

# THE ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW

EDITED BY

REGINALD L. POOLE, M.A., LL.D., Litt.D.

KEEPER OF THE ARCHIVES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD  
AND FELLOW OF MAGDALEN COLLEGE AND OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY

VOLUME XXX.

1915

STANFORD LIBRARY



LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK, BOMBAY AND CALCUTTA

1915

L.

*The Authorities for the Case of Richard Hunne (1514-15)*

MOST accounts of the case of Richard Hunne are based upon those given in Hall's Chronicle<sup>1</sup> and Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*.<sup>2</sup> Both these writers, however, reproduced the greater part of an anonymous tract,<sup>3</sup> which in the original has a preface containing an allusion to the death of Tyndale, and therefore cannot be earlier than 1536.<sup>4</sup> Hall, who includes in the list of authors from whose works he derived his chronicle, 'diuers Pamphlettes, the names of whom are to moste menne unknowen,' reprinted this one almost in full, though not accurately;<sup>5</sup> and Foxe transcribed Hall's version.<sup>6</sup> One of the most serious errors in that version occurs in a sentence very often quoted,<sup>7</sup> part of a letter ascribed to the bishop of London, which in the original runs :

... assured am I if my Chaunceler be tryed by any xij. men in Londõ they be so maliciouſlie set in fauore hereticae prauitatis / that is ar so set upon the fauoure of heresie / y<sup>t</sup> they will cast and condemne my clarcke / thought he war as innocent as Abel.

Hall, or his printer, changed 'my' into 'any', and the mistake has remained current ever since.

Much that has been written, not only on Hunne's case, but on the problem of the amount of 'heretical pravity' existing in England at the beginning of the reign of Henry VIII is based directly or indirectly upon this tract; hence the question of its value as evidence is of some importance. One would be inclined to regard as of no value whatever the evidence of an anonymous pamphlet published more than twenty years after the events of

<sup>1</sup> Under the year 6 Henry VIII.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. iv, pp. 183 *seqq.* of any one of the four complete editions published between 1837 and 1877, and variously known as Cattley's or Townsend's or Pratt's.

<sup>3</sup> I pointed this out some years ago in the *Victoria History of London*, i. 247.

<sup>4</sup> *The enquirie and verditte of the quest panneld of the death of Richard Hune wick was founde hanged in Lolars tower.* I have discussed the date of this tract and given some bibliographical details in *The Library*, April 1914, p. 220. Only three or four copies are known to exist: two (one imperfect) in the British Museum, one in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and part of one in that of St. Paul's Cathedral. All are of the same edition. The preface is an interesting expression of anti-clerical feeling at a time when it was possible to write: 'The light is now broken forth (thankes be to the Lorde) mager there beardes/and they brought in no small feare of sodaine ruine of their kingdome/yet by cause they se the world hath not fully forsaken their deceyuable doctrine in all places/they hope of a chaunge/and haue their secrete conspirisies deuised with all sutteltie to bryng that to pas.'

<sup>5</sup> He omitted the preface and the marginal comments, and his version differs from the original in many details of wording besides those noticed.

<sup>6</sup> In the first edition of the *Acts and Monuments* (1563) pp. 390 *seqq.* He made some alterations in that of 1570 (ii. 934 *seqq.*), which are adopted in those of 1837-77 (iv. 190 *seqq.*).

<sup>7</sup> The authority for it now usually given is *Letters and Papers, Henry VIII*, II, no. 2, which summarizes Foxe's version of the bishop's letter.

which it treats, even if its internal discrepancies had not been declared inexplicable by Gairdner,<sup>8</sup> after a close examination of the text. But some testimony in favour of two of its sections is furnished by the records of the Corporation of London.<sup>9</sup> An entry in the minutes of the Court of Aldermen<sup>10</sup> during the mayoralty of George Monoux (November 1514–15) runs as follows :

Martis xvij<sup>o</sup> die aprilis

ñ Recorder Capell Haddon Aylemer Jenyns Atcheley Boteler Rest Exmewe  
Brugge Milburn Shelton Fenrother Grey Aleyn Yerford Mundy Vicecomites.

for a  
communicacion  
w<sup>t</sup> the Bysshop  
of london.

