

THE ENGLISH

c #

HISTORICAL REVIEW

EDITED BY

S. R. GARDINER, D.C.L., LL.D.

FELLOW OF MERTON COLLEGE, OXFORD

AND

REGINALD L. POOLE, M.A., PH.D.

LECTURER IN DIPLOMATIC IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

AMERICAN EDITOR, JUSTIN WINSOR, LL.D., Librarian of Harvard College, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

VOLUME XI.

1896



LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY

1896

DA

20

.E58

v. 11

1896

E71

Rec. Sept. 18, 1905.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XI.

	PAGE
NECTANEBO, PHARAOH AND MAGICIAN. By <i>D. G. Hogarth</i>	1
ARRIAN AS LEGATE OF CAPPADOCIA. By <i>Professor Pelham</i>	625
EARLY BRITISH CHRISTIANITY. By <i>F. Haverfield</i>	427
THE PROBLEM OF THE HUNDRED. By <i>Edward Jenks</i>	510 -
THE ORIGIN OF THE TURKS. By <i>E. H. Parker</i>	481
AN ARMENIAN VISITOR TO JERUSALEM IN THE SEVENTH CENTURY. By <i>E. W. Brooks</i>	93
THE ORIGIN OF THE BOROUGH. By <i>Professor Maitland, LL.D.</i>	13 -
NOTES ON OLD-ENGLISH HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY. I. THE BATTLE OF RINGMERE. II. THE SITE OF BRUNEMUE. By <i>W. H. Stevenson</i>	801
AN OLD-ENGLISH CHARTER OF WILLIAM THE CONQUEBOR IN FAVOUR OF ST. MARTIN'S-LE-GRAND, LONDON. Edited by <i>W. H. Stevenson</i>	731 -
A BRIEF SURVEY OF DOMESDAY. By <i>Sir Frederick Pollock, LL.D.</i>	209 -
DOMESDAY BOOK AND THE BURTON CARTULARY. By <i>F. Baring</i>	98 -
MAGISTER VACARIUS. By <i>Professor Liebermann, LL.D.</i>	805, 514 -
By the <i>Rev. Canon Jessopp, D.D.</i>	747 -
PETER'S PENCE AND THE POPULATION OF ENGLAND ABOUT 1164. By <i>Professor Liebermann, LL.D.</i>	744 -
THE EARLIEST PLEA ROLLS. By <i>J. H. Round</i>	102 -
THE BARONS DE MAULEY. By <i>C. L. Kingsford</i>	515
CANON LAW IN ENGLAND. I. WILLIAM LYNDWOOD. II. CHURCH, STATE, AND DECRETALS. By <i>Professor Maitland, LL.D.</i>	446, 641 -
AN UNPUBLISHED NOTICE OF THE BATTLE OF LEWES. Printed by <i>J. P. Gilson</i>	520
A SONG ON THE DEATH OF SIMON DE MONTFORT. Printed by <i>Pro- fessor Maitland, LL. D.</i>	814
THE BEGINNINGS OF WYCLIF'S ACTIVITY IN ECCLESIASTICAL POLITICS. By <i>Professor Loserth</i>	819

	PAGE
NEW LIGHTS ON THE DIVORCE OF HENRY VIII. By <i>James Gairdner</i> . I.	673
JOHN A LASCO'S CHURCH PREFERMENTS. By <i>Lewis L. Kropf</i> .	108
REFORMATION CHANGES IN A CITY PARISH. By the <i>Rev. A. G. B. Atkinson</i> .	522
THE DEATH AND FUNERAL OF CATHERINE DE' MEDICI, AS DESCRIBED BY THE VENETIAN AMBASSADOR IN FRANCE. By <i>Horatio F. Brown</i> .	748
THE DUTCH POWER IN BRAZIL. I. THE STRUGGLE FOR BAHIA, 1624-1657. By the <i>Rev. George Edmundson</i> .	231
THE NAVY OF THE COMMONWEALTH, 1649-1660. By <i>M. Oppenheim</i>	20
LETTERS RELATING TO SCOTLAND, JANUARY 1650. Printed by <i>Francis B. Bickley</i> .	113
CROMWELL AND MAZARIN IN 1652. By <i>Samuel R. Gardiner, D.C.L.</i>	479
THE WORKS OF GEORGE SAVILE, FIRST MARQUIS OF HALIFAX. By <i>Miss H. C. Fozcroft</i> .	708
JOHN AUBREY'S BIOGRAPHICAL COLLECTIONS. By the <i>Rev. Andrew Clark, LL.D.</i>	328
WILLIAM PATERSON. By <i>W. A. Steel</i> .	260
A JACOBITE AT THE COURT OF HANOVER. By <i>J. F. Chance</i> .	527
THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH'S LETTERS AT THE HAGUE. By <i>W. Bliss</i> .	118
THOMAS WANTON AND MACHYN'S DIARY. By the <i>Rev. H. E. D. Blakiston</i> .	282
CANNING AND DENMARK IN 1807. By <i>J. H. Rose</i> .	82
REVIEWS OF BOOKS	121, 396, 531, 751
CORRESPONDENCE	609, 813
NOTICES OF PERIODICALS	194, 402, 612, 815
LIST OF RECENT HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS	201, 410, 617, 825
INDEX	888

