

40682

THE ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW

EDITED BY

S. R. GARDINER, M.A., LL.D.

FELLOW OF ALL SOULS COLLEGE, OXFORD

ASSISTED BY

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

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

VOLUME VII.

1892



LONDON

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

AND NEW YORK: 15 EAST 16th STREET

1892

just as he would have resisted an attempt of the crown to deprive his see of a manor, of feudal services, or of goods. The crown might take its pound of flesh, but more than that it should not have; never, through any action of his, should his church be deprived of its prescriptive rights.¹⁹

J. H. ROUND.

ON THE INTERCOURSE BETWEEN ENGLISH AND BOHEMIAN WYCLIFFITES
IN THE EARLY YEARS OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

PROFESSOR LOSERTH, of Czernowitz, who eight years ago established beyond the reach of controversy the literary dependence of Hus upon Wycliffe, and who has edited a number of texts (including no less than five volumes of Wycliffe himself) bearing upon the religious movement derived from him both in England and Bohemia, has lately put forth a valuable paper on the relations between the two branches of the reforming party,¹ upon which I should like to offer a few notes and observations, not by way of exhausting the interest of that article, but for the purpose of adding what I can of illustration and sometimes of correction.

There has been some discussion as to the channel by which Wycliffe's works reached Bohemia. In 1884 Dr. Loserth wrote—

Ebenso unrichtig ist die Behauptung Enea Silvio's, dass ein Mann aus vornehmen Hause Namens Faulfisch die ersten Exemplare Wiclifischer Schriften nach Prag überbracht habe. Es ist dies bekanntlich eine Verwechslung mit jenem Nicolaus Faulfisch, der in Gesellschaft mit einem anderen Studierenden eine Urkunde nach Prag brachte, in welcher die Universität Oxford am 5. October 1406, die Rechtgläubigkeit Wiclifs behauptete.²

Had Aeneas Sylvius made the statement attributed to him, he would undoubtedly have been in error, since it can be shown that some of Wycliffe's writings were read at Prague before the end of the fourteenth century, and possibly within a few years of Wycliffe's death in 1384.³ And we have Jerom of Prague's express statement that he transcribed Wycliffe's 'Dialogus' and 'Trialogus' during his stay in England, and took back the books with him,⁴ probably in 1401 or 1402.⁵ But as a matter of fact Aeneas said not a word about Faulfisch's bringing the first copies of Wycliffe's works: he said simply—

¹⁹ *Antiquas immunitates perdendo.*

¹ *Mittheil. des Instit. für Oesterreich. Gesch.-Forsch.* xii. (1891), pp. 254-69.

² *Hus und Wiclif* (1884), pp. 79 f. Compare Dr. Loserth's introduction to *Wycliffe, de Ecclesia* (1885), p. xvii.

³ Loserth, *Hus und Wiclif*, pp. 78 f.; *Mittheil.*, ubi supra, p. 257; cf. Lechler, *Johann von Wiclif* (1873), ii. 112 f., 135.

⁴ H. von der Hardt, *Corp. Act. et Decr. Constant. Concil.* iv. (1699), col. 635.

⁵ Loserth, *Hus und Wiclif*, p. 82.

vir quidam genere nobilis, ex domo quam Putridi Piscis vocant, apud Oxoniam Angliæ civitatem literis studens, cum Joannis Wiclevi libros offendisset, quibus de realibus universalibus titulus inscribitur, magnopere illis oblectatus, exemplaria secum attulit. Inter quæ de civili iure, deque divino,⁸ de ecclesia, de diversis quaestionibus, contra clerum pleraque volumina, veluti pretiosum thesaurum, patriæ suæ intulit.⁷

Aeneas Sylvius makes this statement at the beginning of his account of the rise of the Hussite movement, and I have no doubt that it was the first notice of Wycliffe's works being brought into Bohemia of which he was aware; but his language, it will be seen, is not chargeable with the mistake which has been read into it. It has, indeed, a remarkable confirmation in the fact that there exists a manuscript (Cod. palat. Vindobon. 1294) of three works of Wycliffe, the 'De Veritate Sacrae Scripturae,' 'De Dominio Divino,' and 'De Ecclesia,'—two of which appear in Aeneas Sylvius's list—containing a note stating that the 'De Veritate' was 'corrected at Oxford on the feast of the Purification 1407 by Nicolas Faulfiss and George of Knyehnicz.'⁸ It is singular that in the English translation of Dr. Loserth's book, where this note is quoted in another connexion,⁹ its bearing upon Aeneas Sylvius's testimony is not observed, although, as I took occasion to point out in my preface to Wycliffe's first book 'de Civili Dominio,' it raised a strong presumption in its favour.¹⁰ I am glad, therefore, to see that Dr. Loserth now accepts the fact that Faulfisch brought at least the works contained in that manuscript back with him to Bohemia.¹¹ He adds that later chroniclers have, by a plain confusion of his name with that of Jerom of Prague, made out of this Nicolas a Jerom Faulfisch and asserted that he was the first to bring Wycliffe's writings to Prague: in other words, they knew that Jerom of Prague and that a certain Faulfisch were Bohemians who had studied at Oxford, and it was tempting to make Faulfisch the surname of Jerom and to identify the two.¹² But neither the statement about the 'first' writings nor the confusion with Jerom is attributable to Aeneas Sylvius.

