**The Lollard Heretics in Surrey**

Picking up on John’s talk this morning, I thought it would be interesting to look at heresy in England, and if at all possible in surrey.

In this short paper I intend to identify all those who were resident in Surrey and were accused of heresy, and in all cases here we mean the Lollard heresy. Where possible I will identify their contacts with other heretical groups, their gender and place in society and compare this to other analyses of Lollard heretics.

Records of heresy during the 12th and 13th centuries are so rare that many scholars see England as a Heresy-free zone through until the late fourteenth century. So Margaret Aston, for instance says:

Before 1388, though the English governing classes had encountered heretics as well as rebels against society, they had never had to deal with either on a large or concerted scale. By the end of May 1382both had been on their hands, and heresy had come to stay.

This is not entirely accurate. William of Newburgh tells us that a group (perhaps 30 strong0 of German speaking people he describes as ‘Publicans’ came to Oxford in 1161. They were led by an educated man called Gerard but managed just one convert and were brought to justice in 1165. (Wakefield p245) This may have been a Cathar-like group, but the evidence is thin. Similarly there was an alleged ‘Albigensian’ burned in London in 1210 and a spiritual Franciscan (or more?) burned in 1330. In 1222 an Oxford deacon was condemned for converting to Judaism[[1]](#footnote-1).

This lack of reported heresy in England has led to commentators claiming that all dissenters must be Lollards, with scant regard for date. An extreme example can be seen in the Victorian History of County of Huntingdon[[2]](#footnote-2),where the writer notes that the case of Maud de Algekirk, a recluse examined for suspect beliefs in 1346 was ‘early for Lollard teaching’. The myth that there was no heresy in England leads to the distortion that all unorthodox thinkers must have been Lollards.

This immediately introduces a problem, one which is shared by all those who study medieval heresy. If there were heretics who espoused views which seem similar to Lollards before there were Lollards, how can we tell who was a Lollard and who was a different sort of heretic? As with many questions that will arise over the next 20 minutes I note the problem and move on. For my purposes any individual accused of being a Lollard after 1388 I will consider to be a suspect or proven Lollard, unless further testimony throws some doubt on that analysis.

**What was Lollardism**

So, who were these Lollards and where did they come from?

Lollards are (and were) often called Wyclifites, those that follow the teachings of John Wyclif[[3]](#footnote-3).

Wyclif was an Oxford academic and theologian. He developed a philosophy based on his opposition to ‘nominalism’, the medieval philosophical approach of Surrey’s most famous medieval philosopher, William of Ockham – assuming we accept that he did come from Ockham in Surrey. Rejecting the neo-platonic idea that things as objects are necessarily different from the way we think of them, Wyclif developed a form of realism, which had implications in the world of theology. During the 1370s, Wycliffe’s philosophical approach led him to advocate increasingly radical religious views. He denied the doctrine of transubstantiation, stressed the importance of preaching and the primacy of Scripture as the source of Christian doctrine.

His theories on dominion, on the grace of the righteous as their basis for authority, the exaltation of the power of the state over the church and the right of temporal rulers to correct ecclesiastics were, as the church was not slow to realise, far reaching and dangerous. For instance, in the 24 Conclusions (condemned 1382) Wyclif suggests:

“Tithes are pure alms, and parishioners may withhold them on account of the sins of their curates, and freely bestow them on others.”

His philosophy was subversive to the lay lords as well as the clergy:

“God cannot give civil dominion to man for himself and his heirs, in perpetuity…

Charters of human invention concerning perpetual civil inheritance are impossible…” (Chronicon Angeliae, Thompson 1874)

Wyclif’s views were widely associated with the Peasant’s Revolt, though Wycliffe himself was emphatically against the uprising. But the secular authority was from then onwards alerted to the possible subversive results of unorthodox religious thought. Wycliffe was charged with heresy and retired from Oxford in 1378. Nevertheless, he was never brought to trial, and he continued to write and preach until his death in 1384.

**Early Lollards**

The first Lollard group centred on some of Wycliffe’s colleagues at Oxford led by Nicholas of Hereford. In 1382 William Courtenay, archbishop of Canterbury, forced some of the Oxford Lollards to renounce their views and conform to orthodox doctrine. The sect continued to multiply, however, particularly among townspeople, merchants, gentry and the lower clergy. Several knights of the royal household gave their support, as well as a few members of the House of Commons.

