

THE ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW

W. G. C.

EDITED BY

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

FELLOW OF MERTON COLLEGE, OXFORD

AND

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

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

VOLUME X.

1895



LONDON

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

AND NEW YORK

1895

CONTENTS OF VOL. X.

	PAGE
THE EARLY HISTORY OF SYRIA AND ASIA MINOR. By <i>John E. Gilmore</i>	1
THE PASCHAL CANON ATTRIBUTED TO ANATOLIUS OF LAODICEA.	
By <i>A. Anscombe</i>	515
By <i>C. H. Turner</i>	699
ENGLISH TOPOGRAPHICAL NOTES. I: SOME PLACE-NAMES IN BEDE.	
II: BANNAVEM TABERNIAE. By <i>F. Haverfield</i>	710
THE 'DONATION OF CONSTANTINE.' By <i>Henry Charles Lea, LL.D.</i>	86
A WORCESTER CATHEDRAL BOOK OF ECCLESIASTICAL COLLECTIONS, MADE c. 1000 A.D. By <i>Miss Mary Bateson</i>	712
THE POPE WHO DEPOSED HIMSELF. By <i>Sir Frederick Pollock, Bart., LL.D.</i>	298, 586
THE OFFICE OF CONSTABLE. By <i>H. B. Simpson</i>	625
HENRY I AT 'BURNE.' By <i>J. H. Round</i>	586
KING STEPHEN AND THE EARL OF CHESTER. By <i>J. H. Round</i>	87
THE HUNDRED AND THE GELD. By <i>J. H. Round</i>	732
THE MURDER OF HENRY CLEMENT, 1285. By <i>Professor Maitland, LL.D.</i>	294
EDMUND, EARL OF LANCASTER. By <i>Walter E. Rhodes</i>	19, 209
A BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE OF DANTE IN THE 1494 EDITION OF THE 'SPECULUM HISTORIALE.' By <i>Paget Toynbee</i>	297
THE 'HERSE' OF ARCHERS AT CRECY. By <i>Lieutenant-Colonel E. M. Lloyd, R.E.</i>	588
THE ARCHERS AT CRECY. By the <i>Rev. Hereford B. George</i>	788
THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE WYCLIFFITE BIBLE. By <i>F. D. Matthew</i>	91
SOME LITERARY CORRESPONDENCE OF HUMPHREY, DUKE OF GLOUCESTER. By the <i>Bishop of Peterborough</i>	99
ERASMUS IN ITALY. By the <i>Rev. Edward H. R. Tatham</i>	642
THE AGE OF ANNE BOLEYN. By <i>James Gairdner</i>	104