THE BEGINNINGS OF WYCLIF'S ACTIVITY IN ECCLESIASTICAL POLITICS.

SINCE the time of Shirley and Lechler it has been usual to place the beginnings of Wyclif's engagement in ecclesiastical politics in the year 1366; in other words, he first came forward in questions of ecclesiastical politics in connexion with the demand made by Urban V upon Edward III for the payment of the tribute due to the curia, which had been in arrear for the previous thirty-three years. The importance of Urban's rescript, which is dated 6 June 1365, has hitherto been exaggerated. It does not contain a threat of punishment, as hitherto assumed, for failure of payment, nor is there any question in it of citing the king before the papal court. Nor, again, is there any evidence that the pope had been induced by French influence to rake up this question, which had slumbered so long. His point of view, as it emerges in his rescript, is a correct one; his claim is just, his attitude moderate: 'The curia has not hitherto made its demands from regard to the necessity of England, which has been involved in grievous wars; but now that peace is restored England is rich and can satisfy her obligations.' We do not hear from contemporary sources that England was roused to any patriotic excitement by the demand of the pope. It is noteworthy that the contemporary writers, usually so communicative, have nothing to say on the subject. It is necessary to emphasise this fact, because a most cautious and distinguished critic of the writings of Wyclif² says—

Jetzt erhob sich in England ein Widerstand, der, wenn auch formell ungenügend begründet, durch das einmüthige Zusammenstehen von König und Volk die volle Macht einer Volksbewegung gewann. Die Curie verkannte diesen mächtigen Strom nationalen Lebens, der die Brust des Engländers mit gerechtem Selbstgefühl erfüllte und stetig in die Breite und Tiefe wuchs. Insofern war die päpstliche Forderung ein politischer Fehler. Sie musste als französischer Angriff gelten und erbittern. Jetzt empfand die Nation auf der Höhe ihrer Macht die Forderung als Schimpf.

So too Lechler, who adds—

Für den Fall, dass der König sich weigern sollte, dieser Forderung zu genügen, wurde er vorgeladen, sich vor dem Papst als seinem Lehensherrn zu verantworten.

Of all this there is nothing to be found in the pope's letter, or in other contemporary sources, beyond the bare fact of the papal

¹ 'Noeti siquidem, fili charissime, quod censum huiusmodi ab anno . . . 1333, die vii. mens. Iulii . . . non solvisti, et quod ecclesia sentiens tuam magnitudinem in actibus bellicis involutam cessationem solucionis eiusdem census cum multa paciencia supportavit, expectans tempus quo ipsum posses commode solvere ut teneris. Et quia tempus tue tranquillitatis et prosperitatis advenit . . . requirimus quatenus ea . . . velis solvere.'

² Buddensieg, *Johann Wiclif und seine Zeit*, p. 118.

demand and its rejection by parliament on the plea that King John had no right to subject the kingdom to a foreign power; John's agreement was not accepted by the people, and was in contradiction to his coronation oath; should the pope prosecute his demand by force he would meet with opposition. The papal curia is supposed never to have resumed her claim. That this is not correct we know from the 'Eulogium Historiarum,' under the year 1374. Lechler says—

Bei dieser Nationalangelegenheit war auch Wiclif betheiligt. Er habe über diese staatsrechtliche Frage eine Streitschrift ganz im Sinne der parlamentarischen Erklärung veröffentlicht und dies in Folge einer Herausforderung, die ein ungenannter Doctor der Theologie aus den Mönchsorden an ihn persönlich gerichtet hatte.