The accession of Henry IV in 1399 signalled a wave of repression against heresy. In 1401 the first English statute was passed allowing the burning of heretics. The Lollards’ first martyr, William Sawtrey, was actually burned a few days before the act was passed.

Concerns about the movement were increasing and the Oxford Lollards were effectively purged in 1410. However, there was no systematic purge and Lollardy retained its adherents in high places. This phase came to an end with Sir John Oldcastle’s revolt in 1414. While it may be contested whether Oldcastle really was a Lollard and to what extend it was Lollards who participated and supported his rebellion, the important point is that this was the perception at Court. The rebellion brought severe reprisals against the unorthodox and marked the end of the Lollards’ overt political influence; from 1414 onwards there is no support for Lollard ideas amongst the elites.

The Oldcastle revolt brought far greater pressure to bear on Lollards, both from the secular and ecclesiastical arms of the law. When Chaucer was writing Canterbury Tales in the late fourteenth century, Lollardism was a light hearted matter; the Shipman, at the start of the prologue to his tale quips:

Our hoste answerde, ‘O Iankin, be ye there?

I smelle a loller in the wind,’ quod he.

‘How! good men,’ quod our hoste, ‘herkneth me;

Abydeth, for goddes digne passioun,

For we shal han a predicacioun;

This loller heer wil prechen us som-what.’

However, thirty years later, in 1417 the spiritual Margery Kempe’s enemies in Beverley could accuse her of Lollardy and realistically threaten her with burning.

Lollardy did not bring England the Inquisition. But, the methods of repression were similar; an increase of episcopal powers, the assistance of the friars and the support of the lay lords. But while there may have been sporadic action taken against Lollards by the 1420s, it remains a patchy and inconsistent attempt at eradicating the heresy, certainly compared to continental responses to heresy.

Lollardy is considered to be a heresy of the artisan classes and was specifically associated with literacy. Current research examining the networks of accused Lollards suggests that Lollardy was spread by merchants and itinerant skilled workers, thrived in certain towns and amongst individual families, and while there clearly was communication between these groups, they were essentially self-supporting.

This pattern continues throughout the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries; periods of active anti-Lollard activity leading to show trials and occasional burnings up to and including Thomas Moore’s bloody reign. But as the reformation begins to transform the religious outlook of England Lollardy disappears, doubtless swallowed up in a variety of new and different protestant formulations.

**Lollard Beliefs**

The most complete statement of early Lollard teaching appeared in the Twelve Conclusions presented to the Parliament of 1395.

They begin by stating that the church in England had become subservient to her “stepmother the great church of Rome.” The present priesthood was not the one ordained by Christ, while the Roman ritual of ordination had no warrant in Scripture. Clerical celibacy occasioned unnatural lust, while the “feigned miracle” of transubstantiation led men into idolatry. The hallowing of wine, bread, altars, vestments, and so forth was related to necromancy. Prelates should not be temporal judges and rulers, for no man can serve two masters. The Conclusions also condemned special prayers for the dead, pilgrimages, and offerings to images, and they declared confession to a priest unnecessary for salvation. Warfare was contrary to the New Testament, and vows of chastity by nuns led to the horrors of abortion and child murder. The Twelve Conclusions covered all the main Lollard doctrines except two: that the prime duty of priests is to preach and that all men should have free access to the Scriptures in their own language.

Any cult that lasts over a hundred and fifty years and lacks a clear central organisation will inevitably show a variety of beliefs. Nonetheless, there are some clear and consistent views that mark out the Lollard from other Christian groupings. Most importantly was the belief, drawn from Wyclif’s work, that Christianity should be based primarily on the scriptures. Lollards believed that the Bible was the closest thing they had to the word of God and that everyone should read and know the bible. The Lollards were responsible for their own translation of the Bible into English, by Nicholas of Hereford, which was later revised by Wycliffe’s secretary, John Purvey.

While not every Lollard will have been able to read these texts, it appears that most Lollard communities had at their heart at least some literate people. Lollard books, of which there were many, were of central importance. The trials report many heretics who claimed Lollard books as their most prized possessions even though they could not themselves read them. This might seem strange, but at this period listening to books read aloud was the main way in which texts were consumed. The very concept of reading to yourself was hardly known. The reading of the bible and the Lollard books was central to Lollard devotion and we can see some convicted heretics, such as Alice Colyns[[4]](#footnote-4), were famed for their ability to commit large parts of these works to memory.