	PAGE
A SIXTEENTH-CENTURY SCHOOL. By <i>P. S. Allen</i>	738
THE CONDITION OF MORALS AND RELIGIOUS BELIEF IN THE REIGN OF EDWARD VI By the <i>Rev. Nicholas Pocock</i>	417
THE CONSTABLE LESDIGUIÈRES. By <i>E. Armstrong</i>	445
THE ASSASSINATION OF THE GUISES AS DESCRIBED BY THE VENETIAN AMBASSADOR. By <i>Horatio Brown</i>	804
VANINI IN ENGLAND. By <i>Richard Copley Christie</i>	298
AN ALLEGED NOTEBOOK OF JOHN PYM. By <i>S. R. Gardiner, D.C.L.</i>	105
HERALDRY OF OXFORD COLLEGES. By the <i>Rev. Andrew Clark</i>	988, 548
By <i>Percival Landon</i>	541
TROUBLES IN A CITY PARISH UNDER THE PROTECTORATE. By the <i>Rev. J. A. Dodd</i>	41
CROMWELL'S MAJOR-GENERALS. By <i>David Watson Rannie</i>	471
AN ECCLESIASTICAL EXPERIMENT IN CAMBRIDGESHIRE, 1656-1658. By the <i>Rev. H. W. P. Stevens</i>	744
A LETTER FROM LORD SAYE AND SELE TO LORD WHARTON, 29 DEC. 1657. Printed by <i>C. H. Firth</i>	106
THE 'MEMOIRS' OF SIR RICHARD BULSTRODE. By <i>C. H. Firth</i>	266
SIR EYRE COOTE AND THE 'DICTIONARY OF NATIONAL BIOGRAPHY.' By <i>Frédéric Dixon</i>	886
AN IRISH ABSENTEE AND HIS TENANTS, 1768-1792. By <i>J. G.</i> <i>Alger</i>	668
THE PERMANENT SETTLEMENT OF BENGAL. By <i>B. H. Baden-</i> <i>Powell, C.I.E.</i>	276
DISPUTED PASSAGES OF THE CAMPAIGN OF 1815. By His Honour <i>Judge William O'Connor Morris</i>	55
THE WAR OF THE SONDERBUND. By <i>W. B. Duffield</i>	675
JOHN ROBERT SEELEY. By <i>J. R. Tanner</i>	507
REVIEWS OF BOOKS	108, 889, 546, 754
CORRESPONDENCE	192, 400
PERIODICAL NOTICES	198, 401, 611, 818
LIST OF RECENT HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS	201, 408, 618, 826
ERRATA	208, 416, 624
INDEX	888

in Nottinghamshire; the even larger one of Mansfield (both of them crown demesne in 'Domesday'), in Warwickshire; Stoneleigh and its appurtenances—also crown demesne—near Coventry. Among the other lands conceded to him was 'Derby,' which Dugdale identifies with West Derby, in Lancashire; but, as that place would certainly be included in his Lancashire grant, one is tempted to see in it nothing less than the borough of Derby itself.

Study of the map of England reveals his sphere of operations. It was, broadly speaking, a triangle, with Chester at its apex and Lincoln and Coventry at the extremities of its base. Halfway on the line between them stood Belvoir Castle, of which he had obtained possession. Derby, indeed, was as a wedge driven into his territory; but the terms of his treaty with the earl of Leicester imply that Earl Ferrers, of Derby, was his friend and ally. Now, just as, in 1149, Stephen had, on my hypothesis, won him over by concessions; so in 1153, when Henry of Anjou came again, and parties were evenly divided, Randulf once more held the scale, and Henry had to lure him back by grants exceeding even those of Stephen. The Devizes charter of the young duke does not, indeed, mention Lincoln, but the castle and town of Nottingham are now added, and, more important still, Stafford and all Staffordshire, with a few specified exceptions, clearly as an addition to his palatinate of Cheshire, to be held on similar terms. In Normandy likewise the Avranchin was to be made a kind of palatinate for him, evidently on the ground that he was great-nephew of Hugh of Avranches, earl of Chester, while in England fief after fief was promised as an addition to his dominion. Among them was that of William Peverel, which proved a fatal acquisition, for to poison at his hand was attributed the death of the earl this very year.

No one can study the extravagant character of Henry's grants in this charter without feeling well assured that the young duke had no intention of observing a day longer than he could help conditions which he must have felt were extorted from him by force, and were only intended to secure, as they did, the support of the earl at this crisis. That he joined the duke is proved by his presence with him, at this period, both at Gloucester and Wallingford.¹¹

J. H. ROUND.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE WYOLIFFITE BIBLE.

It has hitherto been accepted without question that we owe the first English Bible to Wyclif and his followers. It has come down to us in two versions, which have been printed in parallel columns in the monumental edition of Forshall and Madden. According to the editors the earlier translation was mainly the

¹¹ *Geoffrey de Mandeville*, p. 419.

work of Wyclif and his friend Hereford, Wyclif translating the New Testament and Hereford the Old. The style of this version was too literal and stiff, and a revision was carried through by another Wycliffite, John Purvey. This revision may have been begun under Wyclif's auspices, but was not finished until some time after his death. That this account is generally true has not been doubted till, in the July number of the 'Dublin Review,' Dr. Gasquet set forth an entirely new view of the matter. He maintains that these versions are not Wyclif's or even Wycliffite, but are authorised and semi-official. Wyclif, Purvey, and Hereford may have been admitted to some share in the work of translation (on this point Dr. Gasquet is not very clear), but the inception and direction of the enterprise were in no way due to them.

