Jnl of Ecclesiastical History, Vol. 53, No. 1, January 2002. © 2002 Cambridge University Press 18
DOI: 10.1017/S0022046901008703 Printed in the United Kingdom

Ex-Templars in England

by A. J. FOREY

After their trial, Templars in England were in 1311 dispatched singly to religious houses, where they were to observe their vows and do penance. Although there was some opposition from both Templars and monasteries, the payment of pensions assigned to Templars caused longer-lasting problems: the crown and later the Hospitallers frequently defaulted in making payment from former Templar revenues. In 1318 John XXII instructed that Templars should enter a religious house of their choice, either as brothers or lodgers. His decree was occasioned by the situation in other countries, but was implemented in England, and some Templars transferred to other religious houses, although opposition was again expressed by monasteries. There were, however, some Templars in England who were never apprehended and lived out their lives in freedom.

On 27 June 1311 the Templars Stephen of Stapelbrigg and Thomas Totty knelt on the steps outside the west door of St Paul's in London and received absolution from the bishops of London and Chichester, watched by those attending the provincial council and by some citizens. Six days later the Templar chaplain John of Stoke was similarly absolved by the two bishops.[1] These were the only three Templars in England who had confessed to any of the most serious charges levelled against the order.[2] The Templars had first been charged with apostasy, idolatry and immorality nearly four years earlier, when in October 1307 Philip IV of France had ordered the arrest of all brethren of the order in his kingdom. His action may have been prompted by a belief that the accusations were true rather than – as has often been argued – by a desire merely to gain Templar possessions. In the following month, after French Templars had begun under interrogation to admit their guilt, Pope Clement V instructed that Templars should be detained throughout western Christendom: those in England were arrested in January 1308. It was not, however, until the summer of 1308 that the procedures to be

CCR, 1272–1279 = *Calendar of close rolls, 1272–1279*, London 1990; *CCR, 1307–1313* = *Calendar of close rolls, 1307–1313*, London 1892; *CCR, 1313–1318* = *Calendar of close rolls, 1313–1318*, London 1893; *CPR* = *Calendar of patent rolls*; LA = Lincolnshire Archives, Lincoln

[1] *Councils and synods, with other documents relating to the English Church*, ii, ed. F. M. Powicke and C. R. Cheney, Oxford 1964, 1308–11; D. Wilkins, *Concilia magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae*, London 1737, ii. 388–90.

[2] For their testimonies see Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii. 383–8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046901008703 Published online by Cambridge University Press

followed in the conduct of inquiries by diocesans and papal nominees were elaborated by the papal court. When investigations had been completed, provincial councils were to determine the fate of individual Templars – apart from some leading officials of the order – and the future of the order as a whole was to be decided at a council which eventually met at Vienne towards the end of 1311. The interrogations conducted during the Templar trial produced varying results. Templars in Cyprus and the Iberian peninsula maintained their innocence, while damaging admissions were gained mainly in France and parts of Italy. Confessions of guilt were usually made after deprivation, torture and threats, and the three Templars in England who made significant admissions did so at a late stage, when torture may have been used. It is in this way that confessions to implausible charges are to be explained.[3]

Although only these three English Templars confessed to any of the most serious allegations, almost all the other brothers held in custody in London in the summer of 1311 were ready to admit that they were so defamed that they could not clear themselves. They abjured their errors, and by 13 July a further fifty-seven are known to have received absolution in London.[4] On 29 July twenty-four Templars from the northern province were similarly absolved by the bishop of Whithorn at the south door of St Peter's, York.[5]

Only a handful of the Templars in custody were not absolved at this time. John of Saddlescombe and William of Barnwell were too ill and infirm to be brought before the London council,[6] and the absolution of the chaplain Roger of Stowe appears to have been delayed: on hearing that brethren were to be arrested, he had fled to another part of the country, exchanged his habit for the garb of a secular cleric and continued to conduct services, even though by his flight he had incurred a sentence of excommunication.[7] He was later questioned with other brothers,[8] having either surrendered or been apprehended, but his conduct at the beginning of proceedings was apparently responsible for his not being absolved in the summer of 1311.[9] The other two Templars who are known not to have received absolution at that time were the provincial master, William de la More, and Imbert Blanke. When questioned by the bishop of

[3] On the trial in general see M. Barber, *The trial of the Templars*, Cambridge 1978; on proceedings in England see C. Perkins, 'The trial of the Knights Templars in England', *EHR* xxiv (1909), 432–47.

[4] *Councils and synods*, ii. 1312–16; Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii. 390–2.

[5] *Councils and synods*, ii. 1338–9; Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii. 400; *The register of William Greenfield, lord archbishop of York, 1306–1315*, ed. W. Brown and A. Hamilton Thompson (Surtees Society cxlv, cxlix, cli–cliii, 1931–40), iv. 369, no. 2352.

[6] LA, episcopal register III, fo. 232r–v.

[7] Ibid. fo. 359r–v.

[8] Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii. 342.

[9] A later absolution by the bishop of Tusculum is mentioned in LA, ep. reg. III, fo. 359r–v.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046901008703 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chichester on 5 July, the former had refused to abjure errors which he claimed not to have committed; but Clement v had earlier instructed the archbishop of Canterbury and his suffragans not to pass judgement on the English provincial master, whose case – like those of other leading Templars – was reserved for papal consideration.[10] No action was therefore taken, and he was detained in the Tower of London. Although Clement v dissolved the order in March 1312, no further pronouncement had been made on William before the latter's death in the Tower in December of that year.[11] Imbert Blanke, who at the time of his arrest in England had held the office of master in Auvergne, persisted in his denials and also refused to abjure errors of which he claimed to be innocent. But his position had been compromised by confessions made in France, especially at Clermont.[12] The London council drew back from ordering 'the imposition of bodily punishment', but commanded that he should be kept 'in the vilest prison, fettered in double irons'.[13] In April 1313 the sheriffs of London were ordered to deliver him to the archbishop of Canterbury so that the latter could pronounce on him in accordance with ecclesiastical law, but the outcome is not known.[14]

The provincial councils of London and York decided that the brethren who had been absolved should be sent singly to monasteries in order to do penance.[15] This ruling was made on the initiative of the English prelates, who presumably felt that this was the most suitable arrangement for men who were still bound by vows taken on entry to the Temple. Since, however, the councils of London and York were proceeding before a judgement on the order had been made, their decrees were regarded only as temporary pronouncements: the final decision about the Templars' fate was to be made by the pope. Yet in May 1312 Clement left the judgement of individual Templars – other than leading officials – to

[10] T. Rymer, *Foedera, conventiones, litterae et cujuscunque generis acta publica*, London 1816–30, ii. 55; *Councils and synods*, ii. 1311–12; Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii. 390; *Reg. Greenfield*, iv. 287–92, no. 2272; *Registrum Roberti Winchelsey, Cantuariensis archiepiscopi*, ed. R. Graham, ii (Canterbury and York Society lii, 1956), 1005–9.

[11] *Councils and synods*, ii. 1317; Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii. 393; Perkins, 'Trial', 443.