ñ Capell  
ñ Haddon  
ñ Recorder  
ñ Brugge  
ñ Milburn  
The Commen Clerk

Named & appoynted by this Court to speke w<sup>t</sup> the Bisshop of London for certeyn perillous & haynous wordes as ben surmysed be hym to be spoken of the hole body of the Citie touchyng heresy specified in a Copy of a letter supposed to be wreton by the seyd Bysshop

This shows that words not unlike those of the tract were in fact attributed to Bishop Fitzjames in April 1515.<sup>11</sup> Also the details given in the coroner's 'Inquisition' with which the tract concludes are in accordance with the customs of the city<sup>12</sup> regarding the number of jurors and their impanelling from particular wards—matters on which a writer trying to forge such a document would be very likely to go wrong.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, the

<sup>8</sup> *The English Church in the Sixteenth Century*, c. iii, pp. 29–30 and *passim*. It is, however, clear, from the use that Gairdner himself, in his reconstruction of the story, made of the part of Hall's Chronicle consisting of the tract, that he did not regard its evidence as altogether worthless, although his reasoning appears to lead to that conclusion. As he was unaware of the existence of the tract, he made Hall responsible for its defects : see pp. 27 and 40.

<sup>9</sup> My acquaintance with these records is but superficial, and it is probable that an exhaustive search among them would throw further light upon Hunne's case.

<sup>10</sup> Repertory III, fo. 17'. This entry has already been noticed in the *Victoria History of London*, i. 247, where the date 1517 should be 1515.

<sup>11</sup> Gairdner (*op. cit.*, p. 30) notices that the heading of this section of the tract describes Wolsey as cardinal, and must therefore be later than September 1515. But it may well have been added after that date, either as an endorsement on the original or by the compiler of the tract.

<sup>12</sup> For these see R. R. Sharpe, *Calendar of Coroners' Rolls*, p. xiv. The rolls for the sixteenth century have disappeared, except one dated 1590 (*ibid.* p. vii, note). Mr. A. H. Thomas, Dr. Sharpe's successor as records clerk, pointed out to me that the first phrase of the document in the tract, 'The inquisiciõs intendend také . . .' must in the original have read 'The inquisition indented, taken . . .', and that with this correction its form is quite regular, except that it does not contain the customary last clause about the property of the murderer (see G. Jacob, *New Law Dictionary*, ed. 1739, under 'Coroner'). It is curious that Hall, lawyer as he was, did not notice this : he or his printer altered the phrase to 'intendid and taken.'

<sup>13</sup> Hall himself contradicts the tract he was about to reprint by stating 'xii. men were charged before the Coronour.'

discrepancies noted by Gairdner<sup>14</sup> would disappear if the first section of the tract, which he was led by its opening words to regard as the report of the jury drawn up at the inquest held in December 1514, could be dated two or three months later. Now Sir Thomas More says<sup>15</sup> that the 'matter was many tymes in sundry places examyned', especially one day at Baynard's Castle before 'dyuers grete lordes spyrytuall and temporall and other of the kynges honourable counsayle', and Hall, that the jurors were 'many tymes . . . wyth the kynges counsayll and hard their opynions'. This suggests that they were ordered to reconsider their verdict, and if so the compiler of the tract may have been using the final report, very badly drafted, which they made to the council, and in which were combined a statement of the reasons for their original decision with copies of depositions afterwards taken which appeared to provide further justification for it.<sup>16</sup>

It thus seems not improbable that the tract is a collection of genuine documents, with a preface and marginal notes added by the compiler. But it cannot be assumed that even in his version, much less in those of Hall and Foxe, they are accurately printed; and their statements, made at a time when the city was overwhelmed by a wave of excitement and party clamour, cannot be accepted without reserve. Hence the evidence of the tract is at best third rate, and might well be neglected in any general consideration of the state of religion in England at the beginning of the sixteenth century. It is not necessary even in dealing with the special case of Richard Hunne, since enough independent material exists for a coherent account of that, which might be based mainly upon records, some original, others, though only preserved in the pages of Foxe, almost certainly genuine.

Such an account would have to begin with some reference to three movements in which Hunne was involved: the attacks on ecclesiastical jurisdiction which culminated in the Parliament of 1515, the strife between the London citizens and their clergy on the question of offerings, and the undercurrent of Lollardy. For the first it is probable that most of the authorities, except the Journals of Parliament, are mentioned in vols. i and ii of the *Letters and Papers, Henry VIII*; but other material may exist, for example among the judicial and administrative records not included in that collection. For the second there is much material in

<sup>14</sup> These are even more serious than appeared in the version he was using, for in the tract itself one of the depositions is dated 14 February 1514-15—a detail omitted by Hall and consequently by Foxe.

<sup>15</sup> *Dyaloge*, book iii, ch. xv.

