

# PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

**Cambridge Antiquarian Society,**

16 OCTOBER—27 NOVEMBER 1911.

WITH

**Communications**

MADE TO THE SOCIETY

MICHAELMAS TERM 1911.

No. LXI.

BEING No. 1 OF THE SIXTEENTH VOLUME.

(TENTH VOLUME OF THE NEW SERIES.)



Cambridge:

DEIGHTON, BELL & CO.; BOWES & BOWES.

LONDON: G. BELL AND SONS, LTD.

1912

*Price 3s. 6d. net.*

Monday, 30 October, 1911.

Mr W. B. REDFERN, President, in the Chair.

The Rev. J. P. RUSHE, O.D.C., made a communication on  
 THE ORIGIN OF S. MARY'S GILD IN CONNECTION WITH  
 CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

Among the many important Publications, issued under the auspices of the Antiquarian Society, there are two which should prove of special interest to us this evening: Josselin's *Brief Account of Corpus Christi College* and the *Cambridge Gild Records*<sup>1</sup>. Certain references in the former work lead us to infer that it was written about the year 1569; and the author himself assures us of his indebtedness to the Records of two Cambridge Gilds for what he knew concerning the origin of the College of which his patron, Archbishop Parker, had been the Master<sup>2</sup>. Of course, Josselin does not deal with the earlier history of either of the Gilds jointly responsible for this foundation; although the sources of information at his disposal would have enabled him to appreciate the progress made by both these organisations for a considerable period prior to the unification deemed expedient, if not absolutely necessary, for accomplishment of the very serious purpose in view. At all events, the ancient documents to which our author had access suggested no clue to him to account for the existence of those famous mediaeval fraternities at Cambridge. The more ambitious attempt of the Rev. Robert Masters to compile a detailed history of the College has not shed new light on this phase of the subject; nor does Dr Lamb's scholarly edition of the same work remove the difficulties which have long puzzled learned antiquaries as to the genesis of these exclusively religious societies: quite distinct from the "Craft Gilds" and "Merchant

<sup>1</sup> *Historiola Collegii Corporis Christi*, by John Josselin (1529-1603). Cambridge: 1880. *Cambridge Gild Records*, edited by Mary Bateson: 1903.

<sup>2</sup> *Historiola*, p. 1 sqq. *Ibid.* p. 47.

Gilds" familiar to us from the writings of such authorities as Mr Toulmin Smith and Drs Gross and Brentano<sup>1</sup>.

In these circumstances, I can only hope sincerely that my venturing to address you on a subject, which even the most devoted alumni of the College prefer, apparently, to leave alone, will not strike you as amazing presumption on the part of an utter stranger. However, I felt confident of winning your sympathetic attention since I could plead that my own research work has led me, step by step, to Cambridge—compelling me, at length, to identify St Mary's with an organisation already flourishing throughout Europe at the epoch assumed by Masters and others as the approximate period for the origin of this Gild. So, it occurred to me that the results of my investigation might merit the consideration of your Society; and with much diffidence I approached the Rev. Secretary, receiving a prompt courteous invitation to read a paper before you in the course of the present Term. It is my contention, then, that the positive evidence at our disposal leaves no option but to establish the existence of this identity: a momentous issue in itself. Still we may not rest here; because the self-same evidence precludes, on strictly historical grounds, the tenability of any theory rejecting Cambridge as the cradle of the Gild thus identified. Moreover, it demonstrates how the foundation of Corpus Christi College was by no means due to the mere fortuitous happenings surmised either by Josselin or Masters; but resulted from intellectual activities included within the scope of the object which the founder of the Gild itself had at heart in the first instance, and directed by men whose erudition has strongly appealed to the most enlightened scholars of every subsequent age. By dealing with the question according to the principles of scientific history, assigning thoroughly reliable documentary evidence for each assertion made, from the outset you yourselves will be in a position to determine the value attaching to my statements from a rigorously critical point of view<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *The History of the College of Corpus Christi and the B. Virgin Mary*, by Robert Masters. Cambridge: 1753. Dr John Lamb's edition appeared in 1831 (London). See Preface to *Gild Records*, p. vii, sq.

<sup>2</sup> I shall only quote from documents easily accessible.

I will ask you, therefore, to keep clearly before your minds the difficulties which confront the student on a careful examination of the original Gild Records preserved in the Muniment-room of Corpus Christi College; and so admirably edited for the Antiquarian Society within recent years<sup>1</sup>.

1. In the first place, we notice that in the case of St Mary's Gild these Records begin and end abruptly, covering an interval of eighteen years. The earliest is dated 1300; but Masters appears quite confident in stating that this Fraternity "was in being in the beginning of Edward the First's reign," and we shall see whether he may not have been justified in this conviction<sup>2</sup>. Neither are the minutes of the Gild of Corpus Christi more satisfactory; although in this case, also, the precious fragment that has come down to us reveals the essentially religious character of the association. Otherwise, we are left completely at a loss as to the actual date of the inauguration of either Gild; and as to the circumstances attendant on the origin of these two important organisations: questions demanding, peremptorily, a definite reply<sup>3</sup>.

2. Next, we find St Mary's in possession of an official seal, which the historian of Corpus Christi College endeavours to identify<sup>4</sup>. But I may say at once that this attempt has caused Masters to slip into a manifest anachronism; since the monastic Order to which he refers was not established in England until long after the Reformation; and, consequently, could not have had numerous communities throughout the country at the beginning of the fourteenth century. Hence the necessity of ascertaining how this Gild came by its original seal; and whether, in reality, the "Brothers" were dependent upon one or other of the monastic Orders represented at Cambridge in mediæval times. Continuing our study of sigillography, we shall have to account for the somewhat enigmatical device

<sup>1</sup> I have not found it necessary to consult the originals myself, as both the Librarian and Bursar of Corpus Christi kindly furnished such information as I required to prepare this paper.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. C. C.*, p. 10.

<sup>3</sup> *Gild Records*, p. xxi.

<sup>4</sup> *Hist. C. C.*, p. 3. It will be seen later on that Masters is completely mistaken in his surmise concerning this seal.

adopted on the coalescence of the Gilds; and, indeed, the private seals used by the First Master and one of the first Fellows of Corpus Christi College exhibit features worthy of attention in the present connection<sup>1</sup>.

3. Finally, even at the risk of taxing your patience to the most generous limit, I must include the solution of a difficulty which students of the Records seem inclined to regard as hopeless: why certain "London members" of the united Gilds should have been enrolled at Cambridge. It may appear strange to you for the moment, but this is the very point which affords that test of identification suggested in the Preface to the *Gild Records* as a means of determining whether the organisations now in question "preserved the same character throughout their whole history, or whether they took on new functions to meet the requirements of a new era<sup>2</sup>." For in the list of those "London members" I came across the names of certain "Brothers" which furnished the first clue to the identity of St Mary's Gild; while the foundation of Corpus Christi College instantly recalled the achievement of a kindred, if more humble project by contemporaries of Robert Masters: the eighteenth century representatives of that great mediaeval Confraternity to which I have referred.

Now, relying exclusively on the *Gild Records* for our information, and refraining from speculation of even the most legitimate kind, let us see what a brief summary of the principal entries teaches relative to the constitution of this Fraternity of St Mary as it flourished here at Cambridge in the year of our Lord 1285. Masters describes it as "a company of persons associated for religious purposes, including both sexes and representatives of every rank in life<sup>3</sup>." More generally designated by the Anglo-Saxon term "Gild," the organisation is frequently mentioned as the "Fraternity"; and the members are called "Brothers" and "Sisters," a custom that survives in similar societies to the present day. It was incumbent upon all to assist at certain meetings, assembled in a specified church, for

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. C. C. C.*, pp. 11, 16.

<sup>2</sup> *Gild Records*, p. viii.