[12] For the Clermont proceedings, see *Le Procès des Templiers d'Auvergne, 1309–1311*, ed. R. Sève and A.–M. Chagny-Sève, Paris 1986 (this also includes in appendix 1 Imbert's own statements, and a report sent to England from Clermont). See also J. Michelet, *Procès des Templiers*, Paris 1841–51, ii. 130, 147, 248–51, 253.

[13] *Councils and synods*, ii. 1317; Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii. 393. The master of Auvergne had not been among the officials in France whose judgement was reserved to the pope in the bull *Subit assidue*: *Mélanges historiques*, ii, Paris 1877, 418–23.

[14] *CCR, 1307–1313*, 523. As he had entered the Temple about 1271/3, he is not likely to have survived long after the end of the trial. He was still alive in February 1314, but later references are lacking: Rymer, *Foedera*, ii. 243.

[15] *Councils and synods*, ii. 1316–17, 1339; Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii. 392, 400; *Reg. Greenfield*, iv. 369, no. 2352. John of Saddlescombe and William of Barnwell were also assigned to monasteries, even though they had not been absolved.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046901008703 Published online by Cambridge University Press

provincial councils, as he had earlier decreed; and he stated that brothers who had been absolved should be maintained either in former Templar houses or in monasteries belonging to other religious orders.[16] The pronouncements made in London and York came therefore to be of more long-term significance and were in force until John XXII made a new ruling about the Templars in 1318.[17]

The dispersal of Templars in the southern province began almost immediately. On 13 July it was decided that the monasteries to which the Templars were to be sent should be selected from the Canterbury register by the prelates present at the council, and four days later the archbishop of Canterbury was issuing letters to bishops and monasteries, ordering the former to place named Templars in designated monasteries, and commanding the latter to receive them.[18] Royal letters addressed on 15–16 July to Roger of Wingfield, who had overall charge of Templar lands, stated that many Templars had already been handed over to the bishops of various dioceses by the archbishop.[19] On 19 July the bishop of Salisbury instructed monasteries in his diocese to accept the designated Templars, and on 22 July Edward II wrote to sheriffs and other officials, commanding them to aid the bishop of Worcester in placing six Templars in monasteries of that diocese.[20] The bishop of Lincoln issued orders to monasteries on 24 July, and religious houses in that diocese were later acknowledging payments made to them for the Templars' maintenance from the early part of August onwards.[21] There seem to have been delays in a few cases – it was only on 2 September that Archbishop Winchelsey ordered that Richard of Newent should be housed at Wallingford – and John of Saddlescombe and William of Barnwell could not be dispatched to Swineshead and Wardon respectively, because it was felt that the journey would endanger their lives;[22] but the dispersal of Templars in the southern province appears in the main to have been undertaken rapidly.[23]

[16] *Regestum Clementis papae V*, Rome 1885–92, annus VII, 303–5, doc. 8784; *Registrum Simonis de Gandavo diocesis Saresbiriensis, A.D. 1297–1315*, ed. C. T. Flower and M. C. B. Dawes, i (Canterbury and York Society xl, 1934), 531–3. [17] See p. 31 below.

[18] *Councils and synods*, ii. 1316; Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii. 392; *Reg. Gandavo*, i. 403–5, 406–7; LA, ep. reg. III, fos 222v–3v.

[19] *CCR, 1307–1313*, 365. The numbers of those known to have been assigned to each diocese in 1311 were as follows: Bath and Wells 4; Chichester 2; Coventry and Lichfield 6; Ely 2; Hereford 1; Lincoln 18; London 2; Norwich 6; St David's 1; Salisbury 5; Winchester 3; Worcester 6. On the dispersal see also R. Studd, 'From preceptor to prisoner of the Church: Ralph Tanet of Keele and the last of the Templars', *Staffordshire Studies* viii (1996), 47–8. Ralph Tanet was sent to the diocese of Norwich: *CCR, 1307–1313*, 365. The dispersal of Templars is not discussed by J. S. Hamilton, 'Apocalypse not: Edward II and the suppression of the Templars', *Medieval Perspectives* xii (1997), 90–100.

[20] *Reg. Gandavo*, i. 405; Rymer, *Foedera*, ii. 140.

[21] LA, ep. reg. III, fos 223r–v, 242r–v.

[22] *Reg. Gandavo*, i. 407–8; LA, ep. reg. III, fo. 223v.

[23] It is argued in *Councils and synods*, ii.1298, that a few Templars had been sent to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046901008703 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In the northern province, the decision to send Templars to monasteries was taken on 30 July, but it was not until 18 August that the king commanded the sheriff of York to surrender all Templars in his keeping to Robert of Pickering, the archbishop's vicar-general.[24] Two days later Robert, unable to attend to the matter himself because of the parliament then being held, delegated to John of Nassington the task of dispatching Templars to religious houses, and letters were being sent shortly before the end of the month instructing various monasteries in the northern province to accept former Templars into their communities.[25]

The religious houses selected to accommodate former Templars do not appear to have been chosen on any clear basis of principle. Brothers were not allocated to one particular type of religious establishment. In the northern province those dispatched to Cistercian monasteries comprised the largest group, while in the south the biggest group consisted of brothers assigned to houses of black monks; but this difference merely reflects the geographical distribution of monasteries of black and white monks in England. In both provinces houses of regular canons were also utilised. The only significant feature of the allocations in this context was the exclusion of convents of friars from the list of hosts. In the northern province some Templars were sent to religious houses at some distance from the places where they had been resident in 1307: William of Middleton, for example, who had been arrested in Scotland, was sent to the Cistercian monastery of Roche, and Stephen of Radenache, who had been preceptor of Westerdale, was dispatched to Worksop.[26] But it is difficult to perceive a deliberate policy in this respect. Similarly in the province of Canterbury, most Templars after the trial did not reside in dioceses in which they had been living in 1307: the five Templars from Balsall were in fact sent to five different dioceses.[27] Yet some brothers in

monasteries by the end of July, but the editors also draw attention to a Canterbury document which states that on 14 September all the Templars brought to London confessed that they could not clear themselves, and that the council decreed that they should be sent singly to monasteries; but this source appears to be referring to events which had taken place in July: ibid. ii. 1307; Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii. 314.

[24] Rymer, *Foedera*, ii. 141.

[25] *Reg. Greenfield*, i. 140, no. 311; v. 3–4, no. 2354. On the dispersal of Templars in the northern province see E. J. Martin, 'The Templars in Yorkshire', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* xxx (1930–1), 149–50.

[26] Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii. 381; J. Raine, *Historical papers and letters from the northern registers* (Rolls Series lxi, 1873), 269; Martin, 'Templars in Yorkshire', 141; *Reg. Greenfield*, v. 8, no. 2364. As the other Templar arrested in Scotland was sent to Shelford, it is hardly accurate to say that those who had served in Scotland were sent to monasteries near the border: *The Knights of St John of Jerusalem in Scotland*, ed. I. B. Cowan, P. H. R. Mackay and A. Macquarrie (Scottish Historical Society, 1983), p. xxvi.

