedientiary positions of treasurer, steward and precentor – and the contents of their accounts - have all previously been discussed in the introduction to this thesis. In the surviving records for the period between 1468 and 1479 a total of twelve canons out of a potential thirty-three divided these functions between themselves.57 If the auditors are included, then five more canons can be added to this group.58 Roberts calculated that, in the late-fourteenth century, just over 50% of canons held the three chief offices. A century later, this figure had dropped substantially to just 36%.59 The twelve canons in question all also had very high attendance rates, with seven of them in the upper quartile as grouped above, and five in the median group. Thus, by the period covered by the current study the group of canons fulfilling administrative functions was smaller than it had been in 1361-1416, with almost all of the group having high average attendance. Thomas Downe, with 40.67% attendance, was the only canon within this group with an average attendance lower than the mean average value of 53.3%.

Further to the main roles previously mentioned, the chapter had another position: that of the auditor. The auditor was not one of the principal officers, nor was he technically an obedientiary, and indeed Roberts did not consider the position in her study of the college’s administration.60 These individuals audited the accounts of the steward, treasurer and precentor on behalf of the chapter and consisted of two of the college’s

57 See Appendix 2. The twelve canons holding the three chief offices between 1468 and 1479 were: Bury, Cokkys, Downe, Hermer, Hopton, Hore, Hyde, Passhe, Seymour, Smyth, Towres and Wygryme. For the years 1474-5 and 1475-6, Towres was precentor but the attendance register was compiled by Downe and Coryngdon respectively. Downe has been included on this list of officials as he held both the offices of steward and precentor in other years. Coryngdon has not been included as he was only ever auditor.
58 These five auditors not holding other positions between 1468 and 1479 were: Burghill, Coryngdon, Danett, Dunmow and Vaughan.
59 Roberts, St George’s, 1348-1416, p. 50.
60 Ibid.
canons, while the dean also had powers of audit. The auditors were paid 12d. a day, for 16 days, a small sum in comparison to the annual salary of £5 paid to the treasurer and steward, and thus indicating their inferior position. However, the auditors were more often than not drawn from the ranks of the other office holders (seven of the thirteen auditors recorded for the period also held one of the three chief jobs), which justifies their inclusion in the ‘official’ grouping. Among the canons of St George’s, it is striking that of those holding a prebend in the years 1468-79, eleven canons had a very high attendance rate during their time at the college. These eleven, all falling within the upper quartile of attendance, had an average attendance of over 85.68%, with seven between 90 and 100%, and three with perfect records.

These men formed a tightly-knit administrative clique within the college of St George, a grouping of frequently resident canons who lived in close proximity and reaped other benefits of their physical presence at Windsor. Not only did they receive additional income in the form of cotidian payments, denied to non-residents, but they were also able to control the college through their attendance in chapter meetings, thereby controlling the appointment of obedientiary positions and other college business. By statute, the canons had the opportunity to discuss any issues daily after the office of Prime. For more important business, such as the letting of farms and presentations, all the canons, resident and non-resident, were called into chapter, although each individual canon was given a mere ten days to arrive at Windsor and make their case as required. For men such as John Marshall, Alexander Lee and Edmund Audley, and other non-residents, who, among others, were simultaneously canons at York, it would

---

61 Statutes and Injunctions, p. 16.
62 Ibid., pp. 15-6; SGC, XV.34.51-8.
63 Only Bury, Hopton, Towres and Wygryme appear not to have held the position of auditor at some point in this period. This may be deceptive, however, as Wygryme died shortly after the surviving records begin and may have held this position previously. Similarly Bury only filled in as precentor for part of the financial year 1470-1, after Smyth left the college.
64 Table 1: Richard Bowyer, John Wygryme, John Bury, William Towres, Pagan Burghill, Thomas Passhe, Roger Misterton, William Hermer, John Hore, John Faukes (as Dean) and Clement Smyth.
65 Further to cotidian payments for daily attendance, any extra excess was split between the dean and canon at Michaelmas, provided they had been resident for three weeks continuously, with individual amount proportionate to attendance.
66 Statutes and Injunctions, p. 11.
67 Ibid., p. 17.
have proved difficult to make their way back to Windsor in time, without advance warning of a chapter meeting. This provided those canons who were resident within the college to have a distinct advantage in the deciding of important matters.68

Residents (1) - ‘Feathering their nests’

Control of the college’s chapter and, hence, control of internal appointments, meant that the resident canons within the college, particularly those holding obedientiary positions and with high attendance figures, were able to influence and direct the community’s finances to suit their own aims. As a consequence of this, a small core group of obedientiaries were able to secure a financial control over the college’s already limited funds. For much of the fifteenth century, the college of St George’s was in financial difficulty. This problem would eventually be dealt with from 1471 onwards with a series of further endowments, but not before serious arrears had been built up.69 By controlling the annual accounts of the treasurer and steward, and as the accounts were audited within the community, the resident canons caused problems within the college of St George’s. For example, resident obedientiaries could absorb the college’s repair budget, potentially at the expense of more important repairs. However, in order to ‘feather one’s nest’, a high level of commitment to the college, and particularly its financial positions, was required, ensuring that the core of resident canons were confident, competent and loyal in their running of the college’s accounts.

Control of the college’s finances is particularly clear in the expenditure on repairs within the canons’ cloister. This expenditure was all but monopolised by the resident canons. In the period 1468-79, repairs were authorised, by the dean and chapter, to three specific canons’ houses. This was in addition to general expenses incurred in the repairing and cleaning of the cloister as a whole.70 Two of the canons who had their repair expenses authorised were both residents and serial office holders. Thomas Passhe, who had his kitchen repaired in 1474-5, had served as an auditor in that year.

68 BRUO, pp. 75-6, 1228-9; BRUC, p. 360; Fasti Wyndesorienses, pp. 83, 108-9, 145.
69 For more on these financial difficulties, see Evans, ‘The Years of Arrears’, pp. 93-106. See also Appendix 1 for a breakdown of the treasurer’s accounts between 1468 and 1504, which give figures for annual expenses.
70 SGC, XV.34.52; XV.34.53; XV.34.55.
and John Seymour, who had his kitchen re-tiled in 1475-6, had been treasurer that year.\textsuperscript{71} Passhe appears to have served in an administrative capacity as either treasurer, steward or auditor for every year in the period 1468-79, discounting the two financial years 1469-70 and 1472-3 for which only the name of the precentor survives. Seymour served on four occasions as treasurer, steward or precentor after he received his canonry in 1471.\textsuperscript{72} John Dunmow, who had work done on his house in 1478-9, was neither a resident canon, nor particularly loyal to Windsor. He had, however, served as an auditor in 1478-9, having only recently joined the college in the previous year, and was thus in a position to authorise repair works to his house that year.\textsuperscript{73}

The college’s obedientiaries’ habit of using the communal resources available to them to further their own ends was by no means a new phenomenon. As early as the 1430s, the practice had become so endemic so as to require the dean, John Arundel, to petition the King’s council to resolve the problem. In particular, he complained that the treasurer and steward often ‘demanded excessive allowances for repairs’ while ‘other necessary and timely repairs were neglected’.\textsuperscript{74} Royal intervention would appear to have had only a short term impact. In 1442-3, the treasurer, a prominent and influential canon, Nicholas Sturgeon, attempted to account for a series of repair works on his own house. In this case however, the expenses were disallowed, so as not to act as an example to the other canons.\textsuperscript{75} Both the treasurer’s and steward’s accounts were audited annually, and the acquiescence of the dean and two auditors chosen from amongst the canons was required in order for payments to be authorised. When Sturgeon made unreasonable demands, the dean and auditors chose to override the treasurer and prevented him from claiming his money from the college. It is likely that Dean Arundel himself was directly involved, as a \textit{de facto} auditor of the accounts, as

\textsuperscript{71} SGC, XV.34.52; XV.34.53.
\textsuperscript{72} See Appendix 2.
\textsuperscript{73} SGC, XV.34.55; V.B.II, f. 57.
\textsuperscript{74} \textit{CPR}, 1429-36, p. 349; 1436-41, p. 129.
\textsuperscript{75} SGC, XV.34.41. Sturgeon was one of three influential brothers active within the royal court, and Nicholas was one of ‘the two most prominent composers of the Chapel Royal of Henry V and Henry VI’ alongside his fellow canon at St George’s and St Paul’s, Thomas Damett: Roger Bowers, ‘Music and Musical Establishment’, p. 189.
the same roll provides evidence of extensive repairs to the deanery and dean’s cloister, as well as the expansion of the former.

By the time of the treasurer’s rolls for 1449-50, if not earlier, the obedientiaries had regained control of the college’s repair budget. The only two specific repairs recorded that year were for work above the houses of John Deepdene and Payn Burghill, an auditor and the treasurer respectively. This is not to say that the rest of the canons were neglected completely. In 1461-2 Richard Bowyer received some new oak panels for his house. The following year John Hore had work done on his garden, while John Bury and John Wygryme also got new doors. None of these men held administrative positions in the relevant years. All of them, however, would later have very high attendance figures for the period which forms the focus of this study, and can be considered as part of a wider group of Windsor loyalists. The monopolisation of the college’s repair budget continued after 1479. The year immediately after the period under review also saw a similar pattern of administrators and loyalists authorising repairs to their own houses. The financial year 1482-3 saw the treasurer John Seymour repair and tile his house, and also tiling work taking place around the house of Thomas Passhe, who audited the accounts that year. The account for 1483-4 contains further expenses for Seymour, who was again treasurer, to work on his kitchen, alongside entries for the dean’s house and the hire of a plumber for David Hopton, who was a resident, although he did not hold a position during the year in question.

Arundel’s worries about the control exerted over the college by a core group of obedientiaries would thus appear to be justified, highlighting a problem within the college throughout much of the fifteenth century. The college’s limited funds were essentially available to those who controlled the accounts, who absorbed resources
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76 SGC, XV.34.44. The treasurers’ rolls for 1444-5 and 1447-8 are incomplete and show no repairs, and the intermittent years are missing: SGC, XV.34.42; XV.34.43.
77 SGC, XV.48.49.
78 SGC, XV.34.50. Bowyer was noted in the roll for 1462-3 as having borrowed 66s. 8d. from the college in the previous year, and it is possible that may have related to repair works on his house, although it is impossible to be certain.
79 See Table 1.
80 SGC, XV.34.59.
81 SGC, XV.34.60.
such as the repair budget at the cost of those who were absent. No doubt this was seen as a perk of attendance and commitment to Windsor, in the same way that the regular earnings were weighted to reward attendance, without overly penalising absence. The problem persisted despite Arundel’s attempted intervention, and the ‘Windsor-men’ were able to ‘feather their own nests’ at the college’s expense through control of the financial accounts. On one hand, this was clearly a problem if essential communal repairs were neglected at the expense of individual houses, and must have proved a divisive force between residents and absentees. At the same time, however, in order to ‘feather his own nest’, a canon had to commit himself to the day-to-day accounting and running of the college, and a high attendance, ensuring a constant and competent body of financial officers within the community. The financial accounts, however, were not the only way to gain additional income. For the canons of St George’s there were other, more regular, ways of earning extra income.

Residents (2) - Additional Earnings

Canons resident at Windsor could make the most of the financial opportunities at St George’s Chapel. Besides the annual stipend, administrative salary and cotidians for attending chapel, anniversaries provided a useful additional source of income. As will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5, the chapel was used extensively for anniversaries, and obit services for the dead, which formed a major part of the college’s liturgical practices. In the period 1468-79, thirty-three obits were held in St George’s Chapel annually, commemorating former members of the college, members of the royal family, former Knights of the Garter, three bishops, and even a small local presence. Many of these were long-running, had been endowed in the fourteenth century, and were generally endowed with a large cash sum, or the rent of a specific property or properties. These were important anniversaries, with an impressive liturgy, but also provided an extra source of money for a canon, particularly if he was already present in chapel.

Attendance at obits carried a standard fee of 12d., if a canon attended the full obit, and 6d. if he attended only one of the offices. In addition, a number of obits were endowed with the rent of a tenement or tenements (which could vary from year to
year), rather than with a fixed sum, and thus often had extra money available. This generally provided a small amount of money for the poor, 1d. each for twelve paupers, with the rest being split amongst the canons, vicars and other celebrants present.\(^{82}\) Two treasurer’s rolls for the period, those for 1471-2 and 1477-8, provide lists of the canons attending obits, while most mention only the sum paid out. From this it is possible to estimate the potential amount a canon could earn from a full year’s attendance. William Hermer in the financial year 1471-2 is a prime example of this, having attended every obit service and earning an extra £1 16s. 5¾d. for his trouble.\(^{83}\) As treasurer in the same year, and with a high average attendance, it appears that he should have earned a considerable sum over the course of the year, some £26 19s. 5¾d.\(^{84}\) Those earning the extra money from obits were, on the whole, the college’s resident canons. It is unlikely that, with the exception of a major commemoration, a canon would travel to Windsor from another benefice specifically for the purposes of celebrating the anniversary. Rather, those attending obits regularly were those already attending chapel, essentially as it offered extra money for minimal effort. As this chapter has demonstrated, these men were often also the obedientiaries of the college: the ‘Windsor-men’.

Looking first at the records for 1471-2, it is noticeable that six canons all had very high obit attendance figures for the year, with thirty or more attendances out of a potential thirty-three.\(^{85}\) The three chief administrative officials for 1471-2 were represented within the top five obit attendances, with the auditors following shortly behind. These canons all had average attendance within the upper quartile.\(^{86}\) Two canons had a
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\(^{82}\) SGC, XV.34.51-6. Interestingly, any excess money was generally given to local paupers, rather than the poor knights whom the college was required to support. See Chapter 5.

\(^{83}\) SGC, XV.34.51.

\(^{84}\) Hermer would not receive the full amount owed to him in the financial year 1471-2 because of the long standing deficits in the college’s accounts which had characterised much of the earlier fifteenth century. This problem would be resolved by further endowments and grants, the first of which - a £20 pension - would arrive in 1471, which allowed the canons to be paid part of their cotidians for the year, covering the months between October 1471 and April 1472. Hermer, however, still received a substantial payment of £19 7s 5¾d. from his obit attendances, annual stipend, treasurer’s fee and seven months of cotidians: SGC, XV.34.51; Evans, ‘The Years of Arrears’.

\(^{85}\) SGC, XV.34.51. Towres replaced Bury at the end of January 1472 but both canons have full attendance for their periods of the year.

\(^{86}\) These six canons were (by obit attendance): Hermer, Bury/Towres, Hore, Passhe and Burghill. See Table 1.
considerably lower obit attendance of between twenty and thirty attendances, which also correspond to average chapel attendance of the median group.\textsuperscript{87} Finally four canons, including the dean, had very low obit attendance figures of five or less, corresponding with low average attendance generally in the lower quartile.\textsuperscript{88}

The records for the financial year 1477-8 show a greater number of canons, each attending smaller numbers of obits.\textsuperscript{89} Three canons had an attendance of thirty or more out of a potential thirty-three, although only two of these were in the upper quartile of average attendance.\textsuperscript{90} Three canons had attendance figures in the twenties and high teens, all corresponding to average attendances in the median group.\textsuperscript{91} Once again, the three chief administrative officials are among the top five obituary attendees, although the two auditors Danett and Cokkys had generally low obit attendances this year. Finally eight canons attended less than ten obits, ranging from six to as low as one. These generally correspond to the lower quartile with a few exceptions in the median group.\textsuperscript{92} The implication from these two years, therefore, seems to be that the obedientiary officials attended obits as a matter of choice, rather than being forced to do so by penalties for refusal. A canon was required by statute to attend one of the major offices daily unless on college business, and yet attendance at anniversaries was generally voluntary.\textsuperscript{93} As such, it may have been attractive as a means of gaining extra income, particularly on days on which extra money was available. This was especially useful for the resident canons, who were already present in chapter.

\textsuperscript{87} Thomas Downe and John Seymour.
\textsuperscript{88} Lee, Davyson, Hyde and Hopton. Hopton replaced Hyde in August 1472. This was with the exception of David Hopton, who took over from Baldwin Hyde towards the end of the financial year, and attended no obits this year.
\textsuperscript{89} SGC, XV.34.54.
\textsuperscript{90} William Towres and Thomas Passhe were in the upper quartile and David Hopton was in the median group. See Table 1.
\textsuperscript{91} John Vaughan, Thomas Downe and Richard Beauchamp.
\textsuperscript{93} Certain anniversaries were obligatory, but generally attendance was not regulated. See Chapter 5.
Having discussed the ‘Windsor-men’ in detail, this study will now turn to the absentees from St George’s, the pluralists and sinecurists, and demonstrate the way in which such individuals could prove to be valuable assets to the college, despite low attendance records. The absentees can be divided into two groups: absentee pluralists, and sinecurists. In practice, there was often considerable overlap between the two groups. It is of benefit, however, to consider both aspects of absenteeism separately, as they brought different problems and benefits to the community of St George’s. Benefits from absenteeism often came in the form of access, to the king his household, the papal curia, other religious institutions, or to members and officials of parliament. Such access allowed for a powerful petitioning and lobbying network, with the interests of St George’s well represented when favours were required. These ‘old-tie’ networks, could be based on university links or on personal relationships when working together within religious institutions. They allowed the college to hold varying levels of influence over the main figures of English politics and look after their own interests in times of trouble. The balance of absentees and residents was also an important consideration in times of financial insecurity, which prevailed for much of the fifteenth century at Windsor. The general absence of approximately a third of the canons surveyed between 1468 and 1479 allowed for an easing of the college’s financial constraints. The college’s limited funds were split primarily between the residents. Thus when the number of residents was low, more money was available to pay wages and arrears. This allowed for a mutually beneficial constitution at St George’s and helped the college survive and prosper.

Some of the prominent pluralists passing through St George’s in the period 1468-79 went on to more important posts within the Church, most notably bishoprics. Of the thirty-three individuals surveyed, five would go on to become bishops, and one, Richard Beauchamp, would hold his position at Windsor while already bishop of
Salisbury. With the exception of Beauchamp, these men had low average attendance figures, suggesting that they were career ecclesiastics. They may have held little affection for Windsor or the college, instead using the status that their canonry brought with it to advance the ecclesiastical ladder. However, for the time in which these canons held their canonries at Windsor, and indeed once appointed to bishoprics, they provided an opportunity for access to influential individuals and bodies such as the King and parliament. Such personal connections are uncertain in the extant documentation. It is worth pondering, however, whether men such as Thomas Passhe, the notable ‘Windsor-man’, used his personal connections with these men, and his own time as the king’s sub-almoner to help further the college’s cause in times of need, from the college’s own ‘old tie’ network.

Of the additional benefices held by the pluralists of St George’s, the most popular was, by far, a prebend at Salisbury Cathedral. This is perhaps not unsurprising given that the college was located in Salisbury diocese and the Bishop of Salisbury, Richard Beauchamp, had strong links with Windsor in the latter part of the fifteenth century, serving as master of the works from 1473 and – unusually – also as Dean of St George’s from 1477 until his death in 1481. Fourteen of the thirty-three canons surveyed held a prebend at Salisbury at some point in their lives; twelve of them whilst also a canon of Windsor. This included Beauchamp who remained Bishop during his time as Dean. John Davyson, Dean of Salisbury 1473-85, and Edmund Audley, Bishop of Salisbury between 1502 and 1524, both moved to more senior positions at Salisbury immediately after their time at Windsor, demonstrating the strong link between the two institutions. Of these fourteen canons, half had attendance records at Windsor in

94 William Dudley (Bishop of Durham, 1476-83); James Goldwell (Bishop of Norwich, 1472-99); Edmund Audley (Bishop of Rochester, 1480-92; Bishop of Hereford, 1492-1502; Bishop of Salisbury, 1502-24); John Marshall (Bishop of Llandaff, 1478-96); Peter Courtenay (Bishop of Exeter, 1478-87; Bishop of Winchester, 1487-92); Richard Beauchamp (Bishop of Hereford, 1449-50; Bishop of Salisbury, 1450-81).  
95 Ollard, Emden and Davies erroneously date Beauchamp’s appointment as dean to 24 March 1478, but both his patent letters and the college’s attendance register record the year as 1477: R. G. Davies, ‘Richard Beauchamp (d. 1481)’, ODNB; BRUO, pp. 137-8; Fasti Wyndesorienses, pp. 34-5; CPR, 1476-85, p. 33; SGC, V.B.II, f. 53v.  
96 Thomas Passhe; Peter Courtenay; Richard Beauchamp; James Goldwell; Leyson Geoffrey; William Hermer; William Dudley; William Morland; John Davyson; Edmund Audley; John Seymour; Thomas Danett; David Hopton; John Coryngdon. Danett and Coryngdon were the only two canons in the group who did not hold their prebends at Salisbury and Windsor at the same time.
the lower quartile (under 25%) for the period 1468-79, and only two canons had an average attendance in the upper quartile (over 75%). 97

Windsor canons were not so well represented at the other major cathedrals of England. 98 Seven Windsor canons also served at Exeter at some point in their lives, five while also at Windsor, with two moving to the south-west immediately after their time at St George’s. 99 The Exeter prebends in particular are interesting as they, like those at Windsor, were worth very little to absentee canons financially, as cotidians came from a common fund and were only granted to residents. Six Windsor canons served at Hereford during their careers, five of whom held prebends at St George’s at the same time. 100 Lincoln Cathedral had seven such canons, all simultaneously holding canonries in Windsor. 101 Six canons held prebends at York Minster during their lives, five of whom served at St George’s at the same time. 102 In the two major London ecclesiastical benefices within a day’s ride from Berkshire: six Windsor canons also held prebends at St Paul’s during their careers, five of whom were at St George’s at the same time; St Stephen’s, Westminster, often called the twin establishment of the college of St George, had eight Windsor canons holding prebends during their careers, seven of whom were simultaneously at St George’s. 103 Some canons also held preferments at the lesser royal colleges such as Wallingford and Hastings, and all held

97 See Table 1.
98 For more on canons, their connections and movement around the kingdom, see David Lepine, A Brotherhood of Canons Serving God: English Secular Cathedrals in the Later Middle Ages; idem, ‘“Loose Canons”: The Mobility of the Higher Clergy in the Later Middle Ages’, in Freedom of Movement in the Middle Ages, pp. 104-22.
99 Alexander Lee, John Dunmow, John Coryngdon, Thomas Danett and David Hopton held prebends at Windsor and Exeter simultaneously, while Peter Courtenay held positions at Exeter both before and after his time at St George’s and William Cokkys went to Exeter from Windsor.
100 James Goldwell, Edmund Audley, Thomas Downe, David Hopton and John Vaughan all simultaneously held prebends in Windsor, while Richard Beauchamp was bishop of Hereford before his time at St George’s.
102 William Dudley, John Marshall, Alexander Lee, John Dunmow and Edmund Audley held their positions while at Windsor, while John Davyson held his York prebend after St George’s.
103 James Goldwell, William Dudley, John Davyson, Edmund Audley and Thomas Danett held prebends at St Paul’s simultaneous with their time at St George’s, while William Morland held his prebend at St Paul’s after that at Windsor. John Faukes, William Morland, John Crecy, Peter Courtenay, Alexander Lee, David Hopton and Thomas Danett were at St Stephen’s at the same time as St George’s, while Robert Wodmanston moved to St George’s from Westminster.
numerous vicarages and rectories, although such postings held less status than their more prestigious counterparts such as St George’s. Holding several incompatible benefices meant that these men may not have been present at Windsor on a regular basis. It is, however, indicative of their importance within the religious and political networks of medieval England, and provided St George’s with significant connections all around the country.

Crucially, the same names appear in many of these other benefices, implying that these men had connections outside of Windsor, which may or may not have pre-dated their time at St George’s. On occasion, personal relationships between canons may have been focused on a different collegiate institution, to which those canons may have felt their loyalty. One example of this can be seen in the 1495 will of John Coryngdon, who asked to be buried next to David Hopton, his fellow canon at both Windsor and Exeter. Hopton had died two years earlier and had requested burial in Exeter Cathedral. As Coryngdon had left St George’s some years before his death, presumably he felt his loyalty to lie with his current benefice at Exeter, and so also requested his burial there. Another canon, John Seymour, clearly felt his loyalties to lie in Salisbury rather than St George’s, for part of his career. Despite a very high attendance rate between 1471, when he was installed at Windsor, and 1476, when he obtained a second benefice at Salisbury, his average attendance then dropped significantly for the rest of the period in question, presumably because his time was spent at Salisbury instead. Seymour returned as a regular obedientiary from c.1482.

While the higher clergy in the late fifteenth-century were a relatively small and select group in their own right, the individual coteries formed by pluralists at their numerous
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104 Leyson Geffrey was Dean of Wallingford 1469-74, and both Robert Wodmanston and Baldwin Hyde were canons of Hastings. Wodmanston held his prebend for a short period from 1469, when he exchanged it with Hyde for a position at Windsor: BRUC, p. 646-7; BRUO, p. 753. Fasti Wyndesorienses, pp. 118.
105 TNA, PROB 11/10, f. 23.
106 TNA, PROB 11/9, f. 60.
107 SGC, V.B.II, ff. 21v-67v.
108 See Appendix 2.
overlapping benefices allow their classification within their own ‘clique’ at Windsor: that of the generally absentee pluralists. Such networks could provide valuable connections and access, particularly if a member of the network moved up the ecclesiastical ladder to a deanery or bishopric. Such connections could prove useful to the college, but may also have provided an element of division within the community of St George’s. Unfortunately, the chapter acts for the college do not survive for the late-fifteenth century. It is probable, however, that there may have been considerable tensions if such canons decided to involve themselves in the college’s important business, particularly if they had not been resident prior to these decisions. However, the access and political influence that the absentees provided far outweighed any problem of chapter conflict.

**Absentees (2) - Sinecurists**

Having examined the chief obedientiary positions, Windsor loyalists, and discussed pluralism amongst the canons, this study will now examine the other group clearly visible in the analysis of average attendance percentage: the sinecurists. One of the main functions of St George’s was to provide patronage for the king’s loyal servants, both religious and lay. This practice was not limited to Windsor, but can be identified at royal colleges and cathedrals throughout England. The canons present at St George’s during the period 1468-79 were certainly no exception, and many canons held important political positions during their time in the college. These preferments often forced the absence of a sinecurist from Windsor, their canonry at St George’s no more than a status symbol. The lower quartile of canons by average attendance contains a number of canons who appear to have spent very little time at Windsor during the years in which they held their canonries. While some, such as William Morland, held their position for less than a year, others held them for considerably longer and their cases repay examination. Such canons could not have hoped for considerable financial gain from their canonry, receiving only their annual stipend of 40s. with a small amount of cotidian and obit money when they were present. Indeed, several of the individuals named in the lower quartile were men like William Dudley, and the aforementioned Morland, who both served as deans of the college and were
therefore fined for absence in accordance with the college statutes. Why then would these canons hold such a prebend for several years? Amongst the canons of the lower quartile and some within the median group, many had significant links to the royal circle, which may provide the answer. Saul argues, of the earlier period, that as canons were appointed by the king, these canonries could easily have become sinecures, or rewards for royal service and loyalty. In the period 1468-79, this was also the case for many canons.

Alexander Lee, canon 1469-80, received his canonry at Windsor as one of the first signs of royal patronage. After his appointment, he quickly rose in royal favour. Lee gained significant favour with Edward IV by warning in 1470 of the defection of John Neville, marquess Montagu, which precipitated the King’s flight to the Low Countries; he received a number of positions in reward. Royal almoner by c.1474, he was also involved in Edward’s negotiation of the treaty of Utrecht with the Hanse, travelling to Bruges in July 1474, and notably active as an envoy to Scotland between 1475 and 1480. Lee was a member of the king’s council by 1477–8. As such, his average attendance through the period of this study of 19.79% is understandable. James Goldwell, canon from 1460-72, was another such individual with strong royal links. Before he received his canonry at St George’s, Goldwell had served as commissary-general for Cardinal-archbishop John Kemp from 1452-4, after which he was rewarded with several incompatible benefices including St George’s. After his appointment to Windsor, he was entrusted with a number of important diplomatic missions, including ones to Brittany in 1464, Denmark and Poland in 1465, France in 1471, and served as the king’s proctor at the papal curia 1467-71, returning to England as a papal envoy in 1471. Most importantly, however, Goldwell was also Edward IV’s secretary and thus an important member of the King’s council, explaining his extremely low average percentage of 1.17% at Windsor.

109 Statutes and Injunctions, p. 7.
111 David Dunlop, ‘Leigh, Alexander (c.1435–1504?)’, ODNB; BRUC, p. 360.
112 Rosemary Hayes, ‘Goldwell, James (d. 1499)’, ODNB; BRUO, pp. 783-6.
113 Kleineke, Edward IV, pp. 62, 161.
William Dudley, canon in 1471 and dean 1473-6, was one of the king’s personal chaplains, and dean of the Chapel Royal, who was rewarded by the Edward IV in March 1471 for his support during Henry VI’s Reademption.\textsuperscript{114} After his appointment, first as a canon, and later as dean of St George’s, he served as one of Edward’s envoys at the treaty of Picquigny, and later took part in further French negotiations, with an average attendance in 1471 of 0.83% and as dean 1473-6 of 11.98%.\textsuperscript{115} Peter Courtenay, dean of St George’s, 1476-7, was a junior member of an influential Devonshire family - the Courtenays of Powderham – had served as Edward IV’s proctor at the papal curia by November 1463, and was associated with the king’s brother George, duke of Clarence, before becoming Edward’s secretary in 1472-4. As a reward for his services, Courtenay was appointed to the deanery in 1476. He was later rewarded with a position as royal councillor in 1477-8, before his provision to the see of Exeter in 1478.\textsuperscript{116} Courtenay’s attendance in chapel, for the short period in which he held the deanery of Windsor, 16.45%, was thus clearly affected by his political commitment to Edward, as both secretary and royal councillor.

Thomas Danett, canon 1472-81, had a slightly higher average attendance of 19.71% during his time at St George’s, but was clearly an important member of Edward’s court. After his appointment to Windsor, Danett served on diplomatic missions, engaging in negotiations between Edward and Charles, duke of Burgundy, at Namur in August 1475, and travelling to France to take up the cause of Edward’s sister, the dowager duchess Margaret, with Louis XI in 1478.\textsuperscript{117} He was king’s almoner in 1476, a post which he held until his death in 1483, but Danett clearly held a degree of loyalty to St George’s, despite his relatively low attendance. He served as registrar of the Order of the Garter, and was buried in the college near the door of the chapter house.

\textsuperscript{114} Kleineke, \textit{Edward IV}, pp. 139, 161.
\textsuperscript{116} Horrox, ‘Courtenay, Peter’; \textit{BRUO}, pp. 499-500. Courtenay’s entry in the \textit{ODNB} erroneously reverses the order in which he held the deaneries of Windsor and Exeter.
on September 1483, by which time he had also been appointed to the deanery. To a slightly lesser degree, Richard Bowyer, canon 1459-71, served as a chaplain in the royal household. Thomas Passhe, 1449-89, was a sub-almoner to the king, while David Hopton, canon 1472-92, was clerk of the king’s closet. All three men had high attendance rates at Windsor. For these men, royal commitments and loyalty to Windsor were not mutually exclusive, but could instead be complementary. As the college was situated in one of the king’s main castles and residences, if the king or his household were in residence at Windsor, then it was possible for an individual canon to fulfil both his obligations in chapel and in the household without loss of earnings.

It should also not be forgotten that connections with others apart from the King might also play a part in securing a man a prebend at Windsor. As previously noted, Courtenay was associated with George, duke of Clarence, the king’s brother. Two other canons, John Marshall and Thomas Palett, served as keepers of the queen’s chest. Another such individual, Leyson Geffrey, canon 1463-75, appears to have been associated with the leading magnate of his day, Richard Neville, earl of Warwick. Geffrey was granted the deanery of the king’s free chapel at Wallingford, Berkshire, with this estate ratified by letters patent of 8 June 1469. Under the terms of royal letters patent of 1463, the deanery was then in the gift of Warwick and his servant, Sir Walter Skull. Skull was Warwick’s steward in Worcestershire, and it would appear that the appointment was an act by Warwick to promote one of his protégés. This is further supported by a curious addition to the college’s attendance register for the

118 Ibid.; SGC, XV.34.59; Saul, ‘Servants of God and Crown’, p. 109; Elias Ashmole, The Antiquities of Berkshire (London, 1723), iii, p. 225. Unfortunately, while Danett’s brass was identified by Ashmole, it does not survive to the present day. However, a Purbeck marble slab with indents of a figure, identified by Lt. Col. H. de Watteville, in the Dean’s cloister is thought to be associated with Danett’s brass: Nigel Saul, ‘The Growth of a Mausoleum: The Pre-1600 Tombs and Brasses of St George’s Chapel, Windsor’, in The Antiquaries Journal, 87 (2007), pp. 220-258, esp. p. 234.

119 See Table 1; BRUO, p. 1432; Fasti Wyndesorienses, pp. 92, 118.

120 Marshall held this position in 1450, Palett in 1458 and 1463. Palett was also a confessor to the royal household in May 1474: BRUO, pp. 1228-9, 1420-1; CPR, 1467-77, p. 440.

121 CPR, 1467-77, p. 160.

months April 1469-September 1470 inclusive, in which Geffrey’s monthly records were checked by what appears to have been an audit of his attendance alone.\(^{123}\)

It is unclear why Geffrey alone was audited. On one hand, it may have been a simple measure to check his attendance having become dean of Wallingford, but this seems implausible given that many of the canons at St George’s also held significant commitments elsewhere. Politically, however, the dates of audit become more important. At the time of Geffrey’s appointment to Wallingford, Edward IV was on pilgrimage to Bury St Edmunds and Walsingham, a month and a half before Warwick would take him into custody.\(^{124}\) It is likely that as the appointment was ratified early in June, Geffrey may have been presented to the deanery as early as April when the audit began. Most telling, however, is the date when the audit ends – October 1470 - exactly when Edward was fleeing his kingdom for the safety of Flanders.\(^{125}\) Unfortunately the names of the auditors for 1469-70 do not survive, so it is impossible to say definitively whether the high politics of the realm were being played out in the chapter meeting of St George’s. Interestingly, however, once the audit had ceased, Geffrey’s attendance dropped significantly for a number of years when he was rarely present, until recovering between 1473 and his death in August 1475.\(^{126}\)

The royal Chancery could also provide important connections and political advancement outside of Windsor, as demonstrated by three deans and one canon of St George’s: John Faukes, William Morland, John Davyson and Baldwin Hyde. Faukes and Hyde both served as clerk of the parliaments, Faukes in 1447-69, and Hyde during the Reademption parliament of 1470-1.\(^{127}\) Both men also worked within Chancery, Hyde as a clerk and Faukes as a master, as did two other deans: William Morland, Master of

\(^{123}\) SGC, V.B.II, ff. 6-14v.
\(^{124}\) Kleineke, Edward IV, p. 96.
\(^{125}\) Ibid., pp. 108-9.
\(^{126}\) SGC, V.B.II, ff. 15-44.
the Rolls 1470-1, and John Davyson, keeper of the hanaper 1472-79. Such a connection allowed the college access both to parliament and lawyers in order to protect themselves against political machinations and disputes. Indeed, it would appear that such work was sanctioned, if not encouraged, by the college, as Hyde was deemed to be absent on college business when working as clerk of the parliaments 1470-1. 128

The absentee canons of St George’s provided access and influence to centres and individuals of power, which allowed for the college to exert pressure and petition when their interests were threatened. On their own, the majority of the ‘Windsor-men’ did not have the political connections to establish themselves on the political scene of fifteenth-century England as major players. Whether these networks were established at Merton College, in the courts of Chancery, in the Chapel Royal, the papal curia or on foreign diplomatic missions, these individuals were part of an elite political network and able to use their connections to aid St George’s when so required.

**Case Study I – The Readeption**

As has been noted, many of the canons of St George’s in the period 1468-79 had strong links to the Crown or royal court and were firmly entrenched in the political sphere. This invites the question, whether, and to what extent, political loyalties and opinions permeated the notional barrier between secular and religious life to impact on daily life at Windsor. Were the appointments and careers of these high flying canons subject to political fluctuation, or were they a source of continuity against a background of unrest and instability? In order to address this question, we might look to both the appointment and attendance of the canons of St George’s during the fractious years of 1470-1. In doing so, this case study will determine whether any major shifts can be connected with the Readeption of Henry VI and the subsequent return of Edward IV.

128 SGC, V.B.II, ff. 15v-17.
The deposition of Henry VI in 1461 had spelled disaster for neighbouring Eton, and the canons of Windsor must have had this recent precedent on their minds, with Henry’s return in 1470. Some of the canons, particularly the ‘Windsor-men’ who had been in the college for a long time, may well also have remembered the penalties placed upon a previous Dean of St George’s, Thomas Manning (1454-61), in the wake of Edward IV’s victory at Towton and subsequent coronation in 1461. In the Act of Attainder passed by Parliament in December 1461, Manning was deprived of his preferments, including prebends at Hereford, Lincoln, St Paul’s and Salisbury alongside the deanery at Windsor, although he was allowed to live.\(^{129}\) They may also have remembered the problems of living and working in a major royal castle at a time of dynastic change, with upheavals as royal servants left the castle for safer climes.

One such official, Thomas Babham, yeoman of the Crown and yeoman of the robes to Queen Margaret in 1460-1, had left the castle in such a hurry as to leave behind certain evidences.\(^{130}\) When the Yorkists took Windsor, they had attempted to seize these evidences, but had been paid off by Canon Roger Misterton for 13s. 4d., who later sent the documents to Babham’s wife in London, with his servant and one the college’s vicars, John Andever, who was travelling to London already.\(^{131}\) In this case, it is interesting that Misterton clearly trusted Andever more than his own servant, otherwise there would have been no need to involve him. It also demonstrates the disorder that dynastic upheaval could bring to a community such as St George’s. The danger that Henry’s return brought for both the institution of St George’s and individual canons themselves was a very real one. These fears may explain some of the entries in the steward’s roll for 1470-1, such as the repair of Henry’s mantle, which had presumably been left uncared for in his absence.\(^{132}\) The college had worked hard during Edward IV’s reign to gain confirmation of what they called their ‘Great Charter’ and had recently gained not only the moveable goods of Eton College, but also a

\(^{129}\) PROME, xiii, p. 43.

\(^{130}\) TNA, C1/64/1010; For Babham’s positions as yeoman of the Crown and yeoman of the robes, see CPR, 1452-61, pp. 421, 462.

\(^{131}\) TNA, C1/64/1010. Ten years later, in 1478-9, Babham, who had since returned from hiding and established himself as a London grocer, attempted to sue Andever for the theft of these evidences, which had been returned to his wife.

\(^{132}\) SGC, XV.48.39.
number of possessions from King’s College, Cambridge, in 1467, all of which would be at risk if Henry VI chose to revoke Edward’s acts and grants, in the same way that Edward himself had done in 1461-2. Indeed, some of these had already been returned to Eton with Henry’s restoration.

Three key phases can be distinguished during the period leading up to Edward’s return in 1471. While little had taken place before Christmas 1470, the first phase to consider is the period up to 14 March when Edward IV landed at Ravenspur; the second, the period of uncertainty while the king headed south, until he entered London on 11 April; and a third period of cleaning up thereafter, when Edward may be thought to have cleared out those who had become too close to the Readeption regime. At first glance, there would appear to be significant change and upheaval in the community of canons during this short period. Two canons, and the dean himself, left their stalls in 1471, and their replacements did not last long, all leaving within the same year, having rarely attended chapel. A closer analysis of these appointments, however, tells a different story. Two of those leaving their stall in 1471, Richard Bowyer and Dean John Faukes, did not do so willingly, both dying early in the year, having attended chapel regularly up to their death.

Another canon, Clement Smyth, left his stall by exchange on 13 March 1471, apparently unperturbed by the impending return of Edward IV, moving north to the collegiate church of St John’s, Chester. Smyth had been heavily linked with Henry VI’s project at Eton, serving twice as headmaster, and also as a fellow, as bursar, and as precentor in the years 1453-69. It is uncertain whether Smyth, having been active at Eton during the Readeption, saw the writing on the wall, and decided to head for a quiet provincial life. He had, however, been a resident canon at St George’s from as

133 History of Eton College; Kleineke and Roger, ‘Baldwin Hyde, Clerk of the Parliaments in the Readeption Parliament of 1470-1’.
134 See above, p. 47.
136 Faukes died on 4 February 1471, Bowyer died on 12 May, before Matins: SGC, V.B. II, ff.17, 18v; Fasti Wyndesorienses, pp. 30-1, 92.
137 BRUO, pp. 1714-5; SGC, V.B.II., f. 17v.
early as 1467, and may have had little to fear. Similarly, the two canons who replaced Smyth in 1471 appear to have been relatively unaffected by the deposition and subsequent death of Henry VI and the return of Edward IV, despite their short lived time at Windsor. John Crecy, who replaced Smyth by exchange on 13 March 1471, died a few months later on 25 July, having only attended chapel for three days during that time. William Dudley, who then replaced Crecy on 30 July, after Edward’s return to London, resigned a few months later on 23 November having only attended chapel once. He was, however, to return to Windsor as Dean in 1473, ruling out political reasons behind his resignation. Indeed, Dudley’s father, Baron Dudley, having fought on the Lancastrian side prior to Edward IV’s coronation, had made his peace with the King and was high in his favour. Dudley himself was one of the first to rally to Edward on his return in 1471, joining the King at Doncaster at the head of 160 armed men, which may explain his appointment to a canonry at Windsor in July. Both of these men appear simply to have preferred positions elsewhere to those at St George’s, which may explain their low attendances: Crecy was a canon at St Stephen’s, Westminster, at the time of his death, and was probably also warden of the hospital of St John the Baptist, Hungerford. Dudley was dean of the Chapel Royal in 1471, and had also been granted the deanery of the king’s free chapel of Bridgnorth, Salop, in July of that year.

The sole political appointment of the Readeption thus appears to be that of William Morland as Dean of the college in the final months of Henry VI’s second reign. Morland was installed on 26 February by proxy, but not in person until 8 March, three days before Edward would depart from Burgundy to reclaim his throne. However, while this may have been a political appointment, it was not gained politically or by force,

---

138 Ibid., ff. 17v-19v.
139 Ibid., ff. 19v-21v. The notarial instrument of Dudley’s resignation is found in TNA, C270/24/18.
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143 Fasti Wyndesorienses, p. 31.
but by the death of the incumbent, John Faukes. Furthermore, Morland appears to have done little with his new position, attending for only eighteen days in March 1471, before his resignation in October, and apparently warranted no mention in the steward’s account for the year.\textsuperscript{144} The steward’s roll does however, include a note by the auditors of an allowance of 26s. 8d. to be paid to Thomas Passhe, steward that year, for sustaining heavy labours and expense while presiding over the college in the absence of the dean between 4 February and 29 October 1471.\textsuperscript{145} With Edward’s return to the throne in April, Morland was removed from both the deanery and his position of master of the Rolls of Chancery.\textsuperscript{146} The loss of the deanery must have been particularly galling, as his successor was John Davyson, keeper of the Hanaper, and therefore his junior within Chancery.\textsuperscript{147} However, Morland’s positions within the Church appear to have been treated less harshly. He may have been forced to resign as Dean of St George’s, but he had been granted the prebend of Beaminster Prima in Salisbury on 10 April, the day before Edward returned to London, which he kept. He also kept his position at St Stephen’s, Westminster which he had been granted on 11 December 1470.\textsuperscript{148} Nor were his later career prospects limited or restricted after Edward’s restoration, as he held prebends at both St Stephen’s and St Paul’s until his death in 1492.

Throughout the tumultuous events of 1470-1, the canons of St George’s, Windsor, seem to have remained largely unaffected by the political loyalties dividing the rest of England, at least in their capacity as members of the Church. Despite the royal connections of a number of high-flying canons such as Alexander Lee and James Goldwell, neither Henry VI nor Edward IV sought wide-scale changes amongst the college’s personnel, or punished those who supported the other faction. An analysis of the overall attendance of the college in the years 1468-79, however, implies that there was something going on amongst the canons during the crisis years. A graph showing the average number of canons (including the dean), present in chapel over the eleven

\textsuperscript{144} SGC, V.B.II, f. 17v; XV.48.39.  
\textsuperscript{145} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{146} Fasti Wyndesorienses, p. 31.  
\textsuperscript{147} Ibid.; BRUO, p. 552.  
\textsuperscript{148} Fasti Wyndesorienses, p. 31.
year period shows a clear drop in attendance in the years 1470-1, followed by a steady decline to 1479.\textsuperscript{149} Throughout 1468, 1469 and most of 1470, the average number present in chapel daily fluctuated mainly between nine and eleven canons, reaching a peak of twelve during the summer months of 1469, when the political uncertainty created by Edward IV’s captivity at the earl of Warwick’s hands may have caused the canons to close ranks. In the immediate aftermath of Henry VI’s return, however, the number of canons present in chapel dropped sharply. This decline began in November 1470, and continued until November 1471, when just over 5 canons were present in chapel each day on average. In the face of dynastic turmoil, it would appear that prominent sinecurists stayed away from Windsor, leaving the resident community to continue at half capacity.

Average attendance had levelled out by 1472, but fluctuated wildly around a steadily declining trend, indicating a mean value of six to seven canons after 1471. This decline was punctuated by annual influxes of canons in and around October and April, perhaps unsurprising as half their annual stipend was paid in each month, as well as annual lows in and around December each year.\textsuperscript{150} Attendances reached a low in July 1479, when the attendance records end, of a mere two canons present on average each day in chapel.\textsuperscript{151} Several factors could be put forward to explain the decline in attendance documented above, both internal and external to the college, but the results clearly demonstrate that for the vast majority of the 1470s the college of canons at Windsor operated at little more than half capacity, and often even less than this. This statistic is somewhat deceptive, however, as will be demonstrated in Chapter 3. While the number of canons dropped throughout the period, the number of vicars and lay clerks rose substantially, demonstrating a change in liturgical practice and organisation rather than a failed constitution.

\textsuperscript{149} See Appendix 3.
\textsuperscript{150} See Appendix 4. By college statute, the dean and canons were to be paid forty shillings, whether in residence or not, at Annunciation and Michaelmas in equal portions: Statutes and Injunctions, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{151} See Appendix 3. The low in July 1479 was exacerbated by a major incidence of plague in and around Windsor, which required the college to run a skeleton staff: A marginal note next to the entry for the vicar Richard Crow, records that he was absent propter pestilenciam, while the archives of Eton College contain a similar reference to an ongoing plague in the area: Eton College, MS Audit Roll 18.
The events of 1470-1 appear to have affected the resident canons of St George’s very little, in their day-to-day lives within the college’s community. There can be little doubt that the events of the Readeption and Edward IV’s triumphant return must have held personal interest for men such as William Dudley, who so publicly declared his support for Edward on his return to England, and other royal servants such as Goldwell and Lee. During the immediate aftermath of Henry VI’s return, such men may have sought benefices which were less politically charged, contributing to an overall decline in attendance in chapel. However, the college appears to have continued almost unaffected by events, indicating the extent to which a balance and stability derived from the dual system of ‘Windsor-men’ and absentees served to protect them from the majority of political machinations, and allowed them to protect their own interests both in parliament and with the dynastic struggles that characterise the period.

Case Study II – Life on a Building Site

The second case study used in this study is that of the rebuilding of St George’s Chapel on a grand scale, which would continue in phases from 1475 until 1528. Unfortunately little evidence survives outside the college’s financial accounts and some surviving building accounts, transcribed in St John Hope’s work on Windsor. It is therefore difficult to shed light on the initial stages of the works and the impact this had on the college community, both in their living and working lives. However, we benefit from a brief discussion of the implications of such large scale rebuilding on an enclosed community. Furthermore, this case study demonstrates an additional positive impact on the balance of the community of canons at St George’s. As the system was based upon a core group of obedientiaries, with absentees making occasional visits, the chapter was used to running at less than full capacity for much of the year, and was therefore prepared to operate on a limited basis if required. The absentees were not required to be present at Windsor; indeed it was better that they keep such appearances to a minimum in order to keep costs down.

Richard Beauchamp, bishop of Salisbury was appointed ‘master and surveyor of the King’s works’ at St George’s in 1473, and in June 1475 he received letters patent ordering him to build and construct a new chapel within the Lower Ward. This new work required a substantial programme of both demolition and construction work and for much of the late 1470s, 80s and 90s the area around St George’s must have been a difficult place in which to live and work. Tim Tatton-Brown has placed one of the more destructive actions of the works, the moving of earth and artificial terracing of the area around the chapel, and the making of new foundations to c.1475-6. By 1475 at the latest, the scale of disruption and demolition must have been anticipated, as Beauchamp was given permission to destroy any old buildings:

‘both to and upon the walls on the north side and on the west in which the towers commonly called Cluer ys Towre and Amener is Towre and Baner is Towre are situated, and also on the south as far as the belfry’. 

The canons’ houses were not directly affected by the ongoing building works. The proximity of their cloister to the building site must have caused a level of disruption on a human level, but it was the canons’ liturgical and spiritual duty – one of the college’s main functions - that was unsettled to a far greater extent. Edward III’s chapel of St George had been located to the east of the new project, and would be rebuilt as Henry VII’s Lady Chapel between 1494 and 1498. The chapel retained its original plan, and contains elements of its original structure, as well as late fifteenth-century masonry and window-tracery, and it was put back to full use in Victorian times and is now known as the Albert Memorial Chapel. Directly to the north of this chapel lies the
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Dean’s cloister, while the canons’ chapter house, the logical route from canons’ cloister to chapel, lay further west.158

In the course of the new chapel’s construction, the chapter house was moved, at some point between 1477-9, in order to build Edward IV’s tomb and chantry to its south.159 Presumably the canons took routes through the west edge of the dean’s cloister, to travel between their cloister and the chapel, but would have been disrupted both in terms of passage throughout the area, and also by the displacement of the chapter house. The choir of the new chapel itself was probably finished by 1485, after which no work on any part of the chapel appears to have taken place until 1492, when Christopher Urswick became a canon of St George’s, and building works seem to have restarted.160 It was also around this date that Henry VII began his project of a Lady Chapel. In 1493-4, the old chapel was partially demolished, and so it is to be assumed that the college had moved to the new choir by this point.161 Regardless of the disruption caused, the new chapel’s buildings were far from ideal. Having been left derelict for several years, the roof was leaking in several places, pigeons had got in, and it was deemed necessary to post a night watchman to keep an eye on the chapel.162 Furthermore, in the financial year 1496-7, an interesting note in the treasurer’s roll accounts for moving the organ out of the new choir to the chapel of St George, while repairs were ongoing.163

This brings up the difficult question of when the new chapel became the new St George’s. At this point, the old chapel was still being converted to its new status as Henry VII’s Lady Chapel, and as such must have been at least covered in order to house an organ. In 1498-9 more repair works took place in ‘St. George’s chapel’, plastering around a southern window of the chapel, while the new choir was also mentioned in same account.164 It is uncertain when the college made the switch from the smaller

159 Ibid.; Hope, Windsor Castle, ii, p. 379.
161 Ibid., p. 16.
162 Ibid., p. 15; Hope, Windsor Castle, ii, p. 383; SGC, XV.34.70-1.
163 SGC, XV.34.70.
164 SGC, XV.34.71.
chapel of Edward III to Edward IV’s grand design, but there was clearly an overlap in the use of both structures. The confusion between the two structures evident in the treasurer’s accounts of 1496-7 and 1498-9 serves to partially counter Tim Tatton-Brown’s theory that no real work was undertaken on the new chapel between 1484 and 1498. 165 Work was clearly going on, albeit of a restorative nature, rather than the beginning of new building projects. Evidently, the canons would have experienced considerable disruption in their attempts to conduct college business, both religious and financial, whilst living and working on a large-scale building site for a prolonged period. However, with a balanced constitution of residents and absentees, the college continued to function despite the inherent difficulties of rebuilding, and was in a considerably stronger position at the beginning of the sixteenth century for it, as endowments for the new chapel arrived. Key to this success was the split between residents and absentees, which allowed the chapter to operate with a limited number of canons, an essential consideration in times of domestic crisis.

A declining attendance was arguably a positive, rather than a negative factor for St George’s in a time of large-scale development. Interestingly, the decline highlighted in the previous case study appears to have little correlation with the chronology of building works, as the Lower Ward was redeveloped in order to incorporate Edward IV’s grand new chapel. While we might expect to see a sharp decline in attendance during this difficult time, this is not borne out in the statistical analysis. 166 Instead the decline predates the beginning of the building works by several years. Perhaps some of the college’s numerous absentee canons became aware of the impending works through the networks described earlier, and chose to move to another benefice instead for the duration of building disruption. As demonstrated above, the absentee canons were not often present at Windsor in any case, leaving the day-to-day running of the college and its accounts to a core group of resident ‘Windsor-men’, and so absentees would have been relatively unaffected by building works.

165 Tatton-Brown, ‘Chapel and College Buildings’, p. 16.
166 See Appendix 3.
Statistical analysis, based on average attendance figures, reinforced by biographical information and the evidence of the college’s obedientiary records has allowed this study to establish two distinct sub-groups within the community of canons. Resident ‘Windsor-men’, a core group of obedientiaries with very high attendance figures, contrasted with absentee sinecurists and pluralists who had strong connections to the royal court and low attendance figures. Not all the canons at Windsor were specifically in one group of the other, and exceptions can be seen with men such as Richard Beauchamp, whose attendance remained relatively high even as bishop of Salisbury. The chapter thus included among its members a wide range of men with different interests and priorities, with the positives and negatives that such diversity brought. Through the connections of such men as Goldwell, Lee and Audley, the college had access to the king and important nobles; while individuals such as Faukes, Hyde and Morland provided privileged access to parliament. In men such as Passhe, Seymour and Hermer the college maintained a group of loyalists at Windsor, who looked after the finances and day-to-day running of the chapel and college. It has also been shown that the average attendance of the college fell considerably between 1468 and 1479, perhaps partly as a consequence of the Readeption or the large scale remodelling of the Lower Ward, as Edward IV’s new chapel was being built.

With absenteeism, however, came a lack of canonical presence within the chapel, to the apparent detriment of the liturgy. This was in spite of the political access such individuals provided. A balanced community of residents and absentee canons at St George’s had served a purpose through the turmoil of dynastic change, and waning collegiate finances, keeping the college afloat in uncertain times. There was a balance between both sub-groups which allowed the college to function, with resources too limited for the college’s original plan. This allowed the chapter of St George’s to fulfil both of its main functions, patronage of royal servants and prayer by a core group of residents. Both groups brought additional influence and benefits, but could also cause problems. This system allowed the college to keep its payments down to resident canons, while staying strong against political upheaval. The constitution was not without problems, as the ‘Windsor-men’s’ commandeering of the college’s repair budget demonstrates. Evidently, disparity in the dealing of groups within the chapter...
may have been divisive and created problems between members of the community, as
demonstrated by the case of Nicholas Sturgeon, discussed above. The balance of the
college’s constitution, however, worked, encouraging Edward IV enough that he
sought to invest in the college and its chapel: creating a new centre of religion and
Yorkist commemoration in the south of England.
Chapter 2 - Canons in the Cloister II: 1479 – c.1515

The previous chapter provided a detailed analysis of the composition of the college’s chapter, and identified a distinct split between resident obedientiaries and absentee pluralists. In this section of the thesis, I intend to further this discussion. This chapter will take analysis into the early-sixteenth century, in order to assess changes within the college over an extended period. Detailed attendance evidence, as used in Chapter 1, does not survive after July 1479. Some treasurer’s and steward’s accounts are available between 1479 and 1515 but it is impossible accurately to identify attendance patterns and provide any detailed analysis.