It is indeed true that Wyclif published a tract of that sort, but does it belong to the year 1366 or 1367? This, we think, for a whole series of reasons, both internal and external, is to be denied. The treatise is published under the title of 'Determinatio quaedam Magistri Iohannis Wyclif de Dominio contra unum Monachum,' by Lewis, in the 'History of John Wyclif' (ed. 1720, pp. 363-371). The text is based upon a defective copy. Lewis, or whoever it was that transcribed the treatise, was not able to decipher all the abbreviations in the original manuscript. Mr. Matthew has emended the printed text in several places in accordance with a copy at Lambeth.³ Lechler, in agreement with Pauli, Forshall and Madden, Shirley, and others, thinks that the tract was written immediately after the May parliament of 1366. Wyclif introduces seven lords as speakers. They all reject the claim of the pope for the tribute of 1,000 marks; but the arguments and the language which they employ are not their own, but Wyclif's, and such as even he could not possibly have used in the year 1366, nor till at least ten years later.

The first lord starts by urging in support of his proposition, 'We must refuse obedience to the pope: if he attempts to compel it by the sword, we must defend ourselves,' an argument of Wyclif's which in the main agrees with the first of his 'Conclusions,' condemned by the pope in 1377, and with the statements in his book on the Divine Dominion ('De Dominio Divino,' p. 10).⁴

The second lord develops Wyclif's well-known proposition—

The pope is not competent to bear rule. If he does so we must resist

³ *Unprinted English Works of Wyclif*, p. v, note 2.

⁴ Although the text in Lewis's edition is quite corrupt—'quod secundum principia aq[ue] nullum violentum [sic] eternum sive perpetuum'—yet we can discern that it is intended to set forth very much the same statement as that which appears in the 19th conclusion: 'Deus non potest dare homini pro se et heredibus suis in perpetuum civile dominium.' But these are convictions at which Wyclif did not arrive until the time of the Good Parliament.

him. He is indeed the chief successor of Christ; but Christ disdained all worldly dominion. The pope must do the same, according to the words, 'The foxes have holes, and the birds nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head.' Now, since we have to constrain the pope to fulfil his duty, it follows that we must refuse him the tribute.⁵

These are doctrines which Wyclif in part brought forward for the first time after the Great Schism, *e.g.* the proposition that 'every ecclesiastic, even were it the pope himself, can be compelled by the laity to the performance of his duty.' Wyclif cannot have written thus at a time when he still appealed to the pope. The more naturally such language suits 1377, the less probable is it that it should belong to the year 1366.

The third lord moves likewise in Wyclif's later sphere of thought.

It is the duty of the spirituality to edify the people. The pope is bound to fulfil this duty in the highest degree. If he fails to do so he can lay claim to no contributions throughout the land, and if he advances such claims they must be refused. That is in fact the case at present, for neither the pope nor his cardinals do anything for the edification of the church in England.

The fourth lord is still more penetrated by Wyclif's doctrines of a later date. His remarks about the third or fourth part of England which is in the possession of the dead hand coincide exactly with the remarks of Wyclif in the fifteenth chapter of his book 'On the Church.'

QUARTUS DOMINUS

. . . Cum ergo terciam partem [sic] regni sit mortificatam ecclesie, videtur quod papa sit dominus illorum omnium.

In cuius signum post vacationem particularis ecclesie post mortem prepositi exigit . . . primos fructus.

Cum ergo in civili dominio⁶ non possunt esse duo dominantes ex aequo, sed oportet quod . . . sit . . . alter subdominans . . . relinquatur quod papa debet pro isto tempore esse regni vel regis subditus

'DE ECCLESIA, p. 388.'

. . . Cum plus quam quarta pars regni sit devoluta ad manum mortuam, sequitur quod rex noster non sit rex totius Anglie. . . .

In cuius signum papa habet post mortes multorum prelatorum et abbatum in Anglia primos fructus.