[27] E. Gooder, *Temple Balsall: the Warwickshire preceptory of the Templars and their fate*, Chichester 1995, 124.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046901008703 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the southern province continued to live in the dioceses in which they had been resident in 1307. Those making decisions at provincial councils about places of residence may not have known where brothers had been living at the time of the arrests; and in any case this would probably not have been an important consideration, since many Templars had not resided permanently in one house.

The dispersal was not, of course, completed without opposition from some of those who were to house the former Templars. Monasteries to which brothers were sent were not unused to having individuals thrust upon them by the king or others, nor to protesting against such impositions.[28] The financial burden of maintaining lodgers, which was a common cause of complaint, should not have been an issue in the case of the Templars. Yet the latter were not merely additional newcomers: they had been accused of very serious offences, and the comments of non-Templar witnesses during the trial indicate that some in England were ready to believe the accusations.[29] The Templars might well also prove difficult inmates, and the religious houses were to be responsible for their good conduct. The wording of the instructions sent to monasteries shows that prelates foresaw problems. The archbishop of Canterbury's letter of 17 July to bishops included the admonition:

> if the religious of the said monasteries refuse or neglect to obey your orders in this matter, you should not hesitate to impose ecclesiastical censures on them, both on the exempt, who by right – notwithstanding their privileges of exemption – are bound to obey us and you in this particular matter, and on the non-exempt, and on their monasteries;[30]

and letters sent by bishops or their representatives contained threats of ecclesiastical censure for disobedience.[31] Monasteries were also commonly required to affirm their readiness to obey episcopal commands. Towards the end of July 1311 the Cluniac priory of St Andrew in Northampton in fact refused to accept William of Pocklington, and agreed to do so only after it had been subjected to ecclesiastical censure.[32] Some monasteries

[28] See, for example, S. Wood, *English monasteries and their patrons in the thirteenth century*, London 1955, 107–11; J. H. Tillotson, 'Pensions, corrodies and religious houses: an aspect of the relations of crown and Church in early fourteenth-century England', *Journal of Religious History* viii (1974–5), 127–43.

[29] Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii. 358–64; Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS Bodl. 454, fos 91–100. See also A. Gilmour-Bryson, 'The London Templar trial testimony: "truth", myth, or fable?', in A. Gilmour-Bryson (ed.), *A world explored: essays in honour of Laurie Gardiner*, Melbourne 1993, 49–50, 52–6. Outside opinion was more favourable in Cyprus: K. Schottmüller, *Der Untergang des Templer-Ordens*, Berlin 1887, ii. 152–65, 376–99; A. Gilmour-Bryson, *The trial of the Templars in Cyprus: a complete English edition*, Leiden 1998, 51–75, 405–41, and 'Testimony of non-Templar witnesses in Cyprus', in M. Barber (ed.), *The military orders: fighting for the faith and caring for the sick*, Aldershot 1994, 205–11.

[30] *Reg. Gandavo*, i. 403–5. [31] Ibid. i. 405; *Reg. Greenfield*, v. 3–4, no. 2354.

[32] LA, ep. reg. III, fos 224r–v, 225v–6, 227.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046901008703 Published online by Cambridge University Press

expressed their willingness to receive Templars,[33] but then displayed hostility to their guests. Although the abbot of Rievaulx had agreed to accept Henry of Kirby, there were complaints on more than one occasion that the monastery refused to provide for him. Rievaulx seems to have argued that its exempt status excused it from implementing the decisions of the provincial council, but this claim was not countenanced.[34] Kirkstall was accused of allowing Roger of Sheffield to escape: because of suspicions that the brother would attempt flight, the house had been ordered to keep him in irons, but had failed to do so.[35] These incidents occurred soon after Templars had been transferred to monasteries, but in other instances there seems to have been a more gradual increase in tension. The Cluniac monks of Monkton Farleigh carried out their obligations faithfully for more than four years, but then ejected Robert of Hameldon and refused him further maintenance.[36]

Once they were housed in monasteries, Templars were expected to do penance and lead a restricted life. Little detailed information survives about the terms imposed on brothers in the northern province: existing sources refer merely to their being obliged to remain within the limits of the monasteries to which they were sent, although in 1312 William of Grafton, the former preceptor of Yorkshire, was given permission by the archbishop of York to absent himself from Selby for a month in order to conduct certain business transactions.[37] More is known about penances imposed in 1311 in the southern province. These fell into three categories.[38] Those who received the severest penance in the Canterbury province were to remain in the rooms assigned to them and not leave them except to go to the church or cloister to hear divine service. The only concession made was that once a week they were to be allowed out – though not outside the monastery precincts (*septa*) – for a period of four hours 'for breathing fresher air'. For food, they were to be permitted one kind of cheap meat on Sundays and Thursdays; on Fridays they were to fast on bread and water; and on the remaining days they were to have one kind of fish. Literate Templars who incurred a severe penance had to recite the Psalter with the Litany daily. The comparable penalty for the illiterate was the recital of 200 Paternosters and Ave Marias daily. Three of the five brothers sent to the Salisbury diocese and five of the eighteen Templars lodged in monasteries in the Lincoln diocese were subject to these restrictions.

[33] For examples of certificates sent to bishops see *Reg. Gandavo*, i. 405–6.
[34] *Reg. Greenfield*, v. 1, no. 2354; Raine, *Historical papers and letters*, 208–9.
[35] *Reg. Greenfield*, v. 1–3, no. 2354.
[36] *The register of Roger Martival, bishop of Salisbury, 1315–1330*, ii/1 (Canterbury and York Society lvii, 1963), 183–4.
[37] *Reg. Greenfield*, v. 3–4, 7, nos. 2354, 2360.
[38] LA, ep. reg. iii, fo. 223r–v; *Reg. Gandavo*, i. 403–5, 407–8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046901008703 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The Templars in the southern province who incurred penances in the second category were not to leave the monastery precincts (*septa*) except to go to nearby gardens, although the special permission of the head of the house was required for such excursions. They were to abstain from fish on Fridays: on the latter day they were to be allowed bread and beer.[39] The literate were to recite the Psalter with the Litany twice a week, and the illiterate to say 150 Paternosters and Ave Marias daily. Richard of Newent, who was detained at Wallingford, and eight Templars in Lincoln monasteries were given penances of this kind.

Those with the lightest penances were permitted to take exercise in gardens near their monastery twice a week. On Fridays they were to have bread and beer, and were to abstain from meat on Mondays, but on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Sundays they were allowed two kinds of meat; and on other days, except Friday, they were permitted two kinds of fish. No additional prayers were expected of this group, which included Robert of Sautre, who was sent to Abingdon, and three Templars in the Lincoln diocese.

All brothers were forbidden to drink wine, but it was decreed that restrictions on food were to be relaxed on double festivals, when brethren were to be allowed any food and drink in moderation. All Templar chaplains were also forbidden to celebrate offices.