This chapter will, therefore attempt to further discussion through three case studies, covering different aspects of the lives of the dean and canons. The first study will consider the educational background of those individuals who took up canonries at Windsor. A key part of this case study will discuss interactions between two canons in particular with Desiderius Erasmus, and the ways in which such connections could influence patronage and promotions to prominent positions. The second case study will consider the ways in which high politics and dynastic turmoil affected the makeup of the college’s chapter. The discussion will focus on appointments made during the reigns of Richard III, Henry VII, and also the early years of Henry VIII’s rule, to assess aspects of change and continuity in royal patronage at St George’s. The final case study in the chapter will discuss the canons’ housing provisions: how houses were allocated, and the problems this caused within the college. This case study provides, for the first time, a table of housing hierarchy and allocations between 1380 and c.1517.

These three case studies provide insight into patronage and sinecures at St George’s at the turn of the century. They demonstrate the forms that such patronage could take, and the individuals who could provide opportunities for promotion. They also show an enduring sense of continuity in the type of men appointed to a canonry at Windsor, relatively unaffected by high politics and the rise of the Tudors. Long-term continuity was not always a positive feature within a collegiate environment. Discussion of housing provisions indicates that certain individuals took advantage of residency to monopolise the college’s finances, to the detriment of new royal appointees.
Evidence

The survival of an early-sixteenth-century codex in the college’s archive provides a valuable insight into the dealings of the college and its chapter. ‘Denton’s Black Book’, so named for its black cover, survives in two parts, and was compiled by Canon James Denton in 1517.1 Denton had been appointed to the college on 20 September 1509, and produced the codex in his capacity as steward of St George’s.2 The ‘Black Book’ was intended to be a collection of the college’s liberties, privileges, grants of land and chantry foundations, providing a central reference point for the chapter. Many of the original documents had been scattered amongst the deans and canons (both past and present) and, as Denton stated in his preface to the codex, it was important to collect them all together in a book of reference.3

This was not the first time that such a collection had been assembled. John Arundel, dean of the college between 1417 and 1452, had also compiled a similar codex, known as ‘Arundel’s White Book’.4 The ‘White Book’, labelled Registrum Capelle sive Collegii de Windsor, was probably fashioned in the aftermath of Archbishop Kemp’s 1432 visitation, and contains a copy of the injunctions of the same amongst other fourteenth and early-fifteenth century grants, privileges and liberties.5 Dalton suggests that the ‘White Book’ was the work of at least two fifteenth-century hands, with a later entry in a sixteenth-century hand. This may indicate that the codex was compiled not by Dean Arundel, but by various obedientiaries during Arundel’s deanship, and was later updated with new grants and arrangements.6

Both Denton’s ‘Black Book’ and Arundel’s ‘White Book’ contain not only grants of land and property, papal bulls and other confirmations of privilege and liberty, but also

1 SGC, IV.B.2-3.
2 See Table 2.
3 Hec indenture huius Collegii munimenta, que prius divisim ac sine ullo ordine passim minibus hominum terebantur, isto nunc in volume optimis depicta formulis aucthore ac impulsore magistro Jacobo Denton, tunc huius Collegii Senescallo, in ordinem sunt redacta ac digesta cum suo Indice, Anno domini millesimo quingentesimo decimo septimo: SGC, IV.B.2, f. 1; Dalton, Manuscripts, p. 1.
4 SGC, IV.B.1.
5 Registrum Capelle sive Collegii de Windsor a Johanne Arundell eiusdem Collegii quintu Custode, sive prefecto per nomen Decani secundo inchoatum: SGC, IV.B.1; Dalton, Manuscripts, p. 1.
6 Ibid. The sole sixteenth-century addition to Arundel’s register was dated 1507 and so predates Denton’s codex.
miscellaneous letters from the kings of England to the college. It is therefore perhaps more fitting to describe the two codices as entry books or registers in which both the college’s privileges and documents of interest or use could be recorded. While the copied grants of land shed little light on the college’s workings, the miscellaneous documents recorded amongst such grants are of considerable interest, both in content and in assessing what the college’s obedientiaries deemed to be of value. Their contents have been listed by Dalton in his catalogue of the college’s manuscripts, although in limited and occasionally erroneous detail. Both registers, but particularly the ‘Black Book’, thus provide a valuable source of information for a study of the college’s chapter in the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries. They are further supplemented by obedientiary accounts going up to 1504.

Table 2, below, gives a full list of the deans and canons present at St George’s between 1479 and 1515 – who form the subject of this chapter. Those appointed earlier, but still present after 1479, have been included in italics.

**Table 2: Windsor Appointments 1479-1515**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dates at Windsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Passhe</td>
<td>1449 - 1489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Lee</td>
<td>1469 - 1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Davyson (dean)</td>
<td>1471 - 1473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Seymour</td>
<td>1471 - 1501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Vaughan</td>
<td>1471 - 1499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Danett</td>
<td>1472 - 1481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Towres</td>
<td>1472 - 1485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Hopton</td>
<td>1472 - 1492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Audley</td>
<td>1474 - 1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Palett</td>
<td>1474 - 1488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dunmow</td>
<td>1476 - 1488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Cokkys</td>
<td>1477 - 1487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Beauchamp</td>
<td>1477 - 1481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Arundel</td>
<td>17 November 1479 - 3 August 1496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Dynham</td>
<td>2 October 1480 - 3 April 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver King</td>
<td>30 October 1480 - 29 August 1503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Danett (as dean)</td>
<td>25 October 1481 - 19 September 1483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Morton</td>
<td>25 October 1481 - c. March 1486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Beverley (dean)</td>
<td>11 October 1483 - c. September 1485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hutton</td>
<td>14 May 1485 - c. 1487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Davyson (dean for the second time)</td>
<td>20 Sept - 12 October 1485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Morgan (dean)</td>
<td>18 October 1485 - 20 November 1496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Stokes</td>
<td>8 March 1486 - c. July 1503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Fraunces</td>
<td>20 October 1487 - c. November 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Arnold</td>
<td>18 July 1488 - c. October 1491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Baily</td>
<td>16 September 1488 - c. March 1495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Surland</td>
<td>26 September 1488 - 20 August 1509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Creton</td>
<td>c.1489 - c. March 1519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Bowde</td>
<td>c.1491 - c. September 1504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Urswick</td>
<td>26 January 1492 - 16 November 1496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Willoughby</td>
<td>c. March 1495 - 23 November 1508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jane</td>
<td>7 November 1496 - c. July/August 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Urswick (as Dean)</td>
<td>16 November 1496 - c. November 1505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Nix</td>
<td>29 November 1497 - c.18 April 1501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Payne</td>
<td>20 December 1499 - c. March 1507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Cokkys</td>
<td>15 April 1500 - c. October 1512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Term Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Esterfield</td>
<td>7 November 1500 - c. August 1513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Lupton</td>
<td>30 November 1500 - 25 February 1540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey Symeon</td>
<td>17 January 1501 - 21 August 1508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hobbs</td>
<td>17 January 1502 - c. August 1507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Butler</td>
<td>17 July 1503 - c. April 1519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Atwater</td>
<td>21 June 1504 - c. October 1514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Honiwood</td>
<td>28 September 1504 - 22 January 1523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Bainbridge</td>
<td>28 November 1505 - 27 August 1507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(dean)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hobbs (as dean)</td>
<td>c. August 1507 - c. September 1509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Atkinson</td>
<td>25 February 1507 - 8 August 1509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Rawlins</td>
<td>28 November 1508 - 11 March 1523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Oxenbridge</td>
<td>18 May 1509 - 25 July 1522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Fisher</td>
<td>21 May 1509 - c.1510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Chamber</td>
<td>17 August 1509 - 8 August 1549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Duration of Service

As discussed earlier, one useful indicator of the canons’ commitment to St George’s is an analysis of their duration of service. This commitment is particularly useful for the case studies in this chapter. Chapter 1 demonstrated that there was a marked distinction between the fourteenth and late-fifteenth centuries with regards to duration of service. Such a difference is not evident between the canons of 1468-79 and those appointed 1479-1515. Continuity, rather than change, characterised the late-fifteenth century.

Stability was important in protecting the college’s interests throughout the fifteenth century, and there was little change towards the end of the century. Statistical analysis
of those canons appointed in the period 1479-1515, using the same parameters as for
the fourteenth century and 1468-79, gives the following results. Of the forty-one
individuals analysed, only one canon (2.44%) held his canonry for less than a year;
seventeen canons (41.46%) held their prebend for between two and ten years; fifteen
(36.59%) for between eleven and twenty years; six canons (14.63%) held their canonry
for between twenty-one and thirty years; and two canons (4.88%) held their prebend
for over thirty years. The period 1479-1515, like the previous eleven-year period, saw
the great majority of canons holding their canonries for between two and twenty
years. Indeed, the percentage of individuals in these categories was higher than in
1468-79, indicating even greater stability within the chapter: 78.05% as opposed to
69.69%. Furthermore, the number of canons holding their prebend for less than a year
was considerably lower. Only one canon fell into this category, in comparison to four
canons between 1468 and 1479.

Longer durations of service brought greater stability to St George’s in a period of
significant political upheaval, providing both an administrative core to the chapter and
the access provided by important absentee sinecurists. More canons were committing
themselves to the college for extended periods of time, which allowed the college to
flourish at a difficult time in English history. For the canons themselves, residency
brought a degree of stability with regards to their housing, a factor which will be
explored in detail in this chapter.

Case Study III – Education and Erasmus

Having briefly discussed duration of service at St George’s, to emphasise stability and
continuity within the college, this chapter will now turn to the first case study. The late
dean and canons of St George’s discussed in Chapter 1 were, for the most part, highly
educated. This characteristic continued into the later period. For those individuals
appointed between 1479 and 1515, Emden’s biographical registers of Oxford and
Cambridge provide extensive details for all but two canons, enabling an almost full

---

9 Table 2.
10 For those canons present between 1468 and 1479, see Chapter 1.
analysis of the chapter’s education and university connections.\textsuperscript{11} Seventeen canons were recorded at Oxford during the period, ten at Cambridge, and ten took degrees at both English universities.\textsuperscript{12}

By comparison with the canons assessed earlier, later appointees were prominent not just at Oxford but also at Cambridge. The sharp rise in Cambridge graduates appointed at Windsor after 1479 has two-fold significance. On one hand, the proliferation of Cambridge men at Windsor clearly demonstrates the increased prominence of the university in England.\textsuperscript{13} Oxford graduates no longer dominated the market of high-level ecclesiastics. Those canons appointed between 1479 and 1515 were almost evenly split between Oxford and Cambridge graduates, in stark contrast to the earlier period when Cambridge graduates barely featured. It is possible that the statistics are a trick of the light, and merely the result of an increased survival rate of documents. The records of both Oxford and Cambridge become more complete at the end of the fifteenth century and the beginning of the sixteenth century, giving us a more complete picture of educational levels amongst the dean and canons. It is thus possible that even in the earlier period the chapter as a whole was more highly educated than the records demonstrate.

The canons’ educational background was not limited to English universities. Alongside Oxford and Cambridge, the later Windsor canons are recorded at seven European

universities: Bologna, Ferrara, Padua, Paris, Orleans, Valence and Valencia.\textsuperscript{14} Once again, this was a substantial increase on those taking degrees at European universities in 1468-79. It is tempting to suggest that increased prominence of continental institutions as a consequence of the European humanist movement may have caused this rise in foreign trained canons. However, it is equally possible that our picture is distorted by the surviving documents, which survive in greater numbers for the later-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries. Of the seven individuals considered, six were incorporated at English universities alongside their European studies: one at Cambridge, two at Oxford, and three at both. The English universities retained their pre-eminence for those seeking a career in the upper echelons of the English Church, although it was certainly possible for wealthy youths to study on the continent before returning home.

**Erasmus and St George’s**

Three canons are known to have had connections with the notable humanist, Desiderius Erasmus, at some point in their careers. Most significant of these was Robert Fisher, canon at St George’s between 1509 and 1510.\textsuperscript{15} Fisher had studied under the noted humanist in Paris c.1495-8, and was regularly mentioned in Erasmus’s correspondence between 1497 and 1499.\textsuperscript{16} The two appear to have had a curious relationship, based on mutual acquaintances rather than a close companionship. Fisher was living in Paris with one Thomas Grey, a fellow student from England, when they first came under Erasmus’s tutelage. It was Grey who struck up a close bond with his tutor, a relationship which may have been more than platonic.\textsuperscript{17} Fisher and Grey’s

\textsuperscript{14} BRUO, pp. 91-3, 1481-2; BRUO, 1501-40, pp. 118, 385-6; BRUC, pp. 182-3, 342-4; Fasti Wyndesorienses, p. 156; ‘English Students at Ferrara in the XV. Century’; ‘English Students at Padua’; ‘English Students at Bologna’. Robert Fisher studied at Paris, Christopher Bainbridge and Richard Nix read degrees at Bologna, and Nix also attended Ferrara. John Chamber studied at Padua, James Danton at Valence, John Oxenbridge at Valencia and Oliver King studied at Orléans.

\textsuperscript{15} BRUO, 1501-40, p. 118; ‘English Students at Ferrara in the XV. Century’, pp. 79-80.


\textsuperscript{17} It is uncertain whether Erasmus was, in fact the ‘volatile neurotic, latent homosexual, hypochondriac, and psychasthenic’ that Schenk once described him as: Victor W. D. Schenk, ‘Erasmus’ Character and Diseases’, in *Nederlandsch tijdschrift voor geneskunde*, 91 (1947), pp. 702-8. For more on Erasmus’s character and possible homosexuality, see Nelson H. Minnich and W. W. Meissner, ‘The Character of Erasmus’, in *The American Historical Review*, 83 (1978), pp. 598-624.
guardian, whose name is unknown, soon became worried about Grey’s relationship with Erasmus. In 1497, he ordered the tutor to leave, in order to avoid any inappropriate behaviour.18

This incident seems to have sent Erasmus into a deep depression, and his letter to the young Thomas is full of scorn and aggrievement towards the students’ guardian. Amongst such attacks, however, are suggestions that the two men may have had a homosexual relationship. Erasmus makes constant reference to Grey’s ‘gifted mind in handsome body...adding an endearing grace of manners, contributing high birth, wealth, and ability’ and also to his ‘masculine vigour’. He further adds that while Grey’s new tutor may be more intelligent or exacting, he would ‘not, I think, [be] a more loving one’.19 A further letter written the following month, from Erasmus to Grey, ends:

‘P.S. Do not be surprised at the new colour of my writing; you should be apprised that lovers’ letters are written with their blood! For want of ink, I wrote this in mulberry-juice.’20

If Grey’s relationship with Erasmus may, perhaps, have been more than that of tutor and pupil, this cannot be said of Fisher’s friendship with his tutor. At the very end of Erasmus’s July 1497 letter to Grey, the pupil is advised, ‘do not quarrel with Robert [Fisher], for I do not want to lose his friendship’.21 A further letter, probably written to Fisher in the aftermath of Erasmus’s dismissal, speaks only of a delay in dedicating a work to the letter’s recipient. This was on account of his ‘mood of mourning’, and encouraged the reader to devote himself wholeheartedly to literature.22 Despite tutoring both young men, Erasmus’s concern was devoted to only one: Fisher was a mere student and friend.

---

18 The Correspondence of Erasmus I: Letters 1 to 141, pp. 116-23.
19 Ibid.
20 Ibid., pp. 133-4.
21 Ibid., p. 122.
22 Ibid., p. 123.
The tutor’s dismissal was discussed in a letter of August 1497, between two of Erasmus’s students - a letter which Erasmus may have helped compose. In this letter, we learn that Robert, ‘who was wealthy’, supposedly ‘assailed him [the guardian] with promises’, in order to bring the humanist back to Paris. In this example, he was once again contrasted with Thomas, who is described in a more appreciative tone, as ‘a high-minded youth’. Further letters of August 1497 continue a tradition of friendly but not overly-familiar writing between Fisher and Erasmus, discussing the complaints of their previous landlady, and then pausing correspondence for an unknown reason. The former of these two letters highlights Erasmus’s views on of women, writing ‘just observe how greedy and peevish the female of the species is!’

Fisher and Erasmus appear to have fallen out over the unauthorised publication of De conscribendis epistolis to a local printer, which may have been Fisher’s fault. In the preface to a volume of this work, Erasmus writes:

‘Yes, Robert, you have won: here is the method of writing letters, which you have so often begged me to produce. All the same, notice how many disparaging remarks I have exposed myself to in the course of humouring your whim.’

Writing to another student in March 1498, Erasmus dwelt on his grievance with Fisher, complaining that, ‘English Robert also deserted me, but on very different principles; that is, he acted in perfect disloyalty, which well accorded with his character!’ It has been suggested that Erasmus may not have been satisfied with the payment he received from his wealthy student Fisher, although the desertion mentioned is likely to be associated with Fisher moving to Italy.

Certainly, correspondence continued between the two. Erasmus wrote to Fisher in 1498, asking him to look after a mutual friend on his travels, and again in 1499 from...
London. It is this London letter which is particularly relevant in the discussion of Robert Fisher at St George’s. Erasmus wrote to Fisher, still resident in Italy, declaring that he was ‘a little shy at the prospect of writing’, and asking him to hurry home to England. Fisher is described as ‘not only accomplished in the science of law, but equally fluent in Latin and in Greek’, demonstrating that his studies on the continent had not been in vain. The letter also gives an indication of the patronage which would later provide Fisher with a prebend at Windsor in 1509. Erasmus mentions that he was in England at the request of ‘Lord Mountjoy’, about whom Fisher had ‘sung his praises’ and ‘given me [Erasmus] a most lively description’. The ‘Lord Mountjoy’ named was William Blount, fourth Baron Mountjoy, pupil and later patron of Erasmus, and socius studiorum to the young Prince Henry. Mountjoy was close to the young prince and was clearly friendly with Fisher, who probably introduced him to Erasmus. The same letter ended by stating that:

‘the count [Mountjoy] is fond of you [Fisher], and keeps you so much in his thoughts that he speaks of no one more often, or with greater pleasure, than of you’.

Mountjoy was well thought of by Henry VII and served on his council before 1507. He was further rewarded by Henry VIII on his accession to the throne, and was knighted in June 1509 and appointed master of the Mint in the subsequent month. It is probable that Mountjoy was the agent behind Fisher’s appointment to St George’s on 21 May 1509, shortly after Henry VIII took the throne, providing a childhood friend to a prominent benefice. Fisher’s appointment may have caused further tensions, for Mountjoy had promised Erasmus an English benefice, provided that the humanist moved to England, although he appears to have lost interest in this cause fairly quickly, favouring Fisher instead. Fisher did not remain at Windsor for long, and had left by
February 1511, when Thomas Wolsey was appointed in his place. He was, however, clearly a man of great learning whose appointment demonstrates that it was not only the king who might be responsible for appointments, but also his acquaintances and council.

Two other canons of St George’s may also have come into contact with Erasmus at one point in their careers. John Arundel, canon at Windsor between 1479 and 1496, appointed a friend of Erasmus as his registrar when bishop of Exeter, 1502-4. However, this seems to have been the limit of his contact with the humanist movement, and it is unlikely Arundel and Erasmus ever met. Christopher Urswick, canon at St George’s, 1492-6, and dean, 1496-1505, was clearly active in the Tudor humanist movement. J. B. Trapp notes that, while Urswick was not quite a humanist himself, he had ‘humanist interests and a sympathetic understanding of humanist ideas and ideals’. Erasmus first met Urswick when travelling to England with Mountjoy in 1499, when he was probably introduced by their mutual friends Thomas More, the lawyer, future lord chancellor and close friend of Mountjoy’s, and also John Colet, future dean of St Paul’s. No correspondence survives between the two until 1506, by which point Urswick had left St George’s. Erasmus’s tone in his letter of June 1506, a dedicatory preface to his translation of Gallus, included in the Luciani opuscula, demonstrates his gratitude to Urswick for his generosity, and implies that the two were probably in contact during Urswick’s time as dean. Urswick later gave Erasmus a horse as thanks for this dedication, although he was not prepared to replace it when the horse died in 1516, and Erasmus asked for another.

It is clear that at least a small cohort of Windsor canons had experience of European studies and the coterie built up around Erasmus and other such humanists. It is probable that these connections, however, never amounted to much at Windsor,

37 Fasti Wyndesorienses, p. 118.
38 Nicholas Orme, ‘Arundell, John (c.1435–1504)’, ODNB.
39 J. B. Trapp, ‘Urswick, Christopher (14487–1522)’, ODNB.
40 Ibid.; Seymour Baker House, ‘More, Sir Thomas (1478–1535)’, ODNB; J. B. Trapp, ‘Colet, John (1467–1519)’, ODNB.
42 Trapp, ‘Urswick, Christopher’.
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where a deep-seated conservatism prevailed. The dean and canons appointed between 1479 and c.1515 may have been sympathetic to humanist causes, but none can be said to have been prominent humanists themselves, in the vein of Thomas More or John Colet.

**University Connections**

Those canons for whom university degrees are recorded, reveal a split in the type of degrees obtained. Twelve individuals received degrees in theology; twenty-four in law, either canon or civil law; three were granted either BA or MA; and one canon became a doctor of medicine. This demonstrates a clear increase in the number of Windsor canons reading for theological degrees, by comparison with those appointed between 1468 and 1479, from 15% up to almost 50%.\(^ {43}\) It is possible that theologians may have been amongst those canons unaccounted for in 1468-79 but, without evidence, this must remain conjecture. Legal training was still an important consideration for those setting themselves up in the higher echelons of the church, but theology clearly still had a part to play at the turn of the century, more so than for the earlier period.

As in the earlier period, many of the college’s deans and canons maintained connections with the two English institutions of Oxford and Cambridge following their time at university. Fifteen of the individuals analysed made benefactions in one form or another to their *alma mater*, nine to Oxford and six to Cambridge.

**Oxford Benefactions**

Chapter 1 demonstrated that among those canons with a strong connection to Oxford, All Souls and Merton College were particularly well represented in the period 1468-79. Many among those appointed after 1479 still originated from both these colleges.

Robert Morton, canon between 1481 and 1486 and future bishop of Worcester, bequeathed £10 to All Souls’ College, Oxford, in 1493 for the observance of his anniversary.\(^ {44}\) Robert Honiwood, canon of St George’s between 1504 and 1523, also

---

\(^{43}\) See above, Chapter 1.

\(^{44}\) Christopher Harper-Bill, ‘Morton, Robert (c.1435-1497)’, *ODNB*; *BRUO*, pp. 1320-1; TNA, PROB 11/11/97.
granted a house and lands in Clewer, Berks., to fund a perpetual obit in the same college.45 Honiwood had been appointed as a fellow of All Souls between 1486 and 1498, and was probably sub-warden in 1494-5.46 He was also known to have owned a copy of John de Turrecremata’s *Psalterium Commentarius*, which later became All Souls’ College MS 15, although it is uncertain how this manuscript came to be in Oxford.47 Morton’s replacement at Windsor was John Stokes, canon at St George’s between 1486 and 1503. Stokes had served as fellow and warden of All Souls early in his career and was recorded as renting a school from University College in 1449-50. After his death in 1503, All Souls paid carriage for the delivery of books given by him to the college, although the contents of this delivery are currently unknown.48

Merton College, too, was represented in the bequests of Windsor canons. Richard Rawlins, canon at Windsor 1508-23 and future bishop of St David’s, was one individual who maintained a particularly strong connection with his former college throughout his career. Rawlins had been appointed as bachelor fellow of Merton College in 1481, and in subsequent years would hold a variety of positions including bursar, warden, almoner and dean. He was master of Wyliot’s foundation in 1491-2 and elected ‘king of the beans’ in 1492.49 Rawlins’ appointment as warden in 1509 was well celebrated with religious services, plays, drinking and songs. He was, however, deposed as warden on 19 September 1521, accused of taking extended periods of absence, misappropriating funds and resources, and of keeping three unauthorised horses in his stable.50 It is clear that some of Rawlins’ absences from Merton were in order to spend time at Windsor, as he held his canonry throughout. While frequently absent, Rawlins

45 *BRUO*, p. 957; TNA, PROB 11/21/47.
46 *BRUO*, p. 957.
48 *BRUO*, p. 1783.
49 *BRUO*, pp. 1551-2; J. P. D. Cooper, ‘Rawlins, Richard (c.1460-1536)’, *ODNB*. For Wyliot’s foundation see above, p. 44. ‘King of the beans’ was a popular fourteenth-century university tradition on the continent, but by the fifteenth century it was unique to Merton. It formed part of Christmas festivities, when a ‘lord of misrule, a Christmas king, or king of the beans’ was elected from among the senior fellows to rule for a day, similar to the modern day ‘king cake’ tradition in France: Alan Cobban, *English University Life in the Middle Ages* (London, 1999), pp. 205-6; Jeremy Catto, ‘Citizens, Scholars and Masters’, in *The History of Oxford*, i, pp. 181-2.
did not neglect Merton entirely. He is known to have presented a 1505 Venetian edition of Euclid’s *Elementa* to the college and built a bridge between the hall and the sacristy tower, which included his rebus, the letters ‘RAW’, with lines underneath.  

During his time at Merton, it is possible that Rawlins came into contact with John Chamber, canon at Windsor 1509-49 and physician to both Henry VIII and his father. Chamber was elected bachelor fellow in 1493 and, similarly to Rawlins, served in several administrative positions. He too was elected ‘king of the beans’, and also as warden of Merton College from 1525 until 1544, concurrently with his canonry at St George’s. Chamber also remembered his *alma mater* later in life, and gave £6 13s. 4d. for the decoration of his former college, alongside the gift of a woollen rug for the altar steps on 1 November 1528.

Besides All Souls and Merton, other Oxford colleges were also represented in Windsor canons’ bequests. Thomas Jane, canon at St George’s 1496-1500 and future bishop of Norwich, was a benefactor of New College, Oxford, where he had been a fellow c.1454-72, a connection which he retained throughout his career. Jane was also a friend to Merton College and was probably involved in building works at St Mary’s Church, Oxford. Another canon with New College connections was Geoffrey Symeon, who held a canonry at Windsor between 1501 and 1508. Symeon had been appointed as fellow and then sub-warden of New College early in his career, before serving as Senior Proctor of the University between 1478 and 1479. He later gave his former college a bequest of 100 marks for the use of the chapel along with a set of red vestments for use on feast days. Queen’s College received bequests from Christopher Bainbridge, dean of St George’s 1505-7, future bishop of Durham, archbishop of York and cardinal. Bainbridge had served as provost of Queen’s College and also


55 Edmund Venebles, *rev.* Rosemary C. E. Hayes, ‘Jane, Thomas (c.1438-1500)’, *ODNB; BRUO*, pp. 1013-14; *Fasti Wyndesoriones*, p. 58. Ollard suggests that Jane was a fellow of New College by 1454, while Emden dates this period of his career to 1456.

56 *BRUO*, p. 1702.
remembered his *alma mater* in his will, dated 21 September 1509. Bainbridge granted the college the manor of Toot Baldon, Oxon., to provide for a chantry in the chapel of St Michael Bongate, for a perpetual obit in Queen’s College itself, and also for ‘the exhibition of the scolers for the tyme beinge within the same college’.  

Oxford as a university also saw considerable benefits from the patronage of Thomas Wolsey, canon at Windsor 1511-14, future Lord Chancellor, bishop of Lincoln and cardinal. Wolsey maintained a keen interest in education throughout his prominent career. He attended Magdalen College, where he achieved a bachelor’s degree at the age of fifteen, and later served as fellow, bursar, dean of divinity and master. His commitment to education was focused particularly on Oxford University – Wolsey declined the chancellorship of Cambridge in 1514. As Wolsey rose in power, he remembered his *alma mater*. Throughout the university’s disputes with the town of Oxford in 1516, he supported the former; in 1518 he founded six lectureships in Oxford; and in 1523 he procured charters to secure and expand the university’s privileges. The height of his ambitions came in 1525, when Wolsey began preparations to found his own college at Oxford, Cardinal College. The new college was to support both existing studies, but was to encompass new humanist learning and target heresy, with daily lectures on Latin and Greek authors, and on philosophy. Wolsey was fortunate in that he did not live to see the suppression of his college in 1531. After his disgrace and fall, the king took over and reshaped Wolsey’s plans with the foundation being renamed as Christ Church after the Reformation.

**Cambridge Benefactions**

University bequests and connections were not limited to Oxford and its colleges. As this chapter has noted, Cambridge scholars figure more prominently amongst the canons appointed between 1479 and 1515, than those present in 1468-79. This is also reflected in the canons’ bequests.

---

57 D. S. Chambers, ‘Bainbridge, Christopher (1462/3-1514)’, *ODNB*; *BRUO*, pp. 91-3.
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James Denton, canon of St George’s between 1509 and 1533, is perhaps best known at Windsor for his endowment of a house and commons for the college’s choristers, known as ‘Denton’s New Commons’. He was also clearly concerned with the preservation of records and collegiate muniments. As detailed above, Denton was responsible for bringing the varied manuscripts of St George’s together into a reference guide: Denton’s ‘Black Book’. This practice was repeated at King’s College, Cambridge, where he had been appointed Senior Proctor in 1495-6. Kings’ College’s collection of muniments were transcribed at Denton’s bidding into at least one large volume, which was known as Liber Denton. Another Cambridge man with an interest in books was Richard Arnold, canon at Windsor 1488-91 and French secretary to King Henry VII. At some point before his death in October 1491, Arnold gave a copy of Alexander Carpenter’s Destructorium Vitiorum to Peterhouse, Cambridge, where he had been appointed fellow in 1466.

Trinity Hall, Cambridge, received bequests from Richard Nix, canon at St George’s 1497-1501 and future bishop of Norwich. Nix studied at both Oxford and Cambridge in his youth, as well as at Ferrera and Bologna. It was Cambridge, however, that Nix was most interested in. Nix founded three fellowships at Trinity Hall, Cambridge – two for canonists and one for a lay person – and one scholarship. William Atkinson, canon between 1507 and 1509, in his will dated 1505, bequeathed property in Horseheath, Cambridge to Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, where he had served as fellow and treasurer between 1478 and 1488. Atkinson’s university training served him well during the rest of his career, as he was commissioned in 1502 by the king’s mother, Margaret, countess of Richmond, to translate three books of Thomas à Kempis’ Imitatio Christi from the French.

---
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Robert Birkenshaw, canon 1512-26, had served as Junior Proctor of Cambridge, 1499-1500, and also remembered his former university in his will, dated 18 November 1525.67 Birkenshaw bequeathed 40s. to the common chest or ‘hokke’ of the university, 20s. for a ‘hokk’ in Michaelhouse College, called ‘Gotam’s hokk’, alongside a bible, covered with green velvet, to be redeemed as a caution from the same chest.68 On top of these bequests, Birkenshaw also gave 20s. each to Michaelhouse and Queens’ College for a mass and dirige for his soul.

Connections with the English universities were not always realised during a canon’s time at Windsor. Nicholas West, dean at Windsor between 1509 and 1515 and future bishop of Ely, for example, had studied at Cambridge and possibly Oxford in his youth, although it was to the former that he held allegiance. In particular, West became closely associated with Cambridge after taking up the bishopric of Ely.69 In this capacity, he became visitor of St John’s College, and patronised the university’s printer, John Siberch, and the second holder to the official lectureship in Greek, Richard Croke.70 It is uncertain to what extent, if any, these connections influenced West’s time at St George’s but it is important to note the prevalence of university trained canons who maintained links with their alma mater throughout long and often prominent careers.

Eton Connections

The universities of Oxford, Cambridge and Europe were not the only educational institutions close to Windsor. Earlier discussion of the canons indicated that several of those canons present between 1468 and 1479 had close relations with Henry VI’s nearby college at Eton. This association remained strong with a Lancastrian return to the throne under Henry VII, and six canons in particular had ties to their neighbours across the river. Roger Lupton was one canon with strong connections to Eton. Lupton was admitted as a fellow of Eton on 22 February 1504 and elected as provost two days

---
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later. Lupton held this position until 1536, concurrently with his canonry at Windsor, which he occupied between 1500 and his death in 1540. During this time Lupton was engaged in a number of building works within the college, erecting a ‘great tower with double turrets’, known as ‘Lupton’s tower’, and a chantry within the college in 1515.

In 1515, Lupton arranged for the manor of Pirton, Herts., to pass to the college and donated several rare books and manuscripts throughout his time at Eton. Canon Lupton’s interest in education was not limited to Eton – he is also known to have founded a chantry at Sedbergh with scholars, which would later become Sedbergh school. After Lupton’s death in 1540, the former provost, deposed during the Reformation in 1535, was buried in his chantry chapel on the north side of Eton’s chapel. The brass on his tomb, however, depicted him ‘vested in the distinctive cope then worn by the canons of Windsor’.

Lupton may have been an influential figure at Eton, but Windsor remained his principal concern.

Further canons were associated with Eton to a lesser extent. William Atwater had been appointed as a fellow, bursar and precentor of Eton College between 1482 and 1485, some years before he received a presentation to St George’s on 21 June 1504. John Chamber was also elected as a fellow of Eton in his youth, although the exact date is unknown. Three canons, Oliver King, James Denton and Nicholas West, all studied at Eton in their youth as King’s scholars: King between 1445 and 1449, Denton c.1483-6, and West between 1483 and 1486, when he was appointed fellow and remained until 1498. West’s time at Eton was of particular note, as he accidentally set the provost’s lodgings on fire, presumably as part of a youthful accident. Denton’s connection presumably continued throughout his career, as he gave the college three copes and a ‘coote for our lady’, before his death in 1533.

---
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Connections between St George’s and Eton continued during the sixteenth century. Some canons were clearly more involved than others, yet there was a clear difference in the rise in Windsor canons previously educated across the river. As Eton and Cambridge became more established, a new career path became accessible to aspiring students, from Eton to Cambridge and then back home to Windsor. All Souls and Merton were no longer the focus for coterie links; instead the educational background of the college’s chapter became more diverse over the last decades of the fifteenth century and the start of the sixteenth century.

Case Study IV – The Tudor Succession

The canons of St George’s, Windsor, often had strong connections with the King, his household or other centres of power such as parliament. These connections continued through the turn of the century and the advent of a new dynasty. An analysis of these associations is particularly revealing for the thirty-six years covered in this chapter, following Edward IV’s death in 1483 and the political uncertainty that ultimately led to the installation of the house of Tudor on the throne. This case study will assess the identity of the appointed canons and of their patronage in order to measure any change in the type of man serving at St George’s. It demonstrates that, while individual kings may have used patronage in different ways, the college was left relatively unscathed by dynastic change. For the most part, civil servants across the kingdom were not replaced during the various crises during the Wars of the Roses. This held true at Windsor. Canonries were rewards for royal service, and thus remained with their holders.

Ricardian Appointments

In his short time as king, Richard III had little opportunity to appoint canons to the college, and appears to have been little interested in St George’s generally. During the two years Richard was on the throne, only two vacancies became available by the death of the incumbents. On both occasions, the position went to a close confidant of the king. William Beverley, appointed to the deanery in the place of the deceased

---

Thomas Danett on 11 October 1483, was a king’s clerk and had previously served as the first dean of Richard’s college at Middleham. He was also granted Danett’s prebend at St Stephen’s, Westminster, on the same day, in reward for his services to the king. The second appointee, Thomas Hutton on 14 May 1485, had been a canon of Lincoln since 1482, a king’s clerk by 1483, a master of chancery by 1484, and served as both receiver of petitions and clerk of the parliaments in January 1484. Richard had also sent Hutton, as his ‘confidential agent’, to Brittany in July 1483 to discuss the problem of Henry Tudor. Hutton was clearly a trusted advisor and confidant. Both appointments were clearly intended to be sinecures, rewards for previous service to the king. This evidently, did not mark any wholesale change of his brother’s policy of appointments, nor a concerted effort to fill the college with his supporters.

A Yorkist Legacy?

Henry VII followed a similar policy on his accession as king: an impression of continuity prevails. In the aftermath of Bosworth, the chapter of St George’s consisted primarily of men who owed their preferment to Edward IV. With the exceptions of Richard III’s appointments (Thomas Hutton and William Beverley) and one appointment made during Henry VI’s reign (Thomas Passhe), the dean and canons present in 1485 had all been granted canonries by Edward IV. Such men could, perhaps, have expected a loss in status with the renewal of the Lancastrian claim to the throne, yet all but one were spared. The sole political change at Windsor following Bosworth was the removal of William Beverley, Richard III’s confidant, by 20 September 1485. Beverley was replaced by John Davyson, a former dean of the college between 1471 and 1473, who had left to become dean of Salisbury and a canon of St Paul’s. No patent entry for Davyson’s reappointment survives, and it is likely that he may have been appointed by writ of privy seal.
The patent letter removing Beverley from his prebend at St Stephen’s does survive, however, which claims that the position was ‘unjustly occupied with a pretended title by one Master William Beverley’. 86 Beverley, as Richard III’s presentment, was clearly deemed to have been too close to the former king, and was stripped of his major appointments. At Windsor, Davyson fulfilled the role of neutral stop-gap, a former Yorkist dean who would have been known to the senior canons and well respected. Conveniently, Davyson did not last long - he died on 12 October 1485 - at which point Henry VII was able to promote his associate, Welsh protégé, and future bishop of St David’s, William Morgan. 87

With the exception of Beverley’s dismissal from the deanery, Henry seems to have been unwilling to disrupt the chapter of St George’s. This is not to say that loyal servants were not rewarded with sinecures, merely that Henry was content to wait for vacancies to arise before promoting his supporters. Many of those promoted to sinecures by Henry VII had served as royal chaplains or clerks of the king’s chapel, although some had stronger associations. Three canons held diplomatic positions, both before and during their time in Windsor. Richard Arnold was French secretary to the king, and a canon of Windsor between 1488 and 1491. 88 Christopher Urswick, canon at Windsor 1492-6 and dean 1496-1505, was a loyal Tudor supporter who frequently acted as a diplomat. 89 For most of 1486, he was active at the papal curia in Rome. He was an ambassador for peace with Spain in 1488, helped broker the marriage of Prince Arthur and Katherine of Aragon in the same year and travelled to France and Scotland to treat for peace in 1492-3. He was further entrusted with missions to Rome in 1493 and possibly to Sicily, where he was commissioned to invest the future Alfonso II of Naples with the Garter. His last trip overseas came shortly before he was promoted to the deanery of St George’s in 1496, when he met Maximilian, king of the Romans, at Augsburg.
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88 Fasti Wyndesorienses, p. 67.
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Urswick was clearly rewarded with the deanery for his years of service to the king. As well as being a royal ambassador, Urswick was a king’s clerk and royal almoner and has been described as ‘Henry VII’s trusted personal agent’, later acting as executor to the king’s will.\textsuperscript{90} The third diplomat appointed to a canonry at Windsor by Henry VII, the last of his reign, was Richard Rawlins, canon of St George’s between 1508 and 1523. Rawlins is known to have been present at Henry VII’s funeral, where he ‘distributed several hundred pounds’ worth of alms’, and also at the funeral of the infant Prince Henry in 1511.\textsuperscript{91} His diplomatic career did not begin in earnest until Henry VIII’s reign, when he was clearly well known to both the king and Katherine of Aragon. Rawlins accompanied Henry to France in 1513 and 1520, and in 1518 he delivered a ‘gushing speech…comparing the queen to Juno and Minerva’.\textsuperscript{92}

Three further canons served on the king’s councils or in his court. Richard Nix, canon at Windsor 1497-1501 and future bishop of Norwich, was an active member of Henry VII’s council.\textsuperscript{93} Roger Lupton, canon 1500-40, served on the council advising the king on the marriage of Prince Henry and Katherine of Aragon.\textsuperscript{94} Lupton was also present at Henry VII’s funeral alongside William Atwater, his fellow canon of St George’s between 1504 and 1514. Atwater had been a prominent member of the king’s court and was also recorded at Henry VIII’s coronation in 1509.\textsuperscript{95}

Appointments to canonries at Windsor, under both Richard III and Henry VII, followed a similar pattern to those under Edward IV – maintaining the balance in the college between resident obedientiaries and sinecurists. The king, however, was not the sole source of such patronage, as demonstrated by the example of Mountjoy and Fisher. Canons could also gain career advancement through connections with powerful institutions such as parliament or the courts of chancery. This did not change under either Richard III or Henry VII, and many of the canons at St George’s maintained such connections throughout their lives.

\textsuperscript{90}\textit{Ibid.}
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For the purpose of this case study, however, it is useful to briefly discuss two women close to Henry VII, and the ways in which their actions affected the college and its personnel. The king’s mother, Margaret Beaufort, and his wife, Elizabeth of York, both had connections with individual canons at Windsor which may have been contributory to their appointments. Prior to his appointment at St George’s in 1507, one of the canons, William Atkinson, had translated three books of the *Imitatio Christi* for Margaret Beaufort from French to English. Shortly after the publication of these works in 1504, Atkinson was rewarded with canonries at both Lincoln and St George’s, possibly as a reward for his efforts. Christopher Urswick, canon and then dean of Windsor was another individual who had enjoyed the patronage of Margaret Beaufort throughout his early career and was promoted accordingly after Bosworth.

Margaret Beaufort, as the king’s mother, was undoubtedly capable of promoting those within her service. More tentative, however, is the possible influence exerted by the new king’s wife, Elizabeth of York. It is probable that Elizabeth, as Edward IV’s eldest daughter, maintained a keen interest in her father’s grand works at Windsor, yet no tangible evidence survives. Documents within the college’s archives, however, shed further light on this connection. On 4 February 1503, the college received an *inspeximus* and exemplification of an Act of Parliament, dating from 1483. This Act of Parliament concerned the incorporation of the college, with the exception of the poor knights, and will be considered in greater detail in Chapter 4. For the purposes of this case study, it is the letters of *inspeximus* which are of interest.

Letters of *inspeximus* and exemplification were not new at Windsor. Two letters of *inspeximus*, and one exemplification dating from between 1485 and 1501 survive in the college’s archives. The 1503 documents, however, intrigue both as a result of their date and their provenance. Henry VII’s 1503 *inspeximus* – and thus also the following exemplification - were described as being ‘by request of Christopher Urswick’, then the

---
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dean of St George’s.\textsuperscript{99} Urswick was clearly concerned that the college’s liberties or corporate status were at risk, and consequently sought assurances from the king to whom he had been a loyal servant. What caused his worries is not documented, but the dating of both documents may give a tentative indication. Both manuscripts are dated 4 February 1503, a pivotal point in the dynastic succession of the houses of York and Lancaster. Elizabeth of York had given birth two days before to her seventh child, Katherine Tudor. Both mother and daughter died shortly after, from birthing complications, Elizabeth on 11 February, while her child survived only a few days.\textsuperscript{100}

It is probable that Urswick was keenly aware of the queen’s predicament, and made efforts to secure the college’s corporate status before her demise. Urswick himself had helped to broker the match between Henry VII and Elizabeth and he remained a close confidant of the king. Further news may also have come to Windsor from the queen’s almoner, Richard Payne, a canon of St George’s between 1477 and 1509. Elizabeth of York, as Edward IV’s eldest surviving child, must have retained an interest in her father’s grand new chapel and tomb in Windsor, possibly helping to shield the college from the after-effects of Bosworth. Many of the canons present at St George’s were all too aware of the consequences of royal patronage drying up – the experience of Eton College would have been familiar to them – and any protection was greatly appreciated. These men, with the exception of Oliver King, all owed their preferments at Windsor to Henry VII, yet Windsor was still an Edwardian project and a symbol of Yorkist kingship.

The queen’s ill health may have spurred Urswick into action, securing a confirmation of the college’s liberties before her death. Such an interpretation is tentative, yet seems too coincidental to ignore. As Chapter 1 demonstrated, the dean and canons were quick to respond in times of crisis, in order to protect their own interests. Urswick’s efforts in 1503 seem to follow the same pattern, perhaps suggesting that Elizabeth of York was more than just a queen to Henry VII, but had also been a powerful individual in her own right, careful to protect her father’s legacies.

\textsuperscript{99} SGC, X.2.5.

Concerns for St George’s college and chapel passed on to Elizabeth’s son, Henry VIII, on his accession in 1509. In many ways, Henry VIII’s early appointments were similar to those of his father and grandfather. Diplomats featured heavily. Nicholas West, appointed as dean in 1509, shortly after Henry’s succession, has been described as the ‘brilliant diplomat’ of Henry’s reign, and later served as Bishop of Ely. James Denton, canon of St George’s between 1509 and 1533, served as commissioner in Ireland and was with Henry at the Field of the Cloth of Gold in 1520. Even Thomas Wolsey, the king’s councillor, held a canonry at Windsor in 1511-14. Henry VIII, however, appears to have been more willing to leave the choice of appointments to others. West’s appointment as dean had been advocated by his patron, Richard Foxe, Bishop of Winchester, while his successor to the deanery, John Veysey, was put forward by John Arundell, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield. Robert Fisher, as the earlier case study demonstrated, may have been put forward for appointment by Lord Mountjoy, the king’s friend and teacher, and was appointed immediately after Henry’s accession.

Royal women in Henry VIII’s court also had significant patronage to bestow. James Denton served as almoner to Mary, the king’s sister, from 1514, when she married Louis XII and became Queen of France. As almoner, Denton was well received, as Mary ‘showed great anxiety to promote him and informed Wolsey that he had done her much service’. It is uncertain what Denton had done to win such approval, but by 1525 he was serving as chancellor to Princess Mary Tudor, the king’s daughter. In this capacity Denton helped to govern Mary’s ‘principality’ of Wales from Ludlow, where he was frequently resident. Denton’s contemporary in Mary’s service was the aforementioned former dean of Windsor, John Veysey, who supervised the household of the young princess from 1525 in Ludlow until his replacement in 1534.

---
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Both Denton and Veysey probably gained a significant political advantage from serving in the young Princess Mary’s household, but such an appointment had its problems attached. Mary was known to have flirted with her (considerably older) royal councillors on occasion, from as young as nine. One such individual was the treasurer of Mary’s privy chamber, Richard Sydnor, appointed as a canon of St George’s in 1519 and discussed briefly in the final case study of this chapter. Sydnor, already an old man suffering with gout, was allegedly once drawn as Mary’s Valentine at the annual celebrations, and was referred to by the princess as her ‘husband adoptif’. 109 Sydnor was castigated by Mary’s ‘thinly disguised sexual banter’, when she stated that ‘ye take great care of your goute...than ye do of your wyfe’. 110 Furthermore, Mary claimed that Sydnor’s need for prolonged periods in bed should have resulted in him visiting her ‘oftener’ - perhaps inappropriate for a princess who was not yet a teenager. Queen Katherine of Aragon’s court was also well represented at Windsor. Nicholas West, Robert Birkenshaw, Christopher Plummer and James Mallet, appointed at St George’s between 1509 and 1514, all served as Katherine’s chaplains during their careers. 111 Plummer had previously served as chaplain to Elizabeth of York before moving into Katherine’s service and Birkenshaw also acted as the queen’s almoner. 112

It is clear that Henry VIII’s early Windsor appointments were often left to the patronage of high-status individuals, rather than a purely personal display of patronage. At the same time, there was no distinct change in the type of person appointed to St George’s. Henry maintained the balanced structure of the college’s chapter between sinecurists and resident obedientiaries. As shown, this trend, and the need to keep peace within the college, had endured throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The final case study, however, will discuss Henrician reform, particularly concerning the housing of the college’s canons, and the ways in which this allocation was organised.
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Case Study V – Housing a Community: The Houses of Canons’ Cloister

Foundations and Hierarchies

This case study will assess housing provisions for the late medieval canons of the college, how houses were allocated and repaired, and the problems that this system caused. It provides, for the first time, a detailed discussion of housing hierarchy and allocations between 1380 and 1517, and presents the available data in table form.\(^\text{113}\)

In this table I have tracked the movements of canons between individual houses within the cloister. In doing so I have demonstrated that there was a hierarchy in the desirability of housing, through which all of the canons of St George’s were required to progress: from the worst house to the best. This was based on the duration of a canon’s service at Windsor, regardless of status or rank. The study argues that this housing system was manipulated by a core group of resident canons at the expense of others, a system that had endured without reform for over a century until the reign of Henry VIII.

With the college’s foundation in 1348, there was an associated need for housing to provide for the new community of priests who would occupy it. These lodgings were located in canons’ cloister, an area to the north of St George’s Chapel which had formerly been the site of Henry III’s royal apartments, extending up to the northern curtain wall.\(^\text{114}\) The buildings of canons’ cloister, which have been described as ‘perhaps the earliest timber-framed collegiate accommodation in England’, survive to the present day and have been the subject of much debate. The cloister’s early history has been covered extensively by St John Hope and, more recently, by both John Crook and Tim Tatton-Brown.\(^\text{115}\) This work, however, has focused primarily on the fourteenth century, with little discussion of the fifteenth or early-sixteenth centuries.

\(^\text{113}\) See Appendix 5.
\(^\text{114}\) For a plan of the lower ward c.1530, see Figure 1.
Accommodation in the fourteenth-century cloister was initially provided in the form of twenty-three individual chambers located around a rectangular cloister.\footnote{Crook, ‘The Houses of Canons’ Cloister’, pp. 134-9. This number related to the number of priests (excluding the dean) originally intended by the college’s 1348 statutes. The final statutes, completed in 1352, provided for twenty-five priests and a dean, thereby requiring the builders to include two extra sets of chambers. Twenty-six locks were purchased in 1354 for these chambers, although it is uncertain where in the cloister they were located: Hope, Windsor Castle, i, p. 174; Crook, ‘The Houses of Canons’ Cloister’, pp. 140-1.} These chambers housed both the canons and vicars of St George’s. It is uncertain how accommodation was initially shared out between the two groups. All twenty-three lodgings were set out in two storeys of unequal height.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 136-7.} The first floor rooms were often over two metres taller than their ground floor counterparts. They also extended over the cloister walkway and were thus wider than the lower chambers. To St John Hope, this suggested that the canons occupied the first floor chambers, while their vicars lodged in the rooms below.\footnote{Hope, Windsor Castle, ii, p. 501.} However, as Crook has pointed out, this system seems unlikely: the arithmetic is uncomfortable, and would have meant canons occupying adjacent rooms in order to fully utilise the available space.\footnote{Crook, ‘The Houses of Canons’ Cloister’, pp. 140-2.} Rather, Crook argues that it is more likely that the fourteenth-century cloister was designed with a separate, two-storeyed chamber for each individual.\footnote{Ibid.}

It has not yet been conclusively been proven which theory is correct. For the purposes of this study, however, the original layout of chambers is of little importance. In 1409, Henry IV granted the vicars their own accommodation within the college in ‘a place called Woodhaw, beside the great hall, to build there houses for the vicars, clerks and choristers’.\footnote{Ibid., p. 142.} It is assumed that this grant referred to area leading west from canons’ cloister along the curtain wall to the Clewer tower, where the vicars’ hall was (and is) located. The departure of their subordinates allowed the twelve canons to expand their lodgings into the newly available space: creating individual houses rather than chambers. Such expansion allowed the canons significantly to improve their properties, but these upgrades were neither identical nor equal. The development of
new, distinct, lodgings encouraged a further hierarchy of collegiate housing, which had been in place since the cloister’s foundation.

From their construction, the houses of canons’ cloister were not identical. Practicalities of access into the cloister required that some lower chambers were smaller than others, in order to facilitate access. Crook has suggested that there may have been as many as six passageways limiting ground floor space in the surrounding chambers. From their construction, the houses of canons’ cloister were not identical. Practicalities of access into the cloister required that some lower chambers were smaller than others, in order to facilitate access. Crook has suggested that there may have been as many as six passageways limiting ground floor space in the surrounding chambers. Primary access to the cloister was via the great cloister (later the dean’s cloister) in the south, while a passageway to the north to the latrine and the ‘Hundred Steps’ – a stairway leading to the canons’ cemetery. Other passageways would have been required to access corner bays, the hall and the dean’s lodgings, although the exact position of these is currently unknown.

From the outset, thus, some houses were more desirable than others. As the canons expanded their lodgings early in the fifteenth century, this hierarchy became more pronounced. Tim Tatton-Brown’s detailed plans of the Lower Ward in the early-Tudor period clearly demonstrate the difference in size between various houses at the turn of the century. Peculiarities of housing a college within a royal castle are particularly noticeable; two of the northern lodgings were built with access to pre-existing towers, into which they were able to expand. Furthermore, the cloister’s rectangular design limited certain properties while allowing expansion in others. The houses located on the sides of the cloister, most notably in the north and south, could expand to form reasonably large lodgings, but those in the corners were limited by their location.

Access to the latrine was also a consideration in the desirability of housing. The communal latrine - on one occasion charmingly referred to as ‘le pyssyng place’ - was one of the first buildings in the cloister to be completed (perhaps understandably) and a lock was provided in 1354, with 26 keys for access. At first consideration, proximity

---

123 Tatton-Brown, ‘Chapel and College Buildings’, pp. 4-5.
124 Crook, ‘The Houses of Canons’ Cloister’, pp. 141-2. The single reference to ‘le pyssyng place’ was in the treasurer’s account for 1478-9, when repairs were made to the latrine. Such repairs, and entries for cleaning both the canons’ and vicars’ latrines feature regularly in the annual repairs.
to the communal toilet may not seem to be a major selling point. Architectural scars, however, indicate that the latrine was two-storeyed. Access at ground floor level was available for all the canons (and initially also for the vicars), but access to the upper level was probably enjoyed only by the occupant of the adjoining lodgings, forming a fourteenth-century en-suite facility.\footnote{Crook, ‘The Houses of Canons’ Cloister’, pp. 141-2.} Interestingly, second floor access to a latrine area remained until recent years. A fourteenth-century doorway once led from a modern lavatory to the dining room of the present day No. 6, where it adjoins the medieval latrine site.

Sanitation was not the only consideration which may have affected the desirability of houses. Less tangible motives may have had their own effect, such as views, access to gardens or proximity to utilities such as kitchens. In 1412, for example, Canon Simon Marcheford petitioned the king, complaining that his garden gate ‘by the poultry’ had been closed by the officers of the poultry, and he no longer had access by this gate.\footnote{CPR, 1408-13, p. 401; Roberts, St George’s, 1348-1416, pp. 113-14.} Location and access were clearly important. While these less tangible motives are difficult to link with physical remains, it is clear that a hierarchy in the desirability of housing had been established from the very beginning of canons’ cloister. Once the vicars moved out, the canons could expand their lodgings into the vacated space, and this inequality became more severe.

**Housing Allocations**

Problems of housing allocation at St George’s are evident in an early-sixteenth century letter, sent by Henry VIII to the Dean and Canons of Windsor, and copied into Denton’s ‘Black Book’.\footnote{SGC, IV.B.2, f. 177.} The year in which the letter was written is not recorded, although it predates the completion of the ‘Black Book’ in 1517.\footnote{Contemporary foliation is consistent throughout, suggesting that the book has not been reorganised in rebinding. Furthermore, documents follow on from each other with few spaces and it is improbable that later entries were been added in the middle, as had occurred in Arundel’s ‘White Book’: SGC, IV.B.1.} The letter relates to the practice of housing new canons. Henry wrote that:
‘ffor asmoche as we understonde that upon oure gift of any promocion within oure collegiatt church of Windesore, upon the vacation thereof ye use to assigne the personne by us so proffered from the mansion and dwelling place where the late incumbent of the saide promicion enhabited unto a worse mansion. Whereby the mansions in our saide college bee in the more decaye to the hurt of oure college there’.129

Each new canon to the college had previously been presented to the worst house in the hierarchy, moving up the ladder as more senior canons died or left St George’s. This system was similar to that at Salisbury in the fourteenth century, and rewarded long-term residency within the college.130

Methodology

The survival of this letter in Denton’s ‘Black Book’ provides a fixed date at which this housing system was in place: 1517. From there is has been possible to trace housing allocations and movements back through the fifteenth century and the late-fourteenth century. Taking 1517 as my benchmark, I ranked the canons by their seniority among their fellows at St George’s. The longer a canon had been in service at Windsor, the better his house was. I then applied this ranking system to a theoretical hierarchy of houses with the longest-serving in the best house and the newest in the worst. I then worked back, adding in each departing canon, which thus creates a table of the hierarchy over time, as found in Appendix 5.131 The earliest date to which the table can be considered accurate is c.1380. This allows for the first generation of canons – whose original hierarchy is unknown - to have left St George’s.