Cum enim dicunt quod papa dominetur civiliter, nec est possibile quod due tam disparate persone dominentur civiliter super eodem, relinquatur eis dicere quod rex noster est quoad omnia mortificata in regno nostro vel exclusus simpliciter vel pape subdominans.

We see how the speech of the fourth lord can be formally put together out of the passages in the 'De Ecclesia.' We can scarcely be guilty of an error if on this ground alone we assign the dates

⁵ Compare the 17th and 19th conclusions.

⁶ We may, perhaps, be entitled to say that we have here already an appeal to his own book, *De Civili Dominio* (1376-1377).

of both treatises—and the 'De Ecclesia' was written about 1378—to something like the same period.

The propositions which are placed in the mouth of the sixth lord belong in a still higher degree to a later period of Wyclif's life. They too are discussed in the book 'On the Church.' Here we find already the argument: Christ is the head of the church; the pope is a sinful man; if he continues in sin he loses his dominion, and so forth—all doctrines which could not have been advanced by Wyclif before his embassy to Bruges. The same may be said about the declarations of the seventh lord. In the arguments of all the lords there is hardly one proposition to be found which cannot be proved to be intellectually Wyclif's property. But what can hardly be proved is that these doctrines had been already set forth in 1366.

Who is Wyclif's opponent? Neither Lechler nor any other investigator of the subject has as yet come upon his track. And yet this was not an insuperable task: *ex ungue leonem*. If we put together a few passages out of different writings of Wyclif, the riddle will be solved. Wyclif introduces him a second time, and that in the fifteenth chapter of his book 'On the Church.' Wyclif here treats of the confiscation of temporalities, and says that in England this was a thing neither new nor unheard of. He quotes the example of William the Conqueror, who appropriated numerous foundations, altered them, removed them, or gave them to foreigners. He points to the treatment of the Templars. More recently Edward III had deprived William Bathman, bishop of Norwich, for twelve years of the temporalities of his see, and had taken the same proceedings with regard to John Grandison of Exeter and Thomas de Lyte of Ely, and this is also the practice pursued under Richard II. It occurs to no one to apply to the curia in the matter, for this is an affair which appertains exclusively to the crown. Wyclif then continues—

In ista materia est quidam doctor, qui in sui gracia misit mihi in scriptis tres conclusiones huic materie pertinentes.

Est quidam doctor. We must observe that Wyclif speaks of the present time, and that 1378. These three 'Conclusions' and the answer to them respectively are precisely the same as those which meet us in the tract printed by Lewis. Consequently this latter belongs beyond doubt to the period of the 'De Ecclesia.' The very first proposition, *Domini temporales possunt in aliquo casu legitime auferre ab ecclesiasticis bona sua*, was not advanced by Wyclif in 1366, but it was first put forth in the time of the Good Parliament,

⁷ That I myself did not arrive sooner at the true relations of affairs was owing to the fact that I received Lewis's book long ago only as a temporary loan, until through Mr. Matthew's kindness I became possessed of a copy of my own.

and that neither in pamphlet form nor from the pulpit; he taught it from his chair in Oxford. It is the seventeenth out of the nineteen propositions which Wyclif publicly enunciated, and on account of which in May 1377 Gregory XI took proceedings against him. Wyclif had taught the doctrine in the time of the Good Parliament, which occupied itself with the idea of a general secularisation of church property.

This naturally drew down upon him the sharpest opposition on the side of the endowed orders. When he handled the same theme in a learned form in his book on Civil Dominion ('De Civili Dominio,' i. 38), a Benedictine appeared upon the scene, and carried the conflict into the pulpit and the street. The Benedictine delivered his discourses in St. Mary's Church at Oxford. Wyclif was now, we may infer, compelled to reply, and wrote as a sequel to his first book a second, and after that a third one, 'De Civili Dominio.'

Licet [so we read in book ii. ch. i.] capitulo xxxvii rogarem obnixius omne genus auditorii fovere evangelicam veritatem qua dixi *ecclesiasticos ad tantum posse delinquere quod domini temporales possent ab eis legitime ac meritorie auferre temporalia . . . surrepunt tamen emuli, nitentes veritatem istam dirimere. Et revera sepe revolvi in animo quid movebat illum dominum et socium de ordine sancti Benedicti inter omnes valentes Oxonie tam singulariter ac prepostere dictum negocium attemptare. Prepostere dico, eo quod videtur multis sapientibus istam materiam pertractandum scolastice, antequam predicata fuerit super tecta.*

In order, however, that no doubt may remain that the theses in the tract printed by Lewis are the same as those handled in 'De Civili Dominio,' I will place the passages from the two works side by side.