Some aspects of the penances imposed would not have seemed very severe to the Templars. Meat-eating was limited to three days a week in the Templar rule,[40] and brethren were already used to reciting a considerable number of Paternosters every day for the canonical hours and for the souls of the living and the dead.[41] For many brothers the most onerous part of their penance was probably the restriction on freedom of movement, for Templars had never lived an enclosed life: in western countries many must often have been absent from their convents on administrative or other business. Both Templar chaplains and their lay colleagues were also being denied any function to fulfil.

Among those receiving the severest form of penance was John of Stoke, who had confessed to some of the more serious charges. But the same

[39] The details about diet are not altogether clear: one version states that these brothers were to abstain from meat on Mondays. But the statement about food is presumably to be understood in the context of the other penances and of the regulations in the Templar rule: see below. These brothers appear therefore to have been allowed meat, probably of one kind, on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Sundays. The reference to abstaining from meat on Mondays suggests that it may have become the practice for Templars to eat it on that day. In 1300 the Hospitallers had allowed the consumption of meat on Mondays outside the refectory: J. Delaville Le Roulx, *Cartulaire général de l'ordre des Hospitaliers de Saint-Jean de Jérusalem*, Paris 1894–1906, iii. 810–16, doc. 4515, art. 6.

[40] *La Règle du Temple*, ed. H. de Curzon, Paris 1886, 35–6, arts 26–7.

[41] Ibid. 22, 62–3, 64–5, 142, 171, 173, 180, 348–50, arts 10, 62, 65, 199, 282, 286, 306, 682–5.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046901008703 Published online by Cambridge University Press

penance was given to others who had admitted little or nothing. Although the London council in 1311 had decreed that penances should be imposed 'according to the extent to which they [the Templars] have erred in smaller and greater matters'[42] it is difficult to relate the scale of penances to replies given during interrogation.[43] It can, of course, be pointed out that brothers in England were commenting on the order's alleged regulations rather than on any wrongdoing on their own initiative. Even those who made damaging admissions could be faulted only for failing to reveal error and for not resisting what had supposedly been imposed upon them; and the three who made significant confessions in England all maintained that the threat of violence had been used by their colleagues to coerce them. Testimonies do not therefore easily provide a measure of individual shortcomings. The recorded evidence inevitably takes the form of bald, usually stereotyped, accounts, which give little impression of the demeanour or attitudes of individual Templars when questioned, and it might be suggested that those imposing penances could have been influenced by these. Yet the variations in penance seem in fact to have been determined by length of service: those who had been in the order longest were deemed to merit the heaviest penance. Of those known to have been given the lightest penance, none had been a Templar for more than four years at the time of his first interrogation: one of the brothers in this group, Thomas of Ludham, had made his profession only eleven days before the arrest of the Templars.[44] A medium penance was imposed on those who had been Templars between five and ten years, while the brothers who were given the severest penance had been members of the order for at least fourteen years – and in some cases for over thirty years – when interrogated: John of Stoke was thus assigned a heavy penance not because of his testimony but because he had been in the order for seventeen years when he was first questioned. The only known exception to this pattern is provided by Richard of Newent, who had been a Templar for twenty-two years but was subjected to a medium penance. Yet, although he had received absolution on 13 July 1311, there was – as has been seen – a delay before he was dispatched to the diocese of Salisbury to do penance. It is possible therefore that there is a link between the anomalous nature of his penance and the delay in sending him to a monastery.[45]

[42] Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii. 393; *Councils and synods*, ii. 1317.

[43] Full texts of testimonies are not provided in Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii. 329–401; for these see MS Bodl. 454; BL, MS Cotton Julius B xii, fos 67–82.

[44] When they were interrogated, Templars usually stated how long they had been in the order.

[45] A further possibility is that he was confused at this time with the Templar John of Newent, who had been a brother for eight years at the time of his interrogation. It is not surprising that some of those who received heavy penances were preceptors of Templar houses: among these were William of Forde (Denney), John Moun (Duxford) and Roger

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046901008703 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Although some aspects of the penances imposed were not excessively harsh, Templars were being punished for offences which almost all of them had consistently denied. They were being obliged to live in isolation from their former colleagues in an alien and sometimes hostile community; and when they had also lost the considerable freedom of movement which they had enjoyed before the trial and no longer had any function to fulfil, it is hardly surprising that some rebelled.[46] Shortly after he had been sent to Fountains, Thomas of Staunford was reprimanded for insulting and scandalous behaviour:

> you, forgetful of your own salvation, as we have heard, insult the abbot and convent of the said monastery of Fountains, and their servants, with shameful and abusive words and scandalous comments, and behave insultingly towards them, giving offence to God, showing contempt for the apostolic see, railing against the said council and subverting its decrees, as far as it is in your power, to the manifest danger of your soul and to the scandal of many.[47]

As has been mentioned, Roger of Sheffield soon escaped from Kirkstall and, although he was sent back, he continued to cause offence to the abbot and convent.[48] Yet when at a provincial council in London during the spring of 1312 it was inquired whether it would be advisable to investigate how the Templars were conducting themselves and whether they were performing the penances imposed, the conclusion was reached that 'it is not necessary to inquire unless rumours have been circulating'.[49] Although some Templars in the northern province were charged with having worn the order's habit after the pope had forbidden it,[50] this was

Norreis (Cressing). Yet not all preceptors were heavily penalised: William of Burton, preceptor of Temple Combe, received a light penance; but he had been a Templar for only four years. A Templar who submitted after the end of the trial was allowed to enjoy fresh air for four hours a week within the limits of the monastery; he was permitted one kind of meat on Sundays, Tuesdays and Thursdays; on Fridays he was to have bread, beer and broth and on the remaining days one kind of fish; as he was literate he was also to recite the Psalter with the Litany three times a week, in addition to normal prayers: LA, ep. reg. III, fo. 267. It is not known, however, how long he had been in the order.

[46] F. D. Logan, *Runaway religious in medieval England, c. 1240–1540*, Cambridge 1996, 27–8, argues that many Templars in the northern province failed to go to the monasteries to which they had been assigned and that in August 1312 at least fifteen were still free. This statement appears to be derived from letters issued by the archbishop of York in August and September 1312, announcing that he had absolved certain Templars who had continued to wear the order's habit after the pope had forbidden it. But these letters do not say that these Templars had been free up till then: on the contrary, the archbishop stated that he was sending the Templars in question back to monasteries (*remittimus*) after they had received absolution, and that the religious houses were to maintain them as before (*sicut prius*): *Reg. Greenfield*, v. 8, no. 2364. Seventeen, not fifteen, Templars were absolved.

[47] *Reg. Greenfield*, v. 4–5, no. 2354; *Memorials of the abbey of St Mary of Fountains*, ed. J. R. Walbran (Surtees Society xlii, 1863), 193–4.

[48] *Reg. Greenfield*, v. 5, no. 2354.

[49] *Councils and synods*, ii. 1369–70.