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. C. C. C.*, p. 1 sq.

the exercise of devout practices; and duly elected officers were summoned periodically to attend, under the presidency of their "Alderman," to temporal affairs<sup>1</sup>. The members, thus constituted in authority, had control of a common fund to which all subscribed; but at appointed times those in office were required to produce a statement of accounts—the items appearing in the Registers in scrupulous detail<sup>2</sup>. Other Records reveal the qualifications indispensable for membership, a special ordinance being directed against public litigation among the Brethren until the matter in dispute had been submitted to arbiters chosen from the Gild<sup>3</sup>. These entries alone would suffice abundantly to show what prudent precautions were taken to forward the general well-being of those enrolled. The ordinance relating to silence is another instance of the common-sense provision made to insure discretion in what concerned the temporal affairs of those mediaeval Fraternities. And, certainly, there is ample proof of the personal sacrifices which the members were prepared to make in discharge of their simple duties: whether in visiting the sick, helping the needy, or in exercising practical charity towards the dead<sup>4</sup>. As a striking illustration of their zeal, I need only refer to the steps taken to endow a College in the University for the benefit of those otherwise hindered by circumstances continuing their studies when called to priestly service in the Church<sup>5</sup>.

So much the student can glean from that fragment of an ancient Register, recording the transactions of St Mary's Gild. The Bede Rolls and a number of separate documents add considerably to our information, especially in that important matter of the existence of a common seal (Fig. I). You will observe that the design is very simple, representing the Madonna enthroned, but uncrowned, and holding the Divine Child; with a religious person kneeling in the niche underneath. It would not imply a profound knowledge of sigillography to infer the

<sup>1</sup> See the *Gild Records*, p. 3 *et passim*.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 9 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> See *Hist. C. C. C.*, p. 2 sq. for a similar summary of the "Rules" of the religious Gilds at Cambridge.

<sup>4</sup> *Gild Records*, p. 3.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* Appendix I. No. 43. Also, *Hist. C. C. C.*, Appendix, p. 11. *Excerpta e Statutis antiquis*, 1.



I



II



IV



III

period from this device; and I shall revert to the point when dealing with the seals of Corpus Christi College later on. In the meantime, we have to enquire whether at the close of the thirteenth century there existed elsewhere an organisation not merely analogous to, but identical, in all essential respects, with this Fraternity at Cambridge. Interesting as I found the subject, of course it was only incidental to my own work, and for this reason I am not in a position to say what clues might reward one who could devote the necessary time to a thorough examination of the contents of numerous municipal and other archives hitherto practically unexplored. For example, it is argued that St Mary's Gild could hardly have existed before the year 1278 because of "the omission of all mention of it in the Hundred Rolls<sup>1</sup>." But since a Gild of St Mary was established in other places at an earlier date, it is only by diligent research we could ascertain, for certain, the evidential value of the Rolls in this connection: or the reason why this Cambridge Gild might have been the exception to a possible general rule.

Turning, therefore, to similar coeval societies on the Continent, we are at once attracted by a Fraternity associated with the Carmelites or White Friars of Florence. Owing to a curious coincidence, a fragment of the original Register of this society has also come down to us, containing entries between 1280 and 1298—thus comprising another interval of eighteen years. This document, likewise, has been edited, but because written in Italian; for it was deemed of special interest as illustrating the purity of the vernacular when Dante was a boy<sup>2</sup>. Perhaps, I may here remark that I shall have occasion to mention the name of Geoffrey Chaucer when referring to those more intimately concerned for the welfare of Corpus Christi College and the united Cambridge Gilds. If we spare a few moments for a critical study of the Florence MS. we shall have no difficulty whatever in grasping the character and object of the organisation thus clearly connected with the monastic Order of Carmel. In virtue of enrolment in this Fraternity, the members piously

<sup>1</sup> *Gild Rolls*, p. xiii.

<sup>2</sup> *Libro degli Ordinamenti de la Compagnia di Santa Maria del Carmine Scritto nel 1280*. Bologna: 1867. p. 5 sq.

hoped to insure what was known to them as the grace of a happy death by faithful fulfilment of the good works ordained by the Statutes of their Society<sup>1</sup>. These simple duties were, however, only obligatory under prescribed penalties; and, as in the case of St Mary's Gild, were designed to further earnestness in discharge of the grave responsibilities of each Christian's life. Here, too, we find a certain number of the more zealous "Brethren" elected to govern the Fraternity; yet subject to penalty themselves should any of them prove remiss<sup>2</sup>. They were entitled to respect and obedience from their fellow-members; and all freely contributed to a common fund, upon which the needy had recognised special claim. This solicitude for the temporal interests of the living extended to the eternal welfare of the dead. I must confess that it is not easy to furnish this summary from the Florence MS. without repeating what I have already submitted from the Records of St Mary's Gild. For in this instance, too, concord among the members was most rigorously enforced; the intervention of the Spiritual Directors, or Chaplains being ordained to meet emergencies; while the greatest prudence is manifest throughout in the management of temporal affairs.

It is important to note that there is express reference to the relations existing between this Fraternity and other religious societies established in Florence at that epoch; but this did not imply the inter-dependence of the various organisations—or at most indicates what might be described as mutual affiliation to enable the members of each to participate in the spiritual privileges which any of the others enjoyed: a custom quite familiar in our own days; and, unless I am much mistaken, prevailing among the Cambridge Gilds<sup>3</sup>. But, judging from the fragment of the Register before us, there was one very conspicuous detail in which the Carmelite Confraternity at Florence differed from St Mary's Gild: if persons of diverse social spheres are to be found included among the "Brothers"; no mention is made of the "Sisters" at all. Nor should we be

<sup>1</sup> *Libro degli Ordinamenti de la Compagnia di Santa Maria del Carmine Scritto nel 1280.* Bologna: 1867. p. 47.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 25.

<sup>3</sup> *Records*, p. viii. *Vide infra.*

justified in regarding this exclusion as merely accidental; since the meetings were frequently held within the monastic cloister; the very refectory of the religious being utilized for this purpose at times<sup>1</sup>. However, even at present the "Sisters" have their own assembly-room; their meetings being quite distinct from those of the "Brothers," but, otherwise, the constitution of either branch of the Confraternity is identically the same. We shall see that the fact of Great St Mary's Church having been utilized by the "Brothers" and "Sisters" at Cambridge was due to circumstances over which neither the members of the Gild, nor the religious community—upon which they depended—held control; and this will explain the apparent anomaly. It would seem that the "Brothers" at Florence, also, attached great importance to their common seal. In this instance we have no separate documents in which an impression of the device might be found. But it is sure to have been a modification of the mediaeval seal of the Carmelite Order; particularly as there is a special ordination to the effect that a reproduction of the same design should appear in a certain part of the church reserved for the Confraternity: the representation of a religious person kneeling, in prayer, at Our Lady's feet<sup>2</sup> (Fig. II).

The next step in our investigation is to consult the reliable sources of Carmelite history, so as to inform ourselves as to the nature and origin of the Confraternity in organic dependence on the Order from the latter half of the thirteenth century. But in regard to its constitution, there is really nothing to add to what we have already ascertained from that interesting Florence MS.; while the question of its origin is so defined as to admit of no ambiguity<sup>3</sup>. We find it flourishing here in England as early as the year 1273, when the Bishop of Norwich was enrolled among the "Brothers"; recalling the fact that the names of certain other Prelates appear on the Rolls of St Mary's Gild<sup>4</sup>. Fully a century later the Carmelite-Confraternity was in an equally prosperous condition, if we may judge from an ordination made by the Prior-General of the Order during the

<sup>1</sup> *Ordinamenti*, p. 45.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 19.

<sup>3</sup> For here we can consult the various Confraternity Manuals.