<sup>16</sup> Compare their allusions to 'my Lorde of Londons booke' (i. e. statement of the case), which could not have been drawn up till after the inquest, and to a witness whom the summoner, Charles Joseph, had already 'brought before the kynges counsell'.

the City records,<sup>17</sup> some in those of the ecclesiastical courts of the diocese of London,<sup>18</sup> two documents in the *Letters and Papers*, i, no. 5725 (i)<sup>19</sup> and ii, no. 1315.<sup>20</sup> For Lollardy in London at this period there are the entries in the Episcopal Register relating to cases in 1509 and 1511, of which those concerning Joan Baker, whom Hunne was accused of defending, are printed below (no. 1);<sup>21</sup> and there is also a good deal of scattered information<sup>22</sup> to be gathered from Foxe, the London chroniclers, the Chancery Significations at the Record Office, and the records of ecclesiastical courts.

For the trial of Hunne there is a series of five documents, four of which, however, appear to be extant only in the pages of Foxe.<sup>23</sup> In using them one has to remember that his summaries are trustworthy only up to a certain point: he does not insert what is not in the original, but he often omits particulars there given, especially charges accusing the heretics of opinions he did not share.<sup>24</sup> (1) A summary of the articles objected against Hunne when he appeared before the bishop of London, 2 December 1515. (2) A summary of a notice read by the preacher at Paul's Cross the Sunday after his death (i. e. 10 December), containing additional articles collected from the prologue of his English Bible.<sup>25</sup> (3) A summary of the rules drawn up for the

<sup>17</sup> References to some of this will be found in the *Victoria History of London*, i. 249-50.

<sup>18</sup> Extracts from these were printed in 1847 by Archdeacon W. H. Hale, in *A Series of Precedents and Proceedings, 1475-1640*; see pp. 64-87. Compare Colet's *Convocation Sermon of 1512*.

<sup>19</sup> The original of this cannot now be found at the Record Office.

<sup>20</sup> This is the same document as vol. i, no. 5725 (ii), and it may be connected with the Parliament of 1512-14 instead of that of 1515, and so be an antecedent instead of a consequence of Hunne's case.

<sup>21</sup> Those concerning the other case, that of Elizabeth Sampson, are printed in *The Reign of Henry VII from Contemporary Sources* (edited by A. F. Pollard), iii. 242-6.

<sup>22</sup> I collected some, but by no means all, of this in the *Victoria History of London*, i. 234-8.

<sup>23</sup> *Acts and Monuments* (ed. 1837-77), iv. 183-4, 186-90.

<sup>24</sup> See *ibid.* pp. 174-5. Foxe's summary of the charges against Elizabeth Sampson (*ibid.* p. 126) omits those accusing her of erroneous belief with regard to the ascension of Christ and the resurrection at the Last Day.

<sup>25</sup> All of these were evidently derived from the General Prologue prefixed to some of the existing copies of what is usually called 'the second Wycliffite version' (see the *Church Quarterly Review*, li (1901), 291-6), though either Hunne's gloss, or the compiler of the articles, or Foxe in summarizing them, made a statement about the sacrament of the altar more definitely 'heretical' than those in the original. It has been suggested that a manuscript of that version now in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (see Dr. M. R. James's *Catalogue*, i. 336) is the actual copy that belonged to Hunne, on the ground that certain passages marked, in a hand said to be that of Blythe, 'bishop of Lichfield and Coventry from 1503 to 1530, correspond to some of those collected by his accusers. But Blythe is nowhere mentioned (though other bishops besides Fitzjames are) in connexion with Hunne's case; and Mrs. W. J. Harrison, who has kindly examined the manuscript for me, finds that the correspondence is by no means so exact as to warrant such a deduction. Some of the passages which are the originals of the thirteen articles in Foxe's summary are not

procedure at his condemnation, 16 December. (4) The bishop's sentence against him, which gives a good deal of information about the case. (5) The bishop's letter relinquishing his body to the secular power (16 December), lately discovered by Miss E. J. B. Reid at the Record Office, and printed in full below (no. II).