We might be inclined to dismiss this new theory as a humorous paradox, but Dr. Gasquet is evidently serious, and we turn to review the evidence which, according to him, has misled all previous inquirers. Here we notice that the novelty lies in the inferences drawn and not in the facts on which they are based, as to which he has little, if anything, to add.

The first question is naturally, What contemporary authority exists for attributing the translation to Wyclif? and on this point Dr. Gasquet affirms boldly that there is 'an absolute silence of all records, both ecclesiastical and lay, as to any Wycliffite version of the Bible.' With laudable candour he proceeds to quote the authorities cited by Forshall and Madden on behalf of Wyclif's authorship. First we have the words of John Hus: 'It is reported among the English that he' (*i.e.* Wyclif) 'translated the whole Bible from Latin into English.' We know that in the judgment of Wyclif editors this report goes beyond the truth, since they attribute a large share in the work to Hereford. Yet this is hardly enough to justify Dr. Gasquet in airily waving away Hus's testimony with the remark, 'It is now allowed by all that there is not even a probability that he did anything of this kind.' We still speak of Pope's 'Odyssey,' although Fenton and Broome had a good hand in it, and the report recorded by Hus is witness that Wyclif was regarded as the person responsible for the English Bible. Still more direct evidence is furnished by Knighton, who tells us, *Hic magister Iohannes Wyclif evangelium . . . transtulit de Latino in Anglicam linguam*; ¹ and again, *Magis tamen congruunt istis novis populis Lollardis, qui mutaverunt evangelium Christi in evangelium eternum, id est, vulgarem linguam et communem materiam.*² It seems hard to imagine anything more clear and decisive than this contemporary evidence, but the utmost concession it brings from Dr. Gasquet is that, while he does not consider it impossible

¹ Knighton, col. 2644.

² *Ibid.* 2646.

to explain away Knighton's words, he is 'inclined to think there is some ground for holding that Wyclif may possibly have had a share in some translation of the New Testament.' Finally, as if to show that Wyclif's part was not the subordinate one thus assigned to him by Dr. Gasquet, but that he was the moving spirit, we have a letter from Archbishop Arundel, in which it is said that Wyclif 'filled up the measure of his malice by devising a plan of translation of the Holy Scriptures into the mother tongue.'

Against this weight of positive testimony what has Dr. Gasquet to allege? Only negative evidence in the supposed silence of Wyclif and his opponents.

On the other hand [he says] it is difficult to account for the silence of Wyclif himself, who in none of his undoubted writings, so far as I am aware, lays any stress on, or indeed in any way advocates, having the Scriptures in the vernacular, except in so far as he claims that the Bible is the sole guide in faith and practice for all.

The exception is a considerable one, since Wyclif is never tired of insisting on the use of the Bible as the supreme and sufficient rule of life. We need not, however, press this point, because there is no lack of passages in which he directly advocates the spread of the English Bible. A reference to the word 'Bible' in the index of the 'Select English Works' directs us to this passage, which certainly implies the authorship of Wyclif or some associate of his. 'One great bishop of England, as men say, is evil paid that God's law is written in English to lewd men; and he pursueth a priest because he writeth to men this English, and summoneth him.'³ A similar index reference to the 'English Works of Wyclif' would have led Dr. Gasquet to a whole chapter in the tract 'De Officio Pastoralis,' directed against the friars and their supporters, who say it is heresy to write God's law in English. 'For this cause,' says Wyclif, 'St. Jerome . . . translated the Bible from divers tongues into Latin, that it might be afterwards translated into other tongues;'⁴ and again, 'The commons of Englishmen know it best in their mother tongue, and thus it were all one to let such knowing of the gospel and to let Englishmen from following Christ and coming to heaven.'⁵ So too in a sermon:⁶ 'This moveth some men to tell in English Paul's epistles, for some men may better know hereby what God meaneth by Paul.' No one who has read even a little in Wyclif's works can fail to recognise in the first 'some men' a reference to himself and his party. Once more, 'Thus it helpeth here to Christian men to study the Gospel in that tongue in which they know best Christ's sentence.'⁷