<sup>4</sup> MS. Bodley, 73, fol. 51 b.

canonical visitation of the English Province: for while at Doncaster he decreed that the "Brothers" and "Sisters" should thenceforth regard and celebrate the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary as their own especial festival<sup>1</sup>. This serves as a further proof of the intimate relations existing between the Confraternity and the Order upon which it was dependent. And I think I may claim your kind indulgence in order to show that these relations, and the character of the organisation continued absolutely unchanged in this country at a period even subsequent to the Dissolution: for which we have the authority of an English White Friar engaged in missionary duties here during very troublous times. He prepared a short treatise on the subject of such practical import that it was incorporated in an edition of the *Confraternity Manual* published in Dublin about one hundred years ago; the most recent version being that used by the "Brothers" and "Sisters" attached to the Carmelite churches in the same city at the present day<sup>2</sup>. So I must ask you to remember that I am not quoting from comments made by Robert Masters on the constitution of the Cambridge Gilds<sup>3</sup>:—

Once more, the fundamental principle of organisation stands revealed in the due obedience of the members to those elected from among themselves to administer the temporal affairs of the Confraternity in strictest accordance with approved Rules. Lest the interests of the Society might be prejudiced through thoughtlessness, prudent silence was enjoined concerning these affairs. The Spiritual Director was to be consulted in all matters of doubt; and only after every other effort had failed was it permissible to decide a cause by appeal to public litigation. The spiritual welfare of the members being the primary object of the Confraternity, all were required to assist regularly at the usual meetings; and to contribute to the common fund from which the general expenses were to be defrayed. These expenses included provision made for indigent "Brothers" in time of sickness or distress; and for the prescribed

<sup>1</sup> MS. Bodley, 73, f. 138.

<sup>2</sup> *The Carmelite Manual*, Dublin: 1905. p. 7 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. C. C. C.*, p. 4.

practical remembrance of the dead. The exercise of charity was to extend to the instructing of the children of the poor; and, indeed, the members were exhorted to direct their zeal always to best account: keeping clearly in view that they laboured solely for the glory of God under the patronage of Our Lady of Carmel. They were to emulate the good example given by others engaged in similar works of Christian piety, submissive to fraternal admonition and correction: expulsion from the Confraternity being the penalty of grave disedification given—failing hope of timely amendment<sup>1</sup>. I may add that the Registers, dating from the eighteenth century, are preserved in one of the Carmelite churches mentioned in this connection, furnishing some items of information just as curious as any of the entries to be found in the Records of St Mary's Gild.

In the latter case we are told of a brisk business being carried on in the sale of mill-stones during the year 1319; and the student is left to speculate on the circumstances which occasioned traffic in commodities of this kind<sup>2</sup>. But in the Dublin Registers one meets with frequent mention of an article of apparel, for which a certain small sum was disbursed from the common fund. In this instance, however, there is no room for conjecture since the entire Register, for the period in question, is happily preserved; and turning to another page, we find the explanation and forget what now seems strange in the entries to which I refer: each garment formed part of the outfit of some poor orphan boy whom the "Brothers" had succeeded in apprenticing to a trade<sup>3</sup>.

Unlike the members of St Mary's Gild and of that Florentine Fraternity, these zealous "Brothers" were, for the most part, of a very humble rank of life and had to labour hard for their own daily bread. Hence, their efforts to assist others less fortunate than themselves must have bordered on the heroic; and there are memorials of their earnestness quite as remarkable, in a sense, as that College here in Cambridge which testifies to the spirit animating the members of two mediaeval Gilds.

<sup>1</sup> See *Carmelite Manuals*, for the years 1825 and 1905 *passim*.

<sup>2</sup> *Gild Records*, p. 12 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Confraternity Book* [MS.], *passim*.

For when Robert Masters wrote the history of Corpus Christi, owing to the circumstances of the times in Ireland, it was not the children of the poor alone who stood sadly in need of help in the matter of education. So, under the guiding influence of those responsible for their spiritual direction, a number of competent "Brothers" of the Dublin Confraternity resolved to devote themselves exclusively to the higher education of such youths as might aspire to the Church or other profession. In the course of a few years a seminary was established near the city—one of the first of its kind opened in Ireland to inaugurate the revival of learning. In charge of the successors of those directly responsible for so serious an undertaking, it is still a prosperous school<sup>1</sup>; and as the enterprise will have appealed to your sympathy, I may present a view of the original buildings in conjunction with an excellent ground-plan of Corpus Christi College, showing the connection with St Bene't's Church, where the members were wont to assist, as the ancient Statutes ordain<sup>2</sup>.

I need not remind you that it would prove of little avail were we to attempt to identify St Mary's Gild at Cambridge as that great mediaeval organisation dependent on the Carmelite Order, unless we knew for certain how this Confraternity came into being. If we consult the sources again, we learn that, dating from the year 1251, it owed its origin to an extraordinary event in the career of one of the English White Friars, mentioned in the *Dictionary of National Biography* as Saint Simon Stock<sup>3</sup>. A contemporary annalist refers quite casually to this event; but dwells, in detail, on certain happenings in the Carmelite Order inseparably associated with the same<sup>4</sup>. These were the circumstances in brief: After the Hermits of Carmel had been expelled from the Holy Land in the year 1238, many of them found an asylum in England; although their coming was regarded as an intrusion by the secular clergy. On the other hand, they were eagerly welcomed

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. C. C. C.*, Appendix, p. 12 (15). Note:—Elsewhere I have dealt with the foundation of Clondalkin College at considerable length.

<sup>2</sup> See Willis and Clark's *Architectural History of Cambridge*.

<sup>3</sup> Vol. LII. p. 255.

<sup>4</sup> Lambeth MS. 192, f. 139 v. sqq.

by the families of those English Crusaders who had acquired a great esteem for the Carmelites while in Palestine. But this patronage did not count for much when it became a question of securing desirable foundations which would enable the Hermits to conform to the usages of the Western Church in the exercise of missionary zeal. In fact, the White Friars had made hardly any progress at all in this country by the date of the General Chapter held at Aylesford in Kent, A.D. 1245. It is interesting to note, in passing, that a community of the Order was established at Cambridge the next year, even though the evidence at our disposal suggests that some, at least, of the clergy of Ely were anything but favourably inclined towards the new arrivals<sup>1</sup>.

Simon Stock—so called because he had dwelt in the hollow trunk of a tree before joining the Carmelites in 1212—was elected Prior-General of the Order at that Chapter, and he at once appealed to the Bishops for redress and protection; but these Prelates declined to interfere. It was at this very critical juncture the holy man besought Our Lady, as special Patroness of a monastic institute first founded to render her due honour as Mother of the Incarnate Word, to intercede for her clients of Carmel with her Divine Son. The annalist, from whom I am quoting, states that the Blessed Virgin then appeared to Simon Stock, and instructed him to appeal directly to Pope Innocent the Fourth, through whose intervention the oppressed White Friars were to experience speedy relief<sup>2</sup>. Immediate practical steps were taken to carry out these instructions, with the result that a Papal Bull, dated January 1252, obliged the English Bishops to restrain those under their jurisdiction from offering further opposition to the Carmelites. It is by no means necessary that we should pause to discuss the supernatural element in this narrative, since we have other evidence to prove conclusively that the year 1252 marks the beginning of a most prosperous era in the history of the Order, especially here in England. Foundation followed foundation in rapid succession; and from being virtually unknown and

<sup>1</sup> Abp. Peckham's Register, f. 176 v. See Tanner's *Notitia Monastica*, p. 48.

<sup>2</sup> Lambeth MS. 192, cap. 5, l.c.

openly resisted, the White Friars became marvellously popular among all classes—not excluding Royalty—throughout the kingdom<sup>1</sup>.

The MS. copy of the narrative containing this information is preserved in Lambeth Palace Library, and dates from the year 1370. In the Bodleian there is a similar narrative, written by a renowned Prior-General of the Carmelites of the same period, testifying to the historical accuracy of the wonderful event and its sequel; while in Cambridge University Library, a MS. of the year 1420 records the circumstances with such manifest conviction as to suggest that this Apparition to Simon Stock was then of world-wide notoriety<sup>2</sup>. Furthermore, it is significant that in most of the mediaeval seals of the Carmelite Order still extant—including that of the Chapter-General, as we have seen—the device represents, unmistakably, a Vision of this kind. And I think you will admit that the ecstatic posture of the figure depicted in the official seal of the Nottingham community of White Friars (A.D. 1276) leaves no room for misgiving as to the correctness of this interpretation<sup>3</sup> (Fig. III). If anything, I should say it is even more strikingly suggestive of such an Apparition than that favourite medal used by the Carmelites from time immemorial to remind them of Our Lady's intercession at the prayer of St Simon Stock<sup>4</sup>.