These documents, however, deal only with the case of heresy : for the circumstances of Hunne's death and the agitation which followed the authorities are of a different character. The earliest is a letter dated 3 March 1514-15 to the papal collector for England, Cardinal Hadrian de Corneto, from his London representative, Polydore Vergil, who was trying to prevent Ammonius from securing the collectorship. In the well-known summary of this in the *Letters and Papers, Henry VIII*, ii, no. 215, the allusion to Hunne is barely recognizable and appears disconnected from the rest of the letter, but in the original<sup>26</sup> the connexion is clear. The unseemly contest had been going on for some time ; Ammonius had begun to grant dispensations, in spite of an inhibition,<sup>27</sup> and had lately been aided by papal briefs to the king and the bishop of Winchester (Fox) in one of which were ' multa inconsiderate explicata que possent gignere in Ecclesia dei scandalum ingens '. The king and Wolsey were on his side, but Fox supported Polydore Vergil, and before 15 February had written in reply to the Pope

bonas literas quibus palam docuit quanta afficiamur iniuria, quantumque scandalum ex ista re hic ortum sit. Et presertim nunc propter unum hereticum nuper a londoniense episcopo poena mortis affectum populo passim in Clerum reclamante, et iam iam seiviente, nisi Maiestas Regia furorem comperceret.

The first printed account of Hunne's case is in the second edition of the contemporary chronicle in Richard Arnold's *Customs of London*, c. 1521. There are references to it in Simon Fish's *Supplicacyon for the Beggars* (c. 1528) and Sir Thomas More's *Supplicacyon of Soulys*. In More's *Dyaloge* a whole chapter is devoted to a discussion of it, which is mentioned in Tyndale's *Answer* (1531). All these sources of information are of course independent of the tract, and so probably is the account in Wriothesley's chronicle. Later than the tract are the two paragraphs introducing the reprint of it in Hall's chronicle (1542 ?); the account in book xxvii of Polydore Vergil's history

marked, and there are marks against many which are not represented there. Hunne's Bible was popularly supposed to have been destroyed with his body, but More (*Dyaloge*, book iii, ch. xv) states, ' whyther the boke be burned or secretly kepte I can not surely saye.'

<sup>26</sup> Cotton MS. Vitellius B. ii, fo. 123 (old numbering : 148 new). Some words missing in the sentences quoted have been supplied from Ammonius's copy on fo. 127 (154).

<sup>27</sup> The ' certain legal documents ' of the *Letters and Papers* include ' unam dispensationem ab harenario post inhibitionem factam, insolenter concessam '.

(1555),<sup>28</sup> which is particularly interesting as giving the impression left upon the mind of a foreigner who was living in London at the time; and the few additions (apparently gathered from papers belonging to Hunne's grandson)<sup>29</sup> made by Foxe in the second edition of the *Actes and Monumentes* (1570) to the information he derived from Hall (including the tract) and from the London Episcopal Registers. One of these additions refers to the efforts made to bring about the restoration of Hunne's property (which would have been forfeited to the king as that of a condemned heretic<sup>30</sup>) to his children. With this object two bills were introduced into parliament in the spring of 1515. The entries concerning them are very inaccurately printed in the *Journals of the House of Lords*, but the one in which the sense is most seriously affected has lately been printed from the manuscript by Professor A. F. Pollard.<sup>31</sup> Two documents at the Record Office<sup>32</sup> throw some light upon this aspect of the case: a grant dated 1523 to Hunne's daughter, Margaret Whaplod, and her husband, of all her father's property; and a petition to Cromwell, not earlier than 1536, from which it appears that she and her family were then in poverty. Her husband seems to have been administering some at least of the property about 1529,<sup>33</sup> but it is possible that the family did not recover it all, and that an endeavour to obtain redress in another direction led to the composition of an undated letter, printed by Foxe, purporting to be a royal order to Dr. Horsey to compensate Hunne's children for the death of their father and the waste of his goods. Brewer doubted and Gairdner denied the authenticity of this, but the latter suggested that it may have been a draft to which it was desired to obtain the king's signature.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>28</sup> p. 645.

<sup>29</sup> *Acts and Monumentes* (editions 1837-77) iv. 198.

<sup>30</sup> By 2 Henry V, ch. 7. If it had been decided that Hunne committed suicide, the property would have been forfeited to the city (*Historical Charters of the City of London*, edited by W. de G. Birch, p. 53). On the other hand, unless he were protected by 'benefit of clergy', Dr. Horsey's goods would have been similarly forfeited if he had been convicted of murdering Hunne, and by the custom of the city they ought to have been seized and put in charge of one of the sheriffs after the inquest. See above, p. 478, n. 12.

<sup>31</sup> *Transactions of the Royal Hist. Soc.*, 3rd series, viii. 37-8. Professor Pollard has pointed out to me that Gairdner (*op. cit.* p. 40) misunderstood the entry for 3 April. The king's signature was not 'premature', since the bill affected his interests, and 'deliberetur' here means 'should be discharged' (i. e. thrown out).