While Lollardism was associated with a library of works, the difficulty for the modern scholar is that for the most part, there is little heretical in these works. Despite insisting on the supremacy of the Gospels and Epistles, Wyclif himself quoted extensively from orthodox texts, and many of his followers did the same. An anthology of quotes from Jerome, Augustine and Ambrose is hard to condemn on heretical grounds[[5]](#footnote-5). Only the choices of texts hint at their purpose.

Anticlericism was another major strand of Lollard belief. Lollards did not believe that ordination made a priest, but rather that a priest earned their status through pious living and faithfulness to the testament. Priests should be teachers, spreading the word of God rather than wasting their time performing sacraments. In particular, Lollards did not believe that the bread and wine were literally transformed into Jesus’ flesh and blood during communion. The important relationship for a Lollard was between man and God with priests acting as no more than guides or mentors. Many Lollards were also actively iconoclast, repudiating the adoration of images, they did not believe in the intervention of saints and did not keep holy days which were not clearly of biblical origin.

At this time an orthodox church service simply emphasised the division between priesthood and the laity. The majority of the sacrament took place hidden from the view of the participants. The consecration bell told the congregation that the elements had been transubstantiated into the body of Christ. The pious can be said to have witnessed this spectacle rather than participating in it. Conventions suggested that simply being there guaranteed any number of privileges and benefits including a guarantee that sudden death would not strike on that day[[6]](#footnote-6). Heretical critics, such as William Thorpe, a priest from Shrewsbury, could not see how this represented a true communion with God.

However, as with the Lollard texts, much of this strident anticlericalism was no different in tone from that of orthodox critics of the state of the church.

**Sources**

As is usually the case when studying heretic beliefs, our major sources are those of the persecuting orthodox religious authority. Most of our evidence comes from the Bishop’s registers and the court books which recorded witness testimony. While such sources have obvious drawbacks, they can be used to tease out an understanding of the lives and beliefs of at least some of the prosecuted heretics.

While the Lollards did produce a considerable amount of their own writing, this largely consisted of sermons and treatises as well as their translation of the bible. Documents like these are generally anonymous and dateless and consequently tell us little about individuals or the social relationships within their communities[[7]](#footnote-7).

The Bishops registers are a difficult source for historians being both brief and formulaic. In two cases we have Episcopal court books connected with persecutions which provide us with far more evidence. These are for Norwich in 1428-31 and Coventry and Litchfield, 1511-12. These books provide us with a much richer picture of the accused and their beliefs. They also show us how limited the Bishops’ Registers are; in the case of the Norwich court book only one of the 60 cases is present in Bishop Alnwick’s register.

We have some sort of record for the Bishops records in the following major campaigns:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **District** | **Bishop** | **Number involved** |
| 1414 | Bristol | Bubwith | 8 abjurations |
| 1428 | Kent | Chichele | Over 30 arrested |
| 1428-31 | East Anglia | Alnwick | 3 burning, 40 abjurations, 10 purgations |
| 1438 | Kent |  | 5 executions |
| 1440 | West Surrey/NE Hampshire | Lay authorities | 1 execution, 14 indicted |
| 1462-64 | Chilterns | Chedworth | 1 burning 27 abjurations, 5 purgations |
| 1472 | Forest of Dean | Stanbury | 12 abjurations |
| 1476 | Bath & Wells | Stillington | 8 accused |
| 1486 | Coventry | Hales | 8 abjurations |
| 1491 | Newbury | Langton/Courtenay | 13 abjurations |
| 1494 | N. Ayrshire | Blacader | 30 accused |
| 1496 | London/Southwark | Savage/Langton | 12 abjurations |
| 1499 | London | Savage | 12 abjurations |
| 1499 | Reading | Blythe | 8 abjurations |
| 1499 | N Berkshire | Blythe | 14 abjurations |
| 1506 | London | - | 6 abjurations |
| 1510-11 | London | Fitzjames | 22 abjurations |
| 1511 | Kent | Warham | 5 burnings, 34 abjurations |
| 1511 | Chilterns | Smith | 4 burnings, 60 abjurations |
| 1511-12 | Coventry | Blyth | 1 burning, over 45 abjurations |
| 1514 | NE Hampshire | Fox | 7 abjurations |
| 1514-17 | Devizes | Audley | 1 burning, 14 abjurations |
| 1518 | Bradford on Avon | Audley | 1 burning, 3 abjurations |
| 1520 | Coventry | Blyth | 7 burnings |
| 1521-2 | Chilterns | Longland | 4 burnigns, 50 abjurations |