Having referred you to the three ancient MSS. which furnish evidence of the cessation of those hardships which the Hermits of Carmel had to endure for fully ten years after their advent to England, it is right that I should draw your attention to the casual nature of the allusion made in each instance to so singular an event. Moreover, fearing it might prove a surprise later on, I wish to state that the author of the Bodleian MS. visited England, in his official capacity, in

<sup>1</sup> Lambeth MS. 192, l.c.

<sup>2</sup> In Bodleian Library: MS. Laud. Misc. 722, f. 114. In University Library, Cambridge: MS. Ff. 6, 11, p. 43.

<sup>3</sup> An impression from the original matrix of this seal is attached to the *Deed of Surrender* (No. 180) in the Public Record Office, London.

The device of this medal more closely resembles that shown on the seal of the Carmelites of Sutton. (On a deed dated, 1376.)

1412; and when recording the names of some of the more celebrated Englishmen who were members of the Carmelite Confraternity, he expressly mentions the famous first Alderman of the united Cambridge Gilds<sup>1</sup>. But in no case are we informed where the Vision took place, nor is the date of the occurrence assigned. So, for the moment, we have to rely on the tradition handed down among the White Friars themselves concerning the origin of the Confraternity which we find in organic dependence on their Order in the latter half of the thirteenth century. As my references are already somewhat crowded, it will suffice for the purpose in view if I quote again from that quaintly written little manual of "The most famous and ancient Confraternity of Our Blessed Lady of Mount Carmel, commonly called the Scapular," compiled by the English missionary, who gives the following reasons for having undertaken the task:—

"Of all kingdoms of Europe, England was the first that admitted the Carmelites when these religious men were driven from their native soil in Palestine by the Saracens. It was to an Englishman of the Carmelite community at Cambridge that Our Lady appeared on a memorable occasion. And it was here, in Cambridge, that the Confraternity of the Blessed Virgin was erected before any other place in the world: with such a general concourse of people of all sorts that even the King himself, Edward the First, procured himself to be enrolled in it, together with Henry, Duke of Lancaster, Henry Earl of Northumberland, and many others of the chief nobility. The devotion and piety of our ancestors were continued by their successors, and the English did ever signalize themselves by their singular affection towards the Immaculate Virgin Mary, Mother of God, and towards her Order and Confraternity of Mount Carmel<sup>2</sup>."

As is quite manifest, this treatise was solely intended to meet the requirements of those who piously accepted the tradition of the Carmelites as understood by the religious themselves. But it is important to note that the author

<sup>1</sup> MS. Laud. Misc. 722, l.c.

<sup>2</sup> Edition of 1820 (*Manual*, p. ix).

distinguishes very clearly between the Confraternity thus established, and what he describes as the "Sodality of the Order," comprising those entitled by "Letters of Affiliation" to participate in the spiritual rewards of certain specified good works<sup>1</sup>. Having seen, therefore, how very explicitly the tradition in question is defined, we must now inquire whether it can be verified on purely historical grounds. Only a few years before the birth of the writer just mentioned, the truth of the event was questioned for the first time by those unaware of the existence of the documentary evidence supporting the tradition of the Carmelites. Not even the authority of John Bale could be adduced in justification of the hostile attitude assumed by those critics of the seventeenth century, who knew nothing of the MSS. to which students of the subject are now afforded easy access<sup>2</sup>. At this juncture, A.D. 1642, a hitherto unknown document came to light; and its authenticity having been duly established, this new evidence seemed to place the matter beyond the possibility of further question. However, it contained but a more detailed account of the event recorded in those mediaeval narratives which I have brought under your notice: the special importance attaching to this discovery being due to the fact of the document purporting to be the formal testimony of one who had acted as secretary to Simon Stock when the Vision was vouchsafed to the Saint at Cambridge, on the 16th of July, 1251.

You will freely grant, I am sure, that this digression was quite justifiable when I state the practical bearing of the document on the origin of St Mary's Gild, for without it I do not know how I could account satisfactorily for the influential patronage which enabled the members to co-operate with the Gild of Corpus Christi in the grave project of endowing a College in the University. The MS. found at Bordeaux in 1642 first explains the consoling reassurance which the Prior-General of the White Friars received from

<sup>1</sup> *Manual*, p. 42.

<sup>2</sup> MS. Harley, 3838, Lib. I, cap. xviii: "A Virgine Deipara monitus Symon adversus procerum infestationes ab Innocentio remedia sumpsit... Ex Siberto de Beka." (fl. ab A.D. 1280.)

Our Lady in the circumstances described; and then mention is made of the steps taken by Simon Stock to obtain a letter of introduction to Pope Innocent the Fourth. They certainly evince sound common sense, seeing that it was to the Bishop of Winchester the holy man applied for this favour, conscious of the friendliness of that Prelate; whereas the evidence at our disposal does not justify the inference that he would have found the Bishop of Ely equally well disposed. Be this as it may, we know that Aymer de Valence had been recently confirmed "Elect" of the former See; and whatever his after-career, at this particular epoch his contemporary Matthew Paris has nothing to lead us to conclude that the young Prelate was a personage who might not have enjoyed the friendship of so holy a man as Simon Stock<sup>1</sup>. Judging from what is told us by the famous chronicler of St Albans, in all probability Aymer himself had accompanied the embassy despatched to the Papal Court by his step-brother, Henry the Third, to insure the ratification of the choice which the King virtually compelled the Chapter of Winchester to make on the death of William Raleigh. At all events, the newly-Elect was away from England until the middle of July, 1251, when we find him at Winchester just in time to confirm by his presence there one of the most vital statements made in the document discovered at Bordeaux<sup>2</sup>. If wanting in the "orders, age and knowledge" requisite for his exalted position, nevertheless he soon incurred Henry's displeasure, because he declined to withdraw from "all those who loved God and the King's honour." So that at the date of Simon Stock's visit to Winchester, Aymer was, undoubtedly, a person with influence to forward the object which the Prior-General of the Carmelites had closely at heart—effective recognition of the rights of his Order. The Papal Bull issued in the following January guaranteed that recognition, so far as the Church was concerned; and in the course of the same year (A.D. 1252), Royal Letters of Protection were granted to the White Friars for the first time<sup>3</sup>. And thenceforth, as the available evidence

<sup>1</sup> *Chronica Majora*, vol. v, p. 178.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 224.

<sup>3</sup> Patent Roll, 37, Henry III, m. 21. (Public Record Office.)

proves incontestably, "the English did ever signalize themselves by their singular affection towards...the Order and Confraternity of Mount Carmel."

Now, I must explain to you that this affection, if absolutely disinterested from the mere temporal point of view, implied the sharing of a great spiritual favour conferred by Our Lady on St Simon Stock, and extended to all who should study earnestness in God's service as clients of Blessed Mary of Mount Carmel: to the King who could grant Royal Letters of Protection to the White Friars, and to the poor who came for succour to the monastery door. Popularly known as the "Scapular Promise," we find what is implied by this favour expressed in the concluding ordinance of the Florentine Fraternity, and also in Chaucer's beautiful "Prayer," written at the pious request of one related either as daughter or wife to two renowned "Brothers" of the Carmelite Confraternity and Aldermen of St Mary's Gild<sup>1</sup>. Participation in this grand privilege is necessarily presupposed as the motive of enrolment which, consequently, does not appear in the ancient documents at our disposal, whether relating to Gild or Confraternity; and, as the essential reason of membership, it reveals the origin of that mediaeval organisation which we find dependent on the White Friars in virtue of its establishment by St Simon Stock. And now it only remains for me to demonstrate, on positive evidence, the identity of this organisation with St Mary's Gild as known to have existed at Cambridge from the year 1285; or, shall we say, from the reign of King Henry the Third, as certain names on the Rolls seem to suggest<sup>2</sup>?

Personally, I should not like to question the evidential value of those interesting summaries submitted to you in this connection; but, taken by themselves, neither should I venture to urge them by way of conclusive argument. For it is right you should know that at the time of the expulsion of the Carmelites from Palestine, the requirements of Monasticism in the Western Church entailed a certain similarity in

<sup>1</sup> *La Priere de Nostre Dame*. [M.]