<sup>32</sup> Summarized in *Letters and Papers, Henry VIII*, III. ii, no. 3062 (4) and vol. xv, no. 1029 (65). The editors of Foxe (Townsend's and Pratt's editions, iv. 725) refer to the latter by its number under the old classification, among the Chapter House Papers.

<sup>33</sup> Foxe, v. 27.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.* iv. 197-8; *Letters and Papers, Henry VIII*, II, no. 3, n.; *The English Church in the Sixteenth Century*, pp. 39-40. It is to be regretted that this letter, if admitted to the *Letters and Papers* at all, was inserted as early as 1515. Foxe was, of course, wrong in describing it as a warrant 'to redeliver all the said goods', since Hunne's property could not in any case have fallen into the hands of Dr. Horsey.

One more authority remains to be considered : Keilwey's well-known account of the controversy in 1514-15 about the privilege of benefit of clergy,<sup>35</sup> by the use of which Horsey ' fuit preserve hors del temporals maines . . . iesques a le temps que le grand rumor del dit Hunne fuit ascunment abate, et que ils ussent fait son peace oue le roy pur le dit murder.'<sup>36</sup> This seems to have been accepted almost without qualification by F. W. Maitland,<sup>37</sup> whose verdict on such a point can hardly be questioned ; but it may be noticed that the dates indicated in it are difficult to reconcile with those to be gathered from other sources for the events of the years 1514 and 1515.

Nevertheless, however doubtful the chronological details may be, it is certain that it was during the same parliament as discussed the question whether Hunne was murdered in a bishop's prison that

periculosissime seditioes exorte sunt inter Clericum et Secularem Potestatem, super Libertatibus Ecclesiasticis, quodam fratre Minore nomine Standishe omnium malorum ministro ac stimulatore.<sup>38</sup>

The coincidence was not merely one of time. Standish was doubtless encouraged to maintain an opinion contrary to that of the ' spirituality ' in general by the knowledge that he had the city behind him. At least twice within the last century friars had been accused of heresy for supporting the citizens in their quarrels with the ' curates ' or parochial clergy,<sup>39</sup> and Hunne's case was an incident in such a contest. Moreover, Standish was defending an act which limited the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts, and Hunne had tried to invoke the statute of Praemunire against one of those courts, while the circumstances of his death had involved in the gravest suspicion two of their officials. It is significant that the contemporary chronicler Arnold, himself a London citizen, specially mentions ' the temperall Lawe ' as responsible for the verdict of the inquest, while ' the spirituall Lawe ' condemned Hunne as a heretic. Probably the mass of his fellow citizens never regarded him as a heretic at all, in spite of the pains their bishop took to convince them. The impression remaining in London may be summed up in the words of the later chronicler Wriothesley : ' Hunn . . . was made an heretique for

<sup>35</sup> *Relationes quorundam Casuum* (1602), fo. 180'-185'.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.* fo. 185'.

<sup>37</sup> *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England*, pp. 87-9. Also by Gairdner, *op. cit.*, p. 43. But cf. Brewer, *Letters and Papers, Henry VIII*, ii. no. 1313, n. In his introduction, however (pp. ccxxii *seqq.*), Brewer also seems to accept the report as substantially accurate.

<sup>38</sup> *Journals of the House of Lords*, i. 57; cf. *Letters and Papers, Henry VIII*, ii. i, no. 1312 (vi).

<sup>39</sup> *Victoria History of London*, i. 248, 249; cf. 238.



suinge a Praemunire.'<sup>40</sup> His suit would have been watched and discussed as a test case, the result of which affected every one of the citizens ;<sup>41</sup> he, like Standish, was a champion in whose fate they were all interested. Significant, too, is the personal intervention of Henry VIII in the affair,<sup>42</sup> for it may be that the unsuccessful effort made by a London citizen to wield the great weapon of praemunire first suggested to the young king its possibilities in other and mightier hands.<sup>43</sup>

Thus the history of the Reformation in England has to take account of Richard Hunne, not chiefly because of his connexion with the latent Lollardy whose existence may have been not without effect upon its course, nor even because he took a prominent part in that contest between the London clergy and their parishioners which embittered their relations during some of its most critical years : but because his case was an episode in the conflict between the two jurisdictions, spiritual and temporal. It can only be rightly considered in relation both to the case of Standish and to the obscure parliamentary history of the years 1512-15, when began the dissensions which, though stifled for a time by Wolsey, were to end in the complete defeat of the spirituality in the parliament of 1529-36.