[50] *Reg. Greenfield*, v. 8, no. 2364.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046901008703 Published online by Cambridge University Press

probably an unwitting contravention. Persistent rebels appear to have been few. As brothers were being held singly in monasteries, any prolonged protest was dependent on personal initiative by determined individuals, but even such men must have come to realise that little was to be gained by continued rebellion. Most seem to have accepted their new way of life fairly quickly: thus of William of Fenne and William of Middleton it was said towards the end of the decade that they had for some years been leading a decent life at Meaux and Roche respectively.[51]

The provision of financial resources to maintain the Templars appears to have occasioned more constant problems than the conduct of the brothers themselves. Provision for brethren was to be made – as it had been during the period of the trial – from the revenues derived from Templar property, which in 1311 was still largely in royal hands. It was not until 28 November 1313 that Edward II ordered the keepers of Templar lands to surrender them to the Hospital, and not until 8 February 1314 that the Hospitallers were commanded by the king to provide for the maintenance of the Templars.[52] In the meantime, those holding Templar lands in the king's name were responsible for providing revenues for the maintenance of brethren. In 1311 – anticipating Clement V's decree of the following year that former Templars should receive pensions from the order's revenues – the archbishop of Canterbury and the provincial council had ruled that brethren should receive from Templar lands 4*d*. a day, which was the amount which had been allowed during the trial, although William de la More was in 1311 assigned 2*s*. daily.[53] The money for these payments was normally paid to the archbishop or bishop, who would then arrange for its distribution, although in a few instances direct payments were apparently made by royal officials to monasteries which housed former Templars. In the

[51] *The register of William Melton, archbishop of York, 1317–1340*, iii, ed. R. M. T. Hill (Canterbury and York Society lxxvi, 1988), 1, 3, nos 7, 16; Raine, *Historical papers and letters*, 269. In 1319 the prior and two canons of Barnwell, with several others, including Roger le Templer of Barnwell, were accused of assaulting and robbing an individual in Cambridge: *CPR, 1317–1321*, London 1903, 465. If the last-named was a Templar resident at the priory – one of the two Templars dispatched to the Ely diocese in 1311 had been Roger of Dalton – the episode would suggest that he had become integrated into the community. It was reported at the London council in the spring of 1312 that some women were claiming Templars as husbands, on the basis of marriages contracted before their spouses had entered the order. The response had merely been that claims 'are to be admitted in so far as the law demands and requires': no further details have survived. Married recruits were expected to obtain the consent of their spouses before entry, and any who failed to do so were to be put in irons and later returned to their wives: *Règle du Temple*, 342, art. 669; A. J. Forey, 'Recruitment to the military orders (twelfth to mid-fourteenth centuries)', *Viator* xvii (1986), 151–2. [52] Rymer, *Foedera*, ii. 236, 243.

[53] *Reg. Clementis V*, ann. vii, 303–5, doc. 8784; *Reg. Gandavo*, i. 403–5; Rymer, *Foedera*, ii. 243. By 1313 Imbert Blanke had also been given 2*s*. at the request of Louis de Clermont: *CCR, 1307–1313*, 533.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046901008703 Published online by Cambridge University Press

diocese of Lincoln, the sums received by the bishop were transmitted to the abbots and priors of the houses in which Templars were residing.[54] In the province of York, however, the money assigned to the archbishop was at first passed on to the Templar William of Grafton, who was made responsible for distributing the money among his colleagues in northern England.[55] There were complaints, however, from northern monasteries that some Templars, although in receipt of pensions, refused to pay for the maintenance they received in religious houses. In October 1313 the archbishop therefore commanded that his receiver should pay the allowances directly to representatives of the monasteries in question: to safeguard the interests of Templars, he further ordered that these payments were to be made in the presence of William of Grafton and Richard of Keswick, or at least of one of them.[56] Nevertheless, at the beginning of the following year William of Fenne still owed money to the abbot of Meaux for his maintenance.[57]

The channelling of pensions via prelates inevitably caused delays. On 28 January 1312 the bishop of Lincoln was acknowledging payments made by a keeper of Templar lands for seven brothers in his diocese, but it was not until the later part of March that some monasteries were issuing receipts for the sums assigned to them for the Templars in their houses.[58]

Greater problems were encountered, however, in extracting money in the first place from those holding Templar lands. Numerous episcopal complaints on this issue have survived from the period when Templar property was still under royal control. At the beginning of the year 1313, for example, the archbishop of York was claiming that the keepers in Yorkshire, Alexander of Cave and R. of Amecotes, had long since ceased providing money for the Templars.[59] In 1312 Walter Reynolds, bishop of Worcester, had even sought pledges for payment from the keeper of Templar lands in Gloucestershire.[60] Arrears in the payment of allowances, some stretching over long periods, were common. In the summer of 1312 the keeper of Templar lands in Cambridgeshire was being ordered to pay the pensions for Robert Scot and Roger of Dalton for the period from June 1311, together with arrears of allowances accruing before that date; in March 1313 the bishop of Hereford was acknowledging payments for the period stretching back to October 1311; and in September 1315 the bishop of Bath and Wells was giving receipts for payments owed for the sixth year of Edward II, which ended in July 1313.[61]

[54] LA, ep. reg. III, fos 241–3v.

[55] *Reg. Greenfield*, v. 10, no. 2369.

[56] Ibid. v. 29, no. 2429.

[57] Ibid. iii. 214, no. 1592.

[58] LA, ep. reg. III, fo. 242r–v. Receipts were presumably drawn up at the time when payment was received.

[59] *Reg. Greenfield*, v. 20–1, no. 2402.

[60] *The register of Walter Reynolds, bishop of Worcester, 1308–1313*, ed. R. A. Wilson (Dugdale Society ix, 1928), 56.

[61] Rymer, *Foedera*, ii. 173; *CCR, 1307–1313*, 468; *Registrum Ricardi de Swinfield, episcopi Herefordensis, A.D. MCCLXXXIII–MCCCXVII*, ed. W. W. Capes (Canterbury and York

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046901008703 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Some difficulties in securing payment from royal keepers of Templar lands are to be explained by administrative confusion and inadequacy. There seem to have been failures in communication. Royal instructions for the payment of pensions were dispatched in the summer of 1311 to Roger of Wingfield, who had overall charge of Templar lands, not to local keepers; and although the Templar Richard of Newent was sent to the abbey of Wallingford in September 1311 – some six weeks after other brothers had been transferred to monasteries in the diocese of Salisbury – orders for the payment of brethren in the diocese did not include his name until March 1313.[62] Changes in the personnel of keepers of Templar lands, especially in the later part of 1311 in the aftermath of the Ordinances, no doubt also encouraged defaulting.[63]

Difficulties in securing payment continued after the Hospitallers assumed the responsibility for providing pensions. Already in 1314 Archbishop Reynolds was addressing the matter, after hearing that support had been withdrawn, and that 'some of them [the Templars] are well known to be in danger of their lives'.[64] Between 1319 and 1321 the archbishop of York had to intervene on three occasions to obtain instalments for Ralph of Roston.[65] In 1323 the bishop of Lincoln was similarly seeking to obtain payment for Thomas of Staundon, who maintained that the Hospitallers were defaulting.[66] In view of the difficulties which the Hospitallers encountered in gaining possession of Templar properties in England, and the poor financial position of the Hospital of St John as a whole at this time,[67] widespread defaulting is not altogether surprising.