Taken from Thompson

Another source of information on the trials of Lollard heretics is John Foxe in his protestant martyrology *Act & Monuments*. Foxe quotes from Bishop’s registers that no longer exist. Clearly the use of catholic records as a protestant polemical tool makes this material difficult, and Foxe is frequently careless with names. However, where Foxe repeats evidence held independently, he is seen to be essentially accurate in his accounts.

Given the above, we can only surmise that Lollardy was centred on the places where the authorities prosecuted them. This suggests that Lollardy was particularly prevalent in a small number of localities: Norfolk, Bristol, Coventry and of particular importance to us, the Chilterns.

**Persecution processes**

Although the English persecutions were far from an inquisition, the essential tools and tactics were the same. Executions were rare, with most of the accused promising to mend their ways, to only think orthodox thoughts in the future and, crucially, be prepared to name all the others involved. So when James Morden confessed his heresy he also named:

Thomas Chase of Amersham, William, Agnes Ashford of Chesham, Richard Ashford, a smith of Walton on Thames, Thomas Tredway, Robert Pope of Amersham, John Morden & wife (his uncle and aunt), Alice Atkins, Marian Morden (his sister), W. Africke or Littlepage of Amersham, Emma Harding or Africke and John Phip, physician of Hughendon[[8]](#footnote-8).

All of the above named would be tracked down and asked to name associates, so allowing a pattern of heretical activity in an area to be established. This is so effective, the Stasis were still using it until the fall of the Berlin Wall!

In the *Debellation of Salem and Byzance*, Thomas More sets out an accurate description “of how a proper process should run.”

An informant alerts the bishop to a malefactor, and ideally, supplies the names of likely witnesses. The bishop interviews them in a preliminary investigation to see if there is a plausible case. There must be at least two witnesses to justify the inquisition. If he concludes that there is a case, he cites the suspect and charges him with the crime. If, at this point, upon hearing the charges, a suspect confesses, the judge or bishop imposes punishment. On the other hand, if he denies the charge, the bishop calls witnesses, including his original informant, binds them under oath in the presence of the defendant, requiring them to answer truthfully questions concerning the charged crime. In the next phase, the witnesses’ depositions are taken in private, by notary, who ask them to state their belief about the defendant’s guilt—this is *publica fama*—and /or their knowledge of his actual guilt. The informant becomes a witness and swears to the truth of the deposition in the defendant’s presence. The bishop declares that the testimony proves the defendant’s *fama*—that reputable people believe him to be guilty of the heresies charged. The Bishop orders purgation: the defendant must swear to his innocence, and find a number of compurgators, that is, reputable persons who will swear to his good reputation. If the defendant fails purgation, the bishop orders him to perform a penance. On the other hand, if the witnesses’ testimony proves defendant guilty of the crime of heresy, the bishop does not order purgation but abjuration and penance; or if the defendant refuses to abjure, the bishop declares him to be a convicted and unrepentant heretic and delivers him to the “secular arm.”

In other words to be burned.

In the case of James Morden, after abjuring he was ordered to visit the Cathedral of Lincoln twice a year for seven years. However, as this was a difficult journey, he was allowed instead to visit the image of Our Lady Missenden for five years instead. Later he admitted breaking this rule and also confessed to being so used to reciting the Pater Noster and Creed in English he had forgotten the Latin.

While it is true to say that the authorities were reluctant to burn heretics, those that abjured and then did not uphold the terms of their abjuration correctly were skating on thin ice. A second chance was much harder to gain and if possible those who had broken the terms of their abjuration tended to flee the relatively local grip of the ecclesiastical authorities. In James’ case he was judged to have relapsed and was burned in 1522.