³ *Select English Works of Wyclif*, i. 209. The English of these quotations is here modernised.

⁴ *English Works of Wyclif*, p. 429.

⁵ *Select English Works*, ii. 221.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 480.

⁷ *Ibid.* iii. 184.

The tracts from which these quotations are taken are of admitted authenticity. We will add an example from the Latin treatise 'De Triplici Vinculo Amoris.'

Et ex eodem patet eorum stulticia, qui volunt dampnare scripta tanquam heretica propter hoc quod scribuntur in Anglico et acute tangunt peccata que conturbant illam provinciam. Nam possibile est quod nobilis regina Anglię, soror Cesaris, habeat ewangelium in lingwa triplici exaratum, scilicet in lingwa boemica, in lingwa teutonica et latina, et hereticare ipsam propterea implicite foret luciferina superbia. Et sicut Teutonici volunt in isto racionabiliter defendere lingwam propriam, sic et Anglici debent de racione in isto defendere lingwam suam.⁸

It would be easy to quote many more passages, but these are enough to show that Wyclif did advocate the use of the Scriptures in the vernacular, and that strongly. With this proof before us we cannot attach much weight to the further negative argument that Wyclif's adversaries say nothing about the English Bible in their controversies with him. 'Neither Woodford nor Walden nor Whethamstede so much as refers to Wyclif's translations, or to any special desire upon his part to circulate God's word in English among the people.' We accept Dr. Gasquet's statement without surprise, since any such reference would have been irrelevant to scholastic arguments directed against special doctrines. One may peruse all the published works of Wyclif and get very little light on the character and general opinions of his opponents.

Here, with the proof that Wyclif did insist strongly on the need of an English Bible, and that in the belief of his contemporaries he supplied that need, we might leave the matter, but we should be passing by the argument on which Dr. Gasquet lays most stress, and which seems to have led him to his rash thesis. He is unwilling—or rather unable—to believe that there was not an orthodox and authorised English translation for the use of dutiful churchmen who were untainted by Wycliffite heresy. That such did use an English version there is no doubt. Dr. Gasquet calls attention to the existence of copies of the translation attributed to the Wycliffites which belonged to persons of unquestioned orthodoxy, and even to the religious. One, combining both guarantees, was given by Henry VI to the monks of the Charterhouse; another was owned by the convent of Barking.

There are, moreover [says Dr. Gasquet], instances of the English Bible—the production—the secret production—of the Lollard scribes—that perilous piece of property to possess, as we are asked to believe—there are instances of this being bequeathed by wills publicly proved in the public courts of the bishops. . . . It is, of course, obvious that this could never have been done had the volume so left been the work of Wyclif or his

⁸ *Polemical Works of Wyclif* (ed. Buddensieg), p. 168. Cf. in the same book pp. 126, 711.

followers, for it would then, indeed, have been, as a modern writer describes the Wycliffite books, a perilous piece of property. Thus before the close of the fourteenth century—namely, in 1394—a copy of the gospels in English was bequeathed to the chantry of St. Nicholas in the church of Holy Trinity, York, by John Hopton, chaplain there. Fancy what this means on the theory that the English Scriptures were the work of Wycliffite hands! It means nothing less than that a catholic priest publicly bequeaths, in a will proved in his bishop's court, to a catholic church, for the use of catholic people, the proscribed work of some member of an heretical sect.

