

c#

THE ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY

EDITED BY THE

REV. MANDELL CREIGHTON, M.A., LL.D.

DIXIE PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

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

VOLUME V.

1890



LONDON
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
AND NEW YORK: 15 EAST 16th STREET
1890

DA
20
E58
v. 5

In nomine domini nostri Iesu Christi. Anno domini ducentesimo septuagesimo tertio. VII Id. Octobres. In villa Sordue, presentibus testibus infra scriptis. Dominus Edwardus dei gratia Illustris Rex Anglie, dominus Hybernie et dux Aquitanie, et illustris Infans Petrus magnifici Regis Aragonis primogenitus, volentes inter se dilectionem et veram concordiam firmiter duraturam et eandem per affinitatis vinculum consummare, convenerunt quod predictus Dominus Rex Anglie desponsaret filiam suam et illustris Regine domine Alienore coniugis sue maiorem filio majori predicti domini Infantis et illustris domine Constantie uxoris sue, intelligentes illum et illam maiores qui tempore nuptiarum contrahendarum inter eos primi seu maiores supererunt. Unde predictus dominus Rex sub forma predicta filiam suam desponsavit per verba de futuro filio predicti domini Infantis, et predictus dominus Infans sub simili forma desponsavit predictum filium suum filie dicti domini Regis. Promittentes uterque eorum sibi invicem bona fide se daturos operam et facturos ac curaturos ut predicta sponsalia per subsequens matrimonium consumerentur. Et ad majorem firmitatem habendam predictus dominus Rex et predictus dominus Infans iuraverunt super sancta quatuor dei Evangelia predicta attendere et complere ut super continetur. Promisit etiam predictus dominus Infans prefato domino Regi quod tempore matrimonii faciet augmentum ad dotem quam filia . . . domini Regis afferet viro suo, secundum quantitatem dotis, scilicet augendo ipsam dotem in tertia parte plusquam sit ipsa dos. Vel dabit curas secundum morem Regni Aragonis qui est, quod assignantur domine certa loca que vivente viro tenet et percipit et habet redditus omnes ipsorum locorum ad voluntates suas inde faciendas. Similiter et post mortem viri quamdiu vidua in terra remanserit superstitibus filiis vel non, habeat et percipiat quod redditur ad voluntatem suam. Si vere eadem domina ad secunda vota convolaret, percipiat ipsos redditus et habeat non computandos in dote donec sibi fuerit de ipsa dote satisfactum. Super augmento autem et arris predictis sit in optione ipsius domini Regis utrum malit arrhas predictas pro filia sua recipere vel augmentum. In cuius rei testimonium predicti dominus Rex et dominus Infans huic carte sigilla sua fecerunt apponi alteruter. Testibus venerabilibus patribus Ausitanense Archiepiscopo et . . . Episcopo Lectorensis, Ethivarde de Chabbenays comite Bigorre, Aymerico de Rupe Canardi, Imberto Guidonio, Rogero de Clifford, Johanne de Boun militibus et Antonio Bek clerico predicti domini Regis. Bernardo Roggerii Comite Palariense, Blasio de Alagone, Athone de Focibus, R. dorthau (*sic*), P. de Offegato et Berengario de Monte Pavonis militibus predicti domini Infantis. Datum et actum in predicta villa Sordue anno et die prefixis. Regni predicti domini Regis Anglie anno primo.⁴

THE DATE OF WYCLIF'S ATTACK ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

WYCLIF's first denial of the doctrine of transubstantiation is universally ascribed to the summer of 1381. The date rests on fair authority, as it is given explicitly in the narrative of the Fasciculi Zizaniorum, yet it has always been felt to present some difficulties.

⁴ Royal Archives of Aragon, Parchments of Jaime I, No. 1173.

The works of Wyclif written after he had begun his attack on this doctrine are so many and so voluminous that it is hard to believe they were all produced within three years and a half, during two of which he was a paralytic. This consideration alone would weigh little in disturbing the received chronology, but a more important difficulty is that the account as it stands in the *Fasciculi Zizaniorum* does not seem to allow time for the events that it records. The narrative stands thus: Wyclif began in the summer of 1381 to 'determine' on the sacrament of the altar,¹ and laid down twelve conclusions, in which his doctrine on the subject was fully stated. Later he laid down other conclusions of which three were afterwards condemned. This publication led to a formal condemnation of his doctrine by the chancellor, William Berton, assisted by twelve doctors, and the condemnation was publicly proclaimed in the school of the Austin friars, where Wyclif was lecturing. Wyclif refused submission and appealed to the king, and the duke of Lancaster coming down to Oxford imposed silence on him. In spite of this on 10 May he published a confession or statement of his doctrine.