LEWIS, p. 863.

doctor . . . obiciens ex adverso quod sit falsum et pseudo-evangelicum quod domini temporales possunt in aliquo casu legitime auferre ab ecclesiasticis bona sua. . . .

In nullo casu licet viros ecclesiasticos coram seculari iudice conveniri. . . .

Wyclif's antagonist, it seems, had preached in St. Mary's, Oxford, to the effect that the priests might be punished either by one another or by the bishops; but in no case by any secular lord.

Wyclif meets his opponent once more in 'De Civili Dominio,' book iii. ch. xviii.

Secundo incidentaliter patet solutio argumentorum que doctor meus reverendus magister *Willelmus Wadford* multipliciter contra conclu-

'DE CIV. DOMINIO.'

. . . quod domini temporales possent ab eis legitime ac meritorie auferre bona sua. . . .

Sacerdotes peccantes per se ipsos ac suos episcopos debent corrigi.

sionem in secundo huius positam de negacione civilis dominii clericorum arguit. . . .

It is to this opponent that Wyclif replies. According to Wyclif's quotation we must assume that it is the same, although I do not deny that there is a great difficulty in the fact that William Wadford is here called a Benedictine, while according to Shirley's investigations he was a Minorite. There must doubtless be a mistake in the transcription of the manuscript.

However this may be, one thing is certain, that the opponent of Wyclif in the treatise published by Lewis and in 'De Civili Dominio' is the same person. And this same opponent of Wyclif meets us again in 'De Ecclesia.' We there find exactly the same theses, with the exception of one, for which another is substituted. This difference in the arrangement of the theses is explained by the fact that William Wadford opposed Wyclif both in writing and in the pulpit, and when speaking from the pulpit laid special stress on a thesis which was absent from the controversial treatise; moreover, the thesis which is missing in 'De Ecclesia' is mentioned in 'De Civili Dominio.'

The conclusion from all this is that the dispute between Wyclif and his antagonist belongs not to the year 1366 (or 1367), but to the year 1376 (or 1377).

But how, then, about the tribute? Is there not a word said about that? The investigators of the life and works of Wyclif have hitherto overlooked the fact that in Lewis's treatise the subject of debate is not the question of the tribute, but the three theses—

1. Domini temporales non possunt in aliquo casu legitime auferre ab ecclesiasticis bona sua.
2. In nullo casu licet viros ecclesiasticos coram seculari iudice conveniri.
3. Omnis ablacio rerum ab ecclesia est iniusta.

Of the tribute Wyclif says not a word that calls for any reply from his opponent. Wyclif brings the serious objection against him that he is dragging in a question which is irrelevant, which is unimportant in reference to the theses in dispute, and is strange to every 'speculative theologian' and jurist. 'And this he has done although we had agreed to use no subterfuges, but to keep strictly to the matter in hand.' According to this Wyclif's opponent dragged in the question of the tribute wantonly, in order to blacken Wyclif in the eyes of the curia, and by getting heavier ecclesiastical censures pronounced against him to rob him of his endowments, with the view of recommending himself in the eyes of the pope, and, should the pope's dominion over England be established, to bring about the accumulation of worldly wealth by the abbeys in greater

quantities and with increased security. It is, therefore, an accident that Wyclif came to express himself regarding a question to answer which was, as he himself says, no business of his. When, however, he recognised the trap that had been laid for him he answered the question not in his own person, but sent to his opponent replies which had been given—so he had heard—in an assembly of temporal lords. In this consultation Wyclif did not take part himself: *Transmitto doctorem meum reverendum ad solutionem huius argumenti, quam audiri in quodam consilio a dominis secularibus esse datam.* He appeals to hearsay. It is possible that he may have in mind the parliamentary negotiations of 1366, but it is certain that the arguments which he has placed in the mouth of the secular lords are his own. The only answer quite to the point is that of the last lord, which entirely agrees with the resolution of the parliament. It is an important point that Wyclif says the matter is foreign to him. We see from this that he himself could not possibly for a long time after 1366 have played the part which recent writers on the subject have attributed to him.