**Surrey’s heretics**

Surrey was not perceived to be a centre of the Lollard heresy. There is no known centre of heresy and no persecutions were specifically centred in Surrey. However, it is possible to identify certain individuals from Surrey who came to the notice of ecclesiastical authorities. Uncovering these names has not always been easy. Malcolm Lambert provides a helpful map of prosecuted Lollards and includes Kingston, Malden, Walton on Thames, Bisley, Farnham, Thursley and Chiddingfold[[9]](#footnote-9). His only reference for this map is ‘Bishops registers’. I am pleased to say that I have been able to identify all except the Bisley Lollard, and several others as well. Luckily the IHR has a copy of Foxe’s A&M and is only 2 minutes away from my work place, so I have been able to productively study this text at my leisure over many lunchtimes!

So far I have been able to identify 16 Lollards from Surrey and a family from Staines who are in modern Surrey but not the medieval county. The earliest were active after the Oldfield rising while the latest were seen off my Thomas Moore’s bloody persecutions.

One of the earliest Surry Lollards is **John Witton**, who was rector at Chiddingfold. He was ordered to appear before Bishop Praty of Chichester in 1440. Bishop Praty was in this case acting as agent for Bishop Beaufort of Winchester. Praty then ordered him to appear before Beaufort. Sadly Beaufort’s registers are now lost, but he must have surrendered to the authorities at some point as his defence is preserved written in a Wyclif bible now at Trintiy College Dublin. He was accused of heresy concerning the Eucharist, pilgrimages and the veneration of images, a solidly Lollard list of concerns. We do not know how he was found or whether he had to abjure, but he was subsequently translated to Lewisham; such a translation often followed abjuration, so this may have been the case with Witton.

Also in 1440, **Adam Millward** (or possibly Sims), a weaver of Farnham was charged with plotting the death of the King and spoliation of the Church, and planning to burn an image of the Virgin. On August 11 Millward tried to persuade the men of Farnham to join his plot, but one informed Bishop Stafford who acted swiftly to arrest Millward. At this point he tried to make a deal with his prosecutors and blamed the plot on **William Irish**. This was not entirely successful as he was condemned to a traitor’s death. William Irish, who appears to have been a chaplain from Thursley, escaped and from what we can see, was never subsequently apprehended.

The beliefs of the men involved appear similar to a group of heretics prosecuted aabout the same time in Hampshire around Odiham. This group held quite extreme beliefs including denying the Eucharist, denying the efficacy of infant baptism and even denying that it was a grave sin to perform adultery. It may well be that there were contacts between the Surrey and Hampshire groups, but that is pure speculation.

After this early flurry of Surrey Lollards it is another fifty years before I can find another reference to a Surrey heretic. In 1496 a **Joan Brede** of Southwark appears in a list of heretics in a well attested trial. Irritatingly vague references appear in the Chronicle and Great Chronicle of London as well as in Foxe and Bishop Langton’s register. We have more details of another Southward heretic from the same persecution, **Thomas Mayet,** also of Southwark who admitted having possessed Wyclifite books for 12 years and had to abjure.

Bishop Foxe’s register mentions another Southward abjuration, an **unnamed woman** who abjured in 1508. She confessed to a number of heretical beliefs including a vehement rejection of both transubstantiation and icons; indeed she believed that God cursed the wood and stone from which such images were made. Despite this vehemence she finally recanted and promised to uphold orthodox beliefs in the future[[10]](#footnote-10).

In interesting feature of our short list is the prevelance of servants being as involved with the heresy as their masters. Philip Braban of Kingston became ‘as well known as his master, Stephen Carder of Amwell, Hampshire’[[11]](#footnote-11). His confession includes the names of Robert Cosym of Harrwo ont eh Hill, **John Borderer** alias Jenyn, formerly the servant of James Morden also of Kingston and **Thomas Denys** of Morden. Denys was burend in 1513,

Perhaps our most well documented family of heretics in Surrey are **Richard & Alice Ashford** and **James Morden** of Walton on Thames. They were connected by marriage to another heretical group in Amersham, and were caught up in the persecution of Bishop Longland in 1521. Unusually there is evidence here of a cooperative move against the heresy with the bishops of Salisbury and Winchester assisting the Bishop of Lincoln.