E. JEFFRIES DAVIS.

### I.

London Episcopal Register Fitzjames, fo. 25.

*Articuli Crimen heretice pravitatis concernentes contra Johannam Bakar uxorem Gervasii Bakar parochie sancte Margarete in Brigestrete civitatis london' super crimine heresis suspectam obiecti et per eam confessati.*

*First we lay Inquire and aske of the the forsaide Johan that thow art Abydyng and dwellyng within the parishe of saint Margaret in Brigestrete*

<sup>40</sup> *Chronicle* (Camden Soc.), i. 9; cf. Keilwey, *op. cit.*, fo. 182, and Fish, *Supplicacyon for the Beggars* (Early Engl. Text Soc.), pp. 9, 12, and note the pains taken by Sir Thomas More in his *Supplicacyon of Soulys* and *Dyaloge* to deal with this point. More's reiterated assertion that Hunne was cited for heresy before he began the suit of praemunire can be accepted without affecting the argument above, since the accusation of heresy may not have attracted much attention until the praemunire suit had brought him into public notice. But compare the assertion in the bishop's sentence (Foxe, iv. 189) that when he was first summoned before convocation 'apprehendi non potuit'. Possibly the officials dared not arrest him just then.

<sup>41</sup> Compare what More says in the *Dyaloge* of Hunne's hope to become famous by the result of the praemunire suit, 'and haue his matter in the yeres and termes called Hunnes case.'

<sup>42</sup> See Polydore Vergil's letter, *supra*, p. 481; his *Anglicae Historiae Libri xxvii* (1555), p. 645; More's *Dyaloge*, book III, ch. xv; Hall, *Chronicle* (ed. 1809), p. 573.

<sup>43</sup> A few months later the judges decided that the members of convocation who had taken proceedings against Standish "fueront en le case del Premunire facias etc." Keilwey, *op. cit.*, fo. 184<sup>r</sup>.

of london and by reason thereof, art of my forsaid lorde of london diocese and iurisdiction, fatetur

*Also* we lay and purpose to the that thou art cristenyd and expresly professid unto the holy faith of Criste and to the determinacions of our moder holy church And by reason of this holy sacrament of Baptyme and profession unto the saide holy Faith and religion of crist, thou hast utterly renuncied all manor of false errors, erronyows doctryns and opynyons contrary and a gaynst the determinacions of our moder holy church, fatetur hunc articulum & omnia & singula in eodem contenta

*Also* we lay and object a gaynst the that it is not lefull for the nor eny other and most specially lay person for to make dowghtes reason or dispute pryvvyly or opynly of the faith of cristie or of the determinacions of our moder holy church or of the absolute power of our holy father the pope or for to move or holde ony erroneus opinions disputacions or questions a gaynst the determinacions of holy church, fatetur etiam hunc articulum & singula in eodem contenta

*Also* we lay and object a gaynst the, that every cristened person, man and woman, techyng, preching, instructyng upholdyng defendyng or belyvyng of the articules of the Faith and determinacions of our moder holy church, other wyse then our said mother holy church holdith techith prechith instructith upholdith defendith and belyvyth, or makith any new erroneus exposicion determinacion of opinions or pretense lernyng obstinatly contrary unto the saide Articules and determinacions of holy church is an heretik and as an heretyk to be takyn holden and reputed, ad hunc articulum respondet affirmative

*Also* we lay and objecte to the and a gaynst the that every heretike so frowardly erroneusly and obstinatly belevyng theching preching or defendyng and dampnably goyng from the trew determinacions of our moder holy church is in the same dede doyng excommunicat and acursed be the law, fatetur eciam hunc articulum & omnia & singula contenta eiusdem

*Also* we lay and object a gayn the that thou knowist or belevyst that in the parish of saynt Margaret a fore said and in other placis of the city of london thou art sore detecte suspecte and defamyd a pon certyn errors and false opinions of heresy as heraftur doth folow, Ad hunc articulum respondet quod non novit nec credit quod est diffamata vel suspecta de heresi infra parochiam sancte Margarete predictam vel alibi, et si sit aliqua fama sive infamia contra eam laborans in & de premissis quod non fatetur dicit illa infamia incepit ex malis dictis & relacionibus cujusdam mulieris vocate Odiam Wiff & curati dicte ecclesie parrochie sancte margarete