Let us hold, then, to our conclusion: The genesis of the tract printed by Lewis is to be placed somewhere about the year 1377 or 1378. In that case the words too, *Si ego assererem talia contra regem meum, olim fuissent in parlamento dominorum Angliae ventilata*, admit of an easier interpretation than Lechler has succeeded in giving to them, for we know that Wyclif was active in parliamentary affairs earlier than 1378.

On this assumption another passage becomes clear, which has hitherto caused much difficulty to investigators. In the very beginning of the tract published by Lewis we read, *Ego autem cum sim peculiaris regis clericus.* . . . Pauli understands by the term *peculiaris clericus* a royal chaplain, for which no trace of a proof is to be found. Lechler more correctly thinks of a government commissioner. But the matter does not belong at all to the year 1366 or 1367. Ten years later Wyclif, by the king's order, actually drew up statements for the parliament. He could then better call himself a *peculiaris regis clericus* than at an earlier date.

I may add one more piece of internal evidence as a proof that the treatise printed by Lewis belongs to a later period. He makes use therein of almost the very same *protestatio* as in 'De Civili Dominio.'

LEWIS, p. 366.

Ego autem tamquam humilis et obediencialis filius Romane ecclesie protestans me nihil velle asserere quod sonaret iniuriam dicte ecclesie vel racionabiliter offenderet *pias aures.*

'DE CIV. DOM.' ii. 11.

Protestor publice quod non intendo personam aliquam diffamare . . . nec video quomodo *id offenderet pias aures.* . . .

Among all the numerous 'protestations' of Wyclif this turn of expression appears only in the two above-named treatises, and must therefore have been a favourite one with him in 1377 and 1378.

It is quite possible that Wyclif, when he brings forward his seven lords in reply to the claims of the papacy, has in view not the events of 1366 at all, but those of 1374. The 'Eulogium Historiarum' records under this year that after Whitsuntide the king assembled a great council of prelates and lords at Westminster. In the midst of the sanctuary sat Prince Edward and the archbishop of Canterbury, William Whittlesey; on the side of the archbishop the prelates, on the side of the prince the temporal lords. In front of the prince and the archbishop sat on one bench, side by side, four masters of theology, the provincial of the Dominican friars, John Owtred a monk of Durham, John Mardisle, and Thomas Ashburn an Augustinian. At the sides sat the canonists and civilians. The chancellor arose, and stated as the cause of the summons that the pope had sent to the king a bull, wherein he had written: *quod cum ipse sit dominus generalis ex Christi vicariatu, ac dominus spiritualis et capitalis regni Angliæ ex dono olim Iohannis regis, mandat, quod rex levare faciat tallagium in subsidium contra sibi rebelles Florentinos et alios, et illud sibi mittere non postponat*—that is, 'the pope, to whom England belongs by virtue of the gift of King John, desires the king to raise a tax throughout the land, in order that the seditious Florentines may be overthrown. The king must not delay to send the money.' Before I proceed any further I shall remark that the 'Eulogium' proves to be well informed in very many respects, and that the mere mention of the Florentines points to the fact that there is no confusion here with the demand of 1366.

'You prelates,' now inquires the king, 'tell me, is the pope, as the vicar of Christ, our lord? You lords of the laity may speak to-morrow.' The chancellor called upon the archbishop, who then arose. 'I cannot deny,' said he, 'that the pope is lord of all.' And so answer the prelates in order. The provincial begs to be excused from giving an answer. The monk of Durham brings forward the well-known argument of the two swords. On the other hand Mardisle, who was apparently a Minorite, maintained the theory of the Minorites, which they had so brilliantly defended in the contest between Lewis of Bavaria and John XXII, and of whose spokesmen one, himself an Englishman, was Ockham. Mardisle said, 'Neither Christ nor his disciples had any worldly dominion; nay, rather he commanded them to renounce the world.' Then Mardisle relates how Boniface VIII first laid claim to secular lordship, and how he suffered shipwreck in consequence. Mardisle's doctrines are in

complete agreement with those which Wyclif taught at a later date. The reply of the Austin friar was somewhat evasive, but rather more, if anything, in favour of the laity.