There are some limitations with this technique. Some royal letters, discussed herein, survive, which allocated new canons with specific houses – meaning they did not begin in the worst house. It is possible that more of these letters once existed, but do not

129 SGC, IV.B.2, f. 177.
131 See Appendix 5.
now survive. Further problems arise when two new canons were appointed in close succession, or when exact dates of appointment are not known. The hierarchical table, however, is linked to theoretical, not physical houses, and as a consequence these margins of error can be tolerated.

Moving up the Ladder

The system of housing allocation at Windsor, from the college’s foundation until c.1517, was based upon a hierarchy derived from duration of service. This often proved problematic. The death (or departure) of a senior residentiary required the entire cloister to change house, moving one step up the ladder. Such resuffles of housing undoubtedly caused significant wear and tear to a property, leading to ‘more decaye’ within the cloister. Furthermore, if a canon resigned his canonry even temporarily, he forfeited his position, and had to start at the bottom of the housing ladder when he returned.

A fourteenth-century example demonstrates this problem. Richard Medford, canon of Windsor between 1375 and 1381, exchanged his canonry in October 1381 with one William Packington for the church of Ivinghoe.132 Packington, a pluralist, was clearly not impressed with St George’s and resigned his new position in November, at which point Medford was re-appointed to his former canonry. His original house, however, had already passed to the next in line, and Medford was presented to the worst house. In response, Richard II, by letters patent of 2 December 1381 granted him a more senior house, which had been recently vacated by the promotion of Walter Almeley to the deanery (which had its own lodgings).133 Medford was living in the eleventh house in the hierarchy when he exchanged with Packington, the second worst in the cloister. It is difficult to pinpoint which lodging Almeley occupied before his move to the deanery, but it is probable that it was also the eleventh house.134 Medford was

132 Roberts, St George’s, 1348-1416, p. 113.
133 Ibid., pp. 112-3; CPR, 1374-77, p. 165; 1381-85, pp. 48, 54, 62.
134 Multiple appointments in a short period of time make the transition of houses at this time difficult to identify. Almeley was either living in the worst house or the eleventh when he was promoted.
therefore not seeking further promotion up the hierarchy, merely a return to his previous house.

Royal letters patent appear to have been the only way in which a new appointee could jump the queue to gain a nicer house. Richard II in particular used this method: between 1382 and 1389 four of the canons he appointed to Windsor were granted the houses which their predecessors had. Nicholas Slake (1382), Thomas Buttiler (1387), John Drake (1387) and John Boor (1389) all received the lodgings of the canon they were replacing. 135 This was a demonstration of royal favour and patronage, and it is perhaps unsurprising that three of these lodgings were near the top of the hierarchy.136 John Drake received the best house in the cloister, while Thomas Buttiler and John Boor lived in the third house consecutively. Nicholas Slake was granted the eighth house when he replaced its incumbent.

No such letters are known to exist for the fifteenth or early-sixteenth centuries. Instead, control over housing allocation and repairs became the preserve of the resident obedientiaries. As Chapter 1 demonstrated, this core group of ‘Windsor-men’ all but monopolised the college’s finances, and thus repairs within canons’ cloister. Roberts argues that for much of the fifteenth century the canons’ houses ceased to be repaired from the common fund, citing disallowed payments for repairs on the house of Nicholas Sturgeon in 1442-3.137 She further states that ‘since each canon hoped to move into a house more to his liking as soon as one of his seniors vacated it, there was no inducement for him to improve or even keep in good repair the worse houses’.138

This argument is only partially correct for the fifteenth century. As the table of housing allocation and movements demonstrates, there was a high turnover of the worst houses within the cloister as new canons arrived. Consequentially, there was little incentive for many canons to repair or expand their properties in the short term.

135 CPR, 1374-77, pp. 123, 132; 1385-89, pp. 297, 299, 365, 368; 1388-93, p. 106; Roberts, St George’s, 1348-1416, p. 112. These entries have been noted in the hierarchical table in bold.
136 See Appendix 5.
137 Roberts, St George’s, 1348-1416, p. 113. See above, pp. 50-1
138 Roberts, St George’s, 1348-1416, p. 113.
Repair works, however, were still paid for out of the common fund. Treasurer’s accounts throughout the fifteenth century and into the early sixteenth century contain entries for money paid for expansions, repairs and building works. Repairs were not solely for houses, but also for cleaning and repairing the cloister itself, and the chapter house. The fund, however, was monopolised by the resident obedientiaries, and they repaired their own houses.

Indeed, a comparison between repair works and the position within the hierarchy of the canon who required them, demonstrates that repairs took place on most of the houses during the fifteenth century. Indeed, the eleventh house saw seven repair projects take place between 1439 and 1499, the most recorded for any of the houses. These were no doubt required as a consequence of wear and tear, but were all ordered by resident obedientiaries or ‘Windsor-men’, a trend noticeable throughout the rest of the repairs. ‘Windsor-men’ ordered repairs for the houses in which they lived and appear to have left the houses of absentee sinecurists to decay. Furthermore, they regularly occupied the best houses, as is evident from the table of housing hierarchy. Perhaps these resident obedientiaries saw it as acceptable to repair their houses at the expense of others – they were resident, after all – and yet this system was one of inequality, often prejudiced against the king’s most loyal councillors.

Tudor Reforms

Henry VIII, in his letter to St George’s cited above, ordered the canons to change their custom. He wrote that:

‘We therefore wol and comande you that hereafter like wise as it is used in oure college of Saint Stephens within oure paloys of Westmynstre the statutes whereof and of oure said college of windesore bee of oon effect that not only chanons but also alle other ministers of the said college of Saint Stephens as they succeed in
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139 SGC, XV.34.39; XV.34.49; XV.34.55; XV.34.63; XV.34.69; XV.34.70.
140 See Appendices 2 and 5.
prebend and office have the mansions and chambres that their last incumbent had. So to follow like use in our saide college of Windesore oonlesse then ye have any statute or ordinaunce in that caas specially provided to the contrary’.  

The college was no longer to appoint new canons into the worst house within the cloister. Rather, new appointees should receive the lodgings of the canon they were replacing. This system, already in place at the college’s twin institution of St Stephen’s, meant that there would no longer be mass reshuffles at the departure of a senior residentiary, streamlining the process, and avoiding unnecessary wear and tear of properties. Furthermore, the new practice of housing allocations removed an element of obedientiary control over housing, as they could no longer monopolise the best houses within the cloister.

Understandably, the resident canons were not supportive of this proposed change. Elias Ashmole, the seventeenth century antiquary, quotes a now unknown document in his notes on the college, stating that the previous system was:

‘more reasonable, for otherwise it might bee the Lott of the junior to live as it were in a palace, and the senior of all to be shutt up in a box his whole life time, which is very incongruous’. 

The dean and canons may have initially ignored the king’s request. A second letter from Henry VIII followed on 21 March 1519. Henry VIII requested that a new appointee, the aforementioned Richard Sydnor, was to have the dwelling place which one William Creton formerly held, as it was ‘a right mete lodging for our said chaplain’. Possibly the college had not yet made changes to their housing allocation, or perhaps Sydnor simply did not like the house of his predecessor. As the table of
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141 SGC, IV.B.2, f. 177.  
142 Bodleian Library, Ashmole MS 1124, f. 156v; Roberts, St George’s, 1348-1416, p. 113.  
143 SGC, XI.P.23. Dalton erroneously dates this letter to 21 March 1518: Dalton, Manuscripts, p. 477. Sydnor was in fact appointed as a canon of St George’s on 5 March 1519, and so the letter must date from 1519 rather than 1518: Letters and Papers, iii, p. 57; Fasti Wyndesorienses, p. 138.  
144 SGC, XI.P.23.
housing hierarchy shows, however, William Creton, was the longest serving canon in 1519, and thus occupied the best house.  

The college’s response to Henry’s letter unfortunately does not survive, and it is uncertain whether Sydnor was admitted into the cloister’s best lodging. It is also unclear when the dean and canons changed their system of housing allocations; no documentary evidence survives to pinpoint an exact date until the seventeenth century, when the evidence resumes. Changes to the system of housing allocation were an attempt to streamline changes in the community, but also limited the obedientiaries’ privileges. Unfortunately it is difficult to tie down repair works to the specific house to which they relate. While it is possible, using the table of housing allocation, tentatively to link repairs to a theoretical house, i.e. the best house or the fifth house, it is more difficult to relate the theoretical houses with physical buildings.

No. 6, Canons’ Cloister

Figure 2: Canons’ Cloister c.1530 (after Tim Tatton-Brown)  
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145 See Appendix 5.
146 Tim Tatton-Brown, ‘New Chapel’, p.72. This is a close-up view of the cloister, taken from the plan in Figure 1.
It is possible, however, to speculate about one house in particular: the present day No. 6. This lodging was (and is) unique in the cloister, as it actually extends over the cloister, as shown in Figure 2 above. It is likely that this extension probably took place in about 1480, according to dendrochronological analysis of the timber frames.147 Within the modern building there are surviving beams, reused in the floor of a second-floor bathroom. These remains include some extant polychromatic paintwork depicting a small stag in foliage with a decorative design which look like pillow lace. The protagonist behind this extension was possibly the influential statesman, Canon Oliver King, but this identification is problematic.148 Building works, housing allocations and repairs were controlled by the college’s obedientiaries, as has been demonstrated above. King was not an obedientiary in 1480, nor in the preceding or subsequent years. Furthermore, he had only been appointed as a canon on 30 October 1480, and was thus the newest canon at St George’s.149 In the absence of letters patent assigning King a nicer house, we must assume that he was living in the worst house in canons’ cloister in 1480.150 It is surely unlikely that the resident obedientiaries would have spent a considerable sum of money to extend the worst house in the cloister at the expense of their own. It is also improbable that King would have paid to extend his lodgings himself, in the knowledge that he would probably be moving shortly. Indeed, he was required to move house again in October 1481, when Thomas Danett was appointed as dean.

If not Oliver King, then who lived in the medieval house now known as No. 6? Rather than being King’s lodgings, and therefore the worst accommodation, No. 6 may instead have been the best house in the late-medieval cloister. If so, it would have been a resident obedientiary, Thomas Passhe, who occupied the house in 1480 and instigated the expansion. Passhe had frequently served as treasurer in the preceding years, and was commonly linked with repair works in the cloister, as noted in Chapter 1. As the longest-serving canon in 1480, Passhe occupied the best house in the cloister, and had

149 CPR, 1477-85, p. 228; BRUC, pp. 343-4; Fasti Wyndesorienses, p. 146.
150 See Appendix 5.
since 1474. Passhe also served as treasurer in the financial year 1480-1, and it is highly unlikely that he would have authorised expensive building works to expand another canon’s house, so as to rival his own.

Furthermore, as Figure 2 shows, No. 6 was next to the communal latrine, and was therefore the only lodging in the cloister with access to the upper level, a benefit discussed earlier in this case study. It was close to the ‘hundred steps’, which lead to the canons’ cemetery, and the main thoroughfare across the middle of the cloister provided easy access. Its location on one of the long sides of the cloister meant that it was one of the largest houses, even before its expansion over the inner cloister. More tentatively, the lodgings also afford a good view out to the North, which may have been an attractive feature to its medieval occupant. Such an identification is tentative, but is borne out by the analysis of repairs works, housing allocation and obedientiary control in Windsor. The ‘Windsor-men’ who were resident at St George’s controlled the college’s finances. This case study of housing has demonstrated that one of the ways in which this was achieved was by monopolising housing allocations and movements. This would eventually change at the king’s command, but not until the sixteenth century, after a century and a half of inequality.

This chapter, through the use of three case studies, has investigated the stability of St George’s at the turn of the century. The late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth century college saw continuities rather than change. The first case study revealed that the educational backgrounds of the deans and canons of Windsor may have become more diverse, and that there was limited contact with the European humanist movement. As the second case study suggested, sinecure appointments remained common, and relatively unaffected by dynastic change. Indeed, it may have been the case that women such as Elizabeth of York had a significant voice in protecting the college against neglect or deterioration. Arguably more destructive for the college’s chapter was the monopolisation of finances by resident obedientiaries, as discussed in the final case study. Control over housing allocations and repairs was the reward for loyalty and residency at Windsor, and yet caused more upheaval than successive dynastic challenges for the throne. As this chapter has shown, by the early-sixteenth century,
the college was relatively stable, and yet retained a split between resident obedientiaries and absentee sinecurists, as identified in Chapter 1. This balance between patronage and residents providing daily prayer allowed the college to fulfil both of its functions, providing stability through difficult times.
Chapter 3 - The Vicars, Lay Clerks and Choristers of St George’s Chapel

As is evident in the letters patent founding the college of St George, Windsor, its main function was the celebration of divine service and the commemoration of Edward III and his family. In order to perform these tasks, there was the need for a competent choral staff who could provide an increasingly elaborate liturgy. The men (and boys) who comprised the staff are the focus of this chapter. The choir was made up of two groups - the vicars and clerks. This chapter will first analyse the foundation statutes of the college to discover how the choir was intended to function. It will then consider both of these groups separately to determine how their function and composition changed over time.

The chapter will demonstrate that the college’s foundation statutes had to adapt as fashions changed. Changes in liturgical practice, discussed in the following, required a change in structure and personnel. The fifteenth century saw the rise of the lay clerks, many of whom were skilled musicians. This chapter will briefly consider this development, which has been analysed in detail elsewhere, but will focus on the vicars of the college, and the ways in which they reacted to restructuring. Having previously been second in status only to the dean and canons, changes in liturgical practice saw the vicars’ importance decline, forced them to carve out a new place within the college - the position of minor canons. A new structure evolved, one which could provide a grand liturgy befitting Edward IV’s new chapel.

The choral staff of the college - the vicars, lay clerks and choristers - have received extensive coverage in the extant literature on St George’s. This is understandable given the importance of the liturgy and the music that underpinned liturgical practice throughout the chapel’s history. The most comprehensive studies are found in the work of Roger Bowers. His essay on the music and musical establishment of St George’s Chapel in the fifteenth century provides a comprehensive account of the rise of polyphony within the liturgical tradition, and the effects this change had on the college and chapel at Windsor.\(^1\) The article, understandably, focuses on the lay clerks

who were at the heart of this transition, and those members of the college with musical interests. It is, however, still possible to expand on Bowers’ detailed work. The present study will focus on the vicars, their position in the college and how this position changed with the rise of the lay clerks, as documented by Bowers. It will also include a detailed statistical analysis of the period 1468-79 for which the college’s attendance register survives. While Bowers made good use of the register and its contents, a systematic study of the vicars’ and clerks’ attendance in this period sheds new light on daily life within the college.

This chapter focuses on the vicars and lay clerks of St George’s. These were not the only choral and liturgical staff present within the college, but they were the most important, and feature heavily in the records. Other, smaller, groups took part but little information survives, and it is difficult to provide a useful study. As such, this chapter will only briefly consider the subsidiary members of the choral and liturgical staff. Where information is available, it has been considered in other works. The college’s choristers, for whom little evidence survives besides their names, have been discussed by Neville Wridgway, although his focus is on the later period. Other subsidiary members of staff, such as bellringers, clerks of the vestibule and the verger generally have little information available, with the exception of the verger John Plummer, who has been discussed in detail by Helen Jeffries. This thesis will instead focus on the larger groups, which provided a substantial portion of the college community.

Some prosopographical information on the college’s vicars and clerks is provided in the work of Edmund Fellowes. This covers an extended timeframe - from the college’s foundation to 1939 - and is limited as a result in its coverage of the medieval period, for which less evidence is available. As with his work on the poor knights of St
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5 Fellowes, *The Vicars or Minor Canons; idem, Organists and Masters of the Choristers of St George’s Chapel in Windsor Castle* (Windsor, 1979).
George’s, discussed in Chapter 4, Fellowes’ focus is primarily on the period from the mid-sixteenth century onwards. As such, it contains only brief discussion of the fourteenth, fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries. Roberts’ work on the fourteenth-century college also provides insights into the vicars, clerks and choristers. Roberts’ focus, however, lay on the college’s chapter and the management of the estates, and so her work is limited in its discussion of the choral staff. It has also been useful, given the gaps in the evidence, to occasionally compare the vicars of St George’s with those at other leading institutions. The collected essays in *Vicars Choral at English Cathedrals: History, Architecture and Archaeology*, provide a useful survey of vicars around the country.

**Evidence**

The best source material for a study of the vicars, clerks and choristers at Windsor is once again, is found in the college’s attendance register from June 1468 to July 1479, which can be collated with treasurer’s and steward’s rolls for the late-fifteenth century. The register provides a detailed record for the vicars and clerks, giving not only their names and some details concerning their appointments, but also information about which daily services they attended in chapel. From this material it has been possible to establish patterns of daily life and of absences from each canonical hour. The register also provides occasional mentions of the choristers. Attendance by choristers was not recorded, but some evidence survives of their appointment providing a handful of names. The treasurer’s and steward’s rolls for the period record the names and some details concerning the vicars and clerks, as well as providing evidence of select individuals who also served as organists or masters of the choristers. The college’s archives furthermore preserve occasional bills and other such documents, which record payments made to individual vicars and clerks. Used together with the obedientiary and attendance materials, these documents provide a snapshot of the lives of the choral staff in the mid- to late-fifteenth century.
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Fourteenth-Century Expectations

The Statutes

In order to understand fifteenth-century developments in the college’s liturgical and staffing practices, it is necessary to return to the fourteenth-century foundations enshrined in the statutes. The structure of the choral staff at St George’s as described in the college’s statutes was typical for the time. There were to be thirteen ‘presbyters or vicars’, along with four clerks and six choristers, who were also to be clerks or be ‘at the time of their admission distinguished for clerkly character’. The provision for thirteen vicars was a logical one, mirroring the thirteen members of the chapter. Each vicar could act as a substitute in chapel for one of the canons who was absent. However, as Roger Bowers has pointed out, the choice of four clerks was wholly irrational. Six choristers would have provided ‘about the working minimum’, but having only four clerks meant that they were out of balance with the two groups of thirteen above them. Bowers argues that they would not have been able to discharge their duties without aid from some of the junior vicars. It is clear that Edward III, in assembling the college’s liturgical staff, was modelling St George’s on the structure of la Sainte-Chapelle, a model that was also followed at his other new royal college at St Stephen’s. La Sainte-Chapelle had grown in a piecemeal fashion since its foundation in 1246 and doubtless provided Edward with a shining example of a collegiate institution, which he sought to replicate not once, but twice on the banks of the Thames.

The vicars were supposed to be priests at the time of their admission. The statutes stipulated that the college could appoint deacons, provided that they gained the priesthood by the next Ember season. Eight pounds per annum was allocated to each vicar for all their expenses, in return for which they were required to be present at all the eight canonical hours of the day, the High Mass and a certain number of Lady and Requiem Masses as assigned by rota. Out of their annual salary, the statutes
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allocated each vicar eight shillings monthly for ‘their daily table... in such wise that at
the end of any one month it shall be sufficient...for the month then last past’. Any
excess was to be paid quarterly to the vicars.

Attendance was strictly enforced, and fines were to be taken if a vicar was not present
in chapel: two pence for missing Matins, any High Mass, or any other canonical hour,
and a penny each for missing a Lady or Requiem Mass if allocated by rota. A penny
could also be deducted from a vicar’s stipend for any other default in chapel. One full
day’s unauthorised absence could thus incur a fine of a shilling, and eight days absence
would result in the vicar receiving none of his salary that month. The money collected
from fines was to be shared between the other resident vicars, equally each quarter.
Absence from college for twenty-one days or more, by any vicar, or any other
individual within the college below the rank of canon, carried the penalty of expulsion
from the college.

The clerks and choristers were not required to be in holy orders - with the exception of
two who were to be ordained to the position of deacon and sub-deacon respectively.
The clerks received six marks annually. They were paid in a similar fashion to the
vicars: each clerk was given four shillings from their annual stipend at the end of each
month, with any excess split evenly each quarter. The deacon and sub-deacon
received an extra two marks each year for assisting the priests of the chapel in the
daily liturgy. They could also be temporarily promoted to stand in for a vicar when
there were absences in the college. Those clerks not serving as deacon or sub-deacon
would not be promoted unless they became priests. There was, therefore, a hierarchy
in place from the beginning. A clerk, who Bowers suggests was likely to be between
the ages of fifteen and twenty-four, could move through the ranks of sub-deacon and
deacon and then seek promotion to the rank of vicar when gaining priest’s orders.

13 Ibid., p. 6.
14 Ibid., p. 8.
15 Ibid., p. 9.
16 Ibid., p. 5.
17 Ibid., p. 6.
18 Ibid., pp. 5, 9, 11.
was highly unlikely that anyone in 1352 would seek to pursue a career as a clerk: the position merely serving as a stepping stone to the priesthood and a vicarship.

Choristers received a marginally smaller wage than the clerks, some five marks annually.\textsuperscript{20} This was received by the college’s precentor, or by a vicar, appointed to look after the choristers and their food. The excess was split between the resident choristers. Attendance registers for both lay clerks and choristers were carefully kept and absences were punished. Both groups were expected to attend every canonical hour in chapel, unless they had been given leave in advance. So that they should not neglect their education in music and grammar, some absences from chapel were allowed by the college’s statutes for the clerks and choristers, to receive lessons from one of the vicars, who was also given licence to be absent from chapel. If any of the clerks or choristers were absent without a reason, they were to be punished by the dean or his nominated deputy.

The appointment of a vicar or lay clerk had to be agreed by the majority of the resident chapter, and the appointee was required to have ‘a vocal organ capable of expression and a competent knowledge of singing, even if he be well endowed with knowledge or any other leading virtue’.\textsuperscript{21} It is unlikely that the same process applied to the choristers, as the statutes are generally silent about their appointment. However, the choristers were only to be admitted for the time during which ‘they are endued with fullness of voice’.\textsuperscript{22} When a vicarship became empty, the canon who was linked with that stall had a period of one month to present a new candidate to the chapter.\textsuperscript{23} If no presentations were made, or the applicants were found wanting, then the dean or any of the canons could put forward possible candidates. If another month passed, then this right reverted to the dean alone. Once a vicar, clerk or chorister had been appointed, the dean and canons were required to examine and approve the appointment for a period of eight to ten days, tested on the ‘volume of their voice and

\textsuperscript{20} Statutes and Injunctions, pp. 5-6.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., p. 8.
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., p. 9.
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., pp. 8-9.
their competent skill in reading and singing’. In this examination, ‘family, country, friendship, or any other intimacy whatsoever’ was to be set aside in order to ensure a fair test. However, once the individual had been appointed, the dean and canons were not to hinder the vicars, clerks or choristers on account of any service owed to them or otherwise, which might stop them performing their ecclesiastical work and duties.

These were not to be the canons’ personal servants, but an important part of the college in their own right.

The liturgical staff, as set out in the college’s statutes, resembled other leading choral institutions of the time, and at first the statutes seem to have been observed relatively carefully. Unlike the poor knights, the choral staff did not pose an unreasonable cost to the college as a whole. The total cost of the thirteen vicars, four clerks and six choristers, as set out in the college’s foundation statutes, was £142 13s. 4d. per annum, less than half that paid to the dean and canons (£303 18s. 4d.), and considerably less than was intended for the poor knights (£526 10s.).

**Bishop Houghton’s 1378 Injunctions**

The college’s choral staff did not over-burden the college financially, but this does not mean that problems did not arise within the college in the late-fourteenth and early-fifteenth centuries. If we turn to the 1378 injunctions of Bishop Houghton, we can see not only the petty squabbling commonly recorded in religious visitations but also a more inherent financial problem. The entry criticising one of the canons, Edmund Clove, for ‘wenching’, being ‘wanton and bucksome’, and accompanying ‘Laicks in the time of Masse, and of other hours scandalously’, noted that these traits were ‘common insolences of [the] Canons and Vicars [my italics]’. One of the vicars, John Chichester, was described as ‘ill spoken of as concerning the wife of Thomas Swift, which woman’s name is not knowne’. Furthermore, the dean was said to have been ‘too remisse,
simple and negligent in the Correction of the Vicars, soe that being Proud and Malpert they give not due Reverence to the Canons’. 29

The vicars were not alone among the miscreants in the college, and went relatively unscathed in 1378. Looming financial problems can, however, be seen in the same injunctions. The dean was criticised for holding back the vicars’ salaries for too long, while the vicars themselves ‘bear the burthen of the day, and of the heat, or competently suffice for the same’. 30 The vicars were clearly doing their job adequately in the eyes of the visitor, yet received their monthly payments late. The allocation of stipends on a monthly basis would have made this lack of payment particularly difficult for the vicars, as they were reliant on regular payments in order to eat and live. Furthermore, they were not receiving the full amount due to them, as the dean ‘put up in his pockett’, the money accruing from vacant vicarships. 31 This money was meant to be split between those vicars resident but was being held back by the dean for his own use. The clerks and choristers of St George’s do not feature in the Bishop’s injunctions. Perhaps their activities were beneath his remit, or perhaps they were sufficiently disciplined internally and did not warrant any mention. It is clear, however, that in 1378, the liturgical staff of the college was in fairly good health and few real problems emerge in the accounts, save the late payments for their work.

The Rise of Polyphony

Polyphony, in its most basic form, was music composed in two or more parts of independent melody, usually up to five or six voices. This new tradition of liturgical celebration became increasingly popular during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, in stark contrast to the previous technique of monophonic plainchant common in the medieval church. The rise of polyphony has been comprehensively discussed in the work of Roger Bowers amongst others. 32 However, we benefit from a brief discussion of its introduction at Windsor, and the effect this had on the college community.

29 Ibid.
30 Ibid.
31 Ibid.
Changes in choral practise demanded a change in the structure of the choir and its personnel, but this meant that the foundation statutes had to be tweaked. These changes, and the effects they had on the organisation of the choral staff, caused significant problems within the community.

At the time of its foundation, the college was probably capable of limited polyphonic performance on special occasions. As Bowers has argued, there were some 200 to 300 singers capable of the new form across the country in 1380, of whom there were probably three or four resident at Windsor at any one time. The identification of these individuals is difficult, as many of the college’s vicars and clerks are often unnamed in the obedientiary accounts for the late-fourteenth and early-fifteenth centuries. It is, however, possible to identify two individuals, a canon John Aleyn, present at St George’s between 1362 and 1373, and a vicar, Roger Gervays, resident during the 1390s, and who served as instructor of the choristers in 1395-6. Aleyn bequeathed a roll of polyphonic music to the college on his death, and Bowers has identified both men as contributors to a later collection of English music, known as the ‘Old Hall’ Manuscript. While the ‘Old Hall’ Manuscript itself has not been linked with St George’s, other fourteenth-century manuscripts have been connected with the college. These include three fly-leaves found in early fifteenth-century bindings from Windsor and a manuscript of fragmentary polyphony from c.1370.

It is evident that there was a history of polyphony and musical excellence at St George’s prior to the fifteenth century, and as this specialist style of music became more prevalent, the college’s statutes had to change accordingly. The desire for sophisticated musical performance, and the specialist nature of polyphony meant that

34 Ibid., pp. 178-9. For more on the ‘Old Hall’ Manuscript, see: The Old Hall Manuscript, ed. by M. Bent and A. Hughes, Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae, 46 (American Institute of Musicology, 1969). Aleyn’s roll was included in the college’s inventories in 1384-5 and 1409-10: Bond, Inventories, pp. 34, 103.
35 Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 384, ff. i-iii; New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS 978. Neither manuscript was definitely produced or used at Windsor, but it seems likely that there was a strong connection to the college. For more on these manuscripts, see: Bowers, ‘Music and Musical Establishment’, pp. 177-8; Bond, Inventories, pp. 289-92; Frank Harrison, ‘Polyphonic music for a chapel of Edward III’, Music and Letters, 59 (1978), pp. 420-8; E. Sanders, ‘English polyphony in the Morgan Library manuscript’, Music and Letters, 61 (1980), pp. 172-6.
the small pool of singers capable of the new style were in high demand. The college’s statutes had intended that an individual might move up the choral ranks, from clerk to a vicar’s stall, serving as sub-deacon and deacon in between. With the rise of polyphony, there was now the possibility of clerks pursuing lucrative careers as church musicians without having to take major orders. Virtually anyone could sing plainsong with minimal training. Polyphony, however, was much harder and required a trained elite to perform it, separate from the priests who served as canons and vicars. The number of men seeking a vicarship at the turn of the century has said to have been at a marked low, even compared to the general fall in population after the Black Death. 36

A career as a full-time musician in a collegiate institution also brought a further benefit, that of marriage. A clerk with musical ambitions, who did not seek entry into major (or even minor) orders, was not required to take the usual oath of celibacy and was therefore at liberty to marry and have a family. Life as a career musician would have been appealing to those skilled musicians, who would previously have taken major orders in order to progress within the Church. The college’s foundation statutes contained no provision for changing fashions, and now required fine-tuning in order to remain workable.

Liturgical traditions were first tweaked between 1388 and 1393, when the positions of deacon and sub-deacon disappeared from the college’s financial accounts. The anniversary records, contained within the treasurer’s roll, and discussed in Chapter 5, record the presence of both a deacon and a sub-deacon, alongside two other clerks, until Michaelmas 1388. 37 The next extant account, for 1393-4, makes no mention of either deacon or sub-deacon, merely noting that four clerks were present, all of whom were paid the standard rate. 38 The lack of a deacon and sub-deacon, however, left a gap in the college’s liturgy. One of the tasks that fell to the deacon and sub-deacon was the respective reading of the epistle and gospel at the daily High Mass. In 1393-4, the college was required to split these jobs between the vicars and the clerks. The vicars read the gospel, for which they received between them a sum of 40s. annually,

37 SGC, XV.34.15.
38 SGC, XV.34.16.
and the clerks were to read the epistle, for which they were given 26s. 8d. between them. This practice continued and, in the account for 1406-7, was explained in the treasurer’s roll as being necessary because there was no deacon or sub-deacon present. The internal structures and career paths available at St George’s clearly changed at the turn of the century. Bowers has put this turning point at approximately 1390, and argues that comparable collegiate institutions founded at this time followed a similar structure.

The rise of polyphony and the emergence of secular career clerks, who quickly became known as lay clerks, was both a problem and a blessing for the college. The choral staff, as set out by the foundation statutes, maintained a rigid hierarchy. The dean was at the top, followed by the canons, the vicars, the clerks and finally by the choristers. There was a clear intended career path from clerk to vicar, which the new career clerks abandoned. Rather than aspiring to be a vicar, they were content to practice complex musical performance instead. Polyphony was very much in vogue for most of the fifteenth century, and the clerks’ expertise in music elevated them almost to the same level as the vicars within the chapel’s liturgical importance, without the need to take holy orders.

It is unlikely that the vicars were particularly happy with this change in structure, and the subsequent rise in the clerks’ importance, in comparison to their own. The vicars saw themselves as deputies only to the dean and canons and, as we have seen, the 1378 injunctions stated that they did not even give the chapter due reverence. In 1432, the college’s visitor wrote that the vicars did not respect the canons, using the pretext of the use of the Sarum rite to occupy the upper stalls in chapel. These stalls were those of the Order of the Garter, which the dean and canons could sit in when it was not being used by the relevant knight. If the Knight of the Garter who occupied

39 ibid.
40 SGC, XV.34.24.
41 Bowers, ‘Music and Musical Establishment’, p. 181; idem, ‘Choral Institutions within the English Church’.
42 Statutes and Injunctions, p. 22.
43 ibid., pp. 28-9.
that stall was present in chapel, then even the dean and canons were required to
descend to a lower stall or move. The act of a vicar sitting in one of the upper stalls
was to knowingly put himself on the same level as a canon. Clearly the vicars saw
themselves as closer to the canons than to the clerks, because of their shared priestly
status. This is probably the reason that, as Bowers has noted, the vicars generally
stayed away from polyphony for much of the fifteenth century.44

The need to keep the vicars happy may have been behind a ‘new deal’, given to them
early in the fifteenth century, which saw extensive building works on both housing and
a new vicars’ hall. Such treatment was given to the vicars in the context of recruitment
and investment in the choral staff c.1415-17, in preparation for the investiture of the
Emperor Sigismund as a Knight of the Garter on 7 May 1416. In 1415-16, Henry V gave
the college eleven new service books, and a statue of the Virgin Mary.45 At the same
time, efforts were made to recruit vicars for the college, whose numbers had fallen as
low as ten. One of the clerks, Roger Everard, was sent to Oxford to look for priests who
were interested in becoming vicars, and one of the present vicars, William Croyden,
was given a reward for recruiting another vicar, Richard Purdieu. A further vicar,
William Kyrie, was sent to the Midlands to search for prospective candidates, and one
John Brynkman was paid his expenses for trying to take up his appointment as a vicar
within the college, although he was apparently inhibited by the Bishop of Ely.46

The sum of money given for building works on the vicars’ houses and hall was
appreciable. £88 16s. 11¾d. was set aside over two years, £67 14s. 1¼d. in 1415-16
and £21 2s. 10d. in 1416-17.47 It would appear that the vicars’ close was not initially
completed, as the 1432 injunctions to the college stated that the close was ‘not
sufficient for the full number of Vicars’. The chapter was given a year to build one new
chamber ‘like and correspondent to the other chambers, in a place adjoining the said

45 SGC, XV.56.22; TNA, E36/113, p. 107; Bowers, ‘Music and Musical Establishment’, p. 183. These
service books had been seized from Henry, Lord Scrope of Masham, who had recently been convicted of
treason.
47 SGC, XV.34.28; XV.48.5; Tatton-Brown, ‘Chapel and College Buildings’, pp. 30-1; Hope, Windsor Castle,
i, pp. 227-8.
Vicars’ close’. This work had to take place over several years, as a result of the college’s poor finances. Consequentially, entries are found in the steward’s accounts for 1437-8, when three chambers were constructed, and in 1439-40, when nine of the vicars’ lodgings were repaired. The clerks of the college were also granted accommodation at the same time, although the location and form of this housing is currently unknown.

Archbishop Kemp’s 1432 Injunctions

The provision of lodgings and a hall for the vicars appears to have kept them content in the short term. The 1432 injunctions are relatively quiet on any misconduct, although admittedly they are generally prescriptive, giving little detail on any actual problems. Besides the vicars’ usurpation of the upper stalls detailed above, absences only were noted. Absenteeism in the late fifteenth century will be discussed later in this chapter. In 1432, however, the vicars were warned that they should not be absent for a whole day or more without reasonable cause. Furthermore, the dean was not to grant leave of absence on grounds of personal affection, but only when there was good cause.

The visitor, Archbishop Kemp, was more exercised by the chapter’s tendency to keep vicarships vacant for extended periods of time. Kemp ordered that, if the dean and canons were unable to fill a vacant stall within the three-month period stipulated in the statutes, then they were to be fined 40s., a sum which was to be given entirely to the poor knights of the college. The choice of the poor knights as beneficiaries may at first seem curious, given that they were entirely removed from the process of installing a vicar. It was this detachment, however, which probably accounts for Archbishop Kemp’s choice. The poor knights were the only group without a vested interest in filling vicarships. The dean and canons could choose to leave stalls empty to avoid paying wages in times of financial hardship. Likewise, if fines were granted to the resident vicars, the residents in question had an interest in working to keep stalls

48 Statutes and Injunctions, p. 28.
49 SGC, XV.48.14; XV.48.16.
50 SGC, XV.34.41; XV.34.37.
51 Statutes and Injunctions, p. 25.
52 Ibid.
empty, and also in getting their colleagues removed from the college. With the dean and canons now facing penalty from 1432, if vicarships were not filled, the vicars and clerks were also made to swear an oath on appointment that they would not leave the college without a three-month notice period. Resignation had to be stated openly, in a meeting of chapter, unless the vicar received a promotion which warranted immediate attendance. They would then receive testimonial letters under the common seal of the college and were required to resign any incompatible benefices, either before their appointment, or within a period of one month.

It is uncertain whether vicarships had been kept vacant by the dean and canons intentionally or whether they were simply difficult positions to fill. Empty stalls, however, meant an extra burden for those vicars who were resident. Technically it should not have been difficult to fill a vicarship. Unlike the lay clerks, where there was a limited availability of men with the requisite musical ability, the only requirement for vicarship was a basic singing ability and the priesthood (or an inclination to achieve this shortly after appointment). Attendance regulations, however, could prove a problem. As Bowers has noted, attendance at other cathedrals and institutions was often considerably more lax than at St George’s. While the vicars were generally required to be present for almost every Matins and High Mass, at other leading establishments they were often excused about 50% of the rest of the canonical hours. At Windsor, as this study demonstrates, full attendance was required with substantial fines levied for absenteeism. Bowers has also argued that Edward III’s chapel may not have been big enough to be truly impressive, particularly with regards to its height, in comparison to other great churches and private chapels. While the collegiate chapels of St Stephen at Westminster and la Sainte-Chapelle in Paris possessed a similar ground plan, they were considerably taller, giving a grander impression on visitors and potential recruits than Windsor.

53 Ibid.
54 Ibid., p. 28.
Fortunately, the annual wages paid out to the vicars at Windsor were substantial enough to attract good men from other leading institutions around the country. The clerks, however, remained on a wage only just above that of a chorister, despite their new-found status and importance within the college, which would have caused increasing problems. By Michaelmas 1435, the dean and canons appear to have sought a remedy, as the treasurer’s account for 1435-6 includes a series of payments to the clerks in addition to their usual stipend. The two longest-serving lay clerks, John Mildenhall and Robert Walker, were both allocated a top-up of 53s. 4d. for the year. A third clerk, Walter Martyn, was granted 20s., and the final clerk, Thomas Thomas, was allocated two further stipends of 13s. 4d. for serving as the college’s organ-player and also as the Instructor of the Choristers, and for being present at the daily Lady Mass with the choristers.57 None of the clerks received the lump-sum allocated to them in the short term, for the entries were cancelled at audit.58 This was not surprising given the college’s financial problems at the time. The clerks did, however, receive some of money incrementally later that year, and would continue to be paid every year, although the sums appear to have been negotiated annually.

Extra stipends improved the clerks’ status within the college, and took them closer to the vicars in their annual wage. This was not, however, the only way in which they established themselves in the evolving liturgy at St George’s. As demonstrated by the example of Thomas Thomas, it is clear that, by 1435, the clerks had taken over extra responsibilities within the college. The job of Instructor of the Choristers had initially been the preserve of the vicars. One vicar, ‘more learned than the rest in instructing and teaching grammar and singing’, was to teach the choristers, when he was not present in divine service, for which he was to receive a stipend of two marks each year.59 This was not intended as a complex singing school, but was to teach the choristers Latin grammar, in order that they might be able to perform the plainsong chants required for the liturgy. In this regard, it was no different to other grammar schools at less prestigious religious institutions. With the rise of polyphony at St

---

57 Winchester Cathedral Library, MS L38/4/12.
58 Bowers, ‘Music and Musical Establishment’, p. 188.
59 Statutes and Injunctions, p. 9.
George’s, the instruction of the choristers became more important, as it provided as a means of showing off musical gifts and techniques. Furthermore, from perhaps as early as the 1420s, the choristers and their instructor began taking a greater part in the daily Lady Mass. This was yet another change from the foundation statutes, which stated that the Lady Mass should be performed by certain vicars only. The playing of the organ had also, prior to c.1400, been the preserve of the vicars, and was now utilised almost entirely by the clerks. The loss of these positions meant not only a further contribution to the rise of the clerks’ importance within the liturgy, but also a source of income, which should have gone to the vicars but instead brought the clerks of the college closer to a vicar’s pay grade.

A liturgical upheaval was in process at Windsor, requiring new staff for its realisation. This change in personnel, however, was not unique to St George’s. The continued rise of polyphony, throughout the fifteenth century, prompted collegiate churches and other foundations around England to seek an increase in the number of trained lay clerks. Musical training was, however, improved by advances in the notation of polyphony, which made complex music easier to record, and made its performance and dissemination easier. Such training also became better defined and codified within institutions, as degrees in music became available in the 1460s and 70s at both Oxford and Cambridge. The college’s attendance register for June 1468 to July 1479 gives a unique insight into the personnel of St George’s during the period in which they saw considerable change, not only in the status of sub-groups within the college community, but also in the size of each group. The rebuilding of St George’s chapel in grand fashion, and re-endowment of the college, forced the expansion of the college’s choral staff, in order to perform a grand liturgy. An analysis of the attendance register
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can be made to reveal how patterns changed as the college’s personnel evolved and expanded in the late-fifteenth century.

Choir Personnel and Attendance, 1468-79: (I) The Vicars

The college’s attendance register, covering June 1468 to July 1479, contains entries for fifty-three vicars over the eleven year period. Those vicars recorded are tabulated below.

Table 3: List of vicars present between June 1468 and July 1479

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Known Residency at St George’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Wynde</td>
<td>c.1462 - 30 May 1470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Rolygh</td>
<td>June 1468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? Sclater</td>
<td>June - 31 December 1468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. James</td>
<td>June 1468 - 23 September 1469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? Perys</td>
<td>June 1468 - 30 September 1469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Willis</td>
<td>June 1468 - 30 September 1469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Darell</td>
<td>June 1468 - 30 September 1469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Newton</td>
<td>June 1468 - 30 September 1470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Brysewood</td>
<td>June 1468 - 15 November 1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Pensell</td>
<td>June 1468 - 1 January 1473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Jones</td>
<td>June 1468 - 1 August 1476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Seward</td>
<td>June 1468 - 1 July 1478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Paynell</td>
<td>June 1468 - 16 February 1476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Prudd</td>
<td>14 August 1468 - 30 September 1473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Stowe</td>
<td>2 January 1469 - 9 January 1474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hill</td>
<td>3 October 1469 - 4 July 1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Matthew</td>
<td>13 October 1469 - 22 February 1473</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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68 Fellowes erroneously dates Darell’s resignation to 15 November 1471, when it was clearly recorded on 30 September 1469: Fellowes, The Vicars or Minor Canons, p. 62; SGC. V.B.II, f. 8v.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Bygode</td>
<td>24 December 1469 - 1 July 1473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Stevyns</td>
<td>4 December 1470 - 21 October 1475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Humbrestone</td>
<td>30 October 1471 - 2 January 1475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John More</td>
<td>21 November 1471 - 29 July 1474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Stayns</td>
<td>21 December 1471 - 30 September 1473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Byble</td>
<td>25 January 1472 - 31 December 1478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Copland</td>
<td>18 September 1473 - 20 June 1474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Elys</td>
<td>30 September 1473 - 27 June 1474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Blomeley</td>
<td>3 December 1473 - 9 May 1475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Dixon</td>
<td>17 January 1474 - 19 October 1476 (resigned May 1475 and re-admitted 29 October 1475)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wilkinson</td>
<td>1 March 1474 - 4 February 1478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Dullard</td>
<td>16 April - 6 December 1474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Rogers</td>
<td>10 October 1474 - 1 June 1476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Newman</td>
<td>22 October 1474 - 1 June 1475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wright</td>
<td>6 March - 1 October 1475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Martyn</td>
<td>8 March - 9 June 1475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kagewyn</td>
<td>12 May - 14 October 1475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Byrkeheede</td>
<td>June 1475 - c.1493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hall</td>
<td>5 August 1475 - c. January 1483(^{69})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Bowle</td>
<td>2 December 1475 - 1 April 1476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith Tudor</td>
<td>27 February - 12 March 1476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Derby</td>
<td>17 February 1476 - c. January 1484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Richmond</td>
<td>1 April 1476 - 1 October 1477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Merryhurst</td>
<td>7 April 1476 - 14 July 1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Wybbe</td>
<td>6 July 1476 - 1 July 1478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{69}\) Fellowes states that Hall was present until 1484, but cites no evidence in support of this statement: Fellowes, *The Vicars or Minor Canons*, p. 65.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Ledys</td>
<td>7 September 1476 - 1 September 1477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Phillips</td>
<td>6 April 1477 - c. Michaelmas 1490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Bexwyke</td>
<td>13 July 1477 - c. July 1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Pese</td>
<td>15 September 1477 - c. January 1483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Oldum</td>
<td>16 September 1477 - 31 January 1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Cawode</td>
<td>1 October 1477 - c. January 1483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Gossyp</td>
<td>11 February 1478 - c. January 1483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Mustarder</td>
<td>14 August 1478 - 31 January 1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hyll</td>
<td>14 August 1478 - c.1499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Arnold</td>
<td>6 January - 19 July 1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Crowe</td>
<td>29 March 1479 - c.1499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each vicar was named by surname in the register and his attendance was noted on eight occasions daily. As with the dean and canons, attendance is noted by a circle, and absence by a lack of one, as shown here:

**Figure 3: Attendance Register Entries, 1468-79**
Each circle corresponded to one of the eight canonical hours of the day, for which the vicars were required to attend by statute. The entries were intended to be read in a column format from left to right. Matins was thus recorded in the top left of each box, while Compline is found in the bottom right. This practice of recording entries has been identified through the prevalence of coupled entries throughout the register. Canonical hours often fell in pairs during the day, and it is common to distinguish paired entries corresponding to Matins and Lauds, or Vespers and Compline, in the register. If the hourly entries had been recorded in a row format, from left to right, then these pairs would make no logical sense.

No masses were recorded in the attendance register for the vicars. Lady and Requiem Masses were allocated by rota, and it is likely that attendance at masses was recorded separately. Unfortunately these records do not survive. The lack of a record for attendance at the High Mass of the day is curious. This was an important part of the liturgical day and the vicars were to be fined for non-attendance. It is likely that absence was recorded elsewhere, possibly with those for the Lady and Requiem Masses too. Furthermore, as John Harper has noted, the Mass was, at its core, a private ceremony. While the full membership of the college was expected to be present, the mass centred on the priest in charge. Harper describes the concept ‘as “private” Masses at which the whole community was present’, with a clear distinction between what went on in the sanctuary and in the choir.

It is probable that, for the vicars at least, the canonical hours were of primary importance. The dean and canons of the college, according to the statutes, were only required to be present once, at Matins, High Mass, or Vespers and Compline. The poor knights, in turn, were only required at High Mass, Lady Mass, and Vespers and

71 Statutes and Injunctions, p. 8.
72 Ibid.
73 Harper, Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy, p. 113.
74 Ibid.
Compline.\textsuperscript{75} There was therefore a need for the vicars to ensure continued celebrations within the chapel, maintaining the canonical hours when the dean, canons and poor knights were not obliged to attend. High Mass, the preserve of the canons, was less important for the vicars, and was presumably recorded elsewhere. It was presumably only noted for the poor knights because they were only obliged to attend three times and so the register’s compiler could afford the space to record Masses.

The college’s attendance register does not just record the attendance of the vicars in chapel. It also contains entries noting the installation and dismissal of individuals for the college’s community. These entries not only indicate when a vicar left the college but also whether he was thrown out, left by choice, or died. Punishments and warnings were occasionally also recorded for the vicars and clerks. Fines levied against individual vicars were noted next to each entry and warnings appear at the foot of some pages. The vicars were given three warnings before being expelled from the college, and it is in the attendance register that we find limited details about these cautions.

The vicars’ overall rate of attendance for the period between June 1468 and July 1479 was good.\textsuperscript{76} Average attendance for these eleven years was 79.12%, fluctuating mainly between 70% and 90%. The highest recorded average attendance was in March 1472 when the vicars were present at 96.43% of their canonical hours.\textsuperscript{77} The lowest recorded attendance was in July 1479, when the average was 37%, although the college appears to have been hit by plague in this month, and general attendance was subsequently low across the college.\textsuperscript{78} For the most part, however, attendance remained consistent throughout the period, with the exception of dips when vacant

\textsuperscript{75} See Chapters 1 and 4.
\textsuperscript{76} SGC, V.B.II. See Appendix 6.
\textsuperscript{77} SGC, V.B.II, f. 23v.
\textsuperscript{78} Ibid., f. 67v. Two vicars, Richard Merryhurst and Richard Arnold, died in July 1479 and only two vicars remained in chapel from 16 July until the end of the month when the register ends. A marginal note next to the entry for the vicar Richard Crow records that he was absent \textit{propter pestilenciam}, while the archives of Eton College contain a similar reference to the plague in the area: Eton College, MS Audit Roll 18.
stalls were left unfilled. The choir could, and did, continue to function in times of limited vacancies, continuing a high attendance, as the resident vicars appear to have made more of an effort to attend chapel to fill the gap. Examples of this can be found throughout the register, such as in the period from December 1469 to April 1470, when the choir maintained an average attendance of 85.53%, despite a vacant stall.\textsuperscript{79} Throughout the eleven year period it was often the case that up to three of the vicars’ stalls were vacant at any one time, and so it would appear that the dean and canons had paid little attention to Archbishop Kemp’s injunctions of 1432 in trying to fill these positions.

The college’s attendance register gives information about how often the vicars were present in chapel. The nature of the records, however, with their eight entries in a row format, provides further material for analysis. As well as indicating when the vicars were present, it is often more revealing to consider when and why they were absent. The college’s statutes required full attendance under financial penalty and so any break from statute is interesting in itself. As each of the canonical hours was listed individually, the register provides a unique opportunity to analyse attendance not just in chapel, but at specific canonical hour. It is generally impossible, given a lack of documentation, to identify which absences had been authorised by the college and which were simply the result of truancy. Fines were recorded for some vicars in the margin of the register, but are not linked to specific absences and were more likely fines for bad behaviour. However, it is nonetheless intriguing to look at which hours were most commonly missed throughout the eleven-year period covered by the register.

Between June 1468 and July 1479, the vicars missed 12,121 individual canonical hours in chapel. This analysis discounts occasions on which there were vacant stalls, or when a vicar missed an entire day in chapel. From this, it is possible to discern distinctions between the hours.\textsuperscript{80} The most common hour to be missed was Lauds, with 19% of the total absences, followed closely by Prime with 15%, Terce with 14% and Matins with

\textsuperscript{79} SGC, V.B.II., ff. 10-12.
\textsuperscript{80} See Appendix 7.
13%. The second half of the day was better attended. None comprised 11% of the total absences, followed closely by Sext with 10%, and both Vespers and Compline with 9% each. The first four hours of the canonical day thus accounted for 61% of the total absences between them, with only 39% of absences in the second half of the day.

The vicars appear to have been sleeping in. This was not a completely unique occurrence among ecclesiastics. The canons of St Mary Newarke, Leicester, had been castigated in 1440, as they did ‘not rise for matins according to the statutes...and they say “I know how much I shall lose: I had rather lose it than get up”’, for which the Dean did not punish them.81 Interestingly, the difference in attendance between Matins and Lauds implies that the vicars may have got up at day break (or stayed up all night) to attend the major office of Matins, before departing the chapel and missing the other hours. The exact reasons for absence cannot be identified, but it is possible to speculate. The vicars of the college, along with the canons and the clerks in major orders, had been banned by the foundation statutes from frequenting ‘taverns or suspicious places’ and should instead ‘study to live continently’.82 It has been demonstrated, however, that vicars around England, in both colleges and cathedrals, did not necessarily live up to these high ideals.

At York, for example, where the Minster’s vicars had their own college at the Bedern, the vicars had a detailed routine determining when they were to receive their daily allowance of ale.83 In York, as at Windsor, the vicars at the Bedern gave a portion of their annual stipend to pay for supper, although in York this took place weekly, rather than monthly. For this, they received daily meals and also daily rations of ale. These portions included both ale served with meals but also at set times: once after the main meal and three times after supper, until eight o’clock in winter and nine o’clock in summer. Ale could be obtained outside of these times, but Nigel Tringham has

---

82 Statutes and Injunctions, p. 15.
speculated that the vicars would have paid extra for ale on these occasions.\textsuperscript{84} Ale does not only seem to have been drunk at mealtimes, leading Tringham to describe the Bedern as, ‘an all-male environment where there was always a drinking partner at hand’, where the vicars enjoyed regular drinking sessions with the monks from St Mary’s Abbey in both the communal hall and at local taverns.\textsuperscript{85} Furthermore the vicars would often slip out to local taverns on their own. On one occasion in 1422, for example, a vicar and a chantry priest were castigated for wandering around the midsummer bonfires in York, improperly dressed and carrying pole-axes late at night.\textsuperscript{86} Why they required pole-axes in the first instance is unknown, but the pair were clearly not acting as they should have been.

Similar stories are recorded at St Mary Newarke, Leicester, and at Fotheringhay College. At the Newarke in 1440, it was alleged that the gate-keeper’s wife would sell ‘beer within the gates of the close, to the which place flock together the canons, vicars and chaplains of the church, and sit there until eight, nine or ten o’clock after noon’.\textsuperscript{87} Furthermore, ‘certain canons and vicars and other ministers...fear not to haunt and use the public and common taverns and forbidden gatherings and unlawful spectacles by night and by day until they are drunk’, for which they were warned to avoid taverns for eating or drinking, unless ‘in the course of a journey or compelled by need’.\textsuperscript{88} At Fotheringhay in 1438, the visitor, Bishop Alnwick described how the priest-fellows, ‘roam by themselves outside the college into the town’, and ‘do customarily haunt the public taverns in the town’.\textsuperscript{89} They were warned again about this behaviour at the college’s next visitation in 1442, at which point it was also claimed that one of the priests, John Palmer, had also been brewing mead ‘and on this account has sometimes four, five or six women with him in his chamber, sometimes only one’.\textsuperscript{90} Vicars, clerks

\textsuperscript{84} Tringham, ‘At Home in The Bedern’, p. 190.
\textsuperscript{85} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 191; YMA, VC6/1/10, 11, 15.
\textsuperscript{86} Tringham, ‘At Home in The Bedern’, p. 191; Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, D/C AB1, ff. 30, 61v, 220v.
\textsuperscript{87} \textit{Visitation of Religious Houses in the Diocese of Lincoln}, ii, p. 193.
\textsuperscript{88} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 203.
\textsuperscript{89} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 94, 96.
\textsuperscript{90} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 109, 112.
and priests around the kingdom were clearly not the pious figures one might have expected, and spent a long periods of time drinking and frequenting taverns.

Without documentary evidence, it is perhaps unfair to class the vicars of St George’s alongside their northern counterparts. It is, however, probable that they may have, on occasion, stayed up drinking into the night, which caused them to miss the early hours of the day. This is further substantiated by the identification of a musical collection thought to have been produced at Windsor, British Library Egerton 3307. Amongst the usual liturgical material used in chapel, this collection also contains a drinking song, *O potores exquisiti*. It is likely that this song was sung in the vicars’ common hall and accompanied by drinking sessions similar to those in York. It is perhaps no wonder that the most commonly missed offices were those before eleven o’clock, particularly as breakfast was not to be served until midday. At the other end of the scale, it is clear that Vespers and Compline were well attended throughout the eleven year period surveyed, comprising only 9% of absences each. Matins and Vespers were the two most important offices of the cycle, opening and closing the working day respectively. Unlike Matins, however, Vespers was at the considerably more sociable hour of around three o’clock in the afternoon. Possibly also of importance to the vicars was the fact that Vespers, and the office of Compline with which it was generally paired, were followed by supper, an important consideration given that the next meal would not follow until breakfast the next day. Vespers also saw the attendance of the

---

92 The manuscript of the musical text and annotations includes a detailed illumination showing a combination of religious men and merchants drinking from a barrel and clearly enjoying themselves. Monkeys are also depicted as present, chained to the barrel. It is uncertain whether monkeys would have been present at such occasions. Recently, Kathleen Walker-Meikle has demonstrated that monkeys were widely available as pets in Western Europe from the twelfth century, and were often kept by clerics, for company and entertainment. Kathleen Walker-Meikle, *Medieval Pets* (Woodbridge, 2012), pp. 13-14, 19-20, 24-6, 43-4, 55-6, 67-8. Such a presence would explain the curious repair bill found in the treasurer’s account for 1475-6, for a new window in the chapter house, the old one having been broken by a monkey: SGC, XV.34.53. It is unknown whether the monkey in question belonged to a member of the college community, or if it belonged to the king and had escaped from elsewhere in the castle. Edward IV, and successive kings before him, were known to have owned monkeys. Nor is it known if the monkey was intoxicated at the time of his escape.
94 Ibid.
poor knights and possibly some of the resident canons and was thus a highpoint of the liturgical day.