*Also* we lay and object to the that it belongith to my lorde of london ordinary in this behalf and his officers to examyn correcte and reforme such maters and to punyshe them that be Gilte and culpabill in such maters and crimes and all other, fatetur eciam hunc articulum & omnia contenta eiusdem

*Also* we lay and objecte A genst the that thou said to sir John Cawode then beyng parische prist of saint Margaretes a for said in the dwellyng hous their the xvij day of September last past that thou wolde do no

more reverence to the Crucifyx in the church then thow wold do to a dogg for thei be but stockes and stones etc prout in articulis contra eam porrectis & propositis

fo. 25 b

*This be* the Articuls and opinions that Johan Bakar the wif of Gervis Bakar Citezin and taylor of london inhabitant in the parishe of sainte Margarettes in Brigestret of london did holde

*First* the saide Johan Bakar saide to sir John Cawode prest then beyng parishe prest of sainte Margaret a bove saide in hur dwellyng hous ther the xvij day of September last past that she wold do no more reverence to the crucifix in the churche then she wold do to a dogg for thei be but stockes and stones

*Also* she saide unto the saide John Cawod prest that sche was sory that she had gon in so many pilgurmages as to saint Saviors and dyverse other pilgurmages, And they beyng but mawmentes and false goddes

*Also* Wher as oon Thomas Blake of london Taylor lyyng in hys deth bed shuld have had the crucifyx broght and laide be fore hym as the laudable custome is in the citie, the said John<sup>44</sup> reportid the saide wordes be fore the saide preest ther then present, that the said crucifix was not to gif confidence nor trust in but as a fals god

*Also* the said Johan reported be fore the said priste that she colde here a better sermond at home in hur howse than any doctor or priste colde make at poules crosse or any other place

*Also* the said Johan affirmith that she knew the sacrament of the Alter or any other of the sacramentes better then any curat or prest did

*Also* Wher as the said prest and the said Johan wer in comunicacion of the brennyng of the lady yong for suche opinions as she toke the said Johan saide that she dyed a martir be fore god and she be sought god that she myght dy no wors then she did, And then the said sir John said she shulde be brent as she was and as many as takyth hur opinions

*Also* Wer as oon Sampsons Wiff dwellyng in aldermanbury late was detecte for heresy the said Johan said that she was punyshed for sayng the trewth

*Also* the said Johan affirmyth that ther shall never prest cum butte oon

*Also* she holdyth oppinion that our holy father the pope hath no pooer to gif no pardon for the salvacion of mannys soule with many other hereticall oppinions which she will be fownd within the examnyng of hur.

*Abiuracio dicte Iohanne  
Bakar de & super articulis predictis*

*In the name* of god Amen Be fore Almyghty god the father the sonne the holy gost And all the holy cumpany of hevyn and you master Thomas Heede Doctor of law And Commyssary to the most reverent Fader in god lord Richarde by the sufferance of god Bishop of london myne Ordinary and diocesan my Juge in this behalf sufficiently deputyd and ordeyneyd I Johan Bakar otherwise callid Gervis the wiff of Gervis Barker<sup>45</sup> of the

<sup>44</sup> Sic in Register (for *Johan*).

<sup>45</sup> Sic in Register.

parishe of saint Margaret in brigestrete other wise callid saint Margarettes in new Fyshe strete of the city of london of my fogsaide lordes diocese and jurisdiction Knowlege and opynly confesse that I wrechid Synner lyke no trew cristen woman erroneusly and wikkydly contrary unto the Faith of criste and contrary to the laws ordinance and determinacions of holy church fo. 26 oft and many tymys have spokyn publiced rehersed and techid many and dyvers erroneus and dampnable opinions and poyntes And in especiall thes poyntes folowing that is to say that I have said publishid and rehersed that the Images of saintes in the church of god were but ydolls and not to be worshippid nor honorid And also that the Images of the holy Crucifyx set up in the church of godd for the remembrance & representacion of cristes holy passion and ower redempcion was not to gef truste ne confidence in ne to be hadd in honor and reverence And also that [I]<sup>46</sup> ofte & many tymys have spokyn rehersed and tawght many and dyvers oppinions a gaynst goyng of pilgremages unto Images of saintes affermyng myself to be sory that I had goon so many ways in pilgremages as I had doon And also I have spokyn a gayn offeryng to be made unto the Images affermyng that the Images in the church be set up but of covetesnes of prystes and to make them riche Thes forsaid opinions dampnable in especiall be me confessid with all other in generall a gayns me provyd with all other here before you Master Thomas heed doctor & commissary before said I utterly forsake all and iche of them and synguler theis my forsaid wyckkyd saynges and oppinions in especiall and all other in generall And do renounce forswere and abjure them and every of them with all oder for ever more Promittyng and I promitt be this writen boke and the holy contentes of the same by my<sup>47</sup> here bodely and corporally tochid with my hand and kyssid with my mowth my self never to returne to them or any of them nor fall to any other nor to reherse or speke any more or to holde and publishe ne teche them or any of them or any other from hens forthe while my lyff shall endure In witnesse herof I have subscribid this present wrytyng and made this signe with my own hand<sup>48</sup>