Dr. Loserth furnishes some fresh particulars respecting Richard

⁸ Or *de civili, de iure divino*, Aen. Sylv. *Opera* (Basle, 1571), p. 103.

⁷ Aen. Sylv. *Hist. Bohem.* xxxv. (Helmstädt, 1699), p. 49.

⁸ *De Eccl.*, intr. p. xvii; *De Domin. Div.* (ed. R. L. Poole, 1890), pref. p. x.

⁹ *Wiclif and Hus* (1884), p. 101, note.

¹⁰ Wycliffe, *De Civ. Dom.* i. (1885), pref. p. ix.

¹¹ *Mittheil.*, ubi supra, pp. 258 f. I notice that Dr. Loserth speaks of Kenmerton (now Kemerton) as a village in Worcestershire instead of in Gloucestershire. It belonged, of course, to the old diocese of Worcester. The story to which he refers in connexion with Faulfisch (p. 259) was of a *bishop*, not an archbishop, and a cook (*Docum. Mag. Joh. Hus*, ed. Palacky, 1869, p. 729). On pp. 260, 263 'Herford' should be 'Hereford'; and on pp. 263, 266 'Covling' is a mistake for 'Cooling.'

¹² Shirley varied the operation and made Jerom and Nicolas *brothers* (*Fasc. Ziz.*, 1858, intr. p. lxxxii, note); he was aware of the note in the Vienna MS. 1294. But this dichotomy reminds one of 'Lahmi the brother of Goliath the Gittite' in 1 Chron. xx. 5.

Wyche, a narrative of whose trial for heresy was printed, from a copy taken from a Prague manuscript and kindly supplied by him, in this Review, vol. v. (1890), pp. 531-544. I notice that he follows¹³ Lechler, who, indeed, expresses himself with reserve,¹⁴ in making Wyche burned in 1431. But Lechler knew only the royal writ of 15 July 1440, printed by Foxe,¹⁵ forbidding pilgrimages to the place of his execution, and he connected his death with other recorded measures taken against heretics in 1431.¹⁶ There is, however, evidence of the year, the day, and even the hour of Wyche's burning. The Brute chronicle says that it took place on the Friday before Midsummer in the nineteenth year of Henry VI;¹⁷ but, as this would be near eleven months *after* the writ referred to, Stow, who used the manuscript, naturally corrected 'xix' into 'xviiij' and adopted the correction in his 'Annales' (ed. 1631, p. 378 b). The eighteenth year is established by the express statements of Gregory's chronicle,¹⁸ and by the record in a 'Short English Chronicle' of the time which states (with a mistake in the name) that 'in this yere was Sir Robert White, some tyme vicorye of Depfford, and anopere seculer man, dampned for heresye, and brent at Toure Hill in a mornyng at vij of the cloke'¹⁹—that is, to combine the notices, on Friday, 17 June 1440; so that the gatherings at the place of execution were put down within a month.

A letter to Hus purporting to be from an Englishman named Richard has long been known,²⁰ but the signature 'Ricus [*sic*] Vuychewitze,' from its Bohemian ring, led Lechler²¹ to suspect his nationality. A newer text, however, printed by Constantin von Höfler,²² gives 'Richardus Vitze;' and it is clear, as Dr. Loserth remarks, that the longer form is made up out of 'Wyche' combined with a gloss 'Wicze' to help Bohemians in the pronunciation. The further change of *cz* into *tz* will not surprise those who are familiar with the handwriting of the time. One manuscript has 'Richardus Wigleph,'²³ which is a manifest attempt to make an unknown English name intelligible by a bold identification with another which was very well known and, in an abbreviated form,

¹³ *Mittheil.*, ubi supra, p. 269.

¹⁴ *Johann von Wiclif*, ii. 351; cf. p. 320.