<sup>2</sup> *Gild Records*, p. xiii. In allusion to the name of Robert of Madingley.

the constitutions of all religious Orders then approved by the Holy See: a feature that may be said to have its counterpart in the statutes of their respective dependent Confraternities<sup>1</sup>. And if we were to rely for evidence of identification on the *Gild Records* alone, it is quite possible, at least, that a resemblance in constitution might be traced to some other organisation in no wise associated with the White Friars of Cambridge. If we would pass from the region of reasonable conjecture to historical certitude, we expect proof of so convincing a nature as, practically, to preclude even the possibility of doubt of this kind. It has been suggested that an absolutely impartial frame of mind would be *unhuman* in a discussion such as the present; and, of course, you would be justified in thinking that my own judgment may have been influenced—not warped, I trust—by the monastic traditions of the Order to which I have the honour to belong. Perhaps the force of my further arguments is mainly relative; if so, you can best guard against the danger of undue bias, on my part, by consulting the sources to which I shall refer and by weighing my statements from a dispassionate, critical point of view. With this admonition, I may fairly endeavour to forestall an objection very obvious to those more familiar with the Records of St Mary's Gild, and with the constitution of similar societies: if in organic dependence on the Carmelite Order, how came this Gild to form so striking an exception to the usual custom, according to which we should find it associated with the conventual church of the White Friars at Cambridge? From the beginning, we know that it was connected with Great St Mary's Church wherein the members had a chapel of their own, generously endowed for the welfare of the living and for the eternal repose of their dead<sup>2</sup>. Yet, were it not for the fact of a Carmelite community existing at Cambridge from as early as the year 1246, the solution of this difficulty would be quite simple, since at the present day the Confraternity of the Order is to be found established even in cathedral churches,

<sup>1</sup> A copy of the Carmelite Constitutions confirmed by the Chapter of 1324 is preserved in the British Museum: Add. 16372.

<sup>2</sup> See the *Gild Records*, *passim*.

the formal permission of the Prior-General having been previously obtained to insure the validity of the Rolls<sup>1</sup>.

Little as is known for certain concerning the Cambridge community of White Friars, happily it suffices for my purpose: showing that the organisation dependent on the Order there would have been seriously hampered in its progress were it not permissible for the members to assemble elsewhere for their spiritual exercises and general meetings, just as set down in the Records of St Mary's Gild. For it was only at a comparatively late date that these religious themselves succeeded in securing a site for their monastery within the walls of the town; their first temporary abode being at Chesterton, where they remained three years, before changing to a more suitable position at Newnham in 1249. But the inconveniences experienced in this latter place prevented them settling permanently there; and at length they obtained a desirable plot of ground, near the present Queen's College, whereon they built their conventual church and friary<sup>2</sup>. In these circumstances, it is easy to understand how a great Confraternity, dependent on one of the monastic Orders in Cambridge, could have become associated with Great St Mary's Church; all the more so when we remember that this sacred edifice was already dedicated to the Patroness of the organisation in question<sup>3</sup>. As for the actual number of members at any given period, it may be well to state that a branch of the Carmelite Confraternity consisting of about fifteen hundred "Brothers" or "Sisters" would be regarded as quite flourishing to-day: I mean those entered on the Rolls as having bound themselves to observance of the recognised Rules of membership. Yet in the same church, with which such a branch would be connected, the Official Register might contain the names of, perhaps, tens of thousands of living pious clients of Our Lady of Carmel merely enrolled as participants of the special spiritual privilege of the Order, without taking

<sup>1</sup> This permission is essential, as implying official recognition by the Carmelite Order.

<sup>2</sup> See Tanner's *Notitia Monastica*, p. 48 sq. But I rely principally on the Patents still preserved in the Public Record Office, London.

<sup>3</sup> *The Annals of the Church* [C.A.S. Publication, No. X, 1869] are most interesting, but do not assist us in the present inquiry.

part in the voluntary good works of active affiliation: If you bear this in mind, it will go far in explaining the presence of the names of those "London members" on the Rolls of the united Gilds: especially as those prevented sharing in the meritorious zeal of the "Brethren" might be expected, should the occasion arise—say the founding of a College—to contribute gladly, according to their means, to the common fund and so establish their claim to the reward of benefactors<sup>1</sup>. It would be mere speculation to discuss the question of chaplaincy to St Mary's Gild; but in this instance there is no reason why the office might not have been held by the parochial clergy; although the deeds to which Robert Masters refers prove conclusively that in matters of grave importance it was deemed necessary to consult the Superiors of a certain religious community at Cambridge<sup>2</sup>.

I dare say you will be now interested to hear that there is documentary evidence in University Library to prove, without the shadow of doubt, that the Carmelite Confraternity existed here in Cambridge in the Middle Ages; and that it must have been very intimately associated with Great St Mary's Church. The fact is stated on the authority of a distinguished Chancellor of the University, whose name appears in an entry of the Records for the year 1353<sup>3</sup>. It is the only express allusion to the Confraternity of the Order at Cambridge to be met with in any of the mediaeval documents which have come under my notice; and certainly it is not suggestive of distinction from St Mary's Gild. Moreover, it is of such an emphatic kind as to leave not the slightest misgiving about the established position of the organisation mentioned. This reference is made in a decree, issued in the name of the University, on the occasion of one of the Carmelite Professors having successfully defended a thesis against equally learned opponents of his Order<sup>4</sup>. We are informed that this Disputation took place during the course of the year 1374; and was held publicly in a certain chapel of Great St Mary's Church: for it was customary to permit such

<sup>1</sup> I refer here to the Dublin Registers.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. C. C. G.* p. 10.

<sup>3</sup> *Gild Records*, p. 51. John de Dunwich.

<sup>4</sup> Cambridge MS. Ff. 6, 11, p. 49 sqq. See MS. Bodley, e Mus. 86.

debates there in former times<sup>1</sup>. The special significance of this event for ourselves lies in the fact of the Carmelite protagonist having upheld his cause "in his own name, and in the name of his Order and Co-brethren," or Confraternity<sup>2</sup>. I have only to add that the members of St Mary's Gild are designated "Co-brethren" in various documents of the same period<sup>3</sup>.

The evidence furnished by the ancient seals is, likewise, very striking; but in submitting it, I would remind you that the different designs adopted by the White Friars were not so exclusively peculiar to these religious as not to appear in modified form in the seals of several other monastic Orders; yet sufficiently defined to betray some resemblance. This may be accounted for owing to the fact of so many of the Orders being under Our Lady's patronage. Hence, in the present instance, the evidential value of these interesting historical monuments depends on the converging of circumstantial details towards the issue before us: the identifying of Confraternity and Gild<sup>4</sup>. As we have seen, Robert Masters has left a careful drawing of the original seal used by St Mary's from the beginning; and a glance will convince you that it was but a slightly modified example of one officially recognised at a Chapter General of the Carmelites (Fig. IV). Indeed, we find this device popular with several communities of English White Friars in the fourteenth-century, including, I think, those of York and Cambridge. At least, the cast exhibited in the British Museum is said to have been made from an impression attached to a deed or charter preserved at York<sup>5</sup> (Fig. V). But we shall have to subject that surmise occurring in Masters' *History of Corpus Christi College* to critical examination in order to identify the seal to which he refers as belonging to the Carmelites of

<sup>1</sup> *The Annals of the Church*, p. 61.

<sup>2</sup> MS. Ff. 6, 11, p. 50.

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. C. C. C.*, App. p. 12. *Gild Records*, p. 134.

<sup>4</sup> I may say that I have by me very fine sulphur casts of all the Carmelite seals shown.

<sup>5</sup> Seal LXXV., 57, manifestly belonged to a community of Carmelite Friars; but the name of the convent is missing from the inscription. In the MS. copy (private) of Dr Birch's Catalogue, there is a note stating that this seal came from York.