Hospitaller financial difficulties possibly also explain reductions in the size of pensions. The allowance of 4*d*. a day constituted an annual pension of £6 1*s*. 8*d*. Yet in 1319 Ralph of Roston and Henry of Pagula were each receiving only five marks.[68] In 1334 Ralph of Roston was still being assigned that amount, as was Thomas Streche.[69] By 1338, when a survey of Hospitaller lands was made, the pension of the latter Templar had been

Society vi, 1909), 484; *Calendar of the register of John de Drokensford, bishop of Bath and Wells (A.D. 1309–1329)*, ed. Bishop Hobhouse (Somerset Record Society i, 1887), 98. See also R. Hill, 'Fourpenny retirement: the Yorkshire Templars in the fourteenth century', in W. J. Sheils and D. Wood (eds), *The Church and wealth* (Studies in Church History xxiv, 1987), 127.

[62] *CCR, 1307–1313*, 365, 504, 521.

[63] Some information about changes is provided by T. F. Tout, *Chapters in the administrative history of mediaeval England*, Manchester 1920–33, ii. 320–2.

[64] Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii. 447–8.

[65] *Reg. Melton*, iii. 20–1, 25–6, 42–3, nos 44, 58, 85.

[66] LA, ep. reg. v, fo. 342v.

[67] C. Perkins, 'The wealth of the Knights Templars in England and the disposition of it after their dissolution', *American Historical Review* xv (1910), 259–63; A. M. Leys, 'The forfeiture of the lands of the Templars in England', in F. M. Powicke (ed.), *Oxford essays in medieval history presented to H. E. Salter*, Oxford 1934, 161–3; J. Delaville Le Roulx, *Les Hospitaliers à Rhodes jusqu'à la mort de Philibert de Naillac (1310–1421)*, Paris 1913, 19–25, 53–6.

[68] *Reg. Melton*, iii. 20–1, 42–3, nos 44, 85.

[69] Ibid. iii. 126, no. 216.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046901008703 Published online by Cambridge University Press

raised to six marks, and most of the other Templars listed at that time were receiving the same amount, although Roger of Stowe and Thomas of Staundon were each being given £5.[70] But none was then being paid as much as the sum of 4*d*. a day prescribed in 1311.

The reasons for these changes are not explained in the surviving sources, but the reduction first noted in 1319 may have been a consequence of a ruling issued by John XXII in December 1318.[71] The Hospitallers had complained about the size of the pensions given to former Templars, and John argued that

> such excessive and immoderate payments have been granted to the brothers each year that, if payments of this size were made by the Hospital to them, the Holy Land would receive no benefit from the said goods [of the Temple], and the order of the Hospitallers would not even be able to support the burden of the payments.

He ordered an examination of the situation, and decreed that pensions were to be reduced if they were excessive. The pope probably had primarily in mind districts such as Aragon, where Templars had been very generously treated,[72] but the instruction was also sent to other countries, including England. The pension of five marks paid to Ralph of Roston was said in 1321 to have been assigned to him by a provincial council, which was presumably acting in response to the pope's decree.[73] Later changes may similarly have been made by ecclesiastical councils in order to meet local needs. Certainly, the maintenance of former Templars was on the agenda of a northern provincial council summoned for May 1324.[74]

The English Templars were also affected by a further decree issued by John XXII in December 1318.[75] He stated that

> some brothers of the former order of the militia of the Temple of Jerusalem, forgetful of the condition of their souls when returning to their houses after the dissolution of the said order, presume to don lay clothes, conduct themselves like laymen and, like layman, behave in a manner which endangers their souls. Certain of them, immersing themselves further in the pleasures of the world,

[70] L. B. Larking, *The Knights Hospitallers in England* (Camden Society o.s. lxv, 1857), 209. At that time Roger of Dalton was receiving two marks, said to be 'for clothes and his other necessities': he was presumably receiving an allowance of food in his capacity as *custos* at Ashley: ibid. 121.

[71] J. H. Sbaralea and C. Eubel, *Bullarium franciscanum*, Rome 1759–1904, v. 160–2; *Jean XXII (1316–1334); lettres communes analysées d'après les registres dits d'Avignon et du Vatican*, ed. G. Mollat, Paris 1904–46, ii. 310–11, nos 8271–3.

[72] I hope to publish shortly a study of the dissolution of the Temple in Aragonese lands.

[73] *Reg. Melton*, iii. 42–3, no. 85.

[74] Ibid. iii. 50–1, no. 109.

[75] W. Dugdale, *Monasticon anglicanum*, London 1817–30, vi. 848; H. Prutz, *Entwicklung und Untergang des Tempelherrenordens*, Berlin 1888, 293-4; *Registrum Hamonis Hethe, diocesis Roffensis, A.D. 1319–1352*, ed. C. Johnson, i (Canterbury and York Society xlviii, 1948), 345–7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046901008703 Published online by Cambridge University Press

contract *de facto* marriages, which can more properly be called concubinages, and openly take wives, publicly living with them.

This was certainly happening in some countries: in Aragon surviving Templars, after receiving absolution, had been ordered in 1312 to live in convents formerly belonging to the order: as these houses were still in royal hands, brethren were able to lead an unsupervised life, and some left their houses and engaged in various secular activities, while vows of chastity were also not always observed. John therefore ordered prelates to summon Templars in their provinces and dioceses to appear before them within a month and to command them to transfer within three months to one of the approved religious orders. The religious houses of their choice were to admit them as brothers, 'the clerics as clerics, the laymen as *conversi*'. If any monasteries were unwilling to accept Templars on these terms, they were nevertheless to receive them as lodgers, so that brothers could observe the vows which they had taken when making their profession. Not more than two brothers were to go to the same house, unless it was a Hospitaller convent.

Although this papal instruction was again aimed primarily at Templars in countries such as Aragon, it was dispatched to all parts of western Christendom and was implemented in England, even though the Templars there were already resident in monasteries. English prelates in fact responded to John XXII's decree more rapidly than their Aragonese counterparts, but – in view of the Templars' existing situation in England – the former did have the simpler task. The archbishop of Canterbury was taking action in the early summer of 1319, while Templars in the northern province were expected to appear before Archbishop Melton on 20 September;[76] and it was mostly in the later months of 1319 that decisions were being taken by brethren. Some chose to stay where they were: Walter of Clifton opted to remain at the Augustinian house of Shelford, and similarly four Templars in the diocese of Lincoln decided not to move.[77] William of Craucombe, who had apparently been sent to the Benedictine monastery at Muchelney in Somerset in 1311, was still witnessing documents there in the late 1320s and early 1330s.[78] These Templars presumably either felt comfortable where they were or were too old and near to death to contemplate a change. A number of brothers, however, opted to transfer to different religious houses. Some sought to leave Cistercian monasteries for houses of a different affiliation. William of Middleton transferred from Roche to

[76] Dugdale, *Monasticon anglicanum*, vi. 848–9; *Reg. Melton*, iii. 17, no. 42.