Mardisle's speech must have produced a deep impression on the assembly, for the archbishop was moved to the sharp retort, 'Truly good counsel was to be found in England only before these friars came here.' The prince promptly rejoined, 'By reason of thy simplicity we were fain to call them in, for had it depended upon thee we might have lost the kingdom.' The next day even the archbishop admitted that the pope is not lord over England, and the monk of Durham also had changed his views. 'And now,' asked the king, 'what has become of thy two swords?' 'Ah! to-day I am armed with better discernment.'

Lastly, the laity said that King John had given the kingdom to the pope without their consent; he could not possibly have done so legitimately. With this answer messengers were despatched to the pope. This must have been the embassy which was sent to the curia shortly before the congress of Bruges, and to which the very same monk of Durham belonged.

Now observe, the answer of the temporal lords corresponds exactly with the language of the seventh lord in the tract printed by Lewis. We also find expressions there which recall the opening speech of the chancellor. When, therefore, William Wadford, or whoever was the opponent, turned against Wyclif, and brought forward the feudal supremacy of the pope, is it not much more natural to think of the year 1374 than of 1365? If, as has been shown, a sharp controversy arose between the two men in 1376 or 1377, this story about the feudal relation was still so fresh in the memories of men that it could be well used as an argument. Indeed, it now becomes for the first time completely clear how Wyclif could say that his opponent had unjustifiably dragged in the subject in order to bring him into discredit with the curia.

Hence it follows that the tract printed by Lewis, the supposed date of which has hitherto caused Wyclif's entry upon public affairs to be assigned to too early a period, was not composed until after Wyclif had written his first book 'De Civili Dominio.' Otherwise he would surely have taken notice of his opponent in the first book, since he deals with the very same subject in the thirteenth-sixth chapter of that book. The second book only appeared after Wadford's controversy. It is a mistake to suppose that Wyclif up to this time held any fully developed opinion in regard to questions of ecclesiastical politics. Hitherto he is only a 'simple' theologian, and handles definite questions which have been proposed to him from the point of view of theological dogma. Thus he says in the tract published by Lewis, 'If the possession of temporalities is burdensome to the church they must be taken away from it. But

whether the church at the present day is in such a case it is not my business to inquire; that must be left to politicians to determine.' It was the antagonism of a Wadford, and possibly of other adversaries as well, that first compelled him to bring the questions of ecclesiastical politics to the forefront.

How frequently mistakes are made, even at the present day, with regard to such questions concerning Wyclif, Lorimer himself has given a proof, when in a note he rejects Lechler's view that Wyclif's judgment respecting the oath of the papal collector Garnier was written in 1372; this judgment also belongs to the time of Richard II., as we learn from the words *regi nostro, licet in aetate iuvenili florenti*.

Wyclif was sent to Bruges in 1374, not as a man of the sword, but as a man of peace; in this capacity he could not have appeared there had he already in that year, let alone in 1365, taken the position on which he stood in 1377 and 1378.

An objection to my view has been urged by my esteemed collaborator Mr. F. D. Matthew, who asks, 'How was it possible that Wyclif in the short space of about eight years should have written such a multitude of books?' To this it must be said: how quickly Wyclif worked is seen from the rapidity with which both the voluminous second and third books of 'De Civili Dominio' were written; secondly, many of his works were put together out of various parts, some of which might have been composed at very different times, as, for example, the book 'On the Church;' again, others contain, like the 'Opus Evangelicum,' simply commentaries. On the other hand it may well be asked: if Wyclif had already written that vehement treatise (printed by Lewis) in 1366 or 1367, how was it possible that the hierarchy on the one hand, the king on the other, should leave him for nearly another ten years almost without notice? Would the intervention of the curia in that case have actually followed only in 1377, and not at a considerably earlier date? and would not the king have given to Wyclif in 1374 the place which John Mardisle held?

J. LOSERTH.

JOHN AUBREY'S BIOGRAPHICAL COLLECTIONS.

At the suggestion of Anthony Wood, who was at the time collecting materials for the 'Athenae Oxonienses,' John Aubrey, in the years 1680 and 1681, jotted down what he calls 'brief lives' of certain men and women he had met or heard about. Among these were several mathematicians, and in 1690 he added to his collections several notices of mathematical writers of an earlier date, intending to bring them out separately under the title of 'An Apparatus