## II

Chancery Significations. File 126. Public Record Office.

*Excellentissimo* in Christo principi et domino nostro domino Henrico dei gratia Regi Anglie et Francie et domino hibernie, *Ricardus* permissione divina London' Episcopus in eo semper prospere regnare, Cujus Regnum et imperium in eternum manet. Vestre regie celsitudinis maiestati tenore presentium innotescimus et certificamus, Quod Nos in quodam heretice pravitatis inquisitionis negocio contra Ricardum Hune, de parochia Sancte Margarete in Brigestrete London' nostre iurisdictionis dum vixit iam defunctum, nuper ventilato rite et legitime procedentes, Quia per acta actitata deducta exhibita et probata atque per dictum Ricardum dum vixit coram nobis iudicialiter confessata, Comperimus et invenimus, dictum

<sup>46</sup> There is an unintelligible sign here.

<sup>47</sup> Sic in Register.

<sup>48</sup> This entry is undated, but from its place in the Register can be assigned with much probability to May 1511.

Ricardum crimine heresis irretitum et reum fuisse et esse, Ideoque eundem Ricardum defunctum, Ut hereticum pertinacem sive obstinacem impenitentem et super crimine heretice pravitatis reum et convictum condemnavimus et excommunicavimus, Corpusque suum ecclesiastica carere debere sepultura pronunciaimus et declaravimus, Ac ipsum et corpus sive cadaver suum huiusmodi brachio et potestati seculari iuxta sanctiones canonicas et legitimas laudabilemque huius incliti regni vestri hactenus in hac parte usitatam et observatam consuetudinem commisimus et reliquimus nostram per sententiam iusticia id exigente. Vestre igitur regie maiestati humiliter supplicamus quatenus quod reliquum est pro dei amore et fidei catholice conservatione facere, exequi dignemini graciose. *In cuius* rei testimonium Sigillum nostrum presentibus apponi fecimus. Dat' in palacio nostro London' xvi die Mensis Decembris Anno domini millesimo quingentesimo quartodecimo, Et nostre Translationis Anno Nono.<sup>49</sup>

---

*An Assessment of Italian Benefices held by the Cardinals  
for the Turkish War of 1571*

AMONG the letters and documents of Cardinal Giovanni Ricci (now preserved in the Ricci archives at Montepulciano) relative to the time preceding the battle of Lepanto is the following paper (no. I), of which there are two earlier drafts with slight variations. It was written just before the death of Cardinal Carlo Grassi in 1571, one of the chief promoters of the Christian league under Pius V, as appears from his name being entered in the list and a note begun at the end to say that he was dead, but erased. It gives the taxation of the cardinals in 1571, called a Donation, and the accompanying letters (nos. II-IV), which I print in a translation, account for the manner of expenditure of 40,000 other gold scudi imposed by Pius V upon the twelve monastic congregations of Italy for 1571 to pay for arming the pontifical galleys.<sup>1</sup> The first letter was written by Cardinal Ricci at the age of 76, and the summary of the answer at the end of the same sheet in the original is in the handwriting of Cosimo I, grand duke of Tuscany. The Venetians are excluded from the donation, Pius V having granted them a separate decree empowering them to exact 200,000 scudi from their clergy for five years.<sup>2</sup>

A. EDITH HEWETT.

<sup>49</sup> For the text of this document I am indebted to the kindness of Miss Eleanor J. B. Reid.

<sup>1</sup> The congregations were the 'Cassinesi, Certosini, Lateranesi, Olivetani, Camaldolesi, del S.S. Salvatore, Vallombrosani, di San Giorgio d'Alga, Cisterciensi, Girolamini, Crociferi, e Celestini'. Gaetano Moroni, *Dizionario di Erudizione Storico Ecclesiastico*, &c., xix. 186, art. 'Decime'.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*