[77] Ibid. iii. 22, no. 46; LA, ep. reg. III, fos 425r–v, 429. Those in the Lincoln diocese were William of Burton (Barlings), William of Chaleseye (Kirkstead), Alan of Newsom (Revesby) and William of Thorp (Thornton).

[78] *Reg. Drokensford*, 98; *Muchelney memoranda*, ed. B. Schofield (Somerset Record Society xlii, 1927), 82, 89–91.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046901008703 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Augustinian house at Bridlington; Walter of Gaddesby moved from Jervaulx to the Augustinian abbey in Leicester; and Henry of Kirby, who had originally been assigned to Rievaulx, chose to reside at the Benedictine monastery at Selby.[79] But not all wished to get away from Cistercian houses. Several who remained where they were resided in Cistercian monasteries;[80] and Richard of Keswick, formerly living at the Augustinian abbey at Kirkham, moved to Fountains.[81] Not many sought to transfer to the Hospital: Roger of Hughenden, who had been at Guisborough, did decide to go to the Hospitallers, but Thomas le Chamberlain, who in the autumn of 1319 was planning to move from the Benedictine house of Spalding to the Hospital, was before the end of the year returning to Spalding.[82] The surviving sources do not indicate the motivation for changes: the reasons were no doubt often of an individual nature and cannot now be discerned. Thomas of Staundon had entered the Temple at Lydley in Shropshire, and had apparently spent all his time in the order in London; and in 1311 he was assigned to a monastery in the diocese of Chichester: there is nothing to indicate why in 1319 he chose to go to the Lazar house at Burton.[83]

Although England had not been foremost in the pope's mind when he had issued his instruction in 1318, they did provide certain benefits for the English Templars, apart from allowing them to live in religious houses of their choice. They could reside with a former colleague: thus Ralph of Roston, as well as William of Middleton, was resident at Bridlington after 1319, and from the end of that year there were two former Templars at Spalding,[84] although this does not seem to have been a common situation. For all, moreover, there was the possibility of a change in status, so that Templars would again become members of a religious community.

Yet the implementation of John XXII's instructions occasioned hostility on the part of monasteries, just as the dispatch of Templars to religious houses in 1311 had done. Opposition to the brothers' being accepted at all was certainly envisaged by prelates when they sent out instructions for the reception of Templars. When the archbishop of Canterbury ordered the Augustinian prior of Holy Trinity in the Aldgate district of London to

[79] *Reg. Greenfield*, v. 8, no. 2364; *Reg. Melton*, iii. 22, no. 46; LA, ep. reg. III, fos 427v–8. The Walter of Middleton mentioned in a document relating to Coldingham in 1325 is not therefore to be identified with the former Templar: *The correspondence, inventories, account rolls and law proceedings of the priory of Coldingham* (Surtees Society xii, 1841), 16; R. Aitken, 'The Knights Templars in Scotland', *The Scottish Review* xxxii (1898), 34; A. Thomson, *Coldingham: parish and priory*, Galashiels 1908, 120.

[80] William of Chaleseye and Alan of Newsom.

[81] *Reg. Melton*, iii. 22, no. 46; *Reg. Greenfield*, v. 8, no. 2364.

[82] LA, ep. reg. III, fos 223, 425v, 430v; *Reg. Greenfield*, v. 8, no. 2364.

[83] Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii. 344, 346; *CCR, 1307–1313*, 365; LA, ep. reg. III, fo. 427v.

[84] *Reg. Melton*, iii. 22, no. 46. The other at Spalding was Simon Streche: LA, ep. reg. III, fo. 428v.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046901008703 Published online by Cambridge University Press

accept Roger of Stowe, he commanded that the priory should inform him within fifteen days of its intentions, and a similar demand for an answer within twelve days was included in letters dispatched at this time by Bishop Gravesend of London.[85] When the bishop of Winchester told the prior and convent of Twynham to accept Stephen of Stapelbrigg, even if not as a brother, he threatened ecclesiastical censure if they failed to comply.[86] That there was justification for such precautions is apparent from the complaint voiced by the archbishop of York at the end of 1319 that the Augustinian house of Guisborough was refusing to accept Robert of Langton.[87] Presumably most Templars were eventually accepted in the houses of their choice, but it is usually not known whether they were received as brethren or merely as lodgers. It may be noted that the survey of Hospitaller lands drawn up in 1338 mentions that Roger of Dalton had charge of the Hospital's property at Ashley, in Cambridgeshire; but it describes him merely as 'a former brother of the Temple', not as a brother of the Hospital.[88] The *Chronica monasterii de Melsa* also reports that 'one Templar stayed at the said monastery of Meaux for the whole of his life, not, however, in our habit'.[89]

All the time, of course, the problems presented by former Templars living in monasteries were being reduced by the decline in their numbers. The ages of Templars at the time of their interrogations are not recorded in English testimonies, as they are in some other records of proceedings; but evidence from elsewhere would suggest that the average age of recruitment to the order had been in the mid to later twenties; and nearly two-thirds of Templars were over forty when they were interrogated.[90] A fairly high mortality rate would therefore be expected. William of Barnwell died towards the end of August 1311 and John of Saddlescombe

[85] Dugdale, *Monasticon anglicanum*, vi. 848–9; *Registrum Radolphi Baldock*, *Gilberti Segrave*, *Ricardi Newport et Stephani Gravesend*, *episcoporum Londoniensium*, *A.D. MCCCIV-MCCCXXXVIII*, ed. R. C. Fowler (Canterbury and York Society vii, 1911), 213. See also Lambeth Palace Library, London, Register of Walter Reynolds, fo. 227r–v; LA, ep. reg. III, fos 425r-v, 430v; *The register of Thomas de Cobham*, *bishop of Worcester*, *1317–1327*, ed. E. H. Pearce (Worcester Historical Society, 1930), 45–6.

[86] *The registers of John de Sandale and Rigaud de Asserio*, *bishops of Winchester* (*A.D. 1316–1323*), ed. F. J. Baigent (Hampshire Record Society, 1897), 115.

[87] *Cartularium prioratus de Gyseburne*, ii (Surtees Society lxxxix, 1894), 392–3, doc. 24; *Reg. Melton*, ii, ed. D. Robinson (Canterbury and York Society lxxi, 1978), 58, no. 104.

[88] Larking, *Hospitallers in England*, 121.

[89] *Chronica monasterii de Melsa*, ed. E. A. Bond (Rolls Series xliii, 1866–8), ii. 316. If the statement is accurate, it must presumably refer to a Templar resident there after 1318, for William of Fenne, who lived at Meaux immediately after the trial, later moved to Whitby. When William of Craucombe was, with several others, accused of robbery and assault at Muchelney in 1325, he was given the epithet 'templer', which suggests that his status in the monastery had not changed: *CPR*, *1324–1327*, London 1904, 231.