V



VI



VII



VIII



X



IX



XI

Cambridge. He assures us that he himself had seen impressions of this seal, and quotes the legend or inscription; but he did not think it necessary to furnish the device, the difference between this and the original Gild seal being so slight: the latter was somewhat smaller, with the figure of the religious person in the niche underneath "turned the other way<sup>1</sup>." Naturally, I was anxious to study an original impression of this "Seal of the Prior-Conventual of the Friar-Servants of Blessed Mary, Mother of Christ, at Cambridge"; and the Bursar of Corpus Christi most kindly devoted considerable time to a close inspection of the muniments under his charge in the hope of being able to comply with my request. However, his efforts were in vain; for the deeds in question are no longer available. But I had occasion to consult the Cole MSS. in the British Museum at a later date, and there came across a rough sketch of the device which verifies the Historian's description<sup>2</sup> (Fig. VI).

Nevertheless, both Cole and Masters are grievously mistaken in suggesting that those "Friar-Servants of Blessed Mary" should be identified with a community of the Friars de Pica also established at Cambridge<sup>3</sup>. For, as technically understood, the Servites alone were known in mediaeval times as the "Friar-Servants of Mary." And, as I have stated, these religious opened no houses of their Order in England until after the Reformation<sup>4</sup>. Furthermore, Masters asserts that the monastic Order upon which St Mary's Gild was dependent had numerous foundations in England at the beginning of the fourteenth century. Yet, according to Bishop Tanner and others, the Friars de Pica were scarcely known in this country at all; and the very few traces of their establishments that remain are extremely vague<sup>5</sup>. In any case, the seal before us is undoubtedly of Carmelite origin; and the learned Bishop Scrope of Bradley—author of that MS. treatise now in University Library—explains the unusual inscription by demonstrating

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. C. C. C.*, p. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Cole MS. XII. (Add. MS. 5813), f. 208.

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. C. C. C. l.c.*

<sup>4</sup> *A Catholic Dictionary*, p. 761.

<sup>5</sup> Tanner, pp. xxiv, ? 49.

how the White Friars were, in an especial manner, justly entitled to style themselves the chosen Servants of Mary<sup>1</sup>.

The reason assigned by the Historian for stating that the monastic Order in question must have had many houses in England, at an epoch *unspecified*, seems plausible: only neither in this instance does Masters give a drawing of the seals attached to the document to which he refers, including that of the Prior-General with whose consent the Proctor-General of the English Province of the same Order transacted certain business on behalf of St Mary's Gild<sup>2</sup>. This omission is all the more regrettable since we may examine at the British Museum an admirable cast of the mediaeval seal of the Prior-General of the Carmelites: the device being almost identical with that shown in a cast taken directly from the original matrix still preserved in Rome<sup>3</sup> (Fig. VII). On the other hand, it is quite possible that their own private seals may have been used by those officials on the occasion; for there are instances of Carmelite Superiors having done so when subscribing to documents of this kind: just a simple device representing some animal—beast, bird or fish; and, indeed, we shall see in a moment why the very first Master of Corpus Christi College should have wished to introduce three such symbols into the seal adopted by him, with the general design of which you will find yourselves quite familiar. The name of the Proctor-General is mentioned, but it is not in any way illuminative; and I question whether that of the reputed Prior-General of the Order would have proved more helpful, because in case of its not appearing in the Annals of the Carmelites a doubt would always remain as to whether it was actually the name of the Prior-General himself or merely that of his deputy in England. But this verges on pure speculation; and we are dealing with facts far too important and interesting in themselves to admit of indulgence in what may be but fanciful

<sup>1</sup> The treatise in University Library has not been published; but the work quoted above is included in the *Speculum Carmelitanum*, Antverpiæ, 1680, T. I, Pars II, p. 179, no. 790.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. C. C. C.*, p. 10.

<sup>3</sup> The cast in the British Museum is supposed to have been taken from an impression extant at York (?).

conjecture. Still, as a mere coincidence, I may add that an official styled "Proctor of the Order" attended, in a recognised capacity, at Windsor as representative of the Carmelites generally; and it is to one who had held this office that we are indebted for that instructive item of information relating to the special festival assigned to the members of the Confraternity<sup>1</sup>.

In connection with the seal of the Prior-General of the White Friars, I would draw particular attention to a few significant details—divested, however, of the technicalities with which they are surrounded in the report of the expert consulted, a distinguished Professor of Archaeology. You have noticed that Our Lady is represented in the lower panel standing beneath the Lily, and *uncrowned*. The latter feature is rare, if to be found at all, in Carmelite devices of a later period; but we have seen it reproduced in the original seal of St Mary's Gild, disappearing in the more complicated design adopted after the foundation of Corpus Christi College (Fig. VIII). I have described the device of this ancient common seal of the College as somewhat enigmatical; but it admits of easy interpretation, if we avail ourselves of the conventual seal of the White Friars of Newcastle-on-Tyne as a means of elucidation<sup>2</sup> (Fig. IX). This is illustrative of the Carmelite tradition which claims for the Order the distinction of being the first of monastic Institutions to venerate the Blessed Virgin by dedicating a church to her name<sup>3</sup>. Remembering, therefore, that we have the very explicit evidence of both the Bordeaux and Florence MSS. to reassure us as to the object of the members of the Carmelite Confraternity—or, shall I say, of the united Cambridge Gilds?—this is how the device of the original College seal should read: Even as Our Lady was crowned in heaven by her Divine Son; so, on earth, would her devout clients, of either sex, render due praise to the Blessed Trinity by the erection of sacred edifices in honour of the Virgin Mother to perpetuate

<sup>1</sup> MS. Bodley, 73, fol. 138.

<sup>2</sup> From a cast of the impression attached to the *Deed of Surrender* [No. 164] in the P.R.O., London.

<sup>3</sup> Lambeth MS. 192, fol. 110.

the Mystery of the Passion which has wrought the Redemption of the human race<sup>1</sup>.

Robert Masters reminds us that the former Arms of Corpus Christi were the same in design as this seal; and suggests the reason that occasioned Archbishop Parker "to obtain new ones at his own expense" for the College in 1570<sup>2</sup>. The significance of the new device of the Lilies and Pelican is expressed in a Latin couplet which Dr Lamb translates:

"Fit emblem in this Bird I see  
Of Christ, Who shed His Blood for me:  
And in the Lilies undefiled  
The Mother of that Blessed Child<sup>3</sup>."

The motive for the change, if we accept the Historian's surmise, is about the very last that would have occurred to his mind in association with the White Friars of Cambridge; yet in three of their mediaeval seals—that of the Prior-General and those of the monasteries of York and Nottingham—you may have observed that the Lily appears in each design; because typical of the Immaculate Patroness of this Order and thus expressive of the chief devotion of the Carmelites from time immemorial<sup>4</sup>.

I promised to speak of the private seal of the first Master of Corpus Christi College, Thomas of Eltisle, which has three medallions in the embroidered border substituted for the Gothic niche shown in that adopted by John Rayson, one of the two first Fellows<sup>5</sup> (Figs. X and XI). Otherwise, in either instance, we have yet another reproduction of that official seal of the Chapter General of the Carmelites<sup>6</sup>. Remembering the indebtedness of the College to the "good Duke Henry," it is not very surprising to find the "Lion of Lancaster" thus figured in the first Master's seal; but how account for the bird, and those curved lines, understood to be the sign representing a

<sup>1</sup> *Ordinamenti*, p. 47. *Speculum Carmelitanum*, T. II, Pars IV, p. 429, no. 1515.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. C. C. C.*, p. 90.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* Dr Lamb's Edition, 1831.

<sup>4</sup> Lambeth MS. 192, fol. 107 sq.

<sup>5</sup> *Hist. C. C. C.*, p. 15 sq.