Data collected from the college’s attendance register does not just show attendance figures at a set point in time. This study has used statistical analysis to show the average attendance over an eleven-year period, and also to break down daily absences by canonical hour. A combination of the two approaches demonstrates change in absence at each canonical hour over the full eleven year period. The results are curious and difficult to explain.\textsuperscript{95} Four peaks are present in the data, at which point absences at certain offices became considerably higher than in previous years. The four peaks shown occurred in the years 1469, 1472, 1475 and 1477. Of these, the surges in 1469 and 1475 were considerably more extreme. As might be expected, Lauds tops all four peaks, reaching a high of 402 absences in 1469 in comparison to 70 absences from Vespers in the same year. Prime and Terce are generally found just below Lauds in these spikes. The attendance data used to compile this analysis discounts whole day vacancies and vacant stalls to give an indication of which hours were being missed intentionally. It is therefore probable that these spikes, in which the average monthly absence for each hour rose to more than its overall average for the eleven year period, represent periods of declining standards within the college. They occur fairly regularly, at roughly three year periods, and may show cycles of reform and decline, as the dean and canons clamped down on absenteeism every few years.

A further curiosity is found in analysis of absence over an eleven year period. Between 1474 and 1475, the number of vicars missing None rose dramatically, from 88 to 267 absences in the space of a year. This rise put it close to Lauds, Prime and Terce for the year and is difficult to explain. Perhaps a new cook had been appointed, and the vicars were anxious to get out of chapel and down to breakfast early. More likely is a link to the large scale demolition works taking place near the vicar’s hall and lodgings as preparations began for Edward IV’s new chapel. Tim Tatton-Brown has argued that much of the Lower Ward to the west of the old St George’s chapel was levelled in the

\textsuperscript{95} See Appendix 8.
years 1475-6, in order to allow the foundations of the new chapel to be put in place.\textsuperscript{96} These works may therefore have rendered the vicar’s hall unusable for supper, and meant that the vicars were required to seek sustenance in the town, causing them to leave chapel early. This theory cannot be proven conclusively, given a lack of evidence, but may go some way to explaining the curious rise in absence at None in 1475. Certainly, by 1476 absences had returned to their normal levels, where they remained with the exception of a small spike in 1477, which affected almost all of the divine offices.\textsuperscript{97}

Analysis of the college’s attendance register has shown that throughout the period June 1468 to July 1479, the vicars maintained a relatively high average attendance. As priests, they maintained the daily liturgy of the canonical hours, and it does not appear that liturgical practices were abandoned or diminished through a lack of attendance. We can see some irregularities present in the records, with morning offices being missed, but these do not seem to have hindered the workings of liturgical performance. The college’s clerks, however, were not required to be priests and it is their attendance that this analysis will now consider.

**Choir Personnel and Attendance, 1468-79: (II): The Lay Clerks**

During the period between June 1468 and July 1479, fifteen lay clerks were recorded in the college’s attendance register, as tabulated below.

**Table 4: List of lay clerks present between June 1468 and July 1479\textsuperscript{98}**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Known Residency at St George’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Churchman</td>
<td>c. Michaelmas 1442 - 16 August 1468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Rolfe</td>
<td>c.1445 - 31 July 1469, 1 April 1476 - c.1485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Scriven</td>
<td>c. June 1468 - 30 September 1469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Charde</td>
<td>c. June 1468 - c.1484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{96} Tim Tatton-Brown, ‘Chapel and College Buildings’, p. 6. See also Chapter 1.

\textsuperscript{97} See Appendix 8.

\textsuperscript{98}SGC, V.B.II; XV.34.50-6; Bowers, ‘Music and Musical Establishment’, pp. 193-214
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clerk Name</th>
<th>Appointment Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Scalon</td>
<td>c. June 1468 - c.1494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Cotyngham</td>
<td>4 August 1469 - 1 May 1473, 28 March 1477 - c.1504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Browne</td>
<td>1 May 1473 - 6 July 1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Herword</td>
<td>5 March 1476 - c. July 1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Koke</td>
<td>5 March 1476 - 28 November 1476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John North</td>
<td>18 September 1477 - c.1486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gyrton</td>
<td>24 December 1477 - c. March 1492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Edmund</td>
<td>19 April 1478 - c. July 1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Rympyngden</td>
<td>16 July 1478 - c.1486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Lambe</td>
<td>13 February 1479 - c.1484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lane</td>
<td>26 July 1479 - c.1504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with the vicars, the name of each clerk was recorded, and attendance was denoted by eight circles representing the canonical hours of the day. Attendance was generally high, with an average of 83.77%, compared to the 79.12% average of the vicars. The highest average attendance recorded was 99.33% in February 1474, while the lowest was in the plague month of July 1479 when attendance fell to a mere 37%. Unlike that of the vicars, however, the clerks’ attendance did not remain constant over the eleven year period studied. Three distinct periods can be seen in the analysis. The first, running from the start of the register in June 1468 until December 1469 inclusively, had an average attendance of only 62.72%, fluctuating between 50% and 80%. The second period, from January 1470 to February 1476 inclusive, is the largest of the three groupings, with an average attendance of 90.09% and fluctuating for the most part between 80% and 100%. The final period, from March 1476 until the end of the register in July 1479, shows a distinct fall in average attendance to 82.12% with attendance fluctuating between 70% and 90%.

99 See Appendix 9.
Changes in attendance were a direct consequence of redevelopments within the college’s choir. With the rise of polyphony, at Windsor as at other leading establishments, there was a need for expansion and re-organisation of the choral staff capable of a high quality liturgical spectacle. As Bowers has noted, ‘the king’s [Edward IV’s] initial attempt at defining the choir’s needs for new personnel dates from 1475’. Desires for a new and grander choir went hand-in-hand with the building of a much larger chapel. This redevelopment was funded by a new source of income: St Anthony’s Hospital, London, which was appropriated by St George’s in 1475, and its income set aside for the choir. The money was intended to provide for an extra ten vicars, six clerks and four choristers, taking the total choir staff up to twenty-three vicars, ten clerks and ten choristers. Within a year, the intended number of choristers had risen to thirteen, in order to allow for a greater balance of voices. As was often the case at Windsor, changes did not take place overnight. Rather, the college implemented a piecemeal expansion of their choral staff, slowly at first in anticipation of money from St Anthony’s, and then faster as the income materialised. The college’s attendance register for this period allows a detailed study of the increasing numbers of clerks present at St George’s, and how this related to average attendance.

The foundation statutes stipulated that four clerks should be present in the college at any one time, and this appears to have been the case for much of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In June 1468, however, five clerks were recorded in the attendance register. The creation of an extra clerk’s position pre-dated the increased revenue coming from St Anthony’s, and implies that the college’s chapter took an interest in promoting their choral staff prior to Edward IV’s grant. This was clearly an intentional choice: in July 1469, one of the clerks, Thomas Rolfe, left the college and

103 Statutes and Injunctions, p. 4.
104 SGC, V.B.II., f. 1.
105 Interestingly, Bowers does not discuss this extra clerk when discussing the increase in clerks’ numbers in the late-fifteenth century: Bowers, ‘Music and Musical Establishment’, pp. 198-201.
was replaced almost immediately by a new clerk, Robert Cotyngham.\textsuperscript{106} Five clerks remained present in the college until October 1469, when one vacant stall became available for both October and November.\textsuperscript{107} While the position was vacant, squares remained marked out in the college’s attendance register, indicating that it was the college’s intention to fill the empty space. By December 1469, however, these vacant squares no longer appear in the register, and the number of clerks appears to have been consolidated at four, where it remained until the St Anthony’s grant arrived.

Consolidation of the number of lay clerks in December 1469 increased their average attendance drastically. It was at this point that the clerks moved from the first to the second distinct period of attendance. Reducing the number of clerks increased the need for regular attendance. The subsequent rise in attendance shows that the clerks at Windsor clearly were committed, as it was rare for them to miss canonical hours in chapel. Good attendance was maintained until March 1476, when two new clerks were installed to the college, with a third clerk in April 1476.\textsuperscript{108} An increase in numbers corresponded with a decrease in average attendance, as the clerks moved into the third distinct period of attendance noted above. The number of clerks remained at seven until September 1477 - with the exception of an unfilled vacancy between December 1476 and March 1477 - after which numbers increased rapidly.\textsuperscript{109} September 1477 saw a new clerk installed, taking the number of clerks to eight.\textsuperscript{110} The number of clerks then rose to nine in December 1477, to ten in April 1478 – at which level it remained until January 1479 - with the exception of August 1478, when eleven clerks were present. From February 1479, numbers remained at eleven until the end of the register.\textsuperscript{111}

\textsuperscript{106} Ibid., ff. 7v-8. Thomas Rolfe left the college after Vespers on 31 July 1469 and Robert Cotyngham was installed before High Mass on 3 August.

\textsuperscript{107} SGC, V.B.II, ff. 1-9v.

\textsuperscript{108} SGC, V.B.II, ff. 9v-48; XV.34.56. Bowers erroneously claims that three new lay clerks were admitted in March 1476, but the attendance register clearly shows installations in March and April: Bowers, ‘Music and Musical Establishment’, pp. 199-200.

\textsuperscript{109} SGC, V.B.II., ff. 48-56.

\textsuperscript{110} Ibid., f. 56v.

\textsuperscript{111} Ibid., ff. 65-67v.
The rapid rise in the number of lay clerks at St George’s was funded by the appropriation of St Anthony’s Hospital, and the college clearly sought to recruit potential candidates even before the money arrived from London in 1478-9. Part of this recruitment programme may have been an attempt to give the clerks extra prestige within the college. By the time of the first payments from St Anthony’s, the choir’s intended structure had been altered once again. There were to be no new stalls for vicars, with their numbers staying at thirteen. Instead, there were to be eleven clerks and thirteen choristers. As the number of clerks increased, so did their importance within the college and their contribution to the Divine Liturgy.

Interestingly, from September 1477, new admissions were referred to as clerks ‘of the new foundation’ in the college’s attendance register, linking them to the grand new chapel being built. The implication is that Edward IV, through his grant of St Anthony’s to St George’s, wanted an impressive liturgy to be associated with his new chapel. The new clerks were inextricably connected with this re-foundation and thus took its name. No such change took place for the vicars, choristers, or even the clerks already employed by the college. Increases in the number of clerks present at St George’s naturally brought an increase in overall attendances at the canonical hours of the day. While individual average attendance fluctuated, and indeed dropped as the number of clerks increased, their overall attendance in choir rose rapidly after the appropriation of St Anthony’s. Edward IV’s efforts to develop the college’s liturgical presence appear to have borne fruit: talented musicians maintained a more elaborate and impressive liturgy. Average attendance figures demonstrate that they could still have done better, but it is clear that the clerks had a distinct presence within the college by 1479.

112 SGC, XI.B.26; XV.34.55; XV.34.57.
113 SGC, V.B.II, ff. 56v-67v.
114 In 1477-8, for example, Herword, Charde, Rolf, Gyrton, Edmund, Rympyngden and North, were described as being of the new foundation, while Brown, Scalon and Cotyngham were of the first foundation, and Churchman of antique foundation: SGC, XV.34.54. Churchman had left the college in 1468, and this entry must have referred to arrears.
115 See Appendix 10.
As with the vicars, so too the clerks’ attendance at individual canonical hours was recorded. Up to eight attendances were marked daily, allowing an analysis of which offices were most commonly missed. The record, unfortunately, is less complete than that for the vicars. The beginning of the register records the usual eight circles denoting absence on occasion, although the majority of entries record only six attendances, with no indication of which canonical hours are not shown.\textsuperscript{116} The clerks appear to have regularly attended only six of their eight services daily, and the register’s compiler did not make note of which hours were not attended. The reasons behind this limited, but consistent, absence are unknown. It does, however, look systematic. From June 1470 the register begins documenting all eight of the hours in the same way that the vicars’ attendance was recorded, and it becomes possible to assess absence from individual offices.\textsuperscript{117}

Between June 1470 and July 1479, the clerks of the college missed 5,374 individual canonical hours in St George’s chapel.\textsuperscript{118} As with the vicars, the analysis discounts occasions on which there were vacant stalls, or when a clerk missed the entire day in chapel. The most commonly missed offices were Matins and Lauds with 18% each, followed by Prime (14%) and Terce (13%). The afternoon was better attended. None comprised 11% of absences, closely followed by Sext and Vespers with 9% each, and Compline with 8%. The clerks, like the vicars, appear to have been sleeping in. Absences from the morning offices comprised 63% of individual hours missed, while the afternoon offices comprised only 37%. Indeed, a comparison of the offices missed by the vicars and clerks shows an almost identical pattern, implying that both groups got up to similar activities at supper and after curfew. This is perhaps more understandable in the case of the clerks. As laymen, they were not required to be in holy orders and thus lived a secular life. Allowed to marry and have children, the lay clerks were men employed by the college for their singing talent, rather than seeking a life of priesthood. Perhaps it is more impressive that the clerks were able to maintain such a high attendance in chapel despite the trappings of secular life. When they were

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{SGC, V.B.II, ff. 1-12v.}
\footnote{Ibid., ff. 13-67v.}
\footnote{See Appendix 11.}
\end{footnotes}
absent, however, it appears to have been due to difficulties in getting out of bed, as it
was for the vicars.

Interestingly, an analysis of individual hours missed over the nine-year period between
June 1470 and July 1479 does not show the same three year cycle of reform and
decline identified for the vicars above.119 A very slight peak can be seen in 1471, when
absences at Lauds increased for the year, but otherwise there was little discrepancy
until 1476, when the number of clerks began to increase. As detailed above, increasing
the number of lay clerks in the college caused average attendance to drop slightly, as it
was no longer the preserve of a handful of committed enthusiasts. The increase in
numbers also meant that the morning offices became more commonly missed. As
numbers increased, it was possible for a clerk to miss individual offices, safe in the
knowledge that there were plenty of colleagues to cover for him, a system which had
not been tenable with a more limited number of clerks.

Analysis of the college’s attendance register has shown that the number of lay clerks
appointed increased noticeably with the appropriation of St Anthony’s Hospital,
greatly augmenting their presence within St George’s. This increase allowed individual
clers to be absent from chapel on occasion, although overall average attendance
remained high. As the number of clerks rose, they further encroached on the status of
the vicars, who received no new investment from St Anthony’s, despite initial plans to
do so. The rise of the lay clerks required a further redevelopment of the college and
choir structure in order to maintain the primacy of the priesthood over talented lay
musicians and keep a balance within the college.

Choir Personnel and Attendance, 1468-79: (III): Discipline and Dismissal

The college’s eleven-year attendance register does not only provide information about
the attendance of those in the college, but also details of installations, retirements,
fines, dismissals, deaths and discipline. This is particularly the case for the vicars, who
feature heavily. The college’s foundation statutes had set out a very clear hierarchy of

119 See Appendix 12.
discipline, with the dean and chapter in charge of regulating the behaviour of those below them. Fines were levied for any unauthorised absence in chapel: 2d. for missing Matins, High Mass, or other canonical hour and 1d. for missing a Lady or Requiem Mass when allocated by rote. A further 1d. was taken for any other default in chapel or in the divine service. Continued absence for twenty-one days or more required the removal of the vicar in question and absence for less than twenty days was still punished.

The college’s regulations prohibited any arguing, noise or trifles in chapel and stated that ‘defamers and grumblers and sewers of discord’ were to be corrected so as not to bring division into the chapel or provoke hatred. Such vicars causing discontent were to be warned three times before their expulsion, and not readmitted without special mandate from the king. Further statutes warned against improper dress, so that no member of the college was to wear dirty or ragged clothes in chapel, or to wear clothing of ‘a ridiculous kind or remarkable for its extreme shortness’, or to ‘wear their hair long, nor brushed out with wide parting as effeminate persons’. Visiting taverns was also forbidden, but as this chapter has argued, it is likely that this rule may have been broken, as at other institutions. There was clearly, however, an important sense of hierarchy and discipline at St George’s with regards to the vicars’ behaviour.

The college’s attendance register allows for a limited analysis of who was being disciplined at Windsor, and why. In the eleven years covered, 170 fines were recorded, along with twenty-five warnings and thirty-three dismissals. The majority of these were for the college’s vicars, with 119 fines, twenty-five warnings, and twenty-five dismissals, and it is these entries that this analysis will now consider.

Unfortunately, little information survives regarding the causes of fines, warnings and dismissals, with a few exceptions. Dismissals have been differentiated from
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120 Statutes and Injunctions, p. 8.
121 Ibid., p. 9.
122 Ibid., pp. 10, 15.
123 Ibid., pp. 10-11.
124 Ibid., p. 15.
125 SGC, V.B.II., ff. 1-67v.
retirements of vicars by the choice of verbs used to describe the action: recessit for a vicar leaving voluntarily, and dimisit for a dismissal by the dean and canons. Perhaps surprisingly, fines recorded in the register do not appear to have been connected to attendance, but rather to ill-discipline. Throughout the eleven years in which fines were noted, there is little correlation with attendance for the corresponding vicars or clerks. Some may have been as a result of absences, but this cannot be substantiated by the available documentation. Further evidence is found in the form of official warnings, which often link to relevant fines for that month. The college’s statutes had decreed that individuals were to be given three official warnings before the dean and canons before their dismissal, and these warnings often include details about the cause of the offence.

Between June 1478 and July 1479, fourteen vicars were warned twenty-five times between them.\textsuperscript{126} These warnings were given before the full chapter, and generally charged the individual, or individuals concerned, with the standard accusation of being involved in a dispute. Often warnings involved groups of men who had been implicated in the same dispute. On 3 October 1472, for example, five vicars were brought before the dean and chapter: Thomas Bible, William Stayns, Henry Matthew, Ralph Bygode and Henry Stow.\textsuperscript{127} No evidence of their misdeeds was recorded, although all five had been fined frequently in the previous financial year: Bible was fined 2\s{d}; Stayns 1\s{s}.11\s{d}; Matthew 1\s{s}. 6\s{d}; Bygode 3\s{d}; and Stow 1\s{s}. 2\s{d}. in total.\textsuperscript{128} Bible and Stayns must have been considered particularly to blame, or committed further insolences, as they received not one, but two warnings this month. The treasurer’s account for 1471-2 contains further detail about punishments for these vicars.\textsuperscript{129} The recepta forinsece section of the roll notes that the treasurer received 8\s{s}. 4\s{d}. in fines from vicars, and 5\s{d},

\textsuperscript{126} SGC, V.B.II., ff. 4v, 7, 12v, 27, 30v, 40v, 41v, 42, 46v, 48, 59, 61. The fourteen vicars were Robert Darell, Thomas Newton, Thomas Bible, William Stayns, Henry Matthew, Ralph Bygode, Henry Stow, Richard Prudd, John Roger, John Newman, John Blomeley, Griffith Tudor, William Jones and William Wybbe. See also Fellowes, The Vicars or Minor Canons, pp. 61-6.

\textsuperscript{127} Ibid., f. 27.

\textsuperscript{128} Ibid., ff. 21-7.

\textsuperscript{129} SGC, XV.34.51. Warnings from the dean and canons did not necessarily work in this case, as Matthew, Stayns and Stow were fined further in the following months, and Bygode was dismissed in July 1473: ibid., ff. 27v-31v.
from two clerks. Bible and Stayns, as protagonists, both paid 2s. 6d. in partial payment of an overall fine of 10s. each. The treasurer’s account for 1472-3 does not survive, and it is uncertain whether the rest of this fine was paid, or was written off by the college, as it represented a significant proportion of a vicar’s annual stipend. Bygode and Matthews were also fined 20d. each, while Stow paid no fines, having left the college before Matins on 5 October, and staying away until 8 November. It is uncertain whether Stow had run away in anticipation of further fines, or whether he had been sent away. Interestingly, the timing of these warnings and fines corresponds with one of the cycles of decline and reform established above, correlating with the spike in absenteeism in 1472.

Four other ‘group’ appearances were recorded, in which individual fights were noted. Unfortunately, no details of fines were recorded for these warnings, and punishments were probably more substantial than was recorded in the attendance register. Henry Stow was once again called in for a warning on 12 May 1473, along with Richard Prudd, for quarrelling and fighting. John Roger and John Newman were called in on 21 January 1475, also for brawling and causing contention. Newman’s time at St George’s was short and troubled. He was appointed on 22 October 1474, and clearly took a dislike to John Roger shortly after. In the aftermath of their quarrel in January 1475, Roger was fined 2d. and Newman 1d., and by March, Newman had found himself in trouble again, receiving a second warning for fighting. His opponent was not named on this occasion, although both Newman and Roger were fined 1d. for the month. April saw further fighting at St George’s, as Roger was once again summoned to the dean and chapter for brawling, on 7 April. Shortly after, on 11 April, John Newman was back for his third warning for fighting John Blomeley, who received both a first and second warning for his part in the brawl. It is uncertain whether Roger was once again involved in the quarrel between Newman and

130 SGC, V.B.II., ff. 27-27v.
131 Ibid., f. 30v. Their warning was described as pro lite et pugna.
132 pro rixa et contentione: Ibid., f. 40v.
133 Ibid., f. 39.
134 Ibid., ff. 40v- 41v.
135 Ibid., f. 42.
Blomeley, but Roger and Newman were both fined 2d. and Blomeley received a fine of 1d. John Newman left the college in June 1475, probably leaving before he was dismissed. Once again, disputes correspond with a spike in absenteeism in 1475, indicating a period of declining discipline amongst the vicars more generally. Absenteeism may also have had a hand in sparking brawls, particularly if the vicars had been spending time away from chapel in the tavern.

John Roger does not appear to have given up his troublesome ways as he was called before the dean and canons for a third time on 6 April 1476, alongside William Jones, to answer certain allegations against them. Both vicars were given ultimate: Roger had until 1 May to address the concerns, while Jones had until the vigil of Pentecost (1 June). It is uncertain what Jones had done to warrant an ultimatum. He had been present throughout the period covered by the attendance register with no official warnings and only three fines of 2d. each: in August 1471, September 1472 and October 1474. Neither man remained at the college for long. John Roger was eventually dismissed from St George’s on 1 June 1476, having seemingly gained a stay of execution through May, by hiding away from the college, missing almost twenty-one full days. The compiler of the attendance record for that month, Canon John Coryngdon, clearly felt the dismissal to be a long time coming, adding merito to the end of the account. William Jones lasted two months longer, being dismissed on 1 August 1476.

Warnings were not only given to the vicars for bouts of fisticuffs, but also for more personal reasons. One of the vicars, Robert Darell, was warned on two occasions in 1469 for his behaviour, in January and again in June. The first of these warnings saw Darell before the dean and canons on 21 January, for sleeping in town in a suspicious

136 Ibid., f. 44. The entry for Newman’s departure from the college states that he left and was dismissed from his stall. Presumably he read the writing on the wall and decided to jump before he was pushed. 137 Ibid., f. 48. 138 Ibid., ff. 20, 26v, 39. 139 Ibid., ff. 48v-49. Roger was absent on 1 May and from Matins on 6 May until 26 May. 140 Ibid., f. 49. 141 Ibid., f. 50. 142 Ibid., ff. 4v, 7.
place, while the second gave no specific reason. He received further punishment at Michaelmas 1469, when he was fined 12d. - paid to the treasurer - for missing the *exequies* on the vigil of the anniversary of Queen Philippa of Hainault.\(^{143}\) It is uncertain whether Darell missed the vigil on account of suspiciously sleeping in town once again. These warnings, however, again correspond to a period of decline in discipline, as identified above. Another vicar, Griffith Tudor, appointed on 27 January 1476, appears to have arrived at the college with a chequered past, as he was given a conditional offer, on the understanding that he would be dismissed on his first offence.\(^{144}\) The dean and canons were right to be cautious: Tudor was dismissed two months later and was noted to have left without licence, leaving the college without adequate notice.\(^{145}\) The other vicars, for whom the warnings give little details, were Thomas Newton, who received a warning on 26 May 1470, and William Wybbe, who was warned on three occasions in 1478, once on 21 February and receiving his second and third warnings on 13 June and 20 June.\(^{146}\) Wybbe’s third admonishment saw him dismissed from the college on 1 July 1478.\(^{147}\) Unfortunately no reasons for these warnings were recorded.

Certain vicars at St George’s were clearly not behaving as they should. The dean and chapter, however, had a means of clearing out unreasonable characters: dismissal from their stall. Of the fourteen vicars given official warnings, nine were dismissed from their posts at some later point.\(^{148}\) With one exception, the time between a vicar’s last recorded warning was short, on average, three and a half months.\(^{149}\) Misbehaviour was not tolerated in a major religious institution such as St George’s, at least not the type of constant misbehaviour that might catch the eye of the dean and chapter or other royal officials.

\(^{143}\) SGC, XV.34.56. Queen Philippa’s anniversary was one of a few obits for which attendance was compulsory. It was celebrated on 17 August. See Chapter 5.

\(^{144}\) SGC, V.B.II., f. 46v.


\(^{147}\) *Ibid.*, f. 61v.

\(^{148}\) Robert Darell and Richard Prutt appear to have retired from the college of their own accord. Thomas Newton, William Stayns and John Newman appear to have left St George’s before being pushed out, in the face of multiple warnings or frequent fines.

\(^{149}\) The one exception was that of the aforementioned Thomas Bible, warned twice in October 1472, but not dismissed until December 1478.
The chapter’s decision was final and, according to statute, dismissed vicars could not be readmitted without an explicit royal command. It would appear, however, that the king, or at least his court, paid attention to cases of mistreatment or misbehaviour. Two vicars are known to have returned to Windsor after their dismissal. The first, William Stevyns, was dismissed from the college prior to the start of the attendance register, and, as a consequence, his troubles are only recorded in a petition to Edward IV, copied out in a clerk’s copy book from 1470. Stevyns’ complaint was that, having been a vicar at St George’s for some three years and more, he had been dismissed by the dean, acting ‘by excitation of certain persons ayens thentent of his bretheren the Chanons’. Stevyns complained that he had been dismissed because he held a benefice elsewhere and, while this had been banned by an injunction, it was not contrary to the college’s foundation statutes and was widely flaunted. In this case, dismissal seems to have been a personal attack, by either Stevyns’ fellow vicars or a member of chapter. Interestingly, the king conceded to Stevyns’ petition, and he was readmitted to the college on 4 December 1470, although he was dismissed again on 21 October 1475. Another vicar, Thomas Dixson, also received a second chance. Dismissed on 1 May 1475, with no known prior warning, Dixson was readmitted shortly after on 29 October 1475. The reasons for Dixson’s reappointment are unknown, although his stall remained vacant in his absence and he may have served as the dean’s vicar between 1475 and 1476. He did not remain in his position for long, and was dismissed for a second time on 19 October 1476, having been presented as the vicar of Wraysbury, Bucks., on 12 October 1476. Wraysbury was in the college’s gift, and it is uncertain whether this represented a promotion for Dixson, or an attempt to get rid of him from Windsor. He would not return to the college a third time, but remained as vicar of Wraysbury until his death c.October 1479.

150 TNA, SC1/51/100.
151 Ibid.; SGC, V.B.II., ff. 16, 45.
152 Ibid., ff. 42v, 45.
153 SGC, XV.34.52.
154 SGC, V.B.II., f. 51; George Lipscombe, The History and Antiquities of the County of Buckingham, 4 vols. (London, 1847), iv, p. 610; Fellowes, The Vicars or Minor Canons, p. 64.
155 Lipscombe, The History and Antiquities of the County of Buckingham, iv, p. 610.
The king’s will is evident in one dismissal: that of Thomas Wilkinson on 4 February 1478. No prior warning was given to Wilkinson, and he had been fined only once since his appointment on 1 March 1474, for 2d. in January 1475. Higher powers appear to have been at work, as the record for Wilkinson’s dismissal states that he was *expulsus fuit per Regem*. It is possible that Wilkinson may have had a connection to the duke of Clarence, who was charged with high treason in January 1478, and put to death on 18 February that year, but no such connection has yet been proven. It is, however, clear that bad behaviour was not to be tolerated at St George’s, by either the dean and chapter or the ultimate head, the king. Miscreants were fined and warned, yet bad behaviour continued. Discipline was focused heavily on the priestly vicars, who were subject to the vows of chastity and obedience, and it was rare for the lay clerks to receive attention. Only one clerk, Thomas Koke was dismissed in the eleven year period, and no clerks were warned. Some, however, were fined. As laymen, the clerks could get away with substantially more, it is perhaps no wonder that the vicars felt extra pressure on their positions and the appeal of the priesthood.

**Breaking Through the ‘Glass Ceiling’**

Redevelopment of St George’s Chapel into a grand Yorkist monument brought with it a renewed interest in the college, particularly as it neared completion. It is currently uncertain exactly when the new college was suitable for use. It is likely that the grandiose nature of Edward IV’s chapel would have acted, in itself, as a magnet for talented liturgists who wanted an association with one of the leading colleges and chapels in the kingdom. This attraction was further compounded by a renegotiation of stipends and fees, and further increases in the numbers of choral staff. St Anthony’s Hospital provided the college with a large additional income, up to £260 annually, which was used to subsidise the liturgy of the choir. Furthermore, as will be
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156 SGC, V.B.II., f. 59.  
157 Ibid., ff. 35v, 59.  
discussed in Chapter 4, the poor knights ceased to be a burden on the college’s finances, allowing the dean and chapter to concentrate on the choral staff.

By Christmas 1482, three new vicars had been added to the choir, and two new lay clerks, creating a new balance amongst the choral staff of sixteen vicars, thirteen lay clerks and thirteen choristers.\textsuperscript{160} Two additional clerks received an annual stipend for reading the epistle, and a further deacon was paid to read the gospel.\textsuperscript{161} With a new source of income for the choir came newly negotiated stipends. The vicars now received a pay increase of £2, taking them to £10 annually.\textsuperscript{162} The lay clerks also now received £10 for their stipend, putting them on parity with the vicars. This was an increase of £6 compared to the statutes, although, as discussed above, there had been a practice of annually negotiated stipends for some years. The deacon and two clerks reading the epistle received £6 13s. 4d., and the choristers were to receive £4 each year, only a small increase on the £3 6s. 8d. they had been granted by the statutes.

With new money, new stipends and a grand new chapel, the college could provide a far grander liturgy. One final problem remained, however, left unresolved by this redevelopment: the primacy of the priesthood. New liturgical practices were important in order to create an impressive Divine Service, and yet there was still a vital need for a strong priestly element to the college and chapel. In Chapters 1 and 2, this thesis has demonstrated that the dean and canons were often absentees, leaving a small administrative core resident in Windsor. The college therefore required a committed group of vicars who, as priests, could maintain the daily canonical hours and perform the daily liturgy. Polyphony was a means of adding extra ceremony and performance to services. It was not essential in the running of the chapel; priests were. Only priests could celebrate the masses held in chapel. Renegotiation moved the lay clerks to parity with the college’s vicars financially. If we include the deacon and two clerks reading the epistle, then the group of clerks below the priesthood matched the vicars in number.

\textsuperscript{160} SGC, XV.34.59; Bowers, ‘Music and Musical Establishment’, p. 200.
\textsuperscript{161} SGC, XV.3.11; XV.34.70.
\textsuperscript{162} SGC, XV.34.59; Bowers, ‘Music and Musical Establishment’, pp. 200-1.
This parity presumably created pressure within the college: who was more important, priests or talented singers? Contributing to this problem was a notional ‘glass ceiling’ for the vicars at Windsor. Given the college’s status as a leading liturgical institution, and the building of a grand new chapel, it was inconceivable that a vicar at St George’s would be promoted to a prestigious canonry in the same college. There was, therefore, no direct means of promotion within St George’s for those priests serving as vicars. Such frustrations may have led to extra tensions when challenged by the talented singers and musicians, who were the leading lights of the choir. Unfortunately documents such as the college’s chapter acts, which might have shed some light on the situation, do not survive for this period. It is, however, clear that the college took measures to placate their vicars, in order to preserve the primacy of the priesthood whilst retaining the talents of leading musicians from around the kingdom.

With the college’s new chapel came new accommodation for the vicars and some of the lay clerks. Between 1478 and 1481 a set of twenty-one lodgings was built in Horseshoe Cloister which survives to the present day. As this chapter has discussed, efforts to keep the college’s vicars happy were often centred on offering them new lodgings, most notably in 1415-17, and the provision of a grand new cloister may have been a conciliatory measure, as well as a practical one. The building of the college’s Horseshoe Cloister was overseen by the master and surveyor of the new works, Richard Beauchamp, bishop of Salisbury and future dean of St George’s. Bowers has noted that five vicars, appointed during Beauchamp’s time as master and surveyor, may have moved to Windsor from Salisbury, possibly attracted by the presence of their bishop, and the grand work he was involved in. The marked rise of the lay clerks, in
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164 Richard Beauchamp had been appointed as master and surveyor of the new works at Windsor on 19 February 1473. He was installed as dean of St George’s on 24 March 1477 and held the deanship alongside his bishopric. Davies, ‘Richard Beauchamp’; BRUO, pp. 137-8; Fasti Wyndesorienses, pp. 34-5; CPR, 1476-85, p. 33. See above, p. 57 for the dating of Beauchamp’s appointment as dean.
165 These vicars were: Michael Dullard, installed into the college on 16 April 1474, John Roger, installed on 10 October 1474, Thomas Phillips, installed on 6 April 1477, and two vicars, John Kynred and Hugh Latham, who were both installed c.1483. These associations are based on the coincidence of names at Salisbury and Windsor, which Bowers acknowledges may not be trust-worthy. He also erroneously states that these vicars were appointed between 1475 and 1480, when two were in fact admitted the previous year, and two more three years later: Bowers, ‘Music and Musical Establishment’, p. 201; SGC, 162
number, in salary and in importance, meant that extra steps, above building new lodgings, were now required in order to preserve the primacy of the priesthood. At St George’s this was achieved by the creation of a group of ‘minor canons’, an intermediate position between that of vicar and that of canon.\textsuperscript{166} The establishment of minor canonries provided an aspirational position above that of vicar, allowing senior vicars to break through the ‘glass ceiling’ without the need for promotion to a canonry. This new position preserved the primacy of the priesthood, allowing the most senior of the priest vicars an improved status and higher annual stipend than the lay clerks, who may have been talented musicians, but were not in priestly orders.

Establishment of a new level within the college, specifically the position of minor canon, appears to have been fairly unique in England before the Reformation. Minor canonries existed at only one English institution in the fourteenth century and for much of the fifteenth century: the nearby London cathedral of St Paul’s.\textsuperscript{167} At St Paul’s there had been a tradition of minor canonries from at least the late thirteenth century. These minor canonries were not the same as those adopted at St George’s at the end of the fifteenth century, but clearly provided the inspiration. The minor canons of St Paul’s had formed a corporation within the cathedral from as early as 1394, and had their own statutes drawn up two years later.\textsuperscript{168} There were to be twelve minor canons, co-existing with a choir including approximately thirty vicars-choral at any one time, who were allowed to hold communal property and to appoint members of their ranks to regulate behaviour.

There was, however, one crucial difference between St Paul’s and St George’s. As this chapter has noted, the vicars of Windsor were required to have been ordained to the

\textsuperscript{V.B.II., ff. 36, 39, 54; Fellowes, The Vicars or Minor Canons, pp. 64-8; Salisbury Cathedral Archives, Register Machon, pp. 143-4, 154, 157-8.\textsuperscript{166} This group were often also referred to as ‘petty or petit canons’ in the college’s records: all three terms are interchangeable.\textsuperscript{167} Virginia Davis, ‘The Lesser Clergy in the Later Middle Ages’, in \textit{St Paul’s: The Cathedral Church of London, 604 – 2004}, ed. by Derek Keene, Arthur Burns and Andrew Saint (London, 2004), pp. 157-161. Fellowes has noted that, at Chichester in 1320, the chapter made a payment to ‘four Vicars called petty Canons’, although no later lists of choral staff make mention of minor or petty canons: Fellowes, \textit{The Vicars or Minor Canons}, p. 14, n. 1.\textsuperscript{168} Ibid., pp. 158-9.
priesthood, if not by the time of their installation then shortly after. The choir at St Paul’s had a different set-up. The vicars-choral of St Paul’s were only required to be ordained as deacon or sub-deacon, and they were to be skilled singers first and foremost.\(^{169}\) If we are to draw comparisons between these two distinct communities, they must be between the vicars-choral of London, and the clerks of Windsor (in their original guise as a stepping stone to the priesthood). The choir at St Paul’s institutionalised a similar hierarchy to that envisaged by Edward III at Windsor, where a devoted youth could expect to work his way up through the ranks to the priesthood and higher, more profitable benefices. Through the process of adding minor canonries to their hierarchy, the college of St George clearly sought to re-establish this hierarchy and provide the vicars with more realistic aspirations.

The college’s chapter acts do not survive for the late-fifteenth century and, as such, the driving forces behind the establishment of minor canonries at Windsor are unknown. The first extra stipends appeared in the treasurer’s account for 1489-90, when five vicars received an extra £3 6s. 8d. for the year and a further four received smaller rewards. The five vicars receiving the full stipend were Thomas Raynes, John Hyll, John Annes, James Brykhed and John Kynred, while Thomas Philipps and William Morris were paid 33s. 4d. each, Thomas Wakford was paid 30s. 5d. and William Toft was paid 14s. 1d. for part of the year.\(^{170}\) It is uncertain whether stipends had started to be paid this year or earlier: no treasurer’s rolls survive between 1486 and 1489 and the account for 1485-6 is incomplete.\(^{171}\) The idea of minor canonries was clearly copied from the choir of St Paul’s, yet the instigators of this change remain unknown. The close vicinity of the two institutions may have facilitated the transmission of ideas: most of the college’s members would have been familiar with the nearby capital of London and its cathedral. Ideas, however, required an agency in order to become a reality. Who then provided this? It is worth pausing briefly to consider the ways in

\(^{169}\) Ibid.

\(^{170}\) SGC, XV.34.62. Bowers erroneously states that six vicars rather than five received this stipend and that they were paid in 1489, rather than 1490, when the account was completed at Michaelmas: Bowers, ‘Music and Musical Establishment’, p. 201.

\(^{171}\) SGC, XV.34.61.
which minor canonries became established at Windsor and who was behind these changes.

It is tempting to suggest that the vicars themselves may have pushed for change, in an attempt to solve their frustrations, bringing fresh ideas to St George’s from the capital. However, the payment of increased stipends required, at the very least, the assent and approval of the college’s chapter. At the time of increased stipends, c.1486-90, three of the canons of St George’s were men who had previously held prebends at St Paul’s. Robert Morton, canon of Windsor 1481-6, held the prebend of Chiswick and St Martin, Beverley, at St Paul’s between 1478 and 1487, together with his canonry at Windsor.172 Morton resigned his canonry at Windsor in 1486 to become Bishop of Worcester the subsequent year and, if he was responsible for bringing minor canonries to St George’s, then this must have been one of his last acts as a canon.

Two other plausible candidates can be found in John Baily and Oliver King. Baily was a canon of both Windsor and St Paul’s simultaneously, between 1488 and his death in March 1495.173 King had been appointed to Windsor on 30 October 1480 and held the prebendary of Rugmere in St Paul’s between 1487 and 1493.174 Both these men joined St Paul’s in close succession, and held their posts while remaining at Windsor. It seems likely that one of these men, if not both, encountered the *mores* at St Paul’s in 1487-8 and brought them back to St George’s. Developments could have been further developed through the influence of the king. Oliver King was a close confidant of Henry VII and would later be promoted to the bishoprics of Exeter and then Bath and Wells in 1492 and 1495 for his services. He had already been active in lobbying the king over the matter of the poor knights and, from 1488, King was granted a papal licence to visit the churches he held as archdeacon of both Oxford and Berkshire by deputy, as he was constantly occupied in royal business.175 As a consequence of this close connection, it can be difficult to distinguish King’s agency from that of the king.
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174 *CPR*, 1477-85, p. 228; S. J. Gunn, ‘King, Oliver’; *BRUC*, pp. 343-4; *Fasti Wyndesorienses*, p. 146.
175 Gunn, ‘King, Oliver’. For more on King’s lobbying efforts, see Chapter 4.
The waters are further muddied by internal politics within the chapter of St George’s. At the time of the development of minor canonries, the college’s dean was William Morgan, a Welsh protégé of Henry VII, appointed on 18 October 1485 in place of John Davyson. Morgan also received a prebend at St Paul’s, but not until 1493, after the minor canonries had been established. He cannot therefore be credited with introducing the idea to Windsor. He was, however, somewhat of a reformer and is credited with completely revising the statutes of another collegiate institution of which he held the deanery: St Mary in the Newarke. If not the agent of change, Morgan certainly appears to have been inclined to revise and reform statutes and practices when required, and may have been sympathetic to new ideas, whether from King and Baily, or from the vicars themselves.

Changes within the college, however, could come about by not only the import of new ideas, but also by the removal of conservatism and control. The death of one of the canons, Thomas Passhe, in 1489 may have been one such tipping point in the creation of minor canonries. Passhe had been appointed to the college on 11 December 1449 and had served the college faithfully for forty years when he died. As discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, he was one of a core group of obedientiaries who dedicated themselves almost entirely to St George’s against a backdrop of absenteeism amongst the chapter. Even amongst this small group of canons, Passhe was one of the more committed, serving as treasurer or steward regularly throughout his forty-year tenure, and even acting as interim dean when the incumbent of the deanery was absent for extended periods of time. Perhaps most importantly, Passhe had been one of those charged with balancing the college’s books in times of severe financial hardship, experimenting with different ways of accounting to try and relieve this pressure.

It is possible that Passhe, as a senior canon in terms of residency but not in rank, did not believe in promoting the vicars closer to his status. Perhaps he had resisted attempts to give them the extra stipend that would become the mark of a minor

176 CPR, 1485-94, p. 79; Fasti Wyndesorienses, p. 36. See also Chapter 2.
177 Fasti Wyndesorienses, p. 36.
178 CPR, 1446-52, p. 302; Fasti Wyndesorienses, p. 137.
179 See Chapters 1 and 2.
canonry for fear that the college would once again fall into financial straits. It is interesting that the first extant treasurer’s roll after Passhe’s death, that for in 1489-90, was the first to include stipends for what would become minor canonries.\footnote{SGC, XV.34.62.} This was also the first roll for which the college resumed full payments to the poor knights from their own finances, not those of the Crown. Unfortunately no treasurer’s rolls survive between 1486 and 1489, and so this hypothesis cannot be proven, yet the death of a long-standing and dominant member of the residentiary community cannot have failed to have provided a breath of fresh air for the chapter and allowed for new ideas to flourish.

As we saw earlier, increased stipends appeared in the treasurer’s roll in 1489-90, with five vicars on a full stipend and four further vicars on smaller amounts.\footnote{Ibid.} These stipends continued in subsequent years. The treasurer’s account for 1490-1 paid five vicars the full £3 6s. 8d., and a smaller stipend to one other.\footnote{SGC, XV.34.63. Thomas Raynes, John Annes, William Morris, James Brykhed, and John Kynred were paid a full stipend, while William Toft was paid the smaller amount.} A further vicar, John Hill, was paid a stipend of 18s. 8d. as the cellarer this year, the only time when such an obedientiary position was named in the college’s accounts.\footnote{SGC, XV.34.63.} The following year, 1491-2, saw a rise in those receiving an extra stipend. Six vicars received the full amount, while a seventh received a payment of 6s. 8d. for part of the year.\footnote{SGC, XV.34.65. Thomas Raynes, William Toft, John Annes, William Morris, James Brykhed and John Kynred were paid for the full year, while John Michelson was paid a partial stipend.} Numbers remained the same in 1492-3, with six vicars receiving the full stipend and a further vicar receiving 50s. from 1 January 1492. By 1493-4 the number of full payments had risen to seven vicars, while an eighth was paid 52s. 8d. from 10 December 1493.\footnote{SGC, XV.34.64. Thomas Raynes, William Toft, John Annes, William Morris, James Brykhed, John Kynred and John Michelson were paid a full stipend, while Richard Crow was paid for part of the year. Crow was also paid for bringing vicars into the college at the same time.} Here it remained, with seven vicars receiving a full stipend of £3 6s. 8d., and an eighth
These extra annual payments were clearly an early marker of a minor canonry before the position had been formalised within the college. Indeed, the same names appear in the extra stipends year on year, suggesting that the vicars had developed a senior core similar to the core of residents among the canons. This was the group that would become known as the minor or petty canons. By 1511 at the latest their stipends were known officially as minor canonries. An agreement of 31 May 1511 stated that both the petty canons and vicars were to be paid for the celebration of one of the canons’ anniversary. Minor canonries had become a clear sign of status, by this point differentiating senior vicars from the rest. Further acknowledgement of the minor canons as a group in their own right came in subsequent years. The 1516 will of William Jugeler, who described himself as ‘Parson of Swaynston’ in Kent and ‘vicare of Wynsor’, bequeathed a ‘standing maser wit a floure theron’ to his ‘bretheren the petycanons’. A 1519 grant of land from Canon Robert Honiwood to sustain his obit was designated for the use of the minor canons, vicars and their successors. Full status of the new positions were formalised by 1522, when the college was granted a revised set of foundation statutes by Henry VIII, including eight minor canons and eight vicars, at any one time. These minor canons comprised the senior element of the vicars and provided an incentive to pursuing a long career as a priest and a vicar.

---

186 SGC, XV.34.70-1. In 1496-7, Thomas Raynes, William Toft, John Annes, John Michelson, John Kynred, William Morris and Thomas Newton were paid a full stipend, while the eighth vicar, Richard Crow, was paid a partial stipend of 48s. 10½d.: SGC, XV.34.70. The financial year 1498-9 was one exception, as four vicars, Thomas Raynes, John Kynred, William Morris and Thomas Newton received full stipends, while six received partial amounts. William Toft and John Annes were paid between 1 October and 13 April; John Michelson was paid between 1 October and 21 March; Richard Crow was paid between 1 October and 2 May; John Hyll was paid between 28 May and 1 July; and Thomas Boteller was paid between 1 June and 1 July. Clearly problems occurred this year which required the vicars to share the load, although the reasons behind this are unclear: SGC, XV.34.71.

187 SGC, XI.B.27; XI.B.28.


189 Elias Ashmole, The Institution, Laws and Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter (London, 1672), Appendix, p. [27]. Ashmole appears to have mistranscribed ‘viii Peticanons and xiii Vicars’ instead...
By the beginning of the sixteenth century, the choir and choral structure of St George’s were wholly different from that envisaged by Edward III at the college’s foundation. Times had changed, and so that St George’s might retain its status as one of the leading religious institutions in the kingdom, the whole college had to adapt to changing fashions and new ideas. The rise of polyphony was both a blessing and a curse. The development of a sophisticated liturgy enhanced the already impressive proceedings within the chapel, and yet required a significant change and restructuring of the choir in order to maintain balance. No longer was there a distinct hierarchy and career progression within the institution, where young choristers could become clerks and ultimately strive for the priesthood, first as a vicar and possibly later as a canon. Instead there was a need to tempt the most talented musicians into St George’s, whilst maintaining the pre-eminence of the priesthood. The creation of minor canonries re-established a new sense of hierarchy within the choir and preserved the status of priesthood, while allowing room for musical excellence, leading to grander and more elaborate services than ever before.

---

Chapter 4 - The Poor Knights of Windsor: Grand Designs and Modest Means

My helmet now shall make a hive for Bees,
And lover’s songs shall turne to holy Psalms;
A man at Armes must now sit on his knees
And feed on pray’rs that are old ages alms.
And so from Court to Cottage I depart,
My Saint is sure of mine unspotted hart.

And when I sadly sit in homely cell
Ile teach my Swaines this Carrol for a song:
Blest be the hearts that wish my Sovereigne well,
Curs’d be the soules that thinke to doe her wrong.
Goddesse, vouchsafe this aged man his right
To be your Beadsman now, that was your knight.¹

So concludes the sixteenth-century lament, *His Golden Locks Time Hath To Silver Turned*, George Peele’s epilogue to his *Polyhymnia*.² This poem describes the retirement in 1590 of one of Elizabeth I’s champion knights, Henry Lee, a Knight of the Garter. While Lee never became a poor knight of Windsor after his retirement, Peele’s work could very well depict the difficulties encountered by the poor knights, soldiers finding their way in the world at the end of their lives. One of the most unique features of Edward III’s foundation at Windsor was this group of almsmen, knights brought low by the tides of war, maintained in their old age. They were also the most persistent source of discord within the community of the college. Much was expected of the poor

knights of St George’s. The king intended the knights to be individuals with extensive military experience, for whom he could provide patronage after their service. For these men to abandon their code of chivalry for a life of prayer and reflection was a considerable expectation, even in old age. Further, the knights were forced to adjust to an unwelcome situation at St George’s,

In many ways, St George’s was a unique institution, in which Edward III had tried something new with these almsmen. The college’s foundation statutes contained within them an unresolved question. What was the role of the poor knights? Was the college meant as a charitable establishment, to maintain the poor knights, or were they merely an add-on to the main liturgical functions of a secular college of canons? The poor knights, under the college’s foundation statutes, were an integral part of the college and yet, as they were subject to the jurisdiction of the dean and canons, they had very little influence over daily proceedings at Windsor. The poor knights fulfilled one of the college’s main functions - the patronage of royal servants - but, as lay men, they were an awkward part of the community at St George’s, begging the question of whether they were truly part of the wider collegiate community. This conundrum continued to trouble relations within the college, until efforts were made later to resolve the contradiction in the early Tudor period. Edward III had a grand plan in place when he founded St George’s, but his intentions for the poor knights were never made plain. Rather, the poor knights remained atrophied for much of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, culminating in 1483, when the dean and chapter were absolved by parliament from having to support the knights. Further questions thus present themselves. Were the poor knights of Windsor doomed from the start or was their insufficiency the consequence of other factors? Were the grand designs of Edward III realistic, or were they limited by inadequate means?

The poor knights have been generally neglected in the historiography of St George’s college and chapel. This in itself is odd, given their importance within the college’s initial foundation statutes and repays investigation. Edmund Fellowes has published the most comprehensive work on the subject of the poor knights to date, and provides
both a brief history and a list of appointed knights. Fellowes’ work was updated by Peter Begent and Major Richard Moore (himself a modern-day successor to the poor knights), who added further biographical details for many modern knights but contributed little to a discussion of their medieval forbears. The work of both Fellowes and Begent and Moore requires significant expansion. This is provided here in the form of a new biographical register of appointments and residence of poor knights for the fourteenth, fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries. Fellowes’ work, understandably, given the wealth of later material, concentrates on the history of the knights from the mid-sixteenth century onwards and contains only brief discussion and entries for the fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries. Roberts’ work on the fourteenth-century college, save for a handful of references, contains no discussion of the knights as members of the college. The only other article of note regarding the poor knights, concerns their relationship with parliament in the late-fifteenth century, providing a useful, but narrow, case study. A full investigation of the poor knights, as contained here, fills this substantial gap in the literature and provides an updated list of knights for the fourteenth and early-fifteenth centuries.

The evidence for the medieval poor knights is scattered. The college’s foundation statutes provide a starting point. As will become clear, these statutes were fundamentally flawed, and were the cause of tensions throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The statutes set out the day-to-day activities expected of a poor knight, such as when to attend chapel, and how much each was to be paid for their services. However, they depict an ideal, rather than the reality. Episcopal visitations in 1378 and 1432 and the subsequent injunctions produced by these visits provide a more realistic picture. These documents are analysed here to assess the level of tensions between the poor knights and the rest of the college in the late-fourteenth and early-fifteenth centuries and to demonstrate the failings of the statutes.

3 Fellowes, Military Knights.
4 The Book of the Poor Knights of Windsor.
5 See Appendix 13.
6 Roberts, St George’s Chapel, 1348-1416.
7 Kleineke, ‘Lobbying and Access’.
With much of the documentary material for the college, there is a general reliance on the extant obedientiary material. This evidence is best for the late-fifteenth century, and as such it is on this period that this study will focus. The best material, once again, is found in the college’s attendance register from June 1468 to July 1479, and is collated with treasurer’s and steward’s rolls, and royal letters patent from the surrounding years.\(^8\) The poor knights had careers prior to their appointment at Windsor, often in royal service; this yields extra evidence. Analysis will concentrate on the appointments of poor knights: when and why kings sought to make such presentments, and whether they were realistic, given the limited space and funds available at St George’s.

Finally, the study will assess the parliamentary debates of 1483 and 1485, to analyse how and why the poor knights declined at the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth centuries. This evidence includes entries in the parliament rolls, but also documents from the college’s own archives, in both the steward’s rolls and a series of petitions, complaints and replies relating to a protracted dispute between the poor knights and the college’s chapter, which are vital in providing details of tensions and problems within the college at the end of the fifteenth century. This will show that the poor knights, having survived through numerous compromises for the best part of two centuries, had been limited by the provisions of the college’s statutes, and required significant re-endowment to remain viable. While Edward III had grand designs, the poor knights of the fourteenth to the early-sixteenth centuries were far more modest in their means, and a source of constant tensions due to the unresolved question of their role in the college.

The poor knights of Windsor, appointed between the college’s foundation and c.1519 are tabulated below. Biographical details for each of these individuals is found in Appendix 13. Residency dates are recorded when known.

\(^8\) SGC, V.B.II.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Appointed</th>
<th>Known Residency Dates</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Michaelmas 1367 - 7 July 1368</td>
<td>Robert Beverley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Richard Stanley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Annunciation 1376 - Michaelmas 1378</td>
<td>Thomas Tawney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Annunciation 1376 - Michaelmas 1378</td>
<td>John Breton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 August 1377</td>
<td>6 January 1378 - 9 June 1385</td>
<td>John Brancester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 June 1379</td>
<td>1 October 1384 - Michaelmas 1396</td>
<td>Robert Bitterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 1384/11 June 1385</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Henry Sturmy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Sept 1398</td>
<td>January 1399 - 19 July 1408</td>
<td>Nicholas Say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 April 1402</td>
<td>Michaelmas 1402 - Michaelmas 1408</td>
<td>George Muschet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Dec 1402</td>
<td>Michaelmas 1404 - Michaelmas 1408</td>
<td>John Grimsby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Nov 1411</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ralph Whithors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 May 1413</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Adam Koker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Feb 1415</td>
<td>Michaelmas 1415 - Michaelmas 1420</td>
<td>William Lisle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 July 1423</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Walter Clyston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 June 1428</td>
<td>Michaelmas 1428 - Michaelmas 1442</td>
<td>John Kiderow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 May 1430</td>
<td>c. Michaelmas 1433 - c. June 1438</td>
<td>John Trebell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>c.3 September 1437 - Michaelmas 1442</td>
<td>John Salisbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Term Duration</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 July 1438</td>
<td>c. October 1438 - Michaelmas 1439</td>
<td>Richard Lowyk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 May 1441</td>
<td>Michaelmas 1441 - c.20 October 1462</td>
<td>Sigismund Ottelinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 May 1443</td>
<td>Michaelmas 1447 - c. February 1462</td>
<td>William Crafford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Aug 1451</td>
<td>Michaelmas 1454 - Michaelmas 1455</td>
<td>Robert James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 July 1461</td>
<td>c. February - Michaelmas 1462</td>
<td>Walter Cottisford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 June 1465</td>
<td>1 June 1468 - 17 March 1477</td>
<td>William Danyell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Nov 1465</td>
<td>1 June 1468 - Michaelmas 1480</td>
<td>John Pesemerche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Oct 1467</td>
<td>1 June 1468 - 8 September 1468</td>
<td>Thomas Grey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Dec 1467</td>
<td>20 March 1477 - Michaelmas 1480</td>
<td>James Friis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Dec 1468</td>
<td>1 January 1469 - Michaelmas 1480</td>
<td>Hugh Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 May 1480</td>
<td>May - September 1480</td>
<td>William Saunderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>John Sigemond(I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Aug 1481</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Christopher Furneys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Nov 1481</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Walter Harneys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Jan 1482</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>David Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Mar 1482</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Thomas Grenefeld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Mar 1482</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Laurence Fairclothe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Mar 1482</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Laurence Leventhorp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Mar 1482</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>John Kendale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Mar 1482</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Holme al. Clarenceux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 June 1482</td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Assheton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 July 1482</td>
<td>11 March - Michaelmas 1486</td>
<td>Thomas Crabbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Feb 1484</td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Sewall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown (c. 1484)</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Ballard al. Marche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Jan 1485</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Gibbes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Feb 1485</td>
<td>Michaelmas 1489 - 1 January 1493</td>
<td>John Charleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 October 1485</td>
<td>11 March 1486 - 10 September 1491</td>
<td>William Stoughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Nov 1485</td>
<td>18 March 1486 - Michaelmas 1499</td>
<td>Roger Tong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Dec 1485</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Champlayn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 June 1486</td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Tame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Aug 1488 and 14 Sept 1491</td>
<td>c. 24 September 1491 - Michaelmas 1499</td>
<td>Lewis Caerleon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Jan 1493</td>
<td>3 February 1493 - Michaelmas 1504</td>
<td>Peter de Narbonne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 October 1493</td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Spencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Nov 1493</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles de Bresy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Jan 1503</td>
<td>January 1503 - Michaelmas 1504</td>
<td>John Meautis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 June 1510</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Sigemond (II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 May 1514</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bartholomew Westby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Sept 1514</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Fayrfax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1514/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Harrison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fourteenth-Century Foundations and Aspirations

The poor knights of Windsor were a fundamental part of the college of St George from its foundation. The knights were originally intended to number twenty-four, corresponding with the numbers of priests in the college. In the final statutes their numbers increased to twenty-six, mirroring both the number of priests (both canons and vicars), and the members of the Order of the Garter.\(^9\) It has often been assumed that the poor knights were intended to stand in for the knights of the Garter in their absence, and yet neither the college’s statutes, nor those of the Garter state this explicitly.\(^10\) The repetition of this assumption in the literature, is odd given that neither set of statutes makes this connection, while giving specific details for everything else.