We should say that Dr. Gasquet's argument is vitiated by an entire misunderstanding of Wyclif's position. First of all he takes it for granted that a Wycliffite translation could not have been faithful.

So far as I have been able to discover [he says], from an examination of the two texts, there is nothing inconsistent with their having been the work of perfectly orthodox sons of holy church. In no place where (had the version been the work of Lollard pens) we might have looked for texts strained or glossed to suit their well-known conclusions do any such appear.

We are not told what texts we might expect to be tampered with, so we cannot follow Dr. Gasquet in an examination of these test passages, but it seems rash to alter the attribution of a translation simply because it is faithful and is unaccompanied by a gloss in certain places. And since, on Dr. Gasquet's showing, the text is not corrupted, what should prevent its use by good Catholics, even though it were Wyclif's? The answer that it would have been discredited as the work of an heretical sect shows an imperfect appreciation of the circumstances of the time and of the repute in which Wyclif was held. It must be borne in mind that to the end of his life he never met with any formal personal condemnation. Articles drawn from his works were condemned in the Blackfriars council, and some of his followers were compelled to recant; but he seems to have remained personally untouched, except that he was forbidden to teach his doctrine on the Eucharist at Oxford. No formal condemnation of his English Bible was ever issued, or, as far as we know, attempted. Far from being the disgraced head of an outcast sect, he was a prominent and distinguished churchman, in intimate relations with the court and government, and generally allowed to be one of the most illustrious members of the university. No doubt he was regarded with suspicion and dislike by the conservative and orthodox party, but there was no brand of heresy upon him personally that could discredit his work if in itself unobjectionable. On the whole the governing body and leading men of the university were on his side. This comes out clearly after the Blackfriars council in the behaviour of the chancellor, who

excused himself for not publishing the council's condemnations on the ground that in the state of feeling at Oxford it might have cost him his life, and the narrative⁹ shows that Wyclif's support did not come from a rabble of young scholars, but from men of weight and influence.

Thirty years later matters had changed. The 'Oxford movement' had been repressed, the leaders of the party had recanted, and the Lollards had become a sect, composed mostly of poor and ill-instructed men. Meanwhile the remembrance of Wyclif as an ornament of the Oxford schools and an adviser of statesmen had died away, and his memory was connected only with the foundation of the Lollard heresy, so that his name on pamphlet or translation would be dangerous to its possessor. But by this time the English Bible had its own life, independent of its author's reputation. This consideration goes far to resolve another of Dr. Gasquet's difficulties—that some of the remaining copies are too costly to have belonged to Wycliffites.

I cannot but think [he says] that an unbiassed mind that will reflect upon the matter must see how impossible it was for a poor persecuted sect like the Lollards, for the writings of which frequent and rigid searches were made, to produce the Bibles now ascribed to them. Many of these copies, as we may see for ourselves, are written with great care and exactness, and illuminated with coloured borders executed by skilful artists. These must surely have been the production of freer hands than the followers of Wyclif were ever allowed to have in England.

The same question might be raised as to Wyclif's acknowledged writings. It was no poor persecuted Lollard that commissioned the great volume of sermons and treatises now in Trinity College, Cambridge,¹⁰ in which good penmanship and intolerable blunders alike point to the professional scribe. It is adorned with illumination, and must have cost a large sum. Other volumes, though not so large, are equally well executed. With regard to the translation of the Bible Wyclif congratulates himself on the support of the gentry. 'One comfort,' he says, 'is of knights, that they savour much the gospel and have will to read in English the gospel of Christ's life.'¹¹ That this was no empty boast is shown by the list of Wycliffites of rank given in the 'Chronicon Angliae,'¹² in which figure some of the most influential men of the day. This is dated after Wyclif's death, and there is evidence as to some that they retained their Lollard tendencies to the end of their life. Among these Cliffords, Nevilles, and Montagus some might well have a mind to read the gospel and to have it handsomely set forth. Later on, as we have already remarked, the copies would be multiplied without any thought of their authorship.