Now, as Dr. Shirley remarks,² *in aestate* must mean after Easter, which in 1381 fell on 14 April. 'Does this,' he asks, 'allow time for all that passed in the interim?' He is content to raise the doubt without attempting to resolve it, but it is felt so strongly by Mr. Poole, the latest writer on the subject, that he attempts to gain time by making the end of the proceedings later. 'I suspect,' he says, 'that the actual condemnation did not take place until the beginning of 1382.'³ This suggestion is based on the uncertainty of the dates of the chancellors, an uncertainty which, I think, can be cleared up. Among the petitions in the Rolls Office for the imprisonment of persons contumacious under excommunication, are many from the chancellor of Oxford, and among them I have noted petitions from Berton 21 Feb. 1380-1 and 6 April 1381; from Rygge 20 Nov. 1381, 1 March 1381-2, 10 Sept. 1382. The office of chancellor was then tenable for two years. The elections were held on the Thursday before Whitsunday,⁴ which Thursday in 1381 fell on May 30. On that day there can be no reasonable doubt that Berton left office.

It is, then, clearly impossible to make the proceedings last on into 1382, and we are again shut up into the narrow space between Easter and 10 May. But even this has to be got by putting a strain upon language. The natural interpretation of *in aestate* would seem to be in the summer term which began on the Wednes-

¹ *Incepit autem sub anno Domini mcccclxxxi, in aestate, determinare materiam sacramenti altaris.* Fasc. Ziz. 104.

² Fasc. Ziz. xliii. note.

³ Wycliffe and Movements for Reform, p. 105, note.

⁴ *Munimenta Academica* (Rolls Series), pp. 106, 447.

day after Trinity Sunday,⁵ and in this case the commencement of the affair must be referred back to 1380. It is to be noticed that in the manuscript (Bodley, 703) which alone gives the date of Wyclif's confession, the date of the year has been altered by erasure from *m^occc^olxxx^oi^o* by erasing the *i^o* so as to leave 1380.⁶ This would throw back the rise of the controversy to 1379. I should not object to the date in itself, but it is impossible to attach serious weight to such an alteration by an unknown hand.

I may support this contention for an earlier date by an inference from the text of the contemporary St. Albans chronicler. He gives us a chapter⁷ on the various opinions of men as to the causes of the rebellion of 1381. First among them he cites the laxity of the bishops who, knowing that Wyclif and his followers were spreading false doctrines concerning the sacrament of the altar far and wide among the people, did not chastise their perverse children. It was for this neglect above all that the archbishop was punished, and the lesson was pointed by his martyrdom taking place on the day after Corpus Christi (14 June). There is no reason to doubt that we have here an echo of talk that was common at the time. But the vengeance would be swift, not to say hasty, which smote the archbishop on 14 June for not repressing heresies first promulgated in that summer. Indeed, if we may trust the expressions of the chronicler, there had been time for the new opinions not merely to win a hasty condemnation from an old adversary at Oxford, but to spread themselves abroad through the country.

One must not lay too much stress on such an argument as this; but, with those already advanced, it is enough to overthrow the authority of the Fasciculi, especially when we remember that that volume was not compiled till half a century later, and that even the passages that appear to be written by a contemporary were not penned before 1392. After a dozen years even an eyewitness might easily confuse the date of the condemnation with that of the beginning of the controversy.

F. D. MATTHEW.

THE PILGRIMAGE OF GRACE.

ASKE's Narrative of the events of October and November 1536, addressed to the king, is in the Record Office, marked Chapter House Books A/2/28, in which it is the seventh paper, beginning on p. 47. On p. 69 is another version which does not differ materially from the first except at the end where some comments on Cromwell are omitted. Such differences will here be noted as

⁵ *Munimenta Academica* (Rolls Series), p. 447.

⁶ Fasc. Ziz. p. 115 note.

⁷ *Chron. Angliæ* (Rolls Series), p. 311.