The knights were expected to attend chapel three times daily, at ‘the chief Mass of the day, and also at that of the Blessed Virgin Mary, as well as at Evensong and Compline’.\(^11\) They were to stay for the duration of each celebration and were to say ‘one hundred and fifty salutations of the glorious Virgin and Mother’, with the Lord’s Prayer recited after each ten salutations.\(^12\) For their attendance, the knights were to receive a cotidian payment of 12\(d\), supplementing an annual stipend of 40\(s\), mirroring the income of the college’s canons. Further, if a poor knight was absent from chapel, his forfeited cotidians were to be split between those knights who had attended; it was not to go to the canons. The practice of splitting forfeited cotidians would cause problems enough, but greater difficulties emanated from a more intrinsic paradox. St George’s College was a religious institution belonging to the King and yet was managed by the dean and canons. From the very beginning, the poor knights suffered badly from unrealistic ambitions. Had Edward III’s expectations of twenty-six poor knights been fully realised, the annual cost to the college would have amounted to £526 10\(s\).

---

\(^9\) CPR, 1348-1350, p. 144; Statutes and Injunctions, p. 4.
\(^11\) Statutes and Injunctions, p. 6. These services were described in the college’s statutes as ‘the three psalteries of the Blessed Virgin’.
\(^12\) Ibid.
for the knights’ attendance alone. This would have swallowed up more than half of Edward’s intended endowment income of £1000. And in point of fact, the college never realised this sum.\(^{13}\) By comparison, the dean and canons would have received a mere £303 18s. 4d. between them, assuming full attendance from all parties. The balance of payments therefore favoured the poor knights over the dean and canons: they were to receive the lion’s share of the college’s annual income. These disparities are central to the key riddle: what were Edward’s intentions for the college? Was St George’s to be a liturgical and spiritual powerhouse, or a glorified almshouse for knights of the realm brought low by poverty? Were Edward’s aims, as specified in the college’s statutes, a statement of bold ambition or merely an over-enthusiastic attempt to provide for those who had served as his brothers in arms throughout his wars in France?

The knights of the Garter had the initial right of presentment: one per knight. Each of the founder knights of the Garter could appoint one poor knight each, after which appointments reverted to the King. Fortunately for the college, given that they didn’t receive the full foundation endowment promised to them, few poor knights seem to have been appointed, or have taken up their positions within the college. Whether this was at the college’s request, or simply because the knights of the Garter were largely uninterested in the poor knights is uncertain. Indeed, throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, there were never more than three poor knights installed within the college at any one time. Nevertheless, while there may have been only a handful of knights within the college, this did not stop successive kings from granting these positions to their retainers and loyal knights. The dean and canons, on behalf on the college, had a vested interest in limiting the number of knights they were required to support, in order to sustain themselves financially. There was a clear need for a compromise with regards to how many knights actually took up their positions. A full complement of poor knights would have bankrupted the college and, as will become

---

\(^{13}\) The college’s total income in the financial year 1362-3, for example, was £536 13s. 10d.: SGC, XV.34.2; Roberts, *St George’s Chapel, 1348-1416*, p. 243.
clear, negotiations took place to ensure that no more than three were resident at any one time.

Frictions between the chapter of St George’s and the poor knights were a common theme throughout the fourteenth century. Perhaps the canons resented the idea that a poor knight could earn the same annual attendance fee as them. The knights were required to be present more often than the dean and canons in chapel, but had no liturgical commitments other than praying. The dean and canons may also have begrudged the fact that a poor knight’s potential annual income meant that he was, in fact, not poor. The college’s statutes included a clause that should a poor knight ‘afterwards accrue or fall unto them by succession or in any other manner whatsoever, to the yearly value of twenty pounds or more’, he was to be put out of the college, receive none of his money, and the King was to find a replacement. A poor knight could potentially accumulate over £20 5s. annually, so this clause must refer to external land holdings, as it never seems to have been enacted by the college regarding internal earnings. There may have been, however, a basic uneasiness between the poor knights and the college chapter over earnings: a knight could earn the same as a canon with less work and fewer commitments.

Further tensions came with problems of discipline. If we turn to look at the 1378 injunctions we can see that difficulties had arisen. The knights themselves, understandably after years on campaign, were no angels. Two in particular, Sir Thomas Tawney and Sir John Breton, were, during this visitation, described as ‘old Knights of the same Chappell married’, keeping ‘their adulterate Dalilahs, to the great scandal of the Colledge’. Sir John Breton was, furthermore, ‘too much given to his insolencies, comes late and too delicately to his Canonickal hours in the said Chappell; and when he kneels to pray in the same, he presently falls asleep, soe that he scarcely awakes till the Sacrament of the Altar’. As has been previously noted, the canons and vicars of St

---

14 Statutes and Injunctions, pp. 6-7.
15 Ibid., p. 21.
16 Ibid.
George’s in the fourteenth century did not fare much better in the 1378 injunctions.17 These knights, however, were clearly not fulfilling their pious obligations.

The same visitation brought into the open the earliest instance of many disagreements between the poor knights and the dean and canons. As has been noted, any forfeited cotidian payments resulting from a poor knight’s absence were to be split between those poor knights present. This reserve for the poor knights was to form a separate resource from the college’s central fund, although it was administered by the dean and canons. This was not the case at St George’s in 1378. The injunctions claim that the dean, William Mugge, instead ‘puts in his owne purse the mulcts [forfeited cotidians] that are set upon the said Knights for their not being present at Canonickal hours in the said Chappell, and at his pleasure disposeth of them’.18 Substantial sums could be in question, some £5 12s. 4d. for 1378 alone.19 Furthermore, Mugge had taken control of all gifts and possessions given to the college, ‘and doth nothing therewith to the Sustenance of the said Knights’.20 Mugge, as the dean, controlled the entire endowment income, but withheld this extra money from the knights in direct contravention of the foundation statutes. Bishop Houghton, who had undertaken the visitation, ordained that both these matters should be rectified: the dean was to provide the knights with the forfeited cotidians of their peers, and all gifts were to be split equally between the dean and canons and the poor knights.

In this visitation, the poor knights had personally attended the chapter meeting over which Houghton presided. Indeed, the injunctions specifically mention ‘certaine old Knights much broken in the Warrs’ who were ‘personally present in the said Chappell after a Collegiate fashion decently habited’.21 Clearly they objected to the loss of their money to the dean and canons and pressed their case during Houghton’s visitation. However, they opened themselves up to criticism from the college chapter in doing so.

---

17 See Chapter 1.
18 Statutes and Injunctions, p. 21.
19 Roberts, St George’s Chapel, 1348-1416, p. 58; SGC, XV.34.14.
20 Statutes and Injunctions, p. 21.
21 Ibid.
as the complaints about Tawney’s and Breton’s behaviour follows immediately after in the injunctions.

The presence of the knights, and Houghton’s subsequent injunctions seem to have solved the problem of forfeited cotidians, at least in the short term. Mugge agreed to pay the forfeited cotidians owed to the poor knights in the future, although he never made any attempt to pay the arrears.22 The canons also seem to have taken other, more minor, liberties, which have made less of an impact on the historical record. For instance, the canons appropriated a garden on Peascod Street in Windsor. The garden had been part of a royal grant in 1365, which also contained a house and piece of land on the same street, in recompense for giving up the royal garden.23 The king intended this garden to be for the use of the whole college, yet the canons appropriated all of its income. In all likelihood, the knights were distracted by the ongoing financial disputes between themselves and the rest of the college. However, the dean and canons once again assumed control of a source of income, depriving the poor knights from the extra funds the garden would have provided.

While financial disputes continued, the dean and canons were not entirely heartless. After the death of the poor knight John Grimsby by 13 May 1413, his widow Lady Grimsby was named in the precentor’s accounts on multiple occasions between 1415 and 1417, working as a seamstress for the college.24 In the account for 1415-6 she mended ‘one fringe of Pearls and two other fringes for the outer alter’, receiving 12d.; mended ‘albs, amices and apparels for the choir’, receiving 6d.; made ‘nine albs with amices’ for 4s.; made ‘one new alb, three amices and one counter-frontal’ for 12d.; mended ‘the best red cope’ for 10d.; mended ‘the principal white vestment...[and] one alb with an amice’, for 2s. (although this payment was disallowed at audit) and made ‘albs and amices of the boys and for veils for chalices’, receiving 12d.25 In the account for the next year Lady Grimsby made ‘frontals, counter-frontals and frontals with red

22 Roberts, St George’s Chapel, 1348-1416, p. 58.
23 CPR, 1365-67, p. 101; Roberts, St George’s Chapel, 1348-1416, p. 42.
24 John Grimsby was replaced at the college by letters patent of 13 May 1413, when he was described as deceased: CPR, 1413-16, p. 21.
25 SGC, XV.56.22; Bond, Inventories, pp. 7, 128-35.
crosses of buckram placed on them’ and sewed ‘apparels on albs and amices’, receiving 12d. and 6d. respectively.26

After her husband had died, Lady Grimsby was able to sell her services to the college in order to support herself, which was accepted. It is also possible that she may have kept the living quarters of her deceased husband. Grimsby’s replacement at St George’s, Adam Koker, was appointed on 13 May 1413, but appears to have never taken up residence within the college.27 Koker must have died by 14 February 1415, when he, in turn, was replaced by William Lisle.28 Lisle was named as the sole poor knight at St George’s in 1415-16, 1417-18 and 1419-20, and so there would have been spare houses in the Lower Ward. This may have been where Lady Grimsby resided between 1413 and 1417, after which she no longer features in the college’s accounts.29 John Grimsby had held three cottages on nearby Peascod Street from 1412 alongside his Windsor lodging, but after his death these properties quickly passed from Lady Grimsby to her son, John Grimsby, in October 1414, before he in turn granted them to one Simon Say in the same month.30 While it may seem like an unprecedented act of charity from the college, allowing the widow of a former poor knight to remain, there was also a degree of financial sense involved. Allowing Lady Grimsby to remain could potentially block the instalment of a poor knight to that house, and required no financial outlay. No stipend was forthcoming from the dean and chapter and she was required to ‘sew for her supper’, providing a useful service to the college for a wage. Once again, the dean and canons kept a close eye on the college’s accounts.

Disagreements, particularly concerning those forfeited cotidian payments and the common fund of the college, continued under Henry VI. Archbishop Kemp’s injunctions of 1432 finally stated that the dean and canons should stop extending their control over the college’s finances. The poor knights were to be paid their cotidians without prejudice, and were also to receive forfeited payments when a vicar’s stall was left

26 SGC, XV.56.23.
27 CPR, 1413-6, p. 21; SGC, XV.34.28.
29 Ibid.; SGC, XV.34.28; XV.34.29; XV.34.30; XV.34.31.
30 SGC, XV.45.44-6; XV.45.53-4.
The knights and vicars, however, were not to share in any surplus gained from further grants received by the college, and had to be content with the quota allocated by statute: their annual stipend, cotidian payments and shared forfeited cotidians as described above. The canons were also banned from using the common fund of the college to pay for the annual delivery of herrings from Yarmouth granted to them in 1352 as ‘if the contrary were allowed or done, it would tend or might tend to the prejudice both of the Knights there resident and of the augmentation of the common treasury’. In this case, the canons had clearly been using money from the common fund to meet the expenditure incurred in bringing their fish to Windsor, rather than paying the poor knights the money allocated to them by statute.

Kemp’s original visitation from 1432 does not survive, and so it is impossible to tell exactly what complaints his injunctions were based on. A document in the college’s archives, which bears the heading ‘Answers against the second replications of the poor knights within Windsor castle of Windsor by the dean and canons of the castle there’, written shortly after the 1432 injunctions, confirms that ‘old dissensions and debates’ were still causing friction. According to the dean and canons, ‘the said knights allege great hurt and charges’ and had taken a personal dislike to one canon in particular.
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34 This revenue source for the college consisted of a last of red herrings. A last of herrings appears to have varied between 10,000 and 13,200 fish. The fish were generally sold in London, and in 1385, it was recorded that the canons received £5 13s. 4d. for their sale. In 1393 the money from the sale was deemed to pertain to residents only. Expenses in bringing the herrings to Windsor could come in many forms. In 1362 the shipment was attacked by robbers, for which the college paid the messenger 3s. 4d. in compensation, and in 1382 much of the cargo was lost at sea in transit: SGC, XV.34.2; XV.53.64; Roberts, St George’s Chapel, 1348-1416, p. 40.
35 SGC, XI.B.4. The document can be dated from internal evidence to have been written c.1444-52. It must have been written after 16 Henry VI (1437-38), which year is mentioned within. John Kemp, who the document names as Archbishop and Cardinal was Archbishop of York, 1425-52, and cardinal from 1439, so this must date from between 1439-1452. John Deepdene, also named, was a canon 1430-60. If the dean who was there at the beginning of the troubles was still there, it must be have been Dean Arundell, Dean 1419-54. If none of the canons who were there at the time were there any more, all canons who were there at the time of Arundell’s arrival must have left or died: the last survivor of these was John Coryngham, who went in 1444. The document must therefore be c.1444-52: Fasti Wyndesorienses, pp. 29-30, 72-3, 99; R. G. Davies, ‘Kemp, John (1380/81–1454)’, ODNB.
‘that ye lust to saie so evill of Sir John Depden’. It is uncertain what Deepdene had done to incur the poor knights’ wrath. He had become registrar of the Order of the Garter in 1445 but, given the ongoing debate over payments, it is probable that the knights’ grievances date to his time as treasurer of the college, rather than any link with the Garter. Deepdene had served in administrative positions within the chapter on multiple occasions, serving as treasurer in 1430-1, 1434-5, 1438-9, 1439-40, and as an auditor in 1449-50. In the financial year 1434-5, Deepdene, as treasurer, had attempted to claim for repairs to his kitchen and chimney, worth £19, a payment which was suspended for the chapter to discuss, crossed out from the account, and disallowed.

It is possible that the poor knights’ quarrel with Deepdene may have been linked to the outlawry of one of them, John Kiderow, who was denied cotidian payments in the financial years 1429-30 and 1430-1 on account that he was an outlaw, although he had returned to full payments by 1434-5, albeit with no arrears. It is tempting to suppose that tensions over the poor knights’ cotidiens payments had flared into violence, causing Kiderow to be outlawed, but this concern certainly caused significant tensions amongst the college.

Once again, money was at the root of the problem. Forfeited cotidiens were still a matter of contention, leading the dean and canons to state that there simply was not enough income coming in to the college, claiming that:

‘Igitur res non sequitur yimaginacionem in so much as the said canons may not at any time at Michaelmas be content of their cotidiens’.

Rather than solving problems between the chapter and the poor knights, Kemp’s injunctions were ignored for the most part. The canons’ letter states that they

36 SGC, XI.B.4.
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38 SGC, XV.34.37-40, 44.
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40 SGC, XV.34.37-8.
41 SGC, XI.B.4.
accepted the majority of the injunctions and swore on them in the presence of John Norys, esquire for the king’s body. However, ‘as touching that injunction [the payment of the knights’ cotidians] which the knights desire to be kept the dean and canons agreed never thereto nor never held up their hands to that intent’. The dean and canons were not willing to compromise and this generated ill-feeling throughout the fifteenth century. Edward III’s grand ambitions could not be realised in the face of the contradictions inherent in the foundation. Neither he, nor his successors, had ever provided sufficient endowment, and the college’s statutes were therefore untenable. These matters only came to a head in the late-fifteenth century, after a century of concessions and negotiation.

The Fifteenth Century: Reality

In the years c.1367 - c.1519, fifty-six poor knights are known to have been appointed by the king. More difficult, however, is an assessment of how many knights actually took residence at Windsor, and drew annual pensions and cotidians. Clearly, only some of the knights appointed took up residence. The college never had more than three poor knights resident at any one time, prior to the sixteenth century. As noted, it is uncertain whether these numbers were initially limited artificially by the dean and canons as a means of easing pressure on already limited funds, or whether it was a consequence of limited interest amongst the Knights of the Garter. By the fifteenth century, however, the usual complement of three knights was firmly established. Indeed, when questioned on the matter, the dean and canons argued that there had never been more than three knights, disregarding the numbers stipulated in the college’s statutes.

Restrictions may have been based on limited housing, but it is important to remember that residency as a poor knight was on a principle of ‘dead man’s shoes’: positions became available only with the death of the incumbent. As the register of poor knights demonstrates, this did not stop successive kings from appointing poor knights as they

42 SGC, XI.B.4.
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saw fit. It is also clear that appointments could often vary in number from king to king, and also at different points in a king’s reign. Statistical analysis of the mid to late fifteenth-century appointments underlines this point.

Table 6: Number of Appointments of Poor Knights: 1461-1495

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number of Poor Knights Appointed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1461-5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1466-70</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1471-5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1476-80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1481-5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1486-90</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1491-5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appointments of poor knights through the mid to late-fifteenth century were generally consistent, a handful a year at most, with one notable exception: 1481-5. This flurry of appointments can be isolated further. In this five year period, there were two appointments in 1481, nine in 1482, none in 1483, two in 1484 and five in 1485. Of the nine appointments of 1482, six of these took place in the space of one month, March, with one in each of January, June and July. This unprecedented spate of appointments and interest in the poor knights deserves further study in order to understand the King’s intentions. Were the knights simply being given a glorified title, with little substance behind it? Or does this series of appointments hint at a new intention by Edward IV to consolidate the poor knights within St George’s and strive toward Edward III’s lofty ambitions for them?

The college’s records for the early years of the 1480s are unfortunately incomplete, making it difficult to trace which of the nine knights appointed actually took up a position within St George’s. Treasurer’s rolls survive for 1480-1 and partially for 1485-
6, which give the names of the poor knights present in the college.\footnote{Treasurers’ rolls also partially survive for the years 1482-3 and 1483-4 although neither mentions the poor knights, implying that they received no payment from the college in these years: SGC, XV.34.59-60.} However, there is no continuity of names across the gap, meaning that it is very difficult to establish who was present in the interim. Only one of the nine knights can be positively identified as taking up his position in the college: Thomas Crabbe, the marshal of Prince Edward’s household.\footnote{CPR, 1476-85, p. 308.} Crabbe was appointed as a poor knight in letters patent of 11 July 1482, and was listed as being present in the incomplete account for 1485-6. Crabbe drew a stipend of 2s. 2½d. and cotidian payments totalling £10 3s., between March and Michaelmas 1486.\footnote{Ibid; SGC, XV.34.61.} By September 1489, however, Crabbe had clearly died and was replaced at Windsor by one John Charleton.\footnote{SGC, XV.34.62.}

Of the other eight poor knights appointed in 1482, only one other can tentatively be associated with a residency period at St George’s: Thomas Holme, Clarenceux King of arms. Holme’s appointment as a poor knight, by letters patent of 29 March 1482, was somewhat peculiar as it gives some extra information about the house and residency in question. This is a rare example of a poor knight’s appointment when the process of housing being passed from knight to knight was described explicitly. Holme was to receive his appointment ‘with all rights and profits as David Thomas has’, while also taking ‘a mansion and garden within the castle in which John Sigemond, late one of the poor knights, dwelt’.\footnote{CPR, 1476-85, p. 297.} It is possible that David Thomas, an esquire of the household appointed as a poor knight on 25 January 1482, had taken up residency by the time of Holme’s appointment in March, but this seems unlikely.\footnote{Ibid., p. 270.} Poor knights appointed to St George’s could endure a long wait before they could take up residence. Thus, James Friis was appointed by letters patent of 10 December 1467, but not installed in the college until 20 March 1477, almost a decade later.\footnote{Ibid., 1467-77, p. 50; SGC, V.B.II., f. 53v; XV.34.57.} It seems unlikely that Thomas
could have been installed in a house at Windsor in less than two months, and then die almost immediately.

John Sigemond, indeed, may never have existed. No record of his appointment remains in the patent rolls, he was not named in the treasurer’s roll for 1479-80, and cannot have been resident prior to Michaelmas 1480.\textsuperscript{52} He was then described as ‘now late’ in the aforementioned letters patent of 29 March 1482, and so if he had taken residency in this period, he must have died shortly after.\textsuperscript{53} It may instead have been the case that Thomas Holme was moving into the house that a previous Sigemond had lived in: Sigismund Ottelinger, appointed as a poor knight some forty years earlier. In this case, the house may have been known as ‘Sigismund’s house’, hence the confusion in Holme’s appointment. There had been a John Sigemond in royal service in recent times, groom of the chamber to the King and Queen in the financial year 1479-80, but it is currently unknown whether these men were one and the same.\textsuperscript{54}

It is improbable that Thomas Holme ever took up residency within the Lower Ward. He was not named in the partial treasurer’s account for 1485-6, and if he took up his position at Windsor he must have resigned, or been removed from the college by then.\textsuperscript{55} Holme did not die for a further decade, as his will was dated 13 July 1493, and proven 10 June 1494, and so it would seem likely he did not take up his residency despite having a house available.\textsuperscript{56} Instead it is probably that Sigemond’s house and garden were instead taken up by the aforementioned Thomas Crabbe, who was appointed a poor knight by letters patent of 11 July 1482 and was named in the college’s accounts in 1485.\textsuperscript{57} Crabbe was not the next individual to be appointed as a poor knight after Holme: one Richard Assheton had been appointed 10 June 1482, but as Crabbe is known to have taken residency, it seems unlikely that both would have found space at Windsor in such a short space of time.

\textsuperscript{52} SGC, XV.34.57. 
\textsuperscript{53} CPR, 1476-85, p. 297. 
\textsuperscript{54} TNA, E101/412/10, f. 36; E101/412/11, f. 35. 
\textsuperscript{55} SGC, XV.34.61. 
\textsuperscript{56} TNA, PROB 11/10/180. 
\textsuperscript{57} CPR, 1476-85, p. 308; SGC, XV.34.61.
Late-Edwardian Appointments

Of the nine men appointed as poor knights between 25 January and 11 July 1482, it has been shown that only one definitely took up residency at St George’s: Thomas Crabbe. Crabbe was the last appointment of 1482, begging the question of why so many appointments were made, and why so few took up residency. Was this an attempt by Edward IV to boost the numbers and standing of the poor knights at Windsor? If so, why then were the appointments made in such a short space of time, and why did the poor knights not take up residency en masse? Or, rather, was the series of appointments merely the result of a lack of interest by those appointed in residency, and the subsequent need to find an interested party. This chapter will now focus on the 1482 appointments as a brief case study, before going on to establish what sort of men otherwise became poor knights of Windsor. Appointment as a poor knight was one of many ways in which retired royal servants could be rewarded. Alison McHardy has demonstrated that corrodies at other religious institutions could fulfil a similar role in bestowing patronage on royal favourites, albeit on a smaller scale than at St George’s. Windsor, however, brought special privilege given its connection with the king.

In order to evaluate the 1482 appointments, it is necessary to first focus on the context in which they were made. Poor knight appointments were in the King’s grant and were dependent on his personal motives as well as wider issues within the kingdom. At the time of the appointments, Edward had been at war with Scotland for two years. In particular, the winter of 1481-2 had seen intermittent border warfare and it is possible that the mass nominations were a reward to individuals involved in conflict. February 1482, in particular, saw aid arrive in part for those fighting on the border: some £10,000 arrived in wages for those garrisoned on the border and £2,000 for those in...
the east march. Thomas Holme, in his position as Clarenceux king of arms, had been
sent to Scotland from Easter 1480, to prepare the English forces, at the same time that
Alexander Lee, a canon of Windsor and Edward’s envoy in Scotland was threatening
‘rigorous and cruel war’ on the Scots. It is unlikely that Lee had any influence on the
mass of appointments: he appears to have been resident at St George’s rarely, and
was in Scotland on political, not religious duties. Besides Holme, however, none of the
eight other men appointed as poor knights in 1482 appear to have been present in
Scotland, or involved in the conflict in any capacity. Furthermore, Edward himself did
not visit Scotland or the borders during the war, instead leaving his brother, the duke
of Gloucester to campaign on his behalf. While Holme’s appointment may have been
a reward for his services in Scotland, other reasons explain the remainder of the
appointments.

Edward IV’s intentions regarding the poor knights in the last years of his life have been
the subject of some debate. The new chapel of St George was being built on a grand
scale and was probably nearing completion at the time of the 1482 appointments.
Certainly the eastern end of the chapel was probably completed by the end of 1483,
and must have been usable in April 1483 when Edward was buried on the 20 April. It
is tempting to speculate that the wholesale appointment of poor knights was an
attempt to revive the grand ambitions of Edward III’s foundation and the poor knights’
place within the design. But this conjecture deserves closer scrutiny.

The process of appointing a poor knight could be brought about by two very different
motives. For the most part, such presentations were a reward for good service, either
to the King or his kinsmen. Such service was mentioned explicitly in the patent entries
for each knight. Alternatively, an appointment could serve as a means of removing the
more elderly and infirm members of the knightly classes and providing them with a
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pension and accommodation appropriate to their service. Taking residency at St George’s essentially meant the end of an individual’s career, as poor knights were required to be present daily to receive the cotidians which formed a large part of their finances. Personal land holdings and interests were also limited, as, by statute, a poor knight’s position would be nullified and the knight ejected from the college if their landed possessions exceeded the value of £20 annually. This was often not the case in practice. But many of those serving within the royal household, or in other such important courtly positions, would not want to take up the position of a resident poor knight, preferring instead to continue with their careers. Certainly Thomas Holme was one such knight whose career would continue for almost a decade after his appointment as a poor knight, serving for many years as Clarenceux King of Arms and as a royal diplomat.  

It is likely that the 1482 appointments, rather than indicating an expansion of the poor knights within the college, instead simply represent appointments of individuals uninterested in taking up residency. A house within the Lower Ward had become available, which required filling. In the early months of 1482, there was no waiting list for residency, as there had been in previous years, and so the King was required to appoint poor knights until the house had been filled. Unfortunately no evidence survives to prove definitively that each appointee turned down the residency offered to him, aside from the fact that none appear to have taken up their positions at Windsor. It would, however, explain the curious language used in Holme’s appointment, referring to both the rights and profits of David Thomas and the house and garden of John Sigemond.

The poor knights of Windsor were, by the late-fifteenth century, a very different group from that envisaged by Edward III when he founded the college of St George. No longer were these appointees men who had been left impoverished by costly wars in France during the Hundred Years War. Instead they were taken generally from the royal household and other such courtly groups, had successful careers and landed

interests, and were usually given the position as a reward for services to the King or his kinsmen. This transformation was gradual, with no obvious change in policy. As with all forms of patronage, the use of the poor knights and appointments varied from King to King, with no continuous policy emerging. By 1482, the position of a resident poor knight may not have been particularly appealing. The next year, however, saw parliament debate the existence of the poor knights, their position within the college of St George, and the way in which they were funded. How, then, can such a change from disinterest to parliamentary debate be explained? While the maintenance of the poor knights by the dean and canons of St George’s had continued throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, this practice was based on a system of compromise, with the college responsible only for a maximum of three knights at any one time. It is likely that Edward IV’s mass appointments, while more apparent than real, were a cause for concern to the dean and canons, who feared further strains on their already limited funds. They sought confirmations and a reduction of their obligations in the parliaments of 1483 and 1485, as ongoing tensions boiled over into open squabbling.

**Parliamentary Discussion**

Disputes between the dean and canons of Windsor and the poor knights reached a climax, perhaps fittingly, in the aftermath of one of the defining battles of English history: Bosworth, 1485. Henry VII’s first parliament was held in November 1485 and was heavily overshadowed by the events of the previous year. Amongst the attainders, however, there remains evidence of the ongoing dispute between the poor knights and the dean and canons of St George’s. The subject of this disagreement was that of how the poor knights were paid for: an ongoing issue since the foundation. This was not a new occurrence. The steward’s account for 1467-8, for example, records two canons, Clement Smyth and John Bury, travelling to London in an attempt to persuade Edward IV to relieve them of the knights’ maintenance. As Edward’s grand new building project at Windsor became a reality, however, the dean and canons increased
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their efforts. In the years immediately preceding the 1485 parliament, the issue of maintenance arose on two occasions. The appropriation of St Anthony’s by the college in 1481 omitted to mention the poor knights but increased the number of clerks and choristers within the college. Of more concern to the knights, however, was the act of parliament of January 1483, the last parliament of Edward IV’s reign, which separated them from the college entirely. The dean and canons were to be ‘completely quit and discharged of all manner of support or charge of or for any of the same knights’, as the king himself had ‘made other provision for the said knights’. Unfortunately for the poor knights, such a provision was never made as the King died shortly after. It has been suggested that on his deathbed Edward attempted to reconcile this issue by adding a codicil to his will, although if an attempt was made, no money or lands ever materialised to sustain the knights. The dean and canons certainly believed that such a codicil had been added, providing ‘the manor of Long Benyngton and otherwise’ for the knights’ support, and that an oath had been sworn on the matter, as in 1485 they challenged that ‘the persons which are supposed to have made the oath are alive and can show the truth’.

The impetus for a resolution is uncertain. Certainly the dean and canons were keen to be rid of the burden of even three poor knights, let alone the twenty-six anticipated by statute. At the same time, it seems that Edward IV may have intended to fulfil Edward III’s grand ambitions in his new chapel by providing a full complement of poor knights, albeit under royal control rather than the college of St George. When this support didn’t materialise, the poor knights went unpaid, and they do not appear at all in the surviving treasurer’s accounts for 1482 and 1483.

The success of the dean and canons in 1483 in gaining exemption from the poor knights’ support demonstrates the strength of their connections within both the royal
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court and parliament discussed previously. Unlike in previous years, in 1483 the chapter did not have one of their own at Westminster. Instead they entrusted Thomas Bayon, a lawyer who had worked for them previously and was currently under-clerk of the parliaments, to provide them with the access they required to ease through their interests and to ensure the act was properly enrolled in the parliament roll. The poor knights, however, also sent representatives to parliament in an attempt to protect their status and provision, and it is these men that this study will now consider. Two men, John Kendale and William Overey, ‘pretending themselves knights there’, took up the cause in parliament, making ‘gret instaunce & labour’ for the corporation of the poor knights as a separate body in their own right.

The first of these men, John Kendale, came from the royal household, having served Edward IV as royal cofferer and controller of the king’s works. He had also previously served the king’s father, Richard, duke of York. Kendale had been one of those appointed as a poor knight amongst the flurry of such appointments in early 1482, and yet never took up residency. Why then, having declined to become a resident poor knight early in 1482, did Kendale make such efforts to defend their interests less than a year later? To answer this question we must return to the inherent distinction between resident and absentee poor knights. As previously discussed, once a poor knight had taken up residency, his property holdings or annual income could not exceed £20. This limitation meant that taking up residency effectively meant the end of one’s career, whether in politics or the royal household. To be granted the position of poor knight by royal letters patent did not hold the same limitation, leaving the bearer to continue in service with the appointment serving as a mark of royal patronage. Crucially, the grants were also for life, giving the holder the potential to
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cash in on their retirement by taking residency at a time of their choosing. One example of this is James Friis, who initially turned down residency in 1468, but then became a resident in 1477 when a second house became available. While Kendale may not have been interested in taking residency as early as 1482, this is not to say that he was not interested in being a poor knight later in life. Indeed, a royal grant of 1483 styled him posthumously as, ‘late one of the Almesse Knightes...of Wyndesore’. It is perhaps no surprise then that Kendale was interested in protecting the interests of the poor knights in 1483, safeguarding his own potential retirement plans at the same time.

Kendale’s associate, William Overey, on the other hand, is more difficult to assess. Hannes Kleineke has tentatively identified him with a Southampton merchant who had been knighted by 1483, maintained close links with Edward IV’s household and would participate in the Duke of Buckingham’s rebellion later in 1483. However, no such name appears amongst the poor knights, either in the patent appointments or in the records of the college itself, and as such it would seem that Overey was never granted the position. Whether Overey wanted to become a poor knight himself is uncertain, but along with Kendale he was unable to secure the separate incorporation of the knights as a body of their own, or to secure a detailed plan for how and when the king would provide for them.

The canons on this occasion had utilised their powerful connections and won. They were able to cease immediately all payments to the poor knights for their cotidians or annual stipend. No records mentioning the knights exist in the treasurer’s rolls for

---

75 Friis received letters patent appointing him as a poor knight on 10 December 1467, but when the next vacancy arrived with the death of Thomas Grey on 8 September 1468, it was Hugh Jones that became resident rather than Friis, despite Jones receiving his appointment later that year (and after Friis), on 15 December 1468: CPR, 1467-77, pp. 50, 119; SGC, V.B.II., ff. 2v, 4v, 53v; XV.34.57; Fellowes, Military Knights, p. 8; C. H. Talbot and E. A. Hammond, The Medical Practitioners in Medieval England: A Biographical Register (London, 1965), pp. 96-8.

76 British Harleian Manuscript 433, ed. by Peter Hammond and Rosemary Horrux, 4 vols. (Gloucester, 1979-83), i, p. 47.

1482-3 or 1483-4, and it is difficult to assess the impact that the cut off of funds had on those residents who were reliant on it.\textsuperscript{78} Men such as Kendale, who fought the cause in parliament, were less affected by the cessation of funds, as their livelihoods were elsewhere and they were not subject to the college’s £20 limitation. No medieval attendance records survive after 1479, but without cotidian payments, it is probable that the residents would have attended chapel rarely, if at all. However, it is unlikely that they would have been evicted from their residences despite the college’s exemptions. The poor knight’s houses did not come under the college’s jurisdiction, and do not feature in the treasurer’s or steward’s accounts. In the short term, at least, there was a real need for residents to renew or gain new sources of income to maintain themselves.

**Coping with Cut-backs**

At the time of the college’s incorporation in 1483, three poor knights had been admitted to the college. We benefit from a consideration of their activities after they were shut out of their living. Two poor knights in particular, James Friis and Hugh Jones, consolidated their assets in the aftermath of 1483. Friis, the royal physician to both Edward IV and later Richard III, already owned a number of tenements in London, amongst other assets.\textsuperscript{79} The first of these grants, an annuity of £40 had been granted on 28 November 1461 for life.\textsuperscript{80} He had then received a messuage for life on 28 May 1462 called ‘le grete belle’ by ‘le Barbican’ in the parish of St Botolph, with fourteen other annexed messuages, to hold by homage and fealty only.\textsuperscript{81} Early the next year, on 29 April 1463, further London tenements had been added to Friis’ holdings by Edward IV.\textsuperscript{82} These properties had previously been owned by one Edward Ellesmere, formerly an usher of Henry VI, who had been attainted in the parliament of November 1461.\textsuperscript{83} Some years later, on 16 March 1475 and again on 18 November 1477 Ellesmere, along...
with two others, Thomas Danyell, knight, and Thomas Luyt, gentleman, sealed deeds transferring further London properties to Friis, which were said to be worth £26 annually. In 1482, on 29 January, Edward IV had rewarded Friis with one last grant, three tenements to hold for life within the palace of Westminster.85

At the point at which the poor knights ceased to be maintained by the dean and canons of St George’s, Friis certainly had numerous assets. In the aftermath of the 1483 parliament, and with a new king in Richard III, Friis made sure to gain confirmation of his various privileges to ensure his continued wealth.86 Not only Friis’ financial and property grants were confirmed after Richard III took the throne, but also those concerning his denization, which he had received on 27 August 1473.87 The wording of the confirmation makes it clear that Friis did not expect the privilege of denization to continue with a new king on the throne, as he received assurances for protection, ‘for that he did not his homage upon that he was made denzine [sic] before the King now [Richard III] but oonly afore King Edward’.88 Certainly, his expectations appear to have correct. In 1485, Ellesmere petitioned parliament for the return of the

---

84 CCR, 1468-76, p. 1489; 1476-85, p. 261; PROME, vi, p. 327. Ellesmere would later claim that these tenements had been taken from him through ‘excessive, extreme and damnable means’, and that Ellesmere himself was ‘convinced that if he had not done so he would have lost his life’. The tenements included a house called the King’s Head, a brewhouse called the Dolphin in the Old Change, St. Mary Magdalen, Oldfishstreet, and a third in St Vedast’s parish Westchepe, with shops, solars and cellars. The grants may also have included a tenement in Wood Street, St Michael, Hoggenlane, which Ellesmere, Danyell and Luyt also held as part of the same grants, although this is not specified in the close roll accounts and Ellesmere did not mention it when he petitioned Henry VII for the restoration of these properties: TNA, E326/2088; E326/2094; E326/2244. The brewhouse known as the Dolphin had been owned by St Bartholomew’s Hospital since the thirteenth-century, although only as a tenement, and was located under the chancel of St Mary Magdalen: St Bartholomew’s Hospital Archives, HC1/383, 1403, 1404, 1405; HC2/1, ff. 23, 282-5. The point at which the tenement became a brewhouse is uncertain, but the conversion had occurred prior to 1456, when the hospital’s only extant rental record was taken, at which point the brewhouse was known as ‘le Dolphyn on the hoop’. Whether this conversion was at the request of the tenants or the hospital is uncertain, although the hospital had a proven track record in the early-fifteenth century, under its master John Wakeryng, of converting tenements into commercial properties, primarily brewhouses or bakehouses. For more on St Bartholomew’s and its property holdings see Euan Roger, ‘Blakberd’s Treasure: A Study in Fifteenth-Century Hospital Administration at St Bartholomew’s Hospital, London’, in The Fifteenth Century XIII, ed. by Linda S. Clark (Woodbridge, 2014), pp. 81-108.


86 Harleian MS 433, pp. 64, 76, 92.

87 CPR, 1467-77, p. 396; Harleian MS 433, p. 92.

88 Ibid.
aforementioned London properties, in which he referred to Friis as one Jacques Friis, calling himself Sir Jacques Friis, knight’, who was ‘not born under your [Henry VII’s] allegiance or obedience’. Not only did Ellesmere call Friis’ knightly credentials into question, he also questioned the status of denizen under the new king.

In the aftermath of the 1483 parliament, however, Friis held significant property in and around London and was not reliant on his Windsor income or property. Indeed, it is probable that he spent little, if any, time at St George’s. The extant attendance registers record that between his installation on 20 March 1477 and the end of the surviving entries in July 1479, Friis was never once present in chapel. He received his annual stipend of forty shillings on at least three occasions, but no cotidians seem to have been paid out in the extant documentation for Friis’ time at St George’s. Lack of attendance may explain the dean and canons’ acceptance to waive the £20 limitation. In times of financial difficulty, it was more prudent to keep an empty house and merely pay forty shillings annually, than to remove Friis from the college. This alleviated the risk of a new poor knight taking up Friis’ appointment, residing in chapel regularly, and asking for the cotidians promised to him by the college’s statutes, possibly claiming the full amount of £20 5s.

Instead of residing within the castle, Friis probably spent much of his time in London and would have been little affected by the loss of his income as a poor knight. He retained the Ellesmere properties until 1485, when Henry VII and parliament ordered him to return them. Likewise, Friis held his Westminster tenements until 21 September 1485, when they were transferred to another royal physician, Antony Keen. With the loss of his tenements, and the accession of Henry VII in 1485, Friis effectively retired from royal service. Clearly, given Friis’ long service and commitment to the Yorkist kings, he gained little in remaining once their rival had taken the throne.

89 PROME, vi, p. 327.
90 SGC, V.B.II, ff. 53v-67v.
91 SGC, XV.34.54, 55, 57.
92 PROME, vi, p. 327. The Dolphin brewhouse at least was returned, as a receipt of 9 May 1485 to Friis from John Barton, master of St Bartholomew’s Hospital records the tenement as being ‘lately of Ellesmere’: St Bartholomew’s Hospital Archives, HCl/1404.
93 CPR, 1485-94, p. 22.
Interestingly, he did not return to take up his position at Windsor, he was not named in the partial extant for 1485, and his appointment seems to have gone the same way as that at Westminster.\textsuperscript{94} However, no repeal of his appointment survives in the records. Instead it is probable that he took up residence at the priory of Holy Trinity, Aldgate, close to the tenements such as 'la grete belle' which he had been granted in 1462. Friis had been granted a corrody at the priory at an unknown date prior to 1488, which was vacated by his death on 15 February.\textsuperscript{95} It is uncertain whether Friis ever took up residency, as his widow also disposed of property in All Hallows the less later in 1488, providing another potential location for his retirement.\textsuperscript{96}

Another to consolidate his assets in the aftermath of the 1483 parliament was a Welshman, Hugh Jones. Jones was a distinguished soldier:

‘made knight at the Holy Sepulcre of Our Lord Jhesu Crist in the city of Jerusalem...the said Sir Hugh has contynuyd in the werris their long tyme byfore...that is to sey ageynst the Turkis and Sarsyns in the partis of Troy, Grecie and Turky under John, that time Emprowre of Constantynepeople’.\textsuperscript{97}

Jones continued to serve as knight marshall of both France and Ireland in the 1440s, after his Mediterranean exploits. During this period, he would distinguish himself both to Richard, duke of York, and Richard, earl of Warwick, so much so that they both wrote letters to a prospective second wife for Jones.\textsuperscript{98} Jones was appointed a poor knight of Windsor on 15 December 1468.\textsuperscript{99} He was installed in person on 1 January 1469, in place of Thomas Grey, who had died the previous September.

\textsuperscript{94} SGC, XV.34.61.
\textsuperscript{95} Materials for a History of the Reign of Henry VII, ii, p. 244.
\textsuperscript{96} Talbot and Hammond, The Medical Practitioners in Medieval England, p. 97.
\textsuperscript{97} W. R. B. Robinson, ‘Sir Hugh Johnys: A Fifteenth-Century Welsh Knight’, in Morgannwg transactions of the Glamorgan Local History Society (14, 1970), pp. 5-34; idem, ‘Hugh Johnys (b. c.1410, d. in or after 1485)’, ODNB; T. Bliss and G. G. Francis, Some Account of Sir Hugh Johnys, deputy knight marshall of England, temp. Henry VI, and Edward IV, and of his monumental brass in St Mary's Church, Swansea (Swansea, 1845).
\textsuperscript{98} Robinson, ‘Sir Hugh Johnys: A Fifteenth-Century Welsh Knight’, pp. 14-22. These letters have previously been thought to have been intended for Elizabeth Woodville, Edward IV’s future wife, but this theory has been discounted by Robinson.
\textsuperscript{99} CPR, 1467-77, p. 119; SGC, V.B.II., ff. 2v, 4v.
As with Friis, Jones also held a number of properties and grants, although, unlike Friis, these were rewards for knightly service rather than a benefit of royal patronage. Much of Jones’ land was in his native Wales. On 23 June 1446, Jones was granted an annuity for life, of £20 from the revenues of the manor of Llandimore in the Gower peninsula near Swansea.\(^{100}\) In 1451, his influence in the Gower was increased, with three further grants. On 26 February, Jones was made constable of Oystermouth Castle, reeve of the manor of Oystermouth, and surveyor and approver of the whole lordship of Gower, with the appropriate fees that these offices brought.\(^{101}\) A few months later, on 1 April, Jones and Mary, his wife, received an annual rent of twenty marks from the lordship of Oystermouth.\(^{102}\) The final grant of that year, on 4 December gave the manor of Llandimore to Jones and his heirs, and was deemed important enough that Jones included details of it on his tomb.\(^{103}\) Grants did not come solely from Jones’ liege lord, the duke of Norfolk. On 18 April 1452, Henry VI gave Jones the office of steward of the lordship and courts of Magor and Redwck in the Welsh marches, with their usual wages and fees.\(^{104}\) One further tenement was acquired on Fisher Street, Swansea on 19 March 1460, which Robinson has speculated Jones used as a townhouse, when away from his estate.\(^{105}\) It is difficult to assess Jones’ overall wealth during his time as a poor knight, and whether his total annual earnings were more than the college’s £20 limitation, although the case of James Friis has demonstrated that the dean and canons were prepared to waive this condition when required.

Jones kept his Welsh properties after taking up residency. For the period between 1 January 1469 and 31 July 1479, Jones had a fairly high average attendance in chapel,

\(^{100}\) TNA, DL 29/651/10531, m. 12-12d; Robinson, ‘Sir Hugh Johnys: A Fifteenth-Century Welsh Knight’, p. 11.
\(^{101}\) CPR, 1461-7, pp. 80-1; Robinson ‘Sir Hugh Johnys: A Fifteenth-Century Welsh Knight’, p. 12. These fees consisted of an annual rent of ten marks from the manor of Oystermouth, and forty acres of demesne land.
\(^{102}\) CPR, 1461-7, pp. 80-1.
\(^{103}\) TNA, C140/5, no. 12; E149/201, no. 1; Robinson, ‘Sir Hugh Johnys: A Fifteenth-Century Welsh Knight’, pp. 6-7, 12-3.
\(^{104}\) CPR, 1446-52, p. 562; Robinson, ‘Sir Hugh Johnys: A Fifteenth-Century Welsh Knight’, p. 13. This patent letter includes a summary of Jones’ career as a crusader and in France, which have led Robinson to believe that this was a deliberate attempt by Jones to publicize his achievements.
\(^{105}\) Ibid., p. 25; T. Bliss and G. G. Francis, Some Account of Sir Hugh Johnys (Swansea, 1845), pp. 10-12.
attending 71.38% of his required services. Robinson concludes that ‘it is difficult to discern any pattern in his absences...but it is reasonable to explain his longer absences as being occasioned by visits to Gower’. It is probable that these periods away from Windsor would indeed have been spent in the Gower supervising his lands and visiting his children and possibly his wife, whose death date is unknown. That Jones later had his tomb in St Mary’s church, Swansea, which adjoined Fisher Street on its east, indicates that he likely kept his town property until his death or shortly before.

Further analysis of the attendance register data, however, demonstrates that there was, in fact, some pattern in Jones’ absences. When viewed in a numerical format, as Robinson appears to have analysed the data, patterns are difficult to discern. When viewed as a graph, however, the trends become more obvious. While his average attendance fluctuated throughout the year, there were six clear points when Jones’ attendance dropped significantly for a prolonged period. Of these, the first three in particular were relatively regular: the absences were taken annually across the summer months, and include September. Clearly Jones, while resident at Windsor, was still cautious when it came to his Welsh properties. He felt the need, in his early years as a poor knight, to return home and supervise the annual harvest, collecting the money due to him and his heirs at Michaelmas. Periods four and five show a similar pattern, as Jones left Windsor during September and October, returning to chapel for the winter months before departing again in March. The final period of absence also shows some similarity with periods four and five, in that it occurred across March and April 1479. Jones’ three spring absences are currently difficult to identify, but it is clear that much of his absence from Windsor was in order to return home at Michaelmas and deal with the money owed to him at this time. Of the ten years with attendance

106 SGC, V.B.II., ff. 4v-67v.
109 See Appendix 14.
110 Period 1 is between March and October 1469 inclusive; Period 2 ranges between May and September 1470; Period 3 is from July to November 1471; Period 4 is between September 1473 and March 1474, apart from a brief return to Windsor in December and January; Period 5 ranges from September 1475 to August 1476, apart from a return between December and February; Period 6 is from February to April 1470.
statistics covering Michaelmas, Jones was only present at St George’s for four of these. In comparison, he was present in January and February every year with high attendance figures, for each of the eleven years covered by the register. Jones kept up a high rate of attendance for the period between Michaelmas 1479 and 1480, but the lack of an attendance register does not allow for speculation as to his movements during his brief absences.111

Unlike Friis, Jones was a regular fixture in chapel at St George’s, bar the prolonged periods of absence discussed above, yet by 1485-6 he was no longer recorded as a poor knight of Windsor. Robinson speculates that he may have moved home to the Gower in the aftermath of the 1483 parliament, in years that were ‘unfortunate for Johnys, who suffered considerable financial loss and had to give up a way of life which he had followed for years’.112 While it is likely that Jones did return to his native Wales in 1483, why did he not return to take up his position in 1486, after the issue was revisited in Henry VII’s first parliament?

While he had served under Richard, duke of York, during his French service, Jones was by no means a staunch Yorkist, as Friis was, and had little to fear from the new king. Indeed Jones had been associated with the young Henry Tudor during his time in Wales, possibly involved in his military education, for which he was rewarded with a gift of £10 on 15 October 1485.113 This reward came from the lordship of Kidwelly, Wales, and was given ‘in consideracioun of the good service that Sir Hugh John, knyght, did unto us in our tender age’.114 Jones probably died shortly after this reward was granted. No further references to him survive: he was already an old man by 1485, and there is no mention of him in the partial treasurer’s roll for 1485-6.115 Robinson speculates that Jones probably died within a few years after 1485, but it seems probable that this time frame can be narrowed to the period between 15 October 1485 and 11 March 1486, when the treasurer’s records resume for the poor knights. It

111 SGC, XV.34.57.  
114 Ibid.  
115 SGC, XV.34.61; Robinson, ‘Sir Hugh Johnys: A Fifteenth-Century Welsh Knight’, p. 31.
is unknown whether his death was merely the consequence of old age, or a disease such as the sweating sickness which ravaged England and Wales late in 1485.\textsuperscript{116}

Friis and Jones both held considerable grants of land and property and, as a consequence, were affected relatively little by the loss of their annual income from St George’s. Friis never appears to have attended chapel, and was in all likelihood, resident in London on a regular basis, while Jones’s extensive lands in the Gower took him away from Windsor regularly.

The third poor knight in post at the time of the college’s incorporation, John Pesemereche, had been a regular attendee in chapel, in previous years, with an average attendance of 98.58% for the period of the attendance register. Pesemereche had also been granted numerous offices and lands throughout his career in the service of Richard, duke of York. The first of these, on 3 December 1451, was a grant of the keeping of all lands of John Howton, an idiot, worth £20 annually to hold for as long as the lands remained in the king’s hand.\textsuperscript{117} Further rewards came in the first year of Edward IV’s reign. Pesemereche was granted the office of porter of the king’s castle at Newcastle, with fees and issues on 17 May 1461, and on 25 July he received a stipend of 22\textsuperscript{d}. daily from the issues of the county of Northumberland, until the king granted him another office or offices of equal value.\textsuperscript{118} By 1461, however, Pesemereche was clearly advanced in age, as the letters patent he received all described him as of great age and infirm. Furthermore, on 10 July 1462 he was granted exemption for life from continuous attendance in the king’s household, instead he was to be considered a domestic servant of the king and to ‘have wages, eatables, and all that is called ‘le bowche of court’ as the servants of the officers of the household have’.\textsuperscript{119}


\textsuperscript{117} \textit{CPR}, 1446-52, p. 507.

\textsuperscript{118} \textit{CPR}, 1461-7, pp. 17, 130.

Pesemerche was appointed as a poor knight of Windsor on 11 November 1465, although when he took up residency is currently unknown.\cite{120} His final grant came on 4 May 1467, when Pesemerche and his wife, Joan were given two tuns of red wine from Gascony annually at Christmas.\cite{121} This was in recompense of an unrecorded grant of twenty marks from the issue of Hereford in 1461, which had been cancelled by parliament. Interestingly, on one occasion, Pesemerche sold part of this wine supply to St George’s. The treasurer’s account for 1468-9 contains an entry for payment made to Pesemerche, for two *pipis* of red wine, for which the college paid him £5 6s. 8d.\cite{122} This was in addition to a further *pipa* of wine, purchased by the dean in London, for which he was reimbursed £2 13s. 4d. for the wine and 2s. 11d. for its carriage to Windsor. Once at Windsor, the wine was sold to the dean and canons by John Scalon, one of the lay clerks, who paid the treasurer £7 11s. from his endeavours.\cite{123} It is uncertain what happened to the 9s. of wine left over from original purchases. Scalon may have been allowed to keep a portion of wine for his own use, or he may have pocketed some of his earnings - either with or without the treasurer’s knowledge - in return for his services. This was not the first time that the college had purchased useful goods, supplies or services from the poor knights (or their widows). Besides the example of Lady Grimsby cited above, in the financial year 1442-3 the college had paid Sigismund Ottelinger 3s. 6d. for 560 ‘brikes’, which were then used to repair the aerary.\cite{124} It is uncertain why Ottelinger had 560 bricks available, or where these bricks had come from, but both examples indicate that the knights retained connections with the lay world while in retirement at Windsor, and demonstrates interactions between the different sub-groups within the community unrelated from spiritual matters.

Pesemerche, while not as wealthy as Friis or Jones in 1483, was certainly not a pauper at the time of the college’s incorporation. The grants and financial support, accumulated during a long career would have supported him in the wake of exemption

\begin{itemize}
  \item \cite{120} *CPR*, 1461-7, p. 471.
  \item \cite{121} *CPR*, 1467-77, p. 14. The only two grants to Pesemerche in 1461 in the patent rolls were from the issue of Northumberland so it is currently uncertain where this grant was recorded.
  \item \cite{122} SGC, XV.34.56.
  \item \cite{123} This payment was recorded in the *recepta forinsece* section of the account.
  \item \cite{124} SGC, XV.34.41.
\end{itemize}
from his poor knight allowance, yet this was not to be required for long. Letters patent of 8 December 1483 sent to Pesemerche’s second wife Joan, described the poor knight as deceased. They granted Joan twenty marks from the issues of London and Middlesex in lieu of a grant given to her and her previous husband, John Malpas on 1 August 1461. Pesemerche’s death so soon after the college’s incorporation meant that he would have been little troubled by the loss of income, especially with ‘bouche of court’ and wine to fall back on. It is unknown whether a new poor knight was appointed in Pesemerche’s place in 1483, but this seems unlikely. Instead it is probable that the number of poor knights was left at two during the period of limbo between 1483 and 1485-6, when the new appointments were made.

A New Hope?