⁹ *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 298 et seqq.

¹¹ MS. B. 16, 2.

¹⁰ 'Sermons,' *S. E. W.* i. 209.

¹² *Sub an.* 1387, p. 377.

One other point on which Dr. Gasquet lays much stress is that some of these Bibles—indeed, most of them—are marked for the lessons, gospels, and epistles.

There is not a shadow of probability [he says] in the suggestion that Wycliffite Scriptures would be marked for the church services for the use of his 'poor priests.' The truth is that these same 'poor priests' had, in fact, little claim to any sacerdotal character. They are described by Professor Shirley as mere lay preachers, both coarse and ignorant.

Dr. Gasquet is mistaken in saying that Dr. Shirley describes them as lay preachers. He says (what is a very different thing) that in their preaching aspect they bore a resemblance to the lay preachers of John Wesley, and goes on, 'Such as they were they were employed under episcopal sanction through what was then the immense diocese of Lincoln, and probably in others also.'¹³ No such sanction would have been given to laymen, and there is no ground for the suggestion that the 'poor priests' were other than their name described. For their use the Bibles might well be marked as to the passages used in service, which they would probably read in the vernacular. That the Wycliffites did attend to the order of the services is shown by the fact that Wyclif's sermons, collected as aids and models to the poor priests, are all on gospels or epistles, while a copy of the version at Dublin containing the table of lessons is believed by the editors to be in the handwriting of Purvey.

We cannot see that Dr. Gasquet has had any success in impugning the Wycliffite authorship of the existing version. But, as he says, 'this involves the tacit assumption that there was no catholic version at all.' Well, what reason is there to shrink from this conclusion as inadmissible? Would not the wonder rather be if such a version existed? No doubt protestant writers have often exaggerated the hostility of the clergy to the vernacular Bible. There was no objection on their part to the devotional use of the Bible in English any more than in Latin. It was a fitting ornament to the library of the man of rank, a useful help to the pious priest; and in such hands the inquisitor had nothing to say to it. But it was quite another matter when it was spread abroad as 'God's law,'¹⁴ among the people, and they were led in reliance on it to question the teaching of their appointed pastors. Knighton represented the feeling of the higher clergy when he wrote:

*Sic evangelica margarita spargitur et a porcis conculcatur, et sic quod solet esse carum clericis et laicis iam redditur quasi iocositas communis utriusque et gemma clericorum vertitur in ludum laicorum.*¹⁵

When this was the prevalent tone there was little chance of an authorised version.

¹³ *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, xl.

¹⁴ '*Semper prætendendo legem Dei*, Goddis lawe: ' Knighton, 2664.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

To the later of the Wycliffite versions is prefixed a prologue in which the translator describes his method.

For this reason and other [he says], with common charity to save all men in our realm which God will have saved, a simple creature has translated the Bible out of Latin into English. First the simple creature had much travail with divers fellows and helpers to gather many old Bibles, and other doctors and common glosses, and to make our Latin Bible some deal true; and then to study it off the new text with the gloss and other doctors as he might get, and especially Lyra on the Old Testament, that helped him full much in this work; the third time to counsel with old grammarians and old divines of hard words and hard senses how they might best be understood and translated; the fourth time to translate as clearly as he could to the sense, and to have many good fellows and cunning at the correcting of the translation.