¹⁵ *Acts and Monuments*, ed. 1855, iii. 703.

¹⁶ Cf. Fabyan's *Chronicles* (ed. Ellis, 1811), p. 602.

¹⁷ *Engl. Chron. of Rich. II.*, &c. (ed. J. S. Davies, Camden Society, 1856), p. 56.

¹⁸ *Coll. of a Citizen of London* (ed. J. Gairdner, Camden Society, 1876), p. 183.

¹⁹ *Three Fifteenth-Cent. Chron.* (ed. J. Gairdner, Camden Society, 1880), p. 63.

²⁰ *Joh. Hus Hist. et Monum.* (Nuremberg, 1558), i. f. ci.

²¹ *Johann von Wiclif*, ii. 351, n. 3.

²² *Geschichtschreiber der Husitischen Bewegung*, ii. (*Font. Rer. Austriac.*, Ser. iv. 1865), pp. 210 ff. There was no reason why the editor should have changed the *infirmus sacerdotum* in the signature into *infirmus sacerdotum*. If this was the reading of his manuscript, he should have corrected it.

²³ *Mittheil.*, ubi supra, p. 260.

not very dissimilar. The letter was written in London on 8 September: in Höfler's edition it bears no date of year; but the old text gives 1410, which is certainly right. Hus's reply, addressed simply to 'Richard,' has been printed both by Höfler (pp. 212 ff.) and by Palacký.²⁴

Of greater interest is the fact that in this same year, and on the same day as Wyche—Dr. Loserth has omitted to call attention to this latter coincidence—Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham, also wrote, from his castle of Cooling, in Kent, a letter, which Dr. Loserth now prints for the first time,²⁵ to members of the reforming party at Prague,²⁶ to Wok of Waldstein, or in his absence to Zdislaw of Zwierżeticz. If, as the editor thinks, this letter of 8 Sept. shows knowledge of the events at Prague following the burning of Wycliffe's books from 27 July to 6 August, it certainly affords remarkable evidence of the brisk intercommunication between the Wycliffites at home and in Bohemia. The allusion, however, need not, perhaps, be pressed so closely; in any case it need not refer to any events later than Zdislaw's excommunication on 18 July.²⁷ Dr. Loserth observes that Oldcastle's letter contains no mention of any trouble impending over the English Lollards at the time; and yet, he says, *die Prozesse gegen ihn begannen 1410, in demselben Jahre also von welchem . . . das Schreiben Sir Johns datirt ist.*²⁸ This is not quite correct. The archbishop of Canterbury had on the previous 3 April laid the church of Cooling under an interdict on account of the unlicensed preaching of one John, a chaplain, who, we may take it, was maintained by Oldcastle and probably lived in his house; but immediately afterwards, 5 April, in order to permit the marriage of Oldcastle's daughter with Sir Thomas Broke, the interdict was suspended for three days, *ob reverentiam nobilitatis utriusque personae*, and not much later—the date is not given—was relaxed altogether.²⁹ Lechler, to whom Dr. Loserth refers, has quite rightly said that the interdict was imposed *ohne auch nur ein Wort der Rüge wider den Lord selbst laut werden zu lassen.*³⁰ There are, indeed, no reasons for believing that any measures were taken against Oldcastle personally so long as Henry IV lived.³¹

The question arises, How was the intercourse between the reformers in England and Bohemia carried on? Both Wyche and Oldcastle say expressly that they received tidings from brethren, coming unmistakably from Prague, who informed them of the progress of the reforming movement there. Can we point to any

²⁴ *Docum. Mag. Joh. Hus*, pp. 12 ff.

²⁵ *Mittheil.*, ubi supra, pp. 266 f.

²⁶ The subscription is *per Johannem Oldcastellis, summi de Cobham, where I take summi to be a scriptural error for dominum (sumi for dñm).*

²⁷ *Docum. Mag. Joh. Hus*, pp. 397 ff.

²⁸ *Mittheil.*, ubi supra, p. 263.

²⁹ Wilkins, *Concil. Magn. Brit.* iii. 329-31.

³⁰ *Joh. von Wiclif*, ii. 81.