Through the various sources we can put together the Lollard family tree of the Ashford/Tredways of Amersham. Agnes Ashford was the mother of two Lollards, Thomas Tredwey and Richard Ashford, alias Tredway. Richard Ashford converted to Lollardism through his marriage to Alice Morden; her father, John Morden, passed his faith and his books to Richard as he lay dying from plague about 1514. John Morden’s wife (probably Marion) who left a will in 1521 was also a Lollard, as were the children of his brother Harry Morden. James Morden was burned for heresy in 1522.

James Morden, Alice’s cousin, was the servant of Richard Ashford. He learned heretical doctrines form Richard’s mother Agnes Ashford and named Richard’s brother Thomas Tredway. Tredway knew and testified against his brother’s father in law, John Morden. Also involved with the heretics at Iver[[12]](#footnote-12).

This is a good illustration of how the heresy was preserved and promulgated through familial ties with the servants equally involved in the religious practices of the group.

Finally, in 1530 A&M provides us with a list of those who abjured under Henry VIII.

 “Here followeth a brief table or catalogue containing the names of all such as were forced to abjure in King Henry’s days, after the first beginnings of Luther.”

This list includes **William (Butcher),** **Thomas Hempstead**, **Robert Hempstead** and **Robert Faire** from Bansted. Unfortunately there is no further information on this group that I have so far been able to uncover.

The records also tell us quite a bit about **Nicholas and Robert Durdent** of Staines. They were involved in a large group of Lollards based around Iver.

**Conclusions**

The sparse accounts of our 17 Surrey heretics provide tantalising details. We see evidence of involvement with groups from outside of the county, both in the Chilterns and Hampshire, the strength of a familial belief, some violent insurrection, certainly treasonable, some signs of literacy and the importance of Lollard books, the involvement of the lower clergy as well as the artisan trades. Women are there, in lesser numbers than men and we see the inconsistent and sometime local nature of the persecutions; with long periods of inactivity and we wonder at the extent of Lollard belief that has been lost over time and indeed was never detected at all. Our little sample has, however shown a certain consistency of belief amongst the heretics, a general willingness to abjure and some clearly sincerely held beliefs. If Surrey was a hotbed of heretical belief, this seems to have escaped the authorities. The evidence fits with that of other regions where there is more abundant evidence, of a locally-based family or work-centred groups who held strong beliefs about the nature of the liturgy and beliefs of the church but who were in general happy to avoid martyrdom if possible.