On this Dr. Gasquet remarks that these words show that 'the writer had no knowledge of any previous translation, and this is quite inconsistent with the idea that it was the work of one so intimately connected with Wyclif as Purvey was—that is, always supposing that Wyclif had any part in the first version.' Here seemed to be a suggestion for a compromise by which the Wycliffites might be left the honour of one translation while the other was allowed to be the medieval authorised version of which Dr. Gasquet is in search. But how were they to be assigned? Dr. Gasquet's leaning seems to be to the later version; but the prologue is clearly Wycliffite. The term 'simple creature' is quite in accordance with lollard phraseology, but would not so well become a writer to whom had been assigned the honourable task of an authorised translation, while lollardy comes out even more clearly in the clause 'with common charity to save all men in our realm which God will have saved.' Here we have that doctrine of predestination which is so prominent in Wyclif's writings, and which, in its extreme form, was condemned at the council of Constance. Evidently, then, this second version bears the brand of its Wycliffite parentage, while as to the first it is hard to get over the ascription to Hereford in the Bodleian MS. But, in fact, whatever the prologue may seem to suggest, it is impossible to regard the translations as independent. Read for instance these few verses:—

Be 3e my foloweris, as and I of Crist. Forsoth, britheren, I preise 3ou, that bi alle thingis 3e be myndeful of me, as and I bitook to 3ou my comaundements, 3e kepen. Forsothe I wole 3ou for to wite that Crist is the heed of ech man; forsoth the heed of the woman is the man; forsoth the heed of Crist, God.¹⁶

Be 3e my foloweris as Y am of Crist. And, britheren, I preise 3ou, that bi alle thingis 3e ben myndeful of me; and as Y bitook to 3ou my comaundementis, 3e holden. But I wole that 3e wite that Crist is heed of ech man; but the heed of thi womman is the man, and the heed of Crist is God.

¹⁶ 1 Cor. xi. 1 -

This is a passage taken at random, without any selection, and the similarity in the versions is equally great throughout the New Testament. In the Old Testament there is a little more variation, but even there the connexion cannot be doubted for a moment by any one who compares the two. There is no ground for supposing that the writer of the prologue was making false claims to originality, and his language would be natural enough if he were one of a band of workers who carried through the first version. No one could be found more likely to answer this description than John Purvey, to whom the revision has generally been assigned. Here, then, as throughout our survey, the evidence is in favour of the received ascription, and we are under no temptation to exchange the old lights for Dr. Gasquet's new ones.

F. D. MATTHEW.

SOME LITERARY CORRESPONDENCE OF HUMPHREY, DUKE OF
GLOUCESTER.

It is rather remarkable that more attention has not been paid to the progress of Humanism in England, and especially to the literary fame of the duke of Gloucester, whom Oxford honours as the founder of the Bodleian library. That much might be discovered about Duke Humphrey's relation to foreign scholars is proved by the words of Aeneas Sylvius, who in a letter to Sigismund of Austria, written in December 1443, says, *Egredior Italiam et penitus toto divisos orbe Britannos petam, ubi dux est Gleocestriae qui regnum, quod modo Anglicum dicimus, pluribus annis gubernavit; huic tanta literarum est cura ut ex Italia magistros asciverit poetarum et oratorum interpretes* ('Epistolae,' ed. Basil. 105). That Aeneas was not romancing may be proved by the first of the following letters, which shows that Humphrey was in constant correspondence with the writer, who was commissioned to send him books from Italy. Peter de Monte was a Venetian by birth, a pupil in his early days of the famous scholar Guarino. He afterwards studied in Paris, and then at Brescia, where he lectured on canon law. In 1433 he was appointed apostolic protonotary by Eugenius IV, played some part in the council of Basel, was imprisoned for a time by the *condottiere* Niccolò Fortebraccio, and in 1434 was sent to England as papal collector. He remained there for five years, and made himself acceptable to such Englishmen as cared about literature. On his return to Italy he took part, as his letter tells us, in negotiations for an Italian peace, which was concluded at Cremona in November 1441 and left Francesco Sforza in possession of Milan. He afterwards was sent on a legation to France, and in 1442 was nominated bishop of Brescia, though he did not enter upon his duties till 1445. On the death of Eugenius IV Peter's