With Richard III’s death and Henry VII’s coronation in the aftermath of Bosworth, those who had prospered under the old regime flooded to confirm their grants and privileges. The dean and canons of St George’s - as they had done during the Readeption - sought to gain support with the new king, and verify their new found exemption from the support of the poor knights. This was not a purely proactive decision by the dean and canons, but was prompted by the presentation of a petition to parliament by the poor knights asking for the annulment of the 1483 act. It is uncertain when this petition was presented to parliament, or who the poor knights sent to fight their cause. The chapter’s response, however, was swift and meticulous. The dean, John Morgan, was clerk of the parliaments, and was well placed to look after the college’s interests alongside his official duties. The college’s steward, John

---

125 CPR, 1476-85, p. 374. The 1461 grant referred to is probably that entered in the patent rolls on 4 August 1461, to John Malpas and Joan, his wife, granting twenty marks from the issues of Wiltshire: CPR, 1461-7, p. 51. The Joan referred to in both grants was not the same Joan mentioned in 1467 as Pesemerche’s wife but rather his second wife, who had previously been married to John Malpas. Malpas was mentioned in letters patent of 24 November 1473 as deceased, so this Joan must have married Pesemerche at some point between this date and his death before 8 December 1483: CPR, 1467-77, p. 40. Pesemerche’s second wife Joan appears not to have remarried, as she was described in Cecily, duchess of York’s will of 27 August, 1495 as ‘Dame Joan Pesemershe, widow’: Nicholas Harris Nicolas, Testamenta Vetusta, 2 vols. (London, 1826), i, pp. 422-3.

126 SGC, XI.B.8; TNA, E36/113.

Seymour, along with three canons, John Arundel, David Hopton and Oliver King, all also spent extended periods of time at Westminster over the course of the parliament.\textsuperscript{128} Such a practice was not uncommon for the dean and canons of Windsor. As has previously been noted, Baldwin Hyde, canon of Windsor, and clerk of the parliaments during the Readeption had been paid regular cotidians while working at Westminster.\textsuperscript{129} Likewise, the dean, John Davyson, and two canons, John Seymour and Alexander Lee, were granted absent cotidians for extended periods of time during the parliamentary session between 6 October and 30 November 1472.\textsuperscript{130} Davyson was serving as receiver of Gascon petitions for the parliament and was deemed as being away on college business between 4 October 1472 and 30 November, when parliament prorogued.\textsuperscript{131} Seymour and Lee held no official position within the parliament but, as in 1485, were probably lobbying on the college’s behalf.\textsuperscript{132} It is uncertain what the dean and canons sought to protect in 1472. Clearly, however, the senior canons of Windsor flocked to Westminster during parliament in order to lobby and protect the college’s interests.

Further steps were also taken in 1485 to ensure that the college’s interests were heard and to gain access. Thomas Bayon, as in previous years was utilised, as under-clerk of the parliaments, along with two other legal counsellors, the serjeants-at-law William Danvers and John Vavasour.\textsuperscript{133} Other individuals were paid to ease access into Westminster. The porter of the parliament house, John Flygh, was paid 2d. ‘for his favour’, and the serjeant-at arms John Harper received 20d. for the same.\textsuperscript{134} Bayon was

\textsuperscript{128} SGC, XV.48.50. Seymour was present at Westminster between the second day of parliament and 10 December 1485, and again between 20 January 1486, and parliament’s end. Arundell spent fifty days at Westminster in the same period, while Hopton joined for a further seventeen days. King was paid for thirty-one days in London during parliament and also claimed other expenses during this period dealing with messengers: SGC, XV.48.34.
\textsuperscript{129} Kleineke and Roger, ‘Baldwin Hyde, Clerk of the Parliaments in the Readeption Parliament of 1470-1’.
\textsuperscript{130} SGC, V.B.II., f. 27.
\textsuperscript{131} \textit{Ibid}.
\textsuperscript{132} S.G.C, V.B.II., f. 27. Seymour was deemed to be absent on college business between 6 October, when parliament opened, and 2 November, and again between 8 November and 1 December. Lee was away on college business continuously between 6 October and 1 December. There is no specific mention within the college’s records that these two canons were involved at Westminster, although the close correlation between the dates of absence and the dates of parliament mean that it is highly probable that they were at Westminster.
\textsuperscript{133} SGC, XV.48.34; XV.48.50; Kleineke, ‘Lobbying and Access’, p. 155.
\textsuperscript{134} SGC, XV.48.34.
further treated to a breakfast to ensure his support. On 1 February, 9 February and 21 February, the Speaker, Thomas Lovell, received a substantial payment of 66s 8d on 24 January 1486, and Vavasour was paid on three occasions for speaking in parliament in his capacity as king’s serjeant in the Lords.\(^{135}\) Two other MPs, the lawyer Thomas Lymryk and an unknown ‘Morden de domo parliamenti’, were also granted payments for unspecified activities on 1 February, presumably to provide support at the first reading.\(^ {136}\)

Perhaps more important than easing access into parliament, however, was utilising connections to the new king. Oliver King was one canon, in particular, who could provide access to the royal person. King had been secretary to Edward IV, but had been dispensed with by Richard III, and imprisoned in the Tower.\(^ {137}\) By December 1485, King was appointed an ambassador to France by Henry VII.\(^ {138}\) Early in 1486, the dean and canons sought to use King’s connections with Henry. Morgan, Seymour, Arundell and Hopton joined King in royal company and presented the king with a gift of £100 for his favour.\(^ {139}\) Throughout February and March, King was further able to bend the royal ear while out riding with the king, during which time he presumably pushed the college’s cause.\(^ {140}\)

The poor knights’ petition was relatively simple in its content. They argued that ‘the annual rents and profits of the College are sufficient to support all charges twice over’ and that the claims made by ‘the said canons by their sinister labours and subtle covyn practised of great untruth’, in the 1483 parliament were therefore unjust.\(^ {141}\)


\(^ {136}\) SGC, XV.48.34; Kleineke, ‘Lobbying and Access’, p. 156. Kleineke has tentatively associated this Morden with either the Bedfordshire lawyer John Mordaunt, who would serve as Speaker of the Commons in 1487, or Thomas Morton, the nephew of John Morton, Bishop of Ely, who is thought to have sat in the 1485 parliament.

\(^ {137}\) S. J. Gunn, ‘King, Oliver (d. 1503)’, ODNB.

\(^ {138}\) See Chapter 3.

\(^ {139}\) SGC, XV.48.34.

\(^ {140}\) Ibid.

\(^ {141}\) SGC, XI.B.8; TNA, E36/113, f. 12.
Furthermore, the act of parliament had been granted, without the knowledge of the poor knights and had led to their further impoverishment. The petition sought annulment of the 1483 act of the parliament and was supplemented by documents, both outlining the college’s fiscal balance, and summarising the provisions made by statute at the college’s foundation. These documents concerned themselves primarily with the number of poor knights that the college was meant to support. They refuted the canons’ argument that there had only ever been two or three poor knights, and produced evidence to show that this had never been Edward III’s intention.

The canons replied with their own documents, entitled ‘The answer of the Dean and canons of the King’s free chapel of St George within the castle of Windsor to the bill of those which call themselves knights of the college of Windsor’. In this they argued that, while Edward III had originally intended the college to house twenty-four poor knights, the endowments that the dean and canons received were not sufficient to uphold this provision. Furthermore, the grants of land and money they had received, had not named the knights explicitly, but rather had been granted to the dean and canons or other variants of their titles. As such, the canons argued, the college had never been required to sustain any poor knights, let alone the full complement of twenty-four or twenty-six. Instead, the dean and canons had only made provision for a handful of poor knights out of their own personal sense of charity. The fact that even during Edward III’s reign, there had only been one poor knight in some years, was a sign which, ‘plainly declares that the said poor knights were not incorporate together with the said warden and canons nor possessed of their portions’. In response to the knights’ manuscript documenting the college’s finances, the dean and canons replied

142 SGC, XI.B.8; TNA, E36/113, ff. 1-4, 11-12.
143 Ibid., ff. 1-2.
144 SGC, XI.B.5; XI.B.6. XI.B.5 appears to be a partial copy of XI.B.6, although seem to be drafts. Both documents are written on paper, in a poor hand, and XI.B.6 contains multiple amendments and additions.
145 Interestingly, the dean and canons referred to the original college statutes rather than the amendments of 1352, which increased the number of poor knights to twenty-six.
146 SGC, XI.B.5.
that the figures within were invalid, as they included grants of land and money which had been ring-fenced for other purposes. Specifically:

‘the said Dean and canons say that all the possessions that divers of the said manors be assigned to the said college some for the sustenance only of divers obits and some for divers chantries in the said college and divers possessions expressed in the said bill. The said dean and canons have not nor ever had the possessions assigned unto the said college by the said King Edward III suffice not to bear these charges of 26 knights so if the surmise of the said knights were true King Edward III’s foundation of the said dean and canons and all other ministers of the choir were utterly annulled and void for then remains no endowment to bear their charges and over that they say’.147

On this point, the dean and canons were correct in their arguments. Grants of land and money for anniversary celebrations were not to be touched for the use of the college, until their liturgical specifications had been completed. Any excess from the income of land or property was to be split between the resident canons, but only after they had fulfilled the stipulations of the grant.148

Both sides having submitted their petitions and replies, the parliament and the king retired to consider a solution. Further to the usual deliberation in the two houses of parliament, the matter was discussed separately, in the presence of four unknown knights of the Garter, four lords spiritual, Richard Fox, the king’s secretary, the Speaker of the Commons, William Hody, the attorney general, and several other lawyers.149 Also present was Christopher Urswick, the king’s almoner and canon of St Stephen’s, Westminster, who would later become both a canon and then dean of St George’s, although he is not known to have had any connection with the college at this early stage in his career.150 The outcome of this meeting is unknown, but the reaction of the king and parliament survives. The dean and canons, whether by their lobbying efforts

147 SGC, XI.B.6.
148 The question of the college’s anniversary commemorations will be further discussed in Chapter 5.
150 SGC, XV.34.50; Fasti Wyndesorienses, pp. 37-8, 118; BRUO, pp. 1935-6.
or otherwise, were successful in blocking the petition of the poor knights.\footnote{PROME, vi, p. 351; TNA, E175/11/58.} Furthermore they had their privileges confirmed in full on the parliament roll, endorsed with the King’s personal command.\footnote{Hannes Kleineke has noted that the language used in this enrolment differed significantly from the usual language of proviso clauses, indicating the king’s personal support for the confirmation: Kleineke, ‘Lobbying and Access’, pp. 157-8.}

The poor knights seemed to be a spent force, with no provisions made for their maintenance or continuation. By March 1486, however, there were, once again, three poor knights resident at St George’s claiming cotidians. As this chapter has previously noted, none of these knights were those present in 1483. James Friis, Hugh Jones and John Pesemerche were all dead or living elsewhere by 1486, and they were replaced by three new knights: William Stoughton, Thomas Crabbe and Roger Tong. Crabbe had been appointed as a poor knight on 11 July 1482, and may have taken up residence prior to 1486. No such record survives within the college’s accounts, however, and it seems unlikely he would have taken up residence in Pesemerche’s place at the same time as the poor knights were losing their maintenance. Stoughton and Tong were both appointed by letters patent on 14 and 24 November 1485 respectively, while the issue of the poor knights was still being debated in parliament.\footnote{CPR, 1485-94, pp. 37, 42. The Privy Seal record for Tong’s appointment survives. The Privy Seal moving the Great Seal was issued on 18 November and was delivered to the chancellor for execution on 24 November: TNA, C82/4/112.} In Stoughton’s case, this was to confirm a previous appointment on 4 October 1485.\footnote{CPR, 1485-94, p. 37.} Stoughton and Tong had both served Henry VI in their youth, and the dean and canons received mandates to install them as ‘eleemosinary knights’ in the college.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 37, 42.}

Henry VII, despite the best effort of the dean and canons, had no real desire to completely disband the order of poor knights at St George’s. The appointment of two new knights to the college, at a time when the dean and canons had no mandate to maintain them, does not make sense unless Henry VII had a plan to re-endow the foundation. A further appointment was made on 8 December 1485 to Robert
Champlayn, a Knight Templar who had fought in Hungary against the Turks.\textsuperscript{156} Champlayn never took up residence within the college: letters of protection granted to him in February 1488 indicate that he continued within his service in Hungary, gaining commendations from kings and popes alike before his capture, injury and ransom.\textsuperscript{157} Richard III had also appointed poor knights after the 1483 parliament while they were in limbo: Henry Sewall received letters patent on 23 Feb 1484, Thomas Gibbes on 18 January 1485 and John Charleton on 15 February 1485.\textsuperscript{158} However, Henry VII’s appointment of two poor knights during the parliamentary discussions, both of whom would take up residence perhaps hints that the lobbying efforts of the dean and canons were flawed from the start. Henry preferred to return the college to a state of compromise: not a full complement of poor knights, but enough to give meaning to his non-resident appointments. In this way, the college could continue to fulfil its two main functions of patronage and prayer, without restricting the former to ecclesiastic appointments.

While the dean and canons may have felt that they had won, and beaten the poor knights into submission, Henry VII was to have the last laugh. The partial treasurer’s account for 1485-6, in which the poor knights were recorded indicates that the college were once again obliged to pay for the three residents.\textsuperscript{159} Rather than forcing these payments on the dean and canons, Henry instead asked them to provide for the poor knights until he could make provision to do so himself. In buying time in this way, he was able to re-establish the uneasy balance between college and knights which had endured the previous decades, without the need to directly conflict himself with the dean and canons, many of whom had strong social and political connections.

In the first instance, the college’s generosity only stretched so far. The knights’ cotidian payments, amounting to £29 11s. 4d. were paid, with a marginal note stating that this

\textsuperscript{156} Ibid., pp. 125, 157. The second of these letters patent were an exemplification at Champlayn’s request, as he had lost the letters given to him previously.
\textsuperscript{158} CPR, 1476-85, pp. 431, 497, 529; Harleian MS 433, i, pp. 122, 249. Fellowes also includes William Ballard alias Marche within this group, although his date of appointment is given as c.1484, and no patent entry survives.
\textsuperscript{159} SGC, XV.34.61.
was at the king’s wish, and temporary. The knights’ annual stipends, amounting to only 5s. 3d. as they could only claim for part of the year, were accounted for but never paid. By the time of the next extant treasurer’s roll, 1489-90, the poor knights had returned to full payments, both in stipends and cotidian payments. Moreover, the structure of the accounts themselves had changed, with the necessaria entry for the poor knights moving up in importance. Previously all the poor knights’ entries had been included after those of clerical and religious figures. In the account for 1489-90, however, the necessaria were moved up, to directly below the stipends of the canons, but below the canons’ cotidians. The knights’ cotidians, too, were placed before those of the vicars and other clerks of the college. Whether this was a mere attempt by the treasurer to distinguish between stipends and cotidians, or a reintegration of the knights is uncertain, yet this reorganisation was at odds with previous accounting traditions at St George’s, and indicates a distinct change in perceived importance. This was continued in the account for 1490-1, including full payments to the poor knights, and in the accounts for 1491-2, 1492-3, 1493-4 and 1494-5. In the account for 1495-6 the entries were once again reordered, with both of the poor knights’ records placed together, after those of the religious, a system which continued in 1496-7, but had reverted by 1498-9 and 1503-4. During this period the college received no new endowments specifically for the use of the poor knights, and so it appears that Henry VII’s temporary request had become a more permanent fixture of payment after only a few short years.

The college held no obligation to maintain new knights and yet continued to support them, indicating that the college had returned to a state not unlike that before the 1483 parliament. The number of poor knights was kept at three, and those appointed as poor knights were still required to wait for a space to become vacant before they could become residents. It is uncertain whether any ill feeling continued within the college as a consequence of the poor knights’ return.

---

160 SGC, XV.34.62.
161 SGC, XV.34.63, 65-7, 64, 69.
162 Bodleian Library, Berks. Roll 4; SGC, XV.34.70-1; Bodleian Library, Berks. Roll 5.
One poor knight, Lewis Caerleon, in particular is unlikely to have had much grievance with the college, as he had a pre-existing friendship with one of the canons, Christopher Urswick. Caerleon, a prominent physician, mathematician, priest and astrologer, who had trained at both Oxford and Cambridge, had served both Henry VII’s mother, Lady Margaret Beaufort, and Elizabeth Woodville, and was a man immersed in the political intrigue of the Wars of the Roses. Polydore Vergil wrote of Caerleon that ‘because he was a grave man and of no smaule experience’, he was often confided in by both women, and acted as an intermediary in brokering a marriage deal between Henry Tudor and Elizabeth of York, while Elizabeth Woodville was in sanctuary during the ineffective rebellion against Richard III in 1483. Rather than simply passing messages, a job which his high status as physician made easy, Caerleon presented the scheme as his own idea, ‘devysyd of his owne heade’, making it more palatable for both sides. Caerleon was clearly a man heavily linked with the new king and his family, and had been condemned to the tower, in 1484, by Richard III for his treasonous activities. Indeed, his prominence in the high politics of the age has led Carole Rawcliffe to describe him, and another high status medical practitioner, Augustine de Augustinis as ‘not the first physicians to act as diplomats, secret agents and possibly spies’.

As a reward for his services, Caerleon was appointed a poor knight of Windsor by letters patent of 3 August 1488, and took up residency in September 1491, in place of William Stoughton, who died on 10 September. Caerleon attended chapel relatively frequently in his first few years at the college, receiving £7 9s. 8d. in cotidians in the financial year 1491-2 and £4 14s. 4d. in 1492-3 before attending almost every day in

---

163 For Caerleon’s life and career see: Keith Snedegar, ‘Caerleon, Lewis (d. in or after 1495)’, ODNB; Pearl Kibre, ‘Lewis of Caerleon, Doctor of Medicine, Astronomer, and Mathematician (d. 1494?)’, in Isis, 42 (1952), pp. 100-108; Talbot and Hammond, The Medical Practitioners in Medieval England, pp. 203-4; Carole Rawcliffe, ‘More than a Bedside Manner: The Political Status of the Late Medieval Court Physician’ in St George’s Chapel, Windsor, in the Late Middle Ages, ed. By Colin Richmond and Eileen Scarff (Windsor, 2001), pp. 71-91.
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1493-4, when he received £17 16s. 8d. In 1494-5 he received £9 11s., in 1495-6, £16 13s. 4d. and in both 1496-7 and 1498-9 he was granted a full cotidian allowance of £18 5s. Shortly after Caerleon joined the college as a resident poor knight, Christopher Urswick was appointed as a canon of St George’s on 26 January 1492. Caerleon and Urswick had met before and had a pre-existing relationship to their time at Windsor. Polydore Vergil notes that Lady Margaret Beaufort, at the time of Caerleon’s political dealings in 1483, took into her household an ‘honest, approovyd and serviceable priest’, Christopher Urswick. Not only did the two men now both serve in the same household, but Lady Margaret could apparently trust Urswick as he ‘was always a favour of King Henry the vijth’, and had been ‘commendyd to hir by Lewys the physytion’.

Urswick too was involved in spying and diplomacy. Lady Margaret intended to send him to Brittany to inform Henry Tudor of their business, although this plan changed in the wake of Buckingham’s rebellion, after which she chose to send one Hugh Conway instead. Intriguingly, Caerleon may have retained some political connections even after his appointment as a poor knight, in the financial year 1492-3, when he was paid £3 by the college for his expenses working in the king’s negotiations, although no details survive to shed further light on these dealings. Given Urswick and Caerleon’s connection, it is tempting to suggest that the physician had also commended Urswick to a canonry at Windsor, although no evidence survives to substantiate this. Both were present together at Windsor for the next seven years. Urswick was promoted to the deanery on 16 November, and installed 20 November 1496, and Caerleon remained in the treasurers’ accounts until Michaelmas 1499, after which no treasurers’ records survive until 1502. It is impossible to ascertain a definitive level of friendship
between the two, although Caerleon’s commendation is a strong indication that the
two were close, and as such it is likely that the atmosphere at St George’s was a
congenial one.

Another poor knight installed after 1486, who had a more difficult time within the
college, was Peter de Narbonne, barber to Henry VII. Narbonne was appointed a poor
knight by letters patent on 23 January 1493 in place of John Charleton who had died
on 1 January that year.\textsuperscript{175} He was installed at St George’s on 3 February 1493 and
received both \textit{necessaria} and cotidians for the rest of the financial year, amounting to
11s. 4d.\textsuperscript{176} In later years, however, Narbonne was only paid in part. In the financial year
1493-4. Narbonne was paid only his \textit{necessaria}, with no cotidians.\textsuperscript{177} The next year this
was reversed, and he was paid only his cotidians with no \textit{necessaria}, amounting to the
full amount of £18 5s.\textsuperscript{178} He was, however, paid arrears of 58s. for the previous year,
although where these arrears came from is unknown. In 1495-6 he once again received
a full account of cotidian payments, amounting to £18 6s. due to the leap year, but no
\textit{necessaria} payment was forthcoming. In 1496-7 Narbonne was paid £15 9s. for his
cotidians but was once again unpaid in \textit{necessaria}.\textsuperscript{179} In 1498-9, Narbonne was once
again paid full cotidians and \textit{necessaria} for the year, along with 20s. in arrears,
presumably accounting for his stipend for the year before.\textsuperscript{180} In the final year for which
records survive, 1503-4, Narbonne, along with two new poor knights, all received full
cotidian and \textit{necessaria} payments.\textsuperscript{181}

Why then was Peter de Narbonne different? There is no obvious answer why he alone
was subject to only partial payments and had to claim arrears on multiple occasions.
However, a record from the early years of Henry VIII’s reign sheds a small shred of light
on the matter. In this letter, which Fellowes has tentatively dated to c.1509, Henry
acknowledged that the college was under no obligation to pay for Narbonne, and that

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{175} \textit{CPR, 1485-94}, p. 420; SGC, XV.34.66-7.
\item\textsuperscript{176} \textit{Ibid}.
\item\textsuperscript{177} SGC, XV.34.64.
\item\textsuperscript{178} SGC, XV.34.69.
\item\textsuperscript{179} SGC, XV.34.70.
\item\textsuperscript{180} SGC, XV.34.71.
\item\textsuperscript{181} Bodleian Library, Berks. Roll 5.
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he would consider it a personal favour if the college could pay him a pension in his old age of twenty marks, equivalent to his stipend at St George’s. 182 Furthermore, Henry promised that the college would no longer be required to look after any more poor knights, until he had established a foundation to maintain them. Whether Henry meant this as a stop gap - in the same way that his father had - is uncertain. Three appointments were made to poor knights after 1509, which would imply that either the document has been misdated or, more likely, Henry VIII was merely reusing the tried and tested method of stalling while maintaining the use of appointments as a sign of royal patronage. 183 Indeed, Fellowes argues that Henry VIII may have used the appointments of poor knights as mere status symbols, with little financial burden on the college when knights did not take up residence. Peter de Narbonne was the exception to this in Fellowes’ view, as he represented a hangover from Henry VII’s reign, which the new king was required to maintain. 184 The argument, however, is flawed in that it presumes that each appointed poor knight had their own residence within the castle. There had never been more than three poor knights, and three knights’ houses prior to Elizabeth I’s reign, hence the need for each appointment to wait for the previous holder to die in order to take up residency.

The aftermath of 1485 brought an uneasy truce between the poor knights and the chapter of St George’s. In many ways, the state of affairs reverted to that of the college before the 1480s. The college accepted a small number of poor knights, even though they were no longer required, at the king’s command, and neither side pushed the truce. Both friendships and issues of payments may have taken place, but the poor knights remained tentatively balanced. With Henry VIII’s succession, and his promise to not burden the college with more poor knights, the medieval order of the poor knights came to an end. Some appointments were made, as in the aftermath of

182 Fellowes, *Military Knights*, pp. xxiv-xxv; SGC, XI.H.30; Bodleian Library, Ashmole MS 1125, f. 143.
183 John Sigesmond, Bartholomew Westby and Robert Fayrfax were all appointed after 1509, on 2 June 1510, 5 May 1514 and 10 September 1514 respectively. A further poor knight, Robert Harrison is supposed to have also been appointed in 1515, although no evidence survives to prove this: Fellowes, *Military Knights*, p. 14.
Edward IV’s last parliament, but it seems likely that no more of these knights took residency.

Henry VIII, unlike his predecessors, kept his promise to the college. After 1514, no appointments survive for poor knights in the patent roll until the reigns of Mary and Elizabeth. The foundations and grand ambitions laid down by Edward III had ultimately failed, and it required considerable new endowments, known as the ‘New Dotation’, to subsidise the poor knights and increase their numbers to the original grand ambitions. The knights were not doomed from the start. Had the college been fully endowed, the issue of payments would have been null and void from the start. However, enduring financial problems within the college ensured that issues continued beneath the surface, bubbling up from time to time. These frustrations were exacerbated by the anomalous position of the knights in the community. As men with long and successful lay careers, they were never entirely part of the religious community at St George’s, but remained as outsiders. In small numbers, this was tolerable. Mass appointments threatened the careful balance between prayer and patronage, placing a crippling burden on the college’s finances in order to reward royal servants, without a noticeable increase in liturgical celebration.

While the efforts of various kings may not have solved the problem, they did succeed in stalling and providing a compromise at St George’s, which would last until the beginning of the sixteenth century. This allowed the college to fulfil both of its primary functions of prayer and patronage. Even throughout the Tudor period, the lure of the poor knights was too strong: not only did the idea make a strong resurgence under the Tudor queens, but it remained true to its original grand designs. Edward III’s grand designs for an order of poor knights may have lost its way, with modest means. With more grand means however, the plans were set for a charitable order of which England had never seen the likes.
Commemoration of the dead was a crucial aspect of worship and the liturgy enacted in all medieval religious institutions. The medieval belief in Purgatory, discussed at length by Clive Burgess, amongst others, permeated all areas of life, as people, both rich and poor sought to speed their soul’s progress through Purgatory.\(^1\) This process could be ‘initiated and eased by meritorious provision on earth by, for instance, intercession, alms-giving and the celebration of masses’.\(^2\) As this thesis has argued, one of the primary functions of St George’s was to provide prayers for the founder and the royal family, as well as patronage for royal servants. The entire college and chapel was thus a large-scale chantry foundation from the start, providing masses to speed the progress of Edward III’s soul, and those of his family. Chantries have been the subject of most of the literature concerning commemoration, but they were just one type of celebration which could take place. The anniversary was one such service which could speed the progress of the soul after death, and it is this form of commemoration which will be considered in this chapter. Anniversaries involved the entire community - rather than individual priests - forming a corporate commemoration within a larger chantry foundation. The bulk of previous literature on this subject has focused primarily on personal piety - most notably provisions made in wills and the foundation of chantry chapels - rather than annual anniversaries for the dead. As Burgess has noted, ‘while the chantry has been the subject of sustained scrutiny, examination of the anniversary is long overdue’\(^3\). This chapter will focus primarily on obits and annual community commemoration at St George’s, not the grand chantry structures and foundations.


\(^2\) Clive Burgess, ‘“By Quick and by Dead”: Wills and Pious Provision in Late Medieval Bristol’, in English Historical Review, 102 (1987), p. 838.

which have been studied in detail elsewhere. As Kathleen Wood-Legh argues, ‘chantries came into existence as a sort of extension of anniversaries... [where] if, for any reason, a chantry came to an end, the anniversary was usually nevertheless continued’. By the fifteenth century, as Burgess notes, ‘the two services fulfilled different and complementary functions’. The chantry ‘exploited the Mass while the anniversary was a commemorative rite, a public statement of an individual’s need for intercession’ [my italics]. Obits involved the entire collegiate community, as a public event, bringing all of the groups discussed in this thesis together. They provided both of the college’s primary functions, of prayer and patronage, within an intimate and exclusive environment.

Obit ceremonies, marking the annual anniversary of an individual’s death, have been little studied despite a wealth of evidence surviving for many leading religious houses. Indeed, the lack of historiography on these anniversaries led David Lepine in 2008 to lament that, ‘the humble obit has often been overlooked in studies of medieval piety and commemoration, with the notable exception of Clive Burgess’s study of late medieval Bristol’. For Lepine, this discrepancy was unmerited, considering that obits

---


5 Wood-Legh, Perpetual Chantries in Britain, p. 4.
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were ‘the most widespread form of religious commemoration undertaken in the middle ages, so numerous as to be beyond quantification’.⁹ Indeed, as Burgess notes, ‘it seems ironic that the chantry, a relatively unobtrusive celebration, has attracted historians’ attention, while for all its ceremony the anniversary has attracted virtually none’.¹⁰ This chapter seeks to remedy this situation, and forms part of recent efforts to provide a more detailed study of obits, and anniversaries of the dead, in late-medieval England.¹¹

Statutes

The college’s statutes made provisions for the commemoration of the dead at St George’s. These were first and foremost concerned with the royal family. The statutes ordered that,

‘when our aforesaid sovereign lord the King or lady the Queen Consort, or the firstborn son of the same...shall have withdrawn from this world, the names of the same shall be written in all the missals and in the martyrology of the said Chapel in perpetual memory thereof and the anniversaries of their deaths shall year by year for evermore be celebrated’.¹²

Bishop William Edington, the author of the foundation statutes, included himself alongside the royal family, and also made provision for ‘any one of those who have conferred or shall confer in future immoveable goods or possessions upon the said College’.¹³ Any individuals ‘prompted by devotion’, who ‘will to make a disposition for the health of their own souls’ could found an obit at St George’s. Details of these anniversaries were to be recorded by the college, particularly:

⁹ Lepine, “Their Name Liveth for Evermore?”, p. 58.
¹¹ As well as the work of Clive Burgess and David Lepine discussed above, other recent efforts have taken place to assess the commemoration of the dead in leading religious institutions. Most notable of these are Marie-Hélène Rousseau’s work on St Paul’s Cathedral, London (and ongoing work by Elizabeth Biggs on St Stephen’s College, Westminster): Marie-Hélène Rousseau, Saving the Souls of Medieval London: Perpetual Chantryes at St Paul’s Cathedral, c.1200-1548 (Farnham, 2011).
¹² Statutes and Injunctions, p. 12.
¹³ Ibid.
‘the manner and the form of the institution of the aforespecified, and the names of the persons on whose behalf hereafter they are to be performed, and also out of what property and to what extent they are bound to be maintained’.  

The college’s martyrology does not survive, and we have only a handful of details concerning obits founded at St George’s. It was important for the college to keep detailed documentation for each new foundation, in order to preserve the founder’s wishes and ensure that their anniversary continued. Little of this evidence, however, survives. The statutes stipulated that obits should take place on the actual anniversary of the individual’s death, ‘if it can conveniently be done, but otherwise on another day the nearest following on which no impediment shall occur’. Attendance at obits was only obligatory on the anniversaries of Edward III, his wife Queen Philippa, his son Edward of Woodstock, and Bishop William Edington. On those occasions, ‘each and every of the Canons of the said Chapel and the Vicars and Clerks…in their apparel’ were to be present. Attendance at these four anniversaries brought the reward of double cotidians, but absence was punished. Resident canons were fined 5s. for non-attendance, vicars 2s., and the dean was fined 10s. on each occasion he was not present. At regular obits there was no fine for absence, but payment was only made: ‘to those who shall have been present from the beginning to the end of the Evensong for the Vigil, as well as at the whole of the Mattins [sic] and Mass for the Dead that are to be sung or said in the said Chapel on behalf of those for whom they are ordered’.  

Anniversary celebrations took place over two days, starting with exequies of the vigil. Commemoration consisted of ‘with few exceptions, a repetition of the rites
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17 Robert Darell, for example was fined 12d. for missing the vigil of Queen Philippa’s anniversary in 1469, and William Cokkys was fined 5s. for missing the entire anniversary of the same queen in 1480, which was described by the treasurer, Thomas Passhe, as a voluntary absence (pro voluntaria absencia): SGC, XV.34.56; XV.34.57. For Darell’s absence, also see above, p. 157.  
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accompanying – or, more strictly, preceding – the interment of the body after death’. As Burgess has noted, ‘those who paid for the latter [anniversaries] sought to stimulate the continual intercession of the living by the careful repetition of their own funeral service at least once a year’. Commemoration generally included both Placebo and Dirige on the eve, with a Requiem Mass the next day, although individual specifications could be made by founders. Interestingly, the statutes make no mention of the college’s poor knights or the Knights of the Garter. As this chapter will demonstrate, Garter Knights founded a significant portion of the fifteenth-century anniversaries, yet the statutes placed no obligation on the college to establish or attend these obits.

Evidence

No definitive register, such as a martyrology or obit book, survives from the fifteenth or early-sixteenth centuries to provide a comprehensive list of the anniversaries celebrated at St George’s. The extensive collection of extant treasurers’ rolls from this period, however, present details of payments for commemoration for each year in which the rolls survive. The treasurer was required to make payments to members of the college for their attendance at obits, which were recorded in his annual account. Each roll therefore contains a detailed section of obit payments, which provide specific information for each obit celebration. Entries include: the name of the person being commemorated; the day on which the obit took place; the number of canons, vicars, clerks, choristers and bell-ringers present; and how much was paid out. On some occasions, the names of individual canons were included, and some entries include details of how any excess was distributed.

From this information it is possible to identify the number of obits celebrated at St George’s, how this changed over time, and who was being commemorated. The treasurers’ rolls are supplemented by a file of thirty-three obit bills covering all anniversaries held in the financial year 1477-8. These records are individual bills of payment for each anniversary, which were later copied into the treasurer’s account.

---

after they had been paid. A further obit bill survives from 1502, alongside a handful of land and property grants to establish anniversaries, which provide further relevant evidence.

**Establishing an Anniversary**

Any pious individual, concerned for their soul’s progress through Purgatory, could endow an obit at St George’s. Anniversaries were not free, and any such benefactor was required to provide ‘immoveable goods or possessions’ to sustain their obit in perpetuity. This endowment could come either as a monetary settlement, or from the rent of a property given to the college. A significant sum of money was required to celebrate an obit annually for a prolonged period. As discussed in Chapter 1, attendance by the dean or a canon at each anniversary generally brought the reward of 12d. (the daily cotidian rate), if he attended the full obit, and 6d. for partial attendance. Likewise, the rest of the college’s religious community were granted an extra full day’s wage to take part in the anniversary celebrations. The vicars received 5¼d. for attendance, the clerks 2½d., the choristers 2d., and three bell-ringers were paid 2d. each for their efforts.

Anniversaries which had been endowed with the rent from a property, rather than a grant of money, often brought in more than was required. As rents varied year on year, the reserves of money available for each obit varied. From this surplus (when it was available), the college was often required to dedicate a small sum to alms-giving, dependent on the founder’s stipulations. On most occasions, twelve poor individuals were given a penny each in alms in the course of the obit, although there is no indication in the Windsor records of how this took place. Any money left over after alms-giving was shared between the canons present at the anniversary, providing a

---

21 Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ashmole MS 1763, ff. 41-2 (originally Ashmole MS 1296). Roberts suggests that this system of producing individual bills for each anniversary may have been in use during the fourteenth century, but that this is unlikely. She instead proposes that ‘a register similar to that of ordinary chapel attendances was kept for obits and was used by the treasurer both as an authority for payment and as a receipted record’: Roberts, *Saint George’s, 1348-1416*, p. 67.


23 *Statutes and Injunctions*, p. 12.

24 See Chapter 1.
lucrative extra source of income for residents. Grants in the form of property also, however, had their problems. Money collected from obit endowments was not part of the college’s central fund. As a consequence, if rents did not materialise, for one reason or another, the anniversary could not be sustained.

Problems

Land or property transactions for the foundation of an obit could easily cause the college problems, as they attempted to secure rents after the founder’s death. An early example of post-mortem difficulties can be seen in 1456-8, when the college attempted to establish an obit for a local man, one Richard Smith. After Smith’s death, probably on 1 March 1455, two Chancery cases were begun against John Browne and HenryFraunceys, feoffees of the deceased.25 One of these petitions was from the dean and canons of St George’s, who sought the manor of Amerys, Berks., which, they claimed, should have passed to them after Smith’s death.26 The college argued that this manor had been provided to them in order to ‘fynd an Obite for the seid Richard yerely in the Chapell for evermore’.27 The Dean and Canons were quick to use powerful political connections to help their case. Two Knights of the Garter, Ralph Boteler, Lord Sudley, and John Beauchamp, Lord Beauchamp of Powick, were named in the group retrieving the estate, along with three canons, Thomas Manning, Thomas Passhe and William Mitchell.28 A second petition came from Smith’s daughter (and sole heir) Christine, and her husband Roger Fassenham, the bailiff of New Windsor.29 Fassenham and his wife claimed lands and tenements in New Windsor and also complained

25 TNA, C1/26/332; C1/26/335; SGC, XV.2.17; XV.58.C.2; Bodleian Library Ashmole MSS 1126, f. 31v; History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished articles on Roger Fasnam and Henry Fraunceys for 1422-1504 section by Linda S. Clark and Matthew Davis. I am grateful to the History of Parliament Trust for allowing me to see these articles in draft. Smith’s obit was later celebrated on 1 March, which was probably the day he died.
26 TNA, C1/26/335.
27 Ibid.
28 Ibid. Thomas Passhe and William Mitchell had both served as the college’s treasurer or steward in previous years and it is probable that they were acting in an official capacity when receiving these lands: SGC, XV.34.43; XV.34.46; XV.48.21. In later years, the college appointed lay individuals to collect the rents from obit endowments. Few accounts survive for individuals such as one Thomas Hunt, who collected obit rents between 1495 and 1498, to establish how common this was. Certainly by 1512, it was once again the steward who retrieved endowments and rents: SGC, XV.61.15-18.
29 TNA, C1/26/332. Roger Fassenham was identified as bailiff of Windsor when witnessing five property transactions between 1455-7: SGC, XV.45.196; XV.45.197; XV.45.199; XV.45.202, XV.45.207.
against the feoffees, John Browne and Henry Fraunceys, although they added a third, William Heyward. These lands, which should have been transferred to Fassenham on the occasion of Smith’s death, had been retained by the feoffees; so too had the manor of Amerys.

The initial outcome of both petitions is unknown. No mention survives in the college’s records of the manor of Amerys, Bucks., although such evidence may be lost to time. By 25 June 1458, however, Fassenham and his wife had recovered Smith’s lands in New and Old Windsor, with royal licence, which they granted to the college to endow Richard’s obit.\(^\text{30}\) It is probable that these lands were in lieu of the rent from the manor of Amerys. They were certainly sufficient to sustain Smith’s obit, which was first recorded on 1 March 1460.\(^\text{31}\)

The grant of lands in New and Old Windsor were to provide for the annual obit of Richard Smith, and also for his wife Alice. The grant took the form of an indenture, so that if the college neglected Smith’s obit, the lands would be revoked. In this eventuality, the rents would instead pass to Thomas Synnette and Thomas Baker, wardens of the Holy Trinity fraternity in the parish church of John the Baptist, New Windsor. The wardens would then hold the anniversary, rather than the college, and hold the lands themselves. The indenture seems to have provided a measure of security for this endowment, as Smith’s anniversary was celebrated regularly. His wife, Alice, was less fortunate, as she was rarely remembered alongside her husband. On one occasion, she was even recorded in the treasurer’s roll as ‘Joan’, perhaps implying that the college’s martyrrology was not as comprehensive as it should have been.\(^\text{32}\)

The obit for John Arundel, dean of St George’s 1419-54, and the compiler of the college’s ‘White Book’, provides a different example of post-mortem difficulties. In 1453, he granted the college an annual rent of forty shillings from the manor of Thurgarton Hall in Suffolk, in order to celebrate his obit for ten years.\(^\text{33}\) Arundel died on

\(^{30}\) SGC, XV.58.C.2.

\(^{31}\) SGC, XV.34.47. No treasurer’s accounts for the year 1458-9 survives, so it is uncertain whether this celebration took place in March 1459, although this is probable.

\(^{32}\) SGC, XV.34.60.

\(^{33}\) SGC, XV.58.C.1.
8 January 1454, and his obit was listed amongst the anniversaries for that year. 34 A manuscript note attached to the roll suggests, however, that this was not a straightforward matter. 35 The note records that the treasurer paid 66s. to one John Hankyn, chaplain, in part payment of £66 13s. 4d., to celebrate masses for the soul of John Arundel. 36 This change had been made by one of the canons, William Mitchell, then serving as president of the college in the absence of a dean, and by John Mildendale, a lay clerk of St George’s. Rather than establishing an obit for Arundel, the college had instead founded a chantry for the former dean, celebrating his anniversary in only the first year. It is uncertain what caused this change, whether it was Arundel’s own choice, or simply the work of his executors. The example, however, demonstrates that the provisions made in life may not always have been realised after a founder’s death. Once the new chantry had been established, it continued until c.1463, but no further obits were celebrated for Arundel by the college community, having been abandoned after a one-off anniversary. 37

Who was Commemorated?

The treasurer’s account for 1471-2 records thirty-three anniversaries celebrated in St George’s throughout the year. By 1503-4 the number of annual celebrations held in the chapel had risen to fifty-seven. These obits have been tabulated below, with post-1478 endowments – those made in the new St George’s chapel - indicated with italics.

---

34 SGC, XV.34.46; XV.59.4; Fasti Wyndesorienses, pp. 29-30.
35 SGC, XV.34.46.
36 SGC, XV.59.4. The sum of £66 13s. 4d. was intended to pay for ten years of commemoration, and was referred to in subsequent treasurer’s accounts, when a new chaplain, John Morteram received £6 13s. 4d. annually until c.1463 when the money ran out: SGC, XV.34.47-50.
37 Ibid.
Table 7: Obits Celebrated in St George’s Chapel, Michaelmas 1471- Michaelmas 1504

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Day of Anniversary in the Fifteenth Century</th>
<th>Date of Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Wygryme</td>
<td>Canon</td>
<td>6 October</td>
<td>5 October 1468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Edington</td>
<td>Bishop (Winchester)</td>
<td>8 October</td>
<td>7 October 1366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Brewster</td>
<td>Canon</td>
<td>3 November</td>
<td>3 November 1465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brydbroke</td>
<td>Canon</td>
<td>10 November</td>
<td>10 November 1444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert de Vere, duke of Ireland</td>
<td>Knight of the Garter</td>
<td>20 November</td>
<td>22 November 1392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Beauchamp, earl of Warwick</td>
<td>Knight of the Garter</td>
<td>27 November</td>
<td>13 November 1369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Chapman</td>
<td>Vicar</td>
<td>29 November</td>
<td>29 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph/Richard Windsor</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>3 December</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Howden</td>
<td>Canon</td>
<td>14 December</td>
<td>14 December 1449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Beaufort, duke of Exeter</td>
<td>Knight of the Garter</td>
<td>31 December</td>
<td>31 December 1426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Katherine of Valois</td>
<td>Royal</td>
<td>03 January</td>
<td>3 January 1437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey Aston</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>14 January</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38 SGC, XV.34.51-71; Bodleian Library, Berks. Roll 4; Bodleian Library, Berks. Roll 5.
39 The actual day on which was flexible and dependent on the liturgical calendar. The college’s foundation statutes made provision for this eventuality, as discussed above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Raundes</td>
<td>Canon</td>
<td>4 February</td>
<td>3 February 1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Mugge</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>21 February</td>
<td>21 February 1381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Smyth</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1 March</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Wellys</td>
<td>Canon</td>
<td>10 March</td>
<td>10 March 1467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry IV</td>
<td>Royal</td>
<td>20 March</td>
<td>20 March 1413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry, duke of Lancaster</td>
<td>Knight of the Garter</td>
<td>23 March</td>
<td>24 March 1361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Been</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>7 April</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Ravendale</td>
<td>Canon</td>
<td>19 April</td>
<td>19 April 1404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne of Bohemia</td>
<td>Royal</td>
<td>7 June</td>
<td>7 June 1394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward of Woodstock</td>
<td>Royal</td>
<td>8 June</td>
<td>8 June 1376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward III</td>
<td>Royal</td>
<td>21 June</td>
<td>20 June 1377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Aiscough</td>
<td>Bishop (Salisbury)</td>
<td>1 July</td>
<td>29 June 1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Mitchell</td>
<td>Canon</td>
<td>5 August</td>
<td>5 August 1463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Blount</td>
<td>Knight of Thomas Beaufort, duke of Exeter</td>
<td>9 August</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bernham</td>
<td>Canon</td>
<td>10 August</td>
<td>10 August 1362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Philippa of Hainault</td>
<td>Royal</td>
<td>17 August</td>
<td>15 August 1369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry V</td>
<td>Royal</td>
<td>31 August</td>
<td>31 August 1422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Hanslap</td>
<td>Canon</td>
<td>13 September</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William, earl of Northampton</td>
<td>Knight of the Garter</td>
<td>16 September</td>
<td>16 September 1360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John, duke of Bedford</td>
<td>Knight of the Garter</td>
<td>17 September</td>
<td>14 September 1435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Wykham</td>
<td>Bishop (Winchester)</td>
<td>28 September</td>
<td>27 September 1404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard, duke of York</td>
<td>Royal</td>
<td>30 December (first appears 1478)</td>
<td>30 December 1460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothers and Sisters of St Anthony’s Hospital, London</td>
<td>Affiliated Religious Institution</td>
<td>12 June (first appears 1479)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne, duchess of Exeter</td>
<td>Royal</td>
<td>12 October (until 1485)/ 12 January/ 12 April / 12 July (first appears 1482)</td>
<td>14 January 1476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Devereux</td>
<td>Devereux Family</td>
<td>10 January (first appears 1483)</td>
<td>9 January 1469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knights of the Garter</td>
<td>Knights of the Garter</td>
<td>4 March (first appears 1483)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Walter Devereux I (and Alice(?) his wife)</td>
<td>Devereux Family</td>
<td>5 March (first appears 1483)</td>
<td>23 April 1459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward IV</td>
<td>Royal</td>
<td>9 October/ 9 January/ 9 April/ 9</td>
<td>9 April 1483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

40 Walter Devereux I’s wife was, in fact, named Elizabeth, and this appears to have been a scribal error. Wives of the deceased were often misnamed in the college’s financial accounts and often neglected entirely: History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished articles on Walter Devereux I and Walter Devereux II for 1422-1504 section by Simon Payling. I am grateful to the History of Parliament Trust for allowing me to see these articles in draft.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Ferrers of Chartley</td>
<td>Devereux Family</td>
<td>13 June</td>
<td>(first appears 1483)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(and Elizabeth his wife)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 June 1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Beauchamp</td>
<td>Bishop (Salisbury)</td>
<td>19 October</td>
<td>(first appears 1483)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 October 1481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward of Middleham</td>
<td>Royal</td>
<td>14 April</td>
<td>(for one year only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 April 1484</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry VI</td>
<td>Royal</td>
<td>22 May</td>
<td>(first appears August 1484 and only celebrated until 1492)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 May 1471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Thomas St Leger</td>
<td>Knight of the Garter/Royal</td>
<td>3 October</td>
<td>(first appears 1485, when on 12 November)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>8 November 1483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Palett</td>
<td>Canon</td>
<td>16 July</td>
<td>(first appears 1490)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before 18 July 1488</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Plummer</td>
<td>Verger</td>
<td>5 November</td>
<td>(first appears 1496)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41 The treasurer’s account for 1483-4 erroneously records that Henry VI’s obit was celebrated on 33 August. This must have been a scribal error for 13 August 1484, when Henry’s body was reinterred at St George’s from Chertsey Abbey: SGC, XV.34.60; Ralph Griffiths, ‘The Burials of King Henry VI at Chertsey and Windsor’ in *St George’s Chapel, History and Heritage*, pp. 104-5.

42 Thomas St Leger was married to Anne, Duchess of Exeter, and together they founded a joint commemoration at St George’s. When St Leger was first commemorated, he took over one of Anne’s four annual anniversaries: SGC, XV.34.61.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date of Appointment</th>
<th>Date of Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Passhe</td>
<td>Canon</td>
<td>14 November</td>
<td>c.1489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hermer</td>
<td>Canon</td>
<td>13 July</td>
<td>11 July 1473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William, Lord</td>
<td>Knight of the Garter</td>
<td>14 June</td>
<td>13 June 1483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Stokes</td>
<td>Canon</td>
<td>1 June</td>
<td>c.1503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Vaughan</td>
<td>Canon</td>
<td>14 June</td>
<td>c.1499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Dene</td>
<td>Archbishop of Canterbury</td>
<td>17 July</td>
<td>15 February 1503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reginald Bray</td>
<td>Knight of the Garter</td>
<td>5 August</td>
<td>5 August 1503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By 1470, thirty-three obits were celebrated annually at St George’s. This number was low in comparison to other leading religious institutions. As David Lepine has demonstrated, Exeter Cathedral celebrated three times as many obits, with over 100 anniversaries in 1466-7 alone. At St Paul’s Cathedral, 122 obits were listed in 1447, while seventy were recorded at Salisbury in c. 1450. Wells Cathedral had closer numbers to those at St George’s, about forty in 1372-3, rising to almost fifty by 1524-5, but was still a more popular choice for commemoration. How, then, can the limited number of anniversary endowments be explained? Edward III’s St George’s Chapel was considerably smaller than the leading cathedrals of the day, yet obits – unlike many

---

43 Lepine, “‘Their Name Liveth for Evermore’?”, pp. 58-74. Also cf. the notes cited above.
44 Ibid., p. 73; Guildhall Library, London, MSS 25, 520, 25, 511; Ceremonies and Processions of the Cathedral Church of Salisbury, ed. by C. Wordsworth (Cambridge, 1901), pp. 231-42.
chantry foundations – required no extra space within the chapel. Windsor, however, represented an exclusive setting, for a privileged few, rather than for the many. St George’s did not serve a capital city or a diocese like St Paul’s or Exeter and could thus afford to limit its numbers in order to preserve exclusivity. The thirty-three anniversaries recorded by 1470 can be distinguished into five distinct groups. Twelve obits were for former members of the college (including one dean and one vicar). Seven anniversaries were celebrated for deceased members of the royal family. Seven were also in place for former Knights of the Garter (including, on one occasion, for a retainer), while three obits were celebrated for bishops: one of Salisbury and two of Winchester. The final four anniversaries celebrated at St George’s were for prominent locals, such as the aforementioned Richard Smyth, who chose the college for posthumous commemorations. This was an exclusive, not an inclusive environment for commemoration.

Given St George’s status as a royal college and chapel, it comes as no surprise that royal obits formed a significant proportion of those celebrated. The anniversaries of Edward III, Queen Philippa and Edward of Woodstock had been enshrined in college statutes, and future kings followed suit. In the same vein, the celebration of obits for the Knights of the Garter is to be expected, given their strong connection with the chapel, despite not being named in the statutes. Interestingly, the former religious members of St George’s College, who were commemorated within the chapel were not the high-flying absentee sinecurists established in Chapter 1. Instead, they were men who had served the college for a prolonged period: of the eleven canons (including the dean) who had obits established, only one had held his canonry for less than eleven years.46

This, then, was a select group of individuals, commemorated within the distinguished setting of Edward III’s chapel. The intimacy of the chapel may have been further established by its position within Windsor Castle. It is uncertain how much, if any, access was available for the local community to attend obits. As a royal free chapel, St

46 Robert Ravendale held his position at Windsor for five years, although he is known to have served as treasurer in two of these years: Fasti Wyndesorienses, p. 82.
George’s was extra-parochial and thereby served limited numbers of people. Commemoration was thus qualitative, not quantitative. Obits in parish churches, such as those analysed by Burgess, were public statements of ceremony. Celebrations at St George’s may have been statements, but were more intimate affairs focused on a select community. Most of those who were commemorated are known to have had strong connections to the chapel and its community, either through royal status, Garter connections or as a result of long-term residence, and wanted to be remembered by their peers and their successors.

Of the thirty-three anniversaries celebrated in 1470, twenty had been endowed in the fifteenth century and thirteen dated from the fourteenth century. Eight of the fourteenth-century individuals who founded obits were founding members of the collegiate community. As discussed above, the college’s statutes specified annual anniversaries for Edward III, Prince Edward and Queen Philippa, as well as William Edington. In addition to these royal and episcopal endowments, two founder Knights of the Garter were remembered, and two of the first collegiate appointments. There was therefore a strong emphasis on the founder-generation of Edward III’s college, and a real sense of history in the college’s annual commemorations. Later kings, queens and Garter knights supplemented this tradition, associating themselves with the chapel’s founders in the process.

---

47 Ibid., pp. 190-1.
48 Unfortunately it is often difficult to exactly trace connections between the locals who endowed obits and the college, as little evidence survives. For a limited assessment of connections between St George’s Chapel and the town of Windsor, see David Lewis, ‘St George’s Chapel and the Medieval Town of Windsor’, in St George’s Chapel: History and Heritage, pp. 56-62.
49 The following anniversaries began in the fourteenth century: Edward III, Prince Edward of Woodstock, Queen Philippa of Hainault, William Edington, Robert de Vere, Thomas Beauchamp, earl of Warwick, Ralph/Richard Windsor, Geoffrey Aston, William Mugge, Henry, duke of Lancaster, Queen Anne of Bohemia, Robert Bernham, and William, earl of Northampton.
50 Statutes and Injunctions, p 12.
51 The two Founder Knights of the Garter were Henry, duke of Lancaster, and Thomas, earl of Warwick. Dean William Mugge and one of the canons, Robert Bernham also founded anniversaries in Edward III’s new chapel. Mugge was technically not the first dean of St George’s. John de la Chambre had been appointed in 1348 but died the following year and Mugge was appointed in his place. Thus, at the time of the college’s institution, Mugge was the first dean: Roberts, St George’s Chapel, 1348-1416, pp. 30-4, 116-8, 242; Fasti Wyndesorienses, pp. 23-4.
The college’s royal, Garter and episcopal obit foundations were generally spread across both the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, with new obits founded regularly. In comparison, the anniversaries of college members are more clustered. Ten of the twelve date from the fifteenth century, the only such fourteenth-century foundations being those of the early appointees discussed above. As the college developed throughout the fifteenth century, the dean and canons increasingly appear to have commemorated their own, a practice which was also demonstrated by a rise in the number of brasses and burials within the chapel.\(^{52}\) It is important to note, however, that the celebration of an obit within St George’s was not a prerequisite for burial in the chapel. Richard Raundes, for example, chose to be buried in Windsor’s parish church, after his death in 1400, and yet established an obit to be celebrated at St George’s Chapel.\(^{53}\)

It is possible that the sparse number of fourteenth-century canons commemorated within St George’s during the late-fifteenth century is, in some ways, a trick of the light. As Roberts has demonstrated, at least two fourteenth-century anniversaries were established, only to be discontinued some years after the recipients’ death. John de la Chambre, a former dean of St George’s, before the college’s formal institution, died on 1 June 1349, and his first obit was recorded in 1362.\(^{54}\) Chambre’s anniversary was kept by his successor to the deanery, William Mugge, but only until Mugge’s own death in 1381.\(^{55}\) Thomas Buttiler (dean of St George’s 1389-1402), who died on 11 June 1402, also endowed an anniversary in the chapel to be celebrated annually.\(^{56}\) Buttiler’s obit, however, lasted only four years, and was not observed after 1408.\(^{57}\) These anniversaries were probably only intended to endure for a fixed period of time, as in the case of Dean Arundel.

\(^{54}\) Roberts, St George’s Chapel, 1348-1416, pp. 116-8, 242.
\(^{55}\) Ibid., p. 242.
\(^{56}\) Ibid., p. 242; Fasti Wyndesorienses, pp. 26-7.
\(^{57}\) Roberts, St George’s Chapel, 1348-1416, p. 242.
It is probable that some anniversary celebrations took place for which records do not survive. A sole entry for the anniversary of John of Gaunt demonstrates how easy it can be to miss obits for the years in which treasurer’s rolls do not survive. The account for 1425-6 notes that an obit took place for John, duke of Lancaster, on 9 February 1426.\textsuperscript{58} John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, had died on 3 February 1399, but no anniversaries are known to have been held in his father’s chapel before or after 1426.\textsuperscript{59} This commemoration was probably put in place by one of Gaunt’s illegitimate children, Thomas Beaufort, duke of Exeter. Beaufort, whose health was failing by 1426, died on 31 December and founded his own anniversary in St George’s Chapel.\textsuperscript{60} It is uncertain whether Beaufort intended the anniversary to be a one-off, or if he intended it to be celebrated alongside his own. The example, however, demonstrates the ease with which an obit could be lost from the modern historian’s view with the loss of a single manuscript.