Truly, Lollardy was a very English heresy.
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**Prosecuted Lollards resident in Surrey**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **From** | **Primary Source** | **Date/trial** | **Detail** |
| **Adam Millward or Sims, weaver** | Farnham | CCR 1435-41, 387PRO AI fol 65-66, 70-71 | Summoned to jurors in Farnham, 1440 charged with sedition (presumably secular). Sentenced to a traitor’s death | A weaver of Farnham. Charged with plotting death of king and spoliation of the Church, and planning to burn an image of the Virgin. On August 11 tried to persuade men of Farnham to join his plot, but one informed Bishop Stafford. Tried to blame William Irish, but unsuccessfully.Thompson p 64 |
| **William Irish, chaplain** | Thursley | CCR 1435-41, 387PRP AI fol 65-66, 70-71 & 78 | 1440. Found guilty of sedition, but escaped. | Charged with Adam Millward, but escaped his sentence. Their beliefs appear similar to the Odiham/Crondall group of heretics prosecuted at the same time Thompson p 64 |
| **John Witton, Rector of Chiddingfold** | Chiddingfold | Reg Praty fo 46-49TCD MS A 1.10, fo 38-40 | Summoned July 1440 by Bishop Praty of Chichester | Case ‘reserved to Beaufort’. His defence preserved in a Wycliffe bible in Dublin. Denied charge of heresy. Not clear if abjured, but was translated to Lewisham in 1441.Thompson p 63 |
| **Joan Brede** | Southwark | Reg. Fitzjames, fols. 4r-4v, 25r-27r; Reg Fox, 2, fols. 86v-88r; Winchester Reg. Langton, fol 66rChronicle of London, 208, 261; Great chronicle of London 252, 262; | 1496? |  |
| **Thomas Mayet** | Southwark |  | Bishop Langton trialAbjured 1496 | Admitted possessing Wyclifite books for 12 years. Beliefs: disbelief in transubstantiation, marriage lawful on all seasons.Thompson p157Chronicles mention the burnings, but do not name these tindividuals. |
| **A woman of Southwark** | Southwark | Fox 2 86-88 | Abjured 1508 | Beliefs included; disbelief in transubstantiation, anti-iconoclasm, Thompson p160 |
| **Thomas Denys** | Malden | Reg Fox 3 69Reg Audley fo 148A&M 4 174 | Burnt 1513 | Thompson p88 |
| **Philip Braban** | Kingston on Thames | Reg Fox fo 70 |  | Thompson p88 |
| **John Broderer alias Jenyn** | Kingston upon Thames.  |  |  | Was previously a servant of James Morden Hudson p462 |
| **Richard Ashford** | Walton on Thames | Reg Fox 4 fo 18A&M 225, 227A&M P 225: Richard Ashford, Smith and wife Agnes Ashford named by James Morden.A&M p227:Jenkin Butler names Richard Ashworth (also known as Nash or Tredway) | 1521 | In Fox’s register but uncovered by Bishop Longland. Learned heresy from his father in law, John Morden of Chesham, being converted at his deathbed. Also in touch with John’s nephew James Morden who was executed in 1522.Thompson p90/91Quoted in Aston as: Son in law of John Morden inherited his book of heresy, and then came to attend bible readings with Morden’s nephew James. |
| **Alice Ashford** | Walton on Thames | Fox 4 fo 18 |  | Wife of Richard, daughter of John Morden.Thompson p91 |
| **James Marden**  | Amersham, Chesham and Walton on Thames | PRO Signigicavits (C 85), file 115, no 13A&M p224 – para quoted from registerA&M p227 | Executed 1522 | Nephew of Richard AshfordIn A&M names Marion Morden, sister and wife of John Morden |
| **William (Butcher)****Thomas Hempstead****Robert Hempstead****Robert Faire** | Banstead | A&M p585 | 1530 | A&M list of those who abjured under Henry VIII. “Here followeth a brief table or catalogue containing the names of all such as were forced to abjure in King Henry’s days, after the first beginnings of Luther.” |
| ***Nicholas Durdent*** | *Staines* |  |  |  |
| ***Robert Durdent*** | *Iver Court, Staines* | *A&M p 174: named**A&M p 178 quote* |  |  |
| **??** | Bisley |  |  |  |

**Major Heresy Persecutions, 14414 – 1522 (Thompson)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **District** | **Bishop** | **Number involved** |
| 1414 | Bristol | Bubwith | 8 abjurations |
| 1428 | Kent | Chichele | Over 30 arrested |
| 1428-31 | East Anglia | Alnwick | 3 burning, 40 abjurations, 10 purgations |
| 1438 | Kent |  | 5 executions |
| 1440 | West Surrey/NE Hampshire | Lay authrorities | 1 execution, 14 indicted |
| 1462-64 | Chilterns | Chedworth | 1 burning 27 abjurations, 5 purgations |
| 1472 | Forest of Dean | Stanbury | 12 abjurations |
| 1476 | Bath & Wells | Stillington | 8 accused |
| 1486 | Coventry | Hales | 8 abjurations |
| 1491 | Newbury | Langton/Courtenay | 13 abjurations |
| 1494 | N. Ayrshire | Blacader | 30 accused |
| 1496 | London/Southwark | Savage/Langton | 12 abjurations |
| 1499 | London | Savage | 12 abjurations |
| 1499 | Reading | Blythe | 8 abjurations |
| 1499 | N Berkshire | Blythe | 14 abjurations |
| 1506 | London | - | 6 abjurations |
| 1510-11 | London | Fitzjames | 22 abjurations |
| 1511 | Kent | Warham | 5 burnings, 34 abjurations |
| 1511 | Chilterns | Smith | 4 burnings, 60 abjurations |
| 1511-12 | Coventry | Blyth | 1 burning, over 45 abjurations |
| 1514 | NE Hampshire | Fox | 7 abjurations |
| 1514-17 | Devizes | Audley | 1 burning, 14 abjurations |
| 1518 | Bradford on Avon | Audley | 1 burning, 3 abjurations |
| 1520 | Coventry | Blyth | 7 burnings |
| 1521-2 | Chilterns | Longland | 4 burnigns, 50 abjurations |
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