<sup>6</sup> There is a special Rubric on the seals of the Order in Add. MS. 16372 fol. 30 a.

fish<sup>1</sup>? Well, both are popular Carmelite emblems—the former recalling that episode of the raven in the career of the Prophet Elias (Elijah); the latter a legend recorded in the life of St Simon Stock<sup>2</sup>. Hence, just as we have seen how the symbols of the Trinity and the Passion came to be introduced into the original common seal of the College for the pious purpose indicated; so do we here find the first Master protesting, perhaps, his own personal devotedness to the Order of Carmel in quite a charming way. And if it should strike you that this is rather a dogmatic assertion to make without appeal to some evidence of a positive character, I might refer you to the extant copies of those “Letters of Affiliation” in virtue of which certain benefactors of the mediaeval White Friars were admitted to participation in the merit of the good works performed by the religious themselves. For it is quite certain that these generous clients of Our Lady were members of the Confraternity; several of the “Letters” mentioned having attached to them impressions of a seal bearing the device commemorative of the apparition of the Blessed Virgin to Simon Stock: notably that issued by the Prior of the Carmelites at Sutton in the year 1376, showing a group of figures strikingly suggestive of those represented in the lower panel of the ancient seal of Corpus Christi College—only the extended hand of the Madonna more closely resembles the obverse of that favourite medal which you have seen<sup>3</sup>. There happens, however, to be a singular exception among the known examples of the “Letters of Affiliation”; and this copy instead of the usual seal presents a quaint drawing of two Friars in an attitude of prayer, with the raven and fish depicted between<sup>4</sup>.

This allusion to the benefactors of the English White Friars brings vividly before us the names of well-known members of St Mary's Gild most generous to the Cambridge community: such as the Eliots, the de Camps, the Trumpingtons, the de

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. of Scottish Seals* (De Gray Birch, 1907), Vol. II, p. 64.

<sup>2</sup> MS. Laud. Misc. 722, fol. 114. See also Lambeth MS. 192, fol. 22.

<sup>3</sup> The original belongs to a private collection.

<sup>4</sup> Rawlinson, D. 366. [Oxford.] See Peterhouse MS. 251. [Cambridge.] Add. Charter 5837. [British Museum.]

Mortimers, and the Waldens<sup>1</sup>. As for the royal patronage of this house, Bishop Bradley associates Kings Edward the First and Second with the actual founders; and their munificence was emulated by King Edward the Third<sup>2</sup>. It is interesting to note that one of the "Sisters" of the Gild was Margaret de Necton, the wife of John Pilate; and of the same family as the learned Humphry de Necton, the first of the English Carmelites to take the Doctor's degree at Cambridge, A.D. 1259. Robert Masters records his fame without mentioning this fact; and, still more strange, speaks of Friar Thomas Ashwell—who, in the absence of the Chancellor, was President of the University in 1413—without stating that this equally learned man was also a member of the same Order and Prior of the Cambridge community<sup>3</sup>. He survived another Prior of this house who, happily, has left us a list of some of the most renowned "Brothers" of the Carmelite Confraternity<sup>4</sup>. These include Henry, the first Duke of Lancaster; and his son-in-law, John of Gaunt<sup>5</sup>. Both these famous men were most devoted to the Order of White Friars; and the evidence at our disposal proves indisputably that the religious could exercise paramount influence with either powerful patron in the furtherance of any good cause. Possibly, you may have considered my brief, casual reference to the Disputation held in Great St Mary's Church somewhat disappointing; but I could not well pause to enter into fuller detail by quoting from the original MS. preserved in the Bodleian Library<sup>6</sup>. Here, however, I must revert to the subject, for a moment, if only to confess my inability to explain why John of Gaunt, as Alderman of the united Cambridge Gilds, should have intervened in a matter of this kind unless he did so in his official capacity. For we find him writing to Pope Gregory the Eleventh about the controversy in question,

<sup>1</sup> Patents in P.R.O., London. (Mortmain licenses to the Carmelites.)

<sup>2</sup> *Speculum Carmelitanum* (Bradley's Chronicle), T. 1, Pars I, p. 183.

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. C. C. C.*, pp. 33 and 44. [Notes.] But see *Scriptores Britanniae*, Cent. iv, p. 312; and MS. Bodley, 73, fol. 98 *et passim*.

<sup>4</sup> MS. Harley, 1819, fol. 153 b. Thomas Hearne edited this Prior's account of the origin of Cambridge University. [University Library, Mm. 5. 40.]

<sup>5</sup> MS. Harley, 1.c.

<sup>6</sup> MS. Bodley, e Mus. 86.

and subscribing himself a "Brother" of the Carmelite Order<sup>1</sup>. In these circumstances, I submit that it would be superfluous to inquire further how the Court and so many of the nobility—such as Sir Walter de Manny—came to be deeply interested in the welfare of Corpus Christi College, enrolling themselves anew in the local branches of the two Fraternities by which it was endowed<sup>2</sup>. Nor is it necessary to demonstrate more particularly the traditional benevolence of the Royal House of England towards the White Friars, as dating from the time of Aymer de Valence<sup>3</sup>.

In conclusion, I can only suggest the date of the inauguration of the Gild of Corpus Christi at Cambridge; and I do not think that we should be justified in dissociating this event from the introduction of a new Ritual among the Carmelites of the English Province. You will better appreciate the importance of this point when I remind you that the earliest documentary evidence of the existence of the Gild dates from the year 1349. It is true Josselin states that Sir John of Cambridge was Alderman of the same in 1344; and again in 1347. But as it is known that Sir John died in 1335, the testimony of this author seems to stand seriously impugned<sup>4</sup>. However, having accepted the new Ritual, or Ordinal, the English White Friars were obliged to observance of the Festival of Corpus Christi from the comparatively late date of the year 1333. They appear to have relinquished their "Ancient Ordinal" with difficulty; but the reason for this reluctance is not satisfactorily assigned<sup>5</sup>. Without attaching undue importance to the detail, I may remark in passing, that both Ordinals contain prayers to be found prescribed for recital, on certain occasions, by the members of St Mary's Gild<sup>6</sup>. The Confraternity of the

<sup>1</sup> Selden MS. 41; *supra*; but the copy of that letter is in MS. Bodley, 73, fol. 185 a.

<sup>2</sup> *Gild Records*, p. xxiii.

<sup>3</sup> MS. Laud. Misc. 722, fol. 114 b.

<sup>4</sup> *Gild Records*, p. xix.

<sup>5</sup> Bale alludes to the subject [Cent. v, p. 401], the *Ordinale Siberti de Beka* mentioned being the new Ritual to which I refer.

<sup>6</sup> A MS. copy of the *Ancient Ordinal* is to be had at T. C. D. Library [B. 3. 8.]; and a copy of the *De Beka Ordinal* can be seen at Lambeth. [MS. 193. Cf. fol. 68, c. 4; and *Gild Records*, p. 24.]

Order would, of course, join in the solemnizing of the Festival; and this devotion was one to have appealed strongly to the earnestness of the laity. Speaking from present-day experience, I can tell you, with the utmost confidence, what must then have happened at Cambridge. A number of more fervent members of St Mary's Gild became affiliated to the Archconfraternity of Corpus Christi, assembling, for convenience, in St Bene't's Church to take part in such special pious exercises as might be incumbent upon them in order to reap the spiritual advantages of their affiliation<sup>1</sup>. I have already drawn your attention to the fact of "Brothers" of St Mary's Gild being thus identified with various other religious organisations, the constitution of which, I repeat, is substantially the same to-day. So much so, that were you to visit either of those Carmelite churches in Dublin on a specified Sunday of any month of the year, you would be informed that the great concourse of men—or women, as the case might be—therein assembled formed an organisation popularly known as the "Scapular Confraternity"<sup>2</sup>.

You would find, on inquiry, that this organisation is subdivided into sections technically designated by the familiar Anglo-Saxon term "Guild"; and, probably, you would further ascertain that the members enrolled in one or other of these sections to be engaged (outside) in the same profession, business, or trade<sup>3</sup>. This, I suggest, yields a reliable clue to that reference in the *Cambridge Gild Records* to the "Fraternity of Merchants of St Mary"; and, perhaps, may account for Dr Brentano having identified the Religious as Craft Gilds of the fifteenth century<sup>4</sup>. At all events, I am quite certain it explains how a mediaeval "Fraternity of Goldsmiths" came to be associated with the Carmelites of Avignon: the ordinances of their society, in regard to the spiritual welfare of the "Brothers," being substantially the same as those which we have studied in connection with the Dublin and Florence Confraternities; or with St Mary's Gild at Cambridge<sup>5</sup>.

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

<sup>2</sup> The "Brothers" and "Sisters" assemble on alternate Sundays.

<sup>3</sup> If sufficiently numerous.