Those individuals whose anniversaries were celebrated in St George’s Chapel by the 1470s were a select group, commemorated by the college community within the intimate setting of Edward III’s chapel. These celebrations were public ceremonies but within a private setting. Edward IV’s grand rebuilding works, from 1476, changed this. The increased size of the new chapel, most notably the massive vaulted nave, provided space for an increased spectacle and attracted the patronage of influential individuals. Just as Edward III’s chapel commemorated those involved in its foundation, so Edward IV could provide for his loyal supporters.

**The New St George’s Chapel**

Grand building works at St George’s brought the promise of further endowments. The new chapel, built on a far grander scale than Edward III’s building, was intended as a centre of Yorkist commemoration, in which Edward IV himself was to be buried. Between 1478 and 1504, as the new chapel was still being built, the number of

\textsuperscript{58} SGC, XV.34.35. This was not a mistake for Henry, duke of Lancaster, whose obit had been celebrated since 1371. Both entries record different sums paid and different dates.

\textsuperscript{59} Simon Walker, ‘John, duke of Aquitaine and duke of Lancaster, styled king of Castile and León (1340–1399)’, *ODNB*; Roberts, *St George’s Chapel, 1348-1416*, p. 242; SGC, XV.34.31-55; XV.59.4.

\textsuperscript{60} G. L. Harriss, ‘Beaufort, Thomas, duke of Exeter (1377–1426)’, *ODNB*. See above, Table 4.
anniversaries rose dramatically, from thirty-three in the 1470s to fifty-seven by the end of the financial year 1503-4. The first of the new endowments appear in the treasurer’s account for 1478-9. Obits were celebrated on 30 December 1478 for Richard, duke of York, and on 12 June 1479 for the brothers and sisters of St Anthony’s, London. Neither had been celebrated in the previous year. It is possible, however, that both obits may have been founded as early as 1476. In July 1476, Edward IV went to great lengths to have his father, the duke of York exhumed from a modest grave in Pontefract and reinterred in grand fashion at the Yorkist college at Fotheringhay. The foundation of an obit at St George’s was clearly part of Edward’s strategy to commemorate his father, which was an ongoing process. As late as 1482, the king provided a substantial sum, some £100, to complete a monument marking Richard’s resting place at Fotheringhay. St Anthony’s, London, had also been granted to the college in October 1476, when the college received £98 in revenue from the hospital. This benefaction must have included provision for the foundation, now lost, of a perpetual anniversary for the deceased brothers and sisters of St Anthony’s to be celebrated at St George’s. Both anniversaries may have been founded in 1476, but it is possible that they were not put into place until the new chapel was up and running. Later obit foundations explicitly stated that the celebrations were to take place in the new chapel, but in 1476 building works had only just begun.

Further endowments were recorded in the treasurer’s account for 1482-3, when eleven new anniversaries were celebrated throughout the year. Obits were recorded on 19 October 1482 for Richard Beauchamp, dean of St George’s and bishop of Salisbury, and on 4 March 1483 for deceased members of the Order of the Garter.

---

61 SGC, XV.34.55.
62 SGC, XV.34.54.
65 Evans, ‘Years of Arrears’, p. 104.
67 SGC, XV.34.79.
Beauchamp, as dean of St George’s was also made master and surveyor of the king’s works for the new chapel, and the new building works were very much his doing.
Anniversaries were set up for five members of the Devereux family by Walter Devereux, Lord Ferrers of Chartley, who endowed three separate celebrations for the deceased members of his family at some point before 1483. Devereux’s father, Walter Devereux (d. 22/3 April 1459), was commemorated annually on 5 March from 1483 alongside his wife. His first wife, Anne (d. 9 January 1469), had an obit on 10 January, while her father, Sir William Ferrers of Chartley (d. 9 June 1450), and his wife Elizabeth (d. 28 May 1471), had their anniversary on 13 June. A chantry foundation was provided at the same time.
Endowments in the new St George’s Chapel could take a different form to obits in the old chapel, particularly if associated with a chantry foundation. Each anniversary foundation stipulated the terms of its celebration, as a result of which there was the possibility of variety in payment and liturgical practice, encompassing the latest fashions. This was the case with two royal anniversaries first celebrated in 1482-3: Anne, duchess of Exeter, and the king himself, Edward IV. The king’s sister Anne (d. 14 January 1476) established four obits in her brother’s new chapel, to be celebrated annually - on 12 October, January, April and July - alongside a chantry on the north side of the new chapel, now the Rutland Chantry. Edward IV’s death was also commemorated with quarterly obits. The treasurer’s account for 1482-3 records anniversaries on 6 May 1483, when Edward was interred in Windsor, and again on 9 July. From Michaelmas 1483 obits were celebrated for the king on 9 October, January, April and July annually.
These commemorations provided for differing payments. The obits held in October, January and July provided extra payments to the college community, 20d. for each canon attending, rather than 12d., and similarly increased wages for the lesser

69 SGC, XV.34.60.
70 SGC, XV.34.59.
71 SGC, XV.34.59.
72 SGC, XV.34.60.
members of the college. This was not the first incidence of increased payments for attendance – the same rate was applicable at all the Devereux anniversaries and the services for the Order of the Garter – and may have indicated a desire to demonstrate the pre-eminence of commemoration within the grand new chapel. There was also an even higher rate for celebrating the life of the new chapel’s founder. Edward IV’s main obit was celebrated on the actual anniversary of his death, 9 April, and provided substantial extra provision for a grand spectacle. In April 1484, for example, payments to those celebrating the anniversary of Edward’s death came to the sum of £7 3s. 4d. 73 Each canon who attended received 5s., the vicars 2s. 6d. each, the clerks 20d. each and the choristers 10d. Other chaplains and individuals were paid to augment the spectacle. The king’s chantry chaplain, one Master Hamden, was paid the same rate as the vicars, four chaplains were paid 20d., and a further four chaplains 12d.. The verger was present, and received 20d., alongside the clerk of the vestibule and the under-clerk, who were paid 16d. and 10d. respectively. One of the clerks, John Frances, was paid an extra 12d. for his efforts, while bell ringers received 12d. each, and 20s. was shared amongst the poor. Even the poor knights were included in the commemoration of Edward IV’s death, receiving 20d. for a regular obit, and 2s. 6d. for the main celebration. 74

Two further royal anniversaries were celebrated in 1484. 75 Prince Edward of Middleham, Richard III’s son, received an obit on 14 April (discontinued after Bosworth), and the reinterment of Henry VI was commemorated in a grand fashion on 13 August. 76 Interestingly, Henry’s obit celebrations saw the same increased rates as Edward IV’s minor obits – 20d. per canon – and also included the poor knights, who received the same amount. This made it the second most expensive anniversary celebrated in 1484, to a total of 54s. 8d. Unfortunately no evidence survives

73 Ibid.
74 By 1498 the poor knights no long featured in Edward’s obits: SGC, XV.34.71; Bodleian Library, Berks. Rolls. 5.
75 SGC, XV.34.60.
76 Prince Edward died in April 1484, and his obit must have been a part of the prince’s funerary celebrations. He is not known to have been commemorated at St George’s after this date, and if any obit had been endowed, this must have been suppressed with Henry VII’s accession in 1485: Ross, Richard III, p. 92.
concerning the manner in which this obit was funded. The college’s efforts to secure Henry VI’s body for reburial at Windsor offered a useful source of income for St George’s, a steady stream of pilgrims and offerings, for which an offertory box was provided.77 It is uncertain whether this revenue stream was used to finance Henry’s obit or simply absorbed into the college’s central finances. The anniversary was short-lived in any case. No record of Henry’s commemoration is found after Michaelmas 1492, perhaps indicating that the money had dried up, and had not been replenished by the college. Henry’s tomb and offertory box survive to the present day, but anniversaries were no longer celebrated in St George’s for the Lancastrian king, possibly as Henry VII planned to move the cult to Westminster.

Obits in the new St George’s remained popular among the college’s community. Thomas Palett (canon 1474-88) was commemorated in the financial year 1489-90, with his obit on 16 July.78 Thomas Passhe (canon 1449-89), William Hermer (canon 1455-73) and John Plummer (verger c.1442-83) all had anniversaries celebrated from 1496-7, on 14 November, 13 July and 5 November respectively.79 The trio also founded a joint chantry, which was to be located in the ‘new church annexed to the free royal chapel’.80 As noted in Chapter 1, it is uncertain when the college officially moved from Edward III’s chapel to the grand new chapel built by Edward IV. At the time of this chantry foundation, the change had clearly not yet been made. Passhe and Hermer, who originally founded the chantry, made sure to establish their commemoration within the grand new church being built. Two further canons were added to the list of obit celebrations in June 1504.81 John Stokes (canon 1486-1503) had his anniversary on 1 June 1504, while John Vaughan (canon 1471-99) was commemorated on 14 June.

78 SGC, XV.34.62.
79 SGC, XV.34.70. For more on Thomas Passhe and William Hermer, see Chapters 1 and 2. For more on John Plummer see Chapter 3; Helen M. Jeffries, ‘The Composer John Plummer and St George’s Chapel’ in St George’s Chapel, Windsor, in the Fourteenth Century, pp. 135-150; Bowers, ‘Musical Establishment’, pp. 195-8.
80 Passhe and Hermer originally founded this chantry, and Plummer later augmented it to include his own commemoration: SGC, XV.58.C.12; XV.58.C.16.
81 Bodleian Library, Berks. Roll 5.
The Knights of the Garter retained their position within the college’s annual obit celebrations. Besides the aforementioned group obit for all deceased members of the Order of the Garter, celebrated on the anniversary of Edward IV’s accession, individual knights continued to endow commemorations in the new chapel. Thomas St Leger, Knight of the Garter, and also the husband of Anne, duchess of Exeter, was commemorated from 12 November 1485. St Leger had been executed as a traitor on 13 November 1483 and his obit was not celebrated at St George’s during Richard III’s reign. Rather than founding a new anniversary, St Leger was given one of his wife’s quarterly obits, as their endowment – both for a chantry and anniversaries – was shared. A further knight, also executed as a traitor by Richard III, was recorded in the treasurer’s account for 1498-9. William Hastings had an obit celebrated in chapel on 14 June 1499, sixteen years after his execution on 13 June 1483. This anniversary, with a corresponding chantry, was established by Hastings’ son, Edward Hastings, who also provided for his own posthumous commemoration, with an obit in December 1504.

A third Knight of the Garter was added to the college’s list of anniversaries on 5 August 1504, albeit an individual far more closely linked to the new chapel. Reginald Bray, who had provided much of the money to finish building the chapel founded both a chantry and an obit in his new chapel, where he intended to be buried. He has been particularly identified with the impressive vaulting in the nave, which prominently features his rebus – a hemp bray – throughout. Before his death, Reginald Bray may also have been behind the establishment of another obit which first appeared in the treasurer’s account for 1503-4. On 17 July 1504, Henry Dene, Archbishop of Canterbury, and a close associate of Bray, may have had his anniversary celebrated in

---

82 Ross, *Richard III*, p. 117.
84 SGC, XV.34.71; XV.C.14-19. No treasurer’s rolls survive after 1504 to establish whether this obit was ever celebrated by the college.
85 Bodleian Library, Berks. Roll 5.
St George’s. Bray had been one of Dene’s executors after his death on 15 February 1503, and it is probable that the establishment of an obit at St George’s was arranged by the knight. Dene’s anniversary was not celebrated on the day of his death, which may suggest an anxiety by Bray - in poor health - to fulfil Dene’s wishes before he died himself. The date chosen may instead have been linked to a particular devotion. 17 July, on which day Dene’s obit was celebrated, was St Kenelm’s day. St Kenelm, a Gloucestershire saint had a shrine at Winchcombe, not far from Llanthony Priory, where Dene served as prior for thirty-five years.

After 1504, no treasurer’s accounts survive until 1541, and it is uncertain which anniversaries were celebrated during this period. As this chapter has demonstrated, obits were not always celebrated immediately after an individual’s death, and could be abandoned if problems occurred. Nevertheless, the significant rise in the number of anniversaries celebrated at Windsor, prompted by the building of Edward IV’s grand new chapel, reinforced the status of St George’s Chapel as a Yorkist mausoleum, which could stage a grander liturgy than had been possible throughout the fourteenth century and much of the fifteenth. It remained, however, a select group of individuals who were celebrated by the collegiate community first and foremost. New liturgical stipulations could promote a larger and more public ceremony, yet St George’s Chapel was still a relatively private space, occupied by the college’s community and – on grand occasions – high status individuals. Commemoration remained an intimate affair - with a high quality of ceremony - and was an important addition to the private masses said in chantries, linking the souls of the dead to their chapel and easing their way through Purgatory.

88 Bodleian Library, Berks. Roll 5; Christopher Harper-Bill, ‘Deane, Henry (c1440-1503)’, ODNB. This may alternatively have been Sir John Donne, who died shortly before 27 January 1503, having married into the Hastings family, who is supposedly buried in the chapel: George Holmes, ‘Donne, Sir John (d.1503)’, ODNB.
90 Harper-Bill, ‘Deane, Henry’.
Conclusion

This thesis has examined the late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century college of St George, assessing the different groups within the collegiate community, and establishing their hierarchies and interactions. It has posed various questions. Can we consider the late-medieval college at Windsor as a homogenous community? Was the college a cohesive and united community, or was it only ever fragmentary? Given successive problems encountered by the community throughout the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries, how was the college able to survive and prosper? As this thesis has demonstrated, discussion must be placed against a backdrop of prolonged economic crisis, dynastic upheaval and disruptive rebuilding campaigns. The college had two discrete functions: to provide prayer and commemoration, and to provide the king with patronage for his servants. Did tensions within the community, which this thesis has identified, prevent the college from fulfilling its functions?

Within the wider college community there clearly existed smaller sub-groups of individuals, each with its distinct set of motives and interests. On occasion these groups clashed with one another, causing problems for the college as a whole. As Chapters 1 and 2 demonstrated, distinctions can be drawn within the wider body of canons. Absentees and residents formed two clear sub-groups, each with their own concerns. In order for the college to fulfil both functions of prayer and patronage, a balance was required in the chapter. In order to provide patronage for royal servants, a certain level of absenteeism was required, which highlights the importance of the college’s other clerical groups. Nigel Saul identified the fourteenth-century canons at St George’s as ‘servants of God and Crown’.¹ This description does not hold for the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries. Absentee pluralists continued to serve the Crown, but at the heart of the chapter there was a core group of resident canons serving the college and, also, themselves. The latter point is of particular significance. Personal motivation, often difficult and fleeting in nature, was important. The canons of St George’s served themselves, first and foremost, whether by appropriating college

funds to repair their own houses, ensuring their commemoration within a prestigious setting, or treating their canonry as a sinecure and mark of royal favour.

Further sub-groups can also be identified. The vicars and clerks formed distinct small communities within the college and chapel. As Chapter 3 argued, these groups jostled for position throughout the fifteenth and into the early sixteenth centuries. Changes in the importance of both groups, with the rise of the polyphony and changing liturgical practices, required the college to create a new position of minor canon, further subdividing the community. The vicars and clerks were not perfect. Disciplinary problems occurred frequently between 1468 and 1479: fights, fines and absence from chapel were common. These problems were not confined to Windsor – vicars across the kingdom were found wanting - and both groups kept up a good attendance throughout the period studied. This was vital to maintaining balance, supporting the resident canons, and fulfilling the college’s first function of providing prayer and commemoration.

The final sub-group, discussed in Chapter 4, was peculiar to St George’s. The poor knights, although rewarded for their service to the Crown, never fulfilled the grand ambitions set out by Edward III. They remained anomalous. On one hand, the knights formed an integral part of the college’s community, attending chapel and providing a focus for alms-giving. At the same time, they were neither part of the college’s religious community, nor solely associated with lay life. Neither fish nor fowl, to have lay knights living and praying within a religious setting, begs the question of whether they were truly part of St George’s. The knights certainly imposed a financial burden on the college. Their semi-detached character, and ongoing conflict with the canons was one factor that caused tensions and posed a challenge to the college’s fulfilment of one of its functions, the rewarding of royal servants. The canons’ opposition to successive royal appointments effectively reduced the king’s patronage at St George’s.

The college’s incorporation in 1483 - without the poor knights - suggests that, by the late- fifteenth century, the knights were no longer considered an important part of the community. Rather, the religious community was composed of the smaller groups identified above. It was this community which came together regularly to
commemorate anniversaries in chapel. The canons, vicars and clerks who officiated in
the divine services in all likelihood saw the poor knights as unnecessary to their daily
work. These clerical groups clashed, and had problems on occasion, but all contributed
to the daily round of offices and the spiritual life of the college, even if the occasional
vicar was sleeping in. The religious elements of St George’s, despite their differences,
came together to promote the college’s privileges, rights and liturgical magnificence,
when they were required to. It is these groups that can be considered as a relatively
homogenous community, living and working together. The poor knights were different,
an extra element, founded as a new idea by Edward III. They were neither an integral
part of the daily running of the chapel, nor did they bring significant political or social
connections for the college. The knights were surplus to requirements and were a
financial burden on the college, yet they also provided a link with the lay world,
connecting St George’s with the broader, secular, castle environment. The scope of
this thesis has been limited to a discussion of the college and its personnel. Future
study of the college’s interactions with the lay communities in Windsor Castle and the
wider world will, it is hoped, provide new insights into the nature of relationships
between ‘sacred and profane’ space at St George’s.

Despite internal tensions, St George’s was capable of functioning as a cohesive whole.
The pursuit of balance became important, in that it allowed the college to fulfil both its
main functions. One example of this was the celebration of anniversaries, when the
college came together to commemorate the dead. These commemorations excluded
the poor knights - with some exceptions – but provided a focal point for community
celebrations, within an exclusive and intimate setting. As a halfway house between the
ancient prebendal cathedral institutions and newer forms of chantry colleges, St
George’s embodied new ideas from Edward III, which could easily have failed when
initial endowments did not arrive in full. Yet the college endured throughout the
course of the fifteenth century, changing and adapting as necessary. Flexibility in
interpreting the fourteenth-century statutes, and adapting practices to allow for new
fashions, allowed St George’s to evolve with the times and to spearhead new ideas.
The college proved not to be shackled by an outdated set of prescriptive rules, but
retained a relative freedom, reinforced by its status as a royal free chapel.
St George’s enjoyed relative freedom from external sources of influence: it was the king’s chapel, run by his chosen men. Management of the college, and the development of new ideas, was not entirely straight forward. A balance was required between the sub-groups of the community in order to allow for a degree of flexibility. This sense of balance was particularly important in the composition of the college’s chapter. If too many residents were present in chapel, the college’s already limited finances were stretched even further, through extra cotidian payments and repairs. On the other hand, if the majority of the chapter were regularly absent, then this compromised the liturgy celebrated daily in chapel. A middle ground was required between competent administrators based at Windsor, and absentees in royal service.

Saul, writing about the fourteenth-century canons, has suggested that ‘the challenge which they faced was that of balancing their employments in government with their intercessory obligations at Windsor’.\(^2\) In the fifteenth century, the same challenge persisted, but was resolved by the balance between two sub-groups amongst the canons, rather than by each individual. Saul, when discussing the fifteenth-century canons, stated that ‘Windsor from now on became the main focus of their activity’.\(^3\) As this thesis has demonstrated, this was only the case for a small and distinct sub-group within the chapter, not the canons or wider collegiate community more generally.

The college’s response to the rise of polyphony and changing liturgical fashions also demonstrates a sense of balance, in resolving problems as they arose. The fourteenth-century statutes could not predict future developments in musical performance or the increased importance of lay clerks to the liturgy. The college, therefore needed to adopt new ideas, while maintaining old traditions. With a small, hard-core group of residents managing the college, it might be expected that liturgical practices would ossify. Instead we find a degree of flexibility. At St George’s this was accomplished by strategies to improve the status of the vicars at the same time as the clerks’. New housing works were one sign of this adjustment, which culminated in the creation of minor canonries, preserving the primacy of the priesthood. Not all the resident community may have been so forward-thinking – the long serving canon Thomas

\(^2\) Ibid.
\(^3\) Ibid.
Passhe had to die before any movement on the minor canons was possible – but a balanced community drove innovation. This indicates a flexible and proactive approach, aiming to control discontent and improve the liturgy.

Perhaps the most difficult balancing act for the dean and canons of Windsor was the preservation of the poor knights as a part of the college. The knights were a liminal part of the wider community, not part of the religious community, and no longer fully grounded in the lay world. They represented a significant burden on the college’s limited funds, which caused discontent and problems throughout the fifteenth century. The poor knights, as a sub-group within the wider collegiate community, however, survived. The dean and canons were never able to rid themselves of this burden, despite achieving corporate status for the religious community of the college. Successive kings were clearly conscious of the usefulness of the poor knights as a means of rewarding loyal servants, and continued to make appointments. Again, a balance was operative: the college could support three knights, and no more, at any one time. When this balance was threatened, for example by Edward IV’s mass appointments in 1481, the college reacted proactively to ensure its security. Maintaining three knights ordinarily kept the king happy, and reduced pressure on the college’s central fund. A flexible approach to grand ambitions in the fourteenth-century statutes allowed more modest realisation of Edward III’s plans, more in line with the reality of limited endowments.

Flexibility, development and astute management ensured that the college remained in a strong position in the late-fifteenth century. This was reinforced with the foundation of a grand new chapel under Edward IV, intended as a grand Yorkist monument. Re-endowments allowed for a grander liturgy within St George’s, and substantially increased the number of individuals seeking commemoration from the collegiate community. It did not, however, alter the composition of this community. The same sub-groups remained at St George’s, and they continued to walk the fine line between balance and disorder. Successive kings after Edward IV continued his policy of appointments, both to the chapter and as poor knights, while the dean and canons maintained order amongst the vicars and clerks. Reforms eventually arrived under
Henry VIII, when the canons were ordered to change a system of housing allocations, which had prevailed for a century and a half. These reforms, however, did not change the overall composition of the college. Instead they merely sought to remedy a monopolisation of housing allocations by the resident canons.

The balance between residents and absentee canons had ensured financial security for St George’s, and seen the college through tough financial times. Edward III’s grand ambitions may not all have been realised, but the college’s flexibility, pro-activity and committed management throughout the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries provided the means for St George’s to flourish. Further endowments and a grand new chapel under Edward IV had set the scene for a grand testament to the achievements of both the houses of York and Tudor. In the Reformation, fifteenth-century efforts to maintain a balance of the college’s main functions of prayer and patronage paid off. Where the new Protestant faith might have done away with the college’s commemorative role, and thus might have threatened its very existence, its place as a home for deserving royal servants allowed it to weather the storm and ensured its survival to the present day.
Appendix 1: Treasurer’s Accounts 1468-1504

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income:</th>
<th>1468-9 (XV.34.56)</th>
<th>1471-2 (XV.34.51)</th>
<th>1474-5 (XV.34.52)</th>
<th>1475-6 (XV.34.53)</th>
<th>1477-8 (XV.34.54)</th>
<th>1478-9 (XV.34.55)</th>
<th>1479-80 (XV.34.57-8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arreragia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£39 13s. ¾d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recepta Denariorum</td>
<td>£508 6s. 4d.</td>
<td>£543 8½d.</td>
<td>£378 7s. 11¼d.</td>
<td>£525 10s. 1d.</td>
<td>£759 1s. 2½d.</td>
<td>£704 6s. 3¼d.</td>
<td>£851 6s. 1½d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recepta Forinsece</td>
<td>£7 17s. 6½d.</td>
<td>8s. 9d.</td>
<td>10s.</td>
<td>26s. 8d.</td>
<td>14s.</td>
<td>£100 6s. 8d.</td>
<td>25s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Received</td>
<td>£516 3s. 10½d.</td>
<td>£543 9s. 4½d.</td>
<td>£378 17s. 11¼d.</td>
<td>£526 16s. 9d.</td>
<td>£759 15s. 2½d.</td>
<td>£844 6s.</td>
<td>£852 11s. 1½d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superplus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£25 18s. 8d.</td>
<td>£65 13s. 11¼d.</td>
<td>£154 4s. 3½d.</td>
<td>£59 14s. 1d.</td>
<td>£7 9s. 7½d.</td>
<td>£3 19s. 6½d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodia</td>
<td>£52 4s. 6½d.</td>
<td>£61 3s. 8½d.</td>
<td>£66 13s. 4d.</td>
<td>£66 13s. 4d.</td>
<td>£66 13s. 4d.</td>
<td>£66 13s. 4d.</td>
<td>£66 13s. 4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpora Prebendarum</td>
<td>£25 17s. ¾d.</td>
<td>£24 19s.</td>
<td>£26</td>
<td>£26</td>
<td>£26</td>
<td>£26</td>
<td>£26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessaria Militum</td>
<td>£5 6s. 11¾d.</td>
<td>£6</td>
<td>£6</td>
<td>£6</td>
<td>£6</td>
<td>£6</td>
<td>£6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The college’s income this year was bolstered by the first income from St Anthony’s Hospital, London.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cotidiana (dean and canons)</td>
<td>£109 19s. 4d.</td>
<td>£107 2s. 2d.</td>
<td>£62 6s.</td>
<td>£51 15s.</td>
<td>£178 10s.</td>
<td>£103 18s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotidiana (poor knights)</td>
<td>£39 13s.</td>
<td>£48 11s.</td>
<td>£53 3s. 8d.</td>
<td>£43 8d.</td>
<td>£35 17s.</td>
<td>£33 2s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicarii</td>
<td>£104</td>
<td>£105 18s. ¾d.</td>
<td>£103 6s. 4¾d.</td>
<td>£101 7s. 8¾d.</td>
<td>£126 2s. 11d.</td>
<td>£117 6s. 7d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerici</td>
<td>£19 19s. 4d.</td>
<td>£16</td>
<td>£16</td>
<td>£32</td>
<td>£73 15s. 3¾d.</td>
<td>£95 17s. 9¾d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Choral Staff</td>
<td>£48 9s. 10d.</td>
<td>£40 10s. 10¾d.</td>
<td>£32 4s. 3d.</td>
<td>£43</td>
<td>£49 19s. ¾d.</td>
<td>£44 1s. 5¾d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipendia, Vadia et Regarda Officiorum</td>
<td>£42 2¾d.</td>
<td>£34 15s. 4d.</td>
<td>£32 7s. 2d.</td>
<td>£32 6s. 2d.</td>
<td>£31 3s. 2d.</td>
<td>£33 12s. 10d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obitus</td>
<td>£29 17s. 7¾d.</td>
<td>£24 18s. 3¾d.</td>
<td>£22 3s. 2¾d.</td>
<td>£23 19s. 11¾d.</td>
<td>£24 18s. 3¾d.</td>
<td>£25 8s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soluciones Pensionum</td>
<td>£15 3s.</td>
<td>£15 3s.</td>
<td>£16 3s. 3d.</td>
<td>£10 3s.</td>
<td>£15 3s.</td>
<td>£17 9s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Cotidian payments for the dean and canons have been roughly edited at audit, and contain a large number of unpaid arrears. It is thus difficult to obtain an exact amount of exactly what was paid this year. The sum shown here has been extrapolated from the total expenditure, and (tentatively) assumes that the treasurer’s accounting is correct. It should therefore be treated with caution.
| Reparaciones Collegii  
(also written as Necessaria) | £31 3s. 2d. | £19 16s. 11¾d. | £10 5s. | £52 1s. 4d. | £8 5s. 11¾d. | £104 10s. 6¾d. | £88 17s. 7¾d. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expensa In Domus Computaria</td>
<td>12s. 9d.</td>
<td>8s. 2d.</td>
<td>8s.</td>
<td>8s.</td>
<td>9s. 11d.</td>
<td>12s. 4d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custus Auditorum</td>
<td>£3 13s.</td>
<td>£3 12s.</td>
<td>£2 16s.</td>
<td>£2 16s.</td>
<td>£3 12s.</td>
<td>£3 12s.</td>
<td>£4 18s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Liberacio Denariorum Precentori 
[et pro expensis capelle]   | £23 | £13 2s. 6d. | £11 3s. ¾d. | £8 16s. 4d. | £14 1d. | £16 4s. 2¾d. | £22 16s. 9d. |
| Total Expenditure             | £533 11s. 2d. | £547 19s. 6½d. | £533 2s. 2¾d. | £654 11s. 10d. | £720 2s. 1¾d. | £719 9s. 8½d. | £810 7s. 8d. |
| Deficit                       | £17 7s. 3d. | £4 10s. 1d. | £154 4s. 4¾d. | £127 15s. 1d. | £8 | £9 | £10 |

3 £10 of this sum was recorded at the end of the account, rather than with the other college's expenses. This was a loan given to the college by Thomas Passhe to aid in a merger with Eton College, and is discussed in Chapter 1. It has been included with the expenses here for ease of reference.

4 This sum includes miscellaneous expenses for the acquisition of St Anthony's Hospital, London, which were grouped separately.

5 This treasurer’s account was the first to include entries for Resolucio Redditis and Feoda et Robe (normally found in the steward’s account), amounting to 28s. 2d. and 75s. 4d. respectively, which have been included here amongst the general expenses.

6 Along with the total sum recorded in each account, the deficit was also noted. This was then paid by the superplus of the following year.

7 A marginal note records that this was paid at the hand of Canon Thomas Passhe, auditor that year.

8 £39 13s. ¾d. was left over after the audit of the treasurer’s account, to be used in the following year.

9 £124 16s. 3¾d. of the surplus this year was deposited in the college’s aerary, in case of future problems, while £41 12s. 1¾d. was to be shared amongst the resident canons. This pay-out to the resident canons may have been somewhat premature, as a surplus was required again the next year in order to continue paying arrears.

10 £40 17s. 5½d. was split between resident canons this year, and it was recorded in the final sum of accounts that a further £13 15s. 7d. had been received from the rent of obit tenements over the course of the year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1483-3 (XV.34.59)</th>
<th>1483-4 (XV.34.60)</th>
<th>1485-6 (XV.34.61)</th>
<th>1489-90 (XV.34.62)</th>
<th>1490-1 (XV.34.63)</th>
<th>1491-2 (XV.34.65)</th>
<th>1492-3 (XV.34.66-7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Arreragia</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Recepta Denariorum</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Recepta Forinsece</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Received</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Superplus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Custodia</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Corpora Prebendarum</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Necessaria Militum</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cotidiana</em> (dean and canons)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cotidiana</em> (poor knights)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vicarii</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 The beginning of this account does not survive, and no details of the treasurer’s income are extant.
12 The account for 1485-6 only partially survives, and is missing both the beginning and end of the roll.
13 The beginning of this account is torn and the details of income do not survive before the total was recorded.
14 Changed from £154 7s. at audit.
15 Changed from £160 18s. 7d. at audit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerici</td>
<td>£136 3s. 3½d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Choral Staff</td>
<td>£117 12s. 6⅔d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipendia, Vadia et Regarda Officiorum</td>
<td>£42 6s. 2d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obitus</td>
<td>£69 10s. 10⅔d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soluciones Pensionum</td>
<td>£19 19s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reparaciones Collegii</td>
<td>£30 3s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensa In Domo Compositis</td>
<td>12s. 4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custus Auditorum</td>
<td>£4 18s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberacio Denariorum Precentor</td>
<td>£19 14s. 1⅓d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>£841 12s. 10⅔d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Choral Staff</td>
<td>£130 3s. 10d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipendia, Vadia et Regarda Officiorum</td>
<td>£128 18s. 6⅔d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obitus</td>
<td>£68 19s. 5⅔d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soluciones Pensionum</td>
<td>£21 3s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reparaciones Collegii</td>
<td>£18 4s. 7d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensa In Domo Compositis</td>
<td>12s. 4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custus Auditorum</td>
<td>£4 18s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberacio Denariorum Precentor</td>
<td>£25 10s. 1⅓d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>£858 10s. 7⅔d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Choral Staff</td>
<td>£111 17s. 3d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipendia, Vadia et Regarda Officiorum</td>
<td>£132 8⅔d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obitus</td>
<td>£65 16s. 7⅔d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soluciones Pensionum</td>
<td>£17 7s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reparaciones Collegii</td>
<td>£78 16s. 5⅖d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensa In Domo Compositis</td>
<td>15s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custus Auditorum</td>
<td>£4 18s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberacio Denariorum Precentor</td>
<td>£17 11s. ⅛d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>£929 15s. 9⅘d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Choral Staff</td>
<td>£138 6s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipendia, Vadia et Regarda Officiorum</td>
<td>£131 4s. 10d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obitus</td>
<td>£71 5s. 5⅔d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soluciones Pensionum</td>
<td>£20 7s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reparaciones Collegii</td>
<td>£8 19s. 2d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensa In Domo Compositis</td>
<td>6s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custus Auditorum</td>
<td>£4 18 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberacio Denariorum Precentor</td>
<td>£33 14s. 3⅘d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>£894 13s. 8⅘d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Choral Staff</td>
<td>£140 8s. 8⅘d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipendia, Vadia et Regarda Officiorum</td>
<td>£127 6s. 2⅖d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obitus</td>
<td>£67 5s. 7d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soluciones Pensionum</td>
<td>£17 16s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reparaciones Collegii</td>
<td>£28 17s. 11⅛d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensa In Domo Compositis</td>
<td>7s. 3d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custus Auditorum</td>
<td>£4 18 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberacio Denariorum Precentor</td>
<td>£34 6s. 10⅛d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>£927 12s. 7d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 Changed from £22 9s. 3d. at audit.
17 £222 13s. 2⅕d. was recorded as the surplus this year. The account notes how this residue was utilised. Of the surplus, £91 4s. was from the absenteeism of canons. This left a remainder of £131 9s. 2⅕d., from which a third (£43 16s. 5d.) was deposited in the aerary. This left a total of £178 16s. 9⅚d., which was split between the resident canons.
18 There is no record of how the surplus of 8s. 10⅛d. was utilised.
19 £9 6s. 7⅖d. of the surplus this year was paid to Canon Baily, who completed the account after the treasurer’s death that year.
### Income:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1493-4 (XV.34.64)</th>
<th>1494-5 (XV.34.69)</th>
<th>1495-6 (Berk. Roll 4)</th>
<th>1496-7 (XV.34.70)</th>
<th>1498-9 (XV.34.71)</th>
<th>1503-4 (Berk. Roll 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arreragia</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recepta Denario</strong></td>
<td>£1026 3s. 9d.</td>
<td>£1086 16s. 11d.</td>
<td>£1068 3s. 10½d.</td>
<td>£1011 14s. 10d.</td>
<td>£1071 7s. 2½d.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recepta Forinsece</strong></td>
<td>13s. 4d.</td>
<td>13s. 4d.</td>
<td>26s. 8d.</td>
<td>13s. 4d.</td>
<td>20s.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Received</strong></td>
<td>£1026 17s. 1d.</td>
<td>£1087 10s. 3d.</td>
<td>£1069 10s. 6d.</td>
<td>£1012 8s. 2d.</td>
<td>£1072 7s. 2½d.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1493-4</th>
<th>1494-5</th>
<th>1495-6</th>
<th>1496-7</th>
<th>1498-9</th>
<th>1503-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superplus</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Custodia</strong></td>
<td>£66 13s. 4d.</td>
<td>£66 13s. 4d.</td>
<td>£66 13s. 4d.</td>
<td>£65 6s. 9d.</td>
<td>£66 13s. 4d.</td>
<td>£66 13s. 4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corpora Prebendarum</strong></td>
<td>£26</td>
<td>£26</td>
<td>£26</td>
<td>£24 15s.</td>
<td>£26</td>
<td>£23 15s. 5½d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Necessaria Militum</strong></td>
<td>£6</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>£7</td>
<td>£6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cotidiana (dean and canons)</strong></td>
<td>£133 12s.</td>
<td>£124 19s.</td>
<td>£137 8s.</td>
<td>£121 17s.</td>
<td>£128 5s.</td>
<td>£151 6s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cotidiana (poor knights)</strong></td>
<td>£30 14s. 4d.</td>
<td>£48 13s.</td>
<td>£53 5s. 4d.</td>
<td>£51 19s.</td>
<td>£54 14s.</td>
<td>£54 18s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

20 The account for 1493-4 is fragmentary, and is missing the beginning of the roll.
21 The extant account for 1494-5 consists of only two membranes, which do not go together, but have been sewn together in modern times.
22 The beginning of the account for 1503-4 does not survive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£148 18s. 2d.</th>
<th>£150</th>
<th>£145 10s. 2½d.</th>
<th>£154 18s. 5d.</th>
<th>£146 10½d.</th>
<th>£160</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vicarii</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clerici</strong></td>
<td>£133 8s. 3½d.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£143 6s. 8d.</td>
<td>£143 6s. 8d.</td>
<td>£141 8s. 5¾d.</td>
<td>£148 13s. 8½d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Choral Staff</td>
<td>£130 7s. 9d.</td>
<td>£6 13s. 4d.</td>
<td>£145 8s. 8d.</td>
<td>£141 13s. 6½d.</td>
<td>£156 7s. 6d.</td>
<td>£156 17s. 9¾d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stipendia, Vadia et Regarda Officiorum</strong></td>
<td>£102 12s. 6d.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£70 17s. 9d.</td>
<td>£71 15s. ½d.</td>
<td>£70 14s. 4d.</td>
<td>£84 3s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obitus</strong></td>
<td>£66 1d.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£69 15s. 1d.</td>
<td>£64 10s. 3d.</td>
<td>£68 11s. 5¾d.</td>
<td>£82 2s. 6¾d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soluciones Pensionum</strong></td>
<td>£19 6s. 8d.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£17</td>
<td>£17</td>
<td>£18</td>
<td>£11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reparaciones Collegii</strong></td>
<td>£8 11s. 6d.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£14 10s. 7¾d.</td>
<td>£14 4s. 2¼d.</td>
<td>£6 10s. 10¾d.</td>
<td>£5 5s. 11¾d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expensa In Domo Compotis</strong></td>
<td>7s. 8d.</td>
<td>6s.</td>
<td>6s. 8d.</td>
<td>14s. 6d.</td>
<td>9s. 10d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Custus Auditorum</strong></td>
<td>£4 18s. 8d.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£4 18s. 8d.</td>
<td>£4 18s. 8d.</td>
<td>£4 18s. 8d.</td>
<td>£5 18s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liberacio Denariorum Precentori</strong></td>
<td>£26 17s. 8¾d.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£27 10s. 9¾d.</td>
<td>£26 4s. 11¾d.</td>
<td>£22 15s. 1d.</td>
<td>£23 11s. 3¾d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>£904 8s. 8¾d.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£929 11s. 2d.</td>
<td>£906 16s. 2¼d.</td>
<td>£918 15s. 1¼d.</td>
<td>£1093 7s. 10¾d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deficit</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 The deacon’s annual stipend is the only section of supporting choral staff that survives, and is shown here.
24 £4 13s, was set aside at audit according to the wishes of Canon Thomas Passhe. Passhe had died in 1489 and this probably referred to money set aside for his anniversary to be celebrated by the college. £4 4s. 11d. was also set aside in the following year for Passhe.
Appendix 2: Administrative officials at St George’s College, 1468-1504

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Treasurer</th>
<th>Steward</th>
<th>Precentor</th>
<th>Dean (as Auditor)</th>
<th>Auditor (1)</th>
<th>Auditor (2)</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1468-9</td>
<td>Thomas Passhe</td>
<td>Thomas Downe</td>
<td>John Hore</td>
<td>John Faukes</td>
<td>Clement Smyth</td>
<td>William Hermer</td>
<td>XV.34.56; V.B.II, ff. 3-8v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1469-70</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Baldwin Hyde</td>
<td>John Hore</td>
<td>John Faukes (?)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>XV.60.21, 24-6, 28-9; V.B.II, ff. 9-14v;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1471-2</td>
<td>William Hermer</td>
<td>Thomas Passhe</td>
<td>John Hore</td>
<td>John Davyson</td>
<td>Thomas Downe</td>
<td>John Seymour</td>
<td>XV.34.51; V.B.II., ff. 21-26v.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 Hermer was named as treasurer in the steward’s account this year. However, he was also the steward, and it is uncertain whether this was a scribal error, or if Hermer held both positions simultaneously in 1467-8.

26 All evidence cited herein is from St George’s College Archives (SGC), except where explicitly stated.

27 Unfortunately neither the treasurer’s nor the steward’s account survives for the financial year 1469-70, and as such it is unclear whether Faukes audited the accounts as his position required. However, he was present in chapel at Michaelmas, 1470, when the audit would have taken place and thus it is likely he would have been present at the general chapter: SGC, V.B.II, f. 14v.

28 Clement Smyth left St George’s by exchange on 13 March 1471, after which John Bury took over as precentor: SGC, V.B.II, f. 17v.

29 No treasurer’s or steward’s roll survive for the financial year 1472-3. However, John Davyson, Dean of St George’s 1471-3, was not present at Michaelmas and is unlikely to have audited the accounts, unless the college’s general chapter took place later in this year. Davyson was present in chapel on the second and third of October, 1473, but it is unclear whether he involved himself or not: SGC, V.B.II, ff. 32v-33.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name 1</th>
<th>Name 2</th>
<th>Name 3</th>
<th>Role 1</th>
<th>Role 2</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1473-4</td>
<td>John Seymour</td>
<td>David Hopton</td>
<td>William Towres</td>
<td>Dean not present at audit</td>
<td>Thomas Passhe</td>
<td>John Coryngdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1474-5</td>
<td>John Seymour</td>
<td>David Hopton</td>
<td>William Towres/John Coryngdon</td>
<td>Dean not present at audit</td>
<td>Thomas Passhe</td>
<td>John Vaughan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475-6</td>
<td>John Seymour</td>
<td>David Hopton</td>
<td>William Towres/John Coryngdon</td>
<td>Dean not present at audit</td>
<td>Thomas Passhe</td>
<td>John Vaughan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1476-7</td>
<td>Thomas Passhe</td>
<td>David Hopton</td>
<td>John Seymour</td>
<td>Dean not present at audit</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1477-8</td>
<td>Thomas Passhe</td>
<td>David Hopton</td>
<td>Thomas Downe</td>
<td>Richard Beauchamp</td>
<td>Thomas Danett</td>
<td>William Cokkys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1479-80</td>
<td>Thomas Passhe</td>
<td>David Hopton</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Richard Beauchamp</td>
<td>John Seymour</td>
<td>John Arundel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 William Dudley, Dean of St George’s 1473-6, was not present at Michaelmas in 1474, 1475 or 1476 and appears to not have participated in the general chapter for these years: SGC, V.B.II, ff. 38v, 44v, 50v.

31 Towres was named in the treasurer’s roll as the colleges precentor for the both the financial years 1474-5 and 1475-6, but Coryngdon compiled the attendance registers for the two years. It is uncertain why the position of precentor was shared in these years, as the precentor was required by statute to record attendance in chapel: Statutes and Injunctions, p. 13.

32 Passhe was initially recorded as treasurer in the account for this year but the entry was changed to Seymour’s name.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Treasurer</th>
<th>Auditor 1</th>
<th>Auditor 2</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>Auditor 3</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1481-2</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>John Arundel</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>XV.60.46-51; XV.60.59-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1482-3</td>
<td>John Seymour 33</td>
<td>David Hopton</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>XV.48.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1483-4</td>
<td>John Seymour</td>
<td>Thomas Passhe</td>
<td>William Cokkys</td>
<td>Dean’s locum tenens (unnamed)</td>
<td>John Arundel</td>
<td>David Hopton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485-6</td>
<td>Thomas Passhe</td>
<td>John Seymour</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Dean (unnamed) 35</td>
<td>John Vaughan</td>
<td>John Arundel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1489-90</td>
<td>John Seymour</td>
<td>Richard Arnold</td>
<td>John Vaughan</td>
<td>William Morgan</td>
<td>John Vaughan</td>
<td>XV.34.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1490-1</td>
<td>Richard Arnold/John Baily 37</td>
<td>William Creton</td>
<td>John Vaughan</td>
<td>William Morgan</td>
<td>John Seymour</td>
<td>John Vaughan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33 Passhe’s name was once again recorded as treasurer, but later changed to Seymour’s.
34 No auditors were recorded in the account for this year.
35 Depending on the audit date, the dean could have been John Davyson, reappointed as dean between 20 September and 12 October 1485. It is more likely that the dean who audited the account was instead William Morgan, appointed dean on 18 October 1485.
36 Only one auditor was recorded in this account.
37 Arnold died at the end of the financial year and Baily took over the production of the financial account, for which he was paid at audit. The steward’s account records Arnold’s name as the treasurer this year.