[90] Forey, 'Recruitment', 150, and 'Towards a profile of the Templars in the early fourteenth century', in Barber, *The military orders*, 197.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046901008703 Published online by Cambridge University Press

early in September of the same year, still not absolved, and they were buried in unconsecrated ground; and at the end of 1313 royal officials were making payments for only twenty Templars in the northern province, whereas the number had been twenty-four at the end of the trial.[91] There were only thirteen surviving brothers in the whole country recorded in the Hospitaller survey drawn up in 1338: of the twenty-four Templars in the northern province dispatched to monasteries in 1311, only three were still alive in 1338.[92]

The Templars who have been discussed were those who were apprehended, examined and later dispatched to religious houses; but not all Templars resident in England in 1307 had been brought to trial. The records of proceedings contain a number of references to individual fugitives, and in May 1310 a summons was issued for eight named apostates in the northern province.[93] Fugitives were everywhere a matter of concern. In December 1309 the council of the southern province deemed it advisable to issue a summons to runaways and apostates in all dioceses, and at that time the king also instructed sheriffs to arrest apostate Templars.[94] Towards the end of the trial the archbishop of Canterbury further asserted that 'some individual members of the Order of the militia of the Temple are roaming about in various parts of the kingdom', and when Clement v dissolved the Temple in 1312, he issued a general order decreeing that all fugitives were to appear before provincial councils within a year.[95] Yet it has been pointed out that the personal equipment listed in inventories of Templar goods drawn up after the arrests usually corresponds in amount with the number of brothers arrested at a house;[96] and Roger of Stowe was not the only fugitive who either surrendered voluntarily or was apprehended during the period of the trial. John of Ebreston, for example, who was said to have absconded 'through fear of death', later gave himself up 'in a spirit of humility' in 1310, and Stephen of Stapelbrigg was arrested in 1311 in the diocese of Salisbury.[97] Yet it has been calculated that, of thirty-seven Templars known to have been in Yorkshire in 1307, ten were not apprehended

[91] LA, ep. reg. III, fo. 232r–v; *Reg. Greenfield*, v. 33–4, no. 2444.

[92] Larking, *Hospitallers in England*, 121, 209.

[93] Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii. 341, 342, 343, 344, 355–6, 367, 370, 373, 381, 383, 384–6; MS Bodl. 454, fo. 85v; *Reg. Greenfield*, iv. 285–6, no. 2271; Gooder, *Temple Balsall*, 84–5, 127. The third fugitive mentioned in William of Middleton's testimony was John of Ebreston (MS Bodl. 454, fo. 156v), not John of Caraton, as given in Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii. 381. Logan, *Runaway religious*, 251–2, lists only those mentioned in the summons of May 1310.

[94] *Councils and synods*, ii. 1269; Rymer, *Foedera*, ii. 100.

[95] *Reg. Winchelsey*, ii. 1240–1; *Reg. Clementis V*, ann. VII, 303–5, no. 8784.

[96] Gooder, *Temple Balsall*, 84–5.

[97] *Reg. Greenfield*, iv. 326–7, no. 2294; Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii. 383; *CCR*, *1307–1313*, 316–17. Other Templars who were reported to be fugitives but who surrendered or were apprehended during the period of the trial include Michael of Baskerville, John of Stoke and Thomas Totty.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046901008703 Published online by Cambridge University Press

during the period of the trial.[98] Some of these, however, may have died while proceedings were at an early stage, as did a certain number of those in custody,[99] and several Templars – including some not accounted for in the northern province – surrendered or were apprehended after the end of the trial. The London council of 1312 considered the case of Thomas of Lindsey, who had earlier fled to Ireland but who was then offering to stand to judgement, and within a year of Clement v's decree William of Grafton the younger submitted to the bishop of Lincoln.[100] Richard of Engayne, who during the trial was reported to be a fugitive and who did not receive absolution in the summer of 1311, was dispatched before the end of that year to a monastery in the diocese of Bath and Wells to do penance, and in 1313 Thomas of Hagworthingham, who similarly was neither interrogated nor absolved with other brothers, was mentioned for the first time among those receiving pensions in the diocese of Winchester: these two brothers had presumably also surrendered or been arrested at a late stage.[101] On learning of the way in which brothers were treated at the end of the trial, some fugitives apparently felt that a life of penance in a monastery was preferable to that of an excommunicate runaway.[102] Yet a number of English Templars probably survived unapprehended and lived out their years in freedom after the trial, either protected by friends and family or seeking a livelihood in places where they were not known.[103]

[98] Hill, 'Fourpenny retirement', 125. Because of variant forms of names, exact figures are not easily attainable.

[99] Two in custody in the northern province are known to have died by the middle of 1309, and others not mentioned again after their arrest may similarly have soon died: Martin, 'Templars in Yorkshire', 141; Gooder, *Temple Balsall*, 151–2; cf. 97–8, 125–6, 147–50.

[100] *Councils and synods*, ii. 1369; LA, ep. reg. iii, fo. 267.

[101] *CCR*, *1307–1313*, 391; *CCR*, *1313–1318*, 10. The chaplain Richard of Grafton, however, who in 1313 was also said for the first time to be receiving a pension in the same diocese (ibid. 15), was reported in 1309 by several English Templars to have been then in Cyprus, and he is probably to be identified with the Templar who at one point in the Cyprus proceedings was referred to as 'Richard Anglicus priest and chaplain': Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii. 343, 346; Schottmüller, *Untergang des Templer-Ordens*, ii. 169, 234; Gilmour-Bryson, *Trial in Cyprus*, 81, 175. Several Aragonese Templars also returned to their homeland from Cyprus after the trial.

[102] Some Aragonese Templars similarly surrendered after the trial.

[103] In the years after the trial several references occur to individuals who were leading a secular life and who were given the epithet 'le Templer': see, for example, *CCR*, *1313–1318*, 177, 334; but it would probably be unwise to assume, without further evidence, that these were necessarily fugitive Templars. The epithet is encountered among laymen long before the arrest of the Templars: *CCR*, *1272–1279*, 367, 369; *CPR*, *1272–1281*, London 1901, 416. Martin, 'Templars in Yorkshire', 149, states that William of Grafton, the former preceptor of Yorkshire, was absolved from his vows and returned to secular life in 1330. This comment is based on a royal letter issued in that year confirming a letter of Edward ii of 19 July 1308, which was an *inspeximus* of a licence by the Templar master allowing William of Grafton to revert to secular status after being released from his vows: *Calendarium rotulorum patentium in Turri Londinensi*, London 1802, 109; *CPR*, *1330–1334*, London 1893, 36. Doubts must be expressed about the validity of the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046901008703 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The fate of fugitive Templars has inevitably occasioned wild speculation, but the truth is probably more mundane than has been suggested in fanciful surmises.

letter which Edward III confirmed: there is apparently no other record of Edward II's letter, which was supposedly issued after the Templars had been arrested; and Templars were normally allowed to leave the order only if they transferred to a stricter religious foundation. The consequences of Edward III's letter are not known. The former preceptor of Yorkshire was unlikely to have been alive in 1330, for he had entered the Temple more than fifty years earlier: the letter more probably relates to William of Grafton the younger.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046901008703 Published online by Cambridge University Press