<sup>4</sup> *Hist. and Development of Gilds &c.* p. cxxxiii.

<sup>5</sup> Avignon MS. 1959, fol. 6 sq.

Supposing, however, you were to visit that selfsame church in Dublin on another Sunday, you would, no doubt, be surprised to learn that just as numerous a gathering of men—or women—engaged in prayer there, many of whom you could easily recognise from your previous experience, belonged to a Sodality of comparatively modern origin; and more closely resembling the Gild of Corpus Christi in as much as the object of the organisation is to foster greater earnestness in the Divine service, by a certain approved means, out of gratitude for Our Saviour's unending love<sup>1</sup>. Indeed, in this church alone I dare say that some half-dozen similar religious organisations, established either in honour of Our Lady or to commemorate the greater Mysteries of Christian Belief, testifies to the simple fervent piety of the "Brothers" and "Sisters" of the Carmelite Confraternity: just as at Cambridge, in former times, we had those other kindred societies manifestly related, by inter-affiliation, to St Mary's Gild<sup>2</sup>. We noticed the same conditions prevailing at Florence in the year 1280; and even at the present day it is by no means unusual for the "Brothers" of the Confraternity to look for temporal assistance to other Sodalities when engaged in an exceptionally grave undertaking: such, for example, as the building of a Temperance Hall—a project that would imply, later on, a powerful auxiliary in the exercise of veritable miracles of zeal to safeguard the unwary against one of the greatest perils of this age<sup>3</sup>.

You will understand, of course, that all such projects, entailing serious financial risks, are subject to the approval of the Spiritual Directors responsible for guidance of activities of this kind; while the other Sodalities connected with a Carmelite church would—no matter how flourishing—stand in a certain subordinate relation to the Confraternity: whether designated Societies, Gilds, Leagues or Conferences<sup>4</sup>. And in case circumstances did not allow of those enrolled, in any particular

<sup>1</sup> *A Catholic Dictionary*, p. 393.

<sup>2</sup> *Gild Records*, p. xxvii sqq.

<sup>3</sup> The Temperance Hall in connection with the Carmelite Confraternity is doing admirable work in this respect.

<sup>4</sup> By "Conference" is meant a branch of the Society of St Vincent de Paul.

organisation, assembling together for the customary pious practices; membership would merely imply the recital in private of prescribed prayers, or the performance of some simple good work—never binding in conscience. If I dwell on this point, it is really to illustrate what the standing of the other Cambridge Gilds must have been when regarded in connection with St Mary's<sup>1</sup>. And although the preservation of the Bede Rolls of the latter Gild may be entirely accidental, it is significant that the evidence clearly shows how, from the beginning, safe custody of the Register of Names was deemed a matter of vital importance in the Carmelite Confraternity<sup>2</sup>.

Now, prepared as I am to grant fullest credit to the zealous members of the two Gilds responsible for the foundation of Corpus Christi College; I do not think that the ancient documents bearing directly on the subject will admit of our crediting them also with having taken the initiative in a project of such far-reaching consequences. It is quite true that a certain pious motive is expressly assigned; but I must confess that the very first provision made in the original Statutes suggested to me the expediency of accepting this motive with reservation as to the meaning which it was intended the words of the Royal License and other ancient deeds should convey<sup>3</sup>. It was essential that candidates for admission should be already priests, or at least advanced to one of the Holy Orders<sup>4</sup>. I am sure you perceive my difficulty without further explanation. The longer one reflects on the point, the more perplexing it appears: if the object of the promoters of the enterprise was merely to insure the celebration of Masses for the members of the Gilds and their benefactors, why endow a college exclusively for those already ordained? If, however, it be permissible to interpret the documentary evidence before us in the light supplied by the rubric on "Studies," from a contemporary copy of the Carmelite Constitutions approved by the General Chapter held at Barcelona in 1324, that provision of the ancient Statutes of Corpus Christi College becomes not only intelligible but assumes

<sup>1</sup> See Records for *Returns for the Cambridge Gilds*, 1389.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. xx.

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. C. C. C.*, pp. 4 and 11.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 11.

a significance bound to elicit our admiration for the forethought of those responsible in directing the activities of the united Gilds. That rubric reveals a most praiseworthy solicitude for the education of the young White Friars who should be called upon in after-life to take upon themselves the spiritual guidance of souls. And vividly conscious that "ignorance is the mother of error" and the source of greatest evil in every state; it was ordained that the students of the Order should be afforded best opportunity to qualify themselves for the duties of their sacred avocation<sup>1</sup>.

The interesting and valuable MS. containing this rubric may be consulted at the British Museum, and there, too, can be seen another codex devoted to the preservation of the names of those English Carmelites who, from the time of Humphrey de Necton, distinguished themselves greatly either at Oxford or Cambridge<sup>2</sup>. Among them are mentioned those known to have possessed supreme influence, as stated, with the Royal Patrons and the two powerful first Aldermen of the united Gilds. Therefore, if we are prepared to concede that the initiative in the project was taken by men such as these—anxious that provision should be made to enable a certain number of clerks in Holy Orders to continue their studies at the University for the reasons assigned in the mediaeval Constitutions of the Carmelites—the original Statutes appear no longer obscure, and the pure love of learning, with all that this implies, stands revealed as the primary motive for the establishment of the College of Corpus Christi<sup>3</sup>.

Such are the considerations which led me to hope that the results of my own inquiries might prove acceptable to you. Neither the monastic tradition of the Order, associating the name of St Simon Stock with Cambridge; nor that ancient MS. discovered at Bordeaux would have helped me in my purpose, were it not for various clues met with incidentally and culminating in the issue which must be decided on the evidential value of the documents now accessible to all. It

<sup>1</sup> Add. MS. 16372, fol. 16. Rubrica xvi.

<sup>2</sup> MS. Harley, 3838, Lib. II.

<sup>3</sup> See Add. MS. 16372, l.c.

would be as tedious as unnecessary to recapitulate the difficulties encountered while subjecting these documents to critical examination ; but once I recognised in St Mary's Gild a familiar organisation presupposing dependence on some monastic Order, I felt sure of my ground. Because few as are the memorials of that community of White Friars known to have existed here in former times, they suffice to prove that these religious were intimately associated with such an organisation of which, however, it is not easy to find the slightest separate trace<sup>1</sup>. But the moment we begin to study the evidence more closely, in view of the eventual identification of the Carmelite Confraternity with St Mary's Gild, points hitherto tantalisingly vague in either connection often appear to elucidate each other quite marvellously: indicating, I am convinced, a new reliable source of information which furnishes abundant material for an interesting and coherent chapter in the mediaeval history of Cambridge.

JAMES P. RUSHE, O.D.C.

ST MARY'S,  
MOREHAMPTON ROAD, DUBLIN.

<sup>1</sup> Cambridge MS. Ff. 6, 11, 1.c.

---

Monday, 6 November, 1911.

Mr W. B. REDFERN, President, in the Chair.

Professor W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE, D.C.L., F.B.A., delivered  
a lecture on

ROMAN PORTRAITS FROM EGYPT.

---

# CONTENTS

## OF PROCEEDINGS, No. LXI.

VOL. XVI. (NEW SERIES, VOL. X.) No. 1.

	PAGE
Report for the year 1910—11 . . . . .	1
Notes on Mediaeval Ships. H. H. BRINDLEY, M.A. (n. p.) . . . . .	19
Early developments in Egyptian civilization. Mrs JOHNS (n. p.) . . . . .	19
Origin of S. Mary's Guild, Cambridge, and its connection with Corpus Christi College (Plates I, II). Rev. J. P. RUSHE . . . . .	20
Roman Portraits from Egypt. Professor W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE, D.C.L., F.B.A. (n. p.) . . . . .	52
Church Spires of Cambridgeshire (Plates III, IV). F. J. ALLEN, M.D. . . . .	53
Psychical Phenomena in Ancient Mythology. Rev. Canon CREWDSON, M.A. (n. p.) . . . . .	59
Old Trees of Cambridge. Rev. H. P. STOKES, LL.D. (n. p.) . . . . .	59

n. p. means that the Communication has not been printed in full.