257
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Auditor</th>
<th>William Creton</th>
<th>Richard Surland</th>
<th>William Morgan</th>
<th>John Seymour</th>
<th>John Vaughan</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1491-2</td>
<td>John Stokes</td>
<td>William Creton</td>
<td>Richard Surland</td>
<td>William Morgan</td>
<td>John Seymour</td>
<td>John Vaughan</td>
<td>XV.34.65; XV.48.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1492-3</td>
<td>Thomas Bowde</td>
<td>William Creton</td>
<td>Richard Surland</td>
<td>William Morgan</td>
<td>John Seymour</td>
<td>John Vaughan</td>
<td>XV.34.66-7; XV.48.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1493-4</td>
<td>Thomas Bowde</td>
<td>William Creton</td>
<td>John Vaughan</td>
<td>William Morgan</td>
<td>John Seymour</td>
<td>John Baily</td>
<td>XV.34.64; XV.48.56-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1494-5</td>
<td>Christopher Urswick</td>
<td>William Creton</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>William Morgan</td>
<td>John Seymour</td>
<td>Thomas Bowde</td>
<td>XV.34.69; XV.48.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495-6</td>
<td>Christopher Urswick</td>
<td>William Creton</td>
<td>John Vaughan</td>
<td>Dean not present at audit</td>
<td>Thomas Bowde</td>
<td>Richard Surland</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, Berks. Roll 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1496-7</td>
<td>William Creton</td>
<td>Thomas Bowde</td>
<td>John Vaughan</td>
<td>Christopher Urswick</td>
<td>John Stokes</td>
<td>Edward Willoughby/John Seymour</td>
<td>XV.34.70; XV.48.61; XV.48.64-6; XV.61.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1497-8</td>
<td>William Creton</td>
<td>Thomas Bowde</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Christopher Urswick</td>
<td>John Seymour</td>
<td>William Creton</td>
<td>XV.48.63; XV.61.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1498-9</td>
<td>Richard Nix</td>
<td>Thomas Bowde</td>
<td>John Vaughan</td>
<td>Christopher Urswick</td>
<td>John Seymour</td>
<td>William Creton</td>
<td>XV.34.71; XV.48.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1499-</td>
<td>Richard Nix</td>
<td>Thomas Bowde</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Christopher Urswick</td>
<td>John Seymour</td>
<td>William Creton</td>
<td>XV.48.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38 Urswick was recorded as auditing the steward’s account, but not the treasurer’s, when an unnamed canon stood in his place.
39 Willoughby was noted as an auditor in the treasurer’s roll, while Seymour was noted in the steward’s account.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Richard Nix</th>
<th>Thomas Bowde</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>Christopher Urswick</th>
<th>John Esterfield</th>
<th>William Creton</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1500-1</td>
<td>Richard Nix</td>
<td>Thomas Bowde</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Christopher Urswick</td>
<td>John Esterfield</td>
<td>William Creton</td>
<td>XV.49.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Average Number of Canons in Residence per Month (incl. Dean), 1468-79
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Best House</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Fifth</th>
<th>Sixth</th>
<th>Seventh</th>
<th>Eighth</th>
<th>Ninth</th>
<th>Tenth</th>
<th>Eleventh</th>
<th>Worst House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1380 Oct</td>
<td>Clovil</td>
<td>Raundes</td>
<td>Loryng</td>
<td>Shawe</td>
<td>Postell</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>Prust</td>
<td>Saxton</td>
<td>Massingham</td>
<td>Lynton</td>
<td>Medford</td>
<td>Almeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov/Dec 1381</td>
<td>Clovil</td>
<td>Raundes</td>
<td>Loryng</td>
<td>Shawe</td>
<td>Postell</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>Prust</td>
<td>Saxton</td>
<td>Massingham</td>
<td>Lynton</td>
<td>Bouland</td>
<td>Packington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382</td>
<td>Clovil</td>
<td>Raundes</td>
<td>Loryng</td>
<td>Shawe</td>
<td>Postell</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>Prust</td>
<td>Slake</td>
<td>Massingham</td>
<td>Lynton</td>
<td>Medford</td>
<td>Bouland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1383</td>
<td>Clovil</td>
<td>Raundes</td>
<td>Loryng</td>
<td>Shawe</td>
<td>Postell</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>Prust</td>
<td>Slake</td>
<td>Massingham</td>
<td>Lynton</td>
<td>Medford</td>
<td>Bouland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1384</td>
<td>Clovil</td>
<td>Raundes</td>
<td>Loryng</td>
<td>Shawe</td>
<td>Postell</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>Prust</td>
<td>Slake</td>
<td>Massingham</td>
<td>Lynton</td>
<td>Medford</td>
<td>Bouland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1385</td>
<td>Clovil</td>
<td>Raundes</td>
<td>Loryng</td>
<td>Shawe</td>
<td>Postell</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>Prust</td>
<td>Slake</td>
<td>Massingham</td>
<td>Lynton</td>
<td>Medford</td>
<td>Bouland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1386</td>
<td>Clovil</td>
<td>Raundes</td>
<td>Loryng</td>
<td>Shawe</td>
<td>Postell</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>Prust</td>
<td>Slake</td>
<td>Massingham</td>
<td>Lynton</td>
<td>Medford</td>
<td>Bouland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1387 Drake</td>
<td>Raundes</td>
<td>Buttiller</td>
<td>Shawe</td>
<td>Postell</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>Prust</td>
<td>Slake</td>
<td>Massingham</td>
<td>Lynton</td>
<td>Medford</td>
<td>Bouland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1388 Drake</td>
<td>Raundes</td>
<td>Buttiller</td>
<td>Shawe</td>
<td>Postell</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>Prust</td>
<td>Slake</td>
<td>Massingham</td>
<td>Medford</td>
<td>Bouland</td>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1389 Drake</td>
<td>Raundes</td>
<td>Boor</td>
<td>Shawe</td>
<td>Postell</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>Prust</td>
<td>Slake</td>
<td>Massingham</td>
<td>Medford</td>
<td>Bouland</td>
<td>Bouland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1390 Drake</td>
<td>Raundes</td>
<td>Boor</td>
<td>Shawe</td>
<td>Postell</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>Prust</td>
<td>Slake</td>
<td>Massingham</td>
<td>Bouland</td>
<td>Haule</td>
<td>Atfeld</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1391 Raundes</td>
<td>Boor</td>
<td>Shawe</td>
<td>Postell</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>Prust</td>
<td>Slake</td>
<td>Massingham</td>
<td>Bouland</td>
<td>Haule</td>
<td>Atfeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1392 Raundes</td>
<td>Boor</td>
<td>Shawe</td>
<td>Postell</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>Prust</td>
<td>Slake</td>
<td>Massingham</td>
<td>Bouland</td>
<td>Haule</td>
<td>Atfeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1393 Raundes</td>
<td>Boor</td>
<td>Shawe</td>
<td>Postell</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>Prust</td>
<td>Slake</td>
<td>Massingham</td>
<td>Bouland</td>
<td>Haule</td>
<td>Atfeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1394 Raundes</td>
<td>Boor</td>
<td>Shawe</td>
<td>Postell</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>Prust</td>
<td>Slake</td>
<td>Massingham</td>
<td>Bouland</td>
<td>Haule</td>
<td>Atfeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1395 Raundes</td>
<td>Boor</td>
<td>Shawe</td>
<td>Postell</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>Prust</td>
<td>Slake</td>
<td>Massingham</td>
<td>Bouland</td>
<td>Haule</td>
<td>Atfeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1396 Raundes</td>
<td>Boor</td>
<td>Shawe</td>
<td>Postell</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>Prust</td>
<td>Slake</td>
<td>Massingham</td>
<td>Bouland</td>
<td>Haule</td>
<td>Atfeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1397 Raundes</td>
<td>Boor</td>
<td>Shawe</td>
<td>Postell</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>Prust</td>
<td>Slake</td>
<td>Massingham</td>
<td>Bouland</td>
<td>Haule</td>
<td>Atfeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1398 Raundes</td>
<td>Boor</td>
<td>Shawe</td>
<td>Postell</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>Prust</td>
<td>Slake</td>
<td>Massingham</td>
<td>Bouland</td>
<td>Haule</td>
<td>Atfeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1399 Raundes</td>
<td>Boor</td>
<td>Shawe</td>
<td>Postell</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>Prust</td>
<td>Slake</td>
<td>Massingham</td>
<td>Bouland</td>
<td>Atfeld</td>
<td>Marton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400 Shawe</td>
<td>Massingham</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>Prust</td>
<td>Bouland</td>
<td>Boor</td>
<td>Spigurnal</td>
<td>Marton</td>
<td>Ravendale</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>Gough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1401 Shawe</td>
<td>Massingham</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>Prust</td>
<td>Boor</td>
<td>Spigurnal</td>
<td>Marton</td>
<td>Ravendale</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>Gough</td>
<td>Lacy</td>
<td>Gyloth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Fasti Wyndesorienses.
| 1402 | Shawe | Massingham | Dole | Prust | Spigurnal | Marton | Ravendale | Gough | Lacy | Gyloth | More | Spicer | Prentys | Redeburne | Lane |
| 1403 | Massingham | Spigurnal | Marton | Ravendale | Gough | Lacy | Gyloth | More | Spicer | Redeburne | Ashrigge | Mabeley | Alliston | Exton |
| 1404 | Massingham | Spigurnal | Marton | Gough | Lacy | Gyloth | More | Spicer | Redeburne | Mabeley | Melton | Exton | Exton |
| 1405 | Massingham | Spigurnal | Marton | Gough | Lacy | Gyloth | More | Spicer | Redeburne | Mabeley | Melton | Exton | Exton |
| 1406 | Massingham | Spigurnal | Marton | Gough | Lacy | Gyloth | More | Spicer | Mabeley | Melton | Exton | Exton | Exton |
| 1407 | Massingham | Spigurnal | Gough | Lacy | Gyloth | More | Spicer | Melton | Exton | Eston | Wolveden | Marcheford | Malvern | Malvern |
| 1408 | Spigurnal | Gough | Lacy | Gyloth | More | Spicer | Melton | Exton | Eston | Wolveden | Marcheford | Malvern | Malvern | Malvern |
| 1409 | Spigurnal | Gough | Lacy | Gyloth | More | Spicer | Melton | Exton | Eston | Wolveden | Marcheford | Malvern | Malvern | Malvern |
| 1410 | Spigurnal | Gough | Lacy | Gyloth | More | Spicer | Exton | Eston | Wolveden | Marcheford | Malvern | Drayton | Hanley | Hanley |
| 1411 | Spigurnal | Gough | Lacy | Gyloth | More | Spicer | Exton | Eston | Marcheford | Malvern | Lochar | Mersden | Mersden | Mersden |
| 1412 | Spigurnal | Gough | Lacy | Gyloth | More | Spicer | Exton | Eston | Marcheford | Malvern | Lochar | Mersden | Mersden | Mersden |
| 1413 | Spigurnal | Gough | Lacy | Gyloth | More | Spicer | Exton | Eston | Marcheford | Malvern | Lochar | Mersden | Mersden | Mersden |
| 1414 | Spigurnal | Gough | Lacy | Gyloth | More | Spicer | Exton | Eston | Marcheford | Malvern | Lochar | Mersden | Mersden | Mersden |
| 1415 | Spigurnal | Gough | Lacy | Gyloth | More | Spicer | Exton | Eston | Marcheford | Malvern | Lochar | Mersden | Mersden | Mersden |
| 1416 | Spigurnal | Gough | Lacy | Gyloth | More | Spicer | Exton | Eston | Marcheford | Lochar | Mersden | Coryngham | Longville | Longville |
| 1417 | Spigurnal | Gough | Gyloth | More | Spicer | Exton | Eston | Marcheford | Lochar | Mersden | Coryngham | Longville | Longville | Longville |
| 1418 | Spigurnal | Gough | Gyloth | More | Spicer | Exton | Eston | Marcheford | Lochar | Mersden | Coryngham | Longville | Longville | Longville |
| 1419 | Spigurnal | Gough | Gyloth | More | Spicer | Exton | Eston | Marcheford | Lochar | Mersden | Coryngham | Longville | Longville | Longville |
| 1420 | Spigurnal | Gough | Gyloth | More | Spicer | Exton | Eston | Marcheford | Lochar | Mersden | Coryngham | Longville | Longville | Longville |
| 1421 | Spigurnal | Gough | Gyloth | More | Spicer | Exton | Eston | Marcheford | Lochar | Mersden | Coryngham | Longville | Longville | Longville |
| 1422 | Spigurnal | Gough | Gyloth | More | Spicer | Exton | Eston | Marcheford | Lochar | Mersden | Coryngham | Longville | Longville | Longville |
| Dec | Spigurnal | Gough | Gyloth | Spicer | Exton | Marcheford | Lochar | Mersden | Coryngham | Longville | Alcobasse | Duryche | Duryche | Duryche |
| 1423 | Spigurnal | Gough | Gyloth | Spicer | Exton | Marcheford | Lochar | Mersden | Coryngham | Longville | Alcobasse | Duryche | Duryche | Duryche |
| 1424 | Spigurnal | Gough | Gyloth | Spicer | Exton | Marcheford | Lochar | Mersden | Coryngham | Longville | Alcobasse | Duryche | Duryche | Duryche |
| 1426 | Gough | Gyloth | Spicer | Exton | Marcheford | Lochar | Coryngham | Alcobasse | Duryche | Snell | Gates | Kirteton | Kirteton | Kirteton |
| 1427 | Gough | Gyloth | Spicer | Exton | Marcheford | Lochar | Coryngham | Alcobasse | Duryche | Snell | Gates | Kirteton | Kirteton | Kirteton |
| 1428 | Gough | Spicer | Exton | Marcheford | Lochar | Coryngham | Duryche | Snell | Gates | Kirteton | Felton | Southwell | Southwell | Southwell |
| 1429 | Gough | Spicer | Exton | Marcheford | Lochar | Coryngham | Duryche | Snell | Gates | Kirteton | Felton | Southwell | Southwell | Southwell |
| 1430 | Gough | Spicer | Marcheford | Lochar | Coryngham | Duryche | Snell | Kirteton | Felton | Southwell | Pye | Deepdene | Deepdene | Deepdene |
| 1431 | Gough   | Spicer  | Marcheford | Coryngham | Duryche | Kirteton | Felton | Pye | Deepdene | Damet | Bonetemp | Bryd Brooke | Brewster | Allerton |
| 1432 | Spicer   | Marcheford | Coryngham | Duryche | Kirteton | Pye | Deepdene | Damet | Bonetemp | Bryd Brooke | Brewster | Allerton |
| 1433 | Spicer   | Marcheford | Coryngham | Duryche | Kirteton | Pye | Deepdene | Damet | Bonetemp | Bryd Brooke | Brewster | Allerton |
| 1434 | Spicer   | Marcheford | Coryngham | Duryche | Kirteton | Pye | Deepdene | Damet | Bonetemp | Bryd Brooke | Brewster | Allerton |
| 1435 | Spicer   | Marcheford | Coryngham | Kirteton | Pye | Deepdene | Damet | Bonetemp | Bryd Brooke | Brewster | Allerton | Lyseux |
| 1436 | Spicer   | Marcheford | Coryngham | Kirteton | Pye | Deepdene | Bonetemp | Bryd Brooke | Lyseux | Wyot | Thurgarton | Hanslap | Kette |
| 1437 | Marcheford | Coryngham | Kirteton | Pye | Deepdene | Bonetemp | Bryd Brooke | Lyseux | Wyot | Hanslap | Kette | Howden |
| 1438 | Marcheford | Coryngham | Kirteton | Deepdene | Bonetemp | Bryd Brooke | Lyseux | Wyot | Hanslap | Kette | Howden | Brewster |
| 1439 | Marcheford | Coryngham | Kirteton | Deepdene | Bonetemp | Bryd Brooke | Lyseux | Wyot | Hanslap | Kette | Howden | Brewster |
| 1440 | Coryngham | Kirteton | Deepdene | Bonetemp | Bryd Brooke | Lyseux | Wyot | Hanslap | Kette | Howden | Brewster | Walesby |
| 1441 | Coryngham | Kirteton | Deepdene | Bryd Brooke | Wyot | Hanslap | Kette | Howden | Brewster | Walesby | Drury | Sturgeon |
| 1442 | Coryngham | Deepdene | Bryd Brooke | Wyot | Hanslap | Kette | Howden | Brewster | Walesby | Drury | Sturgeon | Burghill |
| 1443 | Deepdene | Wyot | Hanslap | Kette | Howden | Brewster | Walesby | Drury | Sturgeon | Burghill | Mitchell | Hansard |
| 1444 | Deepdene | Wyot | Hanslap | Kette | Howden | Brewster | Walesby | Drury | Sturgeon | Burghill | Mitchell | Hansard |
| 1445 | Deepdene | Wyot | Hanslap | Kette | Howden | Brewster | Walesby | Drury | Sturgeon | Burghill | Mitchell | Wellys |
| 1446 | Deepdene | Wyot | Hanslap | Kette | Howden | Brewster | Walesby | Sturgeon | Burghill | Mitchell | Wellys | Bury |
| 1447 | Deepdene | Wyot | Hanslap | Kette | Howden | Brewster | Walesby | Sturgeon | Burghill | Mitchell | Wellys | Bury |
| 1448 | Deepdene | Wyot | Hanslap | Kette | Howden | Brewster | Walesby | Sturgeon | Burghill | Mitchell | Wellys | Bury |
| 1449 | Deepdene | Hanslap | Kette | Brewer | Walesby | Sturgeon | Burghill | Mitchell | Wellys | Bury | Arundel | Passhe |
| 1450 | Deepdene | Hanslap | Kette | Brewer | Sturgeon | Burghill | Mitchell | Wellys | Bury | Arundel | Passhe | Andrew |
| 1451 | Deepdene | Hanslap | Kette | Brewer | Sturgeon | Burghill | Mitchell | Wellys | Bury | Arundel | Passhe | Andrew |
| 1452 | Deepdene | Brewer | Sturgeon | Burghill | Mitchell | Wellys | Bury | Arundel | Passhe | Andrew | Hore | Misterton |
| 1453 | Deepdene | Brewer | Sturgeon | Burghill | Mitchell | Wellys | Bury | Arundel | Passhe | Andrew | Hore | Misterton |
| 1454 | Deepdene | Brewer | Burghill | Mitchell | Wellys | Bury | Arundel | Passhe | Andrew | Hore | Misterton | Sharpe |
| 1455 | Deepdene | Brewer | Burghill | Mitchell | Wellys | Bury | Arundel | Passhe | Hore | Misterton | Hermer | Kirkeby |
| 1456 | Deepdene | Brewer | Burghill | Mitchell | Wellys | Bury | Arundel | Passhe | Hore | Misterton | Hermer | Kirkeby |
| 1457 | Deepdene | Brewer | Burghill | Mitchell | Wellys | Bury | Arundel | Passhe | Hore | Misterton | Hermer | Wygryme |
| 1458 | Deepdene | Brewer | Burghill | Mitchell | Wellys | Bury | Arundel | Passhe | Hore | Misterton | Hermer | Wygryme |
| 1459 | Deepdene | Brewer | Burghill | Mitchell | Wellys | Bury | Passhe | Hore | Misterton | Hermer | Wygryme | Bowyer |
| 1460 | Brewer | Burghill | Mitchell | Wellys | Bury | Passhe | Hore | Misterton | Hermer | Wygryme | Bowyer | Goldwell |
| 1461 | Brewer | Burghill | Mitchell | Wellys | Bury | Passhe | Hore | Misterton | Hermer | Wygryme | Bowyer | Goldwell |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Burghill</th>
<th>Wellys</th>
<th>Bury</th>
<th>Passhe</th>
<th>Hore</th>
<th>Misterton</th>
<th>Hermer</th>
<th>Wygryme</th>
<th>Bowyer</th>
<th>Goldwell</th>
<th>Geffrey</th>
<th>Downe</th>
<th>Smyth</th>
<th>Wodmanston</th>
<th>Lee</th>
<th>Crecy</th>
<th>Vaughan</th>
<th>Dudley</th>
<th>Vaughan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1462</td>
<td>Brewster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1463</td>
<td>Brewster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1464</td>
<td>Brewster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1465</td>
<td>Burghill</td>
<td>Wellys</td>
<td>Bury</td>
<td>Passhe</td>
<td>Hore</td>
<td>Misterton</td>
<td>Hermer</td>
<td>Wygryme</td>
<td>Bowyer</td>
<td>Goldwell</td>
<td>Geffrey</td>
<td>Downe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1466</td>
<td>Burghill</td>
<td>Wellys</td>
<td>Bury</td>
<td>Passhe</td>
<td>Hore</td>
<td>Misterton</td>
<td>Hermer</td>
<td>Wygryme</td>
<td>Bowyer</td>
<td>Goldwell</td>
<td>Geffrey</td>
<td>Downe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1467</td>
<td>Burghill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1468</td>
<td>Burghill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1469</td>
<td>Burghill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1470</td>
<td>Burghill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>Burghill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Burghill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Burghill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Burghill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1471</td>
<td>Burghill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1472</td>
<td>Burghill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1473</td>
<td>Burghill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Burghill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1474</td>
<td>Passhe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475</td>
<td>Passhe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1476</td>
<td>Passhe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1477</td>
<td>Passhe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1478</td>
<td>Passhe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1479</td>
<td>Passhe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1480</td>
<td>Passhe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1481</td>
<td>Passhe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1482</td>
<td>Passhe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1483</td>
<td>Passhe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1484</td>
<td>Passhe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dec
1485 Seymour King Stokes Surland Creton Bowde Willoughby Nix Payne Cockys Esterfield Lupton
1486 King Stokes Surland Creton Bowde Willoughby Nix Payne Cockys Esterfield Lupton Symeon Hobbs Butler
1487 Surland Creton Willoughby Payne Cockys Esterfield Lupton Symeon Hobbs Butler Atwater Honiwood
1488 Surland Creton Willoughby Payne Cockys Esterfield Lupton Symeon Hobbs Butler Atwater Honiwood Atkinson Rawlins
1489 Surland Creton Willoughby Cockys Esterfield Lupton Butler Atwater Honiwood Atkinson Rawlins Oxenbridge Fisher Chamber Denton
1490 Creton Cockys Esterfield Lupton Butler Atwater Honiwood Rawlins Oxenbridge Fisher Chamber Denton
1491 Creton Cockys Esterfield Lupton Butler Atwater Honiwood Rawlins Oxenbridge Chamber Denton Wolsey Birkenshaw
1492 Creton Lupton Butler Atwater Honiwood Rawlins Oxenbridge Chamber Denton Wolsey Birkenshaw Plummer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Creton</th>
<th>Lupton</th>
<th>Butler</th>
<th>Honiwood</th>
<th>Rawlins</th>
<th>Oxenbridge</th>
<th>Chamber</th>
<th>Denton</th>
<th>Birkenshaw</th>
<th>Plummer</th>
<th>Wren</th>
<th>Malett</th>
<th>Longland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1514</td>
<td>Creton</td>
<td>Lupton</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Honiwood</td>
<td>Rawlins</td>
<td>Oxenbridge</td>
<td>Chamber</td>
<td>Denton</td>
<td>Birkenshaw</td>
<td>Plummer</td>
<td>Wren</td>
<td>Malett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1515</td>
<td>Creton</td>
<td>Lupton</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Honiwood</td>
<td>Rawlins</td>
<td>Oxenbridge</td>
<td>Chamber</td>
<td>Denton</td>
<td>Birkenshaw</td>
<td>Plummer</td>
<td>Wren</td>
<td>Malett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1516</td>
<td>Creton</td>
<td>Lupton</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Honiwood</td>
<td>Rawlins</td>
<td>Oxenbridge</td>
<td>Chamber</td>
<td>Denton</td>
<td>Birkenshaw</td>
<td>Plummer</td>
<td>Wren</td>
<td>Malett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1517</td>
<td>Creton</td>
<td>Lupton</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Honiwood</td>
<td>Rawlins</td>
<td>Oxenbridge</td>
<td>Chamber</td>
<td>Denton</td>
<td>Birkenshaw</td>
<td>Plummer</td>
<td>Wren</td>
<td>Malett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1518</td>
<td>Creton</td>
<td>Lupton</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Honiwood</td>
<td>Rawlins</td>
<td>Oxenbridge</td>
<td>Chamber</td>
<td>Denton</td>
<td>Birkenshaw</td>
<td>Plummer</td>
<td>Wren</td>
<td>Malett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1519</td>
<td>Sydnor</td>
<td>Lupton</td>
<td>Honiwood</td>
<td>Rawlins</td>
<td>Oxenbridge</td>
<td>Chamber</td>
<td>Denton</td>
<td>Birkenshaw</td>
<td>Plummer</td>
<td>Wren</td>
<td>Malett</td>
<td>Longland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6: Vicars' Average Attendance, 1468-79
Appendix 7: Individual Canonical Hours Missed By Vicars, 1468-79

Legend
1 – Matins
2 – Lauds
3 - Prime
4 - Terce
5 - Sext
6 - None
7 - Vespers
8 - Compline
Appendix 8: Changes in Vicars’ Attendance, 1468-79

Legend
1 – Matins
2 – Lauds
3 – Prime
4 – Terce
5 – Sext
6 – None
7 – Vespers
8 – Compline
Appendix 9: Clerks' Average Attendance, 1468-79
Appendix 10: Number of Canonical Hours Attended by Clerks per Day, 1468-79
Appendix 11: Individual Canonical Hours Missed By Clerks, 1468-79

Legend
1 – Matins
2 – Lauds
3 – Prime
4 – Terce
5 – Sext
6 – None
7 – Vespers
8 – Compline
Appendix 12: Changes in Clerks’ Attendance, 1468-79

Legend
1 – Matins
2 – Lauds
3 - Prime
4 - Terce
5 - Sext
6 - None
7 - Vespers
8 - Compline
Appendix 13: Biographical Register of the Poor Knights of St George’s, 1368-c.1519

Robert Beverley

It is likely that Beverley had been resident for some years before his first mention in the treasurer’s roll for 1368.¹ One poor knight was mentioned in the treasurer’s rolls for 1362-3, 1366-7 and 1367-8, although he was left unnamed.² Beverley was paid his stipend until 7 July 1368, at which point Fellowes assumed he had died. He is probably a different man from the Robert Beverley, esquire, who took protections in 1377, 1378, 1380 and 1387 for various naval and French campaigns and was in the earl of Arundel’s company in 1387.³

Richard Stanley

No letters patent for Stanley’s appointment or record of his residency survive. However, patent letters for John Brancester’s appointment on 10 August 1377 record that Stanley had a room in the college and was now deceased.⁴ Fellowes puts Richard Stanley chronologically after Thomas Tawney and John Breton. However, as Stanley was dead by August 1377 and was not named in 1376 or 1377 he must have predated at least one of them. Two unnamed poor knights were paid their stipend and cotidian payments in the treasurer’s rolls for the years 1369-70, 1371-2, 1374-5 and 1375-6.⁵ If Stanley ever took up residency, it must have been during these years. He was not the same man named as man-at-arms in the 1375 French expedition or later in a standing force in Ireland between 1389 and 1392.⁶ It is also unlikely that he was the Richard Stanley who took out protection in Essex in 1378 for a naval campaign.⁷

¹ SGC, XV.34.6; Fellowes, Military Knights, p. 1.
² SGC, XV.34.2; XV.34.4; XV.34.5.
³ TNA, C76/53, m. 23; C76/61, mm. 14, 22; C76/62, m.21; C76/64; C76/71, m. 12; E101/40/33, m. 18; E101/40/34, m. 10.
⁴ CPR, 1377-81, p. 79; Fellowes Military Knights, p.1.
⁵ SGC, XV.34.7; XV.34.8; XV.34.9; XV.34.10.
⁶ TNA, E101/34/5. M. 2; E101/41/18, mm. 1, 4, 10, 18, 21.
⁷ TNA, C76/63, m. 21.


Sir Thomas Tawney

Thomas Tawney and his fellow poor knight John Breton were named in the partial treasurer’s rolls for Annunciation terms in 1376 and 1377 and the account for 1377-8. However, both men may have been resident in the preceding years in the years for which no poor knights are named. He may have been the ‘Thomas Taune’ named in the patent rolls on 12 October 1376, with his wife Margery, in a dispute over chattels worth 100s. Tawney and Breton both featured in Bishop Adam Houghton’s injunctions in 1378 and were reproached for unseemly behaviour. Both men were present at the chapter meeting which Houghton presided over at Michaelmas 1378, and were described as ‘old Knights much broken in the Warrs...after a Collegiate fashion decently habited’. Here it was described that they were married and ‘keep their adulterate Dalilahs, to the great scandal of the Colledge’. Tawney probably remained at St George’s for a short period after Michaelmas 1378, but had certainly died by 3 June 1379, when letters patent described him deceased. Tawney was replaced by Robert Bitterly.

Sir John Breton

John Breton was named as a resident of the college in the period 1376-8, but may have been at the college earlier than this. Along with Thomas Tawney, he was admonished in the injunctions of Bishop Houghton in 1378. Breton, however, came in for further criticism, when it was said that he was ‘too much given to his insolencies, comes late and too delicately to his Canonicall hours...and when he kneels to pray in the same, he

8 SGC, XV.34.11; XV.34.13; XV.34.14; Fellowes, Military Knights, p.1.
9 See above under Richard Stanley.
10 CPR, 1374-7, p. 356.
11 Statutes and Injunctions, p. 21.
12 Ibid.
13 Ibid. There was, at this point, no statutory barrier to a poor knight holding his appointment while married. Indeed, the college in 1413-17 employed the widow of John Grimsby after his death: See below under John Grimsby.
14 CPR, 1377-81, p. 354.
15 See above, under Thomas Tawney.
16 Statutes and Injunctions, p. 21.
presently falls asleep, soe that he scarcely awakes till the Sacrament of the Altar’. 17
Breton died at some point between Michaelmas 1378 and 13 June 1384, when he was
named as deceased in letters patent of Henry Sturmy, who was granted Breton’s
position at St George’s. 18 It is possible that he was the John Breton who was at sea in
1372 and in France in 1373-4 but this is uncertain. 19 He is to be distinguished from the
John Breton present in John of Gaunt’s retinue in 1373, who also took protections to
travel to Spain with Gaunt in 1386. 20

John Brancester

John Brancester was appointed by letters patent of 10 August 1377 and first appears in
the treasurer’s roll for 1377-8. 21 His letters record his good service to the King’s father,
the Black Prince and recommend him on account of his poverty and old age.
Brancester was paid for seventy-seven days prior to Annunciation term 1377-8 at a
third-class rate of 1¾d. per day, and then received his full stipend of 20s. for
Annunciation term alongside Thomas Tawney and John Breton. The reasons for this
lower rate of pay are unknown. The college’s attendance register for the period
between October 1384 and May 1386 records Brancester’s presence until his death on
9 June 1385. 22

Robert Bitterly [Bidleigh]

Robert Bitterly was appointed on 3 June 1379 by royal letters patent to replace
Thomas Tawney. 23 He name appears throughout the attendance register, from
October 1384 to May 1386, when the register ends. 24 After John Brancester’s death,
Bitterly was the only poor knight resident at St George’s. He is named in the treasurer’s
roll for 1395-6 and was likely the unnamed knight paid by the treasurer in 1385-6,
1393-4 and 1394-5. Bitterly died at some point between Michaelmas 1396 and Michaelmas 1397, as the precentor’s roll for the year included wax for his grave and the tiling of his grave.

**Sir Henry Sturmy**

Henry Sturmy was granted letters patent to become a poor knight of Windsor on two occasions, but does not appear to have taken up residency. The first set of letters, on 13 June 1384, were to replace John Breton, deceased, provided the King did not grant the position to anyone else. Sturmy was then granted further letters on 11 June 1385, replacing John Brancester, deceased. Sturmy does not appear in the college’s attendance register after Brancester’s death, or in the next extant treasurer’s roll in 1393-4. Indeed, the letters patent of George Muschet on 27 April 1402 state that Muschet replaced Brancester, rather than Sturmy. It is probable that Sturmy never took up his appointment at St George’s.

**Sir Nicholas Say**

Nicholas Say was appointed by letters patent of 18 September 1398. This appointment was to replace Robert Bitterly, provided the king had not granted it to someone else. Say first appears in the treasurer’s roll for 1398-9, when he was paid for three-quarters of the year, indicating that he took up residency in January. He then appears in the rolls in the years 1400-1, 1402-3, 1404-5, 1406-7 and 1407-8. Say was paid up until 19 July 1408 when he died. It is possible that Say’s son may have been

---

25 SGC, XV.34.15; XV.34.16; XV.34.17.
26 SGC, XV.56.15.
27 CPR, 1381-5, pp. 407, 571; Fellowes, Military Knights, p. 2.
28 SGC, V.B.I; XV.34.16.
29 CPR, 1401-5, p. 91.
30 CPR, 1396-9, p. 412; Fellowes, Military Knights, p. 2.
31 SGC, XV.34.19.
32 SGC, XV.34.20; XV.34.22; XV.34.23; XV.34.24; XV.34.26.
33 SGC, XV.34.26.
the Simon Sy, esquire, who was granted three cottages in Peascroft [Peascod] street by the son of Say’s fellow poor knight, John Grimsby in 1414.\textsuperscript{34}

**George Muschet [Mochet, Muchet, Muschard]**

George Muschet was appointed by letters patent of 27 April 1402 in the place of John Brancester, who had died some years previously (9 June 1385).\textsuperscript{35} He was recommended for his great labours and loss in the wars of the King’s progenitors. Muschet had served in the 1373-4 French expedition under Thomas Beauchamp, earl of Warwick, and John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster.\textsuperscript{36} He first appears in the treasurer’s roll for 1402-3 and is further named in the years 1404-5, 1406-7 and 1407-8.\textsuperscript{37} He was certainly dead by 1411, when he was named as deceased in the letters patent of Ralph Whithors.\textsuperscript{38}

**Sir John Grimsby**

John Grimsby was appointed by royal letters patent on 18 December 1402.\textsuperscript{39} He was recommended for his ‘great debility and poverty and good service to Edward III in war and to the king’s father’. He was named in the treasurer’s rolls for 1404-5, 1406-7 and 1407-8.\textsuperscript{40} During his time at St George’s, Grimsby owned three cottages in Peascroft [Peascod] Street, Windsor, although there is no evidence that he personally occupied these properties.\textsuperscript{41} Grimsby died at an unknown date between 23 November 1412 (when he received the last of three releases regarding his Windsor property) and 13 May 1413, when Adam Koker was appointed as a poor knight in his place.\textsuperscript{42} Grimsby left behind a wife, Agnes, and a son, also named John Grimsby, who inherited his

\textsuperscript{34} SGC, XV.45.54. See also below, *John Grimsby.*
\textsuperscript{35} CPR, 1401-5, p. 91; Fellowes, *Military Knights,* p. 3.
\textsuperscript{36} TNA, E101/32/39, m. 3d; C76/56, m. 33.
\textsuperscript{37} SGC, XV.34.22; XV.34.23; XV.34.24; XV.34.26. Fellowes erroneously describes SGC, XV.34.27 as the next treasurer’s roll in the series, when it is, in fact, a supplication to the king for relief from poverty.
\textsuperscript{38} CPR, 1408-13, p. 355.
\textsuperscript{39} CPR, 1401-5, p. 185; Fellowes, *Military Knights,* p. 3.
\textsuperscript{40} SGC, XV.34.23; XV.34.24; XV.34.26.
\textsuperscript{41} SGC, XV.45.44-6.
\textsuperscript{42} SGC, XV.45.46; CPR, 1413-6, p. 21.
tenements on Peascroft Street.\textsuperscript{43} After her husband’s death, Agnes was employed by St George’s between 1415 and 1417 as a seamstress.\textsuperscript{44} She may even have retained the use of her late husband’s quarters within the college, as only a sole poor knight was resident within the college at this time.

**Sir Ralph Whithors**

Ralph Whithors was appointed by letters patent of 15 November 1411, in place of George Muschet, but does not appear to have taken up his position.\textsuperscript{45} He does not feature in the next extant treasurer’s roll in 1415-6 and so if he took residency, he must have died or left by Michaelmas 1415.\textsuperscript{46} Whithors had served in the company of Richard FitzAllan, earl of Arundel, in naval expeditions in 1387.\textsuperscript{47} He also took out protections to serve with Arundel in 1388 and with John Holand, earl of Huntingdon, in 1396.\textsuperscript{48} In 1380, Whithors’s wife, Isabella was named in a debt case in London, while he was named as being in Berkshire in 1392.\textsuperscript{49} In 1400 he was sued for a debt of thirty marks.\textsuperscript{50} Whithors was recommended because he had laboured long in the wars of Richard II and Henry IV and ‘had not sufficient means to maintain himself in the knightly order’.\textsuperscript{51} There is no evidence that he was ever resident at St George’s.

**Sir Adam Koker [Toker]**

Adam Koker was appointed in place of John Grimsby on 13 May 1413.\textsuperscript{52} He was nominated in consideration of his great poverty and great age. Koker had taken

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{43}SGC, XV.34.53-4.
\item \textsuperscript{44}SGC, XV.56.22; XV.56.23; Bond, *Inventories*, pp. 7, 128-135.
\item \textsuperscript{45}CPR, 1408-13, p. 355; Fellowes, *Military Knights*, p. 3.
\item \textsuperscript{46}SGC, XV.24.28. Fellowes mistakenly claims that this treasurer’s roll contains the names of no poor knights, when one knight, William Lisle, is named. He inadvertently corrects himself on the following page, when Lisle is named as present in this account: Fellowes, *Military Knights*, pp. 3-4. See below under William Lisle.
\item \textsuperscript{47}TNA, E101/40/33, m. 1; E101/40/34, m. 2; C76/71, m. 14
\item \textsuperscript{48}TNA, C76/72, m. 7; C76/81, m. 12.
\item \textsuperscript{49}Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls 1323-1482, 6 vols. (Cambridge, 1926-61), ii, p. 271; Calendar of Fine Rolls, 1272-1509, 22 vols. (London, 1911-62).
\item \textsuperscript{50}TNA, CP40/599, rot. 386.
\item \textsuperscript{51}CPR, 1408-13, p. 355.
\item \textsuperscript{52}CPR, 1413-6, p. 21; Fellowes, *Military Knights*, p. 4.
\end{itemize}
protection to serve with William le Scrope at the Cherbourg garrison in 1390.\textsuperscript{53} He does not feature in the next extant treasurer’s roll in 1415-16 and if he took residency, he must have died or left by 14 February 1415, when he was replaced by William Lisle.\textsuperscript{54}

**Sir William Lisle**

William Lisle was appointed in place of Adam Koker on 14 February 1415.\textsuperscript{55} He was recommended for his great poverty and age. Lisle was named in the treasurer’s rolls for 1415-6, 1417-8 and 1419-20 as the sole poor knight resident at St George’s.\textsuperscript{56} Lisle must have left or died between Michaelmas 1420 and Michaelmas 1422 as no poor knights feature in the treasurer’s rolls for 1422-3 or 1425-6.\textsuperscript{57} The poor knights returned to the records in the account for 1428-9, but Lisle is not named.\textsuperscript{58} Lisle may have been the brother of Sir Robert Lisle, 3rd Lord Lisle of Rougemont, in which case he had served in Ireland in 1399 and was retained by Richard II with a fee of £40. He is to be distinguished from Robert’s illegitimate son, the MP Sir William Lisle (d.1442), who may have been his nephew.\textsuperscript{59}

**Sir Walter Clyston**

Walter Clyston was appointed as a poor knight on 15 July 1423.\textsuperscript{60} The patent letters do not name the knight who he was to replace and it seems unlikely that he ever took up residency, as no mention survives in the college’s archives.

\textsuperscript{53} TNA, C76/74, m. 4.
\textsuperscript{54} SGC, XV.24.28; CPR, 1413-6, pp. 285-6.
\textsuperscript{55} CPR, 1413-6, pp. 285-6; Fellowes, Military Knights, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{56} SGC, XV.34.28-31.
\textsuperscript{57} SGC, XV.34.32-5.
\textsuperscript{58} SGC, XV.34.36.
\textsuperscript{60} CPR, 1422-9, p. 118; Fellowes, Military Knights, p. 4.
Sir John Kiderow [Kederowe, Kydderowe]

Kiderow was appointed in the place of William Lisle on 16 June 1428, and first appears in the treasurer’s rolls during the financial year 1428-9.\(^{61}\) He was nominated because of his great poverty and because he had fallen into old age. He is further included in the accounts for 1430-1, 1434-5, 1437-8, 1438-9 and 1441-2, and was named as being owed arrears for 1429-30, 1433-4 and 1436-7.\(^{62}\) Kiderow is not named in the treasurer’s roll for 1447-8 and must have died between Michaelmas 1442 and 19 May 1447, when he was named in letters patent as deceased.\(^{63}\)

Kiderow appears to have been from Somerset. In 1421 he had (alongside others) letters patent granting a messuage in Compton Durville, Somerset, revoked.\(^{64}\) In 1431 he was described as being of the town of Baryngton, Somerset in a debt case.\(^{65}\) Previously, in 1412, Kiderow had been pardoned for the death of a Welshman, Thomas Hurre, in Bristol two years before.\(^{66}\) Later in life, these violent tendencies were put to good use. Kiderow captained his own retinue in the 1421 French expedition and had taken out protections to fight in France in 1424, with Henry VI, in 1426, with John, duke of Bedford, and in 1431, with William, Lord Clinton.\(^{67}\) The last of these protections was taken at Windsor, in a period c.1429-31, when Kiderow had been outlawed and was not being paid by the college. Clearly, in troubled times, he contemplated a return from retirement in order to maintain himself. He is to be distinguished from John Clitherow, a clerk of the chancery, who appears often in the records.
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\(^{61}\) CPR, 1422-9, pp. 487, 489, 523; Fellowes, Military Knights, p. 4; SGC, XV.34.36.

\(^{62}\) SGC, XV.34.37-8; XV.34.38*; XV.34.39; XV.34.41.

\(^{63}\) SGC, XV.34.43; CPR, 1446-52, p. 52.

\(^{64}\) CPR, 1416-22, pp. 402-3.

\(^{65}\) CPR, 1429-36, p. 94.

\(^{66}\) CPR, 1408-13, pp. 368, 463.

\(^{67}\) TNA, E101/50/1, m. 4d; C76/106, m. 6; C76/108, m. 6; C76/113, m. 5.
Sir John Trebell

John Trebell was appointed as a poor knight on 23 May 1430 and first appears in the treasurer’s accounts in 1434-5, when he was paid for both that year and for unpaid arrears from 1433-4.68 He was named in his royal letters patent as ‘King’s knight’. Trebell had served at Agincourt in the retinue of Sir Thomas West and later took protection to serve with Sir Walter Hungerford in 1417 on another French expedition.69 He is included in the college’s accounts for 1437-8 and 1438-9.70 The roll for 1437-8 mentions Trebell’s arrears from 1436-7.71 It would appear that the entry in 1438-9 is also concerned with arrears, as Trebell had died by 11 June 1438, before Michaelmas when the treasurer began his roll of account.72 Letters patent given on 11 June state that one of the canons of the college, John Deepdene, had been granted the garden that John Trebell had when alive, for the rent of one rose to the constable of the castle on Midsummer’s Day.73

Sir John Salisbury

John Salisbury’s entry in the patent rolls unfortunately does not survive and so it is uncertain when he was appointed.74 He may have been the John Salisbury who took protections in 1428 to serve with Richard Buckland.75 It is likely that he was the John de Salisbury, knight, who took protections to serve with Lewis, Lord Bourchier, on a French expedition in 1430.76 Salisbury first appears in the treasurer’s roll for 1437-8.77 In this account, he was also paid arrears of 29s. for the previous September. If we assume regular attendance from Salisbury after his installation, then we can speculate on a probable residency period starting on 3 September 1437. Salisbury is then named
in the rolls for 1438-9 and 1441-2. There is no mention of him in the account for 1447-8, he must therefore have died between Michaelmas 1442 and Michaelmas 1447.

Sir Richard Lowyk

Richard Lowyk was appointed on 13 July 1438. It would appear that Lowyk replaced John Trebell as a poor knight, although his letters patent give no indication of this. He was nominated on account of his past services and present poverty. Lowyk had been in the field at the siege of Louviers in 1430 and was garrisoned at Vernon with his own retinue in April 1436 before moving to Verneuil in December 1436, when he was garrisoned under the captaincy of William Neville, Lord Fauconberg. He was probably also the knight named in an unknown garrison in February 1433. Lowyk was named in the treasurer’s rolls for 1438-9. His cotidian payments for the financial year are relatively high, suggesting that he arrived in the college between October and December 1438. Lowyk does not appear in the next extant treasurer’s roll in 1441-2 and so must have left the college or died between Michaelmas 1439 and Michaelmas 1441.

Sir Sigismund Ottelinger

Sigismund Ottelinger was appointed on 4 May 1441 in place of Richard Lowyk. This was prompted by the ‘advice and assent of the Knights of the Garter, in consideration of his poverty and age, and of his long service to Henry V and Henry VI in the French wars’. Ottelinger had lost his goods in France in the rebellion of Paris, at which point
he transferred his allegiance to the King of England. He received letters of denization on the same day as his appointment to Windsor. Ottelinger is first named in the treasurer’s accounts at Michaelmas 1441 and was further mentioned in 1447-8, 1450-1, 1454-5, 1460, 1461-2 and 1462-3. In 1462-3, Ottelinger accumulated only twenty days’ worth of payments for October, at which point it is likely he died, as he was described as *nuper* along with another deceased poor knight, William Crafford.

**Sir William Crafford**

William Crafford was appointed on 16 May 1443, and was described in his letters patent as ‘continuing in the wars of France and the duchy of Normandy after the first siege of Harlfleue [sic] and, having often been taken prisoner and mutilated hand and foot, was grievously wounded in the head so that his recovery was improbable, and that which Henry V had given him wherewithal to live is in the hands of the kings enemies in France, so that he is impoverished’. Crafford served in France with his own retinue in 1432, and was recorded in the personal retinue of Thomas, Lord Scales, in 1440 in both the field and at Normandy. He was probably also the knight who served in France in 1424 with Sir John Kyghley and was at Carentan in France with Sir Lewis Despoy and Richard Brumeley in 1438.

Despite his many injuries, Crafford was able to survive for several years at St George’s. He was named for the first time in the treasurer’s roll for 1447-8, and was further mentioned in the accounts for 1450-1, 1454-5, 1460 and 1461-2. In the roll for 1461-2, Crafford was paid for the majority of Michaelmas term, after which payments ceased, and he was replaced by Walter Cottisford. Fellowes erroneously states that
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Crafford was paid until Midsummer Day 1462. His confusion appears to have come from a payment made in 1462-3 to Crafford’s widow of 26s. 8d. in arrears. As with Sigismund Ottelinger, this entry contains the word nuper to describe Crafford, now dead.

**Sir Robert James**

Robert James was appointed on 12 August 1451 and appears to have had only a brief residency at St George’s. James had previously been lieutenant of Bayeux, and had served in Henry V’s wars in France and Normandy for over thirty years. He had been taken prisoner four times and had lost everything after the treaty of Bayeux, forcing him to withdraw to England in ‘great poverty’. James had served in the field with Sir Robert Harling and John FitzAllan, earl of Arundel, in 1433 and was garrisoned at Essay with Harling in 1434. He was garrisoned at Bayeux in 1435 with Robert, Lord Willoughby, and was recorded in the field at the siege of Tancarville with John, Lord Talbot, and his own retinue in 1437. He was named in only one extant treasurer’s roll - 1454-5 - and by 1460 had either left the college or died, no further reference is available within the college’s archives.

**Sir Walter Cottisford [Cotford/Codford/Cresford]**

Walter Cottisford was appointed on 26 July 1461, where he was named as Walter Cotford, knight. Cottisford was nominated as he had suffered losses in France and Normandy. He had served at the siege of Harfleur in 1440, was garrisoned nearby in Montivilliers in 1441 and at Harfleur itself in 1442, 1443 and 1445. He was then
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named in the company of Thomas Chisenal, garrisoned at Gavray in 1446 and 1448. He received 15d for Michaelmas term, as he replaced Crafford towards the end of this term.

**William Danyell**

William Danyell was appointed on 17 June 1465 and first appears in the college’s accounts in 1468. He was named in the college’s attendance register from June 1468, where the extant register begins, until his death after high mass on 17 March 1477. Danyell had a very high attendance during this period, attending 99.15% of his required services in the chapel. He was replaced later that month by James Friis. He is also recorded in the treasurer’s rolls for this period, in 1468-9, 1471-2, 1474-5 and 1475-6. It is unlikely that he was the same William Danyell who served with Hugh Courtenay, earl of Devon, in 1418 and who was garrisoned at Arques in 1420 and 1421.

**John Pessemerche**

John Pessemerche was appointed on 14 November 1465, when he was described as one of the King’s esquires, and first features in the college records in June 1468. He appears in both the attendance register, for the entire period covered between June 1468 and July 1479, and the extant treasurer’s rolls for the years 1468-9, 1471-2, 1474-5, 1475-6, 1477-8, 1478-9 and 1479-80. He had a high attendance rate during his time at the college, attending 98.58% of his required services between June 1468 and July 1479. No entries are recorded for any poor knights for the years 1481-2 and 1482-3 and letters patent record that Pessemerche had died by 8 December 1483. It is
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uncertain whether he remained in the college unpaid between Michaelmas 1480 and his death in 1483. A full discussion of his property holdings and activities is found in Chapter 4

Thomas Grey

Grey was appointed on 22 October 1467 and appears in both the college’s attendance register and treasurers roll for 1468-9. He died on 8 September 1468 and was replaced later in the year by Hugh John.

James Friis

Friis was appointed on 10 December 1467 in place of William Danyell and was installed in the college on 20 March 1477 before high mass. Friis was named in the treasurer’s rolls in 1477-8, 1478-9 and 1479-80 but only ever received his stipend. The lack of attendance register entries and cotidian payments indicate that Friis was installed, but never took up full residency. Friis was a doctor of medicine, king’s physician and staunch Yorkist. A full discussion of his property holdings and activities is found in Chapter 4.

Hugh Jones

Jones was appointed on 15 December 1468 in place of Thomas Grey and was installed on 1 January 1469 before high mass. He is named in the treasurer’s rolls for 1468-9, 1471-2, 1474-5, 1475-6, 1477-8, 1478-9 and 1479-80 and in the college’s attendance register. Jones probably returned to his native Wales when payments to the poor
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knights ceased and was likely dead by 11 March 1486, when the treasurer’s roll resumed payments. Jones was a distinguished soldier who had fought around the Mediterranean, and also in France and Ireland. A full discussion of his property holdings and activities is found in Chapter 4.

William Saunderson

Saunderson was appointed on 8 May 1480 and is named in the treasurer’s roll for 1480-1. He was paid cotidians for attendance between May and September 1480 but received no stipend and no cotidians for 1481. Whether Saunderson died or left the college at this point is unknown, but no further mention survives. Fellowes erroneously states that there is no positive evidence that Saunderson was ever at the college and suggests that he may have replaced Hugh Jones or John Pessemerche. The evidence of cotidian payments shows this to be false, as he was contemporary with both.

John Sigemond (I)

No evidence survives that John Sigemond was ever appointed or installed as a poor knight. The sole reference comes from the letters patent appointing Thomas Holme. Holme was to have the rights and profits that David Thomas had, and the house and garden of John Sigemond, now deceased. There was a John Sigemond in royal service as a groom of the chamber, but without the evidence of a patent entry or college evidence it is unlikely he was ever a poor knight. Rather it is probable that this reference was in fact to Sigismund Ottelinger. Ottelinger had inherited what appears to have been the most popular of the poor knights’ houses, from Lowyk and

121 SGC, XV.34.61.
123 CPR, 1476-85, p. 192; SGC, XV.34.57; Fellowes, Military Knights, p. 8.
124 SGC, XV.34.57.
125 CPR, 1476-85, p. 297; Fellowes, Military Knights, pp. 8-9.
126 TNA, E101/412/10, f. 36; E101/412/11, f. 35.
Kiderow in turn.\textsuperscript{127} This house had often been named specifically in letters patent. It was granted to the dean of the Chapel Royal, Robert Aiscough in May 1447, for his use when visiting, and so must have been suitably grand.\textsuperscript{128} It is therefore likely that the ‘John Sigemond’ named was the result of either scribal or translation error and that this poor knight did not exist.

**Sir Christopher Furneys**

Furneys was appointed on 28 August 1481 but there is no evidence that he was ever resident at St George’s.\textsuperscript{129} He did, however, hold lodgings in Windsor Castle from as early as 1467. On 25 November 1467 Furneys was granted the office of porter of the castle’s outer gate, with fees at the hand of the constable of the castle, which he held until 1477.\textsuperscript{130} On 5 May 1470, Furneys was described as ‘servant of the carriage of the household’, when he was charged to take horses and carriage for the staff of the household.\textsuperscript{131} Furneys may also have occupied lodgings in Westminster palace, described as surrendered in letters patent of 1482.\textsuperscript{132}

**Walter Harneys**

Harneys was appointed on 21 November 1481 but there is no evidence that he was ever resident at St George’s.\textsuperscript{133}

**David Thomas**

Thomas was appointed on 25 January 1482 and appears in the letters patent of Thomas Holme shortly after.\textsuperscript{134} Thomas was an esquire of the household, and Holme’s letters stated that he was to have the rights and profits that Thomas had. However,

\textsuperscript{127} CPR, 1436-41, p. 528; 1436-41, p.176.
\textsuperscript{128} CPR, 1446-52, p. 52.
\textsuperscript{129} CPR, 1476-85, p. 282; Fellowes, Military Knights, p. 9.
\textsuperscript{130} CPR, 1467-77, p. 50; 1476-85, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{131} CPR, 1467-77, p. 208.
\textsuperscript{132} CPR, 1476-85, p. 251.
\textsuperscript{133} CPR, 1476-85, p. 288; Fellowes, Military Knights, p. 9.
\textsuperscript{134} CPR, 1476-85, p. 270; Fellowes, Military Knights, p. 9.
there is no evidence of Thomas’ residency and it is likely that these rights and profits referred to appointments only.

Thomas Grenefeld

Grenefeld was appointed on 14 March 1482 but there is no evidence that he was ever resident at St George’s. Grenefeld was recommended for good service to the King in all his conflicts and necessities, and for service to Richard, Duke of Gloucester.

Laurence Fairclothe [Fairclowe]

Fairclothe was appointed on 16 March 1482 but there is no evidence that he was ever resident at St George’s. He was a King’s servant and marshall of the King’s household and was nominated for his good service to the King in all his victorious conflicts and necessities.

Laurence Leventhorp

Leventhorp was appointed on 18 March 1482 but there is no evidence that he was ever resident at St George’s.

John Kendale

Kendale was appointed on 21 March 1482. There is no evidence that he was ever resident at St George’s. Fellowes does not include John Kendale in his list of poor knights, despite the survival of Kendale’s letters patent. Kendale also represented the poor knights in Parliament in 1483, when he was described, with another man, William Overey as ‘pretending themselves knights there [at St George’s]’. There is no

135 CPR, 1476-85, p. 306; Fellowes, Military Knights, p. 9.
136 CPR, 1476-85, p. 296; Fellowes, Military Knights, p. 9.
137 CPR, 1476-85, p. 301; Fellowes, Military Knights, p. 9.
138 CPR, 1476-85, p. 296.
139 Fellowes, Military Knights, pp. 9-10.
140 SGC, XI.B.6.
appointment evidence, or mention within the college’s archives of Overey, and so he has not been included in this list. 141

**Thomas Holme [Clarenceaux]**

Holmes was appointed on 29 March 1482. 142 His letters patent state that he was to have the house and garden of John Sigismund and the rights and profits that David Thomas had but there is no evidence that he was ever resident at St George’s. 143 Holme was Clarenceaux King of Arms. For more on Holme, see Chapter 4.

**Richard Assheton**

Assheton was appointed on 4 June 1482 but there is no evidence that he was ever resident at St George’s. 144

**Thomas Crabbe**

Crabbe was appointed on 11 July 1482 and is first mentioned in the college’s accounts in the treasurer’s roll for 1485-6, when payments resumed to the poor knights in 1486. 145 It is uncertain when Crabbe took up residence. He is not named in the next extant treasurer’s roll in 1489-90 and so it is likely that he had died between Michaelmas 1486 and Michaelmas 1489. 146

**Henry Sewall**

Sewall was appointed on 23 February 1484, but there is no evidence that he was ever resident at St George’s. 147

---

141 For more on Kendale, see Anne F. Sutton, ‘John Kendale: A Search for Richard III’s Secretary’, pp. 224-38.
143 See above, under David Thomas.
146 SGC, XV.34.62.
William Ballard [Marche]

No appointment survives for William Ballard.148 The only mention to him is in the letter patent of Thomas Gibbes, who was to have the second vacancy, while Ballard was to have the first.149 Ballard was March King of Arms, and there is no evidence that he was ever resident at St George’s.150

Thomas Gibbes

Gibbes was appointed on 18 January 1485 but there is no evidence that he was ever resident at St George’s.151 He was to have the second vacancy, while William Ballard was to have the first.152

John Charleton

Charleton was appointed on 15 February 1485 and is first named in the treasurer’s roll in 1489-90.153 He was not one of the poor knights named in 1486 and must have taken up residency between Michaelmas 1486 and Michaelmas 1489. He replaced Roger Tong, who was appointed after him, but took up residency first.154 He was named in the accounts for 1489-90, 1490-1, 1491-2 and 1492-3, when he died on 1 January 1493. Fellowes erroneously notes that he received payments until 16 January 1493.

William Stoughton

Stoughton was appointed on 4 October 1485, and a mandate was sent to the dean and canons on 14 November to install him.155 Stoughton had been a member of Henry VI’s household and frequently appears in the household accounts between 1446 and

---

148 Fellowes, Military Knights, p. 10.
149 CPR, 1476-85, p. 529.
151 CPR, 1476-85, p. 529; Harleian MS 433, l. 249; Fellowes, Military Knights, pp. 10-11.
152 See above, under William Ballard.
153 CPR, 1476-85, p. 497; SGC, XV.34.62; XV.34.63; XV.34.65; XV.34.66; XV.34.67; Fellowes, Military Knights, p. 12.
154 See above, under Roger Tong.
155 CPR, 1485-94, p. 37; SGC, XV.34.61; XV.34.62; XV.34.63; XV.34.65; Fellowes, Military Knights, pp. 11-12.
1452. He was first mentioned in the treasurer’s roll for 1485-6, as present from March 1486, and is further named in the years 1489-90, 1490-1 and 1491-2. The entry for 1491-2, however, relates to the previous year, when Stoughton was paid until 10 September. Fellowes incorrectly takes this to mean that Stoughton was resident at the college for a short while during the financial year 1491-2.

Roger Tong

Tong was appointed on 24 November 1485. He was appointed for his great losses and injuries in the service of Henry VI. Tong, along with his wife Anne, had received lands worth five marks from Anne’s father, Robert Whitgreve, which had been lost when he ‘wente wythe your saide blysde uncle [Jaspar Tudor] in to Scotland and in many yerys after durste nevere returne into England but was dyspoylyde of all his goodys moveable’. The profits from these lands, had been claimed by Anne’s brother, Humphrey Whitgreve in the meantime, and may never have been reclaimed by Tong. He appears in the college’s account for 1485-6, when he was paid for only eight days, but then appeared regularly until 1499. During his time at St George’s, Tong had an interesting connection with Dean William Morgan. The two men (amongst other) received a grant of properties in Buckinghamshire, Hampshire, Essex and Middlesex on 6 August 1491. Tong was replaced by John Meautis, appointed 8 January 1503, by which point he was described as deceased.

Sir Robert Champlayn

Champlayn was appointed on 8 December 1485, with a mandate sent to the dean and canons of St George’s on 9 December. He then received an exemplification on 14

156 TNA, E101/409/16, f. 36; E101/410/1; E101/410/3; E101/410/6, f. 41v; E101/410/9, f. 44v.
157 CPR, 1485-94, p. 42; SGC, XV.34.61, XV.34.62, XV.34.63; TNA, C82/4/112; Fellowes, Military Knights, p. 11.
158 History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Humphrey Whitgreve for 1422-1504 section by Simon Payling. I am grateful to the History of Parliament Trust for allowing me to see this article in draft.
159 Chichester, West Sussex Record Office, Cap/I/17/63.
160 CPR, 1495-1509, p. 301.
161 CPR, 1485-94, pp. 125, 157; Fellowes, Military Knights, p. 11.
February 1487, because he had accidentally lost his patent letters. There is no evidence that he was ever resident at St George’s. Fellowes places Champlain chronologically before John Charleton, William Stoughton and Roger Tong. His reasons for this are not clear and inaccurate as Champlain was granted letters patent after these men. Champlain was a crusader, who had fought in Hungary against the Turks and had received commendations from Popes Pius II and Paul II, the Emperor, and the king of Hungary.\textsuperscript{162} He had been wounded, had been taken prisoner several times and endured heavy ransoms, for which he was recommended as a poor knight. He also received a papal indulgence for his efforts in the crusades.\textsuperscript{163}

**Richard Tame**

Tame was appointed on 3 June 1486.\textsuperscript{164} There is no evidence that he was ever resident at St George’s.

**Lewis Caerleon**

Caerleon was appointed on 3 August 1488 and again on 14 September 1491.\textsuperscript{165} Caerleon was a doctor of medicine and King’s physician. He appears in the college’s accounts for the first time in 1490-1, when he received cotidians for five days at the end of the financial year.\textsuperscript{166} He then appears in the treasurer’s rolls for 1491-2, 1492-3, 1493-4, 1494-5, 1495-6, 1496-7 and 1498-9.\textsuperscript{167} He does not feature in the next extant roll for 1503-4 and must have died between Michaelmas 1499 and Michaelmas 1503.\textsuperscript{168} Fellowes was confused about the identity of Lewis Caerleon, and erroneously attributed his entries to two individuals, Lewis Caerleon and John Lewis. These two

\textsuperscript{162} *Ibid.*
\textsuperscript{164} *CPR, 1485-94*, p. 100. Fellowes, *Military Knights*, p. 11.
\textsuperscript{165} *CPR, 1485-94*, pp. 219, 365; Fellowes, *Military Knights*, p. 12.
\textsuperscript{166} SGC, XV.34.63.
\textsuperscript{167} SGC, XV.34.65; XV.34.66; XV.34.67; XV.34.64; XV.34.69; XV.34.70; XV.34.71; Bodleian Library, Berks. Roll 4.
\textsuperscript{168} Bodleian Library, Berks. Roll 5.
men were clearly the same individual. The error is likely a scribal or transcription error. For more on Caerleon, see Chapter 4.169

**Peter de Narbonne**

De Narbonne was appointed on 23 January 1493 and took up residency shortly after.170 De Narbonne was a native of Brittany and received letters of denization on 2 April 1490. He was barber to Henry VII and was given a coat of arms on 23 June 1502.171 De Narbonne was maintained by the college under special considerations at the request of the King, who acknowledged that St George’s were not obliged to support the knight.172 He is first named in the treasurer’s roll for 1492-3 from 3 February 1493, replacing John Charleton, who had died in January.173 De Narbonne is then further named in the treasurer’s rolls for 1493-4, 1494-5, 1495-6, 1496-7, 1498-9 and 1503-4.174 After the treasurer’s roll for 1503-4, no further accounts survive, and it is uncertain how long de Narbonne remained at St George’s. He was still alive in 1512.175 For more on De Narbonne, see Chapter 4.

**Henry Spencer**

Spencer was appointed on 29 October 1493.176 He was nominated because of good service in his youth with Henry VI, and on account of his great tribulations and loss.177 He was a yeoman of the crown by 1450, MP for Wallingford in 1450 and 1459, and

---

169 Keith Snedegar, ‘Caerleon, Lewis (d. in or after 1495)’, *ODNB*; Pearl Kibre, ‘Lewis of Caerleon, Doctor of Medicine, Astronomer, and Mathematician (d. 1494?)’, in *Isis*, 42, 2 (1952), pp. 100-108; Talbot and Hammond, *The Medical Practitioners in Medieval England*, pp. 203-4; Carole Rawcliffe, ‘More than a Bedside Manner: The Political Status of the Late Medieval Court Physician’ in *St George’s Chapel, Windsor, in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. by Colin Richmond and Eileen Scarff (Windsor, 2001), pp. 71-91.


171 *Ibid*; Bodleian Library, Ashmolean MS 858, f. 60.

172 SGC, IX.H.30.

173 SGC, XV.34.66.

174 SGC, XV.34.67; XV.34.64; XV.34.69; XV.34.70; XV.34.71; Bodleian Library, Berks Rolls 4 and 5.


steward of the lordship of Hampstead Marshall, Berks. in 1452.\textsuperscript{178} There is no evidence that he was ever resident at St George’s.

Charles de Bresy

De Bresy was appointed on 24 November 1493, notwithstanding the first and second vacancies, but there is no evidence that he was ever resident at St George’s.\textsuperscript{179}

John Meautis [Mewtes]

Meautis was appointed on 8 January 1503 to replace Roger Tong.\textsuperscript{180} Meautis was secretary of the French tongue to the King and nearly lost his life in the ‘Evil May Day’ London riots of 1517. Only one entry survives to link him to residency. Meautis was resident in 1503-4, after which no accounts are extant.\textsuperscript{181} Fellowes was unaware of this reference, although he does place Meautis as a resident of the college.

John Sigemond (II)

Sigemond was appointed on 2 June 1510 but there is no evidence that he was ever resident at St George’s.\textsuperscript{182} He was described as ‘sewer of the King’s Hall’, now in old age. Fellowes speculates that this John Sigemond may have been the son of the John Sigemond mentioned in 1482. There is no conclusive evidence to support this theory, especially as the aforementioned John Sigemond was likely never a poor knight.\textsuperscript{183}

Bartholomew Westby

Westby was appointed on 5 May 1514.\textsuperscript{184} He had previously served as second baron of the Exchequer.\textsuperscript{185} Westby died in 1521, and his will named him as ‘of Saint

\textsuperscript{178} History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Henry Spencer for 1422-1504 section by Linda S. Clark. I am grateful to the History of Parliament Trust for allowing me to see this article in draft.
\textsuperscript{179} CPR, 1485-94, p. 462; Fellowes, Military Knights, p. 13.
\textsuperscript{180} CPR, 1495-1509, p. 301; Fellowes, Military Knights, p. 13.
\textsuperscript{181} Bodleian Library, Berks Roll, 5.
\textsuperscript{182} Letters and Papers, i, p. 301; Fellowes, Military Knights, p. 13.
\textsuperscript{183} See above, under John Sigemond (I).
\textsuperscript{184} Fellowes, Military Knights, p. 13.
\textsuperscript{185} Letters and Papers, i, p. 8.
Bartholomew’s, West Smithfield’. 186 There is no evidence that he was ever resident at St George’s.

**Robert Fayrfax**

Fayrfax was appointed on 10 September 1514. 187 He was a gentleman of the Chapel Royal and a noted musician, composer and organist at St Alban’s Abbey. He was the head of the singing men at Henry VII’s funeral and at the coronation of Henry VIII. He also headed the gentlemen of the Chapel Royal at the Field of the Cloth of Gold in 1520. There is no evidence that he was ever resident at St George’s, and Fayrfax was buried in 1521 at St Alban’s. 188

**Robert Harrison**

No patent entry survives for Harrison, nor any mention within the college’s records. However, an antiquarian record of his name exists and it is therefore possible that he may have existed. 189 There is no evidence that he was ever resident at St George’s.

---

186 TNA, PROB 11/20/178.
188 For more on Fayrfax see Nick Sandon, ‘Fayrfax, Robert (1464-1521)’, *ODNB*.
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