³¹ *Cf. ibid.* pp. 80, 82.

particular persons who brought news and letters from the one country to the other? The general fact that many Bohemians came to England after the marriage of Richard II with Ann of Luxemburg in 1382 is of course well known,³² and there were Czech students at Oxford from an earlier time onwards. Dr. Loserth has before now called attention to the endowment by Adalbert Ranconis in 1388 of a fund for the benefit of Bohemian students in arts or theology at Paris or Oxford.³³ But when we come to ask for the names of individual students we can only cite Jerom of Prague, Nicolas Faulfisch, and George of Kniehnicz. And conversely we hear of no English Lollard by name in Bohemia until the later stages of the Hussite movement. It is, therefore, of some interest that Dr. Loserth has discovered that a certain Scotsman, Quintin Folkhyrde, wrote Lollard tracts which were carried out to Prague in 1410, possibly by the hands of the same bearer as the two letters of 8 Sept. of Wyche to Hus and of Oldcastle to Wok of Waldstein. The tracts, four in number, which are preserved in a Prague manuscript, are introduced by the words, *Hec sunt nova Scoocie anno 1410 Pragam portata. Est quidam armiger, nomine Quintinus Folkhyrde, id est, pastor populi; qui insurgit in causa Dei manu forti, equitando per patrias et palam publicando in materna lingua ista que secuntur.*³⁴ They proceed in the first person. To Dr. Loserth's account of their contents I am able to add a fact which shows the popularity they obtained in Bohemia; namely, that they were translated into Czech and may be found in the Vienna manuscript 4916. The knowledge of this book I owe to Herr Ferdinand Menčik, of the imperial library at Vienna, who kindly showed it to me in January 1889, and interpreted enough of it for me to be able to identify it with confidence with the work described by Dr. Loserth.³⁵ It belongs to the early part of the fifteenth century, and contains besides letters of Hus in Czech, &c. Dr. Loserth is probably right in taking the second letter to be addressed to the bishop of Glasgow, though 'Glatonensi' in the Latin is puzzling, and 'Glocoveskemo' in the Czech more puzzling still. All attempts which I have made to track Quintin Folkhyrde (if Folkhyrde be really a surname) in Scotland have failed.

Dr. Loserth concludes the article which has furnished the text of these remarks of mine by printing a second letter from Oldcastle, addressed to King Wenceslaus and dated from London

³² Cf. Lechler, ii. 111 ff.

³³ *Hus und Wiclif*, p. 55; *Mittheil.*, ubi supra, p. 256.

³⁴ *Mittheil.*, ubi supra, p. 261, n. 2.

³⁵ The first sentence agrees with that quoted from the Latin (but without naming the year 1410). The subscription to the last letter also agrees, as do the addresses of all the letters.

en 7 Sept.; the year Dr. Loserth gives reasons for believing to be 1418. It affords further evidence of the intercourse between England and Bohemia, since Oldcastle speaks of having heard by letter from Hus and others of the king's continued attachment to the reformers.

REGINALD L. POOLE.

A CONTEMPORARY ORATION ON POPE ALEXANDER VI.

ON 16 Sept. 1503 Burchardus records in his diary that Alexius Celadenus or Celadonius, bishop of Gallipoli, delivered a discourse to the cardinals about to enter into conclave for the election of a successor to Pope Alexander VI. *Et fuit tediosa et longa oratio.* Burchardus's most recent editor, Thuasne, states that this oration exists in manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale, and adds, *Bien qu'il ne soit pas dépourvu d'une certaine habileté, vu la difficulté du sujet, sa lecture confirme pleinement les épithètes de Burchard.* He omits to observe that, granting that the discourse may have been too long for the cardinals, the longer the better for us, inasmuch as it contains an account of Pope Alexander of almost unique value, not merely as the judgment of a contemporary, but as delivered in public before an audience of contemporaries, whose station in the church had brought them into almost daily intercourse with the deceased pope, and before whom any serious misrepresentation would have been impossible. It is incomprehensible how he should have failed to reprint an historical testimony of such importance, having it under his own eyes. Fortunately the omission can be repaired by favour of a circumstance unknown to him and to all other writers on the Borgias—the existence of the oration in print. It was printed, no doubt immediately after its delivery, without specification of place or the printer's name, but, as would appear by the type in Rome, and the only copy known to have occurred hitherto has just been purchased by the British Museum.

No startling novelty is to be looked for in the remarks of Celadenus, although some minor facts of interest come to light. Their value consists in the full confirmation of the sane and impartial view of Alexander taken by the bishop of Peterborough, and their refutation alike of the modern Roman catholic apologists who have endeavoured to rehabilitate the pope's moral character and of the depreciatory estimate of him as a sovereign formed by Villari, Gregorovius, and other modern writers of liberal prepossessions. Celadenus is, on the one hand, obviously acquainted with the existence of crimes and grave scandals, which he cleverly avoids enumerating, by assuming their universal notoriety. The remainder of his oration, moreover, is full of oblique reflections upon the defunct pope, and exhortations regarding the choice of a successor which